UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 98th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 130—PART 8

APRIL 26, 1984 TO MAY 8, 1984
(PAGES 10041 TO 11493)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
LAW
LIBRARY
CENTRAL OFFICE

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1984

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 98th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—*Thursday, April 26, 1984*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 24, 1984)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

In a moment of silence, let us remember President and Mrs. Reagan in China.

(A moment of silence was observed.)

Father in Heaven, we thank Thee for the blessing of Senator Jacob Javits' presence with us yesterday. His words resonate in my heart as I compose this prayer. He said, "We need to pray because without it, we would be tyrants or fools." Thank Thee for the wisdom of years and experience with which this beloved Senator speaks. May we take seriously his counsel.

Almighty God, often in this place the Senators find themselves in the vortex of cosmic issues upon which hangs, not simply the common welfare, but the survival of the human race. Help the Senators to accept their inadequacy and need for divine intervention. Help them to see issues from above rather than from within—so they can separate the urgent from the essential—the trivial from the important. Give them grace to *"do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."* (Micah 6:8). In His name and to His glory we pray. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

FORMER SENATOR JAVITS—AN INSPIRATION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I commend the Chaplain once again for the insight and sensitivity of his prayer this morning.

Let me say that I had the occasion to visit with our former colleague, Senator Javits, on the day before yesterday. I am sure all Members here will understand and appreciate the spirit in which I make the next statement and that Senator Javits will as well.

As I sat there next to him—he in his wheelchair, with an electric respirator breathing for him—I began to think that my jet lag from my return trip from the Orient was of such small consequence. And I felt guilty for arising that morning feeling tired and really not wanting to come to work compared to how Jack Javits must feel when he gets up in the morning faced with the terrible physical infirmities that he has.

But after I got past that, I realized that he was talking to me very directly and very seriously about a most important and intricate issue as he proceeded to talk about possible amendments to the War Powers Act. He looked me straight in the eye and said, "Howard, I understand you want to amend the War Powers Act." I said, "Yes, I do. I think that there are defects that we should address that have evolved and developed since it was passed and which were not contemplated."

And then he proceeded to speak in the most eloquent, the most intelligent, and the most incisive way that you can imagine. I have seldom heard such insightful and appropriate analysis of any statute as I heard from this man, sitting there in his wheelchair with his respirator, wheezing away.

So Jack Javits' mobility is gone, his ability to breathe on his own is gone, but there is not one scintilla of damage to his marvelous brain nor to the spirit that drives him.

So I commend the Chaplain for his remarks this morning because his allusion to Senator Javits as an inspiration to all of us is most appropriate indeed and I resonate to it in a most personal way.

(Mr. MURKOWSKI assumed the chair.)

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, after the four Senators who have special orders have concluded, we will have morning business this morning until 11:30 a.m., and then resume consideration of the pending unfinished business. At last count last evening, there were 20-plus amendments known on the minority side and 26 amendments on the majority side, which is mildly embarrassing to me since it is our bill and my amendment. I thought rather highly of it, as a matter of fact. Then to find that 26 amendments are to be offered by my colleagues on this side of the aisle, disputed, at least, the total adequacy of my legislative initiative, and was humbling.

But in any event, Mr. President, the reason for the inventory was to see whether it was possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement that would provide for time limitations on the amendments and a time for final passage of this bill.

I would still like to do that. But I must say in all candor that chances for doing that are less than 50-50 in my opinion, even though eight of the amendments on this side fell by the wayside last evening or before we convened today.

So as of now there are 18 amendments that we know of on this side of the aisle and 20-plus and growing on the other side of the aisle, in the words of the minority leader spoken to me privately before we began.

In view of that, Mr. President, I think it is very likely that the Senate will be in session tomorrow and we will just continue to plow through this matter. I still hope we can get the unanimous-consent agreement as I described it.

Let me describe it again. I would like to see us get a unanimous-consent agreement that would provide that only certain amendments would be in order, those listed, and no other amendments would be in order except the listed amendments, that there be

time agreements on each of them, a time agreement on the bill itself, and a time for final passage.

There are other matters that I have discussed with the minority leader, such as advanced arrangements on how to deal with the Budget Resolution Act. I would like to do that, if it is desirable. Mr. President, I hope we can work something out along those lines. But if we cannot, we cannot. We still have to do this bill, and I told the press this morning that I thought it would be sometime next week before we finished. Indeed, I am afraid it will be next week. That does include a session on Friday, unless extraordinary circumstances deliver us from that.

Let me say on the matter of the Friday session that I wish to announce now that we will be in on Friday. If there is any change in that, I will make that announcement before 1 o'clock today so that Members can make their plans accordingly. But, unless there is a change in plans by 1 o'clock today, the Senate will be in session on tomorrow.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. President, while I am on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, once again I thank the Chaplain for his prayer. I apologize to the minority leader for these rambling remarks, and if I have time remaining, which I believe I do not, I will offer it to the minority leader. But in any event, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader never rambles in his remarks. I am the greatest rambler of all. He speaks succintly, cogently, and persuasively. I sat, and I listened to him as he talked about our former colleague, Senator Jake Javits, whose name was mentioned during the prayer by our beloved Chaplain. I recall an occasion last year—it may have been the year before last—when both the majority leader and I were in New York City to be present on an occasion in which Senator Javits was being publicly honored, and deservedly so.

As the majority leader described his recent occasion in meeting with Senator Javits, I then recalled those same moments last year when we were with Senator Javits. At that time, I marveled at the courage of this man, the strength of his convictions and the clearness of his mind. In 24 years in this body, I have never seen any individual who in my humble judgment—which perhaps should not be called upon publicly because it may be subject to question—but at least in my judgment no one's brilliance in this Chamber in my 26 years has excelled that of Senator Javits. And in my judgment, again, which is certainly ordinarily subject to question, I have seen few whose brilliance exceeds his. The courage of this man under the terrible affliction which he has had to bear is inspirational.

The majority leader said something else about those who have physical problems. I suppose similar ones will come to all of us, if the Lord lets us live. We all want to live, to get old, and at the same time we do not want to suffer afflictions that come with getting old.

From time to time I go to the School for the Deaf and the Blind in Romney, W. Va., and the superintendent will call an assembly of students. There they are. The deaf students will be leading the blind students; or two students, perhaps one entirely blind, another almost entirely blind, will be walking hand in hand. And at the assembly, upon introduction of a visitor, the applause of those students is deafening. As I watch them walk around, leading one another, their faces appear so free of care, and their faith high. They talk so cheerfully, and they do not seem to have a problem in the world.

And those of us who have a few aches and pains, I guess, and some minor problems, go out sometimes with long faces, sort of indulging ourselves and pitying ourselves and feeling sorry for ourselves. I expect, if we looked at almost anyone else, we would not want to change our own troubles for his or for hers. But I suppose that just points to the smallness of ourselves.

There is a poem: I would like to stand aside and watch myself go by. I think that would be, quite often, good for me. So often I have thought about the Moon and wished that I could go to the Moon, look back and see this planet Earth, and, thus, realize how infinitesimally small I am, how little the significance of my own being is, and how my self-importance is so highly self-inflated.

"Today, upon a bus, I saw a lovely maid
with golden hair,
"I envied her, she seemed so gay, and I
wished I were as fair.
"When suddenly she rose to leave, I saw her
hobble down the aisle;
"She had one foot, and used a crutch, but as
she passed, she had a smile.
"Oh, God forgive me when I whine; I have
two feet, the world is mine."

With those thoughts, I begin to sort of feel deflated and that is the way it should be. When I sum all of that up, I come to the conclusion that my importance and my influence in this world are about like that of a drop of sand in the Potomac, and create just about that much of a ripple and will endure about that long.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First of all, I was not able to hear the distinguished majority leader on this, but I want to tell the leaders that I was privileged to be present when Senator Javits testified. I was so deeply impressed. What a marvelous, marvelous human being he is. All of us recognize the extraordinary intelligence and the greatness of knowledge that Jake Javits has on every kind of a subject. But his testimony was really heroic. Here was a man barely able to talk, and he told us about the ravages of this disease. And he appealed to the appropriations subcommittee so eloquently. I will never forget it. It was as profound an experience as I have had since I have been in this body.

I apologize to the leader for mentioning this, but I cannot resist pointing out that the real hero in my view of fighting for the Genocide Treaty was Jake Javits. Nobody worked harder for that. Nobody feels more deeply that we should ratify that convention. If we should ratify it—and I am convinced that this administration will support it—I think Senator Javits deserved the great bulk of the credit for our doing so.

THE DEATH OF DAVID KENNEDY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we are saddened today by yet another tragedy for the Kennedy family. Our hearts go out to the family of our former colleague, Senator Robert Kennedy, and of Senator TED KENNEDY, a family which has borne so much pain, and so much suffering, with strength, and with grace, and with abiding faith.

Anyone's death diminishes us all, but the loss of a young person is especially humbling. David Kennedy, only 28 years old, reminds us of the promise of youth. That promise is fixed in our minds in David's case by the memory of the vitality and energy of his father, who had such a zest for life, and a passion for trying to make a better world.

How precious our days, how limited our time, and how indiscriminate is the hand of fate. We are forcefully reminded once again of the mortality of us all.

Mr. President, I join with the distinguished majority leader who spoke yesterday, and with all Members of

the Senate, in extending our sincerest sympathy. My wife Erma joins me in extending sympathy to TED KENNEDY and all the members of his family.

It may be of some small comfort for them to know that their loss has deeply moved us all.

AFGHANISTAN: SOVIET BOMBER ATTACKS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my colleagues are well aware of my long-standing concern for the fate of the brave people of Afghanistan. I do not know that I have a single Afghan constituent. I may have or I may not have. On many occasions, I have addressed the Senate on the progress of events in that war-torn country, which the Soviet Union continues to occupy after more than 4 years. I have recounted stories of the courage and determination of the Afghan freedom fighters in their struggle to liberate their country. Because of Soviet censorship, news about that struggle is sometimes very hard to come by, and I am disappointed that we see so little reporting on this tragedy.

Over the past few weeks, stories about Afghanistan are back on the front page of the papers. Unfortunately, this latest news is of a new all-out Soviet offensive to destroy the villages and rebel strongholds north of the capital city of Kabul. Two recent reports from the Washington Post reveal that the Soviets have engaged heavy bombers against the Afghan population in the hope of breaking their will. Judging from the past, this sort of massive retaliation will do more to fortify the determination of the Afghan resistance than anything else. The Soviets should expect the same reaction to these massive bombing raids as was seen in Britain during the bombing attacks on that proud country during World War II.

The Washington Post reports that the Soviets have tried and failed six times to take the strategic valley north of Kabul away from the rebels. Apparently, they now have decided to bomb it into oblivion. The use of these heavy bombers against civilian positions is an unspeakable act of brutality. But it serves to point up the desperation that the Soviets now feel. Desertions from the Afghan army of the Soviet puppet regime have increased to such an extent that the Soviets now draft members of the privileged Afghan Communist Party in the hope of suppressing the resistance. At the same time, the ranks of the resistance have swelled to an estimated 100,000 freedom fighters. The Soviets are losing control of the entire country, and they know it. I am talking about the entire country. I am not talking about the capital city of Kabul. What they cannot control on the ground, they are trying to destroy from the air.

The bankrupt strategy of the Soviet occupation is taking a serious toll on Soviet credibility and manpower. And it exacts a terrible price from the people of Afghanistan. But the Soviet treachery and brutality in that country is accomplishing little, if anything. The Soviets have neither advanced their interests in the region nor secured their southern border. In terms of their own priorities, they have failed in Afghanistan. As has been the case throughout the history of that country, the invaders will be forgotten but the courage of the Afghan people will endure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles from the Washington Post titled "Soviets Use Bombers in Afghanistan" and "Soviets Bolster Afghan Force," an editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, April 26, titled "Remember Afghanistan," and I praise that newspaper for repeatedly running editorials with reference to the brave fighters in Afghanistan and the brutal invasion by the Soviets; and also a story that appears in that newspaper today by Drew Middleton titled "Afghan Rebels Are Said To Flee Valley."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1984]

SOVIETS USE BOMBERS IN AFGHANISTAN—MAJOR OFFENSIVE LAUNCHED AGAINST REBEL STRONGHOLD

(By Fred Hiatt)

The Soviet Union has launched a major new offensive in Afghanistan, for the first time using heavy bombers against the rebels in an effort to take a stronghold that has resisted six previous Soviet campaigns, administration officals said yesterday.

The pounding by Soviet Tu16 Badger bombers began Saturday morning and continued through the weekend, officials said. A column of 20,000 Soviet and Afghan army troops with 600 to 800 vehicles is now moving north through the Panjshir Valley, an area that has continued to resist communist control.

U.S. officials said the latest offensive in the Soviets' four-year effort to control Afghanistan is likely to result in high casualties on both sides, with civilians suffering most from the high-altitude bombing.

The new tactics appear to escalate a trend in which the Soviets, frustrated by the stalemated war, have resorted to heavier attacks on population centers from helicopters, ground attack planes and now bombers.

In attacking the Panjshir, the Soviet Union is going after one of the prime rebel strongholds and the most renowned guerrilla commander, Ahmed Shah Massoud. Massoud, who has been called the Che Guevara of Afghanistan, may have provoked the offensive when his men recently blew up two bridges north of Kabul, the capital, officials said.

But if Massoud's action dictated the timing of the offensive, the Soviet Union had been building up to it. During the past several weeks, the Soviets increased their troop contingent in Kabul and deployed about 100 bombers on their border with Afghanistan.

The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December, 1979, and installed a friendly government in Kabul. But much of the countryside has remained hostile to the Soviet occupiers and the Afghan army that supports them, with the Mujaheddin—as the Afghan rebels are called—waging a war of attrition that seems to have grown more effective during the last four years.

The Soviets have stationed more than 100,000 troops in the country and 30,000 more along the border. They have used Mi24 Hind helicopter gunships extensively, but until this weekend had refrained from the kind of high-altitude, widespread bombing that the United States used in Vietnam in an attempt to demoralize enemy forces.

On Saturday, however, the Soviets sent about three dozen medium-range Badger bombers and a probably larger number of Su24 Fencer fighter-bombers from bases along the border to attack the Panjshir Valley. The bombardment was followed by close-in attacks from ground attack planes and helicopters, plus heavy artillery shelling, officials said.

Massoud has established a primitive resistance government in the Panjshir, and about 10,000 rebels are said to be ensconced there, many in caves along the valley's sides.

Massoud's rebels took advantage of a semi-official truce with the Soviets last year to fortify gun positions and ammunition stores deep in the mountains, which is why U.S. officials predicted that the Badger bombing would harm villages more than Mujaheddin positions.

By early yesterday, a column of Soviet and Afghan troops reportedly had advanced as far north as Rokheh, which the Soviets had occupied for about 10 months two years ago but had abandoned under pressure from the Mujaheddin. Officials were making no predictions about how long this offensive would last.

"This is the largest attempt to go in there," one official said. "But they'll have a hard time getting them [the Majaheddin] out of this valley."

"The Soviets as of now, after six tries, don't control the valley," another official said. "But we can't say what their goals are—whether they want to burn crops, or kill Massoud, or control the valley."

Officials also did not say how many of the attacking troops are Soviet. The Soviet Union has tended to let the Afghan army do much of the ground fighting, while the Soviets fly some aircraft and operate some of the tanks and other heavy vehicles further to the rear.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1984]

SOVIETS BOLSTER AFGHAN FORCE—BOMBERS NEAR BORDER

(By Fred Hiatt)

The Soviet Union has stationed about three dozen medium-range bombers at airfields near its border with Afghanistan, presaging a possible new phase in the war against Afghan guerrillas, administration officials said yesterday.

U.S. officials cautioned that they are uncertain about the significance of last week's deployments, which included 36 Tu16 Badger bombers and about 100 lighter bombers and ground attack planes. The movement could be intended as a signal to Pakistan or connected to events in the Iran-

Iraq war, since the Persian Gulf is within the 1,200-mile range of the Badgers.

But the officials said they believe the deployment of the planes, accompanied by support aircraft and large amounts of munitions, indicates the Soviets may be planning large-scale aerial bombing as part of their expected spring offensive in Afghanistan. Helicopter gunships have been used extensively in the war, but until now the Soviets have not engaged in the kind of high-altitude, widespread bombing that the United States used in Vietnam in an effort to demoralize the enemy.

The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December, 1979, and installed a friendly government. Since then, Moslem "freedom fighters" in the countryside have stubbornly resisted the Soviet presence, forcing the Soviets to commit more than 100,000 troops to the mountainous country and station another 30,000 along the border with Afghanistan.

The Soviets also appear to be flexing their military muscles in another part of the world, Pentagon officials said yesterday. Twice in the past two weeks the Soviet navy has staged amphibious landings on the Vietnamese coast, the first time Soviet marines have operated in that part of the world, they said.

A Pentagon official said the amphibious landing exercises are another indication, following the deployment of a helicopter carrier to the Caribbean, of the Soviets' willingness and ability to project force far from its borders.

The most recent exercise, about 90 miles south of Haiphong, involved a 14,000-ton Ivan Rogov class amphibious assault ship, the 38,000-ton helicopter carrier Kiev, several support ships and 400 to 500 Soviet marines.

"The Soviet Union, for decades a continental military power, now possesses an increased capability to transport personnel, arms and equipment to any area of the world," the Pentagon said last week in its latest edition of "Soviet Military Power."

Critics have suggested that the Pentagon exaggerates Soviet capabilities to help convince Congress to appropriate large sums for U.S. defense. Many of those critics acknowledge, however, that Soviet "power projection" has increased in recent years.

In Afghanistan, one Defense official said, there had been indications even before the deployment of bomber aircraft that the Soviets might be planning "a little tougher" spring offensive this year. "They may just be getting tired of it," the official said, noting that the Soviets are estimated to be spending $1 million each day and to have lost several hundred helicopters.

But another official said there was some doubt about the usefulness of aerial bombing, since the guerrillas do not concentrate in large groups. The Badgers were deployed along with about 36 Su17 Fitters, ground attack fighters roughly comparable to the U.S. A7 Corsair, and about 60 Su24 Fencers, which compare with U.S. F111 fighter-bombers.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1984]

REMEMBER AFGHANISTAN

While the United States tinkers with mines in Nicaragua, the Soviet Union is ripping Afghanistan apart. America's offenses in Central America are relentlessly exposed by an inquisitive Congress and public; yesterday's state secret is tomorrow's leak. No wonder American leaders are tempted to envy the Soviet Union its freedom to deploy force beyond its frontiers. Envy not such butchery.

The latest, murderous offensive in the Panjshir Valley, 50 miles north of Kabul, exposes the horror. This is the Russians' sixth attempt to "pacify" the region, and follows a one-year truce with the rebels. Saturation bombing has destroyed villages suspected of sheltering guerrillas. It is said the offensive employed 14,000 troops, 250 tanks, 150 armored personnel carriers and up to 80 helicopter gunships. This is no "contra" skirmish, but full-scale war against tribesmen armed with antique weapons.

So Afghanistan is still not pacified after all. In five years of direct occupation, the Soviet Union has yet to broaden the appeal of its puppet regime. Most of the countryside remains in the control of insurgents. Three regimes in Moscow have been unable or unwilling to negotiate a face-saving withdrawal on lines proposed by a United Nations negotiator. Perhaps they really believe the nonsense that only help from the West through Pakistan keeps the angry rebellion alive.

To believe that is to ignore Afghanistan's history of passionate resistance to every invader. Afghans look upon Russians not only as foreigners but also as infidels, and take up their arms for both nation and Islam. Even if the Soviet brutality prevails, it can give powerful impetus to Islamic fundamentalism throughout the region. This is indeed a no-win war.

For all the disarray caused by open debate in a free society, Americans are gaining a clear understanding of their frustrations in Central America. The tribalism that produces rebels in Afghanistan works the other way in Nicaragua, where rebels associated with America or, worse, the despised Somoza dictatorship, have yet to win control of a single town. And unlike Afghanistan's Marxists, the Sandinistas are confident enough of their support to arm large numbers of their own people.

To debate the similarities and the all-important differences is not a weakness but a corrective. It may hinder decision-making of the moment but provides long-run assurance that foreign policy, and particularly military ventures, will be tested by the evidence of their consequences.

No such test is possible in the Soviet Union. Its bloody squirming in Afghanistan is less an advertisement of its strength than an indictment of its weakness.

AFGHAN REBELS ARE SAID TO FLEE VALLEY

(By Drew Middleton)

Western intelligence sources said yesterday that Afghan guerrillas were withdrawing into the mountains from the valley stronghold in which they were hard hit Tuesday by Soviet and Afghan Government forces.

The sources said the rebels were being attacked by Soviet Su-24 planes.

Afghan refugee spokesmen in Pakistan ridiculed a claim made Tuesday by the Soviet-supported Government of Afghanistan that the attacking forces had scored a decisive victory in the 50-mile-long Panjshir valley, which runs northeast from a point 50 miles north of Kabul, the Afghan capital. But rebel groups in the battle zone appeared to take a different view.

Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, leader of Hezb-i-Islami, a fundamentalist Moslem group, instructed his forces to support the rebels of Ahmad Shah Masood, who were forced to withdraw into the mountains. Intelligence sources said this was significant because the two groups had been bickering ever since Mr. Masood concluded a truce with the Soviet-Afghan forces last year.

FUNDAMENTALISTS GET ORDERS

Mr. Gulbuddin, according to British sources, ordered his Hezb-i-Islami guerrillas to expand their operations against Soviet-Afghan positions at Jabal-us-Siraj and Gulbahar. These places are on the main supply route from the Soviet Union at the mouth of the Panjshir valley and serve as staging areas for operations by the Soviet-Afghan forces.

British and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization intelligence sources said they viewed the size and speed of the Soviet-Afghan operations in the Panjshir valley as a sign that the spring and summer would be used to intensify activity against the guerrillas.

NATO intelligence sources estimate that the Soviet forces in Afghanistan have lost 5,000 dead in combat and from illness and 10,000 wounded since they intervened in December 1979. These losses, the sources said, are unlikely to cripple the total manpower of 1,800,000 in the Soviet Army and are lower than the United States Army suffered in a comparable period in Vietnam.

Soviet losses from illness, the sources said, have fallen in the last 18 months because higher standards of sanitation have been adopted and base hospitals have been established.

10,000 CLEARED FROM VALLEY

The operation in the Panjshir valley was intended to clear the area of 10,000 guerrillas who used to attack convoys on the supply route from the Soviet border town of Termez and, occasionally, raided the Bagram air base used by Soviet transport planes and helicopters.

Western intelligence sources said they thought the Soviet forces now faced the problem of maintaining the momentum of the Panjshir operation. The informants said this could mean the diversion of other units of the 108,000-man Soviet force in Afghanistan for other operations.

At present the Soviet commanders are said to deploy no more than 20,000 soldiers and airmen against the guerrillas while the remainder of the force carries out exercises.

In view of Soviet supremacy in the air, intelligence sources said, the Russians are likely to use their medium bombers and ground attack planes more than they have in the past. The guerrillas have no planes and their antiaircraft resources are negligible.

Experts on the Soviet home front's reaction to the Afghan operations suggest that the internal political problem may prove to be more difficult than the tactical problem in the field.

Moscow acknowledges, one source said, that the impact of losses on the civilian population cannot be hidden. But accounts of casualties are rare in the Soviet press and, when they are printed, the dead are portrayed as heroes.

Soviet publications have begun describing conditions in the field. Krasnaya Zvezda, the army newspaper, took the unusual step in late February or reporting an attack on a Soviet supply convoy. The next day it described an attack on a Soviet airfield.

A British source said these Soviet press developments have been accompanied by tougher language describing the guerrillas as "terrorists" and "bandits" and asserting that an ultimate Soviet victory is inevitable.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR EVANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Washington (Mr. EVANS) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

COMMENDATION OF THE LEADERSHIP

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, may I say first, while the majority and minority leaders are in the Chamber, that I find that neither of them ramble during their morning business. They conduct it well. I enjoy listening, whether from this floor or from the office, to each of them each day. I find it most elucidating. It is a pleasure each morning to hear from both of them.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EVANS. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I will be brief.

The Senator from Washington was on the floor last evening when we recessed and he made similar remarks about having enjoyed the concluding business of the Senate. Now he is on the floor at the beginning of the session today, which puts him in a small and select group. Ordinarily, only the minority leader and I are here at the beginning of the day and the end of the day, which has prompted a remark from time to time that the principal duty of the leadership is janitorial. We are the first here and the last to leave.

The complimentary remarks of the Senator from Washington will be brought to the attention of my wife, and I am sure it will change her mind on the importance of the job that the minority leader and I have to perform.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I join in the remarks and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. I am extremely grateful for the overly charitable comments in my direction by the distinguished Senator from Washington. It is very helpful on a new and bright spring day. I suppose the three of us are joined by the Presiding Officer in quoting someone who once said, "Oh, to be in England when April's there." But it is not so good as being in West Virginia when April's there.

Mr. BAKER. Which is only exceeded by being in Tennessee.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I intend to leave this weekend to beat both the majority and the minority leaders by being in the State of Washington.

DEFICIT REDUCTION PROPOSALS

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bipartisan 1-year freeze deficit reduction proposal. I wish to compliment my colleagues, Senators KASSEBAUM, GRASSLEY, BIDEN, and BAUCUS, for their leadership in the development of this most attractive deficit reduction package. I not only rise in support but am proud to be a cosponsor in that effort.

Since taking my seat in the Senate last September, I have listened, learned, and I hope constructively participated in the budget deficit reduction in this Chamber. It is clear to me that action to reduce budget deficits is a top priority for each Member of the Senate.

I have indicated on numerous occasions, both to my colleagues and publicly, that I intend to vote for the package proposed by the President and by the leadership, but I also intend to vote for other balanced proposals which will do an even better job.

I think it is incumbent on each Member of this Senate to seek to do the maximum, for only the maximum will be effective in gaining the goals we seek.

Two major questions are before us in this debate: What level of deficit reduction should be sought? In a longer range, what framework should guide us toward the ultimate goal of a balanced Federal budget?

Responding to those two questions, I should say at the beginning that I do not believe that the current proposal of the President and of the leadership is adequate to do the job. It may be a first step, but it is only a modest first step.

Let us examine these questions in light of some of the following facts: The annual interest payment on the Federal debt is expected to reach $116 billion this year. It is 13 percent of the total Federal budget and it is growing.

To put it in perspective, this is substantially greater than what we will pay during the same period for medicare and medicaid combined.

The Federal Government has a good many additional financial problems which are just beginning to surface, and for which no current solution is in prospect. We must search for measures to cure a $500 billion unfunded liability in our Federal Civil Service Retirement System. We must examine options to slow the growth of medicare expenditures, which reflected 7 percent of total Federal outlays in 1982 and is expected to reach 10 percent in 1988. This, too, is an element of the Federal budget which continued to grow. Further, the medicare hospital insurance fund deficit is expected to reach $200 billion by 1995.

Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker recently said that the Federal deficits are a real and present danger to our economic recovery. We are all pleased in this Nation by the strength and continuity of our current economic recovery. As responsible representatives of our people we must insure that we not take action which will hamper that economic recovery. The prime rate of interest is now a full percentage point higher than a year ago and it appears to be headed even higher. For recovering industries, particularly such as housing and timber in my home State of Washington, this could end up being a severe setback. For other industries in other States that have yet to show renewed health during this economic recovery—for instance, agriculture—this faltering of a recovery and a return to excess interest rates would mean disaster.

Senator DOMENICI and his Budget Committee, I believe, have worked heroically to conduct the budget process given to him by Congress in as good a manner as possible. Nonetheless, Congress has been unable to operate in a timely fashion under our current budget process and there is a real question whether Congress truly has the procedural tools necessary to responsibly meet the budget needs of this Government and to effectively handle the budget deficit problems.

During the past 5 years, not only has Congress been unable to pass the 13 appropriations bills within the Budget Act deadline, but all 13 were not even passed by the end of the fiscal year they were intended to fund. In spite of that failure, I do commend Appropriations Committee Chairman HATFIELD and his committee. Fiscal year 1984 appropriations represented the best record of recent years.

We came closer than we have, but we still fail to do what the Budget Act calls upon us to do: That is to prepare and present to the Federal Government and to the people of this Nation a completed appropriation before the beginning of a fiscal year. During the past 5 years, Congress has not even been able to meet the deadline for the passage of the first budget resolution. For the past 3 years, the second budget resolution has been adopted more than 2 months after the September deadline, and well after the fiscal year for which it was intended.

Mr. President, I suggest that these facts lead to some initial proposals and some initial required answers. Deficit reduction must be immediate and substantial, and it also must initiate a downward trend for future-year deficits. I believe very strongly that a budget process must be established that provides Congress with the procedural tools to responsibly reduce deficits and work toward rationality in our budget activities. Therefore, I believe very strongly that we must move forward and not work with imaginary or, as some would suggest, "voodoo" deficits—deficit figures that do not really project our true problem, not project the true representation of what we propose in our action. We are all aware of the creative baselines currently being used by both parties to

measure the level of 3-year deficit reduction, suggesting that we are doing more than we actually are.

Admittedly, projecting levels of inflation and interest rates and unemployment and the gross national product for 3 years ahead is a risky business. The best of our economists and econometric models seldom can make that prediction accurately. But I suggest that it is then all the more important for us to use conservative figures for those projections and not the super optimistic predictions used by some in creating rather creative baseline projections.

We are a long way from a balanced budget, Mr. President. If we have conservative predictions for future inflation, interest and gross national product growth rates and if we end up doing better, that is a bonus. But if we make predictions which are almost certainly unattainable, we and the people of this country will be sadly disappointed, even if we succeed in a modest deficit reduction program. So we must look beyond the simple 3-year reduction figures which have been tossed around and move toward sizable and immediate deficit reduction and initiate a sharp downward trend for future years.

Over the past 6 months, I have suggested a simple solution to our burgeoning deficits which reflect many of the comments made by my colleagues. That is simply that we must all work together, with everyone sacrificing something, to realistically stop the growth and begin to reduce the Federal budget deficit. I respectfully submit to my colleagues that with the bipartisan 1-year freeze, we have a balanced and simple start to rid us of these troublesome deficits.

Mr. President, let me focus on a few additional characteristics of the 1-year freeze that may prove to be attractive. First, I believe that it is fair. An across-the-board freeze would require that nearly every American share part of the burden for controlling the deficits, for virtually every American will share in the benefits which come from reduced deficits. No one would receive more, or less, than they do right now. Persons newly eligible for Federal benefits would get them, but benefit levels would be frozen for all, with no exceptions. For our elderly citizens, immediate action to reduce the deficit should result—and I strongly believe will result—in lower interest and inflation rates. That has a direct, decisive impact on the cost of food, energy, and shelter, which are the major elements of these persons' income. Lower inflation rates, incidentally, when you think about it, are a nontaxable benefit. No tax is taken from the benefits accruing from lower prices. This benefit then spreads to all sectors.

We constantly hear requirements for real growth in defense expenditures, for instance, and there are varying figures of real growth as opposed to current dollar growth in defense expenditures. But that comes in two ways: It comes from the budget dollars which are appropriated, but it also comes from the purchasing power of those budget dollars. What we can buy for our military establishment as well as all other functions of the Federal Government is as much determined by future rates of inflation as by new budget authority.

The freeze does maintain our commitments. With a freeze of budget authority in defense spending, actual outlays will continue to grow by $18 billion.

This suggests that with budget authority at fiscal year 1984 levels, most past commitments remain in place while new efforts are rethought or rescheduled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 15 minutes allotted to the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, let me use 15 seconds of that to say I am still being arrested in my flight from the Chamber by the remarks being made by the distinguished Senator from Washington. They are excellent. They are exceptional. Indeed, they pose the problem that we are going to have to resolve one of these days on the budget process. That, succinctly stated, is whether or not the democratic process in which we participate has the courage, the stamina, the determination to do the difficult things necessary to right our fiscal plight. I believe those challenges are well stated by the Senator, and I applaud him for it.

Mr. EVANS. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

In addition to the simplicity, balance, and equity presented by a 1-year freeze, it provides substantial immediate savings—$22 billion more than the leadership plan in fiscal year 1985, and if you assume growth equal to inflation thereafter, $90 billion greater savings over a comparable 3-year period.

Emphasis must be placed on 1-year savings in light of the usual 3-year approach to deficit reduction, because of the historical tendency of Congress to load 3-year plans with heavy future savings and optimistic economic assumptions which seldom materialize. The response of the financial markets to favorable action on this plan should be immediate and I believe dramatic. By sending a clear signal that we are ready to address—rather than finesse—deficits, we can demonstrate the fiscal responsibility necessary to insure continued economic prosperity.

Mr. President, the bipartisan 1-year freeze proposal provides an ideal opportunity to not only address deficit reduction, but initiate more effective budget procedures.

Our distinguished colleague from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) has introduced the Budget Reform Act of 1983, an excellent piece of legislation.

The Budget Reform Act proposes procedural changes that will help rationalize the budget process. This act would establish a 2-year budget cycle, where budget and appropriation activities are restricted to the first nonelection year of the 2-year period. In addition, the act would establish more realistic budget and appropriation timeliness; allow Congress to address more nonbudgetary issues of national importance and provide for greater consideration toward more informed decisions, especially during the second year of that cycle when Congress would have what it desperately needs—an opportunity for more significant oversight of current activities we have authorized in past years; and it would assist State and local governments in coping with uncertain and flexible Federal budget processes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the June 19, 1982, Washington Post article authored by Mr. ROTH appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1982]

THE POST IS ALL WET

(By William V. Roth)

In its June 14 editorial on the budget process ["Budget Questions: Reform"], The Post seems to suggest that the way for Congress to prevent the budgetary chaos of recent months is not to change the procedures, but to stop being so political. That's like telling people to deal with air pollution by not breathing.

There's no question that the Budget Act of 1974 was a major improvement over what had been a haphazard and virtually uncontrollable process. But in the last few years, the new process has resulted in constantly missed deadlines, duplication of effort, and the need to "reinvent the wheel" every time a budget resolution, authorization measure, appropriations bill, continuing resolution or debt-ceiling extension comes along.

Our preoccupation with budget issues leaves little time for other legislation, not to mention oversight of the executive agencies. To the public, Congress seems hamstrung by its own procedures and unable to cope with the urgent problems of the nation.

The need for reforms in the federal budget process seems clear. Here are some of the most important:

First, the government should shift from a one-year to a two-year budget cycle, to begin on Jan. 1 of even-numbered years. As our experience last year and this has shown, setting national priorities through the budget process is too time-consuming and too politically charged to be accomplished in a few weeks at the beginning of each year—especially election years. Congress should pass a

single, binding budget resolution by May 31 of every odd-numbered year, setting revenue and spending levels for the following two-year budget cycle. This step would streamline the process and make Congress more accountable to the public for its budgetary decisions.

Second, we should consolidate the 13 separate appropriations bills into a single two-year appropriation. This bill, as well as authorization measures, would be passed by Oct. 15, leaving the second year of the cycle free for new authorization and deauthorization bills and oversight.

Third, reconciliation of appropriations with outlay levels established by the budget resolution should be in order at any time after passage of the budget resolution. This would let Congress adjust spending priorities to meet changing economic and social conditions while remaining within the overall spending targets set by the budget resolution.

Fourth, revisions in the budget resolution to allow for economic emergencies or other unforeseen circumstances should be discouraged by requiring such changes to receive a two-thirds vote in both the Senate and House. This would make it much easier for Congress to reconcile appropriations with budget ceilings by a reordering of priorities—that is, by increasing funds for some programs while reducing funds for others—than by raising spending levels. In my view, this is the only way to impose real fiscal discipline on a Congress that has repeatedly demonstrated its inability to balance the federal budget.

Fifth, we should end the deceptive practice of funding some federal activities "off budget," exempting them from competition with other government functions for available resources. This proposal will elicit howls of pain from those who are receiving preferential treatment in the allocation of federal funds. But fairness, not to mention honesty with the American public, demands that we stop playing games with the taxpayers' dollars and start dealing with all government expenditures in a unified budget.

These proposals have been incorporated in S. 2629, the Budget Reform Act of 1982, which I introduced in the Senate this week. I believe these reforms are essential if we are to prevent the budget process from collapsing under its own weight. The alternative would be more budgetary debacles like this year's—and is an alternative that the American people simply will not accept.

Mr. EVANS. It is clear that we could move toward short- and long-term fiscal responsibility, first by accepting the 1-year freeze deficit reduction proposal and, second, by committing ourselves to refine and establish a more effective budget process. Whatever immediate political pain may ensue will be far outweighed by the national fiscal health we can help insure.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

TAKING NUCLEAR ARMS RACE INTO SPACE SHARPLY INCREASES CHANCES OF NUCLEAR WAR AT MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR COST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the two hottest concerns of the American people at this moment are the threat of nuclear war and the colossal deficits that threaten to cripple our economy. We in the Congress will be called upon to decide a little later this year whether or not to spend $2 billion next year and $24 billion over the next 5 years for research on an antiballistic missile defense. Obviously, Mr. President, we should spend whatever it takes to protect this country against the ultimate tragedy of a nuclear attack. But there is every reason to believe that the following disastrous results will follow a decision to fund this part of the administration's military budget. First, we would increase, not decrease, the danger of nuclear war. Second, we would end up spending not $24 billion but hundreds of billions, perhaps more than $1 trillion, on such a system. Third, it would almost certainly fail to work. Fourth, to the extent that it did somehow succeed, it would greatly reduce our deterrent capability.

Mr. President, this "Star Wars" defense is dead wrong on two counts. First, it makes a profound military mistake. It assumes that a superpower today can prevent or even win a nuclear war by relying on defensive military measures. It ignores the obvious fact that ever since World War I, more than 65 years ago, technology has overwhelmed the most elaborate military defenses. In the 1930's, the French built their "impregnable" Maginot Line with the firm assurance that that elaborate series of heavily armed pill boxes, organized to maximize crossfire and defeat the most determined onslaught, would frustrate the most determined kind of German assault. But what happened? The Germans hit the defenses with blinding speed in a blitzkrieg attack and simply waltzed around the famed Maginot Line.

Again, 12 or 14 years ago, both the United States and the Soviet Union seemed well on their way to the construction of antiballistic missile systems very similar to the antimissile defenses the Reagan administration now wants to fund. I vividly recall the Senate floor debate on funding that antiballistic missile system. Critics of the system at that time contended that any ABM system we could construct, no matter how brilliantly conceived, deployed, and operated, could be easily defeated at a fraction of the cost of the defensive ABM system. At that time the going estimate was the expenditure of $1 on offense could overwhelm $10 spent on any defensive weapon designed to stop nuclear missiles. The surprise, the mobility, the choice of timing for attack, the level of attack—whether from a high altitude or hugging the ground or even from ground-transported weapons—all of these elements would favor the offense. Furthermore, the offense could pour in successive waves of missiles in an endless series until the defense was exhausted. In addition, in a military milieu in which technology changes swiftly and drastically, even the most elaborate kind of defense against nuclear attack could be overcome at any time with an equally elaborate offense and at a fraction of the cost.

Second, the "Star Wars" defense is wrong because it strives to achieve peace by extending an arms race that simply cannot be won. What is worse, it accelerates an arms race that not only fails to build national security but literally contributes to insecurity. We will end up spending hundreds of billions of dollars and find ourselves less safe.

At the beginning of this speech, I warned that any success this expenditure achieved would simply reduce and maybe destroy deterrence—the basis of our security in this nuclear world for the past 30 years. How could this happen? Here is how: Suppose we found that the Russians were on the verge of some kind of magical breakthrough that would render our massive nuclear deterrent capability useless. What would we do? Would we quietly accept world domination by the Soviet Union and an end to our freedom? What do you think? Put it the other way. Suppose the Soviet Union found that the United States was succeeding in building a truly effective antimissile system that made all their missiles useless. What would they do? Would they seriously consider a preemptive strike before we had put the final touches on our "Star Wars" defense? Of course, they would.

Above all, if this Nation mistakenly proceeds down this path, we would obviously violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972. We would greatly dim the prospect of effective arms control agreements any time in the foreseeable future. We would be taking a long and tragic step toward a nuclear holocaust.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 22, 1984, and headlined "Star-Wars Defenses: Too Costly, Can Be Overwhelmed, Study Says," by Brad Knickerbocker be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 22, 1984]

"STAR-WARS" DEFENSE: TOO COSTLY, CAN BE OVERWHELMED, STUDY SAYS

(By Brad Knickerbocker)

A group of distinguished scientists and nuclear strategists warns that trying to defend the United States against ballistic missiles would cost hundreds of billions of dollars and be extremely vulnerable to overwhelming attack.

In a report released yesterday by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), these experts examine in detail each segment of proposed mutli-layered defense against attacking missile warheads and the advanced technologies involved. In essence, they say, it won't work.

Their conclusion is even more sobering: It would "radically transform the context of US-Soviet nuclear relations, setting in motion a chain of events and reactions that would leave both superpowers much less secure. Deterrence would be weakened and crisis instability increased. Damage-limitation would be undermined by a greater emphasis on the targeting of cities. . . ."

Among those contributing to the report are: Hans Bethe, Nobel Laureate in physics who worked on the Manhattan project; Peter Clausen, a former Department of Energy and CIA analyst; Richard Garwin, a nuclear strategist and Pentagon adviser; retired Adm. Noel Gayler, former director of the National Security Agency; and physicists Kurt Gottfried of Cornell University and Henry Kendall of MIT.

In a dramatic speech a year ago this week, President Reagan called for research into a system that would render attacking nuclear missiles "impotent and obsolete." The Pentagon wants to spend some $2 billion next year on such research, a sum that Reagan administration planners say will increase to $24 billion through 1989. Officials see this as a hedge against Soviet advances in ballistic-missile defenses, as well as a counter to Soviet strategic weapons which capitalizes on a US lead in most of the sophisticated technologies involved.

Intercontinental ballistic nuclear weapons would take about 30 minutes to travel between the Soviet Union and the United States. Experts divide this flight path, and the areas in which defenses might be deployed, into three tiers: the boost phase, or first several minutes when the rocket engine is firing; the midcourse phase, in which the warheads, decoys, and other devices have separated from the missile and are flying ballistically in an arc outside Earth's atmosphere; and the terminal phase, when the nuclear warheads are streaking back down through the atmosphere toward their targets.

The Soviet Union now has about 1,400 ICBMs. Once launched, they could release tens of thousands (perhaps hundreds of thousands) of warheads and decoys, thus presenting an extremely difficult challenge to a defender, who would have to assume for most of their flight time that each was a nuclear weapon. Therefore, most experts say any successful defense would have to concentrate on the boost phase, when the missiles' rocket plumes are easily detectable and during which there are relatively fewer targets to defend against.

Some analysts say this would not be too difficult. In a new book, former Defense Intelligence Agency director Daniel Graham (a retired Army lieutenant general) claims that "within five years, at a cost of $12 billion, the United States could deploy a two-layered fleet of satellites [firing interceptor rockets] that would filter out 98 percent of a Soviet missile launch.

But this is a distinctly minority view not shared even by those who support the President's program.

The UCS experts examine the laser, directed energy, and kinetic energy defenses being studied by the Pentagon and conclude that none could work sufficiently to prevent many warheads from reaching US targets. Each is vulnerable to attack or "spoofing," they say, and it would be easier and cheaper for the USSR to expand its strategic forces than it would be for the US to counter them. "I would far rather be on the side of penetrating this ballistic missile defense than on the side of building one that works," Dr. Garwin told reporters yesterday. He and the others recommend a research effort more modest than planned by the Reagan administration.

The authors warn that deploying (or even testing in space) a missile defense system would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 and that broader nuclear arms control efforts would collapse. They urge "equitable and verifiable deep cuts in strategic offensive forces and immediate negotiations to ban all space weapons."

THE LANGUISHING PERSECUTION OF THE BAHA'I FAITHFUL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, because of the numerous letters I continue to receive and the articles which continue to be written about the plight of the Baha'i faithful, I am compelled to once again bring to your attention the meaningless persecution of this peaceful religious group.

The constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which recognizes and protects the Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian minorities, denies recognition to the Baha'is, though they are the country's largest religious minority. As a result, the Baha'is are deprived of legal protection and have repeatedly been used under the law as a focus for public grievances during constitutional unrest.

The tolerant and peaceful nature of the Baha'is has further encouraged their attackers, who know that they need fear no violent retaliation. Since the revolution of February 1979, over 150 Baha'is have been reported executed and another 500 are in prison without having been charged. Between 5,000 and 10,000 Baha'is are believed to have fled the country.

Baha'is property has been confiscated, and the Baha'is themselves are prevented from holding employment. Converting to Shia Islam is the only way they can escape persecution.

Mr. President, the lengthening grip of intimidation, imprisonment, and torture which the Iranian authorities have devised for their country's Baha'i faithful has to be recognized and the Baha'is basic international human rights have to be restored.

Our present administration has repeatedly voiced its commitment to the restoration of all peoples' human rights, and its denial of the persecution of people worldwide. For example, on April 30, 1981, at a "Day of Remembrance" ceremony for Holocaust victims, the President departed from his prepared speech with the improvised pledge that:

I intend that (the Presidency) shall be used on every occasion . . . to point the finger of shame . . . wherever it takes place in the world against the act of violence or terrorism . . . (and) the persecution of people for whatever reason . . . that it is a matter to be on the negotiating table or the United States will not belong at the table.

Let us follow this pledge of our President by doing all we can to strengthen his hand and those of our representatives abroad to condemn such actions and see that these criminals are brought to justice. The most obvious first step that we in the Senate can take—that will reaffirm our commitment to the right of all peoples to live free of fear destruction—is ratification of the Genocide Convention.

The Genocide Convention seeks to punish those who persecute and deny the right to live to a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. But ratification of this important international treaty will convey an even stronger message: it will show that the United States is determined to back its words and pledges with actions.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in strengthening our hand in protesting the numerous acts of persecution that continue to plague our world by ratifying the Genocide Convention this year.

I yield such time as I may have to the Senator from Missouri.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR EAGLETON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

HARRY S. TRUMAN—THE ROAD TO GREATNESS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, May 8, 1984, marks the centennial of the birth of one of America's truly great Presidents, Harry S. Truman.

All this year, celebrations will take place throughout Missouri and the Nation. There will be a traveling exhibit sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution, scholarly symposiums and lectures, parades, a joint session of Congress, and many other events.

By all accounts, preparations are being carried out with great enthusiasm and public interest and participation are at a high level.

It is fitting that the life and times of an American President should be recalled in his centennial year. But, I have found that the life of Harry Truman, the values and character and essence of the man, continue to cap-

ture the imagination of the American people in a most extraordinary way.

On the personal side, I have two vivid recollections about President Truman.

In 1956, I was elected circuit attorney of St. Louis, my first public office. A few days after the election, a marvelous letter arrived from the former President complimenting me on my election and paying a nice compliment, as well, to my father. My ego, already inflated by winning the election, zoomed off the Richter scale. Here was an inexperienced, obscure youngster named Eagleton getting a personal letter from a former President of the United States. I was thrilled and always will be.

A year later, there was a big Jackson Day Democratic Dinner in Springfield, Ill. President Truman was the featured speaker. He took the train from Kansas City to St. Louis to Springfield. A group of St. Louis politicians, including myself, joined him at the St. Louis stop. I remember walking into the rear lounge car where President Truman was seated.

President Truman said:

You are young Eagleton. Come over here and sit next to me. I want to give you some good political advice.

I nervously sat down.

President Truman spoke:

Tom, being a prosecutor is a tough job. People will ask you to do things you know you shouldn't do. If you ever start accommodating these requests for favors, you will never know where to stop. Say "no" to the first request. Say "no" to the second and the third. Pretty soon the word will get around that you can't be deterred from doing your sworn duty. From then on, people won't bother to ask you. Life will be a lot easier for you and you will be a good public official.

Next, be a loyal national Democrat. I get sick and tired of people who say they are "Dixie" Democrats or "Byrd" Democrats or some other modified form of Democrat. There is only one kind of Democrat, a national Democrat. The national Democratic Party is a broad umbrella and includes everyone. The Republicans are an exclusive bunch; we are inclusive. Never forget your party's heritage. Andrew Jackson—and I've read a lot about him in my time—was one of the great men of our nation. He was for the little guy and wasn't afraid of the rich and powerful. Franklin Roosevelt will go down in history as one of the all-time greats. He took the country out of despair and gave it hope. Read the biographies of Jackson and Roosevelt. Read all you can about Thomas Jefferson. Read about Lincoln. History isn't dead; history is reality. You learn from history; you learn not to make the same mistake twice.

The train bounced on toward Springfield. I absent-mindedly reached for a cigarette.

President Truman said:

You ought to be smart enough to know those damned things aren't good for you. Well, Tom, I've got to talk to some of these old-time politicians in your group. You know some of these men, like Jimmy McAteer and Jack Dwyer, have helped me greatly in my career. I like them. I think politics is a noble profession and people like McAteer and Dwyer are noble men. They are close to the people. They see the needs of the people as they really are, not as some researcher theorizes they are. If politics ever gets away from the people, our country will be in big trouble. That's what I am going to tell the audience in Springfield tonight. Politics is people. People count. People matter. The Democratic Party cares about people. That's why I am a Democrat and always will be to the day I die.

That night, President Truman wowed the audience in Springfield. He talked about people and the people there knew he cared.

The American people strongly identify with Harry Truman because of this caring quality which stemmed from the fact that he was truly one of them. There was never any doubt that Harry Truman empathized with the farmer, the working man, the small businessman, and the citizen of small-town America because he had been all of those things well into his adult life.

From the earliest days of his life, he was educating himself and gaining a wide range of experience that would serve him well in the most important job in the world.

He was the first President since Ulysses S. Grant to have worked a farm with his own hands as an adult. He was a railroad construction timekeeper and bank clerk, among other jobs.

Of all his personal qualities, the one that probably served him best in the White House was his empathy for the common man—what he experienced, what he felt, what he aspired to.

Harry Truman understood the common man because he was the common man, in the finest meaning of the term. He embodied the very idea of government of, by, and for the people.

Like Abraham Lincoln, Harry Truman was not a college graduate. Like Lincoln, he undertook a vigorous course of study at home while still a boy, under the tutelage of a strong mother.

Martha Ellen Truman bought her son many books, particularly in the fields of history and biography. It was the beginning of a lifetime passion for the lessons of the past.

When Gov. Orville Freeman of Minnesota wrote former President Truman in 1958 for "a couple of biographies or historical novels or histories * * * which you felt pointed up particularly the decisionmaking process," he got back a reading list that could occupy many years.

Mr. Truman cited biographies of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Plutarch's Lives of the great Romans, and numerous memoirs.

He believed that biography was the key to a thorough knowledge of history. A few years earlier he wrote:

Real history consists of the life and actions of great men who occupied the stage at the time.

How true that observation rings when we recall the circumstances under which Vice President Harry S. Truman was thrust onto center stage.

As his biographer, Robert J. Donovan points out, there was great apprehension on the part of the people at home and by fighting men overseas at the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. For many millions of servicemen and their countrymen at home, Franklin Roosevelt was the only President they had ever known. Despite Harry Truman's distinguished work as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense program, he had only been Vice President a few months. He was still something of an unknown quantity, not only to much of the public, but to many members of the Washington establishment and our allies as well.

President Truman had good reason to be apprehensive. The greatest war in history was still raging, both in Europe and the Pacific. The industrial and economic base of Europe would have to be rebuilt, the Japanese were yet to be beaten, and the new President would have to learn the complexities of dealing with the Soviet Union—a tall order for any man to face.

Characteristically, he was humble about what lay before him. On his first day in Office, he told a group of reporters:

Boys, if ever you pray, pray for me now. I don't know whether you fellows ever had a load of hay fall on you, but when they told me yesterday what had happened, I felt like the moon, the stars, and all the planets had fallen on me. I've got the most terribly responsible job a man ever had.

But, assuming responsibility and demonstrating leadership were not new to Harry Truman. He had served an apprenticeship in the military and in Government that prepared him well for the Presidency.

With the outbreak of World War I, he helped organize the 2d Regiment of the Missouri Field Artillery, which was placed in Federal service as the 129th Field Artillery. He rose to the rank of captain and took command of battery D.

In later years, his men gave him high marks for leadership.

Said one, "Captain Truman was no arm-chair soldier at any stage of his military career. He went up and down muddy France with his artillerymen from the Vosges Mountains to St. Mihiel; to the Meuse-Argonne offensive; to Verdun."

Another recalled, "Truman slept in the same mud and ate out of the same pots and pans that we did. When his men started on leave, Truman would call on them individually and ask them how they were fixed financially.

If they were short, Truman would lend them 250 frances personally."

And a third said, "Once in the Vosges Mountains in Alsace, Battery D was ordered to fire * * *. The Germans opened up and shells began cracking all around. Truman stood in the open giving commands. He didn't know the meaning of the word fear."

These qualities of courageousness, grace under pressure, and willingness to lead by example would, in later years, well serve Harry Truman and the world.

His innate belief in himself inspired other people. His natural gift for leadership showed the world that Harry Truman was the right man to lead the United States through perhaps the most difficult and dangerous period in its history.

The path that led to the White House began in 1922, when Mr. Truman was elected as a judge on the Jackson County court as a Democrat. The post was an administrative one, requiring supervision of the maintenance and construction of roads and other public facilities.

In this position, as in his Army command, he showed a willingness to do what he asked his subordinates to do. When unpaved roads became muddy following a rainfall, Judge Truman personally graded them, driving a team of Missouri mules.

In 1954, the former President looked back on his years in county government. As in all his endeavors in public life, he was able to conclude that he gave the job all he had and had done some good:

> In 1926 was elected Presiding Judge of Jackson County's Court and took over the running of the administrative end of the County Government. I became thoroughly informed on every phase of County administration, suggested reforms on procedures which were not adopted, became acquainted with the Missouri Legislature and all the County Judges in the State. I caused the whole road system of the county to be rebuilt, rebuilt its public buildings and put it on a sound financial basis. I organized a regional planning system for the metropolitan area which included three counties in Kansas and three in Missouri.

Harry Truman was to know adversity in subsequent years. His two successful races for the U.S. Senate were extremely tough. In 1940, he lacked even the money to buy stamps to seek support for his reelection effort. And 1940 was a year of personal disappointment as well. Despite being reelected to the Senate, Harry Truman could not prevent his 88-year-old mother's farm from being sold out from under her.

The 1940 campaign also showed the people of Missouri the courageous man of principle he was. Senator Truman addressed a gathering of farmers in Sedalia, many of whom had been members of the Ku Klux Klan, by delivering a speech on his commitment to civil rights.

He said:

> I believe in the brotherhood of man, not merely the brotherhood of white men but the brotherhood of all men before law. . . . If any class or race can be permanently set apart from, or pushed down below the rest in political and civil rights, so may any other class or race when it shall incur the displeasure of its more powerful associates, and we may say farewell to the principles on which we count our safety.

Harry Truman did not have to make that speech at that time to that audience, but he did it because he had the courage to confront, not put aside, a controversial issue.

In subsequent speeches, Mr. President, I will discuss the achievements of Senator Truman's second term, specifically his scrutiny of the Nation's war effort, the events that led to his selection as FDR's running mate, and the Truman Presidency.

I am making these speeches because the essence of Harry Truman for us today is his timeliness. Today, in the age of the Imperial Presidency, we could use a healthy dose of Truman candor. In an age when candidates are packaged like soap and sold to the voters, when every major candidate for offices hires a media consultant, we can learn much from Harry Truman.

Once, when filming a television series on his Presidency during his retirement in Independence, Mr. Truman bristled at a filmmaker's suggestion that part of the episode needed dramatization.

He said:

> Now look here, young man, you asked me to tell you the facts, and I'll do it, but I'm not going to be any playactor.

Although he left Office more than 30 years ago, Harry Truman left behind a timeless message for democratic governments: that a nation's leaders must have the courage and honesty to tell the people the unvarnished truth.

Harry Truman's greatness lies in large measure in the strong faith in the American people that his belief reveals. As we celebrate Harry Truman's centennial, let us keep in mind his ideal of courage, honesty, and plain speech. They will continue to strengthen us in the years ahead.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BENTSEN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRIBLE). Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, we spent hour upon hour before the recess debating and evaluating proposals to close the deficit gap with higher taxes. And we are in the midst of still even more debate now on the leadership amendment to shrink the deficit gap. Our sense of urgency is surprising to many outside observers, especially those on Wall Street. But they had better begin to pay attention. Election year or not, there is not one Senator who doubts the need to reduce our deficits quickly or who doubts that we will enact a major deficit deduction package, including tax and spending provisions before summer.

THE IMPACT OF INACTION

Any number of studies have forecast the future deficit trend if we take no steps to shrink them. They all agree that rising debt service costs will continue to increase the deficit year after year even under the most optimistic economic outlook and assumptions. On a current service basis, for example, the deficit will be $326 billion in 1989 according to the CBO—or $339 billion if all off-budget items are included. And a recent analysis by the Joint Economic Committee projected one nearly as large, reaching $306 billion in calendar year 1989.

Those deficits have economists and financial experts scared to death. They have the Treasury scared. They have Wall Street scared. They have the Council of Economic Advisers scared. And, they have the President concerned, too—so concerned that he junked his own budget only 1 month after submitting it, to propose a 50-percent larger deficit reduction package. What has everyone scared is the fear that runaway deficits will shortly plunge this Nation once again into the low savings, low growth, low investment, low productivity spiral which gripped it so tightly in the 1970's.

That risk is a real one according to a recent JEC study of the impact of the deficit. For example, it found that if we do nothing to reduce the deficit:

Treasury crowding-out of financial markets will continue to push interest rates up this year and in 1985, as well.

The present investment and inventory boom will cease. As a result, cutting real GNP growth next year by one-half.

Housing starts will fall to 1.5 million units through 1989, supplying enough new housing for only 8 of every 10 new families.

Rising interest rates will keep the dollar overpriced on foreign exchange markets—boosting imports to the United States and costing us 3 million jobs in export and basic U.S. industries.

Investment in new plant and equipment will sag under the twin pressures of rising interest rates and slowing growth, to 10 percent less than during the 1970's.

That will cripple productivity growth and hold it to only 1.8 percent

a year—only one-fourth the Japanese rate.

IMPACT OF THE JANUARY BUDGET

That outlook, should we do nothing to shrink the deficit, is scary indeed. Yet, the outlook under the administration January budget proposal is not much different. Alan Greenspan, for example, was quoted in the Wall Street Journal on April 11 saying that the administration's tax and spending balance is so far out of kilter that it raises new threats of soaring inflation and interest rates, and sluggish growth.

The blue chip economic indicators asked 41 prominent economists in March for their projections through next year. The typical projection showed the economy worsening by 1986. For example, the average projected growth rate in 1986 was a scant 1.7 percent, only one-fifth the rate in the first quarter. And they predict that unemployment in 1986 would be rising once again, while housing starts would be falling.

For 1985, the UCLA business forecast is projecting a sharp decline in the growth rate to only 3.2 percent. Merrill Lynch, Data Resource, Evan Econometrics, and Chase Econometrics all are coming in with even lower growth projections—all below 3 percent—for next year.

IMPACT OF THE MARCH BUDGET REVISION

These grim projections are based on the administration budget proposed in January. That budget contained a $100 billion reduction in the deficit. But many felt it did not go far enough. Some Republicans and all Democrats joined in calling for a more aggressive deficit package from the administration. The administration consequently went back to the drawing board, threw out its old budget and—jointly with some congressional Republicans—introduced a larger, $150 billion deficit reduction package on March 15.

Yet, there are at least two analysis showing that the revised March 15 administration proposal will not greatly improve the deficit picture.

New studies by the Joint Economic Committee and Lehman Bros. have found that the March 15 proposal is too little—and it may be too late, as well.

CROWDING-OUT

Crowding-out is already underway by the Treasury's deficit financing operations because interest rates have risen about 1 percentage point since February and 2 percentage points since last year.

Investment in long delayed new plant and equipment is still rising rapidly. It will be up 12.2 percent in real terms this year according to the most recent Commerce Department survey. Yet, the demand for funds to finance that investment is clashing head-on with Treasury financing of the deficit. The result has been an increase in the bank C-D rate, in the overnight Federal funds rate, in mortgage rates, and the 91-day, T-bill rate of over 1 percentage point since February. The prime rate has been increased twice in the last month by 1 percentage point, as well.

Needed long-term corporate investments that yield 12 percent would have been made in February. But they have been crowded out now, put back on the shelf as the corporate bond rate has moved close to 13 percent today.

RISING INFLATION

Adding fuel to this crowding-out is the rising pace of inflation. We have a tendency in this country to learn from only the immediate past and ignore economic problems until they become crises. We have pretty much forgotten the trauma caused by inflation in the late 1970's. But signs are beginning to sprout in abundance like spring flowers that it is coming back. The CPI rose in the third quarter of 1983 at a 3.6-percent pace. And despite falling food prices, which held the CPI down in March, consumer prices still rose in the first quarter of this year at a 5-percent rate.

The leading indicator of inflation compiled by the Center of International Business Cycle Research has jumped 14 percent since 1983. The prices of freely traded primary products like tallow and glass are rising at a 20-percent pace. And a number of industries like paper, plastics, and electrical machinery are operating far above the 85-percent capacity level where price increases typically kick in.

Investors see this surge of inflation beginning. They are doing the only thing they can to protect themselves in light of the deficit by raising interest rates to keep the real interest rate spread up around 5 percent. And they will continue boosting their asking price and interest rates as inflation continues to pick up in the months ahead. The robust 8.3-percent jump in GNP during the first quarter was bad news for inflation and interest rate watchers—and perhaps for the recovery itself.

So, its too late to head off rising interest rates by reducing the deficit. That train has left the station and it means slower growth ahead—something we are already seeing in the interest-sensitive housing market. During March, housing starts collapsed by 27 percent to 1.6 million units—far below the 1.9 million unit average scored in other recoveries. And civilian durable goods orders actually fell in March.

TOO LITTLE TO SHRINK THE DEFICIT

Compounding the fact that the Government is acting too late to reduce deficits is the fear that we may do too little. Various estimates show the deficits rising steadily and totaling about $700 billion over the next 3 years. CBO estimates $695 billion. The JEC estimates $707 billion. And, Lehman Bros. estimates they will total $693 billion.

The $144 billion deficit reduction package proposed by the Republican leadership to deal with these deficits is virtually the administration's March 15 proposal, and it will not reverse the projected rising deficit trend. Lehman Bros., the CBO and JEC econometric projections show that the deficit reduction package is too weak to actually move us toward lower deficit. In 1987, for example, Lehman Bros. project $198 billion in deficits, while the JEC projects $187 billion even if we have continue robust growth, low inflation, falling interest rates and avoid a recession. They will be higher if we do not.

These estimates vary slightly according to the defense baseline spending level utilized and result in different estimates for economic growth, interest rates, inflation and other economic variables. Even so, they tell the same story. The leadership amendment deficit-reduction package will not do the job. It does not have the muscle to avoid crowding out and higher interest rates. In fact, according to Lehman Bros. and the JEC analysis, the package will give us the worst of many economic worlds including:

Lower economic growth; higher interest rates; higher unemployment; and lower savings.

Let me review these findings in brief detail:

The JEC found that the administration and leadership package will not head off higher interest rates this year and will have little impact on them thereafter. Indeed, interest rates on long-term corporate bonds are projected to increase in 1987. And, overall, interest rates through 1988 will not be much different with or without the leadership deficit reduction plan.

Compared to the GNP outlook if we do nothing at all of the deficit, Lehman Bros. found that the administration plan will cut GNP growth by up to 1 percent in 1985, 1986, and 1987. In effect, Lehman Bros. says this plan does two things. The lower spending and higher taxes in it hurt growth, and that lower growth is not offset by lower interest rates. Since interest rates fall very little by 1987 because of the plan's small impact, the net effect is to cut GNP growth by nearly $190 billion or $350 for every man, woman, and child over the next 3 years—compared to the outlook if Congress simply sits on its hands and does nothing to reduce the deficit.

That is quite a price to pay for no reduction in the deficit trend.

Compared to unemployment if no action occurs on the deficit, Lehman Bros. projects that the plan before us

will add three-tenths of 1 percent to unemployment in 1985, seven-tenths of 1 percent in 1986 and 1 percent in 1987. In other words—because it slows economic growth—the leadership amendment will halt progress against unemployment and leave over 1 million more men and women out of work by 1987 than would be if we do nothing to shrink the deficit.

That is quite a price to pay for no reduction in the deficit.

Moreover, the JEC found that the plan before us will cut the savings rate even further than it fell in the 1970's. Individuals saved 7.1 percent on average of their disposable income from 1971 to 1980. Under the leadership plan, that rate will fall to only 5.3 percent through 1989, even lower than the 5.4-percent rate expected if we do nothing at all on the deficit.

That reduction in savings will cripple productivity growth, as well. The JEC found that it will shrink to average 1.8 percent through 1989 under the twin forces of slower growth and weak savings. Since 1950, U.S. productivity has grown an average 2.3 percent annually. The lower rate will cut real GNP by compounding one-half of 1 percent a year. By 1988, the lower productivity will have cut GNP a total of 5 percent or $200 billion. That represents lost income to every man, woman, and child of over $800.

That is quite a price to pay for no reduction in the deficit.

An even greater price will be paid if the reaction to the March 15 administration proposal by the housing industry comes true. Just 2 weeks ago, Michael Sumichrast of the National Association of Home Builders jumped his mortgage rate projections by nearly 50 percent. He is now predicting a return to rates above 15 percent within a year. Moreover, he went further on April 11 and predicted a decline in housing starts to only 1.5 million units next year, down nearly 20 percent from his 1984 projection.

These forecasts coincide with the reaction of Henry Kaufman. In a speech recently before the Economic Club of Detroit, he predicted a jump in the prime rate to 15.25 percent by next year from 12 percent now and 11 percent in mid-March. Moreover, he predicted that long-term Government bonds would reach above 15 percent next year, due to crowding out—matching their high point during the last recession.

A LARGER PACKAGE NEEDED

These grim projections and interest rate estimates all point in the same direction. If we enact the leadership deficit package, we will be doing too little, too late. The economy will slow down but the deficits will not.

Lehman Bros. urges a larger deficit reduction package. The CBO and JEC analyses argue for one. And I strongly argue for one.

The JEC analysis contained a comparison of the administration's deficit reduction package and a $50 billion larger one, of the magnitude to be proposed shortly by Senator CHILES. The differences were striking. The larger package was found to clear out financial markets more effectively and resulted in real interest rates which were over 1 percentage point lower in 1987 and nearly 2 percentage points lower in 1988 than with the leadership plan. Nominal interest rates were 2 percent lower by then, as well.

These lower rates were found to have a dramatic impact on growth, productivity, and the deficit. Over each of the next 5 years, for example, real GNP was found to grow nearly 1 percentage point faster than with the administration's proposal. Productivity growth rose above 2 percent annually—the Federal deficit was reduced to $122 billion by 1988, and shrank even further to $82 billion by 1989.

CONCLUSION

In crafting economic policy, the President, the Federal Reserve, and Congress all deal with a great deal of uncertainty over the economic outlook. We have the devil of a time getting the same story from even two economists. Yet, the current debate over sizing our deficit reduction package is remarkable in that regard because we are hearing the same thing from most of them. They are telling us that the deficit reduction package narrowly reported by the Budget Committee and before us now does not have the muscle needed to reverse the deficit trend. It will not do the job. The job is a big one, and only a bigger deficit reduction package will work.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed beyond the hour of 11:30 a.m. with statements therein limited to 2 minutes each.

DON'T FORGET TAIWAN

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, today President Reagan is arriving in Peking on a trip intended to improve relations with Red China and to enhance the prospects of free trade and world peace. I wish the President well and I hope it is a successful trip, but I also wish that the President would make a dramatic gesture of friendship toward the people of Taiwan as he returns to Washington.

It is vitally important that both the Red Chinese and the Free Chinese understand that the United States will not turn its back on its long-time trusted allies at the same time it gains new friends. The President has often said himself that "we must not forget old friends as we make new ones."

Clearly there are advantages to be gained by improving relations with the world's most populous nation. But they must not be won at the expense of faithful friends and allies. In previous efforts to curry favor with the Communists on the mainland of China, the United States has made most of the concessions and compromises, steadily weakening our support for Taiwan's efforts to remain free and independent of Peking's rule.

This time, if there are any concessions or compromises, they should come from Red China. The President can—and I trust he will—negotiate from a position of strength, because it is clear that the Red Chinese need us more than we need them. Before any deals are cut, the President should declare that the United States is not going to give away the store, that commercial, cultural and diplomatic or strategic relations must be a two-way street. His bargaining position will be strengthened if, from the outset, he makes it clear that the United States will not betray its friends on Taiwan and that they can count on us to help them maintain their prosperity and their freedom.

Red China's antagonism toward the Soviet Union ties down some of Moscow's military forces which might otherwise be deployed against the West. But we should have no illusions that Peking would risk war with the Russians to please the United States. In fact, the Red Chinese have been holding reconciliation talks with the Russians and they will host a very high-ranking Soviet visitor right after President Reagan leaves.

Communism, however, is an economic failure. Red China is a pitifully poor country, and it cannot get what it needs from the Soviet Union to modernize its economy or raise its standard of living. Obviously we can help the Red Chinese, but they can help themselves far more if they are willing to gradually move away from the failure of communism and toward the success of capitalism, which is responsible for the economic miracle that has taken place in Taiwan and Singapore and other Asian nations.

That is the message I hope President Reagan will bring to the people of Red China and their leaders this week—the message that "Free Economies Make the Difference," the title of an excellent article by Edward Neilan in yesterday's Washington Times. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Neilan's article be printed in the RECORD, and urge my colleagues to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE ECONOMIES MAKE DIFFERENCE

TAIPEI, REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—They are known somewhat facetiously as the "gang of four" or the "four tiger cubs" or the "booming babies."

The nicknames refer to Asia's friskiest and fastest growing economies, those of South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong and the Republic of China.

In addition to being blatant examples of capitalism at its best production, the strength of the four nations' economies comprises severe embarrassment to the People's Republic of China.

Among the four, the one whose success most rankles, most strongly yanks the tail and tweaks the whiskers of the Big Tiger (China) is the Republic of China here on Taiwan.

President Reagan and his entourage will see with their own eyes in Peking, Shanghai and Xian this week that the People's Republic of China, for all of its bombast, is pitifully far behind Nationalist China in terms of development.

Three of the four "tiger cubs"—Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore—are basically Chinese societies.

Why is it that Chinese in those places prosper and break production and manufacturing and sales records but the Chinese on the mainland don't?

The difference is elementary, dear Watson. It is the difference between the opportunity and motivation and incentives and freedom of capitalism and the restraints, control and drabness of the communist system.

Name one communist nation whose economy works, let alone prospers.

It is no accident that currently there are negotiations or political campaigns under way instigated by Peking to take control of Hong Kong, Nationalist China (Taiwan) and (through North Korea) South Korea. By absorbing these places into the gray drabness of their own communist systems, the embarrassing economic comparisons will cease.

One statistic jabs even the most disinterested layman right in the eye.

That is the amount of trade the United States does with mainland or communist China (where Mr. Reagan is visiting this week) on one hand, and Nationalist China on Taiwan (which was once recognized diplomatically by the United States and embraced as a special friend by Mr. Reagan) on the other.

Mainland China has one billion people in 3,691,521 square miles, and the two-way trade between that country and the United States amounted to $4.4 billion last year.

Nationalist China, with 18 million people and just over 13,000 square miles, contributed to two-way trade with the United States last year of $15.5 billion.

Peking's insistence on taking over sovereignty of Hong Kong in 1997 and stating that the colony's prosperity and lifestyle will not be affected under communism is possibly the most ridiculous line of reasoning in current world affairs.

Most of Hong Kong's more than 5 million Chinese inhabitants—those basically responsible for Hong Kong's economic miracle—left communist China at great risk. They left seeking freedom and opportunity. Why would they want to be a part of something that reverts back to the crude and boring life under communism?

In Shanghai last year, a college student mentioned to me that he knew "the people of Taiwan want to join us as soon as possible." The young man was earnest and believed what he was saying because it was based on the only information available, China's controlled press.

He didn't know about the economic success and personal freedom that exists here in Taipei and other cities of the Republic of China. If he knew and if he had a choice, he would "join Taiwan" rather than the other way around.

Last year there were roughly 10,000 students from the People's Republic of China studying in the United States. Just over 1,000—or more than 10 percent—asked for political asylum or defected outright after getting a glimpse and feel of the freedom of American life. Tennis player Hu Na was the most celebrated case, but there were literally hundreds of others.

When was the last time anyone heard of someone defecting to a communist country?

This positive image and spirit of American freedom is the main commodity Mr. Reagan will be displaying in China during his visit.

A lot has been written about China's revolution. But the longest running success story is our revolution back in the United States. That's the one that the four "tiger cubs" are using as a model and the one we ought to encourage ever more forcefully.

JUNTA PATRIOTICA CUBANA STATEMENT TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES AND TO PRESIDENT REAGAN

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement presented to the Organization of American States on November 14, 1983, by the Junta Patriotica Cubana. I also ask unanimous consent that a junta letter to the President dated March 19, 1984, be printed in the RECORD. I strongly commend the Junta Patriotica Cubana, and in particular its Washington representative, the distinguished Dr. Claudio Benedi, for their excellent efforts to promote the Monroe Doctrine and a firm American foreign policy in Central America.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNTA PATRIOTICA CUBANA,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1983.

Hon. Chairman of the 13th. Period of Sessions, General Assembly of the O.A.S.

Hon. Ambassadors and Representatives of the American Republics,

DISTINGUISHED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAS: We have the pleasure and the historical duty of addressing you and, through you intercession, the peoples and governments of the Americas, in order to reiterate, as participants in the Inter-American System and in our condition of persons born in the Cuban State, the position of the Cuban people and their rights in the conjunction of the American nations. Furthermore, we do this in our capacity as representatives of the organizations that comprise the Cuban Patriotic Board, and in their behalf.

The Cuban State, from which we originate, is a part of the Inter-American System, and a member of the Organization of American States (OAS). What is excluded from the System is the current Marxist-Leninist government, because if its being incompatible with the Inter-American System.

The Cuban State has signed with the American States that you represent, treaties, covenants, agreements and resolutions which are in force in the Inter-American System. Your nations and the Free Cuban State "have entered into agreements freely, but have not become obligated by the agreements" ("pacta sunt servanda"), as stated by the father of International Law, the Rev. F. Francisco Vitoria.

The Cuban State is one and indivisible, and its rights must of necessity be protected by the other Member States in the O.A.S., as regulated by treaties and covenants in force. Cuba is a part of the Americas and it is united to their destiny.

The Seventh Consultation Meeting of Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Americas, convened in accordance with the Treaty of Rio at San José, Costa Rica, declared:

"1. The intervention or threat of intervention, including those subject to conditions, from an extra-continental power, in the domestic affairs of any American Republic, is hereby condemned, and we underline that acceptance of the threat of intervention from an extra-continental power by any American State imperils the solidarity and security of the Americas, thus compelling the Organization of American States to condemn and reject it also with a similar vigor."

Nobody doubts that Castro's satellite government has "accepted the threat of intervention from an extra-continental power" (the Soviet Union) and that he has "imperiled the solidarity and security of the Americas." The "acceptance", the "threat" and the "intervention of an extra-continental power" (the Soviet Union) are much larger, more militant and more serious nowadays than they were when said declaration was approved. This has been proven in Grenanda and Nicaragua, and also regarding the Salvadoran guerrillas, besides many other instances, should any further proof be still needed.

All of this, which is already in place in Cuba, is also happening at a fast pace in Nicaragua, that is proceeding rapidly towards a Marxist-Leninist totalitarian regime, subordinate to Castro and the Soviet Union. Both countries (Cuba and Nicaragua) serve as bases for ideological, political, economic and military subversion, as well as for terrorism and destabilization of other American States, such as El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Colombia and Peru, among them.

The Eighth Consultation Meeting of Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Americas, convened in Uruguay in accordance with the Treaty of Rio, passed Resolution VI, which declares that "Marxist-Leninist Doctrine is incompatible with the Inter-American system." That declaration of incompatibility has not been revoked, it is in force. If we are to be respected in the world, we must enforce our treaties and resolutions.

The Ninth Consultation Meeting of Foreign Affairs Ministers, convened in accordance with the Treaty of Rio, and assembled at the O.A.S. headquarters in Washington, D.C., in 1964, declared:

"1. That the present government of Cuba, since its inception in 1959, has developed, supported and conducted, in several ways, a policy of intervention in the American Continent, with methods, propaganda, provision of funds, training in sabotage and guerrilla operations, provision of armaments and assistance to those movements that promote the subversion of national institutions, through the use of force, with the aim of installing communist regimes . . ."

"2. That assistance to subversion generally adopts the shape of political aggression . . ."

The Ninth Consultation Meeting resolved:

"a. To condemn the present government of Cuba as an aggressor, and because of its intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, thus violating their territories and sovereignties."

That condemnation against the present government of Cuba is still in force, and its strict enforcement is now more necessary and urgent than ever, because the satellite government of Cuba is a danger and a threat to the rest of the American States, and has ridiculed those agreements and resolutions that have been adopted, as well as it has continued to intervene in the domestic affairs of other States, thus violating their sovereignties. It shall continue to do so, due to the expansive nature of communism.

The Soviet Union has shipped to Cuba over 64,000 tons of weapons, that have been utilized not only to equip one million Cuban militiamen but also have been exported to Nicaragua, Grenada, the Salvadoran, Guatemalan, Honduran & Colombian guerrillas, and to other countries in the Americas and Africa.

A supply and repair base for Soviet nuclear submarines has been built at Cienfuegos Bay, in Cuba, and Soviet submarines have already been repaired there, such as that which sustained damages recently near the United States shores and was towed by Cuban ships to Cienfuegos. Is there any further proof needed?

The communist government of Cuba presently has an extensive array of MIG-23 & MIG-27 warplanes, that are capable of transporting nuclear warheads. The MIG-27's have a wider range and are much more dangerous, in their capacity of "offensive nuclear weapons", than those which were stationed in Cuba in 1962 (IL-28's), and which brought about the nuclear missile crisis. Besides, there are in Cuba over 12 "BEAR TU-95 D and F" Soviet bombers. These are anti-submarine warplanes, capable of attacking targets on land and at sea. The Soviets have stationed these planes on a permanent basis in Cuba now. They have also built in Cuba nine airfields specially equipped for bombers.

It has been proven that nuclear submarines of the "Golf" and "Echo" classes have also visited Cuba in several instances.

Cuba is the only country in Latin-America that has not signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco against the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Americas. The reasons are obvious.

It has also been verified that the Soviet Union has a combat brigade stationed in Cuba, besides numerous high-ranking military personnel, some of them disguised as "technicians", "businesspersons" or "diplomats."

Several Soviet warships equipped with nuclear missiles have visited Cuba in 1980, 1981 and 1982. These Soviet naval squadrons have cruised the Caribbean and are a great direct threat against the oil fields & refineries in Venezuela and Mexico.

In summation, the Soviets have now in Cuba 40 MIG combat warplanes, and 12 BEAR bombers, with a total of 52 strategic warfare planes with a capability to transport atomic weapons, in operation and location there. These constitute a threat and danger several times greater than there were in 1962. Senator James A. McClure has inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these and other proofs of Soviet presence in Cuba, and Senator STEVE SYMMS has done likewise. Both of them have denounced it before the full United States Senate. Other sources have corroborated the statements issued by the above listed Senators.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union is a signatory to the Second Protocol of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, obliging itself not to introduce nuclear weapons into the Americas, it has violated said Treaty, as is easily verifiable.

There are recent reports that link the Soviet Union and Cuba with activities related to chemical and biological weapons in Cuba, which infringes the Treaty on Biological Weapons of 1975 and the Geneva Convention on Chemical Weapons of 1925. These informations, that have been documented by several sources, by the U.S. Department of State, by diplomatic personnel stationed in Cuba and finally by clandestine sources, are proof of violations committed by the current government of Cuba, and of the danger that they pose for all of the Americas.

The KGB (Soviet secret political police) has taken over all intelligence and espionage services in Cuba, through its strict control of the D.G.I. (Dirección General de Inteligencia).

There are 37 "schools" in Cuba for training and preparation of guerrilleros, saboteurs and terrorists from all nations in the Americas, run by Soviet, Czech, East-German & Cuban personnel.

The communist government of Cuba utilizes its naval facilities and long shores for narcotics smuggling, and avails itself of the ships that perform that illegal traffic to introduce clandestine weapons intended for Central-American, Caribbean and Colombian guerrillas, as well as for other subversive movements in this hemisphere, as it has been proven.

The Soviet Union's objective, through its satellites in Cuba and Nicaragua, is taking over all of the American nations. This objective cannot be negotiated or settled. They might be able to compromise to "peace" in Central-America for tactical reasons, in the same manner that Hitler compromised in Munich, and there will probably be imitators for Chamberlain in the Americas, ready to let themselves be deceived, thus betraying the destinies of their nations and the future of the Americas.

Jose Marti, the Apostle of Cuban Independence, said: "To witness a crime silently is equivalent to commit a crime."

Human rights are universal values, indivisible in their enforcement, maintenance and defense, and it is not possible to discriminate upon denouncing violations committed against them.

Violations against human rights are being committed by the communist government of Cuba in an institutionalized manner, starting with the so-called "1976 Constitution" and following with its laws, daily practices, in all the country and, especially, in the communist dungeons, where a cruel, subhuman and degrading treatment is constantly in force. This has been denounced by several international organizations, the Inter-American Commission for Human Rights among them.

Political imprisonment in Cuba, at the present time, is the longest and most cruel recorded in the Americas, and human rights are violated in those prisons in a totalitarian fashion. Political prisoners called "Plantados" (those who have stood up to the communist government, by not submitting to communist indoctrination), are especially singled out for the most cruel and inhuman treatments.

There are male and female political prisoners in walled up cells (tapiadas), which have no windows at all. Those political prisoners are not allowed to see the sunlight, and are additionally subjected to physical, psychological and psychiatric tortures.

Over 200 Cuban workers were incarcerated and five of them sentenced to the death penalty (afterward commuted to 30 years of forced labor), because of having tried to organize a labor union similar to Solidarity in Poland. Because of our denouncement, a case has been open at the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Executions by firing squads have continued in Cuba. The largest number of executions recently took place on October 1st, 1982, at the moats of La Cabana Military Fortress, La Habana, where Armando Hernandez Gonzalez, 35; Ramon Toledo, 41 and 27 other political prisoners arrested under the same summary were executed.

Other executions by firing squads have also taken place at the Military Barracks in Mangua; the victims have been youngsters who have refused to combat as "internationalists" in Angola, Nicaragua and other countries. The bodies of those executed are not delivered to their relatives; they are told that "their relatives have been sent abroad" and those who complain become victims of political persecution.

There are thousands of political prisoners all over the island. Some of them are thus classified, but other are labeled "common prisoners" in order to show a lesser amount of political prisoners. In effect, the whole island is a large place of imprisonment.

The Thirteenth Meeting of the General Assembly of the O.A.S. has a legal and moral obligation to learn, during this period of ordinary sessions, about violations against human rights in Cuba and, above all, the institutionalized violation of human rights, despite the fact that the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights may have not included that issue in its annual report, because of an omission that we believe is not justified by explanations regarding the seventh report. On Chapter II of the annual report, references are included regarding the human rights situations in the American countries, and Cuba must have been included. This Thirteenth Meeting of the General Assembly, as well as the Commission on Human Rights, are competent to learn about violations against human rights in Cuba, since the Cuban State is a member of the Inter-American System and of the Organization of American States.

WE STATE TO THIS HONORABLE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AND REQUEST FROM SAME

1. That we have the right to have the voice of the Cuban state heard. We are the voice of those who have no voice to be heard.

2. The enforcement of all treaties, agreements, covenants and resolutions presently in force within the Inter-American System.

3. That all Cubans, those still in the Island and the one million who are in exile, are only one body and make up the democratic Cuban nation. That we all together, based on the experiences of the past, shall build, starting from the present, our respective futures, not looking backwards, but forward.

4. That we reject any kind of coexistence or "détente" with the Marxist-Leninist satellite regime of Castro.

5. That, while we struggle for the Independence of Cuba, the "cruel, inhuman and degrading" treatment to which male and female political prisoners are subjected in Cuba be denounced before the Americas & the world, in order for the tortures to come to an end, especially regarding the "Plantados", in centers of confinement and forced labor camps.

6. Freedom is a natural and inalienable right for men and women, and also for all peoples. There cannot be freedom in the Americas if there is no freedom in Cuba.

7. We request everybody's cooperation for the enforcement of the Joint Resolution adopted by the United States Congress, known as the Symms Amendment of August, 1982, whereby the United States is committed to fight together with freedom-loving Cubans and with the Organization of American States (OAS) to attain the right of self-determination for the Cuban people. This is equivalent to the liberation of the Cuban people.

8. The Inter-American System and those nations and government that are comprised in it, have the moral and legal duty of helping the Cuban people to rid itself from Soviet neo-colonialism, maintained there by the use of force through a satellite government. We, Cubans in the Island and outside of it, are in the forefront of that fight.

9. That independence and freedom for almost all nations in the Americas were attained through the intervention of patriots and other American nations in the domestic affairs of the liberated countries. Bolivar, San Martin, O'Higgins are examples of that. Chile, Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador, just to mention a few, would not have been able to achieve independence at that time, had not the other countries intervened in their behalf. In the same manner, the United States intervened to attain Mexico's independence—and such an intervention was decisive in the defeat of Maximilian. France, Spain and Cuba intervened, in a determining manner, to help attain independence for the United States of America.

10. That the so-called "Kennedy-Khrushchev Understanding" has been violated by the Soviet Union and by Castro, and is null and void, as it has been declared by the U.S. President, Ronald Reagan, in an interview with Cuban journalist Tomas P. Regalado, last September.

11. That the Treaty of Rio must be applied to the Marxist-Leninist satellite regime of Cuba.

12. That the Punta del Este Resolution be enforced as a whole, whereby it was declared that "Marxist-Leninist doctrine is incompatible with the Inter-American System."

13. That in the same manner as Eastern European countries receive information through Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, we Cubans have the right to convey the truth to Cuba through Radio Marti, for which we request everybody's cooperation.

14. That this Board be afforded the representation of the Cuban State, since the current government of Cuba is excluded from the Inter-American System and the O.A.S.

15. That condemnation be issued against institutional and de facto violations of human rights in Cuba, in accordance with the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, and the principles and values of Judeo-Christian civilization.

16. That the Organization of American States appoint from its midst a decolonization committee, to free up Cuba and Nicaragua from Soviet colonialism.

That the Soviet Union be forced to withdraw its occupation troops from the territory of an American State (Cuba), and to remove from this hemisphere the weapons that it has introduced in Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador and other American countries.

That the Thirteenth Meeting of the O.A.S. General Assembly will enact the establishment of the position of Commissioner for Political Refugees, since this problem already affects millions of persons in the Americas.

17. That the General Assembly will declare that "there is no freedom of expression, of the press, of religion, of assembly, of travel, nor any freedom to organize a labor union in Cuba, and that the human person's liberty, integrity and life is not respected in Cuba.

18. That a declaration be issued by the General Assembly to the effect that Cuba has neither signed nor ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco on the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in the Americas, and that it maintains its territory open to nuclear weapons, airplanes and submarines which carry them, and thus imperils all of the Americas, as it happened in 1962 at the time of the so-called "missile crisis."

19. That the Cuban satellite regime be declared guilty of engaging in the illegal traffic of narcotics in the Americas.

20. That pertinent steps be taken for the release of Cuban political prisoners, in Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico, Coasta Rica and the United States.

21. That the Thirteenth Meeting of the General Assembly will declare that the Castro's satellite regime is one which is aligned with the Soviet Union.

22. That assistance will be given to Cuban Freedom Fighters, both inside and outside of Cuba, in the same manner that such assistance is given to Freedom Fighters in other countries subjugated by the Soviet Imperialism (Nicaragua and Afghanistan).

23. That our condition of belligerents in the struggle for Cuban freedom be established and recognized, although we shall continue to fight, with or without said recognition, in the same manner that we have fought thus far.

24. That assistance will be given us in order to dismantle the military, subversive, ideological and political base installed by the Soviet Union in Cuba, presently utilized for the establishment of neo-colonialism in this hemisphere.

25. That Great Britain be forced to negotiate with the Republic of Argentina and to recognize that the Malvinas Islands are Argentinian.

26. That we salute and support President Ronald W. Reagan's policies in this hemisphere, clearly stated in his historical speech before the Organization of American States on February 24, 1982.

27. That we support the collective action exercised against the Soviet Union's intervention through its satellites in Grenada, Cuba and Nicaragua.

28. We declare that collective action is recognized by the OAS Charter, in the Treaty of OECO, in the Treaty of CONDECA and in the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty, also known as the "Treaty of Rio", as the basis for legitimate defense of our hemisphere. It is the counter-intervention opposed to the extra-continental intervention of international communism, represented by the Soviet Union.

29. We declare that, had Collective Action been exercised timely in Cuba, as it was in the Dominican Republic and Grenada, there would be peace and security in the Americas, which there will not be until we, working together, will eliminate the neo-colonialist base established by the Soviet Union in Cuba.

30. We request the circulation of this document among Member Nations present in this Thirteenth Meeting of the General Assembly, since the Cuban State continues to be a member of the Inter-American System and its judicial and political entity, the Organization of American States.

Dr. Manuel Antonio de Varona,
Chairman.
Luis Pagés,
Secretary.
Dr. Emilio A. Brouwer,
Member of the Executive Board.
Manuel Alonso,
Member of the Executive Board.
Dr. Claudio F. Benedí,
Washington Area Representatives.
Fernando Quintana,
Treasurer.
Federico Morales,
Member of the Executive Board.
Dr. Edilberto Reynaldo,
Member of the Executive Board.

JUNTA PATRIOTICA CUBANA,
Miami, Fla., March 19, 1984.

Hon. RONALD W. REAGAN,
President of the United States, c/o The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Cuban Patriotic Council, the major coalition of Cuban organizations in exile, wishes to express its support to your reelection. We are determined to see that you win a second term that would enable you to finish all the projects that were commenced during your present Administration.

The Cuban Patriotic Council wishes to emphasize that the best reason for your reelection would be to strengthen the defense capability of the United States and those efforts to assure peace and liberty throughout the world and the welfare of this great nation.

We Cubans are willing to help you, Mr. President, because we trust you, and because of your firm position against communism and also because you know the risk the free world would be under if the United States does not assume a firm leadership.

You have recognized, Mr. President, the danger that Cuba, the communist bastion in the Caribbean, represents. You are also aware of the difficult economic and political situation in Latin America. This is worsened by the armed guerrillas financed by the sovietized Cuba;

Therefore, we wish to express that:

1. The only way to get rid of the guerrillas and stop the danger to the United States and Latin America would be to eliminate the regime that oppresses Cuba. Accordingly, we, Mr. President, reiterate that Senator Symms' Amendment of August 11, 1982, which reaffirm the resolution of the Congress of October 1962, should be enforced;

"(a) To prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Lenninist regime in Cuba from extending by force of the threat of force in aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this Hemisphere;

"(b) To prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

"(c) To work with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination;"

To prevent Cuba from being a sanctuary for the training and sending of terrorists and guerrillas to other countries and the export of Russian military equipment to other nations. We support your policy in Central America and we know that the only solution is through military action not negotiation.

To force all infiltrated Communists to register as agents of foreign governments and to deport those who act as spies in the United States.

To strictly enforce the economic and commercial embargo imposed by the United States against the totalitarian regime in Cuba. We take this opportunity to denounce that this embargo is violated by planes leaving Miami and other cities carrying all kind of merchandise to Cuba. There are over six such agencies in Miami trafficking people, dollars and merchandise, thus helping the economic situation in Cuba. These agencies are unlawful and are serving the Cuban government. We hope this illegal trade will be stopped immediately.

For the welfare of the entire American Continent and Cuba, we urge that the above be given adequate consideration.

Thank you very much, Mr. President, for your assistance.

We remain,

Respectfully,

CUBAN PATRIOTIC COUNCIL,
DR. MANUEL A. DE VARONA,
President.
DR. CLAUDIO F. BENEDI,
Delegate in Washington (National Board).
DESIDERIO PERDOMO,
President of Cuban Municipalities.

CHAMPION OF LIBERTY

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, great men, when they pass away, leave great absences. It will take a great man indeed to fill the shoes of Leonard E. Read, the intellectual guide for all fighters of free enterprise and liberty.

That his death will not make the network news does not detract from the accomplishments of his life. Perhaps Leonard would have wanted it that way.

For most of his career, Leonard swam against the current. Just a few short years ago, it took great courage to defend classical liberal economics against the prevailing Keynesian wisdom: a heresy that often invited scorn.

That Ronald Reagan and many of us in Washington are now trying to steer America back toward the direction of a free market has a lot to do with Leonard, who held the banner high in the wilderness years.

Leonard preferred to stay out of the limelight. He influenced other thinkers in his own low-key—but effective—manner. This was his style. But in his own easy-going, affable way, Leonard was a prime mover of history.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles, by John Chamberlain in Human Events and Clarence B. Carson in Review of the NEWS, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A "FREEDOM PHILOSOPHER" PASSES FROM THE SCENE

(By John Chamberlain)

A great man died the other day—and got a mere two inches of type in the New York Times, which apparently knew nothing about the importance of his career.

Leonard Read, the man in question, was the creator of the first important conservative foundation to come into being in the aftermath of World War II.

His Foundation for Economic Education, which settled itself in an old building in Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y., next to Washington Irving's Sunnyside river bank home, came before the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation and other conservative think-tanks that helped create the climate that finally turned the 1964 defeat of Barry Goldwater into victory for Ronald Reagan in 1980.

During all the years between the time of Harry Truman's Fair Deal and the present, Read's foundation nurtured a wide variety of "Austrian," or classical liberal, economists who were destined to challenge the campus reign of the Keynesians, who believed in government intervention and lots of it.

The many students who were trained in a famous Ludwig von Mises seminar at New York University found hospitality at the Read Foundation. I first met Milton Friedman, a future Nobel Prizewinner, at Leonard Read's home. That was years before Friedman had become and adviser to governments all over the world.

If it hadn't been for economists and historians that Read had taken under his wing, Ronald Reagan would never have heard of half the ideas that subsequently made him governor of California and President of the United States.

The mystery of it all is that Leonard Read could have attracted big support for his foundation without ever emphasizing his own personality. He did nothing to put himself in the limelight. He never, to my knowledge, grabbed anyone by the lapel. He never plucked a sleeve. He never raised his voice. Once in a while he would say, of a supposed lover of liberty who was inconsistent, that the man "leaked," but that was as personal as Leonard Read ever got.

He must have written more than 20 quiet, well-argued little books during his life. What is interesting about them is that this man who created an economic foundation seldom quoted economists to sustain his own belief in what he termed the "freedom philosophy." A typical Read index would contain references to 30 philosophers, poets, religious teachers and literary men to one economist.

Read didn't like jargon, even when it was on his side. He didn't talk about "liberalism" and "conservatism," or even "libertarianism." It was enough to talk of the freedom philosophy as it could be embraced by anybody who had read James Madison or Thomas Jefferson.

Leonard Read's introduction to his own mature way of thinking was characteristic of his open-mindedness. As head of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce he had gone to see Bill Mullendore of the Southern California Edison Co., intending to tell Mullendore that he was all wrong in opposing some facet of the mixed Roosevelt-Truman economy. But instead of convincing Mullendore, he found himself listening to an entirely different approach to contemporary affairs. In a good half-hour Mullendore had convinced him.

Read's formula for improving the world was to avoid ostentatious proselytizing in favor of practicing self-improvement. He had a theory that people only become convinced by example. His seminars stressed the importance of perfecting one's own philosophy before thinking of raising one's voice in public. At meetings of the Mont Pelerin Society, which he helped Nobel Prizewinner Frederick Hayek to found, he seldom took part in open debate. He preferred conversation in the hallways.

The paradox is that this self-effacing man should have become a most trusted money-raiser and trainer of important public personages. You would see a congressman such as Sen. Steve Symms of Idaho, or Rep. Ron Paul of Texas, at his affairs. His most recent lecturer, Michael Novak, the author of *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism*, invited to talk just before Read had died, reminded people that the subject of the compatibility of capitalism with both democracy and religion had been canvassed in Read's own books.

Read felt that there was someone "up there" who pulled strings to help human beings become partners in creation. He took the phrase "in God we trust" seriously.

His economic theory was part of a wider science of choice. A believer in voluntary association as well as in individualism, Read's touchstone for action was "anything that's peaceful." He will be greatly missed by thousands who knew him all over the Western world.

ECONOMICS

(By Clarence B. Carson)

It is written that "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." It has been my good fortune for the past 21 years or so to know a man whom I would place in the select category of peacemakers. No, he never won the Nobel Peace Prize. So far as I know, he never negotiated any peace treaties among nations. He never engaged in shuttle diplomacy, never dashed hither and yon over the globe engaging in negotiations, never even negotiated a pact with a labor union. He was after something much more basic than what is involved in hammering out compromises that rarely please anyone. He was a man of principle. He was a teacher. For the past 37 years as president and founder of The Foundation for Economic Education he taught what it pleased him to call the freedom philosophy.

I refer, of course, to the late Leonard E. Read, who passed away on May 14th, at the mature age of 84. Although the stated purpose of his foundation was economic education, Leonard was not primarily, or even secondarily, an economist. My point is not that he wasn't formally trained in economics, though he was not, nor that he did not become thoroughly imbued with the principles of economics, for he certainly did. No man could have been more enamored with the workings of the free market than he, or been more greatly impressed with what can be produced by the division of labor. One of the most delightful pieces he ever wrote, "I, Pencil," was a celebration of the wonders wrought by the voluntary cooperation of many people. No one knows every aspect of how to make a pencil, Leonard said. Yet few objects are more common, more generally

available, or more widely used. Few objects of manufacture are less complex, but each actual pencil is the end product of the labor of thousands, from miners to foresters to sawyers to the finishers.

But Leonard Read was not an economist. One way to describe his work is to say that he was an enlightener. He would have liked that way of putting it, I think. One of his favorite demonstrations was with a light in a darkened room. The amount of light emitted could be increased or decreased by turning a knob. At first, there would be only a tiny pinpoint of light in the room. Notice, he would point out, that though the darkness surrounds and almost overwhelms, every eye is drawn to the light. As he increased the amount of light, Leonard would call attention to the fact that as the circle of light expanded it came into contact with more and more of the darkness. It was his way of showing not only how light attracts and overcomes darkness but also how the more we learn—the more we are enlightened—the more we can become aware of how much we do not know.

Above all, Leonard Read was a moral teacher. Even when he talked about economics, which was often, his emphasis was apt to be more upon a fulfilling way of life than upon making money. Only those who are responsible and free, he thought, can be moral beings. Choice is the key. The principles of the market were for him a mirror of the morality that pervades the universe. Those principles are: freedom of choice, voluntary cooperation, willing exchange, and Anything That's Peaceful, as he titled one of his books. He believed in limited government and in individual liberty, the conditions under which man's creative energies are released for constructive activity. Force is anathema, except for defensive force of course, for it confines and restricts man's God-given right to pursue constructive ends.

Leonard was not sailing with the prevailing wind when he set up a foundation and began to search out the ways of peace and expound the freedom philosophy. On the contrary, force appeared to be everywhere in the ascendant, and the tide of socialism was swelling. The year was 1946. World War II had just ended, and leaders of great nations met to parcel out lands and peoples as if they were medieval fiefs. Communism came on the heels of the Red Army to eastern Europe, and all opposition parties were being crushed. China was in the midst of civil war which would shortly usher in Communism there. A Labour Government was recklessly destroying the remnants of free enterprise in Britain. The New Deal had fastened massive government intervention on the United States, and the powers of government had been vastly expanded in the course of the war. Readers of trends would surely have concluded that the future belonged to the greatest concentrations of force.

Yet if Leonard Read despaired, he never let on. Hysterical jeremiads were not his forte. Quietly, calmly, and with a superb confidence in the superiority of right and reason, he set out to find those of like mind, provide them with a forum from which to speak and write, develop a literature of freedom in the American vernacular, and do such a good job that others would be drawn to the ideas of a free market, individual liberty, limited government, and the moral values which undergird them. Leonard Read sought to do all things with grace, charm, gentle persuasion, and right reason. He was always concerned more to fortify those of like mind than to intimidate the unwilling into acquiescence. Under his leadership, F.E.E. became an intellectual tower for free enterprise.

Though there is much yet to be done, there are now signs that Leonard's efforts, along with those of many other individuals and organizations, are beginning to bear fruit. But, win or lose, his was a noble cause, and it has ennobled those working in it. Well done, Leonard Read. And Rest In Peace.

THE INAUGURATION OF DR. THOMAS C. STANTON, PRESIDENT OF FRANCIS MARION COLLEGE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on April 7, 1984, I had the pleasure of participating in the inauguration of Dr. Thomas C. Stanton as the new president of Francis Marion College in Florence, S.C.

Dr. Stanton is only the second individual in the college's history to hold this important position. The first president, Dr. Walter D. Smith, dedicated 13 years of his life to insuring that the students of the Pee Dee Region of the Palmetto State receive the best education possible. He is to be commended for the outstanding service he rendered to Francis Marion College over the years, and we thank him for a job well done.

Mr. President, we welcome Dr. Stanton to South Carolina and I am confident that he will continue the tradition of academic excellence which Francis Marion College has achieved in its relatively short history. Dr. Stanton has held numerous positions both as a professor and administrator at the college level in this country and abroad. Most recently, Dr. Stanton was the vice president for academic affairs at James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Va. His past experiences make him highly qualified to assume the presidency at this institution, and I predict that his leadership will prove to be a valuable asset to the bright future of Francis Marion College.

During the inauguration ceremony, Hon. Richard W. Riley, Governor of South Carolina, and I delivered salutations from the State of South Carolina and the U.S. Senate respectively. Following these remarks, Dr. James A. Rogers, chairman emeritus of Francis Marion College, delivered an address entitled, "The Making of a College" which told the interesting history of Francis Marion College from its founding in 1970. The inaugural address was offered by Dr. Ronald E. Carrier, president of James Madison University. Dr. Carrier's address was an eloquent discourse on the importance and the accomplishments of public colleges in our Nation. After being presented with the Presidential Medallion, Dr. Thomas C. Stanton made a fine response and accepted the charge to be the second president of Francis Marion College.

In order to share more about this outstanding college and its new president, I ask unanimous consent that the program and addresses delivered by Dr. Carrier, Dr. Rogers, and Dr. Stanton at the inauguration ceremony be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

(Joe E. Berry, Jr., Chairman, State College Board of Trustees, presiding)

*Processional: *Ceremonial Processional*, Charles F. Gounod, United States Army Band, Fort Jackson, Michael A. Ferguson, Director.

*Invocation, Thomas E. Liles, Jr., Pastor, First United Methodist Church, Winnsboro.

*The National Anthem, United States Army Band.

Greetings to the President: From the Students, Frank F. Jones, President, Student Government Association; from the Alumni, Lawrence J. Bartol, President, Alumni Association; from the Faculty and the Staff, William C. Moran, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College.

Salutations: From the State, Richard W. Riley, Governor; from the United States Senate, Strom Thurmond, United States Senator.

"The Making of a College," James A. Rogers, Chairman Emeritus, State College Board of Trustees.

Inaugural Address, Ronald E. Carrier, President, James Madison University.

Spiritual: *I'll Never Turn Back No Mo*, The Young, Gifted and Black Chorus, Josiellia Robinson McWhite, Director.

Investiture of the President, Mr. Berry.

Presentation of the Presidential Medallion, Fitz-John C. McMaster, Member, State College Board of Trustees; William H. Breazeale, Jr., Chairman, Department of Chemistry and Physics.

Response, Thomas C. Stanton, President.

Conferring of Honorary Degrees: Ronald Edwin Carrier, Doctor of Humanities; James Alton Rogers, Doctor of Humanities; Strom Thurmond, Doctor of Humanities.

Presentation of Candidates, Dean Moran.

Conferring of degrees, President Stanton.

Hooding Ceremony, Beverly Spears Blackmon, Professor of English and Allard A. Allston, Member, State College Board of Trustees; John W. Baker, Chairman, Department of Fine Arts and Walter D. Smith, President Emeritus; Edwin S. Ervin, III, and Peter D. Hyman, Members, State College Board of Trustees.

Presentation of Diplomas, Mr. Berry.

*Benediction, Charles M. Pee, Pastor, Friendship Baptist Church, Mullins.

*Recessional: *Ceremonial Recessional*, James D. Ployhar, United States Army Band.

*The audience is asked to stand.

ADDRESS BY DR. DONALD E. CARRIER, PRESIDENT, JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

(Inauguration of President Thomas C. Stanton, Francis Marion College, April 7, 1984)

Thank you. I am most appreciative of the great honor Francis Marion College is bestowing on me today and I am equally grateful for the opportunity to take part in this all-important occasion—the inauguration of a respected colleague and a good friend, Dr. Tom Stanton.

As president of James Madison University, I feel a special kindredship and affection for Francis Marion College. Both of these splendid institutions provide that most precious commodity of all—education—to the young men and women of Virginia, South Carolina and other states of our nation. They are learned institutions and, as President James Madison observed, "learned institutions ought to be the favorite objects with every free people." There is, Madison said, no freedom without education and he pointed out: "What spectacle can be more edifying or more seasonable, than that of liberty and learning, each leaning on the other for their mutual and surest support . . ."

There is a closer tie between these two institutions a state apart, however. They are both public colleges. And public colleges have been the backbone of the American system of higher education. America's success is due, in large part, to the role public colleges and universities have played. Allan W. Ostar, president of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, put it succinctly when he said: "Public colleges and universities are the springboards from which generations of students have taken their places as respected citizens and important contributors to American society."

The American system of public colleges and universities is unique in the world. We provide higher education to each and every young man and woman who has the potential to acquire additional knowledge. Our intricate and widespread educational system covers a broad range of educational opportunities for Americans. The complete picture of higher public education is composed of many pieces: the state universities, the land-grant colleges and universities, the regional colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, urban institutions, specialized public colleges, community colleges. Each of these segments is joined to form the complex, highly-successful system that we have. Each of the types of institutions fills a particular role, a particular niche in the total scheme of public higher education. There is a particular type of school—a particular school—designed to fit the needs of every qualified young man or woman who wants higher education.

There is no question that the American system of higher public education is working—and working well. We have had a plethora of national reports issued recently which seem to find fault in our overall system of education. While it is true that some improvements certainly can be made, I question if we've said enough about what is right with our system.

There are plenty of things that are right. Every day, we read of young Americans in their early 20s who are already millionaires because of some brilliant advance they made in technology. We read about 12 and 13-year olds who are so bright they're going into master's or doctoral programs at our leading universities. They were educated in American schools. I will also remind you that the high school dropout rate has declined from 39 percent of 14 percent today.

In comparing the American system of education to other nations, we must remind ourselves that the American educational system is an egalitarian one. Educational systems in most other countries are purely elitist systems. We open education to everyone. We aim to make higher education available to the average student, as well as the extremely bright one. Other countries quickly weed out the less talented students and make advanced education available only to a chosen few. So when you compare "average" students, you are speaking of other countries.

The success of our system of public higher education has been built on two factors: access and quality. We give all students with potential the opportunity to go on to higher education. We offer a broad diversity of different types of public institutions. We bring educational institutions to locations where students want to matriculate. There is an easy access to higher education in our country. Any student who wants to further his or her education has the opportunity to do so through easy access to higher education.

Complementing that access to higher education is a program of high quality. We not only give students easy access to education, we give them access to an education of high quality. Some of the greatest institutions in our country—some of the greatest in the world—are the public colleges and universities of the United States. The record of success by graduates of public institutions speaks for itself. Studies have proven that the persons most likely to achieve greatness are those graduates of the public institutions.

But public higher education does more than just produce enlightened Americans. It does more than teach Shakespearean sonnets, more than making Cobol and Fortran understandable, more than unraveling the mysteries of DNA. America's higher education system—in particular its public system—has made a signal contribution to the American society, one that stands out above all others. It has provided social mobility.

Nothing else in American society has been the equal of higher education in providing social mobility. Many nations of this world bind a young man or woman forever to the class, the level, in which he or she is born. You can achieve no more than your parents achieved in many societies. Advancement, economically or socially, is impossible in many systems. Some systems have been engineered—part by accident, part by design—to insure that the "have-nots" will never gain the wealth, power or comfort of the "haves." Other societies have allowed a modicum of social advancement through devices such as an apprenticeship system. In many places, the military often serves as an escalator from one social or economic class to another.

In America, we have prided ourselves in making this social mobility possible through the acquisition of higher education. We give each person the opportunity to go just as far as his or her capabilities and talents will allow. We do not hold people artificially at levels below their abilities. We allow them to fly—to reach as high as they can. And we do it through our system of public higher education.

You have here two people who have taken full advantage of the social mobility offered through education. Two college presidents—myself and Dr. Stanton—both came from humble roots to achieve the presidency of institutions of higher learning. My beginnings were in the tobacco fields of east Tennessee; Dr. Stanton's were in the cotton fields of South Carolina. But American society did not tie us forever to the tobacco fields and the cotton fields. Through the social mobility offered by education—and, in Dr. Stanton's case, also through the military—we were able to upgrade our position in life. Such cases have been repeated thousands and thousands of times in American history. The capability for such social mobility will continue to exist so long as our system of public higher education remains in place and continues to receive our support and encouragement.

Our system of educational diversity not only provides society with social mobility, it also guards against an individual's skills and knowledge becoming outdated in a rapidly-changing world. Higher education has the responsibility to help people avoid obsolescence in our society.

America's success in today's high technology revolution will depend not on the military, not on big business, not on industry. It will depend on how well American higher education reacts to the changing world of science and technology. And it will depend on how well higher education anticipates further changes, and thrusts, in our society.

There is an obligation for public education beyond the full-time students that are enrolled on its campuses. There is a responsibility to the communities and areas in which our colleges are located. Public colleges and universities must make educational opportunities available to wider and wider circles of citizens. We must all develop a variety of continuing education programs and shoulder the responsibility of expanding the educational horizons of the citizens in our regions.

I call on you today to give your full support to Dr. Stanton and to Francis Marion College. It is not enough to just pay lip service to your support of the institution and its new president. Your support must be total. It requires a commitment to lend all your energies, enthusiasm and emotions to the support of the College.

With Dr. Tom Stanton, you have a great leader. You have a man of vision, enthusiasm, dedication and intelligence. But he cannot do the job alone. You must be a full partner to Dr. Stanton in the development of this institution. All of you must be willing to sacrifice and make a total commitment—students, faculty, staff administrators, board members, alumni, students' parents and friends of the College. With this effective meshing of talents and skills, you can reach new horizons of success at Francis Marion.

I ask you not to consider today's activities as an inauguration. Instead, look on it as a commencement. It is a commencement—a beginning—of an era which can bring success and prosperity to Francis Marion College. Together, you will succeed.

Thank you.

THE MAKING OF A COLLEGE

[For the inaugural of Dr. Thomas C. Stanton as second President of Francis Marion College]

(By James A. Rogers)

Long ago, in ancient Rome, Julius Caesar said to Cicero, "It is a nobler thing to enlarge the boundaries of human intelligence than those of the Roman Empire."

That is what this institution is all about, and that is the purpose which has gone into the making of a college.

Twenty-eight years ago, there came into sharp focus the historic neglect experienced by this region of South Carolina in reference to opportunity for enlarging the boundaries of human intelligence through the presence of institutions of higher learning.

We drew an imaginary line from Charleston through Orangeburg to Columbia and

thence to Rock Hill. Within the territory on our side of that line, representing approximately thirty-five per cent of the state's land area, there were but two colleges offering baccaulareate degrees—Coker College at Hartsville, and Morris College at Sumter, both small liberal arts institutions, one church-related for black students, the other private and at that time for women only.

In contrast, on or beyond that line, there were twenty-four colleges and/or universities. Thus it became dramatically apparent that college opportunity was heavily and prejudicially weighted against this region of South Carolina.

Among other things this meant tragic loss of a large reservoir of young talent going elsewhere to engage in occupations or professions following graduation from institutions beyond the region.

There then began quietly and in a very small way efforts to correct an imbalance which had worked so long against us. That became the genesis of the University regional campus system which has now spread across the state. The Florence branch was the first. It was a small, almost primitive, beginning. A freshman call of fifty-two students enrolled in the fall of 1957. The ground floor of the Florence Public Library, hastily converted into classroom, laboratory, library, and administrative office was the total physical facility.

In 1958, a sophomore class was added, and in 1959 came a dramatic and successful effort to obtain funds for constructing a first building on a land gift of 100 acres.

In 1961, what is now the J.Howard Stokes Administration Building was completed as an all-purpose building housing class-rooms, laboratories, faculty and administrative offices, student center, and library.

Called then the University of South Carolina at Florence, it continued as such for thirteen years. In 1969, the State General Assembly, in its wisdom, authorized its advancement to a four-year, state-supported college independent of and separate from the University. As has often been said, this was the first time South Carolina had established a new state college in the 20th century, or since 1896 when South Carolina State College in Orangeburg was founded.

Though the roots of the college are in that initial thirteen year period of University affiliation, its real beginning as now constituted came in July, 1970, when it officially came into existence as a baccalaureate institution with a new name and its own independent administration under its own Board of Trustees.

When you begin with only an idea and work your way through all the steps necessary for building an institution of credibility, merit, and distinction, you experience the romance involved in the making of a college.

I remember well, as do some of you, that first inaugural in October, 1970, when Dr. Walter D. Smith was officially installed, in public ceremony, as the first president of the college. There was little present except challenges, and they lay in every direction.

The first convocation had been held in the Florence's First Presbyterian Church. It was my birthday, and I remember looking over the sanctuary filled to capacity with a charter student body and thinking what a delightful birthday present this was.

In remarks earlier made on an official occasion, I had quoted from John Ruskin to lay down a principle and a philosophy to guide in building the college.

"When we build," I quoted him as saying, "let us think we build forever. Let it not be for present delight nor present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for; and let us think as we lay stone upon stone, that the time is to come when these stones will be sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and the wrought substance, 'See, this our fathers did for us' ". That has been the guiding principle in the making of this college.

To the original 100 acres, 209 have been added, to make a campus of 309 acres. Among the very first moves was the development of a master campus plan designed for visionary land use—a plan that would serve well the present but would also look far into the future. There was much to consider—the location and spacing of buildings, the type and compatibility of architecture, the development of streets, sidewalks, parking, and playing fields. There was the matter of water acquisition and sewage disposal—all part of converting an old plantation of land grant property into a college campus designed and developed for creating and maintaining a pleasant and inspiring learning atmosphere.

You have around you today the results. On this April day of a spring burgeoning into leaf and bloom, design and beauty are spread across the campus in every direction, in vistas that speak of labors that built not for the present alone, but as Ruskin advised, forever.

But more important than physical design was structuring into the institution a soundness of academics for insuring that this would be a place for broadening the bounds of knowledge and understanding with firm rootage in the liberal arts tradition.

That meant faculty, curriculum, library, laboratory, and solid commitment to high standards of excellence in the teaching and learning process.

It has been this combination of a well-planned and esthetically developed campus, on the one hand, and superior academics, on the other, that has placed Francis Marion College in high standing among undergraduate institutions of higher learning in the Southeast. This combination has gone into the making of the college from that hot day in July, 1970, when Francis Marion moved into history until this day of a second presidential inauguration.

It is therefore well that this milestone event in college history be also an occasion to celebrate the college and the high place it has come to occupy among South Carolina's institutions of higher learning.

So many have been involved in the events of the years leading to this day that one hesitates to single out any for special mention. But the late Dr. J. Howard Stokes must not go unmentioned. He was the first to declare in favor of building a college, and to that end through the remainder of his life he pursued that objective with unceasing vigor, enthusiasm and commitment. He spent about as much time on behalf of the college as in the practice of opthalmology, a profession in which he was highly skilled. His name will be forever associated with the founding years of this institution.

Nor can one fail to speak of the work of Dr. Smith, the founding president, now president emeritus. So wise and professional was his leadership, and so completely was he dedicated to stamping excellence upon every phase of institutional development that the college as you see it today stands in totality as eloquent testimony to his wisdom and guiding hand.

Neither must one overlook the understanding, support and generosity of the State Legislature and successive governors, including the one honoring us with his presence today. The support of state officials has been one of the most rewarding components in making the college. When specific requests pertaining to Francis Marion College have reached the floor of the House of Representatives or the Senate, there has never been a negative vote cast. I hope, and believe, Governor Riley, that you will help maintain that unique record.

We come now to a new period in the history of the college with the installation of the second president. The presence of our own faculty and the representatives of so many institutions of higher learning, all dressed in academic regalia, helps to make this not only a colorful but also a truly historic occasion. So does the presence of such a large company of others of you who are here not only to see a new president installed but because you, too, wish to celebrate a liberal arts college which in so short a time has become so important in broadening the base of learning opportunity.

The years until now have been romance all the way. Many of us love every foot of ground on this campus, and we wish that the mission of the college may never stray significantly from its commitment to liberal arts and to excellence in all its academic programs. That is a legacy from the beginning years, a heritage which reflects an ancient wisdom that among the noblest purposes is enlargement of the bounds of human intelligence by pursuing knowledge in a broad range of intellectual disciplines.

We wish for Dr. Thomas Cousar Stanton the wisdom to so direct the affairs of his presidency that this institution may build solidly upon the foundations which have been so carefully crafted during the beginning years, and thus carry forward the romance of beginning into all the years ahead.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(Dr. Thomas C. Stanton, President, Francis Marion College)

Thank you, Mr. McMaster and Dr. Breazeale, for this handsome medallion and thank you, Mr. Berry, for the charge you so ably delivered. I greet you and all members of the State College Board of Trustees.

Senator Thurmond, Congressman and Mrs. Tallon, Governor and Mrs. Riley, Mayor and Mrs. Pearce, we appreciate your being here to share with Francis Marion College this exciting occasion. I am pleased also to see Comptroller General Morris here as well as Senator and Mrs. Leatherman. It is also nice to have here our own Representative Billy McLeod, the only Francis Marion College graduate in the South Carolina General Assembly. And on the platform today is the founding president of FMC, Dr. Walter D. Smith. Dr. Smith, may I ask you to stand and be recognized for the 13 years of your distinguished presidency.

As I listened to the magnificent 282nd U.S. Army Band play its stirring pieces, I realized that, although I got out of the Army, the Army is not yet completely out of me.

I am glad, also, to see my friends from Virginia and James Madison University. Much of what I hope to accomplish at FMC will have had its roots in the experiences I gained with my colleagues in the Commonwealth of Virginia and particularly from those members of the faculty, staff, and student body at James Madison University. My debt to all of you is enormous and I pay a special tribute to James Madison's President

Ronald E. Carrier who gave me the opportunity some eight years ago to serve one of America's greatest universities in one of its most senior positions. I am glad; also, to acknowledge the presence of the delegates from other colleges and universities as well as those from the learned societies. We welcome you.

I am always inspired in the company of our distinguished faculty, and I enjoy the occasions when I can meet and carry on work with the faculty. To the Francis Marion College students who are here today, let me tell you how invigorating your presence is. There is something about your vitality and your enthusiasm that regenerates me. When I walk through the Commons and have chance encounters with you, I acquire new enthusiasm and greater optimism. I want also to acknowledge the presence of our administrators and staff and all the others of the FMC family who make this college a going operation day after day. Ladies and gentleman, to all of you who have come today as our guests, we welcome you sincerely.

I express my gratitude to the Inaugural Committee that did the work to make this occasion possible. The Chairman of the Committee, Dr. William H. Breazeale, Jr., can be singled out for thanks because his devotion, his tireless efforts, his imagination, and his ability to gain cooperation are typical characteristics of the members of that Committee. Mr. Hyman of the State College Board of Trustees, and himself a member of that Committee, stated that it was one of the hardest working Committees he had ever been on. Their work has brought us to this moment.

In reflecting upon all the events that have brought us to this moment, I want to acknowledge the presence of my family here today. My mother, who reared her sons from the depths of the Great Depression that gripped this Pee Dee area a half century ago, is here today. To her this platform must seem far away from that Dillon County farm on which she struggled so hard to give us a start. But as far away as it is, the shadows and ghosts of the experiences there are lurking over us still. They remind us that we are shaped equally by the hard and the pleasant experiences of life.

Before going further, I wish to express gratitude to my own family, my wife of 34 years and our two children. My wife Sara has given of herself faithfully, generously, and totally. Her constant devotion, her encouragement, here steadfast companionship, and her remarkable strength of character have sustained the children and me as we have moved around the world in my various careers. Along the way, she has sacrificed her own opportunities so that we could have ours; and in the process she has taught us the true meaning of love.

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

Today, I want to say something about my philosophy of education. Plato said, "Education is the process of giving the body and the soul all the beauty and all the perfection of which they are capable." What a lofty thought! Yet I prefer the definition that was given by President Garfield. He said, "Education is a student on one end of a log and Mark Hopkins [1] on the other." I am not sure what President Garfield really meant. However, I can supply my own interpretation. Education begins when a master teacher brings the mind of an eager learner on a level with his own. Also, in the Garfield characterization, education takes place in a spirit of mutual respect and humility.

My own educational philosophy is based in part on the awe in which I hold the universe and all its inhabitants—past, present and future. When one considers the age of creation, probably sixteen billion years, and the age of modern man, roughly 50,000 years, it is inescapable that civilization as we know it is both quite recent and without guarantees—and may indeed be most tentative. Education, then, is that noble process by which we inquire into the secrets of our worlds and search for suitable means for achieving harmony between ourselves and our environment.

An educated person has developed these skills of inquiry. In addition to intellectual skills, I believe education should equip us with social skills and with physical skills. These would not be complete without proper attention to moral development. Consequently, my educational philosophy centers on the development of the whole person in every aspect.

Said differently, education should enable one to know something and to do something. In my view, it is not a question of either a liberal education or job-oriented knowledge; rather, the question is one of preparing people to deal with the totality of life's challenges.

Out of this philosophy grows my profound commitment to honor, to a mandatory liberal arts base in every curriculum, and to a strong student life program. Blending together these activities allows the student to form character, to grow intellectually, and to develop socially. There is no comparable excitement to that of observing students in an honest search for knowledge and growth. As they press against the stubborn frontiers of ignorance and discover every so often that there is a mometary yielding and that slight victories can be gained, their optimism for humankind is quickened. No joy matches the joy of seeing a person discover the power of his or her mind.

How can we translate this philosophy into our work-a-day world at Francis Marion College? It begins with the faculty. (I suppose it really begins with a log.) We must have a faculty that is committed to the development of people and to the carrying on of those programs of faculty development that will keep our storehouse of knowledge replenished and up to date. To insure the presence of a gifted and distinguished faculty, we will press hard for fair and adequate salaries, and, of equal importance, we will insure the best possible conditions under which the faculty can teach, study, and conduct their research. We will strive for excellence. The failure to choose excellence is all it takes to produce poor performance. As Oliver Cromwell put it, "He who stops being better stops being good."

On the other end of the log are our students. The work we do for our students is not just important; it is urgent. Time is the enemy of us all. Some of my grammar school teachers were born in the nineteenth century; our present students will live most of their lives in the twenty-first century. Indeed, some of today's kindergarten students will be FMC's first graduates of the twenty-first century. We must prepare our students for a world where changes are occurring at exponential rates. H. G. Wells said, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

Preparing our students for an uncertain future is not limited to classroom work. We have to provide them with opportunities to grow as persons. More on-campus housing will give us a stronger sense of community. It will also make it easier for us to develop a richer social life. College should be a time for athletics, for dances, for dating, and for falling in love. It should be a time when people learn to handle relations with each other; and it should be a time to learn to change a relationship when, sadly and inevitably, some of them turn sour. In short, we are intent upon educating the whole person.

How successful will we be at Francis Marion College? Unfortunately, no one has any facts about the future. So we do not know how successful we will be. If I answer that question from hope, I can say we will be very successful. If I answer that question from faith, I can say we will be very successful. If courage, and hard work, and dedication, and integrity, and cooperation count for anything, we will be very successful.

Can we guarantee success? If so, how? Often to break the monotony of my jogging, I construct little vignettes and entertain myself by rethinking them as I pound the FMC sidewalks early every morning. Dream with me for a moment. In one of my fantasies, I see a long line of civilization marching up to the bar of the Great Judge. He asks one questioin of each person in turn. "Did your life have meaning?" Some answer "yes" and are sent in one direction. The ones who answer "no" are sent in another direction. At the end of the day, I have the opportunity to go up to the Great Judge and ask him why it is that some people answer "yes" and some answer "no" when both had the same experiences. All had exactly 24 hours a day. All were equal in biological makeup. All had certain talents and abilities. All had opportunities for love, and work, and service. But for some, life had meaning; for others, it did not. The Great Judge's answer was, "Life has only that meaning which we bring to it."

That tells me that we can claim the future if we put meaning in our lives. We can contribute to advancement of civilization. We can add to the accomplishments of humankind. We can grow as creatures of a moral universe, and we can make FMC reach its potential. Yes! We will be successful here.

We need daily to put meaning into the life of this institution. Remember: Institutions have no integrity except that which its people bring to it, nor does it have compassion, nor vigor, nor purpose, nor character, until those qualities are brought to it by the people in it. The meaning of FMC will be exactly that which you and I, Board members, government officials, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends bring to it.

The meaning I see for this institution is reflected in a statement attributed to the English essayist of the nineteenth century, John Ruskin.

'The entire object of true education is to make people not merely do the right thing, but enjoy the right things; not merely industrious, but to love industry; not merely learned, but to live knowledge; not merely pure; but to love purity; not merely just, but to hunger and thirst after justice."

Mr. Berry, members of the State College Board of Trustees, faculty, staff, students, alumni, ladies and gentlemen, by the guidance of Almighty God, I accept the charge

[1] Mark Hopkins (1802-1876) served as President of Williams College for 36 years.

to be the second president of Francis Marion College.

THE NATIONAL WIC EVALUATION

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, within the next few months we will be faced with the job of extending the authorization for virtually all of the Federal nutrition programs, including the special supplemental feeding program for women, infants and children (WIC).

Just recently, the Reagan administration submitted its proposed legislation to reauthorize the WIC program. This administration's proposal is to cut the percentage of funds permitted to be used for administrative purposes, eliminate the current provision of law which requires funds to be reallocated if States cannot use them, and to reauthorize the program for only 1 year at a funding level that would force thousands of participants off the program.

At the same time that we are asked to consider this proposal, the Department of Agriculture has refused to share with the Congress any information regarding the preliminary results of the most comprehensive evaluation of the WIC program done to date—a study that is costing the taxpayers in excess of $5 million. As a part of the national WIC evaluation, the Department has received an analysis of the impact of WIC on preschool children, on the effect of WIC on birth outcome, and on the quality of past evaluations of the program. However, they have refused to make this information available to the Congress or to permit the principal investigators to discuss their findings publicly.

One needs only look at the record of this administration on the WIC program to surmise what is going on here. For fiscal year 1982, President Reagan proposed to revise the budget submitted by President Carter to cut President Carter's request by 32 percent. This would have reduced average monthly caseloads by one-third in fiscal year 1982. President Reagan also proposed at that time that spending for WIC be frozen at a reduced level through fiscal year 1986. If that effort had been successful, WIC caseloads would be less than half of what they are today. For fiscal year 1983, this administration proposed to terminate the WIC program by converting it to a block grant. For fiscal year 1984, the proposal was to cut participation by almost one-third, and for fiscal year 1985, the proposal is again to substantially cut caseloads.

One can assume then that the findings of the National WIC evaluation do not support the jaundiced view this administration has of the WIC program, nor do they support this administration's continued effort to cut participation in the program. That is why USDA is so reluctant to let this information set the light of day.

Mr. President, the WIC program has enjoyed broad bipartisan support in the Congress as is evidenced by the consistent defeat of President Reagan's proposed cuts in the program. That support is well deserved. An evaluation of the Missouri WIC program by the Missouri State Center for Health Statistics which, incidentally, was rated by the principal investigator of the National WIC evaluation as "* * * the most credible and well done (evaluation) we have reviewed" found that WIC participants had significantly longer lengths of pregnancy, that mean birth weights increased with increased length of participation, and that low birth weights are reduced by WIC participation. In addition to the significant health benefits found in the Missouri study, the investigators found significant evidence of the cost-effectiveness of WIC. WIC participation was found to be associated with a significant reduction in medicaid newborn costs. The Missouri WIC study found that for every dollar spent to provide the program for the more than 6,000 participants involved in the study, $1.42 was saved in reduced medical costs during the first 30 days of the newborn's life. These savings would obviously be even much greater if they were to take into consideration savings derived from the prevention of costs of remedial or chronic care resulting from catastrophic health problems.

Mr. President, I am confident that the results of the National WIC evaluation as submitted to the Department will confirm the positive findings of the Missouri study. I only wish I could be so confident that that information will be forthcoming from USDA in a timely manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Elizabeth Wehr which appeared in the April 21, 1984, issue of the Congressional Quarterly regarding this subject be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Congressional Quarterly, Apr. 12, 1984]

FOOD PROGRAM DATA WITHHELD FROM CONGRESS

(By Elizabeth Wehr)

A respected academic researcher who has new evidence that a federal food program for the poor markedly reduces infant deaths has been told by the Reagan administration that he may not discuss his findings with members of Congress.

The evidence comes at a time when Congress is considering what to do with the program, called WIC, which provides milk, fruit juice and other nutritious food to three million pregnant and nursing women, infants and preschool children. Authorization for the program expires in September.

The House has already begun debating a bill (HR 7) that would reauthorize WIC for four years while nearly doubling its current $1.3 billion funding. House advocates of WIC, such as George Miller, D-Calif., say the increase is needed because many people eligible for the food do not get it. (Weekly Report p. 890)

The Senate Agriculture Committee will meet May 2 to vote on a bill (S 2545) by Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., to extend WIC for a year, with no increased spending. Helms believes WIC has yet to prove its worth. Sen. Robert Dole, R-Kan., chairman of the panel's Nutrition Subcommittee, will advocate a four-year extension.

Even though they must decide this spring on how much money to spend on WIC, members may not see the results of the $5 million WIC evaluation until this fall. Officials at the Agriculture Department's Food and Nutrition Service say it cannot be released until then because it must be thoroughly reviewed by experts. The study is the first national evaluation of WIC since 1974.

The study is of unusual interest because of its magnitude and because the principal investigator, Dr. David Rush, was hired by an administration that sought a 30 percent cut in WIC spending in 1981. Since then, it has opposed growth in the program. Congress has consistently rejected the administration's WIX funding proposals.

When Rush was put in charge of the project in 1981, some advocates for the poor thought—mistakenly, Rush says—that he was a "hired gun," recruited to shoot down WIC.

Rush, a professor of pediatrics and of obstetrics and gynecology at Albert Einstein Medical College in the Bronx, describes himself as a hard-nosed investigator. His earlier work had cast doubt on the value of another food program for impoverished mothers and he has publicly criticized the methods of certain studies favorable to WIC. Given his skepticism, Rush's positive findings are noteworthy.

Meanwhile, Helms has been publicizing a General Accounting Office (GAO) finding that earlier WIC studies offered no strong proof that the program worked.

When he outlined his work at a March 15 hearing of Helms' committee, Rush said he had preliminary findings, "potentially of profound importance," that he had hoped to discuss. But, he said, he could not do so until he had the Agriculture Department's (USDA) approval. Rush also declined in an interview to say what he had found, other than to characterize it as "encouraging."

Congressional Quarterly has learned that Rush's preliminary analyses indicate, among other things, that WIC has had impressive success in cutting fetal and infant mortality. The largest impact is among blacks and among the least-educated participants in the program.

At the same hearing, Helms focused on a GAO statement that existing WIC research was "insufficient for making any general or conclusive judgments about whether the WIC program is effective or ineffective overall." GAO also said, however, that there was favorable, if inconclusive, evidence that the program worked.

Still, Helms said, "I would be hopeful that after 10 years, there would be more supportive and conclusive evidence to demonstrate whether this program is worth over $1 billion of the taxpayers' money each year or not."

There are conflicting views on whether Rush's work is in such an unfinished state that it must be held back. Rush was eager to talk about it to the Senate panel.

It is routine for academic researchers to discuss their early findings with colleagues, informally and at meetings, well before publication and even before the peer review that precedes publication. The early feedback, Rush says, is essential. "There's a virtue to telling what you know, and letting people pick away at it."

Conducting research on contract for a federal agency is a different matter with, in this case, very different stakes. Rush likens it to building a nose cone to Defense Department specifications, which the department then owns.

But sometimes agencies allow their contract investigators to share preliminary information with Congress when legislation is pending.

The basic designs of Rush's study were scrutinized and approved by a USDA panel of independent experts. USDA officials also closely monitored the execution of the work. Such controls suggest that review would not turn up major problems. Rush predicts "there will be no changes, no reversals" in his basic findings.

Rush also says he's been sending along data and analyses to the department since December and that, in some cases, he has already responded to technical critiques made by USDA.

The department paints a different picture. John Stokes, Food and Nutrition Service director of analysis and evaluation, said reviewers might decide on interpretations different from those of Rush. Noting Rush is technically a subcontractor to a North Carolina research institute that oversees the project, Stokes said, "he is not the ultimate guy here."

Stokes also said Rush had missed deadlines and that what he sent was "preliminary, I mean, cut and paste. Marginal notes. Many sheets of printout data."

When Rush testified, "we had nothing that anybody would be able to read," Stokes says. "Can you imagine him going up there and saying, 'here are the results,' and we didn't even know what he was going to say?"

ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in recognizing the 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who were massacred by the Turkish Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1923. By designating today as Armenian Martyrs Day we honor the memory of those who suffered and died. We also call the attention of all Americans to this tragedy so that similar atrocities can be prevented in the future.

At the beginning of World War I, about 2½ million Armenians were living in the Ottoman Empire. In 1915, in the midst of the war, a desperate and disintegrating Ottoman Empire turned on its Armenian population. Armenians throughout the Ottoman Empire were deported on short notice. Men were usually separated from their families and murdered. The women, children, and elderly who remained were marched to the Syrian desert and constantly attacked by "guards" who were supposed to offer protection. Most of the deportees were massacred or died of starvation, disease, or exposure. Thus, the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire were virtually eliminated from their ancestral homeland through a carefully executed government plan of genocide. Today, fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians reside in Turkey.

Unfortunately the world did not soon enough learn a lesson from the Armenian genocide and it became distressingly clear that history does repeat itself when lessons are not learned from past tragedies. There have been too many acts of man's inhumanity to man during this century. Besides the slaughter of the Armenians, the 20th century has seen the Soviet-induced Ukrainian famine of 1932-33 which caused the starvation of 7 million Ukrainians, the Holocaust of the Jewish people in World War II, and the recent massacres in Cambodia. Eli Wiesel, a survivor of the concentration camp at Auschwitz, once said, "Memory is our shield, our only shield," to protect mankind against a repetition of the slaughter. Hopefully, events like today's commemoration of the Armenian genocide will help make the memory of these atrocities the strong "shield" that it should be.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENCOURAGE AND INSURE NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, it is no secret that the nuclear power industry in this Nation is in danger of extinction. Last year, Ralph Nader's extremist antinuclear group, Critical Mass, proudly displayed an impressive scoreboard of the nuclear plants it had shut down or stopped in progress or even in the planning stage. Their tactics are simple—to misinform the public, with the assistance of the media, and convince them that nuclear power is unsafe. They frighten their listeners with the unseen and the unknown. The people of France, Japan and the Soviet Union live with nuclear power every day, and they accept it as an integral part of their lives. But in the United States, emotion has ruled this debate, and so some very good nuclear research projects, such as the Clinch River breeder reactor, face uncertain futures, mired in the quicksands of misinformation, and it is estimated that it now takes 12 years to bring a nuclear powerplant on line.

The irony of this debate is that those scientists that work most closely with energy are the strongest proponents of nuclear power. I enclose for the Members attention an article entitled "Scientists Favor Nuclear Power While Press Is Highly Skeptical," which appeared in the May 1983 edition of Nuclear Industry, the monthly magazine of the Atomic Industrial Forum. While that is hardly an objective organization about nuclear power, the article highlights the studies of Prof. Robert Lichter of George Washington University. Professor Lichter's research addressed a Roper Organization, Inc. poll which showed that a quarter of the American people believed a majority of scientists were opposed to further development of nuclear energy by conducting a poll of his own of the scientists themselves. His conclusions were startling, and demonstrated the disparities that plague nuclear power development. He found glaring disparities between:

The great confidence shown by most scientists in nuclear power, and the great lack of confidence shown by the media;

The pro-nuclear scientists who observe the peer-review protocol before speaking out, and their anti-nuclear colleagues who speak out at the sight of a microphone; and

Journalists of a more conservative persuasion and their colleagues whose antinuclear tendencies vary in proportion to their liberalism.

The disparity in the media is overwhelmingly biased, however, in its opposition to nuclear power, which contributes to the public misconceptions about its cost, safety, and necessity to meet future energy needs. Every so often, that bias is tempered by a thoughtful editorial position such as that which appeared on April 18, 1983 in the Blade, which publishes out of Toledo, Ohio. The editorial examines the cost to the American economy of an eroding nuclear technology that results from misinformed public fears. It points out that U.S. manufacturers are increasingly being frozen out as international suppliers of nuclear technology due to the ever increasing expertise of nations like Japan and France. The editors conclude with the warning that decades from now, we may dearly regret letting the technological advantage slip from America to France and Japan. I share their concerns, and hope that this body and the people of this country recognize the vital importance of the safe and continued development of nuclear power to our energy future. I have enclosed a copy of the Blade's editorial also.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the material to which I have made reference.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENTISTS FAVOR NUCLEAR POWER WHILE PRESS IS HIGHLY SKEPTICAL

ATLANTA.—A political scientist had some keen observations on why nuclear power wins such low acceptance in the village square, pointing up to the AIF's public affairs conference here April 13-15 why industry's strategies to combat this situation have taken on such urgency.

To Prof. Robert Lichter of George Washington University, research showed that nuclear power's image suffers from some glar-

ing disparities between the great confidence shown by most scientists in nuclear power, and the great lack of confidence shown by the media; the pro-nuclear scientists who observe the peer-review protocol before speaking out, and their anti-nuclear colleagues who speak out at the sight of a microphone; journalists of a more conservative persuasion and their colleagues whose anti-nuclear tendencies vary in proportion to their liberalism.

PERCEPTION OF DIVISION

People without scientific expertise depend on their perceptions of what the experts think, said Lichter, who is also a fellow of Columbia University's Research Institute on International Change, and many of them perceive a significant division among experts on the viability of nuclear power.

A poll taken by the Roper Organization Inc. found that a quarter of the American people believed a majority of scientists were opposed to further development of nuclear energy.

To find out what scientists really think about nuclear power, Lichter and his colleagues sent out a 14-page questionnaire to a "stratified" random sample of 1,000 scientists listed in American Men and Women of Science. Seventy-four percent responded. Separately, they sampled scientists who were energy experts and nuclear energy experts.

The results, first published in Public Opinion magazine, showed that scientists favor continued development of nuclear power. Given four options—fast development, slow development, halting development, and dismantling current plants—only 10 percent of the randomly selected scientists would halt development or dismantle plants.

HIGH DEGREE OF SUPPORT

Support was higher among those scientists best able to deal with the factual questions involved in energy issues. Among energy experts, 70 percent favored fast development, 25 percent slow development, 4 percent would halt development, and 1 percent would dismantle. Support was highest among nuclear experts, where 92 percent would proceed quickly, 8 percent would proceed slowly, and none chose the more negative courses.

The same level of support was reinforced by several similar questions asked of the scientists. For example, two out of three scientists consider nuclear power risks to be acceptable, as do three out of four energy scientists, and 99 percent of nuclear power experts. The poll was taken slightly over a year after the Three Mile Island accident.

The reasons scientists are so supportive of nuclear power is that the majority of them consider the energy shortage serious, and expect energy usage to double in the next 20 years. In looking at which sources of energy will contribute to energy needs, the scientists listed nuclear after coal and oil. The energy experts were far less hopeful than the general public for contribution from biomass or any form of solar energy. No more than 2 percent of the energy experts look to these sources to provide a large contribution in the next 20 years.

"Most scientists in America believe there is a need for more energy, that there are relatively few places to get it, and that nuclear power is an acceptable source, given the risks," said Lichter.

With the scientific community so supportive of nuclear power, the survey looked at why the public perceptions are so different. The survey looked in two areas: the willingness of scientists to speak out, and the receptivity of the press to the message.

The survey findings were that the majority of scientists, as well as the majority of pro-nuclear scientists, agree in principle that scientists should speak out only in their areas of expertise. Anti-nuclear scientists, however, disagree with that statement by eight to one.

Among all scientists, 80 percent want prior peer review before a scientist takes his findings to the press. Among anti-nuclear scientists, a bare majority, 55 percent, agrees.

Anti-nuclear scientists are three to four times more likely to publish on science policy in non-professional journals than are other scientists, said Lichter.

Even though anti-nuclear scientists publish more often, there are many more pro-nuclear scientists. So Lichter looked at the other half of the equation: that journalists might pay more attention to anti-nuclear scientists. Science writers who worked for major media outlets were surveyed.

The findings were that science journalists were less than one-third as likely as energy scientists to believe that nuclear plants are very safe. A majority of energy scientists agreed that current plants are very safe, while only one in six key science writers agreed with this, said Lichter.

The "prestige" science journalists were also surveyed. The Washington Post, The New York Times, television networks and their opinions of nuclear power were even lower than those of the key science writers.

"The milieu of the newsroom is clearly more critical of nuclear energy than is the milieu of the scientific laboratory," observed Lichter. Other findings:

While 90 percent of scientists believe the contribution from nuclear will be large in the future, only two out of five science journalists agree;

Asked what problems they believe are serious, science journalists are more than twice as likely as scientists to believe that accidents and release of radioactivity are major problems;

Science journalists are five times as likely as scientists to think radiation exposures to workers are a major problem;

When asked if scientists had the expertise to solve the technical problems, scientists were four times as likely as science journalists to agree;

Asked to rate certain groups as poor, fair, good, or excellent, 43 percent of scientists rated nuclear plant licensees good or excellent, about 43 percent poor or fair, and some were undecided. Only 9 percent of science journalists, however, rated nuclear plant owners positive.

Most critical of all were reporters and producers of public television.

Attitudes toward nuclear power transcend energy issues, said Lichter. There is a significant correlation between attitudes toward nuclear power and political liberalism. The more liberal, the more critical of nuclear power.

"The best predictor of anti-nuclear power attitudes is the belief that American social institutions are unjust," he said.

People can make decisions on nuclear power based on factors other than scientific expertise, said Lichter. When the heads of major anti-nuclear organization were asked what factors they thought were most relevant to dealing with nuclear energy, they picked environmental, moral, and social factors far more than scientific/theoretical or engineering/technical ones. Scientists believe it is mainly a scientific and energy problem.

Lichter said he and his colleagues are just beginning a long-term study of the way major media outlets and science journals covered nuclear power.

One way to cover the issues is to get an anti-nuclear group like the Union of Concerned Scientists to comment and a pro-nuclear group like the Atomic Industrial Forum. This was used in a recent Time magazine article, about nuclear power: "An Industry Still in Disarray." It quoted Eric van Loon, head of the UCS, and Carl Walske, president of the AIF.

One problem with this is that it may inadvertently give the impression that scientists are against nuclear energy and industry is for it, he said.

CEA'S COUNTERATTACK

Harold Finger, new president of the U.S. Committee for Energy Awareness, explained to the conference how new methods will be used to convey an old message: while other forms of energy usage have declined since the Arab oil embargo in 1973, electrical usage has increased in lock step with economic growth and will be essential to continued economic expansion. Further, industry considers nuclear power an essential partner with coal in providing for future generation.

The basic case that CEA plans to make to the public and politicians is that electricity is the basic fuel for economic growth. Since 1973, industry has cut back on its overall demand for energy by 18 percent. However, it has increased its demand for electricity by 10 percent. Similarly, since 1973 the nation's economy has grown by 18 percent while energy usage has declined by 5 percent. However, the basic relationship between Gross National Product (GNP) and electric power demand has persisted, with every increase in GNP accompanied by at least an equal increase in electric power demand.

This means that if the economy begins to grow by 3 percent a year, the growth in demand for electrical power will also probably increase by 3 percent. This would mean a need to double electrical output in only 24 years, the equivalent of six hundred 1,000 megawatt plants.

Coal is not limited by supply in the near term, but by the demands of mining, shipping and burning in power plants. "Few energy experts believe that coal alone will be able to meet all of our future electric power needs," said Finger. "Coal needs a partner—and a competitor—for the electrified age of tomorrow."

NEEDED: A CONSENSUS

Before making multi-billion dollar decisions on power plants that can take from 8 to 14 years to build, utilities need something approaching a national consensus and a broader understanding by the public and by policy makers of the stakes involved.

The fundamental importance of electric power to our national well being is not widely understood, said Finger. Nor is the fact that nuclear power is not a hypothetical energy source for the future, but a proven technology that has fueled much of our economic growth over the past decade.

"Getting the message out systematically to policy makers, opinion leaders and the general public—all of whom seem to underrate the role of electricity and nuclear energy to provide it—is our number one goal," said Finger.

CEA plans different approaches than industry has used in the past, with advertising probably the most significant.

The job isn't promoting nuclear power alone, but working to enhance the credibility of utilities, said Finger. He also said that if the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations, which promotes uniform excellence in plant construction, training, and operations, doesn't begin talking about its efforts on the outside, CEA will have to begin talking.

To reach beyond advertising CEA has hired Burson-Marsteller, one of the world's largest public relations firms, to set up a system of task forces made up of specialists in media relations, government and community relations, spokesperson training, speech and technical writing, and other communications disciplines.

The firm has 11 offices around the country in locations that roughly parallel clusters of nuclear plants; this means the company can help with the inevitable brush fires as well as with the strategically planned program.

EARLY "SITE APPROVAL"

CEA will also identify problem areas and work on them. CEA will have to get in early where potential waste sites are located or the anti-nuclear people will get there first and industry could lose, said Finger.

A review of the status of grassroots pronuclear groups was given the meeting by Florence Mangan, a licensing engineer at Westinghouse Electric Corp., who is head of Nuclear Energy Women.

Since 1979 their memberships have increased three-fold, their mailing lists have swelled, they have learned how to get some funding, and they have become closer to political decision-makers and the media.

Yet they are experiencing difficulty in motivating themselves and are using words like "malaise, low morale, and apathy," said Mangan.

The reasons are: some believe they will have difficulty getting funding because some funding sources feel that contributing to CEA and INPO is enough; some feel they lack a visible, specific problem to solve; and they question whether they are really needed or not, and whether they are appreciated.

First, Mangan suggested that the groups may be mirroring "our concerns about the future of the industry and they are doing the same with their membership."

She called this a "very happy problem" for an industry struggling with too much work to do. She suggested that utilities contact the grass-roots groups with specific suggestions of tasks they can do, give them a sense of purpose and a small amount of money or services-in-kind, and allow them to maintain their independence.

WHISTLEBLOWERS AND PROGRAMS

At a session on whistleblowers, a Nuclear Regulatory Commission official said the agency typically finds a higher number of complaints and allegations about companies that have poor programs for soliciting employee safety concerns.

Additionally, said James O'Reilly, administrator of NRC Region II, it is evident that many safety concerns are taken directly to the NRC because the concerned individual was never informed of the resolution of an issue he had previously raised with the licensee.

Also, said O'Reilly, a good licensee program must include a recognized supervisory bypass system for the individual who doesn't believe the first point of contact—usually his supervisor—has or will adequately address the concern, or won't address the concern without retaliation.

A great deal of sensitivity in dealing publicly with allegations of whistleblowers was cautioned by Gerald Charnoff, a partner in the law firm of Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge.

Simply ignoring or denying the accusations initially can have severe public relations, as well as legal repercussions, said Charnoff. Should the whistleblower be proven correct in any way, these postures only serve to undermine the company and the industry's credibility, including the public's perception of management's interest in building and operating safe plants. Further, the company may be subject to all sorts of adverse NRC findings, up to and including shutdown of a licensed facility.

WHEN IN DOUBT, CHECK

When a whistleblower alleges deficiencies in a plant, the utility and the NRC should quickly determine if there are any safety or quality assurance issues, said Charnoff.

If the whistleblower's charges are substantiated, this should be thoughtfully and accurately reported to the press, the whistleblower rewarded, and the public told of changes to alleviate the concerns.

Where the charges are not substantiated, the NRC and the media "must be courageous enough to report the fact. It is not enough, as the NRC has been inclined to do, to report that a complaint has not been substantiated. If there is no basis for the charge, it ought to say so. If there is no safety significance to the charge, it ought to say so."

Where there is smoke, there is often no fire, said Charnoff. "The demonstrated performance of nuclear whistleblowers frequently has been poor."

". . . There is reason for irritation at the inordinate amount of government and industry time and money sometimes fruitlessly spent pursuing endless numbers of accusations which eventually are proven false or unrelated to a legitimate health and safety concern. And we need not be embarrassed to focus the spotlight of publicity on the misuse of whistleblowers by the anti-nuclear movement."

Whistleblowers are a fact of life and will not go away, said Charnoff. They are well protected by law and are well publicized by the media.

NEED FOR EAST ACTION

Government investigators need procedures to quickly submit to the licensee the substance of the allegations and to allow the utility's senior management, in the presence of the NRC, to talk directly with the whistleblower, he asserted. Only in this manner can the utility move quickly from innuendo and sensationalism by the media, determine what the facts are, be candid with the media, and brief the public on the existence or absence of a problem and plans for resolving outstanding concerns.

Like O'Reilly, Charnoff said employers must be sure that their companies have a mechanism for employees to air complaints within the organization, without feeling that reprisals will follow or that their complaints will be ignored.

One method of doing this is to publicize to its employees the accessibility of a company ombudsman, who would be a mid or senior level manager assigned to hear health and safety grievances. Ideally, the ombudsman would be outside the line supervision of workers directly engaged in safety-ralated jobs.

To some extent, this ombudsman could undercut the effectiveness of line management who want to be the first to hear an employee's concerns, said Charnoff. "This potential negative repercussion is more than offset by the need to ensure that employees are aware of the presence of an accessible open door that has no strings attached to it."—John O'Neill

---

WHAT PRICE APATHY?

The continued strong growth of nuclear power in countries like France and Japan, documented in a recent study by the Atomic Industrial Forum, raises disturbing questions about America's ability to remain self-sufficient in nuclear power technology.

It is no secret that in contrast to the situation abroad, these have been lean years for the four American companies that manufacture nuclear power plants. Poor economic conditions have dampened demand for electricity and made the financing of new power plants painfully expensive.

As a result, electric utilities have been canceling plans for new nuclear plants en masse. In the last eight years manufacturers have received only three orders for new facilities. The vendors' order books have been empty since 1979. And economists predict that the dearth of orders may continue for years.

The inevitable consequences of this drastic cutback will be an eroding of the critical base of skilled manpower and technological know-how that enabled American industry to excel in nuclear power plant design. Indeed, most plants under construction abroad are based upon designs and technology originally developed in the United States.

But ironically, foreign manufacturers like France's Framatome and Japan's Hitachi and Toshiba are boasting that their nuclear hardware now actually may be superior to U.S. hardware. And other countries appear to be heeding those boasts, because when smaller nations embark on a nuclear power development program, they tend to buy hardware from French or Japanese vendors. Granted, the governments in countries like France often do underwrite the financing of nuclear power plant exports. But the effect is the same.

American manufacturers are being frozen out as international suppliers of nuclear technology. At the same time, there are no new orders for domestic plants. How long can this situation continue without inflicting serious damage on America's ability to manufacture its own nuclear plants?

Wendell A. Johnson, president and chief operating officer of the Toledo Edison Co., raised exactly that kind of question last Wednesday at a University of Toledo engineering symposium.

"With no new plant orders, what will become of the major vendors?" he asked. "Fifteen years from now will we be able to assemble a design and construction team to build nuclear plants? Or will we become dependent upon the expertise of the French or the Japanese to help us build the next generation of power plants?"

The irony about the American public's preoccupation with sometimes baseless fears about nuclear power safety is that it obscures questions like these that so urgently demand answers and remedial action.

Concerns about safety need to be balanced with concerns about the long-term viability

of this industry. At present, nuclear energy appears to be the only practical source of electrical energy for industrialized societies of the future. Decades from now, we may dearly regret letting the technological advantage move from America to France and Japan.

NICARAGUA

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, this is not a routine request to enter something in the RECORD.

In connection with the security situation which confronts us in Central America, indeed the economic consequences of failing to meet that properly, as well as the security consequences which confront us daily, as we continue our necessary debate on how to confront our deficits, I invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues, all of whom, like me, are capable of rendering judgments only on the basis of the information they receive, this rather significant article.

It is an article in today's Washington Times, entitled "U.S. Officials Black Out Anti-Sandinista Rally." The article is by Phil Nicolaides of the Washington Times. I will read four paragraphs and ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

On Good Friday, a crowd of some 100,000 Nicaraguans thronged the plaza in front of Managua's National Cathedral for three hours to express, in the words of ABC's Peter Collins, "their passionate solidarity with the Catholic Church and opposition to the Sandinista regime." Some 8¼ million Americans watching the ABC-TV Evening News last Friday witnessed the event and heard the veteran network correspondent report it.

But if Americans had to rely on all other news sources singly or combined, they would never know it happened.

And if Americans had to rely on the State Department, they would be told it didn't happen.

None of the wire services carried the story or transmitted a single photograph to their hundreds of subscribers. None of America's newspapers reported it. Neither did NBC or CBS.

In summary, the rest of the article says that top administration officials confirm that such an event did take place, and there were erroneous reports on the part of people in our Embassy down there that it did not take place.

I ask my colleagues, as I shall do, to study carefully what is going on here.

Bishop Obando y Bravo went before the crowd and said, "Free Nicaragua! Christ forever!" He is a man who originally sympathized with the Sandinista regime, and he was at the forefront of that rally.

This is a very important piece of information for us. I happened to speak to that bishop and to the editor of La Prensa, whose father was killed by the Somoza people, and this heroic son is being threatened with death by the Sandinistas.

So I hope that we can recognize that this information is not only a presentation of information but also the withholding of information as characterized by the title of the book "Despite" and this is something we should all direct our attention to and try to sort out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article which I previously mentioned.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. OFFICIALS BLACK OUT ANTI-SANDINISTA RALLY

(By Phil Nicolaides)

On Good Friday, a crowd of some 100,000 Nicaraguans thronged the plaza in front of Managua's National Cathedral for three hours to express, in the words of ABC's Peter Collins, "their passionate solidarity with the Catholic Church and opposition to the Sandinista regime." Some 8¼ million Americans watching the ABC-TV Evening News last Friday witnessed the event and heard the veteran network correspondent report it.

But if Americans had to rely on all other news sources singly or combined, they would never know it happened.

And if Americans had to rely on the State Department, they would be told it didn't happen.

None of the wire services carried the story or transmitted a single photograph to their hundreds of subscribers. None of America's newspapers reported it. Neither did NBC or CBS.

When The Washington Times asked State Department spokesman Joseph Becelia for information about the demonstration, he said he had not heard of it and would have to telephone the U.S. Embassy in Managua for a report. U.S. diplomats in Managua had apparently not cabled to Washington anything about the huge demonstration.

Quoting Roger Gambel, the deputy chief of the U.S. mission, Mr. Becelia sharply challenged the accuracy of the ABC report. "This was not an anti-Sandinista demonstration," he said. "By no means—neither in its origin nor in its nature."

When pressed to explain the loud chants from the crowd and the placards clearly visible on the television screen in the Collins report, Mr. Becelia replied that "any anti-Sandinista character or manifestations were peripheral to the religious nature of the gathering—although there may have been scattered anti-government shouts and a few placards."

He also said the crowd numbered "only 50,000, not 100,000." The larger figure, he said, "was a church estimate."

An ABC spokesman said, "Our crowd estimates were based on a careful review of the capacity of the plaza—the size of two football fields—and the density." In fact, he said, "some church officials were saying the crowd numbered 200,000. That 500,000 figure you got from the embassy is a Sandinista estimate. I don't know why anyone would take it as reliable."

A top administration official said the handling of this affair by the American embassy in Managua "unfortunately confirms the view of some of us that our 'experts' are not expert enough. It casts new light," the source continued, "on the reasons the Kissinger Commission was so dissatisfied with the attitudes and the abilities of our people down there."

A highly placed White House source, told of the State Department explanation, called it "absolutely incredible—those embassy people must be asleep at the switch."

"A disgusting performance," was the reaction of a former high government official closely involved in Latin American policy matters. "But the problem goes beyond embassy ineptitude," he said.

"The real question is why is State's Bureau of Inter-American Affairs putting this curious negative spin on events in Nicaragua which should be playing into our hands and supporting our position?

"It took great courage for those people to join in such a tremendous popular manifestation," he said. "They risked being physically attacked by the turbas divinas [divine mobs]—Marxist goon squads who frequently assault people, even in church buildings, when there is any complaining about the regime."

ABC News officials stood by their story. One reporter on the scene said the State Department's attempt to downplay the political significance of this event—the people of Nicaragua rallying around their church and their bishop in defiance of the Sandinista regime—must be because they don't know what's going on, or don't want to know.

"Anyone who saw what we saw and heard what we heard would have grasped the fact that this was an outpouring of religious fervor, but also that feeling was directed against the regime, which has been fighting the church. The leaders of the demonstration, Bishop Obando y Bravo and Father Bismarck Carballo, are symbols of resistance and frequent targets of the Sandinistas," the network reporter said.

One of the frequent chants, ABC, said, was, "'We are Christians, not Marxists.' That ought to tell you something."

A high administration official confirmed this account and agreed that the State Department's view was "way off base." He recalled how American embassy staffers in Moscow "showed the same kind of blindness when they failed to read the unmistakable signs that Yuri Andropov had died. Dusko Doder [of the Washington Post] filed the story, and eight hours later our embassy there was still denying it," he recalled.

Some highlights of the original ABC report:

"The crowd of 100,000 . . . led by Archbishop Obando y Bravo, in an exquisite rebuff to Sandinista leaders who had said he was out of touch with the people. . . shouted, 'Free Nicaragua!' and 'Christ Forever!'

"None of the Sandinista leaders was present. Most are declared atheists. In a defiant gesture, the march was organized by Father Bismarck Carballo, the director of communications, a priest the regime tried to discredit last year. . . The church has begun to take on the role of the church in Poland. It is becoming the focus of opposition to the Sandinista regime.

"No police were present, because the Sandinistas know the church is the one force that can rally the people against the government. For their part, the church leaders said nothing against the regime, but emphasized the need for Catholic faith which here, as in Poland, means 'No' to Marxism."

Two days after the demonstration, the bishops of Nicaragua issued an Easter pastoral letter sharply critical of the regime. The letter was bitterly attacked in the govern-

ment controlled newspaper Barricada for failing to condemn "North American imperialism," and for urging the regime "to enter a dialogue with the murderers of our people."

The bishops' letter was one of the strongest ever issued by the church against the Sandinista regime. It condemned press censorship, the detention of political prisoners, violence against the Indian minority, restrictions on religious freedom, and the collapsing economy which has caused acute shortages and rationing.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) for bringing to the attention of the Senate the account found in the Washington Times of April 26 under the byline of Phil Nicolaides.

I know the distinguished Archbishop Obando y Bravo, a leader of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua. I met and visited with him at length as part of the Kissinger Commission investigation and finding of facts which took us to Nicaragua in October of last year.

I must say that I have not had as many opportunities in my life to see brave people as the distinguished Senator from Alabama. As a matter of fact, clearly, I have not had an opportunity to be brave as he was as a prisoner of war for over 7 years. The distinguished Senator has far exceeded what I have done and hopefully would have to do.

But I suggest that the subject of the article, this man, Archbishop Obando y Bravo, is a true hero. And I think he is in danger every day of his life in Sandinista Nicaragua, just as we were in danger in Somoza's Nicaragua.

I am delighted that the archbishop presided over or was part of this rally of the faithful that was reported by ABC and then repeated here in the Washington Times, because I think that the international visibility does give him an opportunity to survive in Sandinista Nicaragua, which is, with the passage of each day, growing more and more an armed camp, with no basic freedom whatsoever. It is more and more like Nazi Germany in its beginning days, really, than anything else.

I do not know why we seem to get multiple versions of every little item that happens in Central America when it is against the interests of those we are trying to help. For instance, we, properly, learn about every deficiency of the new democracy that is trying to establish itself in El Salvador, but it is so difficult for us to get news about what the Sandinista Commandantes are doing to freedom-loving individuals and the churches in Nicaragua.

I commend the Senator for putting us on notice here, and, while I am not an expert on embassies, or ambassadors, which are good and which are not, I concur that the Embassy in Nicaragua just has to report events more objectively and more fully than they have in the past.

I was not very pleased with what I saw there when I went down for that visit to Central American countries. Here again, I do not know how the Embassy could miss 100,000 Nicaraguans meeting with church leaders, not Nicaraguan Marxist leaders, but merely church leaders and others outside of the Government. How we could miss reporting that from our Embassy is something rather significant, especially since the cry of the meeting was a simple one—freedom and Christ. I guess these Nicaraguans are trying to tell us that some of their leaders are trying to do away with these ideals in that country. Both freedom and Christ would be replaced by Marxism and Sandino.

So I commend the Senator for bringing this meeting to our attention.

CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, a year ago our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator CHRIS DODD, carefully addressed the issue of Central America and told us where the President's policy was taking us. It was a tough statement and it created a lot of controversy. And it created a lot of controversy because Senator DODD had the guts "to tell the emperor he had no clothes" and a lot of folks around Washington thought that was improper, if not downright impolite.

Improper and impolite, well, I for one wish we had been a lot more improper and impolite on the issue of Lebanon. If we had, we might have saved a few hundred American lives. But we were not and those lives were lost.

Let us not do in El Salvador, or in Central America what we did in Lebanon or in other misguided military adventures. Let us not rely only on a military solution to complicated problems. That was Senator DODD's message a year ago to the American people, and it is a message that is well worth repeating. Let us use our trade markets to bring a needed stimulus to the stagnant economies of Latin America. Let us take advantage of the political options open to us, for example, the Contadora process. Let us take advantage of the negotiating framework established by some of our closest allies in this region—Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama. And let us do it before the quagmire of a military solution in Central America closes around us and we are left to claw our way out.

For those who need a roadmap on how to get from here to there, I urge them to take another look at Senator DODD's statement delivered April 27, 1983. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ADDRESS TO JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

(Remarks delivered by Senator CHRISTOPHER J. DODD)

Good evening. I want to thank the networks for the opportunity to offer a different viewpoint. While there is no unanimity in Congress—on either side of the aisle—on Central America, tonight I am speaking for the many Americans who are concerned about our ever-deepening involvement in the military conflict in that part of the world.

I am pleased to note that the President this evening was willing to recognize an economic and political dimension of the problems in Central America, including the possibility of negotiations. Concerned Members of Congress have been pressing this point of view since he came to office. Regrettably, however, as his statement tonight demonstrates, the fundamental view continues to emphasize military problems and the search for military solutions.

In the months and years that follow this evening, after the applause has faded and the ringing phrases are forgotten, Americans will have to live with the choices we make in this fateful time of decision.

In the past, we as a nation have learned painfully that the truth is never as simple as some would paint it. Charts and statistics can be used or misused to prove any side of a case. And speeches can sound very good without being very right.

So first of all, let me state clearly that on some very important things, all Americans stand in agreement.

We will oppose the establishment of Marxist states in Central America.

We will not accept the creation of Soviet military bases in Central American.

And, we will not tolerate the placement of Soviet offensive missiles in Central America—or anywhere in this hemisphere.

Finally, we are fully prepared to defend our security and the security of the Americas, if necessary, by military means.

All patriotic Americans share these goals. But many of us in Congress, Democrats and Republicans, respectfully disagree with the President because we believe the means he has chosen will not fulfill them.

Those of us who oppose the President's policy believe that he is mistaken in critical ways. To begin with, we believe the Administration fundamentally misunderstands the causes of the conflict in Central America. We cannot afford to found so important a policy on ignorance—and the painful truth is that many of our highest officials seem to know as little about Central America in 1983 as we knew about Indochina in 1963.

I've lived with the people in this region. Let me share some facts with you about Central America.

Most of the people there are appallingly poor. They can't afford to feed their families when they're hungry. They can't find a doctor for them when they're sick. They live in rural dirt shacks with dirt floors of city slums without plumbing or clean water. The majority can't read or write. Many of them don't even know how to count.

It takes all five Spanish-speaking countries of Central America more than a year to produce what this nation does in less than three days. Virtually none of even that

meager amount ever reaches the bulk of the people. In short, a very few live in isolated splendor while the very many suffer in shantytown squalor. In country after country, dictatorship or military dominance has stifled democracy and destroyed human rights.

If Central America were not racked with poverty, there would be no revolution. If Central America were not racked with hunger, there would be no revolution. If Central America were not racked with injustice, there would be no revolution. In short, there would be nothing for the Soviets to exploit. But unless those oppressive conditions change, the region will continue to seethe with revolution—with or without the Soviets.

Instead of trying to do something about the factors which breed revolution, this Administration has turned to massive military buildups at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. Its policy is ever increasing military assistance, endless military training, and further military involvement. This is a formula for failure. And it is a proven prescription for picking a loser. The American people know that we have been down this road before—and that it only leads to a dark tunnel of endless intervention.

Tonight the President himself told us that things were not going well in Central America. But for this the President cannot blame Congress. We have given him what he has asked. $700 million in economic and military assistance has been delivered or is on its way to El Salvador since Ronald Reagan came to office . . . all at his request, and all with Congressional approval. One of every five Salvadoran soldiers fighting for its government was trained right here in the United States. American soldiers are there now training Salvadoran army units which are employing modern weapons built in American factories.

Now the President asks for an even greater commitment. His requests for El Salvador alone will bring the total aid to that country during his term to more than $1 billion.

One billion dollars to counter a rebel army that, according to all reports, does not exceed 7,000 guerrillas. That means you are paying $140,000 in hard-earned tax dollars for each one of those guerrillas we are trying to defeat.

While your tax dollars have been pouring into El Salvador, the money skimmed off by that nation's rich is leaving the country. For every dolar we've sent in, more than a dollar has gone out—to numbered accounts in Zurich or to buy Wall Street stocks. It raises the question of why we should invest in the future of El Salvador when the wealthiest citizens of that country are investing in Swiss banks.

What return have we achieved for all we have spent? The army in El Salvador has been reluctant to fight—and it is led by an officer corps working a nine-to-five shift with weekends off. Land reform has been abandoned. At least 30,000 civilians have been killed, and the majority of them have been victims of the government's own security forces. American nuns and labor advisors have been murdered—and the judicial system is so intimidated that it cannot even bring accused murderers to trial.

For those 30,000 murders, confirmed by our own embassy, there have been fewer than 200 convictions.

American dollars alone cannot buy military victory—that is the lesson of the painful past and of this newest conflict in Central America. If we continue down that road, if we continue to ally ourselves with repression, we will not only deny our own most basic values, we will also find ourselves once again on the losing side. It is folly, pure and simple, to pursue a course which is wrong in principle—in order to wage a conflict which cannot be won.

After 30,000 deaths, after hundreds of millions of dollars, with the ante going up, with no end in sight, and with no hope for any real change, the time has come for a different approach. Yes, we are fully prepared to be involved in Central America. But the question is the nature and quality of our involvement. We must offer an alternative policy that can work.

First, we should use the power and influence of the United States to achieve an immediate cessation of hostilities in both El Salvador and Nicaragua. Already in both those countries too many people have died. It is time for the killing to stop.

Second, the United States should use all its power and influence to work for a negotiated political settlement in Central America.

In El Salvador, the rebels have offered to negotiate unconditionally. Let us test their sincerity. We certainly have the leverage to move the government to the bargaining table. On his recent trip to that very Catholic region, the Pope lent the moral force of his office to such a step. It is practical and realistic to expect, that if we support it, these talks can get underway. And every major ally of ours in the region—Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia—is anxious for such a step to be taken, and has offered to make the arrangements.

Those same nations have volunteered to bring Nicaragua into negotiations—and Nicaragua has agreed to talk. Instead, as we know from press accounts, this Administration is conducting a not so secret war inside that country.

No one in this Congress or this country is under the delusion that the Sandinista government is a model democracy or a force for stability. But the insurgents we have supported are the remnants of the old Somoza regime—a regime whose corruption, graft, torture, and despotism made it universally despised in Nicaragua. The Sandinistas may not be winners, but right now we are backing sure losers. We are doing for the Sandinista Marxists what they could not do for themselves. We are weakening the very groups inside Nicaragua which believe in a free and democratic society. And that is the sad irony of this administration's policy.

Third, we must restore America's role as a source of hope and a force for progress in Central America. We must help governments only if they will help their own people. We must hear the cry for bread, schools, work, and opportunity that comes from campesinos everywhere in this hemisphere. We must make violent revolution preventable by making peaceful revolution possible.

Most important, this approach would permit the United States to move with the tide of history rather than stand against it.

For us, the stakes are diplomatic, political, and strategic. But for the people of El Salvador, life itself is on the line.

I have been to that country and I know about the morticians who travel the streets each morning to collect the bodies of those summarily dispatched the night before by Salvadoran Security Forces—gangland-style—the victim on bended knee, thumbs wired behind the back, a bullet through the brain.

We recoil at such an image for our association with criminals such as these is not America's tradition. In other, brighter days we have stood for the aspirations of all the people who are part of the Americas. Two centuries ago, our nation raised the light of liberty before the world—and all of this hemisphere looked to us as an example and an inspiration. In this Capitol building from which I speak tonight, men like Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and Abraham Lincoln once spoke of an America leading the way to human progress and human rights—and people everywhere listened with hope.

There is no greater or larger ideal than the one which was forged here in the early days of this Republic. That ideal of liberty is our greatest strength as a nation; it is a powerful and peaceful weapon against tyranny of any kind anywhere in this hemisphere.

We can take the road of military escalation. But we really don't know what the next step will be, where it will lead, or how much it will cost. This much, however, we do know. It will mean greater violence. It will mean greater bloodshed. It will mean greater hostilities. And, inevitably, the day will come when it will mean a regional conflict in Central America.

When that day comes—when "the dogs of war" are loose in Central America, when the cheering has stopped—we will know where the President's appeal for more American money and a deeper American commitment has taken us.

Thank you and good night.

ANSEL ADAMS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, a celebrated artist, dedicated conservationist, and fellow Californian, Ansel Adams, died on Sunday, April 22 at the age of 82. I had the privilege of meeting Ansel Adams. His passing will leave a permanent void in the worlds of art and activism, his twin pursuits. For his devotees from both of those worlds, he leaves behind a legacy that will be honored, invoked, and built upon for years to come.

Mr. Adams' photographs are among the most admired and respected of any American photographer, past or present. He pioneered photographic techniques and a unique style that helped to transform photography from a novelty to an art form.

Ansel Adams' photographs of the American West not only changed photography, but also enormously expanded Americans' knowledge of their country. Literally millions worldwide who would never travel to or experience otherwise the beauty of California's Yosemite Valley, New Mexico's desert, and other wilderness areas, were permitted to do so through Mr. Adams' photographs. Through Ansel Adams' art and advocacy, there has come to be a wide awareness of and keen appreciation for the Western wilderness.

That awareness, coupled with Ansel Adams' environmental activism, brought about changes in the Government's attitude toward wilderness. In

the 1930's, Mr. Adams packed up his photographs of Kings Canyon in California, came to Washington, and successfully lobbied Congress to make the area a national park.

Up until the moment he died, Ansel Adams remained active in photography and conservation. He often wrote to me to offer counsel and constructive criticism on environmental issues. I valued his opinion. I only wish he could have lived long enough to see the resolution of the longstanding controversy over the California wilderness issue. I hope we will resolve this impasse very soon, and can perhaps in some way properly honor Mr. Adams' memory in doing so.

Ansel Adams will not be forgotten. His memory will be cherished by all who knew him and his remarkable works.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the previous order, that I may proceed for not more than 2 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDATION OF ELMER E. RASMUSON

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, ordinarily the leadership on this side would not proceed to the consideration of a matter until it has been printed on the calendar for 1 day. There have been two or three exceptions to that because of extraordinary circumstances, and in each case, I believe, the cloakroom on this side has notified Senators that the leadership intends to proceed in that manner.

Such an exception has appeared today and the cloakroom notification has gone out by hotline to Members on this side saying that it is the intention of the leadership to ask the Senate to turn to the consideration of a concurrent resolution on behalf of Senators STEVENS and MURKOWSKI, commending Elmer E. Rasmuson, retiring as Chairman of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission.

The two Senators are especially anxious for this to be done as soon as possible.

Given the circumstances involved, given the fact that it is not a substantive legislative matter, and the fact that a hotline notification has gone out, I will now ask the minority leader if he has any objection to proceeding to the immediate consideration of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, having been informed of the desire of the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished assistant majority leader, we on our side have run the telephones and we find no objection to proceeding with the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader. I am sure that the two Senators from Alaska especially thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution on behalf of Senators STEVENS and MURKOWSKI and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution will be stated by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) to honor Elmer E. Rasmuson.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 108, a concurrent resolution honoring a great Alaskan resident, Elmer E. Rasmuson. This resolution specifically notes Elmer's significant contributions as a member and Chairman of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission (INPFC), from which he will be retiring this June.

During the course of his 15 years on the INPFC, Elmer has been a principal force in the development and management of fisheries in the North Pacific. He has guided the INPFC toward achievement of its goals as stated in its protocol, and was instrumental in the recognition of that protocol in 1978. Elmer was the first Chairman of the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council and established that Council in the forefront of fisheries management in the United States.

In addition to his outstanding contributions to the U.S. fishing industry, Elmer, along with his gracious wife Mary Louise, has been a key citizen in the State of Alaska, in both the private and public sectors. He served as president and chief executive officer of the National Bank of Alaska from 1943–65, and then as chairman of the board until 1974. He is currently chairman of the Budget and Planning Committee of NBA. He is a past chairman of the Alaska Permanent Fund Corp. He served as mayor of Anchorage, Alaska's largest city, from 1964–67. Elmer also served on the University of Alaska Board of Regents for 19 years. He has received numerous awards and recognition for his many contributions to enhance the quality of Alaska lifestyle.

I am particularly proud to join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), as an original cosponsor of this concurrent resolution honoring a great Alaskan.

I initiated my banking career in 1959 with Elmer Rasmuson's organization and was a member of National Bank of Alaska's official corporate family for some 10 years. I am deeply indebted for the valuable training and experiences gained under Elmer's direction.

Elmer Rasmuson's contribution to both the State of Alaska and this Nation has been most significant. Thank you Elmer and Mary Louise.

The concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 108

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson will retire as Chairman of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission (INPFC) in June, 1984 after fifteen years of service on that body;

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson has been a principal force in the development and management of the fisheries of the North Pacific;

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson directed the INPFC toward its goal as stated in the protocol "to promote and coordinate scientific studies relating to the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean . . . and aid in the conservation of these fishery resources";

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson was instrumental in the negotiation of the INPFC Protocol in 1978 which significantly advanced United States fishing interests;

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson has commissioned the preparation of a history of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission to promote the goals and purpose of the Commission; and

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson served as the first chairman of the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council pursuant to the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, and established that council in the forefront of fisheries managment in the United States:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), The Congress of the United States of America commends Elmer E. Rasmuson for his exemplary contributions to the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission and for the promotion of its goals and purposes.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have put out another hotline on this side saying that at or about 1 o'clock today, the leadership on this side may seek a unanimous-consent agreement that only certain listed amendments will be in order to the pending bill or the amendment thereto. I am not sure I can get that unanimous-consent agreement, but this statement is to place Senators further on notice as to that possibility that at 1, approximately, such a request will be made.

It is not meant to encourage Members to list amendments. Indeed, I hope some of the amendments that have been listed will be deleted. We are up to 28 now on this side, 10 more than we began with this morning, and

I do not know what the situation is on the other side of the aisle.

I advised the minority leader that I might make such a request and that I have put out such a hotline. I chose this moment to give Senators further notice of the possibility of such a request at that time.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the time for the conclusion of morning business extended has expired, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct. The time for the transaction of routine morning business is closed.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOM MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume the consideration of the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

(Pending: Baker Amendment No. 3027, to further reduce deficits by including reconciliation provisions and appropriations caps for defense and nondefense discretionary spending for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SYMMS BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I am in the process, I announce to my colleagues, of getting my proposal to the floor, but I would first like to make a few comments about the budget process and the bill that is before the Senate today.

The proposal I would bring before the Senate will freeze all COLA's for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 except for means-tested entitlement programs, which are exempted from the freeze. All nondefense discretionary programs will be cut 10 percent in budget authority, or program level where appropriate, below the fiscal year 1984 CBO baseline level of fiscal year 1985. Then, in 1986 and 1987, they will be frozen at that position and no civilian agency pay raises will be allowed in fiscal years 1985 and 1987.

In defense, Mr. President, we shall assume the revised President's defense request, since I have changed it from the proposal I offered in the Budget Committee, to reflect the numbers that the leadership package has agreed to except for one additional provision. There will be no DOD military or civilian pay raises in fiscal years 1985 through 1987. The plan also includes the assumption of a little additional money to assume that each senior executive staff employee will, in accomplishing these reductions and efficiencies with respect to Government, receive a one-time bonus of $20,000 in fiscal year 1984 and 1985 contingent upon budget cuts and efficiencies being achieved.

Mr. President, I offered that proposal in the Budget Committee. It did not receive much support. I offer it here this morning, not expecting that it is going to have a runaway support level, but I think it is something to which we should give serious consideration. It is an opportunity, a way to substantially reduce the budget deficit.

The proposal I offered in the committee actually reduced the deficit by about $181 billion.

It will incorporate slightly more reductions now because we are actually going to increase the cuts in defense over what I offered in the Budget Committee, because the CBO staff ran the numbers for me using the early, higher defense numbers of the President.

I offer this budget even though there have been months of hard work and negotiations by the leadership and the White House on a leadership package. I do not think there is any plan we can find as Members of the Congress on which we would get complete agreement. The deficit reduction package offered by the Republican leadership is a better alternative than the other major alternatives presented in the committee which all contained greater tax increases.

What disappoints me is that every time we talk about achieving savings in Washington, the recommendations for cuts are usually inequitable. About 27 percent of our total Federal budget is for defense, but defense is always asked to come up with the greater portion of the savings, while nondefense spending consumes 73 percent of the budget. We will continue to take more from the taxpayers by raising taxes, unless we agree to restrain the real budget boosters, which are the growing entitlement programs.

I was, as I said, disappointed but not surprised that the budget proposal which I put forward in the committee was rejected. I think it is unfortunate that Congress is always reluctant, particularly during an election year, to hold the line on spending. This budget plan would have frozen all Federal pay, benefit, and retirement checks at their current level for 3 years, exempting means-tested programs, thereby protecting those citizens at the poverty level. It would enact a 10-percent cut in nondefense discretionary programs from their 1984 levels, freezing the spending level in 1986 and 1987. And this plan would save $180 billion over 4 years without increasing any taxes.

Now, Mr. President, I am, as I said, revising those defense numbers. They are in the process of being compiled right now, so I estimate there will be an additional $16 billion or $20 billion more in savings which will be reflected in defense. Consequently, the deficit reduction would total more than $180 billion over the 4 years. But it achieves these savings without increasing any taxes and without reducing anyone's current benefit levels.

While some viewed this plan as harsh, I am convinced that it contained exactly the spending remedy that this economy needs to stay on the road to recovery. Although President Reagan's economic program has dramatically slowed inflation and increased employment, long-term interest rates will remain unacceptably high until Congress can demonstrate the political will to restrain ever-increasing transfer payments. To date, the political will for fiscal restraint has been virtually nonexistent.

In 1955, after both the Second World War and the conflict in Korea, the national debt stood at $273 billion. Before President Reagan submitted his budget in 1980, the national debt stood at $930 billion. During the time period that big spenders controlled both Houses of Congress, when the tax, spend, and elect mentality gripped our legislators, interest rates rose from 5 to 20 percent. Money drained from our capital markets could have built homes, refurbished antiquated factories and industries, and allowed young people to buy houses which they cannot afford today. Instead, this money was spent wastefully, on pork-barrel projects, on excessive regulation, and on grants and low-interest loans to Communist countries, while the American taxpayer was forced to pay the escalating prime interest rate. Thus, our taxpayers essentially get hit twice, once with taxes to pay for spending programs, and second, with the higher interest rates that accompany deficit spending. Congress big spenders spoke of compassion and urged more spending programs as a solution for perceived social ills. Yet there was little compassion or thought for the young people of today condemned to paying exorbitant interest rates on the debts which were incurred by a series of fiscally negligent Congresses.

The basic premises of the Reagan economic recovery program were

sound. Excessive, anticapital formation taxes had depressed economic activity, the Federal Government had tended to rely on high rates of monetary inflation to finance increased spending, and expenditures had shifted at the national level from defense and capital resource investment to domestic social programs. The Reagan administration sought to reverse that dangerous trend with its accompanying negative impact on economic vitality, free enterprise, and individual initiative. The 1981 tax cuts were meant to leave more money in the hands of those who earned it, and by so doing, spur investment and economic growth. The basic assumption was that tax cuts are more effective in promoting economic growth than Government spending. This approach to economic growth is also termed supply-side economics, and is 100 percent consistent with the fundamental tenets of capitalism, the singular most successful economic system in the world.

But the Reagan economic program was watered down, as Congress diminished the tax cuts, and refused to restrain social spending. Today, we are confronted with the largest budget and the largest budget deficit in our history. The major media tends to incorrectly cite the President's tax cuts and the badly needed defense modernization program as the deficit culprits. The record does not show that that is the truth. The 1981 tax cuts, however, were largely obliterated by several revenue enhancement measures which followed their passage: changing the original Kemp-Roth 10-10-10 formula to a delayed 5-10-10 formula, the 1982 social security tax hike, the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA), a $100 billion package which promised to eliminate the deficit, and the $50 billion tax package which Congress just recently enacted. Indexing, the single most important tax reform achieved by the Reagan administration, has been preserved. But even indexing, which largely protects the middle and lower income families from the unlegislated taxes of bracket creep, has been under constant attack since its passage.

Clearly, the tax cuts have done little more than to stabilize the tax burden of the average American. Two decades ago, taxes amounted to about 18.7 percent of GNP. Tax collections in 1983 ran at about 20 percent of GNP. Federal spending, in contrast, increased in 20 years from 20 to 25 percent of GNP. The deficit is the consequence of excessive Government spending, not undertaxation. Although the President's tax stabilization effort has given new incentives for production and encouraged economic resurgence, the continued high rate of Federal spending threatens long-term recovery.

I think this is an opportunity for us, if we would vote for this amendment, to take a big step toward restoring confidence in this economy among the financial markets and among the people up and down Main Streets of America.

The defense budget, according to popular media misreporting, is responsible for the deficit, and antidefense forces urge that the defense budget take a disproportionate cut in comparison to nondefense programs which comprise 73 percent of the overall Federal budget. Defense, as a portion of the Federal pie has been sharply reduced from its 45 percent level during the Kennedy administration to about 27 percent during the current administration. Since President Carter's last year in office, nondefense spending has increased by $150 billion, the equivalent of 75 percent of our current deficit.

I would not contend that savings cannot be achieved in the Department of Defense. If Congress continues to enact arbitrary cuts, however, it only precipitates a reoccurrence of the problems that have plagued the Pentagon in the past—stretchout of procurement programs at uneconomic rates of production, decreases in readiness by restricting funding for operations and maintenance, foregoing modernization of our strategic and theater nuclear forces, and slowdowns of general purpose and naval force modernization extending already over long leadtimes.

The multiyear approach to defense program planning and budgeting deserves serious consideration. Our defense personnel system must be scrutinized. The All-Volunteer Force and the military retirement program are consuming over half of our defense budget, while in comparison the Soviets spend 11 percent of their defense outlays on personnel costs.

Congress has become fixated with micromanagement, and are overinvolved in decisions on specific weapons based on parochial interests. Congress has failed to provide the long-term program stability that is the key to curbing defense costs. Long-term program stability could cut 5 to 6 years out of the acquisition cycle and consequently achieve tremendous savings. Often, the Soviets are able to steal our technology, deploy, test, and repair their new weapons before the Pentagon can even secure a "yes" or "no" on a specific design from the Congress. This unpleasant truth is not reassuring to anyone concerned about our efforts to catch up with Soviet military superiority. The Soviets, with a GNP 80 percent less than our own, devote 15 percent of their GNP to defense allocations, while we spend 6.7 percent of our GNP for defense. I am pleased that this budget resolution provides adequate funds to continue our efforts to regain military parity with the Soviet Union. Last, the defense budget should never be predicated on budgetary priorities. It should be calculated to counter threats to our national security.

What has brought about the marked shift in Federal spending priorities away from national defense toward increased domestic social spending? The simple, compelling fact is that funding a strong national defense does not have the immediate political gratification that Congress receives from satisfying the demands of the expanding social spending constituency. Politicians discovered years ago that votes were easily bought with social programs and managed to sell their voting public on the outrageous falsehood that government, rather than the private sector, is the creator of wealth.

As a result, the United States has accumulated more debt in the past 13 years than in the first 175 years of the Nation's existence. Indexed benefits have been responsible for the majority of program growth in the decade of the 1970's. Although indexing was intended to counter the effect of inflation, it actually contributes to further price inflation since automatic multibillion dollar increases in income benefits fuel increased Federal spending and higher taxes. Today, nearly every major welfare, retirement, disability, and survivor benefit program adjusts benefits yearly—and some as often as semiannually—to reflect increases in some measuring index. Not surprisingly, entitlements have moved from 36.1 percent of the Federal budget in 1967 to a high of 59.1 percent in 1980.

H. L. Mencken once made a statement that Franklin D. Roosevelt thought the Federal Government was a gigantic milch cow with 100 million teats. It has also been said that government is the illusion that we can all live at someone else's expense. Under the guise of helping the poor and needy, a lot of money has found its way to government administrators, to statisticians, consultants, economists, sociologists, think tanks, and assorted social agencies. The big spenders keep asking for more money for social programs, without questioning how much of the resources intended for the unfortunate in our society actually reaches the source. Yet efforts to circumvent the welfare bureaucracy through block grants or cash payments are met with cries of indignation that the poor would be hurt by such direct aid.

Today's spendthrift politicians should heed advice that was offered by President Coolidge—

> We must have no carelessness in our dealings with public property or the expenditures of public money. Such a condition is characteristic either of an undeveloped people or of a decadent civilization.

Our Republic was created by men of vision, who believed foremost in individual and national freedom. Their premise was that a government composed of imperfect leaders exercising power over others should possess strictly limited authority. That unique concept led to an experiment in freedom that resulted in unparalleled economic growth and a standard of living unmatched by any other nation. That prototype of government has all but disappeared. We face a monumental decision as free people today—do we want continued expansion of the social welfare state and greater usurpation of individual freedom, or do we want to restore individual work incentives, fiscal restraint, and allow for a stable and prosperous economy?

This country has been infected with a sense of entitlement that feeds upon itself. Special interest groups and their beneficiaries are adept at pressuring Congress to enact new and expensive programs and to expand existing ones. I believe we should remember the one entitled group that is neither highly vocal, visible, or astute as lobbying Congress for handouts—the American taxpayers. The taxpayer is too often forgotten in our struggles for the disbursing of public funds.

There are several major initiatives that Congress should implement, and perhaps such will be attainable following the November elections. The balanced-budget concept was dismissed as naive in modern economics. The Federal Government's power to print money was abused, and monetizing the deficit seemed a harmless way to wipe out debt. The side effect was rampant inflation, reduced purchasing power, and economic disaster. I strongly support a constitutional amendment mandating a balanced budget, and restrictions on Federal spending authority to a realistic percentage of the gross national product.

Second, the President of the United States, no matter who he or she is, should be given line-item veto authority, which nearly all State Governors now possess.

Last, fundamental reforms to scale down the growth of the entitlement sector must be instituted, and the freezing of these COLA's and adjustments would be a good way to start.

There is a current pervasive attitude of defeatism about controlling spending in Washington. I find that the most frustrating part of being in the U.S. Senate. In fact, I find it intolerable. Members find enacting tax increases easier than addressing necessary spending reform. Our budgetary problems can only be solved by reassessing proper levels of Federal spending. Public awareness of the impact of higher levels of public spending is crucial to the redirection of national priorities—toward limited government, freedom for the American citizen, and the survival and competitiveness of the United States internationally.

Mr. President, that is why I offer this amendment today. It is why I offer it in the Budget Committee. I find that our problem is Government spending. Our problem is not that we do not have enough Federal revenues.

All we need do is take a look at the chart, and we can see that Federal revenues have increased consistently for the last 10, 15, or 20 years.

It is projected that we will have around $750 billion of revenues in fiscal year 1985. If we were to spend only $85 million an hour, which is all we were spending last year, we would have a balanced budget in fiscal year 1985. But $85 million an hour, no matter how much money it seems to be, is not enough to satiate the appetite of the Federal spending machine. This proposal calls for spending $100 million an hour.

Every hour that goes by another $100 million will be spent when this proposal comes into law. That is why I offer the amendment I do. It is probably too paltry, even though it will cut out over $200 billion in budget expenditures over a 3-year period without hurting national defense, although defense will carry part of this savings.

Mr. President, I now have a breakdown here on the numbers. There will, as I have stated, be no increase in revenues. In my original proposal, there were $27 billion in defense savings and now there will be another $40 billion added to that approximately, so there will be about $70 billion in defense savings, and $132 billion in nondefense savings, coming up for a total of over $200 billion with no tax increases.

So this is something substantive for any of those who wish to have an opportunity to vote for a budget which would mandate additional savings in defense over and above what is contained in this leadership package. This plan would freeze military pensions, military pay, and Department of Defense civil servant pay for a 3-year period, as would all Federal employees' pay and all Federal pensions over the same 3-year period.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado just asked me a question to explain basically the difference between the proposal that I offer here today and the more highly publicized KGB plan that our distinguished colleagues from Kansas, Iowa, and Delaware will be offering. This plan is a 3-year freeze instead of 1 year, and this will have the rose garden defense numbers in it, but in addition to the rose garden defense numbers, it would reflect about significant savings in addition to that because there will be no DOD—civilian and military—pay raises from fiscal year 1985 through 1987, and also in military pensions, there will be no COLA's from 1985 through 1987.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMMS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Senator from Idaho is well aware that this year you cannot offer a budget plan with any hope of success unless it has some sort of an important acronym. In other words, this is in the down payment plan or Rose Garden plan or KGB plan. What is the name that attaches to this by which we should know this?

Mr. SYMMS. This is the Symms budget proposal for 1984, which I think would give us economic recovery.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I must say I am attracted, sort of, to the substance of this idea, but I just think that in 1984 you have to have a flashier name than that in order to attract the attention of Members and the general public, and I urge the Senator to think on that.

While he does, may I ask a couple of questions about the substance of it?

Mr. SYMMS. The Senator certainly may.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to be sure I understand.

What the Senator is doing in this budget proposal is to cut the nondefense discretionary programs 10 percent from the CBO baseline.

Mr. SYMMS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then with respect to the entitlement programs to the cost-of-living adjusted programs, the Senator is freezing the cost-of-living adjustments except for those which are means-tested?

Mr. SYMMS. Anyone that is means-tested would not have their benefits frozen. They would get their cost-of-living adjustments.

I might also say that the people in this plan who would, say, be social security recipients, if for any reason they came under the poverty level, then they would be qualified to apply for means-tested entitlements, and therefore eligible to pick up again a full COLA. So this plan keeps the safety net in place for the people that need to participate in means-tested entitlement programs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, he offered a version of this plan in committee. I voted against it because, as I understood it at that time, it did not in-

corporate substantial savings in the defense function.

It appeared to me, as much as I would like to maintain the strongest and most powerful defense that we can afford, it did appear to me that large-scale cuts in other programs would not be feasible if we are unwilling to make some savings in defense. So I reluctantly voted against his plan.

But do I understand correctly that the Senator is now suggesting, in addition to what we have already discussed, that he is also planning cutbacks in the rate of increase in growth in the defense function, as well?

Mr. SYMMS. That is correct. I have taken the Republican leadership package, known as the rose garden package, and added more savings than that package has with respect to defense by freezing DOD pay and military COLA's. The package I offered in the committee that the Senator refers to included a $27 billion defense savings over fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987. It reflected only $27 billion in savings in the area of defense.

We are having CBO recalculate those numbers, so I believe we will be somewhere closer to $40 billion in defense savings and $132 billion in nondefense savings. The total, instead of around $181 billion, is going to be closer to around $200 billion.

The Senator asked me another question moments ago when we were casually visiting, about the tax side of this package. I did not include the $50 billion package that has passed the Senate since this was estimated. So, in effect, if that package all become part of the law and my budget plan becomes part of the law, there would be over a $250 billion savings on the deficit as opposed to the $200 billion that will be reflected here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The $250 billion, that is from the CBO baseline or from the baseline adjusted in the same way that the committee's proposal is? In other words, should we compare that with the $150 billion number that is proposed by the pending leadership or rose garden amendment?

Mr. SYMMS. I am not sure I can answer that question. I need to counsel with the staff on that.

The reason I had the higher defense number to begin with was because this plan was calculated using the President's original request.

I would say to the Senator that the savings would be about $200 billion from the baseline.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. From the CBO baseline?

Mr. SYMMS. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And that is the amount of the savings in the Senator's amendment?

Mr. SYMMS. That is the savings in Government spending.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And an additional $48 to $50 billion is included in the tax portion of the bill that has already gone through the Senate?

Mr. SYMMS. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. For purposes of comparison, the net deficit reduction we would expect under this plan would be about $250 billion?

Mr. SYMMS. That is correct.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is not quite double, but it is substantially greater than other proposals now pending?

Mr. SYMMS. Yes. And I would say to the Senator that if something like this should pass the U.S. Senate today, I think the response in the financial markets would be absolutely, overwhelmingly positive. I think our colleagues would be heartened if we could, in fact, muster up enough votes to pass this. I think what it would say to the world is that Congress is finally beginning to recognize that the only way they are going to resolve our economic problems is not by cutting everybody's paycheck, or something equally drastic, but by saying firmly that we are not going to increase anybody's benefits until we get out of this economic crisis.

I think the Senator from Colorado is well aware of the fact, as I am, that we are in a crisis situation. Yet, somehow there seems to be no willingness in this body or in the other body to really take a tough stance necessary to get out of this spending spiral.

I do not say that this is an easy vote for anybody to cast, but I do believe it is the right approach to our budget crisis. As I said earlier, we are spending 25 percent of the gross national product, while revenues amount to about 19 percent of the gross national product. The budget is "balanced" by borrowing, of which, I might say, Mr. President, a great portion of the deficit is carried by investment from overseas. So we have become a debtor nation in the proceess of this continuous deficit spending.

I think it creates a highly volatile and dangerous situation for the American citizenry to be in, with instantaneous bank withdrawals where computers can transfer billions of dollars across the ocean in a matter of seconds. The circumstances are certainly present which could in fact allow for a situation to arise where people would decide that it was time to take their money out of U.S. Treasury bills and take it back over to Europe or Japan, or wherever. If that happened, I think we would find that the situation could be an absolute calamity with respect to the financial markets and interest rates could very well increase sharply.

I do not know when this is going to happen, whether it is going to happen in 1984, whether it will happen in 1985, or in 1986. It always astounds me, as a fervent believer in capitalism and free enterprise, how the system in the United States has survived as long as it has when it is so badly abused by the Government policies of overtaxation, of excessively taxing the industrial base of the country, excessively taxing capital, excessively taxing work, and destroying individual work incentive. It amazes me that we manage as well as we do.

I have often made the comment to some of my friends that I am sometimes glad that in general the public and the people of the country do not realize just how bad the situation is or it might create a panic if the public recognized the future impact of the failure of the Congress to come to grips with this excessive spending.

Mr. CHILES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMMS. I am happy to yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. CHILES. I was listening to my good friend explain his defense savings to the Senator from Colorado. I just need a little more edification.

Those defense savings of $40 billion sound a little like the savings my wife tells me she has made when she comes back from a sale. The fact that she only bought one hat and two dresses rather than buying four is supposed to be a "savings." And the other saving, of course, is that the dresses and hat were on sale. But maybe the store took a $100 dress and marked it up to $200 and then sold it "on sale" for $100.

Some savings.

I have a hard time understanding what is meant by $40 billion in defense savings. Maybe the Senator from Colorado can explain that, because he seems to be enamored with the plan that contains these defense "savings."

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think the Senator from Florida is correct that we are talking about savings from the rate of projected increase, whether it is CBO or the President. And he is absolutely correct in describing these as the kind of savings that might occur if someone decided to only buy one new hat instead of four.

But that is the sort of savings we are talking about all across the board in this budget. As far as I know, we are not talking about net year-to-year reductions in anybody's plan. In the private sector and among working men and women, when they talk about making a cut, they are talking about spending less next year than this year. Let me cite one quite specific example that is near to my heart.

In Pueblo, Colo., there is a great company which has been the backbone of that community. And the working men and women of that company, through their labor organization, agreed to a cut in their compensation giving back wage and fringe benefits that they had spent decades earning. When they said they were taking a cut, they did not mean trim off something of next year's increase. They meant rolling back the rate of

pay. That is what a cut means in common parlance. But all through this budget, we are not talking about that anywhere and maybe we should be.

Mr. CHILES. We want to give credit to the Senator from Idaho because I think he is talking about a real cut from the baseline in the domestic programs. That will be a real cut from last year.

Mr. SYMMS. That is correct.

Mr. CHILES. It will be a real cut for the Coast Guard. It will be a real cut for the Department of Justice. It will be a real cut for the FBI. It will be a real cut for the Drug Enforcement Administration. It will mean a real cut for them. But I say to my friend from Colorado, when we get to defense, it is not a real cut at all. The CBO says defense will go up $7.2 billion under the plan of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I say to my friend from Florida that there is an answer to that. Mr. President, while I still have the floor, I will send the amendment to the desk. I want to answer the question, before the clerk reports, to my colleague from Florida. The President initially asked for a much higher defense number. Originally in the committee I had this budget calculated on the President's $305 billion request for defense. I have since reduced that figure to the level agreed upon in the rose garden budget, as I understand it, which is a 7-percent growth in defense. But I say to my colleague that it is not only President Reagan that recognizes that we had to have an increase in our defense spending. On March 15, under congressional pressure, the President agreed to $22 billion in further defense cuts. But if you go back and look at what President Carter was saying in his last year in office, the Reagan program right now is below the levels of defense spending which President Carter felt were required, but which were rejected by the American people in the 1980 elections as being inadequate.

I think the constitutional and the historical mandate of this body—as the National Congress—is that there is a constitutional responsibility to provide adequately for the Nation's defenses.

I say to my colleague that, if there are some issues with respect to drug enforcement, with respect to the Coast Guard, I believe this Congress can address those issues individually, and make some tradeoffs in some of those very vital and critical areas. I have no argument with that. However, if you recall the Grace Commission report, which has largely been set aside thus far by Congress, it made the recommendation that, if we would reward those people in positions of authority in the senior executive management corps of the civil service, they could in fact reduce expenditures in their area by at least 12 to 15 percent with no diminution of the services which they are providing to the public. Peter Grace said the incentive system is totally in the opposite direction from the way it is in the business sector.

What he suggests is that we pay those people a bonus so they are rewarded for saving money. I am suggesting that with this amendment—some of the unnecessary bureaucracy and unnecessary paperwork could be reduced, without reducing the effectiveness of those particular agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 3031

(Purpose: To restrain federal spending)

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) proposes an amendment numbered 3031 to amendment No. 3027.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: "Act."

SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committees on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $296,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $324,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $357,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(b) For all non-defense, discretionary programs, budget authority (or program levels, where appropriate) shall be reduced to a level which is 10% below the Congressional Budget office baseline level, as estimated in January 1984, in fiscal year 1985. For fiscal years 1986 and 1987, such budget authority or program levels shall be those determined above for fiscal year 1985.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no pay raises for civilian employees or for military employees of the Department of Defense in fiscal years 1985, 1986, or 1987.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no cost of living adjustments in federal benefit programs—This subsection shall not apply to means-tested-entitlements.

(e) On October 1, 1984, every senior executive staff employee shall receive a one-time bonus in the amount of $20,000.00, *Provided,* That the spending reductions directed by this section have been achieved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. CHILES. I thank my distinguished friend. He got into an argument on the merits. I really was not trying to encroach on the merits. I am trying to understand the technical parts of the amendment, or how there is a $40 billion savings. The Congressional Budget Office says that defense will increase by $7.2 billion, and yet I hear claims about a $40 billion savings. I heard the distinguished Senator say that President Carter had asked for more.

The way I read the Constitution, it is not what the President asks for that determines what we spend. It is the responsibility of the Congress to tax, appropriate, and spend money. If it is our constitutional responsibility and if we carried out that responsibility last year, then it seems to me what we do this year should be measured against what we did last year, and not by a President's wish list.

When I look at that, I see that the Senator in his "savings" amendment is adding $7.2 billion to the rate of growth for defense, yet would turn around and cut all of the other programs. I have a hard time seeing where that is fair, and how that meets any criteria for claiming genuine savings.

Last year, I would say to the distinguished Senator, we actually ended up appropriating about 3.5 percent real growth for defense. Your amendment would double that rate of growth.

Mr. SYMMS. That is not correct. What this would do is take the Rose Garden number on defense which was substantially reduced from the President's original request.

Mr. CHILES. The Rose Garden number is just a fragrance. It is an essence. It has a smell. I do not want to go any further than that.

Mr. SYMMS. Let me put it this way. How much money is in this particular plan that is before us in the so-called Domenici amendment? How many billions of dollars are in that for defense spending? $297 billion for next year. Is that correct? Nearly $300 billion for 1985.

Mr. CHILES. $299 billion.

Mr. SYMMS. Then what you do is take that number and compute in my savings to get my lowered number—the fact that there will be no military or civilian pay increases in the Department of Defense over the 3-year period—which would be a reduction, according to my original plan, of $27 billion total. That is the answer, if I understand the Senator's question correctly. That is how we arrived at that number.

I say again to the Senator that there is an ongoing bipartisan understanding and agreement across this broad

land of ours that we have to modernize our defense capabilities, both our strategic and tactical capability. It is difficult to get that done, but it is underway. That is how I arrived at that number.

Mr. CHILES. I still do not quite understand. There is $3 billion in the budget for the pay raise in 1985. Even if you multiply that by 3, I still do not get 27.

Mr. SYMMS. In 1985 we end up with $3 billion. In 1986 it would be $9 billion. In 1987 it would be $15 billion, for a total of $27 billion. The pensions account is also on defense. So what we are doing is not having COLA's for 1985, 1986, and 1987, except for those programs which are means tested.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Idaho will answer a question.

I have been handed a copy of this amendment. Let me read two subsections.

Subsection (c). Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, there shall be no pay raises for civilian employees or for military employees of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1985, 1986, or 1987.

Then we come down to section (d).

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, there shall be no cost-of-living adjustments in Federal benefit programs.

The next section says, "This subsection shall not apply to the means-tested entitlements."

The key section I wanted to ask about is subsection (e).

On October 1, 1984, every senior executive staff employee shall receive a one-time bonus in the amount of $20,000, provided, that the spending reductions directed by this section have been achieved.

Are we establishing some kind of a precedent there? What is this section?

Mr. SYMMS. What I would say to the Senator is that this came from the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act which passed the Congress and was signed into law by President Carter. There is a section in that act which allows for incentive bonuses. One of the suggestions from the Grace Commission report was that one of the failures of Government to be able to control its appetite for more and more spending is the fact that there is no economic incentive to achieve cost-savings for those people actually running the senior executive service. These are the people who make the decisions. They are the operation officers of the different agencies, the professional operations officers who are not political appointees. I am talking about people who are professional, senior executive service. There is no incentive for them to reduce expenditures.

The Grace report, in fact, found, over the years, that the bigger the program the more need for a higher civil service rating.

When Mr. Grace testified before the Budget Committee and the other committees of the Senate that I serve on, he made the statement that he believes, that if we allow the political appointees to decide which Federal employees should be paid those $20,000 bonuses to actually go out and save the taxpayers' money, it would be money well spent. There are 7,200 people in this category. What this budget does is to allow for up to $20,000 per year for each one of those. It does not mandate that they all get the $20,000.

I placed that provision in there to make that assumption that the money would be available to give these bonuses.

Mr. PRYOR. May I ask the Senator, what would be the definition of "senior executive staff employee?" Who would fall within that category or that definition?

Mr. SYMMS. It is my understanding that there are 7,200 of them. I might have to do a little research to find a precise definition. When a Grace Commission spokesperson testified, I remember distinctly that he made the statement there were 7,200 of them. The Grace Commission recommended that that number be reduced to 5,200. But, I am not trying to enact that suggestion here.

My point is that no matter who the President is, there should be some way so that the employees who save the taxpayers' money in those agencies without diluting the services that are supposedly being provided by that agency, or the regulatory or other activities, whatever the agency is. If they are doing that in a proper fashion and reducing the waste that takes place by implementing good management practices and good management techniques, there should be a way to reward them. That is what President Carter wanted to do. I think most Senators would like to see that done.

We all know that in the private sector if an employee reduces costs and increases profits, that is how he or she gets promoted. In the Government sector, the incentive is to get bigger numbers of people on the program and then you have to have more people working for you and more responsibility, and you get promoted. I am trying to get a better incentive system in place here.

Mr. PRYOR. I see what the Senator is trying to do. It is somewhat troublesome to me to recognize some factors. One factor is that subsection (e) proposal says "shall receive a one-time bonus." It is not "may be eligible to receive," but it says these senior executive staff employees "shall" receive a one-time bonus.

I will say what concerns me about this. I do not know who is going to be handing out these bonuses. I do not know if the Senator from Idaho does. I believe we have seen some real abuses in our bonus system within the governmental structure in the last 4 or 5 years. I think there is a very small, select group of people which makes decisions on who gets these bonuses.

Mr. SYMMS. I would be willing to modify that to change it to "may."

Mr. PRYOR. I do not have any objection——

Mr. SYMMS. I would ask that the amendment be changed to "may" in that subsection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: "Act."

SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $296,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $324,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $357,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(b) For all non-defense, discretionary programs, budget authority (or program levels, where appropriate) shall be reduced to a level which is 10 percent below the Congressional Budget Office baseline level, as estimated in January 1984, in fiscal year 1985. For fiscal years 1986 and 1987, such budget authority or program levels shall be those determined above for fiscal year 1985.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no pay raises for civilian employees or for military employees of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1985, 1986, or 1987.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no cost of living adjustments in federal benefit programs. This subsection shall not apply to means-tested entitlements.

(e) On October 1, 1984, every senior executive staff employee may receive a one-time bonus in the amount of $20,000.00, *Provided,* that the spending reductions directed by this section have been achieved.

Mr. PRYOR. I will object to the whole section whether it is "may" or "shall." What we are looking at here is sort of a bonus for the buddy system. That is how I would classify this proposal.

Mr. SYMMS. The problem is the way we are failing to address the continued growth of Federal spending. I recall that the Senator and I were in the House recently together. He became Governor of his State, and then came back to the Senate. If he will think back to what the budget was when he was in the House originally and what it is today, he will acknowledge we are not addressing our spending problem today. It is not a partisan issue. It is not solely an issue of either the Democrats or Republicans. The system is growing faster and we are not controlling it. What I am saying is I think when President Carter came into town he had a very good idea of

trying to put more flexibility into the Civil Service Act so that people could be dismissed if they were inefficient or had poor work habits, or had allowed wasteful practices to occur.

Also, he wanted to be able to reward them as in the private sector, because he recognized that those incentives worked in private enterprise. That is what we are trying to accomplish.

It may not be a perfect way. There may be bugs in it. I will not say this will work miracles, but at least it is better than what we are doing now. I think it is totally irresponsible for us to continue on this way without making some attempt to try to cut out some of the expensive growth and waste that we all know takes place in any Government agency, whether it be the Pentagon, HHS, or the Department of Agriculture. The nature of the system is that it breeds inefficiencies and incompetence, and encourages bigger and more spending programs. There is no incentive for anybody to reverse this dangerous trend.

Mr. PRYOR. I think this: what we are really faced with, and will be dealing with this day and in the course of next week, is to truly come forward with an equitable plan, such as a freeze on expenditures. I will support one of those freezes, though I do not know which one. I will vote for it on final passage. I will support one of those freezes just as I supported a freeze last May, which only 16 of our colleagues joined in, offered by Senator HOLLINGS. But that is history. Now we have to deal with the present and what we are about to do.

My real concern is that there will be no cost of living adjustments in Federal benefit programs, under subsection (d).

I wonder how we might react if we were a social security recipient drawing a very nominal sum of support each month who looks up and sees some 14,000 bureaucrats—I hate to call them that—"senior executive staff employees" receiving a bonus of up to $20,000. I think that is what is wrong with our approach in this type of amendment. That approach is simply not fair. It favors one group more than it favors another. In fact, it favors one group to the detriment of others. The cost-of-living increases, or whatever, are going to be spun off from more deserving groups and given to certain bureaucrats, most of whom, I assume, live in Washington, D.C.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, if I may answer that, that would be like comparing apples and oranges. When we talk about the possibility of maybe 7,000 people who could get a bonus of up to $20,000, we are then talking about a completely different thing. Millions and millions of Americans receive automatic cost-of-living adjustments. I find that when I visit with senior citizens, and ask them this question: If the choice is that you not get any cuts in your present benefits but not get any increases either, but we would have the opportunity for Federal spending reduction and a continued reduced rate of inflation which we have now in process—the senior citizens always answer affirmatively, that they would be willing to give up those increases in exchange for having a stable fiscal policy. They know this would mean lower interest rates so their children and grandchildren would afford to buy homes, and also would mean less inflation so they would not have their purchasing power destroyed.

Under my plan, anybody who falls into the poverty level would then qualify for means-tested programs, which are exempted from the cost-of-living adjustment freeze. I am trying to take care of those people who are less privileged in our society.

Mr. PRYOR. How would this affect a disability recipient? Would this cause the administration to continue cutting more from the disability rolls in the disability insurance program? Would this cause more cuts there?

Mr. SYMMS. As we know, Secretary Heckler has recently put a moratorium on that, I think properly so.

Mr. PRYOR. The moratorium is only in place until Congress acts on the issue. But here we are saying, "OK, go out and cut 10 percent more off the disability rolls," and then rewarding the people at the top with a $20,000 bonus for ordering those painful cuts.

Mr. SYMMS. No, Mr. President; that is not the way it is going to work. People who qualify for disability benefits would come under programs that would not be cut 10 percent. These would be programs that are means-tested entitlement programs, that are not cut 10 percent.

The only programs which are cut, which would be cut by 10 percent, would be the nondefense discretionary programs. Anyone who is receiving a Government benefit, say from a disability, would not be affected by this except that there may not be an increase for them if they are in a non-means-tested program.

If it were a social security disability benefit, they might not get an increase unless they fell under the poverty line. Let us say the first year went by, for example, and we had a cost-of-living increase of what is predicted now, 3.5 percent or something for this year and next year. Because of that, if someone fell from above the poverty line to below it, even if they are on a Government pension—a veterans pension, civil service pension, military pension or social security pension—if they in fact fell below the poverty line, they would be eligible to be picked up though the exempted means-tested programs. I am retaining the safety net so that the less advantaged people in our society would be protected. That is the total purpose of the author in writing this amendment.

Mr. PRYOR. One final point, Mr. President. I appreciate the Senator's explaining his position on this matter. My question is this: Should the Senator's amendment pass and be part of H.R. 2163, would not the language and the numbers in the Senator's amendment eventually have to be decided upon by the Senate and House Appropriations Committees?

Mr. SYMMS. That is correct.

Mr. PRYOR. So if we go through the appropriations process and if these levels are approved and if we decide on these levels in the Senator's amendment, it seems we are giving a bonus to civilian employees out there for doing exactly what the Appropriations Committee said to do anyway. So I do not see the Senator's logic in proposing this amendment, or that we can justify a reward or bonus for these employees.

Mr. SYMMS. I think the justification for it is that we are talking about having a few thousand dollars available for an incentive system to create a better managed Federal department or agency by rewarding someone who can run the shop better, and deliver the services more cost-effectively to the public. So I think there is a justification for this provision.

The way we have been operating, I have to say to the Senator, every year the Federal budget gets a little bit bigger. We go back home and find that, instead of raising havoc about a $10 billion deficit, it got to be a $20 billion deficit, then a $30 billion deficit, then a $200 billion deficit—it seems there is no end to it. I would be willing to take a chance to try to give this proposal an opportunity to work.

A certain number of people in each agency are appointed by the President. Those are the political appointees. They would hopefully have to exercise some commonsense and judgment, and make some decisions that it is very possible for them to make here with proper economic incentives.

The Senator is correct, and I think he brings up a very, very important point—that if we just slice off 10 percent of the money, if the agency saved the money but reduced the services to the public, then I would say that the political appointee or the Cabinet officer would decide they do not deserve the bonus. They would have to achieve savings in such a fashion that waste, inefficiencies, and so forth are eliminated.

Mr. PRYOR. Would the Senator's amendment apply to the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. SYMMS. It would apply to all senior executive staff.

Mr. PRYOR. Would it apply to my office, for example, my Senate office?

Mr. SYMMS. No.

Mr. PRYOR. Would my worthy, very worthy, trustworthy administrative assistant, Mr. Don Harrell, receive a $20,000 bonus if he cut expenses in my office by 10 percent?

Mr. SYMMS. The answer to that question is that our offices do not enjoy the same protections that people do in civil service. A Senator can walk in and fire everybody on his staff if he chooses to do so and start over and hire new staff the next day. So I think we have that kind of protection.

Mr. PRYOR. Is this freeze and this bonus going to apply to the legislative branch? Frankly, I think they should. They ought to apply to all of us.

Mr. SYMMS. I think it should, too. It would apply to the legislative branch in terms of the amount of money that each office would get. I do not know if there are any senior executive service personnel serving in the legislative branch of Government. The bonuses would have to result from the specified 10-percent savings in the nondefense discretionary programs as the bill stipulates.

Mr. PRYOR. I do not know if a legislative branch assistant would receive this bonus or not.

Mr. SYMMS. By definition, those people are in the executive branch and in agencies like the Patent Office, Commerce Department, other areas like that.

Just as an example, I say to my colleague, if each senior executive service person got the $20,000 bonus, which I do not anticipate they would, at a maximum, it would cost $140 million. But if they achieve the savings we are asking them to achieve, we would be spending $140 million in order to save $132 billion. So it would pay for itself many, many times over. I think that is really the issue we are discussing.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I shall close by saying that I think every sincere, dedicated, senior executive service staff employee, whatever the definition is, ought to be doing this anyway. Why we are going to reward them $20,000 each for doing their job as they should be under normal, reasonable circumstances, is somewhat baffling.

I do yield the floor, Mr. President, and I appreciate the Senator's answering my questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DENTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I think we are going to have a vote fairly soon, and while we are at ease for a moment I should like to explain how I am going to vote and why. I am going to support this amendment. There are some aspects of the proposal advanced by the Senator from Idaho which trouble me. Frankly, I am disposed to largely agree with what my colleague from Arkansas has said about the $20,000 bonus; there is some logic to that idea, but on balance I think perhaps it is not appropriate in this particular amendment. But the broad thrust and cut of this amendment is a good one, and so while I do have some reservations about that—in fact, I have another reservation or two about the amendment—the real issue is not the detail but the broad implication of it.

The particular aspect of the bonus issue, whether you think it is a good idea, as the Senator from Idaho has explained, and Peter Grace of the Grace Commission has pointed out, and a good argument can be made for it, or whether you have doubts about it, as I do, that is a very minor part of the overall amendment. The main issue is whether or not we are going to find some way to make some savings in this budget and get it balanced. The amendment of the Senator from Idaho goes a long ways in that direction and much further, may I say, than the pending amendment to which Senator SYMMS' proposal is itself an amendment. So I am going to vote for this amendment. If it does not pass, I am going to vote for a freeze, and if that does not pass, I am going to vote for something else because, without being repetitious, I have reached the point where I think we have to do something. I am ready to take some things that I would not otherwise be agreeable to just in the interest of somehow getting these deficits under control.

Mr. President, unless there are others who seek recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I now have the revised numbers on my amendment, and I thank the staff for their very rapid work on this.

What the total deficit reduction now amounts to is about $230 billion in savings. I was talking more in terms earlier of $200 billion, but the level is closer to $230 billion in savings. I will explain what there would be if this is adopted to the Baker substitute, which has revenue increases of $48 billion in it. It would actually reflect over a 4-year period savings of $70.5 billion in defense spending, $132.7 billion in nondefense spending, for a subtotal change of $251.5 billion, a savings of $34.4 billion in interest, for a total change in the budget of $285.9 billion.

So the deficit in 1984 would be $186 billion, in 1985 it would be $160.7 billion, in 1986 it would be $138.9 billion, and in 1987 it would be $131.6 billion.

It still does not go far enough, Mr. President, in what we should be accomplishing here, and I agree I have had many of my colleagues come by and say why do you not change this or why do you not change that.

I am open to suggestions, and the plan would be open for amendment if Senators believe there are areas where maybe there is too much reduction. These questions have been raised with regard to military pay and in other areas. Senators could offer amendments. If this plan were substituted for the Baker substitute, amendments and other changes could be offered.

But I just wish to say again for those who may have missed the debate that we assume the revenue increases contained in the deficit reduction package as reported to the Senate, assume the Republican leadership defense requests for fiscal year 1985 through 1987, except we would allow no DOD military or civilian employee pay raises in fiscal year 1985 through 1987. On nondefense spending savings with respect to COLA's, there would be no COLA's in 1985 through 1987 except for means-tested programs which are exempted from the freeze. Also, we would assume military and civilian retirement COLA's in fact, all COLA's, would resume and could be moved to January 1, 1988. Discretionary programs would be as follows: This plan would cut budget authority, or the program level where relevant, 10 percent below the 1984 CBO baseline level and then freeze at that level in 1986 and 1987.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this entire portion so that it will be clear what we are trying to accomplish.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMMS REVISED PLAN (WITHOUT REVENUE CHANGE)

REVENUES

No change from baseline (current law) levels.

DEFENSE SPENDING

Assume Republican leadership defense request for fiscal year 1985–87 except allow no

DOD military or civilian employee pay raises in fiscal year 1985–87.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING

COLAs: No COLAs in fiscal year 1985–87 except for means-tested programs which are exempted from the freeze. Assume federal military and civilian retirement COLAs, when resumed, are moved to January 1.

Discretionary programs: cut budget authority (or program level where relevant) 10 percent below the fiscal year 1984 CBO baseline level in fiscal year 1985. Freeze fiscal year 1986–87 budget authority (or program level where relevant) at the reduced fiscal year 1985 level. Allow no civilian agency pay raises in fiscal year 1985–87.

Assume each SES employee receives a $20,000 one-time bonus in fiscal year 1985 if budget cuts and efficiencies are achieved. (Note: in the accompanying table, these bonuses are included.)

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1984	1985	1986	1987	Total 1984–87
Baseline deficit [1]	192.7	206.7	235.0	269	
Revenues					
Defense	−3.4	−9.0	−25.0	−33	−70.5
Nondefense	−.3	−23.4	−45.0	−64	−132.7
Subtotal change	−3.7	−32.4	−70.0	−97	−203.2
Net interest [2]	−.1	−2.1	−7.6	−17	−26.8
Total change	−3.8	−34.5	−77.7	−114	−230.0
Plan deficit	188.9	172.2	157.3	155	

[1] Assumes CBO baseline for nondefense and President's budget request (not reestimated by CBO) for defense, plus interest adjustment to take account of the defense change. This is the baseline used in the leadership discussions and used by the House Budget Committee to describe their deficit reduction proposals.

[2] Using CBO economic forecast.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

REVENUES

Assume revenue increases contained in Deficit Reduction Act as reported to the Senate.

DEFENSE SPENDING

Assume Republican leadership defense request for FY 1985–87 except allow no DOD military or civilian employee pay raises in FY 1985–87.

NON-DEFENSE SPENDING

COLAs: No COLAs in FY 1985–87 except for means-tested programs which are exempted from the freeze. Assume federal military and civilian retirement COLAs, when resumed, are moved to January 1.

Discretionary programs: cut budget authority (or program level where relevant) 10 percent below the FY 1984 CBO baseline level in FY 1985. Freeze FY 1986–87 budget authority (or program level where relevant) at the reduced FY 1985 level. Allow no civilian agency pay raises in FY 1985–87.

Assume each SES employee receives a $20,000 one-time bonus in FY 1985 if budget cuts and efficiencies are achieved. (Note: in the accompanying table, these bonuses are included.)

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1984	1985	1986	1987	Total 1984–87
Baseline deficit [1]	192.7	206.7	235.0	269.0	
Revenues	−2.4	−10.7	−16.1	−19.1	−48.3
Defense	−3.4	−9.0	−25.0	−33.0	−70.5
Nondefense	−.3	−23.4	−45.0	−64.0	−132.7
Subtotal change	−6.1	−43.1	−86.1	−116.1	−251.5
Net interest [2]	−.2	−2.9	−10.0	−21.3	−34.4
Total change	−6.3	−46.0	−96.1	−137.4	−285.9
Plan deficit	186.4	160.7	138.9	131.6	

[1] Assumes CBO baseline for nondefense and President's budget request (not reestimated by CBO) for defense, plus interest adjustment to take account of the defense change. This is the baseline used in the leadership discussions and used by the House Budget Committee to describe their deficit reduction proposals.

[2] Using CBO economic forecast.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the yeas and nays have been requested on the pending amendment. I understand we are ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS). The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is absent because of death in the family.

(During the call of the roll the chair was occupied by Mrs. HAWKINS.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 84, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Armstrong	Helms	Rudman
Garn	Humphrey	Symms
Goldwater	McClure	Thurmond
Hatch	Nickles	

NAYS—84

Abdnor	Bradley	D'Amato
Andrews	Bumpers	Danforth
Baker	Burdick	DeConcini
Baucus	Byrd	Denton
Bentsen	Chafee	Dixon
Biden	Chiles	Dodd
Bingaman	Cochran	Dole
Boren	Cohen	Domenici
Boschwitz	Cranston	Durenberger
Eagleton	Lautenberg	Pryor
Evans	Laxalt	Quayle
Exon	Leahy	Randolph
Ford	Levin	Riegle
Glenn	Long	Roth
Gorton	Lugar	Sarbanes
Grassley	Mathias	Sasser
Hatfield	Matsunaga	Simpson
Hawkins	Mattingly	Specter
Hecht	Metzenbaum	Stafford
Heflin	Mitchell	Stennis
Heinz	Moynihan	Stevens
Hollings	Murkowski	Trible
Huddleston	Nunn	Tsongas
Inouye	Packwood	Wallop
Jepsen	Pell	Warner
Johnston	Percy	Weicker
Kassebaum	Pressler	Wilson
Kasten	Proxmire	Zorinsky

NOT VOTING—5

East	Kennedy	Tower
Hart	Melcher	

So Mr. SYMMS' amendment (No. 3031), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if I could be so bold as to do so, I should like now to see if we can get a unanimous-consent agreement, not concerning passage, which I had hoped we might be able to do today, or even to limit time on amendments, which I also would like to do, but just to see if we can limit amendments. Both sides now have complied lists of amendments. I do not know whether we are in a position to do this or not, but what I propose to do is propound a unanimous-consent request that only the amendments which I am about to list will be in order to this bill or amendments to this bill. What that would mean is just what it says: no other amendment could be in order.

It would also mean that there is no time limitation on these amendments. They could go on and on. We might have to get cloture on them and we might not. But we do not know enough about the amendments now in good conscience to try to limit the time. Mr. President, I am afraid if we do not try to structure this debate by at least outlining the issues and the amendments to deal with them, we shall never finish. We shall, obviously, but this would help.

The list I am about to propound may not be complete. If it is not, I shall be perfectly happy to add to it. I guess the chances of this request being granted are pretty slim, but let me put it.

I ask unanimous consent that only the following amendments to this bill will be in order:

A Mattingly amendment dealing with line-item veto; a Mattingly amendment dealing with consultants fees; a D'Amato amendment dealing with Montauk Point location; a Grass-

ley amendment; a Boschwitz sense-of-the-Senate amendment on formula approach to reducing budget deficits; a Weicker amendment, $750 million for biomedical research; a Mathias amendment to study the aspects of the tobacco program; a Heinz amendment dealing with terrorists; a Heinz amendment dealing with aging;

A Stafford amendment to exempt EPA's budget from the appropriations cap; a Packwood amendment to exempt certain aviation programs financed with trust fund receipts from appropriations cap; an Armstrong amendment waiver for appropriations caps; a Gorton amendment, caps on indexing entitlements of COLA's; a Wilson amendment saying if Federal Government passes law with financial impact on State and local governments, the Federal Government will reimburse them; a Kasten amendment dealing with the Grace Commission; a Hawkins amendment on dairy; a D'Amato-Specter amendment for an additional $200 million on budget outlay for prison construction; a D'Amato amendment on transit; three Chafee amendment dealing with appropriations caps;

Two Dole technical amendments; a Nickles amendment to reduce the COLA's and modify the discretionary and adjust the indexing on taxes included in the leadership amendment; a Helms 5-percent across-the-board cut; a Mitchell amendment on pay for Federal judges; three Kennedy amendments, one on medicare-medicaid, one on budget caps, and one not yet specified as to subject matter; three Bradley amendments on education, EPA funding increase, and an overall substitute; three Metzenbaum amendments, one on Job Corps, one on defense spending level, and one unspecified;

A Hollings-Exon amendment on freeze; a Chiles amendment on budget alternative; two Moynihan amendments, one land transport, one unspecified; three Baucus amendments, one Medicare, one bipartisan budget freeze, and one not specified; a Bumpers amendment on medicaid; a DeConcini waste, fraud, and abuse amendment making savings in fiscal year 1985 in areas such as travel consultants and motor vehicles; and a Levin amendment on leaseback transition rule tax exempt entities.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am not surprised, as I said earlier, I feared we might not get it, but I thought it would be worth the effort.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield at that point, let me say, as one Senator who is not on the Appropriations Committee or the Budget Committee, it is the hope of this Senator that we might have an opportunity to agree on an amendment that would be a more effective reduction in the level of spending than the Senate shows a disposition to vote at this point. I just do not like to see that potential closed off until we have a better feel of what the will of the Senate is.

We are hoping to get some idea as to how much economizing it might be good to vote for at this point. We just do not know. I do not feel like closing off my right or the right of other Senators to come up with something that might result in a more substantial reduction in Federal spending. At this moment, I do not see the votes for the Senate to agree upon, so this Senator is hoping that he might get to vote on an amendment that has a better prospect than he sees at the moment. He does not know what it might be. This is to protect the rights of all who might feel that way.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are 48 amendments on this list and 6 are unspecified as to subject matter. There is no time limitation on any of them. I even hesitated to put the request, because there are holes in it big enough to drive a Mack truck through. In any event, I thought it was worth the effort to see if we could identify what we are going to do. I do not think we can at the moment.

The Senate has a way of deciding when it is finished with a subject and moving on to a conclusion. I find that to try to get it to move before that is sort of like pushing a wet noodle, you just cannot make it go.

Mr. President, I will not repeat the request today. We will be in session tomorrow. I fully expect there will be votes tomorrow. We will continue on the matter next week as long as necessary, all week if necessary, and beyond if need be.

Mr. President, I will continue to try to compile a list that we might be able to translate into another unanimous-consent request but not until Monday.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I think it might be helpful to the majority leader and to all of us if we can be sure that all Senators who are here and who are listening understand that they may offer amendments to the bill. They may offer amendments to the Baker amendment. I will refer to it as the Baker amendment; it is the leadership amendment on that side. And amendments to the amendment by Mr. BAKER would be amendments in the second degree. So I hope that Senators will determine whether or not they want to offer amendments to the Baker perfecting amendment to the committee substitute or whether they want to offer amendments to the bill, realizing that any amendments that are adopted to the bill will be wiped out by the adoption of the committee substitute, as amended, if amended. With that, I hope that I have been helpful.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. CHILES. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will yield to me for a minute?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. CHILES. I sympathize with the effort the majority leader is trying to make to move the Senate forward. I am not sure the Senate is ready to move just now. From what we have heard today, it probably is not ready.

I also understand that the majority leader is putting something forward which has no time agreement on amendments and allows everybody to put their name on the list. It is very broad. My understanding was that he was talking about excluding any further amendments to the Baker amendment to the boat bill, or any other amendments.

I think some Senators would be concerned that there should be a possibility for some adjustments. If we are still going the reconciliation route, and the Baker amendment is adopted, and, as anticipated, the Parliamentarian rules we are in reconciliation, that then there should be some opportunity at that stage, under the rules of reconciliation, to attempt to amend. Or if we are going to have a unanimous-consent agreement with that provision, a few key amendments might be allowed to come up. I suggest that might assuage some of the fears out there that Senators do not want to get locked in right now.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida, who is the ranking member of the Budget Committee. His points are well taken. I am perfectly willing to discuss that with any Senator. I privately indicated—perhaps I have said it on the floor, but I will say it now on the floor—to the minority leader as far as I am concerned, if we can obtain the objectives, that is, to make sure that the budget result that we enact has the effect of law and is simply not an objective without going the reconciliation route and assuming we can work out other technicalities like how we meet the other body in conference and with whom we go to conference, if those things can be worked out, I am not stuck on the idea of going the reconciliation route.

I am perfectly willing to try to do it another way. Believe me—and I am sure the Senator does believe me—I am not trying to strong-arm the Senate and I am not trying to create a new precedent. We have gone the reconciliation route two or three times. The most recent one was the TEFRA bill I guess. But I am not stuck on that. We can do it simply by statutory

language and without the use of reconciliation.

But in order to do that, if I am to give up that opportunity, which the Senate has used in the past, it seems to me there ought to be some sort of protection put in its place. That really is what I am after by trying to limit the number of amendments. I would prefer to have a limited number of amendments and have time limitations on those amendments and have a time certain for final passage. Then we would be protected, as we would be on reconciliation.

Mr. CHILES. I think the majority leader's statement falls on welcome ears on this side. I think we have had a great concern about not wanting to set a precedent. There has been some worry about viewing germaneness with a vote of 51. I think he is speaking to calm those fears. I hope, when the time comes, we can reach a unanimous-consent agreement. I think the majority leader believes we have a lot of amendments on the list that will never actually be called up. At this stage the chairman of the committee and I do not know how to get people to move toward some of the freeze packages because everybody wants to be last.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, may I say, if I can interrupt the Senator, I have had by count 10 Senators who have indicated to me they want to be last.

Mr. CHILES. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. Everybody cannot be last. One person can be last. I want to say I hereby claim the right to be last.

Now, I hope everybody else, after taking that into account, will get off that and come on and offer their amendments because they are not going to be last. They may be next to last, but they are not going to be last. If the minority leader wants, he can be next to last.

Mr. CHILES. I think we would like to claim that right.

Mr. BYRD. The majority leader might find the minority leader to be last.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the distinguished majority leader yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BAKER. If the Senator from Florida will yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I say that the distinguished majority leader has indicated his willingness to attempt to work out a time agreement and I had hoped we could do that. I hope that we can yet do so at some point. But from what I have heard said today, I agree that this is not the time. I do want, if the majority leader will allow me, to emphasize, when we seek out the identity of Senators and amendments, that Senators really know that what we are talking about now is amendments, as of now, to the leadership amendment to the committee substitute to the bill.

Now, Senators might be thinking in terms of amendments to the bill, but they may as well forget that at this point. The amendment by the Republican leadership is an amendment in the first degree to the committee substitute and is open only to amendments in the second degree at this juncture. So there will not be any piggy-backing as of this moment as long as Mr. BAKER's amendment is pending as the first-degree amendment to the committee substitute.

Senators can get around that amendment by going to the bill, but it will likely be of no avail to them in the final analysis.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. I think it is important Senators understand that. If they want to see a picture of the amendment situation, it is on page 70 of the book, "Senate Procedure."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am going to yield the floor so the distinguished manager of the bill, the chairman of the Budget Committee, can seek recognition.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Before the majority leader does, will he yield for a question?

Mr. BAKER. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Does the majority leader understand the parliamentary procedure now to be such that further amendments in connection with the revenue portion of the bill would be in or out of order, and would amendments that do not affect the original Dole amendment but are separate and apart that would produce revenue be in order?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I better think about that just for a minute. Certain amendments, one by Senator KENNEDY and one by Senator BAUCUS, were made in order by unanimous consent.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I understand.

Mr. BAKER. The question, as I understand it, put by the Senator is other revenue amendments which do not directly affect that amendment which has already been acted on, the Dole amendment, but affect either the Baker amendment or the bill itself, would they be in order at this time? Let me think about it.

Mr. METZENBAUM. And I might add, while the majority leader is thinking about it, whether or not an amendment which would have some impact either directly or indirectly, upon the Dole amendment that has already been adopted would be out of order?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are some things I have to think about, other things I do not have to think about, and some things I should not think about, even if I could. We are getting carelessly close to the third category. In the final analysis, the Senate or the Chair and the Parliamentarian are going to decide those things.

Give me an opportunity to consult at least with the Parliamentarian, and I will talk to the Senator from Ohio further, in colloquy or privately.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to comment on the situation and put it into perspective versus 2 weeks ago.

The joint leadership met, and we talked about the process and procedures to get this matter completed as a major reconciliation bill. There were some very serious and legitimate concerns. They were not necessarily, as some depicted, precedent-setting; but, nonetheless, a major change in the approach did take place.

One of the suggestions and concerns came from the distinguished Senator from Florida with reference to a budget resolution; others were with reference to, "Do you need a reconciliation bill as part of this tax measure and expenditure savings bill?"

Basically, a number of changes in the approach were taken by the majority leader because of those concerns. We do not have before us anything that limits germaneness, or limits scope, other than the process itself normal to the Senate.

When our leader asks that we list the amendments, he is not asking for time, he is not asking for a time certain for action, but merely that we have some idea when we might complete this matter as it relates to a number of amendments.

It is complicated procedurally, but not so complicated in terms of what people want to do. One can look at this and see that it is a rather simple bill. We finished the tax portion, and now we have a portion of that bill with caps for defense and appropriated accounts. Also included are some entitlement savings that were adopted by the Finance Committee months ago. They are incorporated in the amendment, and that is really about it at this point.

We are having a great deal of difficulty because everybody thinks that the leadership package incorporated in the Baker amendment is not a significant deficit reduction package, and everyone wants to do better and wants to get more deficit reduction. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has already mentioned this.

We have at least four packages that have been proposed which, if adopted, would reduce the deficits more. We do not have to talk about them by name. Everybody has known about them. Those who are concerned can look at them and see if they like them. If they do not, there are plenty of people around here with expertise to modify

them. There is great modification possible with reference to defense and appropriated accounts. Do you like the tax bill, and do you want to add some new tax-raising measure standing on its own as part of an amendment?

The others are freestanding amendments that try to change the appropriated account numbers, and they are lump sum numbers for fiscal year 1985-87. Some would want to add money, and some would want to subtract money from the defense appropriations.

The leadership on this side, particularly Mr. BAKER, met with the chairmen and the distinguished minority leader on the other side and made significant changes. No one is trying to prevent amendments or to keep us from voting. All that has been changed. A number of us would just like an opportunity to call up some of those amendments and let the Senate vote.

The Senator from Florida is right: We have at least four packages, and everybody wants to be last. I am amenable to anyone who wants to be last. If there is an official position on the other side, I have no objection, I say right now, to that being the last package, if that is what is desired.

On the other hand, there are many other freestanding amendments that are being applied to this package in rather ingenious ways so as to express the sense of the Senate. Some are real, in terms of adding money to the appropriated accounts. Frankly, we stand ready on this side to take them up and get some votes. I hope we can get that done before too long.

Eventually, I hope we can agree on a limitation on amendments, so that we can make some headway in taking those we know about, in whatever order the sponsors wish.

Having said that, I do not know that anybody wants to call up an amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do this at the suggestion of Mr. BAKER: There is a possibility that there will be an effort to call up H.R. 4170, which, as I understand it, is a tax bill from the other body, and at that point to put on that bill everything that has been worked out prior thereto. That is a bit of a new idea, I suppose I would call it. I heard it discussed only yesterday, as I think the majority leader also did.

So Senators should know that if that occurs at that point, without a time agreement, that measure would be open to amendments. So we have a number of vehicles to which amendments may be offered: the Federal boat safety bill; the Baker perfecting amendment to the committee substitute; at some point, amendments to the committee substitute; and at some point, if indeed an effort is made to call up this new bill, H.R. 4170, amendments could be offered to it.

So I hope that when we attempt to identify amendments and Senators find out what they want, they have in mind that there is more than one vehicle.

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, earlier this month I introduced S. 2516 to require graduated budget deficit reductions. This bill would establish a maximum deficit for each year and put teeth into the budget process so that these targets would be met one way or another. My bill would reduce deficits about $249 billion over the next 3 years from the Congressional Budget Office's latest baseline projections.

Under my bill, Congress would be committed to adopting a budget which will limit the fiscal year 1985 budget deficit to about $166 billion. Further reductions would be required each year until 1994 when deficits would be eliminated.

During the first 2 years at least two-thirds of the reduction in the deficit, relative to baseline levels, must be in the form of spending reductions. Thereafter, spending reductions would be at least equal to revenue increases.

This legislation would not designate the extent to which mandated savings would be achieved in particular areas. That would be flexible and a subject for further discussions. But, if Congress fails to meet the deficit target, the President would propose rescissions of budget authority sufficient to comply with the target but could propose reducing no area more than 10 percent. Any additional proposal reductions would come across the board. Congress, through a fast-track reconciliation process, could modify the President's proposed rescissions in any way it chooses.

But, if necessary changes are not promptly enacted, the President would be authorized to implement his original proposals with respect to areas of discretionary spending. If further reductions proved necessary to meet the year's deficit reduction target, he would be required to institute additional across-the-board reductions in all areas of spending, except interest on the debt.

The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee should be commended for his efforts and the very significant accomplishments he has achieved. A $144 billion deficit reduction is certainly significant. Similarly, it is a big step in the right direction to write into law statutory spending caps requiring a majority of Senators voting to go on record as big spenders before those caps may be violated.

Still, this is one Senator who would like still more meaningful action with respect to both the magnitude and the enforceability of deficit reductions. That is why I introduced S. 2516. I wish to inquire of the distinguished chairman who has done such a great job, along with his committee, the Budget Committee, if he would be willing to hold hearings on S. 2516 as a potential followup to the downpayment which we are now considering?

If I could ask the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee that question, I shall appreciate hearing his thoughts on that.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me first say that I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

S. 2516 is currently pending before the Budget Committee, but we have not yet scheduled hearings on it.

I think almost everyone in this Chamber now agrees that the Federal deficit is an important issue and must be dealt with forcefully and promptly. We are all taking significant steps in that direction and we are doing that here today. Further steps will have to be taken in the future, and I think that the Budget Committee should hold hearings on S. 2516, and I will be pleased to work with the Senator from South Dakota to arrange those hearings.

I must indicate, however, that I am not sure that amendments to the Budget Act are the ultimate answer or even the answer that we need at this point to our deficit problems.

While I commend the Senator for his efforts, I must say in all honesty that frankly I think we have tools that will alleviate the deficit. One of those is the act itself, but it is only as powerful as the congressional will to implement it. While it may be cumbersome in some respects, it really is only as far as a way and as effective as the collective will of the two bodies and would still be the case if we amended it and tried to make it even stronger.

Nevertheless, there is room for improvement. There is no doubt about that. And I am interested in looking at all these ideas which might improve the process with the ultimate goal of reducing the deficits and having a better and more responsive handle on fiscal policy.

It is gratifying to know that Senators like the Senator from South Dakota are putting their talents to work in this area out of a genuine concern.

I thank the Senator for the bill and for introducing it, and I also thank him for bringing it up to the floor in the manner that he has here.

Clearly he could force a vote on a total amendment to the budget here in a manner and consistent with the ideas expressed in S. 2516, but it must ultimately be heard by a committee because it is a new approach. It must come to the floor with a reasoning that can come out of the committee, and I thank the Senator for doing it that way and commit to him that we will try to arrange hearings as soon as possible.

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for those words. I certainly appreciate the background, knowledge, and expertise he has in this budget problem and the work he has done, along with the Senator from Florida and the whole committee on this very difficult problem.

I know everyone has his own ideas on what makes up a good budget and how to cut the deficit. But this is one proposal and the very fact that it mandates Congress if they pass this to do this I think has great potential, and I appreciate the fact that the chairman has given me the opportunity at a later date when it is a more convenient time to bring this up for a hearing.

I still think it does have merit, but I wish the Senator to know I do appreciate his thoughts and views on this, and I am looking forward to a later time when we can have a further discussion on it, and I thank him very, very much.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, unless somebody has an amendment they would like to bring up, and I see no one here, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Something sort of like this happens on every important bill; that is, at some point you suddenly realize nobody wants to offer an amendment. But I bet that if I were to ask the Chair to put the question on the amendment right now, it would not succeed. I see my friend, the minority leader, is smiling. I know I would do the same, and he would stop me from doing that as he should because it is his responsibility to protect Members on his side of the aisle. But something has to happen, it seems to me, Mr. President. I know the minority is trying to produce an amendment to be offered this afternoon. We are trying to do that on our side. But here we stand, the chairman, the ranking Member, the majority and minority leaders. And, as far as I can tell, we are the only ones here.

Mr. President, I have never done this, and I am not going to do it now. I have never called up somebody else's amendment. It is far too early to do that. But I do not rule out that possibility later.

But, Mr. President, may I make a more modest suggestion, if the chairman and ranking Member are willing to consider it; that is, informally I wonder if they would be willing to try to take a first cut at scheduling some amendments. We have no authority to do that. But at least it would be a point of departure, if we sat down and say, alternated between Republican and Democratic amendments; or, if there was an equal opportunity to make some appraisal from their expert point of view on how long it might take, or ought to take, to debate the amendments and try to fit that into a calendar that would dispose of the 48 amendments that are on the list.

As I say, they have no authority under the rules and the precedents of the Senate to do that. But the leadership, on this side at least, would be terribly pleased to have such a first effort. I bet that some Senators who are listening in their office would then at least have some interest when the chairman and ranking Member might be inclined to put their amendment on that list.

Mr. CHILES. Given the pace at which we are going, would he like to give us until Tuesday or Wednesday? Then keep the Senate in session while we go somewhere to see if we can arrange to come up with that kind of list. That is something that we can certainly sit down and attempt to do. The problem that I am going to find and I think the distinguished chairman of the committee is also going to find, is that we do not have the power to instruct people as to the order in which they are going to go. Probably the only thing that is going to start this thing moving is beginning some kind of debate and voting on the package of amendments.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I think that is right. It might have a very good effect, if the two managers of the bill would be agreeable to sitting down, trying to figure out a logical schedule, not the only logical schedule, but a logical schedule for proceeding.

Then, let us see if we can get Members to come to the floor, and offer their amendments. It is 3 o'clock in the afternoon, almost. Nothing is happening. At least, as I said earlier, that would be a modest effort to get the ball rolling. If the two managers are inclined to do that, I would be personally grateful.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am pleased to try. We will get started on it now. The Senator from Florida and I will advise you as soon as we have something that we think is meaningful. We will start contacting some of the proponents to see if they are interested.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the majority leader is experiencing a very frustrating moment here. I know how frustrating that can be. He is entitled to at least having Senators on both sides of the aisle come forward now. I cannot see any reason why I or more Senators out of 48, 40, 38, or 28 who have the 48 amendments cannot come over and offer an amendment. But as the distinguished ranking Member said a moment ago, there is nothing we can do to force them to do that. We are attempting to get Senators, on our side to come over. We have three Senators in mind. I asked our aides a moment ago to check with the three Senators to see if one of them could come over and offer an amendment today. The majority leader is entitled to that consideration. Everyone has to be understanding of his responsibilities.

Mr. President, I know that the majority leader feels terribly frustrated at times, and has to. But I can remember the last time this Senator tried to call up the amendments of other Senators. That was in 1977, when I called up and disposed of about 30 amendments of other Senators in the course of about 10 minutes. The amendments were from my side of the aisle, and cloture had already been invoked. I expected to be censured, expelled, or lynched. I could not even get some of my own colleagues to agree to my request to speak for a few minutes.

As I recall, Senator SARBANES was kind enough to get recognition and yield to me. The late Senator Jim Allen, with whom I had had a few little skirmishes, came over and told me he was with me. I knew that with Jim Allen on my side, I would come out all right in the end.

At this moment, at least, I have confidence, probably from being born an optimist, that the majority leader will prevail at some point.

Mr. President, I would bet that the chairman of the Budget Committee has a Senator coming over now.

Mr. DOMENICI. We do have two from our side.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, for fear that I might use more time that could otherwise be used in calling up amendments, I am prepared to yield the floor and express my thanks to everyone.

First, I will say to the minority leader I remember that episode. I still have scars and bruises about my body from that because I was a willing participant with the then majority leader, now minority leader. I remember the shouting and screaming that went on. But I also remember we would never have gotten the bill passed if that had not happened.

Mr. BYRD. The majority leader is right.

Mr. BAKER. That experience was not lost on this majority leader, who was then minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. I would say if I had to do it again tomorrow, I would do it again.

Mr. BAKER. I do not doubt it. Whatever the rules, I have learned from the present minority leader, and I believe I have learned a lot.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABDNOR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3032

(Purpose: To provide for reductions in the amount that may be expended for various Government activities)

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) for himself and Mr. MATTINGLY proposes an amendment numbered 3032.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in amendment numbered 3027, insert the following:

COST SAVINGS BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

SEC. . (a) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for travel and transportation of persons and transportation of things for officers and employees of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $750,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such travel and transportation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduction in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government. In making such allocation, the Director shall not reduce any amounts to be obligated for debt collection, administration of loans, necessary and essential law enforcement activities, or emergency national defense activities of the Federal Government.

(b) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for consultant services by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $1,000,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such services for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduction in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch.

(c) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for public affairs activities, public relations activities, public information activities, and advertising by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $100,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduction in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government.

(d) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for publishing, printing, reproduction, and audiovisual activities by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $250,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduction in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government.

(e) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall effect savings of $2,100,000,000 through enhanced identification, recovery, and collection of Federal overpayments, delinquencies, and indebtedness which departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government have most recently considered to be uncollectible. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall implement the preceding sentence in cooperation with the Comptroller General of the United States.

(f)(1) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, shall reduce the total amount which may be obligated for operation, maintenance, management, leasing, acquisition, and disposal of non-tactical, non-law enforcement motor vehicles by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by $160,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, shall promulgate standards governing the identification, collection, and analysis of data which is necessary to implement the preceding sentence.

(2) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, shall conduct a comprehensive and detailed study of the feasibility of entering into contracts with qualified motor vehicle fleet management firms or other private firms and organizations to meet the requirements of the executive branch of the Government for the operation, maintenance, leasing, acquisition, and disposal of motor vehicles. Such study shall include an analysis of the costs that would be incurred, and the benefits that would be provided, as a result of such contracts. Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare and transmit a report containing the findings and conclusions of the study required by this paragraph to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, including the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

(g) Within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare and transmit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the Senate and House of Representatives a report describing the allocations and savings made in carrying out such subsections (a) through (f).

(h) In carrying out subsections (a) through (f), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall adopt, whenever possible, the recommendations, management improvements, and cost control opportunities specified in the report of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, my amendment to the so-called Republican leadership amendment, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, is not complicated. It is not difficult to understand, nor does it cover innovative new measures to reduce Federal spending. In fact, this amendment is very similar to other amendments that I have offered to budget measures in the past.

Specifically, my amendment calls for locking in savings in a number of general Government administrative areas that have consistently been identified as ripe for cost-saving opportunities. Most recently the much-heralded Grace Commission report recommended management improvements and budget savings in virtually all of the areas addressed in this amendment. Let me briefly outline the cost savings in my amendment, cost savings that total $4,360,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

First, my amendment calls for cutting $750 million in Federal travel and transportation activities below current fiscal year 1984 levels. The Grace Commission estimated that Federal travel and freight transportation alone totaled over $9.4 billion in 1982. According to OMB, the Federal travel and transportation budget for 1982 was actually $12.6 billion. Current estimates are that we spend about $12 billion a year on Federal travel. My amendment would embrace the cost saving measures in travel management proposed by the Grace Commission and make further savings in the nontactical nonlaw enforcement travel budget. My amendment would not affect emergency national defense travel, but normal Department of Defense administrative travel would be covered.

Second, this amendment calls for cutting consultant services spending by $1 billion below fiscal 1984 levels. Estimates of what the Federal Government spends on consultant services has varied, based on whose definition one might use. Several years ago, under former Appropriations Committee Chairman Warren Magnuson's leadership, a study was done that showed the Government spent at least $2.4 billion a year on consultants. An OMB estimate done at my request in March 1982 showed that the Government actually spent $3.7 billion a year

on consultant services. A few years ago, the National Tax Limitation Committee suggested that $2 to $3 billion a year could be cut in consultant services without hurting the Government. My amendment calls for cutting the amount the Government spends on consultants by $1 billion in fiscal year 1985. I admit that this is a deep cut, but if we are really serious about cutting out the so-called "fat," consultant services is one of the best places to find that "fat."

Third, this amendment would cut the amount we spend on public affairs, public relations, public information and advertising by $100 million below 1984 levels. A 2-year comprehensive study by UPI investigative reporter Don Lambro a few years back revealed that the Government spends an astounding $1.5 billion a year in public relations activities. As we can see how well Government officials rate with the public, it has not paid off. According to a White House reorganization project in 1978, more than $24 million a year is spent on congressional relations or public affairs personnel alone. Other research has shown that the Defense Department has a press and public affairs staff of more than 1,500 people and the Department of Health and Human Services spends over $25 million a year on public affairs. By any yardstick, public affairs is big business in the Federal Government and should be sharply cut back. My amendment does just that.

It seems to me Government should stand more on its feet and on its reputation of what it produces than just on public relations.

Fourth, this amendment adopts the Grace Commission recommendations for cost savings in Government publishing, printing, reproduction, and audiovisual activities, with a savings of $250 million in fiscal year 1985. The Grace Commission estimated that over $1,463,000,000 could be saved over 3 years if their management proposals are adopted. I am somewhat less optimistic than the Grace Commission that we can achieve those kinds of savings over 3 years, especially in the first year, so I have modified the estimated savings and called for cutting $250 million in these activities in fiscal 1985. Hopefully, this will be a true downpayment on realizing the full savings estimates outlined by the Grace Commission in these areas of activity.

Fifth, my amendment calls for the Government to achieve savings of $2.1 billion through more aggressive, more efficient and more effective debt collection measures. The Debt Collection Act of 1982 that I was proud to cosponsor with Senator PERCY has laid the foundation for a more efficient national effort to go after the more than $43 billion in identified, delinquent debts that are owed Uncle Sam. The regulations to implement that act are now published. The Office of Management and Budget has announced its plans to crack down on the debt collection problem by using private credit rating bureaus. Even when you factor out unpaid Federal income taxes which would not be subject to the new Debt Collection Act provisions, nearly $18 billion in bad debts are on the books waiting to be collected. OMB in its "Major Themes and Additional Budget Details, 1985" book, published earlier this month, calls for an additional $2.1 billion to be collected in fiscal year 1985. My amendment merely locks in that goal and forces the executive branch to meet their own target.

Finally, this amendment adopts both the Grace Commission and my own recommendations with regard to reducing the cost and size of the Federal motor vehicle fleet. Specifically, my amendment calls for cutting the amount spent on the Federal fleet by $160 million—the same amount that the Congressional Budget Office estimates could be saved in fiscal 1985 if the Grace Commission proposals were adopted. The Government has a fleet of over 430,000 vehicles and a complicated hodgepodge of plans and programs for operating, maintaining, leasing, acquiring, and disposing these some vehicles. GSA handles the motor pool, individual agencies go off on their own and buy or lease cars at higher cost to the Government, and the private sector plays only a minor role in operating the fleet. My amendment forces the Government to cut back on both the size and cost of the fleet and also directs OMB to conduct a full-scale study of private sector alternatives to our present system of running the Federal motor vehicle fleet. Both the savings and the study are long overdue, I submit.

Mr. President, this is an amendment that will not hurt anyone in Government. It does not cut entitlements. It does not cut health care. It does not cut veterans benefits. It does force the Government to be more efficient. It does force agencies and OMB to adopt many of the Grace Commission proposals that appear to make good sense in cutting the cost of administering the Federal Government. And it does save over $4.3 billion in real money in fiscal year 1985. I know that many of my colleagues consider this type of amendment somewhat of a nuisance amendment, something that is more of an irritant than anything else. There is always a waste, fraud, and abuse amendment. But if we are going to vote on binding spending ceilings in the Senate and force all nondefense programs to share in the sacrifice, then the least we should do is cut the fat in administering Government activities before we hit the muscle.

I urge the adoption of the amendment and hope that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee may see his way clear to accept this amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator two questions.

As I understand it, this so-called leadership amendment has a domestic appropriated accounts cap for the years 1985, 1986, and 1987. Whatever that cap is, it is the cumulative amount of budget authority for each of the respective years, a freeze, in fiscal year 1985, then a 5-percent increase in fiscal year 1986 and 1987.

As I understand the Senator from Arizona, he is not changing that. Am I correct?

Mr. DECONCINI. The Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Second, as I understand it, the Senator has amended that amendment to provide specific ways that the Senator prohibits appropriations from acting as they apply the total appropriation process to the total budget authority in these caps. Is that correct?

Mr. DECONCINI. Yes; the Senator from New Mexico is correct. The obligations we are amending and specifically directing where the savings shall be achieved.

Mr. DOMENICI. By saying they cannot spend——

Mr. DECONCINI. Obligations.

Mr. DOMENICI. They cannot obligate in the areas that you have spoken of.

Mr. DECONCINI. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Now let me address the issue for the Senate.

Let me first compliment the Senator with respect to efforts to save money in some areas that certainly many of us consider to be among the less important of the Government. And if we had to prioritize, we surely would pick many of the areas that he is speaking of to direct savings cuts.

However, I want to say to the Senate that basically this is a very interesting process and procedure. You see, we are going to get 12 appropriation bills. This bill before us has no limiting effect. Those appropriations will either come or we will have continuing resolutions to authorize in an appropriate manner the budget authority for running our National Government on the domestic side.

Now every one of these things that the good Senator from Arizona is suggesting that we cut or reduce, every one of them will be in an appropriation bill. And he will certainly, understanding his tenacity, he will certainly offer amendments, I assume, in the Appropriations Committee, since he is a member. And if he is unsuccessful here on the floor in those particular bills—and I must say that that is a far more consistent method of handling it

than to come here on the Senate floor when we have a cumulative budget authority for all domestic accounts and to say, "Now we expect your process to work and you appropriators will do your job, but we would like to tell you right here in this bill you cannot do this, and you must do this and you cannot do the other."

I really hope we do not do that. I do not know how effective it is going to be if we do. I cannot imagine that the U.S. House is going to change the total appropriation process of our country here on a bill which is establishing overall caps. But maybe the House would like to do this. Maybe if we have this, they would accept it.

Mr. DECONCINI. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. DECONCINI. The Senator raises a very sensitive point. As he knows, since both sit on the Appropriations Committee, we are very protective about who tells us what to do. It seems to me, at least for the 8 years that this Senator has sat on the Appropriations Committee, we have a difficult time. The Senator from Georgia has consistently offered several of these amendments, as I have, and unless a very good coalition is put together with a lot of hard work and there is time—and often there is not time in the Appropriations Committee—we are somewhat stuck.

So I guess what I am saying to the Senator from New Mexico is that there is an opportunity to do something that I suspect the Senator from New Mexico would vote for in the Appropriations Committee—and I believe he has; I do not want to quote him on that, but I believe he has in the past—here is an opportunity to do it right now, to do what the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Arizona, and many other Members of this Senate have wanted to do, and that is to put some caps on this so the Appropriations Committee is indeed restrained obligationwise. And we can do it one time. We can do it right now for travel, for consultant fees, for the debt collection, and a number of other areas.

I respect the Senator from New Mexico very much, and he knows that I do. I realize his concern about the budget process versus the appropriation process. And being on the Appropriations Committee I appreciate that. It just seems to me that it makes good sense to do it here when we are not touching those caps. I cannot see that it would make a whole lot of difference. If the House does not like it, that is really not our concern; that is their concern.

Mr. DOMENICI. First of all, I clearly do not want to have a vote without calling the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to the floor. And it may be that I will have to ask my friend from Georgia, who is here, to handle this matter for a few months while I go to talk to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I really think all those who appropriate are going to be genuinely concerned about this process that the Senator from Arizona is going to, for the first time, put in here on the Senate floor that in advance of appropriations you take specific items within future appropriation bills and as part of a cap you begin to tell them with specificity what they can do.

We have made a very honest effort telling the appropriation process here that these caps have nothing to do with their ability to appropriate, their ability to decide how they are going to use the total amount of money that is allowed each year, which has been historically, since the 1930's, clearly their prerogative.

Now having said that, let me say something else to the Senate. The Senate should understand, in addition to this very different process, I doubt very much the U.S. House would under any circumstance accept it in conference. That does not matter, maybe we want to do it anyway. I think it is rather foolhardy to do it if we know that under any conditions they are not going to look at it.

But likewise I think you should know you do not really save any money because the distinguished Senator has not reduced the caps. So what he is saying is: "I want you to save $4.3 billion by spending my way but I want you to keep on spending in exactly the same amount that was heretofore authorized in this amendment."

Now that is interesting because what that is saying is that we are not saving anything. But we are not spending in some areas that some would not like here. And they picked some—some are called reform; maybe they are and maybe they are not.

A real test of savings would be to amend the cap and bring it down $4.3 billion and say if you are going to save the $4.3 billion that the distinguished Senator says in the manner he suggests by directing the appropriations with specificity even to a capped bill, lower the $4.3 billion and do not spend it. That would be a good test of whether you want to save money.

This $4.3 billion is going to be available to spend elsewhere because the cap is not changed. And I submit it is just an exercise in declaring sort of, maybe, almost an intent. Sort of a sense of the Senate, because it is not going to go beyond the Senate; to produce appropriation bills on this particular bill is not going to happen.

If you wanted a sense of the Senate that you want to cut consulting fees and other things but you do not want to cut Government, you want to leave the number in, you do not want to cut the freeze or the 5-percent growth, I think that would be a rather interesting vote and probably would receive some rather handsome support that we would like to see consultants and travel, public information, reduced before we reduce other things.

Now, having said that, my good friend from Georgia wants to speak, I assume, in favor of the amendment. He is here. And I am going to be gone for about 15 or 20 minutes. I would only ask, if we finish the debate, that one of you ask for a quorum call so that I might talk to the chairman of Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DECONCINI. Before the Senator from New Mexico leaves the floor, I would like to ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I rise to thank my colleague from Arizona, Senator DECONCINI, for introducing this amendment and letting me sponsor with him this amendment.

I do not think anybody could have been any more eloquent than the Senator from Arizona in stating the case for what this amendment is all about. He and I both serve on the Appropriations Committee, so I think we know where the money goes. I think we try to restrain that spending.

Now we have a proposal before us, the Republican proposal, which is more backloaded than frontloaded. That means there are more spending reductions, or more impact, on the deficit not in fiscal year 1985, but in 1986 and 1987. This amendment is an attempt to frontload it and put something in fiscal year 1985. The objective in other words, is to try to reduce the deficit that everybody in this country is concerned with. It puts a small torpedo into the water leading toward some pork-barrel-spending programs. It will reduce some of the logrolling because we will take several billion dollars out that people cannot spend any more.

It is not done with mirrors. It is spelled out very clearly in the amendment, the reductions and where we would take them from.

This amendment puts some roadblocks in front of that speeding train to try to slow it down. Once again, the objective is to reduce the deficit, and slow Federal spending. The amendment prevents us from ignoring fiscal year 1985. Let us not try to cover up this weakness in this proposal. Let us try to fix it. Let us try to add more reductions to it. As this year progresses, the proposals that the Senator has put forward in this amendment in fact probably later on in this year are

going to more than highlight the waste that is in the budget. I am not going to get into the Grace Commission report. It has 2,478 items, over $400 billion worth of reductions.

But I think what that report did—and I think what this amendment does—is sort of puts a magnifying glass on the Appropriations Committee. What we are trying to do is take out some of this overspending.

The Senator has done, as I said, an eloquent job of laying out this amendment. Once again, we have a Government spending $90 million an hour, and I believe it is time to slow it down.

We want to slow it down in a way that is not going to hurt the people in the country. But will slow it down so it will help them. I have not been able to see one thing in the amendment that we have proposed that is going to injure anybody west of the Potomac. It may injure the "Beltway Bandits." It may injure somebody in this Government that wants to leave town on a first-class airfare. They may have to go tourist or for a lower rate. But I think what we will see coming up here in the next week is a lot of proposals trying to improve the package that is on the floor. A lot ot them are going to fail. Probably most of them are going to fail. But if we have one that is reasonable, we ought to try to pass it. All of us need to be objective, and say this is one that we can really not only buy but one that will do good on this budget process which we are trying to improve upon.

I do not think anybody in America thinks the budget process we are using is too swift. Looking down through all of the options that we will have, we have already voted on the 10-percent reduction. It did not get too many votes across the board. We got 27 or 28 votes. We are going to have freeze amendments coming up. We are going to have some more across-the-board cuts, some more Grace Commission proposals.

I intend to offer the line-item-veto proposal. There are many items that we will be looking at in the next week. When we have one that is rational, one that we can look at and be able to reduce spending with the simple technique—that is, we have pinpointed the items that can be reduced that are not going to hurt anybody or any program—then I think probably in all honesty it ought to be accepted by voice vote. But it probably will not be.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Yes.

Mr. DECONCINI. I want to thank the Senator for his complimentary remarks. Much credit goes to the Senator from Georgia's efforts, particularly in the consultant area, within the Appropriations Committee that we have labored with for a long time. I call to the attention of the Senate, being on the minority side of the aisle, that I am not tampering with the Republican budget bill. I would much rather see repeal of the third-year tax cut, and many other things reduced here. But this is the package that the leadership has put up. Being in the minority, we understand where the votes are. We are not reducing the cap. We are reorganizing the priorities within that cap. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia, there are many areas in which we overspend. This amendment before us which Senator MATTINGLY and myself have offered attempts to put some limitations on the obligations.

That means that the Appropriations Committee, if they want, can allocate that $4.3 billion in other areas which may be more important, and still stay within the "Republican caps" that have been put on.

It is important to understand this is directing them to do what most of us think they ought to do; that is, the Appropriations Committee—and maybe we will. If we do not succeed here, I can assure you—and I am sure the Senator from Georgia can assure you—that we will be right there once again going through it one time after another with 12 or 13 different appropriations bills, trying to seek out where the consultants are spending the billions of dollars, where the overlap in the motor vehicle program is, and where the debt collections can be collected. It is a laborious process. But we will continue to put forth this effort.

It is a good amendment. I hope that the Republican leadership would not considered it an assault on their great program to reduce the deficit here but would take it in the spirit that it is offered by the Senators from Georgia and Mississippi; that is, putting some restrictions on the obligations within those caps.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona makes a comment about being in the minority, and attacking the majority program. You and I both know, serving on the Appropriations Committee, that one cannot tell the difference between the majority and the minority because it is one big cash register that has not been able to identify who the Republican is or who the Democrat is. But when you are in there, you are spending. What the American public is looking for is the people who want to put the reins on. I am glad to cosponsor this with my colleague from Arizona because we sort of walk down the path together when it comes to trying to root out the wasteful spending on that committee along with other members. Sometimes I wish there were more of us.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPECTER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this is one of those meat cleaver approaches to budgetary matters rather than a scalpel. I have never known meat cleavers to accomplish very much. I say that because even though there may be merit in the application of this particular proposal on an appropriation by appropriation process for measures, this matter is ill-timed because the Appropriations Committee has not even established 302 target figures. The appropriations process has only been at the subcommittee level where we have been holding hearings, hearing witnesses and agency representatives.

To, in effect, establish this reduction before we even have a cap established really kind of amazes me because of the utter illogic to the whole approach.

I might say that if this had been proposed by an executive branch office of our Federal Government, I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate would rise up in great anguish, crying that this was an invasion of the legislative prerogative and responsibility. And yet we are inviting the executive branch of Government to take an action that we ourselves have the responsibility to take.

I notice it is bipartisan. I would have thought it might have been—well, I do not know. It really is an amazing proposal to be made to say, in effect, before the appropriations process has really gotten under way in terms of allocations, 302 targets, and so forth, before we have even agreed on a cap, that we are going to ask the executive branch of Government to diminish the allocation by $750 million.

Again, I could easily support this proposal, perhaps, as it would be made program by program or appropriation bill by appropriation bill, but these simplistic notions that, somehow, across the board, we are going to accomplish some kind of budgetary restraint or control or deficit reduction—having worked for about 18 years at the State level, I have seen these approaches many times in legislatures at the State level. Never once in history have I ever seen this approach really turn out to be other than disaster in terms of across-the-board reductions.

It sounds so simplistic: Across the board; everybody is treated fairly, equitably. Well, that is an assumption that is false on its very surface, because it assumes that everybody has been treated fairly up to this point

and they are all moving from the same baseline.

Mr. President, I understand that everyone has spoken who wants to speak on it. I hope the Senate will agree with the motion I make now to table the amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), the Senator from Washington (Mr. EVANS), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), is absent because of death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 78, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Baker	Domenici	Mathias
Chafee	Durenberger	McClure
Cochran	Glenn	Moynihan
Danforth	Hatfield	Stevens
Dole	Lugar	Weicker

NAYS—78

Abdnor	Gorton	Nickles
Andrews	Grassley	Nunn
Armstrong	Hatch	Packwood
Baucus	Hecht	Pell
Bentsen	Heflin	Percy
Biden	Heinz	Pressler
Bingaman	Helms	Proxmire
Boren	Hollings	Pryor
Boschwitz	Huddleston	Quayle
Bradley	Humphrey	Randolph
Bumpers	Inouye	Riegle
Burdick	Jepsen	Roth
Byrd	Johnston	Rudman
Chiles	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kasten	Sasser
Cranston	Lautenberg	Specter
D'Amato	Laxalt	Stafford
DeConcini	Leahy	Stennis
Denton	Levin	Symms
Dixon	Long	Thurmond
Dodd	Matsunaga	Trible
Eagleton	Mattingly	Tsongas
Exon	Melcher	Wallop
Ford	Metzenbaum	Warner
Garn	Mitchell	Wilson
Goldwater	Murkowski	Zorinsky

NOT VOTING—7

East	Hawkins	Tower
Evans	Kennedy	
Hart	Simpson	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment. The distinguished Senator from Arizona has prevailed, and that is not subject to equivocation. If we agree to accept this amendment, I wonder if he will agree to vitiate the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DECONCINI. I do.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3032) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DECONCINI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I thank the Members who supported this amendment and the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee. His arguments were very eloquent, and I know his intentions are to stay within his budget control and the hard work he has done to put this together. I appreciate the position he found himself in.

I also thank the Senator from Georgia for his outstanding work on the floor in passing the amendment. It would not have happened without his support.

Mr. MATTINGLY. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 3033

(Purpose: To establish a National Commission on Federal Spending Reform)

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY) proposes an amendment numbered 3033.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of amendment No. 3004, insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that:

One, federal spending currently exceeds three-fourths of a trillion dollars and, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will surpass the trillion dollar a year level before the end of this decade; and

Two, an ever-growing share of the federal budget is uncontrollable; and

Three, since 1970, as a percentage of gross national product, federal receipts and federal outlays have averaged 19.2 percent and 21.9 percent of GNP respectively; and

Four, detailed examination of historical trends point to expenditure growth as the real culprit of our ever-diminishing ability to balance the federal government's books; and

Five, the obvious result of this economic imbalance is persistent deficits; and

Six, deficits do matter, for they signal something is fundamentally wrong with the trend in government spending; and

Seven, the continued increase in federal spending results in large budget deficits; and

Eight, large budget deficits cause a rise in interest rates and inflation and can choke off the current economic recovery; and

Nine, a National Commission on Federal Spending Reform, similar to the National Commission on Social Security Reform, should be established to study the growth in federal spending and report to the Congress after January 1, 1985, on those steps Congress might consider for the purpose of reforming federal spending programs and curbing their growth in an effort to regain control of the federal budget and reduce the federal deficit; and

Ten, such a commission should—

(a) be composed of distinguished leaders from the executive and legislative branches of government, business, labor, and education, and

(b) consult with other private and public sector experts for recommendations about reforms that would best address existing problems.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, today I am introducing an amendment which calls for the establishment of a bipartisan National Commission on Federal Spending Reform.

Federal spending is quickly approaching a trillion dollars a year. In other words, for the past several decades, Federal spending has been on automatic pilot. Any examination of historical trends points to expenditure growth as the real culprit in Congress' inability to balance the Federal Government's books.

The American public understands the cause of the large Federal budget deficit and how to eradicate it. A recent Gallup poll found that a large majority of Americans are aware that the Government is operating at a loss and 70 percent said spending cuts are the way to reduce the deficit. Only 16 percent favored raising taxes. While some would have you believe that all stones have been turned over, the American public will not be fooled by the Washington mentality that the Federal budget cannot be reduced.

Again, the amendment calls for the establishment of a bipartisan National Commission on Federal Spending Reform. Such a Commission would be established to study and review the growth in Federal spending and report to Congress, after January 1, 1985, on those steps Congress might consider for the purpose of making fundamental spending reforms in an effort to regain control of the Federal budget and reduce the Federal deficit.

Unlike other commissions to address the Federal deficit, this Commission

would be instructed to address fundamental spending reform rather than to rely on tax increases in addressing the deficit issue. History repeatedly has illustrated that, for the most part, tax increases finance added Government spending and do little to reduce the deficit. The public will not continue to be fooled by token stabs at fundamental spending reform, even in the name of a downpayment on reducing the deficit. Moreover, the creation of this Commission provides a way to achieve bipartisanship on fundamental spending reform that currently is so difficult to achieve in the Congress.

Deficits do matter, for they indicate that something is fundamentally wrong in the trend in Government spending. The only way to reverse the prospect of continuing large future budget deficits is to make the necessary fundamental spending reforms. Making recommendations to accomplish the necessary reforms would be the task of the Commission.

I encourage my colleagues to support the creation of a bipartisan National Commission on Federal Spending Reform in an effort to reverse the current fiscal crisis.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we have reviewed the amendment, and we have adopted it before. It is a sense of the Congress with reference to the creation of a Commission, and I have no objection to its adoption by the Senate.

It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Florida who is managing on the minority side had no objection.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from Florida has indicated that he approves of the statement the Senator from New Mexico just made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment (No. 3033) was agreed to.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no further rollcall votes tonight, and it is the understanding of the leadership that the managers of the bill do not wish to proceed on this bill tomorrow. We will soon finish our routine business and stand in recess until 11 a.m. on Monday morning.

There will be no further rollcall votes today, and we will not be in session tomorrow.

REAGAN DEFENSE PROGRAM BELOW CARTER PLAN

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, on March 15, 1984, under congressional pressure, President Reagan agreed to $22 billion in further cuts in defense spending. As a result, the last vestiges of the 1981 Reagan defense build-up were eliminated, and the Reagan defense program is $5 to $10 billion below the levels of defense spending which President Carter felt were required but which were rejected by the American people as inadequate.

Although the Washington Post, the New York Times, and other so-called national media have studiously ignored this subject—about which the public ought to be better informed—the New York Post of March 26, 1984, published a superb editorial giving the facts on defense spending and bringing into focus the adverse national security effects of congressional attacks on the 1981 Reagan plan.

At a time when the number of Russian nuclear warheads aimed at the American people has almost doubled in little more than 4 years, I believe that Senators should take the time to read the New York Post editorial and to consider the implications of the facts outlined in it.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Mar. 26, 1984]

DO NOT LET FALSE ECONOMY IMPERIL NATION'S DEFENSES

President Reagan's package deal with the Republican Congressional leaders for a $150 billion reduction in the deficit over the next three years clearly is not the end of the affair especially as it affects defense.

Indeed, the election-year battle over the deficit is only just beginning.

Reagan says he agreed to cut defense spending by $57 billion over the period only after the Republicans pledged that the new military budget proposal would be treated as the floor—not as a ceiling for still further cuts.

The President should watch out.

House Speaker Tip O'Neill describes Reagan's concession to the Republicans as merely a first step and Democratic House leader Rep. Jim Wright says: "We think we can do a better job."

DOUBLE CUT

The "better job" which the House Democrats propose is to cut defense spending by $95.5 billion—almost double the Republican figure—and impose much higher taxes and delay by at least two years the plan to link tax brackets to inflation.

When push comes to shove in an election year, what is the prospect for holding the line on defense spending?

Let no one be under any illusions. Under Reagan, there has actually been a steady reduction in the growth of defense spending.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, in their latest posture statement to Congress, make this quite clear.

"The original (Reagan) defense program submitted in March 1981, was estimated to add $116 billion spending for FY 1982 through FY 1986 over the total proposed by the (Carter) administration.

"To date, almost $104 billion of that increment has been removed through a series of reductions and economies of operation—as well as the actions of the Congress."

The total cuts—by Congress and through Pentagon economies—left only $12 billion for increased spending before Reagan made his deal with the Republican leaders.

CARTER'S FIGURES

His compromise cut $6 billion from the proposed FY 1985 budget and a further $16 billion from FY 1986 spending.

The Defense Dept. is now operating at $10 billion below Reagan's original request for increased spending.

A comparison of President Carter's last budget in January 1981 with Reagan's budget when he took office and what he has now accepted is instructive (by fiscal years):

	Fiscal year—				
	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Carter:					
January 1981	184	210	238	268	300
Reagan:					
March 1981	189	226	256	304	343
March 1984	187	210	240	266	294

Reagan is $123 billion below the level of defense spending he originally proposed and at least $5 billion below what Carter considered necessary.

Who would believe it? Carter, of course, tried to hold defense spending down during his four years and largely succeeded. But Afghanistan opened his eyes and when he left office real growth in defense spending was running at 12 percent annually.

Since Reagan's inauguration it has declined steadily to the present 4 percent.

How does this conform with reality?

Richard D. DeLauer, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, has provided Congress with a disturbing answer.

SOVIET OUTLAYS

Except for major surface ships, between 1974–83 the Soviets have substantially outproduced the U.S.—not only for their own forces but also for their surrogates around the world. The Warsaw Pact military advantage over NATO in major weapons is two to one.

DeLauer lists 50 of roughly 200 Soviet weapons programs expected to become operational in the 1980s—to be added to 80 systems deployed since 1980 (twice the U.S. deployment).

Item: Soviet millitary research institutes doubled from 1500 to 1960 to more than 3000 today. Millitary R&D now accounts for virtually all Soviet research, compared with 30 per cent in the U.S.

Item: The dollar cost of Soviet military investment over the last 10 years has exceed-

ed that of the U.S. by $450 billion—due to increased R&D spending.

Item: The Soviets spent $200 billion more to buy weapons than the U.S. in the past 10 years. The cost of Soviet weapons R&D alone was $185 billion more than in the U.S.

Item: Over the past 10 years, total dollar costs of Soviet strategic forces exceeded that of the U.S. by about $250 billion (in constant 1985 dollars) almost double U.S. spending for strategic forces.

Item: The cost of Soviet strategic defense weapons—the world's most extensive—was many more times that of U.S. spending on bomber forces.

Item: The estimated inventory value of Soviet strategic offensive weapons has exceeded that of the U.S. since the mid-1980s. It is now about one-fourth greater. During the 1970s detente—or SALT—period the U.S. "essentially eliminated strategic defense procurement and forces."

HOLD THE LINE

"While there is significant uncertainty in these estimates," says DeLauer, "this long-term trend cannot be allowed to continue."

Is it reasonable, in an election year, to expect that we at least can hold the line?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALENDAR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask my good friend if he will agree to deal with some items on the calendar. I say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the Democratic leader, that it would be my intention to ask the Senate to consider the following actions: Calendar No. 549, S. 1982, to be indefinitely postponed; Calendar item No. 755, S. 2303, to pass that bill; Calendar No. 760, S. 1806, to pass that bill; Calendar No. 765, S. 1711, to pass that bill; Calendar No. 76, S. 501, to pass that bill; Calendar Nos. 783 and 784, which are S. 2061 and S. 2468, to indefinitely postpone those bills; and to pass Calendar No. 795, S. 2597, Calendar No. 797, H.R. 3376, and Calendar No. 798, H.R. 3555.

Would that procedure meet with the minority leader's approval?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished assistant Republican leader. These matters have been cleared on this side. We are ready to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the acting majority leader is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the three bills to be indefinitely postponed are Calendar Order No. 549, S. 1982; Calendar Order No. 783, S. 2061; and Calendar Order No. 784, S. 2468. I now ask unanimous consent that those bills be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the items which I suggested to the minority leader be considered en bloc, and that all of those requests be granted en bloc.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will not object.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2303) to revise and extend the Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Service block grant, which has been reported from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant Amendments of 1984".

REFERENCE

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. Section 1911 is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$490,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $518,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $547,000,000 for fiscal year 1987".

ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. Section 1912 is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a);

(2) by redesignating clauses (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) by striking out the matter preceding clause (i) of subsection (b)(1) (as redesignated by clause (2) of this section) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a)(1)(A) From the total amount described in subparagraph (B) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State for such fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to such total amount as the amounts—";

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) (as redesignated by the amendment made by clause (3) of this section) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) The total amount referred to in subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year is the portion of the amount appropriated under section 1911 for such fiscal year which is equal to the total amount allotted to States under this section for the fiscal year preceding such fiscal year.";

(5) by inserting after subsection (a) (as redesignated by the amendment made by clause (3) of this section) the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) For each State, the Secretary shall determine an amount for each fiscal year which is equal to the product of—

"(A) an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount appropriated under section 1911 for such fiscal year as the population of the State bears to the sum of the populations of all States, multiplied by

"(B) 50 percent.

"(2) If the amount determined by the Secretary for a State for a fiscal year under paragraph (1) of this subsection exceeds the amount allotted to such State for such fiscal year under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall allot to such State from the amount described in paragraph (3) of this subsection an amount equal to the amount of such excess.

"(3) The amount referred to in paragraph (2) for a fiscal year is an amount equal to the difference between the amount appropriated under section 1911 for such fiscal year and the total amount allotted to States under this section for the fiscal year preceding such fiscal year.

"(4) If, after making all the allotments required by paragraph (2) of this subsection for a fiscal year from the amount described in paragraph (3) of this subsection for such fiscal year, the Secretary determines that the sum of all such allotments for such fiscal year does not exceed the amount described in paragraph (3) of this subsection for such fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot the remainder of the amount described in paragraph (3) of this subsection for such fiscal year among the States in accordance with paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) and without regard to the allotments made under paragraph (2) of this subsection.";

(6) by inserting "under this subsection or subsection (b)" before "because" in subsection (a)(4); and

(7) by striking out "subsection (b)" the first two places it appears in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (a) and (b)".

REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. Section 1912(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d)(1) The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with a nongovernmental entity to review the distribution of funds allotted to the States under this part during each of the fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984 for the purpose of determining whether a formula for the distribution of funds available for allotment to States under this section can be devised which is more equitable than the formula specified under subsection (a). In conducting such review, such entity shall consider—

"(A) the financial resources of the various States;

"(B) the populations of the States;

"(C) any relevant conditions or circumstances which have changed since the date of enactment of this part; and

"(D) any other factor which the Secretary may consider appropriate.

"(2) In conducting the review required by this subsection, such entity shall consult with appropriate representatives of State and local governments.

"(3) By October 1, 1985, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to the Congress a report concerning the review conducted under this subsection which includes such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate.".

USE OF FUNDS FOR ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

SEC. 6. Section 1915(c) is amended—

(1) by striking out "fiscal year 1984" in paragraph (6)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal year 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987"; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following new paragraph:

"(14) That, in determining programs and activities to be conducted with amounts available in any fiscal year for programs and activities for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism, alcohol abuse, and drug abuse, the State agrees to—

"(A) give special attention to programs and activities for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism, alcohol abuse, and drug abuse among women, including homemakers, single women, single and divorced mothers, widowed mothers, displaced homemakers, pregnant women, and women who have attained the age of 60 years; and

"(B) coordinate the programs and activities described in subparagraph (A) with programs and activities carried out under section 1920.".

AUDITS AND DATA COLLECTION

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1916(b)(2) is amended by striking out "Each State shall annually" and inserting in lieu thereof "Every two years, each State shall".

(b) Section 1916 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate national organizations, shall develop model criteria and forms for the collection of data and information with respect to services provided under this part in order to enable States to share uniform data and information with respect to the provision of such services.".

ELIMINATION OF REPORT

SEC. 8. Section 1916(b)(6) is repealed.

TRANSITION

SEC. 9. Section 1920 is repealed.

ALCOHOLISM, ALCOHOL ABUSE, AND DRUG ABUSE AMONG WOMEN

SEC. 10. Part B of title XIX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ALCOHOLISM, ALCOHOL ABUSE, AND DRUG ABUSE AMONG WOMEN

"SEC. 1920. (a) In addition to the amounts appropriated under section 1911, there are authorized to be appropriated $7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, for allotments to States for programs and activities for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism, alcohol abuse, and drug abuse among women, including homemakers, single women, single and divorced mothers, widowed mothers, displaced homemakers, pregnant women, and women who have attained the age of 60 years.

"(b) Amounts appropriated under this section shall be allotted in accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 1912.

"(c) Except to the extent inconsistent with this section, the provisions of sections 1913, 1914(a)(2), 1914(b), 1914(d), 1915(a), 1915(c)(1), 1915(c)(8), 1915(c)(9), 1915(c)(10), 1915(c)(11), 1915(c)(12), 1915(d), 1916, 1917, 1918, and 1919 shall apply to the payment and administration of amounts appropriated under this section, and to programs and activities carried out with such amounts, in the same manner as such sections apply to the payment and administration of amounts appropriated under section 1911 and to programs and activities carried out with amounts appropriated under such section.".

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 11. Part B of title XIX (as amended by section 10 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 1920A. (a) The Secretary may make grants to States, political subdivisions of States, and private nonprofit agencies for mental health services demonstration projects for the planning, coordination, and improvement of community services for chronically mentally ill individuals, seriously mentally disturbed children, and elderly individuals, and for the conduct of research concerning such services.

"(b) The Secretary may make a grant to a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private nonprofit agency under this section for not more than three consecutive one-year periods, except that the Secretary may waive the provisions of this subsection with respect to a particular grant if the Secretary determines that extenuating circumstances exist which merit such waiver.

"(c) To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.".

GRANTS FOR STATE COMPREHENSIVE MENTAL HEALTH PLANS

SEC. 12. Part B of title XIX (as amended by sections 10 and 11 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STATE COMPREHENSIVE MENTAL HEALTH PLANS

"SEC. 1920B. (a) From amounts appropriated to carry out section 301, the Secretary may make grants to States for the purpose of developing State comprehensive mental health plans. Each State comprehensive mental health plan developed with a grant under this section shall describe, in a form and according to standards established by the Secretary—

"(1) the mental health resources in the State;

"(2) the sources of funding for mental health services provided in the State, including—

"(A) funding from Federal programs such as this part and title XIX of the Social Security Act;

"(B) State appropriations; and

"(C) to the extent that States are provided information, funds provided by private third party insurance coverage;

"(3) State efforts to coordinate the provision of mental health services; and

"(4) State measurable goals and objectives to improve the delivery of mental health services in the State, including efforts to increase services for chronically mentally ill individuals, seriously mentally disturbed children, and elderly individuals and to establish a comprehensive community-based system of care for chronically mental ill individuals.

"(b) By October 1, 1986, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit a report to Congress which contains an analysis of the implementation by States of State comprehensive mental health plans developed with grants under this section and recommendations for legislation to encourage the achievement of goals and objectives established under such State plans.".

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 13. Section 301 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) With respect to programs carried out under part B of title XIX, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance to States and conduct data collection activities.".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. This Act and the amendments and repeals made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to expeditiously approve S. 2303, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant Amendments of 1984. This is vitally important legislation to millions of families throughout our Nation who are tragically touched by alcoholism, drug abuse, or mental illness. This sad toll is enormous and each of us knows many people affected by one of these illnesses—a child robbed of his life by a drunk driver; a nephew, cousin, or neighbor shattered by drug abuse; or a friend touched by mental illness searching for reasons and cures.

The issues of treatment for alcohol, drug abuse, and mental illnesses are among the most widely highlighted in Congress. With the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Congress consolidated a number of categorical health programs into four health block grants. One of the health blocks established with this enactment was the alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services (ADMS) block grant. This block consolidated into a single authority of grants to the States various Federal categorical programs for: First, formula and project grants and contracts for alcohol abuse services; second, formula and project grants and contracts for drug abuse services; and third, grants for community mental health centers (CMHC's).

The ADMS block and other health blocks were established in 1981 to provide State and local governments greater flexibility and decisionmaking authority in focusing Federal, State, and local resources on needs and priorities they know best and in ways they believe are best suited to local conditions. Block grants were also intended to eliminate duplication and overlapping of services and to allow States to better integrate and coordinate services funded by several levels of Government.

Under the ADMS block, States may use their allotments for: First, planning, establishing, maintaining, coordinating, and evaluating projects for the development of more effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and activities to deal with alcohol and drug abuse; and second, for grants to community mental health centers for the following services and for planning, administration, and educational activities related to these activities:

First, services for chronically mentally ill individuals, which include identification of chronically mentally ill individuals and assistance to such individuals in gaining access to essential services through the assignment of case managers;

Second, identification and assessment of severely mentally disturbed children and adolescents and provisions of appropriate services to such individuals;

Third, identification and assessment of mentally ill elderly individuals and provision of appropriate services to such individuals;

Fourth, services for identifiable populations which are currently underserved in the State; and

Fifth, coordination of mental health and health care services provided within health care centers.

This bill contains other provisions that allow States to be more responsive to their special needs and priorities. My committee learned of the rapidly growing problem of alcoholism and alcohol and drug abuse among women and the need for special programs. It is estimated that up to one half of the approximately 10 million alcoholics in this country are women. I learned specifically from a prominent Utah alcohol and drug treatment provider that most women lost family relationships as soon as their chemical dependency became problematic for the family. Consequently, there are minimal resources either for child care or the financing of treatment. More effective treatment and prevention programs are required to reduce specifically the consequences and costs of alcohol and substance abuse among women. This legislation provides the States the greatest flexibility possible in designing treatment and prevention services programs for women.

I am also pleased to report that we have expanded services to States to plan, coordinate, and improve community services for the chronically mentally ill, seriously mentally disturbed children and the elderly. We know that the current community support program provided thousands of families help in securing vital services for mentally ill family members—housing services, educational services, counseling services—all aimed at preparing chronically mentally ill persons for community living. In addition, this bill also expands services for families who have a mentally disturbed child. There are estimates of over 3 million children and adolescents in the United States who suffer from severe mental disability.

Finally, this bill expands its potential services to include our elderly citizens in need of compassionate mental health care. Tragically, our older Americans have a higher rate of mental illness than any other population. Evidence shows dramatic increases of mental illness in nursing home patients, where many of the residents show significant emotional and behaviorial dysfunctions. Moreover, many of these disorders are treatable. This new program may enable many of our elderly citizens suffering from a form of mental illness to return to their community and obtain home health services. Outreach programs and better coordination between mental health and primary health care programs are essential for meeting the needs of the elderly.

I encourage my colleagues to favorably approve this legislation. We can make our statement that we continue support for families, for communities, and for States treating and preventing the destruction and despair that can result from alcohol abuse, drug abuse and mental illness.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to support passage of S. 2303 which reauthorizes the alcohol, drug abuse and mental health block grant. I particularly wish to thank Senator HATCH for supporting inclusion in the bill of the Grassley-Proxmire equity adjustment, which will provide a modest increase in block grant funds for several States, including Iowa and Wisconsin, which were severely deprived by the allocation formula adopted for the block grant when the program was created in 1981. This present distribution formula is simply inequitable, 22 States, receive fewer dollars under this program than they would receive if the funds were distributed simply on the basis of each States share of the Nation's population.

Unfortunately, with 28 States receiving more than their fair share, and with each of those States determined to protect the funds they are now receiving, it would cost tens of millions of dollars to insure that all States received their fair share and that no State would be hurt by such a change. With the Federal deficit the way it is, that simply was not a responsible option.

Therefore, my staff helped draft a proposal for an equity adjustment to the block grant formula and Senator HATCH graciously consented to include it among his chairman's amendments to the bill in committee. This equity amendment would insure that no State could receive less than 50 percent of what it would get under a population-base formula.

Adoption of this equity adjustment is a step in the right direction. The most deprived States will be brought closer to what would be a fair share of the block grant moneys without at the same time costing the Treasury any additional money. This equity adjustment will not cost any additional money because it simply reallocates a small amount of money among the States.

Unfortunately, the most deprived States, including Iowa, will still not receive their fair share under terms of our proposal. The Congress is scheduled to get in 1985 recommendations for a major reform of the funding formula for this program from the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. Once we have these recommendations, I intend to fight for a formula which will insure that Iowa gets its fair share of the block grant money.

In the meantime, the equity adjustment will help those States like Iowa and Wisconsin which are most severely deprived under terms of the allocation formula.

(By request of Mr. BYRD, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased that this bill includes a number of initiatives to improve services to high priority underserved populations, including establishing a grant program directed at the needs of alcoholic women, raising the funding level for the effective community support program for the chronically mentally ill, expanding the community support program to include seriously mentally ill children and the elderly, requiring the Secretary to develop an adequate data system on mental illness and to provide technical assistance to States, and providing grant funds to States to develop comprehensive mental health plans.

A number of these initiatives were adopted, in modified form, from S. 2452, an omnibus health services reauthorization bill I introduced on March 20 and which was cosponsored by all the Democratic members of the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

While this bill is a step in the right direction, it does not go far enough. I believe that States need to be held accountable for the effectiveness and adequacy of the services they provide to the chronically mentally ill and need to be provided additional funding and incentives to adequately serve severely mentally ill children, the elderly, and populations in areas that lack mental health services.

The treatment of the chronically mentally ill, in particular, is a national disgrace.

Psychotropic drugs have largely emptied our Nation's State mental hospitals. Tragically, however, the promise deinstitutionalization has offered for a better and more fulfilling life for our Nation's chronically mentally ill has largely gone unfulfilled. Without adequate community support and services, hundreds of thousands have been effectively abandoned by our society, abandoned to a desolate world of single room occupancy hotels, slum-like board and care homes, a world of sleeping on grates and beg-

ging for meals, of repetitious and unnecessary psychotic episodes that lead to costly hospitalization, stabilization, and discharge, only to begin the cycle again.

The community support program funded on a demonstration basis by NIMH as well as a number of successful programs operated by States has proven there is a better way. With effective case-management services, a developed continuum of care from institutions to independent living, and inexpensive but well-planned social support services, this tragic cycle can be broken. Indeed, evaluations of the community support program have shown rates of hospitalization 50-percent lower than for comparable populations without access to community services.

ADAMHA block grant expenditures are a tiny proportion of total national costs for chronic mental illness. Medicaid and State-only mental health expenditures on the chronically mentally ill were $5.4 billion in 1983, compared to less than $.3 billion for ADAMHA block grant funds. But non-PHS funds were overwhelmingly spent on institutional rather than community-based care, and, in the case of Medicaid, can not even be tracked to services for the chronically mentally ill except through special studies.

Other populations that have been neglected in our current mental health service delivery system are the elderly, children, and those resident in underserved areas. The elderly receive community services at a lower rate than the population as a whole, even though an estimated 10 to 25 percent in the community have some degree of mental impairment and the suicide rate of the elderly is 1½ times the rate for all ages. Of 3 million seriously disturbed children, an estimated two thirds are not getting the treatment they need. Our bill would require the States to include in their plan a program for improving services to these populations.

While ADAMHA funds are a small proportion of total expenditures, they can be vital in creating incentives for a reformed mental health system. I believe that the administration philosophy of simply giving money to States in the form of block grants without standards, accountability, or uniform reporting is wrong. Rather, block grants should be a component of a creative Federal-State partnership that assures national needs are met.

This bill is a significant improvement over current law, but it does not assert the national interest in and responsibility for these highly dependent populations forcefully enough. A more responsible approach would make receipt of ADAMHA funds contingent on States developing a comprehensive plan for an effective community-based treatment system for the chronically mentally ill and a program to address the needs of the elderly, children, and residents of areas without services. Such a State plan would include a system for accounting for all funds spent on the chronically mentally ill, and would track progress toward plan implementation. Case management services—the heart of the effective treatment program—should be fully phased in over a 3-year period.

It should also be recognized that the funding levels provided in this bill, while an improvement over current levels, are less than two-thirds of 1980 spending in real terms. In view of the needs of this population, this is not good enough. While the great bulk of mental health services should come from reorientation of existing funding, significant increases in PHS support are also necessary.

One additional issue deserves mention. Since 1981, ADAMHA staffing has declined by almost 50 percent, from 1,919 to 1,045. Further declines in staffing are not appropriate in view of the expanded responsibilities established by this legislation. Accordingly, the Secretary should maintain staffing allocated to ADAMHA functions at current levels and should assure location of these expanded responsibilities in organizational units with the expertise necessary to fulfill the responsibilities established by this legislation efficiently and effectively.●

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as amended.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1806) to recognize the organization known as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment:

On page 6, line 7, strike "(60)" and insert "(63)".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Incorporated, organized and incorporated as a nonprofit entity under the laws of the State of New York, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a Federal charter.

(b) The corporation shall retain and maintain its status as a corporation organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of New York.

POWERS

SEC. 2. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation are those provided in its articles of incorporation and shall include a continuing commitment, on a national basis, to—

(1) maintain true allegiance to the United States of America;

(2) foster and perpetuate true Americanism;

(3) combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions;

(4) uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed;

(5) encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights and full justice to all men;

(6) combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever the target;

(7) preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families;

(8) cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions, and foster the education of ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen and members of the corporation in the ideals and principles of Americanism;

(9) instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in members of the corporation and their youth; and

(10) preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men and women of the Jewish faith and to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be as provided in the bylaws and constitution of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the resonsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(d) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of accounts and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right to vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under the Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(63) Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.".

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit required by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF STATE

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

TERMINATION

SEC. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as amended.

EXTENSION OF PATENT NUMBERED 3,376,198

The bill (S. 1711) to extend Patent Numbered 3,376,198, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Patent Numbered 3,376,198 (relating to the production of immunocompetent factors in milk) issued on April 2, 1968, to Impro Products, Incorporated, of Waukon, Iowa (hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "patentee") be, and the same hereby is, renewed and extended for a term of seventeen years from the date on which such patent would otherwise expire, with the same force and effect as if said patent had been originally issued for a term inclusive of the terms provided for herein. The benefits conferred by this Act shall accrue to the patentee's heirs, assigns and successors in interest.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of Patents shall—

(1) cause notice of the renewal and extension granted under this Act to be published in the Official Gazette and marked upon copies of such patent for sale by the Patent Office in such manner as the Commissioner may determine; and

(2) whenever requested by the said patentee or the successors or assigns of such patentee, make a certificate of renewal and extension and append an authenticated copy thereof to such patent, whenever the same shall be requested by the said patentee or the successors or assigns of such patentee.

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN THE U.S. CODE REFORM ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 501) to amend the laws of the United States to eliminate gender-based distinctions, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike "(a)".

On page 3, line 1, strike "(b) Section 933 of such title is amended by striking out "and a gentlemen".

On page 5, after line 5, insert:

(b) Section 6964(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "men" and inserting in lieu thereof "persons".

On page 8, line 4, strike "him" and insert "his".

On page 8, strike lines 23 through 25.

On page 9, line 1 strike "(d)" and insert "(c)".

On page 9, line 4, strike "(c)" and insert "(d)".

On page 11, after line 9 insert:

(c) Section 41 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "men" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

(d) Section 192 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(e) Section 351(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "men" and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

(f) Section 353 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(g) Section 354 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(o) Section 366 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(p) Section 367 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member"; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking out "men" and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

(q) Section 370 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(r) Section 421 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(s) Section 424 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(t) Section 483 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(u) Section 487 of title 14, United States Code, including the section heading, is amended by striking out "men" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

(h) Section 355 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(i) Section 357 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "men" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "members"; and

(2) by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(j) Section 359 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(k) Section 360 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(l) Section 361 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(m) Section 362 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(n) Section 365 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

On page 16, line 3, strike "by striking out "wife, sister" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse, sibling". " and insert:

by—

(1) striking out "wages he may earn" and inserting in lieu thereof "wages he or she may earn";

(2) striking out "wife, sister" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse, sibling"; and

(3) striking out "opened by him and maintained in his name" and inserting in lieu thereof "opened by him or her and maintained in his or her name".

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (23 Stat. 55; 46 U.S.C. 599(c)) is amended by striking out "during his absence" and inserting in lieu thereof "during his or her absence".

(d) Chapter 231 of the Act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1167; 46 U.S.C. 627) is amended by—

(1) striking out "part of his effects" and inserting in lieu thereof "part of his or her effects";

(2) striking out "his money and effects" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her money and effects";

(3) striking out "his widow or children" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse or children of such person"; and

(4) striking out "his will" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her will.".

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 112. (a) Section 311(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "males" and inserting in lieu thereof "persons"; and

(2) by striking out "and of female citizens of the United States who are commissioned officers of the National Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(b) Section 772(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or her," after "his" in the first sentence; and

(2) by striking out the second sentence.

(c) Section 1431(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

(d) Section 1451(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding "or widower" after "widow" each place it appears; and

(2) by inserting "or father's" after "mother's".

(e) Section 4313(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "competitor".

(f) Section 6160(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(g) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service," approved April 30, 1956 (70 Stat. 124; 42 U.S.C. 213, note) is amended by striking out "wife, widow" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse, surviving spouse".

(h) Section 551(1)(A) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

(i) Section 3402(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(j) Section 300 of the Soldier's and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. 530) is amended—

(1) in subsection (1) by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse";

(2) in subsection (4) by inserting "or she" after "he"; and

(3) in subsection (4) by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

Strike title II and insert:

TITLE II—ELIMINATION OF GENDER-BASED DISTINCTIONS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 213(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 413a(2)(B)) is amended by striking out "(if a woman) or age 65 (if a man)".

(b) Section 215(f)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(f)(5)) is amended by striking out "a man" and inserting in lieu thereof "an individual".

(c) Section 402(a)(19)(G)(iv) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(19)(G)(iv)) is amended by striking out "mother" and inserting in lieu thereof "parent", and by striking out "she".

(d) Section 1107(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1307(b)) is amended by striking out "former wife divorced" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance "divorced spouse".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply on and after the date of the enactment of the Act, and in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act shall only apply to benefits payable for months beginning on or after such date of enactment.

On page 40, line 6, strike "and," and insert "and".

On page 46, line 11 strike "212," and insert "203".

On page 46, line 23 strike "301," and insert "301(a)".

On page 47, after line 22, insert:

(c) Section 8332(j)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "widow" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

(b) Section 5561(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

On page 50, after line 18, insert:

(g) Section 321 of the Immigration and Nationalilty Act (8 U.S.C.1432) is amended in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) by striking out "the naturalization of the mother".

On page 53, strike lines 18 and 19 after "Sec. 309." and insert:

(a) Section 3 of the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 592; 25 U.S.C. 933 (c)) is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "or her spouse".

(b) Section 3(c) of the Act of September 5, 1962 (76 Stat. 429; 25 U.S.C. 973(c)) is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "or her spouse".

On page 55, line 20 strike all after "is amended" and insert:

by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6); and

(2) inserting a new paragraph after paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(3) any person because of such person's sex, in violation of such other person's right not to be subject to discrimination on that account and because such other person is or has been participating, or in order to intimidate any person from participating, in any benefit or activity described in paragraph (2); or".

On page 57, line 2, after "United States Code" insert:

and all references to such sections including the items relating to such sections in the table of sections, are repealed.

(f) Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof "any officer or enlisted member of the Coast Guard".

(g) Section 2421 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "Whoever" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Any individual who";

(2) by striking out "person" in the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "individual";

(3) by striking out "woman or girl" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "other person";

(4) by inserting "himself or" before "herself" each place it appears; and

(5) by striking out "her" in the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "such other person".

(h) Section 2422 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "Whoever" and inserting in lieu thereof "Any individual who";

(2) by striking out "person" and inserting in lieu thereof "individual";

(3) by striking out "woman or girl" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "other person"; and

(4) by striking out "her" and inserting in lieu thereof "such other person's".

On page 59, line 15, strike "enterer" and insert "enterer's".

On page 62, line 23, after "husband" insert "and inserting in lieu thereof "by the enterer spouse".

On page 63, after line 2, insert " and (D) striking out "entryman" and inserting in lieu thereof "enterer"

On page 64, line 5, after "widow" insert "each place it appears".

On page 65, line 1, strike "provisos" and insert "proviso".

On page 66, after line 13, insert:

(b) Section 2304 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 271) is amended by striking out "after locating his homestead and filing his declaratory statement within which to make his entry and commence his settlement and improvement." and inserting in lieu thereof "after locating a homestead and filing a declaratory statement within which to make entry and commence settlement and improvement of the land.".

On page 66, line 24, strike "App. U.S.C." and insert "U.S.C. App. 563".

On page 67, line 10, strike "App. U.S.C." and insert "U.S.C. App.".

On page 67, line 19, strike "App. U.S.C." and insert "U.S.C. App.".

On page 68, line 20, strike "330" and insert "330(a)".

On page 68, line 22, strike "the first place it appears".

On page 69, after line 2, insert:

(2) striking out "widow" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

(b) Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to clarify the status and benefits of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes" (84 Stat. 1863, 33 U.S.C. 857-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking out "enlisted men" and inserting in lieu thereof "enlisted persons"; and

(2) in subsection (c) by striking out "their widows" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouses of such members".

(c) Section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m), is amended—

(1) by striking out "servicemen" each place such term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "persons in the service";

(2) by striking out "serviceman" each place such term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "person in the service"; and

(3) in subsection (g) by—

(A) striking out "surviving widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse";

(B) striking out "serviceman's" each place such term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "person's in the service"; and

(C) striking out "such widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "such surviving spouse".

(d) Section 2 of the Act of July 5, 1946, commonly known as the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1052), is amended in subsection (c) by—

(1) striking out "his widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse of such President"; and

(2) striking out "the widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "such surviving spouse".

(e) Section 5572 of the Revised Statutes (48 U.S.C. 1413) is amended in the first sentence by striking out "his widow, heir, ex-

ecutor, or administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse, heir, executor, or administrator of the discoverer".

(f) Section 5574 of the Revised Statutes (48 U.S.C. 1415) is amended in the second sentence by striking out "his widow, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns of the discoverer".

(g) Section 5577 of the Revised Statutes (48 U.S.C. 1418) is amended by striking out "his widow, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns of the discoverer".

On page 72, lines 3, 7, 13, and 16, strike "last sentence" and insert "proviso".

On page 72, line 9, strike "placed to his credit therein" and insert "placed to his".

On page 75, after line 15, insert:

(F) by striking out "Such term also includes" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Such terms also include"; and"

On page 78, line 2, strike "of the second sentence".

On page 78, line 24, strike "and" and insert:

(N) by striking out "who is" after "(2)" in paragraph (5); and.

On page 79, line 3, strike "(N)" and insert "(O)".

On page 80, after line 22 insert:

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 333. (a) Section 9(b) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 909(b)), is amended by striking out "dependent".

(b) Section 9(c) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 909(c)), is amended by striking out "dependent husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "widower".

(c) Section 9(g) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 909(g)), is amended by striking out "wife" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

(d) Section 14(j) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 909(j)), is amended by—

(1) striking out "during which he is entitled" and inserting in lieu thereof "during which he or she is entitled"; and

(2) placing a period after "Mortality" in the second sentence and striking out the rest of the sentence.

CONSERVATION

SEC. 334. The last proviso of the subparagraph entitled "Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration" under the paragraph "Fish and Wildlife Service" of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 557; 16 U.S.C. 754) is amended by striking out "per man per day" and inserting in lieu thereof "per day".

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 335. Section 1 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by striking out the clause beginning "words importing the masculine gender" and inserting in lieu thereof "words importing the masculine or feminine gender include the other as well".

BENEFITS FOR INTERNEES

SEC. 336. Section 2004 of title 50, Appendix, United States Code, is amended—

(1) In subsection (d) by—

(A) inserting "or her" after "his";

(B) striking out "husband" each place it appears in paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "widower"; and

(C) striking out "husband" in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "widow, widower";

(2) In subsection (f)(7) by—

(A) inserting "or widower" after "widow"; and

(B) inserting "herself or" before "himself"; and

(3) in subsections (g)(4) and (i)(4) by—

(A) inserting "or her" after "his";

(B) striking out "husband" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "widower"; and

(C) striking out "dependent husband" each place it appears in subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "widower".

SPOUSES OF FORMER PRESIDENTS

SEC. 337. The Act of August 25, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. 102 Note), is amended in subsection (e) by—

(1) striking out "widow" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse"; and

(2) inserting "he or" before "she".

So as to make the bill read:

S. 501

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Sex Discrimination in the United States Code Reform Act of 1983".

TITLE I—ARMED FORCES, SOLDIERS' HOME, COAST GUARD, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE, AND MERCHANT MARINE

PART A—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE ARMED FORCES AND THE SOLDIERS' HOME

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

SEC. 101. Section 920 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Any person subject to this chapter who commits an act of sexual intercourse with another person not his or her spouse, by force and without the consent of such other person, is guilty of rape and shall be punished by death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"(b) Any person subject to this chapter who, under circumstances not amounting to rape, commits an act of sexual intercourse with another person not his or her spouse who has not attained the age of sixteen years, is guilty of carnal knowledge and shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE ARMY

SEC. 102. (a) Section 3683 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) Section 3963 of such title is repealed.

(c) Section 4309(b) of such title is amended by striking out "males" and inserting in lieu thereof "persons".

(d) Section 4651 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4651. Arms, tentage, and equipment: educational institutions not maintaining units of R.O.T.C.

"Under such conditions as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe, such Secretary may issue arms, tentage, and equipment that such Secretary considers necessary for proper military training, to any educational institution at which no unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is maintained, but which has a course in military training prescribed by such Secretary and which has at least one hundred physically fit students over fourteen years of age.".

(e) Section 4712(d) of such title is amended by striking out clauses (1) through (9) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The surviving spouse or legal representative.

"(2) A child of the deceased.

"(3) A parent of the deceased.

"(4) A brother or sister of the deceased.

"(5) The next of kin of the deceased.

"(6) A beneficiary named in the will of the deceased to receive the property.".

(f) Section 4713(a)(2) of such title is amended by striking out subclauses (A) through (I) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) The surviving spouse or legal representative.

"(B) A child of the deceased.

"(C) A parent of the deceased.

"(D) A brother or sister of the deceased.

"(E) The next of kin of the deceased.

"(F) A beneficiary named in the will of the deceased to receive the property.".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE NAVY

SEC. 103. (a) Section 7601 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking out "widows" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouses"; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out "him" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary"; and

(B) by striking out "he" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "the Secretary".

(b) Section 6964(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "men" and inserting in lieu thereof "persons".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE AIR FORCE

SEC. 104. (a) Section 8683 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) Section 8963 of such title is repealed.

(c) Section 9651 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 9651. Arms, tentage, and equipment: educational institutions not maintaining units of A.F.R.O.T.C.

"Under such conditions as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, such Secretary may issue arms, tentage, and equipment that such Secretary considers necessary for proper military training, to any educational institution at which no unit of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps is maintained, but which has a course in military training prescribed by such Secretary and which has at least 100 physically fit students over 14 years of age.".

(d) Section 9712(d) of such title is amended by striking out clauses (1) through (9), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The surviving spouse or legal representative.

"(2) A child of the deceased.

"(3) A parent of the deceased.

"(4) A brother or sister of the deceased.

"(5) The next of kin of the deceased.

"(6) A beneficiary named in the will of the deceased to receive the property.".

(e) Section 9713(a)(2) of such title is amended by striking out subclauses (A)

through (I) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) The surviving spouse or legal representative.

"(B) A child of the deceased.

"(C) A parent of the deceased.

"(D) A brother or sister of the deceased.

"(E) The next of kin of the deceased.

"(F) A beneficiary named in the will of the deceased to receive the property.".

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS AS OFFICERS IN THE ARMY

SEC. 105. The Act entitled "An Act to authorize temporary appointment as officers in the Army of the United States of members of the Army Nurse Corps, female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such corps, female dietetic and physical-therapy personnel of the Medical Department of the Army (exclusive of students and apprentices), and female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such department as female dietetic or physical-therapy personnel, and for other purposes.", approved June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324; 50 U.S.C. App. 1591 et seq.) is repealed.

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ALLOTMENT OF PENSIONS OF INMATES OF THE SOLDIERS' HOME

SEC. 106. Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.", approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564; 24 U.S.C. 52) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking out "wife" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "spouse"; and

(B) by striking out "his" and inserting in lieu thereof "the inmate's";

(2) in the third sentence—

(A) by striking out "him" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "the pensioner"; and

(B) by striking out "his";

(3) in the fourth sentence—

(A) by striking out "his" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "the inmate's"; and

(B) by striking out "he" and inserting in lieu thereof "the pensioner"; and

(4) in the fifth sentence—

(A) by striking out "him" and inserting in lieu thereof "the pensioner"; and

(B) by striking out "his" and inserting in lieu thereof "the pensioner's".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 107. (a) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 353 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 3683.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 369 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 3963.

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 853 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 8683.

(d) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 869 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 8963.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 108. (a) The repeal made by section 102(a) shall not apply in the case of any person who performed active service described in section 3683 of title 10, United States Code, as such section was in effect on the day before the effective date of such repeal.

(b) The repeal made by section 102(b) shall not apply in the case of any member of the Regular Army described in section 3963 of title 10, United States Code, as such section was in effect on the day before the effective date of such repeal.

(c) The repeal made by section 104(a) shall not apply in the case of any person who performed active service described in section 8683 of title 10, United States Code, as such section was in effect on the day before the effective date of such repeal.

(d) The repeal made by section 104(b) shall not apply in the case of any Air Force nurse or medical specialist described in section 8963 of title 10, United States Code, as such section was in effect on the day before the effective date of such repeal.

(e) The repeal made by section 105 shall not apply in the case of any officer in the Army appointed and assigned under the first section of the Act referred to in section 105, as such Act was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

PART B—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE COAST GUARD, THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE, AND THE CREW OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE COAST GUARD

SEC. 109. (a) Section 371 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of subsection (a) by striking out "male" each place it appears; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by striking out "he agrees in writing that upon his" and inserting in lieu thereof "the person agrees in writing that upon"; and

(B) by striking out "he will" and inserting in lieu thereof "the person will"; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2) by striking out "he has the consent of his parent or guardian to his agreement" and inserting in lieu thereof "the person has the consent of the person's parent or guardian to the agreement".

(b) The first sentence of section 487 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking out "men" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "members"; and

(2) by striking out "widows" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouses".

(c) Section 41 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "men" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

(d) Section 192 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(e) Section 351(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "men" and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

(f) Section 353 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(g) Section 354 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(h) Section 355 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(i) Section 357 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "men" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "members"; and

(2) by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(j) Section 359 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(k) Section 360 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(l) Section 361 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(m) Section 362 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(n) Section 365 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(o) Section 366 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(p) Section 367 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member"; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking out "men" and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

(q) Section 370 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(r) Section 421(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(s) Section 424 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(t) Section 483 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(u) Section 487 of title 14, United States Code, including the section heading, is amended by striking out "men" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "members".

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

SEC. 110. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide benefits for the widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes', approved June 20, 1918, as amended.", approved August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465; 33 U.S.C. 771), is amended—

(1) by striking out "he" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "that employee"; and

(2) by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) the surviving spouse of such former employee was married to such former employee prior to the retirement of such former employee from the Lighthouse Service and has not remarried—"; and

(3) by striking out "widow, so long as she" in the flush material after clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse, so long as such surviving spouse".

(b) Section 2 of such Act (64 Stat. 466; 33 U.S.C. 772) is amended—

(1) by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) the surviving spouse of such employee has not since remarried,"; and

(2) by striking out "widow, so long as she" in the flush material after clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse, so long as such surviving spouse".

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE CREW OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

SEC. 111. (a) Section 4509 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 561) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking out "boys" and inserting in lieu thereof "youths";

(B) by striking out "his power" and inserting in lieu thereof "the power of such official";

(C) by striking out "boy" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "youth"; and

(D) by striking out "he has attained" and inserting in lieu thereof "the youth has attained"; and

(2) in the third sentence by striking out "him" and inserting in lieu thereof "such official".

(b) Section 10(b)(1) of the Act entitled "An Act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign carrying trade and for other purposes", approved June 26, 1884 (23 Stat. 55; 46 U.S.C. 599(b)), is amended by—

(1) striking out "wages he may earn" and inserting in lieu thereof "wages he or she may earn";

(2) striking out "wife, sister" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse, sibling"; and

(3) striking out "opened by him and maintained in his name" and inserting in lieu thereof "opened by him or her and maintained in his or her name".

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (23 Stat. 55; 46 U.S.C. 599(c)) is amended by striking out "during his absence" and inserting in lieu thereof "during his or her absence".

(d) Chapter 231 of the Act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1167; 46 U.S.C. 627) is amended by—

(1) striking out "part of his effects" and inserting in lieu thereof "part of his or her effects";

(2) striking out "his money and effects" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her money and effects";

(3) striking out "his widow or children" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse or children of such person"; and

(4) striking out "his will" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her will.".

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 112. (a) Section 311(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "males" and inserting in lieu thereof "persons"; and

(2) by striking out "and of female citizens of the United States who are commissioned officers of the National Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(b) Section 772(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or her," after "his" in the first sentence; and

(2) by striking out the second sentence.

(c) Section 1431(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

(d) Section 1451(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding "or widower" after "widow" each place it appears; and

(2) by inserting "or father's" after "mother's".

(e) Section 4313(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "competitor".

(f) Section 6160(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(g) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service," approved April 30, 1956 (70 Stat. 124; 42 U.S.C. 213, note) is amended by striking out "wife, widow" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse, surviving spouse".

(h) Section 551(1)(A) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

(i) Section 3402(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "man" and inserting in lieu thereof "member".

(j) Section 300 of the Soldier's and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. 530) is amended—

(1) in subsection (1) by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse";

(2) in subsection (4) by inserting "or she" after "he"; and

(3) in subsection (4) by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

TITLE II—ELIMINATION OF GENDER-BASED DISTINCTIONS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 213(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 413a(2)(B)) is amended by striking out "(if a woman) or age 65 (if a man)".

(b) Section 215(f)(5) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(f)(5)) is amended by striking out "a man" and inserting in lieu thereof "an individual".

(c) Section 402(a)(19)(G)(iv) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(19)(G)(iv)) is amended by striking out "mother" and inserting in lieu thereof "parent", and by striking out "she".

(d) Section 1107(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1307(b)) is amended by striking out "former wife divorced" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance "divorced spouse".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, and in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act shall only apply to benefits payable for months beginning on or after such date of enactment.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

SEC. 202. (a) Section 2(c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 213a) is amended—

(1) in subdivision (1)(ii)(C) (45 U.S.C. 231a(c)(1)(ii)(C)), by striking out ", in the case of a wife, has in her care (individually or jointly with her husband)" and inserting in lieu thereof "has in his or her care (individually or jointly with his or her spouse)";

(2) in subdivision (2) (45 U.S.C. 231a(c)(2)), by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife" each place it appears;

(3) in subdivision (3) (45 U.S.C. 231a(c)(3))—

(A) by striking out "who (i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "who", and

(B) by striking out "and (ii)" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(4) by amending subdivision (4) (45 U.S.C. 231a(c)(4) to read as follows:

"(4) The divorced wife (as defined in section 216(d) of the Social Security Act) or divorced husband (as defined in such section) of an individual, if—

"(i) such individual (A) is entitled to an annuity under subsection (a)(1) of this section, and (B) has attained age 62;

"(ii) such divorced wife or divorced husband (A) has attained age 65, and (B) is not married; and

"(iii) such divorced wife or divorced husband would have been entitled to a benefit under section 202(b) or 202(c) of the Social Security Act as the divorced wife or divorced husband of such individual if all of such individual's service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term 'employment' as defined in such Act,

shall, subject to the conditions set forth in subsections (e), (f), and (h) of this section, be entitled to a divorced wife's or divorced husband's annuity, if she or he has filed an application therefor, in the amount provided under section 4 of this Act.".

(b) Section 2(d) (45 U.S.C. 231a(d)) of such Act is amended—

(1) in subdivision (1)(i) (45 U.S.C. 231a(d)(1)(i)), by striking out "and who, in the case of a widower" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon;

(2) in subdivision (1)(ii) (45 U.S.C. 231a(d)(1)(ii)), by inserting "or widower (as defined in section 216(g) and (k) of the Social Security Act)" after "a widow (as defined in section 216(c) and (k) of the Social Security Act)", and by striking out "her care" and inserting in lieu thereof "her or his care";

(3) by amending subdivision (1)(v) (45 U.S.C. 231a(d)(1)(v)) to read as follows:

"(v) the widow (as defined in section 216(c) of the Social Security Act), who is married, or has been married after the death of the employee, the widower (as defined in section 216(g) of the Social Security Act) who is married, or has been married after the death of the employee, the surviving divorced wife (as defined in section 216(d) of the Social Security Act), the surviving divorced husband (as defined in section 216(d) of the Social Security Act), the surviving divorced mother (as defined in section 216(d) of the Social Security Act), and the surviving divorced father (as defined in section 216(d) of the Social Security Act) if such widow, widower, surviving divorced wife, surviving divorced husband, surviving divorced mother, or surviving divorced father would have been entitled to a benefit under section 202(e), 202(f), or 202(g) of the Social Security Act as the widow, widower, surviving divorced wife, surviving divorced husband, surviving divorced mother, or surviving divorced father of the employee if all of the employee's service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term 'employment' as defined in that Act. For the purpose of this paragraph—

"(A) the references in section 202(e)(3) and 202(g)(3) of the Social Security Act to an individual entitled under section 202(f) of that Act shall include an individual entitled to an annuity under paragraph (i) of this subdivision and an individual entitled to an annuity under paragraph (ii) of this subdivision,

"(B) the reference in section 202(f)(4) of the Social Security Act to an individual entitled under section 202(b) of that Act shall include an individual entitled to an annuity under subsection (c) of this section,

"(C) the reference in section 202(f)(4) of the Social Security Act to an individual entitled under section 202(e) or (g) of that Act shall include an individual entitled to an annuity under paragraph (i) of this subdivi-

sion and an individual entitled to an annuity under paragraph (ii) of this subdivision,

"(D) the reference in section 202(f)(4) of the Social Security Act to an individual entitled under section 202(h) of that Act shall include an individual entitled to an annuity under paragraph (iv) of this subdivision,

"(E) the reference in section 202(f)(4) of the Social Security Act to an individual entitled under section 202(d) of that Act shall include an individual entitled to an annuity under paragraph (iii) of this subdivision,

"(F) the reference in section 202(e)(3) and section 202(g)(3) of the Social Security Act to an individual entitled under section 202(d) or section 202(h) of that Act shall include an individual entitled to an annuity under paragraph (iii) or paragraph (iv) of this subdivision, and

"(G) the references in section 202(g)(3) and section 223(a) of that Act shall include an individual entitled to an annuity under subsection (a)(1) of this section."; and

(4) by amending subdivision (2)(B) (45 U.S.C. 231a(d)(2)(B)) to read as follows: "the last month for which the widow or widower was entitled to an annuity under paragraph (2) of subdivision (1) as the widow or widower of the deceased employee, or".

(c) Section 2(e)(5) (45 U.S.C. 231a(e)(5)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife" each place it appears.

(d) Section 2(f)(2) (45 U.S.C. 231a(f)(2)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband's" after "divorced wife's" each place it appears.

(e) Section 2(h) (45 U.S.C. 231a(h)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife" each place it appears.

(f) Section 4(a)(1) (45 U.S.C. 231c(a)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife" each place it appears.

(g) Section 4(f)(2)(iii) (45 U.S.C. 231c(f)(2)(iii)) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(iii) the provisions of paragraphs (i) and (ii) of this subdivision shall not apply to the annuity of a widow, widower, surviving divorced wife, surviving divorced husband, surviving divorced mother, or surviving divorced father, who is entitled to such annuity on the basis of the provisions of section 2(d)(1)(v) of this Act.".

(h) Section 4(g)(5) (45 U.S.C. 231c(g)(5)) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(5) This subsection shall not apply to the annuity of a widow, widower, surviving divorced wife, surviving divorced husband, surviving divorced mother, or surviving divorced father, who is entitled to such annuity on the basis of the provisions of section 2(d)(1)(v) of this Act.".

(i) Section 4(h)(2) (45 U.S.C. 231c(h)(2)) of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Subdivision (1) of this subsection shall not apply to the annuity of a widow, widower, surviving divorced wife, surviving divorced husband, surviving divorced mother, or surviving divorced father, who is entitled to such annuity on the basis of the provisions of section 2(d)(1)(v) of this Act.".

(j) Section 4(i) (45 U.S.C. 231c(i)(1)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife" each place it appears.

(k) Section 5(c)(3) (45 U.S.C. 231d(c)(3)) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "or husband" after "wife" each place it appears in the first sentence thereof;

(2) by striking out "her care" and inserting in lieu thereof "her or his care"; and

(3) by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife" each place it appears in the second sentence thereof.

(l) Section 5(c)(6) (45 U.S.C. 231d(c)(6)) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "or widower" after "widow";

(2) by inserting "or he" after "she" each place it appears; and

(3) by striking out "her care" and inserting in lieu thereof "her or his care".

(m) Section 6(a)(3) (45 U.S.C. 231e(a)(3)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife" and by inserting "or divorced husband's" after "divorced wife's".

(n) Section 6(b)(2) (45 U.S.C. 231e(b)(2)) of such Act is amended by inserting "surviving divorced husband," after "widower," the first place it appears.

(o) Section 6(c)(2) (45 U.S.C. 231e(c)(2)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife".

(p) Section 7(b)(2)(B) (45 U.S.C. 231f(b)(2)(B)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "husband".

(q) Section 7(d)(2)(i)(B) (45 U.S.C. 231f(d)(2)(i)(B)) of such Act is amended by inserting "or divorced husband" after "divorced wife".

(r) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to annuities payable for months after December 1983.

WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM

SEC. 203. (a) Section 433(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 633(a)) is amended by striking out all after the colon in the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "first, unemployed parents; second, dependent children and relatives who have attained age 16 and who are not in school or engaged in work or manpower training; and third, all other individuals so certified.".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO UNITED STATES CODE

TITLE 5

SEC. 301. (a) Section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out subparagraphs (F) and (G) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(F) any parent of an individual who lost his or her life under honorable conditions while serving in the armed forces during a period named by paragraph (1)(A) of this section, if—

"(i) such parent's spouse is totally and permanently disabled;

"(ii) such parent is widowed, divorced, or separated from the other parent and has not remarried; or

"(iii) such parent has remarried but is widowed, divorced, or legally separated when preference is claimed; and

"(G) any parent of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled veteran, if—

"(i) such parent's spouse is totally and permanently disabled;

"(ii) such parent is widowed, divorced, or separated from the other parent and has not remarried; or

"(iii) such parent has remarried but is widowed, divorced, or legally separated when preference is claimed;".

(b) Section 5561(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

(c) Section 8332(j)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "widow" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

IMMIGRATION

SEC. 302. (a) The first sentence of section 283 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1353) is amended by striking out "wives" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouses".

(b) Section 340 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1451) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by—

(A) striking out "his naturalization" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her naturalization";

(B) striking out "his subversive" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her subversive"; and

(C) striking out "his residence" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her residence".

(2) in subsection (b) by—

(A) striking out "his residence" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her residence"; and

(B) striking out "upon him".

(3) in subsection (d) by—

(A) striking out "his nativity" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her nativity"; and

(B) striking out "his petition" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her petition";

(4) in subsection (e) by—

(A) striking out "his certificate" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her certificate"; and

(B) striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse"; and

(5) in subsection (f) by—

(A) striking out "he may" and inserting in lieu thereof "he or she may"; and

(B) striking out "his citizenship" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her citizenship".

(c) The first sentence of section 341 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1452) is amended by striking out "husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

(d) Section 357 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1489) is amended—

(1) by striking out "woman" each of the two places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "person"; and

(2) by inserting before "her" each of the two places it appears "his or".

(e) The Act entitled "An Act to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the transportation therein for immoral purposes of women and girls, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 826, chapter 395; 8 U.S.C. 1557) is amended—

(1) by amending the title to read as follows: "An Act to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the transportation therein for immoral purposes of adults and youths, and for other purposes"; and

(2) by striking out "women and girls" each of the five places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "adults and youths".

(f) Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act Making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921", approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 750, chapter 223; 22 U.S.C. 214) is amended by—

(1) inserting "or her" after "his" each place it appears; and

(2) striking out in the third sentence "widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

(g) Section 321 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1432) is amended in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) by striking out "the naturalization of the mother".

WALSH-HEALEY

SEC. 303. (a) Subsection (d) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes" (commonly referred to as the Walsh-Healey Act), approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036; 41 U.S.C. 35) is amended by striking out "no male person under sixteen years of age and no female person under eighteen years of age" and inserting in lieu thereof "no person under sixteen years of age".

(b) The first sentence of section 2 of such Act (49 Stat. 2037; 41 U.S.C. 36) is amended by striking out "each male person under sixteen years of age or each female person under eighteen years of age," and inserting in lieu thereof "each person under sixteen years of age".

AGRICULTURE

SEC. 304. Section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) is amended—

(1) by striking out "of working mothers" in the third sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "from households in which both parents work or from single parent households in which the parent works"; and

(2) by striking out "his" in the third sentence of subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary's".

INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 305. The Act entitled "An Act authorizing appropriations and expenditures for the administration of Indian affairs, and for other purposes" approved November 2, 1921 (42 Stat. 208, chapter 115; 25 U.S.C. 13) is amended by striking out "field matrons,".

SEC. 306. Section 3 of the Act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 449, chapter 132; 25 U.S.C. 137) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 307. The Act entitled "An Act in relation to marriage between white men and Indian women" approved August 9, 1888 (25 Stat. 392; 25 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by amending the title to read as follows: "An Act in relation to marriage between non-Indians and Indians";

(2) in section 1 (25 Stat. 392; 25 U.S.C. 181) by—

(A) striking out "white man" and inserting in lieu thereof "non-Indian"; and

(B) striking out "woman";

(3) by repealing section 2 (25 Stat. 392; 25 U.S.C. 182); and

(4) in section 3 (25 Stat. 392; 25 U.S.C. 183) by—

(A) striking out "white man" and inserting in lieu thereof "non-Indian"; and

(B) striking out "woman".

SEC. 308. The Act of June 7, 1897 (30 Stat. 62, chapter 3) is amended—

(1) in section 1 (30 Stat. 90, chapter 3; 25 U.S.C. 184) by—

(A) striking out "white man" and inserting in lieu thereof "non-Indian";

(B) striking out "woman" each place it appears;

(C) striking out "her death" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her death"; and

(D) striking out "mother" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian parent"; and

(2) in section 1 (30 Stat. 83, chapter 3; 25 U.S.C. 274) by striking out "girls as assistant matrons and Indian boys" and inserting in lieu thereof "youths as dormitory aids and".

SEC. 309. (a) Section 3 of the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 592; 25 U.S.C. 933(c)) is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "or her spouse".

(b) Section 3(c) of the Act of September 5, 1962 (76 Stat. 429; 25 U.S.C. 973(c)) is amended by striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "or her spouse".

SEC. 310. Section 5 of the Act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. 795, chapter 383; 25 U.S.C. 371) is amended by—

(1) striking out "husband and wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouses"; and

(2) striking out "father" and inserting in lieu thereof "parents".

TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 311. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to abolish certain fees for official services to American vessels, and to amend the laws relating to shipping commissioners, seamen, and owners of vessels, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1886 (46 U.S.C. 331) is amended by striking out "boys" and inserting in lieu thereof "youths".

SEC. 312. Section 12 of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea", approved March 4, 1915 (46 U.S.C. 601) is amended by striking out the first proviso of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this or any preceding section shall interfere with the order by any court regarding the payment by any master or seaman of any part of his or her wages for the support and maintenance of his or her spouse and minor children:".

TITLE 18

SEC. 313. (a) Section 3056(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence in the matter before the first semicolon by striking out "the members of his immediate family" and inserting in lieu thereof "the members of his or her immediate family";

(2) in the first sentence in the clause after the first semicolon by striking out "his wife during his lifetime, the person of a widow of a former President until her death or remarriage" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her spouse during the former President's lifetime, the person of a surviving spouse of a former President until the surviving spouse's death or remarriage"; and

(3) in the first sentence in the clause after the eighth semicolon by striking out "his certificate" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her certificate".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 245 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6); and

(2) inserting a new paragraph after paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(3) any person because of such person's sex, in violation of such other person's right not to be subject to discrimination on that account and because such other person is or has been participating, or in order to intimidate any person from participating, in any benefit or activity described in paragraph (2); or".

(c) Section 1153 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "carnal knowledge of any female, not his wife, who has not attained the age of sixteen years" and inserting in lieu thereof "sexual abuse of a minor".

(d)(1) Section 2032 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out "female" and inserting in lieu thereof "person"; and

(2) striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

(2) The heading for section 2032 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2032. Sexual abuse of a minor".

(3) The table of sections for chapter 99 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item for section 2032 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"2032. Sexual abuse of a minor.".

(e) Sections 2198, 2424, 3286, and 3614 of title 18, United States Code, and all references to such sections including the items relating to such sections in the table of sections, are repealed.

(f) Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof "any officer or enlisted member of the Coast Guard".

(g) Section 2421 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "Whoever" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Any individual who";

(2) by striking out "person" in the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "individual";

(3) by striking out "woman or girl" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "other person";

(4) by inserting "himself or" before "herself" each place it appears; and

(5) by striking out "her" in the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "such other person".

(h) Section 2422 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "Whoever" and inserting in lieu thereof "Any individual who";

(2) by striking out "person" and inserting in lieu thereof "individual";

(3) by striking out "woman or girl" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "other person"; and

(4) by striking out "her" and inserting in lieu thereof "such other person's".

PUBLIC LANDS

SEC. 314. Section 2287 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 161) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking out "Every person who is the head of a family, or who has" and inserting in lieu thereof "Every person who is married or who has one or more dependents or who has"; and

(2) by inserting after "his" each place it appears the following: "or her".

SEC. 315. Section 2290 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 162) is amended in the matter before the first semicolon by striking out "the head of a family, or is over twenty-one years of age," and inserting in lieu thereof "is married, or has one or more dependents, or is over twenty-one years of age,".

SEC. 316. Section 2291 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 164) is amended by—

(1) striking out "No certificate shall be given or patent issued therefor until the expiration of three years from the date of such entry; and if at the expiration of such time, or at any time within two years thereafter, the person making such entry, or if he be dead his widow, or in case of her death his heirs or devisee, or in case of a widow making such entry her heirs or devisee, in case of her death, proves by himself" and insert in lieu thereof "No certificate shall be

given or patent issued therefor until the expiration of three years from the date of such entry; and if at the expiration of such time, or at any time within two years thereafter, the person making such entry, or if such enterer be dead, the surviving spouse, or in case of the surviving spouse's death the enterer's heirs or devisee, or in case of a surviving spouse making such entry the surviving spouse's heirs or devisee, in case of the surviving spouse's death, proves by the enterer";

(2) striking out "he, she, or they" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "they";

(3) striking out "entryman" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "enterer";

(4) in the second proviso by—

(A) striking out "date of his death" and inserting in lieu thereof "date of his or her death"; and

(B) striking out "had he lived" and inserting in lieu thereof "had he or she lived"; and

(5) in the third proviso by—

(A) striking out "area of his entry" and inserting in lieu thereof "area of his or her entry"; and

(B) striking out "by him".

SEC. 317. Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act for the relief of settlers on public lands", approved May 14, 1880 (21 Stat. 141; 43 U.S.C. 166) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by—

(A) striking out "time to file his" and inserting in lieu thereof "time to file his or her";

(B) striking out "perfect his original entry" and inserting in lieu thereof "perfect original entry";

(C) striking out "and his right" and inserting in lieu thereof "and the right"; and

(D) striking out "if he settled" and inserting in lieu thereof "if the settler settled";

(2) in the matter before the first proviso in the second sentence by—

(A) striking out "unmarried woman" and inserting in lieu thereof "unmarried person";

(B) striking out "she" and inserting in lieu thereof "the person";

(C) striking out "her marriage" and inserting in lieu thereof "the marriage"; and

(D) striking out "her right" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her right";

(3) in the first proviso by striking out "she does not abandon" and inserting in lieu thereof "the person does not abandon his or";

(4) by striking out the second proviso; and

(5) in the remaining provisos by—

(A) striking out "he" and inserting in lieu thereof "the settler"; and

(B) striking out "his" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her".

SEC. 318. The Act entitled "An Act providing that the marriage of a homestead entryman to a homestead entrywoman shall not impair the right of either to a patent after compliance with the law a year, to apply to existing enterers", approved April 6, 1914 (38 Stat. 312; 43 U.S.C. 167) is amended to read as follows:

"The marriage of one homestead enterer to another after each shall have fulfilled the requirements of the homestead law for one year next preceding such marriage shall not impair the right of either to a patent, but if they choose to live together, they shall together elect on which of the two entries the home shall thereafter be made and residence thereon by both spouses shall constitute a compliance with the residence requirements upon each entry: *Provided*, That the provisions of this action shall apply to entries existing on April 6, 1914: *Provided further*, That in the administration of this section the term 'enterer' shall be construed to include bona fide settlers who have complied with the homestead law for at least one year next preceding such marriage.".

SEC. 319. The Act entitled "An Act to provide for certificate of title to homestead entry by a female American citizen who has intermarried with an alien", approved October 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 740; 43 U.S.C. 168) is repealed.

SEC. 320. The Act entitled "An Act to provide for issuing patents for public lands claimed under the homestead laws by deserted wives", approved October 22, 1914 (38 Stat. 766; 43 U.S.C. 170) is amended—

(1) in the matter before the first proviso by—

(A) striking out "wife" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse";

(B) striking out "by her husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "by the enterer spouse";

(C) striking out "in her name" and inserting in lieu thereof "in his or her name"; and

(D) striking out "entryman" and inserting in lieu thereof "enterer";

(2) in the first proviso by—

(A) striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "deserted spouse";

(B) striking out "herself" and inserting in lieu thereof "such deserted spouse"; and

(C) striking out "her husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "the enterer spouse"; and

(3) in the second proviso by—

(A) striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse"; and

(B) striking out "husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "deserting enterer spouse".

SEC. 321. The Act entitled "An Act for the protection of homestead settlers who enter the military or naval service of the United States in time of war", approved June 16, 1898 (30 Stat. 473; 43 U.S.C. 240) is amended by—

(1) inserting after "his" each place it appears the following: "or her"; and

(2) inserting after "he" each place it appears "or she".

SEC. 322. The Act entitled "An Act to allow credit in connection with homestead entries to widows of persons who served in certain Indian wars", approved March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1424; 43 U.S.C. 243a) is amended by striking out "widow" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

SEC. 323. Section 2293 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 255) is amended by—

(1) striking out "himself" and inserting in lieu thereof "himself or herself";

(2) striking out "he" and inserting in lieu thereof "the person"; and

(3) striking out "wife" and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

SEC. 324. Section 2305 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 272) is amended—

(1) in the matter before the first semicolon by adding after "he" the following: "or she";

(2) in the clause after the first semicolon by striking out "his homestead for a period of at least one year after he shall have commenced his improvements" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her homestead for a period of at least one year after the improvements were commenced"; and

(3) by striking out the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That in every case in which a settler on the public land of the United States under the homestead laws died while actually engaged in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States as private soldier, officer, seaman, or marine, during the war with Spain or the Philippine insurrection the settler's survivors, if unmarried, or in case of the surviving spouse's death or marriage, then the minor orphan children or their legal representatives, may proceed forthwith to make final proof upon the land so held by the deceased soldier and settler, and that the death of such soldier while so engaged in the service of the United States shall, in the administration of the homestead laws, be construed to be equivalent to a performance of all requirements as to residence and cultivation for the full period of five years, and shall entitle the surviving spouse, if unmarried, or in case of the surviving spouse's death or marriage, then the minor orphan children or their legal representatives, to make final proof upon and receive Government patent for said land; and that upon proof produced to the officers of the proper local land office by the surviving spouse, if unmarried, or in case of the surviving spouse's death or marriage, then the minor orphan children or their legal representatives, that the applicant for patent is the surviving spouse, if unmarried, or in case of the surviving spouse's death or marriage, the orphan children or their legal representatives, and that such soldier, sailor, or marine died while in the service of the United States as hereinbefore described, the patent for such land shall issue.".

SEC. 325. (a) Section 2307 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 278) is amended by—

(1) striking out "his widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse"; and

(2) striking out "entrywoman" and inserting in lieu thereof "enterer".

(b) Section 2304 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 271) is amended by striking out "after locating his homestead and filing his declaratory statement within which to make his entry and commence his settlement and improvement." and inserting in lieu thereof "after locating a homestead and filing a declaratory statement within which to make entry and commence settlement and improvement of the land.".

CIVIL RELIEF ACT

SEC. 326. (a) Section 503 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1187; 50 U.S.C. App. 563) is amended—

(1) in subsection (1) by striking out "his widow, if unmarried, or in the case of her death or marriage, his minor children, or his or" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse, if unmarried, or in the case of the surviving spouse's death or marriage, the minor children, or"; and

(2) in subsection (2) by inserting after "he" the following: "or she".

(b) Section 504 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1187; 50 U.S.C. App. 564) is amended—

(1) by striking out "entryman" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "enterer";

(2) by striking out "his" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her"; and

(3) by striking out "he" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "he or she".

(c) Section 510 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1189; 50 U.S.C. App. 570) is amended—

(1) by striking out "entryman" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "enterer";

(2) by striking out "his" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her"; and

(3) by striking out "he" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "he or she".

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 327. Section 8 of the Act of March 22, 1882 (22 Stat. 31, chapter 47; 48 U.S.C. 1461) is repealed.

SEC. 328. Section 604(a)(7) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out "widows" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouses".

SEC. 329. Section 2 of the Act of August 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 623 chapter 357; 42 U.S.C. 1652) is amended in subsection (b) by—

(1) striking out "surviving wife" the first place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse";

(2) striking out "surviving wife" the second place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse"; and

(3) striking out "his option" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her option".

SEC. 330. (a) Section 1981 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1986) is amended by—

(1) striking out "his legal representative" and inserting in lieu thereof "his or her legal representative"; and

(2) striking out "widow" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse".

(b) Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to clarify the status and benefits of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes" (84 Stat. 1863, 33 U.S.C. 857-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking out "enlisted men" and inserting in lieu thereof "enlisted persons"; and

(2) in subsection (c) by striking out "their widows" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouses of such members".

(c) Section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m), is amended—

(1) by striking out "servicemen" each place such term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "persons in the service";

(2) by striking out "serviceman" each place such term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "person in the service"; and

(3) in subsection (g) by—

(A) striking out "surviving widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse";

(B) striking out "serviceman's" each place such term appears and inserting in lieu thereof "person's in the service"; and

(C) striking out "such widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "such surviving spouse".

(d) Section 2 of the Act of July 5, 1946, commonly known as the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1052), is amended in subsection (c) by—

(1) striking out "his widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse of such President"; and

(2) striking out "the widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "such surviving spouse".

(e) Section 5572 of the Revised Statutes (48 U.S.C. 1413) is amended in the first sentence by striking out "his widow, heir, executor, or administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse, heir, executor, or administrator of the discoverer".

(f) Section 5574 of the Revised Statutes (48 U.S.C. 1415) is amended in the second sentence by striking out "his widow, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns of the discoverer".

(g) Section 5577 of the Revised Statutes (48 U.S.C. 1418) is amended by striking out "his widow, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns" and inserting in lieu thereof "the surviving spouse, heir, executor, administrator, or assigns of the discoverer".

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

SEC. 331. (a) Section 4839 of the Revised Statutes (24 U.S.C. 165) is amended—

(1) by striking out "he" each place it appears in the second sentence;

(2) by inserting "or her" after "his" in the second sentence;

(3) by striking out "and, in the case of a male pensioner, his wife, minor children, and dependent parents, or, if a female pensioner, her minor children, if any," in the last sentence before the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "and the spouse, minor children, and dependent parents of the pensioner,";

(4) by striking out "shall, if a female pensioner, be paid to her minor children, and, in the case of a male pensioner, be paid to his wife, if living; if no wife survives him, then to his minor children; and in case there is no wife" in the last sentence before the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be paid to the spouse of the pensioner, if living, or if no spouse survives the pensioner, then to the minor children of the pensioner; and in case there is no spouse";

(5) by inserting "or her" before "credit at said home" in the proviso;

(6) by striking out "his said transfer" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "the transfer";

(7) by striking out "be transferred with him" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "also be transferred";

(8) by striking out "placed to his" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "placed to the pensioner's";

(9) by striking out "his return from said hospital" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "the pensioner's return from such hospital"; and

(10) by inserting "or her" before "credit at said hospital" in the proviso.

(b) The third clause of section 4843 of the Revised Statutes (24 U.S.C. 191) is amended by striking out "Men" and inserting in lieu thereof "Persons".

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1977

SEC. 332. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 843) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out "commencement of his employment" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the commencement of employment";

(B) by striking out "he" the first place it appears in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the worker";

(C) by inserting "or she" after "he" the second place it appears in the second sentence;

(D) by inserting "or her" after "his" in the fourth sentence; and

(E) by striking out "advise him of his rights" in the fifth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "advise the miner of the miner's rights";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out "from his position" each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) by striking out "him" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner"; and

(C) by striking out "his" in paragraph (3); and

(3) by striking out "him" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner"; and

(4) by striking out "such miner" in the first sentence of subsection (d) and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "such miner, with the consent of the surviving spouse or, if there is no such surviving spouse, then with the consent of the surviving next of kin.".

(b) Section 402 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 902) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by inserting "or husband" after "wife" in the first sentence;

(B) by striking out "her" the first place it appears in the first sentence;

(C) by striking out "husband" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse";

(D) by inserting "his or" before "her" each place it appears (after the amendment made by subparagraph (B));

(E) by inserting "or 'husband' " after " 'wife' " in the second sentence; and

(F) by striking out "The term 'wife' also includes a 'divorced wife' " in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "The terms 'wife' and 'husband' also include a 'divorced wife' and a 'divorced husband', respectively,";

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking out "The term 'widow' includes the wife" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "The terms 'widow' and 'widower' include the spouse";

(B) by striking out "his" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner's";

(C) by inserting "or 'widower' " after " 'widow' " in the second sentence;

(D) by striking out "a 'surviving divorced wife' as defined in section 216(d)(2) of the Social Security Act" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "a 'surviving divorced wife' and a 'surviving divorced husband' as defined in paragraphs (2) and (5), respectively, of section 216 of the Social Security Act";

(E) by inserting "his or" before "her" each place it appears in the third sentence; and

(F) by striking out "Such term also includes" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Such terms also include"; and

(3) by striking out "widow" each place it appears in the third sentence of subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner's widow or widower".

(c) Section 411 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 921) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out "him" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary"; and

(B) by striking out "his"; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking out "his" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "the";

(B) by striking out "his" in the first sentence of paragraph (2);

(C) by striking out "he" each place it appears in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner";

(D) by striking out "his" each place it appears in paragraph (3) and each place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (4);

(E) by striking out "widow's," in the first sentence of paragraph (4) (after the amendment made by subparagraph (D)) and inserting in lieu thereof "or the miner's widow's, widower's";

(F) by striking out "he" in the first sentence of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner";

(G) by inserting "or husband's" after "wife's" in the second sentence of paragraph (4);

(H) by striking out "he" in the third sentence of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary"; and

(I) by striking out "his" in the fourth sentence of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "such miner's".

(d) Section 412 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 922) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out "his widow" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "the widow or widower";

(B) by striking out "he were" in paragraph (2);

(C) by striking out "his" each place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (3);

(D) by inserting "or widower" after "widow" each place it appears in paragraph (3);

(E) by striking out "her" in the first sentence of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "the widow's or widower's";

(F) by striking out "he" in the first sentence of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "the child";

(G) by inserting "or she" after "he" in the first proviso of paragraph (3);

(H) by striking out "his" the first place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (5);

(I) by striking out "at the time of his death" each place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (5) (after the amendment made by subparagraph (H));

(J) by striking out "a widow or a child" each place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "a widow, widower, or child";

(K) by striking out "a widow, child, or parent" each place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "a widow, widower, child, or parent";

(L) by striking out "at the time of his or her death" each place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (5);

(M) by striking out "a brother only if he is—" in the fourth sentence of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "a brother or sister only if the brother or sister is—";

(N) by striking out "who is" after "(2)" in paragraph (5); and

(O) by striking out "him" in paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary"; and

(2) by striking out "his widow," each place it appears in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner's widow, widower,".

(e) Section 413 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 923) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out "he uses" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "used";

(B) by striking out "his wife's" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the wife's or husband's"; and

(C) by striking out ", widow," in the ninth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "or the miner's widow, widower,"; and

(2) by inserting "or her" after "his" in subsection (c).

(f) Section 414 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 924) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "or widower" after "widow" in paragraph (1);

(B) by striking out "her husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner" in paragraph (1); and

(C) by striking out "his" in paragraph (2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "the claimant's"; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting "widower," after "widow," in the matter preceding clause (1); and

(B) by striking out "his" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "the miner's".

(g) Section 421 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 931) is amended—

(1) by inserting "widowers," after "widows," in subsection (a); and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking out "if he finds" in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "upon finding"; and

(B) by striking out "by him" in subparagraph (F).

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 333. (a) Section 9(b) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 909(b)), is amended by striking out "dependent".

(b) Section 9(c) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 909(c)), is amended by striking out "dependent husband" and inserting in lieu thereof "widower".

(c) Section 9(g) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 909(g)), is amended by striking out "wife" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "spouse".

(d) Section 14(j) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 914(j)), is amended by—

(1) striking out "during which he is entitled" and inserting in lieu thereof "during which he or she is entitled"; and

(2) placing a period after "Mortality" in the second sentence and striking out the rest of the sentence.

CONSERVATION

SEC. 334. The last proviso of the subparagraph entitled "Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration" under the paragraph "Fish and Wildlife Service" of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 557; 16 U.S.C. 754) is amended by striking out "per man per day" and inserting in lieu thereof "per day".

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 335. Section 1 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by striking out the clause beginning "words importing the masculine gender" and inserting in lieu thereof "words importing the masculine or feminine gender include the other as well".

BENEFITS FOR INTERNEES

SEC. 336. Section 2004 of title 50, Appendix, United States Code, is amended—

(1) In subsection (d) by—

(A) inserting "or her" after "his";

(B) striking out "husband" each place it appears in paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "widower"; and

(C) striking out "husband" in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "widow, widower";

(2) In subsection (f)(7) by—

(A) inserting "or widower" after "widow"; and

(B) inserting "herself or" before "himself"; and

(3) in subsections (g)(4) and (i)(4) by—

(A) inserting "or her" after "his";

(B) striking out "husband" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "widower"; and

(C) striking out "dependent husband" each place it appears in subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "widower".

SPOUSES OF FORMER PRESIDENTS

SEC. 337. The Act of August 25, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. 102 Note), is amended in subsection (e) by—

(1) striking out "widow" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "surviving spouse"; and

(2) inserting "he or" before "she".

TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 401. Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this Act shall become effective upon the date of enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as amended.

AWARDING OF SPECIAL CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2597) to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughter of Harry S. Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, it is a very special pleasure for me to speak on behalf of this bill to authorize the President—on behalf of the Congress—to present a special gold medal to Lady Bird Johnson in recognition of her many contributions to her Nation.

I introduced legislation to authorize the presentation of a medal to Lady Bird Johnson on October 7. Since that time, a majority of the Senate had joined me in cosponsoring the proposal. Companion legislation, introduced by Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ, has been approved by the House.

The overwhelming support for this proposal is indicative, Mr. President, of the broad, bipartisan agreement I have found all across the political spectrum when it comes to Mrs. Johnson. Republican and Democrats, liberals and conservatives all agreee that Lady Bird Johnson is a remarkable, talented individual who has left an indelible imprint of loveliness on the American landscape. She has enriched the lives of millions of Americans and provided her many friends with the touch of grace, and warmth, and charm so many of us associate with Mrs. Johnson.

Lady Bird Johnson has been a successful businesswoman; she was one of the most active and effective First Ladies in the history of America; she has been a loving mother, a valued political counselor, and an active regent of the University of Texas. There is no question that Lady Bird Johnson has given generously of her talents and

her time to make America a more beautiful and just land.

I think it is only appropriate for America to present Lady Bird Johnson with a token of appreciation for her efforts over the years. The medal provided for in this legislation can reflect only a few rays of light and warmth that Lady Bird Johnson has shared with America, but it is an important symbol for a woman who stands as a symbol of what is finest and most noble in our American experience.

During her tenure in the White House, Lady Bird Johnson took on the tough issues. She promoted the Head Start Program and Lyndon Johnson's "War on Poverty." Her efforts to make this land of America more beautiful took her on a journey of more than 200,000 miles.

Because of Lady Bird Johnson's efforts, our Nation's Capitol is one of the most beautiful cities in the world. As we enjoy the springtime splendor of this city, the brilliant reds and yellows of tulips, the plantings along the Potomac and the vast stretches of highways across this land, we are benefiting from her touch. Lady Bird Johnson let millions of Americans know a deeper meaning of beauty, one they could see reflected in the commitment and energy and caring of their First Lady.

President Johnson's decision not to seek reelection removed Lady Bird Johnson from the political visibility of the White House, but it did not dampen her concern for the landscape of America and the people who inhabit it. She has worked hard and effectively to improve the education of the young people of Texas through her service as a regent of the University of Texas. She has led the effort to preserve and protect the incredible beauty of Texas wildflowers.

Lady Bird Johnson also finds time to remain active at the LBJ Library and School of Public Affairs, she manages her communications interests and is involved with the National Park Service and the National Geographic Society. But even with all this activity and devotion to public service, Lady Bird Johnson has not lost sight of what is important in her life. "The core of it all is my two daughters and seven grandchildren," is the way Lady Bird Johnson puts it.

These days, Lady Bird Johnson claims to be indulging herself. I think she has a right to indulge herself, but those of us who have known her over the years, those of us who have benefited from her example, would like to mark that indulgence with a tribute to a great and wonderful woman.

I sincerely believe that the medal for Lady Bird Johnson is richly deserved; it is a medal for inspiration and beauty, and effective action on behalf of America.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve this legislation and join with us in paying tribute to a great American, Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, S. 2597 is a bill, in part, authorizing the casting of a gold medal in recognition of the tremendous contribution of Elie Wiesel, the well-known author, humanitarian, philosopher, and historian. He is best known, Mr. President, for his contribution in helping all of us to remember the tragedies of the holocaust, both the horror of that period, but more importantly, the triumph of human beings who suffered through it.

Our effort is not only to remember what occurred during those terrible days, but also strongly to encourage mankind not to allow it to happen again.

This legislation, Mr. President, was introduced by myself and my good friend and colleague from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), along with 39 other cosponsors. An identical piece of legislation has been introduced in the other body, and is cosponsored by half of the membership of the House.

It is especially appropriate to honor Elie Wiesel at this time. On April 29 we will begin a week of "Days of Remembrance" for victims of the Holocaust. It is our duty to respect the memory of those who died in the camps and to search for a better understanding of the cause of their suffering so that we can avoid future recurrences.

I know of no other individual who has so diligently carried out the above tasks. No matter how hard we try, it is impossible for us to personally feel the horror of the Holocaust as strongly as Elie Wiesel does. Forty years ago this year, at the age of 15, he was interned with his family in the center of Nazi brutality—Auschwitz. He managed to survive with his younger sister; his parents and two other sisters were not as lucky. He saw his father shot before his eyes—a brutal image that is indelibly imprinted in his memory.

Since then, Elie Wiesel has devoted his life to keeping alive the memory of the Holocaust, speaking for the millions who were silenced in the crematoriums of Auschwitz, Dachau, and Treblinka. Beginning with his first novel Night, he has gone on to publish 25 works of literature which eloquently and movingly express the horrors which he emphasizes we must not forget and, in turn, must prevent from ever recurring.

Alexandra Johnson, of the Christian Science Monitor, writes how Elie Wiesel, in his last novel, retells the story of the "Just Man who attempted to save Sodom." The Just Man reacted to the silence of those he pleaded with by saying:

> If I still shout today, if I still scream, it is to prevent man from ultimately changing me.

This passage illustrates the central theme of Elie Wiesel's works: Like the Just Man, he must bear the burden of a survivor, the need to tell the tale that must be told in order to prevent man's silence and indifference from allowing atrocities to occur. As chairman of the President's Commission on the Holocaust, he led the effort to document the world's silence from 1942–45, when Allied leaders knew about camps like Auschwitz but did not act in time.

He also reported how at the monument to slain Ukrainians at Babi Yar in Kiev, U.S.S.R., there was no mention of the thousands of Jews who were murdered. Elie's humanitarian efforts in light of atrocities in Cambodia, Biafra, and Latin America show us that we must be continually vigilant in opposing inhumanity. We must not allow the silence that has grown since World War II to let us slacken in our fight against hatred and brutality. Men like Elie Wiesel remind us that we can not be satisfied until violence and inhumanity have been eliminated from the world.

Frequently cited as a candidate for the Nobel Prize, Elie Wiesel has won the Prix Medicis, Eleanor Roosevelt Award, and the American Liberties Medallion. He has been awarded honorary doctorates from several universities, and his classes and lectures are continually filled to capacity.

Elie Wiesel devotes his work to serious, sobering issues, and sadly admits that injustice is still rampant throughout the world. However, he has not lost some sense of optimism that we can use our knowledge of the past to attempt to perfect an imperfect world. He stated:

> This is the Jewish belief, that out of total darkness will come total light. My night won't end, and yet other things are possible—day, hope.

Elie Wiesel deserves this commendation because, as the "Just Man" of that parable, he is a symbol of the courage and unflinching determination we all should muster against all forms of ignorance and tyranny. Elie Wiesel has one central wish: that mankind strive to achieve a collective morality which avoids indifference, silence, and despair. Honoring Elie Wiesel makes a statement of those values and actions which we admire. We should go one step further, however, we must emulate Elie Wiesel—we must all become "Just Men."

Mr. President, I urge adoption of this measure on behalf of myself and my 40 cosponsors. Our firm hope would be that the other body, as soon as possible, would take similar action so that we might recognize the tremendous contribution of this marvelous American, a wonderful citizen of

our country and the world, who has given us much of his own life to cause us to remember the burdens of the past in order to secure for humanity a better future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering a bill to provide for the awarding of a gold medal to the humanitarian and internationally acclaimed author, Elie Wiesel. As one who has long been acquainted with Mr. Wiesel and his work, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Elie Wiesel is one of the most eloquent and certainly the foremost spokesman for the victims of the Holocaust. He has used his many talents as a gifted writer to bring the horrors of that tradegy to life. In his first book Night, Mr. Wiesel describes his terrifying experiences as a young boy in Auschwitz and Buchenwald, where his parents and younger sister died at the hands of the Nazis. After Night, he wrote a number of other books on this dark period in which the world stood by and watched in silence as Nazi soldiers wantonly murdered 6 million Jews. Through his writing we feel the pain and suffering of the victims of the Holocaust and we realize that the horrors of this episode—the deportation trains, the death camps, the bigotry and intolerance—must never be repeated.

As author, lecturer and Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Elie Wiesel has waged a persistent and dedicated campaign to educate people about the Holocaust and to establish a permanent and living memorial in the United States to those who perished in this heinous episode. That memorial will take the form of a museum and education center to be housed in Washington at a site near the National Mall. It will serve as a constant reminder that the United States as a national must never again waver, as we did during the Holocaust, in our commitment to the principles of liberty and equality for all human beings.

Besides being recognized as a humanitarian and human rights activist, Elie Wiesel is also well known as a prolific and talented author, whose works cover a broad spectrum of subjects related to Judaism and the Bible. He has received numerous literary awards including the Jewish Heritage Award for Literature and the National Jewish Book Council Awards.

I have had the pleasure of serving with Elie Wiesel on both the President's Commission on the Holocaust, established by President Carter in 1978, and the Holocaust Memorial Council. Over the years, I have been continually impressed by Elie's dedication and unwavering commitment. As we approach the 1984 days of remembrance for victims of the Holocaust, it is fitting and proper that we honor Elie Wiesel, a survivor of that tragedy who has a goal that we all share: to prevent future generations from experiencing the atrocities of a holocaust.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Margaret Truman Daniel, a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of the lifetime of outstanding public service which her father, Harry S Truman, gave to the United States, and in commemoration of his one hundredth birthday which will be celebrated on May 8, 1984.

(b) For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000 for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(d)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury may cause duplicates in bronze of the medal provided for in this section to be coined and sold under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the gold medal.

(2) The appropriation used to carry out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) Lady Bird Johnson represents the finest qualities of American women, having demonstrated exceptional abilities in the fields of government, business, and social justice;

(2) Lady Bird Johnson's life of service to the Nation covers a generation of change in the status of women;

(3) the intelligence and devotion of Lady Bird Johnson to the concerns of the family, natural resources, and education have eased the transition of the roles of women and benefited the Nation;

(4) Lady Bird Johnson, in her roles as wife of a United States Representative and Senator, First Lady of the United States, skilled businesswoman, and regent for the University of Texas, has served as an example of the bridge between the traditional role and the contemporary roles of women in the United States; and

(5) Lady Bird Johnson has received national recognition with the presentation of many awards, including the George Foster Peabody Award, the Eleanor Roosevelt Golden Candlestick Award, the B'nai B'rith Humanitarian Award, the Business and Professional Women's Club Businesswomen's Award, the Ladies Home Journal Women of the Year Award, the University of Texas Distinguished Alumni Award, the Department of the Interior Conservation Service Award, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

(b) The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Lady Bird Johnson a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of her humanitarian efforts and outstanding contributions to the improvement and beautification of America.

(c) For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000 for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury may cause duplicates in bronze of the medal provided for in this section to be coined and sold under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the gold medal.

(2) The appropriation used to carry out the provisions of this section may be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) Elie Wiesel is internationally esteemed for his accomplishments as novelist, teacher, philosopher, critic, historian, humanitarian, and distinguished citizen of the United States and the world;

(2) the twenty-five published works of Elie Wiesel include novels, testimonies, short stories, and essays which fuse the richness of centuries-old religious traditions with the insights of modern philosophy;

(3) the life and writings of Elie Wiesel have been the subject of at least eleven books and his work is taught in high schools, colleges, and universities throughout the United States;

(4) Elie Wiesel in his role of "spiritual archivist of the Holocaust" encourages an understanding of the horrors of the past in order to offer humanity hope for a better and more secure future;

(5) Elie Wiesel served with distinction as Chairman of the President's Commission on the Holocaust and as Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council;

(6) Elie Wiesel has traveled, written, and worked for the cause of human rights in Biafra, Lebanon, Cambodia, the Soviet Union, and Central America; and

(7) Elie Wiesel has received the International Literary Prize for Peace and the Prix Medicis, two of the most prestigious literary awards of Europe, and honorary degrees from twenty-five universities of the United States and Israel.

(b) The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Elie Wiesel a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of his humanitarian efforts and outstanding contributions to world literature and human rights.

(c) For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000 for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury may cause duplicates in bronze of the medal provided for in this section to be coined and sold under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the gold medal.

(2) The appropriation used to carry out the provisions of this section may be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 4. The medals provided for in this Act are national medals for the purposes of section 5111 of title 31, United States Code.

LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE MAKAH INDIAN TRIBE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 3376) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has acted today on H.R. 3376, a companion bill to S. 2468; a bill I introduced to transfer in trust to the U.S. Tatoosh and Waadah Islands for the benefit of the Makah Indian Tribe. These islands are located off the coast of Makah Indian Reservation on Washington's Olympic Peninsula.

These islands are small, comprising less than 80 acres, and of no significant commercial value to the United States. They are, however, of great cultural, historical, and religious importance to the Makah people.

These islands were taken from the Makah Tribe by a treaty negotiated in 1855. None of the tribal members who participated in the treaty negotiations, however, could read or write English. Their understanding of the treaty terms was dependent on the oral explanations of the U.S. treaty commissioners. The records of the treaty proceedings clearly indicate that the cession of Tatoosh and Waadah Islands never was discussed. The Makahs have maintained ever since that they never intended to give up these islands. This bill will restore Tatoosh and Waadah to tribal ownership.

I was concerned about public access to these islands if this bill became law. I am pleased that the Makah Tribal Council has passed a resolution which declares that the "Makah Tribe will extend its traditional hospitality to visitors and nonmembers who may desire to visit these islands."

The bill reserves to the Coast Guard the right to continue to use these islands for aids to navigation. It also states that the bill will not enlarge, impair, or affect any existing fishing right of the Makah Tribe.

I urge President Reagan to right a historical wrong by signing this bill into law.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DECLARING CERTAIN LANDS AS PART OF THE ALLEGANY RESERVATION

The bill (H.R. 3555) to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider en bloc the votes by which the various measures were passed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 38) entitled "Entitled the 'Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act' ", do pass with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983".

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3)(A) The term 'employee' means any person engaged in maritime employment, including any longshoreman or other person engaged in longshoring operations, and any harbor-worker including a ship repairman, shipbuilder, and ship-breaker, but such term does not include—

"(i) individuals employed exclusively to perform office clerical, secretarial, security, or data processing work;

"(ii) individuals employed by a club, camp, or recreational operation;

"(iii) individuals employed by a restaurant, museum, retail outlet, or marina and who are not engaged in construction, replacement, or expansion of such facilities (except for routine maintenance);

"(iv) individuals who (I) are employed by suppliers, transporters, or vendors, (II) are temporarily doing business on the premises of an employer described in paragraph (4), and (III) are not engaged in work normally performed by employees of that employer under this Act;

"(v) aquaculture workers;

"(vi) a master or member of a crew of any vessel;

"(vii) any person engaged by a master to load or unload or repair any small vessel under eighteen tons net; or

"(viii) individuals who are engaged in work on land involving the fabrication of platforms intended, while fixed to the seabed, to be used in connection with energy or mineral extraction, subject to subparagraph (B);

if individuals described in clauses (i) through (iv) are subject to coverage under a State workers' compensation law.

"(B)(i) The exclusion authorized by clause (viii) of subparagraph (A) may be granted only pursuant to a finding on the record by the Secretary of Labor, based on an evaluation of all pertinent records or materials which the Secretary may require, that the additional cost resulting from the coverage of such workers under this Act, in and of itself, will result in the loss of a contract for the construction of such a platform to a foreign bidder which is not subject to this Act and in the resultant loss of jobs for American workers.

"(ii) An exclusion under this subparagraph may be granted on the decision of the Secretary of Labor on an annual basis for a period not to exceed one year or the duration of a contract already in effect, whichever is longer. The decision to grant such an exclusion may be appealed, within 30 days, to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and may not be executed until any such appeal has been completed.

(b) Section 2(13) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) The term 'wages' means the money rate at which the service rendered by an employee is compensated by an employer under the contract of hiring in force at the time of the injury, including the reasonable value of any advantage which is received from the employer and included for purposes of any withholding of tax under subtitle C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to employment taxes). The term wages does not include fringe benefits, including but not limited to employer payments for or contributions to a retirement, pension, health and welfare, life insurance, training, social security or other employee or dependent benefit plan for the employee's or dependent's benefit, or any other employee's dependent entitlement.".

COVERAGE

SEC. 3. Section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"COVERAGE

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, compensation shall be payable under this Act in respect of disability or death of an employee, but only if the disability or death results from an injury occurring upon the navigable waters of the United States (including any adjoining pier, wharf, dry dock, terminal, building way, marine railway, or other adjoining area customarily used by an employer in loading, unloading, repairing, dismantling, or building a vessel).

"(b) No compensation shall be payable in respect of the disability or death of an officer or employee of the United States, or any agency thereof, or of any State or foreign government, or any subdivision thereof.

"(c) No compensation shall be payable if the injury was occasioned solely by the intoxication of the employee or by the willful intention of the employee to injure or kill himself or another.

"(d)(1) No compensation shall be payable to an employee employed at a facility of an employer if the facility is used in the business of building, repairing, or dismantling recreational vessels under sixty-five feet in length, unless—

"(A) the injury occurs (i) within any one-year period beginning on the date on which such employer commences building or dismantling a recreational vessel sixty-five feet or more in length, or (ii) within any succeeding one-year period in which any such building or dismantling is continued on such vessel;

"(B) the injury occurs within thirty days after the date on which such employer commences repairing a recreational vessel sixty-five feet or more in length, if the repair of such vessel is completed within thirty days of the date on which such repairs commence;

"(C) the injury occurs within ninety days after the date on which such employer commences repairing a recreational vessel sixty-five feet or more in length, if the repair of such vessel is completed no sooner than the thirty-first day and no later than the sixtieth day after the date on which such repairs commence; or

"(D) the injury occurs within one year after the date on which such employer commences repairing a recreational vessel sixty-five feet or more in length, if the repair of such vessel is not completed on the sixty-first day after the date on which such repairs commence.

"(2) If, within any period described in paragraph (1)(A) (or any period added by reason of this paragraph), the same facility is used to build or dismantle another recreational vessel sixty-five feet or more in length, compensation shall be payable to an employee at such facility injured during any succeeding one-year period in which any such building or dismantling is continued on any other vessel that is not a small vessel.

"(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), compensation shall be payable to an employee employed at a facility which is used in the business of building, repairing, or dismantling recreational vessels under sixty-five feet in length if such facility receives Federal maritime subsidies.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts paid by any employer for the same injury, disability, or death for which benefits are claimed under this Act pursuant to any other workers' compensation law or section 20 of the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1185, chapter 153; 46 U.S.C. 688) (relating to recovery for injury to or death of seamen) shall be credited against any liability imposed by this Act.".

THIRD PARTY LIABILITY

SEC. 4. (a) The third sentence of section 5(b) is amended to read as follows: "If such person was employed to provide shipbuilding, repairing, or breaking services and such person's employer was the owner, owner pro hac vice, agent, operator, or charterer of the vessel, no such action shall be permitted, in whole or in part or directly or indirectly, against the injured person's employer (in any capacity, including as the vessel's owner, owner pro hac vice, agent, operator, or charterer) or against the employees of the employer.".

(b) Section 2(21) is amended by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "Unless the context requires otherwise, the".

COMPENSATION

SEC. 5. (a) Section 6(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Compensation for disability or death (other than compensation for death required by this Act to be paid in a lump sum) shall not exceed an amount equal to 200 per centum of the applicable national average weekly wage, as determined by the Secretary under subsection (b)(3).".

(b) Section 6 is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) (and any references thereto) as subsection (c); and

(2) by striking out "under this subsection" in subsection (c) (as redesignated) and inserting in lieu thereof "under subsection (b)(3)".

MEDICAL SERVICES AND SUPPLIES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 7(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1)(A) The Secretary shall annually prepare a list of physicians and health care providers in each compensation district who are not authorized to render medical care or provide medical services under this Act. The names of physicians and health care providers contained on the list required under this subparagraph shall be made available to employees and employers in each compensation district through posting and in such other forms as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(B) Physicians and health care providers shall be included on the list of those not authorized to provide medical care and medical services pursuant to subparagraph (A) when the Secretary determines under this section, in accordance with the procedures provided in subsection (j), that such physician or health care provider—

"(i) has knowingly and willfully made, or caused to be made, any false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact for use in a claim for compensation or claim for reimbursement of medical expenses under this Act;

"(ii) has knowingly and willfully submitted, or caused to be submitted, a bill or request for payment under this Act containing a charge which the Secretary finds to be substantially in excess of the charge for the service, appliance, or supply prevailing within the community, unless the Secretary finds there is good cause for the bill or request containing the charge;

"(iii) has knowingly and willfully furnished a service, appliance, or supply which is determined by the Secretary to be substantially in excess of the need of the recipient thereof or to be of a quality which substantially fails to meet professionally recognized standards;

"(iv) has been convicted under any criminal statute (without regard to pending appeal thereof) for fraudulent activities in connection with any Federal or State program for which payments are made to physicians or providers of similar services, appliances, or supplies; or

"(v) has otherwise been excluded from participation in such program.

"(C) Medical services provided by physicians or health care providers who are named on the list published by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this section shall not be reimbursable under this Act; except that the Secretary shall direct the reimbursement of medical claims for services rendered by such physicians or health care providers in cases where the services were rendered in an emergency.

"(2) Whenever the employer or carrier acquires knowledge of the employee's injury, through written notice or otherwise as prescribed by the Act, the employer or carrier shall forthwith authorize medical treatment and care from a physician selected by an employee pursuant to subsection (b). An employee may not select a physician who is on the list required by paragraph (1) of this subsection. An employee may not change physicians after his initial choice unless the employer, carrier, or deputy commissioner has given prior consent for such change. Such consent shall be given in cases where an employee's initial choice was not of a specialist whose services are necessary for and appropriate to the proper care and treatment of the compensable injury or disease. In all other cases, consent may be given upon a showing of good cause for change.".

(b) Section 7(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) An employee shall not be entitled to recover any amount expended by him for medical or other treatment or services unless he shall have complied with subsections (b) and (c) and the applicable regulations or unless the employer shall have refused or neglected to furnish such services, or unless the nature of the injury required such treatment and services and the employer or his superintendent or foreman having knowledge of such injury shall have neglected to provide or authorize same; nor shall any claim for medical or surgical treatment be valid and enforceable against such employer, unless within twenty-one days following the first treatment the physician giving such treatment furnishes to the employer and the deputy commissioner a report of such injury or treatment, on a form prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary may excuse the failure to furnish such report within the twenty-one-day period whenever he finds it to be in the interest of justice to do so. The Secretary may, upon application by a party in interest, make an award for the reasonable value of such medical or surgical treatment so obtained by the employee. If at any time the employee unreasonably refuses to submit to medical or surgical treatment, or to an examination by a physician selected by the employer, the Secretary or administrative law judge may, by order, suspend the payment of further compensation during such time as such refusal continues, and no compensation shall be paid at any time during the period of such suspension, unless the circumstances justified the refusal.".

(c) Section 7 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) The Secretary shall have the authority to make rules and regulations and to establish procedures, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, which are necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of subsection (c), including the nature and extent of the proof and evidence necessary for actions under this section and the methods of taking and furnishing such proof and evidence.

"(2) Any decision to take action with respect to a physician or health care provider under this section shall be based on specific findings of fact by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide notice of these findings and an opportunity for a hearing pursuant to section 556 of title 5, United States Code, for a provider who would be affected by a decision under this section. A request for a hearing must be filed with the Secretary within thirty days after notice of the findings is received by the provider making such request. If a hearing is held, the Secretary shall, on the basis of evidence adduced at the hearing, affirm, modify, or reverse the findings of fact and proposed action under this section.

"(3) For the purpose of any hearing, investigation, or other proceeding authorized or directed under this section, the provisions of section 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 49, 50) shall apply to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary or any officer designated by him.

"(4) any physician or health care provider, after any final decision of the Secretary made after a hearing to which he was a party, irrespective of the amount in controversy, may obtain a review of such decision

by a civil action commenced within sixty days after the mailing to him of notice of such decision. Such action shall be brought in the court of appeals of the United States for the judicial circuit in which the plaintiff resides or has his principal place of business, or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. As part of his answer, the Secretary shall file a certified copy of the transcript of the record of the hearing, including all evidence submitted in connection therewith. The findings of fact of the Secretary, if based on substantial evidence in the record as a whole, shall be conclusive.".

(d) Section 7 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k)(1) Nothing in this Act prevents an employee whose injury or disability has been established under this Act from relying in good faith on treatment by prayer or spiritual means alone, in accordance with the tenets and practice of a recognized church or religious denomination, by an accredited practitioner of such recognized church or religious denomination, and on nursing services rendered in accordance with such tenets and practice, without suffering loss or diminution of the compensation benefits under this Act. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to except an employee from all physical examinations required by this Act.

"(2) If an employee refuses to submit to medical or surgical services solely because, in adherence to the tenets and practice of a recognized church or religious denomination, the employee relies upon prayer or spiritual means alone for healing, such employee shall not be considered to have unreasonably refused medical or surgical treatment under subsection (d) or to have unreasonably refused to undergo physical rehabilitation.".

COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITY

SEC. 7. (a) Section 8(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Permanent total disability: In the case of total disability determined to be permanent, 66⅔ per centum of the average weekly wages of the employee shall be paid to the employee during the continuance of the disability. Loss of both hands, both arms, both feet, both legs, both eyes, or any combination of two such body parts, shall constitute permanent total disability in the absence of conclusive proof to the contrary. In all other cases, permanent total disability shall be determined in accordance with the facts.".

(b) Section 8(c)(13) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Loss of hearing:

"(A) Compensation for loss of hearing in one ear, fifty-two weeks.

"(B) Compensation for loss of hearing in both ears, two-hundred weeks.

"(C)(i) An audiogram shall be presumptive evidence of the amount of hearing loss sustained as of the date thereof, only if (I) such audiogram was administered by a licensed or certified audiologist or a physician who is certified in otolaryngology, (II) such audiogram, with the report thereon, was provided to the employee at the time it was administered, and (III) no contrary audiogram made at that time is produced.

"(ii) The time for filing a notice of injury, under section 12 of this Act, or a claim for compensation, under section 13 of this Act, shall not begin to run in connection with any claim for loss of hearing under this section, until the employee has been provided with an audiogram, with the accompanying report thereon, which indicates that the employee has suffered a loss of hearing.

"(D) Within ninety days of the date of enactment of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to define the term 'loss of hearing' in accordance with the American Medical Association Guides for the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment.".

(c) Section 8(c)(20) is amended by striking out "$3,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,500".

(d) Section 8(c)(21) is amended to read as follows:

"(21) Other cases: In all other cases in this class of disability, the compensation shall be 66⅔ per centum of the difference between the average weekly wages of the employee and the employee's wage-earning capacity thereafter in the same employment or otherwise, payable during the continuance of the partial disability.".

(e) Section 8(d) is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraph (4) (and any references thereto) as paragraph (3).

(f) Section 8(f) is amended—

(1) by striking out "one hundred and four weeks" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "three hundred and twelve weeks"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Any request, filed after the date of enactment of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983, for apportionment of liability to the special fund established under section 44 of this Act for the payment of compensation benefits, and a statement of the grounds therefore, shall be presented to the deputy commissioner prior to the consideration of the claim by the deputy commissioner. Failure of the employer to provide a copy of such request for apportionment shall be an absolute defense to the special fund's liability for the payment of any benefits in connection with such claim, if the Secretary denies the liability of the special fund in connection with such claim. Failure to notify the Secretary pursuant to this paragraph shall not be a bar to subsequent apportionment of liability to the special fund if the Secretary determines that the employer could not have reasonably anticipated the liability of the special fund.".

(g) Subsections (h) and (i) of section 8 are amended to read as follows:

"(h) The wage-earning capacity of an injured employee in cases of disability shall be determined by his actual earnings if such actual earnings fairly and reasonably represent his wage-earning capacity. If the employee has no actual earnings or his actual earnings do not fairly and reasonably represent his wage-earning capacity, the deputy commissioner may, in the interest of justice, fix such wage-earning capacity as shall be reasonable, having due regard to the nature of his injury, the degree of physical impairment, his usual employment, and any other factors or circumstances in the case which may affect his capacity to earn wages in his disabled condition.

"(i)(1) Whenever the parties to any claim for compensation, including survivors benefits, under this Act agree to a settlement, the deputy commissioner or administrative law judge shall approve the settlement within thirty days unless it is found to be inadequate or procured by duress. No liability of any employer, carrier, or both for disability or death benefits shall be discharged unless the application for settlement is approved by the deputy commissioner or administrative law judge. If the parties to the settlement are represented by counsel, then agreements shall be deemed approved unless specifically disapproved within thirty days after submission for approval.

"(2) If the deputy commissioner disapproves an application for settlement under paragraph (1), the deputy commissioner shall issue a written statement within thirty days containing the reasons for disapproval. Any party to the settlement may request a hearing before an administrative law judge in the manner prescribed by this Act. Following such hearing, the administrative law judge shall enter an order approving or rejecting the settlement.

"(3) A settlement approved under this section shall discharge the liability of the employer, carrier, or both. Such settlement may include future medical benefits if the parties so agree and the deputy commissioner approves. Settlements may be agreed upon at any stage of the proceeding including after entry of a final compensation order.".

(h) Section 8 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) The employer may inform a disabled employee of his obligation to report to the employer not less than semiannually any earnings from employment or self-employment, on such forms as the Secretary shall specify in regulations.

"(2) An employee who—

"(A) fails to report the employee's earnings under paragraph (1) when requested, or

"(B) knowingly and willfully omits or understates any part of such earnings,

and who is determined by the deputy commissioner to have violated clause (A) or (B) of this paragraph, forfeits his right to compensation with respect to any period during which the employee was required to file such report.

"(3) Compensation forfeited under this subsection, if already paid, shall be recovered by a deduction from the compensation payable to the employee in any amount and on such schedule as determined by the deputy commissioner.".

COMPENSATION FOR DEATH

"SEC. 8. (a) The matter preceding subsection (a) of section 9 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. If the injury causes death, the compensation therefore shall be known as a death benefit and shall be payable in the amount and to or for the benefit of the persons following:".

(b) Section 9(a) is amended by striking out "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,000".

(c) Section 9(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In computing death benefits, the average weekly wages of the deceased shall not be less than the national average weekly wage as prescribed in section 6(b), except that the total weekly benefits shall not exceed the lesser of the average weekly wages of the deceased or the benefit which the deceased employee would have been eligible to receive under section 6(b)(1).".

DETERMINATION OF PAY

SEC. 9. (a) Section 10 is amended by redesignating subsections (e) through (h) as subsections (f) through (i), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(e) With respect to a claim for compensation for death or disability due to an occupational disease, the time of injury shall be deemed to be the date of onset of the dis-

abling condition. With respect to any such claim based on a death or disability due to an occupational disease in which the claimant was not employed or not employed on a full-time basis immediately prior to the date of onset of the disabling condition, the average weekly wage of such employee shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsections (a) through (d) of this section, and with the first sentence of this subsection, but in no event shall be less than the National Average Weekly Wage as determined by the Secretary pursuant to section 6(b) applicable on the date of the onset of the disabling condition."

(b) Section 10(g) (as redesignated pursuant to subsection (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Effective October 1 of each year following the date of enactment of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983, the compensation or death benefits payable for permanent total disability or death arising out of injuries subject to this Act shall be increased by the lesser of—

"(1) a percentage equal to the percentage (if any) by which the applicable national weekly wage for the period beginning on such October 1, as determined under section 6(b), exceeds the applicable national average weekly wage, as so determined, for the period beginning with the preceding October 1; or

"(2) 5 per centum.".

(c) Section 10(i) (as redesignated pursuant to subsection (a)) is amended by striking out paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2)(A) Any additional compensation or death benefit paid as a result of the adjustment required by paragraphs (1) and (3) of this subsection with respect to claims filed before the date of enactment of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act Amendments of 1983 shall be paid, from the date of enactment of such amendments, from appropriations.

"(B) Any additional compensation or death benefit paid as a result of the adjustment required by paragraphs (1) and (3) of this subsection with respect to claims filed on or after the date of enactment of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983 shall be paid out of the special fund established under section 44 of this Act.".

NOTICE OF INJURY OR DEATH

SEC. 10. (a) Section 12(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notice of an injury or death in respect of which compensation is payable under this Act shall be given within thirty days after the date of such injury or death, or thirty days after the employee or beneficiary is aware, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence or by reason of medical advice should have been aware, of a relationship between the injury or death and the employment, except that in the case of an occupational disease which does not immediately result in a disability or death, such notice shall not be required. Notice shall be given (1) to the deputy commissioner in the compensation district in which the injury or death occurred, and (2) to the employer. Each employer shall designate those agents or other responsible officials to receive such notice, except that the employer shall designate as its representatives individuals among first line supervisors, local plant management, and personnel office officials. Such designations shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and the employer shall notify his employees and the Secretary of such designation in a manner prescribed by the Secretary in regulations.".

(b) Section 12(d) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(or his agent in charge of the business in the place where the injury occurred)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(or his agent or agents or other responsible official or officials designated by the employer pursuant to subsection (a))";

(2) by striking out "injury or death and" and inserting in lieu thereof "injury or death, (2)";

(3) by striking out "or (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (3)"; and

(4) by inserting after "the ground that" in the clause redesignated as clause (3) (by paragraph (3) of this subsection) the following: "(i) notice, while not given to a responsible official designated by the employer pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, was given to an official of the employer or the employer's insurance carrier, and that the employer or carrier was not prejudiced due to the failure to provide notice to a responsible official designated by the employer pursuant to subsection (a), or (ii)".

TIME FOR FILING CLAIM BASED ON OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE

SEC. 11. Section 13(b) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a claim for compensation for death or disability due to an occupational disease which does not immediately result in such death or disability shall be timely if filed within one year after (A) the employee's disease (i) has impaired the employee's functional capacity, or (ii) has resulted in a diminution of wages, and (B) the employee or claimant becomes aware, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence or by reason of medical advice should have been aware, of the relationship between the employment, the disease, and the death or disability.".

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION

SEC. 12. (a) Section 14(b) is amended by striking out "employer" and inserting in lieu thereof "employer has been notified pursuant to section 12, or the employer".

(b) Section 14 is amended by striking out subsection (j) and by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) (and any references thereto) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively.

REVIEW OF COMPENSATION ORDER

SEC. 13. Section 21 is amended—

(1) by striking out "three" in subsection (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "five";

(2) by adding the following sentence at the end of subsection (b)(1): "The Chairman shall have the authority, as delegated by the Secretary, to exercise all administrative functions necessary to operate the Board."; and

(3) by adding the following new paragraph at the end of subsection (b):

"(5) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (4), when the number of cases pending before the Board exceeds 1,000, the Secretary shall designate three administrative law judges of the Department of Labor to serve temporarily on the Board for terms of eighteen months. The Board is authorized to delegate to panels of three members any or all of the powers which the Board may exercise. Each such panel shall have no more than one temporary member. Any party aggrieved by a decision of a panel of the Board may, within thirty days after the date of entry of the decision, petition the entire Board (regular plus temporary members) for a rehearing en banc. Upon affirmative vote of the majority of the Board sitting en banc, the petition shall be granted. If a petition for a rehearing en banc is granted, and the vote of the Board sitting en banc results in a tie, the decision of the panel of the Board shall be affirmed. The Board shall amend its Rules of Practice to conform with this paragraph. Temporary members, while serving as members of the Board, shall be compensated at the same rate of compensation as regular members. Two members shall constitute a quorum of a panel, and three members shall constitute a quorum of the Board. Official adjudicative action may be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least two members of a panel."; and

"(4) by adding the following new paragraph at the end of subsection (b):

"(6) Not later than eighteen months after the effective date of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983, the Secretary shall submit to the Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the United States Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States House of Representatives, a report detailing the operation of the Board in deciding cases presented to it during the period following the effective date of these amendments. The Secretary's report shall evaluate the effectiveness of the Board in operating in panels, the effectiveness of the en banc rehearing procedures, and the ability of these procedures to increase the productivity of the Board. The Secretary shall, in such report, make recommendations to the Congress with respect to any further steps which may be taken to improve the operation of the Board and further enhance its productivity; including a specific recommendation on the advisability of establishing the Board as a body independent of the Department of Labor, and whether the effectiveness of the Board would be enhanced if its members were appointed for fixed terms.".

MODIFICATIONS OF AWARDS

SEC. 14. Section 22 is amended by striking all after "the deputy commissioner may" through "rejection of a claim".

FEES FOR SERVICES

SEC. 15. Section 28(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) A person who receives a fee, gratuity, or other consideration on account of services rendered as a representative of a claimant, unless the consideration is approved by the deputy commissioner, administrative law judge, Board, or court, or who makes it a business to solicit employment for a lawyer, or for himself, with respect to a claim or award for compensation under this Act, shall, upon conviction thereof, for each offense be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.".

REPORTS

SEC. 16. (a) Section 30(a) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the word "injury" a comma and the following: "which causes loss of one or more shifts of work", and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the requirements of this subsection, each employer shall keep a record of each and every injury regardless of whether such injury results in the loss of one or more shifts of work.".

(b) Section 30(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Any employer, insurance carrier, or self-insured employer who knowingly and

willfully fails or refuses to send any report required by this section shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $10,000 for each such failure or refusal.".

PENALTY FOR MISREPRESENTATION—PROSECUTION OF CLAIMS

SEC. 17. Section 31 is amended to read as follows:

"PENALTY FOR MISREPRESENTATION—PROSECUTION OF CLAIMS

SEC. 31. (a) Any claimant or representative of a claimant who knowingly and willfully makes a false statement or representation for the purpose of obtaining a benefit or payment under this Act shall be guilty of a felony, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $10,000, by imprisonment not to exceed five years, or by both.

"(b)(1) No representation fee of a claimant's representative shall be approved by the deputy commissioner, an administrative law judge, the Board, or a court pursuant to section 28 of this Act, if the claimant's representative is on the list of individuals who are disqualified from representing claimants under this Act maintained by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2)(A) The Secretary shall annually prepare a list of those individuals in each compensation district who have represented claimants for a fee in cases under this Act and who are not authorized to represent claimants. The names of individuals contained on the list required under this subparagraph shall be made available to employees and employers in each compensation district through posting and in such other forms as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(B) Individuals shall be included on the list of those not authorized to represent claimants under this Act if the Secretary determines under this section, in accordance with the procedure provided in subsection (j) of section 7 of this Act, that such individual—

"(i) has been convicted (without regard to pending appeal) of any crime in connection with the representation of a claimant under this Act or any workers' compensation statute;

"(ii) has engaged in fraud in connection with the presentation of a claim under this or any workers' compensation statute, including, but not limited to, knowingly making significantly improper or false representations, concealing or attempting to conceal material facts with respect to a claim, or soliciting or otherwise procuring false testimony;

"(iii) has been prohibited from representing claimants before any other workers' compensation agency for reasons of professional misconduct which are similar in nature to those which would be grounds for disqualification under this paragraph; or

"(iv) has accepted fees for representing claimants under this Act which were not approved, or which were in excess of the amount approved pursuant to section 28.

"(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), no individual who is on the list required to be maintained by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be prohibited from presenting his or her own claim or from representing without fee, a claimant who is a spouse, mother, father, sister, brother, or child of such individual.

"(3) No employee shall be liable to pay a representation fee to any representative whose fee has been disallowed by reason of the operation of this paragraph.

"(4) The Secretary shall issue such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

"(c) A person including, but not limited to, an employer, his duly authorized agent, or an employee of an insurance carrier who knowingly and willfully makes a false statement or representation for the purpose of reducing, denying, or terminating benefits to an injured employee, or his dependents pursuant to section 9 if the injury results in death, shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $10,000, by imprisonment not to exceed five years, or by both.".

SECURITY FOR COMPENSATION

SEC. 18. Section 32(a)(2) is amended by inserting "based on the employer's financial condition, the employer's previous record of payments, and other relevant factors," after "in an amount determined by the commission,".

COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES WHERE THIRD PERSONS ARE LIABLE

SEC. 19. (a) Section 33(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Acceptance of compensation (1) under an award in a compensation order filed by the deputy commissioner, an administrative law judge, or the Board, or (2) paid voluntarily by an employer, shall operate as an assignment to the employer of all rights of the person entitled to compensation to recover damages against such third person unless such person shall commence an action against such third person within six months after such acceptance. If the employer fails to commence an action against such third person within ninety days after the cause of action is assigned under this section, the right to bring such action shall revert to the person entitled to compensation.".

(b) Section 33(f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f)(1) If a person entitled to compensation under this Act institutes a proceeding within the period described in subsection (b) and recovers by a judgment an amount in the proceeding against a third party, the person instituting such proceeding shall be permitted to retain an amount equal to 15 per centum of (A) the amount so recovered, minus (B) the expenses incurred by such person in respect to such proceeding (including a reasonable attorney's fee).

"(2) The employer shall be required to pay, as compensation under this Act, a sum equal to the excess of the amount which the deputy commissioner, administrative law judge, or Board determines is payable on account of such injury or death above the balance of the amount recovered (after the deduction required by paragraph (1) and the expenses described in clause (B) of such paragraph).

"(3) The balance, if any, of the amount recovered (after the deduction required by paragraph (1) and the expenses described in clause (B) of such paragraph) shall be distributed as follows:

"(A) there shall be paid to the employer from such balance an amount equal to the sum of the costs of all benefits and compensation actually furnished to the person under sections 7, 8, and 9; and

"(B) the remainder of such excess shall be retained by the employee and credited against future payments of compensation and medical benefits to the employee pursuant to this Act.".

(c) Section 33(g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g)(1) If the person entitled to compensation (or the person's representative) enters into a settlement with a third person referred to in subsection (a) for an amount less than the compensation to which the person (or the person's representative) would be entitled under this Act, the employer shall be liable for compensation as determined under subsection (f) only if written approval of the settlement is obtained from the employer and the employer's carrier, before the settlement is executed, and by the person entitled to compensation (or the person's representative). The approval shall be made on a form provided by the Secretary and shall be filed in the office of the deputy commissioner within thirty days after the settlement is entered into.

"(2) If no written approval of the settlement is obtained and filed as required by paragraph (1), or if the employee fails to notify the employer of any settlement obtained from or judgment rendered against a third person, all rights to compensation and medical benefits under this Act shall be terminated, regardless of whether the employer or the employer's insurer has made payments or acknowledged entitlement to benefits under this Act.

"(3) Any payments by the special fund established under section 44 shall be a lien upon the proceeds of any settlement obtained from or judgment rendered against a third person referred to under subsection (a). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such lien shall be enforceable against the employee or employer, regardless of whether the Secretary on behalf of the special fund has agreed to or has received actual notice of the settlement or judgment.".

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 20. The Act is amended by inserting the following new section after section 41:

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 42. The Secretary shall make to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, commencing at the beginning of the second regular session after the enactment of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983, a report of the administration of this Act for the preceding fisal year, including a detailed statement of receipts of and expenditures from the fund established in section 44, together with such recommendations as the Secretary deems advisable.".

SPECIAL FUND

SEC. 21. (a) Subsection (e) of section 44 is repealed.

(b) Section 44(i) is amended by inserting "and unpaid assessments" after "civil penalties".

(c) Section 44(j)(1) is amended by inserting "certain" before "initial" and by striking out "which occurred prior to the effective date of this subsection".

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 22. Section 46 is repealed.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 23. Section 47 is repealed.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST EMPLOYEES WHO BRING PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 24. (a) Section 49 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "The discharge or refusal to employ a person who has been adjudicated to have filed a fraudulent claim for compensation is not a violation of this section.".

(b) The second sentence of section 49 is amended—

(1) by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000"; and

(2) by striking out "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 25. (a) The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is further amended—

(1) striking out paragraph (6) of section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.";

(2) by striking out "commission" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(3) by striking out "commission's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary's".

(b) Section 17 is amended by striking out "(b)".

(c) Section 18(b) is amended by striking out ", including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this Act,".

(d) Section 39(a) is amended by striking out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

EFFECTIVE DATE; EFFECT ON OTHER LAW

SEC. 26. (a)(1) Except as otherwise provided in the amendments made by this Act—

(A) the amendments made by section 2(a), 3, 4, 7 (except subsection (e) thereof), 8 (b) and (c), 12, 14, 16, and 19(a) of this Act shall be effective for an injury or death which occurs on or after ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) the amendments made by sections 5, 8(a), 9(b), 11, and 19(c) of this Act shall be effective without regard to the date on which an injury, disability, or death occurs or commences, but shall apply on or after ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) the amendments made by sections 6, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 shall be effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) The amendment made by section 9(c), and the amendment made by section 10(a) with respect to notice of injury or death, and with respect to whether such notice is required to be given in the case of an occupational disease which does not immediately result in a disability or death, shall be effective without regard to the date on which an injury, disability, or death occurs or commences, but shall apply on or after ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act. The remainder of the amendments made by section 10 shall be effective for an injury, disability, or death which occurs or commences on or after ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) The amendment made by section 2(b) of this Act shall be effective without regard to the date on which an injury, disability, or death occurs or commences, but shall apply on the date of enactment of this Act, except (A) that such amendment shall not preclude the modification, pursuant to section 21, of awards based on an application filed under such section before December 1, 1983, or (B) in a case decided by a court of appeals of the United States before such date.

(4) The amendments made by section 19(b) of this Act shall apply with respect to all judgments rendered on or after ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act without regard to the date on which the injury, disability, or death occurred or commences, and shall not apply with respect to judgments rendered prior to such date.

(5) There shall be no liability for deaths from causes other than the injury, as provided in sections 8(d)(3) and 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, for any such deaths occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b)(1) The amendments made by sections 6 and 14 of this Act shall not apply to claims filed under the Black Lung Benefits Act (30 U.S.C. 901 et seq.).

(2) Section 422(a) of the Black Lung Benefits Act is amended by striking out "During" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to section 26(b)(1) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments of 1983, during".

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree with the amendment of the House and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HATCH, Mr. NICKLES, and Mr. KENNEDY conferees on the part of the Senate.

VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate Joint Resolution 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the resolution from the Senate (S.J. Res. 136) entitled "Joint resolution to recognize 'Volunteer Firefighters Recognition Day' as a tribute to the bravery and self-sacrifice of our volunteer firefighter", do pass with the following amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "August 20, 1983,", and insert: "August 18, 1984,"

Strike out the second clause of the preamble, and insert:

Whereas three hundred and ninety-five volunteer firefighters have lost their lives in the line of duty during the past five years, with fifty-eight such deaths occurring in 1983 alone;

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER TO PLACE HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 290 ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate receives from the House of Representatives, House Concurrent Resolution 290, the concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no appropriated funds be used for the purpose of mining the territorial waters of Nicaragua, that it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND FOR SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO ASSIST IN DEFENSE OF CERTAIN CASES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk in behalf of Senator BAKER and Senator BYRD and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A Senate resolution (S. Res. 374) authorizing the testimony and production of documents and directing the Senate legal counsel to assist in the defense of Republicbank, Lubbock, and so forth, et al., vs. United States of America, and The Travelers Insurance Corp. vs. United States.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the cases of Republicbank, Lubbock, etc., et al. against United States of America and the Travelers Insurance Corp. against United States of America are pending in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Lubbock Division. The Department of Justice is defending these cases which were filed under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act, and which involve claims for property damages allegedly sustained from a fire which occurred in a Lubbock office building in which Senator TOWER had a State office. The testimony of Thomas J. Fahey, an employee in Senator TOWER's office, and the production of certain documents have been requested in the cases. Testimony of other present and former members of the staff may also be needed for the trial.

In addition, the U.S. attorney has requested the assistance of the Senate legal counsel in the preparation and trial of these cases. In view of the fact that this litigation directly involves a Senate office, it is appropriate that full cooperation be provided in defending these claims. This resolution would authorize the requested testimony and documents and direct the Senate legal counsel to assist in the defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The Resolution (S. Res. 374), with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 374

Whereas, the cases of *Republicbank, Lubbock, etc., et al.* v. *United States of America*, C.A. No. 5-83-059, and *The Travelers Insurance Corp.* v. *United States of America*, C.A. No. 5-83-140 are pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Lubbock Division;

Whereas, the parties have requested the production of certain documents and the testimony of Thomas J. Fahey, an employee of Senator Tower's office in these cases;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that testimony, documents, papers, and records under the control of or in the possession of the Senate are needful for use in any court for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate;

Whereas, the United States Attorney has requested the assistance of the Office of Senate Legal Counsel in the preparation and defense of these cases;

Whereas, pursuant to section 708(c) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288g(c) (1982), the Senate may direct its Counsel to perform such duties consistent with Title VII of the Ethics in Government Act as the Senate may direct: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Thomas J. Fahey and such other present and former members of Senator Tower's staff as may be needed are authorized to appear and testify and to produce documents in the cases of *Republicbank, Lubbock, etc., et al.* v. *United States of America*, and *The Travelers Insurance Corp.* v. *United States of America*, except concerning matters for which a privilege from disclosure should be asserted;

2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized and directed to assist the United States Attorney in the defense of the cases of *Republicbank, Lubbock, etc., et al.* v. *United States of America*, and *The Travelers Insurance Corp.* v. *United States of America.*

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask my good friend from West Virginia if it would meet with his approval for me to request that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with the Department of Education, and including all of the nominations on page 2 and page 3 and the first three items placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no objection on this side.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering the items I have mentioned on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis Roman Disabato, of Texas, to be a member of the National Museum Services Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Ingrid Azvedo, of California; Nelda Ann Lambert Barton, of Kentucky; Edna Bogosian, of Massachusetts; James N. Broder, of Maine; Tony Guglielmo, of Connecticut; and Frances Lamont, of South Dakota, to be members of the Federal Council on the Aging.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the reappointment of James N. Broder, of Portland, Maine, as a member of the Council on Aging.

Over the course of the past decade, the work of the Council has been instrumental in making both the Government and the American people more aware of the special needs of our older population, and more aware of the shortcomings that exist in programs and policies designed to serve them.

An ongoing demographic change in our Nation, now becoming known as the greying of America, will present a challenge to our society by the end of this century which will be as vast in scope as the challenge of absorbing the millions of migrants who flooded our shores at the beginning of this century.

The Council on Aging bears the primary responsibility of focusing on the implications of that demographic change, and it has the unique responsibility within the Federal Government of informing the President, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Congress of the policy changes that must be made to respond to that change.

Those responsibilities will be heavier in the coming years, and I cannot think of an individual whose special expertise and experience will bring more to the Council than Jamie Broder.

The Council on Aging has educated the Congress and the executive branch to the needs of older people. It has helped us understand that the human need for independence and dignity is as crucial to older people as to the most youthful. Jamie Broder has taken that understanding and is applying it to the practial problems of how we can provide adequate and economical shelter for our older people without robbing them of their self-respect and independence.

Jamie's expertise in one of the most difficult and pressing areas of need for the elderly—shelter—is nationally recognized.

He was personally involved in drafting the landmark legislation that established the principle of shelter designed for the elderly which respects their psychic as well as their physical needs. That program, the section 202 housing program for the elderly, has served thousands of Maine's elderly and hundreds of thousands nationally. It is a prototype of the imaginative and practical thinking that our society will need more and more as our population ages.

Today, Jamie is actively working with Maine's State Bureau of the Elderly to establish the home equity conversion project, a program whose purpose is to give older homeowners the opportunity to remain in their communities by using the equity from their homes as a source of income. It is hard to overstate how important it is in the small rural communities typical of Maine to give older people that opportunity.

The work of the Federal Council on Aging has helped us to recognize that the universal experience of growing old need not be a fearful one. Jamie Broder's contribution to that work, both in his service on the Council and in his civic activities in Maine, has been great in the past and I am confident it will be invaluable in the future.

This is a nomination which merits the unanimous support of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Webb, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas H. Anderson, Jr., of Mississippi, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of Dominica, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to St. Lucia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Antigua and Barbuda, and Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to St. Christopher; and the nomination of Harry E. Bergold, Jr., of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN THE AIR FORCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read various nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were considered and confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CENTRAL AMERICA AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, the last few weeks have seen an extraordinary amount of attention paid to events in Central America, and to the role which our country has played in those events. For instance, shortly before the March 6 elections in El Salvador, many of us heard from a high-ranking officer in the Salvadoran military concerning the links between death squad activities and the Salvadoran political system.

On March 8, we were treated to the spectacle of the administration seeking to load a significant appropriation onto the African famine relief bill, bypassing in the process both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Still later, and continuing into April, the Senate undertook 11 separate rollcall votes on the appropriations request which had emerged from a careful and bipartisan consideration of our policy in Central America. On all 11 votes, a majority—frequently an overwhelming bipartisan majority—voted to stay with the package which had been so carefully worked out by Senators INOUYE and KASTEN.

Yet only 1 day after this demonstration of bipartisanship within the Senate and cooperation between the Senate and the Executive, the President was at Georgetown University calling upon us to restore bipartisanship in our foreign policy, and to support "the practical details of policy, not just the general goals."

Finally, a scant 3 days after the President's speech, we in the Congress awoke to news stories which specified the role played by the American Government in the mining of Nicaraguan harbors. As Senator GOLDWATER made clear in his now-famous letter to the Director of Central Intelligence, the Congress had not been fully and appropriately briefed on this activity via the channels of the Senate Intelligence Committee. It was therefore not surprising that the Senate adopted, by an overwhelming vote, a resolution calling for the immediate termination of the mining.

The proverbial "man from Mars," visiting this city for the first time and knowing nothing of our customs, would be hard pressed to make sense of these events. So too would the American public. The question that is being asked, as we resume our legislative session, is "what next in Central America?"

Before we can answer that question, we have to ask ourselves "where have we been?"

POLICY AND PROCESS IN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. President, the reason our actions here in Washington look so confusing is that we are dealing with two separate issues when we debate Central America. The first issue—a perennial in Washington—has to do with the procedures by which foreign policy is made. It touches on such questions as the proper role of Congress in foreign policy, the wisdom of our annual appropriations process, and the necessary tension between a policy that is always consistent enough to be understandable and flexible enough to be realistic.

The second issue, which is sometimes overlooked, is just where we hope to go in our overall Central America policy. When I say that this issue is often overlooked, I mean that we frequently get so bound up in the day-to-day details of ongoing events, or so enamoured of the latest aphorisms to emerge from the critics and proponents of policy alike, that we ignore the forest for the trees.

Both issues are related, and it would be a very naive person who could suggest that policy and process are distinct entities, just as it would be a very naive person who would suggest that there is a large distinction between politics and policy. But even recognizing the necessary overlap between procedures and goals, it can be worthwhile periodically to recognize that they often pose separate questions and challenges to this country as it charts its course in international waters.

The issues with which we dealt throughout March and much of April nominally bore on our policy in Central America. But the actions we took were very distinct, because we were alternately dealing with procedural and policy questions.

I don't want to suggest that this is a desirable state of affairs. It isn't. We cannot hope to develop an integrated and comprehensive policy for Central America until we reintegrate our policy debate with some common understandings about procedures and process. But we will not achieve that state unless we first recognize that our current impasse derives from an inadequate set of procedural understandings and a total failure to elaborate the long-term goals against which our daily actions in Central America can be measured.

So what I am proposing, Mr. President, is that we first get our house in order by artificially separating for the moment the question of policy from the question of process. When we recognize the limitations in each, we can correct them. When in turn they are corrected, we can reintegrate them and get on with the business of foreign relations. Perhaps the best way to do this is to carefully study just what happened in the dizzying couple of weeks I touched upon at the outset of my statement.

THE URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

From March 29 through April 5, the Senate conducted an intense debate on the urgent supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1984. In most respects, the intensity of this debate was no surprise, for the issue involved was Central America and the manner in which the bill first arose—a failed attempt by the President to make an end run around the authorizing committees and to tag his request onto a bill which we all knew could not be delayed—was guaranteed to arouse controversy.

In some respects, however, it is genuinely surprising that we should have devoted so much time to this matter, for the fact is that when we last appropriated funds for Central America we knew full well that the administration would be back this spring looking for more. We knew this because we guaranteed it by reducing the fiscal year 1984 authorization to levels well below what the administration had felt was prudent.

In other words, Mr. President, the real issue in the debate this spring was not over our policy in Central Amer-

ica. We had had that debate last fall. The issue instead was over the relatively trivial point of whether an additional short-term infusion of funds would be granted to carry out a program on which we had signed off last fall.

To draw a simplistic analogy, Mr. President, it was as if somebody had made the decision to purchase a car, and having arranged for consumer credit, to then debate whether or not to make his monthly payment on time and in the amount which his budget could stand. The debate was not over whether to sell the car, or to rely on public transportation, or to purchase a second and better car. The debate was simply over whether to meet an obligation which had been clearly understood from the outset, despite the fact that circumstances had not substantially changed.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that the supplemental appropriation was carefully crafted by a bipartisan team, led by Senators INOUYE and KASTEN. It cut the President's initial request by one-third. It imposed limits. It was explicitly not an open-ended commitment. It was a short-term infusion of funds, designed to carry us through a period in which the glimmerings of a genuine policy are becoming vaguely apparent.

Two years ago, this country moved the Government of El Salvador in the general direction of elections. The first round of the Presidential elections was conducted in early March of this year. The second round will be conducted in May. To have cut off this process before it was even begun—for instance by killing funding for the paramilitary program which helps to preserve the lives of voters by making it harder for rebels armed by and directed from Nicaragua to fight—would simply have been folly. And to cast the vote on this question as a vote on policy is really begging the question, for the fact—as I intend to argue at length later—is that we do not yet have a genuine policy.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that on all separate rollcall votes, the Senate stayed with the appropriations bill by large majorities, frequently by margins greater than 3 to 1. There were few here who believed that it was appropriate to treat a short-term appropriations bill as the vehicle to alter or formulate policy. As my friend, the junior Senator from Connecticut, stated in an exchange with me, the urgent supplemental appropriations bill was "hardly the kind of vehicle we ought to be using, this catchall we have every time we want to move something along." Senator DODD went on to say "my hope is that we might have an opportunity and a better forum for these kinds of policy discussions." I agree heartily.

That brings me to the next point—the remarkable and astonishing comments by the President in his Georgetown University speech, a speech which followed by 1 day the adoption—on a vote of 76 to 19—of the appropriations bill which underwrote his programs.

Perhaps it is a matter of proximity, Mr. President. I think I understand why people in the Senate might have viewed this bill as an occasion for a debate on policy, particularly given how poorly the administration had made its case when it tried to resort to the end run of March 8. But, for the life of me, I cannot understand how the President had this body in mind—if he did—when he gave his speech.

THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY SPEECH AND CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

Mr. President, the tension between the Executive and the legislature in foreign policy is as old as the Republic. It was Thomas Jefferson who believed so strenuously in congressional primacy over the war powers, but it was President Jefferson who ignored Congress when he sent naval expeditions to the Barbary Coast.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution is explicit on the question of congressional powers. So to argue that Congress is a nuisance or worse in the area of foreign policy is no argument at all. If Congress is a nuisance—and it frequently is—it is a necessary nuisance.

This is more than just civics book proprieties. The proper and necessary role of Congress is to act as a sort of board of directors, which mediates between the people and their President on matters of significant policy. We have learned too often that a foreign policy which is not supported by the people of this country is a foreign policy which will eventually fail. All the technology, or money, or keen analysis in the world cannot change this fact. So the best way to guarantee that a policy has support—and to pick up early warnings if it does not—is to rely on the Congress. A failure to do so is more than improper; it is stupid as well.

This does not mean that Congress is necessarily right. It does not mean that Congress is capable of running policy effectively. As the President properly noted in his Georgetown speech:

> Congress has not yet developed capacities for coherent, responsible action to carry out the new foreign policy powers it has taken for itself.

But, with all its failings—institutional, political, intellectual, and emotional—the Congress still remains at the center of our foreign policy process. If we are to correct the flaws which currently make sound policy so difficult to implement, we must begin by asking Congress to live up to its responsibilities, not to abrogate them.

It does not stretch the imagination too much to argue that this President, like all his predecessors, would probably sleep better if the only role we played in foreign policy was cheerleader. When the President spoke of the need for "restoring bipartisanship" and of his hopes that Congress would support "the practical details of policy, not just the general goals," he was to some extent using code words to ask us to be his cheerleader.

Too often, Mr. President, we assume that the fundamental failing in our foreign policy derives exclusively from partisanship. As a result we look back to the few years in our era—shortly after World War II when Senator Vandenberg led his wing of the Republican Party out of isolationism and into strong support for Harry Truman's policies in Europe—as the golden age of American foreign policy. In extreme cases, we come to think of that era as the rule, not the exception.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that a foreign policy which enjoys bipartisan support is better than one that does not. But that goal cannot be cited as its own justification. It has to be worked for, hard, every day. If a policy is to be bipartisan, a broad spectrum of people must be convinced that the policy is worthwhile, at least in its general goals and preferably in its practical details. The act of convincing people has to be based on more than simply a presumptive claim to expertise, on more than simply an emotional appeal for deference to authority. It has to be based on a sound and well elaborated case. And frequently, it has to be based on give and take. Bipartisanship is a compromise, not a call to regimentation.

President Reagan himself understands the limits upon a bipartisan foreign policy when that policy is controversial. As he made clear in his opposition to the SALT II accord and the Panama Canal Treaty—agreements which were first negotiated by President Ford and later culminated by President Carter—bipartisanship is earned through hard work; it is not automatically conferred.

What is ironic in the Georgetown speech, therefore, is that it overlooks three crucial points.

First, it overlooks the fact that bipartisanship is a worthy goal which is observed more in the breach than not.

Second, it overlooks the fact that this Congress has largely supported the President's initiatives and has done so on a bipartisan basis. Despite all we read about the Republican-controlled Senate. The fact remains that congressional support for such things as construction of the MX missile; acceleration of defense spending; deployment of troops to Lebanon; the conduct of the arms talks; and the ongoing paramilitary program in Central

America has occurred in both Houses, and has involved members of both parties. It was Senator INOUYE who steered the supplemental appropriations through Congress a few weeks ago. It was Speaker O'NEILL whose support was crucial to passage of the war powers resolution concerning Lebanon. It has been bipartisanship, in both Houses, which has underwritten this President's remarkable string of foreign policy victories.

Finally, the speech overlooks a third and crucial point. When the President expresses his understandable frustration with the limitations on the congressional ability to shape, oversee, and support policy, he is not speaking about bipartisanship at all. Instead, he is talking about frictions and tensions which are built into the Congress as a body and into exective-congressional relations generically, regardless of party alinements.

As I noted earlier, there are some distinct limitations on the congressional ability to perform its proper role in foreign policy. But these limitations are as much institutional as they are political. And they must be overcome if we are to avoid policy paralysis.

For instance, as I argued when I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 along with Senators INOUYE and KASSEBAUM, Congress is far too reluctant to live up to its own responsibilities when those responsibilities entail making tough decisions and living with them. We are far too prone to dump everything in the President's lap, and then to act offended when he acts as we asked him to. We are far too prone to abrogate a policy-setting role—a role we must share with the President—and to adopt instead a micromanagement role. In that sense, the President's comments concerning the "practical details of policy" are somewhat understandable.

What is called for, if we are to act in a responsible way as a board of directors, is the ability to look at a large issue, recognize the tradeoffs and nuances, develop a sense of direction, and then entrust implementation to the proper authority. Too often, instead, we focus on the small issue or the current symbol; we avoid nuance; and we adopt a skeptical and critical attitude toward the details, not recognizing that when we fail to specify goals then we will necessarily be upset about derivative details.

So I agree with the President that Congress needs to improve its mechanisms for dealing with policy. And I want to reiterate that when we do our job, it will be a shared task. That is why it is so critical that there be regular and complete consultation between the Executive and Congress. Without consultation—and the trust that comes from consultation—there can be no hope for bipartisanship, nor for a Congress willing to recognize its own limits as well as its responsibilities, and to behave accordingly. This brings us, of course, to the issue of the mining of Nicaraguan waters.

MINING AND THE PARAMILITARY PROGRAM

Mr. President, the Congress generally, and the House and Senate Intelligence Committees particularly, have made amply clear their willingness to sustain a program of paramilitary action in Central America if that program is sensible; if it is bounded rather than open ended; if it is explained to the proper authorities rather than concealed; and if it is a clear and needed element of a larger policy.

Unfortunately, we have often lost sight of the reason why the United States looks to this option in its foreign policy. In generally, such programs are designed to provide us measures short of open hostilities to achieve aims which cannot be achieved diplomatically. In the case of Nicaragua, a country which has made abundantly clear its desire to feed the insurgency in El Salvador and export its own form of government by mob to Costa Rica, it has been a sensible idea to impose a cost on such actions. What this calls for, obviously, is limited and finite activities, not large-scale measures. Ideally, it would be beneficial if everybody who smuggled arms from Nicaragua into other countries, or who undertook terrorist bombings in Costa Rica, could be caught and detained.

Failing that, it is altogether sensible to impose a cost on those who get through, both to slow down the spread of subversion in what Nicaragua calls a "revolution without frontiers" and to deter future such actions.

Consistently, the Intelligence Committees have sought to provide guidance to the appropriate authorities in order to insure that what actions might be taken are within sensible and legal bounds. The reason that the Congress has thus far authorized the funding sought is that individual Members of Congress have been able to trust the judgment and the ability of their colleagues on the Senate and House Intelligence Committees. Rather than asking each Member of Congress to investigate what are necessarily highly sensitive matters, the Congress has entrusted that job to small committees.

If the administration—any administration—is to hope for continued congressional authority to conduct the kinds of programs which must occasionally be undertaken, it is vital that there be the greatest possible degree of consultation between the Executive and the appropriate congressional committees. As Senator GOLDWATER put it in his letter to Director Casey of the CIA, we cannot be expected to support a policy when we ourselves do not know what that policy is.

In short, if the Intelligence Committees are to do their job, they must have a reputation among their colleagues for reliability. They cannot have that reputation if vital information is kept from them. And if they should ultimately lose their effectiveness because their reputation has declined, the alternative will be a return to the days when up to eight separate committees oversaw the actions of the intelligence community. Under such circumstances, we will not ever have a policy; we will have a circus.

When the President stated in his Georgetown speech that the administration has tried to "seek new means to reach bipartisan, executive, legislative consensus," I was somewhat curious just what he meant. Keep in mind that these comments were delivered on Friday, April 6.

By Monday, April 9, I simply could not believe that assertion, for I had read—along with all of my colleagues—the details of our involvement in the mining of Nicaraguan waters. There had been no consensus on this issue because there had been no consultation. And, frankly, had there been consultation, there would not have been consensus for the action was foolish in the extreme. It posed a distinct risk of escalating our difficulties with Nicaragua; it involved other countries; and it self-evidently had no hope for secrecy. Worst of all, the subsequent treatment of the controversy demonstrated an incredible insensitivity to reality, and it succeeded in diverting attention from the behavior of the Sandinistas to our own behavior. That is why, of course, there was so lopsided a vote to prohibit future mining.

What this episode demonstrates, Mr. President, is that Congress—with all its cumbersome procedures—can serve as a valuable check on stupidity. It shows, in other words, that procedure can bolster policy. The astonishing failure of the administration to understand the special burdens borne by the House and Senate Intelligence Committees is perhaps the least of the issues involved here, bad as they were. Here was a case where a failure to adhere to procedure led to a policy decision which was disastrous. And that brings us back to the beginning—the need to integrate policy with procedure.

Obviously, the vote against the behavior of the administration did not represent a repudiation of the policy which we had sustained and supported the previous week. In the first place, we adopted a nonbinding resolution. In the second place, few of us agreed that mining harbors was consonant with either the overall policy interests of the United States in Central America or with the paramilitary program in particular. So in voting as we did, we did not undercut our policy, we reaffirmed it. Finally, we were rightly

disturbed that there had been such a flagrant abuse of procedure.

So in some senses, the 84-to-12 vote on the Kennedy resolution was a matter of politics inside the Washington Beltway, not policy at the water's edge. But as a clear signal of the need to conform our policy to proper procedure, the vote spoke legions about the overall failings of U.S. policy in Central America.

We can learn from this episode, Mr. President, and we can use the lessons gained to develop the kind of foreign policy which I know that President Reagan wants to see us adopt in Central America. The first lesson we must learn, of course, is that procedure is a vital element of sound policy, not an impediment to it. And I think we are learning that lesson now, both here in Congress and in the Executive.

Over the past few days, we have begun—at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue—to move toward recommitting ourselves to full and active consultation and participation in the shared duties of foreign policy. Pledges have been made, and misunderstandings have been cleared up. I am confident that we will not see a repetition of the mining fiasco.

But structural reforms are not enough. We cannot just ink in lines of communication on an organization chart and expect to establish the kind of working relationship needed to actually formulate and implement policy. As I mentioned earlier, bipartisanship—which is really a form of trust—has to be earned.

It is not earned when the Secretary of State reiterates the foolish statement that a lack of bipartisanship is what undermined our approach to Lebanon. If people in the administration really believe this point, then they have not read the conclusions of their own Commission of Inquiry, chaired by Admiral Long, and they have forgotten that even as orders were being prepared to load our marines on ships administration spokesmen were attacking anybody in Congress who suggested this alternative.

Bipartisanship is not earned when things like the Georgetown speech follows by 1 day a manifest demonstration of bipartisanship in the Senate of the United States.

Bipartisanship is not earned when the administration apparently views the Intelligence Committees as obstacles, rather than as partners in the tough job of making and implementing policy.

Unless we start seeing a genuine interest in sharing with Congress—both Houses and both parties—the responsibility for crafting our policy in Central America, we will lose any prospect of a policy at all. We already face the threat that the House may cut off the CIA supplemental funding which this body appropriated on April 5. Speaking as a member of the Intelligence Committee, as a person with years of experience in Central America, and as a Republican Senator, I know that this would be a tragic mistake—a point made with some clarity in a recent edition of the New Republic. But if it were to happen, the fault would lie as much with the administration as with the House. So here is one Republican Senator who will make the case that his own party's interest as much as the Nation's interest is served when the President makes better overtures for bipartisanship than he did at Georgetown.

THE CHALLENGE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. President, if we in Congress have the courage and the will to tackle so challenging and complex an issue—particularly in an election year—we have an impending opportunity to help elaborate a policy for Central America, to live up to our own responsibilities, to benefit this country we serve. That opportunity, of course, will be found in the debate—if we have one—over the Jackson plan.

It is often said that we function too often here by continuing resolution—the force feeding of money into programs which have not been well studied. That is nowhere more the case than in our policy toward Central America.

Every year since I have been here, we have gone through occasional debates over particular issues—human rights; land reform; trade relations. We have usually done so on a bilateral basis, and with little real scrutiny of our underlying assumptions about how countries evolve. A debate over the future of a region has too often become a trivia contest over a given country's past. We have seldom, if ever, enunciated what goals we want to accomplish, and we have never determined whether Central America is a distinct region. A cockpit for United States-Soviet relations, or a spot on the map where seven countries happen to be found.

We have not been alone in this failing, of course. Time after time, in listening to administration testimony, I get the sense that our policy is determined simply by whomever has a microphone on a given day, and by whatever minicrisis occurred the day before. We are still coming to grips with this complex region, Mr. President. Because of that, it is simply not correct to say that we have a policy. Instead, it can be said at best that we have a series of programs, which seem to change with the winds.

In the next few weeks, Central America is about to undergo the starts of what could be a profound change. El Salvador and Honduras will both hold elections. These elections may well result in genuinely representative governments which can evolved over time into full-fledged democracies provided we and they are constant in our purpose. This will then leave Guatemala at one extreme and Nicaragua at another. And it will bolster the Contadora peace process, provided the U.S. is willing to follow the advice of such authorities as President Monge of Costa Rica.

In short, Mr. President, we may soon be able to benefit from the advice and expertise of committed democrats in as many as four countries in the region—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, and Panama. If we ourselves can overcome our own prejudices and learn from this unique configuration, I am confident that we can begin to put some flesh on the skeletonized policy outlined by the Kissinger Commission.

Mr. President, this is not the place to outline the details of the Jackson plan, with which all of us are familiar anyway. Suffice it to say that the report is remarkable in its subtlety, in its grasp of the complexity of the situation, in its avoidance of bumper-sticker nostrums, and in the degree to which it has been misrepresented, misunderstood, and ignored by so many Americans. As a recent article in the National Journal makes clear, the report of the Bipartisan Commission, like the works of Shakespeare or the Bible, is more quoted than read.

Mr. President, I am confident that the Jackson plan represents a significant outline which, with modification by the Congress, can begin to shape our long-term policy. It can account for the complex interrelationships among countries in the region. It can account for the urgency of the crisis which has been so long in the making and so long ignored. It can account for the fact that, like it or not, the United States will always be involved in the region even if by default. What will be needed, Mr. President, is a willingness by this body, and by our colleagues in the House, to sit down and actually think this through.

So to conclude, Mr. President, we need to begin now to ask some fundamental questions. Each of us will have different answers, of course, but we need a set of common questions. Let me pose a few of them:

First, will the administration be willing to replace its current hodgepodge of programs with a clear statement of what we are doing?

Second, will the President and his officers begin to demonstrate a genuine willingness to work with Congress, and not against it?

Third, will we in Congress begin, as the Nation's board of directors, to enunciate a vision of the future, recognizing that the United States must play major role in that future?

Fourth, will we in both branches of Government begin to work together to give some specifics to that vision, altering it where needed and deferring

to each other's particular form of expertise where appropriate?

Fifth, will we take advantage of the great pool of talent which can be found among people like President Monge or former President Duarte?

Finally, will we come to recognize that just as our policy must be long term, so too the congressional sense of responsibility for actually shaping and sharing policy must be long term?

Unless these questions are answered in the affirmative, I fear that we will continue to see our current pattern of vacillation between procedural and policy questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the National Journal and the New Republic, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Journal, Apr. 21, 1984]

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE KISSINGER PANEL'S CENTRAL AMERICA CONSENSUS?

(By Christopher Madison)

Last summer, President Reagan appointed a bipartisan commission to help build public support for his Central America policies, which were causing increasing controversy. The 12-member commission finished its work in January and, apparently overcoming many preconceptions about the issues, forged a consensus. But that consensus has not been extended to Congress or the American public.

Instead, in the months since the report's release, as during the previous year, Reagan has been engaged in constant battle with Congress over his Central America policies. Sometimes he wins; Congress has never succeeded in cutting off aid to El Salvador. But the Administration's policy toward Nicaragua has always generated controversy, and may make consensus impossible.

Early this month, for example, the Senate seemed to be leaning in Reagan's direction when it overwhelmingly approved his $62 million aid request for El Salvador and a $21 million authorization to support the antigovernment rebels in Nicaragua.

The very next week, outraged by disclosures that the Central Intelligence Agency had a direct role in supervising the mining of Nicaraguan harbors, the Senate approved a "sense-of-the-Senate" resolution condemning the CIA's role. The House quickly approved a similar resolution by a 281-111 vote, and seemed certain to vote down further funds for the Nicaraguan effort and to scale back the Salvadoran aid request.

Far in the background in these debates, and having almost no obvious influence, it seems, is the report of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, chaired by former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. The lack of impact has left some members frustrated and depressed. Others believe it was unrealistic to expect a commission report to end the Central American debate, particularly in an election year when Democrats need issues on which to challenge Reagan at the polls.

The 12-member commission, appointed by Reagan last year at the first stirrings of controversy over his policies, was asked to make policy recommendations and to suggest how a consensus might be achieved. It undertook an exhaustive review of political, social and economic conditions in the region and took clear stands on most of the issues—but not all—now being debated by Congress.

In its report presented to Reagan last January, the commission concluded there was an acute crisis in the region and proposed a series of complex, long-range solutions emphasizing economic, social and humanitarian programs. The Administration quickly translated the findings into legislation and submitted it to Congress. But debate there has focused instead on highly controversial military questions involving Nicaragua's efforts to launch a communist revolution in the region. Meanwhile, the bulk of the commission's recommendations have become buried in House and Senate committees.

Jim Wright, D-Texas, the House Majority Leader, who served as a senior counselor to the commission, said of its report: "Unfortunately, it has not had the impact that it deserved to have. Maybe it isn't too late, once we get past the harshly divisive subtopics and focus instead on the long-range issues."

Wright counts among the divisive subtopics aid to the Nicaraguan guerrillas, the U.S. military presence in Honduras and continued aid to El Salvador. These are not unimportant questions, but, he said in an interview, they detract from any discussions of the central point of the Kissinger commission's report, the need for the United States "to begin to commit ourselves to a long-term program of economic and social development" for the region.

LONG-TERM PROGRAM

The commission did not ignore the problems of aid to El Salvador and the rebels in Nicaragua, but it took a broader perspective. It said: "Central America is our near neighbor and a strategic crossroads of global significance." After identifying the long festering social, political and economic problems in the region, the commission concluded they were being exacerbated by revolutionary forces in Nicaragua that were backed by Cuba and the Soviet Union. Nicaragua's revolutionary activities in neighboring El Salvador and elsewhere in the region must be neutralized, the commission said, by negotiation if possible, by force if necessary.

On a broader level, the commission said "the advance of Soviet and Cuban power on the American mainland affects the global balance" and required the United States "to defend against security threats near our borders. . . ."

The commission's solutions included $8 billion in economic aid over five years, as well as significantly increased military assistance to U.S. allies such as El Salvador and Honduras. And while it did not explicitly endorse U.S. support for the secret war against the government in Nicaragua, it said the Marxist-Leninist government there was a threat to the region and that the pressure applied by the antigovernment insurgents may force the Nicaraguan government to consider a negotiated settlement to the region's tensions.

In addition to the establishment of an innovative agency to distribute economic aid to all countries in the region, including Nicaragua if it made a commitment to social, political and economic reforms, the commission recommended establishing a literacy and teachers corps, scholarships for Central Americans to attend U.S. universities and increased housing and health programs.

It was a surprise to many, including the commission members themselves, that they managed to reach a consensus on U.S. goals and interests in Central America. Just as surprising, considering the group's bipartisan makeup, that consensus was a close approximation of Reagan's policies.

On the other hand, the Administration's critics were not surprised that the commission endorsed Reagan's policies; they assumed the President would not decide to appoint a commission that would disagree with him. But interviews with some members of the commission and its small staff suggest that something unusual happened among the commission's Democrats and Republicans, politicians and labor leaders, educators and others.

In addition to Kissinger, its chairman, the commission's members were former Republican Sen. Nicholas F. Brady of New Jersey; San Antonio Democratic Mayor Henry G. Cisneros; former Texas Gov. William P. Clements Jr., a Republican; Yale University professor Carlos F. Diaz-Alejandro; Wilson S. Johnson, chairman of the National Federation of Independent Business Inc.; Lane Kirkland, president of the AFL-CIO; Washington political analyst Richard M. Scammon; Boston University president John Silber; former Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart; former Democratic National Committee chairman Robert S. Strauss; and William B. Walsh, founder of Project Hope.

"I was astounded at what happened to that group," said William D. Rogers, a former career diplomat and Kissinger aide who served as a senior counselor to the 12 members. Many commission members, he said, began with only a "primitive understanding of Central America" and were biased in their solutions. "Liberals thought you just needed a New Deal for the region, and conservatives thought you just needed to bomb Cuba."

But the group "learned and came together" and produced, in Roger's view, a complex strategic report that went beyond bland generalities and took into account the interrelationships of politics, economics and human rights in the region. Some members changed their views on the issues in the process of hearing testimony in Washington, visiting Central America and debating and drafting their report. "They came up with a policy that took us beyond infectious bilateralism" Rogers said.

HARD-LINE CONSENSUS

This process may have contributed to the commission's surprisingly hard-line consensus on the problems in the region. Certainly not every member of the commission was prepared at the outset to endorse the Administration's thesis that the United States had to confront the threat posed to Central America and the Western Hemisphere by left-wing revolutions.

But the commission reached that conclusion at the end. It wrote: "The Soviet-Cuban challenge to make Central America part of their geostrategic challenge is what has turned the struggle . . . into a security and political problem for the United States and for the hemisphere." It also said that "the triumph of hostile forces" in the region would be "read as a sign of U.S. impotence."

This cold war reading of the Central American situation has always been the most controversial part of the Administration's policies there; skeptics have questioned whether there was a genuine, widespread communist threat to the region, and Congress has hesitated to approve aid based on these conclusions.

But this view was endorsed by all 12 commission members, including three who were perceived as anything but conservative on Central American politics: Cisneros, Diaz-Alejandro and Strauss. The conclusion served as the basis for the recommendation that the United States increase its military and economic aid to El Salvador, provided it was conditioned on improvements in human rights.

Commission members and staff agree that such a consensus may have surprised outsiders. Rogers said that these views emerged from several key events. Most crucial was a briefing the commission received from leaders of the Sandinista regime, including Daniel Ortega, the head of the government, in Managua last winter.

According to Walsh, a commission member who supported Administration policy before he was appointed, the Nicaraguans had an opportunity to begin a "dialogue" with Americans through the commission. Instead, they delivered what he called a "tirade" against U.S. policy.

Others who attended noted from the briefing that the Sandinistas clearly were using Soviet and Cuban intelligence information and that this erased any doubts commission members may have had about the links between the Soviets and Cubans and the Nicaraguans.

Commission members also received intelligence briefings from U.S. sources about Soviet and Cuban activity in the region. A fact that impressed them was the Soviet arms flow into Nicaragua and to the Salvadoran guerrillas. Several members of the commission concluded, in the words of a member, "Eventually, unless there was a change in the behavior of the Nicaraguans, the United States would find itself with a security problem in the region."

Commission members also heard from other governments in the region. According to Rogers, this was the "bombshell" that produced the commission's hard-line consensus. "They heard repeatedly from respected democratic leaders in the region the sense that the continuation of the Sandinista regime in its current form was incompatible with the long-term peace and security of the region," Rogers said.

According to Walsh, officials in Honduras who met with commission members feared they were about to be invaded. Administration officials familiar with the commission's briefings in the region said that officials in Costa Rica also expressed alarm about the Nicaraguans and that this "surprised" the commission.

"They didn't expect that, even though we'd been telling people that for years," said an Administration specialist on Central America.

MISUNDERSTOOD?

The commission completed its work in early January and released its report on Jan. 11. At that point, Rogers said, it "fell off the table."

The report presented a complex economic, political and military strategy for the region that was not easily digested or presented to the public. Instead, Rogers said, two perceptions dominated. First, in part because of Kissinger's connection with the effort, it was widely perceived that the report viewed the region entirely in terms of the East-West conflict and that it proposed a military solution to problems in the region.

Second, the surprising degree of consensus was partially hidden as public attention focused on two dissenting footnotes. One, supported by Cisneros and Diaz-Alejandro, stated clear opposition to continued U.S. support for guerrillas fighting the Nicaraguan government—a point on which the report had been vague. The other, signed by Kissinger and others, took issue with the report's conclusion that the United States should require improvements in human rights conditions before granting aid to El Salvador. Rogers said that these dissents were secondary to the broad agreement and should have been perceived that way.

"The extraordinary educational experience of the commission was not transferred to the American people at large in any respect," Rogers said.

He also blamed premature leaks about the commission's findings in major newspapers. Most stories appearing before the report was made public were "misinformed" in some aspect, Rogers said, and it was difficult to alter the impression they left. He cited a front-page Sunday New York Times story, written by Seymour M. Hersh, that concentrated almost exclusively on military aspects of the commission's work. Rogers said the story was based on a consultant's draft that already had been rejected.

Rogers also faulted himself and the commission for not working hard enough beforehand to obtain Latin American support for the findings. When the Latin Americans did react, they were luke-warm at best and appeared to be reacting to press accounts rather than the report itself.

Rogers described himself as "depressed and very disappointed" that the commission's consensus was not adopted by Congress or the public. "There was very little realization of the complex and comprehensive nature of what the commission proposed," he said. Rather than debate long-range strategy for the region, he said, Congress became entangled in the details of whether to send aid to El Salvador before or after the election there and whether it should be $90 million or $60 million. Discussion about the economic program presented in the report has been sparse.

But the commission's report has had some impact, even if it has not created a national consensus. "Some people felt a commission on Central America could end the debate. I never believed that. But it has changed the debate in some positive ways," said Rep. Michael D. Barnes, D-Md., a vocal critic of Administration policy in the region who served as a counselor to the commission but who has since distanced himself from some of its findings.

Barnes, who chairs the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, said the report educated Americans about the region, emphasized economic difficulties at a time when most attention was being focused on military and political problems and made it clear that in El Salvador, there was significant right-wing violence. On this last point, he said, it was, in effect, a repudiation of the Administration's policies, which he said "downplayed" right-wing violence.

Over all, Barnes said, "The commission raised the level of the debate. We now have a more knowledgeable debate."

Administration officials put it somewhat differently. "If nothing else, it showed we were on the right track," said Otto J. Reich, the State Department's coordinator for public diplomacy for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Another official, deeply involved in shepherding the Administration's aid program through Congress, said, "It has provided an element of political cover for those that are going to vote in favor of the Administration."

Nevertheless, there has been some grumbling about both the report and the Administration's handling of legislation implementing its recommendations.

Sen. Christopher J. Dodd, D-Conn., a leading critic of Administration policy, for example, criticized the report because it gave little emphasis to the "Contadora" peace process, an effort by Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Panama to mediate the conflicts in Central America and arrange a regional peace agreement.

"Here we have 132 pages of how to bring peace and stability and hope to the Latin Americans in the 1980s," Dodd said during Senate debate in early April on the El Salvador emergency aid package. "We have the four most significant Latin American countries trying to work out an answer to that. We study the problem, and when we get through studying the problem, they find themselves in one paragraph of a 132-page report. We wonder why there is some degree of skepticism about our intention."

Richard E. Feinberg, who served in the State Department and on the National Security Council staff during the Carter Administration and now is a fellow at the Overseas Development Council, said the commission concentrated on "worst-case scenarios that are unlikely and that can be prevented with a reasonably sensible diplomacy. The report raises the specter of offensive Soviet military bases on the isthmus. Yet no evidence is presented that either the Soviet Union or Central American governments are considering such a move, or why it would be in their advantage to do so." Feinberg made the comments in a critique of the commission's report that was presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last February.

More often, criticism has concerned the Administration's implementation of the report. "They picked out what they wanted and ignored what they didn't want," said a Latin American specialist who worked with the commission in drafting the recommendations.

The notion of conditioning aid to El Salvador on human rights improvements and other reforms was strongly endorsed by the Kissinger commission, for example, but a prominent commission member has accused the Administration of ignoring the recommendation.

"One of the ways we were able to achieve a bipartisan consensus was through strong conditionality language, but they walked away from it," said former Democratic National Committee Chairman Strauss in an interview. As a result, he has refused to speak out in favor of the Administration's legislative proposal.

Strauss, Rogers and others have also criticized the Administration's handling of a proposal for a Central American Development Organization, which is a key, if largely unnoticed, element in the report. The organization, with members from all Central American nations and a U.S. chairman, was designed as a multilateral alternative to traditional government-to-government assistance programs, which many believed have not worked and lack credibility.

A fourth of U.S. aid recommended in the report was to be distributed through the organization, which would distribute it to countries in the region that had made commitments to improve social, political and economic conditions and to refrain from military attacks on neighbors.

But critics said the Administration weakened the proposal when it was submitted to Congress. According to Rogers, the designation of the administrator of the Agency for International Development as the chairman of the development organization was exactly what the commission did not want. "This transfers a multilateral effort into an aid mechanism. It can't carry out the goals set by the commission."

DIVIDED CONGRESS

The primary reason Reagan appointed the Kissinger commission, of course, was to try to create more support for his policies in Congress. Even though the commission strongly endorsed most of Reagan's policies, Congress is still divided on the issues, mostly along party lines.

There was a consensus of sorts in April when the Senate approved its emergency aid package to El Salvador, but those who voted against the Administration said the majority were merely afraid of being tagged with "losing" El Salvador. And whatever consensus existed was quickly overshadowed by the controversy over the mining of Nicaraguan harbors. Meanwhile, as Congress concentrates on national security questions, the commission's broader recommendations are much further back in the legislative pipeline.

The Administration packaged them in legislation entitled the Central American Democracy, Peace and Development Initiative Act of 1984, and the bill was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee. There, stripped of the fancy title, the recommendations became part of those committee's annual efforts to produce foreign aid legislation.

Unfortunately for the commissions and the Administration, procedural difficulties and disputes within the House and Senate committees have made it impossible to pass foreign aid bills in the past two years, and this year may prove no different. Without the omnibus aid bills, portions of the commission's recommendations must be tacked on to appropriations bills and continuing resolutions.

Meanwhile, as debate in Congress focuses on U.S. military involvement in Central America, the commission's report has had little influence. Administration critics contend that this is because the commission did not say anything that was new.

Said a congressional staff member who specializes in Latin America and is critical of the Administration's policy: "If the purpose of the commission was to create a consensus behind the idea that we have interests in the region, we already knew that. It was just reaffirming a preexisting consensus."

The real debate, said the staffer, is not over goals but strategy: how the United States should respond to the continued presence of Marxist-Leninist governments in the region.

That view was echoed by Rep. Ed Zschau, R-Calif., a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who recently visited El Salvador and who supports many of Reagan's policies. "I felt the Kissinger commission described the problems pretty accurately," Zschau said. "Where the debate focuses on is what to do to address them."

While it is true that the commission steered clear of policy details in an effort to avoid being seen as a shadow policy arm of the Administration, it did address several key strategy questions in broad terms. On El Salvador, for example, it came down strongly in favor of continued economic and military aid, contingent on human rights improvements there. And it concluded that it is in the interest of the United States to help El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica protect themselves from possible Nicaraguan aggression. The best way to do that, it said, is through a regional peace strategy, which it outlined in detail. Central to the commission's plan was the application of pressure on Nicaragua to end its support of the Salvadoran guerrillas and other leftist movements in the region.

NICARAGUA DEBATE

On the highly controversial question of U.S. military involvement in the region, and especially in support of the Nicaraguan rebels, known as "contras," the commission gave qualified support to the Administration's position.

Like the Administration, it viewed the political struggle in Nicaragua and El Salvador as a crisis that threatens U.S. national security. Moreover, it did not rule out the possibility of U.S. military activity in the region.

"Central America's crisis is our crisis," the report concluded on a note of unmistakable urgency. Like the Administration, a majority of commission members concluded that the existence of the Nicaraguan contras is having the positive effect of exerting pressure on the communist government there to negotiate an end to tensions in the region. On the question of using military force against Nicaragua, the report said: "Nicaragua must be aware that force remains an ultimate recourse."

But that urgency is not yet shared by Congress. Said Rep. Zschau, "The debate is hampered by what is reality" in Central America. "Some people in my district think the Salvadoran guerrillas represent the people," he said, adding that it isn't a view he shares.

Wright said that some members of Congress, unlike the Kissinger commission and the Administration, also sympathize with the Salvadoran rebels. "I don't think they consciously want to promote Marxism, but they romantically identify with the idea of a popular rebellion," he said.

But Wright said the Administration's support of the contras had hampered a consensus and noted that the commission did not conclude the United States had a right to disrupt the Sandinista regime.

Perhaps the most obvious reason for a lack of consensus is congressional distrust and suspicion about the ultimate aims and means of Administration policy. The Kissinger commission said use of U.S. troops should be regarded as a "last resort and only where there are clear dangers to U.S. security."

Judging from recent debate in Congress, Administration critics fear a major U.S. involvement is just around the corner. "We can see where this fellow is taking us," Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr., D-Del., said recently. "I believe the day after he is reelected you will see American troops fighting in Latin America."

Both Administration officials and some members of the Kissinger commission argue that election-year politics and the closed minds of their critics are making matters worse in Congress.

Some Members of Congress worry that a position of strong support for Reagan's policies could be used against them politically. A way for them to put "political space" between themselves and the Administration, an Administration official said, is to put strong conditions on aid requests.

"The biggest problem is that individuals in Congress have very closed minds and fixed ideas" about Central America, said Walsh. He said some liberals are reluctant to accept the commission's conclusion that the United States must act to prevent the spread of leftist governments in the region.

A State Department official who specializes in Latin America, when asked why the Kissinger report had only minimal impact, said many of the views in Congress are based on a perception of the region that is several years old.

Referring to Robert White, a former U.S. ambassador to El Salvador who is critical of continued U.S. support for the country, the official said, "Bob White is describing a Central America that no longer exists."

He cited as evidence land reform, the elections this spring and in 1982 and a steady reduction in the number of political murders in the past few years.

Ironically, before the disclosures about the mining of Nicaraguan harbors caused a storm of protest, Congress appeared to be moving toward a consensus in support of emergency aid to El Salvador. Administration officials were predicting success in the House as well as the Senate. "When you get people aside," said an Administration lobbyist, "there is not a great deal of disagreement about the threat posed to the countries in the region by the spread of leftist governments."

But even before the mining was disclosed, this official conceded that support for the contras was highly controversial.

Also working in the Administration's favor, it seemed, were the Salvadoran elections in late March. Jose Napoleon Duarte, a moderate, led all other candidates. Duarte is now favored to win the presidency in a runoff later this spring against Roberto D'Aubuisson, a right-wing candidate who has been linked to the country's death squads.

Barnes believes Duarte will win and get broader support for his government. Duarte is well regarded by Congress and has pledged to open a dialogue with anti-government rebels, Barnes noted.

It is not clear whether the furor over Nicaragua will permanently negate that progress, or whether the Administration will be able to turn the debate back in the direction of El Salvador. But it unquestionably has lost ground.

[From The New Republic, May 7, 1984]

REMEMBER THE MINE

After the humiliation in Lebanon, the United States might at least have allowed a decent interval to pass before again making itself foolish in the eyes of the world. Yet we were back at it again with the Nicaraguan mining fiasco, a misadventure from its clumsy conception through its abrupt demise. And again, the display of incompetence was bipartisan, initiated by the Republican Administration and compounded by members of both parties in Congress. The C.I.A. apparently could not resist going beyond its role of providing assistance to anti-Sandinista rebel groups fighting in Nicaragua. It had to get its very own piece of the action, so it concocted schemes to involve itself directly in raiding a Nicaraguan port and then in laying mines in Nicaraguan harbors. The operations risked discovery, risked accusations that the United States was violating international law, risked arousing the indignation of countries whose shipping might be damaged. Yet the C.I.A.

persuaded the President's national security adviser to walk its ideas into the Oval Office for approval, and he walked right out again with Mr. Reagan's O.K.

Congress's two intelligence oversight committees should have warned the Administration to drop its plans, but they didn't. Both were informed—in the case of the mining, the House's committee was told in January, the Senate's in March—but if the Members were listening to what they were being told, they did not focus on the implications of a direct C.I.A. operation. Senators Barry Goldwater and Daniel Patrick Moynihan protest that out of more than 130 pages of hearing transcript only two sentences referred to the mining, and did not mention the C.I.A.'s role. The Administration counters that its written submissions—as opposed to oral summaries—described and justified the operation in detail. If the C.I.A. was hiding, the Senate was not seeking. After Murphy's Law was fulfilled with its customary reliability in matters covert and American, Congress panicked—much as it did when the going got rough in Lebanon—and not only condemned the mining operation by lopsided margins in both Houses but also threatened to cut off funding for aid to the contras entirely. That move, if actually carried through when Congress returns from recess, would be at least as mindless as the mining itself.

We do not support aid to the contras with any relish. And in many respects we do not support the Reagan Administration's goals and methods in suplying aid. For example, the bulk of U.S. assistance goes to the rightist, Honduras-based Nicaraguan Democratic Force (F.D.N.), many of the field commanders of which were officers in Anastasio Somoza's brutal and justifiably detested National Guard. A far better prospect for winning the support of Nicaragua's people is the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance (ARDE) headed by the former anti-Somoza guerrilla leader Edén Pastora ("Comandante Cero"). Mr. Pastora's force has just captured a coastal town in southern Nicaragua, has been bolstered (according to news reports) by the defection of an entire battalion of Sandinista soldiers, and is planning to set up a government in exile. ARDE apparently does now receive C.I.A. help, but much less than the F.D.N.

The Administration's purposes in aiding the guerrilla groups are also suspect. ARDE has proposed a plan whereby antigovernment military activity would cease if the Sandinistas agree to hold fair elections this November—that is, if opposition candidates are guaranteed security from Sandinista toughs and the right to have their views heard free from censorship, and if the election is internationally supervised. The Reagan Administration has failed to endorse the ARDE proposal, leading to the suspicion that democracy in Nicaragua is not one of its primary goals. Indeed, there seems to be a split within the Administration over Nicaragua much as there was in Lebanon. One group, said to include Secretary of State Shultz, believes (sensibly, in our view) that aid to the contras should be designed to pressure Nicaragua into halting subversive activity against El Salvador and into entering serious peace negotiations with its neighbors. Another school of thought within the Administration—reportedly led by Secretary of Defense Weinberger and the C.I.A. director, William Casey—regards the very existence of a leftist Nicaragua as an intolerable menace to vital interests of the United States, and wants it expunged. In other words, there is agreement on means but not on ends. The result is a confusion of policy, as the covert war goes forward without any clear idea of what it is meant to accomplish. The immediate danger is that the Administration will fail to press convincingly for negotiations and peace, will arouse fears at home and abroad that the United States intends to send American troops into the region, and will encourage Congress to force an end to American activities in Central America. That could lead to an unpalatable choice between a regional Communist victory and the introduction of American troops.

Aiding the contras is not, by itself, a policy. But helping rebels, especially democratic rebels, with a view toward negotiations leading to some sort of regional settlement, is a policy, and a far better one than either letting the Sandinistas spread revolution or sending in U.S. troops. Could the Sandinista regime be won over with kindness, as all three Democratic Presidential candidates seem to propose? Something like that was tried by the Carter Administration after the new regime took power, and it didn't work. According to Alfonso Robelo Callejas, once a Somoza political prisoner, later a member of the Sandinistas' revolutionary junta, and now political director of ARDE, "It's possible that the United States pushed Castro into the arms of the Soviet Union, but that's not the case with the Sandinistas. The Carter Administration did everything possible to be friendly. It gave us $120 million in aid. It wanted to send a Peace Corps delegation until it was refused. On the other side, the Sandinistas had a secret defense agreement with Cuba from the beginning. That was the original foreign intervention. No government office when I was there was without a Cuban officer. The Cuban Ambassador sat at the table with the junta when it made its decisions."

Not much change in that department. According to both Administration and Congressional sources, there are now about eight thousand Cubans in Nicaragua, including three thousand military advisers installed in the Sandinista army of seventy-five thousand men, which is the largest army in Central America. From the outset the Sandinista regime has been dedicated to a "revolution without frontiers" in Central America, and has tried to destabilize not only El Salvador but also democratic Costa Rica. The Reagan Administration has failed to convince the American people and Congress with its evidence of Nicaragua's subversive activities, but a respected New York Times correspondent, Stephen Kinzer, reported on April 10 that European and Latin American diplomats based in Managua—including some whose governments have been critical of U.S. policy—now share the view that Nicaragua does indeed send military supplies to left-wing insurgents in El Salvador and provides training bases for them.

We believe that American policy toward Nicaragua must be one of both pressure and persuasion. To the extent that U.S.-aided forces tie down Nicaraguan forces and win popular support, the Sandinista regime will have to concern itself with its own security and cannot concentrate on making mischief across its borders. At the same time, the United States should make it clear that its goal is negotiation and political compromise both within Nicaragua and among the nations of Central America.

The trouble with the C.I.A.'s mining harbors aiding ex-Somocistas, and ignoring opportunities for negotiation is that they undermine America's credibility as a respecter of international law, a promoter of democracy, and a partner in peacemaking. However, for Congress to cut off aid to the contras in reaction to the mining fiasco also would damage America's credibility. It would mean—once again—that the United States had embarked on a policy that it would not follow through on, in the process encouraging people to fight for the freedom of their country and then abandoning them. The collapse of American policy in Lebanon was a nasty blow to American credibility. Either a Marxist-Leninist takeover of Central America or an American invasion would be far worse.

TRIBUTE TO ANSEL ADAMS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I pay tribute today to Ansel Adams—my friend, my colleague in addressing the great environmental issues of our times, and the greatest photographer of the American West that ever lived. Ansel Adams died this week. But as it can be said of all great lives, Ansel Adams has left America, and the world, with a legacy of camera art that has enriched us beyond words. Ansel Adams saw the West not only with his eyes, but with his soul. In the mountains, rivers, and valleys of the West he saw poetry, he saw truth, he saw wisdom, he saw grace. To Ansel, the terrain so gorgeously caught by his lens was not just Earth and sky, but spirit and vision. He saw wilderness as metaphor for the very fabric of our lives—mirroring, in our regard for it.

For over 50 years Ansel Adams traveled to every part of America and photographed the extraordinary beauty of our land, from Alaska to the Appalachians, from the Maine coast to California's Yosemite. I admired the work of Ansel Adams for many years. But I only got to know him personally in 1980 when we worked together on legislation to protect the Big Sur coast of California. At that time, Ansel was nearly 78 years old. He had been an ardent conservationist for more than 60 years. But in spite of his age, he was still one of the most forceful spokesmen for preservation of the natural environment I have ever met. He was still meeting new challenges, fighting for Big Sur, working to rid the Interior Department of James Watt.

Ansel Adams will be remembered for his life, and his art, and there was little difference in how he approached each. In his concern for preservation of America's wilderness, he mirrored his deep belief that we treat our physical setting not much different from how we treat our human family as a whole.

Ansel Adams cared deeply about the environment. He cared deeply about people. I and millions of Americans like me cared deeply about him and will deeply miss him.

IDA NUDEL'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, tomorrow is the 53d birthday of Ida Nudel, a woman well known to most of my Senate colleagues for her courage and devotion in assisting Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience and their families.

In 1978, Ida herself was convicted of alleged hooliganism for having placed on her balcony a sign reading "KGB, Let Me Go." She was sentenced to 4 years of internal exile in Siberia. Upon completion of her sentence in March 1982, she was denied permission to live in her Moscow home and wandered for 6 anguished months before she found a town which would grant her a residence permit, the small Moldavian town of Bendery. For the past year she has worked as an attendant at a local amusement park despite her chronic heart condition. When this has flared up, she has not been allowed to leave Bendery to seek adequate medical treatment. Her mail is largely kept from her.

Last December, Ida celebrated the hope of the Chanukah holiday with a few friends quietly in her home. Since January she has been threatened by the local office of the supervisory committee on rules of religion with arrest for practicing religion without registering and receiving permission to do so.

Ida has been trying since 1971 to rejoin her sister in Israel. What a splendid birthday present it would be if the mighty Soviet state decided it had more important and worthy business than the pestering of sick women, and let Ida finally emigrate to join her sister in Israel.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor of the committee substitute to H.R. 4325, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984, and that my name be included as part of the permanent RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM, MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 132

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending to the Congress today four separate bills to attack the pressing and urgent problem of international terrorism.

In 1983 more than 250 American citizens were killed in terrorist attacks, the largest number in any year of record. In the wake of the tragic deaths of our diplomats and Marines, as well as French and Israeli soldiers in Lebanon, in light of the cynical murder of four South Korean cabinet officers and many others by North Korean terrorists in Burma, and as a result of the attack on our embassy in Kuwait, it is essential that we act immediately to cope with this menace and to increase cooperation with other governments in dealing with this growing threat to our way of life.

In the past fifteen years, terrorism has become a frightening challenge to the tranquility and political stability of our friends and allies. During the past decade alone, there have been almost 6,500 terrorist incidents. Over 3,500 people have been killed in these incidents, and more than 7,600 people have been wounded. American citizens have been the victims of more than 2,500 terrorist incidents. Of special concern to me has been the toll inflicted on our diplomats and members of the Armed Forces. I am also deeply concerned, however, about attacks against other American citizens, who have been the victims of forty percent of the terrorist incidents over the past decade.

In recent years, a very worrisome and alarming new kind of terrorism has developed: the direct use of instruments of terror by foreign states. This "state terrorism," starkly manifest in the recent dreadful spectacles of violence in Beirut, Rangoon, and Kuwait, accounts for the great majority of terrorist murders and assassinations. Also disturbing is state-provided training, financing, and logistical support to terrorists and terrorist groups. These activities are an extremely serious and growing source of danger to us, our friends and our allies, and are a severe challenge to America's foreign policy.

The protection of our citizens, our official personnel, and our facilities abroad requires the close cooperation and support of other governments. We depend on other governments to provide security protection to more than 250 United States diplomatic and consular posts abroad. We look to other governments to maintain the normal protections of law in their countries for our citizens living and traveling abroad and for our business representatives and business properties.

In 1983, this Administration sent to the Congress legislation to enable us to provide adequate protection for foreign officials in the United States. Not only is their protection essential to meet the obligations of the United States under international treaties, it is equally important to demonstrate to officials of other governments that they can count on full protection while they are in the United States.

I also asked the Congress to provide legislative authority for anti-terrorism training, and in some cases equipment, to foreign governments in order to enhance cooperation with governments on whom we must depend for protection abroad. In my view, the more effective and knowledgeable local law enforcement officials and officers are, the greater will be their ability to provide the kind of security both they and we need. I commend the Congress for providing a two-year authorization for this program and an appropriation of $2.5 million for 1984.

I am determined that my Administration will do whatever is necessary to reduce the incidence of terrorism against us anywhere in the world and to see that the perpetrators of terrorist acts are brought to justice. I believe it is essential, however, that the Executive branch, the Congress and the public clearly understand that combatting terrorism effectively requires concerted action on many different fronts. With trained personnel, effective laws, close international cooperation, and diligence, we can reduce the risks of terrorism to our people and increase the deterrent to future acts of terrorism.

Dealing with the immediate effect of terrorist violence is only part of the challenge, however. We must also assure that the states now practicing or supporting terrorism do not prosper in the designs they pursue. We must assure that international forums, such as the United Nations, take a balanced and practical view of who is practicing terrorism and what must be done about it. We must assure that governments that are currently passive—or inactive—respecting this scourge understand the threat that terrorism poses for all mankind and that they cooperate in stopping it. We must work to assure that there is no role in civilized society for indiscriminate threatening, intimidation, detention, or murder of innocent people. We must make it clear to any country that is tempted to use violence to undermine democratic governments, destabilize our friends, thwart efforts to promote democratic governments, or disrupt our lives that it has nothing to gain, and much to lose.

The legislation I am sending to the Congress is an important step in our war against terrorism. It will send a strong and vigorous message to friend and foe alike that the United States will not tolerate terrorist activity against its citizens or within its bor-

ders. Our legislative package consists of four separate bills, each of which is outlined below.

Act for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Hostage-Taking

In September 1981, I signed the instrument ratifying the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, which was adopted by the United Nations on December 17, 1979. The convention has not been implemented domestically through enabling legislation, however. This legislation would implement the 1979 convention. It would amend the Federal kidnapping statute to provide for Federal jurisdiction over any kidnapping in which a threat is made to kill, injure, or continue to detain a victim in order to compel a third party to do or to abstain from doing something. This is a common ploy of terrorists. At the time I signed the instrument of ratification, the Congress was informed that the instrument of ratification would not be deposited with the United Nations until enabling legislation had been enacted. To demonstrate to other governments and international forums that the United States is serious about its efforts to deal with international terrorism, it is essential that the Congress provide the necessary enabling legislation, so that we may fully implement the Hostage-Taking Convention.

Aircraft Sabotage Act

The United States became a party to the Tokyo Convention, which covers certain offenses or acts committed aboard aircraft, in 1969 and the Hague Convention, concerning the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft, in 1971. The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation was adopted at Montreal in 1971 and ratified by the United States in November 1972. The Montreal Convention requires all states party to it to establish jurisdiction over certain offenses affecting the safety of civil aviation.

The Congress has approved enabling legislation for the first two of these conventions but not for the Montreal Convention. This means that certain criminal acts related to aircraft sabotage or hijacking are not adequately covered by United States law. This gap in the law sends a false signal to terrorists, and it also indicates to other governments that we may not be as serious as we should be, and as in fact we are, in our efforts to combat international terrorism. Action by the Congress now would provide the basis for long-overdue implementation of this convention.

Act for Rewards for Information Concerning Terrorist Acts

Current law authorizes the payment of rewards for information concerning domestic crimes but is outdated. Maximum rewards are inadequate, and terrorism is not specifically included as a basis for paying a reward. Moreover, there is no authority for the payment of rewards for information on acts of terrorism abroad.

The proposed legislation, which is modelled on an existing statute that allows payment of rewards for information concerning the unauthorized manufacture of atomic weapons, recognizes that payment of a reward in connection with acts of domestic terrorism raises a matter of law enforcement that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, but that the payment of a reward in connection with an act of terrorism abroad poses a political and foreign relations problem within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. By increasing the amounts of fines that may be paid, and by authorizing rewards for information concerning terrorist acts committed abroad, this Act would markedly improve the ability of the Departments of Justice and State to obtain information leading to the freeing of hostages or the capture of the perpetrators of acts of terrorism. In passing this legislation, the Congress can further underscore the intent of the United States to take every appropriate and necessary step to protect its citizens and property from terrorist acts.

Prohibition Against the Training or Support of Terrorist Organizations Act of 1984

The training and support of terrorist groups and activities by a number of countries has reached alarming proportions. In addition, the number of states now using terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy is both increasing and highly disturbing. The provision of assistance to countries that support terrorism and use terrorism as a foreign policy tool has thus become a matter of grave concern to national security. This act, together with revised and strengthened regulations that the Department of State intends to issue shortly, would enhance the ability of the Department of Justice to prosecute persons involved in the support of terrorist activities and of states using terrorism. Enactment of this legislation would be a strong contribution to the effort to combat terrorism.

We must recognize that terrorism is symptomatic of larger problems. We must dedicate ourselves to fostering modernization, development, and beneficial change in the depressed areas of the world. We must renew our commitment to promoting and assisting representative and participatory governments. We must attack the problem of terrorism as a crime against the international community whenever and wherever possible, but we must strive to eradicate the sources of frustration and despair that are the spawning places and nutrients of terrorism.

The legislative proposals that I am sending to the Congress today will, when approved, materially benefit our Nation and help us to assist friendly countries. I believe that they are extraordinarily important, and I strongly urge that the Congress undertake their timely consideration and speedy passage.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 26, 1984.*

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States announced that he had approved and signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

On April 13, 1984:

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 6, 1984, through May 13, 1984, as "National Tuberous Sclerosis Week."

S.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of July 20, 1984, as "National P.O.W./M.I.A. Recognition Day."

On April 17, 1984:

S. 1852. An act to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

S.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution commending the Historic American Buildings Survey, a program of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, the Library of Congress, and the American Institute of Architects.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:21 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 373. An act to provide comprehensive national policy dealing with national needs and objectives in the Arctic.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4170. An act to provide for tax reform, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5394. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2 of the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985, as passed the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no appropriated funds shall be used for the purpose of mining the ports or territorial waters of Nicaragua.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 488. A resolution electing the Honorable Jim Wright as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

WRIGHT) has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1186. An act to clear certain impediments to the licensing of the yacht Dad's Pad for employment in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 3867. An act to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, by impressing a trust on the commodities and sales proceeds of perishable agricultural commodities for the benefit of the unpaid seller, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5298. An act to provide for a White House Conference on Small Business; and

S.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing April 1, 1984, and ending March 31, 1985, as the "Year of Excellence in Education."

The enrolled bills and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 3 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 2460. An act to designate a Federal building in Augusta, Maine, as the Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building";

S. 2461. An act to designate a Federal building in Bangor, Maine, as the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building"; and

S. 2570. An act to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution; without amendment:

S. Con. 108. Concurrent resolution to honor Elmer E. Rasmuson.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4974. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1985.

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4974. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1985.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 25, 1984, the following bills were read the first and second times and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4170. An act to provide for tax reform, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5394. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2 of the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985, as passed the House of Representatives.

The following concurrent resolution was read; and placed on the calendar by unanimous consent:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no appropriated funds shall be used for the purpose of mining the ports or territorial waters of Nicaragua.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary reported that on today, April 26, 1984, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1186. An act to clear certain impediments to the licensing of the yacht Dad's Pad for employment in the coastwise trade; and

S.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing April 1, 1984 and ending March 31, 1985, as the "Year of Excellence in Education."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2601. An original bill to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1985, and for other purpose (Rept. No. 98-412).

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

H.R. 3578. A bill to establish the wilderness areas in Wisconsin (Rept. No. 98-413).

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 3921. A bill to establish additional wilderness areas in the White Mountain National Forest (Rept. No. 98-414).

H.R. 3960. A bill to designate certain public lands in North Carolina as addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System (Rept. No. 98-415).

By Mr. HELMS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

H.R. 4198. A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Vermont for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and to designate a National Recreation Area (Rept. No. 98-416).

By Mr. COHEN, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2300. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize multiyear contracts in certain cases (Rept. No. 98-417).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

H.J. Res. 478. A joint resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean."

S. Res. 312. A resolution to honor Commander Alphonse Desjardins, founder of La Caisse Populaire de Ste-Marie, Manchester, N.H.

S.J. Res. 261. A joint resolution to provide for the designation of the last week in June, 1984, as "Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Week."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bohdan A. Futey, of Ohio, to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the remainder of the term expiring September 30, 1985;

Alicemarie H. Stotler, of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California; and

Lloyd D. George, of Nevada, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Nevada.

By Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Chapman B. Cox, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself and Mr. TOWER):

S. 2598. A bill to designate various areas in the national forests in the State of Texas as components of the Wilderness Preservation System; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HELMS (by request):

S. 2599. A bill to simplify the administration, contain escalating costs and create greater flexibility in the operation of programs under the National School Lunch and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KASTEN:

S. 2600. A bill to reduce tax rates in a manner that is fair to all taxpayers and to simplify the tax laws by eliminating most credits, deductions, and exclusions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PACKWOOD (from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation):

S. 2601. An original bill to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. 2602. A bill to simplify the program of grants to the States for vocational education and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. EAGLETON, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. PELL, Mr. DENTON, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. PERCY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. EAST, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DOLE, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JEPSEN, and Mr. WILSON):

S. 2603. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for, and to revise the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. DENTON, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr.

DOLE, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. EAST, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HELMS, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NUNN, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. PERCY):

S.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. PELL, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. DODD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. CHILES):

S.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 2, 1984, as "National School Age Child Care Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SASSER, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 373. Resolution to seek the discontinuance of certain practices restricting the free flow of travel literature from the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BYRD)):

S. Res. 374. Resolution authorizing testimony and the production of documents and directing the Senate Legal Counsel to assist in the defense of "Republicbank, Lubbock, etc. et al. v. United States of America" and "The Travelers Insurance Corp. v. United States of America"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BAKER (for Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI)):

S. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to honor Elmer E. Rasmuson; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself and Mr. TOWER):

S. 2598. A bill to designate various areas in the national forests in the State of Texas as components of the Wilderness Preservation System; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

TEXAS WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to introduce today a bill to designate five wilderness areas in the national forests of east Texas. I am joined in this by my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. TOWER). This legislation is identical to H.R. 3788, which was approved yesterday by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This legislation will designate about 34,000 acres of Federal land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, thereby insuring that they will remain unspoiled for the enjoyment of future generations.

This bill has been a long time in the making. But the preservation of these unique and unspoiled areas is all the sweeter for the work that went into it.

I remember very well the long struggle to enact my legislation to establish the Big Thicket National Preserve, to save the last unspoiled remnants of one of this Nation's truly unique ecological areas. There is an immense satisfaction in visiting those areas now, in feeling that special feeling of timelessness that is associated only with great natural beauty, and in knowing that our children's children will be able to stand where we stand today and savor the same beauty that we enjoy.

This legislation will extend permanent protection to five more unique and beautiful ecological areas of east Texas. Almost all of these areas are now owned by the Federal Government as part of the national forest system. The sole exceptions to this are certain tracts associated with the Indian Mounds and Upland Islands wilderness areas. These tracts, which are needed to round out the borders of these wilderness areas, are now in private ownership. However, under the provisions of this bill they will be acquired, with the agreement of the current owners, by an exchange of other national forest lands of comparable value. Thus this legislation will not cost the taxpayers any money.

These five areas—Big Slough, Little Lake Creek, Turkey Hill, Upland Island, and Indian Mounds—represent a broad spectrum of east Texas ecosystems, from hardwood bottomland to upland pine forests, from a permanent spring pool where pioneer wagon trains once watered to the largest longleaf pine tree in the Nation. These areas show off the best and most beautiful of these habitats.

The Big Slough Wilderness in the Davy Crockett National Forest is an outstanding example of an east Texas hardwood bottomland ecosystem, and this area boasts the Texas champion water elm as well as a wide variety of other plants and animals.

Little Lake Creek Wilderness, in the Sam Houston National Forest, encompasses both upland pine forests and hardwood bottomlands.

The Turkey Hill Wilderness, in the Angelina National Forest, contains clear creeks fed by seep springs, with upland pine areas and bottomland hardwood areas of beech and magnolia as well as oak and hickory trees.

The Upland Island Wilderness, in the Angelina National Forest, is one of the most diverse of these areas. It contains the largest tree in the national forests of east Texas, a bald cypress, the largest longleaf pine tree in the Nation, rock columns, and a river suitable for canoeing.

The Indian Mounds Wilderness, in the Sabine National Forest, is the largest of these proposed wilderness areas, and it features a number of unique ecological groupings of plants as well as a permanent spring pool where pioneer wagon trains watered, fossil beds, and petrified rock.

All of these areas are relatively close to major population centers such as Dallas and Houston. The preservation of these unspoiled areas will help to meet the growing demand for recreational areas for our urban population and for tourists from other States while protecting these fragile resources for future enjoyment.

This legislation will also settle any possible questions about the roadless area review and evaluation process conducted by the U.S. Forest Service. It will specify that the remaining national forest lands in Texas that were studied under the RARE II process, but that are not designated as wilderness by this bill, will be released for normal multiple-use management by the Forest Service. Possible court challenges of the RARE II final environmental statement on these lands will be prohibited.

Mr. President, I am pleased that this compromise bill has been worked out, and I want to recognize two distinguished members of the Texas Congressional delegation, Congressman JOHN BRYANT and Congressman CHARLES WILSON, for their successful efforts to work out this compromise. Congressman BRYANT is only in his first term in the House of Representatives, but he has demonstrated his leadership abilities in introducing this legislation in the House and in shepherding it successfully through the long negotiations and committee consideration that have led to this point.

This legislation is supported by a wide range of environmental groups, sportsman's groups, and others who care deeply about preserving the natural resources that make east Texas such a unique and beautiful area. I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. TOWER) in introducing this bill, and I urge its enactment into law.●

● Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this bill designed to insure forever the spectacular beauty of some of east Texas' most impressive forest lands. The State of Texas' desire to designate the proposed areas as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System expresses our hope that generations of Texans to come, and all Americans alike, may one day experience the awesome natural drama of totally undisturbed wilderness lands. Indeed, it is important that Texas be allowed to

complete in this Congress the original congressional intent of the Wilderness Act of 1964 and offer more recent wilderness studies such as RARE II in order to preserve this especially unique forest land in the eastern portion of our State.

One cannot comprehend the splendor of these pristine wilderness areas by mere description. Few realize the bountiful variety of flora and fauna that are sustained in the piney woods of east Texas, an area where I spent much of my childhood.

The five areas from which the wilderness land will be designated—Graham Creek, Turkey Hill, Indian Mounds, Big Slough, and Little Creek—contain a spectrum of natural wonders. From beaver ponds to rich seabeds of fossils 25 million years old, and other historic sites, these forest lands also nurture a variety of hardwoods including a unique and rare mature beech-magnolia forest. Many species of wildflowers cover the forest floor, and one may often encounter rare orchids. The varieties of birds, insects, reptiles, and plant life comprise a complex ecosystem that is a natural laboratory for scientists and nature enthusiasts alike.

Since the turn of the century, man's appreciation of uninhabited lands has necessarily changed. The profusion of populated areas has mandated the conservation and preservation of resources which sustain us economically and esthetically. Therefore, in designating these 34,000 acres as wilderness, we must be prudent. We must maintain a balance of these desired goals, weighing cost against benefit.

To set aside as wilderness lands less than 5 percent of the national forest lands in Texas, which are multiple-use lands, is, in my view, a modest proposal. The only other wilderness areas in Texas are in the Guadalupe Mountains of west Texas, which are not easily accessible to most Texans. The east Texas areas are located adjacent to the most populous centers of our State, therefore, magnifying the recreational potential of these wilderness areas. Even hunting, fishing, and camping will be enhanced by protection of the national wildlife habitat. Only clearcutting and roadbuilding will be prohibited; yet, this bill will allow certain soil conservation and watershed protection benefits to occur. Mineral interests will continue to be held by private sources. Furthermore, it should be noted that management costs of these wilderness areas will be low because wilderness simply manages itself.

Mr. President, the opportunity to preserve a portion of the natural heritage of our country in the State of Texas is one that we in the Senate have a responsibility to seize. To protect the delicate balance of life in these forest lands is to defend creation in its purest and most glorious form. Indeed, we would be vain to deny the knowledge of such a natural heritage to generations to come.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile measure.●

By Mr. HELMS (by request):

S. 2599. A bill to simplify the administration, contain escalating costs, and create greater flexibility in the operation of programs under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1984

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, today I introduce on behalf of the administration legislation to extend and reform various child nutrition programs.

Five programs expire this year, and the administration is recommending the reauthorization of four of these.

The administration has made very modest proposals which would result in relatively small savings, approximately $48.7 million in fiscal year 1985. Frankly, I feel that further examination is needed into the operation of these programs. I have offered legislation—S. 1994 and S. 2545—which would propose additional changes, particularly with respect to increasing the accountability and targeting of the day care home portion of the child care food program and the summer food service program.

Nonetheless, the administration has done a commendable job of identifying areas for improvement. The proposals are especially aimed to improve the administrative aspects of these programs at the Federal, State, and local levels.

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is scheduled to begin markup deliberations on all child nutrition legislation, including the administration's bill, beginning next Wednesday, May 2.

Obviously, the committee has a challenge ahead of it in attempting to deal with these and other popular programs in a fiscally responsible and realistic way during these times of fiscal restraint.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of transmittal from Deputy Secretary of Agriculture Dick Lyng, a section-by-section summary, and the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1984.

MODIFICATIONS TO STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE FUNDING

SEC. 2. Section 7(e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by—

(a) striking in the first sentence "funds made available" and inserting in lieu thereof "an amount of funds not to exceed 10 percent of the funds provided"; and

(b) striking in the second sentence "shall" the third time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "may".

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE FUNDS FOR INCOME VERIFICATION COSTS

SEC. 3. Section 7(a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by—

(a) striking paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Of the remaining funds appropriated under this section each fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve not in excess of $3,000,000 for use by States in funding costs associated with verification of household eligibility under section 9(b)(2)(C) of the National School Lunch Act. Such funds may be made available to State agencies in amounts the Secretary determines necessary and shall only be used to reimburse food stamp agencies for the costs incurred in providing to eligible households a document which confirms that the household currently participates in the Food Stamp Program."; and

(b) in paragraph (4), inserting after the phrase "under this section" the following phrase ", excluding any funds reserved by the Secretary under paragraph (3) of this section,".

EXTENSION OF THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. Section 7(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking "1984," and inserting in lieu thereof "1985,".

INDEPENDENT SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FACTOR FOR REDUCED-PRICE LUNCHES AND BREAKFASTS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 11(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) striking "98.75" and inserting in lieu thereof "108.75";

(B) striking "40 cents less than the special-assistance factor for free lunches" and inserting in lieu thereof "68.75 cents"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A) striking "1982" and inserting in lieu thereof "1984"; and

(3) in paragraph (3) striking in subparagraph (A)(ii) "factor for" and inserting in lieu thereof "factors for free and reduced-price".

(b) Section 9(b)(3) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "The maximum price charged for a reduced-price lunch shall be the difference between the special-assistance factor for free lunches and the special-assistance factor for reduced-price lunches as established under section (11)(a) (2) and (3) of this Act, rounded to the nearest 1 cent increment.".

(c) Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by—

(1) in subparagraph (1)(B)—

(A) striking in the first sentence, "57" and inserting in lieu thereof "62.75";

(B) in the second sentence inserting "32.75 cents", after "shall be" and striking the remainder of the sentence;

(C) striking in the third sentence "8.25" and inserting in lieu thereof "9.00"; and

(2) amending subparagraph (1)(C) to read as follows: "The maximum price charged for a reduced-price breakfast including a breakfast for which payment is made under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, shall be the difference between the reimbursement for free breakfasts and the reimbursement for reduced-price breakfasts as established under this section and section (11)(a)(3) of the Na-

tional School Lunch Act, rounded to the nearest 1 cent increment."; and

(3) amending subparagraph (2)(B) to read as follows:

"(B) The maximum payment for each such free and reduced-price breakfast shall be 75.50 cents and 45.50 cents respectively. The payments specified in the preceding sentence shall be adjusted on an annual basis each July 1 to the nearest one-fourth cent in accordance with changes in the series for food away from home of the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor for the most recent twelve month period for which such data are available."; and

(4) striking subparagraph (2)(C).

TERMINATION OF THE SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

SEC. 6. Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act is repealed.

TERMINATION OF THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 7. (a) Section 17 of the National School Lunch Act is repealed.

(b) Section 8 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking in the third sentence—

(1) "any child care institution as defined in section 17 of this Act or"; and

(2) ": *Provided*, That no institution that is not otherwise eligible to participate in the program under Section 17 of this Act shall be deemed so eligible because of this sentence".

NON-SCHOOL FOOD PROGRAM GRANT

SEC. 8. A new section 17 is inserted in the National School Lunch Act as follows:

"NON-SCHOOL FOOD PROGRAM GRANT

"SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide nutrition assistance to children.

"Authorization for Appropriations

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section, $443.7 million for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989.

"Allotments

"(c)(1) From the amounts appropriated under subsection (b) for any fiscal year and available for allotment under this subsection, the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the available amounts for that fiscal year as the amounts provided by the Secretary under the provisions of law listed in paragraph (2) to the State and entities in the State for fiscal year 1983 bore to the total amount appropriated for such provisions of law for fiscal yar 1983. The Secretary may reduce a State's allotment as determined under the preceding sentence taking into account funds which were provided by the Secretary of Agriculture to Head Start Programs through the Child Care Food Program (referenced in paragraph 2) but which are available to the Department of Health and Human Service for Head Start Programs.

"(2) The provisions of law referred to in paragraph (1) are the following provisions of law as in effect on September 30, 1983:

"(A) The authority for grants for the Summer Food Service Program for Children under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act.

"(B) The authority for grants for the Child Care Food Program under section 17 of the National School Lunch Act.

"Payments to States

"(d)(1) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make payments, in accordance with section 203 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4213), to each State from its allotment under subsection (c).

"(2) Any amount made available to a State for a fiscal year and remaining unobligated by the State at the end of such year shall remain available for the next fiscal year to such State for the purposes for which the payment was made.

"Use of Payments

"(e)(1) The amounts paid to a State under this section may be used only for costs related to the provision of nutrition assistance to children, primarily from low-income households. Such costs may include planning, administration, education, technical assistance, evaluation and State administrative costs associated with providing such assistance.

"(2) A State may not use amounts paid to it under this section to—

"(A) purchase or improve land, purchase, construct, or permanently improve (other than minor remodeling) any building or other facility or purchase major equipment, other than food service equipment, or

"(B) satisfy any requirement for the expenditure of non-Federal funds as a condition for the receipt of Federal funds.

The Secretary may waive the limitation contained in paragraph (A) upon the request of a State if the Secretary finds that there are extraordinary circumstances to justify the waiver and that granting the waiver will assist in carrying out this section.

"Intended Use Report

"(f)(1) In order to received payment for each fiscal year under subsection (d) of this section each State shall develop and submit to the Secretary an intended use report. The State shall provided for public input during development of the report. The report shall contain the following information concerning funds received under this section:

"(A) a statement of the State's goals and objectives in using funds,

"(B) a description of the types of activities to be carried out under this section,

"(C) the geographic areas which will be served,

"(D) the characteristics of individuals that will be served including income or age limit eligibility criteria, and

"(E) the criteria for the method of fund disbursement.

"Reports and Audits

"(g)(1) Each State shall prepare an annual report on its activities under this section. The report shall contain an analysis of the degree to which the activities carried out by the State compared to the goals and objectives set forth in the intended use report submitted for that fiscal year under subsection (f) of this section.

"(2) Each State shall establish fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursal of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State for use under this section.

"(3) Each State shall obtain financial and compliance audits of any grant funds which the State receives under this section. Such audits shall be made public within the State on a timely basis. The audits shall be conducted at least every two years by an organization or person independent of any agency administering activities under this section. The audits shall be conducted in accordance with the Comptroller General's Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Progams, Activities and Functions.

"(4) Each State shall, after being provided by the Secretary with adequate notice and opportunity for a hearing within the State, repay to the Secretary amounts found not to have been expended in accordance with the requirements of this section. If such repayment is not made, the Secretary shall, after providing the State with adequate notice and opportunity for a hearing within the State, offset such amounts against the amount of any allotment to which the State is or may become entitled under this section.

"(5) The State shall make copies of the reports required by this subsection available for public inspection within the State.

"Nondiscrimination

"(h)(1) For the purpose of applying the prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of age under the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, on the basis of handicap under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, on the basis of sex under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, or on the basis of race, color, or national origin under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, programs and activities that receive Federal financial assistance under this section are considered to be programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

"(2) No person shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that receives Federal financial assistance under this section; provided, however, that this subsection shall not be read as prohibiting any conduct or activities permitted under the Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

"(3) Whenever the Secretary finds that a State, or an entity that has received a payment from an allotment to a State under subsection (c), has failed to comply with a provision of law referred to in paragraph (1), with paragraph (2), or with an applicable regulation (including one prescribed to carry out paragraphs (1) and (2)), the Secretary shall notify the chief executive officer of the State and shall request the securing of compliance. If within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed sixty days, the chief executive officer fails or refuses to secure compliance, the Secretary may—

"(A) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted,

"(B) exercise the powers and functions provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, or section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as may be applicable, or

"(C) take such other action as may be provided by law.

"(4) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (3)(A), or whenever there is reason to believe that a State or an entity is engaged in a pattern or practice in violation of a provision of law referred to in paragraph (1) or in violation of paragraph (2), the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate district court of the United States for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief."

TERMINATION OF NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM

SEC. 9. Section 19 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is repealed.

ELIMINATION OF DIRECT FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 10. (a) Section 6(b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking—

(1) the third sentence; and

(2) in the fourth sentence "and the Secretary in the case of private schools in which the Secretary directly administers the school lunch program,".

(b) Section 10 of the National School Lunch Act is repealed.

(c) Section 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is repealed.

(d) Section 7(a)(6) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is repealed.

EXTENSION OF THE COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

SEC. 11. Section 14(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1985".

CHANGE IN LUNCH COMMODITY ALLOTMENT FORMULAS

SEC. 12. Section 6(e) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof as follows: "The amount of commodity assistance or cash-in-lieu of commodity assistance given under this section shall be determined by multiplying the national average value of donated foods by the number of lunches served in the preceding school year."

EXTENSION OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN (WIC)

SEC. 13. Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking out—

(a) in subsection (c)(2) "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1985"; and

(b) in subparagraph (g) the word "and" after the phrase "year ending September 30, 1983," and inserting "and $1,254,288,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985," after the phrase "year ending September 30, 1984,"; and

(c) in subparagraph (h)(2) striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1985".

ELIMINATION OF THE REALLOCATION PROVISIONS FOR THE WIC PROGRAM

SEC. 14. Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by—

(a) in subsection (h)(10), striking in the second sentence "When reallocating funds, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The"; and

(b) in subsection (i), striking in the second sentence ", except that the Secretary shall reallocate funds periodically if the Secretary determines that a State agency is unable to spend its allocation".

CHANGE IN WIC PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COST ALLOWANCE

SEC. 15. Section 17(h)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 as amended by this Act is further amended by—

(a) striking "20" both times it appears in that paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "18", and

(b) striking the last sentence of the paragraph.

ELIMINATION OF SPECIAL ASSISTANCE CERTIFICATION ALTERNATIVES

SEC. 16. Section 11(a)(1) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out the second, third and fourth sentences.

ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. (a) Section 7(a)(1) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence, "(excluding State revenues derived from the operation of the program) appropriated or used specifically for program purposes" and inserting in lieu thereof, "(excluding revenues derived from the operation of school food services for children) appropriated or used specifically for providing school food services for children".

(b) Section 14(d) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

(c) Section 21 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(d) Sections 18, 19, 20, and 22 (as added by Public Law 95-627) of the National School Lunch Act are repealed.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 18. (a) Section 3 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out the first sentence ", other than sections 13, 17, and 19".

(b) Section 6(a)(2) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking "section 11 and 13" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11".

(c) Section 11(a)(3)(A) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking subparagraph (iv).

(d) Section 6 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking "through 7" and inserting in lieu thereof ", 4 and 7".

(e) Section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended by this Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (a)(1) by striking ", 11 and 17" and inserting in lieu thereof "and 11"; and

(2) in paragraph (a)(2) by striking "programs authorized under section 13 or" and inserting in lieu thereof "program authorized under section"; and

(3) in paragraph (a)(4) by inserting after "National School Lunch Act" the words ", except for section 17 of that Act,"; and

(4) by striking in subsection (a)(5) "and under section 13(k)(1) of the National School Lunch Act"; and

(5) by striking in subsection (b) "4, 11, and 17" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 and 11"; and

(6) in paragraph 7(d) by adding the word "residential" before "child care institutions"; and

(7) in paragraph (h) striking "13" and inserting in lieu thereof "17".

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 19. Effective dates for the provisions of this Act are as follows:

(a) Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 14 shall be effective on October 1, 1984; and

(b) The remaining Sections shall be effective upon the enactment of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1984.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for the consideration of Congress is a draft bill "To simplify the administration, contain escalating costs and create greater flexibility in the operation of programs under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966." This draft legislation will contribute to important goals shared by the Administration and Congress to streamline programs and simplify administrative requirements and procedures, to decrease error and the potential for fraud, to contain escalating program costs, and to enhance State flexibility. The Department recommends enactment of this legislation.

The draft bill would amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to consolidate two restrictive categorical programs, the Summer Food Service Program for Children and the Child Care Food Program, into a Non-School Food Program Grant designed to permit States the maximum flexibility in designing programs to meet the particular needs of their low-income children. The grant would be funded at the Fiscal Year 1985 current services level for the two programs it would replace. This level does not include the $80.4 million for nutrition funding for Head Start grantees which will be provided by the Department of Health and Human Services. This change is proposed in order to simplify administration of the Head Start Program both for the Federal government and for grantees. The Nutrition Education and Training Program is being proposed for termination since this program has served its intended purpose.

Up to $3,000,000 would be authorized for State Administrative Expenses (SAE) to reimburse food stamp agencies for the costs incurred in providing to eligible households a document which confirms that the household currently participates in the Food Stamp Program. For food stamp households, this document can be used to meet the income verification requirements of the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs. In addition, changes would be made to the SAE provisions which would prevent a State from retaining unobligated funds in excess of its foreseeable needs. The Secretary also would be given the discretion to reallocate funds to States which can demonstrate the ability to efficiently and effectively use funds in excess of their formula allocation.

The amendments would extend the operation of the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, State Administrative Expenses, and the Commodity Distribution Program. These extensions are for one year, since all three of the programs currently are the subject of studies and evaluations which may pinpoint changes to be made in the programs.

The amendments would make changes in the funding of administrative costs for the WIC Program to promote greater efficiency in the operation of the Program. These changes include: 1) lowering the percent of funds available for administrative costs from 20 to 18 percent of the funds provided, 2) eliminating the reallocation provisions and 3) deleting the specific requirement to spend one-sixth of the administrative grant for nutrition education.

This legislative package does not specifically address the expiring requirement to maintain a programmed level of commodity assistance for the Elderly Feeding Program. The Department of Health and Human Services has proposed legislation which would amend the National School Lunch Act and assign administrative responsibility for this aspect of program operation to the Administration on Aging (AOA). This Department would continue to purchase commodities at the request of AOA. The change would simplify program administration by centralizing administration in one Federal agency.

The amendments in the bill would provide an estimated Fiscal Year 1985 savings of $48.7 million. This will enable us to make essential reductions in Federal expenditures and focus resources to assure service of free and reduced-price lunches to the most needy children.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. LYNG,
Acting Secretary.

CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1984—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

MODIFICATIONS TO STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE FUNDING

SEC. 2. This section would prevent a State from retaining funds that the State has not obligated and which are in excess of its foreseeable needs by limiting the amount of unobligated funds which a State may retain at the end of the fiscal year. The limit would be established at a level equal to ten percent of the funds provided. The section also gives the Secretary discretion in the matter of reallocating funds to those States which can demonstrate the ability to efficiently and effectively use funds in excess of their formula allocation.

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE FUNDS FOR INCOME VERIFICATION COSTS

SEC. 3. Since implementation of the income verification requirements in the school lunch program, savings have accrued to the Federal government. This proposal would help defray locally borne costs of verification by reimbursing the administrative costs incurred in providing a certificate of food stamp participation to food stamp households which can be used in the school lunch vertification process.

EXTENSION OF THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. This section amends Section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to extend the authorizing authority for the appropriation of funds to pay State Administrative Expenses for a year. We intend to thoroughly examine the current SAE formula, the usage of funds and provisions for carryover, and this may lead to recommended alternative methods for SAE reimbursement. The current authorization expires on September 30, 1984.

INDEPENDENT SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FACTOR FOR REDUCED-PRICE LUNCHES AND BREAKFASTS

SEC. 5. Section 11(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended to create a separate special-assistance factor for reduced-price lunches with a base of 68.75 cents on July 1, 1983. This separate factor will be adjusted annually based on the change in the Consumer Price Index for food away from home. Because the current law ties the reduced-price subsidy to the free subsidy (it is currently 40 cents less for lunches and 30 cents less for breakfasts), reduced-price meals currently receive a higher increase when an adjustment for inflation is made. Under this proposal, the maximum price for reduced-price meals would not remain fixed at 40 cents for lunches and 30 cents for breakfasts. Instead, these prices would rise in response to the difference between free and reduced-price meal subsidies and in effect would experience the same adjustments to account for increases in inflation. Section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is similarly amended to create a July 1, 1983 subsidy base of 32.75 cents for regular reduced-price breakfasts and 45.50 cents for severe need reduced-price breakfasts. These independent subsidy bases for reduced-price meals would produce a cost savings of $6.7 million in Fiscal Year 1985.

TERMINATION OF THE SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

SEC. 6. Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act is repealed thus eliminating the Summer Food Service Program for Children. (See Sec. 8. below.)

TERMINATION OF THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 7. The Child Care Food Program is terminated by the repeal of section 17 of the National School Lunch Act. (See SEC. 8. below.)

NONSCHOOL FOOD PROGRAM GRANT

SEC. 8. This section creates a new Non-School Food Program Grant. A new Section 17 is inserted, which is described below.

The Administration proposes to consolidate the categorical Summer Food Service and Child Care Food Programs by replacing them with a Non-School Food Program Grant. This grant will substantially increase State flexibility and achieve two major effects. First, administrative efficiencies will be realized through a reduction in program complexity. Second, States will be able to tailor programs under this grant to meet the specific needs of their State's population. Funds would be targeted to meet the food assistance needs of children primarily from low-income households. Funding for this consolidation of programs has been set at the current services level in 1985, thus no savings to the Federal government were included in the President's Fiscal Year 1985 Budget. However, savings have been included in out-year cost estimates because the proposal stabilizes the funding level. The Department believes the grant approach will simplify program administration and will reduce cost. Savings after Fiscal Year 1985, therefore, would rise from $47 million in 1986 to over $233 million in 1989.

Subsection (b) authorizes, for each of the Fiscal Years 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, $443.7 million for carrying out the purposes of Section 17. This funding level does not include funds for food service in Head Start Programs because these meals will be funded by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Subsection (c) requires the Secretary to allot to States from available appropriated funds, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total appropriated funds as the States' allotment under the Summer Food Service Program and the Child Care Food Program for Fiscal Year 1983 bore to the total funds appropriated for those programs. The Secretary will maintain authority to adjust the allotment level based on the funds transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services for the Head Start Program. For example, the Department may adjust a State's grant level based on the fact that a large portion of their Child Care Food Program funds were directed to Head Start Programs.

Subsection (d) provides that the Secretary shall make payments to States from the allotments determined under subsection (c). Any funds unobligated by the States at the end of a fiscal year are to remain available to a State for the next fiscal year, for the same purposes as originally given.

Subsection (e) limits the use of funds to States under Section 17 to payment for the provision of nutrition assistance to children and related activities such as planning, administration, education, technical assistance and evaluation. States may not use funds given under Section 17 to (1) purchase or improve land, or purchase, construct, or permanently improve buildings or facilities, or purchase major equipment, except food service equipment; or (2) satisfy any requirement for the expenditures of non-federal funds as a prerequisite for receipt of Federal funds.

The Secretary may, upon demonstration by the State that extraordinary circumstances exist, waive the restrictions regarding land purchase or construction.

Subsection (f) requires each State, as a prerequisite to receipt of funds under Section 17, to submit an intended use report to the Secretary. The report must contain a statement of the State's goals and objectives in using funds, a description of the types of activities to be carried out, the geographic areas and characteristics of individuals to be served, and the criteria for and method of fund disbursement.

Subsection (g) requires States to prepare annual reports concerning activities carried out under Section 17. These reports will describe how the State has met the goals and objectives established in their intended use report.

States are required to establish and maintain fiscal control and fund accounting procedures to ensure proper disbursal of and accounting for Federal funds.

States are also required to conduct biennial financial and compliance audits of activities under Section 17. These State audits are to be conducted by an entity independent of the administering agency and in accordance with the Comptroller General's standards.

After notice and opportunity for a hearing, a State must repay to the Secretary amounts found not to have been expended in accordance with the requirements of Section 17. If repayment is not made, the Secretary may offset the amount due from funds due the State under subsection (d).

The State must make copies of the required reports and audits available for public inspection within the State.

Subsection (h) makes clear that activities and programs funded under this section are "receiving Federal financial assistance" for purposes of Federal legislation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age, handicap, sex, race, color and national origin. The subsection also establishes the procedure the Secretary is to follow in assuring State compliance with the nondiscrimination provision.

TERMINATION OF THE NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM

SEC. 9. Section 19 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is repealed in order to terminate the Nutrition Education and Training Program. This program, authorized in 1977, originally provided seed money for the States to begin or augment existing nutrition education programs. These programs are now well established and the Federal purpose has been served. Now the States should be given the opportunity to determine and implement their own nutrition education programs. This proposal will save $5 million in Fiscal Year 1985.

ELIMINATION OF DIRECT FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 10. This provision would repeal the legislative requirement that the Food Nutrition Service (FNS) operate Child Nutrition Programs, including the Special Milk Program, in States which do not administer these programs through their own agencies. FNS Regional Offices currently operate portions of the school nutrition programs in 14 States, the Child Care Food Program in nine States and the Summer Food Service Program in 17 States where State law or

policy prevent State agencies from doing so. The burden of administering these programs, added to the Regional Offices' normal duties, creates an immense workload for these offices. Since States are responsible for making Federal programs available to their citizens, it is an inappropriate use of Federal resources to act as a State agency in administering these programs. Finally, this action would resolve some of the ambiguities created by having differing rules for States and Regions with respect to audit closures, report submission deadlines, and other administrative activities.

EXTENSION OF THE COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

SEC. 11. This section would amend Section 14 of the National School Lunch Act to extend for a year the authorization for funding to provide agricultural commodities to programs operating under the National School Lunch Act, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The current authorization expires on September 30, 1984.

CHANGE IN LUNCH COMMODITY ALLOTMENT FORMULAS

SEC. 12. This provision stipulates that commodity allotments be based on the actual number of meals served during the previous school year instead of an estimate of the number of meals that will be served. This change will enable the Secretary to establish initial commodity entitlements for each State at the beginning of the year based on actual data reported by States. These initial allocations would be revised slightly to reflect final meal service reports. States will have greater assurances of the level of commodities they will receive during the year and, therefore, will not be forced to revise their anticipated commodity levels because the Department changes its projection of the annual number of meals during the year.

EXTENSION OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN (WIC)

SEC. 13. This provision extends the program for one year. Currently, the WIC Program is the subject of three major research efforts which may identify desirable changes in the program's design. Thus, extension of the program for a longer period of time is unadvisable at this time.

ELIMINATION OF THE REALLOCATION PROVISIONS FOR THE WIC PROGRAM

SEC. 14. This section would eliminate the provisions which require regular reallocation of program funds. The WIC Program has stabilized over the years and is not experiencing problems with unspent funds. Rather, States are spending according to plans established at the beginning of each fiscal year. By eliminating the reallocation provisions, States will be assured of their annual grant and the Agency will not be required to perform reallocations of the ever decreasing pot of excess funds.

CHANGE IN THE WIC PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COST ALLOWANCE

SEC. 15. This provision will reduce from 20 percent to 18 percent the percentage of total authorized funds for the WIC Program that will be available for State and local administrative costs. This change will serve to encourage efficiency in the administration of this program. The program has been operating on a stable basis for several years so States are in a good position to strengthen their operating processes to make them more efficient. As a further help, the Department also proposes to remove the requirement that States spend one-sixth of these funds for nutrition education. A requirement to provide some form of nutrition education would be retained.

ELIMINATION OF SPECIAL ASSISTANCE CERTIFICATION ALTERNATIVES

SEC. 16. This proposal amends Section 11(a) of the National School Lunch Act by removing the two special assistance certification alternatives which based assistance on prior year free and reduced-price lunch eligibility. This eliminates the authority for some schools to accept applications and determine eligibility once every two years where 80 percent of the children were eligible for free or reduced-price meals or once every three years where all meals were served free. Elimination of this authority is consistent with the emphasis on verification of applications to prevent fraud and abuse. These are the schools which will benefit most from annual certification and verification procedures to ensure correct applications.

ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. This section amends and repeals several sections of the National School Lunch Act to eliminate various obsolete provisions.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 18. This section amends the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to delete references to the Summer Food Service and Child Care Food Programs.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 19. The effective dates for the individual provisions are specified to be consistent with the intent of the legislation.●

By Mr. KASTEN:

S. 2600. A bill to reduce tax rates in a manner that is fair to all taxpayers and to simplify the tax laws by eliminating most credits, deductions, and exclusions; to the Committee on Finance.

FAIR AND SIMPLE TAX ACT OF 1984

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the fair and simple tax plan. This plan is also being introduced in the House of Representatives by my friend and colleague JACK KEMP. We believe that an overhaul of our tax system is long overdue and offer this plan as an alternative. It is fair, simple, and yet still provides incentives for saving, investment, risk-taking activities, and economic growth.

The Kasten-Kemp plan combines the best features of a flat tax system—a simple low tax rate applied to all taxpayers—with special provisions for wage earners, families with children, savers, and homeowners. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to offer a brief summary of the fast plan. The basic provisions are:

First, it cuts the top marginal tax rate by half—to 25 percent. The result is that the Federal Government will not take more than 25 cents of every dollar earned;

Second, it simplifies the Tax Code by eliminating many of the tax preferences—deductions, exclusions and credits—in the Tax Code. But, it does keep the current tax treatment for mortgage interest, charitable contributions, property taxes, IRA's, and the expenses of earning income;

Third, it is oriented toward families by doubling the personal exemptions and increasing the zero bracket amount. The result is that a family of four would not pay tax on the first $14,375 of its income. Currently, the same family does not pay tax on the first $8,936 of yearly income. This is $5,439 more tax-free income than a family has today;

Fourth, it does not require the American taxpayers to pay any more to the Treasury than they do now. The poorest families will pay no tax, and lower- and middle-income families will not be paying higher taxes;

Fifth, it protects taxpayers from inflation by maintaining indexing of the personal exemptions and the zero bracket amount. The capital gains base is also indexed, so that only real income gains are taxed; and,

Sixth, it provides incentives for savings and investment by maintaining the current tax treatment for IRA's, Keogh's pensions, and depreciation.

The American people deserve a Tax Code that is simpler. Two weeks ago, taxpayers all across the country were facing the last minute crisis of filing their Federal tax returns. As we all know, this is no easy task. There are over 5,105 pages in the Internal Revenue Code, about 10,000 pages of IRS interpretations of that Code, and we have just adopted a new tax amendment that runs over 1,300 pages. The House of Representatives has also adopted a tax bill that is just as long. And, by the time Congress finishes its seventh major tax bill in 10 years, the IRS will be more confused than it is now. In fact, the IRS admits that its own tax advice is wrong in 3 percent of all cases. This is not the fault of the IRS. It is the fault of years of tax legislation.

Over the years, inflation and the progressive Tax Code have produced a climate in this country that encourages Americans to continue to consume, rather than save and invest. This consumption comes at the expense of economic growth and productivity. Theoretically, our progressive tax system raises Government revenue in a fair and equitable manner. In reality, the steep and graduated tax schedule provides an incentive to avoid activities that are subject to high taxes—activities such as work, saving, investing, and risk taking.

The present tax system has also provided great incentive for taxpayers to avoid taxes both through legal loopholes and blatant tax evasion. In fact, depending on their sources of income and their opportunities to take advantage of tax preferences, taxpayers earning the same amount of income can pay very different rates—and

amounts—of tax. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, there are 109 special exemptions, deductions, and credits in the Tax Code, which will amount to a revenue loss to the Federal Treasury of $327 billion this fiscal year. These are preferences above and beyond the normal tax deductions for individuals and corporations, and amount to more than the projected deficit for this year—about $200 billion.

The magnitude of tax evasion is also large, with the underground economy conservatively estimated at $100 billion this year.

This behavior of widespread tax avoidance, both legal and illegal, is due to the high marginal tax rates of the current Federal income tax system. As Congress passes laws which, in one way or another, exclude large amounts of income from the tax base, higher tax rates must be adopted on the remaining income just to break even. As the tax rates rise, so does the incentive to avoid paying taxes—both legally and illegally. In fact, some economists and tax experts believe that this avoidance has actually led to a system that is less progressive in reality than on paper.

That is why I am offering this bill today. This bill—the fast plan—is an alternative to the current confusion and widespread inequality in the Tax Code. The fast plan provides a single low rate on income, and is simple enough to figure without a tax table. Unlike some tax reform plans, there are no surtaxes or complicated ways to take deductions against only part of your income, but not the rest. With this plan, if a deduction is allowed, it is allowed in full; we have made sure to maintain essential deductions in the current tax law.

The fast plan also provides significant tax relief for many Americans. Over 1 million taxpayers will be taken off the tax rolls with this plan. And, the working family of four will not even pay taxes on the first $14,375 of income. Then it only pays 25 percent of what is left after allowed deductions. No one below the poverty line will pay any taxes.

Mr. President, the American people are tired of a tax system that robs Peter to pay Paul; that grants loopholes for some, but not for all. The American taxpayers are demanding a change. This legislation is my answer to them. It is time for a major overhaul of our current tax system. I believe the Kemp-Kasten fast plan is a good start in that direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2600

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Fair and Simple Tax Act of 1984".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate a draft of any technical and conforming amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which are necessary to reflect the substantive amendments made by this Act.

TITLE I—REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE TAX RATES

Subtitle A—Reduction of Rates

SEC. 101. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATES.

Section 1 (relating to tax imposed on individuals) is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. TAX IMPOSED.

"There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual for each taxable year a tax equal to 25 percent of the taxable income for the taxable year."

SEC. 102. CORPORATE TAX RATES.

Subsection (b) of section 11 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the sum of—

"(1) 15 percent of so much of the taxable income as does not exceed $50,000, and

"(2) 30 percent of so much of the taxable income as exceeds $50,000."

Subtitle B—Increase in Amount of Personal Exemption and Zero Bracket Amount

SEC. 111. INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF PERSONAL EXEMPTION.

Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions) is amended by striking out "$1,000" each place such term appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000".

SEC. 112. INCREASE IN ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT.

Subsection (d) of section 63 (defining zero bracket amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subtitle—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'zero bracket amount' means—

"(A) $3,500 in the case of—

"(i) a joint return, or

"(ii) a surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

"(B) $2,700 in the case of an individual who is not married and is not a surviving spouse (as so defined),

"(C) $1,750 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return, and

"(D) zero in every other case, adjusted in the manner provided in paragraph (2).

"(2) ADJUSTMENTS SO THAT INFLATION WILL NOT REDUCE THE VALUE OF ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15 of 1984 and each subsequent calendar year, the Secretary shall prescribe the zero bracket amounts which shall apply in lieu of the amounts defined in paragraph (1) with respect to taxable years beginning in the succeeding calendar year.

"(B) METHOD OF ADJUSTING ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT.—The amounts which shall apply in lieu of the amounts described in paragraph (1) with respect to taxable years beginning in any calendar year shall be prescribed by increasing each amount contained in paragraph (1) by the cost-of-living adjustment for such calendar year. If such increase is not a multiple of $10, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10 (or if such increase is a multiple of $5 but not a multiple of $10, such increase shall be increased to the next multiple of $10).

"(C) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the cost-of-living adjustment for any calendar year is the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for the calendar year 1983.

"(D) CPI FOR ANY CALENDAR YEAR.—For purposes of subparagraph (C), the CPI for any preceding calendar year (or for 1983) is the average of the Consumer Price Index as of the close of the 12-month period ending on September 30 of such preceding calendar year (or 1983, as the case may be).

"(E) CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.—For purposes of subparagraph (D), the term 'Consumer Price Index' means the last Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor."

Subtitle C—Employment Income Exclusion Established

SEC. 121. EMPLOYMENT INCOME EXCLUSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items specifically excluded from income) is amended by redesignating section 132 as section 133 and by inserting after section 131 the following new section:

"SEC. 132. PARTIAL EXCLUSION OF EMPLOYMENT INCOME.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Gross income of an individual does not include an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount received during the taxable year by such individual as employment income.

"(b) MAXIMUM AMOUNT EXCLUDABLE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount excludable under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed 20 percent of the FICA maximum wage base for the calendar year in which such taxable year began.

"(2) PHASEOUT OF EMPLOYMENT INCOME EXCLUSION ABOVE FICA MAXIMUM WAGE BASE.—In the case of a taxpayer with employment income for any taxable year in excess of the FICA maximum wage base for the calendar year in which such taxable year began, the amount excludable under subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount determined under paragraph (1) reduced by an amount equal to the product of—

"(A) 12.5 percent, and

"(B) the amount by which the employment income of the taxpayer for such taxable year exceeds the FICA maximum wage base for such calendar year.

"(c) SPECIAL RULE IN THE CASE OF INDIVIDUAL WITH EMPLOYMENT INCOME OF $10,000 OR LESS ($20,000 OR LESS IN THE CASE OF JOINT RETURN).—In the case of a taxpayer whose employment income for the taxable year is $10,000 or less ($20,000 or less in the case of a joint return), so much of the investment income (if any) of the taxpayer for the taxable year as does not exceed the difference between—

"(1) $10,000 ($20,000 in the case of a joint return), and

"(2) the aggregate amount of employment income of such taxpayer for such taxable year,

shall be treated as employment income for purposes of this section.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EMPLOYMENT INCOME DEFINED.—The term 'employment income' has the meaning given to the term 'earned income' in section 43(c)(2),

"(2) INVESTMENT INCOME DEFINED.—The term 'investment income' means any income of the taxpayer which is not employment income, and

"(3) FICA MAXIMUM WAGE BASE DEFINED.—The term 'FICA maximum wage base' means the contribution and benefit base as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part III is amended by redesignated the item relating to section 132 as section 133 and by inserting after the item relating to section 131 the following new item:

"Sec. 132. Partial exclusion of employment income."

Subtitle D—Repeals Related to Reduction in Rates

SEC. 131. REPEALS.

(1) GENERAL RULE.—The following provisions are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 3 (relating to tax tables for individuals).

(2) Section 269A (relating to personal service corporations formed or availed of to avoid or evade income tax).

(3) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 402(e) (relating to special averaging rules for lump-sum distributions).

(4) Part I of subchapter G of chapter 1 (section 531 and following, relating to corporations improperly accumulating surplus).

(5) Part II of subchapter G of chapter 1 (section 541 and following, relating to personal holding companies).

(6) Part I of subchapter Q of chapter 1 (section 1301 and following, relating to income averaging).

(7) Section 1551 (relating to graduated corporate tax rates).

(b) TRUST THROWBACK RULES APPLY ONLY TO FOREIGN TRUST.—Subpart D of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1 (relating to treatment of excess distributions by trust) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 669. SUBPART TO APPLY ONLY TO FOREIGN TRUSTS.

"This subpart shall apply only with respect to amounts distributed from a foreign trust."

TITLE II—BASE BROADENING

Subtitle A—Credits

SEC. 201. REPEALS.

The following provisions are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 37 (relating to credit for the elderly and the permanently and totally disabled).

(2) Section 38 and subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 (relating to credit for investment in certain depreciable property).

(3) Section 40 and subpart C of such part IV (relating to credit for work incentive expenses).

(4) Section 41 (relating to contributions to candidates for public office).

(5) Section 42 (relating to general tax credit).

(6) Section 44 (relating to credit for home purchases).

(7) Section 44A (relating to credit for expenses for household and dependent care services necessary for gainful employment).

(8) Section 44B and subpart D of such part IV (relating to credit for employment of certain new employees).

(9) Section 44C (relating to residential energy credit).

(10) Section 44D (relating to credit for producing fuel from a nonconventional source).

(11) Section 44E and 87 (relating to alcohol used as fuel).

(12) Section 44F (relating to credit for increasing research activities).

(13) Section 44G (relating to employee stock ownership credit).

(14) Section 44H (relating to clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases and conditions).

Subtitle B—Exclusions

PART I—REPEALS

SEC. 211. REPEALS.

The following sections are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 104 (relating to compensation for injuries or sickness).

(2) Section 105 (relating to amounts received under accident and health plans).

(3) Section 116 (relating to partial exclusion of dividends received by individuals).

(4) Section 120 (relating to amounts received under qualified group legal service plans).

(5) Section 124 (relating to qualified transportation furnished by employer).

(6) Section 128 (relating to partial exclusion of interest) as in effect for taxable years beginning after December 13, 1984.

(7) Section 305(e) (relating to dividend reinvestment in public utilities).

(8) Section 621 (relating to payments to encourage exploration, development, and mining for defense purposes).

PART II—OTHER CHANGES

SEC. 212. REDUCTION OF EARNED INCOME CREDIT MAXIMUM AMOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 43 (relating to earned income credit) is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000".

(b) PHASEOUT OF CREDIT BETWEEN $4,000 AND $6,667.—Subsection (b) of such section 43 is amended—

(1) by striking out "$500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400",

(2) by striking out "12.5 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent", and

(3) by striking out "$6,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000".

SEC. 213. TAXATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 85 (relating to unemployment compensation) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Gross income includes any unemployment compensation received by the taxpayer during the taxable year."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 85 is amended by striking out subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

SEC. 214. TAXATION OF ANNUAL INCREASE IN CASH SURRENDER VALUE OF LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES.

Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to amounts specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 88. INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO LIFE INSURANCE, ANNUITY, OR ENDOWMENT CONTRACTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be included in the gross income for the taxable year of the owner of any annuity, life insurance, or endowment contract an amount equal to the excess of—

"(1) the sum of—

"(A) any change in the cash surrender value of such contract during the policy year ending with or within such taxable year,

"(B) any withdrawals during such policy year under such contract,

"(C) the cost of insurance provided during such policy year under such contract, and

"(D) any policyholder dividends paid during such policy year under such contract, over

"(2) the amount of premiums paid during such policy year under such contract.

"(B) CARRYOVER.—If the amount described in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) exceeds the amount determined under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) for any policy year, the amount of such excess shall be treated as a premium paid during the following policy year under the contract.

"(c) INSURANCE COMPANIES TO REPORT TO POLICYHOLDER AND TO THE SECRETARY.—The insurance company (or other payor) under any annuity, life insurance, or endowment contract shall, after the close of each policy year, report to the owner of the contract, and to the Secretary, such information as may be necessary for purposes of this section.

"(d) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 72.—For purposes of section 72, any amount included in gross income under this section with respect to any annuity, life insurance, or endowment contract shall be treated as consideration paid for such contract.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for purposes of this section."

SEC. 215. LIMITATION ON PRIVATE-PURPOSE TAX-EXEMPT BONDS.

(a) REPEAL OF TAX EXEMPTION FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS.—Paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14) of section 103(b) (relating to industrial development bonds) are hereby repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF TAX EXEMPTION FOR MORTGAGE SUBSIDY BONDS.—Section 103A is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103A. MORTGAGE SUBSIDY BONDS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Any mortgage subsidy bond shall be treated as an obligation not described in subsection (a) of section 103.

"(b) MORTGAGE SUBSIDY BOND DEFINED.—For purposes of this title, the term 'mortgage subsidy bond' means any obligation which is issued as part of an issue a significant part of the proceeds of which is to be used directly or idirectly for mortgages (or other owner financing) on owner-occupied residences."

(c) REPEAL OF TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PRIVATE PURPOSE BONDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Subsection (a) of section 103 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Gross income does not include interest on the obligations of a State, a territory, or a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or of the District of Columbia."

(B) Subsection (e) of section 103 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) CERTAIN PRIVATE PURPOSE BONDS.—Any obligation which is issued as part of an issue all or a major portion of the proceeds of which are to be used (directly or indirectly)—

"(1) to finance loans to individuals for educational expenses, or

"(2) by an organization described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a),

shall be treated as an obligation not described in subsection (a)."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subsection (b)(1) and (c)(1) of section 103 are each amended by striking out "subsection (a)(1) or (2)" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)".

(B) Paragraph (3) of section 103(b) (defining exempt person) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) EXEMPT PERSON.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(A), the term 'exempt person' means a governmental unit."

(C) Subsection (d), (g), (h), (k), and (l) of section 103 are hereby repealed.

SEC. 216. REPEAL OF STOCK FOR DEBT EXCEPTION FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING INCOME FROM DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS.

Subsection (e) of section 108 (relating to income from discharge of indebtedness) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) INDEBTEDNESS SATISFIED BY CORPORATION'S STOCK.—For purposes of determining income of the debtor from discharge of indebtedness, if a debtor corporation transfers its stock to a creditor in satisfaction of its indebtedness, such corporation shall be treated as having satisfied the indebtedness with an amount of money equal to the fair market value of the stock. In the case of a debtor in a title 11 case or when the debtor is insolvent, paragraph (8) (and not this paragraph) shall apply."

SEC. 217. SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP EXCLUSION LIMITED TO TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (a) and (b) of section 117 (relating to scholarships and fellowships) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is a candidate for a degree at an educational organization described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii), gross income does not include any amount received as—

"(1) a scholarship, or

"(2) a fellowship grant,

to the extent such amount is used for qualified tuition and related expenses (within the meaning of subsection (c)(2)).

"(b) PAYMENT FOR TEACHING, RESEARCH, ETC.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to that portion of any amount received which represents payment for teaching, research, or other services in the nature of part-time employment required as a condition to receiving the scholarship or the fellowship grant. If teaching, research, or other services are required of all candidates (whether or not recipients of scholarships or fellowship grants) for a particular degree as a condition to receiving such degree, such teaching, research, or other services shall not be regarded as part-time employment within the meaning of this subsection."

(b) CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 117(c)(2)(A) is amended by striking out "at an institution of higher education" and inserting in lieu thereof "at an educational organization described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii)".

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 117(c)(1) is amended by inserting "at an institution of higher education" after "qualified tuition and related expenses".

SEC. 218. TERMINATION OF TAX EXEMPTION FOR DEPOSITS INTO, AND WITHDRAWALS FROM, THE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION FUND UNDER SECTION 607 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936.

(a) TAXATION OF DEPOSITS.—Subsection (d) of section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (relating to nontaxability for deposits) is hereby repealed.

(b) ALL WITHDRAWALS TREATED AS NONQUALIFIED.—Subsection (f) of such section 607 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) No withdrawal after December 31, 1984, shall be treated as a qualified withdrawal."

Subtitle C—Deductions

PART I—REPEALS

SEC. 221. REPEALS.

The following provisions are hereby repealed:

(1) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 151 (relating to additional exemption for the elderly and the blind).

(2) Section 196 (relating to deduction for unused investment credits).

(3) Section 221 (relating to deduction for two-earner married couples).

(4) Section 222 (relating to deduction for adoption expenses).

PART II—OTHER CHANGES

SEC. 226. DEDUCTION FOR LOSSES LIMITED TO CAPITAL LOSSES.

Section 165 (relating to losses) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 165. CAPITAL LOSSES.

"(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—There shall be allowed as a deduction any loss sustained during the taxable year from sales or exchanges of capital assets.

"(b) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"(1) For limitation on deduction for capital losses and carryover of such losses, see sections 1211 and 1212."

SEC. 227. INCREASE IN FLOOR ON MEDICAL DEDUCTION.

Subsection (a) of section 213 (relating to medical, dental, etc., expenses) is amended by striking out "5 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent".

Subtitle D—Adjustment to Basis; Changes in Certain Special Capital Gains Treatment Provisions

SEC. 231. ADJUSTMENTS TO BASIS TO ALLOW FOR INFLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter O of chapter 1 (relating to basic rules of general application) is amended by inserting after section 1021 the following new section:

"SEC. 1022. INDEXING OF CERTAIN ASSETS FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING GAIN OR LOSS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE—

"(1) INDEXED BASIS SUBSTITUTED FOR ADJUSTED BASIS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if an indexed asset is sold or otherwise disposed of, for purposes of this title the indexed basis of the asset shall be substituted for its adjusted basis.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR DEPRECIATION, ETC.—The deduction for depreciation, depletion, and amortization shall be determined without regard to the application of paragraph (1) to the taxpayer or any other person.

"(b) INDEXED ASSET.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' means any capital asset (within the meaning given to such term by section 1221) which has been held for more than 1 year.

"(2) CERTAIN PROPERTY EXCLUDED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'indexed asset' does not include—

"(A) CREDITOR'S INTEREST.—Any interest in property which is in the nature of a creditor's interest.

"(B) OPTIONS.—Any option or other right to acquire an interest in property.

"(C) NET LEASE PROPERTY.—In the case of a lessor, net lease property (within the meaning of subsection (h)(1)).

"(D) CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK.—Stock which is fixed and preferred as to dividends and does not participate in corporate growth to any significant extent.

"(E) STOCK IN CERTAIN CORPORATIONS.—Stock in—

"(i) an electing small business corporation (within the meaning of section 1371(b)), and

"(ii) a foreign corporation.

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR STOCK IN FOREIGN CORPORATION WHICH IS REGULARLY TRADED IN NATIONAL OR REGIONAL EXCHANGE.—Clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(E) shall not apply to stock in a foreign corporation the stock of which is listed on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, or any domestic regional exchange for which quotations are published on a regular basis other than—

"(A) stock of a foreign investment company (within the meaning of section 1246(b)), and

"(B) stock in a foreign corporation held by a United States person who meets the requirements of section 1248(a)(2).

"(c) INDEXED BASIS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The indexed basis for any asset is—

"(A) the adjusted basis of the asset, multiplied by

"(B) the applicable inflation ratio.

"(2) APPLICABLE INFLATION RATIO.—The applicable inflation ratio for any asset is the percentage arrived at by dividing—

"(A) the gross national product deflator for the calendar quarter in which the disposition takes place, by

"(B) the gross national product deflator for the calendar quarter in which the asset was acquired by the taxpayer (or, if later, the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1984).

The applicable inflation ratio shall not be taken into account unless it is greater than 1. The applicable inflation ratio for any asset shall be rounded to the nearest $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent.

"(3) GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT DEFLATOR.—The gross national product deflator for any calendar quarter is the implicit price deflator for the gross national product for such quarter (as shown in the first revision thereof).

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE ASSET.—In the case of any asset, the following shall be treated as a separate asset:

"(A) a substantial improvement to property,

"(B) in the case of stock of a corporation, a substantial contribution to capital, and

"(C) any other portion of an asset to the extent that separate treatment of such portion is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(2) ASSETS WHICH ARE NOT INDEXED ASSETS THROUGHOUT HOLDING PERIOD.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable inflation ratio shall be appropriately reduced for calendar months at any time during which the asset was not an indexed asset.

"(B) CERTAIN SHORT SALES.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (A), an asset shall be treated as not an indexed asset for any short sale period during which the taxpayer or the taxpayer's spouse sells short property substantially identical to the asset. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the short sales period begins on the day the substantially identical property is sold and ends on the closing date for the sale.

"(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS.—A distribution with respect to stock in a corporation which is not a dividend shall be treated as a disposition.

"(4) SECTION CANNOT INCREASE ORDINARY LOSS.—To the extent that (but for this paragraph) this section would create or increase a net ordinary loss to which the second sentence of section 1231(a) applies or an ordinary loss to which any other provision of this title applies, such provision shall not apply. The taxpayer shall be treated as having a long-term capital loss in an amount equal to the amount of the ordinary loss to which the preceding sentence applies.

"(5) ACQUISITION DATE WHERE THERE HAS BEEN PRIOR APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION (a)(1) WITH RESPECT TO THE TAXPAYER.—If there has been a prior application of subsection (a)(1) to an asset while such asset was held by the taxpayer, the date of acquisition of such asset by the taxpayer shall be treated as not earlier than the date of the most recent such prior application.

"(6) COLLAPSIBLE CORPORATIONS.—The application of section 341(a) (relating to collapsible corporations) shall be determined without regard to this section.

"(e) CERTAIN CONDUIT ENTITIES.—

"(1) REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES; REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS; COMMON TRUST FUNDS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Stock in a qualified investment entity shall be an indexed asset for any calendar month in the same ratio as the fair market value of the assets held by such entity at the close of such month which are indexed assets bears to the fair month value of all assets of such entity at the close of such month.

"(B) RATIO OF 90 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 90 percent or more, such ratio for such month shall be 100 percent.

"(C) RATIO OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—If the ratio for any calendar month determined under subparagraph (A) would (but for this subparagraph) be 10 percent or less, such ratio for such month shall be zero.

"(D) VALUATION OF ASSETS IN CASE OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—Nothing in this paragraph shall require a real estate investment trust to value its assets more frequently than once each 36 months (except where such trust ceases to exist). The ratio under subparagraph (A) for any calendar month for which there is no valuation shall be the trustee's good faith judgment as to such valuation.

"(E) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT ENTITY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified investment entity' means—

"(i) a regulated investment company (within the meaning of section 851),

"(ii) a real estate investment trust (within the meaning of section 856), and

"(iii) a common trust fund (within the meaning of section 584).

"(2) PARTNERSHIPS.—In the case of a partnership, the adjustment made under subsection (a) at the partnership level shall be passed through to the partners.

"(3) SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS.—In the case of an electing small business corporation, the adjustment under subsection (a) at the corporate level shall be passed through to the shareholders.

"(f) DISPOSITIONS BETWEEN RELATED PERSONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The section shall not apply to any sale or other disposition of property between related persons except to the extent that the basis of such property in the hands of the transferee is a substituted basis.

"(2) RELATED PERSONS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'related persons' means—

"(A) persons bearing a relationship set forth in section 267(b), and

"(B) persons treated as single employer under subsection (b) or (c) of section 414.

"(g) TRANSFERS TO INCREASE INDEXING ADJUSTMENT OR DEPRECIATION ALLOWANCE.—If any person transfers cash, debt, or any other property to another person and the principal purpose of such transfer is—

"(1) to secure or increase an adjustment under subsection (a), or

"(2) to increase (by reason of an adjustment under subsection (a)) a deduction for depreciation, depletion, or amortization,

the Secretary may disallow part or all of such adjustment or increase.

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) NET LEASE PROPERTY DEFINED.—The term 'net lease property' means leased real property where—

"(A) the term of the lease (taking into account options to renew) was 50 percent or more of the useful life of the property, and

"(B) for the period of the lease, the sum of the deductions with respect to such property which are allowable to the lessor solely by reason of section 162 (other than rents and reimbursed amounts with respect to such property) is 15 percent or less of the rental income produced by such property.

"(2) STOCK INCLUDES INTEREST IN COMMON TRUST FUND.—The term 'stock in a corporation' includes any interest in a common trust fund (as defined in section 584(a)).

"(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter O of such chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1021 the following new item:

"Sec. 1022. Indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss."

SEC. 232. CHANGES IN SPECIAL TREATMENT OF CAPITAL GAINS.

(a) REDUCTION IN RATE OF ALTERNATIVE TAX FOR CORPORATIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1201(a) (relating to alternative tax for corporations) is amended by striking out "28 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent".

(b) SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS REPEALED.—Section 1202 (relating to deduction for individuals for capital gains) is hereby repealed.

(c) CAPITAL LOSSES OF INDIVIDUALS DEDUCTIBLE IN FULL; CARRYOVER OF THE EXCESS OF SUCH LOSSES OVER GROSS INCOME ALLOWED.—

(1) REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION.—Subsection (b) of section 1211 (relating to limitation on capital losses in the case of taxpayers other than corporations) is hereby repealed.

(2) CARRYFORWARD ALLOWED.—Subsection (b) of section 1212 (relating to carryovers for taxpayers other than corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) OTHER TAXPAYERS.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—If an individual taxpayer has capital losses for any taxable year which exceed an amount equal to—

"(A) the gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year, reduced by

"(B) the sum of the deductions allowed by this chapter for the taxable year (determined in accordance with paragraph (2)),

such excess amount shall be treated as a capital loss in the succeeding taxable year.

"(2) DETERMINATION OF SUM OF DEDUCTIONS.—In determining the sum of the deductions allowable under this chapter for the taxable year for purposes of paragraph (1)(B)—

"(A) the amount of any capital loss incurred in the taxable year shall not be taken into account, and

"(B) the amount of any capital losses incurred in the preceding taxable year which may be treated, under this subsection, as capital losses incurred in the taxable year shall be taken into account."

(d) SPECIAL RULES FOR CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES APPLICABLE ONLY TO CORPORATIONS.—The following provisions shall apply only to corporations:

(1) Section 268 (relating to sale of land with unharvested crop).

(2) Section 272 (relating to disposal of coal or domestic iron ore).

(3) Section 631 (relating to gain or loss in the case of timber, coal, or domestic iron ore).

(4) Section 735 (relating to distributions of property).

(5) Section 751 (relating to collapsible partnerships).

(6) Section 1231 (relating to property used in the trade or business and involuntary conversions).

(7) Section 1235 (relating to sale or exchange of patents).

(8) Section 1238 (relating to amortization in excess of depreciation).

(9) Section 1239 (relating to gain from sale of depreciable property between certain related taxpayers).

(10) Section 1245 (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable property).

(11) Section 1246 (relating to gain on foreign investment company stock).

(12) Section 1247 (relating to election by foreign investment companies to distribute income currently).

(13) Section 1248 (relating to gain from certain sales or exchanges of stock in certain foreign corporations).

(14) Section 1249 (relating to gain from certain sales or exchanges of patents, etc., to foreign corporations).

(15) Section 1250 (relating to gain from disposition of certain depreciable realty).

(16) Section 1251 (relating to gain from disposition of property used in farming where farm losses offset nonfarm income).

(17) Section 1252 (relating to gain from disposition of farm land).

(18) Section 1254 (relating to gain from disposition of interest in oil, gas, or geothermal property).

(19) Section 1255 (relating to gain from disposition of section 126 property).

SEC. 233. 10-YEAR TRANSITION PERIOD FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 231.

(a) ELECTION TO DISREGARD INDEXED BASIS.—In the case of a sale or other disposition by an individual of an indexed asset (within the meaning given to such term by section 1022(b), as added by section 231 of this title) at any time within the 10-year period beginning on January 1, 1985, the taxpayer may make an election to apply the provisions of this section for purposes of determining—

(1) the amount of gain or loss with respect to the sale or other disposition of such asset, and

(2) the manner in which any gain or loss shall be treated in determining taxable income of the taxpayer for the taxable year.

(b) TREATMENT OF SALE OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF INDEXED ASSET IN CASE OF ELECTION TO DISREGARD INDEXED BASIS.—If, with respect to a sale or other disposition of an indexed asset, the taxpayer makes an election under subsection (a) to have this section apply—

(1) section 1022 (as added by section 231 of this title) shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of gain or loss with respect to such sale or other disposition,

(2) 25 percent of any gain from such sale or other disposition shall be excluded from gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year in which such sale or other disposition was made, and

(3) 25 percent of any loss from such sale or other disposition shall not be taken into account—

(A) in determining the amount of capital losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets by the taxpayer for which a deduction is allowed under section 165 (as amended by section 226 of this title) for the taxable year in which such sale or other disposition was made, or

(B) under any other section to the extent such amount would otherwise be taken into account under any such section for the purpose of computing taxable income for the taxable year in which such sale or other disposition was made.

(c) TIME AND MANNER OF ELECTION.—An election by a taxpayer to apply the provisions of this section shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulations. Such an election, once made, shall be irrevocable.

TITLE III—CAPITAL COST RECOVERY

Subtitle A—Simplified Cost Recovery System for Depletable Property

SEC. 301. SIMPLIFIED COST RECOVERY FOR DEPLETABLE PROPERTY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Part I of subchapter I of chapter 1 (relating to deduction for depletion) is amended by inserting after section 611 the following new section:

"SEC. 611A. SIMPLIFIED COST RECOVERY FOR DEPLETABLE PROPERTY.

"(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—In the case of qualified depletable property, there shall be allowed as a depletion deduction the amount determined in accordance with subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION.—The deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall be the aggregate amount determined by applying to the unadjusted basis of qualified depletable property the applicable percentage determined in accordance with section 168(b).

"(c) CLASSES OF DEPLETABLE PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each item of qualified depletable property shall be assigned to one of the classes of property defined in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 168(c)(2). In applying the preceding sentence, the anticipated productive life of such depletable property shall be taken into account in lieu of present class life.

"(2) 3-YEAR PRODUCTIVE LIFE FOR OIL, GAS, AND GEOTHERMAL WELLS.—All qualified depletable property which is an oil or gas well or a well drilled for any geothermal deposit shall be assigned to the class of 3 year property (within the meaning given to such term by section 168(c)(2)(A)).

"(d) QUALIFIED DEPLETABLE PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified depletable property' means any property—

"(1) which is of a character subject to the allowance for depletion provided in section 611, and

"(2) production from which first began after December 31, 1984.

"(e) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of subsections (d), (f), and (g) of section 168 shall apply; except that property shall not be treated as placed in service until production from the property begins.

"(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR NONPRODUCTIVE WELLS OR MINES.—This section shall not apply with respect to any nonproductive well or mine. Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny any deduction allowable for a loss sustained by reason of the abandonment of a nonproductive well or mine."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 611 is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 611A.—In the case of any qualified depletable property, the deduction provided by section 611A shall be deemed to be the reasonable allowance for depletion provided by this section."

(2) Subsection (a) of section 611 is amended by striking out "and timber,".

Subtitle B—Other Changes

PART I—REPEALS

Sec. 311. REPEALS.

The following provisions are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 174 (relating to research and experimental expenditures).

(2) Section 175 (relating to soil and water conservation expenditures).

(3) Section 178 (relating to depreciation or amortization of improvements made by lessee on lessor's property).

(4) Section 182 (relating to expenditures by farmers for clearing land).

(5) Section 194 (relating to amortization of reforestation expenditures).

(6) Section 195 (relating to start-up expenditures).

(7) Section 263(c) (relating to intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells and geothermal wells).

(8) Section 613, 613A, and 614 (relating to percentage depletion).

(9) Section 616 (relating to development expenditures).

(10) Section 617 (relating to deduction and recapture of certain mining exploration expenditures).

PART II—OTHER CHANGES

Sec. 316. 10-YEAR AMORTIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION PERIOD INTEREST AND TAXES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (b) of section 189 (relating to amortization of amounts charged to capital account) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS CHARGED TO CAPITAL ACCOUNT.—Any amount paid or accrued which would (but for subsection (a)) be allowable as a deduction for the taxable year in which paid or accrued shall be allowed as a deduction ratably over the 10-year period beginning with such taxable year."

(b) ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (d) of section 189 (relating to certain property excluded) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) CERTAIN PROPERTY EXCLUDED.—This section shall not apply to any real property acquired, constructed, or carried if such property is not, and cannot reasonably be expected to be, held in a trade or business or in an activity conducted for profit."

SEC. 317. CIRCULATION EXPENDITURES.

Section 173 (relating to circulation expenditures) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 173. CIRCULATION EXPENDITURES.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Expenditures (other than expenditures for the purchase of land or depreciable property or for any part of the business of another publisher of a newspaper, magazine, or other periodical) to establish, maintain, or increase, the circulation of a newspaper, magazine, or other periodical shall be allowed as a deduction ratably over the 5-year period beginning with the taxable year in which such expenditure was made.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any portion of the expenditure as (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) is chargeable to capital account if the taxpayer elects, in accordance with such regulations, to treat such portion as so chargeable. Such election, if made, must be for the total amount of such portion of the expenditure which is so chargeable to capital account, and shall be binding for all subsequent taxable years unless, upon application by the taxpayer, the Secretary permits a revocation of such election subject to such conditions as he deems necessary."

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Foreign Income

SEC. 401. REPEAL OF DISC.

(a) Section 991 (relating to tax exemption of a DISC) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This section shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1984."

(b) Section 992(a) (defining DISC) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) TERMINATION.—No corporation shall be treated as a DISC for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1984."

(c) Section 995(b)(2) (relating to deemed distributions upon DISC disqualification) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(C) A corporation which, by reason of the provisions of section 992(a)(4), is a former DISC, for its first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1984, shall be treated, for purposes of this paragraph, as having failed to satisfy the conditions of section 992(a)(1) for such taxable year."

Subtitle B—Other Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 411. METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR TAXPAYERS ENGAGED IN FARMING.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The section heading and subsection (a) of section 447 (relating to method of accounting for corporations engaged in farming) are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 447. METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR TAXPAYERS ENGAGED IN FARMING.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—The taxable income from farming (including timber) shall be computed on an accrual method of accounting and with the capitalization of preproductive expenses described in subsection (b)."

(b) ACCRUAL METHOD NOT REQUIRED FOR TAXPAYERS HAVING GROSS RECEIPTS OF $1,000,000 OR LESS; REPEAL OF OTHER EXCEPTIONS.—Section 447 is amended by striking out subsections (c), (d), (e), (g), and (h) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) TAXPAYERS HAVING GROSS RECEIPTS OF $1,000,000 OR LESS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply with respect to any taxpayer if for each prior taxable year of such taxpayer beginning after December 31, 1984 (December 31, 1975, in the case of a corporation), such taxpayer (and, in the case of a corporation, any predecessor) did not have gross receipts exceeding $1,000,000. For purposes of the preceding sentence, all taxpayers which are treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 (as in effect before its repeal) shall be treated as 1 taxpayer.

"(2) FARMING SYNDICATES SUBJECT TO ACCRUAL METHOD WITHOUT REGARD TO AMOUNT OF GROSS RECEIPTS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any farming syndicate (as defined in section 464(c))."

SEC. 412. RECOGNITION OF GAIN OR LOSS ON DISTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTY BY CORPORATIONS.

(a) DISTRIBUTION.—Section 311 (relating to taxability of corporation on distribution) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 311. TAXABILITY OF CORPORATION ON DISTRIBUTION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the distribution of property with respect to its stock in the same manner as if the property distributed had been sold to the distributee at its fair market value.

"(b) EXCEPTION FOR DEBT OF CORPORATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any distribution of an obligation of the corporation."

(b) DISTRIBUTIONS IN LIQUIDATION.—Section 336 (relating to distributions of property in liquidation) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. DISTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTY IN LIQUIDATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the distribution of property in complete liquidation in the same manner as if the property distributed had been sold to the distributee at its fair market value.

"(b) EXCEPTION WHERE BASIS DETERMINED UNDER SECTION 334(b).—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any liquidation under section 332 for which the basis of property received is determined under section 334(b)."

(c) REPEAL OF SECTION 337.—

(1) Section 337 (relating to gain or loss on sales or exchanges in connection with certain liquidations) is hereby repealed.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO SECTION 338.—

(A) Paragraph (1) of section 338(a) (relating to certain stock purchases treated as asset acquisitions) is amended by striking out "to which section 337 applies".

(B) Subsection (c) of section 338 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 413. ELIMINATION OF SPECIAL BAD DEBT RESERVES OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) BANKS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 585(b) (relating to addition to reserves for bad debts of banks) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 166(c), the reasonable addition to the reserve for bad debts of any financial institution to which this section applies shall be an amount determined by the taxpayer which shall not exceed the addition to the reserve for losses on loans determined under the experience method as provided in paragraph (2)."

(2) Subsection (b) of section 585 is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) and (4) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) OTHER FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 593 (relating to addition to reserves for bad debts) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) ADDITION TO RESERVES FOR BAD DEBTS.—For purposes of section 166(c), the reasonable addition for the taxable year to the reserve for bad debts of any taxpayer described in subsection (a) shall be the amount determined to be a reasonable addition to the reserve to the extent such amount does not exceed an amount determined in the same manner as provided with respect to additions to the reserves for losses on loans of banks under section 585(b)(2)."

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 501. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1984.

(b) TRUST THROWBACK RULES.—The amendment made by section 131(b) shall apply with respect to income accumulated during taxable years of trusts beginning after December 13, 1984.

(c) CREDITS.—

(1) INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT.—The repeals made by section 201(2) shall apply to—

(A) property (to which section 46(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 does not apply) placed in service after December 31, 1984, and

(B) property to which such section 46(d) applies to the extent of qualified progress expenditures made after December 31, 1984.

(2) PRESERVATION OF EXISTING CARRYOVERS.—The repeals made by section 201 shall not apply to any carryover of an excess credit from a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1985, to a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1984; except that any carryover to a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1984, shall be reduced to an amount equal to 30/46 of the amount which would have been such carryover but for this paragraph.

(d) INCREASE IN CASH SURRENDER VALUE OF LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by section 214 shall apply with respect to policy years beginning after December 31, 1984.

(e) TAX-EXEMPT BONDS.—The amendments made by section 215 shall apply to obligations issued after December 31, 1984.

(f) INDEXED BASIS.—The amendments made by section 231 shall apply to dispositions after December 31, 1984, in taxable years ending after such date.

(g) ALTERNATIVE TO COST DEPLETION.—The amendments made by section 301 shall apply with respect to property from which production first begins after December 31, 1984.

(h) RECOGNITION OF GAIN OR LOSS ON DISTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTIES.—

(1) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 412 shall apply to distributions after December 31, 1984, in taxable years ending after such date.

(2) The amendments made by subsection (c) of section 412 shall apply to sales or exchanges after December 31, 1984, in taxable years ending after such date.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. 2602. A bill to simplify the program of grants to the States for vocational education, and for other purposes.

GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I have been an active supporter of vocational education. Vocational education inspires youth initiative, rescues disoriented unemployed individuals, and solves many of the social problems to which unemployment can lead.

The measure I am introducing today would extend the Vocational Education Act while making some changes in the funding of specific programs. There are several different approaches to restructuring voc-ed programs, and I realize this bill is only one of many suggested concepts. These programs should continue, and I offer this legislation in the hope that it might serve as a vehicle for reviewing the current voc-ed system.

My bill extends the Vocational Education Act for 5 years. This measure also incorporates the block grant funding mechanism to give State and local education agencies more flexibility to structure programs in a manner consistent with local priorities.

The bill would reduce funding formula problems by establishing block grants to States. As proposed by President Reagan, block grants allow for flexibility on the State and local level in meeting existing needs. My bill will allow States to become more capable of targeting resources to the programs most needed in the State and communities.

The success of the State and local combined efforts is clearly exemplified in South Dakota. A large farm implement manufacturing firm in Mitchell had a critical need for 40 additional welders. The Mitchell Area Vocational Technical School was able to promptly respond to this need by training people in the evenings and on weekends.

Another local manufacturer had a need for specialized welders. The Mitchell Vo-Tech School was able to respond by taking one of company's employees and providing short-term intensive training programs in MIG and TIG welding.

These are two examples of this one school's effective response to the business and employment needs of the community. What does the school get in return? Local businesses and indus-

tries have played a major role in the development of Mitchell Vo-Tech by donating hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of equipment to the school. Currently, over 100 businesses and industry leaders serve as advisers to the school. The farm implement company I mentioned earlier located in Mitchell because of the availability of the Mitchell Vo-Tech School.

Through coordination with State and local education agencies, students receive valuable experience and industry is able to hire skilled workers. In this instance and countless others, education and industry cooperatively recognize and respond to training and manpower needs. South Dakota's 90 percent in-State placement rate for postsecondary voc-ed graduates is proof that the programs are working.

Statistics show employers are satisfied with workers trained by voc-ed institutions. Voc-ed programs are meeting the need not only of students, but also of the communities in which the graduates are employed.

I have long believed that vocational education offers one of the most effective means by which our country can better prepare its work force and effectively utilize the talents and resources of its people. My very first speech in Congress in 1975 was about the need for strengthening vocational education in this Nation. I have continued that fight in the U.S. Senate. I support speedy reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act and I urge my colleagues to join in better focusing, redefining and refining congressional intent in the Vocational Education Act.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. EAGLETON, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. PELL, Mr. DENTON, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. PERCY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. EAST, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DOLE, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. JEPSEN, and Mr. WILSON):

S. 2603. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for, and to revise the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today it is my pleasure along with 32 cosponsors (Senators EAGLETON, HAWKINS, PELL, DENTON, METZENBAUM, THURMOND, KENNEDY, HEINZ, D'AMATO, PERCY, COHEN, BURDICK, MELCHER, GLENN, EAST, MATSUNAGA, WARNER, DOMENICI, KASSEBAUM, STAFFORD, PRYOR, DOLE, PRESSLER, DURENBERGER, WALLOP, RANDOLPH, RIEGLE, DODD, BINGAMAN, COCHRAN, JEPSEN, and WILSON), to introduce legislation reauthorizing the Older Americans Act for another 3 years. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Aging of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, it has been my pleasure to work with the ranking minority member, Senator EAGLETON, in a bipartisan effort that has brought forth this bill for the consideration of the Senate. It is, I think, a bill that refines, updates, and clarifies a law that has served the Nation's older population well. The members of the subcommittee, Senators HAWKINS, DENTON, THURMOND, METZENBAUM, and PELL have contributed immeasurably as have the leadership of the full committee.

This reauthorization addresses the rising problem of Alzheimer's disease and its effect on victims and their families; faces the realities of elder abuse and its heartbreak without mandating intrusive practices by the States; mandates and funds a program for all 50 States that puts an emphasis on health maintenance and illness prevention through nutrition, exercise, and drug education; and maintains increased authorization funding levels for all titles of the Older Americans Act through the 3-year authorization period.

This reauthorization does not move any title V community service employment programs from the Department of Labor; mandate 100 percent consolidation of title III (B) and (C) funding; call for moving commodities funding from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health and Human Services; set up a means test for participants in Older Americans Act programs nor does it increase the present age limit of 60 for title III services.

The decision to amend or not was made by the committee based on testimony received in a series of six hearings conducted since the first of the year; as well as meetings with interested aging organizations and correspondence from Senators and State officials.

As marked up by the subcommittee, the bill makes two minor amendments dealing with age discrimination in employment—one affecting Americans working for American corporations overseas, the second raises the income level for corporate classification.

Mr. President, this is a bill that I believe many of our colleagues will want to support. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill to reauthorize and amend the Older Americans Act be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2603

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984".

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. Section 101(8) is amended by inserting before the period a comma and "with emphasis on maintaining a continuum of care for the vulnerable elderly".

FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSIONER; FEDERAL AGENCY CONSULTATION

SEC. 3. (a) Section 202(a)(9) is amended—

(1) by striking out the first "and" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and

(2) by inserting after the word "aging" a comma and "including existing legislative protections with particular emphasis on the application of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967".

(b) Section 202(b)(1) is amended by inserting before the semicolon "and with utilization and quality control peer review organizations under title XI of the Social Security Act".

(c)(1) Section 203(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the Job Training Partnership Act,".

(2) Section 203(b)(3) is amended by striking out "XVIII, XIX, and XX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, XVIII, XIX, and XX".

(d) Section 203(b) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (8);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (9) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(10) the Public Health Service Act,

"(11) the Low-Income Energy Assistance Act of 1981,

"(12) part A of the Energy Conservation in Existing Buildings Act of 1976, relating to weatherization assistance for low income persons,

"(13) the Community Services Block Grant Act,

"(14) veterans programs under title 38, United States Code, and

"(15) demographic statistics and analysis programs conducted by the Census Bureau under title 13, United States Code.".

FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

SEC. 4. (a) Section 204(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) There is established a Federal Council on the Aging to be composed of 15 members. Members shall serve for terms of three years without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code. Members shall be appointed by each appointing authority so as to be representative of rural and urban older Americans, national organizations with an interest in aging, business, labor, minorities, and the general public. At least two of the members appointed by each appointing authority shall be older individuals. No full-time officer or employee of the Federal Government may be appointed as a member of the Council.

"(2) Members appointed to the Federal Council on the Aging established by this

section prior to the date of enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984 who are serving on such date, shall continue to serve on the Federal Council established by paragraph (1) of this subsection until members are appointed in accordance with subsection (b)(1).".

(b) Section 204(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) The members appointed in 1985 shall be referred to as class 1 members; the members appointed in 1986 shall be referred to as class 2 members; and the members appointed in 1987 shall be referred to as class 3 members.

"(B)(i) Members of each class shall be appointed in the manner prescribed by this paragraph.

"(ii) Of the members of class 1, two shall be appointed by the President, two by the President pro tempore of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader, and one by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(iii) Of the members of class 2, two shall be appointed by the President, one by the President pro tempore of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader, and two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(iv) Of the members of class 3, one shall be appointed by the President, two by the President pro tempore of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader, and two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.".

(c) Section 204(g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section $200,000 for fiscal year 1985, $200,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $200,000 for fiscal year 1987.".

EVALUATION

SEC. 5. (a) Section 206(d) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "effectiveness" a comma and the following: "including, as appropriate, health and nutrition education demonstration projects conducted under section 307(f)"; and

(2) by inserting after "Congress" a comma and the following: "be disseminated to Federal, State, and local agencies and private organizations with an interest in aging,".

(b) The first sentence of section 206(g) is amended—

(1) by striking "1 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "one-tenth of 1 per centum";

(2) by inserting after "Act" the following: "for each fiscal year"; and

(3) by striking out "$1,000,000 whichever is greater" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300,000 whichever is lower".

GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING; GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The matter preceding clause (1) of section 301(a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "local agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "area agencies" each time it appears;

(2) by inserting after "development" the following: "and implementation";

(3) by adding after "providers" a comma and "including voluntary organizations,"; and

(4) by striking "for the provision of" after the word "planning".

(b) Section 302(2)(B) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "employs" a comma and the following: "where feasible,"; and

(2) by inserting after "staff" the following: "to assess the needs and capacities of older individuals,".

(c) Section 302(4) is amended by striking "legal services" and inserting in lieu thereof "legal assistance".

(d) Section 302 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(10) The term 'multipurpose senior center' means a community facility for the organization and provision of a broad spectrum of services, which shall include, but not be limited to, provision of health, social, nutritional and educational services and the provision of facilities for recreational activities for older individuals.

"(11) The term 'focal point' means a facility established to encourage the maximum collocation and coordination of services for older individuals.".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 7. (a) Section 303(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated $265,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $281,695,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $298,033,310 for fiscal year 1987, for the purpose of making grants under part B of this title (relating to supportive services and senior centers).".

(b) Section 303(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated $338,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $350,168,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $366,976,060 for fiscal year 1987, for the purpose of making grants under subpart 1 of part C of this title (relating to congregate nutrition services).

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated $65,900,000 for fiscal year 1985, $68,272,400 for fiscal year 1986, and $71,549,475 for fiscal year 1987, for the purpose of making grants under subpart 2 of part C of this title (relating to home delivered nutrition services).".

(c) Section 303(c)(2) is amended by striking "legal services" and inserting in lieu thereof "legal assistance".

ALLOTMENT

SEC. 8. Section 304(d)(1) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (B);

(2) by redesignating clause (C) as clause (D); and

(3) by inserting after clause (B), the following new clause:

"(C) such amount as the State agency determines to be adequate, but not more than 1 percent thereof, for conducting effective demonstration projects in health and nutrition education under section 307(f) shall be available for conducting such projects; and"

ORGANIZATION

SEC. 9. (a)(1) Section 305(a)(1)(E) is amended by striking out "(b)(5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(b)(5)(A)".

(2) Section 305(a)(2)(E) is amended by inserting after "individuals" a comma and the following: "especially minorities,".

(3) Section 305(a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new flush sentence:

"The publication for review and comment required by clause (2)(C) of this subsection shall include—

"(i) a descriptive statement of the formula's assumptions and goals, and a definition for greatest economic or social need,

"(ii) a numerical statement of the actual funding formula to be used,

"(iii) a listing of the population, economic, and social data to be used for each planning and service area in the State, and

"(iv) a demonstration of the allocation of funds, pursuant to the funding formula, to each planning and service area in the State.".

(b) Section 305(b)(5) is amended by inserting "(A)" after the paragraph designation, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B) Whenever the State agency designates an area agency on aging after the date of enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984, the State agency shall give the right of first refusal to a unit of general purpose local government when the boundaries of such a unit and the boundaries of the area are reasonably contiguous.".

AREA PLANS

SEC. 10. (a) Section 306(a)(1) is amended by inserting after "area", the third time it appears, "and the efforts of voluntary organizations in the community".

(b) Section 306(a)(2)(B) is amended by striking out "and" the last time it appears in the parenthetical phrase and by inserting after "maintenance" a comma and the following: "and supportive services for families of elderly victims of Alzheimer's disease and other neurological diseases and organic brain disorders".

(c)(1) Section 306(a)(2)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) legal assistance;".

(2) Section 306(a)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of subclause (B);

(B) by inserting "and" after subclause (C); and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subclause:

"(D) services for the prevention of elder abuse;".

(d) Section 306(a)(3) is amended by striking out "to encourage the maximum collocation and coordination of services for older individuals, and give" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "giving".

(e) Section 306(a)(5)(A) is amended by inserting after "individuals" a comma and the following: "especially minorities,".

(f) Section 306(b) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation and,

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Before an area agency on aging requests a waiver under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the area agency on aging shall conduct a public hearing in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph. The area agency on aging requesting a waiver shall notify all interested parties in the area of the public hearing and furnish the interested parties with an opportunity to testify.

"(B) The area agency on aging shall prepare a record of the public hearing conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) and shall furnish the record of the public hearing with the request for a waiver made to the State under paragraph (1).".

STATE PLANS

SEC. 11. (a) Section 307(a)(3)(A) is amended by striking out "legal services" and inserting in lieu thereof "legal assistance".

(b) Section 307(a)(10) is amended by inserting before the semicolon a comma and "and only until such State agency or area agency on aging obtains an independent service provider".

(c) Section 307(a)(13)(C) is amended—

(1) by striking out "charge participating individuals" in division (i), and inserting in

lieu thereof "solicit voluntary contributions" and

(2) by striking out "charges" in division (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "voluntary contributions".

(d) Section 307(a)(15)(B) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the plan contains assurances that no legal assistance will be furnished unless the grantee administers a program designed to provide legal assistance to all older individuals with social or economic need and has agreed, if the grantee is not a Legal Services Corporation project grantee, to coordinate its services with existing Legal Services Corporation projects in the planning and service area in order to concentrate the use of funds provided under this title on individuals with the greatest such need; and the area agency makes a finding, after assessment, pursuant to standards for service promulgated by the Commissioner, that any grantee selected is the entity best able to provide the particular services;".

(e) Section 307(a)(15) is amended by striking out "legal services" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "legal assistance".

(f) Section 307(a) of the Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (16), (17), and (18) as clauses (19), (20), and (21), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after clause (15) the following new clauses:

"(16) provide that with respect to services for the prevention of elder abuse—

"(A) the State will identify the public and private non-profit entities involved in the prevention, identification, and treatment of elder abuse, neglect and exploitation;

"(B) the State will, based on such identification, determine the extent to which the need for services for the prevention of elder abuse are unmet;

"(C) the State will establish, in areas where the State determines that the need for services is unmet, a program consistent with relevant State law and coordinated with existing State adult protective service activities for—

"(i) public education to identify and prevent elder abuse;

"(ii) receipt of reports of elder abuse;

"(iii) active participation of older individuals participating in programs under this Act through outreach, conferences, and referral of such individuals to other social service agencies or sources of assistance where appropriate and consented to by the parties to be referred; and

"(iv) referral of complaints to law enforcement or public protection service agencies where appropriate;

"(D) the State will not permit involuntary or coerced participation in the program of services described in this clause by alleged victims, abusers, or their households; and

"(E) all information gathered in the course of receiving reports and making referrals shall remain confidential unless all parties to the complaint consent in writing to the release of such information, except that such information may be released to a law enforcement or public protective service agency;

"(17) provide assurances that each State will provide inservice training opportunities for personnel of agencies and programs funded under this Act;

"(18) provide assurances that each State will assign personnel to provide State leadership in developing legal assistance programs for the elderly throughout the State;".

(g) Section 307 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(f)(1) From amounts made available under section 304(d)(1)(C), each State shall provide for the establishment of at least one demonstration project for health and nutrition education to be conducted by one or more area agencies on aging within the State.

"(2) Each such project shall—

"(A) be administered by the area agency for the purpose of improving the health and nutrition of older Americans served by the agency;

"(B) be established and administered in consultation with the appropriate Long-Term Care Gerontology Center;

"(C) be designed to improve the health and nutrition of older Americans through increasing their physical fitness activities and improving the nutritional value of meals in their own daily living habits;

"(D) if appropriate, be conducted in conjunction with schools of public health, schools of medicine, public health and social service agencies, private voluntary organizations, or other entities concerned with the health and well-being of older Americans; and

"(E) evaluate and submit the evaluation prior to October 1, 1987 and submit such interim reports as the Commissioner may reasonably require.".

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 12. (a)(1) Section 308 (d)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) From sums appropriated pursuant to section 303 and allotted to each State under section 304(a)(1) for each fiscal year, not to exceed 5 percent or $500,000, whichever is greater, shall be available for the cost of administration of the State plan, except that in the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands, the amount shall be 5 percent or $200,000, whichever is greater. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term 'State' does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.".

(2)(A) Paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 308 (b) are repealed.

(B) Paragraph (5) and (6) of section 308(b) are redesignated as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(b) Section 308 (b) (3) (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by striking "20 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "35 per centum".

AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

SEC. 13. (a) Section 311(d)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1)(A) There are authorized to be appropriated $119,500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $123,802,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $129,744,500 for fiscal year 1987, to carry out the provisions of this section (other than the provisions of subsection (a)(1)) and such additional sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 to maintain the level of reimbursement for the number of meals served under such provisions in fiscal year 1983.

"(B) Effective on the first day of the first month after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, no State may receive reimbursement under the provisions of this section unless the State submits final reimbursement claims for meals within 90 days after the last day of the quarter for which the reimbursement is claimed.".

AUDIT

SEC. 14. (a) Section 313 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section designation and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) State agencies and area agencies on aging shall not request information or data of providers which is not pertinent to a payment made pursuant to this Act.".

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND SENIOR CENTERS

SEC. 15. (a) Section 321(a)(6) is amended by striking out "legal services" and inserting in lieu thereof "legal assistance".

(b) Section 321(a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (14) and (15) as clauses (16) and (17), respectively, and

(2) by inserting after clause (13) the following new clause:

"(14) services for the prevention of elder abuse in accordance with clause (16) of section 307(a);

"(15) inservice training and State leadership for legal assistance activities;".

(c) Section 321(b)(1) is amended by striking all that follows "centers" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 16. (a) Title IV is amended by inserting after the title designation the following new sections:

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 401. It is the purpose of this title to expand the Nation's knowledge and understanding of aging and the aging process, to design and test innovative ideas in programs and services for older individuals, and to help meet the needs for trained personnel in the field of aging through—

"(1) placing a priority on the education and training of personnel to work with and on behalf of older individuals;

"(2) research and development of effective practices in the field of aging;

"(3) demonstration and other projects at the discretion of the Commissioner; and

"(4) dissemination of information on aging and the aging process acquired through such programs to public and private organizations or programs for older individuals.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 402. (a) In order to carry out the provisions of this title effectively, the Commissioner shall administer this title through the Administration on Aging.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Commissioner may request the technical assistance and cooperation of the Department of Education, the National Institutes of Health, and such other agencies and departments of the Federal Government as may be appropriate.".

(b) Section 411 is amended by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "with priority to training in the provision of supportive services to families of elderly victims of Alzheimers' disease and other neurological diseases and organic brain disorders".

(c) Section 421 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Appropriate provisions for the dissemination of resulting information shall be a requirement for all grants made under this section.".

(d)(1) Section 422(b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as clauses (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before clause (2) (as redesignated by this subsection) the following new clause:

"(1) meet the supportive services needs of elderly victims of Alzheimers' disease and other neurological diseases and organic brain disorders and their families, including—

"(A) home health care for such victims;

"(B) adult day health care for such victims; and

"(C) homemaker aides, transportation, and inhome respite care for the families, particularly spouses, of such victims;".

(2) Section 422 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Whenever appropriate grants made and contracts entered into under this section shall be developed in consultation with the appropriate Long Term Care Gerontology Center.

"(2) Grants made and contracts entered into under this section shall include provisions for the appropriate dissemination of project results.".

(e) Section 423(b)(3) is amended by inserting (A) after the paragraph designation and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) Grants made and contracts entered into under this section shall include provisions for the appropriate dissemination of information regarding the development of such services.".

NATIONAL IMPACT ACTIVITIES

SEC. 17. (a) Section 425 is amended—

(1) by designating the first sentence as subsection (b),

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and

(3) by inserting after the section designation the following:

"(a) The Commissioner shall, upon request, provide assistance to State agencies on aging, to work in conjunction with State protective service agencies so as not to duplicate activities already undertaken by such State protective service agencies, for the provision of technical assistance and development of training materials for personnel in State and area agencies who are engaged or intend to engage in the prevention, identification, and treatment of elder abuse".

(b) Section 425(c) (as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) is amended by inserting after "carrying out" the following: "subsection (b) of this".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE IV

SEC. 18. Section 431(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title $28,500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $30,295,500 for fiscal year 1986, and $32,052,639 for fiscal year 1987.".

OLDER AMERICAN COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 19. (a) Section 502(c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Of the amount for any project to be paid by the Secretary under this subsection, not more than 12 per centum shall be available for paying the costs of administration for such project.".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 1985.

ADMINISTRATION FOR TITLE V

SEC. 20. Section 503(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) If the Secretary determines that to do so would increase job opportunities available to individuals under this title, the Secretary is authorized to coordinate the program assisted under this title with programs authorized under the Job Training Partnership Act, the Community Services Block Grant Act, and the Vocational Education Act of 1984. Appropriations under this Act may not be used to carry out any program under the Job Training Partnership Act, the Community Services Block Grant Act, or the Vocational Education Act of 1984.".

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 21. Section 506 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary shall require the State agency for each State receiving funds under this title to report at the beginning of each fiscal year on such State's compliance with subsection (c). Such report shall include the names and geographic location of all projects assisted under this title and carried out in the State and the amount allotted to each such project.".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 22. Section 508(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) $335,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $351,415,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $368,282,920 for fiscal year 1987; and".

GRANTS FOR INDIAN TRIBES

SEC. 23. Section 608(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are authorized to be appropriated $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $7,972,500 for fiscal year 1986, and $8,434,905 for fiscal year 1987 to carry out the provisions of this title other than section 606.".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 24. (a) The heading of title I is amended by striking out the colon and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon.

(b) Section 204(d) is amended by striking out clause (2) and by redesignating clauses (3), (4), (5), and (6) as clauses (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(c) The first sentence of section 206(b) is amended—

(1) by inserting "under" before "title IV", and

(2) by striking out "section or".

(d) The second sentence of section 304(c) is amended—

(1) by striking out "subsection (d)(1)(D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (d)(1)(C)"; and

(2) by striking out "funds for" and inserting in lieu thereof "funds or".

(e) Section 307(a)(20)(B)(ii) (as redesignated by section 11(f)) is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and".

(f) Section 309(b)(2) is amended by striking out "section 304(d)(1)(B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 304(d)(1)(D)".

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967

SEC. 25. (a) Section 11(f) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (hereinafter in this section referred to as "the Act") is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term 'employee' includes any individual who is a citizen of the United States employed by an employer in a workplace in a foreign country.".

(b)(1) Section 4(f)(1) of the Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon a comma and the following: "or where such practices involve an employee in a workplace in a foreign country, and compliance with such subsections would cause such employer, or a corporation controlled by such employer, to violate the laws of the country in which such workplace is located".

(2) Section 4 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) If an employer controls a corporation whose place of incorporation is in a foreign country, any practice by such corporation prohibited under this section shall be presumed to be such practice by such employer.

"(2) The prohibitions of this section shall not apply where the employer is a foreign person not controlled by an American employer.

"(3) For the purpose of this subsection the determination of whether an employer controls a corporation shall be based upon the—

"(A) interrelation of operations,

"(B) common management,

"(C) centralized control of labor relations, and

"(D) common ownership or financial control,

of the employer and the corporation.".

(c)(1) Section 12(c)(1) of the Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1967 is amended by striking out "$27,000" and inserting in lieu thereof $44,000".

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply with respect to any individual who retires, or is compelled to retire, before the date of the enactment of this Act.

● Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Aging and a number of my other colleagues in introducing the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984.

The Older Americans Act, first enacted in 1965, represents the only Federal social services program solely directed toward improving the lives of our senior citizens.

Demographic data on age changes in our society dramatically highlight the fact that one of the most significant demographic facts affecting American society is the aging of its population. The number of elderly persons has grown and, for the next 50 years, will continue to grow more rapidly that the total population. In 1982, 11 percent of all Americans were aged 65 and over; by the year 2025, a projected 19 percent of the total population will be elderly. These statistics represent a significant triumph for our society in terms of our standard of living and advances in medical science, but they bring with them an increasing responsibility to assist elderly individuals to live their lives with dignity.

Contrary to the widespread view, only about 5 percent of the elderly population live in nursing homes. Almost three-fourths of nursing home residents are without a spouse, compared with just over 40 percent of the noninstitutionalized elderly. The data strongly suggests that the absence of family or other support mechanisms

to provide health and maintenance requirements is the most critical factor in the institutionalization of an elderly person.

It is this concern with providing support for health and maintenance requirements of older individuals to which the Older Americans Act addresses itself. Its basic framework of a network of State and area agencies on aging seeks to provide a wide range of services, including transportation, home health care, homemaker services, escort and shopping services, outreach, home repair, elder abuse prevention, legal counseling, and other services to senior citizens. All of these services are designed to allow senior citizens to maintain maximum independence and remain within their own communities.

The bill which we are introducing today maintains and strengthens the basic structures of the Older Americans Act. While we have modified and altered the provisions of the act over the last 19 years, and we make further minor modifications today, it is my view that they have contributed to strengthening and coordinating systems of services reaching into every community, making possible a broad range of nutrition, access, health, and supportive services for elderly individuals. This act has proven itself worthy of our continued support and its program components deserve to be maintained even in these times of fiscal austerity.

Let me briefly highlight the major changes from existing law contained in the bill we are presenting today:

First: Federal Council on Aging. The bill amends the requirement for membership of the Federal Council of Aging. Current law requires that the Council be composed of 15 members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill still requires that the membership be 15, but a portion are appointed by the President, a portion by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and a portion by the Speaker of the House.

Second: Evaluation. Current law authorizes the Secretary to use up to 1 percent of the funds under the act or $1 million, whichever is greater, to conduct program evaluation. The bill limits the amount of funding for evaluation to one-tenth of 1 percent of the funds appropriated under the act or $300,000, whichever is lower. This amount reflects the committee's concern about the manner in which funds have been used, particularly the Department's siphoning off Older Americans Act money for evaluation of programs not in the field of aging and for support of administrative activities of the Department.

Third: Intrastate funding formulas. The bill clarifies existing law's requirement that each State publish its intrastate funding formula by requiring that the formulas, and the manner in which the formulas were arrived at be disclosed with sufficient detail that the public can better understand the formula in order to be able to comment intelligently.

Fourth: New authority with respect to Alzheimer's disease. The committee bill amends title III of the act to require each area agency on aging to give priority funding of supportive services for families of older persons with Alzheimer's disease. The idea behind this amendment is to provide in-home care and respite care for Alzheimer's victims and their families so that family care givers can have an alternative to institutionalizing the patient.

In addition, the bill establishes a new priority demonstration program under title IV of the act for projects related to services to older individuals with Alzheimer's disease and their families.

Fifth: Transfer of funds between supportive services and nutrition services. Current law allows States to tranfer up to 20 percent of its funds for supportive and nutrition services between these two separate allotments. The bill increases the allowable percentage transfer from 20 to 35 percent. During the past 2 years, States have increasingly transferred funds between the programs, and the bill is intended to increase State flexibility in the use of these moneys.

Sixth: Waiver authority. Current law allows the area agencies to request a waiver from the States with respect to the priority services—transportation, in-home services, and legal services; the bill adds Alzheimer's as a priority service—if the area agency can demonstrate that the priority service need is being met in the area. The bill requires the area agency to hold a public hearing on the issue of a waiver of any of the priority services prior to applying to the State for the waiver, and requires that the record of the public hearing be reviewed by the State prior to granting any such waiver.

Seventh: Elder abuse. The bill adds a new category of supportive service under title III dealing with elderly abuse. It would give States and area agencies authority to review complaints and provide referral services to elderly suffering from family, usually spouse, abuse.

Eighth: State administration. The committee bill increases the amount available for State administration activities by upping the State minimum and allowing State administrative funds as a percentage of the overall appropriation of title III, rather than as a separate line item subject to appropriations.

Ninth: Surplus commodities. The bill requires that States submit final reimbursement claims for meals within 90 days after the quarter for which the reimbursement is requested. This tracks language now included as a part of the agriculture appropriations bill and is aimed at requiring States to improve their reporting on claims for reimbursement.

Tenth: Title IV, training, research, and demonstration programs. The bill adds a statement of purpose for title IV, placing priority on education and training of personnel to work with older persons, research and development, demonstration activities, and dissemination of information on aging.

Eleventh: Long term care gerontology centers. The bill adds a new provision with respect to all the demonstration programs that they be developed and administered in conjunction with the regional long term care gerontology centers, where appropriate.

Twelfth: Title V, older worker employment. The bill adds a new provision placing a 12-percent administrative cap on the amount of title V funds which can be used for administrative costs. Existing law does not contain any legislatively imposed cap, although Labor Department regulations set that cap at 15 percent. The 12 percent is based on data compiled by GAO indicating that the average percentage of Federal funds used for administrative expenses by all the contractors was 11 percent for 1982–83. Because of a concern raised that the cap might create hardship for the minority contractors who do not have the economy of scale of some of the larger contractors, the effective date of this administrative cap was pushed forward a year to July 1, 1985.

Thirteenth: Authorizations. Authorization levels for 1985, 1986, and 1987, generally, reflect CBO current services levels based on the actual fiscal year 1984 appropriations. The two major exceptions are title III–B supportive services and title IV training, research, and demonstrations. In each of the above programs, the increase exceeds current services levels to reflect the committee's view that increased activities need to be undertaken.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart showing the authorization levels for aging programs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS, AS CONTAINED IN S. 2603

	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Fiscal year 1987
Title II: Federal Council on Aging	$200,000	$200,000	$200,000
Title III, Grants for State and community programs on aging:			
Supportive services and senior centers	265,000,000	281,695,000	298,033,310
Congregate nutrition services	338,000,000	350,168,000	366,976,060

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS, AS CONTAINED IN S. 2603—Continued

	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Fiscal year 1987
Home-delivered nutrition services	65,900,000	68,272,400	71,549,475
U.S. Department of Agriculture commodities	[1] 119,500,000	[1] 123,802,000	[1] 129,744,500
Title IV: Training, research and discretionary projects and programs	28,500,000	30,295,500	32,052,639
Title V: Community service employment for older Americans	335,000,000	351,415,000	368,282,920
Title VI: Grants for Indian tribes	7,500,000	7,972,500	8,434,000

[1] Plus such additional sums as may be necessary to maintain the level of reimbursement for the number of meals served in fiscal year 1984.●

● Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Aging, in cosponsoring legislation to reauthorize the Older Americans Act. The Older Americans Act has, since its enactment in 1965, served to unite the Federal, State, and local levels in providing essential services to our elderly. This act has been amended nine times since 1965, each time expanding its advocacy and its services. Its funding has also grown, from an original appropriation of $7.5 million to over $1 billion in fiscal year 1984. The Older Americans Act has also been a key force in attracting resources from the private sector to address the needs of our older population.

A constituent in Jacksonville, Fla., best summed up the value of the Older Americans Act; she wrote:

> The Older Americans Act has brought recognition to the American senior citizen that no other program has been able to accomplish. The Senior Employment program, I have seen firsthand, has given pride and a feeling of self-worth to the senior who finds employment and becomes a contributor to our work force. Nutrition programs facilitate a wholesome meal for the senior. The communities need more funds to provide transportation to the meal site . . . and homebound services. In essence, funds for the Older Americans Act are well spent, fiscally sound, and highly beneficial to the senior.

Mr. President, all of us in Congress recognize the value and importance of this program, and we seek expeditious passage of legislation to reauthorize it. I hope that it can be enacted before May, which is Older American's Month. Since this reauthorization process gives Congress the opportunity to improve the programs under the Older Americans Act, however, Senator GRASSLEY held extensive hearings in his Subcommittee on Aging. Testimony presented at these hearings clearly demonstrates the need for continued Federal funding for existing programs and also indicated areas where priority should be given. For example, Senator D'AMATO and Representative OLYMPIA SNOWE testified on the need to include in the Older Americans Act authority for services for elderly victims of Alzheimer's disease. Their eloquent testimony on the difficulties faced by these victims and their families prompted the subcommittee to include provisions in the act to authorize funding for training of health professionals who will specialize in the custodial or skilled care of Alzheimer victims. Also, the subcommittee included provisions requiring area agencies on aging to give priority to funding community support programs serving the families of Alzheimer's victims.

Another issue addressed in this reauthorization bill is the growing problem of elderly abuse. This problem has prompted the Attorney General of the United States to convene a task force to look into the problem of family violence and to make recommendations to Congress. In addition, Senator DENTON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Family, has stated that his subcommittee will hold hearings on domestic violence, including abuse of the elderly. The Older Americans Act has been amended to reflect our growing concern regarding the need to identify the extent of the problem and assure the availability of adequate prevention and treatment services for elderly abuse. Also, the act will require the State to identify the existing public and private entities involved in this area, determine the extent of unmet needs, and establish programs in those areas where services do not exist.

An issue that was debated before the Subcommittee on Aging but incorporated into a separate bill pending before the full Labor and Human Resources Committee was the need for additional community support programs for the frail elderly. I believe we must make an extra effort to reach this group of vulnerable older Americans. Poverty and poor health can isolate the elderly and defeat the purpose of the Older Americans Act. Therefore, I was pleased that the committee favorably reported S. 2301, which incorporates a provision authorizing the expenditure of $150 million in fiscal year 1986 and $200 million in fiscal year 1987 for community-based home health services for the elderly. This provision would provide basic in-home support services, such as a visiting homemaker or health aide, and adult day care or occupational or respiratory therapy to those elderly who are at risk of institutionalization. These services, which enable the frail elderly to avoid premature or unnecessary institutionalization, can result in enormous cost savings over the long run. Fortunately, Congress is beginning to recognize the value of home care for the elderly and disabled, but more needs to be done. Preventing unnecessary institutionalization is crucial to the well-being of the elderly, and it is particularly important in States like Florida, which have large elderly populations.

Mr. President, this reauthorization legislation represents a belief held by a majority of our colleagues that the Older Americans Act is worthwhile and should be continued. It also represents our commitment to continual improvement of programs serving our elderly citizens. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it. The elderly are more grateful than many of us realize; in the words of one of my constituents: "Thanks for your very good work on the Older Americans Act. I think it's great. God bless you for all that you are doing for us shut-ins. We love you."●

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984, a 3-year reauthorization of the the Older Americans Act which is designed to meet the social needs of or senior citizens.

Even though there are other Federal programs that assist the elderly the Older Americans Act is the most comprehensive vehicle for the organization and delivery of services to the aged needy. This act, created in Congress in 1965, has developed from a program of small grants to a major social service provider. By 1983, there were over 650 home-delivered nutrition centers, and over 54,000 community service jobs.

Of the six titles of the Older Americans Act, title III, IV, and V, are the most crucial. Title III grants moneys to State agencies on aging to organize nutritional (Meals on Wheels) and supportive services. Title IV authorizes moneys for training, research, and demonstration programs. Title V, the Community Service Employment program for older Americans, subsidizes part-time community service jobs for unemployed, low-income persons over the age of 55.

I want to commend my close friend and colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, for the fine work he has done on this bill. He has shown his deep understanding of the problems that face the elderly. In this legislation, he has successfully struck a balance between the needs of the elderly and the constraints of budget limitations.

I am especially supportive of this reauthorization of the Older Americans Act because of its streamlined approach to old and new problems. One of the new problems that the elderly fear is Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's disease costs this Nation over $25 billion annually. Up to 1 million are believed to be affected, 5 percent of those over 65 years of age. It is believed that over a quarter of all nursing home patients have Alzheimer's disease.

When the Alzheimer's disease sufferer is not in a nursing home, it is the family which must provide much of the assistance. There is now little as-

sistance, however, for the family. The proposals within this legislation will address this matter.

Under title IV of this act, support will be given for training personnel to provide better care of those afflicted with Alzheimer's disease and related neurological disorders. The availability and commitment of qualified persons to provide quality care to Alzheimer's disease sufferers will be increased. It is just as important to provide services for the victims of Alzheimer's disease as it is to provide respite services for their families. This legislation is an excellent step toward comprehensive respite services for the elderly.

I want the sponsors of this important legislation to know that, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I will do my best to work for full appropriations of the Older Americans Act. I hope my colleagues will do the same.●

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation to reauthorize the Older Americans Act. The bill we are introducing today will strengthen the act and provide additional benefits to our Nation's senior citizens.

With passage of the Older Americans Act in 1965, Congress created a new Federal program specifically designed to meet the social service needs of older persons, The act has been amended 10 times since 1965 and has grown from an original program of small grants into one which now supports an organized network of 57 State units on aging, 662 area agencies on aging, and 25,000 local nutrition and supportive service providers. The budget for the Older Americans Act has increased from $7.5 million in 1966 to over $1 billion in 1984. The act is the major vehicle for the organization and delivery of services to older Americans.

During 1983, an estimated 9.1 million older Americans were served by title III supportive services. The nutrition programs served an estimated 203 million meals, and 300,000 volunteers, many of them elderly, augmented the efforts of paid staff. In addition to providing for basic social and nutritional needs, the act supports other important services at the local level, including employment, counseling, home health care, transportation, adult day care, information, and referral, and legal services. Services are provided to all seniors regardless of income, but the law places a special emphasis on those in "greatest social or economic need." The Older Americans Act has grown to meet its objective to promote among older Americans "freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives."

The legislation we are introducing today will reauthorize the Older Americans Act for an additional 3 years; and it includes several new provisions to benefit older Americans, their families, and their communities. The bill requires area agencies on aging to expend an adequate proportion of title III-B funds on the delivery of services for the prevention of elder abuse. Under this new provision, States would establish a program for public education to prevent and identify elder abuse, receiving reports of elder abuse, and information and referral. These programs would be established consistent with relevant State law and coordinated with existing State adult protective service activities.

The bill also provides for the establishment of demonstration projects under title III in health and nutrition education. These projects would be designed to improve the health and nutrition of older Americans by increasing their physical fitness activities and improving the nutritional value of their meals at home. These projects would be established and administered in consultation with the appropriate long-term care gerontology center. Title IV of the act is amended to provide priority training to persons engaged in the provision of supportive services to victims of Alzheimer's disease and their families. Authorization levels for the act will allow programs to continue at current service levels, with modest growth in several titles.

I enthusiastically support the Older Americans Act and recognize the valuable role it plays in furthering the independence and self-sufficiency of many of our older citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to reauthorize the Older Americans Act.

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, it has been over 19 years since the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965. During that time, we have seen the program grow from a few small social service grants and research projects to a network of over 1,500 individual community service projects serving older persons. These programs have been capably administered by 57 State and territorial units on aging through a complex network of over 670 locally based area agencies on aging. While the budget for these programs in 1966 was $5.7 million, more than $1 billion are committed to them in the current fiscal year.

Since the enactment of this important piece of legislation, the Federal response to the needs of the elderly has been significant. Twenty years ago the poverty rate among older Americans was 33 percent. There was no medicare, medicaid, title XX, or food stamps. A national focus on the special needs and problems of older persons had just begun to emerge shortly after the first White House Conference on Aging in 1961. In 1960, less than 15 percent of the Federal budget was spent on the elderly, and almost all of this spending was in the form of retirement benefits. Since then, the share of the budget spent on the elderly has nearly doubled. In part, this was due to the fact that increasing numbers of older Americans have received improved social security benefits as the system matured.

A more significant cause of this increase, however, was legislated improvements in income protection, health insurance and services which were enacted in the late 1960's and the early 1970's in an effort to reduce high rates of poverty among the elderly. Today, that rate has been cut by more than half, and older Americans at every economic level are more economically secure, enjoy better access to health care, and have a wide range of community services available to support their independence.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, I have worked to improve the functioning of our income, health, housing, and services programs. The Older Americans Act was not intended to meet all the needs of older people, nor can it reasonably by expected to do so. The act is designed to promote social functioning and not, for example, income maintenance. Its first purpose is to assist all older people to be part of the mainstream of American society. Its second purpose is to assist those older persons who are frail in receiving the support they require to live with dignity.

During the past several months, the Senate Aging Committees have held several hearings designed to examine the success of this program in meeting its goals and to receive recommendations for setting new policy directions. In addition, the national aging organizations have done an excellent job at both assessing the progress and examining the shortcomings of the Older Americans Act. We have appreciated their input.

Based on this oversight effort, I do not believe that this is the appropriate time for a major overhaul of the act. Our experience since the 1981 amendments is that the act is working reasonably well. Older persons are indeed benefiting from Older American Act programs that operate in their communities.

The comments we have received on the act, however, indicate that certain additional minor adjustments would contribute to the effectiveness of the legislation. The legislation we are introducing today, I believe, will accomplish this objective. Among other things the bill will strengthen the appointment procedure for members of the Federal Council on Aging, improve supportive services for families of older individuals with Alzheimers dis-

ease, focus attention on issues related to elder abuse, enhance the coordination of the senior community service employment program, and expand resources for additional research and training in the field of aging. These are important and significant improvements.

I have appreciated the opportunity to work along with my distinguished colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, in helping to develop realistic legislative recommendations for strengthening the Older Americans Act. I am pleased to be a cosponsor to this measure, and commend both Senators GRASSLEY and EAGLETON and the staff of the Subcommittee on Aging for their excellent work in formulating this bill.

Mr. President, the goals of the Older Americans Act have been reaffirmed each time the Congress has reauthorized the act. I believe that the suggestions incorporated in this reauthorization bill will further enhance the achievement of those goals which we have set before us.●

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am happy to join Senators GRASSLEY and EAGLETON in introducing the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, OAA. Senators GRASSLEY and EAGLETON and their staffs have worked hard to hammer out a most comprehensive piece of legislation. I commend them for their dedication and for the fine work they have produced.

I want to reaffirm my support for the Older Americans Act and the programs it authorizes. As the greying of America continues, we will need the continuum of opportunities, services, and care for older people at the community level that the act is designed to bring about. As attorney general of my State of New Mexico, I was able to observe firsthand the service delivery systems progressively performed by our New Mexico State Agency on Aging. The participation and the involvement of the local communities and the assembling of networks to perform these duties have been exemplary.

The reauthorizing of the Older Americans Act is just the beginning of our task in the years ahead. First, we must overcome the negative stereotypes about older people that have helped drive many into forced retirement, denying them the opportunity to remain active, self-sufficient members of the society. We need to begin development of more flexible work and retirement policies, allowing older Americans who want to remain in the work force a variety of options for phased in or gradual retirement.

Second, we must insure that adequate assistance and support services, such as housing, health care, and income assistance are available for all older Americans who need them. Despite the tremendous successes in the past several decades in reducing poverty among them, inadequate incomes and resources continue to be devastating problems for millions of elderly people. The native American elderly are perhaps the most underserved group subjected to poverty and inadequate incomes.

The Senate may want to consider during our deliberation of the reauthorization of Older Americans Act the issue of targeting. Without targeting of funds to address the needs of poor, disabled, and disadvantage, the Older Americans Act will not serve those most in need. I suggest, therefore, that the language in section 305(a)(2)(E) of the act should remain the same, or the old language targeting the poor and minorities should be revised.

Mr. President, I am firmly committed to maintaining the strength of this vital program, as well as the adequacy of its benefits. I support the passage of this legislation and urge my colleagues to express their support as well.●

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, senior citizens are among the most valuable resources that this country possesses. I am therefore very proud to join with the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Aging, Senator GRASSLEY, and my fellow members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Human Resources today in introducing the bill which will reauthorize the Older Americans Act for another 3 years.

No State offers a better example of the value of the Older Americans Act than my State of Rhode Island. One-quarter of our population, or more than 230,000 individuals, is over the age of 55. More than 40,000 of them last year took advantage of the senior centers, meals sites, Meals on Wheels, community service jobs, or other services provided by the Older Americans Act in Rhode Island.

The result of these services is better health, more community involvement, and a greater sense of well-being. No activity of the Federal Government is more meaningful or valuable to the senior citizens of my State than the Older Americans Act.

One of the remarkable aspects of this act is the stability and efficiency with which the programs operate. The comprehensive and thoughtful hearings on reauthorization assembled by Chairman GRASSLEY and his staff revealed no major shortcomings, no waste of Government money, and no need for large changes in the act. The hearings did reveal opportunities for minor but important improvements in the act and its programs, and many of those areas have been addressed by the reauthorization bill that is introduced today.

I would like to mention, Mr. President, several areas of improvement which have been of particular interest to me. These subjects came up during the subcommittee hearing which I was fortunate to chair in Rhode Island, and in testimony presented during hearings here in Washington. In each of these areas, the subcommittee chairman and other subcommittee members have been most cooperative in accepting amendments that I have proposed. The amendments would not carry the strength and value that they do were it not for my colleagues interest in them.

The first area concerns education for seniors in personal health and nutrition. One of the most valuable functions that any social service program can perform is that of teaching people how to improve their physical well-being. The task is difficult, however, because all of us as adults have great difficulty in altering the habits and patterns of daily living that we have constructed over the years. Congregate meal sites funded under title III-C of the Older Americans Act, for example, may include nutrition education as part of their daily activities. A 1983 study by Kirschner Associates and the Opinion Research Corp. for the Administration on Aging found, however, that "nutrition education activities offered by meal sites have no discernible impact upon participants' dietary intakes away from the site." A study by Associate Professor Phyllis Brown of the University of Rhode Island arrived at the same conclusion.

Simple means exist, nonetheless, for improved education and daily practices. Dr. Sidney Katz, director of the Southeastern New England Long-Term Care Gerontology Center at Brown University, has stated for example that improved physical fitness is possible just by making daily tasks a bit harder, rather than easier, to do. One example would be that of putting boxes and cans in the kitchen on higher shelves, so that a longer reach is necessary to get to them.

The amendment I have proposed, which was accepted by the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee, would therefore require each of the States to develop new and innovative demonstration projects in health and nutrition education. Improved techniques which can be developed for teaching and retention of necessary changes in daily habits will aid all of us eventually by promoting longer and healthier lives.

The second area of improvement, Mr. President, concerns the prevention of elderly abuse. Physical, emotional, and financial abuse of the elderly has been a subject of growing concern within our country for several years, but Congress has not yet fully responded. I was shocked to discover recently as a result of a 3-year Administration on Aging demonstration project on elder abuse in my own State of Rhode Island, that the level

of physical abuse of frail seniors was far higher than anyone had imagined, and in some cases was life-threatening. Massachusetts and New York, also conducted demonstration grants, and discovered similar patterns. Hearings by the Senate Special Committee on Aging and the House Select Committee on Aging in 1979 and 1980 have provided documentation of the existence of this tragic problem, and at different times the Senator from California, Senator CRANSTON, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator HEINZ, and Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR of Ohio, have sought legislative solutions. To date, none of their efforts have been fully approved by Congress.

The amendment I have proposed will require the aging network to respond to this problem by using the social services that it is so skilled at providing. Public education, receipt of complaints, discussions with the parties, and referral to other sources of help are all activities that State and local areas of aging are well familiar with, and the Older Americans Act will now insure that these activities are provided with respect to elderly abuse. I am particularly grateful to the Senator from Alabama, Mr. DENTON, for his cooperation in drafting mutually acceptable provisions, and I would also like to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. HATCH, and the Senator from Missouri, Mr. EAGLETON, for their help.

One further area of improvement has concerned the "targeting" provisions of the Older Americans Act. The minority elderly have historically possessed a greater need for services because of their greater poverty, yet the level of services that they have received has not reflected this reality. I am thankful that the chairman, Mr. GRASSLEY, has accepted my amendment so that minorities will be specifically mentioned in the language targeting services to the economically and socially needy.

Mr. President, the Older Americans Act is an important example of the ability of our Federal Government to respond to a need for assistance and services on the part of a group of the Nation's people. The drafting and assembly of this reauthorization further exemplifies that responsiveness, and I compliment the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRASSLEY, and the ranking minority member, Mr. EAGLETON, for their work and success. I look forward to swift passage, signing, and implementation of this bill.●

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. DENTON, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. EAST, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HELMS, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NUNN, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. PERCY):

S.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL ARSON AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to introduce, along with 18 of my distinguished colleagues, a joint resolution designating the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week."

Arson is a universal crime, quite diverse in its scope and complexity. It is a street crime, a white-collar crime, a terrorist crime, a crime against property, and a crime against persons. It is carried out by both the rational and the irrational mind, by children, by the elderly, and by persons of both sexes.

According to statistics of the U.S. Fire Administration, one out of four fires is of suspicious origin. In the 1970's, arson was one of the fastest growing crimes. In every State of this Nation, arson is taking the lives, the health, and the money of innocent people. All of us pay for these arson fires through higher insurance rates.

Arson is deadly and costly. Each year approximately 900 people are killed and 4,000 persons are injured in arson-originated fires. Each such fire averages over $6,000 in property loss. Annually, direct property loss from arson totals $1.2 billion and indirect property loss from arson totals $15 billion. Almost 40 percent of the wildfires in the Southern States are incendiary in nature. These wildfires destroy approximately 350 million feet of wood annually. This is over half the total acreage loss due to fire.

Arson is primarily a local problem. Only when it is committed against Government-owned property, when it involves violations of Federal law, or when it is used against property affecting interstate or foreign commerce does arson become a Federal crime.

Arson is an intentional crime and is, therefore, avoidable. However, the complexity of arson makes it difficult to recognize and prevent. There are usually no witnesses to the crime, and much of the evidence is burned up. There is a low risk of apprehension and imprisonment. Also, the traditional roles of policemen, firemen, local prosecutors, and insurance personnel often hamper arson control and prevention.

We, the Members of this body, addressed the issue of arson in the 97th Congress when we passed the Anti-Arson Act of 1982, Public Law 97-298, and again in this Congress in title X, part M, of S. 1762, which passed the Senate overwhelmingly by a vote of 91 to 1. That is not enough. We must make all Americans aware of the arson problem, its impact on each of us, and the community resources available to us in the event we are victims of arson. Accordingly, I am introducing a joint resolution to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 283

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas one of every four fires is of suspicious origin, according to statistics of the U.S. Fire Administration;

Whereas death caused by arson has increased dramatically over the last ten years;

Whereas no other fire cause has exceeded arson in total dollar loss;

Whereas the crime of arson is associated with high profits and a low risk of apprehension and imprisonment;

Whereas the complexity of arson makes it a difficult crime to recognize and prevent; and

Whereas we need to create an awareness of arson, its impact on each of us, and the community resources available to us in the event that we are the victims of arson: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week," and to call upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies and activities.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. PELL, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. DODD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. CHILES):

S.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 2, 1984, as "National School-Age Child Care Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL SCHOOL-AGE CHILD CARE AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, today, I am introducing a joint resolution designating the week beginning September 2, 1984, as "National School-Age Child Care Awareness Week." This is a companion to the resolution offered by Representative JOHN MCKERNAN, JR., of Maine in the House of Representatives.

Although the need for child care for school-age children is not new, the

demand for such care is increasing. Over the past three decades, the dramatic increase in two working parent families and working single heads of households has left millions of school-age children without adult company for significant periods of time each day. In factories and offices throughout our country, parents wait anxiously for their children to call and confirm their safe arrival at home. They hope that their children can take care of themselves for the 2 or 3 hours between the end of the school day and the time when they return home from work. Yet, what do we know about children in self-care, and what is happening to them? In June of last year, the Senate Children's Caucus conducted a policy forum on children in self-care and found that the risks to these children are substantial. The research suggests that children in self-care run greater physical and psychological risks, including accidents and feelings of fear and loneliness, than children who are cared for by an adult. In my home State of Michigan, for example, fire officials in Detroit estimate that one in six fires is caused by a child at home alone.

Some parents and communities have recognized the need for school-age child care and are developing programs for children before and after school. Additionally, traditional family and youth organizations, such as the Y, Campfire, and Boys Club, have developed similar programs for these children. Yet despite these efforts, estimates suggest that as many as 6 to 7 million school-age children may be in self-care each day. Clearly, Mr. President, much more needs to be done to protect our most valuable natural resource, our children.

Last year, I introduced, along with Senator PELL, the School Facilities Child Care Act, S. 1531, which authorizes $15 million a year for 3 years for grants to public and nonprofit organizations to operate school-age child care programs in public schools. Through the use of existing public school facilities, this legislation represents a commonsense and cost-effective approach to child care for school-age children. Many agree with this assessment as nearly 30 organizations have endorsed this legislation and 19 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the Senate are cosponsors.

It is my hope that through this joint resolution I am introducing today, we will generate a greater public awareness of the problems facing children in self-care, and I urge my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring this joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 284

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas more than half of the children in the United States are in families in which both parents are in the work force;

Whereas more than one in five children in the United States are in a one-parent family;

Whereas changes in the composition of American families and the American work force have resulted in an increased demand for child care for children of all ages;

Whereas the demand for child care for school-age children has increased at a greater rate than the availability of school-age child care;

Whereas estimates show that millions of school-age children between the ages of six and thirteen, often referred to as latchkey children, may return alone after school to an empty house or in the supervision of a slightly older brother or sister;

Whereas research studies have indicated that children in self and sibling care run greater physical and psychological risks, including accidents and feelings of fear and loneliness, than children who are cared for by an adult;

Whereas the Congress has begun to examine the issue of child care and the role of Federal and State government, the private sector, and parents in providing child care;

Whereas the parents, communities, employers, and agencies serving youth that have recognized the shortage of adequate and affordable school-age child care have developed after school programs for children in their communities; and

Whereas many more parents, communities, employers, and agencies serving youth need to address the problems facing these children and to maximize the use of State and Federal resources in collaboration with these efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 2, 1984, is hereby designated as "National School-Age Child Care Awareness Week" and the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 20

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. EVANS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to provide for a 2-year budget process, and for other purposes.

S. 430

At the request of Mr. TSONGAS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of S. 430, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

S. 1405

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HECHT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1405, a bill to assure the first amendment rights of all citizens and to provide criminal penalties for violations thereof.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to clarify the application of the Federal antitrust laws to local governments.

S. 1612

At the request of Mr. BAKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1612, a bill to amend title VIII of the act commonly referred to as the Civil Rights Act of 1978 to provide the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Attorney General with additional authority to enforce rights to fair housing, and for other purposes.

S. 1980

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1980, a bill to recognize the organization known as the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) was added as a consponsor of S. 2031, a bill relating to the residence of the American Ambassador to Israel.

S. 2160

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2160, a bill to establish a National Fisheries Marketing Council to enable the U.S. fish industry to establish a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to expand markets for fisheries products, and for other purposes.

S. 2237

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2237, a bill to strengthen the Asbestos School Hazard Detection and Control Act of 1980.

S. 2266

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2266, a bill to grant a Federal charter to Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

S. 2315

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2315, a bill to amend the Energy Security Act and the National Energy Conservation Policy to repeal the statutory authorities administered by the Residential Energy Conservation Service and the Commercial and Apartment Conservation Service.

S. 2380

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2380, a bill to reduce unfair practices and provide for orderly trade in certain carbon, alloy, and stainless steel mill products, to reduce unemployment, and for other purposes.

S. 2436

At the request of Mr. GOLDWATER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2436, a bill to authorize appropriations of funds for activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. QUAYLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2496, a bill to amend the Adult Education Act in order to simplify requirements for States and other recipients participating in Federal adult education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2505

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2505, a bill to provide a right of first refusal for metropolitan areas before a professional sports team is relocated, and for other purposes.

S. 2515

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2515, a bill to extend the provisions of chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, relating to retirement and separation for physical disability, to cadets and midshipmen.

S. 2584

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2584, a bill to provide authorization of appropriations for activities carried out under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 215

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 215, a joint resolution to designate the week of April 23-27, 1984, as "National Student Leadership Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 230

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 230, a joint resolution to designate the week of October 7, 1984, through October 13, 1984, as "National Birds of Prey Conservation Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 236

At the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 236, a joint resolution relating to cooperative East-West ventures in space as an alternative to a space arms race.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 239

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 239, a joint resolution designating the week of October 21 through October 27, 1984, as "Lupus Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 240

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 240, a joint resolution relating to the 40th anniversary of the liberation of Rome.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 267

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 267, a joint resolution to designate the week of September 23, 1984, through September 29, 1984, as "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 273

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HECHT), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE), the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON), the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 273, a joint resolution to designate the week of May 13, 1984, through May 19, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 274

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 274, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 279

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 279, a joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 74

At the request of Mr. PELL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr DURENBERGER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 74, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the future of the people on Taiwan.

SENATE RESOLUTION 122

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 122, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should reduce imports of apparel so that imported apparel comprises no more than 25 percent of the American apparel market.

SENATE RESOLUTION 294

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 294, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Government of the Soviet Union should allow Igor V. Ogurtsov to be released from exile and allowed to emigrate to the West without renouncing his views, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 312

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 312, a

resolution to honor Comdr. Alphonse Desjardins, founder of La Caisse Populaire de Ste-Marie, Manchester, N.H.

SENATE RESOLUTION 372

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 372, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding exposure of members of the Armed Forces to ionizing radiation and to herbicides containing dioxin.

SENATE RESOLUTION 373—RELATING TO THE FREE FLOW OF TRAVEL LITERATURE FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PRESSLER (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SASSER, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 373

Whereas Americans travelling abroad represent a significant source of income to the countries they visit and foreign visitors to the United States make significant contributions to domestic interstate commerce;

Whereas the benefits of international tourism are maximized by the free exchange of travel literature on a worldwide basis;

Whereas a 9 per cent surcharge is levied on travel literature sent into Canada from the United States, while there is no such fee on promotional travel literature sent by Canada into the United States;

Whereas this type of travel literature, which describes tourist attractions in the United States, is distributed free of charge on a worldwide basis;

Whereas the United States travel and tourism industry and the United States economy are adversely affected by any restriction on promoting travel opportunities in the United States; and

Whereas previous attempts to restore the ability of the United States travel and tourism industry freely to promote United States travel destinations have been unsuccessful: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should direct the Secretary of Commerce to seek the discontinuance of practices that restrict the free flow of travel literature to Canada from the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce is urged to present this issue to the Tourism Policy Council, pursuant to the requirements of the National Tourism Policy Act (22 U.S.C. 2121 et seq.), and seek the Council's recommended course of action.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I rise to submit this measure, since it concerns a problem that should have never surfaced, and most certainly should have been resolved by other means.

Last year, our close neighbor and ally, Canada, imposed a 9-percent tax on travel literature imported from the United States. Since the imposition of this tax, our Government has tried, unsuccessfully, to convince the Canadian Government to remove this unfair infringement upon our ability to promote U.S. travel destinations within Canada. I submit this resolution today in the hope that a clear statement by the Senate will help to resolve this unfortunate problem.

This tax is unfair for several reasons. First of all, the literature that is being taxed is not sold in Canada, but distributed free of charge to educate Canadians about travel opportunities in the United States, such as those in my home State of South Dakota.

Second, there is no similar tax imposed on Canadian travel literature brought into the United States, nor should there be. I believe that international travel contributes so greatly to worldwide good will and intercultural appreciation that all nations should be allowed to freely promote their travel destinations throughout the world. I fear that a movement to impose a reciprocal tax might gain momentum if this situation is not quickly resolved, and I do not think any of us view retaliation as an appropriate solution.

Also, Mr. President, visitors to Canada from the United States account for approximately two-thirds of Canada's tourism revenues. This Senator cannot conceive of any reason why Canada would initiate barriers to our mutual ability to freely promote our travel destinations within each other's borders.

In conclusion, I must point out that our Government has thus far been very patient with the Canadians. Although efforts by officials of both the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration and the Department of State have yet to resolve this situation, no one has proposed the imposition of a reciprocal tax.

My hope is that the matter can be resolved without retaliatory measures, and I ask my colleagues to join me in urging the President to direct the appropriate members of his Cabinet to renew efforts aimed at eliminating this tax.

Already, the Senate Tourism Caucus has sent a letter to the Secretary of State, signed by 15 Senators, calling this problem to his attention. I hope that this resolution will bring more pressure to bear and will help bring about the only fair solution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

SYMMS AMENDMENT NO. 3031

Mr. SYMMS proposed an amendment (which was subsequently modified) to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER and others to the bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: "Act.

SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $296,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $324,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $357,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(b) For all non-defense, discretionary programs, budget authority (or program levels, where appropriate) shall be reduced to a level which is 10% below the Congressional Budget Office baseline level, as estimated in January 1984, in fiscal year 1985. For fiscal years 1986 and 1987, such budget authority or programs levels shall be those determined above for fiscal year 1985.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no pay raises for civilian employees or for military employees' of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1985, 1986, or 1987.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no cost of living adjustments in federal benefit programs. This subsection shall not apply to means—tested—entitlements.

(e) On October 1, 1984, every senior executive staff employee may receive a one-time bonus in the amount of $20,000.00, *Provided*, That the spending reduction directed by this section have been achieved.

DECONCINI (AND MATTINGLY) AMENDMENT NO. 3032

Mr. DECONCINI (for himself and Mr. MATTINGLY) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in amendment numbered 3027, insert the following:

COST SAVINGS BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

SEC. . (a) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for travel and transportation of persons and transportation of things for officers and employees of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $750,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such travel and transportation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduction in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government. In making such allocation, the Director shall not reduce any amounts to be obligated for debt collection, administration of loans, necessary and essential law enforcement activities, or emergency national defense activities of the Federal Government.

(b) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for consultant services by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $100,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such services for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduc-

tion in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch.

(c) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for public affairs activities, public relations activities, public information activities, and advertising by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $1,000,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduction in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government.

(d) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the total amount which may be obligated for publishing, printing, reproduction, and audiovisual activities by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government shall be reduced by $250,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall allocate the reduction in such total amount required by the preceding sentence among the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government.

(e) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall effect savings of $2,100,000,000 through enhanced identification, recovery, and collection of Federal overpayments, delinquencies, and indebtedness which departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government have most recently considered to be uncollectible. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall implement the preceding sentence in cooperation with the Comptroller General of the United States.

(f)(1) For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, shall reduce the total amount which may be obligated for operation, maintenance, management, leasing, acquisition, and disposal of non-tactical, non-law enforcement motor vehicles by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by $160,000,000 below the total amount appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, shall promulgate standards governing the identification, collection, and analysis of data which is necessary to implement the preceding sentence.

(2) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, shall conduct a comprehensive and detailed study of the feasibility of entering into contracts with qualified motor vehicle fleet management firms or other private firms and organizations to meet the requirements of the executive branch of the Government for the operation, maintenance, leasing, acquisition, and disposal of motor vehicles. Such study shall include an analysis of the costs that would be incurred, and the benefits that would be provided, as a result of such contracts. Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare and transmit a report containing the findings and conclusions of the study required by this paragraph to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, including the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

(g) Within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare and transmit to the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the Senate and House of Representatives a report describing the allocations and savings made in carrying out such subsections (a) through (f).

(h) In carrying out subsections (a) through (f), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall adopt, whenever possible, the recommendations, management improvements, and cost control opportunities specified in the report of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control.

MATTINGLY AMENDMENT NO. 3033

Mr. MATTINGLY proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

At the end of amendment No. 3029, insert the following:

It is the sense of the Senate that:

One, federal spending currently exceeds three-fourths of a trillion dollars and, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will surpass the trillion dollar a year level before the end of this decade; and

Two, an ever-growing share of the federal budget is uncontrollable; and

Three, since 1970, as a percentage of gross national product, federal receipts and federal outlays have averaged 19.2 percent and 21.9 percent of GNP respectively; and

Four, detailed examination of historical trends point to expenditure growth as the real culprit of our ever-diminishing ability to balance the federal government's books; and

Five, the obvious result of this economic imbalance is persistent deficits; and

Six, deficits do matter, for they signal something is fundamentally wrong with the trend in government spending; and

Seven, the continued increase in federal spending results in large budget deficits; and

Eight, large budget deficits cause a rise in interest rates and inflation and can choke off the current economic recovery; and

Nine, a National Commission Federal Spending Reform, similar to the National Commission on Social Security Reform, should be established to study the growth in federal spending and report to the Congress after January 1, 1985, on those steps Congress might consider for the purpose of reforming federal spending programs and curbing their growth in an effort to regain control of the federal budget and reduce the federal deficit; and

Ten, such a commission should—

(a) be composed of distinguished leaders from the executive and legislative branches of government, business, labor, and education, and

(b) consult with other private and public sector experts for recommendations about reforms that would best address existing problems.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public the scheduling of a public hearing before the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources to consider S. 2157, to clarify the treatment of mineral materials on public lands. The hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 22, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements for the hearing record should write to the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.

For further information regarding this hearing you may wish to contact Mr. Bob Terrell of the subcommittee staff at 224-5205.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NUTRITION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Nutrition of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will conduct a hearing on Monday, April 30, 1984, at 2 p.m., in room SR-328-A.

The purpose of the hearing is a general oversight of legislative proposals relating to the food stamp program.

For further information please contact Chris Bolton at 224-6521 or the Agriculture Committee staff at 224-0014.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY REGULATION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation, of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 26, at 2 p.m., to hold an oversight hearing on North American natural gas reserves and resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND THEATER NUCLEAR FORCES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces, of the Committee on Armed Services, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 26, at 10 a.m., to receive testimony on theater nuclear forces and chemical warfare in review of S. 2414, the Department of Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PREPAREDNESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcom-

mittee on Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 26, to receive testimony on the Air Force and Army munitions program, in review of S. 2414, DOD Authorization Act, 1985.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 26, in closed session, to receive a briefing on intelligence matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

LOW-INCOME HOUSING: A GROWING CRISIS

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, in recent years the National Low Income Housing Coalition has gained a brilliant national reputation as one of the most effective organizations supporting decent housing for low and moderate income Americans. The Coalition's reputation is in large degree a tribute to the knowledge and skillful efforts of its president, Cushing Dolbeare and chairman, our former colleague, Ed Brooke.

Mr. President, I want to call my colleagues attention to testimony presented by Cushing Dolbeare before the House Committee on Appropriations.

Her analysis reviews the effects of the President's fiscal year 1985 budget in light of national housing needs. It provides additional evidence that this administration has consistently used administrative action and spending cuts to drastically reduce Federal support for decent housing for our most needy citizens.

She points out that 7.5 million households are in need of decent, affordable housing. In 1980, 6.3 million households could afford no more than $125 a month in rent and decent apartments running at that level were only available for less than half of those families. The problem is clear, the number of low-income households has risen far faster than the number of low rent units available.

Her analysis also shows that for every dollar spent on defense in 1981, 14 cents was spent on low-income housing and in Reagan's fiscal year 1985 proposal 1.5 cents would be spent on low-income housing.

Mr. President, Congress is in the midst of a major debate on the budgets for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985, and I urge my colleagues to study this report which contains a wealth of information on the budget effects on housing the poor of this Nation. It makes a compelling case for a need to reorder our spending priorities.

Mr. President, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The report follows:

LOW-INCOME HOUSING: A GROWING CRISIS

Testimony of Cushing N. Dolbeare, President, National Low Income Housing Coalition, before Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, April 11, 1984.

The National Low Income Housing Coalition appreciates this opportunity to testify on the 1985 appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We will emphasize low income housing, and attempt to set the Department's budget request in the context of the critical housing needs of low income people.

Two years ago, President Reagan's Commission on Housing submitted its final report to him. That report stated that there were over ten million very low income renter households in this nation. One quarter lived in subsidized housing. Almost all of the rest were in substandard housing or paying more than 25 percent of their income for shelter, or both. In other words, after almost half a century of providing housing assistance for low income people, we are still at least 7.5 million units short.

The National Low Income Housing Coalition believes that sound, effective programs to meet the needs of these 7.5 million households should have the highest priority in allocating resources for housing. To deal with their needs, we believe several major changes in federal policy and programs—unfortunately reaching well beyond the jurisdiction of this committee—must be adopted. Primary among these are a housing allowance (or "voucher") program, under which the groundrules for eligibility would be set and then vouchers made available for all who qualified. Such a program must be coupled with effective approaches to provision of affordable housing, or the cost of the program could become uncontrollable. We therefore propose that at least 750,000 units be added to the permanent stock of affordable units each year.

The rising cost of assisted housing programs is due in large measure to an inability to control housing costs. Over the decade of the 1970's a decade which saw the largest increase in assisted housing units ever, we lost a net of over one million low rent units (rents below $125 monthly) form the inventory each year, primarily (but not exclusively) to rising rents and utility costs. Using the present 30 percent-of-income-for-shelter standard of subsidized housing programs, a household with an income of $5,000 can "afford" $125 monthly for shelter. Yet, as the following tabulation shows, the number of low rent units has decreased far more rapidly than the number of low income households:

	1970	1980
Households under $5,000	8.4	6.3
Units under $125	14.9	2.7
Surplus/deficit	+6.5	−3.6

In other words, even if problems of quality, availability, and suitability, location and accessibility didn't exist, in 1980 there were more than two households with incomes below $5,000 for every affordable unit in the inventory.

Since 1980, there is every reason to believe that the situation have become far worse, although reliable statistics on how much worse are not yet available.

Since 1980, the amount we have committed for additional subsidized housing for low income people has dropped by 78 percent, while housing expenditures through the tax code (primarily homeowner deductions) have continued to rise unchecked and, by some estimates, have more than doubled.

LOW INCOME HOUSING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS COMPARED TO HOUSING-RELATED TAX EXPENDITURES

[In billions of dollars, 1980–85]

	BA	Outlays	Tax expenditures	
			CBO	OMB
1980	26.7	4.5	.....	26.5
1981	30.2	5.7	.....	33.3
1982	17.7	6.7	.....	36.6
1983	8.7	7.8	46.1	35.4
1984	9.9	8.6	50.5	38.5
1985	6.2	9.3	55.2	41.7

At least three quarters of these tax expenditures go to people in the top 15% of the income distribution. Cutting their tax subsidies in half would release enough to pay for entitlement housing allowances and substantial preservation, rehabilitation and construction. The 1985 figure would be more than $20 billion.

This pattern of inequity embedded within federal housing expenditures must be addressed. This is not a partisan issue: the imbalance between tax and direct expenditures for housing is not one that was decided upon as a matter of national policy. Instead, it just happened: the result of the spread of home ownership, the broadening of the tax base, and rising incomes.

Low income people have borne the brunt of the reordering of national priorities. For each dollar cut from low income outlays, $4.15 has been added to military spending; $2.26 to interest on public debt; and taxes have been cut by $5.40 (measured in constant 1984 dollars, comparing 1981 levels with the Administration's 1985 budget).

Using the information in the chapter on "Budget Program and Trends" in the Budget of the United States Government, FY 1985 as our major source, we have developed, for illustrative purposes, how the federal budget would be changed if we had not had the cuts in taxes and low income programs and the increases in military spending since 1981.

CHANGES NEEDED IN FEDERAL BUDGET TO RETURN TO LEVELS EQUIVALENT TO 1981

[in billions of dollars]

	1984	1985
Military spending	−59.3	−81.3
Tax revenue	+90.3	+113.8
Interest on public debt	−42.9	−50.6
Low income program outlays	+7.7	+10.6

A recent Congressional Budget Office study is reported to have found that the combined impact of tax and benefit changes since 1981 has resulted in an average *loss* of $390 per year for households with incomes below $10,000 and an average *gain* of $8,270 per year for households with incomes above $80,000. If we had done nothing else, we

could have left low income program outlays untouched if we had been willing to forego only 10% of the tax cuts made.

Put in perspective, under the Administration's proposed 1985 budget, for each dollar spend on low income programs, we would spend $3.85 on military; $3.68 on Social Security and Medicare; and $2.33 to pay interest on the debt. About 15 cents of each low income dollars would go for housing assistance, 31 cents for Medicaid, 16 cents for food stamps, 13 cents for SSI, 11 cents for AFDC, and 14 cents for a range of smaller programs (low income energy assistance, refugees, etc).

The striking contrast between the cutbacks in housing and the increase in military spending since 1977 can best be grasped by comparing what, in budget authority, has been allocated for low income housing compared with military spending.

Amount spent on low income housing for each $1 of military spending

	Cents
1977	26
1980	19
1981	14
1984	3
1985	1.5

Small wonder that we are not meeting our low income housing needs!

Moreover, we have not yet seen the impact of the cuts of the last several years. The Administration has been able to have its cake and eat it too: the last three years have seen the highest level of completions of assisted housing units that we have ever had since subsidized housing programs began almost 50 years ago. But, as the chart on the next page shows, this is clearly the doing of the Ford and Carter Administrations.

It is important to consider the specifics of the 1985 HUD appropriation in the light of this background. We strongly urge that the Subcommittee report an appropriation bill which uses need, rather than last year's levels or the Administration's request, as your primary criterion and that you appropriate the funds authorized in 1983 for the rental rehabilitation and development program.

In addition, we strongly urge the appropriation of funds for expanding the Section 8 Existing and moderate rehabilitation programs and for additional public housing including Indian housing. These programs have proven their effectiveness in providing housing for low income people. Moreover, even though reluctantly, the Administration has proven willing to let them continue while pursuing its own housing approaches.

Although the National Low Income Housing Coalition is, mentioned above, in favor of an entitlement housing allowance program, we oppose the Administration's request to expand the minuscule voucher program approved last year. At the level requested by the Administration, it would take 86 years to provide vouchers to the 7.5 million very low income renter households not presently receiving housing assistance. Had the Administration chosen instead to use the saving in budget authority represented by shorting the contract term from fifteen to five years to expand the number of people served, it could have provided vouchers for some 300,000 additional households and reduced to 25 years the time it would take to meet our present needs.

Subsidized housing unit reservations, starts and completions, 1975–85

[Section 8, public housing, 202, 236 and rent supplement programs]

	Units
Additional new or rehabilitated units:	
Reservations:	
1975	101,338
1976	227,873
1977	231,551
1978	202,215
1979	249,171
1980	214,685
1981	135,249
1982	51,216
1983	35,931
1984	29,000
1985	12,500
Starts:	
1975	48,403
1976	78,880
1977	128,501
1978	179,262
1979	184,318
1980	183,011
1981	144,348
1982	119,027
1983	81,220
1984	52,000
1985	33,000
Completions:	
1975	119,215
1976	133,164
1977	50,235
1978	100,532
1979	160,638
1980	177,013
1981	218,370
1982	144,810
1983	137,400
1984	112,517
1985	89,342
Section 8 existing and vouchers:	
Reservations:	
1975	55,322
1976	206,046
1977	140,480
1978	98,300
1979	90,375
1980	36,336
1981	83,041
1982	36,163
1984	71,000
1985	91,000

Source: Compiled by Low Income Housing Information Service from HUD budget documents.

There are, moreover, several major shortcomings to the Administration's voucher proposal. Chief among them is that payment adjustments can be made only twice over the five-year period, instead of annually. For very low income families, living at the margin of affordability, this is a painful way to try to save federal funds. We also see no merit, as long as housing programs continue to function under long-term contracts, of cutting the contract term for vouchers.

Because of the paucity of funds available for direct subsidies, increasing use has been made during the past several years of the funds available for resyndicating low income housing projects and using part of the syndication proceeds for project improvements or to reduce indebtedness. This is, in our view, a costly method of accomplishing a worthy objective: retaining the existing subsidized housing stock for low income occupancy. It would be far preferable, we believe, to appropriate directly the funds needed for project improvement and to encourage HUD, using troubled project or other subsidies, to enter into workout agreements where the mortgages are delinquent. We ask this Subcommittee to examine this question for two reasons: first, because we believe it is a better approach and, second, because provisions in the tax legislation pending in both House and Senate would make many of these resyndications unworkable and could result in the loss of additional thousands of subsidized units.

We support the immediate appropriation of the $60 million authorized last year for emergency shelters for homeless people. The growing problem of homelessness is the tip of the iceberg of the low income housing problem. It is bound to get worse, because the low income housing crisis is growing. We believe it is urgent to institutionalize within HUD the capacity to provide assistance for emergency shelters, though, if HUD is unwilling to undertake such a program, we have no objection to providing the funds to an agency which will do so. However, if the funds are appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, we believe it is vital that their purpose be confined to the provision of shelter and that the allocation formula be improved so that rural areas, which also have a problem of homelessness, can receive a share of the funds.

We also urge that the 1985 appropriation include funds for the congregate services, public housing day care, neighborhood development, and housing/welfare demonstration programs and that adequate assistance for housing counseling be provided. It is not, in our view, a feasible or adequate substitute for direct appropriations to point to the option which localities have of using community development block grant funds for these programs. Measured in constant 1984 dollars, the total level of CDBG funds has been cut almost one quarter since 1980.

Finally, the National Low Income Housing Coalition wishes to express its appreciation to the members of this Subcommittee for your efforts to keep low income housing programs alive during these difficult times. While we believe we have made a conclusive case for the need to reverse direction and expand federal support for decent, affordable housing, we also recognize that things would be even worse without your resolution and commitment.

THE 1985 HOUSING BUDGET AND LOW-INCOME HOUSING NEEDS

(An Explanation and Reference Guide)

The federal budget is far more than a set of numbers for Congressional authorizations and appropriations. The official budget materials provide a guide to what the government has done, is doing, and will do in the future.

This memo attempts to provide a broad overview of the budget and the changes which have been made in the federal government under the Reagan Administration, give the specifics on low income housing (including figures on housing reservations and production during the past decade), and provide specific information on HUD and Farmer's Home programs as well as on housing-related tax expenditures. We include several tables, as a concise way to provide information that is not readily available elsewhere. The official budget documents give detailed figures only for the 1983–85 period. We've used information from prior years to show trends and changes. Feel free to reproduce or copy this material, in whole or in part, since we want it to be as useful as possible. We'd appreciate acknowledgement to the Low Income Housing Information Service as the source.

and a copy to us with a note on how you're using it.

The budget proposals for fiscal 1985 which President Reagan submitted to the Congress on February 1 continue the Administration's efforts to reshape the role of government and reorder national priorities. However, they contain far less in the way of proposed slashes—in housing or in most other programs—than his proposal of last year or the year before. With few exceptions, the budget either stays with what the President tried to do in 1984 or accepts what Congress did with it. For example, the President again proposes to replace the Section 8 Existing program with vouchers, but otherwise does not propose to undo or substantially modify the two-year framework set by the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983.

Although the cuts proposed in the 1985 budget seem relatively mild in contrast with 1982 and 1983, in any other time they would be regarded as disastrous. Total funds for additional low income housing are only 15% of the 1980 level; HUD's FY 1985 budget authority for additional low income housing would be 37% less than this year. However, because of several program changes, the number of additional households to be aided by HUD is to be only slightly lower in 1985 than this year. But FmHA program levels would be cut by 35%. The Legal Services Corporation would be abolished; so would the community services block grant.

The budget sets a return to 1971 real spending levels (i.e. eliminating the effects of inflation) for almost everything, except national defense, as the official goal of the Administration. Nevertheless, no cures—other than the rhetoric of a proposed constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget—are recommended this year to deal with the deficits caused by tax cuts and defense spending increases.

There is a general feeling here in Washington that, although Congress will likely reject many of the proposals for more cuts—as it has in the last two years—it will also resist efforts at addbacks or program expansion, primarily because of concern over the huge and growing federal deficit. Therefore, it is important to understand not only what is proposed in the budget for housing and other low income programs, but the overall context of the budget and in particular the causes of the federal deficits.

BUDGET TRENDS: MILITARY VS. LOW INCOME

"Low-income benefit programs," to use the official phrase, are a relatively small part of the total budget. OMB includes ten major programs in this group: Medicaid, subsidized housing, food stamps, WIC, child nutrition, AFDC, low-income energy assistance, SSI, food and commodity distribution, and earned income tax credit. Their total cost in 1985 is budgeted at $65.5 billion, or 7.1% of the $925.5 billion in proposed total outlays. The 1985 level is a 13% cut from what the outlays would have been at 1981 current services levels. The cumulative "savings" from cuts in these programs from 1981 through 1984 amounted to $20.8 billion, and spending in 1985 will be $7.8 billion less than it would have been without these earlier cuts. Now, President Reagan is proposing an additional $2.8 billion in cuts from these programs for 1985, and $15.9 billion more in cuts from 1986 through 1989.

In sharp contrast to the cuts in social programs—advocated on the rationale that the growth of the federal budget must be restrained and deficits reduced—stand increases in the military budget. Between 1980 and 1985, measured in constant dollars, the military budget (Defense and "National Interest" programs) increased by 36%, a hefty $73.7 billion. An additional 29% increase is projected for the 1985–89 period, again in constant dollars. Thus, if the Administration's proposals are adopted, the military budget will have increased by 85% by 1989.

Simultaneously with this huge military increase have come even large tax cuts. There have been three major tax laws since 1981, the effect of which has been to reduce federal revenues by an estimated $113.8 billion in 1985, and a whopping $595.4 billion during the five-year, 1983–87 period. Most of the tax cuts have been in individual income taxes, primarily aiding middle and upper income people. Indeed, the individual income tax reductions for 1985 totaled $121.4 billion; these and other reductions were partially offset by increases of $24.9 billion in social security and excise taxes.

Finally the deficit is now growing on itself, as rising interest rates have meant that the cost of borrowing to cover the deficit is growing more rapidly than the national debt itself. Interest on the public debt has shot up from $95.8 billion in 1980 to $151.4 billion in 1984, an increase of 117.6%. Low and middle income people will bear the primary cost of the huge deficit through spending cuts, higher interest costs on housing, cars, and other items, and probably later through tax increases.

The Administration has made much of the fact that there have been no absolute cuts in spending for low income programs. Rather, there have been "cuts in the rate of increase." True enough, if inflation is ignored. Spending for the low income subfunctions in the budget (Medicaid, subsidized housing, food and nutrition, SSI, AFDC, and other low income programs), measured in current dollars, rose from $50.7 billion in 1980 to an estimated $70.8 billion in 1985. But, as Table 1 shows, the picture is very different if we adjust for inflation. Since 1980, in constant 1984 dollars, almost $30 billion has been cut from low income programs, while the military budget has been increased by $121 billion and interest on the public debt has grown by $66 billion. Thus, for each dollar cut from low income programs, $4.15 has been added to the military budget and $2.26 to interest on the public debt. Another $5.70 has been added to Social Security and Medicare—paid for by payroll taxes. Since only about 18% of Medicare recipients have incomes below the poverty level, the bulk of this money does not go to low income people.

For each dollar authorized for national defense in 1980, we authorized 19 cents for subsidized housing programs; in 1984, we authorized only 3 cents for subsidized housing for each military dollar; in 1985 the administration proposes less than one-and-one-half cents for subsidized housing for each dollar for the military.

Looking at it another way, under the 1985 budget, for each dollar we spend on low income benefit programs, we will be spending $3.85 on the military, $3.68 on Social Security and Medicare; and $2.33 to pay interest on the public debt. About 15 cents of each low income dollar goes for housing assistance, 31 cents for Medicaid, 16 cents for food stamps, 13 cents for Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 11 cents for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and the rest for a variety of other low income programs.

THE HOUSING BUDGET

There are three major components of the "housing budget": HUD programs, the rural housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA), and the costs of housing-related tax expenditures. (Tax expenditures are defined as the cost of "provisions of the Federal income tax laws that allow a special exclusion, exemption, or deduction from gross income or provide a special credit, preferential rate of tax, or deferral of tax liability.")

The sharp contrast between the direct expenditures of HUD and FmHA and the "indirect" or tax expenditures continues. While low income housing is again to be cut, OMB estimates that tax expenditures will increase by almost 10% between 1984 and 1985.

The following tabulation shows the trend of three major categories of housing expenditures: budget authority for additional low income housing assistance, housing payments (the annual subsidy cost of all the assisted units in the inventory) and housing-related tax expenditures. (The differences would be even more dramatic if we used the tax expenditure estimates of the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation, which are much higher than those of OMB. For consistency, in this report we are sticking with the OMB estimates.)

[In millions of dollars]

	Net new housing budget authority	Housing payments	Housing-related tax expenditures
1981	30,170	5,747	33,330
1982	17,734	6,726	36,625
1983	8,651	7,786	35,395
1984	9,913	8,584	38,535
1985	6,243	9,314	41,655
Net change	−23,927	+3,567	+8,325

THE HUD LOW-INCOME HOUSING BUDGET

The HUD housing proposals contain few surprises. Once again, the Administration proposes to replace the Section 8 existing program with vouchers, claiming that this would save about $5 billion. It again proposes recapture and reallocation of some funds previously appropriated for Section 8 or public housing construction. As Table 2 shows, almost one-third (30.3%) of HUD's funds for the 1985 program would come from these recaptures.

The total low income housing program would assist an additional 136,000 households: 97,500 through Section 8 (87,500 vouchers and 10,000 units of housing for the elderly or handicapped under the 202 program); 2,500 units of Indian housing; about 6,000 units from the new rental housing development program; and 30,000 units through the rehabilitation grant program. Of this total, about 18,500 units would be new or substantially rehabilitated; 30,000 would have some rehabilitation. It is assumed that the 87,500 households who would get vouchers could find housing in the existing stock of almost 30 million rental units. (See Table 3.)

The Administration is also requesting a supplemental appropriation for 1984, to provide 56,000 Section 8 existing certificates, instead of the 32,500 for which contract authority is not available. This get a bit complex. The budget authority for these units has already been appropriated; but there is

not enough contract authority (annual payments) to cover them.

Perhaps the most significant part of the HUD budget is what it does *not* do. *There are no proposals for additional rent increases,* either directly or through such measures as counting food stamps as income.

HUD is proceeding to implement the new rental housing development grant program enacted last year. However, the entire $615 million authorized for this program and rental rehabilitation grants is to come from the 1984 budget, with no additional funds requested for 1985. (Some of the 1984 money will be spent in 1985, however.)

Vouchers

Once more, "vouchers" are proposed as the centerpiece of the Administration's housing program. The term itself implies more of a shift than is really there. It would not be at all inaccurate to refer to the present Section 8 Existing program as a voucher program.

The Administration's voucher program embodies three changes from the Section 8 Existing program: (1) the subsidy for each household is fixed, regardless of the amount of rent actually paid; (2) adjustments of the subsidy amount to reflect rising costs may be made only twice over a five-year period, instead of annually; and (3) the contract between HUD and the local agency administering the program is for five years, instead of fifteen years.

HUD will set the subsidy at the difference between 30% of tenant income and the fair market rent (FMR) for existing housing. These FMR's will be set at the 45th percentile of rents in each market area for units of standard quality, including recent movers but excluding new units and assisted housing units. Households finding units for less than the FMR will save money because their tenant contribution will be less than 30% of their income; households renting units for more than the FMR will pay the difference themselves, spending more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities.

Some critical things remain the same for vouchers as for Section 8. The program will be administered by state or local public housing agencies (PHA's) under HUD guidelines. Housing units must still meet basic housing quality standards (the same standards as for the Section 8 program). The payment is made directly to the landlord. In other words, the "voucher" has no cash value; it is simply a statement of the amount of rent which will be paid directly to the landlord by the PHA.

Because of the way budget authority for low income housing programs is calculated (the maximum annual cost times the number of years each contract runs), the voucher program appears to be less expensive. The $3.8 billion "saving" from vouchers is almost entirely because the contract will run for only five years, instead of for fifteen years. What that means is that the cost of extending these contracts will come in the 1990 budget instead of the budget for the year 2000.

The Administration could have provided vouchers for a total of 300,000 additional households, instead of 87,500, if it had proposed using the money "saved" to serve additional needy households instead of to cut the budget. This, however, would require an additional $700 million in annual contract authority.

In addition to the funds proposed for incremental vouchers, the Administration plans to convert as many Section 8 Existing and other contracts to vouchers as it can. It will do this as the five-year contracts come up for renewal. (The fifteen-year period for Section 8 is actually three five-year contract periods.) HUD anticipates converting about 160,000 units presently assisted under Section 8 Existing to vouchers in the next two years.

Public housing

There are no surprises or major new proposals relating to public housing and no repeat of last year's effort to replace modernization and operating subsidies with a "fair market rent" system. The only major new departure is a request for almost $1 billion ($907 million) to cover the increased interest costs of converting some short-term public housing notes to long-term bonds through the Federal Financing Bank.

The 1985 budget proposes an additional 2,500 units of Indian housing, but no further conventional public housing units. An estimated 15,200 units already in the pipeline are expected to drop out, releasing some $2,067 million in budget authority, to be used for other programs.

The public housing modernization program will receive $1.5 billion in budget authority, enough to support $761 million in modernization work. Any funds recaptured by local housing authorities, from projects which were scheduled but will not be built, will fall within the overall limit, not be in addition to it.

Public housing operating subsidies will be reduced for both 1984 and 1985, although Performance Funding System (PFS) will be used to calculate subsidy needs. A rescission of $331.4 million of 1984 funds is primarily because of lower increases in utility costs than anticipated and the impact of higher rent levels. These sources of savings are also reflected in the 1985 estimates.

HUD anticipates that an estimated 2,500 households live in public housing units that are slated to be "deprogrammed." Vouchers will be provided for those displaced.

The production "pipeline"

The pipeline refers to the new or rehabilitated housing for which funds have been appropriated, but which is not yet occupied. HUD's budget describes what will happen to these units in 1984 and 1985.

At the beginning of fiscal 1984, there were 252,979 public housing and Section 8 units in the pipeline, of which 151,494 were under construction. About half of the remaining units, 50,000, are expected to be started during the year. However, about 15,000 (5,000 Section 8 and 10,200 public housing units) will be "deobligated" or cancelled. Some 89,000 units (60,000 Section 8 and 29,000 public housing) will be completed and occupied during the year.

Although the pipeline at the beginning of 1985 is expected to be smaller, 170,000 units, there will be more deobligations than in 1984. Some 15,200 public housing units and 3,000 Section 8 units will fall out. In addition, there will be an anticipated 33,000 starts and 70,850 completions.

The presence of the pipeline has cushioned the impact of the budget cuts over the past few years. Once the units now in the pipeline are completed, additions to the subsidized housing stock will slow to a tiny trickle.

Housing payments

Largely because of the completion of units in the pipeline, the total number of subsidized housing units continues to increase. The "housing payment" appropriation covers the amounts due under all of HUD's housing subsidy contracts.

The following tabulation shows the number of subsidized units, by program, available for occupancy at the end of each year:

Program	1983	1984	1985
Section 8	1,749,904	1,958,000	2,139,000
Public housing	1,250,000	1,274,000	1,289,000
Section 236 (total)	533,469	532,000	531,000
Less units with section 8	−144,986	−173,000	−190,000
Rent supplements	−31,750	−19,000	−5,000
Net 236 units	356,733	340,000	336,000
Rent supplement	76,919	47,000	13,000
Rental subtotal	3,433,556	3,619,000	3,777,000
Section 235 ownership:			
Original program	128,694	114,00	111,000
Revised	101,078	96,000	77,000
Subtotal	229,772	210,000	188,000
Grand total	3,663,328	3,829,000	3,965,000

Looked at in relationship to the extent of low income housing needs, these figures show that only a fraction of our housing needs are being met, or will be met in the foreseeable future. In 1982, President Reagan's Commission on Housing pointed out that only one-quarter of the estimated ten million very low income renter households were living in subsidized housing. Thus, the need for additional assistance was then on the order of at least 7.5 million households. At the rate of increase proposed in the 1985 budget, it will take 55 years to provide shelter just for those low income households who need it now.

Other housing programs

The conversion of rent supplement units to Section 8 will continue in 1985, with the conversion of 32.094 units. Because of this, $1.8 billion of rent supplement authority is proposed for rescission. At the end of 1985, if the schedule holds, only 13,000 units will remain under rent supplement program contracts. Similarly, HUD expects to continue, and substantially complete by the end of 1985, the conversion of about 18,000 Section 236 units.

Once more, HUD proposes to terminate the Section 8 moderate rehabilitation program, except for about 2,000 HUD-held low income units which will be sold. Another 3,000 units will be sold without rehabilitation, but with continued Section 8 subsidy.

The amounts proposed for HUD's other low income housing programs are summarized in Table 2. The proposals for other major HUD programs are shown in Table 5.

THE FARMERS HOME RURAL HOUSING BUDGET

The ax that missed HUD this year hit the Farmers Home Administration's housing programs. While the Administration is no longer pressing its rural housing block grant proposal, it is now asking for a 35% cut in the number of rural housing units assisted by FmHA. See Table 3 for the number of additional units proposed for assistance, and Table 6 for FmHA appropriation levels. Except for authority to renew expiring rural rental assistance contracts, none of FmHA's housing grant programs would receive additional funds.

TAX EXPENDITURES

Table 7 shows OMB's calculation of the cost to the Treasury of housing-related tax expenditures, the income which the federal government does not receive because of spe-

cial provisions of the Internal Revenue code. Home-owner deductions for mortgage interest and property taxes are the largest. Indeed, the increased cost of these deductions between 1980 and 1985 is far larger than total 1985 outlays for low income housing assistance.

There is some discussion, in the Congress and elsewhere, of trying to modify some of the investor deductions which assist in housing construction (though generally not for very low income households), but no discussion, thus far, of capping or making more equitable the far more expensive home-owner deductions.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET AUTHORITY IN CONSTANT 1984 DOLLARS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

[Dollars in millions]

Function, subfunction, or program	1980 actual	1984 estimate	1980–84 change		1985 proposal	1984–85 change		1980–85 change	
			Dollars	Percent		Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
National Defense	178,174	265,316	87,142	48.9	299,046	33,730	12.7	120,873	67.8
International Affairs	18,970	22,959	3,989	21.0	21,317	−1,642	−7.2	2,347	12.4
General science, space, technology	7,506	8,555	1,049	14.0	8,643	88	1.0	1,136	15.1
Energy	44,551	3,413	−41,138	−92.3	3,004	−409	−12.0	−41,547	−93.3
Energy supply	44,998	2,034	−42,964	−95.5	1,511	−523	−25.7	−43,487	−96.6
Energy conservation	900	456	−444	−49.3	365	−91	−20.1	−535	−59.5
Natural resources environment	15,953	11,489	−4,464	−28.0	10,341	−1,148	−10.0	−5,611	−35.2
Water resources	5,081	3,716	−1,365	−26.9	3,440	−276	−7.4	−1,641	−32.3
Conservation/land management	3,161	801	−2,360	−74.7	272	−529	−66.0	−2,889	−91.4
Recreational resources	2,044	1,394	−650	−31.8	1,239	−155	−11.1	−805	−39.4
Pollution control/abatement	5,711	3,976	−1,735	−30.4	3,984	8	0.2	−1,727	−30.2
Agriculture	6,044	4,227	−1,817	−30.1	11,528	7,301	172.7	5,483	90.7
Commerce and housing credit	12,831	5,496	−7,335	−57.2	4,839	−657	−12.0	−7,992	62.3
Mortgage credit/thrift insurance	7,922	2,998	−4,924	−62.2	2,623	−375	−12.5	−5,299	−66.9
GNMA mortgage purchasers	2,285	120	−2,165	−94.7	170	50	41.6	−2,115	−92.6
FHA mortgage credit	396	179	−217	−54.8	209	30	16.8	−187	−47.2
Housing for elderly/handicapped	985	631	−354	−36.0	475	−156	−24.7	−510	−51.8
FmHA rural housing	2,789	2,008	−781	−28.0	1,760	−248	−12.4	−1,030	−36.9
Transportation	24,704	29,427	4,723	19.1	28,110	−1,317	−4.5	3,407	13.8
Community/regional development	12,358	7,232	−5,126	−41.5	6,078	−1,154	−16.0	−6,280	−50.8
Community development	6,022	4,793	−1,229	−20.4	3,986	−807	−16.8	−2,036	−33.8
Community development block grants	4,586	3,468	−1,118	−24.4	3,309	−159	−4.6	−1,277	−27.8
Urban development action grants	825	440	−385	−46.7	420	−20	−4.6	−405	−49.1
Area/regional development	3,410	2,205	−1,205	−35.3	1,798	−407	−18.5	−1,612	−47.3
Rural development	791	905	114	14.4	937	32	3.5	146	18.5
Economic development assistance	676	268	−408	−60.4	21	−247	−92.2	−655	−96.9
Indian programs	1,446	1,093	−353	−24.4	1,057	−36	−3.3	−389	−26.9
Disaster relief/insurance	2,965	234	−2,731	−92.1	294	60	25.6	−2,671	−90.1
Educational Training, Employment, Social Services	37,431	31,225	−6,206	−16.6	26,252	−4,973	−15.9	−11,178	−29.9
Elementary/secondary/vocational education	8,831	7,266	−1,565	−17.7	6,996	−270	−3.7	−1,836	−20.8
Education for disadvantaged	4,396	3,480	−916	−20.8	3,321	−159	−4.6	−1,075	−24.4
Indian education	423	327	−96	−22.7	326	−1	−0.2	−97	−22.8
Higher education	7,010	6,931	−79	−1.1	6,686	−245	−3.5	−324	−4.6
Training and employment	11,763	8,388	−3,375	−28.7	4,623	−3,765	−44.9	−7,139	−60.7
Social services	7,517	6,838	−679	−9.0	6,302	−536	−7.8	−1,215	−16.2
Social services block grants	3,451	2,675	−776	−22.5	2,77	−98	−3.7	−874	−25.3
Community service programs	672	353	−319	−47.5	3	−350	−99.2	−669	−99.6
Health	29,323	31,593	2,270	7.7	30,348	−1,245	−3.9	1,025	3.5
Health care services	22,546	25,242	2,696	12.0	24,283	−959	−3.8	1,736	7.7
Medicaid [1]	17,766	20,674	2,908	16.4	20,243	−431	−2.1	2,478	13.9
Social security and medicare	185,615	238,678	53,063	28.6	351,813	113,135	47.4	166,198	89.5
Social security	141,788	175,900	34,112	24.1	198,392	13,492	7.7	47,604	33.6
Medicare	43,827	62,778	18,951	43.2	66,993	4,215	6.7	23,166	52.9
Income security	132,259	117,578	−14,681	−11.1	132,823	15,245	13.0	564	0.4
Unemployment compensation	21,639	26,406	4,767	22.0	20,902	−5,504	−20.8	−738	−3.4
Housing assistance [1]	33,997	8,022	−25,975	−76.4	5,327	−2,695	−33.6	−28,670	−84.3
Food/nutrition assistance [1]	16,837	17,657	820	4.9	16,382	−1,275	−7.2	−454	−2.7
Food stamps/Puerto Rico aid	11,224	12,156	932	8.3	11,075	−1,081	−8.9	−148	−1.3
Child nutrition, other food	5,613	5,502	−111	−2.0	5,307	−195	−3.5	−306	−5.5
Other income security [1]	21,897	20,435	−1,462	−6.7	19,411	−1,024	−5.0	−2,486	−11.4
Supplementary security income	7,906	8,376	470	5.9	8,919	543	6.5	1,013	12.8
AFDC and related assistance	9,423	8,282	−1,141	−12.1	7,165	−1,117	−13.5	−2,258	−24.0
Earned income tax credit	1,558	1,123	−435	−27.9	996	−127	−11.3	−562	−36.1
Refugee assistance	754	514	−240	−31.8	344	−170	−33.2	−411	−54.4
Low income energy assistance	1,978	1,875	−103	−5.2	1,789	−86	−4.6	−188	−9.5
Veterans benefits/services	25,923	26,303	380	1.5	26,049	−254	−1.0	125	0.5
Administration of Justice	5,367	6,038	671	12.5	5,796	−242	−4.0	429	8.0
General government	5,625	5,553	−72	−1.3	5,521	−32	−0.6	−104	−1.8
General purpose fiscal assistance	10,594	6,741	−3,853	−36.4	6,354	−387	−5.7	−4,240	−40.0
Net interest	78,851	108,239	29,388	37.3	110,828	2,589	2.4	31,977	40.6
Interest on public debt	91,408	149,500	58,092	63.6	157,169	7,669	5.1	65,761	71.9
Total budget authority	805,267	912,517	107,250	13.3	960,515	47,998	5.3	155,248	19.3
Low income subtotal [1]	90,496	66,788	−23,708	−26.2	61,363	−5,425	−8.1	−29,133	−32.2
OMB low income group	NA	63,700	63,700	NA	62,505	−1,195	−1.9	62,505	NA

[1] Included in low income subtotal are medicaid, subsidized housing, food, other income security programs.

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service.

TABLE 2.—HIGHLIGHTS OF HUD LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROGRAMS, 1985 COMPARED TO EARLIER YEARS

[Dollars in millions]

Program activity	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposed	Change 1984–85	Change 1981–85	Percent change 1981–85
SUBSIDIZED HOUSING PROGRAMS								
Budget authority:								
Net new budget authority	30,170	17,374	8,651	9,913	6,243	−3,669	−23,926	−79.3
Permanent authority	32	30	25	19	22	3	−10	−31.0
Carryover balances	2,291	2,772	1,590	1,465	83	−1,382	−2,208	−96.4
Recaptures	5,227	2,831	3,273	2,692	2,755	63	−2,472	−47.3
Prior year funds restored	0	0	750	214	0	−214	0	
Subtotal, available budget authority	37,720	23,007	14,290	14,303	9,103	−5,200	−28,617	−75.9
Less: Rescissions/deferrals	−5,519	−4,099	0	0	0	0	5,519	−100.0
Total budget authority	32,201	18,909	14,290	14,303	9,103	−5,200	−23,098	−71.7

TABLE 2.—HIGHLIGHTS OF HUD LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROGRAMS, 1985 COMPARED TO EARLIER YEARS—Continued

[Dollars in millions]

Program activity	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposed	Change 1984–85	Change 1981–85	Percent change 1981–85
Use of budget authority, Section 8:								
New const/sub rehab	10,245	3,704	1,955	1,926	1,592	−334	−8,653	−84.5
Moderate rehab		551	1,024	540	0	−540	0	
Existing	5,791	1,280	2,013	3,820	0	−3,820	−5,791	−100.0
Vouchers				242	1,572	1,330	1,572	
Loan management		185	293	90	81	−9	81	
Property disposition		552	536	735	364	−371	364	
Conversions to existing, etc	314	2,338	2,443	2,173	1,908	−265	1,595	508.3
Amendments	3,007	4,020	1,069	411	417	6	−2,590	−86.1
Subtotal	19,357	12,630	9,332	9,938	5,934	−4,004	−13,423	−69.3
Public housing:								
Conventional	4,196	1,232	0	900	0	−900	−4,196	−100.0
Indian	472	494	341	390	391	1	−81	−17.1
Amendments	935	372	545	200	300	100	−635	−67.9
Lease/other adjustments	30	25	89	628	928	300	898	2966.4
Modernization	1,699	1,800	2,566	1,550	1,550	0	−149	−8.8
Subtotal, public housing	7,332	3,923	3,541	3,667	3,169	−498	−4,163	−56.8
Rental development grants				315	0	−315	0	
Total obligations	26,689	16,554	12,873	13,920	9,103	−4,817	−17,586	−65.9
Contract authority:								
Net new contract authority	1,417	897	520	699	675	−23	−742	−52.3
Total contract authority	1,155	1,046	772	879	806	−73	−349	−30.2
236 Rental housing			0	−837	−165	673	−165	
Rent supplements	−143	−1,060	−311	−1,643	−1,834	−191	−1,691	1178.4
Total units under subsidy (number)	3,546,700	3,507,896	3,663,328	3,829,000	3,965,000	136,000	418,300	12
Housing payment outlays	5,747	6,726	7,786	8,584	9,314	730	3,568	62
Public housing operating subsidies	1,071	1,493	1,351	1,227	1,124		53	4.9
Public housing modernization								
New budget authority	1,699	1,800	2,566	1,550	1,550	0	−149	−8.8
Capital costs financed	927	858	1,260	761	761	0	−166	−17.9
202 Elderly/handicapped loan limit	873	819	634	666	500	−166	−373	−42.7
235 Home ownership budget authority used	1,650	628	1,018	0	0	0	−1,650	−100.0
Units reserved (number)	5,102	4,754	2,630	0	0	0	−5,102	−100

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from HUD Budget Summaries).

TABLE 3.—SUBSIDIZED HOUSING UNIT RESERVATIONS SINCE THE 1974 ACT WAS ADOPTED

HUD programs	1975	1976 + TQ (Net)	Actual 1977 (Net)	Actual 1978 (Net)	Actual 1979 (Net)	Actual 1980 (Net)	Actual 1981 (Gross)	Actual 1982 (Gross)	Actual 1983 (Gross)	Proposed 1984 (Gross)	Proposed 1985 (Gross)
Section 8:											
New construction	36,798	157,116	145,272	99,342	111,692	75,033	58,108	24,114	15,116	12,000	9,000
Substantial rehabilitation		18,971	24,124	22,703	33,346	17,730	15,753	3,413	456	2,000	1,000
Moderate rehabilitation					34,294	26,167	19,916	6,799	14,917	7,500	0
Existing	55,322	206,046	140,480	98,300	90,375	36,336	83,041	23,418	36,163	56,000	0
Vouchers										15,000	87,500
Subtotal, net additional units	92,120	382,133	309,876	220,345	269,707	155,266	176,818	57,744	66,652	92,500	97,500
Loan management, conversions		111,448	21,101	37,172		13,899	7,213	76,216	77,496	63,200	50,594
Subtotal, section 8	92,120	490,581	330,977	257,517	270,007	169,165	184,031	133,960	144,148	155,700	148,094
Public housing:											
Conventional	36,479	19,252	49,371	63,621	449,649	31,834	33,242	8,944	312	5,000	0
Indian	2,845	6,888	8,065	4,888	5,719	4,893	3,128	3,192	2,500	2,500	2,500
Subtotal, public housing	39,324	26,140	57,436	68,509	55,368	36,727	36,370	12,136	2,812	7,500	2,500
Total, section 8 plus public housing	131,444	516,721	388,413	326,026	325,075	191,993	213,288	145,542	146,960	163,200	150,594
Section 235	1,138	18,574	4,719	11,378	14,471	58,907	5,102	4,754	2,630	0	0
Section 236	22,634	11,515		283	(85)	121	(208)	(683)	(881)	(1,000)	(1,000)
Rent supplement	1,444	(4,443)					(897)	(38,082)	(76,436)	(30,000)	(34,372)
Section 202		(29,875)	(24,791)	(19,973)	(22,525)	(18,720)	(14,828)	(16,038)	(14,112)	(14,000)	(10,000)
Rental development grants										10,000	6,000
Rental rehabilitation grants										30,000	30,000
Subtotal, net additional units	156,660	433,919	372,031	300,515	339,546	251,021	218,290	74,634	72,094	140,000	136,000
HUD total, all units	156,660	542,367	393,132	337,687	339,461	251,021	217,285	111,526	72,273	172,200	151,222
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION											
502 Home ownership loans:											
New, purchase	39,422	54,325	39,337	35,663	38,645	39,374	39,097	35,901	32,697	30,300	20,400
Existing, purchase	16,480	21,447	20,796	26,089	24,368	21,558	20,910	20,223	17,783	16,800	11,300
Existing, repair or rehabilitation	458	618	841	1,013	1,251	1,807	1,527	726	754	770	500
Subtotal, 502	56,360	76,390	60,974	62,765	64,264	62,739	61,544	56,850	51,214	47,870	32,200
515 Rental or coop loans	17,350	27,244	30,175	30,446	36,520	30,980	28,740	30,500	24,200	27,000	19,000
514/516 Farm labor housing	1,097	866	1,208	512	2,575	1,490	890	748	326	1,062	340
504 Very low income repair loans	2,099	3,115	3,028	4,393	5,213	6,934	5,296	2,771	1,993	6,400	4,400
Subtotal, all FmHA loans	76,906	107,615	95,385	98,116	108,572	102,143	96,470	90,869	77,733	82,332	55,940
504 Very low income repair grants			1,882	3,183	6,842	8,589	7,687	4,205	3,845	3,661	0
FmHA total	76,905	107,615	97,627	101,299	115,414	110,372	104,157	95,074	81,578	85,993	55,940
Grand total	233,566	649,982	490,399	438,986	454,875	375,084	218,182	206,600	153,851	258,193	207,162

Figures in parentheses already included in totals, and are not counted twice. Incremental units are net additions to the subsidized housing inventory (excluding conversions from other programs, etc.).

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from HUD/FmHA budget documents).

TABLE 4.—HUD SUBSIDIZED HOUSING STARTS AND COMPLETIONS, 1975–85

	1975 actual	1976 + TQ actual	1977 actual	1978 actual	1979 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 estimate
Starts, section 8:											
New construction		32,284	93,925	139,009	126,853	101,054	49,916	71,344	32,122	24,000	11,250
Substantial rehabilitation		2,051	12,381	19,485	26,398	31,667	10,512	16,487	10,451	8,000	3,750
Subtotal, section 8		34,335	106,306	158,901	153,251	132,721	60,428	87,831	42,573	32,000	15,000
Public housing:											
Conventional	24,532	17,380	8,115	6,749	17,269	36,365	41,660	22,906	23,812	13,000	12,000
Indian		3,517	3,965	4,581	4,599	4,163	3,947	2,194	3,248	5,000	6,000
Subtotal, public housing	24,532	20,887	12,080	11,330	21,868	40,528	45,607	25,100	27,060	18,000	18,000
Total, section 8 plus public hearing	24,532	55,222	118,386	170,231	175,119	173,249	106,035	112,931	69,633	50,000	33,000
Section 235	1,801	531	3,083	7,382	8,489	9,577	38,313	6,096	11,587	2,000	0
Section 236, etc	22,070	23,127	7,032	1,649	710	185	0	0	0	0	
Section 202			(3,414)	(23,372)	(23,860)	(20,850)	(16,895)	(17,253)	(14,112)	(14,000)	(14,000)
HUD total	48,403	482,600	128,501	179,262	184,318	183,011	144,348	144,348	119,027	81,220	52,000
Completions, section 8:											
New construction		6,348	20,867	46,059	91,304	119,366	119,398	77,382	68,096	50,500	39,806
Substantial rehabilitation		468	4,134	7,685	9,198	16,027	22,132	21,437	17,778	9,500	7,044
Moderate rehabilitation						72	4,896	11,366	12,063	20,517	17,492
Existing (including conversion)		30,922	247,537	137,327	107,025	107,288	62,324	96,408	105,955	127,906	102,895
Subtotal, section 8		92,015	272,538	213,468	207,527	242,753	208,750	206,593	203,892	208,423	167,237
Public housing:											
Conventional	47,674	29,583	4,893	7,457	40,009	9,835	29,576	25,051	24,814	26,000	20,000
Indian		2,695	1,299	2,677	4,363	5,274	4,055	3,478	3,062	4,000	5,000
Subtotal, public housing	47,674	32,278	6,192	10,134	44,372	15,109	33,631	28,529	27,876	30,000	25,000
Total, section 8 plus public housing	47,674	124,293	278,730	223,602	251,899	257,862	242,381	235,122	231,768	238,423	192,237
Section 235	2,238	3,498	5,165	7,053	13,574	24,136	38,313	6,096	11,587	2,000	0
Section 236	66,118	32,184	13,877	7,204	2,190	2,303	0		0	0	
Section 202				(396)	(9,320)	(16,418)	(27,968)	(24,072)	(20,681)	(15,000)	(15,000)
HUD total	119,215	164,086	297,772	237,659	267,663	284,301	280,694	241,218	243,355	240,423	192,237

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from HUD Budget Summaries).

TABLE 5.—HIGHLIGHTS OF OTHER HUD PROGRAMS, 1985 COMPARED TO EARLIER YEARS

[Dollars in millions]

Program/activity	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposed	Change 1984–85	Change 1981–85	Percent change 1981–85
Congregate services	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	
Housing counseling	7	4	4	4	0	−4	−7	−100.0
Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity:								
State/local agency aid	2	5	5	5	5	−1	3	119.9
Agencies assisted (number)	32	67	79	90	100	10	68	213
Community Housing Resources	0	2	2	3	2	−1	2	
Number assisted	0	90	89	130	100	−30	100	
Title VIII complaints received (number)	4,209	5,112	4,908	5,350	0	−5,350	−4,209	−100
Processed (number)	3,931	4,479	4,665	4,665	5,650	985	1,719	44
Compliance reviews completed (number)	549	346	332	362	362	0	−187	−34
Homesteading outlays	7	12	9	17	16	−1	9	129.7
Single family units conveyed (number)	1,165	796	809	1,130	1,160	30	−5	−0
Multifamily properties (number)				15	15	0	15	
312 rehab loan outlays	85	49	−33	17	21	4	−64	75.3
Single family loans	3,212	502	720	0	0	0	−3,212	−100
Multifamily	134	255	2,821	0	0	0	−134	−100
Community development:								
Community Devel Block Grants—	3,695	3,456	4,456	3,468	3,468	0	−227	−6.1
Urban Devel Action Grants	675	474	440	440	440	0	−235	−34.8
Rental rehab grants				150	150	0	150	
Units rehabilitated (number)				30,000	30,000	0	30,000	
Mortgage insurance/financing, Federal Housing Administration:								
Insurance limitation	34,155	40,000	50,900	50,900	50,900	0	16,745	49.0
Applications-units (number)	550,296	410,558	963,537	840,000	936,000	96,000	385,704	70
Units insured (number)	408,129	282,038	551,795	563,000	584,000	21,000	175,871	43
Claims paid-units (number)	46,695	48,594	62,263	59,876	65,448	5,572	18,753	40
Claims paid	789	890	1,484	1,695	1,581	−114	793	100.5
TMAP-Temp mortgage assistance	0	76	45	56	65	9	65	
HUD-Owned units, end of year	51,472	48,857	27,169	30,109	30,260	151	−21,212	−41
Single family	19,339	19,247	17,646	19,586	18,467	−1,119	−872	−5
Multifamily	32,133	29,610	9,523	10,523	11,793	1,270	−20,340	−63
HUD-assigned mortgages, year end	238,624	235,312	214,719	203,682	191,710	−11,972	−46,914	−20
Single family	19,696	22,948	28,176	32,515	32,079	−436	12,383	63
Multifamily	218,928	212,364	186,543	171,167	159,631	−11,536	−59,297	−27
Government National Mortgage Association, Special assistance-new commitments:								
Section 8 tandem	1,500	1,393	250	0	0	0	−1,500	−100.0
Targeted tandem	300	580	250	0	0	0	−300	−100.0
Mortgage-backed securities:								
Limit on commitments	64,000	68,250	68,250	68,250	68,250	0	4,250	6.6
Commitments issued in year	42,150	36,382	64,225	68,250	68,250	0	26,100	61.9
Guarantees issued in year	16,853	13,515	45,624	40,000	42,000	2,000	25,147	149.2
Research and technology	40	20	18	19	21	2	−19	−47.2
Salaries and Expenses, total	593	586	585	580	577	−2	−16	−2.7
Transfers from FHA fund	264	267	278	279	282	3	18	6.8
Appropriation to HUD	329	320	308	301	295	−6	−34	−10.3
Staffing (permanent/fulltime) (number)	15,122	13,828	12,427	12,097	11,910	−187	−3,212	−21

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from HUD Budget Summaries).

TABLE 6.—FARMER'S HOME BUDGET DATA, 1980–85

[Dollars in millions]

Program	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1980–84 change		1985 estimate	1984–85 change		1980–85 change	
						Dollars	Percent		Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
SUBSIDIZED LOANS												
502 Home ownership, new	1,392.4	1,462.1	1,419.0	1,314.5	1,275.0	−117.4	−8.4	1,047.0	−228.0	−17.9	−345.4	−24.8
Existing	783.1	812.5	850.6	765.2	759.0	−24.1	−3.1	528.0	−231.0	−30.4	−255.1	−32.6
Repair/rehab	44.6	53.0	30.4	32.2	36.0	−8.6	−19.3	25.0	−11.0	−30.6	−19.6	−43.9
Subtotal	2,220.1	2,327.6	2,300.0	2,111.9	2,070.0	−150.1	−6.8	1,600.0	−470.0	−22.7	−620.1	−27.9
504 repair loans	21.9	17.9	10.0	7.1	24.0	2.1	9.6	17.0	−7.0	−29.2	−4.9	−22.4
515 rental housing	825.3	842.5	953.7	802.0	940.0	114.7	13.9	690.0	−250.0	−26.6	−135.3	−16.4
514 farm labor hsg loans	24.6	18.5	11.9	4.0	20.0	−4.6	−18.7	13.0	−7.0	−35.0	−11.6	−47.2
Subtotal, subsidized loans	3,091.9	3,206.4	3,275.6	2,925.0	3,054.0	37.9	1.2	2,320.0	734.0	24.0	771.9	25.0
UNSUBSIDIZED LOANS												
502 low income	30.9	4.7	2.8	0.4	0	−30.9	−100.0	0	0	NA	−30.9	−100.0
502 moderate income	573.5	251.3	173.8	24.8	0	−573.5	−100.0	0	0	NA	−573.5	−100.0
502 REA weatherization	1.3	1.7	1.8	1.2	0	−1.3	−100.0	0	0	NA	−1.3	−100.0
502 Above-mod guarantees	18.9	5.7	0	0	0	−18.9	−100.0	0	0	NA	−18.9	−100.0
Rural housing site loans	0.8	5.7	0	0.3	1.0	0.2	25.0	0	−1.0	−100.0	−0.8	−100.0
Total unsubsidized loans	625.4	263.9	178.2	26.7	1.0	−624.4	−99.8	0	−1.0	−100.0	−625.4	−100.0
Total loans	3,773.3	3,470.3	3,453.8	2,951.7	3,055.0	718.3	−19.0	2,320.0	−735.0	−24.1	−1,453.3	−38.5
Low/moderate income loan servicing					230.0	230.0	NA		−230.0	−100.0	NA	NA
Total, rural housing insurance fund (RHIF)	3,773.3	3,470.3	3,453.8	2,951.7	3,285.0	−488.3	−12.9	2,320.0	−965.0	−29.4	−1,453.3	−38.5
Reinbursement to RHIF grants and payments	2,280.2	594.0	2,003.5	1,627.8	1,508.1	−772.1	−33.9	1,843.9	335.8	22.3	−436.3	−19.1
Rural rental assistance	393.0	403.0	398.0	124.0	49.0	−344.0	−87.5	116.0	67.0	136.7	−277.0	−70.5
504 home repairs	24.0	25.0	15.0	12.5	12.5	−11.5	−47.9	0	−12.5	−100.0	−24.0	−100.0
Farm labor housing	25.0	25.0	13.8	0	4.4	−20.6	−82.4	0	−4.4	−100.0	−25.0	−100.0
Mutual/self-help housing	5.0	0	4.0	12.5	6.0	1.0	20.0	0	−6.0	−100.0	−5.0	−00.0
Self-help land developmt	0	1.0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	NA
Supervisory assistance	1.5	1.0	0	0	0	−1.5	−100.0	0	0	NA	−1.5	−100.0
Water & waste disposal	290.0	210.0	125.0	300.0	90.0	−200.0	−69.0	90.0	0	0	−200.0	−69.0
Rural development	10.0	5.0	0	0	0	−10.0	−100.0	0	0	NA	−10.0	−100.0
Construction defect comp				2.0	2.0	2.0	NA	0	−2.0	−100.0	NA	NA
Rural community fire protection	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3	−0.3	−7.1	0	−3.3	−100.0	−3.5	−100.0
Subtotal	752.0	673.5	559.0	454.3	167.1	−584.9	−77.8	206.0	38.9	23.2	−546.0	−72.6
Salaries and expenses	235.6	252.6	279.6	305.5	330.4	94.8	40.2	327.3	−3.2	−1.0	91.7	38.9
Total	987.6	926.1	838.5	759.8	497.5	−490.1	−49.6	533.3	35.7	7.2	−454.3	−46.0
RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOANS												
Water & Waste Disposal	700.0	750.0	375.0	600.0	270.0	−430.0	−61.4	250.0	−20.0	−7.4	−450.0	−64.3
Community facilities	240.0	260.0	126.2	130.0	130.0	−110.0	−45.8	100.0	−30.0	−23.1	−140.0	−58.3
Industrial development	1,073.8	652.3	61.2	81.9	300.0	−773.8	−72.1	0	−300.0	−100.0	−1,073.8	−100.0
Alcohol production			63.9	0	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	NA
Total	2,013.8	1,662.3	626.3	811.9	700.0	−1,313.8	−65.2	350.0	−350.0	−50.0	−1,663.8	−82.6
Reimbursement to rural development insurance fund	91.9	217.4	180.0	347.3	477.8	386.0	420.1	560.0	82.2	17.2	468.1	509.5

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (based on data in Appendix: Budget of U.S. Govt, 1982–84).

TABLE 7. REVENUE LOSSES FROM TAX EXPENDITURES, 1980–85

[In millions of dollars]

	1980	1981	Fiscal year—in				1984–85	Change	1980–85	1980–85
			1982	1983	1984	1985				
Homeowner deductions:										
Mortgage interest deductions	15,615	20,145	23,305	20,800	22,985	25,130	2,145	9.3	9,515	60.9
Property tax deductions	7,310	9,125	8,360	8,010	8,775	9,640	865	9.9	2,330	31.9
Subtotal	22,925	29,270	31,665	28,810	31,760	34,770	3,010	9.5	11,845	51.7
Capital gains deferral	1,010	1,160	1,625	1,325	1,700	1,800	100	5.9	790	78.2
Capital gains exclusion	535	450	585	600	755	805	50	6.6	270	50.5
Residential energy credits										
Supply incentives			250	325	370	470	100	27.0	470	
Conservation incentives			220	285	260	305	45	17.3	305	
Subtotal	485	575	470	610	630	775	145	23.0	290	59.8
Total	24,955	31,455	34,345	31,345	34,845	38,150	3,305	9.5	13,195	52.9
Investor deductions:										
Tax exempt bonds:										
Owner-occupied units			905	1,360	1,590	1,480	(110)	−6.9	1,480	
Rental housing			395	710	900	1,080	180	20.0	1,080	
Subtotal	447	1,120	1,300	2,070	2,490	2,560	70	2.8	2,113	472.7
Five-year rehab amortization	15	30	45	60	60	60	0	0	45	300.0
Expensing of interest, etc	659	755							(659)	−100.0
Excess depreciation	385			695	820	885	65	7.9	500	129.9
All Savers certificates	0	0	935	1,225	320	0	(320)	−100.0	0	
Subtotal	1,059	755	980	1,980	1,200	945	(225)	−21.3	(114)	−10.8
Total	1,506	1,875	2,280	4,050	3,690	3,505	(185)	−5.0	1,999	132.7
Grant total	26,461	33,330	36,625	35,395	38,535	41,655	3,120	8.1	15,194	57.4
Percent of total:										
Homeowner deductions:										
Interest plus property taxes	86.6	87.8	86.5	81.4	82.4	83.5	96.5		78.0	
All homeowner deductions	94.3	94.4	93.8	88.6	90.4	91.6	105.9		86.8	

TABLE 7. REVENUE LOSSES FROM TAX EXPENDITURES, 1980–85—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	1980	1981	Fiscal year—in 1982	1983	1984	1985	1984–85	Change	1980–85	1980–85
Investor deductions:										
Tax-exempt bonds	1.7	3.4	3.5	5.8	6.5	6.1	2.2		13.9	
Other	4.0	2.3	2.7	5.6	3.1	2.3	−8.2		−0.8	
All investor deductions	5.7	5.6	6.2	11.4	9.6	8.4	−5.9		13.2	

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service. Calculated from 1985 Budget Special Analysis G (and prior years).

TABLE A.—BUDGET AUTHORITY, IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, 1977–84 FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 administration proposal	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection	1987 projection
National Defense	110,432	145,764	162,405	218,704	245,835	280,503	263,316	313,375	358,982	389,087
Dept of Defense Military	108,425	142,621	178,386	213,751	238,681	273,400	258,102	305,000	349,637	379,214
International Affairs	6,587	15,519	24,812	15,267	7,186	16,813	22,959	22,338	22,341	22,362
Foreign econ/finance assistance	5,626	7,310	4,499	4,552	4,711	4,868	4,960	5,198	5,007	4,926
International security	676		2,543	3,919	4,589	4,692	5,267	10,004	10,218	10,412
General Science, Space Tech	4,576	6,141	6,533	7,063	7,966	8,451	8,555	9,057	9,503	10,020
General science/basic research	1,136	1,461	1,541	1,535	1,638	1,943	1,965	2,253	2,326	2,437
Space flight	2,138	2,820	3,187	3,601	6,328	4,049	6,591	6,804	7,177	7,583
Energy	4,987	36,447	6,769	3,261	4,121	2,869	3,413	3,148	3,059	2,561
Energy supply	3,603	36,813	2,224	2,083	2,552	1,992	2,034	1,583	1,624	1,208
Energy conservation	242	736	728	168	449	74	456	392	398	406
Natural Resources/Environment	9,457	13,051	11,128	11,199	13,294	8,906	11,489	10,837	10,630	10,932
Water resources	3,664	4,157	4,163	3,998	4,605	3,251	3,716	3,605	3,861	4,039
Conservation/land management	1,566	2,586	2,749	2,565	1,883	2,028	801	285	(8)	(356)
Recreational resources	1,236	1,672	1,287	1,262	1,591	1,202	1,394	1,298	1,305	1,317
Pollution control/abatement	2,691	4,672	2,981	3,645	3,677	3,631	3,976	4,175	3,996	3,964
Agriculture	2,424	4,945	6,646	18,763	32,029	13,484	4,227	12,080	11,725	11,318
Farm income stabilization	1,351	3,637	5,049	17,191	29,330	11,839	2,442	10,363	10,018	9,628
Agricultural research	1,084	1,402	1,559	1,586	1,698	1,647	1,786	1,717	1,707	1,690
Commerce and housing credit	5,481	10,497	6,537	6,419	5,270	7,536	5,496	5,071	5,064	6,394
Mortgage credit/thrift	2,044	6,481	3,178	4,055	2,787	5,694	2,998	2,749	2,929	4,234
GNMA mortgage purchase	10	1,869	1,358	1,101	2	1	120	178	209	1,412
FHA mortgage credit	661	324	412	203	183	127	179	219	159	167
Housing for elderly/handicapped	850	806	797	710	500	436	631	498	530	566
FmHA rural housing	522	2,282	596	2,004	2,102	1,508	2,008	1,844	2,021	2,080
Natl Credit Union Admin		1,200	15	36		66	61	10	10	10
Postal Service	2,266	1,677	1,343	707	789	400	879	692	443	444
Other commerce	1,318	2,340	2,022	1,663	1,694	1,464	1,619	1,631	1,692	1,716
Transportation	10,363	20,210	24,920	21,256	27,031	27,780	29,427	29,457	30,170	30,002
Ground transportation	5,593	14,019	18,236	14,559	19,159	19,062	20,761	19,920	20,613	20,442
Highway system	3,848	9,177	9,093	8,723	13,239	13,891	13,941	14,724	15,460	15,420
Mass transit	583	2,565	4,727	3,584	4,529	3,967	4,320	4,112	4,117	3,987
Railroads	1,227	2,198	4,134	1,960	1,088	889	2,169	742	740	738
Air transportation	3,047	3,954	4,082	3,785	4,850	5,692	5,314	6,389	6,317	6,276
Water transportation	1,683	2,199	2,592	2,939	2,912	2,995	3,237	3,032	3,123	3,166
Community/regional development	12,790	10,110	8,143	6,604	8,712	6,071	7,232	6,369	6,641	6,631
Community development	3,684	4,927	4,811	4,291	5,281	4,200	4,793	4,177	4,310	4,300
Community devel block	3,248	3,752	3,695	3,456	4,456	3,500	3,468	3,468	3,468	3,468
Urban devel action grants		675	675	474	440	196	440	440	440	440
Rental rehab grants	50	110				150	300		150	150
Rental development grants							315			
Urban homesteading					12	12	12	12	12	12
Other programs	386	390	443	361	373	368	258	257	240	230
Area/regional development	8,438	2,790	2,626	1,984	2,950	1,777	2,205	1,884	1,935	1,971
Rural development	925	647	701	590	1,353	890	905	982	1,017	1,037
Economic development assistance	418	553	476	224	294	18	268	22	12	9
Indian programs	734	1,183	1,278	1,156	1,178	1,080	1,083	1,108	1,166	1,214
Disaster relief/insurance	684	2,426	737	365	480	128	234	208	305	360
Educational, training	30,377	30,622	30,550	25,854	28,178	25,640	31,225	27,510	27,000	27,868
Elementary/secondary/vocational	6,265	7,225	6,713	6,403	6,854	6,030	7,266	7,331	7,353	7,432
Education for disadvantaged	2,722	3,596	3,112	3,041	3,200	3,014	3,480	3,480	3,490	3,530
Indian education		346	352	343	367	250	327	342	346	351
Higher education	3,765	5,735	6,913	7,401	7,418	6,202	6,931	7,006	7,159	6,997
Research/genl educ aids	1,078	1,344	1,286	999	1,147	867	1,115	1,017	1,008	1,011
Training and employment	13,969	9,623	9,109	4,386	5,515	5,441	8,388	4,845	4,878	4,914
Other labor service	383	572	606	600	640	682	687	707	723	727
Social services	4,924	6,150	5,935	6,094	6,604	6,475	6,838	6,604	6,688	6,778
Social services block	2,730	2,823	2,399	2,400	2,675	2,500	2,675	2,700	2,700	2,700
Community service program	631	550	525	378	383	3	353	3	0	0
Health (1985 def)	40,368	23,989	26,984	27,477	25,041	30,239	31,593	31,802	34,747	37,329
Health care services	[2] 36,107	18,445	21,510	55,087	23,037	24,441	25,242	25,446	28,288	30,763
Medicaid [1]	NA	14,534	17,530	18,014	16,985	20,738	20,674	21,213	23,928	26,238
Health research	2,654	3,642	3,757	3,844	4,252	4,347	4,759	4,850	4,943	5,040
Health care worker ed [1]	847	923	665	494	491	365	458	349	357	364
Consumer/occupational health/safety	770	995	1,077	1,037	1,068	1,113	1,134	1,158	1,158	1,162
Social Security and Medicare	NA	151,852	174,902	197,589	230,536	234,916	238,678	368,670	295,233	323,833
Social Security	NA	115,997	132,950	146,207	184,133	173,430	175,900	198,467	213,237	227,044
Medicare	NA	35,855	41,952	51,382	46,403	61,487	62,788	70,203	81,996	96,789
Income security (1985 def)	[2] 168,566	108,201	116,960	107,981	118,748	110,748	117,578	139,187	151,608	163,297
General retirement/disability	84,663	6,265	6,481	7,109	5,043	7,697	8,031	6,682	7,251	6,655
Federal employee retirement	16,972	24,732	28,777	32,266	35,190	37,922	37,026	67,513	75,437	82,023
Unemployment compensation	16,857	17,703	19,048	21,177	29,348	29,892	26,406	21,903	22,450	24,508
Housing assistance	28,629	27,813	26,105	13,876	10,025	397	8,022	5,582	7,795	10,165
Subsidized housing			24,840	12,245	8,365	(2,319)	6,837	4,267	6,486	8,816
Public housing assistance				1,491	1,547	1,636	1,031	1,124	1,108	1,162
Other housing assistance			1,265	139	113	145	154	192	200	186
Food/nutrition assistance	8,875	13,774	16,573	15,784	18,154	16,302	17,657	17,167	17,950	18,709
Food stamps/Puerto Rico	5,506	9,182	11,740	11,286	12,815	11,726	12,156	11,606	12,256	12,735
Child nutrition, etc.	3,369	4,592	5,103	4,498	5,340	4,576	5,502	5,561	5,694	5,975
Other income security	12,679	17,914	19,985	17,770	20,989	18,539	20,435	20,341	20,726	21,237
Supplemental security	5,895	6,469	7,227	7,769	8,560	7,170	8,376	9,346	9,596	9,972
AFDC and related assistance	6,306	7,709	8,485	6,007	8,401	7,511	8,282	7,508	7,740	7,946
Earned income tax credit		1,275	1,318	1,201	1,213	1,123	1,123	1,044	982	923
Refugee assistance	132	617	902	689	585	485	514	360	332	317
Low income energy assistance		1,618	1,850	1,375	1,975	1,300	1,875	1,875	1,875	1,875

TABLE A.—BUDGET AUTHORITY, IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, 1977–84 FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS—Continued

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 administration proposal	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection	1987 projection
Veterans Benefits/Service	19,069	21,208	23,167	24,982	25,364	26,129	26,303	27,297	28,404	29,580
Administration of Justice	3,601	4,391	4,343	4,718	5,367	5,602	6,038	6,074	6,156	6,277
Border enforcement	604	800	864	974	1,076	1,118	1,137	1,177	1,181	1,197
General Government	3,051	4,602	5,125	4,970	5,544	6,055	5,553	5,786	5,878	5,032
General Purpose Fiscal Assistance	9,272	8,667	6,251	6,392	6,364	6,969	6,741	6,658	6,793	6,963
General Revenue Sharing	6,652	6,861	4,573	4,573	4,574	4,574	4,574	4,575	4,575	4,575
Net Interest	38,092	64,508	82,537	84,697	89,775	103,180	108,239	116,138	134,242	130,868
Interest on public debt	41,900	74,781	95,503	117,190	128,619	144,500	149,500	164,700	177,900	169,600
Total budget authority	465,231	458,790	718,400	779,926	866,745	900,110	912,517	1,006,538	1,100,300	1,181,200
Low Income subtotal [1]	50,183	74,035	80,193	65,444	68,153	55,976	66,788	64,303	70,399	76,349
OMB Low Income group	NA	NA	NA	56,600	63,200	NA	63,700	65,500	68,500	72,500

[1] Included in low income subtotal (medicaid, subsidized housing, food, other income security).
[2] 1977 income security figure includes social security; 1977 Health Care Services figure includes medicare.
Source: Low Income Housing Information Service.

TABLE B.—BUDGET AUTHORITY IN CONSTANT 1984 DOLLARS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 actual admin. proposal	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection	1987 projection
National Defense	175,045	178,174	203,535	238,259	257,009	280,503	265,316	299,046	327,722	340,843
Dept. of Defense Military	171,864	174,332	199,051	232,864	249,530	273,400	158,102	291,054	319,191	332,199
International Affairs	10,441	18,970	27,686	16,632	7,513	16,813	22,959	21,317	20,396	19,590
Foreign econ/finan asstc	8,918	8,935	5,020	4,959	4,925	4,868	4,960	4,960	4,571	4,315
International security asstc	1,072	NA	2,838	4,269	4,798	4,692	5,267	9,547	9,328	9,121
Genl Science, Space, Tech	7,253	7,506	7,290	7,695	8,328	8,451	8,555	8,643	8,675	8,778
Gnl science/basic research	1,801	1,786	1,720	1,672	1,712	1,943	1,965	2,150	2,123	2,135
Space flight	3,389	3,447	3,556	3,923	6,616	4,049	6,591	6,493	6,552	6,643
Energy	7,891	44,551	7,553	3,553	4,308	2,869	3,413	3,004	2,793	2,243
Energy supply	5,711	44,998	2,482	2,269	2,668	1,992	2,034	1,511	1,483	1,058
Energy conservation	384	900	812	183	469	74	456	365	363	356
Natural Resources/Environment	14,990	15,953	12,417	12,200	13,898	8,906	11,489	10,341	9,704	9,577
Water resources	5,808	5,081	4,645	4,355	4,814	3,251	3,716	3,440	3,525	3,538
Conservation/land management	2,482	3,161	3,067	2,794	1,969	2,028	801	272	(7)	(312)
Recreational resources	1,959	2,044	1,436	1,375	1,653	1,202	1,394	1,239	1,191	1,154
Pollution control/abatement	4,265	5,711	3,326	3,971	3,844	3,631	3,976	3,984	3,648	3,473
Agriculture	3,842	6,044	7,416	20,441	32,438	13,484	4,227	11,528	10,704	9,915
Farm income stabilization	2,141	4,446	5,634	18,728	30,663	11,839	2,442	9,889	9,146	8,434
Agricultural research/services	1,718	1,714	1,740	1,728	1,775	1,647	1,786	1,638	1,558	1,480
Commerce & Housing Credit	8,688	12,831	7,294	6,993	5,510	7,556	5,496	4,839	4,623	5,601
Mortgage credit/thrift ins	3,240	7,922	3,546	4,418	2,914	5,694	2,998	2,623	2,674	3,709
GNMA mortgage purchases	16	2,285	1,515	1,199	2	1	120	170	191	1,237
FHA mortgage credit	1,048	396	460	221	191	127	179	209	145	146
Hsg for elderly/handicapped	1,347	985	889	773	523	436	631	475	484	496
FmHA rural housing	827	2,789	665	2,183	2,198	1,508	2,008	1,760	1,845	1,822
Natl Credit Union Admin	0	1,467	17	39	0	66	61	10	9	9
Postal Service	3,592	2,050	1,499	770	825	400	879	660	404	389
Other commerce	2,089	2,860	2,256	1,812	1,771	1,464	1,619	1,556	1,545	1,503
Transportation	16,426	24,704	27,807	23,157	28,260	27,780	29,427	28,110	27,543	26,282
Ground transportation	8,865	17,136	20,348	15,861	20,030	19,062	20,761	19,009	18,818	17,900
Highway system	6,099	11,217	10,146	9,503	13,841	13,891	13,941	14,051	14,114	13,508
Mass transit	924	3,135	5,275	3,904	4,735	3,967	4,320	3,924	3,758	3,493
Railroads	1,940	2,687	4,613	2,144	1,137	889	2,169	708	676	647
Air transportation	4,830	4,833	4,555	4,123	5,070	5,692	5,314	6,097	5,767	5,498
Water transportation	2,660	2,688	2,892	3,202	3,044	2,995	3,237	2,893	2,851	2,773
Community/regional development	20,273	12,358	9,086	7,194	9,108	6,071	7,232	6,078	6,063	5,809
Community development	5,839	6,022	5,368	4,675	5,521	4,200	4,793	3,986	3,935	3,767
Community devel block grants	5,148	4,586	4,123	3,765	4,657	3,500	3,468	3,309	3,166	3,038
Urban devel action grants	0	825	753	516	460	196	440	420	402	385
Rental rehab grants	79	134	0	0	0	150	300	0	137	131
Rental development grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	315	0	0	0
Urban homesteading	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	12	12	11	11	11
Other programs	612	477	494	393	390	368	258	245	219	201
Area/regional development	13,375	3,410	2,930	2,161	3,084	1,777	2,205	1,798	1,767	1,727
Rural development	1,466	791	782	643	1,414	890	905	937	928	908
Econ devel asstc	663	676	531	244	307	18	268	21	11	8
Indian programs	1,163	1,446	1,426	1,259	1,232	1,080	1,093	1,057	1,064	1,063
Disaster relief/Insurance	1,084	2,965	822	395	502	128	234	294	361	315
Educ, Traing, Emplynt, Soc Svc	48,150	37,431	34,089	28,166	29,459	29,640	31,225	26,252	25,386	24,404
Elementary/secondary/voc ed	9,931	8,831	7,491	6,976	7,166	6,030	7,266	6,996	6,713	6,511
Educ for disadvantaged	4,315	4,396	3,472	3,313	3,345	3,014	3,480	3,321	3,186	3,092
Indian education	NA	423	393	374	384	250	327	326	316	307
Higher education	5,968	7,010	7,714	8,063	7,755	6,202	6,931	6,686	6,535	6,130
Research/genl educ aids	1,709	1,643	1,435	1,088	1,199	867	1,115	970	920	886
Training and employment	22,142	11,763	10,164	4,778	5,766	5,441	8,388	4,623	4,453	4,305
Other labor service	607	699	676	654	669	682	687	675	660	637
Social services	7,805	7,517	6,623	6,639	6,904	6,475	6,838	6,302	6,106	5,938
Social services block grant	4,327	3,451	2,677	2,615	2,797	2,500	2,675	2,577	2,465	2,365
Community service progs	1,000	672	586	412	400	3	353	3	0	0
Health (1985 def)	63,987	29,323	30,110	29,934	26,179	30,239	31,593	30,348	31,721	32,701
Health care services	[2] 57,233	22,546	24,002	60,013	24,084	24,441	25,242	24,283	25,825	26,949
Medicaid [1]	NA	17,766	19,561	19,625	19,848	20,738	20,674	20,243	21,844	22,985
Health research	4,207	4,452	4,192	4,188	4,445	4,347	4,759	4,628	4,513	4,415
Health care worker ed & tng	1,343	1,128	742	538	513	365	458	333	326	319
Consumer-occupatnl hlt/safet	1,221	1,216	1,202	1,130	1,117	1,113	1,134	1,105	1,057	1,018
Social Security and Medicare	NA	185,615	195,163	215,256	241,015	234,916	238,678	351,813	269,524	283,684
Social Security	NA	141,788	148,351	159,280	192,503	173,430	175,900	189,392	194,668	198,895
Medicare	NA	43,827	46,812	55,976	48,512	61,486	62,778	66,993	74,856	84,789
Income Security (1985 Def)	[2] 267,193	132,259	130,518	117,636	124,146	110,748	117,578	132,823	138,406	143,051
General retirement/disab	[2] 134,024	7,658	7,232	7,745	5,272	7,697	8,031	6,376	6,620	5,830
Federal employee retirement	26,902	30,231	32,111	35,151	36,790	37,922	37,026	64,426	68,868	71,854
Unemployment compensation	26,720	21,639	21,255	23,071	30,682	29,892	26,406	20,902	20,495	21,470
Housing Assistance [1]	45,380	33,997	29,129	15,117	10,481	397	8,022	5,327	7,116	8,905
Subsidized housing	NA	NA	27,718	13,340	8,745	(2,319)	6,837	4,072	5,921	7,723
Public hsg operating subs	NA	NA	NA	1,624	1,617	1,636	1,031	1,073	1,012	1,018
Other housing assistance	NA	NA	1,412	151	118	154	154	183	183	163
Food/nutrition assistance	14,069	16,837	18,493	17,195	18,979	16,302	17,657	16,382	16,387	16,389

TABLE B.—BUDGET AUTHORITY IN CONSTANT 1984 DOLLARS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS—Continued

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 actual admin. proposal	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection	1987 projection
Food stamps/Puerto Rico aid	8,728	11,224	13,100	12,295	13,397	11,726	12,156	11,075	11,189	11,156
Child nutrition, other progs	5,340	5,613	5,694	4,900	5,583	4,576	5,502	5,307	5,198	5,234
Other income security [1]	20,097	21,897	22,300	19,359	21,943	18,539	20,435	19,411	18,921	18,604
Supplemental security inco	9,344	7,906	8,064	9,464	8,949	7,170	8,376	8,919	8,760	8,736
AFDC and related astc	9,996	9,423	9,468	6,544	8,783	7,511	8,282	7,165	7,066	6,961
Earned income tax credit	0	1,558	1,471	1,308	1,268	1,123	1,123	996	896	809
Refugee assistance	209	754	1,006	751	612	485	514	344	303	278
Low income energy asstc	0	1,978	2,064	2,043	2,065	1,300	1,875	1,789	1,712	1,643
Veterans Benefits/Services	30,226	25,923	25,851	27,216	26,517	26,129	26,303	26,049	25,931	25,913
Administration of Justice	5,708	5,367	4,846	5,140	5,611	5,602	6,038	5,796	5,620	5,499
Border enforcement (Custom/IN)	957	978	964	1,061	1,125	1,118	1,137	1,123	1,078	1,049
General Government	6,104	5,625	5,719	5,414	5,796	6,055	5,553	5,521	5,366	5,109
General Purpose Fiscal Asstc	14,697	10,594	6,975	6,964	6,653	6,969	6,741	6,354	6,201	6,100
General Revenue Sharing	10,544	8,386	5,103	4,982	4,782	4,574	4,574	4,366	4,177	4,008
Net Interest	60,379	78,851	92,098	92,270	93,856	103,180	108,239	110,828	113,423	114,643
Interest on public debt	66,415	91,408	106,566	127,669	134,465	144,500	149,500	157,169	162,409	165,217
Total budget authority	737,434	805,267	801,621	849,663	906,143	900,110	912,517	960,515	1,004,486	1,034,755
Low income subtotal [1]	79,545	90,496	89,483	71,296	71,251	55,976	66,788	61,363	64,269	66,883
OMB low income group	NA	NA	NA	61,661	66,073	NA	63,700	62,505	62,535	63,511

[1] Programs or subfunctions included in Low Income subtotal.
[2] Health services figure includes Medicare; Income Security figure includes Social Security.
Source: Low Income Housing Information Service.

TABLE C.—BUDGET AUTHORITY IN RELATION TO MILITARY SPENDING FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

[For each dollar of National Defense budget authority, shows the amount spent on other programs or functions]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 admin. proposal	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection	1987 projection
National Defense	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Dept. of Defense Military	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97
International Affairs	0.06	0.11	0.14	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.06
Foreign econ/finan asstc	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01
International security asstc	0.01	0	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03
Gen Science, Space, Tech	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Gnl science/basic research	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Space flight	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Energy	0.05	0.25	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Energy supply	0.03	0.25	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
Energy reservation	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Natural Resources/Environment	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
Water resources	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Conservation/land management	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	−0.00	−0.00
Recreational resources	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pollution control/abatement	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Agriculture	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.13	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.03
Farm income stabilization	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.12	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.02
Agricultural research/service	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
Commerce and Housing Credit	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Mortgage credit/thrift ins	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
GNMA mortgage purchases	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FHA mortgage credit	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hsg for elderly/handicapped	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FmHA rural housing	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Natl Credit Union Adm	0	0.01	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Postal Service	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other commerce	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
Transportation	0.09	0.14	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.08
Ground transportation	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.05
Highway system	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
Mass transit	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Railroads	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Air transportation	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Water transportation	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Community/regional development	0.12	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
Community development	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Community devel block grant	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Urban devel action grants	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rental rehab grants (prop)	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Rental development grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0
Urban homesteading	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other progress	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Area/regional development	0.08	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Rural development	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Econ devel asstc	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indian programs	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Disaster relief/Insurance	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Educ, Traing, Emplymt, Soc Svc	0.26	0.21	0.17	0.12	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.08	0.07
Elementary/secondary/voc ed	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
Educ for disadvantaged	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Indian education	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Higher education	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Research/genl educ aids	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Training and employment	0.13	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01
Other labor service	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Social services	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
Social services block grant	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Community service progs	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	00
Health	0.37	0.16	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.10
Health care services	[2] 0.33	0.13	0.12	0.25	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08
Medicaid [1]		0.10	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07
Health research	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01
Health care worker ed and tng	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Consumer/occupatnl hlt/safet	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Social security and medicare		1.04	0.96	0.90	0.94	0.94	0.90	1.18	0.82	0.83
Social Security		0.80	0.73	0.67	0.75	0.62	0.66	0.63	0.59	0.58
Medicare		0.25	0.23	0.23	0.19	0.22	0.24	0.22	0.23	0.25

TABLE C.—BUDGET AUTHORITY IN RELATION TO MILITARY SPENDING FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS—Continued

[For each dollar of National Defense budget authority, shows the amount spent on other programs or functions]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 admin. proposal	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection	1987 projection
Income Security	[2] 1.53	0.74	0.64	0.49	0.48	0.39	0.44	0.44	0.42	0.42
General retirement/disab	[2] 0.77	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
Federal employee retirement	0.15	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.22	0.21	0.21
Unemployment compensation	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.06
Housing assistance [1]	0.26	0.19	0.14	0.06	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03
Subsidized housing	NA	NA	0.14	0.06	0.03	−0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02
Public hsg operating subs	NA	NA	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other housing assistance	NA	NA	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Food/nutrition assistance [1]	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05
Food stamps/Puerto Rico aid	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03
Child nutrition, other pro	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Other income security [1]	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.05
Supplemental security income	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
AFDC and related asstc	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
Earned income tax credit	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Refugee assistance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Low income energy asstc	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
Veterans Benefits/Services	0.17	0.15	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.08
Administration of Justice	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Border enforcement (Customs/IN)	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
General Government	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
General Purpose Fiscal Asstc	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
General Revenue Sharing	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Net Interest	0.34	0.44	0.45	0.39	0.37	0.37	0.41	0.37	0.35	0.34
Interest on public debt	0.38	0.51	0.52	0.54	0.52	0.52	0.56	0.53	0.50	0.48
Total budget authority	4.21	4.52	3.94	3.57	3.53	3.21	3.44	3.21	3.07	3.04
Low Income subtotal [1]	0.45	0.51	0.44	0.30	0.28	0.20	0.25	0.21	0.20	0.20
OMB Low Income group	NA	NA	0	0.26	0.26	0	0.24	0.21	0.19	0.19

[1] Included in Low Income subtotal are Medicaid, subsidized housing, food and other income security programs.
[2] Health Services figure includes Medicare; Income Security includes Social Security.

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (based on Federal budget documents).

TABLE D.—BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR LOW INCOME PROGRAMS COMPARED TO THAT FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

[Shows, for each dollar spent on low income programs, the amount spent on other subfunctions or programs]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection
National Defense	2.20	1.97	2.27	3.34	3.61	3.97	4.87	5.10
Dept of Defense Military	2.16	1.93	2.22	3.27	3.50	3.86	4.74	4.97
International Affairs	0.13	0.21	0.31	0.23	0.11	0.34	0.35	0.29
Foreign econ/finan asstc	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.06
International security asstc	0.01	NA	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.16	0.14
Genl Science, Space, Tech	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.14	0.13
Gnl science/basic research	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03
Space flight	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.10
Energy	0.10	0.49	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.03
Energy supply	0.07	0.50	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02
Energy conservation	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Natural Resources/Environment	0.19	0.18	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.17	0.17	0.14
Water resources	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05
Conservation/land management	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.00	−0.00
Recreational resources	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Pollution control/abatement	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05
Agriculture	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.29	0.46	0.06	0.19	0.15
Farm income stabilization	0.03	0.07	0.10	0.34	0.58	0.04	0.16	0.13
Agricultural research/service	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02
Commerce & Housing Credit	0.11	0.14	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Mortgage credit/thrift ins	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06
GNNA mortgage purchases	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
FHA mortgage credit	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Housing for elderly/handicapped	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
FmHA rural housing	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Natl Credit Union Admin	NA	0.02	0.00	0.00	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00
Postal Service	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Other commerce	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02
Transportation	0.21	0.27	0.31	0.32	0.40	0.44	0.46	0.39
Ground transportation	0.11	0.19	0.23	0.22	0.28	0.31	0.31	0.27
Highway system	0.08	0.12	0.11	0.13	0.19	0.21	0.23	0.20
Mass transit	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05
Railroads	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.01
Air transportation	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.08
Water transportation	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.04
Community/regional development	0.25	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.09
Community development	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06
Community devel block grants	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05
Urban devel action grants	NA	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Rental rehab grants	0.00	0.00	NA	NA	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rental development grants	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Urban homesteading	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other programs	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Area/regional development	0.17	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
Rural development	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01
Econ devel asstc	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indian programs	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Disaster relief/insurance	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Educ, Training, Emplymt, Soc Svc	0.61	0.41	0.38	0.40	0.41	0.47	0.43	0.36
Elementary/secondary/voc ed	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.10
Educ for disadvantaged	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Indian education	0	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
Higher education	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.09
Research/genl educ aids	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Training and employment	0.28	0.13	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.13	0.08	0.06
Other labor service	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Social services	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09
Social services block gran	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Community service progs	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0

TABLE D.—BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR LOW INCOME PROGRAMS COMPARED TO THAT FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS—Continued

[Shows, for each dollar spent on low income programs, the amount spent on other subfunctions or programs]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposal	1986 projection
Health (1985 def)	² 0.00	0.32	0.34	0.42	0.37	0.47	0.49	0.49
Health care services	² 0.72	0.25	0.27	0.84	0.34	0.38	0.40	0.40
Medicaid	0	0.20	0.22	0.28	0.28	0.31	0.33	0.34
Health research	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.07
Health care worker ed & tng	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
Consumer/occupatnl hlt/safet	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Social Security and Medicare	NA	2.05	2.18	3.02	3.38	3.57	5.73	4.24
Social Security	NA	1.57	1.66	2.23	2.70	2.63	3.09	2.97
Medicare	NA	0.48	0.52	0.79	0.68	0.94	1.09	1.27
Income Security	² 3.36	1.46	1.46	1.65	1.74	1.76	2.16	2.14
General retirment/disability	² 1.68	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.07	0.12	0.10	0.09
Federal employee retirement	0.34	0.33	0.36	0.49	0.52	0.55	1.05	1.07
Unemployment compensation	0.34	0.24	0.24	0.32	0.43	0.40	0.34	0.32
Housing assistance	0.57	0.38	0.33	0.21	0.15	0.12	0.09	0.13
Subsidized housing	0	0	0.31	0.19	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.12
Public hsg operating subs	0	0	0	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Other housing assistance	0	0	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Food/nutrition assistance	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.24	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.25
Food stamps/Puerto Rico	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.17
Child nutrition, other pro	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.08
Other income security	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.27	0.31	0.31	0.32	0.28
Supplemental security inco	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.15	0.13
AFDC and related asstc	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.10
Earned income tax credit	0	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Refugee assistance	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
Low income energy asstc	0	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02
Veterans Benefits/Services	0.38	0.29	0.29	0.38	0.37	0.39	0.42	0.39
Administration of Justice	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.08
Border enforcmt (Customs/IN	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
General Government	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.08
General Purpose Fiscal Asstc	0.18	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.09
General Revenue Sharing	0.13	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06
Net interest	0.76	0.87	1.03	1.29	1.32	1.62	1.81	1.71
Interest on public debt	0.83	1.01	1.19	1.79	1.89	2.24	2.56	2.47
Total budget authority	9.27	8.90	8.96	11.92	12.72	13.66	15.65	15.47
Low income subtotal ¹	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
OMB low income group	NA	NA	NA	0.86	0.93	0.95	1.02	0.95

¹ Medicaid, subsidized hsg, food, other income security.
² Health care includes medicare; income security includes social security.

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service.

TABLE E.—MARKET OUTLAYS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

[In millions of dollars]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposed	1986 proposed	1987 proposed
National Defense	97,501	135,056	159,765	187,418	210,484	237,548	272,040	310,550	348,595
International Affairs	4,831	10,733	11,130	9,982	8,995	13,502	17,492	17,855	18,842
Genl Science, Space, Tech	4,677	5,722	6,359	7,070	7,745	8,291	8,818	9,350	9,790
Energy	4,172	6,313	10,227	4,674	3,999	3,463	3,144	2,914	2,517
Natural Resources/Environment	10,000	13,812	13,525	12,934	12,669	12,302	11,346	10,645	10,224
Water resources	3,284	4,294	4,215	4,032	3,901	4,207	3,830	3,728	3,939
Conservation/land management	1,755	2,328	2,576	2,746	1,503	862	323	13	(366)
Recreational resources	1,769	1,707	1,632	1,477	1,454	1,608	1,502	1,417	1,374
Pollution control/abatement	5,704	5,510	5,169	5,012	4,263	3,937	4,171	4,003	3,808
Agriculture	5,526	4,762	5,572	14,875	2,206	10,693	14,319	12,048	11,940
Farm income stabilization	4,485	3,459	3,993	13,289	20,628	8,927	12,599	10,354	10,250
Commerce and housing credit	(31)	7,782	3,946	3,865	4,422	3,805	1,127	564	1,151
Mortgage credit/thrift ins	(3,270)	3,696	651	1,216	2,125	1,063	(1,177)	(1,544)	(1,075)
FHA mortgage credit	492	151	182	(237)	(192)	(753)	(1,157)	(1,436)	(1,608)
Hsg for elderly/handicapped	4	753	817	742	800	803	803	712	648
FmHA rural housing	442	1,719	(129)	1,247	1,830	2,085	1,842	2,012	1,974
Postal Service	1,830	1,677	1,343	707	789	879	692	443	444
Transportation	14,636	21,120	23,381	20,560	21,385	26,123	27,061	28,290	28,870
Community/regional development	6,283	10,068	9,394	7,165	6,936	7,594	7,586	7,076	6,848
Community development	3,526	4,878	5,111	4,583	4,293	4,682	4,788	4,559	4,508
Community devel block grants	2,089	3,902	4,042	3,792	4,293	4,682	4,788	4,559	4,500
Urban devel action grants	0	225	371	388	451	480	490	512	530
Rental rehab grants							75	188	188
Rental development grants							20	112	138
Urban homesteading				12	9	17	16	15	12
Area/regional development	2,139	3,180	2,708	2,735	2,644	2,769	2,618	2,357	2,203
Rural development	343	798	839	917	1,039	1,134	1,181	1,167	1,123
Econ devel asstc	305	629	536	412	303	336	316	162	111
Indian programs	719	991	984	1,078	1,114	1,150	1,148	1,144	1,179
Disaster relief/insurance	634	2,043	1,604	(119)	(1)	143	179	160	137
Educ, Traing, Emplyat, Soc Svc	20,983	30,767	31,402	26,300	26,606	28,683	27,893	27,684	27,598
Elementary/secondary/voc ed	5,078	6,732	7,043	6,780	6,294	6,959	7,144	7,320	7,363
Educ for disadvantaged	2,352	3,569	3,354	2,954	2,635	3,368	3,419	3,479	3,490
Indian education		395	316	339	336	326	331	341	345
Higher education	3,104	5,694	6,790	6,507	7,231	7,766	7,188	7,037	6,855
Training and employment	6,877	10,345	9,241	6,053	5,295	5,085	4,910	4,866	4,896
Social services	4,632	6,116	6,531	5,950	6,133	7,025	6,785	6,667	6,743
Social services block gran	2,551	3,706	2,646	2,567	2,508	2,772	2,796	2,703	2,700
Community service progs	529	592	619	387	333	380	123	0	0
Health (1985 definition)	17,236	23,131	26,833	27,449	28,655	30,665	32,916	32,680	37,246
Health care services	12,978	17,985	21,202	21,782	23,037	24,647	26,550	28,217	30,681
Medicaid	9,874	14,028	16,948	17,391	18,985	20,237	22,129	23,928	26,238
Social Security/Medicare	115,564	152,151	177,119	200,712	223,312	240,225	260,322	280,664	293,662
Social Security	83,861	117,117	137,970	154,144	170,724	179,161	190,639	204,159	208,829
Medicare	21,549	35,034	39,149	46,368	52,588	61,064	69,683	76,505	84,833
Income security	53,143	75,983	87,159	94,199	119,620	92,696	122,188	107,017	140,175
General retirement/disablty	4,781	6,567	7,054	7,661	5,581	5,496	5,670	5,846	15,910
Federal employee retirement	9,503	14,675	17,547	19,388	20,563	21,569	40,017	42,634	45,404

TABLE E.—MARKET OUTLAYS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposed	1986 proposed	1987 proposed
Unemployment compensation	15,258	18,023	19,664	23,756	31,464	20,727	20,069	19,460	18,777
Housing Assistance	2,937	5,514	6,942	8,043	9,536	10,041	10,908	11,330	11,954
Subsidized housing			5,747	6,880	7,786	8,584	9,314	9,815	10,424
Public hsg operating subs				1,008	1,542	1,180	1,175	1,117	1,135
Other housing assistance			1,195	155	228	277	419	398	395
Food/nutrition assistance	8,528	14,015	16,202	15,579	17,952	17,622	17,090	17,920	18,671
Food stamps	5,399	9,117	11,253	11,014	12,653	12,061	11,596	12,242	12,720
Child nutrition, other pro	3,129	4,898	4,949	4,565	17,952	17,622	17,090	17,920	18,671
Other income security	12,238	17,190	19,721	19,773	21,096	20,503	20,605	20,750	21,243
Supplemental security inco	5,297	6,411	7,192	7,677	8,724	8,554	9,349	9,596	9,971
AFDC and related astc	6,351	7,308	8,504	7,990	8,392	8,079	7,489	7,740	7,946
Earned income tax credit		1,275	1,318	1,201	1,213	1,123	1,044	982	923
Refugee assistance	148	368	726	1,011	524	599	419	352	324
Low income energy asstc		1,827	1,780	1,687	1,993	1,887	1,876	1,874	1,875
Low income subtotal [2]	33,597	50,747	59,813	60,786	67,589	68,403	70,732	73,928	78,108
Veterans Benefits/Services	18,038	21,183	22,988	23,955	24,846	25,799	26,723	27,808	28,944
Administration of Justice	3,600	4,570	4,698	4,671	5,099	6,021	6,140	6,086	6,162
General Government	3,357	4,602	4,614	4,726	4,784	5,652	5,744	5,712	5,674
General Purpose Fiscal Asstc	9,499	8,584	6,856	6,393	6,454	6,741	6,658	6,793	6,962
General Revenue Sharing	6,862	6,861	4,573	4,575	4,573	4,574	4,575	4,575	4,575
Net Interest	38,092	64,504	82,537	84,697	89,774	108,239	116,138	124,242	130,868
Interest on public debt	41,900	74,781	95,503	117,190	128,619	149,500	164,700	177,900	188,600
Total outlays	401,902	579,613	657,204	728,373	795,969	853,760	923,492	992,100	1,068,300
OMB's Low Income Benefit Program category	NA	NA	NA	56,600	63,200	63,700	65,500	68,500	72,500

[1] Pre-1985 classification.
[2] Medicaid, Housing Assistance, Food programs, other income security.
Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from Federal Budget volumes).

TABLE F.—BUDGET OUTLAYS IN CONSTANT 1984 DOLLARS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

[Dollars in millions]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1983 request	1986 proposal	1987 proposal
National Defense	154,548	166,063	178,272	204,176	220,051	237,548	259,601	283,507	305,376
International Affairs	7,658	13,119	12,419	10,875	9,404	13,502	16,692	16,300	16,506
Genl Science, Space, Tech	7,413	6,994	7,096	7,702	8,097	8,291	8,415	8,536	8,576
Energy	6,613	7,717	11,412	5,092	4,181	3,463	3,000	2,660	2,205
Natural Resources/Environment	15,851	16,883	15,092	14,090	13,245	12,302	10,827	9,718	8,956
Water resources	5,205	5,249	4,703	4,393	4,078	4,207	3,655	3,403	3,451
Conservation/land management	2,782	2,846	2,874	2,992	1,571	862	308	12	(321)
Recreational resources	2,804	2,987	1,821	1,609	1,520	1,608	1,433	1,294	1,204
Pollution control/abatement	9,041	6,735	5,768	5,460	4,457	3,937	3,980	3,654	3,336
Agriculture	8,759	5,821	6,217	16,205	2,306	10,693	13,664	10,999	10,460
Farm income stabilization	7,109	4,228	4,456	14,477	21,566	8,927	12,023	9,452	8,979
Commerce & Housing Credit	(49)	9,512	4,403	4,211	4,623	3,805	1,075	515	1,008
Mortgage credit/thrift ins	(5,183)	4,518	726	1,325	2,222	1,063	(1,123)	(1,410)	(942)
FHA mortgage credit	780	185	203	(258)	(201)	(753)	(1,104)	(1,311)	(1,409)
Hsg for elderly/handicapped	6	920	912	808	836	803	766	650	568
FmHA rural housing	701	2,101	(144)	1,359	1,913	2,095	1,758	1,837	1,729
Postal Service	2,901	2,050	1,499	770	825	879	660	404	389
Transportation	23,199	25,816	26,089	22,398	22,357	26,123	25,824	25,827	25,291
Community/regional development	9,959	12,307	10,482	7,006	7,251	7,594	7,239	6,460	5,999
Community development	5,589	5,963	5,703	4,993	4,488	4,682	4,569	4,162	3,949
Community devel block gran	3,311	4,770	4,510	4,131	4,488	4,682	4,569	4,162	3,949
Urban devel action grants	0	275	414	423	472	480	468	467	464
Rental rehab grants	0	0	0	0	0	—	72	172	165
Rental development grants	0	0	0	0	0	—	19	102	121
Urban homesteading	0	0	0	13	9	17	15	14	11
Area/regional development	3,391	3,887	3,022	2,980	2,764	2,769	2,498	2,152	1,930
Rural development	544	975	936	999	1,086	1,134	1,127	1,065	984
Econ devel asstc	403	769	598	449	317	336	302	148	97
Indian programs	1,140	1,211	1,098	1,174	1,165	1,150	1,096	1,044	1,033
Disaster relief/insurance	1,005	2,497	1,790	(130)	(1)	143	171	146	120
Educ, Traing, Emplyat, Soc Svc	33,263	37,608	35,040	28,652	27,815	28,683	26,618	23,273	24,176
Elementary/secondary voc ed	8,049	8,229	7,859	7,386	6,580	6,959	6,817	6,683	6,450
Educ for disadvantaged	3,728	4,363	3,743	3,219	2,755	3,368	3,263	3,176	3,057
Indian education	0	483	353	369	351	326	316	311	302
Higher education	4,920	6,960	7,577	7,089	7,560	7,766	6,859	6,424	6,005
Training and employment	10,901	12,645	10,311	6,594	5,536	5,085	4,685	4,442	4,289
Social services	7,342	7,476	7,288	6,482	6,412	7,025	6,475	6,086	5,907
Social services block grant	4,044	4,530	2,953	2,797	2,622	2,772	2,668	2,468	2,365
Community service progs	839	724	691	422	348	380	117	0	0
Health	27,321	28,274	29,941	29,903	29,957	30,665	31,411	29,834	32,628
Health care services	20,571	21,984	23,658	23,730	24,084	24,647	25,336	25,760	26,827
Medicaid	15,651	17,147	18,911	18,946	19,848	20,237	21,117	21,844	22,985
Social security/medicare	183,180	185,981	197,637	219,659	233,463	240,225	248,419	256,224	257,254
Social Security	132,927	143,157	153,953	167,927	178,484	179,161	181,922	186,381	182,938
Medicare	34,157	42,824	43,684	50,752	54,978	61,064	66,497	69,843	74,315
Income security	84,237	92,877	97,256	102,622	125,057	92,696	116,601	97,698	122,796
General retirement/disability	7,578	8,027	7,871	8,346	5,835	5,496	5,411	5,337	13,937
Federal employee retirement	15,063	17,938	19,580	21,122	21,498	21,569	38,187	38,921	39,775
Unemployment compensation	24,185	22,030	21,942	25,880	32,894	20,727	19,151	17,765	16,449
Housing assistance [1]	4,687	6,740	7,746	8,762	9,990	10,041	10,409	10,343	10,472
Subsidized housing	0	0	6,413	7,495	8,140	8,584	8,888	8,960	9,132
Public hsg operating subs	0	0	0	1,098	1,612	1,180	1,121	1,020	994
Other housing assistance	0	0	1,333	169	238	277	400	363	346
Food/nutrition assistance	13,518	17,131	18,079	16,972	18,768	17,622	16,309	16,360	16,336
Food stamps	8,558	11,144	12,557	11,999	13,228	12,061	11,066	11,176	11,143
Child nutrition, other food	4,960	5,987	5,522	4,973	18,768	17,622	16,309	16,360	16,356
Other income security [1]	19,398	21,012	22,006	21,541	22,055	20,503	19,663	18,943	18,611
Supplemental security inco	8,396	7,836	8,025	8,363	9,121	8,554	8,922	8,760	8,735
AFDC and related astc	10,067	8,933	9,489	8,704	8,773	8,079	7,147	7,066	6,961
Earned income tax credit	0	1,558	1,471	1,308	1,268	1,123	996	896	809
Refugee assistance	235	450	810	1,101	548	599	400	321	284
Low income energy asstc	0	2,233	1,986	1,838	2,084	1,887	1,790	1,711	1,643

TABLE F.—BUDGET OUTLAYS IN CONSTANT 1984 DOLLARS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS—Continued

[Dollars in millions]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1981 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1983 request	1986 proposal	1987 proposal
Low income subtotal [1]	53,254	62,030	66,742	66,221	70,661	69,403	67,498	67,490	68,424
Veterans Benefits/Services	28,592	25,893	25,651	26,097	25,975	25,799	25,501	25,386	25,356
Administration of Justice	5,706	5,586	5,242	5,089	5,331	6,021	5,859	5,556	5,398
General Government	5,321	5,625	5,148	5,149	5,001	5,652	5,481	5,215	4,971
General Purpose Fiscal Asstc	15,057	10,493	7,650	6,965	6,747	6,741	6,354	6,201	6,099
General Revenue Sharing	10,877	8,386	5,103	4,984	4,781	4,574	4,366	4,177	4,008
Net Interest	60,379	78,846	92,098	92,270	93,855	108,239	110,828	113,423	114,643
Interest on public debt	66,415	91,408	106,566	127,669	134,465	149,500	157,169	162,409	165,217
Total outlays	637,051	708,486	733,336	793,502	832,149	853,760	883,175	905,708	935,852
OMB's low income benefit program category	NA	NA	NA	61,661	66,073	63,700	62,505	62,535	62,511
GNP Deflator (1972=100)	142.2	184.4	202.0	206.9	215.6	225.4	236.2	246.9	257.3
Adjustment factor for 1984	1.585	1.222	1.116	1.089	1.045	1.000	0.954	0.913	0.876

[1] Medicaid, Housing Assistance, Food programs, other income security.

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from Federal Budget volumes).

TABLE G.—OUTLAYS FOR DEFENSE, COMPARED TO OTHER OUTLAYS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

[For each dollar of defense spending, shows what was spent on other things]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposed	1987 projected
National Defense	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
International Affairs	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.05
Genl Science, Space, Tech	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
Energy	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Natural resources environment	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03
Water resources	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01
Conservation/land management	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	−0.00
Recreational resources	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
Pollution control/abatement	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Agriculture	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.03
Farm income stabilization	0.05	0.03	0.10	0.04	0.05	0.03
Commerce and housing credit	−0.00	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00
Mortgage credit/thrift ins	−0.03	0.03	0.01	0.00	−0.00	−0.00
FHA mortgage credit	0.01	0.00	−0.00	−0.00	−0.00	−0.00
Hsg for elderly/handicapped	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FmHA rural housing	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Postal Service	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Transportation	0.15	0.16	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.08
Community/regional development	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02
Community development	0.06	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Community devel block grants	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Urban devel action grants	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rental rehab grants	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00	0.00
Rental development grants	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00	0.00
Urban homesteading	NA	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Area/regional development	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Rural development	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Econ devel asstc	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indian programs	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Disaster relief/insurance	0.01	0.02	−0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Educ, Traing, Emplyat, Soc Svc	0.22	0.23	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.08
Elementary/secondary/voc ed	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02
Educ for disadvantaged	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Indian education	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Higher education	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02
Training and employment	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01
Social services	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02
Social services block grant	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Community service progs	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Health (excluding Medicare)	0.18	0.17	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.11
Health care services	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09
Medicaid	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.09
Social security/medicare	1.19	1.12	1.05	1.01	0.96	0.84
Social security	0.86	0.86	0.81	0.75	0.70	0.60
Medicare	0.22	0.26	0.25	0.26	0.26	0.24
Income security	0.55	0.56	0.57	0.39	0.45	0.40
General retirement/disa	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.05
Federal employee retirement	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.15	0.13
Unemployment compensation	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.09	0.07	0.05
Housing assistance [1]	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.03
Subsidized housing	NA	NA	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03
Public hsg operating subs	NA	NA	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other housing assistance	NA	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Food/nutrition assistance	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.05
Food stamps	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04
Child nutrition, other progs	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.05
Other income security [1]	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.06
Supplement security income	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03
AFDC and related astc	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02
Earned income tax credit	NA	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Refugee assistance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Low income energy asstc	NA	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Low income subtotal [1]	0.34	0.37	0.32	0.29	0.26	0.22
Veterans Benefits/Services	0.19	0.16	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.08
Administration of Justice	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02
General Government	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
General Purpose Fiscal Asstc	0.10	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02
General Revenue Sharing	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Net Interest	0.39	0.47	0.43	0.46	0.43	0.38
Interest on public debt	0.43	0.55	0.61	0.63	0.61	0.54
Total outlays	4.12	4.27	3.78	3.57	3.40	3.06
OMB's low income benefit program category	NA	NA	0.30	0.27	0.24	0.21

[1] Medicaid, Housing Assistance, Food progress, other income security.

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from Federal Budget volumes).

TABLE H.—OUTLAYS FOR LOW INCOME PROGRAMS, COMPARED TO OTHER OUTLAYS FOR MAJOR FUNCTIONS AND SELECTED SUBFUNCTIONS AND PROGRAMS

[For each dollar spent on low income programs, shows spending for other things]

Function, subfunction, or program	1977 actual	1980 actual	1983 actual	1984 estimate	1985 proposed	1987 projected
National Defense	1.92	2.68	3.11	3.47	3.85	4.46
International Affairs	0.10	0.21	0.13	0.20	0.25	0.24
Genl Science, Space, Tech	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.13
Energy	0.08	0.12	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03
Natural Resources/Environment	0.20	0.27	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.13
Water resources	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05
Conservation/land management	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.00	−0.00
Recreational resources	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Pollution control/abatement	0.11	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05
Agriculture	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.16	0.20	0.15
Farm income stabilization	0.09	0.07	0.31	0.13	0.18	0.13
Commerce & Housing Credit	−0.00	0.15	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.01
Mortgage credit/thrift ins	−0.06	0.07	0.03	0.02	−0.02	−0.01
FHA mortgage credit	0.01	0.00	−0.00	−0.01	−0.02	−0.02
Hsg for elderly/handicapped	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
FmHA rural housing	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Postal Service	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Transportation	0.29	0.42	0.32	0.38	0.38	0.37
Community/regional development	0.12	0.20	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.09
Community development	0.07	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06
Community devel block grants	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06
Urban devel action grants	NA	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Rental rehab grants	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00	0.00
Rental development grants	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.00	0.00
Urban homesteading	NA	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Area/regional development	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03
Rural development	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Econ devel asstc	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indian programs	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Disaster relief/insurance	0.01	0.04	−0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Educ, Traing, Emplymt, Soc Svc	0.41	0.61	0.39	0.42	0.39	0.35
Elementary/secondary/voc ed	0.10	0.13	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.09
Educ for disadvantaged	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.04
Indian education	NA	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Higher education	0.06	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.09
Training and employment	0.14	0.20	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06
Social services	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.09
Social services block grant	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03
Community service progs	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0
Health (except Medicare)	0.34	0.46	0.42	0.45	0.47	0.48
Health care services	0.26	0.35	0.34	0.36	0.38	0.39
Medicaid	0.19	0.28	0.28	0.30	0.31	0.34
Social security/medicare	2.28	3.00	3.30	3.51	3.68	3.76
Social security	1.65	2.31	2.53	2.62	2.70	2.67
Medicare	0.42	0.69	0.78	0.89	0.99	1.09
Income security	1.05	1.50	1.77	1.36	1.73	1.79
General retirement/disability	0.09	0.13	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.20
Federal employee retirement	0.19	0.29	0.30	0.32	0.57	0.58
Unemployment compensation	0.30	0.36	0.47	0.30	0.28	0.24
Housing assistance [1]	0.06	0.11	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.15
Subsidized housing	NA	NA	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.13
Public hsg operating subs	NA	NA	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Other housing assistance	NA	NA	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01
Food/nutrition assistance	0.17	0.28	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.24
Food stamps	0.11	0.18	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.16
Child nutrition, other progs	0.06	0.10	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.24
Other income security [1]	0.24	0.34	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.27
Supplemental security income	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13
AFDC and related astc	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.10
Earned income tax credit	NA	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01
Refugee assistance	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
Low income energy asstc	NA	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02
Low income subtotal [1]	0.66	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Veterans benefits/services	0.36	0.42	0.37	0.38	0.38	0.37
Administration of justice	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.08
General government	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.07
General purpose fiscal asstc	0.19	0.17	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.09
General revenue sharing	0.14	0.14	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06
Net interest	0.75	1.27	1.33	1.58	1.64	1.68
Interest on public debt	0.03	1.47	1.90	2.19	2.33	2.41
Total outlays	7.92	11.42	11.78	12.48	13.08	13.68
OMB's low income benefit program category	NA	NA	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.93

[1] Medicaid, housing assistance, food programs, other income security.

Source: Low Income Housing Information Service (compiled from Federal Budget volumes).

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, the history of the world consists of both triumph and tragedy. Today, I wish to call attention to perhaps history's ultimate tragedy—the 40-year-old nightmare that befell Europe. This Sunday will be the first of the Days of Remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. And I know all in Congress join in recognizing this Day of Remembrance—for we must not only acknowledge history's triumph, we must also remember history's tragedy so that is may never again be repeated.

Mankind has watched many tragedies—the Armenian genocide, Stalin's cruel purges, Pol Pot's systematic murders—yet the Holocaust holds a terrible place among these examples of man's inhumanity to man. Indeed, it is almost impossible to measure the Holocaust's tragedy. The numbers cannot be understood. They are too large. Two million children's shoes; 800,000 suitcases; one million pairs of glasses—such tragedy defies understanding. And such tragedy also threatens to remain anchored in the past, far away; threatens to become a mere abstraction, standing out of reach, beyond the grasp of collective memory. True, we wrap the Holocaust in books and movies and documentaries. But we must remember also and always that the Holocaust's tragedy was real. We must remember that if it happened once, it may happen again. And we must remember that our duty is to hold the Holocaust up as a warning

for future generations, for world leaders yet unborn. In short—we must remember.

Beginning with Hitler's ascent to power in 1933, the official and violent persecution of Jews and other minorities began. Deprived of their political rights, occupations, and property, the Jews of Germany suffered physical violence, mental anguish, banishment, and ultimately death. In Germany and parts of East Europe, Jews were literally worked to death. Members of the Einsatzgruppen operated throughout East Europe—200,000 collaborators assisted. In 2 days at Babi Yar in Russia, 35,000 Jews were shot. Later, methods of death were improved. Extermination became a science. A camp called Auschwitz was soon able to send 12,000 a day to their death. And ultimately, the unbelievable became believable—Hitler's implacable objective was the destruction of an entire race.

Mr. President, during the Days of Rememberance, we must hold up and recognize this most painful part of history. Approximately 6 million Jews died at the hands of the Nazis; 2 million non-Jews perished as well. And their lives must never leave our consciousness, their memory must always be with us.

In the end, the abuse of human rights—and I include the horrid abuse of these rights—may only be quelled with the weapons of justice and principled values. And in remembering the Holocaust, in remembering past abuses, we make better weapons of justice and values—our final and best hope of conquering the worst forces of man in today's world.●

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1983

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, I wish today to inform my colleagues of the growing number of voices seeking quick action on S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act of 1983. In addition to the American Association of Port Authorities and Inland River Ports and Terminals, Inc., whose views I have in the past placed in the RECORD, the following have also called on the Senate to deliberate and pass this legislation as soon as possible:

The Association for the Improvement of the Mississippi River.

The Upper Mississippi River Basin Association.

The Interstate Conference on Water Problems.

The Associated General Contractors of America.

The National Association of Urban Flood Management Agencies.

The National Association of Dredging Contractors.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

The American Water Works Association.

The Tennessee-American Water Co.

Mr. President, I would ask that a copy of their letters seeking action on S. 1739 be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this chorus of voices grows every day, and I believe the reasons for this growing interest are clear. For one thing, it has been 8 years since a water resource development act has been enacted by Congress and the sad fact is that the needs of the country are not being met. I also believe that this may be the last chance to address these needs in this time honored manner. The prospects for such omnibus legislation in the next Congress are not good, and it is likely to be 3 or 4 years before we again have the opportunity now before us to address water resources development issues comprehensively.

Mr. President, I again urge the expeditious consideration of S. 1739 by the Senate.

The letters follow:

INTERSTATE CONFERENCE
ON WATER PROBLEMS,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1984.

Re S. 1739, Water Resources Development Act of 1983.

Hon. HOWARD BAKER, Jr.,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: I am writing on behalf of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems (ICWP) to urge expedient floor action on S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act of 1983. ICWP is the national association of State, interstate and intrastate water officials concerned with the full range of water issues, both quality and quantity related. ICWP was established in 1959. Its purpose is to facilitate cooperation within the water community as to water issues, legislation, and Federal-State relationships. ICWP also serves as the policy advisory group on water issues to the National Governors' Association.

Water development has been at a standstill since the late 1970's, and ICWP believes new, comprehensive water project legislation must be enacted during this Congress. With omnibus water bills pending in both the House and Senate, now is the time for Congress to act.

ICWP strongly supports reform of our national water policy. We have consistently urged the establishment of a Federal-State water resources coordinating mechanism headed by an independent chairman and a State advisory committee. Such a coordinating mechanism should be responsible for promoting consistency of purpose among Federal agencies, influencing the development and implementation of water policies and programs at the Federal level, providing information on Federal water programs, and receiving and communicating State input and providing for direct State involvement. ICWP certainly feels that the provision in S. 1739 establishing a National Water Policy Board is a step in the right direction.

We support the passage of a water resources development bill and feel that S. 1739 is the proper vehicle. ICWP appreciates the hard work and dedication involved in developing this bill and urges that the Senate take action promptly.

If ICWP may be of assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to working with you toward resolving the water problems facing our nation.

Sincerely,

A. KENNETH DUNN,
Chairman.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
DREDGING CONTRACTORS,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Senate Majority Leader,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: The National Association of Dredging Contractors feels it is crucial for both the enhancement of trade and national security and defense that S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act sponsored by James Abdnor, be considered by the Senate at the earliest available time. Port deepening, inland waterway improvements, and operation and maintenance questions are extremely urgent issues now facing Congress.

The National Association of Dredging Contractors is a national association of private dredging companies representing all areas of our nation. At this time approximately 80 percent of the dredging work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is efficiently, and cost-effectively, handled by U.S. private dredging firms. Because of our unique knowledge of the waterways system, both inland and coastal, we are deeply concerned about its present state and its needs, both now and in the future.

We are now entering a recovery after a sustained worldwide recession in which ocean-going vessels suffered as never before. The U.S. is presently losing the ability to handle vital imports and exports, and unless steps are taken now to upgrade and expand our ports and harbors, America will not be able to capitalize to the fullest extent on the projected 32 percent increase in the amount of shipping expected by 1990. Ports are already beginning to see an increase in vessel calls, and with an upsurge in the shipping of bulk commodities and manufactured goods, it is crucial that we have the capacity in our ports and inland waterways to match the capacity of the short-side facilities.

One of the primary missions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is mobilization. Members of the NADC have joined efforts with the Corps in the Corps of Engineers Reserve Fleet (CERF) program to aid them in their mission in times of national emergency and for defense. We recognize that with new classes of defense and security vessels, adequate mobilization ability is vital, and we stand ready to do our part. Provisions in S. 1739 will help insure that the U.S. navigation system is better able to handle the situations which we must prepare for to defend our national security.

The members of the National Association of Dredging Contractors feel it is essential that work on our port and inland waterway infrastructure begin immediately, and that our projects are expedited. With S. 1739 as a basis for discussion, we hope that the Senate will take a giant step in the formulation of a sound navigation policy. It has been over twelve years since Congress last passed a comprehensive water resources bill. It is in the best interests of the nation that we do not wait any longer to address our needs. We must go forward, beginning with the timely consideration of S. 1739.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. DOWNS,
President.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER,
St. Louis, Mo., April 4, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: The Association for the Improvement of the Mississippi River, a group with over 350 members representing local governmental and developmental organizations, businesses, farm organizations, labor unions, waterway carriers and shippers organizations, has been fighting for efficient and reliable water transportation in the midwest since 1974.

Recently our group has been following and offering input to Senate Bill 1739 and the companion house bill. Although there may be a few changes needed in the senate bill, we believe it is essential that this bill be scheduled for floor debate as soon as possible. It is imperative that our country obtain Water Resources Conservation, Development, and Infrastructure Improvement and Rehabilitation legislation this year.

We are confident that with meaningful floor debate in the Senate legislation will emerge from which the Conference Committee can work out an acceptable compromise with the House.

It would be unconscionable to hold up this long delay and much needed piece of legislation any longer. Therefore, we urge you to bring Senate Bill 1739 to the floor as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

GUY E. JESTER,
President.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: The last major water resources bill was signed into law in 1976. Since that time, this country's waterways, ports and locks have continued to age, to deteriorate, and become obsolete.

S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act, addresses the needs of our water resources. It authorizes 130 projects for port development, inland waterways and other related concerns. It provides for cost-sharing as a means of lessening the cost to the federal government.

The Associated General Contractors of America (AGC) respectfully urges that S. 1739 be brought to the Senate floor as soon as the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee completes consideration under its referral of the bill.

AGC's study, "America's Infrastructure: A Plan to Rebuild," documents the cost of rebuilding our locks, ports and waterways at $51.2 billion over a 19-year period. The nation has a 20-year history of failing to adequately invest in its infrastructure. S. 1739 will provide the necessary funds and authorizations to reverse this neglect of our water resources.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Cordially,

SUSAN J. LOOMIS,
Associate Director,
Congressional Relations.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF URBAN FLOOD MANAGEMENT AGENCIES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD BAKER,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: At the direction of the Board of Directors and on behalf of the Membership of the National Association of Urban Flood Management Agencies, I am writing to urge you to schedule floor debate on S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act of 1983.

This legislation, which is the product of careful and deliberate consideration by the Committee on Environment and Public Works, contains a variety of needed flood control project authorizations, as well as important water resources policy provisions. Although our membership does not support all of the provisions in the bill, we believe nonetheless that action is urgently needed now. As you know, Congress has not passed a water resources authorization bill since 1976, with the result that the water resources program of the Federal government has virtually ground to a halt.

Floor action in the immediate future is necessary in order to allow sufficient time in this abbreviated session of Congress for a conference with the House on its version of this omnibus legislation.

Thank you for your consideration of NAUFMA's views.

Sincerely,

KENNETH L. EDWARDS,
NAUFMA President, Chief Engineer, Riverside County, Calif., Flood Control District.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., April 16, 1984.

Hon. JAMES ABDNOR,
Chairman, Water Resources Subcommittee, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ABDNOR: On behalf of the Upper Mississippi River Basin Association, I am writing to urge that the Senate consider as soon as possible S. 1739. The Water Resources Development Act of 1983, as reported by the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Our Association was formed in December 1981, after the Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission was terminated by Executive Order. The Association has been actively pursuing the implementation of the "Comprehensive Master Plan for the Management of the Upper Mississippi River System" which was prepared by the Commission at the direction of Congress in Public Law 95-502. The plan contains recommendations for programs to enhance and protect the economic, environmental, and recreational values of the river system. The necessary Congressional authorizations for these programs are contained in Section 507 of S. 1739.

We are encouraged at the progress this 98th Congress has made in drafting water resources legislation. We also are aware that substantial debate remains on certain provisions with S. 1739. But this is legislation that the Senate must consider, debate, and pass, in order to enact the water resources legislation that is desperately needed across the nation. We urge timely consideration of S. 1739.

Sincerely,

DONALD R. VONNAHME,
Chairman.

AMERICAN WATER WORKS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Senate Majority Leader, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: The American Water Works Association, representing 3,000 municipal and investor-owned utilities that supply approximately 70 percent of this Nation's drinking water, strongly urges that you schedule a floor vote as soon as possible on S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act, introduced by Senator James Abdnor (R-SD).

As you are aware, Title VIII of this bill makes loans available to both municipal and investor-owned systems for rehabilitation and expansion of municipal water supplies. While most systems do not require external funds, a small number of utilities require upgrading to meet evolving standards in the drinking water industry. In view of the American Water Works Association's strong support for provision of safe drinking water at a reasonable cost to the public, we support the loan program for those activities that require upgrading to continue to provide high quality water to their customers.

We note that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has sole responsibility for administering the loan program and that distribution of funds will be based on population and state need. Repayment periods are limited to 30 years and, as a condition of receiving the loan, the water supply system must maintain adequate rates to meet repayment obligations and to maintain, repair and rehabilitate the project for which the loan is made. These key provisions of this bill must be adequately enforced. Certainly, loan recipients who default should cease to be eligible for federal aid.

We also strongly concur with provisions of the bill that permit the state to submit a priority list of water supply projects to be financed by loans. The Secretary of the Army may take these priority lists into account in allocating funds among candidate projects. We strongly support the concept that projects not be listed individually in this vital legislation.

In the interest of "better water for people", the American Water Works Association supports S. 1739 and urges that this bill be considered by the full Senate at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. GROFF,
Deputy Executive Director, Government Affairs.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Senate Majority Leader, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: I am writing on behalf of the many scientists, engineers, and other specialists who deal with water resources in our universities. Many of these men and women have devoted their careers to teaching, research, and public service related to water development and use.

Our community is concerned about the continuing stalemate in water policy. We believe that policy is needed to deal with water conservation, water pollution, shortages, flooding, conflicts over water use and above all cost-sharing agreements on water development efforts. It has been nearly eight years, we note, since the last action on water projects. Yet on the agenda of nation-

al issues water quality appears to be of greater concern than interest rates, the federal deficit or unemployment.

We fully understand that the selection and funding of projects in water resources is controversial and that there are strong political pressures involved in these decision. As university scientists and teachers we are not directly involved in these decisions on particular issues or projects. However, we want you to know that we consider the continuing development and intelligent use of water to be vital to the nation's health and well-being. We respectfully request that this urgent piece of the nation's business be moved ahead!

We are mindful of the confidence expressed in us during the recent override on S. 684, that now permits us to continue to do research on water resources in our universities. We believe that as water development projects are developed the water research program will enable these efforts to proceed more efficiently and effectively.

We note that broad support which the veto override action received, because the bill proposed compromise solutions to complex problems. In similar vein, we suggest that the Senate bring S. 1739 to the floor, so that the issues contained therein may be considered in open debate, and a consensus achieved.

While we do not presume to suggest how these issues should be resolved, we do ask that the Senate move to consider S. 1739. It is time for action on the water resources development agenda.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ERNEST T. SMERDON,
Chairman, Committee on Water Resources.

TENNESSEE-AMERICAN WATER CO.,
Charleston, W. Va., April 12, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: I am writing you concerning SB-1739 sponsored by Senator Abdnor, South Dakota. As you know, it has been almost eight years since Congress has passed water resource legislation. While I realize passage of SB-1739 may not be in keeping with the administration's effort to reduce the federal deficit, I do believe that the Title VIII Loan Program, which is part of the proposed legislation, does have merit. I want to make it clear I do not favor federal grants for water resource projects but I do favor low interest cost loans to water purveyors on a cost-sharing basis as proposed in SB-1739.

Senator Baker, I would appreciate it if you would consider allowing this bill to come to the floor of the Senate for debate.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD W. LIMBACH,
President.●

TRIBUTE TO BILL EVANS

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, a good friend and prominent San Diegan, Bill Evans, passed away last Sunday, April 22. Bill was a moving force in the development of San Diego. He was a devoted supporter of Ronald Reagan's political career. He was also a philanthropist and a family man. I will, as will San Diego, miss him greatly. At this point, I ask that a fine article about Bill's life by Lynne Carrier of the San Diego Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

HOTELIER EVANS RECALLED AS CREATIVE, TENACIOUS

(By Lynne Carrier)

Those who knew William Donald Evans describe him as a doer.

He was the first to build a hotel on Mission Bay. He put up a high-rise apartment building downtown when others shunned such projects. He collected dozens of antique automobiles, then built a private museum for them.

The La Jolla hotelier died Sunday of a heart attack at 61, while still pursuing his hobbies and business activities.

Services will be at 11 a.m. tomorrow at St. James-by-the-Sea Episcopal Church in La Jolla.

"Bill Evans was a major force behind the development of Mission Bay and an inspiration to his friends with his dedication, energy, enthusiasm and consummate ability in the business world," said Gordon C. Luce, chairman of Great American Federal Savings & Loan and a longtime friend of Evans'.

Evans built the Bahia Resort Hotel, the first on Mission Bay, in 1954. Later be expanded the Bahia and built a second hotel, the Catamaran, in Mission Beach. He also operated a cruise boat on the bay, the Bahia Belle, which sank and was rebuilt and put back into service.

"He was a very strong-willed guy," recalls Lester Earnest, who was director of the city's Park and Recreation Department when Evans got a lease from the city to build the Bahia Hotel. "When he decided to do something, you'd better get out of the road."

Not all his plans came to fruition, though. He dropped one proposal to build a floating convention center on the bay, to have been called the Bahia Princess. He also gave up on a 1981 proposal to build a convention hotel on the city-owned site of the old Belmont Park in Mission Beach. Evans had operated the amusement park from 1969 to its closing in 1976. He pleased preservationists by donating the park's vintage 1925 roller coaster to the Save Our Heritage Organization two years ago.

Earnest described Evans as a creative thinker, always coming up with plans on how to make his businesses succeed. Before the Bahia Hotel began to prosper, he said, Evans contemplated leasing units there for 12 months, on the condition that the lease holders let Evans rent their rooms to tourists during the summer months. In exchange, the lease holders would get the free use of boats, which could double as their living quarters during the summer months and become the property of the lease holders after five years. Earnest said Evans abandoned that idea after his hotel business began picking up.

City Councilman Bill Cleator, another of Evans' friends, remembers him as a political conservative who was active in the Republican Party.

"He was the first one beating the drums for Ronald Reagan," Cleator said, adding that Evans supported Reagan before he was elected governor of California in 1966. Evans later became a delegate for Reagan at the Republican national conventions in 1976 and 1980.

Evans also was a quite philanthropist who supported charitable causes without fanfare, Cleator said.

Another acquaintance, W. Daniel Larsen, a member of the Centre City Development Corp., remembered Evans as "a great guy" who "wasn't afraid to put his money on the line to get something done."

Evans is survived by his wife, Anne, a son, William L. of Los Angeles; four daughters, Grace Chereashore of San Francisco, Nancy of San Diego, and Anne and Margaret, who are attending colleges on the East Coast.

The family requests donations to the Aero-Space Museum in Balboa Park or to Meals on Wheels.●

UNITED STATES TIES WITH CHINA AND TAIWAN

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, President Reagan's visit to mainland China this week emphasizes the importance of the Chinese people in international relations. While the focus on attention during this period will be on mainland China and its leaders, I would like to offer a few thoughts on the significance of U.S. ties with both the Republic of China on Taiwan and mainland China.

Mainland China has become a major market for U.S. agricultural products. In fiscal year 1982, mainland China was our seventh largest market for farm products, with purchases of over $1.5 billion. As a result of the textile trade dispute, mainland China fell to 17th position with purchases of over one-half billion dollars in 1983. The decline resulted from China halting purchases of U.S. wheat under our long-term grain sales agreement. That agreement calls for the purchase of 6 million metric tons of wheat annually, but in 1983 China purchased only 1.9 million metric tons. The Government of China has given assurances that they will purchase the additional 4.1 million metric tons in 1984, but there is a legitimate concern about their ability to transport that amount of grain in 1 year.

Taiwan is also a very important market for our farm products. Just last year, a trade delegation from Taiwan visited my home State of South Dakota and purchased substantial quantities of wheat. In fact, Taiwan was the eighth largest purchaser of U.S. farm products in fiscal year 1983 with imports worth $1.3 billion.

It is clear that both nations are important agricultural trading partners. In particular, we need to place a high priority on resolving agricultural trade conflicts with mainland China. For this reason, I have contacted the President, urging him to give agricultural trade issues the highest priority during his personal meetings with Chinese leaders.

President Reagan has made clear his strong support for a continued close relationship with our friends and allies on Taiwan. It is essential that a multibillion dollar trade partner and valuable security ally not be sacrificed to

the whims of changing Chinese Communist Party leaders. In Taiwan, we have a steadfast and loyal ally. Our goal should be to try to draw mainland China toward the U.S. system of greater individual liberty and private enterprise, and Taiwan stands as a rare model in Asia for its efforts to move in that direction.

Some have called for close United States military ties with Communist China. I oppose this, and so do the great majority of other Members of Congress. Although the United States and mainland China share a common interest in opposing Soviet aggression and interference in the affairs of Pacific region nations, it would be a mistake to give Communist Chinese officials United States weapons technology or to cut off the flow of trade and technology between ourselves and our friends on Taiwan. If commitment to principle is an important criterion by which to judge the value of our security allies, then I suggest Taiwan possesses this quality and mainland China does not.

Also, Mr. President, Taiwan is well integrated into the international market trading system. In many respects it is a developed nation. Mainland China is economically and politically underdeveloped. The uncertainty of public policy in such a society is a fair warning to those who are tantalized by the prospects of 1 billion new customers. Many entrepreneurs in the United States and other nations have already suffered losses because substantial economic commitments and agreements were made but fell through because mainland China changed its mind after contracts were entered into. Additionally, there is much uncertainty about Communist China's intentions regarding Hong Kong. Soothing statements have emanated from Peking on this subject, but much doubt remains on the future of Hong Kong.

The most recent statistics show that Taiwan is a more valuable trading partner than mainland China. In 1983, they purchased 1.3 billion dollars' worth of U.S. farm goods. In the same year, U.S. farm exports to mainland China were valued at $544 million. The Taiwan connection continues to be very valuable to the United States and American farmers.

Thus, it is clear we must be very careful with our developing relationship with mainland China. Our policy formulation must be very cautious and it must involve a large measure of congressional consultation. We welcome genuine change in the People's Republic of China. But let us never forget the basic principles of Chinese nationalism and the extent to which our faithful allies on Taiwan have supported U.S. interests through appropriate security policies and an aggressive trade, economic modernization, and political development effort.

Mr. President, I ask that an April 20, 1984, Heritage Foundation study, entitled "The Limits of U.S.-China Strategic Cooperation," be printed at this point in the RECORD. It contains very useful commentary on the question of future United States-Chinese relations.

The study follows:

[From the Heritage Foundation, Apr. 20, 1984]

THE LIMITS TO UNITED STATES-CHINA STRATEGIC COOPERATION

(By Martin L. Lasater)

(Martin L. Lasater is a former Staff Associate on the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives. He currently heads his own consulting firm for foreign policy and security affairs analysis and frequently publishes on issues relating to U.S. policy in Asia.)

INTRODUCTION

U.S.-China ties continue to be based mainly on mutual security advantages. The U.S. Defense Department's FY 1984 Posture Statement declared that one of the national security objectives of the United States is "to build toward a durable strategic relationship with the People's Republic of China." And the Pentagon's FY 1984-85 Defense Guidance portrays China as a U.S. ally in a possible conflict with the Soviet Union, should Moscow invade the Persian Gulf. In much the same way, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger attempted to involve the Chinese in expanded strategic cooperation during his trip to China in September 1983.

The strategic importance of the People's Republic of China (PRC) was also used to explain U.S.-China relations after Secretary of State George Shultz's trip to Beijing in February 1983. Assistant Secretary of State for Asia and the Pacific Paul Wolfowitz listed reasons why China was important strategically to the U.S.:

We no longer have to plan and spend to confront a Chinese threat; our parallel interests in containing the Soviet Union have been repeatedly reaffirmed and we are in fundamental agreement that the Soviets remain the principal threat to the peace of the world; we have common interests in containing not only Vietnamese aggression in Southeast Asia and encouraging a peaceful settlement of the Kampuchean problem based on Khmer self-determination, but also in resisting Soviet aggression in Afghanistan; . . . despite problems, East Asia has emerged as one of the more stable and prosperous regions of the world, with China playing an increasingly responsible regional role.[1]

Wolfowitz also might have mentioned that one of the most frequently cited strategic benefits to the United States is that China pins down some 54 Soviet divisions along the 6,500 mile Sino-Soviet border. These divisions otherwise might be threatening U.S. interests in Western Europe or the Persian Gulf.

If Sino-American strategic cooperation is so beneficial, some have asked, can it be formalized? Can China be drawn into a quasi-defense alliance with the United States? Are there not steps Washington can take to improve China's defense capabilities as a counterbalance to the Soviet Union in Asia?

U.S. policy makers must direct their attention to such questions. The answers could provide a clear indication of the limits of strategic cooperation between the two countries. Once these have been recognized, realistic national goals and immediate objectives in U.S. China policy can be set. Otherwise, U.S. leaders will continue to vacillate between undue pessimism and optimism regarding the value of U.S.-PRC relations.

CHINA'S CURRENT FOREIGN POLICY

Fundamental to an understanding of China's foreign policy is an appreciation of Beijing's own agenda in international politics. The Chinese describe their current foreign policy as "independent." As Premier Zhao Ziyang commented on September 22, 1982:

"China's foreign policy is a policy of independence and self-determination. We shall never be attached to any big power. We will not play the Soviet card against the United States, nor the American card against the Soviet Union, nor allow any other country to play the China card."

When Secretary of Defense Weinberger visited the PRC last year and hinted at greater strategic cooperation, Chinese leaders reacted coolly. China now perceives its interests to be best served by a flexible policy, somewhat equidistant between Moscow and Washington. This aspect of China's foreign policy, signalled publicly in 1982 by Hu Yaobang, General Secretary of the Communist Party of China,[2] is markedly different from the policy of 1978-1979 when Deng Xiaoping called for increased stategic cooperation between China, the U.S., Japan, and Western Europe. The current policy line is also different from that pursued in the 1950s, when China allied itself with the Soviet Union, and contrasts as well with that pursued during much of the 1960s, when Beijing declared a plague on both superpowers.

Valuable insight into the tactical nature of Chinese foreign policy formulation was provided by the Japanese Foreign Ministry in November 1982, when it published a secret Chinese internal document outlining the reasons behind Beijing's decision to begin reapproachment with Moscow. As summarized in the Japanese newspapers Yomiuri Shimbun, the document stated:

"1. The two superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—are contending with each other in pursuit of hegemony. Militarily, the Soviet Union stands in an offensive position and the United States is relatively inferior. The potential strength of the United States, however, should not be underestimated.

"2. The United States normalized its diplomatic relations with China. But it did so for the purpose of compensating for its military inferiority to the Soviet Union and because it thought that normalization would be of benefit to itself. In deciding on nor-

[1] Prepared statement of Paul W. Wolfowitz, "Sino-American Relations: Eleven years after the Shanghai Communique," given before U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Feb. 28, 1983, pp. 1, 3, ms.

[2] According to documents, Hu Yaobang told the delegates: "We note that Soviet leaders have expressed more than once the desire to improve relations with China. . . . If the Soviet authorities really have a sincere desire to improve relations with China and take practical steps to lift their threat to the security of our country, it will be possible for Sino-Soviet relations to move toward normalization."

malization, the United States recognized "one China," but it still continues its commitment to Taiwan. This constitutes an intervention in China's internal affairs and, for the development of U.S.-China relations, it is undesirable for the United States to continue such a policy.

"3. The Soviet Union has lately been making overtures to China for a rapprochement. This is also intended for the Soviet Union's own benefit. Although militarily it is relatively superior to the United States, the Soviet Union is isolated internationally and faces economic difficulties domestically and, therefore, it thinks that easing tension with China will be of benefit.

"4. In the final analysis, both the United States and the Soviet Union are trying to use China as a card in the process of seeking hegemony. The fact that the Soviet Union desires a rapprochement with China does not alter the intrinsic nature of Soviet hegemonism or big-power chauvinism. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union was a friend to China for a long time. An excessive confrontation with the Soviet Union is ill-advised for China as well.

"5. China is an "independent, self-reliant" state, free from the control of any other country, and is resolutely opposed to hegemonism. China's three basic lines are economic construction, national reunification through the liberation of Taiwan, and opposition to hegemonism. Of the three, economic construction is the basic line, because there can be no diplomacy without the backing of strength and, to achieve "independent, self-reliant" diplomacy, it is important to build up strength through economic construction."[3]

Although China's new, independent foreign policy does not constitute a threat to U.S. interest in East Asia or obstruct political, economic, cultural, and other relations between Washington and Beijing, it does have important implications for Sino-American strategic cooperation. While U.S.-Soviet relations have been extremely cool since 1979; Sino-Soviet relations have improved steadily since 1982. The two communist governments have stated their desire to normalize relations and move away from the high level of tension that characterized their relations from the early 1960s. Hu Yaobang in May 1983 said:

"China sincerely wishes normalization of relations with the USSR. This meets the fundamental interests of the two countries and also the interests of peace and stability in the whole world."[4]

Similarly, the late Yuri Andropov continued Leonid Brezhnev's policy of seeking improved relations with China. And from all appearances, Konstantin Chernenko intends to pursue the policies of his immediate predecessor.

Although full normalization of Sino-Soviet relations is not likely in the near future, the fact that Beijing is holding periodic, high-level talks with Moscow and making incremental adjustments in its policy toward the USSR reflects the intentions of the PRC to move toward rapprochement. Moreover, it seems apparent that, in terms of reducing the dangerous level of tension on the Sino-Soviet border and thereby indirectly deterring a Soviet attack, Beijing believes much more can be accomplished through diplomacy than through alliances with the West.

[3] Yomiuri Shimbun, Nov. 30, 1982.

[4] TASS, May 15 1983. See FBIS, Soviet Union, May 16, 1983, p. B1.

This does not mean, however, that Sino-American strategic cooperation is not still useful to the People's Republic of China. But it does call into question U.S. assumptions about automatic Chinese support on key issues of conflict between Washington and Moscow. Washington was, in fact, given advanced warning of this when China refused to support Western sanctions against Poland and the Soviet Union in the wake of suppression of Solidarity and the imposition of martial law in Warsaw in December 1981.

China will cooperate strategically with the United States only when such cooperation serves Beijing's interests. Thus, the nature of the Soviet threat to Beijing, as well as the practical extent to which American assistance to China can reduce that threat, need to be reexamined in the light of current People's Republic of China thinking.

SOVIET MILITARY THREAT TO THE PRC

The opposing forces

China and the Soviet Union long have deployed massive forces along their common border. The following table indicates their relative strengths at the regional level:

USSR AND PRC ARMED FORCES IN EAST ASIA [1]

Category	U.S.S.R.	Peoples Republic of China
Ground forces:		
Personnel	400,000	3,150,000
Infantry divisions	54	131
Mechanized	54	12
Tanks	12,500+	5,000+
Air forces:		
Bombers	400+	850
Fighters	1,300+	5,100
Ground attack	800+	500
Naval forces:		
Submarines	120	106
Aircraft carriers	2	0
Cruisers	12	0
Destroyers	20	10
Frigates	50	30

[1] U.S.S.R. figures represent the one-quarter of the Soviet's total strength that it displays in the Far East. PRC figures represent all of China's regular forces, some 50 percent of which are deployed in the northern part of the country.

In addition, Beijing and Moscow aim hundreds of tactical and strategic warheads at each other. Included in the Soviet arsenal are approximately 50 SS-20 intermediate-range theater nuclear missiles. Chinese nuclear missiles total just over 100. Most of these are well concealed, thus providing some deterrence against a Soviet first strike.

Improving deterrence has high priority for the Chinese. In March 1983, Defense Minister Zhang Aiping reaffirmed the importance of missile and nuclear programs. The Chinese leadership realizes that they cannot match Soviet missile deployments qualitatively or quantitatively; yet they believe continued research and development in these fields will lead to an adequate deterrence under most conditions.

Included in China's deterrence calculations is the notion that the United States would not stand by idly while the Soviet Union destroyed China. The concept of a U.S. "unofficial nuclear umbrella" over China was articulated by Nixon and Kissinger in 1969, when the danger of a Soviet attack against China was high. Relates Kissinger in his memoirs:

"From the beginning Nixon and I were convinced—alone among senior policymakers—that the United States could not accept a Soviet military assault on China—we imposed contingency planning on a reluctant bureaucracy as early as the summer of 1969. . . ." [5]

Yet American intervention on a scale sufficient to make any difference in a major Sino-Soviet conflict is likely to win little support from Congress or the American people. Conversely, it is doubtful that Beijing would risk destruction to aid the United States in the event of a major U.S.-Soviet confrontation.

Related to this argument are some poignant realities. Whereas Soviet forces along the Sino-Soviet border and aboard the Pacific Fleet are an awesome offensive capability, China's ground, air, and naval units are essentially defensive. As a result of the mismatch of forces, there is continuing debate over whether the PRC's People's Liberation Army could effectively stop invading Soviet forces by fighting what would essentially be a "People's War." On the other hand, it is doubtful that Moscow would want to occupy China or even to invade the country in depth. Other options available to the Soviet Union include: the destabilization of Tibet, Sinkiang, and Inner Mongolia; a preemptive strike against the PRC's nuclear weapons and production facilities; seizing Manchuria; and nuclear, chemical, or bacteriological assaults against selected administrative and/or industrial centers. These and other Soviet options would severely set back China's development, yet avoid the pitfalls of engaging the USSR in a prolonged guerrilla war in China's interior.

Pluses and minuses of the People's Liberation Army

Given the unlikelihood of U.S. intervention in the event of a Soviet attack against the PRC, the burden of self-defense would fall squarely on the shoulders of the Chinese themselves. Here then is a paradox. The People's Liberation Army constitutes the world's largest land army; it has under its control the second largest navy, and the third largest air force. Yet there is considerable doubt as to how effective a defense this huge force would be. The PLA suffers from serious weaknesses. Among them:

Ground Forces: Lack of mobility and mobilization; poor logistics for sustained offensive operations; limited power projection capability; obsolescent equipment; and weak command and control abilities.

Air Forces: Obsolescent aircraft, avionics, and weaponry; insufficient pilot training and low proficiency; inadequate communications; and inadequate engine and aircraft production capabilities.

Naval Forces: Obsolescent ships, sensors, and weapons; extremely limited shipboard surface-to-air (SAM) capabilities; limited amphibious lift capabilities; and limited antisubmarine warfare (ASW) capabilities.

The modernization of the PLA has the lowest priority under the Four Modernizations—major economic development goals introduced by Deng Xiaoping in 1978. This ranking does not please the Chinese military leaders, but seems reasonable, given the need of a modern armed force for strong economic and heavy industry sectors. CIA analysts Sydney Jammes and G. Lawrence Lamborn believe that over the next fifteen years "China will not develop an offensive capability against the USSR," but that "China's defensive capabilities will be significantly improved by 1995 if political stability, economic growth, and scientific and

[5] Henry Kissinger, "The White House Years" (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1979), p. 764.

industrial modernization continue unobstructed."[6]

Among the PRC's assets are a dedicated leadership committed to modernization, excellent international credit ratings, availability of advanced technology from abroad, and determination to avoid future costly military engagements such as the conflict with Vietnam in 1979. Current obstacles, however, are serious: the low supply of trained researchers and engineers; the extent of China's nonmilitary needs that compete with the military for limited resources; serious technological weaknesses affecting China's ability to produce high quality weapons; severe problems in China's defense industry from basic research to maintenance of finished products; and organizational deficiencies within the PLA.

Cognizant of this situation from 1978 through mid-1980, Washington and Beijing toyed with the idea of modernizing the PLA with American assistance. The difficulties, however, were formidable. Defense Department document Consolidated Guidance No. 8, estimated that the United States would have to give China $50 billion in military aid to build the PLA into an effective deterrent against the Soviets. While Congress would probably approve a certain amount of U.S. security assistance to China, it is scarcely likely that it would approve $50 billion worth.

It is also unrealistic to expect that China could purchase enough technology and weapons abroad to modernize its armed forces. While China is interested in various advanced fighters, antitank missiles, air defense systems, and destroyer modernization programs, few purchases have been made so far. Beijing's economic development needs are too demanding and its foreign exchange reserves too meager to buy its way to a modern armed military force. PLA modernization will thus have to come from within. As Defense Minister Zhang Aiping said in March 1983:

"In order to achieve modernization of our national defense, our first task is to develop and produce sophisticated military equipment. . . ."

Our country is a big country and it is not realistic or possible for us to buy national defense modernization from abroad. . . . At the outset it is necessary to obtain some technology that can be imported and model some weaponry on that of others. However, if we are content with copying, we will only be crawling behind others and still be unable to attain our anticipated goal. The fundamental way is to rely upon ourselves. . . .[7]

THE PRC VS. THE USSR

The current effort by Chinese and Soviet leaders to ease tensions in PRC-USSR relations should not be seen as a return to normalcy. Historically, Sino-Russian relations have not been good. Geographically, both nations have reason to fear the other. The Central Asian frontier, which extends roughly 1,900 miles from Afghanistan to Mongolia, provides access to the heartlands of both the Soviet Union and China. The provinces on both sides of the border are backward in terms of logistical facilties and communications and are sparsely populated by peoples of non-Han Chinese and non-Great Russian stock. The Chinese feel especially vulnerable through Mongolia, which borders China for some 2,500 miles. Mao called Mongolia a "first in China's back." Important invasion corridors lead east, south, and west into the most strategic regions of Northern China. The fact that the Soviets dominate Mongolia and station large numbers of troops along the Sino-Mongolian border adds immeasurably to Beijing's perception of the USSR threat.

The eastern frontier, largely defined by the Amur and Ussuri Rivers, extends about 2,300 miles. Manchuria is an area of high population, rich in agriculture, industry, and minerals, as are the bordering provinces of the Soviet Union. The region is of great strategic value to both nations. China's administrative and industrial heartland is vulnerable to a Soviet attack through Manchuria, and the strategically important Soviet naval base at Vladivostok and other key facilities are within the range of a Chinese attack from Manchuria.

Their geographic proximity plus the historic tensions between China and Russia intensify other elements of their disagreement. These include fundamental ideological differences, conflicting foreign policies in many areas of the world, intense competition for influence in Asia, racial prejudices, and conflicting national objectives. Although highly subjective, the latter two differences are linked in important ways. The fact that the Chinese and Russians are racially antagonistic adds to the perception of each that the other aims to displace them in Asia. The Chinese long have feared Russian political and territoral expansion, while the Soviets are concerned over possible long-term Chinese demographic and cultural expansion into areas now under USSR control. Given the sense of vulnerability both Moscow and Beijing feel, it is doubtful that either will reduce significantly deployments along their border.

China has posed three conditions for the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations: (1) the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, (2) a major reduction of Soviet forces along the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian borders, and (3) the withdrawal of Soviet-backed Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea.

From the Kremlin's perspective, these demands affect not only Moscow's strategic posture toward the PRC, but also its strategic relationship to the U.S. In view of current superpower tensions, it may be unrealistic to expect the Soviet Union to pull out of Afghanistan or to end its support of Vietnam. The strategic advantages of access to these countries seem to far outweigh gestures of protest from Beijing. If Moscow withdraws from either countrty, it will in all likelihood be for reasons unrelated to the conditions set by China.

Soviet leaders have indicated a willingness to discuss mutual reductions along the Sino-Soviet border as a means of improving relations between the two countries. There is, however, evidence suggesting resistance to this among the Soviet military, who warn against the long-term Chinese threat and look with concern at possible Sino-American military cooperation. Given the powerful voice Soviet military leaders have in such affairs, it would appear that any USSR troop reductions along the border would be minimal. Such a policy would be consistent with the current building program for facilities to maintain forces there permanently.

THE U.S. FACTOR

From Moscow's point of view, U.S. forward deployments in East Asia pose a serious threat to USSR security. Current force strengths of the two countries in the Pacific region are approximately:

U.S. AND U.S.S.R. ARMED FORCES IN EAST ASIA

Category	U.S. West Pac.	U.S. East Pac.	U.S. Total	U.S.S.R.
Ground forces:				
Divisions	1⅔	2⅔	4	54
Tanks	190	135	325	12,500+
Air forces:				
Bombers	14	0	14	400+
Fighters	425	300	725	1,300+
Ground attack	425	300	725	800+
Naval Forces:				
Submarines	10	31	41	120
Aircraft carriers:				
Attack	3	3	6	0
Helicopters	2	6	7	1
Cruisers	4	10	14	12
Fighters	11	27	38	50

And the United States is of course seriously concerned about the Soviet military buildup in East Asia—not as a threat to China, but to its own interests. Undersecretary of Defense Fred Ikle told Congress in June 1982:

"During the past decade and a half, the Soviets have taken disturbing steps to improve their military capabilities and expand their influence throughout the region. These efforts continue unabated, and five years from now the threat will be even more dangerous."[8]

Among Ikle's concerns:

The approximately 54 Soviet divisions deployed along the Sino-Soviet border, plus an additional 120,000 Soviet troops facing Southwest Asia, and more than 100,000 conducting combat operations in Afghanistan. The equipment used by these forces is rapidly being modernized.

The more than 3,000 combat aircraft stationed in the four easternmost military districts of the USSR. These forces have been upgraded significantly with the newest Soviet aircraft, such as the Foxbat interceptor, Flogger fighter, Fencer fighter-bomber, and the supersonic Backfire bomber. In each of the last two years, the Soviet replacements of Far East fighter and interceptor aircraft with new generation aircraft have far exceeded the number of fighters in the entire U.S. Pacific Air Forces.

Deployment to Asia of approximately 150 SS-20 missiles.

The growth and modernization of the Soviet Pacific Fleet, now the USSR's largest fleet containing roughly one-third of all Soviet submarines, one-fourth of all principal surface combatants, and one-third of all naval aircraft.

In addition to these deployments, the Soviet Union has dramatically improved its geostrategic position through the acquisition of basing rights at Danang, Cam Ranh Bay, and other facilities in Vietnam. These provide the Soviets with a vital sea link from Vladivostok to the Indian Ocean and beyond. They also enhance the Soviet Union's ability to interdict free world shipping in sea lanes throughout Southeast Asia.

When asked whether the United States could defeat the Soviet Union in a war in

[6] Sydney H. Jammes and J. Lawrence Lamborn, "China's Military Strategic Requirements," in U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee, "China Under the Four Modernizations," Part I (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1982), p. 604.

[7] "Honggi," March 1, 1983, in FBIS Daily Report China, Mar. 7, 1983, p. K3.

[8] Prepared statement of Fred Ikle, "Soviet Challenges in the Pacific and U.S. and Allied Responses," given before U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, June 10, 1982, p. 2 ms.

the Western Pacific, Admiral Robert E. J. Long, former Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. forces in the Pacific, responded: "I no longer believe the margin we need still exists. It's frankly too close to call."

It is apparent, therefore, that a large percentage of Soviet deployments in the Far East are targeted on the United States and its forces, not on the PRC. This means that, regardless of the state of Sino-Soviet relations, the Soviet force structure in the Far East will remain at roughly its current level. Some ground forces may be moved from along the Sino-Soviet border, but these reductions would probably be symbolic only, because of Moscow's distrust of long-term Chinese intentions in the border regions and concerns over the powerful U.S. threat to the Far Eastern provinces.

FUTURE U.S.-PRC RELATIONS

The above considerations seem to prompt answers to the questions posed.

1. Can Sino-American strategic cooperation be expanded?

Militarily speaking, strategic cooperation probably cannot be significantly increased. The reasons are in large part political. Beijing has chosen to normalize relations with Moscow. Given Soviet sensitivity to possible Sino-American military-strategic cooperation, any move in that direction by Beijing would likely spur Moscow to tighten, not relax, its ring of containment around China. At this stage of its modernization, the PRC needs a stable and peaceful environment. For this reason alone, the Chinese leadership is unlikely to jeopardize its domestic programs by deliberately increasing tensions with the Soviet Union.

Politically, Sino-American strategic cooperation is valued by both Washington and Beijing. Both want the Soviet Union to be uncertain about their intentions but not so threatened as to pursue military solutions. In a political sense, the United States and the PRC can cooperate on a wide range of international issues, particularly in Southeast Asia and potentially in Korea. In other areas of the world, however, disagreement is more likely, because the PRC defines itself as a developing nation whose interests coincide with those of the Third World while it views the U.S. as an "imperialistic," "hegemonisic" superpower. Political strategic cooperation can be increased, but only incrementally and under limited circumstances.

2. Can China be drawn into a defense alliance if the United States so desires?

For a number of reasons this appears improbable. First, China is seeking more normal relations with the USSR. A defense alliance with the United States would destroy this hope and might well lead to a serious deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations. Second, few Americans would be willing to go to war to help China fight the Soviet Union. Similarly, PRC intervention on behalf of the U.S. would be unlikely unless PRC interests were directly threatened. Third, a defense alliance with China would carry the risk of severe USSR reprisal but not add to American security. There is little more the PRC can do to counterbalance the Soviet Union in Asia, and the United States already benefits from current efforts. And the situation is unlikely to change, no matter what the United States does. Fourth, a Sino-American defense alliance would signal a major departure from the U.S. strategy of maintaining a defensive perimeter in East Asia centered on Japan and other U.S. allies, notably the Republic of Korea and the Philippines. Such a shift would cause great concern among U.S. friends in Asia and precipitate substantial diplomatic difficulties.

3. Can the United States improve China's defense capabilities, thereby increasing the PRC's value as a counterweight to the Soviet Union in Asia?

Over time, the U.S. probably can do a great deal to help China modernize the PLA. But the U.S. contribution will be constrained in varying degrees by: (1) congressional opposition to major military assistance programs; (2) limited availability of China's foreign exchange reserves; (3) the sheer magnitude of the modernization effort required; (4) political oppostion in Beijing to close military relations with the United States; (5) the difficulty the PLA will have in absorbing the advanced technology central to modern Western armaments; and (6) the concerns of many U.S. allies in Asia who oppose large-scale U.S. military sales to the PRC.

Following Secretary Weinberger's trip to Beijing in September 1983 and Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige's earlier visit in June, the PRC was placed in export-controls category "V," a category that includes only friendly allied nations. Hence, dual-use technology, which can be applied to civilian or military purposes, now will be sold automatically to Beijing if it so requests, unless the U.S. government puts a hold on a particular item. Weapons still must be approved on a case-by-case basis, but restrictions are far more relaxed than heretofore. It is notable that Sino-American relations have warmed considerably following the mid-1983 decision by the Reagan Administration to permit these changes in the sale of high-technology items to the PRC.

It would seem, therefore, that the U.S. contribution to China's defense capabilities may be significant at the industrial-technological level, but that the limited quantities of weapons sold would have little impact on the strategic balance of power in East Asia. Moreover, any increase in China's defense capabilities would likely be countered by further Soviet force enhancement in the region. Thus, U.S. efforts to improve the PRC's defense would probably not greatly increase Beijing's counterweight value, but might have a profound regional effect where the balance of force structure is crucial, as in the Taiwan Strait area.

In sum, the fundamental national security interests of both the United States and China are well served by normalized Sino-American relations. Yet the allure of strategic cooperation with the PRC—like the image of one billion Chinese consumers for American products—should not be allowed to distort reality. The PRC is unwilling to enter into a strategic alliance with the United States, and such an alliance would not significantly enhance U.S. security interests. Both sides, however, should remain ready to cooperate when their mutual interests are threatened.

Since Marxist-Leninist theory advocates contradictory tactical maneuvering to achieve the long-range goals of the Party, the various zig-zags that have been witnessed in China's foreign policy can be expected to continue, as PRC leaders perceive the shifts in the "correlation of forces" both internally and internationally.

Given these realities, the U.S. has no choice but to downgrade plans for strategic cooperation with the People's Republic of China. U.S. security policy in Asia should be based on strength and the support of traditional allies, not on perceptions of China as an ally vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The possibility for PRC contributions to U.S. security interests will continue and should be taken advantage of when appropriate. Likewise, there is much the United States can do to enhance PRC security without increasing the threat to America's friends in Asia. But the limits of strategic cooperation must be realized clearly. It is to be ardently hoped that the age of myth in U.S.-PRC relations has ended.●

THE SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

● Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today I should like to report to my colleagues the status of the Secondary Mortgage Market Enhancement Act, S. 2040.

Briefly, this bill will enhance the market for privately issued mortgage backed securities and also remove some technical problems in the authorities of the quasi-government agencies involved in the secondary mortgage market. This measure passed the Senate on November 17, 1983, and was jointly referred in the House to the Banking Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee. Further, Chairman ST GERMAIN of the House Banking Committee and my colleague from Texas, Mr. STEVE BARTLETT, with others, introduced companion legislation, H.R. 4557.

H.R. 4557 has been the subject of hearings in both committees. During our debate in the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, there was some degree of controversy surrounding the proposal to increase limits on the value of a single family mortgage that can be purchased by the quasi-government agencies, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac. Ultimately, the committee and the full Senate rejected the proposal. The Members of the House also face this controversial proposal. Proponents of increasing these purchase limits in both Houses of Congress state that high cost increase over the current $114,000 level is essential. Such high cost, or jumbo mortgages, must be made available for Fannie and Freddie purchase in the secondary market in order to provide housing liquidity for this upper end of the market, to lower interest rates to higher income home buyers, and to sustain the robust housing recovery. In my view, this argument is exaggerated.

Mr. President, these single-family mortgage purchase limits are already inflation adjusted. Just between 1984 and 1983 alone the limit has increased 5.3 percent from $108,300 to $114,000. The amount of $114,000 is, Mr. President, the mortgage loan amount, not the price of the home, as many believe. With an average downpayment of 25 percent, a $143,000 home can be financed through Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac. A family income of well over $60,000 would be required to even qualify for such a loan balance. Ap-

proximately only 5 percent of American families make greater than $60,000 per year. As the amount of the loan increases, logically so do the qualifying income requirements. Thus, proponents of an increased purchase limit are not talking about providing Government-assisted credit for individuals or families of meager means. Further, jumbo loans historically only account for some 6 to 8 percent of total mortgage originations.

Even in high cost areas these are upwardly mobile wage earners able to shop around. Further, mortgage credit is available, albeit sometimes at a slightly higher rate. It simply is not accurate to argue that such loans are not available, and as I will discuss in a moment, perhaps there is no added cost, but instead actually cheaper financing. Thus, I agree heartily with those who want liquidity in the jumbo market relief from high mortgage costs to the home buyer. However, in my view, S. 2040 and H.R. 4557 will provide this relief and I urge all interested parties to evaluate this rather carefully. Two years ago private sector alternatives did not exist. Now they do. Let us encourage this private market to grow, produce, and in so doing serve the home buyer in the higher brackets. If on the other hand, the agencies' mortgage purchase ceiling is lifted, and perhaps they are empowered to sell TIM's securities, the private issuers of mortgage securities are convinced, as I am, that Fannie and Freddie will dominate the jumbo market by way of their Government agency status.

Let us not resort to a typical congressional response—"What we give with the right hand we take away with the left."

I would propose to the investment and housing industries that we move for rapid passage of a mutually agreed upon form of S. 2040. Let us let the private market prove itself in this jumbo area. Let us let them innovate products, commit capital, and lower the cost to the home buyers in this small segment of the market.

After a defined period of time, we can measure their success and determine if the private sector has taken up the slack in the market. In my view, we need to use commonsense and good business judgment here. We could never clearly measure the effects of this important step if Congress were to approve additional advantages for the Federal agencies in the jumbo market area.

Also, I should like to comment on the notion that private market players are "fair weather friends." The private sector will continue to find profitable opportunities in down cycles. This is primarily due to the fact that risk or exposure in issuing "conduit" securities is minimal. One is governed by spreads, not absolute rate swings. As Mr. Pope of General Electric Credit said before the Senate Housing Subcommittee, "The only thing at stake in a down cycle is not whether adequate capital is available, but instead whether the home buyer can afford the loan." And that is true for those mortgages purchased by Fannie Mae as well.

Mr. President, I should like to include in the RECORD a study that has just been completed of this high cost area proposal by the General Accounting Office. At the request of Congressman STEVE BARTLETT, the GAO makes a detailed study of how interest rates and fees paid by borrowers for conventional loans which exceeded the 1983 limit of $108,300 differed from those paid by borrowers for conventional conforming—under the $108,300 limit—loans.

The results of this GAO study are fascinating and I call my colleagues attention to this report's finding that on "the basis of the data provided, * * * [the] effective mortgage interest rates for non-conforming loans were consistently lower than those for conforming loans."

Mr. President, I ask that the GAO report dated April 5, 1984, entitled "Borrowers Pay Lower Effective Interest Rates on Large Conventional Mortgage Loans," be printed in full in the RECORD.

The material follows:

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1984.

B-214822.

Subject: Borrowers Pay Lower Effective Interest Rates for Large Conventional Mortgage Loans (GAO/RCED-84-151).

HON. STEVE BARTLETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARTLETT: Your December 23, 1983, letter, requested that we study how the statutory limit (generally referred to as the conforming limit [1] on the size of home mortgages affects the behavior and pricing policies of lending institutions. Subsequently, we agreed to focus our work on three questions related to the impact of the 1983 statutory limit on home purchases. Specifically, the questions were:

1. What proportion of conventional [2] mortgage loan exceeded the conforming loan limit of $108,300 in 1983?

2. How did interest rates and fees paid by borrowers for conventional loans which exceeded the 1983 conforming limit differ from those paid by borrowers for conventional conforming loans?

3. What income would a hypothetical borrower need to qualify for the maximum conforming loan in various high-cost housing markets if the conforming limit was raised as proposed in H.R. 3420?

These questions were considered relevant to your consideration of H.R. 3420, the Secondary Mortgage Market Equity Act, which would raise the conforming mortgage limit in high-cost housing markets.

Briefly, our research shows that only about 8.3 percent of all conventional loans in 1983 exceeded the 1983 conforming limit of $108,300 and that borrowers who received these large loans were charged lower effective [3] interest rates than those whose loans fell below the conforming limit. In addition, if the conforming limit was raised in high-cost areas as proposed in H.R. 3420, household incomes of $60,000 to $80,500 would be needed to qualify for mortgages between the 1984 conforming limit of $114,000 and the new limits for high-cost housing areas. The highest conforming limit under the proposed law would be about $152,000.

BACKGROUND

The Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (FHLMC) purchase mortgages from lenders who, in turn, use the funds to make additional home loans. However, these agencies are limited to purchasing mortgages whose principal amounts do not exceed the conforming loan limit. FNMA and FHLMC purchase both conventional mortgages and those guaranteed or insured by the federal government.

The conforming mortgage loan limit for FNMA and FHLMC is set by section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1454(a)(2)(C)) and section 302(b)(2) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1717(b)(3)), respectively. Both acts require the conforming mortgage loan limit to be adjusted annually based on a Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB) index of nationwide average home purchase prices. The conforming mortgage loan limit for single-family homes was raised from $108,300 in 1983 to $114,000 in 1984.

H.R. 3420 would raise the conforming mortgage limit in high-cost housing markets by percentages equal to the percentage adjustments made for FHA mortgage limits in these same markets. These FHA high-cost area adjustments are based on a cost index reflecting area differences in the cost of housing. By law FHA adjustments cannot exceed 133⅓ percent of the nationwide FHA mortgage limit.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

To determine the proportion and terms of conventional loans that exceeded the conforming mortgage loan limit of $108,300 in 1983, we initially reviewed testimony concerning the volume of conforming loans presented by FNMA, FHLMC, and the General Electric Credit Corporation in May 1983 hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. We also discussed the questions with Congressional Budget Office and Congressional Research Service (CRS) housing specialists.

On the basis of our initial efforts, we determined that no entity tracks the number or the terms of all conventional mortgage loans made each year or how these factors differ between conforming and nonconform-

[1] The conforming mortgage loan limit is the maximum value that a home loan purchased by the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation or the Federal National Mortgage Association can have. Loans which do not exceed the limit are referred to as conforming loans.

[2] Conventional loans are those which are not guaranteed or insured by a federal agency, such as the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), Veterans Administration (VA), or the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA).

[3] The effective interest is the stated or nominal interest rate plus initial loan fees (or origination charges) amortized over 10 years.

ing mortgages. However, during the first 5 days of each month, FHLBB surveys over 1,500 lenders nationwide to collect such data on conventional mortgages. At our request, FHLBB used its survey data to develop monthly differences in interest rates, initial fees and charges, maturities, and loan-to-price ratios between conventional conforming loans (loans not exceeding $108,300) and conventional nonforming loans (loans exceeding $108,300) in 1983. Enclosure I describes the FHLBB survey methodology in detail. We also obtained comments on the results of FHLBB's survey from housing finance experts at CRS, FHLBB, FHLMC, Ohio State University, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Our review was made from January to March 1984 and was performed in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

To determine the income which a hypothetical borrower would need to qualify for the maximum conforming loan in various high-cost areas if the conforming limit was raised as proposed in H.R. 3420, we (1) obtained FHA maximum mortgage amounts set by the Secretary of HUD from the Federal Register, (2) computed what the new conforming limit would be under H.R. 3420, and (3) computed annual mortgage payments for maximum conforming loans under these limits. We also obtained data on the prices of typical upper-income homes in these high-cost areas from Nationwide Relocation Services, Incorporated. Nationwide helps people who wish to move select a new area to live in and then refers them to a Nationwide broker in that area. We compared these prices with the prices of homes that could be purchased with the maximum conforming mortgages loan in 28 high-cost areas if H.R. 3420 becomes law.

PORTION OF CONVENTIONAL LOANS WHICH EXCEEDS THE CONFORMING LOAN LIMIT

On the basis of the FHLBB survey data, no more than 10.4 percent of all conventional loans in any month of 1983 exceeded the conforming mortgage limit. The percentage of loans exceeding the limit in each month ranged from 6.5 percent in January to 10.4 percent in December (see enc. II). The unweighted average of these monthly percentages was 8.3 percent for 1983. The actual average for the year would necessarily fall within the 6.5 to 10.4 percent range.[4]

INTEREST RATES AND LOAN FEES LOWER FOR NONCONFORMING LOANS

We found no studies or published data which compare interest rates (and loan fees) for conforming and nonconforming conventional loans. We therefore asked FHLBB to develop data from its monthly survey of loans which would allow us to make such a comparison. On the basis of the data provided, we found that effective mortgage interest rates for nonconforming loans were consistently lower than those for conforming loans. The unweighted average of monthly effective interest rates from the FHLBB survey in 1983 was 12.40 percent for loans greater than $108,300 and 12.86 percent for loans less than or equal to $108,300 (see enc. V). The difference resulted from both lower nominal interest rates and lower loan fees (or origination charges) for nonconforming loans as compared with conforming loans. The following table summarizes unweighted averages of the monthly data for interest rates and fees in 1983.

[In percent]

	Effective interest rates	Nominal interest rates	Fees and charges (percent of loan amount)
Conforming loans	12.86	12.39	2.44
Nonconforming loans	12.40	12.01	2.05

More detailed information on interest rates and fees from the FHLBB survey is shown in enclosures III, IV, and V.

The FHLBB survey results presented in the table include information on both fixed interest rate and adjustable interest rate loans. For a fixed rate loan, interest is calculated at the same rate over the entire life of the loan. With an adjustable-rate loan, the lender is permitted to adjust the interest rate based on an independent interest rate index. The interest rate for adjustable-rate loans in the FHLBB survey is for the initial loan period before any adjustment is made in the rate. We compared interest rates and fees for fixed- and adjustable-rate loans and found that the same interest rate and loan fee relationships prevailed as for all conventional loans. (See enc. VIII.)

We also found that lower interest rates and loan fees for all conventional nonconforming loans could not be attributed to shorter maturities or lower loan-to-price ratios. These comparisons are shown in enclosures VI and VII.

We asked six housing finance experts[5] to help us determine why FHLBB data show that interest rates and fees for conventional nonconforming loans were lower than those for conventional conforming loans in 1983. Several of these experts believed it logical that initial fees and charges represent a lower percent of nonconforming than of conforming loans because some fees, such as application fees and credit reports, are the same for all loans. Thus, these fixed fees would be a smaller percent of the larger (nonconforming) loans than of conforming loans. Similarly, the cost of servicing conventional nonconforming loans would be no higher than for conforming loans because servicing does not vary with the size of the loan, making lower nominal interest rates possible for large loans. These factors may partially explain the lower interest rates and percentage fees for conventional nonconforming loans.

INCOMES REQUIRED TO OBTAIN MAXIMUM LOANS UNDER H.R. 3420

H.R. 3420, the Secondary Mortgage Market Equity Act, would raise the conforming limit in high-cost housing markets by the same percentages which the Secretary of HUD uses to periodically adjust FHA mortgage limits. In 1984 a borrower would need an income of over $60,000 to qualify for a 30-year fixed interest rate loan of $114,000—the current conforming limit. If H.R. 3420 becomes law, the conforming limit would be raised in a large number of high-cost housing markets, such as Washington, D.C., San Francisco, New York City, and Dallas. In areas receiving the largest permissible increase in mortgage amount, which would be 133⅓ percent of the present $114,000 limit, the new conforming limit would become approximately $152,000. An income of at least $80,000 would be required to purchase a home with this maximum mortgage.

Enclosure IX shows similar calculations for the conforming limits in 28 high-cost markets which would result from the passage of H.R. 3420. Enclosure IX also shows the home prices implied by the higher conforming limits along with prices for a standardized single-family home in these markets. The standardized home prices were developed by Nationwide Relocation Service, Incorporated. Nationwide's standard home has 2,000 square feet of living space, three bedrooms, two baths, a family room, a two-car garage (and a basement in applicable markets), and is located in a neighborhood judged to be above average for the market area. These home prices give some perspective on the significance of the present and proposed conforming limits in these 28 high-cost markets.

Home prices implied by the proposed high-cost area conforming mortgage limits were calculated using a 75-percent loan-to-price ratio and would range from $153,520 in Oklahoma City to $202,160 in cities receiving the largest increase in the conforming limit, such as Washington, D.C., Minneapolis, and San Diego. In these same cities the prices of standardized three bedroom homes which are shown in the last column of enclosure IX (and range from $94,000 to $150,000) are such that they could be purchased without increasing the conforming limit above its present $114,000 level. Of the 28 housing markets analyzed in enclosure IX, only San Francisco; Los Angeles; New York; and Stamford, Connecticut, have standardized three bedroom home prices which could not generally be purchased under the present conforming limit.

As arranged with your office, we did not obtain written agency comments on this report. Unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we will not make any further distribution of this report until 5 days after its issue date. At that time, we will make copies available to other interested parties.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH V. CARLONE,
(For J. Dexter Peach, Director).

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The following paragraphs have been extracted from FHLBB's Data Users Guide for its mortgage interest rate survey of interest rates and other characteristics of conventional first mortgage loans originated on single-family homes. The guide was prepared by the Statistical Division of the Office of Policy and Economic Research in January 1980. Pertinent excerpts from the guide, including underlining, follow.

A. COVERAGE

All series indicate averages of selected characteristics of fully amortized conventional first mortgage loans closed during the first five full working days of the month by major mortgage lenders for the purchase of single-family nonfarm residential properties.

Single-family nonfarm residential properties include detached and semi-detached primary residences, condominium units, vacation homes, and second homes. Mobile homes are excluded. Newly-built homes are

[4] FHLBB weighs the monthly survey data based on the size of the lender as described in enc. I. However, in developing annual averages of loan volume and characteristics, we did not attempt to weigh the monthly data based on the size of the lender. Instead, we computed unweighted monthly averages.

[5] Those consulted were associated with CRS, FHLBB, FHLMC, HUD, and Ohio State University.

properties where the dwelling units have never been occupied. Previously-occupied homes are properties where the dwelling units have had a prior occupant.

Fully amortized conventional first mortgage purchase loans possess the following properties: (1) they require the complete repayment of the loan principal by the scheduled maturity date (i.e., there is no final "balloon" payment), (2) they are not insured by the federal government, (3) they represent a first lien on the property, (4) they constitute a transfer of property ownership, and (5) they represent permanent, not interim, financing. Included in this definition are combination construction-purchase loans (i.e., loans in which construction financing is coupled with a permanent purchase loan in a single transaction). Loans excluded from coverage are refinancing loans, open-ended advances, junior loans (e.g., second mortgages), property or home improvement loans, interim financing loans, FHA- and VA-insured loans, construction loans, and assumed loans. All partially amortized and unamortized loans are also excluded, regardless of all other characteristics. These latter two types of mortgages, however, represent only some 2 percent of the conventional home mortgage market.

B. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The average loan characteristics reported are derived from the individual loan data provided by a random, stratified sample of the major mortgage lenders and represent weighted averages.

The sampling strata are defined by the type, size and geographic location of the lender. The sampling fraction is reduced as lender size declines so as to minimize the sampling error for a given size class. This technique results in the selection of virtually all large lenders. The current sample consists of 951 (888) savings and loan associations, 57 (58) mortgage bankers, 405 (488) commercial banks, and 146 (105) mutual savings banks.[1]

The assigned weights are based on the relationship of the single-family conventional mortgage holdings of the sample participants of a lender type—or other measure of lender size—in each of the sample strata to the holdings of all lenders (of the same type) in a stratum. This procedure provides appropriate representation in the averages of smaller lenders which are sampled at a reduced rate. Thus, the averages represent estimates for the entire population of major mortgage lenders and virtually all (95 percent) of all conventional purchase loan activity during the first five full working days of the month.

The seven average loan characteristics reported include: (1) the contract interest rate, (2) initial fees and charges, (3) the effective interest rate, (4) the term to maturity, (5) the mortgage loan amount, (6) the purchase price, and (7) the loan-to-price ratio. Both the contract and effective interest rates are adjusted to exclude the cost of private (i.e., non-government) mortgage insurance when included in the reported contract rate. The effect of this adjustment is minor, reducing the contract rate (and effective rate) by only one or two basis points. Initial fees and charges are defined to include all fees, commissions, discounts, and "points" paid by the borrower, or seller, in order to obtain a loan, including any general charge for making the loan and specific charges made to offset lending expenses. Specific charges included are commitment application fee(s), costs of credit and appraisal reports, cost of property survey, cost of termite inspection and attorney fees for document preparation and closing services (i.e., presence at settlement). Excluded are title, homeowner, life, or private mortgage insurance, property transfer costs, prepaid real estate taxes, and prepaid interest. Also excluded are attorney fees for title search or examination as well as real estate commissions for the sale of the property. The effective interest rate includes the adjusted contract rate plus initial fees and charges amortized over a ten-year period, the latter being a rough estimate of the actual average life of a conventional mortgage. The loan-to-price ratio is the mortgage loan amount divided by the purchase price, expressed as a percentage.

C. DATA LIMITATIONS

Since the first five full working days of a month are surveyed, the averages may not be representative of the entire month, especially during months in which lending terms are in the process of change. Most mortgage lending moreover, is based on prior commitments made by lenders. The averages, therefore, should not be interpreted as measures of "market" rates and terms prevailing during the reporting period. Additionally, month-to-month changes in characteristics may not reflect "pure" changes, but rather shifts in the loan and housing composition surveyed. These shifts may reflect differences in housing characteristics, changes in relative lending volumes (among lender types or sizes and among geographic areas), and variations in loan risk. Averages for metropolitan areas are generally more prone to fluctuation as a result of these factors than are the national averages. Moreover, in those metropolitan areas in which lenders other than those covered are significant in the conventional home loan market, the average may not approach estimates for the total conventional market.

In all cases, users are encouraged to substantiate the published results with collateral information wherever possible. Use of an average of several months of data is recommended in most instances.

1983 FHLBB SURVEY OF CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGE LOANS MADE—PERCENTAGE ABOVE AND BELOW $108,300

Month	Loans $108,300 or less	Loans above $108,300
January	93.5	6.5
February	92.2	7.8
March	93.2	6.8
April	91.9	8.1
May	92.3	7.7
June	92.2	7.8
July	92.2	7.8
August	91.2	8.8
September	91.2	8.8
October	90.3	9.7
November	90.1	9.9
December	89.6	10.4
1983 range	89.6–93.5	6.5–10.4
Unweighted average	91.7	8.3

Source: FHLBB monthly survey.

DIFFERENCE IN CONTRACT INTEREST RATES BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL CONFORMING AND NONCONFORMING LOANS IN 1983

[Figures = percent]

Month	Conforming loans	Nonconforming loans	Difference (col. 2—col. 3)
January	13.05	12.80	0.25
February	12.84	12.53	.31
March	12.76	12.32	.44
April	12.37	11.99	.38
May	12.35	12.08	.27
June	12.21	11.69	.52
July	12.17	11.92	.25
August	12.24	11.88	.36
September	12.37	11.95	.42
October	12.18	11.83	.35
November	12.12	11.65	.47
December	12.01	11.47	.54
1983 range	12.01–13.05	11.47–12.80	.25–.54
Unweighted average	12.39	12.01	.38

Source: FHLBB monthly survey.

DIFFERENCE IN LOAN FEES AS A PERCENT OF THE LOAN BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL CONFORMING AND NONCONFORMING

Month	Loans in 1983		Difference (col. 2—col. 3)
	Conforming loans	Nonconforming loans	
January	2.51	2.20	0.31
February	2.69	2.45	.24
March	2.25	2.05	.20
April	2.33	1.84	.49
May	2.39	1.99	.40
June	2.41	2.00	.41
July	2.42	2.11	.31
August	2.36	1.92	.44
September	2.48	2.06	.42
October	2.40	2.05	.35
November	2.52	1.97	.55
December	2.50	2.00	.50
1983 range	2.25–2.69	1.84–2.45	.20–.55
Unweighted average	2.44	2.05	.39

Source: FHLBB monthly survey.

DIFFERENCE IN EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATES BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL CONFORMING AND NONCONFORMING LOANS IN 1983

[Figures = percent]

Month	Conforming loans	Nonconforming loans	Difference (col. 2—col. 3)
January	13.55	13.27	0.28
February	13.37	13.02	.35
March	13.21	12.71	.50
April	12.82	12.34	.48
May	12.82	12.47	.35
June	12.68	12.06	.62
July	12.63	12.32	.31
August	12.69	12.25	.44
September	12.85	12.33	.52
October	12.64	12.21	.43
November	12.61	12.02	.59
December	12.49	11.84	.65
1983 range	12.49–13.55	11.84–13.27	.28–.65
Unweighted average	12.86	12.40	.46

Source: FHLBB monthly survey.

DIFFERENCE IN MATURITIES BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL CONFORMING AND NONCONFORMING LOANS IN 1983

[Figures = years]

Month	Conforming loans	Nonconforming loans	Difference (col.2–col.3)
January	25.7	25.6	0.1
February	26.1	27.0	(.9)
March	24.4	27.7	(3.3)
April	25.6	26.7	(1.1)
May	26.1	27.2	(1.1)
June	25.9	27.3	(1.4)
July	26.4	27.7	(1.3)
August	25.8	27.8	(2.0)
September	25.9	27.8	(1.9)

[1] We inserted the current figures as of March 1984 in parentheses.

DIFFERENCE IN MATURITIES BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL CONFORMING AND NONCONFORMING LOANS IN 1983—Continued

[Figures = years]

Month	Conforming loans	Nonconforming loans	Difference (col.2–col.3)
October	25.7	27.7	(2.0)
November	25.8	26.9	(1.1)
December	26.3	28.0	(1.7)
1983 range	24.4–26.4	25.6–28.0	(3.3)–.1
Unweighted average	25.8	27.3	(1.5)

Source: FHLBB monthly survey.

DIFFERENCE IN LOAN-TO-PRICE RATIOS BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL CONFORMING AND NONCONFORMING LOANS IN 1983

Month	Conforming loans	Nonconforming loans	Difference (col. 2-col. 3)
January	72.80	78.30	(5.50)
February	73.66	77.28	(3.62)
March	71.96	78.19	(6.23)
April	72.35	77.95	(5.60)
May	74.26	76.52	(2.26)
June	73.47	78.90	(5.43)
July	73.86	76.70	(2.84)
August	72.60	76.39	(3.79)
September	75.27	77.87	(2.60)
October	74.96	77.23	(2.27)
November	75.77	80.26	(4.49)
December	76.27	79.71	(3.44)
1983 range	71.96–76.27	76.39–80.26	(6.23)–(2.26)
Unweighted average	73.94	77.94	(4.01)

Source: FHLBB monthly survey.

COMPARISONS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF FIXED RATE AND ADJUSTABLE RATE CONVENTIONAL LOANS IN 1983

	Fixed rate	Adjustable rate	All conventional loans
Loans in FHLBB survey (percent):			
Conforming	92.4	89.7	91.7
Nonconforming	7.6	10.3	8.3
Interest rates (percent):			
Conforming	12.61	12.06	12.39
Nonconforming	12.13	11.86	12.01
Fees and charges (percent of loan):			
Conforming	2.45	2.45	2.44
Nonconforming	1.99	2.13	2.05
Effective interest rates (percent):			
Conforming	13.09	12.52	12.86
Nonconforming	12.52	12.27	12.40
Maturity (years):			
Conforming	25.49	26.01	25.80
Nonconforming	25.67	29.03	27.30
Loan-to-price ratio:			
Conforming	73.16	75.18	73.94
Nonconforming	78.31	77.39	77.94

Source: FHLBB monthly survey.

COMPARISON OF HUD MAXIMUM MORTGAGE AMOUNT IN VARIOUS HIGH-COST AREAS

	HUD maximum mortgage amount[6]	HUD high-cost maximum as a multiple of $67,500	Conforming mortgage limit if H.R. 3420 is passed column 3 times $114,000	Home sale price assuming 75 percent loan-to-price ratio and a loan for the amount in column 4	Downpayment for home price in column 5 assuming 25 percent down column 5 minus column 4	Annual income required to obtain loan in column 4 [1]	Cost of comparable homes in various high-cost areas [2]
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
High-cost areas:							
Austin	$77,000	1.14	$129,960	$173,280	$43,320	$69,127	$112,500
Atlanta	78,500	1.16	132,240	176,320	44,080	70,211	96,500
Baltimore	74,700	1.11	126,540	168,720	42,180	67,185	92,500
Boston	72,700	1.08	123,120	164,160	41,040	70,147	114,000
Chicago	83,600	1.24	141,360	188,480	47,120	75,053	85,000
Columbus, Ohio	81,100	1.20	136,800	182,400	45,600	72,632	93,000
Dallas	85,000	1.26	143,640	191,520	47,880	76,264	140,000
Denver	76,000	1.13	128,820	171,760	42,940	68,395	98,500
Detroit	75,300	1.12	127,680	170,240	42,560	67,790	81,000
Fort Worth-Arlington	85,000	1.26	143,640	191,520	47,880	76,264	[3] 100,000–110,000
Houston	72,900	1.08	123,120	164,160	41,040	65,369	105,000
Kansas City	81,600	1.21	137,940	183,920	45,980	73,238	77,500
Los Angeles	90,000	1.33	151,620	202,160	50,540	80,500	[4] 150,000–325,000
Memphis	75,000	1.11	126,540	168,720	42,180	67,185	92,000
Milwaukee	73,500	1.09	124,260	165,680	41,420	65,973	85,000
Minneapolis	90,000	1.33	151,620	202,160	50,540	80,500	144,500
New York	90,000	1.33	151,620	202,160	50,540	80,500	[5] 123,000–154,500
Oklahoma City	68,000	1.01	115,140	153,520	38,380	61,132	94,000
Philadelphia	70,200	1.04	118,560	158,080	39,520	62,948	104,000
St. Louis	85,500	1.27	144,780	193,040	48,260	76,869	109,500
Salt Lake City	75,000	1.11	126,540	168,720	42,180	67,185	93,000
San Antonio	77,000	1.14	129,960	173,280	43,320	69,001	84,000
San Diego	90,000	1.33	151,620	202,160	50,540	80,500	150,000
San Francisco	90,000	1.33	151,620	202,160	50,540	80,500	225,000
Seattle	85,200	1.26	143,640	191,520	47,880	76,264	110,000
Stamford	90,000	1.33	151,620	202,160	50,540	80,500	165,000
Tampa	71,500	1.06	120,840	161,120	40,280	64,159	87,500
Washington, DC	90,000	1.33	151,620	202,160	50,540	80,500	135,000

[1] Assuming a 13 percent interest rate on a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage, with principal and interest payments equal to 25 percent of gross personal income.
[2] Published as of June 1983 by Nationwide Relocation Service, Inc. This house has 2,000 square feet, 3 bedrooms, 2 baths, family room, 2-car garage, and basement (if applicable) and is located in a neighborhood the Nationwide broker judged to be above average to prime.
[3] $100,000 in Fort Worth and $110,000 in Arlington.
[4] Los Angeles County range includes San Fernando Valley, $165,000; San Gabriel Valley, $150,000; Westside, $325,000; and South Bay, $240,000.
[5] New York City range includes New Jersey suburban, $127,500; New York suburban, $146,000; Connecticut suburban, $154,500; and Long Island suburban, $123,000.
[6] Source: Federal Register, Vol. 48, No. 235, December 6, 1983. This figure, which is the lesser of: (1) 133⅓ percent of $67,500 (that is $90,000) and (2) 95 percent of the median one-family house price in area, is the maximum amount of loan HUD will guarantee in the high-cost area.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask that a Washington Post article from April 14, 1984, entitled "Big Borrowers Found To Pay Lower Rates," be printed in the RECORD. In addition, Mr. President, the General Accounting Office has prepared an official paper entitled "Rebuttal of Criticism of GAO Report," which addresses some points raised in the April 14, 1984, Post article. I ask that this rebuttal be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1984]

BIG BORROWERS FOUND TO PAY LOWER RATES

(By Albert B. Crenshaw)

Home buyers who take out loans so large that the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp. cannot buy them pay a lower effective interest rate than buyers of less expensive homes whose mortgages are eligible for Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac purchase, according to a new study by the General Accounting Office.

GAO's conclusions run counter to Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's position, widely accepted in the real estate industry, that they benefit home buyers by enabling them to obtain mortgages more cheaply.

The findings were immediately challenged by Fannie Mae as "inaccurate" and "misleading."

Dale Riordan, senior vice president at Fannie Mae, said that as soon as they heard about the study, officials of the association began reviewing published rate quotations and checking with lenders. Uniformly, he said, eligible (or conforming) loans were being quoted at rates one-quarter to one-half a percentage point below non-conforming ones.

"Let's face it, the report is wrong," he said.

Mark J. Riedy, chief economist of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, also questioned the GAO's conclusions. He said he had asked several of his group's larger lender-members what their experience had been and the consensus among them and also of the MBA staff was that the GAO's "results are impossible."

Freddie Mac officials said they were still studying the report and would have no immediate comment.

The report comes against a background of a rapidly changing secondary mortgage market—a market in which the two organizations are the major participants—and a growing congressional debate over what the proper role of the government and government-related entities such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac ought to be.

The two organizations currently dominate the secondary market, where lenders sell mortgages to raise cash to make more loans. But in recent years private competitors to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have emerged, raising questions, particularly among Republicans, about whether the two organizations should retain their government ties and, if so, whether they should be allowed to participate in all aspects of this rapidly changing market.

The two—particularly Fannie Mae, which is burdened by a large portfolio of below-market loans bought in earlier years—have pressed for wider powers, and the loan limit has become a particular issue.

Current law prohibits either organization from buying mortgages of more than $114,000. Some members of Congress believe that because of the organizations' congressional charters they should be compelled to direct their efforts toward benefiting less-affluent home buyers. Others regard it as unfair that people who live in high-cost areas such as Washington should be less able to obtain conforming loans.

Private competitors complain that the two organizations' ties to the government give them an advantage in the credit markets, where lenders perceive their debt as less risky. Facing that advantage, the private firms have carved a niche for themselves where Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac can't go—above the loan limit.

If that limit is raised, they fear, they will be pushed out of the business.

The GAO report is certain to add fuel to this dispute.

Requested by Rep. Steve Bartlett (R-Tex.), the study examined effective interest rates paid by borrowers of conforming and non-conforming loans, sought to determine what percentage of the market is non-conforming, and looked at how applying a high-cost-area formula similar to the one used by the Federal Housing Administration would affect loan limits and the incomes that borrowers would need.

"Briefly, our research shows that only about 8.3 percent of all conventional loans in 1983 exceeded the 1983 conforming limit of $108,300, and that borrowers who received large loans were charged lower effective interest rates than those whose loans fell below the conforming limit," the GAO said.

It defined effective interest as the stated interest rate plus initial loan fees amortized over 10 years.

The report further found that if an FHA-like standard were adopted, allowing the limit in high-cost areas to rise to as much as 133.3 percent of the nationwide limit, the maximum conforming loan would become $152,000, based on this year's limit of $114,000.

GAO noted that nobody "tracks the number and terms of all conventional mortgage loans made each year or how these factors differ between conforming and non-conforming mortgages." So it used data from a monthly survey of 1,500 lenders taken by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Based no that, it found that borrowers of conforming loans paid an effective interest rate of 12.86 percent in 1983, compared with 12.4 for non-conforming loans.

"We compared interest rates and fees for fixed- and adjustable-rate loans and found that the same interest rate and loan fee relationships prevailed as for all conventional loans," the report said.

"We also found that lower interest rates and loan fees for all conventional non-conforming loans could not be attributed to shorter maturities or lower loan-to-price rations," it added.

The congressional auditing agency said it consulted six housing finance experts to try to explain the results. It said that several thought that since many of the fees associated with mortgage loans, such as application fees and credit reports, are fixed and not related to size of the loan, then the larger the loan the smaller a percentage they would represent.

"These factors may partially explain" the study's findings, GAO said.

Rep. Bartlett said he was "a bit surprised" by the findings, which he said "disputed the conventional assumptions" about the cost of conforming and non-conforming loans. However, he said the report was a "limited" one and that "you can't conclude" anything definite about the benefits of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac based on it.

"The study does support to some extent the conclusion that it is good public policy to encourage the continued existence of private issuers," he said.

"The most important fact Congress has to keep in mind is the enormity of the need for mortgage capital over the next 10 years," Bartlett said, adding that his conclusion is that this "need cannot be met from a sole source."

He said it is going to take Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, private issuers, and institutional investors. "Congress shouldn't, and won't, pit one group against another," he said.

Fannie Mae's Riordan said he thought the report came to a "misleading" conclusion because the data upon which it was based mixed not only fixed-rate mortgages and adjustables, but adjustables of all different types. In addition, the figures were not weighted to allow for the size of the lending institution or the amount of business it is doing.

"The report is fairly faulty," he said, adding that every lender Fannie Mae officials talked to was charging at least a quarter of a point more for non-conforming loans, and one was charging six-tenths more.

The Mortgage Bankers' Riedy said lenders he and his staff talked to reported higher rates for non-conforming loans. He said he thought the problem was with the data GAO used. "They may not have done anything incorrect with the data, but they may not have had enough . . . ," he said, adding that the agency "generally does good work."

"It's unfortunate that GAO didn't talk to any lenders because that seems to be what's missing here," he said.

REBUTTAL OF CRITICISM OF GAO REPORT—"BORROWERS PAY LOWER EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATES FOR LARGE CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGE LOANS"

Last Saturday (April 14th) the Washington Post published the attached article quoting a number of lobbyists involved in the effort to raise the limit on mortgages purchased by federal credit agencies. Our report jeopardizes their campaign by debunking their principal argument—that persons getting large loans pay more because their loans cannot be purchased in the federally created secondary mortgage market. The criticisms contained in the article were: Unweighted loan data was used in the analysis, interest rate quote by lenders would provide a better indication than closed loan data which we used, variable and fixed interest rate loans were mixed together in our analysis.

None of these criticisms are valid. When we asked two of those quoted in the paper whether they had data to support their contention that our results were incorrect, they admitted that they had no actual data, but that our results were very perplexing. Our work was based upon a FHLBB statistical survey of 1500 lenders.

UNWEIGHTED LOAN DATA WAS USED

Although the newspaper quote does not explain why the use of unweighted data would create an analytical problem, we did in fact use monthly weighted averages for all data reported. In every individual month in 1983 the result was identical to the results we reported for the entire year. The monthly data was presented in a table. We did however present a yearly average of the monthly weighted data in which we did not weight the individual months. This is not an analytical flaw nor does it affect the answer derived. Comparing large and small loans in each month provides the same result.

QUOTES BY LENDERS GIVE A DIFFERENT RESULT

Calling individual lenders, as these lobbyists did, to develop anecdotal information shows that very often, large (nonconforming) loans carry higher quoted rates than smaller (conforming) loans provided by the same lenders. Our critics believe this proves their contention that large loans carry higher interest rates.

GAO also called individual lenders and we were able to get similar results. However, in our phone calls to a small sample of individual lenders we found a considerable variance in the range of rates quoted by lenders. We also found that the quoted interest rate for larger (nonconforming) loans at one lender was below the quoted interest rate for smaller (conforming) loans at another lender, even though both lenders quoted a higher interest rate for their larger loans. Borrowers seeking large loans may shop around and get the lowest interest rate available more often then borrowers seeking smaller loans. In addition, lenders may make large loans to their better customers at lower interest rates than those quoted on the phone.

Our report is based on actual loans and loan terms (not on quotes). We rejected using quotes because they tell you nothing about actual lending rates. Furthermore, we know of no information that compares quoted interest rates with rates actually charged or the volume of loans made by each lender at quoted rates. Like new luxury car sticker prices (as compared to compacts) mortgage loan "sticker" interest rates for large loans may differ more from

what borrowers actually pay as compared to the difference between quote and lending rate on small loans.

VARIABLE AND FIXED RATE LOANS WERE MIXED TOGETHER IN OUR ANALYSIS

According to the newspaper article we did not discriminate between fixed rate and variable rate loans. This is not true. We first analyzed the two types of loans separately as shown in the enclosures to the report. In both cases large loans were cheaper than small loans by a significant margin. We then combined these into a single statistic and presented this result in the text of the report, along with the statement that the results were the same whether or not all loans were combined or analyzed separately.●

SALUTE TO USD BASKETBALL

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I have long admired the fine athletes California has produced, and I ask that the comments of the San Diego Union on the University of San Diego's basketball team be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to follows:

SCHOLARS AND ATHLETES

It seems fitting that when the University of San Diego basketball team takes the floor tonight for the school's first appearance in an NCAA Division 1 tournament its foe will be Princeton University, another school better known for academics than athletics.

The Princeton-USD game will be a welcome reminder to collegiate fans, coaches, and alumni that athletic success and academic achievement are not mutually exclusive. Players for both USD and Princeton are truly student-athletes, unlike their counterparts at many of the nation's colleges.

Not only did this year's USD basketball team win the West Coast Athletic Conference championship and qualify for the NCAA tournament, eight of its players earned honors as WCAC "scholar athletes," by achieving grade point averages of 3.0 or better in majors such as computer science, English, business, and accounting.

On the athletic side, USD qualified for a trip to the NCAA tournament in only its fifth year as a Division 1 school. In an era when recruiting violations are commonplace and all too many student-athletes never complete their college education, the academic and athletic success of the USD basketball program is a tribute to the school, its players, and its coaches.

While USD is preparing for its first NCAA championship tournament, the women's team at San Diego State University has a dual role to play in the upcoming NCAA women's tournament. The Aztec women, who compiled a 23-5 record this season, will both host and participate in first-round action in this year's event.

The Aztec women will make their first appearance in an NCAA tournament at Peterson Gym on Friday night against the University of Oregon. The success of the SDSU women's team and the university's selection as host for the first round are indicative of the SDSU athletic department's commitment to provide a first-class women's program.

We wish both the USD men and the SDSU women the best of luck in NCAA tournament play. But no matter how their games turn out, both are winners in our book.●

INFLATION WATCH

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, the staff of the Joint Economic Committee has undertaken an inflation watch project. They are monitoring recent key developments affecting prices and reviewing the outlook for inflation.

Public expectations about inflation crucially affect the economy in a number of ways. If the public expects higher inflation in the future, this will:

First, lead to demands for larger wage increases, to try to keep up with or ahead of the expected increase in prices. This can set off an inflationary price-wage spiral.

Second, lead to higher interest rates, as investors demand a greater inflation premium in order to maintain the same real rate of return.

Third, discourage saving, as consumers buy now, before prices accelerate. This stimulates the economy in the short run, but hurts it in the long run by making funds for productive investment less available.

The Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan provides monthly estimates of the public's views about inflation. They ask approximately 700 Americans two questions:

(1) during the next 12 months, do you think that prices in general will go up, or down, or stay where they are now?

(2) by about what percent do you expect prices to go up, on the average, during the next 12 months?

The most recent survey was conducted in March 1984. Responses every 6 months since March 1981 have been:

Date of survey	Percent of respondents expecting prices to— [1]					Average increase expected (pct)
	Remain same or decrease	Rise, by indicated percentage—				
		1 to 5	6 to 9	10 or more	Rise, do not know amount	
March 1981	26	21	11	29	11	7.0
September 1981	30	21	11	30	7	7.5
March 1982	32	29	12	23	2	6.0
September 1982	31	30	13	19	5	5.4
March 1983	44	35	5	12	3	3.3
September 1983	28	43	7	17	4	5.0
March 1984	24	45	10	16	4	5.1

[1] Responses do not add to 100 percent because 1–2 percent had no opinion, or responses not available.

Source: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Inflationary expectations fell between September 1981 and March 1983, but the average predicted increase in prices has risen by more than 50 percent in the last year, from 3.3 percent in March 1983 to 5.1 percent last month. This exceeds the administration's forecast of a 4.5-percent rise in prices this year. In the past, this survey has underestimated prices in periods of accelerating inflation such as the current situation. This suggests that the public view that prices will rise by 5.1 percent over the next 12 months is likely to be conservative.

Last month one-fourth of those surveyed thought inflation will be 6 percent or more over the next year, and one-sixth believe that we will have inflation of 10 percent or more. Both figures have risen sharply over the past year.

In summary, the American public is becoming more pessimistic about inflation; in the past such changing views have foreshadowed periods of faster price increases. This increasing pessimism is rooted in our inability to reverse the deficit trend, and they pose the threat of becoming self-fulfilling prophecies as long as the present economic surge persists side by side with soaring deficits. The lesson, Mr. President, is that Congress must act now, this year, to reverse the rising deficit trend. The time for talk is over. Only action will head off a substantial surge in prices and place us back where we were in 1979 and 1980. The House of Representatives has passed a $182 billion deficit-reduction program, and the Senate must at least match that to make meaningful headway against deficits.●

OCEAN DUMPING

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, EPA announced a very important decision for New Jersey and the entire New York-New Jersey metropolitan area today. After years of regulatory delay and litigation, the EPA is taking action to help protect New Jersey's

shores and fisheries, and improve the condition of our surrounding waters. This morning, EPA proposed to close the site 12 miles off New Jersey's shores, which is currently used as a dump site for sewage sludge, and move dumping further out to sea at a 106-mile site, until a permanent alternative can be found to accommodate these wastes.

This is good news for New Jersey and our entire region. Mr. President, New Jersey is viewed by many as an urban, industrial State. That is true. We are. We are the most densely populated State in the Nation. We are an industrial State. We are a State plagued by waste disposal problems.

At the same time, New Jersey has an extensive coastline which stretches some 370 miles, from the New Jersey-New York border in the north to Cape May in the south and north again to Trenton. Along this coastline are some of the most beautiful beaches on the east coast, and extensive fisheries resources. New Jersey's economy is heavily dependent on keeping our coastal waters healthy. Our tourist industry, along with a more than $1 billion per year commercial and recreational marine fishing industry, cannot tolerate continued degradation of our precious coastal resources.

Frustration in New Jersey is running at an all time high.

The Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, known also as the Ocean Dumping Act, was enacted over a decade ago. It was intended by the Congress to put an end, once and for all, to continued degradation of our oceans. In the years that have passed since then, disposal of sewage sludge in the waters immediately surrounding New Jersey has increased by more than 50 percent.

Some projections indicate a three-fold increase in sludge dumping as mammoth, new wastewater treatment plants come on line in New York City and other coastal municipalities consider reentering the ocean. The stress this places on our coastal waters is exacerbated by the continual, unconscionable dumping of 230 million gallons of raw sewage a day into the Hudson River by the city of New York.

It is past time to put a stop to these practices. This is why EPA's announcement today, calling for a phase-out of sludge dumping close to our shores, is so welcome.

Mr. President, the resolution of waste disposal issues is not simple. I do not mean to imply it is. In deciding how to dispose of sludges, the byproduct of secondary sewage treatment facilities, we must be mindful that our environment is a fragile system. None of the potential methods for disposal are without problems. Disposal of toxic sludges on land, untreated, can contaminate ground water and soils. Incineration of toxic sludges can spread dangerous pollutants through the air. But, Mr. President, our nearby ocean waters must not continue to serve as an unregulated waste dump—just because the ocean is a cheap place to dump; just because dumpers have resisted alternatives; and just because it has been that way for years. It has got to change.

Mr. President, EPA's decision is consistent with congressional efforts and efforts actively underway in New Jersey to develop alternatives to ocean dumping of sludge. Since 1977, when the Congress adopted an amendment to the Ocean Dumping Act meant to halt ocean dumping of sewage sludge, all but a handful of sewage authorities in the New York-New Jersey region have stopped dumping their wastes in the ocean. New Jersey is moving to stop these practices. I urge others in the region to join this cleanup effort.

The State of New Jersey has an active Ocean Waste Management Committee in the Department of Environmental Protection dedicated to ending the degradation of our coastal waters. New Jersey is committed to revitalizing the waters washing our shores.

Both Governor Kean of New Jersey and myself have actively called on EPA to close the 12-mile sludge dump site and to move dumping, on an interim basis, to the 106-mile site. I will ask that our letters to Administrator Ruckelshaus on this issue be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with EPA's announcement on closing the 12-mile site, and testimony I gave before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on amendments to the Ocean Dumping Act in March.

Mr. President, EPA's proposal will not be without cost to the six New Jersey sewage authorities which continue to dispose of wastes at the 12-mile site. However, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection estimates that when these costs are spread out over the large number of people served by these plants, the cost to each individual would be less than $4 per year. The same de minimus costs would obtain for the city of New York. These costs would be insignificant for the individuals involved, while the benefits to our region would be substantial.

Mr. President, the EPA will now have a comment period and public hearings before finally promulgating this decision. We are several months off from a binding rule. But significant scientific and analytic work on the part of EPA, my State, and other interested parties has laid a solid basis for finalizing this decision. I do not believe EPA will reverse its decision. The major obstacle remaining to implementation of this decision, in my judgment, lies in possible renewed litigation, to thwart congressional intent and the EPA proposal.

Therefore, Mr. President, while fully supporting EPA in its regulatory role, I intend shortly to introduce legislation, as my colleague from New Jersey BILL HUGHES has done, to phase out sludge dumping at the 12-mile site once and for all and require EPA to develop a plan to revitalize the New York Bight Apex.

I now ask that the letters I referred to be printed in the RECORD.

The letters follow:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 1984.

Hon. WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I was enormously encouraged by your Agency's testimony on March 2, 1984 before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, in response to my questioning about the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) plans to require an end to ocean dumping of sewage sludge off New Jersey's shores. I write in strong support of designating the 106 mile site as an alternative to continued sludge disposal at the current site just 12 miles off New Jersey. I hope that sludge disposal at the 12 mile site can stop as quickly as possible.

As you know, the Ocean Dumping Act was enacted by the Congress over a decade ago to put an end to continued degradation of our coastal waters. In the years that have passed since then, ocean dumping of sewage sludge in the waters immediately surrounding New Jersey has increased by more than 50 percent, rather than decreasing as intended by Congress. Unless decisive steps are taken, either by EPA in regulatory proceedings, or by the Congress through legislation, the situation will only worsen.

Two mammoth new sewage treatment plants are scheduled to become operational in New York City in the late 1980's, which will aggravate current sludge disposal problems, and several municipalities are considering re-entering the ocean. The stress this pollution places on our coastal waters is exacerbated by the continual and unconscionable dumping of raw sewage into the Hudson and East River by the City of New York.

Frustration in New Jersey over these practices is at an all time high. As you know, New Jersey has an extensive coastline, which stretches some 370 miles. Along this coast are beautiful beaches, a string of thriving communities, and a significant tourist and commercial and recreational fishing industry. It is imperative to New Jersey's economy, environment and well-being that we put an end to continued degradation of our precious coastal resources. Endless regulatory delay and litigation have gone on for too long.

Based on your Agency's testimony of last week, it appears that EPA is leaning toward designation of the 106 mile site for future sludge disposal as an alternative to the existing 12 mile site. I strongly support moving the sludge disposal site further away from New Jersey's shores as we search for a permanent, long-term disposal strategy.

I look forward to working with you to resolve this issue. I would appreciate being

kept informed about Agency decisions on this matter.

Best regards,

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
Trenton, N.J., February 8, 1984.

Hon. WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: As you know, citizens and public officials in New Jersey have been concerned for some time about the ability of ocean dumping sites off the northern New Jersey shore to continue to absorb dumped sewage sludge and dredge spoils.

The shore is one of our state's most precious economic, environmental and cultural resources, and many of our citizens feel that its future could be threatened by continued dumping of such large volumes of waste in the ocean.

This is one reason why the state of New Jersey strongly supported congressional action that led to passage of amendments to the Federal Ocean Dumping Act, which required an end to ocean dumping by the end of 1981. Unfortunately, for reasons that are well known, that Act has not been implemented, and the problem of ocean dumping continues to trouble us.

Currently, more than 7 million wet tons of sewage sludge per year are dumped at a site 12 miles east Sandy Hook, New Jersey. I am concerned about the effect that continued dumping at this site of this volume of sewage sludge, much of which is contaminated with other materials, will have on the various forms of life which the ocean sustains.

Clearly, the ocean would be much better able to absorb large volumes of sewage sludge at the proposed 106 mile ocean waste disposal site without as great a threat to marine life or to the on-shore environment.

Therefore, I am writing to request that the Agency designate the 106-mile site as the preferred alternative for sewage sludge disposal.

If the 106-mile site is not designated at this time, I would urge the Agency to adopt certain limits on the continued use of the 12-mile site, such as those set forth in the package of recommendations on the reauthorization of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act submitted by our Department of Environmental Protection to the Congress. Our Department's recommendations included:

A firm, five-year limit on the continued use of the site;

The imposition of a user fee surcharge on sewage sludge disposal at the site to be used to finance continued research on the environmental impacts of disposal and development of long term disposal facilities; and

The phasing out of dumping at the 12-mile site during the 5 year period suggested above.

At the same time, I believe that it is vitally important for the Agency to continue to assess the benefits and drawbacks of all land- and ocean-based sewage sludge disposal alternatives, and to continue to work with the states and with the sewage authorities in improving the quality of the sludge.

Moreover, I believe it would be wise for the agency to continue to pursue future alternatives to the so-called Mud Dump site for the disposal of dredged spoils. The capacity of this site could also reach its limits in the near future, and it would be best to explore alternatives for the disposal of dredged materials now in anticipation of that day.

New Jersey's shore supports a vibrant and important tourism industry, as well as a commercial and recreational marine fishing industry worth over $1 billion per year. It is vitally important to the future of our state that we protect the integrity of the ocean resources on which these industries depend.

I hope that you will choose the 106 mile site for sewage sludge, and that we can continue to work together to address the problems posed by all forms of ocean waste disposal.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. KEAN,
Governor.

ENVIRONMENTAL NEWS

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency today announced that it is proposing to end disposal of sludge 12 miles offshore in the New York Bight Apex and is designating two disposal sites at the so-called 106 Mile Ocean Waste Dump Site off the Atlantic Coast to receive municipal sewage treatment sludge and aqueous industrial wastes.

At the same time it is designating a site known as the Mud Dump Site in the New York Bight for the disposal of dredged materials.

Specifically, the actions are:

A tentative denial of petitions to redesignate the 12-mile Sewage Sludge Dump Site in the New York Bight Apex and suspension of further consideration of the redesignation of the 60-Mile Alternative Sewage Sludge Dump Site.

Final designation of two separate disposal sites within the previously interim-designated 106-Mile Site located off the mid-Atlantic Ocean coast; one for municipal sludges; and the other for aqueous industrial wastes.

Final designation of the New York Bight Dredged Material Dump Site, known as the Mud Dump Site, for the disposal of dredged materials.

With regard to the tentative determination to deny petitions to redesignate the 12-Mile Site, Jack E. Ravan, EPA Assistant Administrator for Water, said, "It is generally acknowledged that the New York Bight Apex is heavily degraded. The agency has determined that the dumping of municipal sludge at the 12-Mile Site contributes to this degradation. We anticipate that this decision, along with a series of other agency programs will help to improve the overall quality of these waters which are a source of food and recreation for millions of people annually and vital to the economic well-being of the entire New York and New Jersey metropolitan area. The other programs include financing for the construction of improved sewage treatment facilities, critical evaluation of marine discharge waivers under the Clean Water Act, and additional point source pollution control measures."

Designation of a site does not authorize any actual dumping. The use of a site is granted through a permit process. This process includes the evaluation of the need for ocean dumping, the availability and impact of alternative disposal methods, the volume and characteristics of the wastes, and impacts to the marine environment. Ocean dumping permits are subject to public notice and public hearings.

In making permitting decisions, the agency's approach to ocean dumping may be summarized as follows:

(1) The agency will, as an overall principle, protect the oceans from significant adverse effects of waste disposal. The agency will particularly assure that the oceans are not used for "cheap" waste disposal as a matter of short run economic considerations alone;

(2) In any specific case, the agency will allow ocean disposal of a waste only if the applicant can demonstrate that no practicable alternatives are available that have less impact on the total environment. EPA will apply a rule of reason in determining practicability; and

(3) For the long run, the agency will actively encourage environmentally beneficial approaches such as waste minimization, recycling and reuse.

Designation of the 12-Mile Site, which is located 10.3 nautical miles east of Sandy Hook, New Jersey, expired on December 31, 1981. Since that time, the ocean dumping of municipal sludges has been continued under court order. If EPA's final decision is to deny petitions to redesignate the 12-Mile Site the petitioners will be required to relocate their dumping operations to the 106-Mile Site or other such sites as may be designated, pending the agency's action on their individual applications for ocean dumping permits.

Public hearings on the tentative denial of the petitions are scheduled for June 1984, at three locations in the New York and New Jersey area. Public notice of exact times and locations will be announced in the Federal Register.

EPA designated two disposal sites within the previously interim-designated 106-Mile Site: one for the dumping of aqueous industrial wastes; and the other for the dumping of municipal sewage treatment sludges. The 106-Mile Site is located about 135 nautical miles southeast of the entrance to New York Harbor and has been used in the past for the dumping of aqueous industrial wastes and some municipal sludges. Numerous studies have been conducted including an environmental impact statement prepared by EPA for this site.

This area was selected because of its depth, distance from shorelines, and its capacity to disperse the industrial wastes and municipal sludges. In addition, the site is located off the Continental Shelf, a preference stated explicitly in the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act.

Extensive monitoring plans have been developed by EPA and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, after consultation with the States of New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. Separating the disposal of industrial wastes and municipal sludges at the sites will facilitate monitoring of the effects of dumping these materials. The industrial waste site is designated for continuing use. The designation of the municipal sludge site is limited to five years after the start of dumping at the site.

The Mud Dump Site has been designated for the disposal of dredged materials generated from the Port of New York and New Jersey. The economic viability of the Port depends on the dredging of channels to maintain sufficient operating depths for navigation. EPA is restricting the amount of dredged materials which may be dumped at the site in the future to 100 million cubic yards based upon its analysis of the capacity of the site. The agency, in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers (COE), will continue to monitor disposal at this site in order to determine its continuing ability to meet the site designation criteria. Recognizing the

limitations associated with the long-term use of the Mud Dump Site, the COE with cooperation of the EPA, is actively evaluating non-ocean alternatives for the disposal of dredged material. In addition, EPA is initiating studies on alternate ocean disposal sites.

The decisions to tentatively deny the petitions to redesignate the 12-Mile Site and to designate the Mud Dump Site are based on disposal site characteristics, consideration of the nature of the materials, and their respective environmental impacts.

Dredging operations involve the relocation of naturally occurring sediments which are quite dense in relation to sea water and generally reach the bottom rapidly after disposal. The majority of this material is contained within the site's boundaries. In contrast, the highly organic and predominately liquid municipal sludge tends to disperse through the water column, is not contained within the site, and contributes to impacts beyond the 12-Mile Site boundaries. Therefore, for the dredged material, the shallower containment site is more appropriate, while for the municipal sludge a dispersive site farther removed from beaches and other resources is more appropriate.

TENTATIVE DENIAL OF PETITIONS TO REDESIGNATE 12-MILE SITE

The 12-Mile Site is located approximately 10.3 nautical miles east of Highlands, New Jersey, and 9.9 nautical miles south of Long Island. The site occupies an area of about 6.6 square nautical miles. Water depth is approximately 27 meters.

The 12-Mile Site has been used since 1924 for the ocean dumping of municipal sludges. In 1982, 7.6 million wet tons were dumped at the site.

On May 18, 1979, EPA designated the 12-Mile Site as an approved municipal sewage sludge disposal site. At the same time, an alternate site, the 60-Mile Site, was designated on an emergency basis. No sewage sludge has been dumped at the 60-Mile Site.

These designations were based on information presented in an EPA environmental impact statement (EIS) published in October 1978, in addition to the assumption that ocean dumping would end on December 31, 1981.

The designation of both the 12- and 60-Mile Sites expired on December 31, 1981.

Since that date the ocean dumping of municipal sludge has been permitted as a direct result of court orders while EPA takes action on petitions that the designation of the 12-Mile Site be extended.

Nine municipal sewerage authorities are currently using the 2-Mile Site for sludge disposal under Federal court orders.

On December 20, 1982, EPA requested comments on the possible redesignation of the 12- and 60-Mile Sites since both designations expired.

EPA's tentative decision to deny petitions to redesignate the 12-Mile Site is based upon a finding that designation of the site would not be in compliance with statutory and regulatory criteria for ocean dump site designation. Furthermore, continued use of this site for municipal sludge disposal would result in further degradation to the area, including both ecological and public health impacts.

DESIGNATION OF TWO DISPOSAL SITES LOCATED WITHIN PREVIOUSLY DESIGNATED 106-MILE OCEAN DUMP SITE

The Agency is designating two disposal sites located within the previously interim-designated 106-Mile Ocean Waste Dump Site; one for the dumping of aqueous industrial wastes, and the other for the dumping of municipal sludge treatment sludges.

The 106-Mile Site has been used since 1961 for the ocean dumping of industrial wastes. Small quantities of municipal sludges have been dumped at the 106-Mile Site since 1974.

The location of the previously interim-designated 106-Mile Site is about 120–150 nautical miles southeast of the entrance to New York Harbor.

The municipal sludge site occupies an area of approximately 100 square nautical miles and is located 120 nautical miles southeast of Ambrose Light, New York, and 115 nautical miles from Atlantic City, New Jersey, the nearest coastline. The site is located in water depths ranging from 2,250 to 2,750 meters.

The industrial waste site is located approximately 125 nautical miles southeast of Ambrose Light, New York and 105 nautical miles from Atlantic City, New Jersey, the nearest coastline. The circular site with a radius of 3.0 nautical miles, occupies an area of approximately 30 square nautical miles, is located in water depths also ranging from 2,250 to 2,750 meters.

On May 31 and June 1, 1977, EPA conducted public hearings in Toms River, New Jersey, to gather information and obtain public comment on the possible relocation of municipal sludge dumping at the 12-Mile Site to further offshore at the 106-Mile Site.

Public hearings were held at Mercer County Community College, New Jersey, on August 21, 1979, to receive comments on the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). The final EIS was published in April 1980.

On December 20, 1982, EPA proposed to designate the 106-Mile Site as an approved ocean dumping site for the authorized disposal of aqueous industrial wastes and municipal sewage treatment sludges. At that time, EPA proposed to restrict the disposal of municipal sludge to a period of 5 years during which time further studies on the environmental effects of sewage sludge dumping would be conducted.

At the same time, the Agency solicited public comment on the redesignation of the 12- and 60-Mile ocean dumping sites.

The interim designation of the 106-Mile Site expired on December 31, 1982.

On May 10, 1983, a public hearing was held in Rehoboth Beach, Delaware, to receive comments concerning the proposed action.

On December 16, 1983, EPA published in the Federal Register a Notice of Availability of all supplementary information, reports, and studies used in the decision-making process to designate the 106-Mile Site as an EPA approved ocean dump site for the dumping of aqueous industrial wastes and municipal sewage treatment sludge. A 30 day comment period followed.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Chairman D'Amours, my colleague from New Jersey, Representative Hughes, members of the committee, I am pleased to be with you this morning.

Your committee has a long record of standing as the congressional watchdog for the oceans. I join you this morning to lend my support to your efforts. And to bring you a message from the people of New Jersey. We can no longer sit still in the face of continued degradation of the coastal waters surrounding our state.

New Jersey is viewed by many as an urban, industrial state. That is true. We are the most densely populated state in the nation. We are an industrial state. We are a state plagued by waste disposal problems.

At the same time, New Jersey has an extensive coastline which stretches some 370 miles, from the New Jersey-New York border in the North to Cape May in the South and North again to Trenton. Along this coastline, are some of the most beautiful beaches on the east coast. Along this coastline are extensive fisheries resources. New Jersey's economy is heavily dependent on keeping our coastal waters healthy. Our tourist industry, along with a more than $1 billion per year commercial and recreational marine fishing industry, cannot tolerate continued degradation of our precious coastal resources.

Frustration in New Jersey is running at an all time high.

The Ocean Dumping Act, which was enacted over a decade ago, was intended by the Congress to put an end, once and for all, to continued degradation of our oceans. In the years that have passed since then, disposal of sewage sludge in the waters immediately surrounding New Jersey, has increased by more than 50 percent. Unless steps are taken, either by EPA through its regulatory proceedings, or the Congress through legislation, the situation will only worsen.

Some projections indicate a three-fold increase in sludge dumping as mammoth new wastewater treatment plants come on line in New York City and other coastal municipalities consider re-entering the ocean. The stress this places on our coastal waters is exacerbated by the continual, unconscionable dumping of raw sewage into the Hudson River by the City of New York.

It is time to put a stop to these practices. I join today with Congressmen Hughes and Forsythe, in calling for a phase out of sludge dumping close to our shores.

In 1977, Congressman Hughes won a significant victory in this committee, and in the Congress, by amending the Ocean Dumping Act. His amendment was meant to end ocean dumping of sewage sludge. Municipalities all over this nation, with the exception of a handful of authorities in the New York-New Jersey region, have stopped dumping their wastes in the ocean. It is now seven years since that amendment was adopted. Yet, through regulatory delay and endless litigation—ocean dumping continues just miles off New Jersey's shore.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution of this issue is not simple. I do not mean to imply it is. Enormous quantities of pollutants are entering the Hudson Bay Estuary daily. Not all stem from sewage sludge disposal, but sludge disposal clearly contributes to the problem.

In deciding how to dispose of sludges, we must be mindful that our environment is a fragile system. None of the potential methods for disposal are without problems. Disposal of toxic sludges on land, untreated, can contaminate groundwater and soils. Incineration of toxic sludges can spread dangerous pollutants through the air. But, Mr. Chairman, our nearby ocean waters must not continue to serve as an unregulated waste dump, just because the ocean is a cheap place to dump; just because dumpers and regulators have resisted alternatives; just because it's been that way for years. It's got to change.

The Committee has before it several proposals. H.R. 4829 to reauthorize the Ocean Dumping Act, has been pending before this body for several years. It would make some meaningful changes in the current law by mandating that EPA formally designate ocean dumping sites, and monitor them, as a condition of their use. This would establish the simple principle that no site can be used for waste disposal unless EPA has established that it can safely assimilate wastes without undue harm to the environment. Monitoring would also insure that no unreasonable or undetected harm is occurring at a site. These elementary requirements should no longer be subject to debate. They should be part of the law.

The committee is also considering H.R. 4364, introduced by my colleagues from New Jersey, Congressmen Hughes and Forsythe. This bill is the product of years of work. It is not a sledge hammer. It is a scalpel. Its intent is to establish a regulatory framework for waste disposal decisions—a framework which recognizes public health and environment considerations as paramount, . . . but one which eliminates short-term economics as a driving force in waste disposal decisions.

The Hughes-Forsythe proposal would end sewage sludge dumping at the 12 mile site in the New York Bight Apex by 1986, unless it can be demonstrated that continued dumping at this site is less harmful to the public health and marine environment than ocean disposal at a more suitable, deepwater site. The deepwater site would most likely be the 106 mile site currently under consideration for designation by the EPA as an alternative to the 12 mile site.

H.R. 4364 would require that a phase out of dumping at the 12 mile site be made on scientific grounds, using established criteria developed over many years to protect the public health and environment. It provides for waivers from this requirement where evidence indicates they serve the public interest.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the Hughes-Forsythe proposal would permit EPA to condition any continued dumping at the 12 mile site on compliance with the Clean Water Act. This would serve as a compelling incentive for municipalities, such as New York City, which is currently dumping approximately 220 million gallons of raw sewage a day into the Hudson River, to properly treat their wastes and set up pre-treatment programs. H.R. 4364 would also permit EPA to condition dumping at the 12 mile site on a continuous, good faith effort by municipalities to search for alternatives to close-in ocean dumping.

And, Mr. Chairman, I might add I don't see satisfactory good faith evidence of such an effort right now. Finally, the bill requires EPA to develop a plan to restore the New York Bight.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is consistent with efforts actively underway in New Jersey to develop alternatives to current ocean dumping practices. The State of New Jersey has an active Ocean Waste Management Committee in the State Department of Environmental Protection which is dedicated to ending degradation of our coastal waters. New Jersey has testified before this committee on its efforts in previous hearings, and will do so again today, along with other witnesses from my state committed to revitalizing the waters washing our shores.

Recently, Governor Kean of New Jersey called upon the EPA to designate the 106 mile site of ocean dumping and to phase out dumping at the 12 mile site. I stand with Governor Kean in this request. Tomorrow, when Administrator Ruckelshaus comes before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, I intend to let him know how we feel in New Jersey about ocean dumping close to our shores.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the EPA will move to designate the 106 mile site as the preferred alternative for sewage sludge disposal within the next month. Such a decision would not be without cost to the six New Jersey sewage authorities which continue to dispose of wastes at the 12 mile site. However, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection estimates that when these costs are spread out over the large number of people served by these plants, the cost to each individual would be less than $1 per year. The same would hold true for residents of New York City. These costs would be insignificant for the individuals involved, but the benefits to our state and region would be substantial.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I urge my friends and neighbors across the river to turn away from confrontation and litigation, and to join New Jersey in a cooperative effort to revitalize our common waters. If we would just all turn our best scientists and engineers to work on solving this problem, I am confident we can find the answers we need. Along with you, I hope that the tireless efforts of this committee will move EPA to end years of paper shuffling and to take decisive action. I commend the Committee's relentless search for a better way to protect our oceans against continued degradation of our most precious ocean resources.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today.●

NATIONAL FISHERIES MARKETING COUNCIL

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor legislation offered by my distinguished colleague from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS). This bill, which would establish a National Fisheries Marketing Council, is a well-conceived piece of legislation deserving of our support.

We have witnessed the success of marketing councils in many agricultural areas. In this Congress, in fact, we have created a dairy promotion program precisely because we have seen the benefits that accrue to industries that are served by such a program.

We now have many underutilized marine fisheries in the United States. By passing this legislation expeditiously, the Senate can improve the economies of all of our coastal States and reduce the demand for governmental services in those States.

This is an idea whose time has come. I urge my colleagues to swiftly adopt this vital and timely legislation.●

WE MUST NOT FORGET THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, April 24 was the 69th anniversary of the start of what turned out to be only the first genocide of the twentieth century. Perhaps if we had been wise, it could have been the last. On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire began to arrest and murder the leaders of the Armenian community in Ottoman lands. From May to October, 1915, the Ottoman government exterminated well over 1 million Armenians—men, women, and children—by forced marches, starvation, and outright slaughter. The Ottoman policy was very direct: "The best way to finish with the Armenian question," said one member of the Turkish Government, "is to finish off the Armenians."

Why should we remember these horrible events? Of all people, it was Adolf Hitler who answered that question. When Hitler told his cronies that he intended to exterminate the Jews, Gypsies, and all the others that did not fit his image of purity, someone dared to suggest the world might not stand still for such a vast crime. Hitler sneered "Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?"

Who, indeed? Our own U.S. State Department, in a footnote to an official document, has termed the historic record of these mass murders in 1915, as "ambiguous". In this year 1984, of all years, we must remind ourselves, as that quote from Adolf Hitler reminds us, that only the truth will set us free.

The record is not ambiguous. The Ottoman Empire did move the Armenians from their homes by the hundreds of thousands; did indeed make summary execution; did indeed deny them food and water. Winston Churchill pointed out that this whole, horrible, premeditated crime was "about as complete as such an act, on a scale so great, could well be." But as time has passed, the revisionists have stepped in. Other factors, we are told, must be taken into consideration. It was not so simple. Richard Cohen of the Washington Post wrote on this theme: "The last victim of any genocide is truth."

We must answer Adolf Hitler's question. We must speak of the Armenian Genocide, and commemorate the victims of the first genocide of this century. Let us hope and pray—but above all, let us conduct ourselves—so that we shall have seen the last. We must see to it that genocide is eliminated forever as something any government could ever consider as a means of extending its power.

Mr. President, one of my constituents, Mr. Nighos Mazadoorian of New Britain, Conn., wrote eloquently to me regarding this matter. He points out that some have argued that to commemorate the victims of the Armenian Genocide is to condone terrorism. That is not true. Mr. Mazadoorian writes "As an American, as a Christian, and as an Armenian, I am unequivocally opposed to terrorism . . . I know too well what it feels like to be the victim." That says it all, Mr. Presi-

dent. I ask that Mr. Mazadoorian's letter to me be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

NEW BRITAIN, CONN.,
March 10, 1984.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: I am writing this letter on behalf of my wife Elizabeth and myself to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude for your co-sponsorship of S. 241, the Levin/Wilson Resolution affirming United States recognition of the Armenian Genocide as a historical fact. In addition, I am writing this letter to make an urgent appeal to you to also co-sponsor S.J. 87, the Tsongas Resolution designating April 24 as a national day of remembrance for all victims of genocide, especially those of Armenian ancestry who died between 1915 and 1923. The passage of these two resolutions is important to us for very personal reasons.

My wife and I are both survivors of the Armenian Genocide of 1915. Out of a family of six, I was the sole survivor of the brutal massacre of most of the Armenian residents of the village of Ichmeh in the Turkish Province of Kharpert. My father had come to American and had become a naturalized American citizen before he returned to Turkey. He was still an American citizen when he was put to death in 1915. The other members of my family whose lives were taken included my mother, my six year old sister, my three year old sister and my seven month old infant sister.

My wife Elizabeth was born in the village of Yeghekee, also in the Turkish Province of Kharpert. In 1915, she accompanied her family on a deportation forced march during which her mother and two uncles were put to death, together with countless other Armenians. My wife survived only by the grace of God and under the care of the American Near East Relief in one of its many orphanages.

The present Turkish government has lobbied boldly, vigorously and thus far successfully against the passage of these two resolutions, arguing that those who seek their passage condone acts of terrorism.

As an American, as a Christian, and as an Armenian, I am unequivocally opposed to acts of terrorism against representatives of the Turkish government in the United States or anywhere else in the world. I condemn all such acts of terrorism. I know too well what it feels like to be the victim. I still have too many painfully vivid memories of the brutal terrorism carried out under orders of the Turkish government in 1915 against Armenians and in particular, against the members of my own family, to condone any form of terrorism, against any human beings, for any reason. For me to condone terrorism would be to betray my sacred spiritual heritage and to forfeit my very identity as an American, as a Christian, and as an Armenian.

My wife and I have both been Connecticut residents and citizens for over fifty-five years. We are both in our seventies and we hope to live to see the passage of these two resolutions which mean so much to us. We would be most grateful for your help in the passage of both these resolutions.

Very truly yours,

NIGHOS MAZADOORIAN.●

S. 2266—GRANTING A FEDERAL CHARTER TO THE VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA, INC.

SENATOR WARNER WITHDRAWS AS A COSPONSOR

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, after careful deliberation and a review of the most recent actions of the Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc. (VVA), I must announce that I am withdrawing my cosponsorship of this organization's legislation, S. 2266, an initiative to grant VVA a Federal charter.

Only a few weeks ago, I agreed to lend my support to legislation providing a Federal charter for the VVA because I was advised that the organization had the broad purpose of reflecting the needs of all veterans who served in Vietnam and was a responsible representative of our Vietnam veterans.

Further, I was advised that the VVA was the only veterans organization of national membership which devoted itself solely to Vietnam veterans, particularly to raising public awareness of these veterans' sacrifices and service to our country.

I am now informed that the national leadership of the VVA has recently gone to Cambodia and North Vietnam and that Hanoi has now announced its recognition of the VVA as their official liaison to the United States for POW/MIA matters.

As former Secretary of the Navy during the Vietnam conflict, I cannot condone the actions of a nongovernmental organization negotiating directly with Hanoi. Such negotiations must remain the sole responsibility of the U.S. Government.

I am certain that most of the members of the VVA and many of the chapter leaders throughout the country are sincerely interested in developing a responsible, broad-based veterans organization for those who served in Vietnam. I have, in fact, commended the chairman of the Virginia chapter of the VVA for the role he played in passage of legislation by the Virginia General Assembly this year.

However, I find that I must withdraw my support of the legislation granting a Federal charter because of the actions of this organization's leadership at the national level.●

MICHIGAN SMALL BUSINESS

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, the week of May 6 to 12 has been designated National Small Business Week. This special week provides us with the opportunity to recognize the fastest growing and most job-creating sector of our economy. Small businesses have provided the foundation on which the economic strength of our Nation is based. The men and women who have taken their entrepeneurial spirit and translated these ambitions into businesses have made our Nation the worlds' leading economic power.

I would like to illustrate a few points to underscore the important role small businesses play in the economy.

There are over 14 million businesses in the United States—99.7 percent are considered small businesses.

Small businesses are growing at a tremendous rate. Between 1980 and 1982, small businesses increased between 10 and 15 percent annually.

Between 1980 and 1982, small businesses generated all of the 984,000 net new jobs in the United States.

In my own State of Michigan, small businesses employ almost 1.5 million people, over 51 percent of the State's total employment.

As more women enter the work force, many are going into business on their own. From 1980 to 1982, the number of women who owned their own business increased 2,096,000 to 2,309,000, a 10-percent gain.

The number of minorities who owned their own business increased 42.8 percent between 1972 and 1982—from 332,000 to 474,000.

Many small businesses are leading the way in the development of new products and technologies, such as computer software and health care.

Based on these facts, it is clear that small businesses will continue to provide the strength needed for our Nation to grow and compete in the world market.

It gives me great pleasure at this time, to recognize Mr. Charles O. Pyron, president of ADCO Products, Inc., of Michigan Center, who has been selected the Michigan Small Business Person of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration. Mr. Pyron started ADCO Products in 1971 with two employees and sales of $60,000. Today, ADCO Products employs over 100 with sales of $9,500,000. ADCO's products, which include specially formulated caulking, sealants, and adhesives, are marketed worldwide.

Mr. Pyron is also active in community affairs. He was cofounder of the Small Business Council of the Greater Jackson Chamber of Commerce and was selected chairman of the board of directors of the chamber for 1984. He also serves on the Small Business Advisory Committee of Jackson Community College and the Board of Directors of Ella Sharp Museum. I would like to commend Mr. Pyron, and congratulate him for being selected Michigan Small Business Person of the Year.

I would also like to take a moment to recognize several small business advocates in Michigan, who are being honored for their role in promoting small business and assisting small businesses to grow and prosper.

Mr. A. Samuel Greenawalt, chairman of the board—Mid Michigan, and president, major corporate division for

Michigan National Banks, is the Banker Advocate of the Year. Mr. Greenawalt has taken an active role in responding to the financial needs of small business in Flint through both the rank and civic organizations. He is active with the Alliance for a Greater Flint, the Small Business Development Center/Flint Chamber of Commerce, the Flint-Genesee Corp. for Economic Growth, and the Flint/Genesee Entrepreneurship Forum, all of which are actively involved with small business.

Ms. Jean Thomas, president and owner of Distinctive Designs/Medical Interiors in Detroit, is the Women-in-Business Advocate of the Year. Ms. Thomas is the current president of the Michigan chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners. She has a longstanding commitment to community involvement and has developed and participated in many projects to help women go into business.

Mr. Harold Marks, CPA, Prangley, Marks & Co. of Grand Rapids, is the Accountant Advocate of the Year. Marks is also the second runner-up in the national competition in this category. He is the chairman of the Small Business Council of the Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Marks has donated his time to represent small business owners with accounting, tax, and financial planning problems.

Mr. David Snow, president of the Mister Valet Dry Cleaners of Grand Rapids, is the Minority Advocate of the Year. Mr. Snow is active with the Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce and founded its Minority Business Committee in 1982. The committee's activities have included seminars, luncheons, and an extensive celebration of Minority Business Week.

Mr. Todd Anuskiewicz, research director of the Michigan Energy & Resource Association (MERRA) in Detroit, is the Innovation Award winner. Mr. Anuskiewicz has made numerous contributions to the development of small business R&D projects. One of the most successful has been the annual Michigan Conference on Federal and State R&D projects. Over 300 people attended the last conference and this success has prompted other States to request help in duplicating it. Mr. Anuskiewicz also has assisted small businesses in writing small business innovation research proposals which has resulted in grants to several Michigan firms.

These business leaders have been successful in helping small businesses in Michigan meet the challenges of our changing economy. Because of their dedication and willingness to assist others in business, they deserve our praise and admiration. I am pleased to be able to bring their accomplishments, and the role of small business in our economy, before you today.●

THE BEST DRILL SERGEANTS IN THE ARMY

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, each year the Army Training and Doctrine Command conducts a competition in both the Active Forces and Reserve components to select the two best drill sergeants in the Army. The competition among the Active Forces has been running since 1964, and the competition among the Reserve units began in 1972.

By nature these individuals are highly competitive. In the Active Forces there are some 4,000 drill sergeants across the country, and in the Reserve units, there are 4,600.

The competition for this year has just been completed, and I am proud that for one of the few times in the history of the competition the two winners are both from the same State, in this case, Oklahoma.

I want to offer my congratualtions to Sfc. Danny R. Hubbard of Fort Sill in Lawton, Okla., and Sfc. Garry L. Carter of Madill, Okla. Sergeant Hubbard is on active duty with C Battery, 4th Battalion, U.S. Army Field Training Center, at Fort Sill. Sergeant Carter is with Company C, 3d Battalion, 377th Regiment, 95th Division, headquartered in Midwest City, Okla.

These two fine young men competed for 3 days at Fort Monroe, Va. The Army-wide exercise selects the top drill sergeant from each training command in the active service, 9 in total, and the top drill sergeant from each of the 13 reserve training units. These 22 selectees then meet for the competition at Fort Monroe.

Sergeant Carter and his wife, Vicki Kay, have three children and he is an employee of KXII-TV in Ardmore, Okla. He has been a member of the Reserves for 11 years.

Sergeant Hubbard and his wife, Pam, have two children and he has been on active duty for 11 years.

Both winners have been interviewed by USA Today, and CBS Morning News, and I urge my colleagues to take the opportunity to view the interviews tomorrow on CBS. My congratulations again to these young men who are outstanding examples of the fine personnel in today's military services.●

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1984

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M., MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1984

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 11 a.m. on Monday, April 30, 1984.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, following the time for the two leaders under the standing order, I ask unanimous consent that there be a special order of not to exceed 15 minutes for the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that following Senator PROXMIRE's special order there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 30 minutes with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 2163

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2163, the boat safety bill, with amendment No. 3027 being the pending business.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE ON MONDAY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes on Monday, the reading of the Journal be dispensed with, that no resolutions come over under the rule, that the call of the calendar be dispensed with, and that following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there be the time for the special order and the other proceedings that I have just outlined.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that following the time for the transaction of routine morning business, the morning hour will be deemed to have expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the distinguished Democratic leader.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournment of the Senate over until Monday, April 30, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives, and that they be appropriately referred; and that the Vice President and the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS ON FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1984

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to file reports on Friday, April 27, between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1984, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask if there is any further business to come before the Senate.

If there be no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, stand in adjournment until the hour of 11 a.m. on Monday, April 30, 1984.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:21 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 30, 1984, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26, 1984:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Louis Roman Disabato, of Texas, to be a member of the National Museum Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 1987.

FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Council on the Aging for the terms indicated:

For a term expiring June 5, 1985:
Ingrid Azvedo, of California.
For terms expiring June 5, 1986:
Nelda Ann Lambert Barton, of Kentucky.
Edna Bogosian, of Massachusetts.
James N. Broder, of Maine.
Tony Guglielmo, of Connecticut.
Frances Lamont, of South Dakota.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thomas H. Anderson, Jr., of Mississippi, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of Dominica, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Saint Lucia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Antigua and Barbuda, and Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to St. Christopher and Nevis.

Harry E. Bergold, Jr., of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

James H. Webb, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning Ted K. Broyhill, and ending Thomas C. Abrahamsen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 12, 1984.

Air Force nominations beginning Jeffrey L. Amerine, and ending Kurt D. Storey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 12, 1984.

The following person for appointment as Reserve of the Air Force, in the grade indicated under the provisions of sections 593 and 8371, title 10, United States Code:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

David F. Rice, [redacted].

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 26, 1984*

The House met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT):

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 24, 1984.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS S. FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on Thursday, April 26, 1984.

JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker pro tempore,
House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Thomas W. Evans, Th.D., St. Johns United Methodist Church, Springfield, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Creator of all the Earth. We thank You for this new day of life. We ask Your blessings upon our President, his Cabinet, the House, and the Senate. May each person have an honest, open mind, pure intentions, and sound speech. Help us to rise above self-seeking and party zeal, to the deeper concerns and needs of the people.

May we hear Your Word again:

*If My people who are called by My name, will humble themselves, pray and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, I will * * * forgive their sins and heal their land.*—II Chronicles 7:14.

*Unless You build * * * our labor is in vain. Unless You watch over the city (nation), we labor in vain. It is in vain that we rise up early and go to rest late, eating the bread of anxious toil.*—Psalm 127.

O God, You are the Supreme Ruler over all nations, and only through You can we find peace. Lord, give us peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 319, nays 22, answered "present" 2, not voting 90 as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—319

Akaka	Daniel	Hartnett
Albosta	Dannemeyer	Hatcher
Anderson	Darden	Hawkins
Andrews (NC)	Daub	Hayes
Andrews (TX)	Davis	Hertel
Annunzio	de la Garza	Hiler
Anthony	Derrick	Hillis
Archer	DeWine	Holt
Aspin	Dingell	Hopkins
AuCoin	Dixon	Horton
Badham	Dorgan	Howard
Barnard	Dowdy	Hoyer
Barnes	Downey	Hubbard
Bartlett	Dreier	Huckaby
Bateman	Duncan	Hughes
Bates	Dwyer	Hunter
Bedell	Dyson	Hutto
Beilenson	Early	Hyde
Bennett	Eckart	Ireland
Bereuter	Edgar	Jeffords
Berman	Edwards (CA)	Jenkins
Biaggi	Edwards (OK)	Johnson
Bilirakis	English	Jones (NC)
Bliley	Erdreich	Kasich
Boehlert	Erlenborn	Kastenmeier
Boland	Evans (IL)	Kemp
Bonior	Fascell	Kildee
Borski	Fazio	Kindness
Boucher	Feighan	Kleczka
Britt	Fiedler	Kolter
Brooks	Fields	Kostmayer
Broomfield	Fish	Kramer
Brown (CA)	Flippo	Lagomarsino
Brown (CO)	Foley	Lantos
Broyhill	Fowler	Latta
Burton (IN)	Frank	Leach
Byron	Franklin	Leath
Campbell	Fuqua	Leland
Carney	Garcia	Lent
Carper	Gekas	Levin
Carr	Gephardt	Levitas
Chandler	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Chappell	Gilman	Lewis (FL)
Cheney	Gingrich	Livingston
Clarke	Glickman	Lloyd
Clinger	Gonzalez	Loeffler
Coats	Gore	Long (LA)
Coleman (MO)	Gradison	Long (MD)
Coleman (TX)	Gramm	Lott
Collins	Green	Lowry (WA)
Conable	Gregg	Lujan
Conyers	Gunderson	Luken
Cooper	Hall, Ralph	Lungren
Corcoran	Hall, Sam	Mack
Coyne	Hamilton	MacKay
Craig	Hammerschmidt	Madigan
Crane, Daniel	Hansen (UT)	Martin (IL)
Crane, Philip	Harrison	Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)	Petri	Stenholm
Martinez	Porter	Stratton
Matsui	Price	Studds
Mavroules	Pritchard	Stump
Mazzoli	Quillen	Sundquist
McCain	Rahall	Swift
McCandless	Ratchford	Synar
McCollum	Ray	Tallon
McCurdy	Regula	Tauke
McEwen	Reid	Tauzin
McGrath	Richardson	Taylor
McHugh	Ridge	Thomas (CA)
McKernan	Rinaldo	Thomas (GA)
McKinney	Ritter	Torres
Mica	Roe	Torricelli
Michel	Rogers	Towns
Mikulski	Rose	Traxler
Mineta	Roth	Udall
Moakley	Roukema	Vander Jagt
Molinari	Rowland	Vandergriff
Mollohan	Rudd	Vento
Montgomery	Savage	Volkmer
Moody	Scheuer	Walgren
Moore	Schneider	Watkins
Moorhead	Schulze	Waxman
Morrison (CT)	Schumer	Weaver
Morrison (WA)	Seiberling	Weber
Mrazek	Sensenbrenner	Wheat
Murphy	Sharp	Whitehurst
Murtha	Shaw	Whitley
Myers	Shelby	Whittaker
Natcher	Shumway	Whitten
Neal	Shuster	Williams (MT)
Nelson	Siljander	Williams (OH)
Nichols	Simon	Winn
Nielson	Sisisky	Wirth
O'Brien	Skeen	Wise
Oakar	Slattery	Wolf
Oberstar	Smith (FL)	Wolpe
Obey	Smith (NE)	Wortley
Olin	Smith (NJ)	Wyden
Owens	Smith, Robert	Wylie
Oxley	Snowe	Yates
Packard	Snyder	Yatron
Panetta	Solarz	Young (FL)
Parris	Spence	Young (MO)
Pashayan	Spratt	Zschau
Pease	Staggers	
Perkins	Stark	

NAYS—22

Clay	Goodling	Schaefer
Coughlin	Harkin	Schroeder
Dickinson	Miller (OH)	Sikorski
Durbin	Mitchell	Solomon
Emerson	Penny	Walker
Evans (IA)	Roberts	Young (AK)
Frenzel	Roemer	
Gejdenson	Sabo	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Breaux	Ottinger

NOT VOTING—90

Ackerman	Dicks	Jones (OK)
Addabbo	Donnelly	Jones (TN)
Alexander	Dymally	Kaptur
Applegate	Edwards (AL)	Kazen
Bethune	Ferraro	Kennelly
Bevill	Florio	Kogovsek
Boggs	Foglietta	LaFalce
Boner	Ford (MI)	Lehman (CA)
Bonker	Ford (TN)	Lehman (FL)
Bosco	Frost	Levine
Boxer	Gaydos	Lipinski
Bryant	Gray	Lowery (CA)
Burton (CA)	Guarini	Lundine
Chappie	Hall (IN)	Markey
Coelho	Hall (OH)	Marlenee
Conte	Hance	Marriott
Courter	Hansen (ID)	McCloskey
Crockett	Hefner	McDade
D'Amours	Heftel	McNulty
Daschle	Hightower	Miller (CA)
Dellums	Jacobs	Minish

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Nowak	Robinson	Smith, Denny
Ortiz	Rodino	St Germain
Patman	Rostenkowski	Stangeland
Patterson	Roybal	Stokes
Paul	Russo	Valentine
Pepper	Sawyer	Vucanovich
Pickle	Shannon	Weiss
Pursell	Skelton	Wilson
Rangel	Smith (IA)	Wright

□ 1120

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1984:

H.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution designating February 11, 1984, "National Inventor's Day", and

H.J. Res. 443. Joint resolution designating the month of June 1984 as "Student Awareness of Drunk Driving Month."

On April 9, 1984:

H.J. Res. 432. Joint resolution designating the week of April 8 through 14, 1984, as "Parkinson's Disease Awareness Week."

On April 10, 1984:

H.R. 3249. An act to charter the National Academy of Public Administration;

H.R. 4072. An act to make adjustments in the commodity programs for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice, to provide agricultural credit assistance, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4206. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to exempt from Federal income taxes certain military and civilian employees of the United States dying as a result of injuries sustained overseas.

On April 13, 1984:

H.R. 4202. An act to designate the air traffic control tower at Midway Airport, Chicago, as the "John G. Fary Tower";

H.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution designating the week beginning April 8, 1984, as "National Hearing Impaired Awareness Week"; and

H.J. Res. 520. Joint resolution designating April 13, 1984, as "Education Day, U.S.A."

On April 17, 1984:

H.R. 4835. An act to authorize funding for the Clement J. Zablocki Memorial Outpatient Facility at the American Children's Hospital in Krakow, Poland; and

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution designating May 1984 as "Older Americans Month."

On April 18, 1984:

H.R. 596. An act to transfer responsibility for furnishing certified copies of Miller Act payment bonds from the Comptroller General to the officer that awarded the contract for which the bond was given; and

H.R. 4169. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 3 of the first concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 1984.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution designating April 29, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day."

DR. THOMAS W. EVANS

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Tom Evans delivered the prayer at the opening of our session just a moment ago. The proof is before you. Baseball's loss was religion's gain.

I am told that the Reverend Dr. Evans had a mean fast ball and a major league curve when he played for the Brooklyn Dodgers and New York Giants farm teams in the late 1930's.

But in those days baseball players did not command multimillion-dollar salaries and Dr. Evans' father wanted his son to stay on the North Carolina farm where he was raised.

Dr. Evans pitched two seasons in the minors before bowing to his father's wishes. Eventually though, he left the farm to spend 15 years in business as a traveling salesman for the National Biscuit Co.

Then, in 1958, Thomas Evans got another call from another Father who recruited him for His team. Evans turned his back on business and went into the United Methodist Church's ministry.

Dr. Evans studied at Lynchburg College, Duke University Divinity School, Scarritt, the United Methodist Church's divinity school in Nashville, and at Old Dominion University. Along the way, he picked up his masters degree and earned his doctorate in various stages of study at Wesley here in the District of Columbia and at the International Seminary in Georgia.

He has taught theology and philosophy, and for the past 6 years he has been pastor of St. John's United Methodist Church in Springfield, Va.

I might add that this is an especially significant year for the Reverend Evans and the United Methodist Church. It is the bicentennial of the founding of the denomination in the United States. On behalf of the Congress I am delighted to welcome him here today.

SOLIDARITY WITH THE KENNEDY FAMILY

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all my colleagues at this moment of anguish and agony for the Kennedy family in expressing our deeply felt sympathy and understanding of this latest tragic event.

It is clear to all of us that the death of this promising and talented young man is just a delayed reaction to a terrorist murder some years ago. The only appropriate way for the Congress and for the American people to respond is for all of us to rededicate ourselves to the fight against terrorism and to the struggle against the insidious spread of the drug culture.

THE STAR WARS PROGRAM

(Mr. DOWNEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it seems we never learn the lessons of history. In today's Washington Post there is a story about five administration witnesses who testified before the other body urging them to continue the President's "Star Wars" program.

Mr. Speaker, "Star Wars" will not work. The Office of Technology Assessment says so; professors from MIT and Harvard say so; anyone who has examined this issue understands that.

In 1969 and 1970, we attempted to achieve the illusive goal of nuclear superiority by introducing MIRV'd warheads into our arsenal in the belief that they would provide us more security. The Soviets inevitably followed. And we have now the dangerous and destabilizing situation where both countries are moving toward a first strike.

Mr. Speaker, we can and must stop the development of space-based weapons, they are the MIRV's of the future. The administration says treaties banning spaced-based defense are not verifiable. The testing of space-based weapons is verifiable. Weapons that are not tested are not deployed. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this Congress to act decisively to prevent this next terrible mistake in weapons races.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CREW OF SPACE SHUTTLE "CHALLENGER"

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I stand before this House to pay tribute to the crew of the space shuttle *Challenger,* who landed April 13 at Edwards Air Force Base after completing one of the space program's most significant missions. Shuttle Comdr. Robert Crippen, pilot Francis Scobee, and mission specialists Terry Hart, George Nelson, and James Van Hoften returned having demonstrated that repairing satellites in space is feasible.

At the same time, I wish to recognize the vital contribution made to the success of this mission by the solar maximum mission control team at the Goddard Space Flight Center. The failure of the first rendezvous attempt left Solar Max in an unstable tumble that made chances of capturing the satellite improbable at best. The Goddard team, under the direction of Project Manager Frank Cepollina and Mission Operations Manager Bill Stewart, worked near magic to regain control of the runaway spacecraft, allowing commander Crippen to maneuver *Challenger* close enough so that Astronaut Hart could reach and berth the satellite with the remote manipulator arm.

Given another chance, the "ace satellite repair crew" came through with flying colors. Astronauts Nelson and Van Hoften restored Solar Max to health, opening to science once more the opportunity to study the Sun offered by Solar Max's unparalleled vantage point.

I extend my congratulations to the five astronauts and the ground support teams who worked to make this mission a resounding success.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SUCCESS OF THE SOLAR MAXIMUM REPAIR MISSION

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER).

The crew commanded by Bob Crippen did a wonderful job and their repair of the solar maximum satellite is a good example of what we can do in space.

The Solar Max satellite provides us with important information about the Sun. For example, we are finding that the solar brightness—the strength of the sunshine—varies slightly, and that this may cause variations in our weather here on Earth. Understanding such variations will enable us to do a better job of predicting the weather.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more point about what this repair teaches us.

Originally, we thought of the shuttle as a delivery system. We thought we would merely take things to space and drop them off. But we have found that the missions are becoming richer—we are doing more and more.

What this teaches me is that we are going to need to have men up there all the time. In other words, we need a space station.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the crew and NASA for this successful mission, and I congratulate NASA for its forethought in pushing ahead on a space station.

□ 1130

THE REPAIR OF SOLAR MAX

(Mr. ANDREWS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the tireless efforts of Comdr. Bob Crippen, Pilot Dick Scobee, Mission Specialists George Nelson, James van Hoften, and Terry Hart, and the engineering team at Goddard Space Flight Center, we have rescued the most ambitious and successful solar flare research program ever attempted. The failure of several fuses in the satellite's attitude control system only 9 months after it was placed in orbit brought the Solar Maximum Mission to an early end, much to the disappointment of scientists throughout the world. While this $77 million satellite has been restored at one-quarter of its replacement cost, through this historic demonstration, we have closed the door forever on the era of multimillion throwaway spacecrafts.

Now that Solar Max has been repaired, we can get on with the critical observations of solar flare activity which, in time, will divulge solutions to stubborn puzzles about our own weather and climate patterns. Further, solar flares influence the intensity and composition of solar radiation and matter that bombard Earth. Magnetic storms in space that result from solar flares disrupt communications, endanger orbiting spacecraft, damage power stations and pipelines, and alter the chemistry and physics of the atmosphere. Many questions remain unanswered. Continued monitoring over many solar cycles may be necessary before convincing correlations can be drawn. That is the promise of Solar Max, and that is the debt we owe the courageous scientists and engineers that brought a hard-won success from this last, historic shuttle flight.

WHEN WILL IT EVER END?

(Mr. ANDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the massive buildup of our dairy surplus continues. Even though Congress enacted legislation, which I supported, to distribute surplus cheese and dairy products to the needy last year, an April 24 article by columnist Jack Anderson in the Washington Post illuminates how we must find more effective ways to reduce our stockpile of dairy products. The article follows:

The federal government's massive giveaway of cheese not only was supposed to feed the hungry but also cut down on surplus cheese stocks in government warehouses. It seems the giveaway allowed some consumers to stop buying cheese at the supermarket. So the government's stockpile of surplus cheese has grown from 619 million pounds in 1981, to 1 billion pounds last year. The cost of the government's purchase of surplus cheese and butter went from $1.3 billion in 1979, to $2.8 billion in 1983.

We must do something to curtail the production of surplus dairy products in this country before we find ourselves literally buried under mountains of dried milk, cheese, and butter.

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS TEAM COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT

(Ms. MIKULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, weeks ago, in the middle of the night, the Baltimore Colts were stolen from our city.

They took 15 truckloads of trophies and equipment. They left behind an empty stadium and a million broken hearts.

For 31 years, Baltimore cheered our Colts on to three world championships. We stood by them in good times and we supported them in bad.

In moving the team, the Colts owner shopped from city to city as if he were looking for a site for a fast food franchise.

Sports teams should be allowed to leave cities for financial need—but not for financial greed.

Baltimore is not the only city to face this. Oakland lost its Raiders; New York lost its Jets; and now, other cities may lose their teams.

That is why I have introduced a bill to give hometown cities the right of first refusal if a sports team wants to move.

It requires an arbitration panel to decide whether a team has valid reasons for leaving a city—reasons like they are losing money or they are having to play in an outdated stadium.

Sport teams are a source of revenue for cities and they are a source of community pride. Both should be protected. This bill does just that.

LET US PAUSE AND REFLECT

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing Robert Kennedy, but not his son David. Their lives clearly were closely intertwined in moments of high joy and those of deep tragedy.

I hope that all of us will pause today to reflect on the heavy, indeed the very heavy cost of the use of violence,

both for the individual victims and for society at large. The seeds of violence can produce more than one harvest of bitter fruit. My heart goes out today with millions of others to Ethel and the entire Kennedy family.

DRIFTING TOWARD CALAMITY

(Mr. SIMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, we tend not to pay attention to international crises until they erupt. There is one area that is drifting toward calamity that we ought to be paying attention to, and this administration ought to move aggressively on, and that is the Cyprus situation.

Right now, in Cyprus, there are some small shreds of hope. For example, the Greek and Turkish side cooperate on the water system in Nicosia, but the declaration of Turkish independence by one side is an omen for ill that ought to be paid attention to before it erupts and is in the headlines of every newspaper in this country.

I hope this administration will move aggressively to try to bring the two sides together to work something out on the island of Cyprus.

WHO STANDS IN THE WAY OF VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER, A BALANCED BUDGET, AND LINE-ITEM VETO?

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would hope to offer a unanimous-consent request calling for consideration of amendments to permit voluntary school prayer, balanced budget, and line-item veto.

The Chair has ruled that in order to make these requests I must have the clearance of the majority (Democrat) and minority (Republican) leaderships. This request has been cleared by the minority leadership; I would now yield to a spokesman from the majority leadership for appropriate clearance.

Mr. Speaker, I hear no response. That should make it clear to the American people who stands in the way of these three important issues: The Democratic leadership of the House.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2262

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 2262.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

MANIFOLD BENEFITS OF THE SPACE SHUTTLE

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take 1 minute to discuss the recent flight of the space shuttle on mission 41C. This mission, in particular, highlights the reasons for my enthusiasm for our Nation's space program. Each time the shuttle completes another mission, we have been continually thrilled with NASA's ability to successfully complete complex and challenging activities. The recent missions have made clear the enormous potential the shuttle offers us to expand our ability to do things in space. We are using the shuttle to develop new products—pharmaceuticals, alloys, semiconductors, and so forth—that will someday be valuable parts of our national economy. We are using the shuttle to develop more capability to operate in space. For example, in this last mission, the long duration exposure facility was put into orbit. This project will enable us to understand must better the effects of long-term exposure in space. There are 57 experiments that mark the beginning of a broad research program in space to test new technologies that will be required for future space missions.

The repair of the solar maximum mission further points out our expanding ability to operate in space. Now, not only can we launch satellites with a high rate of success, but NASA has shown that we can retrieve malfunctioning spacecraft and repair them, all without returning to Earth.

But all this drama detracts from another important aspect. We are using the shuttle—and our ability to perform complex activities in space—to do the basic research that will expand our knowledge and understanding of the Earth, the Sun, and the solar system. The solar maximum spacecraft that was repaired is critical to the long-term study of the Sun. The solar maximum mission will help scientists understand how the Sun works, how solar events affect the Earth's weather and communications, and the sunspot cycles.

I am delighted to see that attention is now being directed to what we can and will do in space—not simply in just getting there. This was the greatest thrill of the 41C mission this month.

OUTRAGEOUS COST OVERRUNS MUST CEASE

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1982, the President of the United States issued Executive Order 12352 which dealt with Federal procurement reform. Included in this order was subsection (c) of section 1 which stated that the Office of Federal Procurement Policy be ordered to "insure timely satisfaction of mission needs at reasonable prices by establishing criteria to improve the effectiveness of the procurement systems."

Yet today, over 2 years later, I hold in my hand a 79-cent light bulb that under the so-called reformed Federal procurement system cost the Government $435. If the average taxpayer had to pay out this outrageous amount of money for a simple light bulb, there would be quite a few households in this country left in the dark.

However, it is the Federal Government that has been left in the dark—leaving many of our officials with the inability to see that something has to be done about Federal procurement practices. Cost overruns and sole-source contract abuse must be eliminated.

These cost overruns have frequently occurred in the procurement of spare parts. The Department of Defense's shortcomings in this area have cost the taxpayers an unnecessary $9 billion. Payments of $9,100 for an Allen wrench or $23,000 for an assortment of washers and bolts are a result of sole-source procurement system that lock major contractors into the Federal Government's trough.

Reform in this spare parts procurement is needed in the areas of technical data rights, the certificate of competency program, and the ability of small business to have access to and be included on the DOD's qualified bidders list. Changes in each of these three fields would save the taxpayer a tremendous amount of money. In a year where the main topic of conversation is deficit reduction, would not spare parts procurement reform make a lot of dollarwise sense?

I urge my colleagues to review my bill, H.R. 4092, the Small Business Competitive Procurement Act which deals with each of the above areas. I believe that through positive initiative such as this, the Congress can effectively deal with Federal procurement imperfections and waste.

The Congress of the United States has acted on this matter before. In December 1982, the Congressional Commission on Government Procurement (COGP) suggested 149 recommendations which covered a wide range of procurement topics and issues. Acquisition of major systems, commercial products, research and development programs were some of those issues. It

has been 2 years and still a large number of these recommendations have not been carried out.

The time for change is now. Let us rid ourselves of the horror stories that cost overruns rain on us through responsible action. Legislative initiative and reform will enable the Federal Government to purchase a light bulb for 79 cents and, once and for all, the Federal Government come in from the dark.

NEED FOR CONSTITUTIONAL DEATH PENALTY

(Mr. DEWINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. Speaker, in February, the other Chamber passed a comprehensive, constitutional death penalty. But here in this body, that bill lies dormant because the majority leadership deems such legislation too controversial. Why is it too controversial to protect society from the violent criminal? Why is is too controversial to protect our prison guards from the most violent of inmates?

As a member of the subcommittee that has oversight responsibilites for the Bureau of Prisons, I have listened to testimony describing the brutal murders of prison guards by inmates already serving life sentences for other brutal murders. These violent killers, who have killed before—often a number of times—have nothing to lose in killing again. There is no deterrent. They cannot get a worse punishment than the life sentence they are already serving.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better or more shocking example of the need for a constitutional death penalty than this situation. We cannot allow this to continue. We owe our prison guards more protection than we are giving them now. We cannot tolerate "open season" on prison guards by these inhuman killers. Let us pass a constitutional death penalty.

□ 1140

HOUSE ACTION NEEDED ON CRIME REFORM LEGISLATION

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, very seldom do issues present themselves before this Congress which should draw unanimous, bipartisan concern for immediate action. When they do, there is an unusual effort to deal with them. This is why I am a bit confused now over the House Democrat leadership's refusal to allow any portion of the President's crime package to come to the floor for consideration.

I understand that there are several points in the 42-point proposal that are controversial. But there are also many more points which would institute badly needed reforms on our Federal Criminal Code. It has been almost 14 years since Congress last acted on this issue.

It is interesting to note that the other body was able to separate some of the more controversial points of the crime package and pass almost unanimously a crime reform bill. It seems to me that if Senator THURMOND and Senator KENNEDY can come to an agreement that produces action, we should be able to do likewise in this House.

Concern for crime is widespread. It is shared by conservatives and liberals; Republicans and Democrats; the rich and the poor. There is nothing to be gained by preventing this issue a fair hearing. There is everything to lose by failing to act.

I would hate for my constituents to think that the House leadership did not care about this issue—it is so important to them. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to please reconsider and allow this package to come to the floor.

PRESIDENT'S HISTORIC MISSION TO CHINA

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is now embarked on a historic mission to the large, great country of China. This event is a natural follow-up to the breakthrough that was made by President Nixon in his time, in which the foreign policy decision was made that neither the United States nor the free world could afford isolating that great area of the world.

Now is the time for every American citizen to pray for the success of that mission, not only to open up these new channels of trade and diplomatic exchanges that are just a natural outcome of such visitations, but also because recognizing the mass of people that China represents and its station in the world and in the posture of peacemaking as we should know it, this is a grand opportunity for the United States of America to weld together new ties that can guarantee peace in our time and peace in the next time for our children.

WEAK FEDERAL BAIL LAWS

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, on November 27, 1982, George Gibbs was taken into Federal custody for robbery of the Detroit Teachers Credit Union. That robbery was a violent one as Gibbs pistol-whipped the credit union security officer and held a gun to the head of a teller threatening to kill her. The evidence against George Gibbs was strong as he was in possession of the pistol he had stolen from the security guard at the time he was arrested—he was in a stolen car, incidently—and Gibbs was positively identified by two victims.

Despite the fact that the U.S. attorney's office for the Eastern District of Michigan urged a high bail in light of the danger that Gibbs posed to the community, the U.S. magistrate ruled that bail is intended solely to assume appearance at trial and set bail at $25,000, 10 percent cash. The U.S. attorney's office appealed this ruling to the U.S. district judge who modified the magistrate's order to require a $25,000 cash bond but otherwise refused to overturn the ruling of the magistrate.

On December 2, Gibbs made bail. Four days later, Gibbs and a partner held up the Fidelity Bank of Southfield, a suburb of Detroit. During the course of the robbery, Gibbs struck a teller and threatened to kill an assistant manager. In fleeing the scene, Gibbs and his partner were pursued by Officer Robert Diegel, a lone officer in a police scout car. A shootout occurred in which Officer Diegel was wounded. Gibbs was approaching the wounded officer, apparently intent upon killing Officer Diegel, when other Southfield officers arrived on the scene arresting Gibbs and his partner. Had they arrived seconds later, Officer Diegel would have been a statistic today.

There have been far too many cases like that of George Gibbs because of weak Federal bail laws. The citizens of this Nation and our law enforcement officers deserve better from the Congress of the United States. We must stop the revolving door that current bail laws have created. We must enact President Reagan's bail reform measures in H.R. 2151.

THE SOLAR MAX REPAIR MISSION

(Mr. CHANDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise also today to congratulate the crew of the space shuttle *Challenger* and the whole NASA team for the successful completion of the solar Max repair mission. This success confirms that the space shuttle is, indeed, the primary component in a new era of commerical and scientific outer space utilization.

That the crew of the *Challenger* was able to repair and extend the life of

the Solar Max satellite is, of course, a boon to solar flare research. More importantly, this mission proves that the shuttle can perform one of its primary missions: the repair and deployment of satellites while in orbit. Previously, when a satellite was crippled by a simple problem like a blown fuse, the opportunity to extend human knowledge was lost, along with a lot of effort and money. Now, the space shuttle, along with a new generation of satellites designed to be repaired in orbit, will eliminate this waste. It is estimated that repairing the Solar Max cost only one-quarter of the replacement cost of this satellite. Also, the need for expensive backup components on satellites has largely vanished in the face of the shuttle's proven ability to perform repairs.

Finally, I would like to commend the whole shuttle team for the perseverance and ingenuity they showed in solving the problems which arose at the beginning of the mission. This further proves now invaluable the shuttle's versatility is to America's success in space.

WE NEED CERTAINTY AND SWIFTNESS IN SENTENCING PROCESS

(Mr. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, in recent years a number of criminologists have issued statements or declarations indicating their belief that deterrence no longer should be considered a goal of sentencing in the criminal laws. I think that is an absurd conclusion, but I understand why some might reach this conclusion is because we no longer have certainty and swiftness in our sentencing process. We do not carry out the sentences once they are given, so how can we expect any criminals or would-be criminals to be deterred.

What we must do is put that certainty and swiftness back into our sentences again. What happens is that after a State court conviction and the sentence occurs, an appeal is taken all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. Once that has been upheld, the sentence and the conviction, then we see the criminal going back into Federal district court seeking another avenue of relief through habeas corpus petitions, usually claiming that he was not represented adequately by counsel.

That is appealed all the way again to the U.S. Supreme Court. Then he is back into Federal district court again, and the process goes on and some other issue again and again and again and again.

There is a bill that is in the Criminal Justice Subcommittee of this Congress that has been there for some time that would remedy this problem. It is endorsed by all of the attorneys general of all the States of the Union, and by the U.S. Attorney General, but that bill, which would limit the opportunity for the criminal to do this repetitive kind of going back into the Federal district court again and again, is being held up by the Democratic leadership of this House. It is not being allowed to come out for a vote. It is a part of the President's criminal package. We ought to demand that it come out for a vote now and solve this problem.

CONGRESS: BAG IT

(Mr. WEBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, for several months now we have heard rumors that the majority intends either in this session or the next session of Congress to launch an attack on the people's right to know by restricting C-SPAN coverage of the Congress and the video taping thereof. We now find that there is substance to those rumors, and that the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee intends at some future date to submit a rules change that would, in effect, force the censure of any Member who used video taping of the House proceedings in his campaign.

In response to this attack on the people's right to know, the Washington Post today editorialized in an editorial entitled, "Congress: Bag It!" with a suggestion. They said, and we quote:

> We have another suggestion. Any member of the Congress who doesn't want his constituents to know what he says on the floor of the House should follow the example of undercover witnesses hiding out from mobsters or of spies defecting from the KGB. You've seen these people testifying before committees with paper bags over their heads—very dramatic.

Continuing to quote the Post, they say:

> Why couldn't House members adopt this simple, inexpensive practice themselves? Before they get to the microphones or the well of the House, they could simply cover their heads with a hood, ski mask or brown bag and speak through one of those voice-distorting devices.

Mr. Speaker, it would be funny if it were not so sad. The attack is not on the minority; the attack is on the people's right to know, and this is only the first step.

The full editorial follows:

CONGRESS: BAG IT!

Members of the House of Representatives are in high dudgeon, and no wonder. Candidates running against them—and maybe even some colleagues as well—are planning to resort to a campaign tactic that is widely regarded as foul play. Following the example of one G. Douglas Stephens, who ran against and nearly upset House Republican Leader Robert Michel in 1982, they are planning to use videotape segments of the incumbents speaking before the House. These tapes have been broadcast by C-SPAN (with cameras controlled by the House) for six years, but Mr. Stephens was the first candidate dastardly enough actually to broadcast a clip of what his opponent was saying in an open session of the House. Can you imagine? He has a nerve.

Mr. Stephens was following what some House members may regard as a long road downhill from the golden days of the 18th century, when the British House of Commons prohibited any report of what was said in debate. To get around that ban, the story goes, publishers sent to the galleries reporters capable of memorizing two or three hours of debate and writing it down, with quill pens, immediately afterward. The videotapes are today's technological equivalent of those reporters, and they are even more reliable than the Congressional Record, in which members can correct, revise, extend and greatly pretty up their remarks. That seems to irk some congressmen, who want to discipline members or successful challengers who use the tapes.

We have another suggestion. Any member of Congress who doesn't want his constituents to know what he says on the floor of the House should follow the example of undercover witnesses hiding out from mobsters or of spies defecting from the KGB. You've seen these people testifying before committees with paper bags over their heads—very dramatic.

Why couldn't House members adopt this simple, inexpensive and efficient practice themselves? Before they get to the microphones or the well of the House, they could simply cover their heads with a hood, ski mask or brown bag and speak through one of those voice-distorting devices. That way they could always deny that they were the ones in the videotape. Surely the voters wouldn't object—unless they have some crazy idea that they are entitled to know what their representatives are saying in Congress.

□ 1150

THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the good news: A Federal Express employee alerted narcotics agents when he found a number of bags of white powder in a broken package. The agents tested that powder and found that it was cocaine. Based on this evidence, they got a search warrant for the property of the consignee and convicted a ring of dope smugglers.

The bad news: A Federal court reversed the conviction, arguing that the agents should have gotten a search warrant even to test the powder.

Society cannot survive when its people are forced to live under illogical rules of this type. If we do not do something about the exclusionary rule, we will find ourselves looking for other work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to allow the Senate-passed bill to come to the floor of the House at once.

THE SPENDING PRIORITIES OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, during yesterday's debate I attempted to raise the question of whether this House has any sense of spending priorities whatsoever. Before our colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), cut off my opportunity to fully debate this issue, evidently because she did not like to hear the kind of wasteful spending that may be going on, I sought to point out that we were increasing the deficit in order to fund programs of at least questionable description.

Let us be clear. Yesterday a majority of this House voted for an add-on deficit to fund the National Science Foundation despite the fact that they were told that the money was likely to be spent on programs which most Americans would find unbelievable. Among the programs funded thus far with these moneys are $120,000 to study the nervous system of leeches, $55,000 to study interaction in telephone surveys, $61,000 for something called extrinsic constraints and intrinsic motivation, $61,000 to study the equilibria of games, and $19,000 to study the social ecology of free-ranging coyotes.

Maybe there is some merit in some of these studies—maybe. But the question is, should we be adding to our national deficit to fund such efforts?

Anyone who voted for the add-on deficit to pay for that kind of spending cannot be trusted with the public purse. Interestingly, when I examine the record, I find that many of the people who voted for the deficit add-on yesterday are the same people who voted to raise their own pay just 2 weeks ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Florida). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) has expired.

THE LEGENDARY CHICAGO CUBS IN THEIR QUEST FOR FIRST PLACE

(Mr. HILLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed in discussing ponderous issues such as El Salvador, the Federal deficit, and the Vermont caucus, I think we need to take the time to recognize a truly extraordinary event.

Tuesday night, at 11:07 p.m. Washington time, the Chicago Cubs defeated the St. Louis Cardinals 3 to 2 and moved into sole possession of first place in the National League's eastern division.

I was going to say something about this yesterday during the 1 minute, but my schedule did not allow it. That was too bad because last night the Cubs lost to the Cardinals and fell out of first. Glory has always been a brief and fleeting thing for the Cubs.

The misfortunes and miscues of the Cubs are legendary in the annals of baseball. The lovable losers of Wrigley Field always find a way to snatch defeat from the jaws of certain victory.

Over the years, their incompetence has won the hearts of millions from coast to coast. You have never really enjoyed the essence of the national pastime until you have watched the Cubs blow a five-run lead in the ninth.

But what would happen if the Thomas Deweys of baseball actually started to win? What would happen to the thousands of foul weather fans who always vote for Harold Stassen, own Corvairs and build their homes on the San Andreas fault?

Who will they turn to in their hour of need? The Seattle Mariners?

TELEPHONE ACCESS CHARGES ARE BAD NEWS FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

(Mr. WYDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago 184 of our colleagues joined the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) and I in a letter requesting the Federal Communications Commission to hold off on imposing telephone access charges on our Nation's businesses. If these charges go into effect now at their present rate of $6 a month per line, many of our Nation's small businesses will pay more for the privilege of having the opportunity to make long distance calls than they would pay for the long distance calls that they actually make.

Mr. Speaker, originally supporters of telephone access charges on our businesses said that long distance rates would go down by 10 percent or more if access charges were implemented, but last weekend in an interview with the Washington Post FCC Chairman Fowler said that any rate reductions would be far less.

Mr. Speaker, the present plan to put access telephone charges on small businesses is bad news, and if implemented it surely would hamper the effort to stimulate economic growth in our country.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORTS CONTROVERSIAL NSF RESEARCH PROJECTS

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, decided to take up the issue of the titles of research projects again this morning, as he did yesterday. I think he has weakened his own case in doing so, and I hope he will reconsider his arguments.

He has a legitimate argument against a bill which goes beyond the President's request. It is not a very good argument, but it is legitimate. Each one of the research projects within that bill, however, has been carefully screened by appointees of the President, and they represent the best science that is available today. I have commended the administration for this improvement and for its commitment to the quality of the science that is being supported by the NSF.

The items which were above the President's budget were none of these research projects. Instead, they were for the funding of advanced computer capability in universities, and for additional fellowships for graduate training in science. Now, these can legitimately be attacked, and they were on the floor, but for the gentleman to attack research projects indiscriminately because he does not like their titles shows an unawareness of the significance of the research represented by these titles. The first one he mentioned, for example, involving the nervous system of the leech, is typical. Considerable observation of the nervous systems of lower animals has resulted in choosing the leech as an organism with a simple, easily observed system from which much can be learned about how stimuli are transmitted in the nervous system of higher animals, including humans. Based on this research major new knowledge has been acquired relevant to the human brain and nervous system. The lowly leech has contributed to the betterment of mankind in many surprising ways, as good science generally does, even though we may not always know how that will happen.

AN UPDATE ON CRIME LEGISLATION BEFORE THE CONGRESS

(Mr. HUGHES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of rhetoric in this Chamber in the last couple of days about crime, much of which I think has some merit but a great deal

of which is confusing and has absolutely no merit whatsoever.

My colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), I think, made a very good point about bail reform, and I share his sentiments about the need to put into the law provisions which would enable the court to take into account danger to the community.

Unfortunately, our Subcommittee on Crime, of which my colleague is a distinguished member, does not have jurisdiction over that particular provision, and that is somewhat controversial and we are having some difficulty with it. But for the Members to suggest, for instance, that the exclusionary rule and habeas corpus and the death penalty are in the President's Omnibus Crime Control Act indicates to me that they have not, first of all, read the bill.

For Members to come into this well and suggest that this Congress is not passing major crime legislation is absolutely baseless. We have a major bill over in the other body that has been gathering dust since May of last year. It is called the Justice Assistance Act of 1983. If you ask the International District Attorneys Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, the International Chiefs of Police, and local law enforcement agencies around the country what their No. 1 priority is, they would tell you the Justice Assistance Act.

Well over 90 percent of street crime is within the jurisdiction of local police—not Federal agencies—and the justice assistance bill provides much needed assistance to our local agencies.

Mr. Speaker, today we marked up another one of the items of the President's crime package, the Diversion Control Act. That and about five other measures are moving through the legislative process and will be before the Congress in the coming days. Measures such as credit card fraud, computer crime, trademark counterfeiting, and subpena powers for the President's Crime Commission are being processed by the Subcommittee on Crime.

In addition the Congress has passed and the President has signed an antitampering bill. Child pornography, the so-called drug czar, extradition reform, and pharmacy robbery are all moving through the Congress. Let us lower the rhetoric and keep crime a nonpartisan issue.

THE MANDATORY SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, during this week we have again heard from the minority and from the President suggestions that the House release what they refer to as the voluntary school prayer amendment.

What both the minority and the President forget to tell this House and the American people is, first, the school prayer they support is not voluntary, rather it is mandatory. We now have voluntary school prayer in the United States. The Constitution of the United States allows that. What they support is mandatory school prayer; the Government shall write or designate the writing of a prayer, and then students in the class must say that prayer. That is mandatory school prayer.

The second thing they forget to tell us is that the Senate just considered this mandatory school prayer amendment and overwhelmingly turned it down, both Republicans and Democrats, as they should have. They have, therefore, protected the rights of American schoolchildren to voluntary school prayer.

□ 1200

SILENT PRAYER A VIOLATION OF PRINCIPLE

(Mr. KINDNESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the necessity arises once again to correct the impressions created by those who are against prayer in the schools. To speak of voluntary prayer only in terms of silence is a violation of the principle, if not the letter, of the first amendment right that we all have to freedom of speech. For freedom of speech to extend freely to discussions of Marxism or Leninism or a variety of economic theories, but not to extend to words of prayer is a reprehensible thought, it seems to me, a concept that we cannot abide in our free society, much less support with specious arguments.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2570, TO CONTINUE TRANSITION PROVISIONS OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT UNTIL MAY 26, 1984

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 490 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 490

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House, without intervening motion, the bill (S. 2570) to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes, said bill shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for the consideration of a bill received from the Senate (S. 2570) which will extend existing bankruptcy law for an additional 25 days.

Neither the bill nor the rule is completely without controversy, Mr. Speaker. But I think there is a general understanding that the Congress has rather little choice as regards the procedure recommended by the committee.

The rule provides for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill, in the House. As Members understand, this procedure is similar to a closed rule.

The process of revising bankruptcy law, to comply with the Supreme Court ruling in the Marathon case, has been very difficult. I think the Members are quite familiar with both the procedural and the political history. Nevertheless, it is probably appropriate to outline the current situation.

In June 1982, the Supreme Court ruled that the article I judgeships, under the 1978 bankruptcy law, were unconstitutional.

During the brief period left in the previous Congress, after that ruling, efforts were made to resolve the issue legislatively, but were unsuccessful.

During the present Congress, the issue has become quite difficult because of a dispute over the issue of reconstituting the bankruptcy courts as article III courts, as recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, or revising the courts' authorities to make article I courts acceptable, within the terms of the Supreme Court ruling.

The progress of the legislation was also made more difficult by disputes over changes in bankruptcy law proposed to be offered as amendments to the court bill.

Mr. Speaker, during most of this Congress, a transition rule, issued by the Federal judiciary, has made it possible for bankruptcy law to continue to be administered under the supervision of the district courts.

However, the 1978 law contains a sunset which made it impossible for the interim rule to operate beyond March 31 of this year.

By the time that deadline loomed, both the House and the Senate had agreed to bills on the subject. The broad outlines of the final positions of the two Houses are quite similar. Both

Houses had agreed to codify a system similar to the existing interim rule and both Houses had agreed to make some changes in bankruptcy law. However, there are differences between those changes and a question over the creation of some additional article III judgeships, as proposed by the Senate.

These issues remained in negotiation when the final deadline of March 31 approached. On March 30, both Houses handled legislation to extend that deadline by 30 days, and the President signed the bill.

During the period of the extension, negotiations similar to a conference have been in progress. However, neither House has formally acted on the bills proposed by the other, so a formal conference cannot be appointed.

In anticipation of the Easter district work period, the majority leader in the other body submitted a bill (S. 2570) to allow a further modest extension of 25 days. At the other body's request, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary attempted to present that bill to the House on the evening of April 12 but unanimous consent was not obtained.

The Committee on Rules met yesterday for the purpose of providing a procedure to consider the bill and has recommended a rather expedited rule that will enable the House to handle this simple extension.

I am aware of no controversy over the rule, except for a request made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KINDNESS), to make in order a nongermane amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I think I am required to place into the record, my impression of the general attitude of the Rules Committee in acting on this resolution. I do not think the committee feels it has any choice in the matter now before the House.

However, I think the attitude of the committee is fully in accord with the general concensus of this body. The major issues concerned in bankruptcy have been fought out. And the positions of the two bodies on the major issues are not too dissimilar.

It is now time to resolve the bankruptcy issue, either by conference or otherwise, and to place the matter before the two houses for final action.

Mr. Speaker, I am simply not in a position to assure the House that S. 2570 is the final extension that will be handled before that final resolution. But I think everyone involved understands the general mood of the Congress, and the committee and the House can be expected to face subsequent extensions with increasing reluctance.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I rise in support of this rule. But, true to form, we are up against yet another bankruptcy court deadline. This whole scenario is beginning to make the "Perils of Pauline" look like a Sunday snooze cruise on a slow boat to nowhere.

We have been jerking the Federal bankruptcy courts around like a yo-yo ever since June of 1982 when the Supreme Court ruled in the Marathon case that the existing system was unconstitutional. At that time the Court gave Congress until October 4, 1982, to correct the situation; and, when we did not, the Court further extended the deadline to December 24. Still there was no congressional solution. When the Court denied another stay, the Judicial Conference issued an interim, emergency rule under which the bankruptcy courts have been operating ever since.

Mr. Speaker, in February of last year our House Judiciary Committee reported its bankruptcy bill, H.R. 3, but that bill reposed in the Rules Committee for over a year due to the chairman's reluctance to take his chances with some amendments he did not want. In the interim, the other body passed its bankruptcy bill, S. 1013, in April of last year.

The House deadlock was finally broken this past March when the Judiciary chairman agreed to a compromise that would include the consumer bankruptcy provisions as well as his own labor bankruptcy provisions, and a rule that would permit the offering of the Kindness-Kastenmeier bankruptcy court alternative—placing the courts under the district courts, rather than providing for life-tenured judges. That was the version that finally prevailed in the House on March 21 of this year—just 9 short days away from the potential collapse of the whole bankruptcy system.

When there was no quick compromise forthcoming between the House and Senate versions, the other body sent us a 30-day statutory extension of the interim rule on March 30, and that was passed and signed by the President.

Now, here we are back again on another extension request—this one that would carry us to May 25. And I have no doubt there are some who came out on the short end of the court system dispute last month who would like to continue with these extensions right into the next Congress, in hopes of getting a better shake.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I for one want to put those parties on notice here and now that this darn well better be the last extension of this sort. This House is not going to stand for much more of this little yo-yo derby in which the string jerkers come crying to us at the last minute that their string will snap unless we extend it just a little bit more. The American people do not want a Congress that plays with yo-yo's; they want a Congress that will take decisive action and put our bankruptcy courts on a sound and permanent footing once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering clearly reflects the emergency nature of this situation if we are to get a bill to the President overseas to meet this deadline. The rule provides for the consideration of S. 2570 in the House instead of the Committee of the Whole, meaning no amendments will be in order. The rule does provide for 1-hour of general debate to be divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, whereas ordinarily a bill considered in the House is controlled exclusively by the manager under the hour rule. The rule also preserves the right of the minority to offer a motion to recommit—something which the Rules Committee cannot deny under House Rules. But otherwise, this is a pretty airtight rule.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again in conclusion that I reluctantly support this rule and unusual procedure as necessary to extract ourselves from this self-inflicted emergency situation. But I again want to make clear that we clearly expect this to be the last extension and therefore urge those negotiating on the bankruptcy bill to resolve their differences within this additional 25-day period.

□ 1210

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KINDNESS).

Mr. KINDNESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

I would like to make it clear first of all that I do not oppose this rule. As a matter of fact, I support this rule. I support it because it is what we have, that is what we have to deal with.

I would like to have seen a rule that would have brought the matter before the Committee of the Whole House, that would have allowed at least an amendment to be considered. I take this time on the debate of the rule to describe the situation for the same purpose that I asked to be heard by the Rules Committee yesterday about the matter.

We have played around with bankruptcy long enough. We have played around with the matter of how the bankruptcy courts will be structured and what the judges will be like. That part of it has a time factor affecting it. That part ought to have been settled before now. It really should be settled now.

That is why we have to have the time extension, however, because, again, time has run out on us.

There are other matters, substantive matters, bankruptcy law changes that do not have any time element really affecting them. So why should we not today, instead of simply voting to extend the time of the present ar-

rangement of the bankruptcy courts in this temporary status, instead of just doing that, why should we not amend the bill that will be brought before us by this rule, amend it so as to vote again on exactly what the House voted on before with respect to the bankruptcy judges and the procedure and how the bankruptcy courts will operate, not the substantive matters, just the bankruptcy court part of it?

If we do that again, just as we have done before by a good margin, that would then be sending over to the other body a clear opportunity for the other body as well as this House to separate out those two types of problems: the bankruptcy courts problem on the one hand and the substantive matters on the other hand.

The controversy is with the labor contract provisions and the consumer bankruptcy provisions and what should be added or subtracted from those, all of which have been subject to a very small degree, if any, of hearings and study in either House. So why do we not do what we know we are doing, what we know what to do with, the court's part?

If we are confronted with another request for an extension of time I think a very strong move should develop to say "no," this time we are going to try to do just what I have described, to amend the bill that extends the time again, if the Rules Committee will but give us that opportunity, and to clearly separate out from the other substantive matters this one thing that does have to be dealt with, should have been dealt with a long time ago, and it has been held up unmercifully. It should be dealt with today for that matter.

We could, I think, have had an interesting opportunity to just end all of the unreasonableness of the handling of the bankruptcy matter. We could have brought it back into the area of reason and rationality. The House and Senate versions are not very different.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINDNESS. I yield to the gentleman from California briefly.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I think it should be made clear, and I know the gentleman form Ohio agrees with me, that this is exactly what the Judiciary Committee did more than a year ago, in February 1983. It sent to the Rules Committee the bill passed by and reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee with a request for an open rule at that time, and it has lain in the Rules Committee for more than a year because of requests for certain nongermane amendments.

Mr. KINDNESS. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I guess I must have failed to get my point across because what I have been attempting to say is that now that we have reached this stage in the procedure where the other body says we cannot get all of these problems resolved in time, before the deadline runs out, then let us extend that time.

I am saying let us send them a message back that says look, we have both Houses having acted once on this matter and let us deal with the court's part of it and put the rest aside to be dealt with as the gentleman would prefer, I would take it.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I think also the gentleman from Ohio realizes that that is an impractical suggestion because the President must sign the bill. He is in China. As a matter of fact, if we pass the bill today a special trip will have to be made; a special airplane must be sent at great expense from Washington, D.C. to Shanghai so that the President can sign the bill.

Mr. KINDNESS. Again, I believe the gentleman may have information that differs from the information I have, which does not coincide with what has just been stated, that the logistics for the handling of the President's signature would relate to another geographic location and would not require a trip to China.

But no matter what the subject matter that is taken up or the scope of it with regard to bankruptcy today, we have got to have the President's signature before the time runs out. And it would be a lot simpler to do if we are just dealing with the bankruptcy court and procedure part and not these other matters that are goofing up the process.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINDNESS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the gentleman from California also forgets that available to the Judiciary Committee was the Calendar Wednesday procedure on many, many weeks during this session where the Rules Committee could have been bypassed, where the Judiciary Committee could have called this bill to the floor and refused to do so.

Specifically the Judiciary Committee chairman could have come to the floor, called the bill up, and he refused to do so. So the Rules Committee was not the holdup. In fact, the holdup was the fact that the Judiciary Committee was trying to work out their own deal.

Mr. KINDNESS. No question about it, this matter has been dealt with in a shabby manner. It is about time we started to get the bankruptcy courts operating on a predictable basis. Let these other issues be compromised or dealt with as best they can be, but they are completely aside from the basic problem of getting our bankruptcy courts in order and operating, and that is what we really should be dealing with today, not just an extension of time, but getting that matter permanently decided and then let these other matters then be negotiated back room, front room, wherever it is going to be done, I do not care. Let us have our bankruptcy courts operating.

But the next time we come back here with a consideration of an extension of time for this temporary circumstance, there is going to be a firestorm of protest. And we ought to be doing just what I am suggesting we should be doing today.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has any time he would like to yield.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this side has no more requests for time.

□ 1220

Mr. LOTT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to make just one point in response to the gentleman from California's comments about the bill reposing in the Rules Committee for over a year.

You know, I do not know how much blame the Rules Committee may or may not accept in that process.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I had the impression, was trying to keep it from being moved because of some so-called nongermane amendments that were being requested. But I would remind the gentleman that the Rules Committee is still controlled by his side; by the Democratic leadership and by a membership that is 2 to 1 plus 1. It could have been moved anytime the gentleman wanted it moved over there, but the gentleman did not see fit to do it. So we are not going to be shifting that blame to other pieces of legislation. It could have been moved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable reluctance that I rise in opposition to the rule this morning, simply because it is another closed rule that is being brought up to consider a Judiciary Committee bill. If it is not bankruptcy extensions or bankruptcy substantive legislation, or the equal rights amendment or immigration legislation or what have you, it seems that the Judiciary Committee is scared to bring bills up with an open rule so that amendments can be offered and debated and voted on by the House of Representatives.

Part of the legislative process in a deliberative body is to allow the House to work its will on amendments. And again, the Judiciary Committee wants to short-circuit the amending procedure so that we have to consider this bill as presented either up or down

without so much as changing a jot or a tittle.

Now some would ask, why should I get excited about this particular piece of legislation that is merely an extension of time? Well, if the Members will look at their calendars, May 25 is midnight Friday of the time that we are supposed to go out for the Memorial Day recess.

As the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) has indicated in the course of his remarks, the consideration of bankruptcy legislation has been a history of a game of legislative chicken and we do not legislate on bankruptcy until our backs are up against the deadline.

Now, having the date of May 25 contained in this piece of legislation will mean that we will probably be here until 11:59 p.m. Friday night, May 25, resolving this problem.

And I think the Members ought to be advised that that is the deadline that is contained in that bill and make their plane reservations home for the Memorial Day weekend on Saturday morning rather than on Friday or on Thursday night, because you know and I know that the Judiciary Committee is not going to be able to resolve the substantive matter of bankruptcy until we are having the clock strike 12 and the deadline be upon us.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that this extension is necessary. I wish we could amend this bill to have the deadline a couple of days earlier so that we are not backing up against a weekend when everybody is going out of town and we can consider this issue with a clear head and on the merits rather than the fact that we have all got obligations in our district on this major Federal holiday.

Now, why are we here? We are here because the game of legislative chicken has been played on bankruptcy which the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) has adequately outlined. But there is also one other factor that has not been talked about on this floor relative to the obstruction and the obfuscation by the Democratic majority on the House Judiciary Committee.

And that is that they wanted the President of the United States to appoint 227 new article III bankruptcy judges, but they did not want this President of the United States to do it. So all of this delay has been going on for months and months to back us up against the Presidential election so that that President who will be elected next November 6 will make the appointments rather than this President.

Well, I think that shows how hollow all of their statements are that there is a bankruptcy court emergency. If there was an emergency, we could have dealt with this earlier on. We do not need to bring this up under a closed rule.

The May 25 date is asking for trouble. And I would hope that this rule would be voted down so that at least we could be able to consider an earlier date.

I think the gentleman from Mississippi for the time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am not up here to oppose the rule. Like others who have spoken, I think we should support it. I think it is an important thing to move on.

Nor am I up here to yell a lot of criticism about the handling of this bankruptcy matter, though I certainly have been vocal about the time delays involved for some time.

I simply want to take the opportunity to urge my colleagues and those on the committee and those dealing with whatever kind of final product comes out of the conference that goes on this bill to seriously look at one matter that is not in our bill that the other body has in its.

That is a matter affecting several thousands of Americans, particularly a lot of senior citizens, a matter called time-share ownership.

There are people today who buy a very new form of property ownership, an opportunity to use a condominium, to use a hotel facility, to use some resort in my State of Florida and many other areas of the country where there are these facilities, for say a week out of a year every year. They purchase that opportunity for many years to come. They pay their money down. They have that absolute right to use it, as long as that building or that facility or that condominium exists for what ever length of time is agreed on—say 30 years or 100 years.

But under the present bankruptcy laws, a great many of these, most of these people, are not protected if the developer goes bankrupt. And I think it is exceedingly important because we are talking about people who are usually not that well to do who have invested a small portion of their savings in order to have a vacation every year or in order to have an opportunity to come to Florida in the winter, in order to have a piece of property but it is not considered to be owned, technically to be protected by the current bankruptcy laws. And I truly believe that a remedy to this failure of the bankruptcy laws needs immediate attention—at the very least hearings this spring on pending legislation.

But more importantly, if we could expedite it in the conference on this pending legislation, we would all be better off. I take this opportunity of debate to raise the issue again of timeshare ownership and protection under the bankruptcy laws and again urge my colleagues to get on with all of this legislation. It is critical.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN), a member of the committee.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, this rule I guess is necessary to do what has to be done as we find ourselves here again dealing with the bankruptcy bill. It ought to be made crystal clear that we are at a constitutional crisis not because anything the Senate has done, not because anything the President has done, not because anything Members on this side of the aisle have attempted to do, but because the leadership on the other side decided they would hold this bill up for 13 months after we passed it out of our committee last year.

And then within 28 days of the Supreme Court making a unanimous decision with respect to the standard to be utilized in abrogating collective bargaining agreements when a company has filed a chapter 11 for reorganization, we then had to attach something that had no hearings whatsoever, had never been considered by any subcommittee or committee of this House. That is the reason why it is being hung up.

On the Senate side, they thought that if you are going to make a 180-degree change in what the Supreme Court has decided in interpreting the law, you ought to at least have a hearing. So they need some days to have some hearings on this.

That is why we are asking for almost 30 days. The fact of the matter is the easy way to solve this problem would be to drop out the whole question of the Bildisco decision and allow that to come under the normal procedure. But evidently that is not going to happen.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since we have moved with such dispatch on the question dealing with the labor unions' concern, I would like to direct to the Chair a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, it deals with a piece of legislation that has come out of the same committee and is a variation of H.R. 3635, the Child Protection Act of 1983, which we passed 400 to 1 on November 11, 1983.

There was an agreement worked out between the Members of the House and the Senate for a compromise. That went to the Senate. They passed our version, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and it is my information that H.R. 3635 was sent to the Speaker's desk from the Senate on April 2 or 3 of this year.

My parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is: Is H.R. 3635 presently at the Speaker's desk?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, does that mean that the Senate amendment, H.R. 3635, has not yet been referred to a committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LUNGREN. And can the Chair inform me at this time and inform the House as to what procedure might be available to us at this time to allow for immediate consideration of that Senate amendment?

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the Chair would only recognize for a request by the chairman or another member if authorized by the committee.

Mr. LUNGREN. Authorization of the committee, that means authorization of the Democratic leadership?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Authorization of the committee.

Mr. LUNGREN. Does the Chair mean that it takes an official vote of the committee or an agreement by the chairman of the committee itself?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker would look to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LUNGREN. And failing that, the only other way to bring it up would be under a unanimous-consent request by a Member of this body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the Speaker for that information.

I would just point at this time that this speaks very poorly about this House. This is the third or fourth time we have revisited this to get another extension.

So here we are revisiting this question of bankruptcy. It is the court situation that has to be dealt with. We all know that, but we knew that 13 months ago when we passed it out of the Judiciary Committee. It was held in abeyance because members of the leadership on the other side did not want us to deal with other issues. But once the Supreme Court made their decision with respect to major labor unions in this country, that whole question changed and legislation concerning it was forced on us within 28 days of the Supreme Court decision.

In contrast, a very serious question, about which there is bipartisan support, the Child Protection Act, better known as the child pornography bill languishes at the Speaker's desk for a month while we take care of other less significant legislation—I am not referring to this as insignificant—but other pieces of legislation that certainly do not have the priority that that ought to have.

One just has to question what are the priorities in this House when I have been instructed by the Speaker today the Democratic chairman, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, could bring up the child pornography bill at any time. We have not done it since April 2, even though it has been available to us. But at the same time we again and again court the major labor unions of this country by making sure that we do not do anything they would consider to be even the slightest insult. We now have to jump through this hoop again because we need 30 days to investigate what it is we did. Most Members, I am sure, are not fully aware of what it is we did when we passed this bankruptcy bill just a few weeks ago, because major portions had no hearings. We had no report, and basically we were working on guesswork.

Mr. Speaker, even though I do not object to this rule, I think it is a sad comment on the way this House is operating at the present time and unfortunately, a very sad comment on the committee upon which I am privileged to serve, the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, what we have here is one more dark chapter in a very shabby legislative legacy and I think that the shabbiness of that legacy has been pointed out by what the gentleman from California has just said.

In other words, if you are a big labor boss and you want something out of this Congress you can get it within a few days out of the Judiciary Committee. If you are a parent worried about exposure of your children to pornography of the most disgusting kind, you cannot get action out of this Congress.

I think that says something very, very bad. It says something about the way we operate around here.

This rule says something, too. It is a closed rule, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out. And it is a closed rule which I would say with at least one apparent problem in the course of all of this maneuvering that goes on around here. This bill has a motion to recommit in it. A motion to recommit? This bill has not even been to committee. How in the world do you recommit something that has never been to committee in the first place?

It seems to me that at the very least the rule should have been drafted properly and we ought to have had a motion to commit because that is what it should really be. We are considering legislation here that has never even been considered in the Judiciary Committee.

And so the rule is flawed to begin with. But at least, at the very least, what we are doing is taking up the legislation under the regular legislative process.

What they wanted to do here about a week ago was they wanted to run this through by unanimous consent, not even have this kind of discussion, not even reveal to the American people the kind of shabbiness that goes on here. They want to run it through by unanimous consent and let it go at that.

At least, at least here on the floor today we are having a chance to discuss the things that got us into this very bleak situation, the kind of maneuvering, the kind of political deals, the kind of special interest power that has impacted on this whole process. At least we are seeing now one of the more visible examples of how Congress works by closed door and backroom politics. It is a good example of how the people have gotten forgotten in this body. It is a good example how we become a closed process around here rather than an open process.

I would hope that Members will vote against this rule. This rule, it seems to me, is a closed rule that once again shows how bad things have become in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to respond to the earlier observation of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) I concur in the gentleman's views.

I am unable to enter a commitment on behalf of the leadership, the Committee on Rules, or the Committee on the Judiciary, which we might later be unable to honor.

But, I think the gentleman from Mississippi speaks for the entire committee, and we do not propose to simply filter an unlimited number of extensions down to the floor.

It is my hope that S. 2570 is the last bill of its type, and that the two Houses will act promptly to resolve all remaining issues on bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 295, nays 47, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—295

Akaka	Gibbons	Murtha
Albosta	Gilman	Myers
Andrews (NC)	Glickman	Natcher
Andrews (TX)	Gonzalez	Neal
Annunzio	Gore	Nelson
Anthony	Gradison	Nichols
Applegate	Gray	Nielson
Archer	Green	O'Brien
Aspin	Gregg	Oakar
AuCoin	Gunderson	Oberstar
Barnard	Hall (OH)	Obey
Barnes	Hall, Ralph	Olin
Bartlett	Hamilton	Ottinger
Bateman	Hammerschmidt	Owens
Bates	Hansen (UT)	Oxley
Bedell	Harkin	Packard
Beilenson	Harrison	Panetta
Bennett	Hatcher	Parris
Bereuter	Hayes	Pease
Berman	Hertel	Penny
Biaggi	Hiler	Perkins
Bliley	Hillis	Price
Boehlert	Hopkins	Pritchard
Boland	Horton	Quillen
Bonior	Howard	Rahall
Borski	Hoyer	Ratchford
Boucher	Hubbard	Ray
Breaux	Huckaby	Regula
Britt	Hughes	Reid
Brooks	Hutto	Richardson
Broomfield	Ireland	Ridge
Brown (CA)	Jeffords	Rinaldo
Broyhill	Johnson	Ritter
Byron	Jones (NC)	Roe
Campbell	Kasich	Roemer
Carney	Kastenmeier	Rogers
Carper	Kemp	Rose
Carr	Kildee	Roth
Chandler	Kindness	Roukema
Chappell	Kleczka	Rowland
Cheney	Kolter	Rudd
Clarke	Kostmayer	Sabo
Clay	Kramer	Savage
Clinger	Lagomarsino	Scheuer
Coats	Lantos	Schneider
Coleman (TX)	Latta	Schroeder
Collins	Leath	Schulze
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Schumer
Cooper	Leland	Seiberling
Coughlin	Lent	Shannon
Coyne	Levin	Sharp
Daniel	Levitas	Shaw
Darden	Lewis (CA)	Shelby
Daub	Livingston	Sikorski
Davis	Lloyd	Siljander
de la Garza	Loeffler	Simon
Dellums	Long (LA)	Sisisky
Derrick	Lott	Skeen
Dingell	Lowery (CA)	Slattery
Dixon	Lowry (WA)	Smith (FL)
Dorgan	Lujan	Smith (NE)
Dowdy	Luken	Smith (NJ)
Downey	Lundine	Snowe
Duncan	Lungren	Snyder
Durbin	MacKay	Solarz
Dwyer	Madigan	Spence
Dyson	Martin (NC)	Spratt
Early	Martin (NY)	Staggers
Eckart	Martinez	Stangeland
Edgar	Matsui	Stark
Edwards (CA)	Mavroules	Stenholm
Emerson	Mazzoli	Stratton
English	McCollum	Studds
Erdreich	McCurdy	Stump
Erlenborn	McHugh	Swift
Evans (IA)	McKernan	Synar
Evans (IL)	McKinney	Tallon
Fascell	Mica	Tauke
Fazio	Mikulski	Tauzin
Feighan	Miller (OH)	Taylor
Fish	Mineta	Thomas (GA)
Flippo	Mitchell	Torres
Foley	Moakley	Torricelli
Ford (MI)	Molinari	Towns
Fowler	Mollohan	Traxler
Frank	Montgomery	Udall
Franklin	Moody	Vander Jagt
Frenzel	Moore	Vento
Fuqua	Moorhead	Volkmer
Garcia	Morrison (CT)	Walgren
Gaydos	Morrison (WA)	Watkins
Gejdenson	Mrazek	Weaver
Gephardt	Murphy	Wheat
Whitehurst	Wolf	Yatron
Whitley	Wolpe	Young (AK)
Whitten	Wortley	Young (MO)
Williams (MT)	Wyden	Zschau
Wirth	Wylie	
Wise	Yates	

NAYS—47

Anderson	Edwards (OK)	Porter
Badham	Fiedler	Roberts
Bethune	Fields	Schaefer
Bilirakis	Gekas	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CO)	Goodling	Shumway
Burton (IN)	Gramm	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Hartnett	Smith, Robert
Conable	Holt	Solomon
Corcoran	Hyde	Thomas (CA)
Craig	Lewis (FL)	Walker
Crane, Daniel	Mack	Weber
Crane, Philip	Martin (IL)	Whittaker
Dannemeyer	McCandless	Williams (OH)
DeWine	McEwen	Winn
Dickinson	McGrath	Young (FL)
Dreier	Petri	

NOT VOTING—91

Ackerman	Hance	Nowak
Addabbo	Hansen (ID)	Ortiz
Alexander	Hawkins	Pashayan
Bevill	Hefner	Patman
Boggs	Heftel	Patterson
Boner	Hightower	Paul
Bonker	Hunter	Pepper
Bosco	Jacobs	Pickle
Boxer	Jenkins	Pursell
Bryant	Jones (OK)	Rangel
Burton (CA)	Jones (TN)	Robinson
Chappie	Kaptur	Rodino
Coelho	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Conte	Kennelly	Roybal
Courter	Kogovsek	Russo
Crockett	LaFalce	Sawyer
D'Amours	Leach	Skelton
Daschle	Lehman (CA)	Smith (IA)
Dicks	Levine	Smith, Denny
Donnelly	Lipinski	St Germain
Dymally	Long (MD)	Stokes
Edwards (AL)	Markey	Sundquist
Ferraro	Marlenee	Valentine
Florio	Marriott	Vandergriff
Foglietta	McCain	Vucanovich
Ford (TN)	McCloskey	Waxman
Frost	McDade	Weiss
Gingrich	McNulty	Wilson
Guarini	Michel	Wright
Hall (IN)	Miller (CA)	
Hall, Sam	Minish	

□ 1250

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to honor Elmer E. Rasmuson.

IN HONOR OF ELMER E. RASMUSON

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) to honor Elmer E. Rasmuson, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 108

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson will retire as Chairman of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission (INPFC) in June, 1984 after fifteen years of service on that body;

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson has been a principal force in the development and management of the fisheries of the North Pacific;

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson directed the INPFC toward its goal as stated in the protocol "to promote and coordinate scientific studies relating to the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean . . . and aid in the conservation of these fishery resources";

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson was instrumental in the renegotiation of the INPFC Protocol in 1978 which significantly advanced United States fishing interests;

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson has commissioned the preparation of a history of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission to promote the goals and purpose of the Commission; and

Whereas, Elmer E. Rasmuson served as the first chairman of the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council pursuant to the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, and established that council in the forefront of fisheries management in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America commends Elmer E. Rasmuson for his exemplary contributions to the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission and for the promotion of its goals and purposes.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2460) to designate a Federal building in Augusta, Maine, as the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MCKERNAN).

Mr. McKERNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my bill to name a Federal building in Augusta, Maine,

in honor of former U.S. Senator Edmund S. Muskie.

Ed Muskie's political career has been an inspiration to those of us who have followed him in public service. He began his career as minority leader in the Maine State Legislature, and served two terms as Maine's Governor, and over two decades as U.S. Senator from the Pine Tree State. His career in public office culminated with his appointment to the position of Secretary of State under President Carter in 1980.

Ed Muskie made economic and environmental issues his specialty. He demonstrated his wisdom, compassion, and foresight by promoting economic growth while emphasizing the need for tough environmental protection laws. His work as Governor and Senator have proven invaluable for Maine and the Nation. Mr. Muskie was also gifted in the delicate work of foreign policy. His work on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee gave him the experience necessary to serve ably as Secretary of State until the end of the Carter administration.

I ask my colleagues to support the measure to name the Augusta, Maine Federal building in honor of one of the great statesmen of our times, Edmund S. Muskie.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. SNOWE).

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2461, a bill introduced by my colleague from Maine, Representative MCKERNAN, designating the Federal building in Augusta, Maine, as the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building."

I am proud to be a cosponsor of legislation which seeks to honor a distinguished former Member of Congress and a great American statesman. 25 years ago, Ed Muskie came to Washington to serve our Nation as a U.S. Senator from Maine. But this was not the start of his career. As a State legislator and two-term Governor of Maine, Ed Muskie established a tradition of sensible and firm leadership, helping to guide the State of Maine into a new era of development. As a Senator, Ed Muskie exercised his wisdom for 22 years, leaving his mark on policies improving housing development, Government reform, and our environment.

As well-known as he is nationally for his leadership and dedication to his country—so well typified by his service as Secretary of State—Ed Muskie demonstrated his ability to listen, but also to make a stand where one was needed. With environment issues, in particular, Ed Muskie acknowledged problems emerging due to water pollution long before it became a trend to do so. On the issue of coastal development, he understood better than anyone the complexities created by economic development, on the one hand, and the preservation of our coastlines, on the other.

Perhaps no politician of this era better understood how important it is not to separate national issues from the people served by these decisions. Ed Muskie demonstrated better than anyone how leadership and correct decisionmaking can develop from thoughtful consideration and deliberation. It is fitting that we honor Ed Muskie by naming the Augusta Federal Building in his honor.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senater bill, as follows:

S. 2460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal building located at 40 Western Avenue, Augusta, Maine, shall hereafter be named and designated as the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, S. 2460 will designated a Federal building in Augusta, Maine, the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building."

Edmund S. Muskie spent a distinguished career in public service: a member of the house of representatives in Maine, Governor of Maine, U.S. Senator from 1958 to 1980, and Secretary of State.

Edmund Muskie made a major contribution to the public welfare of this Nation by his distinguished work in the environmental field. He built an unparalleled record of legislation for the preservation of our essential air and water. I cite among these the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and the Toxic Substance Disposal Act.

Designation this building in Senator Muskie's honor is a fitting tribute to a distinguished American.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during my service in this great body to have served with many fine and able Representatives. I include among these a distinguished American, Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, a State legislator, an able Governor, a great Senator, and a dedicated Secretary of State.

I worked with Senator Muskie at close hand for a number of years through his role in the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and my role in this House as a member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. I know of his dedication; his intelligence, and his ability. I know of contributions he made to economic development, budgetary policy, and environmental legislation. I support this bill with pleasure and urge its passage.●

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2461) to designate a Federal building in Bangor, Maine, as the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. SNOWE).

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, which would name the Federal building in Bangor, Maine after Margaret Chase Smith.

It is a fitting honor that we name a Government building after Margaret Chase Smith, for it was Government to which she devoted much of her life. Margaret Chase Smith served for 8 years in the House of Representatives, representing the district that I now am privileged to serve. She was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948, and served in that body until 1972. Through all her years in Government, Margaret Chase Smith showed a great devotion to her constituents and to her country.

Of her many accomplishments, one of her most notable was when, in 1964, she was the first woman to be nominated for President at the national convention of either of our major political parties. It was her strong Senate record, and her reputation among her colleagues that made her one of the leading political figures through the 1950's and the 1960's.

Senator Smith was known for holding fast to her views, even in the face of adverse reaction. She is most remembered as the individual who stood up to McCarthyism. She authored a declaration of conscience in the

Senate, and was responsible for calming some of the fears facing the country at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering this legislation to honor a fine legislator and an outstanding Maine women. I look forward to passage of this measure and the renaming of the Federal building as the Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MCKERNAN).

Mr. MCKERNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill introduced by my colleagues from Maine, Congresswoman SNOWE, that would honor former Senator Margaret Chase Smith by naming the Federal Building in Bangor, Maine, for her.

Senator Smith's service to this country and to Maine included 8 years in the House of Representatives and 24 years in the Senate.

She was first elected in 1940, and for the next 32 years earned a reputation for courage and foresight. Margaret Chase Smith epitomized the independence and integrity of Maine people. She showed both men and women the need to think for themselves, and not to base their decisions on narrow concerns, but on what was best for their country.

Perhaps this was best exemplified by the courage she showed in taking a direct stand against the fear and mistrust that were characteristic of this country under the shadow of McCarthyism. Her speech delivered in Congress appealing to this country's reason, is considered to be one of the most eloquent and effective against McCarthy and the disunity of the times.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Smith received many honors through the years, and the people of Maine are proud of the service and energy she dedicated to this country and to her State. It is fitting that Congress pass legislation that would name the Federal building in Bangor, Maine, in honor of Margaret Chase Smith.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Maine and the gentleman from Maine.

I personally have been acquainted with Mrs. Smith, and know that there is no finer lady that has ever served in this great House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2461

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal building located at 202 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine, shall hereafter be named and designated as the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, S. 2461, to designate a Federal building in Bangor, Maine, as the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building," honors a fine American for a long career of service to her State and her Nation. She served in the House of Representatives for 8½ years and in the Senate for 24 years. Her 32½ years of service are a shining example of dedication and honesty.

Margaret Chase Smith embodies all that is best from the New England soil from which she came and which she brought to her work in the Congress. Her unbroken record of 2,941 unmissed yea and nay rollcall votes is an indication of her ability to work.

Maine is honored when this building is named in her honor.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Chase Smith, a leader in congressional service, a leader in dedication to her profession, both as a Member of the House and Senate, in many ways one of the great beacons of conscience in the history of the Congress, exemplifies all that is best in congressional service. The diligence with which she pursued causes for the benefit of this Nation and her State is spread on the record for all to see. I commend the supporters of this legislation and urge its passage.●

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1300

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bills just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO CONTINUE TRANSITION PROVISIONS OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT UNTIL MAY 26, 1984

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 490, I call up the Senate bill (S. 2570) to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2570

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 402 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a uniform Law on the Subject of Bankruptcies" (Public Law 95-598) is amended in subsections (b) and (e) by striking out "May 1, 1984" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "May 26, 1984".

(b) Section 404 of such Act is amended in subsections (a) and (b) by striking out "April 30, 1984" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "May 25, 1984".

(c) Section 406 of such Act is amended by striking out "April 30, 1984" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "May 25, 1984".

(d) Section 409 of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "May 1, 1984" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "May 26, 1984"; and

(2) striking out "April 30, 1984" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "May 25, 1984".

SEC. 2. The term of office of any bankruptcy judge who was serving on April 30, 1984, and of any bankruptcy judge who is serving on the date of the enactment of this Act is extended to and shall expire on May 25, 1984.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 8339(n) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "April 1, 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 26, 1984".

(b) Section 8331(22) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "April 30, 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 25, 1984".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 490, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of accommodation to the other body, I request favorable consideration of S. 2570 to continue the transition provisions of the bankruptcy law and the terms of office of the judges now sitting on the bankruptcy court until May 25, 1984. This action is taken in response to a request for an extension by the other body, which has not yet been able to act on H.R. 5174, the Bankruptcy Act of 1984, which the House passed on March 21, 1984, to deal with the constitutional problem in the bankruptcy court system. The other body deemed it prudent to extend the transition period until May 25 in the hope that it will be able to either pass the bill, H.R. 5174, or amend it and go to conference before that time.

We have no indication of when the Senate will resolve its internal discussions and take up the bill, but we are hopeful that this extension will be a

sufficient period of time to enable the other body to act. If there are sufficient differences when the Senate finally acts, there will need to be time for a conference between the Houses.

I urge passage of this simple extension to prevent the bankruptcy judges' terms of office from expiring which would create a severe dislocation in the system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) has consumed 1½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH).

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a bill, S. 2570, which would extend the present bankruptcy system from its current expiration date, April 30, until midnight, May 25. It is a delay I had hoped could be avoided when we extended the system last time, on March 30. I reluctantly support adoption of the bill, however, and I do so in the fervent hope that the labor provision which the House tacked onto its bill on March 21, and which has become the cause of the current delay in remedying the bankruptcy courts crisis, can be worked out during this new extension period to the satisfaction of all interested parties.

You will recall that in the House, we have yet to have 1 single day of hearings on the labor provision which we added to H.R. 5174 under a modified, closed rule on March 21. During the nearly 30 days before House consideration, since the Supreme Court issued its decision in NLRB against Bildisco on February 22, the Judiciary Committee had the opportunity to hold hearings, but never did. Since then, the other body has been hard at work doing what the House should have done; namely, working on a compromise to the language in H.R. 5174, negotiating and holding hearings so that all interested parties could be heard.

Part of the function of the Judiciary Committee, as well as all other standing committees of this body, is to inform the House of its recommendation with respect to legislation pending on the floor, and with respect to a House position in conference. Insofar as bankruptcy is concerned, this is a responsibility we have thus far failed to carry out.

Mr. Speaker, what does the record show?

When the other body adopted its bankruptcy courts bill, S. 1013, it did so in combination with a number of other items, including additional district and appellate judgeships. I remind my colleagues that this action took place 1 year ago, on April 28, 1983. In its current consideration of amendments to H.R. 5174, there is every indication that the other body still favors the parts of S. 1013 which differ from H.R. 5174. This is not a secret unknown to our committee leadership. We have every right to expect add-ons by the other body. If I am wrong, I would appreciate being advised now.

It is important to stress that many of the provisions of S. 1013 are of interest to the membership of this House. These include provisions which would better facilitate the assumption of shopping center leases in the event of a shopping center bankruptcy, provisions which would exempt repurchase agreements from the automatic stay under the 1978 code, thereby making them liquid in bankruptcy, and language which would assist elderly creditors who purchase time in real property, only to find that, when the developer of that property goes bankrupt, they become unsecured creditors, often losing their entire investment.

Add to these items the request for additional Federal district and appellate judges, as well as the many substantive differences between the article I bankruptcy court adopted as part of S. 1013, and the article I court passed by the House as part of H.R. 5174, and you can see that there are a number of bankruptcy questions which clearly need to be answered before the Members of this body can intelligently cast their votes.

Mr. Speaker, the Bildisco decision was handed down on February 22. On March 21, the House was called upon to vote on a package of court and substantive amendments. We agreed to an extension on March 30 until April 30. During this entire time, there have been no hearings. Now we are about to agree to a further extension until May 25. During this time, only one hearing on one issue, repurchase agreements, has thus far been scheduled. This is not enough, Mr. Speaker, and I urge that the next 4 weeks be used to advantage by the Judiciary Committee leadership.

This Member, and every Member of this House, has a right to a clear, compelling explanation for the committee's purposeful avoidance of hearings on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to propound some questions to the majority floor manager. The first question is:

Why has the Committee on the Judiciary chosen not to prepare itself, and through it, the membership of this House, on the many items which each of us knows will likely be contained in the amendment of the other body to H.R. 5174 when it comes back to us toward the end of May?

Mr. GLICKMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I will answer in the following way:

The gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) has mentioned holding hearings on extraneous issues the other body may add to H.R. 5174 that are not in the bill passed by the House. As was forcefully pointed out by almost every Member from the other side of the aisle who took the microphone on the floor on March 30, we do not know what action the Senate will take. There is certainly not time in the next 30 days to hold the numerous hearings that would be necessary to review all the bankruptcy law, Federal judgeships, and Federal judicial retirement benefits provisions contained in S. 1013.

The gentleman knows that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) has announced further hearings on a variety of issues that need to be addressed on the bankruptcy law. Starting on May 2, with a hearing on repurchase agreements, other issues will be addressed in further hearings designed to educate and inform ourselves on these issues. However, our schedule will not be dictated by the other body, but by the issues.

Mr. FISH. As the gentleman knows, the expiration date of the proposed extension is May 25, on the eve of the Memorial Day break. Does the gentleman plan to adamantly refuse any Senate amendments which differ from H.R. 5174 on the grounds that they have not been adequately considered by the committee and the House, and if he were to take this action, would it not precipitate yet another crisis?

Mr. GLICKMAN. There are certainly many differences between the court provisions that probably will need to be resolved in the conference, and I would say to the gentleman that we do not know yet what the Senate will do with the bill and how it will amend the bill.

The Senate and the House have now passed similar approaches to the bankruptcy court problem, that is true. Both the Senate and the House have an institutional obligation, however, to resolve this constitutional crisis. It would be irresponsible of the Congress if the May 25 deadline for the resolution of the court crisis were not met because it is sidetracked by unrelated bankruptcy and Federal judicial retirement issues that have no deadline.

□ 1310

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I could not, of course, disagree with the gentleman more, that 30 days is ample time. In fact, in a letter to the chairman of the committee recently I ventured that no more than 4 days would be required, and I question where the gentleman gets his information that we do not know what is in the Senate bill. We have had it before us for a year. A call to any Senator's staff member or any member of the Senate Judiciary Committee would assure the gentleman

that they want the same amendments that differ from ours that the gentleman characterizes as "extraneous."

But I will not go on in colloquy with the gentleman because I feel that I have gotten the reasons on the record as to why we are not going to comply with the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have a little problem with this bill. On February 22, the U.S. Supreme Court came down with a very important decision, a unanimous decision, 9 to 0, called the Bildisco decision, and it has to do with the relative significance—sanctity, if you will, of labor contracts when a company goes bankrupt or seeks a chapter 11 bankruptcy and the status to be given the labor contract in that bankruptcy proceeding, a very important and very controversial issue.

Now, the Democratic leaders of the Judiciary Committee have decided in their wisdom to legislatively reverse that decision, a unanimous decision, of the Court. I ask the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN)—and I know he has got committee counsel Mr. Freeman and Mr. Parker nearby, and also the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), men of great seniority and years—if they can cite one instance in history, the history of this body, when a 9-to-0 Supreme Court decision was to be reversed by legislation without 10 seconds' hearing, without any hearings whatsoever.

I tell the Members that I do not see any bustling or stirring to provide an answer. I will provide the answer. No, it has not been done. This is unique, and I suppose we should take some pleasure in participating in something new and unique in congressional history, that is to say reversing a unanimous Supreme Court decision, an important decision having to do with labor relations, without 10 seconds of hearings.

Now, when we deal with legislation that involves a deliberatial processes, the democratic process, listening to witnesses and listening to people assembled, listening to them in hearings, deliberating and deciding and then adopting or rejecting a law. That whole process has not been eroded by the actions of the Judiciary Committee; it has been assaulted, and destroyed by shoving down the throats of this body—and they persist in doing so—a reversal of unanimous Supreme Court decision without hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN) who is managing this bill and who has answered the previous speaker by saying that hearings are scheduled on repossession, one of the aspects of the bill that he is interested in because he is the chief sponsor, are we going to have any hearings on the reversal of the Bildisco decision.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I certainly do yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not talked personally with the chairman of the committee on that particular point. I repeat what I said before, that the chairman intends to have hearings on some bankruptcy related issues, starting with repurchase agreements, but I cannot answer the gentleman's question specifically.

The only thing I can say is that I know the gentleman did not like the provision, but the full House has passed that provision now, and we are in the position of waiting to go to conference with the Senate.

The Senate can pass the bill without that provision in it, and we can go to conference and confer on the merits of it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, if I may say this to the gentleman, the reversal of the Bildisco decision by legislation was put before this House and we were not permitted to vote on it as an issue because it was put before us in a procedure that did not permit any amendments or a specific vote. That was done on March 21. Now we are extending the time to deal with this issue in a final fashion until May 25.

It seems to me that the importance of the issue, the importance of reversing a Supreme Court decision, calls for hearings in this body, and I ask the gentleman to use his influence with the chairman, who, after all, is noted for being devoted to the Constitution—and I assume that means the deliberative processes of this body are as important to him as they are to me—so that we can have some hearings. And I will rely on the gentleman's assurances that he will bring that up to the chairman of the committee. He can bring it up to the Speaker, too. While you are at it, bring it up to the Speaker, also.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to bring it up with the chairman of the committee. I will mention, however, that the Congress did not deal in Bildisco with a constitutional issue. It was an issue of statutory interpretation by the Supreme Court.

Mr. HYDE. I appreciate that, but it was a 9-to-0 decision, and we are reversing it. May I have the gentleman's opinion on this? Does he not think we ought to have hearings on something that significant?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has expired.

Mr. HYDE. Saved by the gavel.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KINDNESS).

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time to me.

In case the gentleman from Kansas would care to use the time, I would yield to him if he would care to respond to the inquiry presented to him by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to do any better job than the gentleman from Illinois did in bringing this issue to my attention, and I would just repeat my responses to the gentleman from Ohio that I indicated to him.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, the admirable gentleman from Kansas has given an admirable answer, and we appreciate his filling in. He is in difficult circumstances, when the chairman of the committee is missing, along with a few other people. But he is holding up very well on his own over there.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that I would like to just take a moment to again reemphasize the need to look at what we are doing here today and look at it in the light of what we are going to be doing here 24 or 25 days from now. We are going to be doing it again. We are going to be presented, almost assuredly, with another request of having an extension of time for the bankruptcy courts and procedure to be extended under the existing temporary setup.

Why are we going to be presented with such an additional request for delay? We are going to be presented with that request to extend the time again because there are other, not directly related matters, that are in controversy that have not been settled over on the other side of Capitol Hill, and indeed when we get into it with representations from this side of Capitol Hill, it will be worse. It will not be any better; it will be worse.

We have heard some comments here today about the language in the bill as passed by the House that would reverse the Bildisco decision of the Supreme Court of February 22. That was very quick action to attempt to reverse that Supreme Court decision, a unanimous Supreme Court decision. But they are not having much success over on the other side of the Hill in dealing with that issue. The only way they can deal with that issue that quickly is by not allowing anyone to vote on it, like we did over here on this side.

We know how to deal with those issues. Let us not allow anyone to vote, and then we can deal with it quickly.

But as long as there is any vestige of a democratic function and democratic process involved it is not going to be settled all that easily. We are not going to reverse a Supreme Court decision of that importance all that read-

31-059 O-87-6 (Pt. 8)

ily. So we are going to have a request for another extension of time within 20 days or so, and at that point in time that what we ought to do is deal with the bankruptcy courts and bankruptcy procedure matters and separate them out from these other issues. That is the way it ought to be done. There is no reason for them to be tied together.

Those other issues do not have time limits on them. We can deal with the bankruptcy courts and the procedure problem. We could do it today if it were in order to simply add to this temporary extension bill an amendment that says the exact same thing we said in title I of the House-passed bill about the courts and procedural matters. We could send that over to the other body, and the other body would have an opportunity to separate that from all these other things.

Well, we do not have the posture in which to do that today, but the next time another extension is requested, that is going to be the time for us to mount our efforts in getting these issues separated.

□ 1320

They are asking for more time over on the other side of the Hill to deal with the Bildisco or labor contract language, I guess. We ought to go along with that I think on this occasion, this day, but that is all, not one more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio, if he would yield.

Mr. KINDNESS. I yield.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I just say to the gentleman that I agree that this is a matter of very great seriousness. I would hope that we would not need another extension in 3 or 4 weeks, whenever we are back here, because to bankruptcy judges, to debtors, to creditors all over this Nation, as well as to people interested in the substantive changes that were made, these are very important issues.

I will just again make the point that regardless of whether you like the bill or not that we passed before, we have passed the legislation. Right now it is in the Senate's lap. They have the opportunity of passing a bankruptcy bill shortly, if they so choose, and I think that this discussion today might prompt them to do that. If they are able to do that in the next week or two, we will be able to confer and get a full bill by May 25, and that would be my hope and I am sure it is the gentleman's hope as well.

Mr. KINDNESS. I would join the gentleman in that wish, that hope, and I certainly would do anything that we could do on our side to bring about that result; but right now the House and the Senate are not in disagreement technically and there is not anything we can do from this side. We are sort of waiting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I was very interested in the colloquy the gentleman just had with the majority manager of this bill in terms of the conference. Would the gentleman not agree with me that if we are going to go to conference with the Senate, and the Senate has given every indication what it wants to have as part of this bill, that we should inform ourselves as a committee on the issues involved prior to the conference. There is bound to be a very short time between their action and the termination of this extension period.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that it would be wise if we knew the merits of some of the additions to the House-passed version that we would be likely to be considering in conference?

Mr. KINDNESS. Well, the gentleman is quite correct and I would go a step beyond that and suggest that it would seem to me to be quite prudent for the whole committee, the total Judiciary Committee to be a part of that hearing process on these other issues.

The time is not really sufficient to confine that hearing process to the subcommittee's membership, when the need for exposure to the ideas is greater. Why not have the hearings, in a somewhat unusual step, before the full committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. KINDNESS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I recall in our time on the Judiciary Committee we have always taken a great deal of pride in the scrutiny that we give to requests by the judicial conference for additional district court and circuit judges. We have certain standards by which we judge these requests.

It is very clear, as the gentleman knows, that the Senate, a year ago and since, has given every indication that it expects to ask for additional judgeships. It may be a number which is at variance with what our committee standards would recommend.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that since we have known about this for such a long time and now we have almost 4 additional weeks as a result of this extension period, we should be putting the probable request under the scrutiny and under the usual process of our committee to see what judgeships truly are needed at this time?

Mr. KINDNESS. I would thoroughly agree. It is a wonderful opportunity that is not being utilized at present that could have been utilized before this time and certainly ought to be used during this interim period to apply those standards.

Those judgeship figures, of course, are based on 1980 caseloads, so we are not dealing with anything that is brand new and hot off the press. It can be considered in this period of time beautifully.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, it appears that we are going to have to have an extension because of the situation in which we find ourselves, but as many speakers have said, it is unfortunate we are here. If we extend this for another 25 days we will find ourselves just a month short of 2 years since the Supreme Court declared the 1978 reform of the bankruptcy courts unconstitutional.

Now, it is true that the House of Representatives is not always noted for moving swiftly, but this must be considered glacier-like speed, if anything, that has come before the House.

This is a constitutional crisis only because we have allowed it to become a constitutional crisis. The Supreme Court declared the process that we had developed in 1978 to be unconstitutional, but granted us an extension. This will be the fourth judicial and congressional extension, and it seems to me it ill serves this body to have serious matters like this dealt with in so cavalier a fashion.

The real sticking point in all this, of course, is what some of us would refer to as the extraneous matter that has been applied to the court system and that is the whole question of the Bildisco case. I happen to be one of those, as I think most Members are, who believe that we ought to visit the Bildisco case. There is certainly something that ought to be done with respect to a unilateral abrogation of a collective bargaining agreement upon the very entry into chapter 11. It seems to me we could certainly accommodate that by requiring a judicial determination within a reasonable period of time; but the first part of the Bildisco decision also is subject to change by the bill we passed out of the House. That is the standard to be applied by the courts when they make a determination as to whether abrogation is appropriate. This standard was the first part of the decision by the Supreme Court and it was affirmed by a 9-to-0 vote. Justice Brennan and Justice Thurgood Marshall were part of that 9-to-0 vote.

The swiftness with which we move to try and overturn that decision

ought to cause us some pause and some concern. It appears that it is that pause that the Senate is attempting to make by at least holding hearings on the Bildisco decision, now requiring this 30-day extension.

It is unfortunate that during the period of time since we passed this bill, we have not had hearings in the House. It seems to me that we ought to do that. The House at the present time does not seem to be overwhelmed with legislative activity. We are going to leave today about 2:30 to come back next week for a short work term again, and although as I have said on the floor, I do not believe that Members of Congress are overpaid, if this continues much longer the consensus of the country may very well be that we are overpaid, based on the lack of work that is going forward here.

So I would hope that we would look very, very seriously during the 25-day period as to what it is we did on the Supreme Court decision dealing with abrogation of collective bargaining agreements when a company attempts to go through chapter 11.

The important point that seems to be missed in all this is that chapter 11 is a process which we developed to allow companies to reorganize themselves under current management so that they do not have to go belly up. In essence it seems to me that the underlying foundation of all that is the protection of the jobs that exist in those companies as they attempt to reorganize.

If what we want to do is throw out chapter 11 and only allow companies to go belly up and then go through the full bankruptcy, we ought to say that up front, but that consideration has not even been made in any hearings that we have had on this legislation.

I would hope that we would consider it within the next 30 days, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have one more request for time. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman has yielded me this time.

This is not the first time in my brief congressional career in which I come to a point where I am still anguished before casting a vote as to which way to finally go. The squeeze play is on. My heart tells me that I should vote "no" on this measure as a protest, saying it is another delay, another postponement of that time when we must deal with these vital issues. I know that bankruptcy is not a very romantic issue and one which is not likely to spring everybody into great emotional action, but it is important right at a point when our economy needs a stabilization of all our economic machinery, and bankruptcy is one of them; so I want to vote no as a protest and say we have got to deal with this. It is no longer possible to keep on postponing this type of issue, but in my heart I also know, and my mind tells me, what is left of it, that we must vote yes because we cannot leave the country without a bankruptcy machinery as of May 1.

□ 1330

I still have not made up my mind. Somebody is going to have to deal with my heart and my mind in the remaining time left before this vote is cast.

But, as I stand here, I am hoping against hope that this will be the last time that we will be deciding on whether to delay a final decision.

With that in mind and in heart, I will let the scoreboard reveal later which way I have decided.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and yield back my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I would ask the Chair how much that amounts to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to make the following points; that is, that on April 12 the other body passed this bill and as a favor to Senator BAKER asked the chairman of the committee to have this bill pass under a unanimous-consent request.

That unanimous-consent request was brought up and it was objected to I believe by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) on the Republican side. Therefore, I would point out to the House that whereas that bill could have been passed that day extending it to May 25, could have been driven 1 mile downtown and been signed by the President, this bill, if passed today, will have to be flown 8,000 miles to Shanghai to be signed at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers of the United States. Probably, Mr. Chairman, this is the first bill in the history of this House that has ever been literally shanghaied on its way to passage.

I would say, however, that this is a very serious issue and I would like to echo what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KINDNESS) said, that millions of people are affected by the viability of our bankruptcy courts.

We passed a bill which provided for the appropriate constitutional dealings with bankruptcy as well as several substantive issues. That bill has gone to the other body. We have good faith and hope and reason to believe that the other body will act and pass a comparable measure which can then go to conference and can be resolved before the Memorial Day break so that the millions of creditors and debtors and consumer finance people and farmers and everybody else who has an interest in the proper operation of the bankruptcy courts can rest assured that this issue will be taken care of.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I will be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WALKER. I was on the telephone, but the gentleman evidently used my name as the person who stopped the unanimous-consent procedure.

Does the gentleman think that this is the kind of thing that we ought to run around doing by unanimous consent in this body on bills that have absolutely no hearings, that we have no ability to know precisely what is in them? As a matter of fact, it was described when I was reserving my right to object the other day, and I was told that this was not even a bill. The Chair told me we did not even have a piece of legislation before us. There was not even an understanding of what it was we were dealing with.

Does the gentleman think that we ought to proceed by unanimous consent under such circumstances?

Mr. GLICKMAN. The gentleman understood that bill on April 12 to be an extension of time to May 25, or the exact same bill we are taking up today. That was my understanding.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from Kansas may have had an understanding. The Chair obviously did not. The Chair on that day, and the gentleman can check the record, described it as not even being a piece of legislation.

So there was an awful lot of confusion around here as to what it was we were dealing with. I simply suggest to the gentleman that it is very bad procedure to deal with matters of a complicated nature under unanimous consent.

And there was certainly no agreement on our side that it ought to be done by unanimous consent. This gentleman thinks that dealing with it in an open debate such as this, where we have a chance to air the issues, is a much better way of proceeding than the unanimous consent that evidently the gentleman would have had us use.

Mr. GLICKMAN. My only point was the bill we were dealing with was an extension of time and I think the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee knew of it at the time. Again my point is I was not here at that time so I acknowledge that, but we are required now to send a bill 8,000 miles to China to be signed where the bill could have been signed very quickly that day.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield further, if we had acted on it 13 months ago when the Judiciary Committee reported it out, or at least

had brought it up under the Calendar Wednesday that the chairman could have used on several occasions this year, we would not have come to this crisis where we even come into the China trip.

Mr. GLICKMAN. That may have been true and I may have been one of the parties trying to get it to the floor faster than it was. But now we have to deal with the realities of the situation and the realities are, unfortunately, we have another extension. Hopefully the issue will be resolved before a further extension is needed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER moves to commit S. 2570 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 1, line 7, strike "May 26" and insert in lieu thereof "May 24".

On page 1, line 10, strike "May 25" and insert in lieu thereof "May 23".

On page 2, line 3, strike "May 25" and insert in lieu thereof "May 23".

On page 2, line 6, strike "May 26" and insert in lieu thereof "May 24".

On page 2, line 9, strike "May 25" and insert in lieu thereof "May 23".

On page 2, line 13, strike "May 25" and insert in lieu thereof "May 23".

On page 2, line 16, strike "May 26" and insert in lieu thereof "May 24".

On page 2, line 19, strike "May 25" and insert in lieu thereof "May 23".

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to commit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather simple and straightforward motion to commit, merely to move forward the deadline date from midnight Friday, May 25, to midnight Wednesday, May 23.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking for trouble if we have this bill with this history of legislative chicken on the subject of bankruptcy expiring on midnight May 25, which is at the time when the House and the other body are scheduled to go out for their Memorial Day recess. I believe that passing the bill with a Friday, May 25, deadline is a guarantee that the Members will have to change their plans and will not be able to get out of Washington to their respective districts until the deadline has expired.

Merely by moving the date forward 2 days will guarantee that this issue will come to a head and will be resolved on Wednesday, May 23, consequently, not inconveniencing any of the Members and forcing schedules and plane reservations to be rewritten.

I would anticipate that the only argument that could be made against this motion to commit is that it would require the concurrence of the other body and the amendment that is proposed, thus proposing an opportunity that the bill would miss the fast plane to Shanghai. I think that this amendment has so much merit that the other body, when it stops to think about it, would quickly concur in the amendment by unanimous consent and the plane would take off.

Consequently, I would hope that this would be an agreeable motion to commit so that we can get this matter wrapped up on a Wednesday rather than on a Friday. I certainly do not think that it is going to delay the resolution of these bankruptcy problems unduly and it certainly would prevent a substantial inconvenience from occurring to the Members of this body and the other body with respect to the previously announced Memorial Day recess.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to commit.

In the first place, the bill we are dealing with today is the exact bill the other body has passed and sent over here. We are doing this extension as an accommodation to the other body.

In addition, the bill has to be signed tonight by the Speaker pro tem and there is a plane waiting to take off tomorrow morning to go to China to get this bill signed by the President. There is an additional time delay, because they have to cross the international dateline and will lose another day. We are in a situation where we could face a lapse of the court's jurisdiction and expiration of the judges' terms.

I am sure that the President and the Justice Department and the administration are not in favor of this motion to commit.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this motion also. I know that the intent is well intentioned in what the gentleman is trying to do here.

We do quite often get up against these deadlines. We are now scheduled to go out May 24 at the close of business, so we are talking about really just 1 day's difference.

But what worries me is the fact that this has to go back to the other body. They have to get it up. They might try to ask unanimous consent and that very likely would be objected to, or they will have to vote on it again. This will become badminton and we will be hitting this birdie back and forth even further.

The gentleman from Kansas makes a legitimate point. We need to get this finished today and get it out to the President for his signature because we do have this deadline that we are facing on Monday and it takes a lot of time and difficulty getting it to the President at this particular moment.

□ 1340

So I have to question the positive effects of what the gentleman is trying to do here. I would urge my colleagues not to support this motion to commit.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I too must reluctantly rise in opposition to this for the reasons stated by the minority whip. I think we are running a risk of fouling up something that is of no doing on our part and as the gentleman pointed out, it is important that we handle this matter with dispatch.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SENSENBRENNER) there were—yeas 9, nays 17.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of

passage. Members will record their votes by electronic device.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 33, nays 304, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—33

Badham	DeWine	Martin (NC)
Broomfield	Dickinson	McEwen
Brown (CO)	Fiedler	Myers
Clinger	Gekas	Roth
Coleman (MO)	Gradison	Schaefer
Conable	Gramm	Sensenbrenner
Corcoran	Hillis	Siljander
Craig	Hunter	Snyder
Crane, Philip	Lowery (CA)	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Lujan	Walker
Daub	Mack	Whitten

NAYS—304

Akaka	Eckart	Kramer
Albosta	Edgar	Lagomarsino
Anderson	Edwards (CA)	Lantos
Andrews (NC)	Edwards (OK)	Latta
Andrews (TX)	Emerson	Leach
Annunzio	English	Leath
Anthony	Erdreich	Lehman (FL)
Applegate	Erlenborn	Leland
Archer	Evans (IA)	Lent
Aspin	Evans (IL)	Levin
Barnard	Fascell	Levitas
Barnes	Fazio	Lewis (FL)
Bartlett	Feighan	Livingston
Bateman	Fields	Lloyd
Bates	Fish	Loeffler
Bedell	Flippo	Long (LA)
Beilenson	Foley	Long (MD)
Bennett	Ford (MI)	Lott
Bereuter	Frank	Lowry (WA)
Berman	Franklin	Luken
Bethune	Frenzel	Lundine
Biaggi	Fuqua	Lungren
Bilirakis	Garcia	MacKay
Bliley	Gaydos	Madigan
Boehlert	Gejdenson	Martin (IL)
Boland	Gephardt	Martin (NY)
Boner	Gilman	Martinez
Bonior	Gingrich	Matsui
Borski	Glickman	Mavroules
Breaux	Gonzalez	Mazzoli
Britt	Goodling	McCandless
Brooks	Gray	McCollum
Brown (CA)	Green	McCurdy
Broyhill	Gregg	McGrath
Burton (IN)	Gunderson	McHugh
Byron	Hall (OH)	McKernan
Campbell	Hall, Ralph	McKinney
Carney	Hamilton	Mica
Carper	Hammerschmidt	Mikulski
Carr	Hansen (UT)	Miller (OH)
Chandler	Harkin	Mineta
Chappell	Harrison	Mitchell
Cheney	Hartnett	Moakley
Clarke	Hatcher	Molinari
Clay	Hawkins	Mollohan
Coats	Hayes	Montgomery
Coleman (TX)	Hertel	Moody
Collins	Hiler	Moore
Conyers	Holt	Moorhead
Cooper	Hopkins	Morrison (CT)
Coughlin	Horton	Morrison (WA)
Coyne	Howard	Mrazek
Crane, Daniel	Hoyer	Murphy
Daniel	Hubbard	Murtha
Darden	Huckaby	Natcher
Davis	Hughes	Neal
de la Garza	Hutto	Nelson
Dellums	Hyde	Nielson
Derrick	Ireland	O'Brien
Dingell	Jeffords	Oakar
Dixon	Johnson	Oberstar
Dorgan	Jones (NC)	Obey
Dowdy	Kasich	Olin
Downey	Kastenmeier	Ottinger
Dreier	Kemp	Owens
Duncan	Kildee	Oxley
Durbin	Kindness	Packard
Dwyer	Kleczka	Panetta
Dyson	Kolter	Parris
Early	Kostmayer	Pease
Penny	Shaw	Udall
Perkins	Shelby	Vander Jagt
Petri	Shumway	Vandergriff
Porter	Shuster	Vento
Price	Sikorski	Volkmer
Pritchard	Sisisky	Walgren
Quillen	Skeen	Watkins
Rahall	Slattery	Waxman
Ratchford	Smith (FL)	Weaver
Ray	Smith (NE)	Weber
Reid	Smith (NJ)	Wheat
Richardson	Smith, Robert	Whitehurst
Ridge	Snowe	Whitley
Rinaldo	Solarz	Whittaker
Ritter	Spence	Williams (MT)
Roberts	Spratt	Williams (OH)
Roe	Staggers	Winn
Roemer	Stangeland	Wirth
Rogers	Stark	Wise
Rose	Stenholm	Wolf
Roukema	Stratton	Wolpe
Rowland	Stump	Wortley
Rudd	Swift	Wyden
Sabo	Tallon	Wylie
Savage	Tauke	Yates
Scheuer	Tauzin	Yatron
Schneider	Taylor	Young (AK)
Schroeder	Thomas (CA)	Young (FL)
Schulze	Thomas (GA)	Young (MO)
Schumer	Torres	Zschau
Seiberling	Towns	
Sharp	Traxler	

NOT VOTING—96

Ackerman	Hall (IN)	Ortiz
Addabbo	Hall, Sam	Pashayan
Alexander	Hance	Patman
AuCoin	Hansen (ID)	Patterson
Bevill	Hefner	Paul
Boggs	Heftel	Pepper
Bonker	Hightower	Pickle
Bosco	Jacobs	Pursell
Boucher	Jenkins	Rangel
Boxer	Jones (OK)	Regula
Bryant	Jones (TN)	Robinson
Burton (CA)	Kaptur	Rodino
Chappie	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Coelho	Kennelly	Roybal
Conte	Kogovsek	Russo
Courter	LaFalce	Sawyer
Crockett	Lehman (CA)	Shannon
D'Amours	Levine	Simon
Daschle	Lewis (CA)	Skelton
Dicks	Lipinski	Smith (IA)
Donnelly	Markey	Smith, Denny
Dymally	Marlenee	St Germain
Edwards (AL)	Marriott	Stokes
Ferraro	McCain	Studds
Florio	McCloskey	Sundquist
Foglietta	McDade	Synar
Ford (TN)	McNulty	Torricelli
Fowler	Michel	Valentine
Frost	Miller (CA)	Vucanovich
Gibbons	Minish	Weiss
Gore	Nichols	Wilson
Guarini	Nowak	Wright

□ 1350

Messrs. BONIOR of Michigan, MARTIN of New York, WORTLEY, MOORE, and LATTA changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

□ 1400

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's prior announcement, this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 322, noes 13, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—322

Akaka	Erdreich	Long (LA)
Albosta	Erlenborn	Long (MD)
Anderson	Evans (IA)	Lott
Andrews (TX)	Evans (IL)	Lowry (WA)
Annunzio	Fascell	Lujan
Anthony	Fazio	Luken
Applegate	Feighan	Lundine
Archer	Fiedler	Lungren
Aspin	Fields	MacKay
AuCoin	Fish	Madigan
Barnard	Flippo	Martin (IL)
Barnes	Foley	Martin (NC)
Bartlett	Ford (MI)	Martinez
Bateman	Frank	Matsui
Bates	Franklin	Mavroules
Bedell	Frenzel	Mazzoli
Beilenson	Fuqua	McCollum
Bennett	Garcia	McCurdy
Bereuter	Gaydos	McEwen
Berman	Gejdenson	McGrath
Bethune	Gekas	McHugh
Biaggi	Gephardt	McKernan
Bilirakis	Gilman	McKinney
Bliley	Gingrich	Mica
Boehlert	Glickman	Mikulski
Boland	Gonzalez	Miller (OH)
Boner	Goodling	Mineta
Bonior	Gradison	Mitchell
Borski	Gramm	Moakley
Breaux	Gray	Molinari
Britt	Green	Mollohan
Brooks	Gregg	Montgomery
Brown (CA)	Gunderson	Moody
Broyhill	Hall (OH)	Moore
Burton (IN)	Hall, Ralph	Moorhead
Byron	Hall, Sam	Morrison (CT)
Campbell	Hamilton	Morrison (WA)
Carney	Hammerschmidt	Mrazek
Carper	Hansen (UT)	Murphy
Carr	Harkin	Murtha
Chandler	Harrison	Myers
Chappell	Hartnett	Natcher
Cheney	Hatcher	Neal
Clarke	Hawkins	Nelson
Clay	Hayes	Nielson
Clinger	Hertel	O'Brien
Coats	Hiler	Oakar
Coleman (MO)	Hillis	Oberstar
Coleman (TX)	Holt	Obey
Collins	Hopkins	Olin
Conable	Horton	Ottinger
Conyers	Howard	Owens
Cooper	Hoyer	Oxley
Corcoran	Hubbard	Packard
Coughlin	Huckaby	Panetta
Coyne	Hughes	Parris
Craig	Hunter	Pease
Crane, Daniel	Hutto	Penny
Crane, Philip	Hyde	Perkins
Dannemeyer	Ireland	Petri
Darden	Jeffords	Porter
Daub	Johnson	Price
Davis	Jones (NC)	Pritchard
de la Garza	Kasich	Quillen
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Rahall
Derrick	Kemp	Ratchford
DeWine	Kildee	Ray
Dickinson	Kindness	Reid
Dingell	Kleczka	Richardson
Dixon	Kolter	Rinaldo
Dorgan	Kostmayer	Ritter
Dowdy	Kramer	Roberts
Downey	Lagomarsino	Roe
Dreier	Lantos	Rogers
Duncan	Latta	Rose
Durbin	Leach	Roth
Dwyer	Leath	Roukema
Dyson	Lehman (FL)	Rudd
Early	Leland	Sabo
Eckart	Levin	Savage
Edgar	Levitas	Schaefer
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Scheuer
Edwards (OK)	Livingston	Schneider
Emerson	Lloyd	Schroeder
English	Loeffler	Schulze

Schumer	Stark	Wheat
Seiberling	Stratton	Whitehurst
Sharp	Stump	Whitley
Shaw	Swift	Whittaker
Shelby	Tallon	Whitten
Shuster	Tauke	Williams (MT)
Sikorski	Tauzin	Williams (OH)
Siljander	Taylor	Winn
Simon	Thomas (CA)	Wirth
Sisisky	Thomas (GA)	Wise
Skeen	Torres	Wolf
Slattery	Towns	Wolpe
Smith (FL)	Traxler	Wortley
Smith (NE)	Udall	Wyden
Smith (NJ)	Vander Jagt	Wylie
Smith, Robert	Vandergriff	Yates
Snowe	Vento	Yatron
Snyder	Volkmer	Young (AK)
Solarz	Walgren	Young (FL)
Spence	Watkins	Young (MO)
Spratt	Waxman	Zschau
Staggers	Weaver	
Stangeland	Weber	

NOES—13

Badham	Mack	Solomon
Broomfield	McCandless	Stenholm
Brown (CO)	Roemer	Walker
Daniel	Sensenbrenner	
Lowery (CA)	Shumway	

NOT VOTING—98

Ackerman	Hance	Pashayan
Addabbo	Hansen (ID)	Patman
Alexander	Hefner	Patterson
Andrews (NC)	Heftel	Paul
Bevill	Hightower	Pepper
Boggs	Jacobs	Pickle
Bonker	Jenkins	Pursell
Bosco	Jones (OK)	Rangel
Boucher	Jones (TN)	Regula
Boxer	Kaptur	Ridge
Bryant	Kazen	Robinson
Burton (CA)	Kennelly	Rodino
Chappie	Kogovsek	Rostenkowski
Coelho	LaFalce	Rowland
Conte	Lehman (CA)	Roybal
Courter	Lent	Russo
Crockett	Levine	Sawyer
D'Amours	Lewis (CA)	Shannon
Daschle	Lipinski	Skelton
Dicks	Markey	Smith (IA)
Donnelly	Marlenee	Smith, Denny
Dymally	Marriott	St Germain
Edwards (AL)	Martin (NY)	Stokes
Ferraro	McCain	Studds
Florio	McCloskey	Sundquist
Foglietta	McDade	Synar
Ford (TN)	McNulty	Torricelli
Fowler	Michel	Valentine
Frost	Miller (CA)	Vucanovich
Gibbons	Minish	Weiss
Gore	Nichols	Wilson
Guarini	Nowak	Wright
Hall (IN)	Ortiz	

So the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of receiving the legislative schedule for the balance of the week and for next week, and I am pleased to yield to the distinguished majority whip for advising the Members of our schedule.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House will consider next the rule on the National Bureau of Standards Act and complete consideration of that bill, and that will conclude the business for the day.

The House will not meet tomorrow. It will be my intention to ask permission to go over until Monday next, at which time the House will consider under suspension 19 bills. Those bills are as follows:

H.R. 5188, authorizations for International Trade Commission, Customs Service, and U.S. Trade Representative;

H.R. 5147, implement Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement;

H.R. 4585, Office of Environmental Quality authorizations;

H.R. 4921, Bon Secours National Wildlife Refuge, Alabama;

H.J. Res. 537, designate Brigantine and Barnegat Units of National Wildlife Refuge System as Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 5051, Fishermen's Protective Act amendments;

H.R. 5050, Fish and Wildlife Act authorizations extension;

H.R. 4263, Tennessee Wilderness;

H.R. 5076, Pennsylvania Wilderness;

H.R. 4596, acquire McClintock House in Waterloo, N.Y., for national historic site;

H.R. 3472, amend Wild and Scenic Rivers Act re Pierre Marquette River;

H.R. 5100, authorizations for U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council;

Senate Joint Resolution 25, rename St. Croix Island Monument as St. Croix International Historic Site;

H.R. 4406, amend Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate Wildcat Brook (N.H.) for potential addition to Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

H.R. 3787, amend National Trails System Act by adding Oregon-California Trail to study lists;

H.R. 3739, amend the act for Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area;

H.R. 4176, Southern Ute Indians Reservation boundary confirmation, Colorado;

H.R. 5027, United States Code title 10 amendments re retired pay to spouses and former spouses; and

H.R. 4952, assistance to Indian tribes in Nevada and Utah relating to planned deployment of MX missiles.

□ 1410

The House will meet at noon on Tuesday and consider the Private Calendar, and suspensions under the suspension of the rules are as follows:

H.R. 4666, provide for recovery by the United States of costs of hospital and medical care in certain circumstances;

H.R. 5041, Joint Research and Development Act;

H. Con. Res. 275, commending Colombian Government for recent cocaine seizures and for other purposes;

H. Con. Res. 261, supporting initiatives of Contadoras and resulting agreements among Central American nations; and

H.R. 5287, higher education amendments.

Following debates on those suspensions, we shall resume consideration of H.R. 7, the Child Nutrition Act, and complete its consideration.

I would like to advise the House that all votes on suspensions on both Monday and Tuesday will be postponed until the end of business on Tuesday. There will be no votes on suspensions on Monday and no votes on any suspensions on that day or Tuesday until the end of business on Tuesday, May 1.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, May 2, 3, and 4, the House will meet at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, and 11 a.m. the balance of the week, considering the conference report on S. 64, the Irish Wilderness Act; the conference report on S. 1129, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments, and H.R. 4275, Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act, open rule, 1 hour of debate.

The House will adjourn by 3 p.m. on Friday. Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later. It is my thought that it is probable that the House will not meet Friday if we can complete this program, but we cannot give total assurance of that at this time.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for providing us with this lengthy and significant list of legislation that will be considered next week, and the gentleman has answered the one question this gentleman had, as to whether or not we would be in session on Friday. It is not anticipated that we would be in session on Friday of next week, is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. It is not presently anticipated if we can complete the program as announced.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON MONDAY, MAY 7, 1984, TO RECEIVE FORMER MEMBERS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair on Monday, May 7, 1984, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES ON TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1984, FOR JOINT MEETING TO COMMEMORATE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses at any time on Tuesday, May 8, 1984, for the purpose of a joint meeting to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1984

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, May 7, 1984, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, May 8, 1984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1984, FOR JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, May 16, 1984, for the Speaker to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the United Mexican States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1984

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker in House Concurrent Resolution 126, the Chair, on behalf of the Speaker, designates Tuesday, May 8, 1984, as the day for the joint meeting to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5172, NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 481 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 481

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5172) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 and for related purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 311(a), 401(b)(1) and 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived, and all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a), rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. BEILENSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 481 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5172, the National Bureau of Standards authorization for fiscal years 1984 and 1985. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. It is an open rule, allowing any germane amendment to be offered under the 5-minute rule. The resolution also provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles rather than by sections, with each title to be considered as having been read. House Resolution 481 also provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the rule waives a number of points of order so that the bill may be considered. The rule waives, first of all, sections 311(a) and 401(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act.

Section 311(a) of the budget act prohibits consideration of any measure providing new entitlement authority for a fiscal year if enactment of that measure would breach or further breach the spending ceiling for that fiscal year. The spending ceiling for fiscal year 1984 has been breached already. So, any additional spending for fiscal year 1984 will further breach the ceiling and is subject to a point of order under this section.

Section 306 of the National Bureau of Standards Authorization Act, which would be considered under this resolution, raises the salary of the Director of the Bureau to level IV on the executive schedule. The raise is effective immediately. Hence, the bill, as reported, provides new entitlement authority in fiscal year 1984. Consequently, the bill, as reported, would be subject to a point of order under section 311(a) of the Budget Act.

Section 401(b)(1) of the budget act prohibits consideration of any measure providing new entitlement authority which is effective before the start of the fiscal year beginning in the calendar year in which the bill is reported. The bill was reported in calendar year 1984 and the new entitlement authority would be effective before the start of fiscal year 1985. Consequently, the bill, as reported, would violate section 401(b)(1) of the Budget Act.

The Rules Committee understands that the Committee on Science and Technology will offer a floor amendment limiting the raise in salary to amounts provided in advance in appropriation acts. In that case, the bill would not provide new entitlement authority and the bill, as amended, would not violate sections 311(a) or 401(b)(1) of the Budget Act. Because the committee amendment would cure these violations, the rule waives the

points of order and permits consideration of the bill.

In addition, House Resolution 481 waives section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 402(a) of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of any measure making authorizations for a fiscal year if the measure was not reported by May 15 of the preceding year. H.R. 5172 contains various authorizations for fiscal years 1984; however, it was not reported by May 15, 1983. The purpose of the May 15 deadline is to insure that authorizations are adopted in time for the House to consider the relevant appropriations. The Committee on Science and Technology reported out H.R. 2513, providing authorizations for fiscal year 1984 for the National Bureau of Standards, by May 15, 1983. The House, however, did not consider H.R. 2513 last year. However, fiscal year 1984 appropriations were enacted in Public Law 98-166. The fiscal year 1984 authorization levels in H.R. 5172 reflect the fiscal year 1984 appropriations already enacted into law. Because the Committee on Science and Technology reported out fiscal year 1984 authorizations by the deadline and because the purposes of section 402(a) have been met, the rule waives section 402(a).

In addition, the rule waives clause 5(a) of rule XXI. Clause 5(a) prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. Section 301(a) of H.R. 5172 expands the purposes for which fees for calibration and other services may be used. Section 301(a) permits the working capital fund to be used to replace equipment and inventories. The purposes for which the fund may be used have already been authorized. H.R. 5172 does not provide for any additional fees to be collected. For these reasons, the rule waives clause 5(a) of rule XXI.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5172 authorizes $115.7 million in fiscal year 1984 and $132.8 million in fiscal year 1985. The bill authorizes important programs to improve our Nation's research and development capabilities. Two of the programs authorized include the center for building research and the Fire Research Center. These programs were eliminated in the President's 1984 budget proposal. In order to maintain these important programs, the committee recommends an increase of $6.7 million over the President's proposal for the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1985.

In addition, $4.1 million is authorized for the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Innovation. That office develops policies and cooperative activities between Government and industry to enhance technological innovation and industrial productivity. These programs are crucial to our Nation's technological advancement.

I urge my colleagues to begin consideration of the bill by adopting the rule before us.

□ 1420

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes appropriations for the National Bureau of Standards. It is $8 million over the President's budget. I know there will be some amendments offered on the floor and the bill will be amply debated.

I know of no objection to the rule, and I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time either, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 47, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—282

Akaka	Cooper	Garcia
Albosta	Corcoran	Gaydos
Anderson	Coughlin	Gejdenson
Andrews (NC)	Coyne	Gekas
Andrews (TX)	Daniel	Gephardt
Annunzio	Darden	Gilman
Anthony	Davis	Glickman
Aspin	Dellums	Gradison
AuCoin	Derrick	Gray
Barnard	Dingell	Green
Bates	Dixon	Gunderson
Bedell	Dorgan	Hall (OH)
Beilenson	Dowdy	Hall, Ralph
Bennett	Downey	Hall, Sam
Berman	Duncan	Hamilton
Biaggi	Durbin	Hammerschmidt
Bliley	Dwyer	Harkin
Boehlert	Dyson	Hatcher
Boland	Early	Hawkins
Boner	Eckart	Hayes
Bonior	Edgar	Hertel
Borski	Edwards (CA)	Hillis
Breaux	Edwards (OK)	Hopkins
Britt	Emerson	Horton
Brooks	English	Howard
Broomfield	Erdreich	Hoyer
Brown (CA)	Erlenborn	Hubbard
Broyhill	Evans (IA)	Huckaby
Byron	Evans (IL)	Hughes
Campbell	Fascell	Hutto
Carney	Fazio	Hyde
Carper	Feighan	Ireland
Carr	Fiedler	Jeffords
Chandler	Fields	Johnson
Clay	Flippo	Jones (NC)
Clinger	Ford (MI)	Jones (OK)
Coats	Frank	Kastenmeier
Coleman (TX)	Franklin	Kildee
Collins	Frenzel	Kindness
Conable	Fuqua	Kleczka
Kolter	Natcher	Slattery
Kostmayer	Neal	Smith (FL)
Kramer	Nelson	Smith (NE)
Lagomarsino	O'Brien	Smith (NJ)
Lantos	Oakar	Smith, Robert
Latta	Oberstar	Snowe
Leach	Obey	Snyder
Leath	Olin	Solarz
Lehman (FL)	Ottinger	Spence
Leland	Owens	Spratt
Lent	Oxley	Staggers
Levin	Packard	Stangeland
Levitas	Panetta	Stark
Lewis (FL)	Parris	Stenholm
Lloyd	Pashayan	Stratton
Loeffler	Pease	Swift
Long (LA)	Penny	Tallon
Long (MD)	Perkins	Tauke
Lott	Petri	Tauzin
Lowery (CA)	Porter	Taylor
Lowry (WA)	Price	Thomas (CA)
Lujan	Pritchard	Thomas (GA)
Luken	Quillen	Torres
Lundine	Rahall	Towns
MacKay	Ratchford	Traxler
Madigan	Ray	Udall
Martin (IL)	Reid	Vander Jagt
Martin (NC)	Richardson	Vandergriff
Martinez	Ridge	Vento
Matsui	Rinaldo	Volkmer
Mavroules	Ritter	Walgren
Mazzoli	Roe	Watkins
McCurdy	Roemer	Waxman
McEwen	Rogers	Weaver
McGrath	Rose	Weber
McHugh	Roth	Wheat
McKernan	Roukema	Whitehurst
McKinney	Rowland	Whitley
Mica	Rudd	Whittaker
Mikulski	Sabo	Williams (MT)
Miller (OH)	Savage	Williams (OH)
Mineta	Scheuer	Winn
Mitchell	Schneider	Wirth
Moakley	Schroeder	Wise
Molinari	Schulze	Wolf
Mollohan	Schumer	Wolpe
Montgomery	Seiberling	Wortley
Moody	Shannon	Wyden
Moore	Sharp	Wylie
Morrison (CT)	Shelby	Yates
Mrazek	Sikorski	Yatron
Murphy	Simon	Young (AK)
Murtha	Sisisky	Young (MO)
Myers	Skeen	Zschau

NAYS—47

Archer	DeWine	McCollum
Badham	Dickinson	Moorhead
Bartlett	Dreier	Morrison (WA)
Bateman	Gingrich	Nielson
Bereuter	Gramm	Roberts
Bethune	Gregg	Schaefer
Bilirakis	Hansen (UT)	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CO)	Hartnett	Shaw
Burton (IN)	Hiler	Shumway
Cheney	Holt	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Hunter	Siljander
Craig	Kasich	Solomon
Crane, Daniel	Livingston	Stump
Crane, Philip	Lungren	Walker
Dannemeyer	Mack	Young (FL)
Daub	McCandless	

NOT VOTING—104

Ackerman	D'Amours	Hance
Addabbo	Daschle	Hansen (ID)
Alexander	de la Garza	Harrison
Applegate	Dicks	Hefner
Barnes	Donnelly	Heftel
Bevill	Dymally	Hightower
Boggs	Edwards (AL)	Jacobs
Bonker	Ferraro	Jenkins
Bosco	Fish	Jones (TN)
Boucher	Florio	Kaptur
Boxer	Foglietta	Kazen
Bryant	Foley	Kemp
Burton (CA)	Ford (TN)	Kennelly
Chappell	Fowler	Kogovsek
Chappie	Frost	LaFalce
Clarke	Gibbons	Lehman (CA)
Coelho	Gonzalez	Levine
Conte	Goodling	Lewis (CA)
Conyers	Gore	Lipinski
Courter	Guarini	Markey
Crockett	Hall (IN)	Marlenee

Marriott	Paul	Smith, Denny
Martin (NY)	Pepper	St Germain
McCain	Pickle	Stokes
McCloskey	Pursell	Studds
McDade	Rangel	Sundquist
McNulty	Regula	Synar
Michel	Robinson	Torricelli
Miller (CA)	Rodino	Valentine
Minish	Rostenkowski	Vucanovich
Nichols	Roybal	Weiss
Nowak	Russo	Whitten
Ortiz	Sawyer	Wilson
Patman	Skelton	Wright
Patterson	Smith (IA)	

□ 1440

Mr. NIELSON of Utah and Mr. BEREUTER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 5172.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5172.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5172) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 and for related purposes, with Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 5172, provides for authorization of the National Bureau of Standards and several smaller related activities. The bill has been the subject of 4 days of hearings in our committee and was reported by the full committee on April 4. It would authorize some $132.8 million for the Bureau of Standards and an additional $5.2 million for the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Information, for the fiscal year 1985.

The bill is divided into three titles, Mr. Chairman. For fiscal year 1984, our committee last year reported out the bill, H.R. 2513, and that bill was not considered by the House. We have therefore included it as title I of the current bill before us. Title I is identical to H.R. 2513, with one significant exception. The amounts that would be authorized have been reduced slightly to conform with the fiscal amounts provided for in the appropriation acts and also in Public Law 98-166.

We have included title I to provide continuity of authorization for the National Bureau of Standards.

Title II contains the authorization for the Bureau of Standards and several related activities for fiscal year 1985.

The total included in the bill is $138 million, which compares to the President's request of $130 million, and with the appropriation level for the previous fiscal year of $120 million.

Our committee arrived at the recommended level for these activities after considerable hearings and careful consideration of the priorities reflected in the President's budget. Most significant was the administration's recommendation to target two small but important programs, the fire research and the building research programs. Both of these programs had been targeted for termination last year as well. In both instances they were restored by the Congress for the fiscal year 1984.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that handled the hearings on this bill and brought it to the full committee and now for consideration on the House floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN).

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I want to salute the consideration that the chairman of the full Science and Technology Committee has brought to this bill, authorizing the National Bureau of Standards, and the interest that the other members of the subcommittee and the full committee have given to considering the program of the National Bureau of Standards.

This is a relatively small program as its use given the attention of the House of Representatives go, and yet because the Bureau of Standards focuses on the need for sophisticated scientific measurement, this program is critical as a facilitator of much of the economic activity in our country. The Bureau of Standards has the responsibility of assuring us that our measurement capabilities are equal to the demands that exploding technology is making on commerce. It provides a critical service to the American economy.

There are many ways that you can distribute the emphasis we put on programs of the Bureau of Standards. The minority and the majority see eye to eye on some of the most important ones. Although we weigh the requests of the administration a little differently, by and large we are very close in terms of dollars in the overall.

The most important thing is the agreement between the minority and the majority about the importance of maintaining both the Center for Fire Research and the Center for Building Research Technology. Both of these are relatively small efforts, somewhere in the range of $5 million or thereabouts. Both of which were zeroed out by the administration; but I think both sides of the aisle are doing the right thing in supporting their maintenance at the present levels of effort.

Clearly, the contribution of the Center for Fire Research is one which we ought to support out of respect for the lives and safety issues involved. That center has made substantial contributions to a host of fire-related breakthroughs, both in protection for firefighters themselves and also in the development of low-pressure sprinkler systems that are now seen as the real hope for residential fire protection where most of the lives are lost.

The same thing can be said of the Center for Building Technology, an area where the development of standards for buildings and their characteristics is most important for our economy.

The testimony by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States was that one effort alone of the Center for Building Technology, an effort to standardize the requirement for insulation that had been made by the Federal Trade Commission, saved the construction industry literally $90 million in one item alone. The savings from that one action, if simply put in the bank, would provide the ongoing revenue to fund this level of effort forever.

□ 1450

All recognize the Center for Building Technology as a very cost effective effort, one recognized on both the minority and majority sides of the aisle. We want to salute the minority for recognizing the importance of this program, even though the administration did not.

We do differ in how we cut the cloth in some of the other programs. With respect to biotechnology, the administration recommended a $3 million effort. The committee bill preserves that $3 million effort in new measure-

ment techniques for the emerging biotechnology industry.

Measurement is the key to commerce. If we are unable to measure the quantity or quality of microorganisms, it will be difficult to sell them. The administration recognized the importance of this in recommending the biotechnology measurement effort in the bill.

In order to make room for the fire and building technology efforts, the minority provides no funds for biotechnology. I would argue that, inasmuch as the administration recognized this as an area of important present investment that can only be made by Government, we ought to maintain that manpower in the bill.

Similar arguments would lie for the initiatives recommended by the administration in the area of manufacturing process and quality control. Again, measurements efforts that are the key to great increases in productivity, especially considering the role of automation in industry. And again, only Government has the incentive to do the measurement research that lies at the heart of these kinds of processes.

The same is true for the effort, also supported by the administration, of cold neutron beam measurements which are aimed at further understanding of the surface characteristics of materials. Surface characteristics are critical to advanced treatment of materials, such as the layering of one alloy over another or treating the surface of materials to change their performance. There have been applications in that area in jet turbines where before we had to use very heavy materials simply to get the surface behavior. Now we are able to use lighter materials and alloy or overlay on top of that the surface materials that we need.

As I understand it, the cold neutron beam research will enable us to go farther in the area of understanding the surface characteristics of materials and be a very good investment. The administration recognized that. The administration urged that investment. The committee maintains it.

It is true that reasonable people can differ on the priority of these programs. All are relatively small. All are in the $1 million to $5 million range.

But it is also true that, once we preserve the fire and the building technology work, it is hard not to substantially reduce the other programs which were judged to how high priority by the administration. If cuts are to be made to heed the overall level within the total recommended by the administration, it is hard not to reduce these other efforts in our view, below the necessary critical mass, because the dollar amounts we are talking about are literally so small.

So I would urge people to understand that, once you support importance of the fire effort and the building research effort and recognize the strength of the administration's arguments for the other initiatives, the bill will come out at the level that the committee has reported. There is simply not very much room to reduce those programs without cutting them to the point where the proper question would be: Should they exist at all?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee have made an excellent presentation of where we lie with this bill. It is not a bill which involves a significant amount of money relative to the oversight budget of this country. But it is a bill which significantly impacts the commerce of the country and therefore is one which we must take very seriously and address, I believe, in specifics and in light of where the commerce of this country is going to go.

The request by the Bureau prior to this bill being put forward was 8.6 percent above the appropriated level for 1984. In other words, the President's request representated an 8.6 percent increase. This bill, however, represents a 14-percent increase in 1 year. The request of this bill is $6.7 million above the Bureau's request, and, yes, there is no question but that the additional $6.7 million makes sense in many areas, if we did not have a $200 billion deficit.

It is another situation much like the NSF budget which we dealt with yesterday where you have an agency which is doing good work, which can do more good work, but which has received significant increases to reflect the good work it has done, which has been rewarded by the administration for this good work by the significant increases in funding. And yet the committee has decided to even go further and add increases upon increases.

So what we are talking about again today is what level of increase are we going to have for this agency. Are we going to have a level of increase which is 8.6 percent over last year's appropriated level or are we going to have a level 14 percent over last year's appropriated level? And in a combined basis I think you are talking about 22 percent and somewhere in the vicinity of 28 or 29 percent, and maybe it is 26 and 33 percent over 2 years.

So this agency has done well and this bill is a significant increase. But it is an increase which in my opinion is inappropriate because the administration increase was also significant and yet took into account the deficit situation.

The bill itself addresses a number of new initiatives, new initiatives which again the agency should be and can undertake. However, they are initiatives which in this time of fiscal restraint I believe the agency cannot afford to undertake.

The fact, a number of these initiatives sort of have the proverbial camel's nose under the tent syndrome to them. The initiatives proposed in the area of supercomputers presented about $4.3 million and I believe has an out-year cost of up to $5 million in addition. The cold neutron proposal, which I happen to think is a new one and a new initiative, has $1.5 million for this year but could be $30 million before it is finished. The biotechnology area, the limits on biotechnology are totally without perspective at this time but it is clear that we are going to be spending a lot more money in that area if we start this new initiative this year.

In light of the fact that the administration, while increasing the funding for NBS by 8.6 percent, and the bill and the proposal by 8.6 percent zeroed out the fire research and the building research areas. In light of that I think it is fairly clear that these new initiatives which have been proposed and supported by the administration are going to cost a great deal of money, not only this year but in the outyears relative to the entire budget of NBS and will continue to put, as a result of that additional cost, strain on the underlying functions of NBS which have been and have been strongly supported in the area of fire research and building research where they have done such a good job, and for my opinion I also think we should come from strength.

This is an agency whose strength has been in the fire research and building research and we should continue those programs and continue to fund them at adequate levels before we go on to new initiatives, especially at a time of fiscal restraint.

□ 1500

The Bureau is an agency which has an excellent track record, there is no question about it. But it is also an agency which, like every other agency in this Government, must be looked at in the perspective of the entire spending in the Government.

And here we are asking for an 8.6-percent increase by the administration and yet the committee asks for an additional 6 percent on top of that.

I really do not think that if we do not have the strength and capacity in this Congress to bring a budget which is so relatively small, for the Bureau of Standards, which is an $125 to $130 million budget, down to the levels which were requested by the administration, I would say that we probably are not going to be able to reduce this Federal budget at any point. It is just very hard for me to believe that we can sit here and argue that we are concerned about the deficits when we are

dealing with an agency that has received a proposed 8.6-percent increase and we decide to put another 6 percent on top of that and the numbers are so small that we do not have the courage to even stand up to that additional 6 percent and just allow an 8.6-percent increase.

The time has come, I think, as small as this agency's budget may be, the time has come for us to stand and say that we are going to have to judge each agency in relationship not only to its own qualities but in relationship to the deficit.

Here is a good chance to do it, because you can vote for a significant increase in spending for this agency and still say that you are being fiscally responsible.

So I will be offering an amendment to bring this budget in line with an 8.6-percent increase versus a 14-percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I regret, again, taking the time of the Members to go over some of the aspects of this bill, most of which have been very well treated by the chairman of the full committee and the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee.

I think we all understand the nature of the bill, the value of the programs that are involved here, and I think we also understand that we are going to hear some of the same arguments that were made yesterday in connection with the National Science Foundation bill with regard to reductions in this bill.

Now, I will agree with the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire who has made the point that the administration has given a relatively good budget to this agency, the National Bureau of Standards.

I complimented the administration yesterday for their recommendations in connection with the National Science Foundation and I will do the same today with regard to the Bureau of Standards.

But I would ask us all to look at the situation that is involved here and see if we cannot make discriminating judgments on some basis other than simply saying that this is not in accordance with the President's request.

We know it is not in accordance with the President's request. We are not going to adopt a budget that is in accordance with the President's request. So let us look at the details here and see what we want to do about it.

It has been pointed out that two of the additions have to do with the building safety and the fire programs.

We are involved here in that delicate interface between the role of the Federal Government and the role of the private sector.

This administration, in looking at that interface, has made some judgments that they either will or will not continue to fund programs. In this case they decided they did not want to continue funding them. They made a mistake, that is all.

They almost made that same decision with regard to funding aerospace research, for example, and after they went into an extended study of the importance of federally supported aerospace research, they decided to continue with that.

If these programs were not so small that they have not even made such a study, they would recommend that these be continued, because the insurance industry is not going to fund this kind of research and the building industry is not going to fund this kind of research. They both testified to that effect.

They have asked the Bureau to continue with it and there is no doubt of the value of it. If you saw some of the television coverage on the earthquake in California this last week, for example, you would have noted that the question was asked: Why is it that a 6.2 Richter scale earthquake did no more damage than it did? And the answer was given that it is because we have improved building and structural standards to the point that the newly constructed buildings can resist that size earthquake, where they would have been destroyed 25 years ago.

That research is done in the Bureau of Standards and it would not be done anywhere else.

A similar situation exists with regard to the Institute for Computer Science and Technology. Obviously, we have another interface with a huge private industry. Who is going to do the research? Well, I will tell you that private industry is not going to do the kind of standards research that the Bureau is doing. Yesterday's Post had a major article headlined, "Pact Signed for Standards on Computers."

The Secretary of Commerce and the head of the NBS were there along with representatives of a number of private firms. One of those was a vice president of General Motors, a former administrator of NASA, Bob Frosch, who many of us know.

Frosch said that improving existing computer equipment could double productivity in some GM departments and new, completely compatible equipment could increase productivity fourfold.

It was to obtain that kind of compatibility that he signed a contract to establish these interface standards with the Bureau of Standards.

And that is what private industry wants the Bureau to do. Yet the administration, the OMB, is suggesting that we cut funding for this Institute in half. That is ridiculous. That would eliminate a program which holds the potential for multiplying the productivity of American industry many times over.

Now you are going to have before you probably this year or next a lot of proposals to vastly expand the Federal Government's role in improving productivity in this country. We have had them before.

The fact is that the programs we have in existence now, in the National Bureau of Standards, are the best thing we can be doing for American industry. We have had the NBS for generations. It is accepted by industry, it is making a tremendous contribution, and for us to come in willy-nilly and cut the most sensitive parts of it, the most valuable parts of it, the parts that are doing the most to equip our economy for this new age that we are emerging into; is just not good sense.

And yet that little Institute, funded at $10 million over in NBS, gets kicked around from pillar to post. Last year they were going to take it completely out and put it over in the General Services Administration, which knows very little about computer standards. This year they are keeping it in NBS, but they are just cutting its budget in half.

We want to put the money back. It will pay for itself 10 times over.

So I urge Members to accept the figures that are in the committee bill. They have been carefully worked out and apply a standard of commonsense and concern for the welfare of this country, not a blind adherence to some set of numbers that you know and I know came from some bureaucrat over at OMB who did not spend half the time that the committee has in looking at this.

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of H.R. 5172, and to congratulate my friend, Mr. WALGREN, chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman FUQUA, and ranking minority member, Mr. WINN, for their excellent work in creating this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

In particular I would like to address one component of the bill which has been sponsored by myself and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has resulted from the work of my Subcommitteee on Investigations and Oversight.

All of us have read about failures of buildings and bridges throughout the United States that resulted from failures in their structural design. Examples such as the collapse of a walkway at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Kansas City, or the failure of a bridge along Interstate 95 in Connecticut are well known. Moreover, in many of our districts we know of some building or

bridge that collapsed long before it should have.

In its investigation of these structural failures, the subcommittee did not seek to assess blame in any particular case but rather sought to identify generic causes and factors responsible for these failures. The most alarming of the findings is that there is no mechanism for learning from our past mistakes. Results from the investigation of a failure usually just end up in the files of a law firm or insurance company, or are sealed from the public altogether in the litigation settlements.

Without some public access and a central repository for this data, the professionals involved in architecture, engineering, and construction do not have easily accessible technical data on the causes of the collapse and they cannot use the data to avoid making similar mistakes. Section 307 of this bill charges the Bureau of Standards with maintaining this repository, an idea which has been widely endorsed by the professional community.

Section 307 also gives the Bureau the statutory authority to conduct investigations of major structural failures. This is not new; it merely gives the Bureau statutory authority to execute a function it has been carrying out for 15 years already. The Bureau has made a number of investigations of major failures throughout the country, which have been enormously helpful in preventing their repetition.

Section 307 does not give Bureau regulatory or police powers. All language that would have preempted the authority of local and State authorities was purposefully left out of the amendment. Moreover, the report to accompany H.R. 5172 makes it clear that the committee intended that these investigations of structural failures be done in full cooperation with State and local officials. Lastly, the Bureau is not required to undertake any investigation; the decision of whether or not to investigate is left to the discretion of the Director of the Bureau of Standards. Section 307 is widely endorsed and recognizes the excellent and helpful role the Bureau has been performing.●

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say that the gentleman from California's points are well taken and the amendment that I offer will address all the points he raised. My amendment will retain the fire research, retain the building research, and retain the computer programs.

So I agree. And the amendment will still state an 8.6-percent increase in funding versus a 14-percent increase in funding. It will be addressed primarily to new initiatives proposed by the administration and accepted by the committee along with the funding levels of the traditional programs of NBS.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5172, the National Bureau of Standards authorization bill for fiscal years 1984 and 1985. Considering the huge budget deficits we have been having over the last several years, I want to congratulate Chairman FUQUA and the Committee on Science and Technology for doing an outstanding job under difficult circumstances. In my view, the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) has much to contribute to the well-being and the increased productivity of this Nation. In this regard, proper funding of its activities will insure that NBS fulfills its mandated mission.

I also want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the strong support that the Science and Technology Committee has given to the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology (ICST). Public Law 89-306, which I authored, established for the first time a program to develop ADP and communications standards for the Federal Government. The Institute, which has administered this program for almost 20 years, has done a commendable job in developing standards that have greatly benefited the Government as well as the private sector. For example, Secretary Baldrige recently announced a high level Government-industry standards project which, if successful, could increase our Nation's industrial productivity fourfold.

Notwithstanding these significant accomplishments, the administration over the last 3 years has tried to kill this program by drastically reducing its funding. While the Science and Technology Committee has successfully resisted these efforts, the Institute has been forced to operate at the same level since 1981. Clearly, we cannot expect a vigorous standards program if the Institute is to be precluded from even the nominal increases needed for inflation. I am well aware that the Institute's efforts sometimes generate opposition from vested interests, both within and outside the Government. However, given the significant savings and other benefits derived from this program, I do not believe that we can afford to acquiesce to these vested interests. In my view, any program that is saving the Government more than 10 times its cost is worth funding adequately and deserves the full support of Congress.

According to testimony in 1981 by Joe Wright, then Deputy Secretary of Commerce, the issuance of 54 Federal information-processing standards by the Institute is saving the Government about $132 million a year. Mr. Wright, currently Deputy Director of OMB, testified that a base level of $10 million in 1981 was necessary to carry out a productive program in standards development. Since OMB is mandated by law—the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980—to revitalize the Federal standards program, I have recommended to Mr. Wright that OMB should consider increasing, rather than decreasing, funding for this important program. To date, I have not received a response from Mr. Wright. In this regard, I would hope that the Science and Technology Committee would consider a substantial increase in the future funding of the Institute.●

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, today we have under consideration H.R. 5172, the National Bureau of Standards authorizations.

This Congress failed to pass any authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1984, and this bill would take care of that situation by authorizing the Bureau of Standards for both fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

Mr. Chairman, it is out of my concern, once again, for the budget, that I will vote against this authorizing legislation. It seems incredible that with the ink barely dry on the first budget resolution, we are presented with a piece of legislation authorizing a Government agency to spend $138 million, 15 percent above the previous year's appropriations level.

Even after the adoption of the Gregg amendment, the percentage increase in this authorization is over 8 percent, more than current services increase. No agency of Government should receive funding in excess of the anticipated increase in the Consumer Price Index increase.

Granted, the National Bureau of Standards is not a large Government agency, and when compared to some of the big ticket items in the budget, it is little more than a footnote to our deficit problems. However, if equity is one of the standards that we strive for in the budget, then we should not be hesitating to ask this agency to make the same sacrifices that we ask of others.

I intend to vote against this legislation, Mr. Chairman, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.●

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5172, the fiscal year 1985 National Bureau of Standards authorization legislation. I commend the chairman of the full Science and Technology Committee, Mr. FUQUA, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WALGREN, for their excellent work on this legislation.

The National Bureau of Standards (NBS) is the Nation's oldest national laboratory, and the lead agency for measurement science and standards. The NBS is uniquely qualified and has the mission to perform measurement

and standard work vital to the economic vitality of the United States, and critical to establishment of safety standards. There are a few programs I would like to highlight.

For the second consecutive year, the administration proposed to eliminate the fire research program and the building research program at the National Bureau of Standards. The administration's position is that this work can be adequately performed by the private sector. The committee conducted extensive hearings on this subject, and found that the research would be performed most appropriately and effectively by the Federal Government. Building safety and fire research are not the proper areas for skimping on spending. The major task of the NBS fire research program is to reduce fire-related residential death and injury. State governments and the private sector are simply not equipped to adequately perform this kind of work. I wholeheartedly support the Science Committee's restoration of funds for the fire and building research programs. Testimony from both industry and private sector associations gave no basis to expect that this research would be done by the private sector.

I also support the committee's continuation of funding for computer science and technology at the fiscal year 1984 level. I would prefer to see this program grow, but support the level of funding as essential to maintaining the activities of NBS in developing and implementing a coherent national information policy. The Institute for Computer Science and Technology (ICST) has a mandate to develop standards and guidelines to improve the efficiency of purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment within the Federal Government. The Federal Government will spend billions on computers. Ten million dollars per year to insure that this money is well spent is certainly a worthwhile investment. In addition, ICST continues to address computer security issues, assess new technologies, conduct R&D in computer test and performance measurements, and perform international networking.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes $500,000 to provide the Congress and the executive branch with a basis on which to formulate Federal policy on conversion to the metric system of weights and measures. This modest amount would provide for a comprehesive survey of the current status of metric conversion so that its role in U.S. international competitiveness can be ascertained and, if necessary, strengthened. Many U.S. firms with a strong reliance on foreign trade have slowly changed to the metric system as a result of pressure to increase foreign sales. But since only three English-speaking countries—Burma, Brunei, and the United States—are not committed to the metric system, it is appropriate for the NBS to provide the Congress and the exceutive branch with the facts on which to base Federal policy decisions.

I urge my colleagues to support the fiscal year 1985 authorization for the National Bureau of Standards. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.●

□ 1510

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule by titles, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Bureau of Standards Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I

AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES, FISCAL YEAR 1984

SEC. 101. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, to carry out activities performed by the National Bureau of Standards, the sums set forth in the following line items:

(1) Measurement Research and Standards, $50,166,000.

(2) Engineering Measurements and Standards, $21,276,000.

(3) Computer Science and Technology, $10,000,000.

(4) Core Research Program for Innovation and Productivity, $12,053,000.

(5) Technical Competence Fund, $8,169,000.

(6) Fire Research Center, $5,827,000.

(7) Central Technical Support, $8,227,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act for fiscal year 1984—

(1) of the total amount authorized under subsection (a)(2), not less than $4,000,000 shall be available for the Center for Building Research;

(2) of the total amounts authorized under subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2), not less than $1,000,000 shall be available for Measurement Standards for the Handicapped;

(3) of the total amount authorized under subsection (a)(3) not less than $10,000,000 shall be available for Computer Science and Technology;

(4) of the total amount authorized under subsection (a)(4), not less than $3,500,000 shall be available for Robotics Research and Development;

(5) of the total amount authorized under subsection (a)(6), not less than $5,827,000 shall be available for the Fire Research Center; and

(6) of the total amount authorized under subsection (a)(7), not less than $400,000 shall be available for the Central Planning Office.

EXCESS FOREIGN CURRENCY

SEC. 102. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce, for fiscal year 1984, the sum of $700,000 for expenses of the National Bureau of Standards incurred outside the United States, to be paid for in foreign currencies that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTIVITY, TECHNOLOGY, AND INNOVATION

SEC. 103. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Productivity, technology and Innovation, for fiscal year 1984, the sum fo $3,752,000 for the purpose of research, development, and related activities in the field of innovation and productivity.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 9: delete "3,752,000" and insert "3,625,000".

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment conforms to the amount for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Innovation, to the amount actually appropriated.

I ask the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II

AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES, FISCAL YEAR 1985

SEC. 201. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, to carry out activities performed by the National Bureau of Standards, the sums set forth in the following line items:

(1) Measurement Research and Standards, $57,948,000.

(2) Engineering Measurements and Standards, $23,194,000.

(3) Computer Science and Technology, $10,000,000.

(4) Core Research Program for Innovation and Productivity, $12,168,000.

(5) Technical Competence Fund, $8,598,000.

(6) Fire Research Center, $5,827,000.

(7) Central Technical Support, $15,065,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act for fiscal year 1985—

(1) of the total amount authorized under subsection (a)(2), not less than $3,969,000 shall be available for the Center for Building Research;

(2) of the total amount authorized under subsection (a)(3), not less than $10,000,000 shall be available for Computer Science and Technology;

(3) of the total amount authorized under (a)(6), not less than $5,827,000 shall be available for the Fire Research Center.

EXCESS FOREIGN CURRENCY

SEC. 202. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by section 201, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce, for fiscal year 1985, the sum of $600,000 for expenses of the National Bureau of Standards incurred outside the United States, to be paid for in foreign currencies that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTIVITY, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

SEC. 203. (a) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by section 201, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Productivity, Technology and Innovation, for fiscal year 1985, the sum of $4,121,000 for the purpose of research, development, and related activities in the field of innovation and productivity.

(b) Of the sum authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Productivity, Technology and Innovation is authorized and directed to expend $750,000 for the purpose of substantially increasing the availability of Japanese science and engineering literature to United States scientists and engineers through increased accessibility, monitoring, screening, translation, abstracting, indexing, dissemination, awareness, and marketing. In the conduct of this activity the Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants and contracts with private for profit, nonprofit, and educational organizations and to provide funds to other government organizations, and to utilize (for all or part of this effort) the Director, staff, and facilities of the National Technical Information Service.

METRIC EVALUATION ACT OF 1985

SEC. 204. (a) This section may be cited as the "Metric Evaluation Act of 1985".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY.—(1) The President is authorized to have conducted a comprehensive study of the extent of conversion to the metric system of weights and measures in the United States.

(2) The President shall appoint a panel of not to exceed seven persons to establish criteria for eligible bidders to perform the study authorized by this Act and to act in an advisory capacity to the selected study contractor. Among persons appointed to the panel the President shall include representatives from the public sector and the private sector. Such panel shall report to the Secretary of Commerce.

(3) Members of such panel, other than full-time employees of the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such panel shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government serving without pay.

(4) Not later than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, through the Secretary of Commerce, shall promulgate the criteria for eligible bidders to conduct the study described in section 4.

(5) Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, through the Secretary of Commerce, shall enter into a contract with a qualified nongovernmental entity to conduct the study described in section (c).

(c) STUDY AND REPORT.—(1) The study authorized by this Act shall include—

(a) an analysis of the extent and impact, present and prospective, of conversion to the SI metric system in the materials industry, including the minerals industry (ferrous and nonferrous), the nonmetallic materials industry, the forest product industry, the petrochemical industry, and the agricultural materials industry;

(b) an analysis of the extent and impact, present and prospective, of conversion to the SI metric system in the machinery industry including motors, complex machine tools, instruments, and other similar items;

(c) a cost/benefit analysis, to include the cost of not converting to the predominant use, of the SI metric system;

(d) an analysis of potential export opportunities if United States suppliers use the SI metric system of measurement;

(e) an analysis of the benefits and problems which the conversion to the SI metric system of measurement in the materials and machinery sectors would have upon small business; and

(f) any other topics which may be pertinent to such study as may be determined by the panel.

(2) In conducting such study the contractor shall conduct indepth discussions with corporate executives and labor movement officials in both large and small enterprises, and other appropriate individuals to obtain a clear picture of the attitudes toward and effects of metrication.

(3) Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act the President shall submit a report to the Congress on the results and conclusions of the study conducted pursuant to this Act.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $500,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 9, following line 17, add the following new section:

"SEC. 205. Of the sums authorized pursuant to this title, each such sum is hereby reduced by 6.2 percent."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the debate both yesterday and today I am somewhat reminded of the comment that Secretary Harold Brown one time made about the Soviets building military weapons.

He said: "We build and they build. And we don't build and they continue to build."

I think the same thing is true of the budget process here. The administration decreases budget and we increase. The administration increases budgets and we increase even more.

And that is precisely the problem with this bill as it was the problem with the bill yesterday.

What my amendment attempts to do is with a straight percent across-the-board decrease we try to bring this budget level into compliance with where the administration said we ought to be spending in this bill. Let us not forget that the administration budget is not a balanced budget. The administration budget is $175 billion in deficit. All this is attempting to do is keep us from spending even more than that.

So what we are attempting to do here is say that the administration allocated an 8.3-percent increase over fiscal year 1984 appropriations. This amendment, this 6.2-percent across-the-board cut would attempt to keep that 8.3-percent increase, but would keep us from going to the 14-percent increase that the committee thinks is reasonable.

I think that these increases way over what the administration says it can use are just not a reasonable way of proceeding. It seems to me that this approach is a reasonable one.

The amendment does not eliminate either the fire research program or the Center for Building Research that has been talked about here today. This is not in line with the administration's program, but the subcommittee and the committee in reviewing the work of this particular bureau discovered that these are programs that ought to be continued and I agree.

So all this does is it cuts the committee bill across the board but would continue those programs and would continue to allow them to be pursued.

The amendment does reduce the bill to the President's overall request for the National Bureau of Standards, namely, a $130 million figure.

I think if we are serious and hopefully the Members who come to this well constantly and talk about deficits are serious, if we are serious, one small step that we can take is to make this 6.2 reduction and bring the bill into compliance with where the administration says the spending level should be.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this kind of amendment is very attractive. In fact, there may be instances where these kinds of across-the-board cuts should be endorsed and supported.

But I think we have to ask ourselves what the underlying logic of this amendment is, particularly in this instance, because when we say we are reducing this by 6.8 percent, what we are really saying is that the administration has requested amounts which are unnecessary. That has not been my experience with this administration.

Now if we were going flatly back to the administration request, program by program, then there would be logic to returning to the administration amount. But we are not. The House widely recognizes the importance of the fire, and the building, and the computer efforts. It is our judgment that in veiw of the interests of our

constituents we should not reduce those amounts.

If we keep these programs, but cut across the board, we will be reducing levels 6.8 percent or thereabouts below what the administration requested.

As demonstration that the administration does not request money needlessly, it is my understanding that the initial request from the Commerce Department to OMB for the biotechnology initiative, for example, was something in the range of $10 million.

After review by OMB, the administration requested not $10 but $3 million.

Now we have to ask ourselves: Is there unnecessary money in the administration request? I think the answer is "no." The honest approach to going absolutely back to the administration's level is to go absolutely back to their programs. But that is not recommended in this amendment because the administration zeroed out programs which I am sure even the gentleman from Pennsylvania believes are very important.

Under that analysis, I would think that it is not consistent to argue that we should return to the administration level.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. GREGG to the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

On page 4, line 21, strike "$57,948,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "$52,030,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike "$15,065,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "$13,728,000".

On page 6, line 12, strike "$750,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "$500,000".

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) on his point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I understand the gentleman offers as an amendment and a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), the Walker amendment, as I read it, adds a new section.

Therefore, this perfecting amendment would not be in order to the Walker amendment as a perfecting amendment.

It appears to be a substitute for the Walker amendment, but it is being offered as a perfecting amendment to the Walker amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire offer his amendment as a substitute or as a perfecting amendment?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman. I will offer the amendment as a substitute.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment of a substitute for the Walker amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered as a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 4, line 21, strike "$57,948,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "$52,030,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike "$15,065,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "$13,728,000".

On page 6, line 12, strike "$750,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$500,000".

□ 1520

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr GREGG. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which I mentioned in my opening statement which would change the Walker approach from being an across-the-board approach to being a targeted approach.

First, I would like to address the concerns raised by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN), who has stated that there is no relationship between these numbers and what the President has requested because they do not go to the President's numbers.

Well, I think it is the job of our committee to move dollars around. I think it is also the job of our committee to acknowledge the fact that we are dealing with an overall budget, not just a single budget of NBS, but a budget of the entire spending of the Federal Government, and then when we get a budget before us that was presented in good faith by the administration which reflects an 8.6-percent increase in spending, at a time when we have got a $200 billion deficit, that agency has been fairly treated by the administration, and I think we have a certain obligation to try to stay within that level of increases versus adding onto that level of increases, which is what we have done here.

The amendment, as noted in the previous debate, while the budget increases for 1984 are healthy, it does so at the expense of zeroing out programs with strong congressional and private and public support, that being fire research and the building research programs.

Thus, my amendment would keep those programs at their present funded level. There would be no reduction, across-the-board or any other way, in those programs.

Basically, the areas that my amendment addresses involve the new initiatives areas which I discussed in my prior statement. There is a $2 million item in the budget, which is eliminated, in the area for new telephones. I agree that the NBS could probably use new telephones but I do not think at a time of this sort of deficit situation that we should add the new telephones.

There is a reduction in my budget for the supercomputer purchase. The reason the reduction is in there is not to limit their ability to get into supercomputers but to encourage them to get into it through the lease approach versus the outright purchase approach. In other words, I do not believe that my reduction is going to significantly impact NBS' ability to get into the issue of supercomputers. All it is going to do is put some pressure on them to look at it from a different perspective from the one they are presently looking at it from.

We also have a couple of new initiatives which were requested—they are not major in funding, that we have taken out, but we have retrained two of the new initiatives of the five new initiatives which the administration wanted and, therefore, we have at least allowed for some of that area. We have continued the new initiative in cold neutron activity. This, I think, is very important for the building technology trade, for determining tolerances of various materials, and, in my opinion, it is a very appropriate new initiative and is one which we have retained.

There is $1 million across-the-board cut through my proposal in the national measurements laboratories. However, I would represent that this is not a cut. This is actually a reduction again in the increase that is proposed down to $4 million from the $5 million which is in the committee bill.

We also retain the Japanese language translation at $500,000, which I think is a very appropriate new initiative, not necessarily a new initiative,

but an additional initiative in the area of translation.

So, as an amendment which goes to trying to balance the equities in the situation, the equities being the need to have NBS be treated fairly in its various areas, along with the fact that we are facing a $200 billion deficit, I think this amendment is reasonable, it gives us an 8.6-percent increase in the agency, at the same time maintaining the fire research, the building research, the computer activities, giving the key new initiative in the cold neutron area, but while acknowledging the fact that we have got to stop somewhere and the best place to stop is at 8.6 percent versus adding 14 percent.

I must ask my fellow Members of this body here: We cannot look at this through tunnel vision. We must acknowledge the fact that with each one of these agencies, no matter how small, they all add up. The Everett Dirksen Building, for example, a billion here, a billion there—it adds up to be real money. Well, it also counts for millions, a million here, a million there, it adds up to be billions, which adds up to be a billion here and a billion there.

Let us face it, if we as a Congress, cannot face up to one simple little budget, the NBS budget, and say we are going to give them an 8.6-percent increase versus a 14-percent increase, then, my goodness, how are we ever going to handle defense?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALKER and by unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if I understand what the gentleman's amendment does, it essentially saves the same amount of money that was in my original amendment, the 6.2 percent, but what the gentleman is doing is taking a targeted approach and assuring that what we are doing is not the across-the-board thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania objected to, but, rather, has targeted in on specific programs where we can demonstrate specific savings; is that generally correct?

Mr. GREGG. Yes. What I have done is basically look at some of the programs that they have asked for in new initiatives and suggested that they take different approaches, and basically eliminated $2 million of new telephone equipment for the NBS.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, if we proceed along that route, then, we will be within the administration's budget, and we will have done it in a way in which the administration of none of the programs will be adversely impacted; is that the gentleman's belief?

Mr. GREGG. None of the ongoing programs at the agency will be adversely impacted. In fact, I would argue that they would be very positively impacted. Many of them receive significant increases within the 8.6-percent overall growth of the agency.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I think in many ways what he does in his substitute probably improves upon my original language, and I thank the gentleman for his presentation.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to say that this approach has much more to recommend itself than the across-the-board reduction, particularly because we do believe that the administration has recommended absolutely essential funding in a number of areas that an across-the-board reduction cut.

As a point of clarification, as I understand the gentleman's amendment, the gentleman would essentially not pick up the administration request on biotechnology?

Mr. GREGG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. WALGREN and by unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. I should have addressed the biotechnology, and I apologize, so if the gentleman will give me a few more minutes, I will address myself to that.

The reason I did not pick up the biotechnology issue is, I happen to feel that within the entire Government we are seeing a number of major initiatives in the biotechnology area. However, we are not seeing a great deal of coordination in this area. For the NBS to get into biotechnology and start developing standards before the Government in other areas, such as addressing it on a regulatory basis and addressing it in a coordination basis, has gotten into it, I think is premature. I suspect someday NBS will get into biotechnology measurement, but right now I believe it is premature, considering what I perceive as total disarray in the biotechnology area of Government research, because there is a great deal of money being spent without adequate coordination.

Mr. WALGREN. So this amendment would pick up $3 million in biotechnology and pick up approximately $6 million in the computer acquisition, compared to the administration's request?

Mr. GREGG. That would be correct relative to the administration's request. Relative to the committee bill, however, it would only be about 1.5, I think, something like that.

Mr. WALGREN. So you get about 4.5 between biotechnology and computer acquisition, and then you added another 1 in the generalized reduction in the measurement area?

Mr. GREGG. That is correct. Plus there is money taken out of the new initiatives.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Strike "$52,030,000" and insert "$57,348,000".

Strike "$13,728,000" and insert "$13,665,000".

Strike the last two lines of the amendment and at the end of the amendment add the following:

In section 201(a)(2) strike "$23,194,000" and insert "$22,696,000".

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer to the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire is an attempt to try to make some reductions but not impact the programs quite as severely as the gentleman from New Hampshire does in his amendment.

Let me say that the gentleman's amendment is offered in good faith, it is a constructive amendment, and I applaud the gentleman for trying to accomplish the objectives that he is in this fashion, because I think it is a constructive method that he is going about.

□ 1530

However, in certain areas there is some disagreement in the amount that would be impacted on some of the programs. The amendment that I have is approximately a $2.5 million reduction in the overall bill. It does, as pointed out in the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) it does retain

the moneys, the $2.4 million in the biotechnology program.

In the general technology support, there is $1.4 million reduction for a new scientific computer at NBS. The administration had requested, Mr. Chairman, some $8.9 million; the committee reduced that by about half. This amendment or additional funds will be provided to compete in fiscal year 1986. This amendment does reduce that somewhat, and it is very similar to the Gregg amendment.

One of the areas in the computer area that I would like to point out, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire, is that they would not be able to complete the purchase, and they would have to continue to lease a computer. That is one way to acquire one, but in the outyears it is going to cost about $2.5 million more as a penalty for going ahead with a 3-year lease/purchase rather than a 2-year purchase.

I would hope that in an effort of accommodation that we could adopt the amendment that I have offered to the gentleman's substitute amendment. It makes some reductions; it preserves some of the initiatives that had been requested by the administration that they felt were very important. I would hope that my colleagues could see fit to support the reductions that I have offered so that we can get on with this bill and complete it as early this evening as we possibly could.

Mr. WINN. Mr Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in support of the Gregg amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I would tell our chairman that we appreciate his effort to negotiate at the very last minute a new amount of money that was unknown to all of us until about an hour ago. This is particularly strange after we, as he pointed out, held 4 days of hearings on this bill. I guess after the close results of the NSF votes yesterday that the chairman figured that he would have a better chance if he cut this back a little bit.

We do appreciate any cuts that the majority side would care to offer, but this does not go far enough. As authorizations go, and in the context of a Federal budget in the hundreds of billions of dollars, the authorization for the National Bureau of Standards is not a large amount of money. Nevertheless, we have in this authorization another example of the inability of this House and many of its committees to exercise some fiscal restraint in formulating annual authorizations. Once again I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Hampshire for offering this responsible alternative amendment. His amendment would reduce this authorization to the President's request—an already generous amount for NBS.

The Gregg amendment is not a duplicate of the administration request for NBS in all respects. Based on the hearings that our committee held on the request, we believe that the Center for Fire Research, the Center for Building Technology, and the Institute for Computer Science and Technology should be reauthorized. In this, we differ with the administration. However, in order to provide appropriate funding for these areas, the Gregg amendment correctly makes prudent reductions in other areas within NBS. The overall result of this is that this amendment will authorize NBS at the same bottom line total as requested by the administration. The alternative provided in the committee bill would be some 6 percent over the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced in this authorization with a situation similar to the one we faced with the National Science Foundation. That is, the President requested for fiscal year 1985 a substantial healthy increase for the National Bureau of Standards from the fiscal year 1984 appropriation of $120 million, to a fiscal year 1985 level of approximately $130 million. For some reason, this healthy increase of 8½ percent, $10 million, was not adequate for some on our committee and we have here an increase of $8 million above the request. I can understand in the past that there have been some instances where programs in other areas have been cut by the administration and some Members want to see those cuts restored. This is not the case with the National Bureau of Standards. This agency has faired extremely well under the Reagan administration and continues to do so. It is just not responsible to add $8 million to this authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Gregg amendment and to bring this authorization back in line with the President's request.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 1, noes 12.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Akaka	Flippo	McKernan
Anderson	Foley	McKinney
Andrews (TX)	Franklin	Mica
Annunzio	Frenzel	Mikulski
Anthony	Fuqua	Miller (OH)
Applegate	Garcia	Mineta
Archer	Gaydos	Mitchell
Aspin	Gejdenson	Moakley
AuCoin	Gekas	Molinari
Badham	Gephardt	Mollohan
Barnard	Gilman	Montgomery
Barnes	Gingrich	Moody
Bartlett	Glickman	Moore
Bateman	Gonzalez	Moorhead
Bates	Goodling	Morrison (CT)
Bedell	Gradison	Morrison (WA)
Beilenson	Gramm	Mrazek
Bennett	Gray	Murphy
Bereuter	Green	Murtha
Berman	Gunderson	Myers
Bethune	Hall, Ralph	Natcher
Biaggi	Hall, Sam	Nelson
Bilirakis	Hamilton	Nielson
Bliley	Hammerschmidt	O'Brien
Boehlert	Hansen (UT)	Oakar
Boland	Harkin	Oberstar
Borski	Harrison	Obey
Breaux	Hartnett	Olin
Britt	Hawkins	Owens
Brooks	Hayes	Oxley
Broomfield	Hertel	Packard
Brown (CA)	Hiler	Panetta
Brown (CO)	Holt	Parris
Broyhill	Hopkins	Pashayan
Burton (IN)	Horton	Pease
Byron	Howard	Penny
Campbell	Hoyer	Perkins
Carney	Hubbard	Petri
Carper	Huckaby	Porter
Carr	Hughes	Price
Chandler	Hunter	Pritchard
Chappell	Hutto	Quillen
Cheney	Hyde	Rahall
Clay	Ireland	Ratchford
Clinger	Jeffords	Ray
Coats	Johnson	Reid
Coleman (MO)	Jones (NC)	Richardson
Coleman (TX)	Jones (OK)	Ridge
Collins	Kasich	Rinaldo
Conable	Kastenmeier	Ritter
Cooper	Kemp	Roberts
Corcoran	Kildee	Roe
Coughlin	Kindness	Roemer
Coyne	Kleczka	Rogers
Craig	Kolter	Rose
Crane, Daniel	Kostmayer	Roth
Crane, Philip	Kramer	Roukema
Daniel	Lagomarsino	Rudd
Dannemeyer	Lantos	Sabo
Darden	Leach	Savage
Daub	Leath	Schaefer
Davis	Lehman (FL)	Schneider
de la Garza	Leland	Schroeder
Dellums	Levin	Schulze
Derrick	Levitas	Schumer
DeWine	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Dickinson	Livingston	Sharp
Dingell	Lloyd	Shaw
Dorgan	Loeffler	Shumway
Dowdy	Long (LA)	Shuster
Dreier	Lott	Sikorski
Duncan	Lowery (CA)	Siljander
Durbin	Lowry (WA)	Simon
Dwyer	Lujan	Sisisky
Dyson	Lungren	Skeen
Early	Mack	Slattery
Eckart	MacKay	Smith (FL)
Edgar	Madigan	Smith (NE)
Edwards (OK)	Martin (IL)	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	Martin (NC)	Smith, Robert
English	Martinez	Snowe
Erdreich	Matsui	Snyder
Erlenborn	Mazzoli	Solomon
Evans (IA)	McCandless	Spence
Evans (IL)	McCollum	Spratt
Fascell	McCurdy	Staggers
Fazio	McEwen	Stangeland
Feighan	McGrath	Stenholm
Fiedler	McHugh	Stratton

Stump
Swift
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Towns
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Weaver
Weber
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

□ 1550

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred and five Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) for a recorded vote.

Those Members in favor of taking this vote by a recorded vote will rise and remain standing.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, what is the vote now occurring on?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote is on the Fuqua amendment to the Gregg substitute.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. A sufficient number have risen, and a recorded vote is ordered.

Those in favor of the amendment will vote "aye," those opposed will vote "no," and Members will record their votes by electronic device.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 151, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

AYES—164

Akaka
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Biaggi
Boland
Borski
Breaux
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chappell
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Cooper
Coyne
Darden
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Foley
Frank
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gray
Green
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Harkin
Harrison
Hawkins
Hayes
Hertel
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jeffords
Jones (NC)
Kastenmeier
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Lantos
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin
Lloyd
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lowry (WA)
Lundine
MacKay
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Nelson
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Perkins
Price
Rahall
Ratchford
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roe
Rose
Sabo
Savage
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Simon
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stratton
Swift
Tallon
Thomas (GA)
Towns
Udall
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)

NOES—151

Andrews (TX)
Archer
Badham
Bartlett
Bateman
Bereuter
Bethune
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Britt
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Carney
Chandler
Clinger
Coats
Coleman (MO)
Conable
Corcoran
Coughlin
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis
DeWine
Dickinson
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Fiedler
Franklin
Frenzel
Gekas
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gradison
Gramm
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Hartnett
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kostmayer
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Leach
Leath
Levitas
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McKernan
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
O'Brien
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Petri
Porter
Pritchard
Quillen
Ray
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rudd
Schneider
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (NE)
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stump
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—118

Ackerman
Addabbo
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (NC)
Bevill
Boggs
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Chappie
Cheney
Clarke
Coelho
Conte
Conyers
Courter
Crockett
D'Amours
Daschle
Dicks
Dixon
Donnelly
Dymally
Edwards (AL)
Ferraro
Fields
Fish
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Gibbons
Gore
Guarini
Hall (IN)
Hall (OH)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Hatcher
Hefner
Heftel
Hightower
Hillis
Jacobs
Jenkins
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kazen
Kennelly
Kogovsek
LaFalce
Latta
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levine
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Luken
Markey
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (NY)
Mavroules
McCain
McCloskey
McDade
McNulty
Michel
Miller (CA)
Minish
Neal
Nichols
Nowak
Ortiz
Ottinger
Patman
Patterson
Paul
Pepper
Pickle
Pursell
Rangel
Regula
Robinson
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sawyer
Shannon
Shelby
Skelton
Smith (IA)
Smith, Denny
St Germain
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Synar
Torres
Torricelli
Traxler
Valentine
Vucanovich
Weiss
Wilson
Wright
Young (MO)

□ 1600

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pepper for with Mr. Robinson against.
Ms. Kaptur for with Mr. Marriott against.
Mr. Rodino for with Mr. McCain against.
Mr. Torricelli for with Mr. Latta against.
Mr. Rangel for with Mr. Fields against.
Mr. Addabbo for with Mr. Chappie against.
Mr. Guarini for with Mrs. Vucanovich against.
Mr. Miller of California for with Mr. Cheney against.
Mrs. Burton of California for with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Weiss for with Mr. Paul against.
Mr. Lehman of California for with Mr. Denny Smith against.

Mr. THOMAS of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. GREGG. The Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG to the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Strike all after "SEC. 205." and add the following:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, to carry out activities performed by the National Bureau of Standards, the sums set forth in the following line items:

(1) Measurement Research and Standards, $52,030,000.

(2) Engineering Measurements and Standards, $23,194,000.

(3) Computer Science and Technology, $10,000,000.

(4) Core Research Program for Innovation and Productivity, $12,168,000.

(5) Technical Competence Fund, $8,598,000.

(6) Fire Research Center, $5,827,000.

(7) Central Technical Support, $13,728,000.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTIVITY, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

(a) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by section 201, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Productivity, Technology, and Innovation, for fiscal year 1985, the sum of $4,121,000 for the purpose of research, development, and related activities in the field of innovation and productivity.

(b) Of the sum authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Productivity, Technology and Innovation is authorized and directed to expend $500,000 for the purpose of substantially increasing the availability of Japanese science and engineering literature to United States scientists and engineers through increased accessibility, monitoring, screening, translation, abstracting, indexing, dissemination, awareness, and marketing. In the conduct of this activity the Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants and contracts with private for profit, nonprofit, and educational organizations and to provide funds to other government organizations, to coordinate with other government organizations, and to utilize (for all or part of this effort) the Director, staff, and facilities of the National Technical Information Service.

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask uanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I reserve a point of order. I have not had a copy of the amendment. I reserve a point of order against the amendment at this time, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, if I can explain to the body what is happening here, I am reoffering in a form which I believe is appropriate and which I believe is in order and I apologize for not getting a copy to the Chairman, but because of the parliamentary exigencies that have occurred during this debate, it was impossible to get a copy to the gentleman, but I believe one is being delivered to him right now.

I am reoffering the amendment which would allow for the 8.6-percent increase in NBS funding versus the present 12½-percent increase which the Fuqua amendment to my amendment allows.

We have gone through the language of this debate, but just to quickly review it for those who were not present, essentially my amendment maintains all the basic functions of the NBS and significantly increases funding for NBS, but it does not add on top of the funding increases which were proposed by the administration.

At a time when we face a $200 billion deficit it is just very hard for me to believe that if we cannot draw the line with an 8.6-percent real growth increase in an agency of this size, then how are we ever going to get a $200 billion deficit under control?

So I would ask that the body reconsider, since it has not had the opportunity to vote directly on my amendment, which is a $6 million reduction from the committee bill, but still represents an 8.6-percent real growth in the agency, I would ask the body to reconsider and vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. So I can better understand, if I may, I would like to know again the procedure we find ourselves in. As I understand, we had an original amendment that was supposed to cut—how much money?

Mr. GREGG. We had an original amendment, if I can run through the scenario if I am current on it, which was the Walker amendment, which was a 5-percent across-the-board cut—6.2-percent across-the-board cut, to which I offered a substitute which was a specific targeted approximately $6 million cut.

My substitute was then amended by the Fuqua amendment which reduced my reduction to a $2.5 milion targeted cut.

I am now reoffering my $6 million cut, which is not a cut, it allows for an 8.6-percent real growth in the agency. It is a reduction in the rate of growth amendment to the original Walker amendment.

□ 1610

Mr. VOLKMER. Then you would be actually, if we vote on your amendment we are really just revoting on the Fuqua amendment?

Mr. GREGG. No; this would not be a revote of the Fuqua amendment. The Fuqua amendment represented less of a reduction than my amendment that is now pending. This is an entirely different amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. But your amendment was already pending at the time we voted on the Fuqua amendment?

Mr. GREGG. Excuse me. This is a new amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. But basically your amendment would do what you propose to do if the Fuqua amendment had not been adopted; is that not correct?

Mr. GREGG. That is correct. My amendment would have stood had not the Fuqua amendment been adopted.

Mr. VOLKMER. So upon voting for your amendment we are basically revoting on the Fuqua amendment because the House has already decided that the Fuqua amendment should prevail over your amendment?

Mr. GREGG. I do not believe that is true. What you are voting on here is the opportunity to allow an 8.6-percent real growth in that agency and institute a $6 million cut.

What you are voting on is fiscal responsibility and the issue of whether this Congress has the courage to reduce the deficit in at least this one little, tiny agency while still giving that agency a significant rate of growth.

Mr. VOLKMER. If we adopt your amendment then the Fuqua amendment is abrogated; is that correct?

Mr. GREGG. No. The Fuqua amendment still stands and is pending. You will get to choose between the two.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is yours as a substitute?

Mr. GREGG. No. Mine is an amendment to the Walker amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Your amendment originally was an amendment to the Walker amendment?

Mr. GREGG. It was a substitute.

Mr. VOLKMER. So if we vote on the Walker amendment and yours as an amendment, how much do we totally vote on on the Walker amendment as your amendment goes to it, though? He has an across-the-board cut of 6.2 percent. You have a targeted cut in addition?

Mr. GREGG. No. My amendment replaces the Walker across-the-board cut with a targeted cut which arrives at essentially the same number.

Mr. VOLKMER. Against that we will still have the Fuqua amendment?

Mr. GREGG. Then both the Fuqua amendment and my amendment of $6 million would be pending and you would have a choice against extravagant spending or reasonable spending.

Mr. VOLKMER. Either way you want to characterize it the way you see, and if we adopt your amendment to the Walker amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has expired.

(On request of Mr. VOLKMER and by unanimous consent Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. As I understand it, if we vote for your amendment and add your additional amount as an addition to the Walker amendment, when that is done then if we vote then we would have to vote again on the Fuqua amendment as a substitute; is that not correct?

Mr. GREGG. Yes; I guess you would have that.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is the parliamentary procedure we would be in. We would be voting on the very same thing I said before we just got through voting on.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the gentleman's confidence in my parliamentary acumen, but it appears to me if you take my advice what you have is a clear vote on a $6 million reduction in an agency account which will, as a result of that vote, give you an 8.6-percent real growth in that agency, and that is entirely different than a $2.5 million reduction in that account.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida insist on his point of order?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I will not take the full amount of time. But, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER) pointed out, this is a very clever parliamentary maneuver to get the same vote we just took a few minutes ago.

I would urge the Members to vote no on the amendment so that we can get on with the business of the committee. We will spend more money debating this issue than is saved by this vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREGG) there were—ayes 88, noes 63.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 126, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

AYES—185

Andrews (TX)	Dannemeyer	Hiler
Applegate	Darden	Holt
Archer	Daub	Hopkins
Barnard	Davis	Horton
Bartlett	de la Garza	Hubbard
Bateman	DeWine	Huckaby
Bates	Dickinson	Hunter
Bereuter	Dreier	Hutto
Bethune	Duncan	Hyde
Bilirakis	Durbin	Ireland
Bliley	Eckart	Jeffords
Boehlert	Edwards (OK)	Johnson
Breaux	Emerson	Jones (OK)
Britt	English	Kasich
Broomfield	Erdreich	Kemp
Brown (CO)	Feighan	Kindness
Broyhill	Fiedler	Kostmayer
Burton (IN)	Franklin	Kramer
Campbell	Frenzel	Lagomarsino
Carney	Gekas	Leach
Carper	Gilman	Leath
Chandler	Gingrich	Levin
Clinger	Glickman	Levitas
Coats	Goodling	Lewis (FL)
Coleman (MO)	Gradison	Livingston
Conable	Gramm	Lloyd
Cooper	Gregg	Loeffler
Corcoran	Gunderson	Lott
Coughlin	Hall, Sam	Lowery (CA)
Craig	Hamilton	Lujan
Crane, Daniel	Hammerschmidt	Lungren
Crane, Philip	Hansen (UT)	Mack
Daniel	Hartnett	Madigan
Martin (IL)	Quillen	Snowe
Martin (NC)	Ratchford	Snyder
Mazzoli	Ray	Solomon
McCandless	Ridge	Spence
McCollum	Rinaldo	Stangeland
McEwen	Ritter	Stenholm
McGrath	Roberts	Stump
McKernan	Roemer	Swift
McKinney	Rogers	Tallon
Miller (OH)	Roth	Tauke
Molinari	Roukema	Tauzin
Montgomery	Rudd	Thomas (CA)
Moody	Schaefer	Thomas (GA)
Moore	Schneider	Vander Jagt
Moorhead	Schroeder	Vandergriff
Morrison (WA)	Schulze	Walgren
Myers	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Nielson	Sharp	Weber
O'Brien	Shaw	Whitehurst
Olin	Shumway	Whittaker
Oxley	Shuster	Williams (OH)
Packard	Sikorski	Winn
Panetta	Siljander	Wolf
Parris	Sisisky	Wortley
Pashayan	Skeen	Wylie
Penny	Slattery	Young (AK)
Petri	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Zschau
Pritchard	Smith, Robert	

NOES—126

Akaka	Garcia	Nelson
Anderson	Gaydos	Oakar
Annunzio	Gejdenson	Oberstar
Anthony	Gephardt	Obey
Aspin	Gonzalez	Owens
AuCoin	Gray	Pease
Barnes	Green	Perkins
Bedell	Hall, Ralph	Price
Beilenson	Harkin	Rahall
Bennett	Harrison	Reid
Berman	Hayes	Richardson
Biaggi	Hertel	Roe
Boland	Howard	Rose
Bonior	Hoyer	Sabo
Borski	Hughes	Savage
Brooks	Jones (NC)	Scheuer
Brown (CA)	Kastenmeier	Schumer
Byron	Kildee	Seiberling
Carr	Kleczka	Smith (FL)
Chappell	Kolter	Solarz
Coleman (TX)	Lantos	Spratt
Collins	Lehman (FL)	Staggers
Coyne	Leland	Stark
Dellums	Long (LA)	Stratton
Derrick	Long (MD)	Torres
Dingell	Lowry (WA)	Towns
Dixon	Lundine	Udall
Dorgan	Martinez	Vento
Dowdy	Matsui	Volkmer
Downey	McCurdy	Watkins
Dwyer	McHugh	Waxman
Dyson	Mica	Weaver
Early	Mikulski	Wheat
Edgar	Mineta	Whitley
Edwards (CA)	Mitchell	Whitten
Evans (IL)	Moakley	Williams (MT)
Fascell	Mollohan	Wirth
Fazio	Morrison (CT)	Wise
Flippo	Mrazek	Wolpe
Foley	Murphy	Wyden
Frank	Murtha	Yates
Fuqua	Natcher	Yatron

NOT VOTING—122

Ackerman	Conte	Frost
Addabbo	Conyers	Gibbons
Albosta	Courter	Gore
Alexander	Crockett	Guarini
Andrews (NC)	D'Amours	Hall (IN)
Badham	Daschle	Hall (OH)
Bevill	Dicks	Hance
Boggs	Donnelly	Hansen (ID)
Boner	Dymally	Hatcher
Bonker	Edwards (AL)	Hawkins
Bosco	Erlenborn	Hefner
Boucher	Evans (IA)	Heftel
Boxer	Ferraro	Hightower
Bryant	Fields	Hillis
Burton (CA)	Fish	Jacobs
Chappie	Florio	Jenkins
Cheney	Foglietta	Jones (TN)
Clarke	Ford (MI)	Kaptur
Clay	Ford (TN)	Kazen
Coelho	Fowler	Kennelly
Kogovsek	Minish	Shannon
LaFalce	Neal	Shelby
Latta	Nichols	Simon
Lehman (CA)	Nowak	Skelton
Lent	Ortiz	Smith (IA)
Levine	Ottinger	Smith, Denny
Lewis (CA)	Patman	St Germain
Lipinski	Patterson	Stokes
Luken	Paul	Studds
MacKay	Pepper	Sundquist
Markey	Pickle	Synar
Marlenee	Pursell	Taylor
Marriott	Rangel	Torricelli
Martin (NY)	Regula	Traxler
Mavroules	Robinson	Valentine
McCain	Rodino	Vucanovich
McCloskey	Rostenkowski	Weiss
McDade	Rowland	Wilson
McNulty	Roybal	Wright
Michel	Russo	Young (MO)
Miller (CA)	Sawyer	

□ 1630

Mr. YATES changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Just so the Members can understand where we are now and I will try briefly to explain it, we are now voting on the Fuqua amendment to the original Gregg substitute which would put us back at a $2 million reduction, instead of the $6 million which the Members just voted.

It seems to me that having taken this move to reduce this budget's rate of growth by $6 million, leaving an 8.6-percent real growth in the budget, it would be reasonable to maintain that by voting "no" on the Fuqua substitute.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I tried to point out in my discussion before the last vote, we are right back to where we were on not just the last vote, but the vote prior to the last vote. It is the exact thing.

Mr. GREGG. No, no.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes; it is. It is the exact same vote.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we obviously are not back at the same point because this body has just agreed to reduce the rate of growth for this agency by $6 million instead of $2.5 million. I think that is a significant statement as to our willingness to, at least in this small agency, try to get some budget frugality.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are essentially back at the same vote that we were previously when the Fuqua amendment was adopted to the Gregg substitute.

I might point out for clarification—I know the gentleman did not intention-

ally mean that—the amendment is a $2.5 million cut, rather than a $2 million cut.

I would urge an "aye" vote on this amendment which we have already had before and it saves the time of the House. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say if a Member would wish to remain consistent—I know many Members may not—they would vote the same way on this amendment as they did previously on the Fuqua amendment to Gregg.

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My understanding is then that the gentleman is urging an "aye" vote on the Fuqua substitute to the Gregg substitute, which is a $2.5 million cut. And if one voted "no" the Gregg amendment to the Walker amendment would be sustained and that is a $6 million cut.

So a "no" is a $6 million cut and a "yes" is a $2.5 million cut; is that correct?

Mr. FUQUA. I say to the gentleman the vote is the identical issue that was before the House when the Fuqua amendment to the Gregg substitute was adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know the distinguished chairman of the committee did not want to inadvertently affect anyone's vote by indicating that it is exactly the same vote because it is not.

We have had parliamentary activity occur between the last vote and this vote. The parliamentary activity that occurred was the Gregg amendment to the Walker amendment which was a $6 million cut and which passed overwhelmingly.

Now if you vote in favor of the Fuqua substitute, it is a $2.5 million cut.

If you vote "no," the Gregg amendment to the Walker amendment stands and that is a $6 million cut.

It is not an identical situation. There is a clear choice. "No" is a $6 million cut. "Yes" is a $2.5 million cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), as amended, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 172, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

AYES—123

Akaka	Gejdenson	Oakar
Annunzio	Gephardt	Oberstar
Anthony	Gonzalez	Obey
Aspin	Gray	Owens
AuCoin	Green	Pease
Barnes	Harkin	Perkins
Bedell	Harrison	Price
Beilenson	Hawkins	Ratchford
Bennett	Hayes	Reid
Biaggi	Hertel	Richardson
Boland	Howard	Roe
Bonior	Hoyer	Rose
Borski	Jones (NC)	Sabo
Brooks	Kastenmeier	Savage
Brown (CA)	Kildee	Scheuer
Byron	Kleczka	Schroeder
Carr	Kolter	Schumer
Chappell	Lantos	Seiberling
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (FL)	Smith (FL)
Collins	Leland	Solarz
Coyne	Levin	Staggers
de la Garza	Long (LA)	Stark
Dellums	Long (MD)	Stratton
Derrick	Lowry (WA)	Swift
Dingell	Lundine	Torres
Dixon	Martinez	Towns
Dorgan	Matsui	Udall
Dowdy	McCurdy	Vento
Downey	McHugh	Volkmer
Durbin	Mica	Walgren
Dwyer	Mikulski	Watkins
Edgar	Mineta	Waxman
Edwards (CA)	Mitchell	Weaver
Evans (IL)	Moakley	Wheat
Fascell	Mollohan	Whitten
Feighan	Moody	Williams (MT)
Flippo	Morrison (CT)	Wirth
Foley	Mrazek	Wolpe
Fuqua	Murtha	Wyden
Garcia	Natcher	Yates
Gaydos	Nelson	Yatron

NOES—172

Anderson	Davis	Hughes
Andrews (TX)	DeWine	Hunter
Applegate	Dickinson	Hutto
Archer	Dreier	Hyde
Barnard	Duncan	Ireland
Bartlett	Dyson	Jeffords
Bateman	Edwards (OK)	Johnson
Bereuter	Emerson	Jones (OK)
Bethune	English	Kasich
Bilirakis	Erdreich	Kemp
Bliley	Fiedler	Kindness
Boehlert	Franklin	Kostmayer
Breaux	Frenzel	Kramer
Britt	Gekas	Lagomarsino
Broomfield	Gilman	Leach
Brown (CO)	Gingrich	Leath
Broyhill	Glickman	Levitas
Burton (IN)	Goodling	Lewis (FL)
Campbell	Gradison	Livingston
Carney	Gramm	Lloyd
Carper	Gregg	Loeffler
Chandler	Gunderson	Lott
Clinger	Hall, Ralph	Lowery (CA)
Coats	Hall, Sam	Lujan
Coleman (MO)	Hamilton	Lungren
Conable	Hammerschmidt	Mack
Cooper	Hansen (UT)	Madigan
Corcoran	Hartnett	Martin (IL)
Craig	Hiler	Mazzoli
Crane, Philip	Holt	McCandless
Daniel	Hopkins	McCollum
Darden	Horton	McEwen
Daub	Hubbard	McGrath
McKernan	Roberts	Spence
McKinney	Roemer	Spratt
Miller (OH)	Rogers	Stangeland
Molinari	Roth	Stenholm
Montgomery	Roukema	Stump
Moore	Rudd	Tallon
Moorhead	Schaefer	Tauke
Morrison (WA)	Schneider	Tauzin
Myers	Schulze	Thomas (CA)
Nielson	Sensenbrenner	Thomas (GA)
O'Brien	Sharp	Vander Jagt
Olin	Shaw	Vandergriff
Oxley	Shumway	Walker
Packard	Shuster	Weber
Panetta	Sikorski	Whitehurst
Parris	Siljander	Williams (OH)
Penny	Sisisky	Winn
Petri	Skeen	Wolf
Porter	Slattery	Wortley
Pritchard	Smith (NE)	Wylie
Quillen	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Ray	Smith, Robert	Young (FL)
Ridge	Snowe	Zschau
Rinaldo	Snyder	
Ritter	Solomon	

NOT VOTING—138

Ackerman	Ford (TN)	Murphy
Addabbo	Fowler	Neal
Albosta	Frank	Nichols
Alexander	Frost	Nowak
Andrews (NC)	Gibbons	Ortiz
Badham	Gore	Ottinger
Bates	Guarini	Pashayan
Berman	Hall (IN)	Patman
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Patterson
Boggs	Hance	Paul
Boner	Hansen (ID)	Pepper
Bonker	Hatcher	Pickle
Bosco	Hefner	Pursell
Boucher	Heftel	Rahall
Boxer	Hightower	Rangel
Bryant	Hillis	Regula
Burton (CA)	Huckaby	Robinson
Chappie	Jacobs	Rodino
Cheney	Jenkins	Rostenkowski
Clarke	Jones (TN)	Rowland
Clay	Kaptur	Roybal
Coelho	Kazen	Russo
Conte	Kennelly	Sawyer
Conyers	Kogovsek	Shannon
Coughlin	LaFalce	Shelby
Courter	Latta	Simon
Crane, Daniel	Lehman (CA)	Skelton
Crockett	Lent	Smith (IA)
D'Amours	Levine	Smith, Denny
Dannemeyer	Lewis (CA)	St Germain
Daschle	Lipinski	Stokes
Dicks	Luken	Studds
Donnelly	MacKay	Sundquist
Dymally	Markey	Synar
Early	Marlenee	Taylor
Eckart	Marriott	Torricelli
Edwards (AL)	Martin (NC)	Traxler
Erlenborn	Martin (NY)	Valentine
Evans (IA)	Mavroules	Vucanovich
Fazio	McCain	Weiss
Ferraro	McCloskey	Whitley
Fields	McDade	Whittaker
Fish	McNulty	Wilson
Florio	Michel	Wise
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wright
Ford (MI)	Minish	Young (MO)

□ 1650

Mr. HUGHES changes his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. McCURDY changes his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUDD

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUDD: Beginning on page 7, line 1, strike the entire section 204.

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering strikes the provisions of title II which authorize a $500,000 2-year metric evaluation study.

In 1978, the General Accounting Office (GAO) concluded the most complete and objective analysis of metric use and conversion in the United States and found that the benefits of conversion would be negligible, but that the costs would be substantial—in the billions of dollars.

The Commerce Department completed an earlier study and found that "the notion that the United States is losing exports to metric countries * * * is ill-founded,"

Numerous other reports have also been issued. Whether for or against conversion to the metric system, it should be clear that enough studies have been completed and enough money spent. The U.S. Metric Board was allocated more than $8.7 million during its 5-year existence between fiscal year 1978 and fiscal year 1982. Since the time the funding for the Board was terminated by the 97th Congress, more than $600,000 has been budgeted to the Office of Metric Programs at the Department of Commerce.

Let me emphasize that I do not oppose use of the metric system. Those who wish to convert to metric or stand to gain from it, can legally convert and should do so. Our Nation's current policy—established back in 1866—allows the use of either the metric system or our customary system of weights and measures. However, I strongly oppose Government's unwarranted promotion and costly imposition of metric on the American people who do not wish to convert and stand no benefit from conversion.

The fact is that the American people, without question, oppose conversation to the metric system.

Furthermore, Congress, which has the sole authority under article I, section 8 of the Constitution to fix the standard of weights and measures, has never authorized nor endorsed forced conversion to metric.

However, we are not debating whether or not to commit our Nation to the metric system at this time. What we are considering is whether or not to spend another $500,000 on a study which duplicates past efforts. In my view, enough has been spent. If we are to consider whether or not to mandate use of the metric system, we ought to do so on the basis of the abundance of information which is already available. This expenditure of taxpayers moneys is simply an effort to imperially mandate the metric system on the people of the United States.

□ 1700

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the question here really is not the $500,000. I do not think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD) seriously feels that that is an important matter.

What is at stake here is the question of what is the policy of the United States. The gentleman quite correctly cited that policy. He knows it thoroughly and I know it thoroughly, and the GAO study knows it thoroughly, and I will quote it. The GAO study says:

The United States has a policy of allowing for voluntary conversion, a choice of converting or not converting. This has been the policy since 1866 when the metric system was authorized. During the intervening years, use of the metric system has increased.

In fact, during the past 10 to 15 years it has begun to increase substantially as we became more and more involved in international trade and all of the rest of the world is metric. Only the United States, Burma, and Brunei no longer are metric. Canada, Australia, and Britain have all gone through the conversion process within the last few years.

Now, the automobile industry has converted, the wine and spirits industry has converted, the pharmaceutical industry has converted, the suppliers to the automobile industry are beginning to convert.

The question before us really is: Will the United States provide some assistance to this conversion, voluntary conversion, or will it not? In this connection, there has been a misconstruction of policy. We originally, in enacting the Metric Conversion Act, said "Yes, we will help those who wish to convert voluntarily."

Then what happened was that we set up a Board that supervised this. This administration came in and abolished the Board. We had a small budget to assist them. That budget was abolished. Today the only organ in existence is a private industry American National Metric Council which recommended this study in order to determine what the current situation is with regard to whether or not and how much the cost versus the benefits of conversion were today, not 10 years, today in a rapidly changing situation.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD) very properly does not believe in metric conversion. He does not want to see anything in this legislation which would provide any incentive to study it any more or do anything else, and that is his privilege. But this is what private industry has asked for as a way of facilitating their voluntary conversion.

That is all we are asking for; not a change in policy; an opportunity to assist private industry.

The gentleman from Arizona did not quote the whole GAO report. The report shows that the bulk of the Fortune 500 industries are already in the process of conversion. They would like further information on this. Many other segments of business are converting and I think it is time to make it clear that this country is not ambiguous. We are not going backward. We are going to continue to help industry in this country that wants to voluntarily convert to metric, and we are going to make it easy for them. That is the purpose of this.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should remember that we are only providing by authorization $500,000 in this measure. We cannot do very much for $500,000. We can really probably only ask ourselves in a responsible way the question whether we should assist industries in voluntarily converting.

Something very dramatic has happened between the GAO study in the late 1970's and where we are in 1984, and that is that our basic industries have gone through the floor. We have told them that they now must operate in an international market, most of which is metric, and it seems to me that under those circumstances the least we can do is spend a little effort to ask ourselves the question of how much support we should give in terms of allowing them or enabling them to relate to the metric system.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about voluntarily turning into metric because of what this bill will do. The only purpose that this $500,000 presumably is for is to produce another study.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUDD. Whether it was 10 years ago or last year, the results are the same. Let the marketplace determine whether or not we are going to convert to metric. But if we continue to fund programs that will lead to or keep the metric system alive, the purpose really is to impose it on the people of the United States, and that is the only way the metric system has ever been adopted by any country. It has been by imperial decree.

I would just disagree with the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) for whom I have great respect with regard to the fact that there are only three countries in the world that have not mandated the use of metric. As a matter of fact, England, Canada, New Zealand, have all attempted to impose the metric system much in the way the Metric Board, which is defunct now, attempted to do it in the United States, and in each case the people of those countries summarily rejected the use of the metric system as the only weights and measurements that could be used on a national scale.

Since we do have the ability to use the metric system since 1866, or not use it, as we might choose, the companies who are involved in the studies that were provided by the exhaustive 2-year study of the GAO indicated that the only reason that they might want to go to it is where it would be beneficial to them and there would be no danger in them doing that; that they could go ahead and adopt it and use it without imposing the system on the rest of the United States and on the citizens, where it would cost billions of dollars to convert.

But I see no need to spend any more money or any more effort on another exhaustive study, whatever it might be, and I urge rejection of the amendment on that basis alone.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor this. I think we have been through this debate often enough. I think the gentleman from Arizona has correctly phrased the problem.

The gentleman thinks that this half million dollars will keep the metric system alive, and he does not want to keep it alive. Obviously, I think we should keep it alive as an option for American industry and, therefore, I urge that you vote no on the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I made a mistake. I would like to urge adoption of the amendment when we get to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUDD) there were—ayes 38, noes 41.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 143, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

AYES—146

Andrews (TX)	Hall, Sam	Ratchford
Archer	Hamilton	Ray
Bartlett	Hammerschmidt	Rinaldo
Bateman	Harrison	Roberts
Bennett	Hartnett	Roe
Bereuter	Hiler	Roemer
Bilirakis	Holt	Rogers
Bliley	Hopkins	Roth
Boehlert	Horton	Roukema
Breaux	Hubbard	Rudd
Brooks	Hutto	Schaefer
Broomfield	Hyde	Schneider
Broyhill	Ireland	Schulze
Burton (IN)	Johnson	Sensenbrenner
Byron	Kasich	Sharp
Campbell	Kemp	Shumway
Chappell	Kindness	Shuster
Clinger	Kramer	Sikorski
Coats	Lagomarsino	Siljander
Coleman (TX)	Leath	Sisisky
Corcoran	Lewis (FL)	Skeen
Craig	Livingston	Slattery
Crane, Philip	Loeffler	Smith (NE)
Daniel	Lott	Smith (NJ)
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Smith, Robert
Daub	Lujan	Snyder
Derrick	Lungren	Solomon
DeWine	Mack	Spence
Dorgan	Madigan	Stangeland
Dreier	Mazzoli	Stenholm
Duncan	McCandless	Stump
Dyson	McCollum	Tallon
Edwards (OK)	Mica	Vander Jagt
Emerson	Mikulski	Vandergriff
English	Miller (OH)	Volkmer
Erdreich	Molinari	Walker
Feighan	Mollohan	Watkins
Fiedler	Montgomery	Weaver
Franklin	Moore	Weber
Gekas	Moorhead	Williams (MT)
Gilman	Mrazek	Williams (OH)
Gingrich	Myers	Winn
Glickman	Nielson	Wolf
Goodling	Oxley	Wortley
Gradison	Packard	Yatron
Gramm	Parris	Young (AK)
Green	Penny	Young (FL)
Gregg	Petri	Zschau
Gunderson	Porter	

NOES—143

Akaka	Borski	Darden
Anderson	Britt	Davis
Annunzio	Brown (CA)	de la Garza
Anthony	Brown (CO)	Dellums
Aspin	Carney	Dickinson
AuCoin	Carper	Dingell
Barnard	Carr	Dixon
Barnes	Chandler	Dowdy
Bedell	Coleman (MO)	Downey
Beilenson	Collins	Durbin
Berman	Conable	Dwyer
Biaggi	Cooper	Eckart
Bonior	Coyne	Edgar
Edwards (CA)	Lloyd	Ridge
Evans (IL)	Long (LA)	Ritter
Fascell	Long (MD)	Rose
Flippo	Lowry (WA)	Sabo
Foley	Lundine	Savage
Frenzel	Martin (IL)	Scheuer
Fuqua	Martinez	Schroeder
Garcia	Matsui	Schumer
Gaydos	McCurdy	Seiberling
Gejdenson	McGrath	Shaw
Gephardt	McHugh	Smith (FL)
Gonzalez	McKernan	Snowe
Gray	McKinney	Solarz
Hall, Ralph	Mineta	Spratt
Harkin	Mitchell	Staggers
Hawkins	Moakley	Stratton
Hayes	Moody	Swift
Hertel	Morrison (WA)	Tauke
Howard	Murtha	Tauzin
Hoyer	Natcher	Thomas (CA)
Hughes	Nelson	Thomas (GA)
Jeffords	O'Brien	Torres
Jones (NC)	Oakar	Towns
Jones (OK)	Oberstar	Udall
Kastenmeier	Obey	Vento
Kildee	Olin	Walgren
Kleczka	Owens	Waxman
Kolter	Panetta	Wheat
Kostmayer	Pease	Whitehurst
LaFalce	Perkins	Whitten
Lantos	Price	Wirth
Leach	Pritchard	Wolpe
Leland	Quillen	Wyden
Levin	Reid	Yates
Levitas	Richardson	

NOT VOTING—144

Ackerman	Frank	Murphy
Addabbo	Frost	Neal
Albosta	Gibbons	Nichols
Alexander	Gore	Nowak
Andrews (NC)	Guarini	Ortiz
Applegate	Hall (IN)	Ottinger
Badham	Hall (OH)	Pashayan
Bates	Hance	Patman
Bethune	Hansen (ID)	Patterson
Bevill	Hansen (UT)	Paul
Boggs	Hatcher	Pepper
Boland	Hefner	Pickle
Boner	Heftel	Pursell
Bonker	Hightower	Rahall
Bosco	Hillis	Rangel
Boucher	Huckaby	Regula
Boxer	Hunter	Robinson
Bryant	Jacobs	Rodino
Burton (CA)	Jenkins	Rostenkowski
Chappie	Jones (TN)	Rowland
Cheney	Kaptur	Roybal
Clarke	Kazen	Russo
Clay	Kennelly	Sawyer
Coelho	Kogovsek	Shannon
Conte	Latta	Shelby
Conyers	Lehman (CA)	Simon
Coughlin	Lehman (FL)	Skelton
Courter	Lent	Smith (IA)
Crane, Daniel	Levine	Smith, Denny
Crockett	Lewis (CA)	St Germain
D'Amours	Lipinski	Stark
Daschle	Luken	Stokes
Dicks	MacKay	Studds
Donnelly	Markey	Sundquist
Dymally	Marlenee	Synar
Early	Marriott	Taylor
Edwards (AL)	Martin (NC)	Torricelli
Erlenborn	Martin (NY)	Traxler
Evans (IA)	Mavroules	Valentine
Fazio	McCain	Vucanovich
Ferraro	McCloskey	Weiss
Fields	McDade	Whitley
Fish	McEwen	Whittaker
Florio	McNulty	Wilson
Foglietta	Michel	Wise
Ford (MI)	Miller (CA)	Wright
Ford (TN)	Minish	Wylie
Fowler	Morrison (CT)	Young (MO)

□ 1720

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LUJAN and DANNEMEYER changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 69, noes 65.

□ 1730

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 129, not voting 145, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

AYES—159

Akaka	Gephardt	Obey
Anderson	Glickman	Olin
Andrews (TX)	Gonzalez	Owens
Annunzio	Gray	Panetta
Anthony	Hall, Ralph	Pease
Aspin	Hamilton	Penny
AuCoin	Harkin	Perkins
Barnard	Harrison	Price
Barnes	Hawkins	Quillen
Bedell	Hayes	Ratchford
Beilenson	Hertel	Ray
Bennett	Howard	Reid
Berman	Hoyer	Richardson
Biaggi	Hughes	Roe
Bonior	Hutto	Rose
Borski	Jones (NC)	Sabo
Breaux	Jones (OK)	Savage
Britt	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Brooks	Kildee	Schroeder
Brown (CA)	Kleczka	Schumer
Byron	Kolter	Seiberling
Carper	Kostmayer	Sharp
Carr	LaFalce	Sikorski
Chappell	Lantos	Sisisky
Coleman (TX)	Leach	Slattery
Collins	Leath	Smith (FL)
Cooper	Lehman (FL)	Solarz
Coyne	Leland	Spratt
Darden	Levitas	Staggers
Dellums	Lloyd	Stark
Derrick	Long (LA)	Stratton
Dingell	Long (MD)	Swift
Dixon	Lowry (WA)	Tallon
Dorgan	Lundine	Tauzin
Dowdy	Martinez	Thomas (GA)
Downey	Matsui	Towns
Durbin	Mazzoli	Udall
Dwyer	McCurdy	Vento
Dyson	McHugh	Volkmer
Eckart	Mica	Walgren
Edgar	Mikulski	Watkins
Edwards (CA)	Mineta	Waxman
English	Mitchell	Weaver
Erdreich	Moakley	Wheat
Evans (IL)	Mollohan	Whitten
Fascell	Montgomery	Williams (MT)
Feighan	Moody	Wirth
Flippo	Mrazek	Wolpe
Foley	Murtha	Wright
Fuqua	Natcher	Wyden
Garcia	Nelson	Yates
Gaydos	Oakar	Yatron
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Young (AK)

NOES—129

Archer	Campbell	Dannemeyer
Bartlett	Carney	Daub
Bateman	Chandler	Davis
Bereuter	Clinger	DeWine
Bilirakis	Coats	Dickinson
Bliley	Coleman (MO)	Dreier
Boehlert	Conable	Duncan
Broomfield	Corcoran	Edwards (OK)
Brown (CO)	Craig	Emerson
Broyhill	Crane, Philip	Fiedler
Burton (IN)	Daniel	Franklin
Frenzel	Lujan	Rudd
Gekas	Lungren	Schaefer
Gilman	Mack	Schneider
Gingrich	Madigan	Schulze
Goodling	Martin (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Gradison	McCandless	Shaw
Gramm	McCollum	Shumway
Green	McGrath	Shuster
Gregg	McKernan	Siljander
Gunderson	McKinney	Skeen
Hall, Sam	Miller (OH)	Smith (NE)
Hammerschmidt	Molinari	Smith, Robert
Hartnett	Moore	Snowe
Hiler	Moorhead	Snyder
Holt	Morrison (WA)	Solomon
Hopkins	Myers	Spence
Horton	Nielson	Stangeland
Hubbard	O'Brien	Stenholm
Hyde	Oxley	Stump
Ireland	Packard	Tauke
Jeffords	Parris	Thomas (CA)
Johnson	Petri	Vander Jagt
Kasich	Porter	Vandergriff
Kemp	Pritchard	Walker
Kindness	Ridge	Weber
Kramer	Rinaldo	Whitehurst
Lagomarsino	Ritter	Williams (OH)
Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Winn
Livingston	Roemer	Wolf
Loeffler	Rogers	Wortley
Lott	Roth	Young (FL)
Lowery (CA)	Roukema	Zschau

NOT VOTING—145

Ackerman	Frank	Neal
Addabbo	Frost	Nichols
Albosta	Gibbons	Nowak
Alexander	Gore	Ortiz
Andrews (NC)	Guarini	Ottinger
Applegate	Hall (IN)	Pashayan
Badham	Hall (OH)	Patman
Bates	Hance	Patterson
Bethune	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Bevill	Hansen (UT)	Pepper
Boggs	Hatcher	Pickle
Boland	Hefner	Pursell
Boner	Heftel	Rahall
Bonker	Hightower	Rangel
Bosco	Hillis	Regula
Boucher	Huckaby	Robinson
Boxer	Hunter	Rodino
Bryant	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Burton (CA)	Jenkins	Rowland
Chappie	Jones (TN)	Roybal
Cheney	Kaptur	Russo
Clarke	Kazen	Sawyer
Clay	Kennelly	Shannon
Coelho	Kogovsek	Shelby
Conte	Latta	Simon
Conyers	Lehman (CA)	Skelton
Coughlin	Lent	Smith (IA)
Courter	Levin	Smith (NJ)
Crane, Daniel	Levine	Smith, Denny
Crockett	Lewis (CA)	St Germain
D'Amours	Lipinski	Stokes
Daschle	Luken	Studds
de la Garza	MacKay	Sundquist
Dicks	Markey	Synar
Donnelly	Marlenee	Taylor
Dymally	Marriott	Torres
Early	Martin (NC)	Torricelli
Edwards (AL)	Martin (NY)	Traxler
Erlenborn	Mavroules	Valentine
Evans (IA)	McCain	Vucanovich
Fazio	McCloskey	Weiss
Ferraro	McDade	Whitley
Fields	McEwen	Whittaker
Fish	McNulty	Wilson
Florio	Michel	Wise
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wylie
Ford (MI)	Minish	Young (MO)
Ford (TN)	Morrison (CT)	
Fowler	Murphy	

□ 1740

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT) having assumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5172) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 and for related purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2597. An act to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughter of Harry S. Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel.

AUTHORIZING AWARDING OF SPECIAL CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS TO DAUGHTER OF HARRY S. TRUMAN, LADY BIRD JOHNSON, AND ELIE WIESEL

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2597) to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughter of Harry S. Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Margaret Truman Daniel, a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of the life-time of outstanding public service which her father, Harry S Truman, gave to the United States, and in commemoration of his one hundredth birthday which will be celebrated on May 8, 1984.

(b) For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000 for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(d)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury may cause duplicates in bronze of the medal provided for in this section to be coined and sold under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the gold medal.

(2) The appropriation used to carry out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) Lady Bird Johnson represents the finest qualities of American women, having demonstrated exceptional abilities in the fields of government, business, and social justice;

(2) Lady Bird Johnson's life of service to the Nation covers a generation of change in the status of women;

(3) the intelligence and devotion of Lady Bird Johnson to the concerns of the family, natural resources, and education have eased the transition of the roles of women and benefited the Nation;

(4) Lady Bird Johnson, in her roles as wife of United States Representative and Senator, First Lady of the United States, skilled businesswoman, and regent for the University of Texas, has served as an example of the bridge between the traditional role and the contemporary roles of women in the United States; and

(5) Lady Bird Johnson has received national recognition with the presentation of many awards, including the George Foster Peabody Award, the Eleanor Roosevelt Golden Candlestick Award, the B'nai B'rith Humanitarian Award, the Business and Professional Women's Club Businesswomen's Award, the Ladies Home Journal Woman of the Year Award, the University of Texas Distinguished Alumni Award, the Department of the Interior Conservation Service Award, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

(b) The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Lady Bird Johnson a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of her humanitarian efforts and outstanding contributions to the improvement and beautification of America.

(c) For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be struck a gold medal wth suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000 for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury may cause duplicates in bronze of the medal provided for in this section to be coined and sold under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the gold medal.

(2) The appropriation used to carry out the provisions of this section may be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) Elie Wiesel is internationally esteemed for his accomplishments as novelist, teacher, philosopher, critic, historian, humanitarian, and distinguished citizen of the United States and the world;

(2) the twenty-five published works of Elie Wiesel include novels, testimonies, short stories, and essays which fuse the richness of centuries-old religious traditions with the insights of modern philosophy;

(3) the life and writings of Elie Wiesel have been subject of at least eleven books and his work is taught in high schools, colleges, and universities throughout the United States;

(4) Elie Wiesel in his role of "spritual archivist of the Holocaust" encourages an understanding of the horrors of the past in order to offer humanity hope for a better and more secure future;

(5) Elie Wiesel served with distinction as Chairman of the President's Commission on the Holocaust and as Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council;

(6) Elie Wiesel has traveled, written, and worked for the cause of human rights in Biafra, Lebanon, Cambodia, the Soviet Union, and Central America; and

(7) Elie Wiesel has received the International Literary Prize for Peace and the Prix Medicis, two of the most prestigious literary awards of Europe, and honorary degrees from twenty-five universities of the United States and Israel.

(b) The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Elie Wiesel a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of his humanitarian efforts and outstanding contributions to world literature and human rights.

(c) For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000 for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury may cause duplicates in bronze of the medal provided for in this section to be coined and sold under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the gold medal.

(2) The appropriation used to carry out the provisions of this section may be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 4. The medals provided for in this Act are national medals for the purposes of section 5111 of title 31, United States Code.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, two of the gold medal bills, Harry S. Truman and Lady Bird Johnson, have passed the House unanimously. Because of a technical amendment required by the Senate Budget Committee, we are dealing with those two bills again.

The third medal is for Elie Wiesel in recognition of his humanitarian efforts and outstanding contributions to world literature and human rights. In the course of 25 years, Mr. Wiesel has published the same number of novels, short stories, and essays on topics ranging from the Holocaust to religion in America. He is perhaps most famous for the novel "Night," which detailed a teenager's experience in a concentration camp.

As Chairman of the President's Commission on the Holocaust and as Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Elie Wiesel devotes much of his energies toward keeping the memory of the Holocaust alive in the world today. In addition, he has worked toward the cause of human rights in Biafra, Cambodia, Central America, and the Soviet Union. He is currently serving as the Andrew W. Mellon professor in the humanities at Boston University.

Among the numerous awards he has received are the International Literary Prize for Peace and the Prix Medicis of France. Additionally, he holds honorary degrees from 25 universities in the United States and Israel.

Since there is a White House ceremony honoring Mr. Wiesel on the 29th of this month, I have been asked to move this legislation in an expeditious manner so that the announcement of the gold medal can be made at the ceremony.

A companion bill has more than the required 218 cosponsors so it does comply with the rules of the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee.

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in strong support of this measure, which authorizes the President to award a gold medal to Elie Wiesel in recognition of his outstanding efforts and achievements as a humanitarian and in literature. Not only is Elie Weisel being honored by this legislation today, but the memories of the 6 million Jews who perished in the Holocaust are being honored as well, since Elie Wiesel has become the living voice—the author for these martyrs.

No single individual is more deserving for recognition by Congress and the President than this literary giant. He has shown the world that nonviolence and love of one's fellow human beings transcends even the most horrifying personal memories. All too often we are confronted by the question—"does man make history, or does history make the man?" In Elie Wiesel's case, it is undoubtedly both. Because of his experiences during those exceptionally dark years of the Holocaust, Elie Wiesel has been transformed into this generation's most thoughtful and provoking writer and lecturer. Indeed, he has become our conscience. The silent legacy left by 6 million men, women, and children, has been given a richness that can only be told by Elie Wiesel. He has come to embody the last survivor upon whose shoulders now lies the burden of speaking out on behalf of all those who have suffered through the ages. Elie Wiesel's dedication to mankind has spanned religious and national boundaries, and he has not hesitated to aid all those who seek an eloquent spokesman.

Many have written and discussed the foreboding warnings of George Orwell's "1984." In an era where darkness has loomed continually on the horizon, it is incumbent upon us to do everything in our power to dispel the fears that the novel has instilled in so many people. These past decades have plunged our planet into more despair than ever thought possible; yet, Elie Wiesel has always been there to quietly but forcefully remind us of the inherent good in man.

Elie Wiesel's contributions to the people of this Nation and to the world's literature eminently qualifies him to receive this gold medal. By conferring this honor, Congress and the President demonstrates our dedication to the triumph of good over evil, and to the memories of all those who could not make their own voices heard.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be an original cosponsor of S. 2597 awarding a congressional gold medal to Elie Wiesel.

Since April 29 begins the week of Days of Remembrance for victims of the Holocaust it is especially appropriate that Elie Wiesel be the recipient of this award. Through his vigilence and testimony as a survivor of the Holocaust he reminds us that such an event is in the realm of possibility and must not happen again.

As a member of the Holocaust Memorial Council, I have witnessed firsthand that Elie Wiesel has contributed to history, to humanity and to freedom everywhere.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to express my support for S. 2597, which would direct the President to award a gold medal to Elie Wiesel for his contribution to human rights.

As a survivor of Auschwitz, Elie Wiesel has served as a major spokesman and symbol for all Holocaust survivors. Elie Wiesel has dedicated his life to many noble causes and his efforts to record the horrifying history of the Holocaust have been essential in reminding the world that we must continually guard against any future recurrence of the inhumanity and horror of the Holocaust. The publication of his novel "Night," signaled the beginning of a series of novels, short stories, and essays which transformed the horrors of his experience into moving and enduring works of literature and a testament to his perseverence.

Today, Elie Wiesel continues to fight against injustice and for the cause of human rights on all fronts. Elie Wiesel has spoken out on behalf of the oppressed, the exploited, and the deprived people of the world. He has traveled, written, and worked for the cause of human rights in places like Biafra, Lebanon, Cambodia, the Soviet Union, and Central America. He has been honored for these activities by governments all over the world. Elie Wiesel has provided a much needed voice for thousands of people who have been oppressed and deprived of even the most basic of human rights. He has been a tireless spokesman for the cause of justice and freedom for all people the world over.

As his adopted country, it is appropriate for the United States to recognize Elie Wiesel's outstanding and important contribution to humanity. Mr. Wiesel's work reminds all Americans that the freedoms and rights we enjoy as citizens of the United States are not to be taken lightly. By honoring Elie Wiesel we honor a man who has spent a lifetime fighting for the very principles this country was founded upon; we honor a man who has not turned his back on the millions of oppressed people who so desperately need our support; and we honor a man who has done so much to further the cause of dignity and freedom of all men and women.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly appropriate that we honor Elie Wiesel immediately prior to the Days of Remembrance for Victims of the Holocaust, a weeklong commemoration beginning on April 29. The Holocaust is one of the darkest chapters in the history of mankind, and it must not be forgotten.

Yet, while we pay tribute to Elie Wiesel and commemorate the millions of other courageous victims of the Holocaust, we must not forget the perpetrators of those atrocities, especially the Nazi war criminals who still remain at large. The knowledge that persons charged with Nazi war crimes have taken sanctuary in countries which refuse to extradite them to face their charges continues to haunt the survivors of the Holocaust and all of us who value justice.

I am outraged that this tragic situation is allowed to persist and I have authored legislation to help bring this final chapter of the Holocaust to a just end. My bill, H.R. 3036, would suspend all U.S. military and economic assistance to those countries known to be harboring Nazi war criminals, including Syria, Argentina, Paraguay, Chile, and Canada, until those countries take the necessary steps to extradite those criminals. By bringing the remaining Nazi war criminals to justice we would be honoring the memory of those who did not survive the Holocaust, and we would be making life a little easier for those who did, including Elie Wiesel.●

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution offered by Messrs. KEMP and YATES to provide for the awarding of a gold medal to Elie Wiesel in recognition of his outstanding humanitarian and literary contributions to the world.

I am the son of two who survived Hitler's reign of terror, and, therefore constantly aware of the memories and nightmares that haunt those who lived through man's darkest hours.

And yet there is a man among us who has chosen to live with these memories every day for the sake of mankind. He is an acclaimed author, teacher, and moral spokesman; a man who will disturb your peace of mind for the benefit of mankind and not let you remain indifferent to events that could trigger another catastrophe. He is Elie Wiesel, a man worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize.

On October 28, 1981, Professor Wiesel addressed the International Liberator's Conference held at the State Department of the United States. I was there. The room was filled with those who had liberated the concentration camps as well as survivors, Christians and Jews, peoples from all political systems and ideologies. He spoke to the audience fighting back despair with his every word. Using words to overcome silence. Silence that can only mean complicity in the face of evil. He began by saying that it was not easy to speak. "Suffering is a private matter, a personal matter. And yet if we had not decided to share with you—our memories—then I am afraid we would have caused humanity to be ashamed now even more for what it let be done them. Therefore we bear witness for all men and on behalf of all men and go on bearing witness in spite of everything. We must prevent more violence, more wars, and unmask hatred. Unless we do that, mankind has no chance of survival."

Wiesel has continuously reminded us that "the human community must dedicate itself to the ideal." He cries out for peace in the name of the 1 million murdered Jewish children who were never given the opportunity to grow in the light of peace. In the name of humanity he has traveled to Cambodia to witness the senseless loss of so many who were killed by a madman. And again the world kept silent. Wiesel reminded the world that the *St. Louis* was turned away from safe shores to return to Hitler's Europe. We cannot afford to repeat such action with the boat people.

Wiesel disturbs his audience with his message, worrying that we have forgotten what the face of evil looks like. Perhaps only he and his fellow survivors really know its full measure.

It is time to recognize this messenger who has witnessed the abyss, and therefore, I would urge my colleagues to vote for S. 2597 in recognition of Elie Wiesel's humanitarian efforts and outstanding contributions to world literature and human rights.●

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2597, a bill which would award a gold medal to Elie Wiesel in recognition of his outstanding contributions to world literature and human rights. I am proud to join with my colleagues today in honoring Professor Wiesel—a man who has spent a lifetime reminding all Americans that the personal freedoms and rights we in this Nation know and enjoy are not to be taken for granted.

In the course of 25 years, Mr. Wiesel has published numerous novels, short stories, and essays on human rights. He is perhaps best known for the

novel "Night," which detailed a teenager's experience in a concentration camp. It is through this, and other literary works, that Elie Wiesel transformed the horrors of his personal experience in Auschwitz into a moving and enduring testament to survival and reminder to all mankind.

It is particularly appropriate that the Congress and the President pay tribute to Elie Wiesel as we commence the week of Days of Remembrance for the courageous victims of the Holocaust. On April 30 survivors of the Nazi horrors will gather for the symbolic groundbreaking—transformation of two buildings donated by the Federal Government—into the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Not only is Elie Wiesel being honored today, but the memories of the 6 million Jews who perished in the Holocaust are being honored as well. Through his vigilance and testimony as a survivor of the Holocaust he reminds us that such an atrocity must happen "Never Again."●

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1750

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2597, the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO ATTACK THE PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 98-211)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, April 26, 1984.)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND

(Mr. HARTNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND. Senator THURMOND's statement was made at the dedication ceremony, of the Gen. Edwin A. Pollock memorial and causeway in Beaufort, S.C. I wish to also share with my colleagues several newspaper articles addressing this important occasion:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONY OF THE GENERAL EDWIN A. POLLOCK MEMORIAL AND CAUSEWAY, BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1984, 10:30 A.M.

Major Chambers, Mayor Robinson, General McMonagle, Colonel Jones and other distinguished military officers, Reverend Sells, and men and women of the armed forces, distingished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is a distinct pleasure to be in Beaufort this morning to join with all of you in honoring a great American, an outstanding military leader, and a valuable members of the Beaufort community, our good friend, the late General Edwin A. Pollock. The dedication of the General Edwin A. Pollock memorial and causeway is a truly significant occasion in Beaufort history, and I am particularly proud to be a part of this special event. The General Pollock Memorial Committee is to be commended for their fine efforts in making this project a reality.

General Pollock traveled this road many times—several years ago while serving as Commanding General of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island; and later as a private Beaufort citizen visiting that important training installation. In many ways, it is appropriate that the land link connecting Parris Island to Beaufort and Port Royal is being named for this dedicated patriot because it symbolizes General Pollock's contributions in bridging the gap between the military and civilian communities. Indeed, he was a goodwill ambassador highly respected by both groups.

We gather here today to immortalize and pay tribute to this man who has been called a "Marine's Marine"—a superior designation reserved for only the best of this elite group of soldiers—yet, a fitting description of a remarkable man who devoted 38 years of his life in service to our Nation.

General Pollock's distinguished military career began early in life. In 1917, after studying for a year at Staunton Military Academy in Virginia, he transferred to one of America's foremost military colleges, The Citadel, in Charleston, South Carolina. It was there that a young Edwin Pollock first developed his natural abilities of leadership and discipline. In fact, he won the Star of the West Medal as the best-drilled cadet in 1920. He graduated the next year with a commission as a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Army, and resigned this commission to accept an appointment as Second Lieutenant in the Marine Corps Reserve.

Edwin Pollock loved The Citadel, and held many fond memories of his experience there. This great institution, which has played an important role in building many military giants over the years, presented General Pollock with an honorary Doctor of Military Science degree in 1956. General Pollock was an active member of The Citadel Board of Visitors, and served as its Chairman from 1965 to 1968. After his term on the Board expired in 1974, he became the only person in Citadel history to be named Chairman Emeritus. He was also President of the Association of Citadel Men, President of the Beaufort Citadel Club, and a member of the Century Club. Recognizing his numerous contributions to his alma mater, the Beaufort Citadel Club established a Citadel scholarship in General Pollock's name.

General Pollock's superb Citadel training as a young man proved to be a valuable foundation upon which he built an extraordinary military career. It has been said that General Pollock attained one of the best combat records in Marine Corps history, and one need only observe his long list of accomplishments to realize that was certainly the case.

A veteran of five World War II campaigns, General Pollock saw action in Iwo Jima, where he received the Bronze Star with Combat "V"; Cape Gloucester (glow-ster), where he was awarded the Legion of Merit with Combat "V"; and the Guadalcanal-Tulagi (Tool-ah-gee) landings, where he earned the Navy Cross for heroism, General Pollock also fought in the Korean War, where he received the Distinguished Service Medal. In each of these confrontations, the U.S. Marines left an indelible mark of triumph, and General Pollock played a major role in these battles, exhibiting uncommon valor and courageous leadership.

General Pollock was credited for winning many victories off the battlefield as well. While serving as Director of Plans and Policies at Marine Corps Headquarters in Washington, D.C., General Pollock soundly defeated an effort by President Truman and others to dissolve the Marine's traditional amphibious mission and force-in-readiness role.

Today the Marines remain the proven masters of this form of combat, and stand ready to launch a swift and effective mission in any troubled area requiring this type of assistance.

General Pollock was a perfectionist in every way, particularly when it came to being physically and mentally prepared for military service. His own life typified the high ideals for which the Marines are famous, and he strove to ensure that the men who served under him exemplified that same caliber of performance. Throughout his entire military career, he possessed an innate ability to inspire leadership, commanding every conceivable size infantry, from a 44-man platoon to a 40,000-man force.

General Pollock also excelled in many administrative capacities. He was an able Director of the Marine Corps Education Center in Quantico, Virginia; and later became Commandant of the Marine Corps School there. In 1956, two years after assuming command of the Recruit Depot at Parris Island, General Pollock was selected to serve as Commanding General of the Pacific Fleet Marine Force—one of the most prestigious leadership positions in the armed forces. Eventually, he was transferred across the globe to serve as Commanding General of the Atlantic Fleet Marine Force, thus becoming the first officer in Marine Corps history to have ever commanded both of these strategic operations. After 38 illustrious years of military service, General Pollock and his lovely wife, Mary, retired in October of 1959, and settled in the serene and beautiful coastal community of Beaufort.

Who would have ever imagined that this, the son of an Augusta, Georgia, wholesale dry goods salesman, and grandson of a Con-

federate soldier, would become the great military and civic leader we honor today? We do not gather to merely pay tribute to his fine military career, nor to dedicate this boulevard for any one act of heroism. Instead, we are acknowledging General Pollock's lifetime of military and civilian accomplishments which have greatly contributed to the cause of human freedom and the quality of life in the Beaufort community.

General Pollock was a man of capacity, of courage, and compassion, whose uncompromising standard of excellence permeated every area of his life. His untimely death in November of 1982, at the age of 83, created a deep void in our lives, yet we take great comfort in remembering his service which touched the lives of thousands in this region and throughout the world.

Edwin A. Pollack was the complete man whose exemplary life was the result of his deep commitment to God, his strong love for America and burning zeal to defend its freedoms, his devotion to family, and his unquenchable desire to serve his fellow man. All of us are grateful for the enormous time and energy he spent in making Beaufort a better place to live and work, and we consider it an honor and privilege to have known this fine gentleman.

I am pleased to congratulate General Pollock's beloved daughter, Martha; his devoted son, E.A., Jr.; and six grandchildren and two great-grandchildren and other members of the Pollock family on this very special occasion. We are all proud to salute this soldier whose service to Beaufort, South Carolina, and America deserves this high honor.

Thank you again for inviting me to participate in the inauguration of the General Edwin A. Pollock Memorial and Causeway; and may God bless all of you.

[From the Parris Island (S.C.) Boot, Apr. 13, 1984]

CAUSEWAY DEDICATION HONORS FORMER "CG"

The Parris Island causeway will be dedicated the General Edwin A. Pollock Causeway at a ceremony on Horse Island Wednesday.

The commemoration, in honor of the late Gen. Pollock who served as commanding general of Parris Island from mid-1954 to December 1955, will be highlighted with an unveiling of a monument recognizing the general.

Honored guests attending the event will be the Pollock family; South Carolina Senator Strom Thurmond, keynote speaker; MGen. J.J. McMonagle, commanding general and Beaufort Mayor Henry C. Chambers.

The invocation and benediction will be given by Rev. Frank Sells, of the First Presbyterian Church of Beaufort.

Motorists traveling on the causeway between 10 and 11:30 a.m. should be prepared to stop. MGySgt. H.C. Dibiase, NCOIC of the Provost Marshal's Office says, "Motorists should avoid the causeway during the dedication if at all possible." He adds, "Traffic will be stopped for 15 minutes during the unveiling of the monument, therefore, travelers should make other plans."

[From the Parris Island (S.C.) Boot, Apr. 13, 1984]

POLLOCK "BRIDGES" BEAUFORT, DEPOT

"By the grateful and admiring citizens of Beaufort County, this stone has been raised to the memory of General E.A. Pollock, USMC. The causeway on which it rests and which bears his name symbolizes the link he forged between his service and his community . . . ."

These words are part of the inscription on the monument to be dedicated to Gen. Pollock by the citizens of Beaufort County Wednesday.

The general is described as being a "bridge" between the military installations and the civilian establishment, by retired LtCol. W.R. Von Harten, a member of the Gen. Pollock Memorial Committee. Von Harten calls Gen. Pollock a friend to all, whose first thought was always for others.

Prior to accepting his commission to second lieutenant in 1921, Gen. Pollock had an offer to play professional baseball but declined after he learned he had been granted a Marine commission. In a 1971 interview Gen. Pollock said, "I was tempted to accept the baseball offer, but I thought the Marine Corps' proposal was better."

After retiring from the Marine Corps in 1959, Pollock returned to the civilian community to work with various service organizations, the Citadel (a military academy in Charleston, S.C.), Beaufort County and the First Presbyterian Church of Beaufort.

A Citadel graduate, he was elected to the Board of Visitors of the Citadel in 1964. From 1965–1968 he served as Chairman of the Board at the Citadel, and when his final term expired in 1974 he was elected Chairman Emeritus, a title only he has held.

Before his death in 1982, he also served as President of the Association of Citadel Men, the Beaufort Citadel Club, and as a member of the Century Club. In 1963 he was awarded the Rotary Bowl for distinguished civic service to the Beaufort community and later was also appointed honory Deacon Emeritus by the First Presbyterian Church of Beaufort.

Although Pollock was held in esteem, he was characterized as a humble man. Rev. Frank Sells, chairman of the Gen. Pollock Memorial Committee says, "Many people tried to get the general to write an autobiography, but he would not respond. Many would go and sit with him, seeking to inquire into some of the great battles he had fought, and before they realized it he turned the conversation away from himself and showed his interest in the other person. He was a humble man who would not talk about himself."

The general is a highly decorated combat veteran. He is a recipient of the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Sar and the Distinguished Service Medal to name but a few.

As Director of Plans and Policies, at Headquarters Marine Corps, Pollock was credited with helping to preserve the Marines' established amphibious mission. He is also the only one to command both the Atlantic and Pacific Fleet Marine Forces. Gen. Pollock has served duty as director of the Marine Corps educational center in Quantico, and as a drill instructor at Marine Barracks, Parris Island.

[From the Beaufort (S.C.) Gazette, Apr. 17, 1984]

"THE GENERALS"—THEY SERVED IN PEACE, WAR

The nation's last famous World War II general died this morning. Gen. Mark Wayne Clark was 87.

Like his friend, the late Gen. Edwin A. Pollock of Beaufort, Gen. Clark will be mourned by a generation of men who served and fought with him in three wars.

Leaders from around the world have honored the two warriors who had much in common even though they served in different branches of military. A monument honoring Gen. Pollock will be unveiled at Parris Island Marine Recruit Depot Wednesday. Others will gather to honor Gen. Clark at noon Thursday.

The two elements that were greatest among their common bonds were the military and The Citadel, which Gen. Clark called, "a little oasis of honor, duty and enlightened discipline." Both men saw a great deal of Americanism in the school and the men who graduated from it. Gen. Clark served as president from 1954 until 1965. Gen. Pollock, a 1921 graduate of The Citadel, was chairman emeritus of the school's Board of Visitors at the time of his death.

GEN. MARK WAYNE CLARK

Mark Wayne Clark was one of the top U.S. Generals of World War II. During the Korean War, he became United Nations commander in Korea. In 1953, he signed the military armistice agreement that ended the Korean fighting.

Gen. Clark graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1917, and served in Europe during World War I. He commanded the U.S. Fifth Army in Italy from 1943 to 1944 and pushed the Germans out of the country. In 1945, he became commander in chief of the U.S. forces in Austria, and U.S. High Commissioners for Austria. In 1952, he became the United Nations commander in Korea and U.S. commander in the Far East. He signed the armistice that ended the Korean War.

Among the many decorations awarded Clark during his military career were the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, the Honorary Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire and the French Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor.

Clark retired from the Army in 1953. He wrote two accounts of his war experiences, Calculated Risk (1950) and From the Danube to the Yalu (1954.) However, the full exploits of Gen. Clark's 36-year military career may never be told.

GEN. EDWIN A. POLLOCK

Many people have cited him as having one of the most fabulous Marine combat records in the history of the Corps, but his admirers believe his remarkable story has never fully been told. They attributed this to his modesty which restrained him from revealing his own heroics from Guadalcanal to Korea. His citation for the Navy Cross earned for heroics as a battalion commander with the 1st Marines, 1st Marine Division during the battle of the Tenaru River on Guadalcanal told a portion of the story.

Gen. Pollock was a veteran of five World War II campaigns and the Korean War. He was the only officer ever to have commanded fleet Marine forces in both the Pacific and the Atlantic. And, he was once nominated by the S.C. General Assembly to the Secretary of the Navy to become the commandant of the Marine Corps.

They were the last great generals of the last great war this country fought. But they were more than that. Having known the destruction and suffering caused by war, they were humanitarians. They served their country well in peace, as well as war.

ANOTHER WEEK OF BIG SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore, (Mr. KILDEE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are about to complete a very interesting day in which we had a series of votes where finally the American taxpayer won a couple of minor victories. A little bit of money was saved. They were not a very large victories. They were a matter of a few million dollars. And compared to the budget as a whole, those are fairly minor victories, but it was a victory in terms of trying to keep the spending for one agency within the budget the President proposed, a budget that was $175 billion in deficits, and Congress was about to exceed that amount of money by even more.

But today on the House floor, through a series of votes, through some rather complicated parliamentary maneuvering, we were able, in the end, to bring about a small victory for the American people and try to keep that agency within its Presidentially requested sums of money.

And what happened? After all of that maneuvering and after the American people had won a little bit of a victory, the House was gagged. Instead of going to a final resolution of the issue, we resorted to gagging the House, rising, moving out before we could pass such a bill in final form.

Once again we see what happens in the House of Representatives when the tyranny of the majority steps out of line with the American people. The American people want to make doggone certain that this Congress begins to handle deficits, that we get rid of multibillion-dollar deficits. The American people understand that something has gone drastically wrong in this Congress, and today they have an example of it. When the people win a little bit of a victory, when a little bit of money is saved, what happens? The House rises before we can have final passage. And I will bet you that when that bill comes back here a little later on, we are going to find that a lot of arms have been twisted and a lot of work has been done in order to reverse some of those victories that were won on the floor today.

This was not just rising to leave for the week. This was rising in order to make doggone certain that by the time we go to final passage the American people will lose, not win, and we will go back to spending levels irresponsible and unconscionable.

I think that this is a week that the American people ought to focus on; this is a day the American people ought to focus on. Yesterday we had a similar bill on the floor, a bill for the National Science Foundation. It has many, many meritorious programs. The National Science Foundation is one of those agencies that has also had some programs that have not been too meritorious in the past, and we raised on the House floor the issue of whether or not we ought to be spending more money, adding to deficits for programs like studying the social ecology of far-ranging coyotes, and other things that we were appropriating money to do. And the House voted yes, indeed, let us spend an extra $58 million, bust the budget to the tune of $58 million, to do some of those kinds of things yesterday.

And today, when the American people did win a bit of a victory, the House could not stand to move forward and bring that victory to final resolution. Instead, we rose and went for another day. On another day the chances are that the American people may lose. There ought to be some focus on that. We ought to make it clear that this House has no intention whatsoever of dealing responsibly with the issue of our time, the budget issue. This House is continuing its big spending ways. This House is continuing to ignore what the American people know, and that is that you have to live within a budget. This week proves it. The American people should take a close look at how their Representative voted in a week of big spending.

INTRODUCTION OF THE KEMP-KASTEN "FAIR AND SIMPLE TAX" (FAST)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 60 minutes.

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today, together with many of my colleagues in the House, I am introducing a tax reform bill called the fair and simple tax (FAST). Senator BOB KASTEN of Wisconsin is intoducing a companion bill today in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, our current income tax code is now too complex, too encrusted with special provisions, and its tax rates are too high, to be either fair or efficient in raising revenues. There are over 5,100 pages in the Internal Revenue Code, and about 10,000 pages of IRS interpretations to that code. The House has just adopted a measure called the Tax Simplification Act which runs over 1,000 pages. The explanation of this supposed "simplification" runs to three volumes of over 1,000 pages each.

Many provisions which were intended to protect families, like the personal exemption, have been eaten away by years of inflation. The same is true of provisions for those with low incomes, such as the zero bracket amount.

The fair and simple tax (FAST) is designed to bring about a simpler, fairer, and more efficient Tax Code, with greater after-tax incentives for work, saving and investment.

I am pleased to announce as original sponsors of this legislation TRENT LOTT, HENSON MOORE, HENRY HYDE, JOHN HILER, DENNY SMITH, G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, RON PACKARD, DON RITTER, NEWT GINGRICH, DAN COATS, VIN WEBER, CONNIE MACK, DAN LUNGREN, ROBERT WALKER, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, JUDD GREGG, THOMAS KINDNESS, ED BETHUNE, MARK SILJANDER, JIM COURTER, DAVID DREIER, BOB MCEWEN, HAL DAUB, BILL LOWERY, BILL DANNEMEYER, LARRY CRAIG, DAN BURTON, BILL MCCOLLUM, BOB LIVINGSTON, TOM HARTNETT, HANK BROWN, and DAN SCHAEFER.

Mr. Speaker, this tax bill is fair to everyone. But it is especially fair to families with children, to the poor, to working men and women, to homeowners and givers to charity, and to those who face discouragingly high tax rates. It is also fair to taxpayers who now spend countless wasted hours, trying to figure out an unnecessarily complicated Tax Code.

In general, the FAST plan broadens the tax base by eliminating most tax preferences or "loopholes." However, important deductions are retained for interest (including mortgages), charitable contributions, real property taxes and catastrophic medical expenses. Also retained are the current tax treatment of IRA's, Keoghs, social security, and veterans' benefits. After deducting generous personal allowances and a new employment income exclusion, all taxable income is taxed at the same 25 percent tax rate.

FAST is simple enough that most itemizers could use a tax form shorter than today's 1040A "short form" for nonitemizers. And taxpayers will not even need to look up their tax in a tax table, because there is only one tax rate.

Our new proposal is fair to families with children. It is fair to lower and middle income taxpayers. FAST doubles the personal exemption for each taxpayer, spouse, and dependent to $2,000, and increases the zero bracket amounts, or standard deductions. There is also a new exclusion for employment income to protect wage and salary earners. The exclusion is generally 20 percent of employment income up to about $40,000, and is phased out entirely at about $100,000. This new exclusion lowers the effective income tax rate and offsets the social security payroll tax, resulting in a smooth, almost flat total tax rate.

As a result of these generous allowances, Americans near or below the poverty level would no longer pay income tax under FAST. For example, the income at which people start paying income tax would rise from $3,445 to $5,875 for a single taxpayer,

and from $8,936 to $14,375 for a family of four. This lifts the income tax threshold above the poverty line, which is $5,517 for a single person and $11,101 for a family of four. More than 1 million of the lowest income taxpayers are removed from the tax rolls. And FAST helps millions more to get out of the "poverty trap" of steep disincentives caused by a combination of high tax rates and means-tested social welfare payments.

For taxpayers in general, the FAST tax is designed to raise about the same amount of revenue in each income class as under current law. However, because many tax preferences are eliminated, many taxpayers whose deductions are no greater than average would receive a tax cut. For example, a nonitemizing family of four earning $20,000 would receive a tax cut of $616.

FAST increases incentives, too. Today's top income tax rate is cut in half, from 50 to 25 percent. This increases after-tax incentives by up to one-half. The Tax Code is indexed, to protect everyone from future tax increases caused by inflation. For the first time, capital gains are indexed for inflation, to end the taxation of phony, inflated "gains" on assets like stocks or houses.

On the corporate side, most tax preferences are repealed, and the tax rate cut from 46 to 30 percent, with a reduced 15 percent rate for small businesses. The new depreciation schedules enacted in 1981 are retained, and the corporate capital gains tax is reduced. An expensing provision for small business is also retained.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I do not claim that this bill is the last word in tax policy. If we can find ways to improve upon it, either on the individual or corporate side, we will. Rather, it is a first word, a way to restart debate in the Congress on proper tax policy. It is a way to focus the energies of the movement for fairer, simpler, more incentive-oriented tax reform which has been growing in this country for more than a decade.

With its simplicity, protection for families and the poor, and increased incentives to work, save and invest, the fair and simple tax is a plan which families across the country can embrace. I urge my colleagues in both parties to join me in enacting it.

What follows is a more detailed description of the plan and several key features.

THE KEMP-KASTEN "FAIR AND SIMPLE TAX": GENERAL DESCRIPTION

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Reduced rate of 25 percent applies to following tax base:

Eliminate most deductions, credits, exemptions, exclusions except personal allowances: personal exemption doubled to $2,000, zero-bracket amounts (standard deduction) increased to $2,700 single/head of household, $3,500 joint.

Special exclusion for wage-earners: 20 percent deduction of wage/salary income up to Social Security wage base (about $40,000 in 1985); phased out so that no exclusion is allowed on incomes above about $100,000; if a taxpayer's earned income is less than $10,000, all gross income below $10,000 is considered earned income.

Deductions retained: Charitable contributions; mortgage and other interest paid; real property taxes; and medical expenses above 10 percent of adjusted gross income.

Indexing for inflation: Personal exemption, zero bracket amounts, capital basis.

Capital gains treatment: Full taxation of gains, full deduction of loss, with basis indexed from enactment date; taxpayer option during 10-year transition period: 25% exclusion (18.75% rate), without indexing; and current homeowner's rollover and one-time exclusion retained.

Current treatment retained: Retirement annuities (IRA's, Keoghs, Social Security, etc.); military and veterans benefits; employer-provided benefits; foreign source income; earned income credit (slightly modified); nonprofit tax exempt bonds; employee business expenses; and moving expenses.

CORPORATE INCOME TAX

Reduced rate of 30% applied to the following tax base:

Eliminate most deductions, credits, exemptions, exclusions except deductions above if applicable, e.g., charitable contributions; ordinary business expenses; and current-law capital cost recovery schedules (ARCS or 15-5-3).

Small business provisions: 15% tax rate up to $50,000 taxable income and, expensing for up to $10,000 of business property.

Capital gains tax rate cut from 28% to 20%.

Foreign income tax credit.

AN OVERVIEW

The Fair and Simple Tax (FAST) is a tax reform bill authorized by Congressman Jack Kemp (R-NY) and Senator Bob Kasten (R-WI). It is designed to increase the fairness, simplicity, and economic incentives of the current tax system, while raising almost the same amount of revenue.

In general, the FAST tax further increases incentives while broadening the tax base and protecting those at the bottom of the income scale.

FAST is simple. Most tax preferences are removed, permitting a lower tax rate on a broader tax base. A few important deductions are retained, such as interest (including mortgage interest), real property taxes, charitable contributions, and retirement plans (IRA's, Keoghs, Social Security, company pensions, etc.) After deducting generous personal allowances, and an exclusion for employment income, everyone pays the same 25% income tax rate.

FAST is fast. Because of its simplicity, most itemizers could use a tax form shorter than today's 1040A "short form." Taxpayers would not need to use a tax table to figure out what they owe.

FAST is fair. It provides generous personal allowances which protect those with low incomes. The "zero bracket amounts," or standard deductions, are increased to $2,700 for single taxpayers and $3,500 for joint returns. The personal exemption for each taxpayer, spouse, and dependent is doubled to $2,000. This is designed to make up for a decade of erosion of the exemption due to inflation. This means the FAST is fair to families with children.

FAST is fair to the poor and the working poor. Because of the increased personal allowances and the employment income exclusion, a single person would not pay income tax on the first $5,875 of income in 1985 (compared with $3,445 under current law). A working family of four would not pay tax on the first $14,375 of income (compared with $8,936 under current law). The poverty level for 1985 is estimated to be $5,517 for a single person and $11,101 for a family of four. Thus, single taxpayers below the poverty level, and families below about 130% of the poverty level, would no longer pay federal income tax. More than a million of the lowest-income taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

FAST indexes the tax code for inflation, including the personal exemption, the zero-bracket amounts (standard deductions), and employment income exclusion. This prevents automatic tax increases caused by inflation, which hit lower and middle incomes the hardest. The poor and working poor would be permanently protected from inflation. For the first time, capital gains are indexed for inflation, preventing taxation of phony, inflated gains on assets like houses and stocks.

The FAST tax gives special protection for wage-earners. Wage-earners' incomes are subject to risks of health and age note faced by those who receive income from securities and from physical capital: a bond can't get sick, and a human being doesn't receive depreciation allowances. FAST provides an employment income exclusion, which permits taxpayers to exclude 20% of their wages and salaries from taxation, up to about $40,000. (The exclusion is phased out above $40,000, disappearing entirely for incomes larger than about $100,000). If a taxpayer's employment income is less than $10,000, all gross income below $10,000 qualifies for the exclusion.

The employment income exclusion is tied to the Social Security wage base. This has several advantages: First, it removes big discontinuities in the combined Social Security and income tax rates. (However, this in no way constitutes "back door" financing of Social Security with general revenues, because the link between contributions and benefits stays the same. The fiscal integrity of the Social Security system is unaffected.) Second, it results in total marginal tax rates which are about the same for both employment and saving income. Third, this feature avoids a redistribution of the tax burden. Other flat tax proposals, if they raise the same amount of revenue as current law, necessarily shift the tax burden to lower and/or middle-income taxpayers.

The overall distribution of the federal tax burden is little changed from current law—with and without the Social Security tax. In each income class up to about $100,000, the amount of revenue raised is estimated to be about the same as under current law. In fact, there are small tax reductions on average for taxpayers below $20,000. Over $100,000 ignoring incentive effects from tax-cutting, there would be modest revenue losses. Including incentive effects, revenue would be about the same, or slightly higher, than under current law. For example, when the top income tax rate was cut from 70% to 50% in 1982, revenue increased by 13% among taxpayers earning more than $100,000 a year.

Since many tax preferences are eliminated, yet the tax paid in each income class is little changed, many taxpayers with average deductions or less would receive a tax cut. For example, a family of four earning

$20,000 and taking the standard deduction would receive a $616 tax cut.

FAST increases incentives. The marginal tax rate of 25% is only half of the current tax law's top 50% tax rate. That creates after-tax incentives for work, saving, investment and business enterprise which are up to one-half larger than under current law. The treatment of capital gains is mostly more generous than under current law: capital gains are indexed for inflation; gains are fully taxable, but losses are fully deductible. During a ten-year transition period, taxpayers may choose to exclude 25% of gains, without indexing, if this treatment is more favorable. This lowers the top tax rate on capital gains from 20% to 18.75%. Current tax benefits for IRA's, Social Security, and other retirement pensions are retained.

On the corporate side, most tax preferences and credits are eliminated. The corporate tax rate is cut from 46% to 30%. But the current capital cost recovery (depreciation) schedules, enacted in 1981, are retained. Small business benefits from a lower 15% tax rate up to $50,000, and by keeping the ability to expense up to $10,000 of business investment per year. Also, the business capital gains tax is cut from 28% to 20%. The foreign income tax credit is retained.

TREATMENT OF TAXPAYERS BELOW OR NEAR THE POVERTY LEVEL

Under current law, many taxpayers living below the poverty level pay federal income taxes. Under the Kemp-Kasten "Fair and Simple Tax" (FAST), however, no working family or single taxpayer below the poverty line would pay any federal income tax.

FAST also extends similar protection to "the working poor"—families with incomes of up to about 130% of the poverty level. In this way, about a million and a half taxpayers near or below the poverty level would be removed from the tax rolls entirely.

This is because three features of the FAST proposal combine to increase the income threshold at which taxpayers begin to pay Federal income tax: the doubled personal exemption, the increased zero bracket amounts (standard deductions), and the new exclusion for employment income.

What is just as important, the FAST plan makes sure that this protection will always exist in the future. Under FAST, the personal exemption, the zero bracket amounts, and the employment income exclusion are all indexed to keep up with inflation.

INCOME TAX THRESHOLDS AND THE POVERTY LEVEL: "FAST" COMPARED WITH CURRENT LAW

[All figures are for 1985]

	Single	Married couple	
		No children	Two children
Taxpayer status:			
Poverty level	$5,517	$7,071	$11,101
Income tax threshold:			
Current law	$3,445	$5,638	$8,936
FAST proposal	$5,875	$9,375	$14,375
Income tax threshold as percent of poverty level:			
Current law	62	80	81
FAST proposal	106	133	129

Note.—Assumes nonitemizers whose income is entirely from wages and salaries; includes earned income credit where applicable.

Source: Joint Committee on Taxation, U.S. Congress.

SUMMARY OF EFFECTS OF THE EMPLOYMENT INCOME EXCLUSION

A distinctive feature of the Kemp-Kasten "Fair and Simple Tax" (FAST) is a new "up-front" or "above-the-line" exclusion for part of wages and salaries: the employment income exclusion.

In general, taxpayers may exclude 20 percent of wage and salary income, up to the Social Security wage base (which is $39,300 in 1985, and indexed by law). Above that point, the maximum exclusion is reduced by 12.5 percent of a taxpayer's wages and salaries in excess of the Social Security wage base. For 1985, this results in a zero exclusion for all incomes larger than $102,180.

Two exceptions are permitted for the sake of fairness. First, taxpayers with less than $10,000 in wages and salaries may exclude 20 percent of all gross income, up to $10,000. This especially helps retired senior citizens. Second, two-earner couples with combined wages and salaries in excess of the Social Security wage base may figure their exclusions separately and add the two.

This provision has several advantages:

First, it protects the poorest individuals and families, by raising the threshold at which they start paying income tax. For example, under Kemp-Kasten the personal exemptions and standard deduction allowed for a family of four total $11,500. The wage exclusion raises the tax-free level of income further, to $14,375. (The income tax threshold is less than $9,000 under current law; the official poverty level will be more than $11,000 in 1985.)

Second, for middle-income taxpayers, the exclusion offsets most of the Social Security payroll tax rate. Without such a provision, a flat income tax rate would result in significantly higher combined marginal tax rates (Social Security plus income tax) below the Social Security wage base than above it. The FAST plan fixes the problem. (The marginal tax rate is the tax on an additional dollar of income.)

Third, the exclusion results in smooth, virtually flat total marginal tax rates both below and above the Social Security wage base. It keeps the tax rates on employment and savings income about the same above the income tax threshold. And compared with a "pure" flat income tax, the exclusion reduces the tax burden for all wages and salaries less than about $100,000. Incomes larger than about $100,000 receive no benefit from the exclusion.

Finally, the employment income exclusion helps keep the distribution of the income tax burden virtually unchanged in each income class, right up to the point at which the exclusion disappears. This makes FAST fairer than a straight flat rate tax, while remaining almost as simple.

COMPARISON WITH THE BRADLEY-GEPHARDT TAX BILL

Many people have asked how FAST compares with the Bradley-Gephardt bill, which is among the better-known proposals for tax reform.

The two proposals are broadly similar in many important respects. Both bills are designed to broaden the existing tax base, to simplify the tax code and permit significantly lower marginal tax rates. Both are designed to raise roughly the same amount of revenue as under current law in 1985. Both are designed to maintain the distribution of the income tax burden roughly the same as under current law.

However, the two plans also differ in significant ways. FAST would seem to be somewhat simpler, to provide more incentives for saving and investment, and to be fairer over time because, unlike Bradley-Gephardt, it indexes the tax code for inflation.

SIMPLICITY

Under FAST all taxpayers pay the same tax rate (except for the effect of an employment income exclusion). Taxpayers can figure out how much they owe without referring to a tax table.

Bradley-Gephardt retains three progressive tax rates, which consist of one "normal" and two "surtax" rates. A tax table is necessary. Also, under Bradley-Gephardt, sometimes the effect of deductions depends on adjusted gross income, and sometimes on taxable income. This could result in forcing taxpayers, in effect, to figure out their taxes twice.

While Bradley-Gephardt retains some of the existing deductions, most of them apply only to the "normal" tax rate, not the "surtax" rates. For example, a homeowner in the 26 percent tax bracket would find that his deduction for mortgage interest payments is worth only about half of the tax saving allowed in the same circumstances under current law. Under FAST, what you see is what you get: if a deduction is allowed, it is allowed in full, not in part.

Under FAST, the personal exemption is $2,000 for everyone. Under Bradley-Gephardt, the personal exemption is one amount ($1,600) for adults and a smaller amount ($1,000) for dependent children; like the deductions, these exemptions apply only to the "normal," not the "surtax" rates. Under FAST, the personal exemption is $2,000 for everyone, without restriction.

INCENTIVES

FAST's tax rate of 25 percent is lower than Bradley-Gephardt's 30 percent top tax rate. Bradley-Gephardt raises the capital gains tax rate on individuals from 20 percent to 30 percent. On a comparable basis, FAST lowers it to 18.75 percent for individuals. Bradley-Gephardt's limitations on deductions for interest also penalize those who invest for long-term capital gains, since up-front costs cannot be deducted. Bradley-Gephardt increases the taxation of corporate-run retirement pensions; FAST does not.

FAST institutes a new exclusion for employment income, equal to one-fifth of wages and salaries up to about $40,000, which is phased out from $40,000 to $100,000. The exclusion increases the income tax threshold, offsets the Social Security payroll tax, and results in a virtually flat combined income and payroll tax rate. Bradley-Gephardt does not have such a provision.

FAIRNESS

FAST indexes the tax code for inflation, including the low-income allowances. Bradley-Gephardt repeals indexing and thus ensures both "bracket creep" and erosion of the standard deduction and personal exemption by inflation. Thus, with any inflation, Bradley-Gephardt would result over time in tax increases which shift the tax burden in real terms to the middle and lower income taxpayers. FAST extends indexing for the first time to capital gains, ending the taxation of paper "gains" which may actually be losses after inflation. Bradley-Gephardt's higher tax rate is applied to inflated, not inflation-adjusted, gains.

FAST contains somewhat more relief for the poor and working poor than Bradley-Gephardt. Under FAST, the threshold at which a single taxpayer begins paying income tax is $5,875 (compared with $4,600 under Bradley-Gephardt). For a working family of four, the income tax threshold

under FAST is $14,375 (compared with $11,200 under Bradley-Gephardt). The poverty line in 1985 is estimated to be $5,517 for single people, and $11,101 for a family of four. Because FAST is indexed for inflation, it would always protect the poor from future inflation.

ALLOWABLE DEDUCTIONS AND PREFERENCES

Both plans allow deductions for charitable contributions, mortgage interest, property taxes, and medical expenses in excess of 10 percent of adjusted gross income. However, as mentioned, under Bradley-Gephardt these apply only to the 14 percent "normal" tax rate, not the additional 12 percent and 16 percent "surtax" rates; under FAST there is no restriction. FAST permits the deduction of all interest, including mortgage interest. Bradley-Gephardt permits the deduction of interest other than home mortgage interest only to the extent that it does not exceed investment income. Bradley-Gephardt permits a deduction for state and local income taxes; FAST does not. Bradley-Gephardt taxes employees for the value of employer-contributed life and health insurance premiums in addition to compensation actually received; FAST does not.

BUSINESS TAXATION

Both FAST and Bradley-Gephardt eliminate most tax preferences, including the investment tax credit, and lower the corporate tax rate from a maximum 46 percent to 30 percent. FAST lowers the business capital gains tax rate from 28 percent to 20 percent, with indexing; Bradley-Gephardt raises it to 30 percent, without indexing.

However, FAST retains the 1981 capital cost recovery schedules, while Bradley-Gephardt institutes a less generous and more complicated system, which approximates the pre-1981 depreciation schedules. The FAST system is closer to economic neutrality, and so provides more incentives for capital investment.

Bradley-Gephardt changes the treatment of foreign-source income in ways which put U.S. firms and employees at a disadvantage; FAST retains the more generous current law.

FAST retains two special provisions for small business: a reduced 15 percent tax rate on the first $50,000 of income, and the ability to expense up to $10,000 per year of business property. Bradley-Gephardt eliminates both the lower tax rates for small business and the expensing provision.

Aside from these differences, the two proposals are broadly similar.●

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my respected colleague, Mr. OWENS, in paying tribute to National Library Week, which as you know was celebrated the week of April 9.

Libraries are an integral part of our society. They provide valuable information to people of all ages. Adults and children alike can find endless instruction and amusement in our Nations libraries. Print collections and tapes help to entertain the elderly and the handicapped. For the young, libraries offer new worlds and encourage adventure and fantasy.

Libraries, these days, are doing much more for people than ever before. The New York Public Library, for example, offers a variety of programs to benefit the community. Literacy, job and community information centers, English-as-a-second-language classes and a whole range of services for the handicapped are just a few of the exciting projects that the New York Public Library is sponsoring to educate and enlighten New Yorkers.

Libraries are an important resource, critical to the continuation of a free society. Only by guaranteeing the public free access to information about the world we live in can we be promote the high ideals of freedom and liberty that we cherish. National Library Week will focus awareness on this vital national resource, and insure that more people than ever before will benefit from exposure to our libraries.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1984, I was present in the Chamber and voted in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 290, the resolution passed by the House protesting the mining of the Nicaraguan harbors. On rollcall No. 89, the motion to recommit and kill the resolution, I am recorded voting "no." Yet, on the tally for rollcall No. 90, which occurred 5 minutes after the vote on the recommittal motion, I am not recorded, even though I was present and voting. I would like the record to show that, despite the apparent malfunction of the voting equipment, I supported passage of the sense-of-Congress resolution opposing the use of funds for the purpose of mining the territorial waters or ports of Nicaragua.●

NATIONAL NURSING HOME RESIDENTS' DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution designating April 27, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents' Day." I am pleased to say that the majority of the House joins me in support of this measure to honor a most significant and often forgotten group within the senior citizen population. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas, DAVID PRYOR, has introduced an identical resolution in the other body.

This is the fifth year I have sponsored this resolution which is designed to focus attention on the achievements of the over 1 million Americans living in nursing homes today. My colleagues join me in letting these people know that we care about them and are grateful for their substantial contribution to the growth and development of this Nation. They played and continue to play a vital role in our society.

Many of those residing in nursing homes are there not because they require the level of care only provided in nursing homes. Often it is because they are without family to care for them, or without the necessary community services that would allow them to remain independent.

Numerous nursing home residents have lived in relative isolation in our cities and towns. Through major cooperative efforts, we can turn this situation around and actively integrate these citizens into the communities through a broad range of activities aimed at recognizing resident concern, accomplishments, and community involvement. We hope that this joint resolution will go one step further in making this integration possible.

I would like to recognize my distinguished colleague MARIO BIAGGI for his extended contributions in making this resolution possible, as well as the efforts of the National Coalition for Nursing Home Reform.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of the resolution.

H.J. RES. 457

Whereas over one million older Americans reside in nursing homes and one in five older Americans likely will reside in a nursing home at some time;

Whereas nursing home residents have contributed to the growth, development, and progress of this Nation and, as elders, offer a wealth of knowledge and experience;

Whereas Congress recognizes the importance of the continued participation of these institutionalized senior citizens in the life of our Nation;

Whereas in an effort to foster reintegration of these citizens into their communities Congress encourages community recognition of and involvement in the lives of nursing home residents;

Whereas the Congress recognizes the importance of safeguarding the rights of nursing home residents; and

Whereas it is appropriate for the American people to join in support of nursing home residents to demonstrate their concern and respect for these citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 27, 1984, is designated as "National Nursing Home Residents Day", a time of renewed recognition, concern, and respect for the Nation's nursing home residents. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. WIRTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, today 10 of my colleagues and I are introducing legislation to authorize funds for this Nation's excellent public broadcasting system.

The legislation authorizes funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989 and for the public telecommunications facilities program (PTFP), administered by the Department of Commerce, for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987. Additionally, the legislation repeals the so-called unrelated business income tax penalty which is a clear disincentive to stations developing alternative revenue sources.

The bill also eliminates the requirement that a strict 75 percent of PTFP funding be used for unserved areas of the country, although bringing service to unserved areas of the country will remain a priority of the program. For the convenience of my colleagues, the following is a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

I. SHORT TITLE

Section 1 entitles the bill the "Public Broadcasting Amendments Act of 1984."

II. PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES PROGRAM

Section 2 authorizes appropriations for the PTFP at $50 million for FY 1985, $53 million for FY 1986, and $56 million for FY 1987.

The Public Telecommunications Facilities Program, administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration of the Department of Commerce, provides matching grants for planning and construction of additional public broadcasting facilities so that the benefits of our nation's public broadcasting system can reach more Americans. The Administration, as it has done every year since 1981, has proposed abolishing the program by requesting no funds for it. The Administration justification for eliminating the PTFP is that it has met its goals of bringing public television and radio to all Americans. In 1981 Congress enacted a gradual reduction in the authorization levels for the PTFP from $20 million in FY 1982 to $15 million in FY 1983 to $12 million in FY 1984. This compares to a $40 million authorization level for this program in 1981.

Currently, however, 30% of the country cannot receive public radio signals, and 10% of the public still cannot receive a local public television signal. Many large geographic areas, particularly in the West, cannot receive a public television signal. There is no local service yet in Montana, 15% of Missourians do not receive public television signals, and similar problems exist in Nevada, Arizona, Alaska and Hawaii. In other areas there are particular problems where mountains and buildings interfere with signals, and equipment is needed to correct this situation in order to serve the entire community. Finally, a severe problem is developing with respect to preservation and maintenance of existing transmission and other broadcasting equipment, and it has become very clear that updating and replacing equipment and parts requires an ongoing commitment of resources if quality public broadcasting signals are going to be available to the public.

The FY 1984 appropriation for the PTFP was only $11.88 million. However, last year's 324 grant applications requested a combined total of $72 million in funds, backed by an impressive commitment of nearly $30 million in local funds. Thus, only 14% of the applications could be granted.

In order to bring PTFP funding more in line with the demonstrated need for the program, the public broadcasting community has requested an authorization of $50 million, $53 million and $56 million for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 respectively. This legislation adopts this level of funding. Additionally, S. 2436, introduced by Senator Goldwater, was recently reported from the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee and adopts this level of funding for PTFP.

III. CPB FUNDING

Section 3 of the legislation authorizes funding for CPB for FY 1987, 1988, and 1989 at $238 million, $253 million and $270 million respectively.

In 1981, as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, Congress enacted substantial funding cuts for CPB from an authorization of $220 million in fiscal year 1983 to $130 million in each of fiscal years 1984, 1985 and 1986. It was hoped at the time that new sources of revenue, provided for in part by that Act, could be generated to compensate for decreasing federal funds. However, since that time, revenue has not been generated quickly enough and in sufficient amounts to compensate for these drastic cuts. As a result, many stations have had to reduce the amount of locally produced programming, overall broadcast hours and staff. Moreover, important cultural and educational series are being forced out of production. For example, the series "Nature: Living Wild" and "Latenight America" have been cancelled due to lack of funding. Production of new shows for "Great Performances", "Frontline" and "Playhouse" have been scaled back 20%. Production for "Wonderworks" and "Reading Rainbow", both popular and critically acclaimed programs for children, has been cut 50% and 33% respectively. Moreover, two-thirds of all "Sesame Street" programs are now reruns of previous segments.

In order to prevent further erosion of the public broadcasting system and to begin to stem curtailment of services, Congress recently passed a supplemental authorization (P.L. 98-214) which provides a minimal cost-of-living adjustment of 5.6% for fiscal year 1984, 1985 and 1986 to cover inflation, increased costs and growth in the number of public broadcast stations. Under this law, authorizations increased to $145 million, $153 million and $162 million respectively. As the minimum amount of federal funding necessary to restore the level of programming and services provided by the public broadcasting service before the huge cuts the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has requested $238 million for FY 1987, $253 million for FY 1988 and $270 million for FY 1989. This legislation and the Senate bill adopt those levels.

It should be noted that the bipartisan Temporary Commission on Alternative Financing For Public Telecommunications (TCAF) recently reported to Congress that there was no forseeable or rational replacement for Federal funding support at higher levels than exist today.

IV. CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL AND EXPENDITURES BY THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Section 4 of this legislation strikes section 393(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 which in effect removes the stipulation that 75% of PTFP funds must go toward new service.

Because a large proportion of the country is now served by public television and radio, it is no longer necessary for a strict 75% of all facilities funds to be directed to this effort. In fact, much of the equipment now used by public broadcasters is very old and must be replaced, or updated. The elimination of this stipulation will allow more funds to be directed to upgrading and replacement of equipment, which has become a critical need. However, the directive that unserved areas be funded on a priority basis would continue in place.

S. 2436 also contains this amendment.

V. REPEAL OF THE UNRELATED INCOME TAX PENALTY

Section 5 deletes Section 396(k)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 and repeals the unrelated income tax penalty.

The Temporary Commission on Alternative Financing reviewed the possibility that additional sources of income could be generated by public broadcasters entering auxiliary commercial ventures. For example, some public television stations use spare production capacity to produce programs for cable television, another leases its satellite uplink for commercial purposes. Some public radio stations have signed agreements to lease excess satellite distribution capacity for commercial paging ventures. TCAF concluded, however, that profits from these ventures are extremely small, and prospects for them to generate meaningful income in the foreseeable future appear dim.

TCAF did conclude however, that Section 396(k)(8) of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1981 is a barrier to increased entrepreneurial activities by public broadcasters. That section now requires that public broadcasters paying taxes on income earned from unrelated activities must refund to CPB an amount equal to the tax paid. Public broadcasters believe that this "double taxes" stations that earn unrelated business income, and urge that this provision be repealed. This legislation repeals the provision.

I urge my colleages to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.●

□ 1800

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution invoking the War Powers Resolution with respect to Central America. I would like to point out that the RECORD will reflect that I did the same thing last year, exactly 1 year ago, with respect to Lebanon and Beirut. I am hopeful there will be more heedful years in

this case because here the stakes are immensely large.

For, at this point the policy or nonpolicy of this country, our country, is committing our children and our children's children and their children to an endless era of hostility and war between ourselves and these children and those that destiny and God has placed as our neighbors to share what we call the new world.

So today I am introducing this resolution even though I have spoken out on this particular need for months. I am doing this because now there can be no longer any doubt that the administration is following a course that is bound to lead America into an involvement, in a conflict, as I say, in Central America and other parts of the world, that irretrievably condemns our children, future generations, to a situation reminiscent of what has occurred in Europe, where ancient hatreds still boil over.

Honduras, for example, has been transformed by our occupation, for indeed, we are occupying Honduras and have so for quite some time. We have transformed the poorest nation in Central America into a strategic bastion through the guise of continual military maneuvers. We are involved in a clandestine war against Nicaragua. The number of Americans in El Salvador is much greater than has been officially represented, and I have been reporting this for more than 2½ years, thanks to imaginative ways of counting advisers.

Furthermore, Americans have been involved in combat support operations in El Salvador. Through the provisions of aerial reconnaissance, we have been using the same tactics where we have complete control of the air as we did in Vietnam. I think we are forgetting all of that. We are using the same tactics, and I have reports, and have had for more than 2 years of the same terror that we are spreading.

We are, as some editorialists have called us in Latin America, the terrorists, the Nazis of the region. We have been involved in combat support operations in El Salvador and elsewhere, through the provisions, as I said, of these particular maneuvers. The involvement is so intense that American advisers in El Salvador alone have been the target of assassination; have come under fire repeatedly because of the close involvement with active military units.

During the past few weeks the House has been continually shocked by reports coming from Central America. We have discovered by simply picking up the morning newspaper that the Central Intelligence Agency directly supervised the mining of three Nicaraguan harbors. I had reported for a year that the CIA had been actively engaged in attempting to assassinate the leaders of the Nicaraguan Provisional Government; was weekly attempting to blow up their public buildings; their docking facilities; their wharves; their refineries. Finally it could not be denied any longer just about a month ago.

We know that the CIA oversaw the sabotage of Nicaraguan oil tankers; that U.S. reconnaissance flights have aided the Salvadoran military in tracking down guerrilla units, so-called guerrilla units; that the United States is establishing a semipermanent military presence in Honduras. Apparently the Reagan administration is operating under the philosophy of what the Congress does not know or will not know will not hurt them. Yet, when the Reagan policy does fail, it is a calculated course of disaster, so it is inevitable that it will fail just like the Lebanon, the Beirut disaster.

Some of us talked for almost 2 years on that; we were not prophets, we were not seers; we were merely pointing out what such experts like the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously had indicated to the President. The Joint Chiefs of Staff had been strongly against the deployment of the marines in Beirut. All I was saying was the reasons why militarily there was no role but death for those marines. Yet, it was ignored. Even after 240 were murdered in their beds, the President did not change; he persisted until it was absolutely obvious that our allies, so-called, French and Italian were going to withdraw theirs if we did not.

This is the fact that is the truth. But even then, the basic policy was destructive; catastrophic; and the so-called actions, because I do not know that there is a policy, is fated for utter failure, catastrophic in meaning and in eventual significance to our great country.

Yet, when it does, it will be the Congress that will be to blame as the President tried to blame Beirut, the withdrawal of the marines, and of course, was ridiculed not only in our country, but everywhere else, because it was obvious that what he was saying was that those critics, like myself, that had said that this is the obvious ending of this bad policy were to blame for his bad policy. It reminded me of what George E. Reedy, who had been a special assistant to President Johnson and a man whom I have had the honor of knowing, wrote, in one of the books that he published on the Presidency, and I am quoting:

> No President can admit, even to himself, that his problems stem from his inability to persuade the people of the rightness of his purpose. When a President's designs are frustrated he must demonstrate, at least to his own satisfaction, that the popular will was with him, but was somehow divested or discarded by the machinery of government.
>
> The most satisfying method of achieving these rationalizations psychologically, is to zero in on Congress.

In the case of Central America, Reedy's words ring true. The American people, I know at least in my district, do not support the administration and its policies there, because these policies simply are not working. Just like Vietnam. If perhaps, there could have been some definition of a possibility of "victory," the President might have had support, but people do not support policies that do not work. Reagan may blame Congress, but the real culprit, of course, is himself in his unwise, counterproductive foreign actions or policy actions in Central America.

Central America, we must never forget, like most of Latin America, is a region which suffers from extreme poverty, illiteracy, maldistribution of wealth. Its people held enthralled by some of the world's most brutal and corrupt governments. We have been identified with those brutal and corrupt governments. We imposed the Somocista regime, which is what the Nicaraguan Revolution is all about.

□ 1810

But this administration has steadfastly refused to call for reforms, failed to address the causes of unrest and revolution, causes that would motivate us, anyone in our country, to fight. Instead, the countries of Central America have been militarized by our administration like never before in the history of the region.

At this moment, and now for about a year, we have surrounded Nicaragua alone with 30,000 of our military, in the air, on the land, on the sea. Military aid has been pumped into the civil war in El Salvador. Arms are flowing to the so-called rebels or Contras in Nicaragua. United States-Honduran military exercises easily take place off both coasts of Central America.

Salvadorans, terrified by the brutality of the bloodletting, are fleeing in increasing numbers to their country's main backer, the United States. While some would like to deport these war-weary Salvadorans, I support the proposed freeze on the deportation of unauthorized Salvadoran refugees. Surely our Nation must bear some burden for their misery, the misery that we are helping to perpetrate in that region. But a freeze on deportation merely treats the symptoms of the crisis in Central America, just like the proposed amendments to our Immigration and Naturalization Act with respect to illegal entry through Mexico.

Part of the cause of the problem in the area is the United States, whose policies of intervention in the region, both in the present and in the past, have helped to polarize the region ideologically, politically, and economically. If this polarization is to be re-

versed, the United States must terminate policies that militarize our southern neighbors.

First of all, we must and should—and I have been advocating this for months—remove all military adviser personnel from both Honduras and El Salvador. The nation of El Salvador and the Nicaraguan-Honduran and Honduran-El Salvador borders are areas of hostility as defined by the War Powers Resolution. U.S. Journalists, Congressmen, military personnel enter the area at greater risk to their lives than ever before.

Given that, U.S. military personnel have been deployed in Honduras, have been participating in the Salvadoran civil war, and directing Salvadoran troops with U.S. reconnaissance planes and also using them to bomb with, A-37's.

I have introduced a resolution that would invoke the War Powers Resolution, directing the President to remove U.S. troops within 60 days, unless the Congress declares war. I urge my colleagues to give this proposal the urgent attention that it deserves. If Congress does not act now to exercise its constitutional right to decide where and when U.S. Armed Forces will be involved in war, this President will continue to expand our military involvement in Central America and other parts of Latin America.

Consider the facts and consider the case spelled out in the War Powers Act.

First, there can be no question that the United States is involved in hostilities, just as in the case of Beirut, where the President answered in December 1982 that the marines were there in nonhostile, even though they were fully equipped for combat, and that they were there as peacekeepers. The same thing here. Even though the War Powers Resolution did not contemplate clandestine or secret wars, it is clear that a number of U.S. military personnel must, in one way or another, be involved in the support of the CIA operation against Nicaragua alone.

If we need further evidence of the hostile nature of the area in which our forces are operating, consider only that the U.S. helicopters, supposedly operating inside the friendly airspace of Honduras, have been repeatedly attacked, most recently when a helicopter bearing two U.S. Senators was forced down by hostile gunfire. Or consider that American advisers in El Salvador have been in the midst of firefights. Or consider that U.S. personnel fly military observation and bombing mission flights that are in the nature of direct combat support of the Salvadoran Government's forces.

In the curious way that our troops are counted, however, the Americans who train Salvadorans in camps located in Honduras are not counted among the Salvadoran advisers. It depends on when the count is taken. If the count is to be taken on a certain day, they move our troops from Salvadoran soil back to Honduras and count, and bring them back the next day. Neither are the American fliers who provide combat reconnaissance missions counted as advisers because of the handy technicality that their bases are in Honduras, not in Salvador; nor are American medical personnel counted as advisers.

These and other subterfuges are used to obscure the fact that American armed forces for combat have been introduced into Central America in ever-growing numbers, and for purposes other than training. These are facts that exactly fit the case of the War Powers Resolution. These are armed forces being built up in foreign areas for purposes well beyond any training mission. Their deployment is, therefore, subject to the War Powers Resolution.

Likewise, these forces are operating in a hostile area and the environment there is growing more violent as each day passes. It is absolutely inevitable that American personnel who are so intimately engaged in the conflicts of Central America will come under increasing fire and fall victims to that fire.

The only question right now is when? The fact of the danger cannot be denied. The American Embassy in El Salvador suffers from occasional attacks. A key adviser has been murdered there. Military personnel assigned to units in the countryside have come under fire a number of times in the past few months, many times wholly unreported.

Nor are these the only such incidents. The fact of the hostile environment cannot be ignored, and it is also a case that fits the definition of the War Powers Resolution. Untold numbers of Americans have died and are continuing to die, shot down in the planes in which they are contracted out for by the CIA, not only over Salvador but over Honduras and Nicaraguan areas. Those poor Americans, of course, are what used to be defined as mercenaries and nobody counts them when they are killed.

The question is whether the Congress is willing to act to preserve its prerogatives of determining when and for what purpose this country will get into war. There can no longer be any doubt that the Reagan administration is pursuing a course of war in Central America. I have said this. I have said on this House floor for months that President Reagan has gone mongering after that false bitch goddess of war. Is that the course we want to take? I do not think so, but we ought to find out by doing it the way the Constitution says we ought to, and that is right here in the Congress.

If we believe what the President says, or the basic premises, we ought to declare war, help him, legalize it, make it legal, for we learned in Vietnam that blood and treasure from Americans is no substitute for decent government and reasonable justice in the client country. There can be no dispute that the Central American case is a situation that the War Powers Resolution applies to, and I do sincerely urge early action on my resolution.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE CARDISS COLLINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CARDISS COLLINS:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 13, 1984.

Hon. THOMAS (TIP) O'NEILL,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Speaker's Office, H-204, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you that I have received a subpoena duces tecum issued by the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois. In consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk of the House, I have determined that compliance with this subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

CARDISS COLLINS,
Member of Congress.

VOTERS DISLIKE EARLY NETWORK ELECTION PROJECTIONS

(Mr. SWIFT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of last year, T.V. Guide magazine ran two articles entitled "Let's Stop T.V. From Spoiling Our Elections." The articles discussed several aspects of the complex relationship between the television news media and our elections, including the impact of early network projections of election results.

TV Guide also did an editorial on the subject, at the end of which they encouraged interested readers to write to me, as chairman of the House Task Force on Elections.

Well over 1,100 citizens, from 49 of the 50 States, accepted that invitation. Exactly four of those hundreds of letters—one each from Maryland, Maine, Vermont, and New Jersey—defended early projections by the news media. The following quotations are samples of the sentiments of some of the other people who took the time to write.

I commend their comments to the attention of the network executives in New York who, after 4 years in which public anger and frustration have not only not declined, but if anything have

increased, still question the depth of that feeling.

Also, I would like to mention that the committee report on House Concurrent Resolution 227, the resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the adverse impact of early projections of election results by the news media, has just been filed.

When that resolution is before the full House, I urge all my colleagues to support it in order to send a strong, clear message to the television networks asking, on behalf of the voters all across this country, that they exercise voluntary restraint in making early projections.

ALABAMA

"I vote in Clarke County, Alabama, Central Time Belt. On the last Presidential elections, 1980, the T.V. projections of Mr. Reagan's win came before our polls closed here. You can see how the other two zones, and those here who had not voted would feel. Why bother, it's all over!! It is grossly unfair. . . . Their projections might not be right, if everyone had a chance to vote first."

ALASKA

"During the last Presidential election we . . . knew the outcome before we went to vote."

ARIZONA

". . . stop TV reporters, etc. from calling the election before our polls even close."

"It is indeed discouraging to live here in the Southwest and have the fun taken out of election day for us, not to mention the distinct effect such announcements do have on voting practices . . ."

ARKANSAS

"It didn't help the people on the West Coast and Alaska & Hawaii when Pres. Ron Reagan won in a landslide . . . before it even got there, thanks to . . . the press and its projections."

CALIFORNIA

"No results should be released until all of the polls are closed and all of the votes counted. I would guess that it might make the 5 o'clock news of the day after the polls closed."

". . . Most important that ALL newscasters (Radio, T.V. and newspapers) keep their opinions and results to themselves . . . until ALL votes are counted."

"It seems ridiculous to me that before many westerners have a chance to vote, the world knows who the winners are. The winners certainly are not the western voters."

"As a resident at various times of both California and Hawaii I have personally witnessed friends and acquaintances choosing not to bother to vote . . . after hearing network projections. . . ."

"In Calif. we call the heads of a voting precinct the Inspector. I've been inspector in our neighborhood precinct . . . . for the past 10 years. . . . [O]ur last Presidential election was a farce. We had voters come here at 7:00, nearly crying because of the east coast's broadcasting their results before we'd even closed, one hour later."

"It is about time all the rhetoric about my vote making a difference really meant something. I want my vote to count."

"I was really disappointed with our last election, that I wasn't going to vote ever again! . . . . I know one thing for sure, I'm going to give this address to all my friends, who refused to go to the polls, after watching the T.V. newscast, 3 years ago."

"Something must be done about this T.V. early projections of Election Returns. I have worked for L.A. County—teaching Inspectors of Election Boards—and serving as Inspector on Boards. It's insulting to voters to expect them to come to the polls after work, when they've already heard on their car radio and T.V. who has already won the election. Uniform poll closing, Sunday Voting—or simply a legal gag on the media regarding all information until all polls are closed."

"I strongly believe that broadcasting election results prior to the closing of polls in all the states must be prohibited. In my opinion, this does not violate First Amendment rights. It does not keep the media (especially Television) from exercising their "rights"—it merely puts a time limit on doing so."

"I was one person rushing to vote after a super busy day only to hear on the news my vote didn't count. Before you know it only a few will vote, the rest won't and you know as well as I do what that means—it scares the hell out of me."

"The cry should of been Foul and not counted, and a new election date for President should have been processed."

"I am sorry to say that last election, I let the T.V. predictions keep me home. I realize now what an injustice I did to the local candidates and I don't want it to happen again. It seems to me the major networks, instead of reporting the news are attempting to predict the news."

"In 1980 I was driving home from work on my way to the polls when it was announced that Reagan had won. So, instead of voting for the loser, Carter, I went on and voted for Anderson just so that he could get the matching funds I felt he deserved."

"Calif. had many disgruntled voters after the last fiasco in 1980 and we would very much hate to see a repeat. Obviously the election was run for the benefit of the media. They did not win any popularity polls by announcing the winners long before the polls had closed in the West and neither will Congress if the policy is continued."

"* * * we are sick of * * * giving the networks the opportunity to ruin elections for many people, primarily those of us out west who still have hours left to vote sometimes when they announce back east who they think wins or loses."

COLORADO

"All the suspense has been taken out of the elections by having winners projected so early. We don't even bother to watch it anymore."

"I am very much in favor of stopping T.V. from announcing the election outcome before the polls close."

CONNECTICUT

"While the press has every right to coverage, I do not believe this coverage should be allowed to affect the course of the election."

"I'm highly in favor of withholding all predictions until all polls are closed on voting days."

DELAWARE

"I wish it were possible to get a 24-hour voting time . . . to eliminate the unfair advantage the Eastern U.S. holds."

FLORIDA

"I was appalled at the media reporting so called results of the Presidential race of Carter and Reagan, hours before the polls had closed. It did nothing but cause us to lose faith in our system."

"It is very disturbing to hear who the next President will be when you haven't had time to go vote yet—this encourages people not to vote."

"We think it is wrong to allow the news media to project the winners. Indeed stupid, why vote when the winner is being announced?"

"We definitely wish to see reform regarding the farce that is perpetually repeated on T.V. every four years by forecasters predicting winners hours before polls are closed elsewhere."

GEORGIA

"Although I am a resident of the East Coast, I was appalled when television newsmen projected election results so early in the evening before the voters in later time zones had made their choices for candidates."

"I think the projection of election winners before the polls closed everywhere during the last Presidential election was atrocious and very discouraging to those who had not yet voted."

". . . prevent the east coast press from predicting the outcome so early and unfortunately so accurately that the west coast voters tend not to turnout."

HAWAII

"We are angry that we here in Hawaii are informed, even before our polls close, who the winner is."

"I'm not in favor of starting broadcasting until all polls are closed."

"Every Presidential election in which I ever voted was conceded before my vote was cast. This is very important to those of us who live in the state of Hawaii."

IDAHO

"It is depressing to just be going to vote as the Eastern U.S. is announcing winners and participating in victory celebration. It makes my vote seem worthless."

ILLINOIS

"I am discouraged, if I do vote late, to have the winner projected before I even get my chance to vote. I think this keeps many people in the West from voting and yet, how important that they do".

"I believe the media and T.V. reporting are changing the elections unfairly."

". . . prevent the ridiculous T.V. polls that forecast the winners before other time zone areas close their polls."

". . . the T.V. channels should be prevented by law to air election winning projections before all polls close."

IOWA

"Every voter from Maine to Hawaii needs to feel that his or her vote counts the same . . ."

KANSAS

". . . please stop the projecting the outcome before the polls are closed. And then not for hours later as it is killing the votes for state and local elections."

". . . 1980 . . . was absurd for 2 reasons . . . . 2. The disgusting practice of the network's compulsion to project election winners before the polls are closed everywhere."

LOUISIANA

"I know for a fact that my relatives on the west coast have poor voter attendance records due to the news media's projections on their broadcasts (which I also find very irritating)."

". . . although we live in the South and are not affected by the early media reports

indicating the winner before all the polls are closed, both my husband and I have always felt that this detracted from the way an election, especially a presidential election, should be run."

MAINE

"No predictions ever!"

"I urge immediate passage of . . . media restraint as regards exit polls."

MASSACHUSETTS

"Stop the senseless 'projections' by newscasters. . . . I am definitely all for freedom of speech and of the press, but this goes beyond simple reporting of the news."

"I was quite shocked in 1980 when . . . the media proclaimed Reagan the new president, when the polls in the West were still open, and had three more hours to go."

MICHIGAN

". . . prevent the present T.V. disenfranchisement of our Western fellow Americans."

"It is stupid to allow the T.V. media to predict who will be president when the polls are beginning to open."

"The election of the President has been a farce for years and was the worst in the 1980 election. To have the election decided before California closed its doors was ridiculous."

MINNESOTA

"The law should also mean no predictions of results with 1% of the districts reporting in a few key precincts. Let the election polls all close before any precincts report to anybody."

"The East coast should keep their mouth shut until the West coast is done."

"I would not be interested in voting if I heard the report earlier."

". . . do away with premature reporting of election returns before all of the voting is finished."

"Did not vote last presidential (vote day)—News had already conceded election to Reagan."

"I am thoroughly opposed to the practice of major networks announcing presidential election winners within minutes following the first closings of polls. It is most unfair to those citizens . . . who may not yet have voted. . . . From a selfish point of view, it is also unfair to me, a T.V. viewer, who watches the election returns because of the unfolding drama and sense of involvement. It is not unlike watching a football game, Academy Awards presentation, or Miss America Pageant, in the sense that if one knew the winner before-hand, one's interest level would plummet."

"My husband, my Mom, and myself were extremely upset when Reagan was declared the winner before we even voted at 6:30 p.m."

MONTANA

"As a citizen from a Western state, I strongly resent the early projections by the news media."

". . . do something about the way T.V. is projecting winners before half the nation has voted."

NEBRASKA

"I also favor a very heavy fine for any network or news media who violate these procedures."

"The media has become too influential of West Coast voting . . ."

NEVADA

"I would say it is a good idea to hold the news back on projecting the President winner."

". . . can't something be done about prohibiting exit polls by the news media? . . . We realize there must be freedom of the press, but the practice is extremely detrimental."

NEW JERSEY

". . . our whole country is too much affected when T.V. tells the nation the winner and we [do] not like it."

"I wasn't aware that the effect of early projections cause a serious problem and I have been informed. Time to change . . ."

"I . . . realize that because of time differences many people in the West may not exercise their right to vote because of predictions made on radio and television before polls close in the West. Why couldn't the results on presidential elections be kept from the press until the polls are closed in the West?"

"I believe that the voters on the West Coast could easily be swayed by hearing how the vote is going on the East Coast."

NEW YORK

"I really sympathize with the voters in Western States, especially Alaska and Hawaii, who must feel their votes are like vestigial organs—totally unnecessary. Watching the T.V. coverage at night is exciting, but only if you don't know the outcome 5 minutes after you turn it on."

"I am enclosing an article . . . pertaining to . . . network T.V.'s irresponsible handling of the projections after some of the polls have closed. I've felt something must be done even before reading the article because I'm sure that on the West Coast if it hasn't happened already, it will in the future; that is having the networks 'elect' a candidate for office instead of the voters."

"It is ludicrous that results from the East are announced before voting is completed in the West."

"The elections of persons who don't care anything about ordinary citizens might not have happened if later voters had not been discouraged by media projections."

". . . the media has no business making projections; their function is to report the news, that is in this case, the election returns. I cannot tell how much it irks me to see a very close tally on the board, but to have one candidate 'declared' a winner. In my view, especially with the West Coast problem taken into consideration, these 'projections' are tantamount to tampering with an election—which, I believe, is a crime, is it not?"

NORTH CAROLINA

"I believe everyone in this country is upset about a new President being named before the votes were counted across this land of ours. I do not live on the West Coast—but if I did I would not bother to vote next time. It seems like the television news ratings runs this country—not we the people who vote."

OHIO

"It has bothered me for years to have the T.V. project the outcome too early. It is not fair and means that people in the West do not think their votes important."

"I . . . believe that voting results should not be broadcast until all polls throughout the country are closed."

"It has often bothered us that the television news media is able to project a winner, especially in the Presidential race, when their coverage of returns begins at 8:00 p.m. This should be changed. If I were a Californian or a Hawaiian, I would be extremely upset knowing that my vote wasn't going to mean anything because the networks had already projected a winner."

OKLAHOMA

"We are in favor of . . . uniform poll closings all across the nation, clear to Hawaii. As now observed, the voting can't be fair."

OREGON

"As a west coast voter, I am very much interested in something being done to make sure that our votes are going to count."

" . . television technology and news commentaries are predicting and deciding who are winning the elections . . ."

"In 1980, I wrote to NBC about the early 'call' of the elections. I got an unsympathetic and terse reply. The networks are in competition and do not care about 'we, the people.' "

"I for one do not intend to vote until the laws are changed. Why should I? My vote does not count! How can anyone tell me it does when last year I had only walked to my car after voting and already the presidency was decided. Please get the laws changed. I'd like to be counted too."

PENNSYLVANIA

". . . in the Western states . . . early Eastern returns have kept voter interest low and affected several races for Congress."

"Voters on the West Coast must feel completely disenfranchised in cases such as the 1980 election when the decision was final by 8 PM EST!"

"Do not allow the media to project winners . . ."

". . . permit those voters in the West, Alaska and Hawaii to cast votes which are equally important to any Election, without early predictions from the Eastern states, which in essence, tell those voters in the West, that 'it's all over.' "

SOUTH CAROLINA

"Recently with T.V. computer-aided, results forecasting, late-day Western voters have been discouraged from voting by the belief that 'it didn't matter now.' "

". . . eliminate the awful prospect of early T.V. projections discouraging voters in the West from making their opinions known."

TENNESSEE

"I . . . feel that the time has come for the television networks to assume the responsibility of reporting the election results and stop projecting them. I like to be kept informed, but they are carrying it too far."

TEXAS

"Not just Pacific Coast but Mountain time-zone residents are adversely affected by the present system."

". . . if I were a Californian, Hawaiian, or Alaskan, I probably wouldn't vote in a landslide election . . . I never have liked the early projections."

"As a teacher and as a writer, I believe our First Amendment to the Constitution to be invaluable . . . but I do not believe the public's 'right to know' should be abused and used as a tactic in altering the outcome of our elections! As things stand now, that is just what is happening."

UTAH

"Living in the West, it is hardly fair for us voters to know the outcome of an election (based on T.V. news projections) before we even get a chance to vote."

VIRGINIA

"Even though I live on the East Coast, I'm sick to death of hearing projections—sometimes even before our own polls have closed,

and can imagine how the people on the West Coast must feel."

" . . . the T.V. stations should not make 'Predictions' on winners of elections at all! If they must predict winners, they should wait until all the polls across the nation have closed."

WASHINGTON

"I can remember in the last election my feelings when the news kind of told the west coast who had won no matter what or who voted; this happened at 5:30. Two hours before the west coast closing of the polls. Please change this so that our west coast vote makes a difference. Why vote if it doesn't?"

" . . . eliminate the current disenfranchisement that exists for all of us who live in the west and are informed hours before our polls close that our votes are meaningless because the network news services have projected winners in all races!"

". . . irresponsible handling of election coverage by all the networks, including radio . . . systematically excluded millions of thoughtful voters in the western part of the United States and Hawaii."

"In their fervor to 'report the news' the media seems to have gotten their priorities mixed. I don't believe in 'censoring' the news but I do believe everyone should have a chance to vote without being told in advance who won. And did they really win? Who is to say what the outcome would have been if the media had kept a lid on the returns until all had voted. Frankly, we were damned mad. They violated our civil rights!"

"I have written . . . concerning the disenfranchisement of the last election, where all workers going home from work at 4 PM were told the election was over."

"When Reagan was elected I hadn't voted yet. It was only 5 pm Pacific time. All the networks had him as the projected winner."

". . . we favor . . . law banning T.V. & Radio stations from telling the public, who is winning where, they are the ones that are making their candidates win. Are we going to be governed by a bunch of armchair politicians? That's what's happening . . . . [T]ell these smart aleck scandal mongers to keep their mouths shut."

WEST VIRGINIA

"The relative disenfranchising of any people is unfair to all the people."

". . . we are in a way disenfranchising our friends and neighbors to the West by predicting the outcome of national elections even before their polls close."

WISCONSIN

"Stop T.V. news from spoiling our elections—particularly for western voters."

"During the 1980 presidential election, I was standing in line in the cold of Madison, Wisconsin when I heard that Reagan had already won. I almost turned around and went home, but I decided the other local elections were also important. Still . . ."●

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984

(Mr. JONES of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I am submitting to the RECORD a letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending and revenues for fiscal year 1984.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1984.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 10, I am herewith transmitting the status report under H. Con. Res. 91, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1984. This report reflects the adjusted resolution of October 25, 1983, and the current CBO estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues. The attachments show the latest estimate for the current level of fiscal year 1984 spending and divide that amount among committees.

The procedural situation with regard to the spending ceiling will be affected this year by Section 5(b) of H. Con. Res. 91. As I explained during debate on the conference report on that resolution, enforcement against breaches of the spending ceiling under Section 311(a) of the Budget Act will not apply where a measure would not cause a committee to exceed its appropriate allocation pursuant to Section 302(a) of the Budget Act. In the House, the appropriate 302(a) allocation includes "new discretionary budget authority" and "new entitlement authority" only. It should be noted that under this procedure neither the total level of outlays nor a committee's outlay allocation is considered. This exception is only provided because an automatic budget resolution is in effect and would cease to apply if Congress were to revise the budget resolution for fiscal year 1984.

The intent of the Section 302(a) "discretionary budget authority" and "new entitlement authority" subceiling provided by Section 5(b) of the resolution is to protect a committee that has stayed within its spending allocation—discretionary budget authority and new entitlement authority—from points of order if the total spending ceiling has been breached for reasons outside of its control. The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 91 were printed in the Congressional Record, June 22, 1983, H. 4326. Adjustments to such allocations made pursuant to Section 2 of House Concurrent Resolution 91, the reserve fund, are reflected in House Reports 98-313, 98-354, 98-381, and 98-439.

The attached tables show where each committee currently stands comared to its 302(a) allocation of discretionary budget authority and of new entitlement authority.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JAMES R. JONES, *Chairman.*

Attachments.

Fiscal year 1984 comparison of current level and budget resolution allocation by committee [1]

[In millions of dollars]

House committee	*Current level (budget authority)*
Total current level	−2,312
Appropriations committee: discretionary	(−2,061)
Authorizing committee—discretionary action:	
Agriculture	(−383)
Armed Services	(−4)
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs	(+[2])
District of Columbia	(...)
Education and Labor	(−[2])
Energy and Commerce	(−192)
Foreign Affairs	(+[2])
Government Operations	(−450)
House Administration	(−[2])
Interior and Insular Affairs	(+4)
Judiciary	(+[2])
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	(+13)
Post Office and Civil Service	(−[2])
Public Works and Transportation	(+150)
Science and Technology	(+[2])
Veterans' Affairs	(+[2])
Ways and Means	(+2,313)
Unassigned (offsetting receipts)	(−2,108)

[1] Committees are over (+) or under (−) their 302(a) allocation.

[2] Less than $500,000.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

FISCAL YEAR 1984 NEW ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY

[In millions of dollars]

Committee	Allocation	Reported	Enacted
Agriculture		678	27
Appropriations			
Armed Services	1,003	813	805
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs			
District of Columbia			
Education and Labor	1,067	2,335	1,038
Energy and Commerce	476	261	319
Foreign Affairs	−3		
Government Operations	3,763	3,973	3,425
Interior and Insular Affairs			
Judiciary			
Merchant Marine and Fisheries			
Post Office and Civil Service	1,245		−328
Public Works and Transportation			
Science and Technology			
Small Business			
Veterans Affairs	187	214	176
Ways and Means	1,584	1,102	4,090

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1984.

Hon. JAMES R. JONES,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays and estimated revenues in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the 1984 budget (H. Con. Res. 91). This report for fiscal year 1984 is based on our estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues using the assumptions and estimates consistent with H. Con. Res. 91.

Since my last report, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature H.R.

4169, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1983 as amended by S. Con. Res. 102, and H.R. 4206, providing tax forgiveness for federal personnel killed overseas. These bills change budget authority, outlay, and revenue estimates.

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
1. Enacted	917,445	850,353	665,286
2. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action	3,758	3,391	
3. Continuing resolution authority			
4. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses	294	−175	−3
Current level	921,497	853,569	665,283
Budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 91	923,809	853,386	679,600
Current level is:			
Over resolution by		183	
Under resolution by	2,312		14,317

Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1984, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS APR. 10, 1984

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
I. Enacted:		
Permanent appropriations and trust funds	535,902	491,993
Appropriations enacted previous session	522,190	499,031
Offsetting receipts	−141,088	−141,088
Enacted this session:		
Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1984 (Public Law 98–223)		145
Highway emergency relief (Public Law 98–229)	150	10
Urgent supplemental appropriations (Public Law 98–248)	290	262
Total	917,445	850,353
II. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action:		
Child nutrition	417	222
Department of Defense:		
Civilian pay raises	510	494
Military pay raises	1,205	1,169
Claims, Defense	63	57
Foreign Service retirement payment	3	3
Offsetting receipts	−3	−3
Range improvements	2	1
FUBA	33	33
Medicaid	556	556
Advances to unemployment:		
Trust fund	3,932	3,932
Offsetting receipts	−3,932	−3,932
Special benefits, disabled coal miners	20	20
Special benefits, Federal employees	12	12
Social services block grants	25	25
Rehabilitation services and handicapped research	34	28
Guaranteed student loan program	132	
Payment to civil service retirement fund	230	230
Offsetting receipts	−230	−230
Civilian agency pay raises	749	774
Total	3,758	3,391
III. Continuing resolution authority [1]		
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses:		
Agricultural Programs Adjustment Act of 1984 (H.R. 4072)	294	294
Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1983 (H.R. 4169)		−469
Total	294	−175
Total current level as of April 10, 1984	921,497	853,569
Budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 91	923,809	853,386
Amount remaining:		
Over ceiling		183
Under ceiling	2,312	

[1] Agriculture; foreign assistance; Treasury, Postal Service and general Government and other selected appropriations are funded under continuing resolution authority (Public Law 98–151) for the full fiscal year and, therefore, are included in the enacted category of this report.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative programs and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEMP, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLARZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEPPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WIRTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SWIFT, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,212.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. JEFFORDS in two instances.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. GOODLING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. MCHUGH.

Mr. SHELBY.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. GORE.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. MACKAY.

Mr. MOODY.

Mr. SIKORSKI.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. AUCOIN.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. MARTINEZ.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution designating April 29, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2570. An act to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3867. An act to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, by impressing a trust on the commodities and sales proceeds of perishable agricultural commodities for the benefit of the unpaid seller, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5298. An act to provide for a White House Conference on Small Business.

□ 1820

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 30, 1984, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the first quarter of calendar year 1984 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rep. Mike Lowry	2/10	2/14	Israel		400.00		2,032.00				2,432.00
Rep. Richard A. Gephardt	1/6	1/14	Israel		600.00						600.00
	1/14	1/20	Egypt		450.00		[3] 1,258.90				1,708.90
Patrick Bogenberger	1/3	1/7	Germany		395.00		[4] 848.00				1,243.00
Rep. Geraldine Ferraro	1/7	1/10	El Salvador	1,185	300.00						300.00
	1/10	1/12	Nicaragua		150.00						150.00
	1/12	1/13	Honduras	[5] 200	192.00						192.00
	1/13	1/15	Costa Rica	9.708.75	[6] 225.00		[7] 884.67				1,109.67
Committee total					2,712.00		5,023.57				7,735.57

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Total amount for transportation—Israel and Egypt.
[4] Military transportation, Department of the Army.
[5] Reimbursed 139 Honduran lemperas to U.S. Treasury.
[6] Reimbursed $75.00 to Control Officer in Costa Rica.
[7] Total amount for transportation—El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica.

JAMES R. JONES, Chairman, Apr. 9, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Tom Lewis	1/7	1/7	Jerusalem to Beirut, Lebanon and return				([3])				

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Transportation provided by U.S. military aircraft.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman, Apr. 12, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
James Weaver, MC	2/10	2/13	Grenada		399.00		1,098.50				1,497.50
John McCain, MC	2/9	2/13	Germany		225.00						225.00
	2/14	2/16	Saudia Arabia		486.00						486.00
	2/16	2/17	Syria		101.00						101.00
	2/17	2/19	Pakistan		228.00						228.00
Turned back in to State Department					−79.97						−79.97
Antonio Won Pat, MC	2/17	2/19	Western Samoa		225.00						225.00
Jeffrey Farrow, staff	2/17	2/19	Western Samoa		225.00						225.00
Thomas Dunmire, staff	2/17	2/19	Western Samoa		225.00						225.00
Committee total					2,034.03		1,098.50				3.132.53

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MORRIS K. UDALL, Chairman, Apr. 24, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Beilenson, A. C	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.5		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Bonior, David	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		[3] 126.19				102.76		228.95
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR 31, 1984—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Crosby, William	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.83		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Diehl, Richard	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Harris, Rita	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Pepper, Claude	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Sayers, A. A.	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		400.85
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		292.23
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Spulak, Thomas J.	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				206.85		506.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Committee total					10,226.19		55,413.70		7,282.56		72,922.45

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Represents refund made in country.

CLAUDE PEPPER, Chairman, Mar. 30, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bill Frenzel	1/19	1/21	France	1,446.48	168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	England	209.55	297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
Transportation by Department of Defense							3,082.92				3,082.92
Hon. Barbara B. Kennelly	1/6	1/10	El Salvador	1,185	300.00						300.00
	1/10	1/12	Nicaragua		150.00						150.00
	1/12	1/13	Honduras	200	96.00						96.00
	1/13	1/16	Costa Rica	3,708.75	225.00						225.00
Refund				−1,200	−27.81						−27.81
							884.67				884.67
Hon. J. J. Pickle	1/8	1/11	Spain	35,460	225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco	1,842.62	225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy	326,016	192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France	1,446.48	168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/22	England	69.84	99.00		24.36		101.18		224.54
							367.84				367.84
Transportation by Department of Defense							2,141.89				2,141.89
Hon. William M. Thomas	1/8	1/11	Spain	35,460	225.00		84.73		66.96		376.69
	1/11	1/14	Morocco	1,842.62	225.00						225.00
	1/14	1/17	Turkey		324.00		16.60		35.00		375.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy	326,016	192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France	1,446.48	168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	England	209.55	297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
Transportation by Department of Defense							4,283.77				4,283.77
Hon. Guy Vander Jagt	1/8	1/9	Spain	11,820	75.00		84.73		66.96		226.69
	1/13	1/17	Turkey	132,308.64	432.00		16.60		35.00		483.60
	1/17	1/19	Italy	326,016	192.00		41.16		26.65		259.81
	1/19	1/21	France	1,446.48	168.00						168.00
	1/21	1/24	England	209.55	297.00		24.36		101.18		422.54
Transportation by Department of Defense							4,283.77				4,283.77

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Brenda K. Swygert	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy	876,168	516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Transportation by Department of Defense							7,887.56				7,887.56
Committee total					6,794.19		23,608.97		1,033.98		31,437.14

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman, Apr. 16, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 29, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Wise, Samuel G.	1/15	2/14	Sweden	29,727.70	3,660.00		[3]1,301.00				
	2/14	2/15	Greece	5,690	57.00		961.39				
	2/15	2/17	Switzerland	366.85	164.00		23.24				
			To United States								6,166.63
Sletzinger, Martin	2/15	3/17	Sweden	31,495.25	3,974.00		[3]1,519.96				
			To United States								5,493.96
Oliver, R. Spencer	3/7	3/9	Sweden	2,066.30	268.00		[3]1,781.00				
	3/9	3/12	Austria	4,954.95	273.00						
			To United States								2,322.00
Committee total					8,396.00		5,586.59				13,982.59

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Round trip.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Chairman, Mar. 29, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Akaka, Daniel K.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56
Capers, John J.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56
Cusack, John T.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
Total					4,650.00		16,167.93		625.71		21,443.64
Cusack, John T.	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56
Gilman, Benjamin A.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
Military transportation							3,943.78				3,943.78
Guarini, Frank J.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56
Jurith, Edward H.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.97		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
Total					4,326.00		20,111.71		593.31		25,030.97
Jurith, Edward H.	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Lowe, Richard B.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56
Rangel, Charles B.	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong		366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand		444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/17	Pakistan		324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey		108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy		516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military transportation							7,887.56				7,887.56
Total					4,464.00		24.028.07		623.89		29,115.96
Committee total					13,440.00		60,307.71		1,842.91		75,590.57

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman, Apr. 23, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Dan Marriott, MC	1/5	1/7	Italy		192.00						
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		270.00						
	1/10	1/12	India		224.00						
	1/12	1/15	India		261.00						
	1/15	1/18	Nepal		225.00						
	1/18	1/20	Spain		150.00		[3] 5,457.00				
Committee total					1,322.00		5,457.00				6,779.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Air transportation provided by military transportation, equivalent first-class fare.

GEORGE MILLER, Chairman, Apr. 13, 1984.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3224. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Policy), transmitting a report on the Department's program to halt the flow of sensitive technology to our adversaries and the resources necessary to support that program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 138(h); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3225. A letter from the Commissioner for Rehabilitation Services, Department of Education, transmitting notification that the fiscal year 1983 annual report on the activities carried out under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 will be delayed until August 3, 1984, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 712 (Public Law 93-112, section 113 (92 Stat. 2985; 98 Stat. 17)); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3226. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act) during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3227. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Administration, transmitting a report on the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3228. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting financial statements of the Colorado River Basin project for the year ended September 30, 1983, pursuant to Public Law 90-537, section 404; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3229. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Work), transmitting a report dated March 7, 1984, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, on Degognia-Fountain Bluff and Grand Tower Drainage and Levee Districts, Illinois and Missouri, which is in response to a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Public Works (June 17, 1948); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3230. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on the Department's current plan on the possibility of locating a test and evaluation facility at the site of a nuclear waste repository, pursuant to Public Law 97-425, section 305(a); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

3231. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the Merit System Protection Board and the Office of Personnel Management, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2304(b); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 5345. A bill to provide that no Federal educational funds may be obligated or expended to any State or local educational agency which discriminates against any meetings of students in public secondary schools who wish to meet voluntarily for religious purposes. (Rept. No. 98-710).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a mechanism for taxpayers to designate $1 of any overpayment of income tax, and to contribute other amounts, for use by the U.S. Olympic Committee; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-711, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5121. A bill to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Virginia as wilderness, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-712, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5076. A bill to designate certain areas in the Allegheny National Forest as wilderness and recreation areas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-713, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4263. A bill to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tenn., as wilderness areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other then wilderness; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-714, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3739. A bill to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4176. A bill to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3472. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to permit the control of the lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4406. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate Wildcat Brook in the State of New Hampshire for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3787. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act by adding the Oregon-California Trail to the study list; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 25. Joint resolution redesignating the Saint Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine as the "Saint Croix Island International Historic Site"; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5147. A bill to implement the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, signed in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 15, 1983 (Rept. No. 98-721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular affairs. H.R. 4596. A bill to amend section 160(d) of Public Law 96-607 to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire title in fee simple to McClintock House at 16 East Williams Street, Waterloo, N.Y. with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5100. A bill authorizing appropriations to the Executive Director, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, for services necessary to perform the functions of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council; with an amendment Rept. No. 98-723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STRATTON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5395. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL

[Omitted from the Record of April 25, 1984]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4968—Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union discharged, and referred to the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ZSCHAU):

H.R. 5525. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to protect mask works of semiconductor chips against unauthorized duplication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5526. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to escape from custody resulting from civil commitment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FIELDS:

H.R. 5527. A bill to modify the Houston Ship Channel navigation project to maintain a 40-foot project depth in the Bayport Ship Channel; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 5528. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

H.R. 5529. A bill to amend the patent law to restore the term of the patent grant in the case of certain products for the time of the regulatory review period preventing the marketing of a product claimed in a patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. SNYDER) (by request):

H.R. 5530. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 5531. A bill to eliminate the requirement that the portion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway located in the State of Maryland be conveyed to the State of Maryland upon completion of the reconstruction of the parkway authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 5532. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to strengthen the laws against counterfeiting trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HILER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. COATS, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DAUB, Mr. MACK, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 5533. A bill to reduce tax rates in a manner that is fair to all taxpayers and to simplify the tax laws by eliminating most credits, deductions, and exclusions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LELAND:

H.R. 5534. A bill to revise and extend title XX of the Public Health Service Act to provide services for pregnant adolescents and adolescent parents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

H.R. 5535. A bill to provide for the refund of excess duties deposited or paid before liquidation as a result of manifest clerical error; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 5536. A bill to prevent a franchisor from operating, or authorizing the oper-

ation of, a new marketing premises within the marketing area of an existing franchised marketing premises if the new premises will have a significant impact on the sales of the existing franchised premises; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 5537. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to provide that any new authorization to import natural gas may be granted only if domestically produced natural gas is not available at a lower price; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 5538. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of assistance for preventive health programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 5539. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to extend the Federal crime insurance program; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 5540. A bill to provide for restoration of Federal recognition to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, to institute for such tribe those Federal services provided to Indians who are recognized by the Federal Government and who receive such services because of Federal trust responsibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. GORE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. TAUKE):

H.R. 5541. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend certain authorizations of appropriations contained in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to call for the removal of the U.S. Armed Forces from Honduras and El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BARNES, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. SWIFT):

H.J. Res. 558. Joint resolution to designate May 6, 1984, as National Nurses' Recognition Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. YATRON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. COURTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MACK, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. CORCORAN, and Mr. UDALL):

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should express to the Government of the Soviet Union the disapproval of the American people concerning the Soviet Union's systematic nondelivery of international mail addressed to certain persons residing within the Soviet Union, and that the U.S. delegation to the Congress of the Universal Postal Union seek the compliance of the Government of the Soviet Union with the treaties governing international mail to which it is a party; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

377. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kentucky, relative to the imposition of an access fee for the use of telephone service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

378. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to a proposed Constitutional amendment to require a Member of Congress to be a resident, for a specified period of time, of the State from which such Member is chosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

379. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to the proposed designation of May 7 as Vietnam Veterans' Recognition Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

380. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to the high costs of physicians services and hospital services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 5542. A bill for the relief of Santiago Ricardo Gonzalez Hoch and any other child born to Sarah Hoch de Gonzalez outside of the geographical limits of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 5543. A bill for the relief of Esmeralda Martinez-Hernandez, Evangeline Hernandez de Martinez, Manuel Martinez-Hernandez, Morayma Martinez-Hernandez, and Antonia Diaz Vda de Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 225: Mr. COYNE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 1627: Mr. FRANK, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GORE, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. ECKART, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 2697: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 2889: Mr. WON PAT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 3009: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 3010: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WEAVER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COATS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 3028: Mr. DYSON and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 3255: Mr. GOODLING and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 3271: Mr. CARPER, Mr. GORE, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 3950: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BARNES, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 4110: Mr. BIAGGI and Mrs. HALL of Indiana.

H.R. 4243: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4300: Mr. MACKAY and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 4452: Mr. ZSCHAU and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 4453: Mr. ZSCHAU and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 4459: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 4477: Mr. RINALDO and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 4500: Mr. CONABLE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. COURTER.

H.R. 4643: Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. HARTNETT.

H.R. 4805: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BATES, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 4822: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 5017: Mr. EDGAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. WON PAT.

H.R. 5065: Mr. LUNDINE and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 5081: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. WHITTEN.

H.R. 5110: Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 5128: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 5143: Mr. WEAVER and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 5151: Mr. LELAND, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. D'AMOURS, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 5177: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 5197: Mr. BARNES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 5216: Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 5231: Mr. WEISS and Mr. WON PAT.

H.R. 5247: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 5267: Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. GORE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 5452: Mr. SEIBERLING and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 5463: Mr. KAZEN.

H.R. 5486: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. WINN.

H.R. 5490: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.J. Res. 206: Mr. CORCORAN and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.J. Res. 243: Mr. BREAUX and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.J. Res. 418: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

H.J. Res. 420: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BRITT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUNDINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MINISH, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, and Mr. WINN.

H.J. Res. 457: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.J. Res. 485: Mr. LUJAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TALLON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs.

MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. REID, and Mr. HORTON.

H.J. Res. 489: Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BRITT, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FISH, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. WINN.

H.J. Res. 501: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRITT, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COATS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. FERRARO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MICA, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. RAY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STARK, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ZSCHAU, and Mr. EVANS of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 528: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. HANSEN of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. D'AMOURS and Mr. PATTERSON.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. RUSSO.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H. Con. Res. 268: Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BONKER, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. FISH, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H. Res. 450: Mr. STRATTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. DEWINE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2262: Mr. HARTNETT.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

349. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the town of Provincetown, Mass., relative to military aid to any government in Central America; which was referred jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INFLATION WATCH

HON. LLOYD BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, the staff of the Joint Economic Committee has undertaken an inflation watch project. They are monitoring recent key developments affecting prices and reviewing the outlook for inflation.

Public expectation about inflation crucially affect the economy in a number of ways. If the public expects higher inflation in the future, this will:

First, lead to demands for larger wage increases, to try to keep up with or ahead of the expected increase in prices. This can set off an inflationary price-wage spiral;

Second, lead to higher interest rates, as investors demand a greater inflation premium in order to maintain the same real rate of return; and

Third, discourage saving, as consumers buy now, before prices accelerate. This stimulates the economy in the short run, but hurts it in the long run by making funds for productive investment less available.

The Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan provides monthly estimates of the public's view about inflation. They ask approximately 700 Americans two questions:

First, during the next 12 months, do you think that prices in general will go up, or down, or stay where they are now? and

Second, by about what percent do you expect prices to go up, on the average, during the next 12 months?

The most recent survey was conducted in March 1984. Responses every 6 months since March 1981 have been:

Date of survey	Percentage of respondents expecting prices to:[1]					Average increase expected (percent)
	Remain same or decrease	Rise, by indicated percentage				
		1 to 5	6 to 9	10 or more	Rise, don't know amount	
March 1981	26	21	11	29	11	7.0
September 1981	30	21	11	30	7	7.5
March 1982	32	29	12	23	2	6.0
September 1982	31	30	13	19	5	5.4
March 1983	44	35	5	12	3	3.3
September 1983	28	43	7	17	4	5.0
March 1984	24	45	10	16	4	5.1

[1] Responses do not add to 100 percent because 1 to 2 percent had no opinion, or responses not available.

Source: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Inflationary expectations fell between September 1981 and March 1983, but the average predicted increase in prices has risen by more than 50 percent in the last year, from 3.3 percent in March 1983 to 5.1 percent last month. This exceeds the administration's forecast of a 4.5-percent rise in prices this year. In the past this survey has underestimated prices in periods of accelerating inflation such as the current situation. This suggests that the public view that prices will rise by 5.1 percent over the next 12 months is likely to be conservative.

Last month one-fourth of those surveyed thought inflation will be 6 percent or more over the next year, and one-sixth believe that we will have inflation of 10 percent or more. Both figures have risen sharply over the past year.

In summary, the American public is becoming more pessimistic about inflation; in the past such changing views have foreshadowed periods of faster price increases. This increasing pessimism is rooted in our inability to reverse the deficit trend, and they pose the threat of becoming self-fulfilling prophecies as long as the present economic surge persists side-by-side with soaring deficits. The lesson, Mr. President, is that Congress must act now, this year, to reverse the rising deficit trend. The time for talk is over. Only action will head off a substantial surge in prices and place us back where we were in 1979 and 1980. The House of Representatives has passed a $182 billion deficit reduction program, and the Senate must at least match that to make meaningful headway against deficits.●

BIRTHDAY PRESENT FOR THE ARCHIVES

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in this morning's Washington Post begins, "The National Archives, the official preserver of this Nation's history, celebrates its 50th birthday this year. Congress ought to give the institution a suitable present—its independence." I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the Post editorial. The Committee on Government Operations yesterday filed the report on the bill H.R. 3987, the National Archives and Records Administration Act of 1984. This bill would establish an independent Archives and remove it from the bureaucratic structure of the General Services Administration.

In the course of considering this legislation the committee became aware of the serious damage that has been done to the operations of the Archives by virtue of its placement within GSA. The committee concluded that establishing the Archives as an independent agency, the status it held when it was created 50 years ago, would improve its ability to carry out the vital work of handling and preserving our Nation's documentary heritage.

I realize that establishing an independent Archives is not a panacea and that making this organizational move will not, in itself, insure the success of the Archives' operations. But, what it will do is to remove an impediment to those operations, make the Archives' leadership fully accountable and responsible for those operations, and enable them to exercise innovative and vigorous leadership on behalf of the Archives.

I urge my colleagues to read the following Washington Post editorial and to consider its views when H.R. 3987 comes to the floor:

BIRTHDAY PRESENT FOR THE ARCHIVES

The National Archives, the official preserver of this nation's history, celebrates its 50th birthday this year. Congress ought to give the institution a suitable present—its independence.

Fifty years is not very old for an archive, even one in a nation as youthful as this. Many of the Archives' current difficulties stem from the fact that, while it struggles to keep abreast of the exponentially increasing records of current government, it must try to undo the damage caused by years of neglect. Before Congress set up the Archives in 1934, for example, many War Department records moldered in the White House's basement garage. (You can see photos of the mess in the Archives today.) One of the archivists' first jobs was to fumigate and catalogue the tattered remains.

Even so the Archives has managed to become one of the great historical treasure troves of the world. While President Reagan catches up on the latest happenings in China, for example, scholars from China will be searching our Archives for records of their own history lost to them in the tumult of the postwar period. So will scholars from Germany, Bulgaria and numerous other countries, along with many Americans in search of their country's or their own family's history.

The Archives has never had the resources it needs to catch up with its preservation work, and its troubles have increased since it lost its independent status when Congress tidied up government organization charts in

1949. As a stepchild of the General Services Administration—an agency that has had more than enough of its own trouble keeping track of the federal stock of pens, paper clips and paraphernalia—the Archives is unable to make its case to the Office of Management and Budget and Congress for the skilled personnel and resources it needs.

The Archives' vulnerability to political whim was clearly demonstrated early in this administration when GSA volunteered the institution for one of the sharpest staff cuts suffered by any agency. Congress, alerted late to the effect of the cuts, has tried to restore part of the losses, but the Archives' backlog of work continues to grow. To protect the agency from future neglect, committees in both houses have reported bills restoring independent status to the Archives. The measures have strong bipartisan support led by Sens. Charles Mathias, Thomas Eagleton and Mark Hatfield in the Senate and Reps. Jack Brooks and Glenn English in the House. But Congress has its attention focused on next November. It needs to take a few minutes out to think about the future beyond that.●

A BETTER WAY IN SAN JOSE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. I am pleased to share with my colleagues an article that appears in the May 1984 edition of Psychology Today which features the achievements of San Jose's chief of police, Joseph McNamara. Chief McNamara has brought a unique leadership style to the San Jose Police Force, transforming a once troubled department into a widely respected example of the kind of positive role a law enforcement body can play in a community. It has been my pleasure to work with Joe over the years, and I hope my colleagues will benefit from learning of the positive influence of his innovative approach to law enforcement.

A BETTER WAY IN SAN JOSE

In his book, "Psychologist With A Gun," Harvey Schlossberg, a New York cop who became a psychologist, argues that, "unfortunately, the only thing some lawbreakers respect is force. It is the way they have been brought up. As children they were beaten by their parents to make them obey, and as adults they obey only when authority is brutal. You cannot control some criminals unless you threaten them with force."

San Jose Polce Chief Joseph McNamara takes vehement issue with this philosophy. "If your stance in the community is that we're tougher than you are, then you're going to escalate violence. You're guaranteed failure with that kind of approach."

McNamara was hired by San Jose seven years ago to reform what one community organizer referred to as "a police force gone wild." A few years before McNamara was hired, for example, a black chemist at IBM was killed by a San Jose police officer after a minor traffic violation. The city hired McNamara because he had worked with the minority community in Kansas City, Missouri, where he was police chief for three years. Before that, he had been on the New York police force for 16 years and had earned a doctorate in public administration from Harvard.

"We tell our police officers that they are professionals, just like doctors or lawyers or psychologists. We tell them they need to remain objective about their work even when someone is terribly unfair and angry at them. It's understandable to get angry, but we are saying they are better than the average person in their ability to maintain calm and cool. That's what they're paid for.

"It took awhile, but it's worked better than I ever imagined. When I started, the cops were furious with me about changes they now take for granted. When I came here, members of the City Council had asked the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to monitor the department for abuses. Now the commission says we are a model for the country."

McNamara works closely with Mike Roberts, who was hired as a police psychologist 13 years ago. Roberts now also advises and does psychological screening for more than 40 other police agencies around the country. Although his original mandate with San Jose was to "weed out the crazy cops," his screening, which includes a battery of psychological tests and an in-depth interview, goes further. After evaluating each applicant, he assigns a letter grade, A, B, C, D or F, which serves as his recommendation to the department. He reports a high correlation between the letter grades and the applicants' later success in police work.

Since Roberts was hired, the number of citizen complaints against officers has decreased 50 percent. He credits the improvement to the current police chief, the psychological screenings and a good field-training program. After graduating from the police academy, recruits work in the field under close supervision for 14 weeks. This "gives the department an opportunity to evaluate performance on the streets," Roberts says, and acts as a safety net for any mistakes made in the initial screening.

Sergeant Norm Puneo, a 16-year veteran, is proud of the way the department operates now but acknowledges that some of the veterans miss the freedom they had when streetwise criminals tried to avoid the San Jose city limits. "Now, when we pick up people who have been arrested in other California cities, they can't believe the way we treat them. They just expect to be beaten up."

However, both he and the internal affairs commander, Lieutenant Mike Dwyer, question whether San Jose's methods would work everywhere. "When people from other police agencies come, we take them around, we take them to the poorest section of the East Side and they say, 'Where are your slums?' "

"Our red-light district is half a block long," Dwyer adds. "In this department, we discipline officers for calling people ——. I'm not sure that would work in New York."

McNamara, who feels very strongly about the issue of name-calling, counters, "I worked in Harlem as a street officer for 10 years, and I never called anyone a name. If the public can't tell the difference between the good guys and the bad guys, then we're lost. And yes, we do discipline police for using foul language. Again and again we say, 'How can you feel better than the people who break the laws if you break the rules? You may think it's perfectly reasonable to call someone an ——, but the public is shocked and so are juries. They expect more from police officers.' "

Attitudes about use of violence must change from the top to the bottom to be effective. "I tell the supervisors it's their job to keep their men out of trouble, but accountability is not an end in itself. We need to work on peer pressure because no matter how much you hold a supervisor responsible, you're not going to know what happens on the streets unless someone reports it."

McNamara acknowledges that the taboo against snitching is powerful but points out that police agencies have been able to penetrate the protective code in the area of corruption.

"The cops themselves became so opposed to it, they started reporting it. We are beginning to see the same thing happen with abuse of authority. Like corruption, once you hold excessive force up to the light, no one can defend it, not even cops."●

CITIZENSHIP AND OUR CONSTITUTION

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, the following essay, entitled "My Role In Upholding Our Constitution," was written by a young constituent of mine from Danville, Vt., and was the Vermont winner of the 1983-84 Voice of Democracy Scholarship program.

This program, under the sole sponsorship of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, encourages young Americans to reflect on the significance of freedom and democracy in this country and the importance of this in their lives. The subject of this year's essay stresses the responsibilities we have as individuals to insure that our country continues to reflect the fundamental beliefs that our Founding Fathers so wisely outlined in our Constitution. I believe Vermont's winner, Miss Marianne Incerpi, has done this splendidly in her essay which I share with you here.

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

A very special relationship exists between the citizens of the United States and their Constitution.

My role as an individual in upholding the Constitution is to make known my concerns and take action on issues regarding the governing of our democratic society. I can do research, compile facts, and take positive action toward the accomplishment of my goal.

Propaganda is only one way to inform people of concern over an issue. Crisis, dramatic events, and eloquent speakers also make citizens aware of situations and influence public opinion.

You, and I, and the other citizens of this country have a responsibility to remain informed and to express our opinions to government officials.

Interest groups are another way to inform legislators of special interest needs. We can join and become active in interest groups supporting our ideas. If none exists we still have the right, even the responsibility, to inform legislators of our concerns.

Legislation that will directly affect your welfare may fall under the category of public interest or consumer lobbies rather than special interest groups.

An individual has some power but many people striving towards common goals is the strength of our country. We must continue to pull together and defend our rights and ideals.

We can lobby by presenting well-prepared arguments for a cause or simply writing well thought-out and formulated letters to influential people.

Letters, posters, discussions, petitions, campaigning, and demonstrations are all forms of lobbying available to Americans.

We need to get out and vote. An appallingly low percentage of all registered voters actually exercise that hard earned right.

The individual vote carries more power than many people realize. Public opinion—the point of view of many individuals and groups—is what determines the outcome of most political conflicts. Abraham Lincoln stated it well when he said, "It is rare that public sentiment decides immorally or unwisely."

All Americans must take an active interest in our government. We can read political advertisements and propaganda, vote, write to legislators, petition, campaign, testify at legislative hearings, deliver speeches, or run for office. Both sides of an issue need to be analyzed. Concerned citizens must keep an open mind and never overlook the opposing viewpoints.

To uphold my constitutional rights I must not only support or oppose existing legislation, but initiate changes I feel are necessary. An informed citizen must confer with local, state, or federal representatives to help formulate a reasonable solution or alternative to problems.

The Preamble of the Constitution establishes the foundation and goals upon which the governing process I've outlined is built.

That foundation is,

We, the People—We must remind ourselves the Constitution was written by the people, for the people. The citizens of this country determine the future of the nation.

The goals of that Constitution are,

(1) To Form a More Perfect Union—We must continually strive to better ourselves and our environment through education and hard work.

(2) Establish Justice—We must determine and execute what is good and fair for man and society.

(3) Insure Domestic Tranquility—The family is the basic unit in our society. As this nation is a large family we must preserve inner peace.

(4) Provide for the Common Defense—As a nation, we have to provide for the bodily defense of our citizens. What is the best way to confront this need? In the words of writer George P. Morris in "The Flag of our Nation", "United we stand, divided we fall."

(5) Promote the General Welfare—The physical and psychological well-being of our citizens is of utmost importance as they are our governing body.

(6) Secure the Blessings of Liberty to Ourselves and our Posterity—We have built a great country with democracy as our governing process and the guarantee of basic freedoms. These ideals are the foundation of our society and we must preserve them not only for ourselves but for our children and future generations. The relationship I have proposed between the citizens of the United States and their Constitution is firmly rooted in my belief that we must share the responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society.●

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 29, marks Yom HaShoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day. Also, 40 years ago that day, Nazi troops began their campaign to exterminate the Hungarian Jewish Community. For Hungary's more than 700,000 Jews, April 29 signaled their entrance into the hell of Hitler's final solution. Among those carried away to the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Birkenau were all four of my grandparents, most of my parents' sisters and brothers and their children, as well as a large number of other relatives.

In remembrance of the European Jews and other ethnic, religious, and political groups annihilated by Nazi Germany, I am proud to submit for the record a resolution recently passed by the New York State Legislature marking Yom HaShoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day in the State of New York. I offer specific praise and commendation for Senator Manfred Ohrenstein and Assemblyman Alan Hevesi who introduced this resolution and ushered it to its adoption in the New York Legislature. Assemblyman Hevesi's grandfather was the Chief Rabbi of Budapest when the Nazi's occupied Hungary.

Our remembering the horror of the Holocaust enables us to renew our commitment to preventing future genocides. This resolution reminds us that we cannot abandon the legacy of this most heinous and horrific event in human history.

Whereas, April 29, 1984, marks Yom HaShoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day; and

Whereas, This date also marks the Fortieth Anniversary of the beginning of the Nazi campaign to destroy the Hungarian Jewish Community; and

Whereas, There were some 700,000 Jews in greater Hungary at the beginning of this murderous campaign; and

Whereas, In the spring of 1944 Hungary was the only country in Europe that stood intact against the cataclysmic destruction of the Jewish world that had swept that continent; and

Whereas, The virtual Nazi occupation of Hungary in March, 1944, and the installation of the pro-Nazi Sztojay government drastically transformed the situation of the Hungarian Jews; and

Whereas, On March twenty-ninth, nineteen hundred forty-four, new anti-Jewish legislation was enacted, forcing Jews entirely out of professions, ordering the registration of their property and arranging for its almost instant appropriation, concentrating Jews in designated places, and ordering the wearing of yellow stars; and

Whereas, By the end of April, 1944, over 8,000 Jews had been arrested by the Eichmann commando and the Hungarian police; and those arrested were among the first Jewish deportees from Hungary to the Nazi death camps of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, During April, 1944, roundups into ghettos began in the annexed provinces of Hungary: Ruthenia, upper Hungary and northern Transylvania; and

Whereas, Although the Hungarian Jewish community was the last to be attacked by Hitler it suffered the most concentrated and methodical deportation of any Jewish Community; and

Whereas, For forty-six straight days beginning on May 15, 1944, with the end of the war in sight and in full view of the world, the Nazi death machinery worked ceaselessly and murdered over 400,000 Hungarian Jews; and

Whereas, to carry out the deportations of the Jews, Eichmann divided Hungary into six zones: Zone I, Carpathians; II, Transylvania; III, northern Hungary; IV, southern Hungary east of the Danube; V, Transdanubia, including the suburbs of Budapest; VI, Budapest proper; and

Whereas, The Nazis rounded up the Jews, concentrated them within the designated zones, and deported them in rapid order, with Zones I and II cleared of nearly 290,000 Jews by June 7; 92,000 Jews deported from Zones III and IV by June 30; and a total of over 437,000 Jews including some 50,000 from Budapest deported to Auschwitz by July 7; and

Whereas, The two people who symbolize the many acts of heroism during the Holocaust in Hungary are Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg and Hanna Senesch, a 23 year old Hungarian Jew who had emigrated to Palestine; and

Whereas, Raoul Wallenberg arrived at the Swedish Mission in Budapest on July 9, 1944, and organized a rescue operation that saved tens of thousands of Jews, and disappeared in the winter of 1945; and

Whereas, Hanna Senesch parachuted into Yugoslavia in March, 1944 and made her way to Hungary to aid in the rescue of the Hungarian Jews, but was murdered by the Nazis in a Budapest prison in November, 1944; and

Whereas, Some 160,000 Jews remained in Budapest, subject to terror and murder at the hands of the Arrow Cross, suffering cold, hunger and disease in the ghetto; 20,000 died there during the winter of 1944–1945; and

Whereas, On February fourteenth, nineteen hunded forty-five, the Soviet army took Budapest and prevented the deportation to death camps of some 140,000 Jews who survived there; only some 50,000 Jews survived in the provinces; and over 450,000 Jews, 70 percent of the Jews of greater Hungary, had been deported, murdered, or had died under Nazi occupation; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body mark the observance of Yom HaShoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day, in New York State, the residence of the largest number of Holocaust survivors in America; and be it further

Resolved, That this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations to remember the six million Jews and the other victims annihilated by the Nazis, and the heroism of those, such as Raoul Wallenberg and Hanna Senesch, who resisted the terror of the Nazis; and be it further

Resolved, That this Legislative Body mark the Fortieth Anniversary of the beginning

of the Nazi terror in Hungary; and be it further

Resolved, That the lessons of the Holocaust must be recalled, in order to ensure that there is no future genocide against any people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, the New York State Holocaust Memorial Resource Center, the New York City Holocaust Memorial Commission, and the World Federation of Hungarian Jews.●

ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY AND PARENTHOOD ACT OF 1984

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenthood Act of 1984. This legislation would help pregnant teenagers who decide to carry their pregnancies to term and the fathers of these babies.

In 1981, approximately 537,000 teenagers became pregnant and carried their pregnancies to term; 197,000 of these teenage births were to mothers under the age of 18.

The consequences of early childbearing are generally adverse and often long lasting. Moreover, these consequences affect not only the young mothers and children, but also the fathers and their families.

Babies born to teenage mothers are much more likely to die in the first year of life than those born to mothers over the age of 20. Maternal mortality and morbidity, and the risk of having a low-birth-weight infant are also considerably greater among teenage mothers.

One of the most far-reaching consequences of teenage childbearing, however, is the truncation of education among both young parents, often resulting in a limitation of opportunities for these teenagers to gain the skills necessary to compete in our society. Largely because of educational deficits, teenage parents are frequently unable to get decent jobs, and their family incomes tend to be much lower than those earned by other families. Furthermore, the probability is high that a teenage mother will bring up her child alone. Even if young parents do marry, teenage parents are far more likely to become divorced; their babies more likely to spend a large part of their childhood in single-parent households. Alone, with small children, little education, and few skills, it is small wonder that many teenage parents find themselves living below the designated poverty level.

Mr. Speaker, grantees under this legislation would provide pre- and postnatal care; well-child care for the infant; family planning services to prevent a repeat pregnancy; education and job counseling services; family and parenting education; and a broad range of counseling services. Furthermore, recognizing the critical role that the family can, and should, play in assisting these young people, my bill stresses the importance of family support. Finally, in view of the current fiscal realities, the Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenthood Act focuses only on the most vulnerable young people: Those who give birth under the age of 18 and have low incomes or experience other barriers to services.

The adolescent family life demonstration projects, authorized in 1981, was a broad-based piece of legislation with prevention, research, and service components. This demonstration program will expire this year, and I believe the time has come to adopt a service program which will meet the pressing needs of children who bear children.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we all agree that efforts to prevent unintended teenage pregnancy should be given high priority. However, I also believe society has an obligation to help those adolescents who choose to have their children and take on the responsibilities of parenthood at such a young age. The Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenthood Act will give these young people and their infants a chance in life, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.●

THE SOVIET INTERCEPTION OF MAIL

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today along with 17 of my colleagues I am introducing House Concurrent Resolution 294, which memorializes the President to take up the subject of the Soviet interception of international mail with Soviet authorities. Our resolution calls on the U.S. Postal Service delegation to the Universal Postal Union Convention, to be held in Hamburg, Germany, during the months of June and July, to bring this issue before the 167 nations which are members of the UPU.

For the past year, our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has been holding hearings on this issue. To date we have accumulated over 2,000 exhibits which document the fact that the Soviets are interfering with the international mails in a cold and calculated manner to do two things:

First, they are trying to cut the lifelines of communication between those living behind the Iron Curtain with their friends and family members on the outside of the Soviet Union.

Second, the Soviets are deriving a great deal of hard Western currency by intercepting parcels mailed to the Soviet Union, returning them with surcharges to senders under such fabricated claims such as import prohibited, when in the fact the packages were legal. These procedures force American citizens to do business with Soviet-licensed parcel agencies doing business in some 25 American cities, where patrons are required to pay service charges and duty prepaid charges often running $180 to $300 and more in order to be reasonably certain that their packages are delivered.

Many Members of Congress have already provided our committee with exhibits on our investigation. Most ethnic groups in the United States have been in communication with the committee and have also furnished proof of nondelivery of mail. We invite interested Members to join with us in this resolution in order to help resolve a problem that has existed for years, but has been fully documented only within the last few months.

The issue is an emotional one with most ethnic and religious groups not only in the Soviet Union but also here in America. I believe it is incumbent upon the House to move staunchly in annunicating its concern over their interruption of the international mails.

The United States contributes upward of three-quarters of 1 million dollars each year in support of the Universal Postal Union. I question how interested the UPU has been in responding to our concerns, let alone their interest in resolving the dilemma before them.

This resolution would put the Congress on record in this formal effort to alleviate the problems for citizens of our Nation, as well as for the 17 countries from whom we have obtained evidence of Soviet mail interference.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the complete text of the resolution for the RECORD at this time:

H. CON. RES. 294

Whereas the integrity of the mail service between the United States and the Soviet Union is being called into question by postal patrons in the United States and by postal patrons of 17 other countries who assert that postal items are systematically not being delivered to selected addresses in the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Subcommittee on Postal Operations has documented these facts with over 2,000 exhibits and testimony from witnesses at hearings on this matter;

Whereas the explanations required under international law and given by the Soviet postal administration regarding the nondelivery of mail to certain addresses have consistently been untimely and inadequate;

Whereas the mail which is not being delivered typically is between family members or persons sharing a religious bond and typically consists of personal correspondence or gifts of articles for personal use;

Whereas the nondelivery of mail which is deliverable as addressed and which does not contain prohibited articles is an interference by the Soviet Union with internationally recognized human rights guaranteed to all persons by the Univeral Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and

Whereas the systematic exclusion of certain persons from international mail service also violates the Articles of the Constitution of the Universal Postal Union (with protocols), the general regulations of the Universal Postal Union with final protocol and annex, the Universal Postal Convention with final protocol and detailed regulations, and the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—

(1) that the President, through the Secretary of State, should express to the Government of the Soviet Union the disapproval of the American people of the Soviet Union's—

(A) systematic nondelivery of properly addressed mail originating in the United States to the persons to whom it is addressed; and

(B) violation of the Articles of the Constitution of the Universal Postal Union (with protocols), the general regulations of the Universal Postal Union with final protocol and annex, the Universal Postal Convention with final protocol and detailed regulations, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and

(2) that, at the meeting of the Congress of the Universal Postal Union in Hamburg, Germany, from June 18 to July 27, 1984, the representatives of the United States Postal Service should—

(A) bring the Soviet Union's violations of international law governing international mail to the attention of the representatives of the member countries of the Universal Postal Union, and call upon such countries for support in encouraging the Soviet Union to respect its treaty obligations;

(B) request the Universal Postal Union to conduct an investigation of such alleged violations; and

(C) consider possible sanctions against the Soviet Union for such violations.●

CYPRUS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I join tonight with my colleagues to commemorate an ongoing tragedy in the world. In less than 3 months it will be 10 years since the Government of Turkey launched an illegal invasion of Cyprus and began an occupation over some 40 percent of the island that continues to this day.

To add insult to injury, Turkey in recent months has taken the step of making their portion of the occupied island a Republic. This provocative action has angered many in this Congress and may lead to revisions in the foreign aid proposal pending for fiscal year 1985 for Turkey.

We should be ashamed that we have allowed 10 years to go by without a resolution to this problem. We should be ashamed that to this day some 2,000 Greek Cypriots remain missing and unaccounted for—all victims of the invasion. It is a disgrace that thousands of Greek Cypriots have been made into homeless, helpless refugees on their own homeland.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the principle of working for a free and independent Cyprus where human and civil rights are respected for both communities. It is a cause that should unite both sides of the political aisle and one that should be a priority of this Congress.●

HENRY HYDE ON THE PERILS OF ISOLATIONISM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, our colleague HENRY HYDE is one of the most eloquent speakers in the House of Representatives. And as the following article demonstrates, he is also one of the most cogent writers and thoughtful observers in the House.

From his seat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman HYDE has had substantial opportunity to observe and reflect upon the foreign policy goals of the United States, and the ways in which those goals are served—or weakened—by opinion leaders across the political spectrum.

I am convinced that no foreign policy can succeed without bipartisan support. And I am equally convinced that our Nation's foreign policy interests transcend partisan lines, when viewed with objectivity and honesty. For this reason, I enthusiastically supported the establishment of a Bipartisan National Commission on Central America. The quality of that Commission's work, the dedication of its members, and the cogency of its recommendations, reflect bipartisan cooperation at its best.

The response accorded the Kissinger Commission proposals in this Congress, at times, has reflected partisan politics at its worst.

I am deeply disturbed by the tendency some members of the liberal left have displayed to attack the President's policy for narrow domestic political gains, with little or no regard for the international and national security implications of their actions.

In his article, "A new crop of isolationists," HENRY HYDE exposes the ostrich-like assumptions and eclectic reasoning of those who would urge us away from our responsibilities as leader of the Free World, and toward a myopic isolationism. As Congressman HYDE writes, upon our emergence from World War II, our leaders, Democrats and Republicans alike, clearly understood "that America could no longer exist in splendid isolation—immune from the struggle for freedom's survival in an increasingly dangerous world."

Apparently there are some would-be leaders today who need to learn this lesson anew. I commend HENRY HYDE's article as a fine introduction to that course of study.

The article follows:

A NEW CROP OF ISOLATIONISTS

(By Henry Hyde)

Whatever the faults and follies of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, at least they taught us that America could no longer exist in splendid isolation—immune from the struggle for freedom's survival in an increasingly dangerous world.

President Roosevelt understood that a Nazi-dominated Europe and an Asia dominated by Japan's Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere would confront the Free World—what would be left of the Free World—with an intolerable political and economic situation that would soon deteriorate into a military disaster for America.

Later, President Truman understood that communist domination of the Korean peninsula would profoundly affect a disarmed Japan, with the most serious and dangerous consequences for peace and freedom in the world.

But the lessons of history are missed by our Democratic leaders of the left, I suppose, most charitably, because they haven't read history or, perhaps having read it, have failed to understand its lessons.

The two leading candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination share a common view that we disengage from Central America—Jimmy Carter's vice president would have us walk away, while George McGovern's old campaign manager would have us run.

These political leaders have moved the center of gravity of the Democratic Party—the party of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman—leftward towards the new isolationism. They have an almost childlike faith in negotiations, unadorned by military considerations, as the best means towards peace and pluralism in the world. They believe that peace is the natural condition of society and if any conflict arises all that is required is to sit down (provided you can agree on the shape of the table) and talk about the problem and all will be well.

The dominant left establishment has another remarkable genius—the ability to create terrible political disasters and walk away unscathed and never look back.

They even transform their failures into a ratification of their skewed moral vision: Chiang Kai-shek was a corrupt warlord and Mao Tse-tung was an "agrarian reformer;" the Diem and Thieu governments of South Vietnam were corrupt despoilers of human rights while the Viet Cong were "indigenous nationalists." The consequences of this error in judgment has so far—and the final body count can never be totaled—cost 2 million Cambodian lives, and the lives of untold numbers of Vietnamese boat people who would rather risk drowning at sea or attacks by pirates than suffer the evil peace imposed by the communists. These same practitioners of selective outrage in Congress energized the drive to oust the Shah of Iran

and his dreaded secret police, and in their wake? The Ayatollah and all the persecution, violence, and misery that has yet to reach its climax. The names are different, the geography changes but the value judgment is constant—the preferred tyranny is always to the left.

The left liberals in Congress are outraged by what they call right-wing death squads in El Salvador. (Of course there is a criminal element in war-torn El Salvador that indulges its peculiar sense of patriotism by assassinating political enemies, and no one can morally defend them or their crimes. But how strangely absent is any recognition, much less criticism of left-wing death squads in that bleeding country). As of March 22, assassins had killed five members of the Salvadoran constituent assembly—the equivalent of murdering 36 U.S. congressmen. Imagine if terrorists murdered 36 members of Congress—do you think there would be some concern about the identities of the assassins, their political orientation? It is surely worth noting that all five of the murdered Salvadoran assemblymen were conservative. Would you not suppose some outcry would be directed at left-wing death squads?

The cardinal error of the left in this Congress is its inability or unwillingness to take communism seriously in Central America. They perceive the enemy as Russian imperialism and they utter cliches about communism no longer being monolithic—every Marxist state a potential Titoist prize to be weaned away from the Soviets by tender loving care. They will not recognize that the enemy is a massive totalitarian force that is metastasizing in our front yard by projecting Soviet and Cuban power.

How can we sustain an interventionist posture in NATO with our 250,000 troops and in South Korea with our 30,000 troops, and in the Persian Gulf with our naval vessels and at the same time maintain an isolationist posture in Central America?

We are warned that if we continue to involve ourselves in Central America we'll have "another Vietnam" on our hands. Well, in truth there are many similarities:

The left told us the Viet Cong were indigenous insurgents, not controlled from the outside (Today there is a Soviet naval base at Cam Ranh Bay). The same charge is made in reference to El Salvador, but now, as then, the facts are different.

The left urged a "negotiated settlement with power-sharing" in Vietnam. So also in El Salvador. Have you visited the mass graves in Cambodia or the refugeee camps in Thailand or Malaysia recently?

The predictable result in Vietnam as a consequence of the sanctimony and hypocritical fastidiousness of the American antiwar left was a communist takeover, the erection of its own Gulag and the extirpation of human rights accompanied by the ongoing and incalculable loss of human lives. But where are the expressions of outrage at this Asiatic holocaust?

Where are the ringing denunciations and the pastoral letters of condemnation? The pickets at the United Nations?

Of course right-wing death squads are criminal and must be rooted out in El Salvador and everywhere else that pretends to be a democracy. But should this effort fail—an admitted evil—shall we consign the entire population of El Salvador to the Marxist-Leninists? They can then impose Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan communism on the 5 million suffering people of El Salvador, and then proceed with their proclaimed "revolution without frontiers" up the isthmus towards Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico—and down to Costa Rica and Panama. Henry Kissinger told the House foreign Affairs committee that we either defend freedom now at some cost, or do it later at great cost and with direct U.S. involvement. The choice is up to this Congress and time is running out. In World War II, we enjoyed a margin for error. We had time to gear up the arsenal of democracy. We no longer have that margin for error.

I suggest to our righteous friends of the left that the price for selling out Central America is not merely the extinction of democracy in the region and the Sovietization of the Caribbean, but a direct and fearful threat to our own national security. We will then be forced to respond by giving the Soviets their greatest foreign-policy triumph—the redeploying of our troops out of Europe and Korea and into this hemisphere.

And, never forget, there is one thing at which the communists excel—the creation of refugees. I trust our congressional leaders are planning to deal with the human tidal wave of refugees that will stream up the Central-American land bridge into Texas and California.

I must ask, are the political satisfactions of attacking the Reagan administration's foreign policy worth the price of selling out any chance at democracy and freedom in Central America?●

T. C. AND JOHN ED—THEIR RECENT MOVE HAS NOT CHANGED THEIR CLASS OF COMEDY

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, to possess the quality of truly having a good sense of humor is rare among individuals today. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize two individuals who have continued to keep thousands of Alabamians laughing with their morning radio program.

Following is an article that appeared in the Western Star which I would like to share with colleagues in the House of Representatives about my friends T. C. and John Ed:

T. C. AND JOHN ED—THEIR RECENT MOVE HAS NOT CHANGED THEIR CLASS OF COMEDY

What is it with T.C. and John Ed? The sillier they get, the more they laugh at each other, and the more they laugh at each other, the more the audience seems to love it.

"If they think you're funny, and they're having fun, then they're more likely to keep you around," T.C. says about the audience they attract. "We just try to be part of the family."

Since their recent move from a top forty pop radio station to a country music format, the calls that they receive would seem to indicate that a large part of their audience is willing to follow them around the dial to hear them being silly.

T.C. prods the caller with the question—"Were you already listening or did you switch with us?; "I switched." "Well bless you're heart." he replies. And so it goes throughout the morning.

Now going out on two stations, WVOK AM and WQUS FM, they have twice the space to fool around on each morning. A lot of times it's just random conversation between the two when they're on the air, but it can often be hilarious.

"We have to ad-lib," T.C. says. "I'd be scared to write it down. Once we say it then it's too late to go back."

How would they describe the type of show they do? "We specialize in low class," T.C. says. "That's because we have no class", John Ed returns. "You would think a 54 year old man would get a job that he'd be proud to tell his 2 year old granddaughters about," T.C. adds.

When they do take a minute to be serious they say they're very happy with their recent move. "The response has been excellent," said T.C. "We just felt like we were going in different directions at the other station, but it was home and there weren't any hard feelings when we left."

"There's limited interest in a.m. and we have a lot more coverage and power here. These are the main reasons we made the move. Besides, we'll do anything for a dollar, we're just doing it now for a larger audience."

In the process, they're trying to tone down the twangy guitar image of country music on their show by playing a lot of crossover material and some top forty. "We want to be able to please our old audience as well as the one we inherited," T.C. says.

But after just a few minutes of serious talk, the conversation in the booth once again returns to foolishness as they talk about the nine years they've been together.

T.C. says he first chose John Ed as a partner because he felt sorry for him. "He had never really done anything with his life." "Yeah, well I've really made something of myself now, hun." John Ed replies. "When I first hooked up with you I knew I'd gone as far as I was going to go." "Yeah, but it was a challenge," T.C. says. "It's a challenge getting up the guts to come in every morning."

These two individuals are a credit to the community and the radio industry. It takes a great deal of nerve to entertain others with humor. I have enjoyed knowing both of these fine gentlemen for many years and wish both of them the very best in all future endeavors.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. McHUGH. As you know, Mr. Speaker, April 24 marked the 69th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, an event which began on the evening of April 24, 1915, and ended only some 8 years later after the deaths of more than 1 million men, women, and children. It is therefore appropriate to remember and honor these victims, not only to remind us of their brutal fate but also to strengthen our resolve that never again shall such slaughters be allowed.

The tragedy that befell the Armenian people between 1915 and 1923 was only a beginning, of course. As Armenians recovered from the shock of their near annihilation and deportation from their homeland, they found themselves dispersed throughout the world, largely forgotten. Soon, however, the spirit of the Armenian people revived. April 24 became a rallying point, a day of commemoration for the victims and a day of renewal for the survivors and their descendants.

Although the Armenian genocide was ignored for decades by those who had not been touched first-hand by the events that had taken place between 1915 and 1923, efforts to ignore a tragedy of this dimension could never succeed. Thus, in time, religious, and political leaders throughout the world began to participate in the commemorative events of April 24. Their participation was a message that the world could not afford to forget the tragedy that had been perpetrated against the Armenian people.

Even today there are those within Turkey and within our own Government who would have us ignore the Armenian genocide. Some would have us rewrite history while others would be content to have us forget history, but clearly their efforts are doomed to failure.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the past is prolog, prolog to the continuing stream of history. As we look back over the course of events, we must also look forward in the firm belief that by our actions we can affect future events. In looking back across the years to the tragedy that befell the Armenian people, we must look forward as well in order to prevent a repetition of their calamity. For we can draw a direct parallel between the massive genocides of this century and the savage acts of terrorism that plague us today. Both involve violence against innocent people, and both reveal an alarming contempt for human life.

By any standard the massacre of over 1 million Armenians was one of the most callous and barbarous acts ever committed by one people against another. In the end, however, the continuing significance of the Armenian genocide lines not only in the physical history of the events that took place between 1915 and 1923, but also in the symbolic nature of such indiscriminate slaughter.

Thus, even as we honor the victims of this genocide, we must do more. If the brutality committed against the Armenian people is to have a lasting effect, the Armenian genocide must become not only a tug on our heart strings but a call to conscience and a call to action against terrorism around the world. In that sense, Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide speaks to us across the decades.●

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO JUANITA GUERRA BACA ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY, APRIL 27, 1984

HON. ESTEBAN E. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues that tomorrow, April 27, 1984, Juanita Guerra Baca will celebrate her 100th birthday.

Juanita G. Baca was born in El Zapote, Guanajuato, Mexico, on April 27, 1884. In 1899, Mrs. Baca married her husband Cruz Baca who was also from Mexico. Mr. and Mrs. Baca had 16 children.

In 1909, Mr. and Mrs. Baca migrated to the United States. They temporarily settled in San Antonio, Tex. In 1910 the Baca family, after working at times to pay for their passage and walking part of the way, settled in Irwindale, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Baca is known for her dedication to her family and her work. She is an animal lover who raises pigs, goats, several prize dogs, peacocks, pigeons, parakeets, canaries, guinea hens, and turkeys. Today Mrs. Baca, as the matriarch of the Baca family, has six surviving children—Lazaro, Jose, Cruz, Francisca, Refugio, Ralph, a grandson, Trinidad, 46 grandchildren, 86 great-grandchildren and more than 12 great-great-grandchildren. She is a member of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church and has helped raise money for numerous worthy public causes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mrs. Baca happy birthday on this memorable occasion, as well as health and prosperity in the years to come.●

A HUMANE DEPORTATION BILL

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the following article from the April 2, 1984, edition of the St. Paul Dispatch makes clear, refugees from El Salvador seeking asylum in this country are faced with a serious and disheartening dilemma. These individuals have fled an unlivable situation in their homeland and come to the United States seeking the spirit of human rights that serves as the foundation of American life. Upon arrival, however, they are confronted by an unsympathetic administration which will not extend them the same voluntary departure conditions it does refugees from other nations. As the following editorial points out, it is time for us to recognize that an injustice is being done and to take action.

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, Apr. 2, 1984]

A HUMANE DEPORTATION BILL

A 26-year-old Salvadoran national with the assumed name of Rene Hurtado is living illegally in the Twin Cities. St. Luke Presbyterian Church in Wayzata has been providing him sanctuary since December 1982.

Another young Salvadoran with the assumed name of Manuel is living illegally in Minnesota with the help of the Twin Cities Friends Meeting.

Each once served in the Salvadoran army and fled the country. Manuel says his father and brother were killed by the death squads. Both Manuel and Mr. Hurtado fear they would be imprisoned, tortured or targeted by the death squads if they returned to their homeland.

To remain in the United States legally, without the protection of churches, the two would have to qualify for asylum by proving that they are specifically wanted by the killers. Failing that, the government would attempt to deport them back to El Salvador to an uncertain future. For many like Mr. Hurtado and Manuel, the risk of being denied asylum is terrifying and so they have sought protection from churches. The district director of immigration for the Twin Cities has referred to the churches' efforts as "nothing more than a smuggling ring."

The U.S. policy, which has seen thousands of illegal Salvadoran refugees returned to their homeland, is under increasing attack in this country, as it should be. On April 12, the U.S. House subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and International Law will hold hearings on a bill that would place a moratorium on detentions and deportations of Salvadoran nationals. It is a disgrace that such a compassionate act has not been taken by the Reagan administration up to now. It is appalling that Congress would need to pass a law forcing the administration to do what should have been done long ago. But there may be no other choice.

There are an estimated 300,000 to 500,000 illegal Salvadoran aliens living in the United States. Many fled in search of safety, hoping not to be added to the list of 40,000 civilians killed in the civil war since 1979. Others came less out of fear than in pursuit of jobs, and their claims for protection are less pure.

A section of U.S. immigration law is designed specifically for those from troubled nations who neither desire citizenship nor qualify for asylum, which by the way is a costly and time-consuming process that the United States is ill-equipped to handle quickly. The alternative is called "extended voluntary departure." This status simply allows aliens facing danger in their home countries to remain in the United States temporarily and receive authorization to work until conditions improve at home. Natives of Ethiopia, Lebanon, Poland, Uganda and Afghanistan currently are in the United States under that program. Are the Salvadorans any less worthy of such treatment? No.

The Reagan administration has been reluctant to grant either asylum or extended voluntary departure to Salvadorans. To do so would be an admission that the U.S.-supported regime is repressive. Further, the administration worries that such a step would encourage new illegal immigration. Another reason is that State Department officials believe Salvadorans could find refuge in countries closer to their home.

Those all sound like lame and cold-hearted excuses from leaders of a nation steeped in humanitarian treatment of frightened and endangered refugees.

The Congress in 1983 passed a nonbinding resolution recommending that Salvadorans be granted temporary special protection in the United States, saying that deporting them was "creating potentially life-threatening situations for innocent nationals." However, the administration continues to deport about 100 Salvadorans a week.

The bill to be heard by the House immigration subcommittee would impose a moratorium of up to three years on deportation of displaced Salvadorans. Unquestionably, the bill should be approved and should enjoy the support of congressional delegations from Minnesota and western Wisconsin.●

WHO MAY VISIT AMERICA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, April 24, edition of the New York Times.

The editorial examines the embarrassing policies of the State Department in barring entry to the United States to scholars, writers, and others whose political viewpoints the administration finds unsettling. Those denied visas have included Nobel laureates and internationally acclaimed writers.

Each time the State Department arbitrarily denies a visa to a foreign speaker or writer our international prestige and reputation suffers. Such actions make the United States appear hypocritical as we proclaim freedom of speech and association while at the same time prohibiting those with certain political beliefs from visiting our shores. At the same time, such policies do a serious disservice to our own citizens, denying them their first amendment rights to hear and freely associate with those who hold dissenting views.

It is past time that the laws which permit the State Department to arbitrarily exclude foreign visitors on the basis of their ideology were reformed. As the editorial mentions, our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), has introduced legislation that would revise the current exclusionary sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act by substituting language that examines a visa applicant's behavior rather than the applicant's political viewpoints. I commend my colleague for his legislation and look forward to working with him to achieve its enactment.

I am sure my colleagues will find the following editorial useful in examining the need for change.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1984]

WHO MAY VISIT AMERICA

Whenever there's a rumpus about denying a visa to a controversial foreign visitor, the State Department has a standard excuse: Sorry, it's the law.

True, there is a law, the McCarran-Walter Act, which prohibits visas for aliens if, among other things, they are or were affiliated with a Communist or pro-Communist organization. It's a blunderbuss law, badly drafted and rooted in un-American practices. If the State Department were sensitive to the embarrassments it causes, and to the rights of Americans to invite foreign guests, it would press for the law's revision.

What's wrong with the law is illustrated by the confused argument over an aborted visit by Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Colombia's Nobel Prize-winning novelist. Invited to take part in a meeting critical of United States policies in Central America, he applied for a visa in Bogota on April 5. The State Department says it was ready to waive the McCarran Act restrictions, as it may, and offer him a one-year multiple-entry visitor's visa. But Mr. Garcia Marquez rejected the waiver "for reasons of principle and personal dignity," protesting being denied, over 13 years, an unconditional five-year visa.

He has been discriminated against because in the early 1960's he worked in New York for Prensa Latina, Cuba's official news agency. This put him on the blacklist, and his subsequent visits were usually by restricted visa requiring negotiations. Now he balks at negotiating and is accused of posturing, of preferring a propaganda charge to a visit.

Indeed, the novelist has a propaganda purpose. But it is not vile. To dismiss his complaint is to yield to an offensive and capricious law.

America has for too long been granting or denying visas under similarly demeaning restrictions to scores of authors, scholars and scientists. They deserve routine admission to the United States and regular contact with Americans. No other Western democracy subjects visitors to such doubt and humiliation.

A report of the New York City Bar Association sums up the padlock's illogic: "It is incongruous to exclude advocates of Communist or other ideologies when their domestic counterparts run for public office and enjoy the right of free speech, and hypocritical to do so while we boast and even preach of that domestic freedom."

Congress amended the McCarran Act in 1977 to give the executive more discretion in interpreting its restrictions. But that hasn't helped much. Representative Barney Frank, a Massachusetts Democrat, has a better idea. He would scrap the exclusionary sections and substitute new language that tests a visa applicant's behavior, not belief. His blacklist would bear the names of spies, saboteurs and terrorists, not professors and writers.

The House will hold hearings on the bill in June, but the State Department has yet to decide what it thinks. What a contrast, this delay, with its volubility in blaming the law whenever a fresh exclusion makes embarrassing headlines.●

JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1984

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 30, the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 5041, the Joint Research and Development Act of 1984. This legislation, by clarifying the appropriate legal standard and limiting potential antitrust liabilities, is designed to provide assistance to companies contemplating joint research and development ventures—activities that could contribute substantially to the Nation's economic health. I am pleased that we are able to act promptly on a bill that is a product of the careful work of two committees.

As the result of discussions with the Committee on Science and Technology, which reported its own version of a research and development bill in the fall of last year, we shall offer H.R. 5041 in a slightly different form than that reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on April 6.

Most of the changes in the amendment in the nature of a substitute are in the definitions set out in section 2 of the bill. In the definitions, and throughout the bill, the amended version substitutes the term "joint research and development venture" for "joint research and development program." The definition of "joint research and development venture" in section 2(a)(1) has also been slightly restructured. The only substantive change is the addition of a new clause (C), providing that "engineering activities to achieve standards of performance and reliability or to meet economic requirements" will fall within the joint R&D definition.

In section 2(b), the exclusionary language in the definition of joint R&D has been modified. In clause (C), the words "neither developed by such venture nor integrally related to a product or process developed by such venture" have been substituted for "not jointly developed." This change insures that a product or process whose development is integrally related to the joint venture's activities will still fall within the definition of joint R&D.

The changes to sections 3 through 6 of the bill are largely technical and conforming in nature. In subsections (a) and (b) of section 4, the phrase "in lieu of the relief specified in such section" is added. This phrase makes clear the intent to eliminate the threefold damage remedy specified in section 4 and section 4(C) of the Clayton Act in favor of the actual damage remedy specified in H.R. 5041.

Subsection 4(e) has been amended to provide that the protections of section 4 shall lapse only during the effective period of a court order enjoining protected conduct.

Section 6(a) has been amended to make clear in the last sentence that voluntary additional disclosure notifications will serve "to extend the protections of section 4."

Section 6(d) has been amended to eliminate the phrase suggesting that notifications withdrawn prior to publication in the Federal Register "shall have no force and effect." Such withdrawn notifications will continue to enjoy the protections against disclosure provided by section 6. The amended language simply provides that any such withdrawn notification "shall not confer the protections of section 4 on any persons with respect to whom" it was filed.

The amended version of H.R. 5041 is appended to this statement.

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Joint Research and Development Act of 1984".

DEFINITIONS; LIMITATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "joint research and development venture" means any group of activities, including attempting to make, making, or performing a contract, by two or more persons for one or more of the following purposes:

(A) theoretical analysis, experimentation, or systematic study of phenomena or observable facts,

(B) extension of investigative findings or theory of a scientific or technical nature into practical application for experimental and demonstration purposes, including experimental production and testing of models, prototypes, equipment, materials, and processes,

(C) engineering activities to achieve standards of performance and reliability or to meet economic requirements, and

(D) the collection, exchange, and analysis of research information,

and may include operation of facilities for the conduct of research, the conduct of such venture on a protected and proprietary basis, and the patenting and licensing of the results of such venture, but does not include any activity specified in subsection (b),

(2) the term "antitrust laws" has the meaning given it in section 1 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15), except that such term includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that such section 5 applies to unfair methods of competition,

(3) the term "person" has the meaning given it in section 1(a) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)),

(4) the term "State" has the meaning given it in section 4G(2) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15g(2)),

(5) the term "Attorney General" means the Attorney General of the United States, and

(6) the term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(b) The term "joint research and development venture" excludes the following activities involving two or more persons:

(1) exchanging information regarding the sales, marketing, or distribution of any product, process, or service,

(2) entering into any agreement, or engaging in any other conduct, to restrict or require—

(A) the production or marketing by any person who is a party to such venture of any product, process, or service,

(B) participation by any person who is a party to such venture in another research and development venture, or

(C) the sale, licensing, or sharing by any person who is a party to such venture of inventions or developments neither developed by such venture nor integrally related to a product or process developed by such venture to any other joint research and development venture or other person.

PER SE VIOLATIONS

SEC. 3. No joint research and development venture shall be deemed illegal per se under the antitrust laws or under any State law similar to the antitrust laws.

LIMITATION ON RECOVERY

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15) and in lieu of the relief specified in such section, any person who is entitled to recovery on a claim under such section shall recover the actual damages sustained by him, interest calculated at the rate specified in section 1961 of title 28, United States Code, on such actual damages as specified in subsection (d), and the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to section 5 of this Act—

(1) if such claim results from conduct that is within the scope of a joint research and development venture for which notification has been filed under section 6(a) of this Act, and

(2) if such claim is filed after a notice of the research and development venture is published in the Federal Register as provided in section 6(b) of this Act.

(b) Notwithstanding section 4C of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15c) and in lieu of the relief specified in such section, any State which is entitled to monetary relief on a claim under such section shall recover the total damage sustained as described in subsection (a)(1) of such section, interest calculated at the rate specified in section 1961 of title 28, United States Code, on such total damage as specified in subsection (d), and the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to section 5 of this Act—

(1) if such claim results from conduct that is within the scope of a research and development venture for which notification has been filed under section 6(a) of this Act, and

(2) if such claim is filed after a notice of the research and development venture is published in the Federal Register as provided in section 6(b) of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding any applicable provision of any State law providing a damage remedy for conduct similar to that forbidden by the antitrust laws, any person who is entitled to recovery on a claim under such provision shall not recover in excess of the actual damages sustained by him, interest calculated at the rate specified in section 1961 of title 28, United States Code, on such actual damages as specified in subsection (d), and the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to section 5 of this Act—

(1) if such claim results from conduct that is within the scope of a joint research and development venture for which notification has been filed under section 6(a) of this Act, and

(2) if such claim is filed after a notice of the research and development venture is published in the Federal Register as provided in section 6(b) of this Act.

(d) Interest shall be awarded on the damages involved for the period beginning on the date of filing of the claim and ending on the date of judgment, unless the court finds that the award of all or part of such interest is unjust in the circumstances. Interest shall be awarded on the damages involved for the period beginning on the date of injury and ending one day prior to the date of filing of the claim if the court finds that the award of all or part of such interest is just in the circumstances.

(e) The protections of this section shall not apply to any conduct that occurs during the effective period of any court order enjoining such conduct as a result of a claim under the antitrust laws or any State law similar to the antitrust laws.

ATTORNEY'S FEES

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding section 4, 4C, or 16 of the Clayton Act, in any claim under the antitrust laws, or any State law similar to the antitrust laws, based on conduct that results from a joint research and development venture, the court shall, at the conclusion of the action, award to the substantially prevailing party the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee. In the interest of justice, the award may be reduced or withheld and may be reduced by an award in favor of any other party for any part of the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

DISCLOSURE OF JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT VENTURE

SEC. 6. (a) In accordance with rules issued by the Attorney General in consultation with the Commission, any person who is a party to a joint research and development venture may file simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission a written notification disclosing—

(1) the identities of the parties to such venture, and

(2) the nature, objectives, and duration of such venture.

Any person who is a party to such venture may file such additional disclosure notifications pursuant to this section as are appropriate to extend the protections of section 4.

(b) In accordance with rules issued by the Attorney General in consultation with the Commission, and except as provided in subsection (d), not later than sixty days after receiving a notification filed under subsection (a), the Attorney General or the Commission shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice of such joint research and development venture which identifies the parties to such venture and which describes in general terms the area of planned activity and duration of such venture. Prior to its publication, the contents of the notice shall be made available to the parties to such venture.

(c) Except as to the information published in the Federal Register pursuant to subsection (b), all information and documentary material submitted as part of a notification filed pursuant to this section and all other information obtained by the Attorney Gen-

eral or the Commission in the course of any investigation or enforcement action shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall not be made publicly available by any agency of the United States to which section 552 applies.

(d) Any person who has filed a notification pursuant to this section may withdraw such notification prior to the time at which notice of such research and development venture is published in the Federal Register. Any notification so withdrawn shall not be subject to subsection (b) and shall not confer the protections of section 4 on any person with respect to whom such notification was filed.

(e) Any action taken or not taken by the Attorney General or the Commission with respect to notifications filed pursuant to this section, shall not be subject to judicial review.

(f) For the sole purpose of establishing that a person is entitled to the protections of section 4, the fact of disclosure of conduct under section 6(a) and the fact of publication of a notice under section 6(b) shall be admissible into evidence. But no action by the Attorney General or the Commission taken pursuant to this section shall be admissible into evidence in any administrative or judicial proceeding for the purpose of supporting or answering any claim under the antitrust laws, or under any State law similar to the antitrust laws.

(g) The rules promulgated under this section shall be subject to the public notice and comment requirements of section 553 of title 5, United States Code.●

SUPER MISSILES: THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO MILITARY SECURITY AND ARMS CONTROLS

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, it often seems as if the race between weapons technology and sound decisionmaking is entirely one-sided. Time and again we find that our ability to do ever more clever, thought not necessasrily ever more intelligent, things with weaponry has developed far in front of our understanding of the policy and political implications of these matters. Often, the roots of tomorrow's great public disagreements over nuclear weapons policy and arms control can only be found in today's esoteric research work. We become alert to the policy dimensions of these developments ordinarily only after technology presents us with an accomplished fact. By then, it is almost too late for calm deliberation.

We have, however, an opportunity to get ahead of one oncoming issue: the issue of super-accurate ballistic missiles and their relationship to military security and to arms control. Oncoming U.S. ballistic missile systems such as the MX are going to be quite accurate, as the result of steady improvements in inertial guidance systems. But beyond these systems, there is the possibility of refining accuracy almost to the point of perfection through active terminal guidance—a final steering of reentry vehicles to compensate for all previous errors. The name for this technology is MaRV—(for Maneuverable Reentry Vehicle)—and it is basically a gleam in the eye of some officials at the Pentagon, at this stage of the game.

Super accuracy would make silo-basing of missiles completely obsolete. Many of us would assume that silos are already moribund as a concept in the absence of arms control arguments focused on stability. There is, however, research going on that suggests the possibility of increasing silo and weapons hardness to levels previously thought out of the question. Should technology for superhardening prove fruitful, then silo basing could have a new lease on life. That would be an important development both from the point of view of stability and of costs in sustaining a deterrent. But no amount of hardening can survive a direct nuclear hit, and that is the kind of accuracy that terminally guided MaRV can bring about.

Clearly, we could face a situation in which there is a fundamental choice to be made: shall we seek to eliminate any chance the Soviets might have for basing their missiles securely in super hardened silos—by MaRVing our missiles—if that means that we too will lose a second chance for viable silos—for the Soviets will surely follow with their own MaRV—or should we settle for mutual stability?

These issues, though relatively far in the future, were made real to me by articles in Aviation Week pointing out an interest in the Pentagon in proceeding with MaRV for the new single-warhead ICBM as well as perhaps the MX. I wrote to the Secretary of the Air Force expressing my concerns, and have had in return what I consider to a sensible and constructive response, which defines an intelligent approach to the issue. This exchange of correspondence does not settle the MaRV issue, but it does represent a sound beginning to a dialog. Therefore, I am pleased to submit it for the RECORD, for the consideration of my colleagues and the public:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 15, 1984.

Hon. VERNE ORR,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I know that you agree with me that the Scowcroft Commission Report and all that has followed it represent an important achievement. In particular, despite the intense controversy surrounding the MX, it seems to me that the Report's general proposition about strategic stability, and its specific recommendation for a small single-warhead ICBM enjoy broad support.

This is not to say that the "Midgetman" idea is assured a smooth passage. During the years ahead, this system will have to pass a series of hurdles—both technological and political. Not only first-rate management will be required, but also a high order of statesmanship, including a sense of fidelity to the basic logic of the Scowcroft Commission Report.

That is why I am writing to you, to express concerns aroused by recent items in the press suggesting that the Midgetman is viewed in the Pentagon as a weapon that must achieve super-accuracy through MaRVing, or fail in its objectives. I understand the argument which calls for the Midgetman to be no less accurate than the on-coming state of the art in the MX. Achieving even that will be a major challenge, especially if the missile's costs are to be kept under control, and its development not to be unduly drawn out. To insist on going even further in a search for virtually perfect accuracy, would risk making the Midgetman unrealizable at costs and in a time frame that serve the country's needs.

Like a number of other members of Congress, I am paying close attention to the early, experimental work DoD is doing on "super-hardening" of silos. Most of us hope that if this technology works out, it could offer the prospect of regaining security for ICBM forces, of reducing the pressure for unprecedented progress in developing a mobile hardened launcher for Midgetman, and in freeing up the arms control process. Should the same technology afford a degree of sanctuary to the Soviets, that is by no means a necessarily bad development assuming that we are seeking mutually stable forces. While I can understand that this possibility engages the attention of planners whose job it is to think about overcoming super-hardness with super-accuracy, it is also something that must engage the attention of those concerned with arms control.

Similarly, I am aware of concerns in some parts of the government about the possibility of a Soviet ARM "break-out" and the relationship between this and the idea of MaRVing. Once again, however, it seems to be that this is a matter that must be dealt with vigorously from the arms control perspective, in hopes of preserving the ABM Treaty from developments on either side that might undermine it.

I would urge, therefore, that Midgetman not be comingled and confused with MaRV, and that in any event, we analyze and debate the MaRV question from the broadest possible perspective.

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1984.

Hon. ALBERT GORE, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORE: I appreciate you sharing your concerns about the technology development for maneuvering reentry vehicles (MaRVs) and welcome the opportunity to explain the work underway in this area. Recent press reports have tended to confuse the purpose and nature of the development efforts. MaRVs are not part of the baseline for either the Peacekeeper or the small missile system. Our plan is to employ the MK21 RV, a non-MaRV system, on both the Peacekeeper and the small missile.

Before addressing this issue in more detail, let me say that the Air Force is fully committed to implementing the ICBM Modernization Program proposed by the Scow-

croft Commission, endorsed by the President, and approved by Congress. As you correctly pointed out, it represents an important achievement, particularly in providing the basis for a national consensus on ICBM modernization and arms control.

To that end, Peacekeeper production is underway. Deployment is on schedule and within projected costs. We are confident that the December 1986 initial operational capability will be met with a highly reliable system contrary to the report prepared by the House Appropriations Committee's Survey and Investigation Team. Progress is also being made in follow-on basing technology development efforts with potential applicability for both Peacekeeper and the Small ICBM. We are encouraged about the results thus far in silo superhardening technology. Scaled tests have demonstrated that it is possible to achieve levels of hardness 25 times greater than that of existing Minuteman silos, with promise for even greater hardness. Larger scaled tests are planned for the future, along with tests to increase hardness from nonblast nuclear effects.

Our greatest challenge is in the development of the small mobile single warhead ICBM. The goal for the small missile system is to achieve an initial operational capability in the early 1990s at an affordable cost. To assist in this endeavor, the Small Missile Independent Advisory Group, under the leadership of Bernard A. Schriever, was appointed last fall to recommend a management approach and acquisition strategy. The Group recommended the competitive development of all missile subsystems to introduce innovative ideas early in the process, reduce the costs, and minimize the technical risks.

The Group identified guidance and control as the greatest technical challenge for the small missile in a mobile configuration. They recommended competitive development of alternative systems to achieve requisite accuracy, including a lightweight Advanced Inertial Reference Sphere, ring laser gyroscopes, stellar inertial systems, Global Positioning Satellite receivers, and MaRVs, possibly with terminal fix systems. The Air Force has begun concept development in all of these areas. As with all the missile subsystems, contractors are being advised that when full scale development and force structure decisions are made in the latter part of the decade, the cost must be reasonable and affordable.

With respect to MaRVs in particular, they are not presently needed to satisfy the requirements for the small missile system against projected Soviet threats. They could become useful to evade possible future Soviet antiballistic missile defenses and to gain increased accuracy. The potential advantage of terminal guidance and evasion maneuvers, particularly in the event of a Soviet ABM breakout or if further Soviet hardening of critical targets negates the effectiveness of purely ballistic systems, make continued research on MaRVs prudent as a hedge against these possibilities. To the extent that we pursue MaRV technology in the future, it will be funded under a separate program entitled "Advanced Strategic Missile Systems." Of course, we believe any future decision to deploy MaRVs, should the threat warrant, will be a National decision—made in full consultation with Congress.

Additionally, MaRVs could very well be included in future arms control negotiations. As the President has stated, everything is on the negotiating table. In the meantime, it is important for us to negotiate from a position of strength and for the Soviets to know that we are prepared with viable options.

We appreciate your support for the ICBM Modernization Program and look forward to your continued cooperation as we work together to enhance deterrence and stability.

Sincerely,

VERNE ORR,
Secretary of the Air Force.●

1984 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the results of my 1984 congressional questionnaire indicate that citizens of Wisconsin's Third Congressional District believe that the most important economic issues facing our Nation are Government spending and the deficit.

When asked where spending should be cut, 59 percent said they favored cuts in foreign aid, 51 percent said defense spending should be cut and 33 percent supported cuts in domestic social programs. Only 2 percent said no spending cuts should be made.

On the question of raising taxes, 25 percent said no new taxes should be enacted, but a resounding 69 percent favored raising revenue by closing tax loopholes.

In these days when we face difficult questions in Central America, 41 percent of my constituents responding to our survey believe our role should include a combination of military and economic assistance while 29 percent prefer economic aid with no military assistance.

Responding to the question of arms negotiations, only 13 percent said the United States should reduce weapons regardless of what the Soviets do, while the vast majority said arms reductions should be on an equal and verifiable basis.

In other areas, a majority of citizens in the Third District favor the equal rights amendment. And given the options of keeping the current dairy diversion program, moving to strict production controls, or eliminating the Government role, the majority favored eliminating Federal Government involvement in dairy agriculture.

The following is a complete listing of the results of my 1984 questionnaire:

1984 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[All answers in percent]

1. Which of the following do you feel is the most important economic issue facing the nation?

a. Inflation	7
b. High interest rates	10
c. Unemployment	15
d. Excessive government spending	51
e. Excessive taxes	13
f. The deficit	38

2. How would you suggest reducing the budget deficit?

a. Just raise taxes	34
b. Just reduce spending	46
c. Freeze spending across the board	16
d. A combination of tax increases and spending cuts	33

3. In which areas, if any, should spending be cut?

a. Defense	51
b. Domestic social programs	33
c. Foreign aid	59
d. Farm subsidies	22
e. Education	11
f. No further cuts should be made	2

4. Where would you raise taxes, if any?

a. Raise individual income taxes	6
b. Close tax loopholes	69
c. Federal sales tax	8
d. Raise corporate taxes	19
e. Eliminate indexing for inflation	7
f. I would not enact any new taxes	25

5. The National Commission on Education recently stated that education in America is in a serious state of decline. Despite that report, how would you rate your school system?

a. Very high quality	19
b. Average quality	46
c. Needs better teachers	16
d. Needs better discipline	33
e. Needs more federal funding	7

6. Recognizing its closeness and importance to our security, what do you think our role in Central America should be?

a. Absolutely no involvement	26
b. Economic assistance with no military assistance	29
c. A combination of military and economic assistance	41

7. What do you think our policy should be in arms negotiations with the Soviet Union?

a. We should lead by example and reduce our weapons regardless of what the Soviets do	13
b. Reduce arms on an equal basis with the Soviets and with verification	71
c. Continue our arms buildup as the Soviets continue their buildup	13

8. Statistics indicate that many Americans are losing their jobs to high technology. In the area of vocational education should we:

a. Increase funding	29
b. Decrease funding	8
c. Maintain current funding levels	60

9. Concern about sulfur dioxide emissions (primarily coal-fired utility plants in the Midwest) has prompted Congress to consider different methods to control acid rain pollution. Which option would you prefer:

a. "You pollute-you pay" legislation which would affect utilities that pollute the most	34
b. A national cost sharing plan charging user fees to utilities	13
c. Cap emissions and step up research of problem	44

10. As we prepare for the 1985 farm bill, our efforts in the dairy area should be directed toward:

a. Keeping the current milk diversion program	11
b. Moving to a strict supply management program	14
c. Eliminating federal government involvement in dairy agriculture	66

11. The Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) reads as follows: "Equality of rights under

the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex." Do you support this amendment?

a. Yes 63
b. No 33

12. Should Congress pass an amendment which would prohibit abortions nationwide unless the life of the mother is endangered?

a. Yes 46
b. No ..... 51●

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT: STILL A NATIONAL DISASTER

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, a recent Gallup poll conducted for Newsweek magazine showed that most Americans still see unemployment as the most pressing issue of the day. For the young people of our country in particular, there is a good explanation for this. Unemployment for this group has risen, rather than fallen, during the past month.

For the month of March, the unemployment rate for youth climbed to 19.9 percent, which approached the December 1983 level; 55,000 more youth than in February, or approximately one out of every five teenagers, was unable to find work last month. For black and Hispanic teenagers, the jobless rate was higher in March 1984 than in March 1983, near the depth of the last recession. Black youth unemployment, which, at 46.7 percent is over 2.5 times higher than white youth unemployment—17.1 percent—has remained near 50 percent for over a year. However, because of extremely low youth labor market participation rates—in 1983, 36.4 percent for black teens and 56.9 percent for white teens—these numbers grossly understate the true youth unemployment figure. Discouraged by the lack of employment opportunities, youth choose to drop out of the labor force. These statistics serve as further evidence of what has been painfully clear to many Americans of all description: our decelerating economic recovery has yet to reach significant segments of the involuntarily unemployed and, more frighteningly, it may never reach them.

While it is clear that the latest recession has made it difficult for youth in the private sector, the existing employment programs in the public sector are also unable to cope with this problem. The Job Training Partnership Act program severely restricts the use of funds for work experience, which is essential to youth for success in the labor market. Of even more importance, however, is the reduction in JTPA funding programs which effect youth under the Reagan administration, which has rendered ineffective our efforts in this area. Clearly, part of the problem of youth unemployment is our lack of tools to reduce it.

Seventy cosponsors have joined me in introducing legislation to combat the problem of youth unemployment. H.R. 5017, the Youth Incentive Employment Act, is designed to simultaneously provide jobs for youth and encourage them to obtain the basic education and training needed to improve their long-term employment prospects. The proposal is based on the successful implementation of a 30-month demonstration project mandated by Congress as part of the Youth Act of 1977. It will provide part-time employment during the school year and full-time employment during the summer for economically disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 19. To participate in the program, these youth must be members of families whose income does not exceed 70 percent of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' lower living standard, and must agree to resume or maintain attendance in secondary school or an alternative education program and work toward acquiring a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Under this Act, $2 billion for fiscal year 1985, and such sums thereafter, would be authorized to subsidize, up to 100 percent, the employment of approximately 1-million participants. Eligible youth would be employed under strict supervision in public agencies, private non-profit organizations, and by private for-profit employers, and would have to maintain performance standards at school and at the worksite. If enacted, the Youth Incentive Employment Act would encourage the completion of school, provide training opportunities, and help develop a responsible, productive attitude toward work in our Nation's youth.

The first budget resolution passed by the House provides authority for youth employment initiatives such as the Youth Incentive Employment Act. This authority clears the way for Congress to act this session to bring down the explosive rates of youth unemployment. I have scheduled hearings on this act on May 1 and May 3. My good friend, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, has introduced a companion bill in the Senate.

Our inclusion of the language for a youth initiative in the House budget resolution highlights our shared awareness of the seriousness of the youth unemployment problem. H.R. 5017, the Youth Incentive Employment Act, is the best mechanism for dealing with this problem. I urge all my colleagues, to support it.●

THE ST. PETERSBURG TIMES HONORED NATIONALLY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the St. Petersburg Times, the largest newspaper in my district, celebrates its 100th anniversary this year, and I am pleased to note that Time magazine has just rated it as one of America's 10 best daily newspapers for providing excellence in journalism.

The first issue of the Times, then a weekly newspaper, was published July 25, 1884, and had its office in the backroom of a small drugstore. Today, the Times has grown to be the second largest newspaper in the Southeastern United States with a daily circulation of 250,000 and a Sunday circulation of 314,000. More than 1,300 full-time and 1,400 part-time employees are involved in the day-to-day operation of the newspaper in its two main buildings and its bureaus scattered throughout the State of Florida. The Times also has one of the most active Washington bureaus which provides detailed coverage of our Nation's Capital for Florida readers.

The Times has received many national honors in the past including two Pulitzer Prizes for distinguished public service. The newspaper is regarded as one of the most technically advanced in our Nation with an outstanding staff of photographers and artists. The Times' graphics are extremely descriptive and provide a tremendous supplement to the stories they accompany.

While it is no secret that I have occasionally had strong philosophical differences with the Times, and I am sure we will continue to have those differences from time to time, I am pleased to take this opportunity today to congratulate the entire staff of the St. Petersburg Times for their efforts which have resulted in this deserved national recognition from Time magazine.●

CYPRUS

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the people of Cyprus have earned the respect and sympathy of the American people during the tragedy of civil conflict and occupation during the past 10 years.

The continued occupation of the northern third of the island by Turkey violates international law and the in-

tegrity of Cyprus. It has drawn the justified condemnation of the free world.

The tragedy for Cyprus was compounded in November when the Turkish-Cypriot community declared occupied Cyprus an independent republic.

The fundamental position of the Congress and the American Government must continue to be that the occupation by Turkey and the unilateral declaration of an independent republic are illegal.

The policy of providing military assistance to Turkey in the hope that it would encourage the Turkish Government to end occupation and to work toward a peaceful resolution of the conflict with Greece over Cyprus has been a failure.

I have opposed a policy of military aid to Turkey under both Republican and Democratic administrations. I have done so because I must oppose aid to a government which would persist in an illegal occupation of another country. The continuing conflict over Cyprus which has been a tragedy for the Cypriot people has direct—and negative—consequences for U.S. strategic interests in the Mideast.

The House should vote to withhold already authorized aid for Turkey until it agrees to withdraw from the northern portion of Cyprus.

The United States must refuse to provide the means by which Turkey can continue an occupation which violates the integrity of Cyprus, compromises the rights of the Greek minority on Cyprus, and ultimately weakens the ability of the NATO alliance to defend the interests of the Western democracies.

We should realize that only a hardheaded approach on the question of military aid to Turkey will provide a realistic incentive for the Government of Turkey to end its illegal, shortsighted policy.●

THE CRUCIAL IMPORTANCE OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, our former distinguished colleague in the Senate and my good friend, Senator Jacob Javits, along with our late distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee chairman, Clement J. Zablocki, have long been recognized as the chief architects of the War Powers Resolution. This has been recently demonstrated by Senator Javits' article in the New York Times on this important subject.

The War Powers Resolution has played a crucial role in helping to restore Congress preponderant role under the Constitution in the decision to commit troops into hostilities and in restraining ill-conceived foreign interventions without the support of the Congress and the American people.

Unfortunately, in the aftermath of the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon, this administration has sought to blame the Congress and the War Powers Resolution for a failed foreign policy.

As Senator Javits accurately points out, it was in part the administration's failure to comply fully with the War Powers Resolution that led to subsequent arguments over the mission of the U.S. marines and undermined solid support and willing cooperation between the Congress and the President. When fully complied with, Senator Javits correctly argues that the War Powers Resolution results in the collective judgment of Congress and the President concerning the decision to enter into hostilities and is therefore a great source of strength.

Mr. Speaker, the War Powers Resolution continues to play an important role in fostering and preserving the responsibilities of the Congress in foreign and defense policy. I commend to my colleagues Senator Javits' article regarding the effectiveness of the resolution.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1984]

CONGRESS' CRUCIAL WAR ROLE

(By Jacob K. Javits)

America has suffered a serious disappointment in Lebanon, raising questions about our decision to station marines in Beirut. It would, however, be a grave mistake to seek to use this as a reason for excluding Congress from a role in such decisions. Yet Secretary of State George P. Shultz has virtually suggested that.

The fact is that restraint on the President's power to commit troops to the equivalent of war is incorporated in the War Powers Resolution of 1973. That act gives a vital measure of security to our people, a crucial check on the use of our armed forces. It requires, in effect, a collective judgment by both the President and Congress before we take steps that could lead us into war. United States involvement—direct or indirect—in military activities in Central America, in the Persian Gulf and perhaps tomorrow in other places makes this a particularly vital question now.

We had every right to hope that this Administration would comply with the War Powers Resolution. Certainly, the agreement between the President and Congress to send marines to Lebanon for 18 months seemed to indicate that it would. But the President raised questions about this compliance even in signing the measure, reserving his alleged right to commit our armed forces in other international crises. And now we find that this may have been more than just a legalistic reservation: It may have been a statement of policy. This is a critical question, which should not be swept under the rug or left in limbo.

On March 2, Mr. Shultz—for whom I have great respect—told the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations that the invocation of the War Powers Resolution "totally took the rug out from under our diplomatic effort" in Lebanon. He questioned "whether that piece of legislation is the most desirable way to structure the interaction between the legislative and executive branches for dealing with issues involving force." And he called for a review of the resolution.

Changing history often calls for a review of legislation. But Mr. Shultz's charges do not, I believe, give adequate consideration to either the nature of the president's power as Commander in Chief or the importance of Congressional participation in decisions about the commitment of troops abroad. It is the latter that should disturb the American people most.

Let us remember that the Constitution gives Congress—and Congress alone—the power "to declare war." Yet, until the resolution came along in 1973, there was practically no means by which the people could restrain the President's power as Commander in Chief to commit the nation to war by committing troops.

In fact, subsequent events in Lebanon very much justified the invocation of the War Powers Resolution. To begin with, the time limitations in the resolution committing marines to Lebanon were more than justified. A multinational force was indeed a proper instrument to help bring about the removal of all foreign forces and foster national reconciliation. But the marines' participation in such a force should have been limited to six months. Many in both the House and the Senate were inclined to impose such a limit, but they agreed to accept a limit of 18 months in order to win the President's agreement. This now looks like a mistake.

In fact, six months would have been just the right amount of time: We could have withdrawn in an orderly fashion in November after President Amin Gemayel convened the first meeting, in Geneva, to effect a national reconciliaton. Instead, we waited to withdraw until civil war broke our again in early February and our pullback was widely seen as a success for the Syrians.

Besides, a less equivocal accord between Congress and the Administration might have assured a much happier outcome. In this, too, the quibbling over the time limit was very destructive. As soon as it became clear that the Geneva conference had failed and the Lebanese Army began to disintegrate along religious factional lines, Congress's latent resentment—the residue of the Administration's reluctance to cooperate fully on the War Powers Resolution—boiled over. Subsequent arguments over the imprecise definition of the marines' mission rocked the country and added to our inability to deal effectively with the situation by bringing our power to bear on the Syrians.

What does this experience teach us? It demonstrates that in crises like Lebanon, solid alignment and willing cooperation between the Administration and Congress is vital to effective policy. The War Powers Resolution, rather than being a drag on our policy, can be a great source of strength. It is not necessary for a great power to win all battles. It is only necessary to show the ability to act with national unity and effectiveness.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARMINE J. PERRAPATO, ESTEEMED CHIEF OF POLICE OF GARFIELD, N.J., 1984 "MAN OF THE YEAR" BOYS CLUB OF GARFIELD

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 5, the residents of Garfield, county of Bergen, and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to an esteemed chief of police, outstanding community leader and good friend—the Honorable Carmine J. Perrapato—whose standards of excellence throughout his lifetime have earned him the most highly coveted distinguished citizen's award of the Boys Club of Garfield—the Man of the Year. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to Chief Perrapato and share the pride of his wife Josephine and their family upon his receiving this citation of merit for leadership endeavors on behalf of our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the Boys Club of Garfield is one of our Nation's most prestigious affiliates of the Boys Club of America. We are all familiar with the noble traditions of the Boys Clubs of America and their outstanding public service to the people of our Nation in helping our young men to achieve leadership qualities of self-reliance, character building, sportsmanship, fair play, and eagerness to serve others. Their deeply committed endeavors in exercising measures to keep America beautiful and attain greater communion and understanding in friendship and goodwill among all mankind are a significant investment in the enrichment and excellence of the quality of our way of life here in America.

Carmine J. Perrapato has by his example and lifetime of dedication to these same true American ideals personified exemplary leadership in his outstanding responsible service to our people which has truly enriched our community, State and Nation.

Our man of the year Carmine has indeed earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us for his outstanding public service in his law enforcement career, placing other above self in providing safety in the streets, security in the home, and optimum public safety for all of our people. He has been chief of police for the city of Garfield since 1959 and has forged ahead with dedication, devotion, and sincerity of purpose in combating crime and protecting the life of the people of our community. We applaud his knowledge, training, hard work, and personal commitment that has enabled him to achieve the fullest confidence and strongest support of the people of Garfield. He has always applied the most sophisticated and advanced techniques of his profession.

Carmine Perrapato is a graduate of William Paterson College with a B.S. degree in administration and masters degree in education. He was a highly respected member of the faculty of Bergen Community College and is president of the board of education.

Chief Perrapato has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic community improvement programs. He has been chairman of the United Way for the city of Garfield for the past 18 years and has reached its quota for 15 of the 18 years. In addition to the Garfield Boys Club, he is an active member in many worthwhile charitable and benevolent organizations including the Girls Club, Red Cross, United Way, Bergen County Narcotics Force, State & County Police Chief's Association, and the State Drug Abuse Council.

Mr. Speaker, the fulfillment of the purpose, goals, and aims of the Boys Clubs of America could not be achieved without the leadership of people like Chief Carmine J. Perrapato and the strong team effort of volunteer and professional leaders of our communities who participate unselfishly and willingly of their busy schedules in passing these sterling traditions along to our youth of America.

It is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to call your attention to this year's recipient of an award of excellence that expresses appreciation for the untiring, unselfish, herculean efforts of a highly compassionate individual. We do indeed salute an outstanding individual, esteemed chief of police and great American—the Boys Club of Garfield's Man of the Year—the Honorable Carmine J. Perrapato.●

LOOPHOLE OF THE WEEK

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, some recent evidence released by the Internal Revenue Service has prompted supply siders to take to the streets and proclaim the effectiveness of the 1981 tax cut. The IRS figures show that the share of total taxes paid by the wealthy has increased while the share for the less wealthy had declined. One Representative saw these figures and suggested: "These figures prove what we have argued all along. If you really want to soak the rich, as some of my liberal colleagues are always proposing, the best way to do it is to lower all tax rates, and make it more profitable for them to invest their money in profitable enterprises than to hide it in unproductive tax shelters."

The supply side analysis of this evidence is both incomplete and inaccurate. First, it neglects the tax shelters that were also created by the 1981 tax act. These shelters, which have been closed in part by TEFRA, did not have their intended effect of increasing savings and productive activity. Instead, in the wake of a boatload of new tax incentives, capital investment dropped 2 years in a row and the savings rate hit an all-time low. So, I think there is a preferable alternative to get the rich to shift their money out of hiding places in unproductive tax shelters. It is also the simplest alternative. We should eliminate the shelters themselves.

Second, if anyone is getting soaked by supply side economics, it certainly is not the rich. A closer analysis of the IRS evidence indicates, in fact, that the tax burden on those earning less than $25,000 increased in 1982. For though the amount of taxes collected declined, the amount of income earned by this category of individuals dropped even more. Thus the actual tax burden increased.

Third, the increase in taxes paid by the wealthy was not due to a burst of entrepreneurial activity, but due to an unlocking effect on capital gains investments. To quote from the Washington Post article which will be included as part of this statement: "The lower tax rate and higher after-tax gain encouraged taxpayers to sell some assets they had held for some time and might otherwise have continued to hold." There has been no rising tide that has helped the poor. The number of individuals living in poverty has jumped by millions since the Reagan administration took office.

Finally, supply siders ignore one of the worst consequences of their program, and that is the deficit problem which threatens economic recovery. Part of the solution to this problem lies not in more supply side economics but in closing tax loopholes.

I commend to my colleagues the following Washington Post article which discusses why the "Tax Cuts Aren't Working as Promised."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1984]

TAX CUTS AREN'T WORKING AS PROMISED—IRS FIGURES FOR '82 DON'T "VINDICATE THE SUPPLY SIDERS"

(By John M. Berry)

Supply-siders jumped with glee recently when the Internal Revenue Service released preliminary statistics from 1982 individual income tax returns. The IRS figures showed that even with tax rates cut sharply for upper-bracket taxpayers, their share of total taxes went up while the share paid by lower-income individuals went down.

Because 1982 was the first year in which a significant part of the Reagan personal income tax cuts was effective, the supply-

siders immediately concluded that the world was working exactly as they had predicted. Apparently lower rates were drawing the rich out of tax shelters, and encouraging them to channel more of their income into taxable investments. Crowed a Wall Street Journal editorial, "The numbers are in on 1982 and . . . they vindicate the supply-siders."

And in a column by Warren Brookes distributed by the Heritage Foundation for newspaper use, Rep. Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.), one of the original sponsors of the tax cut, was quoted as saying, "These figures prove what we have argued all along. If you really want to soak the rich, as some of my liberal colleagues are always proposing, the best way to do it is to lower all tax rates, and make it more profitable for them to invest their money in profitable enterprises than to hide it in unproductive tax shelters."

Last week some administration officials were urging that President Reagan cite the numbers in a forthcoming speech as evidence that his tax cuts were working exactly as promised, sources said.

The only problem with these claims of victory is that the evidence proves the opposite. The tax burdens of the 62 percent of all taxpayers with incomes under $25,000 went down because their incomes went down. Their taxes naturally went down, too, but by less than their incomes.

Adjusted for changes in their share of total income, the tax burden of the under-$25,000 group went up, not down, in 1982.

In addition, the figures show conclusively that the increase in income for upper-bracket taxpayers is not the result of some burst of entrepreneurial activity or of the rich getting out of tax shelters. Instead, it probably is the result of the surge in stock prices in the latter half of 1982 and a one-time "unlocking" effect on investment assets from the cut in the maximum capital gains tax rate from 28 to 20 percent.

Total reported income went up by $75 billion from 1981 to 1982, while, as a result of the tax cuts, taxes paid were virtually unchanged.

As a result probably of both inflation and the recession, actual income fell from 1981 to 1982 for taxpayers reporting less than $25,000 in adjusted gross income, or AGI. (See table below.) As a share of total reported AGI, the under-$25,000 group also suffered a decline. This group included 59 million, or 62 percent, of all taxpayers. They had 42 percent of total income.

WHO PAYS THE TAXES—THE BURDEN BY INCOME LEVEL

All returns (dollars in thousands)	AGI 1981 (dollars in billions)	AGI 1982 (dollars in billions)	Change 1982/1981 (dollars in billions)	1982 tax as percent of total tax	1981 tax as percent of total tax	Change in tax burden 1981 to 1982
Under 5	46.8	44.2	−2.6	0.25	0.20	0.05
5 under 10	131.4	126.4	−5.0	2.42	2.61	−0.19
10 under 15	175.6	176.7	1.0	5.56	5.96	−0.40
15 under 20	191.5	182.1	−9.4	7.15	7.95	−0.80
20 under 25	204.2	197.1	−7.1	8.77	9.57	−0.80
25 under 30	197.4	208.6	11.2	10.05	10.03	0.03
30 under 40	317.4	338.2	20.8	17.77	18.22	−0.45
40 under 50	185.3	207.9	22.6	12.47	12.27	0.20
50 under 75	164.3	182.1	17.8	12.89	12.78	0.10
75 under 100	55.1	59.5	4.4	5.23	5.18	0.04
100 under 200	67.7	75.6	7.9	7.82	7.57	0.24
200 under 500	33.3	40.7	7.4	5.04	4.49	0.55
500 under 1,000	9.8	14.7	4.9	2.00	1.44	0.56
1,000 or more	11.1	17.6	6.4	2.43	1.72	0.71
Total	1,772.6	1,847.8	75.2			

Source: Internal Revenue Service.

The drop in the number of tax payers in this group is part of an ongoing trend related to rising incomes due both to inflation and an increase in real incomes. The recession and the lower rate of inflation in 1982 than in 1981 apparently slowed this movement toward higher-income categories.

At the top end of the scale, taxpayer incomes rose strongly from 1981 to 1982 almost entirely as a result of a sharp increase in reported capital gains.

A big jump in capital gains realizations can be inferred—the IRS figures included no separate data on capital gains—because of what happened to other major sources of income for the high-bracket taxpayers. The average level of interest and dividends and of business income declined for each upper-bracket income group. So did the average level of wages and salaries for those above $500,000. For other upper-bracket groups, average wages and salaries generally rose less than the rate of inflation.

With rents and royalties not significant items and partnerships undoubtedly continuing to generate tax losses as they did in 1981, the only possible reason for the increase in income shown by the upper-bracket taxpayers is an increase in capital gains realizations.

For taxpayers with AGIs above $1 million in 1981, 33.7 percent of their reported income was from capital gains. (Actual gains were much higher, because 60 percent of a gain is normally excluded from AGI.) Out of $11.1 billion in AGI reported by that group, $3.7 billion was capital gains. Another $6.5 billion came from wages and salaries, interest and dividends and business income, leaving less than $850 million from other sources.

In 1982, the AGI for the $1 million-and-up group jumped to $17.6 billion, by far the largest increase in percentage terms for any income group, and the number of returns in the group rose 55 percent. The IRS data shows that wages and salaries, interest and dividends and business income totaled $9 billion. If the remaining portion, other than capital gains, bore roughly the same relationship to the group's total AGI as it did in 1981, the other non-capital-gains income amounted to $1.3 billion.

If this conservative assumption is correct, then capital gains for this group were about $7.3 billion, or almost twice the 1981 level. The average capital gain on the returns filed by this group, according to this arithmetic, was almost $900,000, about $180,000 more than in 1981.

Because long-term capital gains, by definition, can be realized only on assets held for for one year or longer, it is not very likely that any large share of the assets sold in 1982 were purchased after the tax cuts were enacted in August 1981. In other words, the lower tax rate and higher after-tax gain encouraged taxpayers to sell some assets they had held for some time and might otherwise have continued to hold.

In such cases, the tax cut left the taxpayer with a higher after-tax gain and represented a windfall relative to what most investors would have expected when they made their investments. The investments themselves were not made as a result of the tax cut.

The other really striking story in the IRS numbers is the increase—not a decrease as claimed by the supply-siders—in the tax burdens in the under-$25,000 taxpayer group.

While total AGI was rising 4.2 percent in 1982, from $1,773 billion to $1,848 billion, that for taxpayers below the $25,000 level dropped $23 billion, or 3 percent.

Meanwhile, as that group's share of total income fell, so did its share of total taxes paid—but not by as much. The group's income share went down by 3 percentage points while its share of total taxes paid fell only 2.1 percentage points.

In other words, when 1981 and 1982 tax burdens are adjusted for changes in income shares, the supply-side story is indeed turned on its head. And why not? Common sense would tell you that when tax rates are cut more for those in the top brackets, tax burdens will rise for those in lower brackets.

The supply-siders argue that by reducing tax rates the government somehow can raise national income above what it otherwise would have been by stimulating the desire to work, save and invest. That way, even though rates have been cut more at the top, *after-tax* incomes at the bottom could still be higher than they otherwise would have been.

So far there are precious few signs of that happening. Certainly there is nothing in the 1982 IRS figures to indicate that it has.

But on the possibility that it could happen, President Reagan and Congress cut tax rates while cutting domestic spending and rapidly increasing defense spending. The resulting huge budget deficits mean that interest payments on the national debt are rising by leaps and bounds. And that means that taxes in the future will have to be higher than they otherwise would have been just to meet those interest payments.

Assume for a moment that the tax cuts eventually do pay off as the supply-siders still claim they will, and that national income is raised by some increment. Will *after-tax* incomes be higher than they otherwise would have been once that bigger interest bill is taken into account? Incomes could be up, but taxes could be up still more.

Of course, whatever the level of income, the relative burden of taxes will still have been shifted toward lower-income taxpayers. That is doubly true after counting the Social Security payroll tax.

Perhaps even the supply-siders' faith is being shaken these days. Why else are they so anxious to jump to conclusions about the meaning of preliminary 1982 tax figures?●

AGRICULTURAL PATENT REFORM ACT

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing with Congressman MIKE DEWINE the Agricultural Patent Reform Act. This bill addresses a major inequity in our current patent system for products such as pesticides, animal drugs, and certain other chemicals that must undergo Federal premarket testing and review before they can be marketed. As a general rule, the patents on these products are issued during the time the products are undergoing the Federal premarketing review, a process that may take several years. In the meantime, the clock on the patent ticks away. It is not unusual for 6 or 7 years or more of patent life to be lost while the review period is underway. As a result, rather than having an effective patent life of 17 years, these products may end up with an effective patent life of 10 to 11 years or even less. Our bill aims to correct this problem by restoring to the patent term the period that is lost because of Federal premarket review requirements, up to a maximum of 5 years.

Many of my colleagues may recall that the Judiciary Committee approved a similar bill last Congress. Our bill differs from this earlier legislation in that our bill does not cover human pharmaceutical products which were the center of major controversy. Instead, our bill covers agricultural chemicals and animal drugs, which were noncontroversial aspects of that earlier bill. Those provisions were supported by the generic manufacturers of these products and by farmers and farm organizations concerned about their livestock and crops.

A great many questions were raised last Congress about the human pharmaceutical aspects of the bill. In fact, those concerns led me to vote against that legislation in spite of my realization of the problems caused by patents being effectively shortened as a result of the regulation reviews required by Federal laws. Our colleague, Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, has been working in this Congress trying to resolve those questions. I commend him for his efforts. If that can be worked out, I would want the Judiciary Committee to consider broader patent legislation covering human pharmaceuticals as well as the agricultural chemicals and animal drugs covered by the bill I am introducing today.

Let me give you one example of why patent reform for agricultural chemicals is so important. In my own State of Kansas, farmers lost 9 percent of their wheat crop to two virus strains alone in 1981. Those crops were lost after sizable investments both financially and timewise by farmers who are hard pressed to make ends meet under even the best of conditions. Billions of dollars in damage to the world's commerical crops are caused each year by pests and disease. And of course damage to crops is only part of the story. This past winter, tens of millions of egg laying hens died from or were destroyed to prevent the spread of avian flu virus. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that livestock valued at $12 billion are lost each year to animal diseases. These economic losses, as I noted before, fall heavily on farmers who can ill-afford any further costs of production. Beyond that, these crop, livestock, and poultry losses of billions of dollars annually also lead to higher food prices to the consumer.

The development of new and improved agricultural chemcials and animal drugs are critical if we are to avoid losses like those I have just described. That is the alternate goal of our legislation. It assures there will continue to be an adequate incentive for companies to go through the costly and lengthy process of bringing new pesticides to market, and I would stress again that, in these instances, the users of these products and manufacturers of generics support these changes.

Research and development underlying new pesticides is extremely costly. It is not unusual for a company to invest $40 million in research and development for a single product, not counting the capital required for new plant. And the risks of failure are great. Only one in every 20,000 chemicals synthesized results in a successful product. With odds like this it is clearly understandable for a company to expect to have an adequate patent life on products that do ultimately reach the market. An adequate patent term is the only way a company knows it will be able to recoup its significant R&D investment. This is particularly essential with the agricultural chemical industry where intense price competition precludes investment recovery until late in the life cycle of the typical agrichemical product, often at or about the time the shortened patent life of the product is about to expire.

It is important to keep in mind that the pesticide industry is highly competitive. There will always be alternative products farmers can turn to if a patent holder tries to extract premium prices on a particular product. Remember, the farmer is a businessman and will be willing to buy a product only if it makes economic sense to do so. The farmer and not some third party determines whether and at what price to purchase a pesticide or veterinary product. Prices must reflect the benefits the product provides to the farmer. Again, this differs fundamentally from the situation in the case of pharmaceuticals used to respond to human health problems.

An adequate patent life is also very important to encourage research in recombinant DNA technology for agricultural chemicals and animal drugs. This is an intriguing and promising area but the research and development is extremely costly. We shouldn't let U.S. companies lose out to foreign competitors in this new area because of inadequate incentives for domestic research and development.

We all have an interest in the development of improved pesticides and animal drugs. As I have stated, the most immediate beneficiary is the farmer. Better pesticides can save him money in several ways: By being more labor saving, by requiring application of smaller and smaller amounts to larger areas, by covering a wider weed spectra and being more potent, and by being more environmentally sound. Improved animal drugs can prevent devastating loss of valuable livestock and poultry. Of course, consumers ultimately benefit as well. In sum, improved pesticides and animal drugs mean more efficient, cost-effective agriculture.

It is not surprising then that patent reform for agricultural chemicals and animal drugs is supported by a wide ranging group of organizations. For example, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Cotton Council of America, the National Broiler Council, the National Cattleman's Association, the United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association and the National Arborist Association are just a few of the many organizations that support this needed patent reform.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join us in working for the prompt enactment of this legislation. It is balanced, it is fair, it is noncontroversial and it is needed today.●

ILLINOIS FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SOUNDS OFF ON EDUCATION

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I included an education survey in a newsletter mailed to all the households in Illinois Fourth Congressional District.

I thought my colleagues would be interested in the following results:

(1) The 1984 federal education budget is approximately $15.2 billion. This federal contribution is:

(a) Too small, 30 percent.

(b) Too large, 35 percent.

(c) About right, 21 percent.

(d) Undecided, 9 percent.

(2) Would you be willing to pay more in federal taxes to fund an increased federal contribution to education?

(a) Yes, 21 percent.

(b) No, 70 percent.

(c) Undecided, 6 percent.

(3) How can we best improve the quality of our teachers?

(a) Offer good students incentives to enter teaching, 13 percent.

(b) Institute higher standards for teacher certification, 48 percent.

(c) Increase teachers salaries, 33 percent.

(d) Institute frequent testing of teacher competence, 42 percent.

(e) Merit pay, 38 percent.

(4) In whom do you have the most confidence to improve our schools?

(a) Teachers, 43 percent.

(b) Parents, 44 percent.

(c) State governments, 9 percent.

(d) Teachers' unions, 3 percent.

(e) School boards/administrators, 34 percent.

(f) Federal government, 7 percent.●

IDA NUDEL'S 53D BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Ida Nudel's 53d birthday.

As my colleagues are aware, Ida Nudel is a long-term refusenik who has been waiting for 13 years for permission to emigrate to Israel. Her requests have been repeatedly denied.

She is a brave woman who has devoted her life to the well-being of others who want to emigrate and who are repressed by the Soviet authorities. In fact she has become known as the guardian angel of those who dissent and suffer within the Soviet Union. The KGB has mounted continuous attacks on her but she still signs her name on hundreds of letters of protest and appeals to the Soviet authorities and to the outside world.

In 1978, she hung a banner from her balcony which read, "KGB Give Me My Visa." She was subsequently arrested for "malicious hooliganism," tried in a "kangaroo court," and sentenced to 4 years internal exile in Siberia. Still, through all this, she maintained her dignity and continued to encourage her fellow Russians from her exile.

Now, since her 1982 release, Ida has been residing in the small Moldavian town of Bendery. The Soviet authorities denied her permission to return to her home in Moscow. Suffering from a chronic heart ailment, she was warned not to leave Bendery for the medical treatment she desperately needs. Even more alarming, the Soviet KGB has had her activities under constant surveillance and has instituted high pressure tactics to keep her from observing religious holidays and associating with other Jewish "refuseniks." Recently she was told that she is being watched "by the people whose job it is to do so" and that she is not to have any more visits to her home by "people who call themselves refuseniks."

Ida's sister in Israel, Elena Fridman, states, and I concur, that "After 12 years of refusals, the time has certainly come for the Soviet authorities to relent." I believe this woman has given of herself and has suffered unfairly. We should remember her today and push the Russians to let Ida emigrate to Israel.

But let us not only remember Ida and others like her today, rather, let us use her birthday as a reminder of the terrible abrogation of human rights that continually occurs in the Soviet Union. And let us use it as a reminder of our duty to help protect and support those rights. In Ida's own words:

It seems to me that an individual's opposition to social injustice acquires meaning and significance only when it is supported and encouraged by the men of good will all over the world.

Happy birthday, Ida. We pledge to you that we will do all that we can to bring justice to your plight.●

IN SUPPORT OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House efforts in obtaining a supplemental appropriation for the summer youth employment program. More than $100 million has been cut nationwide from the program by the administration. The programs are scheduled to begin on May 1, 1984, therefore Congress must take immediate action to restore the necessary funds to rectify this tremendous reduction and bring the summer youth employment programs back to last year's funding.

Because of a change in the formula for appropriating how funds are distributed, and a $100 million reduction in funds from fiscal year 1983, the city of Memphis and Shelby County which is located in my congressional district will lose more than $600,000. This decrease, means a 19-percent reduction for the city of Memphis and a loss of over 600 summer jobs.

There is a need for these jobs in Memphis and Shelby County. The Private Industry Council has received requests for almost 5,000 jobs, but will only be able to place 2,600 teenagers in those positions, because of the Federal cutbacks in the summer youth employment program.

We all know that unemployment is more than 50 percent among black teenagers and without these additional funds, those unemployment figures will rise even higher. How do you tell the thousands of young people in this country who depend on this program to help support their families—who use this money to pay for their schooling—that there will not be a job available for them.

We cannot afford to let these young people who want to work, stand on the street corners and waste their time this summer. We in the Congress cannot turn our backs. It is a small price to pay to provide a start for needy young people, and the cost to us, in terms of lack of job experience for those teenagers, could well impair their ability to find work as adults. We must give them the opportunity to work today, so that our society can benefit tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to support and help pass a supplemental appropriation to restore the $100 million in funds so that young people in Memphis and throughout the country can have jobs this summer.●

GOOD ADVICE TO CONGRESS FROM MORE THAN 13,000 VERMONTERS

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, over the last decade I have made an annual tradition of sharing with my colleagues the results of my Vermont questionnaire. It is a pleasure to be able to continue that tradition today.

More than 13,000 responses to the 1984 questionnaire have now been tabulated. As in past years, I am sincerely impressed by the high level of participation and by the depth of Vermonters' insights into the issues we face in Congress. I believe their advice

is well worth the attention of all Members of this Chamber.

ACID RAIN

Four general positions on the acid rain issue were listed, and Vermonters were asked which came closest to their views. The options, and the percentage of Vermonters who agreed with each, are as follows:

A. Since acid rain is the result of pollution from other States, the cleanup costs should be shouldered entirely by people who live in those States. (18 percent of Vermonters agreed.)

B. Since Vermont is on the receiving end of the acid rain problem, it is fair that we should help pay the cleanup costs. Our share of the expense should be less than that of the polluting States. (21 percent agreed.)

C. Regardless of whether nationwide cost sharing is fair, we should accept it if that is the only way to get legislation passed to clean up acid rain. (56 percent agreed.)

D. There is no need for legislation to clean up acid rain. The benefits would not justify the cost. (Only 4 percent agreed.)

Significantly, 77 percent of Vermonters checked either "B" or "C", indicating willingness to pay a portion of the cleanup cost, even though our State is on the receiving end of the problem, rather than the contributing end.

That fact, combined with the growing and decisive evidence that acid rain is a major problem nationwide, should eliminate any conceivable argument for further delay in significant action by Congress.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Five economic problem areas were listed, and Vermonters were asked to check the one they consider most serious. The problems, and the percentage of Vermonters who checked each, were as follows:

A. Inflation. (6 percent.)

B. High Interest rates. (6 percent.)

C. Unemployment. (15 percent.)

D. The Federal deficit. (49 percent.)

E. Worldwide economic deterioration, including mounting Third World debt, trade imbalances, and protectionism. (24 percent.)

A number of respondents chided me for making the question overly simplistic. They noted, correctly, that economic problems interact with each other and cannot be treated in a vacuum, and that the options listed were about as comparable as apples and oranges.

Nevertheless, it is important to know which problem areas are of the greatest concern. It may be an indication of the economic sophistication of the Vermont public that the largest numbers showed greatest concern over the causes of our economic problems, rather than the painful effects.

It is particularly noteworthy, although not surprising, that the problem of greatest concern is the one over which we have the most control—the Federal deficit.

REDUCING THE DEFICIT

To learn what steps Vermonters feel should be taken to reduce the deficit, five options were listed, and respondents were allowed to check more than one. This question was identical to one asked in last year's questionnaire, as I wanted to learn whether there have been any significant shifts in opinion. Following is the list of options and the percentage of Vermonters who checked each, both this year and in 1983.

A. Raise taxes. (35 percent in 1984; 28 percent in 1983.)

B. Reduce defense spending. (75 percent in 1984; 68 percent in 1983.)

C. Reduce benefits for individuals. (27 percent in 1984; 31 percent in 1983.)

D. Reduce payments to States and localities. (25 percent in 1984; 22 percent in 1983.)

E. None of the above is necessary. The problem will be resolved by the economic recovery which is now under way. (7 percent in 1984; 8 percent in 1983.)

The shift in opinion over the last year is subtle, but a comparison of the results of the 1983 and 1984 questionnaires seems to indicate intensification of concern over the Federal deficit. With only one exception, all the means of reducing the deficit have at least slightly increased support among Vermonters this year. The one exception is cuts in benefits for individuals. This may indicate a growing view that cuts in this general area are already as deep as they should be.

MILITARY POLICY

The questionnaire did not address U.S. policy in specific trouble spots, but rather concentrated on Vermonters' views toward the general trends of the last year. Three statements were listed, and each respondent checked the one closest to his or her views. The statements and percentages result follow:

A. The U.S. must flex its military muscle in order to reaffirm its leadership in the world. The administration's actions deserve the support of all Americans—20 percent agreed.

B. Our country must exert all the influence it can on world events, but is placing too much emphasis on military might. More emphasis should be given to other means of influence, such as peace initiatives, diplomacy and economic assistance—54 percent agreed.

C. The U.S. should be less involved in the affairs of other nations, and place more emphasis on our troubles at home—26 percent agreed.

Any analysis of these figures makes it clear that most Vermonters believe it is important for the U.S. to assume a strong leadership role in our troubled world, but that we have been too quick to show military strength at the expense of other forms of influence.

The combined response to "A" and "B" indicates 74 percent believe in strong U.S. world leadership. The combined response to "B" and "C" indicates 80 percent would like less military involvement.

EDUCATION

A year ago this week, the National Commission on Excellence in Education jolted us all by reporting a "rising tide of mediocrity" in our schools. Most of us agree that the Federal Government cannot resolve the problems of education by itself, but we have had many vigorous debates as to what the Federal role should be.

Because of my role on the Education and Labor Committee, the views of Vermonters on this vitally important issue are of particular interest to me. The questionnaire listed four options, and respondents were asked to check the one which is closest to their views. The options and percentage responses are as follows:

A. The Federal Government should provide more direct aid to public schools, for example to upgrade teachers' salaries and improve programs in areas such as math, science, and foreign languages. (45 percent agreed.)

B. The Federal Government should provide indirect aid by providing tax credits or other help to parents who send their children to private schools. (6 percent agreed.)

C. The Federal Government should take both of the above steps. (12 percent agreed.)

D. The Federal Government should reduce its involvement in education. Local and State governments can do a better job without Federal help or interference. (37 percent agreed.)

In interpreting the results, it is important to note that a total of 57 percent ("A" and "C" combined) supports more direct aid to public schools. A total of 18 percent of Vermonters ("B" and "C" combined) supports tax credits or other indirect aid to private schools.

These figures leave no doubt that Vermonters are deeply concerned over the quality of our public schools, and a majority believes more help from the Federal Government is needed. But the 37 percent who take the opposing view are a significant minority. It is clear there is still a significant level of distrust of the strings which might be attached to Federal aid to education.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Vermonters were asked what action, if any, Congress should take this year with regard to the ERA. Three options were listed:

A. Approve the ERA in its original form, to give the States another chance to consider ratification of it. (35 percent agreed.)

B. Approve the ERA with one modification: a provision to assure it will still be possible to distinguish between the obligations of men and women in laws relating to the military draft and assignment to combat duty. (29 percent agreed.)

C. Reject the ERA, because present constitutional law adequately protects the rights of women. (36 percent agreed.)

Since Vermont has been on record in favor of ERA for longer than most other States, I frankly expected an even higher level of support for its revival. Perhaps there is frustration over the setbacks that have occurred over a great many years of effort, or a feeling that it would be more productive for now to focus on other specific legislative initiatives to further the cause of equal rights.

Even so, a big majority of Vermonters—64 percent—expressed support for revival of ERA in one form or another. Despite a division of opinion on its application to military service obligations, it is clear that most Vermonters believe it is well worth our while to continue the effort to enact an equal rights amendment.

VERMONT WILDERNESS

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that several months ago this Chamber approved legislation to put to rest the long dispute over additional wilderness designations for Vermont's Green Mountain National Forest.

That legislation was, and is, a carefully crafted compromise, intended to meet the legitimate needs and concerns of all factions of Vermonters on this sensitive issue. Because of the importance of this legislation to a great many Vermonters, I felt it was important to test public opinion on the issue one more time, prior to its final enactment into law.

Three options were listed, and Vermonters were asked to check the one closest to their views. The options were a little complex, but generally represent the range of opinions which had been expressed during the extensive consideration of this measure.

A. The original bill introduced by Vermont's congressional delegation, designating 65,000 acres of the federally owned forest as wilderness, should be adopted. This bill was a compromise, as proponents had sought 100,000 acres. Leaving 86 percent of Vermont's public forestland (78 percent of the Green Mountain Forest) for nonwilderness use was more than reasonable. (44 percent of Vermonters agreed with this position.)

B. The compromise bill negotiated by Vermont's delegation and already approved by the House, should be passed into law. This bill, which designates about 40,000 acres of the national forest as wilderness and about 22,000 acres as a national recreation area, meets the most important concerns of all factions. (42 percent agreed.)

C. No further permanent wilderness should be designated in Vermont for the indefinite future. All lands not presently in permanent wilderness ought to be returned promptly to continuing professional multiple-use management by the U.S. Forest Service. The compromise bill proposed by the Vermont congressional delegation should be killed—14 percent agreed.

Despite a division of opinion on the extent of the compromise, the results clearly underscore the belief of a large majority of Vermonters that after all these years of consideration, we should enact legislation to designate additional wilderness areas without further delay.

Since the affected land is entirely within the State of Vermont, I trust that all involved in this decision will continue to respect the views of the people of Vermont.

USE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In my 10 years as a Member of this Chamber, the annual questionnaire has become an extremely valuable tool, which is referred to throughout each year in my office as a routine part of our analysis of new legislative proposals.

It is important to recognize the limitations of public opinion surveys. The categories of opinion are inherently arbitrary, and the results lack the important personal insights which are contained in the thousands of letters and personal comments I receive from Vermonters. Therefore, the questionnaire is a valuable complement to those forms of expression, but never could be a substitute.

Obviously, the votes all of us cast in this Chamber are ultimately decisions of conscience. What is right is not always what is popular. But none of us can hope to be an opinion leader without constant effort to tap into the collective wisdom of the people we represent.

The questionnaire is an important part of that effort in my office. Over the years I have become deeply impressed by the active involvement of Vermonters, and by the depth of their insights into the complex issues we face in Congress.

The more than 13,000 Vermonters who participated in this year's questionnaire have my sincere gratitude. They have provided an excellent policy guide for a great many of the most significant issues that face us now and in the foreseeable future.●

ANSEL ADAMS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that we learned this week of the death of the master photographer, Ansel Adams, whose works are familiar to millions of Americans. For over 50 years, Mr. Adams meticulously recorded our Nation's wilderness, making him the most widely exhibited, published, and best-known photographer of our time. His majestic photographs of America's landscape capture the awesomeness of nature with their brilliant clarity and precision.

Mr. Adams, who was awarded the Medal of Freedom in 1980, deserves special recognition for his important contributions to photographic technology and its recognition as a major art form. A cofounder of the Department of Photography at the Museum of Modern Art, he also distinguished himself as a teacher, critic, and author.

Ansel Adams was no stranger to Washington's politics. Through his love of nature, he fought to protect the wilderness which he so carefully recorded on film. Actively involved in environmental preservation, he was a director of the Sierra Club from 1934 to 1971. His effectiveness as a lobbyist was directly responsible for the creation of Kings Canyon National Park in California.

Ansel Adams' vision of nature through the photographic eye has become an indelible image of our country. He will be remembered with respect and admiration for his devotion to his art and his evocation of the precision and grandeur of the American landscape.●

ANOTHER COMMENDATION FOR THE LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD ON A JOB WELL DONE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am tired of constantly hearing adverse stories, frequently unsubstantiated, about the Federal bureaucracy and of how unmotivated Government workers supposedly are. Some of our colleagues tend to be long on criticism and all too short on praise for Federal employees.

Well, today, I would like to share with my colleagues a story complimentary of Federal workers who have received due recognition for a job well

done. I am referring to the dedicated workers of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in Long Beach, Calif. Once again, the excellence of their work has prompted an official commendation. In a recent message to the shipyard, Vice Adm. E. B. Fowler, Naval Sea Systems Commander, expressed his appreciation and extended his congratulations to the shipyard for completing the overhaul of the U.S.S. *Ogden* ahead of schedule. In his message, Vice Admiral Fowler stated:

A positive aggressive attitude continually maintained at Long Beach Naval Shipyard and by the U.S.S. *Ogden* crew throughout her overhaul combined to deliver the ship early. To produce such positive results would not have been possible without the mutual determination, cooperation, and team effort exhibited by both Shipyard and ship's force personnel. Particularly significant in this achievement was the Shipyard's ability to convert a work package written by and for a private shipyard availability . . . without benefit of a ship check. The Shipyard also had to overcome significant obstacles encountered because of late delivery of . . . material and equipment and significant shortfalls . . . I extend my congratulations to the Long Beach Naval Shipyard team for having distinguished themselves with such outstanding professional performance in support of the Fleet . . . well done!

Mr. Speaker, today I want to join with Vice Admiral Fowler in extending my commendations and congratulations to Capt. George Fink, Shipyard Commander, and to all the dedicated employees of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard on another job well done. This is the same team that delivered the U.S.S. *New Jersey* in 1982 ahead of schedule and within budget. The fact that the *New Jersey* has been able to stay deployed so long, most recently off the coast of Lebanon, without a service call is a fine tribute to the quality of work the shipyard delivers. Their performance once again confirms their great devotion to upholding their motto: "Can Do!"●

MORE ARMS IN GRENADA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to share this interesting newspaper article about Cuban weapons caches on Grenada with my colleagues in the House. As more and more information comes to our attention about the Soviet and Cuban plans for that island, the more I realize that what our Government did in October was just and proper.

With large numbers of Soviet, Cuban, Bulgarian, North Korean, Libyan, and East German advisers, the small island of Grenada was being turned into a new Cuba in the Caribbean. Millions of rounds of ammunition, weapons, and related items of military equipment, to include antiaircraft weapons and armored personnel carriers, were initially found on the island after our troops mounted their successful rescue operation. Although our forces thought that they had found just about all of the vast quantities of military equipment, the following news release shows that the Cubans had hidden more ammunition and weapons in their Embassy on the island. Perhaps they left the weapons supply in their Embassy in anticipation of the day when they would return and again force their will on the freedom-loving Grenadian people.

One of the great ironies about the Cuban takeover of Grenada is that the Cuban Ambassador there became the most powerful man on the island and essentially "ran the show." Although the former Prime Minister, Maurice Bishop, complained bitterly about his loss of authority and control, little could be done since the Cubans and their friends held all the cards and all the weapons. Once again, force is the name of the game these days.

After Bishop returned from the United States and tried to steer his government along a more moderate course, the more radical Marxist-Leninists decided that he was not serving the interests of the revolution. A few days later, Bishop and a number of his followers were brutally gunned down near a fort in the city.

One of the basic concepts which drives Marxism-Leninism is the belief that force can and must be used to attain the goals of the revolution. Is there any wonder then that the little island of Grenada was overflowing with a wide range of Soviet and Eastern bloc military equipment, and personnel?

The recent arms cache at the abandoned Cuban Embassy is a stark reminder that the Soviets, Cubans, and their Eastern European friends, to include Cuba and Nicaragua, mean business.

With these observations in mind, I recommend this article to my colleagues in the Congress.

ARMS FOUND UNDER CUBAN EMBASSY FLOOR IN GRENADA

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA.—A large cache of arms including automatic rifles and 1 million rounds of ammunition has been found hidden under a floor in the Cuban Embassy, Grenada's interim government said Tuesday.

The government information service said troops of the Caribbean Peace-keeping Forces, acting on a tip from a Grenadian guard placed in the Cuban Embassy compound in Morne Jaloux near St. George's, found the weapons and ammunition March 26 in a closet with a false floor.

The weapons included 49 American-made M-16 and 40 Russian AK-47 automatic rifles, numerous hand guns and three rocket-propelled grenade launchers, along with the ammunition, the government said.

A government statement made no mention as to whether the weapons were in working condition, but said they would be placed on display Thursday at Fort Rupert, scene of the Oct. 19 massacre in which Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and at least two dozen others were killed.

The search of the Cuban Embassy took place after the sole remaining Cuban diplomat in Grenada, charge d'affaires Gaston Diaz, left the island March 19.

The announcement came a day before the start of a preliminary inquiry into murder and conspiracy charges against 20 people in connection with the October 1983 coup that toppled Bishop's Cuban-backed government.

The hearing will consider murder and conspiracy charges against the 20 suspects. If Magistrate Lyle St. Paul finds probable cause on the charges, they will face trial at a later date.

Among those charged with murder are former Deputy Prime Minister Bernard Coard, his wife, Phyllis, and Gen. Hudson Austin, chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council that ruled Grenada for six days until the Oct. 25 invasion by U.S. and Caribbean troops.

Invading forces initially encountered stiff resistance from some 600 well-armed Cuban reservists working on the Point Salines airfield, financed by Cuban and Soviet bloc nations.

But with American backing, Gov. General Sir Paul Scoon expelled Cuban, Soviet and Libyan diplomats, and eventually, all the Cuban reservists.

A search of the Soviet diplomats' luggage at the airfield before they left the island uncovered a large number of weapons, mostly AK-47's, which U.S. servicemen confiscated.

In the weeks following the invasion, U.S. troops found dozens of weapons caches in searches of the island, and offered rewards to Grenadians who turned in weapons they had harbored or found abandoned.

The Caribbean Peace-keeping Force, made up of soldiers from several Caribbean nations, took over protection of Grenada after American troops left the island.●

CLARENCE AYERS: THE HIGHEST AND THE BEST

HON. BUDDY MacKAY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, throughout my years of public service, I have met countless individuals, among them the most intelligent, the most powerful, the wealthy, and the expert. Yet, I came to realize that the most important attribute an individual can possess is the willingness to make a contribution to his community. Had I gone in search of a man imbued with the highest sense of contribution, I would not have had to search past my own congressional district because Clarence Ayers, of Gainesville, is this sense of contribution personified.

It is said that a man is rarely honored in his own hometown, yet the Gainesville Sun and the residents of Gainesville have honored Mr. Ayers with the Gainesville Sun's "Twenty-

first Annual Community Service Award." I know of no one, nationwide, who deserves such an honor more than Clarence and I include the article from the Gainesville Sun so that others may know him to be, as I know him, the highest and the best:

In 1954, Clarence Ayers listened to entreaties from his wife and children that they should move south and escape the bad weather that rocketed down from Canada to buffet their home in Aberdeen, S.D.

So Ayers moved to Gainesville, a town he never had seen but which had the small size, growth potential and mostly the climate that would be right for his wife and six children.

He quickly became enthralled with Gainesville, then a placid, almost bucolic place with trees right in the middle of University Avenue and cows grazing on much of the acreage now occupied by shopping malls and planned unit developments.

"It didn't take any great mastermind to see that there would be a lot of growth," said Ayers. "The Sun Belt was picked to make great strides in growth, the University of Florida was popping at the seams, veterans were getting out of school, so it didn't take a crystal ball to see that Gainesville would grow."

Ayers had much to do with the expansion of Gainesville. As a banker, especially a president of the powerful Atlantic First National Bank, he loaned the money which helped build new homes and businesses ranging from an envelope plant to auto distributorships.

But what earned Clarence Ayers the Gainesville Sun's 21st Annual Community Service Award is his off-the-job, private efforts to expand and improve health care, education and the general quality of life for which Gainesville has become known.

A number of Gainesville-area residents wrote letters of endorsement for Ayers, who was selected from among 14 candidates by a panel of judges not connected with the Sun.

Letters recommending Ayers show a remarkable consistency in their descriptions of an unassuming, kindly and self-effacing man who nevertheless became one of Gainesville's effective movers and shakers.

"Kindly and gracious at all times," was one description of Ayers.

"Fine gentleman," said another. "The highest and the best."

"A quiet, courteous and thoughtful person," agreed a third.

Ayers, evidently, has not changed. In a story published in the Sun in 1976, Bob Hester, then-president of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Mid-Florida, said, "He just isn't the gladhand, slap-you-on-the-back sort of person that a lot of executives that attain his position are. But don't let that reservation fool you.

The reservation of Ayers when serving the community is a matter of speaking softly while carrying the big stick. An accomplishment most remembered is the way in which Ayers as chairman of the board of Alachua General Hospital directed the hospital out of its financial woes, planned for expansion, and turned AGH into a competitive health institution.

"We had real problems," said Ayers in typical understatement. "We lost $1 million in one year and for three years it was a real struggle. We enlarged the hospital, doubled its size. We had to, to survive. Patients were in the aisles down there."

Ayers has, to varying extents, given time to the Gainesville Area Chamber of Commerce, Santa Fe Health Care Systems, the Committee of 100, youth sports activities and his church.

"What happens, if you're willing to get involved, you get into organizations and work with them. Then others want your time, too," said Ayers. "You finally reach a point where there's no more time to give. Then you have to be selective in what you do."

For 17 years—since 1967—Ayers has found time in his schedule to serve on the Sante Fe Community College Board of Trustees. Presiding over the college's governing board three terms as chairman, Ayers displays those proprietary insights of a banker by questioning contracts and carefully viewing expenses which don't seem to make sense.

Yet there is more to Ayers' interest in education than scrutinizing the ledgers. Basic compassion seems a motivation; testimonials about his humanity are abundant, but the best evidence is his view that the community college "open door" policy of admitting most state high school graduates provides education and a better life for people who otherwise might have had to settle for a lesser existence.

"You can argue about the open door, but it permitted an awful lot of people to get a better education and employ themselves where they never would have had the opportunity," said Ayers. "When I go out at graduation time and see the families of the students—they can be young or old, it makes no difference—it really strikes a strain in the heart to see someone in the family do something in education.

"It's probably the first time someone in the family did something in the education field, probably the first one in the family to go beyond high school. They seem to go on and compete with upper division (university) graduates. They fight, scrap and get their share of education and come out of it, I think, as much better students."

Ayers' higher education experience was at the University of Kentucky, where he was a light but elusive tailback in the early days of the Southeastern Conference. Ayers was 150 pounds when running out of the UK backfield, a weight he still maintains.

In 1936 Ayers graduated from UK and married his hometown sweetheart, Isabelle. The nation was in the midst of the Great Depression and Ayers accepted a lone job offer with the Goodyear Tire Co. Times, though, became even harder when America entered World War II in 1941.

North Africa and, eventually, France were the wartime destinations for Lt. Ayers, a supply officer who to this day is quietly amazed that the first load shipped into Marseille was not combat materiel for American troops but rather sacks of flour for French refugees.

"The service was an enlightening experience," said the laconic Ayers, "but it certainly is something you don't want to do every day. Once is enough, and I was fortunate in my assignments because I had a lot of friends and learned that this person was killed or that person was incapacitated. Anyone who came through it whole ought to be thankful."

After the war Ayers found work with a consumer loan company, and he began his banking career in Aberdeen, S.D. Ayers enjoyed the friends he met in Aberdeen, but the city's "pretty severe" weather induced him to move south to, as it happens, Gainesville.

Ayers never anticipated becoming a bank president, but in 1967 he became the chief executive for the Atlantic First National Bank. The power over vast amounts of money settled well on Ayers, a private executive who felt that a bank has an almost public duty to its community.

"I never did believe that money does any good in a vault or in investment bonds except as necessary," said Ayers. "You use money when you can use it to advantage and pay back what you borrowed. Where it can, a bank's obligation is to the community.

"The money's built a lot of businesses around town and it's built a lot of homes. It's helped people in business to grow. Some fell by the wayside but the majority fulfilled their promises because their plans worked out."

The 71-year old Ayers retired from banking a few years ago and, in accustomed fashion, used the earned rest as a "semi-retirement" where various causes always seem to demand attention.

Recreation consists mostly of golfing, a sport in which Ayers is a self-described "once-a-month-hacker," and attending basketball games at the University of Florida or at area high schools. However, a serious illness has curtailed the outside activities once favored by Ayers.

"Until I got sick I was in kind of an active semi-retirement," said Ayers. "I'd work a few times a week and the rest of my time would be spent with Santa Fe Health Care Systems or something somebody else wanted me to do."

Ayers also is a casual fisherman, the kind who enjoys the scenery whether or not fish are caught. He fondly recalls breakfasts that tasted good at 4 a.m., lolling around in a small boat, and pulling up on a bank for a box lunch.

Although he doesn't get outside much nowadays, Ayers carries in his mind the images of dawn on a North Florida lake, of the mist, quiet, and perhaps most of all, respite from a life that hasn't given him much time to be alone.

"It was real nice to be out on a lake early," said Ayers. "You can watch the fish jumping, the birds coming in. And it was quiet."●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE STS-41C CREW AND JAMES VAN HOFTEN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be the Representative from Riverside, Calif., home of Astronaut James Van Hoften, one of the astronauts who repaired the solar maximum satellite. I commend the crew and the control team at Goddard Space Flight Center for their success in repair of this satellite. Future cost savings and scientific benefits are far reaching. Rather than being restricted to costly and time-consuming replacement of a malfunctioning satellite, we have now demonstrated an alternative; we can retrieve and repair satellites. Plans are already being developed to attempt a similar

rescue and repair mission on two recently lost communications satellites. If successful, this effort would produce savings of hundreds of millions of dollars to owners of these satellites.

Again, my congratulations to the crew, and to NASA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

GRACE COMMISSION

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have become quite interested in the Grace Commission, its reports and the Congressional Budget Office and General Accounting Office review of the reports.

First, a bit of history. The Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 sets up certain requirements for advisory committees. Those requirements include, in pertinent part, an annual report by the President to Congress including—

> The activities, status, and changes in the composition of advisory committees in existence during the preceding calendar year. The report shall contain the name of every advisory committee, the date of and authority for its creation, its termination date or the date it is to make a report, its functions, a reference to the reports it has submitted, a statement of whether it is an ad hoc or continuing body, the dates of its meetings, the names and occupations of its current members, and the total estimated annual cost to the United States to fund, service, supply, and maintain such committee. (5 U.S.C. Ap. 1, Sec. 6c).

The Grace Commission was organized in such a manner as to avoid these requirements. Given that individuals from industries regulated by specific agencies reviewed those same agencies, it is not difficult to understand why it would be awkward to report the names and occupations of the reviewers.

Moving on toward some of the general assumptions of the Commission, it is important that we apply an analytic eye. For example, the Commission assumed a 10-percent inflation rate and a 10-percent interest rate over 3 years. Given that the inflation rate is a component of the interest rate with risk and profit raising the interest rate over the inflation rate, one can readily see that the Commission used parallel rates which are an economic impossibility. This is particularly curious in light of the fact that since 1981 the United States has experienced the highest real interest rates—the difference between inflation and the interest rate—since the Great Depression. Uncertainty about inflation coupled with the ever present incentive for profit, or getting whatever the market will bear, has kept long-term real interest rates at unprecedented highs. To assume, therefore that interest and inflation rates will be close—much less the same—is absurd.

The gross amount of savings over 3 years projected by the Grace Commission was $424 billion but Mr. J. Peter Grace testified before the Senate Finance Committee on February 8, 1984, that the 3-year savings were not for any particular 3 years and definitely not for the next 3 years. The CBO-GAO study concluded that potential savings over 3 years could be $98 billion. The Commission takes its estimate from the nearly 2,500 recommendations that it made. Of those recommendations, CBO-GAO believed that 242 recommendations had merit and of these, 150 had previously been made by the GAO.

This brief overview of the Grace Commission provides some insight into the efficiency of private enterprise when applied to government. Recommending what has been recommended in the past or what is in the process of implementation does not strike me as very creative. Grace Commission proposals which require major policy or statutory changes are indicative of a lack of understanding of the functions of government. Unlike private industry, government cannot abandon markets that are unprofitable. Governmental services necessarily flow to those people and those areas of endeavor which are most costly and least likely to be sought out by private industry. This is the reality of government service.●

THE FLYING DUTCHMEN AEROMODELERS ORGANIZATION

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress an important milestone in the history of the Flying Dutchmen Aeromodelers Organization of Reading, Pa. This year marks the 50th anniversary of this outstanding organization, which has grown into one of the most respected clubs in model aviation in the country.

The Flying Dutchmen Aeromodelers Organization is a charter member of the Academy of Model Aeronautics and a member of the Federation Aeronautique Internationals and the National Aeronautic Association. When they began in 1934, the Flying Dutchmen Aeromodelers Organization flew from baseball diamonds, playgrounds, and abandoned fields. As their membership grew, they established a permanent flying field. In 1948, the club rebuilt Drenkel Field and it was used successfully until 1967.

At that time the field came into disrepair and the club with the assistance of the city government established a renovated Drenkel Field, home of the Flying Dutchmen Organization, which has become the finest control line flying site in the United States. Open to the public, the field has four fully paved flying circles, picnic tables and grills, bleacher and park bench seating, and a fully paved parking lot. Primarily a control line club, the Flying Dutchmen also fly all facets of the hobby: Control line, radio control, free flight, and rubber power.

The Flying Dutchmen Aeromodelers Organization is dedicated to promoting model aviation as a family hobby and sport. They have worked with many local and national civic groups including the Easter Seals Foundation, AMBUCS, Boy and Girl Scouts, Reading Rehabilitation Hospital, the Optimist Club, Schuylkill River Greenway Association, numerous church groups, and television. Each year the club travels across the country performing for the general public. They do an average of 40 shows per year.

I know that my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Flying Dutchmen Aeromodelers Organization on their 50th anniversary and in wishing them many more years of continued success.●

WHERE IS THE BEEF IN JAPAN?

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the April 12, 1984, edition of the Washington Post concerning the senseless obstinancy by the Japanese Government on the subject of meat import quotas and the implications it has for the Japanese consumer.

The recent trade agreement with the Japanese raises the quota of imported American beef of 30,800 metric tons by 6,900 metric tons per year for 4 years. Although this 90 percent increase in beef imports may be considered generous by the Japanese Government, it means only 2 additional ounces of beef per Japanese citizen per year.

The Japanese consumer has for years desired to purchase greater quantities of beef to supplement their diets. Unfortunately, Japan's meager beef industry and the quota on imported beef have priced beef out of the reach of most Japanese consumers. The reluctance of the Japanese Government to further relax its import quota on American beef illustrates the power, influence, and fear wielded by the small Japanese agricultural population. In bowing to the selfish interests of this tiny minority, the Japanese Government continues to deny

the vast majority of its population of nutritious high-quality, low-cost beef. As the world's largest producer of beef, the United States is in the best position to fill the demand of Japanese consumers for more quality beef.

For Nebraska, one of our Nation's largest beef-producing States, the recent trade agreement is an important step toward expanding the Japanese market. While the quota is still too low, and there is still a quota to limit imported meat, it is a necessary and positive first step by the Japanese to open their market to imported beef. Unfortunately, as the Washington Post notes, the real losers in this ongoing trade dispute are not just the American cattlemen but the Japanese consumers.

TRADING BEEF

The Japanese were wise to settle the rancorous quarrel over their beef import quotas last weekend. They would have been wiser to settle it a good deal sooner.

In economic terms, the whole question is trivial. But the Japanese negotiators stuck fast, month after month, protesting that they couldn't move because beef producers are very influential in Japanese politics. No doubt they are influential. So what? Imports of Japanese cars and Japanese steel into this country have generated political trouble for a succession of American presidents on a scale far beyond any challenge that beef growers can raise to a Japanese prime minister.

Perhaps it bears repeating that there is only one good reason for allowing Japanese cars and steel into this country. It's not to accommodate Japanese producers, but to benefit American customers. Those benefits are substantial. Similarly, the best reason for the Japanese government to let in more beef is not to please American cattlemen but to improve the diet of its own people.

But rising imports change a country's economic life, and it's a kind of change that always draws a political reaction. It's a government's job to deal with these side effects, not to let them paralyze it.

By resisting desperately on minor matters such as beef imports, and pushing them to the brink of crisis before compromising, Japanese negotiators create an impression of obduracy. It does not serve Japanese interests to encourage Americans to think of trade with Japan as a one-way street in which even the most modest concessions are made grudgingly and only after inordinate delay.

That impression is damaging to Japan, whose prosperity depends heavily on access to the American market. It is also unfair to Japan because, on subjects of far greater importance than beef quotas, they have taken much more enlightened positions. The Japanese government is now proceeding toward allowing foreign competition in its telecommunications industry. The possibilities there for American companies are enormous.

In the beef case, the Japanese allowed the dispute to drag on much too long at too great a political cost. The current progress in the telecommunications case is a more hopeful precedent for the governance of this enormous flow of trade that brings great advantages to both countries.●

NUCLEAR TRADE WITH CHINA

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, for the past week we have been hearing reports that President Reagan is expected to announce an agreement for nuclear cooperation with the People's Republic of China during his visit there. Such an agreement would be important not only for relations between our two nations and our common interests in expanding Sino-American trade, but it also would signal that the world's most populous nation has committed itself to the goals of nuclear nonproliferation.

However, as valuable as such an agreement would be, it is important that we do not become complacent with regard to the legal requirements of our nuclear nonproliferation laws. These laws were developed to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations, and, while China is a weapons state, it is crucial that they give explicit assurances that any U.S. nuclear technology will be used only for peaceful purposes and that they abide by nonproliferation restrictions on the transfer of sensitive nuclear technology.

The terms and conditions for a cooperative agreement are spelled out in the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act. According to statements made by administration officials these terms have been agreed to by the Chinese. If this is true, the administration should be applauded for its great achievement. However, the administration's record to date on maintaining a strong and aggressive nonproliferation policy has been miserable. Therefore, it is essential that Congress pay close attention to the language and intent of the agreement to assure the law has been followed before we fully embrace the administration's actions.

Last December I wrote Secretary of State Shultz urging that he pursue certain key provisions in reaching an agreement with the Chinese. Senators PROXMIRE, ROTH, and HUMPHREY sent a separate, but similar letter urging the same. Hopefully, he took our recommendations into account when negotiating the agreement.

We must not lose sight of the requirements in our laws and the obligations and conditions we have placed on other valued trade partners in prior agreements. To fail in this consistency will only undermine our ability to maintain the terms of these agreements and may ultimately have serious consequences for our nonproliferation efforts in general.

Mr. Speaker, I request that my letter to Secretary Shultz and a copy of the provisions required for an agreement for nuclear cooperation under section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act be inserted at the end of my statement.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION AND POWER OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,

Washington, D.C., December 2, 1983.

Hon. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that negotiations are currently under way with the People's Republic of China (PRC) on an Agreement for Cooperation with the United States governing trade of nuclear power technology. I am in strong support of efforts to establish a formal relationship with the Chinese in this important area of trade provided that the agreement be drafted as prudently as possible before it is signed and reviewed by the Congress.

In pursuit of a prudent agreement I would expect that the President would not waive any provision of any criteria set forth in Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

In addition, I would expect that the body of the Agreements' text include the following provisions:

(1) An explicit pledge by the PRC not to transfer any nuclear weapons hardware or information to any nation;

(2) An explicit agreement that the PRC will require, as a condition for its own nuclear cooperation and exports, that recipient States place all of their peaceful nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

(3) An explicit pledge that the PRC will enter into an agreement with the IAEA to voluntarily place its peaceful nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards according to terms identical with those of the US-IAEA safeguards agreement.

I believe that all of these provisions must be included in the main text of any nuclear cooperative agreement with the PRC if it is to be acceptable to the Congress.

We have a great opportunity in negotiating this agreement to further the goals of nuclear non-proliferation by enlisting the support of the People's Republic of China for those goals. Many developing nations look to the People's Republic as a model for economic growth and their development decisions are held in high regard. By joining together the American and Chinese people will be sending a strong signal to other nations that nuclear non-proliferation cooperation is fundamental to peaceful economic development.

I would hope that this letter would be shared with the PRC negotiators.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Chairman.

SEC. 123. COOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS

No cooperation with any nation, group of nations or regional defense organization pursuant to section 53, 54, a., 57, 64, 82, 91, 103, 104, or 144 shall be undertaken until—

a. The proposed agreement for cooperation has been submitted to the President, which proposed arrangement shall include the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; and shall include the following requirements:

(1) A guaranty by the cooperating party that safeguards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained

with respect to all nuclear materials and equipment transferred pursuant thereto, and with respect to all special nuclear material used in or produced through the use of such nuclear materials and equipment, so long as the material or equipment remains under the jurisdiction or control of the cooperating party, irrespective of the duration of other provisions in the agreement or whether the agreement is terminated or suspended for any reason;

(2) In the case of non-nuclear-weapon states, a requirement, as a condition of continued United States nuclear supply under the agreement for cooperation, that IAEA safeguards be maintained with respect to all nuclear materials in all peaceful nuclear activities within the territory of such state, under its jurisdiction, or carried out under its control anywhere;

(3) Except in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., a guaranty by the cooperating party that no nuclear materials and equipment or sensitive nuclear technology to be transferred pursuant to such agreement, and no special nuclear material produced through the use of any nuclear materials and equipment or sensitive nuclear technology transferred pursuant to such agreement, will be used for any nuclear explosive device, or for research on or development of any nuclear explosive device, or for any other military purpose;

(4) Except in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c. and agreements for cooperation with nuclear-weapon states, a stipulation that the United States shall have the right to require the return of any nuclear materials and equipment transferred pursuant thereto and any special nuclear material produced through the use thereof if the cooperating party detonates a nuclear explosive device or terminates or abrogates an agreement providing for IAEA safeguards;

(5) A guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any Restricted Data transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation and, except in the case of agreements arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b. or 144 c., any production or utilization facility transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation or any special nuclear material produced through the use of any such facility or through the use of any material transferred pursuant to the agreement, will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction or control of the cooperating party without the consent of the United States;

(6) A guaranty by the cooperating party that adequate physical security will be maintained with respect to any nuclear material transferred pursuant to such agreement and with respect to any special nuclear material used in or produced through the use of any material, production facility, or utilization facility transferred pursuant to such agreement;

(7) Except in the case of agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b. or 144 c., a guaranty by the cooperating party that no material transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation and no material used in or produced through the use of any material, production facility, or utilization facility transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will be reprocessed, enriched or (in the case of plutonium, uranium 233, or uranium enriched to greater then twenty percent in the isotope 235, or other nuclear materials which have been irradiated) otherwise altered in form or content without the prior approval of the United States;

(8) Except in the case of agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b. or 144 c., a guaranty by the cooperating party that no plutonium, no uranium 233, and no uranium enriched to greater then twenty percent in the isotope 235, transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation, or recovered from any source or special nuclear material so transferred or from any source or special nuclear material used in any production facility or utilization facility transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation, will be stored in any facility that has not been approved in advance by the United States; and

(9) Except in the case of agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., a guaranty by the cooperating party that any special nuclear material, production facility, or utilization facility produced or constructed under the jurisdiction of the cooperating party by or through the use of any sensitive nuclear technology transferred pursuant to such agreement for cooperation will be subject to all the requirements specified in this subsection.

The President may exempt a proposed agreement for cooperation (except an agreement arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c.) from any of the requirements of the foregoing sentence if he determines that inclusion of any such requirement would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of United States non-proliferation objectives or otherwise jeopardize the common defense and security. Except in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., any proposed agreement for cooperation shall be negotiated by the Secretary of State, with the technical assistance and concurrence of the Secretary of Energy and in consultation with the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency ("the Director"); and after consultation with the Commission shall be submitted to the President jointly by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy accompanied by the views and recommendations of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Director, who shall also provide to the President an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement regarding the adequacy of the safeguards and other control mechanisms and the peaceful use assurances contained in the agreement for cooperation to ensure that any assistance furnished thereunder will not be used to further any military or nuclear explosive purpose. In the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., any proposed agreement for cooperation shall be submitted to the President by the Secretary of Energy or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c. or 144 b. which are to be implemented by the Department of Defense, by the Secretary of Defense;

b. The President has approved and authorized the execution of the proposed agreement for cooperation and has made a determination in writing that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security;

c. The proposed agreement for cooperation (if not an agreement subject to subsection d.) together with the approval and determination of the President, has been submitted to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate for a period of thirty days of continuous session (as defined in subsection 130 g.): *Provided, however,* That these committees, after having received such agreement for cooperation, may by resolution in writing waive the conditions of all or any portion of such thirty-day period; and

d. The proposed agreement for cooperation (if arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., of if entailing implementation of section 53, 54 a., 103, or 104 in relation to a reactor that may be capable of producing more than five thermal megawatts or special nuclear material for use in connection therewith) has been submitted to the Congress, together with the approval and determination of the President, for a period of sixty days of continuous session (as defined in subsection 130 g. of this Act) and referred to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and in addition, in the case of a proposed agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144 c., the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, but such proposed agreement for cooperation shall not become effective if during such sixty-day period the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the proposed agreement for cooperation: *Provided,* That the sixty-day period shall not begin until a Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement prepared by the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, when required by subsection 123 a., has been submitted to the Congress. Any such proposed agreement for cooperation shall be considered pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 130 of this Act for the consideration of Presidential submissions.

Following submission of a proposed agreement for cooperation (except an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91 c., 144 b., or 144c.) to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Department of Defense shall, upon the request of either of those committees promptly furnish to those committees their views as to whether the safeguards and other controls contained therein provide an adequate framework to ensure that any exports as contemplated by such agreement will not be inimical to or consititute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

If, after the date of enactment of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978, the Congress fails to disapprove a proposed agreement for cooperation which exempts the recipient nation from the requirement set forth in subsection 123 a. (2), such failure to act shall constitute a failure to adopt a resolution of disapproval pursuant to subsection 182 b. (3) for purposes of the Commission's consideration of applications and requests under section 126 a. (2) and there shall be no congressional review pursuant to section 128 of any subsequent license or authorization with respect to that state until the first such license or authorization which

is issued after twelve months from the elapse of the sixty-day period in which the agreement for cooperation in question is reviewed by the Congress.●

A TRIBUTE TO PROFESSIONAL SECRETARIES

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to those members of the secretarial profession and their significant contributions to the public and private sectors of America's economy.

The professional secretary is the backbone of business, government on all levels, industry, and nonprofit organizations. The secretary's competent and efficient management skills, careful execution of assignments, and coordination of everyday workflow within an office are crucial to the effective and smooth operation of any workplace. Furthermore, the secretary is a vital link of communication and public relations between the office and the rest of the business world and public in general.

Demonstrating excellence in many fields, including science, government, law, medicine, and industry, professional secretaries have earned distinction of the highest regard for commitment and dedication to their careers.

As one who daily relies on my professional secretaries staff, I especially appreciate their valuable skills and experience as an important asset to my office. Finally, I commend my colleagues in the House of Representatives for their efforts in paying deserved recognition for the worthwhile contributions of the professional secretary.●

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN REUTER

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to John Reuter, who a few weeks ago was awarded the highly esteemed Papal Knight of St. Gregory by Pope John Paul II.

John Reuter richly deserves this honor. He is a dedicated family man, and one of the most effective individuals in the State of New Jersey in the ongoing effort to restore legal protection for the most vulnerable among us, the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with John for more than 10 years in the Pro-Life movement. I can say without any equivocation that he is one of the most persistent, hard-working, and compassionate leaders in the Pro-Life cause. For more than a decade he has been an inspiration to both my wife, Marie, and me in the battle to protect innocent human life.

Moreover Mr. Speaker, John Reuter is a true defender of the Catholic faith. He is an outstanding role model for the younger generation. Clearly his work record is impressive. He retired in 1973 after distinguished service as a public servant in the State of New Jersey for 42 years. In 1966 he retired from the New Jersey National Guard as a lieutenant colonel, having risen from the rank of private.

Mr. Speaker, for many years John was a member of the board of directors of the New Jersey Right to Life Committee, which is where I got to know and admire him, having served on that board as well. He was always the voice of reason and consistency. He was unflappable.

Mr. Speaker, John Reuter was born in Trenton, N.J., on June 7, 1913, and graduated from Trenton Evening School in 1933. On October 30, 1937, he married Catherine Grimm of East Orange, N.J. They have six children, Mary Ann, Lawrence, Joan, Catherine, Therese and John, Jr.

In 1948 the Reuter family moved to a larger residence in Crosswicks, N.J., to accommodate their growing family. It was named Maryacres in honor of the Blessed Mother. They became members of St. Mary's Parish in Bordentown, N.J., with the children attending St. Mary's Grammar School. In 1955 they became members of St. Vincent dePaul Church in Yardville, N.J.

While at St. Anthony's Parish in Trenton, John Reuter became a member of the St. Vincent dePaul Society. He later was a charter member of the St. Vincent dePaul Conference, Yardville. The conference celebrated its 25th anniversary last year. John is the current president.

He is presently treasurer and acting secretary of the Trenton Diocesan Council of the Society. For many years he was chairman of the Social Service Center Committee of Mercer District Council until the council stores closed in 1975. He also writes and edits the Burlington County Right to Life Newsletter.

A member of the Knights of Columbus since 1951, Bordentown Council 570, John was received into the Fourth Degree in March 1975. During most of his married life he has been a member of the Holy Name Society, serving at various times as president and secretary. He currently also serves as a lector in St. Vincent dePaul Parish.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, John Reuter is a champion of the Catholic faith, a true defender of human rights and I am proud to be counted among his many, many friends.●

ACCESS CHARGES FOR LONG-DISTANCE CALLS

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, 184 of our colleagues joined Congressman Larry Craig and me in a letter to the Federal Communications Commission requesting that it hold off on imposing telephone access charges on our Nation's businesses.

If these charges go into effect now—at their present rate of up to $6 per line per month—many of our Nation's small businesses will pay more just for the privilege of having the opportunity to make long-distance calls than they pay for the long-distance calls they actually make.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of the access charges on business originally said long-distance rates would go down by 10.5 percent or more if the access charge plan were implemented. But last weekend, in an article printed in the Washington Post, Chairman Fowler of the FCC said any long-distance rate reductions would be significantly less.

Mr. Chairman, the present plan to put telephone access charges on small business is bad news and will greatly hamper the effort to stimulate economic growth in our country.●

THE RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN J. KOEHLER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to announce the retirement of an individual who has been a great contributor and leader in the U.S. Army for three decades: Maj. Gen. John J. Koehler, Jr. On May 1, 1984, Major General Koehler will end his tenure as commander of the U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command (Tecom) at Aberdeen-Edgewood Proving Grounds (APG), located in my district. Taking the position as commander in 1979, Koehler has held that position longer than anyone in Tecon's 22-year history. His retirement will be a substantial loss to Tecom, to APG, and to the entire military establishment.

Tecom tests proposed weapons and equipment at nine installations in the United States and the Republic of Panama. As commander, Koehler oversaw an organization which man-

ages and controls more than 6 million acres of real estate and associated air space, employs an annual operating budget exceeding $750 million, completes more than 900 tests annually, and employs a military and civilian work force of almost 12,000 people.

As commander, Koehler worked hard to improve public awareness of the military's role and purpose, particularly with regards to Tecom. He did this by doing more than merely running an organization the size of Tecom; his regimen went way beyond the strenous day-to-day requirements of the job. This included giving speeches across the country to a wide variety of groups and organizations, hosting visitors at APG from around the world, and initiating the Tecom sabbatical and academic program for college and university faculty members and graduate students.

Major General Koehler began his army career upon enlistment in 1944. He later entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and was commissioned a lieutenant of field artillery upon graduation in 1950. He served on assignments in Europe and Korea. In 1969 and 1970, he served with the Office of the Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for Strategic Arms Negotiations, participating as an adviser to the U.S. SALT delegation at Helsinki and Vienna. In 1975, he was appointed Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations and Training of the 8th U.S. Army and Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations and Training of the U.N. Command and of the U.S. forces in the Republic of Korea. By 1977, he was promoted to Chief of Staff for the U.N. Command and of U.S. forces in Korea. Just prior to becoming commander at Tecom, he was the commander general of the U.S. Army Air Defense Center at Fort Bliss.

Major General Koehler has been the recipient of numerous medals recognizing his tremendous courage and dedication to his country including the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Purple Heart.

As commander of Tecom, he has displayed enormous integrity in the management of developmental testing and reportings of tests of new equipment. He supervised all nine subordinate installations and completed all missions while staying completely within his budget guidelines, quite an accomplishment considering the magnitude of the Tecom organization. He greatly improved the quality of life for all military personnel and their dependents at APG and substantially upgraded the working conditions for civilian employees. His service to the Army and to his country is immeasurable. I congratulate him on his long and outstanding career and know he will be sorely missed by all who had the privilege of working with him. My best wishes to Major General Koehler, his wife Helen, and their nine children for continued happiness and success in all their future endeavors.●

SOUTHFIELD SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL FINALIST IN OUTSTANDING SCHOOLS COMPETITION

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on this floor in recent months on the need to improve our Nation's schools. Too often we forget that, standing firmly in the path of the "rising tide of mediocrity," there are many, many outstanding schools, staffed by dedicated teachers and administrators who tirelessly strive to provide their charges with the finest education possible. For this reason, I applaud the U.S. Department of Education's national secondary school recognition program.

This program provides national recognition to outstanding senior and junior high schools across the country. Each year the Department asks the States to nominate secondary schools that they believe merit special recognition. From this pool of nominees the Secretary of Education selects finalists for further consideration. Finally, in the fall of the year the Secretary will announce those schools selected as exceptional examples of secondary education. These schools are then added to the network of schools that can serve as models for other schools and school districts that are seeking to improve.

This year, Michigan nominated nine senior high schools and nine junior high schools. Last month, the Secretary selected 14 of these schools as finalists. It was my distinct pleasure that Southfield Senior High School in my district was among those schools to be so honored.

I have long been aware of the excellent program which Southfield Senior High School offers its students. The teachers, administrators, parents and students of this school can be justly proud of their accomplishments. I am proud to represent them in Washington. I want to take this opportunity to extend my sincere congratulations to Southfield Senior High School and to wish them the best of luck in the remainder of the competition.●

SUPPORT FOR POPULATION RESEARCH BUDGET

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this statement is to describe H.R. 5335, a bill I introduced on April 3 to encourage interest in and attention to the Federal investment in population and contraceptive research by proposing the establishment within NIH of a new Institute on Population and Human Reproduction. Such an institute would replace the work in this field by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), which has been the source of NIH support for population research since the 1960's.

I have several reasons for introducing H.R. 5335 at this time:

First, section 1004 of title X establishes the only explicit authorization for support for population research by the Department of Health and Human Services. In fact, until 1981, title X's authorization contained the funding authorization for NICHD's population research budget in addition to the policy authorization. Thus, it is especially appropriate to raise the issue of the adequacy of Government support for population research before this subcommittee as it reviews title X.

Second, new studies indicate the continuing inadequacy of available methods of contraception. According to Howard W. Ory of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control, more than half of all pregnancies in the United States are unintended, despite the fact that most couples use some method of family planning. As a consequence, in 1980, 1.54 million abortions were chosen by women to terminate their pregnancies. In my own State of Wisconsin, almost 22,000 abortions were performed that year.

The main reason is contraceptive failure and nonuse of contraception. For example, an estimated 2.4 percent of married women using oral contraceptives become pregnant during the first year of pill use; 18.6 percent of the users of the diaphragm do. In addition, an estimated 3 million women at risk of unintended pregnancy do not use any method of contraception; nearly 40 percent do so because of their concern about the side effects associated with the use of different methods of contraception.

Third, the costs of unintended pregnancy are not only personal but also public. When low-income women experience unintended pregnancy, the costs are not only significant to themselves but also to public agencies if they are compelled to seek public assistance to care for their families.

That is why the Federal investment in contraceptive services is so valued; every $1 invested prevents the need for an estimated $2 of public expenditures for public health care, welfare payments, food assistance, and public housing during the following year.

Fourth, since 1981, the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) has reported that a number of new developments in contraception await only additional investment to be realized. In its report, "World Population and Fertility Planning Technologies," OTA stated, "Added investments in this specific area are highly likely to produce payoffs in the form of useful new technologies. * * * An additional $20 million annually in this specific field could have a substantial impact."

Fifth, NICHD is the world's major source of funding for contraceptive research, but its budget has declined during the past 4 years. According to OTA, more than 50 percent of the expenditure for contraceptive research and development in the world is financed by the U.S. Government. Most of that support is provided by NICHD, and the institute spends most of its $92 million population research budget for basic research in the reproductive sciences. It uses only about $8.2 million for the development of better contraception and $3.1 million for the evaluation of contraceptive safety and effectiveness. Funding for both has declined. The administration's fiscal year 1985 budget request for contraceptive development by NICHD is 9 percent below the fiscal 1981 budget; its request for contraceptive evaluation is 25 percent below the 1981 budget.

Sixth, as a new Member of Congress, this hearing and the introduction of H.R. 5335 represent my first opportunity to contribute to the important public discussion about encouragement of contraceptive research. My support for greater discussion about the adequacy of our investment in contraceptive research reflects my longstanding interest in family planning, borne of my many years of experience working and living around the world. I make no claims of expertise in either the area of contraceptive research or the organization of NIH, but I am eager to improve the availability of choice that is so essential to the lives and well-being of virtually all Americans.

THE PURPOSE OF INTRODUCING H.R. 5335

Although the U.S. Government also provides funding for contraceptive research through the U.S. Agency for International Development, NICHD is the key player in supporting population research and contraceptive development worldwide. I have introduced H.R. 5335 to spark greater attention to both the adequacy of NICHD support for such research and the institutional obstacles inherent in the organization of NIH that stand in the way of a stronger investment in the field.

I believe we need to give higher priority to contraceptive research. H.R. 5335 is organized to highlight several goals that need to be considered:

First, greater visibility should be given to population research in general as an area of support provided by NIH. Currently, less than 3 percent of NIH's $4.5 billion budget is devoted to population research.

Second, greater visibility and priority specifically should be given to support for contraceptive research. Currently, combined NICHD funding for both contraceptive development and evaluation, which are applied research rather than the NIH preferred basic research, amounts to less than 0.4 percent of NIH's total budget.

Third, continued strong support for and coordination with research for mothers and children, which now receives the majority of NICHD's annual funding. Historically, approximately 60 percent of NICHD's funding has been devoted to research on mothers and children, as distinct from population research.

Fourth, increased attention to long-range goals and priorities for population research in connection with research on mothers and children. The issue is not simply a question of funding but also of NIH priorities for different fields of research as well as the balance maintained between basic research, which is NIH's top priority, and applied research, which invariably suffers in the budget-making process regardless of its specific merit.

THE SPECIFICS OF H.R. 5335

The goals I have listed must be the focus of any discussion about improving our commitment to contraceptive research in a meaningful way. H.R. 5335 contains several elements that have been designed specifically to call attention to these goals:

First, the creation of a new Institute on Population and Human Reproduction.

Second, a detailed authorization, including specific provision for the Institute on Population and Human Reproduction, and increased funding for the remaining work of NICHD, which specifically earmarks 25 percent of the budget of the population institute to be devoted to contraceptive development and evaluation.

Third, the creation of a National Science Policy Committee on Human Development with special coordinating responsibilities for the budgets and planning for the work of the Population Institute and NICHD.●

DAVID ANTHONY KENNEDY

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, few families in the history of our Republic have sustained a commitment to public service with the courage and the continued concern for others as have the members of the Kennedy family. For several generations, they have involved themselves in the conflicts of public life, and as a nation we have come to know their triumphs and tragedies.

So it saddens me today to note the untimely death of David Anthony Kennedy, the fourth child of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York, at the age of 28.

The deaths of President Kennedy and Senator Kennedy shocked the Nation. How much more profound that shock must have been for their family, for those who knew them as only a child could know his father and his uncle? This tragic death, of so young a man, brings expressions of sorrow for his family from every corner of the country.

I never met David Kennedy, but I have known and admired members of his family for many years. I know our hearts go out to them in this difficult hour. May they find comfort in their grief, as in the past they have comforted the American people in our hours of national grief. As they lay David to eternal peace, we remember the calming words of Lord Tennyson: "God's finger touched him, and he slept."●

PROJECT GRADUATION

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, we are fast approaching that time of year that I, as a former high schoolteacher, principal, athletic coach, and school superintendent, still anticipate with a sense of foreboding: high school prom and graduation season.

"Why such grim talk?" You must wonder. After all, thoughts of another school year's end bring to mind warm weather, baseball season, class rings, the senior prom, flowers, formals, and those coveted mortar boards. All of this accompanied by seemingly unending refrains of that classic favorite, "Pomp and Circumstance."

I speak with foreboding because in Pennsylvania, almost 20 percent of 1983's fatal alcohol-related teenage accidents occurred in May or June; 32

teenagers died in those drunk driving accidents, with June reporting the highest percentage—10.91 percent, or 18 deaths—of any month that year.

That is why I am very pleased to announce that Penn State All-American halfback Curt Warner will appear with me at Carlisle Senior High School from 10:30–11:10 a.m. on Monday, April 30, to talk with the 900-member student body about the dangers of drinking and driving.

This high school assembly, which is cosponsored by the Cumberland-Perry County Drug and Alcohol Commission, is designed to bring attention to the serious problem of teenage drunken driving, particularly during the prom season and a little over 1 month before graduation nights throughout the 19th District and around the country.

I have asked Mr. Warner, the 1983 American Football Conference Rookie of the Year with the Seattle Seahawks, to speak to the Carlisle High School students because I truly believe that he is the best role model for teens in the 15-, 16-, and 17-year-old age group. Not only does he represent the virtues of clean living, but Curt is also as well known and respected as any athlete in Pennsylvania today.

These youngsters need role models and more than ever when it comes to alcohol and drug abuse. In the 1982 "senior season," the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Accident Data Bureau indicates that the highest number of alcohol-related accidents involving teenagers occurred in May: 710, or 9.85 percent. In June 1982, there were 603—8.377 percent—accidents resulting from teenage drunken driving.

My personal experience with the heartbreak that can accompany the high school graduation season stems from my many years as superintendent of Spring Grove schools, principal at West York Area Senior High School, and before that, as teacher and counselor at Kennard-Dale High. All too often, some of my students crossed the border into Maryland, which had a lower minimum drinking age, "to celebrate"—and met their deaths in senseless and tragic automobile accidents.

Clearly, the time is ripe for precautions to prevent future such tragedies.

Curt Warner will be speaking to the students about dealing with this national epidemic on two levels—first, by talking about the benefit of parents and teenagers sitting down to sign safety contracts, and second, by promoting Project Graduation, an idea developed by the U.S. Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Project Graduation is a growing movement whereby high school seniors plan ways in which to celebrate their last month of high school with alcohol-free and chemical-free events. It is the outgrowth of a tragic graduation season in Maine in which, in one community alone, seven teenagers were killed, one was paralyzed and comatose, and several others were arrested for operating vehicles under the influence—all in the 2 weeks prior to graduation night.

This graduation season, I hope that we can change these statistics and prevent tragic deaths, injuries, and accidents.

My message to the class of 1984: Please do not drink and drive, and please do not drive with anyone else who has been drinking.●

TRIBUTE TO RT. REV. WILLIAM MILTON SMITH

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 4, 1984, the New York Conference/African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church will honor the Rt. Rev. William Milton Smith at the Rye Town Hilton in Port Chester, N.Y. More than 1,000 people are expected to attend the event.

Bishop Smith, the senior bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, resides with his wife, Ida, in Mobile, Ala.

In May 1980, Bishop Smith was appointed by the general conference to serve as presiding prelate of the New York Annual Conference, First Episcopal District.

Bishop Smith presently serves as chairman of the church extension board, on the Board of Trustees of Livingston College and as national chairman of the Centennial Campaign of Livingston College and Hood Seminary. he is also vice chairman of the Publishing House and Lay Activities and is a trustee of the Lomax-Hannon College.

Additionally, Bishop Smith serves on the Board of Directors of the Commonwealth National Bank, the National Board of the NAACP, Mobile United, the United Fund of Mobile County, America's Junior Miss Pageant, Inc., on the Governing Board of the National Council of Christ in America, the Executive Board of World Methodist Council, the Dearborn Street YMCA, on the Mayor's Commission on Progress of Mobile and the Steering Committee of the NAACP.

Prior to his coming to the First Episcopal District, Bishop Smith presided over the Western North Carolina and the West Alabama Conferences.

The New York Conference is comprised of the following churches in my home, Westchester County; St. Catherine's in Mount Vernon; St. Francis in Port Chester; Barry Avenue in Mamaroneck; Greater Centennial in Mount Vernon; Institutional in Yonkers; Metropolitan in Yonkers; Mount Hope in White Plains; Foster Memorial in Tarrytown; Dixon Mission in Yonkers; Ossining Mission in Ossining, and Park Street in Peekskill. Long involved in social outreach and community development, these Westchester churches have and continue to be a valuable asset to Westchester County. That activism has matured through a positive and aggressive partnership of the public and private sector for the good of the community.

I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring Bishop Smith for his years of dedication and commitment to the community he so unselfishly serves.●

BEVERLY BAIN HONORED

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1984, Valley Beth Shalom of Encino, Calif., will honor Beverly Bain as Woman of the Year.

Beverly Bain has been active in the field of music. As a public school music teacher she advanced the theory that informed listeners are as important as the performers of good music. As a PTA president and music chairperson, she worked hard to promote excellence and to instill the necessity of music in the public schools.

Beverly is an accomplished musician in her own right. She is an organist, pianist and a director and teacher of Israeli and Yiddish music. As the president of Valley Beth Shalom, she developed guidelines for participation by temple members in music.

Beverly Bain's contributions to the promotion of women's participation in Jewish life have been impressive. She was the coordinator of the Jewish Reconstruction Foundation for the Western Region, where she worked for equality for women in Jewish religious practice. She is presently involved in preparing a program for the adaptation of traditional Jewish life for the modern Jew.

I ask the Members to join Beverly Bain's friends in honoring her contributions to her religion, her community, her concern for the equality of women, and her devotion to the progress of young musicians.●

PROHIBIT TURNING PLOWSHARES INTO NUCLEAR WEAPONS

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1984

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing in the RECORD an excellent article which appeared in the April 27, 1984, issue of Science, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The article, written by Colin Norman, is entitled "Congress, DOE Battle Over British Plutonium."

It details efforts of my colleague, DICK OTTINGER, over the past year to prevent the Department of Energy from diverting plutonium that is now being used for peaceful energy research into nuclear weapons. I commend the article to my colleagues in the House.

The article follows:

CONGRESS, DOE BATTLE OVER BRITISH PLUTONIUM

DOE REFUSES TO GIVE UP THE OPTION OF USING PLUTONIUM FROM THE CIVILIAN R&D PROGRAM, INCLUDING 4 TONS IMPORTED FROM BRITAIN, TO MAKE WEAPONS

A battle between the Department of Energy and Representative Richard Ottinger (D-N.Y.) over the fate of about 8 tons of plutonium in DOE's civilian R & D program could embarrass the British government and cause strained relations between Britain and the United States. Ottinger, arguing that civilian and military nuclear programs should be kept separate, wants to stop DOE from using the plutonium to make weapons. DOE maintains, however, that the material may be needed for the Reagan Administration's weapons buildup.

Britain's stake in this dispute stems from the fact that about 4 tons of the plutonium was transferred from Britain to the United States between 1964 and 1971 under a 1958 agreement "on the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes." It was bartered for highly enriched uranium and tritium, which was used in Britain's defense program.

Although DOE officials have said they do not know the source of the plutonium, British statements indicate that it came from civilian magnox reactors. The agreement provides for use of the bartered plutonium for military purposes, but the British government has repeatedly sought assurances that it would be used only in civilian programs.

The first of these assurances came in April 1964, when Sir Alec Douglas-Home, who was then Britain's Prime Minister, said in a statement in the House of Commons that "I am informed by the United States Government that they have no intention of using the plutonium received from us for weapons purposes." A similar commitment was given in 1982, when Britain's Secretary of State for Energy, John Moore, told Parliament that U.S. authorities had confirmed that the British plutonium was all in the civilian R & D program. Finally, on 5 March, U.S. Energy Secretary Donald Hodel said in a letter to Ottinger that "It has been and is the policy of this Department not to use this material for weapons."

In spite of these assurances, however, DOE is fighting a proposal by Ottinger that would make it illegal to transfer the British-origin plutonium to the military program. DOE officials have told Ottinger that they do not want to give up the option of using the plutonium for weapons production some time in the future, according to congressional sources. Moreover, DOE documents and recently declassified testimony indicate that, at least as recently as last year, the department was planning to use the material to produce nuclear weapons.

Ottinger originally proposed that every scrap of plutonium used or produced in civilian R & D facilities in the United States should be placed off limits for "any nuclear explosive purpose." Language to that effect is included in legislation now pending before the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which is expected to vote on it soon after Congress returns on 24 April from its Easter recess. Ottinger has recently offered to modify his proposal, however, to permit the transfer to military programs of virtually all the plutonium currently in the civilian R & D program, except for the British-origin material. DOE is opposing even this measure.

There are currently between 7 and 8 metric tons of plutonium in the civilian R&D program. About half of it is in the core of the Zero Power Production Reactor (ZPPR) in Idaho; 2.9 metric tons has been fabricated into fuel elements for the Fast Flux Text Facility (FFTF) at Hanford, Washington; and the balance is in a variety of smaller programs. The bulk of the British plutonium is believed to be in the ZPPR core and some is in the FFTF cores.

Virtually all this material contains relatively large amounts of the nonfissile isotope plutonium-240, and is thus undesirable for making weapons. But in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee in March last year, Herman Roser, the head of DOE's weapons programs said DOE intended to convert it to weapons grade by blending some with so-called supergrade plutonium from the military program and running the rest through a laser separation plant in the late 1980's or early 1990's. His testimony, which was recently declassified, made clear that DOE was planning to convert all the plutonium from the civilian R & D program, including the British-origin material, into weapons.

Further evidence of DOE's intentions comes from an internal planning document produced in 1978 and recently turned over to Ottinger. It indicates that DOE was planning to transfer 3.4 metric tons of plutonium from the ZPPR core—where most of the British plutonium is said to reside—to military programs in 1986.

Ottinger is concerned that transfer of any plutonium from the civilian R & D program into weapons production would undermine U.S. nonproliferation policy by blurring the distinction between civilian and military programs. Last year, Congress passed a bill making it illegal for DOE to use plutonium produced in civilian nuclear power plants for military purposes, and Ottinger's proposal is designed to extend the same prohibition to plutonium used in the civilian R & D program.

DOE objected on the grounds that the U.S. plutonium currently in the R & D program was produced originally in defense reactors and there is a commitment to return it to the military. In other words, DOE claims it is technically military plutonium on loan to civilian programs. If Ottinger's proposal were passed by Congress, DOE warned, the department would be forced to reclaim three cores that have been fabricated for FFTF but which are so far unused and thus technically not covered by the proposal. This would effectively bring the FFTF program to a screeching halt.

Ottinger bowed to DOE's pressure and offered to modify his proposal by exempting all U.S. plutonium currently in the civilian R & D program that was originally produced in military reactors. This would permit the eventual transfer back to defense programs of U.S.-origin material but would outlaw any military use of the British-origin plutonium and would prohibit future shuffling back and forth between civilian and defense programs.

DOE has refused to accept the compromise, however. Although DOE said in a letter to Ottinger dated 5 March that it is not relying on the British-origin plutonium to meet its weapons needs, DOE officials told Ottinger's staff that they do not want to relinquish that option. This was repeated by Hodel in a meeting on 5 April, according to Ottinger's aides. Ottinger subsequently outlined DOE's objections in a letter to Hodel and asked him to confirm them in writing. Hodel had not responded by the time Congress recessed on 13 April.

Ottinger's proposal is supported by a broad array of groups and individuals including the Federation of American Scientists, the Environmental Policy Institute, the National Resources Defense Council, former CIA deputy director Herbert Scoville, and MIT defense expert George Rathjens. Their principal concern is that continued swapping of plutonium between military and civilian programs will seriously compromise efforts to prevent the spread to nuclear weapons. "How can we persuade other nations to forego the use in weapons of plutonium from their civilian research programs if we are doing so here?" sixteen citizens' groups said in a letter to Ottinger supporting his proposal.

They have also questioned the need for the plutonium in the weapons program. "The idea that we need this plutonium is just ridiculous," contends Rathjens. He points out that the Administration can recycle plutonium from 2000 warheads it has recently removed from Europe and that the decision to abandon the Clinch River Breeder Reactor will greatly lessen plutonium requirements in the late 1980's and early 1990's. The R & D plutonium would only be needed to build "every weapon that's on everybody's wish list," he says.

The British government would also, presumably, welcome passage of Ottinger's proposal. In recent weeks critics of Britain's nuclear power program have raised numerous allegations about the possible military use of the country's civilian plutonium exports and British officials have reiterated assurances from U.S. authorities that there are no plans to use the material in weapons.

Yet, to the potential embarrassment of the British government, DOE officials have been telling Ottinger that they do not want to relinquish the option of using British-origin plutonium in the weapons program. If DOE does ever decide to use the material, that could put a serious dent in U.S.-British relations. Ottinger's proposal would at least preclude that possibility.●

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 30, 1984*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT).

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O gracious God, Your blessings are new every morning and Your gifts brighten each day. We laud Your name that Your presence has blessed our Nation and we can celebrate our tradition of freedom. We remember all peoples who have known the terrors of oppression, and we pray that their experience will cause us to be mindful of the liberties we enjoy. May Your love and grace and peace be with us and all people this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3376. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington; and

H.R. 3555. An act to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) entitled "Joint resolution to recognize 'Volunteer Firefighters Recognition Day' as a tribute to the bravery and self-sacrifice of our volunteer firefighters."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 38) entitled "An act entitled the 'Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act'," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. NICKLES, and Mr. KENNEDY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4325. An Act to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to assure, through mandatory income withholding, incentive payments to States, and other improvements in the child support enforcement program, that all children in the United States who are in need of assistance in securing financial support from their parents will receive such assistance regardless of their circumstances, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 501. An Act to amend the laws of the United States to eliminate gender-based distinctions;

S. 1126. An Act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

S. 1711. An Act to extend Patent Numbered 3,376,198, and for other purposes;

S. 1806. An Act to recognize the organization known as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Inc.;

S. 1870. An Act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for credit and debit card counterfeiting and related fraud;

S. 1989. An Act for the relief of Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz;

S. 2303. An Act to revise and extend the Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services block grant;

S. 2413. An Act to recognize the organization known as the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.;

S.J. Res. 227. Joint Resolution designating the week beginning November 11, 1984, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week"; and

S.J. Res. 244. Joint Resolution designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

TRIBUTE TO MATT ROMEO

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, a great leader of the labor movement in Maryland and a good and close friend of mine passed away. I speak of the death of Matthew R. Romeo.

Matt was officially the financial secretary and treasurer of Local 100 of the Sheet Metal Workers Union. Unofficially, he was a major force behind the goals of strengthening the labor movement in Maryland and the District of Columbia, and in constructing from that movement a dynamic and influential force in our community.

His work as a cochairman of Local 100's apprenticeship training fund was critical to the successful operation of the training of apprentices in sheet metal work. His activities as chairman of the Washington Building Trades' Committee on Political Education for the past 8 years greatly enhanced the powers wielded by that group.

For 6 years, Matt served his union well as a member of the executive board of the Maryland State and District of Columbia AFL–CIO and as an executive board member of the Metropolitan Washington Central Labor Council. In 1980, he was named "Man of the Year" by the Washington building trades for his work. He has served as the sergeant-at-arms for that body from 1976 to 1982.

But Matt's concerns did not focus solely on his trade. He was a devout Catholic, and he used his abilities as a fundraiser to aid many charities. Most recently, he was involved with the Leukemia Society and helped raise substantial moneys for the Leukemia Radiothon.

Matt had a very close family and he and his beloved wife, Mary Ellen, were always ready to help at any call for assistance.

My relationship with Matt began just a few years ago. But it soon developed into a close friendship. His loss is a very personal one for me and for my wife, Judy. All who knew him, considered Matt to be one of the warmest, most caring, and most decent persons they know. His loss, therefore, is more keenly felt by us all.

Mr. Speaker, Matt Romeo was a fine man, and his contributions to his community and to his work will long be remembered. I know my colleagues would want to join me in sending heartfelt condolences to his family on this sad occasion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the consideration of bills under suspension of the rules.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after legislative business on Tuesday, May 1, 1984.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION, CUSTOMS SERVICE, AND TRADE REPRESENTATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS, 1985

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5188), to authorize appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.

The first sentence of paragraph (2) of section 330(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 133(e)(2)) is amended to read as follows: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission for necessary expenses (including the rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere) for fiscal year 1985 not to exceed $28,410,000; of which not to exceed $2,500 may be used, subject to approval by the Chairman of the Commission, for reception and entertainment expenses.".

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 301 of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Treasury not to exceed $686,399,000 for the salaries and expenses of the United States Customs Service for fiscal year 1985; of which (A) $28,070,000 is for the operation and maintenance of the air interdiction program of the Service, and (B) not to exceed $11,000,000 is for the implementation of the 'Operation EXODUS' program and any related program designed to enforce or monitor export controls under the Export Administration Act of 1979.".

(2) Subsection (d) is redesignated as subsection (e).

(3) The following new subsection is inserted immediately after subsection (c):

"(d) No part of any sum that is appropriated under subsection (b) for fiscal years after September 30, 1984, may be used for administrative expenses to pay any employee of the United States Customs Service overtime pay in an amount exceeding $25,000; except that the Commissioner of Customs or his designee may waive this limitation in individual cases in order to prevent excessive costs or to meet emergency requirements of the Service.".

(b) ELIMINATION OF SURETIES ON CUSTOMS BONDS.—(1) The Commissioner of Customs may not publish, nor take any other action to give force and effect to, any final rule that would revise any provision in 19 CFR part 113 or section 142.4 (as in effect on March 1, 1984) relating to the requirement for sureties on customs bonds—

(A) unless the Commissioner submits to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on the same day, a report containing—

(i) the text of the draft final rule;

(ii) an analysis of the revenue impact of the rule;

(iii) a regulatory impact analysis;

(iv) the estimated cost benefit of the rule to the Customs Service and to the importing community, and an explanation in support of those estimates; and

(v) a justification for each revision to be effected by the rule; and

(B) until the close of the first period of 90 calendar days of continuous session of Congress occurring after the date on which the report is submitted under subparagraph (A).

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) continuity of session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; and

(B) the days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of any period of time in which Congress is in continuous session.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF MANIFEST INFORMATION.—Section 431 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1431) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph designated as "Third" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and the names of the shippers of such merchandise."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2), the following information, when contained in such manifest, shall be available for public disclosure:

"(A) The name and address of each importer or consignee, the marks and numbers on the import containers, and the name and address of the shipper to such importer or consignee, unless the importer or consignee has made a biennial certification, in accordance with procedures adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury, claiming confidential treatment of such information.

"(B) The general character of the cargo.

"(C) The number of packages and gross weight.

"(D) The name of the vessel or carrier.

"(E) The port of loading.

"(F) The port of discharge.

"(G) The country of origin of the shipment.

"(2) The information listed in paragraph (1) shall not be available for public disclosure if—

"(A) the Secretary of the Treasury makes an affirmative finding on a shipment-by-shipment basis that disclosure is likely to pose a threat of personal injury or property damage; or

"(B) the information is exempt under the provisions of section 552(b)(1) of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury, in order to allow for the timely dissemination and publication of the information listed in paragraph (1), shall establish procedures to provide access to manifests. Such procedures shall include provisions for adequate protection against the public disclosure of information not available for public disclosure from such manifests.".

SEC. 3. OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

Section 141(f)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "$11,100,000 for fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "$14,179,000 for fiscal year 1985"; and

(2) by striking out "$65,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$68,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 5188, as amended, presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5188, a bill authorizing fiscal year 1985 appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), the U.S. Customs Service, and the U.S. Trade Representative.

The bill as amended by the committee authorizes $28,410,000 for the fiscal year 1985 appropriation to the International Trade Commission, the amount requested by the Commission, and authorizes the use of funds for rental of conference space in the District of Columbia and minimal representation funds. This amount represents an increase of $6.3 million over that appropriated for fiscal year 1984, largely to fund the planned relocation and consolidation of the Commission and to add an additional 44 full-time permanent positions to strengthen the Commission's ability to carry out its statutory responsibilities.

Because of the Commission's unique charter as an independent, quasi-judicial body to resolve trade disputes and render important determinations under various U.S. trade laws, Congress has provided that the agency's budget be submitted directly to us rather than subject to control by OMB. The process has worked very well, and the agency has a well-deserved reputation for presenting lean, responsible budget requests. This year's request is no exception. The Commission has had a dramatic increase both in caseload and congressional and Presidental requests for special studies and factfinding investigations due to growing trade problems. Further, the Commission will experience substantial relocation expenses as a result of pending legislation to transfer its building to the Smithsonian Institution. The committee therefore believes this funding level is essential to meet the Commission's needs.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes $686,399,000 in appropriations for the U.S. Customs Service for fiscal year 1985. This amount represents an increase of $84 million over the amount requested by the President, which

would have required a reduction in force of 954 customs inspectors, import specialists, and other personnel and a reduction in Customs' funding of the air interdiction program.

This authorization level will not only restore these cuts, but will provide sufficient funds for Customs to hire additional personnel to cope with the growing workload of passengers and cargo and to operate and maintain the Customs air program. The total amount authorized by the bill for the air program is $28.1 million.

The committee is concerned about the adverse impact that increasing illegal imports are having on the American public, and is concerned that Customs effectively enforce U.S. trade law. This budget, together with continuing active committee oversight, will provide the foundation for such enforcement.

The bill, as amended by the committee, also limits to $11 million the amount of authorized funds which Customs may expend for the implementation of Operation Exodus and other export enforcement programs. The committee believes that the amount authorized will be sufficient to operate an effective program in conjunction with other agencies having jurisdiction over the administration and enforcement of export control laws.

The committee also amended the bill to preclude any proposed final rule revising or eliminating sureties on customs bonds from taking effect until 90 calendar days after Customs' submission of a report to Congress.

In addition, the bill places a $25,000 cap on the amount that customs inspectors can earn in overtime pay, but permits the Commissioner of Customs to waive this limitation under certain circumstances.

The committee also adopted an amendment to provide for public disclosure of certain import manifest information.

Finally, section 3 of the bill, as amended, authorizes $14,179,000 for the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) for fiscal year 1985, the amount requested by the agency.

These three agencies are central to U.S. trade policy development and its administration. The Subcommittee on Trade which I chair, and the full Committee on Ways and Means maintain close and continual oversight of their activities. As in past years, we have reviewed their budget requests in depth and have approved authorization levels for fiscal 1985 which are lean yet adequate to insure they get their essential jobs done.

We strongly believe adequate funding for these agencies is essential as international trade continues to grow in volume and in importance to the U.S. economy. The need for effective enforcement of our trade laws by the Customs Service has never been greater than it is today. An increase in Customs manpower and an improved management philosophy in the allocation of its resources is essential to protect American business, workers, and consumers from the enormous increase in counterfeit imports and other forms of unfair trade. Mr. Speaker, we need a tough, well-financed Customs Service with the training and expertise to regulate properly the huge flow of goods through our ports. We have worked closely with the business community and with many of our colleagues here in the House who want to see a more effective Customs Service. Adequate funding to handle our growing trade problems is absolutely essential, and therefore, I urge your support of H.R. 5188, as reported by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the authorization bill we are considering today provides separately for the level of funding for three agencies as required by law. In fiscal year 1985, the Ways and Means Committee has recommended $686.4 million for the U.S. Customs Service, $28.4 million for the International Trade Commission, and $14.2 million for the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

Except for the Customs Service, these funds represent the amounts requested by the administration to cover spending needs for the next fiscal year. The authorized amount for the Customs Service is $84 million above the administration's request and more than 11 percent higher than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1984 for this agency.

Because of the increased authorization for the Customs Service, the administration is opposed to H.R. 5188. The administration has asked that the bill not be considered under suspension of the rules, but that amendments be allowed to bring spending levels down, not only to the administration's request but also to the guidelines of the first concurrent budget resolution approved only 2 weeks ago. Of course, the authorization bill for these three agencies has traditionally been approved quickly without much debate or amendment. It is also true that the annual authorization bill is often ignored by the Senate authorizing committee and by both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The result has been that the funding for these three agencies is approved quite independently from what we do today. During the last Congress, for example, the fiscal year 1984 authorization bill was finally agreed to by both Houses during the last hour of the last day of the session, far behind the appropriations process. One of the principal reasons this happens, in my view, is that we are not thoughtful or responsible about the funding increases we attempt to authorize.

The amount authorized for the Customs Service provides for 650 new positions next year, including additional customs inspectors, import specialists and customs patrol officers. At a time when tremendous efforts are being made to curb the mounting budget deficit, it is unrealistic to expect to achieve personnel increases that cannot be justified. Costly automation and other computerized equipment has been installed over the last few years and this, coupled with consolidation efforts that have been and will continue to be implemented, caused the administration to request fewer employees for this agency.

The Customs Service has important responsibilities, such as drug enforcement and monitoring of programs involving sensitive imports such as textiles, that will test its resources in fiscal year 1985. I hope that as we proceed with the appropriations process and as the Senate considers the authorization for this agency, we can work with the administration to find an acceptable level of funding. The resource needs of an agency with revenue raising functions should be met realistically, yet we cannot ignore the fiscal restraints of the budget process.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can approve H.R. 5188 today, and that we will continue to work toward a lower buget deficit as the process continues.

□ 1210

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PEASE).

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to support this bill and, in particular, to call attention to one section which would allow, or indeed require, certain information about imports coming into this country to be available for publishing by journals which are in the business of doing this sort of thing. The same provision was passed in our authorization bill last year. Unfortunately, that authorization bill never became law. So the subcommittee has seen fit to try again by putting the same language in this year's authorization bill.

Essentially, we are trying to help American companies, American ports, American importers to do a better job in some cases of competing with imports by making this information available to them on a routine basis through publishing houses.

There are ample provisions in the section to protect the proprietary interest of shippers and importers if they so make that request, but it would not be a blanket exemption from disclosure that would go on and

on and on. It would have to be renewed at least every 2 years.

I think this amendment strikes a proper balance between disclosure of information which may be helpful to American companies and importers and manufacturers and port authorities at the same time that it protects the confidentiality of the shippers on those occasions when confidentiality is called for.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure for two reasons. The first concern that I have is that this authorization is above the budget recommendation of the President. The extra money that the committee has seen fit to put in this bill is unnecessary and is not spent in the right place.

The second reason that I am concerned about this measure is that it ignores the previously expressed will of this House that the Soviet Union be condemned and penalized for its continued use of forced, slave labor in its concentration camps to manufacture goods that are imported by the United States.

There has been a great deal of documented proof that the use of slave labor is a fact and that it includes products that we buy here in America. I can think of no more repulsive idea than the thought that American citizens are supporting the continuation of slave camps and the forced repression of political dissidents by buying goods that these prisoners are tortured to produce. The American people have not been adequately told of this barbaric practice by the Soviets and the Commerce Department has not been given adequate incentive and funds to properly deal with these illicit goods.

I was a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 100 last year which passed this House and I am a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 277 which would give the Commerce Department strong support in their efforts to refuse slave produced goods as they come into this country. I feel that this bill should include the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 277 and that the extra spending it entails should be removed or at least shifted to enforcement of the law of the United States of America to refuse to import products manufactured with slave labor.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the development of this legislation, the Committee on Ways and Means heard testimony from many Members of Congress. One of the Members who testified before us was the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. During the testimony of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), certain questions were raised and I responded to those questions, and I responded in writing. I am including at this point in the RECORD the questions and the responses:

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding and wish to congratulate him and his subcommittee for a very important first step in the restoration of the ability of the U.S. Customs Service to police our trade laws. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Commerce Committee which I Chair has thus far held 7 days of hearings on the impact of illegal and unfair foreign trade practices on interstate commerce. Our investigation demonstrated conclusively that American businesses and American jobs are being decimated by the illegal entry of goods into the United States. Even more important, the health and safety of American consumers are being threatened by a flood of piratical counterfeits from offshore sources. Despite an exceptionally dedicated group of civil servants which man our ports, foreign suppliers continue to scoff at our laws and threaten the economic and physical well-being of millions of American citizens.

The increase in the Customs budget to $686.4 million contained in H.R. 5188 is an important first step toward the full and fair enforcement of our laws. There are, however, a few points of clarification that I would like to discuss with the gentleman. Is it true that this bill would authorize about 650 new positions including 450 customs inspectors, 150 import specialists and 50 customs patrol officers, and would further specify that because of the growing importance of commercial fraud work, the Commissioner of Customs should assign these new positions to port facilities evidencing high potential growth in trade activity?

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman for his kind words regarding the work of the Subcommittee on Trade on this bill. The budget level of $686.4 million for the Customs Service in fiscal year 1985 represents an increase of $84 million over that requested by the administration. In addition to restoring the administration's proposed cuts of about 954 Customs positions as well as cuts in other services, this budget would provide the necessary funds to create an additional 650 positions. We believe that this budget will provide the Customs Service with sufficient resources to effectively enforce our customs and trade laws and substantially reduce the number of illegal and counterfeit imports which are entering this country.

The report accompanying H.R. 5188 indicates that a portion of the increased funding is intended to fund about 650 new positions, including some 450 customs inspectors, 150 import specialists and 50 customs patrol officers. Recognizing the growing importance of commercial fraud work, the Commissioner of Customs is urged to assign the new personnel to port facilities evidencing high potential growth in trade activity.

Mr. DINGELL. Let me say at the outset that I believe that these new positions are sorely needed to combat this massive problem of Customs fraud; however, the bill does not fund any new positions for Customs agents. Is that correct?

Mr. GIBBONS. That is correct. However, in our view, the most effective utilization of Customs' resources in curtailing fraudulent importations is to provide a sufficient number of import specialists, inspectors and patrol officers at the ports to detect the importation of illegal goods and prevent their release into U.S. commerce. Generally, customs agents do not get involved in a transaction until after the merchandise is released and frequently the damage has already been done to U.S. industry by the time their investigation is complete.

We believe the increased manpower at the ports will reduce the burden on customs agents. However, we will continue to review the situation and, if warranted, will consider further changes to improve the effectiveness of the Customs' fraud program.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it the intention of the Ways and Means Committee to encourage the Customs Service to continue its commercial fraud efforts and to increase these efforts where needed?

Mr. GIBBONS. Absolutely. The Ways and Means Committee places a high priority on the effective enforcement of our commercial trade laws. We are very concerned about the devastating impact that counterfeit and other illegal imports are having on U.S. companies, workers, and consumers, and will continue our active oversight role to insure that the Customs Service uses it resources in the most efficient and effective manner to enforce U.S. trade laws and protect American industry from illegal imports.

Mr. DINGELL. It is clear from our hearing record that additional customs agents need to be assigned abroad. As many as 50 may be needed to identify sources of counterfeit goods and investigate the possible violations of our textile, steel, and other agreements. Does the gentleman believe that to be reasonable?

Mr. GIBBONS. Your proposal to assign additional customs agents abroad to identify sources of counterfeit goods and investigate possible violations of U.S. trade law is an excellent one. As I said earlier, the best way to protect U.S. industry from the adverse effects of illegal imports is to discover such violations before the goods are released from Customs' custody. Your proposal would help accomplish this result and substantially increase the effectiveness of the Customs fraud program.

Mr. DINGELL. Given the failure of the Customs Service to maintain any presence in Taiwan, the counterfeiting capital of the world, and most other trouble spots in Southeast Asia, would the gentlemen agree that the Customs Service should maintain an effective presence in Taiwan and other parts of the Third World where transshipment of textiles and apparel in violation of our agreements and active theft of American intellectual property are occurring?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes; it seems to me that Customs could more effectively enforce U.S. trade laws and protect American industry from counterfeit and other illegal imports by identifying and maintaining an effective presence in those countries where substantial illegal exports to the United States are likely to occur.

Mr. DINGELL. We have found that the management philosophy of the U.S. Customs Service in the utilization of its customs agents emphasizes narcotics and contraband interdiction at the expense of commercial fraud investigations. Only about 118 of Customs' 932 agents now spend most of their time investigating commercial fraud. Given the magnitude of this problem, would the gentlemen agree that the specific assignment of 50 additional agents to special com-

mercial fraud task forces in district offices around the United States, together with sufficient support in the regional offices and in the Customs Fraud Center at headquarters would help Customs to maintain an effective an ongoing presence to deal with these problems?

Mr. GIBBONS. I share your concern about the management philosophy of the U.S. Customs Service which seems to deemphasize the importance of commercial fraud investigations in the Customs mission.

I strongly believe that this shortsighted management philosophy must be changed if we are to see effective Customs' enforcement of our trade laws and I agree that your proposal of creating special commercial fraud task forces would be a step in the right direction. Until this underlying management philosophy of the Customs Service is changed, however, no such program can be completely effective. Through our oversight function, the Committee on Ways and Means, therefore, intends to take a very active role to see that the Commissioner of Customs and the Customs Service change that philosophy and recognize the importance of effective Customs' enforcement of our trade laws to the continued viability of U.S. industry.

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 5188 which authorizes $686.4 million for the U.S. Customs Service.

The flow of counterfeit goods into the United States has reached epidemic proportions. In order to evade U.S. customs laws, illegitimate foreign manufacturers will go to great lengths to smuggle their goods into our lucrative markets. These activities are not merely violations of law. In addition to depriving Americans of their jobs, they deprive U.S. businesses of the capital needed to expand and develop new products. Furthermore, in many instances, such goods can even result in danger to the American consumer.

The Commerce Department announced on Friday that textile and apparel imports totaled a record $4.7 billion for the first 3 months of the year, up 53 percent over the same period for 1983, while exports declined 2 percent to $788 million.

The American Textile Manufacturers Institute has projected that the industry's trade deficit for 1984 could reach $15.5 billion, a 48-percent increase over last year's record $10.6 billion deficit.

As alarming as the import figures may be, they remain but the tip of the iceberg. They represent huge increases despite the bilateral agreements entered into between this country and 26 foreign countries governing the levels of imports of textile products into the United States. These additional imports mean more work for an already overworked Customs Service.

The hearings conducted by the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of the House Energy and Commerce Committee exposed a number of methods by which textile import fraud is committed, including transshipment to nonquota countries, counterfeiting of textile export visas, false declarations of shipment value or quantity, and outright misrepresentations of textile categories.

The witnesses included a number of import specialists and inspectors with the U.S. Customs Service (USCS). Although these individuals are knowledgeable and dedicated, they lack the resources and authority to move aggressively against import quota violations. The testimony received demonstrated that even when a particular shipment contains illegal goods, there is less than a one in three chance that the shipment can be identified and seized at our border. This is astonishing.

We also learned that the practice of "port shopping" is widespread within the industry. Those seeking to smuggle counterfeit goods or to evade import quotas may shop around for suitable ports within the United States through which to channel their goods. This situation exists because of inadequate staffing, commitments to scrutinize other commodities or through unfamiliarity with textile classifications.

Significant progress has been made in detecting illegal shipments under Operations Tripwire, a commercial fraud investigating unit formed within the U.S. Customs Service. Commercial fraud cases are difficult to investigate, however, and we learned from the Energy and Commerce hearings, criminal and civil penalties are often too lenient or inadequate to provide an effective deterrent to those who wish to evade our trade laws.

We need to bolster the resources available to the U.S. Customs Service in order to provide relief to the hundreds, if not thousands, of American workers whose jobs are placed in jeopardy through fraudulent import practices. This increase in funding in H.R. 5188 will allow the service to hire 450 additional Customs Inspectors, 150 import specialists and 50 patrol officers.

For every dollar the Service spends, it has been estimated that the return is $20. Given the trade problems facing this country, this additional funding is both justified and necessary.●

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5188, the authorization bill for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

Specifically, my interest in this legislation comes from a region on the international border and my position as chairman of the Congressional Border Caucus. I commend the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade for recognizing the shortcomings of the administration's budget proposals for fiscal year 1985, in which funding for personnel in the Customs Service was severely cut, and the customs air interdiction program, the border's last line of defense in the war on drugs in the air, was practically eliminated.

In fiscal year 1984, the administration reduced the personnel of the U.S. Customs Service by 2,000 positions. Fortunately in a compromise between the House and the Senate, that reduction was scaled back to only 400 positions. This bill would not only reestablish the lost 400 positions but would also provide the authority for an additional 250 positions. This measure is needed not only to continue current service levels which Customs must provide but to also match the increase in border traffic and activity. Furthermore, faced with a devastating economy in our region, border area businesses cannot afford delays in transfers of goods and services between our Nation's border due to the lack of adequate personnel. This impedes our Nation's productivity and economy as a whole.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the section of the bill which deals with the consideration of the consolidation of border inspection activities between the Customs Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Although the committee praised the administration for proposing such a consolidation of passenger clearance in order to strengthen law enforcement and provide cost efficiency and budgetary savings, the committee should carefully monitor such a move. This is more than a steamlining of the primary inspection functions of the Federal Government. While the committee reasserts its commitment to the jurisdiction of the Customs Service in the area of inspection and clearance of commercial importations at all ports, it should be wary of any administration attempts which could be construed as simple consolidations but in actuality are attempts to reorganize the Government in a way to merge the Customs Service with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, two very different agencies, with two very different functions and missions.●

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5188, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN TUNA LICENSING ACT OF 1984

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5147) to implement the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, signed in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 15, 1983, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Eastern Pacific Tuna Licensing Act of 1984".

SEC 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Agreement" means the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, signed in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 15, 1983.

(2) The term "Agreement Area" means the area within a perimeter determined as follows: From the point on the mainland where the parallel of 40 degrees north latitude intersects the coast westward along the parallel of 40 degrees north latitude to 40 degrees north latitude by 125 degrees west longitude, thence southerly along the meridian of 125 degrees west longitude to 20 degrees north latitude by 125 degrees west longitude, thence easterly along the parallel of 20 degrees north latitude to 20 degrees north latitude by 120 degrees west longitude, thence southerly along the meridian of 120 degrees west longitude to 5 degrees north latitude by 120 degrees west longitude, thence easterly along the parallel of 5 degrees north latitude to 5 degrees north latitude by 110 degrees west longitude, thence southerly along the meridian of 110 degrees west longitude to 10 degrees south latitude by 110 degrees west longitude, thence easterly along the parallel of 10 degrees south latitude to 10 degrees south latitude by 90 degrees west longitude, thence southerly along the meridian of 90 degrees west longitude to 30 degrees south latitude by 90 degrees west longitude, thence easterly along the parallel of 30 degrees south latitude to the point on the mainland where the parallel intersects the coast; but the Agreement Area does not include the zones within twelve nautical miles of the baseline from which the breadth of territorial sea is measured and the zones within two hundred nautical miles of the baselines of Coastal States not signatories to the Agreement, measured from the same baseline.

(3) The term "designated species of tuna" means yellowfin tuna, Thunnus albacares (Bonnaterre, 1788); bigeye tuna, Thunnus obesus (Lowe, 1839); albacore tuna, Thunnus alalunga (Bonnaterre, 1788); northern bluefin tuna, Thunnus thynnus (Linnaeus, 1758); southern bluefin tuna, Thunnus maccoyil (Castelnau, 1872); skipjack tuna, Katsuwonus pelamis (Linnaeus, 1578); black skipjack, Euthynnus Lineatus (Kishinouye, 1920); kawakawa, Euthynnus affinis (Cantor, 1849); bullet tuna, Auxis rochei (Risso, 1810), frigate tuna, Ausix thazard (Lacepede, 1800); eastern Pacific bonito, Sarda chiliensis (Cuvier in Cuvier and Valenciennes, 1831); and Indo-Pacific bonito, Sarda orientalis (Temminck and Schlegel, 1844).

(4) The term "Council" means the body consisting of the representatives from each Contracting Party to the Agreement which is a Coastal State of the eastern Pacific Ocean or a member of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission at the time of entry into force of the Agreement.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES REPRESENTATION ON THE COUNCIL.

(a) The Secretary of State—

(1) shall appoint a United States representative to the Council; and

(2) may appoint not more than three alternate United States representatives to the Council.

(b) An individual is not eligible for appointment as, or to serve as, the United States representative under subsection (a)(1) unless the individual is an officer or employee of the United States Government.

(c) An individual is not entitled to compensation for serving as the United States representative or an alternate United States representative.

(d) While away from home or a regular place of business in the performance of service as the United States representative or an alternate United States representative, an individual is entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistance, in the same manner as individuals employed intermittently in Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. SECRETARY OF STATE TO ACT FOR THE UNITED STATES.

The Secretary of State shall receive, on behalf of the United States Government, reports, requests, recommendations and other communications of the Council, and, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall act directly thereon or by reference to the appropriate authorities.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) Notwithstanding section 4 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1874), such Act applies with respect to a seizure by a Contracting Party to the Agreement of a vessel of the United States within the Agreement Area for violation of the Agreement if the Secretary of State determines that the violation is not of such seriousness as to diminish the effectiveness of the Agreement.

(b) The seizure by a Contracting Party to the Agreement of a vessel of the United States shall not be considered to be a seizure described in section 205(a)(4)(C) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1825(a)(4)(C)) if the seizure is consistent with the Agreement.

SEC. 6. DISPOSITION OF FEES.

All fees accruing to the United States under Article III of the Agreement shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 7. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and objectives of the Agreement and this Act. Regulations may be made applicable as necessary to all persons and vessels subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, wherever located. Regulations concerning the conservation of a designated species of tuna may be issued only to implement conservation recommendations made by the Council under Article 3(d) of the Agreement.

SEC. 8. PROHIBITED ACTS.

(a) It is unlawful for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—

(1) to engage in fishing for a designated species of tuna within the Agreement Area unless issued a license under the Agreement authorizing such fishing;

(2) to engage in fishing for a designated species of tuna within the Agreement area in contravention of regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce under the Agreement;

(3) knowingly to ship, transport, purchase, sell, offer for sale, export, or have in custody, possession, or control any designated species of tuna taken or retained in violation of regulations issued under section 7;

(4) to fail to make, keep, or furnish any catch return, statistical record, or other report required by regulations issued under section 7;

(5) being a person in charge of a vessel of the United States, to fail to stop upon being hailed by an authorized official of the United States, or to refuse to permit officials of the United States to board the vessel or inspect its catch, equipment, books, documents, records, or other articles, or to question individuals on board; or

(6) to import from any country, in violation of any regulation issued under section 7, any designated species of tuna.

(b) Any person who is convicted of violating—

(1) subsection (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) shall be fined or assessed a civil penalty not more than $25,000, and for a subsequent violation shall be fined or assessed a civil penalty not more than $50,000;

(2) subsection (a)(4) or (a)(5) shall be fined or assessed a civil penalty not more than $5,000, and for a subsequent violation shall be fined or assessed a civil penalty not more than $5,000; or

(3) subsection (a)(6) shall be fined or assessed a civil penalty not more $100,000.

(c) All designated species of tuna taken or retained in violation of subsection (a)(1)(2), (3), or (6), or the monetary value thereof, is subject to forfeiture.

(d) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of a cargo for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such cargo or the proceeds from the sale thereof, and the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under this Act, insofar as such provisions of law are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 9. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) The judges of the United States district courts and United States magistrates may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue such warrants or other process as may be required for enforcement of this Act and the regulations issued under section 7.

(b) The enforcement of this Act and the regulations issued under section 7 shall be the joint responsibility of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Department of Commerce, and the United States Customs Service. In addition, the Secretary of Commerce may designate officers and employees of the States of the United States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and of American Samoa to carry out enforcement activities under this section. When so designated, such officers

and employees may function as Federal law enforcement agents for these purposes.

(c) An individual authorized to carry out enforcement activities under this section has power to execute any warrant or process issued by any officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Act.

(d) An individual so authorized to carry out enforcement activities under this section has power—

(1) with or without a warrant or other process, to arrest any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States at any place within the jurisdiction of the United States committing in his presence or view a violation of this Act or the regulations issued under section 7;

(2) with or without a warrant or other process, to search any vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and, if as a result of the search he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel or any individual on board is engaging in operations in violation of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder to arrest such person.

(e) An individual authorized to enforce this Act may seize, whenever or wherever lawfully found, all species of designated tuna taken or retained in violation of this Act or the regulations issued under section 7. Any species so seized may be disposed of pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, under subsection (f) of this section or, if perishable, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of Commerce.

(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2464 of title 28, United States Code, when a warrant of arrest or other process in rem is issued in any cause under this section, the marshal or other officer shall stay the execution of such process, or discharge any species of designated tuna seized if the process has been levied, on receiving from the claimant of the species a bond or stipulation for the value of the property with sufficient surety to be approved by a judge of the district court having jurisdiction of the offense, conditioned to deliver the species seized, if condemned, without impairment in value or, in the discretion of the court, to pay its equivalent value in money or otherwise to answer the decree of the court in such cause. Such bond or stipulation shall be returned to the court and judgment thereon against both the principal and sureties may be recovered in event of any breach of the conditions thereof as determined by the court. In the discretion of the accused, and subject to the direction of the court, the species may be sold for not less than its reasonable market value and the proceeds of such sale placed in the registry of the court pending judgment in the case.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years after fiscal year 1984 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is H.R. 5147, the Eastern Pacific Tuna Licensing Act of 1984 which was reported unanimously by our committee on April 4, 1984. Briefly stated, the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, which this legislation implements, is the latest international agreement through which the United States has manifested its consistent position that tuna, because of their highly migratory nature, can only be effectively managed and conserved through regional, international cooperation.

From 1950 to 1978, the tuna fisheries in the eastern Pacific region were successfully managed under the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) despite the fact that several parties to the Commission held markedly different positions regarding the juridical status of the resource. During the early 1970's, however, these differing views, in combination with the rapid emergence of 200-mile fishery conservation zones and the development of more sophisticated tuna fleets, led to a desire to replace the IATTC with a new convention.

When renegotiation efforts became completely deadlocked in 1980, Mexico and Costa Rica, which claimed coastal state competence to unilaterally manage tuna within their resource zones, began to enforce their claimed jurisdiction. The resulting seizures of U.S. tuna vessels led the United States to impose a moratorium on the imports of tuna from these nations in 1980.

The Reagan administration made the negotiation of a new agreement a high priority during 1981 and 1982. Although the negotiations did not involve Mexico, Costa Rica fully participated and during that period ceased its active seizure of U.S. tuna vessels. On November 12, 1982, an ad referendum agreement with Costa Rica was achieved and consequently, in February 1983, the embargo of that nation's tuna products was discontinued.

On March 15, 1983, the United States and Costa Rica and Panama signed the Eastern Pacific Tuna Fishing Agreement in San Jose, Costa Rica. Since that time, Guatemala and Honduras have signed the accord. The inclusion of other Central and South American countries is being sought by the State Department.

Briefly, the agreement creates an international authority to issue regional licenses for fishing tuna in a broad area of the eastern Pacific Ocean. License fees are to be distributed among the participating coastal states in proportion to the amount of tuna taken within 200 miles of each party's coast. These fees will also be used to pay for the international administration of the agreement. The agreement also contains provisions for the adoption of conservation recommendations when all significant tuna fishing nations become parties and a comprehensive convention is eventually concluded.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the agreement does not compromise the juridical positions of any party and represents an equitable balance between the interests of the coastal States and distant-water fishing nations. It thus furthers U.S. fisheries policy objectives while reducing tensions that have arisen as a result of conflicting juridical claims. As such, the new agreement should end the cycle of seizures of U.S. tuna vessels and the subsequent imposition of retaliatory U.S. embargoes on foreign imports. The Senate gave its consent to ratify the agreement by a vote of 100 to 0 on July 27, 1983, and the agreement was ratified by the United States on September 6, 1983, by President Reagan. I, therefore, strongly recommend that the House favorably consider this legislation which merely implements this agreement for the United States.

□ 1220

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support of H.R. 5147, a bill to implement the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement.

The agreement was signed on March 15, 1983, by the United States, Costa Rica, and Panama, and subsequently by Guatemala and Honduras. It will enter into force when signed and ratified by five coastal states of the eastern Pacific region. Upon entry into force, the Council established by the agreement will make available international licenses to fish tuna in the agreement area. License fees will be disbursed among the coastal state parties to the agreement in proportion to the catches of tuna in their respective 200-mile zones. Fees will also be used to pay for administration of the agreement. When all major tuna fishing nations become parties to this agreement, the Council can adopt conservation recommendations to be based on studies provided by the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). After this regime is established, the IATTC will be superseded.

Most nations along the coast of the eastern Pacific Ocean claim sovereign rights over tuna in their 200-mile zones. However, in accordance with the Fishery Conservation and Management Act (FCMA), and the Presidential proclamation of March 10, 1983,

establishing the U.S. exclusive economic zone, the United States does not claim or recognize coastal state sovereign rights or jurisdiction over migratory tuna beyond 12 miles from the coasts. The United States maintains that this resource can be managed effectively only by international agreement, not by the unilateral actions of coastal states.

The agreement does not compromise the formal juridical positions of the United States or the other parties. It represents an equitable balance between the interests of coastal states and distant-water fishing nations. Thus, the agreement can serve as a model for regional tuna licensing agreements in other areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting H.R. 5147.

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5147, is the implementing legislation for the recently concluded and ratified Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, signed in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 15, 1983. This agreement has been signed by the countries of Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, Costa Rica, and the United States. This international agreement stems from the unsatisfactory status of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Agreement which has been plagued by discord among the participating nations. The successful implementation of this agreement will buttress the longstanding U.S. position that tuna can only be managed effectively by international accord.

This legislation is supported by the administration and, to my knowledge, is noncontroversial. It merely implements and authorizes appropriations for U.S. participation in this international tuna management regime.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported this bill by unanimous voice vote.

I strongly support this effort to resolve some of the difficulties facing our tuna industry and urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 5147.●

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4147, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AUTHORIZATIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1985, 1986, AND 1987

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4585) to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality and the Council on Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4585

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205 of the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4374(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(d) $480,000 for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1985, 1986, and 1987".

SEC. 2. The Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4371–4374) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"OFFICE MANAGEMENT FUND

"SEC. 206. (a) There is established an Office of Environmental Quality Management Fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'Fund') to receive advance payments from other agencies or accounts that may be used solely to finance—

"(1) study contracts that are jointly sponsored by the Office and one or more other Federal agencies; and

"(2) Federal interagency environmental projects (including task forces) in which the Office participates.

"(b) Any study contract or project that is to be financed under subsection (a) may be initiated only with the approval of the Director.

"(c) The Director shall promulgate regulations setting forth policies and procedures for operation of the Fund."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4585 is a bill which authorizes appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was created by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1969. The Council, which operates within the Executive Office of the President, consists of three members. The Council members are responsible for advising the President on environmental matters, monitoring the status of the environment, reviewing Federal programs and policies for consistency with NEPA, and providing information to the public on environmental matters. The Council has a continuing authorization of $1 million annually under NEPA.

In 1970, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act established the Office of Environmental Quality (OEQ). The Office consists of staff personnel, currently numbering seven full-time employees, who provide support and advice to the Council. The existing authorization for the Office of Environmental Quality expires at the end of fiscal year 1984.

A hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment on February 2, 1984, in regard to the performance and funding requirements of CEQ and its OEQ support staff. On April 11, 1984, H.R. 4585 was reported by the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4585 would provide an authorization level of $480,000 annually for fiscal years 1985 through 1987 for operation of the Office of Environmental Quality. This authorization, together with the continuing $1 million annual authorization for the Council, would provide an authorized annual funding level for the Council and their staff of $1.48 million for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987. In addition, H.R. 4585 would create a management fund to finance joint studies and projects involving the Council on Environmental Quality and other entities. This fund, which would replace the current consolidated working fund, would provide greater accountability to the Congress and OMB. Creation of this fund is supported by both the administration and by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Council on Environmental Quality and their staff have served an important function in advising the President and White House staff on environmental issues. I encourage the administration to take greater advantage of the Council's potential contributions in the future. I am confident that the members will continue to support the role of the Council on Environmental Quality through this reauthorization legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4585 reauthorizes the Environmental Quality Improvement Act by providing $480,000 for each of fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987. The Environmental Quality Improvement Act established the Office of Environmental Quality to provide professional and administrative staff and support for the Council on Environmental Quality. I believe that the reauthorization will, in conjunction with the $1 million permanent authorization for the Council on Environmental Quality, provide the funding levels necessary to carry out the congressionally mandated duties of the Council.

H.R. 4585 also establishes an Office of Environmental Quality Management Fund to be used to finance jointly funded study contracts and interagency environmental projects in which the Office participates. The establishment of this fund will provide improved accountability for the funding of these types of projects.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation.

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is H.R. 4585, a reauthorization of appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality (OEQ) which is an adjunct of the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ).

This legislation reauthorizes OEQ at the rate of $480,000, per year through fiscal year 1987, and also establishes an Office of Environmental Quality Management Fund. The increased authorization and management fund were requested by the administration. The $480,000 is in addition to the continuing appropriation for CEQ in the amount of $1 million annually contained in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

CEQ was created by NEPA for the purposes of advising the President on environmental issues, reviewing Federal programs for consistency with the standards of NEPA, and monitoring the status of the environment. OEQ was created by the Environmental Quality Improvement Act to provide staff and support for the Council.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported this measure, as amended, by a unanimous-voice vote.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 4585, so that CEQ can continue its important role as overseer of the National Environmental Policy Act and counselor to the President on environmental issues.●

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4585, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF EDWIN B. FORSYTHE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 537) designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 537

Whereas, Congressman Edwin B. Forsythe, in his role as Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, was an outstanding leader for conservation of our natural resources and protection of our Nation's natural beauty;

Whereas, during his career he played a critical role in such important natural resource legislation such as the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976;

Whereas, he was the major Congressional sponsor of the Nongame Wildlife Act, which increased public interest and concern for species of wildlife not subject to taking for sport;

Whereas, throughout his Congressional career, he was a strong defender of the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas, he had a deep affection for the coastal wildlife refuges in his home State of New Jersey: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge and the Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge in the State of New Jersey shall hereafter be collectively named and designated as the "Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to either of such refuges shall be held to be a reference to the "Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1984, we lost a good friend and colleague in Ed Forsythe of New Jersey. Ed served for 13 years with great distinction and will be remembered by all of us for his kindness, his quiet but effective work on legislation, and the dignity and sense of decency he brought to all of his endeavors.

A dairy farmer and small town businessman, he began his government career in 1948 as secretary of the Moorestown, N.J., Board of Adjustment. He was elected to the Moorestown Township Committee in 1953 and served as mayor from 1957 to 1962 when he became chairman of the township planning board, a post he held through 1963. He was elected to the New Jersey Senate in 1964, where he became in succession, assistant minority leader, minority leader, senate president and president pro tempore. One of his many accomplishments in the Senate was sponsorship and passage of legislation creating a statewide grand jury, which for the first time gave State law enforcement officials the tools to adequately pursue and prosecute organized crime and official corruption. He was first elected to Congress on November 2, 1970, to fill the unexpired term of Hon. William T. Cahill in the 91st Congress and a full 2-year term in the 92d Congress.

Ed was ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee from the 94th Congress on. He was a strong and effective voice for natural resource legislation during his tenure on the committee, playing a critical role in the passage of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. He was the prime author of the Nongame Act, which has increased the attention given the many species of wildlife in this country that are not hunted.

In January 1983, he became ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. In addition to his role as ranking minority member of the committee and subcommittee, he also served as a member of the Standards of Official Conduct Committee, the Republican Committee on Committees, and the Republican Personnel Committee.

This joint resolution would name the Brigantine and Barnegat Refuges in New Jersey for Ed Forsythe. He was always a strong supporter of the National Wildlife Refuge System and had a deep affection for the refuges in his home State. It was cosponsored by my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, in whose district the refuge is located, along with the entire New Jersey delegation and the entire membership of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, as well as a number of other Members.

I would like the record to include the list of names of all of the cosponsors of the legislation. Along with myself and Mr. HUGHES, they include: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MINISH, Mr. COURTER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LENT, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DYSON, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FISH, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. SHAW.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more appropriate tribute to our friend nor one that he would have appreciated more. I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the words just spoken of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

Mr. Speaker, Ed Forsythe served in the House of Representatives for almost 14 years. Although a quiet and gentle person, Ed was able to forge consensus on nearly every issue in which he was actively involved. His contribution to the protection of our Nation's fish and wildlife resources and environmental quality have been numerous and will be longstanding.

Since his death on March 29 of this year, the many kind remarks of his colleagues and others who have dealt with Ed here in the U.S. Congress and in his home State of New Jersey have, in a small way, eased the sadness felt by his family, friends, and staff.

House Joint Resolution 537 which renames the Barnegat and Brigantine National Wildlife Refuges after Edwin B. Forsythe is an especially fitting tribute to the man and his work. A strong supporter of the national wildlife refuge system in general, Ed had a particular fondness for these two important units on the Atlantic flyway. The renaming of these units will provide a constant reminder of his contributions.

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 537, legislation which will rename two units of the national wildlife refuge system to honor a great statesman who died on March 29, 1984, Congressman Ed Forsythe.

He served in the House with great distinction for 13 years, and will be remembered by all for his leadership in environmental legislation.

Naming this refuge after him is a uniquely fitting tribute and one which I believe he would have greatly appreciated.

I strongly urge all the Members of the House of Representatives to vote for passage of this legislation.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 537, to designate the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the national wildlife refuge system as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge. Indeed, this is a most fitting tribute to our dear friend and colleague, Ed Forsythe, who was a tireless supporter of efforts to improve our national wildlife refuge system.

Ed Forsythe has been an inspiration to all of us in his efforts to promote an effective policy for the conservation of our natural resources and protection of our Nation's natural beauty. As this resolution underscores, he had a deep affection for the coastal wildlife refuges in his home State of New Jersey. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that this body recognizes his dedication to this Nation's precious natural resources, and designate the Brigantine and Barnegat National Wildlife Refuges in the State of New Jersey as the "Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge."●

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 537.

The question was taken.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1240

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONS TO BON SECOUR NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4921) to provide for the selection of additional lands for inclusion within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4921

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to establish the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge", approved June 9, 1980 (16 U.S.C. 668dd note), is amended—

(1) by amending section 2 by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively, and by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

"(1) the term 'additional selection area' means those lands and waters in Baldwin County, Alabama, depicted on the map entitled 'Proposed Addition to the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge' dated February 1984 and on file at the United States Fish and Wildlife Service."; and

(2) by amending section 3—

(A) by amending that portion of such section that precedes subsection (a)(2) to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) SELECTION.—(1) The Secretary shall—

"(A) within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, designate approximately ten thousand acres of land and water within the selection area as land which the Secretary considers appropriate for the refuge; and

"(B) within six months after the date of the enactment of the 1984 amendment to this subsection—

"(i) designate approximately two thousand acres of land and water within the ad-

ditional selection area as land which the Secretary considers appropriate for the refuge, and

(ii) publish in the Federal Register a detailed map depicting the boundaries of the land designated under subparagraphs (A) and (B)(i), which map shall be on file and available for public inspection at the offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.";

(B) by amending subsection (a)(2) by striking out "designated under paragraph (1)(B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "depicted under paragraph (1)(B)(ii)"; and

(C) by amending subsection (b) by striking out "designated under subsection (a)(1)(B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "depicted under subsection (a)(1)(B)(ii)".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8(a) of the Act of September 2, 1937 (commonly known as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, 16 U.S.C. 669g-1) is amended—

(1) by inserting "the Governor of American Samoa," immediately after "the Governor of Guam,";

(2) by inserting "American Samoa," immediately after "Puerto Rico, Guam," each place it appears therein; and

(3) by inserting "for American Samoa one-sixth of one per centum," immediately after "for Guam one-sixth of one per centum,".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect October 1, 1984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4921 would provide for the inclusion of an additional tract of land within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge. It would also make American Samoa eligible for grants from the Federal aid in wildlife restoration program.

The Bon Secour Refuge, which was authorized by Congress in 1980, is located in Alabama at the mouth of Mobile Bay. At present, the authorized refuge consists of four separate units totaling approximately 10,000 acres. These areas contain some of the best remaining undisturbed beach ecosystems along the gulf coast and provide habitat for a broad diversity of wildlife species. The refuge is the last major stopping point for migratory birds of the Atlantic and Mississippi flyways before their migration to the Yucatan Peninsula.

The proposed legislation would simply add another unit consisting of approximately 2,000 acres to the refuge. The new unit is primarily wetlands and contains extremely important bird habitat. The Nature Conservancy has an option on approximately 800 of the 2,000 acres and we understand the other landowners have also demonstrated some interest in selling their land.

Mr. Speaker, we have not increased the authorization of appropriations for acquisition of this refuge. There is a proposal pending at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for the designation of one of the units Skunk Bayou, as an estuarine sanctuary. If this designation occurs, there is a likelihood that the unit could be protected without acquisition. If and when designation of Skunk Bayou as an estuarine sanctuary occurs, we will consider deauthorizing the acquisition of the area and redesignating the boundaries accordingly.

The second section of the bill is an amendment to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act. This act, known popularly as Pittman-Robertson, or P-R, established a program to provide grants to States for wildlife restoration projects. The program is entirely self-supporting, funded by an excise tax on arms and ammunition, including bows and arrows. The funds are allocated among the States on the basis of a formula which takes into account area and number of hunting licenses sold. A special section provides for an allocation to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. This legislation would make American Samoa eligible for the same share as is currently available to Guam and the Virgin Islands.

As the Members can see, this is a noncontroversial piece of legislation and we urge its adoption.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4921.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4921 would provide for the inclusion of an additional 2,000 acres within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge.

The Bon Secour Refuge is located at the mouth of Mobile Bay in Alabama and presently consists of four separate units of about 10,000 acres total. The proposed addition is primarily wetlands and its protection would be of major benefit to the migratory waterfowl of the Atlantic and Mississippi Flyways on their migration routes to the Yucatan Peninsula.

Also contained in H.R. 4921 is a minor amendment to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, known popularly as the Pittman-Robertson Act. The change would make American Samoa eligible for the same share of matching grants as is currently available to Guam and the Virgin Islands for wildlife restoration projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to compliment the gentleman from American Samoa, Mr. FOFO SUNIA, for his wisdom in getting his area recognized in this legislation. I had the privilege of traveling to his district 3 years ago. It is a unique area, and he is a valued member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill.

I introduced H.R. 4921 to expand the boundaries of the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge by adding approximately 2,000 acres to the system. This addition is not expected to entail any further costs for land acquisition since comparable property presently authorized for the refuge should go into an estuarine sanctuary to be administered by the State of Alabama. My bill does not authorize additional appropriations.

The Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge was created when legislation I introduced was enacted in 1980. To date, approximately 2,500 acres have been purchased by the Fish and Wildlife Service. A large portion of this property is located in Baldwin County, Ala., where development in recent years has been phenomenal. Many of my constituents who are not particularly concerned with environmental issues or wildlife preservation have expressed gratitude for this effort to set aside this valuable resource to partially offset the building boom in the area.

I introduced this bill to modify the refuge boundaries to allow the incorporation of a new Sand Bayou tract in the area of Oyster Bay. The tract has been studied by the Fish and Wildlife Service and found to be eminently qualified for inclusion in the system. The tract supports a wide variety of wildlife species, including a number of endangered or threatened species, and its marsh areas are important spawning grounds for shrimp and crabs which have a major economic impact for commercial fishermen in the area. A large portion of the Sand Bayou tract is available from willing sellers. It is my intent, and the legislative history should show, that property within the refuge and within this tract should be acquired from willing sellers only.

The original Bon Secour Wildlife Refuge authorization provided for the acquisition of a 10,000-acre refuge. Four separate tracts were established. One of those tracts, the Skunk Bayou tract on Mobile Bay in Baldwin County, is now proposed for inclusion in the National Estuarine Sanctuary System. The State of Alabama has made application to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for the estuarine sanctuary and it is anticipated that funding will be approved in fiscal year 1984. It is my desire, and I believe the committee agrees, that the Skunk Bayou tract be

deauthorized from the wildlife refuge system once its estuarine sanctuary status has been accomplished. The deletion of the Skunk Bayou tract will allow the refuge to be maintained at approximately 10,000 acres and will make the refuge more manageable while increasing its wildlife value.

I urge adoption of this bill.

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4921, the legislation we are considering today under suspension of the rules, will extend the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge to include an additional 2,000 acres with no additional authorization for appropriation.

An area within the present refuge boundaries, which is comparable to the addition proposed in H.R. 4921, has been proposed by the State of Alabama as an estuarine sanctuary. If and when that proposal becomes final, I feel it would be appropriate to deauthorize the purchase of that area since it would be protected by the State. At that time, it would also be appropriate for the Secretary of the Interior to redesignate the boundaries of the refuge to exclude the State estuarine sanctuary.

H.R. 4921 would also include American Samoa, which was established as a territory in 1900, in the list of States and territories eligible for a percentage of funds under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, commonly called the Pittman-Robertson Act of 1937. American Samoa was inadvertently excluded from this act and will now be eligible to receive one-sixth of 1 percent of the available Pittman-Robertson funds annually. For 1983, the latest figures available, this would have amounted to approximately $147,000.

I strongly support this bill and urge its adoption by the House of Representatives.●

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4921, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read "A bill to provide for the selection of additional lands for inclusion within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge and for other purposes.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT AUTHORIZATION EXTENSION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5051) to give permanent effect to the provisions of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 relating to the reimbursement of U.S. commercial fishermen for certain losses incurred incident to the seizure of their vessels by foreign nations, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5051

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (e) of section 7 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1977(e)) is amended by striking out "The provisions of this section shall be effective until October 1, 1984; except that payments" and inserting in lieu thereof "Payments".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1973) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Secretary of the Treasury in the amount certified to him by the Secretary of State" in the first sentence of subsection (a) of inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of State in the amount determined and certified by him"; and

(2) by amending subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting "determination and" immediately before "certification" in the first sentence thereof, and

(B) by striking out "the Treasury" in the second and third sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "State".

(b) Section 5(a)(1)(A) of such Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1975(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking out "the Secretary of the Treasury" and inserting in lieu thereof "him".

(c) The first sentence of section 9 of such Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1979) is amended by striking out "Secretary of the Treasury" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of the State"; and by striking out "certified to him by the Secretary of State" and inserting in lieu thereof "determined and certified by him".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 2 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1972) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) any vessel of the United States is seized by a foreign country on the basis of claims to jurisdiction that are not recognized by the United States, or on the basis of claims to jurisdiction recognized by the United States but exercised in a manner inconsistent with international law as recognized by the United States;"; and

(2) by amending the matter appearing between subparagraph (D) and clause (i) of paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"the Secretary of State, unless there is clear and convincing credible evidence that the seizure did not meet the requirements under paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be, shall immediately take such steps as are necessary—".

(b) Section 4 of such Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1974) is amended by striking out "any fishery convention or treaty to which the United States is a party." and inserting in lieu thereof "any applicable convention or treaty, if that treaty or convention was made with advice and consent of the Senate and was in force and effect for the United States and the seizing country at the time of the seizure.".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) apply with respect to seizures made after April 1, 1983, by foreign countries of vessels of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill presently before the House is H.R. 5051, which makes permanent the authorization of appropriations for the distant water fishing industry vessel seizure insurance program under section 7 of the Fishermen's Protection Act of 1967 (FPA). Testimony in support of the bill was received from the administration on March 20, 1984. Perhaps remarkably, considering the administration's view of a number of other programs we have established, NMFS testimony reveals that we have, at least in this program, devised a user-fee concept that the administration supports.

For the benefit of the Members who are not familiar with this program, section 7 of the FPA provides direct compensation to American vessel owners and crews for financial losses resulting from seizures of their vessels by foreign governments on the basis of jurisdictional claims not recognized by the U.S. Government. Losses payable under section 7 are limited to: First, the market value of fish caught before seizure if they are spoiled or confiscated; second, up to 50 percent of gross income lost as a direct result of such seizures; and third, actual costs, other than those covered by section 3 of the FPA incurred by an owner during seizure and detention. Section 3, which is currently a permanent authorization, covers fines, license fees, registration fees, or any other direct charge paid to secure the release of the vessel and crew.

For the past several years, all money necessary to fund this program has come from direct industry fees in the form of insurance agreements voluntarily entered into with the Secretary of Commerce. As the administration

testified, this important program provides the dual purpose of supporting "U.S. positions on international law and the continued economic viability of the U.S. distant water fishing fleets."

During our full committee markup on April 11 an amendment was adopted to provide clarifications to the law that we deemed in order to reflect relatively recent changes in international law that spell the need for "modernizing" the statute. In addition, the administration proposed "housekeeping" amendments that were adopted.

Briefly, the amendments adopted by the committee added a new section 2 to the bill, reflecting the desire of the administration to constitute in one agency, the Department of State, the procedure for certification and payment of claims pursuant to section 3 of the Fishermen's Protective Act. Under the current system, the Secretary of State certifies the amount of payment due a vessel owner in order to cover any fine, license fee, registration fee or other direct charge paid in order to secure the prompt release of the vessel and crew. This certification is transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury who then pays the certified amount. The administration, I believe, correctly perceives this process as so much unnecessary paperwork and has requested our support in consolidating the ministerial functions of the Secretary of the Treasury with the more direct programmatic responsibilities of the Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, to fully understand the amendments to the Fishermen's Protective Act contained in the new section 3 to H.R. 5051, allow me to provide the House with some useful background information.

It is to be recalled that the basic purpose of the FPA is to provide prompt and fair reimbursement for certain costs resulting from illegal seizures of U.S. fishing vessels by foreign nations. This reflects a sound policy that furthers our vital national interest in the preservation, and continued exercise by our citizens, of the rights and freedoms of the United States under international law. The FPA represents a recognition of the fact that the legal, political, and economic costs to the United States will be severe if our distant water fisherman are not guaranteed the support of their Government in carrying out their lawful pursuits in the oceans.

Since the enactment of the FPA in 1967, international oceans law has become increasingly complex, and the points of potential conflict and controversy have multiplied. Indeed, it is remarkable that the problems that we have encountered have not been more numerous and more serious. As international rules have become more complicated and international relations more sophisticated, the process of determining when reimbursement is due under the FPA as a result of foreign seizures of U.S. vessels has become more difficult, and the basic policy of the act has not always been served. The standards and criteria for determining when reimbursement is appropriate should be clarified, so that changed circumstances do not stimulate inappropriate interpretations of the FPA that could defeat its purpose.

Section 3(a)(1) for the bill, as added by the amendment adopted by our committee, provides for a technical amendment of section 2 of the FPA. For the purpose intended by the FPA, the reference to territorial waters and high seas is, in modern international law, too simplistic and invites a misapplication of the act. For example, there is no reference to the exclusive economic zone (EEZ), which is a form of maritime jurisdiction that has emerged in the practice of States only recently, but is already well settled in international law. The EEZ is neither an area in territorial waters, nor strictly speaking, an area of the high seas. However, for nonresource related purposes, coastal States must guarantee high seas freedoms of navigation, overflight and the laying and maintenance of submarine cables and pipelines, as the President's March 10, 1983, proclamation establishing the U.S. EEZ, and his accompanying oceans policy statement, make clear. Although the existing reference to high seas in the FPA should be interpreted to include the EEZ, a clarification is in order.

Nevertheless, an explicit reference to the EEZ in a provision referring also to the high seas would be potentially misleading, insofar as that wording could create the incorrect impression that the EEZ does not have the attributes of the high seas for such purposes as navigation. Therefore, the proposed amendment simply refers to "claims to jurisdiction," a term which encompasses territorial waters, exclusive economic zones and the high seas among other things.

It is also worth noting that there are certain claims to maritime jurisdiction that are of a different character from territorial waters, the EEZ, and high seas, but are within the ambit of the act, even as it is currently worded. For example, hot pursuit is an exceptional claim to jurisdiction by one state over the vessel of another state under defined circumstances, and in accordance with certain specific rules. The general rule is, of course, that the flag-state has exclusive jurisdiction over its vessels.

To clarify this point, the amendment adopted by our committee, also stipulates that reimbursement should be made, not only when seizures occur on the basis of claims that are not recognized by the United States, but also with respect to claims to jurisdiction that are recognized by the United States but which are exercised in a manner inconsistent with international law as the United States views it. For example, on December 5, 1983, Mexico claimed hot pursuit when attempting to justify the seizures of the U.S. fishing vessels, *Santa Monica* and *Miss Charmaine*, by a Mexican warship and gunboat in the U.S. EEZ. As a general proposition, hot pursuit by a foreign warship of a U.S. vessel in the U.S. EEZ is regarded by the United States to be lawful. However, in that particular case, there is substantial evidence indicating that the exercise was not in accordance with established international law. Although international rules require, among other things, that hot pursuit be commenced when the pursued vessels are within the maritime jurisdiction of the pursuing vessels, it appears that the Mexican action may well have commenced when the *Santa Monica* and *Miss Charmaine* were in the U.S. EEZ.

It is important to emphasize that these proposed amendments to section 2 of the act simply provide useful clarifications.

It should be further noted that the new section 3(a)(2) of the bill would further amend section 2 of the FPA to assure that the Department of State would not be able to accept, practically out of hand, the representations of foreign governments or other interested parties as to material facts, with the view to making a case for the legality of seizures of U.S. vessels. Under the current provisions of the FPA, even when the evidence shows persuasively that a seizure was unlawful, such representations can give rise to "a dispute as to material facts" that will prevent reimbursement, or delay it indefinitely.

It is all too obvious that foreign governments may seek to present seizures in a light that would deny compensation to U.S. fishermen under the FPA. Other parties have their own motives. The proposed amendment clarifies the act to protect the validity of claims for reimbursement that are not challenged by "clear and convincing credible evidence."

Section 3(b) of the bill would amend section 4 of the FPA. The existing language of the act could be misinterpreted to suggest that reimbursement is unavailable, when a seizure is carried out in accordance with a fishery convention or treaty to which the United States is a party, but which has not been ratified by the President upon Senate advice and consent, or is not in force. The amendment would make clear that the bar to reimbursement in this section of the act would extend only to seizures undertaken in accordance with applicable conventions or treaties that have been approved by the Senate, been ratified by the President, and have entered into force. The

policy of the Congress in the FPA should not be open to the possibility of frustration by executive agreements, as a result of a lack of clarity under existing provisions of the act.

Finally, section 3(c) of the bill, as proposed in the amendment, makes these clarifying amendments applicable to seizures occurring after April 1, 1983, of U.S. vessels by foreign governments.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would only request the Members support for this important piece of legislation.

□ 1250

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has never asserted or recognized unilateral coastal State jurisdiction over highly migratory species of tuna beyond 12 miles from the coast. The consistent U.S. position, in both domestic and international negotiations, has been that tuna, because of their highly migratory nature, can only be effectively managed and conserved through regional international cooperation. The effective implementation of this policy requires that the United States be in a position to support U.S. fishing vessels operating in accordance with that policy.

Consistent with the U.S. position on this matter, the United States has participated in a number of fishery commissions which regulate tuna on an international basis. The United States has also ratified the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, which establishes an international regime for tuna fishing in the eastern Pacific Ocean, including, upon entry into force of the agreement, and international authority to issue regional licenses for tuna fishing in a broad area of the eastern Pacific Ocean. However, without a continuation of U.S. policy with respect to highly migratory species, the international rights recognized by the United States and the continued development of the American distant water fishing industry will suffer.

Reauthorization of this act, and the acceptance of the amendments reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, will be a positive contribution to the maintenance and development of the domestic fishing industry. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5051.

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, H.R. 5051, would make permanent section 7 of the Fishermen's Protective Act (FPA). This act provides a voluntary insurance program to reimburse U.S. commercial fishermen for losses incurred incident to the seizure of U.S. fishing vessels by foreign nations.

Losses covered under section 7 of the FPA include: Damage or destruction of vessels and gear, the market value of any fish seized or which spoil as a result of detention, and up to 50 percent of the estimated loss of gross income to the vessel owner and crew.

The circumstances under which such coverage would apply include seizures by a foreign nation as a result of: Exerting claims not recognized by the United States, restrictions not relating to fishery conservation and management, failure to take into account traditional fishing practices of the United States, fishing conditions and restrictions more onerous than those of the United States, and denial of equitable access to fishery resources by U.S. vessels.

The insurance program carried out under section 7 of the FPA appears to have been carried out efficiently and responsibly since its inception in 1968. The fishing industry has contributed nearly 70 percent of all the funds disbursed via this program.

In addition to the reauthorization, the committee adopted some technical amendments to the act requested by the administration and updated certain terms used in the act. It also clarified the basis on which claims may be paid, the need for clear and convincing evidence to challenge such claims, and added a requirement that conventions or treaties referred to in section 4 of the act must have been ratified by the President on the advice and consent of the Senate and actually be in force before they could be used as a bar to reimbursement.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee ordered this bill reported, as amended, by a unanimous voice vote on April 11, 1984.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 5051, to continue this program which provides much-needed protection for our fishermen.●

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5051, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to improve the operation of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT AUTHORIZATIONS EXTENSION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5050) to extend until October 1, 1986, the authority and authorization of appropriations for certain programs under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5050

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. The Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking out "September 30, 1984" each place it appears in section 4(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986"; and

(2) by striking out "1982, 1983, and 1984." in section 7(c)(6) and inserting in lieu thereof "1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986.".

SEC. 2. Section 221 of the American Fisheries Promotion Act (16 U.S.C. 742c note) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the side heading to read as follows: "LOAN AUTHORITY.—", and

(B) by striking out "September 30, 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986";

(2) by amending subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out "use and" in paragraph (1)(B),

(B) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following flush sentence:

No loan may be made under subparagraph (B) for any fishing vessel that has been reconstructed or reconditioned unless the reconstruction or reconditioning has been carried out within the United States.",

(C) by striking out "each of fiscal years 1982, 1983, 1984," in paragraph (2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "each of fiscal years 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986,", and

(D) by striking out "1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984" in paragraph (2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986"; and

(3) by striking out "any of fiscal years 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984," in subsection (c)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "any of fiscal years 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill currently before the House, H.R. 5050, would

extend for 2 years the authorization of appropriations for the fisheries loan fund. As the Members recall, we revitalized this loan fund in the American Fisheries Promotion Act (AFPA) by placing foreign fishing fees collected during fiscal years 1981 and 1982 into the fund and by restricting use of the fund for loans to commercial fishermen who were suffering temporary economic difficulties. The AFPA stipulated that loans from the fund should go: First, to fishermen holding Government guaranteed loans under the title XI obligation guarantee program; second, to fishermen in danger of defaulting on mortgages not so guaranteed; and third, to fishermen experiencing net operating losses due to temporary economic downturns in a fishery.

In the past 2 years, we have extended the loan fund for 1 additional year each. In this bill, we propose to extend the fund for 2 additional years. On March 20, 1984, the subcommittee received testimony on this legislation from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) which administers this program. At the hearing, NMFS testified to the administration's opposition to the reauthorization of this program even though: First, it is a "user-fee" program of the type which this administration typically promotes; and second, NMFS found it necessary to borrow $18 million from the U.S. Treasury to cover defaults on title XI loan guarantees, the very loan defaults which the fisheries loan fund is designed to protect against. Instead, the administration chose to utilize the regulatory process to clamp down on the application procedures and criteria to the extent that only $1.9 million of the $10 million appropriated in fiscal year 1983 was obligated.

Ironically, the administration's rationale for this action was that "the Nation's economic recovery has reduced the need for this type of program." I submit that it is quite clear from the record that the present status of the U.S. fishing industry does not support the administration's position and that the need for this program is at least as great as it was in 1980.

Apparently, both the subcommittee and our full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is in agreement with my analysis as this bill was reported by unanimous voice vote on March 22 and April 4, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members I would note that when the subcommittee received testimony on this legislation, and during followup discussions with NMFS, a technical aspect of the fund's enabling legislation was revealed which has restricted the implementation of this program in a manner inconsistent with the original legislative intent. Therefore, our committee adopted a minor amendment which clarifies our intent as to those situations where loans may be made to avoid the default of mortgages on used fishing vessels.

Briefly, as I noted earlier, the fisheries loan fund was revitalized and totally restructured by the American Fisheries Promotion Act in 1980. At that time, loan eligibility was restricted to either title XI guaranteed vessel mortgages or those vessel mortgages not so guaranteed but which nevertheless met the documentation and use criteria applied to title XI vessels. The vessel use criteria found in the title XI program restrict Federal obligations for the purchase of used vessels to those which: First, are reconstructed or reconditioned in the United States and which will contribute to the development of the U.S. fishing industry; or second, will be operated in an underutilized fishery. Because of these restrictions, most vessel financing for used fishing vessels have utilized nontitle XI sources, such as commercial lending institutions, which do not impose such limiting criteria.

Since the fisheries loan fund was intended by Congress to be used to avoid defaults on both title XI and nontitle XI vessels, the title XI vessel use criteria unfairly limit the eligibility of nontitle XI used vessels for loans under the fisheries loan fund. Therefore, the amendment adopted by the committee strikes the applicability of the title XI vessel use criteria to the eligibility of nontitle XI vessels for loans under the fisheries loan fund. The amendment maintains the requirement, however, that used fishing vessels be reconstructed or reconditioned in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, while I fully support this bill, I would note to the Members, however, that we do not anticipate a long-term need for full funding under this program as it is currently constituted. The subcommittee has been evaluating various means to better utilize these funds and provide a more effective delivery mechanism for financial services to the industry. In fact, I have recently introduced such legislation which will shortly be the subject of hearings before our subcommittee.

During this process, however, I firmly believe that we must insure the continued viability of this fund as a source of revenue for fisheries development needs. While I would hope that these efforts will bear fruit this year, I believe the proposed 2-year extension of the fund is necessary in light of our shortened legislative agenda during this election year. I would urge the support of the House for this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5050 would extend, for 2 years, the authorization of appropriations for the fisheries loan fund. In 1981, this loan fund was restructured to place foreign fishing fees into the fund and to restrict use of the fund for loans: First, to fishermen holding Government guaranteed loans under the title XI obligation guarantee program; second, to fishermen in danger of defaulting on mortgages not guaranteed; and third, to fishermen experiencing net operating losses due to temporary economic downturns in a fishery.

Although the need for financial assistance is clear, I would like to emphasize that I do not anticipate a long-term need for full funding under this program as it is currently constituted. For the past 9 months, the subcommittee has been evaluating various means to better utilize the approximately $89 million in the fund to provide a more effective delivery mechanism for financial services to the industry. That evaluation process has now led to a proposal to create a Marine Resources Development Bank, which would have the authority to offer a wide range of financial services, including vessel, shoreside facility, and export assistance. While this concept is being considered, it is essential that the fund be maintained as a source of revenue for meeting immediate and future fisheries development needs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5050.

□ 1300

Mr. BREAUX. I would just say in conclusion I appreciate the gentleman's support, as he is well aware, and has been very active in working toward the establishment of a Marine Fisheries Resources Development Bank type approach.

I think the time is very near when we do need to look at all of the fishing programs as far as how we are providing financial assistance to the fisheries industry. I think there is a great need for consolidation and streamlining of the delivery process by which we make these programs available to the U.S. fishing industry.

Agriculture has branched off into one approach toward handling farmers and farmers' needs. I think we have to recognize that the fishing industry is a very large producer of food for the American public and we really do need to come up with a better delivery system for the economic assistance that we are going to make available to the fishing industry.

In the meantime, we do need I think to continue the programs that we already have on the books. Hopefully by the time this comes back for reauthorization we will be able to replace it with a modernized and streamlined banking type of system which will be for the benefit of everyone.

With that, I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering is H.R. 5050, a simple extension of existing programs to provide low interest loans to fishermen for the refinancing of fishing vessels and gear and to permit the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to use volunteers.

This bill will extend the authorization of appropriations for the fisheries loan fund through fiscal year 1986 as well as the purposes of the fund set forth in the American Fisheries Promotion Act. The act specifies who should receive such loans, with priority given to fishermen in danger of default on loans obtained under the title XI fisheries obligation guaranty program.

American fishermen are still struggling to make the necessary changes to take advantage of our underutilized fishery resources and to recover from recent economic problems. Since 1983, $13 million has been appropriated but only a small portion of that has actually been loaned out. During the same period, however, the National Marine Fisheries Service borrowed $18 million from the U.S. Treasury to cover defaults on the title XI loan program. It is my hope that the loan fund could prevent such future defaults and, in the long run, prevent such losses to the Treasury.

Funds for this program are derived solely from fees assessed on foreign fishermen for the privilege of fishing within our 200-mile exclusive economic zone and thus this program operates at no cost to the Federal taxpayer. The authorization covers all of the moneys now contained in the fund but the amount available will be subject to the appropriations process.

The committee also amended the act to delete the requirements that used vessels contribute to the development of the U.S. fishing industry and be operated in an underutilized fishery to be eligible for loans.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported this bill, as amended, by unanimous voice vote.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 5050 because this program provides the assistance needed to aid our fishing industry in realizing its potential to harvest and process all of the fishery resources within our zone.●

● Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for H.R. 5050, a much-needed extension of the Fisheries Loan Fund, a program very important to the coastal counties of the 14th District of Texas. The Fisheries Loan Fund, which was established in 1956, provides low-interest loans to finance or refinance commercial fishing gear and vessels.

H.R. 5050 will go a long way toward keeping our domestic fishing industry, particularly the shrimp fishermen, afloat.

Shrimp fishing off the coast of Texas constitutes a full 28 percent of the entire U.S. harvest and brings in $170,710,000 a year. The shrimp fishery, the second most fuel-intensive fishery, has been hardest hit by today's rising fuel costs. United States shrimp fishermen have been threatened by imports from Mexico and Ecuador, which are duty-free and far more cheaply produced. The extension of the Fisheries Loan Fund will provide short-term, low-cost money to our domestic fishermen trying to keep up with this competition.

The administration opposes H.R. 5050—a decision I cannot fathom, especially since the bill uses only $150,000 of taxpayer funds to reimburse volunteers in U.S. fish and wildlife programs. In fact, the Fisheries Loan Fund is essentially a user-fee program. Fees from foreign vessels operating in U.S. waters are the sole source of capital for the fund. And, as Mr. BREAUX informed us yesterday, we do not anticipate a long-term need for full funding under this program; the Subcommittee on Fisheries has been evaluating ways to better utilize the funds and provide a better delivery mechanism for financial services to the industry.

I strongly support this legislation.●

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5050, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SOUTHERN UTE INDIAN RESERVATION BOUNDARY CONFIRMATION

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4176) to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4176

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CONGRESSIONAL PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to resolve uncertainty over the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation and the status of unrestricted land on such reservation, and

(2) to avoid long and costly litigation over issues dependent on reservation or Indian country status.

INDIAN TRUST LAND DEFINED

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act, the term "Indian trust land" means any land within the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation which—

(1) is held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Southern Ute Indian Tribe or individual Indians, or

(2) is owned by the United States and reserved for use or actually used in the administration of Indian affairs.

Any right-of-way bounded on both sides by Indian trust land shall be Indian trust land. Any other right-of-way shall not be Indian trust land.

BOUNDARIES OF THE SOUTHERN UTE INDIAN RESERVATION DEFINED

SEC. 3. The Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado is declared to have the following boundaries:

(1) Bounded on the north by the southern boundary of the lands—

(A) ceded to the United States by certain bands of Ute Indians under the Articles of Convention entered into on September 13, 1873, and ratified by the Act approved April 29, 1874 (18 Stat. 36), and

(B) described in article I of such Articles of Convention.

(2) Bounded on the south by the boundary line between the States of Colorado and New Mexico as described in article II of the treaty between the United States and the Ute Indians concluded March 2, 1868, and proclaimed November 6, 1868 (15 Stat. 619).

(3) Bounded on the west by the eastern boundary of the Ute Mountain Ute Indian Reservation.

(4) Bounded on the east by the southernmost 15 miles of the eastern boundary of the lands reserved to the Ute Indians by article II of the treaty between the United States and the Ute Indians concluded March 2, 1868, and proclaimed November 6, 1868 (15 Stat. 619), except that the lands east of such boundary in township 32 north, range 1 west, New Mexico principal meridian, that are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Southern Ute Indian Tribe are part of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation.

JURISDICTION OVER RESERVATION

SEC. 4. (a) Such territorial jurisdiction as the Southern Ute Indian Tribe has over persons other than Indians and the property of

such persons shall be limited to Indian trust lands within the reservation.

(b) Any person who is not an Indian and the property of any such person shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the United States under section 1152 of title 18, United States Code, only on Indian trust land.

(c) Any law of the United States related to the sale, possession, introduction, or manufacture of alcoholic beverages or to trading with Indians within Indian country, or within the Indian reservation, shall apply, with respect to the Southern Ute Indian Reservation, only on Indian trust land.

JURISDICTION OVER INCORPORATED MUNICIPALITIES WITHIN THE RESERVATION

SEC. 5. The State of Colorado shall exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction within the boundaries of the town of Ignacio, Colorado, and any other municipality which may be incorporated under the laws of Colorado within the Southern Ute Indian Reservation, as if such State had assumed jurisdiction pursuant to the Act of August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 588), as amended by the Act of April 11, 1968 (82 Stat. 79).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY).

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4176, by the gentleman from Colo., (Mr. KOGOVSEK), ratifies an agreement between the Southern Ute Indian Tribe and the State of Colorado, including the involved local governments. Its purpose is to confirm the generally accepted boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation and to define and adjust the exercise of civil and criminal jurisdiction within the reservation.

In most cases, a State has no jurisdiction over crimes committed by or against Indians within the boundaries of an Indian reservation unless it has assumed jurisdiction pursuant to some Federal law. To a large extent, a State also has little civil jurisdiction over Indians within the reservation. In those cases, criminal jurisdiction is either in the United States or in the tribe itself. Most civil jurisdiction rests with the tribe.

However, where a Federal court has determined that Congress, in some prior action, has "disestablished" the boundaries of an Indian reservation, Federal and tribal jurisdiction is limited to Indian trust lands within the former boundaries of the reservation.

There have been a number of Federal court decisions in litigation between States and Indian tribes on this issue. In some cases, the tribes have won and, in some, the State has won. But this kind of litigation is long, costly, and disruptive.

The Southern Ute Indian Tribe and the State of Colorado together with the involved local governments wish to avoid this kind of litigation. Therefore, they have negotiated an agreement to resolve their jurisdictional differences and to avoid the litigation. To be effective, their agreement must be ratified and implemented by an act of Congress.

I will not go into the details of the bill. However, in brief, the tribe is agreeing to limit the jurisdiction it would have in a "nondisestablishment" situation in return for the State's support of legislation which would confirm the existing boundaries of the reservation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is supported by all the government parties concerned, including the United States, and I do not know of any opposition. I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4176.

The purpose of this bill is to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in Colorado and to define jurisdiction within the reservation. By doing so, it will eliminate uncertainties that have created substantial difficulties for law enforcement personnel with respect to civil and criminal jurisdiction.

Land ownership within the original Southern Ute Reservation is a checkerboard consisting of 307,000 acres of Indian trust and federally owned land and over 300,000 acres of homesteaded and townsite lands. Uncertainty about the boundaries of the reservation as a result of allotments to Indians and the substantial non-Indian inholdings has led to uncertainty with respect to civil and criminal jurisdiction and created difficulties for law enforcement personnel. H.R. 4176 would eliminate this uncertainty by clearly defining the boundaries of the reservation and by clarifying the relative jurisdiction of the tribe, the United States and the State of Colorado.

Under the terms of the bill, the tribe and the United States would retain jurisdiction over Indians anywhere within the reservation except within the limits of incorporated municipalities where State jurisdiction would be exercised over all parties, Indian and non-Indian, as if the State had assumed criminal jurisdiction pursuant to the terms of Public Law 83-280.

Jurisdiction over non-Indians and their property within the reservation would remain with the State, except that the tribe would exercise civil jurisdiction over non-Indians on Indian trust lands and the United States would exercise criminal jurisdiction over-Indians where the non-Indian commits a crime against the person or property of an Indian on Indian trust lands.

H.R. 4176 is an example of the benefit to be gained by parties to a dispute working out their differences by negotiations rather than litigation. The bill is the product of cooperative efforts by the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, the State of Colorado, local political and law enforcement authorities, and the Department of the Interior to resolve common problems. I am very happy to note that this legislation will advance the cause of effective law enforcement in southern Colorado without any additional cost to the taxpayer.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. KOGOVSEK) for his sponsorship and effective management of this legislation. H.R. 4176 has the support of all parties concerned, including the administration. I urge the House to pass it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4176, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENNSYLVANIA WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5076) to designate certain areas in the Allegheny National Forest as wilderness and recreation areas, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5076

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Pennsylvania Wilderness Act of 1984".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) there is an urgent need to identify and protect natural areas to meet the recreational needs of Americans;

(2) certain lands within the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania are worthy of inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System; and

(3) certain other lands within the Allegheny National Forest are suitable for designation as a national recreational area.

PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1) establish the Allegheny Islands Wilderness and the Hickory Creek Wilderness;

(2) establish the Allegheny National Recreation Area so as to assure the preservation and protection of the area's natural, scenic, scientific, historic, archaeological, ecological, educational, watershed and wildlife values and to provide for the enhancement of recreational opportunities, particularly undeveloped recreational opportunities; and

(3) assure that any mineral exploration and development that takes place within the recreation area is down in an environmentally sound manner.

WILDERNESS DESIGNATION

SEC. 4. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1131-1136), the following lands in the State of Pennsylvania are hereby designated as wilderness and therefore as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) certain lands in the Allegheny National Forest, Pennsylvania, which comprise approximately three hundred and sixty-eight acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Allegheny Islands Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, composed of Crulls Island, Thompsons Island, R. Thompsons Island, Courson Island, King Island, Baker Island, and No Name Island, and which shall be known as the Allegheny Islands Wilderness; and

(2) certain lands in the Allegheny National Forest, Pennsylvania, which comprise approximately nine thousand three hundred and thirty-seven acres as generally dipicted on a map entitled "Hickory Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Hickory Creek Wilderness.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas designated under subsection (a) shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

(c) As provided in section 4(d)(8) of the Wilderness Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Pennsylvania with respect to wildlife and fish in Allegheny National Forest in the State of Pennsylvania.

(d)(1) The Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or exchange, with donated or appropriated funds, such lands or interests in lands (including oil, gas, and other mineral interests and scenic easements) within the Hickory Creek Wilderness as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such lands and interests in lands may be acquired only with the consent of the owner thereof.

(2) Not more than $2,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for purposes of acquiring, in accordance with subsection (a), lands and interests in lands in the Hickory Creek Wilderness Area.

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA

SEC. 5. In furtherance of the findings and purposes of this Act, certain lands in the Allegheny National Forest, Pennsylvania, which comprise approximately twenty-three thousand one hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Allegheny National Recreation Area—Proposed", dated March 1984, are hereby designated as the Allegheny National Recreation Area (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "national recreation area"). Following the acquisition, under any other authority of law, of lands within or contiguous to the national recreation area, the Secretary may revise the boundaries of the national recreation area to add such acquired lands to the national recreation area.

ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 6. (a) Subject to valid existing rights, the national recreation area designated by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with this Act and the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the national forest system in a manner compatible with the following objectives:

(1) minimizing to the extent practicable the environmental impacts of exploration and development of privately owned oil, gas, and other minerals;

(2) maximizing opportunities for recreation including, but not limited to, hunting, fishing, hiking, backpacking, camping, nature study, and the use of boats, both motorized and nonmotorized, on the Allegheny Reservoir;

(3) protection and maintenance of fish and wildlife populations and habitat;

(4) protection of watersheds and the free flowing nature of streams; and

(5) conservation of scenic, wilderness, cultural, scientific, educational, and other values contributing to the public benefit.

Subject to valid existing rights, the utilization of natural resources in the recreation area shall be permitted only if consistent with the other provisions of this Act.

(b) To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and publish, and may from time to time amend, a management plan, accompanied by an environmental impact statement and necessary regulations, for the national recreation area designated by this Act. The plan may be prepared in conjunction with, or incorporated with, ongoing planning for the Allegheny National Forest in accordance with the National Forest Management Act of 1976. Such plan and regulations shall include, but not be limited to—

(1) standards and guidelines for the protection and preservation of historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources in the recreation area for the public benefit and knowledge;

(2) provisions to maintain and enhance existing opportunities for recreation on Allegheny Reservoir, including opportunities for motorized and nonmotorized boat use;

(3) provisions to regulate the use of and protect the surface values of the recreation area, including provisions to control the use of motorized and mechanical equipment, and to require surface access routes which minimize damage or alteration of the surface in connection with any authorized activities on such land; and

(4) provisions governing oil, gas, and other mineral exploration and development within the recreation area, including access by road when necessary, and which ensure that—

(A) exploration, development, and transportation of oil, gas, and other mineral resources are not made economically infeasible,

(B) disturbances to the environment are minimized during all phases of exploration and development;

(C) revegetation and restoration of the surface of the land disturbed in performing exploration and development is accomplished as soon as possible after each phase of exploration and development is completed; and

(D) surface and ground water quality is fully protected in accordance with all Federal and State laws and regulations.

In preparing the comprehensive management plan, the Secretary shall provide for oral and written public participation and shall consider the views of all interested agencies, organizations, and individuals.

(c) The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing within the boundaries of the national recreation area designated by this Act in accordance with applicable laws of the United States and the State of Pennsylvania wherein the lands and waters are located except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons for public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations of the Secreatry pursuant to this paragraph shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State fish and game department.

(d)(1) Subject to valid existing rights, the minerals in all Federally owned lands within the national recreation area designated by this Act are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral leasing, including all laws pertaining to geothermal leasing, and all amendments thereto.

(2) Any special use permit issued by the Secretary for exploration, development, or transportation of oil, gas, or other mineral resources (or for any combination of the foregoing activities) shall require approval by the Secretary of a plan of operations (including a reclamation plan) which is consistent with the objectives set forth in subsection (a).

MAPS AND DESCRIPTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file the maps referred to in this Act, and legal descriptions of the national recreation area and the wilderness areas designated by this Act, with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, and the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. Such maps and legal descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that correction of clerical and typographical errors in such maps and legal descriptions may be made. Each such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

EFFECT OF RARE II

SEC. 8. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II); and

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of the national forest system roadless areas in the State of Pennsylvania and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) On the basis of such review, the Congress determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II final environmental statement (dated January 1979) with respect to national forest system lands in States other than Pennsylvania, such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to national forest system lands in the State of Pennsylvania;

(2) with respect to the national forest system lands in the State of Pennsylvania which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in RARE II, that review and evaluation shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revision of the initial plans and in no case prior to the date established by law for completion of the initial planning cycle;

(3) areas in the State of Pennsylvania reviewed in such final environmental statement and not designated as wilderness by this Act need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation pending revision of the initial plans; and

(4) unless expressly authorized by Congress, the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of national forest system lands in the State of Pennsylvania for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

BUFFER ZONES

SEC. 9. The Congress does not intend that the designation of a wildernes area under this Act leads to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around such wilderness area. The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a wilderness shall not preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to bring this legislation before the House today, because it represents the culmination of 5 years of efforts on the part of myself, Congressman KOSTMAYER and Congressman CLINGER, and others, to reach a compromise that will be acceptable to the major interest groups concerned. H.R. 5076, as amended, will establish a 9,700-acre Hickory Creek Wilderness in the Allegheny National Forest in northwest Pennsylvania. I was fortunate to be able to visit this area in the spring of 1979, and was very impressed with its forested ridges, and the absolutely lovely open meadowlands along the bottom of Hickory Creek. The area's gentle terrain and meandering stream makes it ideal for family oriented recreation such as camping and day hikes. I am also interested in the area because it would be one of the few national wilderness areas that lies within a day's drive of my constituents in Akron, and is heavily used by them for primitive recreation.

In addition to the wilderness, the bill designates a 23,100-acre national recreation area along the Allegheny Reservoir and River. The NRA will be composed of three roadless areas on existing national forest lands which are popular for primitive recreation but which cannot reasonably be designated as wilderness at this time because their subsurface rights are privately owned and likely to be utilized for oil and gas exploration in the near future. The NRA designation will protect the surface, insofar as is possible consistent with mineral exploration and development, and will direct the Forest Service to manage the area to promote the combined water/land recreational resource.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 5076, as amended by the substitute adopted by the subcommittee, is a consensus bill which deserves our strong support. I would particularly like to commend Congressmen KOSTMAYER and CLINGER for their patience and diligence in pursuing the matter and in working out this consensus legislation.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KOSTMAYER).

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I want first to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING), a member of the Interior Committee since he came to the Congress in 1971.

For the last 7 years, Mr. SEIBERLING has chaired the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks in a fashion and with zeal rivaled only by the late Phillip Burton of California.

Under his leadership, the subcommittee, the full committee, and the House itself, have passed 10 pieces of separate legislation creating over 6 million acres of wilderness in this Congress.

There is simply no way, Mr. Speaker, to put a price tag on that small portion of the American wilderness saved only by such acts of Congress as we consider today.

For those of us in the East, Mr. Speaker, the legislation now before us is especially precious.

For against the rampage of growth that threatens to smother any visible sign of what this region must have once looked like, this bill saves so little.

In 1979, I introduced H.R. 5488 to create a wilderness area of 33,000 acres, the only one in Pennsylvania and one of only three in the Northeast.

Today, that bill, the product of congressional compromise, reintroduced as H.R. 5076 on March 8, 1984, sets aside just under 10,000 acres, the remaining 23,000 to be preserved in a somewhat less stringent manner as a national recreation area.

Fashioned by my distinguished colleague, Mr. CLINGER of Pennsylvania, and me, this compromise proposal is for me still too modest.

This proposal for a national wilderness area in Pennsylvania enjoys the bipartisan support of Pennsylvania's entire congressional delegation in the House and in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that my colleagues on both sides of the Capitol and on both sides of the aisle are cosponsoring this measure which will serve more than 92 million of our countrymen.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5076.

I would especially like to thank Congressmen CLINGER and KOSTMAYER for their work in coming up with a solution that is more acceptable to me as the ranking member of the committee than the original proposal as introduced.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5076 will designate two areas in Pennsylvania as wilderness totaling 9,700 acres and creates a 23,000-acre national recreation area.

This may seem like a very small area but let me assure my colleagues it was not an easy compromise to arrive at. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLINGER) spent several years working with the various groups to draft a consensus bill and I commend him for his diligence. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KOSTMAYER)

also contributed to the process and his efforts should be recognized.

The Allegheny National Forest, like much of the Federal land in the East, is acquired land. As a result, the ownership patterns are scattered and almost all of the subsurface mineral rights of the proposed areas remain in private ownership and are likely to be developed for their oil and gas potential.

The recreation area concept was proposed as a means of allowing for mineral development but also to recognize the importance of the area for recreation. The mineral rights underlaying the one large wilderness area in the bill—known as Hickory Creek—are being purchased by a local conservancy group for conveyance to the Federal Government. They will not be developed. The bill authorizes the appropriation of no more than $2 million for the eventual purchase of these rights.

My colleagues should be aware of the fact that the administration does not support all aspects of the bill. While they support the designation of the wilderness areas and the acquisition of the mineral rights, they do not support the designation of the recreation area. The Forest Service views it as an unnecessary third system which could be best handled under their existing management authority. While I may agree with their position, it should be recognized that the NRA is a compromise which attempts to address all the concerns involved.

The administration also supports stronger release language for lands not designated a wilderness. I am hopeful that this issue will be worked out for all RARE II wilderness bills before the end of the year.

I intend to support this legislation as a compromise and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLINGER).

Mr. CLINGER. I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as the elected Representative of the four counties that include the only national forest in Pennsylvannia, I have a particular interest in Federal legislation affecting my constituents. The boundaries of the Allegheny National Forest include 750,000 acres of natural black cherry, oak, ash, and other commercial hardwoods that are used in fine furniture, both domestically and abroad. Oil and gas wells on the forest produce high-viscosity, low-sulfur crude oil that is primarily refined into lubricants for the motoring public. Deerherds abound, with wild turkey, bear and elk species making a comeback. The Kinzua Dam, which hold back the Allegheny Reservoir, acts as a flood control project north of Pittsburgh. These benefits are shared by many who wish to pass this legacy and heritage on to future generations.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) for his patience while this lengthy process took place. You have been most helpful in clarifying and assuring me over the concerns raised by the people of Pennsylvania over the intent of the legislation.

Moreover, the entire Pennsylvania delegation has cosponsored H.R. 5076 and both the senior and junior Members of the other body have introduced companion legislation (S. 2551) that is identical to H.R. 5076. The expeditious treatment by the House Interior Committee enhances the likelihood of enactment into law in the short time period that remains in the 98th Congress.

Let me also take this opportunity to express my appreciation to my colleagues from the Pennsylvania delegation (Mr. KOSTMAYER and Mr. MURPHY) who serve on the Interior Committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KOSTMAYER) was especially helpful in coordinating the views and positions of major environmental groups. I realize that for both Members, this bill falls short of their desires for larger wilderness acreage designations. If I had a free hand in drafting the bill, it would contain smaller areas. No one who has worked closely on the bill is entirely pleased with its results, the test of any good compromise.

I have studied this issue for 6 years and I can tell you that this bill is neither a complete victory nor defeat for one special interest. The proposal is fair, feasible, and realistic.

The Pennsylvania Wilderness Act provides for two land-use designations of various areas in the Allegheny National Forest, based upon the surveys of potential wilderness areas in the roadless area review and evaluation II (RARE II). The act designates seven islands on the Allegheny River as the Allegheny Islands Wilderness (363 acres) and a much larger plateau section of northern hardwoods called the Hickory Creek Wilderness Area (9,337 acres). The bill also creates an Allegheny National Recreation Area (23,100 acres) which is comprised for areas identified, and generally depicted in RARE II, as Cornplanter, Tracy Ridge and Allegheny Front. The northern part of the Allegheny Reservoir in the Allegheny National Forest is also included in the National Recreation Area.

Special provisions have been drafted into the legislation to deal with the problem of oil, gas and mineral (OGM) rights beneath RARE II areas by private owners. The problem of ownership by split estates is not unique to the Allegheny National Forest; many national forest were first established in the Eastern United States by the acquisition of only surface rights by the Federal Government. Because wilderness, by its very definition, is an area "substantially untouched by mankind," there should be reasonable assurances that a wilderness designation will protect these values now and in the foreseeable future.

One of the major misconceptions about the Pennsylvania Wilderness Act is that the bill would open forest areas to oil and gas drilling for the first time. Private individuals and firms own around 98 percent of the subsurface mineral rights in the Allegheny National Forest. It is their inherent fifth amendment right that "No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." The Federal Government cannot block oil and gas development by private concerns throughout most of the Allegheny National Forest.

Few people realize that oil and gas drilling has taken place throughout the region, and including the Allegheny National Forest, for over 125 years. The first oil well in the world was discovered just a few miles from the forest boundary. Some of these wells have produced oil and gas for 50 years or more.

Under this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be empowered to exercise stricter control over oil and gas operations in the designated areas. The new rules and regulatory authority could result in higher costs in the exploration of oil and gas resources. However, the Secretary could not impose such onerous requirements that oil and gas development is economically infeasible and therefore, a violation of the fifth amendment rights of private subsurface mineral holdings.

The bill authorizes a modest sum, $2 million, to acquire the OGM rights beneath Hickory Creek. All subsurface rights beneath the Allegheny Islands are already owned by the Federal Government. Consolidating the split ownership of both the surface and subsurface rights will greatly alleviate the burdens upon the Forest Service in administering Hickory Creek in accordance with the objectives and purpose of the Wilderness Act.

Other RARE II areas have been touted for wilderness designation in the past. However, sufficient revenues are not available to purchase OGM rights with the consent of the owners. This legislation proposes an alternative land use designation for three areas surveyed under RARE II and part of the Allegheny Reservoir by the establishment of an Allegheny National Recreation Area.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to formulate management plans for the Allegheny National Recreation

Area that maximize recreation opportunities and protect fish, wildlife, and water quality values. At the same time, oil and gas exploration and development may take place in a manner that is consistent with the preservation of recreational values.

The committee report addresses two concerns that were brought to my attention by my constituents. The first concern involves timber management and recovery on wilderness areas and NRA's. It is my understanding that the Wilderness Act permits timber recovery in the case of insects, disease, and forest fires. NRA designation permits even broader forestry practices in that current statutory laws and regulations governing recoverable resources apply to timber management. The second concern is trapping. The bill permits trapping in wilderness areas and the Allegheny National Recreation Area when in accordance with State fish and wildlife rules and regulations.

Many wilderness bills have not been enacted into law in this Congress because the two bodies have differed over the release language provision. The Pennsylvania Wilderness Act, as introduced, did not address this particular question but left its resolution to the respective committees of the House and Senate. The legislation, as introduced, was sufficiently perfected to meet the concerns of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania without further delay over the release language question. Prompt passage of the Pennsylvania Wilderness Act is necessary if the long-term management of the Allegheny National Forest is to continue without serious ramifications, because of delays over congressional inaction.

This bill was amended in committee to include "soft release" language that gives greater certainty over when the Forest Service and the Congress can consider future areas for wilderness designation. I reluctantly accept the committee's decision because coherent and comprehensive forest management planning requires a degree of certainty today, and in order to avoid serious and undesirable consequences in the future. The only other alternative was the status quo—and that is unacceptable. Enactment of H.R. 5076 will provide this critical certainty and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to lend my support for this legislation to add two areas of approximately 9,705 acres in the Allegheny National Forest to the national wilderness preservation system.

This land was originally recommended for inclusion in the Nation's wilderness lands following the RARE II study in 1979. The area faced problems with designation, however, because of the oil, gas, and mineral resources in the area.

My congratulations go to the area's Congressman, WILLIAM CLINGER, the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, and Chairman MORRIS UDALL and the House Interior Committee for working diligently to produce an equitable compromise that preserves wilderness areas and resolves the mineral questions. I was pleased to join as a cosponsor of this legislation.

Specifically, the bill will:

Designate a 9,337-acre Hickory Creek Wilderness Area that is ecologically diverse and very popular for recreation. The area covers much of the watershed of East and Middle Hickory Creeks and Jack's Run, and is heavily forested. Hiking and camping opportunities in the area are outstanding, as are the natural habitat areas.

Also designated for wilderness preservation is a 363-acre site consisting of seven islands in the Allegheny River which contain several species of plants that are rare. Otter and eagles winter on the islands and osprey stop during spring and fall migration. This bill will insure these wilderness values are preserved.

And the legislation establishes a 23,100 acre Allegheny National Recreation Area consisting of the Tracy Ridge, Cornplanter, and Allegheny Front roadless areas. This designation would allow the area to be managed to preserve the status quo and allow construction of new trails, campgrounds and facilities. If the oil and gas exploration questions can be answered for this area, then it, too, would be eligible for wilderness designation in the future.

This designation can be particularly important because of its closeness to the major population centers of the Northeast and we hope it will open wilderness area exploration to thousands of people who otherwise might never have the opportunity. The bill strikes the proper kind of balance I have long urged between our energy needs and our need to protect and preserve valuable land areas.

I am glad to support this bill as an important step forward in wilderness preservation.●

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5076, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1320

TENNESSEE WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4263) to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tenn., as wilderness areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R 4263

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Tennessee Wilderness Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1131-1136), the following lands are designated as wilderness and, therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, which comprise approximately five thousand and fifty-five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Big Frog Wilderness—Proposed", dated April 1984, and which shall be known as the Big Frog Wilderness;

(2) certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, which comprise approximately sixteen thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Citico Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated April 1984, and which shall be known as the Citico Creek Wilderness;

(3) certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, which comprise approximately three thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Bald River Gorge Wilderness (proposed)"; dated April 1984, and which shall be known as the Bald River Gorge Wilderness.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, each wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisons to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a map and legal description of each wilderness area designated by subsection (a) to the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. Such map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that any clerical or typographical error in such map or legal description may be corrected. The Secretary shall place such map and legal description on file, and make them available for public inspection, in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act, the following lands shall be reviewed by the Secretary of Agriculture as to their suitability for preservation as wilderness during preparation of the initial land management plan for the Cherokee National Forest pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended—

(1) certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, which comprise approximately four thousand eight hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Little Frog Wilderness Study Area—Proposed", dated April 1984, and which shall be known as the Little Frog Wilderness Study Area;

(2) certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest which comprise approximately three thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Big Frog Study Area", dated April 1984.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, the Little Frog Wilderness Study Area designated by this section shall, until Congress determines otherwise, be administered by the Secretary so as to maintain its presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 4. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second Roadless Area Review and Evaluation program (RARE II); and

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of national forest system roadless areas in Monroe and Polk Counties, Tennessee, and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II final environmental statement (dated January 1979) with respect to national forest system lands other than in Monroe and Polk Counties, Tennessee, such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to national forest system lands in Monroe and Polk Counties, Tennessee;

(2) with respect to the national forest system land in Monroe and Polk Counties, Tennessee, which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the second Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II), except those lands designated as wilderness or for wilderness study by this Act, that review and evaluation shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revision of the initial plans and in no case prior to the date established by law for completion of the initial planning cycle;

(3) areas in Monroe and Polk Counties, Tennessee, reviewed in such final environmental statement and not designated as wilderness or for wilderness study by this Act need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation pending revision of the initial plans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4263, the Tennessee Wilderness Act of 1984. This legislation was introduced by our colleague, JOHN DUNCAN, and covers lands in his congressional district only. Other wilderness candidate lands in Tennessee will presumably be addressed in future legislation.

In recognition of their superlative natural and recreational values, two of the wilderness proposals of H.R. 4263 were designated as wilderness study areas by Congress in 1975. The Forest Service has completed the studies, and the administration supports all the wilderness proposals of the bill. The largest area, the proposed 16,000 acre Citico Creek Wilderness, is most exceptional. Lying adjacent to the existing 15,000 acre Joyce Kilmer-Slickrock Wilderness in North Carolina, Citico Creek is known for its magnificent stands of virgin timber and cascading waterfalls. One of these falls reaches 70 to 80 feet in height, and several others are in excess of 40 feet. The falls and other natural wonders of the area are accessed by an excellent system of trails, including a portion of the soon to be completed long-distance Benton MacKaye trail, which will pass along the ridge which forms the Tennessee-North Carolina border and the boundary between Citico Creek and the Joyce Kilmer-Slickrock Wilderness. The area has also been designated a black bear reserve by the State of Tennessee in order to protect its thriving population of these animals.

The other wilderness and wilderness study area proposals of H.R. 4263 reflect similar natural values. All the areas are popular with hunters, fishermen, hikers, and other sportsmen, and are especially significant in that they lie within a 2-hour drive of major population centers in Knoxville and Chattanooga.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 4263 is meritorious legislation which deserves our strong support. I am aware of no opposition to the bill, and urge its approval.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4263, the Tennessee wilderness bill.

The bill will designate three national forest wilderness areas in the congressional district of my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) totaling 24,665 acres. It is my understanding that he worked for some time with the local groups to arrive at a concensus. At the same time, he has the general support of the administration. You must be doing something right.

The administration does not, of course, agree with the so-called release language in the bill and will continue to press for a longer time before we have to reopen the wilderness question in each national forest. I agree with their position and am hopeful some modifications of the release formula can be worked out.

In the meantime, however, I believe it is appropriate to continue to process the wilderness bills and resolve as many of the other issues as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill creates three wilderness areas in the southern portion of the Cherokee National Forest within my district. Two of these wilderness areas are in Monroe County, the third is in Polk County. H.R. 4263 also has been amended in accordance with the recommendation of the Forest Service to make Little Frog Mountain in Polk County a wilderness study area.

I believe this bill represents a compromise between the environmental groups who have sought wilderness in the Cherokee National Forest, and the citizens who live in the surrounding communities. The original requests by the environmental groups have been pared back significantly so that these wilderness areas will not interfere with roads in use, timber operations, or development. The Forest Service has been very helpful in this process in identifying those areas which would be suitable for wilderness as well as those where wilderness was clearly not warranted. I would especially like to thank Forest Supervisor Donald Rollens for his assistance in making this legislation fair to all parties. H.R. 4263 would place 24,965 acres in wilderness. This amounts to only 8 percent of the total 298,526 acres in the southern Cherokees. Citico Creek and Bald River Gorge Wilderness areas would be in Monroe County while Big Frog Mountain Wilderness is in Polk County. Citico Creek is the largest of the wilderness areas with 16,000 acres. It meets the Slickrock-Joyce Kilmer Wilderness at the North Carolina border to create a continuous wilderness area. The area is noted for its waterfalls, and rainbow and brook trout streams. It has been drawn so that it

will not affect the completion of the Tellico Plains-Robbinsville Road which runs along its southern boundary.

Bald River Gorge, which contains 3,887 acres, was recommended for wilderness designation during RARE II. The wilderness area will include the famous Bald River Falls. A trial follows the Bald River through this gorge which is forested with mature timber. Big Frog Mountain, in Polk County, will have 5,055 acres. The Forest Service indicates that the mountain is the most prominent land form in the surrounding area. It is a favorite hiking area for visitors. Both Citico Creek and Big Frog Mountain were studied by the Forest Service and have been recommended as wilderness candidates by the regional and local offices. The Forest Service will also be able to study the area east of the wilderness for possible inclusion if suitable. As I mentioned, this bill is the product of compromise. During the RARE II evaluation there was a great deal of opposition to wilderness. This compromise has been reached to end the dispute over which areas should be made wilderness and which should be developed. Many of the people of this region rely on the timber industry for jobs. I believe this bill will resolve many of the questions which have been hanging over the status of this land in the Cherokee. It is my hope that it will settle this matter once and for all. Unless this bill is passed by the House and Senate, the Forest Service will begin to restudy these and other areas of the forest. A restudy would create more problems and leave the status of these lands in jeopardy for the future. I believe it would be better to set these lands aside now, so that we can begin planning and working for the future.

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to discuss a matter of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Agriculture relating to H.R. 4263, the Tennessee Wilderness Act of 1984, and H.R. 5076, the Pennsylvania Wilderness Act of 1984.

These bills have been referred jointly to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bills involve what are referred to as "Eastern" forests and they contain so-called release/sufficiency language which relates to the management of areas in the national forests which are not designated as wilderness. In order to expedite consideration of these bills, the Committee on Agriculture does not object to their being taken up on the floor of the House without consideration by the committee. This position is taken without, in any respect, waiving jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with regard to these bills or to similar provisions in other bills. If the provisions of H.R. 4263 and H.R. 5076 should become an issue with the Senate—in the event that the bills pass the House—I intend to request that the committee be represented in any conference which may be held.

I appreciate this opportunity to make clear the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Agriculture in these bills.●

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4263, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PERMITTING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACQUIRE TITLE TO McCLINTOCK HOUSE, WATERLOO, NY

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4596) to amend section 1601(d) of Public Law 96-607 to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire title in fee simple to McClintock House at 16 East Williams Street, Waterloo, NY, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1601(c) of Public Law 96-607 (16 U.S.C. 410ll(c)) is amended by striking paragraph "(8)" and inserting the following:

"(8) McClintock House and related structures, 14 and 16 East Williams Street, Waterloo; and".

(b) Section 1601(d) is amended by striking out the word "through" and inserting the word "and" in lieu thereof; and by adding at the end of the subsection the following: "Within two years of the acquisition of the property listed in subsection (c)(8) the Secretary shall have removed all structures from the property that are not relevant to the historic integrity of the McClintock House.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4596 is needed to carry out the intent of Congress in establishing the Women's Rights National Historic Park in and around Seneca Falls, NY. The bill was introduced by our colleague from New York, Mr. HORTON.

Mr. Speaker, when the original legislation creating the Women's Rights National Historic Park was enacted in the 96th Congress, the McClintock House was designated as one of the structures which should have been included in the park. However, the Secretary of the Interior was not authorized to acquire the fee simple title to property because the house was then owned and used by a church, so there were some questions of the propriety of including it in legislation. Since the church has now offered the property for sale, those questions have been resolved and it is now appropriate to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase the McClintock House.

As reported, the bill does two things. First, it clarifies the fact that the McClintock House and related church are located on two lots rather than one as had originally been believed. Second, since the church is not of the same historical era and is in serious disrepair, the bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to remove this structure within 2 years of authorization.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is needed now to properly continue the work begun in earlier years. I urge its enactment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4596, a bill to authorize the acquisition of the McClintock House in Waterloo, NY, for inclusion within the Women's Rights National Historic Park.

In the 96th Congress, the Women's Rights National Historic Park was authorized in recognition of the historic significance of this area to the early women's movement in the United States. At the time of passage, one of the most important historical structures was not authorized to be acquired, because it was owned by a local church congregation, and Congress felt it inappropriate to acquire the property owing to possible church-state conflicts. Because of the leadership provided on this issue by Hon. FRANK HORTON of New York, it was brought to our attention that the church has now moved, and is willing to sell the property so as to round out

the park. By enacting this legislation, Congress will include the property in which Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and other leaders of the early women's movement met to draft the famous "Declaration of Sentiments." Congressman HORTON has rightly concluded that the national historic park requires the addition of this property in order to accurately reflect the purposes for which the park was established—to honor the women who, through their hard work against all odds, brought the extension of voting rights to women into being. And, due to FRANK HORTON'S foresight and the fact that restoration at the park is running close to budget, the money is already appropriated, and the $35,000 to $50,000 it will cost to acquire the property is already budgeted. I urge the Members to let us finish the job we started in the 96th Congress here today, and suspend the rules to pass this legislation.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING), for the courtesies that he extended to me and also for the expeditious manner in which he has handled this bill. It has been moved very quickly, and I think it is very important that it be moved very quickly.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), for his assistance and help and his advice in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 4596, a bill to allow the Secretary of Interior to acquire the McClintock House in Waterloo, NY. The McClintock House is a historic landmark and a designated part of the Women's Rights National Historical Park.

The Women's Rights National Historical Park was established in 1980 as a reminder of the many trials and triumphs of the founders of the Women's Rights Movement. Four houses and the Wesleyan Chapel in Seneca Falls and Waterloo, NY., were designated as the core elements of the park because of the unique role which this area in upstate New York played in the long struggle for equal rights for women.

Last year, we approved a $500,000 appropriation for the acquisition of property previously designated as part of the Women's Rights National Historical Park. At that time, I had the privilege of addressing this body to discuss the most famous of these sites, the Wesleyan Chapel, which was where the first National Women's Rights Convention was held in 1848. At that convention, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and other leaders of the early movement introduced the "Declaration of Sentiments." This document, modeled after the Declaration of Independence, is now recognized as one of the 50 most important documents in American history.

The Declaration of Sentiments, contained 12 resolutions, 11 of which were passed unanimously by the 300 convention participants. I think that you would agree that it was the twelfth resolution, which was offered by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and which only narrowly passed, that has had the greatest impact upon our Nation, and, indeed, this institution. I would like to share this resolution with you now:

Resolved, That it is the sacred duty of the women of this country to secure for themselves the sacred right to the elective franchise.

With these words, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and others embarked upon one of the most important political sojourns in our history—the long and hard quest for equal rights for women.

The McClintock House was designated part of the Women's Rights National Historical Park because it shared in this important moment in American history. Here, at the home of Mary Ann McClintock, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Martha Wright, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony gathered to draft the Declaration of Sentiments. Those of you who have visited the Museum of American History in the Smithsonian Institute, possibly noticed a wooden table preserved for its historic importance to the Women's Rights Movement. This was the very table at which these women sat as they planned the early movement and drafted this historic declaration.

As I mentioned earlier, the purpose of this legislation is to amend Public Law 96-607 to allow the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and preserve the McClintock House in a manner consistent with the historical significance of this building. The authority for acquisition of this property was withheld at the time the original bill was drafted because the Waterloo Baptist Church, which owned and used the property, wished to continue its use. Legislators drafting the bill were concerned that acquisition authority might raise the specter of church-state conflict. The Parish of the Waterloo Baptist Church, whose meeting hall adjoins the McClintock House, moved in 1981 and put the property up for sale.

The problems associated with the acquisition of the house, while important at the time, are no longer relevant. H.R. 4596 has the full support of the Parish and pastor of the Waterloo Baptist Church.

I also believe that you should know of the unanimous support which this legislation enjoys. H.R. 4596 is supported by the citizens of Seneca Falls, and Waterloo, the mayors of Seneca Falls and Waterloo, the Seneca County Board of Supervisors, and the New York Congressional Delegation. Senators D'AMATO and MOYNIHAN have introduced identical legislation in the Senate.

The McClintock House, and, indeed, the entire Women's Rights National Historical Park provide outstanding examples of the progress which can be made when a local community and the Federal Government work together to preserve and promote a historic landmark. You will be interested to know that through the prudent administration of the $500,000 we approved last year for property acquisition, the park retained enough money to cover the costs of the purchase of the McClintock house.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to discuss this legislation. I will continue to update you on the progress of this remarkable 4-year-old park and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG).

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself today with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from New York, in support of H.R. 4596. Not only does this legislation represent an ongoing effort to preserve the Women's Rights National Historical Park, but I think that this is an opportunity that has some real uniqueness to it. I say that as a Westerner, because, as is true here in the East and along the eastern seaboard, there is an opportunity to preserve historical sites that were built of some substance in the beginning that we in the West are oftentimes not afforded. I say that because much of our early heritage was built around mining camps and boom camps which were quickly constructed and oftentimes quickly destroyed.

Traveling on the east coast as a young person, one thing that was striking to me was that a society, a culture, existed here for centuries before we began to explore and develop the West. As a result, we are now able to preserve major portions of that history, not only for the heritage that they represent, but to pass on a glimpse to future generations of that heritage by the structures in which those major historical activities occurred.

I stand in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4596, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO REDUCE EROSION WITHIN THE CUYAHOGA VALLEY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3739) to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, as amemded.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3739

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4(c) of the Act of December 27, 1974 (88 Stat. 1784; 16 U.S.C. 460ff-3(c)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(c)" and by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(2) The Secretary is authorized and directed, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the State of Ohio, and affected local governments, to undertake a program of land treatment for the purpose of restoring suitable vegetative cover to substantially eliminate erosion from all lands, public and private, within the authorized boundaries of the recreation area. In the case of any private lands, within such authorized boundaries such treatment may be undertaken only with the consent of the owner thereof and shall be contingent upon assurances that such land treatment will be maintained by the owner for a period of not less than ten years. The Secretary shall, in conjunction with such program, take such actions as may be required to correct areas of ecological degradation which create hazards to health and safety.".

(b) Section 6 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 460ff-5) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1987, and $1,750,000 for fiscal year 1988, to carry out the provisions of section 4(c)(2) of this Act. Any amounts authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year under this subsection which are not appropriated for that fiscal year shall remain available for appropriation in succeeding fiscal years.".

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Act entitled, "An Act to authorize certain additions to the Sitka National Monument in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 8, 1972 (86 Stat. 904), as amended by section 101, paragraph (23), of the Act of November 10, 1978 (92 Stat. 3472) is further amended by striking out "$1,571,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $4,000,000".

SEC. 3. No authority under this Act to enter into contracts or to make payments shall be effective except to the extent and in such amounts as provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Any provision of this Act which, directly or indirectly, authorizes the enactment of new budget authority shall be effective only for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3739 is to provide authority to the Secretary of the Interior to undertake erosion control and to correct public health hazards on all lands within the boundary of the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, Ohio, and to increase the development ceiling for Sitka National Historical Park, Alaska.

I might say that this bill in itself is an historic bill because the two principal proponents of it are the gentleman from Alaska and myself, and it does something for both States. I think that the coming together of Ohio and Alaska is a very auspicious development.

H.R. 3739 was introduced for myself and Mr. FEIGHAN on August 2, 1983. The Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks held a hearing and considered the bill on April 5, 1984. The bill, as amended, was ordered reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on April 11, 1984.

The Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area has 32,460 acres within its boundaries, of which 14,492 acres are federally owned, about 9,920 acres are private lands and the remainder owned by non-Federal public agencies.

The problem of erosion from lands within the Cuyahoga River drainage and the resultant sediment that is deposited in Cleveland Harbor (deposited from the Cuyahoga River), has been studied at length by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The corps currently dredges Cleveland Harbor at a cost of about $4 million per year.

H.R. 3739 would provide authority and authorization for Federal funding to accomplish upland erosion protection within the CVNRA, resulting in needed protection for federally owned lands in the recreation area and ultimate savings to the Corps of Engineers of about $1 million per year. The bill provides that consent of the owner is required before any work is initiated on privately owned lands. The bill authorizes appropriations for a 4-year program from fiscal year 1985 through fiscal year 1988.

Section 2 of the bill provides for an increase in the development ceiling for the Sitka National Historical Park. The Sitka National Historical Park, located in Sitka, Alaska, was established as a national monument, by proclamation, in 1910. A legislative boundary was established and the area was renamed by the Congress in 1972. The additional authorization would be for the primary purpose of stabilizing the foundations, and completing the renovation of the Russian Bishop House. This structure, which is the focal point for the park, was the home of the Russian bishop assigned to Russian Alaska, prior to its sale to the United States.

□ 1340

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of suspension of the rules for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3739), "To provide authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area."

Title I of the legislation grants the National Park Service authority to take needed actions to reduce erosion on both federally owned lands and private lands in the Cuyahoga National Recreation Area. Of the some 33,000 acres in the park, about 13,000 acres are federally owned. This authorizes the Park Service to control erosion on Federal lands and the private lands of those individuals who agree to the control program.

The need for this legislation stems from the fact that large amounts of sediment caused by erosion within the Cuyahoga River drainage are annually deposited in Cleveland Harbor, requiring an annual expenditure of approximately $5 million per year by the Corps of Engineers. This legislation represents preventative medicine, in that the corps estimates that a large portion of the annual sediment they remove is generated within the Cuyahoga National Recreation Area. By spending money on erosion control now, we may save money in the long run in expenditures by the Corps of Engineers. In addition, erosion within the park would be reduced, leading to a better, more enjoyable unit of the national park system unit.

Title II would raise the ceiling on development costs by the National Park Service for purposes of restoration of the Sitka National Historical Park, thereby allowing the Park Service to complete the restoration and protection of the Russian Bishop House in Sitka, Alaska. As the capital of Russian Alaska, the Sitka area is one of the most important elements of this Nation's national park system. With the raise in the ceiling on development costs for the park, the job could finally be completed once and for all.

I urge Members of the House to vote in support of the suspension of the rules in order to adopt H.R. 3739.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3739) as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation area and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM ACT BY ADDING THE OREGON-CALIFORNIA TRAIL TO THE STUDY LIST

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3787) to amend the National Trails System Act by adding the Oregon-California Trail to the study list, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3787

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(30) Pony Express Trail, extending from Saint Joseph, Missouri, through Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, to Sacramento, CA. as indicated on a map labeled 'Potential Pony Express Trail', dated October 1983 and the California Trail, extending from the vicinity of Omaha, Nebraska, and Saint Joseph, Missouri, to various points in California, as indicated on a map labled 'Potential California Trail' and dated August 1, 1983. Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, the study under this paragraph shall be completed and submitted to the Congress no later than the end of two complete fiscal years beginning after the date of the enactment of this paragraph. Such study shall be separated into two portions, one relating to the Pony Express Trail and one relating to the California Trail.".

SEC. 2. (a) Recognition should be given to the regional significant of the contributions of Daniel Boone in the exploration and settlement of the Nation to assure that a wider segment of the public be afforted the opportunity to share in Boone's contributions to America's heritage through establishment of markings of a Daniel Boone Heritage Trail.

(b) In order that significant route segments and sites, recognized as associated with Daniel Boone may be distinguished by suitable markers, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the donations of such suitable markers for placement at appropriate locations on lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture and other appropriate heads of Federal agencies, on lands under their jurisdiction. The determination of the placement of markers to commemorate the routes and sites of Daniel Boone shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with appropriate private interests and affected local and State governments.

(c) The markers authorized by subsection (b) shall be placed in association with the Daniel Boone Trail identified on maps contained in the study entitled "Final National Trail Study, August, 1983, Daniel Boone" and submitted to the Congress pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the National Trails Systems Act (16 U.S.C. 1244).

SEC. 3. Any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act which, directly or indirectly, authorizes the enactment of new budget authority described in section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be effective only for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3787 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a study of the Pony Express Trail and the California Trail for possible inclusion in the National Trails System as national historic trails. The bill also designates the Daniel Boone Heritage Trail, thereby authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept markers for placement on Federal property to commemorate the pioneering contributions of Daniel Boone.

H.R. 3787 was introduced by Mr. BROWN of Colorado. As reported, it also incorporates the text of H.R. 3198, introduced by Mr. QUILLEN and it provides for a study of the Pony Express Trail as was included in H.R. 4134, introduced by Mr. SHUMWAY.

The California Trail was one of a number of trails used by settlers and prospectors in their emigration West during the mid-1800's. The trail breaks from the Oregon Trail—already included in the National Trails System—at the Raft River, in Idaho and heads southwest toward Sacramento, Calif. There were many branches and side trails which were all highly used, especially by prospectors. The California Trail, however, was the main thoroughfare to California and Sutter's Mill for the 125,000 or more men, women, and children who came to settle or prospect in the year 1818.

The Pony Express Trail was, likewise, a major link between the East and the California frontier. Organized in 1860, the Pony Express was the most direct and practical means of communication, East to West, before the advent of the telegraph, and played a role in aligning California with the Union during the outbreak of the Civil War, Although the Pony Express thrived only 18 months, its riders became legendary because of the daring attitudes they displayed, carrying the mail in every kind of weather and through hostile territory. By riding day and night at approximately 10 miles per hour, the Pony rider could transport the mail pouch from St. Joseph, MO, to Sacramento in 10 days.

These two trails run extremely close together, and at points are right on top of each other. They extend from St. Joseph, MO, through the Rocky Mountains near the Great Salt Lake, to the area around Sacramento, CA. Because of the proximity of these trails to each other, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct one feasibility study of the trails corridor, while still requiring two reports and two recommendations, one for each trail, respectively.

The bill would also designate the Daniel Boone Heritage Trail. This would recognize the significance of the pioneering contributions of Daniel Boone in the exploration and settlement of the Nation by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to mark significant trail route segments of the Daniel Boone Heritage Trail. The Secretary would be authorized to accept donations of suitable markers for placement at appropriate locations on lands under his administration and on other Federal lands with the concurrence of the heads of the Federal agencies administering those lands. Marker placement would be made in consultation with appropriate private

interests, Federal land managers, and affected State and local governments. The Department of the Interior supports this approach toward preservation of the trail.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy connected with this bill. It deserves enactment and I strongly urge its passage today.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3787, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act by adding the California Trail and the Pony Express Trail to the study list. The bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of markers for placement on Federal lands to commemorate routes and sites associated with Daniel Boone.

H.R. 3787 is actually a combination of three bills introduced by my colleague from California (Mr. SHUMWAY), my colleague from Colorado (Mr. BROWN) and my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN). The Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, seeing the great merit of these bills, combined them into one package to expedite their passage. I commend the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. SEIBERLING) for his willingness to move on this legislation.

The administration supports the study provisions for the California Trail and the Pony Express Trail and the donation of markers for the Daniel Boone Trail. They would have preferred a slightly longer time period to complete the studies. However, we gave them 2 complete fiscal years which we believe is adequate.

Again, I commend the members for their initiative and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3787 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of adding the California Trail and the Pony Express Trail to the National Trails System. The bill also provides for recognition of the significance of the Daniel Boone Trail by allowing markers to be placed along the route.

The trails are important pieces of our national history and, if designated, will also provide recreational opportunities. The California Trail was heavily used for westward migration from 1849—the year of the Gold Rush to 1869 and much of their traces remain. The iron-tired wagons left very deep grooves many of which can still be seen today.

The Pony Express Trail is, of course, the historic route used by the brave men who provided the only means of communication with western outposts until the establishment of the telegraph.

Unfortunately, many trail segments have already been lost due in some cases to a lack of knowledge of their existence and appreciation of their importance. During our hearings on the bill, it was pointed out that much of the California and Pony Express Trail routes go through the western Overthrust Belt. Companies working in this area have been supportive of protecting the trail segments but need to know where they are.

The urgency of this matter is one reason why the committee choose to place a 2-year time limit on the studies, instead of the more normal 3 years. I do not believe it will place an undue burden on the Department.

The Daniel Boone Trail would recognize the significance of the contributions of a great explorer and settler. Designation of the trail as a national scenic trail was ruled out when it was found that most of it traversed private land and acquisition of a right-of-way for the trail would not be desirable. Therefore, the bill before us today simply allows for the donation of markers to help identify the trail at no expense to the Federal Government. It has the support of local landowners and State and local governments.

I support H.R. 3787 and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

● Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3787. Two of the trails that the bill would add to the list to be studied under the National Trails Act, the California and Pony Express Trails, pass through my State of Nevada.

There is strong support for the study of these trails within the State, including support from Governor Bryan. I agree with the bill's supporters that the eventual designation of National Historic Trails in Nevada would provide needed recreational opportunities and historic interpretation to persons of all ages and physical abilities—both Nevadans and visitors from other States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to suspend the rules and pass this important piece of legislation. Thank you very much.●

● Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3787 and urge its passage.

H.R. 3787 is a two-part bill. The first part relates to a study of the Pony Express Trail and the California Trail. The second part of the bill is a bill I sponsored, H.R. 3198, to commemorate the historic trail route of Daniel Boone. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) and the other members of the subcommittee and the full committee for moving my bill forward to the House floor today.

I am sure everyone is familiar with the name Daniel Boone, the great explorer and frontiersman whose exploits are an American legend. H.R. 3787 will extend some recognition of the importance of Boone's trail-blazing endeavors in guiding the first pioneer families over the mountains in the initial stage of America's expansion from the Atlantic seaboard to the West.

Study of a proposed Daniel Boone Trail route was authorized by Public Law 94-527 to determine if it were feasible and desirable to designate the route as a component of the National Trails System. The proposed trail route was evaluated to determine if it qualified as either a national scenic trail or a national historic trail. The Park Service study agreed with regional historic groups that a scenic trail designation is not feasible or desirable because its establishment would require extensive acquisition of privately owned lands for a right-of-way and the costs would be prohibitive. A national historic trail designation was rejected by the Park Service on the ground that Boone's Trail was not of "sufficient historical significance." The final report was issued in August 1983. I disagree completely with that finding, but I will not reopen my argument with the Park Service here.

H.R. 3787 provides a third alternative that would recognize the significance of the pioneering contributions of Daniel Boone in the exploration and settlement of the Nation by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to mark significant trail route segments and sites of a Daniel Boone Heritage Trail. The Secretary would be authorized to accept donations of suitable markers for placement at appropriate locations on lands under his administration and on other Federal lands with the concurrence of the heads of those Federal agencies administering those lands. Marker placement would be made in consultation with appropriate private interests, Federal land managers, and affected State and local governments. This bill provides for recognition of this trail through cooperative effort at little or no cost to the Federal Government.

Daniel Boone has many admirers throughout the Nation who are willing to undertake that part of this endeavor. This is true because most Americans have grown up on history lessons about Daniel Boone from their grade school days.

Virtually any American sixth grader can tell you about Boone's trail blazing and his leadership in opening the land beyond the mountains to pioneer settlers. The path of his exploits should be marked not only out of respect for Boone's past accomplishment, but also to recognize the effect his life had on the development of our Nation as we know it today.

There is a great deal of interest in the Daniel Boone Trail in the four

States directly affected: Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky. Nineteen Members of the House from these States have cosponsored my original bill now incorporated into H.R. 3787.

The Department of the Interior recommends enactment, and certainly I know of no opposition to this noncontroversial bill.

Again, I want to extend my appreciation to the members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for bringing this bill to the House floor, and I urge its passage.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 3787. This bill would authorize study of the California Trail and Pony Express Trail for possible inclusion in the National Trails System as national historic trails.

This bill is particularly important to the Sacramento area since both of the trails included in the study extend to Sacramento. The Pony Express Trail runs from St. Louis to Sacramento. The California Trail was one of a number of trails used by settlers and prospectors in their emigration west during the mid-1800's. The trail breaks off the Oregon Trail at the Raft River and heads southwest to Sacramento. As a Sacramentan, I am particularly proud of these important elements of Sacramento history and believe it is essential to preserve the recreational and historic value of the trails.

These trails are a vital part of our national heritage and represent a chapter in U.S. history that greatly deserves our tribute today. It is a memory of the contributions made by a group of bold men and women who braved the dangers of the western frontier to bring progress to our country. In remembering this important period in American history, we remember the dedication and labor upon which this Nation was founded. In this time of technology and modern convenience, it is particularly important that we preserve the memory of the hard work and dedication of our ancestors.

This legislation is an important first step for giving these historic areas the protection they deserve.●

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3787, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5100), authorizing appropriations to the Executive Director, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, for services necessary to perform the functions of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5100

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Holocaust Memorial Council Act (Public Law 96-388; U.S.C. 1408) is amended as follows: After "1983", change the colon to a comma, and add in lieu thereof, "$2,051,000 for the fiscal year 1985, and $2,150,000 for fiscal year 1986:".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5100, as reported, would extend the authorization for the operation of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council through fiscal year 1986.

The legislation establishing the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council was signed on October 7, 1980 (Public Law 96-388). That law was amended by Public Law 97-84, signed on November 20, 1981, which added five new members to the 60-member Council.

The act establishing the Council provided authority for the Council to accept any real property from any agency of the Federal Government for the purpose of establishing a Holocaust Memorial Museum. Appropriations were authorized for the operation of the Council in the amount of $722,000 for fiscal year 1981, $800,000 for fiscal year 1982, and $850,000 for fiscal 1983, with the stipulation that no funds could be used for any construction activity. Public Law 98-146 provided appropriations in the amount of $1,853,000 for fiscal year 1984.

A bill (S. 2387) with language to extend authorization for 2 years has been introduced in the Senate. The language in S. 2387 would provide for $2,050,000 for fiscal year 1985, as does H.R. 5100, and also proposes "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal year 1986. The committee felt a 2-year authorization of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council was appropriate. However, the committee did not feel "such sums" to be acceptable as an authorization for an operating agency of the Federal Government and accordingly amended the bill to include and authorization of $2,150,000 for fiscal year 1986.

□ 1350

Mr. Speaker, today was the formal groundbreaking, I understand, for the Holocaust Memorial Museum, so it is most appropriate that we are taking this bill up on the floor of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

In 1980, Congress took an important step toward remembering the tragedies which occurred in Europe during the Holocaust. By establishing the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Congress demonstrated its intent to establish a permanent reminder, both as a way to remember and to learn the lessons of the past so that these tragedies are not repeated.

Since 1980, the Memorial Council has been working to meet its mandate to plan, construct, and operate a permanent "living" memorial to the victims of the Holocaust. Congress has authorized administrative funds necessary to conduct these activities so that the memorial will be operating by 1989. This bill preserves the intent that construction funds will be raised from private sources.

Passage of this legislation will help to keep these activities on schedule to complete this important project.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation enjoys bipartisan support and the President has included the funds called for in this legislation in the fiscal year 1985 budget.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA).

Mr. CORRADA. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 5100.

It is fitting that this legislation is being considered this week as we remember and pray for the millions of

innocent men, women, and children who fell victims to the Nazis during World War II. As the years pass and those who lived through those years are no longer living testament to the horrors that took place, it is very important that this memorial be built so that future generations can be reminded of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

We must never forget, and our children must also never forget, that humankind has the capacity for greatness and for good, but that we also have the capacity for horror and unspeakable evil against our fellow brothers and sisters. Thus, it is our responsibility to be ever on guard to prevent injustice and repression against any person or group. It is a sign of a just and free society to be, in the most basic sense of the word, our brothers' and sisters' keepers, only then can we insure that a new Holocaust will not take place.

This monument will serve as a living testament to those who died and I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), a distinguished member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the preceding gentlemen and commend the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of our subcommittee, for bringing this matter up on a very symbolic day.

As we struggle here in this Chamber day by day to protect the rights and dignity of all men and women, I think it is only fitting that the worst treatment that mankind ever suffered in the 1940's be commemorated by this body and by this resolution, and that we do erect a proper monument in our country because it is our country that stands first and foremost in the protection of human rights, justice, and dignity.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such additional time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I would like only to say that in a day when people of extreme views are spreading the lie that the Holocaust never took place, it seems to me that this is a very appropriate time for us to be creating this museum. Some people say, "Well, why in the United States?" That is one very good reason why.

I strongly support the council's work. They are undertaking to raise the construction costs entirely from private funds, and it seems to me that with the anticipated costs running into the many millions, the American people are going to be the beneficiaries of a very tremendous private effort.

Second, I think it also serves to remind us that in the words of John Donne, no man is an island; all men are part of mankind. The Holocaust not only diminished the people who were its victims; it diminished all civilized people. We need to remind ourselves that this happened in one of the leading, most civilized countries of the world, or so we then thought, so it was not an aberration necessarily that was limited to one people. We need to be reminded of the alternatives to a civilized and decent respect for humanity and for the rules of law.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support not only this bill, but the concept of the Holocaust Museum being built in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in strong support of H.R. 5100, authorizing appropriations for the Holocaust Memorial Council for fiscal year 1984.

As we consider this bill, it is vital to understand the valuable work of the Holocaust Memorial Council in the formal observance of the days of remembrance and in the construction of the Holocaust Memorial Museum. Through the horror of the Holocaust, Hitler sought not only to destroy the Jewish people, but to eliminate even the memory of their existence. In remembering those who died, we deny Nazism another victory. We should remember, too, those heroic individuals, the righteous gentiles, such as Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg, and the old woman who sheltered my father in Poland, who stood up to the evil and risked their lives to save Jews and other potential victims.

It is also important to preserve the memory of the Holocaust, because it is a source of many lessons for the entire human race. It has taught us how short the distance can be between a threat and its realization. It has taught us the magnitude that evil can reach when it is served by the apparatus of a modern state. Finally, and most importantly, because it was the indifference of the rest of the world that allowed the Holocaust to occur, we have learned that we all share a responsibility to speak out against intolerance, no matter whom it is directed against. Only if we learn this lesson well can we prevent humanity from ever again turning on itself.

The role of the Holocaust Memorial Council in preserving the memory and lessons of the Holocaust is clear. I commend the members of the council for their work and strongly support this legislation.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the Holocaust Memorial Council authorization.

The Holocaust remains the most terrible occurrence of the 20th century. The destruction of 6 million Jews in Europe and the attempt to eliminate a people solely because of their Jewish heritage is a valid and terrifying memory for modern people.

For most of us, the term "holocaust" needs further explanation. It evokes the tragic disregard for even the basic of rights of morality and human decency, the terror of the concentration camps, the tragedy of families torn apart and destroyed, and the scars both physical and mental that the survivors still endure.

While the meaning is fresh and clear for us, the tragedy would be even worse if we allowed ourselves to forget the event and the profound impact it has had on individual lives and the world as a whole. It is important to remember that much time passed before the Holocaust elicited the cries of moral indignation that were deserved. Future generations must be reminder of the lengths to which tyranny may go if it is not opposed and halted.

H.R. 5100 will authorize the necessary funds for the operation of the Holocaust Memorial Council. It is a small price to ask to preserve the truth so that our children for generations to come may understand the Holocaust and its somber lessons.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5100, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REDESIGNATING THE ST. CROIX ISLAND NATIONAL MONUMENT AS THE "ST. CROIX ISLAND INTERNATIONAL HISTORIC SITE"

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 25) redesignating the St. Croix Island Monument in the State of Maine as the "St. Croix Island International Historic Site," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 25

Whereas in the summer of 1604, a small French expedition led by Sieur de Monts established the first European settlement in the northern half of North America on what is now Saint Croix Island, on the Saint Croix River, in the State of Maine;

Whereas pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Saint Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine" (approved June 8,

1949), portions of Saint Croix Island of national historical importance were established as the Saint Croix Island National Monument, a unit of the National Park System;

Whereas the historic settlement on Saint Croix Island marked the beginning of European colonization of Canada, from which the French embarked to establish the settlement which became Quebec; and

Whereas Saint Croix Island is important to the history of the people of Canada as well as that of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in recognition of its historic significance to the United States and Canada, the Saint Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine is hereby redesignated as the "Saint Croix Island International Historic Site".

(b) Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such monument shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Saint Croix Island International Historic Site".

(c) Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the status of the "Saint Croix Island International Historic Site" as a national monument and a unit of the National Park System.

SEC. 2. Section 106(b)(3) of the Act of October 15, 1977, (91 Stat. 1161), as amended by the Act of March 12, 1980, (94 Stat. 84), is further amended by changing "Energy" to "Interior" wherever it appears.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 25 as reported would redesignate the St. Croix Island National Monument as the St. Croix Island International Historic Site and would adjust the authorization for certain health care programs in Micronesia.

St. Croix Island is located on the boundary between Maine and New Brunswick, Canada.

A companion bill was introduced by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) but since the Senate had already acted, we have chosen that as the vehicle for the moment at least.

Mr. Speaker, St. Croix Island was settled in 1604 by a group of 150 French settlers who later resettled to a more habitable site across the Bay of Fundy at Port Royal.

In recognition of the importance of the site to the history of both Canada and the United States, Congress authorized the St. Croix Island National Monument in 1949. More recently, in 1981, Canada and the United States dedicated an interpretive structure on St. Croix Island at Red Beach, Maine, and a similar structure will be built by New Brunswick on the opposite shore. In addition, Canadian and U.S. officials have signed a memorandum of understanding, citing the historic significance of this island to both nations.

Senate Joint Resolution 25 would recognize the truly international significance of St. Croix Island by redesignating the area as the "St. Croix Island International Historic Site."

The committee has also included language which transfers the authorization for funding the four atoll health care plan for the people of Bikini, Eniwetok, Rongelap, and Utirik in the Marshall Islands from the Energy Department to the Department of the Interior.

The present divided responsibility for the health care plan, with the Interior Department administering the program and the Energy Department funding it, has created problems in implementation in the 4 years since the original authorization was signed into law as Public Law 96-205.

Energy was originally directed to fund the health care plan because the Atomic Energy Commission, a predecessor to the Energy Department, was the agency responsible for the U.S. nuclear testing in the Pacific, and the health care program is designed to deal with effects of that testing. However, the Department of the Interior is responsible for the program, and conflicts arose that are normal when one agency is responsible for providing the funds for another agency's program.

As reported, this joint resolution removes this procedural obstacle to providing health care for these people who were victims of the U.S. nuclear tests in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, which has the bipartisan support of the members of the Interior Committee.

The importance of this island to the United States and Canada has been formally recognized since 1949, when Congress designated the site as a national monument.

In recent years, both the United States and Canada have taken steps to increase awareness of the importance of the island as an international historic site. The gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) has furthered this cause by seeking passage of this legislation.

Designating this island as an international historic site would recognize both the cultural and historic importance of the island as well as formalize an ongoing cooperative effort by the United States and Canada to note the importance of the site.

Mr. Speaker, all too often, our relations with our neighbor to the north are marked by a lack of communication and understanding. Our colleague from Maine has presented a convincing case to help improve our understanding as well as the understanding between the people of these great nations.

Finally, with regard to title II, I strongly support the subcommittee amendment to shift funding for the Four Atoll Health Care Plan to the Department of the Interior.

I urge passage of this legislation.

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which would redesignate the St. Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine as an international historic site. On behalf of the many individuals and organizations who have cooperated to help bring more historic recognition to this famous island, I am pleased that the House is acting to pass this legislation.

In recognition of the importance of this site to the heritage of Canada and the United States, Congress authorized the St. Croix Island National Monument in 1949. First settled in 1604 by Samuel de Champlain, St. Croix Island holds the distinction of being the first European settlement in the northern half of North America. By the end of that first year, nearly half of the island's first 79 settlers perished from the harsh winter and lack of food. The island itself is located at the boundary of Maine and New Brunswick, Canada. By redesignating this island as an international historic site, we recognize both the cultural and historic importance of St. Croix Island.

In recent times, citizens of the United States and Canada have recognized the need to better portray the great international heritage of St. Croix. In 1981, the United States and Canada dedicated an interpretive shelter on St. Croix Island at Red Beach, Maine. A similar shelter will be constructed on the Canadian shore to explain the island's first settlement.

In addition, Canadian and United States officials have signed a memorandum of understanding, citing the historic significance of this island to both nations.

I believe this redesignation will enhance the public's appreciation and awareness of St. Croix Island, and will help to better pronounce the importance of this site to Canadian and American history. As the chairman knows, no part of this resolution would affect the status of St. Croix Island, which is already established as

a national monument and as a unit of the national park system.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to passage of this measure, and the redesignation of St. Croix Island as an international historic site.●

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate Joint Resolution 25, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1400

DESIGNATING WILDCAT BROOK IN NEW HAMPSHIRE FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4406) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate Wildcat Brook in the State of New Hampshire for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4406

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof—

"(89) WILDCAT BROOK, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—The segment from its headwaters to its confluence with the Ellis River, including Bog Brook.".

(b) Section 5(b)(3) of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The study of the river named in paragraph (89) of subsection (a) shall be completed not later than ten years after the date of the enactment of this sentence.".

(c) The first paragraph (4) in section 5(b) of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of conducting the study of the river named in paragraph (89) such sums as may be necessary." The second paragraph (4) in such section 5(b) and paragraph (5) in such section 5(b) are redesignated as paragraphs (5) and (6) respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4406 is to require study of Wildcat Brook of New Hampshire, from its headwaters to its confluence with the Ellis River, including Bog Brook, for its possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Wildcat Brook is considered one of the best white-water rivers in the northeastern United States. It has been identified on the Park Service's nationwide rivers inventory as having significant importance for its scenic and natural qualities. The river, a major tourist attraction is widely known for its beautiful falls and is within a day's driving distance of 25 percent of the U.S. population.

H.R. 4406 was introduced by our colleague, NORMAN D'AMOURS, on November 6, 1983. After a hearing by the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, the committee has reported the bill without amendment. I urge its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. D'AMOURS).

Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the majority and minority leadership of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for their prompt action on my bill, H.R. 4406, and particularly my colleague from Ohio, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks. H.R. 4406 amends the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by including, for study purposes, the Wildcat River in Jackson, N.H.

The Wildcat River is located entirely within the bounds of Jackson, N.H., a small community of 600 residents located in the heart of the White Mountain National Forest. The Wildcat, in its short 13.2-mile length, is an excellent example of a rural, scenic river offering breathtaking views of a river passing through all of its natural stages—still pools, wild falls, and meandering brooks—and that is why it has been listed in our Nation's rivers inventory as worthy for study as a wild and scenic river. The citizens of Jackson realize the unique environmental features of the Wildcat and have worked to protect and preserve it.

The support for my legislation is unanimous and bipartisan. The citizens of Jackson, through the offices of the selectmen, the planning board, and the conservation commission, have all strongly spoken out in favor of preserving the Wildcat. In addition, the Appalachian Mountain Club, the National Audubon Society, the Friends of the Earth, the American Rivers Conservation Council and the Governor of New Hampshire all urge the prompt passage of my bill.

As you can see, the support for my legislation to have the Wildcat studies for inclusion as a wild and scenic river is unanimous and bipartisan. I would also like to state that similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate and that legislation has been approved at the committee level. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of my bill so that the citizens of Jackson can rest assured that the Wildcat River will be protected and preserved for all of the generations that will follow us.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4406.

As the distinguished chairman of the Public Lands Subcommitee has noted, the (Wildcat Brook) has been recognized as one of the most significant whitewater rivers in the New England region. The National Park Service included the segment of the river in its 1982 inventory because of the class 4 and 5 rapids and its easy access.

Because of these characteristics, the Wildcat Brook is an important source of recreation for the citizens living in the Jackson area as well as others from throughout the country who visit New Hampshire each year.

Mr. Speaker, this Wildcat Brook receives serious further consideration as a potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System. If this river is designated by the State of New Hampshire, I believe that the Forest Service can work with the State to properly allocate management responsibilities so that the entire segment of the river, including Federal, State, and private lands, will be protected.

Finally, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. D'AMOURS) should be comnmended for his hard work to bring the need to protect the Wildcat Brook to the attention of the Congress.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4406.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT TO PERMIT THE CONTROL OF THE LAMPREY EEL IN THE PERE MARQUETTE RIVER

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3472) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to permit the control of the lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3472

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a)(16) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the installation and operation of facilities or other activities within or outside the boundaries of the Pere Marquette Wild and Scenic River for the control of the lamprey eel shall be permitted subject to such restrictions and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe for the protection of water quality and other values of the river, including the wild and scenic characteristics of the river.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 mintues and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me particular pleasure as a many-time visitor of the State of Michigan to be speaking in support of H.R. 3472.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3472, introduced by Mr. VANDER JAGT of Michigan, would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to allow construction of facilities to control the lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River. That river has been designated a wild and scenic river, and therefore construction of any structures that would interrupt its free-flowing nature are prohibited.

The control of the spawning populations of lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River is necessary to protect the valuable fisheries in Lake Michigan. Chemical lampricide had been used to control the lamprey eel populations but this has aroused concerns about public health and also is expensive. The Forest Service has studied the problem and has reported that construction of a weir or small dam is the best alternative to control the lamprey eel spawning in the Pere Marquette River. This position is also supported by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission.

The proposed weir, which would be constructed by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, would be a cement dam across the river, far downstream, which would have a gap in the middle large enough to permit canoe passage and to allow the river to flow freely for about 10 months a year. The weir would extend 12 to 18 inches above the high-flow level of the river. During the spawning run of the lamprey which lasts about 2 months the gap would be closed. According to testimony we received, the lamprey eel cannot jump such a barrier, but other species, including the brown trout, and the Pacific salmon could easily pass over the weir.

The committee had no objection to such a low, gapped weir, in a carefully selected location, based on the assurance of the official witnesses that they would not approve the construction of a larger dam on the Pere Marquette which would present a greater obstruction to the river, or that would be installed for any purpose other than lamprey eel control.

Mr. Speaker, Pere Marquette, the great French priest and explorer who was the original European discoverer of the Great Lakes, certainly deserves to have a national wilderness area and a national wild and scenic river named for him, but he would also have saluted us for taking action to preserve the tremendous fishery resources in that magnificent system, the world's greatest body of fresh water, the Great Lakes system. Anyone who has seen the devastating effects of the lamprey eel on fish life—and I might say the lamprey eel was an exotic introduced by the introduction of ocean navigation into the Great Lakes system—anyone who has seen that would realize the importance of controls, and at the same time controls that do not poison the very waters that we are trying to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple but very important measure. I strongly support this legislation, and I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) for having taken the initiative in introducing it. I urge its enactment.

□ 1410

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of suspension of the rules for consideration of this legislation, much needed and long overdue. Because of the efforts of our very capable colleague, GUY VANDER JAGT of Michigan, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was convinced that the Federal designation of wild and scenic river for the Pere Marquette River was having a devastating impact on the salmon fisheries of the Great Lakes. Through this legislation, the committee has recognized that such designation is not always consistent with a "clean environment." In fact, the reason for this legislation is to allow the construction of a weir to stop the eel from traveling up the river and devastating the fishing that ultimately takes place in the Great Lakes and its tributaries. By allowing the construction of such a weir, it negates the normal application of chemical lampricide, known to cause large die offs in other fish species that are not intended to be killed. This is a good bill, authored by a good colleague, and I urge the Members of the House to suspend the rules and adopt the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3472, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks in the RECORD on the following bills:

H.R. 4176, Southern Ute Indian Reservation boundary confirmation;

H.R. 5076, Pennsylvania Wilderness Act of 1984;

H.R. 4263, Tennessee Wilderness Act of 1984;

H.R. 3739, erosion control within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area (Ohio);

H.R. 5100, authorization for U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council;

H.R. 4406, designation of Wildcat Brook (New Hampshire) for potential addition to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act;

S.J. Res. 25, redesignating St. Croix National Monument as an international historic site;

H.R. 3787, amending the National Trails System Act;

H.R. 3472, amending the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act re Pere Marquette River (Michigan); and

H.R. 4596, providing for the acquisition of the McClintock House as part of the Women's Rights National Historical Park.

Mr. Speaker, these are the bills we have just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MX MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4952) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to certain Indian tribes for expenses incurred for community impact planning activities relating to the planned deployment of the MX missile system in Nevada and Utah in the same manner that State and local governments were provided assistance for such expenses.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4952

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Defense may provide community impact planning assistance to assist Indian tribes located near sites which on October 10, 1980, were considered to be potential sites for the MX missile system. Such assistance shall be provided for the same purposes and in accordance with the same program under which the Secretary provided community planning assistance under section 801 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1981 (Public Law 96-418; 94 Stat. 1775) to State and local governments near such areas. The Secretary may provide such assistance using amounts which were made available to the Air Force under Public Law 96-436 for the purpose of assisting State and local governments in community impact planning in potential MX basing areas and which remain available for obligation.

SEC. 2. This Act shall apply only with respect to assistance for which a request was received by the Secretary of Defense before April 16, 1982, and which relates to expenses for community impact planning activities incurred before October 2, 1981.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS).

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4952 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to compensate certain Indian tribes for expenses they incurred for community impact planning activities related to the planned deployment of the MX missile in the multiple protection shelter (MPS) basing mode.

The Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1981, Public Law 96-418, authorized $5 million to assist communities near planned MX weapons system sites in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such communities. The Military Construction Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1981, Public Law 96-436, appropriated $5 million but provided it should be available only to assist State and local governments in community planning in the potential MX basing areas. Pursuant to that legislation the Department of the Air Force transferred about $2,225,000 to the affected State and local governments.

Certain Indian tribes residing in the potential MX basing areas incurred similar expenses in community impact planning. Those expenses total about $228,000. The tribes submitted claims for reimburesement but the Department of the Air Force concluded that the language of the law did not permit reimbursement of Indian tribes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4952 would expand the reimbursement authority to provide for payment of the affected Indian tribes. It would specifically authorize the Air Force to reimburse those tribes from the funds remaining in the fiscal year 1981 appropriations. The reimbursement would be for the same purposes, and in accordance with the same program under which the State and local governments were reimbursed. The bill would provide equal treatment for the Indian tribes. It would place them on the same footing with the State and local governments for similar community impact planning expenses. It would give the tribes no more and no less than the Government entities. This reimbursement would not require any additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the bill be adopted.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4952 to permit reimbursement of the Indian tribes which incurred community impact planning expenses in connection with the planned deployment of the MX missile in the multiple protection shelter basing mode.

These tribes were affected in the same manner that the State and local governments were by the planned deployment of the MX. They took action similar to those taken by the Governmental entities; but, due to the restrictive wording of the Appropriations Act, the Department of the Air Force was unable to comply with their claims for reimbursement.

This bill would expand the authority of the Department of Defense, thereby permitting it to consider the claims of the Indian tribes in the same manner that the State and local governments were treated. In the simplest terms, it would treat the Indians fairly.

No additional appropriations would be necessary for reimbursement of the Indian tribes. Their claims total only about $228,000. Approximately $2,775,000 remain from the fiscal year 1981 appropriations, which is more than adequate for payment of their claims.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair that the tribes should be treated in the same manner that the local governments were, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. VUCANOVICH).

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4952. This is a bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to certain Indian tribes for expenses incurred in community impact planning for the proposed deployment of the MX missile system in the Great Basin. Three of the four tribes affected are from my State of Nevada.

The Military Construction Authorization and Appropriation Act of 1981 provided a community impact assistance planning program. Funds were appropriated under this program to the Air Force to assist State and local governments in community impact planning in potential MX basing areas. To this end, Congress authorized and appropriated $5 million. However, Indian tribes were not recognized by the Air Force as being eligible for funding under this program. Though the tribes did incur legitimate planning expenses, the Air Force feels it presently lacks the authority to use any of the remaining planning funds to assist the affected Indian tribes.

H.R. 4952 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse tribes which filed verified tribal claims before April 16, 1982. Only verified expenses, incurred for the same purpose and in accordance with the same program under which local governments received assistance, would be eligible for reimbursement. It is important to note that the bill does not authorize any new funds. Payment of the money claimed by the Indian tribes, some $228,000, can be accommodated within the original appropriation.

I firmly believe that these tribes did, in fact, incur legitimate expenses for MX-related impact planning, just as similar expenses were incurred by the local governments that received reimbursement under the assistance program. I think it is time to recognize this fact and allow the tribes to be reimbursed for the same impact assistance granted to the local communities.

I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in voting to suspend the rules and pass this very important piece of legislation. Thank you very much.

□ 1620

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. VUCANOVICH) for introducing this much needed legislation in behalf of her constituency.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4952.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS ENCOURAGING THE USE OF CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4616) to amend the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 to require States to use at least 8 percent of their highway safety apportionments for developing and implementing comprehensive programs concerning the use of child restraint systems in motor vehicles, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4616

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 203(a)(1) of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. (a)(1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out section 402 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety programs), by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), $115,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986.".

(b) Section 203(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Each State shall expend each fiscal year not less than 8 per centum of the amount apportioned to it for such fiscal year of the sums authorized by paragraph (1) of this subsection, for developing and implementing comprehensive programs approved by the Secretary of Transportation concerning the use of child restraint systems in motor vehicles. Upon request of the Governor of any State, the Secretary may reduce the amount required to be expended by the State for any fiscal year under the preceding sentence if the State demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the percentage of children under the age of 4 traveling in motor vehicles in the State who are properly restrained by a child restraint system is greater than 75 percent.

"(B) No project for developing and implementing a comprehensive program concerning the use of child restraint systems in motor vehicles may be approved by the Secretary of Transportation in the fiscal years ending September 30, 1985, and September 30, 1986, unless the State applying for approval of such project enters into such agreements with the Secretary as the Secretary may require to ensure that such State will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all non-Federal sources for such programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in its two fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this paragraph.

"(C) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph shall not apply to sums authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1987.".

SEC. 2. Section 203(b) of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total of all obligations for highway safety programs carried out by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration under section 402 of title 23, United States Code, shall not exceed $115,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and the total of all obligations for highway safety programs carried out by the Federal Highway Administration under section 402 of title 23, United States Code, shall not exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1985, and September 30, 1986.".

SEC. 3. (a) The sixth sentence of section 402(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", except that the apportionments to the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa shall not be less than one-quarter of 1 per centum of the total apportionment.".

(b) Section 401 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", except that all expenditures for carrying out this chapter in the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa shall be paid out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall only apply to fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California, (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4616, as amended, is designed to eliminate or reduce the epidemic which the Surgeon General states in his report on "Health Promotion and Disease Prevention" that: "no other preventable cause poses such a major threat as (automobile) accidents which account for 45 percent of total childhood mortality."

That is right. More infants and small children under 5 years old are killed or crippled while riding in motor vehicles than the totals killed or crippled by the seven common childhood diseases that youngsters are routinely immunized against. Automobile accidents are the No. 1 traumatic cause of epilepsy and are a major traumatic cause of mental retardation and spinal cord injury in children.

To address this tragic epidemic, H.R. 4616 will increase the amount this Nation spends on the section 402 highway safety program by $15 million in fiscal year 1985, and $20 million in fiscal year 1986. And it will set aside 8 percent of a State's apportionment to develop and implement a comprehensive child-restraint program.

Over 40 States and the District of Columbia presently have laws on their books requiring the use of safety seats, and yet their usage rate is still only 40 percent. Of this number, 70 percent are being misused and thus offer minimal, if any, protection.

So, we have this epidemic. Nearly 3,400 kids under the age of 5 were killed in the years between 1978 and 1982, and an additional 250,000; a quarter of a million, were injured.

This is even more tragic in light of the evidence cited in a National Transportation Safety Board report indicating that most of these deaths and injuries are preventable; 90 percent of the fatalities, and 67 percent of the disabling injuries could have been prevented by the proper use of child seats.

As I indicated, despite the fact that the vast majority of the States require the use of safety seats, only 12 percent of the children in this country—40 percent that use them multiplied by the 30 percent that use them correctly—are being protected by their proper use. Clearly, laws by themselves are not adequate. Parents must still be en-

couraged to use them, and just as importantly, to use them correctly.

H.R. 4616 provides seed money to the States to encourage parents to use the seats and to teach them their proper use; $18.8 million over 2 years is not an excessive amount to spend considering all the lives that are presently being needlessly ended or crippled so near their very beginnings; $18.8 million is not too much to spend to help fund grassroots programs, education programs, media programs, loaner programs, and to help police enforce State laws; $18.8 million is a good investment.

Before I conclude, though, I should point out that, when the section 402 program is extended beyond fiscal year 1986, it is my intent to add a third year to this program. But after the third year, the States will be expected to pick up the cost of programs this legislation has helped generate.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that comprehensive child-restraint legislation should prove its effectiveness by a reduction in fatalities and injuries. However, because of certain anomalies, aberrations may occur which would not reflect accurately the effectiveness of a State's program. In this regard, the committee would like to alleviate the problem by clarifying its intent. The intent is that the Secretary shall also evaluate the effectiveness of the child-safety-seat program to determine if proper child-safety-seat use has increased and the level of misuse has decreased. The approval of the States' program should be contingent upon the showing of such positive results in the previous fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4616 as amended.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4616, a bill which has the potential for helping reduce accidental deaths and injuries among young children riding in motor vehicles.

It would do this by: First, increasing the authorizations for State and community highway safety programs from $100 million a year to $115 million and $120 million, respectively, for fiscal years 1985 and 1986; (second, requiring States to spend a minimum of 8 percent of these funds on programs to increase proper use of child restraints; and third, giving the Secretary of Transportation the authority to approve State programs as eligible for funding.

There is a strong case for this bill. During 1982, the last year for which we have good data, highway accidents took the lives of 633 children through the age of 4 who were occupants of motor vehicles. As to injuries, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that the injury-to-fatality ratio is roughly 30 or 40 to 1.

Child-restraint devices work. The National Transportation Safety Board has studied the issue and confirmed that contention. Testimony before the Public Works Committee has indicated that 90 percent of the fatalities and two-thirds of disabling injuries could be prevented by proper use of child-restraint devices—with the device properly installed in the vehicle and the child properly secured in the device.

Yet the use of such restraints runs about 40 percent, and it has been estimated that only 12 percent represents proper use. The need, then, is for a program to encourage wider use and correct use.

This bill can help, and is likely to lead to development of programs nationwide, consisting of mandatory use of child restraints—under State law—an intensive education program for parents and police, enforcement, media efforts, availability of loaner devices to low-income families, and involvement of a wide range of individuals and organizations.

I am encouraged to believe that it will indeed help. It has a lot going for it, including a heightened concern for highway safety in general, the support of a number of groups and organizations, and the fact that at least 44 States have enacted some form of child restraint legislation in recent years.

In 1983, this Nation recorded the lowest number of highway fatalities in 20 years. Some 42,500 died on the highways last year, more than 12,000 fewer than in the peak year of 1972. And the death rate in terms of fatalities per million vehicle miles traveled is at an all-time low.

Evidently a number of safety and safety-related efforts are paying off, and it is my hope and expectation that with enactment of this bill we will continue the progress of recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4616, if enacted into law, will assist States in their efforts to reduce the threat of death and injury created by the No. 1 killer of children under 5, the automobile. Child restraint programs have been initiated more or less to some degree in all the States, and according to a 19-State study done by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the evidence is clear that in those States where the programs are strongest, the rate of proper usage is highest. Yet, because laws that focus on the problem are relatively recent, these programs have not fulfilled their potential, and in States where funding has been relatively sparse, the progams and rate of usage are similarly weak.

Because children have no choice as to whether or not they are optimally protected in an automobile, it is important that parents be well informed of the benefits of child safety seats and how to use them. It is also important that those families without sufficient means to purchase seats be given the opportunity to protect their children through loaner programs and public health clinics. The authorization provided in H.R. 4616, while not necessarily sufficient in themselves to fund an entire program, will help to provide funds to enhance or commence programs that are designed to educate parents on why and how to use child restraints. These programs, in conjunction with laws that now exist in 44 States, will establish a base from which both public and private sector organizations or groups can build a self-sustaining program that will promote child safety seat use from the child's first ride, ideally to continue to 3 or 4 years of age. The child safety seat program may also begin a trend toward the wearing of seatbelts beyond childhood, thereby extending the life-saving benefits that safety restraints provide.

It is hoped that this important legislation will be speedily approved by the other body.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4616, as amended.

The question was taken; and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1430

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order speech today by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARCIA).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. VUCANOVICH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, district business prevented me from being present on April 24, April 25, and April 26, 1984 during consideration of several measures before the House. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 91, "yea";
Rollcall No. 93, "yea";
Rollcall No. 94, "yea";
Rollcall No. 95, "no";
Rollcall No. 96, "yea";
Rollcall No. 97, "no";
Rollcall No. 98, "no";
Rollcall No. 99, "yea";
Rollcall No. 100, "no";
Rollcall No. 102, "no";
Rollcall No. 103, "yea";
Rollcall No. 104, "no";
Rollcall No. 105, "yea"; and
Rollcall No. 106, "no".●

MORATORIUM ON FURTHER DEPLOYMENT OF CRUISE AND PERSHING II MISSILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a proposed amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1985. The amendment is designed to offer a reasonable alternative to the arms control stalemate in which we presently find ourselves.

My language would place a 6-month moratorium on the further deployment of cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe, provided the Soviets agree to and, in fact, return to the intermediate-range nuclear force (INF) reduction talks. The moratorium would be in place for the entire 6 months except if, after resumption of INF talks and before the end of the 6-month period, the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union has unilaterally broken off talks. The text of the amendment is as follows:

The United States may not deploy any additional Pershing II or ground-launched cruise missile in Europe during the six-month period beginning on the date on which intermediate-range nuclear force reduction talks between the United States and the Soviet Union resume in Geneva, Switzerland, except that if, after such talks have resumed and before the end of that period, the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union has unilaterally broken off such talks, the United States may resume such deployment.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARCIA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of honor that I participate in this special order for Yom Ha'shoa, the Days of Remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The human memory is a strange thing. Painful events are pushed into the subconscious, immersed in a depth of forgetfulness that allows us to go on living sane lives despite experiences of unspeakable horror. And the event which we recall on this day, in remembering its victims, is one of the most awesome examples of inhumanity to be inflicted on innocent people in an era of so-called advanced civilization.

It is difficult, nearly impossible to conjure up a vision of the Holocaust without feeling an overwhelming sorrow at the loss, and disbelief at the monstrous plan behind it—conceived by man, in a highly cultured and well-educated society. The impossible has happened over and over again in our lifetime. This was one of the most shameful events in history, particularly when most of the world turned deaf ears to the pleas for help. It is a nightmare from which humanity has awakened, and yet, for those who survived it continues.

Why then, if it is so terrible to contemplate, if the human mind shuns such pain, and recoils from such horror—why should we consciously remember, and build a museum to this memory, read and write the books and poems, tell and retell the horror at length? In three simple words, "Lest we forget."●

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is Yom Ha'shoa, Holocaust Remembrance Day.

Today the annual National Days of Remembrance civic ceremony took place in the Rotunda of the Capitol. It is a special time of solemnity and sadness when the survivors of the Holocaust and all people of conscience devote special moments in remembrance to the 6 million Jewish victims of the Holocaust.

As a founding member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, I am proud of the commitment made by this Congress and this Nation to officially recognized and commemorate this uniquely tragic event, and to sensitize our collective conscience so that we will be able to better understand how this living hell could have been allowed to happen. Its enormity is almost impossible to comprehend, yet comprehend we must. How can we understand the purposeful annihilation of 1 million children? It is, as Elie Wiesel says, an act against creation itself.

My 3-year-old granddaughter Deborah is also the granddaughter of Holocaust survivors Hilda and Sol Fox. Deborah and her family were among over 1,000 people who gathered at Temple Beth Sholom in Miami Beach on Sunday, April 29, to commemorate and remember those who now live only in our memories. The speaker was Elie Wiesel, the horror of the Holocaust his overwhelming message. "I have a sad notion," he said, "that the world did not care." The loss of an entire Jewish community in Hungary occurred as world leadership did nothing to save them. There were lost opportunities to do so, to bomb the rail lines to Auschwitz. Perhaps we would not have been able to save them all, but our tragic indictment is the sin of not trying, for failing to be our brother's keeper.

As a member of the Holocaust Council, I pledge to do all I can to see that we remember, that we not fail to understand that such indifference is nothing less than sin of commission, the creation of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C., will be a living memorial to those who perished in the Holocaust and will help us to learn the lessons that must be learned so that we can save ourselves from ourselves.

For the interest of my colleagues I would like to share the Miami Herald article about the memorial service led by Elie Wiesel and attended by Deborah Lehman and her tearful grandmother Hilda Fox.

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 30, 1984]

HOLOCAUST IN HUNGARY RECOUNTED: WORLD DID NOT CARE, AUTHOR SAYS

(By Fred Strasser)

Early in 1944, the Jews of Elie Wiesel's village in northern Hungary thought the war would soon be over. Only 30 miles to the east, Soviet guns pounded weakening German positions. Nazism, it seemed, had run its course without a takeover of Hungary. They felt they had escaped its terrors.

But in March the German occupation began, and within three months the Jews of Wiesel's village, Sighet, and of all Transylvania, were gone.

"Let us remember," Wiesel said Sunday in a Holocaust Memorial Day service. "Let us remember. Our task, simply because we are here, is to remember."

Looking over 1,000 somber faces at Temple Beth Sholom in Miami Beach, Wiesel, a novelist who has become the persistent voice of that terrible recollection, said:

"Those who took up arms perished, as did those who did not. Those who resisted persecution perished, as did those who did not.

"They all shared the same destiny. They were condemned for what they were, sons and daughters of an ancient people. All the victims were not Jews, but all the Jews were victims."

Wiesel, chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, has spent the memorial day in Miami Beach before, but this year has been dedicated to the experience he most closely recalls.

It is the 40th anniversary of the Hungarian Holocaust, the slaughter that took place in his homeland in the twilight of the war.

"What took place happened with an amazing speed," Wiesel said. "Before, because of the political situation, because of a certain influence, because of money, the Jewish population was more or less protected. It was a normal life.

"Then, on March 19, the German army invaded. At first, there was nothing. They were polite; they smiled at people; they even gave away chocolates. I recall a neighbor of ours, a Jewish woman, and a German officer kissed her hand. That gesture made a deep impression. Imagine, a German officer kissed the hand of a Jewish lady! What we didn't know were the detailed plans that lay behind this guile."

Those plans were executed swiftly and efficiently.

On March 29, the Jews were forced to wear identifying yellow stars.

An April 5, Wiesel's province was transferred from Hungarian to German control as a military zone.

On April 19, his neighborhood was declared a ghetto and closed off from the outside.

On May 11, the first transport trains left for the concentration camps.

On May 18, the last transport departed.

Wiesel, the sad-eyed survivor, asked once again a question he has asked a thousand times:

"Why didn't we know? It remains a mystery to me. It was there. Auschwitz was in The New York Times. I don't know if it would have made a difference, but why didn't we know? Why didn't anyone go on the radio and tell us, 'Jews of Hungary, don't go.' I have a sad notion," he said. "The world did not care."

The week of Holocaust-related activities that began Sunday includes a new exhibit meant to propose the same notion. "And the World Knew and Kept Silent" is a collection of aerial photographs of the Auschwitz concentration camp taken by the U.S. Air Force in 1944. The collection, which belongs to the National Archives, is being shown for the first time at the South Dade Jewish Community Center.

On Sunday, as survivors of the camps lit candles at Beth Sholom, they vowed that such silence would never again cover the facts of the Holocaust, that its lessons will be passed from that aging generation to its children.

Said Alex Hofrichter, the son of two survivors, "We shall tell the world of the depths to which humanity can sink, and the heights which were attained even in hell itself."●

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a Days of Remembrance ceremony, sponsored by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, was held at noon today in the Capitol Rotunda. I was honored to represent the House at that ceremony and I submit the attached copy of my remarks made at the ceremony:

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE, APRIL 30, 1984

Mr. Chairman, this is a Day of Remembrance. Recently the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History held a poignant exhibition of Jewish religious artifacts known as the Precious Legacy. These were selected from a massive collection which the Nazis had gathered from synagogues all over Czechoslovakia and brought to Prague as part of an insidious plan to mark the annihilation of the Jewish people. As the culmination of that plan, Heinrich Himmler intended to make a gift of the collection to Adolf Hitler after the Jewish people had been totally liquidated. It was to be called the Museum to an Extinct Race. Hitler is gone. The precious Legacy remains as a reminder of the madness and horror of Hitler's time.

This is a Day of Remembrance. Almost 40 years have gone by since the end of World War II when the American soldiers liberated the death camps and revealed to an unbelieving world the shame and barbarism of the Nazis. One would have thought that such revelations would have so kindled the conscience of every civilized country that ceremonies and memorials would have been created to keep alive forever the determination that such evils would never happen again. National memorials are taking place only in two nations—the United States and Israel.

This a day of remembrance. We remember the words of General Dwight D. Eisenhower spoken in 1945 when he said "I visited every nook and cranny of the camp because I felt it my duty to be a position from then on to testify at firsthand about these things in case there ever grew up at home the belief or assumption that the stories of Nazi brutality were just propaganda."

This is a day of remembrance, remembering Elie Wiesel who survived the death camps to become a ringing voice of conscience to arouse a callous world and to remind it of its indifference to the destruction of millions of innocent human beings by the Nazis. Last Thursday I joined my colleagues in the House and the Senate to vote proudly to bestow a gold medal in the name of the people of the United States upon Elie.

We remember his soul-searing words in the White House in 1979:

"Those of us who were there," he said "are haunted by those whose lives were turned into ashes, by those whose cemetery was the sky". . . . and Elie spoke of a young boy. "Father," said the young boy, "Is it painful to die? Must I die?" The father answers: "Think of something else, my son. Think of tomorrow."

For the young boy, Tomorrow never came.

This is a day of remembrance. We remember the men and women of other faiths whose superb courage and fierce determination saved the lives of Jews destined for death, providing them with the tomorrows the young boy never saw.

We are thankful that there were so many—more than we will ever know, but yet so very few for the task that had to be done.

This is a day of remembrance for Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat, for Oskar Schindler, a German, for Marion Pritchard, one of the brave Dutch, for Italians in Azzizi, the courageous Danes and for all of the people of good will whose names border the path leading up to the memorial of Yad Vashem in Jerusalem. To those names must be added the town of Le Chambon in France whose good deeds might still be unknown except for their telling in the book by Philip Hallie wherein he relates the story of the farmers, peasants, and housewives led by their pastor Andre Trocme who took into their homes thousands of refugees from all over Europe, risking their lives and the lives of their families.

"Why did you do it?" A farmer was asked. He replied with a shrug of his shoulders, "Where else could they go?"

There was Daniel Trocme, who was seized by the SS because he sheltered several hundred Jewish children. His passionate plea for the children was to strong that his captors finally said: "You must be one of them. Otherwise you would not defend them so." He was put to death with the children he sought to save.

We bear witness today to the tragedy and to the triumphs of the Holocaust. In Elie's words: "We must tell, awaken, alert and repeat over and over again without respite or pause the stories that have no end."

We mourn for the millions of innocent victims. We take hope from those whose decency and superlative courage ennobled the best in mankind.

We pledge to the lost and to the living—we will not forget.●

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust will insure that the terrible reality of the Holocaust is burned in the memory of history.

A young child used these words to describe the Holocaust: "They brought live people to a place called Auschwitz and made them dead." Six million Jews and millions of others were exterminated by the Nazis. More than 400,000 Hungarian Jews alone were murdered in a 46-day period beginning on May 15, 1944.

But 6 million is not just a number. It is a reminder of the parents and children who perished in the death chambers of Auschwitz, Birkenau, and other camps. It is a personal reminder of my grandparents and many uncles, aunts, and cousins lost in that awful barbarity. It is a reminder that the goal of Hitler's "final solution" was the obliteration of all Jewish life and Jewish culture.

We should remember as well those who resisted the madness of the Holocaust. Forty-one years ago yesterday the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto organized to resist their deportation to the concentration camps. These Jewish fighters' desire for freedom spurred them to persevere for nearly 1 month against the infinitely better armed German troops. We should also remember Raoul Wallenberg. Wallenberg, the man known as the "Angel of Rescue," helped save the lives of nearly 100,000 Hungarian Jews. Subsequently he himself was taken prisoner by the Russian Army in 1945.

The philosopher Karl Jaspers said of the Holocaust:

That which has happened is a warning. To forget it is guilt. It must be continually remembered. It was possible for this to happen, and it remains possible for it to happen again at any time. Only in knowledge can it be prevented.

By remembering the victims of the Holocaust we can help to forestall future atrocities. We must keep their memory alive so that future generations will remember and understand where unabated totalitarian leads.●

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and sorrow that I join with many of my colleagues in commemorating the Days of Remem-

brance of the Victims of the Holocaust. We can be proud that we have never allowed ourselves to forget this horrendous event and we can be proud of those who courageously survived and who remind us that we must never forget. We feel great sorrow for those who died and who were taken from us in a grotesque instance of man's inhumanity to man, we feel great sorrow over this example of human weakness that created a period in which humanity turned against itself with a vengeance and a fury.

The 6 million Jews who died at Hitler's hands must always be remembered because the Holocaust teaches us many lessons that we should never forget. The continuing massacre of innocent people in nations around the world demonstrates that we have not yet learned those lessons. We must learn to live in peace with one another before we destroy ourselves. If we have learned nothing else from the Holocaust, let it be that life is sacred and must be revered. We must learn that lesson and practice it if we hope to pass on to our children a world of peace and justice.

And let us remember that the forces that inspired and fueled the Holocaust have not disappeared. They exist today and present a continuing danger to the State of Israel and the diaspora. The lessons of the Holocaust serve as a psychological shield against such forces. While we can never fully understand or share the deep suffering and anguish the survivors of the Holocaust have known nor the pain and suffering of those who died, we can pledge to work with one another to insure that such an event will never occur again. May they rest in peace. Shalom.●

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, today we have set aside a special order so that this body may observe the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust. This is a solemn moment, in which the Nation recalls the tragedy which befell European Jewry. It is the duty of all of us to keep the horror of the Holocaust fresh in our minds, for it is the only way that we can prevent a recurrence of such a genocide. We can never educate ourselves enough about the Holocaust.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that Elie Weisel is the chairman of the commemoration held today in the Capitol rotunda. This man's work stands as a monument to the victims of the Holocaust. He has, for readers all over the world, made the Holocaust come alive. The Holocaust has left its imprint on the conscience of humanity. By commemorating the event we redouble our vigilance. Such an outrage can never be allowed to happen again.●

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in this special order to commemorate the 6 million Jewish men, women, and children who died at the hands of the Nazi forces 40 years ago. Unfortunately, with the passage of time, the vision and understanding of these sickening events become obscure in the minds of many individuals. And for younger people, this is an event from the distant past which may have hardly any real meaning at all. By continually taking the opportunity to reflect on the history of nazism, and its war against the Jewish people, we play a vital role in raising the consciousness of those who might not remember, and the growing number of those who might not otherwise know about the Holocaust at all.

The most effective means of making certain that the American people have a basic understanding of this bleak period in history is to make a special effort to insure that the realities of the Holocaust are brought before the people of our Nation, to bring a sense of reality to the words we speak. I recently had the opportunity to visit the Holocaust memorial in Israel at Yad Vashem. There is no experience like it. Anyone who witnesses the dazed and defeated faces of the men, women, and children being swept from their homes, packed in cattle cars and transported to the concentration camps, cannot help but be moved.

Too often, people do not have a firm understanding of the American commitment to the preservation of Israel or our strong determination to eradicate anti-Semitic activity in this country and throughout the world. The absolute vulnerability of the Jews to the Nazis during World War II has stiffened the resolve of many to guarantee that the nation which has been created from the ashes of the Jewish people will be able to live in peace and security. There is a basic feeling within the Jewish community that every possible step must be taken to insure that an event of such horrible magnitude will never occur again. In order to achieve this objective, the visual experience of the Holocaust must be made available to every citizen of this country. In the United States, we are moving closer to meeting this goal with today's groundbreaking for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. This is a momentous occasion for which all individuals associated with this project deserve our recognition and special thanks.

Mr. Speaker, the Holocaust represents one of the worst experiences the world has endured. The fact that one man was able to secure the political and military power that permitted him to organize and execute a plan of such massive destruction must never be stripped from our memories. We must not delude ourselves; it is entirely possible for such actions to be repeated. It is my hope that the Days of Remembrance of the Holocaust will serve as a catalyst for reaffirming the determination of the American people to prevent such inhuman behavior from ever again prevailing while the world stands by.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust which is currently being observed throughout the country.

The Holocaust was one of the darkest chapters in human history, one that must never be forgotten. It is estimated that over 10 million people perished at the hands of the Nazis during the Holocaust. An estimated 6 million of those executed were Jews. The systematic slaughter that occurred at the death camps was one of the most abhorrent and heinous crimes in all of human history. In Buchenwald, Germany, where medical experiments were carried out, there were 56,549 deaths. At the Dachau death camp in Munich there were more than 40,000 deaths. The most prolific and repugnant of all the concentration camps were located in Poland where gas chambers and ovens were used to exterminate the Jews as part of the Nazi's master plan to exterminate all the Jews from Europe. At Auschwitz the estimates for the total number of deaths range from 1,000,000 to 2,500,000. At Chelmo death camp the death estimates range from 170,000 to 360,000. At Treblinka death camp there were approximately 750,000 deaths. Those who survived the horrors of these camps were near starvation and had been subjected to a multitude of physical and psychological abuses at the hands of the Nazis. That most of these survivors were able to persevere is a testament to their courage and immense personal fortitude.

The memory of the millions of innocent human beings who perished at the hands of the Nazis shall live forever in the hearts and minds of all those who cherish human freedom, human decency, and human courage. To turn our backs on the Holocaust would indeed be another inexcusable crime. The harsh memory of the Holocaust must be preserved as a tragic reminder to all future generations of the evil and brutality that man is capable of and to insure that the horror and evil of the Holocaust is never repeated.

Yet, while we pay tribute to both victims and the survivors of the Holocaust, we must not forget the perpetrators of those atrocities, especially the Nazi war criminals who still remain at large. While it is not possible to establish the exact number of Nazi criminals who participated in the slaughter of innocent human beings in the Holocaust and the number of those still at large, it is important to recognize that the number who did participate was quite large and quite extensive. There were two main

groups of criminals: the instigators, the planners, and the commanders, who directed the killing operations or with whose knowledge, agreement, and passive participation these acts were committed; and the actual implementors of the plans and commands at various levels of authority and initiative. The first group, to which the high command of the German Government belonged—the heads of the Nazi Party, the heads of the Gestapo, the S.S., and the head office for the Security of the Reich—numbered many hundreds. The second group included hundreds of thousands of people—members of the Gestapo, the S.S., the Waffen S.S. units, the S.D., the national police, officials from special departments of the Foreign Ministry and Ministry of the Interior who dealt with Jewish matters, the staff of the concentration camps, doctors who practiced in the concentration camps, and other members of the armed forces. The above number of Nazi criminals who participated actively in the Holocaust is not an exaggeration.

This number, however, does not include the collaborators from the Nazi conquered territories. These number in the tens of thousands; collaborators who participated in the planning and execution of the murder of Jews, Soviet prisoners of war, and local civilian populations. Many of these perpetrators have never been brought to justice and many have been given refuge in countries like Paraguay, Argentina, and Chile. In January of this year another appeal was sent to the Government of Chile by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith urging the detention of Walter Rauff, a former S.S. colonel wanted for wartime killings of as many as 250,000 Jews in mobile gas vans. Because the high number of war criminals, legal constraints, and the passage of time, many of these criminals will never be brought to justice. Despite these problems, as of 1979, the West German Government alone has investigated 84,403 persons for suspected war crimes and has convicted 6,432. Many of the war criminals that are known to be alive are still at large. The knowledge that persons charged with Nazi war crimes have taken sanctuary in countries which refuse to extradite them to face their charges continues to haunt the survivors of the Holocaust and all of us who value justice.

I am outraged that this tragic situation is allowed to persist and I have authored legislation to help bring this final chapter of the Holocaust to a just end. My bill, H.R. 3036, would suspend all U.S. military and economic assistance to those countries known to be harboring Nazi war criminals, including Syria, Argentina, Paraguay, Chile, and Canada, until those countries take the necessary steps to extradite those criminals. By bringing the remaining Nazi war criminals to justice we would be honoring the memory of those who did not survive the Holocaust and we would be making life a little easier for those who did.

This Day of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust is an important step in firmly implanting the memory of the Holocaust and the permanent documentation of this tragic event in the anals of human history. The horror of the Holocaust and the memory of the millions who perished should never be forgotten and all of us who value justice and human freedom should continually work to insure that the Holocaust is not forgotten and that we all learn from the tragedy of the Holocaust so that it may never occur again.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to commemorate Yom Ha'shoa, the Days of Remembrance of the Jewish Holocaust.

This time of year is one of both festive celebrations and somber remembrances for Jews. The joyous activities of Passover, and the anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel, are darkened by the horrific memories of the Holocaust which left 6 million Jews dead. Although the Holocaust experience is unique to Jews, it serves as a tragic lesson to all of us. The Holocaust vividly demonstrates the danger of combining totalitarianism and religious hatred in an atmosphere of indifference on the part of the community of nations. As we remember the Jews who perished at the hand of the Nazis, let us resolve to challenge violations of human rights wherever and whenever they occur.

The effects of the Holocaust have been felt throughout the world. The great exodus from Eastern Europe which was triggered by the Holocaust, has scattered Jewish families far from their ancestral homes. They have enriched many societies, including our own, and have become a powerful moral force. Their example reaffirms for each of us the strength of the human spirit to survive even the most severe oppression. Their lives are truly an inspiration and I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to them.●

● Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we remember a tragedy which was perpetrated on an innocent group of people in such a calculated, heartless fashion as to be nearly unbelievable. The Holocaust left its scar not only on the Jewish people, but on the entire populace of this Earth. It is a painful episode in the world's history to be remembered, especially for those of us who had relatives among those tortured and killed at the hands of the Nazis. But, painful as it is, it is absolutely essential that we take the time to remember this outrageous crime against humanity and that we assure that future generations never forget the horror of the Holocaust.

Remembering what happened in that period of annihilation must be the basis for preventing similar tragedies in the future. Unfortuntely, intolerance continues to plague this world of ours and acts of man's inhumanity to man, though not of the scale and magnitude of the Holocaust, do continue to occur. We have an obligation to those whose sacrifices we recall today to do everything we possibly can to eliminate that intolerance and curb the inhumane acts which continue to occur.

For the Jewish people, this means that we must continue to work to permit the free and open practice of their religious beliefs everywhere they live, to encourage other governments to allow free emigration, and to maintain our commitment to the independence and security of Israel. To the world at large, this means maintaining our commitment to principles we hold dear and working to secure lasting peace among peoples of differing views.

Let us not forget the tragedy of the Holocaust. Let us continue our vigilance against another such tragedy ever occurring.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues during these Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust, in recalling the barbaric atrocities committed by the Nazis during one of the darkest periods in the history of mankind.

The world must never forget the unspeakable crimes systematically perpetrated against the Jewish people and against all humanity, and we must continue to keep the lessons of this tragedy alive for all generations to follow. Out of our efforts come hope and renewal culminating in an unwaivering determination to prevent future genocides and defend liberty, self-determination, and religious freedom for all.

This commemoration serves to remind us that human rights violations around the world must not go unchallenged. We must continue to be vigilant, and the memory of the Holocaust should strengthen our commitment to resist the many forces around the world which are working to undermine the advances made by civilized nations living in freedom.

Mr. Speaker, on these solemn Days of Remembrance, I join with the many Holocaust survivors living in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and all Jews throughout the world, as we remember the victims of the Holocaust and renew our commitment to preventing another such genocide from ever occurring again.●

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my distinguished col-

leagues from both sides of the aisle in this special order commemorating the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust. It is fitting that we pause to reflect on what the Holocaust means to us as Americans, and I wish to thank my colleagues for their participation today.

On Yom Ha'shoa—the last day of Passover—it is traditional for Jews everywhere to recite "Yizkor," or the memorial prayer for the dead. This Hebrew prayer is said in remembrance of all the departed souls from Biblical times to the present, including those who lost their lives during one of the darkest chapters in human history, the Nazi Holocaust.

Although it is man's nature to put aside unpleasant thoughts, we cannot afford to forget the painful memory of the 6 million Jewish men, women, and children who died at the hands of the Nazi regime. Even though we who were not victims can never fully comprehend the awful reality of the Holocaust, we have a solemn obligation to those who perished in the flames of human hatred to come as close to comprehension as we can and to be conscientious in our remembrance so that a similar atrocity will never again be visited upon any people, anywhere.

It is precisely for this reason that Congress approved in 1980 the creation of a U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council. This organization, under the outstanding leadership of Mark Tailsman and Elie Wiesel, has been charged with the responsibility of creating a living memorial museum to the victims of the Holocaust and to honor their memories in annual Days of Remembrance ceremonies such as the one held earlier today in the Capitol Rotunda. I commend the members of the Council for their efforts to ensure that the United States will continue to remind the world of the horrors of the persecution and genocide of the Holocaust.

During these Days of Remembrance, I urge my colleagues, my constituents and the people of the world to reflect, and to remember the lessons on the Holocaust not only during this week, but in their everyday lives. We who live in freedom must never compromise in our advocacy on behalf of others who seek the same. Let us commit ourselves to the protection of human rights throughout the world with the heavy weight on our conscience of all those, living and dead, who were denied that protection.●

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad yet important day in that we are observing a day of remembrance for the victims of the Holocaust. It is a solemn duty for those of us in Congress, as it must be in legislative bodies and other places around the world, to once again detail the gruesome tragedy that took place during the years of World War II. At that time, Adolph Hitler established a twisted government policy and oversaw its implementation, resulting in the deaths of over 6 million Jewish people.

Hitler predicted in 1939 that the coming world war would bring about "the annihilation of the Jewish race throughout Europe." He then set about to accomplish that aim, and directed that Jewish men, women, and children in Germany, Poland, and any territory invaded by the Nazis be harassed, separated from the rest of society, driven out of their homes, placed in ghettos in large cities or sent to concentration camps, where they would be tortured and killed. When this particularly dark chapter in our world history was completed, over 6 million Jews were killed by the Nazis. Hitler's reign of terror and inhumane barbarism came to a halt with his defeat in World War II.

As I mentioned earlier, it is indeed our duty as Government officials to remember publicly the awful events which took place during the Holocaust. It is vital that each of our children today hear of this experience, and have it ingrained forever in their own memories. In that way, we can hope that our expressed horror at these murders will be passed on to future generations, thus preventing a Holocaust from ever taking place again.

It is impossible for me to overestimate the importance of any and all organizations taking part in remembering the Holocaust, be they governments, schools, places of worship, or any civic group. As a State Senator in Pennsylvania, I was honored to participate in several events that served to spread the story of the Holocaust throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In fact, I number among my friends some of the fortunate people who were survivors of the Holocaust. I will always benefit by the expertise they have provided me on this grim subject. We should all dedicate our efforts today to those who were forced to live through the hell known as the Holocaust, and share their hope that it will never even come close to happening again.●

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of sharing with my colleagues some observations on a bleak moment in world and American history. Yesterday was Yom Hashoa—a day of memorial for the victims of the Nazi Holocaust of World War II.

This Congress and its predecessors have seen fit to dedicate 1 week each year both to the memory of this tragedy and to the need to benefit from its terrible lessons. Throughout this great Nation, Jews and Gentiles and all colors of America—white, black, red, and yellow—are joining together to reflect and to study the events of the Holocaust so that such events may never be repeated.

It is ironic that a word can, in time, come to mean the exact opposite of what it was originally intended to mean. "Cleave," which can mean either to cut apart or to come together, is one example, and "Holocaust," which once referred to a purifying fire from God, now refers to a Satanic, despicable and unconscionable act by one group against an entire people, and while the holocaust of Biblical times scourged those who treated God's laws in a cavalier way, the modern Holocaust was visited upon the Jews of Eastern Europe for the opposite reason—because they refused to disavow God's laws or surrender their heritage.

The Holocaust is the ultimate act of racism, genocide honed to a precise science. The Holocaust refers to the systematic murder of 6 million Jews by the Nazis and their accomplices from 1933 to 1945.

To be sure, other people suffered severely during World War II. We dare not forget the millions of soldiers who were starved to death by the Nazis, or the countless numbers of gypsies and European nationals who were put to death or who died as a result of the war.

The Holocaust, however, was not an act of war. The planned extermination of Jews was not connected to any military operation. It served no strategic purpose. Others died in World War II, but only the Jews died in the Holocaust. My friends, it is essential that we keep the memory of that event alive. It is essential that we teach its lessons to our children and that we, as leaders of the greatest and freest Nation on Earth, never turn away from those lessons.

The Holocaust is example par excellence of Lord Acton's caveat—"power tends to corrupt; absolute power, to corrupt absolutely." Let no one have too much power. Let no nation, no ruler, no idea, no system have power without checks and balances lest we repeat history. The Holocaust makes vivid the truth of that message. Western civilization depends upon a fine balance between social law and individual rights, between civic concerns and individual freedoms. When that balance is skewed, disaster ensues.

The Nazis showed us how public law can be used destructively. In the hands of tyrants, it can be fashioned to deprive people of liberty first and then of life. It can serve to pervert and corrupt if justice is not its goal. In the hands of the unscrupulous, the uncontrolled, the unbalanced, the law can undo persons, societies, and even civilization itself. That is the message left to us by the Holocaust. It is a message that we must pass along to tomorrow's leaders.

The Holocaust also teaches us about lies and the terrible power of lies. No

lie is too inhuman, too cruel, too absurd to be believed if it is told often enough and backed by terror.

The Holocaust must be remembered. Its terrible truths must serve as a lasting reminder that the survival of civilization depends upon the survival of each and every group of people and that if we are each other's keepers, we can also become each other's killers.

Of course, suffering was not the only legacy of the Holocaust. In remembering those who died during those terrible years, we must not forget those who survived. Their triumph over death remains a lasting memorial to the enduring nature of human life and to the finest qualities of the human spirit. These survivors stubbornly refused to abandon hope even when all hope seemed lost. That stubbornness became a kind of courage, and it was that courage which allowed them to cheat the Nazi death machine of its ultimate goal—the total destruction of the Jewish race.

The story of the Holocaust abounds with incidents of personal heroism. To our generation, which is still searching for heroes, the Holocaust offers heroes and heroines by the dozen. To maintain sanity in a world gone mad is itself heroic. Look at how many escaped to the inescapable. Remember the thousands who resisted the irresistable. Hear the many who lived to describe the indescribable. To learn from them is vital if we are to grow as a civilized people.

And not all of the heroes of the Holocaust were Jewish. There were heroic Christians, too, like the Danes and Swedes who rescued 7,000 Jews and the common folk who braved great danger to offer refuge to fugitives from the Nazis. These were not saints who cared nothing about their own lives or safety. They were simply good people whose integrity and values left them no choice but to act. To act righteously when the world is wrong, bravely and forthrightly when the world is craven, is to be truly Christian, truly Jewish, truly human, truly secular, truly holy.

Our children must know that no matter how dark the night, dawn will arrive. I had the opportunity last year to visit Yad Vashem, Israel's memorial to the Holocaust. No experience is so penetrating and so totally overwhelming than to stand in that cavernous memorial and remember.

There is a saying, I am told, which is attributed to an ancient rabbi. A person, he said, should have at all times two scraps of paper in his pockets. On one scrap should be written, "dust and ashes, ashes and dust am I." The other should say, "for my sake was the world created."

This is to teach us that we each have a right to be here and that each and every one of us is responsible, totally responsible, for this world of ours.

So here is the moral of the Holocaust. If we are not all teachers, if we are not all purveyors of the truth, seekers of justice for all and makers of peace between all, if we are not all responsible for this world which was created just for our sake.

Then ashes and dust, dust and ashes are we. That message is an American message and a message for all Americans. Thank you.●

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, almost 40 years have passed since we became fully aware of the crimes that the Nazis committed against humanity with scientific precision. Never before in man's often violent history had we known of a horror of such magnitude. In all that time, our collective sense of revulsion, outrage, and disbelief has never diminished for this is a hurt which time can never fully heal.

But our reaction now to the knowledge of the Holocaust is often to hide our emotions deep inside, to try to keep them far below the surface of our daily lives. We speak out against such horrors but we do so carefully, so as not to disturb the delicate balance of our emotions. But if we are to prevent such madness from ever darkening our world again, we must force ourselves away from the comfort of our daily lives and remember the suffering and indignities of those who were lost.

It is for this purpose that we observe the Days of Remembrance for the Victims of the Holocaust each year. We remember those brave men, women, and children whose precious lives were destroyed in one stroke. We reflect on the greatness and beauty those individuals might have known had their lives not been cut short. But more important, we force ourselves to think about those terrible times so that man will never again commit such heinous crimes against his fellow man.

We remember those millions with a great sense of loss but from this sadness we draw strength and hope for our future. Only we can prevent such tragedy. The observance of the Days of Remembrance reminds us that we must.●

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, reflecting over the course of history, I am struck by the awesome scope of human capability. Indeed, one needs only to study the civilization of ancient Athens, a Shakespeare sonnet, or the circuitry inside a microcomputer to appreciate human capacity of enlightenment. Yet there have been too many times when man has turned his ingenuity and imagination against his fellow man as he did in Nazi Germany. No history lesson is complete without a thorough examination of our darkest moments.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the Holocaust was the methodic ease with which one nation sought to exorcise an entire race. Hannah Arendt referred to this inclination for unconscious brutality as the "banality of evil." In spite of this horrific tendency, there were Holocaust survivors. They and their children are here today—in America, Israel and all over the world.

Their presence means something. Through their bravery, valor, and will they triumphed over the banality of those who sought their destruction. Their survival provides the hope that we can rise above our weakness. Our reflections on the Holocaust cannot heal the wounded or restore lives yet through them, we too, fight that unmitigated propensity to destroy one another without a second thought. Simply by calling to consciousness our own weaknesses we acknowledge the power we can exercise in checking the misapplication of our capabilities as human beings.

It is vital to our society that every generation be encouraged to take on such introspection and reassessment of its powers and limitations. For it is a society which acknowledges its blackest historical periods and openly admits to the heinousness of such weaknesses that is best able to forge ahead to a human and positive future. It is only with a realistic recognition of our weaknesses that we are able to comprehend how far we have come and how far we have to go.●

● Mr. REID. As Congressmen, it is not uncommon for us to participate in activities on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, whether it be meeting with constituents or joining people for photographs.

Yet, no event has affected me more than one day, during the spring of 1983, when I joined a special group on those historic steps for another reason. Though I stood with others, most of them unknown to me, none of us were strangers. For, on that memorable day, we shared a purpose. We shared an identity.

We had united ourselves for a 1-day fast and memorial service—a commemoration of the Holocaust of five decades before—to remind our own Nation and the rest of the world that freedom, an endowment so precious to us all, is not universal.

As we each proudly wore the name of a different Soviet refusenik—a person who is repeatedly refused permission to emigrate from Russia—the realities of personal freedom hastened my heartbeat. I continued to visualize the words and message printed on a B'nai B'rith pamphlet that I had studied: "Let my people go. If you forget them, the world will forget them."

I had learned that these freedom-seeking Russian Jews, who only seek the right to practice their culture and faith without harassment, are isolated, alone and persecuted. Yet, despite the constant deprivations of religious education, culture, and lifestyle, these

people continue to demonstrate the ultimate qualities of bravery. They never abandon their faith; this is the foundation of their commitment to freedom.

Strong commitment to faith and freedom, however, is not new for the Jews. Their struggle against the destructive forces of World War II—a struggle for existence that resulted in the deaths of 6 million Jews—has left a painful brand on the history and conscience of the world.

The Holocaust represented an unprecedented governmental policy to purge from the human race all people with Jewish blood in their veins, regardless of the economic, political, religious or military views or circumstances.

But, the consequences for all free societies, and the lessons to be learned by participants and bystanders alike, can and must be generalized. Because of this need to remember the atrocities, so that they will never be repeated, we will one day be able to experience and recall this historical devastation through the everpresence of a permanent reminder—the Holocaust Memorial Museum on the Nation's Capital Mall.

There is probably no more befitting location for this memorial than Washington, which is not only the capital of the United States, but, truly, the capital of the free world. It is appropriate that we should preserve this history, for, at least 45,000 concentration camp survivors call this country home—a place where they sought and found freedom.

As an American who has never had my own freedoms withheld, it is difficult for me to understand how a country could deprive its people of their basic human right to maintain their own religion and culture, or the right to leave a country that is denying them their heritage.

It is for this reason that we people of the free world must speak out for them. We must demonstrate for them. We must continue to do what we can to guarantee that, indeed, they are not forgotten.●

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of the 6 million Jewish victims of the Nazi Holocaust and the survivors of that atrocity. I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. GARCIA) and my other colleagues for holding this special order today. It is important to remember the tragedy of 40 years ago on this Yom Ha'shoa, day of remembrance for the Holocaust, so that society never again repeats this blemish on history.

So often we denounce man's inhumanity to man when we discuss human rights. Today, in every nation of the world there are evident human rights violations directed toward race, color and creed. Even more significant is our obligation as human beings to recall past indiscretions to prevent their happening again. The inhumanity committed against the Jewish people when Hitler reigned in Germany almost eradicated a race, a religion, and a people.

Jews traditionally remember the bitter with the sweet during holidays and celebrations. Never should a Jew forget the times in ancient Egypt when their lives were made bitter with forced labor. We remember the bitter in times of joy because life is intertwined with joy and sadness, sickness and health, blessings and unforeseeable difficulties. Thus, today, we all should remember the suffering of all peoples, the bitter and the sweet, so that no people are again threatened with extinction.

My family suffered personal losses as many other families did. The Holocaust changed the face of Judaism and history. Families were separated, villages and communities were destroyed, and Jewish objects of religious and family life were confiscated. The Jewish heritage suffered a violation, family histories, and heirlooms were lost never to be recovered. As a Jew and as an active member of the Jewish community, I stand here with great sadness that so many people were uprooted, imprisoned, tortured, and murdered.

God bless the victims of the Holocaust. We have not forgotten. God bless the survivors. We will not forget.●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague in this special order for the "Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust."

The Torah, the Five Books of Moses, admonishes all to "zakhor," to remember. As we are about to observe the 41st anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising and the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust, it is fitting that we pause to remember and to reflect on the terrible and tragic events that befell the Jews of Europe some 40-odd years ago. At the same time, we should use this occasion to renew our commitment to the future that such a Holocaust will never happen again.

Mr. Speaker, the Holocaust defies understanding and comprehension even today. Never before in human history had genocide on such a grand scale been an all-pervasive, government-directed and organized, bureaucratic policy, totally unrestricted and unchecked by moral, religious, ethical, and judicial restraints. The Holocaust was a central act of state during the Second World War. Adolf Hitler planned and asked for the Final Solution—the death of every single Jew, and even now the horror of his obsession and the fact that so many carried out his orders to exterminate are too much for the human mind to grasp—but we must remember.

We must recall what happened in the death camps of Auschwitz, Bergen-Belsen, Maijdanek, Treblinka, and others, all of whose names today are synonymous with human suffering and torture. Nor can we forget the mass murder and inhuman conditions that were inflicted upon the Jews in the ghettos of Warsaw, Vilna, and other European ghettos, and in the now infamous places such as Babi-Yar. Two-thirds of the Jewish population of the world in 1940, 6 million people, including 1 million Jewish children, were systematically and ruthlessly put to death. Apart from this inconceivable loss, we must also remember the wholesale destruction of Jewish communities, houses of worship, libraries, universities, social service organizations, and civic groups. The gas chambers, the crematoria, the medical experiments on Jewish children, the squalid life in the death camps, and all the death machines of the Nazis seem so unreal, yet they were a reality to an entire race of men, women, and children selected to die.

Even now, the events of the Holocaust remain a reality to those who were lucky or fortunate or brave enough to have survived Hitler's hell on Earth. Thus, Mr. Speaker, in commemorating the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust, we must pay tribute to the survivors. They have used the memory of that painful experience to reach out and to seek fellow survivors to enjoy life and to help ease the pain and burden of losing their loved ones and friends in the death camps. The survivors have not stood idly by and asked for our pity. To the contrary, they have overcome the destruction and the suffering and have gone on to raise families and to become outstanding members of their communities. Despite the immeasurable suffering inflicted upon them, many have not lost their belief in God and their identity with the Jewish people.

Mr. Speaker, this special order should not only serve as a memorial to the martyred 6 million, but should inspire us to a reaffirmation of life and of the hope that man will never again witness such atrocities. We must never forget what happened in those death camps. We must reach out to our children and to everyone else's children and remind them of what happened to the Jews of Europe during World War II. We must speak out now against those voices being heard today who are denying that there ever was a Holocaust or that the blame for the occurrence of the Holocaust lies with the Jewish people. As we remember that great tragedy of the 6 million, as we remember the heroism exhibited by the Warsaw ghetto fighters in their

hopeless struggle against the Nazi hordes, we must insure that never again will such murder be seen on the face of the Earth.●

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again we gather to remember, to honor, and to mourn the victims of the Holocaust of European Jewry. The fact that this has become an annual event is significant. It means that this Congress recognizes the horrific dimensions of events that occurred 40 years ago; how could we do otherwise? But is also illustrates our understanding that we must do more than identify the evil of the past, we must remember it.

By remembering, we insure that the world never forgets that a people and a culture were destroyed for all time. There are still Jews today, but the world that encompassed the Jews of Europe will never return. During the Nazi reign two-thirds of all the Jews in Europe were destroyed; with them died a cultural tradition of a thousand years. Although the fact of their existence has been extinguished, they will never be completely gone as long as we remember.

Members in this Chamber know better than most that the public never likes to be reminded of unsettling or bad news. This is one time when they must have the facts placed before them. This is one issue that we cannot afford to forget about. As lawmakers we must also review the facts, because the Holocaust was based firmly in Nazi law.

The laws were written to define Jews, to determine how Jews would be treated; then, step by step, the Jews were denied their rights. They lost their jobs, they could no longer participate in society. Next, they lost their property, or were forced to sell their titles, claims, and ownership. Finally they were separated from the rest of society and crowded into ghettos; after that the mass killing began. In Eastern Europe, the process sometimes was not so orderly. Teams of security police would rove from town to town simply exterminating the Jewish population. The expropriation of land and property followed later.

When we look back on these events we do so not to magnify this catastrophe above all others that resulted from the Nazi era. But this evil was unique among all the others. The destruction of the European Jews was a cold and careful implementation of a policy. Vast bureaucratic machinery was created to carry out that goal. And every aspect of the murder, within the context of the Third Reich, was perfectly legal.

There are many things to remember about the Holocaust. These are only some of them. As we commemorate the casualties of this abomination, we should celebrate its survivors. These witnesses contribute much to our understanding. We commend them for their courage and their ability to maintain their humanity after experiencing unimaginable evil. Today we let them know that we will not forget.●

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this special order commemorating Yom Ha'shoa, the "Days of Remembrance." While this day is ladened with bitterness and unbearable memories, I am proud to join with the survivors of this tragedy in honoring the dead and celebrating life.

Today's Remembrance is important, first and foremost, so that present and future generations will not forget the horror that engulfed millions of Jews just 40 years ago. The events surrounding the Holocaust were unprecedented in human history, and recollection of the depths of destruction and cruelty that can lie at the bottom of the human soul is critical to ensuring that it never happen again.

The Holocaust was more than a crime against God and humanity. It was an instance where genocide became an all-pervasive Government policy unaffected by territorial or economic advantage and unchecked by moral or religious constraints. The systematic extermination of the Jewish people was an overriding obsession of Adolf Hitler, transcending even the goal of victory in war. Even after the defeat of Nazi Germany on the Russion front, when it was evident that the Germans had lost the war, Hitler pursued the final solution.

And all of this occurred just 40 years ago—40 years in the course of mankind is a very short timespan, yet it is enough time so that a majority of the world's population has no personal recollection of these events. So, it is imperative that we remember. We must remember the number—6 million Jews died, two out of three residing in Europe and one-third of the world's Jewish population, along with countless others who were victims of a dark inferno that swallowed Europe. And, we must remember the places—Auschwitz, Dachau, Majdanek, Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald, and others. The Torah admonishes us to "zakhor," that is, to remember—and remember we must.

Nonetheless, while we remember in honor of the memory of those who perished, we also must remember because the ghosts of the Holocaust are very much alive and walking among us throughout the world today. Now, more than ever, we must be on our guard against a growing trend of racial and religious intolerance, especially in the United States. For if one lesson of the Holocaust must not be lost, it is that the human hatred that occurred was unleashed as much by inaction and complacency as by the heinous ideology of its perpetrators.

Just last year, hundreds of anti-Semitic incidents were reported nationwide. These incidents ranged from vandalism and cemetery desecrations to arson and bombings. Furthermore, there has been an alarming rise in the number of anti-Semitic occurrences in Western Europe, including everything from swastika graffiti to machinegun murders. While these crimes have led to tougher enforcement and better laws, the fact that they occurred at all is a tragedy that must not be forgotten.

And so, today we have much to remember. We remember the destruction, death, and cruelty of the Holocaust. But, we also remember the gallant heroism of those who fought in the face of hopeless odds in resisting the Nazi exterminators. We remember the survivors, and we celebrate the joys of life and a reaffirmation of the strength of the human spirit with them. But, we also remember that constant vigilance is necessary to prevent the type of incidents we are now experiencing which shows the same hatred and cruelty as was demonstrated by the Nazis.

Finally, we remember the importance of standing up against tyranny so that the principles we believe in, and freedom itself, can be sustained. It is up to us to remember, and that is a lesson we must never forget.●

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have this opportunity to participate in this year's special order to commemorate Yom Ha'shoa, or a Day of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust.

It is difficult to believe that 51 years have passed since Hitler first seized power and moved a nation to frenzy. His reign of terror and bloodshed lasted 12 years; 12 years in which Hitler methodically planned his final solution: the exterminaton of the Jewish people. Through such tools as mass murders and graves, gas chambers, crematoriums, and institutionalized slavery, he almost accomplished his goal. It was estimated in 1944, by Heinrich Himmler in a dispatch to Eichman, that over 6 million Jews had been exterminated to date, thus reducing European Jewry by approximately two-thirds.

Thirty-nine years have passed since the defeat of the Axis powers by the Allies. Already, a generation has succeeded the original survivors of the Holocaust. The concentration camps are now nothing but ruins and tourist sites, Hitler is dead and the mass graves have been bulldozed over. No more do we hear the fanatical talk of final solutions by frenzied crowds. Rather, with the passing of time, all has become settled and quiet. It is therein that lies the danger. We must never become so complacent that the Holocaust becomes nothing but a dis-

tant memory. The flame of anger and indignation concerning the near destruction of a people must never die. We must never forget—else such horrors will surely be repeated. Never again should any people be the victims of such heinous and inhuman crimes to suit the purpose of any final solution.

It is for these reasons that I completely support such special orders as this one sponsored by my colleague ROBERT GARCIA, the Evening of Commemoration through the Performing Arts, the Day of Remembrance Civic Ceremony and the establishment of a U.S. Holocaust Memorial. Only through actions such as these and mass education can we combat the fading memory that accompanies time.

My friends, this Yom Ha'shoa I appeal to you to take the time to reflect on the Holocaust. Think of the death camps, the useless and cruel deaths, the indignities, the resistance of a people and remember the children. Never forget the over 1 million children who perished at the hands of the Nazis. Remember all those who were murdered merely to complete a fanatic and insane plan. Remember—so that it will never happen again.●

● Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to remember the Holocaust. Most of us have a difficult time digging back 40 years into the past. But Holocaust survivors have no trouble at all remembering even the smallest details of the most terrible part of World War II.

And perhaps even more tragic than their memories are our own memories of how we knew what was happening, and did little or nothing to help them. Their ships sailed to our shores and we turned them away. Our planes flew over the incinerators at Auschwitz, taking photographs, but dropping no bombs.

We look back on the war and congratulate ourselves for the victory. But there was no victory for the millions who met death in the camps. And the victory for those who survived was haunted by memories of those outside the camps who knew what had happened but did not lend a hand.

For 40 years, survivors have determined to insure that this never happens again. And that means that it never happens again to any people of any race in any nation. Never again.

Of course, the threat of holocaust is always with us. And the threat of holocaust is usually accompanied by a threat of genocide.

Whether the threat occurs in the Soviet Union of Southeast Asia or with Indians in Nicaragua, we must join the Holocaust survivors in saying, "Never again."

We cannot allow ourselves to rationalize that the lives of 600 Indians in Central America or 600,000 refugees in Kampuchea are not as important as 6,000,000 Jews in Germany. In the eyes of God, lives are precious in any circumstance.

So when we remember the Holocaust and those who did and did not survive, let us also remember the possibility of holocaust in our own day and in the days ahead.

We cannot afford to forget how it happened, how we looked the other way, and that the survivors in our midst force us to face the truth. If this ever happens again, it will be because good men and women knew and did nothing to stop it.

We cannot let that happen.●

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues as we pause from our daily routines to remember the 6 million Jews and other ethnic, religious, and political groups annihilated in Europe during the Nazi reign of terror.

This time has been set aside by request from Mr. GARCIA and my other colleagues as part of the national observance which began yesterday, April 29, with Holocaust Remembrance Day. I commend my colleagues highly for their efforts to insure that this legislative body does its part in remembering the victims of so great a tragedy. As representatives of this great Nation that has long been the symbol of hope and freedom for the oppressed peoples of the world, we cannot help but acknowledge our responsibility to insure that the lessons of the Holocaust are never forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is not as simple as remembering the people who lost their lives because they were born into a certain religious or cultural group. It is not enough to commemorate the courage and strength of spirit of those who risked their lives to save others from a terrible fate. Unless we are constantly aware of the circumstances in which we live today which could once again give rise to such a terrible tragedy, we are not truly honoring the memory of those who have died. The Jews in the Soviet Union who are today being persecuted for trying to emigrate, the Bahai's in Iran who are being killed indiscriminately for refusing to disavow their religious heritage, and their fellow human beings all over the world who are being hunted down and oppressed are all the inheritors of the legacy of man's inhumanity to his fellow man—a legacy which spawned the Holocaust.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit the home in Amsterdam where Anne Frank and her family lived in hiding and in terror of the Nazi occupation troops. The home is a living memorial to tell the terrible story of the Holocaust, so that new generations will never allow this to happen again.

Mr. Speaker, there is much economic, political, and social unrest in the world today that could yet engender another tragedy like that of 40 years ago. We must work to alleviate those conditions which could create an environment capable of spawning the evil of the Nazi era. That is our vigil to keep for the world today, and our duty to those whose memory we honor.●

● Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1930's was one of the darkest eras in human history. The world economy was suffering from the most severe depression of the 20th century. Hunger was fast becoming a way of life around the world, and world tensions were at a dangerously high level due to the dissatisfaction many people felt with the economic policies of established governments. The climax of this dissatisfaction was the rise of the Nazi Party to power in Germany.

The fascist Nazi regime represented all that Americans abhor. Adolf Hitler's dedication to the establishment of a German empire and the creation of a so-called superrace for this empire was the antithesis of the goals and ideals which underlie Western civilization and our Christian-Judaic heritage.

The history of the world contains too many examples of cruel and premeditated persecution of ethnic and religious groups. Jewish people through the centuries have been the victim of such persecution, but human history records no persecution as evil, debased, and widespread as that inflicted on the Jews by Adolf Hitler and his Nazi henchmen. Not only did Hitler intend to remove Jews from his "perfect society," he openly proclaimed that he intended to exterminate them as he added more and more conquered territory to the Nazi empire.

The people of the world must never forget the Holocaust. The memories of Treblinka, Buchenwald, Auschwitz, and Dachau, as horrible as they are, must remain in our minds so that we can understand the horror associated with a repressive totalitarian regime.

Even today, some Jews are not at peace. Israel, our ally in the Middle East, is under nearly constant terrorist attack. In addition, few Jews in the Soviet Union are allowed to emigrate to join their families and friends in other nations, particularly Israel. The United States must continue to address this persecution of the Jewish community.

As we in the Congress observe the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust, let us reflect upon the pain and horror experienced by the Jews, and other people who were subjected to the barbaric and obscene fascist persecution. As a humane, peace-loving society, America must be ever vigilant and exert itself to deter such crimes against humanity.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I address this body today not only as a Member of Congress, but also as a member of

the Jewish community. I rise in order to remember, honor, and commemorate those fellow Jews who perished in the most tragic event ever to occur in the history of the civilized world, and also to celebrate the ideal of Jewish identity and distinctiveness.

Chanukah, Purim, Passover, Tisha B'Av, these holidays throughout the Jewish calendar all have at least one thing in common. They commemorate an important characteristic of the Jewish people: Adaptability tempered with continuity. For on each of these occasions a malicious attact or an attempted genocide was made on the Jewish people. Yet, on each of these occasions, the Jewish people not only survived the attack, but preserved their traditions as well.

Despite the long history of persecutions and attempted genocides made on the Jewish people, the Holocaust was allowed to happen while the rest of the world looked the other way in a policy of isolation and professed ignorance. And so on this Day of Remembrance, I ask you to recall once more the horrors of 40 years ago: Remember the prison, labor, and extermination camps where 4 million Jews were gassed and where an additional 2 million died of starvation, disease, and torture. Dachau, Oranienburg, Auschwitz, Buchenwald, Bergen-Belsen, Treblinka, and Ravensbrueck were only a few of the countless camps.

Remember those individuals that were responsible for the massive devastation that was allowed to occur: Not only Hitler, but also Himmler, Diels, Goering, Eichman, Horst Schumann, Karl Clauberg, Gerhard Madaus, Ernst Kock, August Hirt, Odilo Globocnik. Their legacy of horrors—advances in mass extermination and human experimentation are too cruel to be believed.

Remember the pseudonyms employed by the Nazis: "Sonderbehandung" which literally means special treatment but a term which came to mean execution; "selektion" the sorting and selection of those to die; "desinfektion" which meant gassing. Remember Zyklon B, a gas which was designed to destroy insects but which was used by the Nazis to destroy Jews. Remember the crematoriums and the mass graves. Remember the horrors, remember the Holocaust.

World War II did not mark the end of anti-Semitism. Israel has fought four wars against the Arabs in her constant struggle for survival beginning in 1948 and again in 1956, 1967, and 1973. Israel has also had to contend with terrorist groups such as the Palestine Liberation Organization, devoted to the extermination of the State of Israel. Indeed, the 100-member Palestine National Council rewrote the Palestine National Covenant in 1948 which declares in article 9 that "armed struggle is the only way to liberate Palestine and is therefore a strategy and not tactics." The PLO is perhaps best remembered for the slaughter of Israeli athletes in the 1972 Olympics in Munich, Germany, but has proudly taken credit for countless other attacks on innocent civilians.

Israel, however, is not the only country where Jews are continuously targeted. Jews in the Soviet Union continue to face devastating oppression by the repressive regime that will not let them practice their religion or emigrate to the land of their forefathers. I have received numerous letters from constituents and nonconstituents alike, urging me to write on behalf of a friend or a relative so that he or she may be allowed to leave the Soviet Union and be reunited in Israel with their families.

In Ethiopia, groups such as the Falasha have been singled out by the Government for oppression. The Jews living in Ethiopia are one of the oldest Jewish communities in existence. Most alarming is the fact that the old population of 250,000 Jews in Ethiopia has been reduced to a mere 20,000 and those survivors are not allowed to attend their synagogs nor to emigrate to Israel.

Since the end of World War II, the world has had to bear witness to numerous calamities which have resulted in the loss of countless Jewish lives. No region has been granted immunity from anti-Semitism be it the Middle East, Africa, South America, the Soviet Union, Europe or even our own country.

On this Day of Remembrance I believe that it is of paramount importance to not only remember the tragedy of the Holocaust, but to also remember and commemorate all the other tragedies that have subjected the Jewish people to torture, persecution and death. Failure to do so, as history has shown, may result in the reenactment of the most abominable chapter of man's history to date. In our endeavor to remember and ultimately prevent a future holocaust we must not falter, we must not fail.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, these are the most solemn and awesome days of the year. On these days we remember the 6 million people, the innocent victims of barbaric racism, who were exterminated in Nazi death camps.

We broke ground on the Mall this morning to begin construction of a U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and Education Center. This permanent, living memorial to the victims of the Holocaust will enable present and future generations of Americans to learn of the ghastly atrocity. And our collective memory of the Holocaust, the darkest moment in human history, will serve the cause of democracy and freedom. The memorial will embody our determination to protect the civil and human rights of all people in all places.

The Days of Remembrance were marked yesterday in New Haven, Conn., at the Holocaust Memorial Place, a shrine to the 6 million erected jointly by the New Haven Jewish Federation and the city of New Haven. This modern, free-flowing structure, which contains ashes from the ovens of Auschwitz in its base, was ringed by 1,500 people, including many survivors of the camps and ghettos. I was privileged to address this gathering, and to give tribute there.

On the Days of Remembrance we rekindle our memory of the victims of the Holocaust. To sustain the living, to honor the dead, we shall never forget.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in observing a Day of Sorrowful Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust. The ceremonies taking place today in conjunction with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council will help us all reflect upon the horrifying crimes against humanity perpetrated in Nazi Germany during World War II. It is a painful, emotional experience to look back to a time 40 years ago when almost an entire people perished under Nazi tyranny. Six million Jews were put to death—almost all of Europe's Jewish population. Six million victims of Hitler's barbarism.

These horrifying and unspeakable crimes must never be forgotten by anyone. We need to listen to those who survived this carefully planned, deliberate genocide of the Jewish people, who lived to tell the truth to recall the horrors they endured.

Those who survived have a harsh, but vital lesson to teach every one of us: That lesson is that these evil crimes man committed against his fellow man must never be forgotten. We must never again permit such hatred, bigotry, and barbaric cruelty to go unchallenged. All of us here today, as Members of this hallowed body, have a special obligation to help make clear to the world the brutal facts of this terrible atrocity; the pain and suffering 6 million Jews endured must never be forgotten. It is our responsibility to assure the memory of the Holocaust remains fresh in all minds. Part of our efforts today will help make certain we understand the importance of that responsibility. Only in this way can we prevent such an evil from recurring, that a Holocaust never happens again. We must remember. We must be willing to act to make sure this human tragedy never happens again.

On this Day of Remembrance, I urge my colleagues to observe the exhibits at the Holocaust Memorial Museum, exhibits brought from Yad Vashem.

And join me in pledging anew: "Never again."●

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, among the darkest pages in the history of mankind are those that mark the Holocaust—the systematic slaughter of 6 million Jewish men, women, and children during World War II by Nazi Germany and its minions.

Would that this Day of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust be unnecessary. But, it is necessary. It is necessary that we recall the unprecedented barbarism of the Holocaust so that today's generations—and those yet to come—understand what can happen when hatred overcomes reason.

The death of an individual moves us. Yet, the enormity of the Holocaust crimes tends to desensitize our emotions. The Holocaust, so overpowering in numbers killed and depravities committed, numbs the heart and the mind. The tableau is so unbelieving that it becomes only a surrealistic nightmare from the newspapers and news films of a past to be forgotten. We cannot let this happen and so call attention to the Holocaust, lest history be permitted another atrocity equal or greater.

The Holocaust is remembered also so we do not forget that lesser slaughters of peoples because of religion, color, or ethnic origin have been taking place around the globe since the end of World War II. Along with the rest of the civilized world, perhaps, we in this country have looked the other way or have not exerted enough effort to prevent future slaughters or to bring to account those responsible.

I know that I shall be haunted constantly by the memories recalled when I stood at the Martyrs' Shrine, Yad Vashem, in Jerusalem. In that cradle of Christianity, Yad Vashem stands as an unforgiving reminder of how far we traveled from Bethlehem to Dachau, and how little we have learned.

The civilized world can do better. We, as a government and a people, can do better. We must do better.●

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, communities across this country and around the world gather this week to commemorate Holocaust Memorial Day—Yom Ha'shoa. We join in sharing painful memories of the Holocaust. We pay tribute to those who suffered immeasurably and survived and to those who resisted, spiritually and physically, to the attempt by the Nazis to annihilate the Jewish people. And today we grieve for the more than 6 million who perished; a testimony to the lowest form of barbarism to which man can sink.

But our purpose here today is not just to mark an occasion in history, an event out of our past. We are here to teach a lesson—that the circumstances of the Holocaust could have, should have, been avoided. America, and the rest of Europe did not do enough to save those endangered by the Nazi regime. We closed our eyes and ears and hearts to the horrors of that time. The lesson of the Holocaust must be taught from generation to generation so that humanity will never forget, and never repeat, the catastrophic events of those dark days.

Toward that end we gather today in the Rotunda of the Capitol to affirm the strength and resolve of those who resisted and those who survived. We who were not caught up in the maelstrom can never fully know what their world was like. We can never fully assimilate the horror of the Holocaust. But while we can never fully understand the horror, we can take steps to insure that it never happens again. We cannot sit back and believe that this was an accident of history and that it will never occur again to the Jews, or to other peoples. The building of the U.S. Holocaust Museum is one way to keep the memory of the Holocaust alive—to teach each generation the reality of the Holocaust and how the world allowed it to occur. We must also pledge our continued support for the state of Israel, so that never again will the Jewish people have to depend on the sufferance of others for their survival.●

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to join together with my colleagues in remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust.

As painful as this moment in history was, we must not allow its memory to die. All of mankind can take a lesson from the fact that remembrance of the 6 million has become a Mitzvah of Jewish observance. It is through reminders such as this that we can assure that the Holocaust will never be relived.

Many have postulated on how the Holocaust was allowed to come about. Indifference, cynicism, whatever the cause, we, particularly as national leaders, must be vigilant and cautious in our deliberations, with the Holocaust serving as a warning against indifference toward our fellow men and women.

Ours is a humanitarian nation; a nation which respects and promotes human rights world-wide. As such, we carry an obligation to support, among other causes, the perpetuation of the state of Israel. What better time to repledge this commitment than during the days of remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust.●

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with my colleagues in recognizing the Days of Remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust. There will be few special orders in this body which are more important or significant than this one.

The Holocaust, at the hands of Nazi Germany, was unprecedented; never before in human history had genocide been an all-pervasive bureaucratic, government policy, unaffected by territorial or economic advantage and unchecked by moral or religious constraints. The Holocaust was the systematic extermination of 6 million Jews and countless other people by the Nazis and their collaborators as a central act of state during the Second World War. The overriding obsession of Adolf Hitler became the purpose of the Nazi state, transcending the cause of victory in the war. Even after the defeat of Nazi Germany on the Russian front, when it was evident that the Germans had lost the war, the killings were intensified in a last desperate attempt at complete annihilation of an entire culture. Adolf Hitler asked the final solution—the death of every Jew—and even after 41 years, the horror of his obsession and the fact that others carried out his orders to kill are too much for the human mind to comprehend, but we have to remember.

We shall never forget the horror and the genocide which engulfed millions of Jews just 41 years ago. This crime against God and against humanity points to the depths of behavior of which mankind is capable. By reminding us, and all of the world, of the Holocaust in their gathering here in Washington, the survivors do the world a great service by inspiring us to pledge our efforts to insure a Holocaust never happens again. It has been said that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." We must listen to the survivors and do our part to make sure such a human tragedy never again occurs.

The purpose of the special order, I believe, is not to dwell on the despair of the Holocaust, but remember it well and to use its memory to strengthen us in never allowing a recurrence. The Holocaust was not just a grotesque crime against the Jews, but a crime against all of humanity. This month also marks the 41st anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, where the Jews of that city demonstrated great courage and heroism by revolting against the brutal Nazi occupation of their homeland. Although unsuccessful, the revolt was of enormous importance. It demonstrated the extent to which people will resist persecution in the face of overwhelming odds. The Holocaust made clear to the world the strength and conviction of the Jewish people. The Jews stood defiant to the greatest assault on a culture that mankind has ever seen.

We must continue our efforts to insure that basic human rights are never denied by the state because of race or religion. We must teach our children that man's fate is in his own hands, and by learning the lessons of history, a better future is indeed possible.●

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today the entire world joins in the observance of the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust, the anniversary of the liberation of the camps.

For those of us who lived through those dark years, the fact that the Holocaust occurred is a chilling and stark reality. But to more recent generations, it may seem impossible that a civilized society could degenerate so completely. It may seem impossible that evil could so permeate the world.

Our participation in this Day of Remembrance demonstrates that we shall never forget, and we shall never let future generations forget, the genocide and the horror which engulfed millions of Jews, and indeed the whole world, some 42 years ago. It was, and will forever remain a global nightmare that will serve as a perpetual warning of the atrocities and unspeakable cruelty of which man is capable.

We gather today in remembrance of the 6 million Jews and others who died in the Holocaust. Six million Jews went to their deaths in ovens and gas chambers, or were worked to death, throughout Eastern Europe. Two out of every three European Jews died—one-third of the world's Jewish population. Those camps were so unimaginably horrible that even children and grandchildren of those who survived bear psychological scars. Those who survived live not only with the scars, but with the fear that it could happen again.

We remember the Holocaust today to insure that history not repeat itself. All generations must know of these horrors. If they do not know, they will not learn the lessons history offers. History demonstrates that the world cannot remain indifferent to human misery and evil without suffering grave consequences. In Elie Wiesel's book "The Town Beyond the Wall," a survivor of Auschwitz says there is only one thing he has wanted to understand since the war—how a human being can remain indifferent.

Today we join together with firm resolve that this Nation will not remain indifferent to human misery and suffering.

Our most sacred task now is insuring that the memory of this greatest of human tragedies, the Holocaust, never fades—that its lessons are not forgotten. Although so much has been written and said, words are somehow never enough.

To remember means not only to gather here each year in this important commemoration. It means to open our memory and include those who are not allowed to keep this memory alive. Remember that in the Soviet Union, Jews today are not allowed to remember.

To remember means to issue an appeal so powerful that it would break all the indifference in the world on behalf of the Soviet Jews.

To remember also means to open our soul and make it more sensitive to suffering and injustice everywhere, no matter what forms it takes, or against whom it is directed.

Let us return next year, and the following, and the following, to do our best to see that this dark stain on the history of man is not forgotten, and never repeated.●

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my strong support for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 537. This resolution will rename the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

Due to Ed's diligent efforts in protecting the environment, I believe this measure will properly honor both the legislator, who fought many battles to secure environmental legislation, as well as the man, who strongly felt that we needed to protect the environment for future generations.

Over the years, Ed worked steadily, maintaining the highest standards in his efforts. With his unobtrusive style, Ed was a conscientious and effective lawmaker who let his actions display his intent, rather than counting media attention.

Ed Forsythe was active in public service from 1948 until this year, starting out in local New Jersey offices and continuing his involvement up through his election to the 91st Congress, and his service in each Congress since then. But even after years in Washington, Ed never lost sight of his constituency at home.

I had the privilege of working closely with Ed Forsythe on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, where we worked closely on a number of proposals aimed at protecting our New Jersey shore. Ed left his mark as a leader in the fields of environmental protection and conservation, never letting partisan affiliations stand in the way of what he believed was right.

Ed's rarest quality, which I deeply admired, was this conviction to follow his conscience. Ed legislated with honesty and integrity. By doing so, he always stood out as an example of what is right about the Government.

By the simple task of renaming this portion of the wildlife refuge, much of which is located in my southern New Jersey district, we can immortalize the efforts of an esteemed colleague, but most importantly, of a truly decent man. I ask that you vote to adopt House Joint Resolution 537.

Thank you.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CRAIG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GARCIA, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HUGHES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 60 minutes, on June 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CRAIG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. MCCAIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROE.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. GARCIA.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. BARNES.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. D'AMOURS.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 501. An act to amend the laws of the United States to eliminate gender-based distinctions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1711. An act to extend Patent Numbered 3,376,198, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1806. An act to recognize the organization known as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1870. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for credit and debit card counterfeiting and related fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1989. An act for the relief of Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2303. An act to revise and extend the Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services block grant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 2413. An act to recognize the organization known as the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J Res. 227. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 11, 1984, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title.

S. 2460. An act to designate a Federal building in Augusta, Maine, as the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building";

S. 2461. An act to designate a Federal building in Bangor, Maine, as the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building"; and

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to recognize "Volunteer Firefighters Recognition Day" as a tribute to the bravery and self-sacrifice of our volunteer firefighters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1984, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3232. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reduce the cost of and improve the food stamp program and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3233. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Installations, and Logistics), transmitting the fifth quadrennial review of the compensation system for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1008(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3234. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting the selected acquisition reports (SAR's) and SAR summary tables for the quarter ending March 31, 1984, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 139a (b)(1) and (f) (96 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3235. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the report on the Federal Open Market Committee's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3236. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report on the agency's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3237. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

3238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 16, 1981, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Mingo Creek, Tulsa, Okla. These reports are in response to section 208 of the Flood Control Act (Public Law 89-298) as modified by section 134(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-587) (H. Doc. No. 98-212); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 5544. A bill to assist the United States and Mexican border economy, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Ways and Means; Argiculture; and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 5545. A bill to provide that unemployment compensation included in gross income shall be treated as earned income for purposes of the deduction for two-earner married couples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 5546. A bill to establish the Commission on Missing Chilren and to impose mandatory sentences for violent felonies committed against individuals of age 17 or under, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 5547. A bill to amend the act of October 21, 1970, establishing the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain highways owned by Benzie and Leelanau Counties, Mich., in the lakeshore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5548. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the counties of Benzie and Leelanau, Mich., with respect to the repair and maintenance of certain highways owned by such counties and and located in and around the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER.

H. Res. 492. Resolution commending Amistad Promotions, Inc., for promoting understanding of the history and customs of AfroAmericans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1676: Mr. PARRIS and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 2889: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3686: Mr. WILSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 4356: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 4966: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 5136: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ECKART, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 71: Mr. PORTER.

H.J. Res. 451: Mr. SILJANDER.

H.J. Res. 488: Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. YATES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. STUMP.

H.J. Res. 497: Mr. HILLIS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BATES, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MACKAY.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MACKAY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5167

By Mr. BENNETT:

—Page 10, line 19, strike out "$8,664,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,942,700,000".

At the end of title I (page 15, after line 5), add the following new section:

MX MISSILE PROCUREMENT

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be used for the MX missile program.

SENATE—*Monday, April 30, 1984*

The Senate met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; and thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds. Thy righteousness is like the great mountains; thy judgments are a great deep: O Lord, thou preservest man and beast. How excellent is thy loving kindness, O God!—Psalm 36: 5-7.

We thank thee, Gracious Father, for your unconditional, impartial, unwearying, patient, forgiving, victorious love, love which never changes, never coerces, never manipulates, never ceases. Forgive our indifference—our reluctance—our rejection—our rebellion against this relentless love which seeks us throughout our lives from conception to death.

Deliver us from whatever it is within us that causes us to deprive ourselves of the matchless grace which Thou dost lavish upon us. We pray in the name of Him whose cross is the measure of that love. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is one special order today in favor of Senator PROXMIRE to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not more than 30 minutes. Then we will resume consideration of H.R. 2163, which is the boat bill, which is carrying its heavy cargo of a tax bill and now appropriation bills and in effect a budget resolution. A reporter in dugout chatter, as we call it, this morning asked me why things were going so slowly, and I thought to myself what a remarkable question considering what is being packaged in this one measure. It is extraordinary, if indeed we can finish this bill, that we are putting together all of these things in one piece of legislation and doing so in a relatively brief period of time. We have not yet done it so I should not crow about it until it is finished, but we have done the tax portion of it, which has been known to take weeks. In this case it took 1 week. With the exception of a couple of amendments that may be offered and others that might follow in another way, and we are now into the appropriations part of it and the budget part of it.

I hope, Mr. President, that we can finish this bill this week, and by this week I am afraid I mean by Thursday, the end of business on Thursday. I wish to say right now that I have tried hard to keep the Senate in on Friday in the springtime, but it is very difficult, and this Friday for a variety of reasons is going to be especially difficult. I will be glad to confer with any Member on a more private basis on what those special circumstances are but most of them already know. In any event, Mr. President, I think we can finish this bill by Thursday evening.

We will not be in late tonight. I estimate the Senate will be in no longer than 5 or 6 p.m. today, but I wish to put Senators on notice that we may be in late Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, or any combination thereof, if there is a realistic opportunity to finish this bill. So let me repeat, the Senate will be in until normal hours today, but all bets are off on the remainder of the week through Thursday evening. We may be in late on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. I do not anticipate, however, that we will be in on Friday.

Mr. President, there are other bills that may be taken up this week. I am told, for instance, that the clean water bill is available and we might be able to get a fairly short time limitation on it. I would like to do that if we can. It is not yet done. It is not cleared on this side either yet, but I have asked staff to explore the possibility of clearing it.

There are a few items on the Executive Calendar that have been there for a while, and it is possible that we could get to that this week or next week.

My principal ambition, Mr. President, is to try to finish the boat bill this week. I have been advised by the chairman of the Finance Committee that that committee will probably report a debt limit bill on Thursday of this week. We will have to pass that sometime toward the middle of May, and I am giving that notice now so Senators will be aware that we have a debt limit debate coming up at sometime beginning after the first of the month, perhaps before May 15.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. What does the distinguished majority leader foresee from the standpoint of a date when we might take up the math-science bill and also the bankruptcy bill?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the minority leader will let me have until tomorrow, I have a caucus and a chairmen's meeting tomorrow and both of those items are on my agenda. So if I can defer my answer until tomorrow, I will be in a position to give the minority leader more information.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I think that is all I have. I thank the minority leader for his consideration and I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished minority leader is recognized.

SENATE RECONFIRMATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in March 1984, I introduced S. 2446, the "Senate Confirmation Act of 1984." That legislation was designed to improve the Senate confirmation process—

First, by taking the responsibility for supervising background investigations out of the White House and placing it in the hands of an independent office of Government; namely, the Office of Government Ethics.

Second, by requiring that the Senate be given exactly the same information about a nominee that is provided to a President or to a President-elect and his transition team.

Third, by providing that with respect to a limited number of high-ranking officials, there would be a reconfirmation requirement in the event a President were reelected to a second term and wished to keep those same officials in place.

On April 11, 1984, in the wake of the discovery that the Director of Central Intelligence had not adequately informed the Senate Intelligence Committee about the Nicaragua mining operation, I announced that I had decided to introduce the third provision—requiring reconfirmation of certain top officials of Government, in the event a President were to be elected to a second term—as separate legislation. It seems to me that that would be the most meaningful way we could hold

such officers accountable for their performance in office.

Mr. Casey is not the only official I would like to see go through the confirmation process the second time, so that the Senate might have the advantage of a previous track record and make its judgments accordingly.

Mr. Casey is not an elected official, and the most responsible way for the Senate to exercise its responsibilities under the "Advice and Consent" clause would be to require that nominees for such positions be reconfirmed.

Also, I would like very much to find a way to include the Director of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation, in view of the recent history of that plagued agency.

Moreover, this is not necessarily a situation that is limited to this administration. As I stated on April 11, "Senators will remember that, from time to time, I differed with President Carter, a member of my own political party, and this requirement of reconfirmation should apply regardless of what party is in control of the Senate or the White House."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce this legislation today, at this point, as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2604

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Senate Re-Confirmation Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person who—

(1) is an appointee to a position listed in section 5312 of title 5, United States Code, or to the position of Secretary of the Air Force, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Director of Central Intelligence, or Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

(2) has served in such position for the last year of a Presidential term,

may serve in the same position during the next succeeding Presidential term unless and until such person is reappointed to such position by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does my senior colleague wish to have some time to speak? I will be glad to yield him as much of my time as he may require.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the minority leader. The majority leader said there was a special order for the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). Finding him not in the Chamber and wanting to make just a very brief remark, I hope the two leaders can accommodate me just for perhaps a minute or two.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I note that maybe I have not used my entire standing order time. I yield it to the minority leader as he may wish.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Now, Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished senior colleague (Mr. RANDOLPH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the able minority leader.

IN MEMORY OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. RANDOLPH. I call attention at the beginning of the session of the Senate today to a very meaningful service which was conducted yesterday at the Washington Cathedral. It was a service in memory of our beloved former President of the United States, Harry Truman.

There will be official programs for the remembrance of our 33d Chief Executive as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of his birth this year. Truman served in difficult times, as a former Member of this body who was in the Roosevelt administration as Vice President and was then elected President in his own right.

Margaret Truman Daniel, daughter of the President spoke, as did her husband, Clifton Daniel.

The Right Reverend John T. Walker officiated, assisted by the Reverend Provost Charles A. Perry.

More than a thousand worshippers joined in this memorable tribute.

In the service on Sunday morning, eloquent comments were made by Clark Clifford on the faith and the beliefs and the Christian character of Harry Truman. He quoted the President. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Clark Clifford, who served President Truman as a naval aide and later as a special counsel, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL CATHEDRAL APRIL 29, 1984

Divine providence has played a great part in our history. I have the feeling that God has created us and brought us to our present position of power and strength for some great purpose.

It is not given to us now to know fully what that purpose is, but I think we may be sure of one thing. And that is that our country is intended to do all it can, in cooperating with other nations to help create peace and preserve peace in the world. It is given to us to defend the spiritual values—the moral code—against the vast forces of evil that seek to destroy them.

This is a hard task. It is not one that we have asked for. At times we would like to lay it down. And, as we go on with it, we see it is full of uncertainties and sacrifices. But we need not be afraid, if we have faith.

We often hear it said that spiritual values are indestructible, but I think it should be said that they are indestructible only so long as men are ready and willing to take action to preserve them.

The essential mission of the church is to teach the moral law. Religion is not an easy thing. It is not simply a comfort to those in trouble or a means of escape from present difficulties, as some people today would have us believe. Moreover, religion is not a negative thing. It is not merely a series of prohibitions against certain actions because they are wicked.

Our religion includes those elements. But it also includes more. It is a positive force that impels us to affirmative action. . . . Selfishness and greed can tear this Nation apart. . . . Our religious faith gives us the answer to the false beliefs of communism. We are defending freedom of worship and conscience. . . .

My political philosophy is based on the Sermon on the Mount. And it is the hardest thing in the world for any man to live up to. If you haven't read it lately, I would advise you to go home tonight and read it. It will do you a lot of good.

I am convinced that we are strong enough to meet the challenge. We are strong enough because we have a profound religious faith. The basic source of our strength as a nation is spiritual. We believe in the dignity of man. We believe that he is created in the image of God, who is the father of us all.

"Oh, Almighty and Everlasting God, creator of heaven, Earth and the universe:

"Help me to be, to think, to act what is right because it is right; make me truthful, honest and honorable in all things; make me intellectually honest for the sake of right and honor and without thought of reward to me. Give me the ability to be charitable, forgiving and patient with my fellow men; help me to understand their motives and their shortcomings even as Thou understandest mine."

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have some time remaining. If the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin would like that time, I would be happy to yield it to him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. I am all right.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I therefore yield back to the majority leader any of his time and my remaining time, if he wishes to utilize it.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

ALLEGED WRONGDOING BY GENERAL DYNAMICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, serious allegations of wrongdoing in connection with the Navy's nuclear attack submarine program have been made by the former head of the General Dynamics shipyard. The allegations of fraud were first made months ago together with an offer to provide full details to the Justice Department. Yet, the Justice Department has been dragging its feet about following up the offer, and the circumstances of the case are beginning to suggest that the Government is more interested in keeping the lid on a potential new scandal than in finding out some unpleasant facts about defense contracting.

SHIPBUILDING COST OVERRUNS AND CLAIMS

The facts of the case are these:

In 1978, the Navy "settled" a longstanding dispute with General Dynamics over huge cost overruns on the 688 submarine program. General Dynamics blamed the Navy for the overruns and filed a $544 million claim for reimbursement. Later, it told the Navy that the overruns would be much larger and that the claim would be increased to about $1 billion.

Although the Navy's Claims Settlement Review Board found that the claim was worth only $125 million, the Navy decided to pay General Dynamics about $624 million, party under a law authorizing financial rescues of ailing contractors. The decision to pay General Dynamics was made despite charges of possible fraud made by Adm. H. G. Rickover, who was then in charge of procuring the nuclear components of the submarines.

The Justice Department began an investigation of the alleged fraudulent claims in 1978. After nearly 3 years, in late 1981, Justice decided there was insufficient evidence for a prosecution and terminated its investigation.

ALLEGED KICKBACKS

In 1983, a Federal grand jury indicted P. Takis Veliotis, a vice president of General Dynamics and former general manager of the company's Electric Boat Division, where the submarines are built, for allegedly taking kickbacks from a supplier. Mr. Veliotis holds dual citizenship from the United States and Greece and he now resides in Greece as a fugitive from the U.S. Government. The kickback case is apparently unrelated to the alleged false claims.

VELIOTIS ACCUSES GENERAL DYNAMICS

In January of this year, the news media reported that Mr. Veliotis was accusing General Dynamics of an illegal "buy-in" to the submarine contract and of then falsifying the claims, and was offering to provide detailed information to the Justice Department.

After I made several inquiries to the Justice Department about Mr. Veliotis' allegations, it became clear to me that the top officials were not enthusiastic about going to Greece to meet with him. I requested that such a meeting be arranged, not because I accepted at face value Mr. Veliotis' allegations, but because he was in a position to have information and his allegations are too serious to be ignored.

The Justice Department's position has been that it does not want to undermine the criminal kickback case. I agree with that, but simply discussing the alleged fraudulent claims with Veliotis would not undermine the kickback prosecution.

In later February, I informed the Justice Department that I was sending a member of my staff to Athens to interview Mr. Veliotis and I requested that a Justice Department official accompany the staff person. The Justice Department refused my request on the grounds that it would be impractical and could raise procedural and substantive problems.

MEETING WITH VELIOTIS

Richard F. Kaufman, assistant director of the Joint Economic Committee, met with Mr. Veliotis in Athens during March 22-24 and held extensive interviews with him. On the basis of what has been reported to me of those discussions, I am more convinced than ever that it is urgent for the Justice Department to meet with Veliotis, to hear what he has to say, and to obtain copies of documents that might substantiate his allegations. If his allegations can be substantiated, every effort should be made to arrange for his return to the United States so that he can testify about what he knows.

Before summarizing what Mr. Veliotis said, I want to reiterate that his statements should not now be taken at face value. Veliotis is under indictment for a Federal crime and is a fugitive from justice. That certainly makes anything he says suspect. On the other hand, contrary to some published reports, he has not asked for immunity from the kickback prosecution in return for information about the claims. He has asked for immunity from any prosecution that might arise from his information about the claims. Also, it should be kept in mind that his allegations have not yet been substantiated. The truth of what he has to say has not been established.

For these reasons, while I believe it is my duty to pass along the essence of his accusations, I will not identify the individuals he names. However, he does name names as well as places and dates of meetings, the substance of conversations, and actions that were taken.

VELIOTIS' ALLEGATIONS

Mr. Veliotis alleges that the Electric Boat Division intentionally "bought-in" to the contract for 11 688-attack submarines awarded in 1973 by offering a price below the shipyard's own estimated costs. The buy-in was considered necessary because the shipyard's estimates of what it would cost to build the submarines were so high it was believed the company would not get the contract unless it lowered the price.

Mr. Veliotis further alleges that the company decided to file false claims against the Navy to seek reimbursement for the cost overruns. A scheme was developed to simply blame the Navy for the overruns, although it was known from the outset that the costs would exceed the price.

According to Mr. Veliotis, the final decisions to lower the price so as to buy in to the contract and to falsify the claims were made at General Dynamics headquarters by high officials of the corporation.

The claims were filed in 1976, 1 year before Mr. Veliotis was named general manager of the Electric Boat Division. During that period, Mr. Veliotis was general manager of the Quincy Division, General Dynamics' other shipyard. However, Mr. Veliotis states that, for a number of months prior to taking over Electric Boat, he interviewed all the key officials and employees at Electric Boat and reviewed the books and records in order to familiarize himself with the shipyard.

In addition, he says he participated in meetings with high officials of General Dynamics, both before and after he became general manager of Electric Boat, at which the fraudulent claims were discussed.

Mr. Veliotis states that some officials at Electric Boat objected to falsifying the claims but were overridden by General Dynamics. At least one was forced into early retirement and replaced by an individual from corporate headquarters who had no experience in shipbuilding and was made responsible for seeing to it that the false claims were prepared.

According to Mr. Veliotis, he was surprised when the Justice Department failed to question him and when he was not asked to testify before the grand jury during the investigation into the alleged fraudulent claims. He says he had intimate knowledge of the buy-in and the false claims and had in his possession numerous documents that spelled out what had been done. Some of the documentation had been given to him for safekeeping by another official of Electric Boat.

He claims to have copies of much of the documentation and says that he has offered to provide them to the Justice Department. Among other things, the documents contain a record of the original cost estimates of the submarine contract, notes about why and at whose request the price was reduced, a record of periodic presentations to corporate management of projected costs and why they were

overrunning, and a description of how the false claims were put together.

Finally, Mr. Veliotis states that Admiral Rickover was right all along about the false claims. He states that he, Mr. Veliotis, was able to convince Members of Congress that the claims were valid by citing figures and using devices such as films to illustrate his points. He states that in all of his meetings with Members of the House and Senate, no one ever questioned the validity of the claims, and Rickover's allegations were ignored.

VELIOTIS NOT QUESTIONED DURING INVESTIGATION OF CLAIMS

One of the most astonishing parts of Mr. Veliotis' story is that he was never questioned by the Justice Department. He was the head of the shipyard throughout most of the nearly 3-year investigation. Yet, he was never questioned. I asked the Justice Department about this and was told that he was not questioned because the claim was filed before he became general manager.

Apparently, the Justice Department did not know that he had spent a significant amount of time interviewing key officials before he took over the shipyard, a fact that has been verified by my staff. It may not have occurred to the Justice Department that Mr. Veliotis might have obtained important information before he became general manager of Electric Boat, either by interviewing key officials or by taking part in meetings with officials of the corporation.

But why would it not occur to the Justice Department that the head of the shipyard might come across important facts after he took over the management of the shipyard? Why would it not occur to the investigators that he would have access to all the books and records? Why would it not occur to them that, if the claim was false to begin with, it might be necessary for the general manager to know the truth? Why would it not occur to the Justice Department that, as one who had spent many years managing shipyards, Mr. Veliotis might have useful information and insights about shipbuilding?

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION MISMANAGED

One can only conclude that the failure to question Mr. Veliotis during the original investigation was a gross oversight. It suggests that the investigation may have been longer than it was deep, and that it may have been mismanaged.

Indeed, a report issued by the Justice Department last year concludes that there was mismanagement in the investigation of the General Dynamics claims. The report, entitled "Review of Navy Claims Investigations," was prepared by the Office of Policy and Management Analysis of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department. It reviews the Justice Department's handling of three separate shipbuilding investigations, including the investigation of the General Dynamics claims. Among the report's findings are the following:

At the outset of these investigations, the Fraud Section did not recognize how large and complex these matters would become or how difficult proof of criminality would be given the nature of the Navy claims process.

The Division did not direct concentrated management attention to these cases until an indictment review meeting or when a problem arose. In addition, there were problems with attorney and agent staffing. Although it was clear that Navy assistance was needed in these cases, there was no consensus on how a criminal investigation should be staffed to use the assistance best.

Concerning the handling of the General Dynamics-Electric Boat Division claim, the report states:

The Electric Boat matter was also first assigned to the Fraud Section attorney who was to coordinate the establishment of USAO-Navy-Section teams for that matter. . . . This attempt floundered in the Electric Boat investigation because both the Fraud Section line attorney assigned to the case and the Assistant U.S. Attorney from Connecticut moved on to other jobs. Then, after the FBI had been working on the case for about 10 months, the Fraud Section assigned the line attorney who ultimately performed most of the work on the case.

It is clear to me that the investigation was botched from beginning to end. There was excessive manpower turnover, a lack of coordination, and general mismanagement. Now there is a real possibility in light of the Veliotis allegations that the Justice Department made a mistake in closing down the investigation. If Mr. Veliotis is correct, there is more than one smoking gun in this case, and he can help find it.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT DRAGGING ITS FEET

The incredible thing is that the Justice Department has dragged its feet in taking up Mr. Veliotis' offer. I can understand that some in the Justice Department would want to avoid the embarrassment of learning it had made a mistake. I cannot understand the reluctance to do the prudent and appropriate thing even if it means admitting a mistake was made.

The Justice Department wrote to me on February 17, 1984, in response to questions I raised about the allegations made by Mr. Veliotis. I had also suggested that the Justice Department reopen its investigation of the claims based on Mr. Veliotis' allegations. The Justice Department states in its response:

We are pursuing all avenues toward securing any information in Mr. Veliotis' possession. Without the cooperation of Mr. Veliotis there is no "new information" to warrant reopening the investigation.

This is a classic "Catch-22." The Justice Department will not reopen the investigation until it gets new information. It admits that it needs Mr. Veliotis' cooperation to get new information. But it refuses to talk with Mr. Veliotis and thereby rules out any chance to get his cooperation.

The Justice Department also says in its letter:

However, we consider it important that Mr. Veliotis, currently in a fugitive status from an indictment charging serious offenses, not be permitted to utilize vague suggestions of information of criminality to undermine an important pending prosecution charging him with receipt of $2.7 million in kickbacks.

This statement is misleading in three respects:

First, Mr. Veliotis' allegations are not "vague suggestions of criminality." As reported to me, they are concrete allegations of specific acts of wrongdoing, with dates, names, and places.

Second, there is no way that talking with him to get the information he has firsthand will undermine the pending prosecution.

Third, the kickback case is important, but the shipbuilding claims case is not just chopped liver. The claims case involves about $642 million in taxpayers' money paid or obligated to be paid by the Navy to General Dynamics. Besides, there is no reason why the Justice Department cannot prosecute the kickback case and look into Mr. Veliotis' allegations of fraudulent claims.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks the letter from the Justice Department, dated February 17, 1984.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, much time has already been wasted since Mr. Veliotis offer to cooperate was first reported in January. Months have gone by. What is the Justice Department waiting for?

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
CRIMINAL DIVISION,
Washington, DC, February 17, 1984.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Vice Chairman, Subcommittee on International Trade, Finance and Security Economics, Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. VICE CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter to the Attorney General of February 7, 1984, concerning allegations of fraudulent contract claims on nuclear attack submarines built by Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics,

As you know prosecution was declined in that matter in 1982 after an intensive three year investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the grand jury. That investigation concerned claims submitted by Electric Boat in 1976 on contracts with the Navy in 1971. These claims were the subject of a Navy settlement as well as Public Law 85-804 relief in 1978.

You may be aware that Takis Veliotis is a fugitive from an indictment pending in the southern District of New York charging him

and others with obstruction of justice and racketeering offenses in connection with a kickback scheme beginning in 1973 and continuing through 1979. Mr. Veliotis, through his attorney in that case, has initiated discussions concerning information in his possession about wrongdoing at General Dynamics relating to the claims matter. We have advised his attorney we continue to be interested in any such information, but are not willing to compromise or otherwise prejudice the pending prosecution. These discussions are continuing.

For your information at the time the claim was submitted to the Navy, Mr. Veliotis was not employed at Electric Boat. Mr. Veliotis became the general manager of the Electric Boat Division in October 1977. We are pursuing all avenues toward securing any information in Mr. Veliotis' possession. Without the cooperation of Mr. Veliotis there is no "new information" to warrant reopening the investigation. However, we consider it important that Mr. Veliotis, currently in a fugitive status from an indictment charging serious offenses, not be permitted to utilize vague suggestions of information of criminality to undermine an important pending prosecution charging him with receipt of $2.7 million in kickbacks.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN S. TROTT,
Assistant Attorney General.
By JOHN C. KEENEY,
Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

SENATOR BIDEN ON "MEET THE PRESS"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday one of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Delaware, JOE BIDEN, appeared on "Meet the Press." Senator BIDEN's performance was remarkable. He fielded a series of questions primarily on foreign affairs with eloquence. His answers were specific. They were brief, sometimes terse, but right on target and Senator BIDEN ducked nothing.

Frankly, he made this Senator proud to be a colleague. As a U.S. Senator, Senator BIDEN made this body look good.

WHY WE MUST ACT NOW TO STOP NUCLEAR WAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, President Reagan has announced our withdrawal of military forces from Lebanon. Our troops may be engaged in limited hostilities at any time in Central America. But overall for most Americans we are living in a time of peace with personal income breaking all records and almost as high a proportion of American adults at work as ever before in our history. There is other good news. Americans have never been so healthy. Life expectancy is now greater than it has ever been. For the first time, an American who discovers he has cancer has a better-than-ever chance of surviving and leading a healthy life. The No. 1 killer of Americans—heart disease—takes a lighter toll of Americans on a per capita basis than ever. Our elderly in many cases still have a hard time. But thanks to medicare and improvement in social security benefits, they are better off now than the elderly have ever been in American history.

The situation is not all hearts and flowers, however. We do, indeed, have more Americans living in poverty than we had 10 years ago. Certainly that is a blemish on our country. But the economy is recovering vigorously. Unemployment has been declining at a steady rate—with nearly 5 million more Americans employed than 15 months ago in December of 1982. Public opinion polls show a general upbeat, optimistic expectation by most Americans about our future. So while millions of Americans are in trouble and need help, most Americans are doing well now and expect the future to be even better.

In spite of our generally good and improving economic situation, there is a corrosive, haunting fear that a few years from now or even next month or tomorrow we could suffer the catastrophe of a nuclear war that could destroy our good lives and happy dreams. People seldom talk of this fear unless you ask them. Surveys show that this concern about nuclear war especially haunts youngsters. Some studies show that millions of our young people suffer nightmares frequently in dreaming about an agonizing death or the death of their parents—leaving them alone—in a nuclear devastated world. Unfortunately, Mr. President, these nightmares are not just passing childish fantasies, not simply a concern with ghosts and hobgoblins that will pass as children grow into maturity. These nightmares are based on a truthful understanding of the grim world that actually confronts mankind today. Those who foresee the end of the world at hand, are not deluded visionaries, they are realists. They are looking squarely and honestly at very real dangers that threaten us and that will utterly destroy this country and perhaps all of mankind, unless we act to prevent it.

Mr. President, George Kennan is one of our wisest and most thoughtful historians and experts on the Soviet Union. Mr. Kennan has served as the U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union. He has written and lectured for many years on the Soviet Union. Now he has told us:

> It is not just that Soviet-American relations are at the lowest point in thirty years—at a point where there is very little cushion of mutual understanding and communication to absorb any unexpected shocks. It is not just that the present weapons race plus political tension bears all the earmarks of the situations which have relentlessly led to great wars in the past. It is also the fact that we have in several parts of the world where the interest of the two super powers are now heavily engaged, situations of extreme instability where complications could spring up at any moment, complications which neither of the super powers may have provoked or desired or even foreseen, and where these complications might nevertheless create highly fragile and tense crises, in the face of which neither super power would feel itself in a position to avoid the resort to armed measures.

Mr. Kennan wrote these words 3 years ago. The situation between the two superpowers is worse today. So what do we do? First, we recognize the critical importance of moving promptly to negotiate a mutual, verifiable, and comprehensive nuclear arms control treaty with the Soviet Union. We do everything we can to encourage the administration to propose such comprehensive negotiations to replace the suspended START and INF talks. Second, we stop the export of any nuclear technology from the United States to any foreign country, unless that country has agreed to international inspection to assure that the nuclear technology we export is not diverted to military purposes. And we work to greatly strengthen both the resources and the procedures of the International Atomic Energy Agency in its critical mission to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Third, we use our full economic and diplomatic power to persuade other countries with nuclear technology to desist from any exports that could conceivably build or strengthen nuclear arsenals in other countries. Fourth, we should take seriously the proposal of Dr. Carl Sagan to move promptly for deep, very deep cuts in the nuclear arsenals of all countries to try to achieve a reduction in the number of strategic nuclear weapons worldwide from the present level in excess of 20,000 to less than 500. Professor Sagan has argued that this is necessary to assure that a nuclear war would not bring a nuclear winter that could literally exterminate mankind.

THE MISTREATMENT OF A REFUSENIK: A CLIMATE FOR GENOCIDE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Nadezhda Fradkova, a Soviet Jew, was finally released from a Leningrad hospital on March 16, where she had been held for 75 days. Fradkova has become yet another symbol of Soviet human rights violations.

On December 24, 1983, Nadezhda began a hunger strike in protest of Soviet harassment and repeated refusals to receive permission to emigrate. She was later abducted by Soviet authorities, taken to the emergency room of the Leningrad Hospital, and forcibly drugged and fed to break her hunger strike.

In the hospital, Fradkova suffered repeated abuse. A KGB agent remained at her bedside for her entire hospital stay. A psychiatrist from a local clinic considered Nadezhda para-

noid for thinking that she was always watched by the KGB. Another psychiatrist told her that she was developing mental illness because she was not working in her profession. Incidentally, Fradkova lost her job as a mathematical linguist several years ago when she first applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Finally, the hospital staff physician who gave her drug injections gave her a steady dose of anti-Semitic insults as well.

The many examples of Soviet human rights violations do not constitute genocide as defined in the Genocide Convention. These violations are, however, evidence of the Soviet Union's promotion of hatred and persecution along religious lines. Such action creates the kind of climate in which genocide can occur.

As I have pointed out time and time again, Mr. President, the Genocide Convention is a definitive condemnation of the appalling abuse of the right of man to live. Let us remember that the General Assembly, at the request of the United States, gave its unanimous approval, 55 to 0, to the text of the Genocide Convention in 1948.

The Genocide Convention would strengthen our hand in dealing with human rights abuses, both those that meet the test of the Genocide Convetion and others such as the case of Nadezhda Fradkova, which fall short.

Can we ignore the persecution of the Soviet Jews, the Bahai'is, the Timorese, or the Tamils? Shall we allow the climate for genocide the opportunity to flourish?

Mr. President, the answer is "No." Let us embrace the fundamental principle of the Genocide Convention. Let us condemn this international crime once and for all. Let us act now to ratify the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, during which Senators may speak for up to 5 minutes apiece.

PRIVATELY PROVIDING PUBLIC SERVICES

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, May 1, and Wednesday, May 2, the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Monetary and Fiscal Policy will hold hearings to examine innovative privatization approaches to reduce Federal expenditures. I should like to announce to may colleagues, those who may be listening in their offices, or their staff people, that the first witness will be J. Peter Grace, chairman of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control. These hearings on privatization of the Federal Government will be held on May 1 at 2 p.m., and on May 2 at 10 a.m. That is tomorrow afternoon and the following morning, Wednesday morning.

Both hearings will be held in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, room 562.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by Mr. Steve H. Hanke entitled "Privately Providing Public Services," which was in the New York Times of March 29, 1984. That person, Mr. Hanke, is the staff person on the Joint Economic Committee who has done the work to put together these hearings. I think many Senators will find it of interest on the general subject of the possibilities that are offered this country for the privatization of some of the services that Government is now offering, that might otherwise deliver more services for less cost to the taxpayers who will receive these services. I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1984]

PRIVATELY PROVIDING PUBLIC SERVICES

(By Steve H. Hanke)

BALTIMORE.—For the many municipalities facing grave fiscal problems, privatization may be the wave of the future. Wisely, New York City has latched on to the trend.

Item: Scottsdale, Ariz., saves $2 million a year by contracting for fire protection.

Item: One-third of the refuse in Newark, N.J., is privately collected, saving $200,000 a year.

Item: Dallas closed its municipal late-night gasoline depots; now police cars and some fire vehicles use gas pumps at 7-11 stores after midnight, saving $200,000 annually.

Item: A private firm operates the Orange County, Calif., computer center, at an annual saving of $1.6 million.

Item: Butte, Mont., contracted for the private operation of its municipal hospital; annual savings are $600,000.

Item: Newton, Mass., saves $500,000 a year through a contract with a firm that supplies the city with paramedical and ambulance service.

The innovative, cost-cutting transfer of public services to the private sector is increasingly being given attention as mayors and other municipal officials find traditional fiscal solutions more and more unattractive.

The national magnitude of the problem was demonstrated in a study, "Trends in the Fiscal Conditions of Cities: 1981-1983," prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress by staff members and published last November. It found that 64 percent of the 299 cities sampled anticipated operating deficits last year.

The growing desirability of the solution was demonstrated by another survey. The International City Management Association in 1982 looked at 1,780 cities and counties and found that 59 different types of public services were being privately provided. Of the cities and counties reporting, 41 percent used private contractors for commercial solid-waste disposal, 34 percent for residential solid-waste collection, 30 percent for tree trimming and planting, 78 percent for vehicle towing and storage and 28 percent for vehicle fleet management. Moreover, since the survey was taken, the types of public services privatized has almost doubled and the frequency with which privatization is used has increased, according to my own studies.

What has set the privatization trend in motion?

To address their fiscal problems, municipalities customarily have cut back public services, raised more revenue, or both. But these standard options are disappearing. Reduction of services can create political problems for everyone involved. As for revenue-generating, citizens' revolts have made increases in local taxes fraught with political peril, too. In the face of high real interest rates, constitutional debt limitations, voter disapproval and the prospect of poorer bond ratings, municipalities have slowed down their borrowing. State and Federal grants-in-aid, and old source of municipal funds, have been reduced in recent years and show no prospect of being increased.

Cost savings are the key to privatization's success. With the private sector brought into play, services don't have to be reduced; rather, they are simply provided cheaper. The process works well because private enterprise usually can outperform public enterprise. Entrepreneurs' incentives are imposed by the competitive market, while politicians' and bureaucrats' incentives are imposed by political and bureaucratic processes. As a result, private enterprise is usually able to supply the same quantity and quality of service at about one-half the cost of public provision.

In addition to contracting out, cities are realizing the benefits of privatization by putting unused or underused real assets on the auction block. New York City, for example, sold the old United Nations School in midtown Manhattan for $12.3 million—a bid that was almost twice the original asking price. The city, in 1983, received $13.15 million for a parcel at William and Beaver Streets in Lower Manhattan—a local record for a single parcel of city-owned property—after a 10-minute bidding spree. Moreover, the city has made sure that some idle property has been put to productive, higher valued used: For example, the abandoned King Street School, in Greenwich Village, was sold to a private interest and then converted into apartments. Another benefit of such action, of course, is that once properties are privatized, they join the tax rolls.

Troubled municipalities and counties that have begun to privatize are putting their fiscal houses in order. More important, they are setting the stage for depoliticization of economic decisions, improved delivery of services, tax reductions—and for the consequent economic growth and social revival that they need.

THE DIFFICULT SEARCH FOR PEACE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is easy to lose track of the search for peace in Central America. In recent days, two events, one in Managua and one in San Salvador, remind us how difficult is the role of peacemaker in

the region, but that there are those who persist in making proposals for national reconciliation.

Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate the remarkable peace proposals of three Central American foreign ministers and the heroism of the bishops of Nicaragua, particularly Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo.

On April 25, the foreign ministers of Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras met in San Salvador to discuss the prospects for peace in the region. They agreed to promote actions to achieve the internal reconciliation that will permit both the establishment of more democratic governments in their respective countries and a possible political resolution to the Central American crisis.

There is great specificity in the statement of the foreign ministers, and I would hope that all interested governments, including the United States, Cuba, Nicaragua, and the Contadora Group, find this effort a useful guide in the search for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an account of the foreign ministers' statement as monitored by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C.A. FOREIGN MINISTERS ISSUE JOINT COMMUNIQUE

SAN SALVADOR, APR. 25 (ACAN-EFE).—The foreign ministers of El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica today agreed in San Salvador to promote actions to achieve the internal reconciliation that will permit the establishment of democratic regimes in their respective countries and a political resolution to the Central American crisis. In a joint communique, Fidel Chavez Mena of El Salvador, Edgardo Paz Barnica of Honduras, and Carlos Gutierrez of Costa Rica stated that promotion of a political and democratic resolution to the regional crisis through diplomatic means is advisable.

The foreign ministers reaffirmed their respective governments' commitment to begin negotiations to conclude a general treaty on Central American peace, democracy, security, and cooperation that will simultaneously resolve all the differences among the countries of the region, and that will create a favorable climate to resolve the internal conflicts in each nation.

In the communique, the foreign ministers indicated that in order to achieve regional peace and harmony, appropriate conditions must be created so that each country can achieve social peace and political stability through a process of internal reconciliation. They stated that the efforts being carried out by the Contadora Group, made up of Mexico, Panama, Colombia, and Venezuela, are an important mechanism for the achievement of those objectives and that those efforts must continue in an impartial and neutral manner.

In the political field, the foreign ministers of El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica promised to support the efforts for national reconciliation in each country by maintaining unconditional offers to the political and armed opposition groups to seek suitable means to guarantee their participation in the electoral process. This offer includes guarantees for the personal security of the opposition candidates, equal participation of the political parties, free access to the communications media, and their due representation in the electoral bodies, as well as the compilation of a trustworthy electoral register.

The foreign ministers also promised to support the establishment of national reconciliation or peace commissions to begin or to reactivate a dialogue with the armed or unarmed opposition groups and to invite Nicaragua to do likewise. On behalf of their respective governments, the foreign ministers expressed their commitment to issue a broad amnesty that will lead to the pardoning of political crimes and to permit full press freedom.

In order to achieve a military balance in the region, the foreign ministers of El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica said that the introduction into the region of new types or systems of weapons that are not held by any of the Central American governments must be prohibited. In addition, they said that the inventory of weapons must be reduced, that no country in the region should be left with an advantage over its neighbors, and that the number of foreign military and security advisers must be reduced. According to the communique, the traffic of weapons, ammunition, and other supplies from or through any country of the region to persons or groups that carry out subversive activities in another nation of the area must be stopped. The foreign ministers proposed reducing the number of troops in the various Central American countries and prohibiting or disbanding the paramilitary groups that operate within or outside the normal structure of the armed forces.

In the economic area, the foreign ministers expressed support for the Contadora Group's efforts, such as those of capitalizing the Central America Bank of Economic Integration, granting legal status to the Central American Monetary Council, and negotiating the necessary measures to resume free trade.

Guatemalan Foreign Minister Fernando Andrade was invited to the meeting that the foreign ministers of El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica held in San Salvador today. According to Chavez Mena, Andrade did not attend due to "unforeseen circumstances." This meeting was held just 5 days before the meeting of Contadora Group and Central America foreign ministers in Panama.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Catholic bishops of Nicaragua on Easter Sunday issued a pastoral letter regarding internal reconciliation in their own country. The pastoral letter suggested that all Nicaraguan parties, political and armed groups alike, be involved in this reconciliation effort. The foreign ministers' statement included a similar appeal for each of the Central American countries.

The risks to the peacemaker in Central America who suggests discussions with the opposition are always great. There are those in El Salvador who would oppose the role of Foreign Minister Chavez Mena in the joint statement, but as far as I know, he spoke for the Government of El Salvador when he made the joint initiative for peace.

In the case of Nicaragua, the Sandinista Government prohibited publication of the pastoral letter for 3 days, and undertook a campaign of personal attacks against the leading bishop, the Archbishop of Managua, in the government press and radio. No Nicaraguan who remembers Archbishop Obando y Bravo's role in the fight against the Somoza dictatorship will believe the charges that the archbishop called for reconciliation because he favors a return of the Somoza family, but such charges could provide an excuse for an attack on him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an Associated Press account of the danger faced by Archbishop Obando in the search for peace by the bishops of Nicaragua.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 30, 1984]

ARCHBISHOP RAPS MEDIA IN NICARAGUA

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA (AP).—Managua's Roman Catholic archbishop issued a letter accusing the government-controlled news media of conducting a campaign against him and saying the media would be responsible for his safety.

The Office of Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo said in the letter dated Saturday that the media of the left-wing Sandinista junta was trying to "darken" the church leader's reputation by making him appear to be a rightist.

It said the church was holding "the official means of communication" responsible for "anything that might happen in terms of the personal safety" of the archbishop.

Archbishop Obando y Bravo has frequently been critical of the Sandinistas, who gained control of the country after winning the civil war against the government of the late President Anastasio Somoza in July 1979.

Church-state tensions increased after a pastoral letter was read in Catholic churches on Easter Sunday calling for negotiations between the government and anti-Sandinista rebels.

The archbishop's office said the prelate was in Rome on Saturday, meeting with Pope John Paul II and other church leaders.

Articles and broadcasts critical of Archbishop Obando y Bravo have become prominent since the Easter statement.

On Tuesday, the government newspaper Barricada published old photographs of the archbishop meeting with Mr. Somoza. On the same day, the pro-government newspaper El Nuevo Diario carried a picture of the archbishop with the headline, "Guess Who's in Florida?" Many Nicaraguans consider Florida a haven for ex-members of Mr. Somoza's national guard.

"Not having any meaningful argument against [the pastoral] call for reconciliation, they have begun to attack the archbishop . . . trying to darken his image as pastor," the statement from Archbishop Obando y Bravo's office said. "They [the government media] have manipulated mere meetings and acts of protocol from the past" in a way

that makes the archbishop appear as a Somoza supporter, it added.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I believe the time for the transaction of routine morning business has expired; has it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Morning business is closed.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOM MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

(Pending: Baker amendment No. 3027, to further reduce deficits by including reconciliation provisions and appropriations caps for defense and nondefense discretionary spending for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.)

RECESS UNTIL 1 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is a ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol beginning at 12 o'clock in commemoration of the Holocaust.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 1 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate at 11:54 a.m., recessed until 1:01 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WILSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from California, suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3034

(Purpose: To provide for a 7½ percent reduction in budget authority)

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the pending legislation to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) proposes an amendment numbered 3034.

Mr. SYMMS. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amendment, insert the following:

SEVEN AND ONE-HALF PERCENT REDUCTION IN SPENDING REQUIRED

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 if such concurrent resolution does not comply with the provisions of this section.

(b)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority discretionary Federal programs which does not exceed an amount equal to the product of the total amount of budget authority provided by law for such programs for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 92.5 percent.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "discretionary Federal program" means any Federal program other than—

(A) a program classified under the functional category of National Defense in the budget submitted by the President for the applicable fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(B) a program for which spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) is provided by law.

(c)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority for the payment of obligations under spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) provided by law which does not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for such payments for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 92.5 percent.

(2) The requirements of paragraph (1) shall not apply to budget authority provided for payments under spending authority provided by titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(d) To carry out subsection (c), a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall contain provisions to require the committees described in clauses (1) through (10) of this subsection to submit, by June 1, 1984, recommendations to the Senate Committee on the Budget in accordance with such clauses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill, or resolution, or both, carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $6,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $2,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $10,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(2) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $2,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $3,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $4,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(3) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $11,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $13,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $14,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(4) The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(5) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $500,000,000 in fiscal year 1986.

(6) The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(7) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $900,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $900,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $900,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(8) The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $300,000,000 in Fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $500,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(9) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(10) The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,020,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today is similar to the one that was offered unsuccessfully last week by Senators

HELMS and MCCLURE. I hope this budget proposal will have some appeal to those Members of the Senate who felt that enacting 10-percent cuts in all spending categories of the Federal budget, except for defense and social security, was too extreme. What I propose is a 7½-percent cut in all spending, still leaving untouched the two contentious areas of the budget—national defense, and social security, including medicare.

As with the Helms/McClure proposal, this plan would still give the authorizing committees the authority to streamline or restructure programs to bring about these spending cuts. It does not instruct the committees in how to reduce the cost of any entitlement program by 7½ percent. Now I know that there has been great resistance in this body to any social spending cuts, and particularly in an election year.

I think that was demonstrated quite amply on the amendment this Senator offered last week. Also, it included everything under the tent for some freezes and reductions.

The problem with many of these social spending programs is that they are indexed for rapid growth, usually along the lines of a cost-of-living estimation formula. Indexing has put us in a vicious circle: We are risking destroying this fragile economic recovery by the growing level of Federal spending, and yet we are paying people more Federal money to compensate for the inflation and higher living costs that are fueled by heavy taxation and deficit spending.

The budget proposals this year are all deficit reduction packages of one sort or another.

Deficit reduction—a new phrase here in Washington, Mr. President. That is what they are, deficit reductions, because they obscure the fact that the real problem is not the deficit, but the Federal spending.

How many Members of Congress go back to their States and districts and tell their constituents that they are not being taxed enough? I venture to say that very few of us do that.

How many of us believe that tax increases will promote economic recovery? Federal tax collections this year are running at 20 percent of the GNP, the total value of the country's annual economic output. Just 20 years ago, the tax share of GNP was 18.7 percent. During the same period of time, Federal spending has risen from just under 20 percent to 25 percent of GNP. Why has the Government amassed four times more debt in the past 13 years than in the first 170 years of this country's existence? It is elementary: spending by Government has accelerated at a much greater rate than tax collections.

Now, I know that, as in the previous debate on the Helms/McClure proposal and on my other budget proposal last week, there will be opposition on reducing funding in certain areas. That is to be expected—everyone, including me, has spending priorities. We all have certain things we think are more important than others. That is only human. The problem is that when each one of us steps in and fattens up the appropriations for our individual priority items, the budget just keeps getting larger and larger and larger. We need a comprehensive approach and a consensus for restraint in spending. Otherwise, the budget will only continue to expand. There has got to be a way out of this swamp; if Government does not reduce the amount of national wealth it consumes, our economic problems will only worsen.

It is apparent to me that some of the biggest decriers of the deficit are some of the very same people who have voted for years for excessive appropriations. Here is the opportunity for my colleagues to show their constituents that their talk about deficit reduction is more than just election-year rhetoric. There seems to be a great deal of concern that voting for budget restraint may be interpreted as being hard-hearted or uncaring about the needy in our society. I think we forgot that inflation and interest rates are perhaps harder on the poor than on other sectors of society. My colleagues should also keep in mind that an overwhelming number of Americans—well over 70 percent—favor achieving deficit reduction through spending restraints, not through tax increases.

I believe there is a point above which Government's boundless appetite should not be satiated. I believe the Government is already consuming too much of the national wealth. I urge my colleagues who share that belief to support this budget plan. There is a large public interest in controlling the deficit, but somehow it always seems to take second place beside the opportunity to placate a special interest group by spending more money. The American people, however, are growing tired of duplicitous chatter about deficit concerns and are ready for action. This is a chance to show that Congress recognizes that concern and will exercise fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, this amendment would reduce deficits by $226 billion over the next 3 years. The amendment adopts the leadership proposal for defense spending, thereby saving $43.4 billion in defense. The amendment reduces entitlement spending 7½ percent below the CBO baseline except for social security and medicare. This saves $94.6 billion fiscal year 1985 through 1987. The amendment would reduce nondefense spending by 7½ percent, therein saving $59.2 billion over fiscal year 1985 through 1987. With a net interest saving of $28.8 billion, the 3-year deficits would be reduced by $226 billion and the deficit would decline to $169 billion from $189.4 billion today.

So I think it is a very worthy amendment. It is patterned after an amendment this body has already voted on. Senators have already voted basically on this issue based on 10 percent. Now we are cutting it to a 7½-percent reduction, and Senators can voice their dismay at this never ending cause for more spending.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? The Chair is advised by the clerk there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who once again has shown that he has a great deal of courage in offering this kind of amendment in an effort to reduce the deficits that beset our country.

I will summarize this. The Senate voted last week on a Helms amendment, which was basically a 10-percent across-the-board reduction, with the exception of social security and medicare; and the Baker amendment, or leadership amendment, was used as the baseline for defense spending.

In this particular case, instead of 10 percent, it is a 7.5 percent across the board on everything except social security and medicare. Defense is the same as the Helms amendment, or Baker amendment.

Frankly, I am not going to take any more time. The Helms amendment received 27 yea votes. This may be 2.5 percent better than the Helms amendment.

Nonetheless, it would seem to me that for those who did not think the other was an appropriate course of action, they might very well think this is close to it.

But I do commend the distinguished Senator for a substantive amendment, which is well thought out, giving us an opportunity to do some work here today.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, my understanding is that the amendment as presented by the Senator from Idaho would provide that defense would have a 7-percent increase. That is real above inflation. So that would mean a 13-percent total increase.

Domestic programs would go down 7½ percent nominal, so they would actually be down 12½ percent in real.

So that looks to me that we would be talking about a 25-percent gap between how we would be treating domestic programs and how we would be treating defense.

I am afraid that if we pass this it would be very difficult to enforce, but I wonder if we really can consider this a fair way to deal with the deficit when we have those kinds of numbers. It is a little less drastic, I guess, than the amendment that was at 10 percent, but I think it still fails to meet any test of fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG), the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. QUAYLE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) would each vote "yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) would vote "nay".

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILSON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Boren	Humphrey	Proxmire
Garn	Long	Rudman
Goldwater	Mattingly	Symms
Hatch	McClure	Thurmond
Hecht	Nickles	Warner
Helms	Nunn	Wilson

NAYS—50

Abdnor	Domenici	Mitchell
Baker	Durenberger	Moynihan
Baucus	Eagleton	Packwood
Bentsen	Evans	Percy
Bingaman	Ford	Pryor
Boschwitz	Glenn	Randolph
Bumpers	Grassley	Roth
Burdick	Hatfield	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hollings	Sasser
Chafee	Inouye	Specter
Chiles	Jepsen	Stafford
Cochran	Johnston	Stennis
Cohen	Kassebaum	Stevens
Cranston	Laxalt	Tower
Danforth	Lugar	Wallop
Dixon	Matsunaga	Weicker
Dodd	Melcher	

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews	Hart	Metzenbaum
Armstrong	Hawkins	Murkowski
Biden	Heflin	Pell
Bradley	Heinz	Pressler
D'Amato	Huddleston	Quayle
DeConcini	Kasten	Riegle
Denton	Kennedy	Simpson
Dole	Lautenberg	Trible
East	Leahy	Tsongas
Exon	Levin	Zorinsky
Gorton	Mathias	

So Mr. SYMMS' amendment (No. 3034) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Maine will have an amendment. He needs a few moments.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum can be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3035

(Purpose: To revise the procedures for soliciting and evaluating bids and proposals for Government contracts and awarding such contracts)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. BINGAMAN proposes an amendment numbered 3035.

At the end of the amendment, add the following new title:

TITLE —COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 10. This title may be cited as the "Competition in Contracting Act of 1984".

Subtitle A—Amendments to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

COMPETITIVE AND NONCOMPETITIVE PROCEDURES

SEC. 11. (a) Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking out section 303 (41 U.S.C. 253) and the heading of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"COMPETITION REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 303. (a) Except as provided in subsection (e) or otherwise authorized by law, executive agencies shall use competitive procedures in making contracts for property or services. Executive agencies shall use advance procurement planning and market research and shall prepare specifications in such a manner as is necessary to obtain effective competition with due regard to the nature of the property or services to be acquired. Executive agencies shall use the competitive procedure or combination of competitive procedures that is best suited under the circumstances of the procurement action and shall specify its needs and solicit bids or proposals in a manner designed to achieve effective competition for the contract.

"(b) An executive agency may provide for the procurement of property or services in order to establish or maintain any alternative source or sources of supply under this

title using competitive procedures but excluding a particular source for that property or services if the executive agency determines that to do so would (1) increase or maintain competition and would likely result in reduced overall costs for such procurement, or for any anticipated procurement, of such property or services, (2) be in the interest of industrial mobilization in case of a national emergency, or (3) be in the interest of national defense in establishing or maintaining an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States.

"(c) Procurement regulations shall include special simplified procedures and forms for small purchases to facilitate making small purchases efficiently and economically.

"(d) For other than small purchases, and executive agency, when using competitive procedures—

"(1) shall solicit sealed bids when—

"(A) time permits the solicitation, submission, and evaluation of sealed bids;

"(B) the award will be made on the basis of price and other price-related factors;

"(C) it is not necessary to conduct discussions with the responding sources about their bids; and

"(D) there is a reasonable expectation of receiving more than one sealed bid;

"(2) shall request competitive proposals when sealed bids are not required under clause (1) of this subsection.

"(e) An executive agency may use noncompetitive procedures only when—

"(1) the property or services needed by the Government are available from only one source and no other type of property or services will satisfy the needs of the executive agency;

"(2) the executive agency's need for the property or services is of such unusual and compelling urgency that the Government would be seriously injured by the delay associated with using competitive procedures;

"(3) it is necessary to award the contract to a particular source or sources in order to (A) maintain a facility, producer, manufacturer, or other supplier available for furnishing property or services in case of a national emergency, (B) achieve industrial mobilization in the case of such an emergency, or (C) establish or maintain an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States;

"(4) the terms of any international agreement or treaty between the United States Government and a foreign government or international organization, or the directions of any foreign government reimbursing the executive agency for the cost of the procurement of the property or services for such government, have the effect of requiring the use of noncompetitive procedures;

"(5) a statute authorizes or requires that the procurement be made through another executive agency or from a specified source or the agency's need is for a brand-name commercial item for authorized resale; or

"(6) the disclosure of the executive agency's needs to more than one source would compromise the national security.

"(f) For the purposes of applying subsection (e)(1)—

"(1) property or services shall be considered to be available from a source if such source has the capability to produce the property or deliver the service in accordance with the Government's specifications and delivery schedule; and

"(2) in the case of the procurement of technical or special property which has required a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and where it is likely that production by a source other than the original source would result in additional cost to the Government by reason of duplication of investment or would result in duplication of necessary preparation which would unduly delay the procurement of the property, the property may be deemed to be available only from the initial source and may be procured through noncompetitive procedures.

"(g) An executive agency may not award a contract using noncompetitive procedures unless—

"(1) the use of such procedures has been justified in writing; and

"(2) a notice has been published with respect to such contract pursuant to section 313 and all bids or proposals received in response to such notice have been considered by such executive agency.

"(h) For the purposes of the following laws, purchases or contracts made under this title using other than sealed bid procedures shall be treated as if they were made with sealed bid procedures:

"(1) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (commonly referred to as the 'Walsh-Healey Act') (41 U.S.C. 35-45).

"(2) The Act entitled 'An Act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1931 (commonly referred to as the 'Davis-Bacon Act') (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5).".

(2) by adding at the end of section 309 (41 U.S.C. 259) the following new subsections:

"(b) The term 'executive agency' has the same meaning as provided in section 4(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U..C. 403(a)), except that such term does not include the departments or establishments specified in section 2303(a) of title 10, United States Code.

"(c) The term 'competitive procedures' means procedures under which an executive agency enters into a contract after soliciting sealed bids or competitive proposals from more than one source that is capable of satisfying the needs of the executive agency.

"(d) The term 'noncompetitive procedures' means procedures other than competitive procedures.

"(e) The term 'small purchase' means any purchase or contract which does not exceed $25,000. A proposed procurement shall not be divided into several procurements primarily for the purpose of using the small purchase procedures."; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 311. (a)(1) Each solicitation under this title shall include specifications which—

"(A) consistent with the needs of the executive agency, permit effective competition; and

"(B) include restrictive provisions or conditions only to the extent necessary to satisfy such needs or as authorized by law.

"(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), the type of specification included in any solicitation shall depend on the nature of the needs of the executive agency and the market available to satisfy such needs. Subject to such needs, specifications may be stated in terms of—

"(A) function so that a variety of products or services may qualify;

"(B) performance, including specifications of the range of acceptable characteristics or of the minimum acceptable standards; or

"(C) design requirements.

"(b) Each solicitation for sealed bids or competitive proposals other than for small purchases shall at a minimum include, in addition to the specifications described in subsection (a)—

"(1) a statement of—

"(A) all significant factors, including price, which the executive agency reasonably expects to consider in evaluating sealed bids or competitive proposals; and

"(B) the relative importance assigned to each of those factors;

"(2) in the case of sealed bids—

"(A) a statement that sealed bids will be evaluated without discussions with the bidders; and

"(B) the time and place for the opening of the sealed bids; and

"(3) in the case of competitive proposals—

"(A) a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated with, and awards made after, discussions with the offerors but might be evaluated and awarded without discussions with the offerors; and

"(B) the time and place for submission of proposals.

"EVALUATION AND AWARD

"SEC. 312. (a) An executive agency shall evaluate sealed bids and competitive proposals based solely on the factors specified in the solicitation.

"(b) All sealed bids or competitive proposals received in response to a solicitation may be rejected if the head of the executive agency determines that such action is in the public interest.

"(c) Sealed bids shall be opened publicly at the time and place stated in the solicitation. The executive agency shall evaluate the bids without discussions with the bidders and shall, except as provided in subsection (b), award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the United States, solely considering the price and the other factors included in the solicitation under section 311(b)(1). The award of a contract shall be made by transmitting written notice of the award to the successful bidder.

"(d)(1) The executive agency shall evaluate competitive proposals and may award a contract—

"(A) after discussions conducted with the offerors at any time after receipt of the proposals and prior to the award of the contract; or

"(B) without discussions with the offerors beyond discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification where it can be clearly demonstrated from the existence of effective competition or accurate prior cost experience with the product or service that acceptance of an initial proposal without discussions would result in fair and reasonable prices.

"(2) In the case of award of a contract under paragraph (1)(A), the executive agency shall conduct, before such award, written or oral discussions with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within a competitive range, price and other evaluation factors considered.

"(3) In the case of award of a contract under paragraph (1)(B), the executive

agency shall award the contract based on the proposals as received (and as clarified, if necessary, in discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification).

"(4) The executive agency shall, except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the United States, considering price and the other factors included in the solicitation under section 311(b)(1). The executive agency shall award the contract by transmitting written notice of the award to such offeror and shall promptly notify all other offerors of the rejection of their proposals.

"(e) If the head of an executive agency considers that any bid or proposal evidences a violation of the antitrust laws, he shall refer the bid or proposal to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

"PROCUREMENT NOTICE

"SEC. 313. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (c)—

"(A) an executive agency intending to solicit bids or proposals for a contract for property or services at a price expected to exceed $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice described in subsection (b); and

"(B) an executive agency awarding a contract for property or services at a price exceeding $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice announcing such award if there is likely to be any subcontract under such contract.

"(2) The Secretary of Commerce shall publish promptly in the Commerce Business Daily each notice required by paragraph (1).

"(3) Whenever an executive agency is required by paragraph (1)(A) to furnish a notice of a solicitation to the Secretary of Commerce, such executive agency may not—

"(A) issue such solicitation earlier than fifteen days after the date on which such notice is published by the Secretary of Commerce; or

"(B) establish a deadline for the submission of all bids or proposals in response to such solicitation that is earlier than thirty days after the date on which such solicitation is issued.

"(b) Each notice required by subsection (a)(1(A) shall include—

"(1) an accurate description of the property or services to be contracted for, which description is not unnecessarily restrictive of competition;

"(2) the name and address of the officer or employee of the executive agency who may be contacted for the purpose of obtaining a copy of the solicitation;

"(3) a statement that any person may submit a bid, proposal, or quotation which shall be considered by the executive agency; and

"(4) in the case of a procurement using noncompetitive procedures, a statement of the reason justifying the use of noncompetitive procedures and the identity of the intended source.

"(c)(1) A notice is not required under subsection (a)(1) if—

"(A) the notice would disclose the executive agency's needs and the disclosure of such needs would compromise the national security; or

"(B) the proposed noncompetitive procurement would result from acceptance of an unsolicited research proposal that demonstrates a unique or innovative research concept and the publication of any notice of such unsolicited research proposal would disclose the originally of thought or innovativeness of the proposed research or proprietary data associated with the proposal.

"(2) The requirements of subsection (a)(1)(A) do not apply—

"(A) to any procurement under conditions described in clause (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 303(e); and

"(B) in the case of any procurement for which the head of the executive agency carrying out such procurement makes a determination in writing, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that it is not appropriate or reasonable to publish a notice before issuing a solicitation.

"RECORD REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 314. (a) Each executive agency shall establish and maintain for a period of five years a record, by fiscal year, of the procurements, other than small purchases, in such fiscal year in which—

"(1) noncompetitive procedures were used; and

"(2) only one bid or proposal was received after competitive procedures were used.

"(b) The record established under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to each procurement—

"(1) information identifying the source to whom the contract was awarded;

"(2) the property or services obtained by the Government under the procurement;

"(3) the total cost of the procurement;

"(4) the reason under section 303(e) for the use of noncompetitive procedures; and

"(5) the position of the officers or employees of the executive agency who required and approved the use of noncompetitive procedures in such procurement.

"(c) The information included in the record established and maintained under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the General Services Administration and shall be entered in the Federal Procurement Data System referred to in section 6(d)(4) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)).".

(b) The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the item relating to section 303 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 303. Competition requirements.";

and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 310 the following new items:

"Sec. 311. Solicitation requirements.
"Sec. 312. Evaluation of bids; awards.
"Sec. 313. Procurement notice.
"Sec. 314. Record requirements.".

COST AND PRICING DATA

SEC. 12. Section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) A prime contractor or any subcontractor shall be required to submit cost or pricing data under the circumstances listed below, and shall be required to certify that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the cost or pricing data he submitted was accurate, complete, and current—

"(A) prior to the award of any prime contract under this title using other than sealed bid procedures where the contract price is expected to exceed $100,000;

"(B) prior to the pricing of any contract change or modification for which the price adjustment is expected to exceed $100,000, or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the head of the agency;

"(C) prior to the award of a subcontract at any tier, where the prime contractor and each higher tier subcontractor have been required to furnish such a certificate, if the price of such subcontract is expected to exceed $100,000; or

"(D) prior to the pricing of any contract change or modification to a subcontract covered by clause (C), for which the price adjustment is expected to exceed $100,000, or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the head of the agency.

"(2) Any prime contract or change or modification thereto under which a certificate is required under paragraph (1) shall contain a provision that the price to the Government, including profit or fee, shall be adjusted to exclude any significant sums by which it may be determined by the executive agency that such price was increased because the contractor or any subcontractor required to furnish such a certificate, furnished cost or pricing data which, as of a date agreed upon between the parties (which date shall be as close to the date of agreement on the price as is practicable), was inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent.

"(3) For the purpose of evaluating the accuracy, completeness, and currency of cost or pricing data required to be submitted by this subsection, any authorized representative of the head of the agency who is an employee of the United States Government shall have the right, until the expiration of three years after final payment under the contract or subcontract, to examine all books, records, documents, and other data of the contractor or subcontractor related to the proposal for the contract, the discussions conducted on the proposal under this chapter, pricing, or performance of the contract or subcontract.

"(4) The requirements of this subsection need not be applied to contracts or subcontracts where the price is based on adequate price competition, established catalog or market prices of commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public, prices set by law or regulation or, in exceptional cases where the head of the executive agency determines that the requirements of this subsection may be waived and states in writing his reasons for such determination.".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 13. (a) Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 302 (41 U.S.C. 252)—

(A) by striking out the second sentence in subsection (b);

(B) by striking out subsections (c), (d), and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c)(1) This title does not (A) authorize the erection, repair, or furnishing of any public building or public improvement, but such authorization shall be required in the same manner as heretofore, or (B) permit any contract for the construction or repair of buildings, roads, sidewalks, sewers, mains, or similar items using other than sealed bid procedures under section 303(d)(1), if the conditions set forth in section 303(d)(1) apply or the contract is to be performed outside the United States.

"(2) Section 303(d)(1) does not require the use of sealed bid procedures in cases in which section 204(e) of title 23, United States Code applies."; and

(C) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (d);

(2) by striking out the heading of section 304 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS"

(3) in section 304 (41 U.S.C. 254)—

(A) by striking out "negotiated pursuant to section 302(c)" in the first sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded using other then sealed bid procedures";

(B) by striking out "negotiated pursuant to section 302(c)" in the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures"; and

(C) by striking out "negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this Act" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures".;

(4) in section 307 (41 U.S.C. 257)—

(A) by striking out "Except as provided in subsection (b), and except" in the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except";

(B) by striking out subsection (b);

(C) by striking out "by paragraph (11)–(13), or (14) of section 302(c)," in subsection (c);

(D) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b); and

(E) by striking out subsection (d);

(5) by striking out "entered into pursuant to section 302(c) without advertising," in section 308 and inserting in lieu thereof "made or awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures"; and

(6) by striking out "section 302(c)(15) of this title without regard to the advertising requirements of sections 302(c) and 303." In section 310 and inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of this title relating to other than sealed bid procedures.".

(b) The table of contents of such Act is amended by striking out the item relating to section 304 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 304. Contract requirements.".

Subtitle B—Amendments to Title 10, United States Code

COMPETITIVE AND NONCOMPETITIVE PROCEDURES

Sec. 21. (a) Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2302—

(A) by inserting "the Secretary, any Deputy Secretary, any Under Secretary, or any Assistant Secretary of Defense;" after "means" in clause (1);

(B) by striking out clauses (2) and (3) of section 2302 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) 'Agency' means any department or establishment specified in section 2303(a) of this title.

"(3) 'Competitive procedures' means procedures under which the head of an agency enters into a contract after soliciting sealed bids or competitive proposals from more than one source that is capable of satisfying the needs of the agency.

"(4) 'Noncompetitive procedures' means procedures other than competitive procedures.

"(5) 'Small purchase' means any purchase or contract which does not exceed $25,000. A proposed procurement shall not be divided into several procurements primarily for the purpose of using small purchase procedures.";

(2) in section 2303(a)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) as clauses (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before clause (2) (as redesignated by subclause (A)) the following:

"(1) The Department of Defense.";

(3) by striking out sections 2304 and 2305 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 2304. Competition requirements

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (e) of this section or otherwise authorized by law, the head of an agency shall use competitive procedures in making contracts for property or services. The head of an agency shall use advance procurement planning and market research and shall prepare specifications in such a manner as is necessary to obtain effective competition with due regard to the nature of the property or services to be acquired. The head of an agency shall use the competitive procedure or combination of competitive procedures that is best suited under the circumstances of the procurement action and shall specify the needs of the agency and solicit bids or proposals in a manner designed to achieve effective competition for the contract.

"(b) The head of an agency may provide for the procurement of property or services in order to establish or maintain any alternative source or sources of supply under this title using competitive procedures but excluding a particular source for that property or services if such head of an agency determines that to do so would (1) increase or maintain competition and would likely result in reduced overall costs for such procurement, or for any anticipated procurement, of property or services, (2) be in the interest of industrial mobilization in case of a national emergency, or (3) be in the interest of national defense in establishing or maintaining an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States.

"(c) Procurement regulations shall include special simplified procedures and forms for small purchases to facilitate making small purchases efficiently and economically.

"(d) For other than small purchases, the head of an agency, when using competitive procedures—

"(1) shall solicit sealed bids when—

"(A) time permits the solicitation, submission, and evaluation of sealed bids;

"(B) the award will be made on the basis of price and other price-related factors;

"(C) it is not necessary to conduct discussions with the responding sources about their bids; and

"(D) there is reasonable expectation of receiving more than one sealed bid; and

"(2) shall request competitive proposals from responding sources when sealed bids are not required under clause (1) of this subsection.

"(e) The head of an agency; may use noncompetitive procedures only when—

"(1) the property of services needed by the Government are available from only one source and no other type of property or services will satisfy the needs of the agency;

"(2) the agency's need for the property or services is of such unusual and compelling urgency that the Government would be seriously injured by the delay associated with using competitive procedures;

"(3) it is necessary to award the contract to a particular source or sources in order to (A) maintain a facility, producer, manufacturer, or other supplier available for furnishing property or services in case of a national emergency, (B) achieve industrial mobilization in the case of such an emergency, or (C) establish or maintain an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States;

"(4) the terms of any international agreement or treaty between the United States Government and a foreign government or international organization, or the directions of any foreign government reimbursing the agency for the cost of the procurement of the property or services for such government, have the effect of requiring the use of noncompetitive procedures;

"(5) a statute authorizes or requires that the procurement be made through another agency or from a specified source; or the agency's need is for a brand-name commercial item for authorized resale; or

"(6) the disclosure of the agency's needs to more than one source would compromise the national security.

"(f) For the purposes of applying subsection (e)(1) of this section hereof—

"(1) property or services shall be considered to be available from a source if such source has the capability to produce the property or deliver the service in accordance with the Government's specifications and delivery schedule; and

"(2) in the case of the procurement of technical or special property which has required a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and where it is likely that production by a source other than the original source would result in additional cost to the Government by reason of duplication of investment or would result in duplication of necessary preparation which would unduly delay the procurement of the property, the property may be deemed to be available only from the initial source and may be procured through noncompetitive procedures.

"(g) The head of an agency may not award a contract using noncompetitive procedures unless—

"(1) the use of such procedures has been justified in writing; and

"(2) a notice has been published with respect to such contract pursuant to section 2305(c) of this title and all bids or proposals received in response to such notice have been considered by such head of an agency.

"(h) For the purposes of the following laws, purchases or contracts made under this chapter using other than sealed bid procedures shall be treated as if they were made with sealed bid procedures:

"(1) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (commonly referred to as the 'Walsh-Healey Act') (41 U.S.C. 35–45).

"(2) The Act entitled 'An Act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1931 (commonly referred to as the 'Davis-Bacon Act') (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5).

§ 2305. Solicitation, evaluation, and award procedures; notice requirements

"(a)(1)(A) Each solicitation under this title shall include specifications which—

"(i) consistent with the needs of the agency, permit effective competition; and

"(ii) include restrictive provisions or conditions only to the extent necessary to satisfy such needs or as authorized by law.

"(B) For the purposes of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the type of specification included in any solicitation shall depend on the nature of the needs of the agency and the market available to satisfy such needs. Subject to such needs, specifications may be stated in terms of—

"(i) function so that a variety of products or services may qualify;

"(ii) performance, including specifications of the range of acceptable characteristics or of the minimum acceptable standards; or

"(iii) design requirements.

"(2) Each solicitation for sealed bids or competitive proposals other than for small purchases shall at a minimum include, in addition to the specifications described in paragraph (1) of this subsection—

"(A) a statement of—

"(i) all significant factors, including price, which the executive agency reasonably expects to consider in evaluating sealed bids or competitive proposals; and

"(ii) the relative importance assigned to each of those factors;

"(B) in the case of sealed bids—

"(i) a statement that sealed bids will be evaluated without discussions with the bidders; and

"(ii) the time and place for the opening of the sealed bids; and

"(C) in the case of competitive proposals—

"(i) a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated with, and awards made after, discussions with the offerors but might be evaluated and awarded without discussions with the offerors; and

"(ii) the time and place for submission of proposals.

"(b)(1) The head of an agency shall evaluate sealed bids and competitive proposals based solely on the factors specified in the solicitation.

"(2) All sealed bids or competitive proposals received in response to a solicitation may be rejected if the head of an agency determines that such action is in the public interest.

"(3) Sealed bids shall be opened publicly at the time and place stated in the solicitation. The head of an agency shall evaluate the bids without discussions with the bidders and shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, award a contract with reaonable promptness to the responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the United States, solely considering the price and the other factors included in the solicitation under subsection (a)(2)(A) of this section. The award of a contract shall be made by transmitting written notice of the award to the successful bidder.

"(4)(A) The head of an agency shall evaluate competitive proposals and may award a contract—

"(i) after discussions conducted with the offerors at any time after receipt of the proposal and prior to the award of the contract; or

"(ii) without discussions with the offerors beyond discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification where it can be clearly demonstrated from the existence of effective competition or accurate prior cost experience with the product or service that acceptance of an initial proposal without discussions would result in fair and reasonable prices.

"(B) In the case of award of a contract under subparagraph (A)(i) of this paragraph, the head of an agency shall conduct, before such award, written or oral discussions with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within a competitive range, price and other evaluation factors considered.

"(C) In the case of award of a contract under subparagraph (A)(ii) of this paragraph, the head of an agency shall award the contract based on the proposals received (and as clarified, if necessary, in discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification).

"(D) The head of an agency shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the United States, solely considering price and other factors included in the solicitation under subsection (a)(2)(A) of this section. The head of the agency shall award the contract by transmitting written notice of the award to such offeror and shall promptly notify all other offerors of the rejection of their proposals.

"(5) If the head of an agency considers that any bid or proposal evidences a violation of the antitrust laws, he shall refer the bid or proposal to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

"(c)(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection—

"(i) the head of an agency intending to solicit bids or, proposals for a contract for property or services at a price expected to exceed $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice described in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

"(ii) the head of an agency awarding a contract for property or services at a price exceeding $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice announcing such award if there is likely to be any subcontract under such contract.

"(B) The Secretary of Commerce shall publish promptly in the Commerce Business Daily each notice required by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

"(C) Whenever a head of an agency is required by subparagagph (A)(i) of this paragraph to furnish a notice of a solicitation to the Secretary of Commerce, such head of an agency may not—

"(i) issue such solicitation earlier than fifteen days after the date on which such notice is published by the Secretary of Commerce; or

"(ii) establish a deadline for the submission of all bids or proposals in response to such solicitation that is earlier than thirty days after the date on which such solicitation is issued.

"(2) Each notice required by paragraph (1)(A)(i) of this subsection shall include—

"(A) an accurate description of the property or services to be contracted for, which description is not unnecessarily restrictive of competition;

"(B) the name and address of the officer or employee of the agency who may be contacted for the purpose of obtaining a copy of the solicitation;

"(C) a statement that any person may submit a bid or proposal which shall be considered by the agency; and

"(D) in the case of a procurement using noncompetitive procedures, a statement of the reason justifying the use of noncompetitive procedures and the identity of the intended source.

"(3)(A) A notice is not required under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection if—

"(i) the notice would disclose the agency's needs and the disclosure of such needs would compromise the national security; or

"(ii) the proposed noncompetitive procurement would result from acceptance of an unsolicited research proposal that demonstrates a unique or innovative research concept and the publication of any notice of such unsolicited research proposal would disclose the originality of thought or innovativeness of the proposed research or proprietary data associated with the proposal.

"(B) The requirements of paragraph (1)(A)(i) of this subsection do not apply—

"(i) to any procurement under conditions described in clause (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 2304 (e) of this title; and

"(ii) in the case of any procurement for which the head of the agency carrying out such procurement makes a determination in writing, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that it is not appropriate or reasonable to publish a notice before issuing a solicitation."; and

"(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2316. Record requirements

"(a) Each head of an agency shall establish and maintain for a period of five years a record, by fiscal year, of the procurements, other than small purchases, in such fiscal year in which—

"(1) noncompetitive procedures were used; and

"(2) only one bid or proposal was received after competitive procedures were used.

"(b) The record established under subsection (a) of this section shall include, with respect to each procurement—

"(1) information identifying the source to whom the contract was awarded;

"(2) the property or services obtained by the Government under the procurement;

"(3) the total cost of the procurement;

"(4) the reason under section 2304(e) of this title for the use of noncompetitive procedures; and

"(5) the position of the officers or employees of the agency who required and approved the use of noncompetitive procedures in such procurement.

"(c) The information included in the record established and maintained under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the General Services Administration and shall be entered in the Federal Procurement Data System referred to in section 6(d)(4) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)).".

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended—

(1) by striking out the items relating to sections 2304 and 2305 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"2304. Competition requirements.

"2305. Solicitation, evaluation, and award procedures; notice requirements.";

and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2316. Record requirements.".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 22. Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2306—

(A) by striking out "may, in negotiating contracts under section 2304," in the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "may in awarding contracts

after using other than sealed bid procedures";

(B) by striking out "negotiated under section 2304" in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures";

(C) by striking out "section 2304 of this title," in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "this chapter";

(D) in subsection (f)(1)—

(i) by striking out clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) prior to the award of any prime contract under this title after using other than sealed bid procedures where the contract price is expected to exceed $100,000;";

(ii) by striking out "negotiated" each place it appears in the second paragraph;

(iii) by striking out "negotiation," in the third paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "proposal for the contract, the discussions conducted on the proposal under this title,"; and

(iv) by striking out "$500,000" each place it appears in clauses (B), (C), and (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,000"; and

(E) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Except in a case in which the Secretary of Defense determines that military requirements necessitate the specification of container sizes, no contract for the carriage of Government property in other than Government-owned cargo containers shall require carriage of such property in cargo containers of any stated length, height, or width.";

(2) by striking out subsection (b) of section 2310 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Each determination or decision under section 2306(c), section 2306(g)(1), section 2307(c), or section 2313(c) of this title shall be based on a written finding by the person making the determination or decision, which finding shall set out facts and circumstances that (1) clearly indicate why the type of contract selected under section 2306(c) is likely to be less costly than any other type or that it is impracticable to obtain property or services of the kind or quality required except under such a contract, (2) support the findings required by section 2306(g)(1), (3) clearly indicate why advance payments under section 2307(c) would be in the public interest, or (4) clearly indicate why the application of section 2313(b) to a contract or subcontract with a foreign contractor or foreign subcontractor would not be in the public interest. Such a finding is final and shall be kept available in the agency for at least six years after the date of the determination or decision. A copy of the finding shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office with each contract to which it applies.";

(3) by striking out section 2311 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The head of an agency may delegate, subject to his direction, to any other officer or official of that agency, any power under this chapter."; and

(4) by striking out "negotiated" in the second sentence of section 2313(b) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures".

Subtitle C—Advocate for Competition; Annual Report on Competition

DEFINITION

SEC. 31. For the purposes of this subtitle, the term "executive agency" has the same meaning as provided in section 4(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(a)).

ADVOCATE FOR COMPETITION

SEC. 32. (a)(1) There is established in each executive agency an advocate for competition.

(2) Each head of an executive agency shall—

(A) designate for each executive agency one officer or employee serving in a position authorized for such executive agency on the date of enactment of this Act to serve as the advocate for competition;

(B) relieve such officer or employee of all duties and responsibilities that are inconsistent with the duties and responsibilities of the advocate for competition; and

(C) provide such officer or employee with such staff or assistance as may be necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the advocate for competition.

(b)(1) The advocate for competition shall promote competition in the procurement of property and services.

(2) The advocate for competition in an executive agency shall—

(A) review the purchasing and contracting activities of the executive agency;

(B) identify and report to the head of the executive agency—

(i) opportunities to achieve competition on the basis of price and other significant factors in the purchases and contracts of the executive agency;

(ii) solicitations and proposed solicitations which include unnecessarily detailed specifications or unnecessarily restrictive statements of need which may reduce competition in the procurement activities of the executive agency; and

(iii) any other condition or action which has the effect of unnecessarily restricting competition in the procurement actions of the executive agency; and

(C) prepare and transmit to the head of the executive agency an annual report describing his activities under this section.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 33. (a) Not later than September 30 of each of 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987 each head of an executive agency shall transmit to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives an annual report including the information specified in subsection (b).

(b) Each report transmitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a specific description of all actions that the head of the executive agency intends to take during the next fiscal year to—

(A) increase competition for contracts with the executive agency on the basis of price and other significant factors; and

(B) reduce the number and dollar value of contracts entered into by the executive agency after soliciting bids or proposals from, or evaluating bids or proposals with discussions with, only one source; and

(2) a summary of the activities and accomplishments of the advocates for competition of the executive agency during the fiscal year in which the report is transmitted.

Subtitle D—Applicability

SEC. 41. The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to any solicitations for bids or proposals issued on or after the date two hundred and seventy days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment, I believe, as an offer that really cannot be refused. I am offering it on behalf of myself and Senators LEVIN and ROTH. This amendment is identical to S. 338, the Competition in Contracting Act of 1983, which we passed unanimously in this body last November. The reasons I am offering it now are, first, it is projected to save at least $2 billion annually and is therefore consistent with the goal of this bill to reduce the Federal deficit; and second, it is the most expeditious way to insure the enactment of S. 338 this Congress. I might point out there seem to be some procedural difficulties taking place in the House which prevent them from moving forward expeditiously before the end of this session on adopting S. 338 or even something reasonably close to it.

The objective of this amendment is to increase the use of competition in Government contracting and to impose more stringent restrictions on the awarding of noncompetitive—sole-source—contracts.

Each year, the Federal Government spends more than half of its discretionary budget on the procurement of property and services, ranging from weapons systems to janitorial services, from the private sector. According to the Office of Management and Budget, Federal procurement costs in 1985 are projected to be $207 billion—an 88-percent increase from the 1980 level. I am convinced that savings can be realized through the effective implementation of procurement reforms.

The Competition in Contracting Act is one such reform which the Congressional Budget Office estimates would result in significant savings. The CBO found that each 1 percent saved in new contract actions reduces costs by about $200 million per year. Since studies on the use of competitive contracting have concluded that potential savings range from 15 to 50 percent, a conservative estimate of the savings resulting from this amendment would be well over $2 billion.

A number of recent examples come to mind which demonstrate the efficacy of this approach.

The recent Air Force jet engine competition is a good example of how competition in contracting may result in substantial savings. While the Air Force paid a 5-percent premium by having two companies compete rather than awarding a sole-source contract, the expected savings over the next 10 years may exceed $3 billion because the engines will be more dependable and efficient. By dual-sourcing, moreover, the Air Force hopes to continue pressure on the companies to hold down prices and provide service and spares at lower costs.

This amendment represents over 2 years of work, beginning in the 97th Congress with S. 2127, the Competition in Contracting Act of 1982. S. 338

was subsequently introduced in this Congress and has been subject to extensive hearings before the Governmental Affairs and Armed Services Committees, both of which reported the bill unanimously. Considering the bipartisan support for S. 338 in the Senate and widespread support from the administration, the General Accounting Office, the American Bar Association and others throughout the procurement community, I strongly believe that this amendment represents the best opportunity for procurement reform this year.

This amendment, while not intended to be a panacea to our contracting problems, was based on the administration's Feburary 1982 proposal for a uniform Federal procurement system. The administration's proposal, in turn, was based on recommendations from the Commission on Government Procurement's 1972 report to Congress, which set forth nearly 150 recommendations to improve the efficiency of the Federal procurement process.

I repeat, in 1972, the Commission made a recommendation which embodied these principles. Here we are, in 1984, still talking about it.

Despite the consensus that has developed over the past years, the laws which have governed contracting since 1947 have remained largely intact. Under these current laws, Government agencies are required to promote the use of full and free competition in the procurement of property and services. In Government contracting, competition is a marketplace condition which results when several contractors, acting independently of each other and of the Government, submit bids or proposals in an attempt to secure the Government's business.

Formal advertising is currently the preferred procurement procedure, with negotiation authorized by proscribed exceptions. Despite this stated preference for competition through formal advertising, negotiated contracts account for the vast majority of Federal procurement dollars. Negotiated contracts can be competitive—and this amendment recognizes and encourages competitive negotiation when it is the appropriate contracting method—but more than half of all negotiated contracts are sole-sourced.

While not all Government contracts can be awarded competitively, too often agencies contract on a sole-source basis when competition is available. This problem arises from what I consider to be two primary shortcomings in the present laws: First, they do not recognize negotiation as a legitimate competitive procurement procedure; and second, they do not adequately restrict the use of noncompetitive negotiation.

I wish to take this opportunity to summarize the five major provisions of this amendment:

First, this amendment removes the present restriction from—and the written justification required for—competitive negotiation and places it on par with formal advertising. Together, they constitute competitive procedures, with exceptions provided for noncompetitive procedures. The objective is to establish an absolute preference for competition and to provide more flexibility in contracting.

Second, agencies under this amendment are not only required to obtain competition under this amendment, but to increase its effectiveness. Agencies would be required to obtain effective competition through advance procurement planning, market research, and the development of specifications which do not restrict competition.

Third, this amendment places greater restrictions on the use of noncompetitive procurements without precluding its use when necessary. Six exceptions are provided to competitive procedures which permit agencies to use noncompetitive procedures in awarding a contract when competition is not possible. Awarding a contract on a sole-source basis would for the first time constitute a clear violation of statute unless permitted by one of the following six exceptions:

First, the property or service is available from only a single source and no competitive alternatives are available;

Second, the agency's need is of such unusual and compelling urgency that the Government would be seriously injured by the delay involved in using competitive procedures;

Third, the Government needs to award the contract to a particular source in order to create or maintain an essential industrial capability or for purposes of industrial mobilization;

Fourth, the terms of an international agreement have the effect of requiring the use of noncompetitive procedures;

Fifth, a statute requires that the procurement may be obtained through a specified source; or

Sixth, disclosure to more than one source of the property or service to be obtained would jeopardize the national security.

Those, Mr. President, are the six basic exceptions to the rule that we have to have competition. I believe that they would help to narrow the present exceptions down to a more manageable and more realistic level.

These six exceptions parallel the conditions under which the Comptroller General has historically permitted agencies to award on a sole-source basis. Even in these situations, however, I feel there should be a "double-check" for potential competition before the sole-source award is made. The fourth major provision would therefore generally require agencies to publish a notice of their prospective contracts over $25,000 in the Commerce Business Daily. The objective is to alert contractors, who may be capable of meeting the agency's needs but would have otherwise not known of the contract, to submit offers.

Fifth, this amendment facilitates oversight of noncompetitive contracts by requiring agencies to maintain records, by fiscal year, which identify all sole-source procurements. In addition, an advocate for competition would be appointed in each procuring agency who would be responsible for reporting the opportunities to achieve competition and any conditions which could potentially restrict competition.

In summary, Mr. President, I believe this amendment substantially reduces the costly and longstanding problem of unnecessary sole-source contracting. It puts us on record to do what we say we are pledged to do and that is, base our system upon the free enterprise system under the notion that more competition will insure a better product at a lower cost. This amendment also removes what I believe to be the great cynicism that exists and is pervasive in this country—that we have a revolving door from which many people go out of Government into private companies and have a straight line right back into the very agencies that they worked with and thereby have an inside track on getting a sole-source contract which results in millions, and I submit to you billions, of dollars being spent each year unnecessarily. In view of the fact that the Senate has already passed S. 338 unanimously, I hope the chairman of the committee will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me first say to my good friend from Maine, I think he has an excellent amendment. I am hopeful that we are going to be able to accept it today. Obviously, the amendment under normal circumstances does not belong on a budget proposal, but we do have a substantive bill instead of a budget resolution before us today. It is a law. And since this proposal is not only a substantive change in the law but is clearly prompted by a desire to save substantial amounts of money, and since the report from the Congressional Budget Office would indicate in a very serious way that this is apt, if applied properly, to save $2 billion, I have no objection, if others do not, to voting on this. Hopefully, the vote would be on the Senator's side, he would prevail, and we would take this entire amendment which heretofore was a bill that passed without any objection, as I understand it, by the Senate and for some reason has not yet been considered in the House.

I would like to discuss the matter briefly by asking the Senator a question. First, I think he knows the Senator from New Mexico has the greatest respect for him. I believe he is furnishing a very valuable service to the American people by proposing this competitive measure, but I also think he is doing a marvelous job in enhancing the image of military procurement as an example. Some people do not quite understand that the American people might very well support military preparedness, might support increased budgets for it, more money, new systems, but they, too, have pretty good commonsense approaches to things and when they see noncompetitive approaches, they really need a very valid reason why. If this becomes substantive law, there will be valid reasons for noncompetitive contracts by the Government but the exemptions and the exceptions will be few—am I correct?

Mr. COHEN. That is precisely correct. When we read the horror stories of the thousand-dollar wrenches and plastic caps—and the list of abuses goes on and on—it is because the procuring agency is not taking advantage of the competition in the defense industry. One of the best ways of reducing that kind of outrageous abuse, which is almost tantamount to fraudulent abuse, I might add, is to have greater competition which to date has not been sufficiently accomplished.

I believe that Senator BAUCUS would like to have an opportunity to speak on this matter, although he is not on the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to ask a specific question by way of interpretation and then certainly I will yield the floor and confirm with the leader that it would be all right to accept the amendment or to voice vote it. That is satisfactory to the Senator from New Mexico.

I say to my friend from Maine that I have a situation that does concern me. I believe the Senator has made an exception for it. I find the exception on page 24 of the original S. 338 among those ways that the head of an agency may use noncompetitive procedures and I refer specifically to paragraph 3, item (c), when the Senator is speaking of——

Mr. COHEN. Which page?

Mr. DOMENICI. Page 24. All right, on the amendment that the Senator has submitted, I believe it is on page 18, top of the page, item (C), six lines down: "or establish or maintain an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States." I want to ask about that.

In the case of New Mexico—and I am sure this exists across this land—there are certain contracts—let us just give a general one—with the Department of the Army. They have been doing basic research for 10, 15 years and have an established record, have a physical plant, the academic capacity, on an annual basis they make their proposal, and they receive the award. Now, it seems to me that if we forced every one of those kinds of contracts to go to bid, with no exceptions, we clearly could end up with contractors that clearly had no ability or capacity to provide the continuity required for the kind of services needed.

They may be able to do it for 2 years or 3 and then if they went on to something else because the private sector business said get on with something else, we would have to start all over again and perhaps we would lose money over a 5- to 10-year period because sooner or later somebody is going to have to bid the physical plant, have to provide the kind of overhead that maintains some of these very excellent educational or nonprofit type of commitments.

Now, do I understand it is that kind—and perhaps I am even too limited—of exception that the Senator has in mind in the paragraph that I read?

Mr. COHEN. Yes, that is precisely the reason it was incorporated into S. 338, after we consulted at length with educational institutions, not only as an exception to completion but as a criterion for dual sourcing. I might say to the Senator that dual sourcing is not necessarily desirable in every single situation. If you have an aircraft carrier or if you have some large weapons system which is going to cost billions of dollars and is going to be one type of ship over a very long period of time, it does not make a good deal of sense to necessarily have dual sourcing. But when you are dealing with smaller contracts with universities and the types of research capability that is provided by those universities and educational institutions, we felt it made sense to create exceptions in order to preserve that capability.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHILES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CHILES. The amendment that the Senator from Maine is proposing is identical to a bill that has passed the Senate. The Senator from Maine has been working on this long and hard in the Committee on Governmental Affairs. It is a proposal that I have certainly supported for a long time. I was a cosponsor of the bill that passed the Senate.

I concur in the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee. Normally this is something we would be objecting to on a budget resolution, but we find ourselves not with a budget resolution but a substantive bill. I see no reason why we can raise that objection at this time. Because the legislation has passed the Senate and certainly would invoke savings, I think it is an amendment that we should accept.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3035) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COHEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3036

(Purpose: To provide for a pay increase for Article III judges subject to salary adjustments pursuant to section 461 of title 28 of the United States Code)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the Baker amendment and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL) proposes an amendment numbered 3036.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the amendment insert the following new section:

SEC. . Effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after January 1, 1984, each rate of pay subject to adjustment by section 461 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by an amount, rounded to the nearest multiple of $100 (or if midway between multiples of $100, to the next higher multiple of $100), equal to the overall percentage of the adjustment taking effect under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule during fiscal year 1984.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators MATHIAS, THURMOND, BENTSEN, and BOSCHWITZ be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering will authorize a salary adjustment for those Federal judges who have been excluded from salary adjustments afforded most other Federal employees on January 1.

As of January 1, the salary of officers and employees of the U.S. Government were to have been increased 3.5 percent in accordance with President Reagan's recommendation of August 31, 1983 (Presidential Message No. 74, H.R. Doc. No. 98-97), and the "comparability adjustment provisions" of title 5, U.S.C. Under the provisions of section 202, Public Law 98-270, which was enacted just this month, Federal pay rates have been increased another 0.5 percent retroactive to January 1.

One distinct class of Government officers, however, has been denied the total 4 percent adjustment, Fedeal judges. Judges of the appeals courts and district courts, the Justices of the Supreme Court, judges of the Military Court of Appeal, judges of the U.S. Tax Court and senior judges for the article III courts have been excluded from any salary adjustment, an inequitable consequence directly attributable to an amendment added to a continuing resolution for fiscal year 1982 passed in December 1981.

That amendment, section 140, Public Law 97-92 requires express statutory authorization for any increase in judicial salaries. The Comptroller General of the United States has determined that this provision is permanent legislation, and as such, was not limited to fiscal year 1982. This removes judges from coverage of the Executive Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1975 and in the annual payroll comparability adjustments received by other Federal employees.

My amendment would constitute the required statutory authorization to enable members of the judiciary to receive a pay raise this fiscal year equal to the pay raise given to other Federal employees. Under my amendment, outlays will increase under $2 million. Since that is the same amount that is included in the CBO baseline, my amendment does not add to the deficit, according to the method of accounting used by the Congressional Budget Office.

As the Comptroller General has interpreted section 140, Public Law 97-92, judges, and judges only, are singled out for special treatment. Judges, and judges only, are precluded from the operation of statutory provisions applicable to all other employees of the Federal Government. Judges, and judges only, have to overcome the hurdle of affirmative congressional action that no other Federal employee need face. That prejudicial, discriminatory treatment is precisely what article III of the Constitution was intended by our Founding Fathers to prevent.

Section 1, article III, of the U.S. Constitution, which provides that "Judges * * * shall * * * receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office," was designed to further three public policies: To promote the independence of the judiciary, to attract the highest quality lawyers to the bench, and to reinforce the guarantee of life tenure for Federal judges.

The current system of judicial compensation, however, undermines all of these policies. Faced with salaries that are slipping behind the cost of living, and, perhaps most critically, other career opportunities open to them, many judges are moving closer to the point where they must decide, for financial reasons, to leave the bench. At the same time, lawyers of the caliber sought for Federal judgeships are declining nominations for these same reasons.

If we fail to correct this situation quickly, we may see the judiciary lose the services of those individuals who serve it best: Those who will not permit their performance in office or their personal integrity to be compromised or questioned.

Before assuming my current office, I was a Federal judge in Maine. Perhaps because I have served as a Federal judge, I have heard, directly or indirectly, from or about many judges around this country. What I see on the part of the Federal judiciary is an increasing apprehensiveness over action or inaction on the part of Congress vitally affecting their security and their ability to plan for their families. So intense is this apprehensiveness becoming that we, perhaps unintentionally, are well along toward achieving precisely what the Constitution seeks to avoid: A judiciary in fear of a retributive Congress. Passage of this amendment is one step toward assuaging those fears.

I believe it is a mistake for Congress to have made available routine cost-of-living adjustments to the employees and top officials in the legislative branch, to the employees and top officials in the executive branch, and to employees in the judicial branch, but not to Federal judges. Decency, equity, and commonsense require immediate remedial legislative action to confer upon judges the same adjustment all others are already receiving.

Commonsense requires corrective action to insure that this situation does not arise again. Legislation which I introduced in January, S. 2224, would repeal section 140, Public Law 97-92 so that the Senate would not have to address this issue again and again and again in future years. That is the course I recommend to my colleagues.

This amendment, however, would only constitute the required authorization to enable members of the judiciary to receive a pay raise this year. It would not repeal or alter in any way section 140 of Public Law 97-92 which is the underlying cause of this immediate problem.

My amendment is a first step which I hope the Senate will support so that these highly deserving individuals will not be singularly excluded from an otherwise across-the-board pay increase retroactive to January 1.

Mr. President, I understand that this matter has been cleared with the manager of the bill, Senator DOMENICI, and with Senator CHILES, the ranking minority member.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I have not talked to Senator DOMENICI, but it is my understanding that this has not been cleared on this side of the aisle.

At this point, I should like to add something with respect to procedure that may relieve some fear the Senator might have as a result of what I have just said.

It would be our intention on this side that the Senator's amendment be the pending order of business when the Senate reconvenes in the morning, and this afternoon we would like to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have no objection to that, but I have been informed—obviously erroneously, because I accept what the Senator has said—that Senator DOMENICI had agreed to this.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will let the Senator from New Mexico, the distinguished chairman of the committee, speak for himself at this point.

Mr. MITCHELL. Obviously, I have been misinformed.

Mr. GRASSLEY. That can happen. But I ask the Senator from Maine to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not know what the issue is. I have just returned to the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is the cost-of-living increase which was granted to all Federal employees, the one-half of 1 percent which was added to legislation recently enacted; and because of section 140 of Public Law 97-92, it does not go to Federal judges.

Express statutory authorization is required for any increase to be received. My amendment would constitute that authority, so as to permit the judges to receive the additional one-half of 1 percent that is going to all other employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand the issue.

The Senator from Maine and I talked about the incremental amount of one-half of 1 percent; but the Senator from New Mexico, as floor manager, cannot accept the amendment. There are Members who want to address the issue. Some may want to insist upon a rollcall vote, and some may want to oppose it on a rollcall vote. So I am not in a position to do anything more than to say that we are prepared to take it up. But if the Senator brought it up because he thought it would be accepted, I do not want to mislead him, and I will do anything possible to alleviate his situation. He can withdraw it or do whatever he wishes at this point. However, because of objections, I cannot agree to accept it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that. I brought it up under the misapprehension that it had been cleared, but I do not wish to withdraw it. If others wish to oppose it and to have a vote on it, we will proceed to do that tomorrow.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, is this amendment going to be taken up now or on another day? I want to say a few words in favor of this amendment, of which I am a cosponsor. Is this an appropriate time?

Mr. MITCHELL. The amendment is now pending. It is appropriate for the Senator to discuss it now. It will be the order of business tomorrow, and there may be a vote on it tomorrow. I welcome the Senator's remarks.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment with my distinguished colleague from Maine, Senator MITCHELL. His amendment would constitute the necessary congressional authorization to give members of the Federal judiciary the same pay raise already given to other Federal officers and employees. This amendment would not, however, repeal or alter the requirement in existing law that Congress specifically authorize any salary increases for the article III Federal judiciary.

On March 26 of this year, I introduced a bill, S. 2476, which would accomplish the same goal as the Mitchell amendment. That bill, cosponsored by Senators MITCHELL, DOLE, MATHIAS, DECONCINI, and BENTSEN, would have given all Federal judges and justices a 3.5 salary increase retroactive to January 1, 1984. Like the pending Mitchell amendment, it did not repeal or alter current law requiring congressional authorization for such an increase.

As many of my colleagues will recall, Congress in December of 1981 passed, as part of the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1982 appropriations, a provision requiring express statutory authorization for any increase in judicial salaries. Subsequent to passage of this appropriations rider, the Comptroller General of the United States determined that this provision, section 140 of Public Law 97-92, was permanent legislation, not limited to fiscal year 1982.

This change effectively removed judges from coverage of the Executive Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1975, which had included judges, as well as Members of Congress and high-ranking executive branch officials, in the annual payroll comparability adjustments received by other Federal employees. Thus, Federal judges and justices were not allowed the salary increase received this year by other Federal employees because there was no specific authorization for such an increase. The decision of the Comptroller General of the United States is file No. B-200923, December 28, 1983, and that determined that no such specific authorization had been enacted.

This amendment would constitute the required authorization to enable members of the judiciary to receive a pay raise this year. It would not repeal—I want to repeat this—it would not repeal or alter in any way section 140 of Public Law 97-92. Express statutory authorization by Congress would continue to be necessary for any salary increases for the Federal judiciary.

Mr. President, I strongly support the existing requirement for such specific statutory authorization. Rather than including more Federal employees within automatic pay adjustment provisions, we should be including more Federal employees within the requirement that Congress specifically authorize their pay increases. It will be difficult, if not impossible, for Congress to establish any control over Federal spending while automatic pay adjustments and cost-of-living increases in a variety of areas slowly but steadily increase the costs of Government. Congress should begin by reasserting its control over Federal pay increases, especially for those employees covered by the Executive Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1985 and should face up to the difficult decisions which we were elected to make.

Mr. President, I am in favor of fair and equitable treatment of all Federal employees. That is why I support this amendment giving members of the Federal judiciary the pay increase received by all other Federal workers. I would be strongly opposed, however—and I want to repeat—I would be strongly opposed to any repeal of the requirement for statutory authorization for such increases. This is a sound principle which should be extended to cover more Federal employees.

Mr. President, I just wish to say that it is my judgment that Congress should have to approve each year any increases for any Government employees and not have automatic increases.

This does not give an automatic increase. As I said, I am opposed to that. But we have already given the other Federal employees an increase. Why not give the judges a similar increase?

That is all this amendment does, as I understand it; is that not correct?

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator is correct.

I should note, as the Senator has indicated, all other employees of the Federal Government have now received a 4-percent increase, first 3½ percent, then an additional one-half of 1 percent. Federal judges have received neither because they have received none. They did not get the 3½ percent; they did not get the additional one-half percent.

So we are talking here about a 4-percent increase that has been provided, as the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee has made clear, to all other Federal employees other than the 700 men and women who serve as Federal judges.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it seems to me this would be a fair step to take. Just give the judges the same increase as others, no more, no less. I feel that it is reasonable under the circumstances.

Again I wish to say I am not in favor, as some people are, of just having automatic increases. That is one thing that has gotten this country into the trouble it is in today. That is one thing that has gotten the budget into the trouble that it is in today—automatic increases. Some years we may be able to do it; other years we may not be able to do it.

But this year we have already given it to the other employees, so I say let us give it to the judges, also, this year.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I do not very often disagree with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is also chairman of the Judiciary Committee on which I serve, but this is one of those opportunities that seldom occur in which I feel I must

take exception to the amendment that is being proposed by the Senator from Maine and now supported by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

I wish to say that we are dealing with an effort here in the Chamber on reconciliation in which our thrust is almost totally the reduction of the level of expenditures. This would be the wrong time to make an exception to that.

I also wish to say that we in this body have already taken the opportunity to disapprove of the pay raise that was voted to Members of Congress. We have expressed our opposition to pay raises and at this time of the year when we are faced with $200 billion budget deficits, it is no time to think about increasing anything.

I think the debate of whether or not there should be automatic increases, or whether they should be voted by us and our being on record in each instance is a very worthy debate. But that is not the real issue before us as far as what we are faced with here.

I wish to have my colleagues be cognizant of what Federal judges make at this point.

The Chief Justices' salary is $100,700; the Associate Justices, $96,700; the U.S. circuit court of appeals judges, $77,300; the U.S. district court judges, $73,100; the Court of International Trade judges, $73,100; the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, $77,300; and judges of the U.S. Tax Court, $73,100.

Now, if this salary increase were to go through, as suggested by my good friend from Maine, there would be increases from a high of $3,500 for the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, to a smaller increase of $2,600 for the U.S. district court judges.

The bottom line is that once a judge's salary is increased, of course, under the Constitution, it cannot be decreased because the Constitution says that Federal judges compensation, "* * * shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

Now if we were to approve a pay raise for Federal judges, it would be impossible to reduce it if congressional pay were later reduced. As I said, we in the Senate have previously passed this. This would result in even greater differences between congressional and judges salaries.

Now, I know this issue has not been presented so far in this debate, but I would remind all of my colleagues that there was a relationship until about 3 years ago between what judges were paid and what we in the Congress, both the House and the Senate, were paid. Basically there was a relationship at the district judge level that they would not receive more than Members of Congress would. This would be even further distorted if we were to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Maine and then later have our salary decreased as a result of our earlier vote.

Now I pointed out, in my listing of what the pay is for the various members of the judiciary, that the weighted average is $75,000, but even for those at the district court level, where I said that there was parity between Members of Congress and district courts until very recently, that level is distorted to a point where those judges of the district court now receive $73,100.

So for all the various reasons given, I think that this amendment should be disapproved. But most important, we do not want to approve the amendment at this time, when we are considering bringing the Federal budget deficit under control. It has very little control now, so we want to institute not just greater control, but control, period. It would set a very poor example if we were to approve this amendment at this point.

Consequently, we are asking that this amendment be disapproved and that when we have ordered the yeas and nays—and we would hope that they would be ordered—that we would have a resounding no vote on this amendment and in support of fiscal austerity. This is a time when, quite frankly, almost any increase in any pay level of any position within the Federal Government is not going to set a very good example, as we go into private sector negotiations on collective bargaining agreements that are up this fall.

We in the Federal Government ought to be setting an example. And there is no place it can be better set than as we deal with public officials, including judges of the various courts.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for this comments, and I certainly understand them.

The question of pay for Members of Congress is, of course, one of the most awkward issues with which we, as Members of Congress, must deal. But it is unfortunate, I think, that we would permit our own difficulty with our own salaries to affect the legitimate views of the small number of people who the President nominates, and we confirm, to make decisions regarding issues of great importance to the people of this country.

I emphasize that we are talking about 700 people in all—that is all there are—700 Federal judges who would be affected by this. The total amount involved in less than $2 million. So we are dealing with 700 people out of millions of Federal employees and less than $2 million out of billions of Federal spending. And the notion that we are somehow going to balance the budget or make a major step toward balancing the budget if we will just single out 700 Federal judges, deny them the pay increase that has been granted to very other Federal employee, is, I submit, preposterous on its face.

But, second, I would point out to the Senator from Iowa, who has unfortunately since left the Chamber, that the $1,900,000 which this amendment would entail is included in the CBO baseline assumption which is used in the budget resolution. Therefore, this amendment's adoption will have no effect on the deficit when contrasted with the budget resolution which, as I said, incorporates the CBO baseline figures.

So if that is the only argument to be made, then there really is no argument. It seems to me what we have is an attitude that has existed and continues to exist. It is understandable in human terms, but it makes no sense in logic, either for this body or for this country, that because of our own difficulties with pay raises—and it is a difficult, awkward issue, I concede that—that we somehow improve our own circumstance by denying the Federal judges an increase that was granted to every other employee of the Government. I do not think it makes any sense. I hope very much that the Members of this body will agree and approve this amendment.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if there are no further arguments to be made at this time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). The Clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is a request for the yeas and nays on this amendment, as I have advised the distinguished Senator from Maine. By the same token, for a variety of reasons—numbering about 30—I would prefer not to vote this afternoon. It seems agreeable with the Senator from Maine that we try to arrange a time in the morning. We have not yet done that. I wish to confer with the minority leader before we go any further. But, in the meantime, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not past the hour of 5 p.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there will be no more rollcall votes today.

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of our distinguished leader, the senior Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), made today at the Holocaust ceremony in the great rotunda of the U.S. Capitol, be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAKER AT CEREMONY COMMEMORATING VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. BAKER. I am honored to join you today for this special ceremony commemorating the victims of the Holocaust. It has been nearly 40 years now since the end of World War II and the liberation of the death camps in which 6 million people were put to death at the hands of the Nazis.

As General Eisenhower described one such camp, it was a horror almost beyond human comprehension, and yet it was an act of atrocity by humans against humans—not a passionate struggle in battle, but bureaucratized, systemized, authorized evil.

It is the way of human nature to block such horrors from our consciousness, to bury them beneath our memory, to convince ourselves that they are aberrations that "couldn't happen here."

It is for precisely this reason that we come together here today in the Rotunda, which so clearly symbolizes this country's struggle for freedom. We must make people think and remember and understand how fragile is the separation between civilization and barbarism, between the precious rights we take for granted, and the monstrous wrongs of which man is capable.

I join with each of you today not only to memorialize the victims of the Holocaust, but to join with you in renewing our pledge to ensure that we never forget the Holocaust and its horrors and to remember that "all that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men and women to do nothing."

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have been advised by the minority leader that there is no objection on his side to the consideration of one item on today's Executive Calendar. I refer to Calendar No. 568, the nomination of Lloyd D. George, of Nevada, to be U.S. District Judge for the district of Nevada.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into executive session for the purpose of considering that nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JUDICIARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lloyd D. George, of Nevada, to be U.S. District Judge for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified that the Senate has given its consent to this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 26, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 27, 1984, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The nomination received on April 28, 1984 is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 26, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate on April 26, 1984, during the adjournment of the Senate received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT) had signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 2570. An act to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 26, 1984, the enrolled bill was signed on April 26, 1984, during the adjournment of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary reported that on April 26, 1984, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2570. An act to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-610. A resolution adopted by the Olymphant Borough Council, Olyphant, Pennsylvania urging Congress to direct the Environmental Protection Agency to recognize Giardia as a water pollutant; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-611. A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Syracuse, New York urging Congress to reauthorize Issuance of Mortgage Revenue Bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-612. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Finance.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas, The members of the 115th General Assembly of Ohio wish to take this opportunity to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact into law H.R. 4352, known as the Fair Trade in Steel Act of 1983, which would temporarily limit imports of steel mill products into the United States; and

"Whereas, The United States steel industry is critical to the national defense and to maintaining a strong industrial economy, on which millions of Americans depend for their livelihood. Over the past twenty years, unfair trade practices in the international steel market, such as subsidization, dumping, industrial targeting, discriminatory bilateral agreements, selling below cost, and other predatory practices have substantially injured the United States steel industry; and

"Whereas, Continuing financial losses in the domestic steel industry are a threat to national military security and economic prosperity. In the past decade, the industry has seen a drastic reduction in employment, a drop in steelmaking capability, the permanent and temporary closure of plants and facilities, and the costly deferral and cancellation of vital capital investment projects. These trends are evidence that existing United States trade statutes have failed to deal effectively with the problem of widespread unfair trade practices, and that new legislation is needed to save an ailing industry; and

"Whereas, In order to promote and expand the economic viability of the United States steel industry, to protect the jobs of its workers, and to prevent the industry's further decline, it seems necessary and appropriate to limit imports of carbon, alloy, and specialty steel mill products for at least five years. It is hoped that this action will safeguard the national security, reduce unfair trade and ensure orderly trade in steel mill products; therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the 115th General Assembly of Ohio, in adopting this Resolution, petition the Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 4352, known as the Fair Trade in Steel Act of 1983, and by this action enable the domestic steel industry to become fully competitive in the world market; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Ohio Congressional Delegation, and the news media of Ohio."

POM-613. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance.

"SENATE RESOLUTION

"Whereas, Spiraling costs for physicians' services and hospitalization threaten to deprive many elderly citizens, handicapped persons, and persons on fixed incomes of affordable health care; and

"Whereas, While theories abound on the reasons for the rise in health care costs, no action yet taken has been successful in controlling these increased costs; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this senate of the state of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby respectfully memorializes the congress of the United States to investigate, through a proper committee, the high costs of physicians services and hospital services in this country for the elderly and handicapped with an eye toward the imposition of possible excess profit taxes similar to those imposed on the oil companies; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of this senate, to the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States and to the repective members of the state of Rhode Island congressional delegation."

POM-614. A resolution adopted by the City Council and the County of Honolulu, Hawaii relating to the reauthorization of mortgage revenue bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-615. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance.

"A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas, the American steel industry has engaged in extraordinary self-help efforts including the commitment of millions of dollars to modernization and the reduction of employment cost; and

"Whereas, foreign steel imports now account for approximately twenty percent (20%) of the steel consumed in the United States; and

"Whereas, the American steel and coal industries, and those particularly in Kentucky, are suffering from painfully high levels of unemployment which result in large measure from foreign steel imports; and

"Whereas, most steel entering the United States is unfairly traded because it is dumped, subsidized or the beneficiary of targeted foreign government development assistance; and

"Whereas, United States trade laws have been ineffective in stemming the tide of unfairly traded foreign steel; and

"Whereas, unfair trade in steel is the single most serious threat to the survival of a healthy industry in Kentucky and in the United States; and

"Whereas, the American steel industry produces industrial material which is essential to the United States economy and necessary to our national defense; and

"Whereas, the steel industry is an important part of the Kentucky economy, providing employment for thousands of the Commonwealth's residents; and

"Whereas, the American steel industry and Kentucky's coal mining industry are linked by an important and mutually beneficial customer-supplier relationship; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Senate concurring therein:

"SECTION 1. That the Commonwealth of Kentucky urges Congress to support the Fair Trade in Steel Act of 1983 which limits imports of foreign steel to not more than fifteen percent (15%) of American steel, consumption for a period of at least five (5) years; and

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Kentucky delegation to Congress, each member of the Congressional Steel Caucus, the presiding officers of each House of Congress, and the President of the United States."

POM-616. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Finance.

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 279

"Whereas, the Social Security Amendments of 1983, Public Law 98-21, completely altered Medicare reimbursement for in-patient hospital services by creating the prospective payment system (PPS); and

"Whereas, the Medicare PPS is being phased in over a three year period to prospectively reimburse hospitals on a fixed price based on the principal diagnosis of the patient and known as diagnostic related groups (DRGs); and

"Whereas, this system of predetermined rates totally reverses the incentives of the retrospective payment system used since the creation of the Medicare program and may be applied to other providers, such as physicians and skilled nursing care, in the near future; and

"Whereas, the new Medicare reimbursement system will provide incentives for hospitals to control health care costs; and

"Whereas, many of the effects of the new system are not yet known and may result in the closing of many hospitals across the United States; and

"Whereas, Nebraska's rural health care structure, consisting primarily of rural hospitals and nursing homes smaller than the national average and a higher proportion of primary care physicians, may be effected in a manner substantially different than in other states; and

"Whereas, an example is demonstrated by the PPS formula which is based in part on the Wage Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, adjusted for local wage rates; and

"Whereas, this index does not account for differences between full-time and part-time employees and many of Nebraska's rural and metropolitan hospitals employ a large percentage of part-time workers in their efforts to contain hospital costs; and

"Whereas, this index fails to recognize differences in rural hospital wages due to hospital size and specialization of services provided; and

"Whereas, this wage index fails to recognize that wages for rural hospitals located adjacent to metropolitan areas or with specialized employees must be competitive; and

"Whereas, the Medicare PPS wage formula currently affects Nebraska hospitals in an inequitable manner and a change in the formula to reflect these differences would increase the wage index component for rural hospitals in Nebraska as well as in Lincoln and Omaha; and

Whereas, the Health Care Financing Administration should recognize the intent of Congress in the development of the wage index and make monetary adjustments for inadequacies in this index; and

Whereas, when Congress reconvenes on January 23, 1984, the Senate will begin debate on S. 2062, which includes an amendment to correct the PPS formula and reflect such wage differences; and

Whereas, the House of Representatives will consider H.R. 4170, including an amendment to provide an appeal process for situations where the wage index is inequitable; and

Whereas, the Nebraska Congressional delegation has been instrumental in the effort to correct the inequity in the current wage index; and

Whereas, the magnitude of the Medicare PPS and its potential effect on the state indicate a need for the State of Nebraska to become more actively involved in federal health policies; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the Eighty-eighth Legislature of Nebraska, Second Session:

"1. That the State of Nebraska assume an advocacy role in monitoring federal health policies and developing responses to policies which adversely impact the state in an inequitable manner.

"2. That the Legislature carefully examine health care cost containment issues at the state level in light of the recent federal policy changes.

"3. That the Legislature recognize the efforts of the Reagan administration and the Congress of the United States to develop cost containment mechanisms through a prospective Medicare reimbursement system.

"4. That the Legislature urge the Members of Congress to actively support and vote favorably for amendments to S. 2062 and H.R. 4170 which will correct the current inadequacy of the wage index used in the PPS formula.

"5. That the Clerk of the Legislature send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and Members of Congress representing the State of Nebraska."

POM-617. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas, There is a substantial imbalance in international wine trade resulting from the easy accessibility enjoyed by foreign wines to the California market which is in direct contrast to the export position of the California wine industry in virtually every existing or potential foreign wine market; and

"Whereas, The United States government does not impose any nontariff trade obstacles to the entry, distribution, and sale of foreign wines; and

"Whereas, Foreign wines move freely in the American market subject only to the same laws and regulations which apply to American wines and to payment of the lowest duties assessed anywhere in the world by a significant wine-producing country on foreign wine; and

"Whereas, Even though California produces some of the finest wines in the world, this state's wine producers who seek to market their products abroad are faced with

a maze of restrictive and prohibitive tariff and nontariff barriers, thus placing California wine producers in an unfair position; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the California Legislature hereby respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would accomplish all the following:

"(1) Achieve access to foreign markets for United States wine substantially equivalent to the market access afforded to foreign wine by the United States.

"(2) Provide the President of the United States with the authority and remedies to deal with trade barriers relating to wine; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-618. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance.

"A RESOLUTION

"Whereas, the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation establishing the Medicaid Program; and

"Whereas, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has promulgated regulations governing eligibility standards for Medicaid recipients and state participation in the Medicaid Program; and

"Whereas, the Medicaid regulations provide that in the case of institutionalized individuals eligible for Medicaid coverage, such individual's income, excluding a "personal needs allowance," must be applied to cover the cost of that individual's care; and

"Whereas, the Medicaid regulations provide that the personal needs allowance must be at least $25.00 per month for the aged, blind, or disabled individual and at least $50.00 per month for an institutionalized couple if both spouses are aged, blind, or disabled and their income is considered available to each other in determining eligibility; and

"Whereas, the amounts of personal needs allowance required to be protected by the Medicaid regulations have not been increased since January, 1974, although social security payments and inflation have increased substantially during that time period; and

"Whereas, the increase in social security payments made on behalf of such institutionalized Medicaid recipients has been used solely to pay for the cost of such patients' care with no portion thereof being available to cover increases in the cost of the patients' personal needs; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and requests the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations to increase the amounts of personal needs allowance required to be protected for institutionalized Medicaid recipients who are aged, blind, and disabled to at least $35.00 per month for individuals and $70.00 per month for institutionalized couples and to provide for periodic automatic increases in such amounts based on the percentage increase in any social security assistance payments.

"Be it further resolved That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to transmit an appropriate copy of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, and to each and every member of the Georgia congressional delegation."

POM-619. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas, 'Project: Bring Americans Home' is a volunteer, nonprofit organization, based in Orange County, California, that is dedicated to the identification and prompt repatriation of fellow American citizens unlawfully imprisoned as a consequence of past military hostilities in Southeast Asia; and

"Whereas, Reliable information available to the United States Government indicates that substantial numbers of the 2,494 Americans officially listed as "missing in action" are in fact held in physical custody by one or more estranged governments of Southeast Asia; and

"Whereas, 'Project: Bring Americans Home' supports a reasoned and responsible effort to resolve this highly emotional issue of human enslavement by nonviolent, diplomatic initiatives even after 12 years of deliberate delay and misinformation by the offending nations; and

"Whereas, The continuing injustices imposed upon those captive American citizens and their families must be condemned as ongoing violations of international law and human decency, as well as a latent threat to the ultimate achievement of world peace; now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to take immediate appropriate action to secure the prompt release of all American personnel now held as military or diplomatic prisoners by certain nations of Southeast Asia, including the governments of Vietnam and Laos; and be it further

"Resolved, That the California Legislature herewith conveys the commendation and appreciation of the people of California to the organizers and participants of 'Project: Bring Americans Home' for their exemplary efforts to secure the freedom of unjustly detained American servicemen; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chairperson of 'Project: Bring Americans Home.'"

POM-620. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION

"Whereas, although the United States, along with Great Britain, and the Soviet Union signed and ratified a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 banning atmospheric, outer space and underwater testing, nuclear weapons testing in the Pacific Basin continues; and

"Whereas, France, one of the international community's largest producer and supplier of nuclear weaponry has conducted nuclear testing that virtually destroyed one Pacific atoll and currently is threatening to do the same to another while leaking radioactive materials into the seabed; and

"Whereas, as an intrinsic part of the Pacific Basin community, residents of Hawaii are deeply affected by the apparent insensitivity of the nuclear powers' unclear and inconsistent policies regarding nuclear weapon testing; and

"Whereas, the potential and actual hazardous and destructive effects of nuclear testing on the environment and all forms of life must be averted; and

"Whereas, the well-being of the people of the Pacific Basin demands that the leaders of our nation make every possible effort toward keeping the Pacific Basin free of all nuclear weapon testing; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twelfth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1984, that President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State, George P. Schultz, and the United States Congress work toward the banning of all forms of nuclear weapon testing in the Pacific Basin, and

"Be it further resolved That certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State, George P. Schultz, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the President of the U.S. Senate, members of Hawaii's Congressional delegation, the President of France, Francois Mitterrand, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Margaret Thatcher."

POM-621. A resolution adopted by the City of Dothan, Ala., relating to the Civil Rights Act of April 20, 1871; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-622. A resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers urging Congress to adopt the amendments to the Bankruptcy Act which were developed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Bond Lawyers Bankruptcy Project; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-623. A resolution adopted by the Ninth Circuit District Judges Association relating to the Criminal Justice Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-624. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"SENATE RESOLUTION 107

"Whereas, the economy of Iowa is heavily dependent upon the well-being of the agricultural producers of this state; and

"Whereas, the Iowa producers of cattle, hogs, sheep, grains, and soybeans are large in number but small in market power because each individual producer constitutes only a miniscule segment of the producers of the agricultural product; and

"Whereas, markets into which the agricultural producers of Iowa sell are highly concentrated and are susceptible to pricing collusion because of the small numbers of purchasers with significant market shares; and

"Whereas, the markets into which the agricultural producers of Iowa sell are in interstate commerce and thus subject to the jurisdiction of the United States of America; and

"Whereas, agricultural producers of Iowa typically sell their commodities to middleman handlers before they reach the buyer

with the highly concentrated market power; and

"Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States has interpreted Section 4 of the Clayton Act as preventing persons not dealing directly with price fixers from suing for damages resulting from the price fix, even though the middleman has no significant damage and all damage is aimed at and incurred by the indirect sellers, such as the agricultural producers of Iowa; and

"Whereas, there has been introduced into the Senate of the United States a bill to amend the Clayton Act to allow certain sellers of agricultural products to bring antitrust actions to redress injuries by an action in damages; now therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate, That the Congress of the United States be encouraged to enact into law the Agricultural Producers Antitrust Access Act now pending for consideration before the United States Senate in order to protect the interests of Iowa producers of cattle, hogs, sheep, grains, and soybeans from price fixing and other violations of the antitrust laws occurring in interstate commerce and now insulated from effective redress by federal court interpretations of *Illinois Brick* v. *Illinois,* 432 U.S. 720 (1977), and *Hanover Shoe Co.* v. *United Shoe Machinery Co.,* 392 U.S. 481, (1968), and

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate and all members of the Iowa Congressional Delegation."

POM-625. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 16

"Whereas, The Constitution of the United States requires members of the House of Representatives to have attained twenty-five years of age, have been a citizen of the United States for seven years, and inhabit the state from which they are chosen; and

"Whereas, The Constitution of the United States requires members of the Senate to have attained thirty years of age, have been a citizen of the United States for nine years, and inhabit the state from which they are chosen; and

"Whereas, The Constitution of the United States requires a member of the House of Representatives or a member of the Senate to be a citizen of the United States for a specified period of time so that such members may apprise themselves of the ideals and needs of their adopted country, and the Constitution should also require that such member inhabit, for a specified period of time, the state from which he is chosen so that such members may also apprise themselves of the ideals and needs of the state which they not only inhabit but represent at the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas, The requirement that a member of either the House of Representatives or the Senate merely inhabit the state from which he is chosen was appropriate for an agrarian nation which had little personal mobility but is not appropriate for a highly industrialized nation with a great deal of personal mobility; now, therefore,

"Be It Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

"That the General Assembly hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to submit such amendment to the state legislatures for ratification, in a form substantially as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, for at least the twelve months next preceding his election, have been a qualified elector within the territory of the state in which he shall be chosen.

"SEC. 2. No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, for at least the twelve months next preceding his election, have been a qualified elector within the territory of the state in which he shall be chosen.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each member of Congress from the State of Colorado."

POM-626. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1017

"Whereas, American servicemen throughout the history of the United States have been called upon to uphold the ideals and honor forming the principles upon which this country was founded; and

"Whereas, In the course of defending our country, many servicemen have been put at risk of loss or capture at the hands of the enemy; and

"Whereas, April 9 commemorates the fall of Bataan in the dark days of World War II, and the memories of that battle cause us to stop and consider not only the 12,000 soldiers captured there, but also the approximately 127,000 other soldiers who were prisoners of war during the remainder of World War II and the 4,900 soldiers who were prisoners of war during the Korean conflict; and

"Whereas, Most poignantly and recently, American soldiers have been prisoners of war while serving in Vietnam and, in a number of situations, soldiers remain missing in action long after American involvement in the conflict has ended; and

"Whereas, The families of those soldiers missing in action from the Vietnam War live with uncertainty about the fate of their loved ones to this day; and

"Whereas, It is fitting and proper to remember those both living and dead who were prisoners of war or missing in action in each and every American military action, up to and including the present; now, therefore,

"Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

"That April 9 shall be designated as POW-MIA Day to honor and remember those soldiers who have been prisoners of war or missing in action while defending the honor and ideals of the United States in military conflicts and that, in memory of those brave soldiers, we send our condolences to the families of those still considered missing in action.

"Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the United States Veterans Administration."

POM-627. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Township Committee of Lacey, N.J., relating to the five unknown members of the U.S. Navy, killed and interred in 1804 and for the interment of such remains at the U.S. Naval Academy of the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

POM-628. A resolution adopted by the Commissioners' Court of Matagorda County, Tex., relating to the U.S. Postal Service in the Bay City; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

POM-629. A resolution adopted by the National Federation of the Blind of Connecticut concerning commendation of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 26, 1984, the following reports of committees were submitted on April 27, 1984:

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 1739. A bill to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-418).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2604. A bill to require reappointment and reconfirmation of 20 high level officials during a President's second consecutive term; to the Committee on Government Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD (by request):

S. 2605. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey property to the Committee for a National Museum of the Building Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. BIDEN) (by request):

S. 2606. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1985 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (for Mr. HUDDLESTON):

S. 2607. A bill to provide for improvements in the school lunch and other child nutrition programs and the food stamp program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

S. 2608. A bill to establish the farm and crop acreage base and program yield system to provide more efficient, equitable, flexible, and predictable programs for farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself and Mr. GORTON):

S. 2609. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with regard to mobile source emissions control; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. FORD, Mr. GARN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HECHT, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. GORTON):

S.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to designate June 13, 1984, as "Harmon Killebrew Day;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2604. A bill to require reappointment and reconfirmation of 20 high-level officials during a President's second consecutive term; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD on this legislation appear earlier in today's RECORD.)

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. BIDEN) (by request):

S. 2606. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1985

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at the request of the administration, and on behalf of myself and the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., I am introducing a bill authorizing certain activities of, and appropriations for, the Department of Justice.

Last year, the Department sent two bills to Congress. The first primarily authorized appropriations for fiscal year 1984. The second would have enacted into the United States Code various authorities which traditionally have been part of the annual authorization bill, such as those relating to the purchase of vehicles and firearms, and some new provisions. The request for this change in approach stemmed from "serious concern" on the part of the administration that authorizing legislation for the Department had not been enacted since fiscal year 1980, except on a continuing basis. There was even a lapse in that continuing authorization during 1982, with considerable confusion and disruption.

Mr. President, since we also felt great concern and frustration about the authorization situation, Senator BIDEN and I carefully examined the proposal relating to permanent authority with an eye toward minimizing the disruptive effects of the annual authorization process on the Department, while preserving the important oversight responsibilities of the Committee on the Judiciary. When the committee reported the fiscal year 1984 authorization bill (S. 1192), it adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute aimed at achieving that goal, which I offered, along with Senator BIDEN. That amendment provided appropriations ceilings for fiscal year 1984, created permanent authority for routine, noncontroversial activities of the Department, and retained annual authority for sensitive Department activities and new functions requested by the Department. The bill, as amended, passed this body without objection last summer.

The bill requested by the Department this year essentially combines the two bills submitted last year, with a few new requests. As a result, the amendment sponsored by myself and Senator BIDEN last year will serve as a good basis for beginning work on the fiscal year 1985 bill. We will take under careful consideration any new authority requested in order to continue strengthening our Federal law enforcement effort.

Mr. President, I want to thank the various committee members for their past assistance in processing authorization bills. Senator BIDEN and his staff have been especially cooperative in this effort. I look forward to continuing our fruitful working relationship in connection with the fiscal year 1985 measure. Hopefully, with the responsible cooperation of all of our colleagues here and in the other body, we will be able to enact an authorization bill for the first time in 5 fiscal years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill which I am introducing, the letter of transmittal from the Department of Justice, and section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1985."

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, to carry out the activities of the Department of Justice (including any bureau, office, board, division, commission, or subdivision thereof) the following sums:

(1) For General Administration, including the Working Capital Fund: $73,584,000.

(2) For the United States Parole Commission: $8,778,000.

(3) For General Legal Activities including not to exceed $98,000 which may be transferred from the "Alien Property Funds, World War II," for the general administrative expenses of alien property activities, and for the investigation and prosecution of denaturalization and deportation cases involving alleged Nazi War Criminals: $203,720,000.

(4) For the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: $1,011,000.

(5) For the Antitrust Division: $45,620,000.

(6) For the United States Attorneys and Marshals: $425,626,000.

(7) For the Support of United States Prisoners in non-Federal institutions: $58,240,000: Provided that amounts available will be available for the reimbursement to Saint Elizabeths Hospital and to other appropriate health care providers for the care, diagnosis and treatment of United States prisoners and persons adjudicated in Federal courts as not guilty by reason of insanity at rates that in the aggregate do not exceed the full cost of the services.

(8) For Fees and Expenses of Witnesses: $40,988,000.

(9) For the Community Relations Service: $34,128,000.

(10) For the Presidential Commission on Organized Crime: $2,559,000.

(11) For the Federal Bureau of Investigation: $1,157,223,000, including constructing and equipping new facilities at the FBI Academy, Quantico, Virginia: Provided that notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302(b) the Director of the FBI may establish and collect fees to process fingerprint identification records for noncriminal employment and licensing purposes and credit not more than $13,500,000 of such fees to the FBI's appropriation to be used for salaries and other expenses incurred in providing these services.

(12) For the Drug Enforcement Administration: $334,654,000.

(13) For the Immigration and Naturalization Service: $574,539,000.

(14) For the Federal Prison System: $580,218,000.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, such sums as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law, and for other non-discretionary costs.

SEC. 4. Part II of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 37 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 38—GENERAL AUTHORIZATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

"Sec.

"576. General authorizations

"577. Evaluations

"§ 576. General authorizations—Department of Justice

"(a) The Attorney General or his designee is authorized to make payments from Department of Justice appropriations for:

"(1) the hire of passenger motor vehicles;

"(2) miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General for Administration;

"(3) benefits authorized under section 901(3)(5)(6A)(8)(9) and section 904 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081 (3)(5)(6A)(8)(9) and 22 U.S.C. 4084), and under the regulations issued by the Secretary of State;

"(4) the purchase of insurance for motor vehicles and aircraft operated in official government business in foreign countries;

"(5) services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109;

"(6) official reception and representation expenses in accordance with distributions, procedures, and regulations issued by the Attorney General;

"(7) per diem allowances in accordance with regulations prescribed under 5 U.S.C. 5707 by the Administrator of General Services or his designee, for an employee who serves in a law enforcement, investigative, protective, or other capacity, or members of his immediate family, or both when necessarily occupying temporary living accomodations at or away from the employee's designated post of duty, and transportation to and from such location, because of threat to life or property or because law enforcement, investigative, or protective interests may be compromised.

"(8) attendance at meetings in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General;

"(9) anti-terrorism training for dependents of Department of Justice personnel who will be stationed abroad on the same basis as Department of State personnel;

"(10) assistance to individuals under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-422) who meet the definition of 'Cuban and Haitian entrant' under section 501(e) of said Act but for the application of paragraph (2)(B) thereof; and

"(11) payment of interpreters and translators who are not citizens of the United States.

"(b) Travel advances issued to Special Agents of the Department of Justice engaged in undercover activities shall be deemed to be government funds within the meaning of 31 U.S.C. 3527.

"(c) The Offices, Divisions and subdivisions included in the Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities appropriation of the Department of Justice and the Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division appropriation are authorized to make payments from their appropriations for:

"(1) the hire of passenger motor vehicles;

"(2) miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General for Administration;

"(3) expenses for collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General;

"(4) advance of public moneys under 31 U.S.C. 3324;

"(5) necessary accommodations in the District of Columbia for conferences and training activities; and

"(6) expenses necessary under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-422).

"(d) The Fees and Expenses of Witnesses activity of the annual appropriation of the Department of Justice is authorized to make payment from its appropriation for:

"(1) expenses, mileage, compensation, and per diem of witnesses in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law;

"(2) contracting for expert witnesses according to the procedure similar to that authorized by section 904 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 544);

"(3) advance of public moneys under 31 U.S.C. 3324;

"(4) expenses incurred for the use of facilities required as command posts in the protection of witnesses, including official phone calls made from command posts; and

"(5) planning, construction, renovation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto for protected witness safesites.

"(6) no sums authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay any witness more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.

"(e) The Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice is authorized to make payments from its appropriation to pay for:

"(1) the hire of passenger motor vehicles; and

"(2) payments in advance for grants, contracts, and reimbursable agreements and other expenses necessary under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-422) for the processing, care, maintenance, security, transportation and reception and placement in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants.

"§ 577. Evaluations

"(a) The Attorney General shall perform periodic evaluations of the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the Department of Justice programs and any supporting activities funded by appropriations and annual specific program evaluations of selected subordinate organizations' programs, as determined by the priorities set by the Attorney General.

"(b) Subordinate Department of Justice organizations and their officials shall provide all the necessary assistance and cooperation in the conduct of evaluations, including full access to all information, documentation, and cognizant personnel, as required."

SEC. 5. Section 263a of title 22, United States Code, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"The Attorney General is authorized to make payments from the Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities appropriation of the Department of Justice for expenses necessary to host, on an alternating basis, the annual meeting of the General Assembly of INTERPOL, and to periodically sponsor INTERPOL conferences on emerging topics of international crime."

SEC. 6(a). Chapter 31 of title 28, United States Code is amended by inserting after section 530 the following new section:

"§ 530a. Department of Justice gift fund

"(a) The Attorney General is authorized to accept and utilize, on behalf of the United States, any gift, donation, or bequest of real or personal property for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department of Justice. No gift may be accepted:

"(1) that attaches conditions inconsistent with applicable laws or regulations, or

"(2) that is conditioned upon or will require the expenditure of appropriated funds unless such expenditure has been authorized by Act of Congress. Gifts from foreign governments may be accepted only pursuant to the Foreign Gifts Act, 5 U.S.C. 7342.

"(b) The Attorney General shall promulgate rules for accepting gifts pursuant to this provision, to ensure, among other things, that no gifts are accepted under circumstances that will create a conflict of interest for the Department of Justice.

"(c) Gifts of property no longer required for the Department of Justice for its needs in the discharge of its responsibilities shall be reported to the Administrator of General Services for disposition in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

"(d) Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or bequests shall be deposited in the Treasury in a separate fund and shall be disbursed upon order of the Attorney General.

"(e) For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property accepted under subsection (a) of this section shall be considered as a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States."

(b) Subsection 871(c) of title 21, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. Section 104 of the Act of March 14, 1980, (P.L. 96-209) (22 U.S.C. 1622d) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"The Commission is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for the hire of passenger motor vehicles (for field use only); advances of funds abroad; rental or lease, for such periods as may be necessary, of office space and living quarters for personnel assigned abroad; and maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties rented or leased abroad; and furnishing fuel, water, and utilities for such properties."

SEC. 8(a). Part II of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 35 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 36—GENERAL AUTHORIZATIONS—UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS SERVICE

"§ 555. General authorizations—United States Attorneys and Marshals Service

"Appropriations for the United States Attorneys and the United States Marshals Service are available for:

"(a) the purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches;

"(b) lease and acquisition of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year including acquisition of vehicles seized and forfeited to the U.S. Government for official use;

"(c) supervision of the United States prisoners in non-federal institutions;

"(d) bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime;

"(e) acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; and

"(f) payment of rewards and the purchase of evidence and payments for information.

(b) Section 1921 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1921. United States Marshal's fees

"(a)(1) The United States marshals or deputies shall routinely collect, and a court may tax as costs, fees for the following:

"(A) serving a writ of possession, partition, execution, attachment in rem, or libel in admiralty, warrant, attachment, summons, capias, or any other writ, order or process in any case or proceeding;

"(B) serving a subpoena or summons for a witness or appraiser;

"(C) forwarding any writ, order, or process to another judicial district for service;

"(D) the preparation of any notice of sale, proclamation in admiralty, or other public notice or bill of sale;

"(E) the keeping of attached property (including boats, vessels, or other property attached or libeled), actual expenses incurred, such as storage, moving, boat hire, or other special transportation, watchmen's or keepers' fees, insurance, and an hourly rate including overtime for each deputy marshal required for special services, such as guarding, inventorying, and moving;

"(F) copies of writs or other papers furnished at the request of any party;

"(G) necessary travel in serving or endeavoring to serve any process, writ, or order, except in the District of Columbia, with mileage to be computed from the place where service is returnable to the place of service or endeavor; and

"(H) overtime expenses incurred by deputy marshals in the course of serving or executing civil process.

"(2) The marshals shall collect, in advance, a deposit to cover the initial expenses for special services required under subparagraph (E), and periodically thereafter such amounts as may be necessary to pay such expenses until the litigation is concluded. This paragraph applies to all private litigants, including seamen proceeding pursuant to section 1916 of this title.

"(3) For purposes of subparagraph (G), if two or more services or endeavors, or if an endeavor and a service, are made in behalf of the same party in the same case on the same trip, mileage shall be computed to the place of service or endeavor which is most remote from the place where service is returnable, adding any additional mileage traveled in serving or endeavoring to serve in behalf of that party. If two or more writs of any kind, required to be served in behalf of the same party on the same person in the same case or proceeding, may be served at the same time, mileage on only one such writ shall be collected.

"(b) The Attorney General shall prescribe from time to time regulations for the fees to be collected and taxed under subsection (a).

"(c)(1) The United States Marshals Service shall collect a commission of 3 per centum of the first $1,000 collected and 1½ per centum on the excess of any sum over $1,000, for seizing or levying on property (including seizures in admiralty), disposing of such property by sale, setoff, or otherwise, and receiving and paying over money, except that the amount of the commission shall be within the range set by the Attorney General. If the property is not disposed of by marshal's sale, the commission shall be in such amount, within the range set by the Attorney General, as may be allowed by the court. In any case in which the vessel or other property is sold by a public auctioneer, or by some party other than the marshal or his deputy, the commission authorized under this subsection shall be reduced by the amount paid to such auctioneer or other party. This subsection applies to judically ordered sales and execution sales, without regard to whether the judicial order of sale constitutes a seizure or levy within the meaning of State law.

"(2) The Attorney General shall prescribe from time to time regulations which establish a minimum and maximum amount for the commissions collected under paragraph (1).

"(d) The United States marshals may require a deposit to cover any of the fees and expenses prescribed under this section.

"(e) Without regard to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302(b), the United States Marshals Service is authorized to credit amounts from fees and expenses collected (including amounts for overtime expenses) for the service of civil process, including complaints, summonses, subpoenas, and similar process performed by the Marshals to its current appropriation account (Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals) for the purpose, only, of carrying out those activities."

(c) Section 548 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 548. Salaries

"Subject to sections 5315-5317 of title 5, United States Code, the Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of the United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys, appointed under section 543 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the rate of basic compensation provided for Executive Level IV of the Executive Schedule set forth in 5 U.S.C. 5315."

SEC. 9. Chapter 301 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4011 the following new section:

"§ 4012. Support for United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions

"The Attorney General or his designee is authorized to make payments from the support for United States Prisoners in non-Federal institutions appropriations for:

"(a) the necessary clothing, medical aid, and payment of rewards; and

"(b) entering into contracts or cooperative agreements provided that, amounts made available for this purpose shall not exceed the cost of constructing space for the average Federal Prison population for a facility as projected by the Attorney General, to assist the government of any State, territory, or political subdivision thereof, for the necessary construction, physical renovation, and the acquisition of equipment, supplies, or materials required to improve conditions of confinement and services of any facility which confines Federal detainees, in accordance with regulations issued by the Attorney General and which are comparable to the regulations issued under 18 U.S.C. 4006: Provided further, that following agreement on or completion of any federally assisted jail construction, the availability of such space shall be assured and the per diem rate charged for housing Federal prisoners at that facility shall not exceed operating costs for the period of time specified in the cooperative agreement.

SEC. 10. Chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 537 the following new sections:

"Sec.
"538 General authorizations—Federal Bureau of Investigation
"539 Fees for furnishing identification services

"§ 538. General authorizations—Federal Bureau of Investigation

"(a) The Federal Bureau of Investigation is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for:

"(1) expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States;

"(2) protection of the person of the President of the United States and the person of the Attorney General;

"(3) acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with, and for the official use of, the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions, such exchange to be subject to cancellation if dissemination is made outside the receiving departments or related agencies;

"(4) such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General;

"(5) purchase for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year and the hire of passenger motor vehicles;

"(6) acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;

"(7) purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches;

"(8) payment of rewards;

"(9) expenses to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and to be accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General;

"(10) payment of travel and related expenses for immediate family members of employees, including expenses incurred for specialized training and orientation in connection with a transfer to Puerto Rico, other territories and possessions of the United States, and assignment in a legal attache post outside the territory of the United States; and

"(11) research related to investigative activities.

"(b) None of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee in the competitive service."

§ 539. Fees for furnishing identification services

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation may establish and collect fees for the processing of noncriminal employment and licensing fingerprint cards. Such fee is to represent the cost of furnishing the service. The funds collected shall be credited to the Salaries and Expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation appropriation without regard to 31 U.S.C. 3302(b), and may be used to pay for salaries and other expenses incurred in operating the FBI Identification Division, and such funds may be carried over from fiscal year to fiscal year for such purposes. There will be no fee assessed in connection with the processing of requests for criminal history records by criminal justice agencies for criminal justice purposes or for employment in criminal justice agencies. 'Criminal justice agency' is defined in 28 CFR 20.3."

"SEC. 11. Section 6 of the Act of July 28, 1950, (c. 503) (8 U.S.C. 1555) is amended to read as follows:

"§ 6. General authorizations—Immigration and Naturalization Service

"The Immigration and Naturalization Service is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for:

"(a) interpreters and translators who are not citizens of the United States and distribution of citizenship textbooks to aliens without cost to such aliens;

"(b) allowances, (at such rate as may be specified from time to time in the appripriation act), to aliens while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed;

"(c) expenses to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General;

"(d) expenses related to the purchase and/or lease of privately owned horses;

"(e) advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while enroute;

"(f) expenses and allowances incurred in tracking lost persons as required by public exigencies in aid of State or local law enforcement agencies;

"(g) payment of rewards and purchases of evidence and payments for information;

"(h) purchase for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles;

"(i) acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;

"(j) purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches;

"(k) planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities and construction, operation, maintenance, remodeling and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto, subject to the limitations of 8 U.S.C. 1252(c) and 18 U.S.C. 4003;

"(l) refunds of maintenance bills, immigration fines and other items properly returnable except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage money;

"(m) acquisition of land as sites for enforcement fences, and construction incident to such fences;

"(n) research related to immigration enforcement;

"(o) the emergency replacement of aircraft upon the certificate of the Attorney General;

"(p) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad, provided that such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States Government for the purpose of any law administered by the Office of Personnel Management; and

"(q) a uniform purchase allowance not to exceed $400 per annum, in accordance with procedures established by the Attorney General for members of the Border Patrol of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who are required by regulations or statute to wear a prescribed uniform in the performance of official duties.".

SEC. 12. Authority for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to accept voluntary services:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1342, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service is authorized to accept voluntary and uncompensated services to assist the Service in information services to the public. Persons providing voluntary services shall not be used to displace any federal employee and shall not be considered federal employees for any purpose except for the purposes of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to compensation for injury) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2671-2680 relating to tort claims).".

SEC. 13. Drug Enforcement Administration general authorizations:

"Chapter 13 title 21, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 904 the following section:

"§ 905. General authorization—Drug Enforcement Administration

"The Drug Enforcement Administration is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for:

"(a) the hire and acquisition of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year;

"(b) payment in advance for special tests and studies by contract;

"(c) payment in advance for expenses arising out of contractual and reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies while engaged in cooperative enforcement and regulatory activities in accordance with section 503a(2) of the Controlled Substances Act (P.L. 91-513 (1970));

"(d) expenses to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, and to be accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General;

"(e) payment of rewards;

"(f) publication of technical and informational material in professional and trade journals and purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment;

"(g) necessary accommodations in the District of Columbia for conferences and training activities;

"(h) acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;

"(i) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad, provided that such individuals shall be not regarded as employees of the United States Government for the purpose of any law administered by the Office of Personnel Management;

"(j) purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches;

"(k) payment for tort claims when such claims arise in foreign countries in connection with Drug Enforcement Administration operations abroad;

"(l) research related to enforcement and drug control; and

"(m) payment of travel and related expenses for immediate family members of employees, including expenses incurred for specialized training and orientation in connection with a transfer to Puerto Rico, other territories and possessions of the United States, and assignment in a post outside the territory of the United States".

SEC. 14. Chapter 13 of title 21, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 886 the following new section:

"§ 887. Awards resulting from forfeiture of assets

"(a) Without regard to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302(b) and 21 U.S.C. 881(e), the Drug Enforcement Administration is authorized to set aside 25 per centum of the net amount of money realized from the forfeiture of assets seized by it under any provision of the Controlled Substances Act (P.L. 91-513 (1970)), to be available in amounts as specified in appropriations Acts for obligation and expenditure only for the purpose of paying awards of compensation with respect to such forfeiture; and to pay, totally within its discretion, such awards to any entity not an agency or instrumentality of the United States, or to any person not an officer or employee of the United States or of any State or local government, that provides information or assistance which leads to a forfeiture. Such awards can be made in any amount up to 25 per centum of the amount realized from the forfeiture, or $150,000, whichever is lesser, in any case, except that no awards shall be made based on the value of the contraband. The authority of the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration to pay an award of $10,000 or more shall not be delegated.

"(b) The amounts credited under this section shall be made available for obligations until September 30, 1986.

"(c) The remaining 75 per centum of the net amount of money realized from such forfeitures shall be paid to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Provided, That the authority furnished by this section shall expire on September 30, 1986 or upon the creation of a Department of Justice asset forfeiture fund, whichever is sooner, at which time any amount of the unobligated balances remaining in this account, accumulated before September 30, 1986, shall be paid to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *And provided further*, That the Drug Enforcement Administration shall conduct detailed financial audits, semi-annually, of the expenditure of funds from this account and—

"(1) report the results of each audit, in writing, to the Department of Justice; and

"(2) report annually to Congress concerning these audits."

SEC. 15. Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4043 the following new section:

"§ 4044. General authorizations—Bureau of Prisons

"The Bureau of Prisons is authorized to make payments from its appropriations for:

"(a) the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including supervision and support of United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions, and for inmate legal services within the system;

"(b) purchase and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles;

"(c) compilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal penal and correctional institutions;

"(d) purchase of firearms and ammunition and medals and other awards;

"(e) payment of rewards;

"(f) purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock;

"(g) construction of buildings at prison camps and acquisition of land as authorized by 18 U.S.C. 4010;

"(h) entering into contracts with governmental or private organizations or entities for the safekeeping, care and subsistence of persons held under any legal authority; and

"(i) planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities, and constructing, remodeling and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, to remain available until expended and the labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed with sums authorized to be appropriated by this subsection.

SEC. 16. Chapter 307 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4128 the following new section:

"§ 4129. General authorizations—Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

"Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitation as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles."

SEC. 17. Section 4204(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(9) hire passenger motor vehicles."

SEC. 18. Part II of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 37 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 40—UNDERCOVER INVESTIGATIVE OPERATIONS

"Sec.
"599. Federal Bureau of Investigation undercover operations.".
"600. Drug Enforcement Administration undercover operations.".

"§ 599. Federal Bureau of Investigation undercover operations

"(a) With respect to any undercover investigative operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which is necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States or for the collection of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence—

"(1) sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be used for purchasing property, buildings, and other facilities, and for leasing space, within the United States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 1341, section 3732(a) of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11(a)), section 305 of the Act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 396; 41 U.S.C. 255), the third undesignated paragraph under the heading "Miscellaneous" of the Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 370; 40 U.S.C. 34), 31 U.S.C. 3324, section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22), and subsections (a) and (c) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 395; 41 U.S.C. 254 (a) and (c)),

"(2) sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be used to establish or to acquire proprietary corporations or business entities as part of an undercover investigative operation, and to operate such corporations or business entities on a commercial basis, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 9102,

"(3) sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the proceeds from such undercover operation, may be deposited in banks or other financial institutions, without regard to 18 U.S.C. 648 and 31 U.S.C. 3302, and

"(4) the proceeds from such undercover operation may be used to offset necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in such operation, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 3302, in operations designed to detect and prosecute crimes against the United States, upon the written certification of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (or, if designated by the Director, a member of the Undercover Operations Review Committee established by the Attorney General in the Attorney General's Guidelines of FBI Undercover Operations, as in effect on July 1, 1983) and the Attorney General (or, if designated by the Attorney General, a member of such Review Committee), that any action authorized by subparagraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this paragraph is necessary for the conduct of such undercover operation. If the undercover operation is designed to collect foreign intelligence or counterintelligence, the certification that any action authorized by subparagraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this paragraph is necessary for the conduct of such undercover operation shall be by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (or, if designated by the Director, the Assistant Director, Intelligence Division) and the Attorney General (or, if designated by the Attorney General, the Counsel for Intelligence Policy). Such certification shall continue in effect for the duration of such undercover operation, without regard to fiscal years.

"(b) As soon as the proceeds from an undercover investigative operation with respect to which an action is authorized and carried out under subparagraphs (3) and (4) of paragraph (a) are no longer necessary for the conduct of such operation, such proceeds or the balance of such proceeds remaining at the time shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(c) If a corporation or business entity established or acquired as part of an undercover operation under subparagraph (2) of paragraph (a) with a net value of over $150,000 is to be liquidated, sold, or otherwise disposed of, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as much in advance as the Director or his designee determines is practicable, shall report the circumstances to the Attorney General and the Comptroller General. The proceeds of the liquidation, sale, or other disposition, after obligations are met, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d)(1) The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall conduct a detailed financial audit of each undercover investigative operation which is closed in fiscal year 1985, and each fiscal year thereafter,

"(A) submit the results of such audit in writing to the Attorney General, and

"(B) not later than 180 days after such undercover operation is closed, submit a report to the Congress concerning such audit.

"(2) The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall also submit a report annually to the Congress specifying—

"(A) the number, by programs, of undercover investigative operations pending as of the end of the one-year period for which such report is submitted,

"(B) the number, by programs, of undercover investigative operations commenced in the one-year period preceding the period for which such report is submitted, and

"(C) the number, by programs, of undercover investigative operations closed in the one-year period preceding the period for which such report is submitted and, with respect to each such closed undercover operation, the results obtained. With respect to each such closed undercover operation which involves any of the sensitive circumstances specified in the Attorney General's Guidelines on FBI Undercover Operations, such report shall contain a detailed description of the operation and related matters, including information pertaining to—

"(i) the results,

"(ii) any civil claims, and

"(iii) identification of such sensitive circumstances involved, that arose at any time during the course of such undercover operation.

"(e) For purposes of paragraph (d)(1)—

"(1) the term "closed" refers to the point in time at which—

"(a) all criminal proceedings (other than appeals) are concluded, or

"(b) covert activities are concluded, whichever occurs later,

"(2) the term "employees" means employees, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 2105, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and

"(3) the terms "undercover investigative operation" and "undercover operation" mean any undercover investigative operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (other than a foreign counterintelligence undercover investigative operation)—

"(A) in which—

"(i) the gross receipts (excluding interest earned) exceed $150,000, or

"(ii) expenditures (other than expenditures for salaries of employees) exceed $150,000, and

"(B) which is exempt from 31 U.S.C. 3302 or 31 U.S.C. 9102, except that clauses (A) and (B) shall not apply with respect to the report required under subparagraph (2) of such paragraph."

"600. Drug Enforcement Administration Undercover Operations

"(a) With respect to any undercover investigative operation of the Drug Enforcement Administration, which is necessary to carry out its function—

"(1) sums authorized to be appropriated to the Drug Enforcement Administration may be used for purchasing property, buildings, or other facilities and leasing space within the United States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States without regard to 31 U.S.C. 1341, section 3732(a) of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11(a)), section 305 of the Act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 396; 41 U.S.C. 255), the third undesignated paragraph under the heading "Miscellaneous" of the Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 370; 40 U.S.C. 34), 31 U.S.C. 3324, section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22), and subsections (a) and (c) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 395; 41 U.S.C. 254 (a) and (c));

"(2) sums authorized to be appropriated for the Drug Enforcement Administration may be used to establish or acquire proprietary corporations or business entities as part of an undercover operation, and to operate such corporations or business entities on a commercial basis, without regard to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 9102;

"(3) sums authorized to be appropriated for the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the proceeds from such undercover operations, may be deposited in banks or other financial institutions without regard to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 648 and 31 U.S.C. 3302; and

"(4) the proceeds from such undercover operations may be used to offset necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in such operations without regard to 31 U.S.C. 3302; only upon the written certification of the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (or by a person designated to act for the Administrator in his absence) with prompt notification of the Attorney General or his designee thereafter, that any action authorized by this section is necessary for the conduct of such investigative operation. Such certification shall continue for the duration of the undercover operation without regard to the fiscal years.

"(b) As soon as the proceeds from an undercover investigative operation authorized under this section are no longer necessary for the conduct of such operation, such proceeds shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(c) If a corporation or business entity established or acquired as part of an undercover operation under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) with a net value of over $150,000 is to be liquidated, sold, or otherwise disposed of, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, as much in advance as the Administrator or his designee determines is practicable, shall report the circumstances to the Attorney General and the Comptroller General. The proceeds of the liquidation, sale, or other disposition, after obligations are met, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d)(1) Upon completion of an undercover investigative operation authorized by this section, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration shall conduct de-

tailed financial audits of these operations and—

"(A) report the results of each audit in writing to the Attorney General, and

"(B) report annually to the Congress concerning these audits.

"(2) for the purposes of paragraph (1), the terms 'undercover investigative operation' and 'undercover operation' mean any undercover operation of the Drug Enforcement Administration—

"(A) in which the gross receipts exceed $150,000, and

"(B) which is exempt from 31 U.S.C. 3302 o4 31 U.S.C. 9102."

SEC. 19. Section 535 of title 28, United States code, is amended—

"(a) in subsection (b) by striking out the phrase "violations of title 18 involving Government officers and employees" and adding in its place "any violation or suspected violation of federal criminal law," and by inserting after the word "agency," and before the word "unless" the following: "provided the violation or suspected violation was committed by a person while engaged in any activity which relates to the operations of the department or agency, or the violation or suspected violation resulting from such activity,";

"(b) in subsection (c)(2) by striking out "Postmaster General" and adding in lieu thereof "United States Postal Service"; and

"(c) by adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) Any person who reports any information, allegation, or complaint described in subsection (b) relating to any violation of federal criminal law to his or her department or agency, to an Inspector General, or to any other person authorized to receive the information, allegation, or complaint shall possess a complete defense to any civil liability under any law unless the report was made with knowledge that it was false or with willful disregard for its truth or falsity."

SEC. 20. Title 18, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(a) The first paragraph of subsection 2516 is amended by inserting the words "Deputy Attorney General, Associate Attorney General," after the words "Attorney General."

"(b) Subsection 2518(7) is amended by inserting, "the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General," after the words "Attorney General."

SEC. 21. Subsection (b) of section 6003 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding "the Associate Attorney General" after the words "the Deputy Attorney General,".

TECHNICAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 22. The table of chapters for part II of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item related to chapter 35 the following new item:

"36. General Authorizations—the United States Attorneys and Marshals Service 555"

and by inserting after the item relating to chapter 37 the following new item:

"38. General Authorizations 576.".

and by inserting after the item relating to chapter 39 the following new item:

"40. Undercover Investigative Operations 599.".

SEC. 23. The table of sections for chapter 301 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4011 the following new item:

"4012. Support for United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions.".

SEC. 24. The table of sections for chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4043 the following new item:

"4044. General authorizations—Bureau of Prisons."

SEC. 25. The table of sections for chapter 307 of title 18, United States Code, is amending by inserting after the item relating to section 4128 the following new item:

"4129. General authorizations—Federal Prison Industries, Inc."

SEC. 26. The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 21, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 886 the following new item:

"887. Awards resulting from forfeiture of assets."

and by inserting after the item relating to section 904 the following new item:

"905. General authorizations—Drug Enforcement Administration."

SEC. 27. The table of sections for chapter 31 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 530 the following new item:

"530a. Department of Justice gift fund."

SEC. 28. The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 537 the following new items:

"538. General authorizations—Federal Bureau of Investigation."

"539. Fees for furnishing identification services."

SEC. 29. The table of sections for chapter 36 of title 28, United States Code, shall read as follows:

"555. General authorizations—United States Attorneys and Marshals Service."

SEC. 30. The table of sections for Chapter 38 of title 28 Unites States Code, shall read as follows:

"576. General authorizations."

"577. Evaluations."

SEC. 31. The table of sections for chapter 40 of title 28, United States Code, shall read as follows:

"599. Federal Bureau of Investigation undercover operations."

"600. Drug Enforcement Administration undercover operations."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 26, 1984.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a legislative proposal to meet the requirements of the Fiscal Year 1985 appropriations authorization process for the Department of Justice. This proposal would incorporate much of the general authorization language previously contained in the Department's annual appropriations authorization bill within title 28 and other titles of the United States Code. It would take most of the funding related authorities out of the annual authorization cycle. Sections one through five of the proposal have been drafted to satisfy the statutory requirement of submitting to the Congress an annual funding level authorization request for the Department. This portion of the legislative proposal addresses only specific funding levels for 1985.

As in the 1984 request, we have taken the approach of drafting such a two part proposal because of our serious concern regarding the current authorization process. The Department's 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984 authorization bills were not passed and action on continuing our authorities is often in doubt.

It is critical that the Department be provided a reasonable expectation of continuity for its basic programs. The current authorization process does not provide this expectation. On the contrary, it has created an environment which makes planning and program implementation most difficult; hence, the need for legislation which would take many basic, noncontroversial authorities out of the annual authorization cycle.

The annual authorization bill requests resource levels identical with the President's 1985 appropriation request. The "permanent" authorization portion requests most of the same general provisions the Department routinely includes in its authorization requests, e.g. undercover provisions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), authority to use confidential funds, authority to pay rewards, etc.

However, this authorization bill does include some changes. The most pertinent changes are as follows:

Section 4 (Proposed section 576(a)(11)(p. 4)) would authorize the Attorney General to procure the services of interpreters and translators who, while not United States citizens, are legally allowed to work in the United States. This provision is identical to that granted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and would facilitate the Executive Office of Immigration Review's mission.

In Section 4 (Proposed section 576(d)(4) (p. 5)) language has been added in order to clarify the Department's authority to use the Fees and Expenses of Witness appropriation to fund specific expenses incident to the operation of the Witness Security Program. Specifically these changes pertain to the construction, renovation and operation of command posts and safe sites to insure the protection of individuals admitted to the Witness Security Program.

Section 5 (p. 6) would amend 18 U.S.C. 263a to allow the Department to periodically host the annual meeting of the General Assembly of INTERPOL, and to periodically sponsor INTERPOL conferences on emerging topics of international crime. This measure is extremely important to the INTERPOL United States National Central Bureau (USNCB). As United States involvement continues to expand, it is important that the United States assume a greater participatory role in the organization. This authority would allow the United States to host the annual meeting of the INTERPOL General Assembly for the first time since 1960, facilitating the efforts to establish a greater leadership role in the international organization.

Proposed Section 6 (pp. 6-7) would amend chapter 31, title 28, United States Code, to establish a Department of Justice Gift Fund. The Department currently has no general authority to accept gifts. Thus, when the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) wished to accept donated horses for the use of its Border Patrol, it was necessary for the Department to submit to Congress proposed legislation authorizing INS to accept gifts. A general gift accept-

ance authority for the Department could end the need for piecemeal legislative solutions.

Proposed Section 6(p) (p. 17) would provide INS the flexibility to hire individuals on a temporary basis at times when vacancies and the normal recruitment process leave the INS foreign offices without the assistance of necessary support personnel for extended periods of time.

Proposed Section 6(q) (p. 17) provides the INS with a uniform purchase allowance for members of the U.S. Border Patrol to mitigate the inequitable burdens placed upon over 2,400 of these uniformed personnel within the INS.

We are confident the overall approach contained in this legislative proposal will adequately address the needs of the Congress to carry out its legislative mandate and oversight function while, at the same time, providing for the Department's program continuity needs.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the presentation of these legislative proposals to the Congress and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. MCCONNELL,
Assistant Attorney General,
Office of Legislative Affairs.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

PROPOSED SECTION 4

This language amends title 28 of the United States Code by creating a new Chapter 38 which would provide general authorizations for the Department of Justice especially the General Administration area.

Part 11 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 37 the following new chapter.

Chapter 38 general authorizations—Department of Justice

§ 576. General authorizations—Department of Justice

Proposed Section 576(a)—The Attorney General or his designee is authorized to make payments from Department of Justice appropriations for.

Proposed Section 576(a)(1) the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

This provision allows the Department of Justice to lease automobiles and general purpose vehicles from the General Services Administration for the purpose of providing necessary transportation for the Attorney General and other high-level staff in the Washington, D.C. area.

Proposed Section 576(a)(2) miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

This provision allows the Attorney General to respond to unforeseen circumstances where a need for action is clear but is not considered a normal cost of administration. Examples of these expenses include the Department's response to the Miami Civil disturbances, the Atlanta mass homicide situation, and the influx of the Cuban boatlift entrants. Another situation which required the use of this emergency authority was the Department's initial involvement at Wounded Knee, South Dakota.

Proposed Section 576(a)(3) benefits authorized under section 901 (3)(5)(6)(A)(8)(9) and section 904 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081 (3)(5)(6)(A)(8)(9) and 22 U.S.C. 4084), and under the regulations issued by the Secretary of State.

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 was the basic statutory source for providing medical treatment and health care facilities for Department of Justice employees serving overseas. The Foreign Service Act of 1946 was replaced by the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-465) on October 17, 1980. The new language conforms the FY 1985 Authorization bill with certain benefits included in the Foreign Service Act of 1980. These provisions would allow the payment of certain travel benefits for employees stationed overseas and their dependents.

Proposed Section 576(a)(4) the purchase of insurance for motor vehicles and aircraft operated in official government business in foreign countries.

A number of overseas employees in the Department of Justice, in particular the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Drug Enforcement Administration, are required to operate motor vehicles or aircraft in the scope of their employment. In addition, a number of officers stationed in the United States at points along the borders use automobiles to enter Canada and Mexico in the performance of their official duties. This provision authorizes the Department to pay the premiums or fees for contracts of indemnification or insurance of officers, employees and agents for their liability or that of the United States.

If an employee of the Department, while operating a motor vehicle or aircraft on official business in a foreign country becomes involved in a collision which causes personal injury or property damage, then this section provides a basis for payment of damages to a third party. Failure by the United States to assume responsibility for these third party claims could possibly result in international incidents, especially in those countries with compulsory insurance laws. This provision protects employees and permits them to comply with the laws of countries where they operate vehicles and aircraft on official business and, at the same time, avoids embarrassment or unfavorable publicity for the United States.

Proposed Section 576(a)(5): services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

This provision allows the Department flexibility in its hiring practices, and maximizes managerial efficiency. Section 3109 of title 5 requires that the use of temporary or intermittent services be authorized by an appropriation or other statute.

Proposed Section 576(a)(6): official reception and representation expenses in accordance with distributions, procedures, and regulations issued by the Attorney General.

This language authorizes the use of funds to cover the expenses of Department of Justice senior employees whose official positions entail the responsibility for establishing and maintaining relationships of value to the Department.

Proposed Section 576(a)(7): per diem allowances in accordance with regulations prescribed under 5 U.S.C. 5707 by the Administrator of General Services or his designee, for an employee who serves in a law enforcement, investigative, protective, or other capacity, or members of his immediate family, or both when necessarily occupying temporary living accommodations at or away from the employee's designated post of duty, and transportation to and from such location, because of threat to life or property or because law enforcement, investigative, or protective interests may be compromised.

Authority is proposed to provide per diem allowances and transportation expenses for law enforcement employees and transportation expenses for their families in emergency situations, principally because of threat to life or property. Primarily, the adjustment amends the current travel regulations to permit temporary living accommodations.

Proposed Section 576(a)(8): attendance at meetings in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General.

This provision ensures that funds for attendance at meetings are expended in the legally required manner, thus eliminating waste and deliberate abuse.

Proposed Section 576(a)(9): anti-terrorism training for dependents of Department of Justice personnel who will be stationed abroad on the same basis as Department of State personnel.

This would provide virtually identical training opportunities to dependents of the Department of Justice personnel assigned to foreign posts that are available to dependents of the U.S. Foreign Service authorized by Chapter 7 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980. The training provides classes primarily in safety precautions.

Proposed Section 576(a)(10): assistance to individuals under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-422) who meet the definition of "Cuban and Haitian entrant" under section 501(e) of said Act but for the application of paragraph (2)(B) thereof; and

Title V of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-422) was added primarily to provide federal reimbursement for State and local government expenditures for Cuban and Haitian entrants. However, because of the way section 501(e) of the Act defines Cuban and Haitian entrants, funds provided for this program cannot be applied to Cuban and Haitian entrants who are under "final, nonappealable, and legally enforceable orders of deportation or exclusion." Since Cuba will not accept these individuals, this language will authorize the Department of Justice to carry out the processing, care and maintenance activities associated with Title V for all Cuban and Haitian entrants notwithstanding the restricting clause. This language was included in the FY 1984 Appropriations Act, P.L. 98-166.

Proposed Section 576(a)(11): payment of interpreters and translators who are not citizens of the United States.

This legislation would permit the Attorney General to pay interpreters and translators who are not U.S. citizens. It is designed primarily to assist the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) in carrying out its functions. Translators and interpreters are necessary to facilitate communications between EOIR personnel and persons who do not speak or write English. EOIR has occasionally had difficulty in obtaining the services of native-born or naturalized United States Citizens. This provision would provide EOIR the capability to procure the services of interpreters and translators who, while not United States citizens, are legally allowed to work in the United States.

Proposed Section 576(b): Travel advances issued to Special Agents of the Department of Justice engaged in undercover activities shall be deemed to be government funds within the meaning of 31 U.S.C. 3527.

This provision would relieve the agents of liability for loss of travel advances when there is no fault or negligence of the agents

in consonance with the standards set forth in 31 U.S.C. 3527.

The inherently dangerous nature of law enforcement should entitle DOJ agents (and their estates) to be afforded some protection from the potential liability for nonnegligent loss of travel advance funds.

Proposed Section 576(c): This section addresses authorization for those organizations within the General Legal Activities area and the Antitrust Division. The General Legal Activities area includes the Office of the Solicitor General, the Tax Division, the Criminal Division, the Civil Division, the Land and Natural Resources Division, the Office of Legal Counsel, the Civil Rights Division and U.S. National Central Bureau—INTERPOL.

Proposed Section 576(c): The Offices, Divisions, and subdivisions included in the Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities appropriation of the Department of Justice, and the Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division appropriation are authorized to make payments from their appropriations for.

Proposed Section 576(c)(1): the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

The Department of Justice leases automobiles and general purpose vehicles for the purpose of providing necessary transportation for high level staff in the Washington, D.C. area.

Proposed Section 576(c)(2): miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

The language authorizes the use of funds in unforeseen circumstances, such as expenses related to appointment of an independent counsel under the Ethics in Government Act.

Proposed Section 576(c)(3): expenses for collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

Funds authorized by this provision are used primarily by the Criminal Division to collect information.

Proposed Section 576(c)(4): advance of public moneys under 31 U.S.C. 3324.

Occasional advances have been made to State and local governments when they cannot legally begin performance on a contract until it receives partial payment in advance. Section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, prohibits the advance of public moneys unless authorized by the appropriation or other law.

Proposed Section 576(c)(5): necessary accommodations in the District of Columbia for conferences and training activities; and

This language provides the authority to pay for accommodations and training facilities for Department attorneys. Proposed Section 576(c)(6) expenses necessary under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-422).

Executive Order 12341 dated January 29, 1982 transferred this program to the Department of Justice. The Criminal Division executes the duties and administration of the Attorney General's Review Panel which screens Cuban entrants, currently housed in the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary, for possible parole.

Proposed Section 576(d): This section addresses certain authorizations for the Fees and Expenses of Witnesses area.

Proposed Section 576(d): The Fees and Expenses of Witnesses activity of the annual appropriation act of the Department of Justice is authorized to make payment from its appropriation for.

Proposed Section 576(d)(1): expenses, mileage, compensation, and per diem of witnesses in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law.

The protection of witnesses activity provides financial security for government witnesses and potential government witnesses and their families in legal proceedings against persons alleged to be involved in organized criminal activity. Subsistence and relocation costs are paid from this appropriation.

Proposed Section 576(d)(2): contracting for expert witnesses according to the procedure similar to that authorized by section 904 of the Federal Property and Adminstrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 544).

This proposal will permit the Justice Department to award contracts for expert witnesses on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications at fair and reasonable prices but not based entirely on price competition. Current statute provides that expert witness services may be procured without regard to the bid advertising statutes. However, current law does not permit the selection of an expert witness purely on the basis of experience and qualifications. Under existing regulations expert witnesses generally must be procured through the traditional competitive negotiations. This requires that an incremental value analysis be done in order to justify the payment of a premium (the difference in price between the low acceptable and superior witness) before awarding a contract to the superior witness. Selection of expert witnesses must be made primarily on a basis of technical merit; that is, qualification, experience, and professional reputation. The court opponent of the Department is not required to select witnesses based on price and other factors. The Department can thus be put at a decided disadvantage if not permitted to procure witnesses on the same basis as its opponent. A selection process not based entirely on the lowest cost is a small price to pay when considering the economic consequences of losing important cases. Accordingly this language will provide authority to negotiate contracts for expert witness services on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications at fair and reasonable prices but not at prices based entirely on price competition.

Proposed Section 576(d)(3): advance of public moneys under 31 U.S.C. 3324.

Advances of fees and expenses are often necessary to ensure appearance of those witnesses who could not otherwise afford to appear. Section 3324 of title 31 United States Code prohibits the advance of public moneys unless authorized by an appropriation or other law.

Proposed Section 576(d)(4): expenses incurred for the use of facilities required as command posts in the protection of witnesses, including official phone calls made from command posts; and

Proposed Section 576(d)(4): is intended to limit expenses for command posts to rental or lease payments for facilities (including payments made under reimbursable agreements with other government agencies) and official phone calls only.

Proposed Section 576(d)(5): planning, construction, renovation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto for protected witness safesites.

These proposed language changes would clarify the Department's authority to use this appropriation to fund specific expenses incident to the operation of the Witness Security Program. Specifically, these changes pertain to the operation of command posts and the renovation and construction expenses associated with the establishment of "safesite" facilities for the protection of individuals admitted to the Witness Security Program and the processing and protection of individuals admitted to the Witness Security Program and the processing and protection of individuals considered to be protected entrants into the Witness Security Program. The language change clarifies (1) the extent of the authority given to the Attorney General by Title V, Section 502, of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, (P.L. 91-452), as it relates to "renovation" and "construction" in light of 41 U.S.C. 12 and 31 U.S.C. 1301, 1307 and (2) the source of funding to exercise the authority contained in Section 502. Authorizing the use of this appropriation to fund all command post costs will enhance witness security and facilitate improved administrative accountability for these expenses. Currently, command post costs are split between this appropriation and the U.S. Attorneys and Marshals appropriation.

Proposed Section 576(d)(6): No sums authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay any witness more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.

The limitation of one attendance fee reduces the possibility of excess payments to witnesses who testify more than once on any given calendar day.

Proposed Section 576(e): The Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice is authorized to make payments from its appropriation to pay for.

Proposed Section 576(e)(1): the hire of passenger motor vehicles; and

Automobiles are leased from the General Services Administration for the purpose of providing necessary transportation for key personnel in carrying out their proper assignments.

Proposed Section 576(e)(2): payments in advance for grants, contracts, and reimbursable agreements and other expenses necessary under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-422) for the processing, care, maintenance, security, transportation and reception and placement in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants.

On January 21, 1982, the President, by Executive Order 12341, transferred from the Department of Health and Human Services (HH) to the Department of Justice the responsibility and funding for the Cuban/Haitian entrant processing and care activities mandated by Section 501(c), Title V of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980. This transfer of responsibility has been ratified by the Congress in past appropriation actions. The Department of Justice, with the concurrence of the Office of Management and Budget, has decided to consolidate the major activities related to the 501(c) program within the Community Relations Service (CRS). It was decided that since the President had vested the responsibility and the funding for this program in the Department of Justice, the personnel carrying out the program's principal activities would also be vested in the Department of Justice.

The consolidation of these activities required the transfer of personnel associated with the 501(c) Cuban/Haitian entrant related activities formerly situated in the Office of Refugee Resettlement, HHS to CRS. Since a considerable portion of the ac-

tivities within this program is conducted through funding of grants or entering into contracts with qualified voluntary agencies or other qualified individuals to resettle or place Cuban/Haitian entrants, appropriate statutory language is required for CRS.

§ 577. Evaluations

This section includes a generic authority to conduct evaluations of Department programs.

Proposed Section 577(a): The Attorney General shall perform periodic evaluations of the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the Department of Justice programs and any supporting activities funded by appropriations authorized and annual specific program evaluations of selected subordinate organizations' programs, as determined by priorities set by the Attorney General.

Proposed Section 576(b): Subordinate Department of Justice organizations and their officials shall provide all the necessary assistance and cooperation in the conduct of evaluations, including full access to all information, documentation, and cognizant personnel, as required.

A similar provision was included in most of the past Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Acts. It was again proposed by the Department for fiscal year 1984 and is being reinitiated by the Department in an effort to continue to improve its management capabilities and to work with Congress to increase the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the Department's programs.

PROPOSED SECTION 5

Section 263a of title 22, United States Code, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

The Attorney General is authorized to make payments from the Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities appropriation of the Department of Justice for expenses necessary to host, on an alternating basis, the annual meeting of General Assembly of INTERPOL, and to periodically sponsor INTERPOL conferences on emerging topics of international crime.

The additional legislative authority being proposed is extremely important to INTERPOL-USNCB, and to the United States in general. Currently, the United States, through the INTERPOL-USNCB, is exerting a greater leadership role in the international organization. In this regard, the INTERPOL-USNCB, with substantial member country support, has successfully initiated an ongoing fiscal audit and review of the INTERPOL General Secretariat and plans are currently being made to implement a similar management review of the General Secretariat.

Additionally, during the recent meeting of the General Assembly, the United States achieved the support of the majority of the INTERPOL member countries in passing specific resolutions relating to international crime. The increasing leadership role of the United States in the international organization also is reflected by this country's continuing efforts to seek and win the Presidency of INTERPOL in 1984. As United States involvement continues to expand, it is important that a hightly credible United States image is maintained and that INTERPOL member countries perceive that the United States is assuming a greater participatory role in the organization. One way to accomplish this objective is for the INTERPOL-USNCB to host the annual meeting of the INTERPOL General Assembly and to sponsor an annual meeting of the INTERPOL General Assembly since 1960. The proposed legislative language, if approved, would enable the INTERPOL-USNCB to pursue its plans to host the annual meeting of the General Assembly in 1985. These plans have the full support of the Department's policy level officials.

PROPOSED SECTION 6

This section would establish general statutory authority for the Department of Justice to accept gifts.

SEC. 6(a). Chapter 31 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to include the following section:

§ 530a. Department of Justice gift fund

SEC. 530a. (a) The Attorney General is authorized to accept and utilize, on hehalf of the United States, any gift, donation, or bequest of real or personal property for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department of Justice. No gift may be accepted:

(1) that attaches conditions inconsistent with applicable laws or regulations, or

(2) that is conditioned upon or will require the expenditure of appropriated funds unless such expenditure has been authorized by Act of Congress. Gifts from foreign governments may be accepted only pursuant to the Foreign Gifts Act, 5 U.S.C. 7342.

(b) The Attorney General shall promulgate rules for accepting gifts pursuant to this provision, to ensure, among other things, that no gifts are accepted under circumstances that will create a conflict of interest for the Department of Justice.

(c) Gifts of property no longer required for the Department of Justice for its needs in the discharge of its responsibilities shall be reported to the Administrator of General Services for disposition in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, of 1949, as amended.

(d) Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or bequests shall be deposited in the Treasury in a separate fund and shall be disbursed upon order of the Attorney General.

(e) For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property accepted under subsection (a) of this section shall be considered as a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.".

The proposed legislation would authorize the Attorney General to accept gifts, donations, or bequests of real or personal property to aid the Department in carrying out its functions. Gifts that attach conditions inconsistent with applicable laws or that are conditioned upon or require the expenditure of appropriated funds (unless the expenditure had been authorized by Congress) may not be accepted. The Attorney General is required to establish rules to insure that no gifts are accepted that will create a conflict of interest for the Department.

The Department of Justice currently has no general statutory authority to accept gifts, although similar authority exists for the Treasury Department (31 U.S.C. 3113), and the Administrative Conference of the United States (5 U.S.C. 575). Without specific authorizing legislation, no federal official may properly accept gifts or contributions for particular agencies to augment Congressional appropriations.

The Department has received a variety of gift offers, including an offer of eight Morgan Horses to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and an offer to the FBI of a piece of real property that was to be used in a foreign counterintelligence operation.

Proposed Section 6(b) Subsection 871(c) of title 21, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

21 U.S.C. 871—(c) The Attorney General may accept in the name of the Department of Justice any form of devise, bequest, gift, or donation where the donor intends to donate property for the purpose of preventing or controlling the abuse of controlled substances. He may take all appropriate steps to secure possession of such property and may sell, assign, or transfer, or convey any such property other than moneys.

The Department is proposing that this subsection be deleted so that all organizational units within the Department will be subject to a standard gift provision. The provisions of this subsection will be fully subsumed by proposed section 530a of title 28.

PROPOSED SECTION 7

This language amends Section 104 of the Act of March 14, 1980, 94 Stat. 97, and provides certain authorizations for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Proposed Section 7 Section 104 of the Act of March 14, 1980, [P.L. 96-209, 22 U.S.C. 1622d] is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

The Commission is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for the hire of passenger motor vehicles (for field use only);

Motor vehicles are used from time to time for the field work of the Commission.

Advances of funds abroad.

There have been instances in previous programs where the Commission was required to advance funds to foreign governments as part of leasing arrangements or contracts abroad. Federal law prohibits the advance of funds unless authorized by the appropriation or other law.

Rental or lease, for such periods as may be necessary of office space and living quarters of personnel assigned abroad; and

This provision authorizes the Commission to use funds to maintain necessary facilities in foreign countries. During previous programs the Commission has maintained field offices abroad. The Secretary of State has similar authority under 22 U.S.C. 2670(h).

Maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties rented or leased abroad, and furnishing fuel, water, and utilities for such properties.

This provision authorizes the Commission to use funds to maintain necessary facilities in foreign countries. During previous programs the Commission has maintained field offices abroad. The Secretary of State has similar authority under 22 U.S.C. 2670(i).

PROPOSED SECTION 8

Subsection 8(a) Part II of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 35 the following new chapter:

Chapter 36—General authorizations—United States attorneys and Marshals Service

§ 555. General authorizations—United States Attorneys and Marshals Service

This section amends part II of title 28, United States Code, to provide certain authorizations for United States Attorneys and the United States Marshals Service.

Proposed Section 555 Appropriations for the United States Attorneys and Marshals are available for.

Proposed Section 555(a) the purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches.

The marshals and their deputies perform hazardous law enforcement duties which require expertise in handling weapons. These duties range from providing personal protection to judges and witnesses to arresting and transporting felons. Attendance at firearms matches increases the expertise in the use of firearms and is a significant factor in boosting agent morale. This authority is identical to the authority requested and previously enacted for other organizations in the Department.

Proposed Section 555(b) lease and acquisition of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year including the acquisition of vehicles seized and forfeited to the United States Government for official use.

Personnel require passenger motor vehicles to perform their routine duties such as service of government process, movement of prisoners, and the transportation of protected witnesses. In addition, this language would allow the retention of seized vehicles for official use on a limited basis, primarily for undercover work in the warrants program where an unknown vehicle is required for surveillance. This authorization would mitigate the need for short term leases for such surveillance work.

Proposed Section 555(c) supervision of United States prisoners in non-federal institutions.

This clause provides for the safekeeping of United States prisoners in non-federal institutions. Minimum standards for health and general welfare for the United States prisoners are required when contracting with non-federal institutions for housing such prisoners.

Proposed Section 555(d) bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime.

Extradition involves the return of fugitives ordered surrendered by a foreign government pursuant to a request by the United States.

Proposed Section 555(e) acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; and

Aircraft is used to transport United States prisoners in the custody of the U.S. Marshals Service. This authority will be utilized only if it will result in a cost savings. The U.S. Marshals Service does not intend to acquire a large number of aircraft.

Proposed Section 555(f) payments of rewards and the purchase of evidence and payments for information.

This language provides for payments to informants or other persons aiding the Government in the arrest of suspects, federal law violators and their prosecution.

Proposed Section 8(b) Section 1921 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows.

§ 1921. United States Marshal's fees

This subsection would amend section 1921 of title 28, United States Code, as follows:

"(a)(1) The United States marshals or deputies shall routinely collect, and a court may tax as costs, the fees for the following:

"(A) serving a writ of possession, partition, execution, attachment in rem, or libel in admiralty, warrant, attachments, summons, capias, or any other writ, order or process in any case or proceeding;

"(B) serving a subpoena or summons for a witness or appraiser;

"(C) forwarding any writ, order, or process to another judicial district for service;

"(D) the preparation of any notice of sale, proclamation in admiralty, or other public notice or bill of sale;

"(E) the keeping of attached property (including boats, vessels, or other property attached or libeled), actual expenses incurred, such as storage, moving, boat hire, or other special transportation, watchmen's or keepers' fees, insurance, and an hourly rate including overtime for each deputy marshal required for special services, such as guarding, inventorying, and moving;

"(F) copies of writs or other papers furnished at the request of any party;

"(G) necessary travel in serving or endeavoring to serve any process, writ, or order, except in the District of Columbia, with mileage to be computed from the place where service is returnable to the place of service or endeavor; and

"(H) overtime expenses incurred by deputy marshals in the course of serving or executing civil process.

"(2) The marshals shall collect, in advance, a deposit to cover the initial expenses for special services required under subparagraph (E), and periodically thereafter such amounts as may be necessary to pay such expenses until the litigation is concluded. This paragraph applies to all private litigants, including seamen proceeding pursuant to section 1916 of this title.

"(3) For purposes of subparagraph (G), if two or more services or endeavors, or if an endeavor and a service, are made in behalf of the same party in the same case on the same trip, mileage shall be computed to the place of service or endeavor which is most remote from the place where service is returnable, adding any additional mileage traveled in serving or endeavoring to serve in behalf of that party. If two or more writs of any kind, required to be served in behalf of the same party on the same person in the same case or proceeding, may be served at the same time, mileage on only one such writ shall be collected.

"(b) The Attorney General shall prescribe from time to time regulations for the fees to be collected and taxed under subsection (a).

"(c)(1) The United States Marshals Service shall collect a commission of 3 per centum of the first $1,000 collected and 1½ per centum on the excess of any sum over $1,000 for seizing or levying on property (including seizures in admiralty), disposing of such property by sale, setoff, or otherwise, and receiving and paying over money, except that the amount of the commission shall be within the range set by the Attorney General. If the property is not disposed of by marshal's sale, the commission shall be in such amount, within the range set by the Attorney General, as may be allowed by the court. In any case in which the vessel or other property is sold by a public auctioneer, or by some party other than the marshal or his deputy, the commission authorized under this subsection shall be reduced by the amount paid to such auctioneer or other party. This subsection applies to judicially ordered sales and execution sales, without regard to whether the judicial order of sale constitutes a seizure or levy within the meaning of State law.

"(2) The Attorney General shall prescribe from time to time regulations which establish a minimum and maximum amount for the commissions collected under paragraph (1).

"(d) The United States marshals may require a deposit to cover any of the fees and expenses prescribed under this section.

"(e) Without regard to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302(b), the United States Marshals Service is authorized to credit amounts from fees and expenses collected (including amounts for overtime expenses) for the service of civil process, including complaints, summonses, subpoenas, and similar process performed by the Marshals to its current appropriation account (Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals) for the purpose only of carrying out those activities."

The language would permit the Attorney General to set fees for the service of process commensurate with the costs incurred to serve such process. The receipts from such fees are to be credited to the U.S. Marshals Service's appropriation.

Proposed Section 8(c), pertaining to United States Attorney and related salaries, would amend section 548 of title 28 to read as follows:

Proposed Section 8(c) Section 548 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 548. Salaries

"Subject to sections 5315-5317 of title 5, United States Code, the Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorney, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 543 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the rate of basic compensation provided for Executive Level IV of the Executive Schedule set forth in section 5315 of title 5, United States Code."

Subsection (c) would amend 28 U.S.C. 548 to adjust the salaries for United States Attorneys, Assistant United States Attorneys (AUSAs) and attorneys appointed under 28 U.S.C. 543, to rates which are comparable to salary levels for members of the Senior Executive Service (SES). At the present time, approximately 68 supervisory AUSA positions in 30 United States Attorney's offices are "equivalent positions" within the definition of the SES. However, these positions have been indefinitely administratively exempted from the SES. Subsection (c) would provide pay comparability for the United States Attorneys with non-career SES members. Section 548 of Title 28 U.S.C. presently limits United States Attorneys and AUSAs' salaries to the maximum rate allowable for a GS-18 of the General Schedule, as set forth in 5 U.S.C. 5332. Since the salary ceiling for SES members was recently lifted, United States attorneys and senior AUSAs have been more adversely effected monetarily.

The current maximum salary for a GS-18 of the General Schedule is $66,000. The current salary for an employee at Executive Level IV is $69,600 per year. Consequently, this change would provide a maximum increase of $3,600 per year for these employees. The annual salary for an employee at Executive Level IV is the same for a member of the SES at ES-6 ($69,600).

PROPOSED SECTION 9

This section would amend chapter 301 of title 18, United States Code, by inserting a new section after section 4011 providing certain authorizations for the Support of United States Prisoners appropriation.

Chapter 301 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4011 the following new section:

§ 4012. Support for United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions

The Attorney General or his designee is authorized to make payments from the support for United States Prisoners in Non-Federal Institutions appropriation for:

Proposed Section 4012(a) the necessary clothing, medical aid.

The contracts with non-Federal institutions provide funds to these institutions to confine, clothe and provide medical care for certain unsentenced Federal inmates, for certain sentenced Federal prisoners awaiting transportation to permanent incarceration facilities, and for certain Federal prisoners called to non-Federal facilities for judicial purposes.

Proposed Section 4012(a) (continued) and payment of rewards; and

This authority is required to allow the U.S. Marshals Service to pay rewards for the capture of escaped Federal prisoners who were in the custody of the U.S. Marshals Service at the time of escape.

Proposed Section 4012(b) entering into contracts or cooperative agreements provided that, amounts made available for this purpose shall not exceed the cost of constructing space for the average Federal prison population for a facility as projected by the Attorney General, to assist the government of any State, territory or political subdivision thereof, for the necessary construction, physical renovation, and the acquisition of equipment, supplies, or materials required to improve conditions of confinement and services of any facility which confines Federal detainees, in accordance with regulations issued by the Attorney General, and which are comparable to regulations issued under 18 U.S.C. 4006: Provided further, that following agreement on or completion of any federally assisted jail construction, the availability of such space shall be assured and the per diem rate charged for housing prisoners at that facility shall not exceed operating costs for the period of time specified in the cooperative agreement.

This language would provide the Department with statutory authority to use the "Support of United States Prisoners" appropriation for the purpose of improving local jail facilities and conditions.

PROPOSED SECTION 10

Chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 537 the following new sections:

§ 538. General authorizations—Federal Bureau of Investigation

Proposed Section 538(a) The Federal Bureau of Investigation is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for.

Proposed Section 538(a)(1) expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States.

Authorization for appropriations for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States includes the expenses necessary for the FBI to conduct investigations of those violations of Federal law for which the FBI has responsibility. In addition to national priority areas of organized crime, foreign counterintelligence, terrorism, and white-collar crime, the FBI has primary jurisdiction over numerous other Federal statutes concentrating on such areas as interstate crimes, forcible crimes against banking institutions, civil rights, and fugitive investigations. Typical expenses include personnel compensation and benefits, travel and transportation of persons and property, rent, communications and utilities, capital and noncapital equipment, and supplies.

Proposed Section 538(a)(2) protection of the person of the President of the United States and the person of the Attorney General.

Appropriations are utilized for the purposes of assuring the security of the President, and of the Attorney General, when so requested by the Department of Justice. Typical expenses include personnel compensation and travel costs.

Proposed Section 538(a)(3) acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with, and for the official use of, the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions, such exchange to be subject to cancellation if dissemination is made outside the receiving departments or related agencies.

Authorization for appropriations for the collection and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with authorized officials includes expenses for the maintenance at FBI Headquarters of the Central Records System, consisting of over six million investigative, personnel, applicant, administrative, and general case files, and for the maintenance of fingerprint identification records submitted by over 20,000 authorized agencies. In addition, this authorization for appropriations includes expenses of providing information contained in FBI records to other Federal agencies in compliance with Executive Order 10450 and to authorized officials of States, cities, and other institutions.

Proposed Section 538(a)(4) such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General.

This language would permit the expenditure of funds at the direction of the Attorney General for other investigations regarding official matters as determined by the Attorney General.

Proposed Section 538(a)(5) purchase for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Authorization for appropriations for motor vehicles includes the expenses associated with the purchase and hire of motor vehicles utilized by investigative and support personnel in the performance of their official duties.

Proposed Section 538(a)(6) acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft.

Authorization for appropriations for aircraft includes the expenses of acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft strategically located in various field offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Proposed Section 538(a)(7) purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches.

Authorization for appropriations for firearms and ammunition includes the expenses of acquisition and maintenance of firearms and implementation of FBI firearm training programs utilized by employees in the performance of their official duties.

A provision has been added to allow FBI agents to attend certain organized firearms matches. Participation in competitive matches with other law enforcement agencies improves firearms proficiency and improves the morale of the agents. Other entities in the Justice Department have authority to permit their agents to attend firearm matches.

Proposed Section 538(a)(8) payment of rewards.

Authorization for appropriations for payment of rewards is utilized on a selective basis for information which results in the identification and apprehension of individuals being sought by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Proposed Section 538(a)(9) expenses to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and to be accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

The word "solely" has been dropped from the phrase "solely on the certification of the Attorney General." The word "solely" restricts the certification process by providing that only the Attorney General is permitted to approve the use of funds for such purposes. Removing the word "solely" and adding the Deputy Attorney General permits expeditious certification by either the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

Proposed Section 538(a)(10) payment of travel and related expenses for immediate family members of employees, including expenses incurred for specialized training and orientation in connection with a transfer to Puerto Rico, other territories and possessions of the United States, and assignment in a legal attache post outside the territory of the United States; and

This provision would allow family members of agents under transfer to Puerto Rico, other territories and possessions of the United States and legal attache posts outside U.S. territories, travel and per diem allowances. These expenses would be incurred when receiving orientation training prior to the agent's departure to a new assignment. Family success in adjusting to life in a new environment depends largely upon language ability, attitude and cultural awareness prior to arrival. Training and orientation will be coordinated by the FBI Academy and the State Department's Foreign Service Institute.

Proposed Section 538(a)(11) research related to investigative activities.

The Technical Services Division of the FBI is involved in several long-term, high-technology research projects. These projects relate to audio and technical collection systems, surveillance aids, and radio engineering. Due to the high degree of sophistication some of these projects involve, some aspects of them are contracted out to private industry. Because funding for these projects is available only on a fiscal year basis, the FBI has experienced some reluctance on the part of private companies to sign contracts to assist in our research. No year authority for research activities will be requested in the appropriation act to permit the FBI to enter into long-term contracts and enhance its ability to conduct scientific research.

Proposed Section 538(b) None of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee in the competitive service.

All positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation are excepted from the competitive service and the incumbents of such positions occupy positions in the excepted service.

§ 539. Fees for furnishing identification services

Proposed Section 539 The Federal Bureau of Investigation may establish and collect fees for the processing of noncriminal employment and licensing fingerprint cards. Such fee is to represent the cost of furnishing the service. The funds collected shall be credited to the Salaries and Expenses, Fed-

eral Bureau of Investigation appropriation without regard to 31 U.S.C. 3302(b), and may be used to pay for salaries and other expenses incurred in operating the FBI Identification Division, and such funds may be carried over from fiscal year to fiscal year for such purposes. There will be no fee assessed in connection with the processing of requests for criminal history records by criminal justice agencies for criminal justice purposes or for employment in criminal justice agencies. 'Criminal justice agency' is defined in 28 CFR 20.3.

This language allows the FBI to set fees for services rendered by the Identification Division and permits the receipts from these fees to be utilized in paying for the operation of the FBI's Identification Division.

PROPOSED SECTION 11

This section would amend section 6 of the Act of July 28, 1950, 64 Stat. 380 (8 U.S.C. 1555) to provide authorization for certain activities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Proposed Section 11 "Section 6 of the Act of July 28, 1950, (c. 503) (8 U.S.C. 1555) is amended to read as follows:

§ 6. General authorizations—Immigration and Naturalization Service

Proposed Section 6 "The Immigration and Naturalization Service is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for.

Proposed Section 6(a) interpreters and translators who are not citizens of the United States and distribution of citizenship textbooks to aliens without cost to such aliens.

Translators and interpreters are necessary to facilitate communication between Service personnel and persons not speaking or writing English. While protecting the interests of the non-English speaking people, translators and interpreters are primarily used during deportation proceedings and other legal hearings. The textbooks provide clear instruction in citizenship responsibilities to applicants for naturalization. Similar authority exists at 8 U.S.C. 1555.

Proposed Section 6(b) allowances (at such rate as may be specified from time to time in the appropriation act), to aliens while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed.

Payment of allowances to aliens held in custody is for work such as serving meals and cleaning. Such expenses are incurred by the Detention and Deportation function. This authority is contained in existing law (8 U.S.C. 1555).

Proposed Section 6(c) expenses to meet unforseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

These expenses are often necessary to protect the identity of informants. This proposal would amend existing authority (8 U.S.C. 1555) by deleting the word "solely" from the phrase "solely on the certificate of the Attorney General. The provision permits the expenditure of funds for the collection of evidence and information of a confidential nature. The word "solely" restricts the certification process by providing that only the Attorney General is permitted to approve the use of funds for such purposes. Removing the word "solely" and adding the Deputy Attorney General permits expeditious certification by either the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

Proposed Section 6(d) expenses related to the purchase and/or lease of privately owned horses.

This language would allow INS to use horses in its routine activities under the Border Patrol program. Remote areas not accessible by motor vehicle require the use of such horses to accomplish routine patrol. Similar authority currently exists in 8 U.S.C. 1555.

Proposed Section 6(e) advance of cash of aliens for meals and lodging while en route.

Section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, prohibits the advance of public money unless authorized by appropriation or other law.

Proposed Section 6(f) expenses and allowances incurred in tracking lost persons as required by public exigencies in aid of State or local law enforcement agencies.

Local law enforcement agencies often request Border Patrol agents to participate in searches for lost persons. Without the proposed language, there is no authority to pay officers while on a regular tour of duty or on an overtime basis. This authorization is also necessary to clarify employee rights to benefits if injured or killed while conducting searches.

Proposed Section 6(g) payment of rewards and purchases of evidence and payments for information.

Such expenses are incurred by the border and interior enforcement program activities of the Service. Payment of rewards is used for purposes of a confidential nature such as informant development, infiltration, and information or evidence in civil or criminal prosecution.

Authority is also included for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to use funds for the purchase of evidence and to make payments for information. The nature of investigative operations carried out by INS requires the use of certain amounts of money for the purchase of evidence and for the payment for information. This provision would permit the use of appropriated funds for these purposes. The use of these funds is particularly critical to the anti-smuggling program.

Proposed Section 6(h) purchase for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicle.

Motor vehicles are a necessary enforcement tool of the Service for pursuit of individuals in violation of the immigration laws, transportation of aliens in custody, travel status situations, and case investigation.

Proposed Section 6(i) acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

Aircraft are used in the Service by the Border and Interior Enforcement Program Activities. These aircraft are an effective method of detecting the presence of persons attempting or completing unlawful entry into the United States, while providing further assistance in the containment and apprehension of these individuals.

Proposed Section 6(j) purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches.

Firearms and ammunition are provided primarily to Border Patrol and Investigative Agents of the Service for use in emergency situations only. Firearms matches are conducted to develop the expertise and safe use of these weapons.

Proposed Section 6(k) planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities and construction, operation maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto, subject to the provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1252(c) and 18 U.S.C. 4003.

These buildings and associated equipment are used primarily for purposes of alien detention, inspections and border patrol facilities and in some cases, living quarters for officers assigned to remote locations. Language has been added to refine the authority INS has to construct facilities. INS believes that additional language for planning site acquisition and construction is required to clarify its authority to construct facilities. It is anticipated that no year authority will be requested for this provision in order to facilitate construction.

Proposed Section 6(l) refunds of maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payments of fines and passage money.

Occasionally it is necessary to refund immigration fines collected from a carrier when it is determined, through adjudication, that such fines were improperly imposed and other items properly refundable.

Proposed Section 6(m) acquisition of land as sites for enforcement fences, and construction incidental to such fences.

Enforcement fences are utilized by the Service in certain border areas as part of its prevention strategy, and are useful for the purpose of controlling the flow of unlawful entrants into areas where apprehension is most assured.

Proposed Section 6(n) research related to immigration enforcement.

This research includes the evaluation of new technology for its applicability to Service programs, such as communications systems and detection services. Research and development projects have, for example, been directed toward new capabilities in wide area surveillance through infrared and radar devices, in automatic inspections of large vehicles and rooms through heartbeat detector techniques, and in selected enforcement and public service activities through satellite and digital communications techniques. No year authority for research activities will be requested in the appropriation act.

Proposed Section 6(o) the emergency replacement of aircraft upon the certificate of the Attorney General.

This language authorizes the Immigration and Naturalization Service to quickly replace aircraft, on an emergency basis, in order to avoid an undue interruption of the enforcement function.

Proposed Section 6(p) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad, provided that such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States Government for the purpose of any law administered by the Office of Personal Management; and

The INS currently has the authority to hire aliens, by contract, abroad. This authority continues to be necessary to hire investigative assistants, translators and other aliens for a variety of purposes in its foreign offices. Recruitment actions for clerical positions in many overseas offices meet with negative results because few qualified people apply due to the remote locations and adverse living conditions. Even when recruitment is successful, the time between selection and actual arrival at post often leaves the INS foreign offices without the assistance of necessary support personnel for extended periods of time. There are dependents of U.S. Foreign Service Offices, U.S. military personnel and other U.S. citizens at all posts where INS has an office who are available for temporary employment.

Proposed Section 6(q) a uniform purchase allowance not to exceed $400 per annum, in accordance with procedures established by the Attorney General for members of the Border Patrol of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who are required by regulations or statute to wear a prescribed uniform in the performance of official duties.

There are slightly over 5,000 uniformed personnel within the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Border Patrol agents presently constitute the largest group of these personnel, approximately 2,474.

The Border Patrol uniform is a part of a 60 year tradition of pride and professionalism. Throughout that time, the respect accorded to Border Patrol agents has stemmed in part from the image presented by their uniforms. Careful attention to uniforms is demanded, since appearance contributes to the officer's own sense of responsibility as well as the public's perception of his or her authority. Dress uniforms are required for any activity requiring contact with the public and rough duty uniforms are required for operations in rural or industrial settings. Different weights of clothing and different articles of outerwear are required for different weather conditions.

The price of one complete Border Patrol uniform, including shoulder straps, holster, handcuff case and cartridge case is approximately $1,018. Each agent must purchase the complete rough duty and dress uniform by the end of his or her first year of employment. This amounts to 9% of the current entry level salary for these agents and creates an undue burden on them, since most have no savings to draw upon, and many have families to support. The cost of maintaining the Border Patrol uniform in an acceptable condition is high, about $400 per year, because of the unusual wear and tear associated with Border Patrol operations. Agents must work in locations such as railroad yards, slaughterhouses, industrial work areas or fields containing cactus plants or barbed wire fences. When it becomes necessary to chase illegal aliens found in these locations, uniforms are frequently stained or torn, which renders them unacceptable.

PROPOSED SECTION 12

This section would provide authority for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to accept voluntary services.

Notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1342, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service is authorized to accept voluntary and uncompensated services to assist the Service in information services to the public. Persons providing voluntary services shall not be used to displace any federal employee and shall not be considered a federal employee for any purpose except for the purpose of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the compensation for injury) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2671-2680 Code (relating to tort claims).

The authority to use voluntary services without compensation in the information service function of INS would remove the restriction in 31 U.S.C. 1342 for the acceptance of such services. This provision will enable voluntary agencies to operate "ask immigration" tape libraries in conjunction with INS and maintain roving information representatives in INS' waiting rooms.

PROPOSED SECTION 13

This section would provide authority for certain activities of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Proposed Section 13 Chapter 13 of title 21, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 904 the following new chapter:

§ 905. General authorizations—Drug Enforcement Administration

Proposed Section 905(a) the hire and acquisition of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year.

This provision authorizes the hire of passenger motor vehicles to give special agents the capability to operate in a clandestine mode to carry out surveillance and other enforcement techniques in enforcing the drug abuse laws. The vehicles must appear to be the same as those found in the environment in which the agents carry out their mission, with no identification to indicate that the vehicles are government owned. Vehicles purchased for law enforcement use typically cost more than fleet-type vehicles. DEA's operations, such as special investigative matters and regulatory and training activities, are most effectively and efficiently carried out through use of passenger motor vehicles hired or leased from private organizations and from GSA.

Proposed Section 905(b) payment in advance for special tests and studies by contract.

This section provides for payment in advance for research contracts and projects. Advance payment is the most efficient financing mechanism. These projects maximize the effectiveness of DEA's operations by development of new or improved techniques and procedures and increase the quantity and quality of investigative evidence. Section 3323 of title 31, U.S.C., prohibits advance payments unless specifically authorized by the appropriation or other law.

Proposed Section 905(c) payment in advance for expenses arising out of contractual and reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement and regulatory agencies while engaged in cooperative enforcement and regulatory activities in accordance with section 503a(2) of the Controlled Substances Act [P.L. 91-513 (1970)].

This section provides for the funding of contracts, cooperative or reimbursable agreements, executed for the purpose of supporting cooperative law enforcement activities with State and local law enforcement, and with controlled substance regulatory agencies. These agreements aid in suppressing the abuse of controlled substances through the institution and prosecution of cases in courts and before licensing boards. It is often necessary to advance funds to accomplish this activity.

Section 905(d) expenses to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, and to be accounted for on the certificate of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

These expenses are necessary for the purchase or procurement of information or evidence from individuals whose identity must be protected and remain confidential, to meet emergency situations threatening the personal safety of Government agents, informants, or their families, and for emergency situations in which disclosure of the expenditures would jeopardize investigative operations. The above language has been included in DEA's appropriation since 1974. It has also been included in the appropriation of predecessor agencies from 1966.

The word "solely" has been dropped from the phrase "solely on the certificate of the Attorney General." The provision permits the expenditure of funds for the collection of evidence and information of a confidential nature. The word "solely" restricts the certification process by providing that only the Attorney General is permitted to approve the use of funds for such purposes. Removing the word "solely" and adding the Deputy Attorney General permits expeditious certification by either the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General.

Proposed Section 905(e) payment of rewards.

This language provides for payments to informants or other persons aiding the Government in the arrest of suspects, seizure of drugs, or prosecution of violators.

Proposed Section 905(f) publication of technical and informational material in professional and trade journals, and purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment.

This section provides for the publication of materials which help to develop an awareness of Federal drug enforcement and drug industry regulatory activities. The DEA laboratories perform analyses of drug evidence and provide expert scientific testimony for prosecutorial purposes. In-depth ballistics examinations are performed to help determine sources of drugs. Research capability is maintained in the areas of forensic science and advanced technological development.

Proposed Section 905(g) necessary accommodations in the District of Columbia for conferences and training activities.

This language provides authority to house specialized and advanced trainees in quarters close to the Specialized Training Unit in Washington, D.C. Although the Office of Training is now located in Glynco, Georgia, the Specialized Training Unit has remained in Washington, D.C. The Specialized Training Unit provides the Office of Training with the capability and flexibility to conduct conferences and training sessions pertaining to enforcement, regulatory and technical programs in the Washington, D.C. area.

Proposed Section 905(h) acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

This provision authorizes aviation support for DEA operations. Aircraft is needed by DEA to detect and interdict narcotics traffic primarily through air to ground surveillance, overwater surveillance, and undercover operations. The use of aircraft by drug traffickers is well documented. The use of aircraft for surveillance activities can often replace complex or impossible ground surveillance.

Proposed Section 905(i) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad, provided that such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States Government for the purpose of any law administered by the Office of Personnel Management.

The authority to employ aliens and U.S. Citizens, by contract, abroad, is necessary to hire investigative assistants, translators, clerical and other personnel in foreign offices. Staffing clerical positions with personnel hired in the U.S. is difficult in many foreign offices and impossible in others due to remote locations and adverse living conditions. Recruitment of personnel from the U.S., even if successful, is generally met with extended delays in the selectee's actual arrival at post. Hence, without this authority, the office will be without clerical assistance for extended periods of time. There are dependents of State Department Foreign

Service Officers, U.S. Military personnel and other U.S. citizens at all posts where DEA has an office who are available for temporary employment.

Proposed Section 905(j) purchase of firearms and ammunition and attendance at firearms matches.

This section provides authorization for appropriations for firearms and ammunition including the expense of acquisition and maintenance of firearms utilized by employees in the performance of their official duties. These duties include participating in firearms matches to develop the expertise and safe use of weapons.

Proposed Section 905(k) payment for tort claims when such claims arise in foreign countries in connection with Drug Enforcement Administration operations abroad. This authority provides for payment by the United States Government to persons injured in a foreign country as a result of actions of DEA employees acting within the scope of their employment.

Proposed Section 905(l) research related to enforcement and drug control; and

This language provides for a research and engineering program covering the following elements: search and surveillance; communications; command and control; regulatory support; forensic sciences; operational support; and special studies. No year authority for research activities is being sought in the Department's appropriation request.

Proposed Section 905(m)—payment of travel and related expenses for immediate family members of employees, including expenses incurred for specialized training and orientation in connection with a transfer to Puerto Rico, other territories and possessions of the United States, and assignment in a post outside the territory of the United States.

This provision would allow family members of agents under transfer to Puerto Rico, other territories and possessions of the United States and posts outside U.S. territories, travel, and per diem allowances. These expenses would be incurred when receiving orientation training prior to the agent's departure to a new assignment. Family success in adjusting to life in a new environment depends largely upon language ability, attitude, and cultural awareness prior to arrival. Training and orientation will be coordinated by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Glynco, Georgia.

PROPOSED SECTION 14

Proposed Section 14 Chapter 13 of title 21, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 886 the following new section:

§ 887. Awards resulting from forfeiture of assets

This section would provide discretionary authority to the Drug Enforcement Administration to make certain award payments.

Proposed Section 887(a) Without regard to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302(b) and 21 U.S.C. 881(e), the Drug Enforcement Administration is authorized to set aside 25 per centum of the net amount of money realized from the forfeiture of assets seized by it under any provision of the Controlled Substances Act [P.L. 91-513 (1970)], to be available in amounts as specified in appropriation acts for obligation and expenditure only for the purpose of paying awards of compensation with respect to such forfeiture; and to pay, totally within its discretion, such awards to any entity not an agency or instrumentality of the United States, or to any person not an officer or employee of the United States or of any State or local government, that provides information or assistance which leads to such a forfeiture. Such awards can be made in any amount up to 25 per centum of the amount realized from the forfeiture, or $150,000, whichever is lesser, in any case, except that no awards shall be made based on the value of the contraband. The authority of the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration to pay an award of $10,000 or more shall not be delegated.

(b) The amounts credited under this section shall be made available for obligations until September 30, 1986.

(c) The remaining 75 per centum of the net amount of money realized from such forfeitures shall be paid to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Provided, That the authority furnished by this section shall remain available until September 30, 1986, or upon the creation of a Department of Justice asset forfeiture fund, whichever is sooner at which time any amount of the unobligated balances remaining in this account, accumulated before September 30, 1986, shall be paid to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *And provided further,* That the Drug Enforcement Administration shall conduct detailed financial audits, semi-annually, of the expenditure of funds from this account and—

(1) Report the results of each audit, in writing, to the Department of Justice; and

(2) Report annually to Congress concerning these audits.

The proposed authority provides discretionary authority to make award payments of up to 25 percent of the net value of seized assets. Section 9 of the Proposed of 1982 Authorization Act (S-951) contained a request for authority to make moiety payments to informants in narcotic cases. Section 9 of S-2567, the Proposed 1983 DOJ Authorization Act, contained language similar to this proposed revision as a refinement of that authority and reflects the need for a more flexible and effective enforcement mechanism than would be provided by the moiety authority. In addition this language is a necessary and logical reaction to the recent trend of drug traffickers to utilize large amounts of currency and assets, expensive aircraft, vessels, and vehicles to facilitate their drug trafficking. In November of 1978, Congress saw fit to make assets of drug traffickers used in exchange for drugs or to facilitate drug activities forfeitable. The proposed provisions give DEA the practical tool of being able to pay informants meaningful rewards from the assets and property of the drug traffickers.

PROPOSED SECTION 15

This section would amend chapter 303 of title 18 United States Code by inserting a new section 4044 authorizing certain activities by the Bureau of Prisons.

Proposed Section 15 Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4043 the following new section:

§ 4044. General authorizations—Bureau of Prisons

The Bureau of Prisons is authorized to make payments from its appropriation for:

Proposed Section 4044(a) the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including supervision and support of United States Prisoners in non-Federal institutions, and for inmate legal services within the system.

The Bureau contracts with appropriate non-Federal agencies for facilities to board certain types of Federal offenders and detainees. These facilities are used for the following reasons:

(1) To relieve overcrowding in Federal institutions,

(2) To offer protection to Federal offenders who would be in danger in Federal institutions,

(3) To help keep inmates near to their home communities,

(4) To provide programs not generally available in Federal institutions, and

(5) To place juvenile offenders in residential facilities.

Provision is also made to make available certain funds for inmate legal services, such as assistance programs where law students represent inmates on selected matters.

Proposed Section 4044(b) purchase and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles. Hire of passenger motor vehicles is often necessary for personnel in travel status. Law enforcement and passenger vehicles are used to transport offenders and for routine functions in the operation of Bureau of Prison facilities.

Proposed Section 4044(c) compilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal penal and correctional institutions.

Administrative services performs up-to-the-minute locator and status information on all individuals in the custody of the Attorney General; population counts and statistics; and inter-agency, inter-facility and intra-institution population movement schedules, notices, statistics, and computation and update of sentences; this language provides the authority to gather such information.

Proposed Section 4044(d) purchase of firearms and ammunition and medals and other awards. Expenses are incurred for the purchase of firearms and ammunition necessary to ensure the security of Bureau facilities and to respond to emergency situations. Correctional officers must undergo weapons familiarization as a routine part of their training activities. Medals and other awards are offered to staff personnel for recognition of superior performance.

Proposed Section 4044(e) payment of rewards. Rewards are offered for information leading to the capture of those who escape from Federal penal or correctional institutions.

Proposed Section 4044(f) purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock. The farm program uses available land resources to produce food products that will be used by federal correctional institutions. Farm productivity provides a primary hedge against inflation and spiraling food costs. The effective use of equipment, supplies, and manpower is used to achieve maximum use of the available land resources.

Proposed Section 4044(g) construction of buildings at prison camps. Projects of $100,000 or less may be charged to the Salaries and Expenses appropriation of the Bureau of Prisons. Projects in excess of $100,000 are funded from the Buildings and Facilities appropriation with the specific line items being approved by Congress. The nature of construction at prison camps involves housing and administrative facilities for staff and inmates at the prison camp.

Proposed Section 4044(g) (continued) and acquisition of land as authorized by 18 U.S.C. 4010. Acquisition of land relates primarily to perimeter security and camp expansions. As correctional programs expand, the necessity for renovation or expansion of existing facilities often requires the acquisition of additional acreage. Section 4010 of

title 18, U.S.C., indicates the Attorney General may acquire land, if authorized by law.

Proposed Section 4044(h) entering into contracts with governmental or private organizations or entities for the safekeeping, care and subsistence of persons held under any legal authority; and

The Bureau of Prisons has general authority (18 U.S.C. 4042) to "provide for the safekeeping, care, and subsistence of all persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, or held as witnesses or otherwise." A place of confinement may be "any available, suitable, and appropriate institution, whether maintained by the Federal government or otherwise" (18 U.S.C. 4082). With expanding prison populations, and special needs for some offenders, this authorization recognizes the necessity of looking to a variety of agencies, public and private, for the custody and care of federal offenders and others who are in lawful federal custody. It provides specific authority to enter contracts, wherever the appropriate contract source may be found, for the care of such persons. This concept of contractual placement of offenders in the facilities of another jurisdiction or agency is recognized in 18 U.S.C. 4002 (placing federal offenders in state institutions), and in 18 U.S.C. 5003 (contracting to receive state offenders in federal institutions).

Proposed Section 4044(i) planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account,

This section provides authority for the Buildings and Facilities of the Bureau of Prisons. This language authorizes appropriations for planning, acquisition of sites, constructing, remodeling, and equipping of penal and correctional institutions. The purposes of the site aquisition and planning process are to identify and locate suitable sites for construction of new correctional facilities, and to design these facilities in a manner consistent with security, program requirements, and architectural innovation. Construction is completed within a specific timetable, within budgeted costs, and with the highest degree of quality. Rehabilitation and renovation of buildings is made to effect repairs at existing facilities and make modifications to accommodate new correctional programs.

Proposed Section 4044(i) (continued) to remain available until expended,

A no-year appropriation allows for the efficient and effective implementation of construction funds. Construction schedules are approximately two years for the warmer climates and two and a half years for the colder climates.

Proposed Section 4044(i) (continued) and the labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed with sums authorized to be appropriated by this subsection.

The use of inmate labor contributes to lower construction costs and provides inmates with vocational training opportunities.

PROPOSED SECTION 16

Chapter 307 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 4128, the following new section:

§ 4129. General authorizations—Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

Proposed Section 4129 Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation.

This section will provide authorization for Federal Prison Industries (FPI) Inc. FPI was created by Congress in 1934 and is a wholly-owned Government corporation. Its mission is to employ and train Federal inmates through a diversified program providing products with a minimum of competition to private industry and labor. Employment provides inmates work, develops occupational knowledge and skills and earns money for personal expenses and family assistance.

Proposed Section 4129 (continued) including purchase and hire of passenger vehicles.

Passenger motor vehicles are often necessary for personnel in travel status. Purchase of passenger motor vehicles is required for routine functions in the day-to-day operations of the factories at Bureau facilities.

PROPOSED SECTION 17

This section would amend 18 U.S.C 4204(b) by adding a new paragraph at the end for the United States Parole Commission.

Proposed Section 17 Section 4204(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection.

Proposed Section 4204(b)(9) hire passenger motor vehicles.

Passenger motor vehicles are necessary for transporting hearing examiners to hearing locations. This language would authorize the hire of such vehicles.

PROPOSED SECTION 18

This section would amend Title II of part 28, United States Code by inserting a new Chapter 40 which would provide authorization for certain undercover investigative operations of the FBI and the DEA.

Proposed Section 18 Part II of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 37 the following new chapter:

Chapter 40—Undercover investigative operations

§ 599 Federal Bureau of Investigation undercover operations

Proposed Section 599(a) With respect to any undercover investigative operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which is necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States or for the collection of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence—

(1) Sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be used for purchasing property, buildings, and other facilities, and for leasing space, within the United States, District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 1341, section 3732(a) of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11(a)), section 305 of the Act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 396; 41 U.S.C. 255), the third undesignated paragraph under the heading "Miscellaneous" of the Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 370; 40 U.S.C. 34), 31 U.S.C. 3324, section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22), and subsections (a) and (c) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Adminstrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 395; 41 U.S.C. 254 (a) and (c)),

(2) Sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be used to establish or to acquire proprietary corporations or business entities as part of an undercover investigative operation, and to operate such corporations or business entities on a commercial basis, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 9102.

(3) Sums authorized to be appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the proceeds from such undercover operation, may be deposited in banks or other financial institutions, without regard to 18 U.S.C. 648 and 31 U.S.C. 3302; and

(4) The proceeds from such undercover operation may be used to offset necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in such operation, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 3302, in operations designed to detect and prosecute crimes against the United States, upon the written certification of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (or, if designated by the Director, a member of the Undercover Operations Review Committee established by the Attorney General in the Attorney General's Guidelines of FBI Undercover Operations, as in effect on July 1, 1983) and the Attorney General (or, if designated by the Attorney General, a member of such Review Committee), that any action authorized by subparagraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this paragraph is necessary for the conduct of such undercover operation. If the undercover operation is designed to collect foreign intelligence or counterintelligence, the certification that any action authorized by subparagraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this paragraph is necessary for the conduct of such undercover operation shall be by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (or, if designated by the Director, the Assistant Director, Intelligence Division) and the Attorney General (or, if designated by the Attorney General, the Counsel for Intelligence Policy). Such certification shall continue in effect for the duration of such undercover operation, without regard to fiscal years.

(b) As soon as the proceeds from an undercover investigative operation with respect to which an action is authorized and carried out under subparagraphs (3) and (4) of paragraph (a) are no longer necessary for the conduct of such operation, such proceeds or the balance of such proceeds remaining at the time shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) If a corporation or business entity established or acquired as part of an undercover operation under subparagraph (2) of paragraph (a) with a net value of over $150,000 is to be liquidated, sold, or otherwise disposed of, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as much in advance as the Director or his designee determines is practicable, shall report the circumstances to the Attorney General and the Comptroller General. The proceeds of the liquidation, sale, or other disposition, after obligations are met, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(d)(1) The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall conduct a detailed financial audit of each undercover investigative operation which is closed in fiscal year 1985, and each fiscal year thereafter.

(A) Submit the results of such audit in writing to the Attorney General; and

(B) Not later than 180 days after such undercover operation is closed, submit a report to the Congress concerning such audit.

(2) The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall also submit a report annually to the Congress specifying—

(A) The number, by programs, of undercover investigative operations pending as of the end of the one-year period for which such report is submitted,

(B) The number, by programs, of undercover investigative operations commenced in the one-year period preceding the period for which such report is submitted, and

(C) The number, by programs, of undercover investigative operations closed in the one-year period preceding the period for which such report is submitted and, with respect to each such closed undercover operation, the results obtained. With respect to each such closed undercover operation which involves any of the sensitive circumstances specified in the Attorney General's Guidelines on FBI Undercover Operations, such report shall contain a detailed description of the operation and related matters, including information pertaining to—

(i) The results;

(ii) Any civil claims; and

(iii) Identification of such sensitive circumstances involved, that arose at any time during the course of such undercover operation.

(e) For purposes of paragraph (d)(1)—

(1) The term "closed" refers to the earliest point in time at which—

(a) All criminal proceedings (other than appeals) are concluded, or

(b) Covert activities are concluded, whichever occurs later,

(2) The term "employees" means employees, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 2105, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and

(3) The terms "undercover investigative operation" and "undercover operation" mean any undercover investigative operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (other than a foreign counterintelligence undercover investigative operation)—

(A) In which—

(i) The gross receipts (excluding interest earned) exceed $150,000, or

(ii) Expenditures (other than expenditures for salaries of employees) exceed $150,000, and

(B) Which is exempt from 31 U.S.C. 3302 or 31 U.S.C. 9102, except that clauses (A) and (B) shall not apply with respect to the report required under subparagraph (2) of such paragraph.

This language is virtually identical to the language contained in the Justice Department's FY 1984 Appropriations Act (P.L. 98-166, § 205(b)), with two exceptions. First, the proposed language provides permanent authority for the FBI to conduct undercover operations in the section rather than limiting authority to one year. Secondly, section (a)(4) has been amended in order to permit the FBI Director to delegate his authority to certify the use of exemptions in foreign intelligence or counterintelligence undercover operations to the Assistant Director of the FBI's Intelligence Division, and to permit the Attorney General to delegate his authority to certify the use of these exemptions to the Counsel for Intelligence Policy.

§ 600. Drug Enforcement Administration undercover operations

Proposed Section 600(a) with respect to any undercover investigative operation of the Drug Enforcement Administration which is necessary to carry out its function—

(1) Sums authorized to be appropriated to the Drug Enforcement Administration may be used for purchasing property, buildings, or other facilities and leasing space within the United States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States without regard to 31 U.S.C. 1341, 3732(a) of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11(a)), section 305 of the Act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 396; 41 U.S.C. 255), the third undesignated paragraph under the heading "Miscellaneous" of the Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 370; 40 U.S.C. 34), 31 U.S.C. 3324, section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22), and subsections (a) and (c) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 395; 41 U.S.C. 254 (a) and (c));

(2) Sums authorized to be appropriated to the Drug Enforcement Administration may be used to establish or acquire proprietary corporations or business entities as part of an undercover operation and to operate such corporations or business entities on a commercial basis, without regard to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 9102;

(3) Sums authorized to be appropriated to the Drug Enforcement Administration and deposit appropriated funds and the proceeds from such undercover operations may be deposited in banks or other financial institutions without regard to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 648 and 31 U.S.C. 3302; and

(4) The proceeds from such undercover operations may be used to offset necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in such operation without regard to 31 U.S.C. 3302; only upon the written certification of the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (or by a person designated to act for the Administrator in his absence) with prompt notification of the Attorney General or his designee thereafter, that any action authorized by this section is necessary for the conduct of such investigative operation. Such certification shall continue for the duration of the undercover operation without regard to the fiscal years.

(b) As soon as the proceeds from an undercover investigative operation authorized under this section are no longer necessary for the conduct of such operation, such proceeds shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) If a corporation or business entity established or acquired as part of an undercover operation under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) with a net value over $150,000 is to be liquidated, sold or otherwise disposed of, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, as much in advance as the Administrator or his designee determines is practicable, shall report the circumstances to the Attorney General and the Comptroller General. The proceeds of the liquidation, sale, or other disposition, after obligations are met, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) (1) Upon completion of an undercover investigative operation authorized by this section, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration shall conduct detailed financial audits of these operations, and—

(A) Report the results of each audit in writing to the Attorney General; and

(B) Report annually to the Congress concerning these audits.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), "undercover investigative operation" and "undercover operation" mean any undercover operation of the Drug Enforcement Administration—

(A) In which the gross receipts exceed $150,000; and

(B) Which is exempt from 31 U.S.C. 3302 and 31 U.S.C. 9102.

The purpose of this proposed authorization language is to provide narrow exceptions to certain provisions of law which relate to government procurement and public moneys and which currently present problems with respect to the continued effective performance of DEA undercover operations.

The DEA has traditionally used undercover operations in the performance of its drug law enforcement and intelligence function. Undercover operations are often the only effective means to detect and prosecute drug related criminal activity, particularly if the DEA cannot secure the cooperation of one of the participants in a criminal enterprise.

The DEA recognizes, of course, that these activities must be conducted in accordance with the requirements of all applicable laws.

In the course of studying the legality of these operations, several legal questions have been raised which could present substantial obstacles to the continued effective performance of undercover operations. These problems include:

1. Use of income to offset expenses. Section 3302 of title 31 U.S.C. requires the gross amount of all funds received, from whatever source, for the use of the United States be paid into the Treasury without any deduction for expenses. This statute could pose serious problems with regard to the scale on which the DEA can conduct its undercover operations. If these operations must return all gross receipts to the Treasury, and thereby meet expenses only with appropriated funds, the funds appropriated for these operations will quickly be exhausted, and the administrative complexity of the fund transfers would jeopardize the operations. We thus seek legislative authority to use the income derived by these operations in order to meet expenses; any profits generated in the operations will, of course, be returned to the Treasury.

2. Deposit of funds in banks. Federal officials are prohibited from depositing government funds in banks by 18 U.S.C. 648 and 31 U.S.C. 3302. The Department of Justice has advised the DEA that, under certain circumstances, a deposit of government funds in banks would not violate these provisions. Legal problems still remain in some situations necessary to the successful conduct of undercover operations, and the Department of Justice thus believes that explicit legislative authority should be obtained in this area.

3. Leases. Various problems arise in situations where the DEA, either in its law enforcement or intelligence responsibilities, needs to enter into a lease of property. Questions arise whether the DEA has authority to do so; whether provisions usually required in government leases, see 41 U.S.C. 22, 254 (a) and (c), must be included in contracts which necessarily cannot disclose government involvement; whether the DEA may, under 31 U.S.C. 1341, 41 U.S.C. 11(a), enter into leases extending beyond the current fiscal year; whether the DEA might, under 41 U.S.C. 255, make rental payments in advance as most landlords require; and whether the DEA might enter into rental contracts in Washington, D.C., under 40 U.S.C. 34. While the Department of Justice has satisfactorily resolved many of these issues, some legal questions still remain. We thus believe it is necessary that the DEA be granted explicit legislative authority to act in this regard.

It should be emphasized here that the DEA seeks legislative authority in the areas set forth above only insofar as that authority is necessary to the successful performance of its undercover operations. This au-

thority would not be available to the DEA where other methods of law enforcement would sufficiently meet its needs, or where areas other than undercover operations are involved.

PROPOSED SECTION 19

Section 535 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(a) In subsection (b) by striking out the phrase "violations of title 18 involving Government officers and employees" and adding in its place "any violation or suspected violation of federal criminal law," and by inserting after the word "agency," and before the word "unless" the following:

"Provided the violation or suspected violation was committed by a person while engaged in any activity which relates to the operations of the department or agency, or the violation or suspected violation resulting from such activity,";

(b) In subsection (c)(2) by striking out "Postmaster General" and adding in lieu thereof "United States Postal Service"; and

(c) By adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) Any person who reports any information, allegation, or complaint described in subsection (b) relating to any violation of federal criminal law to his or her department or agency, to an Inspector General, or to any other person authorized to receive the information, allegation, or complaint shall possess a complete defense to any civil liability under any law unless the report was made with knowledge that it was false or with willful disregard for its truth or falsity."

This provision amends susbsection (b) of 28 U.S.C. 535 by broadening the duty imposed on heads of departments and agencies to report to the Attorney General information, allegations, and complaints received in the department or agency regarding criminal violations. The bill requires such reporting for any violation or suspected violation of federal criminal law if the violation or suspected violation was committed by a person while engaged in any activity which relates to the operations of the department or agency or if the violation or suspected violation resulted from such activity which relates to the operations of the department or agency or if the violation or suspected violation resulted from such activity. Offenses committed by federal officers or employees, State or local government employees, private contractors, grantees, or any other person are subject to the reporting requirement of the bill. By requiring the reporting of information regarding suspected violations of federal criminal law, the will assures that doubts regarding the duty to report will be resolved in favor of reporting.

In order for evidence of an offense to be subject to the reporting requirement, the activities surrounding the violation must relate to the operations of the department or agency. Thus, if an agency learns that a person under contract with it violates a federal criminal law, such as the law prohibiting extortion, whle carrying out activities under the contract, the agency head must report this information to the Attorney General. However, an agency would not be bound by 28 U.S.C. 535 to report evidence of a street crime observed by an agency employee in the course of his or her official duties if the crime was not committed in connection with any activity relevant to the agency's operations.

The provision would also add a new subsection (d) to 28 U.S.C. 535 protecting any person who reports information regarding criminal activity from civil liability by a department or agency, unless the report was made with knowledge that it was false or with willfull disregard for its truth or falsity. This provision will encourage federal officers and employees to report to their agencies evidence of crime they encounter in the course of their official duties.

PROPOSED SECTION 20

Title 18 United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) The first paragraph of subsection 2516 is amended by inserting the words "Deputy Attorney General, Associate Attorney General," after the words "Attorney General."

(b) Subsection 2518(7) is amended by inserting, "the Deputy General, the Associate Attorney General," after the words "Attorney General".

This provision makes a minor change in the wiretap statutes, 18 U.S.C. 2516 and 2518(7) to permit Department of Justice authorization of a wiretap to be made by the Deputy Attorney General and the Associate Attorney General as well as by the other high ranking officials currently authorized to approve interceptions of communications.

Section one simply adds the Deputy Attorney General and the Associate Attorney General to subsection (1) of section 2516 which lists the officials who may authorize an application to a Federal judge for an order authorizing the interception of communications. Presently such applications may be authorized by the Attorney General or a designated Assistant Attorney General.

Section two makes an indentical change in subsection 2518(7) to allow the Deputy Attorney General and Associate Attorney General to designate law enforcement officers who may make interceptions without a court order in certain narrowly limited emergency situations related to national security and organized crime. Presently, the law enforcement officials who make interceptions in these emergency situations may only be designated by the Attorney General or by the principal prosecuting attorney of a State or political subdivision thereof.

Neither section alters the principle that wiretap authorizations should be approved only by high-level Departmental officials. When the wiretap statutes were first enacted in 1968, the omission of the Deputy Attorney General was probably an oversight since the deputy was then, as now, the superior of an Assistant Attorney General. The Office of the Associate Attorney General did not exist in 1968 although now that official exercises general supervisory authority over criminal investigations and prosecutions.

PROPOSED SECTION 21

Subsection (b) of section 6003 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding "the Associate Attorney General" after the words "the Deputy Attorney General,".

This amendment adds the Associate Attorney General to the short list of Departmental officials who may approve applications for a court order granting immunity to witnesses testifying before courts or grand juries. Presently the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, and designated Assistant Attorneys General may approve such applications. The addition of the Associate Attorney General preserves the principle that such applications must be approved by high level officials. The Office of the Associate Attorney General did not exist when the immunity statutes were enacted in 1970 although presently the Associate Attorney General is superior in rank to the Assistant Attorneys General who have been designated to approve immunity applications.

By Mr. BYRD (for Mr. HUDDLESTON):

S. 2607. A bill to provide for improvements in the school lunch and other child nutrition programs and the food stamp program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

ANTI-HUNGER ACT OF 1984

● Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that addresses the nutritional needs of our Nation's citizens.

A number of reports have been made recently indicating that hunger and malnutrition exist in various urban and rural areas across the Nation.

This resurgence of hunger and malnutrition in the United States is, I believe, primarily the result of the recession in the economy that still plagues many parts of our Nation.

Over the last 3 years, we have seen the national unemployment rate reach its highest level in several decades. In some areas of the country, including my State of Kentucky, the unemployment rate still exceeds 10 percent.

Fortunately, the economy appears to be slowly recovering from the recession. And, with the development of sound economic and fiscal policies, we could expect the unemployment rate to eventually drop to acceptable levels.

However, the nutrition problems now facing unemployed workers and their families, elderly people living on fixed incomes, and the children of the working poor cannot be ignored in the hopes that the economy will eventually get better.

Particularly at risk are young children and the elderly. They are the most susceptible persons to medical problems caused by deficient diets. Poor nutrition can cause stunted growth and learning disabilities for children, anemia, and severe health problems that can lead to death.

With that in mind, I have developed this legislation to make the existing Federal food assistance programs more effective. My bill will increase the availability of food assistance to low-income persons, particularly those who are most vulnerable—the elderly, the homeless, and the very young. The legislation would also make changes in the operations of the school lunch, WIC, and other child nutrition programs, and the food stamp program, designed to make the programs work better.

In developing this legislation, I have been mindful of the need to control deficit spending and have attempted to provide for the needed improvements in these programs with only a very modest increase in their costs, or at no cost where possible.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Title I of the bill addresses deficiencies in the school lunch and other child nutrition programs, including the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC). Title I also reauthorizes, for 4 years, appropriations for those programs due to expire on September 30, 1984.

On September 30, 1983, I introduced S. 1913, a bill to provide for improvement in the school lunch and certain other child nutrition programs. To date, 52 Senators have cosponsored S. 1913. Title I of the bill incorporates many of the provisions of S. 1913.

The Agriculture Committee will consider child nutrition legislation in markup sessions on Wednesday and Thursday of this week. Because of the imperative need for changes in the child nutrition programs, I am also submitting a substitute amendment to S. 1913 that embodies title I of the bill I am introducing today.

The need for the enactment of title I of the bill I am introducing today arises from action Congress took in 1980 and 1981. In 1980 and 1981 budget cuts were made in the Federal school lunch and child nutrition programs that totaled $1.5 billion. Unfortunately, a portion of those savings were realized by penalizing the children of the working poor who have no other safety net available to them.

This has led to what I believe is a deplorable situation: That is, the high dropout rate in the reduced-price categories of the Federal school lunch and breakfast programs. Approximately 400,000 children who once were receiving reduced-price meals are no longer participating in the school lunch and breakfast programs.

Other children were forced from the free category to the reduced-price category because the income eligiblity levels were changed for free meals. Moving from free to reduced-price meals was particularly devastating for these children because their cost of a meal went from free to 40 cents. For a family on a tight budget and with several children, additional annual expenses of hundreds of dollars are a severe burden.

My bill will help remedy this situation and make other needed improvements in these programs by adding back less than one-sixth of the total $1.5 billion cut from the programs.

Many of the beneficiaries of the legislation will be children from families that may not be eligible for food stamps or other welfare programs but whose annual income may be as low as $12,871 for a family of four. I know that families of four with incomes of $12,871, before taxes, are not having an easy time trying to make ends meet.

I would note that proposals have been made to cut the budget in these programs even further. The status quo for these programs is preferable to the additional budget cuts, but that is not much of a choice. It already appears that the 1980 and 1981 budget cuts were penny-wise and pound-foolish. My bill correcting the inequities caused by prior budget cuts is clearly needed.

Also, I would point out that the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4091, which contains many of the provisions of title I of my bill, 6 months ago. That legislation continues to await the Senate's consideration. In addition, the House Education and Labor Committee has reported H.R. 7, which also makes changes in the food programs comparable to those made by title I of my bill. The House of Representatives has begun floor debate on H.R. 7.

My legislative proposal, then is timely and I urge the Senate to give it prompt consideration.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Title II of the bill would enact many of the recommendations for improvements in the food stamp program made by the President's Task Force on Food Assistance earlier this year. Included among these are restoring the cost of the thrifty food plan to 100 percent of its cost; increasing the value of resources that an eligible household may own to more fairly represent current values of ordinary possessions; restoring the earned income deduction to 20 percent of such income; and insuring that the homeless are able to participate in the program.

Other provisions of title II are specifically directed at improving the food stamp program for the elderly and the disabled. These include: authorizing the elderly and disabled to use coupons to purchase low-cost meals from restaurants; authorizing the additional expenses that result from physician-prescribed special diets to be deducted from income as a medical expense; and authorizing funds appropriated for the program to be used for outreach activities directed at households containing such persons, as well as young children.

In addition, title II of the bill would reauthorize an option for State food stamp agencies to use either prospective or retrospective accounting methods for calculating the monthly benefits of food stamp recipients and require monthly reporting of income only for certain categories of food stamp recipients whose benefits are calculated on a retrospective basis. The current mandatory retrospective budgeting and monthly reporting requirements in the food stamp program have proven to be a costly burden on the States, and there is no sound evidence that these procedures are effective in reducing error rates under the program.

Mandatory retrospective budgeting and monthly reporting have resulted in hardship to eligibile recipients by delaying needed benefits for as much as 2 months. It is, therefore, very important that the States have the option to use whichever method best fits the needs of a particular situation.

The bill also addresses a problem which exists for low-income persons living in high-unemployment areas. In such areas, the newly unemployed persons whose unemployment benefits have expired often do not qualify for food stamps because they own personal properly valued in excess of the resource limitations under the programs.

These assets that, under ordinary circumstances, could be sold by the household to provide for their food needs cannot be quickly sold for a reasonable cash price in high-unemployment areas because of the depressed market conditions. My bill would address this problem by excluding such excess personal property from the resource limitation requirements in high-unemployment areas for a period of no more than 4 months to allow food stamp applicants adequate time to dispose of their property at a reasonable price.

Title II would also maintain the level at which sanctions are imposed on States for errors made in the administration of the food stamp program at the current level of 7 percent for fiscal year 1985. The reduction to 5 percent scheduled to take effect in fiscal year 1985 would be postponed until fiscal year 1986. There is much evidence that one of the reasons for high error rates in the food stamp program is the numerous statutory and regulatory changes made in the program over the years.

My legislation recognizes this problem and would not impose additional sanctions on the States during the period in which the needed changes in the program are being implemented.

CONCLUSION

The hunger and nutrition problems that have been documented throughout the country and that I have seen firsthand in Kentucky cannot be ignored in the hopes that things will eventually get better. I have attempted to address these problems while being mindful of the need to control deficit spending. The improvements made in these programs under my bill will be achieved with only a very modest increase in their costs, or at no cost in many instances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of organizations that are supporting my bill, a summary of the bill, and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Anti-Hunger Act of 1984".

TITLE I—SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

SEC. 101. (a) Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) is amended by—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), striking out "Subject to" and all that follows through "September 30, 1984—", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Subject to the amounts appropriated for the purposes of the program under subsection (g)—";

(2) in subsection (g), striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,522,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $1,634,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $1,771,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $1,915,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, for the purpose of carrying out the program authorized by this section."; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2), striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(b) Section 7(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1776(i)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(c) Section 19(j) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1788(j)) is amended by—

(1) striking out the subsection designation "(j)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)";

(2) striking out paragraph (1);

(3) redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by clause (3) of this subsection—

(A) striking out "For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for each succeeding fiscal year ending on or before September 30, 1984, there" and inserting in lieu thereof "There"; and

(B) striking out "$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1981, and not more than $5,000,000 for each subsequent" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,000,000 for each".

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

SEC. 102. (a) Section 13(p) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(p)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(b) Section 14(a) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1762(a)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

INCREASE IN FEDERAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR REDUCED PRICE MEALS

SEC. 103. (a) Section 11(a)(2) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(a)(2)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "40" and inserting in lieu thereof "25"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The price of a reduced-price lunch shall not exceed 25 cents.".

(b) Section 9(b)(3) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(3)) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

(c) Section 11(f) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(f)) is amended by striking out "section 9(b)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11(a)(2)".

(d) Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C 1773(b)) is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), amending the second sentence to read as follows: "The national average payment for each reduced-price breakfast shall be 15 cents less than the national average payment for each free breakfast, adjusted to the nearest one-fourth cent.";

(2) in paragraph (1)(C), striking out "30" and inserting in lieu thereof "15"; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(C), striking out "thirty" and inserting in lieu thereof "15".

ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO IMPROVE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM MEAL PATTERN

SEC. 104. (a) Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773(b)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph (3) as follows:

"(3)(A) The Secretary shall increase, by 6 cents, the annually adjusted payment for each breakfast served under this Act and section 17 of the National School Lunch Act to assist States in improving the nutritional quality of such breakfasts, to the extent feasible.

"(B) Expenditures of funds from State and local sources for the maintenance of the breakfast program shall not be diminished as a result of funds received under this paragraph.".

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall review and revise the nutrition requirements for meals served under the school breakfast program to improve the nutritional quality of such meals, taking into consideration both the findings of the National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs and the need to provide increased flexibility in meal planning to local school food authorities. Not later than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate regulations to implement such revisions.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE COSTS

SEC. 105. Section 6(e) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755(e)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation "(e)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) Each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available to the States, for the transportation and storage of commodities donated under this section, an amount equal to 3 percent of the value of such food. No State may charge recipient agencies for the distribution of such commodities an amount that is in excess of the State's direct cost of transporting and storing such commodities for recipient agencies minus the amount provided by the Secretary to the State under this subsection.".

RESTORATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS

SEC. 106. (a) Section 12(d)(5) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(d)(5)) is amended by striking out ", except private schools whose average yearly tuition exceeds $1,500 per child".

(b) Section 15(c)(A) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1784(c)(A)) is amended by striking out ", except private schools whose average yearly tuition exceeds $1,500 per child".

RESTORATION OF ONE MEAL AND ONE SNACK TO THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 107. Section 17(f)(2)(B) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(f)(2)(B)) is amended by striking out "two meals and one supplement" and inserting in lieu thereof "three meals and two supplements".

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL EXPENSES FROM INCOME OF HOUSEHOLD

SEC. 108. Section 9(b)(3) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(3)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(A)" after the paragraph designation "(3)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (B) as follows:

"(B) For purposes of determining eligibility under subparagraph (A), household income shall not include amounts expended for unusually high medical payments, as determined by the Secretary, that (i) cannot be reasonably anticipated or controlled by the household, and (ii) are not recoverable through public or private sources.".

VERIFICATION LIMITATION

SEC. 109. Section 9(b)(2)(C) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", except that the Secretary may not require any such verification for any fiscal year for which funds have not been appropriated to reimburse local school food authorities for direct costs, as defined by generally accepted accounting principles, attributable to such verification. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subparagraph.".

AUTOMATIC ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS

SEC. 110. Section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (6) as follows:

"(6) Any child who is a member of a household participating in the food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1977, or a member of an AFDC assistance unit under the aid to families with dependent children program under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act in a State where the standard of eligibility for such assistance does not exceed 130 percent of the income poverty guidelines, shall be served free meals without further application or eligibility determinations. For the purposes of any verification under paragraph (2)(C) of this subsection, proof of receipt of such assistance shall be sufficient.".

RESTORATION OF CERTAIN KINDERGARTENS TO THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

SEC. 111. The first sentence of section 3(a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772(a)) is amended by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(2) kindergarten programs operating through any nonprofit school, and (3)".

RESTORATION OF PROVISION FOR FOOD SERVICE EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 112. (a) The National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting, after section 4, a new section 5 as follows:

"FOOD SERVICE EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 5. Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under the authorization contained in section 3 of this Act, $4,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of providing, during such fiscal year, food service equipment assistance for the school lunch program under this Act. The Secretary shall provide assistance under this section only to school food au-

thorities in which 60 percent or more of the lunches served in the school lunch program during the second preceding school year were served free or at a reduced price.".

(b) Section 12(d) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (8) as follows:

"(8) 'Food service equipment' means equipment used by schools in storing, preparing, or serving food for school children.".

(c) Section 17(g) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(g)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"(4) Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this section, $2,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary for the purposes of providing, during such fiscal year, food service equipment assistance for the child care food program under this section. The Secretary shall provide assistance under this paragraph only to institutions in which 60 percent or more of the meals served in the child care food program during the second preceding fiscal year were served free or at a reduced price.".

USE OF SCHOOL LUNCH FACILITIES FOR PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY

SEC. 113. Section 12 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (i) as follows:

"(i) Facilities, equipment, and personnel provided to school food authorities for programs under this Act and under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 may be used, as determined by the local educational agency, to support nonprofit nutrition programs for the elderly (including programs funded under the Older Americans Act).".

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN SPONSORS FOR THE SUMMER FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 114. (a) Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761) is amended by—

(1) in the second sentence of subsection (a)(1)—

(A) inserting "private nonprofit organizations," after "county governments," in clause (B);

(B) redesignating clause (E) as clause (F); and

(C) inserting after clause (D) a new clause (E) as follows:

"(E) 'private nonprofit organizations' means only such organizations (including summer camps) that (i) operate at not more than 15 sites (or, if a waiver under subsection (i)(2) of this section is granted, at not more than 20 sites) and (ii) use self-preparation facilities to prepare meals or obtain meals from a public facility (such as a school district, public hospital, or State university);"; and

(2) inserting, after subsection (h), a new subsection (i) as follows:

"(i)(1) A private nonprofit organization shall be eligible to participate in programs under this section during any year as a service provider only if the organization—

"(A) operates in an area where a school food authority or the local, municipal, or county government has not indicated by March 1 of such year that such authority or such unit of government will operate a program under this section in such year;

"(B) exercises full control and authority over the operation of the food service programs under this section at all sites under its sponsorship;

"(C) provides ongoing year-round activities for children;

"(D) demonstrates adequate management and fiscal capacity to operate programs under this section; and

"(E) meets applicable State and local health, safety, and sanitation standards.

"(2) The Secretary may waive the limitation to 15 sites under subsection (a)(1)(E) of this section and permit a private nonprofit organization under this section to operate at up to 20 sites if such organization demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that a need for such additional sites exists and that such organization has the capability to serve such additional sites.".

EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 115. Section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(i)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation "(i)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not more than 2.5 percent of any State's allocation under this section for supplemental foods for any fiscal year may be expended by such State for expenses incurred under this section for supplemental foods during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the sums were appropriated.".

COSTS FOR NUTRITION SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 116. (a) Section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(b)) is amended by—

(1) striking out paragraph (1);

(2) redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) adding, after paragraph (3), as redesignated by clause (2) of this subsection, a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"(4) 'Costs for nutrition services and administration' means costs for certification of eligibility of persons for participation in the program (including costs for centrifuges, measuring boards, spectrophotometers, and scales used for such certification), food delivery, monitoring, nutrition education, outreach, start-up expenses, and general administration applicable to implementation of the program under this section (such as costs for staff, warehouse facilities, transportation, insurance, developing and printing food instruments, and administration of State and local agency offices), and other appropriate costs for nutrition services and administration.".

(b) Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) is amended by—

(1) striking out "administrative funds" each place it appears in subsections (f)(11), (h)(2), (h)(3), and (h)(4), and inserting in lieu thereof "funds covering costs for nutrition services and administration"; and

(2) striking out "administrative costs" each place it appears in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "costs for nutrition services and administration".

IMPROVING STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

SEC. 117. The second sentence of section 17(g) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(g)) is amended by inserting "providing technical assistance to improve State agency administrative systems," after "health benefits,".

COORDINATION WITH AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM

SEC. 118. Section 17(f)(1)(K) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(1)(K)) is amended by inserting "with the aid to families with dependent children program," after "child abuse counseling,".

PAPERWORK REDUCTION

SEC. 119. Section 17(h)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(1)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The Secretary shall limit any documentation required under the preceding sentence to a minimal level.".

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 120. (a) Section 17(k)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(k)(1)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The Secretary shall fill any vacancy in the Council within ninety days.".

(b) Section 17(k)(3) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(k)(3)) is amended by—

(1) in the first sentence, inserting "and shall ensure that the Council meets at least once every twelve months" immediately before the period; and

(2) striking out the second sentence.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 121. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the provisions of this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) The amendments made by sections 106 and 111 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that each school food authority may elect to delay implementation of any such amendments to a date not later than July 1, 1984.

(c) Not later than sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue final regulations to implement the amendments made by section 108. The amendments made by section 108 shall take effect on issuance of such final regulations, except that each school food authority may elect to delay implementation of the amendments to a date not later than July 1, 1984.

(d) The amendments made by sections 103, 104(a), and 107 shall take effect on the first day of the first month following the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) The amendments made by section 101(a), 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, and 118 shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977

PREPARED MEALS FOR THE ELDERLY AND DISABLED

SEC. 201. Section 3(g) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(g)) is amended by striking out "contract with the appropriate agency of the State to offer meals for such persons at concessional prices" in clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "offer meals to such persons at low or concessional prices under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary".

DEFINITION OF HOUSEHOLD

SEC. 202. Section 3(i) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(i)) is amended by striking out ", if the income (as determined under section 5(d)) of the others, excluding the spouse, does not exceed the poverty line, as described in section 5(c)(1), by more than 65 per centum" in the second sentence.

THRIFTY FOOD PLAN

SEC. 203. The second sentence of section 3(o) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(o)) is amended by—

(1) redesignating clauses (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8), as clauses (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9), respectively;

(2) inserting, after clause (3), a new clause (4) as follows: "(4) effective October 1, 1985, make cost adjustments in the thrifty food plan for any State that imposes a tax on the retail sale of food purchased with coupons (other than a tax on prepared food sold by restaurants or similar establishments and purchased with coupons, as authorized by this Act) to reflect the increased cost that results from the tax,"; and

(3) striking out ", reduce the cost of such diet by 1 per centum," in clause (8), as redesignated by clause (1).

DEFINITION OF DISABLED MEMBER OF A HOUSEHOLD

SEC. 204. Section 3(r) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(r)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "or" after the semicolon at the end of clause (1); and

(2) Striking out clauses (2) through (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a new clause (3) as follows:

"(2) receives benefits, assistance, or payments under any Federal or State statute based on a determination of blindness or disability under criteria that the Secretary determines are the same as, or provide for substantially the same degree of disability or blindness as, the criteria for disability or blindness in sections 216(i) and 223(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 416(i) and 423(d)).".

CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN HOUSEHOLDS

SEC. 205. (a) Section 5(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation and adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) Any household that has applied for assistance under this Act and in which each member is a recipient of benefits under a State plan approved under Part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, or supplemental security income benefits under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, shall be deemed to meet the requirements of this section and section 6 of this Act except for (A) the requirements set out in subsections (b), (f), and (g) of section 6 and (B) if the household contains an individual described in section 6(f)(2)(B), the income and resource requirements of subsections (a) through (i) of this section.".

(b) Section 11(i) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2020(i)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No household shall have its application to participate in the food stamp program denied or its benefits under the food stamp program terminated solely on the basis that its application to participate has been denied or its benefits have been terminated under any of the program carried out under the statutes specified in section 5(a)(2) without a separate determination by the State agency that the household fails to satisfy the eligibility requirements for participation in the food stamp program under this Act.".

(c) Section 17(d) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2026(d)) is repealed.

DEDUCTIONS FROM INCOME

SEC. 206. Section 5(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "18 per centum" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "20 per centum";

(2) in the fourth sentence—

(A) striking out "or" at the end of clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "and"; and

(B) striking out ", or" at the end of clause (2) and all that follows down to the period at the end of the sentence; and

(3) striking out "exclusive of special diets, that exceed $35 a month" in clause (A) of the eighth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "including any additional expenses resulting from physician-prescribed special dietary programs, that exceed 5 per centum of the household income".

PROSPECTIVE AND RETROSPECTIVE ACCOUNTING

SEC. 207. (a) Section 5(f)(2) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(f)(2)) is amended by—

(1) amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

"(B) Household income for all other households shall be calculated either on a prospective basis as provided in paragraph (3)(A) or on a retrospective basis as provided in paragraph (3)(B), as elected by the State agency under regulations prescribed by the Secretary."; and

(2) striking out subparagraph (C).

(b) The first sentence of section 6(c)(1) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2015(c)(1)) is amended by inserting "that elect to use a system of retrospective accounting in accordance with section 5(f) of this Act" after "State agencies".

EMERGENCY ALLOTMENT INCREASE

SEC. 208. The third sentence of section 5(f)(3)(B)) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 214 (f)(3)(B)) is amended by inserting "and for supplementing allotments of households that experience sudden and significant losses of income of more than $100 in a month" before the period at the end thereof.

SEC. 209. (a) Section 5(g) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(g)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "$1,500" and "$3,000" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,250" and "$3,500", respectively; and

(2) striking out "$4,500" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,500".

(b) Section 5(j) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(j)) is amended to read as follows:

"(j)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) through (i), the Secretary shall prescribe the manner and the period of time, not to exceed four months, in which, for any household located in an high unemployment area, as defined in paragraph (2), personal property that is not otherwise excluded from the resource limitations relating to nonliquid assets prescribed under subsection (g) must be disposed of in order not to be included in the resources of such household for purposes of determining the eligibility of the household for participation in the food stamp program. Any coupons issued to a household during the period for which disposal of property is prescribed under the preceding sentence shall be conditioned on the disposal of the property and shall be considered an overissuance if—

"(A) at the time of the disposal, it is determined that the coupons would not have been issued if the disposal had occurred at the beginning of the period for which such coupons were issued, or

"(B) at the end of the authorized disposal period, the property is not disposed of by the household.

"(2)(A) For the purpose of this subsection, 'high unemployment area' means (i) an area classified as a surplus labor area by the Department of Labor or (ii) a civil jurisdiction, as defined in subparagraph (B), in which the unadjusted unemployment rate, as determined monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, has not been less than 10 percent during the most recent 6-month period for which information is available.

"(B) For purposes of this subsection, 'civil jurisdiction' means—

"(i) a city with a population of 50,000 or more people, based on the most recently available Bureau of the Census estimates; or

"(ii) a town or township in the State of New Jersey, New York, Michigan, or Pennsylvania with a population of 50,000 or more people, based on the most recently available Bureau of the Census estimates, that possesses powers and functions similar to those of cities; or

"(iii) a county or parish, except those counties or parishes that contain any civil jurisdiction included in clause (i) or (ii) of this subparagraph; or

"(iv) a balance of county or parish consisting of a county or parish less any component civil jurisdiction included in clause (i) or (ii) of this subparagrph; or

"(v) a county equivalent that is a town in the State of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, or Connecticut.

"(3) The Secretary shall obtain from the Department of Labor information necessary to determine which areas and civil jurisdictions in each State are high unemployment areas for the purposes of this subsection and shall supply such information to the State agencies.".

COUPON ISSUANCE

SEC. 210. Section 11(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (20) and (21) as paragraphs (21) and (22), respectively; and

(2) inserting, after paragraph (19), a new paragraph (20) as follows:

"(20) at the option of the State agency, for the staggered issuance of coupons to recipients throughout the month: *Provided,* That, in the case of the initial or any subsequent change in the date of issuance to a household under this paragraph, there shall be no more than thirty-five days between issuances of coupons to the household;".

OUTREACH FOR HOUSEHOLDS WITH ELDERLY, DISABLED, OR YOUNG MEMBERS

SEC. 211. Section 11(e)(1) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(1)) is amended by inserting after the word "activities" in subparagraph (A) the following: ", except those activities directed at households that include at least one member who is elderly or disabled or under six years of age,".

HOMELESS PERSONS

SEC. 212. (a) The first sentence of section 3(i) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(i)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "home" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "his or hers"; and

(2) striking out "home" at each place it appears in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "their own".

(b) Section 11(e)(5) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(5)) is amended by inserting, before the semicolon at the end thereof, the following: ", and the specific methods to be used by the State agency for certifying, and issuing coupons to, an eligible household that does not reside at a per-

manent dwelling or does not have a fixed mailing address".

HOURS OF OPERATIONS

SEC. 213. Section 16(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2025(b)) is amended by inserting "including standards for the hours that food stamp offices are to be opened during the day, week, or month to better serve persons who are employed," after the comma at the end of clause (1).

ERROR RATES

SEC. 214. Section 16(d)(2)(A) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)(2)(A)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "fiscal year 1984" in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years 1984 and 1985"; and

(2) striking out "1985" in clause (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1986".

REFUND OF STATE SALES TAX

SEC. 215. Section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (h) as follows:

"(h)(1) If a State participates in the food stamp program in any fiscal year and in such fiscal year imposes a tax on the retail sale of food purchased with coupons (other than a tax on prepared food sold by restaurants or similar establishments and purchased with coupons, as authorized by this Act), the State shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury as soon as practicable after the end of such fiscal year, but not later than the end of the following fiscal year unless a longer period of time is authorized for the transfer by the Secretary of the Treasury, an amount equal to the total value of coupons redeemed during the fiscal year by retail food stores in the State, as determined by the Secretary, multiplied by the rate of tax imposed by the State on the sale of food purchased with coupons. The amount required to be transferred by the preceding sentence may be adjusted by the Secretary to reflect (A) any change in the rate of the tax during the fiscal year, (B) the portion of any refund for overissuance of coupons collected by the State agency during the fiscal year that can be attributable to tax paid on food purchased in the State with such coupons, (C) the number of retail food stores in the State whose sales involving payment with coupons are not subject to the tax, and (D) the portion of the coupons redeemed in the State during the fiscal year that the Secretary determines were not redeemed for food purchases.

"(2) If a State fails to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of funds described in paragraph (1)—

"(A) the Secretary of the Treasury shall notify the Secretary of such failure; and

"(B) the Secretary may withhold, from funds that the State would otherwise be entitled to receive under subsection (a), the amount that the State failed to pay.".

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 216. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the provisions of this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue final regulations to implement the amendments made by sections 202, 206(1) and (2), 208, 209(a), and 211, and such amendments shall take effect on issuance of such final regulations.

(c) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue final regulations to implement the amendments made by sections 201, 204, 205, 206(3), 209(b), 210, 212, and 213, and such amendments shall take effect on issuance of such final regulations.

(d) The amendments made by sections 203 and 215 shall take effect on October 1, 1982.

ORGANIZATIONAL ENDORSERS OF THE ANTI-HUNGER ACT OF 1984

American Association of Retired Persons.
American Camping Association.
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.
American Public Health Association.
American School Food Service Association.[1]
Bread for the World.
Camp Fire, Inc.
Center for Science in the Public Interest.
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
Child Care Food Program Sponsors Forum.
Child Welfare League of America.
Children's Defense Fund.
The Children's Foundation.
Communications Workers of America.
Community Nutrition Institute.
Cooperative League of the U.S.A.
Council for American Private Education.
Council of Chief State School Officers.
Council of Great City Schools.
Food Research and Action Center.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
Health, U.S.A.
Interfaith Action for Economic Justice.[2]
International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
Iowa Advocator Welfare Answering Service.
Lutheran Council.
Lutheran Family and Child Services of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.
League of United Latin American Citizens.
League of Women Voters of the United States.
Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund.
National Anti-Hunger Coalition.
National Association of Counties.
National Association of Wheat Growers.
National Black Child Development Institute.
National Coalition of Title I Parents.
National Consumers League.
National Council of LaRaza.
National Council of Senior Citizens.
National Farmers Union.
The National Institute of Hispanic Children and Families.
The National Milk Producers Federation.
The National PTA.
National Rural Housing Coalition.
National School Board Association.[1]
National Urban League.
Public Voice for Food and Health Policy.
Rural American Women.
Rural Coalition.
Service Employees International Union.
Society for Nutrition Education.
United Auto Workers.
United Food and Commercial Workers.
U.S. Conference of Mayors.
Vermont Food Stamp Advisory Council.
World Hunger Education Service.
Women's Equity Action League.

---

[1] Does not have a board policy on food stamps and, therefore, reserves its endorsement for the child nutrition provisions of the Anti-Hunger Act of 1984.

[2] A coalition of 26 national Protestant, Jewish, Roman Catholic, and ecumenical agencies that work together.

SUMMARY OF THE ANTI-HUNGER ACT OF 1984

Title I of the bill would amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Title II of the bill would amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

The major provisions of title I would—

(1) Reauthorize, for fiscal years 1985 through 1988, funding for the Summer Food Service Program for Children, the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), certain State administrative expenses, and the Commodity Distribution Program;

(2) Provide a permanent authorization of $8 million annually to carry out the nutrition education and training program;

(3) Lower the cost to the student of a reduced-price lunch from 40 cents to 25 cents;

(4) Lower the cost to the student of a reduced-price breakfast from 30 cents to 15 cents;

(5) Improve the nutritional quality of breakfasts served by providing an additional reimbursement of 6 cents for each breakfast served;

(6) Provide funds to the States for the storage and distribution of USDA entitlement commodities in an amount equal to 3 percent of the value of the commodities donated;

(7) Allow private schools with an average yearly tuition in excess of $1,500 again to participate in the child nutrition programs;

(8) Restore the reimbursement made to institutions and day care organizations under the child care food program to three meals and two supplements served per day per child;

(9) In determining eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals, provide a special hardship deduction for students from families with unusually high medical payments that cannot be reasonably anticipated or controlled;

(10) Provide that any requirement by the Secretary that local school districts verify the income information on applications for free and reduced-price meals be conditioned on funds being appropriated to assist such districts in carrying out such verification;

(11) Allow children in certain kindergarten programs to participate in the special milk program;

(12) Provide food service equipment assistance to those schools and child care centers in which 60 percent or more of the meals served in the second preceding year were served free or at a reduced price;

(13) Clarify that school feeding facilities, equipment, and personnel participating in federally-assisted school meal programs may be used to support nonprofit nutrition programs for the elderly;

(14) If by March 1, a school food authority or a local government agency does not intend to operate a summer feeding program in an eligible area, permit certain nonprofit private organizations to operate such a program in an eligible area if the organization has facilities for the preparation of meals or obtain meals from a public facility;

(15) For purposes of carrying out the WIC program, authorize approriation levels at $1.52 billion, $1.63 billion, $1.77 billion, and $1.92 billion for fiscal years 1985 through 1988, respectively; and

(16) Require the Secretary of Agriculture to fill vacancies on the National Advisory Council on Material, Infant, and Fetal Nutrition within 90 days and to hold Council meetings at least once every twelve months.

The major provisions of title II would—

(1) Allow elderly or disabled persons to purchase low-priced prepared meals from restaurants or similar establishments under the food stamp program;

(2) Permit an elderly person who is unable to purchase and prepare food (and the person's spouse) to be considered a separate food stamp household even if the elderly person lives with others whose income is 65 percent above the poverty line;

(3) Adjust the thrifty food plan to cover 100 percent of the cost of the diet;

(4) And provide for the cost of the thrifty food plan to be adjusted upward for States that tax the retail sale of food;

(5) Define "disabled member" of a household, for purposes of the food stamp program, as a person who receives payments, assistance, or benefits under Federal or State programs based on a determination of blindness or disability under criteria which are the same, or substantially the same, as those in title II of the Social Security Act;

(6) Make households in which all members are recipients of AFDC and supplemental security benefits under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act categorically eligible for participation in the food stamp program;

(7) Restore the food stamp earned income deduction to 20 percent of income (under existing law, it is 18 percent of income);

(8) Provide for separate dependent care and excess rent deductions, each with a maximum at the current level;

(9) Provide that additional expenses associated with physician-prescribed special diets will be included as a deductible medical expense for elderly and disabled;

(10) Change the threshold for the elderly or disabled excess medical expense deduction from $35 to 5 percent of the monthly household income;

(11) Reauthorize a State option for either prospective or retrospective accounting of income by food stamp households, and require monthly reporting of income only for certain categories of recipients whose benefits are calculated on a retrospective basis;

(12) Authorize the increase in a household's food stamp allotment if the household experiences a sudden loss of income of $100 or more in a month;

(13) Increase the limits on resources for nonelderly or disabled food stamp recipients from $1,500 to $2,250; for elderly or disabled from $3,000 to $3,500, and increase the limit on automobiles from $4,500 to $5,500;

(14) Allow otherwise eligible households in areas of high unemployment to receive food stamps on the condition that certain excess nonliquid assets owned by them are sold within a four month period and provide that coupons received by them during that period are to be treated as an overissuance when the property is sold;

(15) Provide for a State option to issue coupons on a staggered basis;

(16) Authorize States to use funds appropriated for the food stamp program to conduct outreach programs directed at households with elderly, disabled, or very young members;

(17) Ensure that homeless persons are given the opportunity to participate in the food stamp program;

(18) Provide authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to set standards for the hours during which State food stamp offices are to be opened in order to better serve employed individuals;

(19) Maintain the current 7 percent level at which sanctions are imposed against States for errors in the program for fiscal year 1985, and postpone the reduction in the level to 5 percent until fiscal year 1986; and

(20) Require any State which imposes a tax on the sale of food purchased with food stamp coupons to refund the amount of tax collected on such purchases to the Secretary of the Treasury.●

By Mr. BENTSEN:

S. 2608. A bill to establish the farm and crop acreage base and program yield system to provide more efficient, equitable, flexible, and predictable programs for farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

AGRICULTURAL EFFICIENCY AND EQUITY ACT

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to provide farmers with a dependable, rational system of determining their base acreages for participation in our farm programs. Identical legislation, H.R. 4565, has been introduced in the House by Congressman CHARLES STENHOLM of Texas.

Congressman STENHOLM comes from a farm background also, and his firsthand knowledge of the day-to-day problems of farmers seeking to participate in government has made him an effective spokesman for the farmers of Texas and the Nation. This legislation is the result of an extensive survey conducted last year by Congressman STENHOLM of problems that farmers have with our farm programs.

This bill will write into permanent law a standard method of determining farm base acreages for the various crops covered by Federal farm programs. If a farmer does not have an acreage base for a crop, then he generally cannot participate in the farm price support program for that crop. Under our current system, farmers are continually but needlessly subjected to erratic changes in the method of determining farm base acreages. This makes it impossible to plan with any certainty even 1 year ahead for a crop rotation, even though farmers need to be able to plan ahead for several years in many cases to develop the most efficient farm plan.

All programs to reduce production must start from an established base of some kind. Almost all farmers have had problems at one time or another with the Government in determining their crop base. A major part of the problem is that the method of computation of this base can and does change with each farm bill and even with individual years' farm programs during the 4 years of a farm bill. Some individuals are invariably trapped and caused hardship whenever a change is made.

For example, the farm bases for 1982, the first under the current farm bill, were established on the basis of the farmers' plantings in 1980 and 1981. Texas farmers who happened to plant cotton in 1980 and 1981 were thus assigned a cotton base for 1982. Many of these farmers then felt forced to plant that acreage in cotton in 1982, even though they might have wanted to plant wheat or some other crop. They did so simply to keep from losing their cotton base.

Other farmers switched to wheat in 1982, often planting large acreages to average in with previous years in order to get a significant acreage base established for 1983. However, instead of averaging in the 1982 plantings to set the 1983 bases, the 1983 bases were frozen at the 1982 levels. Farmers who wanted to change their crop base for 1983 found that they could not do so. And on top of that they were stuck with a lot of very cheap wheat in 1982 without any protection from the Federal wheat price support program.

They and their neighbors learned from that bitter experience, and now they often plant whatever crop base they have just to avoid losing it. A farmer who accidentally got a cotton base may keep planting cotton instead of switching to wheat, simply because a switch to wheat might leave him with no wheat base and no cotton base.

This bill would remedy that problem by establishing a new system for setting these bases and writing it into permanent law. The new system would establish a total cropland acreage figure for each farm based on a 5-year moving average of acres planted in farm program crops. Using a moving average allows new land to be added, but over a 5-year period.

An acreage base for each crop would also be set. Flexibility is allowed by permitting the farmer to switch up to 25 percent of his total farm from one crop to another each year, with a limitation that acreage in any one crop can increase by no more than 100 percent in any 1 year.

Farm program yields would be set by a 5-year moving average of actual yields. Needed protection against catastrophic failures, such as last year's drought, would be provided by limiting changes in the farm program yield to no more than 10 percent per year.

This legislation will provide farmers with the certainty that they can plan ahead for changes in their cropping patterns without risking the loss of their eligibility to participate in Federal farm programs. Farmers do not have to participate in these farm programs, and they do not have to use the methods established in this legislation to change their cropping patterns. However, this bill will, for the first time, guarantee farmers that they can change crops and still retain farm program eligibility by following a simple and unchanging set of guidelines.

The details of a new base acreage system are important and deserve careful consideration. I expect that

this bill will be revised and improved. However, even more important is the hope for improved stability which this concept holds for American farmers. Some version of this bill needs to be enacted into law so that our farmers can plan ahead.

I think it is high time that the Federal Government stopped playing silly games with an issue as serious as eligibility for our farm programs. The vagaries of the weather and marketplace are more than enough for farmers to contend with already. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation to bring needed consistency and dependability to our farm programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

SHORT SUMMARY OF BILL

1. Writes into permanent law a system of determining acreage bases, rather than having those changed in each farm bill.

2. A Farm Acreage Base (FAB) would be established for each farm growing a farm program crop. The Farm Acreage Base would be the total acreage planted to program crops and would be set equal to the average acreage planted over the last 5 years. The Farm Acreage Base will be a 5-year moving average and will be updated each year.

3. A Crop Acreage Base (CAB) would be established for each program crop. It will be a 5-year moving average of acreage planted to each crop, but can be easily changed by the farmer if he wants to switch crops. The Farm Acreage Base cannot exceed the sum of the Crop Acreage Bases (unlike current programs.)

4. Flexibility will be allowed by permitting farmers to switch up to 25 percent of their Farm Acreage Base from one Crop Acreage Base to another each year. This will be limited by providing that no individual Crop Acreage Base can be increased by more than 100 percent in one year.

5. The Program Yield for each crop will be the five year moving average of previous yields, dropping the high and low years and disregarding any year in which the crop was not planted, except that the Program Yield cannot be raised or lowered by more than 10 percent in any one year.

6. County ASCS committees, which are elected by and from local farmers, are authorized to make adjustments in bases and yields for individual circumstances.

7. This would not go into effect until the 1986 crop year.●

By Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself and Mr. GORTON):

S. 2609. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with regard to mobile source emissions control; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

AIRBORNE LEAD REDUCTION ACT OF 1984

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which would place a ban on the sale of leaded gasoline by 1988. I offer this because I have become convinced that lead in our environment is a significant health problem, particularly for children in urban areas.

The dangers of exposure to lead have long been recognized. Our past efforts in controlling lead exposure have been largely centered on leaded paints. But numerous reports have indicated that airborne lead is the most serious source of exposure, and 95 percent of airborne lead can be attributed to automobile emissions.

Congress first addressed the need to control harmful automobile emissions in the Clear Air Act of 1963. Subsequent amendments require modifications in automobile engineering to reduce a variety of pollutants. The industry responded by developing catalytic converters to remove or convert toxic emissions. However, the use of lead as a gasoline additive interferes with the catalysts and as a result, 1975 and later models are designed to run on unleaded gasoline.

The Environmental Protection Agency has developed a regulatory program to reduce the amount of lead in unleaded gasoline. The oil industry developed new refining techniques to meet these standards and to achieve the octane levels formerly met with lead. New industries were created to produce the additives that replace lead as an octane enhancer.

It was generally estimated that with these regulations and the new automobile technology, leaded gasoline would largely disappear from the market by 1990. But today leaded gasoline is still 45 percent of the gasoline market.

There are two principal reasons for this. The first are the two recessions which we experienced in the late 1970's and early 1980's. Individuals and families did not buy or trade their pre-1975 cars as quickly as expected. Pre-1975 cars make up 35 percent of today's highway fleet.

The other factor is called putting leaded gasoline in cars designed for unleaded fuels. Misfueling, by EPA estimates, occurs at an average rate of 13 to 16 percent.

Although the problem of misfueling and a ban on leaded gasoline have been connected in recent press accounts and several EPA studies, they are in fact, separate issues. Misfueling disables catalytic converters that are designed to prevent carbon monoxide, hydrocarbon, and nitrogen oxide emissions. The purpose of a ban on leaded gasoline is not to prevent misfueling—although it has that effect—but primarily to reduce lead emissions.

The misfueling problem has already been addressed by the Committee on Environment and Public Works during markup of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1984. But the problem of airborne lead has yet to be considered by Congress.

It has always been known that lead at high blood levels is toxic. But numerous studies released this winter, by private organizations as well as EPA, reveal startling statistics indicating that lead is also more dangerous at lower levels than previously estimated.

In today's urban areas, airborne lead exceeds 4,000 to 5,000 times its natural concentrations. Estimates indicate that auto emissions account for 35 percent to 45 percent of the blood lead found in children, especially those between the ages of 1 and 6.

Children with high lead blood levels can suffer irrepairable brain damage, mental retardation, and even death. Children with low blood lead levels do more poorly on intelligence tests, have higher incidence of speech impairment, fail more frequently academically, and require more psychiatric referrals.

In adults, lead is known to damage the kidney, the liver, the reproductive system, blood creation, basic cellular processes, and brain functions.

For these reasons the Environmental Protection Agency has been considering a ban on leaded gasoline. Last week EPA released its study on the costs and benefits of reducing lead in gasoline. This report overwhelmingly supports existing data on the health hazards of lead and further outlines other significant benefits that would result from the use of unleaded gasoline. A lead ban appears technologically feasible and more than justified from a cost-benefit perspective. By EPA's estimates we will save more in auto repairs alone than the costs of retrofitting refineries to produce unleaded gasoline.

As lead is reduced or eliminated as an additive, nontoxic substances must be used to replace it as an octane enhancer. The most environmentally sound replacement for lead is fuel ethanol. Refineries will not have to upgrade much if they replace the lead additive with ethanol to achieve the same octane rating. Further, fuel ethanol's proven performance record is accepted by the major automobile manufacturers who extend their warranty to cover vehicles fueled with a 10-percent ethanol/gasoline blend.

The bill I am introducing today would assist EPA in their efforts to reduce the amount of lead in the air. It amends section 211 of the Clean Air Act to make it unlawful for anyone to sell, offer for sale, or introduce into commerce, leaded gasoline for highway vehicle use. It further provides for EPA to allow limited sales of leaded gasoline. This provision will address the concerns of those who own vehicles with engines which require lead as a lubricant.

Mr. President, I urge early Senate action on this legislation and ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be inserted in the RECORD. Thank you.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2609

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Airborne Lead Reduction Act of 1984."

SEC. 2. (a) Findings. The Congress finds that—

(1) Ambient air concentrations of lead exceed 4,000 to 5,000 times its natural conditions;

(2) Automobile emissions account for 35% to 45% of the blood lead found in children, especially those between the ages of one and six;

(3) Lead is known to damage the kidney, liver, the reproductive system, blood creation, basic cellular process and brain functions.

(4) Children with high lead blood levels suffer irrepairable brain damage, mental retardation and even death, while children with low lead blood levels do more poorly on intelligence tests, have a higher incidence of speech impairment, fail more frequently academically and require more psychiatric referrals;

(5) The Environmental Protection Agency, under section 211 of the Clean Air Act has made great strides in reducing the amount of lead used in gasoline;

(6) Because a significant correlation exists between the reduction of lead in gasoline and lower lead blood levels, a ban on the sale of leaded gasoline is the most cost effective way to further reduce levels of airborne lead and further reduce the health hazards of lead.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to ban the sale of leaded gasoline except for limited quantities as determined by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SEC. 3. Section 211 of the Clean Air Act is amended adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h)(a) Not later than January 1, 1988, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell, offer for sale, or introduce into commerce, leaded gasoline for general use as a fuel for any highway motor vehicle. Under regulations promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency leaded gasoline may be offered for limited sales."●

By Mr. MCCLURE (for himself, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. FORD, Mr. GARN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HECHT, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. GORTON):

S.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to designate June 13, 1984, as "Harmon Killebrew Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HARMON KILLEBREW DAY

● Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. President, it is my distinct pleasure to rise today to introduce a Senate joint resolution to designate June 13 as "Harmon Killebrew Day."

As most of my colleagues know, Harmon Killebrew got his first start in professional baseball in Washington DC, with the old Washington Senators. He was discovered by former U.S. Senator Herman Welker of Idaho, who convinced Clark Griffith, then president of the Washington Senators, to sign the slugging youngster before his 18th birthday. At the same time, in 1954, the University of Oregon was heavily recruiting Harmon to play quarterback on their football team.

What most of my colleagues do not know, is that Harmon and I both grew up in Payette, ID. Unfortunately, this is about where the similarities between us stop.

I have never been compared to Babe Ruth, but Harmon has on many occasions. In his heyday, Harmon's home run ability was frequently compared to the Bambino's. Harmon could hit a baseball as far as anybody and his legendary ability is marked with x's in Bloomington's Municipal Stadium so fans can gaze and wonder how any human being can hit a baseball so hard, so far, and so often.

During his 17 full seasons and parts of several others, Harmon led the league in home runs in 7 seasons and amassed an amazing 573 home runs, fifth among baseball's all-time home run leaders. Had he not been robbed of long stretches of playing time due to injury, there is no telling what this total would have been. Harmon's best season was 1969 when he batted .276, hit 49 home runs, had 140 runs batted in, had a fielding average of .975, and was the American League's most valuable player.

Harmon hit a home run every 14.2 times at bat. Only Babe Ruth hit more home runs more frequently, connecting every 11.76 times at bat. Baseball purists insist that the true test of a home run hitter is the ratio of homers hit to the number of times at bat, or homer percentage. As it is listed in the Baseball Encyclopedia, Babe's homer percentage was 8.5, meaning that he hit 8½ homers for every 100 official times up. In comparison, the great Hank Aaron and Willie Mays are tied for 10th at 6.1. Harmon Killebrew ranks third with a percentage of 7 homers per 100 at bats.

Not only was Harmon a great home run hitter, but he was an extremely versatile player, willing and able to play almost any position on the field. When the Senators moved from Washington to Minneapolis, Harmon arrived as a second baseman. He was soon switched to third base, then became the team's regular left fielder. Later, he was moved back to first base and then again back to third.

Harmon certainly was not being shuffled around in an effort to shuffle him out the door. Because of his immense talent the team was able to move him around to whatever position they needed him the most. His versatility was so great that he is honored by being the first major leaguer to have been selected to the All Star team at three positions—first base, third base, and left field. Harmon was also a member of 13 All Star teams.

Earlier this year, Harmon Killebrew was bestowed the highest honor in baseball; he was elected to baseball's Hall of Fame and will stand prominently among baseball's greats in Cooperstown. During his career in Washington, some knew him as "the Senator's Senator".

Since his retirement, Harmon has been very active in several worthy causes, the most prominent has been the Danny Thompson Leukemia Foundation. Danny Thompson was a second baseman for the Minnesota Twins who died of leukemia at the age of 26. In the few years since Harmon Killebrew and former Congressman Ralph Harding started the foundation it has raised over $400,000 for leukemia research. The money is raised primarily through the Danny Thompson Memorial golf tournament held annually in Sun Valley, Idaho.

While I enjoy the game of baseball as much as anybody, I do not have an eye for baseball talent like my former colleague, Senator Welker. However, I do have an eye for a truly fine human being and that is Harmon Killebrew. I am proud to offer this resolution honoring my good friend Harmon Killebrew, and ask that all of my colleagues join me in cosponsoring this joint resolution designating June 13, 1984 as "Harmon Killebrew Day."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 285

Whereas Harmon Killebrew was named to Major League Baseball's Hall of Fame on January 10, 1984;

Whereas Harmon Killebrew was a member of 11 American League All-Star squads and was the first American League player elected at three positions—first and third bases and the outfield;

Whereas next to Babe Ruth, Harmon Killebrew is the most prolific home run hitter in American League history;

Whereas Harmon Killebrew had eight seasons of at least 40 home runs and eight years of 110 runs batted in;

Whereas Harmon Killebrew was the American League's Most Valuable Player in 1969, when he hit 49 home runs, had 140 runs batted in, and had a fielding average of .975;

Whereas Harmon Killebrew hit four home runs in one double header;

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That June 13, 1984, is designated "Harmon Killebrew Day", and the President is authorized and requested to

issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator McCLURE in introducing this resolution declaring June 13, 1984, Harmon Killebrew Day.

The history of American baseball and baseball in Minnesota would not be complete without including the renowned name of Harmon Clayton Killebrew. His professional baseball career, spanning 2½ decades, proved him to be one of America's outstanding athletes of the century. Playing for the Minnesota Twins from 1961 to 1975, he led the team to win the American League pennant in 1965 and on to the World Series against the Los Angeles Dodgers. Playing in more than a half dozen All Star games the twins' star hitter was the 10th major legaue batter to pass the 500 home run mark in August 1971. Nicknamed "Killer" by his fans, Harmon earned the distinction of "most valuable player" for the American League in 1969. I am very pleased that Harmon recently received an honor he so richly deserves, that is, being voted into the baseball Hall of Fame.

Summers in Minnesota were not complete without a trip on a sunny day to Met Stadium to watch the Twins play baseball. Inevitably, the point would come in the game when Harmon Killebrew would step up to the plate. The excitement swept through the crowd like a prairie fire. The anticipation that Killebrew would hit yet another home run brought the fans back again and again and made them devoted fans of both Harmon Killebrew and the Minnesota Twins. Harmon was a team player, his loyalty and determination were an example for his teammates.

Today, Harmon Killebrew remains one of baseball's legendary superstars whose name will always be equated with excellence in the world of American sports.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 269

At the request of Mr. McCLURE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 269, a bill to provide for the disposal of silver from the National Defense Stockpile through the issuance of silver coins.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. BYRD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to protect semiconductor chips and masks against unauthorized duplication, and for other purposes.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), and the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1651, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for presumption of service connection to be estabished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for certain diseases of certain veterans exposed to dioxin or radiation during service in the Armed Forces; to require the administrator to develop, through process of public participation and subject to judicial review, regulations specifying standards for the presumptions applicable to the resolution of claims for disability compensation based on such exposures; to require that such regulations address certain specified diseases; and to require that all claimants for Veterans' Administration benefits be given the benefit of every reasonable doubt in claims adjudications, and for other purposes.

S. 1884

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1884, a bill to relieve the Elephant Butte Irrigation District of certain repayment obligations and for other purposes.

S. 2207

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2207, a bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to assure, through mandatory income withholding, incentive payments to States, and other improvements in the child support enforcement program, that all children in the United States who are in need of assistance in securing financial support from their parents will receive such assistance regardless of their circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 2266

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HECHT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HUMPHREY) were withdrawn as cosponsors of S. 2266, a bill to grant a Federal charter to Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. EAGLETON, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2374, a bill to extend the authorization for 5 years for the low-income home energy assistance program, for the community services block grant, and for the Head Start program, and for other purposes.

S. 2422

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2422, a bill to provide a program of planning grants, demonstration grants, and formula grants to assist local educational agencies to improve the basic skills of economically disadvantaged secondary school students, and for other purposes.

S. 2476

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2476, a bill to provide for a pay increase for article III judges subject to salary adjustments pursuant to section 461 of title 28 of the United States Code.

S. 2490

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2490, a bill to amend and extend the Library Services and Construction Act.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 228

At the request of Mr. RANDOLPH, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 228, a joint resolution to designate the week of May 20, 1984, through May 26, 1984 as "National Digestive Diseases Awareness Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 246

At the request of Mr. BAKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 246, a joint resolution strongly urging the President to secure a full accounting of Americans captured or missing in action in Southeast Asia, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 254

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 254, a joint resolution to designate the month of October 1984 as "National Down's Syndrome Month".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 258

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 258, a joint resolution to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984 as "National Safety in the Workplace Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 270

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 270, a joint resolution designating the week of July 1 through July 8, 1984, as "National Duck Stamp Week" and 1984 as the "Golden Anniversary Year of the Duck Stamp".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 279

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 279, a joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 283

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 283, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 284

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 284, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 2, 1984, as "National School Age Child Care Awareness Week".

SENATE RESOLUTION 127

At the request of Mr. ANDREWS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 127, a resolution to make the Select Committee on Indian Affairs a permanent committee of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

SYMMS AMENDMENT NO. 3034

Mr. SYMMS proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amendment, insert the following:

SEVEN AND ONE-HALF PERCENT REDUCTION IN SPENDING REQUIRED

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 if such concurrent resolution does not comply with the provisions of this section.

(b)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority for discretionary Federal programs which does not exceed an amount equal to the product of the total amount of budget authority provided by law for such programs for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 92.5 percent.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "discretionary Federal program" means any Federal program other than—

(A) a program classified under the functional category of National Defense in the budget submitted by the President for the applicable fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(B) a program for which spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) is provided by law.

(c)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority for the payment of obligations under spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) provided by law which does not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for such payments for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 90.5 percent.

(2) The requirements of paragraph (1) shall not apply to budget authority provided for payments under spending authority provided by titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(d) To carry out subsection (c), a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall contain provisions to require the committees described in clauses (1) through (10) of this subsection to submit, by June 1, 1984, recommendations to the Senate Committee on the Budget in accordance with such clauses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill, or resolution, or both, carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $6,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $8,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $10,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(2) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $2,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $3,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $4,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(3) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $11,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $13,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $14,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(4) The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authorty as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(5) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $500,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $300,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(6) The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(7) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $900,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $900,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by 900,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(8) The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $500,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(9) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(10) The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

COHEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3035

Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. ROTH) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following new title:

TITLE —COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING

SHORT TITLE

SEC. . 01. This title may be cited as the "Competition in Contracting Act of 1984".

Subtitle A—Amendments to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

COMPETITIVE AND NONCOMPETITIVE PROCEDURES

SEC. 11. (a) Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking out section 303 (41 U.S.C. 253) and the heading of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"COMPETITION REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 303. (a) Except as provided in subsection (e) or otherwise authorized by law, executive agencies shall use competitive procedures in making contracts for property or services. Executive agencies shall use advance procurement planning and market research and shall prepare specifications in such a manner as is necessary to obtain effective competition with due regard to the nature of the property or services to be acquired. Executive agencies shall use the competitive procedure or combination of competitive procedures that is best suited under the circumstances of the procurement action and shall specify its needs and solicit bids or proposals in a manner designed to achieve effective competition for the contract.

"(b) An executive agency may provide for the procurement of property or services in order to establish or maintain any alternative source or sources of supply under this title using competitive procedures but excluding a particular source for that property or services if the executive agency determines that to do so would (1) increase or maintain competition and would likely result in reduced overall costs for such procurement, or for any anticipated procurement, of such property or services, (2) be in the interest of industrial mobilization in case of a national emergency, or (3) be in the interest of national defense in establishing or maintaining an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States.

"(c) Procurement regulations shall include special simplified procedures and forms for small purchases to facilitate making small purchases efficiently and economically.

"(d) For other than small purchases, an executive agency, when using competitive procedures—

"(1) shall solicit sealed bids when—

"(A) time permits the solicitation, submission, and evaluation of sealed bids;

"(B) the award will be made on the basis of price and other price-related factors;

"(C) it is not necessary to conduct discussions with the responding sources about their bids; and

"(D) there is a reasonable expectation of receiving more than one sealed bid;

"(2) shall request competitive proposals when sealed bids are not required under clause (1) of this subsection.

"(e) An executive agency may use noncompetitive procedures only when—

"(1) the property or services needed by the Government are available from only one source and no other type of property or services will satisfy the needs of the executive agency;

"(2) the executive agency's need for the property or services is of such unusual and compelling urgency that the Government would be seriously injured by the delay associated with using competitive procedures;

"(3) it is necessary to award the contract to a particular source or sources in order to (A) maintain a facility, producer, manufacturer, or other supplier available for furnishing property or services in case of a national emergency, (B) achieve industrial mobilization in the case of such an emergency, or (C) establish or maintain an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States;

"(4) the terms of any international agreement or treaty between the United States Government and a foreign government or international organization, or the directions of any foreign government reimbursing the executive agency for the cost of the procurement of the property or services for such government, have the effect of requiring the use of noncompetitive procedures;

"(5) a statute authorizes or requires that the procurement be made through another executive agency or from a specified source or the agency's need is for a brand-name commercial item for authorized resale; or

"(6) the disclosure of the executive agency's needs to more than one source would compromise the national security.

"(f) For the purposes of applying subsection (e)(1)—

"(1) property or services shall be considered to be available from a source if such source has the capability to produce the property or deliver the service in accordance with the Government's specifications and delivery schedule; and

"(2) in the case of the procurement of technical or special property which has required a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and where it is likely that production by a source other than the original source would result in additional cost to the Government by reason of duplication of investment or would result in duplication of necessary preparation which would unduly delay the procurement of the property, the property may be deemed to be available only from the initial source and may be procured through noncompetitive procedures.

"(g) An executive agency may not award a contract using noncompetitive procedures unless—

"(1) the use of such procedures has been justified in writing; and

"(2) a notice has been published with respect to such contract pursuant to section 313 and all bids or proposals received in response to such notice have been considered by such executive agency.

"(h) For the purposes of the following laws, purchases or contracts made under this title using other than sealed bid procedures shall be treated as if they were made with sealed bid procedures:

"(1) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (commonly referred to as the 'Walsh-Healey Act') (41 U.S.C. 35-45).

"(2) The Act entitled 'An Act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1931 (commonly referred to as the 'Davis-Bacon Act') (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5).".

(2) by adding at the end of section 309 (41 U.S.C. 259) the following new subsections:

"(b) The term 'executive agency' has the same meaning as provided in section 4(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(a)), except that such term does not include the departments or establishments specified in section 2303(a) of title 10, United States Code.

"(c) The term 'competitive procedures' means procedures under which an executive agency enters into a contract after soliciting sealed bids or competitive proposals from more than one source that is capable of satisfying the needs of the executive agency.

"(d) The term 'noncompetitive procedures' means procedures other than competitive procedures.

"(e) The term 'small purchase' means any purchase or contract which does not exceed $25,000. A proposed procurement shall not be divided into several procurements primarily for the purpose of using the small purchase procedures."; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 311. (a)(1) Each solicitation under this title shall include specifications which—

"(A) consistent with the needs of the executive agency, permit effective competition; and

"(B) include restrictive provisions or conditions only to the extent necessary to satisfy such needs or as authorized by law.

"(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), the type of specification included in any solicitation shall depend on the nature of the needs of the executive agency and the market available to satisfy such needs. Subject to such needs, specifications may be stated in terms of—

"(A) function so that a variety of products or services may qualify;

"(B) performance, including specifications of the range of acceptable characteristics or of the minimum acceptable standards; or

"(C) design requirements.

"(b) Each solicitation for sealed bids or competitive proposals other than for small purchases shall at a minimum include, in addition to the specifications described in subsection (a)—

"(1) a statement of—

"(A) all significant factors, including price, which the executive agency reasonably expects to consider in evaluating sealed bids or competitive proposals; and

"(B) the relative importance assigned to each of those factors;

"(2) in the case of sealed bids—

"(A) a statement that sealed bids will be evaluated without discussions with the bidders; and

"(B) the time and place for the opening of the sealed bids; and

"(3) in the case of competitive proposals—

"(A) a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated with, and awards made after discussions with the offerors but might be evaluated and awarded without discussions with the offerors; and

"(B) the time and place for submission of proposals.

"EVALUATION AND AWARD

"SEC. 312. (a) An executive agency shall evaluate sealed bids and competitive proposals based solely on the factors specified in the solicitation.

"(b) All sealed bids or competitive proposals received in response to a solicitation may be rejected if the head of the executive agency determines that such action is in the public interest.

"(c) Sealed bids shall be opened publicly at the time and place stated in the solicitation. The executive agency shall evaluate the bids without discussions with the bid-

ders and shall, except as provided in subsection (b), award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the United States, solely considering the price and the other factors included in the solicitation under section 311(b)(1). The award of a contract shall be made by transmitting written notice of the award to the successful bidder.

"(d)(1) The executive agency shall evaluate competitive proposals and may award a contract—

"(A) after discussions conducted with the offerors at any time after receipt of the proposals and prior to the award of the contract; or

"(B) without discussions with the offerors beyond discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification where it can be clearly demonstrated from the existence of effective competition or accurate prior cost experience with the product or service that acceptance of an initial proposal without discussions would result in fair and reasonable prices.

"(2) In the case of award of a contract under paragraph (1)(A), the executive agency shall conduct, before such award, written or oral discussions with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within a competitive range, price and other evaluation factors considered.

"(3) In the case of award of a contract under paragraph (1)(B), the executive agency shall award the contract based on the proposals as received (and as clarified, if necessary, in discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification).

"(4) The executive agency shall, except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the United States, considering price and the other factors included in the solicitation under section 311(b)(1). The executive agency shall award the contract by transmitting written notice of the award to such offeror and shall promptly notify all other offerors of the rejection of their proposals.

"(e) If the head of an executive agency considers that any bid or proposal evidences a violation of the antitrust laws, he shall refer the bid or proposal to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

"PROCUREMENT NOTICE

"SEC. 313. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (c)—

"(A) an executive agency intending to solicit bids or proposals for a contract for property or services at a price expected to exceed $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice described in subsection (b); and

"(B) an executive agency awarding a contract for property or services at a price exceeding $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice announcing such award if there is likely to be any subcontract under such contract.

"(2) The Secretary of Commerce shall publish promptly in the Commerce Business Daily each notice required by paragraph (1).

"(3) Whenever an executive agency is required by paragraph (1)(A) to furnish a notice of a solicitation to the Secretary of Commerce, such executive agency may not—

"(A) issue such solicitation earlier than fifteen days after the date on which such notice is published by the Secretary of Commerce; or

"(B) establish a deadline for the submission of all bids or proposals in response to such solicitation that is earlier than thirty days after the date on which such solicitation is issued.

"(b) Each notice required by subsection (a)(1)(A) shall include—

"(1) an accurate description of the property or services to be contracted for, which description is not unnecessarily restrictive of competition;

"(2) the name and address of the officer or employee of the executive agency who may be contracted for the purpose of obtaining a copy of the solicitation;

"(3) a statement that any person may submit a bid, proposal, or quotation which shall be considered by the executive agency; and

"(4) in the case of a procurement using noncompetitive procedures, a statement of the reason justifying the use of noncompetitive procedures and the identity of the intended source.

"(c)(1) A notice is not required under subsection (a)(1) if—

"(A) the notice would disclose the executive agency's needs and the disclosure of such needs would compromise the national security; or

"(B) the proposed noncompetitive procurement would result from acceptance of an unsolicited research proposal that demonstrates a unique or innovative research concept and the publication of any notice of such unsolicited research proposal would disclose the originality of thought or innovativeness of the proposed research or proprietary data associated with the proposal.

"(2) The requirements of subsection (a)(1)(A) do not apply—

"(A) to any procurement under conditions described in clause (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 303(e); and

"(B) in the case of any procurement for which the head of the executive agency carrying out such procurement makes a determination in writing, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that it is not appropriate or reasonable to publish a notice before issuing a solicitation.

"RECORD REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 314. (a) Each executive agency shall establish and maintain for a period of five years a record, by fiscal year, of the procurements, other than small purchases, in such fiscal year in which—

"(1) noncompetitive procedures were used; and

"(2) only one bid or proposal was received after competitive procedures were used.

"(b) The record established under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to each procurement—

"(1) information identifying the source to whom the contract was awarded;

"(2) the property or services obtained by the Government under the procurement;

"(3) the total cost of the procurement;

"(4) the reason under section 303(e) for the use of noncompetitive procedures; and

"(5) the position of the officers or employees of the executive agency who required and approved the use of noncompetitive procedures in such procurement.

"(c) The information included in the record established and maintained under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the General Services Administration and shall be entered in the Federal Procurement Data System referred to in section 6(d)(4) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)).".

(b) The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(1) By striking out the item relating to section 303 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 303. Competition requirements.";

and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 310 the following new items:

"Sec. 311. Solicitation requirements.
"Sec. 312. Evaluation of bids; awards.
"Sec. 313. Procurement notice.
"Sec. 314. Record requirements.".

COST AND PRICING DATA

SEC. 12. Section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) A prime contractor or any subcontractor shall be required to submit cost or pricing data under the circumstances listed below, and shall be required to certify that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the cost or pricing data he submitted was accurate, complete, and current—

"(A) prior to the award of any prime contract under this title using other than sealed bid procedures where the contract price is expected to exceed $100,000;

"(B) prior to the pricing of any contract change or modification for which the price adjustment is expected to exceed $100,000, or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the head of the agency;

"(C) prior to the award of a subcontract at any tier, where the prime contractor and each higher tier subcontractor have been required to furnish such a certificate, if the price of such subcontract is expected to exceed $100,000; or

"(D) prior to the pricing of any contract change or modification to a subcontract covered by clause (C), for which the price adjustment is expected to exceed $100,000, or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the head of the agency.

"(2) Any prime contract or change or modification thereto under which a certificate is required under paragraph (1) shall contain a provision that the price to the Government, including profit or fee, shall be adjusted to exclude any significant sums by which it may be determined by the executive agency that such price was increased because the contractor or any subcontractor required to furnish such a certificate, furnished cost or pricing data which, as of a date agreed upon between the parties (which date shall be as close to the date of agreement on the price as is practicable), was inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent.

"(3) For the purpose of evaluating the accuracy, completeness, and currency of cost or pricing data required to be submitted by this subsection, any authorized representative of the head of the agency who is an employee of the United States Government shall have the right, until the expiration of three years after final payment under the contract or subcontract, to examine all books, records, documents, and other data of the contractor or subcontractor related to the proposal for the contract, the discussions conducted on the proposal under this chapter, pricing, or performance of the contract or subcontract.

"(4) The requirements of this subsection need not be applied to contracts or subcontracts where the price is based on adequate price competition, established catalog or market prices of commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public, prices set by law or regulation or, in excep-

tional cases where the head of the executive agency determines that the requirements of this subsection may be waived and states in writing his reasons for such determination.".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 13. (a) Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 302 (41 U.S.C. 252)—

(A) by striking out the second sentence in subsection (b);

(B) by striking out subsections (c), (d), and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c)(1) This title does not (A) authorize the erection, repair, or furnishing of any public building or public improvement, but such authorization shall be required in the same manner as heretofore, or (B) permit any contract for the construction or repair of buildings, roads, sidewalks, sewers, mains, or similar items using other than sealed bid procedures under section 303(d)(1), if the conditions set forth in section 303(d)(1) apply or the contract is to be performed outside the United States.

"(2) Section 303(d)(1) does not require the use of sealed bid procedures in cases in which section 204(e) of title 23, United States Code, applies."; and

(C) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (d);

(2) by striking out the heading of section 304 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS";

(3) in section 3204 (41 U.S.C. 254)—

(A) by striking out "negotiated pursuant to section 302(c)" in the first sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded using other than sealed bid procedures";

(B) by striking out "negotiated pursuant to section 302(c)" in the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures"; and

(C) by striking out "negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this Act" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures";

(4) in section 307 (41 U.S.C. 257)—

(A) by striking out "Except as provided in subsection (b), and except" in the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except";

(B) by striking our subsection (b);

(C) by striking out "by paragraphs (11)–(13), or (14) of section 302(c)," in subsection (c);

(D) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b); and

(E) by striking out subsection (d);

(5) by striking out "entered into pursuant to section 302(c) without advertising," in section 308 and inserting in lieu thereof "made or awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures"; and

(6) by striking out "section 302(c)(15) of this title without regard to the advertising requirements of sections 302(c) and 303." In section 310 and inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of this title relating to other than sealed bid procedures.".

(b) The table of contents of such Act is amended by striking out the item relating to section 304 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 304. Contract requirements.".

Subtitle B—Amendments to Title 10, United States Code

COMPETITIVE AND NONCOMPETITIVE PROCEDURES

SEC. 21. (a) Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2302—

(A) by inserting "the Secretary, any Deputy Secretary, any Under Secretary, or any Assistant Secretary of Defense;" after "means" in clause (1);

(B) by striking out clauses (2) and (3) of section 2302 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) 'Agency' means any department or establishment specified in section 2303(a) of this title.

"(3) 'Competitive procedures' means procedures under which the head of an agency enters into a contract after soliciting sealed bids or competitive proposals from more than one source that is capable of satisfying the needs of the agency.

"(4) 'Noncompetitive procedures' means procedures other than competitive procedures.

"(5) 'Small purchase' means any purchase or contract which does not exceed $25,000. A proposed procurement shall not be divided into several procurements primarily for the purpose of using small purchase procedures.";

(2) in section 2303(a)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) as clauses (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before clause (2) (as redesignated by subclause (A)) the following:

"(1) The Department of Defense.";

(3) by striking out sections 2304 and 2305 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 2304. Competition requirements

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (e) of this section or otherwise authorized by law, the head of an agency shall use competitive procedures in making contracts for property or services. The head of an agency shall use advance procurement planning and market research and shall prepare specifications in such a manner as is necessary to obtain effective competition with due regard to the nature of the property or services to be acquired. The head of an agency shall use the competitive procedure of combination of competitive procedures that is best suited under the circumstances of the procurement action and shall specify the needs of the agency and solicit bids or proposals in a manner designed to achieve effective competition for the contract.

"(b) The head of an agency may provide for the procurement of property or services in order to establish or maintain any alternative source or sources of supply under this title using competitive procedures but excluding a particular source for that property or services if such head of an agency determines that to do so would (1) increase or maintain competition and would likely result in reduced overall costs for such procurement, or for any anticipated procurement, of property or services, (2) be in the interest of industrial mobilization in case of a national emergency, or (3) be in the interest of national defense in establishing or maintaining an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States.

"(c) Procurement regulations shall include special simplified procedures and forms for small purchases to facilitate making small purchases efficiently and economically.

"(d) For other than small purchases, the head of an agency, when using competitive procedures—

"(1) shall solicit sealed bids when—

"(A) time permits the solicitation, submission, and evaluation of sealed bids;

"(B) the award will be made on the basis of price and other price-related factors;

"(C) it is not necessary to conduct discussions with the responding sources about their bids; and

"(D) there is reasonable expectation of receiving more than one sealed bid; and

"(2) shall request competitive proposals from responding sources when sealed bids are not required under clause (1) of this subsection.

"(e) The head of an agency may use noncompetitive procedures only when—

"(1) the property or services needed by the Government are available from only one source and no other type of property or services will satisfy the needs of the agency;

"(2) the agency's need for the property or services is of such unusual and compelling urgency that the Government would be seriously injured by the delay associated with using competitive procedures;

"(3) it is necessary to award the contract to a particular source or sources in order to (A) maintain a facility, producer, manufacturer, or other supplier available for furnishing property or services in case of a national emergency, (B) achieve industrial mobilization in the case of such an emergency, or (C) establish or maintain an essential research capability to be provided by an educational or other nonprofit institution or a research and development center funded by the United States;

"(4) the terms of any international agreement or treaty between the United States Government and a foreign government or international organization, or the directions of any foreign government reimbursing the agency for the cost of the procurement of the property or services for such government, have the effect of requiring the use of noncompetitive procedures;

"(5) a statute authorizes or requires that the procurement be made through another agency or from a specified source; or the agency's need is for a brand-name commercial item for authorized resale; or

"(6) the disclosure of the agency's needs to more than one source would compromise the national security.

"(f) For the purposes of applying subsection (e)(1) of this section hereof—

"(1) property or services shall be considered to be available from a source if such source has the capability to produce the property or deliver the service in accordance with the Government's specifications and delivery schedule; and

"(2) in the case of the procurement of technical or special property which has required a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and where it is likely that production by a source other than the original source would result in additional cost to the Government by reason of duplication of investment or would result in duplication of necessary preparation which would unduly delay the procurement of the property, the property may be deemed to be available only from the initial source and may be procured through noncompetitive procedures.

"(g) The head of an agency may not award a contract using noncompetitive procedures unless—

"(1) the use of such procedures has been justified in writing; and

"(2) a notice has been published with respect to such contract pursuant to section 2305(c) of this title and all bids or proposals received in response to such notice have been considered by such head of an agency.

"(h) For the purposes of the following laws, purchases or contracts made under this chapter using other than sealed bid procedures shall be treated as if they were made with sealed bid procedures:

"(1) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (commonly referred to as the 'Walsh-Healey Act') (41 U.S.C. 35-45).

"(2) The Act entitled 'An Act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1931 (commonly referred to as the 'Davis-Bacon Act') (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5).

"§ 2305. Solicitation, evaluation, and award procedures; notice requirements

"(a)(1)(A) Each solicitation under this title shall include specifications which—

"(i) consistent with the needs of the agency, permit effective competition; and

"(ii) include restrictive provisions or conditions only to the extent necessary to satisfy such needs or as authorized by law.

"(B) For the purposes of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the type of specification included in any solicitation shall depend on the nature of the needs of the agency and the market available to satisfy such needs. Subject to such needs, specifications may be stated in terms of—

"(i) functions so that a variety of products or services may qualify;

"(ii) performance, including specifications of the range of acceptable characteristics or of the minimum acceptable standards; or

"(iii) design requirements.

"(2) Each solicitation for sealed bids or competitive proposals other than for small purchases shall at a minimum include, in addition to the specifications described in paragraph (1) of this subsection—

"(A) a statement of—

"(i) all significant factors, including price, which the executive agency reasonably expects to consider in evaluating sealed bids or competitive proposals; and

"(ii) the relative importance assigned to each of those factors;

"(B) in the case of sealed bids—

"(i) a statement that sealed bids will be evaluated without discussions with the bidders; and

"(ii) the time and place for the opening of the sealed bids; and

"(C) in the case of competitive proposals—

"(i) a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated with, and awards made after, discussions with the offerors but might be evaluated and awarded without discussions with the offerors; and

"(ii) the time and place for submission of proposals.

"(b)(1) The head of an agency shall evaluate sealed bids and competitive proposals based solely on the factors specified in the solicitation.

"(2) All sealed bids or competitive proposals received in response to a solicitation may be rejected if the head of an agency determines that such action is in the public interest.

"(3) Sealed bids shall be open publicly at the time and place stated in the solicitation. The head of an agency shall evaluate the bids without discussions with the bidders and shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the United States, solely considering the price and the other factors included in the solicitation under subsection (a)(2)(A) of this section. The award of a contract shall be made by transmitting written notice of the award to the successful bidder.

"(4)(A) The head of an agency shall evaluate competitive proposals and may award a contract—

"(i) after discussions conducted with the offerors at any time after receipt of the proposals and prior to the award of the contract; or

"(ii) without discussions with the offerors beyond discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification where it can be clearly demonstrated from the existence of effective competition or accurate prior cost experience with the product or service that acceptance of an initial proposal without discussions would result in fair and reasonable prices.

"(B) In the case of award of a contract under subparagraph (A)(i) of this paragraph, the head of an agency shall conduct, before such award, written or oral discussions with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within a competitive range, price and other evaluation factors considered.

"(C) In the case of award of a contract under subparagraph (A)(ii) of this paragraph, the head of an agency shall award the contract based on the proposals received (and as clarified, if necessary, in discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification).

"(D) The head of an agency shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the United States, solely considering price and other factors included in the solicitation under subsection (a)(2)(A) of this section. The head of the agency shall award the contract by transmitting written notice of the award to such offeror and shall promptly notify all other offerors of the rejection of their proposals.

"(5) If the head of an agency considers that any bid or proposal evidences a violation of the antitrust laws, he shall refer the bid or proposal to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

"(c)(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection—

"(i) the head of an agency intending to solicit bids or, proposals for a contract for property or services at a price expected to exceed $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice described in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

"(ii) the head of an agency awarding a contract for property or services at a price exceeding $10,000 shall furnish for publication by the Secretary of Commerce a notice announcing such award if there is likely to be any subcontract under such contract.

"(B) The Secretary of Commerce shall publish promptly in the Commerce Business Daily each notice required by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

"(C) Whenever a head of an agency is required by subparagraph (A)(i) of this paragraph to furnish a notice of a solicitation to the Secretary of Commerce, such head of an agency may not—

"(i) issue such solicitation earlier than fifteen days after the date on which such notice is published by the Secretary of Commerce; or

"(ii) establish a deadline for the submission of all bids or proposals in response to such solicitation that is earlier than thirty days after the date on which such solicitation is issued.

"(2) Each notice required by paragraph (1)(A)(i) of this subsection shall include—

"(A) an accurate description of the property or services to be contracted for, which description is not unnecessarily restrictive of competition;

"(B) the name and address of the officer or employee of the agency who may be contacted for the purpose of obtaining a copy of the solicitation;

"(C) a statement that any person may submit a bid or proposal which shall be considered by the agency; and

"(D) in the case of a procurement using noncompetitive procedures, a statement of the reason justifying the use of noncompetitive procedures and the identity of the intended source.

"(3)(A) A notice is not required under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection if—

"(i) the notice would disclose the agency's needs and the disclosure of such needs would compromise the national security; or

"(ii) the proposed noncompetitive procurement would result from acceptance of an unsolicited research proposal that demonstrates a unique or innovative research concept and the publication of any notice of such unsolicited research proposal would disclose the originality of thought or innovativeness of the proposed research or proprietary data associated with the proposal.

"(B) The requirements of paragraph (1)(A)(i) of this subsection do not apply—

"(i) to any procurement under conditions described in clause (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 2304(e) of this title; and

"(ii) in the case of any procurement for which the head of the agency carrying out such procurement makes a determination in writing, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that it is not appropriate or reasonable to publish a notice before issuing a solicitation.''; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2316. Record requirements

"(a) Each head of an agency shall establish and maintain for a period of five years a record, by fiscal year, of the procurements, other than small purchases, in such fiscal year in which—

"(1) noncompetitive procedures were used; and

"(2) only one bid or proposal was received after competitive procedures were used.

"(b) The record established under subsection (a) of this section shall include, with respect to each procurement—

"(1) information identifying the source to whom the contract was awarded;

"(2) the property or services obtained by the Government under the procurement;

"(3) the total cost of the procurement;

"(4) the reason under section 2304(e) of this title for the use of noncompetitive procedures; and

"(5) the position of the officers or employees of the agency who required and ap-

proved the use of noncompetitive procedures in such procurement.

"(c) The information included in the record established and maintained under subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the General Services Administration and shall be entered in the Federal Procurement Data System referred to in section 6(d)(4) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)).".

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended—

(1) by striking out the items relating to sections 2304 and 2305 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"2304. Competition requirements.
"2305. Solicitation, evaluation, and award procedures; notice requirements.";

and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2316. Record requirements.".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 22. Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2306—

(A) by striking out "may, in negotiating contracts under section 2304," in the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "may in awarding contracts after using other than sealed bid procedures";

(B) by striking out "negotiated under section 2304" in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures";

(C) by striking out "section 2304 of this title," in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "this chapter";

(D) in subsection (f)(1)—

(i) by striking out clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) prior to the award of any prime contract under this title after using other than sealed bid procedures where the contract price is expected to exceed $100,000;";

(ii) by striking out "negotiated" each place it appears in the second paragraph;

(iii) by striking out "negotiation," in the third paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "proposal for the contract, the discussions conducted on the proposal under this title,"; and

(iv) by striking out "$500,000" each place it appears in clauses (B), (C), and (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,000"; and

(E) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Except in a case in which the Secretary of Defense determines that military requirements necessitate the specification of container sizes, no contract for the carriage of Government property in other than Government-owned cargo containers shall require carriage of such property in cargo containers of any stated length, height, or width.";

(2) by striking out subsection (b) of section 2310 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Each determination or decision under section 2306(c), section 2306(g)(1), section 2307(c), or section 2313(c) of this title shall be based on a written finding by the person making the determination or decision, which finding shall set out facts and circumstances that (1) clearly indicate why the type of contract selected under section 2306(c) is likely to be less costly than any other type or that it is impracticable to obtain property or services of the kind or quality required except under such a contract, (2) support the findings required by section 2306(g)(1), (3) clearly indicate why advance payments under section 2307(c) would be in the public interest, or (4) clearly indicate why the application of section 2313(b) to a contract or subcontract with a foreign contractor or foreign subcontractor would not be in the public interest. Such a finding is final and shall be kept available in the agency for at least six years after the date of the determination or decision. A copy of the finding shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office with each contract to which it applies.",

(3) by striking out section 2311 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The head of an agency may delegate, subject to his direction, to any other officer or official of that agency, any power under this chapter."; and

(4) by striking out "negotiated" in the second sentence of section 2313(b) and inserting in lieu thereof "awarded after using other than sealed bid procedures".

Subtitle C—Advocate for Competition; Annual Report on Competition

DEFINITION

SEC. 31. For the purposes of this subtitle, the term "executive agency" has the same meaning as provided in section 4(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(a)).

ADVOCATE FOR COMPETITION

SEC. 32. (a)(1) There is established in each executive agency an advocate for competition.

(2) Each head of an executive agency shall—

(A) designate for each executive agency one officer or employee serving in a position authorized for such executive agency on the date of enactment of this Act to serve as the advocate for competition;

(B) relieve such officer or employee of all duties and responsibilities that are inconsistent with the duties and responsibilities of the advocate for competition; and

(C) provide such officer or employee with such staff or assistance as may be necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the advocate for competition.

(b)(1) The advocate for competition shall promote competition in the procurement of property and services.

(2) The advocate for competition in an executive agency shall—

(A) review the purchasing and contracting activities of the executive agency;

(B) identify and report to the head of the executive agency—

(i) opportunities to achieve competition on the basis of price and other significant factors in the purchases and contracts of the executive agency;

(ii) solicitations and proposed solicitations which include unnecessarily detailed specifications or unnecessarily restrictive statements of need which may reduce competition in the procurement activities of the executive agency; and

(iii) any other condition or action which has the effect of unnecessarily restricting competition in the procurement actions of the executive agency; and

(C) prepare and transmit to the head of the executive agency an annual report describing his activities under this section.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 33. (a) Not later than September 30 of each of 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987 each head of an executive agency shall transmit to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives an annual report including the information specified in subsection (b).

(b) Each report transmitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a specific description of all actions that the head of the executive agency intends to take during the next fiscal year to—

(A) increase competition for contracts with the executive agency on the basis of price and other significant factors; and

(B) reduce the number and dollar value of contracts entered into by the executive agency after soliciting bids or proposals from, or evaluating bids or proposals with discussions with, only one source; and

(2) a summary of the activities and accomplishments of the advocates for competition of the executive agency during the fiscal year in which the report is transmitted.

Subtitle D—Applicability

SEC. 41. The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to any solicitations for bids or proposals issued on or after the date two hundred and seventy days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

MITCHELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3036

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. BOSCHWITZ) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

At the end of the amendment insert the following new section:

SEC. . Effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after January 1, 1984, each rate of pay subject to adjustment by section 461 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by an amount, rounded to the nearest multiple of $100 (or if midway between multiples of $100, to the next higher multiple of $100), equal to the overall percentage of the adjustment taking effect under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule during fiscal year 1984.

CHAFEE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENTS NOS. 3037 THROUGH 3039

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. CHAFEE (for himself, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. WEICKER) submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by them to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3037

On page 19, strike subsections (a) and (b) and insert the following:

(a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or the House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, and for non-defense discretionary activities to exceed $436,800,000 in fiscal year 1985, $477,900,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $523,400,000 in fiscal year 1987.

AMENDMENT NO. 3038

On page 19, strike subsections (a) and (b) and insert the following:

(a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or the House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, and for non-defense discretionary activities to exceed $431,700,000 in fiscal year 1985, $466,200,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $504,500,000 in fiscal year 1987.

AMENDMENT NO. 3039

On page 19, strike subsections (a) and (b) and insert the following:

(a) It should not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or the House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, and for non-defense discretionary activities to exceed $434,600,000 in fiscal year 1985, $472,300,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $514,600,000 in fiscal year 1987.

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am today introducing three amendments on behalf of myself and Senators MATHIAS, STAFFORD, and WEICKER, all relating to the caps on defense and nondefense spending provided in the leadership amendment which is pending.

Each of these three amendments has the effect of combining or unifying the two caps contained in the pending amendment. The first of these amendments simply combines the amounts provided in the pending amendment, thus setting an overall cap for all appropriated budget authority, both defense and nondefense, for the 3 coming fiscal years.

The second and third amendments also provide for unifying the cap on aggregate total budget authority, but they each use different numbers for defense and for nondefense budget authority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table illustrating the components and effects of these three amendments be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS TO LEADERSHIP PLAN APPROPRIATIONS CAPS

[Budget authority, billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			3-yr. total
	1985	1986	1987	
Amendment 1:				
Defense (5.6 percent CBO; 7.2 percent Administrative)	299.0	333.7	372.0	
Non-Defense	137.8	144.2	151.4	
Total	436.8	477.9	523.4	1,438.1
Amendment 2:				
Defense (3.0 percent CBO; 4.5 percent Administrative)	288.0	315.4	345.3	

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS TO LEADERSHIP PLAN APPROPRIATIONS CAPS—Continued

[Budget authority, billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			3-yr. total
	1985	1986	1987	
Non-Defense (CBO baseline)	143.7	150.8	159.2	
Total	431.7	466.2	504.5	1,402.4
Amendment 3:				
Defense (4.0 percent CBO; 5.5 percent Administrative)	290.8	321.5	355.4	
Non-Defense (CBO baseline)	143.7	150.8	159.2	
Total	434.5	472.3	514.6	1,421.4
Savings from amendment 2 versus leadership plan	5.1	11.7	18.9	35.7
Savings from amendment 3 versus leadership plan	2.3	5.6	8.8	16.7

Note: All dates relating to budget authority are supplied by CBO. All percentage growth rates are estimated by CBO.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, our purpose in offering these amendments is to demonstrate our concern that spending authority included for nondefense discretionary programs is insufficient. Human and natural resource programs have been reduced enough to actions we have taken in previous years. Further reductions are unwise and unnecessary. Each of these amendments, by unification of the so-called "cap," would allow the Congress to determine spending priorities by the normal method.

The table presents the three defense and nondefense components of the three amendments and totals the spending for each. I should note that a certain amount of confusion surrounds the question of defense spending. For example, the leadership plan has been presented as providing 7.2 percent real growth over 3 years. But this growth rate is based on administration inflation assumptions, with which the CBO does not agree. CBO's calculation of the growth rate for the defense budget authority in the leadership plan is 5.6 percent, and this rate of growth is also used to describe the plan's defense growth path.

Similarly, for each amount of defense budget authority chosen, the CBO's and the administration's estimation of the real growth path differs. Thus, one learns with surprise that the defense budget authority provided by the House is 3.5 percent if calculated according to the administration's economic assumptions, but 2 percent if calculated according to the CBO's assumptions.

As for nondefense spending, amendments two and three use baseline budget authority as calculated by CBO. This has the effect of raising BA for these accounts by $20.3 billion above the amount in subsection (b) of the leadership amendment. This reflects what the baseline would be in the absence of the 1-year freeze provided in the leadership plan. Again, these data have been provided by CBO.

The effects of the amendments are interesting to note. The second amendment uses 3-percent growth and the baseline for nondefense, and saves $35 billion. The fourth amendment uses 4-percent defense growth and the baseline for nondefense, and it saves $16 billion.

Mr. President, I hope this explanation helps rather than confuses my colleagues.●

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

HUDDLESTON AMENDMENT NO. 3040

(Referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.)

Mr. BYRD (for Mr. HUDDLESTON) (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. EAGLETON, and Mr. EXON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1913) to provide for improvements in the school lunch and certain other child nutrition programs as follows:

Striking out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

SECTION 1. (a) Secton 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) is amended by—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), striking out "Subject to" and all that follows through "September 30, 1984—", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Subject to the amounts appropriated for the purposes of the program under subsection (g)—";

(2) in subsection (g), striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,522,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $1,634,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $1,771,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $1,915,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, for the purpose of carrying out the program authorized by this section."; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2), striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(b) Section 7(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1776(i)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(c) Section 19(j) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1788(j)) is amended by—

(1) striking out the subsection designation "(j)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)";

(2) striking out paragraph (1);

(3) redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by clause (3) of this subsection—

(A) striking out "For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and for each succeeding fiscal year ending on or before September 30, 1984, there" and inserting in lieu thereof "There"; and

(B) striking out "$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1981, and not more than $5,000,000 for

each subsequent" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,000,000 for each".

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

SEC. 2. (a) Section 13(p) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(p)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(b) Section 14(a) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1762(a)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

INCREASE IN FEDERAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR REDUCED PRICE MEALS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 11(a)(2) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(a)(2)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "40" and inserting in lieu thereof "25"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The price of a reduced-price lunch shall not exceed 25 cents.".

(b) Section 9(b)(3) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(3)) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

(c) Section 11(f) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(f)) is amended by striking out "section 9(b)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11(a)(2)".

(d) Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773(b)) is amended by—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), amending the second sentence to read as follows: "The national average payment for each reduced-price breakfast shall be 15 cents less than the national average payment for each free breakfast, adjusted to the nearest one-fourth cent.";

(2) in paragraph (1)(C), striking out "30" and inserting in lieu therof "15"; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(C), striking out "thirty" and inserting in lieu thereof "15".

ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO IMPROVE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM MEAL PATTERN

SEC. 4. (a) Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773(b)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph (3) as follows:

"(3)(A) The Secretary shall increase, by 6 cents, the annually adjusted payment for each breakfast served under this Act and section 17 of the National School Lunch Act to assist States in improving the nutritional quality of such breakfasts, to the extend feasible.

"(B) Expenditures of funds from State and local sources for the maintenance of the breakfast program shall not be diminished as a result of funds received under this paragraph.".

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall review and revise the nutrition requirements for meals served under the school breakfast program to improve the nutritional quality of such meals, taking into consideration both the findings of the National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs and the need to provide increased flexibility in meal planning to local school food authorities. Not later than one hundred and eigthy days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate regulations to implement such revisions.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE COSTS

SEC. 5. Section 6(e) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755(e)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after this subsection designation "(e)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) Each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available to the States, for the transportation and storage of commodities donated under this section, an amount equal to 3 percent of the value of such food. No State may charge recipient agencies for the distribution of such commmodities an amount that is in excess of the State's direct cost of transporting and storing such commodities for recipient agencies minus the amount provided by the Secretary to the State under this subsection.".

RESTORATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS

SEC. 6. (a) Section 12(d)(5) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(d)(5)) is amended by striking out ", except private schools whose average yearly tuition exceeds $1,500 per child".

(b) Section 15(c)(A) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1784(c)(A)) is amended by striking out ", except private schools whose average yearly tuition exceeds $1,500 per child".

RESTORATION OF ONE MEAL AND ONE SNACK TO THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 7. Section 17(f)(2)(B) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(f)(2)(B)) is amended by striking out "two meals and one supplement" and inserting in lieu thereof "three meals and two supplements".

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL EXPENSES FROM INCOME OF HOUSEHOLD

SEC. 8. Section 9(b)(3) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(3)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(A)" after the paragraph designation "(3)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (B) as follows:

"(B) For purposes of determining eligibility under subparagraph (A), household income shall not include amounts expended for unusually high medical payments, as determined by the Secretary, that (i) cannot be reasonably anticipated or controlled by the household, and (ii) are not recoverable through public or private sources.".

VERIFICATION LIMITATION

SEC. 9. Section 9(b)(2)(C) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", except that the Secretary may not require any such verification for any fiscal year for which funds have not been appropriated to reimburse local school food authorities for direct costs, as defined by generally accepted accounting principles, attributable to such verification. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subparagraph.".

AUTOMATIC ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS

SEC. 10. Section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (6) as follows:

"(6) Any child who is a member of a household participating in the food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1977, or a member of an AFDC assistance unit under the aid to families with dependent children program under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act in a State where the standard of eligibility for such assistance does not exceed 130 percent of the income poverty guidelines, shall be served free meals without further application or eligibility determinations. For the purposes of any verification under paragraph (2)(C) of this subsection, proof of receipt of such assistance shall be sufficient.".

RESTORATION OF CERTAIN KINDERGARTENS TO THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

SEC. 11. The first sentence of section 3(a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772(a)) is amended by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(2) kindergarten programs operating through any nonprofit school, and (3)".

RESTORATION OF PROVISION FOR FOOD SERVICE EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 12. (a) The National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting, after section 4, a new section 5 as follows:

FOOD SERVICE EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 5. Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under the authorization contained in section 3 of this Act, $4,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of providing, during such fiscal year, food service equipment assistance for the school lunch program under this Act. The Secretary shall provide assistance under this section only to school food authorities in which 60 percent or more of the lunches served in the school lunch program during the second preceding school year were served free or at a reduced price.".

(b) Section 12(d) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (8) as follows:

"(8) 'Food service equipment' means equipment used by schools in storing, preparing, or serving food for school children.".

(c) Section 17(g) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(g)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"(4) Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this section, $2,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary for the purposes of providing, during such fiscal year, food service equipment assistance for the child care food program under this section. The Secretary shall provide assistance under this paragraph only to institutions in which 60 percent or more of the meals served in the child care food program during the second preceding fiscal year were served free or at a reduced price.".

USE OF SCHOOL LUNCH FACILITIES FOR PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY

SEC. 13. Section 12 of the National School Luch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (i) as follows:

"(i) Facilities, equipment, and personnel provided to school food authorities for programs under this Act and under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 may be used, as determined by the local educational agency, to support nonprofit nutrition programs for the elderly (including programs funded under the Older Americans Act).".

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN SPONSORS FOR THE SUMMER FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 14. (a) Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761) is amended by—

(1) in the second sentence of subsection (a)(1)—

(A) inserting "private nonprofit organizations," after "county governments," in clause (B);

(B) redesignating clause (E) as clause (F); and

(C) inserting after clause (D) a new clause (E) as follows:

"(E) 'private nonprofit organizations' means only such organizations (including summer camps) that (i) operate at not more than 15 sites (or, if a waiver under subsection (i)(2) of this section is granted, at not more than 20 sites) and (ii) use self-preparation facilities to prepare meals or obtain meals from a public facility (such as a school district, public hospital, or State university);"; and

(2) inserting, after subsection (h), a new subsection (i) as follows:

"(i)(1) A private nonprofit organization shall be eligible to participate in programs under this section during any year as a service provider only if the organization—

"(A) operates in an area where a school food authority or the local, municipal, or county government has not indicated by March 1 of such year that such authority or such unit of government will operate a program under this section in such year;

"(B) exercises full control and authority over the operation of the food service programs under this section at all sites under its sponsorship;

"(C) provides ongoing year-round activities for children;

"(D) demonstrates adequate management and fiscal capacity to operate programs under this section; and

"(E) meets applicable State and local health, safety, and sanitation standards.

"(2) The Secretary may waive the limitation to 15 sites under subsection (a)(1)(E) of this section and permit a private nonprofit organization under this section to operate at up to 20 sites if such organization demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that a need for such additional sites exists and that such organization has the capability to serve such additional sites.".

EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 15. Section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(i)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation "(i)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not more than 2.5 percent of any State's allocation under this section for supplemental foods for any fiscal year may be expended by such State for expenses incurred under this section for supplemental foods during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the sums were appropriated.".

COSTS FOR NUTRITION SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 16. (a) Section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(b)) is amended by—

(1) striking out paragraph (1);

(2) redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) adding, after paragraph (3), as redesignated by clause (2) of this subsection, a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"(4) 'Costs for nutrition services and administration' means costs for certification of eligibility of persons for participation in the program (including costs for centrifuges, measuring boards, spectrophotometers, and scales used for such certification), food delivery, monitoring, nutrition education, outreach, start-up expenses, and general administration applicable to implementation of the program under this section (such as costs for staff, warehouse facilities, transportation, insurance, developing and printing food instruments, and administration of State and local agency offices), and other appropriate costs for nutrition services and administration.".

(b) Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) is amended by—

(1) striking out "administrative funds" each place it appears in subsections (f)(11), (h)(2), (h)(3), and (h)(4), and inserting in lieu thereof "funds covering costs for nutrition services and administration"; and

(2) striking out "administrative costs" each place it appears in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "costs for nutrition services and administration".

IMPROVING STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

SEC. 17. The second sentence of section 17(g) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(g)) is amended by inserting "providing technical assistance to improve State agency administrative systems," after "health benefits,".

COORDINATION WITH AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM

SEC. 18. Section 17(f)(1)(K) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(1)(K)) is amended by inserting "with the aid to families with dependent children program," after "child abuse counseling,".

PAPERWORK REDUCTION

SEC. 19. Section 17(h)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(1)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The Secretary shall limit any documentation required under the preceding sentence to a minimal level.".

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 20. (a) Section 17(k)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(k)(1)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The Secretary shall fill any vacancy in the Council within ninety days.".

(b) Section 17(k)(3) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(k)(3)) is amended by—

(1) in the first sentence, inserting "and shall ensure that the Council meets at least once every twelve months" immediately before the period; and

(2) striking out the second sentence.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 21. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the provisions of this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) The amendments made by sections 106 and 111 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that each school food authority may elect to delay implementation of any such amendments to a date not later than July 1, 1984.

(c) Not later than sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue final regulations to implement the amendments made by section 108. The amendments made by section 108 shall take effect on issuance of such final regulations, except that each school food authority may elect to delay implementation of the amendments to a date not later than July 1, 1984.

(d) The amendments made by sections 103, 104(a), and 107 shall take effect on the first day of the first month following the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) The amendments made by sections 101(a), 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, and 118 shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

● Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment in the form of a substitute to S. 1913, a bill to provide for improvements in the school lunch and certain other child nutrition programs.

The substitute amendment adds provisions reauthorizing appropriations over the next 4 years for those programs with authorizations due to expire at the end of this fiscal year. The authorizations expiring this year are those relating to the summer food service program, the commodity distribution program, the nutrition education and training program, the funding for State administrative expenses, and the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC). A 4-year reauthorization is important because it provides stability to these programs. The administration of these programs would become increasingly difficult if, each year, local administrators faced the possibility of program termination.

In addition, the amendment adds provisions for program changes to meet emerging needs and improve program administration. The amendment incorporates many of the provisions of S. 1913, a bill that would make needed restorations in several of the child nutrition programs. I introduced S. 1913 last September. To date, 52 Senators have cosponsored S. 1913.

The House Education and Labor Committee has reported, and the House of Representatives has begun floor debate on, H.R. 7, which is legislation comparable to my substitute amendment. The House expects to complete action on H.R. 7 this week. Many of the provisions of H.R. 7 are from H.R. 4091—the House companion measure to S. 1913—which passed the House last October and is awaiting the Senate's action. I believe it is imperative that the Senate also act immediately to address the problems that have occurred as a result of the 1980 and 1981 budget cuts in the school lunch and child nutrition programs. S. 1913, with this substitute amendment, is a reasonable and balanced approach to solving those problems, and I urge the Senate to approve it as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of organizations that are supporting my substitute amendment, and a summary of the amendment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONAL ENDORSERS OF THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO S. 1913

American Association of Retired Persons.
American Camping Association.
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

American Public Health Association.
American School Food Service Association.[1]
Bread for the World.
Camp Fire, Inc.
Center for Science in the Public Interest.
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
Child Care Food Program Sponsors Forum.
Child Welfare League of America.
Children's Defense Fund.
The Children's Foundation.
Communications Workers of America.
Community Nutrition Institute.
Cooperative League of the U.S.A.
Council for American Private Education.
Council of Chief State School Officers.
Council of Great City Schools.
Food Research and Action Center.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
Health, U.S.A.
Interfaith Action for Economic Justce.[2]
International Ladies Garment Workers Union.
Iowa Advocator Welfare Answering Service.
Lutheran Council.
Lutheran Family and Child Services of Missouri—St. Louis, Mo.
League of United Latin American Citizens.
League of Women Voters of the United States.
Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund.
National Anti-Hunger Coalition.
National Association of Counties.
National Association of Wheat Growers.
National Black Child Development Institute.
National Coalition of Title I Parents.
National Consumers League.
National Council of LaRaza.
National Council of Senior Citizens.
National Farmers Union.
The National Institute of Hispanic Children and Families.
The National Milk Producers Federation.
The National PTA.
National Rural Housing Coalition.
National School Board Association.[1]
National Urban League.
Public Voice for Food and Health Policy.
Rural American Women.
Rural Coalition.
Service Employees International Union.
Society for Nutrition Education.
United Auto Workers.
United Food and Commercial Workers.
U.S. Conference of Mayors.
Vermont Food Stamp Advisory Council.
World Hunger Education Service.
Women's Equity Action League.

SUMMARY OF SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO S. 1913

The major provisions of the amendment would—

(1) Reauthorize, for fiscal years 1985 through 1988, funding for the Summer Food Service Program for Children, the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), certain State administrative expenses, and the Commodity Distribution Program;

(2) Provide a permanent authorization of $8 million annually to carry out the nutrition education and training program;

(3) Lower the cost to the student of a reduced-price lunch from 40 cents to 25 cents;

(4) Lower the cost to the student of a reduced-price breakfast from 30 cents to 15 cents;

(5) Improve the nutritional quality of breakfasts served by providing an additional reimbursement of 6 cents for each breakfast served;

(6) Provide funds to the States for the storage and distribution of USDA entitlement commodities in an amount equal to 3 percent of the value of the commodities donated;

(7) Allow private schools with an average yearly tuition in excess of $1,500 again to participate in the child nutrition programs;

(8) Restore the reimbursement made to institutions and day care organizations under the child care food program to three meals and two supplements served per day per child;

(9) In determining eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals, provide a special hardship deduction for students from families with unusually high medical payments that cannot be reasonably anticipated or controlled;

(10) Provide that any requirement by the Secretary that local school districts verify the income information on applications for free and reduced-price meals be conditioned on funds being appropriated to assist such districts in carrying out such verification;

(11) Allow children in certain kindergarten programs to participate in the special milk program;

(12) Provide food service equipment assistance to those schools and child care centers in which 60 percent or more of the meals served in the second preceding year were served free or at a reduced price;

(13) Clarify that school feeding facilities, equipment, and personnel participating in federally-assisted school meal programs may be used to support nonprofit nutrition programs for the elderly;

(14) If by March 1, a school food authority or a local government agency does not intend to operate a summer feeding program in an eligible area, permit certain nonprofit private organizations to operate such a program in an eligible area if the organization has facilities for the preparation of meals or obtains meals from a public facility;

(15) For purposes of carrying out the WIC program, authorize appropriation levels at $1.52 billion, $1.63 billion, $1.77 billion, and $1.92 billion for fiscal years 1985 through 1988, respectively; and

(16) Require the Secretary of Agriculture to fill vacancies on the National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant, and Fetal Nutrition within 90 days and to hold Council meetings at least once every twelve months.●

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I am cosponsoring an amendment in the form of a substitute to S. 1913. This legislation will reauthorize for 4 years a number of nutrition programs including the summer food service program for children; the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children; certain State administrative expenses; and the commodity distribution program.

These programs are crucial to the proper nutrition of school children, infants, mothers, and the elderly. Reauthorizing these programs for 4 years will provide both administrators and recipients with much needed program stability.

This amendment would provide funds for nutritional education and outreach programs. These funds should encourage better nutrition for everyone and help to insure that those in need receive nutritional assistance.

Studies show the educational benefits of nutrition are that improved nutrition is linked to a more alert student and thus one more capable of learning. Likewise, better nutrition for all ages provides health benefits by lowering health care costs. Both of these are vital to the future of this country.

Although some refinements may be needed in this amendment, I would like to compliment Senator HUDDLESTON and my colleagues on the Senate Agriculture Committee for taking a vital step toward assuring the continuation of nutrition assistance programs.●

[1] Does not have a board policy on food stamps and, therefore, reserves its endorsement for the child nutrition provisions of the Anti-Hunger Act of 1984.

[2] A coalition of 26 national Protestant, Jewish, Roman Catholic, and ecumenical agencies that work together.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY REGULATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public the scheduling of a public hearing before the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation to continue consideration of the following bills: S. 1069, to amend the Federal Power Act to limit the recovery by public utilities of certain costs of construction work in progress through rate increases; S. 817, to amend section 205 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824D) relating to inclusion of construction work in progress in the wholesale rate base of public utilities; and H.R. 555, to amend the Federal Power Act to limit the recovery by public utilities of certain costs of construction work in progress through rate increases.

The hearing will be held on Friday, May 18, beginning at 9 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements for the hearing record should write to the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.

For further information regarding this hearing you may wish to contact Mr. Howard Useem of the subcommittee staff at 224-5205.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee will hold a hearing on May 1, 1984, on S. 2069, a bill to amend the Small Business Act in order to permit section 503

companion loans in excess of $500,000. The hearing will start at 10 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. Senator PRESSLER will chair. For further information, please contact Robert Wilson, counsel for the committee, at 224-2030.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee will hold a full committee markup on pending legislation on May 8, 1984, in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m. For further information, please contact Robert Dotchin, staff director of the committee, at 224-5175.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee will hold an oversight hearing on June 6, 1984, on the impact of Government competition on small business. The hearing will start at 9:30 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. Senator RUDMAN will chair. For further information, please contact Michael Morris, counsel for the committee, on 224-2016.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SITUATION IN KOREA

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in these days of heightened tension in Central America; days of apprehension for the situation in the Middle East; days of quarrels and misunderstandings over the issue of arms control, we cannot forget those areas of the world which have long been of primary importance for American foreign policy. Today, I am thinking specifically of a region to which the United States committed itself in the years 1950-53: the Korean peninsula.

In those years, we fought alongside citizens of many other countries to defend Korea and "make the world safe for democracy." I ask you Mr. President, where is that democracy today?

U.S. rhetoric has not been matched with deeds. The Koreans welcome our friendship and our support. But we must lend that support responsibly; we must insure that our support helps strengthen the ties between the people and their government, and not support repressive policies which only serve to alienate the people and erect barriers between society and official leadership.

Mr. Kim Dae Jung, founder of the Korean Institute for Human Rights and respected leader of the South Korean opposition who came to the United States last year, recently shared with me his optimistic analysis of the present situation in South Korea. According to Mr. Kim:

For peace, in Korea, the most important thing is: establishing a sound government which enjoys the voluntary support of the people. Support from the people will prevent any subversive force from gaining hold in the South and will prevent any possibility of the North's communizing the South. Furthermore, from a position of strength, the South can lead North Korea to dialog and peaceful resolution of problems. The future for peace on the Korean peninsula will be decided on the question of whether the people in the South can restore democratic government and on whether the United States supports such efforts and terminates its present policy of support for military dictatorship.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of Mr. Kim's most recent addresses on the Korean situation be printed in the RECORD.

The addresses follow:

THE KOREAN PENINSULA—PEACE AND REUNIFICATION

(By Kim Dae Jung)

It is a privilege for me to speak before you at this church—a church which is so closely identified with one of the themes in my talk—that of peace. This church must take pride in the role it has had and in its minister, Rev. Coffin, who has been a leader in the peace movement for a long, long time. He is widely recognized as having been an outstanding figure in the Vietnam peace movement. I believe we may safely call him a prophet of our time as he continues to press for a resolution of the conflict in Central America.

I am touched by and deeply grateful for the role Rev. Coffin and this church took in my personal plight in 1980. I know that on very short notice Rev. Coffin opened this church to a gathering of some 600 people who expressed concern and anger when news of my arrest in May of that year reached here at the time of the Kwangju incident.

It is my hope that Rev. Coffin and this church will continue to play a significant role in the resolution of problems facing my country, Korea.

I. THE CONDITIONS OF PEACE

Technically speaking, the Korean peninsula has continued on in a state of war ever since the truce of July, 1953 because there has been no progress toward a peace treaty. Intense hostility has remained. The number of soldiers and the amount of weaponry has actually increased. The possibility of another conflict has been evident for over thirty years. The United States has maintained tens of thousands of troops in South Korea throughout this period in order to prevent another conflict. However, there has been peace on the peninsula—though it has been tenuous.

I see two major reasons that this peace has been maintained in spite of the poor conditions. First, there has been a balance of power factor not only between the South and the North but also with their respective supporters, the United States and Japan on one side and China and the Soviet Union on the other. As in Europe, the balance of power on the Korean peninsula has helped to keep the peace. The situation in Korea is thus not like that in the Middle East where there is no effective balance of power. Second, neither side has felt that it could gain any advantage by provoking war and thus upset this balance of power. Each side has felt it would only sustain serious damage should war break out. The damage would destroy the works of great labor which went into building up out of the ashes of war. War has been avoided because there has existed a balance of power and there has been no temptation to gain advantage on either side. These conditions will last long into the future. Thus, I don't see much possibility of another conflict. In addition, China has recently expressed a strong desire to promote peaceful conditions on the peninsula in cooperation with the United States and Japan. The Soviet Union is also unwilling to see any conflict on the Korean peninsula because it can see no advantage in such a conflict.

Last month, North Korea proposed a three-way dialogue revealing a drastic change in attitude. It had strongly opposed any dialogue with South Korea before then and had persistently insisted on having negotiations only with the United States to bring about a peace treaty. There is a great possibility that dialogue involving both South and North Korea will take place this year in spite of present delays. President Reagan's visit to China this April may bring about significant progress toward the start of dialogue. Though I am not sure that a permanent peace treaty can be achieved, I believe that dialogue can ease the tensions and hostility on the peninsula. I know that South Korea on the one hand and China and the Soviet Union on the other have hopes of establishing trade ties. It is known that North Korea also has a desire to develop economic relations with western countries. There is talk that North Korea is preparing a free port for this purpose on its west coast. Such economic relations could greatly help to maintain peace on the Korean peninsula.

However, there is a serious factor which if uncorrected can certainly damage the balance of power on the peninsula and the national security of South Korea. Since South Korea is under dictatorial rule, there is no guarantee of freedom of speech, academic freedom, freedom to organize and participate in trade unions, and elections of true value. There is a rubber stamp opposition party, National Assembly, and judicial branch. The more the economy grows, the greater is the gap between the haves and the have-nots, between urban and rural areas, between big enterprises and small enterprises, and between regions. Ten tycoon businessmen alone control 50% of the GNP. Therefore, the people's dissatisfaction has seriously increased. Consequently the present military regime can not enjoy the people's support and the United States is being criticized as the main support of this evil government. North Korea is eager to take advantage of the situation, but I don't see much chance that North Korea will stage an invasion across the DMZ. As Congressman Stephen Solarz has said North Korea will become ever bolder in seeking to promote turmoil by agitating dissatisfied people. Without improvement toward democracy there is no doubt that turmoil will become common and continue. Thus, North Korea may have a chance to create another Vietnam-like situation.

The clearest danger to peace is within South Korea. For peace, the most important thing is not good negotiations with the North but establishing a sound government which enjoys the voluntary support of the people. Only democratic government can gain the people's full support and ask for the people's dedication in maintaining stability and security. This is so because democratic government can guarantee the freedom, justice, and human dignity to which the Korean people have so long aspired.

Support from the people will prevent any subversive force from gaining hold in the South and will prevent any possibility of the North's communizing the South. Furthermore, from a position of strength, the South can lead North Korea to dialogue and peaceful resolution of problems. The future for peace on the Korean peninsula will be decided on the question of whether the people in the South can restore democratic government and on whether the United States supports such efforts and terminates its present policy of support for military dictatorship.

Another important factor is on an international level. Support for peace must come from the four big powers, the United States, the Soviet Union, Japan and China, which have geographical and traditional interests in the region. So, a three-way dialogue alone will not be sufficient. It must develop toward a six-way dialogue.

In a word, restoration of democracy and four-power cooperation are essential for peace on the Korean peninsula.

II. PROSPECTS FOR REUNIFICATION

Unlike the two Germanys, both Koreas have taken unification as their main goal. Unification has been persistently supported internationally. The four powers, the United States, the Soviet Union, Japan and China, which have strong interests in and influence on the peninsula now also support unification officially. In spite of the lack of opposition to unification, we have failed to achieve it in forty years time and there is no strong hope that we may achieve this goal in the near future.

There are two reasons for failure to achieve unification. First, even though the four powers support unification, they have not been truly interested in the realization of unification due to the nature of the cold war. They have not wanted to see any change in the balance of power in the peninsula and unification might upset it. The strategic importance of the peninsula is perceived as critical. The four powers have preferred to maintain the status quo with the peninsula divided in two. There is no real possibility of establishing a unified and neutral government such as that in Austria. Second, the persistent ambition of North Korea to communize South Korea and South Korea's continuing fear of North Korea have prevented moves toward peaceful unification. There has been no mutual trust, no progress toward reduction of hostilities between the two sides, no progress toward the restoration of a national consensus. There is a significant difference in the two systems' political, economic, and social development over the last forty years, and so we can see little possibility of early peaceful reunification as one country under the present circumstances.

To achieve peaceful unification we must succeed in addressing two areas of concern—a local one and an international one.

First, in South Korea, we must establish a strong and truly stable government with the people's cooperation and full support via the implementation of democracy. Such a government may have meaningful dialogue with North Korea in working toward the realization of peaceful coexistence and move toward a loose federal system as a first step. The existence of the communist government in the North could be recognized on one hand while South Korea would have to be guaranteed its right to exist as a democratic government on the other. The greater the increase of mutual trust and negotiation, the farther along we may proceed toward establishing one country under a loose federal system.

Second, on an international level, though we think of unification as something to be solved by the 60 million Koreans in the South and North, we can not deny that there is a strong influence coming from the four powers affecting the goal of unification. Each of the big powers has serious misgivings about a unified Korea. Each fears that a unified Korea might damage its security or other interests. The four powers may maneuver to thwart our efforts for the realization of unification thus augmenting the anti-unification factors within the South and the North. Whether we like it or not, we can not, therefore, ignore international attitudes though we should maintain a strong national determination to work toward one Korea.

Fundamentally speaking, peace and unification should be gained with the aid of the Korean people's strength. When there is a government in the South which is strong, North Korea will be cooperative in working toward the realization of peace and unification. When there is such a strong government in the South, the four powers will not be able to disregard the Korean people's desire for peace and reunification. Such strength must come from democratic government which can enjoy the people's full support. But, unfortunately, there is now no such democratic government in the South. This is mainly because of United States support for the present military dictatorship. It is well-known that while enjoying little support from the Korean people, General Chun can maintain his power only with United States support. United States support has led to Japanese support. Such international support for dictatorship has seriously discouraged democratic elements in the military and among our people. Though the United States has justified its support of military dictatorship using maintenance of peace as an excuse, this stand has backfired and peace is now actually threatened because dictatorship has greatly destroyed our people's loyalty. There is also a growing anti-American feeling among our people because of United States failure to support the cause of democracy in the South. If the present situation continues, we can not avoid meeting a fate similar to that seen in Vietnam: The present feeble peace may not be maintained and South Korea may be communized by the North.

I am not asking the United States to restore democracy in our stead; we only ask the United States not support military dictatorship but lend moral support to our democratic cause. With such moral support, we can achieve democratic government and work toward peace and eventually toward reunification.

As I said at the beginning of this talk, this church under the guidance of Rev. Coffin is a world-renowned force for peace. You base your belief and work for peace in God's love. I sincerely ask you to impress your government and the American people to support the Korean people's efforts. We can succeed with your help.

I thank you.

THE PRESENT SITUATION IN KOREA

(By Kim Dae Jung)

You are all knowledgeable in Asian affairs and particularly well-versed in Korean issues. As a Korean who has long been imprisoned and thus separated from Korean society and now one who has been away from Korea for more than one year, I should be the one receiving information from you on the present Korean situation. In Korean, we say this is like preaching Buddhism to Buddha. Recognizing my shortcomings in this regard, I will tell you briefly what I know of the present situation in South Korea to set the stage for the question and answer period which is to follow.

I want to address five areas. They are: 1) the issue of talks between North and South Korea as proposed by North Korea; 2) the necessity of systematic reform for human rights; 3) the possibility of another Yushin System; 4) the possibility of conflict between students and the government; and 5) the present role of the Korean churches.

I. THE ISSUE OF TALKS BETWEEN NORTH AND SOUTH KOREA

Last month North Korea made an unexpected proposal for three-way dialogue involving both Koreas and the United States. A similar proposal for a three-way dialogue was put forward by the late Park Chung Hee and President Carter in 1979 when President Carter visited Seoul. In spite of this, the attitudes of South Korea and the United States toward the present North Korean proposal are not very positive. The United States prefers to have a four-way dialogue which would include China. South Korea insists on a bilateral dialogue between the South and the North while leaving open the possibility of a four-way or six-way dialogue which would include the Soviet Union and Japan. South Korea is firmly resisting participation in a three-way dialogue even at the risk of contradicting its stand of 1979 when a proposal for such talks was issued from South Korea. South Korea worries about being excluded if North Korea should concentrate its efforts on dealing with the United States alone. North Korea might justify such an attitude on the grounds that it was North Korea and the United States which signed a truce agreement to end the Korean War in 1953.

On the other hand, North Korea is strongly opposed to a four-way dialogue. Two reasons can be cited. One is to avoid the dissatisfaction of the Soviet Union by participating in talks which would only involve China and not the Soviets. The other reason is to prevent South Korea's long-held desire of establishing contacts with China. The North Koreans are not likely to support a six-way dialogue at present either. The North Korean proposal for a three-way dialogue is supported by the Soviet Union.

The coming visit of President Reagan to China may result in decisive progress on this issue.

I see a strong possibility of opening some type of dialogue this year. However, I think that if there is a firm guarantee of equal status for South Korea at a three-way conference, that the three-way dialogue would be most likely.

My position is not in opposition to any type of dialogue as a first step to easing tensions on the Korean peninsula, but I firmly believe that only a six-way dialogue can produce any progress toward peace on the Korean peninsula because all four powers, the United States, Japan, China, and the Soviet Union, have vital interests and strong influence in Korea. Without their combined cooperation, we can never expect real peace on the Korean peninsula. This has been my persistent position since the 1971 Korean presidential election when I proposed four-power cooperation on the Korean peninsula.

II. THE NECESSITY OF SYSTEMATIC REFORM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The State Department has pointed out improvement in the Korean human rights situation in 1983 as compared with previous years. This came in its annual report on human rights. It mentioned the release of political prisoners—mainly students—and the granting of permission for students to return to their respective campuses. Of course, I also welcomed these moves, but this does not constitute a fundamental improvement in the human rights situation because many times in Korea we have seen the repeated release and imprisonment and the repeated expulsion and re-entry of students to college campuses. Without systematic reform toward a guarantee of human rights, we can never say that there is improvement in human rights. What we see is rather the cosmetic tactics of dictatorial rule in cheating public opinion both domestically and internationally. We need legal guarantees for the democratic rights of assembly, academic freedom, freedom for labor to organize, and freedom for farmers to form cooperatives. Of all freedoms, the freedom of speech and the freedom to have fair elections are the most essential core elements in guaranteeing human rights. When there is freedom of speech, any violation of human rights can be publicly criticized. When there is a fair system of elections, any government which can not guarantee human rights or which violates human rights will be voted out of office. The South Korean regime of Chun Doo Hwan strongly opposes any systematic reform—especially anything moving toward freedom of speech and free elections. The regime strongly opposes abolition of the notorious basic law governing the mass media, and government dominated elections laws. Further, it refuses to lift the ban imposed on 300 political figures. This ban prohibits these figures from making any public speeches or participating in any election activities.

III. THE POSSIBILITY OF ANOTHER YUSHIN SYSTEM

As you may remember, Park Chung Hee abused the South/North dialogue coming out of the July 4, 1972 joint communique. He proclaimed the Yushin System—justifying it as necessary to promote reunification, but from the time of the proclamation of the Yushin System until his death in 1979—a period of seven years—the Yushin System only served to shore up his dictatorial regime.

In spite of General Chun's repeated pledges to step down from office in March of 1988 after serving one term, there is a strong possibility that he seeks to continue his rule after 1988. There is a possibility of political maneuvering this year. Something which indicates that this is so is a move by the rubber stamp opposition parties for direct election of the president. The rubber stamp mass media has given full coverage to this idea. In South Korea without government approval, no opposition party or press organization can put forward such an idea. Chun was elected indirectly. A direct election after a constitutional amendment could be justified by Chun as a necessity in facing North Korea in talks. That is, Chun could say he needed to prove his popular support in order to face the North. Such a direct election under present conditions without freedom of speech and fair elections could easily be orchestrated by the government.

I predicted that Park Chung Hee would abuse the unification issue as a means to have himself elected for life. I made this prediction in 1970 and 1972. In 1972, the Yushin System was put in place and confirmed my prediction. I now see a similar possibility under the Chun regime.

IV. THE POSSIBILITY OF CONFLICT BETWEEN STUDENTS AND THE GOVERNMENT

Student power has grown tremendously through years of bitter experience and ordeal. Students are firmly determined to fight against dictatorship. Most of our people are different than they were in 1980. They now support the students' cause.

Expelled students are being forced to sign pledges of repentance before they may return to the campuses. However, the majority of these students refuse to do this, saying that they have nothing to repent for and that what they have stood for is an open advocacy of democracy which is not wrong. At the same time, there are signs that the government seeks to stir up trouble among students so that it may have an excuse to strongly repress them this coming spring. The government has been letting statements out from unidentified sources which accuse students of being leftist or pro-communist. The government has always used the charge of communism to crack down on its rivals. You know that in Korea this is a very serious charge which may easily turn some people against the students. I believe we must exercise caution at this critical time to avoid playing into the government's hands. We should be on our guard against such plots by the government and not be abused by such things.

V. THE PRESENT ROLE OF THE KOREAN CHURCHES

Korean churches have played a central role in the restoration of democracy and human rights movement since Park Chung Hee proclaimed the Yushin System in October, 1972. The role of churches has been significant and decisive in maintaining our movement. Recently, there have been signs of a lessening of the churches' role and there has been criticism—especially among students—of the role played by the churches because of the churches' pro-American attitude and the reluctance of the churches to continue their courageous role as they, as individuals, did before with prayer meetings and in rising imprisonment because of their stands. I don't think these criticisms are necessarily correct, but there is some indication of weakness in the church movement for democracy and human rights. On the other hand, some young men are showing signs of impatience. Patience is very necessary in enduring such periods of trial and in dealing with the short-tempered military regime.

Even though there are some arguments between church and non-church groups, we still have the same strong goal of realizing democracy. All recognize this as most important. Democracy is necessary in order to realize national security without the presence of American troops and to have a dialogue with North Korea with full confidence that a peaceful solution may be realized. To promote mutual understanding, joint activities involving church and non-church groups are essential in order to achieve our goal and not give any room for abuse by the shrewd maneuvering of the government.

I came here in December of 1982. During this last year I have devoted myself totally to persuading the United States government and friends not to support the military dictatorship in Korea. I believe it is harmful to the United States to support the dictatorship. For stability and security in Korea and for friendly relations between the people of Korea and the United States such support is also harmful. In spite of the Chun Doo Hwan government's lack of support from the people as reported in the American press, the Chun regime is maintained mainly because of United States support. As the United States supports the regime so does Japan. Because the United States and Japan support the Chun regime, democratic elements in the military and among our people have been greatly discouraged. Now, the United States has become a target of criticism and even hatred among our people. I really worry about this phenomenon for both Korea and the United States. My main purpose in being here in the United States is to persuade the United States to change its policy. I seek American public support. We must avoid another debacle such as seen in Vietnam. As I first mentioned, you are well informed about the Korean situation and I believe you will share my worries about the present situation. Let's focus our attention and energies to impress your government to change its policies.●

NEW YORK DISTRICT COUNCIL

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a statement made by the New York District Export Council on behalf of American exporters located in New York. This organization has diligently worked to express the views of its members in regards to the Export Administration Act, especially in reference to the issue of contract sanctity.

Contract sanctity, according to the New York District Council, is vital to American competitiveness abroad. Without it, U.S. firms will be considered unreliable suppliers and will consequently be unable to sell products and commodities with long lead times in manufacturing and delivery. The council urges, therefore, that retroactive controls never be imposed for foreign policy reasons and that only the strongest justification lead to the imposition of national security controls on a retroactive basis.

Because of the relevance of these remarks to the congressional debate on the Export Administration Act, I request that the full statement of the New York District Export Council be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

ARMCO CORP. OFFICES,
New York, NY, March 28, 1984.

Hon. JOHN HEINZ,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HEINZ: The Executive Committee of the New York DEC adopted and sent to the Secretary of Commerce the attached statement of position on the renewal of the Export Administration Act. I thought the statement might be of interest to you.

I would like to point out that no provision of the bill is as important to many of us in the business community as the provision dealing with "contract sanctity". The position of the New York DEC (see paragraph 5D on the attachment) is identical to many other organizations such as the National Foreign Trade Council. There should be no

retroactive application of export controls except in times of war or national emergency!

Many people do not understand that without an effective contract sanctity provision, there simply will be *no* trade with countries such as the Soviet Union except in commodities or products which do not require long lead times to manufacture and deliver. Armco, for one, will not seek export opportunities unless it can be assured that once it receives an export license, it will not be suspended or revoked except under conditions equivalent to force majeure. We know many other companies feel the same way.

I respectfully urge you to consider this question carefully and to adopt an Export Administration Act that will both encourage an expansion of U.S. exports and protect true U.S. national security interests.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. GIFFEN.

AUGUST 3, 1983.

NEW YORK DISTRICT EXPORT COUNCIL

STATEMENT OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT POSITION

The Executive Committee of the New York District Export Council has unanimously adopted the following position on the proposed renewal of the Export Administration Act:

1. The ability of American exporters to compete effectively in international markets has been seriously hampered by U.S. export policy and administration of the Export Administration Act.

2. Exports are essential to the health of the U.S. economy. Both the Legislative and Executive branches must make a strong commitment to facilitating exports which do not make a direct and substantial contribution to our adversaries' military capability. The Congress and the Executive branch must remove the serious disadvantages faced by U.S. exports in Free World markets as a result of an export controls policy which is distinctly less favourable to U.S. exports than are the policies of our trading partners to their own exports.

3. The New York District Export Council recognizes the need for export controls over exports which make a direct and substantial contribution to our adversaries' military capabilities. However, this Administration and past administrations have confused and mixed foreign policy objectives with national security objectives. Despite the clear direction of Congress, export controls, and validated license requirements, cover a range of products and technology which is broader than necessary, and possibly counterproductive, to concentrating on the most strategically important items.

4. To enable American business to compete effectively, export controls must be clear, comprehensive and certain. Presently the Export Administration Act gives essentially no guidance on which exports will be prohibited for either national security or foreign policy reasons. Export controls have been applied retroactively and unpredictably, such that American exporters have come to be viewed as unreliable suppliers.

5. To deal with these problems, the New York District Export Council recommends:

(a) the United States should adopt a comprehensive clear policy on when U.S. exports will be restricted or prohibited.

(b) exports should not be restricted unless they would make a direct and substantial contribution to the military capabilities of our adversaries. It is implicit in this principle that export controls for foreign policy reasons should be eliminated. Our allies do not control exports for such reasons and foreign policy controls have uniformly failed to achieve any meaningful foreign policy goal except where supported by all foreign countries capable of supplying similar exports.

(c) except for national security reasons, exports should never be prohibited or restricted where equivalent goods or technology is available from non-U.S. sources. The lack of foreign availability should be raised from a matter simply to be considered (among others) in determining to apply export control to an affirmative determination to be made before imposing controls.

(d) there should be no retroactive application of export controls except in times of war or national emergencies. Once export contracts have been executed under valid licenses, exports under these contracts should not be subject to prohibitions. Retroactive controls should never be imposed for foreign policy reasons and the strongest justification (such as mistake) should be required for national security controls to be imposed retroactively.

(e) the Executive branch must have a generalized commitment to exports. Distortion of Congressional intent through the misapplication of foreign policy controls and unnecessarily broad interpretations of the contribution which exports may make to an adversaries' military capability, must be eliminated.●

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there have been persistent reports in the press that President Reagan has decided to condition aid to Mexico on Mexican support for his Central American policies. Relations between the United States and Mexico have always been difficult and need careful, sensitive handling. Such a big stick approach, if indeed it has been adopted, is bound to prove counterproductive.

Carlos Fuentes has written a recent analysis on the likely Mexican reaction if President Reagan makes such an approach to President de la Madrid when he visits Washington next month. Mr. Fuentes argues that U.S. foreign policy has suffered its greatest defeats not at the hands of Marxism-Leninism but of Third-World nationalism. He asserts that pressure on Mexico would cause the Reagan administration's rudderless Central American policies to hit a mine more explosive than any planted by the Central Intelligence Agency in Nicaraguan waters if it provoked in Mexico a nationwide anti-U.S. reaction: Mexico would not shift to Marxism but to stronger nationalism.

Mr. Fuentes does not pull his punches, but the points he makes are important for us all to hear. I urge my colleagues to read this important analysis that appeared in the April 24 New York Times. I ask that the full text of Mr. Fuentes' analysis appear at this point in the RECORD.

DON'T PUSH MEXICO

(By Carlos Fuentes)

ST. LOUIS.—President Reagan, we are told, has signed National Security Decision Directive 124, which is designed to convince Mexico's President, Miguel de la Madrid, and his principal aides that their interest lies in supporting United States policies in Central America.

According to Newsweek, when Mr. de la Madrid visits Washington in May, Mr. Reagan will argue that "the price for continued economic aid to Mexico is support for Washington's policies in Central America." The Administration has neither confirmed nor denied the report. I hope it is denied. Confirmation would add to the mess Washington's policies are churning up in Central America.

A keystone of United States foreign policy has been a secure southern border. This security arises not from Washington's imposing its will on Mexico but from a long, painful experience that involved war and other military intervention, territorial annexation, revolution and pressures and harassments resembling those heaped on Nicaragua today. In the late 1930's, Mexico and the United States reached a *modus vivendi* based on mutual respect and diplomatic, not military, solutions.

It is appalling that these lessons are forgotten in dealing with Central America simply because Washington wants to treat the small republics as satellites. But it would be disastrous if the model for correct relationships with Latin America—the Mexico-United States relationship—should wantonly revert to "big stick" and gunboat-diplomacy policies.

Mexico proves its friendship through its diplomatic independence. Would the United States be better off with a Latin Poland on its border? It also proves its friendship by keeping historical memory alive when the United States suffers amnesia. Mistakes should not be repeated out of ignorance or arrogance. When they are, it discourages all in the Southern Hemisphere who do not want to fall into the Soviet Union's arms but also do not want to be manipulated by the United States. Yet many Latin Americans, thanks to the Administration's actions, have stopped perceiving a Soviet danger and see only a United States danger in the hemisphere.

Any action designed to put pressure on Mexico will feed this perception. United States foreign policy has suffered its greatest defeats not at the hands of Marxism-Leninism but of third-world nationalism. Some politicians in this country may fool some of the people about their anti-Communist crusades in Central America, but it would be hard to characterize Mexico as a Communist pawn. Such pressures would be glaringly seen here and in Mexico as an encroachment on its national independence.

The Administration can be certain that using muscle on Mexico will serve only to strengthen Mexico's independent foreign policy and unify the country behind President de la Madrid. He is not only a man of strong character and strong nationalist sentiment but also a canny politician acutely aware that national unity rests considerably on a policy of defense against North American pressures.

The Reagan Administration's rudderless Central American policies would hit a mine more explosive than any planted by the Central Intelligence Agency in Nicaraguan waters if it provoked in Mexico a nationwide anti-United States reaction: Mexico would not shift to Marxism but to stronger nationalism. A hostile Mexico is the last thing Washington needs.

This would add to the accumulated disasters we are now witnessing. A policy designed to enhance United States credibility

abroad is openly opposed by Latin America's principal governments and by your European allies. Washington's international machismo flounders in the incompetence of its covert armies, covert air forces, covert mining operations, a Salvadoran Army that supplies half the guerrillas' military needs and a Nicaraguan Government that grows stronger the more it is assailed from without.

This results from putting the chariots of war before the steeds of diplomacy. Mexico wants to put the horse before the cart. The pragmatic Contadora process has reached the stage of preparing a Draft Treaty on the Maintenance of Peace, Security, Economic Cooperation and the Strengthening of Democratic Institutions in Central America, to be signed by the five Central American republics, plus protocols dealing with particular problems between Nicaragua and Honduras, El Salvador and Costa Rica. These instruments deal with all the United States' legitimate security interests in the region.

After thumbing its nose at international law on the steps on the court at The Hague and in Nicaraguan waters, the Administration, to heal its damaged reputation, should abandon its dangerous, unproductive policies and support peaceful diplomacy with more than lip service. It could start by shelving National Security Decision Directive 124.●

ADVANCE NOTIFICATION—PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of $50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of $14 million. Upon receipt of such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Pursuant to an informal understanding, the Department of Defense has agreed to provide the committee with a preliminary notification 20 days before transmittal of the official notification. The official notification will be printed in the RECORD in accordance with previous practice.

I wish to inform Members of the Senate that such a notification has been received.

Interested Senators may inquire as to the details of this advance notification at the office of the Committee on Foreign Relations, room SD-440.

The notification follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, April 19, 1984.

Dr. HANS BINNENDIJK,
Professional Staff Member, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. BINNENDIJK: By letter dated 18 February 1976, the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, indicated that you would be advised of possible transmittals to Congress of information as required by Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act. At the instruction of the Department of State, I wish to provide the following advance notification.

The Department of State is considering an offer to a Middle Eastern country tentatively estimated to cost in excess of $50 million.

Sincerely,

GLENN A. RUDD,
Deputy Director.●

PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of $50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of $14 million. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that such information is immediately available to the full Senate, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the notification which has been received. The classified annex referred to in the covering letter is available to Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

The notification follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, April 19, 1984.

In reply refer to: I-02223/84ct.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 84-41 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Army's proposed Letter of Offer to Italy for defense articles and services estimated to cost $57 million. Shortly after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media of the unclassified portion of this Transmittal.

Sincerely,

GLENN A. RUDD,
Deputy Director.

[Transmittal No. 84-41]

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF LETTER OF OFFER PURSUANT TO SECTION 36(b) OF THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

(i) Prospective purchaser: Italy.

(ii) Total estimated value:

	Millions
Major defense equipment [1]	$53
Other	4
Total	57

[1] As defined in section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

(iii) Description of articles or services offered: A quantity of 5,390 I-TOW missiles and 1,239 TOW practice missiles with applicable publications.

(iv) Military Department: Army (XKW).

(v) Sales commission, fee, etc., paid, offered, or agreed to be paid: None.

(vi) Sensitivity of technology contained in the defense articles or defense services proposed to be sold: See Annex under separate cover.

(vii) Section 28 report: Case not included in section 28 report.

(viii) Date report delivered to Congress: April 19, 1984.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

ITALY—I-TOW AND TOW PRACTICE MISSILES

The Government of Italy has requested the purchase of a quantity of 5,390 I-TOW missiles and 1,239 TOW practice missiles with applicable publications at an estimated cost of $57 million.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the military capabilities of Italy; furthering NATO rationalization, standardization, and interoperability; and enhancing the defenses of the Western Alliance.

The Government of Italy requires the I-TOW missile system to improve its antitank defense posture. Italian military forces are currently equipped with the basic TOW missile system.

The sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be the Hughes Aircraft Corporation of Tucson, Arizona.

Implementation of this sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor personnel to Italy.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.●

ENZO DE CHIARA

(By request of Mr. BAKER the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, there is one thing upon which Americans pride ourselves above all: the opportunity that our Nation affords to the industrious individual. We do well to remember this distinctly American phenomenon, particularly as it relates to those who make their way to our shores from other nations. Right here, in Washington, DC, there is a classic example of the limitless possibilities presented to those who come to America with a dream of success and the determination to make this American dream come true.

Many of us in this Chamber have had the pleasure of knowing Enzo de Chiara. After many a late night session of the Senate, we have made our way to his family-owned-and-operated restaurant, Romeo & Juliet, for a fine Italian dinner. Along with the fine food, Enzo de Chiara dispenses his keen observations on current affairs. He is an eternal optimist who came to America with the will to succeed.

Recently, he was spotlighted in the Courier Diplomatique. I ask, therefore, that this article be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The article follows:

ANOTHER AMERICAN OF ITALIAN ANCESTRY MAKES HIS MARK

Enzo de Chiara is a man who thrives on challenge; a man who creates for himself opportunities which might not otherwise exist.

Today, after only 16 years in the United States, Enzo is a successful, independent businessman who exercises an increasingly effective presence in the Italian-American community.

His professional stature has not always been so assured, however. Enzo is a graduate of the University of Naval Sciences and spent the earliest years of his career as a Merchant Marine officer. As a young bachelor in his native Italy, Enzo forsook a financially comfortable and professionally promising career in the blossoming Italian fashion industry to make a life for himself in the United States. He arrived in New York in September 1968 with $150 and seven pieces of luggage, most of which contained books and records.

Enzo seized every opportunity that came his way. His first job paid $45 a week and occupied (but hardly satisfied) him for exactly 45 days. Subsequent positions, including one with Italian master tailor Lino Lentini, were more rewarding.

But it was not until Enzo decided he would work only in Gucci's Fifth Avenue shop that he first began to forge his own career. After careful cultivation, Dr. Aldo Gucci offered Enzo the position of manager of his shoe boutique. At this point, Enzo's talent and tact for business asserted itself. He refused the manager's position because he believed himself unqualified for it. But he accepted the manager's salary to work as a Gucci salesman so that he could learn every aspect of the business. It was a decision Enzo and Dr. Gucci have never regretted.

Within one month, Enzo had become Gucci's best salesman, and shortly thereafter he assumed the management of the shoe boutique. At the time, Gucci sold 25 pairs of shoes a day. Nine months later, the shoe boutique, under Enzo's suave and efficient management, was selling 350 pairs of shoes a day. His position eventually encompassed responsibility for sales, styling, and purchasing for all Gucci shops in the United States.

Enzo's success at Gucci was the foundation for his association with Mario Valentino, Italy's premier couturier, and in 1970 he moved to Washington, D.C. where, at The Watergate, he opened his own boutique with the Valentino franchise.

Enzo discovered, however, that success as an arbiter of taste and fashion entrepreneur was not as satisfying as he had thought it would be. In an abrupt career change, he sold his five-year-old boutique and, in the tradition of his family, he opened, in partnership with his two brothers, Romeo and Juliet restaurant, indisputably one of the best Italian restaurants in Washington.

Today, from his office at Romeo and Juliet's, Enzo acts as an international business consultant, advising Italian industries on sales to U.S. clients.

Enzo's activities are not limited solely to the business community, however. He is consistently and increasingly involved in Italian-American political affairs and is highly respected as an effective liaison between American and Italian politicians. He attributes his interest and participation in politics not only to his business success which, he says, "makes me realize I have the talent to address myself to larger issues," but also to the close bond he has with his relative Giovanni Leone, former President of the Republic of Italy. "It is he who taught me the Italian machinery of politics, and it is from him I learned that personal contributions in the political arena help to improve the quality of our lives".

Enzo's political contributions to Italian-American friendship have not gone unnoticed. In 1977, he was decorated with the Cross of Merit by the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. The following year, he was decorated by the Secretary of State of the Republic of San Marino. He serves as special assistant to the Chairman of the Italian-American Foundation for International Affairs, and in a departure from his inherent Italian-American interests, he has been appointed Honorary Consul of the Republic of Panama in Washington, D.C.

How does he view his life in the United States? Enzo replies simply, "This is the most wonderful land in the world. I love this country with the same feelings and strength that I love the country of my birth." ●

CHURCHILL AND REAGAN

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, yesterday, the New York Times opposite-editorial page carried a very thought-provoking article deserving of the attention of the Senate. I ask that the article of Pamela C. Harriman, entitled "Churchill and Reagan," be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

CHURCHILL AND REAGAN

(By Pamela C. Harriman)

In 1945, Winston Churchill was more than a British hero; he was the personification of the free world. Yet in political terms, this counted for far less than Churchill—and virtually everyone else—assumed. In the midst of the Potsdam Conference, while he was plotting the future of the globe with Truman and Stalin, Churchill was suddenly and unceremoniously deposed in a British general election he was supposed to win handily.

The news came like a thunderclap; but after the reverberations faded, the results seemed almost foreordained. And the reasons why a British Prime Minister lost that long ago election suggest that the same unexpected fate could befall an American President forty years later.

Churchill, like Reagan, was certainly personally popular; indeed the Prime Minister was universally regarded as the savior of the nation. Churchill was a dominant presence. By contrast, the leader of the opposition, Clement Attlee seemed so drab that Churchill once described him as "a sheep's clothing." More eloquently and more powerfully than Reagan, Churchill was the great communicator, the man had mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. Attle's voice was high-pitched and staccato; he was a poor speaker. By comparison, every Democratic candidate for President in 1984 is an able speaker.

In short, Churchill had more of Reagan's strengths and fewer of his weaknesses. Although he was the oldest Prime Minister of the century, he was two years younger in 1945 than Reagan is today. No one questioned what Churchill had achieved or the importance of it. His war policy was not at issue in an election that followed the German surrender by only a matter of months. No one suspected that he was a part-time leader, not fully in command, or not quite up to the job intellectually.

So what happened? Churchill, who saw the election as a judgment on his past success, lost power to Attlee because he lost control of the political dialogue. Instead of voting for Churchill's leadership, his character, or his record, the British acknowledged these factors and then all but ignored them. They responded to the issue of housing starts at home, not zones of occupation. Attlee spoke of social justice, not international arrangements; he pledged a Britian "with cake for none until all had bread." The election was about the future, not the past—and the candidate who had been preeminently first in war was not seen as the right man to be first in peace.

This did not mean that Churchill had lost his place in the hearts of his countrymen. Rather, with rough democratic dispatch, they decided that he had finished the job he had been selected to do. As for the future, his vision was not theirs.

As Churchill went, so could Reagan in 1984. The signs of the similarity between the two political situations are interesting and impressive. While the President's personal popularity is high, his Gallup ratings are markedly lower when the question concerns the job he is doing in specific areas—the economy, his policies in Lebanon and Central America, the overall conduct of foreign policy. He offers no program for the American future beyond the continuation of his present course.

Many who voted for him in 1980 may very well decide that he, like Churchill, has completed the task and can be thankfully retired—that he is no longer a man for the times.

Indeed, Mr. Reagan was elected when Americans worried that our national defense was weak. Now, they wonder if we are spending too much, moving too fast into another round of the nuclear arms race, and edging too near the brink of war in Central America.

This President was elected to cut the waste in government; now people are thinking again about fairness, compassion and the poor. The realization is setting in that the Reagan tax cut must be modified to reduce the Reagan deficit. The social issues—abortion, school prayer, censorship—mobilized new voting blocs for the new right in 1980; this year, the gender gap and civil rights are likely to do as much or more for the Democrats.

The causes closest to Mr. Reagan's heart have become yesterday's concerns. If Americans look to the future, if they treat 1984 as a chance for change instead of a referendum on the past four years, even those who like this President, even some who approve of what he has done, may vote their hopes for what the Democrats will do. Obviously the opposition must at least echo this mood, and this year's Democratic candidates can surely do so far more skillfully than Attlee did in 1945. If the Democratic nominee does it with any effectiveness at all, Ronald Reagan could be popular, genial, likable—and defeated.

In breadth of talent, sense of history, and real achievement, there can be no comparison between Churchill and Reagan. The parallels relate only to the political situation now and in 1945, when a British election demonstrated that the most charismatic leader—even a Churchill at the height of an undisputed success unparalleled by any

of the controversial Reagan policies—can be beaten.

While Churchill, Truman, and Stalin were negotiating at Potsdam in the days before the British election, a number of us were visiting British army encampments in Germany. We shared the confidence in a Churchill victory, but we were also feeling—and I must confess, discounting—a persistent undercurrent among the soldiers. "Old Winnie was great for the war, but we want something different," they were saying to each other and writing home to England. It was a signal of the upset to come. I thought of it again as I watched the President on a recent visit to an auto factory; he was smiling and the workers were applauding. Many of them were also wearing Mondale hats. I wondered how many of them were saying to themselves: "I like old Ronnie, but I want something different."●

SMOKEY BEAR WEEK

(By request of Mr. BAKER the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I recently cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 273, legislation introduced by my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Senator HEFLIN. This resolution would designate the week of May 13 as "Smokey Bear Week."

Mr. President, in my State of New York, we have one of this Nation's most beautiful forests in the Adirondack Park. The people of my State feel very strongly about preserving this area in its natural state. Indeed, an amendment to the State constitution mandates that the area be kept forever wild. In light of this deep concern by the people of my State for conservation, I felt it was most appropriate to honor the symbolic leader of the fight to conserve our forests—Smokey the Bear.

Smokey has been a symbol of the fight to maintain our forests for many years. It is indeed appropriate that we honor him on this, the 40th, anniversary of his adoption by the American public. I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution without delay.●

ROBERT N. CLEMENT

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the elevation of a friend and distinguished public servant, Mr. Robert N. Clement, to the presidency of Cumberland College in Lebanon, TN.

Mr. Clement's career, although not lengthy, has been characterized by high achievement. He has served with great distinction on the Tennessee Public Service Commission, to which he was elected by the people of our State, and as a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Interspersed in this career of public service has been a successful history of ventures in private business, indicating the enormous energy and devotion Mr. Clement brings to his work.

Mr. Clement represents the third generation of his family to have attended or been associated with Cumberland College. Both his father, the late Tennessee Gov. Frank G. Clement, and his grandfather were alumni of the institution.

Cumberland College has a rich heritage and once had more graduates in the U.S. Congress than any other college or university. Its alumni include such prominent figures as the late U.S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull, justices of both United States and State Supreme Court, Governors, college presidents, and other local and national leaders.

I am confident that Mr. Clement will uphold and strengthen the tradition of this fine institution. Even though Mr. Clement is now only 40 years old, he has demonstrated wisdom and insights far beyond his years, and these qualities will help establish him as an honored and distinguished leader of Cumberland College.

Mr. President, I wish to extend my hearty congratulations to President Robert N. Clement of Cumberland College on the occasion of his inauguration to that position, May 4, 1984.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Lebanon Democrat written by that newspaper's editor, Mr. Sam Hatcher, commemorating Mr. Clement's inauguration.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

(By Sam Hatcher)

Today marks the beginning of a new era for Cumberland College as this institution dressed and redressed in gowns of historical prominence inaugurates Robert N. Clements as its 16th president.

The college, returning to a full four-year academic degree program last year after a 27 year stint as a standard two-year junior college, turns the pages of its history to yet another chapter in its long and glorious 142 year life.

President Clement, who comes to Cumberland with a distinguished record of public service, is today coronated with the challenges of Cumberland's future.

There is much to be done and far more than can be expected of one person.

With President Clement's leadership and our community's unified force this school, which once graduated a U.S. Secretary of State, more than 100 Congessmen and Senators, 50 college and university presidents, two U.S. Supreme Court Justices and literally hundreds of justices of state supreme courts, judges, attorneys, public officials and religious leaders, will continue to be a strong, viable and influential institution.

As President Clement, his wife Mary and their two children embark on page one of this new era in Cumberland's history, we wish them well.

Their mission is not a simple one but surely one that can be filled with an abundance of satisfaction knowing that their hands have played a significant role in the continuing existence and enrichment of this college that has meant to much to so many.

With these editorial comments we extend our congratulations to President Clement and Cumberland College's first family.●

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 246—URGING THE PRESIDENT TO SECURE A FULL ACCOUNTING OF OUR MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL CAPTURED OR MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By request of Mr. BAKER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 246, a joint resolution to secure a full accounting of our military and civilian personnel captured or missing in action in Southeast Asia.

This resolution calls upon the President to secure from the governments of Southeast Asia a full accounting of the 2,490 Americans captured or missing as a result of the Vietnam conflict. It calls upon the President to work for both the immediate release of each living American listed by the Department of Defense as a prisoner or as missing in action and for the immediate return of the remains of all American POW's and MIA's who have died in Southeast Asia.

Finally, this resolution calls for two reports by the President describing the Government's efforts to achieve a full and complete accounting of our POW's and MIA's. The first report is due within 30 days of the passage of this joint resolution and will describe the actions taken by the Federal Government before the enactment of this resolution to achieve a full accounting. The second report is due not earlier than 90 days and not later than 180 days after the enactment of this resolution and will describe the actions taken by the Government to implement the first section of the resolution.

This resolution is a necessary means to keep the attention of the public, of the executive branch, and the international community focused on the urgent humanitarian need to achieve a full accounting of the 2,490 Americans listed as POW's or MIA's in Southeast Asia. There are 2,490 families who have lived for more than a decade in cruel uncertainty regarding the fate of their loved ones. This uncertainty can only be resolved through the vigorous efforts of the U.S. Government and the cooperation of the nations who control the territory in which our citizens were lost or taken prisoner.

We must have a full accounting. New York has 160 citizens listed as unaccounted for in the latest Department of Defense tally. Only California and Texas have more unaccounted for and more families living in protracted anguish. I know, because I attended the 1981 National Convention of the National League of Families of Prisoners and Missing in Action in Southeast Asia. I listened to their stories of the

devastating impact this intolerable situation has had on them.

Nothing speaks more eloquently of the need to achieve this accounting than the experience of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama. He was one of the lucky ones—he came home. He was shot down on July 18, 1965, and was held prisoner for 7½ years. He personally experienced the savage brutality of the Communist Vietnamese regime.

Now, it has been more than 12 years since the last American forces were withdrawn from South Vietnam. This means that some early POW's are approaching 20 years of harsh captivity. Even the last Americans captured are nearing twice the period of captivity our distinguished colleague endured. The courage and resolve required to withstand this experience can be judged from the distinguished Senator from Alabama's testimony. We must keep faith with these men and their families.

There has been recent movement on this issue. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Governments of Laos and Kampuchea have shown signs of cooperation in recent months. Now is the time to increase public awareness of the seriousness of this issue which has remained an open wound in our national psyche for far too long. As the administration presses ahead to explore these opportunities, this resolution will serve as a unified expression of congressional support for a full accounting. With an aroused public and a united government, we can convince the governments in Southeast Asia of our seriousness and our unyielding resolve. Only in this way can we ever hope to achieve the full accounting we must have.

In closing, I call upon my colleagues to lend their support to this important measure. The families of those listed as POW's or MIA's, and, most of all, the men our efforts are attempting to save, will remember. I want them to remember that we kept the faith and did not let them down.●

THE PRESIDENT'S INAUGURATION, FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

● Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that on May 5, 1984, the first president's inauguration will take place at Fort Valley State College in Fort Valley, GA. This 89-year-old institution received its charter in 1885 and is one of the three historically black institutions operating under the auspices of the State University System of Georgia. Fort Valley State College, located in middle Georgia, has over its years of existence made significant contributions to the betterment of the Fort Valley community, the State, and Nation. It is worthwhile to note that the diligent efforts made in agricultural research has and continues to have a positive impact on technological advancement in the field of agribusiness. I especially want to note that this institution has, in fact, established a most prestigious and recognized school of business and economics.

On May 5, 1984, at 1:30 p.m. the Fort Valley State College family, its many friends and well wishers will witness the first president's inauguration. At this moment in history, Dr. Luther Burse will receive the mace in acceptance of the role as president of this prestigious institution. I can say with all candor that Dr. Burse comes to this institution with impeccable credentials, enormous management talents, and dedication to progressive education. He earned a bachelor's degree from Kentucky State University in 1958, a masters degree from Indiana University in 1960, and a doctoral degree from the University of Maryland in 1969. Dr. Burse joined the faculty of Cheyney State College as a full professor in 1969, coordinated the graduate studies program in the division of behavorial and applied science, became acting dean of the division of technical and applied sciences in 1974, and in 1981, served as interim president of Cheyney State College. In 1983, the board of regents of the University System of Georgia elected Dr. Burse to serve as president of Fort Valley State College.

Dr. Burse is married to the former Mammie Melbor and they have an 18-year-old son, Luther, Jr., a sophomore at Morehouse College in Atlanta, and 13-year-old daughter, Elizabeth.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues of the Senate to join with me in extending best wishes for a successful inauguration of Dr. Luther Burse as president of Fort Valley State College.●

DEATH OF HENRY PALEY

(By request of Mr. BAKER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise today to inform the Senate of the untimely death of one of the great educational leaders in my State and our Nation.

Henry Paley, president of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities in New York, was dedicated as no man I have ever known to the proposition that educational opportunity is not a privilege but a right. He fought to see to it that college-bound students were given the widest possible range of academic choice.

Hank, as he was called by many, fought for students in both the private and public sectors of higher education. As the director of university relations at the City University of New York, he was a champion of broadened access to postsecondary education while always stressing the need for adherence to high academic standards.

At the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities Hank Paley performed brilliantly to help preserve New York's nationally respected private colleges and universities. Thanks to his efforts, thousands of young people benefited from the opportunity to attend some of the great schools in our land. That opportunity is the foundation of our progress as a Nation.

Hank endeared himself to us in New York because he combined intelligence with intellectual integrity. He was a son of New York, a city he loved dearly. He never forgot those roots, and always exuded the unbridled optimism and good humor of a man truly at peace with himself and his fellowman.

Hank's social conscience was perhaps most influenced by his work as a young organizer for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. He carried through life a keen sense of responsibility to working people. Whenever he spoke to me about higher education matters, Hank always framed the issues in terms of their impact on "working people." As a young man who benefited myself from a national defense student loan, I could always relate to Hank's passion for making quality education accessible and affordable to all.

So, Mr. President, we have lost a dear friend of one of the values we hold most dear: that in this Nation, anyone can pursue an education in an environment of freedom, can excel, and can contribute personally to our national well-being. While Hank is gone, that ideal will survive as long as there are men and women who believe in it with the passion and the dedication that he did. We will sorely miss him.●

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in a moment we are going to go out until tomorrow. There are no takers for morning business that I am aware of. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending amendment.

RECORD OPEN UNTIL 5 P.M. TODAY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the RECORD today remain open until 5 p.m. for the insertion of statements and the introduction of bills and resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1984

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am going to outline a program. If the minority leader has any problem with any part of it, I would be happy to change it. I have not yet had a chance to confer with him.

Let me put the request at this time. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders are recognized on tomorrow under the standing order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be recognized under a special order not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, tomorrow, after the execution of the special order, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 10:45 a.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it may be possible to obtain unanimous consent for a time certain to vote on the Mitchell amendment, but I will not attempt that now. Rather, after I confer with the minority leader I will proceed further, if possible, in that direction.

PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on tomorrow, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m. After the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) will be recognized on a special order of not to exceed 15 minutes.

After the execution of the special order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until the hour of 10:45 a.m., in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

At 10:45 a.m., or sooner if morning business is closed prior to that time, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, which is H.R. 2163, the Federal Boat Safety Act, at which time the Mitchell amendment, No. 3036, dealing with the pay raise for Federal judges, will be the pending question.

The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Mitchell amendment.

Rollcall votes are expected throughout the day tomorrow. There is a distinct possibility that Tuesday will be a late session.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators seeking recognition, and I see none, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 4:33 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, May 1, 1984, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate April 27, 1984, under authority of the order of the Senate of April 26, 1984:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Carol E. Dinkins, of Texas, to be Deputy Attorney General, vice Edward C. Schmults, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, April 30, 1984:

THE JUDICIARY

Lloyd D. George, of Nevada, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Nevada.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROMESA: A RAY OF HOPE IN THE SOUTH BRONX

HON. ROBERT GARCIA
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, more and more we see and hear evidence for hope and promise in my district of the South Bronx. One such example, is described in the following article of Nuestro. The article points out that through a program called PROMESA, those addicted to drugs can struggle to successfully rebuild their lives. In the middle of the South Bronx, in the Mount Hope section, in two renovated old buildings, society's "rejects" struggle to find themselves and to rebuild their lives against great odds. PROMESA survives despite devastating Federal cutbacks. Unfortunately, these cutbacks are indicative of the Reagan administration's hypocrisy toward social spending. That is, on one hand they want all members of society to be productive, but on the other hand, they remove the very financial assistance which could lead to that end. In any event, PROMESA will survive and provide that ray of hope for those "rejects" of the South Bronx.

[From Nuestro, March 1984]

PROMESA—A RAY OF HOPE IN THE SOUTH BRONX

(By Frank Espada)

"I was really down and out before I came here." Doris is an attractive 28-year-old addict, a resident of PROMESA, a drug treatment residential and ambulatory program in the South Bronx.

"I didn't have anything. I didn't have a family. I had to steal, to prostitute . . . I had been on drugs since I was 13."

Doris came into the program on February 28, 1983, a date she wants to remember. "I was in a similar program before, but I was never involved like this . . . I'm really dedicated to what I want to do, and it feels so good!"

At PROMESA, she is an "advanced client," undergoing clinical training. She works at the center's youth component and receives a stipend for her services. These may include such duties as escorting the youngsters to the medical department and making sure they are attending school. She is learning by observing the techniques employed by the counselors, assisting them in various ways.

She is planning to go to college next year, "because I understand that I need a full knowledge of what I'm going to be dealing with . . ." A talented young woman, she recently played Maria in PROMESA's production of "West Side Story."

According to the New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services (DSAS), almost 1.5 million people in New York are regular users of drugs. Most of them are between the ages of 12 and 35. Of these, almost 250,000 are heroin addicts, and more than three-quarters of them live in New York City.

Blacks, Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics are disproportionately represented in this group. Although they are about 21 percent of the population, they constitute 57 percent of the "hard" drug addicts in the city. In stark numbers, the estimate is that there are about 49,000 Puerto Rican and other Hispanic addicts in New York City alone. DSAS lists 48,800 clients in treatment of which more than half, 26,500 are minorities.

To a large extent, then, the hard drug problem is, and has always been, primarily a minority community problem, a very real and difficult one which is becoming increasingly worse, particularly in places like the South Bronx.

A recent Census Bureau report lists the 18th Congressional District of the South Bronx as the poorest in the nation. Yes, poorer than any districts in Mississippi, Alabama or West Virginia, with a median income of $8,448; 44 percent of the residents live on incomes below the federal poverty line.

The decade of the '70s saw a wave of arson for profit which decimated the housing stock. Many areas are totally devastated and, as a result, school enrollment has dropped dramatically, forcing the closing of many schools (one school district's population has dropped by more than half in less than five years).

Add to this situation the generally poor public services which are the norm, the specter of ever present crime and the desolation of a Martian landscape and one may have a hint of what it's like to live in the South Bronx.

In the middle of all of this stands PROMESA, in the Mount Hope section of the South Bronx. There, in two renovated old buildings that were formerly a Hebrew Home for the Aged, society's rejects struggle to find themselves and to rebuild their lives against great odds.

"Most of our clients are individuals who never had structure in their lives, who always ran away from responsibilities, who had a negative life style," says Felix Velásquez, the executive director of PROMESA. "They come because all the other doors have been closed to them."

Velásquez leans forward for emphasis. "Our job is to motivate them, to turn them around, to give them some self-esteem, a sense of values, to bring out their potential, to give them self-confidence—that's what PROMESA is about."

The program presently serves 210 adults and 25 youth between the ages of 12 and 19. Most are live-in residential clients, with an average stay of up to 18 months. There is also an ambulatory program on weekdays. The treatment modalities vary, depending on the needs of the client, from methadone-to-abstinence to a completely drug-free condition which is always the ultimate goal.

"We provide a multiple of options to our clients . . . We can fit them to the program that can best serve them," explains Velásquez.

The PROMESA program has been in existence since 1976 and has treated several thousand clients with a staff of 60 people in four departments: medical, administrative, fiscal and therapeutic (counseling).

Acceptance in the program is conditioned by the clients' agreement to a contract which spells out what is expected from them. There are rules of behavior that must be followed to the letter. If any are broken (stealing, abusing drugs, violence, etc.), termination may result. Unless the offense is unusually severe, their peers serve as the judges and decide how to deal with the problem. An appeal process and a client Bill of Rights protect the clients and assure fair treatment.

Upon arrival at PROMESA (from the courts, jail, hospital, the community) prospective clients are evaluated by counselors and social workers in order to develop a treatment plan. Clients are a vital part of this process, are fully aware of the elements of the plan and finally review and sign it. In addition, the counselor and the director also sign the plan, signifying agreement of all concerned.

John Franco, the deputy clinical director, says that this contributes to the success of a most difficult task—"modifying client's behavior towards becoming a bigger and better person."

The emphasis is on self-help, with intensive therapy through group counseling sessions, to deal with physical, emotional and mental problems.

A work-like atmosphere is maintained at PROMESA. Besides the therapy sessions, clients must be at their assigned work stations by 9 a.m. and are expected to perform their duties. There are 17 training positions, like the kitchen, where they learn to cook, to maintain a good apprearance, to develop a good attitude and to supervise. They are initially placed on probation, and after evaluation (once monthly), they receive small stipends, which are increased if they continue to perform their duties competently.

In consultation with their counselors, the clients decide how the money will be used. Most often a bank account is established. During their stay clients have an opportunity for additional education. Four teachers are available for adults, covering such areas as basic math, English, GED preparation and English As A Second Language.

"We have a unique population," says Franco. "A great number of our clients are non-English speaking. Therefore, a lot of work is done with them to bring them to the English-speaking group." He points out that alienation is a major cause of drug abuse and that lack of English language ability can contribute to that alienation. Thus, language instruction is considered a very important part of the treatment.

Because of the large Spanish-speaking population at the facility (70 percent of the residents are Hispanic), half of the counselors are bilingual as are the four assigned teachers. This ability to serve a primarily Spanish-speaking clientele effectively is con-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

sidered one of the unique features of the home.

"If they don't speak English well, they do not need to feel embarrassed," says Franco. "A comfortable learning environment is provided. Also, with a bilingual staff, treatment will not be adversely affected by the language deficiency."

After six or seven months, clients may be advanced to what is termed a "re-entry level," where they re-enter the community to look for a job while continuing to live at PROMESA. Once they have jobs, they are expected to save enough money to allow them, when ready, to move out on their own. Once this has happened, they are still required to report to the facility once a week, render a urine test (to be assured they are drug-free), and to continue participation in group therapy. In another three to six months, usually around March, there is an annual graduation.

The program generally takes about a year before a staff committee screens candidates for graduation. At this time client-candidates are asked specific questions about their employment, how they handle pressure, what kinds of friends they have and their social life generally. Based on this the committee recommends whether or not the client is ready to graduate.

A separate annex building houses the Youth Component, for those between the ages of 12 and 19. Two floors provide dormitory-type accommodations for 25 residents as well as school rooms, offices and a lounge area.

On a typical day, the clients get up about 6:30 a.m., clean up, eat between 7 and 7:30 a.m. and then clean up the area for which they are responsible until about 8 a.m. At that time there is a morning meeting, for therapeutic purposes, a kind of family hour, where they may sing together or otherwise socialize in an effort to become closer.

The students go to classes from 9 to 12 noon, have lunch at noon and return at 1 p.m. for the discussion of a topic of interest to the community. This usually is a question and answer session, with a staff member or an outside guest. It provides an opportunity to ventilate on a number of subjects.

From 2 to 4 p.m. there is another class period; from 4 to 5 p.m. the focus is on homework and tutoring efforts, with adult clients often tutoring the younger ones. Dinner is served in the main building at 5 p.m. and then it is back to the annex again for an hour of leisure.

A house meeting is scheduled around 6:30 p.m. to discuss the day's happenings, to acknowledge good or bad efforts and to take care of general business. Afterwards, some may go in a supervised group to a movie, the library or a museum. Otherwise, they are not permitted to leave the facility unless accompanied by a responsible family member or other adult.

On Wednesdays or Fridays they split up into small groups around 7:30 p.m. for therapy sessions. They break up around 9 when a snack is provided. Bedtime is 10:30.

It is obviously a busy schedule for anyone and that is the intention, says Franco. "Young people have a lot of energy and it is important that they be kept busy and involved constructively."

Four Board of Education teachers are assigned to the Youth Component. Classes take place in four classrooms, in groups of 10 to 15 students. "In the small groups we provide, the learning environment is more family-like and they are less sensitive about their difficulties. As a result they have more success with the learning process," explains Franco.

Many have excelled in the center's educational program. Sixteen graduated from the nearby John F. Kennedy High School through a special arrangement with the board of education. "and some even graduated with honors," Velásquez points out proudly. What is most needed, says Franco, was "some patience, a little understanding and somebody to acknowledge that they were people."

Studies indicate that the Puerto Rican youngster is more greatly at risk of becoming involved with drugs than his counterpart in the greater society.

Dr. Francisco Trilla, medical director of PROMESA, ascribes stress as a major cause of drug addiction.

"An important consideration of the cause of drug addiction in our community is the despair connected to our experience . . . the uprooting of the Puerto Rican family from the island, arriving in a hostile environment, with all of the difficulties of adjustment, with discrimination in all aspects of life, especially in employment . . ."

All this often leads to family disintegration and to dependence on government assistance programs by families headed by single women.

Add to this, says Dr. Trilla, "an educational system that causes a very high dropout rate among our children and the absence of employment for those dropouts and you can begin to understand why they attempt to escape from this quagmire by getting into drugs . . ." And he concludes, "They eventually become prisoners of drug addiction."

"These things create a blueprint for failure," says Franco. "Instead of encouraging hard work and perseverance, what's touted on TV and in the movies are short-term solutions, short cuts and money will solve all the problems."

When the young realize the truth, "they become angry, they try to escape by using and abusing what society has always put in their way: liquor, pills, drugs . . . We live in a basically drug-oriented society. Everything our kids see leads them to believe that there is something you can take for every problem you might have . . ."

PROMESA is a family providing much-needed support through a team approach that attempts to meet every need clients may have. And their commitment to a contract of conduct and goals "is important," Dr. Trilla explains, "because it commits them to a pattern of conduct that is very necessary for their recovery. It is dramatic to see the improvement in the health and appearance of many of the clients after only a few weeks. That's because they are living a more structured life, a more normal life. . ."

The Youth Component is a sentimental favorite of the staff.

"Most of them are dropped off there," says Franco. "They are from broken homes or have other problems. They are brought here so we can save their lives and it sometimes is a matter of life and death."

The staff prides itself on the fact that PROMESA is the largest drug treatment program in the city primarily serving the Puerto Rican and Hispanic community generally, but they also recognize and are humbled by the enormity of the task they face.

As Velásquez expresses it, "The problem is monstrous and we are just a drop in the bucket. What's worse is that we are not growing, although there should be another 10 or 20 PROMESAS. Instead we have barely survived the federal cuts of the past three years. We have lost 93 client slots, but we are still managing to serve."

The federal money that PROMESA receives is currently channeled through the state and is supplemented by client support payments from Medicaid and Social Security. Clients are not charged for services.

Velásquez makes his statement with a tone of quiet resignation, of a perseverance developed after many years of having to do much with little, of having to "make do." But the anger is evident when he talks about the contradictions in Reagan Administration policies.

"The hypocrisy is something. Here we have the First Lady taking on drug abuse as her pet project, doing a national TV campaign urging people to get involved in solving the problem and here is her husband, the President of the United States, cutting back whatever little we have to deal with here in the South Bronx, where we have an epidemic, where it's killing our people . . . Good God!"

But let us listen to Doris, to understand why the PROMESA staff stays with it, why they persevere:

"Since coming here I have continued my education, I've learned that I have a lot of potential . . . I'm finding out that there are a lot of things about being Puerto Rican that I can be proud of . . . I've also found that I don't need drugs to feel good . . . I like being under the influence of just good feelings, and I'm excited about that. I haven't felt so excited in a long time . . ." Now she fights back tears, "I've changed a lot . . . My own mother doesn't even know me any more . . ."

There are some heroic things going on in a place called PROMESA, in a rundown neighborhood called Mount Hope, in a sad and desperate wasteland called the South Bronx.

(Frank Espada is director of the Puerto Rican Diaspora Documentary Project and the National Puerto Rican Cultural Center, located in Washington, D.C., sponsored by Boricua College.)●

MAZZOLI COSPONSORS THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS EMPLOYEES' PROTECTION ACT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 5391, legislation introduced by Representative TIM WIRTH to provide pension benefit protection for the thousands of dedicated communications employees—largely members of the Communications Workers of America—who were employed by the Bell System prior to the Court-ordered breakup.

Under the Court decree thousands upon thousands of workers will have to be transferred to and from Bell companies and AT&T.

H.R. 5391, the Telecommunications Employees' Protection Act, guarantees that employees who move from one company within the Bell System to

another company within the system or who move to AT&T are allowed to take their accrued service credit and pension benefits with them regardless of when they move. The Court decree permitted portability only through 1984.

Virtually identical protections were included in H.R. 4102, the Universal Telephone Service Preservation Act of 1983, which passed the House in November 1983. And, Congress has acted on similar protection bills in previous years.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5391 and I hope it can be quickly enacted into law to insure that communications workers who made this Nation's communications system what it is today—the best in the world—are not hurt through actions of the Court over which they had no control.●

NATIONAL LOYALTY DAY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, May 1, this country will again have the honor and privilege of celebrating National Loyalty Day, a practice that has been going on for nearly three decades since the creation of this special observance in 1958.

It is my fervent hope that all Americans will take this occasion to show their strong feelings for their country by displaying prominently the American flag. I believe that such a show of patriotism is of special importance at this juncture in our history, a time when we are besieged by complex and difficult challenges everywhere we look, at home as well as abroad. A day such as this, when we can step back and remind ourselves about who we are and what our goals are can help provide the inspiration to conquer those challenges.

In my Eighth District of New Jersey, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, adhering to its charter that it shall foster true patriotism, will be in the forefront of this observance, as it has been for nearly 30 years.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the VFW and its many branches, not just in my district but in the State of New Jersey and the entire Nation, for being instrumental in the creation of National Loyalty Day, and for taking the lead in its celebration.●

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD CYPRUS

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, the divergence between the reality and rhetoric in America's foreign policy toward Cyprus must not continue. The tragedy that has struck the people of that island nation has been permitted to linger 10 long years, and I am sorry to report that American policy in the Eastern Mediterranean this last year has greatly exacerbated the situation.

I need not remind my colleagues that almost a decade ago, on July 20, 1974, the Republic of Turkey—using American supplied weapons—invaded the Republic of Cyprus. While the roots of the Cyprus conflict go back to the early 1960's, the invasion was in direct violation of the treaties which established the republic and all norms of international law and conduct.

In the weeks after this catastrophe, when it became obvious that Turkey did not intend to quickly withdraw its troops from the 40 percent of Cyprus which it had occupied, Congress, asserting its constitutional prerogatives, imposed an arms embargo on Turkey. The embargo was imposed not only because the use of American weapons for aggressive purposes was a direct violation of American law, but because we had hoped that the embargo would encourage Turkey to be more forthcoming in negotiating the withdrawal of its troops from the sovereign nation.

After Turkey refused to respond to these efforts, some members of the Executive argued that Turkey would only negotiate after the embargo was lifted. Congress then lifted the embargo in 1978, but Turkey—ignoring numerous U.N. resolutions and world opinion—has yet to return 1 inch of territory to the Cyprus Republic.

The Turkish Cypriots, who administer the area under the control of Turkey, have failed to offer any substantive proposals concerning either the return of territory or the administration of a new government.

I would have expected that the Reagan administration, which has been so vocal concerning the need to strengthen NATO and to promote stability in the Middle East, would have told the Turks that the occupation of Cyprus cannot continue. The President might have further informed Turkey that American weapons should not be stationed against either Greece or Cyprus, but against the Soviet Union. But, in spite of the fact that recent Turkish actions have aggravated the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Reagan administration proposed increasing aid to Turkey to almost $1 billion.

In November the Turkish Cypriots attempted to establish a separate state in the occupied territory and received immediate diplomatic recognition from the Republic of Turkey. In April, the secessionist state and Turkey exchanged diplomatic representatives, and the Turkish Cypriots have taken further steps to consolidate their control over 40 percent of Cyprus, even though they constitute only 18 percent of the population.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently voted to condition $215 million in military grant aid to Turkey upon the return of the ghost town of Varosha to the Government of Cyprus. This area could resettle approximately 50,000 refugees and be a first step toward a solution. I hope that such conditions become a part of the foreign aid bill this year. The world must come to understand that the United States will not support aggression by any nation, and that American aid is provided to support American objectives and principles.

For 10 years Turkey has failed to understand this message. I urge my colleagues to make our principled stand loud and clear. The American people, the people of Cyprus, and people everywhere are ready to hear it.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE SECOND MARINE DIVISION

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pride and admiration that I rise today to take note of the outstanding service that the men of the 2d Marine Division have given to our country. With the founding of the division on February 1, 1941, these men engaged in some of the fiercest battles of World War II, including Tarawa, Guadalcanal, Saipan, and Okinawa.

After the war, the 2d Division served a brief deployment as an occupational force in Japan, and in 1946, was transferred to Camp Lejeune. In 1948, battalion-sized units of the 2d Division began regular deployment in the Mediterranean. During the Korean conflict, this combat-ready infantry division was deployed to the Far East. Later in this decade, it played a key role in the evacuation of American citizens during the Israeli-Egyptian war of 1956 and was the force called upon in 1958 to prevent civil war in Lebanon.

During the Cuban missile crisis, President Kennedy again summoned the 2d Marine Division for duty and they remained in the Caribbean until December 1962. The 2d Division re-

turned to the Caribbean in 1965 in order to prevent civil war in the Dominican Republic.

Most recently, the 2d Marine Division was deployed in response to a crisis situation in Lebanon. On August 15, 1983, President Reagan directed the 32d Marine Amphibious Unit to become part of the multinational peacekeeping force in Beirut. This unit, as well as other 2d Division Marine amphibious units served in Lebanon with unprecedented dedication and valor until they were redeployed to ships off the coast of Beirut in February 1984.

Too often our fellow citizens forget the price that our combat forces have paid for freedom. For the 2d Marine Division, that price has often been the ultimate sacrifice. These modern day patriots have often paid this price quietly and with little recognition. Let us all take a few moments to recall their dedication to freedom and liberty and let us give them the respect, admiration, and applause that they deserve.●

CLOSING AN UNINTENDED LOOPHOLE IN THE MARRIAGE DEDUCTION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, in 1981 Congress took action to eliminate the so-called marriage penalty, that is, the tax penalty incurred by married couples. Under current law, married couples filing joint returns are entitled to deduct 10 percent of the lower paid spouse's qualifying income, on a maximum base amount of $30,000, from gross income for tax purposes.

I strongly supported the elimination of the marriage penalty. However, downturns in the economy have revealed that there is a major loophole in the marriage deduction. This loophole is adversely affecting those who can least afford it—the Nation's unemployed, who cannot count as income their unemployment compensation for purposes of determining their marriage deduction. This unintended penalty is made even worse by the fact that, under certain circumstances, unemployment compensation is now subject to taxation.

Under current law, a two-earner married couple filing a joint return would be able to deduct 10 percent of the lower earning spouse's income. If the lower earning spouse loses his or her job, and then received unemployment compensation, the couple would only be able to deduct 10 percent of that portion of the unemployed spouse's income which is earned—not the unemployment compensation, even though the unemployment compensation may ultimately be taxed under another provision of law. This is grossly unfair, and needlessly imposes an additional tax burden on the Nation's unemployed.

In order to rectify this inequity, I have introduced legislation which amends the Tax Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the marriage deduction only, unemployment compensation will be counted as earned income, to the extent it is taxed. Under current law, unemployment compensation for a married couple filing jointly—the criterion for taking the marriage deduction—is taxed on one-half the excess of $18,000 in adjusted gross income. My bill would allow only that portion of unemployment compensation which is taxed to be counted toward the marriage deduction. This would result in a very modest increase in the marriage deduction which the couple would be able to take.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of my bill would mean a great deal to the Nation's unemployed, and would eliminate an absolutely unfair penalty. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

TRIBUTE TO RALPH HAMILTON

HON. JOHN McCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in saluting a man who, for the past 15 years, has been a strong and compassionate advocate for the needs of veterans.

On April 27, Mr. Ralph Hamilton completed 5 years as team leader of the veterans center in Phoenix, AZ. His distinguished accomplishments there followed 10 years of dedicated service to Wisconsin veterans. This remarkable man demonstrated unique skills and extraordinary commitment to our country. His diligence, integrity, and special insights helped make the Phoenix Vet Center a model for all veterans programs across the country.

Mr. Hamilton was not driven in his work by a desire for personal recognition, but by a genuine concern for the needs of veterans. Like those to whom he devoted so many hours, Ralph Hamilton put his country first and his personal life second.

Having set an outstanding example for those who will follow him, Ralph Hamilton will be sorely missed at the Phoenix Vet Center. I thank him and salute him for his outstanding efforts.●

HAMILTON BOWSER AND SAMUEL SALTER HONORED BY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize two of my constituents who will be honored next week by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Hamilton Bowser and Samuel Salter II, both of East Orange, NJ, will receive awards during Small Business Week, hosted by the SBA here in Washington May 8–10. Mr. Bowser is to be honored as "Small Business Minority Advocate of the Year," and Mr. Salter will receive the award for the "Small Business Young Entrepreneur."

Hamilton Bowser is the president of Evanbow Construction Co. in East Orange. He has been an effective and influential advocate for the cause of minority entrepreneurship both in New Jersey and around the country. He has played an especially significant role in helping minority-owned businesses obtain contracts with the Federal Government. Mr. Bowser is one of the founders of the New Jersey United Minority Business Brain Trust, and conducts monthly seminars for small businesspeople in New Jersey. I am extremely pleased that Mr. Bowser's outstanding support of minority business, as well as his selfless assistance to others, is being recognized by the SBA with this prestigious award.

Mr. Salter, the recipient of the Young Entrepreneur of the Year Award, is living proof of the resourcesfulness and drive flourishing in our younger generation. At the age of 19, Mr. Salter has already established himself as a successful businessman, as the president and founder of Continational Financial Corp., which packages and services around $1 million in loans each month.

Mr. Salter's business career began as a bookkeeper in his father's auto repair shop when he was 13 years old. Two years later a summer job found him selling real estate. This fostered an interest in the field of venture capital and Mr. Salter set about learning everything he could about this area.

Shorty after his 16th birthday, with $500 in savings, Mr. Salter established his new company. Within 2 years the company grew to the point where he now has processed over 275 loans, and he has offices in East Orange and Wall Street. Currently enrolled in Rutgers University where he is earning his MBA degree in finance, Mr. Salter will certainly be someone we will hear about in the years to come.

I offer my best wishes to both Mr. Salter and Mr. Bowser. They are certainly deserving of these awards, and I know that they will continue to serve our community with great distinction.●

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK CHURCH

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this House in mourning the death of Frank Church, a friend, a statesman, and certainly among the most eloquent of all who have ever served in this Congress.

I suppose that of all the ways I shall remember Frank Church, the one that will stand out in my mind will be his role as conscience of the Senate.

All of us in public service have seen the seductiveness of the easy path, the popular stand, the politically expedient. Frank Church never buckled to any of them.

For 24 years, Frank Church served this country and his native Idaho. As a Senator, he addressed the major foreign policy issues of his time with reason, foresight, thoughtfulness, and always with a very keen appreciation for the lessons of history.

As our Nation became gradually bogged down in Vietnam, Frank Church was among the earliest voices cautioning that we were headed toward disaster. It was not a popular stand at the time, and he was, in many quarters, vilified for it. Time proved him right—from the start.

"No nation, not even our own, possesses an arsenal so large or a treasury so rich as to damp down the fires of smoldering revolution throughout the whole awakening world," were Frank Church's words about Vietnam in 1966.

His beliefs were steadfast, and he echoed similar sentiment in his last public writing, published in the Washington Post on March 11, 1984, as he cautioned his countrymen to not be led into another folly in Central America. The words of that message, already published in full in this RECORD by several colleagues, are worth heeding.

I knew Frank also as a man concerned about the land, and his role in the passage of the Wilderness Act of 1974 was not unimportant. Legislation that Frank introduced in 1967 established the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, which now includes miles and miles of some of this country's most beautiful waterways. As chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, it was my pleasure to help Frank enact the Hell's Canyon National Recreation Area bill in 1978, as well as the Central Idaho Wilderness Act of 1980.

The Idaho bill added Frank's name to the wilderness area that surrounds the "River of No Return"—a fitting tribute to his concern and work on behalf of the American conservation effort.

Frank and I became rivals in 1976, as we both campaigned for our party's Presidential nomination. In such contests, emotions can become badly frayed and a sharp exchange in the heat of a moment can turn to a lifetime of regret. But Frank did not let that happen to his campaign. He campaigned on the issues. He was never anything less that a gentleman. When the battle ended, we remained friends.

Foreign affairs, of course, was Frank's passion, and he leaves an indelible mark in that arena. His examination of the Central Intelligence Agency remains as a model. Thanks to the efforts of Frank Church, the CIA was brought into a partnership with the Congress, and the congressional intelligence committees were established. The impact of his work in that field remains as current as the evening news.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to Bethine, Forrest, Amy, and Chase Church.

Frank Church was my friend. I will miss him.●

HONORING THE NORWALK-LA MIRADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT EMPLOYEES

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1984, at a special reception, the Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District will be honoring 12 people who have served the district as loyal employees for 30 and 35 years.

These fine and dedicated people will be honored for their outstanding public service. After serving so many years with much distinction, these admirable people will be honored by their peers, their school district, and their communities. It is with honor and pride that I rise to recognize them on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Education is an extremely important subject to me. The people who educate and tend to the needs of our young are very special. As we commend these individuals, let us also commend all those who serve in our educational system.

I would like to point out that these employees have served in one of the finest school districts in the country. The Norwalk-La Mirada School Unified District has an outstanding record of high educational quality.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues of the House to extend best wishes and heartiest congratulations to the following honored persons who have added so much to the youth of our country.

Eunice N. Egan, Hutchinson Elementary School, teacher; Catherine M. Alarie, Adult School, counselor; Donald J. Berberet, La Mirada High School, teacher; Wanda Lee Billings, New River Elementary School, teacher; Eleanor K. Bondurant, Lampton Elementary School, teacher; Donald D. Bruns, La Mirada High School, teacher; Albert E. Coleman, data processing, director; Ronald L. Gardner, La Mirada High School, teacher; Stephen M. Gertz, Hargitt Elementary School, principal; Carl W. Kraushaar, John Glenn High School, teacher; Authur D. Turman, Norwalk High School, counselor; Dean F. Waters, educational support services, coordinator-child welfare and attendance.●

WHAT THE PAST SHOULD TEACH US IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as George Santayana wrote in 1906, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." In spite of this wise admonition, it seems that many of us have an amazingly poor memory of events that happened just over two decades ago and again a mere 5 years ago. Of course, I am referring to the Communist takeover of Cuba and the more recent Communist victory in Nicaragua.

These two incidents should have left no doubt in the minds of sincere observers as to the intentions of terrorist movements throughout the region. In spite of their claims to widespread popular support and their proclaimed goals of human rights, justice, and national liberation, these movements are nothing more than fronts that are set up, financed, and supplied by the Soviets and their surrogates. Shortly after taking power, these true intentions become painfully obvious.

Why then do so many people continue to call the Sandinista regime progressive rather than Communist? Why are the terrorists in El Salvador still called freedom fighters and agrarian reformers? Perhaps it is ignorance; or it may be embarrassment. It may even be that some hope that by calling these groups by such euphemistic names they will miraculously convert

themselves into innocuous liberators and progressives.

As Ambassador J. William Middendorf II states in the following editorial, all this doubletalk is not new; Castro was lauded as a reformer and liberator when he first came to power. He himself made some remarkably democratic and encouraging statements in the beginning. But he soon betrayed his real plans for Cuba.

The same is now happening in Nicaragua. All this talk about "free elections" and "human rights" is greeted in this country as conclusive evidence of the Sandinista's purposes. Somehow, all I feel is an acute sense of déjà vu. I only hope that this time around we will have learned our history lessons. Let us not be taken in again.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 9, 1984]

NICARAGUAN ELECTIONS AND A SENSE OF DÉJÀ VU

(By J. William Middendorf)

On Feb. 21, Sandinista Junta Coordinator Daniel Ortega announced that elections for president, vice president, and a constituent assembly would be held in Nicaragua on Nov. 4, 1984. The announcement appears to be one belated step toward meeting the electoral portion of the commitments the Sandinistas made to the Organization of American States 4½ years ago. However, many important questions remain about the nature of the elections the Nicaraguan government contemplates. These questions take on increasing relevance if we look at the history of elections and pluralism in other Marxist-oriented states.

I often reflect on how, as one with a business in Cuba in the late 1950s, I was initially encouraged by Fidel Castro's public statements. At that time he seemed to embody the hopes of most Cubans—and a lot of foreigners—for a return to democratic government and a purge of the graft and corruption of President Fulgensio Batista's regime. I remember some of the statements Castro made shortly after taking power that buoyed these expectations.

On April 2, 1959, before Cuba's CMQ Television Station, Mr. Castro also asserted: "When one newspaper is closed down, no newspaper can feel safe; when one man is persecuted for his political ideas, no one can feel safe." And two weeks later speaking before the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Castro declared: "I am not a communist. I do not think communism has any chance of success in Cuba."

I and many other U.S. businessmen, who saw our businesses illegally expropriated by Mr. Castro, learned the hard way the true nature of the Cuban revolution. So did the Cuban people—over one million of whom chose to flee Castro's tyranny.

I felt a sense of deja vu when in July 1979, we heard promises nearly identical to those of Fidel Castro when the Sandinistas took over with Cuban assistance in Nicaragua. Like Mr. Castro, they promised much. In a letter that month to the OAS secretary general, for distribution to all OAS member countries, they pledged "to establish full respect for human rights . . . enforce civil justice, and to call Nicaraguans to the first free elections that our country will have in the century.".

Instead, we have watched with deepening concern as Nicaragua has moved away from its pledges of political pluralism toward a repressive, one-party state. Business and union leaders have been jailed, strikes outlawed, the press and religious groups have been attacked, and much of the large Miskito Indian population uprooted.

Since 1979, the Sandinistas have moved to consolidate their domination over Nicaragua. They have built a military establishment five times the size of Somoza's notorious National Guard. They also have developed close military ties to Cuba and the Soviet Union, including thousands of advisers and a sophisticated cooperative effort to destabilize El Salvador and other neighboring governments.

In recent months, the Sandinistas have appeared to soften their stance. They agreed formally to the 21 objectives of the Contadora process—objectives that include democratization, arms control, an end to support for subversion, and gradual withdrawal of foreign military and security advisers.

Late last year, the Sandinistas hinted they were reducing their ties to Cuba and to the Salvadoran guerrillas. They also made overtures to some of their internal opposition.

For instance, Nicaragua claimed it was reducing the Cuban presence. But, as Interior Minister Borge himself admitted publicly, only normal, year-end rotations of teachers were involved. Nicaragua had implied it was forcing the Salvadoran FMLN/FDR out of Managua. Although a few FDR leaders did leave Nicaragua, the FMLN's sophisticated command and control headquarters and infrastructure remain intact and operating in Nicaragua.

Nicaragua claimed it was offering a generous amnesty to the Miskito Indians. Yet, just before Christmas, another 1,200 Miskito men, women and children chose to flee under hostile conditions into Honduras rather than suffer continued Sandinista repression.

The Sandinista commitment to elections, too, appears to be heavily conditioned. Sandinista leaders have said there will not be "bourgeois" elections, and Daniel Ortega on Dec. 24, 1981, said, "elections will not be to contest power but rather to strengthen the revolution."

Last month, Carlos Nunez, president of the Council of State, announced that the new electoral law will bar candidates of parties advocating a reversal of the Sandinista revolution. The opposition parties are rightly concerned that at a minimum they must have access to the media if the 1985 elections are to have any meaning. The continuation of the current state-of-emergency itself imposes limitations on the media and political activity. The opposition also has called for an end to Sandinista attacks upon the church and independent labor. These are issues which are vital to any free election process.

We and the rest of the world are watching with intense interest to see whether the Sandinistas, to consolidate their power and to gain international credibility, are in fact using the same public-relations tactics so successfully employed by Fidel Castro in 1959 and before him by Lenin.

It is often forgotten that before taking power in 1917, Lenin and the Bolsheviks not only called for, but insisted upon, elections for a constituent assembly leading to a "democratic" government. Yet, once in power, the Bolsheviks simply disbanded the constituent assembly and proceeded to establish one of the most ruthless regimes in the history of mankind.●

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity on this special day to join Representatives COELHO, PASHAYAN, and WAXMAN along with my other friends and colleagues and all Americans to commemorate the Armenian Genocide. This horrific occurrence in world history is one that we must constantly disclose and engrain in our memories for two important reasons: To mourn the lives of those that were brutally taken and to insure that the barbaric extermination of the Armenian race or any race or group of people, is always remembered, but never repeated.

Throughout the late 19th and early 20th century the Armenians were persecuted, massacred, and driven from their homeland by the Ottoman Turks. Approximately 2,500,000 Armenian citizens resided throughout the Ottoman Empire when World War I began. From 1915 to 1923, 1,500,000 Armenians were brutally slain while 500,000 others attempted to escape from their ancestral homeland of 3,000 years. The Edict of Deportation, which was formally promulgated by the Turkish Government on May 27, 1915, is but one piece of evidence substantiating the systematic deportation and extermination of almost an entire people. In fear of their lives, the Armenians were forced to flee and scatter north across the Turkish border to Russia, south into the Arab countries, and to Europe and the United States. Many died of starvation, disease, and exposure or were murdered while attempting to leave the Ottoman Empire. Clearly, there are many well-documented accounts of this cold-blooded massacre in our National Archives, in libraries around the world, and most importantly, in the minds and hearts of those who lost their families and homeland in this brutal purge.

There appears to be some controversy, however, about documentation and the fact that some Turkish lives may have been lost in this alleged "civil war." These controversies, I believe, only cloud the real issue at hand; the deliberate annihilation of almost an entire race. German and Nazi lives were lost during World War II but clearly this did not sanction, warrant, or does not lessen the impact and horror of the extermination of 8 million Jews. Germany today will acknowledge and attest to that fact. An essential and vital point, that we must all remember, is that a series of socio-economic and political events in Turkey and throughout Europe in the

late 1800's and early 1900's led a people and government to completely turn on and massacre an innocent faction of their own population as a scapegoat for extraneous and unrelated problems and events. I believe we must commemorate the Armenian Genocide and all genocides this year and every year so that such misunderstanding and violations against an entire people will never occur again. The purpose of our expression here today is not to punish or to seek revenge on a present-day government or people for what occurred 69 years ago. If that was our purpose, then none of us have really learned from the past. The intent of our assembly here today is to acknowledge and confirm the Armenian Genocide here in the United States, in Turkey and throughout the world, to mourn the lives of those who were lost, and to learn from past events.

The final purpose of my expression here today is to praise all Armenian-Americans and all people of Armenian dissent throughout the world for their courage, perseverance and the continuation of their cultural beliefs and strong faith. I am proud to know many Armenian-Americans personally as friends, neighbors, colleagues, and copatriots and I hold nothing but admiration and praise for their unbending spirit and heroic character. I look forward to the day when myself and all those who come to Washington may visit the U.S. Holocaust Memorial where the 1915-23 Genocide of the Armenian citizens of the Ottoman Turkish Empire will be prominently displayed.●

PROFESSOR TRIBE ON THE EQUAL ACCESS ACT AND THE CONSTITUTION

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the Equal Access Act—which would prohibit discrimination against extracurricular student religious groups—is designed to protect public high school students' free speech rights without violating the separation of church and state as proscribed by the establishment clause of the Constitution.

Hearings before the Education and Labor Committee established that many school administrators have banned any form of student religious activity on campus—even when there is no State involvement—rather than risk expensive litigation. Such discrimination against religious speech constitutes a serious abridgment of students' first amendment rights and relegates religious speech to second class status. The Supreme Court, in Widmar against Vincent, recently held that, at the postsecondary level, such discrimination is unconstitutional and that State colleges must provide equal access for student religious groups. Unfortunately the Court did not rule on the applicability of the equal access doctrine to public secondary schools. The Equal Access Act attempts to clear up the confusion regarding the role of religious speech in schools by extending the Widmar holding to secondary schools.

Since these constitutional issues have been raised, I thought my colleagues would be interested in a scholarly analysis of the Equal Access Act by a noted constitutional authority. Reprinted below is the testimony of Prof. Laurence Tribe of the Harvard Law School before the House Education and Labor Committee. Please note that H.R. 4996 was reported by the committee as a clean bill, H.R. 5345.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LAURENCE H. TRIBE

I am honored to appear before this Subcommittee to express my views on the constitutional implications of H.R. 4996. Although I am the Tyler Professor of Constitutional Law at Harvard Law School, I appear on behalf of no institution or group but am here solely in my capacity as a student of constitutional law and a scholar in the field. In the brief discussion that follows, I set forth my reasons for concluding that H.R. 4996 is entirely constitutional

1. The ultimate aims of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment are two: to assure that the church not be armed with the governmental powers of sword or purse, and that government not be wrapped in the mantle of infallibility that comes from identification with the divine—a mantle that makes it possible for government to denounce its critics as enemies of the Almighty. The injunction that one render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's presupposes a society in which God's earthly messengers may not borrow Ceasar's secular powers—and in which Caesar's Roman Empire is not permitted to become the Holy Roman Empire.

2. It is for this fundamental reason that churches must be denied the ability to use public coercion to sponsor official prayers in public elementary or secondary schools—organized prayers that, however "voluntary" in theory are likely to be mandatory in fact, given the legal compulsion that collects children in the public school in the first place, and the combination of official ceremony and peer pressure that makes publicly organized and sanctioned religious sessions in any such setting inherently coercive.

3. Such official school prayer thus violates the Free Exercise of Religion Clause as well as both of the core commands of the Establishment Clause—that government's heavy hand not be placed at the disposal of any religion, and that no religions' sanctifying aura be used to create a halo of spiritual authority around the state or its schools.

4. No Free Exercise Clause violation, and neither of these Establishment Clause concerns, are present where, in the language of Section 3 of H.R. 4996, "non-school-sponsored groups of students . . . meet" to discuss religion, or indeed to pray, on public secondary school premises where:

"(1) the meeting is voluntary and student initiated,

"(2) there is no sponsorship of the meeting by the school, government, or its agents or employees, and

"(3) no activity which is in and of itself unlawful is permitted."

5. Indeed, for public school authorities, or the local and state agencies responsible for public school policies and practices, "to discriminate on the basis of the religious content of the speech at such meetings"—to quote again the language of H.R. 4996—would, in my view, constitute a violation of the right to free speech and free exercise of religion of the students involved. See *Widmar* v. *Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263, 272 n.11 (1981) (citing section 14-6 of L. Tribe, American Constitutional Law (1978)). I therefore have no doubt that Congress has the constitutional authority—and may even have a real if imperfectly enforceable constitutional duty—to withhold federally appropriated funds from any such authorities or agencies that do discriminate in this manner.

6. It follows that H.R. 4996, which would withhold federal funds on precisely this basis, is a constitutionally permissible exercise of Congress' broad spending power—at least when coupled with the proviso of Section 4 that:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof to—

"(1) influence the form or content of any prayer or other religious activity,

"(2) require any person to participate in prayer or other religious activity, or

"(3) expend public funds beyond the cost of providing the meeting space for student initiated meetings."

7. The text of H.R. 4996 assures that, should student prayers be structured or led in such a way as to make non-participants feel pressured to attend or penalized for non-attendance, the statute's equal-access guarantee would cease to apply. For such coercion of religion in public education "is in and of itself unlawful," and thus runs afoul of Section 3(3), and serves to "require (a) person to participate in prayer," and thus runs afoul of Section 4(2). Those who are concerned that students who reasonably feel coerced into religious activity in a public school might somehow be denied access to otherwise available judicial relief by H.R. 4996 simply misunderstand the language and structure of that bill—and overlook the fact that, in the absence of the bill, some students, at least, might well feel coerced into avoiding even wholly voluntary, student-initiated and student-led religious observance.

8. H.R. 4996 draws added support from Congress' broad authority, under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, to protect First Amendment rights from abridgment at the hands of state and local officials and agents. Nor do I think anything in the First Amendment, or in its underlying policies, is even arguably violated by H.R. 4996. Accordingly, my view as a constitutional scholar, teacher, and lawyer is that Congress would be acting in a constitutionally sound manner were it to enact this measure.

9. If H.R. 4996 is to be opposed on any principled basis, it must be opposed on the ground that even voluntary prayer may not take place in our public schools—a proposition that the proponents of a prayer amendment to the Constitution have incorrectly and irresponsibly attributed to decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Since

that proposition is demonstrably false, it seems entirely appropriate that Congress codify its repudiation in a statute assuring that federal funds not subsidize discrimination against students who wish to exercise their First Amendment rights to pray, or to engage in other non-coercive religious activities, in a school setting.●

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS UNRESPONSIVE TO URBAN POOR

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the inequitable distribution of health care in this country and would like to focus more attention on the National Health Service Corps (NHSC), a Federal program which was designed to provide medical assistance to traditionally unserved communities. As the following New York Times article of April 27, 1984, shows, recent policy changes within this agency have had a disproportionately negative impact on inner city areas. The administrators of the Corps are citing a physician diffusion theory to justify the removal of federally funded doctors from urban clinics. This theory is based on the erroneous assumption that because of record numbers of medical school graduates, the surplus physicians will drift into poor urban neighborhoods. At a time when infant mortality is on the rise in over 30 cities, and black infants die at twice the rate of white infants, I must take issue with the change in physician assignment.

I would like to share the New York Times article, with the hope that interest in the National Health Service Corps can be engendered among my colleagues. It is imperative that we work together to insure adequate and accessible health care for all of our constituents.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1984]

NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, CONNECTICUT: 11 NEEDY AREAS OF CITY LOSING AID FOR DOCTORS

(By Ronald Sullivan)

At least 11 poor areas of New York City will no longer get federally sponsored physicians because the Reagan Administration has decided to shift such doctors from urban to rural areas, Federal and state health officials said yesterday.

Physicians already serving poor areas of the city will not be transferred, but no more will be sent to the 11 neighborhoods that have been dropped from the Federal Government's list of medically underserved areas.

There are 140 such doctors in New York City, serving two to four years in the National Health Service Corps program in return for scholarship aid they got from the Government. The new policy, Federal health officials said, will ultimately reduce that number by more than 20 percent as doctors who have served their obligation are not replaced.

Federal officials said the shift was designed to send doctors where there was the greatest need. But state health officials said the shift jeopardized health care for the poor in the cities.

MORE AREAS MAY BE DROPPED

The 11 areas—nearly one-third of the 34 areas in the city that were on the Federal list—were dropped beginning last August, and state health officials said 8 more areas in the South Bronx, as well as parts of West Harlem, could lose their designation as health-manpower shortage areas.

Thus far, the officials said, the hardest hit has been South Jamaica, Queens, where two areas have been "de-designated." Other areas that have lost their designations include parts of the South Williamsburg, Bushwick and Red Hook sections of Brooklyn, the Hunts Point and northeast sections of the Bronx and the Lower West Side of Manhattan.

Dr. Kennethy Moritsugu, the director of the corps, said the de-designations were the result of a shift seeking to restore the corps to its original mission of providing doctors to remote rural areas of the country.

Raymond Porfilio, a regional official of the United States Public Health Service, said, "Some areas are going to lose corps doctors, although the situation may not be as adverse as it looks."

For example, he said, parts of the areas losing their designation were absorbed by newly designated shortage areas.

To qualify as medically underserved, an area must produce statistical proof that it has less than one doctor for every 3,500 people. According to state health officials, such evidence is sometimes extremely difficult to gather, particularly in sections of the South Bronx that have burned out buildings and highly transient populations.

"We see less medical need in the Bronx then we saw before," said Howard Stambler, the director of the office of Data Analysis and management in the Bureau of Health Professions of the United States Public Health Service.

Dr. Katherine Lobach, the director of a comprehensive health care center at 1175 Morris Avenue in the East Bronx and the head of a group of 11 health-care centers in the South Bronx, disagreed. "We could lose 8 to 12 corps doctors who want to serve here," she said. "Their loss would just be one more blow to our efforts to provide quality care to patients here who otherwise have no way of getting it."

In Harlem, Dr. Paul Reagan, medical director of the Sydenham Neighborhood Family Health Care Center on West 125th Street, said that his area might be dropped as a shortage area and that any loss of corps doctors "would be a very serious blow."

All told, 64 of New York State's 104 health-manpower shortage areas have lost their designations, virtually all of them in urban areas, said David Abernethy, a deputy state health commissioner.

The loss of designation, he said, means that those areas no longer qualify for the services of National Health Corps physicians and other federally sponsored health care professionals such as dentists and nurses. "It seriously jeopardizes the health care of those areas that lose it," he said.

In 1972, when the corps was established, 95 percent of its doctors were assigned to rural sections of the country. However, an urban shift was ordered by the Carter Administration in 1978, and a roughly equal balance between urban and rural areas was achieved within three years. But the corps' original rural character was re-established by the Reagan Administration in 1982. Its annual budget is $91 million.

Dr. Moritsugu, the corps director, said the urban-to-rural shift would not have any immediate adverse effect on New York City. In fact, he said, the city's complement of 191 corps personnel in 1983 was increased to 218 in 1984, including 140 doctors. But he declined to say whether there would be any attrition next year.

According to Dr. Moritsugu, the loss of physicians would be compensated for by what Federal officials termed "defusion"—that is, doctors concentrated in wealthier city neigborhoods and suburbs would be persuaded to serve poor communities, or patients from those communities would develop new access to physicians outside their immediate neighborhoods.

"We are attempting to shift doctors where there is the greatest need, and where patients have no access to medical care," he said.

But state health officials described defusion as the equivalent of the Reagan Administration's "trickle down" economic theory, which they said did not work economically and would not work medically.

While sections of New York City—and Manhattan in particular—have more physicians than state and Federal health officials think are necessary, the state officials said a majority of them were specialists and not the kind of basic primary-care doctors needed in poor neighborhoods. Most of the corps doctors work in health-care centers and clinics.

About 500 medical students and young physicians in hospital residency programs who signed up for corps service in return for Federal subsidies for medical school and who anticipated serving the urban poor contended in a statement that the rural shift was a reflection of the Administration's conservative policies that would cost cities medical care.

The dissident physicians have formed an organization to oppose the rural shift and are resisting corps assignments away from cities. As a result, an increasing number of doctors face financial penalties that equal three times what they borrowed for medical school, with high interest penalties added.

The organization asserts that the Administration is trying to decimate the corps by refusing to commission obligated doctors with the rank and salary given to Public Health Service doctors. Instead, they said, most of the doctors are offered only the "private practice" option, which means they are paid by local health agencies and thus lose the professional and financial security of a Government commission.

For example, Mr. Abernethy said two-thirds of the corps doctors in New York held commissions before 1982, while only one-third had them now.

However, Dr. Moritsugu said there were "no politics involved in the rural shift" or in cutting down on corps commissions. He said 47 percent of the corps' 2,765 physicians were assigned to cities.

Federal health officials said increased use of the private-practice option was an effort to cut the Federal health budget and encourage private enterprise.●

CUBA'S ACTIVE ROLE IN DRUG TRAFFICKING TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. TOM LEWIS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on the front page of today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Havana Haven—Smugglers of Drugs From Colombia to United States Are Protected by Cuba."

The article states that while Cuba maintains an outwardly tough posture on drug trafficking, the Government is secretly aiding in the trafficking of illegal drugs into the United States. In return, Cuba receives hard currency, which it uses to purchase arms, which are then smuggled to guerrillas in Latin America. High-level Cuban officials are directly involved and these activities are said to be sanctioned by Castro himself.

I urge my colleagues to read the article and join with me in cosponsoring the two resolutions I introduced, House Concurrent Resolutions Nos. 284 and 285, requesting the President to bring before the United Nations and the Organization of American States the issue of Cuba's involvement in drug dealing, smuggling, and trafficking in the Western Hemisphere.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 30, 1984]

HAVANA HAVEN—SMUGGLERS OF DRUGS FROM COLOMBIA TO UNITED STATES ARE PROTECTED BY CUBA

(By Stanley Penn and Edward T. Pound)

The drug business is helping Cuba foment revolution in Latin America.

While maintaining an outwardly tough posture toward drug smugglers, the Cuban government has secretly singled out a few for special favors. These selected traffickers have been permitted to use Cuban waters as a haven from the U.S. Coast Guard while transhipping narcotics to the U.S. from Colombia.

In return, Cuba gets scarce hard currency—as much as $500,000 per shipment, by some estimates. It uses some of this money to buy arms that are secretly ferried by the drug smugglers to guerrillas in Latin America.

This arrangement, said to be sanctioned by Fidel Castro himself, has been detailed by U.S. drug investigators and intelligence specialists, as well as by drug runners who have given first-hand testimony of their activities to lawmen in the U.S. and Mexico.

OFFICIAL CONCERN

"There's evidence of a considerable amount of drug trafficking that transits through Cuba by water and air," says Frank V. Monastero, assistant administrator of the federal Drug Enforcement Administration. Noting that the smugglers sometimes use Cuban government facilities, Mr. Monastero adds: "If the Cuban government wanted to cease that activity, they could put a stop to it."

Drug agents don't think Cuba operates its own drug-smuggling network. Rather, they say, Cuba permits certain traffickers safe passage and allows large "mother ships" laden with drugs from Colombia to lay over and refuel in Cuba. This allows the mother ships to transfer their illicit cargo to smaller, faster boats for delivery to Florida.

The Cuban government's ties to drug smuggling were discussed two years ago during hearings by a Senate subcommittee headed by Sen. Jeremiah A. Denton of Alabama. Federal lawmen gave Senate panels additional information last year and in closed session last month.

A criminal trial last year in Miami provided still more evidence. Four Cuban government officials were among those charged with conspiring to permit Cuba to be used as a loading station for U.S.-bound drug vessels during 1980 and 1981. Six people were convicted or pleaded guilty. The Cuban officials, including a former Cuban ambassador to Colombia and a vice admiral who belonged to the Cuban Communist Party's central committee, failed to appear at the trial and are considered fugitives, according to the U.S. Justice Department.

Evidence presented at the trial has convinced Tom Boyatt, a former U.S. ambassador to Colombia, of the Cuban government's complicity. "When you have a Cuban ambassador and a Cuban admiral involved" he says, "you don't need further evidence that it's a matter of national policy."

Indicted with the Cuban officials was Jaime Guillot-Lara, a 38-year-old Colombian charged with using Cuban facilities to help transport large quantities of marijuana and Quaalude tablets in the U.S. The U.S. government has never apprehended Mr. Guillot-Lara, but in November 1981, he was imprisoned in Mexico for using false identity papers.

Mr. Guillot-Lara admitted shipping arms to Colombia's Cuban-backed M-19 terrorist group, according to a State Department official reporting to a Senate subcommittee. Mr. Guillot-Lara said that funds for the arms shipments were furnished by Cuban embassies in Mexico and Colombia. He was freed by Mexico in 1982, but the Mexican government refused a U.S. request for his extradition. His current whereabouts aren't known.

Mr. Guillot-Lara apparently entered the drug business in 1976. By the U.S. government's estimate, his 15-member gang shipped some 2.5 million pounds of marijuana, 80 pounds of cocaine and 25 million Quaaludes to the U.S. between 1977 and 1981.

THE M-19 CONNECTION

In 1980, Mr. Guillot-Lara allegedly arranged to receive Cuban assistance with those shipments and agreed to transport arms to M-19. Mr. Guillot-Lara was known to M-19 through his longtime acquaintance with Jaime Bateman, a Colombian who was an M-19 leader until his death in a plane crash in 1982.

Mr. Guillot-Lara is known to have purchased Uzi submachine guns, pistols and AR-15 rifles from a Miami arms dealer. According to State Department reports, the arms he purchased typically were ferried to Colombia, where his boat picked up drugs for delivery to the U.S.

In October 1981, for example, Mr. Guillot-Lara's boat, Zar De Honduras, received arms from a ship off the coast of Panama. The arms—550 FAL rifles worth at least $500 apiece and 90,000 cartridges—were delivered to a port on Colombia's northeast coast and taken to a clandestine airport nearby. After 5,000 pounds of marijuana bound for the U.S. were stowed on board the ship, the weapons were flown to an M-19 base in Caqueta province, a large cocaine-producing area in southern Colombia.

M-19 and other Colombian insurgents profit from narcotics by taxing drug growers and by guarding traffickers' airstrips and cocaine-processing laboratories. Colombia's defense minister, Gustavo Matamoros, recently attacked the "alliance" between drug runners and guerrillas. He claimed that planes leave Colombia with cocaine and return with weapons originating in Cuba.

Colombia broke ties with Cuba in 1981, following the capture of some M-19 terrorists who admitted they had been trained and outfitted in Cuba. Just last month, 100 M-19 insurgents, armed with submachine guns and hand grenades, battled a Colombian army garrison in Florencia, the capital of Caqueta province. The army drove off the guerrillas, but not before they had seized the local jail and freed 125 prisoners.

Cuba stoutly denies involvement with drug smugglers. "We have been trying to help in control of the drug traffic," says a Cuban government press officer in Washington. "Every plane, every ship or yacht which we catch in our waters or in our air space, we have detained." Terming the charges that Cuba helps drug smugglers "unfounded," he says that at any given time, 15 to 30 American traffickers are in Cuban jails. "We have been freeing some of them at the request of some [U.S.] congressman as a goodwill gesture," he adds.

By denying its ties to dope runners, diplomats say, Cuba hopes to avoid antagonizing other Hispanic governments. "The Cubans are interested in expanding regular diplomatic relations with Latin America," a U.S. State Department official says, "and they'd like to present at least a plausible denial that they're involved in subverting these governments."

A MIAMI SUSPECT

Jose Alvero-Cruz, a Miami beauty parlor operator, is among those suspected of using Cuba to smuggle drugs to the U.S. According to a secret 1982 Drug Enforcement Administration report, an informant disclosed that Mr. Alvero-Cruz met with Fidel Castro, and during the meeting they arranged for a fishing vessel, the Santa Marta, to use a secluded harbor on Cuba's southern coast.

"The vessel would contain 50 tons of marijuana and a large quantity of cocaine," the report stated. "Arrangements were made from Cuba to have the Santa Marta leave port and meet the offload boats at sea."

Mr. Alvero-Cruz, who took part in the abortive, U.S.-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961, recently began a 10-year prison sentence for federal income-tax evasion. The wealthy 44-year-old had "large" bank deposits in Spain, the Justice Department has said. Mr. Alvero-Cruz's attorney says his client "hates Castro" and hasn't been involved with Cuba in drug smuggling.

Another suspected smuggler with Cuban ties is Osiris Santis. According to the Drug agency report, Mr. Santis told an informant that he had received "large quantities" of marijuana and cocaine from "high Cuban government officials." The drugs assertedly came from Colombia's M-19 guerrillas. The informant said he saw "automatic weapons, grenades and explosives of apparent Russian manufacturer," in Cuban-born Mr. Santis' possession.

In 1982, Mr. Santis pleaded guilty in Miami's Dade County circuit court to charges of possession of cocaine and a concealed weapon. He received probation. His attorney says that the 40-year-old Mr. Santis denies any wrongdoing in connection with Cuba.

Fresh information about M-19's links to the drug trade may surface as a result of the federal indictment of Harold J. Rosenthal and 29 others in Atlanta last January.

Mr. Rosenthal fled to Colombia after escaping in 1981 from a Memphis prison, where he had been serving time for a drug conviction. He was captured by Colombian authorities last September and returned to the U.S. where he was charged with operating a ring that had smuggled five tons of cocaine into the U.S. since June 1982. "He was sharing his profits with M-19," says an investigator familiar with the case. "In turn the M-19 allowed him to conduct his business." Mr. Rosenthal had denied any wrongdoing.

Back in 1979, when Cuba was considering aiding drug smugglers, one high-level Cuban official branded the plan "barbarous," according to a Central Intelligence Agency report. But according to the CIA's informant, the prevailing view was that by assisting the narcotics trade, Cuba would obtain hard currency while hastening the "deterioration" of U.S. society.

The major Colombian narcotices smugglers long had been eager for an understanding with Cuba. Cuba's vigilance in seizing narcotics boats and confiscating drugs had added burdensome costs to their business.

TOP-LEVEL MEETING IN SPAIN

One former smuggler, interviewed in his attorney's office in Miami, recalls that the leaders of five major Colombian drug gangs met in Spain in 1979 "to see what could be done to get Cuba not to kidnap boats anymore." According to the former smuggler, who says he attended some of the meetings, the smugglers determined to seek help from Jaime Guillot-Lara, in the belief that he had contact with the Cubans."

Whether Mr. Guillot-Lara aided the traffikers at that time isn't clear. But his Cuban connection was a Colombian lawyer and the admitted drug dealer, Juan (Johnny) Crump, who was a close friend of Cuba's Ambassador to Colombia at the time, Ferndo Ravelo.

The 43-year-old Mr. Crump, who was briefly jailed in the U.S. after a guilty plea for a drug violation, testified for the government at the Miami drug trial that stemmed from the indictment of the four Cuban officials.

Interviewed in New York, Mr. Crump, currently a U.S. resident, recalls his association with the former Cuban ambassador to Colombia: "We talked to each other almost daily during the last two or three years I was in Colombia," he says. "We called each other compadre." The tall, lanky Mr. Crump displays a snapshot of his youngest daughter, Viviana, with Ambassador Ravelo at the child's baptism in Bogota in November 1980. "Ambassador Ravelo was the godfather," Mr. Crump says.

GATHERING IN BOGOTA

Mr. Crump figured prominently in the negotiations that led to an agreement between the smugglers and Cuba, according to the interview and trial testimony. The deal was struck at a series of meetings held during 1979 and 1980 at the Bogota Hilton Hotel, Mr. Crump says. In attendance were Mr. Crump, Mr. Guillot-Lara, Ambassador Ravelo and Cuba's minister-counselor to Colombia, Gonzalo Bassols. They agreed that Mr. Guillot-Lara's drug boats, flying the Panamanian flag and bearing the code name Viviana, would be given passage through Cuban waters.

Also privy to those meetings was Mr. Guillot-Lara's girlfriend at the time, Carmen Blanco, whose room at the Bogota Hilton adjoined the conference room. Miss Blanco later told the Miami grand jury that indicted the four Cuban officials what she had overheard. At one point, she said, Mr. Guillot-Lara told the Cubans that "he had enough money to do any type of business with them."

She also testified that Mr. Bassols, the Cuban minister-counselor, told Mr. Guillot-Lara that the drug scheme had been cleared by a high Cuban official. "Did he mention that man's name?" the prosecutor asked. "Fidel Castro," replied Miss Blanco, who wasn't accused of any wrongdoing.

A self-described former Cuban intelligence agent, Mario Estevez, was a government witness at the Miami trial. Mr. Estevez said he served on the crew of the Lazy Lady, a fishing boat that sailed from Florida to Cuba in late 1980 to rendezvous with the Viviana, a mother ship laden with 10 million Quaaludes from Colombia. Mr. Guillot-Lara, who had purchased the pills for 10 cents each, intended to smuggle them into the U.S., where they would fetch 70 cents apiece, according to information at the trial in Miami.

Mr. Estevez testified that when the Lazy Lady pulled into port on Cuba's north coast it was greeted by Aldo Santamaria-Cuadrado, a Cuban vice admiral. The vice admiral allegedly said to the crew: "We are going to fill Miami completely with the drugs." Imprisoned for a drug conviction in 1982, Mr. Estevez has since been released.

Since that incident, U.S. drug agents have seized a number of Mr. Guillot-Lara's ships, thus sharply reducing his drug income and hampering his ability to pay Cuba the required fees. He owed the Cuban government an estimated $8 million as of October 1981, an official of the U.S. drug agency says.

One trawler, seized off North Carolina in 1981, contained 40,000 pounds of marijuana, worth $16 million wholesale. U.S. Coast Guard officials say it bore the name Viviana and flew a Panamanian flag.

Since 1982, the U.S. Coast Guard has intensified its effort to choke off the flow of drugs by placing its cutters along two major trade routes: the Yucatan Straits between Cuba and Mexico and the Windward Passage between Cuba and Haiti. But the Cubans apparently have devised a plan to undercut the U.S. strategy.

According to a Defense Department intelligence report, Cuba has rented a cargo ship for $24,000 a month from a Panamanian shipowner. The scheme calls for the ship to move narcotics north from Colombia to a small island off Cuba's southern coast. The drugs would then be flown over the Cuban mainland to an island off the northern coast and from there shipped to Florida. This route would nearly avoid the Yucatan Straits and the Windward Passage. Whether the plan has yet been employed isn't known.●

TERRORISM: A NEW MODE OF WARFARE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my foreign affairs newsletter for April 1984 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The newsletter follows:

TERRORISM: A NEW MODE OF WARFARE

Terrorism is a frightening and all too familiar part of modern life. In 1983 terrorist incidents took place in 91 countries, and in the past 15 years more than 4,500 people have been killed in such attacks. In April 1983 more than 50 people, 17 of them Americans, died in a terrorist bombing of our embassy in Beirut. Terrorist violence again erupted in Lebanon in October, when 241 Marines were killed in a bomb attack. Such terrorist attacks have one common feature—a wanton disregard for human life.

Americans are the most frequent targets. Forty percent of the more than 550 terrorist attacks worldwide last year were directed against American citizens. There is significant terrorist activity within our borders as well. Last November, a bomb exploded in the Capitol, and possible terrorist activities are a major concern as we prepare for the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles. Americans are especially attractive targets of terrorism because of the guaranteed publicity and because Americans are viewed as symbols of policies or principles which terrorists seek to undermine.

New trends in terrorism are emerging. Diplomats from dozens of countries have been targets in the last few years, and they are now the victims of more than half of all terrorist incidents. Since 1968, 23 ambassadors from 13 countries have been killed. Terrorists are also better armed and are exploiting new tactics, such as suicide truck bombings. Ominously, governments are getting into the business of terrorism. There is evidence that North Korean agents killed South Korean officials in Burma last year, and that Syria and Iran tolerated and assisted in the Beirut bombings.

However, there also have been some positive trends in recent years. Hostage incidents are less frequent, and many victims have been rescued through negotiations or commando operations. Aircraft hijackings have been reduced since the mid-1970s, because of increased security measures at airports and stronger international action against hijackers and nations which harbor them.

The war against terrorism must be intensified. We need to:

Improve our intelligence: American and other intelligence services already give high priority to combatting terrorism. Terrorist groups, such as Italy's Red Brigades and West Germany's Baader-Meinhof Gang, have been hurt by good intelligence work. However, the Beirut bombings showed that intelligence gaps remain, particularly in regard to radical Middle East groups. Such groups, because of their close-knit membership and fanatical motivation, are very difficult for Western intelligence to penetrate. Another problem is how to assemble and to

assess better the jigsaw puzzle of raw reports to create intelligence which can predict possible terrorist attacks. The recent appointment for the first time of a National Intelligence Officer for Terrorism is a good step in the right direction.

Tighten anti-terrorist laws: In his State of the Union message, President Reagan announced his intent to propose new laws to crack down on terror-related activity in the United States, including increased fines and prison terms, rewards for informants, and measures to outlaw conspiracy to commit terrorists acts in foreign countries. This legislative package reached Capital Hill on April 26, and Congress should act quickly so that there can be no doubt of our national resolve to combat terrorism.

Increase security abroad: The State Department already spends fifteen percent of its small budget on security, but much more needs to be done to protect Amercian diplomatic and military installations overseas. Even in this era of budgetary stringency, we must be sure that our diplomacy will not be impaired by terrorists.

Strengthen cooperation among countries: Multilateral diplomacy should build on the success of the Bonn Declaration of 1978 and other agreements in combatting aircraft hijacking. An urgent priority of the international community must be effective multilateral diplomatic and economic action against countries which support terrorism. More needs to be done in the areas of mutual assistance, intelligence sharing, research into the causes and tactics of terrorism, and joint planning with friendly governments.

Build an American capability for anti-terrorist action: The first specially trained hostage rescue unit was created last year in the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Also, the Pentagon has a special anti-terrorist unit know as the "Delta Force." Congress and the President must ensure that these units continue to receive sufficient resources.

Maintain our respect for law and civil liberties: We dare not fall into the trap of violating our own laws in the pursuit of terrorists. The President has signed a directive that endorses the principle of preemptive strikes and raids of reprisal against terrorists. While the directive does not lift the existing ban on assassination attempts, it still raises troubling issues concerning due process and the rule of law. Congress should air these issues fully. At home, the FBI's anti-terrorist activities are carried out now under guidelines established in the mid-1970s and updated last year after talks between the President and Congress. The Intelligence Committee of the House and Senate have oversight responsibility to ensure that steps to combat terrorism do not violate Americans' civil rights.

Address the roots of terrorism: The only long-term solution for terrorism is to address the political grievances which give rise to it. Terrorism is a new mode of warfare. We must work to understand what causes it, as well as what can be done about it. Terrorism must not deter us from acting to promote our interests or the cause of peace. But we must be careful to maintain our reputation for balance, fairness, and real dialogue with all parties.●

B'NAI B'RITH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, this year the B'nai B'rith organization is celebrating its 140th anniversary, as well as the 25th anniversary of the B'nai B'rith National Capital Association which serves the Washington metropolitan area. In honor of this important occasion, I would like to say a few words about this remarkable institution.

B'nai B'rith, the first international service organization founded in the United States, was started in a small cafe in New York City in 1843. Its 12 founders established the organization's purpose as the "mission of uniting persons of the Jewish faith in the work of promoting their highest interest and those of humanity." Since that time, B'nai B'rith has more than lived up to its mission. Its accomplishments have been varied and far reaching, ranging from the everyday to the extraordinary and including political activism, youth education, and community volunteer work.

Today B'nai B'rith represents a partnership of programs working to uphold the Jewish tradition. The Anti-Defamation League has fought for the cause of anti-Semitism and human rights the world over; the Hillel and Youth Organizations—representing the world's largest youth movement—have reached out to countless young people to instill in them a positive interpretation of the Jewish experience; the community services program has provided assistance wherever there is a need—be it for impoverished families, unsettled emigrants, senior citizens or the handicapped; the Israel Programs, through emphasizing cultural and social interchange, have strengthened ties between Jews in Israel and other countries; and B'nai B'rith Women has furthered the cause of understanding among groups through its own voluntary service programs.

The driving spirit behind the efforts of B'nai B'rith is manifested in its volunteers, who have devoted such phenomenal energy for the benefit of humanity. The grassroots involvement of these committed individuals will continue to serve as an ideal for what can be accomplished if we accept and act on the responsibility for mankind that we all share.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 1, 1984, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 2

9:00 a.m.
*Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on child sexual abuse matters.
SD-226

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Legal Services Corporation.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1913, S. 1994, S. 2545, and S. 2599, bills to authorize funds for and reform certain child nutrition programs.
SR-328A

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-138

Armed Services
To hold hearings on H.R. 4900, to authorize funds for fiscal year 1985 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, S. 2314, to provide that claims against the Panama Canal Commission for vessel damage sustained in the Panama Canal or adjacent waters, other than the canal locks, may be handled in the same manner as claims for vessel damage while passing through the canal locks, and the substance of H.R. 5404, to allow William R. Gianelli to continue to serve as a member of the Board of the Panama Canal Commission after his retirement as an officer of the Department of Defense.
SR-222

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on legislative proposals which authorize funds for those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To continue hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant worker's union (HEREIU).
SD-342

* Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider S. 2521, to authorize funds for fiscal year 1985 for the National Science Foundation, S. 2341, to authorize funds for fiscal years 1985 through 1989 for vocational education assistance programs, S. 2490, to authorize funds for fiscal years 1985 through 1989 for programs of the Library Services and Construction Act, S. 2491, to provide for the reauthorization of the loan consolidation program provided for under the Higher Education Act (Public Law 89-329) which expired November 1, 1983, S. 2496, to authorize funds for fiscal years 1985 through 1989 for programs of the Adult Education Act, and pending nominations.
SD-430

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

Joint Economic
Monetary and Fiscal Policy Subcommittee
To continue hearings to review policies to reduce the cost of the Federal Government.
SD-562

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
Closed briefing on the senior interagency group (SIG) review of the issues raised in the Orion Satellite Corp. and the International Satellite, Inc. (ISI) applications pending before the Federal Communications Commission.
S-116, Capitol

4:00 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Frank C Casillas, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.
SD-430

MAY 3

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance and Monetary Policy Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Argentine debt.
SD-538

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nominations of Robert T. Hennemeyer, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Gambia, and S. L. Abbott, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the kingdom of Lesotho.
SD-419

9:45 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings on the nominations of Joseph F. Dennin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Economic Policy, and Joel Gerber, of Virginia, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to continue markup of S. 1913, S. 1994, S. 2545, and S. 2599, bills to authorize funds for and reform certain child nutrition programs.
SR-328A

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for U.S. territories.
SD-138

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-124

Finance
Business meeting, to consider the nominations of Joel Gerber, of Virginia, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court, and Joseph F. Dennin, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, proposed legislation to raise the limit on the public debt, proposed legislation authorizing funds for the U.S. International Trade Commission, U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, S. 476, to revise the old age, survivors and disability insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, and S. 1718, to extend until January 3, 1995, the authority for the operation of the Generalized System of Preferences.
SD-215

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2117, to establish the national vaccine-injury compensation program as an elective alternative remedy to judicial action for vaccine related injuries.
SD-562

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2565, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for the Head Start program.
SD-430

10:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Michael H. Armacost, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.
SD-419

2:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold a closed briefing on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

3:00 p.m.
Conferees
To hold hearings on S. 979, to improve the enforcement of export administration laws.
EF-100, Capitol

MAY 4

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on S. 2414, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for military procurement programs of the Department of Defense, focusing on the Navy nuclear propulsion program, and in open session on civil defense programs.
SR-222

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for April.
SD-106

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 2494, to clarify and revise certain provisions of the impact aid program (Public Law 81-874).
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the low-energy assistance block grant program.
SD-562

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Department of Justice.
SD-226

3:00 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2573, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for developmental disability programs.
SR-428A

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-253
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on pornography issues.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406
Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, including title X (family planning), and title XX (Adolescent Family Life Act), proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Head Start program, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act.
SD-430
Small Business
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-428A

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.
SD-138

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the revised constitution of American Samoa.
SD-366

MAY 9

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Rosemary M. Collyer, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.
SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the environmental restoration program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up a committee resolution to authorize certain construction projects of the Veterans Administration contained in the Administration's budget for fiscal year 1985.
SR-418

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-124

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
SD-138
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

10:30 a.m.
*Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the impact of drugs on crime.
SD-430

MAY 15

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the joint weapons program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on child sexual abuse issues.
SD-226
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on title IX of the Higher Education Act relating to educational equity.
SD-430

MAY 16

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366
Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposals to extend and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund).
SD-406

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for space programs of the Department of Defense.
SD-192
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the nomination of Jacqueline E. Schafer, of New York, to be a member of the Council on Environmental Quality.
SD-406

MAY 18

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1069, H.R. 555, and S. 817, bills to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve the inclusion in the rate base of a public utility of the costs of construction work in progress.
SD-366

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2157, to clarify the treatment of mineral materials on public lands.
SD-366
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on alleged corruption by officials of the Boilermaker's Union.
SD-430

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 10, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women and men.
SD-562

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

11:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1405, proposed Federal Neutrality Act of 1983.
SD-226

MAY 24

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for defense programs.
SD-192

JUNE 5

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review the transfer of information by the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration to other Federal and State government agencies and the examination of the collection of data by the Internal Revenue Service from private sector sources to identify cases of nonfiling or underreporting of income.
SD-342

Small Business
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of Government competition on small business.
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Inspector General and Medical Inspector of the Veterans Administration.
SR-418

JUNE 7

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 138, to establish a National Commission on Teacher Education.
SD-430

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of drugs on women.
SR-325

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review the sharing agreement between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and to discuss the Veterans' Administration's supply and procurement policy.
SR-418

JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation relating to veterans' compensation.
SR-418

JUNE 26

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the status of college athletic programs.
SD-430

SEPTEMBER 18

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.
SR-325

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 1

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-138

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 804, to reform Federal criminal laws by establishing certain standards and limits for conducting Federal undercover operations and activities.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review veterans' compensation programs.
SD-418

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

MAY 3

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the public buildings service, General Services Administration.
SD-406

SENATE—*Tuesday, May 1, 1984*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 30, 1984)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Merciful Father in Heaven, thank You for Your gracious perseverance in seeking and wooing us. Forgive us when we run away as though we are afraid lest You get too close or when we ignore You or find substitutes to replace You. Help us to see the distinction between religion—man's search for God—and Biblical faith—God seeking man. Save us from creating our own gods and diminishing our true humanness which was created in the image of God. Save us from trying to be our own gods—believing only in ourselves and suffering the frustration that self-worship generates. Lead us to Thee, the true God, that we may find ourselves and be fulfilled as the children of God we were meant to be. In the name of the Perfect Man, who served Thee as Father. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, after the formalities of reopening are over, which includes the special order and the time for morning business, we shall be back on the unfinished business. The Mitchell amendment is the pending question. I have been advised informally that Senator MITCHELL perhaps will not wish a rollcall vote on that amendment until after the two caucuses. If the minority leader confirms that, I am willing to arrange that so that all Senators will be accommodated. I do not want to prolong the debate unnecessarily. It may be possible, if that is the case, if the debate does not require much more time, that we will want to deal with some other amendments temporarily.

I guess I put that rambling question to the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HECHT). The minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall be happy to respond to the majority leader's inquiry.

Mr. MITCHELL is going to have to attend a committee meeting during the morning. It is my understanding that he is willing to have his amendment set aside temporarily and that debate start thereon at 2 o'clock, with a half-hour to be equally divided, and with a vote to occur at the end of that time. Moreover, I am advised that Mr. HOLLINGS is prepared to come over and talk about his amendment during the morning and I believe that we are prepared to enter into agreement. I think we have an arrangement with Mr. MITCHELL to enter into an agreement dealing with his amendment as I have described it.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I think that that would be eminently agreeable to this side, but if I could have just a moment to check with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget and our calendar operation, I shall happily put that request.

There is also a Wilson amendment that might be taken up, but I would rather have the Hollings amendment up. I thank the minority leader for that information, that Senator HOLLINGS is willing to do that.

As I understand the suggestion, Mr. President, it will be that when we resume consideration of the unfinished business, the Mitchell amendment will be temporarily laid aside and we would lay down the Hollings amendment. Then, after the recess which will occur today, at 2 o'clock, we shall resume the consideration of the Mitchell amendment on a time agreement of 30 minutes, to be equally divided and, at the end of that 30 minutes, we vote on or in relation to the Mitchell amendment and once again resume consideration of the Hollings amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has stated the position which I shall say I meant to outline and perhaps did not exactly; namely, if I may say, the majority leader used the words "lay down the Hollings amendment." I am not sure Mr. HOLLINGS wishes to lay it down at that point. I meant we shall discuss it before he calls it up. To prevent any misunderstanding, I have not discussed that with him, but if instead of laying it down, Mr. HOLLINGS could be recognized at that point to talk on his amendment, that would be fine.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there will be no problem with me. Indeed, I should be happy to agree to a time certain to go to the Hollings amendment, which precludes the possibility of a tabling amendment or that no tabling amendment would be in order until a time certain. I hoped that we could actually lay it down, because, as the minority leader will appreciate from his experience both as majority and minority leader, I rest more easily when there is something pending.

Mr. BYRD. Especially when it can be tabled.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am advised by my staff that we are cleared on this side to accept the proposal of the minority leader in respect to the Mitchell amendment. Therefore, I make this request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the resumption of the consideration of the unfinished business, the Mitchell amendment, which is the pending question, be temporarily laid aside and that the Chair then recognize the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) for the purpose of discussing an amendment to be offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

I further ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12 noon today, the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m. and that, at 2 p.m., the Senate resume consideration of the Mitchell amendment; that there be a 1-hour time limitation on that amendment, to be equally divided, with control of the time to be in the usual form; and that at the end of that hour, the Senate vote on or in relation to the Mitchell amendment.

That is the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair, and I thank the minority leader. I thank Senator MITCHELL, who I believe is attending an Environment and Public Works Committee hearing. While I am at it, I might point out to Senator MITCHELL, if he is listening, there are some good Tennessee projects in there, and I urge he consider them favorably.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are a number of items on today's Executive and Legislative Calendars that I am advised have been cleared on this side for action. If the minority leader is prepared to do so, I am prepared to get those out of the way right now with a minimum of time.

Mr. President, I gather from the minority leader's indication to me that he is prepared to consider some items. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am cleared on this side to take up these matters by unanimous consent: Calendar Order 777, 786, 789, 801, 802, and 803.

May I inquire of the minority leader if he is prepared to consider those or any portion of them and, in the interest of time, to do so en bloc?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. I have no objection.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the items just identified en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GOOSE LAKE BASIN COMPACT

The bill (S. 1135) to consent to the Goose Lake Basin Compact between the States of California and Oregon, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the Goose Lake Basin Compact between the States of California and Oregon, which compact is as follows:

"GOOSE LAKE BASIN COMPACT

"Index

"Article I	Purposes.
Article II	Definition of Terms.
Article III	Distribution and Use of Water.
Article IV	Administration.
Article V	Termination.
Article VI	General Provisions.
Article VII	Ratification.
Article VIII	Federal Rights.

"ARTICLE I. PURPOSES

"The major purposes of this compact are:

"A. To facilitate and promote the orderly, integrated and comprehensive development, use, conservation and control of the water resources of Goose Lake Basin.

"B. To further intergovernmental cooperation and comity and to remove the causes of present and future controversies by (1) providing for continued development of the water resources of Goose Lake Basin by the States of California and Oregon, and (2) prohibiting the export of water from Goose Lake Basin without consent of the legislatures of California and Oregon.

"ARTICLE II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

"As use in this compact:

"A. 'Goose Lake Basin' shall mean the drainage area of Goose Lake within the States of California and Oregon and all closed basins included in the Goose Lake drainage basin as delineated on the official map of the Goose Lake Basin which is attached to and made a part of this compact.

"B. 'Person' shall mean the States of Oregon and California, any individual and any other entity, public or private.

"C. 'Water', 'waters' or 'water resources' shall mean any water appearing on the surface of the ground in streams, lakes, or otherwise, and any water beneath the land surface or beneath the bed of any stream, lake, reservoir, or other body of surface water within the boundaries of Goose Lake Basin.

"ARTICLE III. DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF WATER

"A. There are hereby recognized vested rights to the use of water originating in Goose Lake Basin existing as of the effective date of this compact and established under the laws of California and Oregon.

"B. Except as provided in this Article, this compact shall not be construed as affecting or interfering with appropriation under the laws of California and Oregon of unappropriated waters of Goose Lake Basin for use within the basin.

"C. Export of water from Goose Lake Basin for use outside the basin without prior consent of both State legislatures is prohibited.

"D. Each State hereby grants the right for a person to construct, and operate facilities for the measurement, diversion, storage, and conveyance of water from the Goose Lake Basin in one State for use within the basin in the other State, providing the right to such use is secured by appropriation under the general laws administered by the Water Resources Director of the State of Oregon or the Water Rights Board of California and the laws of the State from which the water is to be taken shall control.

"E. Should any facilities be constructed in one State to implement use of water in the other State, the construction, operation, repairs and replacements of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of the State in which the facilities are constructed.

"ARTICLE IV. ADMINISTRATION

"No commission or administrative body is necessary to administer this compact.

"ARTICLE V. TERMINATION

"This compact may be terminated at any time by consent of the legislatures of California and Oregon and upon such termination all rights then established hereunder shall continue unimpaired.

"ARTICLE VI. GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit, or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, in any court having jurisdiction thereof for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"ARTICLE VII. RATIFICATION

"A. This compact shall become operative when ratified by the legislatures of California and Oregon and consented to by the Congress of the United States.

"B. This compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended in the same manner as is required for it to be ratified to become operative or until terminated.

"C. A copy of any proposed amendments to or termination of this compact shall be filed with the Board of Supervisors of Modoc County, California, and the County Court of Lake County, Oregon, at least 30 days prior to any legislative consideration by the legislatures of the States of California and Oregon.

"ARTICLE VIII. FEDERAL RIGHTS

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"A. To impair or affect the existing rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Goose Lake Basin nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters.

"B. To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities by reason of the acquisition, construction or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality or entity, whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes.

"C. To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to any extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the compact.".

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NAVAJO INDIAN TRIBE CLAIMS JURISDICTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1196) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Claims Court with respect to certain claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe, which had been reported from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

On page 2, line 8, strike "required"

On page 2, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 2. This Act shall not affect the finality of the judgments entered in Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 229 and 353 or alter the effect, if any, of those judgments on other litigation brought by the Navajo Indian Tribe against the United States as third parties in other judicial proceedings."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding sections 2401 and 2501 of title 28, United States Code, or section 12 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1052; 25 U.S.C. 70k), or any other provision of law, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Claims Court to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe against the United States which (a) arose before August 13, 1946, (b) were timely presented under section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050; 25 U.S.C. 70a), (c) were withdrawn

without required approval by the Tribe and the Secretary of the Interior, and (d) were held by the Court of Claims in Navajo Tribe of Indians against United States, Docket Numbered 69, on June 13, 1979, to have been voluntarily dismissed by the Tribe before being considered or decided on their merits, and which no longer pending before the United States Claims Court and have not been previously determined on the merits by the United States Court of Claims. Such claims must be filed within six months after this Act shall have become law.

SEC. 2. This Act shall not affect the finality of the judgments entered in Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 229 and 353 or alter the effect, if any, of those judgments on other litigation brought by the Navajo Indian Tribe against the United States as third parties in other judicial proceedings.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as amended.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2184) to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to impose certain limitations with respect to the administration of such act and to authorize appropriations under such act for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments, as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 10 and 11 and insert:

(2) at the end of subsection (a), add the following: "Every determination made with respect to a request for financial assistance under this section shall be made without regard to whether the agency making such request serves, or the project to be assisted is for the benefit of, Indians who are not members of a federally recognized tribe. To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that each project to be assisted under this title is consistent with the priorities established by the agency which receives such assistance.".

On page 4, line 1, strike "Secretary" and insert "Commissioner".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Native American Programs Act Amendments of 1983".

DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 803 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b) is amended—

(1) by striking out "including but not limited to" in the first sentence.

(2) at the end of subsection (a), add the following: "Every determination made with respect to a request for financial assistance under this section shall be made without regard to whether the agency making such request serves, or the project to be assisted is for the benefit of, Indians who are not members of a federally recognized tribe. To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that each project to be assisted under this title is consistent with the priorities established by the agency which receives such assistance.".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 803 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "No project" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) No project", and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) No project may be disapproved for assistance under this title solely because the agency requesting such assistance is an Indian organization located in a nonreservation area or serving Indians in a nonreservation area.".

ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. Section 812 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992b) is amended to read as follows:

"ADMINISTRATION; DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

"SEC. 812. (a)(1) The general administration of the programs authorized in this Act shall remain within the Department of Health and Human Services and, notwithstanding any authority under any other law, may not be transferred outside of such Department.

"(2) The Secretary shall administer grants under section 803 through the Administration for Native Americans. The Commissioner of such Administration may not delegate outside of such Administration the functions, powers, and duties of the Commissioner under the provisions of such section.

"(b)(1) Except as provided in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary may delegate to the heads of agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services any of the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary under this title and may authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such agencies only to heads of other agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(2) Funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, other than section 803, may be transferred between agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services only if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are authorized and appropriated.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit interagency funding agreements made between the Administration for Native Americans and other agencies of the Federal Government for the development and implementation of specific grants or projects.".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. Section 813 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.".

EXPENDITURE OF AVAILABLE FUNDS

SEC. 5. Section 814 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) by striking out "1981" and inserting in lieu thereof "1987";

(2) by striking out "There are" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) There are"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(b) Not less than 90 per centum of the funds made available to carry out the provisions of this title for any fiscal year shall be expended to carry out the provisions of section 803(a) for such fiscal year.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as amended.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

HELEN KELLER DEAF-BLIND AWARENESS WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 261) to provide for the designation of the last week in June 1984 as "Helen Keller Deaf-Blindness Awareness Week," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 261

Whereas the anniversary of the birth of Helen Keller, the most accomplished, respected, and renowned deaf-blind American in our history, falls on June 27; and

Whereas deaf-blindness is one of the most severe of all disabilities, with respect to which some forty thousand Americans are deprived of two primary senses; and

Whereas the rubella epidemic of the 1960's, along with other pathologies, has resulted in deaf-blindness for approximately six thousand of our children; and

Whereas, because of the severity of deaf-blindness the cost of educating, training, and rehabilitating persons who are deaf and blind is high in comparison with other disabilities; and

Whereas this high cost causes many service agencies to be reluctant to serve deaf-blind persons, thus inhibiting the independence and self-sufficiency of such persons, and frequently resulting in their placement in custodial institutions; and

Whereas, although the Helen Keller National Center and its network, and regional deaf-blind centers serve a portion of this population, inadequate education, training and rehabilitation services to the deaf-blind population represents a terrible waste of human lives and resources, imposing a high economic cost on the Nation; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to prevent this waste of human resources, foster independence, create opportunities for employment, and maximize the ability to achieve among our deaf-blind citizens; and

Whereas these objectives can be accomplished only through an increased public

awareness of, and attention to, the needs, abilities, and potential contributions to society of persons who are both deaf and blind; and

Whereas it is highly appropriate to publicize the needs, abilities, and potential of all deaf-blind persons, and simultaneously to recognize Helen Keller not only as a beacon of courage and hope for our Nation, but also as a symbol of what is possible for deaf-blind persons to achieve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President shall issue a proclamation designating the last week in June of 1984 as "Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Week" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

HONORING COMMANDER ALPHONSE DESJARDINS

The resolution (S. Res. 312) to honor Comdr. Alphonse Desjardins, founder of La Caisse Populaire de Ste-Marie, Manchester, N.H. was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S. RES. 312

Whereas Commander Alphonse Desjardins observed a lack of adequate banking facilities for most working Americans and undertook an active role in encouraging interested groups to develop a useful community-based alternative,

Whereas the objectives of credit unions are to encourage economy and financial responsibility among members, to promote Christian and humane values, to combat usury, to provide capital for local individual enterprises, and to help borrowers achieve economic independence through self-help,

Whereas the credit union movement in the United States began on a note of high idealism, its purpose service, its motivation religion, and its essence the practicality of the association of individuals, and

Whereas Commander Desjardins responded to the request of Monsignor Pierre Hevey, priest of Saint Mary's parish, Manchester, New Hampshire, to organize a credit union among a group of Franco-American citizens, resulting in the first incorporation of a credit union in this Nation, La Caisse Populaire de Ste-Marie: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes and honors the efforts of Commander Alphonse Desjardins, who, in this important way, did so much to bring credit unionism to the United States.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL WEEK OF THE OCEAN

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 478) designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, my executive calendar today also has a number of clearances on it. May I inquire of the minority leader if he is prepared to consider all those nominations under the heading "Nominations," not including those nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, however?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this side of the aisle is ready to proceed with all nominations with the exception of Calendar Order No. 514.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I hope to have cleared the nominations placed on the Secretary's desk early this afternoon. I think I may be able to do that.

I also hope that the minority leader might be in a position to clear Calendar Order 514. The minority leader I am sure will understand what I am about to say. We discussed it privately, and I mentioned it on the floor yesterday. At some point the leadership on this side will feel compelled to move to the consideration of that item. We do not do that often, and I will not do it today certainly. But if the minority leader could reexamine that particular item, I would be grateful for it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that will be done.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, then I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into executive session to consider those items that are cleared on both sides, to wit: Calendar Orders 567, 569, and 570.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alicemarie H. Stotler, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California.

The nomination was considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bohdan A. Futey, of Ohio, to be chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the remainder of the term expiring September 30, 1985.

The nomination was considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chapman B. Cox, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

The nomination was considered and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, that concludes my business for this morning. I thank the minority leader for his assistance and cooperation. I apologize to the Senator from Wisconsin for taking so long.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the standing order, the Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may retain control of the time that is left for me, and that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) proceed with his order, if he so wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

HOLLAND: THE WELFARE STATE GONE WILD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 1, the "60 Minutes" program on CBS carried the most damning indictment of the welfare state pushed to its extreme that this Senator has ever seen. This was a depiction of the economic plight into which Holland has worked in its quest to create a perfect social democracy. It provides subsidies for just about everything: for opera, for art, for marihuana for teenagers. As CBS commentator Morley Safer observed:

By the mid-70's the social welfare system had reached a crescendo of plans and programs, a reverse of Orwell's "1984." Big Brother was not watching; he was asking, "Can I do anything to help?"

In recent years, Mr. President, our country the United States, has begun to show a little restraint in foolish domestic spending. But we could easily lapse back into the bad old habits; "60 Minutes" offered a vivid picture of why we should be very careful about such a lapse.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the transcript of the "60 Minutes" television presentation of Sunday, April 1, on where the social democracy crusade has led Holland be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DUTCH TREAT"

MORLEY SAFER.—The Dutch ideal 20 years ago or so was to create the perfect social democracy, a state that would meet every need but, more than that, a state that would indulge every whim. The "Dutch Treat" is the result. Some of you will see it as something as close to Utopia as can be found on this earth. Others will see it as proof that there are limits to what the state can do, even with the best intentions. And once the state giveth, it is nearly impossible for the state to taketh away. Whatever way you do see it, one fact is it's running out of money. Dutch workers are paying fifty to sixty percent in taxes, the tax base is declining, unemployment in Holland may be the highest in Europe, but the treat goes on.

[Opera excerpt.]

The Dutch treat is for everyone. For the opera lover, it's particularly delicious. If the production wasn't subsidized, it would cost $85 a ticket, but it only costs $7 to attend. The government puts up the difference.

In Holland, the government puts up the difference for everything, from tennis lessons to providing a place for teenagers to buy cheap hashish, to paying undiscovered artists a state salary. It pays a retired bookkeeper, age 30, a nice pension for an alleged bad back, giving him time to be a full-time hawker for a sex club. And he pays not a penny in taxes.

By the mid-70's the social welfare system had reached a crescendo of plans and programs, a reverse of Orwell's 1984. Big Brother wasn't watching; he was asking, "Can I do anything to help?" The militant women demanded the government give them a women-only restaurant. The Government gave them money to get one going. And when lesbian women felt they were excluded from job opportunities as barge captains, the Dutch government put up money, got the Common Market to put up more, and gave them a school and bought them a barge.

[Barge engine revving up.]

The male barge crews objected, predicted disaster—accidents in Holland's delicate canal system. But the women won; the canal walls held.

[Dog barking; women barge workers chatting.]

WOMAN. Have a good time now. [Laughing, kissing].

SAFER. The homosexual community demanded and got a government-subsidized club and dance hall. The Hell's Angels complained they had no place to meet; so, the government gave them a clubhouse. Youth in general complained that youth was not being served; so, the government started something called "The Happy Family Clubs". Kids from 15 to 24 are provided with free music, sausages and soft drinks. Beer is 35¢ a glass; the hashish and marijuana are sold at discount prices.

[Singers performing Dutch pop music.]

The system is almost self-sufficient. The man who runs this Happy Family told me that the sale of drugs helps to offset the cost of running the clubs. The drugs are half the street price, and they're pure.

Remember, there's nothing clandestine about the sale of drugs in these clubs. This has the approval of the Dutch social welfare system.

[Singers performing.]

For older children and younger adults, the government subsidizes other clubs, like the "Milkey Way". In the Milkey Way, the drugs are sold at booths that give the latest market prices for marijuana and hashish. Everyone goes to great pains to say that hard drugs are not offered for sale, though the government is about to open a center where 300 heroin users will be given free drugs and a clean place to inject themselves.

[Orchestra tuning up.]

Holland is a great haven for musicians and for lovers of music. It pays virtually the entire cost for 19 symphony orchestras, plus operas and ballet companies. The musicians are all on civil service salaries and pensions, given 12 months a year of work, even though some of them put in only eight weeks.

[Orchestra tuning up.]

"The Ysbreaker"—[pronounced ice-breaker]—an Amsterdam cafe and experimental music club—gets a stipend of about a quarter of a million dollars a year from the government. Holland may be the most youth-conscious society in the world. Youth is indulged and pampered and subsidized, right through to middle age and beyond. At The Ysbreaker, just about any kind of music goes.

[Avant-garde violin and trombone music.]

It's also a place to try out new vaudeville acts, even though vaudeville is as dead in Holland as it is anywhere. The performers are, of course, on a government stipend as well. (Trombone blats; vaudeville excerpt)

Pop music is not left out, and here you may have the most enigmatic non sequitur in the history of musicology—the Committee for Non-Commercial Pop Music, designed to make more commercial and more popular non-commercial music. In other words, they're here to find ways of getting the bottom 400 into the Top 20, which of course would then make it no longer non-commercial.

But the most graphic, visual example of the Dutch treat is the way it treats its unsuccessful artists and those claiming to be artists. Last year, the Arts Committee of the Dutch Government spent more than $43-million on artworks from painters and sculptors who could not otherwise make a living. There are 3500 such artists on the government payroll. In return for the money, the artists offer their, quote, "best work", unquote, to the state.

[Chairman of Arts Committee speaking Dutch.]

The state committee is made up of civil servants and artists who are themselves on the nation's payroll. They meet twice a month to select art and artists to be added to the payroll.

The decision will be made today about whether to vote to——

MAN [municipal government employee]. Yes?

SAFER [continuing]. Subsidize that artist or not.

MAN. Right. That's correct. First, they have a general judgment whether the work presented is good enough, qualified to be bought. And then, if they vote yes, then afterwards they vote which part of the work they actually will buy.

SAFER. And are you from the Ministry, or——

MAN. From the municipal government.

SAFER. I see.

[Background comments in Dutch.]

SAFER. Much of what the committee looks at is atrocious. There's just no other word for it. And most members will privately admit it. But, not unlike certain departments of the U.S. government, once you have a budget, it must be spent—so they spend it.

[Comments in Dutch; pounding of gavel.]

SAFER. If the spiritual and esthetic sides of Dutch life seem indulged, what about the more practical side of life? Well, Holland has the most generous compensation for disabled workers anywhere, and it may be no surprise that it has more disabled workers than any other country. One in six people in the Dutch work force is on the "permanently disabled" list, being paid up to 80% of their former salaries. Right now, between the disabled and the unemployed, 41% of the Dutch work force is not working but being paid handsome benefits. And those benefits are not the end of it.

The abuses are not legendary; they are factual. In order to receive the disability pension, the alleged accident does not have to be job-related. One young man wrenched his back skiing, and managed to pull a $20,000-a-year pension for life. And then again, Willem the bookkeeper, back at his stand, earning, as he says, "luxury money" in Amsterdam's red-light district.

[Willem hawking outside sex shop; dialogue in Dutch.]

SAFER. Willem says doctors have not been able to trace the exact cause of his bad back, but he says it does hurt after a few hours of sitting.

But you look like a very healthy fellow.

WILLEM. Yeah, that's because I have—well, enough money to live in a bit of luxury, to go on—on a holiday for a year. Eat good to live good.

SAFER. Where do you go?

WILLEM. Well, depends. I've been through Europe, all over, most countries of Europe. And next year, I plan to go to the highlands of Scotland, this year, in the summer.

SAFER. Can you sit in an airplane for three or four hours?

WILLEM. That's okay, yeah.

SAFER. Or a car?

WILLEM. That's not—that's not hanging over a desk with your back bent.

SAFER. I see.

Dr. Jop Stork is a leading internist. He was the doctor to a former prime minister of Holland. He sees plenty of legitimately ill people, and he sees some others as well.

Dr. JOP STORK. Most of the patients come in to us with—with complaints like headache, backache, irritable colon, hyperventilation. And that's more than 50% of my patients. And then, we are ex—— examining everything: laboratory tests, X-rays, endoscopical examination.

At the end we say, "Congratulations! We didn't find anything!" And then we don't see a laugh. They say, "Well, I'm sorry, but I have my complaints. I'm not able to work." And then the problem starts.

Dr. VICTOR HELMBERSTADT. The system is abused, because it has been made to be abused.

SAFER. Dr. Victor Helmberstadt is a world-renowned Dutch economist. He lectures at Leyden University. He's one of the architects of the system, a system he now says has gotten completely out of hand.

Dr. HELMBERSTADT. It has been a terrible blow against morality, against the work ethic, and especially it has been a terrible blow for younger people, because in the past decade lots of young people have seen around them fraud, legal fraud, which allowed workers to obtain a benefit as a disabled person. And that, in—in turn, made it seem to young people, I think, that, well, trying to get a benefit instead of working was socially acceptable. And that's why we have now brought up generations of people who think that it's quite normal to live on a benefit instead of living on the income made from work.

[Laughter at cafe; Turks playing cards and dominos.]

SAFER. Non-Dutchman take further advantage of the Dutch social welfare system. There are hundreds of thousand of foreign workers in Holland, invited in to do the menial work many Dutchmen did not want to do. These Turkish men, many of them now on unemployment or disability themselves, are entitled to full benefits, plus family benefits for wives and children who've never been to Holland. The system is badly abused. Men claim more children than they have, and in some cases the money's going back to buy up farmland in Turkey.

[Turks playing; clatter of dishes.]

Imdad Alli is a Pakistani who came to Holland seven years ago. He works as a dishwasher in an Amsterdam hotel. On top of a fairly good salary, he gets a whole array of benefits.

[Music—Pakistanis watching Dynasty on TV.]

He lives in a big house which is subsidized by the state. He rents out rooms to other Pakistanis on an unofficial basis. On top of that, the Dutch government sends $3,000 a year in family assistance to his family in Pakistan, a family he claims numbers nine people. That $3,000 alone is nine times the average annual income in Pakistan.

[TV excerpt from Dynasty, with John Forsythe portraying Blake Carrington, declaring: "Yes, I'm going to get my grandson back home where he belongs!"]

Dr. HELMBERSTADT. The Dutch system is as generous to those who have—hold a Dutch passport as to those who do not hold a Dutch passport but who have worked here, are still working. That implies that those who return to their own country—because they have, for instance, entered the disability scheme and have been declared disabled or partially disabled—will get a benefit even in their own country. Some people will, for their specific disability, need a car, as to be able to transport themself. Now, if this were a foreign worker, and he goes back to his own country, which is perfectly legitimate, he'll be entitled to take that car along and get a replacement for that car after a few years.

SAFER. What's been the net effect on Dutch society of this generosity—I mean, beyond any economic problems? Has there been some other——

Dr. HELMBERSTADT. People consider it quite normal that government finances almost everything, be it education, be it art, be it benefits. And government is not a strange and alien body somewhere; government is us. And now people are finding out that—that they're paying the bill themselves, and that bill today is very high. And that makes a situation whereby wor—more and more workers will say, "We can't accept it." It's not yet a revolt, but there is a strong resistance to an increase in the tax take, only to finance schemes, benefits, for those who don't work.

SAFER. And what about those who do? All those universally unrecognized artists on the Dutch payroll, what happens to all that output? In theory, the work that is selected is sent to public buildings like this one. This building's main purpose is to administer "bad back" benefits. The idea is that state-employed office workers can enjoy the fruits of state-approved art. in fact, most of the art is sent here, to a warehouse. This one is down by the waterfront in Amsterdam. This is the little warehouse. It houses only 40,000 pieces.

Last year, the Dutch government paid $43-million for this stuff, and who knows how much more to house it. And as I said, this is only part of it. In the Hague, in the big warehouse, there are another 200,000 pieces of forlorn, long-forgotten inspiration.

[Gavel pounding at Arts Committee meeting.]

HOW A BRILLIANT BUREAUCRAT SAVED NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in contrast with the waste and extravagance of social expenditures gone wild in Holland, I want to offer at this point an example of bureaucracy at its best in our Government.

This town has a great time denouncing bureaucrats gone wrong. But when a public official does something brilliantly, no one read about it, hears about it or talks about it. This morning I should like to call the Senate's attention to a bureaucrat who did a superlative job. The name of this public official is Ronald Bornstein. If you have never heard of Ronald Bornstein, welcome to the club. Very few have.

But here is what he did: Last year, National Public Radio was in abysmal financial shape. Its budget crisis was so severe that it appeared impossible for this excellent public service to survive. The usual answer under these circumstances is to pump more public money into the operation. Just hike the old appropriation. But sometimes Congress says no and a service dies. In this case, Congress did not act, and the service carried on.

In spite of strong public and congressional support for National Public Radio, especially for its excellent "Morning Edition" and "All Things Considered," it appeared that National Public Radio might have to go. At this point, Bornstein was asked to come to the rescue. Why Bornstein? Bornstein has for a number of years run National Public Radio's most successful radio as well as its affiliated television station: WHA in Madison, Wis.

In 1976, Bornstein had come to Washington briefly to head a committee to recognize National Public Radio, a nonprofit programing and distribution organization which serves more than 240 affiliated public stations. He did such a good job then that he won the Edward R. Murrow Award for Distinguished Service to Public Radio. Bornstein also returned to Washington when he served as a vice president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for 18 months beginning in 1980.

So when National Public Radio got into trouble, the National Public Radio Board of Directors turned to Bornstein. No other name came up. When Bornstein arrived, he had to do a painful, difficult job. He reduced the staff of NPR by more than 150, including firing more than a hundred, and these were people whom Bornstein acknowledged were good people. As Bornstein told the Wisconsin Business Journal: "There were no financial systems operating at National Public Radio. There was lack of internal discipline, management discipline, erosion of the chain of command." At one point, NPR had $65,000 in the bank and a $6.5 million debt. The telephone company repeatedly threatened to disconnect the phones. The landlord threatened eviction. The satellite interconnection system operated only through emergency payments to Western Union. The company had 9,000 checks that could not be sent, because there were no funds to pay them. NPR owed almost $800,000 in salary withholding taxes to the Internal Revenue Service and was behind in paying withholding tax moneys to the District of Columbia and other tax districts. Bad business practices abounded in the chaotic climate. NPR had issued 110 American Express credit cards for use by its 449 employees. The cards were billable directly to the company. There were no uniform expense reimbursement procedures.

Bornstein moved quickly and decisively to clean up this messs. But he acquired some deep resentment along the way; he was called Attila the Munchkin and the Midwest Hick. The board chairman of NPR, Myron Jones, said that he could not tolerate Born-

stein's style of management. He told the Board: "One of us has to go. It's either Bornstein or Jones." Jones went.

Mr. President, today we still have an excellent National Public Radio, not only by virtue of a regard for the importance of the service NPR brings, but also a sensitivity to hardheaded, sound business practices and accountability, and a remarkable, first-class bureaucrat: Ronald C. Bornstein of Madison, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Wisconsin Business Journal of April 1984, by Joel McNair, entitled "Is Ron Bornstein God? Or Is He Just Damn Good?" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS RON BORNSTEIN GOD? OR IS HE JUST DAMN GOOD?

(By Joel McNair)

The Madison newspaper headline last November lableled him "Superman." Another anointed him "Savior." Yet another news story said he's "an authentic American hero."

For the press to gush is one thing. For the press to gush over a bureaucrat is quite another.

But to the eight million persons who regularly listen to National Public Radio, balding, 51-year-old Ronald C. Bornstein, at five feet six inches, is a man of heroic proportions. In the space of six eventful months last year, Bornstein quite literally saved NPR—an organization "close to anarchy"—from oblivion. A communications professor with UW-Madison and just recently appointed chief lobbyist and public relations officer of the University of Wisconsin System, Bornstein was directing WHA public television and radio in Madison before he headed east.

When he assumed the temporary presidency of NPR last May, Bornstein discovered the organization was some $9 million in debt in a total budget of $26 million. NPR wasn't meeting payrolls. Withholding taxes were not being paid. Employees had to cross the street to borrow paper for the copying machine.

Through massive budget cuts, employee layoffs, programming reduction and a craftily negotiated loan, Bornstein in a summer's time left NPR in a position to survive, if not thrive. Most critics and listeners agree that, despite the cutbacks, the quality of the network's programming was not greatly affected.

And, perhaps most incredibly, "Superman" did all this as a half-time employee.

"The remedies were standard business practice, nothing revolutionary," claims Bornstein in the soft, steady voice that belies his "tough guy" image within the broadcasting industry. His special qualifications, Bornstein feels, were knowing public broadcasting and the political workings of Washington, D.C., where NPR is headquartered.

"No other name ever came up," says Jack Mitchell, a member of the NPR board of directors that selected Bornstein to succeed Frank Mankiewicz as president last May. "There's nobody else quite like him."

Bornstein carved his unique niche through more than a decade of managing WHA, interrupted by stints at NPR and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in Washington. In Madison he learned to handle the budget and staff of a highly regarded public broadcasting station that ranks first in the nation in terms of radio listeners and second in television viewers.

In Washington, Bornstein says he learned "the political landscape" of public broadcasting—and where the organization's "corporate bodies were buried."

A Detroit native, Bornstein came to Madison in 1967 to be associate director of television services at WHA, which is part of the University of Wisconsin Extension. He has headed the station's television and radio operations since 1970. Now, he is the chief spokesperson and lobbyist for the University of Wisconsin System.

WHA produces local broadcasts and statewide information and educational services for the Wisconsin public television and radio networks. It also provides educational materials for state and educational agencies.

Under Bornstein's stewardship, WHA radio and television has modernized its facilities and increased staff (to 135 full-time employees) and budget (to a total of $7.8 million for the current fiscal year). Despite its growth, Bornstein points with pride to the fact that use of state tax money as a percentage of direct operating costs has decreased substantially in the last 15 years.

"Our direct operating costs are supported in the majority by nontaxpayer funds," Bornstein says. The majority of these operations are paid for by providing services to non-profit organizations and by donations from foundations and individuals.

In 1976, Bornstein traveled to Washington to head a committee to reorganize NPR, a non-profit programming and distribution organization which serves more than 240 affiliate public stations. As a result of that effort, he won the Edward R. Murrow Award for Distinguished Service to Public Radio.

He was also instrumental in hiring Frank Mankiewicz as NPR's president.

Bornstein went to Washington again in 1980, taking an 18-month leave of absence from the UW to serve as a vice-president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. He says the CPB, an independent non-profit organization which receives federal funding to be used for public broadcasting, acts as an "insulator between the political sector and a First Amendment enterprise."

Despite spending his entire broadcasting career in the public sector, Bornstein says his philosophy is the same as that of any good small businessman. "We believe in the same business-like principles of private enterprise," he says. "We believe in budget integrity, appropriate stewardship of funds and attention to the bottom line and performance."

He says these principles were what NPR lacked last spring.

Jack Mitchell, who is also station manager at WHA, says the 17-member NPR board of directors first realized they had a serious budget crisis in March. the board tried to balance NPR's current (1983) budget. They found, Mitchell says, that this was impossible.

Mankiewicz resigned under pressure. And the board gave Bornstein a call.

Bornstein agreed to help out on a part-time basis—with one stipulation. "I told the board that I would not accept a permanent position," he explains. "I promised my family I would be home in time for Halloween."

For the next six months, he spent three days a week in Washington, generally from Sunday night through Wednesday. He was soon on a firstname basis with crew members of Northwest Airlines Flight 379 out of Washington.

Bornstein's arrival was not greeted with enthusiasm by the NPR staff. Mankiewicz had been popular, particularly with the people who produced NPR's stellar news shows, "Morning Edition" and "All Things Considered."

Mankiewicz, too, had fostered an attitude that the organization's problems were minor and temporary. "Frank was saying that things are rosy, 'there's a little cash flow problem, but if we just hang tough we'll get through it'," Mitchell remembers. "Then the NPR board essentially fires Frank and sends in a guy who has a reputation for toughness."

"Since they had been told there was no problem, the staff thought that 'someone's out to get us.' "

The word at NPR, Mitchell says, was that Bornstein represented President Reagan's plan to kill public radio. Or that the CPB and hostile public radio stations were planning similar deeds. And Bornstein was friendly with NPR's rival, American Public Radio.

He was dubbed, "Attila the Munchkin" and "The Midwest Hick."

Bornstein had his own description of the situation: "Chaos."

"There were simply no financial systems operating at National Public Radio," he says. "There was lack of internal discipline, management discipline, erosion of the chain of command, lack of financial and administrative leadership by some of the principal department heads and officers."

"It was an organization that I thought was pretty close to anarchy."

The results of that anarchy were everywhere. At one point, NPR had $65,000 in the bank and a $6.5 million debt. The telephone company repeatedly threatened to disconnect the phones. The landlord threatened eviction. Member stations, Bornstein recalls, were "owed lots of money." The satellite interconnection system operated only through emergency payments to Western Union.

Bornstein more than once had to obtain emergency loans to meet the payroll. The company had 9,000 checks that could not be sent, because there were no funds to pay them. NPR owed almost $800,000 in salary withholding taxes to the Internal Revenue Service and was behind in paying withholding tax monies to the District of Columbia and other tax districts.

"A series of administrative fiefdoms were built that had their own books," says Bornstein. "These had a tendency not to agree with each other's or the corporate books."

Bad business practices abounded in the chaotic climate. For example, NPR had issued 110 American Express credit cards for use by its 449 employees. "The cards were billable directly to the company," Bornstein explains. "There was no uniform expense reimbursement procedure."

He says employees "would somehow, someday turn in a reconciling piece of paper, but the company would by that time have paid the American Express bill."

When he first stepped into NPR's Washington headquarters, Bornstein realized almost immediately that drastic budget and staff cutting was needed.

"We knew what we had to cut the first week we were there," says Mitchell. "His (Bornstein's) great strength is decisiveness."

Mitchell was part of a transition team, hand-picked by Bornstein to carry out his directives. As the temporary programming specialist, Mitchell was Bornstein's "cutter." Weekend and hourly news programs were terminated and reporters laid off. Four-fifths of arts and performance programming was chopped away.

Steve Symonds, a CPB veteran, was Bornstein's deputy, the man who provided Bornstein with much of his decision-making information. When Bornstein wanted a chief financial officer from the commercial broadcasting sector, Westinghouse Broadcasting offered George Miles, a Boston television station manager.

In the space of a few weeks, the team reduced NPR's staff by more than 150 employees. More than 100 were fired. Mitchell says he was "numb."

"It was absolutely agonizing," Bornstein remembers. "Those people were good people. They were the victims of the problem, not the cause."

Bornstein's axe was criticized within the organization. In what his staff calls the "June 14th Shootout at the OK Corral." NPR Board Chairman Myron Jones said he could not tolerate Bornstein's style of management. "He told the board it was either him or me," Bornstein recalls.

It was "him." Bornstein stayed.

Outsiders like the Washington Post's Jacqueline Trescott say some public radio station managers criticize Bornstein's decision to cut first and seek funds later.

"He stayed away from direct fundraising for so long," says Trescott, who covered the NPR story for the Post. Although more than $2 million was eventually raised in a "Drive to Survive" broadcast appeal, Trescott says much of the arts and performance division could have been saved if money had been raised earlier.

"In the long run, those cuts hurt NPR," she adds.

Bornstein counters that "Morning Edition" and "All Things Considered" are the heart and soul of NPR, the programming that is demanded by listeners and station managers. To attract foundation support and negotiate a loan with the CPB, he says all other areas had to suffer cuts. Without the cuts, he feels outside contributors would have been "throwing money down a rat-hole."

Once Bornstein felt the situation was under control, he went to the CPB for a loan that would keep NPR afloat. The negotiations were not friendly.

Bornstein is frank in his assessment of the CPB. "(CPB) should have been watching the store while someone took the cookies. They should have watched the financial performance of NPR."

The corporation, he says, was not experienced in negotiating what essentially was a commercial loan. Bornstein also feels the CPB's general counsel was not familiar with broadcast regulation. He says CPB's initial loan stipulations required too much control over NPR, and represented a First Amendment threat.

CPB wanted title to NPR's interconnection system. "Legally, they couldn't do it," Bornstein relates.

"But they maintained they could."

When the two parties decided upon a trust to oversee continued operation of the system, CPB attempted to select representatives of public radio stations as trustees. This is also illegal, Bornstein says, because trustees cannot be beneficiaries of the trust.

The corporation also wanted tighter control of NPR's budget. "Most people in the business sector clearly understand that if you have control of the budget for one day you have control of the organization," Bornstein says. Elements for CPB budget review were a continuing battle.

"Our position," Bornstein explains, "was that the NPR budget review should not provide the Corporation for Public Broadcasting with any ability to either approve or disapprove the receipt of grants. If you have that, you have significant influence over programming.

"If that had come to push and shove, I would rather have seen the organization stop, if that was the price. Nothing is worth that."

The $8.5 million loan guarantee came just hours before NPR would have been forced to close its doors for lack of money.

While not guaranteeing NPR's future, Bornstein and his team had at least given it some breathing space with the loan. And Bornstein returned to Wisconsin, where he helped pass out the Halloween candy.

Bornstein has received the praise of the NPR board, the news staff, the CPB and the press. With new President Douglas J. Bennet at the helm, Trescott reports that NPR appears to be staying above water, even to the point of having a small surplus for the first quarter of fiscal 1984. "People there are restless, because the real frustration is coming now in holding to a tight budget," she says.

Despite 10 to 15 percent cuts in the news budget, Trescott feels NPR is still respected. "'Morning Edition' uses more pieces from the BBC, so you know they are still stretching," she says. "But the quality of reporting stands with anyone in town."

Though he no longer has the power associated with the presidency of National Public Radio, "Bottom Line Ron" Bornstein is glad to be home. "The job doesn't pay enough" is his flip answer to questions about whether he would want to be NPR's permanent leader.

But Bornstein's feelings for Wisconsin—and Washington—run far deeper. "(In Washington) every act is questioned on the basis of running for office. I do not like to go into a situation like that with hidden agendas," he says. "That is the first thing that paranoid Washington types think about, because it's a hyper-political town. I told the board going in that I didn't want the job.

"I happen to be a great believer in personal choice and lifestyle," he continues. "Madison has been pleasing to me, and the university has been pleasing to me. There are several things that are important to me, and one of them is my family."

Mitchell says Bornstein was "never fully accepted as 'one of them'" by the NPR staff. "He's not one of them."

Bornstein and Mitchell agree that the Madison Ron Bornstein is a completely different person from the one who ran NPR. "The Ron Bornstein here is a lot nicer," Mitchell says. "(In Washington) there wasn't time for that."

"Here, I operate as a collegial manager," Bornstein says. "My talent is hiring good people and giving them a creative environment. I like to manage through others and bask in the glory of my own staff," he says.

In Washington the staff, while talented, was in complete disarray. "In Washington I was much more autocratic," he explains. "In a situation as critical as NPR's, you don't operate on a plebiscite basis.

"It's like providing policy directives to the inmates. You can't do that."

Bornstein, who says "boredom is my worst enemy," plans to stay active, both on the job and in the community.

He still offers advice when NPR calls from Washington. "I'm glad I was able to do a job," he says. "The entire experience is probably the greatest management challenge I have ever had, and may ever have. I'm really happy that it turned out well."

But he says he is also happy that it is over.

Happy, too, that his staff has stopped greeting him with "Good morning, savior."

DOES THE UNITED STATES HAVE IT WITHIN ITS POWER TO PREVENT A NUCLEAR WAR?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, is it possible for this country to find and follow military and foreign policies that will sharply reduce the prospects of a nuclear war? This Senator thinks it is. If we have a nuclear war, it will be very largely brought about by forces over which we in the Government have control. It will be the consequence of the failure of the U.S. Government to work wisely enough and hard enough to achieve two objectives: One, a comprehensive mutual, verifiable agreement to stop the arms race with the Soviet Union; two, an international agreement to stop the spread of nuclear arms material or equipment to other nations. Can we achieve either of these objectives? Yes, indeed. We can achieve both.

Are we making progress now in achieving either objective? No. We are losing ground every day. Consider: the limited nuclear arms talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both the START talks and the intermediate nuclear force talks have been suspended. The Russians—not the United States—walked away from both. Will they return to the table if the United States proposes to negotiate a comprehensive freeze on all testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons? There are strong indications they would. This Senator feels it is highly likely that eventually, and probably within the next year, they would do so. Would such negotiations lead to an agreement we could confidently verify? Of course, we will not know for sure until we try. But the Russians have indicated they will agree to consider to some of the principal and most critical elements such an agreement would have to contain, including verification by locating monitoring equipment within the Soviet Union, unrestricted satellite inspection, and verification of suspicious developments by on-the-spot inspection.

Most Americans and most Members of Congress have paid far less attention to an even more critical threat of nuclear war: the continued prolifera-

tion of nuclear weapons. The United States by itself can make a far more profound contribution to slamming the door shut on this threat than Russia. Russia has not engaged in selling or providing nuclear arms capability to other nations, and for obvious reasons. A nuclear-armed Hungary or Poland or East Germany could and very possibly would turn on their Soviet masters, once any of these Soviet-dominated satellites achieved the strength and independence of a nuclear arsenal.

After all, the biggest Communist defection in history has been the break between the Communist People's Republic of China and the Communist Soviet Union. What was the military basis for that split? Why did China leave the Soviet orbit while other Communist nations stayed under the Soviet wing? Certainly a prime reason was the development of an independent nuclear arsenal by China. Russia has held its international power through puppet governments that rely on the Soviet Union for military strength. The proliferation of nuclear weapons among these Soviet-dominated countries in Eastern Europe and elsewhere would mean a spectacular loss of Russian domination. But it would also mean a far, far more dangerous world. So Russia has tightly resisted the export of any of its nuclear arms technology. Unfortunately, the United States has not. We have provided nuclear materials or equipment to India, Pakistan, and South Africa. None of those countries has ratified the nuclear nonproliferation pact. So none of them permits international inspection to determine whether or not they are building a nuclear arms arsenal. And each of these countries seems determined, with our help, to build exactly that. India already has.

We are about to enter into a nuclear export agreement with the People's Republic of China. China has informally agreed to international inspection to determine whether or not she has diverted nuclear technology to military purposes. Meanwhile, she may have exported nuclear technology to other countries, including Pakistan, which could end up as nuclear weapons.

It is within the power of the United States to change this dangerous proliferation policy decisively. We could and should make an end to the spread of nuclear weapons the number one objective of our foreign policy.

To do this effectively would force this country to take truly radical and drastic action in our trade policies. That action would not only require stringent export controls on nuclear technology. It would also take a policy of tough and strict discipline with those of our trading partners who now sell nuclear technology: the French, the West Germans, the Swiss, the People's Republic of China, and others. This Senator is convinced that we should declare that we will refuse to buy or sell. We should refuse to trade at all with any country that permits trade in nuclear technology with any nation that diverts that nuclear technology to military purposes.

Mr. President, the survival of people throughout the world is at stake here. This country's military intelligence agencies estimate that unless we stop this nuclear proliferation, more than 30 nations will have nuclear arsenals within the next 16 years. If we permit that to happen, the prospect of our children living out their lives free of nuclear war would be nil.

So, Mr. President, it is within the power of the U.S. Government to take the steps we must take to give peace a chance. No one can guarantee that any steps we will take will surely lead to freedom from nuclear war forever. But we can immensely reduce the prospect of nuclear war and give our children a fighting chance to live out their lives.

THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE LIFE OF YURIY SHUKHEVYCH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last month, the National Executive Board of the Ukrainian Students Association of Mykola Michnowsky (TUSM) set aside a week of observance and remembrance for the life of Yuriy Shukhevych. The activities surrounding this year's observance are designed to broaden public awareness and bring moral pressure on the Soviet Union to release Mr. Shukhevych from his 32-year incarceration in Soviet Russian prisons, concentration camps, and exile.

Yuriy Shukhevych was arrested in 1948, at the age of 15, because he was born the son of Roman Shukhevych. His father was the commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) which fought on two fronts against Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia during World War II and continued the struggle for national liberation well into the 1950's.

Though it is not uncommon to have the relatives and friends of a leader like Roman Shukhevych jailed and tortured by opposing factions, it is unintelligible and senseless to continue his confinement so long. After all, Yuriy Shukhevych's sole "crime" is having been born the son of Roman Shukhevych. Thirty-two years, I am sure everyone will agree, is more than sufficient payment for this offense.

However, just serving a sentence for his crime is not enough for the Soviet regime. What now stands between Yuriy Shukhevych and freedom is the odious demand by the authorities to renounce his father and the Ukrainian National Liberation struggle. For his continued aversion to comply, he has been subjected to the most repulsive physical and psychological torture that the KGB has devised and only our nightmares can comprehend.

Mr. Shukhevych's case is symptomatic of Moscow's fears of open resistance to its policy denying the most elementary human and national rights. Furthermore, it is indicative of the plight of the thousands of Ukrainian political prisoners who are today languishing in Soviet concentration camps because of their resistance to the occupation and colonization of Ukraine by Soviet Russia.

Mr. President, Yuriy Shukhevych's courageous life is an inspiration to all of us to continue the fight for every group's basic, international human right to self-determination and self-sufficiency, without having that pursuit oppressed.

Let us join the Ukrainian Students Association in not only bringing moral pressure on the Soviet Union to release Mr. Shukhevych and countless others like him, but also in condemning under international law the Soviets' persistent persecution of all of its country's minority groups. We can strengthen our efforts through the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

The Genocide Convention attempts to defend the fundamental right of all national, racial, ethnic, and religious groups to live in this world without being subject to persecution. Ratification of the Genocide Convention will give Mr. Shukhevych a much-needed inspiration to continue his struggle against his senseless, prolonged oppression. His hope, to live without persecution, should not be denied.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 10:45 a.m., during which Senators may speak for up to 5 minutes apiece.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. EAGLETON. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CAREER OF SENATOR HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, next Tuesday, May 8, 1984, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of America's truly great Presidents, Harry S. Truman.

All across the Nation, Americans will be reflecting on the achievements of President Truman and his enduring legacy as a champion of freedom and democracy, both at home and abroad.

On the eve of the centennial, I will discuss the Truman Presidency here on the Senate floor as part of a series of speeches on the greatness of the man from Missouri, Harry S. Truman.

Today, however, I would like to concentrate on a period in Mr. Truman's life which I believe is of particular significance to my colleagues—the career of Senator Harry S. Truman.

The historical record tells us that Harry S. Truman was "a Senator's Senator"—well-respected and liked by his colleagues for his absolute integrity, fairness, and willingness to go to great lengths to allow other Senators to share the credit for his outstanding work. As we all know, at any time in this body, that is a rare quality.

In 1934, after serving two terms as presiding judge of Jackson County, Harry Truman entered the race for United States Senator from Missouri as an underdog. The pundits did not give him much of a chance of winning then, just as they did not give him much of a chance of winning the 1948 Presidential election against the "unbeatable" Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

Instinctively, the Jackson County presiding judge knew that he could win if he took his case directly to the people. He won a tough primary battle by driving himself across the State, speaking to farmers and small-town Missouri at dozens of stops. In November, riding the enthusiasm generated by his feisty campaign he defeated the incumbent, Roscoe C. Patterson, by a whopping 262,000 votes. At the age of 50, Harry Truman was just beginning his Senate career.

During his first term, Senator Truman distinguished himself as a hard worker with a diligent eye for the details of legislation. He painstakingly researched the issues before his committees, wrote his own statements and speeches, and demonstrated an unswerving determination to have all the facts at his command.

These qualities won for him that all-important asset needed for the making of an effective U.S. Senator: The respect of his colleagues.

Despite outstanding work as chairman of the subcommittee that wrote the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and outstanding work on the Transportation Act of 1940, Harry Truman entered the 1940 campaign as an underdog once again.

In fact, talk of his likely defeat was so strong within the Democratic Party that President Roosevelt offered Senator Truman a seat on the Interstate Commerce Commission as an inducement not to run.

Harry Truman, however, was nothing if not a man who believed in himself. He sought reelection in 1940, saying, "I would run even if I only got one vote—mine." He reiterated his firm position when he met with a group of friends in St. Louis on the eve of the 1940 campaign. He said, "I'm going to file. I wouldn't have the guts to go home and face my people if I ran out."

Initially, he lacked even the money to buy the stamps for letters asking for support. But, once again, his unshakable belief in himself prevailed, and Senator Truman won the election. Nevertheless, 1940 was a year of personal disappointment. Despite being reelected to the U.S. Senate, Harry Truman could not prevent his 88-year-old mother's farm in Grandview from being sold out from under her. His political opponents foreclosed on her as a way of hurting him in the campaign, but, he said years later, "Everybody in Missouri had a mortgage, so it didn't do me a bit of harm." Once again, Harry Truman suffered the hard knocks of political life. This time, however, the effects were felt by one of the people he was closest to.

It was in his second term that Senator Truman developed the national reputation which led to his selection as President Roosevelt's running mate in 1944.

The famous Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program grew out of a personal investigation Senator Truman performed after being told by Missourians that equipment was being ruined at Fort Leonard Wood from being left out in the rain and snow to rust.

Plunging into the task he set for himself, as was his usual practice, he drove over 30,000 miles in his own car not only to Fort Leonard Wood, but also to military facilities in Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Tennessee, South Carolina, and Georgia. Almost everywhere he found wasteful practices that were weakening the Nation's defense and squandering taxpayers' money.

In February 1941, he introduced a resolution calling for further investigation into the pattern of personal and geographical favoritism he had discovered.

Ever the diligent student of history, Harry Truman got the only remaining copy of the hearings of the Civil War Committee on the Conduct of the War.

Before asking for the establishment of a special committee to investigate America's defense in the 1940's, Senator Truman studied the proceedings of a congressional committee which 80 years previously had done an especially bad job of wartime oversight.

The Civil War Committee's sensational investigations included testimony from President Lincoln over wild rumors of anti-Union activities by Mrs. Lincoln. And, it actually meddled in war strategy.

Senator Truman had no such committee in mind, later saying, "Lee said that committee was worth two divisions to him."

As a former Missouri presiding judge, Harry Truman was interested in the unglamorous, but highly fruitful examination of the contracting procedures, billing procedures, and labor practices used in the defense effort. There was no one better qualified in the U.S. Senate than Harry Truman. The principles of public contracting were fundamentally the same, whether for the construction of defense plants or for roads and bridges for Jackson County.

One of Senator Truman's key concerns was the practical exclusion of defense contracts to small manufacturers.

"The little manufacturer, the little contractor, and the little machine shop have been left entirely out in the cold," Mr. Truman said in a 1941 Senate floor speech. "The policy seems to make the big man bigger and to put the little man completely out of business."

He also pointed out that "I am reliably informed that from 70 to 90 percent of the contracts let have been concentrated in an area smaller than England."

In early 1941, the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program was organized, with Senator Truman as its chairman. The Senate leadership did not think the committee would amount to much; all except one of the six members appointed to serve with Mr. Truman were junior Senators. Its initial budget was just $15,000.

But, as at so many other times in his career, the unassuming Harry Truman was underestimated.

On April 25, 1943, Richard Stokes wrote in the conservative Washington Star:

> The committee's streamlined efficiency is due to compulsion as well as choice. It has a staff of only 30, of whom 15 are stenographers. To examine a program rising toward $300 billions, it has received aggregate appropriations of $200,000 as against $570,000 lavished on the Dies Committee. * * *
>
> The committee was Truman's own idea and at the beginning no one took it seriously but himself. The powers that be thought that a bit of humoring was owed to a faithful New Dealer * * * It is generally thought that the appointment of freshman Senators of small influence reflected the slight esteem in which the committee was first held.

In Truman's view, the appointment of rookie Senators to the Committee did him a favor. He found himself associated with youthful, energetic and ambitious men who in many cases still had their spurs to win.

Truman's style as chairman was to share the credit for the committee's successes, even to the point of appointing subchairmen to examine various aspects of the defense program; to achieve bipartisanship through complete unanimity on all committee reports; and to scrupulously avoid sensational publicity or unfair accusations against anyone.

On its first major investigation into practices employed in the construction of Army camps, the Truman committee, as the press had dubbed it, saved the taxpayers $250 million.

From 1941–45, the committee saved the taxpayers an estimated $15 billion.

Early on in the process, the Nation discovered Harry Truman. He became a national figure. Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Washington bureau wrote on November 2, 1942, that among the Members of the Senate, Harry Truman had become "one of the most useful and at the same time one of the most forthright of the ninety-six."

Although he had become one of the most valuable civilians the United States had in its service, Harry Truman, serving on his last duty as a full colonel in the Field Artillery Reserve, went to Gen. George A. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, to offer his service in uniform.

Walter Hehmeyer, the committee publicity man, told Truman biographer Jonathan Daniels of the conversation Senator Truman and General Marshall had early in the war. The Senator did not like the general's answer, Hehmeyer recalled. Hehmeyer recounted the exchange as follows:

Senator Truman, you've got a big job to do right up there at the Capitol, with your Investigating Committee. Besides, Senator, this is a young man's war. We don't need any old stiffs like you.

"I am younger than you, General Marshall," the Senator replied.

Yes, but I'm a general and you'd be only a colonel. You stay right where you are.

His hope of fighting in both World Wars dashed, Senator Truman continued in his outstanding work as chairman of the committee.

In Daniels' view,

Perhaps the main accomplishment of the committee was not the fine result it obtained in the war effort in better organization or greater production in aluminum or rubber, steel, or planes. Its lasting product was the example it provided "of the results that can be obtained by making a factual investigation with a good staff." It demonstrated the effectiveness of investigation by a committee of Congress.

Harry Truman once advised me that "history isn't dead; history is reality." All of us who serve in the U.S. Senate in 1984 could learn some valuable lessons in the field of congressional oversight by studying the work of the Truman committee.

The national reputation Harry Truman developed from the committee's work for honesty, integrity, fairmindedness, straightforward speech, and gritty determination was being watched closely by President Roosevelt.

Typical of the kind of national exposure Senator Truman was receiving was this comment in the Washington Star on April 16, 1944:

Inherently democratic, congenial and affable, scrupulously fair * * * his activities as chairman of the Senate Committee Investigating the Defense Program have won him the enmity of those he has investigated and the gratitude of millions of taxpayers * * * No flowing tie, no pomposity, no meaningless eloquence; just a regular guy by any standard. But the finest investment the taxpayers have in Washington today.

Despite the fact that his name had become well known across America, Senator Truman resisted the coaxing of Democratic Party leaders, who were in search of a 1944 running mate for F.D.R.

On the second day of the Democratic National Convention, Mr. Truman was sitting near the telephone in the room of National Committeeman Robert E. Hannegan of St. Louis when the President called.

Mr. Truman had just told Hannegan that he could not believe F.D.R. wanted him as a running mate. Hannegan held the phone so that Mr. Truman and others in the room could hear the President ask if the Senator from Missouri had agreed to accept the Vice-Presidency yet.

According to Truman biographer Jonathan Daniels:

Hannegan said, "No. He hasn't agreed yet." Roosevelt replied loud enough for Truman to hear him. "Well, tell him if he wants to break up the Democratic Party in the middle of a war, that's his responsibility."

Hannegan turned to Truman. "Now what do you say?"

"My God," said Truman.

After the reelection of President Roosevelt against Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Harry Truman was to serve as Vice President for just 82 days before the President's death.

Characteristically, he was humble about assuming the Presidency. One of his first acts was to ask members of the White House press corps to pray for him.

But, he also knew that the American people, Allied fighting men around the world, and perhaps most importantly, our enemies, had to understand quickly that firm and capable hands were guiding the most powerful Nation on Earth.

To convey this impression, Harry Truman did not have to "act Presidential," or be photographed "doing Presidential things." He merely had to be himself.

Throughout his life, whether as a timekeeper on a Missouri railroad, as an artillery officer leading his men in combat, as a county judge, U.S. Senator, or President, Harry Truman led by example.

His strength, his vision, his dignity, naturally came through.

That is the essence of leadership. There is no doubt that the world was extremely fortunate to have Harry Truman as President of the United States at one of the most crucial and dangerous periods in history.

I have spoken today on the mark Harry Truman made in this Chamber to remind my colleagues of the achievements of one of America's great Senators.

In his centennial year, I urge all my Senate colleagues to study the life and accomplishments of Mr. Truman. There is much to learn that can be applied to our work here in the Senate. I can also promise a great deal of enjoyment in becoming reacquainted with Harry Truman, the man.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT ON THE HOLLINGS AMENDMENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I conferred with the minority leader on this subject, and he brought to my attention a request by the Senator from Mississippi in respect to the sequence of speakers after the introduction of the Hollings amendment or after debate on the Hollings amendment has begun, whether the amendment has been laid before the Senate or not.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi, of course, is the ranking minority member on the Armed Services Committee. He is a former chairman of the Armed Services Committee. He is beloved on all sides.

Without any hesitation, I was happy to clear this request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate commences debate on the Hollings amendment, the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS, be next recognized after the principal author of the amendment, Senator HOLLINGS, for the purpose of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. STENNIS and myself, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his accommodation in this matter.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S TRIP TO MAINLAND CHINA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, finally, President Reagan's trip to mainland China has ended and, by now, he is on his way home or, safely again, home in the White House.

If one measures the fact that he was able to establish a basis to sell a number of nuclear electric plants to that country as a success, then I guess the trip could be called that. It may, at least, be a small start at giving electricity to 1 billion people, most of whom do not know what it is; and it can help to prove that American made nuclear reactors are safe and will work, something many American citizens are not willing to admit.

Another thing I was grateful for was the fact that he did not agree with Red China to sell them weapons or even advanced technology to help make them.

I believe the President understands fully that military aid to Communist China would be harmful to our national interests because it could threaten our allies in Asia, arouse increased Soviet military preparations, and drain the United States of many billions of dollars of financial resources and technology needed elsewhere.

His attitude toward Taiwan, while quite a bit changed, in fact, completely changed from the rhetoric he used during his Presidential campaign, remains what he put it at a few years ago, but, I would hope that he would soften just a bit and allow Taiwan to buy some defensive aircraft that they badly need should the mainland ever attempt to take them by force.

There is no way, in my opinion, that the mainland forces can cross the channel while Taiwan has a technological superiority and, what they need to achieve this and keep it, are a good number of our modern interceptor aircraft.

Mr. President, I think the rather shameful demonstration of Red China's willingness to censor the remarks made by the President to her people should indicate to the President, and anybody else who does not quite grasp the full meaning of Communist government, that they do not want their people to learn, they want to keep from them the words of encouragement that the President made in what I consider to be an exemplary speech but, that is the way those people operate. And, some day, I hope our State Department and our executive branch will realize that we are not playing with ordinary people and, when having learned that, we can begin to conduct ourselves more wisely.

We might even realize that the so-called normalization of relations with Communist China has caused the United States more problems than it would have faced had we not played the China card. If Red China had remained allied with the Soviet Union, political turmoil between the two ideological competitors may have created serious instability within the Communist camp.

Our economic and diplomatic ties with Red China did not prevent the Soviet Union from invading Afghanistan, nor from acquiring basing rights in Vietnam. Nor have they slowed down the growth of Soviet military forces.

Instead of playing the China card, the greatest priority should be given to strengthen U.S. relations with the non-Communist, private enterprise nations of Asia and the Pacific, which includes the Republic of China on Taiwan.

TRIBUTE TO KEN MURPHY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take the floor briefly this morning to express my appreciation for the work that Ken Murphy has done as staff director of the Environmental and Energy Study Conference. There are two accomplishments of his tenure which I particularly want to mention.

First, before Ken came to the Environmental and Energy Study Conference, the conference had established a reputation for developing the soundest, nonpartisan material available on energy and environmental matters. However, during these last 3 years, unusually partisan issues have developed involving environmental policies, personalities, and budgets. Throughout this period, with Ken's hand at the helm, the Environmental and Energy Study Conference's nonpartisan reputation has been both preserved and enhanced.

Second, during this same period, because of changes in the rules of the other body, a major reorganization of the conference has been necessary. Under weaker leadership, these changes could have disrupted, and even destroyed, the organization. Throughout this difficult process, however, Ken's personnel and administrative skills have made the Environmental and Energy Study Conference even a stronger organization.

He moves now to the executive directorship of the Environmental and Energy Study Institute. Establishing this new organization will be a major new personal and professional challenge at which I am confident Ken will succeed.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUGAR). The Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS) as a member of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

DEATH OF ANSEL ADAMS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with the death of Ansel Adams last week, America lost one of the greatest conservationists and greatest artists in its history. A renowned photographer, Ansel Adams used his incomparable artistic and photographic talent to immortalize the subjects he loved best—the landscapes of the American West.

For half a century his work has been a reminder to us all of the critical need to preserve our most precious natural resources. Whenever conservation legislation was under consideration by the Congress, Ansel's presence and his photographs would bear eloquent witness to the tremendous importance of the issues at stake in our deliberations. Most of all, he taught us that America the beautiful must never be permitted to become America the exploited.

Ansel Adams' twin legacies to the future are his extraordinary art and his spirited commitment to conservation. He has been an inspiration to all of us who had the privilege to know him personally, to millions more across America who love the beauty of this land, and to anyone in any land who ever stood in awe before the natural majesty of his work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials and articles from the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the Los Angeles Times, on the life and work of Ansel Adams may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1984]

ANSEL ADAMS

It was, finally, the light—not simply the monumental face of the Half Dome at Yosemite, or the great fact of Mount McKinley itself looming over Wonder Lake in his famous photograph, but the light that Ansel Adams saw, captured and presented to the world in thousands of magisterial photographs. These photographs earned him fame and fortune and, more important, admiration and enduring respect. He was an artist of the beautiful, in Hawthorne's phrase, and the source of his artistry lies in the light (and the reverence) with which he imbued the wild landscapes he so indefatigably photographed. The wonders of nature may speak for themselves, and the light is there for all to see; but the essence of the artist lies in the vision that is uniquely his own. Mr. Adams's vision was luminous. Light emanates—gloriously, mysteriously—

from those silent, unpeopled, unforgettable images of vastness and wildness.

There is no art without craft, and the meticulous craftsmanship of Ansel Adams, whose life was 82 years long, died with him last Sunday. But what he saw and seized and made uniquely his own—the single moment of a particular hour on one ordinary day—is now part of history, part of the record, part of our legacy because he made the ordinary extraordinary and caught it on a simple piece of light-sensitive paper.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 24, 1984]

DEATH OF AN ARTIST

Ansel Adams, dead at 82, was the self-commissioned portrait photographer for the western wilderness who did far more than help elevate photography from the level of hobby to the level of high art. His portraits of Yosemite National Park and the New Mexico wilderness and the rugged California coast are gifts of beauty second only to the real thing. But in his later years his most important work lay in doing all that one man could to make sure that the real thing was not trampled in the name of progress.

Adams left 50,000 photographs to be cherished, stark and fragile fragments snatched from reality, as disembodied as poetry; he came, in fact, to call himself a "photo-poet." His reputation was that of a patient artist, standing with his tripod for hours or even days waiting for the perfect light, the perfect formation of clouds. Yet one of his most spectacular photographs, which captured the moon rising over Hernandez, N.M., was a chance work of art created by the side of a road in the panic of a missing exposure meter, a balky tripod, a vanishing sun that, in the end, left him 15 seconds to compose.

In recent years he combined politics with photography, a voice not in the wilderness but of the wilderness, battling not always gently the encroachment of blind development on his favorite parts of the world—Big Sur, endangered stretches of the coastline, Yosemite Valley. One of his last crusades was against a plan to fly sightseers over Yosemite, a plan he feared would shatter what was left of the silence of the High Sierra meadows.

Ansel Adams also leaves thousands of grateful students who flocked to his home in the Carmel Highlands to study in his huge darkroom and to hike with him into the wilderness. Some marveled at what they saw as the willingness of a successful photographer to tell everything he knew, to give away his secrets.

He insisted that he had no secrets. In the most technical and mechanical sense, that may be true, but a colleague who saw him at a reception in his home overlooking the ocean a few weeks before his death says he did. As the sun dipped toward the ocean, Adams scrambled to his huge picture window, urging his guests to join him to watch the setting sun and stood motionless and enthralled by an event he had watched for 82 years without any discernible failure of enthusiasm. That was the secret.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1984]

ANSEL ADAMS, PHOTOGRAPHER AND ENVIRONMENTALIST, DIES AT 82

(By Dale Russakoff)

Ansel Adams, the photographer who celebrated the majesty of nature through panoramic pictures of the virgin American West and a lifetime of environmental activism, died of a heart ailment Sunday at a hospital near his home in Carmel, Calif. He was 82.

Renowned for his twin commitment to art and activism, Mr. Adams worked at both causes until the end. He had recently finished his autobiography and was at work on a series of technical books on photography. On the day he died, aides said he dictated notes on his concern over threats to the natural environment.

Mr. Adams was one of a small group of 20th-century photographers credited with elevating his field from a hobby to an art form. He took his first snapshot at age 14 in Yosemite National Park with a Kodak Brownie box camera and spent much of the rest of his life capturing on film the contrasting light, beauty, and power of the American wilderness.

"We will remember him more than anything else for his vision of the western landscape," said John Szarkowski, director of the department of photography at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. "He understood that the earth was not just a sculpture, it was an event, constantly changing. That's what he explained in his pictures, which is why they were so moving and why they gave us another sense of what the world was about."

Szarkowski and others said it was Mr. Adam's creative energy and intensity, as much as his artistic achievement, that distinguished him. Even in his later years, friends said, it took two, full-time darkroom assistants working in shifts to keep up with him.

Mr. Adams' heralded photographs of Kings Canyon and his personal lobbying efforts as a director of the Sierra Club in the 1930s helped persuade Congress to preserve the 455,000-acre wilderness area as a national park.

For the past three years, he wrote a letter a day to congressmen and newspapers decrying the Reagan administration's environmental policies, which he once branded "the Pearl Harbor of our American earth." He often said that only his Pacemaker and his fight against Reagan and former Interior Secretary James G. Watt kept him alive.

Last summer, after Mr. Adams told Playboy in an interview, "I hate Reagan," the president invited the photographer-conservationist to meet with him. After a 50-minute session at a Los Angeles hotel, Mr. Adams emerged to call the president "sincerely cordial" but unconvincing. Borrowing a phrase from Oscar Wilde, he said Reagan "knows the cost of everything and the value of nothing."

"Ansel believed everyone had a responsibility in the larger world, that an artist couldn't just withdraw," said William A. Turnage, executive director of the Wilderness Society and a close friend and former business manager of Mr. Adams. "He became one of the most important environmentalists of the century. His work had a tremendous impact on the way Americans understand nature."

Born in San Francisco Feb. 20, 1902, Mr. Adams had his first encounter with the raw power of nature at age 4, when the great earthquake of 1906 hurled him into a brick wall, leaving him with a broken nose that later became one of his best-known trademarks, along with his brushy white beard, tall presence and Stetson hat.

He embarked first on a career as a concert pianist, with photography as a hobby, but committed himself full time to the camera and the serious study of light, form and nature in 1930. He dated this interest to 1915, when at age 13, he went daily to see the Armory Show, the revolutionary modern art exhibit of impressionists and surrealists, at the San Francisco World's Fair.

Mr. Adams returned to Yosemite each summer after snapping his first picture there. In 1919, he joined the Sierra Club, and later became caretaker of its Yosemite Valley headquarters. He became an expert mountaineer in pursuit of pictures of the vast, rocky expanse.

"The excitement of Yosemite became strong and filtered through me into some esthetic experiences, which probably were supported by similar experience I was having in music study," Mr. Adams recalled in a 1975 interview.

Mr. Adams' early works were impressionistic and soft-focus, but under the influence of photographer Paul Strand, whom he met in 1930 in Taos, N.M., he moved toward conveying sharp, stark details. In 1932, he joined Edward Weston, Imogen Cunningham and others to form Group f/64, whose name refers to the small lens opening of a camera, symbolizing the depth of field and sharpness of image that Mr. Adams and his compatriots sought.

In 1935, Mr. Adams attracted the attention of the renowned photographer, Alfred Stieglitz, with his first technical manual, "Making a Photograph." The next year, Stieglitz sponsored a one-man show of Mr. Adams' work titled "An American Place," at his New York City gallery.

Over the years, Mr. Adams helped develop the concept of "equivalents," which he described as the link between the spiritual excitement that a photographer feels about his subject and the image he creates of it. He said this allows the spectator to create his own "equivalent."

Mr. Adams also was a proponent of the concept of "visualization," which frowns on retouching, requiring an artist to see and feel the final print of a picture before releasing the camera shutter. He developed the break-through "zone system" of film exposure to control specific textures and contrasts in each part of a panoramic vista.

A prolific writer, Mr. Adams published a series of technical works, known as the Basic Photo Books, and numerous collections of his photographs, of which the most famous include the luminous and haunting "Moonrise, Hernandez, New Mexico," and the mystical "Monolith, the Face of Half Dome."

More than 1 million copies of his books have been sold, and more than 5,000 students have attended his workshops. He is also well known for "Born Free and Equal," a photographic record of the lives of thousands of Japanese Americans interned at the Manzanar Relocation Center in California during World War II.

Mr. Adams helped launch the first department of photography as a fine art at the Museum of Modern Art in 1940, and in 1946 he founded the first academic department of photography at what was then the California School of Fine Arts.

On Sunday, Swiss pianist Vladimir Ashkenazy performed at Mr. Adams' home overlooking the spectacular Big Sur coastline in a private concert scheduled months earlier. He then visited Mr. Adams at Monterey's Community Hospital, where the photographer had been confined since Friday, and gave his friend a tape of his latest recording of Brahms.

Mr. Adams spent the day reading newspapers and a mystery book, dictating his

thoughts on photography and conservation into his tape recorder and listening to Ashkenazy's tape on his Walk-Man, said Mary Alinder, Mr. Adams' chief assistant and editor of his autobiography.

"He was Ansel right to the end," Alinder said.

Survivors include his wife of 56 years, the former Virginia Best, of Carmel; a daughter, Anne Helms, and a son, Dr. Michael Adams.

MEMORIES OF A.A.: DINING ON APPETIZERS AND DRIVING THE CADDY

(By Tom Zito)

Those who were lucky enough to have known Ansel Adams will hardly remember him for his photographs, as monumental as they were. That's just it; the photos were monumental and A.A., as he was affectionately known, wasn't. He was the first person in the world to admit absolute bafflement over why his pictures had become so pricey and, beyond all that, he was hardly the sort who liked to sit around and talk photography. Unlike most people who have become famous for some body of work, A.A. was well aware that his life was not defined by his work.

I first met A.A. some 10 or 15 years ago. The occasion was an exhibition of his photographs at the Corcoran, and I, the young reporter, had been assigned to interview him. I was immediately struck by his joviality: he dressed in a Stetson and string tie, he loved to laugh, there was always a mischievous twinkle in his eye, and he was quite able to drink me under the table. I recall him interrupting me after about five minutes of conversation and saying, "Please don't call me Mr. Adams; it makes me feel old and I don't."

Generally in journalism, interviews are completed and all contact is lost with the subject—hardly the case with A.A. He called me the day after my interview had run and invited me to dinner. He had five appetizers, which was always his favorite way to dine out, drank several vodkas and regaled me with tales about getting his nose broken in the San Francisco earthquake, hauling dead bodies down from the High Sierras on the backs of mules, and convincing his father to let him take a year off during grammer school, so he could attend the Centenary Exhibition. I think we spent not one moment talking about photography.

He told me he liked me. The great difference with A.A. was that he meant it. He and his wife Virginia would regularly invite me out to visit them in Carmel. The house was big and warm and modern, and sat up on a point overlooking the Pacific where each spring the whales would migrate past. A.A. would sit there and look at the whales, or hop into his white Cadillac and drive over to Point Lobos to take a little constitutional.

He was a real technology junkie; he said he liked the Caddy because it dimmed its own high beams, turned on the interior lights when your hand touched the outside door handle and had a little onboard computer that told you how many miles you could go before you needed to stop for gas. He said one of the great benefits of being a senior citizen was that he got into parks like Point Lobos for free.

He'd park the Caddy and wander around the wooded hills of Point Lobos. The place was always full of people lugging around view cameras, and A.A. would jokingly go up to them and say, "Haven't you heard about 35 millimeters?" You could see their faces get bent out of shape. They suspected that this was the great Ansel Adams, who worked only with view cameras, but they were too embarrassed to ask and so they'd just stare and wonder and A.A. would trot off over the hill and laugh.

Several years later I was to write a long, detailed piece about A.A., for which I went out to Carmel and was given complete run of the house. A.A. and Virginia opened up closets and drawers and said, "Well, if you really want to do this you'd better go through this stuff. Don't be bashful." I had never had a subject provide such access. I remember quizzing A.A. about his seeming abandonment of privacy, and he said, "I'm 75 years old; why would I want to hide anything?"

He always seemed to display this sort of elfin, child-like quality: a blending of the absolutely forthright and the sublimely humorous. A few years back when he was making an official portrait of Jimmy Carter—for which he used his Horsemann view camera—he said, "We're putting the Carter before the Horsemann."

There were some wonderful times at the house in Carmel. You were never quite sure who would show up for dinner. One night Georgia O'Keeffe came by and she and A.A. went back and forth about who was the better mountain climber. Sometimes at night A.A. would sit down at the piano and play; he'd studied as a boy to be a concert pianist but abandoned all that for the camera. Later his hands became withered by arthritis and it was difficult for him to play, but if you goaded him enough he'd eventually sit down and the touch and the ear were still absolutely there. He'd always finish up with a piece he had composed for left hand and orange, that involved rolling an orange around the treble keys with a surprising degree of melody.

A.A. transposed some of his alacrity at the piano to another keyboard, that of his IBM Displaywriter, a word processor that he would sit at for hours each day and bat out chapter and verse for an autobiography he was well into. Most recently he had been anticipating a visit from Steve Jobs, the young chairman of the board of Apple Computer. Jobs was scheduled to bring A.A. one of Apple's new MacIntosh computers, which had captivated A.A.'s interest because of its remarkable ability to create graphics. You knew that A.A. probably wanted to figure out some way to get a black and white image up on the screen and then fiddle around with it.

He was always fascinated with this sort of technological wizardry. He did some of the very early testing of Polaroid film (Ed Land was an old friend of his), and also made some fascinating home movies with the Polavision system. The first time I met him he'd just gotten ahold of one of Kodak's new Instamatic cameras, and he was snapping away with wild abandon, just like the kid he really was.

Years later, when I finally took him up on his invitation to visit the photography workshop he conducted each year in Yosemite, he was fooling around with an SX-70. Here were all these students trying to learn the intricacies of the view camera and the zone system and there was A.A. firing away with his Polaroid. He stuck me in front of Half Dome and made a little snapshot. Then he handed it to me and said, "Hang on to this; with the way the prices of my pictures are going this will be worth $1,000 soon." And he laughed.

I saw A.A. in Virginia very recently and he seemed well and happy. He said he had been working on two major projects. One had been to get rid of James Watt, and he was quite pleased with that endeavor.

The other one is beyond A.A. now. Several months back he had gotten a call from Ronald Reagan, who had requested an audience. It seemed that the president was pretty tired of A.A.'s verbal assault in the press, and wanted to know why A.A. was so critical of him. So the octogenarian went to visit the septuagenarian in some California hotel room, and basically told him that he just didn't like his politics.

"It was like I was dealing with somebody who had just landed from Mars," A.A. said. "So now I've got to put my energy into getting a different president elected."

He was always ready for a battle. And always willing to turn the other cheek. And he will be missed long after the last of his prints have faded away—except that he made such damned good ones that some of them will probably last forever.

MASTER OF THE CAMERA, POET OF THE LANDSCAPE, PROTECTOR OF THE WILD

(By Paul Richard)

At photography—and politics—Ansel Adams was a master.

When Adams came to Washington, as he often did, Adams would dress up like the Old Man of the Mountains. He'd wear a string tie and a Stetson. He'd scratch his grizzled beard, grin his impish grin, snap his red suspenders—and go about his business with implacable intensity. Adams had two missions here. One was selling photographs. The other was pressuring politicians into helping him preserve the wild landscapes that he loved.

At both of his two missions, Adams, 82—whose heart gave out on Sunday night—was enormously successful. He was the grand old man of the environmental movement. His photographs appear in nearly a million books. He had countless exhibitions and honors. He was the best loved and best known of American photographers.

Adams was in some ways a 19th-century artist who flourished in the 20th. The technically impeccable, usually unpeopled, photographs that brought him fame blend two different traditions of American landscape art, one factual, one fanciful.

Adams was not the first good artist to go into the mountains. The western landscapes he portrayed had been portrayed in previous century by photographers and painters. The painters leaned toward poetry, the photographers toward prose. They taught him different things.

"Not everybody trusts paintings," said Adams, "but people believe photographs."

His photographs are believable in part because their details seem absolutely right. When he shows a still-young aspen tree growing in New Mexico, one can take a magnifying glass and study ever leaf. When he shows a field of stones, one can see the texture of every rounded rock.

Adams as a lobbyist was comparably effective. His pictures of California's Kings Canyon, hand-carried to Washington in the 1930s, helped lead to the creation of the 455,000-acre Kings Canyon National Park. Adams, a Sierra Club director from 1936 to 1970, worked over every president from Franklin Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan. He made phone calls, he wrote letters. When Interior Secretary James Watt was in office, Adams would dash off a letter of complaint—to newspapers and congressmen—almost every day.

"You should see him lobby," said his friend Bill Turnage in 1979. After seven years as Adams's business manager, Turnage had become the head of the Wilderness Society. When Adams came to Washington, they would work the Hill together.

"We run this Abbott and Costello act," said Turnage. "I let Ansel start. He speaks about the spirit, then I hit them with the details."

Adams the photographer took a similar approach. The majesty of landscape, and its minutiae, too—the spirit and the details—dance together beautifully in his finest works of art.

He was a masterful technician. He invented the "zone system" of exposure, he taught 5,000 students, and his printing sets a standard that has rarely been surpassed. When, in 1932, Adams, Edward Weston, Imogen Cunningham and Willard Van Dyke began to work together, they called themselves "Group f64," in honor of the smallest lens opening then available. They liked f64 because it offered the greatest depth of field and the sharpest possible focus. "A lot of younger American photographers," observes John Szarkowski of the Museum of Modern Art, "have no clue about how much they've been influenced by Ansel's rigorous sense of obligation to using the machine well."

The scientist in Adams insisted on the precise replication of the smallest detail. But he was a poet, too.

"Ansel Adams was complaining about the clouds when I first met him," wrote David Brower, then director of the Sierra Club. "They weren't yet what they ought to be, but he thought they would get better."

The early western photographers took nature as they found it. C.L. Weed, C.E. Watkins, E.J. Muybridge and their colleagues were rock-hard men who left us rock-hard pictures. They cared little for the arty. They were scientists, explorers. They rode mules to Yosemite. Their cameras were cumbersome, their lenses were handground. they hauled carboys of acid and fragile glass plates up the rocky slopes. They did not sleep in lodges, but outside, on the ground. Their pictures call to mind the pictures the first astronauts took from outer space. They brought back to the cities accurate, convincing images of marvels rarely glimpsed before.

Bierstadt and Moran and other 19th-century painters of the mountains cared less for reportage than they did for drama. Their pictures feel like operas. In the wilds they made sketches that were relatively straightforward. But when they returned to New York, to their studios, they pulled out all the stops. Their lakes are just a bit too clear, their peaks a bit too high. They liked to dress their mountains with waterfalls and rainbows, sunsets, stormy clouds, little bears and deer. Their pictures aren't believable. They are too gaudy, too romantic.

Like Bierstadt, like Moran, Adams often stretched the truth a bit. He wasn't always a "straight" photographer. He once admitted that he dodged the crosses in the foreground of his "Moonrise, Hernandez, New Mexico," his most famous image, to make them just a bit lighter and more ghostly.

As a young man in California, Adams studied to be a pianist. The day he died, his family and friends gathered in his Carmel, Calif., home to hear a recital by his favorite pianist, Vladimir Ashkenazy. When he talked about the aims that guided him in art, Adams often spoke of seeking "spiritual resonance, as moving and profound as great music." When one looks at Adams' photographs, one can almost feel him there behind the camera, a maestro in control, conducting all those boiling clouds and those shafts of sunlight that seem to shoot, on cue, through the stormy clouds.

"Purism, in the sense of rigid abstention from any control, is ridiculous," he wrote. "A great photograph is a full expression of what one feels about what is being photographed in the deepest sense, and is, thereby, a true expression of what one feels about life in its entirety."

Washington's Harry Lunn, the dealer who helped make Adams rich, used to say, "there are two markets for photography—there is one for Ansel Adams, and one for everybody else."

A single print of "Moonrise" sold recently for $71,500. It wasn't a unique object; its edition had been "limited" to 942. Suppose each "Moonrise" print is worth that much. That means that the artist, with one click of his shutter in 1941, had made a golden goose whose golden eggs today have a combined market value of more than $67 million.

The most popular American artists—Norman Rockwell, Andrew Wyeth, and Adams, too—tend to lend their art a quality of almost shameless emotional exaggeration. Most of Wyeth's pictures are a bit too morbid, most of Rockwell's too goody-goody. Szarkowski writes that "the natural world," as seen by Adams, "is infinitely varied in aspect . . . : its grand vistas and its microcosms are never twice the same . . . ; the landscape is not only a place, but an event."

Still, something in his pictures suggests a benign propaganda. No tin cans mar his landscapes. His elegant, authoritative, perfectly made prints show us what we wish the world outside to be. He was a true believer. His mission was to awe.

One great photographer, Paul Strand, helped show Ansel Adams the path that led to art. Another, Alfred Stieglitz, gave Adams his first one-man show 46 years ago.

"It is all very beautiful and magical here," Adams wrote Stieglitz from New Mexico many years ago. What he said of that landscape could describe the viewer's experience of Ansel Adam's art:

"The skies and land are so enormous and the detail so precise and exquisite that wherever you are you are isolated in a glowing world between the macro and the micro—where everything is sidewise under you and over you, and the clocks stopped long ago."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1984]

ANSEL ADAMS DIES AT 82; PHOTOGRAPHED THE WEST

(By John Russell)

Ansel Adams, whose majestic black-and-white landscapes of the American West and whose devotion to clarity and precision made him probably the best-known photographer in the United States, died of heart disease Sunday night at Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula, near his home in Carmel, Calif. He was 82 years old.

In a career that spanned more than 50 years, Mr. Adams combined a passion for natural landscape, meticulous craftsmanship as a printmaker and a missionary's zeal for his medium to become the most widely exhibited and recognized photographer of his generation.

His photographs have been published in more than 35 books and portfolios, and they have been seen in hundreds of exhibitions, including a one-man show, "Ansel Adams and the West," at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1979. That same year he was the subject of a cover story in Time magazine, and in 1980 he received the Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian honor.

In addition to being acclaimed for his dramatic landscapes of the American West, he was held in esteem for his contributions to photographic technology and to the recognition of photography as an art form.

Though trained as a concert pianist, Mr. Adams decided in 1930 that his true vocation was photography. Two years later, he was accomplished enough to be given a one-man show at the M. H. de Young Museum in San Francisco, and the same year he joined Edward Weston and Imogen Cunningham in forming the short-lived "Group f/64."

In the words, of Mr. Adams's friend Wallace Stegner, the founding of this group was a benchmark in the establishment of photography as a distinct and legitimate art form that would be "not a substitute brush, but a way of seeing."

From that point onward, Mr. Adams rapidly became famous not only as a photographer but also as critic, teacher, publisher of portfolios, co-founder of the department of photography at the Museum of Modern Art, longtime consultant to the Polaroid Corporation and spokesman for a heroic and yet plainspoken approach to photography.

BOOK CONSECRATED REPUTATION

The publication by the New York Graphic Society in 1975 of his book "Ansel Adams: Images 1923–1974" consecrated his reputation as a photographer whose work appealed to the widest possible public for its evocation of an American scene that was still without blemish.

Ansel Adams was born in San Francisco on Feb. 20, 1902, of New England descent. The next year, his parents moved to a house overlooking the Golden Gate, where he formed his life-long taste for a spectacular natural scene.

In 1916, while on a visit to the Yosemite Valley, he made his first photographs with a box Brownie. Yosemite had so fired his imagination that for four summers running he took a job as caretaker for a lodge owned by the Sierra Club, of which he was later to be a director for 37 years.

In 1927, while earning his living as a professional musician, Mr. Adams acquired a patron in San Francisco by the name of Albert Bender. Mr. Bender took him to Taos, N.M., where, during visits over the next few years, he made friends with Robinson Jeffers, John Marin and Georgia O'Keeffe. As his biographer, Nancy Newhall, said later, "Taos was his Paris and his Rome." His first book, "Taos Pueblo," with a text by Mary Astin, came out in 1930.

Precision and sharp focus were fundamental to good photography, as Mr. Adams saw it, and as a born teacher he neglected no opportunity to make his views felt. He wrote for the Sierra Club Bulletin, he published a series of books on the basics of photography, he ran workshops and seminars in the Yosemite Valley, he taught and lectured at the Museum of Modern Art and colleges all along the Pacific Coast, and he published his work in portfolio form.

As his reputation grew, he was encouraged to travel throughout the United States in order to bring his characteristic clarity and his sense of unforced grandeur to studies of national parks and remote places of every kind.

In the 1930's he made extended trips with his fellow photographer Mr. Weston to the High Sierra, and with O'Keeffe and David McAlpin to the Southwest. In 1933, he met Alfred Stieglitz, and in 1936 Stieglitz gave Mr. Adams a one-man show at his New York City gallery, "An American Place." This was the first one-man show of photography that Stieglitz had put on since Paul Strand was similarly honored two decades earlier.

DIRECTED A PAGEANT

In 1940, Mr. Adams directed "A Pageant of Photography" as part of the Golden Gate Exposition in San Francisco, and took part with Mr. Weston and Dorothea Lange in a photographic forum organized by U.S. Camera in the Yosemite Valley. Also in 1940, he helped Beaumont Newhall and Mr. McAlpin to found the department of photography at the Museum of Modern Art.

At the outbreak of World War II, he became a consultant to the Armed Services. But, ever-sensitive to the plight of minority groups, he published in 1944 "Born Free and Equal," a photographic survey of a California camp in which Japanese-Americans were interned at the outbreak of war with Japan.

After the war, Mr. Adams three times received Guggenheim Fellowships, which enabled him to record national parks and monuments in Alaska, Hawaii and elsewhere. In many writings in the postwar period, he stressed the importance of vision, as distinct from gadgetry. "A picture," he liked to say, "is only a collection of brightnesses," and, he would add, "There is nothing worse than a brilliant image of a fuzzy concept."

FELLOW OF AMERICAN ACADEMY

Films about Mr. Adams and his work were directed by David Myers in 1957 and by Robert Katz in 1959. In 1964, Mrs. Newhall published a study of him (called "The Eloquent Light," after the 1963 show of that name that Mr. Adams had just had at the de Young Museum in San Francisco). In 1967 he and Mrs. Newhall published a book called "Fiat Lux," to mark the centenary of the University of California, and in 1974 he was honored by a retrospective exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum in New York.

In 1966, Mr. Adams was made a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and in 1970 he was made a Chubb Fellow at Yale University. He received honorary doctorates from Occidental College, the University of Massachusetts and Yale University.

In 1928, Mr. Adams married Virginia Best. After many years in Yosemite, the Adamses moved in 1962 to Carmel.

He is survived by his wife; two children, Dr. Michael Adams of Fresno, Calif., and Anne Adams Helms of Redwood City, Calif., and five grandchildren. Funeral services will be private.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1984]

ADAMS: HIS LEGACY ENDURES

(By Gene Thornton)

The brilliant clarity of Ansel Adams's photographs—and especially the Western landscapes in black and white for which he is best known and most loved—is no accident. It is partly the result of a deep love of nature and a good eye, plus the natural dryness and clarity of the Western air.

But it is also the result of a technical procedure that Adams, the master photographer who died Sunday at the age of 82, developed, refined and codified in a series of instruction books and technical manuals. These began in 1935 with the publication of "Making a Photograph," and continued for the rest of his life. The most recent how-to book, "Examples, the Making of 40 Photographs," was published in 1983 by the New York Graphic Society.

At the heart of this procedure is the practice of previsualization. This means planning the photograph in advance of making the exposure, carefully studying the image in the camera's viewfinder or on the groundglass screen and making sure that every element of the picture—lighting, composition, focus and pose—is the way the photographer wants it before making the exposure. The result should be a picture that can be printed straight from the negative without any need for retouching or other manipulation of negative or print.

This type of "straight" or "pure" photography is the norm today among serious amateurs and art photographers, so much so that it may seem odd to include it among the characteristics of Adams's technique. But it was not yet the norm when Adams was starting out as a photographer in the 1920's. In those days it was customary for artistically ambitious "Pictorialist" photographers to retough the photographic image extensively to make it look more like a painting, a drawing or a print. The unassisted camera was not believed to give its operator enough control over the picture to dignify the results with the name of art.

ABANDONDED PICTORIAL APPROACH

Adams did not invent the idea of straight or pure photography. An early and eloquent spokesman was the critic Sadakichi Hartmann, in his review of the 1904 Photo-Secession exhibition at the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh, and early practioners included the photographers Paul Strand, Alfred Stieglitz and Edward Weston. However, after a meeting with Strand in 1930, Adams abandoned his earlier, more Pictorial approach in favor of straight photography and became its most eloquent spokesman and exponent.

He had his work cut out for him. Although the straight photographers rejected the Pictorialist practice of darkroom manipulation, they did not reject the Pictorialist claim that photography was art. On the contrary, they claimed that "pure" photography, the type they practiced, was more artistic than the type practiced by the Pictorialists. However, straight photographers had less control over their final results than Pictorialists, since they had restricted themselves to purely photographic means, and this left them open to Pictorialist charges of not being real artists.

It was in part to meet this objection that Ansel Adams developed the celebrated Zone System of photography, a method that he and such successors as Minor White and Fred Picker have written about and taught in workshops all over the country and abroad. The aim of the Zone System is to give the photographer the maximum control over his pictures making consistent with a purely photographic technique.

HOW PICTURE WILL TRANSLATE

Adams began by dividing the darks and lights of the photographic print into 10 distinct shades or zones, ranging from pure black (Zone 0) to pure white (Zone IX). Between are eight graduated shades of gray—Zone V, the middle tone, being the one that seems closest to halfway between dark and light, and Zone VI, the next lightest tone, being the tone of human skin under good light. By learning to see his subject in this scale of grays, the photographer can "previsualize" not only the subject matter and composition of his picture but also how it will translate into the darks and lights of a photographic print.

Adams used a photoelectric exposure meter to measure the brightness of the parts of a scene he was photographing, Beaumont Newhall explained in his classic "History of Photography." These calibrations were then correlated with exposure and development to enable the photographer to achieve in the final print the entire gamut of values he had previsualized.

"The control is comparable to that which a musician has over his instrument," Mr. Newhall wrote. "Guesswork is eliminated, and the photographer can concentrate on esthetic problems, secure in the knowledge that his results will not only be of technical excellence, but will embody his subjective interpretation of the scene."

This kind of planning of a picture can be done better with a camera that has a large viewing screen showing the image in considerable detail. It is also better suited to motionless subjects, such as landscapes, still lifes and portraits, rather than to action shots. Long practice, however, enabled Adams to work rapidly when necessary, and perhaps his most famous picture, "Moonlight: Hernandez, N.M.," was seen, conceived and shot in a brief moment before the moon went behind a cloud.

ASHES OVER MOUNTAIN

MONTEREY, CALIF., April 24.—The Adams family said it expects to scatter the photographer's ashes over a mountain long known informally as Mount Ansel Adams in Yosemite National Park.

"We will probably scatter the ashes on Mount Ansel Adams in Yosemite National Park," said Ann Helms, Adams's daughter. "The mountain has been called that unofficially for years, but you can't name a mountain after a living person."

Lisa Dapprich, a public affairs officer at Yosemite National Park, said that the National Park Service would allow the ashes to be scattered on the mountain. She said the mountain "will probably" be named after Adams, a process that takes five years.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 24, 1984]

ANSEL ADAMS, ARTIST WITH A CAMERA, DIES

(By Burt A. Folkart)

Ansel Adams, whose camera celebrated nature's wonders and whose life was dedicated to perpetuating the purity of its creations, has died.

Death came late Sunday at age 82 in Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula, near Big Sur, where he had lived, photographed and battled for his beloved environment.

Adams had undergone heart surgery in 1979 and was admitted to the hospital last Friday with his recurring heart problem.

Adams and Edward Weston were the two names most often mentioned when historians tried to decide when photography had moved from the realm of hobbyists and was accorded a niche in the world's art salons and museums.

ASSIGNMENTS FROM WITHIN

And it was Adams, the gruffly pleasant bear of a man, who generally is credited with taking Weston's visions of unsullied clarity and moving them from the curious to the commercial, providing through-out his lengthy and prolific career thousands of

negatives and prints from the photographic assignments that he said came "from within."

At his death, more than a million books of his photographs rested on coffee tables and in libraries throughout the world.

A single Adams photograph once commanded $70,000 and, more important to Adams the man, 5,000 students had trudged to his studio and then on with him to view the scenic glories of the United States, watching as the aging master set up his tripod to capture what he said were the "images and not just records" of their world.

Like those early students who worshiped him, the photographer—whose "Moonrise, Hernandez, New Mexico," and "Moon and Half Dome, Yosemite National Park," would one day hang in museums around the world—began with a Kodak Brownie box cameras.

He was a gangly 14-year-old with a nose that tilted angularly left, the result of a falling wall during an aftershock from the 1906 San Francisco earthquake.

("The doctor said to get it straightened when I matured," Adams loved to say. "But of course, I never matured.")

A year earlier his father, a successful businessman, had given him a pass to the World's Fair in San Francisco. Adams spent most of his time at the Armory Show, the revolutionary modern art display transplanted from New York that gave prosaic America its first glimpse of the impressionists and surrealists.

He also had been exposed to a book, "In the Heart of the Sierra," part of the tutoring program his parents had designed for him when he opted to give up formal schooling.

"A-A," as he would someday be known to friends, bought a simple camera, hoping to combine a vacation trip to Yosemite, the excitement of abstract art and his blooming vicarious sentiments for the High Sierra into a new interest.

RETURNED TO YOSEMITE

At the time he was an accomplished, albeit beginning pianist and was leaning toward a career in music.

His vacation pictures fell far short of his dreams, however, and he talked a San Francisco photofinisher into a job as an apprentice.

Adams continued to return with his camera to Yosemite every summer, as he would for the next 60 years, joining the young Sierra Club and working summers as caretaker at the club's headquarters in the Yosemite Valley.

He learned to climb the mountains where climate and light varied with shifting wind and cloud patterns. He also learned of "conservation," long before it was a cocktail hour byword.

Photography remained a hobby and music a predilection at this time, but his visits to the mountains "filtered through me into some aesthetic experiences which probably were supported by similar experiences I was having in music study," he told an interviewer in 1975.

It wasn't until 1930, after trying to serve both masters, that his "own personal satisfaction with the pictures was greater than with music."

But by then the self-proclaimed "photopoet" was tired of having to deal with the popular notion of photography as "painting with a lens."

He had produced a mildly successful portfolio of the High Sierra that proved his knowledge of technique but left him personally dissatisfied.

PHOTOGRAPHY EXISTS

Still seeking the modernist vision that had first stirred him at the Armory Show, he took his pictures to master photographer Paul Strand who talked to him of organization and composition.

Years later he would say:

"I came home thinking: Now photography exists."

Within a few months he had met a fellow seeker of visual truth, Weston.

In 1932 he, Weston, Imogen Cunningham and Willard Van Dyke formed the loosely knit "Group F/64," devoted to high-contrast realism.

(The name was adopted from the smallest camera lens opening then available. It offered the greatest depth of field and therefore the sharpest images.)

Although the group would exist formally for only two years, its impact on the world's then-newest art form continues to this day.

He had married in 1928 and, to support himself, was taking on "assignments from the outside" that did not interfere with "assignments from the inside," his term for "visualization" of the trees, rocks and leaves he found and illustrated in his beloved Sierra.

He began accepting the students that would one day include the daughter of a President (Susan Ford). The alacritous acceptance of the "Group F/64" concept of crispness in pictures now brought offers from photography magazines and product manufacturers.

And now he had words for his craft:

"A photograph is not an accident, it is a concept." Pictures, he explained, were composed in the mind and only then recorded by the camera.

In 1935 he published "Making a Photograph," the first of his many manuals on technique in which he noted that the making of many negatives in the hope that one will be good "is fatal to serious results."

His reputation was growing and in 1936 Alfred Stieglitz, perhaps the world's best-known photographer, arranged a one-man Adams show in New York City, the first since A-A's former mentor Strand had shown there in 1917.

Adams by now had moved to the Yosemite Valley, and his feel for its mountains and valleys began to transcend just photography.

As official photographer and a director of the Sierra Club, he had traveled to Washington to show his photographs of Kings Canyon and to lobby for a bill that would preserve that area as a national park.

The result was not immediately successful but his efforts had come to the attention of Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes. By 1940 Ickes had shown the photos to President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the resultant presidential arm-twisting produced from Congress what Adams considered a personal monument—the establishment of 455,000 acres as the Kings Canyon National Park.

His first ecological triumph was followed quickly by a professional one. In 1941 he had stopped his car in New Mexico to take, in 15 seconds, a photograph that four decades later commanded $71,500 at auction.

It was the moon rising over the village of Hernandez. It, with another photo of the moon shining over Half Dome in Yosemite, taken in 1960, became synonymous with Adams' name.

The two photos were archetypically Weston—the preconceived clarity felt before the shutter was snapped and then transferred to film and paper. To Weston's theory of visualization Adams brought his own contributions—a system of film exposure to predetermine the tones of the print.

It has become known as the Adams zone system, and he soon was teaching it at the California School of Fine Arts (later the San Francisco Art Institute) where he founded the first photography department in 1946.

He also was teaching at Art Center in Los Angeles, lecturing at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and at colleges throughout the West.

Between 1948 and 1956 he published four photography books and in 1949 was named a consultant to Polaroid Corp., working with Edwin Land on the Polaroid Land process.

ANSWERED CRITICS

He also answered those who criticized "Group F/64" adherents for photographing trees and mountains while the nation struggled through the Great Depression and World War II.

He published a book of the photographs he had taken of the thousands of Japanese-Americans interned in the Manzanar Relocation Center in California during the war. Its wry title was "Born Free and Equal."

His spreading fame resulted in "The Eloquent Light," a 1963 biography of Ansel Adams published by the Sierra Club.

He was a Sierra Club director from 1936 to 1970, and his many trophies include the Conservation Service Award of the Interior Department.

He was an untypical artist—outspoken, opinionated and highly political when it came to his dearly loved scenery.

He warred against those trying to develop Big Sur and led a drive to oust Interior Secretary James G. Watt for "halting 100 years of growth of the national park system." His attacks on Watt led President Reagan to seek a meeting with Adams—a session held in July, 1983. Adams afterward pronounced Reagan "opaque—a substance that does not permit the passage of light . . . in either direction.

REAL HAM

Until his hospitalization the artist-advocate had been working to limit Reagan to one term.

Adams' personality lent itself to public display and theatrical statements.

"You'll understand him better," painter Georgia O'Keeffe—a longtime friend—told a prospective interviewer in 1979, "if you think of him as a real ham, the eternal life of the party."

His leathery countenance was on the cover of Time magazine on Sept. 3, 1979, the first photographer ever honored there.

In 1980, President Jimmy Carter awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his "visionary efforts to preserve this country's wild and scenic areas both on film and on Earth."

This came after he had supported legislation to protect 100 million acres of the Alaska wilderness.

The boy with the Brownie box camera and a vision had become the Grand Old Man of Photography.

He was pleased but took the accolades lightly. They were but the gifts of man.

The greatest gift God had granted him, Adams said in a long-ago letter to photographer Stieglitz written from New Mexico, was the Earth itself.

"It is all very beautiful and magical here . . . a quality which cannot be described.

The skies and land are so enormous and the detail so precise and exquisite that, wherever you are, you are isolated in a glowing world between the macro and the micro—where everything is sidewise under you and over you, and the clocks stopped long ago."

DEATH OF "CAPTAIN JACK" BARLEON

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Massachusetts and the entire Nation have lost a true hero and an outstanding human being with the death last month of Naval Capt. John S. Barleon, Jr.

"Captain Jack," as he was affectionately known by his legions of friends and admirers, was a man of uncommon valor who turned a crippling injury into a courageous life of helping others. He fought with great bravery in the Pacific in World War II and later suffered a serious spinal injury which eventually resulted in quadriplegia. For the rest of his life, he kept on fighting—for paralyzed and disabled veterans, for the physically handicapped, and for the retarded. He was a tireless advocate for their cause; his active lifestyle defied his disability and made him an inspiration to all he touched.

Captain Jack was also a generous supporter of a program close to the heart of the Kennedy family, the Eunice Shriver Clinic for retarded children and their families at the Walter E. Fernald State School in Massachusetts. His extraordinary life brought hope to millions, and his achievements are an example to all of us who carry on his work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the obituary for Captain Jack, which appeared in the Boston Globe on March 27, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 27, 1984]

"CAPTAIN JACK" BARLEON, WAR HERO AND FIGHTER FOR THE PARALYZED, 70

(By William P. Coughlin)

They called him "Captain Jack."

A decorated World War II hero whose Navy career continued until 1961, Capt. John S. Barleon Jr. was a wheelchair quadriplegic the last 23 years of his life who:

Was a dynamic, one-man advocate and former national research director for the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Was a 1962 delegate to the World Veterans Organization in Copenhagen, Denmark; Lausanne, Switzerland, and The Hague.

Sought government and private grants in a constant search for ways to improve health care and devices for the handicapped.

Was active as a member of the corporation of the Walter E. Fernald School and helped raise $2.4 million in 1962 to fund the Eunice Shriver clinic, the first clinic in the nation where parents could live in and be examined with their retarded children.

Flew aircraft, despite his handicap, as a member of the Wheelchair Pilots Assn; drove his car, fished, sailed a kayak, and visited archeological ruins from Greenland to Europe, Asia and South America.

A long-term member of the International Oceanographic Foundation, he also was a member of the Society of Naval Architects and Engineers.

He held the Bronze Star, the Navy Commendation Medal and numerous campaign ribbons from his World War II experiences, and in his final two decades Capt. Barleon was a live-in quadriplegic at the Veterans Administration hospitals in West Roxbury and in Brockton for six years.

He died at age 70 yesterday, after four weeks in a coma in the Veterans Hospital in West Roxbury. He had fallen ill Jan. 9 with a respiratory ailment linked to quadriplegia.

As a Naval officer and fighter pilot he was a hero and doer; as a quadriplegic, he turned his wartime spine injury and disability into a life of helping others similarly crippled. By all accounts, "Captain Jack" was not a quitter.

In a 1980 interview for a magazine called Paraplegia News, he summed up his outlook:

"Although my disability—quadriplegia—is disagreeable, I have had a far more fortunate, full and interesting life than most citizens . . . What I need is a system of getting 48 hours into a 24-hour day so I can do all the things I want to do."

Born at the Naval Academy at Annapolis where his father, Jack Barleon Sr., was an officer, he entered the Navy in 1931 after a boyhood during which he had climbed aboard the World War I German submarine Deutschland and US Admiral Richard E. Byrd's famed tri-motor airplane which had seen the Arctic and Antarctic. As a boy, he met Byrd practicing landings at the Naval Station in Norfolk, Va.

Perhaps it was Byrd's plane or the flying model of an old NC-4 Navy seaplane, given him by Adm. Albert C. Read, that hooked young John Barleon on flying.

He followed his father's beginnings at the Naval Academy where he cruised the Mediterranean on the battleship Wyoming, met a Pope and the Italian dictator, Benito Mussolini, and graduated in 1935. As a freshman he had won the small bore rifle intercollegiate championship, and later the national intercollegiate title.

He was aboard the cruiser San Francisco when she suffered heavy battle damage at Savo Island in the battle of Guadacanal, and during one of the war's lighter events he played against the Peruvian Olympic basketball team on a dirt floor of the Lima bull ring. The Peruvians won, "Captain Jack" recalled with a smile.

Later he was aboard the USS Phelps, flagship of the First Destroyer Squadron, which, records show, fought in every Pacific battle. Then, after a tour from Panama to Newfoundland in the old World War I four-stack destroyer, USS McCormick, he began flight training in the new Grumman open cockpit fighters.

It was in one of these craft, during a landing rollout exercise, when he flipped on his back, crushing and dislocating several vertebrae. After six months in a San Diego Hospital, he returned to active duty and underwent a spinal fusion. Six months later, with a slightly stiff neck, he headed for the old USS Enterprise, a carrier where he became air officer, executive officer and commanding officer. In her, he lived through the so-called Admiral William (Bull) Halsey typhoon when three destroyers were lost. Still later, he commanded air groups, flying the old Hellcats, Corsairs and Bearcats.

Ashore, "Captain Jack" held many fleet posts, including Pentagon and Bureau of Personnel positions in which he was responsible for personnel planning. He testified often before the Department of Defense review teams, the Bureau of the Budget and before congressional committees. It was his job to justify naval expenses and plans.

"Captain Jack" also served in the former British Joint Services Staff College and at the National War College at Washington, D.C.

During this time he underwent five more spinal operations to remove bone and scar tissue, while carrying out his duties. He told an interviewer then that he relaxed by scuba diving and racing outboard runabouts. He also was a championship skeet shooter.

But his wound became infected and after the fifth operation he was a quadriplegic. His condition deteriorated and in September 1961, after another operation to remove a cyst, he was retired for physical disability and sent to the Veterans Administration Hospital in West Roxbury.

At the hospital he learned of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, became active, and was a delegate to national conventions. He was the first chairman of the Paralyzed Veterans' investment committee in the mid-1960s and was its national research director until the mid-1970s. In 1976, he became a trustee of the organization's technological and research foundation.

He was appointed by Gov. John A. Volpe in 1962 as a member of the corporation of the Fernald School.

He leaves a son, John S. Barleon of Waltham; three daughters, Anne B. Nolan of Waltham, Elizabeth H.B. Ross of Loveland, Colo., and Claudia B. Danikian of Boston; two sisters, Claudia B. Burkey of Bozman, Md., and Elizabeth B. Keller of Alexandria, Va., and a grandchild.

A memorial service will be conducted at 1 p.m. Saturday in the chapel at Brockton Veterans Administration Hospital.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOMS MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Baker Amendment No. 3027, to further reduce deficits by including reconciliation provisions and appropriations caps for defense and non-defense discretionary spending for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

(2) Mitchell Amendment No. 3036, to provide for a pay increase for Article III judges subject to salary adjustments pursuant to section 461 of title 28, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 3041

(Purpose: To increase revenues and limit budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, and 1989)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators EXON, ANDREWS, BINGAMAN, JOHNSTON, BUMPERS, STENNIS, and myself, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), for himself, Mr. EXON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. STENNIS, proposes an amendment numbered 3041.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. —, relating to limitations of aggregate total budget authority for National Defense and non-defense discretionary activities, is amended by striking out subsections (a) through (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE X—INCREASES IN REVENUES AND LIMITS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

DELAY COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT TO 1990

SEC. 1001. (a) Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to adjustments in tax tables so that inflation will not result in tax increases) is amended—

(1) by striking out "1984" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "1989", and

(2) by striking out "1983" in paragraph (3)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(b) Subsection (e) of section 104 of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1989".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1984.

INCREASED TAX AUDIT COVERAGE

SEC. 1002. (a) In the case of revenue agents, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to section 7803 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, shall employ no less than 15,647 in fiscal year 1985, 16,569 in fiscal year 1986, 17,395 in fiscal year 1987, 18,834 in fiscal year 1988, and 20,320 in fiscal year 1989.

(b) In the case of tax auditors, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to such section, shall employ no less than 4,098 in fiscal year 1985, 4,529 in fiscal year 1986, 5,001 in fiscal year 1987, 5,339 in fiscal year 1988, and 5,773 in fiscal year 1989.

WITHHOLDING OF TAXES ON ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND PAYMENTS TO INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

SEC. 1003. (a) Section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(q) EXTENSION OF WITHHOLDING TO ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND PAYMENTS TO INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which—

"(A) a person issues a royalty payment, or

"(B) notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), a person issues a payment to an independent contractor,

such person or any withholding agent shall deduct and withhold from such payment an amount equal to 10 percent of such payment.

"(2) WITHHOLDING AGENT.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the term 'withholding agent' means, with respect to any payment described in paragraph (1), the person who controls, receives, has custody of, disposes of, or pays such payment.

"(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER SECTIONS.—For purposes of sections 3403 and 3404 and for purposes of so much of subtitle F (except section 7205) as relates to this chapter, payments described under paragraph (1) which are subject to withholding shall be treated as if they were wages paid by an employer to an employee.".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply to payments made after June 30, 1984.

REVENUE INCREASES

SEC. 1004. (a) Within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the full Senate changes in laws within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Finance sufficient to increase revenues by $4,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $7,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, $11,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1987, $19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1988, and $28,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1989.

PAY COMPARABILITY ADJUSTMENT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 1005. Nothwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any other law—

(1) there shall not be an adjustment under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule and in the rates of pay under the other statutory pay systems during fiscal year 1985; and

(2) the overall percentage of the adjustment in such rates taking effect under such section in each of fiscal year 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989, shall be an increase of 3 percent.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES

SEC. 1006. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), for the purpose of determining or computing the amount of any increase in payments or benefit amounts or in standards for eligibility for payments or benefits taking effect on any date during the fiscal year 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989 under any provision of Federal law which requires an increase or change in such payments, benefit amounts, or standards as a result of any change in—

(A) the Consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

(B) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages,

the change in any such index shall be deemed to be the change as computed or determined under such provision of Federal law or (if less)—

(1) zero percent in the case of increases taking effect in fiscal year 1985; or

(ii) 3 percent in the case of increases taking effect in fiscal year 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989.

(2) Nothwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, no person shall be—

(A) entitled to any increase in payments, benefit amounts, or rates of pay; or

(B) eligible for any payments or benefits, under any provision of Federal law to the extent that such increase or eligibility is denied by reason of paragraph (1).

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any change in any index described in paragraph (1) which would have resulted in an increase in payments or benefit amounts or in standards for eligibility for payments or benefits effective on any date during the fiscal year 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989 but for paragraph (1) shall not be taken into account for the purposes of determining or computing any increase or change in such payments, benefit amounts, or standards taking effect on any date during any fiscal year after fiscal year 1989.

(b)(1) With respect to the Social Security Act, subsection (a) shall apply only to cost-of-living adjustments to cash benefits paid under section 202 or 223, and shall not limit cost-of-living adjustments under section 1617 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382f), or any other adjustment under any other provision of such Act. The adjustments becoming effective under such section 1617, and any other adjustment to which subsection (a) does not apply, will be made as though there had been made the full cost-of-living adjustment which, but for subsection (a), would have become effective under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)) with respect to cash benefits.

(2) Subsection (a) shall not apply to increases under section 3(o), 5(c), or 5(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(o), 2014(c), and 2014(e), respectively).

(3) Subsection (a) shall not apply to increases under section 3112 of title 38, United States Code. For the purposes of such section, benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act shall be deemed to be increased when and by the percentage such amounts would be increased (as a result of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act) if subsection (a) had not been enacted.

MEDICARE FREEZE

SEC. 1007. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendment made by this Act) or any provision of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the "applicable percentage increase" under section 1886(b)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act for any 12-month cost reporting period or fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1984, and before October 1, 1985, shall be zero percent.

(b) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall report to the Congress within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to suggested methods for assuring that hospitals will not increase amounts charged to patients who are not entitled to benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to compensate for amounts not paid by reason of the limitation under subsection (a).

LIMITATION ON INCREASE IN BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 1008. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendment made by this Act), the Congress declares that—

(1) an urgent priority of the United States Government is the pursuit of a national defense policy that adequately provides for the security of the United States and that of its allies against the threat of their adversaries;

(2) the basic goal of any national defense program of the United States should be to

provide a consistent and sustained growth in defense readiness activities and in weapon systems research and development, procurement, and force modernization;

(3) an annual increase in the defense budget of the United States Government, in accordance with the commitment made in 1977 and 1978 by the United States Government and the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to provide for annual increases in the defense budgets of the members by three percent in excess of the rate of inflation, is an essential element in developing a reliable national defense capability; and

(4) the policies relating to the commitment of resources to develop and maintain a strong and comprehensive defense program by the United States must be fully integrated with an overall fiscal and economic policy directed toward restoring the financial credibility of the Government in an equitable manner.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that the amount of budget authority provided for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, and 1989 for all purchases made by departments and agencies administering activities classified under the functional category of National Defense in the Budget transmitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, should be the amount of budget authority provided for such purchases for the preceding fiscal year plus an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the amount of budget authority provided for such purchases for such preceding fiscal year; and

(2) the sum of—

(A) the rate of inflation projected (in accordance with Subsection (c)(2)) to occur during the fiscal year 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989, as the case may be; and

(B) four percent in fiscal years 1985 and 1986; and

(C) three percent in fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989.

(c)(1) For the purposes of subsection (b), budget authority does not include the budget authority provided for the pay of employees of any department or agency described in subsection (b), including members of the Armed Forces, or for military retired or retainer pay.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (b), the rate of inflation projected to occur during a fiscal year under subsection (b) shall be—

(A) for fiscal year 1985, the percent change in the defense purchases index which is projected for such fiscal year by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) for fiscal year 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989, the most recent projection of the percent change in such index for such fiscal year made by such Director before the date on which the Senate or the House of Representatives, or any committee thereof, takes action to provide budget authority for such fiscal year to which subsection (b) applies.

DISCRETIONARY FEDERAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 1009. (a) Not withstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendment made by this Act), it is the sense of the Senate that the total amount of budget authority provided for all discretionary Federal programs for fiscal year 1985 should not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for all such programs for fiscal year 1984.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the total amount of budget authority provided for all discretionary Federal programs for each of the fiscal years 1986, 1987, 1988, and 1989, should not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for all such programs for the preceding fiscal year plus an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the total amount of budget authority provided for all such programs for such preceding fiscal year, multiplied by

(2) three percent.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "discretionary Federal program" means any Federal program other than—

(1) a program classified under the functional category of National Defense in the budget submitted by the President for the applicable fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; or

(2) a program for which spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) is provided by law.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, an order has already been entered that when the Senate resumes consideration of the unfinished business which we have now done, the Mitchell amendment would be temporarily set aside, the vote to occur this afternoon at 2 p.m., and that the Senator from South Carolina would be the first recognized. That is as far as we went. We did not provide for the purpose of his offering his amendment. I hope the Senator will do that. I understand he has now done that. Then it would be automatic under the order entered that at 2 p.m. the Hollings amendment would be laid aside for 1 hour, plus voting time, and then we would be back on the Hollings amendment again at 3:30 p.m. or thereabouts.

The order also provides that the Senator from Mississippi would be next recognized after the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS).

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for being here and agreeing to these things. If he cares to proceed with this amendment now, that is the procedure that would automatically ensue.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Chris McLean, of the staff of Senator EXON, be granted the privilege of the floor during debate on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, with respect to this particular amendment, before I go into a detailed discussion of it, I note the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the floor and I note his vital interest in this matter. He and I were talking informally just a few moments ago about the seriousness of the occasion where we are running some $200 billion in deficits. While there is some concern amongst small groups here and there, the gallery is partically empty and there is no real interest in the White House and in the Senate about really doing something. Well, some of us care and we are not going to stop trying to save our future.

This is a sad commentary to have to make, Mr. President. It should be understood what is really going on.

We had last year an organized effort on behalf of those responsible for trying to maintain the discipline in fiscal integrity of both the public and the private sectors, which culminated in the Hatch amendment. That included all the different business groups, who are noticeably absent here in 1984.

I want to divert for a second and mention that the majority leader, myself, and others traveled to Argentina a couple of years ago. We searched out the Argentine Economic Minister, who was trying to rebuild that nation's economy. At the time, he had just been discharged from the hospital and was resting at home. He was hospitalized, I should say, from exhaustion. He described his exhaustion from having traveled from town to town trying to build a solid civic and business foundation and interest in maintaining and building communities.

He said private free enterprise could not exist except where you had civic and community interest and pride in maintaining the community and the business climate.

He said in the United States we took this for granted almost in the sense that we had our civic clubs, our Lions, our Rotary, our Kiwanis, Optimists, and on down the line—various civic clubs continually meeting and taking on the various community needs. When the public entities, the city council, the State or otherwise got out of line, these were the things that were discussed at those particular meetings.

There was a common responsibility for building the communities here in America.

I had been in Argentina some years earlier when they had roughly 400 to 500 of the American blue chip corporations located in Argentina and they had a dynamic flow of the economy. I wondered what had happened. He said they were down now to about 16 to 17. He said the demands made upon business were easily answered by accepting the demands, including the increases in prices with increased inflation and a runaway economy ensuing from there. As a result, they had a terrible economic mess.

I only allude to that because here in the United States, in a similar fashion during this particular year, you should find with $200 deficits literally every chamber of commerce, Federation of Independent Businesses, advisory councils, the Round Table, the National Association of Manufacturers, here in the Senate. These galleries should be filled, and they should be imploring us with telephone calls, letters and

visits to get hold of ourselves and control ourselves at the national level.

They are not here today. They were here last year to show that there was an awareness. Rather than having things turn out better, with lesser deficits than predicted, less than $100 billion, now we run into $200 billion deficits. Things are more drastic than before, and already the signs of economic recovery indicate that it is perhaps retrenching. We are all keeping our fingers crossed as to whether or not we will have a complete economic turnaround.

The reason, of course, that they are not here is this is an election year. It is not my purpose in bipartisan presentation on behalf of the distinguished Senators from North Dakota and Mississippi to engage in the partisan litany. But I was on a bipartisan panel last Thursday evening before the Bond Club in New York. The former Secretary of the Treasury, John Connally, of Texas, was there. He was the captain of the Republican team—so we had the two sides ably represented. The bottom line of the captain of the Republican team, John Connally, was that Congress will do nothing; that the most serious problem we ever had confronting us was these deficits; and that, second, the Congress would do nothing. I had to agree with the distinguished former Secretary of the Treasury; that the deficits is the most important problem facing us.

I had to agree, also, that Congress would do nothing. He said we did not have courage, and we did not have a long enough term. He was recommending 8-year terms; something historically all of a sudden that happened to the Constitution; what we ought to have is Senators who serve for 8 years, had a long enough term, and had more courage. Then he went off, as they always do, on incentive; that we as Senators did not have enough incentive to run. So we had a bunch of nonincentived Senators now encompassing the U.S. Senate. Since we did not have any incentive, of course—alluding I guess to financial reward—we were not going to do anything.

I countered that we were not going to do anything because we did not have the incentive in that particular audience—The Bond Club. I told them flat out. It was the financial, economic minds and brains of this land there in New York City. It was the famous Bond Club. They had all of the investment brokers, the financiers, former Secretaries of Treasury, and others involved. While they had nice, charming meetings and seminars, with a story here, and running an advertisement in the newspaper from time to time, they know how to bring the pressure and interest on a subject. This year we have not been shown that interest. The country is fat and happy. There is no real alarm in the boondocks. So to speak, as I have traveled the 50 States over the last 2 years.

Mr. President, the reason nothing will happen, of course, is that those who normally have the greatest to lose in a way are the financial communities, banks and everything else of that kind which would ordinarily be here along with the Chambers of Commerce. As I was alluding to the Argentine comparison, you cannot expect the Main Street merchant, you cannot expect the farmer on his family farm, you cannot expect the ordinary student or the professor to organize a movement. But the financial communities are not here. Of course, this is an election year. We have a very, very anomalous situation. We are both into a particular political mode. Our Republican colleagues, who passed Reaganomics here a couple of years ago, are seeing signs that the Reaganomics economic plan is working. They hope it will continue to work. They hope there will be no high interest rates.

They will be able to get by the election. Of course, running as some are for reelection, they are running on the particular platform and program—that Reaganomics was an accomplishment of the present administration. The riverboat gamble described by the distinguished majority leader has now happened. We have seen some houses being built, some automobiles being bought. The Republicans say they ought to be reelected because rather than giving you what we had in the previous administration—12-percent inflation and 20-percent interest rates—we ought to be given another 4 years.

The Republican colleagues do not want to recognize the problem. They do not want to come at the finish line of election day, "Chicken Little, the sky is falling," and saying all of a sudden something needs to be done. So they are not here. No one is going to do anything. In contrast, our Democratic colleagues have their fingers crossed hoping against hope that it will not work, that the signs of the slowing down of the recovery will accelerate, and that in turn what will happen is the interest rates will start climbing. As the interest rates climb, come November the plan has not worked, and the people in disgust and despair then will throw the rascal out and put the Democrats back in the White House. We do not want to solve the problem. Certainly, it is not the Democratic cause to run forward and solve the problem that might get us into the White House if it continues to exacerbate. I like that word "exacerbate." I learned these wonderful words since I have been in Washington.

That is exactly what we see here in the U.S. Congress today. The Republicans do not want to recognize the problem, and the Democrats do not want to solve it. I say to my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, in a capsule that is where we find ourselves.

Now to the freeze itself: I would like to add a few other comments because freeze, freeze, freeze, everywhere a man cries freeze. There is no freeze, because in essence there is a misapprehension with respect to the so-called tax, tax and spend, spend.

You hear that is all we are going to continue to do. We have done it for 40 years. Why should we expect this Congress in an election year to repair the damage, or in an election year bite the bullet, or make the sacrifice, or stand tall, or whatever when it has been going on for 40 years of tax, tax and spend, spend. It has really been the responsibility of all the Congresses, in the 40 years since World War II. Why should this Congress be the stupid one that steps forward in 1984 just before an important national election and start solving problems.

We should because it is our problem. It is not the problem of 40 years of tax, tax and spend, spend. No. 1, with respect to tax, and tax, Republicans and Democrats both love tax cuts.

This is my 18th year in the Senate. In the 18-year period there had been only one general tax increase up until this administration. That one was the surtax in 1968 and for 6 months into 1969. We and President Johnson put a surtax on in order to pay for the war in Vietnam. In contrast, let us take the last decade of the seventies. During the seventies we passed seven tax cuts for a revenue hemorrhage loss of some $73 billion. The genesis of Kemp-Roth was to counter the redistribution of the wealth of the United States of America. The Democrats were leading every year. They had control of the Congress. Every year they would come up, and the title always sounded good: "tax reform bill;" "tax stabilization bill;" "reindustrialization." We are great with words of description.

In any event, every year we talked about leveling it out, closing loopholes, reforming the measure, making it more equitable. What happened was that our friend, Senator ROTH and Congressman KEMP said: "Look, if they are going to redistribute the wealth of America with a little bit here and a little bit there each year, we are going to give in. If you cannot beat them, join them. We will give them the family size.

"We'll give them the big, mammoth tax cut of 10 percent, 10 percent, and 10 percent—10 percent each year for 3 years. Then let us see how they like that; just straight across the board."

The distinguished Vice President, who addressed the Chamber of Commerce last night, called it voodoo economics. The chairman of the Governors Conference, the Republican Gov-

ernor of Vermont, Governor Snelling, called it an "economic Bay of Pigs." The distinguished majority leader called it a riverboat gamble. But in any event, it was taken seriously and is now the law.

(Mr. WALLOP assumed the chair.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, would my distinguished colleague, since he is mentioning all of my great friends on this side of the aisle, want me to add a word or two to the Hollings-Andrews amendment or, as it is known in North Dakota, the Andrews-Hollings amendment?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I think we can do this briefly, because I know we are interested in hearing from Senator STENNIS, our great colleague from Mississippi.

I think we ought to be frank with one another, Mr. President, and with the American people. That is really what we are talking about today. We are not engaged in this debate because we need a budget. We are engaged in this debate because we have monstrous deficits which stand poised to devour our economy and kill our economic prosperity within a few short years. A halfway solution, which is called the best that we can get, the rose-garden solution—the petals are wilted by now, with everybody seeing it for really what it is—is not the way to go, Mr. President. For the sake of the future of our country, we have to attack these deficits with the best we can do, not the best we can get. There is a vast difference between the best we can do and the best we can get.

I do not have to tell you about the problems we have out in rural America, Mr. President. Farmers are impacted by these high interest rates more than anyone else. Industry is impacted, too.

The thing people forget is the fact that to finance these deficits, we are depending today on one-third of those deficits being covered by foreign investors. That means that we have to value our dollar higher by one-third than foreign currencies; we have to keep our interest rates abnormally high.

That is great if you want to ski in the Swiss Alps and it is fantastic if you want to eat in a fancy French restaurant; but it is not worth a darn if you want to sell a bushel of wheat overseas or if you want to sell an American-built tractor overseas.

My good friend from South Carolina, I am sure, Mr. President, saw what I saw in the Sunday Washington Post about the Caterpillar Tractor Co. and the fight they are having now with their Japanese counterparts. It pointed out that the president of Caterpillar Tractor, when he goes to work in the morning, the first thing he asks for is not what the productivity rate is, not what quality control says, but what the Japanese yen is in comparison to the American dollar, because the Japanese yen is down one-third in comparison to the American dollar in order to finance this horrendous deficit. There are 22,000 workers laid off in Caterpillar Tractor because of this disparity. That is why we have to address this deficit and do something about it.

That is why, of course, I am proud to join my distinguished colleague from South Carolina in proposing a plan that will have immediate and profound deficit reduction. This is not a business-as-usual downpayment, where promises inevitably fade with economic fortune. This is a balanced plan, Mr. President, which demands equality of sacrifice while, at the same time, it avoids an unreasoned and indiscriminate approach to budget cutting.

The rose-garden package, Mr. President, simply is not enough. A 150 billion dollars' worth of budget deficits sounds great, sounds wonderful—until you look at it and find that it is only $12 billion in the first year; it is only about $25 billion or $26 billion in the second year; and then, aha, yes, $100 billion in the third year. It reminds me of the old college story; "Yes, I will love you tomorrow."

That is the kind of promise we have, and it is not a promise that the American people are going along with. Even more important, it is not the kind of promise that the people who set interest rates are buying. That is why interest rates have gone up, Mr. President.

The heart of this debate is the question of defense spending. Our plan calls for 4 percent real growth in defense expenditures. I have talked with many experts in this area, including Members of this body sitting on the Committee on Armed Services. I am firmly convinced that in the defense of our country, we can seek no lower figure. In fact, it would be more costly in the long run to set aside defense programs that we have already initiated in order to meet a more immediate lower rate of growth. Yet some who agree that there is an urgent need for deficit reduction object that our plan does not call for defense spending cuts which are equal to cuts in social spending. In actual numbers, I suppose they are correct, Mr. President. In actual ability to reduce spending, we have extracted equality.

Equality is exactly why we have exempted from budget cuts those programs for the needy which can least afford to be cut. A plan which calls for equal amounts of defense spending cuts, social spending cuts, and tax increases does not have an equality of sacrifice; it merely has equality of numbers, with no vision into the real inequities of the Federal budget.

There is also criticism of our call for deferring tax indexation. I would be the first to agree that additional taxes are onerous; any taxes, for that matter, are onerous. Yet a few of us on this floor have voted to forgo the third year of the tax cut, have voted against a number of tax cuts because, Mr. President, the toughest tax today on the American working men and women, the toughest tax today on the American farm family, is the tax of high interest rates coming about because of these inflated budget deficits.

The simple fact is that most of the Members of this body have voted into law spending programs that were implicitly intended to be paid for with taxes. Three years ago, we cut taxes by 25 percent, on a gamble, referred to by some as a riverboat gamble. Whether it was a riverboat gamble or a prairie dog gamble does not make a whale of a lot of difference, Mr. President. It was a gamble and, quite simply, it did not work. We did not win that gamble.

Now that we are facing the disastrous consequences of our actions, I suggest the only responsible approach is to reclaim a small portion of that lost tax revenue until such time as we are willing to curb our irresponsible, but sometimes very necessary, spending habits.

This deficit reduction plan has a message to send to the American people. That message ultimately is that the U.S. Senate is now prepared to be a responsible governing body. That time has long passed, Mr. President. We have been delinquent in our duty, and the only way we can recapture the challenge the American people gave us when they elected us is to do something about it now instead of just talking about it. This package gives us the biggest net reduction in the immediate outyear deficit of any package that will be offered.

That is why I urge its support. That is why I am proud and privileged to join with my good friend and colleague from South Carolina and a number of other Senators in introducing this package—a package that is not easy, really. But it does address the real needs of our Nation and addresses it now. I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I appreciate the distinguished leadership of the Senator from North Dakota. He has been very conscientious about it. We have worked hard in that Budget Committee and this is presented in all genuineness and sincerity to really solve the problem. In completing the thought on tax and taxes because I want to fix the responsibility, I say to the Senator from North Dakota, it is our responsibility, this Congress. It is not the 40 years of Congresses, profligate Congresses, tax and tax and spend and spend, for the main and simple reason that I have just described by way of record that rather than raising we were cutting taxes and

thereupon followed Kemp-Roth and rather than spending and spending we did have a discipline.

Now, let everybody fall out of the gallery or wonder about that statement, but there was always a discipline in the National Congress, all Congresses, against going completely overboard. If you go back to the end of World War II, to 1947, and you take all of the deficits from 1947 up to 1980, a 33-year period, the cumulative total deficit for that period would be $465.5 billion. But the deficits just for the 3-year period 1982, 1983, and this year, 1984 amount to $495 billion. So the problem is not one of 33 years or 35 or 40 years, the aura of futility that we are getting by with, that this Congress is getting by with—is by blaming it on previous Congresses.

I went as chairman of the Budget Committee to President Carter in November 1980, after his defeat. Here was a lameduck Democratic President. We had a lameduck Democratic U.S. Senate. In addressing the President I said, "Mr. President, you are going to leave a deficit bigger than the one you inherited from President Ford." And he said, "What did you say? Is that right? I said, "Yes, sir, it is going to be about $75 billion." He said, "Well, we are going to have to do something about that. What can we do?" And I was talking about reconciliation, which is a fancy budgetary description of a spending cut. I said, "If you can just help us along, we are working and ready to go in both the House and the Senate. We will put in this reconciliation bill and I think we can have some spending cuts." And we did. We cut the deficit back for the year 1980, the last year of President Carter, to $58.7 billion. It has been about $66 billion.

That is a high deficit, but there was a discipline. The Democrats were absolutely frightened that they would leave a record of having a deficit in excess of $66 billion.

That was only a little more than 3 years ago. President Truman, whom we are going to memorialize in another week, balanced the budget four times. President Johnson balanced the budget and gave Richard Nixon a surplus, if you can imagine such a thing as the Great Society giving President Nixon a surplus. But it occurred. The discipline has only broken in the last 2 to 3 years right here on the floor of the Congress. We are the ones responsible. And we are not doing anything about it because it is an election year. And business and financial and economic leadership of the country does not speak out loudly about this particular problem. That could be one of the fallouts from a prolonged Democratic Presidential campaign.

We had candidates out on that Presidential track and if they said anything critical about the economy or critical about Reaganomics or critical about high deficits, we had eight of us ready to pick up on what any business leader said and put it on national TV, and so you almost have a system of lockjaw. The business and financial and bond and stock market communities all have lockjaw. They do not speak out on this. They write a few little articles, they go to their business clubs, but they are not in the galleries. They are not pressuring for anything to get done and they are all talking in terms of "Let us first reelect President Reagan and then we will all get together next year and we will take care of it."

I want to comment on how that hits me as a matter of politics. If I were Governor of South Carolina, and I walked down the capitol steps and a TV reporter walked up to me and put that microphone under my nose and said, "Now, Governor, what are you going to do about the $400 million deficit"—which would be the comparable to the $200 billion national deficit. If a reporter asked me that on the capitol steps of Columbia, S.C.—what I was going to do about the $400 million deficit—and I reared back and said:

Oh, well, now, wait a minute. This is an election year and there are a lot of political costs to getting anything done in an election year but after my reelection, then I am going to get together a bipartisan group and we are going to really do something about this.

That reporter would look at me and say, "Governor, there is not going to be any reelection for you if you do not do something between now and November."

That would be the worst of politics. I could not get by with it. Every newspaper editorial would take me on.

But in Washington that is the best of politics. There are a lot of political costs, do you not understand. This is an election year and we have to get everybody reelected first and then we will get on to the business of the high deficits and then really begin the launching of new spending programs because this is a double speak. We talk about spending cuts but President Reagan came with spending increases. He asked for $50 billion more in defense, he talked about spending cuts and he asked for tax cuts. He said I want my indexing. It amounts to $6 billion the first year, but by year after next it is $31 billion and out to the 5-year budget projection where it is $65 billion. Mr. President, we do not have revenues to cut. You and I know that. There are no revenues to cut. We just go out and borrow the money and spread it around again.

So in January we received a Presidential budget that I think on the House side got one vote. I think there were 427 votes against and one affirmative vote. They did have a formal vote on President Reagan's budget. So we have the double speak. We talk about having spending cuts but asking for spending increases. We say we do not want to do anything about taxes but we are asking for tax cuts. And that is why we cannot get the public mind fixed on this particular problem.

Specifically, with respect to the different freezes, I wish I could join with my distinguished colleague from Florida, for example, on the Democratic alternative. First, the Republican alternative increases the deficit up to $204 billion. It does not even make any bones about trying to solve the problem. It becomes a part of the problem and exacerbates the problem.

There is that word again. I am getting pretty good at that one.

It really adds to that particular problem.

Now, the Democratic alternative goes up and down the highways and byways, but when I look at the bottom line, after all the descriptive language, it says $170 billion next year, next year and next year. It sort of levels off at $170 billion. I only allude back to what I said about the conscience we had not to exceed $66 billion. To put it coldly, I cannot run on a $170 billion deficit. I come from a State that believes in a balanced budget. I was the first Governor of the Southern States to get a triple-A credit rating back in 1959.

We have maintained that bond rating and credit rating since that time. It is almost a discipline among Republicans and Democrats at the State level that the budget shall be balanced. You pay as you go. We raise the revenues. If we want any new initiatives, we must afford those new initiatives. We do not offload onto the next generation.

It might give comfort to some, but I do not want to see my name connected to a $170 billion deficit. That does not solve the problem. That, according to the financial markets, makes you part of the problem.

There is no difference between a $200 billion and a $170 billion deficit when it comes to the interest rate and inflation and the impact on the economy. We are still out there borrowing; and now, at the $200 billion level, we are actually launching a new spending program of $20 billion. When I say a new spending program of $20 billion, you cannot avoid this until next year.

When you run that $200 billion deficit, you go out and borrow at 10 percent to finance that add-on to the national debt; and 10 percent of the $200 billion is $20 billion. It is estimated that in the next year, the interest cost add-on will be $23 billion. So it is a $23 billion new spending program.

If they had gone along with the Domenici-Hollings budget of 3½ or 4 years ago, we would have had a balanced budget by next year. We would be in the black, and we could take that

$23 billion and use it for research in cancer, to repair cracks in roads and bridges, for quality education, and even for defense. We are not using those amounts for defense or anything else. We are just adding on that new spending program that compounds and really goes on to the next generation.

Ask the question: Are you better off than you were 4 years ago? My 60-year-old crowd says, "Yeah, we are doing fine. Everything is just grand. We are all going to get reelected. We are all going to stay in office."

We are spending $200 billion more than we are taking in. Obviously, some cars are being sold and houses are being built when you are spending $200 billion more than you are taking in.

The 60-year-olds, my generation, are saying that we are doing grand, and nobody cares. But our children and our children's children will find themselves in a gridlock in 3 to 5 years.

Right now, it is $150 billion, $3 billion a week—$150 billion of carrying charges on the national debt. That is $3 billion for nothing. In 3 to 4 years, it is going to be $200 billion.

I want somebody to look at the chart in the U.S. News & World Report. They have $288 billion as what we will get in personal taxes. We had income tax day the other day, and when we all paid our income taxes, they used $288 billion, and I used $293.6 billion, which I think are the figures of the IRS, in individual income taxes we paid the week before last. We are going to spend over half of that on interest costs—for nothing.

Can you imagine such a thing? A runaway government is what we have here. In 3 years, it is going to be $200 billion just in interest costs.

So Congress will meet, and we will provide for nominal defense, social security, and some health care; and, like the British Parliament, we will have a big wrangle about how to raise the revenues to pay the interest costs on the national debt. That is what we are providing for the next generation, and we should be ashamed. It is our responsibility. That is why we should vote for some kind of freeze to solve the problem.

I would like to go along with the Republican proposal, but it increases the deficit. the Democratic alternative still does not solve it. It is $170 billion—the same impact upon the financial markets.

The Kassebaum-Biden proposal is a 1-year proposition that cuts defense. It does not do much of anything with revenues. It just puts down a figure. It is not balanced. It is for only 1 year, and it does not solve the problem.

I heard last night from our Chamber friends, and I will get into that later, as to whether they endorse the Kassebaum open-year plan because they were adamant last year for a 7.5-percent increase in defense. If they endorse this, they have changed direction totally for a cut in defense.

Mr. President, I think this is a good time for me to yield to our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Mississippi. I appreciate his patience in hearing me out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I really did not expect to proceed at this time.

As I understand the parliamentary situation, the Senate will recess at 12 o'clock. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I will proceed at this time.

Mr. President, I am more concerned about the situation we are in now than I ever have been since I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. President, I was here when we were debating what became known as the Marshall plan, whereby we were proposing a new step altogether, that we were going to take money, billions of dollars, and send it as a gift to our former adversaries, those who had attacked us and with whom we had been at war. We were also going to send it to our allies in World War II. We were trying to rehabilitate the nations, the people of those nations. We wanted them to have a chance to get back on their feet, turning the wheels of industry again, making their own living, and restoring themselves to the family of nations that were self-sustaining, and had reasonable economy for their people. There was tremendous interest.

We were the kingpin of the world financially, in a way. We were the best-fixed nation in the world, moneywise. We had only 96 Senators then, but during those debates we met here day after day and had from 50 to 60 to 70 to 80 to 90 Senators present, listening intently, to those who had prepared themselves; listening over and over to the new developments, to the continuity of the idea, and welding here, on the anvil of debate, a plan that really put the world back on its feet economically.

Of course, we were interested, too, in building up some customers. That was one of the motives. But primarily it was to get things going again, to get the wheels turning again. We were in a position to do those things. We had the most influence in the money markets of the world.

Now, I am really confounded. Just a little over 30 years later, we find ourselves in such a situation that one of the chosen leaders of our Nation, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Volcker, who was appointed by a Democratic President originally, served 4 years, and was reappointed by a Republican President, with his nomination confirmed by the Senate by a vote of about 80 to 16, pointed out in very graphic language, in a hearing on the Hill this year, that soon—and by "soon" he meant 2 or 3 years in the future—we would become a debtor nation, at the rate we are going.

Now that is what really woke me up. That is what made my mind up that I better lay aside these other things that I have been trying to do for the areas of business here and the bills that are to come, that I better do what little I could, and I really went to work.

Mr. President, let me say, also, that I wish to highly commend the members on our Budget Committee. They have been through plenty. I will not stop to name all of them, but I think we were blessed to have these men at these critical times in these crucial places. I am thinking about men like Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico, who is now chairman of that committee. I am thinking about Senator CHILES of Florida, who is presently the minority representative on that committee. I am thinking about the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), who developed and showed a remarkable intelligence, knowledge, perspicuity, and perspicacity with reference to the financial affairs of our Nation. I could go on naming others, and I compliment them all.

Maybe it gets rough sometimes as to what is said about the Budget Committee with its powers reaching out and replacing part of the duties and responsibilities of our regular committees, and I am a committee man, but I appreciate very much what has been done by these Senators, and they had the capacity to master and did master our services.

I have a prepared speech here, Mr. President, that is not long. I may take further part in the debate, I hope so, to some extent.

So I think that the remaining time now before there is a recess under previous order of the Senate I will confine myself to my written remarks and take up other things later.

Mr. President, let me say that as far as the things I point out here I assume my part of the guilt that goes with the neglect, and that is what it amounts to, of the preceding years. I am not trying to point to any culprits or blame them any more than I blame myself. That is not the question now.

We can go point out to where the President was in error, and so forth, and we can point out where we were in error. That is not what the people are interested in at all, not at all. They want someone who will come in here and tackle this problem and come up with some kind of improvement on the

situation that will lead to further improvement.

This is the fourth year we have tried hard to improve our annual budget and substantially reduce the annual deficit and the national debt.

In this field things have not gotten better. But instead they have gotten substantially worse.

Let me mention now some of these facts that impress me and impel me to whatever action I can bring.

In 1964 we operated the entire Federal Government on less than $100 billion. For fiscal year 1985 it is estimated that the interest alone on the national debt will be $127 billion.

If that does not arouse and stir almost to anger any redblooded American, I do not know what it will take, and particularly those who stand in the positions that we do with entrusted power of the citizenship of our country to act. We are the ones, the Members of Congress, the President of the United States, who are the chosen ones for this particular period and we are the only ones who can move in under our system of law and try to bring about real meaningful corrections.

At the present rate, the national debt in 1989, that is just 5 short years away, will be $2.805 trillion—$2.805 trillion, however much that means. Now, these are figures from the Office of Management and Budget. They are official. They come from the administration as such, but they are official and legal and certainly cannot be challenged unless it is for a correction of reasonable error.

That sum is 52.4 percent of our entire gross national product. Think of that. Over half of the gross national product, the total production of our enterprises.

These figures, Mr. President, speak for themselves.

Now I fully considered some valuable comments by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Honorable Paul A. Volcker, who has served one 4-year term and was recently appointed for another term by President Reagan and by this body, less than a year ago by a vote of 84 to 16, confirmed for another 4 years.

Now, many economists and financial people at large endorse his positions. In my own official duties, I rely on his knowledge, judgment, and integrity a great deal. There is nothing between us. I have never known him, nor had the privilege of knowing him until he came here to Washington. At my request I have gone to his office several times. I have found him to be highly responsible, knowledgeable, and modest, but by experience, he is the one in whom I put confidence, in his predictions and his estimates.

Chairman Volcker has said, for instance, that he favors a $50 billion reduction per year in the deficits for 3 years, and he predicted that a $50 billion cut, a reduction in the Federal deficit in the next fiscal year, would reduce the interest rates 1 percentage point. I will come back to that later. He said such action would suggest that the budget is coming firmly under control, and would ease upward pressure on interest rates.

I believe he knew what he was talking about. This gentleman has issued a timely warning that unless something is done within a few years we can become a debtor nation in the financial world for the first time in many, many years, since back in the early days of our country.

He put it this way before the House Banking Committee recently, and I am quoting him literally.

> The net investment position of the United States overseas built up gradually over the entire postwar period will in the space of only 3 years be reversed. The richest economy in the world is on the verge of becoming a net debtor.

Now that means that we are not supreme. That means we are not the leading nation in the world. That means in money matters, in the financial markets of the world, we are in doubt. We are in question. We do not have that solid integrity feeling behind our position that was once found when we were taking these leading positions that I referred to earlier.

As I have said, I was here during the Marshall plan, when there was that rehabilitation of Western Europe. And there was a plan for Japan and others, that was extended under the name of the Marshall plan. I was here when it was conceived, debated, finally passed, rigidly applied, and lived up to. Here we are, as I said a minute ago, a little over 30 years later finding ourselves really in an inferior position. I do not mean down in the gutter, but we are not in a superior position in the financial world.

And with our capacity, we just cannot—and I am not in the habit of predicting dire consequences that we are going to be overwhelmed and overcome, but unless we restore that position, considering the strength that we have, the basic strength that we have to do it, then we become a have-not Nation, we become a has-been Nation—call it what you will—and we are on the way down.

I am not saying that we are going to surrender, that we are going to yield to it, but I do realize that we are yielding now, we are postponing, we are not doing enough, almost a do-nothing program. And things cannot continue.

I am no economist, Mr. President, but trying to find out what has happened—what in the world has happened—I believe I know one basic reason that is perhaps controlling. For many years we have been living well beyond our means. We spend more and more above what we had. Most everyone else knew it but we did not realize it enough to act on the thought. We know it now, but we are too slow in trying, really trying hard to do something about it.

Next year, how it would be easier to start next year than now—true, the election will be over. Someone brought that in. But, what about the doubt, what about the suspicion, what about the opinion of fellow nations, what about the financial world's trust in us, in our ability to meet the problem, however great it may be?

We are not doing enough about it, Mr. President, I submit, under any interpretation, unless we really put our teeth into this problem and come up with something far reaching and definite and meaningful like what I call the Hollings plan does.

Now, in view of these facts pressing on us, which will get worse rather than better if we merely wait, what shall we do? I have decided we should by all means act now. We have no choice on that. The longer we put off dealing with this imbalance, the harder it will be to correct it. There is an opportunity to set in motion a long period of growth and stability, but to delay in making a substantial reduction in this deficit places the economy at great risk.

The budget year before the Congress for consideration now, fiscal year 1985, will be the third year of this current recovery period. By all historical precedents, this should be a year of falling deficits. Instead, the deficit will be near record levels: Up.

According to leading financial experts, if the Federal deficits continue, the possibility of higher levels of inflation, followed by a decline in economic growth, is highly possible and probable. It would be very difficult to restrain cost-of-living increases during a period of high inflation. The burden on the people will be far too great. Now, when inflation has cooled, is the time to act.

This budget year, the fiscal year which begins on October 1 of this year, is an opportunity which should not be missed to start on the budget problems. This is the year when we must make a concerted effort to reduce this deficit.

Now, the economy has been through a bleak period. A high price has been paid to beat down inflation. It would be a terrible waste to lose all that has been gained in the battle against inflation by continuing to spend beyond our means and set off another round of inflation. We know now what it would mean.

I believe that we are now at the jumping off place. And what shall happen if we let those things come about? We already know that we will have a return of that devastating evil of inflation. We already know that we

will have a return of higher and higher interest rates. And what does that mean? We already know that that means the cutting off of sales of automobiles, of new starts in homes and countless other activities in our economy that caters to the necessities of the American way of life as we have learned to know it and to expect it.

It destroys the concept of stability and reliability and frugality. It destroys the opinion that has been held of us that we have the nerve, we have the ability to see a thing through and to make sacrifices and to make ends meet and keep things on a sound basis for our children and our grandchildren.

I have no doubt—I am not given to scare words if I could think them up, but I cannot think them up—but I have no doubt in my own mind that we are inviting these troubles that we have had in the last few years and inviting a renewal and a new start with a certainty and with consequences that we will have a more devastating round of inflation and things that go with it than we have had before.

We already know that unless we actually check these $200 billion annual deficits, we shall have higher and higher interest rates.

I am impressed with the Hollings plan, that it really tackles the situation, really tackles the problem and gets down to specifics, all problems and all causes, and comes up with a definite constructive, meaningful recommendation. The approach is across the board; that is, reductions apply at a small rate, apply across the board to everyone in sharing this burden, and a fair spreading of the load. And the load can be made, under that method, fairly thin.

It will be felt. I do not want to mislead anyone. But it calls on all groups to carry an equal part of the load according to their situation.

The Hollings plan for deficit reduction will have an early impact on the deficit. It approaches the deficit problem on an overall basis, calls for a sharing of effort. It is in this across-the-board approval of all shared sacrifices and early deficit reductions that makes this plan so appealng, appealing for results. And that is what we want. The amendment holds the defense budget authority growth to 4-percent above inflation for 2 years. Then it holds the growth to 3-percent above inflation through fiscal year 1989.

Now, I am not an expert in the field, but I have been on the Armed Services Committee a long time—since the beginning of the Korean war. The rate of military preparedness, in my opinion, may be stretched out or slowed down, considering the enormous rate in which it is traveling now, or postponed, some of them, the weapons, over future years without injury or serious impairment of our capacity for action.

Now I tried to check out every way I knew before I made that conclusion to this august body that I do respect so highly. This does not apply to every phase of our program, but the military can temporarily defer some of the funds for the sake of a dire emergency like we are facing now in our financial affairs.

I know the cost of weaponry is great. I have some idea about the need. I am confident that this reasonable stretch-out—for a few years, while we are catching our breath and catching up with reality—can be safely done under this idea of 4 percent increase above inflation for 2 years.

In summary, this is what the Hollings amendment plan would specifically do in addition to holddown defense spending grants to the 4 percent above inflation rate. It freezes the nondefense agency programs for 1 year, and holds the growth to 3 percent through 1989. It also freezes for 1 year the pay raises of all Federal civilian employees, military personnel, and then holds the payroll growth to a level not to exceed 3 percent through 1989. It freezes the cost-of-living adjustments for 1 year, and holds future adjustments not to exceed 3 percent through 1989. It freezes physician and hospital reimbursement for 1 year; delays cost-of-living adjustments to tax brackets until 1990; increases tax collection by increasing the tax audit helping the Internal Revenue Service; and directs the Finance Committee to report within 45 days after enactment changes in the law to increase revenues by $4.3 billion in fiscal year 1985; $7.1 billion in fiscal year 1986; $11.7 billion in fiscal year 1987; $19 billion in fiscal year 1988; and $28.7 billion in fiscal year 1989.

Mr. President, none of us like the flavor of increasing taxes. But sometimes it is necessary. We are in the predicament of having outflows greatly exceeding the income. I believe it is virtually unanimous among the financial experts that it is going to require an approach to this problem for both ends of the line, and going to require the changes in the income statute. We are not fooling anyone except ourselves, if we persuade ourselves to believe to the contrary. I emphasize, as the financial world knows, that we cannot get the economy on its feet unless we increase the revenues. That is what I am striking at here in connection with discussing becoming a debtor nation. It is unthinkable to me and I believe on analysis to all of us that we could let that happen. We are on the way down, sure enough, if we do.

Mr. President, I have figures here that show for every 1-percent increase in unemployment, there is an additional cost to the Federal Government of 25 percent per year; $13 billion of that is increased unemployment benefits; $13 billion is lost income tax revenue. It only adds further to the deficit and the national debt to do the same or fail to them which results in high inflation, high interest rates leading to recession and loss of jobs.

We know what that means. We are just out of the frying pan with those experiences. We would rather sacrifice something now or do without some things now, whatever you want to call it—pay the price is another way to describe it—and do those things now avoiding these evil consequences that we must avoid one way or another.

Mr. President, I thought about the proposition—I am not preaching a doctrine—that we are down, out, in despair, and that we do not have the ability to come back. We do have the ability to come back. I think we will come back. Our Nation will get adjusted, on the front where it belongs and partly through the same thing that has always made us grow and prosper; that is, growth, growth and hard work. We had the resources, national resources, will power, ability on the part of our people, and their willpower to make this growth become reality.

We have grown rapidly as a nation during these decades, and we are still a relatively young country. We still have those same resources—a tremendous amount, beginning with iron, coal, others, and coming on around to the human elements, too. Do not discount the American people.

Opponents in the Pacific in World War II discounted the American people, throught we would not fight back, and thought we would give up part rather than go through the cost of victory. Do not discount the American people, and their natural resources, their human resources, their willpower, their ability all the way around. We are going to come back. We will survive.

I remember Mississippi. I remember when we had boll weevils down in the South. They thought the boll weevil was going to wipe out the cotton crops. They did for 2 years. We overcame that and went on to higher production then we had ever known. I remember World War I. After it was over, we had a panic, to use that word. It was an extreme recession. But people fought right on. The automobile business was born about that time. We came out of the big depression of the 1930's. I was practicing law by that time, and was intimately connected with the debacles that we had with extreme loss of everything people had. The drought, the wind in Oklahoma, all those things—we came through all of that.

We came back stronger than we had ever been before. We fought World War II not alone, but we furnished a lot to it. I believe it was said that we

fought that war on borrowed money. What we had to borrow was borrowed at a rate of 2.5 percent. Let the record bear that out fully. Yes. We are still a resourceful people. We are determined. We have the manpower and the other things that go to make up success. But we have got to have commonsense enough, nerve enough to turn around, and do the hard things. That is what this amendment does.

I commend the author again for his resourcefulness, and the gentleman on our Budget Committee, as well as others. I have not been on it but others who worked on it deserve tremendous credit. But what we have to do is get together, have a vote. It will not be unanimous, of course. But there has to be a majority that will carry this thing because of its positive features.

It will be politically popular, maybe not now, but years ahead. In years ahead, it will be looked to with pride and appreciation. My time is virtually up.

I thank the Chair.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12 noon having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:02 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUGAR).

AMENDMENT NO. 3036

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment of the Senator from Maine will be considered.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, there is an hour on this amendment. But I think it is likely that we can finish much quicker than that. I would urge Senators to confine their remarks to the essentials.

The Senator from Maine has already indicated, I believe, that it will not take very long on his side. I would hope the managers on this side would follow his good example.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his remarks. I will accommodate him, and those other Senators who are interested in a prompt resolution of this matter.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Maine.

The Senator from Maine has brought to this body a most inequitable situation which I probably supported, but cannot remember, in the budget restrictions before. I compliment the Senator for permitting us to have an opportunity to demonstrate that many of us in this body realize the necessity to keep the judicial salaries at a pace with at least inflation. Though there are ample criticisms of the judiciary, I am one of those who has said many times that it is not fair to do what we have done.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I be made a cosponsor of the Senator from Maine's amendment. I thank the Senator sincerely for bringing this to the attention of our colleagues. I hope that our colleagues will support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The name of Mr. SASSER was also added as a cosponsor by unanimous consent.)

The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, the Senate had the opportunity yesterday afternoon to discuss the particulars of the amendment offered by me, Senator MATHIAS, Senator THURMOND, Senator BENTSEN, and Senator BOSCHWITZ which would extend to the members of the Federal Judiciary the same pay adjustment received by other Federal employees on January 1.

I would like now to just briefly review the important points for the benefit of those Senators who were not present yesterday.

As of January 1, the salaries of officers and employees of the Federal Government were increased 3.5 percent in accordance with the pay plan submitted by President Reagan last summer. Under the provisions of Public Law 98-270, which was enacted only last month, Federal rates of pay have been increased another one-half percent retroactive to January 1.

That is for a total of 4 percent for all Federal employees except Federal judges.

Members of the Federal judiciary received neither pay adjustment because of an amendment to a continuing resolution passed in 1981. This amendment provides that Federal judges are not entitled to any salary increase, except as may be specifically authorized by act of Congress. The Comptroller General has ruled several times, most recently in connection with the 3.5-percent pay adjustment under the President's plan, that section 140 of Public Law 97-92 is permanent legislation and that absent specific authorization by Congress, Federal judges are not entitled to across-the-board pay increases given other Federal employees.

That is where we stand today. My amendment would constitute the required authorization for Federal judges to receive a pay increase equal to that afforded other Federal workers this year. That proposition, on its fact, is modest and equitable.

It is modest, if we consider the scope of who is affected under my amendment; namely, there are roughly 700 Federal judges, including Justices of the Supreme Court, judges of the Federal Appeals Court, Federal district court judges to U.S. Tax Court judges; 700 Federal judges. The cost of the amendment? The Congressional Budget Office estimates the cost at roughly $1.7 million. I should also point out that in compiling its baseline assumption for the budget resolution, CBO included a pay adjustment for Federal judges. Therefore, this amendment's adoption will have no effect on the deficit when contrasted with the budget resolution.

As a policy matter, I also believe the scope of the amendment is modest. The amendment authorizes a pay adjustment for Federal judges for only 1 year. It in no way repeals or alters section 140 of Public Law 97-92.

The amendment is also equitable. The question may arise in this debate as to "Why Federal judges? Why are we singling out judges for special consideration?" It is an excellent question, Mr. President, one which lies at the heart of my amendment. Without passage of the amendment, judges, and judges alone, would be excluded from a pay adjustment under the provisions of this bill.

My amendment, far from singling out Federal judges for special consideration, does, in fact, just the opposite. It includes judges with other Federal employees for a pay increase retroactive to January. Judges will get nothing more, nothing less, than other Federal workers under my amendment.

Finally, the Senate may be asked to consider my amendment in light of pay rates for Members of this body and the House of Representatives. The question of our own pay is, of course, one of the most difficult questions with which we must deal. It makes no sense in logic for Members of this body to believe we somehow improve our circumstances by denying the Federal judges an increase given other Federal employees. Or that we elevate our discussion relative to Members' pay when we include the issue of judges' pay.

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I believe this Senate should support my amendment so that the highly deserving individuals who compromise our Federal judiciary—700 men and women entrusted with the most serious responsibilities—will not be singularly excluded from an otherwise across-the-board pay increase retroactive to January.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is on his way to address the issue. He should be here shortly.

May I ask the distinguished Senator from Maine a question?

Even with the Senator's explanation—because some of us have been busy, have not had a chance to be here, and have not been able to read the Record—there still appears to be some confusion.

Would the Senator tell the Senator from New Mexico again, whether or not the judges would be increased 3.5 percent without the Mitchell amendment, and they will go to 4 with it, or did they get totally eliminated in the redrafting that occurred on the earlier reconciliation bill?

Mr. MITCHELL. Unless this amendment passes, they get nothing because the provision added in 1981 to the then continuing resolution provided that Federal judges cannot receive a pay increase. I quote from that provision. "Except as may be specifically authorized by act of Congress." The Comptroller General has ruled several times that that requires specific authorization by Congress for any increase to be received by judges. As a consequence, Federal judges receive neither the 3.5 percent that was provided in the President's recommendation, nor the 0.5 of 1 percent that was added last month.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND), had indicated a desire to speak on this amendment. He is, however, opening a hearing at this moment and cannot leave. He has authorized me to say that he supports the amendment and urges other Senators to do the same.

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Mitchell-Bentsen-Mathias amendment providing Federal judges with the 3.5 percent pay adjustment retroactively to January 1984. This adjustment has already been received by other Federal employees.

This summer the Quadrennial Commission on Legislative and Judicial Salaries will begin meeting on recommendations for legislative and judicial compensation levels. This amendment, however, would grant Federal judges only that amount of pay increase that other Federal employees have already received. It is only fair and just that these men and women who serve in such extremely demanding and critical roles receive the compensation that was afforded other Federal employees by Executive order in January. Until the Quadrennial Commission makes its recommendations to the President early next year, I believe we must provide Federal judges with this pay adjustment.

I am aware that in these times of high deficits and spiralling Government spending we must be mindful of the way we spend our dollars. I also believe, however, that it would be highly inequitable for this body to use Federal judges as the starting point for a revised fiscal policy. I would stress that this is only a pay adjustment that every other Federal employee has already received, including Members of this distinguished body. I realize that the issue of salary increases for Members of Congress is a very sensitive one, and that we have voted to rescind last January's pay increase for ourselves. But that measure is not public law.

There can be no argument that Federal judges serve a vital function in this country. It is through the opinions that they write and the rulings that they make that the Constitution is enforced and upheld, and that the rights of individuals are protected. Unlike other professionals, Federal judges do not enjoy incentives or bonuses for increased productivity or professional expertise. Their sole source of income derives from the salaries they receive from the Federal Government.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I must note that it is incumbent for us to be able to continue to attract and retain highly competent and motivated individuals to the Federal judiciary. We cannot expect the best and the brightest of the legal profession to remain in or join the ranks of the Federal judiciary if we cannot, at the minimum, guarantee them that they will be treated on par with other Federal employees. As we wait on the recommendations of the Quadrennial Commission, I believe we must grant the Federal judges the pay raise already received by other Federal employees.●

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I know of no other requirements for time. I believe we are prepared on this side to vote.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader would put in a quorum before we do that, because we have a Senator on this side who is counting on a vote at 2:30 p.m.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have Senators who need to leave. That is the reason I was trying to precipitate it a little bit. I assure the minority leader I shall be generous in accommodating the length of the rollcall as far as I can. Of course I shall.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is 2:20 p.m. We have checked on our side and there are no other speakers. We are prepared on this side to go forward with the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield back his time?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do, Mr. President. I am prepared to vote at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Baker	Gorton	Packwood
Bentsen	Hatch	Pell
Biden	Hawkins	Percy
Bingaman	Hecht	Quayle
Boschwitz	Heflin	Riegle
Bradley	Heinz	Roth
Chafee	Hollings	Rudman
Chiles	Huddleston	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inouye	Sasser
Cohen	Johnston	Simpson
Cranston	Kennedy	Specter
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Stafford
Danforth	Laxalt	Stennis
DeConcini	Leahy	Stevens
Denton	Levin	Thurmond
Dodd	Long	Tower
Dole	Lugar	Trible
Domenici	Mathias	Tsongas
Durenberger	Matsunaga	Warner
Eagleton	Melcher	Weicker
Evans	Mitchell	Wilson
Ford	Moynihan	
Glenn	Nunn	

NAYS—28

Andrews	Bumpers	Garn
Armstrong	Burdick	Goldwater
Baucus	Byrd	Grassley
Boren	Exon	Hatfield

Helms	McClure	Randolph
Humphrey	Metzenbaum	Symms
Jepson	Nickles	Wallop
Kassebaum	Pressler	Zorinsky
Kasten	Proxmire	
Mattingly	Pryor	

NOT VOTING—5

Abdnor	East	Murkowski
Dixon	Hart	

So, Mr. MITCHELL's amendment (No. 3036) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—AMENDMENT NO. 3041

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, earlier I had a conversation with the minority leader about the possibility of establishing a time certain to vote on the Hollings amendment, which is now pending, after the disposition of the Mitchell amendment.

I wonder if the minority leader is in a position now to consider a request that I might put to provide for an up-or-down vote on the Hollings amendment at 5:30 p.m. and that the time between the time we recommence considering the Hollings amendment and 5:30 p.m. be equally divided.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have discussed this with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) who is on the floor. He has indicated, I believe, that he would be agreeable to this approach.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I do not know how many speakers they have on that side. The Senator from North Dakota, Senator ANDREWS, would know on that side of the aisle how long they wish to talk in opposition. When you say divided, then we are going to end up with about an hour's time and I know six that want to talk on this side. I think we could do it by 5:30 p.m.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I may say I discussed this with our caucus today and with Senator ANDREWS. He feels that we could do it easily in the time provided. I do not think there will be many speakers on this side. I do not think there would be any difficulty.

I see the Senator from North Dakota is here. I yield so that he may respond.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I appreciate the leader yielding. I certainly want to accommodate the movement of this legislation through the Senate. If we are going to divide the time between that side and this side, I would be glad to yield some time that came to this side. I have said essentially all I have to say on this. I would be glad to yield some of that time to Senator HOLLINGS. I would say an hour on this side and 1½ hours on that side would probably be a fair breakdown.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, could I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the manager on this side, if that would suit him.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the hour on this side would be in opposition and I would say to my friend I do not think I would use it all and to the extent that I did not, I would yield it to him; 1½ hours on his side and 1 hour on mine.

Mr. HOLLINGS. All right.

Mr. EXON. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have not made the request yet. Just so Members can reserve, I make that request. Let me state it for clarification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate resumes consideration of the Hollings amendment at not later than 3 p.m. today, the time between 3 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. be divided as follows: 1½ hours under the control of the distinguished mover of the amendment, Senator HOLLINGS, and 1 hour under the control of the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI; and that at the hour of 5:30 p.m. the vote occur on the Hollings amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, only for the purpose of stating for the record that this side has checked by telephone with offices of Senators and there is no objection.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EXON. Reserving the right to object, was the arrangement made for 1½ hours on this side, for the proponents, and an hour on that side in opposition?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Right.

Mr. EXON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, while the Hollings amendment is now pending under the order previously entered, do I understand there is a D'Amato amendment that will take a minute or two?

Mr. DOMENICI. There is a D'Amato-Moynihan amendment that will take 2 minutes. Both sides have conferred on it and I assume we will accept it.

Mr. BAKER. That was why I provided that the time between 3 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. would be divided. If the Senator wishes to proceed in that manner, who is the author of the amendment?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am offering it for myself and Mr. D'AMATO.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senator from New York to be recognized for the purpose of calling up an amendment and the debate and action on that amendment will not extend beyond the hour of 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3042

(Purpose: To require the disposal of certain lands at Montauk Air Force Station, East Hampton, N.Y., for park and recreation purposes)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York (Mr. Moynihan), for himself and Mr. D'Amato, proposes an amendment numbered 3042.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . The Administrator of General Services shall assign to the Secretary of the Interior for use as a public park or recreation area, portions of the Montauk Air Forces Station in East Hampton Township, Suffolk County, New York, totaling two hundred and seventy-eight acres that were declared surplus to the needs of the United States Government on December 21, 1981.

"SEC. . The Administrator of General Services shall assign the land identified in the first section of this Act to the Secretary of the Interior within thirty days of enactment of this Act. Within thirty days of said assignment, the Secretary of the Interior shall, in exchange for the transfer of the fee title to one hundred and twenty-five acres of the real property owned by the State of New York at Fire Island, New York, to the Secretary of the Interior, convey the property to the State of New York for public park or recreation uses in accordance with section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2)."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the amendment that I offer today with my colleague from New York, Senator D'AMATO, is identical to the legislation we introduced on April 25, 1984, S. 2595. This amendment would compel the Administrator of the General Services Administration to relinquish to the Secretary of the Interior, 278 acres of the Montauk Air Force Station in Suffolk, N.Y.; land the GSA declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government more than 2 years ago, on December 21, 1981. The Secretary of the Interior will exchange the land for 125 acres of State-owned parkland on Fire Island.

This is not the first time I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate. Last year, I introduced S. 2041, which simply would have directed the Government to do that which a 35-year-old statute authorizes

and encourages. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 allows for the free transfer of surplus property to States and local governments for park and recreational use. Unfortunately this policy changed under the current administration, and the GSA opposed such a transfer for the Montauk property. This policy, however, is inconsistent with the intent of the law. Instead GSA has sold similar properties to the highest bidders, and in fact, GSA attempted to do just that with the Montauk Air Force Station.

This amendment will insure that a marvelous tract of recreational land will become part of the Montauk Point State Park, in accordance with the desires of the elected officials and citizens of eastern Long Island. And permit to me to mention, the Secretary of the Interior supports this proposal. Secretary Clark wrote to Ray Kline, Acting Administrator of GSA, that—

Keeping such environmentally significant property as Montauk Point in public ownership is most important, especially where the public can enjoy and appreciate it through the superlative development program proposed by the State.

The Department of the Interior will be compensated, by receiving a stretch of beach property worth perhaps three times as much as the Montauk tract. This kind offer from the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation will close a long-time gap in the Fire Island National Seashore.

The General Services Administration notwithstanding, there is complete agreement that this precious land should belong to the people of New York and used for recreation. My amendment will insure this happy outcome.

The Secretary of the Interior is most anxious to do this. I am authorized to state for my friend, and Senator D'AMATO's friend, Orin Lehman, commissioner of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation, that he is most anxious to bring it about, as well.

I ask unanimous consent that certain material pertaining to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY LEGISLATURE, COUNTY OF SUFFOLK,
Riverhead, N.Y., March 8, 1984.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: This is to advise that at a regular meeting of the Suffolk County Legislature held on February 28, 1984, the following motion on the Sense of the Legislature was taken and approved by a majority of its members:

Sense of the Legislature resolution supporting exchange of Montauk Air Base properties for Fire Island Seashore properties.

As Clerk of the Legislature, I have been requested to forward notification of this action to your office.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. ROGERS,
Clerk.

SENSE OF THE LEGISLATURE RESOLUTION SUPPORTING EXCHANGE OF MONTAUK AIR BASE PROPERTIES FOR FIRE ISLAND SEASHORE PROPERTIES

Whereas, the General Services Administration (GSA) has placed the properties at the Montauk Air Base, Southampton, New York, up for public auction and has received bids in connection therewith; and

Whereas, such public auction may result in the acquisition of said properties by private interests which may develop such land for residential and/or commercial purposes; and

Whereas, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior has offered to transfer 277.6 acres at the Montauk Air Base to the State of New York, to be used for State Park purposes, in exchange for a transfer from the State to the Federal government of 125 acres at the Fire Island Seashore in lieu of the above-mentioned public auction; and

Whereas, this proposal will preserve the open nature of the land at the Montauk Air Base and constitutes fair exchange of value between the State and Federal governments, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislature hereby supports the proposal of the U.S. Department of the Interior to transfer 277.6 acres at the Montauk Air Base to the State of New York in exchange for 125 acres at the Fire Island Seashore in lieu of a public auction of said properties; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the County Legislature is hereby directed to file copies of this resolution with the Long Island delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives, to the U.S. Senators from the State of New York, and to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 6, 1984.

Hon. GERALD P. CARMEN,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CARMEN: The concern of the state of New York and its Congressional delegation regarding the February 8 sale by GSA of the surplus Montauk Air Force Station has been brought to my attention. I also understand that the State of New York has proposed a mutual conveyance of 125 acres of State owned land for addition to the Fire Island National seashore and the federally owned 282 acre Montauk property for addition to the Montauk Point State Park.

The Montauk property is surrounded on three sides by the State Park, has significant natural features and a fragile ecology. I am sure it could be developed by the state to serve important public outdoor recreation needs. The 125 acre State of New York property is identified in the Fire Island National Seashore Land Protection Plan as the last remaining piece of land needed to complete the acquisition requirements for the Seashore. For these reasons, I believe such a mutual conveyance is appropriate and advantageous to both the Federal Government and the State of New York.

The National Park Service informs me that the State of New York will soon submit an application for public benefit discount conveyance of the entire Montauk Air Force Station surplus property to replace their current application for only 35 acres. The Town of East Hampton has written the National Park Service withdrawing its application in favor of the State. I would appreciate you making no final decision on the disposition of the Montauk property until I am able to evaluate the State of New York's revised application.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM CLARK.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1981.

Hon. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: This is to provide you with information concerning property disposal at Montauk Air Force Station, New York.

Attached is a copy of Disposal Report No. 511 being submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services. The report describes the property in detail and indicates the circumstances of disposal.

We hope this information will be useful to you. If additional facts on this matter would be helpful, please let us know.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. SCHROEDER,
Colonel, USAF, Chief, Program Liaison Division, Office of Legislative Liaison.

Attachment.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, DISPOSAL REPORT NO. 511, JANUARY 30, 1981

Submittal Pursuant to Section 2662, Title 10, United States Code.

1. Name of Installation: Montauk Air Force Station, Montauk Communications, Facility Annex, New York.

Using Service: Air Defense/Tactical Air Command (USAF).

Former Use: Radar Station.

Land Area: 314 Acres Fee, 10 Acres Easement. 103 Buildings, including 27 Appropriated Fund Family Housing units, totaling 203,131SF.

Cost: Land, $125,000; Improvements, $10,050,000, Total $10,175,000.

Proposed Action: Report the property to the General Services Administration (GSA) for disposal.

Authority for Disposal: Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

2. This reports an Air Force proposal to dispose of all Air Force controlled facilities and land at Montauk Air Force Station, New York, and its off-base Communications Facility Annex. The station is located on the eastern tip of Long Island, New York.

3. Land for the radar station was acquired from the Army on what had been a portion of former Camp Hero, a Coast Artillery post. Land for the off-base communications annex was acquired in 1959. The main installation was activated in 1950 as an aircraft control and warning radar site in the developing air defense system. The station operated height finder and search radar in support of the 21st Air Division's air defense mission at Hancock Field, New York, The proposed disposal results from the radar station's function, but not the site, being transferred to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) as part of the Joint Surveillance System (JSS). This combined surveillance will meet both FAA's civil aviation requirements and the Air Force's detection and reporting requirements for the North American Air Defense Command.

4. This property has been screened with the Departments of the Army and Navy, the Defense Agencies and Services, the National Guard Bureau, and the U.S. Coast Guard (DOT), with negative results. It is planned to declare the installation excess to the requirements of the Department of Defense for disposal through GSA. A condition imposed on disposal of the off-base Communications Facility Annex is that the Air Force continue to use that facility until the Regional Operations Control Center programmed for Griffiss Air Force Base, New York is activated in late 1982. The Report of Excess will contain the proviso that the net proceeds from sale of the family housing will accrue to the Family Housing Management Account, Defense. The Air Force does not contemplate acquiring any property at or near this location in the foreseeable future. It is certified that the property is not suitable for exchange for other real property authorized to be acquired for military purposes.

5. This disposal has been approved by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics).

[From Newsday, Feb. 14, 1984]

REJECT THE BID FOR FEDERAL LAND AT MONTAUK

The Reagan administration's decision to sell 278 acres of surplus federal land at Montauk was wrong from the beginning—and now that the sale has been held, it's clear that the price was wrong, too. The highest bid was $1.3 million lower than the administration's $3.25-million estimate of the property's fair market value.

The acreage, surrounded on three sides by Montauk State Park, is ill suited for development, and it's now zoned only for park use. It contains valuable fresh-water marshland, has little groundwater, and its soil is heavy with clay, making wastewater disposal difficult.

The General Services Administration should reject the bid and begin negotiations with New York State to exchange the Montauk property for 125 acres of state-owned land within the federally owned Fire Island National Seashore.

The GAS went ahead with the sale despite the opposition of Interior Secretary William Clark and the intervention of U.S. District Judge Leonard Wexler, who ruled the day before the auction that if the sale proceeded, no title transfer could take place until a hearing had been held. That hearing has yet to be scheduled.

GSA Administrator Gerald Carmen has the power to refuse the $1.9-million bid. "If the government were going to buy 125 acres on Fire Island, $1.9 million would be a down payment," said Rep. William Carney (C-Hauppauge). "I will suggest very strongly to Carmen that he aggressively pursue swapping that land."

That's good advice; for everyone's sake, Carmen should heed it.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by myself and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from my State. This amendment is identical to legislation we offered last week. It would transfer jurisdiction over an old Air Force base at Montauk on Long Island, N.Y., from the General Services Administration to New York State for use as a park and simultaneously, it would transfer a park at Fire Island currently administered by the State, to the Department of the Interior. This is a fair and even swap of State land for Federal land.

I believe that Senator MOYNIHAN and I have fashioned a very reasonable compromise in this matter. The General Services Administration had opposed our earlier efforts in this area which would have transferred the Federal land to New York State without any compensation to the Federal Government except, of course, for the knowledge that the land was being put to its optimal use.

Our current proposal, however, will transfer to the Federal Government land that, by all accounts, is worth more than the land for which it is being exchanged. In fact, the Department of the Interior is eager to acquire the Fire Island parcel and has gone on record in support of that acquisition.

The parcel of land at the abandoned Air Force base has been the subject of lengthy negotiations between the local government and various local citizens groups and the GSA. These negotiations have bogged down, however, because the town government did not believe that any portion of the parcel should be used for private development.

The town and State subsequently initiated a lawsuit to prevent the sale of the land. That suit is currently being held in abeyance while the GSA prepares an environmental impact assessment.

As these negotiations have progressed, however, the Department of the Interior also has become interested in the land: The State of New York had filed a request with them to have the land considered as a suitable site for a park. Mr. President, I think it is especially worth noting that the Interior Department issued a press release last Thursday stating that the GSA ought to accede to the request of State and local officials and make the area a park.

I believe that this history clearly demonstrates that, but for a few bureaucrats, everyone involved with this problem believes that the area is most suitable for park usage. It is for that reason that Senator MOYNIHAN and I are urging that this amendment be accepted. I urge my colleagues to support us in this endeavor.

Mr. President, I am delighted to have had the opportunity to work with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, in bringing about this magnificent result. I commend the senior Senator for his perspicacity and for his interest in preserving the delicate balance of fragile lands on Long Island. And also to make available and keep open to future generations this magnificent park and recreational area.

Indeed, this is a reasonable compromise which will add to the parklands of both New York State and the Federal Government. These precious resources on Montauk Point can never be replaced.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I emphasize that this is a matter that my distinguished colleague and I were together on from the beginning and I am happy to state the Federal Government, except for one small portion, has been working together on from the beginning.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we have had an opportunity to review the Moynihan-D'Amato amendment. Obviously it is not exactly the kind of amendment that belongs on this budget bill that is here, but we have been convinced that it is the right thing to do and that it will be helpful to the Senators and the State of New York.

As a consequence, we have no objection on this side. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Florida on the minority side has reviewed it and has no objection. With that, I join in the motion that we approve the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN).

The amendment (No. 3042) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. D'AMATO. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3041

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. My understanding now is that the Senate returns to the Hollings amendment, the Hollings-Andrews amendment. Is the Senator correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, the Senate returns to the Hollings amendment. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. He has made an informative statement about the conditions we have worked ourselves into. He gives us a sense of hope, and a sense of purpose. But as Senator STENNIS has stated, there is going to have to be a sobering up, a stopping, looking, and listening by us as a body to get hold of ourselves and control these runaway deficits so that we can give hope to the next generation.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska, as a former Governor, has been giving real leadership through-

out on our Budget Committee at every particular turn to try to hold these deficits down, and practice fiscal responsibility at the Federal level, which he did as a Governor at the State level. He understands, and knows it better than anyone I know of in this particular Chamber. We yield to him as a cosponsor. I am really following his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). Who yields time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield such time as necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair. I thank my friend and colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I hope that every Member of this body, before we vote on the matter before us, will take time to stop by and take a look at the charts that are on display here. They are very self-explanatory. It is clear that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, cosponsored by myself and the Senator from North Dakota, is the only—I emphasize the word "only"—proposition that is before this body that really does anything about deficits. I simply say that all of the figures on this chart are CBO figures.

Oftentimes in this body, we try to compare apples with oranges and oranges with apples. These are factual figures. We have bitten the bullet. We are recognizing the fact that this country is not going to be able to go on with $200 billion deficits, plus or minus $10 billion or so, forever without doing something about it.

I simply say that the President's Rose Garden approach is not a downpayment on the deficit, as has been loudly proclaimed in the press; in fact, it is not even a bandaid. It clearly shows that, even the Rose Garden approach of the President, which I understand is very near obtaining half of the votes in this Chamber, according to the CBO will not—I emphasize the word "not"—reduce the budget deficit at the end of 3 years.

When we talk about these propositions, we should emphasize not only what again is the deficit in its amount, but also what happens to the budget deficit at the end of each year. It does not just go away, as you know, Mr. President; it is transferred at the end of each year over to the national debt. At the end of this fiscal year, we shall find that the national debt has nearly doubled in the last 4 years. I cite that only as a reference point. Most of the discussions that will take place here today, I suspect, will be on the deficit, where the annual deficit will be at the end of a certain period of time.

Mr. President, this is not a time to find fault; this is a time to seek remedy to the catastrophic situation that faces the economy of this country. Somebody out home last week said to me that the real problem is that too many people in the United States do not realize the difference between a $20 billion deficit and $200 billion deficit. It is about time—and, hopefully, the discussions on this and other proposals to be offered will rivet home the necessity for change in the direction this country has been moving in with regard to irresponsible spending programs.

Supposedly, in some sections of the economy in the United States today, we are seeing an economic recovery. You can pick up any newspaper, you can hear it in every newscast. I can tell the Senate that the economic recovery has passed by completely one of the basic sectors of our economy. That is agriculture. Never since the great days of the 1930 Depression have we seen a time when agriculture is in the difficult situation it is in now.

This economic recovery that supposedly is going on has been caused, in the opinion of this Senator, by Keynesian economics running completely wild, Keynesian economics that have been attacked by certain conservative groups in this country from its very inception, yet those same conservative economic groups are saying today, "We are all for Keynesian economics; it is a wonderful, great thing." It has been embraced by some of the conservative Members.

I do not know whether the Senator from Nebraska is a conservative or moderate—I am not a liberal—but I certainly have a record in my home life, in my business, and in my entire career in public service as being one who always balanced the budget when I had control. I have not had control, obviously since I came to the U.S. Senate, or things would be run a lot differently than they have been.

I simply say in this regard, Mr. President, that for the last 3 years, each and every year, this Senator has joined with others on this floor in sounding the alarm for the difficulties that were obvious to anyone who wanted to take a look at the facts. But we were shunted aside and Keynesian economics has continued to run wild.

There are three reasons, Mr. President, in my opinion, for the economic recovery that is not going on in some sectors for our economy—three reasons.

First, history shows us that whenever we have been on a wartime footing economy, the good times have rolled. Does anyone question that we are not on a wartime economic footing today? That is one reason.

Second, we always let the good times roll when we have massive tax cuts. There cannot be any question that we have had massive, huge tax cuts, titled toward the wrong segment of our society, in the opinion of this Senator, to the more wealthy in this country. But certainly the good times have rolled partially because of the tax cuts and the infusion of that money into the economy.

Third, if you look back through history, you will see that the good times have always rolled when we had massive deficits—the Federal Government spending but not paying for it, not balancing income with outgo. And the good times have always rolled in the past when that has happened. I simply put out that never before in history have we had a situation such as we have had in the last 3 years, where little, if any, attention has been paid to these massive deficits. Never before in our history have we begun to match the deficits that we have piled up in the last 3 years, and never before in our history have we amassed the huge national debt that we have amassed in the last 3 years.

Mr. President, 4 short years ago, in 1980, the Federal budget deficit was projected to be under $200 billion. My friend from South Carolina and I, with other Members on the floor, are members of the Budget Committee. Ed Muskie was chairman of the committee at that time. I remember well when he was pointing across that room late one evening and said, "If we just work a little harder now, we can balance this budget, because we are only $19 billion to $20 billion away."

Where are we today? Over $200 billion.

I recall the great efforts expended by the Senate Budget Committee, aimed at whittling down that deficit so our committee could submit a balanced Federal budget to this floor. Today, deficits are projected to be near $200 billion for many, many years to come. In my mind, the projected deficit is 10 times as large as it was in 1980. It is at least worthy of 10 times the effort to eliminate it. Instead, the steady stream of $200 billion deficits is treated with a shocking lack of action.

Between the end of World War II and the beginning of this administration, deficits as a percentage of our gross national product never exceeded 4 percent. In 1983 the deficit was 6.1 percent of GNP and is expected to remain in the 4- to 5-percent range through the end of the decade.

The accumulated national debt has nearly doubled from $791 billion in 1981 to over $1.4 trillion today. By the end of 1986, it is expected to top the $2 trillion mark.

As yearly deficits add to the debt, the proportion of Federal resources devoted to interest expense necessarily increases. Interest expense is the fastest growing part of the Federal budget. In 1971 it comprised 7 percent of total outlays. In fiscal year 1985 it is at 13 percent and by 1987 it is expected to devour a full 15 percent of the budget.

This year's deficit alone will make next year's budget $20 billion more expensive than the previous year; $20 billion could fund the entire medicaid program. Increased interest costs since 1981 have more than offset the savings from cuts in social programs, many of them very painful.

The Federal Government's enormous appetite for credit has kept interest rates much higher than they need to be. Real interest rates, the difference between the nominal interest rate and inflation, is at record high levels. Historically, the gap between interest rates and inflation was less than 2 percent. In 1983 it was an astounding 7 percent.

In turn, the high real rates of interest attract foreign capital to this country like a magnet, pushing the value of the dollar to record levels. While a super-strong dollar is great for American tourists abroad, it is devastating for export-sensitive industries such as agriculture. Last year produced a record $69 billion balance of trade deficit, and there is relief in sight. Ambassador Brock, the U.S. Trade Representative, has estimated that figure to increase to $100 billion at the end of this year. The Department of Commerce estimates that the 17-percent decrease in exports from 1981 to 1983 cost American workers 1.3 million jobs.

A few of us have recognized the evils of deficit financing for quite some time. The record shows that we did not just preach, but we offered serious legislation to courageously attack the problem. Mr. President, I can assure you that this Senator is no "born-again deficit cutter." As a small businessman in Lincoln, Nebr., I learned that income must match expenditures or financial disaster will result.

As Governor of the State of Nebraska, I learned how difficult it can be for the executive and legislative branches to work together to produce a balanced budget as required by our State constitution, and it required a great deal of effort, but, Mr. President, in each and every year it was done. And we can do it here if we have the courage.

As a U.S. Senator for over 5 years, my greatest disappointment has been the Federal Government's inability to bring its budget under control.

The very President who once said he would "fight to the last blow to balance the budget by 1984" recommended a budget in February with $200 billion deficits for each of the next 5 years. Despite calls for a constitutional balanced budget amendment, which I support, this is the first administration not to attempt to balance the budget within its 5-year plan.

In the past 2 years, I have come to this floor to support alternative budgets which take an across-the-board approach to deficit reduction. Today Senators HOLLINGS, ANDREWS, and I offer a comprehensive across-the-board plan to put the Federal budget on an accelerated glide path toward balance. This bipartisan freeze is a good plan which makes serious but achievable deficit reductions. It is a plan which actually balances the budget using sound and realistic economic assumptions as prepared by the CBO.

Mr. President, I cite once again the blue line on the end which shows deficits plunging from the $200 billion range down to $26 billion in 5 years, and I say that there is no other plan that would even come close to doing anything like that.

This package concentrates primarily on spending cuts, saving $450 billion in spending over 5 years. Because the revenue portion of this package is significantly less than the spending cuts, the plan guarantees that increased revenues go toward deficit reduction rather than new spending. It is also a plan which controls entitlement program growth and allows an acceptable level of growth in necessary defense expenditures.

This $800 billion deficit reduction package over 5 years gives the Senate its only real opportunity to make the meaningful deficit reductions which will send a strong signal to the financial markets to reduce interest rates and will spur long-term economic recovery. We can hope for no improvement in interest or exchange rates unless we attack the deficit.

The country is bobbing up and down in a sea of red ink. Whether our economy drowns or swims to safety, depends on what we do now. To wait until after the national elections to make serious deficit reduction is not only an example of cowardice, it shows callous disregard for the economic well-being of the very people who sent us here to represent them.

It is time to stop nibbling away at these corrosive deficits and, instead, take a large bite out of them. Only a comprehensive, long-term budget plan like that being presented now can do the job. I urge the Senate in the strongest possible terms to vote for the Hollings-Andrews-Exon plan to restore our Nation to fiscal sanity.

Mr. President, I would like to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks letters that I have received from the National Association of Realtors and the National Association of Home Builders which address and support the plan that I have just outlined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, these two organizations represent highly sensitive, interest-sensitive, industries. They have extensive research analysts who look at the different proposals that come out. The proposal now before us is the only one that these and many other organizations and individuals are supporting.

So I simply say that before the vote is taken on this proposal about 5:30 today, I hope my colleagues will look at the proposal, understand it, and be prepared to support the matter before us.

I yield back to my friend from South Carolina.

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1984.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the 120,000 members of the National Association of Home Builders, I am writing to urge rapid action on a deficit reduction package. After reviewing a variety of options which have been presented, we would support the bipartisan "freeze" proposal sponsored by Senator Hollings, Senator Andrews and Senator Exon. We believe that a one-year freeze on all domestic discretionary and entitlement program increases represents the fairest way of spreading the burden across-the-board. Similarly, the 3% rate of growth in defense spending represents a reasonable attempt to hold down spending without crippling our national security.

We would urge that the increased revenue portion of the plan similarly focus on broad-based, across-the-board "shared sacrifice" as opposed to the Finance Committee's approach which takes at least 20% of the increased revenue from the real estate sector of the economy.

We are deeply concerned about recent increases in interest rates which threaten the continuation of economic recovery. We are pleased to see various alternative budget proposals which offer greater deficit reduction than the three-year $150 billion "down-payment." And we share the view of Senator Chiles that such competition can lead to "a bidding war to see who can cut the deficit the most."

We urge you to act responsibly to reduce the deficit substantially in FY '85. We support an approach which is fair, across-the-board and represents the spirit of "shared sacrifice" in the Hollings-Andrews-Exon plan. We believe that this is the only plan which has been proposed which would provide for a budget near balance in five years.

A budget reduction package of $285 billion over three years and $800 billion over five years is politically attainable . . . and makes good common sense. We cannot wait until next year to take such a step in order to keep the economic recovery on track.

Get on with the "competition"—the American people . . . and the American homebuyer will be the real beneficiaries.

Sincerely,

PETER D. HERDER,
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1984.

Hon. J. JAMES EXON,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EXON: The National Association of Realtors is extremely concerned about the threat to continued economic growth in housing and the entire economy imposed by the continued enormous deficits. We continue to urge significant deficit reduction now through spending reductions in all categories: defense growth should be

held to the 5% real growth level agreed upon by Congress last year; real domestic discretionary spending should be frozen; and the rapid growth of entitlements should be slowed. Any tax increases necessary to help lower the deficit toward balance should not discourage savings and investment.

We offer support for the deficit reduction plan you are sponsoring since it calls for across the board spending reductions. Of all proposals being offered it is the only one which promise to bring the budget to a near balance by 1989. This result would be a dramatic improvement over the $326 billion deficit now being predicted for 1989.

We are concerned, however, that the plan encompasses the tax increases included in the Finance Committee bill and calls for an additional $50.9 billion to be recommended by the Finance Committee. We urge you to oppose tax changes which discourage savings and investment. Some provisions of the Finance Committee bill, if put in law, such as increases in the cost recovery by 33% from 15 to 20 years would effectively reduce the growth of jobs and family income. Moreover, the rollback of ACRS for rental residences and commercial structures proposed by the Finance Committee bill asks housing and real estate alone to bear 25% of the total tax bill, twenty-five times greater than the burden on all industries.

Requiring the Finance Committee to report $50.9 billion additional tax increases could have the effect of putting housing or other investment in greater jeopardy unless you make clear your intention to encourage savings and investment.

To suggest, as I have in this letter, that your proposal contains flaws is not to damn it with faint praise. We understand that your support of the Dole package is based on a support of the aggregate number only, a position we too support, and that you, as well as we might oppose components within the Finance bill. We are merely trying to point out, as we have consistently done throughout the deficit debates of the last five years, that there are two basic ways to provide jobs and economic growth:

(1) Through the stimulation provided by new, excessive government expenditures and deficits;

(2) By providing the private sector with sufficient incentives to save and invest in the capacity to grow on a more long-term and stable basis—clearly this approach is preferable.

With that understanding, the National Association of Realtors supports your effort to reduce deficits.

It is in the national interest that a significant deficit reduction plan be adopted now. Interest rates are already rising—we cannot wait.

Sincerely,

DONALD H. TREADWELL,
President.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) wants to be heard on this matter, and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) wishes to speak at 4 o'clock.

While we are waiting, I say to the Senator from Nebraska that I think there has to be a way to get attention. The Senator has done a splendid job.

I do not want to insult anybody. I have tried some harsh language. The word "deficit" is an accounting term. All of us suffer from deficits in our families and personal accounts, so we do not become alarmed by it.

I reiterate that the deficits from the end of World War II, 1947, until 1980, a 33-year period, were only $464.5 billion; and the deficits for the 3-year period 1982, 1983, and 1984, the 3 years my friends on the other side of the aisle have been in charge of Congress, were $495 billion.

So I refer to the profligacy of this Congress and the one before it—wild extravagance. I had to get a better word. We may get out of their chairs some people who are listening on their radios, and maybe they will come to the floor and defend themselves. According to Webster, the definition of "profligacy" is "completely given up to dissipation and licentiousness." That is Congress—"completely given up to dissipation and licentiousness." That is far better than the word "deficit." "Deficit" just does not get anybody's attention. I have tried for 2 years on the highways and byways, and you see where I am. I am back here.

I hope the distinguished chairman of our Budget Committee can tell us the wisdom of the Rose Garden strategy for about 10 minutes of his time, while we are waiting for Senator TSONGAS and Senator BUMPERS.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will be pleased to use 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I want to hear the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, because this will be the best act off Broadway this year. I know how he feels. I know how responsible he is and how he has to carry this one. It ought to be very interesting, so I am going to watch.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to my good friend that he described it as the best act off Broadway. I want him to know that there is no way I can follow him, so I do not know what I can call his remarks. I have no name to describe it in terms of his eloquence.

I would prefer at this time to take a few minutes to describe the Hollings-Andrews-Exon plan. We have a KGB. This one is the HAE plan.

First, I should like to suggest a couple of things about it. Very simply, it is said that this really reduces deficits significantly. There is no doubt about it. How could it help but do that? It raises $87 billion more in taxes than any other proposal around. It freezes indexing, and then still needs more money. It does not provide those additional taxes, so it says to the Finance Committee: "You find the other $20 billion or $30 billion. We don't know how you're going to do that."

That is easy, I say to my friend, for whom I have the greatest respect. You reduce the deficits nicely when you increase taxes $87 billion more than that we just passed, after a week's debate, which the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate took months to do.

So there is part of it: $87 billion more in taxes. I am not saying that is good or bad. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina has his views, and I have mine. I do not think we should do that at this particular time, No. 1.

Second, I do not think it is going to happen, under any circumstance, at this particular time. But there may be people who want to vote for it, nonetheless, because we would like to reduce the deficits, and there is one nice way, and that is $87 billion worth of it. There are no easy ways to do that.

I recall very well about 3 years ago when we in the Budget Committee said that social security is almost broke, just about bankrupt. The two Senators who have spoken so eloquently were there in our Budget Committee. I recall that neither supported the budget resolution that said we had better fix social security. We said it is $40 billion insolvent. We reported a budget resolution that required $40 billion worth of solvency over 3 years.

It did not take 30 minutes for the people of the United States to be informed that the Republicans in the Senate Budget Committee were cutting social security $40 billion.

Do you know what else happened? It was said that there are 36 million of elderly folks in this country; they then added up the savings and divided it by the number of elderly, and concluded, "You are cutting the social security fund, and the number is $1,110.00 over three years." It did not take 25 minutes for that to go out across this land—cutting social security.

Let me tell you an interesting thing. We were right. That fund was $40 billion insolvent, because 18 to 20 months later, a bipartisan commission fixed social security, and they did not cut anybody. They deferred COLA's for 6 months. They found that it was $38.3 billion worth of insolvency. We were pretty close to being right.

They fixed it in this very excellent bipartisan commission and said, "We are taxing people some more, and all the money is going into social security and it is taken care of." They did that, and we voted for it. I guess it was the third major reform in the history of social security.

So that everyone will know, using the same logic and the same approach, this proposal will cut social security, after all the things we just did. We attempted to reform it, and I thought we did reform it. According to what I

understand, nobody wants to balance the budget on social security or on social security recipients. This proposal will cut social security over what we just fixed in that reform, so that the average retired couple will lose $1,848 in benefits. The average disabled worker with a family will lose $2,100 in benefits.

That is all in social security.

I remind the Senate, though, that if we are interested in Federal retirees—I notice the Senator from Nebraska is on his feet. I am going to speak for another 10 or 12 minutes. I have been listening attentively, and the Senator from Nebraska will have an opportunity to respond.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. DOMENICI. I wish to finish.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. DOMENICI. I will just finish mine and then I will yield in maybe 5 minutes.

I shall move over to the Federal retirees and leave social security for a minute. As to Federal retirees, there are $2,976 in benefits lost and military retirees loose $2,472 compared to the current law.

I do not state those because I wish to say this plan is something we should not under any circumstance ever consider. I have too much respect for both Senators who have spoken and others who support it.

But I do suggest that everyone should know that we are not talking about a vague budget resolution with tentative targets that may or may not be complied with by committees later on.

This is a bill. We intend that this go to the House of Representatives in conference, and what is done here is to literally change the social security and retirement laws of the Nation so that the recipients are reduced in terms of their entitlement. And I think that is a fair way to say it, that they are reduced in terms of their entitlement by the amounts that I have stated.

Now I really am not going to talk a great deal more. I hope everyone understands that the $87 billion in taxes plus a 1-year freeze on the entitlements that pay people's pensions, social security, disability, plus 2 years thereafter at a special COLA level when we add that up, we sure reduce the deficits. If that is what the Senate wishes to do here today, in a substantive law, not a budget resolution, then I want them all to understand that is what we are doing.

There are some other aspects to it. Defense is reduced somewhat over the leadership package, but clearly not in a freeze manner.

The Senator from South Carolina and I started too far back on defense to say that we can freeze it and it will not hurt anything because we are the ones, if I recall, that said before President Carter went out that we are going to raise defense and we are going to do it, and we will put it on a 5-percent growth trend line. In fact, I say to my friend, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) I told President Carter a number of times when we talked about the budget in the outyears on defense, he was pretty low. Go back and look at it. We made them raise defense a real 5 percent even when we had the 11-percent inflation. We made them raise it 16 percent at one point. We were afraid that America was in serious risk of military preparedness, and this was a number that permitted it to grow substantially as it must.

We cannot start weapons systems in this country because we are ready to compete and provide this country and the world with deterrence and peace and just turn that off and on like a water faucet. I mean, we start eight or nine new systems and say let us freeze it. While we freeze half, finish some, with the buys done 2 years out of 10, and people will say it is not going to cut anything; we are just going to freeze military.

This does not do that. I am going to say that in all honestly it provides a significant increase, slightly less than the leadership package, but in that regard certainly livable.

With reference to the appropriated accounts, it is not as stringent as the leadership package but clearly evidences the kind of fiscal responsibility that we are going to have to exercise around here if we are going to get where we have to go.

Now having said that, I wish to repeat that I think the Senate should know precisely what is in a package. If anyone needs more detail on the taxes, I think Senators who are involved in this particular plan can give it to them.

I suggest, however, that clearly it does away with indexing for 3 years and it says we do not know where the other money is going to come from but we want the Finance Committee to change the tax laws to raise additional revenue, and I do not have any argument with that, except that is normally the way we do it in a reconciliation and not a substantive bill.

But they are not trying to hide the fact that there is $87 billion more than is provided in the Baker leadership plan over the next 3 years. There is something in it that I am a little concerned about. There is some withholding requirements on independent contractors and royalty recipients, and I do not really know the extent of it, but I would just say we went through a huge debate here on further withholding, and I guess we had to do away with that tax on withholding because of the public pressure on the banks withholding and dividend withholding.

I do not know that portion in this amendment with regard to independent contractors and royalty recipients, whether that would be the kind of thing that would be considered to be harmful as the previous dividend withholding requirement was assumed to be.

That is about all I have to say to the Senate. We have substantial time, if any Senator wishes to address this issue in any regard. I do say to my good friends, and they are my good friends, on the other side, I have no way of explaining things that I feel strongly about other than as best I can and in my typical manner, and I surely did not intend anything other than a straightforward explanation, and if they do not want me to call those COLA changes cuts, I will do whatever they like. I will say a reduction in entitlements, however they wish me to say it. But clearly I think the numbers that I have given are the result and will result if this plan were adopted.

How much time did the Senator from New Mexico use?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 13 minutes and has 47 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS and Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my friend from South Carolina.

I wish to say I tried to save time to interrupt my friend from New Mexico. He misinterpreted my standing. I stood so that I could hear his words of wisdom a little bit clearer. I was not at all upset with what he had to say. I never, ever get upset with what my friend from that great State down south has to say.

So if he thought that I was objecting to what he said, I wish him to stand corrected.

Mr. President, I listened to the chairman of the committee very closely, and I first wish to tell him that whatever he had to say about a $40 billion reduction in social security that was not said by this Senator, and I hope he knows that. I would have thought maybe people who did not know the background who might be reading this or sitting up in the gallery might have thought that this Senator went out and said that. He did not.

I think the chairman of the Budget Committee knows that while he and I do not always agree, I do not know of a case where he has ever taken advantage of me politically or that I have ever taken advantage of him, but I

simply wish to say and hope that the Senator from New Mexico will agree that, whatever he had to say about what certain people did, did not include the Senator from Nebraska.

Is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct. It was not he who construed the reform required to make social security solvent as a cut. It was other Senators. The record is clear. But it was not the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from New Mexico for that.

I simply point out that if the Senator fron New Mexico was complaining about certain statements that were made then, that he thought were inappropriate, then it might be fair to say that in the statements that he just said on the floor with regard to the plan offered by the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from North Dakota and myself, he criticized those I think in basically the same vein and fashion, but then I understand politics. I have been in it a long time also.

I simply wish to say, Mr. President, that we got out of the social security difficulty by not only freezing some COLA's, but we also got out of that problem by significant tax increases.

I simply say that I hope that sooner or later people who claim to be conservative leaders on both sides of that aisle will stand up and tell the people that we have to have a combination of tax increases and spending cuts, a combination of the two if we are ever going to do anything about this deficit.

In fact, no less authority than the Director of the Office of Management and Budget testified in public to the Budget Committee this year that the U.S. Government was in effect in chapter 11 bankruptcy. And if the Federal Government is in chapter 11 bankruptcy, then I think it is time that we have the courage to face up and do something about it.

I think, though, the point that the chairman of the Budget Committee makes is probably a good one. If you will look at all of the other plans, including the rose garden plan that the chairman of the Budget Committee is supporting, I think he would concede and he would agree that according to the nonpartisan, nonpolitical Congressional Budget Office, there is none of those plans that makes any reduction at all or any significant reduction in the budget at the end of 3 years except the plan before us.

So I simply say that what we are trying to do is not take the easy way out, not to fool the American public that this is going to be done without sacrifices on the part of all. And it has been my experience with Nebraskans, who have their heads screwed on right, that they are all willing to make some sacrifices so long as it is fair and equitable.

I would simply emphasize that the plan before us cuts spending in billions of dollars, considerably more than it increases revenue.

I yield back to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank my distinguished colleague. I yield now to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I am at the same basic level with the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Nebraska, I think I am ready to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. President, the deficit is the No. 1 economic problem this country faces today. It is the chief culprit in the untypically high interest rates that we have been experiencing and it threatens to crowd the private sector out of financial markets, thereby undermining future economic growth and prosperity. If Washington does not take the deficit seriously, Wall Street does. Financial markets have been unstable and nervous since the beginning of the year, waiting to see what we in Washington will do.

In many ways, the deficit is a king pin, which, if knocked down, would take many problems with it. Reducing the deficit would certainly result in lower interest rates which in turn would favorably affect the exchange rate and with it our trade deficit. At home, lower interest rates would encourage the capital investment that we need to modernize our plants and equipment and realize the productivity gains necessary to improve our competitiveness at home and abroad.

I think the time to act has now come. We were elected to represent our constituents. Mine are telling me to reduce the deficit. We were also elected to serve the Nation as a whole. It is time to take these responsibilities seriously. The Nation, the economy will best be served today and in future years by a serious effort to cut the red ink.

That is why I support the bipartisan budget offered by Senators EXON, ANDREWS, and HOLLINGS. According to CBO estimates, the package will reduce the deficit by $268 billion over the next 3 years. That is nearly three times the reduction offered by the administration as a "downpayment." The time for downpayments is past. We need to pay off some of the principal as well.

Our plan is a fair one—it would affect virtually all sectors and programs equitably and responsibly. It freezes all social and entitlement spending programs for the next year, with the exception of those social programs targeted for the most needy of our society—SSI, food stamps, health care, and veterans—which would be allowed to expand to the extent that the number of eligible clients increased. I believe this is a necessary and important feature particularly because of the rapid increase we have experienced in the past 3 years in the number of families in poverty.

The plan also takes a responsible approach to defense. It provides a 4-percent real rate of increase over the next 2 years and 3 percent thereafter for the rest of the decade. These increases are high enough to maintain combat readiness and continue modernization of our forces. In fact, given the huge increases for defense already in place, the DOD budget will have grown at an average annual rate of 6 percent in real terms throughout the 1980's. All together, our plan cuts spending by $425 billion over the next 5 years.

On the revenue front, substantial gains are realized by postponing for 5 years the tax bracket indexation. I have long been opposed to this indexation policy because I would rather see Congress correct the problem of bracket creep due to inflation through legislative action rather than an automatic formula. Most importantly, this allows a greater degree of flexibility for coping with difficult economic circumstances. The postponement of indexation, together with the Senate tax bill passed last month would raise total revenues by about $350 billion over the next 5 years. In total, our plan would cut the deficit by two-thirds over that period and by 1989, instead of facing triple-digit budget shortfalls, the annual deficit would have fallen to $16 billion.

Mr. President, the budget deficit is a clear and present danger. It is undermining the health of our economy and the credibility of all of us as elected leaders. Let us accept our responsibility and make this bipartisan budget our choice in dealing with the deficit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Michael K. Evans in the March 19, 1984, issue of Industry Week be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CROWDING OUT" ISN'T FAR DOWN THE ROAD

(By Michael K. Evans)

The term "crowding out" has become somewhat overused in recent economic discussion. It refers to the situation in which an increase in interest rates—caused either by excessive borrowing or insufficient saving—causes business investment (as a percent of gross national product) to decline.

Normally, the capital-spending ratio bottoms out in the first year of recovery and then begins to rise again. Either interest rates fall by then and/or profits, stock prices, and capacity utilization rise.

The ensuing investment boom is then financed—for a while—by an increase in corporate savings and a reduction in the federal government deficit, which by its nature is—or at least used to be—countercyclical.

But once government spending begins to catch up with the increase in tax receipts, the competition for funds intensifies and interest rates begin to rise again until they tend to reduce capital spending, housing, and inventory investment.

Yet, for some reason, there are some economists who still believe that these basic suppositions (supported by historical data, see graph) can be suspended during this business cycle and that interest rates will somehow fall in an apparent denial of the laws of supply and demand.

If anything, rates ought to *rise* more rapidly in this cycle because of two unusual factors. First, the government deficit will not decline very much as a proportion of GNP, certainly much less than normal for the later stages of a business cycle. There are several reasons for this. First, personal-income tax rates will be indexed, starting in 1985. Second, defense spending continues to rise more rapidly than usual. Third, all the cuts that can be made in social-welfare programs have already been accomplished. Fourth, interest payments are growing so rapidly that they are more than wiping out any modest cutbacks in social-welfare programs. Fifth, the tax base is eroding faster than ever because most middle-class taxpayers have now been pushed into the 40% to 50% marginal tax bracket. Yet, in spite of these reasons, we hear nonsensical talk that the budget-deficit ratio will shrink sharply in the next few years.

The other unusual factor is the projection of net foreign investment, which is more or less the inverse of the net export deficit. Generally speaking, our net exports are quite strong during a recession—since the U.S. economy is usually more depressed than the rest of the world—but then they decline as the recovery moves into high gear. The reduction in net exports translates into more dollars coming to our shores, which to a certain extent ameliorates the credit crunch. However, this time the trade figures are starting off from a horrendous deficit, and with the weakening of the dollar imminent, the trade deficit will bottom out at its current rate of about $100 billion and then will improve only slightly in 1985 and 1986. Hence, foreign money will be fleeing our shores.

The total investment ratio this year is expected to be about 14.5%, which is about 2.5 percentage points below normal for this stage of the business cycle. However, 1.5 points of that gap have been temporarily closed by the influx of foreign funds. The remaining shortfall is split about evenly between capital spending and a rather modest level of 1.75 million housing starts expected for the year. Hence, crowding out is already in evidence and will become much worse when foreign investment declines. But how far will interest rates have to rise to clear the market?

It probably takes about a 2-point increase in the long-term bond rate to reduce the investment ratio by 1 point. If this is the case, then the 2-point decline in this ratio we have predicted by the time of the 1987 recession would be caused by long-term interest rates increasing about 4 points from their present levels to their peak sometime in 1986. Thus will crowding out return with a vengeance.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, this is an interesting situation we find ourselves in because it seems like there are two worlds that we live in, one the world of politics. And I am struck by how much of the discussion that takes place is a concern for interest groups. Somehow the impression is given that, if the economy goes to hell in a hand basket, particular interest groups will somehow not be affected. That not only violates any sense of rationality but, if you think of it in nautical terms, if you have got a hole in the floor of a boat, the idea that anybody is not going to get wet just simply defies logic.

I was at a conference 2 months ago in Europe. And the Europeans are very concerned about the United States because if our economy slips back into a recession, they are going to be affected by that as well.

Their comments basically were along the lines of the following: That we have so much going for us in terms of natural resources, in terms of the education base, the high technology sweep that we see in my State and others, and why is that the only thing we lack is leadership on the deficit?

Now, part of that, of course, was addressed to the President. You remember the President's comments about balancing the budget in 1982 but certainly by 1983. Well, history will write the legacy of Ronald Reagan as the deficit. And if I were Ronald Reagan I would be terrified by what historians are going to say. Historians do not spend their time watching candidates on television. They have the lamentable procedures of reading the record. And the record of Ronald Reagan on deficits is worse than anyone could have presumed.

If I had taken my colleagues back to 1972 and I said I am going to ask you a question and I am going to give you two pieces of information. Piece No. 1: In 1984, we will have deficits that approach, and will exceed over time, $200 billion a year. That is information No.1. Information No. 2: You will have a Secretary of the Treasury who will say there is no linkage between high deficits and high interest rates.

Those are the only two things I will tell you. Question: Who is the President? George McGovern or Ronald Reagan?

No one in 1972 would have said Ronald Reagan. If you said that they would have tied you up and carried you off. It was inconceivable that this person could give us these kind of deficits. And yet, in fact, that has happend.

We are not going to get any leadership from the White House. So the question is: Is there another place in the Government of the United States where there is leadership? And it seems to me rather obvious that Senators HOLLINGS, EXON, and ANDREWS have demonstrated indeed there is. The question is now one of, will we follow?

The Europeans, in their comments in talking about leadership and courage, had a rather curious reflection upon where America has come. The sacrifice that we have been through to be the Nation that we are and here we are talking about deficits that threaten our economy and we are caught, and we are caught in inaction.

What we are talking about on the Senate floor is a downpayment. It would be curious to go back and look at all our campaign literature about leadership. You know the old expression, "Tell me where my people are going so I can lead them."

Well, in terms of the long-term survivability and health of our economy, we only have to do one thing and that is deal with the deficit. There are other issues, obviously, that are important but they are secondary in my mind to this issue.

What is so difficult about supporting the amendment offered by my three colleagues? First of all, it is the most dramatic in terms of the impact on the deficit. Those people who want more defense, you have 3 percent real growth in there. There is some sensitivity to the social programs. But overall it deals with the deficit. Now what is so difficult about that? I do not, frankly, think it is.

And somehow the idea that one is vulnerable if you vote for this, I would just suggest the vulnerability is on the other side. To have run for the Senate and to be here and to, in essence, walk away from some very tough votes that are in the national interest, I do not think is good politics. And I think that could be sold.

The final point I would make is that I intend to support, as well, the bipartisan freeze that Senators KASSEBAUM, BIDEN, BAUCUS, and GRASSLEY have introducted. Part of, I must say, my support of these two is somewhat selfish; that I am not going to be a Senator next year and I am going to be out in the private sector; that I do not have a Government salary that I can depend on. So if the economy goes into a decline, I will be one of those people out there who will be affected by it. So I have learned, since I decided to retire in the last 3 months, something about the frustration of those out in the private sector who look to us to do something as we sit here twiddling our thumbs.

The final comment I would make is this. Part of the reason that I think the Democratic Party is in trouble in this country—and I have been saying this for a number of years now—is that fundamentally the Democratic Party is very good on issues of justice, social justice, that kind of thing, and very good on the issues of war and peace. When those are the issues before the country, Democrats generally prevail. The weakness that we have is that we, as Democrats, have never convinced the country we know how to run the economy; that Demo-

cats are viewed as people who care less about how well the economy is doing and spend all of their time worrying about how you distribute the golden eggs. The goose's health is irrelevant. There is somehow some kind of tooth-fairy view that the economy will do well no matter what happens. And there is a basic disrespect for Democrats.

You know, the funny thing about it is, we deserve it, because it is true.

When I was on the House side, I remembered that the late Bill Steigers had an amendment that dealt with the capital gains tax, reducing it. I voted against it. Do you know why I voted against it? Because I was a Democrat. I considered the ethic in the House among my fellow colleagues that this was probusiness and, therefore, since it is probusiness we are against it. So I voted against it. That bill which I did not support did more for the economy of my State than anything I did as a Congressman.

And there is a lot of that still lingering, the notion that concern about economic growth is a Republican instinct, that Democrats are uncomfortable caring about economics.

I think the reason we are not ahead of Ronald Reagan in the polls is not through any great skill of the President. I mean what, for example, would you say his foreign policy achievements were? I mean you would really be hard pressed. Grenada?

Grenada has the same number of people as Lynn, Mass. If I went into Lynn and deposed the mayor, do you think anybody would say it was a great achievement? They would think I was crazy. No. The President's major accomplishment beyond personality skills is the default of the Democrats on economics. No one believes when push comes to shove that Democrats care about economic growth and will do the tough things to make things work. Our colleagues give us a chance. We should be grateful. If the Democratic Party were ever to show real concern—not rhetorical concern—about the deficit and did something about it, then I think we would do very well in November and do very well in the Novembers that follow that.

I feel very strongly about this. The reason I do can be laid to two matters.

I know this is a terrible thing to admit, but my father was a conservative Republican businessman. I should get this out of my system before I leave. He thought Spiro Agnew was just wonderful, and that Richard Nixon would go down in history as a great American President. Needless to say, we had our disagreements at the time. But the funny thing about my father was that he was a nice guy. I grew up believing that you could be a businessman and still be a decent human being. That would almost disqualify me from membership in the Democratic Party.

The second major reason is that I grew up in a city in economic decline. I saw my father's business get wiped out. I still live in that city. The fact is that most of my colleagues have never really experienced economic hardship, and feel that economic decline is sort of an academic issue. If you grew up the way I did, it is not. So when I look at my home city that has an unemployment rate of about 5 percent because of high technology and other things that were done, I think that is good. Democrats should be proud of it. The one thing we can do to sort of bring that about throughout the country more than anything else is to deal with the deficit. I commend my friend from South Carolina, and my friends from Nebraska and North Dakota. They are doing us a real service, and I hope that we have the commonsense to support them.

I yield back to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, before I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, let me thank my friend from Massachusetts. He has made a very dramatic statement. There is no question that he has analyzed it. He has voted as a private citizen could, would, and should vote. He states very candidly that next year he will be out and working. In that sense he will be very, very much concerned about interest rates, unemployment, and everything else of that kind. He brings into sharp focus the Achilles heel of the Democratic Party. I could not agree more.

I state this advisedly. There is no one I respect more. I ran on his ticket in 1968. I was running for reelection for the U.S. Senate; our friend from Minnesota, Senator Humphrey was running for the Presidency. He could and should have been the President. We had gotten rid of Richard Nixon. My friend, Pat Brown, the Governor of California, had run him out of California. He had even stated—that is, Nixon—"you will not have me to kick around any more." That was his public statement.

We as Democrats recreated that monster. Senator Humphrey had all the high ground on arms control. He started the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It was his bill; and, certainly on feeding, on housing he knew the problems. He was a city mayor. On urban renewal he certainly was respected; education; certainly with respect to student loans; and everything else; legal services. He had the high ground on the social programs.

But I was running in a race, in 1968 and I was always having to explain the problem because my constituents had the perception that the Democratic nominee, Senator Humphrey, was not going to be able to handle the economy. He was a spender. We reincarnated that fellow Nixon, and brought him back to political life. In 1972, standing right here was our good friend as a Senator, the Senator from South Dakota. Again, he had the high ground on all the social issues but he was going to mail everybody $1,000. I told George, "You frighten me."

Of course, we continued Mr. Nixon. In 1980, the only question, Senator, was could the economy stand 4 more years of 12-percent inflation and 20-percent interest rates? I was in a State where my distinguished senior colleague went around talking about the movie star, and that we had to have John Connally. You could not find a more loyal and leading Republican. But the Republican Governor, Jim Edwards, and the Republican Senator STROM THURMOND, were running all over saying you could not have the movie star. You had to have Connally who knew how to handle these things. Why? We Democrats, Senator TSONGAS, put Ronald Reagan in the White House because of the fact which you mentioned—handling the economy. It has been true. We had 12-percent inflation, 20-percent interest rates. I know it. I was running for reelection at that time. We lost the last three out of four races.

The Senator from Massachusetts is right on target. I think it would behoove us to get back into the saddle of Government as a party and as Senators by showing collectively—that is why I am delighted to have Republican support for this particular amendment—that we can handle the economy at the national level as leaders from around the country do as city mayors, and as State Governors.

James Madison over 200 years ago foresaw the difficulty of this particular time. He said Government is none other than the best reflections of human nature. If men were angels, a government would not be necessary. And if angels governed men, you would need no controls over the government. So he had the task in formulating a government to be administered by man over man, and a government with the capacity to control government, and thereafter oblige that same government to control itself. That is what we flunked and failed to do. We are not controlling ourselves. We did not last year. We did not the year before. Seemingly, we are not going to do it next year. We are always saying let us wait until after the election.

I could not thank the Senator from Massachusetts more for his wisdom and candor in setting forth the problem that confronts us.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, a cosponsor of our amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to speak in support of the efforts of the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Nebraska, and other Senators to deal with this very serious deficit problem. Any attempt to constrain increases in spending is subject to attack. It is for that very reason I believe that the job of controlling these increasing expenditures each year is so difficult for the Congress and the administration to come to grips with.

Mr. President, since coming to the Senate I have been impressed with the urgency and sincerity with which all of us express our concerns about the deficit. Also, I have been impressed with how we can agree upon the need for us all to get together to do something about the deficit. But the problem is, that is about all we have been able to agree upon. We spend the rest of our time trying to score points off the other party, or playing to various constituency groups rather than sitting down to hammer out the kind of compromise that is passable and will get things done.

We are good at having it both ways. We all get out and vote against things we do not think need more money. We vote for the programs that we do think need more money. The problem is, of course, that when the cuts we vote for do not pass, we do not adjust our demands for spending elsewhere.

Most of the comments and suggestions that I have heard for reducing the budget play to some absolute solution which is guaranteed—at least in this body based on my observation—to never receive a majority.

The suggestions range from wholesale abolition of departments and programs—suggestion like no more foreign aid, abolish the Department of Energy, abolish the Department of Education, cut entitlements to the bone—on the one side, and on the other side, no increase in defense spending at all. There are several problems, at least two major problems, with these absolute approaches. First, they do not get us around to solving the problem; second, we cannot pass them.

What we have seen in the budget standoffs of the Reagan years is a great deal of posturing, with the implicit and sometimes explicit message being given, "Don't worry, we can solve this budget deficit problem without affecting you. It will come out of someone else's taxes, someone else's benefits, some one else's public services." But I think we all know that does not work.

The President has not been as successful as he would like in rewriting the last 50 years of American history. Those on the opposite side of the argument have had to accept cuts in social programs, as well as substantial increases in defense spending. The fact is that despite the rhetoric, there is a basic consensus that has appeared between the Congress and the President on spending. This consensus has been arrived at through the budget and the appropriations process. Through the accumulation of decisions, through the votes cast on individual issues, we have decided where cuts will be made, where we will hold the line, and where increases will be allowed. The irony is that the President and the Congress have not been that far apart in overall spending levels. Where we have disagreed is in the mix. But those decisions have been made and they have been agreed to by the President.

I believe we need to build on this hard-won consensus to attack the deficit this year in the only practical way that we can attack it seriously. This amendment does that. It imposes a 1-year freeze on the discretionary spending levels, with the exception of defense. It imposes a 4-percent increase on defense spending, an amount which is dramatically smaller than that proposed by the President.

This is realistic, Mr. President. It is not ideal, it is not exactly what I would prefer, but it is realistic in this Congress this year. It recognizes the widespread agreement that our defenses need improving. Contrary to political charges that will be made this year and for many years, it does not cut the actual dollar amounts received by such groups as the elderly, the needy, the sick. It reflects the agreement in this Congress that these programs have already suffered substantial reductions and should not bear any more. Those battles have been fought over the last few years, and Congress has decided on its answer, and we do not need to expend more energy and time unnecessarily aruging those issues again.

The Hollings-Exon-Andrews freeze recognizes that we cannot attack the structural deficit without dealing with taxes. The proposal would instruct the Finance Committee to report measures which would raise $350 billion in revenue increases over the next 5 years.

I know, Mr. President, that this is a proposal that does not draw applause from anywhere. No one wants to have their taxes raised. But I have to stress again that if we do not balance the burden of deficit reduction as fairly and as practically as we can in this Congress, we shall never succeed.

We must agree that if we decide to expend a certain level of resources to do the things that we as a people believe will make our country safe abroad and prosperous and compassionate and just at home—and that is what we all seek—then we should be willing to pay for the Government we create.

Mr. President, I do not believe that our Government spending programs are perfect. It is not my intention to forgo my responsibility to make those programs more efficient and to cut them where necessary and to support increases where I believe it is important to make investments for the future such as in the area of education. I shall continue to do my best to see that Americans get the best they can for their tax dollars. But I believe we have to get started with deficit reduction this year. We have to work within the political reality that exists on spending issues. To do otherwise is to contribute to the delusion that the deficit can always be cured if only the other fellow can be made to pay.

Mr. President, in his small book on the Vietnam war, John Kenneth Galbraith had a statement which I believe is worth repeating. He said in that book that when all the people agree, the politicians cannot be far behind. I believe that statement is appropriate in this case.

This amendment represents a tough but honest and fair approach which I believe the American people would agree to. This amendment deserves the support of my colleagues. I urge them to vote for it.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPECTER). Who yields time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I yield now to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from South Carolina. I commend him, the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from North Dakota, and others who have joined together in offering this bipartisan proposal.

This is, I think, a truly bipartisan proposal. It is an American proposal. As I talk to people in my State, they send me a very strong message that they are tired of the partisan bickering, they are tired of the finger-pointing, they are tired of one party trying to cast blame on another for the deficits, the budget problems we now face. They are sending us a loud and clear message. That is, get on with solving this problem now. Do something to get these deficits under control before they destroy the economy of this country.

I think if there are a few words that we could take out of the American vocabulary this year they should be the words, "Wait until after the election." None of us was elected to this body or

to positions of responsibility and public trust to wait until after some election to deal with the problems at hand. There are always some 468 Members of Congress within 2 years of some election. We need to get on with solving the problems now. We need to get deficits under control before it is too late. Our country is walking on a high wire without a net underneath it.

We all know what is going to happen if we do not take substantial action under the trendline on which we are now operating. The national debt of the United States is projected to reach almost $3 trillion by 1989. Every Member of this body knows that if we were to allow the debt to continue to skyrocket in this fashion, long before that time, the Government of the United States would be taking two-thirds of all the available credit in the country just to finance this kind of debt. That would leave only one-third of the credit or less for everyone else—the farmer, the small businessperson, the young couple who want to buy a home, all of the other people who need credit. It would set off an auction, set off a bidding war for that little bit of credit that would be left. It would drive interest rates absolutely through the ceiling.

Already, the stock market is responding on a daily basis to rumors of increases in interest rates. The leading economic indicators are beginning to slow down. And even now, other sectors of our economy are already paying a heavy, a disastrous price for the huge deficits which we are running.

Because of our high deficits, the dollar has been overvalued compared with other currencies in the world. We have had to allow a massive influx of foreign investment and foreign dollars into the United States. Our trade deficit this year will be over $100 billion, and it is again attributable to the huge deficits which we are running. There is not a farmer in the United States who is not already paying the high price exacted by these huge deficits as we have seen our exports plummet and the value for our agricultural products fall. It is estimated that over 2 million people in this country have lost their jobs because of declining exports brought about by the trade imbalance which has been caused by these huge budgetary deficits.

We had testimony before the Finance Committee just 2 weeks ago that if the trade imbalance continues at the current rate, it will take only 30 months to make the United States a net debtor nation for the first time in its history. That would mean people in other countries would own in essence more of the United States of America than we would have investments in the rest of the world. What a tragedy it would be for a nation with our vast resources and strengths to be dependent on the whims of those in other nations with other aims and with other goals for our economic well-being and our economic security.

We cannot afford to wait until after an election. We cannot afford to wait to deal with the problem while interest rates start back up substantially under the pressure of Government borrowing. We cannot afford to have another year in which we add so much to the national debt. Every single American worker would have had to have saved $2,000 last year and loaned every penny of it to the Federal Government just to finance what was added to the national debt last year alone.

We cannot afford to continue along that path without courting disaster. I applaud the bipartisan group of Senators which has come together to offer a proposal that asks all Americans to join together in sacrificing in the short run to come up with an American solution. This proposal will more dramatically reduce the deficit over the next 3 years and over the next 5 years than any other proposal about which we will have an opportunity to express our views.

Under this plan, For example, using the accounting of the administration, the deficit would be reduced some $316 billion over the next 3 years compared to only $144 billion under the administration plan. If we use CBO accounting, the figure for deficit reduction is $268 billion versus $89 billion under the administration plan. In 5 years we could reduce the deficit $800 billion, bringing this country to the brink of a balanced budget, if we pass this bipartisan proposal.

So I say, Mr. President, let us not wait until after the election to do our duty. Let us not continue to court economic disaster by running deficits that are going to raise interest rates through the roof and cripple our economy, bringing it to a grinding halt. Let us not continue to run deficits that devastate the export sector of this economy; that threaten to make the United States of America a net debtor nation for the first time in its history within the next 3 years. Let us not underestimate the understanding, the intelligence, and the patriotism of the American people. The American people know that their Government cannot continue year after year to live so far beyond its means. The American people have enough belief in this country and enough love for their country to be willing to sacrifice, as long as that sacrifice is fairly shared, to get our country back on the right track again.

We who have been elected to positions of leadership must not be guilty of underestimating the intelligence, understanding, and patriotism of those who sent us here to do a job. They sent us, as I have said, Mr. President, not to wait for some signal from political leaders, not to wait until after some election, not to wait until our own personal political interests have been met. They sent us here to do a job. They sent us here to do an American job. This is an American plan and it ought to be adopted.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma. He has been a tremendous help last year and the year before and we will keep on plugging to see if we can bring about a sense of responsibility.

I now yield to our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding these few minutes for me to speak on this measure.

I am one of the 16 Senators, I believe it was, who supported a similar amendment the Senator from South Carolina offered last year. We are going to do better than that today. How much better is anybody's guess.

Mr. President, for the next 3 or 4 days, depending on how long it takes us to deal with this bill, every person on this floor is going to speak at some time or other lamenting the deficit. Everybody is going to talk about how terrible the deficits are and what it is doing to the interest rates, what it is going to do to our grandchildren, but the truth is this place is paralyzed with fear. This is a drastic measure the Senator from South Carolina is offering. It deals with entitlements. It deals with indexing. It deals with discretionary spending. It is not going to be easy, especially for those who are up for reelection this fall, to go home and tell our constituents, particularly those interest groups, why we supported this amendment. I suspect there will not be enough votes to pass this amendment. And what a tragedy. What a travesty.

I have never known a candidate since I have been in the Senate—I will take that back; there may be two or three—who lost because they demonstrated some courage in this body. I have seen politician after politician finally, ultimately stiffen his spine and do what had to be done, and then soar in the polls.

Mr. President, we are in an election year and the promises are flowing on both sides. The truth is this deficit is going to be the issue. These deficits and the economic apocalypse that is absolutely certain to come if we do not deal with it, and the nuclear apocalypse that is going to come if we do not scale down the arms race, are the only two issues that can be legitimately discussed in this fall's campaign. The only honest promise you or I or any of the Presidential nominees can make is that the future holds a lot of

sacrifice, a lot of burden, a lot of sweat and a lot of tears. You are not going to bring under control a trillion-and-a-half dollar debt or a $2 trillion debt by lamenting it on the floor of the Senate.

Yesterday I went down to speak to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. HOWARD BAKER, our distinguished majority leader and a good friend and a very able man and a fine man, and I spent 20 minutes each trying to persuade them to vote Democrat or Republican this fall. And to tell you the truth, with that a group I do not fare too well against HOWARD BAKER. But I tell you, I said to those people, "four years ago when President Reagan said, 'Are you better off?' that was the dynamite, litmus test question that catapulted him into the White House and gave the Republicans control of the U.S. Senate." I said, "If I were to repeat the question to that particular audience today, 'Are you better off now than you were 4 years ago?' there would be a resounding yes," because the economy is red hot, people are making money as never before. But if you were to follow that question up with a more sobering question: " 'Do you think your children and your grandchildren are going to have a better, more secure future as a result of what has happened in the past 3½ years?' then at least people would have to pause and reflect on that." I said in that speech and I have said in other places, "If you think you are going to deal with the deficits without raising taxes, you are simply saying, 'I love the deficits.' " If you think you are going to deal with the deficits by saying we can continue to increase defense spending 100 percent every 4 years, then you are not serious about controlling the deficits. If you think we are going to grow our way out of this, you are the only economist in the United States who has said that.

I am not speaking as a partisan Democrat. I am saying what Milton Friedman has said. I am saying what even George Will and William Safire are saying. I am saying what the President's chief economist, Marty Feldstein, has said. Yes, I am even saying what the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has said. And Henry Kaufman, too.

When Henry Kaufman says interest rates are going up, bonds are sold or bought by the billions of dollars worth, based on his predictions. Henry Kaufman and Paul Volcker say that if you think you are going to deal with this deficit by cutting out social spending—why, if you eliminated every dime that could remotely be classified as social spending in the deficit, you still would have a $60 billion deficit.

I know it is easy to go home and say: "I would have voted for it, but there is this little thing in there. I did not quite know what to do. But I came down on this side or that side because there was this little provision in there. You have a 62-page bill, and one line in there really troubled me." That is the way we justify our votes back home.

This amendment postpones indexing. There is a good argument to be made for indexing. I have never supported it. I am sorry the Senator does not postpone it for 3 years. That is $51 billion. Are we postponing it for 5 years?

Mr. HOLLINGS. As each year goes by, yes.

Mr. BUMPERS. We will have to deal with it each year?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Right.

Mr. BUMPERS. I know the statistics on a 3-year postponement of indexing, $51 billion.

The other night when we debated indexing, it was brought up by Senator CHAFEE, and we had figures showing that the median family of four, under indexing, over the next 5 years, would save $1,500 in taxes. But if you reduce the interest rate in this country by 1 percent—and $51 billion in deficit reduction might just do it—the same family, paying on a home that cost them $50,000, would save $2,000 in interest on the mortgage.

So just the postponement of indexing alone, if it reduces interest rates by 1 percent, means $500 more to the average family over the next 4 to 5 years than what they are going to get out of indexing.

Mr. President, the thing I like best of all about the Hollings amendment is that everybody shares. Everybody assumes a part of the burden. Nobody is let loose scot-free. If that is not part of our national character, I do not know what is.

I have heard RUSSELL LONG say a thousand times on the floor of the Senate: "Don't tax me, don't tax thee, tax that man behind the tree." That is the reason why our tax code is now to the point where it has very little popular support and confidence in America. People do not really understand a flat tax rate. All they know is that they do not like what we have.

So when you are up for election this fall, here is a chance to tell your people that you are really serious, that this is not make believe. Do not worry about what your opponent is going to say about you.

That is the reason why we have a tough time voting around here. Everybody looks at it and says, "How could my opponent use that?" Here is a chance to go home and say, "I know this is true, but I voted for an amendment that shared the burden. The social security recipients, everybody, shared in trying to get this country back on track."

There is not one Member of the Senate who does not know we are going to suffer an economic collapse if we do not get control of the deficit. At a time when we are going through a 7-percent growth rate, the hottest growth rate since 1966 or 1962 we still have a $180 billion deficit. If you cannot deal with it now, how are you going to deal with it next year, when every economist in the country says the economy is going to turn down?

So here is a chance to vote for your children and their future. Do not vote for it just hoping it will be defeated. Vote for it because you believe in it and you feel confident in your ability to go home and explain it to your folks.

I did not initially oppose the Vietnam war. I am ashamed that I did not turn against it earlier than I did, sitting in a small town in Arkansas, watching the evening news. We were confused. We thought democracy was on the line, freedom all across the world was on the line.

Do you know when I turned against it? When my two sons became old enough that I was going to have to explain it to them, and I tried to explain to them why they might have to die in Vietnam. I could not explain it to them; and I thought, "If I can't explain it to them, I'm not for it." So I turned against it.

That is one of the reasons why I ran for the U.S. Senate, I was so despairing of that war. The reason I stay in politics is that I love the politics of hope, and I am hoping the U.S. Congress, somehow or other, when the chips are down, as they are now, will do the responsible thing, so that the Members can go home and tell their children, "Today I did something for your future."

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, the distinguished Seantor is right on target. It seems to me that we would be satisfied to do a good job, I say to the Senator. I think of the old school, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi. We used to get reelected the hard way. We earned it. You had to do a good job in the legislature in order to get to Lieutenant Governor. Then, as Lieutenant Governor, you had to do a good job to become Governor. Then, you had to do a good job as Governor in order to be sent here.

Now that is out the window. You can forget about doing a good job. That is not the issue or concern here today. Were that the case, we would all vote for this. I think if we had a secret ballot, we could pass this quickly.

They do not know how to explain it over there to the President. That is what is bothering them.

What we have learned is pollster politicking. What you do in national office, I say to the Senator from Iowa, is that you take a poll, find out what

the issues are, and then the pollster will say, "Having found that out, identify, but do not solve." That is where you divide voters and begin to lose.

So the favorite gimmick among Democrats and Republicans, both sides of the aisle, is, "I am concerned." If you ask about deficits, "I am concerned about the deficits." "I am concerned about Central America." "I am concerned about the Mideast." But do not go with a plan that will solve the problem.

I came around and tried to identify, tried to do something. I showed my concern. This is a real solution; and as the Senator indicated, it is a sacrifice. It is not easy. But it is certainly a desirable one at this particular hour, because next year, with the interest rates, the countercyclical funds, food stamps, and unemployment compensation beginning to trigger, you cannot cut those, and then we do not want to raise taxes.

A minute ago, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico mentioned $87 billion. He says sure we could do it if we would get $87 billion in revenues and new taxes.

That is easy for me. We have listed these amounts that came from the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Let me just yield whatever time necessary.

How much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes and fifty-four seconds.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I might have to get some time from my distinguished colleague here on the other side of the aisle.

But in a capsule, if we had taken a 10-percent tax cut that we had last July, less than a year ago, and reinstated it, we pick up $183 billion. That is where we have been losing all the revenues.

With respect to indexing alone, over the 5-year period, that is $165 billion, not just $87 billion. Over 5 years we lose $165 billion.

I am limited by time. The Senator from New Mexico talks about cutting social security. No one is cutting social security.

The last word to be said on this particular debate is it is time we in public office quit treating social security recipients as welfare recipients. They resent it. They should not be demeaned. And they are not entitled to a cost of living adjustment.

I have been elected three times to the Senate when they did not even have COLA's in 1966, 1968, and 1974. We only started them in 1975.

We did not have COLA's under the Great Society. Our friend President Johnson thought of every way in the world to spend money, but he never thought of COLA's.

And the recipients have not paid for a COLA. They have not been taxed for it.

Right this minute, the other Senator was saying a moment ago we raised taxes and we have frozen entitlements. And we did a third thing. We dipped into the general revenues to the tune of $16.9 billion for social security for this year alone.

We are now making it a means tested program. The trust capacity has been destroyed. We are not only paying out from the general revenues but we are going to begin next year taxing social security. And we are going to change it into welfare then.

I know the senior citizens. I have gone to them all over this country. As long as it is a shared sacrifice, they have children and they have grandchildren, and they will go along so long as it is a shared sacrifice and we are not balancing the Federal budget on their backs, and we are not. We are not cutting their benefits. We are just not giving them an increase for 1 year for their part of the sacrifice. We are holding up on discretionary spending, holding up on tax spending, holding up on defense, and all the rest. They will do their part, rather than offload this debt onto their children and grandchildren.

So is it reducing their entitlements? No. They are not entitled to it. The average social security recipient gets all the money he paid into the trust in 18 months.

So they should be told the truth. Even with the increased revenues now they are not paying for it. They are not entitled to it and they should not be treated as welfare recipients.

If I have another minute I withhold that time, and then I will go begging to the distinguished senior Senator, the chairman of our Budget Committee, for additional time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, from our side, I say to my good friend from South Carolina, the only Senator I know who wishes to speak is Senator DOLE, after I finish here. He needs maybe 10 minutes or so. I will get hold of him and ask him if he can come down.

I am only going to talk for about 5 minutes and then I will yield another 10 or 15 minutes of my time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I will be happy to check with a couple of other Senators who have not gotten here yet.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield to the Senator. We will probably, combined, need about 20 minutes.

And we have how much time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six minutes and thirty seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think at least 20 minutes, or more, we will yield to the Senator from South Carolina, I say to my friend.

Let me make just two points, and then leave it in the hands of the Senate.

To tell the truth, I think I have been as much for reducing deficits as anyone. But I can tell the Senate in all honesty I am not sure that if I were king of the world here—I told the story once what my little daughter told me one morning when I was trying to get their attention. They were 6 years old, and I was talking to them one morning. There was a teachers' convention so they were home, and I stayed late and did not come down here at 7:30 a.m. I was getting their attention, and one of them looked back at me and said: "Daddy, you is no king; you is just a Senator."

Even if I were king, I am not sure that I would take, and I did the numbers here—if I am wrong, correct me—I do not know that I would take $71 billion out of the social security to balance this budget. I am not sure I would do that. I say that in all honesty. That is for 5 years what this proposal does to a social security plan that we just finished reforming, that we just put the taxes on for, that we are just told in probably 1 more year it will be solvent for a long time. I am not sure I would take $71 billion and say put that on the debt. I do not know what we want to call that. I think it is a $71 billion reduction in social security divided up, as I said here a while ago. I think it is an $1,800 reduction for an average retired couple. I think it is a $2,100 reduction for a disabled worker. But I am not sure that I would take almost $71 billion out of an entrusted fund for which taxes are imposed and say here today that I know enough about the next 5 years that I am going to take that big a chunk of money and apply it on this debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. If I could finish two points, and then I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is one.

If the Senator wants to do it on 3 years to compare it with whatever else we are doing, it is almost $32 billion. Let me round it out. It is $31.9 billion in social security over 3 years that we are taking out of the trust fund and saying even though it is there we are not going to pay it to these people; we are going to reduce their benefits. I am going to round that to $32 billion over the 3 years.

Let me say medicare I know is in big trouble, but I am not sure that I know enough today to reduce by some kind of freeze on medicare over 5 years at the rate of $18 billion. I say in all honesty that I do not know that I know enough about how to straighten up this fiscal policy to just come along

and say today for 5 years we are going to take $18 billion out of medicare by cutting it or reducing it or whatever we are talking about here. That is a reduction over current law of $18 billion.

I remind the Senate also that is entrusted money. I know that by 1992 it will be in trouble if we do not fix it. Maybe by 1995 it will be in big trouble. But I think everyone should know that is $18 billion reduction in medicare. Then we have these other entitlements, the predominant ones being Federal pensions, both military and civilian. Those are the principal ones, and we reduce them by $40.2 billion, some of which are entrusted, some are not.

That is for starters on the cut side, and then over 5 years we would today by one act, by one vote, we would increase taxes $352 billion; over 3 years, $132.5 billion. I tell the Senate I am for multiyear budgets. I have been one who has argued regularly with the administration about looking at 2, 3, 4 years, but I can tell the Senate in all honesty I am not at all sure if I were the benevolent dictator that I know enough about this American economy to put on $352 billion in new taxes now in a permanent manner saying we are just going to fix everything, get rid of indexing, do these other things, and we are really going to have a humming economy. I am just not sure of that.

As a matter of fact, to tell the truth, I am not going to give my speech here today. I think I will save it for other packages. But I do not think this economy is in such bad shape. As a matter of fact, I think we have to reduce the deficit, but I do not have a great anxiety about it that we better do it tomorrow morning or this world is coming to an end.

As a matter of fact, we have some things in pretty good shape that were in pretty bad shape 4 years ago. We had inflation at 14 percent; it is now 4 percent. We had interest at 21 percent; it is now 12.5 or 13 percent. Yes; it has gone up a little bit, and I am worried about it. We had a dollar falling off the table then, and it is now strong. We had a Defense Department that did not have enough money to pay its personnel and they were on food stamps. We have doubled their pay. Maybe that is extravagant to some.

Those are four pretty good things we have done. And we have a deficit left. There is no question about it. We should fix it. But I just think to sit here today and say to the Senate, let us fix it all right now and let us take almost $71 billion out of social security, when we just had the reform, and let us take $18 billion out of medicare, and let us take the other entitlements and take $40 billion out of that, I really think when Senators get to thinking about that we are not going to do it; but it is not because they do not have any courage, and it is not because they are not fearful of the deficits.

To tell the truth, with all the respect I have for the proponents, I do not know that the Senate should be putting on a $485 billion deficit reduction package in law here today and say that is going to fix the American economy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I have been here and I did not use much of my time. I am going to send a message for Senator DOLE. He wants to speak and we are going to reserve some time for him.

But I would be delighted to answer some questions from the Senator from North Dakota or my good friend, Senator HOLLINGS. I have an appointment in about 5 minutes, so if you will make them brief, we will answer them brief.

Mr. ANDREWS. Could I ask my colleague a question?

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator HOLLINGS was first.

Mr. HOLLINGS. By way of explaining, because there is really inflammatory language being used, taking the money from the trust fund, and Senator knows and I know, that this amendment does not disturb any moneys in the social security trust fund.

Mr. DOMENICI. No; I know that.

Mr. HOLLINGS. It is not taking money off the trust fund.

Second, I am sending for a copy of it now, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—I will never forget it because we were both concerned—made the statement at that particular time, and I ask the Senator if that was not correct, that he said over the next 3 years it would cost the general revenue $61 or $62 billion out of the general revenue for that so-called reform you are talking about. That is why I have checked and that is why I have the accurate figure from the CBO and the social security trust fund. That is why I quoted the $16.9 billion this year, fiscal year 1984; that we are taking from the general revenues to put into the trust fund, $16.9 billion.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Medicare is not covered in this freeze. You cannot freeze that right now. You said we were freezing funds of the medicare. I will correct that later when you give me the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, since the Senator from New Mexico has the floor, let me just correct this. I do not want to overcorrect, because I am not suggesting that anybody is taking social security money and absconding with it. I am suggesting that when we wanted to make social security solvent and we spoke of raising $40 billion to make it solvent, what did we hear? "Don't balance the budget on the backs of social security." And we needed $40 billion to make it solvent.

Now, all I am telling you is that it is solvent. And you are taking $71 billion and saying, "Don't pay benefits; keep it in the general fund to reduce this deficit."

You are not taking it. It is there. It is just that they are not going to get it. You can call it what you like—a cut, a reduction, an entitlement that is not going to be realized, whatever you like. I am merely telling you that this is how you get the deficit reduced, $70.8 billion out of social security when nobody is even telling us that it is insolvent.

The other big item is $352 billion in taxes imposed now for the next 5 years. Now, that does reduce deficits, I say to my friend, if it does not do some other things along with it. It surely will reduce the paper deficits as you read them.

Now, my friend had a question.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do have a question, Mr. President. I listened to my chairman's remarks with a great deal of interest. Now, I will admit that things get awfully cold in North Dakota, Mr. President, and they are warm down in New Mexico.

But if I heard my good friend correctly, I think he said that we were trying to do this all at once. My gosh, Mr. President, there is a $181 billion projected deficit for next year out there. This rose garden package—and those blossoms are pretty well wilted and faded away when we take a look at that—only cuts $12 billion out of that deficit. Now, maybe that is movement, but it is surely a turtle.

Now, ours cuts $37 billion. That is no Kentucky Derby winner. That is not doing it overnight. That is not doing it quick. But it is a whale of a lot more responsible, Mr. President, if you want ot get this deficit under control or starting under control in that first year if you want to impact the interest rates.

Our farm families. Mr. President, are not very happy with these interest rate projections that we see. Our homebuilders are not very happy.

And, certainly we end up freezing social security. I would rather not do that. But we are not cutting anybody.

And if my colleague and good friend and the chairman has any suggestions on how you do it and still keep 4 percent for defense and how you do it any better than we are doing it, and if my colleague really thinks that reducing a $180 billion projected deficit by $37 billion is doing it too fast, gosh, that is kind of smoky mirrors. That is a little bit "Alice in Wonderland." I wish we could do it faster.

So I hope, Mr. President, that my colleague recognizes the need is there and the need is now and if we are going to address that deficit in that

first year, instead of more promises, promises, promises in that third outyear, we are going to have to do something about it now. And if that is excessive speed, it is excessive speed. But I suggest it is not speed, as I say, that is going to win that Kentucky Derby this weekend. But at least our turtle is moving while the Senator's seems to be pretty well bogged down in sand. And the goal is to reach that final point of getting these deficits more well-defined and under control.

I hope that my colleague and good friend would join us in that effort to get these deficits more swiftly under control.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me just suggest two more things, then I will yield the floor.

First of all, I will argue the package that the Senator referred to as the rose garden is not really the issue here. The issue is not the rose garden or any others. The issue is your package, the issue is the Hollings-Andrews-Exon package referred to as the bipartisan package to reduce the deficits.

I do not know how bipartisan it will be when we get to vote, but it is bipartisan in its sponsorship at this point and that is enough to call it that. It has been called American here today by those who proposed it. I guess it is. If we pass it, I think it probably is American.

But let me repeat, I honestly do not believe that the U.S. Congress, this President, this President if reelected, or one of the other individuals running to become President, that they are going to pass a 5-year plan that takes $70.8 billion out of social security with no reform, that just says we are going to freeze it or cut the COLA's where there is hardly anything left and we are going to take $70 billion out of that program for senior Americans that is solvent and the only reason you would be doing it is because of the deficit.

I just do not believe anybody is going to do that. I think we are going to have to do some major reform in all these areas. But I think the Senate ought to know that that is what it is and they ought to know that on medicare it is 18 billion dollars' worth.

And I do not know how you are reforming it. I wish I did know. I do not know how you can find that kind of money by just saying we are not going to pay doctors or hospitals are going to be frozen for a while. That is a huge amount of money.

The rest of the entitlements, $40.2 billion over 5 years, and we know how to do that right now. I just do not think that is going to happen.

Having said that, I understand my friend from Missouri would like to speak. And I would ask the Senator to hold the floor for the Senator from New Mexico for a few minutes and then if Senator DOLE desires to speak, we can give the rest of the time back to those who are the sponsors of the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, at the outset let me say that I intend to vote against the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina, basically because I think that it increases taxes more than I would be willing to increase taxes—as I understand it, $89 billion—and also that it would cut defense spending below what the administration and the Republican leadership in the Senate agreed to. My guess is, although I could be educated on this, that that would be too deep a cut in defense spending.

But I want to say this to the Senator from South Carolina: I think what is happening right now on the floor of the Senate is a watershed. I think that it is a very significant occasion because what we have had is a bipartisan effort to face up to the serious nature of the budget deficit and a bipartisan effort to take on the untouchable in deficit reduction, and that is the growth rate of the entitlement programs.

I do not have a list in front of me of the cosponsors of this amendment, but it is my understanding that, in addition to the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Arkansas spoke on behalf of this amendment, and the Senator from Oklahoma, Senator BOREN spoke in favor of the amendment.

It has significant and very highly respected Democratic support for the concept which has been politically poisonous to date; that is, dealing with the entitlement programs.

Mr. President, I do not know how it is possible mathematically to get the deficits under control without doing something about entitlements. This is something we in the Congress are going to have to face up to as quickly as possible. This year with the fact that an election is coming, realistically it is not going to be done until after the election. But it is going to have to be done. But I simply want to review the bidding on the entitlement question, because I remember so well 3 years or so ago when President Reagan suggested doing something about social security. I can remember what happended on the floor of the Senate. I can remember how that proposal was turned into a major political issue. I can remember the distinguished minority leader standing at his desk talking about Republican efforts to cut social security. I was a candidate for reelection in 1982. I am told—although I do not know—that the National Education Association ran a phone bank in one of the congressional districts of our State in which they said, if you vote for the reelection of JACK DANFORTH to the Senate and GENE TAYLOR to the House of Representatives, you will lose social security. That is how it was used politically. It was used in a very partisan way.

I have on my desk a mailing which was received by one of my constituents in Kansas City, Mo. This man is a senior citizen. He is incapacitated. He suffers Lou Gehrig's disease. He is at home. He is on a respirator.

It is a long letter from the Speaker of the House, TIP O'NEILL, and is five pages long. Then it has a little form to send in. The form is headed "Campaign To Save Medicare-Medicaid." It says on the form,

> I want to help stop the Republicans from gutting critically needed health assistance programs of older Americans. Only the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives was able to protect and save social security from Republican attacks. Now is the time for the same Democratic majority to stop the Republicans from taking their budget axes to Medicare and Medicaid.

Then the letter, which is single spaced, and five pages long, says, among other things—I will just read one paragraph, Mr. President:

> • • • right this moment, my Democratic colleagues and I are in the midst of a crucial fight to block the Reagan Administration and New Right Republicans from callously slashing the benefits and services of what is literally the life's blood of our elderly—Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Speaker of the House O'NEILL, a form letter, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> DEAR FRIEND, hardly an American could have missed the enormous battle waged here in Washington last year to save the Social Security system. And when Congress placed this all-important program on a sound financial foundation for future generations, headlines and TB reports proclaimed "Social Security Saved!"
>
> Well, sad to say, the battle is not yet over.
>
> What millions of Americans do not realize is that our battle to ensure the health and economic security of older Americans is only half-won. Because without adequate health care insurance, the economic protection that Social Security provides to millions of elderly people is hollow and meaningless.
>
> And right this moment, my Democratic colleagues and I are in the midst of a crucial fight to block the Reagan Administration and New Right Republicans from callously slashing the benefits and services of what is literally the life's blood of our elderly—Medicare and Medicaid.
>
> We are vehemently opposed to their vicious proposed cuts of more than $1 billion in Medicare and the new cuts of more than $1 billion in Medicaid. And I am personally appealing to you to enlist your immediate help in preventing Medicare and Medicaid from being gutted. Just as the Democratic-controlled House prevented the Reagan Administration from destroying Social Security, we must now save Medicare and Medicaid. And I urge you to help us right now, by

making a contribution to the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee's Campaign To Save Medicare/Medicaid.

If you could see some of the letters I receive from older Americans throughout the country, I am sure you would be as appalled as I am with the stories all too many of them tell.

Here are honest, upstanding citizens, who have worked hard—many even fought hard in our nation's wars—to keep America strong. They have given this great country their entire lives. Their only crime is that they have gotten old and sick.

Some letters cry out how, even under current Medicare and Medicaid programs, critical health needs go untreated . . . an 80-year-old woman needs eyeglasses, but the fuel bill is overdue . . . a grandfather needs a heart operation, but cannot have the operation and pay his rent.

And with over 30 million people in this country without any medical insurance, the frequency of such tragedies is all too common.

In spite of this, Ronald Reagan and the New Right Republicans advocate a utopian kind of self-responsibility. In their country-club mentality, they seem to think that every American can somehow find the money to pay for enormous medical bills, hospitalization, and physicians' services. And in their ruthless attempt to cut to the bare bones domestic services, they totally ignore the real facts. The average American over age 65 has a total gross yearly income of only $9,700! The Republicans could not care less that low-income, elderly Americans are already spending at least 16% of their annual income on medical care!

If passed, the Republican plan would substantially increase the financial burden of medical care for older citizens. Reagan has proposed over $1.9 billion in cuts to Medicare in the 1984 budget. More than 50% would come out of the pockets of the elderly.

I, for one, am not going to stand by silently and let the Republicans add intolerable medical expenses to the budgets of millions of older Americans already struggling just to get by. And I don't think you will stand by either.

That's why I'm writing to ask you to join with me and the Democrats in our Campaign To Save Medicare/Medicaid.

Medicare was first instituted under Democrat Lyndon Johnson in 1967. Medicare fulfilled the earlier commitment of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who founded Social Security, to provide the security of guaranteed medical health care. Tens of thousands of senior citizens are alive today thanks to advanced medical technologies, such as kidney dialysis, provided through Medicare. But the opportunity for a longer, healthier, and more satisfying life is being denied to many other older American because of Reagan's "get tough" attitude toward older citizens.

As soon as Ronald Reagan took office, he attacked Medicare by cutting millions of dollars in funding and by asking low-income elderly citizens to pick up the burden of even heavier medical expenses.

If Reagan gets his way, hospital costs alone for the average older American would increase more than 80% in just one year!

Medicaid was first proposed when Democrat John F. Kennedy was president and later passed into law by Democrat Lyndon B. Johnson. Medicaid took an enormous burden from families who were faced with the need to provide long-term residential care for elderly parents.

But once again, President Reagan and his New Right political allies have taken the budget axe to Medicaid during the last two years.

These Republican budget cuts would be as catastrophic to our nation's elderly as the original Reagan proposals to gut Social Security. And just as we fought off those attacks together, we must now save Medicare/Medicaid.

Over the years it has been the Democratic Party that has guarded Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and other critically needed programs.

With the health and economic security of millions of older Americans under attack by the Reagan Administration, we Democrats have set as our number one priority the goal of saving Medicaid and Medicare.

And believe me, there's a lot at stake for all of us. Medicare and Medicaid together account for over $80 billion a year in federal health care expenditures.

Members of your family have probably already benefited greatly from these two programs which pay for a large part of their hospitalization, their physicians' fees, and medical necessities, such as prescription glasses and wheelchairs.

With so much at stake for all of us, here's our battle plan for our campaign to save Medicare/Medicaid.

1. First, the political staff of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee has started working up strategies to guarantee the election of a Democratic House in 1984 that will stand for, work for, and fight for strong and improved programs in both Medicare and Medicaid.

2. Next, Democratic leaders in the House are scheduling a series of hearings on the future of Medicare and Medicaid. But we're also going to appear on radio and TV talk shows and write editorials for the newspapers. We intend to make the survival and improvement of Medicare and Medicaid a top political issue in the 1984 elections.

3. Third, we must bring our battle to save Medicare/Medicaid into the homes of millions more Americans like you—people who care; people who will not turn their backs on the nation's elderly.

We must seek their help through letters like this one asking for their personal support in making our Campaign To Save Medicare/Medicaid one of the very top issues of the coming campaign. And we must also urge their financial support to make sure Democrats are victorious.

Believe me, the ballot box is the most important weapon we have against those who would destroy or weaken health care services for older Americans.

But to elect and reelect candidates who will champion the defense of Medicare and Medicaid will not be easy.

In the 1982 midterm elections, the three Republican campaign committees outspent the democratic committees by nearly 8 to 1. Their spending, in fact, was the largest in the annals of American politics. And their immense financial influence threatens to destroy our two-party system of government.

Of course I know we Democrats can never match them dollar for dollar. The Republican Party has always been and will always remain the party of wealth and privilege.

But to defend the future of Medicare and Medicaid on which so many older Americans critically depend, you and I must close the money gap. Next November we must be able to send to Washington more Democrats who will stand up and fight for health care services for older Americans.

But we face heavy opposition. The Republicans, now in control of both the Senate and the White House, will spend lavishly to gain control of the House . . . the last remaining govenmental opponent of their cruelly indifferent public policy for our older citizens.

You and I must not turn our backs on millions of older Americans who have planned their retirement and their monthly budgets on their trust in the good faith and commitment of our federal government.

Just as Americans have a legitimate right to expect their monthly Social Security checks, so they have an equally legitimate right to expect that their government will continue to protect them against the high costs of hospitalization, surgery, and the long-term care required after a devastating illness.

Growing old and getting sick is a natural part of life. Citizens should not be penalized and burdened with medical bills beyond their ability to pay.

But unless we act now, the Republicans following President Reagan's lead will penalize and burden older Americans for the natural and inevitable results of aging and illness.

The only way you and I can make sure that insensitive politicians do not undermine or dismantle Medicare and Medicaid is to elect Democrats who will stand for, work for, and fight for a strong, secure health program for older Americans.

We need Democrats in the House of Representatives who will place Medicare and Medicaid at the top of their list of priorities—not at the bottom.

As Speaker of the House, I know from firsthand experience that the threats to Medicare and Medicaid are real and imminent!

I urge your help in our Campaign To Save Medicare/Medicaid.

Your emergency membership contribution today of $15, $20, $25, or more will help us expand this campaign and win this fight.

I am doing all I can every day to protect the health needs of older Americans. But more help is urgently needed now. Please let me know that the Democrats in the House of Representatives can count on your help in this battle to save and improve Medicare and Medicaid services and benefits.

Age and illness befall every one of us. And that's why the stakes are so enormously high for every one of us.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I believe that something has to be done to check the rising cost of medicare. I believe that something has to be done to check the uncontrollable rise in the entitlement programs; and that without that action, there is no possibility of having a responsible budget.

Some people say, well, let us cut defense spending. Fine. But no responsible suggestion on defense spending would get a deficit below, say, $150 billion a year.

Anything more than that is wildly beyond the mainstream of debate on the subject of the defense budget. Some people say we should raise taxes. I am sure we are going to have to do that. All of us have proposals. Most of us have proposals which have some in-

creases in revenue. But there has to be a limitation, Mr. President, as to what we can do on the tax side of the ledger.

What we are going to have to do is put together a package which will include something on defense, something on taxes, and something on the entitlements. Let us face it. Without that there is no possibility of having a responsible budget.

The people of my State believe that the Congress of the United States is acting irresponsibly. They are willing to face up to the necessity of reducing the size of the deficit provided everybody is treated fairly. People of all ages, Madam President, people who are retired, people who are elderly, people who are of all ages and all groups are willing to do their part provided they are treated fairly.

But I say to the Senate today that one thing that is going to absolutely prevent the possibility of responsible action on the budget, is the question of the entitlement programs continues to be demagog for political purposes; that is if it continues to be made into such a political issue that nobody can vote for anything without fear of political death, then the Congress is going to be immobilized.

I compliment the Senator from South Carolina for breaking the ice. It is statesmanlike. With proposals like this, I understand why the Senator's Presidential campaign may not have exactly led the parade. While I have difficulties with the tax and defense proposals of this proposal, the Senator from South Carolina has shown the way in indicating that the politically poisonous subject of the entitlement programs can be addressed in a responsible and bipartisan manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAWKINS). Who yields time? Does the Senator from Missouri yield time?

Mr. DANFORTH. Madam President, I am not aware of anyone in opposition to this amendment who desires to speak at this time. Senator DOLE, I understand, is on his way to the floor.

Does the Senator from South Carolina want to speak on his time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes; I would like to put some things in the RECORD, if I am allowed a minute. I appreciate your courtesy. I thank the distinguished Senator for his generous references to me. I wonder. When we talk about the cuts in defense, Senator, we are not cutting defense. This present fiscal year, right this very minute, we are experiencing a 3-percent real growth 1984 over 1983. If we pass the pay supplemental, we will then have a 3.5-percent real growth for 1984. This particular bipartisan amendment calls for a 4-percent real growth of a larger defense budget figure.

In reality, instead of cutting defense—yes; from the President's request it is a cut—it is a $24 billion increase. In a way, it is a little larger than desired for this particular Senator. But I was trying to fashion the amendment to do exactly what you say; that is, get into the realm of debate where we were.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas has a follow-on amendment where there is an absolute flat freeze on defense. In other words, it is $24 billion less than this particular amendment.

I thought that unrealistic. I thought it was unwise with respect to our 3-percent commitment to NATO. I thought it was unwise economically, trying to keep the defense programs current so we would not have to retrench on any particular program.

I ask unanimous consent at this point to include in the RECORD the tables that would provide specific details about the Hollings-Andrews-Exon bipartisan budget reduction plan and a talk I recently gave on the topic of budget freeze. I ask unanimous consent that they be included.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1985–89
CBO baseline deficit	197	217	245	272	308	1,239
Deficit reduction measures spending:						
1. Defense (4 percent real growth 1985–86; 3 percent real growth 1987–89)		−6	−16	−27	−41	−90
2. Discretionary programs—1-year freeze, then 3 percent annual nominal growth	−3	−6	−8	−11	−13	−41
3. Civilian agency pay raises—1-year freeze, then 3 percent raises each year	−1	−2	−3	−4	−5	−15
4. COLA's—1-year freeze, then 3 percent COLA each year	−7	−14	−18	−23	−27	−89
5. Impact of pending reconciliation, finance, and farm bill legislation	−2	−6	−9	−10	−13	−40
6. Impact of 1-year physician and hospital freeze (modification of finance provision	−2	−3	−3	−4	−4	−16
7. Offsets	+1	+2	+3	+4	+4	+14
8. Interest savings	−2	−9	−20	−36	−59	−133
Subtotal, spending	−16	−44	−74	−111	−158	−403
Revenues	−23	−44	−67	−93	−124	−350
Remaining deficit	158	129	104	68	26	[1] −753

[1] In reductions.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

BIPARTISAN BUDGET FREEZE PROPOSAL

MAJOR POINTS ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Provides 4 percent annual "Real Growth" in fiscal year 1985–86 and 3 percent in fiscal year 1987–89 with CBO economic assumptions.

Provides 5.5 percent annual "Real Growth" in fiscal year 1985–86 and 4.5 percent in fiscal year 1987–89 with Administration economic assumptions.

Reduces Congressional Baseline Defense totals for fiscal year 1985–87 established in fiscal year 1984 Budget Resolution by $22 billion. Reduces President's new Defense totals by $26 billion.

President's revised Defense totals add $4 billion to Congressional baseline.

Historical defense spending totals:

Annual real growth in total defense spending, fiscal year 1981–84	8.9
Annual real growth in defense procurement, fiscal year 1981–84	17.2
Annual real growth in defense R&D, fiscal year 1981–84	11.9

Holding defense spending to 4 percent in fiscal year 1985 would still provide for annual real growth of 7.7 percent (fiscal year 1981–85) and meet the NATO commitment.

Bipartisan proposal provides for annual real growth through fiscal year 1989 of 5.7 percent per year for 1980s under CBO economic assumptions.

Bipartisan proposal provides for annual real growth through fiscal year 1989 of 6.5 percent per year for 1980s under administration economic assumptions.

DEFENSE ALTERNATIVES

[In billions of dollars]

	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
Hollings/Andrews/Exon 4–4–3–3–3 real growth:						
Budget authority		287.7	314.3	341.3	370.2	401.6
Outlays		263.0	288.4	313.3	340.8	367.5
CBO baseline:						
Budget authority	264	297.3	329.0	367.2	408.7	454.9
Outlays	235	263.4	294.6	329.0	367.4	408.3
President—original request:						
Budget authority		313.7	359.0	389.1	421.6	456.4
Outlays		273.5	315.3	352.5	387.4	419.3
President—new defense total:						
Budget authority		299.0	333.7	372.0		
Outlays		266.0	294.6	330.4		
House Budget Committee:						
Budget authority		285.7	310.0	336.1		
Outlays		255.9	275.8	303.9		
Hollings/Andrews/Exon changes to:						
CBO baseline:						
Budget authority		−9.6	−14.7	−25.9	−38.5	−53.3
Outlays		−0.4	−6.2	−15.7	−26.6	−40.8
President—new						
Budget authority		−11.0	−19.4	−30.7		
Outlays		−3.0	−6.2	−17.1		
House Budget Committee:						
Budget authority		+2.0	+4.3	+5.2		
Outlays		+7.1	+12.6	+9.4		

FREEZE, FREEZE, FREEZE

Everywhere men cry "freeze" but there is no freeze. This is to be expected. David Brinkley recently said, "We have been spending with abandon for 40 years and there is no reason to think that Congress will change this election year." Perhaps we could dispel this air of futility if we understood that for years we have maintained a discipline against "tax and tax and spend and spend." Today that discipline has been broken. We are in serious trouble.

All politicians love tax cuts. For the twenty year period 1960–1980, we had one general tax increase. In contrast, we passed seven tax cuts during the 70's for a revenue loss of $731 billion. The thrust of Kemp-Roth supply side was "if you can't beat them, join them." If the Democrats insisted on redistributing the wealth of the country with niggling tax cuts then the Republicans would take care of the rich with a 30 percent tax cut. Discipline against large deficits

had been maintained since World War II. For the 33 year period between 1947 and 1980, the total cumulative deficit was $465.5 billion. The cumulative deficit for the three years 1982, 1983 and 1984 amounts to $495 billion. Our trouble didn't begin 40 years ago but just now. Each year you run a $200 billion deficit you in essence launch a new spending program of $20 billion for interest costs—$20 billion that could be spent for cancer research, cracks in roads and bridges, education, etc.—$20 billion for nothing. The national debt grows, and interest compounds. Today we are spending $3 billion a week to finance the national debt. Before long Congress will be meeting and after taking care of defense, Social Security and health costs there will be an annual struggle to raise taxes to finance the national debt. We won't be able to provide for anything else.

The reason there is no freeze is that the Republicans want to run on the Reagan tax cuts and hope they can get past the election before interest rates rise. Democrats, knowing that the deficits will cause a rise in interest rates, hope that this will happen before the election causing the Republicans to be thrown out of office. One side doesn't want to see a problem, the other doesn't want to solve it. Neither side wants to face the necessary sacrifice and discipline before the election so both sides engage in the political charade of "freeze" plans that identify with the problem without a solution.

To do the job, the freeze must:

1. Be Bipartisan. The Republicans and Democrats each have the power to cancel the other in the Congress today so that any freeze must be bipartisan;

2. Be Politically Attainable—one that could pass the House and the Senate;

3. Eliminate the Deficit in 5 Years. Unless there is a realistic five year plan, the financial markets will not respond. We must show that we can control the uncontrollables and that the Federal budget will be back in the black in five years;

4. Be Enacted Now—next year is too late. A freeze today could be impossible later. When inflation reignites, touching entitlements will be out of the question. If recession hits, restraining counter cyclical spending will be impossible.

The Republican freeze increases the deficit instead of cutting it. The House Democratic freeze maintains the deficit at a $181 billion level and probably higher. The Senate Democratic freeze maintains the deficit at a $170 billion level. The Kassebaum freeze is only for one year and its total freeze for defense would require a cut in readiness and maintenance of the troops.

The Hollings-Andrews-Exon freeze is bipartisan and politically attainable in that it has just been attained. We are saying, "Let's take this year's budget which was signed into law just five months ago and live with it another year." Is that so difficult? Is that so different from what most families, businesses, unions, state and local governments have had to do during the last four years? We say NO. We say it's about time Washington caught up with the rest of the country. Our proposal will freeze cost-of-living adjustments, discretionary spending and civilian pay for one year followed by 3 percent increases for the next four years. Programs for the nation's needy—supplementary security income, food stamps, Medicare, Medicaid—are exempted. Our plan allows a 3 percent real growth in defense. A total freeze is politically unrealistic—and damaging to defense. The 3 percent maintains the readiness of our troops and our NATO commitment. Our proposal cuts spending $450 billion. On the revenue side, our plan provides $350 billion over 5 years to be raised by a delay in tax indexing, a stretch-out of building depreciation from 15 to 20 years, full basis adjustment for investment tax credits, a minimum corporate tax and other measures included in the Finance Committee bill. The deficit is reduced in five years to $8 billion.

This bipartisan freeze is severe. But the economic forces afoot in the Federal budget are so devastating that it has to be traumatic to get the the job done. A down payment is just a cop-out. Our plan calls for sacrifice but it's a shared sacrifice. We have been on a spending binge too long. Now is the time to put America on a diet and give the future a chance.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Pending the arrival of Senator DOLE in the Chamber, I might also comment on social security. The distinguished Senator from Missouri, on the Finance Committee, will understand that it is not solvent in the sense that we are now taking from the general fund this year. Those on the Finance Committee know we will be taking again next year.

The so-called reform plan had the word saying "reform," but what we did was to borrow from the general revenue. We ran out of the health care fund. We had been borrowing from there. Now we jump the borrowing over to keep it all going, with the so-called increases, from the general revenues. Senator LONG will be on hand in just a moment. I am trying to jog my memory. I believe he used the figure in excess of $60 billion which we would be borrowing from the general revenues in order to pay social security. So we are not taking from the trust fund.

One letter was read about medicare. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. We really have demagogged the social security issue all over the country. I have traveled the country and everywhere we went different candidates were running for office who stood for social security and would save it, and wondered who really opposed it and were trying to cut it.

I did not know of any movement on either side to cut social security.

We do have damagogs. But we do not cut medicare. We do not cut the medicare funds.

With that, I see that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska also has a small inclusion for the RECORD that he also wants to present, if the Senator will yield. I will yield so the Senator from Nebraska may proceed.

Mr. DANFORTH. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska. The only problem I have is that I understand Senator DOLE may be coming to the floor and may like to speak. When he arrives, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will yield to him.

Mr. EXON. Of course. I thank my friend from Missouri.

Madam President, there has been a lot of talk here today, much of it not about the merits or demerits of this bill, but politics.

I say to my friend from Missouri what I said to my friend from New Mexico earlier. This Senator does not play the games that he alluded to in his campaign. If it was my party that was behind that, I apologize. It was not this Senator who played the type of games that the Senator from New Mexico indicated were played 2 years ago on the social security issue.

Concerning the letter that the Senator read from TIP O'NEILL, I have several letters of that general nature by prominent Republicans, some holding the highest offices in this land, which I do not believe would meet the test of fairness in terms of what the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Nebraska would think was right.

Obviously, the Senator from Missouri was quite touched and probably hurt by the unfairness of the campaign waged against him.

I would not be surprised if some of us might not find a like circumstance coming up this November. I think the stage was set pretty clearly for that by the chairman of the Budget Committee and inadvertently, perhaps, by the Senator from Missouri.

I would like to say that there has been some talk here about this terrible tax increase. I would simply say, Madam President, that the first 3 years, $137 billion over a 3-year period, would just about, or a little bit more, cover the two main increases in our bill, national defense, which I suppose we are all interested in, the increase for national defense, and the increase in interest on the national debt.

Somewhere along the line those who support defense must arrange to pay for it.

A great hue and cry went up on the other side when the House said we should have a tax for national defense. I simply say that the Hollings-Exon-Andrews bill in the first 3 years, with the $137 billion figure alluded to by the chairman of the Budget Committee, would just about take care of the increase that our bill allows for national defense and interest on the national debt, two things that we cannot get out of, in the opinion of this Senator.

I was quite discouraged, Madam President, to again hear talk by my good friend, in whom I have great respect, the chairman of the Budget Committee, talking about attacks on entitlement programs. There is no attack on entitlement programs in this particular bill. We try to treat everyone equally.

I am quite surprised that the Senator from Missouri is not with us on this, because he has been with us on similar plans that did about the same

thing as this, only for a shorter period of time.

I was also quite disappointed, Madam President, frankly, at the attitude expressed by the chairman of the Budget Committee about entitlement programs.

On three or four occasions I have personally heard the chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator from New Mexico, get on the air—and I said, "There is a man of courage"—and say "We are not going to attack the deficit program until we take a look at entitlements." He said that over and over and over again, until today.

There is a lot of politics going on, a lot of politics being played. I see a lot of smiles on faces of staff members, who had part and parcel of this. I only say to you, Madam President, that we can make political attacks and we can play politics. But that is not going to solve the deficit. This is a fair and reasonable proposal. I would hope that for once we could put partisan politics and elections aside and do what is right for this country.

I am disappointed that we are not getting more support so far from the other side of the aisle, despite what the Senator from New Mexico said, that this is indeed a bipartisan plan. How many votes we will get on the other side I do not know, because that side is already locked into the rose garden patchwork plan that is not going to do anything.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the distinguished Senator yield 1 more minute?

Mr. DANFORTH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the revenue proposal table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN—REVENUE PROPOSAL

[In billions of dollars]

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1985 to 1989
Pending finance and reconciliation action to date [preliminary estimate]	10.9	15.9	20.8	26.8	32.8	107.2
Delay indexing	5.7	17.1	30.9	46.7	64.7	165.1
CBO estimate of improved taxpayer compliance	1.9	3.3	5.0	7.1	9.5	26.8
Subtotal	18.5	36.3	65.7	80.6	107.0	299.1
Additional revenue requirement, as determined by Finance Committee [1]	4.0	7.2	9.8	13.0	16.9	50.9
Total	22.5	43.5	66.5	93.6	123.9	350.0

[1] Possible alternatives include repeal of excess bad debt allowance for banks, increased minimum corporate tax, full basis adjustment for investment tax credit, and other base broadening measures.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, what we propose to do is not out of thin air and not in contradiction to anything being considered by the Finance Committee. In order to be realistic, we went to the Finance Committee. We took the pending Finance Committee Reconciliation Act to date. Then, unlike the Finance Committee, since there has been a split in the committee, we did delay indexing. We added on the Congressional Budget Office estimate of improved taxpayer compliance.

Then we took the different revenue measures that were suggested by different members of the Finance Committee and their staffs, namely the bad debt allowance of banks. Some of these were to be considered. Not to hogtie, because we could not, the Finance Committee, but to consider some things they had been proposing. The minimum corporate tax, the full base adjustment for the investment tax credit, and all the rest.

When my distinguished colleague from Kansas, the chairman of the Committee on Finance (Mr. DOLE) comes in, I know he might say I am trying to foresee—he will say, you give us these billions and billions, and where are we going to get them from? These proposals come from the Finance Committee. We are not taking it out of whole cloth and giving it an unrealistic assignment.

Now that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is here, I say I shall never forget his poignant statement at the time the so-called social security reform package was adopted. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana and I voted against it. I believe the figure used at that time by the Senator from Louisiana was some $60 billion over a period of 3 years or 5 years that was to come out of the general revenues in order to pay for social security.

I called the social security office and the CBO. They both agreed that this year, 1984, the figure is 16.9 billion. But cumulatively, was there not some $60 billion figure, I ask the Senator from Louisiana, coming from general revenues in order to pay social security?

Mr. LONG. Madam President, I shall be glad to review the matter and give a more complete statement on it, but as I recall it amounts to about $68 billion over the period of 1983 through 1989, over this period, by gimmicks, tricks, and sleight of hand, about $68 billion of printing press money was put in the social security fund. It worked out exactly the same as if you said, "Let's simply adjust the figures. The general fund is $68 billion deeper in debt, and the social security fund is richer by $68 billion."

One device that was used was to put money in the trust fund before it is collected. When the Secretary of the Treasury collects the social security tax, he puts it in the social security fund. Rather than have him put it in the fund when he collects the money, we said, "Let him estimate how much that is going to be and put it in in advance." By doing that, this social security fund gets the money a month sooner than it would otherwise.

It works out just exactly the same as if you had simply taken an amount equal to 1 month's tax payment and put that in the social security fund, without having collected the tax.

That one trick picks up about 8 percent of 1 year's social security tax collection. That is a lot of money, quite a few billion dollars.

Then there were various other ways to transfer general fund money to the social security fund. For example, we have been paying benefits based on World War II military service even though they did not pay social security tax. Previously, we just charged the general fund for the cost of the benefits. Last year we changed this to pay the money into the Treasury that we would have collected if we had put the tax on the servicemen for all those years before 1956.

Mr. HOLLINGS. There you go.

Mr. LONG. All these devices work out just exactly the same as if you were simply ordering that the Treasury print and add to the Federal debt $68 billion of cash and put that in the social security fund.

In fact, you do not even have to print the money; you just put the number of the balance sheet. But it all works out the same as if you had printed the money, put the Government $68 billion in debt over a period of years to help pay for the program.

I shall be glad to provide the Senator a memo saying in detail what these various gimmicks were. You can say that we are paying for the benefits that have been provided the servicemen in years gone by and things like that, but what it all amounts to is just taking the money out of the Federal Treasury, saying the Government is

just that much deeper in debt, and adding it to the social security fund, so the social security fund is hereby solvent and the Federal Government is hereby that much deeper in debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. There you go. We are deeper in debt.

I appreciate the distinguished Senator's clarifying that point. The reason it is significant is that the chairman of the Budget Committee was talking in terms that someone would think we would take $70 billion. Rather than taking $70 billion from the trust fund, what we have done is really add it to the general revenue, $68 billion. We are not taking anything from the trust fund by this particular amendment. That is what frustrated me.

We are cheated by going ahead, for seeing, as the Senator says, gimmicks. We have paid farmers already. I hope they are living because they have the money and if they do not plant next year in accordance with the moneys advanced them this year—this is the most shameful, or shameless, or whatever, Congress I have ever seen. We are just doling money out to farmers, social security recipients, $200 billion generally to the public that we do not even have and do not seem to be worried about it.

I can tell the Senator right now, it just distresses me that, somehow, somewhere, we cannot get the attention of the American people.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. It falls into the same category as an item we did in the Finance Committee some years ago when the Senator from Louisiana was chairman. We just ran out of ways to save money, so we simply said we would move forward the date on which a certain payment was due. By moving that date forward, that meant that money would be paid in one fiscal year rather than the other fiscal year. That improved our situation in the budget year by several hundred million dollars by just moving that date. That was not a very honest way to improve our situation.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I think the Senator from Missouri is trying to get our attention.

Mr. LONG. If I can just complete this statement—then the next year, under Mr. DOLE's leadership, the committee was again in difficulty. If found itself hard put for money in the new budget year so it just moved the date back where it came from and picked the money up all over again. One year you improve your situation by moving the date forward, and the next year, you improve your situation by moving the date back where it came from and there is quite a bit of that same type of legerdemain in the social security bill.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the Senators from Missouri, New Mexico, and Louisiana.

May I have the yeas and nays on the amendment, please Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DANFORTH. Madam President, I should like to point out that it my understanding of the Hollings amendment that it does alter the proposal before us in that it cuts defense spending more than—I would say the increase in defense spending is less than the Budget Committee's proposal. In addition to that, it would raise more revenue than the proposal that is before us. But I think that the thing that is really important to emphasize is that this proposal, as I understand it, does have a freeze on medicare.

Mr. HOLLINGS. No; it does not freeze medicare, Mr. President.

Mr. DANFORTH. It is my understanding that within the amendment itself, under the provision, "Medicare Freeze," that is found on page—apparently the pages are not numbered—but there is a section called Medicare Freeze.

In addition to that, it is my understanding that it does freeze cost-of-living adjustments for entitlement programs for 1 year. Then, for an additional 2-year period, it places an additional cap on the growth. So it does deal with the entitlement issue.

I think, therefore, that what this amendment recognizes, although the numbers are not what I would prefer, is that a mix is necessary, that some additional revenues, restraint in defense spending, and doing something about the entitlements is a mix which is necessary if we are going to get the deficit under control.

For that reason, I commend the Senator from South Carolina, even though I shall not be voting with him, for the political courage necessary to face up to the problem of the entitlement programs and what to do with them.

(The name of Mr. NUNN was added as a cosponsor, by unanimous consent.)

Mr. SASSER. Madam President, any vote to cut the looming Federal budget deficits facing this country this year and for future years entails significant sacrifice. This vote is no different.

The plan offered by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS, the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. ANDREWS, and the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. EXON, is tough medicine. Given the depth and scope of the current deficit dilemma we find ourselves confronted with, tough medicine is needed.

This budget plan represents an integration of two extremely important concepts which are essential to the current debate: First, it is comprehensive from the standpoint that it reduces the Federal deficit by some $315 billion over the next 3 years; second, it embodies the notion of shared sacrifice in that everybody is asked to pay the price for sustained economic growth for the future.

I voted for the plan only reluctantly due to the nature of the social spending constraints contained within. In particular I refer to the 1-year freeze on social security cost-of-living adjustments. While the freeze is not an actual cut, it does represent holding the line on these adjustments for 1 year. The Government's commitment to the elderly is one of the most profound commitments we have to make. It is my belief, however, that had the Hollings-Andrews-Exon plan been adopted, we would have secured a stable economic growth path which would have fully protected the fiscal integrity of the social security trust funds.

It must also be remembered that the budget reconciliation we are considering would only be binding for 1 year, and given encouraging economic performance we would have the opportunity to revisit these actions next year.

In summary, I felt that the drastic nature of the economic problems facing the Nation warranted drastic action, and drastic action now, not after the November elections. This vote in no way reflects a change in unwavering commitment to the security of one of the Nation's most valuable resources; our elderly citizens.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I commend the Senator from South Carolina for his work on deficit reduction. I agree with the basic thrust of his amendment, which calls for very substantial deficit reduction through a program of shared sacrifice. I agree that we must take action or else we risk generating higher interest rates which will cut short economic recovery. For my State of Michigan, stalling out the recovery would mean having the unemployment rate stay at a plateau of 11 percent, which is a higher rate than was reached nationwide during the depth of the recession. We cannot permit this to happen.

However, my general agreement with the approach of the Hollings amendment does not include its provision which would freeze for 1 year the COLA's for social security recipients and others who are receiving Federal retirement benefits. This provision represents asking many of those who are most in need to take too large and sudden a step in the march toward deficit reduction. Due to the parliamentary situation, it was impossible to amend the Hollings plan prior to its being voted on. However, I have consulted with the Parliamentarian and was advised that if the Hollings plan is

adopted, then it would be possible to amend it. I have informed the Senator from South Carolina that I would at that point seek to offer an amendment to modify the 1-year COLA freeze. If this amendment to the Hollings plan were not adopted, then I would not support the Hollings plan on final passage.

Deficit reduction is essential. So is being fair. I shall continue to work during this debate to achieve both of these goals.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I cannot support this amendment, much as the Senator from Kansas would like to cut the deficit by $314 billion. We have to live in the real world, and there is just no reality behind these numbers. The Hollings budget raises taxes by more than is possible or desirable and asks us to vote for a COLA freeze that is sure to be vetoed by his own party in the House. Moreover, Mr. President, the centerpieces of this budget—repealing indexing and freezing COLA's—have already been rejected or have received little support this year.

The Hollings budget claims to reduce baseline deficits by $314 billion over the next 4 years, including $135 in tax increases, $172 in spending cuts, and $36 billion in interest savings.

The amendment would raise $135 billion in taxes by: First, accepting the Finance Committee package of $48 billion; second, delaying indexing 5 years—$54 billion; third, imposing a 10 percent withholding on independent contractors and on royalty payments; and forth, an unspecified increase of $23 billion by issuing the Finance Committee a reconciliation instruction.

Delaying indexing 5 years is tantamount to repeal. We have fought this battle before; a short time ago, a similar indexing delay was defeated by a vote of 38–57. Yet, this failed amendment is the centerpiece of this budget.

It is interesting that Senator HOLLINGS would offer an extension of withholding. We could have used his support in the vote on withholding last year but the Senator from South Carolina opposed the Dole compromise on withholding.

This amendment accepts the Finance Committee package on revenues; yet a similar-tax reform, base-broadening package of 2 years ago, TEFRA, was opposed by the Senator from South Carolina.

Then there is the unspecified tax increase of $23 billion. Apparently the sponsors of this amendment ran out of ideas, so they are laying it on the Finance Committee. This is another demonstration of the unreality of the budget. The Senator from Kansas, as chairman of the Finance Committee, would have liked to raise another $23 billion, but $48 billion was as high as we could go. I dare say that the Senator from South Carolina would oppose many of the provisions necessary to raise another $23 billion. If he has some ideas, I would suggest he spell them out instead of passing the buck to the Finance Committee.

This budget lacks credibility. Of $137 billion in revenue, $77 billion come from delaying indexing and an unspecified tax increase. Neither is going to happen.

Neither is the freeze on entitlements going to happen, not until it is endorsed by TIP O'NEILL.

The Hollings-Exon-Andrews budget would yield $7.3 billion in savings in medicare by freezing hospital payments; but our finance committee bill gives more than that, $10.4 billion, in fact. And we believe that we have done so in a more efficient and equitable fashion.

This amendment would reduce social security spending by $28 billion over the next 3 years, or a reduction of $1,850 for an average retired couple over this period.

When you strip away the items on the Senator's wish list, you are left with the Republican leadership budget. This underscores why I am supporting the leadership budget—it is not perfect, but it is the best that is going to happen this year.

Plans that make larger savings sound great, but they make those savings by either raising taxes substantially more than $48 billion, freezing entitlements, or making deep cuts in defense. None of these is in the cards this year.

Madam President, the Republican leadership budget is the only realistic possibility this year. If it is defeated, the likelihood is that there will be no deficit reduction in 1984.

Madam President, is there 1 minute remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute remains.

Mr. DOLE. Again, I commend everybody who wants to reduce the deficit. I think it is great to make these speeches on the floor, but when you go into the committee of jurisdiction to get the votes, they are not there.

The House had a little freeze—it was not even frozen, a semifrozen proposition. It got 108 votes. That is controlled by the Democrats.

There is not going to be any freeze passed by the Congress. We are walking into a trap, the House just waiting for us to vote a big freeze over here. Then they say, "Ha, ha, there they go again."

So if you want to defer indexing for 5 years, who is going to lose? Seventy-eight percent of the tax increase for deferring indexing would fall on taxpayers earning less than $50,000 per year. Twenty-two percent of the cost of the repeal of indexing would fall on taxpayers earning more than $50,000. I hope next year we can continue this bipartisan spirit. This year let us go ahead and pass something that we can get support for on both sides. I hope we will defeat this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), would vote "nay."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Andrews	Hollings	Nunn
Bentsen	Inouye	Pressler
Biden	Johnston	Proxmire
Bingaman	Kassebaum	Pryor
Boren	Leahy	Quayle
Bumpers	Levin	Sasser
Burdick	Long	Specter
Chiles	Mathias	Stafford
Cohen	Matsunaga	Stennis
Dodd	McClure	Tsongas
Eagleton	Melcher	Weicker
Exon	Mitchell	Zorinsky
Grassley	Nickles	

NAYS—57

Abdnor	Garn	Metzenbaum
Armstrong	Glenn	Moynihan
Baker	Goldwater	Packwood
Baucus	Gorton	Pell
Boschwitz	Hatch	Percy
Bradley	Hatfield	Randolph
Byrd	Hawkins	Riegle
Chafee	Hecht	Roth
Cochran	Heflin	Rudman
Cranston	Heinz	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Helms	Simpson
Danforth	Huddleston	Stevens
DeConcini	Humphrey	Symms
Denton	Jepsen	Thurmond
Dole	Kasten	Tower
Domenici	Lautenberg	Trible
East	Laxalt	Wallop
Evans	Lugar	Warner
Ford	Mattingly	Wilson

NOT VOTING—5

Dixon	Hart	Murkowski
Durenberger	Kennedy	

So Mr. HOLLINGS' amendment (No. 3041) was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I do not know what is going to happen next, and until I can find out, we cannot go out.

I do not know how to proceed except with a quorum call, but let me warn Senators that we have not necessarily had our last vote. I hope we can work something out, but it is not yet done.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am happy to report that the authors of the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden-Baucus amendment have said that they will offer that amendment tonight. In exchange, I have assured them that we will not proceed beyond the point of simply offering it, and making it the pending question.

As soon as it is offered, reported, and made the pending question, it will be the intention of the leadership of this side to put us in a brief period for morning business, and to go out promptly. Based on that, and with great gratitude, I wish to announce that there will be no more RECORD votes today.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON AMENDMENT NO. 3034

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I was necessarily absent yesterday during the rollcall vote on amendment No. 3034. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay," and I ask that this be made a part of the permanent record.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am advised that the Kassebaum, et al., amendment is on its way to the floor to be introduced. It is not yet here.

To conserve time, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to proceed with morning business with certain routine matters not past 6:30 p.m., with no limitation as to time so that the minority leader and I may speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the material that I am about to cover appears to have been cleared on both sides for action by unanimous consent. Let me go through it now and state the requests for the minority leader and other Senators.

ORDER TO PLACE HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 537 ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate receives from the House, House Joint Resolution 537, a joint resolution designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER TO PLACE HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 275 ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate receives from the House, House Concurrent Resolution 275, to commend Colombia for drug enforcement, it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT OF REPORT NO. 98-400

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Report No. 98-400 to accompany S. 2582 be star printed to reflect the following changes which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS ACT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the minority leader has no objection, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate calendar order No. 262.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2733) to extend and improve the existing program of research, development, and demonstration in the production and manufacture of guayule rubber, and to broaden such program to include other critical agricultural materials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry with an amendment.

On page 11, after line 20, insert:

TARGET PRICES AND EXPORT INITIATIVES

SEC. 16. (a) This section may be cited as the "Target Prices and Export Initiatives Act of 1983".

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 107B(b)(1)(C), 105B(b)(1)(C), 103(g)(3)(B), and 101(i)(2)(C) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe that the established price for the 1984 or 1985 crop of wheat, corn, upland cotton, or rice shall be such price as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, but in no case shall the price be less than the minimum established price for the 1983 crop of the commodity.

(c) Effective for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1984, and September 30, 1985, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use not less than $300,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for export activities authorized to be carried out by the Secretary or by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of law in effect on the date of enactment of this section, notwithstanding the fact that the activity may not be included in the budget program of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary shall carry out the program authorized by this section through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The authority provided in this section shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any authority granted to the Secretary or the Commodity Credit Corporation under any other provision of law.

(d) Section 4(d) of the Food for Peace Act of 1966 is amended by—

(1) striking out the second sentence of paragraph (3);

(2) amending the second sentence of paragraph (4) to read as follows: "All funds received by the Corporation in payment for credit extended by the Corporation (A) under the provisions of the Target Prices and Export Initiatives Act of 1983 and section 135 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982, and (B) using the revolving fund, including interest or other receipts on investments and credit obligations, in financing export sales of the types specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be added to and become a part of such revolving fund.";

(3) striking out "1982" in the third sentence of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "1985";

(4) striking out paragraphs (6) and (8); and

(5) redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

COTTON

SEC. 17. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to acquire a sufficient amount of upland cotton to carry out the payment-in-kind program established by the Secretary of Agriculture for the 1983 crop of upland cotton, the Secretary shall solicit bids from cotton producers, without specifying any limit on the amount of the bids, for sale to the Commodity Credit Corporation of cotton pledged by such producers as security for nonrecourse loans made under section 103(g)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1444(g)(1)). Until sufficient cotton to carry out the payment-in-kind program for the 1983 crop of upland cotton is acquired under this procedure, or until a reasonable bid period opportunity has been determined and made available by the Secretary, but in no event less than two weeks, no bid shall be rejected unless it exceeds the amount (on a percentage basis) of the highest bid received and accepted by the Secretary under the same procedure for feed grains. The Secretary shall give any producer who has previously submitted a bid the opportunity to nullify such bid if the producer agrees to submit another bid under the terms of this section.

The title to be amended so as to read: "An Act to improve research and

development in the production and manufacture of guayule rubber and to broaden the program to include other critical agricultural materials, to provide discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in the establishment of target prices, to extend agricultural export initiatives, and to provide equity in the payment-in-kind program for certain producers of upland cotton".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1983, H.R. 2733, extends for 5 years the authorization for appropriations for existing programs of research, development, and demonstration in the production and manufacture of guayule—pronounced why-you-lee, and broadens program authority to include other nontraditional agricultural materials as well. This bill continues the promotion of the development and commercialization of a domestic natural rubber based on the cultivation of guayule.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of H.R. 2733 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HELMS. I urge the support of H.R. 2733 since it provides the impetus to develop the capability for the United States to produce native latex and reduce the 100-percent dependency we have for natural rubber. The natural rubber supply for this country comes totally from foreign sources. Presently the United States imports annually 800,000 metric tons of natural rubber at a cost exceeding one-half billion dollars per year.

Mr. President, Federal involvement in guayule research has spanned the last two decades. Guayule was produced in California during World War II when foreign supplies of natural rubber were cut off. However, production ended once foreign rubber again became available. During the Korean war, cultivation programs began in Texas, but were ended after the war.

Increased efforts in this area were renewed in 1978 when Congress passed th Native Latex Commercialization and Economic Development Act of 1978. My distinguished colleague, Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico, took a leadership role in this effort and I commend his efforts to establish a national policy for the development and demonstration of economically feasible means of culturing and manufacturing guayule for the extraction of natural rubber.

However, Mr. President, the full capacity of the program has never been reached and the United States still remains totally dependent on foreign sources of natural rubbers. H.R. 2733 will send the message from Congress that we intend to see this dependency reduced.

Most of the natural latex produced in the world comes from tropical plants which are not suitable for growth in the United States. Yet guayule, which is a member of the sunflower family and native to North America, produces significant amounts of natural rubber, and its development could introduce a domestic source for natural rubber. Research on the commercial development of guayule suggests that the United States may be able to produce 30 percent of its domestic rubber needs from guayule. This legislation furthers this endeavor.

In addition, Mr. President, H.R. 2733 broadens program authority to include other nontraditional agricultural materials. We have the potential to develop new uses for many ancient crops which hold commercial promise as renewable sources of critical materials. Plants such as meadow foam, crambe, buffalo gourd, gopher weed, and jojoba—pronounce ho-ho-bah—are but a few known to produce feedstocks, industrial hydrocarbons, plastics, fertilizers, and lubricants.

Furthermore, modern technology and continuing research are opening new doors that will allow us to produce more and better food and fiber products. It is interesting to note that just a few decades ago soybeans and sunflowers were considered nontraditional crops. Thinking ahead, it may be, for instance, that concentrated protein from the tobacco plant may be the wonder food of the next decade.

Mr. President, private capital investment cannot be expected until it can be shown that such crops can be grown profitably. The future in this area is encouraging, and we have yet to reach our full capacity. For example, the commercial development of guayule could encourage growth of jobs and small industries in our Southwest. Similar activity with other plants can provide these opportunities nationwide.

Research in both the public and private sectors is appropriate for developing guayule into a viable crop to supply an alternative natural rubber source for this Nation. Public support should be directed toward basic genetic materials, disease and general pest resistance, improved cultural practices, and providing information on seed production practices, harvesting, and storage procedures.

The private sector can engage in applied and developmental guayule research to improve large-scale planting and harvesting techniques, new storage technology, processing, and ultimately the commercialization of guayule as a finished natural rubber product.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of the RECORD, two letters that were received in support of H.R. 2733. These letters are very encouraging and provide insight on this new frontier in agricultural research and development. I am convinced that with proper research, production data, and feasibility studies, private industry can and should be encouraged to pursue new uses for ancient crops, and new crops as well, that are found to have a promising future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I urge adoption of H.R. 2733. This bill will continue efforts to develop farming systems which conserve our resources, develop new crops and new uses for existing crops, and better agriculture-related research and development programs. Additionally, H.R. 2733 can favorably contribute to our national economy and security, our national defense, and our foreign trade balance.

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY: H.R. 2733, CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS ACT

H.R. 2733, A bill to extend and improve the existing program of research, development, and demonstration in the production and manufacture of guayule rubber, and to broaden such program to include other critical agricultural materials.

The Purpose of this bill is to extend for five years the Native Latex Commercialization and Economic Development Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-592). The measure broadens our guayule research and development program to one of a more generic nature that will include other agricultural crops that have the potential for producing materials of strategic or industrial importance.

Major Provisions of H.R. 2733:

Extends for five years the Native Latex Commercialization and Economic Development Act of 1978;

Authorizes appropriations on an annually graduating scale totaling $50 million. Of this amount USDA will receive $32.5 million and the Department of Commerce will receive $17.5 million;

Establishes the Department of Agriculture as the lead agency to carry out provisions of the Act;

Establishes within USDA an Office of Critical Agricultural Materials, which will coordinate research activities on native latex and other agricultural crops that bear strategic and industrial materials;

Calls for the acceleration of genetic research, large-scale plantings, and development of pilot and commerical size extraction facilities for native latex from guayule;

Broadens the guayule research and development program to include other critical agricultural materials that would be of strategic and industrial importance to the United States; and

Expands the membership of the Joint Commission that coordinates activities in this area to include the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The Secretary of USDA will chair the Joint Commission.

EXHIBIT 2

BOTANICAL RESOURCES,
October 12, 1983.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: In discussions of glamorous new technologies there is a tendency to overlook that agriculture is our country's most productive technology. As such it deserves its proportionate share of stimulation and scientific support.

New cash crops are needed for the United States. With food crop overproduction there is now much unused fertile land, and with it come highly skilled farmers eager to develop the new cash crops. If the crop has an existing market and a critical end use but is totally imported from unstable growing regions, then domestic production simultaneously serves national security, creates jobs and returns money to the United States rather than a foreign economy.

Pyrethrin is a natural insecticide extracted from pyrethrum flowers and is the safest insecticide. It is classified a strategic and critical material by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and is to be stockpiled because the United States is completely dependent on foreign sources of supply. However, we recently formed Botanical Resources to begin producing pyrethrin domestically.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter recently sent to Dr. Wheaton at the USDA along with other information detailing the importance of pyrethrin. But briefly here is what can be said about pyrethrin: It is a non-synthetic, non-petroleum based, non-persistent, renewable natural material extracted from daisy-like flowers, having FDA/EPA food tolerance and safety towards humans, animals and the environment; after centuries of use it is definitely established that it does not cause cancer, birth defects or cellular mutations. In these days of dioxin, toxic waste dumps, improperly tested synthetic pesticides, etc., there will be much popular support for such a benign alternative.

The manufacture of pyrethrum extract has such commercial potential that it can be privately financed. But the most important and most expensive step of the project is to develop the agriculture; that is, to show that U.S. farmers can make money growing pyrethrum, that they can grow it more efficiently than anywhere else. Botanical Resources has spent about $75,000 with nurseries, farmers and the universities to get the project started, and we would at least like to see our funds matched by state and federal agencies.

Developing the agriculture of a new crop is what the USDA and agricultural universities have done so successfully in the past. Earlier this year the House passed by a wide margin a $50 million Critical Agricultural Materials Act (summary enclosed) which will provide funding to the USDA and other agencies to develop crops such as pyrethrum. The bill is now with your agriculture Committee and we urgently request your support for its passage into law in its pure form. It is a very efficient use of federal money for stimulating the creation of new U.S. industry. We will be grateful for any help you can provide.

Sincerely,

MARC SIMS,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE,
Riverside, Calif., June 7, 1983.

GEORGE S. DUNLOP,
Chief of Staff, U.S. Senate, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUNLOP: Dean Irwin Sherman has asked me to respond to your letter of May 25, 1983.

The major objective of agricultural research has been the development of technology for producing more and better food on our better agricultural lands. In recent years, however, a new frontier in agricultural research and development has emerged: the development of technology for the production of energy related, renewable resources, in our extensive semiarid regions of the Southwest.

Non-traditional plants such as jojoba, guayule, mesquite, latex plants, tepary bean, salt bush, fast growing tree species, and meadowfoam have been suggested as potential crops for the semiarid regions. It is implied that private industry would engage in the development of large scale commercial plantings of the above plants. Investment of private capital in such ventures could not be expected, however, until it can be shown that these new crops could be grown profitably. This is a role for state and federal governments. To accomplish this, pilot size (100-200 acre) plantings need to be established for each crop to generate well documented production data which could be used for the preparation of sound feasibility studies. Once this was done private industry could be encouraged to pursue those crops that would be found to have a promising future.

To take jojoba as an example, considerable information has been gathered on how to grow this plant commercially. Also, sources of superior germplasm have been identified. This germplasm could be transferred into a pilot plantation for evaluation and further improvement. At the same time large scale experiments and demonstrations could be established to develop information on optimum cultural and management practices that should be used for it, in terms of irrigation, fertilization, weed control, population density, disease and pest control, mechanical harvesting, companion crops, etc. Additional research could look into the utilization of these crops and their by-products, the expected demand for them, the price range at which they could be sold, and the degree to which they could contribute to our national economy. A similar approach could be used with each of the other potential crops mentioned. It should be pointed out that crops such as the above would not only develop economic activity and job opportunities in semiarid areas which are economically depressed, but also provide materials of considerable significance to our national defense and foreign trade.

Sincerely,

LEWIS G. WEATHERS,
Associate Dean, Research.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, the provisions of H.R. 2733, as passed by the House of Representatives, are important to the Nation's program for research to promote self-sufficiency in critical materials, and I am pleased that the bill has been cleared for consideration by the Senate.

H.R. 2733, as reported by the committee last June, contained controversial provisions concerning the wheat, feed grain, upland cotton, and rice programs. The issues relating to those programs have been resolved in the conference report on H.R. 4072, which passed the Senate on April 2. The President approved the legislation on Tuesday, April 10. That action clears the way for consideration, at this time, of the critical agricultural materials portion of this legislation, which is the same in the House-passed bill and the bill, as reported by the Agriculture Committee.

H.R. 2733 will amend the Native Latex Commercialization and Economic Development Act of 1978 to strengthen the existing program of research, development, and demonstration in the production of guayule rubber. In addition, other critical materials will be included in the program.

As world demand for rubber expands and the price of synthetic rubber continues to rise, there has been renewed interest in the use of guayule as a domestic source of natural rubber.

The United States is wholly dependent on foreign sources for natural rubber, including all strategic and military stockpile requirements. The successful commercialization of quayule in the United States will enable us to break this dependence on foreign production of rubber.

The 1978 act established a national policy for the development and demonstration of economically feasible means of culturing and manufacturing guayule for the extraction of natural rubber. In addition, the 1978 act authorized development of other hydrocarbon-containing plants to produce raw materials for industrial use.

H.R. 2733 will redesignate the 1978 act as the "Critical Agricultural Materials Act" and expand it to require research and development into the use of any native agricultural material having critical strategic or industrial importance.

Also, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to construct a developmental rubber processing facility for the extraction and production of test quantities of guayule natural rubber and to establish an office of critical agricultural materials within the Department of Agriculture. The bill authorizes appropriations of funds to carry out the critical materials program through 1988.

I urge the Senate to approve the House-passed bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am authorized by the chairman of the commitee to ask that the amendment to the bill and the amendment to the title be withdrawn. Does it require unanimous consent, Mr. President, under those circumstances?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chairman of the committee has authority to approve that request.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am not sure that I agree with that interpreta-

tion of the Chair. For future reference, it may be that the matter should be addressed again. At the moment, I will not raise the issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee reported amendment and the amendment to the title, at the request of the chairman of the committee, be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2733) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, that completes the action I had to raise for wrapup, as we call it. May I inquire of the minority leader if he has anything further?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2597. An act to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughter of Harry S Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel.

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT) has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 2460. An act to designate a Federal building in Augusta, Maine, as the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building";

S. 2461. An act to designate a Federal building in Bangor, Maine, as the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building"; and

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to recognize "Volunteer Firefighters Recognition Day" as a tribute to the bravery and self-sacrifice of our volunteer firefighters.

The enrolled bills and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 1, 1984, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 2460. An act to designate a Federal building in Augusta, Maine, as the "Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building";

S. 2461. An act to designate a Federal building in Bangor, Maine, as the "Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building"; and

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to recognize "Volunteer Firefighters Recognition Day" as a tribute to the bravery and self-sacrifice of our volunteer firefighters.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3116. A communication from the Director of the DOD Office of Dependents Schools transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Test Report for 1983-84 for overseas dependents' schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3117. A communication from the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on applications for delays of notice and customer challenges under the Right to Financial Privacy Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3118. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the Master Meter Gas Operators report; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3119. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on activities of the Office of Personnel Management and the Merit Systems Protection Board; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3120. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's annual Freedom of Information report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3121. A communication from the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on applications for court orders to permit the interception of wire or oral communications during 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3122. A communication from the Administrator of the Veterans Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, recommendations for equitable relief in certain cases of reliance on erroneous determinations; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

EC-3123. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3124. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the technology transfer control program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3125. A communication from the Acting Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the matter of the wounding on April 3, 1984 of the Administrative Supervisor for the Joint U.S. Military Aid Group in Greece by unknown assailants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3126. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize forfeiture of accrued leave by certain members of the uniformed services discharged prior to serving satisfactorily on active duty for 6 months; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3127. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, and Logistics transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the adequacy of pay and allowances of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 1868. A bill to add $17,996,558 to the budget ceiling for new acquisitions at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore (Rept. No. 98-419).

S. 2095. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Wildcat River for study as a National Wild and Scenic River (Rept. No. 98-420).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1224. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain undistributed judgment funds awarded the Creek Nation (Rept. No. 98-421).

By Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 384. An original resolution relating to the purchase of calendars (Rept. No. 98-422).

S. Res. 375. An original resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., as Chaplain of the Senate during the Ninety-seventh Congress.

S. Res. 376. An original resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., as Chaplain of the Senate during the Ninety-eighth Congress.

S. Res. 377. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Carol Jeffery Toliver; Norman Lee Toliver; Marvin Lewis Toliver; Catherine Amelia Henderson; Ruth Louise Toliver; Mary Etta Samuel; Phyllis Jean Pelham; Alvin Windell Toliver; Grace Ann Toliver.

S. Res. 378. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Firshein.

S. Res. 379. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Eric Swanson and Kristan Booth.

S. Res. 380. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Patsy L. Funk.

S. Res. 381. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Walter M. Stickell.

S. Res. 382. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Laura Dudley Page.

S. Res. 383. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Daniel T. Foley; Maureen C. Canny; Eileen P. Twigg.

By Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 107. A concurrent resolution authorizing the rotunda of the Capitol to be used from May 25, 1984, through May 28, 1984, for the unknown American of the Vietnam era to lie in state.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. McCLURE (by request):

S. 2610. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. McCLURE (by request):

S. 2611. A bill to entitle certain United States citizens and nationals domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands to document vessels under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GORTON (for himself, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 2612. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HEINZ:

S. 2613. A bill to suspend the duties on circular knitting machines designed for sweater strip or garment length knitting until the close of December 31, 1989; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. HATFIELD):

S. 2614. A bill to amend the Indian Financing Act of 1974; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. HAWKINS (for herself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

S. 2615. A bill to revise and extend programs conducted by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DENTON (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. EAST, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. EAGLETON):

S. 2616. A bill to extend the Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HEINZ):

S. 2617. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the National Lunch Act to reauthorize the special supplemental food program and other child nutrition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. DANFORTH (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 2618. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to promote expansion of international trade in telecommunications products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCLURE (by request):

S.J. Res. 286. A joint resolution to approve the "Compact of Free Association", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 375. An original resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., as Chaplain of the Senate during the Ninety seventh Congress; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 376. An original resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., as Chaplain of the Senate during the Ninety-eighth Congress; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 377. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Carol Jeffery Toliver; Norman Lee Toliver; Marvin Lewis Toliver; Catherine Amelia Henderson; Ruth Louise Toliver; Mary Etta Samuel; Phyllis Jean Pelham; Alvin Windell Toliver; Grace Ann Toliver; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 378. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Firshein; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 379. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Eric Swanson and Kristan Booth; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 380. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Patsy L. Funk; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 381. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Walter M. Stickell; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 382. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Laura Dudley page; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 383. An original resolution to pay a gratuity to Daniel T. Foley; Maureen C. Canny; Eileen P. Twigg; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 384. An original resolution relating to the purchase of calendars; placed on the calendar.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McCLURE (by request):

S. 2610. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT AMENDMENTS

● Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, at the request of the administration, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

Mr. President, this draft legislation was submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and the executive communication which accompanied the proposal from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the materials was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2610

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460 l-4), as amended, is further amended by striking out section 9 in its entirety and renumbering succeeding sections accordingly.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1984.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft bill, "To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965."

We recommended that the draft bill be introduced, referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and enacted.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1985 proposes the repeal of certain authority contained in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to enter into contracts for land acquisition in advance of appropriations for that purpose. This authority, section 9 of the Act as amended, has only been used twice—in 1969 and 1970. Further, the Congress now appropriates Federal land acquisition funds for recreation purposes on the basis of specific projects that are considered individually by the Appropriations Committees. Accordingly, we believe the advance contracting authority should be repealed. The draft bill would strike section 9 from the Act and renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that this legislative proposal is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

G. RAY ARNETT,
Assistant Secretary.●

By Mr. McCLURE (by request):

S. 2611. A bill to entitle certain U.S. citizens and nationals domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands to document vessels under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

DOCUMENTATION OF CERTAIN VESSELS UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

● Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, at the request of the administration, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to entitle certain U.S. citizens and nationals domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands to document vessels under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this draft legislation was submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and the executive communication which accompanied the proposal from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2611

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this Act to further the economic development of Guam, American Samoa and the Northern

Mariana Islands by promoting the development of an indigenous local fishing industry. Recognizing the economic needs of these islands and the impracticability of—

(1) requiring the use of United States-built hulls for fishing and the coastwise transportation of fisheries products in these locations;

(2) limiting by statute the documentation of vessels to citizens of the United States; and

(3) requiring United States citizenship for the operation of vessels in an area in which, due to the great distance from the United States, the cost of processing, transporting, and maintaining United States-built vessels is prohibitive, and in which many persons, although not citizens of the United States, owe permanent allegiance to the United States or will become citizens in the near future;

it is declared the intent of Congress to provide for limiting exceptions to the requirements of the use of United States-built hulls for fishing and coastwise transportation of fisheries products in those locations, and of United States citizenship for the documentation and operation of vessels.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS. For purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) "national of the United States" has the meaning given it in section 101(a)(22)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)(B));

(2) "citizen of the Northern Marina Islands" means an individual citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who is exclusively domiciled in the Northern Mariana Islands within the meaning of section 1005(e) of the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America (90 Stat. 278);

(3) "domicile" means that place where a person maintains a residence with the intention of continuing such residence for an unlimited or indefinite period, and to which such person, when absent, even for an extended period, has the intention of returning; and

(4) "fishing" includes—

(A) all activities defined as fishing in section 3(10) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(10)); and

(B) all activities included in the definition of fisheries in section 102(2) of the Vessel Documentation Act of 1980 (94 Stat. 3453).

SEC. 3. VESSELS ELIGIBLE FOR DOCUMENTATION. Any vessel of at least five net tons that is not registered under the laws of a foreign country is eligible for documentation under this Act if it is owned by—

(1) an individual who is a citizen or national of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or a citizen of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(2) an association, trust, joint venture, or other entity capable of holding title to a vessel under the laws of the United States or of Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, all the members of which are citizens or nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(3) a partnership whose general partners are citizens or nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the controlling interest in the partnership is owned by citizens or nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(4) a corporation created under the laws of the United States, Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands if—

(A) the controlling interest is owned by citizens or nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or by citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands;

(B) its president or other chief executive officer and the chairman of its board of directors are citizens or nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or are citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands and

(C) no more of its directors than a minority of the number necessary to constitute a quorum are other than citizens or nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands; or

(5) the government of Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 4. FISHING AND COASTWISE TRADE BY FOREIGN-BUILT VESSELS. Foreign-built vessels documented under this Act are entitled to engage in—

(1) fishing within the territorial sea and fishery conservation zone adjacent to Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands in accordance with applicable United States laws; and

(2) coastwise trade of fisheries products in and among Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 5. CITIZENSHIP FOR PURPOSES RELATED TO THE OPERATION OF DOCUMENTED VESSELS. Nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands shall be considered citizens of the United States for all citizenship requirements related to the operation of vessels documented under this Act while the vessel is engaged in the activities described in section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 6. EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF TRUSTEESHIP. Upon the effective date of the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement over the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, section 2(2) of this Act and all references to the Northern Mariana Islands contained in this Act shall cease to be effective.

SEC. 7. EFFECT ON THE LAWS APPLICABLE TO THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to render applicable to the Northern Mariana Islands the coastwise laws of the United States or any prohibition in the laws of the United States against foreign vessels landing fish or unfinished fish products in the United States.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. This section declares it the purpose of the Act to further the economic development of Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands by allowing, in those jurisdictions, limited exceptions to the requirements that only United States-built vessels be used for the fishing and coastwise fisheries trade.

Section 2. This section contains definitions. The term "fishing" includes fishing activities as defined by both section 3(10) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(10)) (MFCMA) and by section 102(2) of the Vessel Documentation Act (46 U.S.C. 65)(VDA). The term has been defined to include both definitions of fishing in order to make the range of included fishing activities as broad as possible. For instance, sole use of the definition of "fishing" contained in the MFCMA would mean that the subject vessels could not be used for the tuna fishery, since tuna is a highly migratory species and not included within the scope of the MFCMA definition. Since the tuna fishery is one of the richest in the waters surrounding these jurisdictions, such an omission would undercut the intent of the legislation.

Section 3. This section is patterned after section 104 of the VDA (46 U.S.C. 65b) and describes the vessels eligible for documentation under this Act. It permits documentation of vessels over five net tons owned by United States citizens or nationals domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands, or citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands; by associations, trusts, or joint ventures comprised of these citizens or nationals; by partnerships and corporations under their control; and by their governments.

Section 4. This section provides that any foreign-built vessel documented under this Act is allowed to engage in fishing, as defined in section 2, within the territorial sea and fishery conservation zone adjacent to Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands. These vessels may also engage in the coastwise trade of fisheries products in and among these jurisdictions. The latter provision is intended to dispel confusion as to whether transportation in and among the jurisdictions is coastwise trade. It confers a clear entitlement to transport fisheries products regardless of whether that activity is characterized as coastwise trading. It should be emphasized that this entitlement is restricted in scope and does not contemplate the use of these vessels in unlimited coastwise trading.

Section 5. This section provides that United States nationals domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands are considered United States citizens for purposes of satisfying all citizenship requirements related to the operation of vessels documented under this Act.

Section 6. This section provides that reference to "citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands" will cease to be effective upon termination of the Trusteeship Agreement over the Trust Territory.

Section 7. This section draws from the language of the Covenant with the Northern Mariana Islands to state that nothing in this legislation overrules the provisions in the Covenant concerning the non-applicability of either the coastwise laws of the United States to the Northern Mariana Islands, or the prohibitions against foreign vessels landing fish in the United States.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1984.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft bill, "To entitle certain United States citizens and nationals domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands to document vessels under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the draft bill be introduced, referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and enacted.

This proposal is intended to increase the economic vitality of Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands by removing a number of statutory impediments currently blocking development of an indigenous fishing industry in these jurisdictions. The statutory relief contemplated by this proposal would consist of a narrow exception to the vessel documentation, vessel manning and fisheries laws.

This proposal would entitle domiciliaries of Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands who are also citizens or nationals of the United States or citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands to register vessels under United States vessel documentation laws. The Vessel Documentation Act (94 Stat. 3453) (VDA) currently restricts vessel documentation to those vessels wholly owned by United States citizens. Since the availability of preferred mortgage financing hinges on a vessel being documented as a "vessel of the United States," inability to document vessels under United States law is a significant handicap to procuring and financing the larger vessels necessary to a viable fishing industry.

In addition, the definition of United States citizens found in the VDA excludes citizens of American Samoa. This proposal would create a legal entitlement to United States vessel documentation for this currently excluded group, at the same time as the privilege of documenting foreign-built vessels is conferred on all of the Pacific territorial groups.

This proposal would also create a limited exception to existing statutory restrictions on the activities in which a foreign-built United States registered vessel may engage. One of these restrictions, found in the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (90 Stat. 331) (MFCMA), allows only United States-built vessels to be documented as vessels of the United States eligible to be employed in commercial fishing activities in the fishery conservation zone without a permit. The other restriction, found in the VDA, also requires, as a general rule, that a vessel be United States-built in order to obtain a fishery license entitling the vessel to fish within the fishery conservation zone created by the MFCMA. In these remote Western Pacific areas, United States-built vessels are prohibitively expensive to buy, transport and maintain. Consequently, the fisheries resources of these areas are either underutilized or principally benefit foreigners who fish these areas. This legislation would permit qualifying entities to document foreign-built vessels for use in fishing activities in the territorial sea or the fishery conservation zone adjacent to the territorial sea surrounding Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands. It would also allow foreign-built vessels documented under this proposal to engage in the coastwise trade of fisheries products in and among these jurisdictions only.

Finally, this proposal would provide that nationals of the United States domiciled in Guam, American Samoa, or the Northern Mariana Islands and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands are to be considered United States citizens for the purpose of meeting the manning standards related to the operation of vessels documented under this proposed legislation. Statutes imposing citizenship requirements on the crews of United States-flag vessels have been an impediment to the development of a local fishing industry in that these statutes have precluded American Samoans and citizens of the Northern Mariana Islands from serving on documented vessels as masters, licensed officers, and pilots and have limited the numbers who may serve as crew members. Examples of these restrictions include the following:

(1) A vessel of the United States is required to be under the command of a citizen of the United States (94 Stat. 3456).

(2) All licensed officers and pilots of vessels of the United States must be citizens of the United States (46 U.S.C. 672a and 46 U.S.C. 690).

(3) Upon each departure of a vessel of the United States from a port of the United States, 75 percent of the crew, excluding licensed officers, must be citizens of the United States (46 U.S.C. 672a).

Enactment of this proposal is necessary to further the economic development of the jurisdictions concerned. The waters surrounding Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands are rich in marine resources and have the potential for serving as the basis for a profitable commercial fishing and canning industry. The passage of a large number of statutory requirements has, however, created a series of perceived legal barriers to the development of an economically significant commercial fishing industry. This proposal does not reflect an intent to overturn established cabotage and citizenship requirements. Rather, recognizing that the various statutes discussed above serve legitimate political and economic objectives, this proposal is limited in scope and creates specific exceptions only to the extent necessary to further an equally legitimate objective in a unique political and geographic context.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

RICHARD T. MONTOYA,
Assistant Secretary.●

By Mr. GORTON (for himself, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 2612. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION ACT, 1985

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am introducing today, along with my colleagues, Senators PACKWOOD, HOLLINGS, HEFLIN, and LAUTENBERG, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and for other purposes.

We have just witnessed a space shuttle mission in which our astronauts performed their second untethered space walk and the first shuttle-assisted repair in space of a malfunctioning satellite. The space shuttle has now proven itself in yet another dimension and has shown the world that the shuttle is indeed a truly remarkable spacecraft whose capabilities we have just begun to exploit.

This legislation proposes funding for other meaningful and exiting missions and activities, one of which is a new planetary start, the Mars geoscience/climatology orbiter, which, when launched in 1990, will begin yielding the most comprehensive Mars data since the earlier Mariner and Viking missions.

Another new start proposed in this legislation is the upper atmosphere research satellite, which will give an important boost to the atmospheric science community, especially in our universities.

Most exciting of the new starts in this legislation, however, is the proposal to develop within a decade a permanently manned civil space station. This initiative promises to advance our scientific and technological capabilities, to provide a focal point for the commercialization of space, and to serve as an operations base for more advanced missions.

The increases proposed in the space science and applications budget provide additional support for NASA's programs and missions of most importance to our universities, in addition to addressing the problem of aging laboratory instrumentation in our universities.

At a time when the communications satellite technology gap between the United States and our foreign competition is narrowing, this legislation supports a flight-test demonstration for advanced communications satellite technologies.

The budget for aeronautical research and technology reflects a healthy growth in funding for basic and applied research and supports the activities leading to a 1987 flight test of an innovative aircraft technology, the advanced turboprop.

This legislation also provides funding for structural spares for the space shuttle fleet and reserves the option for procurement of a fifth orbiter.

As our Nation moves into a new era of space activity, it is important that we articulate our long-term goals and policy options for our civil space program. Included in this legislation is a provision that establishes a National Commission on Space. This Commission will help formulate our role in space for the next 25 years and will help maintain our Nation's position of preeminence in space.

NASA's position as the world leader in aeronautics and space is no longer uncontested; foreign competition is seriously, and quite often, successfully

challenging this position. However, NASA's commitment to our Nation's leadership in aeronautics and space will continue to be the decisive factor in meeting this challenge. This legislation asserts this commitment to meeting our Nation's goals in aeronautics and space and to maintaining the position of preeminence which NASA has held in the past.●

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in introducing the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1985 with my colleagues on the Senate Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee.

The bill provides for the continuation of several aeronautics and space programs, the initial design work on a proposed civil space station, and the creation of a National Commission on Space to help this Nation devise appropriate space policy and programs for the future. Finally, the bill reaffirms our commitment to NASA space applications programs to further space communications technology.

Pathbreaking work by NASA was responsible for the growth of a new industry in communications satellite manufacturing, and a new industry in satellite communications services. These are industries in which the United States has enjoyed a trade surplus and a technological edge. However, our dominance is being challenged by foreign nations that are eager to develop capabilities of their own.

The advanced communications technology satellite program, which is authorized at $50 million for fiscal year 1985, is intended to respond by leapfrogging existing technology in satellite communications. The bill contemplates a flight test program, with a launch in 1989. The ACTS program will test new high-risk technologies that will enhance spectrum efficiency and increase the economies of satellite communications for rural and remote areas.

Initial work on the project had been authorized in prior years. In 1983, bids were solicited. A team of contractors led by RCA in New Jersey, along with TRW in California, and Motorola in Arizona, was selected, and a contract was negotiated. However, the contract was not signed and work on the project has been at a standstill since the end of the year. The bill mandates the execution of the negotiated contracts and the commencement of work without delay.

In a race for technological superiority, continuing delay can be fatal. I have attempted, in the course of our committee review of the NASA authorization, to make the case for maintaining a fight test program and getting it back on track. I am pleased that this bill would accomplish that goal.

The bill also authorizes $150 million for a civil space station. This is an initial step in what may be the next major undertaking in space. A space station program could result in innovations in automation, robotics, and artificial intelligence, while providing the platform for scientific experiments and the development of manufacturing in space. However, during the course of subcommittee hearings, it also became apparent to me that a great deal of work needs to be done in defining the kind of civil space station we should develop. Should it be manned or unmanned? What should its economic or technological goals be? What should it cost?

I view this initial authorization as a means of finding answers to these questions. One point, however, is made certain in the bill. Any space station shall be civil in purpose, and shall not be used as a vehicle for militarizing space.

Another important element in the NASA Act is the creation of a National Commission on Space. This proposal is similar to that embodied in Senator HOLLINGS' bill, S. 955, which I was pleased to cosponsor. There is no question that NASA's work in the past has made a significant contribution to American technological leadership and industrial growth. The advice of an independent commission on space should assist the Congress and the administration in charting our path for the future.

Mr. President, I want to acknowledge the work of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, Senator GORTON, and the ranking minority member, Senator HEFLIN, for their hard work in developing a NASA authorization bill. This legislation will enable us to continue to reap the benefits from our Nation's aeronautics and space activities. I am pleased to join as a cosponsor.●

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. HATFIELD):

S. 2614. A bill to amend the Indian Financing Act of 1974; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

INDIAN FINANCING ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

● Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to amend the Indian Financing Act of 1974. It is necesssary to amend this piece of legislation because the current authority to make and/or guarantee loans out of a revolving fund provided in the act, will be used up at the end of this fiscal year. The need to continue this program is clear. The President's action in appointing a special Commission on Reservation Economies recognizes that for the most part that Indian reservations are severely depressed areas—areas where unemployment rates are often five and six times higher than that of Americans generally.

Some progress has been made in economic development and there is currently underway a growing interest on the part of many Indian tribes and individuals to promote economic development on reservations, an interest that exceeds the available financing. Because of the trust status of Indian lands and other resources, conventional financing is frequently unavailable. Economic development has the potential to provide jobs, to promote a level of economic self-sufficiency and provide funds for essential tribal governmental services.

The bill that I am introducing will aid in these economic development efforts. The Indian Finance Act is one of the few bright spots in the otherwise spotty record of the Federal Government on Indian reservations. Since its inception, a total of $63.4 million have been appropriated which has allowed loans of $163.2 million. In all, the fund has produced a net profit of $18.4 million.●

By Mrs. HAWKINS (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

S. 2615. A bill to revise and extend programs conducted by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

ALCOHOL ABUSE, ALCOHOLISM, AND DRUG ABUSE AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, as the first step in the reauthorization of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), and in an attempt to find out more about the effects of drugs and alcohol on women, how these problems can be treated and how we can better educate the public about the dangers of drugs, I am today introducing reauthorization legislation for these two organizations.

Recent figures show an alarming trend among women. The percentage of female members of alcoholics anonymous has risen from 26 percent in 1968 to 31 percent in 1980. Of the 10 million alcoholics in the United States today, up to one-half may be women; 68 percent of all psychoactive drugs are prescribed to women; a figure which indicates women are more prone to cross addiction—mixing alcohol with pills.

Perhaps these figures should not come as a surprise. Women have made great strides over the last 15 to 20 years. Women have entered the work force and quickly risen to the high-pressure jobs formerly occupied only by men. But along with these women are those who were forced to enter the work world, displaced homemakers who because of divorce or death of a husband, are forced to find work while raising a family.

The recovering alcoholic is taught to watch out for four danger signals, they are strung together into the anagram halt. These four danger adjectives are hungry, angry, lonely and tired; all of these would apply to the typical displaced homemaker.

But even if and when a woman realizes she needs help, the help may not be there. Recent statistics show that of the 5,577 drug and alcohol treatment programs in the country, only 375 are women's centers. The treatment system, having grown up catering to male needs often ignores the special problems of women. Most treatment programs do not provide child care or adequate alternatives for women who are entering treatment. An expert's quote of 15 years ago still seems to hold true that—

Studies on alcoholism tend to either ignore women entirely or to simply assume that alcoholism is the same regardless of the sex of the sufferer.

The legislation I introduce today would ask that the Directors of NIDA and NIAAA carry out a program of research, investigations, experiments and studies with an eye toward cataloging the special problems that exist in preventing and treating alcoholism and drug addiction among women and then helping to solve those problems.

Another important aspect of this legislation is its requests in regard to education. I recently held a hearing which looked into the role of the media in drug abuse prevention and education.

During the hearing we better came to realize that we live in the media age and that while it was once enough for children to hear about the dangers of drugs and alcohol from parents and teachers, times have changed. Children now need constant reenforcement of correct behavior. Parents and teachers need help.

The media seem willing to help. The networks and their production partners have said that they will assist in creating, testing, and airing public service announcements designed to educate children about the dangers of drugs and alcohol.

This legislation, in recognition of the power of the media, requests that the Directors of NIAAA and WIDA enter into contracts with commercial producers and television networks to produce stimulating, informative cost-effective commercials. Television has been accused of molding our minds and selling us everything under the Sun. It is about time that we moved to harness this awesome power of persuasion for the best possible cause; to help us win the battle for our childrens' minds.

Finally, this legislation requests that NIAAA and NIDA be reauthorized at the following funding levels:

	Fiscal year—		
	1985	1986	1987
NIAAA	$47,835,000	$49,748,000	$51,739,000
NIDA	63,513,000	66,053,500	68,695,000

For the money expended, these programs perform invaluable services. They provide leadership, policy and goals in our efforts to discover the causes and cures of alcohol abuse, alcoholism, and drug and substance abuse.

They are the leaders in the various fields of research in these areas and are working to inform the public about the dangers associated with drugs and alcohol. They also make sure that those involved in prevention and treatment of these troublesome problems are informed and effective in their work.

NIAAA and NIDA are out in front in the fight to save lives from the ravages of alcoholism and drug abuse. The noble efforts of these fine organizations deserve our full moral and financial support.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to join my colleagues in introducing the Alcohol Abuse, Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Amendments of 1984, which would among other things, reauthorize the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse and the National Institute on Drug Abuse. In particular, I would like to salute Senator HAWKINS, who chairs the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, and who is the Senate's legislative leader on substance abuse and drug prevention.

This bill is critically important legislation addressing a major public health problem in our Nation, substance abuse. The problem of alcohol and drug abuse takes it toll on an ever increasing number of Americans and their families. The estimated cost is above 100 annually.

ALCOHOLISM AND ALCOHOL ABUSE

The Fifth Special Report to the U.S. Congress on Alcohol and Health issued earlier this year, and other reports from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism offer some perspectives on the problems created by drug and alcohol abuse. Consider the following:

First, alcohol plays a role in 10 percent of all deaths in the United States. It is the principal cause of deaths through accidents among those aged 15 to 24.

Second, alcohol abuse during pregnancy has been found to cause fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) and other alcohol-related birth defects.

Third, the prevalence of adolescent drinking—75 percent of 10th to 12th graders—is high.

Fourth, approximately 15 percent of adolescent drinkers consume five or more drinks per session weekly and about 30 percent of the adolescent sample can be classified as alcohol misusers.

Fifth, more males than females indulge in heavy drinking, and heavy drinking peaks at younger ages in men—ages 21-34—than in women—ages 35-49—but the percentages of women who drink is on the rise and alcoholism appears to progress more rapidly in women than in men.

Sixth, employed women appear to have a higher rate of alcoholism and employed married women have significantly higher rates of both problem drinking and heavier drinking than either single working women or housewives.

Seventh, in adults, alcohol abuse is the leading cause of liver cirrhosis—the eighth leading cause in the United States—and the leading contributing factor for chronic pancreatitis as well as other illnesses.

Eighth, the heaviest drinking one-third of the population accounts for over 95 percent of total consumption, and the heaviest drinking 5 percent of the population account for roughly 50 percent of the total alcohol consumed.

Ninth, one in three Americans surveyed last year felt that alcohol caused problems in his or her family.

Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Margaret Heckler, is a leading advocate of increased research into the causes and cures of alcohol and drug abuse. In her introductory remarks in the Fifth Special Report, she states:

Fortunately, this long-neglected problem has now become of increasing concern to many Americans. As a result of citizen action, drunk driving, once largely ignored, is now being taken seriously. More and mores States are enacting tougher laws to discourage driving after drinking. Treating alcoholics once was of interest to a few dedicated men and women—themselves often recovering alcoholics. Treatment now involves many thousands in the helping professions as well. In industry, many, perhaps most, companies are coming to recognize that losing a valued employee to alcholism is costly—and that making provision for treatment just makes good business sense. Many health insurance plans are providing benefits to treat alcoholism itself as they discovered it costs much less in the long run than treating its chronic health consequences.

The report also notes that there have been other benefits of more honestly recognizing that problems from alcohol abuse can occur at all levels of drinking and of the society. The prevalent myth that drinking is sophisticated, a necessary part of a successful life, is slowly being eroded. It now requires less social courage to refuse a drink or to request a nonalcoholic substitute. The belief that drinking is essential to masculinity has been very much a part of American folklore. It is being supplanted by an increasing recognition of the health hazards of alcohol abuse and a new commitment to affirmation of good health practices. A

public health revolution is underway with official recognition that the individual can do more for his or her own health than any doctor, hospital drug, or other medical innovation. The past decade has clearly shown that habits as basic to personal health as smoking, diet, and exercise can be changed—and in a remarkably short time. Our success in changing behaviors that were once thought immutable provides good reason for optimism about alcohol and drug abuse. As has become true of smoking, not using drugs, not drinking, or drinking more moderately may become the in thing.

DRUG ABUSE

Now, let us turn to a more detailed look at drug abuse. The National Institute on Drug Abuse has concluded:

Eighth, from the late 1950's to the late 1970's, there was a tenfold to twentyfold increase in levels of drug use among American teenagers and young adults.

Second, drug use levels remain unacceptably high. For instance, more high school seniors reported in 1983 that most or all of their friends used marihuana than that none of their friends use the drug. Also, nearly as many high school seniors are current users of marihuana as are current smokers of cigarettes.

Third, although overall levels of drug use have peaked, or are declining, patterns of heavier use, more dangerous use, and use of more potent materials are present. This causes an inevitable increase in the level of adverse consequences and medical complications.

Fourth, recent changes in administration of the drug-abuse service system has allowed States greater flexibility to target resources to meet their unique needs.

Fifth, research continues to provide insight into such vital areas as the biological factors of drug abuse, the efficacy of drug-abuse treatment services, and ways to increase the effectiveness of prevention efforts.

THE ALCOHOL ABUSE, ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE AMENDMENTS OF 1984

The Department of Health and Human Services cites one of the satisfying developments in recent years has been research innovation. Federal support for substance research, once almost nonexistent, has had significant impact. By its very nature, basic research is a long range enterprise, and its practical implications are not immediately apparent.

The bill we are introducing today would:

Reauthorize at President Reagan's requested funding level, the research programs of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcholism at $47,835,000 for fiscal year 1985, $49,748,000 for fiscal year 1986; and $51,739,000 for fiscal year 1987.

Reauthorize at President Reagan's requested funding level, the research programs of the National Institute on Drug Abuse at $63,513,000 for fiscal 1985, $66,053,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $68,695,000 for fiscal year 1987.

Continue the demonstration programs for NIAAA and NIDA with separate authorizations for each Institute at $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1985 to 1987.

Include an additional $1 million for each Institute for each of the next 3 fiscal years to conduct research into the impact of alcoholism, alcohol abuse, alcohol-related problems, and drug abuse among women.

Require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prepare and transmit to the Congress a report which sets forth a comprehensive national plan to combat alcohol abuse and alcoholism. The report is intended to provide basic information of such a plan and is not intended to be exhaustive or burdensome.

Provide explicit authority for NIAAA and NIDA to develop public service announcements on research findings to help inform and educate the American public on the problems of alcohol and drug abuse.

I have long been an advocate of Federal, State, and private efforts to reduce the tragedies of alcohol and substance abuse. This bipartisan effort is one important step in pursuit of our national goals.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this cost-saving measure, and, help promote the public health of this Nation.

By Mr. DENTON (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. EAST, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. EAGLETON):

S. 2616. A bill to extend the adolescent family life demonstration program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

ADOLESCENT FAMILY LIFE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President. It is my pleasure to introduce, with Senators HATCH, GRASSLEY, EAST, KENNEDY, and EAGLETON, a bill to reauthorize the Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects Act of 1981, title XX of the Public Health Service Act. My bill would reauthorize the law with no changes in the current statute at the current authorization of $30 million for 1985, 1986, and 1987. The $30 million authorization level would continue the operations of the multiyear demonstration projects and research grants already funded under the act, and would establish several new demonstration projects.

The passage of the Adolescent Family Life Act by the Congress in 1981 was a very important accomplishment. I, and many of my colleagues, are constantly reminded of the alarming rise in the number of adolescent pregnancies and abortions, in spite of major Federal expenditures for policies to deal with the problem. According to statistics recently released by the National Center for Health Statistics, 527,000 babies were born to adolescents 15 to 19 years of age in 1981, and over 9,600 babies were born to teens under 15 years of age. In 1980, 460,000 abortions were performed on pregnant, unmarried teenagers. The statistics show that pregnancy causes health and social problems for the mother and baby. Pregnant teenagers generally begin prenatal care later than the national average for pregnant women and, consequently, have higher rates of infant mortality and a higher incidence of low birth weight babies. Furthermore, adolescent mothers exhibit a lower level of educational and vocational attainment than the national average for adolescents. The continuing tragedy of unintended teenage pregnancy led me to believe strongly that new and different approaches had to be found for alleviating the problem. We found a different way.

As a result of a bipartisan effort in which my bill was reported unanimously by the Labor and Human Resources Committee, the Adolescent Family Life Act was enacted into law as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. It was readily embraced by the Reagan administration as an essential demonstration of a desirable approach to addressing our Nation's adolescent pregnancy problem.

The Adolescent Family Life Act has a threefold purpose. First, prevention demonstration programs around the country are helping teenagers and their parents to work together, with the assistance of outside advisers and counselors, to exchange views and to examine the values of family life and sexuality. Second, care demonstration programs are providing comprehensive services to help pregnant adolescents and their families throughout the pregnancy, delivery, and care of the babies. Third, Federal funds are being used for practical research into the causes, consequences, and means of discouraging premarital sexual relations and of reducing adolescent pregnancy, and for evaluation of the best kinds of programs for adolescent parents.

I am a supporter of family life and sex education. My experience in that area for 10 years, including the last 3 years as a Member of the Senate, has shown me that parents are not necessarily the only and best source of information about sexuality. I have found, however, that the best sex education includes the parents and relies upon the cooperation of teachers, social workers, the medical community, representatives of community and

religious organizations with parents to develop the curriculum. The Adolescent Family Life Act provides an opportunity for demonstration projects throughout the country to involve parents along with their children in learning and communicating about sexuality and the problems of adolescent pregnancy.

One purpose of the law is to support the development of prevention demonstration projects at the local level to encourage teenagers to refrain from premarital sexual relations and to involve their families so that they have a chance to help their children to develop and reinforce their decisions. The Adolescent Family Life Act provides the seed money for projects that, among other things, attempt to deal with the problem, in ways different from before, namely, by developing sex education programs that present more than biological facts, birth control pills, and abortion when birth control fails.

Another purpose of the law is to provide funds for the development of model care programs which provide supportive services to pregnant adolescents. These young pregnant women are linked up with health, educational, and counseling services in their communities. The care programs also direct their services toward the young men involved. These programs rely heavily on the cooperation of other community and religious organizations, as well as their families.

Thus, the Adolescent Family Life Act places a significant emphasis on the involvement of parents with their children in the demonstration projects. The reason for the requirements for parental consent and family involvement in programs conducted under the act is to provide program administrators, counselors, and researchers with the opportunity to evaluate the principle that family involvement in sex education and adolescent pregnancy programs should be the rule rather than the exception.

Although I am firmly convinced that Government-funded programs should and must acknowledge the family as the first line of defense in dealing with the problems of adolescent pregnancy, I am continually exploring the best possible approaches to insure that parents are granted the privilege of exercising their inalienable right and obligation to be properly involved in federally supported sex education and adolescent pregnancy programs that serve their children. The demonstration projects that have been initiated under the Adolescent Family Life Act offer examples that we should observe and from which we can learn.

One of the other major thrusts of the Adolescent Family Life Act is to present adoption as a positive alternative for adolescent parents to consider. The prevention and care projects funded under the act are required to provide information about the adoption option and to establish formal linkages with agencies that are licensed to provide adoption placement services as well as maternity residential services. Adolescent family life projects are currently testing new approaches to see how adoption can be better presented to and understood by adolescents and their families. Research is also being conducted to ascertain the current attitudes about adoption as well as to determine the requirements for successful adoption planning by young parents. Today we will hear about the results of one research project on adoption that is funded by the Adolescent Family Life Act.

Through the adoption emphasis, the Adolescent Family Life Act is providing demonstration projects opportunities to develop better techniques for counseling. Teenage parenthood is not the only, nor necessarily always the best alternative to teenage abortion. By providing funds for projects developing adoption counseling services, we are giving renewed support to another option that can provide positive outcomes for both the adolescent parents and the baby. Adoption also provides an opportunity for many waiting couples to become loving adoptive parents.

The Adolescent Family Life Act is one Federal Government program that acknowledges the need for supportive services to pregnant adolescents as an alternative to abortion. To that end, the act specifically restricts the activities of the demonstration projects by prohibiting abortion counseling, referral to abortion clinics, or payment for abortions. If both the adolescent and her parents request information about abortion, however, a referral for abortion counseling can be provided.

Through the demonstration approach, the Adolescent Family Life Act is assisting in the development of workable and effective programs for adolescents and their families who might otherwise turn to an abortion when faced with an unintended pregnancy. That aspect is a very important factor for many who support the adolescent family life program, both here in the Congress and in the local communities where the demonstration projects are located. The act provides an alternative approach to demonstrate to adolescents and their parents that options other than abortion do exist in their communities. I am firmly convinced that the demonstration effort is worthwhile and that it is a necessary addition to the current Federal repertory of family planning services and programs to pregnant adolescents.

The Adolescent Family Life Act is not a large Federal program. It is purposefully a small demonstration approach. There are currently 59 demonstration projects, 18 research projects, and a technical assistance project operating in 39 States, Guam, and the District of Columbia, utilizing $15 million in adolescent family life funds.

Each of the demonstration projects is required to develop an evaluation process so that its program can be tested and those programs shown to be effective can be replicated in other communities. The projects can receive Federal funds only for a maximum of 5 years. The majority of the projects are in the first or second year of their program. When the 1984 grant awards are made, by September 30, 1984, there will be several new projects initiated.

Obviously, we do not have the final results or accomplishments of the programs. The evaluation process is just getting started. In order to get a clear picture of the law's successes to date, the Subcommittee on Family and Human Services held 2 days of hearings on April 24 and April 26.

The hearings provided interested grantees and organizations with the opportunity to discuss their perceptions of the need for adolescent sexuality and pregnancy programs in their communities. The record provides strong evidence that the Adolescent Family Life Act, which expires on September 30, 1984, should be reauthorized.

During the subcommittee's hearings, administration officials and grantee representatives from across the country discussed their involvement with the demonstration and research projects. Dr. Edward N. Brandt, Jr., the Assistant Secretary for Health of the Department of Health and Human Services, made it clear that the Department is committed to the principles of the Adolescent Family Life Act's alternative approach to the problems of teenage sexuality and pregnancy. Mrs. Marjory Mecklenburg, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs and Director of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, enthusiastically described her work with grantees to establish projects that can provide services to teenagers in accordance with the act's requirements and restrictions. I appreciate the support of the President and the Department in the effort to find ways of providing sex education and services to pregnant teenagers through a family-centered approach.

The grantee representatives who testified before the subcommittee emphasized their willingness fully to develop their projects so that the alternative methods of providing services to adolescents can be tested and evaluated during an adequate period.

After hearing the testimony of two young program participants, both of

whom received care services throughout pregnancy and delivery, I am convinced that the Adolescent Family Life Act is providing services that can help to change the normally devastating condition of teenage pregnancy into a positive and healthy outcome for both the teenage mother and the baby.

The witnesses representing the prevention projects asserted that many teenagers want to learn how to say no to premarital sexual relations. Preliminary results show that the program participants are exhibiting a less promiscuous attitude toward premarital sexual relations and a more mature understanding of the joys and responsibilities of family life.

Two recipients of research grants discussed the need for improved data on the causes, consequences, and most effective means of reducing the incidence of teenage sexual relations, pregnancy, and parenthood. One researcher reviewed his findings on the attitudes of pregnancy counselors about the adoption option. Another researcher discussed the use of services in the community by pregnant adolescents and adolescent parents and the need to improve the access to comprehensive services for pregnant adolescents.

I am gratified to know that the people most involved in the development and operation of adolescent family life projects are encouraged by the results, even though the projects are relatively new and have just begun to set up their evaluation systems.

In addition, the subcommittee received testimony from a broad and diverse group of national and community organizations active in fields related to the goals of the adolescent Family Life Act which are interested in the intent of the Act and in its practical application. Many of the organizations endorsed the bill when it was first proposed in 1981, and all of them urged the reauthorization of the Adolescent Family Life Act for 3 more years.

The need for the continuation of the demonstration projects established by the Adolescent Family Life Act has been clearly established. I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization bill in order to allow this alternative approach to the reduction of adolescent pregnancy to be tested fully.

I look forward to a strong, bipartisan effort of my colleagues to report the bill as quickly as possible from the Labor and Human Resources Committee.●

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HEINZ):

S. 2617. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the special supplemental food program and other child nutrition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

CHILD NUTRITION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1984

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today I and my colleagues, Senators JEPSEN, BOSCHWITZ, HAWKINS, DURENBERGER, BOREN, COHEN, and HEINZ are introducing legislation to reauthorize the child nutrition programs that expire at the end of this fiscal year. These include the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children—usually referred to as WIC—the commodity supplemental food program, the summer food service program, nutrition education, and training (NET), State administrative expenses, and the authority to purchase commodities for the school lunch program. Under this legislation, all programs would be reauthorized for 4 years—through fiscal year 1988. The school lunch, school breakfast, and child care food programs are entitlements, but we traditionally evaluate them along with the others, as we go through the hearing and markup process.

CHANGES IN WIC PROGRAM

Most of this legislation consists of changes to improve the WIC program. This is the first opportunity we have had in 6 years to address this program in any comprehensive fashion, and it is my hope that these proposed changes will further strengthen what is already a very effective Federal nutrition program. The authorized funding levels for the 4 year reauthorization are based on CBO estimates and baselines, and they are sufficient to accommodate the current level of services—3 million women, infants, and children.

OTHER PROGRAMS

The other reauthorization provisions are fairly straightforward and merely extend expiring programs. However, this legislation would raise the authorization level for the nutrition education and training program for $5 million to $10 million, because I believe that nutrition education is the foundation upon which all of our food assistance efforts lie. This net provision would permit the additional $5 million to be used for efforts to provide nutrition education to food stamp recipients. This would seem to be a good investment for our Federal food assistance efforts.

The only other significant provision relates to the school lunch program. This legislation would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a feasibility study for a universal school lunch program, evaluating potential options for a self-financing structure. As a Member of Congress who has witnessed the growth of this program over several decades, I believe that we should continue to look for new directions that may be appropriate for future program development.

EFFECT OF SPENDING REDUCTIONS

Mr. President, during the budget process of 1981 the Congress made some serious attempts to take a look at social programs and slow their growth in a bipartisan effort. At this time about $1.3 billion in spending reductions were achieved in various child nutrition programs.

As one who played a lead role in designing budget-cutting proposals for child nutrition programs to make certain that we could achieve savings without imposing harm on low-income Americans. I believe that what was accomplished was more effectively targeted available program benefits to the most needy children. Some program directors will actually admit that the changes we made really strengthened the administration of their programs and made them better, more accountable, and more responsive to the real nutritional needs of children.

At this time I remain unconvinced that we should retreat from our previous efforts to impose spending restraints on Federal social programs, including child nutrition. It might be appropriate to mention that this budget-cutting trend began in 1980 under the last administration when savings in the $500 million range were enacted. Unless any real harm can be demonstrated to have been caused by congressional action as a result of our efforts. I believe we should not begin to undo what we have so carefully achieved in past years. Above all, we should make certain that our priorities are well-directed.

CHILDREN'S ACCESS TO GOOD NUTRITION

Today, there is a wide array of child nutrition programs serving children of all ages—infants to high school age kids. All American children have access to good nutrition through these various programs, but a recurrent issue continues to be who should pay for these benefits. In the school lunch, breakfast and child care food programs, the Federal Government continues to subsidize meals for children from families of every income level, but it only provides free meals to those who meet the low-income eligibility criteria of 130 percent of poverty. The children of near-poor families must contribute part of the cost of their meals in the school lunch and breakfast programs, and those who can afford to pay more participate in the so-called paid category.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement from the Nutrition Subcommittee hearing on the child nutrition programs from March 12, 1984 appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BOB DOLE

REAUTHORIZATION PROCESS

Every four years, we have an opportunity to evaluate the child nutrition programs in their entirety, even though we are technically engaged in the process of reauthorizing only the nonentitlement programs, which are WIC, the summer food service program, nutrition education and training, State administrative expenses, and the authority to purchase commodities.

We made a lot of program changes in the school lunch, school breakfast, child care and the summer food programs back during the reconciliation process of 1981, just a year after the programs were reauthorized the last time. After a period of program stability, we can now look back to see how these changes have affected the programs in question. I am aware of two bills currently pending before the Congress and this committee—S. 1913, the Huddleston-Cochran bill, and its counterpart, H.R. 4091. Although I disagree with the way in which benefits are targetted under both of these bills, I think they should receive a fair hearing. We are now at a time in our Nation's history when we must be certain that nutrition program funds are being targetted effectively to low-income children. As the CBO evaluations reveal, both of these legislative initiatives would direct over 70 percent of their benefits to children from families above 130 percent of poverty, which defines low-income eligibility for both the food stamp program and the school lunch and breakfast programs.

SUPPORT OF CHILD NUTRITION

As everyone here knows, the Senator from Kansas has long been a strong supporter of child nutrition programs. Nothing has changed my commitment to these programs or my belief that the Federal Government should maintain its leadership role in the nutrition program area. However, the Federal Government can't be expected to do everything.

In recent years, I have been concerned about a tendency for people to consider these programs in terms of Federal spending instead of the children served. I would like to address this concern.

In 1970, the Federal Government was spending just over $700 million on all child nutrition programs. By 1980, this amount had grown to approximately $4.4 billion, and would have exceeded $5 billion by fiscal year 1982 had it not been for reconciliation. Based strictly on budgetary considerations, some might say, and have said, that this over 500% increase in Federal child nutrition funding is not justified. Others, whose considerations are limited to program operations and activities, have said that the $1.3 billion that Congress cut from the 1982 child nutrition program is equally unjustifiable. I would like to address both of these contentions, because I think they are equally false. They are false because they overlook the important issue of how changed funding has affected the children served.

LOW-INCOME TARGETTING

For those who limit concerns to budget numbers, I would point out that in 1970 very little of child nutrition expenditures (about 20%) were directed toward low-income children. Only 4.6 million out of the 22.4 million children in the school lunch program were receiving free or reduced price meals.

Additionally, the school breakfast program, which was better targetted to low income children, had just begun, and served only 450,000 children. Finally, the WIC program, which many regard as the best need-based of all child nutrition programs, had not yet been created. In contrast, by 1980, Federal expenditures for children in low-income families represented 60% of all federal child nutrition program expenditures. The school lunch program served a total of 26.6 million children in 1980, or 4.2 million more children than in 1970. However, all of this growth and more was in the free and reduced price programs, which increased by 7.3 million children (to 11.9 million), while participation in the regular, non-income tested portion of the program dropped from 17.8 million to 14.7 million. For the breakfast program, participation grew from a total of 450,000 in 1970 to 3.6 million in 1980. And 85% of these children were from low-income families.

Finally, the WIC program, which had not existed in 1970, was serving an average of nearly 2 million women, infants and children in 1980, and funding for this program alone represented 16% of all child nutrition program expenditures.

I recite these statistics for those whose primary interest is in dollar figures because I think it is important for them to understand the human consequences of child nutrition expenditure growth. The dollar growth in funding for these programs, when viewed from the context of participation is not as haphazard as a graph only showing dollars might suggest. Yes, funding grew considerably between 1970 and 1980, but with it came a commitment to the needs of low-income children, a commitment which costs more than just providing a minimal subsidy and letting childen pay the difference, or go hungry. In the late sixties and early seventies, the Federal Government embarked on a non-partisan effort to improve the nutrition of our children, particularly our needy children. As a consequence of this commitment we have provided the best nutrition programs for children that the world has ever seen. Not perfect perhaps, but unequivocally the best. Even more importantly, our special concern for needy children is clearly reflected in the data showing the dramatic increase in the number of such children participating in these programs, and the proportion of expenditures committed to their needs. We chose to give more, not because more is necessarily better, but because more is necessary where there is greater need.

EFFECT OF RECONCILIATION

Now let me turn to what happended to child nutrition programs after 1980 when Congress enacted reconciliation legislation that reduced program funding. Compared to 1980, when Federal expenditures for child nutrition were $4.4 billion, 60% of which went to low-income children, 1983 expenditures were $4.7 billion. And even more importantly, nearly $3.7 billion of this amount, or 78% of these funds were expended for low-income children.

In 1980, it is true that there were 26.6 million children participating in the school lunch program, compared to 23.1 million in 1983. However, all of this 3.5 million difference is in the paid category where participation is down from 14.7 million to 11.2 million. The same total number of children participated in the free and reduced price segment of the program in 1980 as in 1983—that is 11.9 million. However, the distribution is slightly different with reduced price participation going down from 1.9 million to 1.6 million, while free participation went up from 10 million to 10.3 million.

WIC PROGRAM

For the WIC program, Federal expenditures grew to approximately $1.16 billion in 1983 and represented 25% of all child nutrition program funds. This is an increase of $390 million over the FY80 funding level for this program and compares to 16% of child nutrition program funding in 1980. More importantly, average WIC participation in FY1983 was approximately 2.6 million, compared to 1980 when average participation was just under 2 million.

FACTS BEHIND STATISTICS

I am pointing out these statistics for those who continue to allege that the child nutrition budget cuts of 1981 were too large, and harmed an inordinate number of low-income children—an allegation that I believe to be unjustified. It is unjustified because it looks only to dollar terms and not to the human reality—the children being served, and their need. The data indicates that low-income children continue to be served in significant numbers and that a growing proportion of expenditures are being distributed on the basis of need. It also appears that greater numbers of children with very low income levels are participating in the programs than in the past. This sounds to me like appropriate targeting, and I find it hard to see the danger in it.

In this difficult time, I believe that those of us involved in the delicate balancing act of allocating limited Federal resources should look carefully at the human factor instead of dollars. I believe that if we do, we will find that our current commitment to child nutrition programs is justified and that there is no need to either cut more child nutrition funds, or restore them.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry plans to begin the markup process on the reauthorization of the child nutrition programs tomorrow. There are many worthwhile proposals that will be considered by the committee.

As chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee I have a great interest in what we do with the child nutrition programs. This legislation is being introduced in an attempt to provide a neutral, responsible approach to various programs during the reauthorization process. I thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary along with the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2617

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act of 1984".

TITLE I—SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

COSTS FOR NUTRITION SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 101. (a) Section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

"(4) 'Costs for nutrition services and administration' means costs that shall include, but not be limited to, costs for certification of eligibility of persons for participation in the program (including centrifuges, measuring boards, spectrophotometers, and scales used for such certification), food delivery, monitoring, nutrition education, outreach, start-up costs, and general administration applicable to implementation of the program under this section (such as the cost of staff, warehouse facilities, transportation, insurance, developing and printing food instruments, and adminstration of State and local agency offices).".

(b) Section 17 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "administrative funds" each place it appears in subsections (f)(1)(A), (f)(1)(D), (f)(11), (h)(2), (h)(3), and (h)(4) and inserting in lieu thereof "funds for nutrition services and administration"; and

(2) by striking out "administrative costs" each place it appears in subsections (h)(1) and (h)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "costs for nutrition services and administration".

DISTRIBUTION OF FOODS FOR THE INITIAL MONTH

SEC. 102. Section 17(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) If a person is certified as eligible to participate in the program after the beginning of the initial month or other initial period for which supplemental foods are distributed to the person, the amount of supplemental foods distributed to such person for such initial month or other initial period shall be reduced accordingly.".

PREGNANT WOMEN UNDER INCOME ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS

SEC. 103. Section 17(d)(2) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(d)(2)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "For the purpose of such standards, a pregnant woman shall be considered two individuals.".

PARTICIPATION REPORT

SEC. 104. (a) Section 17(d) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) The Secretary shall report biennially to the Congress on the income and nutritional risk characteristics of participants in the program and such other matters relating to participation in the program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(B) In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary may not require a State agency to report any information which is not required to be reported under other provisions of this section.".

(b) The second sentence of section 17(g) of such Act is amended by inserting "preparing the report required under subsection (d)(4)," after "benefits,".

PLAN OF OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 105. Paragraph (1) of section 17(f) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) Each State agency shall submit annually to the Secretary, by a date specified by the Secretary, a plan of operation and administration for a fiscal year.

"(B) In order to be eligible to receive funds under this section for a fiscal year, a State agency must receive the approval of the Secretary for the plan submitted for the fiscal year.

"(C) The plan shall include—

"(i) a description of the State agency's food delivery system, to be administered in accordance with standards developed by the Secretary;

"(ii) a description of how the State agency plans to coordinate operations under the program with special counseling services such as, but not limited to, the expanded food and nutrition education program, immunization programs, prenatal care, well-child care, alcohol and drug abuse counseling, and child abuse counseling, and with the food stamp program;

"(iii) plans to provide program benefits and nutrition education under this section to eligible migrants and Indians; and

"(iv) such other information as the Secretary may require.

"(D) The Secretary may permit a State agency to submit only those parts of a plan which differ from plans submitted for previous fiscal years.

"(E) The Secretary may not approve any plan that permits a person to participate simultaneously in both the program authorized under this section and the commodity supplemental food program authorized under sections 4 and 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note).".

PUBLIC COMMENT

SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of section 17(f) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) A State agency shall establish a procedure under which members of the general public are provided an opportunity to comment on the development of the State agency plan.".

NOTIFICATION PERIOD

SEC. 107. The first sentence of section 17(f)(7) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(7)) is amended by striking out "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty".

AVAILABILITY OF PROGRAM BENEFITS

SEC. 108. Paragraph (8) of section 17(f) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) The State agency shall, in cooperation with participating local agencies, distribute information on the availability of program benefits (including the eligibility criteria for participation and the location of local agencies operating the program) to offices and organizations that deal with significant numbers of potentially eligible persons (including health and medical organizations, hospitals and clinics, welfare and unemployment offices, social service agencies, farmworker organizations, Indian tribal organizations, and religious and community organizations in low income areas).".

COORDINATION WITH CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAMS

SEC. 109. Section 17(f)(13) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(13)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of children who receive food under the program authorized under this section and the child care food program authorized under section 17 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766), such authority shall assure that supplemental foods served under this section complement the foods served under the child care food program.".

REPAYMENT OF CERTAIN BENEFITS BY RECIPIENTS

SEC. 110. Section 17(f) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(15) If a State agency determines that a member of a family has received benefits under the program authorized by this section as the result of fraud or intentional misrepresentation by a member of such family, the State agency shall seek to recover from such family, in cash, an amount which the State agency determines is equal to the value of the benefits issued to such member as the result of such fraud or misrepresentation, unless the State agency determines that the recovery of such benefits would not be cost effective.".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 111. (a) The first sentence of section 17(g) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(g)) is amended by striking out "and $1,126,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,360,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, $1,470,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $1,525,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $1,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $1,670,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

(b) Section 17 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "1984" in the matter preceding clause (A) of subsection (c)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "1988"; and

(2) by striking our "1984" in subsection (h)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

IMPROVING STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

SEC. 112. The second sentence of section 17(g) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(g)) (as amended by section 104(b) of this Act) is amended by inserting "providing technical assistance to improve State agency administrative systems," after "subsection (d)(4),".

PAPERWORK REDUCTION

SEC. 113. Section 17(h)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall limit any such documentation required under the preceding sentence to a minimum level.".

EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS

SEC. 114 (a) Section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(i)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not more than 2 percent of any State's allocation of funds under this section for supplemental foods for any fiscal year may be expended by such State for ex-

penses incurred under this section for supplemental foods during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the sums were appropriated.".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to appropriations made before the date of the enactment of this Act.

REPORT OF MIGRANT PARTICIPATION

SEC. 115. Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (j); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively.

TITLE II—OTHER CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

SEC. 201. Section 5(a)(1) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended—

(1) by striking out "two years" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "five years";

(2) by redesignating clause (2) as clause (3);

(3) by inserting after clause (1) the following new clause: "(2) shall permit local agencies administering the commodity supplemental food program to provide supplemental commodities to low-income elderly persons under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, except that such agencies may not terminate or reduce the amount of commodity assistance provided to women, infants, and children in order to provide such assistance to low-income elderly persons,"; and

(4) by striking out "1985" in clause (3) (as so redesignated) and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

SEC. 202. Section 13(p) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(p)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

SEC. 203. The matter preceding clause (1) of section 14(a) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1762a(a)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 204. Section 7(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1776(i)) is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING

SEC. 205. Section 19(j)(2) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1788(j)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "September 30, 1984" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1988"; and

(2) by striking out "$5,000,000" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

STUDY OF A UNIVERSAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

SEC. 206. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a study to consider—

(1) the feasibility of making the school lunch program established under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) a universal program for all children in the United States; and

(2) various methods of operating a self-financing school lunch program under such Act for all children, including reserving a separate source of revenue for any such program.

(b) The Secretary shall submit a report containing the results of the study required by subsection (a) to the Congress, together with any recommendations or proposals for legislation, no later than January 1, 1987.

(c) This section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 301. (a)(1) Clause (1) of the sixth sentence of section 17(a) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(a)) is amended by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "Health and Human Services".

(2) The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (7 U.S.C 1771 et seq.) (as amended by section 115 of this Act) is amended by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" each place it appears in section 4(a) (42 U.S.C. 1773(a)), subsections (b)(6), (b)(13), (e)(2), (j)(1), and (j)(2) of section 17 (42 U.S.C. 1786), and subsections (d)(2) and (d)(3) of section 19 (42 U.S.C. 1788) and inserting in lieu thereof "Health and Human Services".

(3) Section 19(j)(3) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1788(j)(3)) is amended by striking out "Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Education".

(b) Section 22 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769c) (as added by section 9 of the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1978 (92 Stat. 3623)) is redesignated as section 23 of the National School Lunch Act.

(c) Section 19 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1788) (as amended by subsection (a)(3) and section 204 of this Act) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATES

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 401. Except as provided in sections 111(c), 114(b), and 206(c) of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall become effective on October 1, 1984.

SUMMARY OF TITLE I—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

Section 101. Redefining administrative costs: Section 101 changes the term "administrative costs" to "costs for nutrition services and administration" in recognition of the fact that costs for nutrition assessments and nutrition education are included in this cost category. The new term provides a more accurate description of the costs involved.

Section 102. Initial month's benefits: This section requires that when WIC benefits are issued to a participant for only a part of a month (because the participant has applied after the beginning of the month), the monthly WIC food package must be reduced accordingly.

Section 103. Pregnant women: This section provides that a pregnant woman shall be counted as two individuals (in order to count both the unborn child and the mother) when it is determined whether her family meets the WIC income limits for its family size. This provision affects income determinations only and does not affect the quantitites of supplemental foods distributed to pregnant women.

Section 104. Participation report: The Secretary would be required to report to the Congress every other year on the income and nutritional risk characteristics of WIC participants. The Secretary would be allowed to use some of the $3 million currently reserved for evaluations and pilot projects in order to collect the data and provide the report.

Section 105. State plan: This section simplifies and streamlines the state plans by eliminating 9 of the 12 current statutory requirements for what must be included in the plan.

Section 106. Public comment: This section repeals the statutory requirement that states must hold a public hearing each year to secure public comment on the state plan and state WIC operations. Instead, states would simply be required to have some procedure, of their own choosing, to obtain public comment.

Section 107. Notification period: Currently, states are required to provide supplemental foods to eligible applicants within 20 days of application. This section lengthens the timeframe to 30 days. However, the requirement that persons at particularly high risk (e.g., pregnant women suffering from nutritional deficiences) be processed more quickly would be retained.

Section 108. Availability of program benefits: The requirement that state and local agencies publicize the availability of WIC and publicly announce WIC eligibility criteria at least once a year would be repealed. However, the requirement that eligibility information be provided to hospitals, health clinics, medical organizations, social service agencies, etc. would be retained—in order that these agencies refer high-risk persons to WIC.

Section 109. Coordination with child care food program: This section requires that when children certified for WIC receive meals through the Child Care Food Program, the WIC medical professional who prescribes the WIC food packages shall tailor the food package accordingly.

Section 110. Recovery of excess benefits: This section requires that when a WIC participant improperly receives benefits due to fraud or intentional misrepresentation, the state agency must seek repayment in cash from the participant, except in cases in which the cost of pursuing recovery would exceed the amount to be collected.

Section 111. Authorization of appropriations: Section 111 reauthorizes the WIC program for four years at the Congressional Budget Office current services level. These levels—$1.47 billion in FY 1985, $1,525 billion in FY 1986, $1.6 billion in FY 1987 and $1.67 billion in FY 1988—would allow enough funds to be appropriated to hold WIC caseloads at current levels for the next four years with neither growth nor reductions in participation.

Section 112. Improving state administrative systems: This allows the Secretary the flexibility to use a portion of the $3 million now reserved for evaluations and pilot projects for technical assistance contracts to improve state computer systems and other state administrative systems. Continued enhancement of program integrity requires upgraded computer systems, and this provision enables the Secretary to utilize a modest amount of funds in this area if he finds this to be useful.

Section 113. Paperwork reduction: This section directs USDA to keep to a minimum the paperwork that states are required to complete in order to satisfy USDA that at least ⅙ of WIC administrative funds are used for nutrition education. It is intended that USDA would reduce the current paperwork requirements in this area.

Section 114. Expenditure of funds: This section allows up to 2 percent of a state's

WIC food grant for a fiscal year to be used for WIC expenses incurred in the state in the prior fiscal year. This provision, recommended by the National WIC Directors' Association, is designed to enable states to utilize their WIC grants more fully and to improve their program management in the final months of the fiscal year.

Section 115. Report on migrant participation: This deletes a statutory requirement for an annual USDA report on migrant participation in the WIC program.

TITLE II—OTHER CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Commodity supplemental food program: Section 201 reauthorizes the program for four years; permits local agencies administering this program to provide supplemental commodities to low-income elderly persons at the discretion of the Secretary, provided these efforts do not interfere with commodity assistance to low-income women, infants, and children; extends pilot projects in Detroit, New Orleans, etc.

Summer food service program for children: Section 202 reauthorizes the program for four years; maintains current law (during reconciliation in 1981, changes made eliminated just about all fraud and abuse that had been previously reported).

Commodity distribution program: Section 203 extends the authority to purchase commodities for the School Lunch Program for four years.

State administrative expenses: Section 205 extends the program for four years.

Nutrition education and training: Section 205 reauthorizes the NET program for four more years, raising the authorization ceiling from $5 million to $10 million, and allowing this additional $10 million to be spent to provide nutrition education to food stamp recipients.

Universal school lunch program study: Section 206 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study concerning the feasibility of a universal school lunch program as well as various methods of operating a self-financing program through various revenue options; report is to be submitted January 1, 1987.

Title III—Technical corrections.

Title IV—Effective dates.●

By Mr. DANFORTH (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 2618. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to promote expansion of international trade in telecommunications products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE ACT OF 1984

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, on August 5, 1983, a decision was made that is likely to have the greatest impact on U.S. trade of any other in recent decades. The decision was not made by the President or by the Congress—in fact, its impact on American trade was hardly considered by those involved in this and other events leading up to the final outcome.

For this reason, I am pleased to be introducing legislation to address the trade impact of that decision and to open major foreign markets to U.S. exports.

The decision—the final step before the breakup of the Bell System—came about after years of thought, litigation and legislation focused on domestic considerations of competition and deregulation. Yet, this domestic policy decision will have an enormous impact on the U.S. position in world markets.

In fact, the restructuring of the U.S. telecommunications market is a trade disaster in the making:

In trade terms, AT&T divestiture is nothing less than the unilateral giveaway of the U.S. market to foreign suppliers. Moreover, since most foreign markets are effectively closed to U.S. telecommunications exports, divestiture also represents a giveaway of the only leverage that might ever be used by our trade negotiators to gain access to those markets.

Therefore, it is imperative that we capitalize on the restructuring of the U.S. market to promote negotiations that will achieve an open world trading system in telecommunications.

The Telecommunications Trade Act provides such a framework for negotiations. In a manner fully consistent with U.S. trade obligations under the GATT, it offers U.S. trade negotiators the mandate, authority, and leverage to gain access for U.S. exports of telecommunications equipment and services comparable to that provided by the restructuring of the U.S. telecommunications market.

BACKGROUND

Observed in a vacuum, the fragmentation of the American telecommunications system may be a good idea, where increased competition among domestic providers of equipment and services may ultimately benefit the system's users.

But in this interdependent world, we cannot afford to make decisions in a vacuum. We cannot afford to let trade be the stepchild of domestic policy decisions—particularly if we consider the tremendous impact trade has on the U.S. economy, our employment, and our competitiveness.

If we are to have a forward-looking trade policy, a job-creating trade policy, we must pay special attention to those sectors with the greatest promise for growth and employment—be it direct or indirect.

Taken in this context, the decision to restructure the U.S. telecommunications market is devastating. In trade terms, divestiture represents the unilateral dismantling of a major nontariff barrier to imports through elimination of AT&T's vertical integration relationship between the manufacturer of equipment and the provision of service. That a number of American equipment manufacturers will be able to take advantage of the breaking of this link is clearly a healthy event. That this will also lay bare the U.S. market to many billions of dollars in new sales by foreign manufacturers—without any corresponding improvement in market access for U.S. exports—would be grounds enough to fire any team of trade negotiators.

The Constitution provides for Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It is imperative that Congress act now to prevent this trade disaster before it is too late.

The international situation with respect to telecommunications trade is unique. The United States is virtually the only country in the world with a private telecommunications system. Practically all other industrialized countries have telecommunications entities that are controlled by—if not owned and operated by—their governments.

The world over PTT's—post, telegraph, and telephone entities—are protected, nurtured, and supported by their governments. Equipment procurement is confined to the extent possible to domestic manufacturers, who in turn use government financial support to develop new equipment and to promote their export drives. And export they must—because in this day of highly sophisticated, R&D-intensive telecommunications equipment, economies of scale dictate that few home markets are big enough to provide adequate returns on investment.

Throughout the world, one finds that virtually all major telecommunications markets are closed: The European Common Market may be an EC-wide market for many products—but not for telecommunications. In Europe, almost every country has its own system and each government inures the protection of its home market and producers.

In Japan, Nippon Telegraph & Telephone serves an enormous market. Although efforts have been made by the NTT leadership to increase purchases of foreign products, the agreement to open NTT's procurement to foreign suppliers has had marginal impact. Moreover, recent moves to privatize NTT have exposed governmental and industry efforts to protect key markets for telecommunications services and sales, leaving in doubt prospects for the future.

Meanwhile, major Japanese manufacturers continue to make inroads into the U.S. telecommunications market at an alarming pace—a pace that will increase exponentially with the restructuring of the U.S. market.

Therefore, in trade terms, the breakup of AT&T is more than just the unilateral elimination of a major barrier to imports. It also means that on January 1, 1984, we may have discarded the only trade concession that could ever be effective negotiating leverage for the United States to gain reciprocal market access for our telecommunications exports. It is hard to imagine any other U.S. concession providing as much incentive for foreign telecommunications manufacturers

and their governments to really open up domestic markets.

Today the United States is still the world's most highly competitive producer of telecommunications equipment. The wholesale giveaway of the U.S. market, however, has already set the stage for a major, irreversible shift in high technology trade patterns.

The exponential growth in U.S. imports will not happen overnight, but the trends are there. Unless we are willing to risk waiting for the clamor for import quotas on telecommunications equipment that is sure to come, something must be done now—before the damage cannot be reversed.

Recent trends in telecommunications trade only begin to tell the story: Although the consent decree which set the terms for divestiture was only signed in 1982, the shift in purchasing patterns has already contributed to America's first negative balance of trade in telecommunications. This 1983 deficit is expected to almost double in 1984, attributable once again to flat exports and an increase of imports by over one-third.

One need look no further than the landmark FCC Carterfone decision of 1968—involving the interconnection of certain terminal equipment with the national network—to see the dramatic impact a domestic decision to deregulate can have on production and imports of telecommunications equipment.

Since the Carterfone decision, the United States has accelerated the move toward telecommunications deregulation. Some court and regulatory decisions have had a greater impact on trade than others. Yet, at no time has the United States sought from its trading partners reciprocal concessions for these unintended market liberalizing measures. Recent decisions—in particular, the final breakup of the Bell System—will produce a trade effect that can no longer be ignored.

The potential trade giveaway from AT&T divestiture is staggering: One Japanese telecommunications newsletter recently estimated that the breakup of AT&T would open a new $5 billion market in the United States—almost 50 percent more than all NTT purchases in a single year. Another study has predicted that by 1990, imports of customer-premises equipment alone will triple, with Japan and Canada capturing 42 percent and 23 percent shares, respectively.

It is hardly surprising, then, to find that Japanese, Canadian, and European companies alike have already launched massive sales offensives in this country.

The magnitude of the shift in telecommunications trade in the future should not be surprising in the light of deregulation.

Foreign telecommunications firms will be increasingly dependent on exports to meet the growing cost of their investments. The U.S. market will stand alone in size and openness.

U.S. manufacturers will have to rely on the domestic market for the bulk of their sales with little prospect of foreign barriers being lifted and major export opportunities.

At home, U.S. manufacturers will be faced with competition from foreign firms that can afford to move into this market for long periods without turning a profit—given protection in their home markets, patient capital and the potential return on their investment in the most lucrative market for telecommunications in the world.

Finally, in the foreseeable future, U.S. telecommunications manufacturers will consist of one major producer that is unused to full competition and many other American firms that could be highly successful competitors if given a few years to take advantage of divestiture without being swamped by imports.

The Bell operating companies have already begun to assert their independence and are in the market for the cheapest quality source of equipment they can find. It is no accident that the first major wave of telecommunications imports coincided with a dramatic drop in purchases by some of the BOC's from Western Electric. With the Bell logo in hand and access to AT&T patents, foreign suppliers willing to slash profits to expand market share offer attractive bargains.

Unfortunately, these same American companies will be the most severely hurt if—as I expect—the end of the decade finds us scrambling to close the U.S. market to imports in the face of lost sales and lost jobs.

And make no mistake, the trade shift is by no means inevitable: The world market for telecommunications shows signs of growth undreamed of a few years ago—expanding from $45 billion today to $60 billion by 1987 and $90 billion in 1990. The shift is not inevitable—if only American producers are able to garner a share of the world market commensurate with their competitiveness.

What is absolutely certain is this: The United States cannot afford to wait before we react to the trade implications of the restructuring of the U.S. telecommunications market. A few years from now it will be too late. Efforts to close the U.S. market then will hurt consumers and put at risk American exports.

We need to resolve this potential trade disaster before its full impact is felt—to use the opening of the U.S. market as leverage to gain access for U.S. telecommunications exports.

The legislation I am introducing today can accomplish this—in a manner fully consistent with U.S. obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). AT&T divestiture presents us with a unique set of circumstances, including low levels of current trade relative to the future and a major reduction in U.S. import barriers as yet uncompensated by our trading partners.

These unique circumstances offer us a unique opportunity—namely, the opportunity to create on open world trading system in telecommunications that will benefit world producers and consumers alike.

SUMMARY

Title I of the Telecommunications Trade Act establishes the framework for major multilateral negotiations in telecommunications trade.

Title II of the act sets out new tariff nomenclature for telelcommunications equipment to clarify and facilitate data collection on trade in this sector.

Under title I, based on concepts and provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, U.S. negotiating objectives are established for agreements on trade in telecommunications. These objectives stress the need for competitive opportunities abroad for U.S. exports of telecommunications products and services comparable to those in the U.S. market following AT&T divestiture. Above all, U.S. negotiators are urged to seek the reduction of foreign nontariff and tariff barriers to compensate for the trade liberalizing impact of the restructuring of the U.S. market for telecommunications.

The President would be granted negotiating authority for a 3-year period to meet these objectives. Ideally, the authority would be used to negotiate multilateral or plurilateral free trade agreements—perhaps a cross between the MTN tariff agreement on trade in civil aircraft and the Government Procurement Code. Should he be unable to negotiate a multilateral agreement, the President would have the authority to negotiate a series of bilateral agreements—such as the reciprocal landing rights arrangements that accompanied airline deregulation or the sectoral agreements currently in effect or being considered between the United States and Canada.

All such agreements in telecommunications trade would be subject to congressional approval under the accelerated legislative procedures set out in the Trade Act of 1974.

To provide negotiating leverage for the President, the legislation provides for the removal of U.S. tariff bindings on certain telecommunications equipment negotiated in previous GATT rounds, as well as any compensation authority the President might need for article XXVIII negotiations under the GATT. In the absence of legislation to implement telecommunications trade agreements, these U.S. duties would, after 3 years, revert to rates specified in column 2 of the tariff schedule—namely, those higher rates

in place prior to GATT trading rounds.

It would be my hope and expectation that the U.S. tariff increases would never have to occur.

The object is not to shut out imports that would have entered in the absence of divestiture, but rather to counteract the import-liberalizing effect of divestiture in the absence of compensatory foreign concessions.

Should, however, all of our trading partners steadfastly refuse to negotiate telecommunications trade agreements, it is worth noting that even U.S. import duties on the order of 35 percent would still leave the U.S. market far more open than foreign markets where discriminatory government purchasing and other nontariff barriers effectively bar entry.

As regards any compensation needed to bring U.S. actions into conformity with GATT, relatively low predivestiture trade levels and the fact that foreign countries never expected or paid for AT&T divestiture in trade terms should make the cost minimal.

Finally, title I of the legislation cites a broad definition of telecommunications equipment for which duties would be raised—namely, those products where court and regulatory orders pertaining to divestiture would have had the effect of lowering barriers to importation.

As currently drafted, the legislation does not specify the actual product categories involved. The specific tariff line items will be added later—based on public hearings and the International Trade Commission study on the trade implications of AT&T divestiture that was requested by the Finance Committee last November.

Title II of the legislation, the Telecommunications Product Classification Act, establishes new tariff nomenclature for telecommunications equipment. Without changing current tariff rates, it is designed to facilitate data collection on trade in such equipment—correcting a major flaw in the U.S. tariff schedules—(TSUS)—attributable to hopelessly out-of-date definitions.

The proposed nomenclature—drafted by the ITC as part of its study—provides for a breakout of certain types of telecommunications equipment currently buried in other high technology categories.

The need for new terminology is clear: Current tariff nomenclature for telecommunications equipment reflects pre-1962 technology. In fact, the definitions of "telegraph" and "telephone" in TSUS can be traced back to at least 1897. Technologies such as fiber optics do not even appear in the U.S. tariff schedule.

The fact that our tariff nomenclature has not kept up with technological improvements in communications means that it is now virtually impossible to find adequate statistics to measure trade in telecommunications. For example, in 1983 over $1 billion in telephone equipment entered the United States under three general tariff annotations: "switching equipment," "telephone instruments," and "other."

Clearly, better trade statistics are needed to measure U.S. imports and exports of telecommunications equipment. Title II of this act provides a means of accomplishing this.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, U.S. trade policy to date has invariably been reactive or, in the case of AT&T divestiture, a by-product of purely domestic decisionmaking. Therefore, it is not surprising that we constantly find ourselves trying to resolve last year's trade problems.

The United States must have a forward-looking trade policy. Problems must be anticipated and resolved before they reach unmanageable proportions.

In the case of telecommunications, we have a unique opportunity to resolve a trade problem before it does major harm to our economy. If we do not resolve the problem now, it will have been a problem of our own making.

The negotiation of reciprocal access market arrangements is the cornerstone of the GATT. In the case of telecommunications trade, unfettered access to our market is the only concession likely to be attractive enough to open foreign markets for U.S. exporters. To give away this access without compensation would be an opportunity lost and foolish to the extreme.

International trade is too important to the U.S. economy to allow it to remain a stepchild of our domestic policy decisions. The restructuring of the U.S. telecommunications market has major trade implications. We ignore them at our peril.

ATTACHMENTS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a detailed outline of the Telecommunications Trade Act and the text of the legislation be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2618

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—TRADE IN TELECOMMUNICATIONS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Telecommunications Trade Act of 1984".

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the restructuring of the United States market for telecommunications will result in a dramatic increase in imports of telecommunications equipment;

(2) foreign telecommunications markets are characterized by extensive Government intervention (including restrictive import practices and discriminatory procurement practices) which adversely affect United States exports of telecommunications equipment and services;

(3) there will be rapid growth in the world market for telecommunications in the coming decades;

(4) the United States can improve prospects for United States telecommunications exports, and export-related employment, technological leadership, and consumer service by taking steps to achieve an open world market for trade in telecommunications products, services, and investment; and

(5) without reciprocal foreign market access, the United States should avoid granting improved access for foreign telecommunications products to the United States market.

SEC. 103. AMENDMENTS TO THE TRADE ACT OF 1974.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 8—TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITIES

"SEC. 181. TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

"(a) GENERAL NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The United States negotiating objectives under section 182 shall be—

"(1) to obtain multilateral or bilateral agreements that would provide competitive opportunities for United States exports of telecommunications products (including services using such products) in foreign countries which are substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities provided by the United States after the restructuring of the United States market for telecommunications, and

"(2) to avoid uncompensated reductions in barriers to foreign access to the United States market.

"(b) FACTORS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—In pursuing United States negotiating objectives under subsection (a), the President shall take into account the following factors:

"(1) barriers to United States exports of telecommunications products, including, but not limited to foreign government—

"(A) procurement practices;

"(B) restrictions on services and investment related to trade in telecommunication products;

"(C) nontariff barriers not described in paragraph (1) or (2); and

"(D) tariff barriers;

"(2) domestic and international competitiveness of United States telecommunications products and services; and

"(3) the national economic interest of the United States.

"SEC. 182. TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY.

"(a) GENERAL NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY.—Whenever the President determines—

"(1) that—

"(A) any duties, import restrictions, or barriers to (or other distortions of) international trade of any foreign country or the United States—

"(i) unduly burden and restrict the foreign trade of the United States in telecommunications products, or

"(ii) adversely affect the United States economy, or

"(B) the imposition of such duties,

restrictions, or barriers (or other distortions) is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect, and

"(2) that attainment of the objectives of this chapter will be promoted by the taking of action under this subsection,

the President, during the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Telecommunications Trade Act of 1984, may enter into multilateral or bilateral trade agreements with foreign countries or instrumentalities which provide for the harmonization, reduction, or elimination of such duties, restrictions, or barriers (or other distortions), or the prohibition of or limitations on the imposition of such duties, restrictions, or barriers (or other distortions).

"(b) AGREEMENT TREATMENT IN SAME MANNER AS AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 102.—For purposes of subsections (c) through (g) of section 102 and chapter 5 of this Act, any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) of this section shall be considered to be a trade agreement entered into under section 102.

"SEC. 183. SUSPENSION OF TARIFF BINDINGS.

"(a) UNBINDING OF DUTIES ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS.—The President shall, after not more than 90 days of consultations with the appropriate foreign countries or instrumentalities—

"(1) terminate, withdraw, or suspend all or part of any trade agreement entered into under this Act (other than section 182), section 201 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, or section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to any United States duty or other import restriction on telecommunications products (as defined in section 184), and

"(2) terminate, withdraw, or suspend the obligations of the United States with respect to such duty or other import restriction.

"(b) 3-YEAR SUSPENSION OF UNBINDING.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) or section 125(e), any duty (or other import restriction) with respect to which action is taken under subsection (a) shall remain in effect, including previously staged reductions (as though such action had not been taken) until the date which is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Trade Act of 1984. After such date, any duty with respect to which action is taken under subsection (a) shall be increased to a rate equal to the rate applicable under the rate column numbered 2 unless such duty has been otherwise modified pursuant to an implementing bill adopted under section 182 of this title.

"(c) ACTION TREATED AS INCREASE OR IMPOSITION OF DUTY FOR PURPOSES OF COMPENSATION AUTHORITY.—For purposes of section 123, any action under subsection (a) shall be treated as an action under section 203 to increase or impose a duty (or other import restriction) which takes effect on the date such action is proclaimed (and not on the date an increase in duty takes effect under subsection (b)). For purposes of this subsection, section 123(b)(4) shall not apply.

"SEC. 184. DEFINITION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS.

"For purposes of this chapter, the term 'telecommunications products' means any equipment, instruments, components, parts, or other property—

"(1) which is designed for incorporation in, conncection to, or interconnection with telephone, telegraph, and related telecommunications networks, and

"(2) for which uncompensated reductions in barriers to importation have occurred as a result of judicial and regulatory orders intended to increase competition in U.S. telecommunications services and products.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for title I of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 8—TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITIES

"Sec. 181. Telecommunications trade negotiating objectives.
"Sec. 182. Telecommunications trade negotiating authorities.
"Sec. 183. Suspension of tariff bindings.
"Sec. 184. Definition of telecommunications products.".

SEC. 104. CONSULTATION.

The President shall consult with the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and other appropriate congressional committees, as well as the appropriate committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974, in carrying out the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRODUCT CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Telecommunications Product Classification Act".

SEC. 202. TARIFF SCHEDULE NOMENCLATURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are amended as follows:

(1) Subpart G of part 4 of schedule 6 is amended—

(A) by striking out item 676.15 and inserting, in numerical sequence and subordinate to the superior heading to item 676.15, the following new items:

	"Accounting, computing, and other data processing machines:			
676.13	Machines designed for connection to telegraphic or telephonic apparatus or instruments or to telegraphic or telephonic networks.	4.5% ad val.	3.9% ad val.	35% ad val.
676.14	Other	4.5% ad val.	3.9% ad val.	35% ad val.",

(B) by striking out item 676.30 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new items:

	"Office machines not specially provided for:			
676.28	Machines designed for connection to telegraphic or telephonic apparatus or instruments or to telegraphic or telephonic networks.	4.2% ad val.	3.7% ad val.	35% ad val.
676.29	Other	4.2% ad val.	3.7% ad val.	35% ad val.",

and

(C) by striking out item 676.52 and inserting, in numerical sequence and subordinate to the superior heading to item 676.50, the following new items:

	"Other:			
676.53	Parts designed for connection to telegraphic or telephonic apparatus or instruments or to telegraphic or telephonic networks.	4.5% ad val.	3.9% ad val.	35% ad val.
676.54	Other	4.5% ad val.	3.9% ad val.	35% ad val.".

(2) Subpart H of part 4 of schedule 6 is amended—

(A) by striking out item 678.50 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new items:

	"Machines not specially provided for, and parts thereof:			
678.49	Machines designed for connection to telegraphic or telephonic apparatus or instruments or to telegraphic or telephonic networks.	4.2% ad val.	3.7% ad val.	35% ad val.
678.53	Other, including parts	4.2% ad val.	3.7% ad val.	35% ad val.",

and

(B) by redesignating item 678.51 as item 678.55, with the article description therefor subordinate to the article description for items 678.49 and 678.53 (as added by subparagraph (A)).

(3) Part 5 of schedule 6 is amended—

(A) by inserting after headnote 5 the following new headnote:

"6. For purposes of the tariff schedules, the term 'entertainment broadcast band receivers' means those radio receivers designed principally to receive signals in the AM (550-1650 kHz) and FM (88-108 MHz) entertainment broadcast bands, whether or not capable of television, marine, public safety, industrial, and citizens band),",

(B) by striking out items 684.62 and 684.64 and inserting, in numerical sequence and subordinate to the superior heading to item 684.62, the following new items:

	"Telephonic apparatus and instruments and parts thereof:			
684.57	Telephone switching apparatus (including private branch exchange and key system switching apparatus), and parts and components.	8.5% ad val.		35 ad val.
684.58	Telephone sets and other terminal equipment and parts thereof.	8.5% ad val.		35% ad val.
684.59	Other	8.5% ad val.		35% ad val.
	Other:			
684.65	Switching apparatus and parts thereof.	5.6% ad val.	4.7% ad val.	35% ad val.
684.66	Terminal apparatus (including teleprinting and teletypewriting machines) and parts thereof.	5.6% ad val.	4.7% ad val.	35% ad val.
684.67	Other	5.6% ad val.	4.7% ad val.	35% ad val.".

(C) by inserting, in numerical sequence, the following new items:

"Communications satellites (however provided for in this part) and parts thereof:

684.80	To be launched in the United States for use in a global communications satellite system.	Free		Free
684.82	Other	Free		Free",

(D) by striking out items 685.21 through 685.31 and inserting, in numerical sequence and subordinate to the superior heading to item 685.21, the following new items:

"685.20	Radio receivers, other than solid-state (tubeless).	6%		35% ad val.
	Solid-state (tubeless) radio receivers:			
685.21	Designed for motor-vehicle installation.	8.9% ad val.	8% ad val	35% ad val.
	Other:			
685.22	Enterainment broadcast band receivers.	7.7% ad val.	6% ad val	35% ad val.
685.23	Other	7.7% ad val.	6% ad val	35% ad val.
	Transceivers: Citizens band:			
685.24	Hand-held	6% ad val		35% ad val.
685.25	Other	6% ad val		35% ad val.
685.26	Low-power radio-telephonic transceivers operating on frequencies from 48.82 to 49.90 MHz.	3.8% ad val.	2.4% ad val.	35% ad val.

685.27	Other transceivers	6% ad val		35% ad val.
	Other transmission apparatus incorporating reception apparatus:			
685.28	Cordless handset telephones.	6% ad val		35% ad val.
685.29	Other	6% ad val		35% ad val.
	Other:			
685.30	Transmitters	6% ad val		35% ad val.
685.31	Other including parts	6% ad val		35% ad val.
685.32	Radiotelegraphic and radiotelephonic transmission and reception apparatus, and radiobroadcasting transmission and reception apparatus, if certified for use in civil aircraft (see headnote 3, part 6C, schedule 6).	Free		"

(E) by inserting, in numerical sequence and at the same hierarchical level as the article description for item 685.40, the following new item:

"685.39	Telephone answering machines, and parts thereof.	4.5% ad val.	3.9% ad val.	35% ad val.",

(F) by striking out the article description for item 685.40 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Tape recorders and dictation recording and transcribing machines (other than telephone answering machines), and parts thereof",

(G) by striking out item 685.50 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	"Other:			
685.48	Combination articles designed for connection to telegraphic or telephonic apparatus or instruments or to telegraphic or telephonic networks.	5.9% ad val.	4.9% ad val.	35% ad val.
685.49	Other	5.9% ad val..	4.9% ad val.	35% ad val.",

(H) by striking out item 688.15 and inserting, in numerical sequence and subordinate to the superior heading to item 688.10, the following new items:

	"Other:			
688.17	With modular telephone connectors.	5.8% ad val.	5.3% ad val.	35% ad val.
688.18	Other	5.8% ad val.	5.3% ad val.	35% ad val.",

(I) by redesignating item 688.16 as item 688.19, with the article description therefor subordinate to the article description for items 688.17 and 688.18 (as added by subparagraph (G)), and

(J) by striking out item 688.43 and inserting, in numerical sequence and subordinate to the superior heading to item 688.34, the following new items:

	"Other:			
688.41	Equipment designed for connection to telegraphic or telephonic apparatus or instruments or to telegraphic or telephonic networks.	4.5% ad val.	3.9% ad val.	35% ad val.
688.42	Other	4.5% ad val.	3.9 ad val	35% ad val.".

(4) Subpart A of part 2 of schedule 7 is amended—

(A) by inserting in numerical sequence the following new items:

	Optical fibers, optical fiber bundles, and optical fiber cables; all the foregoing whether mounted or not mounted.			
707.90	Optical fiber bundles	13.1% ad val.	8.4% ad val.	65% ad val.
707.92	Optical fibers and optical fiber cables.	13.1% ad val.	8.4% ad val.	85% ad val.".

and

(B) by redesignating items 708.09 and 708.29 as 708.10 and 708.30, respectively.

(5) Subpart A of part 3 of schedule 8 is amended by striking out the superior heading to item 837.00 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Articles for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and articles (other than communications satellites and parts thereof) imported to be launched into space under launch services agreements with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:".

(6) Subpart B of part 3 of schedule 8 is amended by striking out the superior heading to item 842.10 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the request of the Department of State, articles (other than communications satellites and parts thereof) which are the property of a foreign government or of a public international organization:".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) RATE REDUCTIONS.—

(A) The rate of duty in column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (as added by subsection (a)) for each item set forth below in the column headed "A" in the table under subparagraph (C) shall be subject to all staged rate reductions for the corresponding item set forth below in the column headed "B" in such table which were proclaimed by the President before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) Whenever the rate of duty specified in column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States for each item set forth below in the column headed "A" in the table under subparagraph (C) is reduced to the same level, or to a lower level, as the corresponding rate of duty specified in the column entitled "LDDC" of the Tariff Schedules of the United States for such item, the rate of duty in such "LDDC" column shall be deleted.

(C) The table referred to in this subparagraph is as follows:

A	B
676.13	676.15
676.14	676.15
676.28	676.30
676.29	676.30
676.53	676.52
676.54	676.52
678.49	678.50
678.53	678.50
684.65	684.64
684.66	684.64
684.67	684.64
685.21	685.21
685.22	685.24
685.23	685.24
685.26	685.26
685.39	685.40
685.48	685.50
685.49	685.50
688.17	688.15
688.18	688.15
688.41	688.43
688.42	688.43
707.90	708.29
707.92	708.09

(2) AUTHORITY UNDER THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930.—Subsection (a) of section 322 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1322(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The authority delegated to the Secretary by this subsection shall not extend to communication satellites and components and parts thereof.".

(c) MODIFICATION OF SCHEDULE B.—The President shall modify schedule B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to reflect the changes made by this section.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this title.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE ACT: SUMMARY

TITLE I: THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE ACT OF 1984

1. Findings:

The restructuring of the U.S. market for telecommunications will result in a dramatic increase in imports of telecommunications equipment.

Foreign telecommunications markets are characterized by extensive government intervention, including restrictive import practices and discriminatory government procurement.

The world market for telecommunications will be the source of rapid growth in the coming decades.

The United States can increase U.S. telecommunications exports, export-related employment, technological leadership and consumer service by achieving an open world trading system for telecommunications products, services and investment.

The United States should avoid granting improved access for foreign telecommunications products in this market in the absence of improved market access abroad for U.S. exports.

2. Amendments to the Trade Act of 1974:

(a) Telecommunications Trade Negotiating Objectives.—

Competitive opportunities for U.S. exports of telecommunications equipment and services in foreign countries substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities provided by the U.S. market following AT&T divestiture—with a view to avoiding uncompensated reductions in U.S. import barriers.

Competitive opportunities abroad should be measured in terms of both nominal access opportunities and documented or anticipated results. Government procurement practices, standards, investment restrictions and other non-tariff barriers should be considered, as well as tariff barriers.

(b) Telecommunications Trade Negotiating Authority.—

For a period of three years from enactment, the President is granted the authority to enter into multilateral or bilateral trade agreements providing for open trade in telecommunications equipment. For this purpose, he may reduce, eliminate or otherwise modify U.S. tariff and non-tariff barriers.

Any such telecommunications trade agreement must be approved by Congress and will be treated as a trade agreement under fast-track legislative procedures set out in Sections 102/151 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(c) Suspension of Tariff Bindings.—

Upon enactment, tariff bindings on U.S. imports of telecommunications equipment negotiated in previous GATT trade rounds shall be removed, however

For three years following enactment, U.S. import duties will remain at current rates. After three years, such duties will, in the absence of legislation to implement telecom-

munications trade agreement(s), automatically revert to Column 2 rates (i.e., the higher rates in place prior to GATT trading rounds.)

The President is granted authority to compensate (through offsetting trade concessions, if necessary) major foreign suppliers of products for which tariff bindings have been removed. U.S. negotiators would be expected to cite low pre-divestiture trade levels and involve "reasonable expectations" arguments (re: AT&T divestiture) to minimize compensation in GATT Article XXVIII negotiations.

3. Definitions:

For purposes of this bill, the term "telecommunications products" refers to any telecommunications equipment for which uncompensated reductions in barriers to importation have resulted from court and regulatory orders intended to increase domestic competition in U.S. telecommunications services and products (i.e., related to divestiture.)

(Note: Specific product categories will be drawn from hearings and the ITC report on the trade impact of the breakup of AT&T, and will be substituted later in the legislative process. Products could include:

Transmission Equipment (microwave, satellites, cable, fiber optics, etc.);

Switching Equipment (all central office equipment); and

Customer Premise (Terminal) Equipment (telephones, mobile telephones, PBXs, call directors, pagers, etc.))

4. Consultations:

The President will consult on a regular basis with the appropriate committees of Congress and private sector advisory committees established under Section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TITLE II: TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRODUCT CLASSIFICATION ACT

1. Specifies new tariff (TSUS) nomenclature for telecommunications equipment to clarify and facilitate data collection on trade in telecommunications. (Nomenclature was drafted by the ITC at the request of the Committee on Finance and does not change current tariff rates.)●

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, January 1 marked the end of an era. It marked the end of the Bell System, and the end of the integrated monopoly. But, January 1 also marked a beginning of a new era; an era of competition.

Like it or not, we have embarked on a monumental experiment unequalled in our industrial history. The prospects are there for boosts in innovation; for a widening variety of services and products; and for rising productivity in the keystone industry of our information based economy. Seven of ten Americans are employed in the service sector of our economy and the quality, efficiency, and variety of communications is key to how well they compete.

But, this great experiment has many risks. We face risks as we move to new ways of pricing telephone service—ways based on cost. Some people may no longer be able to afford basic access. While a move toward cost-based pricing should yield new efficiencies, we cannot abandon universal service as a result. We also face the risk that regulation will tilt unfairly in one direction or the other. We face another risk. We face the risk that we will lose a major American market to foreign competition. That is the subject of the legislation I join in sponsoring today: Trade in telecommunications in the new era. For while Government sorts out the regulatory strands in the domestic industry, and while industry continues to adjust and shake itself out, with new corporate alinements and new services, something very significant—something very disturbing, is happening at the national border.

What is happening is that America has dramatically slipped from a net exporter of telecommunications equipment to a net importer. This is happening in a nation that, by any reasonable measure, enjoys the world's technological edge. Is it happening in an economic sector whose growth America counts on for America's benefit. Is it happening in an high tech industry, when high tech is key to maintaining our international competitiveness. If we lose ground here, then where do we hold ground?

The numbers are striking. In 1982 we had a trade surplus in telephone and telegraph equipment of $203 million. In 1983, we had a trade deficit of $240 million. And the trend seems likely to get worse.

Why is this happening? In part, because foreign manufacturers have products that people want. But why, for 1982 to 1983 did our exports remain virtually unchanged, at around $830 million, while imports rose some 70 percent, from $626 million to $1,075 billion?

A major reason I think, is clear. That reason is divestiture of AT&T and our procompetitive telecommunications policy. Viewed in the light of international trade, the AT&T breakup must be seen as a step of major significance. America has unilaterally withdrawn a major barrier to foreign entry into our market. True, it was a nontariff barrier. But it was a barrier all the same. And America has withdrawn it unilaterally.

Before divestiture, $13 billion in annual procurement by Bell operating companies went, by and large, to Western Electric. But the Bell operating companies have now been unlinked from AT&T. And already we see the Bell operating companies shopping for the best deal on central switches even if it means going off-shore. Before divestiture, relatively few customers took advantage of the right—granted since 1977—to buy their own terminal equipment. Before divestiture, AT&T rented out some 100 million telephone sets. But as divestiture approached, customers became more and more aware that they could buy their own telephone. AT&T faces competition not only from GE and GTE, but from NEC—Nippon Electric Co.

Some 70 percent of telephone customers said in a recent survey that buying a phone is a better deal than leasing it. Is it any wonder that analysts predict that the sale of telephone sets will be a multibillion-dollar industry in the eighties? Is it any surprise that the import of telephone handsets rose, in the first 9 months of 1983, a whopping 247 percent over the previous year?

Lest there be any doubt about what divestiture means, a comment by a manager of NEC North America is revealing. Quoted in a recent Business Week article, he said, "All at once the United States has become an open market. If you have a good product, you can ride the wave." And, let us not focus solely on the Japanese. Jeumont-Schneider, the largest PBX manufacturer in France, is entering the U.S. market, with a target of 5 percent of a market that should top 10 billion by 1990. A lot of foreign based manufacturers have their eyes set on a bigger piece of the American pie.

What is terribly wrong is not that we have opened our markets. What is terribly wrong is that at the same time, foreign markets remain closed. Unless we act, trade in telecommunications equipment will increasingly be a one-way street. Any rational observer has to wonder whether in the area of trade, the divestiture and our procompetitive policy are a monumental case of American shooting itself in the foot.

While America has opened its doors to new entry, the doors to foreign markets remain largely closed. In most developed nations, the public network is owned and operated by government-owned monopolies—the Postal Telephone & Telegraph or PTT's generally favor their domestic manufacturers. While large American firms may respond by buying into firms abroad, buying into foreign companies is not all that easy for smaller firms. Moreover, such activity does not do as much for American jobs and American economic growth.

Industrial nations adhere to the so-called government procurement code, under which their government agrees to forgo policies of buying domestic. But few have agreed to extend the code to telecommunications agencies.

Japan has entered into a bilateral agreement with the United States. Japan is the second largest telecommunications market. Its government-owned monopoly is Nippon Telephone & Telegraph—(NTT). Since 1980, NTT has promised open procurement under a bilateral agreement with the United States. But in the first 3 years of the agreement, less than 1 percent of the $3 billion in yearly purchases has gone

to American firms. Meanwhile roughly half our imports come from Japan.

I led 14 other Senators late last year in urging various improvements in the agreement. And shortly after the new year, an agreement was struck between the United States and Japan, incorporating some of those. Time will tell if they will make a difference. But we had something of a warning about overoptimism. Around the time the agreement was extended, Japanese officials clarified their reading of the new agreement. They said that communications satellites were excluded from the agreement. Why? Quite simply because Japan felt it in its national interest to develop a domestic industry. Recent talks between Ambassador Brock and Japanese officials still have not completely resolved this matter.

Obviously, there is no turning back the clock. Divestiture is complete. But, we cannot stand by while our trade position deteriorates. America must take firm steps to insure that trade in telecommunications is a two-way street. The legislation we introduce today is just such a step.

The outline of the solution we are proposing is a simple one. It directs the President to commence multilateral negotiations with our trade partners—to secure access to their markets reciprocal to the access enjoyed in the United States. At the very least, we would demand improvements. Failing to achieve that, the United States would significantly increase tariffs on imports.

For New Jersey, taking these steps for the industry is critical, New Jersey ranks fourth in the Nation in shipments of telephone and telegraph equipment. Home of Bell Labs, New Jersey is a leader in the research and development of new products. Some 40,000 men and women are employed here in the manufacture of communications equipment. It is in their interest that we move quickly, and decisively.

When trade sanctions are mentioned, some people are apt to think, negatively, that that amounts to protectionism. What I am suggesting is not the protection of a sick industry. What I suggest is that we stop the sacrifice of a healthy one; a vital industry; a leading industry.●

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of the Telecommunications Trade Act because this country needs to be more vigilant in opening up foreign markets for U.S products. The telecommunications industry is one of the most protected industries in other countries. According to the Department of Commerce:

> Other major markets—outside of the United States—remain essentially closed, operating according to the established system of government held PTT's—postal-telephone and telegraph—and preferential procurement procedures.

We must do more to open those markets for U.S. products because the telecommunications industry is among the world's fastest growing industries. It is estimated that the worldwide telecommunications market will expand from $59 billion in 1983 to $88 billion in 1988.

The U.S. market for telecommunications equipment was $24 billion in 1983 and is expected to rise to $35 billion in 1988. However, access to this market has been opened up as a result of the AT&T divestiture. In effect, we are unilaterally giving foreign companies new U.S. market opportunities and we are getting nothing for it. We can no longer afford to give something away for nothing. If the U.S market is open and foreign markets remain closed, foreign producers will have no incentive to pressure their governments to give U.S. companies a chance to sell our telecommunications products in their markets.

In the words of the Commerce Department:

> As long as this type of asymmetry persists, firms based in open-market countries—and therefore without the luxury of insulated domestic demand—could find themselves at a temporary competitive disadvantage before their protected counterparts. And since the United States has led the way in terms of liberalization, American telecommunications equipment manufacturers in particular may face unreciprocated foreign competition.

What the act does is to grant for 3 years to the President the authority to enter into trade agreements providing for more open trade in telecommunications equipment. As leverage, the act stipulates that U.S. tariffs on telecommunications equipment will rise after the 3 years to the level that would have been in effect without the commitments made during multilateral negotiations, unless the President successfully negotiates a trade agreement opening up foreign markets for U.S. products. In effect, the act puts another arrow in the quiver of our trade negotiators when they sit down with their counterparts from other countries.

While I am generally reluctant to increase trade restrictions, this country needs to use whatever means available to force other countries back to the bargaining table to liberalize trade. Let me emphasize however, that the act is GATT consistent because compensation is provided for, if in fact tariffs have to be raised. Of course, if other countries negotiate to open their markets, tariffs will not be raised. My hope is that this act will result in more open markets, not less.

National, even international, debate is sadly limited by the brittle cliches of "free trade" and "protectionism." The first is a myth and the second is a menace. Free trade is a noble goal but like absolute zero in physics or the perfect oil painting copy of the Mona Lisa, it can never be obtained. Liberalized trade, developed under a set of rules which provide a discipline in the international market place, has served the world well since World War II. But those rules are not providing an effective international discipline today. Five years ago this Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 and we had high hopes for new codes, including the one on government procurement. But 5 years later we find that precious little has been gained. Our agreement with Nippon Telephone and Telegraph (NTT) has resulted in less than $200 million in sales.

The policy issue today is not a question of free trade versus protectionism. It is a question of discipline and rules, who obeys and who does not, what is fair and what is not. Is it fair that foreign producers of telecommunications equipment continue to receive protection and support from their governments, while we open up our market to competition from these firms and their governments?

This country must stop treating trade policy as a stepchild of foreign policy and domestic policy. Put bluntly, we do not have a trade policy. In this interdependent world, all of our domestic policies have an effect on industry's ability to compete internationally. We have no idea what our myriad of policies for defense procurement, small businesses, subsidies, tax breaks, and all of our trade restrictions have on the structure of our industry or its ability to compete internationally. The divestiture of AT&T is another in a long list of policy changes which are taken without considering the implications for trade. Until this country adopts a more coherent trade strategy, we will be forced to use whatever leverage the Congress can muster, on a piecemeal basis, to open up foreign markets. That is why I support this bill.

In sum, the world market for telecommunications will be the source of rapid growth in the coming decades. However, foreign telecommunications markets are characterized by extensive government intervention, including restrictive import practices and discriminatory government procurement. Only by using access to the U.S. market as leverage, can the United States achieve an open world market for trade in telecommunications—thereby gaining access for U.S. exports and increasing export-related employment. The time has come for the United States to use that leverage, otherwise our firms will continue to operate at a competitive disadvantage to the detriment of our economic base.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support the bill.

By Mr. McCLURE (by request):

S.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution to approve the "Compact of Free Association," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

APPROVAL OF THE "COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION"

● Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, at the request of the administration, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution to approve the "Compact of Free Association," and for other purposes. The text of the President's letter of transmittal appears at page S. 3522 of the RECORD of March 30, 1984.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 476

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 476, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require a finding of medical improvement when disability benefits are terminated, to provide for a review and right to personal appearance prior to termination of disability benefits, to provide for uniform standards in determining disability, to provide continued payment of disability benefits during the appeals process, and for other purposes.

S. 1163

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1163, a bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide death benefits to survivors of Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 1201, a bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to protect semiconductor chips and masks against unauthorized duplication, and for other purposes.

S. 1746

At the request of Mr. RUDMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1746, a bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector of the economy the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies and that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States identify the activities of the Federal Government to produce, manufacture, or otherwise provide goods and services which should be provided by the private sector and prepare a schedule for transferring such activities to the private sector.

S. 1816

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1816, a bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, the Tariff Act of 1930, and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to improve the labeling of textile fiber and wool products.

S. 1844

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1844, a bill entitled the "Aviation Tax Reduction Act of 1983."

S. 1884

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1884, a bill to relieve the Elephant Butte Irrigation District of certain repayment obligations and for other purposes.

S. 1938

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1938, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2014

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2014, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide for assistance in locating missing children.

S. 2025

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2025, a bill to amend the Highway Improvement Act of 1982 to provide additional funds for the completion of certain priority primary projects.

S. 2096

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2096, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit investment by employee benefit plans in residential mortgages.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2374, a bill to extend the authorization for 5 years for the low income home energy assistance program, for the community services block grant, and for the Head Start program, and for other purposes.

S. 2423

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2423, a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for the purpose of compensating and otherwise assisting victims of crime, and to provide funds to the Department of Justice for the purpose of assisting victims of Federal crime.

S. 2490

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2490, a bill to amend and extend the Library Services and Construction Act.

S. 2505

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2505, a bill to provide a right of first refusal for metropolitan areas before a professional sports team is relocated, and for other purposes.

S. 2569

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to amend XVI of the Social Security Act to make necessary improvements in the SSI program with the objective of assuring that such program will more realistically and more equitably reflect the needs and circumstances of applicants and recipients thereunder.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 55

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 55, a resolution to recognize the pause for the Pledge of Allegiance as part of National Flag Day activities.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 87

At the request of Mr. TSONGAS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 87, a joint resolution designating a day

of remembrance for victims of genocide.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 165

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 165, a joint resolution to commemorate the bicenntennial anniversary of the constitutional foundation for patent and copyright laws.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 260

At the request of Mr. QUAYLE, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 260, a joint resolution designating the week beginning on November 11, 1984, as "National Blood Pressure Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 261

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 261, a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the last week in June, 1984, as "Helen Keller Deaf Blind Awareness Week."

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 261, supra.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 264

At the request of Mr. TSONGAS, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 264, a joint resolution to designate the month of March 1985 as "National Hemophilia Awareness Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 269

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 269, a joint resolution designating the week beginning September 23, 1984, as "National Adult Day Care Center Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 279

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 279, a joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 283

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 283, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 284

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 284, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 2, 1984, as "National School Age Child Care Awareness Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 241

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 241, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the foreign policy of the United States should take account of the genocide of the Armenian people, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 360

At the request of Mr. TOWER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 360, a resolution to amend rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to provide that no amendment that is not germane or relevant to the subject matter of a bill or resolution shall be in order unless such amendment has been submitted at the desk at least 48 hours prior to consideration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 364

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 364, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that certain recommendations of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control relating to the Veterans' Administration health care system should be rejected as a matter of national policy.

AMENDMENT NO. 3036

At the request of Mr. SASSER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3036 proposed to H.R. 2163, a bill to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3036 proposed to H.R. 2163, supra.

SENATE RESOLUTION 375—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE PRAYERS OF THE SENATE CHAPLAIN DURING THE 97TH CONGRESS

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 375

Resolved, That there be printed with an appropriate illustration as a Senate document, the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., the Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Ninety-seventh Congress, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed such additional copies not to exceed $1,200 in cost of such document for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SENATE RESOLUTION 376—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE PRAYERS OF THE SENATE CHAPLAIN DURING THE 98TH CONGRESS

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 376

Resolved, That there be printed with an appropriate illustration as a Senate document, the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., the Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Ninety-eighth Congress, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed such additional copies not to exceed $1,200 in cost of such document for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the

direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SENATE RESOLUTION 377—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO CAROL JEFFERY TOLIVER, NORMAN LEE TOLIVER, MARVIN LEWIS TOLIVER, CATHERINE AMELIA HENDERSON, RUTH LOUISE TOLIVER, MARY ETTA SAMUEL, PHYLLIS JEAN PELHAM, ALVIN WINDELL TOLIVER, AND GRACE ANN TOLIVER

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 377

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Carol Jeffery Toliver; Norman Lee Toliver; Marvin Lewis Toliver; Alvin Windell Toliver, brothers of James R. Toliver and Catherine Amelia Henderson; Ruth Louise Toliver; Mary Etta Samuel; Phyllis Jean Pelham and Grace Ann Toliver, sisters of James R. Toliver, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to one-ninth of five months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SENATE RESOLUTION 378—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO RUTH M. FIRSHEIN

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 378

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ruth M. Firshein, widow of Benjamin H. Firshein, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to nine months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SENATE RESOLUTION 379—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO ERIC SWANSON AND KRISTAN BOOTH

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 379

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eric Swanson, son of Ruth B. Swanson and Kirstan Booth, daughter of Ruth B. Swanson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to one half of seven and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances,

SENATE RESOLUTION 380—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO PATSY L. FUNK

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 380

Resolved, that the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Patsy L. Funk, daughter of Thomas L. Maloney, and employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty on the Senate side of the Capitol grounds at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SENATE RESOLUTION 381—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO WALTER M. STICKELL

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 381

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Walter M. Stickell, widower of Rita L. Stickell, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SENATE RESOLUTION 382—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO LAURA DUDLEY PAGE

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 382

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Laura Dudley Page, widow of Stanley H. Page, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to four months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SENATE RESOLUTION 383—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION TO PAY A GRATUITY TO DANIEL T. FOLEY, MAUREEN C. CANNY, AND EILEEN P. TWIGG

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 383

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Daniel T. Foley, brother of Joan V. Foley and Maureen C. Canny and Eileen P. Twigg, sisters of Joan V. Foley, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to one third of seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SENATE RESOLUTION 384—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED RELATING TO PURCHASE OF CALENDARS

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 384

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of that committee, not to exceed $65,520 for the purchase of one hundred and four thousand calendars. The calendars shall be distributed as prescribed by the committee.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

HOLLINGS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3041

Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. EXON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. NUNN) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 19 of amendment No. 3027:

SEC. relating to limitations of aggregate total budget authority for National Defense and non-defense discretionary activities, is amended by striking out subsections (a) through (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE X—INCREASING IN REVENUES AND LIMITS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

DELAY COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT TO 1990

SEC. 1001. (a) Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to adjustments in tax tables so that inflation will not result in tax increases) is amended—

(1) by striking out "1964" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "1989", and

(2) by striking out "1983" in paragraph (3) (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".

(b) Subsection (e) of section 104 of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1989".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1984.

INCREASED TAX AUDIT COVERAGE

SEC. 1002. (a) In the case of revenue agents, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to section 7803(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, shall employ no less than 15,647 in fiscal year 1985, 16,569 in fiscal year 1986, 17,395 in fiscal year 1987, 18,834 in fiscal year 1988, and 20,320 in fiscal year 1989.

(b) In the case of tax auditors, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to such section, shall employ no less than 4,098 in fiscal year 1985, 4,529 in fiscal year 1986, 5,001 in fiscal year 1987, 5,339 in fiscal year 1988, and 5,773 in fiscal year 1989.

WITHHOLDING OF TAXES ON ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND PAYMENTS TO INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

SEC. 1003. (a) Section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(q) EXTENSION OF WITHHOLDING TO ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND PAYMENTS TO INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which—

"(A) a person issues a royalty payment, or

"(B) notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), a person issues a payment to an independent contractor,

such person or any withholding agent shall deduct and withhold from such payment an amount equal to 10 percent of such payment.

"(2) WITHHOLDING AGENT.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the term 'withholding agent' means, with respect to any payment described in paragraph (1), the person who controls, receives, has custody of, disposes of, or pays such payment.

"(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER SECTIONS.—For purposes of sections 3403 and 3404 and for purposes of so much of subtitle F (except section 7205) as relates to this chapter, payments described under paragraph (1) which are subject to withholding shall be treated as if they were wages paid by an employer to an employee.".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply to payments made after June 30, 1984.

REVENUE INCREASES

SEC. 1004. (a) Within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the full Senate changes in laws within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Finance sufficient to increase revenues by $4,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $7,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, $11,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1987, $19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1988, and $28,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1989.

PAY COMPARABILITY ADJUSTMENT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 1005. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any other law—

(1) there shall not be an adjustment under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule and in the rates of pay under the other statutory pay systems during fiscal year 1985; and

(2) the overall percentage of the adjustment in such rates taking effect under such section in each of fiscal year 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989, shall be an increase of 3 percent.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES

SEC. 1006. (a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), for the purpose of determining or computing the amount of any increase in payments or benefit amounts or in standards for eligibility for payments or benefits taking effect on any date during the fiscal year 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989 under any provision of Federal law which requires an increase or change in such payments, benefit amounts, or standards as a result of any change in—

(A) the Consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

(B) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages.

the change in any such index shall be deemed to be the change as computed or determined under such provision of Federal law or (if less)—

(i) zero percent in the case of increases taking effect in fiscal year 1985; or

(ii) 3 percent in the case of increases taking effect in fiscal year 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, no person shall be—

(A) entitled to any increase in payments, benefit amounts, or rates of pay; or

(B) eligible for any payments or benefits,

under any provision of Federal law to the extent that such increase or eligibility is denied by reason of paragraph (1).

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any change in any index described in paragraph (1) which would have resulted in an increase in payments or benefit amounts or in standards for eligibility for payments or benefits effective on any date during the fiscal year 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989 but for paragraph (1) shall not be taken into account for the purposes of determining or computing any increase or change in such payments, benefit amounts, or standards taking effect on any date during any fiscal year after fiscal year 1989.

(b)(1) With respect to the Social Security Act, subsection (a) shall apply only to cost-of-living adjustments to cash benefits paid under section 202 or 223, and shall not limit cost-of-living adjustments under section 1617 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382f), or any other adjustment under any other provision of such Act. The adjustments becoming effective under such section 1617, and any other adjustment to which subsection (a) does not apply, will be made as through there had been made the full cost-of-living adjustment which, but for subsection (a), would have become effective under section 215(l) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)) with respect to cash benefits.

(2) Subsection (a) shall not apply to increases under section 3(o), 5(c), or 5(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(o), 2014(c), and 2014(e) respectively).

(3) Subsection (a) shall not apply to increases under section 3112 of title 38, United States Code. For the purposes of such section, benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act shall be deemed to be increased when and by the percentage such amounts would be increased (as a result of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act) if subsection (a) had not been enacted.

MEDICARE FREEZE

SEC. 1007. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendment made by this Act) or any provision of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the "applicable percentage increase" under section 1886(b)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act for any 12-month cost reporting period or fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1984, and before October 1, 1985, shall be zero percent.

(b) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall report to the Congress within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to suggested methods for assuring that hospitals will not increase amounts charged to patients who are not entitled to benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to compensate for amounts not paid by reason of the limitation under subsection (a).

LIMITATION ON INCREASE IN BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 1008. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendment made by this Act), the Congress declares that—

(1) an urgent priority of the United States Government is the pursuit of a national defense policy that adequately provides for the security of the United States and that of its allies against the threat of their adversaries;

(2) the basic goal of any national defense program of the United States should be to provide a consistent and sustained growth in defense readiness activities and in weapon systems research and development, procurement, and force modernization;

(3) an annual increase in the defense budget of the United States Government, in accordance with the commitment made in 1977 and 1978 by the United States Government and the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to provide for annual increases in the defense budgets of the members by three percent in excess of the rate of inflation, is an essential element in developing a reliable national defense capability; and

(4) the policies relating to the commitment of resources to develop and maintain a strong and comprehensive defense program by the United States must be fully integrated with an overall fiscal and economic policy directed toward restoring the financial credibility of the Government in an equitable manner.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that the amount of budget authority provided for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, and 1989 for all purchases made by departments and agencies administering activities classified under the functional category of National Defense in the Budget transmitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, should be the amount of budget authority provided for such purchases for the preceding fiscal year plus an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the amount of budget authority provided for such purchases for such preceding fiscal year; and

(2) the sum of—

(A) the rate of inflation projected (in accordance with subsection (c)(2)) to occur during the fiscal year 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989, as the case may be; and

(B) four percent in fiscal years 1985 and 1986; and

(C) three percent in fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989.

(c)(1) For the purposes of subsection (b), budget authority does not include the budget authority provided for the pay of employees of any department or agency described in subsection (b), including members

of the Armed Forces, or for military retired or retainer pay.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (b), the rate of inflation projected to occur during a fiscal year under subsection (b) shall be—

(A) for fiscal year 1985, the percent change in the defense purchases index which is projected for such fiscal year by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) for fiscal year 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989, the most recent projection of the percent change in such index for such fiscal year made by such Director before the date on which the Senate or the House of Representatives, or any committee thereof, takes action to provide budget authority for such fiscal year to which subsection (b) applies.

DISCRETIONARY FEDERAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 1009. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendment made by this Act), it is the sense of the Senate that the total amount of budget authority provided for all discretionary Federal programs for fiscal year 1985 should not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for all such programs for fiscal year 1984.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the total amount of budget authority provided for all discretionary Federal programs for each of the fiscal years 1986, 1987, 1988, and 1989, should not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for all such programs for the preceding fiscal year plus an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the total amount of budget authority provided for all such programs for such preceding fiscal year, multiplied by

(2) three percent.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "discretionary Federal program" means any Federal program other than—

(1) a program classified under the functional category of National Defense in the budget submitted by the President for the applicable fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; or

(2) a program for which spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) is provided by law.

MOYNIHAN (AND D'AMATO) AMENDMENT NO. 3042

Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . The Administrator of General Services shall assign to the Secretary of the Interior for use as a public park or recreation area, portions of the Montauk Air Force Station in East Hampton Township, Suffolk County, New York, totaling two hundred and seventy-eight acres that were declared surplus to the needs of the United States Government on December 21, 1981.

"SEC. . The Administrator of General Services shall assign the land identified in the first section of this Act to the Secretary of the Interior within thirty days of enactment of this Act. Within thirty days of said assignment, the Secretary of the Interior shall, in exchange for the transfer of the fee title to one hundred and twenty-five acres of the real property owned by the State of New York at Fire Island, New York, to the Secretary of the Interior, convey the property to the State of New York for public park or recreation uses in accordance with section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2)).".

GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 3043

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2163, supra, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: "Act.

"LIMITATIONS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY

"SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order in the Senate or House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution making appropriations, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $264,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

"(b) It shall not be in order in the Senate or House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution making appropriations, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $137,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

"(d) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

"(e) It is the sense of Congress that the unprecedented magnitude and persistence of current and projected Federal budget deficits must be addressed in a comprehensive strategy to moderate increases in defense spending while continuing the effective constraints on nondefense discretionary programs. To assure the success of such an initiative, the foregoing procedural restraints. In addition to the total aggregate spending limitations pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are necessary on budget authority both for defense and for nondefense discretionary programs for fiscal year 1985.

"MEDICARE FREEZE

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendments made by this Act) or any provision of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the 'applicable percentage increase' under section 1886(b)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act for any 12-month cost reporting period or fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1984, and before October 1, 1985, shall be zero percent.

"(b) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall report to the Congress within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to suggested methods for assuring that hospitals will not increase amounts charged to patients who are not entitled to benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to compensate for amounts not paid by reason of the limitation under subsection (a).

"LIMITATIONS ON COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no increase shall be made in payments or benefit amounts under any provision of law which would otherwise require such increase to become effective during fiscal year 1985 as a result of changes in—

"(1) the Consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

"(2) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages.

"(b) No person shall be entitled to any increase in payments or benefit amounts under any provision of law if payment thereof is denied by reason of this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any change in—

"(1) the consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

"(2) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages,

which would have resulted in any increase in payments or benefit amounts during fiscal year 1985 but for the provisions of subsection (a) shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining any increase in payments or benefit amounts during fiscal year 1986 or any fiscal year thereafter.".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a business meeting on Wednesday, May 2, and Thursday, May 3, to consider legislation pertaining to the child nutrition programs.

The bills to be considered are S. 1994; S. 2545; S. 1913, a proposed measure by Senator DOLE; and S. 2599.

The markup will begin at 10 a.m. in room SR 328-A on Wednesday and Thursday.

For further information, please contact the Agriculture Committee staff at 224-0014 or 224-0017.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 1, 1984, in order to receive testimony concerning S. 2423, the Victims of Crime Assistance Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEA POWER AND FORCE PROJECTION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Sea Power and Force Projection, of the Committee on Armed Services, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 1, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing to receive testimony of the Navy's Mark 92 fire control system upgrade program in review of S. 2414, the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND THEATER NUCLEAR FORCES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces, of the Committee on Armed Services, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 1, to hold an executive session on theater nuclear force issues, S. 2414, fiscal year 1985 DOD authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL NURSES' DAY

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to salute our Nation's 1.7 million registered nurses. These unselfish and caring individuals are, in this Senator's mind, the backbone of our country's health care system and deserving of special recognition. Sunday, May 6 is National Nurses' Day and citizens all around our country will be involved in events to heighten public awareness of the countless contributions these professionals make in insuring quality health care for all Americans.

The rapid advances in medicine and the changing nature of health care has greatly expanded the role of registered nurses. The intensity of care has increased with more R.N.'s needed to carry out such activities as monitoring vital functions, ventilation therapy with infusion pumps, and the application of many new technologies. The development of these kinds of settings has particularly increased the need for nurses with advanced preparation. And, Mr. President, our Nation's nurses have responded to these challenges, assuming increased responsibilities and accountability for our health care needs.

I am pleased to have joined my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator INOUYE, in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 274, a resolution to officially designate May 6, 1984, as National Nurse Recognition Day. Mr. President, these health care professionals are most deserving of this tribute and I urge my colleagues to join me in a demonstration of recognition and support of our Nation's nurses.●

A SESQUICENTENNIAL POEM

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on the weekend past, April 28, 1984, to be specific, I had the pleasure of participating in the celebration of Rochester, N.Y.'s Sesquicentennial. On its 150th birthday, the Flower City, as it is known, is indeed flourishing; looking to its past with pride and to its future with confidence.

The observance had many memorable moments and events, but one in particular stands out for me. It is a poem written specially for the celebration by William Heyen, professor of creative writing at the State University of New York at Brockport.

The poem, "Downriver," elegantly and eloquently captures the spirit and history that has helped make Rochester one of New York's, and the Nation's great cities.

Mr. President, I ask that Professor Heyen's poem, as reprinted on April 29, 1984 in Upstate, the magazine of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

DOWNRIVER

(A Poem for the Sesquicentennial of the City of Rochester, N.Y.)

I

At the country auction, boxes of books. In one,
Bryant's *Poems*, a gilt-edged, false-leather parlor edition
losing its words, disbound, falling apart
even while I held it.
Under century-old backyard shagbark hickories
in the spread of full summer,
I stood reading "A Forest Hymn" for the first time
in twenty or thirty years.
Do you remember? You probably had it in high school,
as I did. Its hundred-eighteen lines
rocked all us little American scholars into oblivion.
Who cared about trees?
This was the day after a Russian pilot tracked a passenger jet,
locked in his missiles, and shot it down, killing 269.
I tried to imagine that many people in flames,
had counted the auction crowd to half that number.
Bryant rhapsodizes wildflowers growing at the roots
of huge trees. Each one, he says,
"With scented breath and look so like a smile,
Seems, as it issues from the shapeless mould,
An emanation of the indwelling Life,
A visible token of the upholding Love,
That are the soul of this great universe."
There's more in his hymn than heavenly flowers smiling,
but the desperate poet does blame all catastrophe on human pride
his forest could keep us from: "O God," he prays, "when thou
Dost scare the world with tempests, set on fire
The heavens with falling thunderbolts, or fill
The swift dark whirlwind that uproots the woods
And drowns the villages; when, at thy call,
Uprises the great deep and throws himself
Upon the continent, and overwhelms its cities,
Spare me and mine, nor let us need the wrath
Of the mad unchained elements to teach who rules them."
He ends by asking for that quiet wisdom to be found
under the emblematic trees in contemplation:
"Be it ours to meditate,
In these calm shades, thy milder majesty,
And to the beautiful order of thy works
Learn to conform the order of our lives."
But I kept brooding the charred fuselage sinking into brine mud
with innocent dead, of limbs washed up on beaches.
I knelt to place the book back into its box.
A long time seemed to have passed.

II

The auction droned into evening, generations-deep possessions
knocked down for the dollars of inflation, spirited
across lawns from home, outbuildings, barns,
into cars and vans.
This was one of the old farmsteads along the Genesee
where the river still glides with Seneca apparitions
past graves of the first settlers. Who could have dreamed the American city, a glass and steel skyline,
corporate limbs in a hundred countries?
But it was always there, born in the sewn brain-patterns
of homemade quilts, in the first Kodaks giving us back
to ourselves, in flails and scythes,
in pots mended by travelling tinkerers a hundred years before,
in anvils and ogee mirrors, in hand-ruled ledgers,
cast iron stoves, tin candle moulds, a trophy buck whose antlers
branched above this congregation,
in grains of the high-headboard oak beds
whose women bore those who worked this land, in the now
nondescript uniforms of three or four wars,
in shotguns, sheepskin coats, bridal gowns,
coarse overalls, a stereopticon, butter crocks, dovetailed dressers,
a rosewood Acolian piano, corn shuckers, churns, apple peelers,
cabbage boards, blue-tinged canning jars, a loom,
a spinning wheel, a Currier & Ives of Sam Patch above the river,
a barrel of Depression glassware now fought for by dealers,
oval walnut frames of ancestral faces, redware, sheet music,
an Uncle Sam iron bank, a roll-top desk—the years
cascading forward with yearned-for objects as though
over the river's falls . . . And then,
held up by the auctioneer for special admiration,
a single amethyst jack-in-the-pulpit bud vase, its cowl-
like spathe gleaming above dispersal and the emptiness
of money . . .
Did elms once clarify our streets with toothed translucent leaves?
Did we know God because the chestnut hillsides blossomed?
We pray, again, to invest things with meaning, to build a city
within our time but free from the terror of this new world.

III

The others have gone. Will you, now, stay
here with me?
We will stand beside the river, watch stars
hold still
in the flowing night water. In the same way,
we have come here from everywhere,
and from all time. We, our parents, theirs,
theirs,
followed history, dumbly, or beguiled by it.
We were the ones in kitchens, fields,
churches
of a thousand villages who heard the re-
peated dream
until we reached for it, or were handcuffed
to it,
or driven toward it by famine, or slavers, or
pogroms
of bayonet and flame. In 1834,
as he testifies in his *Narrative*, Frederick
Douglass
prepared himself "for a final struggle which
should decide
my fate, one way or the other." For Freder-
ick,
for Susan B. Anthony in her and her sisters'
life-long passional
against sexist greed and stupidity,
the same city still glows, downriver, over the
treeline.
Lord of life and of all things, help us to
know,
now, what our struggle is, its human forms
within objects within a world daily
more dangerous. Help us to know ourselves,
the motives
of our most secret voices and gestures.
Stars in the river's water move, but stay,
as the river passes away, but stays. May we
abide,
but build here the blessed city before we
die . . .
A slag-glass lamp, a book with Bryant's
prayer, a two-handled
crosscut saw . . . let us look into one an-
other's eyes
imagining flames, imagining love, and
decide.●

SOUTH DAKOTA RECOGNIZES THE EFFORTS OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a proclamation issued recently by Gov. William J. Janklow, declaring May as National Federation of the Blind Month in South Dakota.

Mr. President, the National Federation of the Blind is the largest organization of blind persons in our Nation. I am proud of the work the affiliate in South Dakota is doing to insure equality, security, and opportunity for the blind citizens of my State. I wish also to commend and congratulate the president of the South Dakota affiliate, Ms. Karen S. Mayry, for her continued dedication to issues of concern to the blind.

Mr. President, I ask that Governor Janklow's proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the National Federation of the Blind of South Dakota is a vital advocacy group that represents the interests of thousands of blind citizens statewide; and,

Whereas this invaluable organization is an effective voice of the blind for it seeks to enhance the dignity and increase the independence of our state's visually handicapped; and,

Whereas as the largest organization of the blind in America, the NFB strives to educate the public about the capabilities of the visually impaired; they are a group of individuals who see themselves not as blind people, but as people who just happen to be blind; and,

Whereas the National Federation of the Blind of South Dakota is a group whose blind members don't as for sympathy, but for empathy . . . they wish not to be pampered, for they only desire to be given a chance to prove how much they CAN do and how little they can't do; and,

Whereas the NFB not only seeks to educate the sighted, but works as well to inform the visually handicapped of their rights and of the many services available to them:

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Janklow, Governor of the State of South Dakota, do hereby proclaim the month of May, 1984, as "National Federation of the Blind of South Dakota Month" in South Dakota. As citizens of this great State, it is important we all recognize the blind as fellow human beings who desire only to live full, rich lives in dignity and equality.●

UPHOLSTERED FURNITURE ACTION COUNCIL MEETING

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, American upholstered furniture manufacturers, through their own initiative, are making great strides in consumer safety. Over the weekend in High Point, N.C., at the annual spring furniture market there, the Honorable Terrence M. Scanlon, Vice Chairman of the U.S. Consumer Products Safety Commission, addressed the Upholstered Furniture Action Council. This group has been responsible for spearheading the drive for consumer safety with respect to furniture products.

Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues and the public will find Commissioner Scanlon's remarks important in that he acknowledges the safety contributions made by the furniture manufacturers and he lays stress on the key role that individual consumer responsibility must play in the whole effort of consumer safety.

Mr. President, I ask that the speech by Commissioner Terrence M. Scanlon of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission to the Upholstered Furniture Action Council in High Point, N.C., on Saturday, April 28, 1984, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF TERRENCE M. SCANLON, VICE CHAIRMAN AT THE UFAC SPRING MARKET PRESS CONFERENCE, APRIL 28, 1984

CPSC-UFAC, "A SUCCESS STORY"

I am pleased and privileged to address you this morning about the successful cooperative program between the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) and the Upholstered Furniture Action Council (UFAC) on the upholstered furniture ignition problem. Many would say industry/government cooperation is simply not appropriate. However, if one takes the time to carefully examine the record, understand the voluntary standard process, and look for the common good, a different conclusion is readily reached.

The long-standing working cooperative effort between UFAC and the CPSC is an excellent case in point. Your successful program now in its second phase is working for the future improvement of furniture from ignitions. Your many efforts in the past, such as the development and patenting of the aluminum welt cord, and other safety improvements, have already greatly contributed to consumer safety, and will continue to do so for years to come. I challenge you to continue this progress.

The UFAC program is cited by my fellow Commissioners in Public Commission meetings and before Congressional committees as a model of successful government/industry cooperation. I share that view as well. You have all heard that before, so let me raise a few new issues. Industry/government cooperation, of course, must be a "two-way street." What is industry's contribution to consumer safety, often at substantial cost, is a contribution to all of our society. The benefits, of course, reach primarily to those we all ultimately seek to protect, the consumers. One of the reasons I am an outspoken proponent of voluntary standards is that in this day of government cutbacks at most levels, "private sector resource" intensive efforts, such as yours are critical to accomplishing our mutually consistent goal of consumer safety.

The government has a special role to play in the parternship of regulator and regulated. We have a special obligation to ensure fairness in our dealing with both the business community and consumers. When a voluntary effort is successful, it is critical to reward that success. That is one reason I support the recognition of voluntary standards. But even more basic efforts can be made by fair treatment of industry. A prime example is the reporting of statistics; in particular the measurement of the improved fire safety in upholstered furniture.

The Commission, in a spasm of "fairness," has agreed to represent the statistics on furniture flammability testing in two ways: chair-by-chair results and cigarette-by-cigarette results. I am concerned, however, that reporting results on a chair-by-chair basis, even juxtaposed to more appropriate cigarette-by-cigarette measurements, can lead to misunderstanding. Frankly, I see no statistical basis for reporting chair-by-chair when there are many cigarettes on each chair. No useful information is provided. This concern is especially serious because of the way the results may be interpreted. I believe responsible regulation requires more sensitivity to the reality of the marketplace and to the way testing results are reported that reflect that reality. The impressive work of the Upholstered Furniture Action Council toward consumer safety is a good place to start.

I would also like to add a new element into this whole cigarette ignition debate, that of consumer responsibility. President Reagan last May on the 10th anniversary of the CPSC said . . . "The effort to prevent accidents is a shared responsibility of industry, consumers and government."

We in government and you in industry can do our share, but individual responsibility and accountability for one's actions is also and essential element, and in fact may be the key element in the long run.

Smoking requires an inherent responsibility on an individual smoker to do so safely, and with consideration for the safety of those around him, both his or her family and the public at large. This must be stressed more and more in the whole debate on cigarette ignitions. You in industry, and we in government can't do it all. Individuals must share this responsibility as well.

In conclusion, I am again glad to be here and I hope my visit to High Point will help to foster this "two-way street" of which I speak. This is one Commissioner who believes that all wisdom does not reside within the confines of Washington. I can assure you that my second visit in two years to your Spring Market will help foster our cooperative efforts, and lead to a greater mutual understanding of our common problems and concerns.

I would especially like to thank Charlie Carey and Bill Richman, UFAC co-chairmen, and Betty Grace Terpstra and Joe Gerard, who represent you so professionally before the Commission in Washington. They work hard at what we all seek in the name of the common good, greater consumer safety.

Again I congratulate you for your efforts, I look forward to a cooperative working relationship in the years ahead as well.

Thank you.●

YWCA CELEBRATES 125TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Young Women's Christian Association of the United States is currently celebrating their 125th anniversary, and I should like to congratulate this fine organization.

The YWCA has been a pioneer for social justice and peace. They have been in the forefront with such accomplishments as establishing the first day-care center in the country, holding the first retreat for unwed mothers, providing the first typing instruction for women, opening the first school to train practical nurses, conducting the first interracial conference of women to be held in the South, and many others.

On the local level, the YWCA has pioneered in areas of local need and concern, such as teenage social adjustment, school age parents, women offenders, postmastectomy rehabilitation, divorce support, legislative support for "Latch Key" program, and parenting and job clubs.

Founded in Boston in 1859, the YWCA today is a worldwide movement: Women in 83 nations responding to their own needs and those of others, breaking down barriers of race, religion, education, and status to work together for the common good, to improve the life situations of the unemployed, the displaced, the disabled, the powerless, the young, the old, women working in offices, the home and in the fields, women abandoned, or abused women without the necessary skills for survival.

By the turn of the century, the YWCA had moved into communities and college campuses throughout the United States—into the lunchrooms of factories and department stores, into black neighborhoods and the waiting stalls of Ellis Island, into Indian territory and the farmlands of the Midwest. Wherever women needed a job, a home, a hearty meal, a safe journey, friends, books, exercise, schooling or a counselor, the YWCA was there.

Today the YWCA of the U.S.A. is still there with locally funded community or campus associations in 4,700 locations in our Nation. They have grown, through concern and commitment, to be the largest women's membership organization in the world today, and the only one to have made service synonymous with social change for more than a century.

I am pleased to salute the YWCA on their 125th anniversary, and I wish them continued success in the years ahead.●

STEEL QUOTA BILL NOT INFLATIONARY

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, one of the issues lurking behind the scenes in the steel import quota debate is the likely impact on consumer prices. Since steel is not by itself a retail product, the ultimate price impact, if any, to consumers is difficult to determine. Raw material prices are not always passed on in their entirety by the manufacturers of finished products.

Recently, however, David Cantor, the Congressional Research Services' specialist in industry economics, has done an analysis of the likely impact on the producers price index for intermediate products if steel prices increase. Mr. Cantor does not attempt to predict what quota legislation would do to steel prices; he simply analyzes what the effect of a range of possible price increases on steel would be on intermediate products.

Mr. Cantor's conclusion is that the price effects would be relatively modest: If steel prices rise by 10 to 50 percent, intermediate product prices could increase by 0.65 to 3.26 percent. This is a much more modest impact than has been suggested publicly by some who have not done any serious analysis of the problem.

Mr. Cantor has done such work, and it will facilitate the debate on steel import quotas by focusing on facts rather than rhetoric. I ask that the CRS study be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The material follows:

EFFECTS OF HYPOTHETICAL INCREASES IN STEEL PRICES ON THE PRODUCER PRICE INDEX FOR INTERMEDIATE MATERIALS, DECEMBER 1983 TO DECEMBER 1984

ABSTRACT

If, possibly due to steel import quotas, steel prices rose by 10 to 50 percent, prices of intermediate products used in manufacturing could increase by 0.65 to 3.26 percent. While these increases would probably influence prices of other goods and the inflation rate, various statistical problems preclude estimating these effects.

EFFECTS OF HYPOTHETICAL INCREASES IN STEEL PRICES ON THE PRODUCER PRICE INDEX FOR INTERMEDIATE MATERIALS, DECEMBER 1983 TO DECEMBER 1984

If, possibly as a result of quotas on steel mill product imports, domestic steel prices were to be raised in the range of 10 percent to 50 percent, the Producer Price Index for Intermediate Materials (hereafter, PPI-I) would, all other things being equal, increase by from 0.65 percent to 3.26 percent. While the PPI-I is by no means a measure of the inflationary impact of increased steel prices, it is an indicator of the prices faced by producers of goods and services, and, thus, of changes in their costs of production. These higher costs of production could influence both wholesale and retail prices, although any changes in them cannot be measured directly or inferred from changes in the PPI-I.

The effect of hypothetical increases in steel prices on the PPI-I

A 10-percent rise in domestic steel prices, as measured by the Producer Price Index of Steel Mill Products, could result in an increase in the PPI-I of 0.65 percent for the period from December 1983 to December 1984. Similarly, a 50-percent increase in domestic steel prices could result in a 3.26 percent increase in the PPI-I in this period. The PPI-I would rise from 315.8 in December 1983 to between 317.9 and 326.1 in December 1984. These and the effects of steel price increases between 10 and 50 percent are presented in table 1.

TABLE 1.—EFFECTS OF HYPOTHETICAL PRICE INCREASES OF STEEL MILL PRODUCTS ON THE PRODUCTS PRICE INDEX FOR INTERMEDIATE MATERIALS, DECEMBER 1983 TO DECEMBER 1984

[1967=100]

	Producer price index for intermediate materials		
	December 1983	December 1984	Percent change
Percentage price increase in steel mill products:			
10	315.8	317.9	0.65
20	315.8	319.9	1.30
30	315.8	322.0	1.95
40	315.8	324.0	2.61
50	315.8	326.1	3.26

Calculated by CRS based on: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Producer Prices and Price Indexes Data for December 1983. Washington, Janaury 1984.

The effects on the PPI-I show how the overall PPI-I would react, if only steel mill product prices were allowed to change. The assumption is made that prices of all other intermediate goods—such as: paper, plastics, motor vehicle parts—are unchanged. It should be noted that steel is categorized as an intermediate good, because it is used to produce other products, both final goods and other intermediate goods.

The effects on the price index were calculated by, first, determining the change in the relative importance of steel mill products in the PPI-I, and, then, recalculating the overall PPI-I, based on the revised relative importance. The procedures are presented in more detail in the appendix to this report. The concept of relative importance refers, in principle, to the share of total shipments of all commodities represented

by a particular commodity.[1] In the present case, the share of total shipments of all intermediate goods, as defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, represented by steel mill product shipments is the relative importance of steel mill products. Normally, the Bureau of Labor Statistics determines the relative importance of all goods for December of each year. For intervening periods (i.e., some other month), or, as in the present case where total shipments are unknown, relative importance is estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics by adjusting the relative importance in the base period by the ratio of the percentage change in relative prices.[2]

Implications and limitations of the analysis of hypothetical changes in steel prices and the PPI-I

The calculated hypothetical effects of changes in steel prices on the PPI-I are, at best, an indicator only of changes in the costs of production of other goods and services. Thus, while these effects may point in the direction of change of both producer and consumer prices of final goods, they cannot and should not be taken as a quantitative estimate of the ultimate impact of changes in steel prices on other prices or on the rate of inflation. One cannot infer that any changes in price of one product, steel for example, would be passed through completely to steel users and ultimately to producers and consumers of final goods. What can be said about these effects is that costs of production of intermediate goods taken as a whole category of goods would rise by the percentages indicated in table 1, and, to the extent that they can be passed through to buyers of steel and products embodying steel, other prices could be expected to rise.

The effects calculated apply only to one particular price index, the Producer Price Index for Intermediate Materials. Furthermore, any changes in this index are assumed to be due to price changes only in the one commodity, steel. Thus, these effects do not take into consideration changes that might occur in the prices of even other intermediate goods, because those prices were assumed to be constant in order to develop the estimates.

How prices of final goods might be affected by changes in steel prices cannot be estimated using price indices for a variety of reasons. To estimate these effects on the Producer Price Index for all commodities is to risk double-counting of steel prices; that is, the price of steel will be counted once when it is sold by the steel mill, and will be counted a second time as part of the price of the product using that steel. Thus, such an estimate would imply the effect of a change in steel prices on the steel prices built into the price of the final good.

Nor can the effect of steel price changes on consumer goods be determined using price indices. First, some steel, indeed a large share of steel is used only in other producer goods (e.g., machine tools) and only enters into the production of consumer goods indirectly and over time. Second, even as steel is fabricated into consumer goods, its relative share of total inputs declines as it is combined with other inputs (including labor) at various stages of production and distribution.

One inherent difficulty in using any price index as a measure of inflation is that price indices only track trends in prices, and do not take account of changes in demand. They are constructed on the assumption that the quantities of the goods, prices of which are being measured, remain constant. Thus, price indices do not take account of changes in demand due to price.[3] In general, differences in the construction of the various price indices prevent meaningful linking of them.

It should be noted that one analytical technique does exist which permits analysis of the effects of price changes on the Consumer Price Index or other measures of the inflation rate—namely, input-output analysis. This procedure permits one to trace the direct and indirect effects of changes in production in one sector of the economy on all other sectors. In the process, it is possible to assess price effects. While conceptually this approach has great merit, it requires making assumptions regarding technical relationships between sectors as well as about economic performance. Thus, the results of an input-output analysis depend, therefore, upon the validity of the assumptions made.

Clearly, depending on the degree of any price increase of steel mill products, costs of production of manufactured goods could be expected to rise, and perhaps substantially. One can expect some of these costs to find their way into consumer prices, and, therefore, the rate of inflation. What cannot be estimated with confidence is the degree to which prices generally throughout the economy will be affected.

APPENDIX

CALCULATION OF CHANGES IN THE PRODUCER PRICE INDEX OF INTERMEDIATE MATERIALS DUE TO A CHANGE IN THE PRICE OF STEEL MILL PRODUCTS

The procedures employed call, first, for calculating the change in relative importance of steel mill products for the base period of this analysis, December 1983. The most recent published relative importance data is for December 1982; within the intermediate materials index, steel mill products had a relative importance of 6.360. The relative importance of steel mill products in December 1983 is obtained by adjusting the 1982 value of relative importance by multiplying it by the ratio of the percentage change in the price index of steel mill products from 1982 to 1983 to the percentage change in the price index for all intermediate materials. This procedure yields a value of relative importance for steel mill product prices of 6.500 in December 1983.

The Producer Price Index for Intermediate Materials (PPI-I) for December 1984 is calculated by employing the formula:

$$PPI\text{-}It = ((1 - RIc) + dRIc) \times PPI\text{-}Io,$$

where:

PPI-It=the Producer Price Index for intermediate materials in time t, or, in this case, December 1984;
RIc=the relative importance of steel mill products (= 6.500);
d=percentage change in steel mill products; and,
PPI-Io=the Producer Price Index for intermediate materials in the base period, December 1983.●

[1] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Supplement to Producer Prices and Price Indexes Data for 1982. Washington, September 1983. P. 145.

[2] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Information obtained by telephonic communication, Mar. 28, 1983.

[3] U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service. U.S. Government Price Statistics. Report No. 81-237 E, by Barry Molefsky, Washington, 1981. 34 p.

C. BRAXTON VALENTINE

● Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, for those of us, Members and staff, for whom the Senate is a daily experience of life, the Senate community often seems to be one large tumultuous family. When one of the family passes away, we all feel the resulting sorrow on a personal level.

It is, therefore, with regret that I tell my colleagues about the recent passing of a well-respected and honored Senate employee, C. Braxton Valentine, Jr., who until this past November, was the staff director of the Select Committee on Ethics. Although Brack had a very full life as a lawyer in private practice, with the Internal Revenue Service, and with several congressional committees, it was as the first and only staff director of the Select Committee on Ethics that we in the Senate remember him. From the time he accepted that position in 1977 until his retirement in November 1983, my predecessors and successors, the chairmen of the select committee, continually turned to Brack for advice and guidance with respect to the mission of the committee.

As the committee's chairman from 1980 until 1982, I had the privilege of working closely with Brack on many important matters. I trusted his calm demeanor, insightful grasp of legal issues, and the sensible way in which he approached the committee's work. Brack was always noted for a reasoned argument, a pleasing sense of humor, a natty bow tie, and a shy smile.

We all regret his untimely passing and will be forever in his debt. His unselfishness to the Senate will forever be a model for all those who follow in his footsteps. To his wife, Robin, and to their children, we express our profound sense of grief and our condolences. He was a fine man, and we will miss him greatly.●

GRAND RAPIDS JOB CORPS CENTER

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Department of Labor's Job Corps program has recently designated May 1984 as "Community Appreciation Month."

I wish to draw special attention to the activities of the Grand Rapids, Mich., Job Corps Center in recognizing the support they have received from the community. The Center, administered by the Grand Rapids public schools, has plans for a number of events to show that they care about Grand Rapids. Some of the events scheduled are: neighborhood cleanups, Earth day, blood drives, and many other worthwhile projects. Having personally toured the Center, I am well acquainted with the strong bond that has developed between the community and the Center.

The Grand Rapids public schools first received a contract for the Center from the Department of Labor in March 1980 and were recently awarded a 3-year extension. This will insure the continuation of this very fine program. Since 1980, more than 2,700 young people have received vocational and educational training at the Center.

While Community Appreciation Month is intended to show the Nation's Job Corps Centers support for their local communities, I wish to extend my thanks and support to the Grand Rapids Job Corps Center as one example of Job Corps Center achievement in the past, and many that I am confident will follow in the future.●

SAVE THE CHILDREN DAY

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to rise and pay tribute to an organization committed to helping needy children in the United States and 36 countries abroad. Today is the seventh annual celebration of "Save the Children Day" and to commemorate the occasion, children from around the country will visit Capitol Hill in hopes of heightening the awareness for the problems of low-income American children.

In the over 50 years since its founding in southern Appalachia, Save the Children has developed a unique approach to helping the impoverished children of this country and elsewhere in the world. Working in partnership with local residents, this program has proved to be a very effective means to achieve permanent solutions to pressing community problems. However, the common denominator of all Save the Children projects, be they health and nutrition programs, school, home, or road construction, or increased agricultural productivity, is that they have a direct beneficial impact on improving the lives of the children.

As part of the delegation participating in the Save the Children Day—Children's Lobby program, Shannon Mull and Denny Miller of Hilton Head Island, S.C., will share with members their firsthand experience in working with this program. Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to join me in listening to the message these children bring to Washington. It is my conviction that the future of America depends on the development of its children, and the dedicated work of this fine program will aid us in insuring this goal is achieved.●

NATIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN HALL OF FAME AWARD

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it is my great honor today to present to the Senate an award granted by the National Senior Citizen Hall of Fame. This great honor is given to individuals or groups of people in recognition of outstanding work that makes life more meaningful for our senior citizens.

The National Senior Citizen Hall of Fame was established by Joe Kappler in 1975 in Everett, Wash. Mr. Kappler, the director of the Hall of Fame, is a truly unique individual. Mr. Kappler's work in Washington State deserves our appreciation and respect. Mr. Kappler became disabled in 1968. At that time he decided to get involved with senior citizens, and began his search for those individuals or groups who deserve national recognition for their activities.

The Senate, as a body, has been chosen by Mr. Kappler for this respected award to the National Senior Citizen Hall of Fame. Mr. Kappler feels that the work that the Senate has done over the last 50 years to improve the lives of our senior citizens is truly deserving of this high award. It is my pleasure and honor to present this award to the Senate on his behalf. May the Senate continue to work to make the lives of senior citizens more meaningful. Further, let us all look to Joe Kappler for inspiration in this endeavor.

I ask that the text of the award be printed in the RECORD.

The text follows:

THE NATIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN HALL OF FAME AWARD

Presented to: The United States Senate.

This award is presented as recognition of outstanding work performed that makes life more meaningful for our elder citizens.

Dated April 9, 1984. Signed by Joe Kappler, Executive Director.●

THE 410TH EVAC RECEIVES HIGHEST AWARD

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, with our Nation's Armed Forces strength dependent upon its readiness, it is encouraging to know that maintenance management by our reserve units is being accorded recognition.

The Senator from Kansas is particularly pleased to report that the 410th Army Evacuation Hospital from Topeka, Kans., has been singled out for the highest honor a unit can achieve in the area of maintenance management by the Chief of Staff of the Army.

The 300 members of this unit have given unselfishly of their time and efforts, whether supplementing an active duty hospital during summer training or standing by on call in Topeka, Kans. It is a model for readiness, maintenance training, maintenance management, and cost control. Under the command of Col. Donald E. Clark and with the leadership of Sfc. Steven Hansford, this group of physicians, dentists, medical technicians, supply specialists, food service personnel, and maintenance staff has been singled out for recognition by both the American Defense Preparedness Association and the Chief of the Army Reserves during recent ceremonies here in Washington.

Mr. President, at a time when we are all deeply concerned about fiscal responsibility and preparedness, the Senator from Kansas is proud to cite this group, casually known as the 410th EVAC, which has set an example as the best maintained unit in the U.S. Army Reserve.●

THE SUPREME COURT'S RULING IN THE BOSE CASE: EXERCISING DUE DILIGENCE IN PROTECTION OF THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, as a one-time newspaper reporter, a member of a publishing family, and a public official who feels passionately about first amendment guarantees, I welcome and applaud the decision handed down yesterday by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Bose Corp. against Consumers Union of U.S. Inc.

Since its ruling in the 1964 case, New York Times against Sullivan, the Supreme Court has consistently held that under the first amendment's guarantee of a free press, public figures cannot win in libel cases unless they can prove that a false statement was published or broadcast about them with "actual malice"—with knowledge that it was false or with reckless disregard for the truth.

At issue in the Bose case was a fairly technical question: Whether a Federal appeals court in a libel case should review not only a trial judge's legal conclusions but also findings of fact in determining if a news organization has published or broadcast a story about a public official with "actual malice."

In its decision yesterday, the Supreme Court quite properly broadened the responsibility of Federal appeals court judges in libel cases from merely examining how a trial court or jury interpreted the law to reviewing their factual determinations on the "actual malice" question as well.

I fully agree with the opinion rendered by Justice Paul Stevens for the Court in the Bose case that the—

> Requirement of independent appellate review • • • reflects a deeply held conviction that judges—and particularly members of this Court—must exercise such review in order to preserve the precious liberties established and ordained by the Constitution.

One of the Nation's leading libel attorneys, Floyd Abrams, has cited statistics that in 20 libel cases between 1964 and 1982 in which news media appealed to Federal appeals courts, the trial courts were reversed 14 times. That 70 percent reversal rate, Abrams has noted, is more than triple the reversal rate in other civil cases.

There can be no doubt, as the Court found in the Bose case, that the protection of the first amendment should not be left solely to a trial judge or jury. As Justice Stevens wrote for the majority in this important decision:

The question whether the evidence in the record in a defamation case is of the convincing clarity required to strip the utterance of First Amendment protection is not merely a question for the trier of fact. Judges, as expositors of the Constitution, must independently decide whether the evidence in the record is sufficient to cross the constitutional threshhold that bars the entry of any judgment that is not supported by clear and convincing proof of "actual malice."

In ruling as it did in the Bose case, the Supreme Court exercised due diligence in protection of freedom of the press.●

TAIWAN

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President: With the coming home of President Reagan from his trip to mainland China, it would be well to keep in mind the fact that there is another small piece of land that calls itself China; it is called Taiwan.

The Republic of China moved its Capital to Taiwan over 30 years ago when a group of Chinese left the mainland because they were extremely unhappy with the advent of a Communist government. This literal handful of Chinese people have made out of the Republic of China on Taiwan a prosperous, private enterprise economic area that is a model to all developing countries of the world. It has one of the highest gross national products in the world, and contributes over $5 billion annually to the United States.

It is very well that the Members of Congress keep this in mind as we will be asked to vote on different concessions from time to time involving Communist China. To forget a proven ally, a proven friend, and a proven economy on Taiwan would be pure foolishness on our part.

I ask that an article appearing in the Tuesday, May 1 issue of the Washington Times be printed in the Record.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, May 1, 1984]

TAIWAN THRIVES AS MAINLAND CHINA ECONOMY LIMPS

(By Edward Neilan)

TAIPEI, REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—Communist Chinese semantics has tried to create the impression that the mainland is a success story, while the offshore Republic of China on Taiwan is a failure, an outcast or simply an "obstacle" to world peace.

In reality the reverse is true, according to all economic signs.

The track record on the mainland reads like a compendium of failed programs, power struggles, inability to get an economic drive going and the built-in constraints of communism.

But on Taiwan, despite being dwarfed in size by the mainland, the island's 18 million people outproduce on a per capita basis the one billion people of communist China.

President Reagan was almost defensive in telling the mainland leaders and people that the United States would "stand by old friends," as if sentimental attachment were the only pull to continued relations with the Republic of China on Taiwan.

But there are much more than sentimental advantages for continued Washington-Taipei ties, says Robert Parker, an American lawyer here, past president of Taipei's American Chamber of Commerce and a contributor to formulation of the Taiwan Relations Act.

"Taiwan has its own merits to warrant continued strong U.S. ties," Mr. Parker says.

He notes that the Republic of China on Taiwan is no runt among nations—that it has a larger population than Greece, Sweden, Ireland or Austria, is larger than any country in the Middle East except Iran and Egypt, larger than all the countries in Central and South America except Brazil and Argentina and larger than Australia and New Zealand combined.

"In economic terms," Mr. Parker said, Taiwan is America's sixth largest trading partner—larger than France or Italy, any country in South America, Africa, Eastern Europe and Asia other than Japan."

Mr. Parker makes you sit up and take notice with these statistics: "The Republic of China's—or Taiwan's—trade with the United States is larger than the United States' trade with Communist China and Soviet Union combined."

This country has been so successful that it is both an embarassment and challenge to Peking. That is the nature of the "obstacle." In embattled El Salvador, Mr. Parker pointed out, Christian Democrat Jose Napoleon Duarte has articulated a vision of hope for his country: "We must do what Taiwan has done—if there is time." He knows that the republic of China on Taiwan is a role model for what a developing country can become.

Commentator Ni Su-Fei, writing in the current issue of the Free China Review Magazine published here, said it is the Peking regime that is the "odd man out" but it has managed to dupe the rest with words.

"Without the Republic of China on Taiwan, there would be no model nor proponent for a Chinese way to success, in the repressive ideology of a monolithic Peking regime which still aspires to be the sole mind, activator and voice for a billion plus people," Mr. Ni wrote. "While the surface propaganda aspects of the Reagan journey are, obviously, useful to Peking, it is nevertheless a certainty that there will be no communist ideological gain at all from the trip among either the American or Chinese people—indeed, quite the contrary."

The mainland regime's censorship of Mr. Reagan's speeches told the story. The U.S. supports the progress and liberalization of the Chinese people and society. But the United States does not support the communist trappings of the regime.

Popular support for America's China policy during the past dozen years has been based on two ideas: selling products to China's one billion and using China as a strategic counterweight to the Soviet Union.

Realistically, China's masses don't have the purchasing power to become genuine customers. India, a democracy, is closest to China in numbers of people, but they aren't big spenders either. The United States has never given India the big rush but continues to go berserk over the "potential" of selling to China.

Kĭhg-yuh Chang, director of the Institute of International Relations here, believes it will be the people of the mainland joining the Nationalist ideology rather than the other way around.

"When the present Peking regime tries to open up the economy, the cadres who enjoyed emperor-like status in their domains will resist and turn against the center," Mr. Chang said, "There are millions of them and they will fight all forms of democratization."

"Basically the feudal system is being perpetuated under the guise of communism." Mr. Chang said. "Most of the 10,000 students now studying in the United States are relatives of high officials. They will return home and take good jobs and they will be resented."

But Mr. Chang said the seeds of revolution against the communists are being planted by such study abroad. "Those young people will return to the drab mainland after two years in Los Angeles and San Francisco, shopping in supermarkers that are beyond the wildest dreams of mainlanders. They will insist on change.'

Mr. Chang, like many others, believes the urgency of Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping in wanting to "solve" the "Taiwan problem" is based on fears that the longer the issue waits the less likely reunification on communist terms will occur.●

FOSTERING EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION IN THE WORKPLACE

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, our Nation's corporations and small businesses have been facing tough times in recent years. Failing companies, low productivity, and worker discontent have marred our economic prosperity. There are a few exceptional companies, however, who have taken the initiative in tackling these problems, and have developed programs which eliminate worker burnout and high turnover rates, and, in the process, have increased their productivity.

According to the new book "The 100 Best Companies To Work for in America" by Robert Levering, Milton Moskowitz, and Michael Katz, the secret of their success is innovative management techniques, designed to make work more enjoyable by making employees feel like they are part of the team. According to a recent Washington Post article, though each company utilizes various methods of achieving greater productivity, the 100 best share at least the following characteristics:

First, they make workers feel as if they are part of the team, initiating worker-management discussions on various issues that affect employment and employment practices.

Second, they engender pride in workmanship, and always stress quality over quantity.

Third, they initiate profit-sharing programs, savings plans, and stock ownership in addition to the base salary.

Fourth, they minimize hierarchical distinctions by eliminating executive privileges such as special dining rooms or parking places, and so forth.

We in Maryland are proud of the two companies in our State which are included in the 100 best list. The McCormick Co. in Hunt Valley and the Preston Trucking Co. in Preston have utilized these techniques with exceptional results.

Productivity at Preston Trucking Co. has increased over 30 percent in the last 4 years. Worker morale is at an all-time high. At a time when trucking companies are facing severe losses and stiff competition, the Preston Trucking Co. is flourishing. Officials with the company attribute their success to reflective listening, early conflict resolution, easily accessible lines of communication, and nonaggressive approaches to problem solving. Preston was also one of the first trucking companies to use the Scanlon plan: The distribution of any profits derived from increased productivity.

The McCormick Co. attributes its success in part to the establishment of junior boards of directors. Fifteen boards of about 20 members each contribute to diversity of ideas and a sense of participation in the management of the company. Permanent employees are rarely laid off, and employees are encouraged to bid for better jobs within the company structure.

My hope is that companies across America, large and small, will follow the example of these companies, and help to get American industry back on its feet again. It has always been my belief that American workers can make contributions above and beyond what is expected if they are brought into a full partnership with management and perceive themselves as having a real interest in the success of the enterprise. I am most pleased that these Maryland firms are helping to pave the way for a more productive and committed work force.●

KEEPING OUR PROMISE TO TAIWAN

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, I think most Americans look forward to better trade relations with the People's Republic of China and the promise such trade relations might hold for American export industries.

At the same time, I think that most Americans do not want to go back on any of our stated commitments to our ally and already strong trading partner, Taiwan. Certainly, this is President Reagan's position. He made this clear last Wednesday when he assured Taiwanese officials that the Taiwan Relations Act is still good law. As he noted in a recent interview with journalists from China, "we are not going to turn our backs on old friends in order to strengthen or make new friends."

In the case of Taiwan, this reflects good sense. Taiwan, after all, conducts much more trade with the United States than does the People's Republic of China. Also, the United States has had constant, good relations with the Republic of China far longer than we have had relations with the People's Republic of China.

In Taiwan we have a good friend. Certainly, we should do nothing in our pursuit of better trade relations with the People's Republic of China to prejudice the freedom and independence of the people under the Republic of China. This is the promise we must keep. To do otherwise would be a disturbing precedent for all of our loyal friends throughout the world.●

WHO REALLY WANTS NEGOTIATIONS IN NICARAGUA?

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, we learned on Easter Sunday that all nine of Nicaragua's Catholic bishops signed a pastoral letter to the leaders of the Nicaraguan Government concerning the need for political dialog among all Nicaraguans. In brief, the letter said, and I quote: "Dialog is necessary if we are to have social peace."

This statement would not seem objectionable or inflammatory, yet that is exactly how the Sandinista leadership of Nicaragua responded to it. In past months, Junta Coordinator Daniel Ortega and Interior Minister Tomas Borge had loudly and repeatedly stated that they favor dialog with Nicaragua's opposition and that they support free elections. Their response to the pastoral letter seems to put the lie to their earlier claims of willingness to engage in serious and comprehensive negotiations with opposition elements. For example, Minister Borge states: "This is a criminal suggestion * * *. The Pastoral letter seeks confrontation and violates the law of the land." For his part, Mr. Ortega says that this letter "supports the plans of aggression of the North American administration against the Nicaraguan people" and that it is part of a "plan of internal destabilization."

My question would simply be this: What type of dialog do the Sandinistas really want? My answer would be: None, unless the opposition subordinates itself to the control of the Nicaraguan state. In Nicaragua, opposition is tolerated only to the extent that it provides window dressing. Any person or group with a claim on the affections of large numbers of Nicaraguans, or with the potential to make the Junta give up its privileged status while ordinary Nicaraguans do without, is considered intolerable by the Sandinistas. In short, anybody loyal to the original goals of the revolution is now viewed as a threat by Nicaragua's new autocrats.

There is more than enough blame to go around for this situation, and we in the United States certainly must recognize our share of responsibility for it. Nevertheless, the greatest blame for the tragedy of Nicaragua must rest with the Sandinista leadership. The Sandinistas made many pledges when they seized power in 1979: Establishment of a pluralistic democracy; creation of a mixed economy; protection of each citizen's rights from arbitrary infringement by the Government; and development of an independent and truly nonalined Nicaragua. These are all admirable goals and ones which merit our support. Unfortunately, the Sandinista has repudiated these pledges and has sought to impose a dictatorship upon the Nicaraguan people.

It appears that the Sandinista leadership has decided to renew its policy of confrontation with the Catholic Church. Some of us are aware of their policy of harassment of church leaders practiced through 1981–82. As many may remember, Pope John Paul II visited Nicaragua about 1 year ago and was heckled and threatened by numerous Sandinista militants. For a time, the Sandinistas relaxed some of the constraints imposed upon the Catholic Church and seemed to act in a more conciliatory manner toward the church. However, the Sandinistas seem to have given up on negotiations with Catholic leaders. This is particularly unfortunate because the church is uniquely suited to serve as a mediator among the various factions that have embroiled Nicaragua in civil war. And let there be no mistake about this, Nicaragua is in the midst of a civil war.

Sandinista policies since 1979 have polarized and alienated numerous segments of Nicaraguan society, including the Catholic Church, the middle class, and the various Indian minority groups of the Mosquitia region. To give you a brief illustration of the level of disenchantment within Nicaragua today, we need look at the number of Nicaraguan refugees in neighboring countries: In Panama, 20,000 Nicaraguans; in Costa Rica, at least 30,000 Nicaraguans; and in Honduras, 25,000 Nicaraguans. As you can imagine, these 75,000 Nicaraguans place a tremendous burden on these neighboring countries. Nevertheless, Nicaragua's Government denies that a refugee problem even exists or that its policies may have caused this exodus of its citizens.

We must also remember as well that much of the Nicaraguan opposition movement is not composed of former adherents of Anastasio Somoza's dictatorship. Yet, this is how the opposition to the Sandinistas is often por-

trayed in our press. Leaders of the opposition such as Violeta Chamorro, Alfonso Robelo, Arturo Cruz, and Eden Pastora fought Somoza's dictatorship of the right and now oppose the directorate's dictatorship of the left. These people all worked for the implementation of the original goals of the Nicaraguan revolution, yet the regime in which many of them served has now branded them as traitors.

I do not believe that men and women like Robelo and Chamorro are anything but loyal Nicaraguan patriots who also fervently believe in democracy and human rights. Various opposition leaders, both inside and outside Nicaragua, have repeatedly called for a comprehensive effort to peaceably resolve the civil war in Nicaragua. Sadly, the Sandinista directorate has given little more than lip service to these requests for conciliation. I have spoken with a number of individuals in the opposition and they all voice a willingness to open a political dialog with the Sandinista regime. To date, the Sandinistas have indicated that they will not negotiate with any individual who has taken up arms against the Nicaraguan Government and that they may not even permit the participation of many domestic opposition leaders in that country's upcoming elections.

In closing, I would echo the Washington Post's editorial of April 27 in saying that Messrs. Ortega and Borge and the rest of the Sandinista directorate should realize that peace will not return to Nicaragua unless there is a genuine peace dialog among all Nicaraguans. The Nicaraguans demand such a broad-based dialog in El Salvador—they should reciprocate in their country and set a good example for the rest of the Central American region by observing the call for peace of Nicaragua's Catholic Church.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the pastoral letter and articles on the controversy from the Washington Post and the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

PASTORAL LETTER ON RECONCILIATION FROM THE NICARAGUAN BISHOPS

To the priests and deacons in our dioceses:
To members of religious orders:
To catechists and bearers of the Word:
To our brothers and sisters in the apostalic lay movements:
To principals, teachers, and students in Catholic schools:
To all our beloved faithful:

Grace and peace from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.

DEAR BROTHERS AND SISTERS: At this solemn Easter celebration, the ultimate expression of God's love for mankind through the redemption, we invite you to share more fully in the spiritual wealth of the Holy Year, which will be extended in Nicaragua by a special concession from Pope John Paul II until June 17, 1984, the feast of the Holy Trinity.

This extension and the urgent need in our society for sincere and brotherly reconciliation through individual conversion have moved us to send you this exhortation.

I. DOCTRINAL SECTION

1. Sin, the root of all evil

When sin came into the world, all things were changed profoundly; the soil yielded brambles; civilizations and institutions passed away; man himself rebelled against his fellow men, and the empire of tyranny and death began (cf. Gen. 3:16-19; 4:7-8)

Man, created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26) did not wish to acknowledge or glorify Him; man became vain in his imagination, and his foolish heart was darkened (Rom. 1:21). There were also those who, like Satan, disguised themselves as angels of light to deceive others and lead them to perdition. (cf. II Corinthians 11:14-15). A poorly understood anthropocentrism plunged mankind into the heavy bondage of sin.

2. Redemption by Christ

Christ, by His death and resurrection, has reconciled us to God, to ourselves, and to our brothers and sisters, has freed us from the bondage of sin (cf. Col. 1:20-22, Cor. 5:18), and has given His church the mission of transmitting His message, pardon, and grace (cf. Mt. 29:18-20, Mk. 15-20).

All this should be for us a call to conversion; it should be the beginning of a radical change in spirit, mind, and life [1] (cf. John Paul II, Bull, "Open the Doors to the Redeemer,", No. 5).

There are three aspects to this conversion which redeems our individual and collective lives:

(A) We must avoid personal sin, any act that disrupts our baptismal alliance with God.

(B) We must banish any sinful attitudes from our hearts, that is, any habitual rejection, whether conscious or unconscious, of Christian standards and moral values.

(C) We must put an end to such sins of society as participation in injustice and violence.

3. Sin after the redemption

Nonetheless, sin has persisted in the world since our redemption by Christ, because:

(A) Man abuses his freedom and does not accept God's grace.

(B) Society has become secularized and is no longer oriented toward God; it does not heed the church, the universal sacrament of salvation, but considers it an alienating institution.

(C) At times it claims to accept Christ and His teachings, but it repudiates the church and thereby falls into the temptation of establishing other "churches" than the one founded by the apostles and their successors, the legitimate bishops.

(D) We forget that coexistence can only be based on an accurate perception of the individual as an intelligent, free, and religious human being, with rights and duties devolving from his very nature (cf. John XXIII, Enc. *Pacem in Terris* No. 9-10).

(E) Materialistic concepts of mankind distort the person and teachings of Christ, reduce man to merely physical terms without taking account of his spiritual nature, so he remains subject to physical forces called the "dialectics of history." And man, alienated from God and from himself, becomes disoriented, without moral and religious reference points, without a higher nature, insecure and violent.

II. OUR SITUATION

1. The problem of sin in the world

Pope John Paul II, in his message for the 17th World Day of Prayer for Peace on January 1, 1984, expressed his concern about the current world situation, a concern which we, too, share: "Peace is truly precarious, and injustice abounds. Relentless warfare is occurring in many countries, continuing on and on despite the proliferation of deaths, mourning, and destruction, without any apparent progress toward a solution. It is often the innocent who suffer, while passions become inflamed and there is the risk that fear will lead to an extreme situation."

2. In Nicaragua

A. Belligerent Situation

Our country, too, is plagued by a belligerent situation pitting Nicaraguan against Nicaraguan, and the consequences of this situation could not be sadder:

Many Nicaraguan youths and men are dying on the battlefields.

Many others look toward the future with the fear of seeing their own lives prematurely ended.

A materialistic and atheistic educational system is undermining the consciences of our children.

Many families are divided by political differences.

The suffering of mothers who have lost their children, which should merit our great respect, is instead exploited to incite hatred and feed the desire for vengeance.

Farmworkers and Indians, for whom the Church reserves a special love, are suffering, living in constant anxiety, and many of them are forced to abandon their homes in search of a peace and tranquility that they do not find.

Some of the mass media, using the language of hate, encourage a spirit of violence.

B. The Church

One, albeit small, sector of our Church has abandoned ecclesiastical unity and surrendered to the tenets of a materialistic ideology. This sector sows confusion inside and outside Nicaragua through a campaign extolling its own ideas and defaming the legitimate pastors and the faithful who follow them. Censorship of the media makes it impossible to clarify the positions and offer other points of view.

3. Foreign interference

Foreign powers take advantage of our situation to encourage economic and ideological exploitation. They see us as support for their power, without respect for our persons, our history, our culture, and our right to decide our own destiny.

Consequently, the majority of the Nicaraguan people live in fear of their present and uncertainty of their future. They feel deep frustration, clamor for peace and freedom. Yet their voices are not heard, muted by belligerent propaganda on all sides.

4. The root of these evils

This situation is rooted in the sin of each and every one, in injustice and oppression, in exploitative greed, in political ambition and abuse of power, in disregard for moral and religious values, in lack of respect for human dignity, in forgetting, abandoning, and denying God.

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, quotations throughout the letter have been translated without reference to any official English text.

III. RESPONSE OF THE CHURCH

1. Conversion and reconciliation

The Church ardently desires and encourages peace and tranquility and believes that there is only one path to that end, conversion. This means that we must all turn our eyes and heart to God, our Father, who through Christ offers us the true path to reconciliation, forgiveness, and peace.

"It is not behavior alone that needs to be changed, but the heart that guides our lives. At the community level it is important to examine ourselves as persons, as groups and social units, not only as victims but also as authors of certain collective deviations from God's plan, in order to implement together God's plan for constructive human endeavor." (cf. Peace and Conversion, a Pontifical document issued by the Commission on Justice and Peace at Rome on September 30, 1983.)

The entire universe is the object of redemption since it also reveals the glory of God and must be sanctified and consecrated to God (Cf. Vatican II, Const. Lumen Gentium, No. 34). Christ resurrected is at the center of history and of the world, leading us toward its full maturity and its final liberation from all the forces of evil (Cf. Vatican II, Const. Lumen Gentium, No. 48).

2. Confession: The path of conversion

John Paul II in his address on reform and holiness given at Rome on November 26, 1983, said: "To assist such conversion, the Lord instituted the sacrament of reconciliation. In it Christ Himself goes to meet the man oppressed by the awareness of his own weakness, He raises him and gives him the necessary strength to continue his path. With the sacrament the life of the Resurrected Christ enters the spirit of the believer, bringing forth renewed generosity of purpose and an enhanced capacity to live by the Gospel."

Jesus reconciled all things, bringing peace through the Cross (Col:20) and transmitted this power to His disciples (cf. Jn4:21, 13:34-35, 12-17).

Preparing to receive the benefits of the sacrament of confession is an important step in conversion. A sincere examination of our sins, self-criticism of our attitudes and our life, these reveal to us our faults and make us abhor sin which is an offense against God, an affront to the Church, and damage or injury to our neighbor. It encourages us to turn totally to God and to reform our lives, it brings us back to the Church and closer to our brothers.

3. Dialogue

The road to social peace is possible through dialogue, sincere dialogue that seeks truth and goodness. "That [dialogue] must be a meaningful and generous offer of a meeting of good intentions and not a possible justification for continuing to foment dissension and violence." (John Paul II, Greeting to Nicaragua, March 4, 1983)

It is dishonest to constantly blame internal aggression and violence on foreign aggression.

It is useless to blame the evil past for everything without recognizing the problems of the present.

All Nicaraguans inside and outside the country must participate in this dialogue, regardless of ideology, class, or partisan belief. Furthermore, we think that Nicaraguans who have taken up arms against the Government must also participate in this dialogue. If not, there will be no possibility of a settlement, and our people, especially the poorest among them, will continue to suffer and die.

The dialogue of which we speak is not a tactical truce to strengthen positions for further struggle but a sincere effort to seek appropriate solutions to the anguish, pain, exhaustion, and fatigue of the many, many people who long for peace, the many, many people who want to live, to rise from the ashes, to see the warmth of a smile on a child's face, far from terror, in a climate of democratic harmony.

The terrible chain of reactions inherent in friend-enemy dialectics is halted by the word of God, who demands that we love even our enemies and that we forgive them. He urges us to move from distrust and aggressiveness to respect and harmony, in a climate conducive to true and objective deliberation on our problems and a prudent search for solutions. The solution is reconciliation. (Cf. John Paul II, Peace and Reconciliation. Address by the Pope in El Salvador, March 6, 1983).

If we are not open to objective acknowledgment of our situation and the events that distress our people ideologically, politically, and militarily, then we are not prepared, in a true and Christian way, for reconciliation for the sake of the real, living wholeness of our nation.

Considering that freedom of speech is a vital part of the dignity of a human being, and as such is indispensable to the well-being of the nation inasmuch as a country progresses only when there is freedom to generate new ideas, the right to free expression of one's ideas must be recognized.

The great powers, which are involved in this problem for ideological or economic reasons, must leave the Nicaraguans free from coercion.

CONCLUSION

If we want our conversion to find true expression in the life of our national community, we must strive to lead lives worthy of the Gospel (cf. Ph 1:27, Ep 4:1), reject all lies, all harmful or offensive words, all anger and evil utterance, and be benevolent and forgive generously as God forgave us through Christ (cf. Ep 4:25-32, Co 13:12-14).

It behooves us to value each life as a gift of God, help the young to find meaning and value in their lives and prepare themselves for their future roles in society, forgive enemies and adversaries, facilitate the return of those who have left their country and welcome them with an open heart, free those imprisoned for ideological differences, create a climate of friendship and peace conducive to social harmony.

"In the great task of bringing peace and reconciliation to the nation, the family as the basic unit of society cannot be ignored. Nor can respect for its rights." (Cf. Gaudium et Spes N.52, quoted by John Paul II in his address to the bishops of El Salvador, February 24, 1984).

May the Holy Virgin, who played her part in our redemption with such exemplary fortitude, provide us with the necessary strength to perform our Christian duty of love and peace.

And may the Lord of Peace grant us all, always and in all our endeavors, the peace and tranquility which we seek (cf. 2 Th 3:16).

Done at Managua, April 22, Easter Sunday, 1984 (to be read and published in the usual manner), Episcopal Conference of Nicaragua.

Pablo A. Vega, Bishop of Juigalpa, President; Bosco Vivas Robelo, Assistant Bishop of Managua, Secretary; Miguel Obando Bravo, Archbishop of Managua; Julian Barni, Bishop of Leon; Leovigildo Lopez Fitoria, Bishop of Grenada; Ruben Lopez Ardon, Bishop of Esteli; Salvador Schlaeffer B., Bishop of Bluefields, Carlos Santi, Bishop of Matagalpa; Pedro L. Vilchez V., Prelate of Jinotega.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1984]

NICARAGUAN ASSAILS BISHOPS IN RENEWED CONFLICT

(By Richard J. Meislin)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, April 25.—A top Nicaraguan leader today condemned a call by the country's Roman Catholic bishops for talks with the opposition, saying that it was part of a "plan of internal destabilization."

The leader, Daniel Ortega Saavedra, coordinator of the Nicaraguan junta, charged that the nine bishops were "repeating the policy" of the Reagan Administration. He said their position, expressed in a pastoral letter, "supports the plans of aggression of the North American Administration against the Nicaraguan people."

Mr. Ortega's remarks, published in the official newspaper Barricada, reflected renewed frictions between the Sandinista Government and the Roman Catholic Church. The way in which the issue has developed, meanwhile, demonstrated the manner in which information and opinion reaches the Nicaraguan public.

The pastoral letter, signed by Nicaragua's nine Catholic bishops, was issued Easter Sunday. It said that "dialogue is necessary if we are to have social peace" and added:

"All Nicaraguans, within the country or abroad, without regard to their ideology, class or political affiliation, should participate in this dialogue. Moreover, we believe that those Nicaraguans who have taken up arms against the Government should participate."

PUBLICATION BARRED AT FIRST

The position of the bishops ran counter to that of the Government, which has repeatedly vowed not to negotiate with the anti-Sandinista rebels. Mr. Ortega said that is was "totally absurd" that the bishops, who he said "have rejected a dialogue with the people and the revolution, on the other hand want us to have a dialogue with the assassins."

The Government initially responded to the pastoral letter by barring its publication. On Monday, the official Sandinista newspaper—the only paper to mention the letter—published a sarcastic article about the bishops' call under the headline, "Bishops ask 'pardon' for the Somocistas."

Much of the criticism in the article stemmed from the bishops' lack of emphasis on outside causes for Nicaragua's problems. The Government regularly asserts that the guerrilla opposition lacks any internal support and functions only because of United States backing.

The pastoral letter said that it was "not always honest to justify internal aggressions and violence on agressions from outside." But it criticized the superpowers as well, saying that "they see us as an object to support their power, without respecting our people, our history, our culture and our right to decide our own destiny."

ON THE SIDE OF IMPERIALISM

Although the text of the letter had not yet been made public, Tuesday morning's issue of Barricade quoted the mother of a young man who died in the 1979 uprising

here as having asked "How is it possible that the bishops propose that the people talk to the assassins?" She said the bishops were "on the side of imperialism, of the traitors."

Other mothers of fallen soldiers, whom the newspaper described as representing "moral authority," were quoted in a similar vein.

The same day's issue of El Nuevo Diario, another pro-Government newspaper, published an editorial roundly denouncing the pastoral letter and asking, among other things: "Can the authors of this document present one single mother of a martyr who would confirm that she has been manipulated to hate and seek revenge?"

El Nuevo Diario's editorial appeared directly under a photograph of President Reagan and his wife, Nancy, frolicking in the waters off Hawaii, over the caption, "Happy while the world burns." Beside the editorial was another article reporting the statement of Bishop Paul Moore, Jr. of the Episcopal Diocese of New York on Sunday that the Reagan Administration's Central American policy was "illegal, inconsistent, ill-advised and immoral."

FULL TEXT IS PUBLISHED

The full text of the pastoral letter appeared in Tuesday evening's issue of La Prensa, an independent newspaper that frequently spars with the Government.

It was preceded by an explanation from the Interior Ministry, which said that it was authorizing the publication "because of superior orders," even though the letter "contains violations of the laws of our country and positions in open confrontation with the revolution."

It added that it was for the people to "judge the positions of the top ecclesiastical hierarchy."

La Prensa, which has refused to publish several times rather than submit to Government censorship, has published no reaction or commentary about the pastoral letter.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1984]

SANDINISTA OFFICIAL ASSAILS BISHOPS' BID FOR TALKS

(By Bernd Debusmann)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, April 25.—Interior Minister Tomas Borge has branded as "criminal" a call by the country's Roman Catholic bishops for peace talks, rejecting any negotiations with U.S.-backed insurgents.

"We will never negotiate with the Contras," Borge said in an interview, using the term for right-wing rebels armed and financed by the CIA.

In a pastoral letter read in most of Nicaragua's churches over Easter, the nine Roman Catholic bishops suggested a dialogue for peace involving all Nicaraguans, including those "who have risen in arms against the government."

"This is a criminal suggestion," Borge said. "The pastoral letter seeks confrontation and violates the law of the land."

The rebel forces includes senior former members of ousted dictator Anastasio Somoza's National Guard, the only Nicaraguan organization which was formally declared illegal after Somoza's removal in a broad-based popular revolution spear-headed by the Sandinista National Liberation Front.

Borge, the only surviving founder-member of the front, said the bishops' pastoral letter was "more radical in its anti-Nicaraguan tone . . . than even statements by Kirkpatrick."

Jeane Kirkpatrick, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, is seen here as a leading proponent of military force to oust the nine Sandinista commanders who effectively run Nicaragua.

Diplomats said the pastoral letter and the Sandinistas' angry reaction to it could herald a new round of confrontation between the church hierarchy and the state.

Church-state tensions were thrown into sharp focus a year ago when Pope John Paul II visited here and harshly criticized the Sandinista-promoted "popular church," whose priests see no conflict between Christianity and left-wing revolution.

The bishops' pastoral letter at Easter said, "The road through which social peace can be achieved necessarily leads through dialogue. All Nicaraguans inside and outside the country should participate in this dialogue, regardless of ideology, class or party position. What is more, we feel that Nicaraguans who have risen in arms against the government must participate."

The Associated Press reported another development from The Hague:

Former State Department legal adviser Abram Chayes told the World Court today "there can be no doubt" that the United States is violating the charter of the United Nations by supporting rebels fighting the Nicaraguan government.

Chayes spoke on behalf of Nicaragua during the first day of preliminary hearings on a complaint Nicaragua filed against the United States. Both Nicaragua and the United States are arguing their cases in the preliminary hearings, although the United States has rejected the court's jurisdiction.

The court granted a one-day recess requested by the U.S. delegation to allow it to "prepare its case," a court source said.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1984]

ADVICE FOR MANAGUA

President Reagan has been receiving much good advice, from Congress and, especially generously, from the press, on the subject of Nicaragua. But Nicaragua needs some good advice, too, if Central America is eventually to settle down. It could most usefully come from the Willy Brandt-type social democrats in Europe and those liberals elsewhere who tend to coddle the Sandinistas, and from the larger group that has faulted the interventionist aspects of President Reagan's policy. We have in mind two points.

The ruling Sandinistas stand strongly behind the demand of the Salvadoran guerrillas to be admitted to a "power-sharing" process in El Salvador. In Nicaragua, however, the nine comandantes reject any thought of admitting Nicaraguan guerrillas to power-sharing or even to the elections the regime now plans on Nov. 4. After the country's Catholic bishops called for a peace dialogue involving all Nicaraguans, including those "who have risen in arms against the government"—such dialogue is the left's constant appeal in El Salvador—the Sandinista police chief denounced the call as "criminal." The Sandinistas insist they will not open their elections—elections they seem intent on running in the Soviet style anyway—to the Nicaraguan contras even if the guerrillas lay down their arms.

The Sandinistas, by way of seeking international support, are now broadcasting news of the considerable damage done by the contras. People are being killed in military engagements, but many of the targets are economic and civilian in character, and the results are commonly measured in dollar terms or in terms of hardships inflicted upon the population. The Sandinistas, of course, show no similar dismay over the substantially greater damage done to economic and civilian targets by the guerrillas whose operations they encourage in El Salvador. Some on the left suggest it is all right to destroy, say, a coffee plantation belonging to an "oligarch." This is rubbish. Peasants work on plantations; Nicaragua's friends in El Salvador have also shot up the bus fleet, which transports the poor.

There is great need for a single standard in judging political events in Central America. There is a need for it in Washington and a need for it in Managua, too.●

MARGARET HAZARD, A BORN DEMOCRAT

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to share with my colleagues the sad news of the death of Margaret M. Hazard, the matriarch of Rhode Island's Democratic Party, who died on Sunday at the age of 101.

She cast her first vote for President in the 1924 election, when she voted a straight Democratic ticket—a practice she continued throughout her life.

Her formal involvement with the Democratic Party started in 1948 when she was a delegate to the National Democratic Convention in Philadelphia and she has been a delegate to each one ever since.

The Democratic Party, both in Rhode Island and nationally, will miss her pioneering spirit, her wisdom, and her charm. I had looked forward to working with her once again at the 1984 Democratic Convention.

Regardless of political party affiliation, I know Rhode Islanders and citizens throughout the Nation join me in mourning her passing and in treasuring her legacy.

I should like to share with my colleagues a brief tribute to her legacy that appeared in the Providence (R.I.) Journal on May 1, 1984, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

MARGARET HAZARD, SPIRITED PUBLIC SERVANT

The Democrats will have to get along without Margaret M. Hazard at their national convention this summer in San Francisco. It will be no small loss: the tiny North Kingstown woman probably would have given the party the distinction of being first with a centenarian in its delegate ranks. Mrs. Hazard was a regular since 1948 (except in 1972) at such presidential-nomination sessions. Despite advancing age, she was always a spirited participant, just as she was in Rhode Island political affairs.

"Aunt Margaret," as she was known within the party, was wooed biennially by candidates for the Democratic state ticket. In earlier days, during her half-century on the party's state committee, her support carried special weight. As a deputy clerk for decades of the old district court in Wickford and Wakefield, her endorsement just about put South County's imprimatur on an aspirant. As she became an elder stateswoman, a recommendation from Aunt Margaret still was sought, for its sentimental as well as practical value.

One convention at which she showed her mettle was the 1968 embroglio in Chicago, the scene of violent Vietnam War protests. Tightly guarded buses transported delegates from their hotels to the Stockyards convention center, which was ringed with fencing, and national guardsmen. Mrs. Hazard, then 85, took all the turmoil in stride. Though the security measures didn't deliver delegates back to bed until well after midnight, she was invariably first on line each morning for the return trip to the arena, meantime soothing colleagues concerned about their safety.

Probably the only thing that could have kept her from San Francisco this July was her death, which occurred Sunday at age 101. To the very end, Aunt Margaret remained the darling of state politicians—Republicans, too. Her charm as well as her longevity had put her above partisanship. All will miss her.●

HOME HEALTH CARE

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, my colleagues and I have had many discussions about community-based services and their importance in the care of frail elderly and disabled. I know that many other Senators share my interest and support for these services. I was therefore pleased to learn that a home health agency from my home State of Ohio, the Visiting Nurse Service (VNS) of Toledo, was recently chosen the agency of the month by the National Association for Home Care.

The Toledo VNS was founded in 1902 and incorporated in 1908 as the Toledo District Nurse Association (TDNA). For more than 80 years the agency has provided nursing, home health, and therapeutic services. It currently makes 50,000 home visits a year, and in 1982, the VNS/TDNA provided care to 3,763 individuals.

Home health services are particularly vital for the elderly, who often suffer from multiple chronic conditions which severely limit their ability to care for themselves. Once stabilized through the services of agencies like the VNS/TDNA, these individuals are often able to remain at home. The VNS/TDNA also assists families caring for young children or adults who would otherwise require hospitalization or prolonged institutionalization.

In the past I have sponsored legislation to extend the services of home health agencies and have supported resolutions recognizing the importance of these valuable programs. This includes measures such as National Nurse Recognition Day on May 6 which acknowledges one of the health professionals so responsible for the success of home care.

I ask that the article, "Visiting Nurse Service of Toledo—Eighty-three Years of Caring" from the April issue of Caring be printed in the RECORD so my colleagues can share in my appreciation for this fine organization.

The article follows:

VISITING NURSE SERVICE OF TOLEDO—EIGHTY-THREE YEARS OF CARING

The Visiting Nurse Service of the Toledo District Nurse Association (VNS/TDNA) has been caring for elderly and disabled persons for over eighty-three years. During that time they've given 4.3 million home visits to needy persons.

HISTORY

The agency was originally founded in 1901 by two philanthropic women's groups in Toledo, Ohio—the Thalian Society and the Kings Daughters. The first nurse, Margaret Edmond, was hired in 1901 at $50/month and operated out of the local Humane Society office. In 1902, the Visiting Nurse Aid Society was finally founded. In 1908 the nursing service of the Kings Daughters and Visiting Nurse Aid Society were incorporated as the Toledo District Nurse Association (TDNA).

In 1960, TDNA and the Public Health Nursing Program of the City of Toledo combined to form what was then called Community Nursing Services. With increasing budget problems for the City of Toledo in the late 1970s, the city gradually withdrew its staff and support to the combination and, in late 1980, the combination arrangement was ended. TDNA, the survivor, began using the name "Visiting Nurse Service" in addition to its original title as incorporated. The ending of the combination agreement resulted in the termination of the agency's school nursing program and some related services.

OPERATIONS

VNS/TDNA's annual number of home visits peaked at about 63,000 in 1978 and has stabilized at about 50,000 in 1982 and 1983. In 1982, the 49,778 visits covered 3,763 persons. About 55 percent of the clients were 65 years of age or older, and about 18 percent were 19 years of age or younger. The bulk of the clients (76.6 percent) were referred from hospital with ten percent being referred by agency staff and 7.4 percent by physicians.

Medicare accounted for the major part of the agency's income (60 percent) with trust/investment income being twelve percent, private insurance—eleven percent, United Way—seven percent, Medicare—four percent, and self-pay, grants and miscellaneous income accounting for two percent each. Agency expenditures, as with most home health agencies, reflect the labor-intensive nature of home care. The agency has 84 full-time and part-time employees and about seven therapists on contract. Sixty-three percent of all expenditures went for salaries, sixteen percent for payroll taxes/health and retirement benefits, twelve percent for contract services, three percent for rent and utilities, two percent for transportation, and four percent for other.

The core of the agency's program is a traditional Medicare-certified program providing home care services to the sick elderly and disabled persons. VNS/TDNA also has maternity, communicable disease, and health promotion programs.

The most unique program may be the agency's "60-Plus Home Health Maintenance Program" which is jointly funded by the United Way and the Area Agency on the Aging with Federal Older Americans Act funds. The "60-Plus" program patients are seen at no charge by a nurse and at clinic sites throughout the city. The budget for this service is about $150,000 per year. The program is in two parts: a clinic program, at twelve sites, serving 874 clients in 1983, and a home maintenance/followup program, serving 450 clients, primarily the frail elderly.

The goals of the program are:

Maintain a level of functioning with adequate support systems to allow independent living in a person's own familiar surroundings.

Prevent persons from becoming more severely impaired, therefore requiring more intensive level of services.

Prevent complications or acute episodes requiring hospitalization.

Enhance the continuity of care as needs of the clients change or become more apparent.

Under the program, a nurse will make an initial visit to do the following:

Assess abilities to perform activities of daily living, overall health condition, environment, support systems, access to an adequacy of medical care, etc.

Identify health care and health-related needs.

Provide nursing intervention to assist persons to make realistic plans around their individual needs. This might indicate the need to contract their physician, aid in finding a physician, or simply refer to other available community services agencies for appropriate assistance, etc.

Evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention; i.e., follow up on the outcome.

If the nurse determines further visits are warranted, the following additional services are available:

Teaching regarding good health practices, normal changes occuring in the older person, etc.

Monitoring of health conditions to detect new problems or changes in frequency of existing problems.

Instructing in relation to the client's medical plan of treatment to increase knowledge of special diets, medications, activities, and disease process.

Counseling in regard to options for health care with accent on client choice and decision-making.

Referring to other health and/or social service agencies, as needed, such as care-of-the-sick services at homedelivered meals, etc.

THE PEOPLE

VNS/TDNA is guided by its Executive Director, Robert "Chip" Liversidge, Jr., and board of trustees President Mr. S. Orrick Jennings. Mr. Liversidge has been the agency's Executive Director since 1978 and only the ninth executive director in the agency's 83 year history. He has a masters in business administration from George Washington University and a bachelor's degree from Cornell University.

In addition to running his agency, Mr. Liversidge is a well-known and active professional at the national level. He currently serves both as Secretary of the Board of the National Association for Home Care (NAHC) and President of the Board of the newly-founded Foundation for Hospice and Homecare. He is a past president of the former National Association of Home Health Agencies (NAHHA) and former Vice-Chairman of the NAHC Board.

At the state level, Mr. Liversidge is a past president of the Maine Association of Home Health Agencies and served as chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Ohio Council of Home Health Agencies.

Mr. Liversidge's 84 employee staff is coordinated by a six member executive staff which includes; Jeanne Johnston, RN, BSN, MPH (deputy director), Janet Blaufuss, RN,

BSN (director of home health services), Barbara Cook, MPA (director of development), Judith King, RN, BSN, MBA (controller), Nan Pawlaczyk (office manager), and Dorothy Siebert, RN, BSPHN (director of quality assurance).

The Board of Trustees headed by Mr. Jennings also includes as officers: Mrs. Robert Younger (Vice President), Mr. James J. Secor (Treasurer), Mrs. Russell Berman (Recording Secretary), and Mrs. Patrick Murlow (Corresponding Secretary). Mrs. Berman's husband is President of Ohio Citizen's Bank and Mr. Secor's grandmother (Mrs. Jay Secor) was the first president of the agency's Board, serving from 1902-1907. Another Trustee, John Gibbs, MD, heads the agency's Medical Advisory Committee and is Chief of Staff at Toledo Hospital.

THE CARING TOUCH

The teamwork of the executive staff, employees, trustees, and client families results in continuation of an 83-year caring tradition for VNS/TDNA clients. Some of the personal results of this teamwork are described in the special writeup of case histories accompanying this article.

Such care has earned the VNS/TDNA plaudits from clients and professional colleagues as well. Dr. Paul Miller, Cardiology Fellow at the Medical College of Ohio, wrote the agency in August 1983:

"I wanted to thank all the nurses at the Toledo Visiting Nurses' Association for the tremendous effort and care they have given the patients I have worked with at the Medical College clinic over the past three years.

During the medicine residency, I have found even the best laid-out therapeutic plans could be quickly destroyed when the patients were discharged if their social problems and education about their disease was not also planned for. I was continually amazed at the resourcefulness the nurses demonstrated in acquiring supplies, arranging for transportation, increasing the patient's ability to remain functional and in educating entire families about diseases and the health-care system."

An employer of a client wrote:

"Just a short note 'Unsolicited Testimonial' to thank you for the fine care given to my employee after his recent surgery and release from the hospital.

He had an excellent nurse, very compassionate and caring.

Mr. and Mrs. ( ) have only praise for her. Never having had surgery before, the family was unaware that this fine service existed in the city of Toledo."

And the wife of another client wrote in February 1983:

"Thanks, and we commend your services which were given to my husband the past six weeks. I found our nurse efficient and concerned with our particular problems. She made many helpful suggestions.

The aide was also a great help to me. She was efficient and prompt and easy to have in my home."

CARING is proud to salute the Visiting Nurse Service of the Toledo District Nurse Association for establishing such a fine caring tradition.●

TAX FREEDOM DAY

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the taxpayers of our Nation have cause to celebrate. Today marks the arrival of Tax Freedom Day, the day average taxpayers stop working for the Government and begin earning for themselves and their families.

Economists at the Tax Foundation, a Washington-based tax watchdog organization, report that Americans have been working from January 1 until today to satisfy tax obligations owed to Federal, State, and local governments if every dollar earned this year had gone to the tax collector.

For the second year in a row, Tax Freedom Day falls on May 1. However, taxpayers will actually have worked an extra day—122 instead of 121—since 1984 is a leap year. That additional day is needed, the foundation reports, despite a slight drop in the Federal tax bite that resulted from passage of President Reagan tax cut proposals in 1981—or, I should say, the portion of the tax cut left after increases in payroll tax. What Uncle Sam leaves in taxpayers' pockets, State and local governments take out, plus a little more.

Mr. President, for workers who put in an 8-hour day, it will take 2 hours and 40 minutes to pay the average tax bill. Of that, 1 hour and 43 minutes will be for Uncle Sam and the rest for State and local governments.

Mr. President, a milestone in tax history will occur this year. For the first time ever, total tax receipts will exceed $1 trillion. Yet, unless Congress puts a stop to its wasteful and reckless spending practices, it will again manage to spend far more than its share of that amount.

Last week Senators had an opportunity to significantly reduce Federal spending by cutting funds for all Federal programs except social security, medicare, and defense, yet only 26 of my colleagues supported the plan. If adopted, it would have saved the taxpayers over $200 billion in 3 years.

There will no doubt be other opportunities this week and later in the year for Senators to cut spending and reduce the size of Government. As the options are considered, I urge my colleagues to keep in mind the working men and women who pick up the tab for the costly Government spending programs Congress authorizes and funds. In terms of Tax Freedom Day next year and beyond, we ought to think of rolling back the clock.

Mr. President, the Tax Foundation has furnished me with several tables which illustrate the tax burden on families. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The tables follow:

Tax Freedom Day—selected years, 1930–84

Year:	*Tax Freedom Day*
1930	February 13
1940	March 8
1950	April 3
1960	April 17
1970	April 28
1975	April 28
1980 [1]	May 4
1981 [1]	May 6
1982 [1]	May 3
1983 [1]	May 1
1984 [2]	May 1

[1] Revised. [2] Forecast.

TAX BITE IN THE 8-HOUR DAY—SELECTED YEARS, 1930–84

	Hours and minutes		
	Total	Federal	State and local
Year:			
1930	:57	:17	:40
1940	1:29	:45	:44
1950	2:02	1:30	:32
1960	2:22	1:40	:42
1970	2:34	1:40	:54
1975	2:35	1:38	:57
1980 [1]	2:43	1:49	:54
1981 [1]	2:46	1:53	:53
1982 [1]	2:41	1:47	:54
1983 [1]	2:39	1:43	:56
1984 [2]	2:40	1:43	:57

[1] Revised. [2] Forecast.

TAX BITE IN THE 8-HOUR DAY AND TAX FREEDOM DAY, 1979–84

	May 3, 1979 [1]	May 4, 1980 [1]	May 6, 1981 [1]	May 3, 1982 [1]	May 1, 1983 [2]	May 1, 1984 [3]
Item:						
Taxes	2:41	2:43	2:46	2:41	2:39	2:40
Federal	1:48	1:49	1:53	1:47	1:43	1:43
State and local	:53	:54	:53	:54	:56	:57
Food	1:03	1:05	1:03	1:06	1:05	1:04
Housing and household operation	1:25	1:28	1:27	1:35	1:35	1:34
Clothing	:22	:22	:21	:22	:21	:21
Transportation	:42	:42	:41	:42	:43	:42
Medical care	:27	:30	:31	:35	:37	:36
Recreation	:19	:19	:19	:20	:20	:20
All other [4]	1:01	:51	:52	:39	:40	:43

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Forecast.
[4] Includes personal care, personal business, private education and research, religious and welfare activities, net foreign travel, and net savings.

Source: Tax Foundation, derived from data supplied by U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.

HOW THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL SPEND A WORKER'S TAX DOLLARS IN FISCAL 1984 [1]

	Worker's share		Total amount (millions)
	Amount	Percent of total	
Function:			
Income security [2]	$2,055	31.58	$275,118
National defense	1,775	27.26	237,548
Net interest	809	12.42	108,239
Health [3]	685	10.53	91,729
Education, training, employment, and social services	214	3.29	28,683
Transportation	195	3.00	26,123
Veterans' benefits and services	193	2.96	25,799
International affairs	101	1.55	13,502
Natural resources and environment	92	1.41	12,302
Agriculture	80	1.23	10,693
General science, space, and technology	62	.95	8,291
Community and regional development	57	.87	7,594
General purpose fiscal assistance	50	.77	6,741
Administration of justice	45	.69	6,021
General government	42	.65	5,652
Commerce and housing credit	28	.44	3,805
Energy	26	.40	3,463
Total	6,509	100.00	[4] 853,760

[1] In this example, the worker is the sole source of support for a spouse and two dependent children, and earns $26,000 per year.
[2] Includes social security.
[3] Includes medicare.
[4] After deducting $17,541 million for undistributed offsetting receipts not classified by function.

Source: Office of Management and Budget, and Tax Foundation computations, based on official budget estimates presented February 1, 1984.●

ELECTION IN PANAMA

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the pivotal and important nation of Panama is about to complete the difficult transition from military rule to democratically elected civilian government this Sunday. For the first time in 16 years, the citizens of Panama will once again be exercising their constitutional right to elect a President through their popular will and I congratulate them on this action. The election offers the opportunity for the people of Panama to establish a civilian government which will be especially responsive to their hopes and aspirations for tranquility and economic well-being.

The election is also important in the context of the turmoil that we are witnessing today in Central America. A democratic election in Panama will serve as a symbol and a beacon of hope for the people of Central America who struggle for peace. A strong civilian government, supported by the military institution that ruled the country for the past 16 years, will certainly offer inspiration for the people of El Salvador, who also will elect their President on Sunday, and for the people of Nicaragua, where elections will be held in November. A democratic election in Panama also will strengthen the Contadora process as Panama's civilian leadership will be able to work for peace in the name of the people.

It is with great satisfaction that I recall the days of the debate and the passage of the Panama Canal treaties in the Senate. That was certainly an important milestone. That is exactly what this coming election offers. The election of Sunday, May 6, symbolizes the hopes and aspirations of the proud people of Panama for a truly democratic government and a bright future.●

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, at a time when education in our country is the occasion of so much attention, it is indeed a pleasure to praise the achievements of a remarkable educator, Miss Helen Stevens. On June 10, after an unprecedented 49 years of distinguished service to education, Miss Stevens will retire from the Gilman School in Baltimore, Md. Over the course of the last half century, she has been a gifted teacher of both young students and their teachers. In addition, she has served as director of admissions for the Gilman Lower School and has been the adviser and confidant of four headmasters.

Helen Stevens came to the Gilman School in 1935 as a young graduate of Penn State to serve as a second grade teacher and as an inspiring instructor in music and drama. While actively teaching, she continued her studies in graduate work at the University of Maine, the Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore, and the Philadelphia Conservatory of Music and went on to receive her masters in education at the Johns Hopkins University.

Over the years she assumed additional responsibilities. She shaped the language arts and reading and study skills program for the lower, middle, and upper schools at Gilman, programs which bear her stamp to this day. From 1963–80, she went on to help fashion the Gilman summer school program, which is an important resource for the entire public and private school population in the Baltimore area.

So successful were her programs that she was invited to teach at the Johns Hopkins University; and for 17 years she, in conjunction with Miss Mary York of the St. Louis Public School system, instructed graduate students and practicing teachers in language arts and communications skills. As a university instructor, Miss Stevens, through the thousands who took her course, influenced the reading, language arts, and study skills of many schools, both public and independent, all across the country.

Over the years, as her reputation grew as a thorough, compassionate, knowledgeable teacher and expert in the field of communication skills, she was increasingly called upon to advise developing teachers, to speak before education groups, and to chair meetings of such organizations as the National Council of Teachers of English, the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the International Reading Association.

In her half century at Gilman, Miss Stevens has helped to launch the academic careers of thousands of today's business, professional, and public service leaders in Maryland. So impressive and varied have Miss Stevens' contributions to the Gilman School been over the years that in June 1979 she became the first recipient of the Edward T. Russell Memorial faculty chair.

As she enters upon an active and busy retirement schedule already packed with long-planned projects, I am delighted to join with generations of students, faculty, and parents in saluting a magnificent teacher and educator from whose example young teachers everywhere can draw lasting inspiration.●

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

● Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the child support enforcement bill the Senate passed April 25 is an important piece of legislation. It should be of great benefit to the many children in our country who live in single-parent households and who depend on the financial support of the noncustodial parent to meet their basic needs. I want to emphasize that nothing in this legislation inhibits the States' efforts to enforce vigorously the visitation rights of noncustodial parents. To the contrary, the bill expresses the Senate's desire to encourage such enforcement.

Financial support is important, indeed critical to the well-being of children of divorced parents. But the emotional support of both parents is critical, too. The emotional support of the noncustodial parent must be guaranteed and supported by the States. The conscientious enforcement of visitation decrees helps to insure that this emotional support will be provided. We must guarantee financial stability; but we must also encourage the strong and continuing bond between the child and both parents. I hope the States will redouble their efforts in this area.●

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNIST COUP IN AFGHANISTAN

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, April 27 marked the sixth anniversary of the coup in Afghanistan which brought a Communist regime to power in Kabul. The coup, known locally as the Saur revolution, launched a series of events leading up to the 1979 Soviet invasion and the ongoing tragedy in Afghanistan today.

This tragic anniversary coincided with a major Soviet offensive against the freedom fighters in the Panjsher Valley. This fertile and strategically important valley has been in the hands of the freedom fighters since the Soviet invasion. In the past, Soviet forays into the valley have met fierce resistance and, following Soviet withdrawal, the freedom fighters have quickly reestablished their control. This time the Soviets apparently intend to pacify the Panjsher by killing everyone in it. Day after day, for the past week, Soviet bombers have been carpet bombing the entire valley. This massive air attack does not distinguish between military objectives and the many civilians in the valley. The carpet bombing of the Panjsher is barbaric; it is also in keeping with the forces unleashed by the Saur revolution.

Six years after the Communist coup in Afghanistan, the resistance of the Afghan people continues unabated. As recent events in the Panjsher Valley demonstrate, the Afghan people pay a terrible price for their determination to be free. Nothing, however, more conclusively demonstrates the failure of the Communist coup in Afghanistan than the events in the Panjsher Valley.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this notice of a Member and Senate employees who propose to participate in a program, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Senator JIM SASSER and two members of his staff, Mr. John Callahan and Mr. Jerry Grant, to participate in a program in the Republic of China, sponsored by the Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce, from April 17–20, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator SASSER and Messrs. Callahan and Grant, in the program in Taiwan (Republic of China), at the expense of the Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the time for transaction of routine morning business be terminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOMS MATTERS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3043

(Purpose: To reduce the deficit of the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1985)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 3043.

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: "Act.

"LIMITATIONS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY

"SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order in the Senate or House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution making appropriations, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $264,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

"(b) It shall not be in order in the Senate or House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution making appropriations, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $137,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

"(d) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

"(e) It is the sense of Congress that the unprecedented magnitude and persistence of current and projected Federal budget deficits must be addressed in a comprehensive strategy to moderate increases in defense spending while continuing the effective constraints on nondefense discretionary programs. To assure the success of such an initiative, the foregoing procedural restraints. In addition to the total aggregate spending limitations pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are necessary on budget authority both for defense and for nondefense discretionary programs for fiscal year 1985.

"MEDICARE FREEZE

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendments made by this Act) or any provision of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the 'applicable percentage increase' under section 1886(b)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act for any 12-month cost reporting period or fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1984, and before October 1, 1985, shall be zero percent.

"(b) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall report to the Congress within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to suggested methods for assuring that hospitals will not increase amounts charged to patients who are not entitled to benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to compensate for amounts not paid by reason of the limitation under subsection (a).

"LIMITATIONS ON COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no increase shall be made in payments or benefit amounts under any provision of law which would otherwise require such increase to become effective during fiscal year 1985 as a result of changes in—

"(1) the Consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

"(2) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages.

"(b) No person shall be entitled to any increase in payments or benefit amounts under any provision of law if payment thereof is denied by reason of this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any change in—

"(1) the Consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

"(2) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages,

which would have resulted in any increase in payments or benefit amounts during fiscal year 1985 but for the provisions of subsection (a) shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining any increase in payments or benefit amounts during fiscal year 1986 or any fiscal year thereafter.".

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this amendment represents the best collective effort of a number of Members on both sides of the aisle to freeze the Federal budget for fiscal year 1985 at the 1984 level as our way of getting the Federal budget deficit under control.

This bipartisan budget freeze is not a cap on aggregate expenditures, for it looks at each program of the Federal budget and determines the way in which that program can or should be frozen. For instance, all discretionary spending, defense and nondefense alike, is frozen at the budget authority level rather than the outlay level. In defense, a budget authority freeze allows for $18 billion additional growth in outlays in fiscal year 1985 as a result of money already in the pipeline.

In benefit entitlements, we would freeze benefit levels, but not the number of individuals eligible.

In medicare, we would not cap total expenditures, but rather reimbursements to hospitals and physicians. In this amendment, however, only hospital reimbursements are addressed since the Senate has already passed a freeze in physician pay.

Overall, the budget freeze, all elements included, lowers spending by $27 billion in fiscal year 1985. It is the only spending reduction plan that makes any sense, given the revenue increases already passed in the Senate. In the freeze plan, defense savings and entitlement savings will each equal the revenue savings.

So from that standpoint, it is a very balanced approach, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa. As I indicated in my earlier statement, it is not the intention of the leadership to proceed further on this question at this time.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1984

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order on tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that there be a special order in favor of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) of not to exceed 15 minutes.

I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that following Senator PROXMIRE's special order there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to go past 10:30 a.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 2 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have been advised by the minority leader that he has nothing further. If I could determine from the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee if he has nothing else, I am prepared to ask the Chair to recess the Senate.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I have nothing more.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to and, at 6:27 p.m., the Senate recessed until Wednesday, May 2, 1984, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1984:

THE JUDICIARY

Alicemarie H. Stotler, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bohdan A. Futey, of Ohio, to be chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for the remainder of the term expiring September 30, 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Chapman B. Cox, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, May 1, 1984*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Duane H. Carlson, pastor, St. Mark's Lutheran Church, Springfield, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of the universe, You have lavished on us gifts.

The gift of life: To think, to hold intelligence, to have something significant to do and a place to do it.

The gift of language: That we can form sounds, and share what is on our minds with the assurance that if not shared in agreement is yet heard and understood.

The gift of perspective: That we can turn over alternatives in our mind, that we can debate, view things differently, yet be bound to common purposes that would serve Thee, our Nation, and our world.

Yes, You have given us much and we dare to ask for one thing more: A sense of gratitude that provokes honorable service to our country and good will to all people everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

RESTORATION OF COASTWISE TRADING PRIVILEGES TO THE VESSEL "LA JOLIE"

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 1015) to clear certain impediments to the licensing of the vessel *La Jolie* for employment in the coastwise trade.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE CHARLESTON NAVAL SHIPYARD, CHARLESTON, S.C.

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 1212) for the relief of 16 employees of the Charleston Naval Shipyard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 1212

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following named employees of the Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, are hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the below listed sums representing overpayments of per diem made through administrative error and received in good faith by the employees:

(1) Henry Brown, the sum of $476;

(2) Byron R. Buchanan, the sum of $1,077;

(3) Arthur Canady, the sum of $450;

(4) Robert E. Carter, the sum of $442;

(5) Edwin L. Clickner, the sum of $476;

(6) William F. Cummings, the sum of $1,077;

(7) Edward F. Fuller, the sum of $1,077;

(8) Wilbur Geathers, the sum of $482.85;

(9) Donell E. Gourdine, the sum of $1,250.05;

(10) David D. Lorick, the sum of $1,077;

(11) Martin N. Olmeda, the sum of $1,077;

(12) Lawrence E. Riley, the sum of $617;

(13) Dean W. Sabo, the sum of $1,077;

(14) Leon T. Scarborough, the sum of $902.75;

(15) George B. Stone, the sum of $442; and

(16) Paul K. Vincent, the sum of $434.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to an employee listed above any amount equal to the aggregate of the amount paid by such employee or withheld from any sum due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States as specified in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. No part of the amounts appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of the Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF SURFACE RIGHTS IN CERTAIN PARCELS OF LAND IN ELK HILLS NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4968) to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of Energy of surface rights to certain parcels of land located on Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 2 in the State of California on which private residences are located.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) Subject to section 2, the Secretary of Energy (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall make the conveyances described in subsection (b) in accordance with this Act. The interest of the United States to be conveyed in each instance is all surface rights of the United States in the parcel of land involved.

(b) Each parcel of land referred to in a paragraph of this subsection is located on Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2, in the northwest quarter of section 12, township 32 south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, Kern County, California, and is more particularly described in a survey dated November 5, 1982, on file in the Naval Petroleum Reserves in California Office of the Office of Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves of the Department of Energy. The conveyances referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Conveyance to Robert Lee Starkey of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 110, consisting of 0.41 acres, more or less.

(2) Conveyance to Seth Fowler of Glendale, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 118½, consisting of 0.34 acres, more or less.

(3) Conveyance to Ernest Olaf Johnson and Patricia Louise Johnson of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 815, consisting of 0.11 acres, more or less.

(4) Conveyance to Howard Byron Gray and Ruth Alice Gray of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 816, consisting of 0.03 acres, more or less.

(5) Conveyance to Herbert Henry Mitchell and Alma Iola Mitchell of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 817, consisting of 0.30 acres, more or less.

(6) Conveyance to Wilma Arlene Kelly of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 819, consisting of 0.20 acres, more or less.

(7) Conveyance to Elton D. Divelbiss of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 820, consisting of 0.60 acres, more or less.

(8) Conveyance to Mildred E. Phillips of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 823, consisting of 0.35 acres, more or less.

(9) Conveyance to Daniel Dwayne Wilson and Linda Sue Wilson of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 825, consisting of 0.41 acres, more or less.

(10) Conveyance to Ralph Elmer Knowles and Jenita Laura Knowles of Taft, California, of the parcel of land known as lot 900, consisting of 0.37 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. As payment for the conveyance by the United States under a paragraph of section 1(b), the individuals referred to in such paragraph shall pay to the United States the amount determined by the Secretary to be the fair market value (as of the date of the conveyance) of the rights conveyed.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall make a conveyance described in a paragraph of section

1(b) (subject to payment under section 2 with respect to such conveyance) not later than the end of the three-year period beginning on the date of the receipt by the Secretary of an application for such conveyance by the individuals referred to in such paragraph. Any such application shall be made in such form and in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary prescribes.

(b) Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe the form and procedures for an application under subsection (a) and shall notify each individual referred to in a paragraph of section 1(b) of such form and procedures. Such procedures shall require that any such application be submitted to the Secretary not later than the end of the 15-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) Before the end of the 15-month period referred to in section 3(b), the Secretary may not take any action (including eviction) otherwise permitted under any law other than this Act with respect to a parcel of land described in section 1 in order to quiet title to such parcel. After the end of such period, the Secretary may not take any such action with respect to a parcel of land for which an application for conveyance has been submitted to the Secretary under section 3(a), but may take any such action with respect to any other parcel.

(b) Section 7431(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to a conveyance under this Act.

(c) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under this Act as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this Act, the term "surface rights" means all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land, excluding (1) the title and interest of the United States in all oil, gas, coal, and other mineral deposits in such parcel, and (2) the right of the United States to prospect for, mine, and remove such oil, gas, coal, and other minerals.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4968, which appears before the House today on the Private Calendar. This legislation, introduced by our colleague from Alabama, is similar to H.R. 1863 which I introduced last session to resolve a small but difficult problem affecting some of my constituents.

H.R. 4968 will allow the Department of Energy to sell 10 parcels of surface rights to specific individuals owning homes on those lots. The bill requires that these parcels of surface rights, which lie within Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 2 in Kern County, Calif., be sold for their fair market value. This bill, like my earlier legislation, was developed with the Department of Energy's needs in mind and has the Department's full support.

I want to emphasize that H.R. 4968 completely protects our Government's Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 2 mineral resources. The bill specifically reserves mineral interests to the Federal Government. The Department of Energy will have complete access to these mineral resources through directional drilling.

This legislation is necessary, however, to prevent the Department of Energy from having to evict the occupants of these houses or enter into landlord-tenant relationships. The houses have been on NPR-2 land for decades because a lessee of the Navy's encouraged people to move onto this land. When a 1972 examination of Navy properties revealed the houses' existence, the Government was left in a difficult position: Either evict the occupants, causing substantial hardship for people who have lived there for years or who bought these houses in good faith, or take on the unacceptable administrative burdens of running a short-term leasing operation. H.R. 4968 provides a third, simpler option that is fair to both the occupants and our Government. It is an option we can all support.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water Resources of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be permitted to sit during the 5-minute rule in the House on Tuesday, May 1, 1984.

The minority has approved this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today we begin Older Americans Month in the United States—a month-long celebration saluting our Nation's greatest natural resource—our senior citizens.

We the Members of the 98th Congress can be proud of our accomplishments for senior citizens. We passed legislation which rescued the social security system and put it on a sound fiscal footing for the next 75 years. In the very near future, we will complete action on a 3-year reauthorization and expansion of another key program—the Older Americans Act.

Yet we have quite an unfinished agenda. We still have mandatory retirement in this Nation. True—we did raise the age from 65 to 70 for most types of employment—but that was more than 5 years ago. This means the older worker who faced mandatory retirement at 65 then—faces it at 70 now unless we pass legislation to once and for all end this unwarranted practice. We must also work to reform medicare before it collapses and before it drives more elderly deeper into poverty. Senior citizens pay 122 percent more in out-of-pocket expenses today than just 6 years ago. Medicare reform must include reducing costs and profits at the provider level and making the program more responsive to the real health care needs of the elderly.

As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I am proud to mark the beginning of Older Americans Month. The words of Benjamin Franklin seem appropriate—"All would live long—but none would be old."

HYDROGENERATORS SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO PAY FOR SULFUR OXIDE REDUCTIONS

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker I rise to ask that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3400. I do so not because I am opposed to stringent acid rain control legislation; indeed, I want the strongest possible controls or incentives to curtail all forms of pollution which are presently doing the most serious injury to people and the environment. However, I do not believe the compromises included in H.R. 3400 are workable.

There is no question that acid rain is a serious problem both in the United States and in other parts of the world. Many of our forests are dying and many lakes and streams already are dead. We must act—and soon—to drastically reduce the massive quantities of sulfur and nitrogen oxides currently being poured into our atmosphere. There are other dangerous conditions, such as ozone, which also must be addressed.

There are problems associated with all forms of electric energy generation. Coal produces sulfur oxides that lead to acid rain, nuclear produces radioactive wastes, and hydro damages fish populations and habitats. While it is true that acid rain is a national problem, it is also true that radioactive wastes and destruction of our fisheries are national problems.

H.R 3400 exempts nuclear generating facilities from the acid rain fee because they already are assessed a 1-mill fee to help pay for radioactive waste disposal. Although there is no similar fee on hydrogenerators at this time, it would be equally unfair to assess them for the acid rain controls.

If the hydro facilities are to be taxed, the revenues should be applied directly to fisheries enhancement activities. I oppose the levy on hydropower for this reason.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that hydroelectric generators should be forced to pay for sulfur oxide reductions any more than I believe that coal-burning utilities or nuclear generators should be taxed to pay for installation of fish ladders and other mitigation devices at hydro facilities.

I will strongly support legislation to reduce sulfur and nitrogen oxide emissions. In fact, I believe that these emissions should be reduced in all 48 contiguous States, and not only in the Midwest and Eastern States. I cannot, however, in good conscience cosponsor a bill which taxes hydroelectric generators to pay for sulfur and nitrogen oxide reductions. For that reason, I ask that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 3400.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3400

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 3400.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

WASTEFUL SPENDING IN GOVERNMENT

(Mr. REID asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, the horror story goes something like this: The Air Force spent $3,100 for three plastic caps to fit the legs of a stool. After this transaction was challenged the original seller found a commercial supplier that would sell the caps for 34 cents each.

Simply put the Air Force paid more than 3,000 times the price for what it later purchased for about $1.

This kind of abuse in military spare parts procurement is not unique. More and more it seems, supply and procurement officers place a priority on getting the part as quickly and easily as possible, despite the cost.

As a cosponsor of the Defense Spare Parts Procurement Reform Act, I am firmly committed to eliminating these intolerable abuses.

This bill, H.R. 5064 targets several areas of needed reform ranging from increased focus on competitive bidding to more efficient preprocurement planning.

Our defense procurement process must incorporate sound business practices. This bill will do just that by reducing costs while not weakening our Nation's defense.

□ 1210

COMPREHENSIVE NATURAL GAS LEGISLATION

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is tempting, as winter draws to a close and temperatures moderate, to put off attempts to enact comprehensive natural gas legislation. However, I believe it is essential for Congress to take action to reduce the burden on natural gas consumers. Natural gas prices will inevitably skyrocket again next winter, particularly when the price of new gas is decontrolled as of January 1, 1985. Congress needs to act now to prevent another round of spiraling gas prices and the accompanying economic hardship.

The House is now in a good position to enact comprehensive natural gas legislation—better than it has been all session. The Energy and Commerce Committee has recently succeeded in forming a coalition that was able to report a natural gas compromise bill which has been referred to as the "Sharp/Madigan compromise." Since the bill is a compromise, it does not please everyone. However, its enactment would clearly result in lower prices for consumers—a goal we all support. Because it is a step in the right direction, I will do all I can to see that the legislation is considered by the full House.

I am introducing a bill today which I feel will strongly complement the goals of the Sharp-Madigan compromise. The bill has two sections, both of which are intended to ease the burden of natural gas prices on consumers and allow the light of public disclosure to play upon the ratemaking process.

The first section required the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit semiannual reports to the Energy Committees of the House and Senate. These reports are to compile and organize information filed by pipeline companies at FERC to make data on pipeline activities more readily available to Congress and the public. With enhanced accessibility to this information, Congress and the public will be able to exercise much greater scrutiny over pipeline activities.

In these semiannual reports, FERC will specifically be required to submit: A list of all purchase gas adjustments from all pipeline companies during the previous six months; a list of all rate changes, including the percent change; the status before FERC of each rate filing, and of those filings still pending from preceding periods; and a description of any action taken by FERC, or change in FERC policy, that has a positive or negative effect on consumer prices, along with an analysis of that effect.

The second section of the bill modifies FERC's current policy of granting interim rate hikes to pipeline companies subject to refund. The bill specifies that consumers will not be called on to pay the higher prices unless and until FERC has ruled on the lawfulness of that rate hike.

Under current law, FERC may suspend for 5 months any rate filing that will increase rates while the filing is being adjudicated. Pipelines submit rate filings to FERC whenever they wish to reflect any changes they face in their operating or fixed costs. If the case is not resolved at the end of the 5-month period, then the increase goes into effect subject to refund pending final resolution of the case.

Unlike rate filings, purchase gas adjustments are filed by pipeline companies every 6 months and reflect changes in the price of gas paid by pipelines. When a pipeline files a PGA, FERC suspends the rate hike for 1 day, after which it goes into effect subject to refund pending FERC's decision on the case. In the case of both a PGA and a rate filing, consumers may be forced to pay the higher prices before FERC has ruled on whether or not they are lawful.

My bill changes that provision both for rate filings and for PGA's. When a pipeline company submits a rate filing or a PGA, FERC must hold a hearing and make a decision on the lawfulness of that rate increase within a 5-month period if it receives a complaint about the increase from a State, a municipality, a State commission, or a gas distributing company. It may also decide to hold a hearing on its own initiative. During that 5-month period, FERC must suspend the rate hike so that it will not go into effect until FERC has ruled on whether it is lawful.

If FERC is unable to come to a decision within the 5-month period, for any reason, it may extend the period for an additional 5 months to conclude its deliberations. However, the suspension of the rate hike will continue during these extra months, with one exception. The rate hike may go into effect subject to refund only if the pipeline company can demonstrate to FERC that continued suspension of the rates will result in severe financial hardship. Regardless of whether the rates are suspended or go into effect subject to refund, FERC must make a final ruling by the end of the second 5-month period.

In sum, by requiring that pipeline companies prove that their increased costs are justified before they can begin to collect from consumers, and by increasing congressional and public access to FERC's information, I believe we can go a long way toward curbing natural gas price increases. I

welcome the support of my colleagues for this legislation.

VAN P. SMITH—NEW CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(Mr. SHARP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of the House a very distinguished Hoosier, Van P. Smith, who this week is being inaugurated as the chairman of the board of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Smith is an accomplished businessman, now serving as the chairman and president of the Ontario Corp. in Muncie, Ind.

He is an active civic leader, ably contributing time and energy to many State and local causes.

He is a strong participant and leader in his church, St. Mary's.

He is a dedicated family man who with his very capable wife, Margaret, is rearing five outstanding children: Lynn, Mark, Paul, Susan and Victor.

Mr. Speaker, Van Smith's many friends wish him well as he undertakes his new responsibilities with the chamber. We are confident he will again distinguish himself and bring further honor to his home city and State.

MISSING CHILDREN TOLL-FREE HOTLINE

(Mr. LEWIS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last night NBC rebroadcast the document-drama "Adam."

This tragic story painfully depicts the suffering endured by one family following the abduction and murder of their only son.

At the conclusion of the program, a toll-free hotline allowed viewers to relay information concerning missing children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the toll-free hotline for this event was located at Florida's Department of Law Enforcement's missing children clearinghouse.

The Florida Department of Law Enforcement has been asked to continue manning the hotline for the next 3 months until the U.S. Department of Justice has fully established its National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Florida's efforts set the example for all States to follow in locating missing children.

CATHOLIC CHURCH IN NICARAGUA QUESTIONS AUTHORITY OF COMMUNIST RULE

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Church in Nicaragua appears to be playing a role similar to that of the church in Poland: Questioning the authority of Communist rule. The massive demonstration of 100,000 Nicaraguans on Good Friday "in Solidarity with the church and in opposition to the Sandinista regime" points to the church as being a leading force in opposition to the Sandinistas.

It is strange that the American media, only too enthusiastic to cover the Solidarity movement in Poland and the church's role there, chose—with the single exception of ABC—to ignore this massive demonstration. Of equal concern are the reports of our own Embassy not adequately reporting the event. That omission notwithstanding, the importance of such a large group of Nicaraguans talking the risk to express their opposition to the ruling Sandinistas cannot be overlooked.

Also significant is the Sandinista refusal to consider the church plea for dialog with those opposing their regime. It is ironic that the Sandinistas argue that the Salvadoran Government should have dialog with those opposing it but reject the same proposal for themselves.

H.R. 5188, AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE CUSTOMS SERVICE

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, the House will vote today on H.R. 5188, authorizing funds for the customs service and other agencies. I urge Members to vote against this bill on suspension.

Although H.R. 5188 is over the President's request and over the budget we passed only 2 weeks ago, that is not the main problem. In fact, H.R. 5188 is a good bill, it just does not go far enough.

H.R. 5188 makes no effort to encourage or direct the customs service to enforce a law which has been on our books since 1930. The 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act prohibits the importation of articles produced by slave labor. Yet we have evidence that the Soviets use forced labor to produce goods which are then brought into our country. These imports directly contradict our moral principles, our national laws and the spirit of House Concurrent Resolution 100, which this House passed last year, condemning the Soviet use of slave labor.

A "no" vote on H.R. 5188 is not a vote against the bill, it is a vote against it being on the Suspension Calendar, where we cannot amend it to direct customs to enforce the law and our moral outrage over slave labor. I urge Members to vote this bill off the Suspension Calendar so that we can offer such an amendment under normal House rules.

HARRISBURG, PA., SECTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Harrisburg, Pa., section of the National Council of Jewish Women deserves the recognition that we place in it today by inserting remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The National Council of Jewish Women has long been part of a court-appointed special advocates program, and for its work in that field it has received a special award from the Department of Health and Human Services, a reward recently received by Barbara Mandrell, the current president of that organization.

There are some 270,000 children across the United States who are living in some kind of substitute care. The court-appointed special advocates program, purely of volunteers, makes certain that its volunteers contact every such child and arranges for it whatever temporary residing care it needs or permanent placing in the various forms available.

The court-appointed special advocates program is responsible for from beginning to end following through with court actions and other necessary actions that would insure the best possible situation for these unfortunate children.

The President of the United States himself has directed the Department of Justice to cooperate in the funding of this program and to work directly with the National Council of Jewish Women and other cosponsors for the success of this program.

The Greater Harrisburg chapter, which is, as I said, in my district, was one of the first five sections in the country to participate in this vital element of our volunteer program.

I urge similar organizations in every district in the country to look closely at this court-appointed special advocates program. It is a fine volunteer effort in complete justification of the new emphasis on the American volunteer.

THE REAL DEFICIT STORY

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, last week we saw a classic example, or two classic examples, here in the House of Representatives, controlled by the Democrats, of why the House cannot or will not reduce Federal spending and therefore the deficit.

On Wednesday we considered the National Science Foundation. We all remember NSF and some of the infamous grants that it has made in the behavioral sciences, but there was an amendment offered to reduce just $51 million in that NSF authorization bill. It had already been increased over 17 percent above last year's level, but we were trying to cut back just $51 million in that amendment. It was defeated.

On Thursday the National Bureau of Standards came before the House, and for 1½ hours we debated cutting just $6 million, and we went through this tremendously convoluted process of having a substitute, amendments to substitutes, haggling over $4 million.

The problem with the Federal deficit is here in the House of Representatives. And if the American people want something done about it, they have got to do something about the votes that are being cast here on amendments just like these.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Journal recently editorialized on the "Dear Commandante" letter signed by Mr. WRIGHT of Texas and nine other Members:

> The letter represents a dangerous trend toward self-negotiation by U.S. officials, a trend that undermines the adopted policies of the U.S. Government and further fragments American leadership.
>
> The nation needs new stringent laws to prevent Congressmen from molding their own foreign policies. It needs to reaffirm the principle that only the Executive Branch has the power to negotiate with foreign governments. And it needs laws that make it a crime to intentionally undercut a policy that has been democratically adopted by the Administration and the Congress.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am taking a special order to talk specifically about the debate on the Logan Act, and to talk about precisely the parallel the Founding Fathers drew between the "Dear Commandante" letter to a foreign government with which we are in difficulty, and the problems that the United States was having with France in that period.

I think it will be of some interest to all Members, and I think it is particularly important that we address the question of whether or not Congressmen have the right to write foreign governments opposing the policies of the United States.

HAUNTING DECISIONS?

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the President's just-ended historic trip to the People's Republic of China was a triumph of American diplomacy and a personal triumph for President Reagan. But we must be very careful in these times not to confuse China with our allies such as those in Western Europe or Japan.

China is an ally, if at all, of convenience. There is little sharing of common principles among our countries or commitment by the Chinese to the values or the ideals our society believes in and holds dear. We can, of course, have a cordial relationship with countries different from our own. But amid all the professions of friendship, we must remind ourselves that the Chinese Communists lack a commitment to human rights, to a free press, to religious liberties, and protections of the individual from the powers of the state.

We must remind ourselves too that while China represents a potential market of immense proportions for American goods, the proposed sales of military equipment and nuclear technology to China must be considered only with ironclad safeguards so that decisions made now do not come back to haunt us in the future.

A FAIRER, MORE SIMPLER, FLAT RATE TAX SYSTEM

(Mr. SILJANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, today is tax freedom day, the first day Americans begin paying their own bills rather than the Government's bills. I have introduced a flat rate income tax, House Resolution 5432; I hope the Members will consider it.

Another flat rate tax bill is the Bradley-Gephardt bill. In a way, it is a step forward, since it confirms the supply side belief in lower marginal tax rates. Yet, I am going to talk about something that is very dangerous in that bill: How it affects small businesses.

Bradley-Gephardt is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It talks about simplification of the tax system, but what it really does is five things to small business:

One, it doubles the small business tax rate.

Two, it increases capital taxes on small businesses.

Three, it eliminates small business expensing of the first $10,000 of business property.

Four, it taxes fringe benefits by increasing the tax burden on employees and employers since the employers pay a matching percentage on social security tax.

Last, five, it changes the depreciation schedules to the adversity of small business that were passed in 1981. Now large national companies might appreciate the lowering of the corporate tax rate, but small business does not. Small business is the one that primes the pump of our economy. It is small business that creates over 70 percent of all the new jobs in America. It is small business that does not abandon the rural and urban areas of this country. Bradley-Gephardt is in opposition to small business.

I urge the Members of Congress look at H.R. 5432 for a fairer, more simpler, flat rate income tax system.

"MAY DAY" IN THE OIL INDUSTRY—MAY 1, 1984

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, from Webster's Dictionary we read the following for "May Day":

> May 1st is celebrated as a spring time festival and in some countries as Labor Day.

But this May 1 is no cause for celebration for labor in the oil industry. Last week for example, the Wall Street Journal reported the following about the Texaco-Getty merger approved in January:

> The fact that many workers will be fired as a result of one of the largest corporate consolidations in history isn't surprising. These are tense and confusing days for Getty's 19,400 world-wide employees, many of whom will be out of a job after years of steady employment.

Mr. Speaker, for boardroom executives and stock speculators, this May 1 is not "May Day"—it is "pay day"! They are the ones cashing in on the current wave of big oil mergers—at the expense of labor and the consumer.

That is labor and the consumer yelling "May Day" all right, but it is not in celebration of May 1. Can you hear them, Mr. Speaker? With FTC approval of each oil mega-merger, that is labor and the consumer yelling "May day! May day! May day!," the international distress signal.

I urge my colleagues to support the Conte Moratorium—Let us put an end to big oil's "heyday."

HOUSE SHOULD MOVE ON YOUTH SUMMER JOB FUNDS

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last month the other body approved legislation to provide an additional $100 million for summer youth employment under the Job Training Partnership Act. As we rapidly approach the summer months when thousands of young people will be on the streets looking for work, it is vital that this House similarly approve these much needed funds. Nationally, teenage unemployment in March rose to 19.9 percent, while a staggering 46.7 percent of all black teenagers seeking jobs were unable to find them. Despite the current recovery, it is clear that this Nation's young people are being left behind.

The additional funds are necessary if many of our hardest hit cities are to maintain the rather limited youth employment programs of last year. In my own State of Michigan under current law, the city of Detroit, with a December 1983 unemployment rate of 11.8 percent, is facing a 20-percent reduction of $1.87 million. Grand Rapids, with 10-percent unemployment—December 1983—will lose $1.08 million, down 41 percent from last year. The city of Flint, with 12.9-percent unemployment—December 1983—will be cut by $1.03 million, 30 percent below 1983. Oakland County and Ann Arbor will also suffer drastic reductions. These reductions will come at a time when many of these cities and the State of Michigan—March adjusted unemployment: 11.3 percent—are continuing to face double-digit unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman WHITTEN has recently introduced legislation, H.R. 5419, which will appropriate funds for youth summer jobs and other programs. It is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee will consider the legislation this week. I urge the committee to retain these critical funds for summer jobs and I urge my colleagues to join with me to provide an opportunity for thousands of teenagers to be gainfully employed this summer. We cannot allow our Nation's youth to be left behind by the economic recovery to fend for themselves in the streets.

"YE SHALL KNOW THEM BY THEIR DEEDS"

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Mr. WRIGHT, our distinguished colleague from Texas indicated on the House floor, and I quote, "that while a majority leader in the hierarchy of the House may be the equivalent of a bishop * * * it is difficult for the majority leader of the House to schedule legislation * * *".

In an article in this morning's Washington Post which talked of the lack of meaningful legislative action on the part of this Congress, our colleague from Texas was quoted as saying with astonishment:

> Some of these members don't seem interested, * * * They act like their sole purpose in coming to the Congress was to make sure they remain in Congress.

I must admit that I was rather shocked at his statement. For it appears that Bishop WRIGHT has had possibly a religious Damascus Road experience. Is it possible that Bishop WRIGHT may be headed for an apostleship? Is it possible that in the future the House may be working on meaningful legislation such as the immigration reform bill, the President's comprehensive crime control bill or even possibly a line item veto or balanced budget amendment, rather than limiting ourselves to, in the words of the Washington Post, "such weighty issues of the control of the lamprey eel, an international tuna treaty, or the territorial rights of the Southern Ute Indians"?

Mr. Speaker, I believe the words of James are especially apropos at this point. "Ye shall know them by their deeds."

WHO STANDS IN THE WAY OF VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER, BALANCED BUDGET, AND LINE-ITEM VETO?

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would hope to offer unanimous consent requests calling for consideration of amendments to permit voluntary school prayer, balanced budget, and line-item veto.

The Chair has ruled that in order to make these requests I must have the clearance of the majority and minority leaderships.

This request has been cleared by the minority leadership.

I would now yield to a spokesman from the majority leadership for appropriate clearance.

Mr. Speaker, I hear no response. That should make it clear to the American people who stands in the way of these three important issues—the Democratic leadership in this House.

□ 1230

TAX FREEDOM DAY

(Mr. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, today is Tax Freedom Day. When American workers return home from work tonight they will have finally worked long enough to cover what they owe this year in local, State, and Federal taxes. Starting tomorrow, the money Americans earn on the job will go in their pocket—not the Government's.

Fifty-four years ago, Tax Freedom Day arrived on February 13. In 1930, Americans had to work for only 43 days to cover their tax debt. Today, the number of work days needed to cover their tax debt has increased to over 4 months.

If liberals in Congress have their way, Tax Freedom Day will be pushed even further ahead. Just how many days Congress wants our people to work free for the Government remains to be seen. But I can tell you this, give Congress another dime and they will spend another dollar.

That's why a balanced budget/tax limitation amendment to the U.S. Constitution is so absolutely necessary. If we can control Congress' spending appetite—then we can control its hunger for more taxes.

A balanced budget amendment will stop the ever increasing Tax Freedom Day encroachment on working America's paycheck.

TAX FREEDOM DAY 1984

(Mr. McKERNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today is Tax Freedom Day. If every working hour between January 1 and May 1 is counted toward tax liability, today marks the time when Americans have worked off their total tax burden of over $600 billion.

Yes; as of May 1, Americans stop "working for the Government" and begin "working for themselves."

Mr. Speaker, this milestone day is an important symbol of the challenge America faces. While Tax Freedom Day comes 4 days earlier in the year than in 1981, still it is true that one-third of all income generated in America goes for taxes. For the average working man and woman, 2 hours and 40 minutes of every 8-hour day are spent paying off the tax burden.

As the Federal deficit looms as a threat to the current economic recovery, we should keep in mind the recent words of Secretary of Treasury Regan who said the problem is not that the American people are under-taxed; but that the Federal Government is overspent.

On this Tax Freedom Day 1984, I would ask my colleagues to join with me in committing ourselves to seek real reductions in Government spending, and to set our sights on reforming the Tax Code so that it is both simple

and equitable. Only through serious bipartisan efforts can we hope to get the tax burden under control so we can celebrate Tax Freedom Day earlier next year.

DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR MRS. MARGARET CORBIN

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight a day of remembrance for one of the lesser known heroes of the American Revolution. On May 1, at West Point, tribute is paid to Mrs. Margaret Corbin, one of America's first servicewomen.

Margaret Corbin (nee Cochran) was born on November 12, 1751, in Pennsylvania. In 1772, she married John Corbin, a member of the Pennsylvania Artillery Regiment. She served at her husband's side throughout the war. On November 16, 1776, John Corbin was killed in the defense of Fort Washington. Margaret Corbin took her husband's place at the cannon. During the battle, she, too, was wounded in the arm.

Margaret Corbin became the only female member of the Invalid Regiment at West Point. In 1783, Congress gave her a pension for her efforts. Mrs. Corbin lived out the rest of her life in Highland Falls, N.Y. She died in 1800. In 1926 her remains were moved from Highland Falls to West Point where she was reinterred. Each year on May 1, the Daughters of the American Revolution pay tribute to her memory by laying a wreath at her grave.

Mr. Speaker, in today's world, it is easy for the younger generation to lose sight of the sacrifices made by both men and women for the cause of American independence. It is, therefore, instructive and inspirational to pay tribute to brave heroes of our Revolution like Mrs. Margaret Corbin.

A STATE OF SIEGE IN COLOMBIA

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last evening the world was shocked to learn that the drug traffickers had gunned down Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, the Minister of Justice of the Nation of Colombia, whose life was frequently threatened by drug traffickers.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from New York, Mr. RANGEL, the distinguished chairman of our Select Committee on Narcotics, our committee went to Colombia and visited with the Minister of Justice just last August and we were impressed by his dedicated and sincere efforts to combat narcotics trafficking in Colombia. He reportedly played a leading role in implementing Colombia's herbicidal spraying of marihuana, and in the recent world record seizure of more than 12 metric tons of cocaine worth an estimated street value of over a billion dollars.

We have been informed today that the President of Colombia, President Betancur, has declared a state of siege in Colombia following this assassination. The assassination of the Justice Minister should serve as a poignant reminder to the entire world that the deadly effects of narcotics trafficking and drug abuse are getting worse, and if the war against drug traffickers is going to be won, then the nations of the entire international community are going to have to pool their resources, their personnel, their funds and technology to combat this deadly menace that is undermining the political, economic, and social institutions of all mankind.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later, after the legislative business and prior to the suspension votes which were postponed yesterday.

MEDICAL CARE RECOVERY AMENDMENTS

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4666) to provide for the recovery by the United States of the costs of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States in certain circumstances, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4666

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of Public Law 87-693 (42 U.S.C 2651) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out "a right to recover" and inserting in lieu thereof "an independent right to recover"; and

(B) by inserting ", or his insurer," after "from said third person";

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) In any case in which the United States is authorized or required by law to furnish hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment (including prostheses and medical appliances) to a person who is injured or suffers a disease and the laws of the State in which such injury or disease occurred have abolished or limited tort liability as a cause of action and, in lieu thereof, have created or authorized a system of compensation or reimbursement for medical expenses pursuant to a policy of insurance, contract, medical or hospital service agreement, or similar arrangement for the purpose of paying, contributing, or reimbursing expenses for hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment furnished to that person, the United States shall be deemed to be a third-party beneficiary of such a policy, contract, agreement or arrangement, and, for purposes of this Act, expenses for hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment furnished to such person by the United States or paid for by the United States shall be deemed to have been incurred by that person as a result of that injury or disease. The United States shall be subrogated to any right or claim that the person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors have under such policy, contract, agreement, or arrangement to the extent of the reasonable value of the care and treatment so furnished or to be furnished.".

(b) The first section of Public Law 87-693 is further amended in subsection (c), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2) of this section—

(1) by striking out "such right" and inserting in lieu thereof "the rights conferred by subsections (a) and (b) of this section"; and

(2) by inserting "insurance carrier or other entity responsible for the payment or reimbursement of medical expenses or the" before "third person who is liable" each place it appears.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of Public Law 87-693 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, all sums collected pursuant to this Act, or collected for the types of care and treatment described in the first section of this Act pursuant to any other right the United States may possess, shall be credited to the appropriation from which the costs of such care and treatment were paid, except that such sums shall be available only in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.".

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to all cases in which the United States is authorized or required by law to furnish hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment, whether such care and treatment is furnished before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply to all sums collected by the United States on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, whether the claim for such moneys arose before, on, or after such date of enactment.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KINDNESS) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.).

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4666 is to allow the recovery by the United States of the costs of hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care, and treatment provided by the United States in those jurisdictions where tort liabilty has been limited or substituted by a no-fault system.

The bill was introduced as recommended in an executive communication from the Department of Justice dated December 5, 1983.

The Federal Medical Care Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 2651, et seq., grants the Federal Government an independent right of action, sounding in tort, to recover the reasonable value of hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment when the Government is required or authorized to provide such care and treatment to a person injured under circumstances giving rise to third party liability.

Twenty-one States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have implemented some type of no-fault system and due in part to these changes, the number of successful claims under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act is declining. In some cased recoveries have not been pursued because legal precedents have been set barring recovery under the act in no-fault States.

In *Heusle* v. *National Mutual Insurance*, 628 F. 2d 833 (3rd Cir. 1980), the Court held that the Government could not recover its medical expenses because the right of recovery is based upon tort liability, and Pennsylvania had abolished tort liability in favor of a no-fault system. The Court expressly stated that the resolution of the conflict was up to Congress, not the courts.

While the Heusle precedent is not universal, it has had a negative impact on an important source of revenue. Government recoveries under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act totaled $25 million in fiscal year 1982. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enactment of this bill would increase Federal receipts by several million dollars annually.

The bill creates a new subsection (b) to 42 U.S.C. 2651 defining the basis of the Government's right of recovery to circumstances where a State had abolished or limited tort liability in favor of a no-fault system. Under this bill, the Government is deemed to be a third-party beneficiary of any State compensation plan so as to receive any reimbursement benefit provided by that plan; and in those States that require the injured party's actually incurring the medical expense, the injured party is deemed to have incurred that expense for reimbursement purposes.

Additionally, the bill establishes a new deposit and collection procedure for funds recouped under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act, or any other right the United States has for the recoupment of medical care costs. H.R. 4666 authorizes the deposit of the recouped funds to the appropriation from which the care or treatment was charged. This differs from the current requirement of depositing recouped funds to general Treasury revenues, and is intended to encourage recovery actions under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act.

The committee has concluded that the recommendations of the Department of Justice will strengthen the United States' ability to recover medical care and treatment costs in those jurisdictions where tort liability has been limited or abolished in favor of a no-fault system. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

□ 1240

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my friend and very able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.), in urging the House to pass H.R. 4666.

The Medical Care Recovery Act, passed in 1962, allowed the United States to recover the costs expended for medical care, when a third party was responsible for causing the injury giving rise to the costs. This was a reasonable system to require reimbursement from a negligent party in situations where the Government was obligated to provide medical services to its injured employees.

In recent years, however, with new no-fault compensation systems in many States, the existing law has been found by the courts to be inadequate to obtain reimbursement in those States. This legislation brings the Medical Care Recovery Act up to date, and reaffirms the Government's right to be reimbursed for its costs in no-fault States.

This bill also includes a strong incentive for agencies to pursue medical care recovery cases. Instead of funds recovered being deposited in the general Treasury, the new language would return the funds to the appropriation from which the costs of care were charged. I suspect this will give medical care recovery cases a higher priority in the legal sections of most agencies.

It is especially timely that we deal with this legislation. First, we are all acutely aware of the steadily rising cost of medical care. The Government has shared in paying those higher costs, and will continue to do so. This bill provides a mechanism to recoup those costs from negligent persons or entities.

We are also well aware of the growing disparity between how much money the Government takes in through taxes and other revenues, and how much the Congress appropriates and spends. I am most pleased to report that this bill will reduce that disparity, which is sometimes called the deficit, by adding funds to the revenue side of the Government ledger. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that receipts will increase several million dollars annually, under this bill.

All that, and no increase in taxes.

I only wish we had the opportunity to vote for more bills like H.R. 4666.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KINDNESS), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for the very fine and able assistance that he has given in bringing H.R. 4666 to the floor. I commend him very highly.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4666, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1984

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5041) to promote research and development, encourage innovation, and make necessary and appropriate amendments to the antitrust laws, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5041

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Joint Research and Development Act of 1984".

DEFINITIONS; LIMITATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "joint research and development venture" means any group of activities, including attempting to make, making, or performing a contract, by two or were

persons for one or more of the following purposes;

(A) theoretical analysis, experimentation, or systematic study of phenomena or observable facts,

(B) extension of investigative findings or theory of a scientific or technical nature into practical application for experimental and demonstration purposes, including experimental production and testing of models, prototypes, equipment, materials, and processes,

(C) engineering activities to achieve standards of performance and reliability or to meet economic requirements, and

(D) the collection, exchange, and analysis of research information,

and may include operation of facilities for the conduct of research, the conduct of such venture on a protected and proprietary basis, and the patenting and licensing of the results of such venture, but does not include any activity specified in subsection (b),

(2) the term "antitrust laws" has the meaning given it in section 1 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15), except that such term includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that such section 5 applies to unfair methods of competition,

(3) the term "person" has the meaning given it in section 1(a) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)),

(4) the term "State" has the meaning given it in section 4G(2) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15g(2)),

(5) the term "Attorney General" means the Attorney General of the United States, and

(6) the term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(b) The term "joint research and development venture" excludes the following activities involving two or more persons:

(1) exchanging information regarding the sales, marketing, or distribution of any product, process, or service,

(2) entering into any agreement, or engaging in any other conduct, to restrict or require—

(A) the production or marketing by any person who is a party to such venture of any product, process, or service,

(B) participation by any person who is a party to such venture in another research and development venture, or

(C) the sale, licensing, or sharing by any person who is a party to such venture of inventions or developments neither developed by such venture nor integrally related to a product or process developed by such venture to any other joint research and development venture or other person.

PER SE VIOLATIONS

SEC. 3. No joint research and development venture shall be deemed illegal per se under the antitrust laws or under any State law similar to the antitrust laws.

LIMITATION ON RECOVERY

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15) and in lieu of the relief specified in such section, any person who is entitled to recovery on a claim under such section shall recover the actual damages sustained by him, interest calculated at the rate specified in section 1961 of title 28, United States Code, on such actual damages as specified in subsection (d), and the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to section 5 of this Act—

(1) if such claim results from conduct that is within the scope of a joint research and development venture for which notification has been filed under section 6(a) of this Act, and

(2) if such claim is filed after a notice of the research and development venture is published in the Federal Register as provided in section 6(b) of this Act.

(b) Notwithstanding section 4C of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15c) and in lieu of the relief specified in such section, any State which is entitled to monetary relief on a claim under such section shall recover the total damage sustained as described in subsection (a)(1) of such section, interest calculated at the rate specified in section 1961 of title 28, United States Code, on such total damage as specified in subsection (d), and the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to section 5 of this Act—

(1) if such claim results from conduct that is within the scope of a research and development venture for which notification has been filed under section 6(a) of this Act, and

(2) if such claim is filed after a notice of the research and development venture is published in the Federal Register as provided in section 6(b) of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding any applicable provision of any State law providing a damage remedy for conduct similar to that forbidden by the antitrust laws, any person who is entitled to recovery on a claim under such provision shall not recover in excess of the actual damages sustained by him, interest calculated at the rate specified in section 1961 of title 28 United States Code, on such actual damages as specified in subsection (d), and the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to section 5 of this Act—

(1) if such claim results from conduct that is within the scope of a joint research and development venture for which notification has been filed under section 6(a) of this Act, and

(2) if such claim is filed after a notice of the research and development venture is published in the Federal Register as provided in section 6(b) of this Act.

(d) Interest shall be awarded on the damages involved for the period beginning on the date of filing of the claim and ending on the date of judgment, unless the court finds that the award of all or part of such interest is unjust in the circumstances. Interest shall be awarded on the damages involved for the period beginning on the date of injury and ending one day prior to the date of filing of the claim if the court finds that the award of all or part of such interest is just in the circumstances.

(e) The protections of this section shall not apply to any conduct that occurs during the effective period of any court order enjoining such conduct as a result of a claim under the antitrust laws or any State law similar to the antitrust laws.

ATTORNEY'S FEES

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding section 4, 4C, or 16 of the Clayton Act, in any claim under the antitrust laws, or any State law similar to the antitrust laws, based on conduct that results from a joint research and development venture, the court shall, at the conclusion of the action, award to the substantially prevailing party the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee. In the interest of justice, the award may be reduced or withheld and may be reduced by an award in favor of any other party for any part of the cost of suit attributable to such claim, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

DISCLOSURE OF JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT VENTURE

SEC. 6. (a) In accordance with rules issued by the Attorney General in consultation with the Commission, any person who is a party to a joint research and development venture may file simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission a written notification disclosing—

(1) the identities of the parties to such venture, and

(2) the nature, objectives, and duration of such venture.

Any person who is a party to such venture may file such additional disclosure notifications pursuant to this section as are appropriate to extend the protections of section 4.

(b) In accordance with rules issued by the Attorney General in consultation with the Commission, and except as provided in subsection (d), not later than sixty days after receiving a notification filed under subsection (a), the Attorney General or the Commission shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice of such joint research and development venture which identifies the parties to such venture and which describes in general terms the area of planned activity and duration of such venture. Prior to its publication, the contents of the notice shall be made available to the parties to such venture.

(c) Except as to the information published in the Federal Register pursuant to subsection (b), all information and documentary material submitted as part of a notification filed pursuant to this section and all other information obtained by the Attorney General or the Commission in the course of any investigation or enforcement action shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall not be made publicly available by any agency of the United States to which section 552 applies.

(d) Any person who has filed a notification pursuant to this section may withdraw such notification prior to the time at which notice of such research and development venture is published in the Federal Register. Any notification so withdrawn shall not be subject to subsection (b) and shall not confer the protections of section 4 on any person with respect to whom such notification was filed.

(e) Any action taken or not taken by the Attorney General or the Commission with respect to notifications filed pursuant to this section, shall not be subject to judicial review.

(f) For the sole purpose of establishing that a person is entitled to the protections of section 4, the fact of disclosure of conduct under section 6(a) and the fact of publication of a notice under section 6(b) shall be admissible into evidence. But no action by the Attorney General or the Commission taken pursuant to this section shall be admissible into evidence in any administrative or judicial proceeding for the purpose of supporting or answering any claim under the antitrust laws, or under any State law similar to the antitrust laws.

(g) The rules promulgated under this section shall be subject to the public notice and comment requirements of section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during the 97th Congress, the gentleman from California (Mr. MINETA) and I introduced a bill to clarify the application of our antitrust laws to joint research and development programs. Some 3 years have passed since that time, during which support for this type of legislation has grown without regard to party lines or to economic philosophy. I am pleased that this issue is now ripe for action by the House and that a similar bill has recently been reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In crafting what is now H.R. 5041, the Committee on the Judiciary had the benefit of the hard work and analysis that had gone before it. Aspects of the disclosure system set out in the bill are very similar to a bill proposed by Mr. MOORHEAD on behalf of the administration. And we have learned a great deal from earlier legislative proposals, not only my own, but also that of Chairman FUQUA of the Science and Technology Committee and that introduced by our distinguished ranking minority Member, Mr. FISH.

The legislation before us will clear the decks of any unnecessary antitrust obstacles to legitimate joint research and development. It comes not a moment too soon. To be sure, our basic science is still, without question, the finest in the world. Yet, we seem to be experiencing a critical gap between the discoveries of basic science and the application of that information and new knowledge to our marketable goods and services. Whether America is, in fact, losing its overall technological leadership to others is a complex question. But if one looks at the decline of the U.S. share of world exports of manufactured goods, including technology-intensive goods, one can be very certain that we are in the midst of changing patterns of production and consumption in what can only be described as a global economy.

America must maintain and strengthen its competitive position in a changing marketplace—a marketplace where all participants may not play by the same rules and where some may take advantage of the relative openness of the U.S. economy and our devotion to free trade. Certainly, in some countries, industry has the benefit of government subsidies that we do not give to American firms. But H.R. 5041 does not grant anyone a subsidy. Nor does it provide anyone carte blanche to violate the antitrust laws. The legislation does, however, clear a path for jointly conducted R&D programs that can make the difference in cases in which research by individual firms is either too expensive or too inefficient to be carried out alone.

Successful innovation, especially in the high-technology fields, depends upon a very subtle blend of cooperation and competition. H.R. 5041 strikes this note by sending a clear signal to American businesses that joint research, properly structured, is favored under our antitrust laws. That we can create this favored status without substantially altering the fabric of our antitrust laws disputes the theory that antitrust and high technology cannot advance together into the 21st century.

The bill has three operative sections. It mandates application of the rule of reason in any antitrust claim directed at a joint research and development program. Thus, under either Federal or State law, no joint R&D venture may be condemned as per se unlawful.

The bill also grants to the substantially prevailing party in a private antitrust suit the costs of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. But unlike earlier proposals, the adverse effect of this provision on an unsuccesful plaintiff is tempered by allowing that plaintiff to collect costs, including a reasonable attorney's fee, if in the interest of justice.

Finally, by disclosing to the Department of Justice, the FTC, and the public the parameters of the joint research and development program, the maximum liability in any civil antitrust suit will be reduced to actual damages plus interest. While such disclosure will eliminate the pervasive threat wielded by treble-damage actions, privacy safeguards in section 6 insure that it will not lead to the release of sensitive proprietary information.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a responsible and balanced piece of legislation that we all can enthusiastically support. I hope you will join with us today in the bipartisan effort to maintain and strengthen American technological leadership.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), the very distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, whose cooperation in this bill is sincerely appreciated.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me. I want to commend him and the gentleman from California (Mr. MINETA) and the ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH), for their leadership in crafting this bill. It was their idea that motivated this legislation. I think it is a responsible piece of legislation, sorely needed at this time when we are moving in an area of advanced technology.

For this reason, I rise in support of H.R. 5041, the Joint Research and Development Act of 1984. This carefully crafted bill is the product of the efforts of two committees. It addresses an important issue for the economic health of our Nation—the ability of our businesses to stay apace of foreign competitors in research and development.

The record gathered by the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law does not document widespread antitrust problems for those who jointly undertake research and development. There have been only two or three reported cases involving antitrust challenges to joint R&D. And many of the competitive problems that U.S. industry has confronted in recent years appear to be due not to failures in research and development, but to the relative weakness of the United States in efficient production of products on which research and development information is readily available.

But the record does suggest that some R&D endeavors, particularly costly long-term efforts, may be more efficiently conducted if two or more firms join forces. Indeed, some research may be so expensive that no single firm acting alone can afford it. The record also suggests a perception problem for many businesses that might choose such joint R&D undertakings—a belief that jointly conducted R&D will substantially increase the risk of antitrust exposure. This perception, whether or not based on fact, may deter firms from combining their R&D endeavors.

To address this problem, the Committee on the Judiciary has reported a bill that clarifies the antitrust standard applicable to joint research and development, provides a notification procedure for limiting the damage exposure of such ventures, and discourages unwise or frivolous antitrust suits by awarding attorneys fees to the successful defendant. These changes will substantially benefit companies that are considering joint R&D undertakings. They send a clear signal that such undertakings are to be looked upon with relative favor under the antitrust laws.

I understand that some would favor more expansive legislation granting more protection, or even outright antitrust immunity, to joint R&D activity. The committee, however, rightly guarded against overreaction. The antitrust laws have provided funda-

mental protection for the free market system since enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890. The incentives of competition, firm against firm, are essential in fostering research and innovation by individual firms. In many industries, small firms are the most innovative and creative in bringing new products and processes into the market. Thus, no legislation enacted by Congress should create an automatic exemption for all jointly conducted R&D activity. And legitimate joint R&D should not be an excuse to restrain competition in marketing or sales, or for imposing competitive restraints on activity unrelated to joint R&D.

We have before us today a consensus bill—a balanced measure that enjoys enthusiastic support from the members of the Judiciary Committee. I am pleased that Chairman FUQUA of the Science and Technology Committee has joined in approving this legislation. I want to thank him and the other members of his committee for their cooperation in moving this important legislation toward enactment. Finally, I want to thank the floor manager of this bill, Mr. EDWARDS, for his leadership in bringing responsible legislation to a vote.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5041.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Joint Research and Development Act of 1984 (H.R. 5041).

This measure is analogous to, and patterned after title II of the National Productivity and Innovation Act (H.R. 3878)—legislation which I introduced last year on behalf of the administration. Like that bill, H.R. 5041 makes it clear that research and development joint ventures are judged under the rule of reason standard in antitrust law. Further, the measure limits the potential damages against a research and development joint venture to actual damages, plus interest, and attorneys fees.

The elimination of potential treble damage liability, along with the reinforcement of congressional intent on the applicability of the rule of reason test to these joint ventures is significant. It will serve to remove the clouds of deterrence and doubt that currently hover over these types of cooperative activities, discouraging their very formation. The overriding purpose of H.R. 5041 and its legislative predecessors, is to encourage American companies to compete more effectively in the international marketplace. It is a refinement in the antitrust laws, modifying the disproportionate incentives currently available to private litigants who may seek to undermine the viability of particular joint ventures.

American businesses should be able to enter into legitimate cooperative arrangements to pursue scientific and technological investigation, without an undue fear of costly litigation and potential treble damage judgments. At the same time, H.R. 5041 does not alter the current law as to any production and marketing by a joint venture. Once a discovery is jointly arrived at, the participants may seek patent protection and license the results of their investigation. But they receive no additional antitrust protection with respect to marketing or production activities. The line is a clear and fair one to draw.

H.R. 5041 represents compromise and cooperation on the part of the members of two committees of this House—the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Science and Technology. The Reagan administration, particularly through the efforts of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice, has been of great assistance in formulating and refining the provisions of this important legislation. I understand that the Judiciary Committee in the other body has processed similar legislation and favorable floor action is likely there in the near future.

At times, this legislation has been characterized by some as a high tech bill. While this is true in part, it also should be emphasized that the benefits of this new statute will be available to all types of American business—steel and automobiles as well as electronics, pharmaceutical companies as well as computer firms.

This is needed legislation, developed in a truly bipartisan manner. It deserves the favorable support of this House.

□ 1300

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. position in international business is—in some ways—analogous to our position in the Olympic games. Many countries develop their best athletic talent through subsidies and other incentives. Their definitions of "professionals" and "amateurs" is very different than ours. U.S. business is in a similar situation. During recent years foreign firms have gained advantages over American firms in high technology industries largely because the former have been openly encouraged by their respective governments to pool their R&D resources in order to improve their position in the international market. On the other hand, our Nation's companies have avoided such action out of fear of the application of U.S. antitrust laws. Our long-held lead in technological innovation has begun to decline as a direct result of U.S. business' inability to emulate foreign joint R&D ventures out of fear of violating vague antitrust laws. If we are to retain our technological lead in the world. this costly difference between U.S. and foreign business practices needs immediate attention.

As D. Bruce Merrifield, Assistant Commerce Secretary for Technology, said:

> When a nation targets an area, no company can meet the challenge alone. We can either exit the business, raise trade barriers, or get our act together.

The most viable response to our shrinking lead in the area of high technology seems to be the promotion of more R&D. R&D is as important to high tech industries as oil is necessary to the efficient running of an automobile.

STATS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF R&D TO HIGH TECH

The benefits of joint R&D are obvious: It prevents duplication of work among competitors, thus reducing unnecessary overhead costs which are ultimately passed on to the consumer. It also creates an environment in which more and better research and development can be carried on. This all adds up to increased cost efficiency.

The American auto industry is well aware of this. Each of the three major auto manufacturers separately spent hundreds of millions of dollars developing basically the same catalytic converter because the Federal Government prevented them from working together.

This case sharply contrasts the reaction of private and public sectors of the Japanese business community with the American development of the semiconductor and integrated circuit. The Japanese formed the very large scale integration (VLSI) group as a vehicle which would bring Japan into the market. The organization was comprised of three joint ventures, including such corporate giants as Hitachi, NEC, Toshiba, and Fujitsu.

The results of the VLSI are painfully obvious. The message is clear: Foreign joint R&D ventures have created a serious challenge to American leadership in the R&D intensive field of technological innovation.

So, what is preventing companies from entering into these partnerships? Answer: Vague and threatening antitrust laws.

I believe our country is now confronted with a clear choice. Either we can adjust our antitrust laws to allow our internationally involved businesses to compete on more equal terms with foreign businesses, thus giving our companies a fair opportunity to develop their products, or we can remain inflexible, and continue our competitive decline.

When antitrust legislation was enacted in the late 1800's, it was thought that anticompetitive practices would

be discouraged if a company found guilty had to pay three times the actual damages its illegal practices cause, that is, treble damages. But now the fear of violating antitrust law is so great that U.S. businessmen shy away from joint ventures even when they are legally sound.

A recent example illustrates the problem. As soon as the 12 company consortium known as the Microelectronics Computer Corporation (MCC) announced its formation, it received warnings, including a suit-threatening letter from a respected senior San Francisco antitrust attorney. What makes this example rare is that MCC, one of the few joint R&D projects now in progress, has decided to ride out the storm of antitrust suit threats.

But the threat of possible suit is ever present and the possibility of paying treble damages is enough of a threat that many constructive joint ventures never make it to the planning room.

H.R. 5041 strikes a balance. The strong policy against unfair competitive practices is retained as well as the remedies for violation. However, the size of the remedy is reduced—or detreblized, allowing only for the awarding of actual damages—which lowers the barrier against entering into joint ventures. The law will then be effectively modified to encourage activities in research and development.

It is important to note that the suggested modification in antitrust law, if passed, would represent the first modification in the treble damages remedy since 1890. However, this would not change the basic thrust and purpose of the antitrust laws.

Even if the U.S. Government allows American companies to pool their resources for research and development, they will continue to uphold the spirit and the letter of the antitrust laws. Anticompetitive practices such as price fixing have never been tolerated under antitrust laws and will not be in the future.

Our economy is entering a new economic revolution, shifting its focus from one based predominantly on an industrial sector to one of a high tech orientation. New areas of activity are developing, once again creating producing dubious results. In this case however, business is the victim, not the offender. It now appears that the perception of our antitrust laws in this area is contributing to an uneven international field of competition which is eroding our world technological lead. The passage of H.R. 5041 is absolutely essential if we are to maintain that lead and expand our participation in international markets.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ZSCHAU).

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, the challenge that we face today in the United States is creating enough new productive jobs for our growing work force. We hear many proposals to meet that challenge. Some suggest industrial trageting whereby some sort of government body would try to identify growth opportunities and allocate taxpayer dollars to them. Experience suggests that such a central planning approach—although it has laudable objectives—would be doomed to failure.

An alternative approach is to improve the environment for innovation in this country and thereby stimulate technological development, new products, and new processes, which will increase the competitiveness of U.S. businesses in all those areas where opportunities exist. This approach does not involve massive Government expenditures and it works. It stimulates the private sector to do what it does best—make products, serve customers, and create jobs.

H.R. 5041 is an initiative that we can take now to enable our U.S. companies to become more competitive. H.R. 5041 would permit companies to pool their scarce research resources to pursue projects that are either too risky or too expensive for any single company to do alone. The technical breakthroughs that we need today in order to increase competitiveness dramatically require projects that are more expensive and more risky than they have been in the part.

Second, we have a scarcity of trained technical people in this country. Japan trains twice as many engineers per capita as we do. If we are going to make the best use of the engineers that we do have we must permit companies to combine resources and jointly pursue projects where they have mutual interests.

Third, the United States is facing competition from industrial consortiums abroad. In 1970, IBM had more than 60 percent of the Japanese computer market. During the 1970's, at a time when the U.S. Government was prosecuting IBM on antitrust grounds, the Japanese Government was allowing Japanese computer companies to work together on joint research projects. It was subsidizing the research too. As a result, IBM has only 40 percent of the Japanese market today.

H.R. 5041 would permit U.S. companies to compete more effectively against the consortiums that have been encouraged and even subsidized by our foreign trading competitors.

Finally, I would just like to stress one point that has been made here today. H.R. 5041 is not just a high technology bill. It would enable companies in the steel industry, the automobile industry, the durable goods industry, the construction industry to pool their resources to find ways to solve common problems, to improve their products, to improve their production processes. If we have new products, we have new processes, then we will get new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 5041.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee has been working closely on this legislation with the great Committee on Science and Technology chaired by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) who represents the chairman of that great committee.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for bringing the bill H.R. 5041 before us today. This legislation should remove the barrier that current antitrust law presents to legitimate attempts by businesses to pool resources to solve research problems.

Last June, I chaired a set of hearings entitled "Japanese Technological Advances and Possible U.S. Responses Using Joint Ventures." We learned from these hearings that the Japanese Government actively encourages its industry to do cooperative research but our antitrust laws stifle similar American cooperation. We followed up in July with legislative hearings on several research and development joint venture bills followed by several days of markup which led to H.R. 4043, which the Science Committee reported unanimously last November. In my opinion, the bill before us captures the spirit of the Science Committee's work and should be helpful in removing unintended roadblocks to legitimate scientific cooperation among corporations.

When my subcommittee began work on our R&D joint venture bill, our committee reflected three major concerns. We sought definitions which would permit companies to do research together but which would preserve the historic, beneficial protections that antitrust laws have provided the American consumer.

Second, if a joint venture does stray into illegal activity, we felt that actual damages, not treble damages, were the appropriate penalty. Third, we felt that the strict "per se" violation rule of our antitrust law should not be applied to research and development. But rather a test of reasonable effect of the actions at issue should be applied. H.R. 5041 answers each of these concerns in an unambiguous manner.

I applaud the Judiciary Committee for adding a clear description of proscribed activities to the Science Committee's definition of a joint venture. When these two provisions are examined side by side, there should be no reasonable doubt in a company's mind

both that the Congress wants to encourage joint research and development and that it has no intention to weaken the essential antitrust bans against dominant companies developing and marketing new products together.

The bill sets out a neat, simple mechanism that guarantees that actual damages plus attorney's fees are the outside limit of damages companies will face if their joint venture runs afoul of antitrust rules. Furthermore, it states unambiguously that R&D projects conducted jointly shall not be considered to be illegal per se. These two provisions should end the chilling effect witnesses before our committee described to be a major disadvantage to American companies in international competition.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5041. It is a clean, straightforward bill which will go a long way toward removing the artificial impediments that American firms often face when they consider solving common research problems together.

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to join the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in urging passage of H.R. 5041, the Joint Research and Development Act of 1984. This bill represents a carefully crafted compromise between H.R. 5041 as introduced and the more comprehensive H.R. 4043, which was reported last November by the Committee on Science and Technology. I am supporting H.R. 5041, not as the ideal solution to antitrust problems facing joint ventures, but as the best legislative response to the problems we can hope to enact this year. Given the attention comparable legislation is receiving in the Senate and the administration's favorable disposition toward the bill, I am reasonably confident that H.R. 5041 can become law this year if our colleagues approve it today.

Last summer in oversight and legislative hearings, the Committee on Science and Technology examined the negative impact of existing antitrust law on research and development joint ventures. We followed up last fall with markup of H.R. 4043 over a several day period. We consider our major accomplishments in that bill to be a comprehensive definition of R&D joint ventures, elimination of treble damages if a joint venture violates antitrust law, antitrust exemptions for R&D joint ventures qualifying under safe harbor and negative clearance procedures, modification of the per se rule, antitrust exemption for attempts to form joint ventures, and a more reasonable attorney's fee provision. I am pleased to report that the Judiciary Committee has addressed all of these topics except safe harbor and negative clearance.

The definitional section combines the best work of both committees. The main section closely follows the work of the Committee on Science and Technology while section (b), added by the Judiciary Committee, declares that several of the major proscribed areas in antitrust law are out of bounds for R&D joint ventures as well. Also at the suggestion of the Science Committee, the subsection 2(b) 2(c) has been modified to permit patents, which are integrally related to inventions and developments of the joint venture, to be sold, licensed or shared as part of the joint venture activities. This reflects the likelihood that most joint ventures will involve partners holding background patents or patents related to components or processes used in the invention or development. Transferability of those related patents will be essential to the success of the joint venture.

The changes in the disclosure section of H.R. 5041 clearly improve that legislation. They move it close to the Science Committee position that actual damages should be the upper liability limit in an antitrust case relating to jointly performed research and development.

The Justice Department now clearly has only an administrative function related to joint venture filings; after the Justice Department, within 60 days, gives public notice in the Federal Register of the joint venture's existence, the actual damages limit automatically applies to that venture.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that we have not included a procedure in this legislation such as safe harbor or negative clearance which would permit companies to establish with certainty that their joint venture does not run afoul of antitrust laws. However, I also realize that inclusion of such a provision, however meritorious, would decrease the chances of any reforms being enacted into law. I am willing at this point to push ahead with the major improvements currently contained in H.R. 5041 with the hope that in a later Congress, we will revisit the safe harbor question and push for its enactment as well. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to give their wholehearted support to this legislation which makes major advances toward the goal of permitting American industry to work together to solve its research problems and to meet the technological competition from overseas.

At this point I include a comparative analysis of the two bills and the compromise, which has been prepared by the staff of the Committee on Science and Technology and approved by the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary:

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4043, H.R. 5041, AND AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 5041

H.R. 4043	H.R. 5041	Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 5041
Section 1. Title: Research and Development Joint Venture.	Section 1. Title: Joint Research and Development Act of 1984.	Identical to H.R. 5041.
Section 2. Findings and Purposes.	No similar provision.	No similar provision.
Definitional section found at Section 12. No exclusionary language provided.	Section 2. Definitions and Limitations. Inclusionary and exclusionary language provided for definition of joint R&D.	Term "Joint research and development program" changed to "joint research and development venture." Inclusionary and exclusionary language expanded to include work on prototypes and process improvements; prohibition section reworded such that patents integrally related to the work of the joint venture as well as licenses and patents resulting from its work may be the subject of agreements between parties to a R&D joint venture.
Section 3. Application of the antitrust laws (to the making or performing of a contract to carry out R&D projects).	No similar provision.	No similar provision.
Similar provision in section 9.	Section 3. Per se violations shall be judged under the rule of reason standard.	Similar to H.R. 5041. Report language makes clear that worldwide competition and the relevant research market(s) are to be considered in a rule of reason analysis.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4043, H.R. 5041, AND AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 5041—Continued

H.R. 4043	H.R. 5041	Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 5041
Section 4. Notification of Attorney General. These two subsections establish "safe harbor" standards under which a R&D joint venture can be formed and carried out without risk of violation of the antitrust laws.	No similar "safe harbor" provision.	No similar "safe harbor" provision.
No similar provision.	Section 4. Limitation on recovery. Voluntary disclosure of the parameters of joint R&D program results in limiting liability in civil suits to actual damages plus prejudgment interest. Attorney fees recoverable by substantially prevailing party in accordance with section 5. Section does not grant immunity from antitrust suits, but merely sets the limits on recovery. Limitation on recovery does not apply after an order granting a permanent injunction issued against protected conduct.	Similar to H.R. 5041, with the exception of language in § 4(e) that damage limitations do not apply during the effective period of a court order enjoining protected conduct.
Section 5. Clearance Procedure. Section establishes a procedure for advance review by the Attorney General of proposals for joint venture R&D, with automatic "clearance" if adverse action taken by Attorney General within a specified period. Following clearance, immunity (with the exception of injunctive relief) from antitrust suits attaches.	No similar certification provision. (A voluntary notification procedure is established in Section 6, with properly disclosed conduct being subject to actual damages, plus interest as provided in section 4.)	No similar certification provision. (Similar voluntary notification procedure as found in H.R. 5041.)
Attorney's fees provision found at section 11. Fees awarded to successful defendant if plaintiff has acted in bad faith.	Section 5. Attorney's fees. Substantially prevailing party in private antitrust suit receives the costs of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fees. Award may be reduced or withheld in the interest of justice. Report language addresses concerns raised by Rep. Frank during full Committee mark-up.	Similar to H.R. 5041. (See note on report language to H.R. 5041.)
Section 6. Investigation by the Attorney General. This section allows the Attorney General to investigate the accuracy of information submitted under sections 4 or 5, and provides safeguards, or exemption, from public disclosure for information submitted. Results of AG's investigation inadmissible as evidence in private antitrust cases.	Section 6. Disclosure of Joint Research and Development Program. Voluntary notification procedure established, with antitrust enforcement agencies assigned ministerial functions. Publication of abbreviated notice of the R&D program in the Federal Register triggers reduced liability exposure for parties to the venture, as set out in section 4. Increased privacy safeguards for proprietary information submitted to the DOJ and FTC. Inadmissibility as evidence of any action taken by the antitrust agencies for purpose of supporting or answering a claim under the antitrust laws. Additional disclosures are to be made by the parties as are appropriate.	Similar to H.R. 5041, with the exception of language making clear that additional disclosures by parties will extend the protections of section 4.
Section 7. Attempts to make contracts. Attempts to form R&D joint ventures exempted from antitrust laws (to eliminate concern on the part of prospective parties that preliminary discussions may be viewed as illegal activity).	Attempts to form joint ventures are covered in the definitions of section 2, and are to be judged under the rule of reason standard, as with other proper joint R&D conduct.	Similar to Section 2 of H.R. 5041. (See note on H.R. 5041.)
Section 8. Claims under the antitrust laws. This section declares that the mere fact that a joint venture does not comply with the provisions of either the safe harbor or negative clearance sections does not render the joint venture's conduct a violation of the antitrust laws.	No similar provision. Report language makes clear that all R&D conduct to be judged under rule of reason standard regardless of whether voluntary disclosure made under section 6.	No similar provision. (See note on report language to H.R. 5041.)
Section 9. Per se violations of the antitrust laws. This section provides that all joint venture R&D projects shall be judged under the rule of reason standard.	Similar to section 3.	Similar to section 3.
Section 10. Modification of Damages. This section establishes actual damages, prejudgment interest and the costs of the suit, as the recovery limits for antitrust violations found to occur as a result of a joint venture R&D project.	Similar to section 4, in which damages for conduct disclosed under section 6 are limited to actual damages plus prejudgment interest and the costs of the suit.	Similar to H.R. 5041. (See note on H.R. 5041.)

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4043, H.R. 5041, AND AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 5041—Continued

H.R. 4043	H.R. 5041	Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 5041
Section 11. Attorney's fees. Attorney's fees awarded to successful defendant in an antitrust claim involving a R&D joint venture if plaintiff has acted in bad faith.	Section 5 awards attorney's fees to the prevailing party. Such fees may be reduced or withheld in the interest of justice.	Similar to section 5 of H.R. 5041.
Section 12. Definitions. Most important of these is the treatment of an "R&D joint venture project." The definition covers basic and applied research as well as research leading to process improvement.	Section 2 sets out definitions and limitations. Definitions of "joint research and development program" contains both inclusionary and exclusionary language.	Similar to H.R. 5041, but with the following changes: (1) term "joint research and development program" changed to "joint research and development venture"; (2) definition of R&D expanded to include work in prototypes and process improvements; (3) exclusions not to extend to patents integrally related to the work of the joint venture.
Section 13. Effective Date.	No similar provision.	No similar provision.
Section 14. Severability.	No similar provision.	No similar provision.●

□ 1310

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. MINETA).

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my strong support to H.R. 5041, the Joint Research and Development Act. I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from "Silicon Valley," Mr. EDWARDS of California as well as Mr. FUQUA and Mr. WALGREN in their work on this bill.

In many ways, bringing this bill to fruition represents Congress at its best. Without abrogating or undermining the kind of protection offered to the public by antitrust law, we are adding to this body of law to allow visionary and creative endeavors by American industry. In fact, the laws we enact are meant to be flexible and reflective of changing times and new realities. Antitrust laws are no exception. By rethinking and recrafting antitrust statutes today, we are indeed paving the way for new and highly profitable ventures which ultimately will serve business and consumer alike.

Research and development is the backbone of our economy. This is true for high tech as well as for smokestack industries. Without new products and without innovation, our economy will stagnate. We in this country have never taken a static view of industry and technology, and legislation such as the one under consideration today takes into account the need to make research and development serve our overall economic well-being.

The share of American gross national product going into research and development is lower today than it was a generation ago. The rate of increase in American R&D investment averaged 5 percent a year in the 1960 to 1969 decade. But it dropped to a low of 1.4 percent a year in the 1970 to 1979 decade. The lesson from this development is that we are devoting a smaller fraction of our resources to our future economic security than at any time since the mid-1950's.

One deterrent to R&D spending is the sheer enormity of investment required to bring out major new advancements. Creating next-generation computer chips, satellites, aircraft, or even such basic industrial products as machine tools requires billions of dollars of investment. The road from the drawing board to full production is a long and costly one and we have to facilitate industry's ability to carry this off. To a reasonable degree, antitrust laws should promote industry cooperation in this regard—not deter it.

We face ever-increasing competition in the global marketplace. Antitrust laws in other countries are often less strict than our own, and companies can more easily enter into joint research projects and business groups to lower their costs and to spread the risks. How, then, can we ask our own industries to enter the competition hampered by stricter rules and a lesser commitment by the U.S. Government? Clearly, we cannot ask this.

This is why I urge my colleagues to vote for the Joint Research and Development Act today and thank our colleague for California (Mr. EDWARDS) for his leadership and perseverance in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), who has been of assistance on this bill.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5041. Because of the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are considering today legislation that will promote the kind of private investment in joint research and development projects that is vital to our national well-being.

In a world economy that is driven by increasingly rapid technological change, American businesses must invest in extensive—and expensive—research and development programs. But only the largest corporations can maintain the sophisticated technical capacity needed to develop new products, and even they often find the cost too high to bear alone. For smaller businesses on the cutting edge of new technologies, the ability to work cooperatively, and share the risk, can determine whether or not R&D work is undertaken.

This legislation encourages joint R&D programs by eliminating uncertainty about the application of our antitrust laws. It clearly spells out the legitimacy of these efforts. And it is equally clear in protecting the consumer from anticompetitive practices involving the production and marketing of new products.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5041.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Joint Research and Development Act of 1984, of which I am an original cosponsor.

This is a bipartisan work product.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because of the diligent bipartisan efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) the chairman of the full committee (Mr. RODINO) and on our side, because of the initiatives of Messrs. MOORHEAD, LUNGREN, and SENSENBRENNER.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will go far toward encouraging cooperative research ventures between competitors, particularly in high technology, where it is most needed. Cooperative research enterprise is vital to our national interest if our objective is, as it must be, not merely to survive but to prevail in the world marketplace.

Perhaps mindful of my own legislative initiative in this area, H.R. 3641, I would have prefered a bill without a notification procedure. Indeed, the committee report makes such a strong case against notification that one is

almost startled to find it still in the bill. I also favor the unqualified award of attorneys fees to prevailing defendants. But there are enough other elements in this legislation to make H.R. 5041 a strong bill, indeed, an essential bill. There is no question that mandating the application of the rule of reason and the provision of single damages for antitrust violations within the scope of R&D joint ventures are critically important incentives for cooperative research by American industry.

I would like to clarify the legislative history on two points. It was clearly the intention of the committee to extend the protection of the bill to development as well as research. The "bright line" is drawn between these activities, on the one hand, and marketing or commercial use of the research product on the other. This is not consistently clear in the committee report. In addition the definition of a joint research and development program is not intended to represent a distinction between permissible and nonpermissible conduct—see page 4 of the committee report. Legality is unrelated to what is in a program. Participants acting within the scope of the venture may happen to engage in conduct which is violative of the antitrust laws, although I hope this will not be the case. The point is that such illegal activities will be punishable by single damages. In sum, conduct which is legal and illegal may fall both within and without the ambit of the R&D program.

Credit for advancing this legislation to this stage properly goes to many individuals on both the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Science and Technology. Not to be overlooked, however, is the Republican task force on high technology initiatives, under the able chairmanship of my colleague from California, ED ZSCHAU. While a number of R&D bills were working their way through the committee stage, the Republican task force performed an important informational and promotional function which has also materially helped to advance this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5041 is supported by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 5041 will allay the fears of the business community regarding their antitrust exposure and will underscore our commitment to regaining America's competitive edge in world markets. Accordingly, I strongly urge its enactment.

□ 1320

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES), a member of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary in supporting H.R. 5041, the Joint Research and Development Act.

The antitrust laws are a vital protection for the competitive economy that has stood this Nation in good stead from the very beginning. Competition is a major incentive for research and development. Spurred by competitive incentives to gain a larger market share, the small company may hold the key to our technological leadership. I am told, for example, that small companies frequently introduce new and innovative products in the computer and telecommunications industries before their bigger brethren, such as IBM and AT&T.

So, generally speaking, concentrating all R&D in cartel-like ventures among competing corporations will not serve the cause of innovation. But there are situations in which joint R&D can be helpful or even vital to maintaining technological leadership. For example, if R&D projects are long term and costly, it may be extremely inefficient to have each competing firm attempt these projects independently. Indeed, individual firms may choose not to conduct such research at all. Or, if it is done, the burden may fall on the Government, and ultimately on the taxpayer, to finance it.

The legislation before us today represents a measured approach, designed to encourage the right kind of a joint R&D venture. It clarifies the antitrust standard, assuring that no joint research endeavor is deemed per se illegal. It also provides that plaintiffs who unsuccessfully sue such a joint venture pay attorney's fees to the joint venture. And, if a particular joint venture desires additional protection, there is a procedure for reporting the venture to the antitrust agencies—receiving in return an actual damages' limitation in any private antitrust suit challenging the venture's conduct.

I understand that some would prefer legislation that grants broader protection to joint researchers. But I am satisfied that we have struck a proper balance. We have acted to clear unnecessary obstacles to legitimate joint research endeavors while maintaining the protections that the antitrust laws provide for competition. A competitive market structure will, in the long term, provide the best guarantee that our research and development ventures serve the public interest.

I congratulate all of my colleagues on the Judiciary who worked so diligently on H.R. 5041 particularly our chairman, Mr. RODINO, the ranking Republican, Mr. FISH, and Mr. EDWARDS. It is a good bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NELSON).

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is an example of the megatrends in this country—new directions in which America is moving. Shared technology and cooperative ventures are the order of the day. Cooperation among U.S. firms, if it is properly structured, can be a significant way for conducting research and development efficiently and for enhancing American productivity and making us the most competitive in world markets.

Today, we see the need to reduce the potential legal liability of joint American R&D ventures.

H.R. 5041 would clarify the existing treatment under antitrust laws of joint research and development programs undertaken by businesses or groups of individuals.

The bill codifies a stand found in existing law that no conduct which meets the definition of a "joint R&D program" is to be deemed "illegal per se." This provision requires courts before condemning R&D joint ventures, to first consider their potential benefits.

The bill creates a voluntary notification system whereby parties to a R&D joint venture would disclose the identities of the parties, and the nature of the venture to the antitrust enforcement agencies, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and thereby receive reduce damage exposure from civil suits based on such activities. Companies complying with these notification provisions would be subject to actual damages in antitrust suits brought against them rather than treble damages.

I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA), and others who have crafted this legislation. I have been privileged to cosponsor similar legislation, H.R. 4043, authored by Mr. FUQUA.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5041, the Joint Research and Development Act. I believe this legislation is necessary to increase the incentive for competitive-minded joint ventures. H.R. 5041 does this by lessening fears of large antitrust penalties stemming from cooperative efforts.

The Federal Government should foster industry cooperation aimed at making a better product and increasing competitiveness. However, our antitrust laws governing cooperative efforts (section 1 of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act) say that cooperation is in violation if it lessens competition. The line between joint ventures that foster competition and those that increase monopoly power is not drawn clearly. Consequently, the uncertainty of when antitrust penalties would be violated has stifled joint venture activity. This view

has been supported by the National Academy of Sciences.

In 1980, the U.S. Department of Justice issued an "Antitrust Guide Concerning Research Joint Ventures" to clarify the law. These guidelines have decreased some of the present law's uncertainty. But treble damages for violations probably still discourage truly competitive ventures.

The U.S. sorely needs industry cooperation in this age of greatly heightened international competition. Our best industrial policy may be to encourage industries to be more efficient, including research through joint enterprises. H.R. 5041 will provide a better environment for cooperation, while keeping appropriate penalties in place.

I also believe H.R. 5041 will help strengthen local industry in Cincinnati. Several local industries could likely benefit through more joint efforts. In addition, the new Institute for Advanced Manufacturing Science in Cincinnati could benefit through increased participation by local firms that have been encouraged to cooperate because of this bill.

I commend the Judiciary Committee for their hard and diligent work and I hope this body will move to strengthen the U.S. economy by passing H.R. 5041.●

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original authors of legislation on this subject, H.R. 3393, I endorse the efforts embodied in this legislation to remove the disincentive inherent in our antitrust laws that inhibit the formation of research and development joint ventures. This action is imperative if we are to insure the future economic viability of our country, and begin to perceive and confront world competition.

As I indicated in my additional views accompanying this legislation, our antitrust laws implicitly inhibit the ability of U.S. corporations to conduct joint research and development by providing an incentive for costly litigation. Although some of my colleagues believe that this view is more a matter of perception rather than reality, I respectfully suggest that in this instance, perception is reality. If the antitrust threat is perceived to be so great that a particular R&D project is not undertaken, it is immaterial what the Supreme Court might have decided about it years later if it had been undertaken and litigated. In fact, the paucity of decided cases, and thus precedents, is itself one of the reasons for this uncertainty.

Private litigation is an even greater threat to joint ventures than Government action. In order to encourage private attorneys general to supplement the Federal Government's enforcement of the antitrust laws, triple damages are provided as a reward for litigation. Thus, antitrust attorneys are encouraged to file lawsuits. The threat of litigation has seriously affected the private sector's perception of joint research and development cooperation. Unless this perception is removed, businesses will be reluctant to conduct joint research and development under our current interpretation of our antitrust laws.

While this legislation does address the issue of treble damages it does so in a manner that imposes a precondition to the obtaining of relief. Under section 4(a), treble damages are reduced to actual damages only if the notification is deemed sufficient, and in conformance with the requirements of section 6. This determination, I am afraid, can only be made by a court, after extensive litigation, encouraged by the prospect of treble damages. Only after the litigation is concluded will the joint ventures know whether they are liable and whether their damages are times 1 or times 3.

Further, the issue of good faith compliance is not directly addressed in the legislation. Good faith compliance must be taken into consideration, if potential litigants are not to be encouraged to find unintentional errors in the notice so as to obtain treble damages.

While I support the passage of H.R. 5041, I am hopeful that these deficiencies will be remedied prior to its enactment.●

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5041. This bill does what I consider to be the minimum to promote cooperative research and development efforts in the private sector. The antitrust laws today have too much of a chilling effect on cooperative R&D ventures. This is counterproductive to our national interests and has become especially critical in the last few years when we have been trying to shift more of the Government's research and development efforts into the private sector while continuing to compete internationally against government-industry trade partnerships.

Although there are some similarities to the bill that the gentleman from Wisconsin and I introduced in June last year, I fear that it provides minimal protection for industrial R&D joint ventures in the face of Federal and State antitrust laws.

As I have previously stated, this country does not have a Government organization to underwrite and coordinate industrial activities overseas such as Japan has, and yet we continue to hang this antitrust sword of Damocles over our industry should they attempt to respond in kind with cooperative research and development programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to see this legislation include immunity and exemption from Federal and similar State antitrust laws for any venture by meeting statutory standards that the Congress could set in the law. This would have completely removed the threat of antitrust lawsuits for cooperative research and development efforts.

Additionally, I would have preferred to see this legislation include a provision which would limit the liability of any joint research and development venture should it fail to meet the requirements of the act and be held in violation of the Federal antitrust laws. Although this bill, H.R. 5041, purports to limit liability to actual damages, there is substantial uncertainty as to whether actual damages, rather than treble damages, will be applied in a particular case. This uncertainty diminishes the attractiveness of establishing a joint venture by failing to completely remove this legal disincentive to joint research and development. I am afraid that the present vehicle has too much of the "Mr. Sherman said to Mr. Clayton" flavor.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my thanks to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science Research and Technology of the Science Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALGREN, for taking action on my bill and H.R. 4043, the compromise bill later introduced and reported from the full Committee on Science and Technology.

I would also thank the chairman of the full Committee on Science and Technology, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FUQUA, for his foresight in leading the first Committee of the House to report this type of legislation.

I thank the ranking Republican members of the SRT Subcommittee and full Science Committee, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. WINN, for their strong support for this legislation in our committee.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for his leadership on this issue.

Finally Mr. Speaker, although I have not spoken in superlative about H.R. 5041, I believe it is a starting point in the legislative process and for that reason I would like to thank the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. RODINO, for his in bringing this bill to the floor. However, I would like to say to the gentleman that I would have preferred that this legislation come before the House in a manner that would allow the House to consider improving and perfecting amendments. I would also say to the gentleman that the bill probably should have been sequentially referred to the Committee on Science and Technology so that it could share its expertise on the unique requirements of research and development with the Committee on the Judiciary. However, I know these issues

were discussed with the gentleman and considering the differences between us, I believe this bill is much better than no bill at all. I, therefore, join in supporting it and urge its adoption in the House.●

THE CUTTING EDGE

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. RODINO, for his efforts to give our electronics and high-technology companies the tools they need to compete in today's international marketplace.

The need for legislation of this sort is clear. Research and development is the foundation upon which economic growth, productivity, and modern and efficient manufacturing techniques are built. Today, however, that foundation appears to be crumbling.

Research and development expenditures in this country as a percentage of the GNP have declined by one-fifth over the past 20 years. By way of contrast, in Japan such expenditures went up by one-third over that same period.

At any point in time, these kinds of statistics would be embarrassing. But at a time when we are rapidly becoming part of a global economy—when the economic inefficiencies of any one industry mean that our country as a whole loses ground to our overseas competitors—they are potentially devastating.

There are a number of reasons for our national lag in R&D. Research and development is incredibly expensive, and many firms are plagued by a severe shortage of qualified scientific and engineering personnel and must engage in an expensive competition for a limited number of technically qualified workers.

For many firms, particularly the smaller ones, the only realistic way to conduct an active research and development program is to pool resources with other firms. Unfortunately, however, confusion over current antitrust restrictions has choked off such endeavors—leaving many of these companies high and dry.

And that is why Congress needs to step in and clarify these laws—to provide these companies with clear, precise, and certain guidelines—such as Mr. SYNAR, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ZSCHAU, and I attempted to do in legislation we introduced on this subject last year (H.R. 1952). H.R. 1952, which was widely supported by the electronics industry, would have achieved this goal by establishing a set of objective statutory standards that, if met, would have insulated a joint venture from antitrust liability.

Mr. RODINO's bill also clearly intends to provide our companies with the kind of certainty they need to proceed with legitimate joint research and development endeavors. For example, with regard to the issue of defining the impacts on competition, the committee report on H.R. 5041 clearly states on page 21: "As in current merger analysis, the possible worldwide reach of the relevant market should be carefully examined for each R&D joint venture."

Unfortunately, the bill itself is silent on the issue of worldwide market: a potentially serious problem in my opinion. After all, if we are attempting to provide our companies with the certainty they need to move ahead with joint R&D—and place themselves on the cutting edge of new innovation—we must set down rules that are applicable to the game that is being played. And with ever-increasing frequency that game is international—not domestic—in scope. No one would dream of trying to govern Olympic competition with rules set up for an intramural soccer match. Neither should we try to govern R&D activities in worldwide industries within domestic market parameters.

It is my understanding that the Senate Judiciary Committee has recognized this fact in its own legislation, which it reported out recently. Specifically, as I understand it, that bill stipulates that the permissability of joint R&D ventures should be judged on the basis of reasonableness, taking into account all relevant factors affecting competition, including the "effects on competition in properly defined relevant research and development markets." It also is my understanding that the draft report on that bill goes on to discuss in some detail what factors should be taken into consideration in defining those markets, including overseas competition/markets.

Although I intend to vote in favor of Mr. RODINO's bill and believe it is a good first step toward providing our high technology, electronic, and other companies with the kind of certainty they need to engage in needed joint research and development endeavors, I am hopeful that the bill that is eventually passed by the full Congress and signed into law by the President will include even clearer guidelines, such as those laid out in the version under consideration in the other body.

Again, I commend the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. RODINO, for his leadership in this area, and look forward to eventual enactment of a law that will give our companies the tools they need today to fuel innovation for a healthier economy tomorrow.

Thank you.●

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my Judiciary Committee chairman, Mr. RODINO, for his prompt leadership on this important issue.

The need for clarification of our antitrust laws in relation to joint ventures for research and development is unquestionable. Today's bill modestly solves the problem of uncertainty as to antitrust enforcement and provides a framework within which aggressive American firms can confidently join forces to accomplish basic R&D.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Monopolies Subcommittee, I would like to stress one point. The bill mandates that courts analyze the competitive status of joint ventures under the rule of reason. This longstanding test offers a fair and thorough measure. But rule of reason analysis of joint ventures for R&D may require that factors other than those traditionally used be taken into account.

For example, traditional rule of reason analysis looks at the competitive effects on both geographic and end-product markets as measured by sales. These can be nonsensical in an R&D context: There are no sales, there may be no end-product market or clearly defined geographic marketplace. Consequently, courts should be mindful of this when reviewing joint ventures under this legislation.

The rule of reason is a good tool and the courts generally have used it creatively and successfully in analyzing business behavior. I am hopeful that the courts will recognize the essential differences in the nature of R&D and apply the rule of reason accordingly.

I support this effort to clarify our antitrust laws and hope we can have a final product enacted into law before the 98th Congress adjourns. I am proud of the speed with which we have moved on this matter and hope that we are helping improve our Nation's ability to compete.●

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5041, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA ON ITS EFFORTS TOWARD HERBICIDAL ERADICATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275) congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication and expressing the hope that the Government of Colombia will carry out a sustained eradication program, as amended.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 275

Whereas the importation of cocaine and marihuana into the United States is of major, continuing concern to the Congress;

Whereas during the week of March 11, 1984, the Government of Colombia undertook a series of raids during which a record total of over twelve metric tons of cocaine was seized;

Whereas while the Colombian interdiction efforts are increasingly effective, control of illicit cultivation and production requires the use of technologically advanced, systematic eradication programs; and

Whereas Colombia, as well as the United States, suffers the effects of drug abuse, thus sharing a common need to bring this illicit production under control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) commends the Government of Colombia for its recent seizure of record amounts of cocaine; and

(2) congratulates the Government of Colombia and the Colombian National Council on Dangerous Drugs on the recent decision to conduct experimental testing of herbicidal eradication methods which can be used to eliminate the cultivation of both cannabis and coca; and

(3) expresses its hope and encouragement that the comprehensive pilot program which has now begun becomes the start of a sustained program to eliminate all illicit cultivation.

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby deplores the brutal assassination on April 30, 1984, of the Minister of Justice of Colombia, Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, a leader in the fight against illicit narcotics in Colombia, and extends its condolences to the Government of Colombia, his family, and his friends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 275, as amended, commending the Government of Colombia for its recent seizure of record amounts of cocaine, congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication, and expressing the hope that the Government of Colombia will carry out a sustained eradication program. This resolution was approved, as amended, by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 5, 1984.

In March of this year, an extraordinary event took place in Colombia: The largest drug bust in history. The Colombian National Police seized 13.8 tons of cocaine with a street value of $1.2 billion. This amount is approximately one-fourth the annual cocaine consumption in the United States. House Concurrent Resolution 275 commends the Government of Colombia for its record seizure.

Earlier this year, there was another significant development in Colombia: For the first time, the Colombian National Council on Dangerous Drugs has recommended experimental testing of herbicidal eradication methods which can be used to eliminate marihuana and coca cultivation. This decision is a crucial step toward controlling the flow of cocaine and marihuana into the United States, and the resolution therefore congratulates the Government of Colombia for making this decision.

House Concurrent Resolution 275 also expresses the hope and encouragement of the U.S. Congress that the comprehensive pilot program which has been authorized by the Colombians becomes the start of a sustained program to eliminate all illicit cultivation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform my colleagues that last night the Colombian Minister of Justice, Rodrigo Lara Bonillo, was brutally assassinated by machinegun in Bogota. Minister Lara, since his appointment last August, had waged a vigorous fight against narcotics trafficking in Colombia. Therefore, House Concurrent Resolution 275 has been amended to deplore Mr. Lara's assassination, and express the condolences of the Congress to the Government of Colombia, his family, and his friends.

I would like to commend my colleague from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for his leadership on this resolution, and I urge the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 275, as amended.

I am including as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, one of the wire service stories on the brutal assassination of the Colombian Minister of Justice, because it points out more clearly than most of us realize how desperate this situation is with respect to eradication and the control of the drug traffic in all countries, our own included.

The article follows:

[From the United States Press International]

ASSASSINATION OF COLOMBIAN MINISTER OF JUSTICE

(By Ray Perez)

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, May 1, 1984—President Belisario Betancur declared a state of siege in Colombia today following the machinegun assassination of the justice minister in an attack believed connected with his crackdown on drug trafficking.

Betancur went on national television early today—hours after the killing—to announce that the state of siege already in effect in four of the nation's provinces would be extended to the whole country. He also called an emergency meeting of his Cabinet.

Under the state of siege, all guarantees under the constitution are suspended, meaning among other things that police and troops can detain suspects indefinitely.

The assassination Monday of Justice Minister Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, 40, followed death threats against the minister for his sweeping crackdown on Colombia's lucrative drug trade.

Bodyguards escorting Lara in another car returned fire, killing the driver of the motorcycle and wounding the submachine-gun wielding assailant in the back, police said.

Police said the wounded gunman, identified as Byron Velasquez Arena, 23, confessed he and his partner were offered $20,000 by an unknown person in Medellin, Colombia, to kill a high government official but said he did not know the victim was Lara.

Medellin, 150 miles northwest of Bogota, is believed to be the center of the Colombian drug trade.

The assassins struck at about 7:30 p.m. Monday as Lara was being driven home through a northern Bogota neighborhood, shadowed by a police car and a second station wagon that held his four bodyguards.

The gunman riding on the back of the motorcycle opened fire with a submachine gun at an intersection, blasting the minister's car with more than 20 bullets, and hurled a grenade that stopped the police car, police said.

Lara was hit at least 10 times in the head, chest and arms in a hail of fire that smashed through the windows, doors and seats of the cream colored Mercedes. He died shortly after being taken by police to a Bogota clinic, officials said.

His bodyguards leaped out of their stationwagon and opened fire with submachine guns, killing the driver and wounding the rider, both of whom were armed with submachine guns and wearing bullet-proof vests. The dead driver was not immediately identified.

President Belisario Betancur, who had met earlier in the day with his justice minister, went to the hospital where Lara died and offered condolences to the family. The president made no public comment.

Lara, a senator for the New Liberalism party, had announced he planned to retire as minister soon and take a post as ambassador after leading a government campaign against Colombia's lucrative drug trade.

Seven months ago, Lara told the Colombian Congress that drug traffickers were plotting to kill him.

Within weeks of his appointment as justice minister last August, Lara launched a tough campaign against the drug trade and charged that crime families were influencing political elections with "dirty money."

About 100 airplanes were grounded by Lara and scores of others were placed under surveillance because his investigation revealed they were being used to transport drugs.

□ 1330

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), and also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), for their bipartisan support of this concurrent resolution.

I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 275 which praises the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication. I encourage Colombia to continue this fine effort and work to eliminate all illicit cultivation.

More than ever before, almost every country in the world is faced with some type of drug problem. Our country and Colombia are certainly no exception to the rule. Both of our Nations face the drug challenge.

Drug addiction is a national problem here in the United States of crisis proportions. Lives have been lost and families have been ruined. Drug dealers make billions of dollars annually in their illegal and immoral efforts to corrupt our Nation's youth and lead them down the road to drug dependence. Just last week, we all heard of the tragic death of David Kennedy and the details of his life-long battle with drugs. My heart goes out to his family and loved ones. His tragic death is one of the many which will occur this year unless our country does something now to stop this shameful, illicit drug trade.

The Government of Colombia recently undertook a series of successful raids and large quantities of cocaine were seized. Much of that cocaine was destined for the United States. The Colombian Government is to be commended for its successful drug interdiction program.

Let us hope that the current Colombian program to control illicit cultivation and production will continue. I am certain that our Government is standing by to provide any necessary assistance to the Colombian Government in their noteworthy efforts.

I am delighted to know that we are united in this battle, and I am confident that the battle will, in the end, be won.

With these sobering thoughts in mind, I call on my colleagues to support this resolution congratulating the Government of Colombia for its excellent efforts in drug eradication.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN), chairman of the Task Force on International Narcotics Control.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for bringing the resolution to the floor. It is important for this Congress to note genuine progress in the field of international narcotics control—an area that is all too often marked by frustration and failure.

For years, Colombia has been one of the major source countries for narcotics entering the United States. Over half of the cocaine, and nearly 85 percent of the marihuana, consumed here comes from Colombia. Moreover, substantial evidence links the illegal drug trade and the Cuban-directed flow of arms to terrorist groups throughout Central and South America.

The effects of this traffic are staggering and well-known. Just this morning, we were all saddened to learn that the Colombian Minister of Justice, Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, fell to an assassin's bullet. His untimely death is a direct result of the Government of Colombia's determination to attack drug smuggling head on, and a vivid reminder of the dangers facing any individual—or any country—which seeks to stop the ruthless smugglers.

We should encourage, support and protect the Colombian Government as best we can. In the last year, they have intensified the antidrug fight, and the results have been remarkable. In March, Colombian police working with the U.S. Embassy in Bogota made the biggest cocaine bust in history. And for the first time, the Colombian Government has authorized the use of herbicides to eradicate large coca and marihuana plantations.

Our experience has shown that crop eradication is one of the best ways to control drug trafficking. We should encourage it whenever we can. This resolution rightly applauds the Colombians for their energetic efforts; it is a tribute to Rodrigo Bonilla who led these vital efforts, and it will tell the American people that we care about the health of our children and the strength of our families.

I commend the gentleman from Florida for offering this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 275, which commends the Government of Colombia for its recent action in a major cocaine seizure and drug bust.

I also want to commend the original sponsors, Mr. FASCELL and Mr. SHAW.

The United States has made a concerted effort to stem the flow of illegal narcotics into this country. That effort relies in major part on the cooperation of our allies around the world. To those who are not well informed on the subject, it often appears that other countries in the world are not taking as active an interest in the drug problems that affect all of us, not only in this country, but in virtually every society in the world.

Those problems are compounded when inaccurate and misleading media reports ignore or incorrectly relate the efforts made by friendly governments overseas to halt drug trafficking in their country. The case of Columbia is an excellent example. As this resolution points out, the largest seizure of illegal drugs ever made was carried out by the Government of Colombia. It was a massive undertaking, and in the process revealed the active involvement of leftist guerrillas, backed by Castro, in the drug trafficking. A number of us in the Congress have urged an investigation into the Cuban connection in drug trafficking. In light of the Colombian actions, the evidence is all the more compelling of Cuban direction and support of drug trafficking in this hemisphere. Once again, I take this opportunity to urge the Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate Castro's and Cuba's role in drug dealing.

Unfortunately, a recent report by Bill Moyers on CBS overlooked the Cuban connection and specifically criticized governments "like Colombia" for not working actively to control drug trafficking. Reports like that, which are patently false, only serve to make our work more difficult in trying to gain the cooperation of our allies in trying to stop drug trafficking. For that reason it is especially important to take this opportunity to commend the Government of Colombia for its efforts. It is also a fitting memorial to the Minister of Justice of Colombia Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, who led the fight against the subversive elements in his country in trying to stop the flow of drugs through Colombia. The reports of his assassination this morning add a sober reminder that the war against drugs will not be easy and will not be without great cost. The Government of Colombia deserves the admiration and gratitude of this Nation for its tireless efforts to stop the flow of drugs through its country.

I commend the gentlemen for their timely and appropriate resolution and I especially commend the Government of Colombia for its remarkable achievements in fighting the menance of drugs.

□ 1340

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA).

Mr. CORRADA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this resolution which commends the Government of Colombia for its recent

actions to control the production of cocaine.

Illegal drugs, with their tragic effect on our society, must be eradicated. In this battle, all efforts must be coordinated and no reasonable and vigorous method spared to insure that, to the maximum extent possible, we free ourselves from the slavery of drugs.

The tragic murder yesterday of Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, the Justice Minister of Colombia, and a vigorous fighter in the war against drugs, only reaffirms the need for firm and thorough actions against those that seek to enslave us. I am hopeful that the Government of Colombia will redouble its efforts to insure that the comprehensive pilot program which is scheduled to begin will give yield to a sustained program to eliminate all illicit cultivation.

I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for sponsoring this measure, and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) and our ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

Both our Foreign Affairs Committee's Narcotics Task Force, on which I serve, and our Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control on which I serve, as the ranking member have been reviewing extensively the terrible problem of illicit narcotics trafficking to which this resolution refers. We have been actively seeking the assistance of other nations to help us eradicate the production of narcotics and I am pleased to note the efforts undertaken by one such nation, the Government of Colombia.

As I stated during our committee's deliberations of House Concurrent Resolution 275, during our Government's consideration about the narcotics problem, we often point to the shortcomings of the narcotics control programs of other nations. I believe that any good work and diligent efforts in the war against narcotics, should be recognized and for that reason, I am pleased that the House has this opportunity to note the commendable measures undertaken by the Colombian Government.

As this resolution observes, Colombia, as well as our own Nation, suffer the effects of drug abuse and thus our two nations share a common need: To bring illicit drug production under control. I know my colleagues share the hope that our two nations will expand our current efforts to combat jointly the illicit narcotic cultivation and trafficking which continues to threaten the peoples of both of our nations.

Mr. Speaker, this measure also points to the heinous assassination on April 30, 1984, of the Minister of Justice of Colombia, Rodriguez Lara Bonilla. The resolution deplores that brutal crime against the Government of Colombia, and indeed against all nations and groups seeking to eradicate the criminal forces which stop at nothing to ply their despicable trade.

Mr. Lara set a fine example during his tenure as Colombia's Justice Minister, applying the full weight and authority of his office in his nation's fight against the illicit drug trade. Our Select Committee on Narcotics had the opportunity of meeting with Mr. Lara just a few months ago, and from what we learned, we certainly respected the effort that he had undertaken.

We mourn the loss of this dedicated public servant, Minister Rodriguez Lara Bonilla, a courageous combatant in the fight against illicit narcotics and we extend our Nation's condolences to the Government of Colombia, to his family and to his friends.

It is our hope that the Government of Colombia will continue in its valiant efforts to stamp out the production and distribution of illegal narcotics. We were pleased to read the April 1 statement of President Betancur of Colombia, and the need for his nation to intensify its campaign against narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, I am requesting that a full copy of President Betancur's statement be included at this point in the RECORD.

The following is an unofficial translation of comments on drug trafficking made by President Belisario Betancur in a nationally broadcast speech on Sunday April 1, 1984:

We must continue to seek the solid peace that we now have sight of. Do you know why? To dedicate all our energy and many resources to the safety of the citizenry; to the defense of the life, honor and the possessions of the average Colombian, not only in the sense of protection against crime, but in providing the necessary basic services that are not available because the money is obligated to other needs.

And do you know for what else? To recover the national dignity that the narcotics traffic has snatched away from us, displaying us with that black image to the world and making our youth ill, perverting it with drugs. This is the great task we have ahead of us; to denounce them daily; to tell them they cannot continue unhinging our society to which they themselves belong. To tell them in one great chorus: Enough!

We should stop speaking with amusement, as if it were a subject to be taken lightly, about the things that are happening with the power of that money. The greatest problem Colombia has faced in its history is drugs and their tenebrous effect on our people, their health and their morality. There, all our poverty, our unemployment, our estrangement from the basic values, was dramatically synthesized. Putting it another way, what is at issue is to rescue a society made to feel alien, estranged, almost nonexistent by many factors. From there comes the major surgery which should become the untiring, sleepless and bold new battle for moral peace.

Just a few days ago I was saying without an apocalyptic tone that every city councilman that appears in a town on account of drugs can easily equal three, four, or five guerrilla fronts in the remote mountains; each family with an honest background that enters the drug business is not akin to someone taking up arms for some vague or concrete political ideal, instead, they contribute to the expansion of the army of the new anarchy created by the demolishing chimera of that easy money which permits opulent and extravagant life-styles.

Because of all that and because the multinationals of crime that assume various forms in the world are a fact. We are urgently requesting a world pact against these new types of crime, a pact proposed to us with our concurrence by the United States, Venezuela and Bolivia, among other countries. This obviously signifies a recognition of the interdependence, of the common interest to survive, among the peoples and the states, with direct reference to certain aspects of national sovereignty. Through this formula the difficulties with the bilateral agreements that lend themselves to troublesome confusion because of certain details and characteristics can be overcome.

I insist that we are faced with a new, more lethal menace, because it does not manifest itself solely in a classic revolt against legitimate authority, but rather with its startling strategy and plan of action attempts to overpower the state practically as a secondary objective because it first accomplishes the stage of demoralization by means of money; with a society's core destroyed in this manner, the state falls almost on its own.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass this resolution.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to congratulate my distinguished colleague for an excellent statement. I would like permission to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think the gentleman has spoken eloquently. I congratulate him on his work, not just on this particular measure, but in the area of drug enforcement and demand reduction generally.

I also congratulate my colleague from Florida (Mr. SHAW), who also serves with me on the Subcommittee on Crime for his leadership, and the chairman, for so expeditiously moving this resolution to the floor.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. The gentleman from New Jersey has been one of the outstanding, long-term fighters against narcotics in the Congress, and joined us last summer in our mission to Colombia where we had the opportunity of meeting personally with the Colombian Attorney General, the gentleman who was recently assassinated.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to review for just a moment what got us to this point where we are today. About 10, or 15 years ago Mexico was the largest foreign producer of marihuana supplying the United States. The Government of Mexico adopted an eradication program which was most ambitious and most effective. They decreased the production of marihuana in Mexico down to a negligible amount.

Colombia then came to the front and became the chief producer of marihuana to the United States. It has been estimated that 85 percent of the marihuana imported illegally into the United States comes from Colombia. They have also grown considerably in both the production of cocaine and the growing of the coca plant.

This has become a matter of great concern to the American people, recognizing the devastating effect that drugs have had on this country. The gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my friend Mr. FASCELL, is more aware perhaps than anyone in this Chamber today of the devastating effect that drugs can have on a community. As representing the southernmost district in the United States, comprised of Key West up to the southern part of Miami, he is keenly aware of the effect that lawlessness can have on his own community, even though this lawlessness may be centered a thousand miles away in the area of Colombia.

About 1½ years ago, Mr. FASCELL and I had a similar resolution, but this resolution was one more of a critical nature that made its way through the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. The then chairman, Mr. ZABLOCKI, with my encouragement, held back bringing that resolution to the floor of this House because it did appear at that time that there was improvement underway. That Colombia had indicated a willingness, and in fact, a desire to become involved in an active way in the eradication of illegal drugs that were produced and manufactured in that country.

Then past March, you heard about the drug raid that took place in that country, and at last we did see that the country of Colombia was going to embark upon what could develop, and which we hope and pray, will develop into a most ambitious program of eradication.

□ 1350

All of the interdiction efforts that we can put forth in this country cannot put anywhere near the dent in the drug trade as an eradication program in the source country, and the source country in this instance is Colombia. So Colombia, under President Betancur, and the former Minister of Justice Bonilla, had gone forward with what we thought and what we still believe and hope will be a most effective eradication program.

Unfortunately, just this morning we learned of the most untimely and unfortunate death of the Minister of Justice. I would hope this resolution of this House of Representatives would stand as a memorial to his life and what he was able to accomplish, and his purpose, not only for his own country but for the good of the world, in the eradication of drugs. He foresaw the problems that his country has undergone.

We have seen now the Communist guerrillas becoming more and more involved in the growing of domestic drugs in Colombia, "domestic," of course, referring to Colombia itself. Colombia has also felt the problems of having their young people and their adult population becoming involved with the use of drugs. They have seen a necessity, for their own purposes, of joining in a partnership with the United States for a meaningful eradication of drugs and what we believe will be an effective program.

I would hope that what we have seen happen in Colombia is a meaningful first step, small as it may be, but one that should not go unrecognized by this country and by this House of Representatives. They have a long way to go. There is a lot of work yet to be done. We have only dented the surface, but the promise of success is so great and so meaningful to this country and to the population of the world that I urge this Congress to overwhelmingly approve this resolution and congratulate Colombia for the small first step that they have made, and encourage them to go on and join the rest of the world in doing away with this threat to the population of the entire world.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAW. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for a very eloquent statement and commend him again for his leadership, and that of the chairman of the committee, in bringing this issue before us.

I think what the gentleman has said about this resolution being a memorial to the Justice Minister is certainly apt and appropriate, and I hope that the House unanimously adopts this resolution.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for his statement and the hard work that has been done here. This is a recognition of the truly enormous fight that we have on our hands with regard to narcotics. I commend the gentleman from New York for the fine work that he has done on this, and I hope that this resolution will pass without any opposition.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most important to note here that so many of the committees of this Congress have been deeply involved in trying to do away with the growing drug menace throughout the entire world, and this has got to be a worldwide effort.

We have seen our own youth attacked by the use of these illegal drugs, and I think that the rest of the world now has to gather together and say, "Enough is enough, and we are serious about eradicating this menace to the future of the world and mankind."

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 275, congratulating the Government of Colombia on its use of herbicides as a means of eliminating the cultivation of marihuana and coca, and expressing the hope that this program of eradication can be sustained.

Last August, I traveled with the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control to Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, Jamaica, and Colombia. At that time, Mexico was the only country of the five we visited that showed us positive proof that they were addressing the drug-cultivation problem using herbicide eradication.

However, I am pleased that Colombia now recognizes its obligations to detect and eradicate the illicit cultivation of narcotic crops in its territory and demonstrate a national will and commitment to eliminate that cultivation.

Earlier this year, Colombia was the site of the world's largest drug bust. Airborne Colombian Police raided a cocaine-processing plant operating under Communist protection in southeastern Colombia and seized 12,500 kilos of cocaine. State Department narcotics experts placed the street value of the captured cocaine at $1.2 billion.

Much of the credit was due to the efforts of Colombian Justice Minister Rodrigo Lara Bonilla. I was deeply saddened to hear of his assassination

yesterday. His assassination is a tragedy for both the Colombian Government and the United States, for he was a friend and ally against the baneful evil of the illicit drug trade.●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolutions 275. I would also like to commend the gentlemen from Florida (Mr. SHAW and Mr. FASCELL) for introducing this resolution congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication and expressing the hope that the Colombian Government will carry out a sustained eradication program.

The bulk of the cocaine consumed by users in the United States originates in Colombia where it is clandestinely manufactured from raw coca materials produced mostly in Peru and Bolivia. During the first 6 months of last year, the retail price of cocaine in the United States plummeted by 50 percent and its purity has increased.

Simultaneously, the abuse of cocaine has shown a dramatic increase. In the United States there are an estimated 8 million users of cocaine and one out of every four users of cocaine are reported to commit crime to support their habit. Emergency room mentions for cocaine reported through the Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN) system increased from 4,731 in 1982 to 5,394 in 1983. My own city of New York showed the most dramatic increases in cocaine abuse in recent years with emergency room mentions rising from 751 in 1978 to 2,670 in 1982.

Colombia is also the source of almost 70 percent of the marihuana smuggled into the United States. Marihuana is still the most commonly abused drug in the United States and poses a particularly serious abuse problem among young people. The DAWN system reported a 13-percent increase in marihuana-related hospital emergencies in 1982. Marihuana-related hospital emergency reports over a 4-year period rose from 982 to 1,782 in New York; 238 to 393 in Los Angeles; and from 4,055 to 5,293 nationally.

Last year, during a study mission that included Peru, Bolivia, and Colombia, members of the Select Committee met with Colombia's President Belesario Betancur and several of his cabinet members. At that time, the delegation urged President Betancur to wage a more effective battle in the effort to eradicate coca and marihuana and the trafficking of the drugs to the United States.

The Colombian National Police raids, which were undertaken in March and which netted 12½ metric tons of cocaine—the largest seizure ever made—is evidence that our study mission has had some impact. We commend the Colombian Government for this initiative and we urge the Colombian Government to intensify its efforts against narcotics production and drug trafficking.

House Concurrent Resolution 275 is especially important because it represents continuing congressional concern about the drug problem in this Nation and in nations all over the world. It also emphasizes that the United States will support and work alongside those nations which strive to eradicate illicit narcotics production and halt drug trafficking.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 275, which congratulates the Government of Colombia for its recent efforts to control the production of cocaine and marihuana.

I believe that drug addiction is the most terrible disease affecting the young people in America. And although Colombia is one of the main sources of the narcotics entering the United States, its present Government is taking the lead among Latin American countries in cooperating with the international community in putting an end to drug trafficking.

During the week of March 11, 1984, Colombian authorities in cooperation with U.S. authorities seized more than 12 metric tons of cocaine with a street value of over $1 billion. This initiative dealt a serious blow to drug traffickers in Colombia and elsewhere and established a world record. This is the beginning of a long fight against those who profit from the destruction of the minds of our children. But unfortunately, this is going to be a long and bloody battle. The first casualty occurred just a few days ago when Rodrigo Lara Bonilla, the Colombian Minister of Justice, was murdered. Minister Lara had taken the lead in the drug battle and thus had been targeted for assassination. His murder is a great loss to Colombia and to all of us who support these efforts.

The Government of Colombia deserves to be commended for this effort and other initiatives underway to experiment with herbicidal erradications. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 275, which sends a message to Colombia that the United States is behind them 100 percent in their meritorious efforts to fight the production of narcotics.●

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution. House Concurrent Resolution 275, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR INITIATIVES OF CONTADORA GROUP AND RESULTING AGREEMENTS AMONG CENTRAL AMERICAN NATIONS

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 261) expressing support for the initiatives of the Contadora Group and the resulting agreements among the Central American nations.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 261

Whereas at the initiative of the four Contadora Nations of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela, the Governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua agreed on January 8, 1984, to Principles for the Implementation of the Commitments Undertaken in the Document of Objectives;

Whereas those agreed Principles include specific and significant measures for immediate implementation as well as establishment of a mechanism for development of recommendations for verifications, supervision of compliance, and further steps toward a regional peace agreement;

Whereas those measures include human and political rights as well as immediate elimination of illegal arms traffic and all forms of support for insurgents;

Whereas the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America concluded that "a key objective for the United States should be to promote the development of an independent system of regional relations, backed up by commitments of United States economic resources, diplomatic support, and military assistance" and that the Contadora process deserves "the gratitude and encouragement of all the nations in the hemisphere";

Whereas President Reagan has expressed the United States Government's support for the Contadora process; and

Whereas this effort by the countries of the region to resolve their differences peacefully in accordance with internationally recognized principles deserves the concrete support of the United States and other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) strongly supports the initiatives taken by the Contadora Nations and the resulting Document of Objectives and Principles for

Implementation which have been agreed to by Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua;

(2) believes that the United States should support the effort to translate the agreed Principles into practical and concrete regional peace agreement based on the principles of noninterference in the affairs of other countries, national reconciliation, and democracy; and

(3) believes that in fashioning our policies toward the countries of the region, the Government of the United States should take into consideration the degree of cooperation of Central American governments with the Contadora process in seeking a peaceful and secure solution to Central American conflicts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES).

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of briefly describing the resolution and its legislative history. So far as I know the resolution is noncontroversial, and I do not believe that we will need all our time on this side.

House Concurrent Resolution 261 expresses support for the initiatives of the Contadora Group and the resulting agreements among the Central American nations. It was introduced on February 22 of this year by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ), a member of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, which I have the honor to chair. I was pleased to join the gentleman in cosponsoring the resolution. On April 5 the resolution was reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs by voice vote.

The resolution notes the progress made by the Contadora nations—Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela—and the five Republics of Central America toward devising formulas for peace in the region. It also notes the support for the Contadora process that has been expressed by President Reagan and the Kissinger Commission. The resolution then resolves that the Congress strongly supports this process, and believes that our Government should support it and should encourage our Central American allies to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I am in frequent contact with representatives of the Contadora governments, and I can tell my colleagues that those governments rely a great deal on us in the Congress for support for their efforts. The Contadora process is at a crucial stage. The leaders of those four countries are meeting in Panama even as we meet here this afternoon, and I believe that this further expression of congressional support at this key moment could be very useful. I would urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ), the principal author of the resolution.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I also want to thank him not only for his support of this resolution, but for his leadership in helping to bring it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when both El Salvador and Nicaragua are wracked by internal conflicts that could very easily spill over and engulf the neighboring countries of the region, it seems to me that the adoption of this resolution by the House would be an extraordinarily timely gesture. The truth of the matter is that the Contadora process probably represents the last best hope for peace in Central America. If this commendable diplomatic initiative which was undertaken by Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia should ultimately fail, the chances are that the conflicts within the countries of the region will escalate, with the very real possibility of a full-scale war involving all of Central America thereby ensuing.

The Contadora process is by no means guaranteed to succeed. It is going to be extraordinarily difficult. There are very deeply rooted differences among and within the countries of the region, but over the course of the last year or so, the Contadora countries have achieved more progress than many skeptics believed they originally would, and they have, in fact, managed to achieve agreement on a broad statement of principles which would provide for the nonintervention in the internal affairs of other countries in the region by any of the nations in Central America. It provides for the withdrawal of all foreign military advisers. It provides for the disestablishment and the nonestablishment of foreign military bases in the hemisphere, and it would also provide for periodic elections and the democratization, accompanied by national reconciliation within each of the countries of the region.

The ability of the Contadora countries to succeed in their diplomatic endeavors will depend on many factors.

□ 1400

To some extent it will depend on the willingness of the United States to actively support it. The administration says that it supports the Contadora process. This is a way in which the Congress of the United States can go on record supporting it as well.

I think that if this resolution were to pass the House, it would greatly encourage the Contadora countries to continue with their efforts confident that the United States is truly supportive of their efforts. Given the consequences of a failure of the Contadora process, not only for the people of Central America but for our own country, I call upon my colleagues today to support this resolution and to make it absolutely and manifestly clear that the United States, both the President and the Congress, are deeply committed to the success of the Contadora process and are prepared to do whatever we can to make it a success.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 261, expressing support for the Contadora initiative and acknowledging President Reagan's support of it.

Last year, my Republican colleagues on the western hemisphere subcommittee and I introduced a resolution commending the President and expressing the support of the Congress for the President's efforts in support of the Contadora process. At that time, it appeared that too many critics overlooked or ignored the President's efforts at encouraging a negotiated settlement of the Central American crisis. I have believed all along that the President's intention and policies have been directed at achieving a peaceful, political settlement in the region and his support for the Contadora initiative is one element of that process. Where there has been disagreement over the President's policies, I believe, it has been over the most effective way to achieve the result of a political settlement. I do not believe there is any disagreement over the ultimate objective: peace with secure democratic governments and economic progress for the nations of Central America.

I am pleased this resolution recognizes the contribution the Contadora nations have made to the search for a settlement of the crisis affecting the nations of the region and for the degree of cooperation and dialog they have been able to achieve. It is everyone's hope that their efforts will lead to further gains and eventual settlement of the problems in the region. However, the recent refusal by the Sandinista government of Nicaragua to negotiate with its armed opposition and to agree to the suggestions of El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica on implementation of Contadora points, does not provide a great deal of optimism. And, as I mentioned before, I am pleased the sponsors of this resolution have cited President Reagan's effort in support of the Contadora process, and with that I support this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 261, expressing support for the initiatives of the Contadora group and the resulting agreements among the Central American nations, which was approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 5, 1984.

The resolution underscores support for the principles forged by the Contadora nations, and agreed to as well by the Central American nations of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua in January. Implementation of their document of principles presents the most realistic chance for peace in the region.

The administration has voiced its support for the Contadora process. We in Congress, through this resolution, again affirm our support for the objectives put forward by that group. Contadora presents a path toward improved relations among the Central American nations, and is an important factor in enhancing our own relations with neighbors in the hemisphere. A peaceful resolution of the conflicts of the region in vitally important for the Central American nations and is, unquestionably, in our own security interest as well.

I would like to commend the sponsors of the resolution, the Honorable STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, and the Honorable MICHAEL D. BARNES, chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere affairs for introducing the resolution, and for their continued diligence and oversight in monitoring the issues relating to Central America.

Throughout consideration of foreign aid proposals to the region the committee, cognizant of the Contadora group's efforts, tried to be supportive of that process and its potential benefits to regional relations and security. House Concurrent Resolution 261 is a further measure of congressional support for attainment of the Contadora objectives. I urge adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 261.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) and the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES), for bringing this measure to the floor and for bringing the whole problem to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 261, legislation expressing the support of the Congress for the initiatives of the Contadora Group and the resulting agreements among the Central American nations, seeking a comprehensive regional peace agreement.

I welcome this opportunity for the House to reaffirm its support for the Contadora process. As my colleagues will recall, this body last November passed similar legislation which I was pleased to support.

The Contadora process is an endeavor to bring to the troubled Central American region a comprehensive approach to resolving many of the long lingering economic, political, and social problems. The Contadora Group (Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia) has been moving from the conceptual stage of approaches to actual drafting of specific language designed to explore workable policy options. It is my hope that our Nation can continue to assess how it can best work with the Contadora nations. The Contadora process is a meaningful and important undertaking which all nations in the region could accept as a sincere and comprehensive means for bringing a peaceful and secure solution to Central American conflicts.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 261.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation to my distinguished colleague (Mr. BARNES), the chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding this time to me. I wish to commend him, as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ), who is the sponsor of this resolution, for their efforts in bringing this resolution before the House at this time.

I had the privilege of heading a small delegation to Central America in January of this year. It was about a 10-day visit, and the first part of it occurred just as that second round of Contadora meetings was taking place. Subsequently we had occasion to meet with the top level governmental people such as foreign ministers and presidents of the various countries in Central America, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that all of those people with whom we spoke, were so pleased that in spite of all the cynicism and all the concern about whether they could or could not get to agree with one another, in fact they were able to agree sufficiently to move on to the next step.

This resolution, it seems to me, is extremely important because it allows us to demonstrate that the Congress of the United States, if fully supportive of their very difficult and fragile efforts embodied in the Contadora process.

□ 1410

Would that the Reagan administration's protestations of support for the Contadora process be able to be taken at face value. Unfortunately, with the military buildup that this administration is engaging in in Central America, the idea that that has been accepted around the region and throughout the world is that the last thing in the world the administration wants is to negotiate our way out of the situation there.

Congress can play a very significant role. This House can play a very important role in demonstrating that at least as far as the people's representatives are concerned, we do not want to shoot our way into that problem. We want the countries involved to negotiate their way out of it.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is all well and good to speak about a peaceful resolution of the troubles in Central America. I am for a peaceful settlement, and I am sure all Members of this House are for it as well.

However, we are not talking about rational persons or groups in Central America. We are talking about terrorists in El Salvador who know they have no popular support and could never gain power through free elections. They destroy bridges, burn crops and homes, and terrorize the Salvadoran people, hoping to gain power through threats and intimidation.

We are talking about the Sandanistas in Nicaragua who have committed acts of genocide against their own people—the Miskito Indians—and who are seeking to undermine the stability of the entire Central American region, and for that matter, all of Latin America. We are also talking about Cuba, where Western Hemisphere terrorism began.

I recently had the opportunity to speak with appointed and elected officials of Colombia. They are deeply concerned, because in their opinion, Bolivia, Peru, and Colombia are all in grave danger of becoming bloody battlegrounds like those of El Salvador and Nicaragua. These Colombian officials indicated that terrorists, who were trained in Soviet Russia, Cuba, and Nicaragua, are building air strips and headquarter bases in the jungles of their countries.

The Communists would like nothing better to negotiate. They have no popular support. They would never gain power through the ballot box. But once they are accommodated through negotiations, and receive a share of power and positions in government, they will take control. They will have achieved their objectives toward taking power without ever having allowed the people of Central America some way of choosing for themselves who their leaders would be.

I do favor a peaceful resolution of the problems in Central America, but how can the free world ever accommo-

date the Soviets and their allies in Cuba and Nicaragua by allowing them to obtain power which they could never earn at the ballot box. How can the freedom loving peoples of this hemisphere stand quietly aside for the murderous terrorist armed assault of Soviet Communists in imposing slavery on us all.

This resolution represents what we all wish but cannot obtain without defeating Soviet Cuban encroachment. That means we must devise a way to enforce this resolution.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made some very good statements about terrorist activities and the Sandinista's perpetration of terror and denial of human rights to the very people that they supposedly are representing.

Just 15 minutes ago I came over here from my office where we had a meeting with Mr. Prudencio DeJesus Baltodano Silva, who is a farmer and who was a lay minister of an Evangelical Church in Nicaragua.

This gentleman was tortured by the Sandinistas. His ears were cut off. His throat was cut and he was left to bleed to death, but he is alive to tell his story today, and it is a horror story, indeed.

I think sometimes we have to stop and take note of some of the travesties that are going on which we do not see on television, we do not hear on the radio or see in the newspapers.

Mr. Baltodano is here to tell his story. He told it to seven Members of the House in my office and he is telling it to other people; but I think we have to pause and take note that not just one side or the other side has all the good guys or all the bad guys, that there are travesties going on and the Sandinistas are perpetrating many of these on their own people.

Here was an innocent individual, who with his wife and family, was tortured and left to die and yet through some will was able to survive to tell his story.

Mr. Speaker, pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

He says the people of Nicaragua do not support the Sandinistas and that all the people want to do is farm their land and take care of their families, and yet they are not able to do so.

So let us talk about human rights, let us talk about a balanced approach to this issue. That is why we all want to support the Contadora effort. We have come together to do so, but let us not forget that there are people, as the gentleman from Arizona mentioned, who are on the other side of the issue, who are coming forward, the Cubans, the Soviets, and the Sandinistas, who continually deny people their human rights, create terrorist activity and torture individuals, probably right now as we talk, down in Nicaragua and El Salvador and throughout Central America.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So the point is really that everybody wants peace and this resolution addresses itself very well to that, as does the Contadora process; but the question really comes down to the fact, how do we enforce it and does anyone ever believe that the Communists, once they take power or achieve power or arm themselves in a country enough to the point that they become a power, that they will ever leave peacefully or peaceably or through negotiation.

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to offer my support of House Concurrent Resolution 261 commending the Contadora Group for its initiatives. I believe that the agreements which this Contadora process has produced will hopefully move the nations in that region along the road to peace. This is a goal which all of us can support.

As all of my colleagues know, the Contadora nations of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela worked closely with the governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua on a number of basic principles to implement their commitments to a regional peace agreement process. One of the measures agreed to included the elimination of illegal arms traffic and all forms of support for insurgents.

It is encouraging to note that the recent National Bipartisan Commission on Central America supported the efforts of our Government to develop an independent system of regional relations. The Commission also noted that the Contadora process deserved the encouragement of all the nations in this hemisphere. Our President has also expressed his personal support for the Contadora efforts.

I strongly encourage the governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua to continue their participation in the Contadora process and I support our Government's fine efforts to encourage this regional peace program. I believe that all Americans are hopeful that a peaceful and secure solution to the conflict in Central America can be brought about.

With these thoughts in mind, let me call upon my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 261, I urge its adoption by this House.

There are two fundamental errors in this Nation's current foreign policy. We try and impose our will, our ideas and solutions, upon other people and nations who have just as much capacity to solve their own problems as we have to solve those problems for them.

Sometimes, being a leader means supporting others as they take their own lead.

Our other major mistake is to impose—or at least to try and impose—military solutions upon decades old social and political problems.

We are committing both errors right now in Central America, and the shame of this is that there is an alternative: The attempt by the Contadora group of nations to find a regional, peaceful solution.

Let us be smart, not provocative. Let us not just pay lip service to regional efforts, but let us start today with this resolution, to put this Nation firmly on record in enthusiastic support for the Contadora nations and their peace efforts.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, events in Central America continue to dominate the news as we continue to focus our attention and concern on the turmoil in the region.

Although the United States is perceived as the major influence and catalyst in the region, we cannot put aside and ignore the countries that border the region. Their views and suggestions, in light of their own interests and history, are particularly helpful and relevant.

Since its formation, the Contadora Group has assiduously and thoroughly worked toward the goal of achieving a just and lasting peace among the countries in Central America. Their efforts and dedication have earned them a reputation for fair and equitable suggestions as reflected in the Documents of Objectives and Principles for Implementation. These principles have been agreed to by Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

The United States should do everything within its power to assist the Contadora nations in their efforts to turn these principles into concrete arrangements that will yield a lasting peace. Throughout this process, we must always keep in mind the goals of

democracy and national reconciliation together with noninterference in the affairs of other nations.

I urge my colleagues to enact this resolution which will place us on record as supporting these efforts that we all hope will bring peace and prosperity to the inhabitants of all countries in the area.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 261, a resolution "expressing support for the initiative of the Contadora Group and the resulting agreements among Central American nations."

As a region, Central America is a major focus of U.S. foreign policy. Millions of dollars in development, economic and security assistance are sent to these countries annually. The Kissinger Commission report recommended even more American financial assistance, a massive aid package "aimed at promoting democratization, economic growth, human development and security." This unprecedented aid request, however, cannot alone buy a stable and lasting peace—the ultimate goal of the Kissinger Commission recommendations for Central America. A strong and vigorous diplomatic effort, on a regional basis, must accompany any U.S. foreign assistance program. The Contadora Group has provided the impetus and leadership for such an effort, and the United States should strongly support this initiative.

In November, the House of Representatives passed a resolution supporting the 21-point "Document of Objectives" adopted by the Contadora nations during a September 1983 meeting. The document outlined broad objectives aimed at resolving the tensions in the region. I strongly supported this effort when the resolution was considered.

In January of this year, the Contadora Group took another step toward regional peace in Central America. The Governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras—joined by the Contadora nations of Columbia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela—agreed to "Principles for the Implementation of the Commitments Undertaken in the Document of Objectives." The principles include specific and significant measures for immediate implementation as well as the establishment of a mechanism for development of recommendations for verification and compliance.

The principles include three specific areas of concern of Central American peace and security. First, activities are recommended to eliminate foreign involvement in the conflicts in the region and to end illegal arms traffic and other forms of support for insurgents. This handsoff policy must apply universally for all nations inside and outside the region.

Second, the newly agreed to document recommends a national reconciliation effort and a guarantee for full respect for human rights and the democratic electoral process. Finally, the document recommends intensified aid for refugees and other actions to promote social and economic progress through trade and investment. The agreement also provides an important mechanism to develop verification and compliance procedures.

No one expects this agreement to be a final solution; it is not even close. It is, however, a step in the right direction. As a powerful influence in the region, the United States must support the constructive efforts of the Contadora Group. The Kissinger Commission clearly recommended that "the United States should actively encourage the Contadora progress".

House Concurrent Resolution 261 expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should support the recently agreed to principles and the Contadora process in general. I strongly support this diplomatic effort designed to achieve "a peaceful and secure solution to Central American conflicts".

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to unanimously express their support for the Contadora Group initiative.●

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 261, which recognizes the continued and overwhelming support of the Congress for the Contadora peace process in Central America.

Today, Members of this body are given a chance to endorse the substantial negotiating efforts of four key Latin American nations—Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela—who are referred to as the Contadora Group after the island on which their representatives first met to seek peaceful solutions for Central America.

Last September, representatives of the Contadora nations met with officials from the five Central American countries of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua and adopted a 21-point "Document of Objectives" for resolving problems and reducing tensions in the region.

In January 1984, the nine Latin American nations further agreed on a set of principles for implementation of their mutual objectives. These more specific provisions included, first, preparation of a detailed inventory of military installations, weapons and troops; second, activities to end foreign involvement, illegal arms traffic, and support for insurgents; third, creating mechanisms to permit dialog and guarantee respect for human rights; fourth, intensified aid for refugees; and fifth, cooperation with regional groups to promote economic development.

The Contadora and Central American nations are expected to meet again this month to consider the detailed findings and recommendations of three Contadora working groups which have been studying verification, supervision of compliance, and further steps toward a regional peace agreement. This next stage in the Contadora peace process offers an important opportunity to test Nicaragua's expressed support for change by mandating an end to armed aggression and government-supported insurgencies in the region.

Recently, the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America concluded that —

> A key objective for the United States should be to promote the development of an independent system of regional relations, backed by commitments of U.S. economic resources, diplomatic support, and military assistance—

And that the Contadora process deserves—

> the gratitude and encouragement of all the nations in the hemisphere.

While the President himself has expressed the U.S. Government's support for the Contadora process, I believe that a clear signal of strong congressional support at this time would give the Contadora nations confidence that the United States is committed to back regional efforts toward a peaceful settlement and encourage them to continue pressing in their difficult endeavor.

I urge Members of Congress to support this legislation and continue working hard for a durable negotiated solution in Central America.●

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 261.

The question was taken.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 AMENDMENTS

Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5287) to amend title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit additional funds to be used to continue awards under certain multiyear grants.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5287

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Section 347(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"(f)(1) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve from the amount appropriated for part B such sums as may be necessary to fund continuation awards for multiple year grants awarded to institutions under section 331 prior to October 1, 1983.

"(2) For each fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve from the amount appropriated for part B, not more than an amount equal to the difference between the amount awarded under paragraph (1) and the amount equal to the aggregate amount institutions receiving grants under part B would contribute under section 324 to the cost of their grants in that fiscal year assuming their grant amounts are the same as those received in the prior fiscal year. The Secretary may use this amount to award grants to eligible institutions under section 333.

"(3) In reserving and awarding funds under this subsection, the Secretary shall assure in each fiscal year that the funds that would have been reserved under part B for institutions described in subsection (c) or (e) shall be reserved under section 331 or 333 for those institutions.".

SEC. 2. The amendment made in section 1 shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. KOGOVSEK) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. KOGOVSEK).

Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been carefully worked out by Chairman SIMON and my colleagues on the other side and with the administration. My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) is a cosponsor of this legislation along with Mr. SIMON.

This bill is necessitated by the Department of Education's concern that certain institutions of higher education, previously eligible for program grants under title III, part C (challenge grants) of the Higher Education Act will be precluded from completing the activities that they began in 1982 or 1983 before the enactment of the Challenge Grant Act Amendments of 1983 (Public Law 98-95).

The new law requires that 100 percent of challenge grant funds be allocated to endowment building in fiscal year 1985. At least 21 colleges received multiyear challenge grants and made financial commitments with the expectation that the Federal multiyear commitment would be honored. These institutions' financial matching support from non-Federal resources would be in jeopardy if the Federal share is not forthcoming.

The bill authorizes the Secretary to reserve from the amount appropriated for part B of title III an amount equal to the aggregate that eligible part B institutions would match under section 324 of part B as the institutional share, assuming that their grants were the same as the previous year. This will permit the Secretary to reserve about $6.2 million in order to continue funding the 21 institutions which are currently receiving challenge grant fundings or program purposes.

The bill involves no new appropriations for title III and has the full support of the Secretary and the administration. We expect the other body to act on the bill promptly following action by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point Chairman SIMON's statement; a series of letters between the Secretary and the chairman; and a letter of support from the American Council on Education:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
DIVISION OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,

Washington, D.C., March 20, 1984.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that you and Representative Thomas Coleman (MO) plan to introduce a technical amendment to the Endowment Grant Program of Title III of the Higher Education Act. We understand further that the amendment is designed to assure that a number of institutions now receiving Challenge Grants under Title III will continue to receive funding as projected through FY 85, when the Endowment Grant Program is scheduled for full implementation.

We have previously written you to express concern with the problem posed for these institutions, and to urge remedial action. This is to thank you for sponsoring the amendment, and to express the support of the higher education community.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. SAUNDERS, Jr.,
Vice President for Governmental Relations.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,

Washington, D.C., January 27, 1984.

Hon. TERREL H. BELL,
Secretary, Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

DEAR TED: Thank you very much for your letter of January 23 in response to my inquiry regarding implementation of the new endowment program under Title III of the Higher Education Act.

I am pleased to note that you and your staff have consulted extensively with Title III eligible institutions regarding the forthcoming regulations implementing the Challenge Grant Act Amendments of 1983 (P.L. 98-95). However, after reviewing the Department's proposed technical amendment, my position remains unchanged regarding the continuation of program grantees under Part C. As you know, the entire purpose for enactment of the Challenge Grant Amendments was to alter the basic purpose and objective of the Challenge Grant program. Endowment grants fulfill not only the basic needs of a larger variety of postsecondary institutions, but fulfill the original purpose of the Challenge Grant program as envisioned by Dr. Patterson and the United Negro College Fund.

The fact that only 21 institutions are currently participating in the program further underscores my concern that the Federal government make every effort to assist a broader number and variety of institutions of higher education in inaugurating or strengthening existing endowments.

As I indicated in my previous letter, I am interested in doing whatever is necessary to resolve the problem as it relates to the Morehouse Medical College. I believe we have three basic alternatives:

Seek $3 million in additional funding in the fiscal year 1984 Supplemental, or in the fiscal year 1985 Appropriation bill;

Request the necessary funding ($6.3 million) in order to fund all of the 21 institutions in fiscal year 1985; or

Enact a technical change in the Title III statute which would permit you to use some of the "pour-over" funds from Part B to Part C to fund the 21 institutions, including Morehouse Medical College, in fiscal year 1985.

I met with Dean Sullivan, Dr. Patterson and Representatives of the United Negro College Fund yesterday and discussed the latter option with them. They are in agreement that this is a workable solution to the problems of Morehouse and the other affected institutions. From my perspective this preserves the basic intent and integrity of the new Challenge Grant program from the possibility that all or part of the funds would be used for other purposes. In the event that no funds are "poured-over" from Part B to Part C, no funds would be available to make program awards to the 21 institutions.

I do want to underscore my willingness to work this out, however, I am opposed to any fundamental changes in the amendments that the Congress passed and the President signed into law on September 25, 1983. I believe it is extremely important that you make clear that all of the affected 21 institutions that any commitments made beyond the current life of the Title III authorization (fiscal year 1985) are inoperative.

Cordially,

PAUL SIMON,
Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1984.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: Thank you very much for your letter regarding the regulations we are developing to implement our new Endowment Grant Program.

We have been working for the past few months to prepare a draft Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) and we are committed to making awards in a timely manner. We have spent a considerable amount of time consulting not only with representatives of affected Title III institutions and key organizations such as the United Negro College Fund, but also representatives of the investment community. We want to be sure to have adequate input in the NPRM development process to ensure that our proposed regulations are reasonable and responsible.

I am troubled to learn that you are opposed to our efforts to honor the multi-year award commitments made under the Challenge Grant Program. Based on the information contained in your letter, it seems you have been misinformed as to the scope of the problem and the plight that faces the 21 affected institutions.

None of the 21 institutions affected can receive part A or B funds at this time to carry out the activities that are supported under these Challenge Grants. These institutions are receiving non-competitive preference for multi-year continuation grants on the basis of the activities that they proposed to carry out in their original application. To avoid the possibility of institutions "double-dipping," no activity approved for a grantee under part A or B could be performed by that grantee under part C. There is no mechanism to "transfer" the activities funded under part C by augmenting the existing part A or part B grants many of these institutions receive.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we do not believe the purpose of the Endowment Grant Program would be threatened in any way by continuing to honor our multi-year grant commitments made under the Challenge Grant Program. As my staff indicated to Mr. Blakey of your committee staff, the cost of honoring our multi-year commitment in fiscal year 1985 would be approximately $6.3 million. This cost is reduced to $4.8 million in fiscal year 1986. Even after deducting these costs, we estimate that more than $15 million will be available for Endowment Grants in fiscal year 1985 and nearly $23 million will be available in fiscal year 1986. These amounts are approximately ten times greater than the amounts that would have been available under legislation you introduced which reserved only 20 percent of available part C funds for Endowment Grant purposes.

Approximately one-third of the institutions adversely affected are historically black colleges and universities. Five institutions receive no other Title III assistance. In addition, I understand that one school—the Morehouse School of Medicine—could be so seriously affected as to risk losing accreditation.

I hope you will join me in supporting a technical amendment to remedy a problem which was inadvertently created by the passage of the new Challenge Grant legislation. I have attached a staff report which explains our proposed technical amendment and its impact in more detail.

Please contact me if I might be of assistance in resolving this issue.

Sincerely,

T. H. BELL.

CHALLENGE GRANT PROGRAM

I. RATIONALE FOR THE TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

The Education Amendments of 1980 established a Challenge Grant Program among the new Institutional Aid Programs. Its purpose is to encourage support for institutional development by matching Federal funds with new monies raised by colleges and universities from new public and private sector sources. These funds permit institutions to develop significant new educational resources that have the potential to increase institutional self-sufficiency.

Because the new program requires a fundraising capability, many institutions have been slow to respond to the Challenge Grant concept. Nevertheless, in the first year of the program (FY 1982), forty seven (47) institutions requested assistance, and all but one institution received an award. Twenty-nine (29) new institutions requested assistance in FY 1983, and fourteen (14) awards were made. Thus, fifty-six (56) institutions currently participate in the program. A majority of these grants are multi-year, and provide up to five years of support. All current grants expire in FY 1985 or FY 1986. No new awards will be made in FY 1984.

Grants support significant activities, including: the ambitious development of the first new Black Medical School to be established this century in which Federal funds are matched by a special State appropriation of $3 million annually for five years; a significant group of new media communications majors closely tied to the establishment of a new minority-oriented public television station for a major southern city which also permits the grantee institution to develop programs designed specifically for a large minority population of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians; and significant new mathematics and science programs developed at the undergraduate and graduate levels designed to alleviate current personnel shortages. A sample of funded projects is attached as Appendix A to show the range of funded activities.

Although it can be argued that the successful completion of any approved Federal grant award cycle depends upon the availability of funds, there are other important considerations:

The ethical issue involved in the decision to terminate six (6) institutions which have received approval for Challenge Grant activities through FY 1985, and fifteen (15) additional institutions scheduled to complete activities in FY 1986;

The impact of the decision on the private sector and State government both of which have been encouraged to support special institutional development with the expectation that the Federal commitment of assistance was firm. All private sector or State funds have been earmarked for specific developmental undertakings.

The likelihood that many of the currently funded activities will not be continued because these institutions will face unanticipated new costs to complete activities and the possibility the matching funds will be withdrawn if their grants are terminated. Termination will negatively affect the institutions ability to achieve self-sufficiency.

Preliminary estimates suggest that we have a probable maximum continuation request in fiscal year 1985 of $6,457,870 to complete approved activities. An accurate figure cannot be arrived at because all costs must be reviewed to determine that they are allowable and reasonable. For fiscal year 1986, a probable maximum of $4,792,411 will be needed to complete commitments for that terminal year of support.

II. EFFECT OF THE PASSAGE OF THE TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

If the technical amendment is approved, twenty one (21) institutions will be able to continue developmental activities during fiscal year 1985 and fifteen (15) will complete all approved activities in fiscal year 1986. Continuation is critical because of the complexity of many activities. None of the Challenge Grant activities duplicate programs funded under the strengthening or the special needs grants. Significantly, many of the activities are closely geared to support activities approved in development grants at institutions that also participate in the Challenge Grant. An examination of the kinds of activities supported by current Challenge Grant awards found in Appendix A demonstrates the complexity of some activities and why a need exists to allow current grantees to complete their agreed-upon awards cycle.

If the technical amendment is not approved, it is obvious that the Federal investment to date will likely produce small results because of the amount of dollars needed by many small institutions to complete projects without Federal assistance.

It has been suggested that some of the activities can be "picked up" under the Strengthening or the Special Needs Programs. This is not the case. Applications may not be modified to significantly change the scope of the work by proposing new activities not included in the original submission. Moreover, even if possible, Federal support could double. There is no provision for private sector support in the Strengthening Program while under the Special Needs Program the grantees are required to contribute a maximum of 30 percent of the grant cost by the fifth year. Many institutions will be unable to replace Federal assistance with increased private sector support. It is unlikely, for instance, that the Morehouse School of Medicine can raise $3 million new dollars for both FY 1985 and FY 1986 to match the funds appropriated by the State of Georgia to permit this institution to achieve accreditation.

Funds are available to match FY 1984 commitments after Endowment funds are transferred from the $9.6 million currently authorized for Challenge Grants. Current projections suggest that the $7,680,000 remaining will be sufficient for all non-competing continuation grants. A modest ratable reduction may be necessary, but of minor consequences.

Appendix B contains the following projected figures for FY 1985 and FY 1986:

Challenge Grants and Endowment Funds distribution according to the current Endowment legislation;

Challenge Grant estimated commitments for FY 1985 and FY 1986;

What funds would be available for Endowment purposes in FY 1985 and FY 1986, if Challenge Grants are fully funded, based on estimates.

Appendix C lists the institutions affected by the termination of the Challenge Grant Program after FY 1984.

III. SUMMARY

The Department feels strongly that institutions were encouraged to raise private sector and State support for new Challenge Grant activities. That support was given with the reasonable expectation that the Federal commitment would permit the development of the kinds of activities that assist institutions in attracting new students and in providing quality education that assures a more competitive graduate for the market place. Virtually all activities ultimately benefit students. Many of them strengthen the management of institutions. Few institutions have the capability of raising new matching funds to replace the Federal funds if they are terminated.

APPENDIX A.—A SAMPLE OF ACTIVITIES DEVELOPED WITH CHALLENGE GRANT FUNDS

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, AL

Biomedical Information Management System—Create computerized data base for 100 percent of the clinical cases of the School of Veterinary Medicine; and at least 200 biomedical topics linked to at least 3 other existing national knowledge-based systems.

Engineering, Chemistry and Physics Programs—Computer labs to support engineering, chemistry and physics programs; develop micro-computer and logic-design courses for engineering and computer science programs; tie in with several nationwide computer data bases for engineering, chemistry and physics programs; develop B.A. degree programs in Engineering and Physics.

School of Business, Agribusiness and Public Affairs—Create this school as an effective means of organizing instruction and outreach.

Nursing—Improve support services; improve student clinical experiences; develop a multi-disciplinary program.

Institutional Advancement—Computerize records and information systems; improve laboratories to produce in-house videotapes, slides and other audio visual systems; develop an alumni tracking system; develop a capability to research fund-raising sources; general staff training in development.

MOREHOUSE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, GA

Develop a third and fourth year medical curriculum;

Accredit the institution as the first new Black Medical School of this century;

Develop a medical program to concentrate on rural medical needs; and

Develop clinical experience out-patient training clinics that also serve low-income areas of Atlanta.

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY, GA

Computer Science and Related Areas—upgrade computer facilities and develop new courses in graduate computer science, and other areas including management, information systems, and library science.

International Affairs—create a Center for International Affairs and develop a Master of Arts Program.

Interdisciplinary Curriculum and English Education—improve both technical writing and the Humanities.

Academic Technological Support Services—develop media centers, and up-grade equipment in academic areas, such as the purchase of an electron microscope.

Biology and Chemistry—develop a course in electron microscopy and inter-phase this course with other institutional programs; train faculty in the use of the electron microscope; develop courses in endocrinology, biochemistry, plant genetics and bio-technology.

Mathematics and Science Education—design new specialty programs relating mathematics to science education.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, FL

Establishment of Engineering Programs—develop Civil and Environmental Engineering B.A. and M.A. programs; develop new B.S. and M.S. programs in Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Industrial Engineering, and a B.S. program in Chemical Engineering.

Enhancement of Educational Programs in Translation/Interpretation and Linguistics—Develop a training program in translation and interpretation for an academic minor; Develop a M.A. program in Linguistics.

MAHARISHI INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, IA

Develop a B.A. degree program in Chemistry; Develop a MBA program.

EASTERN COLLEGE

Develop a B.S. degree program in Nursing.

SUOMI COLLEGE, MN

Develop a Job Placement Program; Develop a Special Counseling Program; Develop student services individualized to the needs of the adult (older) portion of the student body.

ST. MARY'S JUNIOR COLLEGE, MN

Improve student financial assistance programs by initiating a new College Loan Program for disadvantaged students; Integration of the special services for Handicapped Students into the regular institutional support programs.

YORK COLLEGE, NE

Curriculum development for the Natural Sciences and for Business majors—Introduction of computer-related training; curriculum revision in keeping with new technological requirements of the market place.

UNION COLLEGE, NE

Curriculum development in Science, Mathematics and Business Revision of the Consumer Science Program.

XAVIER UNIVERSITY, LA

Development of a series of new Media Communications majors heavily dependent upon television-related preparation—Journalism (revision); Radio (revision); Television (development); Speech and Drama.

On-hand experience with the development of television programs through the new public television station established by the Archdiocese of New Orleans—Script preparation; Set design; Actual filming, such as athletic events, series, community events, accidents, social events, documentaries, etc.

Development of television courses for home study targeted at the minority community, and at students enrolled at Xavier who must work at conflicting course times—

Development of a series of basic programs geared to the special needs of the Black, Hispanic and Asian communities, such as beginning, basic, medium, or advanced English, Mathematics, and Social Studies courses;

Training the faculty to develop courses for a television audience;

Identifying courses that need to be offered to students who are unable to attend regular courses, and to videotape such courses and make them available through television offerings.

APPENDIX B.—THE FOLLOWING STATISTICS INDICATE THE SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR THE NEW ENDOWMENT PROGRAM THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1986

PART I.—*Challenge grant and endowment funds distribution according to the current legislation*

1984:	
Challenge grant 20 percent transfer	$1,920,000
Special needs 10 percent transfer	5,215,256
Available for fiscal year 1984 endowment awards	7,135,256
Available for challenge grant continuations	7,680,000
1985:	
Challenge grant 100 percent transfer	9,600,000
Special needs 20 percent estimate	12,000,000
Available for fiscal year 1985 endowment awards	21,600,000
Available for challenge grant continuations	0
1986:	
Challenge grant funds	9,600,000
Special needs 30 percent estimate	18,000,000
Available for fiscal year 1986 endowment awards	27,600,000
Available for challenge grant continuations	0

PART II: *Challenge grant continuation estimates* [1]

1984: Estimated	$7,974,646
1985: Estimated	6,357,870
1986: Estimated	4,792,411

PART III.—*If challenge grants are fully funded, based on estimates, the funds that would be available for endowment purposes in fiscal year 1984 to fiscal year 1986.* [2]

1984:	
Challenge grant authorization	$9,600,000
Estimated continuation needs	−7,680,000
Challenge grant available for endowment	1,625,354
Special needs transfer	+5,215,256
Available for fiscal year 1984 endowment	6,840,610
1985:	
Challenge grant authorization	9,600,000
Estimated continuation needs	−6,357,870
Challenge grant available for endowment	3,242,230
Special needs transfer	+12,000,000
Available for fiscal year 1985 endowment	15,242,230
1986:	
Challenge grant authorization	9,600,000
Estimated continuation needs	−4,792,411
Challenge grant available for endowment	4,807,589

Special needs transfer.....	+18,000,000
Available for fiscal year 1986 endowment.....	22,807,589

[1] Estimates based on the institution's statement of available funds. Estimate does not include allowable activities and allowable costs.

[2] The special needs program transfers for fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1986 will possibly be higher because of the supplemental funds received in fiscal year 1983. Awards made from supplemental funds were for 18 months to bring all funded projects into a regular 12 month grant cycle.

APPENDIX C.—INSTITUTIONS AFFECTED BY A TERMINATION OF THE CHALLENGE GRANT PROGRAM IN FISCAL YEAR 1985 TO FISCAL YEAR 1986

Institution	1985 estimated award level	1986 estimated award level
Tuskegee Institute (Alabama) [1]	$697,000	0
Arkansas College (Arkansas)	123,287	0
Florida International University (Florida)	211,445	$211,445
Miami-Dade Community College (Florida)	350,000	0
Morehouse School of Medicine (Georgia) [1]	3,000,000	3,000,000
Southern University, Main (Louisiana) [1]	166,147	146,147
Maharishi International University (Iowa)	237,369	237,369
Xavier University (Louisiana) [1]	194,353	0
Suomi College (Michigan)	93,419	93,419
St. Mary's Junior College (Minnesota)	46,981	46,981
Union College (Nebraska)	113,074	113,074
York College (Nebraska)	9,998	9,998
St. Anselm College (New Hampshire)	46,898	46,898
Marist College (New York)	60,000	60,000
Eastern College (Pennsylvania)	54,521	54,421
Jacksonville State University (Alabama)	66,234	66,234
Atlanta University (Georgia) [1]	533,270	553,270
Catonsville Community College (Maryland)	67,092	67,092
Essex Community College (Maryland)	86,063	86,063
Our Lady of the Lake University (Texas)	164,177	0
Paul Quinn College (Texas)	36,542	0

[1] Historically Black colleges or universities.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1984.

Hon. TERREL H. BELL,
Secretary, Department of Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TED: I wanted to write and share several concerns regarding promulgation of regulations and implementation of the Challenge Grant Act Amendments of 1983 (Public Law 98-95). As you know, Congress passed and the President signed this law almost four months ago. I am becoming very concerned that the drafting of regulations, in order to conduct a grant competition early in 1984, is not receiving a high priority within the Office of Postsecondary Education.

Shortly after the bill became law, the Subcommittee staff met with Department officials responsible for the Title III program and for drafting the regulations. At the meeting, the type of grant program, the legislative intent surrounding certain provisions in the law, and the timetable for publishing the regulations and implementing this important program were discussed. Bud Blakey emphasized that it was my desire that awards be made to eligible, successful grantees no later than June 30, 1984. Since a point-system would be used (as in the College Housing Program) and no readers would be required, this appears feasible. However, very little consultation has been held with representatives of affected Title III institutions. That is critical to assure adequate input from the higher education community and to reduce the public comment period following publication of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).

The sooner the endowment amendments are implemented, the sooner eligible institutions can receive awards and begin to build or repair their endowment. Early publication will permit schools to determine their eligibility, begin fund-raising or solicitation of matching funds and assist them in preparing their applications by gathering the desired data *in advance*. If awards are not made until near the end of the fiscal year, significant time and interest earning potential will be lost.

I understand that two issues regarding the legislation have been raised: Continuing eligibility of current Challenge Grant recipients beyond FY 1984; and the law's provision that a school be eligible for a Challenge Grant for two years in any one five year period.

While I am sympathetic to the plight of Morehouse Medical School—since their eligibility for *program* funds is restricted to Part C of the Act—I am strongly opposed to the use of Part C funds for any purpose other than endowment building after the current fiscal year. Only 21 institutions are affected and I believe most of them could receive Part B funding on a matching basis, if necessary. The whole purpose of enacting P.L. 98-95 would be threatened, since very little Part C funding would be available for endowment purposes.

Finally, I believe Dr. Patterson has written you regarding the two-year limitation in the law. That provision was supported in testimony by the Department and serves as a rationing device for limited Part C funds. I am willing, however, to review Dr. Patterson's concerns in the upcoming reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The provision will have no impact before FY 1986.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss my concerns, please let me know.

Cordially,

PAUL SIMON,
Chairman.

□ 1420

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this amendment, H.R. 5287, to the endowment grant program of title III in the Higher Education Act which allows unused funds from part B for the continuation of programmatic multiyear grants.

I believe that this technical amendment is important for two reasons. First, it is designed to insure that a number of institutions now receiving challenge grants under title III will continue to receive funding as projected through fiscal year 1985 when the endowment grant program is slated for implementation. Without the enactment of this amendment, 21 of our Nation's institutions of higher education would be adversely affected. Second, it allows the Secretary of Education the important flexibility needed in administering this program.

I feel that H.R. 5287 is truly productive in helping the cause of higher education. We must continually face the challenge of looking toward a better use of existing resources and not just more funding. This amendment is clearly an example of attempting to meet that challenge.

This amendment has secured the strong support of both the administration and the higher education community. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5287, a bill which will authorize the Education Department to carry out a commitment made by the Department to 21 institutions of higher education for their program development prior to enactment of the Challenge Grant Amendments of 1983.

The Challenge Grant Amendments of 1983 changed the purpose for which funds provided under part C of title III of the Higher Education Act could be used. Prior to 1983, part C funds could be used for program development at colleges serving large numbers of low-income and minority students.

The Challenge Grant Amendments of 1983 in essence siphoned off funds for challenge grant programs to endowment programs. As a result of this legislative change, some of the institutions receiving multiyear commitments by these challenge grants will not be able to complete existing projects.

In brief, these new endowment grants will take over the funding from the challenge grants resulting in the institutions affected facing unanticipated new costs for the completion of activities and seriously jeopardizing the ability of some of these institutions in achieving self-sufficiency as well as meeting their accreditation requirements.

Twenty-one higher education institutions in our Nation that had previously received funding commitments from the education Department's challenge grants for program development will be adversely affected.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is much needed because it will provide for these institutions to continue their developmental activities and complete approved programs. Continuation of these programs is critical because of the complexity of many of these activities. If this amendment is not approved, many of the smaller educational institutions and the ones which serve large numbers of low-income and minority students will not be able to complete existing projects.

Further, it is clear to me that if this technical amendment is not approved, it is obvious that the Federal investment to date will likely produce negligible results because of the inability of small institutions to complete existing projects without some Federal assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this technical amendment. This Federal commitment will posi-

tively affect the institution's ability to achieve self-sufficency, and will make it possible to complete existing projects which are so vital to the growth and development of the institution.

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education has spent considerable time in the last session and in this one developing legislation to assist institutions of higher education strengthen their endowments. Last year the Congress enacted the Challenge Grant Act Amendments of 1983 (Public Law 98-95), which authorized, for the first time, the use of Federal funds for endowment building purposes.

This legislation mandated that all part C funds be used for endowment purposes and terminated the use of part C funds for program development purposes. This arrangement was agreed to by the Department and both Houses of Congress in order to facilitate this important aspect of institutional growth.

Twenty-one institutions of higher education which were receiving challenge grants under part C were given multiyear commitments by the Department and they have taken steps to raise private funds and in some cases have received public funds to implement their challenge grant programs. They have been placed in the position of having their programs interrupted and the agreements they made broken unless the Congress acts to continue their funding through fiscal year 1985.

H.R. 5287 authorizes the Secretary to pour over part B funds to part C in order to fund these 21 institutions. The Secretary has advised me that this would necessitate transferring about $6.2 million. We expect that the Secretary will provide that amount of funding to the 21 schools and no more. Part B funds, in excess of the amount needed to satisfy the fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 commitments to the 21 institutions, should not be transferred to part C. It is important that the basic integrity of the title III program be preserved and that the funds provided by the Congress be expended for the purposes for which they are appropriated.

It is extremely important that the fundamental purpose of the challenge grant program, as an endowment building mechanism, be preserved and expanded. At the same time, I do not want to cause any harm to the 21 schools who received a commitment from the Federal Government through the expiration of the current law in fiscal year 1985—that commitment should be honored.●

Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. KOGOVSEK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5287.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFICATION OF PROCEDURES UNDER THE UNIFORMED SERVICES FORMER SPOUSES' PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5027) to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify procedures for payment of military retired pay to spouses and former spouses of members of the uniformed services in compliance with court orders.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5027

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a)(2)(C) of section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "in the case of a division of property," before "specifically provides for".

(b)(1) The first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows: "After effective service on the Secretary concerned of a court order providing for the payment of child support or alimony or, with respect to a division of property, specifically providing for the payment of an amount of the disposable retired or retainer pay from a member to the spouse or a former spouse of the member, the Secretary shall make payments (subject to the limitations of this section) from the disposable retired or retainer pay of the member to the spouse or former spouse in an amount sufficient to satisfy the amount of child support and alimony set forth in the court order and, with respect to a division of property, in the amount of disposable retired or retainer pay specifically provided for in the court order.".

(2) The first sentence of paragraph (5) of such subsection is amended by striking out "disposable retired or retainer pay" the first place it appears and all that follows through "any part" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "child support or alimony or the payment of an amount of disposable retired or retainer pay as the result of the court's treatment of such pay under subsection (c) as property of the member and his spouse, the Secretary concerned shall pay (subject to the limitations of this section) from the disposable retired or retainer pay of the member to the spouse or former spouse of the member, any part".

(c)(1) Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out "from the disposable retired or retainer pay of a member, such pay" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the disposable retired or retainer pay of the member".

(2) Paragraph (3)(A) of such subsection is amended—

(A) by striking out "from the disposable retired or retainer pay";

(B) by striking out "the least amount of disposable retired or retainer pay" in clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "from the member's disposable retired or retainer pay the least amount"; and

(C) by striking out "of retired or retainer pay" in clause (ii)(I).

(3) The first sentence of paragraph (4)(A) of such subsection is amended—

(A) by striking out "the retired or retainer pay of"; and

(B) by striking out "such court orders and legal process shall be satisfied" and inserting in lieu thereof "satisfaction of such court orders and legal process from the retired or retainer pay of the member shall be".

(4) The first sentence of paragraph (5) of such subsection is amended—

(A) by striking out "of disposable retired or retainer pay" both places it appears; and

(B) by striking out "such pay" and inserting in lieu thereof "disposable retired or retainer pay".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to court orders for which effective service (as described in section 1408(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code) is made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration H.R. 5027, a technical corrections bill to insure that the original intent of the Former Spouses' Protection Act is carried out.

H.R. 5027 was introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN), the gentlelady from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST). Because of other commitments, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, has asked that I manage this legislation in his stead.

As my colleagues will recall, the Former Spouses' Protection Act does not make a Federal presumption of the division of military retired pay between the retiree and the former spouse but, instead, returns to the individual States the authority to treat military retired pay in accordance with State law in divorce settlements.

The act also provides a direct payment mechanism to permit the military finance centers to honor valid State court orders in all types of settlements: child support, alimony, and division of property.

Due to a problem in the wording of the Former Spouses' Protection Act, the direct payment mechanism is not working as Congress intended in many child support and alimony cases.

Currently, in order to be honored by the military finance centers for the purpose of direct payment, the court order in all types of settlements must specify that the payment be made from military retired pay. Many existing child support and alimony decrees, however, simply order the periodic payment of a certain amount of money without specifying that those payments must be made from military retired pay.

To facilitate the enforcement of valid child support and alimony awards, H.R. 5027 would eliminate the requirement that the court order specify that the payment be made from retired pay in the case of child support or alimony. However, the bill would retain that requirement in the case of divisions of property.

Without the correction included in the bill, the former spouse must continue to resort to the more cumbersome garnishment mechanism which varies from State to State. Garnishment is also costly. In many cases, the former spouse is unable to afford the lawyers' fees required to obtain payment of legally due child support and alimony obligations.

The Former Spouses' Protecton Act was designed to provide a direct payment mechanism to solve this problem. The purpose of H.R. 5027 is to insure that this original intent of the act is carried out. A provision similar to H.R. 5027 was included in last year's Department of Defense authorization bill as passed by the House but was dropped in conference due to technical disagreements with respect to the language. These minor differences have subsequently been resolved and, hopefuly, we can now close the circle with the passage of H.R. 5027.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) in urging my colleagues' favorable consideration of H.R. 5027, to make technical corrections to the Former Spouses' Protection Act. The amendments envisioned by this legislation are exactly that: technical. But they are also extremely important to thousands of women and children who are encountering difficulty in receiving legally due support payments from their military retiree exhusbands.

In recognition of this problem, Congress in 1975 provided authority for the attachment of Federal wages—for both current workers and retirees—in order to satisfy a court order on behalf of a former spouse for child support or alimony. In theory, the garnishment process is simple and straightforward: the defaulting spouse's employer withholds from the individual's salary the amount specified in the court order until the judgment has been satisfied. In practice, the garnishment path is often strewn with obstacles.

Garnishment procedures are as varied as the 50 States, and in several States the ability to use garnishment is extremely limited. Considerable delay is frequently involved. It may be necessary to return to court on a number of occasions in order to obtain compliance with a court order for child support or alimony. For example, once the original arrearage has been paid through garnishment procedures, if the defaulting spouse has again fallen behind in payments, the former spouse must go back into court and start the process all over.

The most serious problem with utilizing garnishment, however, is a very basic one: the cost. Many former spouses simply cannot afford the expense of good legal counsel, particularly if repeated access to the courts is required to force compliance with legally due support obligations.

In view of these problems, the Former Spouses' Protection Act established a direct payment mechanism to streamline the process and to insure timely payment. Because of a technical problem with the definition of "court order" included in the Former Spouses' Protection Act, however, direct payment is not possible in the case of many existing child support and alimony decrees.

H.R. 5027 will make the technical corrections to the act necessary to insure that the original intent of Congress is carried out, and I urge my colleagues' wholehearted support.

□ 1430

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITEHURST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HILLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation. Furthermore, I want to commend the gentleman, for I know the great work and effort he has gone to both in this matter and legislation that was passed last year. It would have not come to the floor except for the hearings that were held, I believe in the gentleman's district at his insistence and initiation; looking into the problem, finding out the need and getting legislation drafted, prepared to meet it.

Now this legislation is necessary, I believe, to perfect the action previously taken. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. WHITEHURST. That is correct. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. HILLIS. I want to commend the gentleman for what he has done in this legislation. We would not be here discussing it today if it were not for his efforts.

Mr. WHITEHURST. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield time to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) who certainly pushed this legislation, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST).

Because of their efforts we were able to have this legislation, a technical amendment in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the committee and everybody for working so hard on this; especially the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) who has been wonderful in trying to help with this and so many other problems we found in the military regarding the treatment of family.

These technical amendments are terribly important because people forget in family law we are dealing with the laws of all the different States and territories and they are very, very, very different.

So by passing this bill we will expedite the problems that have come about from the prior progress we made in this area requiring pension sharing when the court orders it.

For example, just to give you some of the problems we were faced with, in Maryland when a spouse was owed money, they had to go to court every month to renew the garnishment order. That is real "Mickey Mouse". It ties up the courts. It is a real problem. It is not what we intended. When this passes there will be direct payment, period.

In New York you have the garnishment orders being executed by the local sheriffs who collects the money, then he only makes an accounting of the money and turns over the proceeds within the next 6 months. That is real "Mickey Mouse," also. It delays getting much needed money to the family.

I could go on and on and on in State after State with some of the problems that we had. The law is better than it was before because at least a claim can be made on the pension but this will make the law much better because we will have a uniform law. Payments will be automatic if the courts and lawyers do the order properly.

I want to thank everybody for helping clear this up. Passage will certainly bring dignity to the women who worked so hard to bring dignity to this country through the role they served in by helping support their family and support our military. This law is long overdue.

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) for his outstanding work on this legislation. Without his tireless efforts, both the original Former Spouses' Protection Act and the technical corrections incorporated in H.R. 5027 would not come to pass. The gentleman has been a strong advocate of protecting the rights of former spouses of military retirees.

H.R. 5027 makes technical corrections to insure that the original intent of the Former Spouses' Protection Act is carried out. In 1982, Congress passed the Former Spouses' Protection Act following the June 26, 1981, U.S. Supreme Court *McCarty against McCarty* decision. In the McCarty decision, the Supreme Court invalidated the right of the State courts to treat military retired pay as property in divorce settlements. In overturning the McCarty decision, the Former Spouses' Protection Act makes no Federal presumption of any automatic divisibility of military retired pay between the retiree and a former spouse but instead returns to the individual States the right to treat military retired pay in accordance with State law in divorce settlements. The act also established a direct payment mechanism to insure that valid State court orders for child support, alimony, and division of property are honored by the military finance centers.

These technical corrections will make certain that the direct payment mechanism is available for existing child support and alimony decrees. Without these technical corrections, the former spouses would have to go back into court to have the original support order modified or would have to use the more costly and cumbersome garnishment process. ●

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5027.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 478 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to make permanent certain of the authorizations of appropriations under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1963, with Mr. LEVITAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 11, 1984, the bill was open to amendment at any point.

Pending at that time was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT) and a substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT) rise?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Chair.

The Chairman, as I understand, if I were to request unanimous consent to withdraw my pending amendment, then there would be another amendment offered in short order that would move back the deadline for the study that would permit a formula funding study by the Department of Agriculture, to give the Congress the opportunity to react legislatively, including the possibility of a markup if desired, after a colloquy.

Is that the intention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, that is my intention.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, that is the agreement.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania then does have an amendment that would accomplish that?

Mr. GOODLING. I have an amendment to accomplish that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to have a colloquy with the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to make sure that it is on the record that we have a gentleman's agreement, among all interested parties, to reopen next spring the State Administrative Expense Authority issues, including the question of a State matching requirement and, at that time, to react legislatively, that is, move a bill out of full committee and to the floor as may be necessary based on the findings and recommendations including the merits of a State matching requirement that will be forthcoming from a more comprehensive State Administrative Expense Authority study.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the committee will act expeditiously in the event the study offers suggestions and recommendations that necessitate quick action.

We will not be dilatory or anything along that line, we will go along.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the chairman for his assurances.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: Page 25, after line 19, strike out the section relating to State Administrative Expenses (inserted by the Bartlett amendment) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES STUDY

SEC. 30. Section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) The Secretary shall conduct a study of the allocation formula and procedures

under section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Such study shall provide information on State costs and contributions for administrative expenses, as well as the merits of a State matching requirement. The Secretary shall submit a report of such study to the Congress, together with any recommendations, by January 31, 1985.".

Page 26, line 15, strike out "and 29" and inset in lieu thereof "29, and 30".

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I did not interrupt the reading, because I would have had to have read the amendment if the Clerk had not. It is self-explanatory. It is what we have just talked about.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my committee chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we agree to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. WILLIAMS) is not here, but he has a technical amendment which I will offer in his stead.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PERKINS: Page 18, line 11, insert "and breakfast" after "lunch".

□ 1440

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, in committee the gentleman from Montana (Mr. WILLIAMS) offered an amendment which was adopted which made children from families receiving food stamps automatically eligible for free lunches and simplifying the income verification for these children.

The Williams amendment today modifies that provision of the bill to make these same children also eligible for free breakfasts. That was the gentleman's original intent in the committee and this is the amendment that I am offering today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. (a) Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2) by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1987";

(2) in subsection (g) by inserting "$1,471,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $1,525,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $1,597,000,000 for fiscal year 1987" after "September 30, 1984,".

(3) in subsection (h)(1) by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1987".

(b) Section 7(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1987".

(c) Section 19(j)(2) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking out in the first sentence "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1987".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 13(p) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1987".

(b) Section 14(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "1987".

Mr. BARTLETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, by offering this amendment in the nature of a substitute, I would return the House to the nexus of the debate on H.R. 7.

We have gone through a number of amendments during this debate. I would offer this amendment as an opportunity for Members to vote for current services funding of child nutrition programs and to reauthorize these programs in their exact format as contained in current law. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, would simply reauthorize the programs that are in this legislation—WIC, NET, State administrative expenses, summer feeding, and other programs.

This amendment would provide for the reauthorization of the current programs and the current law for an additional 3 years. It would allow for a continuation of services for the needy with inflation factored in; it would be a current services substitute so as to continue the same level of services.

The current services substitute does not include any of the provisions which were added in committee and which therefore add on costs to nutrition programs. This amendment would, for example, not raise the WIC authorization, does not raise the authorization for nutrition education training, and it does not attach H.R. 4091 to the bill. Let me pause at that point. It seems to this Member that it is the addition of H.R. 4091 that caused this bill to have less than bipartisan support when it came out of committee.

Now, some Members of this House voted for H.R. 4091 when it came through the House and some voted against it. The point is it has already passed. It could be brought up by the Senate at any time that they would choose. To add H.R. 4091 to H.R. 7, which adds enormous funding, simply would derail this child nutrition bill also.

My amendment would delete the provision for tiering in the child care program, it would delete the addition of the food service equipment service program, and it would delete the allowance for private vendors to reenter the summer food program. In short, it would delete the extraneous add-on and costly programs from H.R. 7, while reauthorizing existing child nutrition programs.

In terms of dollar savings to the taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a chart, which I will share with the House as a whole. H.R. 7, in its present form, would increase over current services the expenditures by the Government by a total of $297 million in fiscal year 1985, $393 million in fiscal year 1986, and $480 million in 1987, for a total of $1.17 billion.

So, if the House favors reauthorization of child nutrition programs without the addition of an extra $1 billion in spending then the House should vote for this substitute amendment, which would simply reauthorize those programs.

Mr. Chairman, one other point. That is, this amendment is very close—in fact, it may be identical to the original bill that was offered in the committee before the committee began markup.

I think a reauthorization of child nutrition is what is needed and not the addition of spending that could well result in no legislation at all being passed. The add-ons have already derailed H.R. 4091 so that H.R. 4091 has not been considered by the Senate and will likely not become law.

With this simple reauthorization I think we would serve the children who are being assisted by the child nutrition programs quite well.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all understand that back in 1981 when we had the Gramm-Latta vote No. 2, we cut this program $1½ billion. We have only since that time sought to restore to the program 14 percent of that cut. We cut these programs 35 percent in 1981, and this increase today is only restoring about 14 percent of that cutback.

And what did we do by reason of that cutback in 1981? Let me tell the Members. The paying children in the school lunch program dropped from 14.7 million down to 11.2 million as a result of that big cut.

At that time we had the greatest feeding program in the world and we are trying to do something for the reduced-price children here. At that time a meal was only costing the reduced-price children 15 cents. And today, as a result of that cut, it is costing them 40 cents. And we are trying

today to reduce that cost to the children to only down to 25 cents.

So there is nothing in this bill that is extravagant anywhere along the line. The amounts added back to these programs are minimal, about $200 million in 1984 and about $400 million to 1985, considering the good that will be achieved.

I think we all want to remember that these programs were cut by 35 percent in 1981 and as a result, 3 million children have dropped out of the school lunch program in the last 3 years and as many as 1 million of these children are poor.

We ought to begin to repair this damage by restoring some of the funds which only amounts in this bill to about 14 percent of the funds cut in 1981. These programs were cut in 1981 more than any other means-tested program.

I would hope that we would not want to go farther today with a substitute that will not only cut back the free and reduced-price programs, but will again perhaps knock another 3 million children out of the paid program.

We have a good bill. We brought here a good bill. It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we vote the substitute down because none of us wants to further destroy a great program and what we will do is knock another 3 million children out of this program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JEFFORDS: Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) A school or school food authority participating in a program under this Act may not contract with a food service company to provide a la carte food service unless such company agrees to offer free, reduced-price and full-price reimbursable meals to all eligible children.".

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this amendment will be controversial. The situation we are dealing with here is a new one which is coming into play.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Is this an amendment to the original bill?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman.

□ 1450

Mr. JEFFORDS. I think the gentleman is aware of my amendment and will enthusiastically agree with me on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, under this amendment we are trying to deal with an emerging problem. In the school lunch program we have found that a profitable aspect is the a la carte offering to our young people. The a la carte service in combination with the type A school lunch program works to the advantage of all children participating in the school lunch program. What we are seeing now in just a few instances could grow and pose a substantial threat to the national school lunch program. Specifically, I am referring to the push being made by the fast food industry to enter the school feeding market. Fast food company representatives are approaching local school authorities, offering to lease school building space and free local districts from operating at least a part of the school lunch program; namely, the a la carte meal service. When this happens, the profit made from the a la carte service which, when operated by the school food service, must be reinvested in the school's overall meal service, disappears. Stated somewhat differently, the profits recognized in a la carte sales serve to defray the costs incurred in the national school lunch program and are especially important in keeping the costs of lunches reasonable. When meal charges go up, participation drops, and many schools could be faced with a decision of whether or not to continue their participation in the federally assisted national school lunch program. The national school lunch program is the only national program available to insure that nutritionally balanced meals are available to children from low-income families.

All this amendment says is that if a food company wishes to come in and run a local school lunch program, it must be willing to operate the traditional, type A national school lunch program and offer free, reduced-price and paid category meals as well as any a la carte meal service. It will preclude food service companies from skimming off the profits associated with a la carte meal service, thereby jeopardizing the fiscal well-being of the national school lunch program.

That is the essence of the amendment. I do not believe it has any controversial aspects.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as I understand the gentleman's amendment, he is seeking to protect the school lunch program against fast food chains, and so forth?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Coming in and ripping off the profitable aspects and leaving the national school lunch program to deal with the more expensive aspects, resulting in a decreasing number of schools participating in the school lunch program as we know it and increasing numbers ending up with just a fast food outlet for the kids who can afford to pay for lunch at school.

Mr. PERKINS. And all the gentleman's amendment does is to assure that all children who are eligible are fed?

Mr. JEFFORDS. That is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has an excellent amendment, and we agree to that amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Ackerman	Borski	Corcoran
Addabbo	Bosco	Coughlin
Akaka	Boucher	Courter
Albosta	Boxer	Coyne
Alexander	Breaux	Craig
Anderson	Britt	Crane, Daniel
Andrews (TX)	Broomfield	Crane, Philip
Annunzio	Brown (CA)	Crockett
Anthony	Brown (CO)	Daniel
Applegate	Broyhill	Dannemeyer
Aspin	Bryant	Darden
AuCoin	Burton (CA)	Daschle
Badham	Burton (IN)	Daub
Barnard	Byron	Davis
Barnes	Campbell	Dellums
Bartlett	Carney	Derrick
Bateman	Carper	DeWine
Bates	Carr	Dickinson
Bedell	Chandler	Dicks
Beilenson	Chappell	Dingell
Bennett	Chappie	Dixon
Bereuter	Cheney	Donnelly
Berman	Clarke	Dorgan
Bethune	Clay	Dowdy
Bevill	Clinger	Downey
Biaggi	Coats	Dreier
Bilirakis	Coelho	Duncan
Billey	Coleman (MO)	Durbin
Boehlert	Coleman (TX)	Dwyer
Boggs	Collins	Dymally
Boland	Conable	Dyson
Boner	Conte	Early
Bonior	Conyers	Eckart
Bonker	Cooper	Edgar

Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

□ 1510

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and six Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 270, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

AYES—136

Andrews (TX)
Archer
Badham
Barnard
Bartlett
Bateman
Bennett
Bethune
Bilirakis
Bliley
Breaux
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Coleman (MO)
Conable
Corcoran
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis
DeWine
Dickinson
Dreier
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Frenzel
Gingrich
Gradison
Green
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hansen (UT)
Hartnett
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Kasich
Kindness
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach
Leath
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Ray
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Roth
Rudd
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Smith (NE)
Smith, Denny
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Winn
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zschau

NOES—270

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnes
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Britt
Brown (CA)
Burton (CA)
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
D'Amours
Darden
Daschle
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gray
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harkin
Harrison
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Panetta
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Shannon
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Synar
Tallon
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews (NC)
Berman
Brooks
Bryant
de la Garza
Early
Fascell
Frost
Fuqua
Gramm
Hall (IN)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Heftel
Jones (NC)
Kazen
Kemp
Markey
Matsui
Paul
Shelby
Simon
Smith, Robert
Swift
Whitten
Wilson
Wirth

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Paul for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. FISH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of the committee and as a cosponsor of this legislation to add my voice of support to H.R. 7. This legislation is essential if we are to attempt to restore some of the drastic cuts that were imposed upon our child nutrition program in 1981 as a result of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act—which slashed these programs by a total of 15 percent. More importantly, H.R. 7 provides for modest growth in this program by adding $80 million for the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children. Finally, it should be noted that funding for H.R. 7 is consistent with the first concurrent budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 280) which assumes full funding for these programs.

Let me take a moment to refresh the memories of those here who might not recall what the 1981 Gramm-Latta bill has wrought on this program.

As one who did not support the 1981 omnibus legislation—I opposed it for what it did to programs such as this—programs which serve to give the working people of this country some financial relief if they are to remain a part of the labor force. In many cases the children that are served by this program are part of families who work—but cannot afford to provide them with an adequate diet without these programs. The cuts that prevailed in 1981 were aimed at the working poor—and for that we have paid dearly. This bill attempts to reverse the regressive policy which has resulted in a loss of nearly half of this program—$1.5 billion.

The 1981 bill resulted in 3.6 million children being dropped from these programs—children of the working poor. The number of schools have also dropped off—from 93,770 to 90,500. Many of these schools are nonpublic schools and public schools that serve large numbers of needy children. These are the very same students—and the very same schools—that we are trying to help.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill is a dramatic illustration of the fact that we can put our money toward a more compassionate and humane set of programs. We can demonstrate that we are succeeding in reversing the damage of the past and moving toward growth in these programs for the future.

Since 1981 the loss in noncash benefits to poor households has been dramatic, averaging $170—with those making $10,000 or less the hardest hit with a loss of $250 in cash benefits. These same 10,000 households have also lost $160 in noncash benefits, and have net a mere $20 from the tax cut.

Laudably, H.R. 7 moves in the same direction I believe the majority of the Members of this House want to move. For the second time in 2 weeks—the first being the passage of the first concurrent budget resolution last week—we are putting ourselves on record in support of the maintenance of a compassionate and humane approach to government.

I also wish to advise my colleagues that this legislation contains an important provision which I offered in the committee, that reestablishes the food equipment assistance program, which was also lost in 1981. This amendment was based upon legislation authored by my good friend and colleague from New York, Mr. SOLARZ, H.R. 4911. Restoration of this program is essential particularly to nonpublic schools which serve large numbers of low-income children. According to the U.S. Catholic Conference, the demise of the equipment program has severely hampered the growth of the lunch program in many poorer neighborhoods. These schools are being forced to choose between serving meals with funds provided under this act—or use these same funds to purchase equipment. As a result, many schools are struggling with obsolete equipment in need of constant repair or replacement.

H.R. 7, as amended, authorizes $10 million a year for 4 years over the life of the bill, for the equipment program. It targets funds to the neediest of districts by requiring, as a condition of participation, that 60 percent or more of the children in that district be receiving free or reduced-price lunches. Testimony before the committee confirmed the need for this program and, I am pleased that we were able to restore this important component to this program to assure that our schools have the appropriate "infrastructure" to fully operate these programs.

In addition to the equipment program, I wish to make note of the remaining major provisions of H.R. 7 which merit our support:

Under the school lunch and breakfast program, the bill requires OMB to seek congressional approval before attempting to change the poverty guidelines of the programs as they relate to eligibility. The bill also eliminates the requirement for local agencies to verify the income of free and reduced-price students unless Congress provides full funding for such activities. To further assure that all needy individuals receive benefits from this program, H.R. 7 exempts food stamp and AFDC households from additional verification and makes recipients of food stamps, AFDC and State public assistance programs automatically eligible for free school lunches. Finally, the bill requires USDA to conduct a feasibility study on self-financing of the universal lunch program, extends the school lunch pilot project study of alternative means of providing assistance under the school lunch program under the "cash-in-lieu of commmodities" program and extends the "offer versus serve" provisions in the school breakfast program.

Under the summer food program, a provision was added to allow private, nonprofit organizations—including summer camps—to participate if they serve not more than 2,500 children daily at not more than 25 sites and prepare their meals onsite.

Under the child food program, we restore the "tiering" system of reimbursements for child care centers. This system is necessary if we are to provide adequate assistance to centers which serve large numbers of low-income children and reduce the paperwork burden to these same centers so they can concentrate on providing services instead of filling out forms.

Under the WIC program, H.R. 7 provides for the following:

Creates WIC as a capped entitlement and provide $80 million in fiscal year 1985 for program expansion and improved program administration through curtailing activities of OMB, requiring State agency outreach with AFDC and allowing States to spend 102.1 percent of their annual grant to assure that all funds appropriated will be used to the benefit of clients.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill incorporates the provisions of H.R. 4091 passed overwhelmingly by the House last year by a vote of 306 to 114. This bill lowered school breakfast and lunch charges, improved school breakfast meal patterns and provided additional meals for CCFP.

In sum, it is important that we act to pass this legislation. These programs cannot expire for the very individuals they serve are those who are hardest hit by recent ravages in Federal income maintenance programs as well as unemployment. The working poor of this country are the very ones who have suffered from the cuts in these programs and they are the very same people we are trying to assist with this legislation. It has been the topic of nine hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education, of which I am a member. I commend my chairman, CARL PERKINS, for his dedication not only to this legislation, but to the child nutritions programs as a whole. His leadership has been instrumental in assuring that the neediest of our citizens in this Nation are served by this program.

This bill also recognizes that schools, as focal points in our communities, can be used to serve the nutritional needs of seniors. The bill allows feeding sites to serve as meal sites to seniors, as long as no reductions in meals to children occur. As an original member of the Select Committee on

Aging, I have maintained a longstanding commitment to our nutritional programs for the elderly under the Older Americans Act, and I believe that this provision in H.R. 7 complements those programs.

I urge support for this legislation.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7, a bill to extend and improve the Child Nutrition Act.

The devastating effects of hunger and malnutrition are faced daily by many people in this country. In my own State, the department of public health has recently shown, in a report entitled "1983 Massachusetts Nutrition Survey," that a significant number of low-income, preschool children suffer one or more signs of malnutrition. The report found that "there may be between 10,000 and 17,500 chronically undernourished, low-income, preschool children in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts." Pointing to probable consequences, the survey stated that "the implications of this level of undernutrition include retarded growth, impaired learning ability and increased health problems."

The special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC) is a proven defense against chronic malnutrition. In fact, the WIC program is one of the most effective and efficient programs run by the Federal Government. A study by the Harvard School of Public Health documented not only a marked decrease in the incidence of low birth weight by those enrolled in the WIC program, but also reported that each dollar spent on the kind of prenatal care that WIC provides saves $3 in future hospitalization costs. This cost/benefit ratio is far above most programs sponsored by the Federal Government.

The WIC program currently serves about 3 million infants, children, and pregnant and postpartum mothers. The program supplies supplemental food, nutrition information, and prenatal care to qualified low-income individuals who are shown to suffer nutritional risk. At present, over 10 million persons are eligible, yet the program serves less than a third. In my district, only 27 percent of the need can be met, with only approximately 19 percent of the eligible 1- to 5-year-olds being served. This modest increase in WIC authorizations is a first step to meet this important need.

Back in January, in response to these rising problems of malnutrition, I introduced H.R. 4661. This bill, in part, sought to extend and increase the WIC authorization. Today, therefore, I wish to commend members of the Education and Labor Committee for moving on my suggestion and that of many other members to expand the WIC program.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this move to include increased WIC authorizations in this child nutrition legislation and urge my colleagues to support this measure.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, a bill to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. This bill will restore a small portion of the funds cut from child nutrition programs since 1981, and will improve certain features of these vital programs. We must take this step toward insuring that the children of the world's wealthiest country are adequately nourished.

Every provision of this complex bill—the child care food program, the summer food program, the nutrition education and training program, and the others—merits the strong support of the Congress. I would like to explain in some detail, though, how the enactment of two sections of this bill, namely, the WIC amendments and the school lunch program amendments, will improve the lives of children in the Third District of Connecticut.

In New Haven, Conn., WIC programs supplement the diets of 7,350 high-risk pregnant and nursing women, infants, and children under the age of 5. Of these 3,325 are served through Yale New Haven Hospital, 1,925 through St. Raphael's Hospital, 1,375 through the Hill Health Center, and 725 by the Fairhaven Community Health Center.

Elizabeth Gersten of the Fairhaven clinic has helped to make WIC the success it has been in my district for the past 10 years. In Ms. Gersten's judgment, "WIC is a phenomenally successful program." She explained that WIC serves crucial functions in addition to providing its participants with individually tailored quantities and combinations of milk, fruit juice, eggs, fortified cereal, peanut butter, dried beans, and infant formula.

"WIC brings people into the health center, it keeps them coming, and it gets them tied into health care," states Ms. Gersten. As we struggle to contain the soaring costs of health care, we should be pleased to continue a program like WIC which gives people at health risk basic, nourishing food; significantly reduces the incidence of low birth weight; teaches people the broad principles of nutrition; and connects these people into the health-preserving screening and treatment system.

Connecticut has been exceptionally smart about positioning itself to take advantage of WIC dollars as they became available. An official at the State department of health emphasized to me that Connecticut serves two-thirds of the people in the State eligible for WIC, while the national average is only 30 percent. And by law, in every State, a minimum of 80 percent of the money Congress appropriates to WIC must be spent on food.

While spotlighting the State's achievements, though, we should look to the shadows also. One-third of the low-income pregnant women, infants, and children in Connecticut determined by the medical profession to be at nutritional risk cannot be served by the WIC program because of lack of funds.

H.R. 7 extends the WIC program for 4 years. It provides for modest program growth, and makes changes in the program to improve administration. Along with its other strongly warranted provisions, these WIC measures make H.R. 7 a priority bill for adoption by the Congress.

Another section of this bill with special relevance to my congressional district is the school lunch amendments. Towns throughout south-central Connecticut are experiencing increased financial strain on their school lunch programs, and many of these problems date to the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981.

The 1981 legislation cut the Federal reimbursement for school lunches, raised the price charged to the child, tightened eligibility requirements, and excluded private schools whose annual tuition exceeds $1,500 from participation in the school lunch program. As a result of these changes, participation dropped sharply. In fiscal 1981, 27 million children were fed by the school lunch program. By fiscal 1983, only 23.4 million children took part. And the number of schools involved dropped from 93,770 to 90,500.

Some of the schools which opted out of the program were in the Clinton School District. Dr. Joseph Cirasuolo, superintendent at Clinton, explained that their program costs would actually have been higher had they stayed with the Federal subsidy.

Mr. D. Edward Mas, superintendent of Hamden public schools, told me yesterday that the Hamden program will run at least a $30,000 deficit next year and if the Federal subsidy were to be reduced any further, their program could not be continued.

H.R. 7 may help school districts like these continue to offer free and reduced-price meals to children with low-income families. By increasing the Federal reimbursement rate for reduced-price meals, and making a number of changes in the law designed to increase participation in the school lunch program, H.R. 7 will help restore this crucial Federal program to its intended scope.

I urge the support of every Member of the House for H.R. 7.●

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1984.

Three years ago, President Reagan had his way: This Congress acquiesced to his demands and slashed $1.5 billion from child nutrition programs. Those of us who fought those cuts warned then that the results would be disastrous. Our fears have been borne out. In the school lunch program alone, nearly 4 million fewer poor children participate today than in 1981.

Now we are fighting back. This bill will restore those funds and help restore a sense of fairness to our country. We can bring the Federal subsidy for the school lunch and school breakfast programs back almost to the 1981 levels. We can strengthen WIC, the program so vital to pregnant women, infants, and children whose diets are dangerously inadequate.

Passage of this bill is both a practical necessity and a moral imperative. For $1.5 billion, roughly the same amount of money President Reagan wants to spend on the military budget each day, we can fund these programs adequately for an entire year.

Let us show President Reagan what fairness means. Let us tell him this is an investment we cannot afford to miss. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 7.●

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1984, and commend my colleagues, Mr. PERKINS and Mr. MILLER, for their leadership on this issue.

H.R. 7 reauthorizes school lunch and child nutrition programs and restores funding to the school lunch, breakfast, and child care food programs. Most critically, this bill will authorize increased funds for those individuals especially at risk—an additional 150,000 low-income, pregnant and nursing women, infants, and children will be served by these programs by fiscal year 1985.

H.R. 7 will restore only 15 percent of the funds which were cut from child nutrition programs in fiscal year 1982. This increase in the fiscal year 1984 authorization level is just sufficient to prevent reductions in the number of persons served by the program in 1983; and still, tragically, less than one-half of the persons who are eligible and in need will be able to obtain services under WIC.

H.R. 7 is supported by the American School Food Service Association, the National PTA, and the child nutrition community. I urge my colleagues to support the recommendations put forth by the Education and Labor Committee in H.R. 7. We cannot afford to alter the structure or reduce the scope of the child nutrition programs if we are to maintain a strong commitment to the health and welfare of this Nation's most valuable resource, its children. Thank you.●

□ 1520

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a minute to indicate what we have done to this point as far as amendments are concerned.

We eliminated the entitlement status for the WIC program. There were perfecting changes in the summer feeding program. More specifically, we limited the number of sites a private sponsor may operate to 15. We permitted only self-prepare sites that are operated by sponsors who provide yearlong activities for children and have demonstrated management and fiscal capacity. We gave the first right of refusal to the schools and units of local government to run summer feeding programs sites. We limited the tiering change in the child care food program. We also placed a 2-year limitation on the freeze on the current means for determining income eligibility for free and reduced-price meals.

Some of the additions we may wish to deal with in conference committee. There is $100 million extra in WIC. Tiering will cost $9 million extra, equipment $10 million extra, the summer feeding program $14 million extra, and $42 million for the breakfast program. In short, some perfecting amendments were accepted here; there are several remaining changes which I trust we can work out in conference committee to make certain reductions in child nutrition program costs. It is very clear that if we wish to see the five child nutrition authorities scheduled to expire on September 30 reauthorized—namely, the summer feeding program, the commodity distribution program, the nutrition education and training program, the State administrative expenses, and the WIC programs—if we want to continue those programs, then this is the vehicle we need in order to so do. As I indicated, we will try to clear up some of the few remaining troublesome policy issues we were unable to clear up on the floor when we go to conference.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GOODLING. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLING. All through the debate and in committee, he has offered constructive amendments. Several of them have been adopted. He has made a great contribution, along with other Members on the minority side.

But I do want to state—and I think the gentleman will agree—that we have only restored 14 percent of the $1.5 billion that was cut out of this legislation in the Gramm-Latta vote in June 1981. So this bill is not bloated anywhere along the line. Every penny in it is necessary. In fact, the bill is presently underfunded. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a cautious member and has offered constructive amendments, and I think he deserves the compliments of every Member in the Chamber.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to merely say that the change made in the Reconciliation Act of 1981 have represented savings of between $1.4 and $1.5 billion annually since their implementation in fiscal year 1982.

This legislation which is designed to fine tune some of the Reconciliation Act changes will not eliminate the bulk of these cost savings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT) having assumed the chair, Mr. LEVITAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7) to make permanent certain of the authorizations of appropriations under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1963, pursuant to House Resolution 478, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 343, nays 72, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—343

Ackerman	Feighan	Marlenee
Addabbo	Ferraro	Marriott
Akaka	Fish	Martin (NC)
Albosta	Flippo	Martin (NY)
Alexander	Florio	Martinez
Anderson	Foglietta	Matsui
Andrews (TX)	Foley	Mavroules
Annunzio	Ford (MI)	Mazzoli
Anthony	Ford (TN)	McCloskey
Applegate	Fowler	McCurdy
Aspin	Frank	McDade
AuCoin	Franklin	McEwen
Barnard	Frenzel	McGrath
Barnes	Fuqua	McHugh
Bates	Garcia	McKernan
Bedell	Gaydos	McKinney
Bellenson	Gejdenson	McNulty
Bereuter	Gekas	Mica
Berman	Gephardt	Mikulski
Bevill	Gibbons	Miller (CA)
Biaggi	Gilman	Miller (OH)
Boehlert	Gingrich	Mineta
Boggs	Glickman	Minish
Boland	Gonzalez	Mitchell
Boner	Goodling	Moakley
Bonior	Gore	Molinari
Bonker	Gradison	Mollohan
Borski	Gray	Moody
Bosco	Green	Moore
Boucher	Gregg	Morrison (CT)
Boxer	Guarini	Morrison (WA)
Breaux	Gunderson	Mrazek
Britt	Hall (OH)	Murphy
Broomfield	Hall, Ralph	Murtha
Brown (CA)	Hall, Sam	Myers
Bryant	Hamilton	Natcher
Burton (CA)	Hammerschmidt	Neal
Byron	Harkin	Nelson
Campbell	Harrison	Nichols
Carney	Hatcher	Nowak
Carper	Hawkins	O'Brien
Carr	Hayes	Oakar
Chandler	Hefner	Oberstar
Chappell	Hertel	Obey
Chappie	Hightower	Olin
Clarke	Hillis	Ortiz
Clay	Holt	Ottinger
Clinger	Horton	Owens
Coats	Howard	Oxley
Coelho	Hoyer	Packard
Coleman (MO)	Hubbard	Panetta
Coleman (TX)	Huckaby	Parris
Collins	Hughes	Pashayan
Conte	Hutto	Patman
Conyers	Ireland	Patterson
Cooper	Jacobs	Pease
Corcoran	Jeffords	Penny
Coughlin	Jenkins	Pepper
Courter	Johnson	Perkins
Coyne	Jones (OK)	Petri
Crockett	Jones (TN)	Pickle
D'Amours	Kaptur	Porter
Darden	Kasich	Price
Daschle	Kemp	Pritchard
Davis	Kennelly	Pursell
de la Garza	Kildee	Quillen
Dellums	Kindness	Rahall
Derrick	Kleczka	Rangel
Dicks	Kogovsek	Ratchford
Dingell	Kolter	Ray
Dixon	Kostmayer	Regula
Donnelly	LaFalce	Reid
Dorgan	Lantos	Richardson
Dowdy	Latta	Ridge
Downey	Leach	Rinaldo
Duncan	Lehman (CA)	Rodino
Durbin	Lehman (FL)	Roe
Dwyer	Leland	Roemer
Dymally	Lent	Rogers
Dyson	Levin	Rose
Early	Levine	Rostenkowski
Eckart	Levitas	Roth
Edgar	Lewis (FL)	Roukema
Edwards (AL)	Lipinski	Rowland
Edwards (CA)	Lloyd	Roybal
Edwards (OK)	Long (LA)	Russo
Emerson	Long (MD)	Sabo
English	Lowery (CA)	Savage
Erdreich	Lowry (WA)	Sawyer
Evans (IA)	Luken	Scheuer
Evans (IL)	Lundine	Schneider
Fascell	MacKay	Schroeder
Fazio	Madigan	Schulze
Schumer	Stratton	Weaver
Seiberling	Studds	Weiss
Shannon	Swift	Wheat
Sharp	Synar	Whitley
Shaw	Tallon	Whitten
Sikorski	Tauke	Williams (MT)
Sisisky	Tauzin	Williams (OH)
Skelton	Taylor	Wise
Slattery	Thomas (GA)	Wolf
Smith (FL)	Torres	Wolpe
Smith (IA)	Torricelli	Wortley
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Wright
Snowe	Traxler	Wyden
Snyder	Udall	Wylie
Solarz	Valentine	Yates
Spence	Vander Jagt	Yatron
Spratt	Vandergriff	Young (AK)
St Germain	Vento	Young (FL)
Staggers	Volkmer	Young (MO)
Stangeland	Walgren	Zschau
Stark	Watkins	
Stokes	Waxman	

NAYS—72

Archer	Fields	Nielson
Badham	Hansen (UT)	Ritter
Bartlett	Hartnett	Roberts
Bateman	Hiler	Robinson
Bennett	Hopkins	Rudd
Bethune	Hunter	Schaefer
Bilirakis	Hyde	Sensenbrenner
Bliley	Kramer	Shumway
Brown (CO)	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Broyhill	Leath	Siljander
Burton (IN)	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Cheney	Livingston	Smith (NE)
Conable	Loeffler	Smith, Denny
Craig	Lott	Solomon
Crane, Daniel	Lujan	Stenholm
Crane, Philip	Lungren	Stump
Daniel	Mack	Sundquist
Dannemeyer	Martin (IL)	Thomas (CA)
Daub	McCain	Vucanovich
DeWine	McCandless	Walker
Dickinson	McCollum	Weber
Dreier	Michel	Whitehurst
Erlenborn	Montgomery	Whittaker
Fiedler	Moorhead	Winn

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Brooks	Heftel	Shelby
Frost	Jones (NC)	Simon
Gramm	Kastenmeier	Smith, Robert
Hall (IN)	Kazen	Wilson
Hance	Markey	Wirth

□ 1540

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Paul against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 7

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, the clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill H.R. 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT ON TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1984, DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, May 2, 1984, for the purpose of marking up the following bills:

H.R. 5505. To amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (war risk insurance);

H.R. 3289. To establish a commission to study the defense-related aspects of the U.S. merchant marine;

H.R. 5091. To authorize appropriations for the maritime construction differential subsidy for fiscal year 1985;

H.R. 5220. To protect the national defense shipyards of the United States; and

H.R. 5364. To authorize the construction of versatile motor-vehicle-carrying vessels under title VII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PRITCHARD) and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) have been apprised of the markup time and date and are in accord with this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3457, SOIL CONSERVATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-727), on the resolution (H. Res. 493) providing for the consideraiton of the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building

soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land from wind and water erosion to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands from cultivation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5167, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1985

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-728), on the resolution (H. Res. 494) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5167) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today and then on each motion postponed on Monday, April 30.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5041, House Concurrent Resolution 275, House Concurrent Resolution 261, H.R. 5188, H.R. 5147, H.R. 4585, House Joint Resolution 537, H.R. 5050, H.R. 5076, H.R. 4263, H.R. 4596, H.R. 3787, H.R. 5100, H.R. 3472, and H.R. 4952. On each of which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote in this series.

□ 1530

JOINT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5041, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5041, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—417

Ackerman	Dickinson	Hutto
Addabbo	Dicks	Hyde
Akaka	Dingell	Ireland
Albosta	Dixon	Jacobs
Alexander	Donnelly	Jeffords
Anderson	Dorgan	Jenkins
Andrews (TX)	Dowdy	Johnson
Annunzio	Downey	Jones (OK)
Anthony	Dreier	Jones (TN)
Applegate	Duncan	Kaptur
Archer	Durbin	Kasich
Aspin	Dwyer	Kastenmeier
AuCoin	Dymally	Kemp
Badham	Dyson	Kennelly
Barnard	Early	Kildee
Barnes	Eckart	Kindness
Bartlett	Edgar	Kleczka
Bateman	Edwards (AL)	Kogovsek
Bates	Edwards (CA)	Kolter
Bedell	Edwards (OK)	Kostmayer
Beilenson	Emerson	Kramer
Bennett	English	LaFalce
Bereuter	Erdreich	Lagomarsino
Berman	Erlenborn	Lantos
Bethune	Evans (IA)	Latta
Bevill	Evans (IL)	Leach
Biaggi	Fascell	Leath
Bilirakis	Fazio	Lehman (CA)
Bliley	Feighan	Lehman (FL)
Boehlert	Ferraro	Leland
Boggs	Fiedler	Lent
Boland	Fields	Levin
Boner	Fish	Levine
Bonior	Flippo	Levitas
Bonker	Florio	Lewis (CA)
Borski	Foglietta	Lewis (FL)
Bosco	Foley	Lipinski
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Livingston
Boxer	Ford (TN)	Lloyd
Breaux	Fowler	Loeffler
Britt	Frank	Long (LA)
Broomfield	Franklin	Long (MD)
Brown (CA)	Frenzel	Lott
Brown (CO)	Fuqua	Lowery (CA)
Broyhill	Garcia	Lowry (WA)
Bryant	Gaydos	Lujan
Burton (CA)	Gejdenson	Luken
Burton (IN)	Gekas	Lundine
Byron	Gephardt	Lungren
Campbell	Gibbons	Mack
Carney	Gilman	MacKay
Carper	Gingrich	Madigan
Carr	Glickman	Marlenee
Chandler	Gonzalez	Marriott
Chappell	Goodling	Martin (IL)
Chappie	Gore	Martin (NC)
Cheney	Gradison	Martin (NY)
Clarke	Gray	Martinez
Clay	Green	Matsui
Clinger	Gregg	Mavroules
Coats	Guarini	Mazzoli
Coelho	Gunderson	McCain
Coleman (MO)	Hall (OH)	McCandless
Coleman (TX)	Hall, Ralph	McCloskey
Collins	Hall, Sam	McCollum
Conable	Hamilton	McCurdy
Conte	Hammerschmidt	McDade
Conyers	Hansen (UT)	McEwen
Cooper	Harkin	McGrath
Corcoran	Harrison	McHugh
Coughlin	Hartnett	McKernan
Courter	Hatcher	McKinney
Coyne	Hawkins	McNulty
Craig	Hayes	Mica
Crane, Daniel	Hefner	Michel
Crane, Philip	Hertel	Mikulski
Crockett	Hightower	Miller (CA)
D'Amours	Hiler	Miller (OH)
Daniel	Hillis	Mineta
Dannemeyer	Holt	Minish
Darden	Hopkins	Mitchell
Daschle	Horton	Moakley
Daub	Howard	Molinari
Davis	Hoyer	Mollohan
de la Garza	Hubbard	Montgomery
Dellums	Huckaby	Moody
Derrick	Hughes	Moore
DeWine	Hunter	Moorhead
Morrison (CT)	Roe	Studds
Morrison (WA)	Roemer	Stump
Mrazek	Rogers	Sundquist
Murphy	Rose	Swift
Murtha	Rostenkowski	Synar
Myers	Roth	Tallon
Natcher	Roukema	Tauke
Neal	Rowland	Tauzin
Nelson	Roybal	Taylor
Nichols	Rudd	Thomas (CA)
Nielson	Russo	Thomas (GA)
Nowak	Sabo	Torres
O'Brien	Savage	Torricelli
Oakar	Sawyer	Towns
Oberstar	Schaefer	Traxler
Obey	Scheuer	Udall
Olin	Schneider	Valentine
Ortiz	Schroeder	Vander Jagt
Ottinger	Schulze	Vandergriff
Owens	Schumer	Vento
Oxley	Seiberling	Volkmer
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Panetta	Shannon	Walgren
Parris	Sharp	Walker
Pashayan	Shaw	Watkins
Patman	Shumway	Waxman
Patterson	Shuster	Weaver
Pease	Sikorski	Weber
Penny	Siljander	Weiss
Pepper	Sisisky	Wheat
Perkins	Skeen	Whitehurst
Petri	Skelton	Whitley
Pickle	Slattery	Whittaker
Porter	Smith (FL)	Whitten
Price	Smith (IA)	Williams (MT)
Pritchard	Smith (NE)	Williams (OH)
Pursell	Smith (NJ)	Winn
Quillen	Smith, Denny	Wirth
Rahall	Snowe	Wise
Rangel	Snyder	Wolf
Ratchford	Solarz	Wolpe
Ray	Solomon	Wortley
Regula	Spence	Wright
Reid	Spratt	Wyden
Richardson	St Germain	Wylie
Ridge	Staggers	Yates
Rinaldo	Stangeland	Yatron
Ritter	Stark	Young (AK)
Roberts	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Robinson	Stokes	Young (MO)
Rodino	Stratton	Zschau

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Shelby
Brooks	Heftel	Simon
Frost	Jones (NC)	Smith, Robert
Gramm	Kazen	Wilson
Hall (IN)	Markey	
Hance	Paul	

□ 1600

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1610

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GLICKMAN). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on all of the additional motions to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings on today and on yesterday.

The Chair announces that there are 14 suspensions. Each vote will be 5 minutes.

CONGRATULATING THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA ON ITS EFFORTS TOWARD HERBICIDAL ERADICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 275, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 275, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—416

Ackerman	Clinger	Ferraro
Addabbo	Coats	Fiedler
Akaka	Coelho	Fields
Albosta	Coleman (MO)	Fish
Alexander	Coleman (TX)	Flippo
Andrews (TX)	Collins	Florio
Annunzio	Conable	Foglietta
Anthony	Conte	Foley
Applegate	Conyers	Ford (MI)
Archer	Cooper	Ford (TN)
Aspin	Corcoran	Fowler
AuCoin	Coughlin	Frank
Badham	Courter	Franklin
Barnard	Coyne	Frenzel
Barnes	Craig	Fuqua
Bartlett	Crane, Daniel	Garcia
Bateman	Crane, Philip	Gaydos
Bates	Crockett	Gejdenson
Bedell	D'Amours	Gekas
Beilenson	Daniel	Gephardt
Bennett	Dannemeyer	Gibbons
Bereuter	Darden	Gilman
Berman	Daschle	Gingrich
Bethune	Daub	Glickman
Bevill	Davis	Gonzalez
Biaggi	de la Garza	Goodling
Bilirakis	Dellums	Gore
Bliley	Derrick	Gradison
Boehlert	DeWine	Gray
Boggs	Dickinson	Green
Boland	Dicks	Gregg
Boner	Dingell	Guarini
Bonior	Dixon	Gunderson
Bonker	Donnelly	Hall (OH)
Borski	Dorgan	Hall, Ralph
Bosco	Dowdy	Hall, Sam
Boucher	Downey	Hamilton
Boxer	Dreier	Hammerschmidt
Breaux	Duncan	Hansen (UT)
Britt	Durbin	Harkin
Broomfield	Dwyer	Harrison
Brown (CA)	Dymally	Hartnett
Brown (CO)	Dyson	Hatcher
Broyhill	Early	Hawkins
Bryant	Eckart	Hayes
Burton (CA)	Edgar	Hefner
Burton (IN)	Edwards (AL)	Hertel
Byron	Edwards (CA)	Hightower
Campbell	Edwards (OK)	Hiler
Carney	Emerson	Hillis
Carper	English	Holt
Carr	Erdreich	Hopkins
Chandler	Erlenborn	Horton
Chappell	Evans (IA)	Howard
Chappie	Evans (IL)	Hoyer
Cheney	Fascell	Hubbard
Clarke	Fazio	Huckaby
Clay	Feighan	Hughes
Hunter	Mitchell	Shannon
Hutto	Moakley	Sharp
Hyde	Molinari	Shaw
Ireland	Mollohan	Shumway
Jacobs	Montgomery	Shuster
Jeffords	Moody	Sikorski
Jenkins	Moore	Siljander
Johnson	Moorhead	Sisisky
Jones (OK)	Morrison (CT)	Skeen
Jones (TN)	Morrison (WA)	Skelton
Kaptur	Mrazek	Slattery
Kasich	Murphy	Smith (FL)
Kastenmeier	Murtha	Smith (IA)
Kemp	Myers	Smith (NE)
Kennelly	Natcher	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Neal	Smith, Denny
Kindness	Nelson	Snowe
Kleczka	Nichols	Snyder
Kogovsek	Nielson	Solarz
Kolter	Nowak	Solomon
Kostmayer	O'Brien	Spence
Kramer	Oakar	Spratt
LaFalce	Oberstar	St Germain
Lagomarsino	Obey	Staggers
Lantos	Olin	Stangeland
Latta	Ortiz	Stark
Leach	Ottinger	Stenholm
Leath	Owens	Stokes
Lehman (CA)	Oxley	Stratton
Lehman (FL)	Packard	Studds
Leland	Panetta	Stump
Lent	Parris	Sundquist
Levin	Pashayan	Swift
Levine	Patman	Synar
Levitas	Patterson	Tallon
Lewis (CA)	Pease	Tauke
Lewis (FL)	Penny	Tauzin
Lipinski	Pepper	Taylor
Livingston	Perkins	Thomas (CA)
Lloyd	Petri	Thomas (GA)
Loeffler	Pickle	Torres
Long (LA)	Porter	Torricelli
Long (MD)	Price	Towns
Lott	Pritchard	Traxler
Lowery (CA)	Pursell	Udall
Lowry (WA)	Quillen	Valentine
Lujan	Rahall	Vander Jagt
Luken	Rangel	Vandergriff
Lundine	Ratchford	Vento
Lungren	Ray	Volkmer
Mack	Regula	Vucanovich
MacKay	Reid	Walgren
Madigan	Richardson	Walker
Marlenee	Ridge	Watkins
Marriott	Rinaldo	Waxman
Martin (IL)	Ritter	Weaver
Martin (NC)	Roberts	Weber
Martin (NY)	Robinson	Weiss
Martinez	Rodino	Wheat
Matsui	Roe	Whitehurst
Mavroules	Roemer	Whitley
Mazzoli	Rogers	Whittaker
McCain	Rose	Whitten
McCandless	Rostenkowski	Williams (MT)
McCloskey	Roth	Williams (OH)
McCollum	Roukema	Winn
McCurdy	Rowland	Wirth
McDade	Roybal	Wise
McEwen	Rudd	Wolf
McGrath	Russo	Wolpe
McHugh	Sabo	Wortley
McKernan	Savage	Wright
McKinney	Sawyer	Wyden
McNulty	Schaefer	Wylie
Mica	Scheuer	Yates
Michel	Schneider	Yatron
Mikulski	Schroeder	Young (AK)
Miller (CA)	Schulze	Young (FL)
Miller (OH)	Schumer	Young (MO)
Mineta	Seiberling	Zschau
Minish	Sensenbrenner	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Hance	Paul
Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Shelby
Brooks	Heftel	Simon
Frost	Jones (NC)	Smith, Robert
Gramm	Kazen	Wilson
Hall (IN)	Markey	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution commending the Government of Colombia for its recent seizure of record amounts of cocaine, congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication, expressing the hope that the Government of Colombia will carry out a sustained eradication program, and deploring the assassination of the Minister of Justice of Colombia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR INITIATIVES OF CONTADORA GROUP AND RESULTING AGREEMENTS AMONG CENTRAL AMERICAN NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 261.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 261, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—416

Ackerman	Boxer	Crockett
Addabbo	Breaux	D'Amours
Akaka	Britt	Daniel
Albosta	Broomfield	Dannemeyer
Alexander	Brown (CA)	Darden
Anderson	Brown (CO)	Daschle
Andrews (TX)	Broyhill	Daub
Annunzio	Bryant	Davis
Anthony	Burton (CA)	de la Garza
Applegate	Burton (IN)	Dellums
Archer	Byron	Derrick
Aspin	Campbell	DeWine
AuCoin	Carney	Dickinson
Badham	Carper	Dicks
Barnard	Carr	Dingell
Barnes	Chandler	Dixon
Bartlett	Chappell	Donnelly
Bateman	Chappie	Dorgan
Bates	Cheney	Dowdy
Bedell	Clarke	Downey
Beilenson	Clay	Dreier
Bennett	Clinger	Duncan
Bereuter	Coats	Durbin
Berman	Coelho	Dwyer
Bethune	Coleman (MO)	Dymally
Bevill	Coleman (TX)	Dyson
Biaggi	Collins	Early
Bilirakis	Conable	Eckart
Bliley	Conte	Edgar
Boehlert	Conyers	Edwards (AL)
Boggs	Cooper	Edwards (CA)
Boland	Corcoran	Edwards (OK)
Boner	Coughlin	Emerson
Bonior	Courter	English
Bonker	Coyne	Erdreich
Borski	Craig	Erlenborn
Bosco	Crane, Daniel	Evans (IA)
Boucher	Crane, Philip	Evans (IL)

Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews (NC)
Brooks
Frost
Gramm
Hall (IN)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Heftel
Jones (NC)
Kazen
Markey
Paul
Savage
Shelby
Simon
Smith, Robert
Wilson

□ 1620

Mr. CLARKE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION, CUSTOMS SERVICE, AND U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS, 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5188, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5188, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 289, nays 127, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—289

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Campbell
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
D'Amours
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Fuqua
Garcia
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harkin
Harrison
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach
Leath
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Marlenee
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Packard
Panetta
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Rangel
Ratchford
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Sikorski
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Snyder
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vandergriff
Vento
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

NAYS—127

Badham
Bartlett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Carney
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Conable
Corcoran
Coughlin
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeWine
Dickinson
Dreier
Dyson
Early
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fiedler
Franklin
Frenzel
Gaydos
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall, Ralph
Hansen (UT)
Hartnett
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hubbard
Hyde
Kasich
Kemp
Kolter
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Livingston
Lott
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Nichols
Nielson
O'Brien
Oxley
Parris
Pashayan
Petri
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ray
Ridge

Ritter	Smith (NJ)	Vucanovich
Roberts	Smith, Denny	Walker
Robinson	Snowe	Weber
Rogers	Solomon	Whitehurst
Roukema	Spence	Whittaker
Rudd	Stangeland	Winn
Schaefer	Stump	Wolf
Schulze	Sundquist	Wortley
Shumway	Tauke	Wylie
Shuster	Taylor	Young (AK)
Siljander	Thomas (CA)	Zschau
Sisisky	Vander Jagt	
Smith (NE)	Volkmer	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Brooks	Heftel	Shelby
Frost	Hunter	Simon
Gramm	Jones (NC)	Smith, Robert
Hall (IN)	Kazen	Wilson
Hance	Markey	

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. FRANKLIN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. JOHNSON changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GLICKMAN). The Chair wishes to inform the Members that there are 11 more suspensions after this vote, so he would ask the Members' indulgence to make sure they vote within the 5-minute period.

□ 1630

EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN TUNA LICENSING ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5147, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5147, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—416

Ackerman	Barnes	Boggs
Addabbo	Bartlett	Boland
Akaka	Bateman	Boner
Albosta	Bates	Bonior
Alexander	Bedell	Bonker
Anderson	Beilenson	Borski
Andrews (TX)	Bennett	Bosco
Annunzio	Bereuter	Boucher
Anthony	Berman	Boxer
Applegate	Bethune	Breaux
Archer	Bevill	Britt
Aspin	Biaggi	Broomfield
AuCoin	Bilirakis	Brown (CA)
Badham	Bliley	Brown (CO)
Barnard	Boehlert	Broyhill
Bryant	Goodling	McCandless
Burton (CA)	Gore	McCloskey
Burton (IN)	Gradison	McCollum
Byron	Gray	McCurdy
Campbell	Green	McDade
Carney	Gregg	McEwen
Carper	Guarini	McGrath
Carr	Gunderson	McHugh
Chandler	Hall (OH)	McKernan
Chappell	Hall, Ralph	McKinney
Chappie	Hall, Sam	McNulty
Cheney	Hamilton	Mica
Clarke	Hammerschmidt	Michel
Clay	Hansen (UT)	Mikulski
Clinger	Harkin	Miller (CA)
Coats	Harrison	Miller (OH)
Coelho	Hartnett	Mineta
Coleman (MO)	Hatcher	Minish
Coleman (TX)	Hawkins	Mitchell
Collins	Hayes	Moakley
Conable	Hefner	Molinari
Conte	Hertel	Mollohan
Conyers	Hightower	Montgomery
Cooper	Hiler	Moody
Corcoran	Hillis	Moore
Coughlin	Holt	Moorhead
Courter	Hopkins	Morrison (CT)
Coyne	Horton	Morrison (WA)
Craig	Howard	Mrazek
Crane, Daniel	Hoyer	Murphy
Crane, Philip	Hubbard	Murtha
Crockett	Huckaby	Myers
D'Amours	Hughes	Natcher
Daniel	Hunter	Neal
Dannemeyer	Hutto	Nelson
Darden	Hyde	Nichols
Daschle	Ireland	Nielson
Daub	Jacobs	Nowak
Davis	Jeffords	O'Brien
de la Garza	Jenkins	Oakar
Dellums	Johnson	Oberstar
Derrick	Jones (OK)	Obey
DeWine	Jones (TN)	Olin
Dickinson	Kaptur	Ortiz
Dicks	Kasich	Ottinger
Dingell	Kastenmeier	Owens
Dixon	Kemp	Oxley
Donnelly	Kennelly	Packard
Dorgan	Kildee	Panetta
Dowdy	Kindness	Parris
Downey	Kleczka	Pashayan
Dreier	Kogovsek	Patman
Duncan	Kolter	Patterson
Durbin	Kostmayer	Pease
Dwyer	Kramer	Penny
Dymally	LaFalce	Pepper
Dyson	Lagomarsino	Perkins
Early	Lantos	Petri
Eckart	Latta	Pickle
Edgar	Leach	Porter
Edwards (AL)	Leath	Price
Edwards (CA)	Lehman (CA)	Pritchard
Edwards (OK)	Lehman (FL)	Pursell
Emerson	Leland	Quillen
English	Lent	Rahall
Erdreich	Levin	Rangel
Erlenborn	Levine	Ratchford
Evans (IA)	Levitas	Ray
Evans (IL)	Lewis (CA)	Regula
Fascell	Lewis (FL)	Reid
Fazio	Lipinski	Richardson
Feighan	Livingston	Ridge
Ferraro	Lloyd	Rinaldo
Fiedler	Loeffler	Ritter
Fields	Long (LA)	Roberts
Fish	Long (MD)	Robinson
Flippo	Lott	Rodino
Florio	Lowery (CA)	Roe
Foglietta	Lowry (WA)	Roemer
Foley	Lujan	Rogers
Ford (MI)	Luken	Rose
Ford (TN)	Lundine	Rostenkowski
Fowler	Lungren	Roth
Frank	Mack	Roukema
Franklin	MacKay	Rowland
Frenzel	Madigan	Roybal
Fuqua	Marlenee	Rudd
Garcia	Marriott	Russo
Gaydos	Martin (IL)	Sabo
Gejdenson	Martin (NC)	Savage
Gekas	Martin (NY)	Sawyer
Gephardt	Martinez	Schaefer
Gibbons	Matsui	Scheuer
Gilman	Mavroules	Schneider
Glickman	Mazzoli	Schroeder
Gonzalez	McCain	Schulze
Schumer	Stark	Watkins
Seiberling	Stenholm	Waxman
Sensenbrenner	Stokes	Weaver
Shannon	Stratton	Weber
Sharp	Studds	Weiss
Shaw	Stump	Wheat
Shumway	Sundquist	Whitehurst
Shuster	Swift	Whitley
Sikorski	Synar	Whittaker
Siljander	Tallon	Whitten
Sisisky	Tauke	Williams (MT)
Skeen	Tauzin	Williams (OH)
Skelton	Taylor	Winn
Slattery	Thomas (CA)	Wirth
Smith (FL)	Thomas (GA)	Wise
Smith (IA)	Torres	Wolf
Smith (NE)	Torricelli	Wolpe
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Wortley
Smith, Denny	Traxler	Wright
Snowe	Udall	Wyden
Snyder	Valentine	Wylie
Solarz	Vander Jagt	Yates
Solomon	Vandergriff	Yatron
Spence	Vento	Young (AK)
Spratt	Volkmer	Young (FL)
St Germain	Vucanovich	Young (MO)
Staggers	Walgren	Zschau
Stangeland	Walker	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews (NC)	Hance	Paul
Brooks	Hansen (ID)	Shelby
Frost	Heftel	Simon
Gingrich	Jones (NC)	Smith, Robert
Gramm	Kazen	Wilson
Hall (IN)	Markey	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1640

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL AUTHORIZATIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1985, 1986, AND 1987

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4585, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4585, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 4, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—412

Ackerman	Bartlett	Boland
Addabbo	Bateman	Boner
Akaka	Bates	Bonior
Albosta	Bedell	Bonker
Alexander	Beilenson	Borski
Anderson	Bennett	Bosco
Andrews (TX)	Bereuter	Boucher
Annunzio	Berman	Boxer
Anthony	Bethune	Breaux
Archer	Bevill	Britt
Aspin	Biaggi	Broomfield
AuCoin	Bilirakis	Brown (CA)
Badham	Bliley	Brown (CO)
Barnard	Boehlert	Broyhill
Barnes	Boggs	Bryant

Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—4

Applegate
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Stump

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews (NC)
Brooks
Frost
Gramm
Hall (IN)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Heftel
Jones (NC)
Kazen
Long (MD)
Markey
Paul
Shelby
Simon
Smith, Robert
Wilson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality and the Council on Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF EDWIN B. FORSYTHE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 537.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 537, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—416

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Billirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula

Reid	Sisisky	Udall
Richardson	Skeen	Valentine
Ridge	Skelton	Vander Jagt
Rinaldo	Slattery	Vandergriff
Ritter	Smith (FL)	Vento
Roberts	Smith (IA)	Volkmer
Robinson	Smith (NE)	Vucanovich
Rodino	Smith (NJ)	Walgren
Roe	Smith, Denny	Walker
Roemer	Snowe	Watkins
Rogers	Snyder	Waxman
Rose	Solarz	Weaver
Rostenkowski	Solomon	Weber
Roth	Spence	Weiss
Roukema	Spratt	Wheat
Rowland	St Germain	Whitehurst
Roybal	Staggers	Whitley
Rudd	Stangeland	Whittaker
Russo	Stark	Whitten
Sabo	Stenholm	Williams (MT)
Savage	Stokes	Williams (OH)
Sawyer	Stratton	Winn
Schaefer	Studds	Wirth
Scheuer	Stump	Wise
Schneider	Sundquist	Wolf
Schroeder	Swift	Wolpe
Schulze	Synar	Wortley
Schumer	Tallon	Wright
Seiberling	Tauke	Wyden
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Wylie
Shannon	Taylor	Yates
Sharp	Thomas (CA)	Yatron
Shaw	Thomas (GA)	Young (AK)
Shumway	Torres	Young (FL)
Shuster	Torricelli	Young (MO)
Sikorski	Towns	Zschau
Siljander	Traxler	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Brooks	Hawkins	Shelby
Frost	Heftel	Simon
Gramm	Jones (NC)	Smith, Robert
Hall (IN)	Kazen	Wilson
Hance	Markey	

□ 1650

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT AUTHORIZATIONS EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5050, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5050, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 309, nays 104, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—309

Ackerman	Aspin	Biaggi
Addabbo	AuCoin	Bilirakis
Akaka	Barnard	Boehlert
Albosta	Barnes	Boggs
Alexander	Bateman	Boland
Anderson	Bates	Boner
Andrews (TX)	Bedell	Bonior
Annunzio	Beilenson	Bonker
Anthony	Bennett	Borski
Applegate	Bevill	Bosco
Boucher	Hightower	Pease
Boxer	Holt	Penny
Breaux	Horton	Pepper
Britt	Howard	Perkins
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Petri
Bryant	Hubbard	Pickle
Burton (CA)	Huckaby	Porter
Carney	Hughes	Price
Carper	Hunter	Pritchard
Carr	Hutto	Quillen
Chandler	Ireland	Rahall
Chappell	Jeffords	Rangel
Clarke	Jenkins	Ratchford
Clay	Johnson	Ray
Clinger	Jones (TN)	Reid
Coelho	Kaptur	Richardson
Coleman (MO)	Kasich	Ridge
Coleman (TX)	Kastenmeier	Rinaldo
Collins	Kemp	Ritter
Conte	Kennelly	Rodino
Conyers	Kildee	Roe
Cooper	Kindness	Rose
Coughlin	Kleczka	Rostenkowski
Coyne	Kogovsek	Roth
Crockett	Kolter	Roukema
D'Amours	Kostmayer	Rowland
Daniel	LaFalce	Roybal
Darden	Lantos	Russo
Daschle	Leach	Sabo
Davis	Leath	Savage
de la Garza	Lehman (CA)	Sawyer
Dellums	Leland	Scheuer
Derrick	Lent	Schneider
DeWine	Levin	Schulze
Dicks	Levine	Schumer
Dingell	Levitas	Seiberling
Dixon	Lipinski	Shannon
Donnelly	Livingston	Sharp
Dorgan	Long (LA)	Sikorski
Dowdy	Long (MD)	Sisisky
Downey	Lott	Skelton
Duncan	Lowery (CA)	Smith (FL)
Durbin	Lowry (WA)	Smith (IA)
Dwyer	Luken	Smith (NJ)
Dymally	Lundine	Snowe
Dyson	MacKay	Snyder
Early	Marlenee	Solarz
Eckart	Martin (NY)	Solomon
Edgar	Martinez	Spratt
Edwards (AL)	Matsui	St Germain
Edwards (CA)	Mavroules	Staggers
English	Mazzoli	Stark
Erdreich	McCloskey	Stenholm
Erlenborn	McDade	Stokes
Evans (IL)	McGrath	Stratton
Fascell	McHugh	Studds
Fazio	McKernan	Swift
Feighan	McKinney	Synar
Ferraro	McNulty	Tallon
Fish	Mica	Tauzin
Flippo	Mikulski	Taylor
Florio	Miller (CA)	Thomas (GA)
Foglietta	Mineta	Torres
Foley	Minish	Torricelli
Ford (MI)	Mitchell	Towns
Ford (TN)	Moakley	Traxler
Fowler	Molinari	Udall
Frank	Mollohan	Valentine
Franklin	Montgomery	Vander Jagt
Fuqua	Moody	Vandergriff
Garcia	Moore	Vento
Gaydos	Moorhead	Volkmer
Gejdenson	Morrison (CT)	Walgren
Gephardt	Mrazek	Watkins
Gilman	Murphy	Waxman
Glickman	Myers	Weaver
Gonzalez	Natcher	Weber
Gore	Neal	Weiss
Gradison	Nelson	Wheat
Gray	Nichols	Whitley
Green	Nowak	Whitten
Guarini	O'Brien	Williams (OH)
Hall (OH)	Oakar	Wirth
Hall, Ralph	Obey	Wise
Hall, Sam	Olin	Wolf
Hammerschmidt	Ortiz	Wolpe
Harkin	Ottinger	Wright
Harrison	Owens	Wyden
Hatcher	Oxley	Wylie
Hawkins	Panetta	Yates
Hayes	Parris	Yatron
Hefner	Patman	Young (AK)
Hertel	Patterson	Young (MO)

NAYS—104

Archer	Gregg	Pashayan
Badham	Gunderson	Pursell
Bartlett	Hamilton	Regula
Bereuter	Hansen (UT)	Roberts
Bethune	Hartnett	Robinson
Bliley	Hiler	Roemer
Broomfield	Hillis	Rogers
Brown (CO)	Hopkins	Rudd
Broyhill	Hyde	Schaefer
Burton (IN)	Jacobs	Schroeder
Byron	Jones (OK)	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Kramer	Shaw
Chappie	Lagomarsino	Shumway
Cheney	Latta	Shuster
Coats	Lewis (CA)	Siljander
Conable	Lewis (FL)	Skeen
Corcoran	Lloyd	Slattery
Courter	Loeffler	Smith (NE)
Craig	Lujan	Smith, Denny
Crane, Daniel	Lungren	Spence
Crane, Philip	Mack	Stangeland
Dannemeyer	Madigan	Stump
Daub	Marriott	Sundquist
Dickinson	Martin (IL)	Tauke
Dreier	Martin (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	McCain	Vucanovich
Emerson	McCandless	Walker
Evans (IA)	McCollum	Whitehurst
Fiedler	McCurdy	Whittaker
Fields	McEwen	Williams (MT)
Frenzel	Michel	Winn
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Wortley
Gibbons	Morrison (WA)	Young (FL)
Gingrich	Nielson	Zschau
Goodling	Packard	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Oberstar
Berman	Heftel	Paul
Brooks	Jones (NC)	Shelby
Frost	Kazen	Simon
Gramm	Lehman (FL)	Smith, Robert
Hall (IN)	Markey	Wilson
Hance	Murtha	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend until October 1, 1986, the authority and authorization of appropriations for certain programs under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

PENNSYLVANIA WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5076, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5076, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 28, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—387

Ackerman	Albosta	Andrews (TX)
Addabbo	Alexander	Annunzio
Akaka	Anderson	Anthony

Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
D'Amours
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Mack
MacKay
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Selberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—28

Badham
Cheney
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Daub
Dickinson
Hartnett
Holt
Leath
Lloyd
Lungren
Nielson
Patman
Roberts
Robinson
Rudd
Schaefer
Shumway
Smith, Denny
Stenholm
Stump
Vucanovich
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Winn

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews (NC)
Brooks
Frost
Gramm
Hall (IN)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Heftel
Jones (NC)
Kazen
Madigan
Markey
O'Brien
Paul
Shelby
Simon
Smith, Robert
Wilson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENNESSEE WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4263, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4263, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 12, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—404

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
D'Amours
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth

Roukema	Snowe	Volkmer
Rowland	Snyder	Walgren
Roybal	Solarz	Walker
Rudd	Solomon	Watkins
Russo	Spence	Waxman
Sabo	Spratt	Weaver
Savage	St Germain	Weber
Sawyer	Staggers	Weiss
Schaefer	Stangeland	Wheat
Scheuer	Stark	Whitehurst
Schneider	Stokes	Whitley
Schroeder	Stratton	Whittaker
Schulze	Studds	Whitten
Schumer	Sundquist	Williams (MT)
Seiberling	Swift	Williams (OH)
Sensenbrenner	Synar	Winn
Shannon	Tallon	Wirth
Sharp	Tauke	Wise
Shaw	Tauzin	Wolf
Shumway	Taylor	Wolpe
Shuster	Thomas (CA)	Wortley
Sikorski	Thomas (GA)	Wright
Siljander	Torres	Wyden
Sisisky	Torricelli	Wylie
Skeen	Towns	Yates
Skelton	Traxler	Yatron
Slattery	Udall	Young (AK)
Smith (FL)	Valentine	Young (FL)
Smith (IA)	Vander Jagt	Young (MO)
Smith (NE)	Vandergriff	Zschau
Smith (NJ)	Vento	

NAYS—12

Badham	Dannemeyer	Smith, Denny
Crane, Daniel	Leath	Stenholm
Crane, Philip	Patman	Stump
Daniel	Robinson	Vucanovich

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Brooks	Heftel	Shelby
Frost	Jones (NC)	Simon
Gramm	Kazen	Smith, Robert
Hall (IN)	Livingston	Wilson
Hance	Markey	

□ 1710

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACQUIRE TITLE TO McCLINTOCK HOUSE, WATERLOO, N.Y.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4596) as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4596) as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 13, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—404

Ackerman	Applegate	Bates
Addabbo	Archer	Bedell
Akaka	Aspin	Beilenson
Albosta	AuCoin	Bennett
Alexander	Badham	Bereuter
Anderson	Barnard	Berman
Andrews (TX)	Barnes	Bethune
Annunzio	Bartlett	Bevill
Anthony	Bateman	Biaggi
Bilirakis	Ford (MI)	Madigan
Bliley	Ford (TN)	Marlenee
Boehlert	Fowler	Marriott
Boggs	Frank	Martin (IL)
Boland	Franklin	Martin (NC)
Boner	Frenzel	Martin (NY)
Bonior	Fuqua	Martinez
Bonker	Garcia	Matsui
Borski	Gaydos	Mavroules
Bosco	Gejdenson	Mazzoli
Boucher	Gekas	McCain
Boxer	Gephardt	McCandless
Breaux	Gibbons	McCloskey
Britt	Gilman	McCollum
Broomfield	Gingrich	McCurdy
Brown (CA)	Glickman	McDade
Broyhill	Gonzalez	McEwen
Bryant	Goodling	McGrath
Burton (CA)	Gore	McHugh
Burton (IN)	Gradison	McKernan
Byron	Gray	McKinney
Campbell	Green	McNulty
Carney	Gregg	Mica
Carper	Guarini	Michel
Carr	Gunderson	Mikulski
Chandler	Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)
Chappell	Hamilton	Miller (OH)
Chappie	Hammerschmidt	Mineta
Cheney	Harkin	Minish
Clarke	Harrison	Mitchell
Clay	Hatcher	Moakley
Clinger	Hawkins	Molinari
Coats	Hayes	Mollohan
Coelho	Hefner	Montgomery
Coleman (MO)	Hertel	Moody
Coleman (TX)	Hightower	Moore
Collins	Hiler	Moorhead
Conable	Hillis	Morrison (CT)
Conte	Holt	Morrison (WA)
Conyers	Hopkins	Mrazek
Cooper	Horton	Murphy
Corcoran	Howard	Murtha
Coughlin	Hoyer	Myers
Courter	Huckaby	Natcher
Coyne	Hughes	Neal
Craig	Hunter	Nelson
Crane, Daniel	Hutto	Nichols
Crane, Philip	Hyde	Nowak
Crockett	Ireland	O'Brien
D'Amours	Jacobs	Oakar
Daniel	Jeffords	Oberstar
Darden	Jenkins	Obey
Daschle	Johnson	Olin
Daub	Jones (OK)	Ortiz
Davis	Jones (TN)	Ottinger
de la Garza	Kaptur	Owens
Dellums	Kasich	Oxley
Derrick	Kastenmeier	Packard
DeWine	Kemp	Panetta
Dickinson	Kennelly	Parris
Dicks	Kildee	Pashayan
Dingell	Kindness	Patman
Dixon	Kleczka	Patterson
Donnelly	Kogovsek	Pease
Dorgan	Kolter	Penny
Dowdy	Kostmayer	Pepper
Downey	Kramer	Perkins
Dreier	LaFalce	Petri
Duncan	Lagomarsino	Pickle
Durbin	Lantos	Porter
Dwyer	Latta	Price
Dymally	Leach	Pritchard
Dyson	Lehman (CA)	Pursell
Early	Lehman (FL)	Quillen
Eckart	Leland	Rahall
Edgar	Lent	Rangel
Edwards (AL)	Levin	Ratchford
Edwards (CA)	Levine	Ray
Edwards (OK)	Levitas	Regula
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Reid
English	Lewis (FL)	Richardson
Erdreich	Lipinski	Ridge
Erlenborn	Livingston	Rinaldo
Evans (IA)	Lloyd	Ritter
Evans (IL)	Loeffler	Roberts
Fascell	Long (LA)	Robinson
Fazio	Long (MD)	Rodino
Feighan	Lott	Roe
Ferraro	Lowery (CA)	Rogers
Fiedler	Lowry (WA)	Rose
Fields	Lujan	Rostenkowski
Fish	Luken	Roth
Flippo	Lundine	Roukema
Florio	Lungren	Rowland
Foglietta	Mack	Roybal
Foley	MacKay	Rudd
Russo	Solomon	Walgren
Sabo	Spence	Walker
Savage	Spratt	Watkins
Sawyer	St Germain	Waxman
Schaefer	Staggers	Weaver
Scheuer	Stangeland	Weber
Schneider	Stark	Weiss
Schroeder	Stokes	Wheat
Schulze	Stratton	Whitehurst
Schumer	Studds	Whitley
Seiberling	Sundquist	Whittaker
Sensenbrenner	Swift	Whitten
Shannon	Synar	Williams (MT)
Sharp	Tallon	Williams (OH)
Shaw	Tauke	Winn
Shumway	Tauzin	Wirth
Shuster	Taylor	Wise
Sikorski	Thomas (CA)	Wolf
Siljander	Thomas (GA)	Wolpe
Sisisky	Torres	Wortley
Skeen	Torricelli	Wright
Skelton	Towns	Wyden
Slattery	Traxler	Wylie
Smith (FL)	Udall	Yates
Smith (IA)	Valentine	Yatron
Smith (NE)	Vander Jagt	Young (AK)
Smith (NJ)	Vandergriff	Young (FL)
Snowe	Vento	Young (MO)
Snyder	Volkmer	Zschau
Solarz	Vucanovich	

NAYS—13

Brown (CO)	Hartnett	Smith, Denny
Dannemeyer	Hubbard	Stenholm
Hall, Ralph	Leath	Stump
Hall, Sam	Nielson	
Hansen (UT)	Roemer	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Shelby
Brooks	Heftel	Simon
Frost	Jones (NC)	Smith, Robert
Gramm	Kazen	Wilson
Hall (IN)	Markey	
Hance	Paul	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1720

AMENDING THE NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM ACT BY ADDING THE OREGON-CALIFORNIA TRAIL TO THE STUDY LIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3787) as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3787) as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 14, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—401

Ackerman	Annunzio	Barnard
Addabbo	Anthony	Barnes
Akaka	Applegate	Bartlett
Albosta	Archer	Bateman
Alexander	Aspin	Bates
Anderson	AuCoin	Bedell
Andrews (TX)	Badham	Beilenson

Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—14

Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Durbin
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Holt
Jacobs
Leath
Montgomery
Roemer
Slattery
Stenholm
Stump
Vandergriff

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews (NC)
Brooks
Frost
Gramm
Hall (IN)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Heftel
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Kazen
Markey
O'Brien
Paul
Shelby
Simon
Smith, Robert
Wilson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Trails System Act by adding the California Trail to the study list, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL AUTHORIZATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5100) as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5100) as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 5, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—410

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Harrison
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford

Ray	Sisisky	Udall
Regula	Skeen	Valentine
Reid	Skelton	Vander Jagt
Richardson	Slattery	Vandergriff
Ridge	Smith (FL)	Vento
Rinaldo	Smith (IA)	Volkmer
Ritter	Smith (NE)	Vucanovich
Roberts	Smith (NJ)	Walgren
Robinson	Smith, Denny	Walker
Rodino	Snowe	Watkins
Roe	Snyder	Waxman
Rogers	Solarz	Weaver
Rose	Solomon	Weber
Rostenkowski	Spence	Weiss
Roth	Spratt	Wheat
Roukema	St Germain	Whitehurst
Rowland	Staggers	Whitley
Roybal	Stangeland	Whittaker
Rudd	Stark	Whitten
Russo	Stenholm	Williams (MT)
Sabo	Stokes	Williams (OH)
Savage	Stratton	Winn
Sawyer	Studds	Wirth
Schaefer	Stump	Wise
Scheuer	Sundquist	Wolf
Schneider	Swift	Wolpe
Schroeder	Synar	Wortley
Schulze	Tallon	Wright
Schumer	Tauke	Wyden
Seiberling	Tauzin	Wylie
Sensenbrenner	Taylor	Yates
Shannon	Thomas (CA)	Yatron
Sharp	Thomas (GA)	Young (AK)
Shaw	Torres	Young (FL)
Shuster	Torricelli	Young (MO)
Sikorski	Towns	Zschau
Siljander	Traxler	

NAYS—5

Crane, Daniel	Patman	Shumway
Crane, Philip	Roemer	

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews (NC)	Hance	Martinez
Brooks	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Coelho	Heftel	Shelby
Frost	Jones (NC)	Simon
Gramm	Kazen	Smith, Robert
Hall (IN)	Markey	Wilson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT TO PERMIT THE CONTROL OF THE LAMPREY EEL IN THE PERE MARQUETTE RIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3472, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3472, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 5, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—410

Ackerman	Anderson	Archer
Addabbo	Andrews (TX)	Aspin
Akaka	Annunzio	AuCoin
Albosta	Anthony	Badham
Alexander	Applegate	Barnard
Barnes	Erlenborn	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett	Evans (IA)	Lewis (FL)
Bateman	Evans (IL)	Lipinski
Bates	Fascell	Livingston
Bedell	Fazio	Lloyd
Beilenson	Feighan	Loeffler
Bennett	Ferraro	Long (LA)
Bereuter	Fiedler	Long (MD)
Berman	Fields	Lott
Bethune	Fish	Lowery (CA)
Bevill	Flippo	Lowry (WA)
Biaggi	Florio	Lujan
Bilirakis	Foglietta	Luken
Bliley	Foley	Lundine
Boehlert	Ford (MI)	Lungren
Boggs	Ford (TN)	Mack
Boland	Fowler	MacKay
Boner	Frank	Madigan
Bonior	Franklin	Marlenee
Bonker	Frenzel	Marriott
Borski	Fuqua	Martin (IL)
Bosco	Garcia	Martin (NC)
Boucher	Gaydos	Martin (NY)
Boxer	Gejdenson	Martinez
Breaux	Gekas	Matsui
Britt	Gephardt	Mavroules
Broomfield	Gibbons	Mazzoli
Brown (CA)	Gilman	McCain
Brown (CO)	Gingrich	McCandless
Broyhill	Glickman	McCloskey
Bryant	Gonzalez	McCollum
Burton (CA)	Goodling	McCurdy
Burton (IN)	Gore	McDade
Byron	Gradison	McEwen
Campbell	Gray	McGrath
Carney	Green	McHugh
Carper	Gregg	McKernan
Carr	Guarini	McKinney
Chandler	Gunderson	McNulty
Chappell	Hall (OH)	Mica
Chappie	Hall, Sam	Michel
Cheney	Hamilton	Mikulski
Clarke	Hammerschmidt	Miller (CA)
Clay	Hansen (UT)	Miller (OH)
Clinger	Harkin	Mineta
Coats	Harrison	Minish
Coelho	Hartnett	Moakley
Coleman (MO)	Hatcher	Molinari
Coleman (TX)	Hayes	Mollohan
Collins	Hefner	Montgomery
Conable	Hertel	Moody
Conte	Hightower	Moore
Conyers	Hiler	Moorhead
Cooper	Hillis	Morrison (CT)
Corcoran	Holt	Morrison (WA)
Coughlin	Hopkins	Mrazek
Courter	Horton	Murphy
Coyne	Howard	Murtha
Craig	Hoyer	Myers
Crane, Daniel	Hubbard	Natcher
Crane, Philip	Huckaby	Neal
Crockett	Hughes	Nelson
D'Amours	Hunter	Nichols
Daniel	Hutto	Nielson
Dannemeyer	Hyde	Nowak
Darden	Ireland	O'Brien
Daschle	Jeffords	Oakar
Daub	Jenkins	Oberstar
Davis	Johnson	Obey
de la Garza	Jones (OK)	Olin
Dellums	Jones (TN)	Ortiz
Derrick	Kaptur	Ottinger
DeWine	Kasich	Owens
Dickinson	Kastenmeier	Oxley
Dicks	Kemp	Packard
Dingell	Kennelly	Panetta
Dixon	Kildee	Parris
Donnelly	Kindness	Pashayan
Dorgan	Kleczka	Patman
Dowdy	Kogovsek	Patterson
Downey	Kolter	Pease
Dreier	Kostmayer	Penny
Duncan	Kramer	Pepper
Durbin	LaFalce	Perkins
Dwyer	Lagomarsino	Petri
Dymally	Lantos	Pickle
Dyson	Latta	Porter
Early	Leach	Price
Eckart	Leath	Pritchard
Edgar	Lehman (CA)	Pursell
Edwards (AL)	Lehman (FL)	Quillen
Edwards (CA)	Leland	Rahall
Edwards (OK)	Lent	Rangel
Emerson	Levin	Ratchford
English	Levine	Ray
Erdreich	Levitas	Regula
Reid	Sisisky	Udall
Richardson	Skeen	Valentine
Ridge	Skelton	Vander Jagt
Rinaldo	Slattery	Vento
Ritter	Smith (FL)	Volkmer
Roberts	Smith (IA)	Vucanovich
Robinson	Smith (NE)	Walgren
Rodino	Smith (NJ)	Walker
Roe	Smith, Denny	Watkins
Rogers	Snowe	Waxman
Rose	Snyder	Weaver
Rostenkowski	Solarz	Weber
Roth	Solomon	Weiss
Roukema	Spence	Wheat
Rowland	Spratt	Whitehurst
Roybal	St Germain	Whitley
Rudd	Staggers	Whittaker
Russo	Stangeland	Whitten
Sabo	Stark	Williams (MT)
Savage	Stenholm	Williams (OH)
Sawyer	Stokes	Winn
Schaefer	Stratton	Wirth
Scheuer	Studds	Wise
Schneider	Sundquist	Wolf
Schroeder	Swift	Wolpe
Schulze	Synar	Wortley
Schumer	Tallon	Wright
Seiberling	Tauke	Wyden
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Wylie
Shannon	Taylor	Yates
Sharp	Thomas (CA)	Yatron
Shaw	Thomas (GA)	Young (AK)
Shumway	Torres	Young (FL)
Shuster	Torricelli	Young (MO)
Sikorski	Towns	Zschau
Siljander	Traxler	

NAYS—5

Hall, Ralph	Roemer	Vandergriff
Jacobs	Stump	

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Mitchell
Brooks	Hawkins	Paul
Frost	Heftel	Shelby
Gramm	Jones (NC)	Simon
Hall (IN)	Kazen	Smith, Robert
Hance	Markey	Wilson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1740

AUTHORIZING ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MX MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4952.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4952, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 11, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—402

Ackerman	Andrews (TX)	AuCoin
Addabbo	Annunzio	Badham
Akaka	Anthony	Barnard
Albosta	Applegate	Barnes
Alexander	Archer	Bartlett
Anderson	Aspin	Bateman

Bates	Fazio	Lott
Bedell	Feighan	Lowery (CA)
Beilenson	Ferraro	Lowry (WA)
Bennett	Fiedler	Lujan
Bereuter	Fields	Luken
Berman	Fish	Lundine
Bethune	Flippo	Lungren
Bevill	Florio	Mack
Biaggi	Foglietta	MacKay
Bilirakis	Foley	Madigan
Bliley	Ford (MI)	Marlenee
Boehlert	Ford (TN)	Marriott
Boggs	Fowler	Martin (IL)
Boland	Frank	Martin (NC)
Boner	Franklin	Martin (NY)
Bonior	Frenzel	Martinez
Bonker	Fuqua	Matsui
Borski	Garcia	Mavroules
Bosco	Gaydos	Mazzoli
Boucher	Gejdenson	McCain
Boxer	Gekas	McCandless
Breaux	Gephardt	McCloskey
Britt	Gingrich	McCollum
Broomfield	Glickman	McCurdy
Brown (CA)	Gonzalez	McDade
Brown (CO)	Goodling	McEwen
Broyhill	Gore	McGrath
Bryant	Gradison	McHugh
Burton (CA)	Gray	McKernan
Burton (IN)	Green	McKinney
Byron	Gregg	McNulty
Campbell	Guarini	Mica
Carney	Gunderson	Michel
Carper	Hall (OH)	Mikulski
Carr	Hamilton	Miller (CA)
Chandler	Hammerschmidt	Miller (OH)
Chappell	Hansen (UT)	Mineta
Chappie	Harkin	Minish
Cheney	Harrison	Moakley
Clarke	Hartnett	Molinari
Clay	Hatcher	Mollohan
Clinger	Hayes	Montgomery
Coats	Hefner	Moody
Coelho	Hertel	Moore
Coleman (MO)	Hightower	Moorhead
Coleman (TX)	Hiler	Morrison (CT)
Collins	Hillis	Morrison (WA)
Conable	Holt	Mrazek
Conte	Hopkins	Murphy
Conyers	Horton	Murtha
Cooper	Howard	Myers
Corcoran	Hoyer	Natcher
Coughlin	Huckaby	Neal
Courter	Hughes	Nelson
Coyne	Hunter	Nichols
Craig	Hutto	Nielson
Crane, Philip	Hyde	Nowak
Crockett	Ireland	O'Brien
D'Amours	Jacobs	Oakar
Daniel	Jeffords	Oberstar
Dannemeyer	Jenkins	Obey
Darden	Johnson	Ortiz
Daschle	Jones (OK)	Ottinger
Daub	Jones (TN)	Owens
Davis	Kaptur	Oxley
de la Garza	Kasich	Packard
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Panetta
Derrick	Kemp	Parris
DeWine	Kennelly	Pashayan
Dickinson	Kildee	Patterson
Dicks	Kleczka	Pease
Dingell	Kogovsek	Penny
Dixon	Kolter	Pepper
Donnelly	Kostmayer	Perkins
Dorgan	Kramer	Petri
Dowdy	LaFalce	Porter
Downey	Lagomarsino	Price
Dreier	Lantos	Pritchard
Duncan	Latta	Pursell
Durbin	Leach	Quillen
Dwyer	Leath	Rahall
Dymally	Lehman (CA)	Rangel
Dyson	Lehman (FL)	Ratchford
Early	Leland	Ray
Eckart	Lent	Regula
Edgar	Levin	Reid
Edwards (AL)	Levine	Richardson
Edwards (CA)	Levitas	Ridge
Edwards (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Rinaldo
Emerson	Lewis (FL)	Ritter
English	Lipinski	Roberts
Erdreich	Livingston	Robinson
Erlenborn	Lloyd	Rodino
Evans (IA)	Loeffler	Roe
Evans (IL)	Long (LA)	Rogers
Fascell	Long (MD)	Rose
Rostenkowski	Smith, Denny	Vento
Roth	Snowe	Volkmer
Roukema	Snyder	Vucanovich
Rowland	Solarz	Walgren
Roybal	Solomon	Walker
Rudd	Spence	Watkins
Russo	Spratt	Waxman
Sabo	St Germain	Weaver
Savage	Staggers	Weber
Sawyer	Stangeland	Weiss
Schaefer	Stark	Wheat
Scheuer	Stokes	Whitehurst
Schneider	Stratton	Whitley
Schroeder	Studds	Whittaker
Schulze	Stump	Whitten
Schumer	Sundquist	Williams (MT)
Seiberling	Swift	Williams (OH)
Sensenbrenner	Synar	Winn
Shannon	Tallon	Wirth
Sharp	Tauke	Wise
Shaw	Tauzin	Wolf
Shuster	Taylor	Wolpe
Sikorski	Thomas (CA)	Wortley
Siljander	Thomas (GA)	Wright
Sisisky	Torres	Wyden
Skeen	Torricelli	Wylie
Skelton	Towns	Yates
Slattery	Traxler	Yatron
Smith (FL)	Udall	Young (AK)
Smith (IA)	Valentine	Young (FL)
Smith (NE)	Vander Jagt	Young (MO)
Smith (NJ)	Vandergriff	Zschau

NAYS—11

Crane, Daniel	Hubbard	Roemer
Gibbons	Olin	Shumway
Hall, Ralph	Patman	Stenholm
Hall, Sam	Pickle	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Mitchell
Brooks	Hawkins	Paul
Frost	Heftel	Shelby
Gilman	Jones (NC)	Simon
Gramm	Kazen	Smith, Robert
Hall (IN)	Kindness	Wilson
Hance	Markey	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE MONTH

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 451) designating the month of November 1984 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so simply to say that the minority has no objection to the legislation.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWERY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my support for House Joint Resolution 451, which declares the month of November 1984 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month." I would particularly like to thank Mr. LELAND for arranging his schedule so as to bring this important legislation to the floor today.

Alzheimer's disease, which is the primary cause of senile dementia, affects over 2 million Americans, most of whom are over 65. The course of this disease is progressive and irreversible, beginning with simple forgetfulness followed by severe changes in personality and memory. This debilitating disease accounts for more than one-half of all nursing home admissions which, when translated into dollars, costs an estimated $30 billion annually—a cost virtually uncovered by private health insurance or medicare.

Consider too, the ever-increasing "golden-age" population and it will not be difficult to imagine the enormous impact of this disease on our society. I agree with Jerome Stone, president of the Alzheimer's Disease & Related Disorders Association, who recently stated that if something is not done to check the progress of this disease, it will be the most serious health problem of the next century.

It was with great hope that I introduced House Joint Resolution 451, as well as similar legislation which, for the past 2 years has brought recognition upon those sometimes forgotten silent majority of our senior citizens. Passage of comparable legislation has proven to be tremendously helpful in focusing national attention on the unique problems of Alzheimer victims and their families.

As an honorary member of the San Diego board of directors and the national advisory committee of the Alzheimer's Disease & Related Disorders Association, it is with much pride that I mention that local chapters of this organization have increased by 40 percent—an impressive statistic for a disease which appeared unknown only a few years ago. The services provided by this group are vital, for they help defer, by offering professional care in a homelike atmosphere, the trauma and expenses of institutionalization, as well as alleviate the emotional stress on the victim's family.

The cause of Alzheimer's disease is, as of yet, unknown although there are many committed individuals throughout this country who are diligently working toward a cure. In my district alone, much has been done to promote research. For example, Dr. George Glenner, who is affiliated with the University of California, San Diego School of Medicine, established the Nation's first brain bank, to exclusively study Alzheimer's disease. This brain enhanced bank with the recent addition of two internationally acclaimed professors, has the dedication

necessary to pinpoint the cause of this dreadful, mind-ravaging disease. Here in Washington, Congress stepped-up medical research funding and last year, Secretary of HHS Margaret Heckler created an interagency task force to specifically examine Alzheimer's disease.

It has only been in the last few years that this disease has received national attention, and Mr. Speaker, it deserves no less than a national effort. A virtually unheard-of disease, AIDS, was targeted by HHS, as the No. 1 health problem and just examine the monumental breakthrough. In as little as 3 years, we may have a vaccine for this frightening, newly observed medical syndrome, a disease which baffled doctors, scientists, and medical researchers only a couple years ago. I am confident that by streamlining research funds, increased congressional support, and alerting our society to the tragedy of this ailment, the same success story can happen to Alzheimer's disease. Mr. Speaker, I believe that by declaring November 1984 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month," this will significantly further enhance public awareness of the fourth most common cause of death and bring us one step closer to identifying the cause of this horrible illness.

□ 1750

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I rise to thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing this legislation to the floor, and to all of those who have had a part in making it a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to objection, and I will not object, but I would just like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for bringing forth this legislation. It serves to focus further attention on one of the most serious ailments that confronts the people of our Nation, and absent this focus, who is to say when resolution would be obtained and sufficient remedies will be produced.

Like many other diseases that plague our Nation, hopefully this, one day, will be just a sad place in America's history.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 451

Whereas more than two million Americans are affected by Alzheimer's disease, which is a surprisingly common disorder that destroys certain vital cells of the brain;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is the fourth leading cause of death among older Americans;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is responsible for 50 per centum of all nursing home admissions, at an annual cost of more than $20,000,000,000;

Whereas in one-third of all American families one parent will succumb to this disease;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is not a normal consequence of aging; and

Whereas an increase in the national awareness of the problem of Alzheimer's disease may stimulate the interest and concern of the American people, which may lead, in turn, to increased research and eventually to the discovery of a cure for Alzheimer's disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of November 1984 is designated as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL NURSING HOME RESIDENTS DAY

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 198) designating April 27, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COURTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make the point that the minority has no objection. We are very much in favor of passage of the legislation.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 198

Whereas over one million older Americans reside in nursing homes and one in five older Americans likely will reside in a nursing home at some time;

Whereas nursing home residents have contributed to the growth, development, and progress of this Nation and, as elders, offer a wealth of knowledge and experience;

Whereas Congress recognizes the importance of the continued participation of these institutionalized senior citizens in the life of our Nation;

Whereas in an effort to foster reintegration of these citizens into their communities Congress encourages community recognition of and involvement in the lives of nursing home residents;

Whereas the Congress recognizes the importance of safeguarding the rights of nursing home residents; and

Whereas it is appropriate for the American people to join in support of nursing home residents to demonstrate their concern and respect for these citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 27, 1984, is designated as "National Nursing Home Residents Day", a time of renewed recognition, concern, and respect for the Nation's nursing home residents. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LELAND

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LELAND: In the resolve on page 2, line 3, strike "April 27, 1984" and insert in lieu thereof "April 26, 1985".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LELAND).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LELAND

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. LELAND: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating April 26, 1985, as 'National Nursing Home Residents Day'."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS MONTH

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 232) to authorize and request the President to designate the month of May 1984 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not

object, I just point out the fact that some time early today I received a letter from a high school friend of mine pointing out the fact that sometime in the fall it will be 25 years since I graduated from high school. It is hard to believe that that much time has gone by.

Reflecting over those 25 years, I think there are two things that the American society as a group has grown more conscious of, and I think both are very definitely pluses.

First of all, we are much more environmentally concerned about our environment, clean air, clean water, and clean land; and second, I think this country is much more concerned about physical fitness. I think both of those concerns are my concerns. I know that the gentleman from Texas, MICKEY LELAND, has those concerns as well, and I think we have progressed well in those 25 years by bringing up to more public consciousness those two areas.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to mention the fact that I am very much a proponent, a cosponsor of this legislation. It is important, indeed, for all Americans to revere their own health, the function of their own bodies, and any time we pass a resolution that sets aside a month so that America can be concerned about physical fitness, it is something that deserves the attention of this Congress and certainly the attention of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 232

Whereas one of every two adults in our country is a regular participant in exercise and sports;

Whereas the number of physically active men and women has doubled in ten years and continues to grow rapidly;

Whereas today we recognize that physical activity is an important part of daily life for people of both sexes and of all ages;

Whereas physical activity is vital to good health and is a rich source of pleasure and personal satisfaction;

Whereas our physical fitness and sports programs are one of the primary means by which we strengthen our bodies and refresh our spirits; and

Whereas it is essential that we make fitness and sports programs increasingly available so that all of our citizens will be able to experience the joys and benefits they offer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1984 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month", and to call upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 451, Senate Joint Resolution 198, and Senate Joint Resolution 232, the resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1800

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order may be called at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO ANSEL ADAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am going to proceed for approximately 5 minutes under a prior agreement. I will recognize those who want to introduce their comments into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I have invited my colleagues here tonight to give some sense of the profound impact which Ansel Adams had upon our lives and our country and—perhaps—upon the way we look at both. I welcome you all here tonight; your presence alone speaks well of the strength and depth of the impression Ansel left with us.

In remembering, one is tempted to note the best-known accomplishments of a man like Ansel Adams. It is difficult not to do so; his professional accomplishments were many and well known. Ansel Adams was a giant in photography. His rise to prominence in the field of photography coincided with a metaphorphosis in photography in this Nation, and contributed to it. Within the lifetimes of other well-known photographers such as Alfred Stieglitz, Imogen Cunningham, Edward Weston, and Paul Strand, Ansel Adams sought successfully to establish photography as a distinct art form in which the photographer interpreted rather than recorded a scene. Perhaps more than any of these talented photographers, Ansel Adams assisted the transformation of photography from a hobby (as it was for him in his youth) to an expressive and fine art. To accomplish this transformation, he published books on fundamental principals of photography, he helped found the department of photography at the Museum of Modern Art, he published books of his own work, he directed exhibitions, lectures and seminars regarding photography. And he photographed.

His photographic survey of a Japanese-American internment camp directed national attention to the plight of internees. Prints of his photograph of a moonrise over Hernandez, N. Mex. and of the moon and Half Dome in Yosemite National Park hang now in the world's premiere museums. He photographed Presidents. He presented and directed numerous shows and exhibitions. Collections of his work are the mainstay of home collections and photographic libraries across the country.

Yet, despite the deserved fame his photographs brought him, it was not notoriety that attracted him most strongly to photography. Rather, he wanted most to portray his subjects in their finest moments, and thereby to capture and express his deep admiration for them. The high degree of precision and resolution which characterized his finest work reflects well the painstaking care with which he prepared for a shot, and illustrates his nearly-unyielding commitment to precise, realistic interpretation of the wonders which he saw. With characteristic ability, Ansel articulated this commitment well when he said: "a great photograph is a full expression of what one feels about what is being photographed in the deepest sense, and is, thereby, a true expression of what one feels about life in its entirety."

One look at "Monolith—Moonlight over Half Dome, Yosemite" gives a clear impression of the depth of feeling Ansel held for the natural grandeur which he photographed. This photograph, taken in the Yosemite Valley where Ansel passed 60 summers, was clearly—as he termed it—an "assignment from within."

Ansel used terms like "magical" to describe that quality in nature which he sought to capture in his photographs. He wrote once of New Mexico to Alfred Steiglitz saying, "The skies and land are so enormous and the detail so precise and exquisite that wherever you are, you are isolated in a glowing world . . . where everything is sidewise under you and over you, and the clocks stopped long ago." These expressive words close to identifying the wonderment, affection, and joy he derived from the natural world he photographed. But his work—in photography as well as other pursuits—

help express more completely this love.

In an interview earlier this spring, Ansel referred to his life's work (his photography, his work with conservation, and his work as a part-time lobbyist and gadfly to Washington) by saying: "I like what I'm doing, and this is my vacation." As the recipient—or target—of some of Ansel's many missives, I can attest to the persuasive manner in which he employed all of his talents and resolve to preservation of our Nation's natural wonders.

As official photographer and director of the Sierra Club, Ansel came to Washington in 1935—his photographs in hand—to lobby for a bill which would preserve the Kings Canyon area as a national park. Ansel's photographs came to the attention of Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes and ultimately to President Franklin Roosevelt, who were persuaded to request Congress for the area's protection. In 1940, Congress responding by establishing the Kings Canyon Park. Later, Ansel lent his support to passage of the Alaska Lands Act, which protected 100 million acres of wilderness land in Alaska.

This talented photographer and onetime musician once said that the greatest gift God had granted him was the Earth itself. His appreciation of this gift was evident as he worked to preserve the natural areas he loved so well. Areas near his home like Yosemite, and the Big Sur coast—which he once described as "the grandest meeting of earth and ocean in the world"—were as dear to him and deserving of preservation as any. Through his work with the Big Sur Foundation, an organization committed to preservation of the Big Sur coast, he played a central role supporting legislation I introduced in 1980 to establish a Federal-local partnership for land planning on the Big Sur coast. During this successful period of public involvement, Ansel continued to lobby, to direct, and to inspire for the preservation of wild and scenic areas with his characteristic wit, good nature, and exceptional talent.

I will miss the wit and good nature he displayed with such zest through his life. While we will miss his friendship and vitality, we are left with the comforting knowledge that his work will continue to inspire future generations—as it did him—as an expression of his love of nature and his dedication to its preservation.

Again, let me welcome you all here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BURTON).

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it will be difficult to imagine this world without Ansel Adams, but it is equally impossible now to see the Sierras and other western landscapes without remembering how he has captured their beauty. These images of nature cannot be separated from the memory of the artist who added such a panoramic dimension too our visions of the American West. In fact, I like to think of Ansel as a landscape choreographer who combined shadow, light, and the natural elements of our environment into a perfect drama for the eye.

His creative achievements and conservation activities are too lengthy to adequately enumerate here, but from his early days of using a Kodak Brownie to the time he took on James Watt, Ansel's life was a unique example of creative force combined with a powerful passion for our environment. This vitality, vigilance and dedication to highlighting beauty and fending off threats to its preservation were evident in every task he approached.

The contributions Ansel made to his hometown of San Francisco, alone, are monumental. In 1932, we San Franciscans were honored by his first one-man show at the M. H. De Young Memorial Museum. He later organized a photography department at the California School of Fine Arts (San Francisco Art Institute). We also benefited from his expertise and ideas as a board member of the Sierra Club for 37 years. In 1972, when the Army relinquished control of open lands in San Francisco, Ansel worked with my late husband, Phillip Burton, to see that overzealous developers were not allowed the opportunity to urbanize this natural open space. It was later to become the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

His letter-writing campaigns in support of our Environment were well known and apparently he wrote almost daily about threats to our public lands and resources. From water shortages in the southwest to the dangers of acid rain in the Northeast, Ansel was an ever watchful and able steward of our environment. In California, he protested offshore drilling, worked to preserve Mineral King as a national park and championed wilderness preservation as a top priority for our State. The list goes on.

There was Ansel Adams, the genius, philosopher, activist, and complete artist, and, as if that were not enough, there was yet another Ansel Adams.

Just a few years ago, my husband and I had the very special experience of sharing an Easter holiday with Ansel and his lovely wife, Virginia. Ansel made certain that nature-loving Phillip Burton had a real opportunity to experience the outdoors. We walked in the woods, had long talks about the future of our planet and it was one of the rare times I recall that Phillip actually put his Chesterfields aside and relaxed in the very woods he struggled so in Congress to preserve for future generations. This encounter, and the many others we shared over the years, had a profound effect on my personal philosophy and appreciation of our environment.

It was indeed an honor for me to accept the "Ansel Adams Wilderness Society Award" on behalf of my husband last May. Ansel once said of Phillip: "When history looks back over our decades, Phil Burton will stand out as a colossus of achievement in preserving the beauty of the world and its benedictions on future generations." The same can be said of Ansel Adams.

The citation from the Presidential Medal of Freedom awarded Ansel Adams in 1980 aptly concludes with: "It is through his foresight and fortitude that so much of America has been saved for future Americans."

As long as this rare and wild beauty of nature is protected, we will remember Ansel's work and thank him for his signature across our landscape.

It must be reassuring to Virginia, and all of Ansel's family, to know that such an extraordinary legacy is bequeathed to our Nation.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEHMAN).

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and most especially for arranging this special order today to honor Ansel Adams.

Ansel was a dear and beloved friend of all who care for the integrity of the American landscape. He was a tireless champion of environmental causes, a vigorous advocate of protecting the natural beauty of our coastline, our mountains and our deserts.

It was Ansel Adams more than any other single individual who deserves credit for the establishment of King's Canyon National Park in the congressional district which I represent.

It was his magnificent photographs that finally convinced President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the need to protect this precious segment of the Sierra Nevada in Fresno County, Calif.

His artistry was as diverse as our national parks; but Adams always returned to the Sierra Nevadas for inspiration. Yosemite Valley, the John Muir Trail, and Mono Lake have no better friend than this photo laureate of the American West.

Adams vision, his humor, and his fresh approach to the world around us are the human legacy he has left alongside his art.

Ansel Adams illuminated the grandeur of California's remarkable landscape for millions who had never experienced it.

For those of us who have, he both deepened and sharpened our awareness that great miracles are still happening all around us. His impact as a

Sierra naturalist can only be compared with John Muir. His work will survive for all time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

We will miss Ansel Adams, his vitality, his artistry, his dedication, but I think his photographs and his memory will forever inspire others to follow in his footsteps.

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Ansel Adams is dead at the age of 82. California has lost a favorite son, and the world has lost an artist whose famous photographs have made his name a household word. Adams is the man who has been given credit for turning photography into an art form, and he left 13,000 prints as his legacy of lifetime achievement.

Born in San Francisco in 1902, Adams was originally trained as a concert pianist. But by the age of 28, he decided that photography was his true calling, and within 2 years he opened his first one-man show. Adams broadened his talents over the years to become author, teacher, and critic.

Ansel Adams is probably best known for two black and white photographs from the 1940's that captured split-second scenes of nature in all its splendor. "Moonrise, Hernandez, New Mexico" 1941 was made even more dramatic after years of experimenting with developing techniques in the darkroom. Adams captured his beloved Yosemite National Park in 1944 with "Clearing Winter Storm."

His respect for the outdoors earned him a position on the board of directors for the Sierra Club, where he worked for 37 years as a dedicated protector of the environment. In that role, he was frequently called upon to testify on Capitol Hill where he sought to influence legislators and Presidents alike.

In a fitting tribute to Adams in his dual roles as artist and environmentalist, his ashes will be scattered from the Yosemite mountain peak whose majesty he captured on film, and whose timeless beauty he fought to protect.

All of what I have said is a part of the public record of this great man's life. As a personal note I should add that while I had met him on one or two occasions, I was proud of the fact that he was concerned enough about environmental politics to support my campaigns over the years. He was knowledgeable, concerned, and involved in a wide range of issues, and he put his money where his concerns were. There should be more men like Ansel Adams.●

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker—

Life gives you pretty much what you give it. She gives beauty to those who try to add to her beauty. She gives happiness to those who share her happiness with her. She gives, even, love to those who love her.

This quote aptly describes Ansel Adams and his zeal for life. Ansel was a very special and selfless man who generously shared his talents and energies with others. Indeed, he was a man who constantly gave to others. Much more than an outstanding photographer who filled our lives with beauty, he made us respect photography as an art form and taught us to appreciate the beauty or our natural landscape, which can so easily be taken for granted.

Ansel Adams did not limit himself to photographing beauty—he sought to preserve it in other ways. He was active in environmental causes and frequently spoke out on various environmental issues. In the thirties he worked hard to convince Congress of the need to establish Kings Canyon National Park and was successful in his efforts. He became very active in the Sierra Club, contributing frequently to its bulletin and serving as its director for 37 years. His love for life and the opportunities it presented was unlimited.

Aside from perfecting his own craft, he shared with others his techniques through various books which he published and the seminars and lectures that he conducted at various colleges and universities.

Ansel Adams will always be remembered as a man who gave his all throughout his life—and in return, life gave him beauty and happiness in his work.●

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Ansel Adams is no longer with us and we mourn his death, but what a life he lived and what a legacy he left. From my position as chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I know how his years of work with the Sierra Club and the conservation movement have enriched this country. Ansel Adams made photography an art form and he used that art and his passion and intellect to enrich our lives and to protect the beauty of this world. His life was a magnificent blend of the artistic and intellectual with the technical and very practical aspects of the 20th century. We and our children are in his debt, and I offer my most sincere condolences to Mrs. Adams and his family.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I acknowledge the passing of a man so great as Ansel Adams, truly a legend in his own time.

The talents of Ansel Adams helped to instill a sense of pride in the hearts of all those who live in the Great Western United States. His ability to capture the strength and beauty of such western treasures as the Yosemite Valley made him a hero to lovers of the outdoors. In addition, his photographic techniques revolutionized the field and left an important legacy for generations to come.

Yet, for all his artistic talent, Ansel Adams was also a humanitarian. He spent much of his time teaching, establishing facilities for education, and sharing his artistic appreciation with a variety of Americans. Ansel Adams' artistic vision showed us a glimpse of our world that we had never seen before, and his humanitarian vision taught us how to appreciate it.●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Ansel Adams. This man was a brilliant artist who, for over half a century, showed us the splendor of America in a unique, clear, and sensitive way. He brought new meaning to the art of photography for he pioneered the concept that photography could be more than mere documentation; indeed, it could express a world vision.

Since childhood, I have been an avid amateur photographer. The work of Ansel Adams influenced me from the start. I have experimented with different films, light sources, and processing techniques, shooting a variety of subjects and thoroughly enjoying this fascinating hobby.

Most of us remember Ansel Adams for his photos of the exceptional places of natural beauty in our country. He was a passionate speaker for protecting the environment and traveled extensively. Some of his best known and beloved works are dramatic scenes taken in the Sierra Nevada Range and the Southwest.

Mr. Adams' desire to depict America extended to his interest in people, as well. In 1944, he published a photographic survey of the Manzanar relocation camp in California where Americans of Japanese ancestry were interned during World War II. The title of this book, "Born Free and Equal," plainly stated Ansel Adams' concern for minority groups and the injustice to which one particular group was exposed. He used his superior skills as a photographer to insure that a tragic part of our Nation's history would not be forgotten.

The powerful photographs in this book, along with his legacy of exquisite pictures of our natural world, reflect a man of courage, ingenuity, and dedication to his art. It is with sadness that I note the death of Ansel Adams, yet there is strength in knowing that his noble contributions to our American heritage will live on.

Thank you.●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California, LEON PANETTA, for his leadership in arranging this special order on behalf of Ansel Adams. He is a man the world will truly miss, and I am honored to be able to pay tribute to him.

Ansel Adams died a week ago last Sunday at the age of 82. He was probably the best known photographer in the United States. He devoted more than 50 years to his career and he became the most widely exhibited and

recognized photographer of his lifetime. World renowned for his dramatic landscapes of the American West, Adams was also acclaimed for his contributions to photographic technology and photography as an art form.

In addition to his work as a photographer, Adams was a prolific teacher and writer, an environmental activist and a part-time lobbyist. He often testified here in Washington on behalf of protecting and preserving the environment he so passionately treasured.

His photographs have been published in more than 35 books and portfolios, and his own books have sold more than a million copies. A frequent lecturer at the Museum of Modern Art and at colleges all along the Pacific coast, Adams also conducted workshops and seminars in the Yosemite Valley. It was Yosemite where Adams shot his first photographs with a box Brownie camera.

Ansel Adams has left a lasting impression on our lives. And although his physical life has ended, his wonderful spirit and his treasured art form will be with us always.

Last Sunday, the attached article appeared in the Los Angeles Times, opinion section, which beautifully illustrates Ansel Adams' contribution to photographic art. I ask unanimous consent to reprint this article so that I may share it with my colleagues.

A HISTORIC ACT OF FAITH IN THE LAND—ANSEL ADAMS' ROMANTIC ROOTS

(By William Wilson)

When Ansel Adams died last Sunday at age 82, we lost a pioneer camera artist of grandiose vision. In his vintage years he had himself become something of a national monument, like the magnificent mountains, valleys and rivers he photographed. He was very nearly more of a folk hero of media mythology than an artist. His pictures were widely appreciated, but that had something to do with his looking like a salty, white-bearded backwoodsman who fought for ecological causes and made pictures that broke records at auction during a now-defunct boom in art photography. It is well for the citizens who thought of him as Paul Bunyan to remember he had wanted to be a concert pianist. It is well for aesthetic perfectionists who felt him tainted by popularity to contemplate his real contribution.

Because he worked with lens and film, developing methods of expression unique to his medium, there is a tendency to regard Ansel Adams as a child of that 150-odd years the photographic art has been with us, a "modern" artist. His was, however, a 19th-century sensibility at its core.

Adams' imagery belongs to an archetypal American preoccupation with the Land. It is a vision cradled in the European Renaissance, when bit by bit it dawned on brave explorers of the sea that there literally was a New World out there. It's hard for us to recreate the immense upsurge of adrenaline that discovery must have caused in every soul from the soldier of fortune to the idealist and debtor longing for one more chance. Imagine a modern space flight returning with the information that, just out there beyond the moon, lies a perfectly habitable planet just waiting to be colonized. Every jaded earthling with an ounce of imagination would be rejuvenated.

America did that to the Old World's worn soul. The continent was settled because that bracing vision of the Land hovered ever before its enthralled votaries. The Land of Promise. The Promised Land. It has all the resonance of religious revelation. No matter how venal, stupid, violent and exploitative humankind became, the Land remained forever both virginal and fecund. Frederick Edwin Church painted its awesome Andes peaks like atavistic gods cloaked in gorgeous sunsets. Martin Johnson Heade saw the Land benign and nurturing, covered with mammalian haystacks.

There we have it. The essential American artistic vision had to be based on the fixated American beatific conception: the Land. To this day Europeans confronted with vintage American art see landscape as our most inspired accomplishment. We have used landscape for eveything. Thomas Cole spoke moral allegory through it. Castles hovered in the sky. The Hudson River School's meandering river enjoyed sluggish transcendental contemplation. The Luminists brought hallowed stillness. Alfred Pinkham Ryder disgorged a nightmare of tiny boats about to capsize in tumultuous seas lit by a seductive, indifferent moon. By the time Jackson Pollock gets hold of it, most folks can no longer see it's landscape and we have outrun our story.

Ansel Adams was not the last to inherit the recognizable version of the American Sublime, but he was one of the last to make it move us. He did so here in the West, in California and Yosemite where Albert Bierstadt had once made Manifest Destiny sing in orotund operatic choruses of paint. My country tisofthee on the big rock candy mountain and down in the valley solo.

Something was eroding paradise. History rained it with countless droplets of war, doubt and empty pop-top beer cans. Ansel Adams came to grips with that. If Mt. Rushmore is really only an ashtray, you have to admit that Death Valley, Mt. Williamson and the towering peaks of Yosemite are only shades of black and white made to appear on a peice of paper by chemicals in solution.

The place of glorious fulfillment changed its location. It was still out there at certain specific sites in the world. It was, however, no longer universally lodged in the human psyche as the symbol of fulfilled aspiration. We would henceforth settle for a landscape viewed between the French windows and the back fence or spewed upon subway cars with a spray-can. Those with a more exalted conception might make desert landscape with earth-moving machines or try to direct light through a volcano crater, but people would not connect it to the old Sublime.

Ansel Adams kept the link. He retained the shadow of breathtaking nature as an act of individual faith and an invitation to any romantic who willfully assests grand belief in spite of the evidence.●

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened this week to learn of the passing of America's best loved and best known photographer, Ansel Adams of California. A warm and good humored friend, Ansel Adams was a man who made it his passion to observe and capture the powerful majesty of nature on film, yet stand in awe of the raw beauty of the outdoors.

Ansel never claimed to be called to the art of photography. Instead, his first love was the inspiring beauty of his native California. As a young man, a trip to Yosemite National Park convinced him of the need for a "visual diary" which would allow him to share the awesome spectacle of the park's features through pictures. A commitment to detail, honed through years of training as a musician, drove Ansel to perfect his pictures and master the photographic arts. His favorite subject in those early years, Yosemite, would be an intimate part of his work for more than 50 years.

A deep motivation to capture the truest image possible led Ansel to explore the intricacies of photography in pursuit of clarity, beauty of tone, and sharpness of detail. His brief work with the talented young photographers in Group f/64 in the early thirties produced a school of thought that strongly influenced the direction of American photography. To students of the technical aspects of the photography, Ansel Adams will be remembered for his development of the "zone system" to control tone and specific textures and contrasts in each part of his panoramic views of nature.

The technical contributions of the man are but a small part of what made Adams the revered figure he is in American photographic circles and among the people. Adams was simply in love with the natural beauty of this country. In its varied settings he observed the wonder of natural design and texture. By capturing that beauty for millions of people who would get no closer to the wilderness than a book of pictures, Adams instilled in generations of Americans an appreciation and love for the natural diversity of their homeland.

He was quietly religious. But for those of us who knew Ansel and viewed the reverence with which he approached his subjects in nature, there could be little doubt of his deep love of the forces that had created the world he sought to photograph. The greatest works of art are created by God, but thankfully a few mortals are capable of preserving the beauty and wonder of such works with a depth of sensation that touches all mankind. Ansel Adams was such a man.

Many of my colleagues are well aware of Ansel's deep commitment to insuring that the natural beauty of our country would be preserved for our future generations. The sight of this large, broad-shouldered, Stetson-wearing man with the perpetual smile was well-known in our Nation's Capitol. He was a hard-nosed and empassioned advocate of wilderness conservation and strengthening of our national park system. He would remind us that we held the beauty of our Nation in our hands, and failure to protect those natural wonders would

irreparably damage the character of America.

Ansel was honored many times for his commitment to conserving America's natural beauty. The Sierra Club, an organization which he served as a director for more than 35 years, honored him with their Muir Conservation Award in 1963. The U.S. Department of the Interior presented him with the Conservation Service Award in 1968. President Carter paid tribute to a distinguished career by presenting Ansel with the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1980. And five prestigious American universities added to his laurels by conferring honorary doctorate degrees on the basis of his lasting contribution to photography and conservation.

The publication of 7 original portfolios and 30 books kept Ansel constantly on the move throughout the United States. He was far more than a "western photographer," though his works in that area alone would have insured his fame. Instead, he traveled widely to experience the diversity of his country. From Hawaii and Alaska to New England, Ansel pursued the grandeur of the American outdoors. He largely sought to capture landscapes free of man's influence, dramatically breaking with that tradition in 1944 when he published the moving "Born Free and Equal" which depicted the lives of Japanese-Americans interred at the Manzanar Relocation Center in California during World War II.

Always, though, he would return to his lifelong home of northern California. While he made his final home in Carmel, he would often walk the coastline and photograph the foothills of my district in the San Francisco Bay Area. Knowing the beauty of the area so well, I have always been amazed at Ansel's ability to find one more new vista to photograph that seemed to be created just for him.

The passing of Ansel Adams at the age of 82 has saddened his friends and appreciators. But the vision of this man will not pass as long as his photographs capture the brooding strength of the outdoors. America will remember Adams as a man who walked softly through the forests, and viewed the richness of this land as a blessing for all generations to behold. Ansel Adams will be remembered as a man who illuminated the land he loved with an eloquent light.●

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 22, Ansel Adams, one of the great creative artists of our time, perhaps the greatest photographer, a leading conservationist and a magnificent human being, passed away at the age of 82.

Ansel Adams, one of the warmest and most unpretentious of human beings, suddenly looms bigger than life. It is difficult, in retrospect, to reconcile his legendary achievements, as an artist and as a human being, with the compass of a human life, even one that filled 82 years of living to the full.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the many who had the real pleasure and privilege of getting to know Ansel Adams personally, to experience his humor and generosity, his dedication to preserving the American earth, and to hear some of his insights as a creative artist. Being an amateur photographer myself and a Member of Congress who shared his love of our land and its natural beauty, I felt like a disciple sitting at the foot of the master.

Only last month, I received a note from Ansel, written on one of his beautiful photographic notecards, urging timely action to protect the South Fork of the Merced River in California. I was happy to be able to report to him that Congressman TONY COELHO had introduced legislation to accomplish that purpose and that a hearing on it has been scheduled by the Public Lands Subcommittee. Ansel concluded his note with the statement that he was dedicating the last of his diminishing energies to the struggle to bring a more sensitive national leadership, believing that "the world as we know it" hangs in the balance.

Our finest tribute to the vision and genius of Ansel Adams will be to carry on his work of protecting our great natural heritage, revealed in all its mystical beauty by his superb photographic works or art.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the RECORD, following these remarks, two articles about Ansel Adams from the Washington Post of April 24. One, by Paul Richard, is entitled "1902–1984: Master of the Camera, Poet of the Landscape, Protector of the Wild." The other article, by Dale Russakoff, is a brief but sensitive biographical sketch summarizing Ansel Adam's life of twin commitment to art and activism.

1902–1984: MASTER OF THE CAMERA, POET OF THE LANDSCAPE, PROTECTOR OF THE WILD

(By Paul Richard)

At photography—and politics—Ansel Adams was a master.

When he came to Washington, as he often did, Adams would dress up like the Old Man of the Mountains. He'd were a string tie and a Stetson. He'd scratch his grizzled beard, grin his impish grin, snap his red suspenders—and go about his business with implacable intensity. Adams had two missions here. One was selling photographs. The other was pressuring politicians into helping him preserve the wild landscapes that he loved.

At both of his two missions, Adams, 82—whose heart gave out on Sunday night—was enormously successful. He was the grand old man of the environmental movement. His photographs appear in nearly a million books. He had countless exhibitions and honors. He was best loved and best known of American photographers.

Adams was in some ways a 19th-century artist who flourished in the 20th. The technically impeccable, usually unpeopled, photographs that brought him fame blend two differing traditions of American landscape art, one factual, one fanciful.

Adams was not the first good artist to go into the mountains. The western landscapes he portrayed had been portrayed in the previous century by photographers and painters. The painters leaned toward poetry, the photographers toward prose. They taught him different things.

"Not everybody trusts painting," said Adams, "but people believe photographs."

His photographs are believable in part because their details seem absolutely right. When he shows a still-young aspen tree growing in New Mexico, one can take a magnifying glass and study every leaf. When he shows a field of stones, one can see the texture of every rounded rock.

Adams as a lobbyist was comparably effective. His pictures of California's Kings Canyon, hand-carried to Washington in the 1930s, helped lead to the creation of the 455,000-acre Kings Canyon National Park. Adams, a Sierra Club director from 1936 to 1970, worked over every President from Franklin Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan. He made phone calls, he wrote letters. When Interior Secretary James Watt was in office, Adams would dash off a letter of complaint—to newspapers and congressmen—almost every day.

"You should see him lobby," said his friend Bill Turnage in 1979. After seven years as Adams' business manager, Turnage had become the head of the Wilderness Society. When Adams came to Washington, they would work the Hill together.

"We run this Abbott and Castello act," said Turnage. "I let Ansel start. he speaks about the spirit, then I hit them with the details."

Adams the photographer took a similar approach. The majesty of landscape, and its minutiae, too—the spirit and the details—dance together beautifully in his finest works of art.

He was a masterful technician. He invented the "zone system" of exposure, he taught 5,000 students, and his printing sets a standard that has rarely been surpassed. When, in 1932, Adams, Edward Weston, Imogen Cunningham and Willard Van Dyke began to work together, they called themselves "Group f64," in honor of the smallest lens opening then available. They like f64 because it offered the greatest depth of field and the sharpest possible focus. "A lot of younger American photographers," observes John Szarkowski of the Museum of Modern Art, "have no clue about how much they've been influenced by Ansel's rigorous sense of obligation to using the machine well."

The scientist in Adams insisted on the precise replication of the smallest detail. But he was a poet, too.

"Ansel Adams was complaining about the clouds when I first met him," wrote David Brower, then director of the Sierra Club. "They weren't yet what they ought to be, but he thought they would get better."

The early western photographers took nature as they found it. C. L. Weed, C. E. Watkins, E. J. Muybridge and their colleagues were rock-hard men who left us rock-hard pictures. They cared little for the arty. They were scientists, explorers. They rode mules to Yosemite. Their cameras were cumbersome, their lenses were handground. They hauled carboys of acid and fragile glass plates up the rocky slopes. They did not sleep in lodges, but outside, on the ground. Their pictures call to mind the pictures the first astronauts took from outer

space. They brought back to the cities accurate, convincing images of marvels rarely glimpsed before.

Bierstadt and Moran and other 19th-century painters of the mountains cared less for reportage than they did for drama. Their pictures feel like operas. In the wilds they made sketches that were relatively straightforward. But when they returned to New York, to their studios, they pulled out all the stops. Their lakes are just a bit too clear, their peaks a bit too high. They liked to dress their mountains with waterfalls and rainbows, sunsets, stormy clouds, little bears and deer. Their pictures aren't believable. They are too gaudy, too romantic.

Like Bierstadt, like Moran, Adams often stretched the truth a bit. He wasn't always a "straight" photographer. He once admitted that he dodged the crosses in the foreground of his "Moonrise, Hernandez, New Mexico," his most famous image, to make them just a bit lighter and more ghostly.

As a young man in California, Adams studied to be a pianist. The day he died, his family and friends gathered in his Carmel, Calif., home to hear a recital by his favorite pianist, Vladimir Ashkenazy. When he talked about the aims that guided him in art, Adams often spoke of seeking "spiritual resonance, as moving and profound as great music." When one looks at Adams' photographs, one can almost feel him there behind the camera, a maestro in control, conducting all those boiling clouds and those shafts of sunlight that seem to shoot, on cue, through the stormy clouds.

"Purism, in the sense of rigid abstention from any control, is ridiculous," he wrote. "A great photograph is a full expression of what one feels about what is being photographed in the deepest sense, and is, thereby, a true expression of what one feels about life in its entirety."

Washington's Harry Lunn, the dealer who helped make Adams rich, used to say, "there are two markets for photography—there is one for Ansel Adams, and one for everybody else."

A single print of "Moonrise" sold recently for $71,500. It wasn't a unique object; its edition had been "limited" to 942. Suppose each "Moonrise" print is worth that much. That means that the artist, with one click of his shutter in 1941, had made a golden goose whose golden eggs today have a combined market value of more than $67 million.

The most popular American artists—Norman Rockwell, Andrew Wyeth, and Adams, too—tend to lend their art a quality of almost shameless emotional exaggeration. Most of Wyeth's pictures are a bit too morbid, most of Rockwell's too goody-goody. Szarkowski writes that "the natural world," as seen by Adams, "is infinitely varied in aspect . . .: its grand vistas and its microcosms are never twice the same . . .; the landscape is not only a place, but an event."

Still, something in his pictures suggests a benign propaganda. No tin cans mar his landscapes. His elegant, authoritative, perfectly made prints show us what we wish the world outside to be. He was a true believer. His mission was to awe.

One great photographer, Paul Strand, helped show Ansel Adams the path that led to art. Another, Alfred Stieglitz, gave Adams his first one-man show 46 years ago.

"It is all very beautiful and magical here," Adams wrote Stieglitz from New Mexico many years ago. What he said of that landscape could describe the viewer's experience of Ansel Adam's art:

"The skies and land are so enormous and the detail so precise and exquisite that wherever you are you are isolated in a glowing world between the macro and the micro—where everything is sidewise under you and over you, and the clocks stopped long ago."

ANSEL ADAMS, PHOTOGRAPHER AND ENVIRONMENTALIST, DIES AT 82

(By Dale Russakoff)

Ansel Adams, the photographer who celebrated the majesty of nature through panoramic pictures of the virgin American West and a lifetime of environmental activism, died of a heart ailment Sunday at a hospital near his home in Carmel, Calif. He was 82.

Renowned for his twin commitment to art and activism, Mr. Adams worked at both causes until the end. He had recently finished his autobiography and was at work on a series of technical books on photography. On the day he died, aides said he dictated notes on his concern over threats to the natural environment.

Mr. Adams was one of a small group of 20th-century photographers credited with elevating his field from a hobby to an art form. He took his first snapshot at age 14 in Yosemite National Park with a Kodak Brownie box camera and spent much of the rest of his life capturing on film the contrasting light, beauty, and power of the American wilderness.

"We will remember him more than anything else for his vision of the western landscape," said John Szarkowski, director of the department of photography at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. "He understood that the earth was not just a sculpture, it was an event, constantly changing. That's what he explained in his pictures, which is why they were so moving and why they gave us another sense of what the world was about."

Szarkowski and others said it was Mr. Adams' creative energy and intensity, as much as his artistic achievement, that distinguished him. Even in his later years, friends said, it took two, full-time darkroom assistants working in shifts to keep up with him.

Mr. Adams' heralded photographs of Kings Canyon and his personal lobbying efforts as a director of the Sierra Club in the 1930s helped persuade Congress to preserve the 455,000-acre wilderness area as a national park.

For the past three years, he wrote a letter a day to congressmen and newspapers decrying the Reagan administration's environmental policies, which he once branded "the Pearl Harbor of our American earth." He often said that only his Pacemaker and his fight against Reagan and former Interior Secretary James G. Watt kept him alive.

Last summer, after Mr. Adams told Playboy in an interview, "I hate Reagan," the president invited the photographer-conservationist to meet with him. After a 50-minute session at a Los Angeles hotel, Mr. Adams emerged to call the president "sincerely cordial" but unconvincing. Borrowing a phrase from Oscar Wilde, he said Reagan "knows the cost of everything and the value of nothing."

"Ansel believed everyone had a responsibility in the larger world, that an artist couldn't just withdraw," said William A. Turnage, executive director of the Wilderness Society and a close friend and former business manager of Mr. Adams. "He became one of the most important environmentalists of the century. His work had a tremendous impact on the way Americans understand nature."

Born in San Francisco Feb. 20, 1902, Mr. Adams had his first encounter with the raw power of nature at age 4, when the great earthquake of 1906 hurled him into a brick wall, leaving him with a broken nose that later became one of his best-known trademarks, along with his brushy white beard, tall presence and Stetson hat.

He embarked first on a career as a concert pianist, with photography as a hobby, but committed himself full time to the camera and the serious study of light, form and nature in 1930. He dated this interest to 1915, when at age 13, he went daily to see the Armory Show, the revolutionary modern art exhibit of impressionists and surrealists, at the San Francisco World's Fair.

Mr. Adams returned to Yosemite each summer after snapping his first picture there. In 1919, he joined the Sierra Club, and later became caretaker of its Yosemite Valley headquarters. He became an expert mountaineer in pursuit of pictures of the vast, rocky expanse.

"The excitement of Yosemite became strong and filtered through me into some esthetic experiences, which probably were supported by similar experience I was having in music study," Mr. Adams recalled in a 1975 interview.

Mr. Adams' early works were impressionistic and soft-focus, but under the influence of photographer Paul Strand, whom he met in 1930 in Taos, N.M., he moved toward conveying sharp, stark details. In 1932, he joined Edward Weston, Imogen Cunningham and others to form Group f/64, whose name refers to the small lens opening of a camera, symbolizing the depth of field and sharpness of image that Mr. Adams and his compatriots sought.

In 1935, Mr. Adams attracted the attention of the renowned photographer, Alfred Stieglitz, with his first technical manual, "Making a Photograph." The next year, Stieglitz sponsored a one-man show of Mr. Adams' work titled "An American Place," at his New York City gallery.

Over the years, Mr. Adams helped develop the concept of "equivalents," which he described as the link between the spiritual excitement that a photographer feels about his subject and the image he creates of it. He said this allows the spectator to create his own "equivalent."

Mr. Adams also was a proponent of the concept of "visualization," which frowns on retouching, requiring an artist to see and feel the final print of a picture before releasing the camera shutter. He developed the breakthrough "zone system" of film exposure to control specific textures and contrasts in each part of a panoramic vista.

A prolific writer, Mr. Adams published a series of technical works, known as the Basic Photo Books, and numerous collections of his photographs, of which the most famous include the luminous and haunting "Moonrise, Hernandez, New Mexico," and the mystical "Monolith, the Face of Half Dome."

More than 1 million copies of his books have been sold, and more than 5,000 students have attended his workshops. He is also well known for "Born Free and Equal," a photographic record of the lives of thousands of Japanese Americans interned at the Manzanar Relocation Center in California during World War II.

Mr. Adams helped launch the first department of photography as a fine art at the

Museum of Modern Art in 1940, and in 1946 he founded the first academic department of photography at what was then the California School of Fine Arts.

On Sunday, Swiss pianist Vladimir Ashkenazy performed at Mr. Adams' home overlooking the spectacular Big Sur coastline in a private concert scheduled months earlier. He then visited Mr. Adams at Monterey's Community Hospital, where the photographer had been confined since Friday, and gave his friend a tape of his latest recording of Brahms.

Mr. Adams spent the day reading newspapers and a mystery book, dictating his thoughts on photography and conservation into his tape recorder and listening to Ashkenazy's tape on his Walk-Man, said Mary Alinder, Mr. Adams' chief assistant and editor of his autobiography.

"He was Ansel right to the end," Alinder said.

Survivors include his wife of 56 years, the former Virginia Best, of Carmel; a daughter, Anne Helms, and a son, Dr. Michael Adams.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order on Ansel Adams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1810

UNDERMINING OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY BY THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk this afternoon about the recent letter to Commandante Daniel Ortega signed by 10 Members of this House and its relationship to the Logan Act, and act which was passed in 1799 by the Congress of the United States. I am going to use as a source for that both the original letter signed by Congressman WRIGHT of Texas and nine other Members of the House; a recent editorial in the Atlanta Journal; an analysis of the Logan Act by Michael Seitzinger, legislative attorney, American Law Division; and the actual debates and proceedings of the Congress of the United States in 1799.

Let me start by saying that the recent disclosure that there was a letter from American Congressmen to a foreign government stating explicitly, and I quote: "We have been and remain opposed to U.S. support for military action directed against the people or Government of Nicaragua," has aroused a certain amount of interest.

First of all, the Atlanta Journal, in a recent editorial on April 26 entitled "'Crime' and Punishment" says, and I quote:

U.S. Representative Newt Gingrich plans to introduce a "resolution of disapproval" against 10 Congressmen who wrote a sort of "get well" letter to Nicaragua's Marxist leader.

The editorial goes on:

* * * his "resolution of disapproval" is a step toward penalizing Congressmen who want to set their own foreign policies.

But it's not enough. The letter presents a dangerous trend toward self-negotiation by U.S. officials, a trend that undermines the adopted policies of the U.S. Government and further fragments American leadership.

So Gingrich's "resolution of disapproval" hardly fits the offense. The Nation needs new, stringent laws to prevent Congressmen from molding their own foreign policies. It needs to reaffirm the principle that only the executive branch has the power to negotiate with foreign governments. And it needs laws that make it a crime to intentionally undercut a policy that has been democratically adopted by the administration and the Congress.

Certainly, Gingrich's measure is better than no punishment at all. But it won't stop other Congressmen from doing it again.

I might make mention of the fact that the Atlanta Journal is normally regarded as a moderate Democratic publication and is certainly not considered a voice of rightwing concern.

The fact that it would consider the letter from Congressman WRIGHT and nine other Members of the Commandante Ortega, the Marxist dictatorship of Nicaragua, is something worthy of being called "a crime," and that is the Atlanta Journal's term, I think is something that people need to look at.

More recently in the Washington Times on April 30 there was a letter from a Col. Otis McCormick, U.S. Army, retired, entitled "Ortega's Congressional Pen-Pals." I would like to read part:

Pat Buchanan's April 20 column, "Mash note to a thug," discusses a letter that, in the case of a declared war, would border on treason. Ten members of Congress, including the Majority Leader Jim Wright and Reps. Michael Barnes and Stephen Solarz, sent a letter to Daniel Ortega, head of the Nicaraguan government controlled by communists and viciously anti-American Sandinistas. Mr. Buchanan details how this letter opposed U.S. action and policy towards Nicaragua. How can this nation survive if so many people will not help our president, who in fact, actively oppose him? Why can we not close ranks behind our president and give him full support in this desperate struggle for survival against those enemy hordes that are getting ever closer?

It is completely ridiculous, and is also inimical to the safety of our country, that so many members of Congress and the media are so prone to promptly and heavily criticize their own country while complimenting or sympathizing with our enemies for some fancied wrong the U.S. may have done to them.

We have been at war with communism since its inception. No, we didn't declare war. We only tried to protect ourselves. They declared war on the United States and the rest of the civilized world many years ago.

Of course, their primary objective now is the United States, the most powerful member of the free world. They have never lost sight of their objective but many members of the free world have been asleep, have been fooled by their propaganda. It is too bad that so many people can only see evil in their own government.

A verse in the Nicaraguan national anthem condemns the United States. Every American should know that.

That is the letter from Otis McCormick, U.S. Army, retired.

Third, I received a very informative letter from a man who has had considerable experience in U.S. foreign policy, Carl Lichtenstein, senior fellow at the Heritage Foundation and former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, a man who has seen American foreign policy undercut by the Congress, and a man who has personally witnessed the kind of problems we must deal with. He says in a letter dated April 23:

THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION,
April 23, 1984.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR NEWT: Whenever my capacity for outrage begins to exhaust itself, some new provocation seems always to emerge—and that is exactly what has happened regarding the letter of the Majority Leader and his House Democratic colleagues to Commandante Daniel Ortega of the Sandinist junta, the letter of March 20.

I want you to know how much I admire and support what you are attempting to do, in running up urgent warning flags, and how imperative it is for our country—indeed, for freedom in our hemisphere—that you succeed.

"Outrage" is too bland a word. It does not begin to fit the deed. I join in your judgment that this invasion of executive prerogative, this intrusion into the making (and unmaking) of U.S. foreign policy reflects (1) profound unconstitutionality, (2) almost certain illegality, and (3) a depth of ignorance and even contemptuous disregard of real world challenges that is quite simply frightening.

On the constitutional issue, there seems to me no room for doubt. This effort, particularly on the part of ten legislative leaders who have been unsuccessful in working their will through the regular processes of decision-making, is an impermissible intrusion into the exclusive power of the President to conduct U.S. foreign policy. Whatever these ten may think of its wisdom, or its efficacy, or even its morality, the policy of the United States in Central America has been repeatedly articulated by the President—as early as February 1982 in his address to a Joint Session of the Congress—and by his responsible deputies in the executive branch, and in effect reaffirmed by the Bipartisan Commission in its balanced, authoritative, unanimous conclusions issued last fall. As I have always understood the U.S. constitutional system, that is the way in which U.S. foreign policy is and ought to be laid down—not by a self-styled one-party leadership elite in one house of the Congress. These ten in particular know full well how the legislative role in the broad over-

sight of U.S. foreign policy is appropriately exercised.

I am not a lawyer. But I have no hesitation in suggesting, moreover, that the transmission of this letter to the leader of a foreign government with which our country maintains formal diplomatic ties is a flagrant violation of the Logan Act which, as you pointed out in your statement in the House, since 1798 has barred "personal" and "private" diplomacy. I cannot help but recall the firestorm of criticism that greeted the efforts of Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin in 1953 to negotiate with Greek shipowners concerning the use of their vessels in trade with Mainland or Communist China. President Eisenhower denounced this intrusion into executive prerogative, and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles demanded an apology, in effect, and a promise to sin no more—which in fact he got from the senator in a public statement.

What makes this analogy even more pointed, it seems to me, is that (1) the senator's critics in the Congress were the partisan and ideological forefathers of the ten who now sign the letter to Commandante Ortega, (2) that Senator McCarthy never even presumed to deal directly with the leadership of a sovereign government, and (3) that the present case involves a matter of immediate strategic interest to the United States, as the earlier case did not, and an explicit commitment by the U.S. government and the American people. I refer of course to our commitment, in which the Congress has joined, to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters who are laying their lives on the line in opposition to the Cuban- and Soviet-supported Sandinist junta which is both "exporting revolution" throughout Central America and eradicating the freedoms of the Nicaraguan people, in violation of its own pledges of 1979.

This last point gets to the heart of the present controversy over U.S. assistance to non-Communist and anti-Communist governments and indigenous forces in Central America—U.S. support for those who are fighting to preserve or to secure their freedom and independence from totalitarianism, and to defend their countries against externally-inspired and supported Marxist-Leninist aggression. On either score, it reveals astonishing naivete (or ignorance) on the part of the House Democratic ten to address to the Sandinist junta an appeal for "serious negotiations for broad political participation in El Salvador" in the face of all that we have so painfully learned since 1945 about the predictable results of "power-sharing" with militant Communists. This naivete (or ignorance) is compounded when the ten dare to "commend" the Commandante for "taking steps to open up the political process in your country" (concerning which seeing will be believing) "in the midst of ongoing military hostilities on the borders of Nicaragua".

Even aside from constitutional and legal considerations, in other words, this backdoor diplomacy by the House Democratic ten reflects a policy orientation that threatens to deal away the Central American republics' last hopes for resistance to externally-supported aggression and puts at grave risk the strategic interests of the United States in the immediate neighborhood of our hemisphere. As you also point out, the letter to the Commandante invites him to disregard the official policy of the United States, to appeal over the President's head to some apparently "higher" U.S. constituency, and to look to this self-styled House Democratic "state department" as a negotiating partner. The sheer hubris, the presumption of these ten is as awesome as it it frightening.

The message, is critically important to our country. I will do whatever I can to support and supplement your effort and stand ready, always, to assist you in every possible way.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. LICHENSTEIN,
Senior Fellow.

□ 1820

As I said, that is a letter from a man who served for 3 years as the Deputy U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and who has lived through a process of watching this Congress undercut foreign policy.

Now, in that setting, I have reviewed the Logan Act, and I think that it is very important to look carefully at the Logan Act in this context.

As I mentioned earlier, Durward McAllister, the editor of the Atlanta Journal, in a column by him on April 24 had raised also the issue and had said: "United States foreign policy is in peril."

I think that it is important that we look at this whole question.

Let me start by quoting the summary from Mr. Michael Seitzinger of the American Law Division on the Logan Act:

Although the Logan Act was intended to cover relations between private citizens of the United States and foreign governments, there appear to have been no prosecutions under the act. However, the act has not been forgotten and remains as a sanction against anyone who, without authority, interferes in the foreign relations of the United States.

The question seems to me very simple: First, when the term "private citizen" is used, does that mean somebody who is not in elected office, or does that mean everyone except the executive branch? Second, were there in fact any interferences in the foreign relations of the United States and if there were, was there any authority for those interferences? Third, what did the framers of the Logan Act intend when they passed the original act in 1799?

Let me first focus on the analysis of the act. The act was passed in 1799. I think the setting has to be understood here. The United States was involved in very difficult negotiations with revolutionary France. Many people in that period saw revolutionary France as a universal radicalizing power, much along the tradition of the Communist Soviet Union today.

There were Jacobean clubs and efforts to relate to revolutionary France in this period, much as in the modern era there are various subversive activities involving the Soviet Union.

In 1779, President Adams sent John Marshall, Charles Pinckney, and Elbridge Gerry as special envoys to France to negotiate and settle claims and causes of differences which existed between the French Directory and the U.S. This mission resulted in the XYZ letters controversy. And its failures led to such strong anti-France feelings in the United States that preparations for war were begun by the Congress.

After the unsuccessful envoys returned from France, Dr. George Logan, a Philadelphia Quaker, a doctor and a representative, decided to attempt on his own to settle the controversies. Bearing a private certificate of citizenship from his friend Thomas Jefferson, who at the time was Vice President, Logan sailed for France on June 12, 1798.

In France, he was hailed by the newspapers as the envoy of peace and was received by Talleyrand. The French Directory having concluded that it was politically wise to relax tensions with the United States, issued a decree raising the embargo on American ships and freed ships and seamen.

Logan, however, received a less friendly response from the United States after he returned. Secretary of State Pickering told him that the French decree was illusory. George Washington expressed his disapproval of Logan's actions. President Adams recommended Congress take action to stop the "temerity and impertinence of individuals effecting to interfere in public affairs between France and the United States."

"Representative Roger Griswold of Connecticut introduced a resolution in Congress to prevent action similar to Logan's," resolved that a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of amending the Act entitled: "An Act in addition to the Act for the Punishment of Certain Crimes against the U.S." so far as to extend the penalties if need be to all persons, citizens of the United States who shall usurp the Executive authority of this government by commencing or carrying on any correspondence with the governments of any foreign princes or state, relating to controversies or disputes which do or shall exist between such princes or state and the United States.

Let me stop for a moment to make three points about the initial resolution introduced by Roger Griswold of Connecticut.

First it says, "All persons citizens of the United States"; second, it focuses on usurping the Executive authority. It does not say the government, the constitutionally elected, it says Executive authority.

Third, it distinctly mentions correspondence "by commencing or carrying on any correspondence" and so forth.

Finally, it refers to controversies or disputes, not war; controversies or disputes. So as it relates to the Dear Commandante letter of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) and nine other Members of this House the question is first of all are they persons; second, are they in the executive branch, third, did they commence or carry on any correspondence, and fourth, was it relating to controversies or disputes?

Now this of course is Mr. Griswold's initial resolution. Let us continue with what happened.

The resolution was passed and the committee was appointed. On January 7, 1779,

Griswold introduced in the House a bill based on the resolution.

Going back again, the bill was passed on January 17, 1799, in the House; on January 25, 1799, in the Senate and it was signed and became a law on January 30, 1799.

Now, I think at this point it is very important to look at the judicial references. Is the Logan Act in fact in its current form an irrelevancy or is it still a real law? After all, it has been a long time since 1799, it is not something which we have looked at for a long time.

So let us look at it again. There are references to the Long Act. No one has ever been prosecuted under it, but there are a number of occasions in which there have been references made. In 1863, Judge Sprague of the Circuit Court for the District of Massachusetts mentioned the Logan Act in saying:

We have seen it stated in such form as to a reasonable attention that unauthorized individuals have entered into communication with members of Parliament and foreign ministers and officers in order to influence their conduct in controversies with the United States or to defeat the measures of our government. It ought to be known that such acts have long been prohibited by law.

Notice here that Judge Sprague refers to communications in order to influence the conduct of foreign governments. In other words, to communicate with a foreign government during a controversy in order to change that government's behavior according to Judge Sprague back in 1863 is a question which has to be looked at and which has to be, and again I quote:

"It ought to be known that such acts have long been prohibited by law," a reference to the Logan Act.

In 1909, in American Banana Co. versus United Fruit Co., there is a reference to the Logan Act.

In 1951, in the United States versus the Peace Information Center, and I quote:

The court at 261 mentioned similarities between the Logan Act and the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the language used appeared to indicate that the Logan Act, like the Foreign Agents Registration Act, is constitutional.

Citizens of the United States are forbidden to carry on correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government with an intent to influence its measure or conduct in relation to disputes or controversies with the United States.

□ 1830

Let me reread this because I think it is very important to look at. And I want to continue with the second paragraph. But notice who it says. It does not say unelected citizens; it does not say those citizens who do not serve in the Congress. It says:

Citizens of the United States are forbidden to carry on correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government with an intent to influence its measures or conduct in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States.

The act under scrutiny in this case represents the converse of the last mentioned statute. The former deals with citizens of the United States who attempt to conduct correspondence with foreign governments.

In 1955, in Marvin against Young:

The court stated that the conduct described in the specification violated at least three criminal statutes under which the petitioner could be tried in a civil court, one of which was the Logan Act and granted a petition.

The court in Briehl against Dulles, 1957, "upheld certain Department of State regulations which provided that no passport should be issued to members of the Communist Party."

At 587 of the opinion the court referred to other valid Federal statutes which restrict persons in the area of foreign relations.

We have statutes dealing with persons who act as agents of a foreign government or those who have correspondence with a foreign government with intent to influence its measures in relation to disputes or controversies with our government or to defeat the measures of the United States.

Finally, in Waldron against British Petroleum Company, 1964, the court "unequivocally asserted policy measures of the United States instead of merely statements of opinion attitude, and belief of government officials."

The court went on to argue in footnote 30 at 89,

The court indicates that although Congress should perhaps eliminate the vagueness of the Logan Act, the act remains valid despite the lack of prosecutions under it."

The court finds no merit in plaintiffs argument that the Logan Act has been abrogated by desuetude. From the absence of reported cases one may deduce that the statute has not been called into play because no factual situation requiring its invocation has been presented to the courts.

Citing Shakespeare measure for measure, act II, scene 2, "The law hath not been dead thou it has slept."

United States against Elliott, 1967, appears to be the latest judicial reference to the Logan Act, "At 326 it reaffirms the statute as it is discussed in Waldren."

Pertinent, too, is Waldron against British Petroleum Company wherein this court held vital a previously unenforced section of the Logan Act promulgated in 1799.

In other words, as recently as 1967, the Supreme Court has held that the Logan Act is valid, it has not been repealed, it is the law of the United States.

Let us look for a minute at the executive branch. We have one example where two Senators were dealing with Fidel Castro and another example where Richard Nixon was going to China as a private citizen, having left the Presidency. There are fascinating aspects. These are opinions by the State Department and therefore are not as powerful as opinions by the U.S. Supreme Court. But they are worth noticing.

I want to quote from the opinion of the State Department first on the cases of Senators John Sparkman and George McGovern who went to Cuba.

The clear intent of this provision—the Logan Act—is to prohibit unauthorized persons from intervening in disputes between the United States and foreign governments. Nothing in Section 953, however, would appear to restrict Members of the Congress from engaging in discussions with foreign officials in pursuance of their legislative duties under the Constitution.

In the case of Senators McGovern and Sparkman, the Executive Branch, although it did not in any way encourage the Senators to go to Cuba, was fully informed of the nature and purpose of their visit and had validated their passports for travel to that country.

Senator McGovern's report of his discussions with Cuban officials states: "I made it clear that I had no authority to negotiate on behalf of the United States—that I had come to listen and learn."

Senator Sparkman's contacts with Cuban officials were conducted on a similar basis. The specific issues raised by the Senators, the Southern Airways case, Luis Tiant's desire to have his parents visit the United States, would in any event, appear to fall within the second paragraph of section 953.

Accordingly, the Department does not consider the activities of Senators Sparkman and McGovern to be inconsistent with the stiplulations of section 953.

Let me make a point here. First of all, the State Department in its interpretation clearly implies that the Logan Act would include Congressmen. It is clear from the whole nature of this analysis, after all, they could have simply said the Logan Act does not apply to elected officials, one paragraph. Instead, they systemically walked through the Logan Act and said: One, they told us they were going; two, they told us why they were going; three, we gave them a passport to go; four, they specifically said we are not negotiating we are "listen and learn" from McGovern; and five, in Senator Sparkman's case, he was directly talking about cases that involve individuals and if you read the legislative history of the Logan Act it is quite clear that they intended that individuals should be allowed to prosecute private cases not involving U.S. Government policy with foreign governments.

I would suggest that the entire context of the Department of State opinion in the Sparkman and McGovern cases would imply that the Logan Act is alive, valid, and relates to Congressman WRIGHT of Texas' letter to Dear Commandante. And furthermore I would suggest that in order to be convincing that that letter does not violate the Logan Act, the Members who signed it would have to prove first that they told the State Department; second, they were clear the State De-

partment knew what they were doing; and third, that they specifically were not in any way trying to influence the policies of the Government of Nicaragua.

I think it is impossible for them to argue those three cases.

The second example where the State Department was involved was an opinion in 1976 concerning former President Nixon's visit to the People's Republic of China.

It goes on to say and I quote:

It is the responsibility of the Department of Justice to make determinations of whether criminal statutes of this sort have been transgressed and whether individuals should be prosecuted under them. However, the Department of State is unaware of any basis for believing that Mr. Nixon acted with the intent prohibited by the Logan Act. In this connection, it should be noted that no one has ever been prosecuted under the Logan Act * * *.

Interestingly enough an ideological colleague of the Members who signed the Dear Commandante letter wanted to eliminate the Logan Act. Let me read the conclusion because it states the case for itself.

Although it appears that there has never been a prosecution under the Logan Act, there have been several judicial references to it, indicating that the Act has not been forgotten and that it is at least a political weapon against anyone who without authority interferes in the foreign relations of the United States. However, there have been efforts to repeal the Act. For example, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY (D.-Mass.) wished to delete the Logan Act from the bill to amend the United States criminal code, S. 1437, 95th Cong., 2d Sess. (1978). Senator James Allen (D.-Ala.) insisted on reenacting the Act in exchange for promising not to prolong debate over the bill, and Senator KENNEDY agreed to this. Since the House was unable to consider the criminal reform bill in the 95th Congress, the possibility of deleting the Act in a conference committee was eliminated. Yet, it is possible that the issue of whether the Logan Act should remain in the United States Code will be considered by a later Congress.

Notice now. First, that there are people who wish the Logan Act did not exist and Senator KENNEDY is one of them. And that his ideological allies signed the letter to Dear Commandante, which, if the act did not exist, would, in fact, probably not have any question about whether or not it was illegal.

Second, that the act has not been repealed and it specifically was not repealed, even on the Senate side because the conservative, Senator Allen of Alabama, insisted on keeping it.

Third, again let me quote from the conclusion:

There have been several judicial references to it indicating that the Act has not been forgotten and that it is at least a political weapon against anyone who without authority interferes in the foreign relations of the United States.

One of the issues this House will have to decide this spring and summer is where the 10 Members who wrote to the dictator of Nicaragua authorized to do so? Did they have authority? And, second, did that letter interfere with the relations of the United States?

If one can argue successfully that there was no interference, that the letter in no way assisted the Nicaraguan-Marxist dictatorship, that it was not of value to them, then probably there will be no question about the letter.

□ 1840

Or if one could prove that in fact they were authorized to send the letter, there would be no problem about the letter.

Now, having given the American Law Division's opinion, having outlined the problems that are involved, let us turn to the debates and proceedings of the Congress of the United States, and the debate on the Logan Act in the House in January 1799. And let me say that it is a fascinating debate.

In the first place, to set the stage, one must recognize that for the Founding Fathers, the French Revolution was both a good and a bad event. On the one hand, as people who believed in freedom, they liked the idea that there was a revolution in France drifting toward freedom. But then as the French Revolution became more and more radical, more and more bloody, increasingly there was concern about the nature of the French Revolution. And as the French Revolution itself became more and more vicious in its foreign policy, it began to prey upon American shipping, engaged in a war with virtually every power in Europe. There was a sense on the part of many Americans that France was a threat to freedom.

And it is literally possible to take sections of this debate, and if you replace revolutionary France with the Soviet Union, if you replace the Jacobins with the Communist Party, you could have this debate on the floor of the House today and not a word would be changed. The same fears, the same concerns about global tyranny, the same sense of a universal state reaching out through subversive agents and reaching out with ideological allies to try to conquer the world.

Let me walk through some key points.

Mr. Pinkney stated at one point:

All power with respect to negotiations with foreign Governments, is placed in the hands of the Executive by the Constitution, and no act of Congress can alter the Constitution.

And this comes down to a key point about whether or not you have to be at war, technically:

Mr. Otis said, it appeared to him, that it would be necessary to introduce an amendment into the bill, after the words "foreign Government," viz: "being at peace with the United States," because if the correspondence was with a nation with whom we are at war, the offence might amount to treason, by adhering to the enemies of the United States.

In other words, if we were at war with a country, you would not need an act like the Logan Act, and it is specifically designed to regulate negotiations and communications with countries that we are at peace with, but engaged in difficulties.

We got into a fascinating dialog.

Mr. Nicholas said that he—

believed the gentleman from Massachusetts was for extending this law too far, for the purposes intended. The endeavors of an individual to procure peace for a nation, could surely never be construed into treason.

In other words, if you meant well, then the acts could not apply to you. After all, if you were trying to do something good for the country, such as develop peace, there could not be a problem.

Listen, though, to what Mr. Gordon thought:

. . . it was the intention of this bill to restrict improper correspondence at all times, both of peace and of war.

Mr. Bayard went on to say:

The object of this law is to prevent these private interferences altogether since the Constitution has placed the power of negotiation in the hands of the Executive only. An individual may do good, but he may also do evil; and it cannot be supposed that any private person has more wisdom, or a greater desire to serve his country than the Executive of the United States.

Let me carry you back through the last part, because it relates directly to the most powerful defense of the signers of the "Dear Commandante" letter. "An individual may do good, but he may also do evil; and it cannot be supposed that any private person has more wisdom or a greater desire to serve his country than the Executive of the United States."

Now, Mr. Dayton came in and said—

. . . there may be instances of persons carrying on a correspondence with a foreign Government, without saying anything relative to any dispute which may exist between the two Governments, and yet influence the conduct of the foreign Government toward us. He might report, for instance, that the people of the United States are divided among themselves; that they are disarmed or disorganized.

Furthermore, Mr. Claiborne:

. . . In every country, the laws of which breathe humanity and justice, the intention of an act almost always constitutes its criminality or its innocence. Our foreign relations ought doubtless to be managed by the Executive department, and if any other character attempts to interfere in this business . . .

Now, the question becomes what in fact were the Congressmen in that period attempting to do in the bill which is today?

Mr. Bayard went on:

In order to establish a crime by this bill, what is to be proved? First, that there are disputes subsisting between the United States and the foreign nation with whom the correspondence is said to have taken place; that this intercourse has really existed; and that it was carried on with a view to influence the measures or conduct of the foreign Government in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States; and, unless all these facts are proved, the crime is not made out.

Let me walk through those just a minute. In describing the intent of the act, one, is there a dispute between the United States and Nicaragua? Very clearly, we have legally approved covert actions. We are taking all sorts of steps to put pressure on Nicaragua. Clearly we fit Mr. Bayard's first requirement.

Second, has the intercourse existed? That is, did they in fact send the letter? Very clearly they did.

Third, was the letter carried on with a view to influence the measures or conduct of the foreign government? Quite obviously.

Therefore, Mr. Bayard says:

. . . unless all these facts are proved, the crime is not made out.

One would think the burden begins to be on the part of those who signed the letter to prove that they do not fit Mr. Bayard's definition.

Mr. Pinckney:

Can it be proper, said Mr. P., when any gentleman of this country may conceive himself better informed, better instructed, or better delegated, than the President of the United States, for him to league himself with others to oppose the measures of the Government of the United States, and by this means usurp, in some degree, the powers of the Government?

Again Mr. Pinckney:

Whenever a person transgresses the laws of his country, he certainly does a criminal act. He would agree with gentlemen, that to procure peace for a country is generally a laudable thing; but to procure even peace, by taking the power of negotiating out of the hands of the Executive, is an usurpation of power, and therefore criminal. And when a law is passed to prevent this kind of interference, it becomes doubly criminal. He mentioned this circumstance, because the gentleman from Virginia had charged the authors of this bill with creating a new crime. It does not create a crime, but provides for the punishment of one.

In other words, Pinckney's argument is precisely that the Constitution makes it clearly illegal for anyone but the President to negotiate with a foreign government. All the Logan Act does is to provide a punishment for violating the Constitution and that even if it was the most noble of causes, to bring peace, that it would be illegal for a private citizen of the United States to negotiate directly with a foreign government because it would undercut the capacity of the Executive to run the foreign policy of the United States.

Why is it important that we have an act to regulate our relationships when we are not at war? Many of our colleagues would say, "Well, we are not really at war with Nicaragua. Oh, there is some covert actions, there is a little violence going on, but we are not really at war, we have not declared war."

Let us go back to this very same period and let us listen to some of the problems that we have to look at. This is Mr. Gallatin, who opposed the bill but who described the situation in a way which fits our own day:

He allowed our situation with France was different from our relative situation with any other country. It is something less than war, and something more than two countries having a controversy with each other. On this account, though they have reported a bill of a general nature, they have always had France in view. It is certain that, if we were at war with France, for an individual to correspond in a certain manner with the French Government would be criminal, would be treason by the Constitution; and though a correspondence of the identical kind which would be treason when we are at war, would not be so now; yet he was not surprised that gentlemen wish to make such acts misdemeanors at the present time.

In other words, the relationship that the United States had with revolutionary France in 1799 was remarkably like our relationship with the Soviet Union today. They were an aggressive, constantly expanding power, a national which constantly tread on the rights of other nations and which constantly sought to subvert another mind, other countries, just as the Soviet Union is today.

Let me go on. Mr. Edmond said:

. . . it will be wise and prudent, at this time, to frame a law to prevent individuals from interfering with the Executive authority, in a manner injurious to the community.

Mr. Edmond goes on to say:

. . . before the crime intended to be punished by this Act can take place, a controversy must have existed between the government of the United States and a foreign government, and an individual must have carried on a correspondence with an "intent to influence the measures with respect to the controversy." The bill goes no further.

I would suggest again that by Mr. Edmond's standard it is clear that the "Dear Commandante" letter usurps the power of the Executive, and it is precisely what the Logan Act was written about.

□ 1850

Mr. Bayard said:

The offense proposed to be punished by this law is separated only by a shade from treason. Yet such is the act which the gentleman from Virginia in his place has avowed that he should not be ashamed to do. This act is that of an individual taking upon himself to settle dispute with a foreign government after the proper authority in his own government has vainly attempted to do it. But it is said by the gentleman from Virginia that this act is so far from being dishonorable that it is a virtuous and a laudable thing to accommodate national differences.

If we are to admit that the sole object of such person was to settle these differences, we might accede to the sentiment in the abstract, but in a political point of view it cannot be justified. For though he may do good in some instances, who he would do evil in others, by making disgraceful stipulations. He acknowledged peace to be a desirable thing but the honor and the independence of a country are still more desirable.

In other words, even if the best of intentions under this act, by the people who wrote the act, it would be wrong legally to deal with a foreign government.

Mr. Bayard went on to say:

Is it possible that the gentleman from Virginia can seriously avow a belief that an individual has a right to assume this power to negotiate? For what purpose have we an executive, and foreign ministers? If any unauthorized individual may assume the power placed in them? As to this object of negotiation for peace, as he had already stated, it might be purchased at too great a price. With respect to the individual alluded to, we are in a state of darkness. Whether his object was honorable or not, we cannot tell. How far he was connected with other persons is uncertain. The House had heard indeed disavowals on this floor which he was willing should go out to a credulous community. As to his own opinion, it was a matter of faith which he was not obliged to disclose. It must be clear to every reasonable man that a law of this kind is necessary as a barrier to guard against an arrogation of power and public factions.

Is the offense proposed to be punished by this bill of crime or not? If it is, it is in the intention of Congress to define it better than it stands upon common law principles. If it is not a crime, it is the intention of Congress to make it one, since the most deplorable consequences may be prevented by it.

Let me go back again to one specific point Mr. Bayard made:

A law of this kind is necessary as a barrier to guard against an arrogation of power in public factions.

What better definition of the 10 signatories of the "Dear Commandante" letter than precisely what the Founding Fathers would have thought of as a faction?

Mr. Bayard goes on to explain, and this is again a key point:

For anyone else to negotiate for the United States starts with an assumption that the President of the United States has failed.

One of the things that most angered the Members of the Congress in 1799 was the notion that Mr. Logan thought that where the U.S. Government was failing he would succeed.

Let me quote from Mr. Bayard:

There could be no doubt that these ministers possessed a sincere desire to settle the existing disputes between the two countries if it could be done with honor. This was found impossible. And yet, after all this, a single individual, not appointed by the administration, thinks he can accomplish what the whole government could not do and goes to France under this idea. Can it be right that an individual should go and offer terms of peace which could have no other

effect than to incite that clamor at home, which the gentleman from Virginia has been pleased to say is the object of this bill, by making it appear that there is an unwillingness in the government to make peace?

But suppose a treaty of peace was negotiate by an individual thus situated, and government should not approve of it? It would be thrown out to the people as a bone of contention, the consequences of which would be that one party in the United States would say that the terms ought to be accepted, and the other, that they ought not. So that a rash step of this kind might involve the country in a civil war.

In other words, precisely the danger the Founding Fathers were worried about, was that one group of Congressmen might write off and say to a dictator, "Hi, we would like to negotiate, the U.S. Government has failed, the President has failed, we have this new idea. Why do you not do what we suggest?" One could almost pick up the Dear Commandante letter and say, for example, if you would do certain things "the prospects for peace and stability throughout Central America would be dramatically enhanced."

Those responsible for supporting violence against your Government and for obstructing serious negotiations for broad political participation in El Salvador would have far greater difficulty winning support for their policies than they do today.

Or you might even say, again from the Dear Commandante letter:

A decision on your part to provide these reasonable assurances and conduct truly free and open elections would significantly improve the prospect of better relations between our two countries and significantly strengthen the hands of those in our country who desire better relations based upon true equality, self-determination and mutual good will.

This letter, the Dear Commandante letter by Mr. WRIGHT of Texas and the other nine Members, almost reads as though someone had sat down and read the debate in 1799 and decided to write a 20th century version of exactly the kind of communication that the Founding Fathers were arguing about in 1799.

It significantly suggests how Nicaragua could change its behavior, something which they are clearly against; it specifically suggests how Nicaragua could strengthen the faction in America which wrote the letter, something which the Logan Act is clearly against, and it is a remarkable document in fitting into this entire debate.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SILJANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the gentleman for the last, give or take, 40 minutes, and I am rather fascinated, I serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and as I hear you speak and relate to history, the gentleman from Georgia brings up some incredible points that I think the American people and certainly the Members of this Congress need to know and need to hear about. Historical references.

Why it is dangerous; why it is so deeply dangerous for the U.S. Congress or a delegation a self-appointed delegation of the Members of Congress to assist to negotiate foreign policy, especially foreign policy clearly, blatantly contrary to the administration and to the Congress now in power.

Especially those of credible leadership positions in Congress. If the gentleman's historical reference really in a true sense makes my stomach turn, because the implication of what you have been saying, if I have been hearing the gentleman correctly over the last so many odd minutes, the implications of what the gentleman is saying I think are very, very deep in terms of the future foreign policy statements of this body that Congress ought to make.

I have no opposition to resolutions in Congress deploring the President for doing one thing or another or patting him on the back, for that matter, telling him a particular position on foreign policy was, in fact, a good idea. I guess what concerns me is that a group of leaders deciding amongst themselves in a little clique in Congress, that let us write a letter to a government that is in opposition to most everything we believe in terms of democracy and freedom; let us write a letter to them and try to encourage them to carry on policies that are again, I repeat, are clearly, unequivocably contrary and conflicting to the policy statements that have been made by this Government; by the United States of America.

If I were someone back in Michigan, where I represent or in Georgia, where the gentleman whose eloquent statements, where he comes from, his State, and I just want to tell the gentleman I appreciate what he is going tonight.

If I were a citizen listening to your presentation, I would be upset, to put it mildly.

□ 1900

I would wonder who do we think we are, as a small little group of Members, to decide behind the scenes on their own accord, based on their limited knowledge, they do not have access to Department of Defense daily intelligence briefings or CIA daily intelligence briefings, or they do not have the time, as the President would have, to pool the information of all the intelligence agencies together, some very, very classified and others not, and be able to make a very qualified decision as a group on what our foreign policy statements ought to be as a nation, especially considering this is a Marxist country, Nicaragua; especially considering what this country could do with the information in terms of incredible propaganda.

So I would just like to tell the gentleman that I thank him for yielding and I thank him for the comments he is making, because it seems clear that the American people, if they really knew what the implications of this letter meant, and as the gentleman is well defining these implications, I believe that the American people will certainly be standing up and taking note of any future activity. I hope this type of letter will never, never happen again in the history of this country.

Mr. GINGRICH. I appreciate very much the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think this letter, the Dear Commandante letter, has to be seen in context, and I will take up again another evening the issue of the Logan Act because we are only about a third of the way through the debate on the Logan Act in the House.

But let me again put in frame the Dear Commandante letter by Mr. WRIGHT of Texas and nine other Members. It is a prelude, since that was the foriegn policy establishment of the Democratic Party in the House, to the Fascell-Moakley unilateral disarmament amendment which will be coming to the floor next week, an amendment which literally guts any capacity by the United States to do anything in Central America, an amendment so mindlessly weak and so irrationally anti to the interests of the United States that it is hard to believe that serious, competent men could offer it. Let me put it in context.

At a time when leading Democrats in this House feel free to write the dictator of Nicaragua, the pastoral letter on reconciliation from the Nicaraguan bishops, the Easter celebration letter signed and released on April 22, Easter Sunday, in Nicaragua, says this:

Our country, too, is plagued by a belligerent situation pitting Nicaraguan against Nicaraguan and the consequences of this situation could not be sadder. Many Nicaraguan youths and men are dying on the battlefields. Many others look toward the future with the fear of seeing their own lives prematurely ended. A materialistic and atheistic educational system is undermining the consciences of our children. Many families are divided by political differences.

The suffering of mothers who have lost their children, which should merit our great respect, is instead exploited to incite hatred and feed the desire for vengeance. Farmworkers and Indians, for whom the church reserves a special love, are suffering, living in constant anxiety, and many of them are forced to abandon their homes in search of a peace and tranquility that they do not find. Some of the mass media, using the language of hate, encourage a spirit of violence.

In other words, the bishops in Nicaragua do not see Dear Commandante as a reformer, as a man who has improved things. One month after 10 Democrats in this House signed the

letter to the head of the Communist dictatorship in Nicaragua, it is the bishops who are crying out.

Or let us look at a Joint Declaration of the Foreign Ministers of Costa Rica, El Salvador and Honduras. I realize this is April 25, it is a statement by three countries that are pro-American and, therefore, some people automatically assume that they are puppets or people we cannot listen to, but let me just give you two quotes from the Ministers of Honduras, El Salvador, and Costa Rica, meeting together.

They ask the Government of Nicaragua to set aside its obstructionist attitude toward the labors of the working commissions established within the Contadora framework.

Nicaragua has repeated this behavior today in the meetings of the working commissions taking place in Panama by rejecting the regional objective of military equilibrium and security in Central America, maintaining that it will continue arming itself and will not accept measures that would limit that government in that respect; it argues that its problems are with the United States and not with its neighbors and that, for this reason, it must prepare to defend itself against a world power. Likewise, Nicaragua totally rejected the document of principles and obligations of the Central American states in the political area, thereby frustrating one of the principal political objectives, that of democratization, contained in the Document of Objectives approved by the five countries on September 9, 1983.

This negative attitude of Nicaragua, pointed out in the statements of the Ministers of the Contadora Group in its information bulletin of this past April 8, to the effect that in the working commissions "there remain obstacles resulting at times from attitudes that are not always flexible and effectively oriented toward negotiation."

Now, what are they saying? Costa Rica is a little democracy with no army. Honduras has a relatively weak army. El Salvador is already engaged in a guerrilla war financed and supported by the Communists in Nicaragua, aided by Cuba and Russia.

And what is Nicaragua's answer when they say why do we not have a balance of power? Nicaragua is going to be strong enough to fight the United States. Now, if they are going to be strong enough to fight the United States, all of it with Soviet equipment and Cuban training, that means they are going to be so powerful they will be the dominant military force in the Western Hemisphere south of the United States, except for Cuba. And Cuba and Nicaragua, if that is their intention, will be able to defeat Mexico and every country in Central America militarily.

That is what the Ministers of Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras are reporting 1 month after the Dear Commandante letter. So here we have the Foreign Ministers of three countries in Central America, here we have the pastoral letter from the Nicaraguan Bishops, neither of which relates to the realities of the Dear Commandante letter.

But let me go a stage further, because this is part of a worldwide scene. Remember, in the Logan Act our Founding Fathers were terrified of revolutionary France, which they saw as a universal power. Let me quote from the May 1, 1984, Chicago Sun Times, a column by Morton Kondracke, normally considered a liberal, entitled "Time to Examine Soviet Actions."

Anyone who thinks the Soviet leadership is aged, stody, passive, defensive and reactive, in other words, not expansionist or aggressive, needs to cast an eye at recent events in the Mideast and South Asia.

He goes on to talk about Afghanistan, where there are 14,000 Soviet troops, 250 tanks, 80 helicopter gunships and, for the first time, high-altitude carpet bombing; in India, where there is a delegation headed by the Defense Minister, and 66 senior generals and admirals; in the Middle East, where there is $2.5 billion worth of Soviet arms being sold to Iraq; and in Syria, where the Soviets have sent between 6,000 and 7,000 troops to help rebuild the Syrian military.

He goes on to say:

Around the world there are other signs of Soviet assertiveness as well: large-scale maneuvers in the Baltic Sea, an increased naval presence in the Caribbean, tightening of Western air corridors into West Berlin, a Soviet aircraft's reconnaissance flight over a secret French naval base, two "accidents" involving U.S. and Soviet ships, and the firing at a U.S. helicopter that strayed across the Czech border.

All these incidents and developments could be unrelated and coincidental. It seems unlikely each one was carefully planned and executed, but they do all seem to be part of a pattern of aggressiveness and provocative behavior.

If patterned behavior is involved, what explains it? Even U.S. intelligence officials confess this country lacks the assets, the spies and electronic penetration, to know for sure what the Kremlin leadership is up to.

Administration speculation includes the possibility the Soviets are attempting to influence the U.S. elections by creating the impression that Ronald Reagan has made this an unsafe world. Another interpretation is that Reagan really has scared the Soviets by installing Pershing missiles in Europe and threatening to build a "Star Wars" missile defense and that they are reacting truculently.

Officials also mention the possibility of trouble inside the Kremlin, with permission to the military to be more aggressive as a chip in some bargain between the Generals and civilian authorities.

Speculation as to Soviet capabilities aside, the hard reality about Soviet behavior is on display in Afghanistan. It is a reality of utter ruthlessness. The American news media rarely report the evidence, including videotape smuggled out of Afghanistan and seen fairly frequently on European television, but Soviet anti-guerrilla tactics differ markedly from those employed by the United States in Vietnam.

In the winter issue of the quarterly Foreign Affairs, French physician Claude Malhuret wrote that the American tactic was to establish strategic hamlets where the local population could be gathered, protected from guerrillas and won over to the government cause.

By contrast, Malhuret wrote, the Soviet tactic in Afghanistan is "massive reprisals against the population, sometimes including the extermination of a large part of that population."

This includes purposeful and systematic destruction of villages, towns, food supplies and innocent civilians as a means of destroying guerrilla resistence.

Malhuret wrote that the Soviet tactic also includes "dropping mines and booby-trapped toys, in most cases plastic pens or small red trucks, that are choice terror weapons. Their main targets are children whose hands and arms are blown off." Their purpose seems to be to spread terror and despair in the population.

After working with the Afghan resistance, Malhuret concluded that the Soviets will probably win unless "there is profound change in the international balance of power and in the reactions of Westerns to Soviet totalitarianism."

"The first step is for all of us to look closely at what the Soviets are doing in the world," and I complete my quotation of Morton Kondracke, a liberal.

□ 1910

Let me say this in closing. The Soviets are nothing more nor less than leftwing Nazis. The KGB is simply the Gestapo of the left. They are a deliberate, ruthless, brutal tyranny. They have established one colony in the Western world called Cuba. They have established a second colony called Grenada, which we have liberated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

TAX FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SILJANDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH).

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is going to have an extremely important special order on the tax program, but let me just conclude, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding, by saying that I want to drive home certain very key points, and I will be taking shortly another special order further about the Logan Act.

The Founding Fathers faced with a ruthless revolutionary tyranny in France reacted properly. They knew that this country could not survive if every American who thought they could do better than the President were allowed to go off and negotiate.

I think it is very clear from the Bishops' statement, from the statement of the Foreign Ministers of Costa Rica,

El Salvador, and Honduras, from every evidence we have, from Morton Kondracke's column, that the letter to the Nicaraguan Communist dictatorship was unwise, improper and just plain wrong.

I would look forward to the distinguished majority leader and his nine cosigners issuing a statement to that effect.

I would think that it is important that they recognize that this issue is not going away, that we are going to establish a precedent one way or the other, that it is wrong for Members of this Congress to deal with Marxist governments against the policies of the United States and to communicate with them at a time when the United States is engaged in a controversy.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I also want to say again that I appreciate the special order that the gentleman from Georgia took and the very important facts he has brought forth before the U.S. Congress.

I just want to say to my colleagues, congratulations. Today is a very important day in the lives of many, many millions of people. Those of us who pay taxes, those of us that have been working and striving to pay our bills, today is the first day that we are all able to pay our own bills.

Today is Tax Freedom Day. Today is the day that a taxpayers' group has calculated that finally we are done working for the Government and for government taxation.

Today is the day that we can begin, as I said earlier, paying our own bills, rather than paying Uncle Sam's bills, the State and local governments' bills, of taxes of all types and of all sizes and of all denominations.

Between January 1 and May 1, every single penny the taxpayer earned has gone to tax collectors. Every year economists of the Washington-based Tax Foundation figure out just how much of our money goes toward Federal, State, and local taxes. They try to translate that into so many days of the year and May 1 is Tax Freedom Day.

Looking at it another way, the watchdog economists found that this year we work the first 2 hours and 40 minutes of each and every 8-hour day for Uncle Sam and his local counterparts. Uncle Sam took the first hour and 43 minutes and State and local governments usurped the rest.

There are a couple ways we can look at this and assess it. We can say, well, that is the way it goes and count our blessings, just assume that finally we are free from all the tax burden.

We can say we paid for our schools, our police, our firefighters, our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, social services, the first 4 months of the year.

We can celebrate and lie back with the knowledge that everything is freedom from May 2 through the end of the year, December 31.

We could, but it would not be very realistic in the minds of most Americans, nor would it change the fact that one-third of our lives is spent shoveling our silver into the tax collector's sack.

The other response could be righteous outrage, and let me tell you, every time I have been home back in the 4th District of Michigan, I have heard the righteous outrage and indignation of many, many taxpayers.

What are they upset about? They are upset that they have to wait 4 months, working 8 and 10 hours a day, just to break even with the tax collector. They are sick and tired of it. The American people are fed up with the complicated, confusing, present tax system that faces us all each and every year during our Federal income tax season.

We do not have to look too far for the answers. So many people have said, "Well, MARK SILJANDER, there are just too many complications in the tax system."

There are 10,000 pages of rules and regulations by the IRS. There are another 2,000 pages of alternatives by the IRS. Pages upon pages are added each and every year by new laws. Just this year, for example, we passed in 1984, at least through the House and now in the House-Senate committee is a document 1,023 pages of a tax bill and 810 pages of explanations. That is all new complications to the tax reforms and tax rules.

What it all comes down to is that this average taxpayer is frustrated. After all, I am frustrated as well. We are all frustrated with a system that is too overbearing, that is much too confusing, that is elitist in nature.

And why is it elitist in nature? Well, this box is a box that says "Return to Sender." It is to Mr. Fat Cat, Mr. Free Ride, U.S.A. This is a box full of loopholes, a box of 10,000 pages with another 1,023 up and coming in the new tax bill. These are the loopholes—symbolically, of course—that only the elite that can afford a lawyer, that can afford a famous or well-educated tax lawyer to figure out each and every loophole.

This is symbolic of those loopholes that most of us, the vast majority of us, cannot afford someone to find all these loopholes.

Most Americans might have a CPA or an accountant. Many Americans toil at night near the end of the year trying to figure out all the deductions and all the loopholes they can and usually come out very short.

So what is the answer to this complication? What is the answer to the incredible confusion that seems to be permeating the country and the minds especially here in this Congress, because it seems as though every time we are in trouble economically, we think of thousands more pages to add more complications and more addendums and changes and more rules and more regulations, as though more will make things better.

The idea is very simple. I do not want to startle my colleagues by something too simplistic. We do not need 10,000 pages of IRS rules and regulations, nor do we need a new tax bill of 1,023 pages more. What we need is one single page. Take the box of loopholes and throw it out. All we need is one page, one page for every American, be that person making $1 million a year or $10,000 a year, that working American could fill out his income taxes in 10 minutes on one single page and that would be through a simple, fair, flat rate income tax.

I have asked my constituents, "Do you think you are overtaxed?"

And the answer is inevitably in the vast majority of cases, "Yes."

I ask, "Do you think government spends too much money?" And they say in the same percentage, high percentages, "Yes, indeed."

I ask them, "Do you think the present system is fair and simple?" They say, "Absolutely, it is not."

That is why, my friends and colleagues in Congress, I have introduced a House resolution. I call it the countdown bill. It is bill 5432. That is the number of the bill. It is a simple number. It is a simple 10 percent flat tax bill. This is why I bring the issue up today, because today, as I alluded to earlier, is Tax Freedom Day. After all, what better forum could we use to tell the American people and to tell my colleagues in Congress that there is an alternative to the maze of rules and regulations, to the maze of confusion, there is an alternative, a 10-percent flat tax bill, a simple 10 percent, a fair 10 percent flat tax bill.

□ 1920

If one made $1 million a year or more he or she could not avoid taxes by the box of loopholes behind me but, rather, he or she would pay their fair tithe or 10 percent of his or her income, a fair rate.

If you make $10,000 or $20,000 a year you pay 10 percent, a fair rate.

My bill takes a more pragmatic approach. We could not certainly allow the poor to pay a 10-percent flat rate income tax. No, we would hear many choruses of voices and duly so that it would be unbearable for the poor.

So what we have done is a couple of things. No. 1, it is a 10-percent flat rate on net income minus $2,000 per person in each family deduction, indexed for inflation. For an example, say you have a family of five, times each individual by $2,000. And this

gives you a total of $10,000 in exemptions from any taxation. So a poor family of five would be exempt for the first $10,000 and they would not have to pay a penny of tax. So it is not imposing on the poor, absolutely not.

To those of us that are homeowners and believe in the American dream of owning a home, interest payments and payments on property taxes are deductible.

For those of us that believe in giving to our favorite charity or church, that would be deductible.

And an IRA savings account for the future, savings and an incentive to save would be deductible.

But ladies and gentlemen, that is it, that is it, five simple deductions in total, 10 minutes of your time once a year on one single page to fill out your income tax forms.

The only problem is we would have to find somewhere to retire all of these copies of the 10,000 pages each group of books of the Tax Code. We would have to dump all of these loopholes and the boxes of loopholes. And certainly H&R Block might not be the greatest fan of this particular proposal. But I can tell you, 9 out of 10 Americans would support the proposal, for according to the Republican Study Committee, 90.4 percent of all gross taxable income are those that earn under $35,000; 75 percent of all the gross taxable income, according, again to the Republican Study Committee, it suggests that 75 percent of all of the gross taxable income is under $20,000. That is not the rich that are paying. It is the middle-income Americans for the bulk and the majority of the tax burden in this country. It is the middle-income Americans that this bill is addressing today. It is the middle-income Americans that are frustrated and furious that they have to work until today for all of the taxes they have to pay.

So what we ought to do as a Congress is do something to help the frustrated American who breaks his back and works to pay the home heating bill, the property taxes, the high interest rates that are finally, thank God, coming down from the 21.5 percent prime rate of a couple of years ago.

The middle-income American is concerned. And I would say in a philosophical sense, and I mean this with all due respect to the middle-income Americans, they are ready to revolt. And I do not mean by taking up arms or shedding blood. I think they are willing to start shedding votes for Members of this body who refuse to engage themselves in a new form of simplicity for the tax system, they refuse to listen to the cries and shouts of Americans all over the country saying that the time has come for a fair and simple Tax Code, a fair and simple tax system. Americans are calling for it every day. There are news columns. Somewhere in the country likely today there would be an editorial saying it is time we simplified the Tax Code.

Is this such a new idea? It is not a new idea at all. This is why it is time in this forum of tax freedom today that we are expressing these concerns.

There have been many flat tax bills. JACK KEMP has one. PHIL CRANE has one. Congressman JIM QUILLEN has a flat tax bill. Many of them are very good alternatives. MARK SILJANDER has one.

But they sit and they collect dust in the committees of Congress without even a fair hearing. It is time that Americans changed the course of tax and budget history.

The reason I say it is time for Americans to do so, my colleagues, is because they are the only ones that will force the change. I bring your minds back to the time when we passed the Tax Equity Act and included withholding of dividends and interest. The majority of the Members of Congress voted for that bill and it went through.

Lo and behold, the American taxpayer said "Wait a minute, who is the Congress to tell me that they are going to withhold on savings interest and dividends?" Who are we to do that? Millions of letters poured into the Congress, corporately, to House and Senate offices. I had 14,000 alone and I voted against it in the beginning.

Is it not coincidental that the Congress, with the influence of millions of pieces of letters, decided to change their mind and repeal what they passed less than a year prior.

So when the American people are frustrated enough and ready to take action, even if it is with the pen threatening the lives and livelihood of those that serve in this body, action does in fact take place. Action does take place.

So today is the time. Now is the time for a very simple and basic flat rate tax system.

There are a couple of questions I would like to respond to that have been asked in the course of developing this particular bill on the flat rate income tax. The first question I think is quite relative. Will my social security be taxed and it will not be taxed under House Resolution 5432, the 10-percent flat tax.

What deductions will be allowed? I think this is important to repeat. There will be a limited amount of deductions. There will be $2,000 per person indexed to inflation, property taxes, interest, charitable contributions and IRA and Keough, private, individual retirement savings plans. Those are the deductions, fair, simple, and still we could fit it all on one sheet of paper.

Another question is would not the 10-percent flat tax really benefit the wealthy. I repeat again what has benefited the wealthy is this box of loopholes. That is what has benefited the wealthy. We would now be throwing those loopholes out.

The other question is what about the underground economy. After all, the IRS has conservatively estimated of the half a trillion dollars in the underground economy, of that half trillon dollars nearly $100 billion of that would be legal moneys that should be reported. This is not drug moneys or prostitution dollars earned from those types of illegal, illicit activities. Almost $100 billion would be legal moneys that ought to be coming to the coffers of the U.S. Treasury. So we have addressed that in House Resolution 5432, the 10-percent fair and simple flat tax. We have said that we will allow anyone who has not reported their income taxes amnesty. We will allow you amnesty. If you have never paid taxes or have cheated or have not reported fully in your tax reports, here is an opportunity to come clean, to repent, if you will, and come clean without any fear of adjudication by the IRS or anyone else.

Will it work? Massachusetts tried. Massachusetts tried and they estimated about a $7 million net benefit of revenue. Less than half a year into their system and, mind you, they did not change the tax laws, they just offered amnesty with the same State tax laws and the same provisions, almost 10 times or almost $60 million has since come in, 10 times the amount they estimated originally.

We are telling Members here is their opportunity, here is a government's opportunity to salvage another $100 billion in new revenues.

What forced many of those who have avoided paying taxes? It was those in the 40- to 50-percent tax bracket that reverted to not participating in the present tax system. It was their large tax bracket that forced them underground. With the incentive of a 10-percent flat tax most people believe that we could accumulate the vast majority of that estimated nearly $100 billion and that could be very, very low as an estimate in itself.

You see House bill 5432 does not take effect immediately, assuming it passed this austere body and the other body and the President signed the bill into law. It takes effect 3 years later.

□ 1930

But in that 3 years, the amnesty provisions will take effect immediately and every penny that comes in of new revenue from the amnesty, those that come forward and come clean, will go into a special trust fund which will accumulate during those 3 years as Congress considers ways of adjusting their habitual spending habits to adjust for 10-percent inflation.

Then after the 3-year period the flat tax will take effect; 10 percent, with a deduction that we mentioned and that cumulative amount of the amnesty grace provision will then be used to help offset any lost revenues.

And coming to my last question: "Well, wait a minute, Mark, won't this 10 percent flat tax lose an incredible amount of revenue?" Who knows? I have some figures that may indicate, and we will present this on another evening, but they may indicate that 10 percent could bring in the same amount of revenues even with some of the deductions we have offered, incredible as it may seem.

Here is the reason: in 1962, they all laughed at President Kennedy, who said: "You can't cut taxes and if you do, it will deplete our Treasury of revenues."

What followed was an economic stimulus. More people worked, contributing to the system, less people drawing out of the system; 1982 was no different.

Many of the same critics said, "Reagan's tax cut won't work; it will deplete revenues from the Treasury." But fortunately for the American people the opposite happened, the same as in 1962, people began going back to work, unemployment dropped, inflation dropped, interest rates have dropped, the economy is in an upswing. No one denies that. Even the great doomsayers who predicted a downswing and a catastroph now are saying we are in a recovery.

So it proves that incentive; when you begin putting money back in the pockets of Americans, let them spend their money the way they see fit, rather than the addicts here in Congress who are addicted to spending the way we see fit, which is usually promiscuous spending, we find an economic stimulus.

But you, being those in the American population, you spend money the way you see fit.

Now, a 10-percent flat tax would undoubtedly be an incredible stimulant to our economy. What new revenue would that produce? It is hard to decipher. But the Congress would have 3 years to break that down. In the meantime, there will be, in my projections a balanced budget amendment.

The reason I say that, amazingly enough, is simply because if two more States pass the resolution for a balanced budget amendment, the Congress would be forced to pass one or face a constitutional convention for the balanced budget amendment.

So by the time the flat tax would take effect, even if it passed this year, I would predict, and quite safely, that Congress would have some sort of a balanced budget amendment eventually, and the 10-percent flat tax could be just the added incentive and catalyst to force us to do the job we know we need to do, but we just do not have the courage to stand up and do.

A 3-year budget freeze in those 3 years before the tax takes effect, even at today's rates, if we froze the budgets at 1984 levels, we would have a balanced budget in 3 years with probably a slight surplus.

Is that so complicated? A 10-percent flat tax with amnesty; a 3-year budget freeze, included with the constitutional amendment to balance the budget and simply implement some of the Grace Commission reports and, my friends in Congress, we would not be in fiscal catastrophy, but rather we would have a fair and simple tax system, and economic prosperity, an economy that is even more stimulated. We then would have a Congress that is finally responding in the fiscal manner that they ought to.

One last point regarding the potential impact of a 10-percent flat tax on the economy: I read recently in an article in the news media suggesting that the American people, understand this, the American people, pay $60 billion a year, yes; B for billion dollars, a year, in tax preparation. Think what a simple and flat 10-percent tax would mean.

That money could be pumped into IRA savings accounts, buying new homes, new automobiles, helping stimulate the economy. That is another $60 billion that could be pumped or redirected in the economy in a much more productive manner.

All in all, we have a proposal that I believe is very basic, in terms of what human need emotionally that I hear is, out in the grassroots; to satisfy the concern of the complexity and the elite nature of the present Tax Code and tax system.

So I am proud to introduce House bill 5432. I invite my colleagues to cosign the bill with me. Today is the day we all need to take heart to the cries of the American people; that is, "Tax Freedom Day." And maybe if Congress could be so bold, could be so courageous to pass a fair and simple flat tax, maybe next year, just maybe, we could announce to the American people that, "Tax Freedom Day" is a month earlier, and the economy is doing well, and that Congress is living within its means. Would not that be amazing?

Sounds like Utopia, but with a simple system, I believe in my heart, in my mind and through all our research, that this could truly, truly happen.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS AND POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY 40TH ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1791, marks a very special day in the hsitory of democratic nations, for it was on this day 193 years ago that the first democratic Constitution of Poland was adopted. It was the first liberal constitution in Europe, and following the American pattern, it established three independent branches of government and emphasized humanitarianism, tolerance, and liberty for all.

In observance of this special anniversary, as well as the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Polish American Congress, the South Bend, Ind., chapter of the Polish American Congress sponsored a banquet and program on April 29 at the St. Adalbert Heritage Center in South Bend.

My good friend of many years, Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, who is national vice president of the Polish American Congress and a resident of my 11th Congressional District of Illinois, was the principal speaker at this event, during which the South Bend chapter of PAC presented a $5,000 check to him to be used to help those less fortunate in Poland.

Additionally, two certificates of merit were presented by the national office of the Polish American Congress—one to Cas and Irene Dzikowski, and the other to Irene Czyzewski, both for their many, many years of faithful service to the South Bend community.

Congressman JOHN HILER of the Third District of Indiana extended his greetings, as did Fire Chief Timothy Braell, who represented South Bend's Mayor Roger Parent.

Dr. Rozanski gave a stirring address, and in speaking of the Polish soldiers who courageously fought and died in the Italian campaigns of World War II, he quoted the inscription on a monument at the cemetery in Monte Cassino, Italy, dedicated to the Polish war dead: "We Polish soldiers for our freedom and yours, have given ourselves to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy, and our hearts to Poland." I, too, have visited the cemetery at Monte Cassino on several occasions, and I share Dr. Rozanski's feeling of heartfelt gratitude for the ultimate sacrifice these brave soldiers made on the altar of justice, honor, and freedom.

The full text of Dr. Rozanski's remarks follow along with the program for the April 29 observance, the text of the two certificates of merit, and a letter addressed to Mr. Aloysius Mazewski, the distinguished national president of the Polish American Congress, the headquarters of which are located in my own 11th Congressional District of Illinois at 6100 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago:

ADDRESS BY E. C. ROZANSKI

It is with pride and pleasure to be with you my dear Friends, to participate in a celebration marking the 40th anniversary of the Polish American Congress.

This is a historical year, for also it is the 40th anniversary of Victory over Monte Cassino in Italy . . . This was the most fierce battle fought during World War 2.

The mountain site with St. Benedict Monastery overlooking the Valley of the Lira river, was a fortified German stronghold protecting the way to Rome.

This is the story in a capsule form: In January of 1944, the American Fifth Army was the first to engage the Germans, which was continued by the Free French, Indian, New Zealanders, and British troops of the Eighth Army.

In May, the task to "take" Monte Cassino was entrusted to the troops of the Second Polish Corps.

Finally on May 18, 1944, after heavy losses the victory was attained by the Polish forces and the road to Rome was opened again.

It is a touching site, Monte Cassino—I have visited the cemetery on three occasions and I have this eerie feeling that the Polish soldiers are asleep, and at a command, will rise again and march into a free Poland.

There are so many crosses, white crosses, the Star of David, the Eastern Rite crosses.

They all loved God and Country and for Country sacrificed their lives on the altar of justice, honor and freedom.

Nothing but nothing says this better then the inscription on the marble spire which stands on the hilltop above the Monte Cassino cemetery: "We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given our souls to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy and our hearts to Poland."

Please let us rise and with a moment of silence pay tribute to gallant heroes of Monte Cassino (Thank you.)

Next week Chicago will host the National Council of Directors of PAC and PAC Charitable Foundation taking place at Conrad Hilton Hotel. Mr. Mazewski invites you all to partake in the four day commemoration and meetings of Polonia's leaders.

The commemoration will begin on Thursday, May 3rd, with a wreath laying ceremony at Kosciuszko monument.

On Saturday, May 5, a parade in down town Chicago will take place. Flags, bands, drum and bugle corps, 50 floats, uniformed marching units of veterans and organizations will parade on Dearborn street.

After the parade a civic program will be conducted at Daley Center Plaza.

We will hear from President Mazewski, U.S. Senator Percy, Congressman Annunzio and Jan Nowak, former director of Radio Free Europe.

In the evening, at Hilton Hotel, a gala 40th anniversary banquet. We will have a prominent speaker from Washington, D.C.

Finally, the commemoration will conclude on Sunday May 6 with the offering of Mass at Holy Trinity Church.

Let us regress for a moment. What does the 3rd of May 1791 Constitution mean to us?

To the Poles and their descendants May 3 is a national holiday—for it bestows upon the Poles a priceless heritage of humanitarianism, tolerance and a democratic precept when Europe lived under the existence of unconditional power and tyranny exemplified by Prussia and Russia.

Poland's parliamentary system actually began at the turn of the 15th Century, but a series of defensive wars, internal stresses, outside influences, widespread permissiveness and excessive concern for the right to dissent brought Poland to the brink of disaster and anarchy in the 19th Century.

Reforms became imperative.

The May 3rd Constitution was the first liberal constitution in Europe and the second in the world, after the Constitution of the United States. Following the American pattern it established three independent branches of government—executive, legislative and judiciary. Throughout the Constitution runs a philosophy of humanitarianism and tolerance, such as liberty to all people—rule by majority—secret ballot at all elections—religious freedom and liberty.

In terms of democratic precept, the 3rd of May Constitution is a landmark event in history of Central and Eastern Europe. This is one part of our celebration.

Today we honor the 40 years of untiring efforts and service to Polonia by the PAC.

The preamble of PAC lasted 40 years. It is as fresh in concept for today:

"In the name of God Almighty! We, the representatives of united Polonia in America, gathered at Congress in Buffalo, N.Y., May 1944, conscious of our responsibilities as citizens of the United States pledge our love, attachment, absolute service and active participation in the American life as Americans, in whose veins flows the Polish blood.

We solemnly affirm to bring far reaching help to the Polish people and in order to express our feelings and wishes in a real sense. Therefore, we establish the Polish American Congress. . ."

Today PAC is the representative body of over 12 million Americans of Polish ancestry and therefore occupies a unique position in the history of American ethnic groups.

It was the first large body of Americans that opposed many of the unjustified concessions that the Western powers granted the Soviet Union during World War 2 and its aftermath.

These unconditional concessions that gave Russia unwarranted domination over Poland and East Central Europe were the primary motivation for the constitutional assembly of PAC on May 30, 1944, in Buffalo, N.Y. where 5,000 delegates representing all Polish organizations agreed on a unified action in behalf of a free and independent Poland and for the betterment of Americans of Polish ancestry.

Today we have 33 state divisions, fundamental units of PAC being the activists of Polonia.

Our objectives and goals are, to give complete support to the government of the United States in its efforts to maintain a durable peace, based on principles of democracy and the universal application of individual human rights.

To combat derogatory misinformation about Poles and particularly about the Polish Americans, and to promote the positive image of Polonia by projecting the proud heritage of the Polish people and their world-wide contribution in all fields—be it science, industry, arts, civics and religion.

We are proud of our contribution as religious people * * * we are proud of our kinsman Pope John Paul II.

We must together with the Polish American Congress as an umbrella organization foster our commitment and objectives.

The political parties in Washington must understand our well justified demand for proper recognition and appointments or nominations to higher positions of trust and responsibilities.

We can learn very much from the Black Latino Americans. They don't wait. They act. Why can't we.

We must support and encourage our youth. We must support and encourage our intellectuals, artists, men and women of science, writers, educators, business and industry, banking, leaders in the Church for better service to Polonia needs.

Let's not forget the news media, radio and TV * * * We must convince them all that we are here to stay * * * we must press for the right to objective reporting of our contributions in the mainstream of American life.

Recently with pride and pleasure as an American I have viewed the General Motors TV presentation of "George Washington" on CBS, until we realized that the history we were taught in grade school on the War of Independence of 1776 was abridged.

There was an omission of two great generals serving under Washington in this war, namely Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski. Pulaski gave his life for American Independence.

If GM, CBS and the producers of this presentation saw fit to bring into this story Generals William von Stueben of Prussia and the Marquis de Lafayette of France, then in the name of justice why omit Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who left their native Poland to fight for American Independence?

We all can help the Congress—we all can write letters of protest—we can vote for our friends; combat misinformation promptly. This my Friends, is what the Polish American Congress is all about.

We shall continue our struggle for a truly free and independent Poland within the framework of America's world leadership and security. We are with the SOLIDARITY movement.

Our lives are based on the traditions of Christianity, social progress and justice.

As Abraham Lincoln once said at the conclusion of his address honoring the dead soldiers at Gettysburg on November 19, 1863: ". . . that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth".

In this I believe—as the sun rises each morning, I am proud to be an American of Polish heritage—I pray to GOD! God bless America!

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS AND POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

BANQUET SPONSORED BY SOUTH BEND CHAPTER

Welcome: Joseph Noetzel.

Invocation: Rev. Casimir Grabarz, C.S.C.

Dinner

Introduction of Mistress of Ceremonies: Dr. Z. W. Sobol.

Mistress of Ceremonies: Mrs. Jeanette Dzikowski.

Principal Address: Dr. Edward C. Rozanski.

Musical Program: Gaska String Quartet.

Presentation of Awards: Dr. Edward C. Rozanski.

Introduction of Head Table: Mrs. Jeanette Dzikowski.

Greetings: Guests.

Acknowledgment of Organizations: Martha Pieszak.

Benediction: Rev. Casimir Grabarz, C.S.C.

Singing of National Hymns: God Bless America, Boże Coś Polske: Audience.

Raffle: Mrs. Gene Grzesiowski.

Dancing: Music by The Continentals.

Committee

Chairman: Joseph Noetzel.

Reservations: Matthew Baran.

Program Arrangements: Mrs. Ewa Sobocinska, Dr. Z. W. Sobol.

Decorations: Matthew Baran, Mrs. Nelly Hlawacz, Mrs. Halina Wlochowska.

Reception: Martha Pieszak.

APRIL 29, 1984.

The South Bend Chapter of the Polish American Congress acknowledges with gratitude the 23 years of faithful service rendered to the South Bend community by Cas and Irene Dzikowski. For the wide variety of Polish music and for the gracious support of Polish activities with publicity on the Polish American Hour every Sunday noon on Radio Station WAMJ, for their part in assisting the Polish community to organize for aid to Poland in need, the PAC is proud to present Mr. and Mrs. Cas Dzikowski with a Certificate of Merit by the National Office of Polish American Congress.

APRIL 29, 1984.

The South Bend Chapter of the Polish American Congress acknowledges with gratitude the many years of service rendered to the South Bend community by Irene Czyzewski. For the delightful Polish music and for the gracious support of Polish activities with her publicity on the Polish Hour every Sunday morning on Radio Station WSBT, for her part in helping the Polish community to aid our friends in need in Poland, the PAC is proud to present Irene Czyzewski with a Certificate of Merit by the National Office of Polish American Congress.

APRIL 29, 1984.

MR. ALOYSIUS MAZEWSKI,
President, Polish American Congress, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. MAZEWSKI: In a spirit of love and generosity, the "Poland In Need" Committee of South Bend, Indiana is happy to present a check in the amount of $5,000.00 to the Polish American Congress to help our less fortunate brothers and sisters in Poland.

This donation represents the results of our latest fundraising activity. We are fully aware of the great need that continues to exist in Poland and are glad for the opportunity to share our many blessings with the needy in Poland.

You have our best wishes for continued success in your program of assistance to Poland in view of the existing circumstances.

Sincerely,

HELEN V. WILCZEWSKI,
Treasurer,
"Poland In Need" Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to PAC National President Aloysius Mazewski, PAC National Vice President Edward C. Rozanski, and to the scores of others who have worked with dedication and devotion over the years in behalf of the Polish American community. Defending the principles of democracy and the furtherance of individual human rights are uppermost in the objectives of the Polish American Congress, and I extend my best wishes for continuing success in the years ahead as the officers and members of the Polish American Congress continue their outstanding work in behalf of the just cause of Polonia.●

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE COUNTRIES TO SHARE TAX INFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying to the effect that "to know what you know and to know what you don't know is to know." When Congress enacted the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) in August 1983, what we did not know at that time was the degree of our success in negotiating exchange of information agreements with prospective beneficiary countries. We believed that the attraction of offering regional trade preferences for the first time as well as qualifying such beneficiary countries for North American area convention status would create an appropriate climate to stimulate these negotiations.

What we now know is that our optimism was excessive and has not been matched by results. At the present time, we have made real progress toward negotiating an agreement only with the Dominican Republic.

The March-April 1984 issue of Price Waterhouse's "International Tax Review," analyses the status of the CBI program designed to obtain information on tax evasion, drug money, and the flow of organized crime loot. To quote from the article:

> The main result to date of the exchange of information provision has been to give the Caribbean tax havens (and aspiring tax havens) a highly visible forum in which to assure the world that Yankee money cannot unseal their lips.

Treasury has reported that there are serious tax haven problems in five countries: the Bahamas, Bermuda, the Caymans, the Netherlands Antilles, and Panama. It was not expected that these countries would be interested in tax information exchange agreements: Their role as tax havens is more important than any possible gains they can get from being designated as convention centers. But other area countries are also thumbing their noses at us: St. Vincent and the Grenadines have rejected an agreement, as have Barbados and Montserrat. The Prime Minister of St. Vincent and the Grenadines has reportedly said, the United States wants "top secret information on offshore banking operations" but "we are not going to make disclosure on accounts that come within the area of confidentiality and on people who do business with us."

These tax havens are a refugee for blood money; for the proceeds of drug trafficking, for organized crime loot, for unpatriotic citizens cheating on their taxes.

Therefore, I am today introducing legislation to amend the CBI Act to require that a country may not be designated as a beneficiary unless it enters into an agreement with the United States to provide for the exchange of tax information.

Mr. Speaker, this condition is a reasonable one to impose upon a process designed to invigorate the economy of the Caribbean community. I strongly urge the prompt consideration of this bill, so as to correct a glaring defect in the act as originally passed. It will send a clear signal that acceptance of preferences by a country must be matched by its willingness to assume complementary responsibilities which will foster compliance with our tax laws. In a partnership such as is envisioned by the CBI, we should not accept less.●

THE INACCURATE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, even the title of this document "the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD" sounds important. Most people assume that it is what it says it is; an accurate record of the proceedings of Congress. Yet the modern-day CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is significantly altered before printing; distorted in its content and quite often inaccurate.

The alterations and distortions grow out of a privilege granted to Members of Congress to revise and extend their remarks. The privilege may have made sense at one point in our legislative history for it does provide an opportunity to make grammatical changes or add pertinent material not actually spoken because of time constraints on debate.

Whatever the limited purpose, the practice was to have served, revising and extending has become a large loophole which permits Representatives and Senators to substantially alter their own remarks. Therefore, the RECORD which was intended and is thought of as a verbatim account of congressional proceedings has become something altogether different.

It is full of speeches never delivered; speeches made are quite often drastically changed before the RECORD is printed or in some cases deleted entirely. Explanations about the purpose of legislation under consideration are regularly manufactured and inserted into the RECORD after the deliberations have been completed.

And this whole process of alteration and distortion takes place under a cover of secrecy since no one is permit-

ted access to legislative transcripts before the RECORD is printed.

The result is disastrous. The public often is provided deception rather than truth about congressional proceedings. Those institutions of our society which must rely on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to interpret our laws, including our courts and our regulatory agencies, are left relying on a mixture of fact and fiction.

Let us consider a minute how revise and extend was supposed to work. As is the practice here in the House, a practice right now being engaged in, reporters are here taking down what is said.

□ 1940

Within about a half an hour of the speech being made on the floor, the transcripts are made available to the Members of Congress who delivered the remarks. We are supposed to take a look at those transcripts, look for grammatical errors, and other assorted problems and then make nonsubstantive changes, if necessary, on those transcripts. The transcripts then go back to the reporters who submit those transcripts then for printing as corrected in what is the RECORD for the next day.

The problem is that this practice has developed into what James Nathan Miller, writing in the February 1983 Reader's Digest, has called, Congress' License to Lie.

He writes in that article, and I quote:

> According to Congressional rules and custom what a Member actually does to his manuscript is a matter between him and his conscience. Nobody checks up on him. And so revising and extending has often been used as a license to lie.

He continues:

> They just don't wipe out words they wished they hadn't uttered, they also glue in whole speeches they wished they had delivered. And they alter words to reverse positions they wished they had taken. As a result, the RECORD is probably the government's most untrustworthy official publication. Up to 70 percent of what is in it is never spoken on the floor and 10 to 15 percent of what was spoken doesn't get in it.

The newspaper columnist and TV commentator, Jack Anderson, looked at the evidence given him by his staff investigators who took an indepth look at a 2-day period during which they looked at transcripts and then compared them to the document and after reviewing that information, Jack Anderson called the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "A fraud, a travesty, a monumental sham."

The specific abuses range from minor to major, but many, I must say, defy the imagination.

The late Representative from Wisconsin, William Steiger, took a real interest in this issue and a real interest in trying to bring about CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reforms. He discovered, as a part of his investigation, for example, that a day in 1977, when Congress was not even in session, Congress managed to produce a 131-page edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Imagine that, we produced 131 pages of speeches that could not have possibly been delivered on that day on the House floor because the Congress was not even in session.

In 1972, Representative Hale Boggs delivered an address to the House, despite the fact that he had been reported missing 2 days earlier in a small plane disaster in Alaska and in that accident disappeared forever. And yet 2 days after that, he had delivered a speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, duly printed.

Such abuses and others like them convinced Congress that some controls were needed in the late seventies. In 1978, a Steiger resolution was passed which required bullets to be placed before and after any speech in the RECORD that was not actually delivered on the House floor. Clearly that reform, though well intentioned, has not worked.

We are supposed to produce a "substantially verbatim report of House proceedings." That has been required by House rules since 1895.

By virtually all accounts, that mandate has been severely weakened and even abused to the point where one Member of Congress has labeled it "meaningless."

The consequences of that erosion are crucial to the integrity not only of the institution as a whole, but to the rights and responsibilities that Members of Congress have to insure that their constituents' views are accurately represented.

Just a few examples will more adequately illustrate how far we have allowed the standard to slip. We had an incident during the summer of 1983 in which one Member of the House held his floor statement, which included some of my remarks, as well as those of a number of other Members, beyond the deadline for submission in the evening.

As a result, my comments and the comments of others were completely omitted from that day's proceedings, despite the fact that we had indeed taken part in a lengthy and somewhat heated debate. The RECORD for that day therefore ends up being a distorted RECORD.

In December 1981, the House passed what seemed to be a relatively noncontroversial bill dealing with black lung sufferers. The bill's benefits for coal miners were adequately explained. Unexplained and unspoken though was an amendment that had been added during the Senate consideration which greatly liberalized allowable living expense deductions for Members of Congress, which had the effect of providing a substantial pay increase, if you want to look at it in that way.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day includes two paragraphs beginning with the words, "In the first continuing resolution," and ending with, "Members may deduct without substantiation for away-from-home business expenses."

But those words were never spoken, nor were there any bullets indicating that it is a statement that was not even given on the House floor.

Indicative of the magnitude of the problem is the passage of the $98 billion tax increase bill in August 1982. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day seven pages of comments were made, roughly 10,000 words in a 10-minute period. In reality, the vast majority of those words were never spoken on the floor of the House, nor could they have been humanly spoken in the short period of time that was allocated. Neither were they even inserted into the RECORD before the actual vote was recorded. And again, none of the remarks were even identified by bullets to indicate that they were not spoken on the House floor.

In another case, a recent case, the debate over school prayer produced a statement on the House floor by a Member who got up and said first:

> There is no procedure within the House whereby we can bring up a school prayer amendment through some method which has anything to do with these 1-minute speeches. That is not within the procedures of the House.

That is what he said. That is what he said when you go back and take a look at the actual video tapes of the House that day.

Well, he was called on that. Some of us got up and in 1-minute speeches which followed that said that indeed there was a procedure by which it could be done. A procedure that the Chair was not particularly in favor of, but nevertheless it was a procedure that certainly could be used.

When the RECORD came out, he had changed his original speech to say first, "There is no accepted procedure within the House." He qualified his remarks.

Later on he said, "It is not within the understood procedures of the House," further qualifying his remarks, thereby making the remarks that were made later on look ridiculous in contrast, even though those remarks were not changed. A change of the RECORD, a distortion of the RECORD, purposely, knowingly done and something which I think reflects adversely on the body.

In another instance, during the ERA discussion last year, during the 1-minute speeches which preceded that discussion, one Member of Congress got up and made the statement that

the Constitution begins with the words, "All men are created equal," and then went on and made a whole speech about how the Constitution ought to be made sex neutral with the amendment that we were about to take up.

Well, a few moments later I got up and suggested that that was a totally wrong characterization, that the Constitution did not begin with the words, "All men are created equal," that those words are found in the Declaration of Independence.

Sure enough. When the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD came out the next day, the Member who had made the speech originally changed her words so that it said, "In the Declaration of Independence it says that . ." and changed her speech accordingly, thereby rendering my speech in rebuttal, which was not changed at all, somewhat inaccurate in its appearance, even though it was the accurate presentation of what went on on the floor for that day.

Well, I guess the key question about all of this is whether or not what we do substantially differs from the preparation of other public documents or the practices of other parliamentary bodies.

□ 1950

Let us think, first of all, about our court system. Now, there is a place where they deal with matters of life and death, where what goes on in the court is very, very important.

I cannot imagine that we would put up in our court system with witnesses going back and changing what they said, with attorneys, who asked questions, going back and changing their questions with the judge's statements in the course of the trial being subject to his revision.

That would not take place. It does not take place. It would be regarded as absolutely absurd in a court situation. And yet that is precisely the kind of thing that we allow in the House of Representatives.

The Canadian and British Parliaments both require that all words spoken in their sessions be recorded verbatim in their records. If it works there, the question is: Why could it not work here?

Well, of course, the answer to that question is: It could work here. That is the way that we could proceed if we cared to do it, if we decided that we were going to actually have an accurate record.

We are different, in part, because of a rather interesting history of the publishing of the proceedings of Congress. All the Constitution says about having a record of Congress is in article I, section 5, of clause 3, in which the Constitution says:

"Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy. . . ."

Under that provision of the Constitution, the Congress has kept a fairly general Journal of its proceedings.

Now, that is not the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Journal and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are two different things, because the Journal is only an abbreviated kind of version of what goes on around here and it only reflects the substance of congressional activities without actually talking about the speeches and all of the things that actually went on.

Each day, at the beginning of the day, we approve that Journal, we have the Speaker's approval of the Journal. That is not approving the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as such. That is simply approving that constitutionally mandated keeping of a journal.

For some time, in the early days of Congress, there was no official effort by Congress to keep a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as such. There were some people out who observed the workings of Congress, who wanted to have some kind of a written record of what was actually spoken, and so partisan newspapers, private services, grew up that came in and, through one way or another, managed to transcribe some of what went on in the Halls of Congress.

Now, because those publications did not always get it too accurate, they did permit the Members to come and take a look at what it was that had been taken down, and they gave them the privilege of what we now call revising and extending, of changing the remarks to more accurately reflect what was actually said. And it must be said that most Members of Congress during that time, during those early days, took that privilege quite seriously and exercised it quite a good deal.

However, as Congress became more and more involved in national affairs and as the ability to take notes improved, the process became quite cumbersome, and long delays in the coverage of what was said in Congress were not unusual. And so finally Congress was moved to act in a way that would have us do our own system of reporting. On March 4, 1873, the Government Printing Office began publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In a paper prepared by the Mountain States Legal Foundation for submission in a Federal court action, the following statement gives us a little bit of perspective of what happened after that:

> Yet it was not until January 12, 1895, that Congress passed any legislation as to the form the Congressional Record was to take. This statute, codified as 44 U.S.C. 901 (1980), has remained unchanged and states: "The Joint Committee on Printing shall control the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings, shall take all needed action for reduction of unnecessary bulk."

Continuing the quotation from the Mountain States Legal Foundation:

> The language "substantially a verbatim report" and "reduction of unnecessary bulk" does suggest that additions and deletions were contemplated by the statute's draftsman, but certainly not wholesale distortions.

Let us think a little bit about what happens when you have wholesale distortions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

What are the implications of that to the country?

Well, first of all there are some very major legal implications. Many court decisions and regulatory decisions affecting the lives of millions often hinge on the legislative history of a bill or amendment, and that legislative history is determined by debate on the bill during the consideration here on the floor of the House. To have members' statements willfully and intentionally distorted strikes at the very heart of that process and goes right to the core of our responsibilities as Members of Congress to accurately represent our constituents' opinions.

How can we, if our speeches are altered and our original intentions are open to distortions, say that we have an accurate record in this Congress?

It goes, second, to the integrity of this institution. That integrity has been severely weakened, as it is, over the past several years, and it certainly is not improved when people know that what is printed in the RECORD is not exactly what is spoken on the floor of the House. Who can trust an institution that permits its official record to be a lie and an undermining of the truth?

There is another consideration here and one that we have got to think a little bit about, and that is the fact that we do now have televised proceedings of the House. We now have a dual record, therefore, of House proceedings, one in video and the other printed. The printed record, as I have been describing, is often contrary to the actual proceedings of Congress. Consequently, the video record is the only true, accurate representation of what takes place on the floor of Congress, and it makes for some interesting problems when you compare the video record and the printed record and find the two to be substantially different. That leads to all kinds of questions about what it is Congress really does.

But the video record, the truth, is interestingly destroyed after a few months, leaving the distorted printed record to stand as the official record in terms of posterity.

In my opinion, that can no longer be allowed to occur. We must begin the process of implementing verbatim transcripts of House proceedings so that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD matches reality. Whereas 100 years ago technology precluded that option,

today technology and the truth demand that that option be exercised.

The standard for the future should be that voiced by Representative Jefferson Davis on February 18, 1851, and I quote:

I am willing that my own remarks should stand and be published as they are taken by reporters. I am willing that they should go out in the careless and poor language in which they were delivered in order that there may be a fairness in the record, fairness in the representation as it goes out to the country.

What we are talking about is truth. The U.S. House of Representatives hardly can expect to be trusted if it has little regard for the truth and its records have little acquaintance with the truth.

The truth, it has been said, shall make us free. The assumption, therefore, must be that truth is also required to keep us free. That is why the record of how our laws are made, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, should be the truth and nothing but the truth. Anything else brings daily disgrace to our legislative process.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LOTT, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. SILJANDER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SILJANDER, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, for 60 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. MCEWEN, for 60 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BURTON of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LANTOS, for 60 minutes, on May 8.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. THOMAS of California, prior to the vote on H.R. 4968 on the Private Calendar today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. MCGRATH.

Mr. BADHAM.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. RUDD in two instances.

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

Mr. HARTNETT.

Mr. BROYHILL in two instances.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. WORTLEY.

Mrs. JOHNSON.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BURTON of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. WISE.

Ms. OAKAR.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mrs. LLOYD in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. OBEY.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. RODINO in two instances

Mr. SYNAR.

Mr. YATES.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. WIRTH in two instances.

Mr. LEVINE of California in two instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. DWYER.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. FAUNTROY.

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. FLORIO in two instances.

Mr. MARTINEZ in two instances.

Mr. CARR.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. AUCOIN.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. SOLARZ.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3376. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington; and

H.R. 3555. An act to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2597. An act to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughter of Harry S. Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1984, at 3 p.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4784. A bill to reform the remedies available to U.S. producers regarding unfair import competition, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLAND: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 5164. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to regulate public disclosure of information held by the Central Intelligence Agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-726, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 493. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3457, a bill to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land from wind and water erosion, to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands from cultivation (Rept. No. 98-727). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 494. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5167, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-728). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 5549. A bill to establish the Marine Resources Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H.R. 5550. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit biannual reports to the Congress on the various interstate pipelines' sales and transportation tariffs, including filings for adjustments for purchased gas costs, and to amend the Natural Gas Act to require hearings on tariffs which provide for rate increases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EDGAR:

H.R. 5551. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to waive certain restrictions on the provision of health care to veterans in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and to extend the authority for Veterans' Administration geriatric research, education, and clinical activities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANCE (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 5552. A bill to suspend the duty on certain surface active agents until the close of June 30, 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5553. A bill to suspend the duty on certain benzoid chemicals until the close of June 30, 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5554. A bill to suspend the duty on certain nitrogenous chemical compounds until the close of June 30, 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LELAND:

H.R. 5555. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise the pay structure for Federal employees whose duties primarily relate to firefighting; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 5556. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway demonstration project in the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 5557. A bill to revise and extend the National Health Service Corps program under the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. STARK:

H.R. 5558. A bill to amend the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act to provide that a country may not be designated as a beneficiary country under such act unless it enters into an agreement with the United States providing for the exchange of tax information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 5559. A bill to amend titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend the programs of assistance for the training of health professions personnel, to revise and extend the National Health Service Corps program under that act, and to revise and extend the programs of assistance under that act for health maintenance organizations and migrant and community health centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 5560. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of assistance for preventive health programs and the programs of assistance under titles X and XX of that act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WON PAT (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. SUNIA):

H.R. 5561. A bill to enhance the economic development of Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 5562. A bill for the relief of Angela Cincotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5563. A bill for the relief of O'Ferrall Pauly, publisher of the Mid-Coast Advertiser of Wharton, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 242: Mr. REID.

H.R. 287: Mr. WHITTAKER and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 965: Mr. WON PAT, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 2029: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 2474: Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2514: Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 2766: Mr. MONTGOMERY and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2837: Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 2977: Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.

H.R. 3013: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3105: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 3175: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 3254: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3658: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 3829: Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.

H.R. 3876: Mr. LENT, Mr. MCKERNAN, and Mr. IRELAND.

H.R. 4037: Mr. WISE and Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 4193: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 4305: Mr. DENNY SMITH and Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

H.R. 4373: Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 4548: Mr. RINALDO and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 4549: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4565: Mr. HIGHTOWER.

H.R. 4571: Mr. MCCAIN.

H.R. 4772: Mr. CARPER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 4775: Mr. MOODY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4843: Mr. EDGAR and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 4966: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 5023: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BRITT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SABO, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 5038: Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 5043: Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MINISH, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 5153: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 5223: Mr. OLIN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 5232: Mr. VENTO, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ECKART, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 5239: Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 5261: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mrs. BROYHILL, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 5370: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BATES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. KOGOVSEK, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 5381: Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 5389: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 5447: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 5452: Mr. BEDELL and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 5457: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REID, Mr. HAWKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 5486: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 5503: Mrs. BOGGS and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 5511: Mr. BARNES.

H.R. 5525: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WORTLEY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. KOGOVSEK, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.J. Res. 247: Mr. OLIN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. PETRI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 309: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 358: Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.J. Res. 389: Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.J. Res. 428: Mr. PATMAN, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.J. Res. 451: Mr. SPRATT.

H.J. Res. 452: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. CARPER.

H.J. Res. 455: Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PURSELL, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. BADHAM, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. COURTER.

H.J. Res. 456: Mr. COELHO and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.J. Res. 463: Mr. WILSON, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. BYRON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STARK, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.J. Res. 484: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. COELHO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CHAPPIE, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.J. Res. 497: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.J. Res. 501: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 508: Mrs. BYRON, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. ZSCHAU.

H.J. Res. 514: Mr. COOPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. GORE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.J. Res. 523: Mr. GREEN, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. YATES, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BONKER, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.J. Res. 524: Mr. GREEN, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. YATES, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BONKER, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.J. Res. 525: Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.J. Res. 526: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SABO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LELAND, Mr. WINN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. RODINO, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. YATRON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. HARTNETT, and Mr. WHITTEN.

H.J. Res, 535: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DAUB, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HUGHES, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.J. Res. 543: Mr. WORTLEY.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. SHAW.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. CONTE, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. MINETA.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. GREEN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. GREEN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H. Res. 287: Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H. Res. 450: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. FUQUA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H. Res. 459: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MINISH, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. OLIN.

H. Res. 468: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H. Res. 477: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. CRAIG.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3400: Mr. WEAVER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4275

By Mr. BATES:

—On page 18, immediately before line 1, insert the following new subparagraph:

(D) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs B and C, contracts for capacity and associated energy generated at Hoover Dam as a result of the uprating program shall be offered to public and private power entities not presently served by the Boulder Canyon Project Act as specified in this subparagraph. In allocating the uprated power, preference shall first be given to those entities in the Reclamation States serving large residential loads without regard to whether these entities own their own transmission and distribution facilities. Preference shall also be given to entities serving those areas where the retail electric rate for residential use is higher than the average for the state in which the entity or, its major service area is located. As a condition for receiving the uprated power, the entity shall be required to certify that the power received will be resold, or distributed as the case may be at cost plus distribution costs.

By Mrs. BOXER:

—On page 15, strike out line 19 and all that follows thereafter through page 24, line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 205. The power generated at Hoover Dam that is made available by this Act shall be auctioned off at market rates, with auctions conducted by the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary of Energy is authorized to grant to the highest responsible bidder or bidders by competitive bidding, under regulations promulgated in advance, contracts for such power. Such systems of bid, variables, terms, and conditions which the Secretary determines to be useful to accomplish the purposes and policies of this Act shall be submitted to Congress and published in the Federal Register. Within six months after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall report to the Congress with respect to the recovery from the various bids. The Secretary of Energy shall consider whether to auction winter and summer peaking capacity separately, and firm and non-firm energy separately and develop rules and regulations accordingly.

By Mr. EDGAR:

—Page 27, (Union Calendar No. 368), after line 11, add the following:

TITLE III

SEC. 301. (a) Each long-term firm power service contract entered into or amended subsequent to one year from the date of enactment of this Act by the Secretary of Energy acting by and through the Western Area Power Administration (hereinafter "Western"), shall contain an article requiring the development and implementation by the purchaser thereunder of an energy conservation program. A long-term firm power service contract is any contract for the sale by Western of firm capacity, with or without energy, which is to be delivered over a period of more than one year. The term "purchaser" includes parent-type entities and their distribution or user members. If more than one such contract exists with a purchaser, only one program will be required for that purchaser. Each such contract article shall:

(1) contain time schedules for meeting program goals and delineate actions to be taken in the event such schedules are not met, which may include a reduction of the allocation of capacity or energy to such purchaser as would otherwise be provided under such contract; and

(2) provide for review and modification of the energy conservation program at not to exceed five year intervals.

(b) For purposes of this Title, an energy conservation program shall:

(1) apply to all uses of energy and capacity which are provided from any federal project;

(2) contain definite goals;

(3) encourage customer consumption efficiency improvements and demand management practices which ensure that the available supply of hydroelectric power is used in an economically efficient and environmentally sound manner.

SEC. 302. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, Western shall amend its existing regulations (46 Fed. Reg. 56140) to reflect—

(1) the elements to be considered in the energy conservation programs required by this Title, and

(2) Western's criteria for evaluating and approving such programs.

Such amended regulations shall be promulgated only after public notice and opportunity to comment in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 551-706).

(b) The following elements shall be considered by Western in evaluating energy conservation programs:

(1) energy consumption efficiency improvements;

(2) use of renewable energy resources in addition to hydroelectric power;

(3) load management techniques;

(4) cogeneration;

(5) rate design improvements, including:
(i) cost of service pricing;
(ii) elimination of declining block rates;
(iii) time of day rates;
(iv) seasonal rates; and
(v) interruptible rates; and
(6) production efficiency improvements.

(c) Where a purchaser is implementing one or more of the foregoing elements under a program responding to federal, state or other initiatives that apply to conservation and renewable energy development, in evaluating that purchaser's energy conservation program submitted pursuant to this Title Western shall make due allowance for the incorporation of such elements within the energy conservation program required by this Title.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MILITARY APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, during the week beginning May 5, the people of Harford County, Md., will celebrate Military Appreciation Week. This event is sponsored by the Harford County Chamber of Commerce and is designed to celebrate the cooperative relationship the county shares with the U.S. Army at Aberdeen Proving Grounds. The week's events will be highlighted by special exhibitions, commerations and civic activities.

The Aberdeen Proving Ground, located on 80,000 acres of land on the banks of the Susquehanna and Gunpowder Rivers and the Chesapeake Bay, is famous for the contributions it has made to our Nation's defense. It has also had a significant and beneficial impact on Maryland's economy.

The Aberdeen Proving Ground was established in 1917 by a Presidential proclamation that called for acquisition of the land as a weapons testing facility. The first official testing came 2 years later and since then APG has become one of the most diversified military installations in the country. Today, in addition to developing and testing advanced weaponry like the new Abrams M1 main battle tank, it is involved in a number of projects ranging from ballistics development to biomedical research on the safety and health of soldiers. Current testing programs include the testing of tank maintenance, antitank vehicles and the new Divad gun.

Aberdeen Proving Ground plays a key role in the economic life of northeastern Maryland, and is of particular importance to Harford County. It is the major employer in Harford and its neighboring counties with over 8,000 civilian employees and almost 6,000 military personnel.

For the 7th year the growing Harford County Chamber of Commerce continues to recognize the APG's importance to the county during Military Appreciation Week. The week begins with a dinner on May 5 and concludes the following Saturday when an open house and field demonstration will be observed by thousands.

The cooperation that exists among APG, the county chamber, county businesses, and local persons is unique in our country. Military Appreciation Week provides an excellent showcase for this special relationship.●

CHURCH AUDIT PROCEDURES ACT

HON. MICKEY EDWARDS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 2977, the Church Audit Procedures Act, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that a compromise version of this important legislation has been drafted after months of consultation with religious leaders and officials of the Treasury Department. This compromise preserves the integrity of the original bill, by providing needed protection for churches from unnecessary IRS investigations and audits and at the same time, addresses concerns expressed by the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department regarding administrative applications of the act.

The compromise language was attached by unanimous vote in the Senate Finance Committee to the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 and was subsequently adopted by the full Senate.

The battle to provide churches with adequate protection from the excesses of Government has brought together an impressive coalition of Members of Congress and organizations representing all parts of the political spectrum. I am delighted that we have been able to achieve this important agreement, but regret that the House Ways and Means Committee was not able to address this issue prior to passage of H.R. 4170, the Tax Reform Act. It is my hope that the House-Senate conferees which will meet to reconcile differences between the House and Senate measures will agree to retain the church audit procedures language adopted by the Senate.

So that my House colleagues may be fully informed about the contents of the revised version of the Church Audit Procedures Act, I have inserted below the Senate Finance Committee's report language describing those provisions. I endorse this report language and commend the work of the Senate sponsor, Senator GRASSLEY, the Finance Committee and the Joint Committee on Taxation for their superb work.

Within this otherwise fine report, however, there is one element which lacks sufficient clarity. This was unintentional, but nonetheless requires clarification.

Regarding the scope of the provision, I would like to emphasize that the church audit procedures in this act will become effective at any point at which the tax status of a church, as opposed to that of any individual, becomes the issue in any IRS investigation.

Thus, the IRS would be prohibited from investigating or revoking the tax exempt status of a church or assessing taxes against a church, without following these church audit procedures.

This jurisdictional question may arise in connection with investigations of individuals who may contribute to a church.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the over 170 House cosponsors of the Church Audit Procedures Act will enthusiastically support the compromise we have achieved and will join me in encouraging the House conferees to agree to retain the language as added in the Senate.

DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 1984

[Explanation of provisions approved by the committee on Mar. 21, 1984]

[Church audits (sec. 872 of the bill and Secs. 6501, 7428 and 7605(c) of the Code)]

REASONS FOR CHANGE

The committee's actions concerning church audits were motivated by two competing considerations. First, the committee is aware of the special problems that arise when the Internal Revenue Service (or any governmental agency) examines the records of a church, including problems of separation of church and state and the special relationship of a church to its members. These problems may be compounded by the relative inexperience of churches in dealing with the IRS and the resulting occasional misunderstandings between churches and the IRS. While present law imposes limitations on the examination of church records, these limitations are somewhat vague and rely heavily on internal IRS procedures to protect the rights of a church in the audit process. Additionally, there is some uncertainty regarding the scope of the investigations to which the existing law applies and the nature of the records which are protected by the law.

While desiring to protect churches from undue interference, the committee recognizes that an increasing number of taxpayers have, in recent years, utilized the church form primarily as a tax-avoidance device. The committee believes that the IRS must retain an unhindered ability to pursue individuals who use the church form in this manner.

The bill attempts to resolve these competing considerations by providing a detailed

series of rules that the IRS is to follow in investigating churches, both as to their tax-exempt status and as to the existence of unrelated business income. These provisions emphasize the need for a speedy determination of church tax liabilities and, where possible, a determination without unnecessary examination of church books and records. The committee believes that these provisions will protect the rights of legitimate churches without unduly hindering IRS investigations of tax-avoidance schemes posing as religious organizations. Further, the committee believes that the adoption of detailed statutory rules will reduce misunderstandings between churches and the IRS and allow for a more stable and cooperative audit process.

The bill effectively incorporates the present-law examination rules in the new provisions regarding church audits. Thus, there will be no diminution of any rights presently held by a church.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

Overview

The bill allows the IRS to investigate an organization claiming to be a church only if an IRS regional commissioner reasonably believes, on the basis of facts and circumstances recorded in writing, that the organization is engaged in taxable activities or does not qualify for tax-exemption. The bill also provides expanded notice requirements that must be satisfied before the IRS may examine any church records, including a requirement that church officials have an opportunity to meet with IRS representatives before an examination of such records. Examinations of church records are limited to the extent necessary to determine tax liability. The bill also adds special procedural provisions designed to hasten the determination of church tax liabilities, including a requirement that church audits generally be completed within 2 years after commencement of an investigation.

Restrictions on investigation of churches generally

The bill prohibits the IRS from commencing any investigation or proceeding to determine whether a church (including a convention or association of churches) is engaged in taxable activities, or whether an organization qualifies for tax-exemption as a church under section 501(c)(3) of the Code, unless an IRS regional commissioner reasonably believes, on the basis of facts and circumstances recorded in writing, (1) that the church actually is engaged in taxable activities, or (2) that the organization does not qualify for tax-exemption as a church. The committee intends that this standard will provide a basis for judicial review of the IRS action in commencing the investigation which would not exist if a mere belief standard were applied (*Veeders* v. *Commissioner*, 36 F. 2d 343, 345 (7th Cir. 1929)). The committee further intends that the facts and circumstances which form the basis for a reasonable belief must be derived from information lawfully obtained by the IRS. Information obtained from informants used by the IRS for this purpose must not be known to be unreliable.

Before commencing an investigation or proceeding for the purposes described above, the IRS is required to provide written notice to the organization against which the investigation or proceeding is initiated. The notice of commencement of an investigation must include: (1) A list of the Code provisions which authorize the investigation or proceeding, (2) a general explanation of the applicable administrative and Constitutional rights of the organization in connection with the audit (including the right to a pre-examination conference regarding the organization's tax liabilities and the right to request relevant material under the Freedom of Information Act), and (3) an explanation of the concerns which gave rise to the investigation and the general subject matter of the investigation.

The explanation of the church's administrative and Constitutional rights (item (2)) may be of a general nature and need not explain all possible legal and Constitutional aspects of a church audit. However, this statement should include a brief general description of the various stages of the church audit procedures contained in this bill (including the right to a pre-examination conference) and the principle of separation of church and state under the First Amendment.

The explanation of the concerns and general subject matter of the investigation (item (3) above) should be sufficiently specific to allow the church to understand the particular area of church activities or behavior which is being investigated. For example, in an investigation of unrelated business income, the notice should indicate the general activities of the church which may result in unrelated income (e.g. use of a particular property or facility for other than tax-exempt purposes). For an investigation of tax-exempt status, the notice should indicate those general aspects of the church's operations or activities which have given rise to questions regarding its tax-exempt status. The IRS is not to be precluded from expanding its investigation beyond the concerns expressed in the notice as a result of facts and circumstances which subsequently come to its attention (including, where appropriate, an expansion of an unrelated income investigation to include questions of tax-exempt status, or vice-versa).

The notice requirement is not to be interpreted to require the IRS to share particular items of evidence with the church, or to identify its sources of information regarding church activities, where providing such information would be damaging to the investigation or to the sources of IRS information. For example, in an investigation of unrelated business income, the IRS might indicate that its investigation was prompted by a local newspaper advertisement regarding a church-owned business; however, the IRS would not be required to reveal identity of any so-called "informers" within a church (including present or former employees).

The requirement of notice upon commencement of an investigation does not apply to criminal investigations.

Examination of church records and activities—notification of regional counsel

Under the bill, the IRS may examine church records (including books of account and other records) or religious activities to determine tax-exempt status or church tax liability only after the regional commissioner sends a notice of intent to examine church records to the IRS regional counsel. This notice to the regional counsel must be provided at least 15 days after the general commencement of investigation notice (discussed above) is provided to the church. The regional counsel is then allowed 15 days from issuance of the notice to him in which to file an advisory objection to the examination. During this period, the IRS may not begin examination of church records. The committee intends that the regional commissioner will take any objection by the regional counsel into account when determining whether to proceed with the examination of church books and records.

Additional notice and offer of IRS conference

At the same time that the regional counsel is notified of a proposed examination, the regional commissioner is required to send a second notice (in addition to the commencement of investigation notice) to the organization whose records are to be examined. This second notice is required to include (1) a restatement of the information contained in the commencement of investigation notice (discussed above), adjusted for any change in the relevant facts and circumstances during the intervening period, (2) a description of all church records and activities which the IRS seeks to examine, and (3) an offer of an opportunity to request copies of any relevant materials in the possession of the IRS under the Freedom of Information Act. The committee intends that this offer will describe the type of materials available under the Freedom of Information Act in sufficient detail to enable the church to frame a reasonable request for information. Any request for such materials will be subject to the general rules (including rules regarding payment of costs) applicable under the Freedom of Information Act. The types of materials to which an organization is entitled under the Freedom of Information Act is not intended to limit the scope of any IRS investigation (or the scope of church records which may be examined by the IRS).

The regional commissioner is further required, as part of the second notice, to offer the organization an opportunity to meet with an IRS official to discuss the concerns which gave rise to the investigation and the general subject matter of the investigation. The organization will have 15 days after the second notice is sent in which to request such a meeting, during which time the IRS is prohibited from examining church records. This 15-day period runs concurrently with the period during which IRS regional counsel may object to a proposed examination. If an organization requests a meeting, the IRS is required to schedule a meeting and may proceed to examine church records only following the meeting. If an organization makes a properly filed Freedom of Information Act request, the IRS is also prohibited from examining church records until the appeal is granted or a final administrative denial of the appeal is made.

For example, if notice of commencement of an investigation is sent to a church on day 1, notice of a proposed examination may be sent to the church and the IRS regional counsel no earlier than day 15, and no examination of church records may be made prior to day 30. If an organization does not request a meeting or make a Freedom of Information Act request by day 30, the IRS may proceed to examine church records.

The purpose of a meeting between the church and the IRS is to discuss the relevant issues that may arise as part of the investigation, in an effort to resolve the issues of tax-exemption or liability without the necessity of an examination of church books and records. The committee therefore intends that the church and the IRS will make a reasonable effort to resolve outstanding issues at the meeting. To avoid misunderstandings, the committee intends that the IRS will remind the church at the meeting, in general terms, of its rights

under the audit process as described above (including the right to make an appropriate request under the Freedom of Information Act). However, the IRS will not be required to reveal information at the meeting of a type properly excludable from a written notice (including information regarding the identity of third-party witnesses or evidence provided by such witnesses).

Definition of church records

Church records include all regularly kept church corporate and financial records, including (but not limited to) corporate minute books, contributor or membership lists, and any materials which qualify as church books of account under present law. The committee further intends that church records will include private correspondence between a church and its members that is in the possession of the church. Church records protected by the bill do not include records previously filed with a public official or, as under present law, newspapers or newsletters distributed generally to the church members.

Records held by third parties (e.g., canceled checks or other records in the possession of a bank) are not considered church records for purposes of the bill. Thus, subject to the general provisions regarding third party summonses, the IRS is permitted access to such records without regard to the requirements of the bill (sec. 7609). As under present law, either the IRS or a third party recordkeeper generally is required, however, to inform a church of any IRS requests for materials.

The bill provides that the IRS may not proceed to revoke a church's tax-exemption or assess any tax for unrelated business income unless the Service follows the church audit procedures as described under the bill. Thus, the IRS may not revoke an exemption or assess tax against a church solely on the basis of third party records, without complying with these procedures. The committee further intends that the IRS will be prohibited from using information obtained from third party bank records in an attempt to avoid the purposes of the bill by harassing individual members of a church. (See, e.g., *Powell* v. *Commissioner*, 379 U.S. 48 (1964).)

The notice requirements before examining church records do not apply to criminal investigations.

Scope of examination

The bill provides that church records may be examined only to the extent necessary to determine tax.

The bill retains the present-law rule that the religious activities of any organization claiming to be a church (including a convention or association of churches) may be examined only to the extent necessary to determine whether the organization actually is a church.

Requirement of IRS determination within two years

Under the bill, if any investigation or proceeding is commenced against a church, the IRS will be required to make a determination within two years after notifying the church of the commencement of the investigation. Running of this two-year period is suspended for (1) any period during which any judicial proceeding initiated by the church or its agents challenging the IRS investigation, examination, or proceeding is pending, (2) any period in which the IRS is unable to make a determination because of the refusal of the church or its agents to comply with reasonable and lawful requests for information or materials necessary for the conduct of the investigation, or (3) any period during which any stay of a suit involving access to third-party records is in effect (sec. 7609). Additionally, running of the two-year period is suspended for any period during which the IRS is responding to a properly filed request from the church under the Freedom of Information Act. Running of the two-year period will resume at any point at which the IRS exceeds the statutory time limit for responding to a request (or the appeal of a denial of a request) under the Freedom of Information Act or when any of the suspension periods discussed above expire.

The bill allows the two-year determination period to be extended by mutual agreement of the church and the IRS.

Statute of limitations

The bill requires the IRS to assess any tax against a church (including a convention or association of churches) within three years after the relevant tax return is due. The IRS also is prohibited from bringing a court proceeding for collection without assessment more than three years after the tax was due. These limitations apply regardless of whether the church actually filed a return for the taxable year in question. No limitation applies in cases of fraud or willful tax evasion or in cases of knowing failure to file a return which should have been filed.

Under the bill, running of the three-year limitation period is suspended during any time period when the special two-year limit on IRS determinations of church tax liability is suspended under the rules described above (i.e., the two-year period beginning on commencement of the IRS investigation). This is in addition to the general statutory criteria for suspending the running of the period of limitations for assessment or collection of tax.

The three-year limitation period may be extended by mutual agreement between the church and the IRS.

Declaratory judgments

Under the bill, once the IRS issues a revenue agent's final report ("30-day letter") to a church which proposes to revoke the organization's tax-exempt status as a church, the organization will be deemed to have exhausted its administrative remedies for purposes of the declaratory judgment provision of the Code (sec. 7428). The organization thus will be entitled to bring a declaratory judgment action to preserve its tax-exempt status without awaiting further IRS action.

The bill does not affect the present law rule which generally prohibits injunctions against assessment or collection of tax (sec. 7421).

Further requirements

The bill requires the IRS regional counsel to approve in writing the issuance to a church of any statutory notice of deficiency or adverse determination letter.

To prevent unwarranted repeated audits, the IRS regional commissioner is required to obtain written approval from the Assistant Commissioner (Employee Plans/Exempt Organizations) for any second audit of a church arising from the same activities as were examined previously where a first audit of that church resulted in neither (1) revocation of tax-exemption or a change in tax liability of a church for one or more years, nor (2) a request by the IRS for any significant changes in church operational practices (including the church's method of keeping records).

The bill specifies that failure by the IRS to follow proper audit procedures as provided by the bill (including a failure to make a determination within two years) may be raised as a defense (but not an absolute defense) in a proceeding to gain access to church records. Once this defense is raised in such a proceeding, the IRS has the burden of establishing that correct procedures have been followed. As under present law, the IRS will be permitted to correct any violations of proper administrative procedures before continuing an investigation.

Scope of legislation

The committee intends that the church audit procedures provided by this bill will apply when an investigation relates directly to the tax status or liability of a church itself, as opposed to that of any individual. The church audit procedures are not intended to apply to investigations of any individual who has made a gift or other contribution to a church, or to investigations of any tax-exempt organization other than an organization claiming to be a church. This is true although issues regarding a church's tax status may arise in such proceedings as part of a determination of another individual's or organization's tax liability. The procedures also are not intened to apply to routine IRS inquiries to a church, including inquiries with respect to income tax withholding for church employees, social security taxes, and similar matters. However, repeated failure by a church or its agents to respond to IRS inquiries (including inquiries relating to investigations of other taxpayers or routine inquiries described above) may provide a reasonable basis for commencement of an investigation of the church under the applicable church audit procedures.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This provision is effective for investigations, examinations, and other proceedings commencing after the date of enactment of the bill.

REVENUE EFFECT

This provision has a negligible effect upon revenues.●

WASTE IN GOVERNMENT

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, it has been said, "the people demand big government."

The Grace Commission does not challenge this but I do not think anyone would suggest the people demand and approve of waste in Government. Yet the Grace Commission found much unnecessary waste. I would like to outline some of these examples recently published in a national magazine:

The Minority Business Development Agency did not notice when a management consulting firm used part of its $4 million MBDA grant to rent a townhouse and two cars for its executives, buy unauthorized gifts for its employees, and promote "questionable activities." The firm also neglected to pay some $315,000 in Federal and State taxes, consulting fees, and salaries.

The Government Printing Office sends millions of pamphlets and uses duplicate, incorrect, out-of-date mailing lists. The Grace Commission says this lack of bringing the mail lists up to date costs us, the taxpayers, an estimated $96 million a year.

The Federal Government uses 17,000 computers, operated by 250,000 employees, but they are mostly obsolete. On average they are twice as old as computers in private business.

The Social Security Administration's computers stay 4 to 6 weeks behind in issuing new social security cards and the agency has a 3-year backlog on posting retirement contributions. It is unable to process the 7.5 million new claims each year on time or correctly.

Some 20 percent of all tax returns for 1978—that is right, 1978—have yet to be entered into the IRS computer system, a 20-year-old dinosaur that predates most modern computer technology. Delinquent accounts are therefore at $23.2 billion and growing.

The Urban Mass Transit Administration has been unable to close its accounting books since 1979. This agency gives out $425 billion in grants. The Grace Commission report substantiates the claim that some $20 billion can be saved over a 3-year period by straightening out the computer mess.

The Commission recommends naming a manager to oversee computer operations throughout the Government: Hiring competent professionals; upgrading the obsolete systems; and using common payroll, personnel, property-management, and other such systems throughout the Government.

In 1982 the Justice Department seized $317 million in the form of cash and property, such as dope-smuggling planes. But the captured cash, $79 million of the total, was not put into interest-bearing bank accounts. Instead, the Justice Department just let it sit. Noncash assets were allowed to depreciate to as little as 65 percent of their value before they were sold off.

At the Transportation Department, some $473 million in recent grants was paid to contractors an average of 13 days sooner than necessary, costing the Government $13 million in interest payments.

The Grace Commission says:

If payments were made only when due, and bills collected promptly, the Department could save $144 million per year.

The Grace Commission says the Government could save up to $79 billion if it ran its asset management programs as business does. The Commission reports that:

One Government study determined that word processing operators were not as skilled as regular secretaries, so it cut word processing pay by $3,000 a year. The predictable result was that word processing operators disappeared from the Federal word processing pools, only to turn up as secretaries. Some word processing centers went idle for lack of operators. Productivity fell.

The VA has a hospital construction staff of 800, while the Hospital Corp. of America does the same work with a staff of 50. As a result of overstaffing, it takes the VA 7 years to finish a project, versus 2 years at the HCA. Administrative costs are 8 percent, versus 2 percent in the private sector.

Anyone who pays a Federal income tax has and should have an interest in how our Government operates. And all taxpayers should be outraged at the waste and mismanagement in Government. Here is one more example:

When the Agency for International Development bought 399 cars and trucks for projects in the Middle East, and audit found that five were missing; 93 had been diverted to personal or nonproject use; 84 had been sitting idle in parking lots, some for 2 years, and many of the remaining vehicles had been commandeered by host government officials for their private use.

The American public has long known that Government is wasteful. The Grace Commission documents and validates that fact.

Unless the people make it plain to their Representatives in Congress that they want the recommendations of the Grace Commission implemented, they will be dumped into the dust bin along with the reports of the Hoover Commission.●

HONG KONG: HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months I have become increasingly concerned over the fate of the free people of Hong Kong. In the ongoing negotiations between the Governments of Great Britain and the People's Republic of China, the people of Hong Kong have had virtually no representation. The latest word from Her Majesty's government, in a statement by the Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, is that when the British lease on the new territories expires in 1997, Great Britain will relinquish all claims to the colony and it will become a part of the People's Republic of China.

The issue of these negotiations has been set forward very clearly by Robert Cottrell. In an article for the Financial Times he gave strong arguments for concern over the freedoms which the People's Republic of China claims it will preserve for the already free people of Hong Kong. He wrote of the agreement:

It is not likely to mention in passing that such freedoms are already promised to China's people under China's existing constitution, but go unobserved in what remains a totalitarian State.

I insert the full text of Mr. Cottrell's article in the RECORD.

[From the Financial Times, Apr. 25, 1984]

HONG KONG'S FUTURE—HOW CHINA GOT ITS WAY

(By Robert Cottrell)

The veil of secrecy covering Hong Kong's future was lifted just enough last week for Sir Geoffery Howe, the Foreign Secretary, to tell the territory that its days of British administration are numbered. In 1997, when Britain's lease over most of Hong Kong expires, British authority will cease, and the colony will become once more a part of China.

"The Chinese government," Sir Geoffery said, "have made it clear publicly that they recognise the special circumstances of Hong Kong, and that they want its social and economic systems and lifestyle—in many ways so different from those of mainland China—to remain unchanged. We share with the Chinese Government the strongest possible common interest in these objectives."

Amid the confidence and enthusiasm marking this final leg of Sino-British negotiations, it would be easy to assume that this is exactly what Britain has been negotiating for ever since Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister, went to Peking and raised the Hong Kong question in September 1982.

The fact is, however, that the settlement now in the process of being reached contains precisely those elements which produced such fear and volatility in Hong Kong only a few months ago—withdrawal of British administration, and the subjection of the territory to Chinese sovereignty with only a paper agreement to separate the territory's liberal capitalism from China's socialism. What has changed?

To start with, the Hong Kong issue has been an extraordinary public relations triumph for China. Its tactics have been an unsophisticated stratagem of carrot-and-stick, but far in advance of Britain's silent shuffling.

While Britain was observing the confidentiality which it was agreed should surround the Sino-British negotiations China was announcing regularly through quasi-official channels the state of the talks, the good fortune which would be Hong Kong's under Chinese sovereignty, and the perils of supporting a continued British administration.

China had the immense negotiating advantage of a simple declared objective—reunification of the motherland, described as a "sacred duty" in the preamble to the Chinese constitution.

Britain, by contrast, has been negotiating on behalf of a territory which it manages at arms' length, in which it has no direct economic interest, and which has itself no substantial democratic means of expressing an opinion of its own.

With the coming into force of the British Nationality Act, Britain publicly underlined the limits of its commitment to the people of Hong Kong while in the middle of negotiating their future. This, together, with rows over overseas students' fees, and the negotiation of world textile quotas, in which the interests of Britain and Hong Kong were opposed, did nothing to win popular sympathy for Britain in the territory.

Until Mrs. Thatcher's visit 18 months ago to Peking, Chinese leaders had set out two objectives; resumption of sovereignty and maintenance of Hong Kong's prosperity.

It seems unlikely that China would have been willing to negotiate some indefinite form of continued British linkage but Mrs. Thatcher's public defence of the legality of Britain's claim to sovereignty over Hong

Kong effectively foreclosed that option. From that point onward, China's two main objectives seemed to become: resumption of sovereignty, and the ousting of British administration.

China appears to have conceded nothing of significance at the negotiating table. In July 1983, when regular rounds of formal diplomatic talks began, Chinese leaders issued a "10-point plan" for Hong Kong to a delegation from the Hong Kong Federation of Students (HKFS) on a visit to Peking. The HKFS document is regarded as containing the basics of the settlement which Britain is likely—a year or so later—to initial.

At first, Britain argued that a continued British-linked administration would be the best guarantee of maintaining Hong Kong's "stability and prosperity."

Even then, Britain probably saw its role in Hong Kong being very gradually phased out. But it wanted this to be done over the long term, without a deadline only 14 years away.

China's public anger at Britain's proposals strained the confidence of Hong Kong's businessmen and investors, culminating in the collapse of the Hong Kong dollar in September 1983, which in turn helped bring down a local bank. Both the dollar and the bank were eventually rescued, but China's evident willingness to jeopardise Hong Kong's social and economic stability persuaded Britain to drop its own plans for continued British administration.

The game was effectively over. China had prevailed.

Britain appears to have nursed some hopes early on that China's promises of autonomy to Hong Kong could be in some way "guaranteed," though quite how is not clear. To judge by Sir Geoffrey's comments on Friday, Britain is now looking for "assurances" rather than "guarantees"—those assurances would amount simply to the publication of China's promises in the form of a detailed agreement between the two countries.

China would prefer a shorter, more general, more abstract document. It regards the "basic law" of post-1997 Hong Kong as something to be drawn up by China in consultation with the people of the territory, not as something to be negotiated by Britain in exchange for a cession of sovereignty.

It is therefore far from certain, that Britain will get as detailed an agreement as it might like on Hong Kong's future. But if this situation seems more "acceptable" to Hong Kong than it did two years ago, it is probably for several related reasons:

China convinced Hong Kong relatively early in the negotiations that a cessation of British sovereignty and administration was inevitable.

China greeted any British opposition to its plans with outbursts of public anger calculated to frighten Hong Kong and destabilise its financial markets.

Hong Kong people are so tired of uncertainty that the prospect of a settlement is welcome if only as something to plan towards.

At least China will not touch Hong Kong until 1997, leaving 13 more years of the status quo.

To some Britain has seemed weak and aloof while China's strength has been clear for all to see.

Britain has no real negotiating cards left to play now—not even withholding its approval of an agreement. China has set its September deadline, not necessarily for reaching an agreement with Britain, but for announcing unilaterally its own plans for Hong Kong's future if agreement has not been reached. If anything, Britain may need an agreement more than China, if it wants a sure and stable basis on which to rest its administration of Hong Kong until 1997.

When an agreement does come, it may be as much what is left unsaid, as what is said, which will determine how well the territory works after 1997. The agreement will no doubt promise Hong Kong people a succession of "freedoms." It is not likely to mention in passing that such freedoms are already promised to China's people under China's existing constitution, but go unobserved in what remains a totalitarian State.

The agreement may promise Hong Kong a "democratic" government—though Sir Geoffrey spoke on Friday of a "representative" government, and ducked a request to distinguish between democracy and representation. If so, it will be worth bearing in mind that Xu Jiatun, Pekin's senior representative in Hong Kong, has said that socialism as practiced by China represents democracy in its widest sense.

The agreement is likely to include words to the effect that China will not send down cadres from Peking to interfere with Hong Kong's autonomous government. But it can hardly speak of other, more subtle, ways of influencing the territory through fear or favour.

What of Peking's already-extensive business presence in Hong Kong? Will such firms, and their respective ministries, be able for example to restrain themselves from using political "clout" in commercial transactions?

By the time any Sino-British agreement on Hong Kong's future comes into force, it will already be 13 years old. Most of the administrators who negotiated or ratified it will have retired. Hong Kong's autonomy will ultimately depend not on negotiations, nor agreements, but on the strength and impartiality of its future administrators, and the extent to which those virtues command respect in Peking.●

H.R. 5081, THE FAIR TRADE IN STEEL ACT OF 1984

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 I testified before the Subcommittee on Trade of the House Ways and Means Committee in support of H.R. 5081, the Fair Trade in Steel Act of 1984. This bill is supported by the Congressional Steel Caucus, the United Steelworkers, and the Nation's steel industry. I would like to take this opportunity to enter the following remarks into today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The remarks follow:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ELWOOD H. HILLIS BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADE, H.R. 5081, THE FAIR TRADE IN STEEL ACT

I want to thank the Members of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade for this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 5081, the Fair Trade in Steel Act of 1984.

I believe that this legislation is vital to the interests of America. Without it our domestic steel industry will continue its precipitous slide, with disastrous implications for our national economy and security.

The American steel industry is in a crisis. During the recent recession industry unemployment reached 45 percent. Even now, during the recovery, it stands as high as 29 percent. Within the last eight years more than 200,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs. Capacity utilization has fallen as low as 47 percent. Clearly this must not be allowed to continue.

The American steelworker is, by nature, not an individual who welcomes government intervention. Those familiar with steel mill operations recognize that steelmaking is a strenuous and even dangerous occupation. Steelworkers have always been, and will continue to be, independent—proudly and stubbornly so. All that they ask for is the right to compete fairly in the domestic and international steel market.

The American steel industry has not been given a chance to compete fairly. It is difficult to see how the American steel industry can compete, much less modernize, in an environment where trading practices are so blatantly unfair.

For example, the unanimous final injury determination of the International Trade Commission found that dumping margins for Brazilian plate imports ranged from a minimum of 50 percent to a maximum of 100 percent. This is not an isolated example of dumping. Many nations have engaged in this practice in an effort to make inroads into the American market.

It is unclear how American steelworkers are to compete against substandard wages paid to steelworkers in developing countries. The Congressional Research Service found that 1982 wages, including fringe benefits, were $22.74 for American steelworkers. In Mexico the comparable wage was $2.37, in Taiwan $1.98, in Korea $1.72. American steelworkers have sacrificed wages and benefits in an attempt to become more competitive. Yet how can such workers compete against wages of $1.72 per hour?

Those opposed to this legislation claim the American steel industry is inefficient. This is refuted by a recent study by World Steel Dynamics, a branch of Paine Webber, which found that the productivity of American integrated steelmakers has surpassed that of Japan, West Germany, France, and the United Kindgom.

It is claimed that steel management is unwilling to make necessary investments in order to modernize. While this was once true it is no longer. American steelmakers recognize that they must modernize their operations to compete in the international market, and they are responding. For example, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, to cite only one example, has announced plans to invest $540 million to install continuous casters in its Burns Harbor, Indiana and Sparrows Point, Maryland plants.

Installation of modern equipment and the renewed efforts of American steelworkers will not, by itself, be enough. For example, Bethlehem installed a modern 110-inch plate mill in its Burns Harbor facility in 1978. Not once in the six years since then has it operated at capacity. At capacity this mill would be employing over 300 workers. Currently it employs 66. Despite their best efforts, it has been impossible for Bethlehem to fairly compete against foreign steel.

Critics of the steel industry say that the industry must continue to modernize. Indus-

try and labor agree, but it is difficult to see where this capital will come from given present conditions. The Office of Technology Assessment found that the industry will need to spend more than $30 billion just to replace obsolete equipment. The American Iron and Steel Institute estimates that over the next decade the industry will need to spend $60 billion (in 1982 dollars) to bring all of its facilities up to world-class standards.

The industry's inability to further finance modernization is evident. Capital expenditures to modernize have fallen during this decade, and will continue to fall this year. The industry must increasingly look towards internally generated funding for its needs. It is difficult to see how this will be possible given the continuing influx of cheap foreign steel.

The consequences of this are evident. I fear that the long-term consequences are even more ominous.

As a Member of the Armed Services Committee, I am alarmed at the prospects of the United States being increasingly dependent on foreign steel for its domestic needs. Steel is our most important industrial material, and is a critical component of our infrastructure. There is not a major American sector which does not depend heavily on steel, be it manufacturing, construction, energy, transportation, mining, or agriculture. In addition, steel is a vital component of military equipment such as tanks and guns.

In the event of a steel shortage the United States would be open to rapid price escalation of its steel imports. This situation occurred in 1973-1974. Because of shortages foreign steel producers were able to command an average premium of $60 per ton, or approximately 25 percent above the domestic price. During this period the United States paid $1.8 billion for the privilege of buying imported steel. This was at a time when foreign steel accounted for 16 percent of the domestic market. In January foreign steel imports were 26 percent.

Once lost, American steel capacity is not easily replaced. Closed plants are not mothballed. They are scrapped and sold for junk. Highly skilled workers move away.

It is not impossible to foresee a time when America would find itself as seriously dependent on foreign steel as it was on foreign oil. The implications that this would have are most serious. This would affect our European and other allies as well. Many of them look toward the United States to provide both direct and indirect strategic support. Our efforts to give them such assistance would be greatly hampered by a long-term steel shortage.

The Fair Trade in Steel Act will not give the American steel industry a free ride. It will give it five years in which to modernize itself while protected from unfair foreign steel trading practices. During this time the industry will be monitored to insure that modernization continues.

I have brought with me today letters that I have received from my constituents asking that the Congress act now to save this industry. I would like to read to you part of a letter which I have recently received:

Dear Congressman HILLIS:

* * * I wanted to write and tell you that I have been working for a steel mill for 10 years, and that out of those 10 years I have been laid-off for 3 years. The latest lay-off lasted 22 months. In the April 17 issue of the Hammond "Times" there was a front-page story saying that my plant is to be closed.

Now so far, since I have been laid-off, I have lost my new car * * * and I am about to lose my house.

Now I'm not crying on your shoulder, but as a steelworker I think something should be done about all of this imported steel.

When I worked in the mill I thought I was making a good life for my family and myself. But now I feel as though my country doesn't want to do anything to help the mills.

* * * * *

We are witnessing the demise of a vital American industry. We must act now if we are to reverse this. Current legislative and regulatory procedures are not working. A comprehensive solution to this problem, as set forth in H.R. 5081, the Fair Trade in Steel Act, is clearly needed.●

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on this sober occasion in remembering the tragic slaughter of the Armenian people nearly seven decades ago. The historical record of massacres and deportations in 1915 and the years after is bone-chilling and led then-U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., to warn in a cable to Washington that "* * * it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress.* * *"

While the 20th century witnessed its first genocide in the shadows of Mount Ararat, it was not until the conclusion of World War II and the horrors of still another Holocaust in Nazi Germany that the revulsion of civilized humanity against such grievous crimes was translated into specific international remedies. Unfortunately, the Genocide Convention, which sought to provide for the prevention and punishment of such future crimes, has not to date been ratified by the United States.

Today, as we remember the massacres of the Armenians so long ago, it is important that we ask ourselves if remembering is enough. It is a dark blotch on the national reputation of the United States—as the leading democracy and advocate of the rule of law—that we have failed to ratify the Genocide Convention of 1948. Although administrations under both Republican and Democratic Presidents have urged ratification, the United States remains outside the convention. It is time for the United States to reassert its moral leadership in this area. No longer should we content ourselves with days of remembrance alone. If the civilized international community can outlaw hijacking and other crimes, we must insure that a crime so heinous as genocide is also outlawed.

Finally it should be stressed that the vast majority of Members of this body have no intention of increasing tension between the United States and Turkey. The need to protect our commonly shared commitment to the NATO alliance is widely understood. By the recognition of the Armenian tragedy in 1915, no indictment is intended of the present, modern-day Turkish Government.

Concern for terrorism committed by one national group in the past does not justify countervailing terrorism a half century later by descendants of its victims. The past may not be pretty, but its reality does nothing to sanction the senseless acts of terrorism committed by a majority of Armenian extremists against Turkish diplomats and other innocent civilians. There is no justification for such violence even as there is no justification for historical acts of State-sponsored violence or genocide.

By drawing attention once again on this occasion to the tragic deaths of so many Armenians so long ago, the U.S. Congress is once again underscoring the respect for human life and human rights for which this Nation stands. It is also asserting the importance of acknowledging the truth of this awesome genocide. If civilized people do not do so, mankind has little hope of learning from the lessons the past so poignantly provides.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, last week, several Members took part in a special order observing "Armenian Martyrs' Day" and recognizing the destruction caused by the Turkish Government's killing of 1.5 million Armenians from 1915 through 1923. To say that the act was devastating to the Armenian people is an understatement—and yet it is ironic that 69 years later that both the Turkish Government and the Reagan adminstration have failed to acknowledge that this incident ever occurred.

It is very important that we recognize this event and commemorate this day. For although the Turkish Government and the Reagan adminstration would prefer to forget the incident, I feel that it is necessary for us all to be reminded of it—not only to prevent such events from happening in the future, but to pay tribute to those families who were affected by this tragedy. It is sad that the Armenian people have had to live with the fact that the Turkish Government

sought to eradicate their people and culture and that they must continue to bear the scar of this incident amid denials of the act by the Turkish Government.

This day has become a day of mourning for the Armenian people, but indeed we should all mourn. It is tragic that such an abhorrent incident can occur in our civilized world, but it is even more tragic that people would choose to ignore it.●

RULES ADOPTED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with rule XI, clause 1(d), I am submitting herewith the rules adopted by the House Select Committee on Hunger on May 1, 1984.

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

RULE 1.—MEETINGS

The regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the third Tuesday of each month at 9:30 a.m., except when Congress has adjourned. The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof, and to call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the committee may be requested by members of the committee in accordance with the provisions of House Rule XI, 2(c)(2). Every member of the committee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to each meeting or hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The minority staff shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request.

RULE 2.—QUORUMS

A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence. Proxies shall not be used to establish a quorum. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the committee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

RULE 3.—COMMITTEE REPORTS

Every committee report shall be approved by a majority vote of the members voting, a quorum being present. Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed in accordance with House Rule XI, 2(l)(5). The time allowed for filing such views shall be three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) unless the committee agrees to a different time, but agreement on a shorter time shall require the concurrence of each member seeking to file such views. A proposed report shall not be considered in committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of the committee for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to the consideration of such proposed report in the committee. If hearings have been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the committee prior to the consideration of the proposed report in the committee.

RULE 4.—PROXY VOTES

A member may vote by proxy on any measure or matter before the committee and on any amendment or motion pertaining thereto. A proxy shall be in writing and be signed by the member granting the proxy; it shall show the date and time of day it was signed and the date for which it is given and the member to whom the proxy is given. Each proxy authorization shall state that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present; shall be limited to the date and specific measure or matter to which it applies; and, unless it states otherwise, shall apply to any amendments or motions pertaining to the measure or matter.

RULE 5.—ROLLCALLS

A rollcall of the members may be had upon the request of any member.

RULE 6.—RECORD OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The committee staff shall maintain in the committee offices a complete record of committee actions including a record of the rollcall votes taken at committee business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement.

RULE 7.—TASK FORCES

The committee may establish such task forces as it deems appropriate. The jurisdiction of such task forces shall be established by the chairman of the committee in consultation with the ranking minority member of the committee. The chairman and ranking minority member of the committee shall serve ex officio on each task force.

RULE 8.—HEARING DATES AND WITNESSES

The chairman of the committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the committee, shall announce the date, place, and subject matter of all hearings at least one week prior to the commencement of any hearings, unless he, after consultation with that member, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearings at an earlier date. Witnesses appearing before the committee shall, so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours in advance of their appearance.

RULE 9.—OPEN MEETINGS

Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

RULE 10.—FIVE-MINUTE RULE

Insofar as practicable, witnesses shall be permitted to present their oral statements without interruption, questioning by the committee members taking place afterward. After completing his questioning, the chairman shall recognize the ranking majority and then the ranking minority Member, and thereafter in recognizing members present, he may give preference to the members on the basis of their arrival at the hearing, taking into consideration the majority and minority ratio of the members actually present. A member desiring to speak or ask a question shall address the chairman and not the witness in order to insure orderly procedure.

Each member may question the witnesses for 5 minutes, the reply of the witness being included in the 5-minute period. After all members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round may begin again under the 5-minute rule.

RULE 11.—INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS; PROCEDURE

Investigative hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the committee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the committee for consideration, and the chairman shall rule on the relevance of any questions put to the witness.

RULE 12.—STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the chairman may prescribe.

RULE 13.—TV, RADIO, AND PHOTOGRAPHS

When approved by a majority vote, an open meeting or hearing of the committee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, 3. In order to enforce the provisions of said rule or to maintain an acceptable standard of dignity, propriety, and decorum, the chairman may order such alterations, curtailment or discontinuance of coverage as he determines necessary.

RULE 14.—STAFF

The committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the committee. The authorization for the creation of new positions shall be approved by a majority vote of the committee, a quorum being present.

RULE 15.—AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL

Travel to be paid from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel.

(2) The dates during which travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made.

(3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made.

(4) The names of member and staff seeking authorization.

RULE 16.—ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

The chairman of the committee shall—

(1) make available to other committees the Select Committee's findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the committee as appropriate; and

(2) prepare a budget for the committee and present such budget to the committee for its approval.

RULE 17.—AMENDMENT OF RULES

These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by a majority vote of the committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present, if at least two legislative days' written notice of the proposed change has been provided each member of the committee prior to the meeting date on which such changes are to be discussed and voted upon.●

TAX FREEDOM DAY

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, today is "Tax Freedom Day"—the day the average American taxpayer would finish satisfying his or her obligations to Federal, State and local governments if every penny earned went to the tax collectors since the beginning of the year.

According to the Tax Foundation, Inc., "Tax Freedom Day" falls on the same date as last year, but because 1984 is a leap year, taxpayers will have actually had to work 1 extra day to fulfill their tax obligations.

Because of the current drive for further tax increases, rather than responsible spending cuts to bring the deficit under control, I fear "Tax Freedom Day" will come even later in the year in 1985, reversing the progress made in the last 3 years in reducing the tax bite borne by working Americans.

Every dollar's worth of additional tax increase will mean one less dollar in the hands of Americans for savings, investment, or consumer spending; one less dollar to drive the economic recovery and put Americans back to work.

The answer to Federal budget deficits is not higher taxation. It is a tax policy which encourages economic growth, and a responsible spending policy to rein in runaway entitlement spending.●

THE ECONOMY OF CHANGE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to point out the importance of supporting the Government of South Africa. In a geographic region characterized by brutal dictatorships, terrorism, dramatically failing economies, and mass starvation, the Republic of South Africa stands alone as an example to the contrary.

While political and religious leaders in this country scream about apartheid in South Africa, thousands of blacks are streaming into South Africa to escape the much greater problems that they face in neighboring black-ruled countries. As ironic as it might sound, the Republic of South Africa currently offers greater hope for the future of blacks in southern Africa than Marxist-dominated governments on its borders.

The key to South Africa's success in that region is its economic and political stability. While South Africa is prospering, revolutionary Marxist rhetoric has only succeeded in leading its neighbors down a bloody dead-end road to economic failure. The lessons of history surely must teach us that democracy and freedom can only be achieved in a climate of economic security and not in the midst of poverty.

Attempts to force divestment of U.S. funds from South Africa serve to weaken the only self-sufficient economy in southern Africa. Rather than abandoning South Africa on the grounds that they fail to meet our racial standards, we should encourage peaceful transition to a fully integrated system by supporting those corporations and businesses that follow the Sullivan codes. Positive and productive change is only going to occur in South Africa if we continue to set the example. The United States must remain in support of positive change in South Africa and must not advocate the same types of radical change that are responsible for the tremendous economic and political problems plaguing the rest of southern Africa.

The following article expands upon the notion that change can only occur in a stable atmosphere in southern Africa. I urge my colleagues to look at it closely.

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 30, 1984]

GUNS AND ECONOMICS

The power of South Africa to manhandle its neighbors has been expressed in clear terms in the nonaggression treaty signed with Mozambique. The document is a recognition of the harsh reality that small black African states that seek to topple apartheid in South Africa may be biting off more than they can chew—particularly if they have hitched their wagon to such economically debilitating notions as Marxism.

The two nations pledged to leash the terrorists that operate from the territory of each against the other—the African National Congress in Mozambique and the Mozambique National Resistance in South Africa. Mozambique was getting the worst of the low-grade warfare.

But President Samora M. Machel was forced to his knees as much by his own incompetence as the military strength of the insurgency supported by his South African neighbors. He ran a closed Marxist state that was rapidly running downhill. His economy badly needed some tranquility and a dose of South African expertise. When the Soviet bloc nations cut their support, he negotiated a food-aid package with West Germany.

Black Africans must now see for themselves that history is not going to deliver white South Africa into their hands—that is, as long as neighboring black states are weak. Further, if history is to be their handmaiden it must also be their teacher. The strongest lesson of modern history in that region is that Marxism does not give emerging African nations any sinew.

This is not a time for the Botha government to strut in victory. If wisdom prevails, Mr. Botha and company must realize that they have bought a slice of time. Change is occurring, slowly. The multinational corporations, wise enough to know that disinvestment doesn't contribute to that process, are hanging in and forcing liberalizations in the work place, thereby setting the example. Some statutory rights have been conveyed to the Asians and mixed races and black labor unions are flourishing. South Africa's leaders are well aware of the racial powder keg on which they sit.

The irony of southern Africa has been that despite the hated apartheid, blacks for years have been streaming into South Africa. It is the one economy in the region that works. It creates more jobs and wealth—for white and black—than all the surrounding countries combined.

This gives South Africa tremendous staying power. Moreover, the ruling Afrikaners aren't timid about using that power. They have not only forced Mozambique to the bargaining table, but they appear on the brink of forcing Angola into a somewhat similar agreement.

Careless revolutionary rhetoric has led South Africa's neighbors down a bloody dead end. Perhaps a more tranquil era is dawning in that troubled region. Apartheid will be more threatened by economically viable neighbors than by gangs spouting left-wing rhetoric.●

MARINE RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the Marine Resources Development Bank Act, in the hope of establishing a new framework for fisheries development programs. Over the course of the last three decades, the Congress has established, refined, fine-tuned, and otherwise legislated a number of programs in an attempt to provide our fishing industry with the management tools and capital it needs to become a world leader in fisheries production.

Since the early 1970's, we have tended to concentrate our efforts on the construction of a comprehensive management framework that has allowed our fishing industry and managers to address serious problems associated with overfishing by foreign nations and resource cycles that depleted the valuable, renewable fishery resources within 200 miles of our shores. The enactment of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, the American Fisheries Promotion Act of 1980, the Fishery Conservation and Management Improvement Act of 1982, as well as the Presidential Proclamation of March 10, 1982, establish-

ing an exclusive economic zone for the United States, have largely fulfilled this goal.

Nonetheless, we still find our fishing industry largely bereft of the financing necessary to transform it from a cottage industry into the world leader it should be. This is not to say that we have not tried to create solutions to this problem. The fisheries loan fund and the title XI obligation guaranty program are testimony to this fact. These programs are also, I believe, testimony to our failure to enact, in one institution, the comprehensive and responsive financial assistance framework that so many who have studied this problem believes is essential.

Last year, the late Congressman Ed Forsythe initiated our efforts to reform the financial services delivery system for the U.S. fishing industry through the introduction of H.R. 3806. That bill was the subject of 2 full days of hearings in our Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment Subcommittee. The bill I am introducing today is the result of those hearings and the extensive discussion that ensued.

Under this bill, there would be established a Marine Resources Development Bank with its headquarters located within the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia and with such branch offices throughout the United States as the Board considers necessary or appropriate. The bank would be a Government corporation under the terms of the Government Corporation Control Act. It would have its powers vested in a board of directors consisting of nine voting directors appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and four nonvoting observers, or their respective designees, as follows: First the Secretary of Agriculture; second, the Secretary of Commerce; third the Secretary of the Treasury; and fourth, the U.S. Trade Representative.

The Board would be required to establish and appoint knowledgeable individuals to serve on three private sector advisory committees which would advise the bank regarding its policies and operations in the harvesting, processing, and marketing sectors of the domestic fishing industry. The Board of Directors would establish the offices of the bank, including a chief executive officer who would be responsible for the management of the bank on a full-time basis.

The bank would have the capability to select, employ, and set the salaries of officers and employees as the Board deems necessary, and to organize the bank as it sees fit to fix responsibility and promote efficiency. Upon request of the Board, the head of any Federal agency would be given the authority to detail to the bank, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that agency to assist the bank in the performance of its functions.

Subject to specified terms and conditions, the bank would have the authority to make loans to citizens of the United States for purposes of assisting them to:

First, finance the cost of purchasing or constructing new U.S. fishing vessels or new fisheries shoreside facilities;

Second, finance the cost of purchasing, reconstructing, or reconditioning used U.S. fishing vessels or used fishery shoreside facilities;

Third, finance the purchase of fishing gear for new or used U.S. fishing vessels;

Fourth, provide working capital necessary to successfully operate a fishing vessel or fisheries shoreside facility for which a loan is made under the above provisions; and

Fifth, to refinance any existing obligation for any activity described above.

The Bank would also have the authority to facilitate export transactions involving U.S. fish and fish products, including countertrade, which, in the judgment of the Board, offers sufficient likelihood of repayment to justify the Board's support. Such financial assistance would include loans and insurance to foreign importers of U.S. fish and fish products to improve the capability of importing nations to purchase and use such products and loans to exporters of U.S. fish and fish products to assist such exporters in meeting sales competition from other nations or to make additional export sales. The Bank would also be able, if determined feasible, to make credit financing available for the establishment of facilities in importing nations to handle U.S. fish and fish products, to provide guarantees for loans extended by financial institutions or other public or private creditors to export trading companies, and to provide, subject to reasonable charges, technical support to exporters and importers of U.S. fish and fish products. In carrying out its export responsibilities, the Bank would utilize the services of the U.S. Agricultural Trade Offices, which would be required to carry out these functions to the same extent and in the same manner with respect to fish and fish products as they are now carried out with respect to agricultural commodities.

Primary funding for the Bank would come from the issuance of its own obligations in the private credit market, with the full faith and credit of the United States pledged to the payment of all obligations including both principal and interest. The Bank would be limited, at any one time, to having no more than $1.5 billion in outstanding obligations. As required by current market conditions, the Secretary of the Treasury would be required to purchase obligations of the Bank and use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued.

Initial capital for the Bank would come from: First, all appropriated yet unobligated moneys of the fisheries loan fund that are held by the Secretary of Commerce as of October 1, 1984; second, unappropriated funds on deposit in the fisheries loan fund on that date (which are expected to approximate $89.7 million); and third, subsequent foreign fishing fee receipts. Upon creation of the new bank, NMFS would cease to administer the current fisheries loan fund. In addition, the Secretary of Commerce would not be able to guarantee any obligation under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which aids in the financing or refinancing or the construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, or purchase of a fishing vessel or fishery facility. Instead, the bank would provide the necessary funds and services to replace these programs.

There is no question that the U.S. fishing industry is a diverse industry with a broad variety of perspectives. That does not mean, however, that it cannot work together toward common goals. The Marine Resources Development Bank legislation, in that it is a direct result of close consultation with all affected sectors of the domestic fishing industry, could provide a means for reaching the common goal of maximizing economic benefits from the ocean resources under the jurisdiction of the United States. The Fishery Conservation and Management Act was but a first step toward full development of the U.S. fishing industry. The United States has now further emphasized its commitment to maximizing economic benefits from the oceans through the declaration of an exclusive economic zone. The Marine Resources Development Bank could provide an even stronger foundation for the resurgence of the U.S. fishing industry to a position of world leadership. The bill could be a vehicle which will signal that the industry and the Federal Government recognize the current and potential contribution of the domestic fishing industry to the Nation's economy, and that both are prepared to offer their full support to the realization of that potential.●

TASS INADVERTENTLY SALUTES OUR FRIEND DAVE BRODY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, one good friend to all of us, who does not need an introduction in this Chamber, is Dave Brody.

Dave has been the chief Washington representative of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith since 1965. Next month, he will be celebrating his 68th birthday.

As a salute to this happy occasion, my colleagues and I could individually pay tribute to Dave on the floor of the House. But I thought a more dramatic—and meaningful—gesture would be to call to the attention of my colleagues the only nonlaudatory profile of Dave I have ever read.

In January of this year, TASS, the Soviet News Agency, carried an in-depth profile of this hard-working individual. Although the story on Dave's career was certainly not intended to be a credit to him, I thought my colleagues would be interested to read what readers in the U.S.S.R. are being told about Mr. Brody, our governmental system, and the cause of Jewry here in the United States.

Accordingly, I insert this TASS article in the RECORD at this point:

[From "Sovetskaia Moldaviia", Jan. 11, 1984]

"HABITUÉ OF THE CAPITAL"

(By A. Lazarev)

"Only for Senators"—read the signs over the doors of certain official premises of the Congress of the USA. But this does not trouble David Brody. He is brought in by Senator Charles Grassley (Republican, Iowa). In front of the elevator in the Capital there is the same sign—"Only for Senators." Here too the prohibition is no hindrance in the path of David Brody. He is politely invited into the compartment by Senator Jesse Helms (Republican, North Carolina), who, like Grassley, voted for one of the legislative projects needed by Brody.

If one enters the apartment of Brody, then he may see on the walls photographs of presidents and other "celebrities" of the White House, decorated with the autographs of these political figures. "Dave can get into the office of practically any senator more quickly than any other person whom I ever knew," said former US Vice-President Walter Mondale.

Who is this 67 year old energetic habitué of the Capital? "Dave is an un-elected member of the American Senate," thinks Charles Mathias, legislator of the upper house of the Congress from Maryland. And he is very close to the truth. "Brody," according to the "New York Times," is the Washington representative of the "Anti-Defamation League." Here we must be more precise: the League is one of the most influential branches of the largest Jewish organization in the US, "Bnai Brith," which is completely under the control of Zionist circles.

It is perfectly natural that the "energetic lobbying campaign" being conducted by Brody sets as its aim to get approval in Congress of as many legislative projects beneficial to Israel as possible. At the same time he tries to block the passage of proposals which do not correspond to the interests of the Tel Aviv "hawks." Brody often puts American legislators on the right path: "You will not get the good-will of the Arabs by weakening Israel. If Tel Aviv receives the assistance it needs, then the USA will be in a better position."

Brody's lobbying efforts have not gone unnoticed. "He conducts his campaign around the clock," the "New York Times" wrote in this connection. The Zionist agent advertises "his" senators to their electors, arranges meetings for them with persons who might give them financial assistance during election campaigns, and also with journalists. Meanwhile, he does not care to which party the senator belongs or what his views are—only whether he came out in favor of Israel. Brody often holds parties in the evening in his home, and frequently the Israeli ambassador in the USA is invited. As the former West German ambassador to the US, Rolf Pauls, once declared, having also visited in the home of the lobbyist, he "saw more senators there than at the Capital."

Brody has many companions-in-arms, who represent Zionist and pro-Israel organizations. And their pressure on American legislators affects the concrete acts of the Congress, its decisions, and even the absence thereof. Not so long ago the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee published a report with the title, "The Summer of Silence: The Response of Congress to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon." Many members of the US Congress, it says in this report, openly followed the lead of Israel. They refused to condemn it for this act of armed aggression. The growing military-economic assistance of the USA to the Israeli terrorist-state is also a "service" of the Zionist lobby. In the 1983 financial year the Tel Aviv "hawks," not without the help of their agents in the Capital, managed to get an increase of gratis military assistance alone to Israel up to 850 million dollars. In the following financial year it is planned to increase it by another 400 million dollars. On the whole, as CBS TV network reported, from the time of the creation of the Jewish state until 1982, the USA granted Israel 24 billion dollars. During the visit in Washington not long ago of the Israeli emissaries—Prime Minister Y. Shamir and Minister of Defense M. Arens, the White House took upon itself the obligation to grant Tel Aviv another 1.4 billion dollars in the form of gratis assistance.

One of the main aims of the Zionist lobby in the USA is to support the constant flow of the most modern American weapons to Israel. Thus, during the Lebanese aggression about 100 types of American arms were used, which before this had not been tried out in war-time conditions. The most up-to-date "F-16" fighter-bombers have been given to Tel Aviv, and they are used for barbaric attacks on peaceful Arab towns. In all Israel has received 150 of these "birds of prey." The Zionists also have "their people" in the Pentagon. These include the Assistant Minister of Defense for Policy Questions in the Area of International Security, Richard Perle and Deputy Assistant Minister of Defense for International Economic Trade and Questions of Security, Steven Bryen.

"Israel always had good friends in important places in the American Administration and Congress. But when Reagan came to power an unprecedented change occurred in the system of Israeli-American contacts," according to the English journal "New Statesman."

Precisely for this reason all the doors and loop-holes on Capitol Hill are open for David Brody which he sees in his dreams crowned by the Zionist symbol—the six-pointed Star of David.●

SOVIET ACTIVE MEASURES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, does the Soviet Union spread false information about the United States? It may seem naive to ask such a question, but from time to time it is good to remind ourselves that we are faced with a wily and persistent superpower which is not too concerned over the means it uses to pursue its ends. How do we fight the disinformation programs of the Soviet Union and its satellites? A recent article in USIA World demonstrates that at last we are beginning to take notice of a counter Soviet active measures.

At this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD "Disinformation: No Longer Thriving in Darkness" by Hugh Burleson, USIA World, April, 1984:

DISINFORMATION: NO LONGER THRIVING IN THE DARKNESS

(By Hugh Burleson)

In an article prepared for the NATO Review last year, Undersecretary Eagleburger wrote of active measures by the USSR and its clients:

"Active measures need to be countered by public exposure. They are infections that thrive in the darkness, and sunlight is the best antiseptic."

As an active participant in the interagency Active Measures Working Group (AMWG), the U.S. Information Agency has a primary role in providing the public exposure—the sunlight of plain, objective facts about the United States and its policies—to counter Soviet active measures, especially disinformation.

Not everyone associated with USIA knows what this new term—"active measures"—signifies. It is a Soviet term, *aktivnyye meropriyatiya*, only recently brought into use in English to denote the particular combination of deceptive techniques which the USSR and its client states employ routinely to advance their policy aims.

In Soviet parlance, active measures are counterposed to such passive measures as political reporting and intelligence analysis. They include covert manipulation or control of the media, written or oral disinformation (including planted rumors), use of foreign communist organizations and front organizations, clandestine radio broadcasting, and other political influence operations.

The form of active measure which USIA professionals most often come across is disinformation embedded in propaganda of Soviet origin. Less often do they discover in a local magazine or newspaper a text purporting to be an official U.S. or European document but saying some very odd things about the policies or actions of the U.S. and/or its allies. Close investigation often proves these to be forgeries.

Until some three years ago, these Soviet-inspired activities were treated mainly as intelligence matters because they usually are perpetrated covertly by KGB agents and operatives. But, they also are normally intended to affect public opinion, or influence the decision-makers and opinion-molders of

a society, and hence should unmistakably be treated as public affairs, USIA's area.

As the newly formed Active Measures Working Group, chaired by a deputy assistant secretary of state, formulated its strategy for meeting the problem, USIA naturally took on the job of exposure—publicizing instances of active measures and providing the facts to refute the distorted message.

USIA's strategy. USIA staffers on the front line of dealing with active measures know that the process of exposure boils down essentially to 1) field reporting of the instance of disinformation, 2) Washington analysis of the case and provision of guidance or refutation, and 3) field publicity centering on the facts or policies brought into question in the first place. This strategy against active measures has, for convenience, been tabbed "R.A.P."—reporting, analysis, and publicity—and seeks to counter the activity directly and share information about it with other interested parties.

On a week-in/week-out basis, this means that field posts advise Washington of cases of active measures, usually disinformation spotted in local publications or heard on the radio. In turn, Washington—specifically the Disinformation Response Staff in the Office of Policy Guidance (P/G), with area office support and assistance—looks at each instance and decides how best to deal with it.

P/G also constantly watches the voluminous output of the Soviet and other Bloc media. We feed it, vastly compressed, to the field in a weekly "Soviet Propaganda Themes" cable, designed as an aid in identifying which of the "passing strange" items about the U.S. in the local media may have sprung from the fertile pens of Soviet or Soviet-proxy propagandist and active measure specialists.

Also, by cable and USINFO message, and sometimes by phone, USIA feeds back to USIA posts the best available facts, policy guidance or other wherewithal for refuting allegations or outright fabrications. This is supplemented by occasional Wireless File features dealing with active measures. The Office of Research produces the bimonthly Soviet Propaganda Alert, which provides a fuller framework for understanding the Soviet and Bloc output.

What is involved. A few cases of active measures can illustrate what is involved.

A "neo-classic" active measures was the early 1983 "Kirkpatrick Balkanization text" which appeared in the pro-Soviet New Delhi Patriot of Jan. 25, 1983. It alleged that the government of India had proof of a U.S. plan for "balkanizing" India.

To old India hands, this brought to mind the charge often recycled in India that U.S. intelligence services, under a top-secret "Project Brahmaputra," had for years fomented separatist insurrection among minority groups in northeast India, to split the cluster of states there away from India and thus "balkanize" and weaken this Asian anchor of the nonaligned nations.

Two days later, a fuller version of the "Kirkpatrick" text showed up in a south Indian paper along with a photograph, no less, of page one of an apparent USICA cable transmitting the text of a speech a year earlier by U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick at a forum in Washington, D.C. The full text described a comprehensive and provocative policy for destablizing Third World nations and using a Machiavellian ways such resources as food aid to advance supposed U.S. foreign policy aims.

On Jan. 26, 1983, Ambassador Kirkpatrick's denial that she had ever authored or delivered such a speech was cabled to USIA-New Delhi. Within a few days, USIA, with AMWG support, had established that 1) Ambassador Kirkpatrick had attended the Washington forum, but had not spoken there, and 2) the cable pictured in the south Indian paper had dealt with routine administrative matters, not global U.S. policy. In short, the AMWG established that this was a forgery.

We call this active measure neo-classic because:

The English was nearly flawless—apparently crafted by the best talent in Moscow;

Its appearance seemed carefully timed to produce maximum political and psychological impact at the Non-aligned Ministerial Conference opening in New Delhi a few weeks later; and,

It followed the classic active-measure pattern of being very quickly replayed in such far-off places as Managua and recycled through places like Prague and Moscow to crop up over and over in other Third World media outlets, usually with light camouflaging of the source.

Since deployment of U.S. INF weapons—Pershing II's and ground-launched cruise missiles—to NATO countries began last fall, Soviet propagandists and disinformers have made these missiles their favored hardware bogeymen with which to frighten supposedly naive audiences. Over and over, the Soviet media themselves, or Third World media carrying items with the telltale odor of Soviet sourcing, have claimed that the United States will soon deploy these missiles in such unlikely places as South Africa or Pakistan—almost any country on the Kremlin's blacklist will do. Over and over, either the local U.S. embassy on its own initiative, or with Washington input, has had to puncture these flimsy tales. As this is written, the charge most recently has been made in a forged State airgram. The document surfaced in Peru and claimed the U.S. would sell Pershing II's to Chile!

Gradually signs are appearing that in countries targeted by active measures, the officials and media gatekeepers receiving this stuff are increasingly able and ready to identify it as bunk and either "round-file" it or pass it along to USIA for comment and input before printing it. The coordinated effort has not yet reached the stage, though, where the evidence of effectiveness is negative proof: A declining incidence of these Soviet deceptive operations. But, there are signs that our countering effort is making it more difficult for the opposition to successfully pass forgeries or otherwise disinform various publics around the world.●

AN IMPORTANT SAFETY DEVICE—AUTO RESTRAINT SEATS FOR CHILDREN

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleagues, Mr. ANDERSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BARNES, Mr. GORE, Mr. COELHO, and Mr. GOODLING in sponsoring a very important and sensible piece of legislation requiring all the States to adopt a comprehensive child safety seat program.

Automobile accidents are the major cause of death and disfigurement of children in the United States. This statistic is especially tragic because most of the time these deaths and injuries could have been prevented if the child was properly secured in a car safety seat. Automobile accidents kill 10 times as many children as all the diseases we immunize them against combined. Comparing accidents and health care exemplifies the irony of the situation: We spend a lot of time and money to care for our children's health needs, but almost ignore a device that would insure their safety and welfare.

A recent report by the National Transportation Safety Board indicates that over the last 5 years—1978 to 1982—nearly 3,400 child passengers under 5 years old were killed in traffic accidents and more than 250,000 more were injured. Most of these deaths and injuries are preventable; up to 90 percent of the fatalities and 67 percent of the disabling injuries could have been prevented by the proper use of child safety seats.

Car safety seats are the most effective way of protecting a child while in an automobile. One reason children are so vulnerable to injuries in a car crash is the way they are built. The upper part of the body tends to develop faster than the lower part in children under 5 years old. This means if a child is not restrained properly in a sudden stop or accident the child will plunge forward, head first.

Having an adult hold a child in his arms is not a substitute for child safety seats. Studies show that in an accident the impact of the crashing car pushes the passengers forward causing the child to be crushed between the adult and the interior of the car. In other cases, the unrestrained child exerts such a strong force on impact that even the strongest adult would not be able to hold on to the child.

My own State of Michigan passed a child restraint law in April 1982. It requires all infants under 1 year to be properly secured in a child restraint system. Children ages 1 to 4 have to do likewise, unless they are in the backseat where they had the option of using a seatbelt.

The first year the law went into effect the number of children ages 1 to 3 placed in car safety seats rose 191 percent compared to the previous year. The number of casualties for this same group declined nearly 25 percent compared to the year before. Likewise, the number of infants under 1 year placed in an auto safety seat rose 88 percent, bringing injuries down

42 percent from the year before the safety seat law.

The dramatic increase in the number of people using child safety seats demonstrates that people are very willing to participate in this important and sensible program. Nearly one out of two infants under 1 year were portected from injury compared with statistic 1 year before the law. The amazing success of this program in a very short time is a key indicator that all States would benefit by adopting child restraint programs.

Child safety seats save lives and help prevent disabling injuries. Establishing national guidelines for child restraint systems would help insure that every child is protected from injury while in an automobile and that the programs developed by the States adequately and fairly address the needs of children and families.●

MS. GERRI WOODS-WILLIAMS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to bring to my colleagues' attention an extraordinary young woman, Ms. Gerri Woods-Williams of Elizabeth, N.J., for her continuing contribution to the community.

In the past 5 years alone, Ms. Williams has received over a dozen awards and commendations for her community service and achievement, especially for her work with the Urban League Guilds of Union and Essex Counties. Her commitment and dedication to the work of the National Council of Urban League Guilds is without parallel. Ms. Williams is currently treasurer of the national council, and she was president of the Union County Urban League Guilds for 2 years as well as vice president of the Essex County Urban League for 2 years. In addition to her work as treasurer of the national council, she has attended 13 of the last 15 National Urban League conferences. At those conferences she participated in some of the very important national committees such as constitution and by laws, recommendations, budget and finance, and nominating.

Gerri Woods-Williams is a successful businesswoman in the Union and Essex County area of New Jersey, and in fact, she was president of the Union County chapter of the National Association of Negro Business & Professional Women's Club, Inc. But it is her work in the community and on behalf of blacks, minorities, and other disadvantaged persons that is particularly noteworthy. Her efforts on behalf of the United Negro College Fund's fundraising activities prompted letters such as the following:

UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND, INC.,
NEW JERSEY STATE CORPORATIONS COMMITTEE,
Newark, N.J., February 2, 1981.

Mrs. GERRI WILLIAMS,
Elizabeth, N.J.

DEAR GERRI: We cannot begin to thank you enough for dedicating your time, energy and effort to our Telethon—a first for the United Negro College Fund in New Jersey.

All your help in the pre-planning and preparation was so pertinent to the success of the Telethon, resulting to date in a total of $440,000.

Despite some of the temporary obstacles which sometimes occurred, it was an outstanding achievement and one of which you may well be proud.

We look forward with you to the second UNCF Telethon. We could not have done this one without your sharing and doing.

With gratitude and apprecation,

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) VERDELL L. ROUNDTREE.

Gerri Williams is a doer. In 1981 she was selected as one of the Outstanding Young Women of America. While employed as a management specialist at the Internal Revenue Service, she received a Special Achievement Award for her participation in Black History Month. The contents of her commendation letter gives you an idea of the level of commitment Gerri gives to every endeavor she undertakes:

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
March 10, 1981.

Ms. GERALDINE WILLIAMS,
Newark, N.J.

Thru: Chief, Resources Management Division.

DEAR MS. WILLIAMS: Congratulations on receiving this Special Achievement Award of $250.00, and Certificate of Award with Seal. This is a special act award for your participation during the month of February in the observance of Black History.

Your enthusiasm and willingness to bring the February activities to fruition in conjunction with the performance of the duties of your position has exceeded normal expectations.

Your accomplishment is worthy of this special recognition and is in keeping with the highest traditions of the Service.

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS J. COLEMAN,
District Director.

If all this is not enough, Gerri Williams has also been active in the planning and coordination of the Congressional Black Caucus' annual legislative weekends. Her efforts and commitment prompted letters such as the following from our colleague, District of Columbia Delegate WALTER FAUNTROY:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 6, 1981.

Ms. GERALDINE (GERRI) WILLIAMS,
Elizabeth, N.J.

DEAR GERRI: This is to express my deep appreciation for your support and hard work which contributed to making the Congressional Black Caucus Weekend a success.

In addition, your willingness to assist in sponsoring the Chairman's Reception in its initiation contributed greatly to its success.

Moreover, your help in addressing the Challenge and beginning the process of implementing the Plan is a source of encouragement to me and my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus.

Again, many thanks for your help and support. I shall see you soon in New Jersey.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. FAUNTROY,
Member of Congress.

It is indeed an honor to know Gerri Woods-Williams. Her energy and commitment to improve her world and the world of those around her is an inspiration to us all. I wish her the best of luck in the future in all her endeavors.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, we gather this afternoon to commemorate the "Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust." It is a solemn and important occasion.

Some 40 years ago the world was ablaze with the fires of war. Under the Nazi regime, particularly heinous, government-sanctioned crimes against humanity were being carried out. In an attempt to realize Adolf Hitler's dream, the Nazis were systematically rounding up the Jews and shipping them to concentration camps, like animals to the slaughter. There they were tortured, experimented upon, humiliated, and finally, exterminated by bullet, burning, or whatever other unspeakably torturous methods could be devised by human beings gone mad.

We meet today to remember the over 6 million Jews who were the victims of Adolf Hitler's madness. Elie Wiesel, a witness to the Holocaust who has written articulately and powerfully about his experience under the Nazi madness, said, "The problem for all of us is what do we do with our memories? We must deal with them or they will crush us. Those who died in anonymity must be remembered in anonymity. Our collective remembrance must save future generations from anonymity." Mr. Wiesel wants us to remember, to prevent such an inhuman catastrophe from recurring.

And so we meet here to remember, as others throughout the world meet to remember, on these special Days. We meet to pay tribute to the more than 6 million innocent lives that perished. We join in sharing the survival of all those who escaped the death sentence of the Holocaust and the survival of a people the Nazis sought to annihilate.

The lessons of the Holocaust must be taught from generation to generation so that humanity will never forget those dark days of Nazi rule. On this day we help to fulfill our collective responsibility to transmit the lessons of history, and we help to insure that never again will a Holocaust happen to any people.●

WORLD FOOD DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SIMON and I have introduced House Joint Resolution 556 which would designate October 16, 1984, as World Food Day. World Food Day has been supported by Congress on prior occasions and has proven to be an effective tool for increasing the public's awareness of the global problems of hunger and malnutrition.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a full description of the goals, objectives, and programs actively being planned for World Food Day 1984, and the main activities undertaken in 1983 by the National Committee for World Food Day at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert the full text of House Joint Resolution 556 at this point in the RECORD:

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND PLANS OF THE NATIONAL WFD OFFICE 1983-84

World Food Day proved again in 1983 that it is a unique vehicle for unifying and expanding a U.S. (and world) anti-hunger constituency, an important tool for development education and a laboratory for experimentation, idea development and cross-sectoral collaboration. Past experience has also shown the potential for using a one-day focus to initiate and/or strengthen existing year-around activities at local, national and international levels. In sum, World Food Day works and the more it is used the more useful it becomes.

The year-around potential of the program is of special importance as we plan for 1984 and 1985, and the evidence of it—shown in detail in pages of this report to the national committee—is worth summarizing as an introduction to the many separate elements of our activities:

From the beginning in 1981, the WFD secretariat has been a year-around resource/service center, developing and distributing information, assisting field organizers and working with national committee members.

WFD has assisted local organizers and organizations to broader anti-hunger networks and increase the impact of their regular year-around programs; many ongoing programs—local and national—have been set in motion through WFD initiatives.

The WFD mailing list of local organizers, growing each year, is a proven year-around channel for reaching front-line community activists and groups with new ideas and materials.

The size of the national committee and the public response to WFD have helped to prove to public officials at all levels that a broad constituency exists for national and international hunger action.

WFD is demonstrating new possibilities for joint action by NGOs, government and the UN system, and is building human and institutional contacts and trust through the "tripartite" sponsorship of the event.

The international nature of WFD has helped to develop anti-hunger structures in many nations and avenues for exchange of ideas and materials between nations, with joint programing as a logical next step.

This report seeks to highlight the main activities of the WFD program in the U.S. in 1983 and initiatives foreseen for further development in 1984 at each level of program operation: community action, national committee activities, cooperation with public officials at federal, state and local levels, cooperation with the UN system, other international links, media impact. It is, however, a report of the secretariat to sponsoring organizations and cannot reflect the full range of activities undertaken in the filed or by individual national committee members.

COMMUNITY ACTION

Growth: The WFD community organizer list, which was roughly 3,000 in 1981 and 5,000 in 1982, grew to more than 7,000 in 1983. WFD was marked in every city of more than 50,000 population and hundreds of smaller towns. Observances were characterized by diversity and growing significance.

Examples: Statewide WFD conferences in several states; rapidly growing use of WFD for community fund raising; widespread reprinting of national WFD materials such as "sunburst" folder and basic flyer; multiple, highly publicized observances with official participation in many cities.

Secretariat Activities: Four major mailings during year to entire list and individual contacts throughout the year providing ideas, network information, media aids and observance and study materials.

Directions/Goals/Materials for '84:

Continued growth of year-around WFD committees and activities;

Emphasis on public policy issues such as urban food planning and pre-election meetings with candidates;

Completion of organizer list in cities of 25-50,000 and expansion of contacts in smaller communities;

New study papers for schools and colleges, community groups (in consultation with FAO and others) on 10-year review of World Food Conference, Women in Agriculture, Basic Foods in Developing Nations, etc.;

Production of "Hunger Primer" on world food situation (basic facts, statistics, maps), special bulletin insert for general use, etc.;

Continued assistance to communities on "needs assessment" studies.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Growth: National WFD committee member organizations numbered 178 in 1981, 262 in 1982 and 311 in 1983. Special WFD activities by member organizations have grown steadily over the three years, including increased promotion through organizational publications.

Examples: Very positive response by religious groups to appeal by FAO Director-General; increased participation of Jewish organizations on national committee and nationwide through special promotion letter; expanded support of CARE and Church World Service regional offices; strong response nationwide from 4-H chapters; separate educational materials on world food problems by several committee organizations; WFD highlight at UNA-USA national conference and major mailing to local chapters; promotion of WFD through Bread for the World outreach forum series.

Secretariat Activities: All secretariat mailings include full list of national committee member organizations with encouragement to contact national organizations for WFD ideas and materials. Special small flyers provided by members included in secretariat mailings from the following: Alternatives, American Friends Service Committee, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Bread for the World, CARE, CAST, Church World Service, Community Nutrition Institute, Food Marketing Institute, FRAC, Gardens for All, Global Perspectives in Education, Heifer Project, Institute for Food and Development Policy, Interfaith Hunger Appeal, International Development Conference, National Farmers Union, Overseas Development Council, OXFAM-America, Project Concern, Science for the People, SEEDS, Society for Nutrition Education, Soil Conservation Society of America, and World Hunger Education Service. Presentations by the national coordinator to key religious meetings and conferences. The secretariat also worked with several members to provide curricular materials.

Directions/Goals/Materials for '84: (Also see final page of report.)

Some additions to national committee membership;

Assistance from member organizations to adapt FAO prototype education materials;

Publication of a new national committee directory;

Continuation/expansion of mailings of member promotion flyers;

Development of "think pieces" by committee members for WFD mailings;

Increased financial support from national committee members.

GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION/FEDERAL

Growth: WFD participation and support by federal departments and agencies increased appreciably, headed by the Department of Agriculture (the official WFD sponsoring organization) and AID, but with inputs from approximately ten other government branches.

Examples: White House ceremony with President Reagan signing the WFD proclamation; increase in development education grant by AID and introduction by AID of annual hunger action awards; USDA activities nationwide (experiment stations, extension service, stamp cancellation, media promotion) and Patio ceremony featuring Secretary John Block; joint congressional resolution; letter from 28 senators to President; letter to religious leaders from Senator Hatfield.

Secretariat Activities: Participation in interdepartmental planning committee headed by USDA; liaison work with Congress on joint resolution; meetings with Secretary Block, White House staff, AID and Department of Education; mailing of flyers from USDA on Agriculture in the Classroom; national coordinator was a speaker at Patio ceremony and a member of Secretary Block's party to FAO conference in Rome in November.

Directions/Goals/Materials in '84:

Expected growth of role of interdepartmental committee headed by USDA;

Increased cooperation with AID and Department of Education on development education and links to state/local education networks;

Cooperation with BIFAD, FAO and others on symposium packet for World Food Conference 10-year review;

Promote congressional colloquy on world food problems timed with WFD, and participation of legislators in WFD events;

Cooperation with proposed House Select Committee on Hunger as appropriate.

GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION/STATE-LOCAL

Growth: WFD contacts with state legislative leaders, state superintendents of eduction and mayors were a special emphasis in 1983.

Examples: WFD school materials were distributed to local systems by superintendents of education in 15 states; WFD proclamations were received from all governors again in '83 but joined this year by resolutions from several state legislatures; several gubernatorial proclamations were signed at public ceremonies involving WFD organizers; important expansion occurred in proclamations and participation in observances by mayors.

Secretariat Activities: Special letters sent to all speakers and presidents pro tem of state legislatures; letters with examples of school lesson plans sent to all state superintendents of education; materials on possible right-to-food legislation sent to several state legislators on request; materials sent to (and follow-up contacts made with) interested mayors on urban food policy planning; introductory WFD letters sent to all mayors of cities with 100,000 or more population; presentation by coordinator to Washington representatives of Governors; participation in ad hoc meeting called by U.S. Conference of Mayors on urban food strategies.

Directions/Goals/Materials for '84:

Continue to build contacts with mayors on urban food policies and other WFD participation;

Networking among federal, state and local education organizations, with development and distribution of new materials for k-12 as feasible;

Continue work with state legislatures on right-to-food legislation;

Develop links between county/state officials (through National Association of Counties and National Association of State Departments of Agriculture and others) and local WFD coalitions.

COOPERATION WITH FAO AND INTERNATIONAL LINKS

Growth: Each WFD has seen an expansion in cooperation between the WFD secretariat and officials of FAO, as well as new contacts in other countries and regions. This was highlighted in 1983 by the invitation of the national coordinator to Rome for the biennial FAO Conference. The secretariat has continued its close cooperation with the FAO office in Washington.

Examples: WFD on agenda of the FAO Conference with half-day discussion marked by many favorable interventions by national delegations and a special resolution of the Conference calling for renewed support and cooperation with NGOs; creation of a Canadian WFD association; very positive meetings with Ambassador to FAO Millicent Fenwick; publication by FAO of the first annual World Food Report for WFD study; a special appeal by the FAO Director-General to world religious leaders and a joint FAO/UNESCO appeal to ministers of education.

Secretariat Activities: Consultations with FAO officials on long-range WFD planning; joint meetings with Canadian NGOs and Agriculture Canada; initial meetings with pan-Asian and pan-African NGOs on planning and information exchange; meetings with the Organization of American States on a right-to-food symposium (to be considered in 1984); participation with other NGOs on meeting of World Food Council and subsequent mailing; cooperation with PAHO and health NGOs on links between WFD and World Health Day; reprinting and broader distribution of FAO and FAO/UNESCO appeals to religious and education leaders; visits to the secretariat by NGOs from Israel, France and United Kingdom; mail inquiries from many other countries.

Directions/Goals/Materials for '84:

Adaptation of new FAO school materials for U.S. use in consultation with national committee education groups;

Distribution of planned FAO paper on 10th anniversary of the World Food Conference and other FAO materials;

Closer cooperation with Canada and Mexico WFD committees.

MEDIA IMPACT

Growth: Although impossible to measure precisely, it is clear that media penetration was substantially higher in 1983 than 1982, both print and electronic, especially at local and regional levels.

Examples: ABC 7 o'clock evening news coverage; widespread newspaper coverage of White House ceremony (photo in Washington Post); nationwide pick-up of Secretary Block TV/radio PSAs through USDA network; print PSA with cartoon figure "Ziggy" running full page in *Time, U.S. News & World Report, People* and *Farm Journal;* Religious News Service feature; several editorial page cartoons on world hunger; major increase in coverage in NGO publications reaching millions of readers.

Secretariat Activities: "How-to" media guide sent to community organizers; two press releases (March and October) issued by national office; appeal for support issued through National Association of Editorial Cartoonists; request to author of "Ziggy" cartoon for use in PSAs; mailing of 500 WFD "TV identification slides" and 50 radio PSA messages by Ambassador Fenwick (both of these paid for by the National Agricultural Chemical Association); numerous radio and press interviews by national coordinator (including 5-minute taped interview with AP radio going to 1,500 stations).

Directions/Goals/Materials for '84:

Development of a press kit including feature material on World Food Conference review;

Greater use of legislators and experts/consultants for radio/TV interviews;

Exploration of documentary on food/hunger issues for television.

NATIONAL OFFICE VOLUNTEER STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

The national WFD office is staffed entirely by volunteers. The national office is open year-around, and the national coordinator is assisted during the summer by interns and throughout the year by other volunteers as needed.

The following persons worked in 1983: Jonathan Barton, Mary Beth Bologna, Carolyn Dunckel, Amy Manela, Allen Raymond, Brooks Robinson, Kathryn Sessions, Alison Toni, Ken Weil and Sarah Youd.

Amy Manela served again as a volunteer public relations consultant. Brooks Robinson had primary responsibility for a new edition of the WFD Directory, Sarah Youd began outreach to towns of 25-50,000 and others assisted with the general work of the office and in assembling special mailings.

In addition to this invaluable and much appreciated assistance, the FAO staff continued to provide back-up services in maintaining print inventories and mail processing.

Further, the secretariat was greatly assisted in 1983 by special donations of art—Tom Wilson, creator of the "Ziggy" cartoon used in our PSA and Dick Ehst as PSA art designer; a work from the estate of the artist DeGrazia used in our post-WFD mailing to organizers, a poster drawing by artist Ted Egri, used in our church bulletin cover series and adopted by the Canadian WFD committee for use in all of their materials, and a woodcut entitled "Harvest the Wheat" by artist Mary Azarian and also used in our church bulletin cover series. Several new songs for use in the WFD songbook were donated by Avery and Marsh, Jules Rotella, Ray Repp, Mary Lou Walker and the Community of New Zoin.

SPECIAL '84 PROGRAM OPPORTUNITIES

10th Anniversary of World Food Conference: The secretariat, which in 1983 distributed a special paper for colleges and universities on "town-grown" cooperation, plans a major effort this year in cooperation with FAO and interested U.S. government and non-governmental groups to encourage university and community symposia to review the goals of the 1974 World Food Conference and what more needs to be done to attain them. WFD observances were held in '83 on more than 1,000 college campuses, and it is hoped that this support can be increased and focused on the World Food Conference review through preparation of special study papers.

Election Year Political Forum: Since WFD began members of congress have received a great many invitations to speak at observances. It is to be expected that there will be an expansion of this public debate and political interplay in the election year to come, especially with the timeliness of WFD on October 16. Secretariat materials will encourage both sides—urging community groups to extend invitations and develop appropriate forums to discuss food-farm-trade issues, while also urging elected officials and candidates to participate. The secretariat will also work with national committee members to publicize and promote election-year activities surrounding national and world food issues.

Mayors and Urban Food Policy: In a program that gathered momentum in '83, the secretariat will continue to build its contacts with mayors and WFD coalitions to develop urban food policies and local-global connections. It will cooperate with the U.S. Conference of Mayors in the development of that organization's proposed design for six urban food policy models and will also work with individual mayors and consultants along these same lines. The secretariat has a packet of materials and is working to acquire further ideas and materials in this area.

K-21 School Materials: The secretariat will continue to expand contacts with state and local school authorities for introduction of world food and hunger curricular materials, building on the enormous increase in receptivity of materials in 1983. New materials will be developed for distribution to school systems and individual teachers, working with FAO and national committee members in the education field. We also hope to begin international exchange of curricular materials.

SOME FINAL THOUGHTS FOR SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS

The more WFD is used the more useful it becomes is not only true for local communities; it is even more true for national committee members. The WFD core mailing list of community contacts provides direct access to hunger activists across our country—individuals and groups that are eager for new resources for their efforts to end hunger, for information about organizations working on the problems, for contacts with experts in various disciplines. The WFD promotion flyers which we mail for members are one way for you to introduce yourself and your wares to this most receptive audience. One of our member groups sent out a flyer on a new print resource and received requests and inquiries from 31 states.

But there are other no-cost or low-cost ways for you to use WFD and to help the national campaign at the same time.

Staff Awareness: Everyone on your staff from the person who answers the telephone or opens the mail to your officers and board should know that you are a member of the WFD national committee and believe in its goals. Hold a staff meeting or send a staff memo about your involvement.

Member Awareness: Your membership wants to know that your name on the letterhead signifies programmatic involvement. Do a special mailing or put an article or editorial in your next newsletter or magazine explaining why your organization supports WFD.

Public Awareness: Persons other than your own direct constituents want to know what your name on the letterhead means—want to know more about you—would be interested in being introduced to your resources. Consider a flyer for one of our mailings or talk to us about a special print resource that our office can use for targeted mailings.

National Office Support: We need your help in at least three ways.

First—advice and counsel—a chance to talk to you about the way WFD works and can work for you.

Second—complete information in this office about you—samples of your materials, inclusion on your mailing list so we know regularly what you are doing and can share this information and so we can build a reference library for use by the committee, the public and researchers in the field.

Third—financial support—no matter how little—as evidence to foundations and other funding sources that our members believe in WFD—and because the work we do for you and your members costs money.

One final note: the FAO office is moving in March, and we will be moving with it. The new address will be 1001 22nd Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20437. We will announce this to our general mailing list in our first mailing in 1984, but it will be a great help if you would "spread the word" as well.

H.J. RES. 556

Whereas hunger and chronic malnutrition remain daily facts of life for hundreds of millions of people throughout the world;

Whereas the children of the world suffer the most serious effects of hunger and malnutrition, with millions of children dying each year from hunger-related illness and disease, and many others suffering permanent physical or mental impairment, including blindness, because of vitamin and protein deficiencies;

Whereas Congress is particularly concerned by the rise of hunger, recurring natural catastrophes, and inadequate food production now affecting a large number of African countries and the need for an appropriate United States response to emergency and long-term food needs of that continent;

Whereas although progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and malnutrition in the United States, certain groups, notably Native Americans, migrant workers, the elderly, and children, remain vulnerable to malnutrition and related diseases;

Whereas the danger posed by malnutrition and related diseases to these groups and to other people is intensified by unemployment and slow rates of economic growth;

Whereas national policies concerning food, farmland, and nutrition require continuing evaluation and should consider and strive for the well-being and protection of all residents of the United States and particularly those most at health risk;

Whereas there is widespread concern that the use and conservation of land and water resources required for food production throughout the United States ensure care for the national patrimony we bequeath to future generations;

Whereas the United States has always supported the principle that the health of a nation depends on a strong agriculture based on private enterprise and the primacy of the independent family farm;

Whereas the United States, as the world's largest producer and trader of food, has a key role to play in efforts to assist nations and people to improve their ability to feed themselves;

Whereas the United States has a long tradition of demonstrating its humanitarian concern for helping the hungry and malnourished;

Whereas efforts to resolve the world hunger problem are critical to the security of the United States and the international community;

Whereas Congress is acutely aware of the paradox of immense farm surpluses and rising farm foreclosures in the United States despite the desperate need for food by hundreds of millions of people around the world;

Whereas a key recommendation of the 1980 report of the Presidential Commission on World Hunger was that efforts be undertaken to increase public awareness of the world hunger problem;

Whereas the member nations of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations designated October 16 of each year as World Food Day because of the need to alert the public to the increasingly dangerous world food situation;

Whereas past observances of World Food Day have been supported by proclamations of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States, by resolutions of Congress, by Presidential proclamations, by programs of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Government departments and agencies, and by the governments and peoples of many other nations; and

Whereas more than three hundred private and voluntary organizations and many thousands of community leaders are participating in the planning of World Food Day observances this year. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 16, 1984, is hereby proclaimed "World Food Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate activities to explore ways in which our Nation can further contribute to the elimination of hunger in the world.●

CONDEMNING THE USE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS BY IRAQ—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 292

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, 69 years ago this week, French soldiers manning the soggy trenches in a Belgian field struggled for life as they were immersed in a slow-moving yellowish cloud rolling forward from German territory. Confusion gave way to terror as unsuspecting soldiers in the Flanders field became victims of the first documented use of chemical warfare agents on the battlefield. Before World War I was over, more than 1.3 million soldiers were poisoned by chlorine and mustard gas, and almost 100,000 died as a result of their exposure.

The terror and suffering produced by chemical weapons during the First World War prompted the drafting of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. Claiming that use of toxic gases and poisoning agents ran counter to international law and human decency, the protocol sought to create an alliance of nations dedicated to elimination of these weapons through renouncing the first use of chemical agents.

The subsequent 59 years of the protocol have not been without violations of the treaty. However, the Geneva Protocol on chemical weapons has contributed to a worldwide spirit of revulsion over the prospects of any nation using poison gas or nerve agents to achieve its ends on the battlefield. More than 100 nations have adhered to the principles of the Protocol and refused to use chemical agents in combat, regardless of the military situation.

Now Iraq, a signatory to the Geneva Protocol for over 50 years, is openly and blatantly violating the international covenant. A team of U.N. investigators has demonstrated, far beyond any reasonable doubt, that mustard gas and nerve agents have been used against Iranian forces in the continuing war between Iran and Iraq. The U.N. diagnosis has been confirmed by medical experts who have examined and treated fallen Iranian soldiers. While lamely protesting the charges leveled by an outraged world community, Iraq simultaneously vows to use

any means at its disposal to resist attacks against its borders.

The violation of the treaty banning the use of chemical weapons goes far beyond the pain and suffering inflicted in the deserts of the Middle East. It strikes at the very heart of international law and conscience, undermining the rational attempts of nations to maintain a semblance of decency and integrity in international negotiations. When treaties are adhered to only when it is deemed convenient, then the safety and security of the world is imperiled to a degree seldom witnessed by mankind. Once a treaty based on mutual respect and trust is violated, the door swings open for repeated violations by those nations eager to exploit the weaknesses of pacts centered on the human conscience, rather than military might.

Our Government has already taken steps to interrupt the flow of base materials to Iraq that might be utilized in the production of chemical warfare agents. Negotiations are now underway to produce a substantive ban on chemical weapons through the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. As we pursue these actions designed to produce positive developments in the near future, however, it is vitally important for our Nation to raise its voice against the present transgressions committed by the Government of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 292, which condemns the Iraqi use of chemical weapons as a contravention of international law and the practices of civilized nations. This resolution also condemns the Iranian utilization of "human waves" of young soldiers as sacrificial cannon fodder in the Iran-Iraq war. I urge my colleagues to send a firm message of condemnation to those nations of the world that would gladly embrace barbaric acts, rather than negotiate a peaceful resolution of their problems.●

COUNCIL ON HEMISPHERIC AFFAIRS HUMAN RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA 1983

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent publication of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs—COHA—Human Rights in Latin America 1983. My staff and I have utilized this most useful document in evaluating events in the Caribbean and Central and South America. It has been most beneficial and I would urge my colleagues to study this document when consideration is given to events in the Western Hemisphere.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on Haitian Refugees, I have been most interested in the section that concerns itself with Haiti. I enclose that section as an example of the fine work of COHA as evidenced in the publication Human Rights in Latin America 1983.

HAITI

Despite nominal movement toward democracy in 1983, Haiti remained the fiefdom of the Duvalier family and its cronies, with little evidence of any improvement in the country's bleak human rights record or prospects for future change.

Responding to international pressure, President-for-Life Jean Claude Duvalier conducted the first municipal elections in Haiti in over 25 years between April and August of 1983. Despite this modest move—riddled with irregularities—Duvalier dissolved the legislative assembly in late August and introduced a new constitution that confirms his life-tenure and right to appoint a successor.

Both internal and external forces pressed Duvalier to improve the human rights situation and to stage a true democratic opening—with little success. The Haitian Christian Democratic Party, a number of religious bodies, the U.S. Congress and Pope John Paul II (who visited the island in March), all sharply criticized the harsh practices of the Duvalier regime. But this criticism appeared to have little impact, despite Reagan administration claims to the contrary. The U.S., in fact, increased the level of its foreign assistance to Haiti in 1983, seeming to offer a "carrot" without the much-needed "stick."

The results of the series of municipal elections held across Haiti were mixed. In Cap Haitien, the country's second largest city, and in the southern regional center of Les Cayes, non-government candidates won by significant margins. Mr. Wilson Borgella, a popular hotel owner of Cap Haitien, which has a long history of political independence from the capital, defeated the incumbent mayor. However, in other municipalities, including Jacmel and Port-de-Paix, elections were marred by ballot-stuffing and other serious irregularities.

In the year's most crucial contest, held in the capital, Port-au-Prince, the election was virtually nullified by government intervention. Three members of the banned Haitian Christian Democratic Party and a lawyer from the private Haitian Human Rights League, Mr. Jean Claude Baptiste, were rounded up and detained. The move complemented actions against the Christian Democrats earlier in the year, many of whom were forced into exile after spending months either in hiding or under house arrest. As a result, the Duvalier palace's favorite, Mr. Frank Romain, who earned his tough guy image as a brutal thug under Francois "Papa Doc" Duvalier, was returned to office as mayor with 90 percent of the vote. Christian Democrat Sylvio Claude was re-arrested two months after the August elections, and then released again on December 28.

In neighboring Petionville, the very popular incumbent mayor declined to run once the local "Tonton Macoute", or secret police, chief announced his candidacy.

Voter interest and participation varied widely, with the highest percentage turnout in Cap Haitien. In Port-au-Prince, the electorate seemed indifferent to the election, as most perceived the result to be predetermined and inevitable.

Across the country, local officials responsible for administering the elections were hampered by their inexperience in voter registration and procedures. Voters often used open, color-coded ballots to cast votes, a practice that Haitian officials claimed was needed due to Haiti's high illiteracy rate. There were few reports of overt intimidation of voters or outbreaks of violence at the polls. Most fundamentally, however, the municipal elections boiled down to little more than popularity contests between different "cartels" of candidates. The Duvalier government squelched any efforts to organize political parties, and no criticism of the palace and its policies was heard.

The Pope's visit on March 9 was a landmark event in the nation's recent history. The Pontiff spoke out forcefully against the "misery, hunger and fear" so pervasive in Haiti. (With an annual per capita income of $260 a year, Haiti is the poorest nation in the Western Hemisphere.) Pope John Paul II also declared that "the Church has a prophetic mission in this field inseparable from its religious mission, and it demands the right to carry it out."

To a broad spectrum of Haitians, Catholic, Protestant and Evangelist alike, the Pope's words struck a chord and made clear the Church's commitment to seek improvements in human rights and socio-economic conditions. The papal discourse was also viewed as reinforcing the efforts of the Haitian clergy in its vigorous support of social justice.

Earlier in 1983, the clergy successfully flexed its political muscle to secure the freedom of Mr. Gerard Duclerville, a Catholic lay worker who hosted a popular religious radio program. Arrested in December 1982, Duclerville was held incommunicado and without charges for several weeks, during which time he was severely beaten. Only when six of Haiti's bishops and representatives of religious orders aired a statement denouncing Duclerville's imprisonment was the church activist freed on February 7, 1983. The unprecedented letter, which was read in most of Haiti's Catholic churches in late January, warned that "Today it is Gerard and all those whose names we don't know; tomorrow it is us, it is you, it is me, it is another. Where a man is debased and tortured, all of humanity is debased and tortured." Duclerville's release presumably came about because the Duvalier regime did not want to risk putting the Pope's upcoming visit in jeopardy, a visit which it hoped would bolster the President-for-Life's stature both domestically and abroad.

Expectations of a major political struggle between church and state were raised briefly following the Pope's visit, when Mr. Ernest Bennett, the powerful father-in-law of President Duvalier, published a series of harshly worded broadsides in the official government paper, denouncing some Haitian clerics as communist agitators intent on fomenting a Central American-style revolution in Haiti. However, the confrontation never materialized, and the Church's voice was somewhat more subdued through the rest of the year.

The Reagan administration has taken a considerably more upbeat approach toward the Duvalier government than did the Vatican. In January, former Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Enders issued a statement during his visit to Port-au-Prince hailing the Haitian government's "positive steps" to-

wards democratic rule, including its decision to hold municipal elections and the formation of a government-sponsored human rights commission. U.S. aid to Haiti reached its highest level ever in FY 1983, topping the $45 million mark, in addition to $10 million in supplemental CBI funds. Despite the U.S. administration's enthusiasm over what it portrayed as significant progress toward democratization in Haiti, congressional critics see the Duvalier regime's actions as more shadow than substance. A continuing resolution in November authorized $34 million in economic assistance to Haiti, but made it conditional on progress towards greater democracy and observance of human rights. Next March, President Reagan will be called upon to certify Haiti's observance of these conditions.

The Duvalier government's November 1983 announcement of legislative assembly elections in February 1984 seemed calculated in part to assuage congressional critics of Haiti's domestic policies. In all likelihood, the upcoming vote will not alter the overriding political realities of Haiti under Jean Claude Duvalier: the prohibition of organized political activity and the formation of parties; bullying of the largely impotent Haitian media; and arbitrary arrests, beatings, and, occasionally, torture. If the 1983 elections are any indication, Duvalier's authoritarian rule seems secure.●

IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my full support to this week's observances of the Holocaust, and especially to acknowledge yesterday's groundbreaking of the new Holocaust Memorial.

This year marks the 41st anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, when a handful of Jewish men, women, and children fought Hitler's SS to a standstill. There are few examples in the history of mankind that we can look back to and feel such a mixture of inspiration, hope and courage. The uprising had all of these. Sadly, it was also an act of desperation when all expectations of deliverance from the Nazi genocide had faded.

Mr. Speaker, the Holocaust was a time when the most advanced technology of the time was used to murder millions of people. Six million Jews, and an estimated 6 to 10 million Slavs, Gypsies, Christian Democrats, Socialists, and others were systematically killed by the Nazis. We decry the use of gas in the Iran-Iraq war, as though this is the first instance of its use since World War I. And yet, gas warfare was waged against helpless civilians during World War II.

Let us not deceive ourselves. History has shown that we tend to use the technology at hand, an unsettling prospect when we consider that the means to construct nuclear weapons is now spreading to the Third World.

We must never forget the Holocaust, Mr. Speaker. And we must understand that genocide can and will happen again if we allow it to happen. We are entrusted with treating humanity humanely, and cannot turn our backs as we did in 1933.●

AMERICKE LISTY

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House of Representatives has, at one time or another, taken to this floor to talk about a group of people in his or her district who exemplify much good about America—people who make an extra effort to help improve the status of their fellow man, either in this country or abroad.

We in the Sixth District of New Jersey are proud to have many such people resident there. But, today, I would like to call to your attention to the efforts made on behalf of the Czechoslovak people and of a great and historic event which is coming up.

"Americke' Listy," which is translated to mean "American Letters" is published in Perth Amboy, N.J. This fine tabloid newspaper brings to Czechoslovak-Americans news of the latest events happening in Czechoslovakia.

It details the activities of Czechoslovakian activists and dissidents—persons who have continued to resist the domination of this great and good people by a Communist dictatorship which refuses to acknowledge their culture, their traditions and, perhaps saddest of all, their hopes and dreams.

On October 24 of this year, "Americke' Listy" will celebrate its 110th anniversary of publication. Begun in 1874, it was originally known as "New Yorske' Listy," a fledgling publication designed for the then-small number of persons from Czechoslovakia who had sought a home in our great country.

Over the years, "Americke' Listy" has grown as the Czechoslovakian population in this country has grown. In 1960, they moved from their previous home in New York to their present location in Perth Amboy.

Today, this fine publication is widely read in the Czechoslovak-American community but, more than that, it is carried to Prague in diplomatic pouches where it is available in the U.S. Embassy Library, representing one of the few visions of light to people in an otherwise darkened environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly privileged to have such a fine publication produced in my district. But I would be remiss if I did not say a few words about Frank Svehla, the publisher of "Americke' Listy."

Frank Svehla has given unselfishly of his heart and his mind to the commendable effort of exposing the situation in Czechoslovakia. He is a tireless worker, dedicated to the truth and dedicated to freedom. It wounds him deeply to see his native Czechoslovakia in the repressed state which it is today.

But unlike many people, Frank Svehla is determined to do something about it. Day in and day out, he makes his contribution through the only weapon he has—the pen. He is a credit to Czechoslovakia and a credit to America.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that each of us is dedicated to the many ideals which make America what it is today. But, as we approach the 110th anniversary of "Americke' Listy," it would do each of us well to reflect on the struggle of the Czechoslovakian people—and the care and concern of Czechoslovak-Americans like Frank Svehla—and be grateful for all that we have, while rededicating our commitment to support freedom and democracy anywhere in the world that it is denied.●

AMERICAN INDUSTRY PULLING AHEAD

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, in the ongoing debate over the future course of American industry, there has been a tendency to dwell on our weaknesses—adversarial relations between labor and management, a failure to foresee technical change or emerging foreign competition, and a seeming inability to bring coherence to a hodgepodge of governmental programs and incentives. But in the battle for the industrial future, America's pioneering spirit continues to be a major asset.

In a recent article, "In this New Age of Entrepreneurs, We're Number One Again," Joel Kotkin details the continuing strength of the Silicon Valleys that have grown up in many parts of the country. Mr. Kotkin suggests that the United States will gain ground relative to both Japan and Europe in the growing market for complex memory chips and customized chips of all kinds—what may be a $100 billion market by the end of the decade.

While a number of American analysts still point to Japan's MITI as the model for an American approach to industrial policy, MITI has shifted its own gaze to the American entrepreneur. The Japanese have a proven talent for targeting well-known technologies and achieving high quality,

low-cost mass production of even such complex products as random access memory chips. That will not, however, assure them of success in the rapidly changing technologies of the future. In fact, both the Europeans and the Japanese are attempting to emulate the entrepreneurial successes of the United States in everything from the creation of new over-the-counter stock markets to actually luring American venture capitalists overseas.

The lessons of Silicon Valley should not be misread. They do not suggest that the government has no role to play. Government at all levels has an enormous impact on whether or not capital is available for investment at reasonable interest rates, the quantity and quality of research that is carried out, and the type of work force that enters the job market. It does suggest, however, that it is not time to move toward a centralized MITI-like structure just as the Japanese are being forced to move in the opposite direction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the Kotkin article at this point in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1984]

IN THIS NEW AGE OF ENTREPRENEURS, WE'RE NUMBER ONE AGAIN

(By Joel Kotkin)

At the very time that "industrial policy" has become the rage among many of our professors and policy makers searching for ways to salvage America's place in the world economy, their role models abroad are looking enviously at what the Japanese call "the Silicon Valley way."

On this side of the ocean, the chorus of industrial-policy advocates argue that America should take its cue from Japan, where government plays an active role in deciding which industries to nurture and promote with financing, subsidies, retraining and protection from foreign competition.

Yet European and Asian business and government leaders, increasingly impressed by the vitality of a U.S. economy that has enjoyed higher growth rates over the past 18 months than any other major industrial nation, are looking towards America's dynamic, if somewhat chaotic, entrepreneurial economy as their role model for the future.

"Coordination is all right if you're building a steel and car industry on the model of other people. But now we're in an era of rapid change, of integrated circuits and microprocessors," observes Jiro Tokuyama, dean of Tokyo's Nomura School of Advanced Management and a longtime confidant of Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone. "I don't think our large organizations can move quickly enough to make the changes. We must find our model among the entrepreneurs like (those) in your Silicon Valley."

Of course, innovating in the field of high technology and managing the decline of old, smokestack industries are not the same. But where the growth industries of the future are concerned, U.S. entrepreneurism is the world's model.

Enthusiasm for "the Silicon Valley way" is based largely on the remarkable performance of the young, entrepreneurial U.S. companies, particularly in such burgeoning industries as microelectronics, telecommunications and biotechnology. Due in part to the innovate and competitive spark provided by these upstart firms, America between 1977 and 1981 doubled its trade surplus in these technology-based industries.

To meet the challenge posed by America's entrepreneurs, Tokuyama and other influential foreigners are urging their governments to move away from the industrial policy which served them well in the past. Even the elite bureaucrats at Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI)—often cited by American enthusiasts of industrial policy as the ultimate model for a planning agency—now advocate wide-scale deregulation of the economy and devote considerable resources to promoting small start-up companies known in Japan as "venture businesses."

In addition, the Ministry of Finance, long a bastion of bureaucratic controls, recently fostered the opening up of Japan's traditionally conservative equity markets, including the development of a special, small-issues market consciously modeled on the U.S. "over-the-counter" stock exchange which has played such a key role in the financing of such American entrepreneurial companies as Apple Computers, Federal Express and Tandem.

"Nothing happens in Japan unless there's a crisis and we feel there's a crisis now in our industries," remarks Hiroshi Kato, a 29-year veteran of MITI who is now an adviser to Yamaichi Securities, one of Japan's leading investment banks. "Our talent is queued up in the big bureaucracies of the giant companies.

"Their talents are being wasted. They must be forced to become more independent. Being an entrepreneur in Japan must become more respected, like it is in America, if we wish to compete in the future."

Computer chips—"the crude oil of the '80s," as one American industrialist describes them—aptly reflect the Japanese dilemma. Beginning in the late 1970s, Japan became a formidable competitor in this area, reducing the American share of the world market to 53 percent last year.

There was talk that the small, entrepreneurial U.S. companies which had provided many of the early breakthroughs in silicon computer chip technology (and which gave the Silicon Valley its name) were in serious jeopardy.

But now U.S. firms have staked out commanding leads in new chip technologies which promise to constitute the key growth sectors of the future.

For instance, they hold an almost complete monopoly on the future generation of large, complex memory devices known as EPROMs and EEPROMs, which are used to store the programs for microcomputers. The advantages of these devices is that they are erasable, and therefore allow the programs recorded on them to be modified. This feature, for example, allows a user to easily change the function of a robot on an assembly line. The market for these chips is expected to nearly double annually in coming years—a growth rate five times the industry average.

Another U.S.-dominated growth area is in customized or semicustomized computer chips, the specialized devices that serve as the brains, or controls, in thousands of pieces of equipment, from the most advanced scientific instruments to systems that control the energy consumption and fire detection for an entire building complex. In this market, American firms now hold a commanding 2-to-1 lead over the Japanese. As little as 5 percent of the world computer chip market in 1981, these chips could account for most of the projected $100 billion chip market (up from $25 billion today) by decade's end.

Although the Japanese can be expected to challenge the American hegemony in custom chips, as they did earlier in RAMs (random-access memories), their prospects for success seem sharply less promising.

In producing RAMs, Japan could exploit its advantages: its skills at mass producing a single, high-volume product while holding down price and achieving high quality.

But custom or semicustomized chips allow U.S. companies to exploit their advantages: marketing and management flexibility and superior technology. These highly complex devices, which have to be specially tailored to the job they perform, are frequently sold in small batches to makers of expensive and complex products. Success in custom chips has far less to do with price and much more with technology and design—traditional American strengths.

Bolstered by a series of alliances with larger (and less technologically dynamic) European and American companies, and backed by the now $3 billion American venture-capital industry, over 30 new computer chip firms have started operation since the late 1970s. In the new and fast-paced chip markets of the 1980s, these "start-ups" enjoy clear advantages over their larger competitors both at home and in Japan.

Concentrating only on particular market niches, usually in new and rapidly expanding fields, these firms are not slowed down by the bureaucratic inertia of giant, diversified corporations. Also, facing big risks but also the hope of huge profits, they are driven by a sense of "existential challenge" rarely found in the corridors of giant companies.

Thus the changes sweeping the chip world have lured back some who once conceded the industry to the Japanese. In the late 1970s, L. J. Sevin looked on with horror as his Dallas-based Mostek computer chip firm was almost annihilated by the Japanese RAM blitzkrieg. But today, "the game has changed suddenly," claims Sevin, who now chairs Cypress Semiconductor, a Silicon Valley-based chip firm. "The technologies are exploding and driving the markets here. When it was a question of selling chips by the bagful, it was playing to their [Japan's] strength. Now that there are so many new niches, it's becoming a marketing game and that gives the smaller U.S. firms the advantage."

These changes are also likely to work against the targeting strategies which played a major role in Japan's previous industrial triumphs, observes Michael Borrus of the University of California's highly regarded Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy. Borrus states it succinctly: "You can't target a moving target."

Under current circumstances, it is unlikely that Japan will produce anything like the explosion of start-ups now revitalizing the American computer-chip industry. Takeshi Ogata, manager of the industrial electronics division of the giant C. Itoh trading company, and Dr. Atsuyoshi Ouchi, senior executive vice president of NEC Corp, believe the big-business bias of Japan's large financial institutions will prevent start-ups from garnering the $20 to $50 million needed to start a new chip firm.

Equally important, the much ballyhood Japanese "corporate culture," with its ethos

of lifetime loyalty to the company and its worship of bigness, makes it virtually impossible for a start-up to attract the necessary talented technicians and managers.

"It would be very difficult even for me to start a [semiconductor] firm here," Ouchi, one of Japan's preeminent electonics industry figures, admits. "Now, if I were young and spoke better English maybe I would go to California and try it."

As long as Japan's computer chip industry remains the exclusive province of the giants, observers such as Ogata fear Japan will continue to lag behind more competition-minded American companies in the development of new technologies. Despite all the hysteria associated with such projects as the "fifth-generation" computer, many Japanese fear that the technological gap between the two nations has been widening in recent years. Indeed, a 1980 survey of 200 top Japanese managers involved in technical innovation at major companies found 73 percent convinced that their nation lagged behind the U.S. in revolutionary new technologies.

"I am sorry to say that in the leading-edge technologies, there is a continuing advantage for the States," say Ogata. "Our social environment, the personality and character of our people and institutions is to constantly improve on a process, say from the 16K RAM to 64K RAM to 256K RAM. But to develop a whole new technology, to get on the leading edge, you have to look to the American firms. It's a cultural thing."

Eager to break down these "cultural" constraints, many younger Japanese are adopting "the Silicon Valley way" as their own business creed. To them, the idea of young Americans in their 20s, such as Apple Computer's Steve Jobs and Microsoft's Bill Gates, building giant companies based on their technological vision contrasts favorably with the situation in Japan, where a seniority-oriented system relegates most executives to relatively minor positions well into their 40s.

During the 1970s, for instance, the number of male college graduates wanting to change companies during their careers—almost unthinkable in traditional Japan—doubled to nearly 20 percent. Those interested in going out on their own jumped to nearly one-third.

To many of this generation, "the Silicon Valley way" expresses more than a path to success: it reflects a new, free-wheeling, democratic approach to capitalism, expressed by such things as the widespread ownership of equity by workers and a relative dearth of hierarchical corporate structure.

"When I first came to America, I was shocked to see a company president wearing jeans and having his feet on the desk," recalls Shigenobu Nagamori, the 39-year-old founder of Nippon Densan, a fast-growing Kyoto-based firm which last year sold $35 million worth of small motors used in such products as high-speed cassette recorders and computer disc drives. "To have workers call you by your first name would be unthinkable in Kyoto. But I liked it very much."

Today, companies like Nagamori's one-third of which is owned by its employees, are injecting this new democratic spirit into a hierarchical business culture where owners are frequently viewed as quasi-deities with unchallenged rights to the sweat and intelligence of their workers. The American model is also captivating the new entrepreneurs in other Asian nations such as Korea, Taiwan and Singapore.

"Asian societies are at a turning point," observes Yasunobu Nagura, an Osaka-based small-business consultant to over 500 companies both in Japan and Taiwan. "There is a new spirit, a willingness to try new things. We are becoming Americanized."

Like their Asian counterparts, Europeans are also undergoing Americanization. Aware that their economies have actually lost jobs over the past decade—while the United States created a remarkable 20 million new jobs, mostly in small- and mid-sized companies—European leaders are beginning to question the efficacy of "industrial policy" over the free-wheeling U.S. system.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the United Kingdom, birthplace of the first industrial revolution. Under the government of Margaret Thatcher, tax incentives for investment in small, entrepreneurial companies have lured such American-based venture capitalists as Jean Deleage, Peter Brooke and Brian Haslett into what has long been considered the stodgiest of industrial cultures.

"I learned the trade in the United States—a way of doing business that was quite different than traditional in Britain," observes Haslett, who now shuttles between London and Boston serving as a consultant to venture capitalists on both sides of the Atlantic. "There's not been very close contact between the City of London [the financial district] and the dirty-fingernail guys. They didn't talk to each other. What I learned in America was that a venture capitalist can have a positive professional relationship with the entrepreneurs where the class thing—the void—doesn't get in the way."

Due in part to the efforts of Haslett and other venture capitalists, Britain is slowly emerging from its established role as the proverbial sick man of the European Community. Indeed, with the emergence of such entrepreneurial firms as Sinclair Research, a leading maker of computers as cheap as $30, and Kleentech International, an engineering services firm, Britain astoundingly is now even regarded by other Europeans as "something of a role model," according to Bank of Paris analyst Phillipe Sahut D'Izarn.

Fundamentally, D'Izarn's comment represents something more of an indictment of the continent's sloth than a reflection of the grandeur of Britain's still-modest resurgence. Although American "industrial policy" advocate Robert Riech praises the "sophisticated tools for industrial policy-making" used in France and West Germany, all the elite planning institutions and "targeted" investment to promising new industries have succeeded in doing so far is to turn those nations into technological backwaters.

Indeed, with the exception of Nixdorf Computers, Germany seems to have slept through the entire microelectronics revolution, despite millions spent on government aid to research. Nor has France, despite its well-deserved reputation for superb engineering, done much better. IBM continues to dominate Europe's computer industry, dwarfing its nearest European competitor by nearly 4 to 1. Untroubled by local Apple-style upstarts, Big Blue faces no sizeable European competition in such growth fields as personal computers.

Searching for the reasons behind their disappointing perfomance and prospects, a growing number of Europeans point to the very sort of corporate-government partnership which so excites the imaginations of American advocates of "industrial policy."

"Even before [French President Francois] Mitterrand, our government was 'helping' private industry far too much," says D'Izarn, who served in the powerful Ministry of Industry during the conservative regime of Valery Giscard d'Estaing. "We missed the mini, then the micro, in part because our government wanted to have mainframes like IBM. Our policies directed huge amounts of money to our large electronics firms which didn't have the innovative spark we needed."

So pervasive has this analysis become that even France's socialist government has placed greater emphasis on entrepreneurism—as evidenced by Mitterrand's recent pilgrimage to Silicon Valley—than its more conservative predecessors. At first determined to turn France into "the Japan of the West," the Mitterrand regime now seems to be following a play book composed in San Jose rather than Tokyo.

Over the past year, the socialist regime has developed major encouragements for young entrepreneurial firms, including an over-the-counter stock market and a three-year tax holiday for start-up firms. Prodded by the government, venture capital investments have doubled to $37.5 million during the last three years.

"We know perfectly well that the growth we want depends on the entrepreneurial spirit," concedes Bernard Attali, a leading socialist intellectual, government official and adviser to President Mitterrand. "Only entrepreneurs create jobs and new opportunities. The world is changing and we are all entering an era of profound decentralization and the entrepreneur. We are now interested in helping people go out there and help themselves."

"We are seeing a new mentality among the people 30 to 35," observes Jean Fonteneau of Soffinova, the French government's venture-capital fund. "They realize that the job situation is no good, that the bureaucracy at companies like Thomson [an electronics giant nationalized in 1981] or the government isn't the safe haven it used to be. People are getting more into building their own companies and making profits like in the States."

Yet despite these changes, the French and Japanese, as well as other foreigners, will no doubt face a tough time in trying to emulate "the Silicon Valley way." Despite the rhetoric, America's recent entrepreneurial explosion was not detonated by Ronald Reagan's speeches or supply-side policies. The path leading from the robber barons and Andrew Carnegie to Steve Jobs and Steve Wozniak founding Apple Computers in a California garage represents the continuity of a unique history, people and culture.

Constantly replenished by both foreign immigrants and the development of new regions, America's entrepreneurial spirit remains the one irreducible competitive edge that this nation possesses over all others. It should not be squandered at the altar of an ill-considered "industrial policy."

"It's incredible that some Americans are going to heavy state planning when I'm being asked to go to Europe to help them disband theirs," remarks Boston venture capitalist Peter Brooke, who has also been summoned to Japan to spark entrepreneurial growth. "We shouldn't follow their mistakes. Hell, we're the ones with the answers."●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE EDWIN R. EVERITT OF CLIFTON, N.J., OUTSTANDING CITIZEN, COMMUNITY LEADER, AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 15, residents of the county of Passaic, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to an outstanding citizen, community leader and good friend, the Honorable Edwin R. Everitt of Clifton, N.J.—whose 40 years of exemplary service with the Passaic County Surrogate's Court in Paterson, N.J., will provide an opportunity for his colleagues and many, many friends to express tribute to his lifetime of good works. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greeetings and felicitations to him and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife Dorothy, and their children, Pam Bradley and Marjorie Everitt, on this joyous occasion in recognition of his professional expertise in his career pursuits, the warmth of his friendship, and his standards of excellence in our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of great personal dedication and always working to the peak of one's ability with sincerity of purpose and determination is the success of the opportunity of America. Ed Everitt is an outstanding individual who throughout his lifetime has earned the respect and esteem of all of us who have had the good fortune to know him. As each one of us stands up in tribute to Special Deputy Surrogate Edwin R. Everitt and his four decades with the Law Enforcement and Judiciary Branch of the County of Passaic for the administration of justice in a court of law having jurisdiction over the probate of wills and the settlement of estates, we are indeed proud to have had him on the team. He has played an important role in the achievement of Government in his chosen field of endeavor.

Ed joined the surrogate's office May 13, 1944 and has served as chief clerk in the surrogate's court since July 1963.

Mr. Speaker, professionals like Ed Everitt serve as the bulwark of strength in the day-by-day challenges of government in meeting the needs of our people. For a job well done, there is no doubt that he has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. He also served our people and our country with distinction on active duty with the United States Army during the Korean conflict, November 1950 to November 1952.

Over the years he has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community-improvement programs. He was also an officer with the Passaic County Employees Credit Union for approximately a quarter of a century.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of our way of life here in America and I am pleased to call your attention to Ed Everitt's lifetime of outstanding public service. As we gather together on May 15 in tribute to the quality of his leadership and sincerity of purpose dedicated to service-to-people, we do indeed salute a distinguished citizen, outstanding community leader and great American—the Honorable Edwin R. Everitt of Clifton, N.J.●

REV. JERRY FALWELL TESTIFIES FOR MOVING THE U.S. EMBASSY IN ISRAEL TO JERUSALEM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee and the International Operations Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee held historic joint hearings on the bill to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, which I introduced with my distinguished Republican colleague from New York, Mr. GILMAN.

The lead witness at this hearing was Dr. Jerry Falwell, the pastor of Thomas Road Baptist Church in Lynchburg, Va., and the chancellor of Liberty Baptist College.

Dr. Falwell emphasized to the joint hearing the right of a sovereign nation to designate its own capital and cited the double standard inherent in the U.S. policy to place our Embassy in Tel Aviv rather than the designated capital of Israel—Jerusalem. Jerusalem is the ancient and historic capital of Israel. Dr. Falwell also cited the excellent record of Israel in permitting and insuring access to the holy sites of the three great religions, for whom Jerusalem is a religious center.

For the benefit of my colleagues in the House, who were unable to participate in these hearings, I place in the RECORD the statement of Dr. Falwell.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY BY DR. JERRY FALWELL BEFORE A JOINT HEARING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE AND THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1984

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Reverend Jerry Falwell. I am the pastor of Thomas Road Baptist Church in Lynchburg, Virginia, the Chancellor of Liberty Baptist College and, as a part-time extra curricular activity, I sometimes participate in the Moral Majority.

One of the issues we have addressed from the outset of Moral Majority in 1979 and from the beginning of my ministry nearly twenty-eight years ago is support for the nation of Israel, born in our lifetimes, and for the Jewish people everywhere who deserve a homeland where they may forever be free of the scourge that nearly eliminated them from the face of the earth during World War II.

The question before this joint hearing today, however, is not the support of Israel (though it is in a sense), but rather whether a sovereign nation has the right to declare its capital where it wishes and have that capital recognized by other sovereign nations. As all of you are aware, the United States recently granted full diplomatic recognition to The Vatican, a religious entity that, despite this recognition, still does not recognize Israel as a nation, much less Jerusalem as its capital. The political identification of The Vatican flows from its religious status. Jerusalem, on the other hand, is revered not by one religion, but by three and even by those who hold to a secular faith. It has always been and is the historic capital of Israel.

Even in our dispute with the British, the English government did not deny us the right to place our capital in Philadelphia or New York or Washington or anywhere else we wished. This has been the historic right of all nations whatever their political status, religious belief or concept of freedom to establish its capital where it wishes.

The argument might be advanced, as it often is, that Jerusalem is a controversial city and that some accommodation should be made for the dissension that so often surrounds it. What about the land held by the Soviet Union in violation of signed treaties at the end of World War II? Has the Soviet Union's violation of these and other treaties been sufficient for us to tell the Russians we will withdraw diplomatic recognition from you? Of course it has not. Have these treaty violations been enough for any President or our State Department to suggest we should punish the Soviets by moving our embassy to Novosibirsk or Siberia instead of Moscow? They have not.

This is a double standard, Mr. Chairman, which no other nation, save Israel, is expected to endure.

We treat no other nation the way we treat Israel. President Reagan has just finished a trip to the People's Republic of China, a nation that is officially atheistic and hostile to everything we stand for and believe in. Yet, our embassy is in their capital of Beijing.

Nicaragua recently had a revolution and we are hardly favorable toward the regime that holds power by force and denies the elections they promised, yet our embassy is in Managua.

Israel has treated Jerusalem and particularly access to the holy places of the three religions better than any other has or would. As a pastor, I am particularly appreciative of how the Israeli government and particularly the city administration of Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kolleck have meticulously maintained access for Jews, Christians and Moslems. Even Israel's harshest critics cannot criticize her on this issue.

Compare Israel's treatment of the holy places to Jordan's when that nation main-

tained control of East Jerusalem. Jordan razed all Jewish synagogues in East Jerusalem. Jordan used tombstones from Jewish cemeteries for roads and for latrines in its Army camps. Jordan signed an agreement with Israel that it would let any Jew visit the Western Wall. It never lived up to that agreement.

Jordan forbade any church to build a steeple higher than the Islamic minaret.

Compare this with Israel's record, not only in Jerusalem but also its open bridges policy over the Jordan River which allows Moslems and anyone else to cross into Israel and visit the holy places in Jerusalem even if the country from which the person comes is at war with Israel. Israel is not obligated under international law, Mr. Chairman, to provide access to citizens of countries at war with Israel, though she does. Even the Vatican recognizes this policy.

Listen to what Israel's Declaration of Independence states: "The State of Israel will be based on the principles of liberty, justice and peace as conceived by the Prophets of Israel; will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens, without distinction of religion, race or sex; will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, education and culture; and will safeguard the holy places of all religions." Is there any other nation in the Middle East which has made such a pledge or has carried it out so faithfully as Israel? I think not.

Jerusalem is not only the capital of the nation of Israel, it is also the capital of the three great religions. Jerusalem is holy to Christians because of what Christ did there. Why did Jesus come to Jerusalem? Because he recognized it as the capital of His country.

It is the same with Islam. Mohammed lived and worked all his life in Arabia, but Moslems believe that when he went to Heaven he came first to Jerusalem because he recognized Jerusalem as the center of Judaism and Christianity and saw the validity of the claims of their prophets. Of course, to the Jew, Jerusalem is the capital because it was declared so thousands of years before Jesus and Mohammed by God, Himself.

What, then, is the main stumbling block keeping the United States from doing what is morally right, religiously justified and politically correct? It seems to be the fear of what might happen, given the threats of some who have an interest in keeping Israel de-stabilized and her borders unfixed.

Should we really be fearful of such threats? I think not. President Harry Truman was advised by the State Department in 1948 not to recognize the newly independent nation. He was told that Arab nations would riot, American Embassies would be attacked and forced to close and that America would be boycotted by the Arab states. Mr. Truman ignored the advice and did what was right. He recognized Israel and the threats failed to produce the dire consequences that were predicted.

I might mention that the United States, which does not recognize Berlin as the capital of East Germany, still maintains its embassy in Berlin. We sometimes treat our adversaries better than our friends.

Israel is the only nation on earth which is denied the right to place its capital where it wishes. It is not right. It is not fair.

Tel Aviv is no more the capital of Israel than Alexandria is the capital of Egypt.

Tel Aviv is a modern creation. Jerusalem is an ancient heritage.

Tel Aviv is the brainchild of man. Jerusalem is the heart throb of God.

Moving our embassy from exile in Tel Aviv to its rightful home in Jerusalem would tell the world that our commitment to this single democracy in the Middle East is irrevocable; that, regardless of economic or political conditions, we stand behind Israel's right to exist, free from outside predators and that no surplus or shortage of oil or any other reason will allow us to sacrifice our friend on the altar of expediency.

Do we think that we can promote reasonable behavior among those who have sworn to wipe Israel from the map by allowing threats to determine American policy, even the location of our embassy?

From whom should we expect reasonable behavior? From Libya? From Syria? From Iraq or Iran, the latter of which, we are told, is responsible for the killings of our Marines in Lebanon? From the reasonable and rational PLO, who massacre innocent women and children and civilians of all types, and who certainly are not going to kill fewer Israelis because we have kept our embassy in Tel Aviv?

Israel is not asking for a favor, Mr. Chairman. It is exerting a right—the right to be treated as other nations; the right to have its capital recognized by all nations.

Certainly Israel has a greater claim to national identity and to its own capital of Jerusalem than, let us say, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, which was created by government decree. Israel's heritage and history are much older.

There are hundreds of references to Jerusalem in both the Old and New Testaments. In Psalm 128:5, the king of ancient Israel, David, said, "The Lord shall bless thee out of Zion, and thou shalt see the good of Jerusalem all the days of thy life." He had no reference to Tel Aviv.

Mr. Chairman, fairness, equity, and morality argue in favor of the United States moving its embassy to Jerusalem, the past, present, and future capital of Israel.

I respectfully urge you to pass this important bill.

Thank you, sir.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the skies were weeping over Washington as ground was broken for the Holocaust Memorial Museum in a heart wrenching and moving ceremony. Survivors of the Holocaust, whom this generous and great Nation accepted with open arms, and their second generation American-born children paid tribute to the decency of this great Nation as they remembered the nightmare of the Holocaust at noon, in the rotunda of the Capitol Building, the National Civic Commemoration of the Days of Remembrance. The day before a special program was held in the Kennedy Center to commemorate through the performing arts the darkness and horror of that period.

On these occasions a number of deeply moving and personal addresses were delivered by the survivors. On Sunday evening, at the Kennedy Center, Ted Koppel read "A Plea for the Survivors" by Elie Wiesel, whom this Congress has honored by approving the minting of a special congressional gold medal in his honor. As usual, everyone present was moved by his uniquely penetrating words. Mr. Speaker, I include the statement of Elie Wiesel in the RECORD:

A PLEA FOR THE SURVIVORS

I speak without bitterness and even without anger. I feel only sadness. For you, for all of us. Together we have bungled a story unlike any other. An event that by itself should have brought about a greater sense of awareness, an all-encompassing metamorphosis, was reduced to the level of an anecdote. As for us, we were too numb, too weak, and perhaps too timid to object to what was happening before our eyes.

The Holocaust no longer evokes the mystery of the forbidden; it no longer arouses fear or trembling, or even outrage or compassion. For you, it is one calamity among so many others, slightly more morbid than the others. You enter it, you leave it, and you return to your ordinary occupations. You thought yourselves capable of imagining the unimaginable: You have seen nothing. You thought yourselves capable of discussing the unspeakable: You have understood nothing, you have retained nothing.

You have retained nothing of its blinding truth. You prefer imitation, embellishment. For you, all these horrors, all these atrocities undoubtedly are terrible but not extraordinary phenomena, possibly the result of mental aberration. Auschwitz? The decadence of an ideology. Treblinka? To be demystified, demythified. Dachau and Mauthausen? Nothing but a tremendous and tremendously convenient theme to bolster the theories of thinkers and the ambitions of politicians. Once robbed of its sacred aspect, the holocaust became a fashionable subject: Good to impress or shock. Recommended to anyone seeking a vehicle to climb, succeed, create a sensation. You thought that you could face the agony of a people; you have felt nothing.

In the beginning they tried to raise their voices—however shyly, however clumsily. In vain. People turned away, and shrugging their shoulders, muttered, "Poor devils, they are exaggerating, for they want our pity." No, they did not want your pity. Or your charity. Or you good deeds. Or your tears or your money. They asked for nothing, demanded nothing from you or anybody; they claimed no rights. All they wanted was your attention. They wanted to transmit a message to you, a message of which they were the sole bearers. Having gained an insight into man that will remain forever unequaled, they tried to share their knowledge with you, their contemporaries, they were not asking for anything in return. Anyway, your gratitude, your medals were meaningless to them. As were the goals you were pursuing. They merely hoped to justify their survival by accomplishing a mission that mattered more to them than their survival. And for years and years you, their contemporaries, refused to listen, refused to believe, refused to understand. You disclaimed their testimony.

And so they began to feel superfluous in a society that continued to repudiate them, thus forcing them into cynicism or despair.

Time does not heal all wounds; there are those that remain painfully open. How can

one forget the passion, the violence a simple crust of moldy bread can inspire? Or the near-worship evoked by a slightly better dressed, better nourished, less beaten inmate?

How can one repress the memory of the indifference one had felt toward the corpses. Will you ever know what it is like to wake up under a frozen sky, on a journey toward the unknown, and to record without surprise that the man in front of you is dead, as is the one before him and the one behind you? Suddenly a thought crosses one's mind: What if I, I too, am already dead and do not know it? And this thought also is registered with indifference. Will you ever know the nature of a world where, as in Moses' time in the desert, the living and the dead are no longer separate? Will you ever know what a survivor knows?

The distinguished cochairmen of this year's Days of Remembrance Committee addressed these gatherings. Their speeches deserve the attention of the Members of this House.

Days of Remembrance, April 30, 1984—Remarks by Benjamin Meed, cochairman of the Days of Remembrance Committee and member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE, APRIL 30, 1984, REMARKS BY BENJAMIN MEED

I, a survivor of the Warsaw Ghetto, am honored to have the privilege of addressing you in the Capitol Rotunda.

It is fitting that we meet in a chamber of law, because the legal system, the entire power of the state—was used to persecute and oppress Jews and others. The Nazis assumed power legally and made the legislature captive to their own desires. From the Nuremberg laws to the decrees of deportation, the legal system was mobilized in the Jewish destruction; the German legislators did nothing to object, and the world stood by mute.

So I ask you—please remember. The laws that you pass—the statements that you make—the society you shape—affect real people—men, women and children.

It is fitting, too, that we meet in our Nation's Capitol. For generations, America has been the refuge of the immigrant. It is here that we made our homes—here that we raised our children. When we survivors came to this country we had nothing—no family, no language, and no profession. It is here that we began to reshape our lives and our future. No one paid attention to our foreign accents but only to the quality of our deeds.

This morning, at a symbolic ground-breaking ceremony, survivors from all over the nation gathered at the site of the future U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. We spoke of where we have been: Hell is the place we have been—a hell created by people, men and women of culture, by lovers of music and art, by scientists, legislators, psychologists and theologians. . . .

We spoke of the future museum as a magnet for all those who visit Washington where they shall come to learn of our experience of the holocaust and to teach future generations.

This afternoon, we survivors speak of where we are—a free people in a land we cherish—and that cherishes us. We believe in that magnificent ideal called the United States of America—a place in which a person can draw the breath of self respect; a nation of just laws, where leaders and legislators can learn from mistakes, for us survivors, and for millions of others, America will always remain a blessed place—its dream will remain for us immortal—everlasting.

And with good reason. For many of us, afterall, are graduates of the Warsaw ghetto, of Auschwitz, Bergen-Belsen, Treblinka and other concentration camps. We have faced destruction, degradation and death.

The hand of fate has brought some of us—too few—and too late—to this land of freedom from which we look not backward toward the triumph of tyranny, but forward to the challenge of democracy.

We survivors today offer ourselves to this challenge, to the defense of the human spirit against the evils of hatred, against the alienation of man.

This we give to you—America—in the freedom of our adopted country, it is here that we have been living a life consecrated to both memories and tears, and to a vision of brotherhood and peace.

We are in the midst of a world of gathering clouds and impending tragedy. The world may find reasons again to abandon fellow human beings: But holocaust survivors and their children here and everywhere must speak our forever against tyranny and brutality. For the only salvation for all of us lies in remembering the past and in building a moral society.

An Evening of Commemoration, April 29, 1984 and Days of Remembrance, April 30, 1984—Remarks by Sigmund Strochlitz, cochairman of the Days of Remembrance Committee and member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

AN EVENING OF COMMEMORATION, APRIL 29, 1984

On behalf of the United States Holocaust Memoral Council, and the Days of Remembrance Committee, welcome to an Evening of Remembrance through the Performing Arts.

In times when survivors are getting older and the prospects of the last survivor looms before us, it is reassuring that an evening of remembrance like the one tonight is taking place and that you remember with us for the benefit of humankind—present and future.

Tonight, we ask you to hold your applause in respect for those who perished whispering in desperation or shouting in defience—"Shema Israel."

Tonight, we will bring you the work of those who in the Ghettos and concentration camps turned to different forms of art—composing songs and music, writing poems and diaries, sculpting and drawing.

The songs of the ghettos reveal a burning will to live as human beings with dignity and self-respect and a determination to fight unto death for life—life in freedom.

The poems, written mostly by children, express sometimes hope, but more often, despair; sometimes courage, but also panic. In the face of the strongest force of dehumanization that the world has ever seen, writing, composing or drawing while the angel of death was closing in, may sound strange or even bizarre and yet it happened. We should not assume that those activities undertaken while life was ebbing were prompted only by an urge to record for posterity or to save Jewish history or even go beyond—no—not only. It was also to reassure our humanity to fight back with the only weapon—the human spirit.

Those voices—their dreams, their yearnings for a bit of nature, a site of a tree, a butterfly, were stilled in the ovens of Auschwitz, Treblinka, Majdanek and the Ghettos of Warsaw, Vilna and Theresienstadt. Those voices will come alive tonight through the craft of distinguished American artists, and because of the painful truths of which they shall remind us.

With a feeling of sadness and a heavy heart, I must remind you tonight that art, in and of itself, does not humanize. We shall be reminded this evening that a person can read Gothe and Schiller, or listen to Schubert and Bach in the evening, and still go to his or her murderous work in the morning. It happened not long ago in the heart of Europe, in Germany, in the cradle of European culture.

Where gas chambers were built by architects and engineers.

Children poisoned by physicians and nurses. Infants burned alive by teachers and lawyers. Women killed by college graduates and writers.

Yes, it happened. All those cold-blooded murders were witnessed by many who are here tonight, and recorded in diaries by others who perished.

May the memory of the Six Million Jews—men, women and children—who perished in the Holocaust, and the millions of others enslaved, starved, and killed by the Nazis never be forgotten.

Please rise for the National Anthem.

In this hall of freedom and democracy, we gather for this Nation to remember—never to forget as our Chairman, Elie Wiesel said: "What we all have in common is an obsession not to betray the dead we left behind or who left us behind. They were killed once, they must not be killed again through forgetfulness."

The Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate have forever committed this Nation to remember by passing Public Law 96-388.

Memory is now law and memory is indispensible to freedom, in commemorating the Days of Remembrance in every state, in cities throughout the country, in the Nation's Capitol, we not only bear witness and fight the angel of forgetfulness, but we also alert humankind to respond immediately when, under the guise of legislative or administrative processes, attempts are made to curtail the human and civil rights of any group in any place.

The process of dehumanization that began in the 1930's in the German legislative body was only the first step to the ultimate—the building of death camps.

The death camps perverted the values of the Western civilization and were at the same time a tragic failure of the Western world.

Failures are difficult to face. We would rather keep up the memory of those moments in history that show the human race at its best. But it seems to me that the administration and Congress decided that it is in the public interest for the public to contemplate the experiences of the Holocaust and its lessons.

It is our memory that could indeed serve the cause of freedom and democracy.

On behalf of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council's Days of Remembrance Committee—thank you for joining our annual national commemoration. Your presence lends respect and honor to this historic occasion.●

HOLOCAUST VICTIMS

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. OWENS, Mr. Speaker, as we remember the horrors of the Holocaust, it is important that we also remember the heroism of those who resisted the Nazi plans to exterminate their neighbors. The particular heroism of the Danish people was recently remembered by a congregation in Brooklyn adjacent to my district.

Rabbi Block, spiritual leader of Temple Emanu-El of Canarsie, Brooklyn, N.Y., and the congregation met to honor the Danish people for their humanitarian efforts in helping many Jewish people during World War II on Friday, March 23, 1984. The Honorable Birger Lehman Nielsen, Danish Deputy Consul General represented the people of Denmark at this event.

In April 1940, the Germans occupied Denmark where they attempted to persecute the Jews. Both the Government, under the leadership of King Christian X, and the people of Denmark raised a great cry of protest and succeeded in preventing the persecution of their Jewish neighbors. In 1943, when the Danish people learned of Gestapo plans for the deportation and annihilation of Danish Jewry, they organized a broad plan of rescue which was the only national rescue operation of Jews during the entire Nazi period.

Pastor William H. Gentz of Salem Evangelical Lutheran Church and other members and organizations of the Danish-American community participated in the service honoring the Danish people. Presentations were made by the Honorable Howard Golden, borough president, the Honorable Carol Bellamy, president of the city council, and the Honorable Howard Babbush, State senator.

It is indeed tragic that the Holocaust occurred. It would be more tragic if we forgot its horrors and the heroism of resisters and victims.●

H.R. 5076

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support of H.R. 5076, the Pennsylvania Wilderness Act of 1984, which was passed by the House of Representatives today.

H.R. 5076 designates certain areas in the Allegheny National Forest as wilderness and recreation areas. The idea of wilderness area designation in Pennsylvania has been considered in Congress for many years. I am most pleased by the passage of this particular legislation, which truly represents a compromise between preservation and development. Two large sections, Hickory Creek Wilderness and Allegheny Island Wilderness, will be designated as wilderness areas by the act. Many other regions will be protected as recreation areas.

We have done an admirable job of preserving large tracts of land in the Western section of our country as wilderness areas. As constituents of mine recently wrote in a letter to me: "It is a good idea to start creating more wilderness areas in the East. We have areas of great beauty in our wonderful state." Once again, I commend the House for its swift action in passing H.R. 5076 and am hopeful of similar action in the Senate.●

NUCLEAR POWER—NO LONGER THE PANACEA, BUT NOT THE PARIAH

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, March 28, 1984 was the fifth anniversary of the Three Mile Island accident. Although this was certainly not a time for celebration, some reflection on the status of our Nation's nuclear power industry seems to be in order. We must ask the question, "Is the nuclear power option still viable in this country, or should we pull the plug on more than 40 years of work and call it quits, leaving the rest of the world to continue the challenge of peaceful uses for the atom?"

We have been brought to this crossroad by a confluence of circumstances and events, not the least of which was the unfortunate accident at Three Mile Island. But increased plant construction costs, marked declines in electricity demand, public concerns about reactor safety, and ratcheting licensing requirements all have been major culprits in the downward trend now facing the U.S. nuclear power industry. Can we afford to be complacement, even fatalistic, about this state of affairs? I think not.

Nuclear power is an inseparable part of a secure energy future for America. This is a fact that cannot be—indeed must not be—overlooked. As chairman of the principal subcommittee responsible for Federal research programs on nuclear fission reactors, I along with other Members, have proposed strong Government initiatives to deal with these problems head-on. Reactor designs are needed that use intrinsic rather than, or in addition to, engineered safety features, employ standardized fabrication procedures to reduce costs and are substantially insensitive to the wide variations in electricity demand that we have experienced over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent assessment of the situation was presented in an article in the Washington Post editorial page on Tuesday, March 27, 1984, written by Josh Kraft, which I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD. I direct my colleagues' attention to Mr. Kraft's assessment that, "safe nuclear power is possible and makes sense." I believe that most of the Members will wholeheartedly agree.

The assessment follows:

KEEPING THE NUCLEAR OPTION

(By Joseph Kraft)

The accident at Three Mile Island, five years ago tomorrow, started something. Since then, many diverse failures in all parts of the country have led most Americans to give up on nuclear power.

But analysis shows that a common problem underlies all the difficulties. A fix can be made—providing the country wants to keep the nuclear option as a source of energy.

At first glance, every part of the nuclear power venture seems unsound. At Three Mile Island, near Harrisburg, Pa., a reactor went out of control. Construction flaws jinxed the Diablo Canyon plant in California, the South Texas project and the Zimmer plant in Ohio. Costs went through the roof at Shoreham in New York and in the case of the Washington Public Power project in the Northwest.

But while the troubles are different, the underlying cause is the same. In each case installation and management of a new and complex technology were left to relatively small and inexperienced units of this country's highly fragmented electrical power industry.

The New Jersey utility running Three Mile Island had one previous experience in nuclear energy. The San Francisco utility responsible for Diablo Canyon had only worked with nuclear power once before—and in a trivial project. The Long Island utility that managed Shoreham, and the Houston utility that commissioned the Texas project, had no past in the nuclear field. The Washington venture was a coalition of 80 municipal utilities all inexperienced when it came to nuclear power.

"The fragmented utility structure" has been summarized by Commissioner Victor Gilinsky of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. According to his figures, the country now has 80 nuclear power plants "in the hands of 44 utilities, 19 of which have only a single operating reactor."

The inability of most local utilities to organize and manage nuclear power plants has been asserted with commanding force by Gov. Bruce Babbitt of Arizona, a trained engineer who served as a member of the national commission investigating Three Mile Island. In an article published in the Arizona Republic, Babbitt wrote:

"The utility industry is highly dispersed and some local utilities do not have strong management. Electric utilities are natural monopolies, heavily regulated and undisciplined by competitive forces. . . . Nuclear technology seems too complex to have much

of a future in the dispersed hands of scores of local utilities."

Experience abroad makes the same point inversely. France and Japan and Korea and Taiwan have all been successful in the installation of nuclear reactors. Not because of superior technical skill. On the contrary, they have used American technology. But the management of their electrical utilities is centralized. It learns from each new project. So much so that the Japanese are getting ready to market in other countries their own improved version of American nuclear power plants.

Gov. Babbitt points out that Adm. Hyman Rickover managed development of a nuclear submarine fleet for the Navy and that NASA has successfully organized even more difficult scientific achievements in space. He suggests that if the United States wants nuclear power, it should vest research, development and installation in a single governmental entity able to work with the most experienced private firms. There would be the energy equivalent of NASA, or the National Institutes of Health.

But does the country need a nuclear option in energy?

The answer is far from evident. Oil prices have recently come down, and there is now an excess of supply over effective demand. Reserve stocks are very high. Sustained economic recovery through the industrial world would drive up consumption again. Still it would take a major political event—such as the fall of the shah in 1979 or the Arab-Israeli war of 1973—to force another shortage.

Coal is abundant in this country and some other parts of the world. Extracting the fuel is messy and dangerous. Burning it has something to do with the destruction of lakes and forests by acidification. But, though the costs go up astronomically, the acid-causing particles can be washed away by scrubbing.

The great peril in burning coal comes from the "greenhouse effect"—the collection of enough carbon dioxide in the atmosphere to admit all ultraviolat rays, while imprisoning infrared. That process yields atmospheric changes of epic proportions. A recent study for the National Academy of Sciences projects a climatic catastrophe that might, among other things, cripple agriculture in the Middle West. But not for another 50 years.

So we are thrown back on the political leadership. Safe nuclear power is possible and makes sense. But events do not force development. It will be achieved only if the Reagan administration pushes ahead. But in nuclear energy, as in so many other things, that means admitting exceptions to the free market ideology and giving up the narcotic habit of mortgaging the future to the present.●

TRIBUTE TO COUNT BASIE

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, nations often cannot communicate with other nations. A failure in communications is certainly a major factor responsible for the arms race that threatens the world now. But language is not the only barrier which hamstrings government communications. Sometimes, Congress has trouble understanding the White House. And we speak the same language, or so we believe.

A breakdown in communications has left a dark shadow over all our lives. That is why when we see a man that holds the very special talents to communicate universally, we cherish his presence. Count Basie was such a man.

The Count could play a single note, one musical expression on his keyboard, and generations of people of all colors, religious beliefs, and ideologies, from New York to Moscow and everywhere in between, could unite in its message. The Count's playing gave us a feeling of joy, of hope renewed, that in this complex world where men have difficulties talking with other men, there is a bit of goodness left.

I was deeply saddened by the Count's death. He was truly a good friend, a fine constituent, a loyal Democrat, and the penultimate word in piano playing for the last 50 years. His royal era spanned decades and created a bond between cultures.

It is a bit farfetched to suggest that the Count's music could be the universal language that brings about global understanding, but would not it be something if it could be. Surely his music makes men realize their commonalities, it creates harmony and prompts them to investigate discord. It was Longfellow who said "Music is the universal language of mankind," what he left out was that Count Basie was the diplomat of world harmony. I will never forget his contributions to humanity, his records will echo in many of the great halls of the world forever.●

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO VOTE

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, each of us bears a special responsibility to be present throughout the various stages of the legislative process to see our ideas and proposals carried through from committee to the floor. I have spent the past year and a half working very closely with my colleagues as we translate ideas into actions. I therefore believe it is extremely important that we, as elected representatives, be in attendance when the House is in session and bills are pending on the floor. I take my responsibility to vote very seriously and have tried diligently not to miss any votes.

It has therefore always been my practice to remain in Washington when legislation is pending before the House and not to miss any votes, except under the rarest circumstances such as a health emergency. This has often meant that I have had to cancel prearranged meetings and appearances, but I know my constituents understand that my attendance in Washington is required on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my colleagues my reason for missing rollcall votes during the week of April 23d. I suffered chest and stomach pains while working in Corpus Christi during the Easter recess and was admitted to Spohn Hospital on April 24 for 3 days of extensive tests. It was with great relief that I learned that I have no serious health problems and that the pains were not a signal of a more serious condition.

I regret that this unexpected hospital stay prevented me from participating in my usual way in committee hearings, floor debates, and votes. Although no major bills were considered during this period, I would like my colleagues to know that if present I would have voted in favor of S. 2570. This bill continued the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26. Fortunately, this extension was passed by a vote of 322 to 13.

I appreciate the many kind inquiries of my colleagues about my health and thank you all for your thoughtful concern for my well being. Your consideration is greatly appreciated.●

HOLOCAUST VICTIMS

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York for reserving time today to take a moment from our hectic schedules to remember the victims of the Holocaust. For remembering is, perhaps, the most important way to remind and educate ourselves as well as our children of this ultimate experience of human horror.

Now, many years later, we are still left in a state of shock as we recall the methodic and systematic deaths of millions of innocent people. In that perverted moment of world history where greed and destruction dominated the lives of the world, lies the message of the Holocaust. As the survivors, along with their families and friends, have grown older—the everlasting hope in their hearts as well as ours is that the concept of "ethnic purity" and "master race" will forever be locked in the pages of history.

As we race for nuclear superiority, the importance of remembering the Holocaust becomes even more crucial. We must seek out ways to prevent the continuation of a cycle of horror. We, as Members of Congress, have a commitment to remember the Holocaust,

for historical amnesia would perpetuate this crime committed against all mankind.●

RULE ON THE TRADE REMEDIES REFORM ACT OF 1984

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that the Committee on Ways and Means today reported to the House H.R. 4784, the Trade Remedies Reform Act of 1984. This bill would provide for needed reforms to the countervailing duty and antidumping laws under the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended in the Trade Agreements Act of 1979.

I wish to serve notice, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic Caucus, that I have been instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to seek a modified closed rule for the consideration of this bill by the House of Representatives.●

THE RETIREMENT OF BLAIR R. KOST

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, few citizens have contributed more to the good government movement in Ohio than Blair Kost, who retired on April 1, 1984, as executive director of the Citizens League and the Governmental Research Institute. Blair Kost's energy, devotion, and skill are legendary in Cuyahoga County. His contributions to the quality of our governmental institutions, his unswerving commitment to efficiency and sound management in public service, and his tireless support of reform, will all be missed. During 27 years with the Citizens League, the oldest and largest civic organization of its kind in the United States, Blair was at the forefront of every major reform battle during the past quarter century. Thanks to his efforts, we have a lowered voting age, professional budgeting offices in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County, a code of ethics in the State legislature, and a host of other improvements in the running of our State, county, and city governments. I know that my colleagues in the House will want to join me in extending thanks to Blair Kost for his years of service to the people of the Greater Cleveland area, and offering our best wishes for health and happiness during the years of his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an article announcing Blair's retirement as Citizens League executive director be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Citizens League of Greater Cleveland]

BLAIR R. KOST RETIRES AS CITIZENS LEAGUE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Winding up a career of over a quarter century, Blair R. Kost has announced that he is retiring as Executive Director of The Citizens League and the Governmental Research Institute on April 1, 1984.

In a letter to The Citizen League and GRI boards, Blair said that it was extremely difficult for him to leave after having served the two organizations for so long a period. He noted that, following his recent illness, it was impossible for him to carry out the demanding duties of the Executive Director position on a full time basis.

Blair has served The Citizens League for twenty-seven years—having joined the League Staff in 1957 as an executive assistant. The League and GRI Boards of Trustees appointed him Executive Director in January, 1973. He is the League's 14th Director since 1896. He has served the League longer than any professional staff person except Mayo Fesler, who served thirty years prior to 1945.

Blair has been on the leading edge of the reform movement of municipal, county, and state government during the span of his Citizens League career. He has been The Citizens League voice in countless efforts to promote reform measures at those three governmental levels.

When he began to work for the League in 1957, voters faced the confusion of a "bedsheet ballot". It was not unusual for a voter having to wade through 110 Democratic candidates to choose 18 State Representatives from Cuyahoga County. Because of the infamous Hanna Amendment, the "cornstalk brigade" held a disproportionate power in the Ohio General Assembly. In Cleveland, some wards were four and one-half times larger than other wards-57,000 people in the largest to 12,000 in the smallest.

At the time, it seemed an insurmountable task to change these ingrained political inequalities. Yet, all three were torn down and Blair played a leadership role—in the battle to subdistrict Cuyahoga County and the other populous counties, in the struggle to reapportion the Ohio General Assembly on a more equitable basis, and in the fight to equalize Cleveland City Ward populations.

Those three issues typify Blair's philosophy about governmental reform. "To be a reformer, you must have perseverance and patience," he says. "None of those changes would have taken place if the League hadn't doggedly worked on them year after year. It is vital that a community have an organization like the League which pushes incessantly for needed changes in spite of the odds."

Blair notes that similar resistance met the League's initial proposals for a State conflict-of-interest law. He took that proposal to the Legislature on five different occasions before the concept was finally accepted and enacted into law.

The script for these changes followed a familiar pattern: League volunteer committees studied various means of improving government; a report was written; Blair took the report to the appropriate governmental body and lobbied for adoption.

Characteristic of this format was the effort to get Cleveland City Hall to adopt better budgeting procedures, a recommendation of the League's 1964 Operation Cleveland Followup Committee. Blair oberves, "I worked for a year to convince Mayor Ralph Locher to set up an Office of Budget & Management and staff it with professionals rather than politicos. And, it was not any easier to convince the County Commissioners to establish a similar office for the County. Both the City and the County are, however, in a better position to deal with fiscal problems having this modern budgetary tool."

In a like manner, Blair successfully lobbied for Code of Ethics legislation in Cleveland City Council. Numerous suburbs followed the Cleveland example. Any number of significant reforms would probably not have been adopted except for the work of Blair and the League.

Other important measures that he championed for the League were: lowered voting age, Ohio constitutional revision commission, county alternate forms legislation, open meetings of the Ohio Senate Rules Committee, public defender legislation, statewide voter registration, election of governor and lieutenant governor as a team, municipal income tax reciprocity mandatory retirement of judges, merit selection of judges four-year terms for Cleveland Mayor, Cleveland council reduction, All-America City Award for Cleveland, Ohio tax policy reforms. The list could go on and on.

For the last sixty-five years, the League has worked to get a more viable form of government for Cuyahoga County. Eight times the League has taken the lead in trying to reorganize county government and make it more effective. Blair was out front for the League in four of those attempts. In 1980, Blair took the lead role in bringing a County Home Rule Charter to a vote of the people by initiative petition. He directed the effort to secure over 60,000 initiative signatures, at that time the highest number ever secured in the county.

Blair has regularly been sought out for advice by politicians, candidates, news editors, and civic leaders. They respect his judgment as a valued resource and authority on politics and government. He has been a confidant of every Mayor since Anthony Celebrezze—as well as numerous congressmen, councilmen, state legislators, county commissioners, judges, and other public officials.

He has been the League's lobbyist before the Ohio General Assembly and the Cleveland City Council. He has directed the League's biennial State Legislation Committee that developed scores of legislative proposals which he took to the General Assembly and lobbied on their behalf.

Blair has guided the League's well-known Candidates Committee that interviews and makes recommendations on candidates for local and state offices. Likewise, he directed the affairs of the League's highly credible Issues Committee which annually makes recommendations on many volatile ballot issues.

Blair served on the 1971-72 Ohio Citizens' Committee on the State Legislature—a 25-member statewide Committee composed of Ohio Citizens with a broad knowledge of the Legislature. He acted as Secretary to the Committee which made significant recommendations for improvement after conducting a twenty-month inquiry into the structure and organization of the Ohio General Assembly.

Blair was recently awarded Mount Union College's Alumni Service Award, which is the highest non-academic honor an alumnus of Mount Union College can receive. According to Mount Union President G. Benjamin Lantz Jr., the award was presented to Blair for, ". . . his many years of distinguished service to his community and the college. Blair Kost is truly deserving of this prestigious award. His hard work and leadership in the Citizens League in Cleveland have gained him just recognition in his community and we are pleased to present him with our institution's highest alumni honor."

The award not only honors Blair but also the Citizens League, which is appropriate. For, his "life work" personifies the League. To many, many people, he is the Citizens League. His successes have been League successes. His goals have been League goals. His retirement will leave a void in the League and in the community. He will be hard to replace.●

COUNT BASIE: MASTER OF JAZZ AND SWING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the music world has lost a living legend. William "Count" Basie was buried yesterday, having finally succumbed to cancer at the age of 79.

The Count stood out from the other giants of jazz and swing for decades. He was a true master of his art—a musician who struck out on his own to create a unique sound that others have only imitated. Some musicians go with the flow. Count Basie created the flow.

As with so many young artists and intellectuals of this generation, Count Basie was drawn to Harlem to find his fortune. It was here that he met Fats Waller, who taught him how to play the organ. This was the beginning that launched his career, a career that spanned an incredible eight decades.

When Count Basie played, the whole room swayed. His bands were the best around mainly because of Basie's ability to set a rhythm that other musicians flowed around. He and Freddie Green on guitar formed what was perhaps the greatest rhythm section ever, and will be remembered for maintaining the intensity of each performance.

We will remember Count Basie's music, Mr. Speaker. And just as importantly, we will remember that his music was the music of a gentleman. He was not loud and eccentric like so many of today's artists. No, the Count was smooth, elegant, and he made your soul move.

God bless him.●

A SALUTE TO THE NIMITZ HIGH SCHOOL BAND

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the 1984 National Cherry Blossom Festival was celebrated in Washington, D.C. from April 1–7. The 1984 festival marked the 57th year of what is the oldest and has grown to be the largest annual event in the Washington area. First Lady Nancy Reagan served as honorary chairperson of the 1984 event.

In 1909, First Lady Mrs. William Howard Taft became interested in obtaining a number of pink and white Japanese cherry trees to plant in the Potomac Park area. Hearing of Mrs. Taft's interest in the trees, Dr. Johichi Takimine arranged for the city of Tokyo to donate more than 3,000 cherry trees to its sister capital in the United States.

The trees arrived in Washington in 1912, and the first tree was planted in a symbolic ceremony by Mrs. Taft on March 27 of that year. The original planting of Japanese cherry trees was first commemorated in 1927, when Washington schoolchildren reenacted the event, and, later, in 1934 by a 3-day celebration. From 1935 on, the festival has grown into a week-long event that is rated one of the top events in the Nation.

The Cherry Blossom Festival Week includes musical concerts, receptions, special tours, shows, and various other events. The festival is culminated by the Cherry Blossom Festival parade on Saturday. The Nimitz High School Band, of Houston, Tex., was chosen from among approximately 125 bands, nationwide, to participate in 1984's Cherry Blossom Festival parade. Following this year's parade, an awards ceremony for participating parade bands was held at the Old Post Office Building.

It is with a great deal of pride that I congratulate the Nimitz High School Band for their selection as the No. 1 band in AA concert competition. In addition to their selection as first in concert competition, the band's performance was given a superior rating, the highest rating possible.

A salute is in order for each of the 118 Nimitz High School Band members, Directors Louis Kleeman and Gary Speck and the chaperons who made the Nimitz band trip to Washington possible.●

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO ENCOURAGE STANDARDIZED NUCLEAR POWERPLANT DESIGNS AND PROVIDE FOR REGULATORY STABILITY

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 months, we have been reading almost daily about the difficulties associated with nuclear powerplants—difficulties seriously threatening the continued existence of the nuclear power industry in this Nation. Utilities are being forced to abandon newly completed nuclear construction projects worth billions of dollars, but which the utilities cannot afford to finish because they have no assurance that the plants will ever be allowed to operate.

There can be no doubt that these difficulties are due in large measure to the manner in which the Federal Government regulates this industry. The laws governing the regulation and licensing of nuclear powerplants have not been overhauled since they were enacted in 1954, and are inhibiting the development of this critically important energy resource. The industry and its regulators are caught in a quagmire of regulations which prolong construction time, divert the industry from important safety work, and impose new and modified requirements without regard to overall plant and industry safety. Few utilities would consider ordering a new nuclear plant under the current regulatory regime.

Mr. Speaker, the public has the right to expect congressional action on the difficulties associated with nuclear power. I invite you to join the bipartisan group of colleagues who support nuclear licensing reform and cosponsor H.R. 5053, the "Nuclear Powerplant Standardization Act of 1984." The Nation will benefit from licensing reforms which encourage standard nuclear powerplant designs, a more effective application of industry and NRC resources, the reduction of unnecessary cost, and regulatory stability.

Mr. Speaker, I insert two editorials which appeared in the Wall Street Journal and Washington Post, on April 23 and 27, respectively, and a letter I received from the Buildings and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO, at the end of my statement. This material indicates the public's growing awareness that Congress must act to preserve the nuclear option, and that their patience is not unlimited.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 23, 1984]

CLAMSHELL VICTORY

A newspaper photograph of former workers at the Seabrook nuclear power project lining up for unemployment benefits in Portsmouth, N.H., last week reminded us of some other familiar New England scenes: "No Nukes" stickers on the bumpers of BMWs in Ivy League parking lots, earth children doing their protest thing at the perimeter of the Seabrook site, lawyers tying up billions while they argue about remote threats to clam larvae.

But in looking at the news photograph, it occurred to us that the construction workers had just lost and the "No Nukes" forces had just won another big battle. After seven years and $3.4 billion in sunk costs, Seabrook is finally stalled, one unit 75% complete and the other only 25% finished. The project's future is very much in doubt, as is the financial health of Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, the lead utility in the project. The children of the Clamshell Alliance are surely exultant in their triumph. They owe it in large part to the legal playground created by Congress that we describe above.

The walking wounded of this rout are those construction workers lined up at the unemployment offices. If any of them have BMWs, they make their own payments. Their view of reality has been conditioned by the simple experience of having to earn a living. It must be incomprehensible to many of them that a country's legal system could become so warped that it favors obstruction over construction.

But we know also that the forces that have fought nuclear power to a near-standstill are not entirely dilettantish. Their manipulation of the nation's tangle of law and regulation and their enlistment of pampered youngsters to their cause conceals a political agenda. The agenda is difficult to define, but it identifies with the anti-establishment, anti-business politics that had its origins in the 1960s.

It will of course be argued by these people that the problems with nuclear power lies elsewhere, most especially with the executives of the utilities that are building nuclear power plants. Such an incompetent bunch you'll seldom find, the No-Nukers smilingly suggest. That would be more plausible if there were not such a clear correlation between the projects the No-Nukers have targeted, such as Seabrook, and the amount of trouble encountered. Nuclear power projects abroad have had very little trouble at all. It is implausible that U.S. utilities have a monopoly on incompetent management. The management incompetence theme fits nicely with the general anti-corporate stance of the No-Nukers.

It is also true that the U.S. is the only country in the world rich enough to tolerate the colossal economic losses stalled nuclear projects are piling up. But U.S. wealth is not infinite and surely the electorate's patience isn't either. Those workers in the Portsmouth unemployment line have every right to be demoralized, but they also have every right to be very angry with the people who put them there.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1984]

NUCLEAR POWER OR NOT?

Four nuclear power plants, construction well along, have been cancelled and abandoned so far this year. Four others have slid into limbo, unfinished or finished but not operating. Although these eight are big plants, the delays and cancellations will not create an immediate shortage of electricity. But the pattern here points toward trouble. If Americans don't want nuclear power, perhaps the time has come to decide what kind of power they prefer instead.

With the current rise in industrial production, the demand for electric power is also rising. There's still excess generating capacity available, and scrubbing eight nuclear plants won't plunge the country into darkness tomorrow. But generating plants wear out, and the need to replace some of them is going to get urgent as the decade goes on. Most of the country's power is now generated with coal. Anxieties about acid rain seem to be rising, and, unfortunately, acid rain is the least of the damage that results from the present methods of burning coal. The smoke is toxic, and breathing it kills thousands of people in this country every year.

Nuclear plants are both safer and cleaner than coal. But, caught among rising construction costs, past mistakes and increasingly stringent enforcement of federal safety standards, the utilities are rapidly backing away from nuclear power. The last time a utility ordered a reactor without later cancelling it was in October 1973—just before the first oil crisis arrived, with its warning not to count on oil-fired generators.

Of the four nuclear plants abandoned this year, the extreme example is the Zimmer plant that three Ohio power companies were building near Cincinnati. Suffering from an accumulation of disputes over quality control, it was 97 percent complete by the owners' reckoning when they called it quits, confronted with estimates of another $1 billion or so to meet the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's requirements.

The latest addition to the limbo list is the Seabrook plant in New Hampshire, three-quarters built. Last week, after years of litigation and disputes, the principal owner suspended work there simply because it had run out of cash.

Under these circumstances, no American power company is likely ever again to try to build a nuclear plant with its own money. If Americans think they will need nuclear power in the 1990s, the government is going to have to intervene—and it may well have to build the plants itself. Alternatively, if Americans want to dispense with nuclear power they will need to find ways to burn coal without driving up the death rates. Ideally those are choices to be made now. But past experience suggests that decisions will come only after the brownouts begin.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR—CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1984.

Hon. JAMES T. BROYHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROYHILL: The Building and Construction Trades Department has always believed that it is vitally important to assure that America has an adequate supply of electricity at the least possible cost. This is essential to ensure that America continues on a path of economic growth: for without a reliable source of competitively priced electrical energy, American businesses will be forced to expand their operations in other countries and may in fact relocate their existing operations.

It is important to utilize a wide mix of energy sources to achieve the balanced, secure, and economical supply of electricity we believe is necessary to meet our future energy needs. One source, nuclear power, must be included in such an energy mix. In 1983, some 13 percent of the nation's electricity was generated by nuclear power plants. That figure is expected to double in a decade so that nuclear power will fuel more of our electric power supply than any energy source other than coal.

We are concerned, however, that current federal regulation of nuclear power plants is inhibiting the development of this crucial energy source. The laws governing the regulation and licensing of nuclear plants have not been overhauled since they were enacted in 1954, and they are seriously out of step with the development of nuclear power in this nation.

The time necessary to construct and license a nuclear plant in America now may exceed 14 years—over twice as long as other industrialized countries. The industry and its regulators are being diverted from important safety-related work as new or modified requirements are impose without regard to the impact on overall plant safety. Utilities are being forced to choose between abandoning nuclear construction projects or continuing to invest without any assurance that the plants will ever be allowed to operate. No rational utility would order a new nuclear plant under the current regulatory regime.

In order to remedy this situation, we believe that it is essential to provide regulatory stability and to encourage the development and use of standardized nuclear power plant designs. Standardized designs will improve safety by concentrating the resources of designers, engineers and vendors on a few improved designs, and by stimulating standardized construction practices and quality assurance. It will also facilitate a more ready sharing of construction experience within the industry, which will in turn reduce construction times and promote uniformly high construction standards. Predictability and stability are prerequisites for the industry to fully benefit from the expertise construction workers develop while working on nuclear construction projects. These workers' expertise is an important resource our nation cannot afford to waste.

We understand that the promotion of standardized designs and regulatory stability is the intent of H.R. 5053, the "Nuclear Power Plant Standardization Act of 1984," a bill introduced by you and a bipartisan group of cosponsors just this past month. We applaud you and you colleagues for introducing this bill. The nation will benefit from licensing reforms which encourage standardization, a more effective application of industry and NRC resources, and the reduction of unnecessary costs. The legislation you and your colleagues have introduced comprehensively addresses many of the public's concerns about nuclear power, including questions raised about the competence of utility management and the need for more meaningful public participation.

This is a workable compromise which we feel will lead to the facilitation of a sound energy policy for the United States, and will help stabilize our future energy needs.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. GEORGINE,
President.●

SUPPORT OF CONTADORA PROCESS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, in a region which is torn apart by strife and ravaged by violence from every side, the Contadora peace process offers the last ray of hope.

These four nations, Mexico, Panama, Colombia, and Venezuela, have a vested interest in peace and stability. They are just as concerned as we are that strife and instability in Central America can threaten their nations. They are highly aware that the infusion of military from a variety of foreign powers could lead to an explosion which could threaten their security. And they have a vested interest in assuring that communism does not encroach on their borders.

These nations also have the experience to understand what is needed in the region. They understand that the problems are deep and complex, that a few more weapons and twisting a few more arms will not solve the tangled social and political difficulties.

With the document of 21 objectives, the Contadora Group has stressed respect for democracy, pluralism, and social and human rights. These objectives provide a frame of reference, a foundation upon which to construct a long-term and stable peace. It is this framework that has been lacking as military buildup and violence continues to shake the semblance of stability in the region.

We must do more than give lip service to peace. By supporting the Contadora process, we acknowledge that responsible settlement and negotiation are the most effective path to peace.

The President has asked for a bipartisan concensus on central America policy. With this resolution, the House can give the message that the bipartisan conclusion is for peaceful resolution of the conflict. Not an escalation of tension, but support for those nations who are working toward a comprehensive peace.●

A TRIBUTE TO BEN LEDERMAN

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know very well that the key to running a successful and effective district office operation involves having a dedicated and talented staff which cares deeply about the personal needs of the people of the community they are supposed to serve.

In my Brighton Beach office, I have one such staffer who exemplifies this description in every way. He is celebrating a birthday this week, and I wanted to bring to the attention of the House the wonderful work of Mr. Ben Lederman.

Ben serves as one of my district representatives to the shorefront community. To the civic organizations with which he is affiliated, and to the people who come to the Brighton Beach office for assistance, he is a giant. The gentle and considerate attention which he provides to my constituents—who may need help with a lost social security check or with a form with which they apply for benefits—soothes the concerns of the distressed who seek help and enables him to complete successfully most of the cases he takes on.

One thing which makes Ben a particularly effective asset is the extraordinary ties he has to the community. He is a founder and current president of the Oceanfront Coordinating Council; a long-time member and vice president-elect of the Kiwanis Club of Coney Island; chairman of the Brighton Beach Chapter of the Oddfellows Lodge; a long-term member and former vice president of the Brighton Beach Board of Trade; a board member of the Oceanfront Development Corp., and a member of community planning board 13. These are all activities to which Ben devotes an enormous amount of personal time. And they represent further examples of his commitment to making the shorefront area a better place for all the residents and business people located there.

I would like to pay particular tribute to Ben for his work as chairman of the summer program for Vacations and Community Services for the Blind and president of their advisory board. This is just one of many examples where Ben makes a commitment to improving the lives of those less fortunate.

On his birthday, I would be remiss if I did not state publicly how much Ben's contribution means to my office, and how much Ben's friendship means both to me and my wife Nina. Ben, we salute you.●

ELIE WIESEL'S REWARD

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday night at the Kennedy Center, Elie Wiesel was presented with the Congressional Gold Medal for his contribution to world literature and human rights. I can think of no one more deserving of this award, for Wiesel, who was interned in Auschwitz during World War II, is an eloquent spokesman and living symbol for Holocaust survivors.

Wiesel has spent the better part of his life bearing witness to the crimes committed against his family and other Jews who fell victim to the Nazis. He has steadfastly reminded us, through words and deeds, of the profound darkness and horror of the Holocaust.

Mankind must know palpably the horror of the Holocaust so that history does not tragically repeat itself. And this is why Wiesel has written, lectured and traveled so often—to guard against any future recurrence of such inhumanity. In a sense, his message has been simple: we must not forget the lessons of the past.

Mr. Speaker, Elie Wiesel has done an enormous amount to advance the cause of human rights and peace. It is fitting that we have rewarded him for his extraordinary work.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, this year Armenian Martyrs' Day, which fell on April 24, had particular significance for me. Although every year for the past 69 years, we have marked this black date in order to remember the mass extermination of 1.5 million Armenians who died at the hands of the Ottoman [Turkish] Empire, this year we must reaffirm our understanding. This year, the Turkish Government is pushing the State Department of the United States to deny that this ruthless Turkish Government ever intended to complete a mass extermination of the Armenian culture.

How the State Department could suggest that the death of 1.5 million Armenians was not deliberate is beyond me. Our own Ambassador to Turkey, at that time, reported "a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion."

The nations of the free world cannot go about changing history in order to improve diplomatic relations. To do so would be to turn our backs on 1.5 million Armenians who died in this holocaust. It would be a sign to our friends and foes alike that we are willing to sell out our moral commitment to improve surface relationships.

It has been suggested that by calling attention to the Armenian holocaust we are encouraging the escalation of terrorist activities by Armenian nationalists against Turkish diplomats. There is no Member of this House who condones terrorism. At the same time, I could not see any Member, of sound

conscience refusing to speak out against the mass slaughter of innocent people. Speaking out sensitizes people, it brings an awareness to those who otherwise would be in the dark.

We are not trying to bring about a rise in terrorism, we are offering a remembrance on behalf of humanity. The Turkish Government cannot continue to deny these heinous events ever happened. A woman who survived the holocaust once said to me something I shall never forget:

What the Turkish government did was evil, but I cannot hate the Turks. They must admit their crimes and make reparations. But even more importantly, mankind must know that what the Turks did was not so unique, there were people who did it before them, and there was Hitler who did it after them. What the Holocaust shows us is man's inhumanity toward man, that is what I hate. Because all men have the capabilities to commit crimes against their fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, there is no message that I could offer which has greater meaning than these words. I will always speak out in remembrance because the chance that this occurs again is a thought far too horrible to consider.●

OSHA AND COORS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, an ongoing investigation by my office concerning the Department of Labor's enforcement of laws protecting worker health and safety at the Adolph Coors Co. has uncovered additional evidence of possible favoritism in the treatment of Coors by the agency.

Prior to the Easter recess I reported to the House that documents that we had received indicated:

Repeated ex parte contacts between OSHA leadership and the Coors family and officials of the Adolph Coors Co. evidenced by official documents from the Labor Department and sworn depositions and interrogatories from Labor Department officials.

That Coors facilities targeted for inspection because of their hazardous nature were removed from an OSHA inspection list or not scheduled for inspections on several occasions based on discussions and directives from the national office.

That the OSHA regional administrator for the Denver regional office, a career civil servant, may have been forced from his job because of urgings from officials of the Adolph Coors Co.

That OSHA compliance officers entered and inspected Coors facilities on only four occasions between the time Assistant Secretary Auchter was sworn in and January 1 of this year, as compared with 20 entries in the equivalent 33-month period prior to his taking over the agency.

That three of the four occasions in which compliance officers entered Coors facilities were forced by death or serious injury to Coors employees in accidents related to that company's failure to follow proper safety and health practices.

That OSHA failed to cite Coors for all of the violations found by the compliance officers and that numerous serious violations by the company appear to have contributed to the accident that caused permanent brain, nerve and liver damage to one young woman employee and the death of two of her male coworkers, in one instance resulted in a fine of only $810. In a second instance failure by the company to provide proper guarding on a backhoe tractor and adequate training in the safe use of the backhoe resulted in an employee being crushed to death for which the company was fined only $720.

That despite the serious nature of the violations that appear to have contributed to these fatalities, no follow-up inspections were conducted by OSHA to determine whether these hazards were abated.

Since then our investigation has uncovered documents indicating that OSHA inspectors were left idle and without assignment because of directives from higherups not to inspect Coors facilities and that OSHA compliance strongly disagreed with the deletion of two Coors facilities from the inspection list. A letter from Mr. Jerry Ryan, industrial hygene supervisor for the Denver area, is included at the end of these remarks.

I would also clarify a point made in my statement of April 19, the one made immediately prior to the Easter recess. In that statement I indicated that only four inspections of Coors facilities were made between the time Assistant Secretary Auchter took over at OSHA and January 1 of this year and that three of those four were accident inspections, two of which involved fatalities. Further review of the OSHA files indicate that the third accident inspection also involved a fatality. In that instance an employee was crushed by a malfunctioning machine that was neither labeled or locked to prevent its use. During the course of the inspection officials of the company indicated that they previously considered a lock on the equipment but had decided it would be too expensive. The company was cited for failure to lock or tag the equipment and a $420 fine was proposed by the area office but the citation and penalty were later vacated by the Department of Labor.

In the one nonfatality inspection that was conducted by OSHA against Coors during the 33-month period in question, noise has a major target of the inspection. The agency found that noise levels throughout the plant were two to four times higher than permissible levels, that proper engineering controls to control noise were not used, and that nearly a third of the employees had experienced significant hearing loss since they began work at the plant. The agency initially proposed one nonserious citation for those violations but later vacated any citation.

The memo from the area industrial hygene supervisor follows:

MAY 21, 1982.

Memo For: Wm Corrigan, Area Director.
From: Jerry Ryan, IH Supervisor.
Subject: Significant problems affecting the DAO health enforcement.

The single largest problem that I am experiencing is the lack of available assignments for my staff. Since 5-4-82 we have been finished with the first cycle of the health planning guide with the exception of the four Coors plants. As you are aware CPL 2.25B Ch-1 eliminated the two Coors Porcelain plants much to our disapproval. Per instructions from Curtis we have not attempted an inspection at the Coors Container or glass plants. Without such inspection attempts we can't begin to schedule inspections for the health second cycle since cycle 1 isn't completed yet. Since I have projected 30% of my inspection activity from the planning guide and we have been without planning guide inspections for the past month, I will continue to be so in the future. Until Coors inspections are resolved our inspection numbers will fall short of our projections. At present I am 17% from where I should be for the total number of inspections at this time in the third quarter. The other scheduling problem is we still don't have approval for our lead emphasis program which was submitted back in Nov. 1981.

The second problem that we have is the inspection involving the Department of the Army at the Rocky Mt Arsenal. Verbally we had been instructed not to hold a closing conference, or issue citations. On June 21, 1982 the inspection will be 6 months old. Our case file shows evidence of 23 serious violations, two of which are willful and all of which involve a potent carcinogen, NDMA. I believe our Act and Executive Order mandate that citations be issued.

Our other problems are our continued lack of search warrants and the lack of clerical support for the office.

The only good news is that I'm looking forward to my vacation June 3-10th.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. KATIE HALL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House on a very important and far-reaching issue. The slaughter of 1.5 million Armenians by the Turks during World War I will remain a part of our memories for all time. The Armenian genocide must be recognized as a gray fact in history that cannot be minimized or forgotten.

Armenian Martyrs' Day recounts the sadness of that period and recalls other crimes of genocide caused by man's inhumanity to man.

Let us not forget, and let us fight to prevent another tragedy of the magnitude of the Armenian genocide.●

IN TRIBUTE TO BARRETT C. SHELTON, SR.

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, Alabama suffered the loss of one of its greatest native sons, Barrett Shelton, Sr. In tribute to this outstanding citizen, I want to submit an editorial which appeared in the paper he edited and published for 60 years, the Decatur Daily.

This outstanding Alabamian was given more civic and service awards than anyone I know. There is hardly an award worth having in Alabama that he had not received. He was even selected to address the United Nations.

His accomplishments and honors are literally a book of golden deeds.

There are few things in the lives of north Alabama that he has not touched and made better, whether it be business, industry, health, religion, government, or journalism.

I am a better person and a better Congressman for having known Barrett Shelton, Sr., and benefited from his wise and loving counsel. As he was to everyone, whether they knew him or not, he was my friend and benefactor.

When I had an extremely important decision to make about north Alabama and the Tennessee Valley, he was always one of the first that I went to for advice.

He was more than merely a newspaper publisher in my district. He was my mentor, confidant, critic, and helper.

Decatur, Morgan County, the Tennessee Valley, Alabama, and America are better because Barrett Shelton lived and loved them all and did his very best to make them all better for each and every person.

He would be embarrassed by all of this, as he often was by praise and plaudits. If I had to list one person whom I felt always did his best, he would be at the top of the list.

I thank the Good Lord for the splendid life of Barrett Shelton, Sr.

I send my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Shelton, Barrett, Jr., and Suzanne, as well as all the employees of the Decatur Daily.

My greatest hope is that somewhere, sometime, somehow, we shall see his likes again.

The editorial follows:

[From the Decatur Daily, Apr. 24, 1984]

BARRETT C. SHELTON

(The Bridge Builder by Will Allen Gromgoogle)

An old man going a lone highway,
Came in the evening cold and gray.
To a chasm vast and deep and wide,
The old man crossed in the twilight dim
The sullen stream had no fear for him.
But he turned when safe on the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.

"Old man," said a fellow-pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength a building here.
Your journey will end with the ending day,
You never again will pass this way.
You've crossed the chasm deep and wide,
Why build you this bridge at evening tide?"

The builder lifted his old gray head,
"Good friend, in the way I've come," he said,
"There followeth after me today,
A youth whose feet must pass this way.
The sullen stream was a naught to me,
To that fair haired youth may a pitfall be;
He too must cross in the twilight dim,
Good friend, I am building a bridge for him."

Barrett C. Shelton knew he had a special gift as a leader and he gave of it freely. Sitting in a hotel room in Tokyo two years ago, he hatched a scheme to entice Toyota to build a plant here that would employ 10,000 people.

The plant wasn't built but the effort was an example of his never-ceasing drive to do something for his people. He never let up at trying to improve Decatur, Morgan County and the Tennessee Valley. Even as life slowly flowed from him during the three weeks he was in a Birmingham hospital, he directed projects he had under way.

Barrett Shelton had far greater vision than most people. He had a belief in himself and in his ability to bring together the right people and the right elements at the right time to transform his visions into reality. He was a builder, and he believed in people.

He knew a million people, it seemed, and each could tell a story about the "Old Man," each story sprinkled with his ever-present humor, but each with a common theme of trying to help someone, or trying to help Decatur, Morgan County, the Tennessee Valley or the State of Alabama.

It was his life. While others played golf and took vacations, he rarely did. He worked, not only at building a better newspaper, but at building a better community. He believed a job was sacred and he wanted each person to have one. Thousands of people are at work today because of him.

Barrett Shelton was inquisitive. He had a thirst for knowledge. He believed in education. He often said that he wasn't exactly sure what high tech was, but that North Alabama had to have it. He knew its companion was education.

He had a natural enthusiasm for everything but most of all an enthusiasm for life. He loved living. He was determined to whip that dreadful thing that kept tugging at his lifeline. Two days before he died, when talking was almost impossible for him, he said twice in measured, deliberate words: "I will be back." The vow was to return to his office at THE DAILY, the place that was his life and the place where he often said "things get started."

He was more human than most of us. He felt things more keenly. Poverty made him grieve. "It's horrible," he often said. He was a pushover for hardluck stories that cost him no telling how much in personal charity.

He had a deep loyalty to his friends and to his beliefs.

He was a Democrat, always, and it pained him greatly to have to support a Republican president, a Republican senator, a Republican anything. But he saw it as his duty to support those in office, those building a better America. Building was always the key. He supported politicians because they could aid his city, his county and his people.

Of course, at election time he would be back trying to build the Democratic Party. He was a Democrat.

He felt that a newspaper's single most important function was to build. He devoted his last 15 years to that task full time and fretted that time was running out on him and that he had projects, such as downtown renovation, yet to be finished. At age 81, he had no desire to retire.

Mr. Shelton believed in quality journalism, but often practiced it a little differently from the norm. While some editors contend that the press and government should be adversaries, Mr. Shelton didn't believe a reporter should stick his finger in an elected official's eye simply because he represented the press. But let an official violate his public trust and he became fair game.

He loved his family, and that included "The Daily Family," the men and women who produce this newspaper every day.

Barrett Shelton had an unshakable faith in God, his church, his family and his people that was the cornerstone for all that he helped build.

The Decatur Daily was born in 1912 out of a need two small towns had for leadership. Its founder was William Randolph Shelton who provided directon through his newspaper for the growing area.

When New Decatur's name was changed to Albany, the name of the paper changed in 1916. W. R. Shelton continued to supply the leadership a newspaper must when it became The Albany-Decatur Daily.

His son, Barrett C. Shelton, became publisher in 1924. Making the twin towns one city was a major goal and it was accomplished in 1927 when the paper also received its current name, The Decatur Daily.

Now a third generation of that family, Barrett C. Shelton Jr., leads The Daily. The leadership that began on that February day in 1912 under W. R. Shelton and continued under Barrett C. Shelton for 60 years will continue to be a family tradition.

The Daily will remain a Shelton family owned newspaper.●

SOVIET GOVERNMENT HARASSMENT OF JEWISH "REFUSENIKS"

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the devoted efforts of the Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC) of St. Louis on behalf of five Soviet Jewish "refuseniks." The five cases I shall outline represent the ongoing harass-

ment by the Soviet Government of members of the Jewish community. The JCRC of St. Louis, in conjunction with the National Conference on Soviet Jewry and the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council representing 113 community relations agencies throughout our Nation are leading the effort to end this senseless religious persecution.

The first case is that of former Prisoner of Conscience Grigory Goldshtein, a physicist from Tbilisi, who is accused of "taking advantage of his position" at the Central Bureau of Statistics, and may face a new, 3- to 5-year prison term. He has been informed that his file was transferred to a local prosecutor. He has protested the move with a detailed letter to the First Secretary of the Georgian Republic's Communist Party. Harassment of Goldshtein and the threat of another sentence is a sign of continuing surveillance of committed Jewish activists.

Leningrad refusenik and Jewish cultural activist Mikhail Beizer was threatened with arrest by authorities if he fails to "discontinue his activities." He has taught at private seminars on Jewish history and culture, and conducted unofficial tours of Leningrad's sites of Jewish interest. The JCRC protests this interference with Beizer's human right to learn and perpetuate his own culture and religion.

Prisoner of Conscience, Victor Brailovsky was to be released in March. A scientist of international reputation, Brailovsky continues to suffer for his Jewish activism. The JCRC expresses concern that once released, he be allowed to emigrate to Israel with his family, and looks to the time when his knowledge can be contributed to the West rather than imprisoned in a Soviet jail.

In two cases, the JCRC supports the emigration of Soviet Jewish individuals who are ill and seek the right to medical care outside the U.S.S.R. Wife of Moscow physicist Naum Meinman, Mrs. Ian Meinman, is gravely ill after undergoing a painful operation for a tumor in October. She was refused permission to leave for Israel where treatment is available.

Nadezhda Fradkova has been hospitalized as the result of a life threatening hunger strike in protest of the denial of the right to emigration. Rather than being force-fed and under guard, Fradkova should be allowed to leave for Israel.

I commend the agencies working in behalf of Soviet Jews and continuing to press the American Government to work on their behalf in all appropriate channels.●

DO NOT GIVE CONRAIL AWAY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation is currently in the process of trying to sell Conrail. Conrail is now profitable, thanks to a large Federal investment of over $7.5 billion and hard work and sacrifice by shippers, employees, and others.

I have been concerned about a precipitous sale. Conrail will make over $400 million this year. We should sell only when we get an offer that provides the best return to the Federal Government and insures continued rail service.

What follows is an editorial from the Record of New Jersey which expresses concern about a sale.

[From the Record of New Jersey, Apr. 23, 1984]

DO NOT GIVE CONRAIL AWAY

Conrail, the phoenix that rose from the ashes of the Penn Central and four other bankrupt Eastern railroads in 1976, is now making handsome profits and attracting eager buyers. Mr. Reagan is in a rush to close a deal, but the government should look carefully at the arithmetic.

Two years ago, the White House hired a Wall Street investment firm, Goldman Sachs & Company, to study how best to return the 15-state freight service to the private sector. There are several alternatives: private purchase, purchase by Conrail's 40,000 union employees, a public stock offering, or some combination of the three.

It helps in weighing these choices to look at how the railroads collapsed, why the government was forced to create Conrail and pour $8 billion into it, and how the corporation has finally achieved profitability.

The postwar railroads in the Northeast suffered from bad government policies and bad management. The industry was severely over-regulated. Competing truckers were subsidized by lavish highway programs. Congress made prodigal rules for the railroad labor unions, and the unions excelled at featherbedding.

Deteriorating service drove passengers back to their autos. Tracks and rolling stock were neglected. With bankruptcy looming, Penn Central's directors repeatedly borrowed to pay dividends. Investigating the railroad's collapse in 1972, the Securities and Exchange Commission called this policy "reckless."

The Senate Commerce Committee suggested that five directors, headed by Fred Kirby of Alleghany Corporation, were among the largest shareholders of the railroad and stood to gain millions by their votes. Shares controlled by Mr. Kirby paid $4 million a year before the bankruptcy. Now the very same Mr. Kirby and his associate directors are looking to buy Conrail, and they apparently have the inside track with the administration.

The deal they have offered the government is as self-serving as their conduct on the Penn Central board. They say they are prepared to pay $2 billion, but their figures don't hold together. Counting the tax credits collected by Conrail when it was losing millions a year and the $700 million in cash that Conrail will have accumulated by the end of 1984, Mr. Kirby and company are offering the equivalent of $500 million for a property that is earning $500 million a year. That's a price-earnings ratio of 1 to 1. A conventional New York Stock Exchange ratio is 7 to 1.

That would be quite a bargain for Mr. Kirby and company, but it's a bad deal for the taxpayers, the freight customers, and the employees of the railroad.

For years, Conrail was kept afloat—and a vital freight network preserved—by the taxpayers. It's no accident that it has finally emerged in the black. Deregulation has freed it to operate rationally; union members have given up the old featherbedding rules and more than $120 million in pay increases, and the states—New Jersey, New York, and Pennsyvania—have taken over Conrail's money-losing commuter railroads. It's time to consider the equity of the ordinary people whose hardships have paid for Conrail's success.

Any of the alternatives is better for the taxpayers than the Kirby deal. Employees deserve something for their sacrifices. They now own 15 percent of Conrail stock. In order to buy the rest, they might have to borrow more money than is prudent. Goldman Sachs has predicted that a public stock offering would net the largest return. Perhaps a combination of public and employee ownership is soundest, fairest to taxpayers and union members, and best for rail service in the long run. We've had the Great Railway Fiasco. We mustn't follow it with the Great Railway Giveaway.●

BUILDER BONDS

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, builder bonds are bonds issued by homebuilders to various investors. The proceeds from the bond sales are used to provide mortgage money for home buyers; the mortgages held by the builder are used as collateral for the bonds. This innovation was developed by homebuilders in response to the high interest rates of the late 1970's and early 1980's and the use of builder bonds has expanded rapidly.

By tailoring the bond structure to specific investor needs and eliminating various fees and profits to financial intermediaries, builders issuing bonds are able to offer reduced mortgage rates and/or lower home prices than would otherwise be available to home buyers. In view of the current upward pressure on interest rates and the key role the housing industry plays in sustaining economic recovery, I believe the importance of builder bonds cannot be overstated.

Unfortunately, the future of these instruments and their benefits are being threatened by Treasury Department consideration of changes in the method of taxing them. Currently a

builder pays taxes only on income received from payment of mortgages using the installment sales method of reporting income. Treasury has been exploring the idea of taxing builders when the funds are borrowed, that is, when the bonds are sold. Not only would such a change effectively eliminate builder bonds as a source of more affordable home financing, it would also contravene longstanding principles of taxation applicable to many industries.

House Concurrent Resolution 253 which I am cosponsoring expresses the sense of Congress that the Internal Revenue Code relating to installment sales, or any other provision of the code or IRS regulations, should not be modified or amended in any way to alter the manner in which mortgage-backed builder bond transactions are currently taxed.

Now is the time for Congress to go on record in support of builder bonds and I urge the Ways and Means Committee to approve House Concurrent Resolution 253 so that it may be brought to a vote on the House floor.●

JOHN J. JURSKI

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, recently, the city of Toledo lost one of its most respected community and political figures. John J. Jurski's death is a great loss for all Toledoans.

John J. Jurski served 45 years in various Lucas County posts. A native of Poland, John Jurski served in the offices of the Lucas County Treasurer, sheriff, and engineer. He retired in 1969 from the sign painting department at the Lucas County garage.

John Jurski's contribution to the Democratic Party was of the highest order. He was Democratic chairman of the fourth ward for 15 years. Upon his retirement from the party post in 1961, John received a letter from President John F. Kennedy commending him for his valuable years of service to the party. John Jurski was an inspiration to generations of Democrats.

I know my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in offering condolences to John Jurski's family and thank them for sharing him with us.●

DRUG ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM CONCERNS IN MAJOR U.S. CITIES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a preliminary report of the results of the 1984 survey by the National Association for City Drug and Alcohol Coordination [NACDAC] on drug abuse and alcoholism concerns in major U.S. cities.

This survey requested data from 50 major cities on incidence and prevalence of substance abuse, funding and implementation of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services [ADMS] block grant, and the effects of funding changes on treatment and prevention services. The preliminary report is based on data furnished by 19 of the cities surveyed, a 40-percent return. Efforts are continuing to collect and analyze more returns.

The results of this sample show that alcohol, heroin, cocaine, and marihuana are the most abused substances. A third of the cities reporting mentioned an increase in cocaine, heroin, alcohol, and polydrug abuse.

More than three-fourths of the cities report a reduction in Federal funds since the ADMS block grant went into effect in 1982. The cities claim that State funding has not been adequate to compensate for the loss of Federal support, and many cities feel that States have not been fair in allocating block grant funds.

As a result of funding cuts, cities report that treatment and prevention services have been reduced, waiting lists and gaps in services exist, and programs are overutilized, raising concerns about the quality of care. Last year, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, which I chair, conducted a series of hearings around the country to examine the extent of drug abuse problems. The preliminary results of NACDAC's survey relect the testimony we heard. Witness after witness told us that although some surveys indicate slight declines in drug abuse nationally over the past few years, drug abuse remains extremely high in our cities and has increased sharply in a number of urban areas. While the drug problems facing many cities have grown, their resources for treatment and prevention have been reduced, and they cannot keep up with the increased need for services. If we are to be successful in reducing the adverse consequences and immense costs of drug abuse to our society, we must make a stronger commitment to helping our cities meet their unique drug abuse problems.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe the NAC-DAC's preliminary survey report will be of interest to other Members of Congress and the public, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point. I intend to insert the final survey results as soon as they are available.

Dr. Piccone's letter, the survey and a list of cities responding to the survey, follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CITY DRUG AND ALCOHOL COORDINATION,

Boston, Mass., March 21, 1984.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman, Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RANGEL: Enclosed with this letter is a preliminary report of the results of the 1984 survey by NACDAC (National Association for City Drug and Alcohol Coordination) of Drug Abuse and Alcoholism Concerns in Major U.S. Cities.

This survey requested data on incidence and prevalence of substance abuse, funding and Block Grant implementation and the effects of funding changes on treatment and prevention services in 50 major U.S. cities.

The greatest unmet needs noted in this sample were adolescent treatment, polydrug abuse treatment, and detoxification services, among other needs. The most abused substances were noted as alcohol, heroin and cocaine, in that order, among other substances abused. A third of the 19 cities reporting mentioned an increase in cocaine, heroin, alcohol and polydrug abuse. Alcohol maintains its place as the number one drug of abuse.

More than three-quarters of the cities reporting say that they have experienced a reduction in federal funds since the implementation of Block Grant funding, that State funding has not adequately compensated for this loss, and that the states have not been fair in allocating these federal funds. Over half the reporting cities believe that federal D & A funds should be allocated directly to large cities.

While there is a State Block Grant Allocation Task Force available to half of the 19 reporting cities, only one city has reported having meaningful participation on such a task force.

The reporting cities claim that they anticipate an average decrease in D & A services and program staff of 10 to 25%. They already have: Reduced treatment and prevention service; waiting lists and caps in service; and over utilized programs, causing concern about quality of care.

Despite the Federal mandate that D & A prevention should be a nationwide priority, survey results show a decrease rather than an increase of D & A prevention services in the cities reporting.

I would like to emphasize that this preliminary report is based on a 40% return and that we continue to work to collect more returns and broaden the data base.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS L. PICCONE, Ed. D.,
Chairman, NACDAC.

Enclosures.

SURVEY OF DRUG ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM CONCERNS IN MAJOR U.S. CITIES—PRELIMINARY REPORT

There were 55 Surveys mailed out, 22 Returned (40 percent): 19 cities, 2 states, and 1 region.

This preliminary data is based on returns from the 19 cities.

INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Those cities responding have a variety of unmet D & A abuse needs. Their focus was on (in priority order): adolescent treatment, polydrug abuse treatment, detoxification services (alcohol and drug adolescent detox), evaluation of D & A programs, diversion to treatment from CJS, treatment of the dual diagnosed (D & A and MH/MR), and greater collaboration among city agencies (D & A and others, e.g. MH/MR, aging, etc.)

The most abused substances in these cities are (in order of priority): Alcohol, heroin, cocaine, marijuana, amphetamines, barbiturates, hallucinagens, and other (Talwin and Pyribensamine that is, T's and Blues).

Since 1981, heroin abuse has increased in half of these cities, decreased in 25 percent, and remained essentially unchanged in 25 percent. Alcohol abuse has increased in 75 percent and remained unchanged in 20 percent of the reporting cities (5 percent no response).

The cities provided their data from a variety of data bases: Internal City, State, DAWN, CJS and Community Epidemiology Work Group Report as well as Special University or Government Studies.

About a third of the cities mentioned the increase they have seen in cocaine, heroin, alcohol and polydrug abuse. They also noted the younger age of abusers generally and certain populations, such as women, where more alcohol abuse is noted.

FUNDING AND FUNDING STRUCTURE

Nine (47 percent) out of 19 responding cities have all governmemt funds going through a central city office/agency.

Seventeen (89 percent) cities are located in states where there are SSAs (Single State Agencies).

Half of the cities have single county authority structures. Most are responsible for city or county geographical areas.

BLOCK GRANT IMPLEMENTATION

Half of the cities reporting describe a negative effect on their D & A service system by the new Block Grant Funding mechanism and feel strongly that federal D & A funds should be allocated directly to large cities. Of the remaining cities, 4 claim a positive effect from the Block Grant mechanism and want no change in it, while 5 have given no opinion.

Half of the cities reporting say that their states have a Block Grant Allocation Task Force. However, of this number, only one city has reported meaningful effective participation in it. The others either have not been invited to join it or have had only a limited effective input.

Almost all the 19 cities claim that their SSA does not provide adequate financial support for their D & A needs.

Fifteen (79 percent) cities say that they have experienced a reduction in federal funds since the implementation of Block Grant funding, that the state funding has not adequately compensated for this loss, and that the state has been unfair in allocating these federal funds. The same 15 cities also ascribe to needs based funding.

Only three cities report that legislatively approved D & A additional funds were actually used to replace federal funding reductions.

TREATMENT

Approximately 400 D & A treatment facilities are receiving public money in the 19 reporting cities—serving 116,502 clients.

More than a third of these 19 cities have formal waiting lists for Methadone Maintenance, alcohol and outpatient drug free treatment, extending for up to five weeks.

They also note, in several instances, that they continue to have heavily over-utilized programs. This raises concerns regarding quality of service in these over-utilized situations.

For fiscal year 1985 they are anticipating an average decrease in D & A services of 10-25 percent, as well as a program staff reduction of 10-25 percent.

They claim that they have already experienced: Reduced treatment and prevention services; waiting lists and gaps in services; and overutilized programs.

They have reduced, or will be reducing services even as they all seek other public and private funding and strain to use all available resources in a maximum way.

EDUCATION, PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION

Only Los Angeles and Buffalo note any significant increase in prevention funding. This is significant as regards the Federal mandate that D & A prevention should be a priority, nationally. Despite this mandate, the survey results thus far show that there is a decrease rather than an increase of prevention services in the cities reporting.

84 prevention programs are represented by the reporting cities.

5,000 to 105,000 people in these cities received substance abuse prevention education in fiscal year 1983; 90 percent were youth.

Prevention programs anticipate a reduction in services of an average of 10-25 percent during the coming year.

Prevention programs are seeking alternate funding from public and private sources even as they face the reality of reduced prevention service availability.

NACDAC SURVEY RESPONSE STATUS AS OF MARCH 19, 1984

Cities responding: 1. Anchorage, Alaska,* 2. Akron, OH (D) letter, 3. Atlanta, GA, 4. Birmingham, Ala., 5. Boston, Mass.,* 6. Buffalo, NY,* 7. Chicago, Ill,* 8. Colorado Springs, CO (D), 9. Detroit, Mich.,* 10. Jersey City, NJ,* 11. Los Angeles, Calif.,* 12. Madison, Wisc., 13. Milwaukee, Wisc., 14. New Orleans, LA,* 15. Oklahoma City, OK (State Resp), 16. Omaha, Neb. (State Resp), 17. Philadelphia, PA,* 18. Phoenix, Ariz., 19. Providence, RI,* 20. San Diego, Calif. (D/A), 21. San Juan, PR,* and 22. Virginia Beach, VA.

Cities not responding by March 19, 1984: 1. Albuquerque, N. Mex.,* 2. Baltimore, MD,* 3. Cincinnati, OH, 4. Cleveland, OH,* 5. Colorado Springs, Co,** 6. Columbus, OH,*** 7. Dallas, Tex.,*** 8. Denver, Colo., 9. El Paso, Tex., 10. Fort Worth, Tex. (D./A), 11. Gary, Ind., 12. Houston, Tex., 13. Indianapolis, Ind.,*** 14. Jacksonville, Fla., 15. Kansas City, MO,* 16. Memphis, Tenn., 17. Miami, Fla., 18. Minneapolis, Minn.,* 19. Nashville, Tenn., 20. New York City, NY,* 21. Pittsburgh, PA, 22. Portland, Ore., 23. Rio Piedras, PR,* 24. St. Louis, MO,* 25. San Antonio, Tex,* 26. San Francisco, CA,* 27. San Jose, CA, 28. Seattle, Wash., and 29. Washington, DC.*

*NACDAC member.
**Alcohol only.
D=Drug only.
***Responded but could not complete survey.
D/A=Separate surveys for separate D and A administrative units.●

HOLOCAUST VICTIMS

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, this week begins the designated Days of Remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust. Today I would like to convey my sentiments to the survivors of the Holocaust and their families.

These men and women are truly brave individuals. Throughout severe persecution, they retained the mental and moral strength to persevere and withstand the fear and dangers initiated by their oppressors. Their spirit and resilience deserve our deepest respect.

But these people wish more than our respect. They desire our attention and remembrance. Those who gather here in Washington implore our recognition of the destruction one group brought upon another, so that the complacency which allowed this Holocaust will never again occur.

Plans for a Holocaust Museum are still underway, and recently a building was acquired. Like all symbols, this museum will serve as a constant reminder to future generations of the darkest hour in human history. It will also serve as a memorial to the many who were killed.

These days of remembrance are the cornerstone from which we must build a disgust against tyranny. For tyranny has historically wrought havoc, as can be seen from the nightmarish events under tyrannical Germany that led to such great human loss and suffering.

I am pleased I had this opportunity to share my deepest admiration for those people who fought to remain alive, and who now share their experiences in the hope of saving succeeding generations from the senseless scourge of war.●

ANGRY COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKS OUT ON INTERVIEWERS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with grave concern that I insert the following article from the April 1984, issue of Navy Times magazine in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The attitude and tone of the chairman of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control, Mr. J. Peter Grace, is such that I fear that the national alarm concerning his committee's recommendations is indeed justified.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Navy Times magazine, Apr. 1984]

ANGRY COMMISSION CHAIRMAN WALKS OUT ON INTERVIEWERS

(J. Peter Grace, chairman of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control, agreed to be interviewed by Navy Times Staff Writer Tom Philpott and Federal Times Reporter Winston Wood in his Washington office February 8. He angrily cut short the interview after about 15 minutes. The following is a transcript of the discussion.)

Times: Mr. Grace, I work for the service Times papers, the Army Times, the Navy Times, the Air Force Times. Winston (Wood) is with Federal Times. Of course, your recommendations would touch the lives of these people in many ways.

Grace: Yes, Well, may I say that an awful lot of people would not be affected because of the grandfathering of the situation. Anybody, basically, 45 years and older would really not be affected. But the whole issue comes down to, really, we were asked to look at the economics and thrust of the whole government. And when you see we are heading for a total unfunded liability in Social Security and the civil service and the military of $27 trillion in 17 years then you say to yourself, "Can we afford this?" And there is nothing in our ideas and recommendations that the people who are, say, 45, 46 and beyond, those on retirement, would really be affected very much at all.

We've had letters—another thing I want to say is—we have had letters, a number of letters, and even money, from retired service people who have said, "We think that what you are recommending might hurt us. But we want to tell you that we have children and grandchildren who are looking down the road to the future and we think you are right in principle and we want to send some money in to help you."

And I've been on quite a number, quite a few radio call-in shows and I have had retired military people and retired FBI, widows of retired FBI men, come on and say the same thing. "We think you're right. We don't think the government can afford to spew this money out the way they are doing it."

So I just mention, I don't think it's something that people above 45 years of age are really not going to be affected very much. Or those that are retired. We shouldn't get into a confrontational attitude. And those that are below these ages, they are going to get hit with the overall impact of all these expenditures anyway. And I think they will be just as anxious as all the rest of us to see that something is done sensibly. To see, you know, that the whole nation doesn't go down the drain.

Because, as we pointed out to the Senate Finance Committee today, the difference between doing our recommendation, our 2478 suggestions that we have made, and of not doing them, is a difference of having a $1.996 trillion deficit or a $37 billion deficit in the year 2000.

So, it is a total cumulative difference of $10.35 trillion. And therefore, something has to be done. If it isn't these ideas, then it will have to be something else. And a younger man, as I am saying, those that are say 40 or 45, they'll only be 52 to 57 [sic] at the turn of the century, fairly young people. And yeah, they will be affected by this, but by the same token, if they weren't affected by this and if nothing else is done they will be living with an economy which has a $2 trillion annual deficit. So I just wanted to put the whole thing in context.

(Grace aide): Mr. Grace, both gentleman attended the Dole hearing this morning.

Grace: You did?

Times: Yes.

Grace: And you saw the numbers?

Times: Yes. And we have seen them in your reports as well.

Grace: You stayed for the whole hearing?

Times: Yes.

Grace: Oh, you did?

Times: Yes. Well, let's see. Until 12 o'clock. I don't know whether that was . . .

Grace: Yeah, that was about when it ended.

Times: Yes, we were there for the whole thing. But perhaps we can start with the cost-savings figures. There's been criticism of that throughout the government. Even the agencies that are looking over your numbers now, months ago they said . . .

Grace: You said, ". . . are looking over your numbers now." Ah, that means they are looking over 23,650 pages. Is that right? Is that what you are saying? Yeah, they are looking them over. How long do you think it will take them to study those carefully?

Times: Well, your reports were out in August, as I recall.

Grace: Oh no, the final reports came out about 10 days ago. With duplicated savings and everything else. We stand on our final reports, which came out on January 16.

Times: But the people who have looked over your findings since August, though . . .

Grace: "The people who have looked over . . ." I want to be very careful now. Who are "the people?" These are certain people who have looked over it.

Times: Okay.

Grace: "The people," huh?

Times: You want me to name names?

Grace: No, no. I don't want you to name names. Your sentence reads, "The people who have . . ."

Times: Well, let me ask you this, Mr. Grace.

Grace: No, no. I would like to hear the end of that sentence. "The people who have . . ." Go ahead.

Times: Looked over . . .

Grace: Now what were you going to say?

Times: That is, analysts in the government. That is, people—like in a corporation, the comptroller people, but like in the government—who have looked over your budget of cost esimates, they're saying your cost estimates are grossly exaggerated.

Grace: So you are saying everybody who has looked it over is saying that?

Times: I'm saying the people I have talked to. I would go so far as to say consistently, the people I've talked to.

Grace: The people you have talked to. So now we are down to the circle of people you have talked to, is that right?

Times: Okay.

Grace: Good. That's fine. Now what am I supposed to say to that? I don't know who you have talked to. I mean I'm not going to say to you that, before I came in here, I went over to the Carlton Hotel and talked to everybody I could find in the lobby about you and they all told me you were a son-of-a-bitch. But I'm not going to say that to you.

Times: Uh, uh.

Grace: And that I didn't do it. And they didn't say it. But I don't know who you talked to. So, therefore, it doesn't mean a damn thing to me.

Times: Okay. Do you know (Defense) Secretary Weinberger?

Grace: Sure, I know him.

Times: Then he says that your savings are, what you plan for military retirement won't work. Won't provide you with the force that you need.

Grace: Hooray for him. That's his opinion.

Times: Well, all I'm asking you is if that's not going to work, what does the President do with * * *

Grace: You say it's not going to work. When did you ever hear people * * * I got the senators all laughing this morning when I said, "When did anybody ever start on an economy program where all of the people, before you gave them your recommendations, said, 'Oh, yeah, that's right. We haven't done any of those things that we should have done before.'" The first reaction from people who have told, "If you do thus, thus and thus * * *"

Times: Who are these "people" you're talking about?

Grace: I'm talking anybody. Anybody. Anybody.

Times: Same people I was talking about.

Grace: Same people. Anybody you talk to who said, "Now I'm going to show you how you can do everything that you do, only at 30 percent less cost." And when I come out and tell your boss about it, you're going to say, "He's nuts. He doesn't understand," et cetera.

(Aide hands Grace a one-paragraph letter)

Grace: Here's a letter I got from Cap Weinberger, received on January 17th. "You may be assured that we are considering all of your recommendations in our office to gain the fullest advantage from your many good ideas."

Times: He may be considering them, but let me tell you what Cap Weinberger said at a recent press conference.

Grace: Sir, I think I have had it. I mean, you obviously have come in here to insult me. We stand on our recommendations. I don't give a goddamn who you saw or what they said. And I went through this and you didn't even listen to it. I've had it.

(Grace gets up from the conference table and walks toward the door.)

Grace: I haven't got time to talk to someone as prejudiced as you.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, over 40 years ago today, the rumor of a terrifying Nazi plot to exterminate the Jewish race began to circulate throughout Europe. Soon after that the Jews were expelled from the countryside of Poland and forced into urban ghettos. Their property was confiscated, their labor exploited, and their bodies starved as a means of control. This marked only the first phase of destruction.

What followed was the most unconscionable act of programed genocide the world has ever known. The use of mobile killing units and extermination camps ultimately brought about the death of 6 million Jewish men, women, and children.

The most devastating part of the Holocaust for many who lived through

it was their fear that no one would ever know. For many survivors, the past would be obliterated. The duty to describe the past became the very reason to stay alive. Their testimony was a moral appeal to the world's conscience, an urgent plea that this moment in world history never be repeated.

We have learned a valuable lesson from those survivors who stepped forward to bear witness. The Holocaust left them with memories far worse than any of us can imagine yet they had the courage to live on, publicizing to the world their tragedy, even though the world might have preferred not to listen. Their lives were a testimony to humaneness in spite of the inhumanity of the concentration camp.

Today we have the duty and opportunity to pay homage to those who died and those who survived this physical and psychological catastrophe. Through this day of remembrance we proclaim to our fellow Americans and the world that we have not forgotten the conditions the Jewish people were forced to live and die under. It is in honor of the courage of the victims—and the survivors—that we mark the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust.●

CRIME ISSUE

HON. THOMAS F. HARTNETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an issue which is becoming an embarrassment to the House of Representatives. The issue is criminal justice system reform. In March 1983, the President sent to the Congress the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983, of which I am a cosponsor, proposing substantive changes to the criminal justice system. Some of the issues in this bill include bail reform, capital punishment, and the exclusionary rule. The Senate held hearings and processed the act as four separate bills resulting in passage of all four this past February. Unfortunately, on our side, the bill was not even sent to the appropriate subcommittee until March 1984.

Crime is one of the high priority issues on the minds of our citizens. All polls reflect crime as being considered one of the major ills of our Nation. And yet, for some unexplainable reason, the House is unable to act on legislation which will improve the criminal process in our country.

The issue of crime is complex and concessions have been made in order to get a consensus on proposed legislation. The Senate's action reflects taking on a difficult issue and resolving it with passage of the bill reflecting bipartisan support.

It is time for us to get on with the crime issue and act in a responsible manner to pass this legislation. More specifically, Mr. Speaker, when are we going to get this bill out of committee in order that we may vote on the issue at hand? I call upon the leadership of the House to take necessary steps to insure this proposed legislation is brought to the floor so that we may act responsibly before the end of the session. The American people are worried about crime, constructive legislation has been passed by the Senate and we desperately need to get on with the process and pass this measure without delay.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marks the 69th anniversary of the deaths of Armenians in Ottoman Turkey. Estimates suggest that as many as 1.5 million Armenians died, and another half a million were forced into exile. The unfortunate events of 1915–23 presaged darker efforts to extinguish other religious, ethnic, cultural, and racial groups during the Second World War.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 247, which sought to designate April 24, 1984 as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man." Unfortunately, a shortsighted technicality prevented the House from passing the resolution in time to commemorate April 24 as a day of remembrance for victims of the events of 1915–23, and indeed for all victims of the brutalities which we have inflicted on each other from time immemorial.

We should not forget the victims of Armenian genocide, just as we should not forget the victims of the Holocaust. To paraphrase the Armenian Genocide Commemorative Fund, such a remembrance would be an affirmation that will help preserve life today, and will reconfirm our dedication to the ideals of personal and religious freedom.●

NETWORKS GETTING MESSAGE ON EXIT POLLS

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Mr. Daniel Ritchie, chairman and CEO of Group W (Westinghouse Broadcasting and Cable Inc.), which appeared in last week's New York Times.

Mr. Ritchie expresses his very compelling thoughts on the extraordinary role that television has in our society and the potential it has to provide diverse and quality programing. I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Ritchie that television is an enormously pervasive medium for informal learning and has not lived up to its potential to be a more positive influence.

It is unfortunate that there are not more broadcasters like Daniel Ritchie who understand that in return for the exclusive use of a very scarce natural resource—the public's airwaves—a broadcaster is statutorily required to provide programing that serves a community's needs and interests. One way that this lack of concern by some broadcasters for the public's interest has manifested itself is in the role that the broadcast media play in our electoral process.

The article focuses on a side of the problem of early projections of election results by the networks that has yet to receive much attention—the responsibility of local television affiliates for network practices. Mr. Ritchie very aptly points out that—

> Local stations form each community's delegation to a much larger process . . . as local television licensees, they are the legal arbiters of what is ultimately transmitted via the airwaves.

More and more Members of Congress are condeming the networks' practice of explicitly or implicitly projecting an election winner, based on exit polls or other techniques, before all voters have had the opportunity to cast their ballots. However, the ultimate resolution of this particular issue, and the overall issue of responsiveness to the community that a broadcaster is licensed to serve, should not lie with the Congress, but with the industry itself.

Voluntary restraint from projecting a winner before the polls close hides no information, censors no fact and destroy no one's right to know. Broadcasters, as public trustees of our Nation's airwaves, can play a key role in encouraging voter participation and informing the public about our electoral process. There need be no conflict between the electronic media's rights to report actual news events as they occur and a voter's right to exercise his franchise. These are two very compelling, not competing goals.

Mr. Ritchie's thoughtful article comes from a very interesting perspective—that of a broadcaster. I encourage my colleagues to read it.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1984]

NETWORKS GETTING MESSAGE ON POLLS

(By Daniel L. Ritchie)

It was a fitful and dog-tired Harry Truman who turned in his sleep one memorable election night in 1948 to hear radio commentator H.V. Kaltenborn pronounce him doomed. Mr. Truman was ahead in votes counted, Mr. Kaltenborn acknowledged, but no matter. The polls showed Thomas E. Dewey incontestably ahead. Tally all the votes and it would be done with.

Daylight, of course, told a different tale. The pollsters ran for cover as Mr. Truman, skillfully mimicking the clipped diction of Mr. Kaltenborn, chided all those who had guaranteed his defeat.

We'll never know how Mr. Truman might have fared had there been exit polls back in those days. But he might not have had quite so much fun the next morning.

Within four years of his victory, in time for the next national election, television had eclipsed radio as the medium of prime importance to Presidential candidates. And in the decades since, the science of polling and the technical artistry of television have grown ever more sophisticated. Yet here we are again, witnesses to the same uneasy relationship, with pollsters and broadcasters locked in the same awkward embrace. Not strange bedfellows, perhaps, but unsettling ones.

Consider the words of Ted Koppel of ABC News on election night 1980. At 10:15 P.M. he proclaimed: "It's inevitable now that as this night continues, the Democrats are simply not going to bother to vote where the polls are still open. why should they? It's all over as far as they're concerned." Mindful of the power of the medium he serves, Mr. Koppel had the presence of mind to amend his comments moments later: "Voters on the West Coast: there's more than a Presidential race. Please vote." Yet he was right the first time. Television had made millions of American voters feel superfluous.

The simple answer is to heap scorn on the networks for reporting election winners prematurely. But network news practices, including those governing the use of exit polls, are not born willy-nilly. They are the product of fierce competition for viewers nationally, and, in this respect, each network's approximately 200 affiliated stations share a measure of respsonsibility for preserving the integrity of the voting process.

Local stations form the networks' most important constituency. The networks need to hear from their own membership that premature reporting of exit-poll information on election day is unacceptable.

As owners of three NBC affiliates, two CBS affiliates and an ABC affiliate, we are seeking to make that point. Last month, we ceased reporting the results of exist polls we conduct locally until after the polls close. Our radio stations, including three of the country's largest all-news stations, are following the same policy.

But the polling issue, which has been the subject of debate since at least 1964, is only the most topical challenge facing television today. Political coverage overall warrants deeper scrutiny and more substantive treatment. And matters of equal moment need tending to. In a candid address recently, Grant Tinker, the chairman of NBC, suggested that the industry as a whole might have failed its viewers in terms of the quality and diversity of its programming.

I believe television has much to its credit. But Mr. Tinker speaks the truth. Prime time seems hardly prime these days. Most of what turns up on the dial seems roundly duplicative and silly. How many stories of abused and violated people do we really need? How many living room sitcoms can we survive?

Local stations cast a powerful vote in the conduct of network news and program practices. As local licensees, they are the legal arbiters of what is ultimately transmitted via the airwaves. In theory, if not always in practice, local stations form each community's delegation to a much larger process.

Television's best hope this election year is that grass-roots industry support for self-prohibition will encourage a responsible resolution to the exit-poll dilemma. Contrary to popular belief, the networks are not insensitive to questions concerning their role in the American political process. Most noteworthy in this regard is the example of Leonard Goldenson, the chairman of ABC, who has begun a scholarly review of television's place in our political system.

Such actions cannot advance unsupported. They require and merit a show of solidarity among television's own precinct workers: its station people in cities and towns across the country. Beyond that, it is vitally important to the continued health and well-being of our society that the powerful affiliate bloc play a more active role in shaping future programming policy for television.●

CAPITOL TO CAPITOL VISIT

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of this week a delegation of 115 businessmen, women, and local government officials from the greater Sacramento metropolitan area will converge on this city for the 14th annual "Capitol to Capitol" visit. Their purpose will be to communicate to us and to the Federal bureaucracy the unique concerns and needs of Sacramento.

Divided into 15 separate teams, the delegates will keep 88 appointments over 2½ days to discuss 92 subjects in areas such as water resources, health, housing, public broadcasting, agribusiness, small business, transportation, energy, welfare, education, employment and training, and arts and history.

They will be following in the footsteps of the first "Capitol to Capitol" delegation, sent to Washington in 1971 by the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce to protest the proposed closure of McClellan Air Force Base, one of Sacramento's major employers.

That year, five chamber members, the mayor of Sacramento and a county supervisor were successful in removing McClellan from the base closure list. Thus encouraged, the chamber decided to make the cross-country journey an annual event designed to express the community's appreciation for area military installations and to show support for their military construction programs.

In 1975 the trip was expanded, at the suggestion of then-Mayor Phil Isenberg, to cover not just military involvement in the area but also a wide range of community projects and legislative issues affecting Sacramento. As a result, what began as a handful of concerned community members has now expanded to more than 100 individuals paying their own way and devoting time away from their businesses to communicate and support the interests of their community.

The chamber of commerce and the people of Sacramento are to be applauded for their foresight, their commitment and their willingness to involve themselves in the wheels of government for the betterment of the greater Sacramento metropolitan area. I know of no other community in the Nation that has undertaken such an endeavor. It is with a measure of pride as one of Sacramento's congressional representatives that I commend their efforts to your attention.●

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, IDA

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable woman who has recently celebrated her 53d birthday.

Ida Nudel is one of the more well-known Soviet refuseniks. She has gained notoriety for her steadfast and courageous resistance to Soviet authorities who seek to cut off her contact with the Jewish religion and her people's heritage.

Ida's fight to keep the traditions alive has cost here dearly. She has been imprisoned, harassed, and exiled from her native Moscow.

Authorities continue to monitor her activities although her sentence of internal exile expired in March 1982. She has been warned not to leave the town of Bendry where she has been living. This implied threat of disciplinary action for violation of the warning has prevented her from receiving medical treatment for her heart condition.

Even in her weakened condition Ida Nudel continues to fight. She is an inspiration to other refuseniks throughout the Soviet Union and to all of us who marvel at the dedication and belief in religious values and teachings which burns inside people like Ida.

She has the admiration and respect of millions to which today I add birthday greetings.●

H.R. 5503, THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS MINORITY TRAINING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1984

HON. LOUIS STOKES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the severe underrepresentation of minority physicians, dentists, veterinarians, pharmacists, and other minority health professionals is a critical national problem that can no longer be studied, discussed, and debated. It is a problem that deserves priority national attention and action by Congress.

On June 16, 1983, the Association of Minority Health Professions Schools (AMHPS), an organization of eight predominantly black medical, dental, pharmacy and veterinary schools released a study, entitled "Blacks and the Health Professions in the 80's: A National Crisis and a Time for Action," which examined the status of minorities in the health professions. The AMHPS study reported that there are significant shortages in the number of minority health professionals in the United States and warned that these shortages are likely to become more acute unless action is taken by the President and the Congress.

The AMHPS study documents the continuing shortages of black physicians and other health professionals. While blacks represent nearly 12 percent of the U.S. population, the percentage of black physicians is a pitiful 2.6 percent. This percentage represents a mere one-half of 1 percent increase in the proportion of black doctors which has existed since 1950. The statistics for the representation of blacks in other health professions are equally dismal. Less than 3 percent of the Nation's dentists are black, only 2.3 percent of the pharmacists and a mere 1.6 percent of the veterinarians throughout America are black.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I consider it a national disgrace that there has been little or no improvement in minority representation in the health professions, during a period when there has been a tremendous growth overall in the numbers of students being trained for service in the health industry. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that recent projections of a surplus of some types of health professionals in the United States by 1990 is totally unrelated to the status of blacks and other minorities in the health arena.

Currently, of the 127 medical schools in the United States, the four minority schools—Howard University, School of Medicine, Meharry Medical College, Morehouse School of Medicine and Charles Drew Medical School—produce almost 25 percent of the black physicians; of 58 dental schools, the two minority institutions—Howard University, School of Dentistry and Meharry Dental College—produce 38 percent of the black dentists; of 71 pharmacy schools, the four minority schools—Howard University, School of Pharmacy, Texas Southern, Xavier University and Florida A&M—produce 45 percent of all black pharmacists; and of 27 veterinary medicine schools, predominantly black Tuskegee produced 75 percent of all black veterinarians.

In 1984, the scarcity of black role models among practicing health professionals in the United States suggests to black young people that it is not realistic to pursue a career in the health professions. This negative message to black youngsters is reinforced by poor counseling in high school and college, where minority students are often steered into vocational courses and less rigorous academic subjects, leaving many of them poorly prepared for the study of a health profession.

In addition to the very important goals of insuring parity and equity for minorities in the health professions, there are other very crucial reasons why Congress should turn its attention to the shortage of minorities in the health professions. Numerous studies over the years have documented the fact that blacks and other minorities in this country still receive the short end of the stick with respect to high quality and easily accessible health care. The appalling statistics describing the disparate health status between black Americans and white Americans, most recently published by the U.S. Public Health Service in, "Health, United States, 1983," tell us that something is terribly wrong with our health delivery system today.

Mr. Speaker, our country has the most sophisticated health system in the world. Yet, the average life expectancy for black males is 6 years less than that of white males. The infant mortality rate for black babies is 21.4 per 1,000 live births, twice the rate for white babies. And, this gap is growing.

Our Nation's history has shown that a major factor in improving the health status of blacks and other minorities lies in expanding the supply of qualified health professionals and enhancing the likelihood that these professionals will practice in inner city and rural communities that are underserved. We also know for example, that black physicians also tend to locate in underserved areas and to specialize in primary medicine more so than other physicians. We know that this is true of other black health professionals as well.

Mr. Speaker, because minority health professionals and predominantly minority health professions schools are needed to address the severe unmet health care needs of our poor and minority citizens, we face a philosophical and ethical dilemma: Either we provide the financial and other resources needed to implement our country's creed of equal opportunity, or we abandon a large segment of our population to a high infant mortality rate, a shortened life expectancy, debilitating poverty, a crushing burden of illness and disability and increasing disillusionment, frustration and loss of hope. As the most affluent of nations and the leader of the free world, we should not allow this to happen.

Recently, I introduced H.R. 5503, the Health Professions Minority Training Assistance Act of 1984. H.R. 5503 is a modest and sound proposal which seeks to accelerate the rate of participation of blacks and other minorities in the health field, and thereby help to improve the health status of minorities in the United States. Specifically, the bill, if enacted, would:

Provide grants to health professions schools to establish a fund from which low-interest loans may be made to low-income students;

Establish a low-interest, service obligated, loan forgiveness program for minority health professions students;

Provide for federally guaranteed loans to assist minority graduates of health professions schools to set up private practices in underserved areas;

Provide incentive grants to accredited public or nonprofit health professions schools to encourage the expansion of minority enrollments;

Establish endowment development grants for health professions schools with predominantly minority or low-income students;

Provide grants for health professions schools with predominantly minority or low-income students;

Provides financial need scholarships to minorities and low-income students;

Provide fellowship grants to encourage minorities to pursue academic and research careers; and

Reauthorize the advanced financial distress and the disadvantaged assistance programs for an additional 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, the development and enactment of the Health Professions Minority Training Assistance Act, is of the utmost importance to the millions of ethnic minority groups living throughout the Nation. It is my firm belief that special and targeted Federal efforts for minority training and education activities are required and well justified to raise the level of national commitment to improving health care for all Americans. Mr. Speaker, even the Reagan administration has admitted that we must increase opportunities in health education for the economically disadvantaged and minorities, and increase the number of health care providers serving populations of minorities and underserved. Unfortunately, the adminis-

tration's budget and legislative proposals do not reflect a significant commitment toward these goals.

H.R. 5503, however, would provide for a substantive and long-term commitment by providing the necessary resources for minority students to attend health professions schools and for minority health professions schools to expand training activities.

Mr. Speaker, many factors other than the availability of health professionals affect the health status of minorities. However, expanding the supply of well trained minority health professionals, sensitive to the needs of the minority community, is a key tool in addressing the pernicious problem that has plagued minorities in this country for far too long—the lack of accessible health care.

In the words of Dr. Louis Sullivan, president and dean of Morehouse Medical College and immediate past president of the Association of Minority Health Professions Schools:

As a nation, we need to utilize the most talented individuals available for the demanding health professions in an effort to improve the health status of our citizens and to improve our nation's system of health care. For blacks, who are aware of the fact that, compared to whites, their lives are shorter, their pregnant mothers and their infants die more frequently, and they have a greater burden of illness and disability, the statement that the United States has the best system of medical care in the world has a hollow ring.●

NATIONAL NURSING HOMES RESIDENTS DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 457, which would establish April 27, 1984, as "National Nursing Homes Residents Day," I rise to urge favorable consideration of this legislation which was introduced by the distinguished former chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, CLAUDE PEPPER.

As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I think it is only appropriate that we take time out today to pay tribute to those 1½ million older Americans who reside in nursing homes across the country. These very special citizens have contributed and continue to contribute to the growth, development, and progress of this great Nation, and as elders, offer a wealth of knowledge and experience.

A look at the demographic changes which confront this Nation today and in the coming decades amply demonstrate that we must consider fundamental changes in our health care systems if we are to protect these vital services for all elderly Americans. The over-65 population is growing at a phenomenal rate and will comprise 14 percent of our total population by the year 2000. By 2080, there will be more than 18 million Americans over 85, representing 24 percent of the over 65 population. The combined age groups of 75–84 and over 85, which are now 40 percent of our older population, will represent more than half of this same age group by the year 2040.

We can be grateful that conditions in nursing homes have improved so dramatically as a result of the strengthening of inspection standards in those nursing homes reimbursed by medicare and medicaid. There was a time not too long ago when conditions inside nursing homes were nothing short of horror stories. We can be happy that as a result of action taken here in Congress these days are past.

The establishment of a National Nursing Home Residents Day will serve as an effort to reintegrate these valuable elderly citizens into their communities by encouraging community recognition of and involvement in the lives of nursing residents. This day would also serve to educate the community about the needs and special contributions of these frail elderly and disabled residents.

I was proud to join with my colleagues in cosponsoring this important resolution. At this time I would like to take time to recognize a member of private sector who played a key role in encouraging support for this measure. Mr. Vic Rosenthal, executive director, of the Coalition of Institutionalized Aged and Disabled, has for many years been a strong and loyal supporter of programs benefiting the elderly. He has on many occasions provided valuable assistance to me in my congressional district as I strive to improve life for our Nation's senior citizens. Because of his intense involvement in this campaign to provide for a special day for nursing home residents, House Joint Resolution 457 has achieved more than the needed number of cosponsors—and a near 100 percent from the New York delegation.

The House is taking a very important step in taking into consideration this resolution which would recognize nursing home residents in America.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE FIFTH GRADE CLASS OF HUNTINGTON WOODS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, being a Member of Congress entails many responsibilities, long hours of hard work, and often, a great deal of frustration.

But every once in a while, you receive a phone call, a letter or experience something personally that reminds one of the honor and the privilege of serving the 513,000 individuals whom you represent.

I recently received such a letter, and it brought such an overall good feeling that I thought I would share it with you.

This letter was addressed to the Statue of Liberty—Ellis Island Foundation. It begins:

DEAR FRIENDS: The enclosed money is a contribution from our school to help restore the Statue of Liberty. We fifth graders organized and conducted a second-best sale. All the students in the school, kindergarten through sixth grades, brought in good used toys, books, games and other things. The total amount we earned on this sale was $120.77. Our Parent Teacher Organization contributed an additional $200.00 which gave us the amount we have sent to you, $320.77.

We understand that our name will be entered in the Register of School Contributions to be displayed at the museum of the statue. We would appreciate having the entry read: Huntington Woods Elementary School, Wyoming Public Schools, Wyoming, Mich.

Due to declining enrollment, our building is being closed at the end of this school year. It will mean a great deal to all of us at Huntington Woods to have our building's name listed, as well as the name of the school system.

The money is a small amount compared to the $230 million needed. But we know it will help. We had a good time earning the money, and are grateful to our P.T.O. for helping us, also.

Sincerely,

THE FIFTH GRADERS,
Huntington Woods Elementary School.

I would like, if I may, to list these individuals who, as young as they are, understand and appreciate the symbolism and meaning behind our grand lady, the Statue of Liberty. I am deeply proud and honored to have them as a part of our community, and thank them for making my job all the more worthwhile.

They are as follows:

Ryan Bardins, Jenny Berry, Amy Blumenstein, Nikki Braun, Josie Carbone, Kim Centille, Ken Chester, Merci Delamar, Ronnie Didion, David Harris, Nicole Heise, Ron Humphrey, J. J. Jingles, Todd Kerkstra, Jason Klitz, Kevin Koets, Cheri LaMange, Chris Land.

Delphia Patterson, Jenny Rathbun, Stephanie Rathbun, Chad Sackrison, Jenny Schneider, Natalie Sebastian, Tina Selleck, Jeremy Strotheide, Todd Tofferi, Tina Truax, John Turkopp, Mike VanderLugt, Mike Wagner, Joji Williams, Cris Winchel, Spring Wright, Mrs. Mary Jane Franklin, Teacher.●

LOIS WINDHORST: A REMARKABLE WOMAN OF TOTAL DEDICATION AND DEEP COMMITMENT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, motorists in Kentucky enjoy greater protection against drunk drivers now, thanks to a stiff drunk driving law passed by the 1984 Kentucky General Assembly in substantial part due to the courageous and untiring efforts of Mrs. Lois Windhorst, president of the Kentucky Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD).

For the past 3 years, Lois Windhorst has been the driving force behind the welcome crackdown on drunk drivers in Kentucky. As president and founder of the local chapter in Kentucky—a responsibility she assumed after the death of her in-laws in 1980 at the hands of a drunk driver—Mrs. Windhorst has done an extraordinary job of focusing our communities' and our Commonwealth's attention on the tragedy of drunk driving.

Lois has increased community awareness of this national menace and she has been an effective grassroots lobbyist in seeking and getting needed changes in Kentucky drunk driving statutes.

At all times, it has been a demanding and tiring effort for Mrs. Windhorst and her organization. She had to curtail personal and family activities to attend to her duties at the helm of MADD.

It is no wonder to me that Lois is now stepping down from her leadership role in order to devote more time to herself and her family who have personally sacrificed much to support her in her work.

I have had the privilege of working with Lois Windhorst over the years, and have found her to be a remarkable woman of total dedication and deep commitment. In many ways I hate to see Lois leave an active leadership role in MADD, but she is entitled to a respite from her noble efforts.

She certainly can take with her into her retirement the satisfaction and pleasure of knowing that she has helped place laws on the books which make Kentucky highways and streets safer for all of us. That is a worthy and significant legacy to leave to her successor in MADD and to all of us.

I extend my thanks and congratulations to Lois for her efforts over the years and I wish her family the very best.

I insert the following article on Mrs. Windhorst, which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on April 8 in the RECORD in its entirety at this point:

[From the Courier-Journal, Apr. 8, 1984]

DRIVING FORCE IN MADD IS GIVING UP LEADERSHIP, BUT WILL "ALWAYS BE THERE"

(By Elinor J. Brecher)

A prominent Jefferson County Democrat, apparently assuming Lois Windhorst would want to parlay her wide recognition into political office, recently told the outgoing Mothers Against Drunk Drivers president she had a bright future.

"Yes," replied Mrs. Windhorst, who founded Kentucky's first MADD chapter in 1981, "a bright future in my kitchen."

After 3 years of struggling for a tougher drunken-driving law, passed in the 1984 Kentucky General Assembly, Mrs. Windhorst, 30, is headed home.

One of the more successful grassroots lobbyists to work the legislature recently, Mrs. Windhorst said it's time others take over what she started 16 months after the deaths of her in-laws on Father's Day 1980.

That day, Ollie and Francis Windhorst were killed in a wreck with an unlicensed, uninsured drunken driver. One of their three sons was severely injured.

Mrs. Windhorst said even though she's relinquishing her leadership position, she'll "always be there, but at my pace."

Mrs. Windhorst said Louisville MADD began as her effort to "do something positive" about her in-laws' deaths. "Then it became something for my husband and my kids and the family. Then it was grasping at the hope of saving other people."

She said she never believed MADD "would get this far. My goal was to get 20 people at that first meeting."

But 140 showed up: victims, sympathetic citizens and grieving survivors, who she intends to continue helping. She'll also continue advising new Kentucky chapters and acting in a liaison role with the national MADD board, a nomination to which she declined last week.

In explaining that decision to Candy Lightner, the California woman who started the group after her daughter was killed by a drunken driver, Mrs. Windhorst cited pressure at home and anxiety attacks that have plagued her for two years.

Daughters Hollie, 7, Bobbie Anne, 6, and Tiffanie, 4, have been asking, "Mommy, when are you going to quit your job with MADD?" and telling her to get off the phone, which rings all day long.

Mrs. Windhorst said the death of a son several days after his premature birth in October 1982; the parole a month later of the man convicted in her in-laws' deaths, who served only 14 months of a 9-year sentence for manslaughter and wanton endangerment; and a frantic schedule on behalf of MADD and former Gov. John Y. Brown Jr's. drunken-driving task force, combined to cause the anxiety attacks.

"It all added up," she said. "And I realized there was nothing I could do that would take away the hurt from the victims. I kept seeing myself in them over and over. I guess I never had a chance to heal."

Sometimes she found herself taking heat from disgruntled MADD members and combative legislators at the same time, which made her feel "like a puppet with its feet in two blocks of cement and 105 strings on each arm with people pulling on them."

But she said she learned important political lessons from two sessions at the Capitol, much of the time spent battling people who claimed to be friends of the "Slammer Bill," as well as with its opponents:

"Never take anything for granted. No matter how right the cause is, it won't ever be easy. And never trust a politician. They don't even trust each other."

She said she also discovered that successful lobbying "means beating your head against the wall till you have no brains left," but she believes the results were worth the effort.

A major feature of the new law, which takes effect in July, is that it gives judges the option of jailing first offenders, as well as fining them. It also mandates a license suspension for 30 days with treatment and education (6 months without) and mandates jail for repeat offenders.

Mrs. Windhorst said she supports the consistency of enforcement the new law will bring and is convinced it will keep drunks off the road.

But she still favors mandatory jail on first offense and thinks the law falls short in part because it doesn't meet the requirements that would have brought federal money for state enforcement.

The law finally passed, she thinks, because of public support and "the fact that we kept our emotions pretty much in check on a highly emotional issue. We had our facts straight and we had documentation for all our arguments. . . . We didn't do any wining and dining. We meant business and were never treated with anything but respect."

Mrs. Windhorst credits her husband, Ollie Jr., an electrical contractor, and her mother, Nova Hensley, with making her successes possible, by taking over many family chores.

"The cause was a good one," said Windhorst, who didn't become directly involved in MADD. "My helping her was my way of contributing to the community."

He said the hardest part of his wife's commitment was "listening to the other victims' stories, and there was a constant flow of that."

Mrs. Windhorst said MADD now plans to monitor compliance with the new law statewide because "there will be loopholes and we want to find out what they are and be ready to shut the door on them in 1986."

Despite the bill's passage, Mrs. Windhorst said there are disappointments. Few volunteers are willing to spend the time it takes to monitor Jefferson County's courts, and the sentences for drunken drivers who kill or injure aren't severe enough.

She hopes someone will start a "judge watch" in Kentucky, part of a nationwide effort to monitor all sentencing by the National Organization of Victim Assistance, or NOVA, based in Washington, D.C.

New officers of the Louisville chapter are Bill Davenhall, president; Wendy Frockt, first vice president; Mildred Hilton, second vice president; and Calre Eyl, secretary-treasurer. Harold Rosen, a MADD board member, is in charge of public relations. The new MADD office number is (502) 425-8555.●

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. BARBARA MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to Polish Constitution Day, the anniversary of which falls on May 3. On May 3, 1791, Poland

adopted a new and progressive constitution which embodied the great ideas of democracy, justice, and freedom. In fact, many of the ideals represented in this constitution are also essential components of America's Constitution, principles which we cherish today. Free Poles throughout the world continue to celebrate Polish Constitution Day. It is an important reminder that Poland was one of the first pioneers of progressive thought in Europe. It is a bitter fact of history that although the Polish people have cherished freedom, tyrannical neighbors and leaders have made Polish liberty more a dream than a reality.

Through the long history of the United States, freedom-loving Polish immigrants have contributed their skill and hard work to make this country great. They have actively worked for our Nation's freedom and have defended it on battlefields since it was born.

Today, when we honor Polish Americans in history who have made great contributions to our Nation and our world, we quite appropriately look toward two great American war heroes, Thaddeus Kosciuski and Casimir Pulaski. While it is vital to recognize the crucial accomplishments of these two brave and dedicated men, I feel that we should not overlook the work of many other great Poles. For example, Madam Curie performed landmark research on radiation from which even today people around the world derive enormous benefits. Madam Curie holds the remarkable honor of being the only physicist in history to receive two Nobel Prizes.

Second, we should not forget Dr. Marie Zakrzewska, a Polish American of the 19th century who was one of the first women physicians in the United States. Despite enormous obstacles, she established two outstanding hospitals in the United States and helped to establish a third. Finally, I want to pay tribute to the great accomplishments of all of the Polish nuns and priests in America who played such an important role in teaching us about the old world in Poland while at the same time preparing us to be good citizens in our new home.

In spite of the invasions and occupations of the Polish nation through history, the spirit of the Polish people remains strong. Although our homeland remains under the shadow of Soviet domination, the Polish people still commemorate the Polish Constitution and honor the rich contributions of Poles around the world. It is my hope that the great principles of freedom and democracy embodied in the Polish Constitution will in the near future become not just a dream but a reality of Polish soil.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, because my presence was required at a black lung advisory meeting in my district, I missed rollcall Nos. 104, 105, and 106.

Had I been present, I would have voted "Aye" on rollcall No. 104, "No" on rollcall No. 105, and "Aye" on rollcall No. 106.●

A SELF-MADE MAN

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to address the House about an owner of a fine small business in Greater Cleveland. John R. Leone represents what America is about: he is a self-made man.

John has been involved with the construction industry all his life. This year he celebrates his 30th year in business. President of the Leone Corp., he was elected its chief executive officer in 1970. Previously, Mr. Leone was vice president and general manager of this corporation. He began his business career in 1953 with this company, then called the L. Leone Trucking Co., Inc. As its chief executive officer, he worked toward the diversification of this company and established four divisions which were instrumental in surviving the poor economy of the past 2 years. Subsequently, the company was a builder of highways.

Born, raised, and educated on the West Side of Cleveland, Leone donated many hours to civic projects in the city of Cleveland going back to the year 1970 and including the Rapid Recovery Group. Among other activities, John is a long-time member of the Tremont Civic Organization and a trustee of the Clark-Metro Neighborhood Improvement Group which involved the rebuilding of neighborhoods.

Active in the small business community and a member of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association and the Council of Small Business Enterprises, Leone was appointed a delegate to the White House Conference on Small Business by President Carter in 1980. Real estate development is a major part of Leone's career, and he has been quite successful.

Some of his other activities include president and cofounder of the United Trucking Association, an industry group; executive secretary and trustee to the Local 436 Welfare and Pension Fund Board of Trustees for 16 years; chairman of the Legislation and Resolution Committee, Cleveland Chapter of the Ohio Contractors Association for 2 years and the current chairman of the Cleveland chapter.

Truly, John Leone is a great American, a fine civic leader, and an outstanding business man.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is both with pride and sorrow that I join my colleagues in commemorating the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust. This commemoration serves as a constant reminder to all freedom loving nations that human rights violations must never go unchallenged.

The world must never forget the unspeakable crimes committed against the Jewish people. Over 6 million innocent Jewish men, women, and children were slaughtered during World War II. It is imperative that we pay tribute to those who have died and have suffered immeasurably. The Jews who have survived the Holocaust were subject to a multitude of physical and psychological abuses at the hands of the Nazis. With this in mind, I urge all persons to reflect on and remember the lessons of the Holocaust.

As we consider this terrible atrocity, let us challenge violations of human rights wherever and whenever they occur. As representatives in the free world, it is up to us to challenge the policies of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes that have led to direct aggression and the enslavement of nations. We must offer hope to those seeking control of their destiny.

The memory of the millions of innocent human beings who perished at the hands of the Nazis will live forever in the hearts and minds of those who cherish individual freedom.●

FTC DISCONTINUES COSTLY AND INEFFECTIVE LINE OF BUSINESS PROGRAM

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Federal Trade Commission wisely voted to discontinue the line of business program. After extensive public comment and lengthy internal review, the Commission determined

that the line of business program did not yield the benefits it was designed to generate, and, in fact, was quite costly to industry.

The Commission's line of business program collected detailed sales, profitability, expense and asset data from hundreds of the Nation's largest corporations. As originally envisioned, the program was to provide financial data, which was industry specific, for use by business planners, private investors, academic researchers, and antitrust enforcement agencies.

The Commission's review of this program clearly established that the program's goals were not being realized. The accumulated data was not significantly utilized in either case selection for antitrust enforcement or for purposes of business planning or investment. Moreover, the data is antiquated—the data collected for 1977 has yet to be published. Further, in terms of financial impact, it has been estimated that the compliance cost to the subject firms exceeded $40 million annually.

The line of business program has had a controversial history since its inception in 1974. It has been the subject of extensive litigation, as to the Commission's authority to collect such information, and legislation, dealing with industry concern over the confidentiality of sensitive financial information that is supplied.

Given the negative conclusion of the Commission's review, I heartily applaud the Commission's decision to discontinue the line of business program. Instead of ignoring the clear signals that this program was not utilized and was overly burdensome, the Commission had the wisdom and foresight to take this important step.●

A TRIBUTE TO JUDGE GILBERT "RUDY" RUIZ

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we all wonder if the admirable quality of putting compassion and duty toward our fellow man above our own concerns has all but faded away, I find it inspiring to honor a citizen of the 30th district of California who has exemplified this quality and is stepping down from just one of his positions of honor and respect.

Judge Gilbert "Rudy" Ruiz is resigning from the East Los Angeles Boys and Girls Club board of directors after 11 years of distinguished service and after twice being elected president of that board. He has unselfishly given his time to this organization to better the lives of the boys and girls of East Los Angeles and has provided a superior role model for everyone with whom he has worked.

This position will join the long list as just one of the worthy organizations with which Judge Ruiz has worked. He has been active in such community organizations as the Mexican-American Bar Association and the Montebello-Ensenada Mexico Sister City Association. Judge Ruiz has been president of the Belvedere Rotary Club, chairman of the Hispanic Alumni Association of Whittier College, and chairman of other narcotics prevention projects. Few people can boast of such a diverse history of community service.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring this remarkable and eminent citizen of my community to the attention of my fellow Members of Congress, and to personally thank him for his diligent work in community service.●

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN SECTION OF THE ORANGES HOLDS ANNUAL SPRING EVENT

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call my colleagues' attention to the annual spring luncheon and fashion show sponsored by the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., Section of the Oranges.

The event will take place on May 5 in West Orange, N.J., and has as its theme: "Dedication, Compassion, and Caring For One." These three words certainly apply to this organization. The section has been involved with numerous charitable activities in our local community, including the Toy Bureau of the Oranges and Maplewood, which provides new toys and Christmas stockings for indigent children. In addition, the section has been working on the pressing problems of adult literacy and teenage pregnancy.

At this annual fundraising luncheon, the section will pay tribute to one of the founding members of the National Council of Negro Women, Miss Garnette Henderson. Miss Henderson played an active role in founding the organization in 1935, and also served as the fourth president of the New Jersey chapter and the first president of the section of the Oranges. She will be honored by her colleagues for her part in the development of the national organization as well as the local chapter.

The National Council of Negro Women works for equal opportunity for all, and it is a special privilege for me to pay tribute to them today. I offer my best wishes to Miss Henderson and all of the participants in Saturday's event.●

A SALUTE TO CHIEF KENNETH J. CRAST

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday, May 6, 1984, at Hancock Field, the Air Force base in my congressional district of New York State, Chief M. Sgt. Kenneth J. Crast will retire from the Air National Guard after a distinguished military career of 39 years, 4 months and 5 days.

It is a signal honor for me to bring the occasion of this event to the attention of the Congress.

Chief Crast began his dedicated service to our country in the Army Air Corps on July 7, 1942, during World War II.

During that war, he was a flight engineer and gunner on a B-17 Flying Fortress. On September 13, 1944, while flying on a mission over Germany, he and fellow crew members were shot down and captured by the enemy. After 8 months as a prisoner of war and several unsuccessful escape attempts, Chief Crast and a fellow prisoner managed to escape confinement and successfully elude the Nazis.

During the Berlin crisis, Chief Crast was reactivated and served in France.

His many decorations for bravery in World War II and other service include the Air Medal with two oak leaf clusters and the Purple Heart.

In July 1948, when the 174th New York Air National Guard unit was in its infancy at Hancock Field, Chief Crast joined the unit as a full-time air technician.

Since that time, over a period of 35 years, Chief Crast's contributions to the 174th Tactical Fighter Wing have been consistently outstanding.

According to Brig. Gen. Paul A. Schempp, the commander of the 174th, the chief's "sense of duty, professionalism and dedication to excellence have been an inspiration and example for all to emulate."

The selection of the 174th as the best aircraft maintenance squadron in the U.S. Air Force, in 1982, is due, in large part, to the efforts of Chief Crast. With varied responsibilities, including that as squadron training noncommissioned officer and chief enlisted maintenance superintendent, the chief has played a key role in making the 174th the premier unit of its type in the Tactical Air Force.

Chief Crast's superior skills have kept America's combat aircraft flying for nearly four decades, from the P-47 Thunderbolt of World War II to the

awesome A-10 Thunderbolt II of today's tactical force.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, whom the Members of this Congress represent, have been well served by the faithful dedication of Chief M. Sgt. Kenneth J. Crast.●

KEN PITTS, OUTGOING PRESIDENT OF LONG BEACH JAYCEES, TO BE HONORED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 the Long Beach Junior Chamber of Commerce will hold its 53d annual installation dinner. As I am sure you are aware, the Jaycees' membership is comprised of young men between 21 and 35 who are committed to its political, civic, and charitable goals. Their motto, "Service to humanity is the best work of life," has certainly been exemplified by the dedication of the outgoing president, Ken Pitts.

Ken was born November 18, 1950, in Compton, Calif. He attended Compton Junior College and graduated from Long Beach State in 1973 with a degree in journalism. Following graduation, he entered the sales and sales management field. By the age of 30, he was the youngest regional sales manager ever in industrial sales. He supervised 31 salespersons in 13 States for Armac Tape, later American Tape. At this time, he was also accepted in Who's Who in California. Not one to rest on his laurels, in 1983 he personally was responsible for over $2.5 million in sales.

His success in the business field is matched by his accomplishments with the Jaycees. He served as State director from 1982 to 1983 and as president of the Long Beach organization in 1983-84. Currently, he is a candidate for metro vice president for the California State Jaycees.

Nor is the Jaycees the only community organization to which he devotes his efforts. He has served on the Board of Directors of the Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce and was a candidate for the Special Olympics Boosters contest in 1983.

Ken has achieved much and given much to his community. I am confident the Long Beach Jaycees will continue to benefit from his support, as will Long Beach. My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Ken and his wife, Rita, continued success in the years ahead.●

PASSAGE OF THE CHILD PASSENGER—SAFETY ACT OF 1984

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House of Representatives unanimously passed H.R. 4616, the Child Passenger Safety Act of 1984, which directs States to use at least 8 percent of their Federal highway funds for additional highway safety programs concerning child passenger-restraint safety devices.

I heartily applaud the intent of the legislation and the action of the House in this area.

Child passenger-restraint safety seats protect lives; the facts prove it. Child safety seat usage could be up to 90-percent effective in preventing fatalities and injuries, but less than 1 out of every 12 children who are passengers in automobiles are given the protection of a restraint system. The young child between the ages of 1 and 4 is 50 times more likely to die in a car accident if unprotected by a car safety seat or seatbelt, than from some illness or disease.

It is hard for me to comprehend the fact that in the last decade 10,000 children under 5 lost their lives as passengers in cars, yet more than 90 percent of our children still ride without using safety restraints. That is why State programs, prompted by this act, are so necessary to promote the use of the child safety seat.

I have been active for many years in Pennsylvania in the cause of promoting safety seat usage. In 1982, as the State senator from Dauphin County in Pennsylvania, I was able to lead the legislative efforts in the General Assembly of Pennsylvania to acquire a child safety seat law. Now, as the Congressman from Pennsylvania's 17th District, I pledge my support to urge all 50 States to enact child safety seat legislation and promote passenger safety programs.●

APRIL 24: A DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR ARMENIANS

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 in the city of Montebello, in my district, Armenian people from all over California and over the Nation will come together in a day of remembrance. They will join hands and hearts at the base of a monument built to commemorate the memory of the Armenian men, women, and children who, on April 24, 1915, were the world's first genocide victims.

This deplorable action of mass murder by the Ottoman (Turkish) Empire must be remembered in order to prevent such occurrences in the future. It can never be assumed that genocide will not occur in this century. It is no secret that Hitler pointed to the Turkish example when he began the mass extermination of Germany's Jewish population. He answered his critics, who cautioned him against such a policy because it would alienate world opinion, by saying that the world had no opinion when the Turks eliminated the Armenians.

There is a great need for the Armenian people to remember these historical crimes against a peaceful people, because we all share the responsibility for allowing such events to slip into obscurity and be disregarded or forgotten. To remember will hopefully prevent another Hitler or ruthless dictator from implementing a policy of genocide.

Today, the Armenian people believe that the Turkish Government not only refuses to come to terms with its past, but insists on distorting this truth by closing access to its archives, fabricating data, and pressuring other countries into denouncing the occurrence of the genocide of the Armenian people.

As a nation with a longstanding commitment to truth, liberty, and justice, the United States should insist on having Turkey recognize history for what it is and open dialog with representatives of the Armenian community in the diaspora.

By supporting House Joint Resolution 247, the U.S. Congress will not only set April 24 as a day of remembrance of man's inhumanity to man, we will show that our strength and determination is to be used to prevent another future tragedy such as the Armenian genocide. It is not a foreign policy issue, as the State Department might have us believe. It is a recognition of world history and a pledge that we can learn from the past experiences of others. Congress should join the people of Montebello and Armenians from around the Nation in remembering April 24 as a tragic day in world history.●

THE KID FROM RED BANK

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, Monmouth County, N.J., has been the home and birthplace of many extraordinary individuals. But no one has generated more pride and enthusiasm

than Count Basie, who was born in Red Bank, N.J., 79 years ago.

The "Count" died Thursday and the entire country is mourning the loss of one of our greatest pianists and band leaders. In Monmouth County, we feel the loss of a favorate son loved and admired by everyone.

Count Basie's skill at the keyboard and feel for his audience were matched only by his qualities of kindness and concern for others. He was a "class act" in every way.

The following editorial reprinted from The Sunday Register, Shrewsbury, N.J., conveys a sense of what Count Basie meant to the people of the Third Congressional District:

WILLIAM "COUNT" BASIE

The death of Count Basie robs American music of one of its giants, a gifted pianist and band leader who revolutionized jazz, influenced some of the finest musicians of his time, and delighted millions with the sound of swing.

He took his first piano lessons in Red Bank, where he was born William James Basie 79 years ago, practicing—only because his mother forced him to, he said—on an old oak piano in the basement of the Mechanic Street house where he grew up.

From his first professional appearance in a Jersey shore restaurant, he went on to play the Harlem clubs in the '20s, and then toured the black vaudeville circuit. The tour took him to Kansas City, where he joined the famous Bennie Moten band. When Moten died in 1935, Count Basie formed his own band, which soon won wide acclaim and devoted fans, and over the years included some of the greatest jazz musicians. Despite the diminishing health of his last few years, the Count never stopped being on tour—he had performed in California last month and had several concerts scheduled for May. When arthritis made it difficult for him to walk, he would drive on stage on a motorized scooter, sometimes honking his horn with gleeful enthusiasm, as he did at a concert in Marlboro Township two-and-a-half years ago.

The Count is Red Bank's claim to royalty. His was the first American band to play a command performance for the queen of England; he played for presidents and was awarded the highest honor this nation bestows on performing artists. But he never forgot the borough of his birth and boyhood. "The kid from Red Bank" was a nickname he relished, and he made the borough known throughout the world of music as Count Basie's hometown. Last April, although grieving for the death of his wife only 10 days earlier, he returned to Red Bank to pay a benefit concert for the educational youth center of the Shrewsbury Avenue A.M.E. Zion Church, as he had done four years earlier. His voice soft with emotion, he told the hushed crowd, "I just couldn't miss being here with you. You don't know what a pleasure it is to be back home again."

Count Basie's mark is indelible; Basie hits have become American classics. It is sad that the borough he made famous has been so slow to pay official tribute to its famous son. It was not until last month, when the Borough Council voted to rename Memorial Field "Count Basie Park" that there was any move to acknowlege his accomplishments. We believe the planned honor too meager. We repeat our urging that consideration be given to naming one of Red Bank's schools for the man who established a standard of excellence in American music.●

A TRIBUTE TO OFFICER RANDY LYMAN

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Officer Randy Lyman, whose brave and expert performance on board the Redondo Beach Harbor patrol boat recently saved the life of Mr. Leonard Alfonso.

On Saturday, March 10, 1984, a large wave broke over the breakwall in Redondo Beach Harbor causing two people to be washed off the wall and thrown into the water. The Harbor Patrol, with Lt. William Wheeler at the helm and Officer Randy Lyman as second officer immediately responded to the call, but when Mr. Alfonso was taken aboard he was unconscious, with no pulse and was not breathing. Officer Lyman, with the assistance of a citizen, administered CPR to Mr. Alfonso as he was transported to the Harbor Patrol docks. During that time, Mr. Alfonso's breathing and pulse were restored. He was then transported to South Bay Hospital by the paramedics where he was listed in critical condition.

I am pleased to report that Mr. Alfonso has been released from South Bay Hospital and has fully recovered. Had it not been for the professional administration of CPR, Mr. Alfonso would not be alive today.

I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in commending Officer Lyman for a job well done. His quick and competent performance of his duties enabled him to save this citizen, and I am proud to know that men like him are serving the citizens of Redondo Beach, Calif.●

OPM RESTRICTS FEDERAL WORKERS POLITICAL ACTIVITY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 24, 1984, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) published final regulations which prohibit the use by Federal employees of voluntary payroll deductions for contributions to political funds of nonparty affiliated organizations. I believe these regulations exceed OPM's authority, conflict with current law, and are bad public policy.

No Federal employee would be exposed to partisan political pressure in his workplace, to coercion or reprisal on political grounds because of his or her contributions through payroll deductions to a political fund unaffiliated with any political party. Unlike direct contributions to parties and candidates, which are permitted by the Federal Election Campaign Act, such contributions would not be required by law to be a matter of public record subject to the scrutiny of superiors and "others in a position to affect careers or working conditions." Payroll deductions could be kept confidential.

OPM's only real policy purpose is to limit the freedom of Federal employees to organize and work together to support common political goals. It is understandable, but unacceptable, that an administration that has waged war against its employees would seek to stifle their legitimate political activity.

Mr. Speaker, OPM has not adequately responded to the objections I raised in February 1983, together with the chairmen of the House Committee on the Judiciary and House Administration. A statement of our objections appeared in the RECORD on February 22, 1983, and I refer my colleagues to that statement again.

I am afraid that Federal employees will once more be forced to resort to the courts to secure rights which Congress and the Constitution have granted, but which Director Devine and the Office of Personnel Management seek to strip away.●

THE STARS REALLY ARE "STARS"

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to share with my colleagues a few words about a basketball team within my district who displayed superior athletic performance throughout the basketball season.

Jacksonville is proud these days—proud of the athletic achievements made by "The Stars," Florida Junior College's (FJC) basketball team. And proud they should be, because for 2 out of the last 3 years "The Stars" have made it to the State Junior College basketball tournament. In addition, they were regular season champions in the mid-Florida conference and rated the second best junior college basketball team in the State of Florida.

"The Stars" exemplify the cliche that "nothing is impossible" particularly when so actively pursued. With the steering of FJC's basketball coach

Arthur (Buster) Harvey, the team set their goals and then went on to accomplish them.

Although "The Stars" season ended with disappointment in the final championship game, they walked away, nonetheless, proud of what they had accomplished.

Friends, it gives me great pride to acknowledge the accomplishments of this team, Coach Harvey, and FJC President Ben Wygal for their display of spirit in true American competition.●

FAIRVIEW STATE HOSPITAL

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, Fairview State Hospital in Costa Mesa, Calif., will be celebrating its silver anniversary on May 28. To mark their 25 years of service to the community they are going to embark on a "Silver Challenge."

Fairview State Hospital opened its doors to serve the needs of the developmentally disabled on January 4, 1959. Since that time, the dedicated staff has served more than 6,000 clients with 1,150 living at the facility today. Of the 6,000 persons housed at Fairview, some have returned to their homes and some developed the necessary skills to live semi-independent lives in the community of their choice.

However, after 25 years Fairview is beginning to show the wear and tear. The "Silver Challenge" is a renewal of effort and commitment to bring the environment at Fairview up to standards that show respect for its clients, their families, and those who work at the facility. The challenge is to find ways with the assistance of the community to get Fairview in topnotch shape for the years ahead.

The "Silver Challenge" is a community celebration of Fairview's continuing contribution to society. I congratulate and commend all those involved with Fairview State Hospital and wish them nothing but success and happiness in the years ahead.●

ACID RAIN: SULFUR DIOXIDE MAY NOT BE THE VILLAIN

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleages some recent statements made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, William Ruckelshaus, regarding the causes of acid rain and the status of our current knowledge of this phenomena. While testifying before the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, he stated:

Our current knowledge does not tell us whether the offending pollutants (which cause acid rain) are sulfates, nitrates, oxidants, or heavy metals. This new information, while troubling, raises the possibility that if we act too quickly, we may control the wrong pollutant. If, as many believe, sulfate deposition is not a major contributor to forest problems but oxidants and nitrates are, a significant reduction in sulfur dioxide emissions could inadvertently result in elevated levels of oxidants or nitrates * * *.

Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable that given the importance of this subject, this is the first time that the complex chemical aspect of acid rain has received attention. It has been characteristic of the debate on this controversial issue that these scientific facts have been virtually ignored by the press to the extent that the public has been subjected to a purely visceral discussion. There are, of course, those parties interested in this issue who would prefer unilateral controls on specific chemical compounds no matter what the scientific facts suggest. The fact that sulfur dioxide may not be the chemical villain is a fact which they prefer to ignore, and the fact that SO_2 may even have a benign effect by reducing oxidant levels is something that they would apparently prefer to suppress. The EPA Administrator's statement confirms the information which I have received through correspondence and discussions with distinguished scientists who are participating in the Federal acid precipitation research effort which involves uniquely capable teams at our national laboratories.

In attempting to determine the effects of acid rain on forests in particular, there is by no means unequivocal evidence to support the current claims of those who believe that sulfates are the major cause of tree diebacks. On the contrary, conclusive evidence linking acid rain to diebacks has not been found. Even in what is possibly a worst case example, the German Black Forest for which the damage to the trees quadrupled between 1982 and 1983, scientists are contending that ozone formation leading to oxidant production is the more likely major cause of the damage.

We do know that, given the complicated atmospheric processes which occur, attempting to single out one type of pollutant, such as the sulfur oxides, as the cause of forest damage would be difficult, if not impossible. Even in the Black Forest area, research has shown that the rate of decline of the trees is not equivalent for the various species affected, nor is it uniform across the affected regions. Ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, fluoride, hydrogen chloride, and trace metals, among others, can cause serious damage to crops and forests and cannot be considered separately from acid rain as solitary causes of damage. It is obvious that our lack of knowledge of the various interactions constituting the complex chemistry, as well as air transport and deposition phenomena in determining species concentrations, have hindered our efforts to identify the causes and effects of acid rain. Indeed, there is some question as to whether the impact of the previously mentioned chemical species can even be separately delineated from other pollutant effects.

For these reasons, it is imperative that we augment our efforts to improve our scientific knowledge through continuing research before regulating specific pollutants which may or may not be a direct cause of acid deposition. In concert with our cause-and-effect research efforts, we should continue to aggressively pursue our development of control technologies so that a genuine range of options will be available beyond today's wet scrubbers. When research ultimately provides us with clarification of these complex interactions and related phenomena with a delineation of the role of the major pollutants, we shall then be prepared to take the necessary control action.●

"ADAM"

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, last night the movie "Adam" was aired for the second time. The tragic story of a courageous family gripped the Nation and focused our attention on the problem of missing children.

The first half of the movie deals with the actual circumstances of an abducted child, the long search, and the tragic news of Adam's death. The second part of the program focuses on us and what Congress and the Federal Government can and must do to address this national tragedy.

Every time that we call attention to the problem of missing children by recognizing a missing children's day, or by sponsoring a child safety day in our districts, or by supporting local, State, and Federal efforts to help find missing children or prevent their abduction, we make this country more secure for all our children.

I have introduced H.R. 4740. This legislation will conduct a national symposium on missing children, will disseminate information to citizens and agencies, and will make recommendations to the President and Congress. In addition, I plan on sponsoring a child safety day in the Sixth Con-

gressional District of Ohio and encourage all of you to do the same. The ACTION Agency has provided an excellent handbook describing how to do this.

The Walsh's have used their personal tragedy to focus efforts on making this Nation safer for other children. Let us join them in this just cause.●

HOLOCAUST

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we remember the Holocaust. The immediate thought that comes to mind is Conrad's line, "The horror. The horror." However, there is another side to the Holocaust. There were untold numbers of victims and resisters who dared to defy the overwhelming military might of the Nazis. There were those who were safe, who put themselves at risk by hiding Jews, and other intended victims. In Denmark, a whole nation chose to wear the Star of David rather than identify, isolate and prepare their Jewish citizens for slaughter.

Looking back, what lessons can we learn from the horror and heroism that characterized the Nazi Holocaust? We can see that it is possible for many to be led by force and persuasion. We can see that it is physically possible to destroy vast numbers of human beings for no reason other than the accident of birth. We can also see that amidst the atrocities it is also possible for all that is good in human beings to survive and resist the evil that surrounds them. It is that goodness in people which survives as a living memorial to those who perished.

It is particularly important for us, as Members of Congress, to remember the Holocaust as an example of the power of government to direct the energies of a people in the path of hatred. The corresponding power to direct a people in the path of reconciliation and peace also exists. It is our responsibility to speak to that which is constructive and good in our people. To encourage and support efforts which bind our people together. Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural address, said:

> Let us strive to do all which will achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and among all nations.

The forces which bind and separate us may be different than they were in President Lincoln's time, but the goal should remain the same.

The Holocaust was a product of the most scientifically organized and systematic hatred that the world has ever experienced. The Holocaust was not a savage massacre committed by a small group in the isolation and stress of the battlefield. The Holocaust involved widespread systematic savagery facilitated by the industrial efficiency of one of the most educated nations of the world. Men and women with high IQ's and numerous credits for their technological achievements administered and implemented the Holocaust.

The America of 1984 should take heed. If and when we fail to use the power of our Government to direct the energies of our people in the path of reconciliation, peace, and charity, there is a great danger that they will succumb to behavior which leads to the path of hatred. High achievements in education, culture, and technology do not guarantee that a nation will pursue the proper path. Only the constant promotion of reconciliation, peace, and charity can save us. Let the Holocaust be a lesson to America and the whole world.●

TRIBUTE TO SYBIL BRAND

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 8, 1984, on the occasion of her birthday, Sybil Brand will be honored by the Ann Mary Kelly Foundation for the Performing Arts. It is rare that I have the honor of recognizing a woman who has contributed so much of her time to the encouragement of others who is also a dear friend.

Sybil serves as one of two honorary chairmen of the foundation and has been instrumental in promoting its ideals and purposes over the past several years. She has worked selflessly to carry on the tradition started by the work of Ann Mary Kelly and John Augustus Kelly, Sr.

Sybil continues to support talented emerging performers in the Los Angeles area through her work at the foundation. The foundation's financial assistance to such performers enables them to pursue their work and also brings these dedicated artists to the public.

During the 10 years which I have known her, Sybil has not limited herself to promoting only those affiliated with the foundation. She has participated in a number of civic and philanthropic activities. I was honored to work with her as a State legislator on projects aimed at helping troubled youth.

For the years of dedication to emerging performers through her support of the foundation, and her extensive community involvement, I ask the Members to join the Ann Mary Kelly Foundation for the Performing Arts and myself in honoring Sybil Brand.●

A TRIBUTE TO HERMAN PLATT

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Herman Platt, a unique community leader in Los Angeles and a lifelong friend of mine and of my family, on the occasion of his 75th birthday. I would like to bring some of his accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues.

Herman Platt, one of Los Angeles' most prominent civic leaders, celebrates his 75th birthday May 7, 1984. One of the few members of his generation to be born in Los Angeles, he attended Los Angeles High School and graduated in 1931 from UCLA.

Herman Platt is a legend in the Jewish community of Los Angeles. Following in his father Ben's footsteps, he served as president of Sinai Temple and on its board of directors for more than 35 years. His chairmanship of Mt. Sinai Memorial Park since its inception 20 years ago has earned him the nickname "Digger Platt."

Platt and his wife of 37 years, Marjorie, this year endowed the Marjorie and Herman Platt Art Gallery at the University of Judaism. He was instrumental in raising the funds to build the west Los Angeles campus of the university. He is chairman of the Patron Society and he and Marjorie were honored by the university at a testimonial dinner held January 15, 1983, at the Beverly Hilton Hotel.

In 1972, Platt received the prestigious "Spirit of Life" award at a testimonial dinner held at the Beverly Hills Hotel, for his dedicated service to the City of Hope. He is also a trustee of the UCLA foundation.

Platt compensates for his one unfulfilled desire in life—to have been a prominent sportswriter—by editing the newsletter for Hillcrest Country Club, where he serves on the board of directors.

In business as well as community work, Herman Platt is recognized as an inspirational and tireless community leader. He has been president of Platt Music Corp., for the past 52 years, bringing the small chain of concession departments in the southern California May Co., stores to 107 department store branches, nationwide.

Platt has served the city of Torrance Chamber of Commerce for 18 years, where he was chairman of the Housing Task Force Committee.

But despite his lifetime of outstanding accomplishments, Herman Platt feels his most satisfying achievement is his large family of 5 children and 15 grandchildren.

It gives me great personal pleasure to honor this man whom I have known

and respected for three decades—a true community leader and an outstanding human being.●

HHH CITES NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN'S COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE INVOLVEMENT

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Harrisburg, Pa., Section of the National Council of Jewish Women, in my district, deserves recognition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The National Council of Jewish Women has received an award from the Department of Health and Human Services for its outstanding public service in advocating for children and in promoting volunteerism through the court appointed special advocates program. National Council President Barbara A. Mandel received the award on behalf of the organization.

Some 270,000 children in the United States are living in some form of substitute care. The court appointed special advocate volunteer's first responsibility is to the child—advocating for whatever is in the child's best interest, whether it be temporary care, return to the birth parents or placement in an adoptive home. A court-appointed special advocate volunteer investigates the circumstances surrounding a child abuse or neglect case, makes an evaluation, recommends to the court that further action is in the child's best interest, both immediately or in the long run, and monitors the case until permanent placement is achieved.

It should be noted that President Reagan has instructed the Department of Justice to fund the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges to work with the National Council of Jewish Women and other cosponsors to spread court appointed special advocates to even more than the 250 jurisdictions currently served.

The National Council of Jewish Women's involvement with the special advocates program dates from 1979. Currently, the National Council of Jewish Women maintains 15 special advocates sites across the United States.

Established in 1893 the National Council of Jewish Women is America's oldest Jewish women's organization with more than 100,000 members in some 200 sections nationwide. The Greater Harrisburg, Pa., section of the National Council of Jewish Women was one of the first five NCJW sections nationally to initiate the court appointed special advocates program.●

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I had the honor of participating in a meeting with students from my congressional district. The topic of that meeting was "What is Leadership." Three of those students have written prize-winning essays in the Everett McKinley Dirksen essay contest sponsored by the Dirksen Center in Pekin, Ill.

I would like to share with you the essays of R. Clark Hunt of the Washington Intermediate School, Jenny Spurlock of Broadmoor Intermediate, and Chad A. Reiman, Edison Intermediate School, all from Pekin, on the subject of leadership.

These young people had some nice remarks to make about me in their essays and I appreciate their kindness. But the reason I want to share their views with you is to give you some idea of how our young Americans are thinking about leadership for our country.

At this point I would like to insert those essays in the RECORD:

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

(By R. Clark Hunt)

Leadership, serving the people and keeping unity among them, is best achieved by having an understanding of the needs of those people being led.

Although the dictionary defines leadership as the act of leading or guiding, I found the word had as many meanings as the people I interviewed—a business leader, a teacher, and my parents.

My parents' thoughts about leadership were, "Qualities of leadership are having a goal, being committed to that goal, and planning to reach it. Showing how the goal meets the needs of people and caring and being committed to others are other leadership characteristics." My dad only had one important quality when he said, "Plan your work, and work your plan."

Mr. Dale Pauley, a former coach stated, "A leader is a servant to the people. Jesus was a servant to the people, and He was humble."

A business leader, Mr. Jim Rassi, listed seven leadership qualities. They are dependability, consistency, authoritativeness, perception, getting along with others, keeping unity among people, and understanding people. "A problem with some leaders is they don't stand out in the group, and others want to take over." He also told me that the most important quality is to have an understanding of the people you lead.

In the Jaycee Action Magazine for Leadership Training was a checklist of good leadership attributes. Here are a few:

Leaders are judged by the performance of their followers.

Leaders must always set the example.

Leaders must accept responsibility.

Leaders must exercise supervision.

Leaders must develop loyalty toward members of the organization.

Leaders must be good counselors.

Leaders must be firm, fair, and just in all action.

Robert H. Michel is an example of a good leader. Michel was elected House Republican Leader of the 98th Congress in Decem ber of 1982. He served in that position three other times.

On March 2, 1923, Robert Henry Michel was born in Peoria, Illinois. He went to school in Peoria and graduated from Bradley University with a B.S. degree in Business Administration. Michel served during World War II in the enlisted ranks. He was wounded at the Battle of the Bulge, was discharged as a disabled veteran, and was awarded two Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, and four battle stars for his service.

Michel was first in Washington in 1949 as an Administrative Assistant to his forerunner, Representative Harold Velde. He served in this position until 1956. Since 1964 Michel has been a delegate to every National Convention, has chaired the Platform Subcommittee on Human Resources, and was Floor Leader for Presidents Ford and Reagan.

Michel said that his three qualities of leadership are a desire to be a good leader, an ability to be a good listener, and a good measure of confidence in his own ability.

He said, "A person should listen 90% of the time and be tolerant enough to listen to the other person's point of view."

I think he is an effective leader because he is brave, a good listener, and unafraid to speak his thought. I think a leader should really desire to be a leader. A leader should listen, be a good planner, and carry out his plans.

Bob Michel is a good listener, and he plans well, too, in order to carry out his plans.

Thus we can see that an understanding of the people being served is necessary to planning for effectiveness as a leader.

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

(By Jenny Spurlock)

The dictionary suggests direction and guidance as synonyms for leadership. There have always been those who are eager to guide and direct, but they need to have followers if they are truly to be leaders. What leadership qualities make people willing to follow a particular person?

Honesty is a quality most people demand from a leader. One of the leaders who had this quality was given the nickname "Honest Abe." He was given the nickname when, overchanged by three pennies, he walked ten miles back to the grocery store to correct the error. This quality stayed with Abraham Lincoln throughout his entire life. Without his honesty and compassion, the Emancipation Proclamation may never have been written.

Another quality people demand from a good leader is courage. A good example of courage was President John F. Kennedy. Without courage, he would not have been able to take the stand he did during what has come to be known as the Cuban Missile Crisis. He proved to the world that he would not let the United States of America be intimidated by any other world power.

Every good leader needs public speaking ability. Congressman Robert Michel has shown that this is a strong quality of his. By being elected to eight terms in public office, he proves that he can convey to the public his ideas in a way that meets with their approval. By becoming the House Minority leader, he proved that he can relay these

ideas and be listened to and accepted by his peers.

Representing the people and their needs is a most important quality also. A man who led with this quality was Everett McKinley Dirksen. His interest of creating a clearer knowledge of Congress to the public was in response to a need he saw. He is quoted as saying, "I want to do what I think is in the interest of the present and future well-being of probably the only real, true free republic that still remains on God's footstool."

Of course, these are only a few of the qualities of a good leader. There are many others. Alone, none of them is as valuable as when they are put into use together by one man or a group of men. Our leaders today, I believe, have an abundance of these qualities and are continually striving to provide us with the leadership we desire.

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

(By Chad A. Reiman)

Leadership was a word I didn't give much thought to until I entered this essay contest. As I read materials and listened to comments about leadership, I realized that good leadership is a valuable resource in our United States. In the following paragraphs I would like to share some of my insights on this subject.

The ability to unite and guide a group of people to a common goal is one definition of leadership. It can also mean bringing, greatness out of people rather than trying to make people great.

Sixty-one years ago a leader was born in Peoria, Illinois. On March 23, 1923, the proud parents named their son, Robert Henry Michel. Mr. and Mrs. Charles Michel lived with religious convictions and also had a belief that politics were evil.

One of the first opportunities Robert Michel had to show his ability as a leader was while he served as president of his high school class. After high school, he served his country in war, not as a leader, but as an enlisted combat infantryman.

His public political career began in 1949 when he served as Administrative Assistant to Representative Harold Velde. Mr. Michel assisted Rep. Velde for seven years. In 1956, he was elected to the 85th Congress as Mr. Velde retired. Congressman Michel has been re-elected for 14 consecutive terms since then. He is presently serving as House Republican Leader of the 98th Congress.

As Mr. Michel explained to me, to be a good leader one must have the desire to lead, be a good listener, have confidence, not live in fear of making wrong decisions, and must be able to take criticism. He went on to say, a good leader will be educated and informed in a variety of matters. He said Teddy Roosevelt possessed the qualities he admires in a leader.

I believe Congressman Michel shows qualities of a good leader and he tries to do what is best for us. He seems to be more concerned about how people he is leading and representing regard him, rather than how he impresses President Reagan and Speaker of the House, "Tip" O'Neill. He appears to fit this quote by General Omar N. Bradley, "Fairness, diligence, sound preparation, professional skill, and loyalty are marks of American leadership."

In summing this up, I know we all have the opportunity to try to become good leaders. People can have confidence in and count on a good leader. A good leader will leave behind him a will and a conviction in his followers.●

TRIBUTE TO TRINITY EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 20, Trinity Episcopal Church in my home district of the Bronx, will be celebrating their 110th anniversary. At this time I would like to pay tribute to Trinity Episcopal Church and the fine work it has done for the Bronx community.

Trinity Episcopal Church has a long history of service to the Bronx community. For 110 years it has stood as a spiritual center and has worked closely with its parishioners to provide them the spiritual guidance and religious enrichment in times of sorrow and joy. The history of Trinity Episcopal Church has been one committed to fulfilling the religious and spiritual needs of its parishioners.

Father Wendell Roberts has been the pastor of Trinity Episcopal for 34 years. During his 34 years of service, Father Roberts has worked hard to keep up Trinity Episcopal's tradition of service and commitment to the Bronx community. An example of this commitment is the summer program for children run by Father Roberts. The program includes musical instruction and daily field trips to various educational and recreational facilities. Trinity Episcopal currently has about 400 members and together with the clergy they have worked hard to maintain Trinity Episcopal Church as a fine religious institution.

It gives me great pleasure to honor Trinity Episcopal on the occasion of their 110th anniversary. This anniversary not only marks 110 years of service but is also indicative of the important role Trinity Episcopal Church has played in the lives of its members. Those 110 years were undoubtedly marked with times of hardship as well as times of prosperity and joy. Through it all Trinity Episcopal has stood as a symbol of hope, love and understanding. I am proud to pay tribute to Trinity Episcopal on this momentous occasion and I am confident that Trinity Episcopal will continue to serve the Bronx community and continue to provide its parishioners with spiritual and religious guidance and enrichment.●

A SINGLE STANDARD OF JUDGMENT FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington Post caught my attention. It is rare that one reads a balanced analysis of the hostility in Central America, and I believe this editorial is a serious attempt by critics of the administration's policies in Central America to look at all sides of the issue.

Nicaragua cannot continue to receive a free ticket of support from critics of U.S. policy in Central America. In the past, the Sandinistas have been able to talk their way out of being judged by the same standards as all the other countries of the region. Now there are signs everywhere that supporters of the Sandinistas are beginning to rethink their unquestioning endorsement of everything that is done in Managua. The Post editorial focuses on two particular issues: The elections of November, which seem to be an enlightened version of the Cuban-Soviet model, and Managua's support for Salvadoran guerrillas who are intent on criminally destroying civilian targets—just like the contras who also are wantonly engaged in the destruction of civilian targets in Nicaragua.

As the Post says, "There is a great need for a single standard of judgment in Central America." This need is great both in Washington and Managua. I commend this article to my colleague's attention.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1984]

ADVICE FOR MANAGUA

President Reagan has been receiving much good advice, from Congress and, especially generously, from the press, on the subject of Nicaragua. But Nicaragua needs some good advice, too, if Central America is eventually to settle down. It could most usefully come from the Willy Brandt-type social democrats in Europe and those liberals elsewhere who tend to coddle the Sandinistas, and from the larger group that has faulted the interventionist aspects of President Reagan's policy. We have in mind two points.

The ruling Sandinistas stand strongly behind the demand of the Salvadoran guerrillas to be admitted to a "power-sharing" process in El Salvador. In Nicaragua, however, the nine comandantes reject any thought of admitting Nicaraguan guerrillas to power-sharing or even to the elections the regime now plans on Nov. 4. After the country's Catholic bishops called for a peace dialogue involving all Nicaraguans, including those "who have risen in arms against the government"—such dialogue is the left's constant appeal in El Salvador—the Sandinista police chief denounced the call as "criminal." The Sandinistas insist they will not open their elections—elections they seem intent on running in the Soviet style

anyway—to the Nicaraguan contras even if the guerrillas lay down their arms.

The Sandinistas, by way of seeking international support, are now broadcasting news of the considerable damage done by the contras. People are being killed in military engagements, but many of the targets are economic and civilian in character, and the results are commonly measured in dollar terms or in terms of hardships inflicted upon the population. The Sandinistas, of course, show no similar dismay over the substantially greater damage done to economic and civilian targets by the guerrillas whose operations they encourage in El Salvador. Some on the left suggest it is all right to destroy, say, a coffee planation belonging to an "oligarch." This is rubbish. Peasants work on plantations; Nicaragua's friends in El Salvador have also shot up the bus fleet, which transports the poor.

There is great need for a single standard in judging political events in Central America. There is a need for it in Washington and a need for it in Managua, too.●

THOMAS H. BRUGGERE

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that Thomas H. Bruggere, founder of one of Oregon's fastest-growing, high-technology companies, has been named Oregon's Small Businessman of the Year by the Small Business Administration.

As we all know, a great deal of attention is being focused all across the country on the role our high-technology electronics industry must play in developing America's economic strength and competitiveness in world markets. It is clearly an industry that holds promise for America's future, and for Oregon's.

It is therefore fitting that we acknowledge and encourage those entrepreneurs who have kept this critical industry at the cutting edge of technological innovation.

Tom Bruggere is such a man. As President and Chief Executive Officer of Mentor Graphics Corp. in Beavertown, Oreg., he has contributed significantly to the diversification of Oregon's economic base. Tom founded Mentor Graphics in 1981 in the heart of Oregon's "Silicon Forest." Under his leadership, the company has emerged as the industry's leading supplier of computer-aided engineering systems. These advances have substantially increased the productivity of electronics designers at a time of intense worldwide competition for computer applications to old problems and new challenges.

Since 1981, Mentor's work force has grown to 260 employees. In 1983, the company's first sales year, Mentor had nearly $26 million in revenue from domestic and overseas sales.

Overseeing the operations of a firm that is growing as fast as Mentor Graphics does not leave Tom much spare time. Despite the demands of his business, however, Tom has worked to improve Oregon's business environment through service on the board of directors of the American Electronics Association and as chairman of the AEA's Oregon chapter.

I am delighted to salute the remarkable achievements of my friend, Tom Bruggere, to congratulate him on being named Oregon's Small Businessman of the Year, and to extend to him my best wishes for continued success.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, while on an official leave of absence to serve as a congressional adviser at the annual meeting of the Asian Development Bank, I was unable to be present and voting on the floor of the House during the week of April 24. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On Tuesday, April 24:

Yes on rollcall 91, final passage of S. 373, Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983.

On Wednesday, April 25:

No on rollcall 93, Gregg amendment to H.R. 4974, National Science Foundation Authorization for fiscal year 1985.

No on rollcall 94, Walker amendment to H.R. 4974.

Yes on rollcall 95, final passage of H.R. 4974.

On Thusday, April 26:

Yes on rollcall 96, on approving the Journal of Wednesday, April 25.

Yes on rollcall 97, passage of House Resolution 490, the rule on S. 2570, extending the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act.

No on rollcall 98, Sensenbrenner motion to commit S. 2570.

Yes on rollcall 99, final passage of S. 2570.

Yes on rollcall 100, passage of House Resolution 481, the rule on H.R. 5172, National Bureau of Standards Authorization for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

Yes on rollcall 102, Fuqua amendment to Gregg substitute to Walker amendment to H.R. 5172.

No on rollcall 103, Gregg amendment to Walker amendment to H.R. 5172.

Yes on rollcall 104, Gregg substitute, as amended by Fuqua amendment, to Walker amendment to H.R. 5172.

No on rollcall 105, Rudd amendment to H.R. 5172.

Yes on rollcall 106, Fuqua motion that the Committee of the Whole rise.●

SENATE—*Wednesday, May 2, 1984*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 30, 1984)

The Senate met at 10 a.m. on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

May we have a moment of silence during which we remember Judge William Webster and the loss of his wife Drusilla.

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord . . .—Psalm 33: 12.

Almighty God, we have come a long way since our birth as a Republic but we have wandered somehow. Our Founding Fathers held freedom of religion as fundamental. We have translated their deep conviction into freedom from religion. We have become technological giants—spiritual and moral dwarfs. We are sophisticated in scientific progress and primitive in spiritual development. We are knowledgeable in the ways of the world and ignorant in the way of God. We live as though man is the center of the universe and God a peripheral invention of pious enthusiasts. We are abundantly rich in material resources and abysmally poor in spiritual and moral capital. Dear God, help us to get our act together before it is too late. In the name of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALASKA

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the assistant majority leader, wishes part of my time today. I am happy to accord him that time to speak on the matter of the President's and the Pope's visit to Fairbanks, AK. I was in Fairbanks once, and judging by the pictures I saw on television last night there are going to be more reporters up there than there are people. But in all seriousness, I congratulate the State of Alaska and Senator STEVENS and his colleague for playing host to the President and to the Holy Father. I yield to him now so that he might proceed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

PRESIDENT REAGAN AND POPE JOHN PAUL VISIT ALASKA

Mr. STEVENS. I do want to call attention to the Senate that the President, returning from his most successful trip to China, has stopped in our State. He arrived there about 3 a.m. Tuesday morning. He has had a most interesting visit with the people of Fairbanks and of Alaska as a whole. Because of personal reasons I was unable to be there, but I am delighted that the President has spent this time in Alaska; that he has decided to stop and wait for the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II. It is a most historical occasion for Alaska to be able to play host to both the President and the Pope at the same time. I thank my good friends from the White House staff, Jim Baker and Mike Deaver, for their courtesies in assisting us to arrange this visit and to make it one that will be so memorable for the people of my State.

When the President arrived in Fairbanks, he was greeted by an editorial that was in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, which is published by my good friend, C.W. "Bill" Snedden. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which is entitled "Our Nation On The Right Track," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, May 1, 1984]

OUR NATION ON THE RIGHT TRACK

During the four years that Ronald Reagan has led our nation, Alaskans have taken a growing pride in being Americans.

Our nation is on the right track, with an emphasis on private sector growth, a strong defense posture, and a balance between natural resource development and environmental preservation. We believe the leadership of President Reagan is in good part responsible for the positive changes we've seen over the last four years.

Today, we're pleased to welcome President and Mrs. Reagan to our community. We take this opportunity to acknowledge—with thanks—the economic policies, defense positions, and conservative attitudes that have set America on a course we heartily endorse.

Fairbanksans were strong supporters of Mr. Reagan during the 1980 elections, voting for him nearly two to one over Democrat Jimmy Carter. We Alaskans can certainly answer the Reagan administration query—are you better off today than four years ago—with a resounding yes.

Granted, we still have some disputes with the federal government over issues where the Alaskan perspective has not been given due consideration, but at least we are dealing with an administration that recognizes the vital contribution the private sector makes to our nation's health.

Four years ago, under the heavy hand of the Carter administration, Alaskans voted to set up a state commission to study our status within the federal fold. Our distrust and dislike of the federal government even led some of us to go so far as to propose independence. A few Alaskans still press for that release, but the thrust of the movement has dissipated under a federal administration that has lightened the government regulatory burden, brought down inflation rate, eased the pressures for locking up our natural resources, stimulated private sector growth, and reduced the income tax burden.

When Alaska was granted Statehood 25 years ago this year, it was partly due to a growing national recognition that Alaska had many contributions to make to the nation.

As we enter our second 25 years, the Reagan administration is helping us continue to make good on that promise. Initially under Secretary of the Interior James Watt and now under William Clark, many of the repressive policies of the Carter Administration have been turned around. Federal oil and gas leasing have been accelerated, state and Native land conveyances have been made a top priority, access provisions have been loosened, fewer permits have been required, and local input has been encouraged.

Those policies haven't solved every problem we have with every federal agency, and the priorities of a Democratic Congress have often hampered them. Nevertheless, the good will and sensible policies of the Reagan administration have been apparent and appreciated.

Though Alaska never really participated in the recession which grew out of the short-sighted policies that preceded President Reagan's election, today we are enjoying the benefits of the nation's strong economy. In addition, renewed emphasis on patriotism, conservative values and a bootstraps attitude have been welcome to Alaskans.

We are indeed honored by the visit here of our nation's leader. We say welcome, and thank-you . . . A very sincere "thank-you!"

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

(Mr. KASTEN assumed the chair.)

A PRESIDENTIAL VISIT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska. What I said about Fairbanks, of course, was said in jest. A man who comes from a town of 500 has no right to poke his finger at a town of 50,000, but in any event I congratulate the State of Alaska and the two Senators and the Governor of Alaska for this singular honor.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

I cannot resist remembering it was 2 years ago yesterday that President Reagan came to Knoxville to open the 1982 World's Fair, and my wife and I invited President and Mrs. Reagan to be our guests overnight after the official ceremonies, which they did, which is a great honor to us and we were and are very grateful for that. Senator MURKOWSKI had told me that the President and Mrs. Reagan were going to stay at his house. I said:

Well, now, FRANK, that is fine, but as a man who is a veteran in these experiences, let me tell you a few things. Presidents are nice to have but they are tough to be around.

I certainly am not complaining about the subject, but to begin with when we confirmed that the President was going to visit in our home, the telephone company showed up and installed a telephone cable as big as my leg. I was fearful that it was at my own expense. It turned out not to be. But my fears had only just begun. That telephone cable had to go someplace and there was then a forest of telephones installed. I still have evidence of that because they drilled a hole in the floor every place they put them.

We were especially pleased that the President was going to be in our little guest house, which is built on a bluff overlooking the river canyon, a beautiful view. That is why we built it there. I really relished the idea of taking the President out on the back porch and showing him this view across the canyon to a wooded hillside 2 miles away. But when the President arrived, I found that the Secret Service had nailed my drapes shut.

Then that night we had some 30 guests for a dinner party. I found that instead of the caterers which we had employed to serve the meal, as far as the President was concerned they had brought their own waiters and had cooked his meals in Washington and brought them to Tennessee.

All those things are absolutely necessary, I am sorry to say, in this time when there is such grave threat to world leaders and to the President in particular, but I had to tell my friend FRANK MURKOWSKI that while it is a great honor to have a Presidential visit in one's home—look out for the drapes and the floor.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, I have been facetious, too long. I should report that after the special order is executed, there will be morning business until 10:30 a.m., when we will resume consideration of the boat bill and the Grassley-Kassebaum-Biden-Baucus amendment will be pending. I get mixed signals about that. Some of the sponsors, whom I will not now identify, say that they should be able to finish with about 3 hours on a side. Some of the sponsors say it may be 3 days. I have assured them that we are going to do whatever we need to do and that we will explore the situation as the day progresses. It is my unpleasant duty, however, to reiterate what I said on Monday and again on Tuesday: Members should expect a late evening tonight.

Mr. President, if I have any time remaining, I reserve 1 minute of that time so that after the minority leader has spoken, I may perform certain other routine functions.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

KAL 007—AN INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is an easy thing to let the press of events claim our attention. Here in the Senate we are propelled from one demanding situation to another. Emergencies—real and imagined—often set the agenda. The most recent crisis thrusts itself on us, and we forget the dangers of a situation that intensely absorbed our attention a short time before.

Often I have called upon my colleagues to remember the freedom-loving peoples of Afghanistan. As I have said on previous occasions, I do not know of any Afghan constituents in West Virginia. There may be some in the town of Weirton, in Hancock County, where, I have been told, there are more than 60 different ethnic groups. The press, for the most part, has been excluded from war-torn Afghanistan. The reporters who covered that brutal invasion are off in Iran or Iraq, in Beirut or Chad, in El Salvador or Grenada. Afghanistan has, in a real sense, become another forgotten tragedy. But brave men and women still fight and die there, civilian homes still are bombed there, and refugees still seek safety from the 4 years of Soviet tyranny.

Other recent examples of infamy also seem to have faded from the popular imagination. Last September 1, 269 men, women, and children died when their civilian airliner was attacked and destroyed by Soviet fighters when it strayed into Soviet air space. The Soviets to this day have shown no real hint of remorse or regret for this vicious action. The Soviet Government admits no legal responsibility to compensate the families of the victims. Indeed, the Soviets refused to permit search and rescue operations within Soviet waters. The Soviet navy harassed search vessels operating in international waters, ignoring diplomatic protests and repeated appeals for cooperation. Recently we have heard reports that the Soviet pilot responsible for shooting down the Korean airliner has received a medal for that act of butchery.

Despite this complete lack of Soviet cooperation, the international community went forward with an independent investigation of the shootdown of the Korean airliner. The call for that investigation came from a special session of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). At my request, Kevin Nealer of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee staff attended that meeting. As a former State Department officer and legal adviser to U.S. delegations, Kevin assisted the U.S. delegation to ICAO in obtaining a commitment to an impartial investigation. I commend the U.S. delegation for their efforts, and I am pleased that a member of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee staff was able to participate in that accomplishment.

After several months of thorough work by an international team of experienced investigators, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) reported that a navigation error was the likely cause of the Korean airliner's deviation into Soviet airspace. The investigation discounted the espionage theory advanced by the Soviets. Moreover, the investigators concluded that the Soviets did not adequately warn the Korean airliner that it had entered Soviet air space, and that the Korean airline pilot was unaware of the Soviet interceptor aircraft, even after his plane had been hit by the Soviet missiles which destroyed it.

This was powerful evidence. On the basis of the independent investigator's report, the ICAO Council recently passed a resolution condemning the Soviet Union for its use of force against a civilian aircraft and called for improvements and cooperation to avoid such tragedies in the future.

The resolution is some measure of the international outrage at the brutal and irresponsible act that led to the deaths of so many unarmed, helpless civilians. I am pleased to see that the international community has censured the Soviet Union for the wanton waste of innocent lives. I commend the members of the ICAO Council and the international investigation team for their pursuit of the truth. It is important that the international community speak with unity and conviction when the norms of human behavior are disregarded so utterly. And it is also important that we take steps to assure that such a tragedy will not recur.

This month, all 152 members of the ICAO are meeting to consider a proposed amendment to the 1944 Chicago Convention which would prohibit the use of deadly force against civilian air-

craft. Despite Soviet opposition, it seems clear that some version of that amendment will succeed, this codifying existing international understandings that such a resort to force is lawless and irresponsible.

Mr. President, the SALT II Treaty was on the Senate Executive Calendar at the time of the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviets. Immediately following the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviets, I called then-President Carter from my home and asked to see him.

Later that day, I was in his office, and I said to him: "Mr. President, we would be poorly advised now if we were to call up the SALT II Treaty. In the light of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, there are not the votes in the Senate for the adoption of the resolution of ratification of the SALT II Treaty."

President Carter agreed with me, and that was the end of that.

So, the Soviets, themselves, scuttled the treaty when they invaded Afghanistan. But that has not been the end of the invasion and the ruthless efforts on the part of the Soviets to suppress the spirit of liberty and freedom in Afghanistan.

May the Afghan freedom fighters fight on.

I hope that the Moslem communities throughout the world will be more sensitive than it appears up to now with respect to the brutal murder of their brothers and sisters in Afghanistan.

Perhaps even the large Moslem community in the Soviet Union will finally learn the facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Journal of Commerce article reporting on the ICAO Council's action be printed in the RECORD, along with a copy of the resolution of the ICAO Council.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Mar. 8, 1984]

ICAO COUNCIL CONDEMNS SOVIET ACT

MONTREAL.—The governing council of the International Civil Aviation Organization has condemned, by an overwhelming vote, the Soviet Union for the shooting down of a South Korean airliner last Sept. 1.

By a vote of 20-2, with nine abstentions, the ICAO council passed a U.S. resolution late Tuesday condemning "the use of armed force which resulted in the destruction of the Korean airliner and the tragic loss of 269 lives." Two countries were absent for the secret ballot.

The ill-fated aircraft, en route from Anchorage, Alaska, to Seoul, was shot down by Soviet fighter planes over the Sea of Japan after it had inadvertently strayed 500 kilometers off course. An ICAO technical report, released last week, confirmed the findings of an earlier report by the Montreal-based organization that referred to navigational errors by the pilots.

The resolution also "deeply deplores the Soviet failure to cooperate in the search and rescue efforts of other involved states and the Soviet failure to cooperate with the ICAO investigation."

Earlier this week, the Soviet delegate reiterated the allegation, rejected by the ICAO report, that the airliner was on a spy mission when it flew over strategic military installations on Sakhalin Island.

In a separate report to ICAO, the Soviet Union argued that its interceptors tried to communicate visually with the airliner on KAL flight 007. The ICAO report, however, took the Soviet authorities to task for failing to provide the agency's investigation team with radar data or transcripts of communications between the Soviet fighters and their base commander.

An ICAO spokesman noted that the affair constitutes "quite an unprecedented case" in the history of the international civil aviation body, which will be celebrating its 40th anniversary this year.

In effect, though Israel was condemned in 1973 by ICAO for the shooting down of a Libyan airliner, the Israeli authorities admitted their responsibility for the incident, accepted the legal consequences and offered compensation to the victims.

After the crushing vote, U.S. delegate Donald Segner said "the United States is gratified that the council has fulfilled ICAO's responsibility for the safety of international civil aviation. The world can now be assured that such attacks against a civilian airliner and its innocent passengers will not be condoned no matter who is the perpetrator."

South Korean observer Keun Park remarked: "It is a motion of censure, of disapproval, and it will certainly have an impact on the future of civil aviation."

Council President Assad Kotaite said the vote terminated ICAO's investigation of the incident unless new evidence surfaced.

Mr. Segner added that ICAO deserved credit for passing the resolution despite "severe political pressure" from the Soviet Union not to vote on it.

France, Italy, Japan, Canada, Belgium, Australia, West Germany and Spain were among the countries supporting the U.S.-sponsored resolution, which also invited all of ICAO's 151 contracting states to cooperate fully in the preparation of an extraordinary session at the end of next month.

On April 24, an extraordinary session of the ICAO assembly will consider a proposed amendment to the Chicago Convention, which involves an undertaking to abstain from the use of force against civil aircraft and improvement of procedures to follow to avoid any future similar tragedies.

RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO) COUNCIL, AS PASSED MARCH 6, 1984

(1) Recalling the resolutions adopted and the decisions taken on 10 September 1983 at the extraordinary session of the ICAO Council and endorsed by the 24th session of the ICAO assembly in October 1983 as well as the council resolution of 13 December 1983, relating to the destruction of a Korean Air Lines civil aircraft on 1 September 1983 by Soviet military aircraft:

(2) Having considered the report of the investigation by the Secretary General and the subsequent technical review by the Air Navigation Commission:

(3) Recognizing that, although this investigation was unable, because of lack of necessary data, to determine conclusively the precise cause for the serious deviation of some 500 kilometers from its flight plan route by the Korean aircraft into the air space above the territory under the sovereignty of the Soviet Union, no evidence was found to indicate that the deviation was premeditated or that the crew was at any time aware of the flight's deviation;

(4) Reaffirming that, whatever the circumstances which, according to the Secretary General's report, may have caused the aircraft to stray off its flight plan route, such use of armed force constitutes a violation of international law, and invokes generally recognized legal consequences:

(5) Recognizing that such use of armed force is a grave threat to the safety of international civil aviation, and is incompatible with the norms governing international behavior and with the rules, standards and recommended practices enshrined in the Chicago convention and its annexes and with elementary consideration of humanity:

(6) Expressing its continuing sympathy with the families bereaved in this tragic incident:

(1) condemns the use of armed force which resulted in the destruction of the Korean airliner and the tragic loss of 269 lives;

(2) Deeply deplores the Soviet failure to cooperate in the search and rescue efforts of other involved states and the Soviet failure to cooperate with the ICAO investigation of the incident by refusing to accept the visit of the investigation team appointed by the Secretary General and by failing so far to provide the Secretary General with information relevant to the investigation;

(3) Urges all contracting states to cooperate fully in the work of examining and adopting an amendment to the Chicago convention at the 25th session (extraordinary) of the ICAO assembly and in the improvement of measures for preventing a recurrence of this type of tragedy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I congratulate the Democratic leader, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, for his persistence day after day for many months in calling attention to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan which has gone on so long and because there has been no spectacular development. It has been ignored by our press and has not been discussed as it should have been by those of us here in the Senate, with the prominent exception of our distinguished Democratic leader.

The Soviets, after all, have violated human rights. They have also violated a treaty, the Chemical Warfare Treaty. Their violations have been documented. I am delighted to know and am very proud that our leader, ROBERT C. BYRD, has called attention to this this morning as he has done so persistently pointed to the Soviet violations in shooting down an unarmed plane and in documenting the independent investigation by an international group.

So I thank my leader for this service. I joined him once or twice. I wish I

had been with him even more often. But I expect to do so in the future.

I congratulate him again for a great service.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his kind comments. He has spoken out on this tragedy, and I am delighted to hear him say that he will continue to do so.

As the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, more of us should be doing this so that the world will not so easily forget the sacrifices that are being made by Afghans in that war-torn, brutalized country. And from what we hear, the suffering, the killings, the woundings, the maimings, are not limited just to Afghan women and men, but are also being sadly experienced by Afghan boys and girls. Young people—even children—have been slaughtered in the villages, as they have been victims of minefields, chemical warfare, and high altitude bombings.

It is just too bad that the world press is not allowed to go into that war-torn country. It is a sad reflection on the Soviet Union's system of government that it shamelessly excludes the press so that the world may not see, may not know, and may not feel the terror occurring in Afghanistan.

RECORD FIRST QUARTER TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last week the Commerce Department announced the latest trade figures. For the third consecutive month, our deficit grew. For March, that deficit reached a record $10.26 billion! That is the largest monthly trade deficit in our history. The March data completes the quarterly trade profile, which reveals the largest trade shortfall ever in the first quarter of 1984—a total deficit of $29.9 billion. That deficit is more than twice as large as the total trade shortfall for the entire year of 1976. Dr. Fred Bergsten, Director of the Institute for International Economics, predicts that these records could foreshadow a total manufacturing trade deficit of $140 billion by the end of this year. This would be twice the level of last year's record trade deficit.

If that figure is a little difficult to appreciate, let me put it in human terms. The Commerce Department tells us that every $1 billion decline in exports costs this country 25,000 jobs lost or not created. This means we could add more than 2.5 million more Americans to the jobless roles this year, solely because we are losing our ability to export. It means that the record March trade deficit translates into more than 250,000 Americans out of work. That is more than a quarter of a million men and women who will not know if they can make the house payment, feed themselves and their children, or otherwise make ends meet.

What do these numbers mean for our major industries? For the steel industry, they mean that foreign steel imports flooded the U.S. market in the first 3 months of this year at a rate that exceeds all previous levels. Over 6 million tons of foreign steel entered the U.S. market, giving foreign companies control of an astonishing 24 percent of this country's steel market in the first quarter of 1984. On Capitol Hill today, there is a truck carrying the last pieces of steel made at the Armco steel plant in Houston, TX, in January some 4,200 people lost their jobs when that plant closed. I am an original cosponsor of a bill introduced by Senator HEINZ and Senator RANDOLPH on behalf of the Steel Caucus which would limit steel imports to 15 percent of the U.S. market. That Fair Trade in Steel bill requires the American steel industry to spend more on capital improvements and modernization. It provides an interval of adjustment so that American firms can compete on a level playing field for their share of the domestic and international market.

Why are we facing the current trade crisis? In March I outlined the source of the real problem. It is just as Martin Feldstein and Senator MATHIAS, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, have said. High interest rates, a dangerously overvalued dollar, and the related Federal deficit all work hand in hand to create this crisis. These are policies which the administration has encouraged, and continues to support. This triple threat has caused our trade deficit, and it is a problem which will not be solved until we bring our economic policies into line with reality.

The American worker and our companies are doing all they can to be productive and competitive in the international market. But their best efforts are being undercut by a policy that creates the largest budget deficit in history and, as I have pointed out before, is leading to a situation where this country is a debtor nation. Within the next few years, the President's own economists tell us that much of America's growing debt will be held by foreigners. Thus we are facing a situation where our economy is being run from beyond our borders. The trade deficit is one symptom of that problem.

I am pleased to say that Senate Democrats are looking for honest solutions to the challenge of the international marketplace. We recognize that the world economy has become interdependent—that the United States cannot and should not insulate itself from the world market. Indeed, trade is and continues to be vital to the health of our economy. My own State of West Virginia ranks third in the Nation in the percent of its manufactured goods going to export. West Virginia jobs—American jobs—depend on a strong export policy.

The Senate Democratic Task Force, chaired by Senator KENNEDY, offered 22 specific recommendations for a stronger American economy. That task force is preparing legislation to implement those recommendations, and I understand that a package of trade initiatives will be ready for introduction within a month. I welcome that effort, and I know many American businesses will welcome these initiatives. If this administration is content to stand by failed policies and the failure of political will which has resulted in the worst trade deficit in history, I am not. I know my colleagues are not. And I know that many members of the President's own party have made it plain that they are not satisfied with those policies.

American workers and American business deserve more from Government than good wishes in the struggle to compete in the international market. They deserve good policies—ones that are responsive to the real problems that handicap our exports. I look forward to the initiatives being prepared by the Democratic Task Force as an important step in coming to terms with the challenge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post article of April 28, 1984, entitled "Trade Deficit Hits Record $10.3 Billion" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1984]

TRADE DEFICIT HITS RECORD $10.3 BILLION

(By Jane Seaberry)

The nation's merchandise trade deficit last month grew to a record $10.3 billion—the third consecutive monthly record deficit—as purchases of imports in the United States also reached new heights.

At the current rate, 1984 is shaping up as the worst trade year in U.S. history.

The February trade deficit was $10.1 billion, and it exceeded the January record of $9.5 billion, the Commerce Department said. The deficit for the first quarter also was a record—$119.3 billion at an annual rate, up from an $89.1 billion rate during the fourth quarter last year.

Although imports continued to grow to record levels, exports also improved by $515 million last month because of improved economic conditions abroad, Commerce said.

"Faster economic growth among our trading partners should limit further widening of the U.S. trade gap and may help to bring some improvement by the end of this year," said Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige. He has predicted that the trade deficit, which was a record $60.6 billion last year, probably will top $100 billion this year.

Imports last month totaled $28 billion compared with $27.8 billion in February. Major increases were in imports of iron and

steel plates and sheets, motor vehicles, aircraft and parts, electronic tubes and transistors, office machines, advanced data-processing equipment, and power-generating machines.

Sales of several kinds of foreign agricultural products declined, as well as fish and shellfish, and some crude inedible goods, Commerce said.

The trade deficit with Japan was $2.7 billion, the largest for the year so far, up from $2.4 billion in February. Trade with the European Economic Community resulted in a deficit of $1.7 billion last month, up from $999.4 million in February, Commerce said.

First-quarter exports were 3.6 percent higher, and imports were 12.8 percent higher, than during the fourth quarter of 1983.

The trade-deficit problem threatens to be a catalyst for more protectionist legislation this year, which some members of Congress may find hard to resist—particularly with elections in November.

One reason for the deficit has been the high value of the dollar, caused largely by high U.S. interest rates resulting from the large federal budget deficits and the safety of investing U.S. assets.

High rates attract foreign investment, increasing the demand for the dollar and raising its value. The strong dollar, in turn, makes U.S. exports more costly to foreign trading partners, discouraging sales, while simultaneously making goods from abroad cheaper for Americans, thus encouraging imports.

Another problem has been the general pattern of consumption following recessions. As a country pulls out of hard times, incomes expand and consumers tend to buy more imports. In addition, the economic recoveries in many countries have lagged behind that of the United States, preventing them from having the incomes to purchase American goods.

Many Latin American countries, burdened with debt problems, also have cut back on imports from the United States.

For example, the West German economy probably will grow by about 3 percent this year compared with only 1 percent last year, according to Kemper Financial Services Inc. In Great Britain, growth may exceed 3 percent for the second straight year. The Japanese economy should grow by between 4 and 5 percent this year following a 3 percent expansion last year, Kemper said.

WILLIAM COCHRANE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article about a man whom we all know, and whom we hold in high regard, Mr. William Cochrane, who has served on the staff of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration since 1972.

Bill Cochrane came to Washington in 1954 as administrative assistant to Senator W. Kerr Scott of North Carolina, intending only to stay for 1 year. Thirty years later, Bill continues to work with the diligence and dedication he has shown from the very beginning of his career, wishing only that there were more hours in the day to complete his many duties.

Mr. President, this article which appeared in Carolina Alumni Review is titled "North Carolina's Man on the Hill."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA'S MAN ON THE HILL

(By James P. Hughes)

Outside of his family, there are just two loves in the life of William McWhorter Cochrane—the University of North Carolina and the United States Senate. He is a loyal son of one (Class of 1937), resident sage of the other, and tireless servant of them both.

Leave it to Bill Cochrane to find a way to combine the two. In all his 30 years as a top Senate staffer, the 67-year-old Newton native has acted as an unofficial and unpaid lobbyist for the University, a role that earned him its Distinguished Alumnus Award in 1978.

Looking out for the University, however, has never conflicted with his official staff duties, nor kept him from performing many other invaluable services for his state and nation. On Capitol Hill they call him North Carolina's third Senator.'

He's served as administrative assistant to North Carolina Senators W. Kerr Scott (1954-58) and B. Everett Jordan (1958-72), staff director of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration (1972-80), and, since the 1980 GOP takeover, Democratic staff director of the same committee.

No matter what his title, Bill Cochrane has always been there when North Carolina calls. In his home state there are countless examples of his influence at work. The Jordan and Falls Lake reservoir projects, which he stood behind from start to finish, are two; another is the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, which he and Senator Jordan directed to Research Triangle Park by requiring it to be located outside a 50-mile radius from Washington.

Probably his biggest satisfaction, though, comes from running an informal employment agency for the sons and daughters of his native state. They are almost daily visitors to his cramped and cluttered office in the rotunda of the Russell Building, where they are provided with friendly advice, encouraging words, and, more often than not, a leg up on a job.

He has never cast the first vote in the Senate, but the Cochrane imprint can be found on any number of major bills. The landmark Budget Control and Impoundment Act is largely his doing, as is the creation of the Federal Election Commission and the Office of Technology Assessment.

Some of his best work has been reserved for the Library of Congress. As senior staff member of the Joint Committee on the Library, he has overseen the most dramatic expansion in the Library's 180-year history. Officials there credit him with the idea to rename its two older buildings in honor of Jefferson and Adams, and only half-jokingly say that the new Madison Building stands more a monument to Bill Cochrane's quiet influence than to our fourth President.

Every four years for the past 20, Bill has been in charge of arranging the presidential inaugural ceremonies, each of which takes a full year of preparation. Both parties keep asking him, and he has yet to say no.

Bill runs on a simple formula of hard work and longer hours, which are as much a Cochrane trademark as his bow ties and ever-present pipe. He says there's no telling what he could get done if only the day didn't end so soon.

His career with the Senate coincides with some of the most tumultuous years in American history—the dawn of desegregation, the close of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, and the unprecedented resignations of a vice president and president. Bill Cochrane was heavily involved in all three.

The Supreme Court ruled segregation of public schools unconstitutional in its now famous Brown v. Board of Education decision of May, 1954. Almost two years later, on March 11, 1956, 101 Southern members of Congress issued the "Southern Manifesto," a petition protesting racial desegregation, declaring Brown "a clear abuse of judicial power" and pledging resistance "by all lawful means."

The signatures of both North Carolina Senators were on the document, and nine of the 12 Representatives. Of the three who refused to sign, only one was returned to Congress after elections that fall, and then only after he was forced to say that he "hated and despised every word" of the Brown decision.

To this day, the morning of March 11, 1956 stands out in Bill Cochrane's memory. "It was about 9:30 or 10," he recalled in a recent interview. "The Senator was usually in by that time. He walked in every morning from the Westchester Hotel, about five or six miles. This morning he hadn't gotten in yet.

"I was sitting at my desk, reading the newspaper, when my phone rang. It was Senator Scott. 'Bill, are you where you can talk?' I told him I was. He said 'You know, they're coming out with that statement today. And I said yes.

" 'Bill, is there any way you can get my name off that thing?' I reflected on it a minute. It was already 10 by that time, too late. Senator Walter George of Georgia was supposed to read it in an hour, and advance copies had already been distributed to the press.

"It hurt me to say it, but I had to tell him, 'No, Senator, there's no way to withdraw your name now. You'd call more attention to yourself that way than if you left it on there: There was silence, and then he said, 'I guess you're right and hung up.

"That story's never been told before, at least not publicly. Only a few people know about it," Cochrane said. "I was always sad that we couldn't get his name off of there. Senator Scott never had any problem with black people, and he never went in for that kind of strong stuff."

Thirteen years later, when the Vietnam War had replaced race as the central issue back home and in Congress, Biil returned from a fact-finding trip to the Far East convinced of the futility of further U.S. military involvement there.

Over the next few weeks, he and Senator Jordan discussed the war issue from every conceivable angle and for hours on end. With the Sentor's permission, Bill taped their discussions, and these tapes will go with his papers to the Southern Historical Collection at Chapel Hill upon his retirement from the Senate.

The Senator, too, soon became convinced that disengagement was the preferred course, and in June, 1970, cast his vote in favor of the Cooper-Church Amendment, which called for an immediate pullback of U.S. troops from Cambodia. He was one of a handful of Southerners to do so.

"I remember Senator Mark Hatfield called our office that afternoon looking for the

Senator. He got me instead," Cochrane said. "He said, 'Bill, that was a courageous thing your boss did today, and I want you to thank him for me. It'll mean five more votes for our side down the road.' "

"A few weeks later, Senator Jordan went to the state Democratic convention in Raleigh, and when he came in there, he made a triumphal entry, with his arms raised and his hands up in a V for a Victory salute, and they gave him a thunderous ovation. And when they voted, it came out 1,200 to 600, his way, against the war," Cochrane said.

His health failing, Jordan was upset in the 1972 primary by Nick Galifianakis of Durham, who was subsequently buried in the Nixon landslide in November, losing to Jesse Helms. Before leaving the Senate, Jordan made Bill staff director of the influential Committee on Rules and Administration, which the Senator had chaired since 1965.

The stage was now set for Bill Cochrane to make his most important contribution. By mid-1974, the nation was in a state of crisis; confidence in government had hit an all-time low.

The Nixon Presidency had steadily deteriorated under revelations of White House complicity in the Watergate break-in. Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew was already out of the picture as a result of criminal charges left over from his tenure as governor of Maryland.

In place but untested, the 25th Amendment provided for Presidential succession in just such emergencies. No one knew if it could work. Finding out fell to Bill Cochrane and the Rules Committee, not once but twice in the space of eight months. First, Nixon named Gerald Ford of Michigan to succeed Agnew; then, after Nixon resigned, Ford chose Nelson Rockefeller of New York.

"We spent 60 days—mornings, nights, and Sundays—investigating Gerald Ford, and then had to turn right around and spend another 120 days on Nelson Rockefeller," Cochrane said.

By all accounts, Bill performed with considerable grace under pressure, and served as a steadying influence during the nation's long ordeal.

His achievements in the Senate are all the more remarkable considering Bill Cochrane never intended to stick around anywhere near this long. When he came to Washington in 1954, he announced to one and all he intended to stay no more than a year. After that he was going back home to Chapel Hill and the Institute of Government, where he had worked since his discharge from the Navy in late 1945.

The year came and went; Bill stayed. Three years later, Senator Scott died, and Gov. Luther H. Hodges appointed Jordan to succeed him. Bill said he'd stay until Jordan got settled, then he was going home. His bags were already packed.

Somehow he got sidetracked. He found out he liked working for Jordan. "He was just like a daddy to me," he said. Bill decided to stay just a little bit longer.

For the next 10 to 15 years, he was always going back to Chapel Hill after "just one year more." Today he swears he never left.

"I've got 20 acres down there with the Gimghoul view, and I'm going to put a house on it one of these days, and then I plan on sticking around as long as my cousin Louis Round Wilson did," he said.

If he ever follows through on that pledge, the University will lose one of the best friends it ever had in Washington. "There are few federally funded projects here that he didn't have a hand in one way or another," said UNC President William C. Friday, his friend of nearly 40 years.

"For every one you see or hear about, there's probably 10 back there that you'll never know Bill helped get. That's the way he is. He's never done one thing for public credit or personal aggrandizement, but he always gets the job done," President Friday said.

Dr. Isaac Taylor, dean of the UNC-CH School of Medicine from 1964 to 1971 and presently deputy director of the Hubert H. Humphrey Cancer Research Center at Boston University, recalls how Bill got the job done for an expansion of Memorial Hospital in the mid-1960s.

"We were in line for a Hill-Burton Award to build the Ambulatory Patient Care Facility," Dr. Taylor said. "We had secured whatever matching funds we needed from the General Assembly, we had taken bids, and now we had 30 or 60 days to get the contracts signed, or we'd have to rebid the project.

"The man in charge of Hill-Burton awards happened to be out of the country at the time, and his stand-in was a timid sort who wasn't about to approve those funds for us on his own. Meanwhile, the clock was ticking.

"Finally, I went to see this fellow, and I remonstrated with him. I said, 'If we don't have those funds by the end of the week, we will have to rebid those contracts, and it will cost us 10 percent more, which we don't have.' And he said, 'But, Dr. Taylor, I could lose my job.'

"Well, I figured right then that what he needed was somebody to assure him that he wouldn't lose his job if he approved our award. So I called Bill. 'No problem,' Bill said, 'I'll just call over to the White House.' Senator Jordan and President Johnson were good friends.

"When I got back to Chapel Hill, I got a call from the timid stand-in. 'Dr. Taylor,' he said, 'I believe I've figured out a way to get that money to you.' "

Devotion to the University took root in Bill Cochrane from the first day he set eyes on Chapel Hill—September 12, 1933, barely six months past his 16th birthday, he fell under its spell, and it holds him to this day.

"The idea of taking the University to the people, and not taking it C.O.D., that was the theme of those days," he said. "You were taught to give freely of what had been given you. And, of course, Dr. Frank Porter Graham had a lot to do with that.

"But it was the University of the people, and it was the University against the vested interests, or the other way around. The University's struggle over all those years was a very inspiring thing, and it was hard not to be caught up in it.

"All of these things have been better said by a lot of other people. You know who says things right, in the great old tradition? The Chancellor, Chris Fordham. He can say the University story—freely and easily and much better than I can. Alderman had that gift, and Frank Porter Graham, and Edward Kidder Graham, too, from what I've read by him. Those are some of the key figures who've been able to express the spirit of the University.

"It is a unique place, and nobody has really ever been quite able to say why, but I suppose that all those things together are the reason."

ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, beginning on May 6, the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues will hold its annual conference in Orlando, FL. I take this opportunity to commend P.A.L. participants for the fine work they do.

Since 1944, when the league was founded in New York City, its membership has grown to over 2 million youths in over 150 cities throughout the United States and Canada. There are six participating leagues in my own State of West Virginia.

P.A.L. sponsors leagues for such sports as baseball, basketball, tennis, hockey, and softball, and organizes cultural activities such as dance, music, drama, and arts and crafts.

By providing young people with access to such wholesome activities, P.A.L. helps to reduce juvenile crime and delinquency. Further, by forging friendships between police officers and children, P.A.L. encourages a positive approach to a young person's view of the role of a policeman. The value of this, in terms of community relations alone, is incalculable.

The national P.A.L. organization offers a number of helpful services to the individual leagues, such as reduced insurance rates, discounts on the purchase of sporting equipment, and training seminars. P.A.L. also circulates a newspaper to provide information about championship games and matches and other such activities in which the local leagues can participate.

I congratulate the National Association of Police Athletic League for their 40 years of excellent service to our young people and to our communities, and I urge people everywhere to pursue the formation of P.A.L. leagues in their own communities and to support them. This is a national juvenile crime prevention program that works.

A NUCLEAR WEAPONS CHALLENGE TO SENATORS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this Senator wishes to challenge my colleagues this morning. I wish to challenge my colleagues to a contest to pick the easiest, softest, most vulnerable spending target in the 1985 budget. The target should cost at least $1 billion. It would require $20 billion or more in spending over the next 5 years. It should also be totally useless or even counterproductive. And it should provide the basis for spending hundreds of billions of dollars—perhaps $1 trillion or more over the next couple of decades.

Is there a nice, easy multibillion dollar spending candidate out there that we can chop out of this budget

and pave the way for far greater savings as the years go by? Yes, indeedy, there is. Nestled neatly into the 1985 budget is a little old $2 billion item to begin to shoot this country off on the long and immensely expensive road to carry the nuclear war into space. The administration is asking for $2 billion in 1985 and $25 billion over the next 5 years to begin to develop the capability to shoot Russian missiles out of space before they reach American targets. When I say begin to develop the capability, I mean exactly that. It will certainly take hundreds of billions of dollars, perhaps several trillion dollars to develop a complete system, and there is every scientific reason to expect that no matter how much we spent on it, it would never work.

Indeed the Under Secretary of Defense for Research, who is in the Reagan administration, Mr. DeLauer, says that there is no way we can make it work unless we can also persuade the Russians to limit their production of offensive missiles. Well, good luck.

But suppose through some 100-to-1 miracle, it did work. Suppose that this new "star wars" system would be able to intercept every missile the Soviets could launch, suppose the new defensive system absolutely dominated the skies of the future. Would this prevent nuclear war? Of course not. It would simply change the way nuclear payloads are delivered. For a trillion dollars or so, the United States would simply have assured that any nuclear attack on this country did not come through the atmosphere from anything like an intercontinental ballistic missile. Would that defense then defend this country from a nuclear attack? No way. It would simply assure us that nuclear attack would come from any number of other sources.

Our port cities could be hit from submarines firing very low trajectory war heads from a few miles off our thousands of miles of shoreline. Nuclear attack could come from commandos and terrorists, carefully organized and trained to bring portable nuclear weapons on their person across the endless miles of U.S. borders for deployment at military targets and cities throughout the country.

As the New York Times pointed out on April 2 in an editorial, nothing in technology is forever. A defensive system that might work perfectly in 1995, could and almost certainly would be overcome by newer technology by the year 2000. Furthermore, such a defense would make nuclear war more likely, not less. The Times writes:

> Defense is destabilizing. It stimulates the opposing side to develop offenses that will defeat it, and offers a premium to the side that strikes first.

Mr. President, the more we spend on this nuclear technology, the more we find ourselves wandering down a maze that leads ever more certainly to nuclear war. We find ourselves in a technological nightmare. Safety, security, an assured peace all keep fading into the distant mists. We have been very lucky for the last 30 years or so. We have literally stumbled into a deterrence—a balance of terror, an assured mutual suicide that has kept the nuclear peace. It is as if God has given us a few years of grace to find a way to end this terrible arms race that promises utter destruction. In all this, we have two choices. Both are treacherous. Both are dangerous. Both are risky. Neither of these two choices can assure us salvation. But to this Senator the choice is very easy, indeed.

The two choices are these: First we can follow the road we are now pursuing. This is an all-out defensive and offensive reliance on building ever more destructive nuclear arms with a little feeble lip service to arms control. The second is a genuine commitment—a firm and full reliance on arms control. That means primary reliance on negotiations with the other superpower, totalitarian, Communist Russia. It means reliance on a mutual agreement with the knowledge that whatever verification and enforcement provisions we write into the agreement will always be subject to violation by a nation few Americans trust.

What then makes this choice easy to this Senator? Just this: we know that if we go down the nuclear arms race path, the nuclear arms technology will speed us closer and closer to a steadily more dangerous world with nuclear deterrence eventually evaporating as one side or the other senses that it has gained or lost the ability to mount a nuclear attack without the retaliation that constitutes the heart of deterrence. And there is an even more threatening consequence of the ongoing arms race. It is the assurance that the developing nuclear arms technology will surely lead to an increasing proliferation. Continuation of the nuclear arms race assure us that scores of nations will acquire some of the nuclear weapons the superpowers develop. And then the days of human life on this planet will, indeed, be numbered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times of April 2, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIRAGE OF SPACE DEFENSE

In his "Star Wars" speech a year ago, President Reagan challenged scientists and engineers to design a space-based defense against Soviet missiles to "give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons obsolete." An expert panel has now given a forceful response: For the foreseeable future, a total shield is technologically impossible.

A defense against strategic missiles has been sought for years. If there was any practical basis for Mr. Reagan's exhortation, it lay in new technical ideas—the X-ray laser developed under Edward Teller's auspices at Livermore or the ground-based excimer laser advocated by George Keyworth, a Teller protégé who is Mr., Reagan's science adviser.

Mr. Teller is often given credit for developing America's hydrogen bomb. But others, like Hans Bethe and Richard Garwin, also played important parts. Mr. Bethe and Mr. Garwin led the opposition to an antiballistic missile in the late 1960's. Now, as members of the Union of Concerned Scientists panel, they express vigorous skepticism about the X-ray laser and other aspects of the proposed defenses.

The X-ray laser is a one-shot device powered by a nuclear explosion. Its beam would shoot 2,500 miles across space and hit Soviet missiles before the warheads—and easily deployed decoys—separate from their booster rocket.

The scientists' panel points to a fatal flaw: Boosters can be redesigned to part from the payload low in the atmosphere, beyond the reach of the most powerful X-ray beam. Other lasers could, in theory, penetrate the atmosphere enough to damage a booster by heating its skin. But they would be effective only if the Russians neglected simple countermeasures, like spinning the booster to prevent the laser from burning a hole, or hiding its telltale flame with heat shields.

Destroying missiles in the booster phase is by far the best strategy for the defense. Only after reentry into the atmosphere sorts out the decoys is defense again feasible. At that late stage, some protection could be given to missile silos, but not to cities vulnerable to nuclear bursts at high altitude.

The science panel found that all conceivable defense weapons, from particle beams to the homing device used in America's antisatellite missile, have grave if not insuperable defects for a Star Wars system. So do platforms which such weapons might be launced or directed. Platforms in space are sitting targets, and the gigantic mirrors needed to direct laser beams would be especially vulnerable. To cover Soviet silos round the clock would require hundreds of platforms. Just to lift their laser fuel into space would cost $70 billion.

Computer speed is another problem. It is unlikely that any software now conceivable could work fast enough to manage an antimissile battle. Since even minor holes in any defense would risk millions of deaths, no system is worth having unless it works almost perfectly. And since it could never be fully tested, perfection is unattainable.

Secretary Weinberger says he has no doubt that a "reliable and effective defense" will one day be possible. Other Pentagon officials have told Congress that the Star program is designed only to develop technology and that no deployment decisions will be taken before 1990.

But a decision can be taken right now. It's worth spending something, but surely not $25 billion, on Star Wars research. Short of some giant new stride in technology, the old answer remains as cogent as ever: Defense is destabilizing. It stimulates the opposing side to develop offenses that will defeat it, and offers a premium to the side that strikes first. As far ahead as anyone can see, the most effective protection is agreement with the Soviet Union to limit the nature and quantity of nuclear forces.

A BUDGET FREEZE—BITTER, NECESSARY MEDICINE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have decided to vote for the budget freezes which will be offered over the next few days. I have strong objections to some parts of a freeze—delaying social security cost-of-living adjustments, for example—but the staggering deficits facing this Nation are so dangerous that drastic, painful measures are justified.

Optimists look ahead and say that deficits will "remain" around $200 billion for the next 3 or 4 years. But if the country slides into another recession the deficits could easily double and reach $400 billion or more. Under those circumstances, we could be facing an economic crisis matched only by the Great Depression.

Even if the optimists are correct and the deficits stay around $200 billion, they will still push our economy into an economic slough of despond. They will provide the tinder for another round of inflation. New investment money will be absorbed; productivity will remain anemic. The dollar will continue as a strong currency because of high interest rates and our ability to compete in the world market will weaken. Unemployment will stay high, especially in industries whose customers rely on reasonably priced credit.

A sick economy cannot help but endanger many vital Federal programs. Over the past decade, as the economy faltered, Government spending programs faced unprecedented difficulties.

Look at what happened to social security. In 1977, Congress passed a far-reaching bill designed to put social security on a sound financial footing for the rest of this century. Then the economy was buffeted by a combination of record inflation and high unemployment. Last year, 6 short years later, Congress had to pass another bill to rescue social security. We had to face this explosive issue once again purely and simply because the economy performed much worse than anticipated.

Other social programs suffered similar fates. Grants to State and local governments were actually cut, reversing a 15-year upward trend. Means-tested entitlements, centerpieces of a compassionate government, were ground in the same mill.

I do not want Congress to be forced into repeating this experience. Next time, the measures needed to avoid an economic calamity will be that much more draconian. Better to take some bitter medicine now and avoid open-heart surgery later.

I expect that most of us who vote for a budget freeze have objections to some aspect of the overall package. I certainly object to opening the social security issue again and delaying cost-of-living adjustments. Some of my colleagues will object to the reductions in defense and still vote for the package.

Mr. President, the leadership plan endorses a $200 billion deficit in 1987—4 years into a recovery. What a vain hope. The deficits will choke that recovery before 1987. A freeze is the only way to make more than a dent in the deficit. It is bitter but necessary medicine.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS: AS BAD AS EVER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I received a publication compiled by the American Civil Liberties Union and Americas' Watch Committee entitled "As Bad As Ever: A Report on Human Rights in El Salvador." The report documents the continuing atrocities perpetrated against those whom the death squads and the security forces wish to suppress. In El Salvador as in other countries, murder instills terror; and terror is the government's method of maintaining control.

The fact remains that an average of 120 civilian noncombatants were killed weekly in the last 3 months of 1983, and the response of the Salvadoran Government has been limited to the transfer of only three of the officers linked to death squad activity.

Systematic torture continues. Disappearances continue. The number of political prisoners is increasing. The evidence clearly demonstrates that the Army, in massacres of unarmed civilians during military operations, is responsible for the majority of civilian killings in El Salvador.

The record is clear: The Government of El Salvador is engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

Mr. President, the current administration apparently acknowledges the tragic realities of this region, but our pleas lack credibility when we continue to underwrite the violence. It is an embarrassing situation to supply the aggressors and then apologize for their abuse on human rights.

A cloud of inconsistency is shadowing our pledge to uphold individual rights around the world. To remove this conflicting and ambigious message we must be consistent in publically condemning all violators.

El Salvador is one area which has harmed our international credibility as the leader in human rights. Our failure to ratify the Genocide Convention is another.

Unless we have recanted that priority to human rights, the necessity to pledge ourselves as a forerunner has not diminished. And ratification of the Genocide Convention, which outlaws the murder and serious mental or physical harm of a racial, ethnic, or religious group, will undoubtedly strengthen that commitment.

Let us return to solid ground by refusing to support the barbarous acts of the Salvadoran Government and by endorsing the Genocide Convention.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. during which Senators may speak for up to 2 minutes each.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act of 1983, is scheduled to be considered by the Senate later this month. My distinguished colleague, Mr. ABDNOR, chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, has called for expedited floor action on this legislation. I commend Senator ABDNOR for his work in the area of water resources development. However, I feel that, prior to bringing S. 1739 to the floor, it is imperative that the Senate be made aware of the great concern that waterway carriers and shippers have with title V—inland waterways—of S. 1739.

I feel very strongly that, before the Senate acts on S. 1739, the Finance Committee should be given the opportunity to consider the tax policy included in this bill. I have worked hard with my colleagues in the Environment and Public Works Committee to craft a sound water policy bill. I support passing a "Water Resources Development Act" this year.

But, I cannot support title V of S. 1739. This title has major tax implications that could have a far-reaching effect on waterway users, the waterway industry, and international trade. Title V should be referred to the Finance Committee in order to fully consider these tax implications. Amendments to title V could strengthen the bill. Absent these amendments, I cannot support S. 1739.

Title V would cap through the year 2000, annual Federal obligations for expenditures on the commercial inland waterway system at $646 million. At the same time, it would give the Secretary of the Army sole authority to impose and collect additional waterway user charges, that is taxes, if funding above the annual cap is required. Title V also establishes a 21-member Inland Waterway Users Board, whose members are selected by the Secretary of the Army, to recommend inland waterway spending levels. This Board, however, is strictly advisory; the Secretary is not required to follow the recommendations of this

Board concerning either revenue or expenditure levels.

No one knows the potential impact of title V. It amounts to a game of Russian roulette for users. It places the private sector—shippers and carriers—totally at risk. The bill surrenders jurisdiction over expenditures and revenues of the Federal inland waterways from Congress to the Corps of Engineers. According to the corps' own analysis, drastic increases in the fees would occur year to year.

It is my view, and the view of a number of my colleagues that, prior to reaching the Senate floor, the Finance Committee should be granted jurisdiction over this revenue-raising measure to address its equity and to insure that any additional navigation user fees are determined by Congress—not the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

AGRICULTURAL CONCERNS

Many members of the agricultural community have expressed strong opposition to title V. In 1983, the United States exported 162 million metric tons of wheat, feed grains, corn, and soybeans. Approximately 40 percent of these exports moved through the Nation's waterways. Existing user fees are expected to cost American farmers $38 million in 1984. Using the corps' projections for an increase in the fuel rate tax to 48 cents and without taking inflation into account it is estimated farmers will have to absorb $226 million in user fees in 1990 for grain alone.

The Congressional Budget Office in a study on charging for Federal services completed late last year, concluded that a user fee set to recover one-half of all Federal waterway expenditures would increase the cost of waterborne grain shipments by about 9 cents per bushel by 1990. Assuming that only one-half of this increase were passed on to America's farmers, it would mean an additional transportation cost and loss of gross annual revenue of about $1,300 for a typical 400-acre corn and soybean farm.

Increased user fees could seriously threaten the U.S. share of world grain exports. Loss of grain markets would further erode our balance of trade and would result in further increases in transportation costs. A recent study prepared for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Office of Transportation, but never released, States that any increase in waterway transportation costs will adversely affect the U.S. grain industry. Using corn as the example, the study concluded that any increase in the cost of shipping corn will be primarily shifted to corn producers. The study further asserts that waterway user taxes would have similar impact on the other grain producers dependent on the inland waterway system. Higher prices for waterborne farm production inputs such as fertilizer and chemicals would also result from increased waterway user fees and would be passed to farmers as a cost of production.

CONDITION OF THE BARGE INDUSTRY

We must consider the severe economic condition of the domestic water transportation industry. This industry is still in the throes of the recession. No recovery is foreseen for at least 2 years. It makes no sense for Congress to be advocating higher waterway user fees at this time. The inland water transportation industry has been paying an escalating waterway user tax since 1980. This tax is scheduled to be increased 2 additional cents beginning in 1985. The tax has been accumulating in a trust fund that by law must be used for construction, rehabilitation and replacement projects. These funds have never been spent. Title V treats this tax as part of the Federal expenditure cap. It fails to credit the industry for the contribution that they are already making.

CONCLUSION

I want to reiterate, title V should be referred to the Finance Committee for consideration of tax policy. I strongly oppose title V in its present form. I plan to work to amend title V in the Finance Committee. If I am not successful there, I will bring my concerns to the floor of the Senate. If title V is not substantially amended, I will be forced to oppose S. 1739.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint letter from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., the American Inland Waterways Committee, the Water Transport Association, and Pacific Northwest Inland Waterways Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN WATERWAYS OPERATORS, INC.,
Arlington, VA, April 10, 1984.

To: Members of the United States Senate.

The undersigned, representing a broad cross-section of the domestic waterway industry, are concerned with the development of comprehensive and equitable legislation improving the efficiency of our water transportation system. We now understand that there may be uncertainty concerning the industry's position on S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act of 1983, which has been reported by the Committee on Environment and Public Works. The purpose of this letter is to inform you that a unified waterway industry cannot support S. 1739 in its present form.

This is a time of crisis in our industry. According to figures compiled by Arthur Andersen & Co., fifteen of the leading companies in our industry reported losses well in excess of $40 million last year. At the same time, we are painfully aware of the need to improve navigation on America's rivers. While the cost of necessary improvements represents an insignificant portion of the federal budget (without considering that each project has earned a favorable public cost/benefit ratio), those costs projected over the next decade would probably exceed the gross revenue of our entire industry. Thus. any changes in the present system of financing the improvements on, and operation of, our navigation system require very careful consideration.

Such consideration is missing from S. 1739. The industry finds it unacceptable that Title V delegates most of the control over the authorization, appropriations and taxing processes from the Congress to the Secretary of the Army. Most importantly, S. 1739 does not even address the level, type or timing of taxes or other charges to finance waterway projects; all of these decisions are left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Army. A bill that allows a government agency to levy special taxes to support whatever level of spending it chooses, which is the essence of S. 1739, does not make good legislation for the public or the Congress.

We are equally disturbed by some provisions of Title X. This Title would impose taxes on the shallow draft coastal industry for deep draft channels which our industry neither needs nor would gain from in any way. It also contemplates a Board to "study" what level of fees should be charged for operation and maintenance—not whether such charges make any sense. The Board purports to be user-oriented, but its proposed make-up belies that claim.

At hearings following the reporting of the bill, our industry joined with representatives of the shipping community to announce opposition to the bill's abdication of Congress' traditional responsibilities and prerogatives. Both before and after those hearings, we met repeatedly with Committee members and staff in an attempt to find common ground. Unfortunately, despite our best efforts, we have been unable to reach a workable compromise with advocates of S. 1739.

We certainly do not agree that the solution to this problem is beyond the will and capability of the Congress, and we intend to continue our efforts to work with the Senate to devise a proper solution. In the meantime, we must make clear our opposition to S. 1739, and we ask for your help in assuring that this fundamentally flawed bill does not become law.

Very truly yours,

William E. Timmons, on behalf of The American Inland Waterways Committee, Louis B. Susman, Counsel to The American Inland Waterways Committee; Joseph Farrell, President, The American Waterways Operators, Inc.; Walter H. Evans III, Counsel to The Pacific Northwest Inland Waterways Association; and John D. Geary, Chairman, Water Transport Association.

IMPORT QUOTAS ON JAPANESE CARS NOT TO BE RENEWED WHEN THEY EXPIRE

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, the Washington Post today carries on its front page the news that the President's Trade Representative, Ambassador William Brock, said yesterday that the voluntary import quotas on Japanese cars will not be renewed when they expire next March. Mr. Brock's stand is correct and I support it enthusiastically.

Citing the fact that General Motors paid 5,807 executives $181.7 million in bonuses last year, and that Ford paid 6,035 executives bonuses totalling $80.6 million, exclusive of salary and stock options, Mr. Brock correctly asked why this industry needs protection from imports.

The unfortunate fact is that the fourth year of the voluntary Japanese auto import restraints has just begun in April. We have a full year to go. And this at a time when the industry is predicting profits as high as $10 billion for 1984.

Mr. President, I am pleased to see that the auto industry has rebounded, that it is now profitable. But this is a false prosperity as long as import quotas are in place. Why should the industry not use its new profits to reduce the price of cars, so as to compete more effectively, and let the American consumer share in the good times?

Even more troubling is the inevitable effect of management's generosity to itself on wage negotiations. Management effectively is sending a loud, clear signal to unions to demand wage agreements that will raise industry costs.

Mr. President, I believe that the auto quotas are a serious mistake. I commend highly Ambassador Brock's firm stand, and I applaud his determination not to ask the Japanese to renew the quotas next year.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article referred to be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROCK: AUTO-IMPORT QUOTAS TO END

(By Hobart Rowen)

The Reagan administration's chief trade officer, angered by big bonuses paid to U.S. auto executives, served notice on the industry yesterday that the "voluntary" import quotas on Japanese cars will not be renewed when they expire next March.

U.S. Trade Representative William E. Brock said in an interview that the industry will discover "that our reluctance [to extend the quotas] is a mile wide and a mile deep."

To continue the limitation on imported Japanese cars, now in its fourth year, cannot be justified in view of "unbelievable new management bonuses," Brock asserted.

Asked why the administration does not send such a message directly to the industry, Brock smiled and replied, "I thought I just did."

General Motors Corp. recently announced it had paid a group of 5,807 executives $181.7 million in bonuses last year—an amount that Brock said averages out to more "on a one-shot basis than the average worker in one of those plants makes in a year." Ford paid 6,035 executives bonuses totaling $80.6 million. Those figures are exclusive of salary and stock options.

If the industry is healthy enough to pay such compensation to its executives, "then why does it need protection?" Brock asked. "Do the American people really want to subsidize as much as $5 million or more in bonuses for one manager?"

Ford Chairman Philip Caldwell received $7.3 million last year in salary, bonus and stock options.

"It's hard not to feel a little bit 'had' at this point," Brock said of the quota deal, which for the first three years limited the number of imported Japanese cars to 1.68 million units annually, and to 1.85 million units in the current year, plus a small number of station wagons.

The quotas were established on a "voluntary" basis by the Japanese government under pressure from the U.S. government to relieve the impact on the American industry of heavy Japanese imports.

Some companies had already begun to lobby for continued quotas, arguing that with no limits on the number of Japanese cars that can be imported, and a cheap yen in relation to the dollar, Japanese companies will be able to cut prices and extend their penetration of the market from the present 25 percent level to 40 percent or more.

Several administration officials, including Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige and Economic Council Chairman Martin S. Feldstein, had earlier questioned the wisdom of continuing the quotas. Many independent analysts agree that quotas have sharply boosted prices for both Japanese and American cars.

But Brock's language was the most definitive so far that the Reagan administration, if returned to office, will let the quota system expire next year. When pressed, he said he was expressing his own point of view, but added: "I don't know of anyone in the administration who will disagree with me."

The administration engaged in the quota exercise with some reluctance and after strong internal debate because it ran counter to its general free-market philosophy. But it concluded that the U.S. industry needed a breather to enable it to retool and recover some of its lost market.

Although the numbers of cars sold in the past year were far below the volume records for major companies, modern equipment and sharp reductions in the auto labor force helped churn out record profits. The Japanese exporters, meanwhile, upgraded their models sold here, a process that boosted sticker prices—and profits per car—all around.

GM and Ford spokesmen have said that the large bonuses paid to executives are only fair rewards for officials who led the industry out of its deepest depression to a record $6.3 billion profit year, a figure that may bulge to $10 billion for 1984.

But some others in the industry have begun to wonder about the ultimate costs of this generosity. At a meeting last week with Washington Post staff members, American Motors President W. P. Tippett predicted that the bonuses paid by GM and Ford will "cost hundreds of millions" in the form of higher wages that the unions will now be able to demand in contract talks this summer.

Brock pointed out in the interview that "this will be a cost to [all of] us," because higher costs ultimately are passed on to the consumers. "If wages and salaries and bonuses all go up, with U.S. cars already $1,500 to $2,000 over the competition's cost of production, then the industry will be here, saying, 'We need another four or five years of protection.'"

He made clear that the Reagan administration will oppose continued quotas even for another year or two. "Protectionism becomes addictive," Brock said. "It becomes tantalizing to ask for more and more. But it doesn't deal with the problem."

He contended that in the first three years of the quotas, the American industry "made an enormous effort to get competitive, and I think labor played a significant role. . . . I know they're producing a better quality product over what we saw three years ago."

Management, Brock added, "has sunk about $50 billion of new investment into modernization and new technology. But that doesn't say that we've solved the problem. It does say that we're doing the things that will lead to a solution, if continued."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator for his remarks. I read that piece in the paper this morning also, and I took the liberty of calling Mr. Brock to tell him he was doing a good job and that he had my enthusiastic support.

Mr. CHAFEE. I want to say to the majority leader that sad though it is, the fourth year of the import quotas just started on April 1 so we have another year to go. I think that is regrettable, but, nonetheless, we are locked into that. But, thank goodness, they are going to end next March.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTES FOR FRANK CHURCH

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on April 10, the friends of Senator Frank Church gathered in the National Cathedral for a memorial service to one of the best friends and colleagues we ever had. The tributes delivered to Frank Church are witness to our affection and respect for a great Senator and dedicated public servant who loved his native Idaho and who touched all Americans with his eloquence, his brilliance, and his compassion.

I believe that all of us who served with Frank, and many more across the country who knew this wonderful man and admired his work, will be interested in these tributes. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The tributes follow:

READING BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL FROM I CORINTHIANS 13 OF THE BIBLE

If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. If I give away all I have, and if I deliver my body to be burned, but have not love, I gain nothing.

Love is patient and kind; love is not jealous or boastful; it is not arrogant or rude. Love does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice at wrong, but rejoices in the right. Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.

Love never ends; as for prophecies, they will pass away; as for tongues, they will cease; as for knowledge, it will pass away. For our knowledge is imperfect and our prophecy is imperfect; but when the perfect

comes, the imperfect will pass away. When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became a man, I gave up childish ways. For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall understand fully, even as I have been fully understood. So faith, hope, love abide, these three; but the greatest of these is love.

TRIBUTE BY GEORGE MCGOVERN

One Saturday morning a few weeks ago when Eleanor and I went to visit Frank and Bethine, I said to him: "I'm really sorry about what is happening to you; it's a lousy piece of luck."

"Oh," he said, "It's not really all that bad. It happens to all of us. It's just coming to me a little earlier than I had expected."

And then he flashed that marvelous ear-to-ear smile that was his trademark.

If there was ever anyone in the Capital City endowed with a more infectious smile and a more engaging laughter than Frank Church, I have not met that person. Although I must confess that Forrest is so much like his father that I find myself glowing inwardly every time I hear him speak.

In any event, Frank wanted to talk that day last winter not about illness but about the current political campaign. Ordinarily we politicians, like other mortals, are envious if not resentful about the success of a contemporary.

As Aeschylus observed twenty-five centuries ago: "It is in the character of very few men to honor without envy a friend who has prospered."

Frank is one of those very few men who did "honor without envy" the prosperity of his friends. He spoke about a friend who had experienced a political regeneration of sorts and he could not conceal his joy.

He had read a piece by David Broder—a columnist whom he greatly admired—in which David had written some kind words about his friend. If that friend had been his brother or his son, he could not have been more delighted about that column.

I think he himself experienced a profound spiritual and personal revitalization even as his physical life ebbed away. He spoke and wrote in his closing days with a sharpened perception and an informed wisdom that is a precious legacy to history. He saw clearly the underlying historical forces that are now convulsing Central America, Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

Since the early 1960's, he was distressed that this great nation which he loved with such pride and passion should sometimes be on what he believed to be the wrong and losing side of today's revolutionary struggles.

He believed, for example, that the late Ho Chi Minh was not a stooge of Moscow or Peking seeking to extend Soviet and Chinese power into Southeast Asia. Rather he saw Ho Chi Minh as the dedicated leader of a legitimate nationalist revolution against French and Japanese colonialism in Indo China.

Frank and I came to the Congress on the same day twenty-eight years ago—both of us having been elected the first time in 1956—he to the Senate and I to the House.

When I joined him in the Senate a few years later, we soon found ourselves as allies in many battles over American foreign policy in the turbulent 60's. Without any discussion between us, we had both prepared major Senate speeches on the same day in mid-January, 1965, calling for a U.S. effort to negotiate an end to the Vietnam War instead of sending in U.S. forces. Three weeks later we were back on the Senate floor again with speeches written independently but amazingly similar in their diagnosis of the Vietnam struggle. From that day forward we stood together on issue after issue affecting the foreign policy and national security of the United States.

Once after a lopsided Senate vote against one of our joint ventures, I saw Frank ambling across the Senate floor with an amused expression on his face.

"George," he said, "I've learned two things about this partnership of ours. We're always right, but we always lose!"

It is perhaps appropriate that having been first elected on the same day in 1956, we were defeated on the same day in 1980—a quarter of a century later.

Whether in fact we were right or wrong, history will decide, but I shall always feel that Frank Church was a witness to the world for what is decent and just in human affairs—one of the great Senators in American history. In Lincoln's phrase, he always appealed to the "better angels of our nature."

I saw him briefly for one final goodby Thursday afternoon as he lay dying—too weak to speak more than a word or two—but still attempting to smile. I have always felt awkward in embracing another man. But I found myself leaning over to hold him for a moment in my arms believing that he was asleep, but he whispered in my ear: "You are a dear man."

I could not speak at that moment but I would like to say now: "Frank, you are the dear man."

God bless you and may God sustain dear Bethine, Forrest and Chase. This remarkably brave and cheerful family holds the love and admiration of us all.

TRIBUTE BY CECIL D. ANDRUS

Seldom do we have the opportunity to stand in the shadow of a truly great man.

Frank Church was such a man.

A world class leader of peace.

A strong and enlightened leader in foreign affairs.

A sensitive leader in protecting the environment in which we live.

A compassionate leader when dealing with the matters of aging.

Frank Church served his state and nation with distinction—with dedication and with unwavering integrity. Yes, he was truly a great man.

But Frank did not occupy a throne. He was human, warm and caring.

He could take a senior's hands in his and give them strength and hope—And he did.

He could take a small child in his arms and make her smile and laugh—And he did.

He instinctively knew when people were in need of help—and he was there.

When he stood at Robinson Bar, at the Middle Fork, or on the Selway, he understood that future generations had a right to see portions of their land unspoiled—the way it was created.

He was a rare man. A true Idaho son—strong independent and loving.

Bethine, Amy, Forrest and Chase have lost their husband and father. We have lost a friend. The world has lost a statesman.

We will miss him, but thank God he was here for those too few years. Our world is a better place because of Frank Church.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

Last week, on the last morning I saw Frank Church, he opened his eyes, looked up from his bed, and asked me if I would say a few words on this day. "I think it's coming soon," he said—and smiled. And I think I know why he flashed that famous smile at that moment. It was not only that Frank had the courage to face this fate as he had all his life—as a resolute and happy warrior. And it was more than affection for a friend. I believe Frank chuckled that morning because he knew that the best orator of our time in the Senate would not be available for this service—so he was asking some of the rest of us to do the best we could.

Few in any generation speak with true eloquence; fewer still speak from heart and conscience to the soul of the whole nation. Frank Church was a prophet in this democracy—and so we gather here now to honor the meaning of his life as well as the man who lived it.

He was skilled, which a political leader must be—and his talent took him to the Senate, as a progressive candidate from a conservative State, at an age so young that he was at first mistaken for a Senate page. Yet his ambition was not merely for office, but for the ideal that power had a higher purpose.

He was one of the youngest Senators in history, but one of his deepest concerns was for older Americans.

His greatest interest was foreign relations, but some of his greatest contributions were also the protection of civil rights—and the preservation of America the beautiful—the natural gifts which were for him so wondrous in his own State of Idaho.

When he was twenty, he served as a soldier during World War II in China, Burma and India. And when I think of him in that conflict, of his friends George McGovern and John Kennedy who fought in those same battles long before they met each other, I am convinced that it is the men who are brave in war who are also bravest in the cause of peace.

Frank Church was among the first lonely voices of dissent raised in the wilderness of warmaking in Vietnam. He was a Senator from Idaho; but he was also a voice for those half a world away who had no votes to cast against the bombing and devastation of their own land. He loved peace so much that he became a founding father of the War Powers Act—one of the constitutional landmarks of our time. He loved this country so much that he took the lead in exposing the abuses of the C.I.A. and the F.B.I.—and in calling us to a higher standard. His own sense of patriotism would not let him declare for the Presidency in 1976 until that investigation was done—and so he lost the nomination he very well might have won.

He understood that he stood often at the brink of defeat for re-election to the Senate; in 1968, he realized his opposition to Vietnam meant fierce opposition in Idaho—but he would not be moved. Yet even Frank could not beat the political odds forever. Four years ago, this man of reason lost his campaign by the narrowest of margins to the negative forces of reaction and extremism. He ran as far ahead of the Democratic ticket as he was so frequently ahead of his constituency and the country. And what were the charges against him in 1980? That he was for peace, for civil liberties and social justice. He had fought for the Panama Canal Treaty with a clear vision both of its merits—and of the political danger. And

there was more honor in his defeat than in most victories.

For the remarkable fact is not that Frank Church was finally defeated, but that he was elected and re-elected four times. His quarter century in poser left a rare mark upon the world. He made his compromises, as every politician does; but he was pre-eminently a man of principle and commitment.

So much was still ahead of him. He might have been—he should have been—the next Secretary of State in a new Democratic Administration. Now he is gone, but he has left his words, his record, and his wisdom to guide us.

As war rages in Central America, we need to hear his challenge that: "America must become the breadbasket of the world, not is cannon factory."

We need to heed his call to "reject the counsel of the compulsive interventionists"—and to restrain "an irrational arms race which continues at an unabated pace."

In his last months, Frank Church was still a tireless apostle of arms control and the nuclear freeze.

Perhaps he lived so much at the cutting edge of history and his own beliefs, no matter what the political risks, because he had come so close to dying at the age of twenty-three, when he was given six months to live. And so the thirty-six more years he had seemed a specific gift, a grace of time. He made all the moments count for all that he cared about—for Bethine, the wife who shared his live, his politics and his laughter; for his family and the friends he cherished; and for the causes that were his deepest concern.

A defeated opponent once said of him: "he really had guts."

And Frank Church wrote his own truest epitaph when he spoke of the passing of his friend, my brother Bob. I remember what Frank said then: "Too often men who would win elections tend to be followers, not leaders. They are inclined to go along in order to get along. They are specialists in telling the people what they want to hear. They are animated mirrors, styled to the fashion of the moment, bent to reflect current opinion . . .

"Robert Kennedy," said Frank Church, "was a shining exception to that rule. He was no ordinary, garden-variety politician. He scorned conformity, insisted on being himself, and he sought to prod the conscience of America."

So it was with Frank Church. He was a shining exception—and he is a shining memory. He was true to himself—and he was true to America. He was extraordinary—as a public leader and a friend. For each of us, his life will endure as long as our own—and as long as our country lives.

TRIBUTE BY F. FORRESTER CHURCH

This morning I speak on behalf of the family.

First, let me thank Senator Pell, Senator McGovern, Secretary Andrus, and Senator Kennedy for sharing with us in this celebration of my father's life. Each of them, and so many of you, have comforted my mother and father over the past few difficult, yet memorable weeks. Your friendship is a gift that will never be forgotten. On behalf of my mother, I wish particularly to thank the Senate wives, who delayed their annual luncheon with the First Lady to be with her and all of us today.

Looking out over this gathering, recognizing so many of you, colleagues, friends, neighbors and soul mates of my father, I am reminded once again of what really matters in this life. Each of us is here only for a short while. We all have special things to offer, to one another and to this precious, fragile world we share. Before I thank my father for what he gave to us, I want to thank you for the love and care and affection you have shown to my parents over these many years. You are boon companions. You know what the word companion means. A companion is one who breaks bread with another. In the final analysis, the bread we break with one another is the bread of life and death. My father lived well and he died well. Above all, he was fortunate, throughout his journey to have you with him.

Today I am speaking for my brother, Chase, as well as for myself. As we look back upon our upbringing, one really quite extraordinary thing strikes home. Never did we sense that we were growing up in the household of a great man. We grew up in the household of a great father. He was present. He was kind. He was generous. Above all generous.

Two brief illustrations. My wife, Amy, and I were married in 1970. It was the spring of the invasion of Cambodia. We were less aware of my father's own relentless efforts to end the war, than we were of our disaffection from the entire establishment that had allowed that war to come about. Today I am a minister. I have performed more than 500 weddings. Never have I had to suffer through as lengthy, inflated and sanctimonious a set of vows as I myself inflicted upon the guests at my own wedding. Vows perhaps is the wrong word. It was more in the order of a proclamation or manifesto.

Well, my parents arrived, hard upon the debate over the Cooper-Church amendment, and my mother, who is perhaps the most talented politician I have ever known, was, understandably, and I must admit, volubly, appalled. My father simply got a little quieter than usual. "Forrest," he said, "there is nothing you might wish to say that I would ever censor. I have only one request. Speak your piece, but please don't release it to the press."

The second illustration has to do with my brother. Chase, unlike me, is a spontaneous, natural and gifted outdoorsman. We are nine years apart in age, and when I left home for college, my father and mother sensed and responded to Chase's passion for open spaces by renting a cabin every weekend in Pennsylvania. There was no phone. Dad and Mother declined social engagements that surely would have advanced his career. They walked the mountain paths. They fished. They shot skeet. And they reaffirmed a sense of priorities that most of us lose track of.

What it comes down to is not that our father was not a member of the club. It's just that he was a member of a different club. It wasn't exclusive. A lot of you were in it. And it was good.

One last thing. And this is the hardest thing for me to say, because there is so much pain in it. It is the kind of pain we would pray for, if we had any sense, for that is the way love is. The more you love the more you risk to lose. My father and my mother together were one of the great American love stories. As great as most of us will ever know. He is gone now. I really don't have to say anything more.

Thank you so very much, and God bless you all.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOMS MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Baker Amendment No. 3027, to further reduce deficits by including reconciliations and appropriations caps for defense and non-defense discretionary spending for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

(2) Grassley Amendment No. 3043 (to Baker Amendment No. 3027), to freeze budget authorization levels for certain Federal programs at the fiscal year 1984 level.

AMENDMENT NO. 3043

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is amendment No. 3043, offered by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), for himself, the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), to amendment No. 3027.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is there any time agreement on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time agreement on the pending amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, from time to time I am going to add cosponsors to this amendment. At this point, I would like to add as cosponsors the Senator from Washington (Mr. EVANS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN) as cosponsors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last night the amendment offered by Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator BAUCUS, Senator BIDEN, and myself was laid down and is now the pending business before the Senate.

This matter of dealing with the budget deficit is the most important matter we will deal with this session of Congress. It is the one important thing that we are going to do that is going to signal to the business community and to the people of this country at large whether or not we are serious about getting the deficit under control, thereby reducing the pressure on interest rates, thereby solving the unemployment problem, and thereby keeping the recovery going. Anything short of dramatic action on our part I think is going to turn this economic recovery, this economic boom, into a fizzle.

We owe it to the American people to take dramatic action. We owe it to the American people not to do business as usual. It is because of business as usual that we are in the trouble we are in today.

I hope that my colleagues, both those on the floor and those who are listening elsewhere, will be cognizant of the importance of what we are talking about because we are trying to put a trend into Government that signals a new direction, new ideas, and to abandon the business as usual practice that has brought us $200 billion deficits that we see now and in the outyears, as far as we can see.

In conjunction with the overall discussion of whether or not we are going to reduce the deficits, I think we have to look beyond just what immediate matter, and look at the problems that have brought us to the situation where we are today; where we have in the past 4 or 5 years always expected things to get better, and, in fact, they have gotten worse.

We may fool ourselves, as was stated by the chairman of the Budget Committee yesterday, by thinking we are in a boom, that we really do not have much to worry about, that there are all sorts of signs and signals that the economy has turned around.

I do not disagree with the signals. But most of what will be said by us in 1984, as true as it might be, serves no purpose other than to help us as the majority party and the President of the United States look good between now and the November elections.

What we have a responsibility to do here is to look beyond the November elections in the actions we are talking now, and consider the impact, good or bad in the years ahead.

I say now, as I have just said, that if we do not do something dramatic about these deficits then we are going to turn this economic boom—which is in fact a boom, and one that I am proud to speak of—into a fizzle.

We need to look beyond the next election and see what is the impact we are making today on the future. If we do not learn anything else out of this debate, we ought to remember that the decisions we are making are going to have a long-range impact, not only upon this generation of politicians, but upon this generation of young people who have to pay for the mistakes that we make. So each one of us ought to look to the young people who are employees of this Senate as pages and their generation of people as we consider the decisions we are about to make, and consider whether or not we do not have to be overly concerned about $200 billion deficits; and concerned about not only what impact our decisions have on the near-term political impact in the 1984 election or the near-term impact on this economy, but also the impact on the burden of young people who have to pay the interest on the national debt.

Part of the information I am going to present is, quite frankly, relates to a need for better planning. If we are only off 1 percentage point on interest rates, or 1 percentage point off on the growth of the GNP, we can be talking about $120 billion deficits greater than what we otherwise anticipate for the fiscal year 1989 baseline deficit as we use the rosy figures that come out of CBO and OMB.

In regard to this, I have passed out for the benefit of all Members a series of charts measuring the planning competence of this Congress since the origin of the Budget Reform Act of 1975.

For those of you who were here in 1973 and 1974, as this Budget Act was passed, I do not know what sort of solution to the problems you had then with the budget deficits before you at that time, how you viewed this Budget Act might help to solve those problems. But I think as we look now we can only conclude that the Budget Act was not and end-all for the planning problems that we had then and which we still have.

These charts will show you the results of our budget plans over the last several years.

They basically show that the planning competence of the Congress has not been very good. I have provided each of these charts for the benefit of my colleagues.

For those who are not in eyesight of these charts, I would like to describe them.

The charts tell the relationship between plans for future budgets versus what actually happened. These charts tell the relationship between the real versus the unreal.

The easiest way to describe these charts is to say that reality goes in exactly the opposite direction as what we planned for.

The mismatch is becoming more and more severe.

The mismatch is true of actual deficits, as one chart will show. Another chart shows it is true of baseline deficits; The GNP; unemployment; revenues; outlays; tax expenditures; and I can go on and on to develop charts in almost every area of statistical gathering that we use in our planning for the future during the budget process. Its occurrence is systematic, it is predictable, and it has always been wrong. Yet it is the basis upon which we plan our budgets every year. To borrow a phrase, something is amiss.

These charts shine a bright spotlight on our planning incompetence. We fail to understand the long-term consequences of current decisions. Even more accurately, we cover up and hide the long-term consequences of our current decisions. The data shows a systematic underestimation of costs and spending, but more severe is our constant overestimation of resources, or revenues—the income of the Federal Government. By overestimating our resources, we make undisciplined spending decisions seem very disciplined. We mislead ourselves.

When the revenues fail to come in as optimistically projected, what do we do? You know what we do, Mr. President: We add to the deficit from year to year. That is how we have added to the deficit until we have gotten ourselves up to $200 billion deficits for each of the years as far as we can see into the future.

We have reached a very critical point. We have become overextended and the baseline deficits for this year are going to be, once again, $200 billion. Meanwhile, interest rates are rising. Just within the last month, we have seen the prime go up 1 percentage point. If interest rates just stay at the level that we have projected over the next 5 years, we must add over $100 billion to the $300 billion baseline deficit that we have projected for fiscal year 1989. And, of course, if interest rates keep rising, that 1989 baseline deficit would approach $500 billion and maybe surpass it.

These figures were given to me by OMB Director David Stockman. We are talking about just a little movement in the interest rates upward. We are talking about interest rates just staying constant, where they are now—because we have projected them to go down in the next several years. If they just stay constant, the cost of interest on the national debt is going to be such that the young people I referred to are not going to be able even to produce enough to pay the interest on the national debt, let alone support the programs that we now have.

The Congressional Budget Office figures would also lead us to the same conclusion. CBO projects real growth

from fiscal year 1983 to fiscal year 1989 to average 3.8 percent. That covers seven consecutive years of growth at 3.3 percent or greater. This kind of sustained growth has never happened in post-war America. I think we have to emphasize that we are projecting a rosy future as we develop fiscal year 1985 budgets that show a sustained growth rate that has never happened before in the history of our country. Yet we are making decisions today based upon those rosy projections that have never happened and, based upon the charts I have shown, never will happen.

CBO predicts that if GNP averages only 2.8 percent instead of 3.8 percent, 1 percentage point less than those rosy projections I have talked about, the 1989 deficits are going to be $120 billion higher than we anticipate they will be.

Not only is the average 3.8 percent assumption unrealistic, it is obviously an absurdity as a baseline projection. It is a fact of political life that recessions are never predicted, despite the fact that recessions do occur; 28 of them since 1855, when we started keeping track of them—and of course, nine since World War II. So boom-and-bust cycles are part of our history. They are predictable. We ought to be working them into our equation. But we do not.

Why are not recessions predicted? They are not because politicians, like each of us in this room, do not like to talk about recessions. It is that simple. Consequently, what we have been doing for the last several years is making policy decisions in ignorance and avoidance of reality. It is no wonder, then, that as demonstrated by these charts I have passed out to each Member of the Senate, plans and realities move in inverse directions.

I raise these facts to make two points. First, deficits are not the real problem. I am guilty of talking about deficits all the time. I have already stated in my remarks this morning that they are a problem. But the fact of the matter is that deficits are not the real problem. They are only symptoms of the problem.

The real problem that we ought to be dealing with as 100 Members of this body is our planning incompetence, fed by a narcotic of planning optimism. We always plan for an optimistic future that never materializes. We always plan wearing rose-colored glasses. In time, the rose in the glasses wears off and then we see the real world in front of us. Somehow, in 1984 on May 2, as I stand here, shocked about the fact that we have $200 billion deficits projected, the fact of the matter is the symptoms will only get worse. We need to be attacking right now the real underlying problem head-on: That is, our planning assumptions.

The second point is that until we have a better idea of what we are getting ourselves into, we should abandon outyear budgeting. We try to project the future so we can make some long-range planning. But unless we change the way we do our planning the second and third year and the fourth and fifth year, it is just a waste of time, we do so poorly.

There is one and only one binding year for the Federal budget each year. Our track record demonstrates an utter inability to even come close to projecting reality beyond 1 fiscal year. This is the best case I know for arguing a 1-year budget. In light of these points, let us contrast the deficit-reduction plans before us.

The plan that was announced in the rose garden, referred to as the leadership plan, reduces the fiscal year 1985 deficit by $16 billion. In it is only $5 billion of spending reduction. The bulk of those savings are in the outyears. Those happen to be the same elusive, nonbinding years that I have already talked about. And as I mention the mistakes of the past, there is something about this plan that ought to sound very familiar to us. This rose garden, leadership package would be the next installment in that pathology on the deficit chart that I referred to.

All you have to do is extend each one of these charts that I gave you just one more year and we will not have to wait until next year to find out how wrong our approach is. Our plans would show declining deficits, but of course in reality they would grow.

By contrast, this bipartisan budget freeze, Grassley-Kassebaum-Baucus and Biden, is a 1-year freeze. Everything is upfront. It is a response to our planning disarray. We are giving, through our budget, an opportunity to get at the real causes of the problem. It neither indulges in the narcotic of optimism nor engages in outyear uncertainties. All savings are real savings. They are right there. They are going to be determined by this body of U.S. Senators. It is not going to be left to the future. Also, these savings are evenly distributed among defense and entitlements. No other budget comes close to doing that. Budget savings in fiscal year 1985 equal $27 billion compared to $5 billion in the rose garden leadership plan.

Most important, the freeze represents a shared sacrifice. All elements of the budget are treated equally. A 1-year freeze will give us a momentary handle on a moving target. It will provide us time to analyze the extent and causes of our planning shortcomings, and it might provide us with a glimpse of direction for further policy savings.

It gives us time. We need time. We have never found the time in the past. Of course, the greatest obstacle that we have in the path of sustained recovery is the absence of consensus on the direction of tax and budget policy. We never really take time to think about that. We are all united in the goal of reducing the Federal budget deficit. I would not accuse a single Senator of not being sincere in his own individual way that he, first of all, believes we ought to reduce the deficit and, two, he has a sincere and workable plan for doing it, at least for the first year. I am not so sure I could say that for the second or third year. But the problem is finding a combination of budget elements that will fit into a significant deficit reduction box.

We have seen the combination agreed upon in the rose garden. The goal there was to preserve the budget elements, not lower the deficit. May I say that again.

What was decided by leadership and by the President was to preserve the budget elements, as if those elements were ends in themselves. Their decisions were not to deal with the deficit, and more important not to deal with the underlying problems. That is a coalition approach. It was a coalition of those who want higher defense spending, higher domestic spending, and a few tax increases. The resulting budget package that was developed by the leadership shows little or no budget savings—only $5 billion in spending in the first and only binding year.

I have to explain, for those who might take offense at what I said, that the leadership budget shows little or no budget savings because, by constitutional law, we are not going to bind any succeeding Congress. The only real gain as far as budget savings are concerned is what we are going to save this year. And more than twice the amount that the leadership plan would save to reduce the deficit is going to come in tax increases. Not only are budget savings scarce but they are also ill-balanced between defense and entitlements, and in the remainder of the budget.

If real restraint and deficit reduction is to be achieved by this Congress, a consensus for doing so must be built among the public. We must earn the moral support of the American people. A prerequisite of that support is for the Congress to provide moral leadership so people will understand the nature of the sacrifice each one of us must make. Without moral leadership there can be no consensus, and without consensus there can be no solution to the economic and fiscal problems facing our country.

Too often we think in terms of the economics of the situation we are dealing with today, what it does to interest rates. We approach it merely from a materialistic standpoint. But there is a morality involved: Whether or not it is right for my generation of policymak-

ers to live high on the hog, to build up the Federal budget deficit, not curtail programs out of control, have a high standard of living today, and put off the paying of that bill to the young people, young people such as those represented here today as pages of the U.S. Senate. We ought to go into this discussion today with some sort of guilt complex about the burden we have put on the shoulders of the young people of this Nation, and we ought to do what we can today to change the symptoms—and the deficit is only one of those symptoms—of the underlying structural problems so we will not continue to load debt upon debt upon debt on the young people of this country.

Now, debt is legitimate in times of war and national crisis when the preservation of the Nation is at stake, but in times of peace and prosperity, as we have right now, they are not a demonstration of a moral approach by our country's leaders.

Many of you have been listening to me talk about a budget freeze for 3 years. This is in fact the third consecutive year. This is the first year this issue has reach the floor of the Senate, even though I have brought it up each year in the Budget Committee. But it has reached the floor of the Senate this year because our situation has not gotten better, though all the time we were led to believe it would. And more people now are waking up to the necessity for taking dramatic action to get the budget deficit under control.

But from the very beginning I have perceived that this approach of a budget freeze enjoys widespread public support—it is probably less necessary to build public support for this deficit reduction package than any other one we will be considering. Today, that support has grown in leaps and bounds in the grassroots.

Our biggest failure has been to not recognize the willingness of our grassroots constituents to sacrifice for the good of the country. We in Congress have become hostage to the stale perception that no one will tolerate a cut in this benefit or a cut in that program.

It is my belief that the way to create a moral bond between the people and Congress, to accomplish meaningful change, is to present the people of this country with solutions that are fair and equal. But no budget is fair unless it deals with all programs on an equal basis. That is truly the only way we will reduce the growth of Federal spending.

Three years ago, when I initially proposed a budget freeze, the one area I lost support for was the defense budget. So last year I set out with a vengeance to prove that the defense budget can and should be subject to a freeze, the same as any other budget.

To my own satisfaction, to the public's satisfaction, and to that of many Members of Congress, we uncovered a planning nightmare in the Pentagon which has been producing a systematic reduction in our Armed Forces, at ever-increasing costs.

I wonder if my colleagues understand that because of this planning problem in the Pentagon, we are actually getting less for our money—that is, reducing our Armed Forces—and it is costing us more while we do it.

The Pentagon problem is not unlike our own budget problems here in the Congress. In Congress, our planning incompetence produces massive deficits. The Pentagon's planning incompetence produces less defense more expensively.

No one who has looked at the evidence we have uncovered over the last year and a half can have the slightest doubt that a freeze should apply equally to the defense budget and the rest of the budget. Believe me, there are structural problems in the Pentagon which would make even the most conservative Members of this body, myself included, eager to make sweeping changes. And it is critical that we do so, or we face the danger of losing the moral support of the people.

If you do not think that a closely-knit social fabric in this Nation is as important to the defense of this country as how many tanks and planes we have, then I say you are not looking at the real defense strength of this Nation in its totality; because a strong nation defense-wise is not a strong nation if the people of this country do not feel a part of it, if they are not a group closely knit in the defense of our Nation. There must be staying power behind each effort we make defense-wise, and the moral support of our people is a necessary part of that.

Right now, I have a feeling, as I go around our country, as I travel in my own State, that our people have doubts about whether their money is being spent wisely in the Defense Department.

Also, there tends to be a growing acknowledgement of the fairness of an across-the-board freeze approach to reduce deficits. The freeze proposal now before the Senate has received strong endorsement from the business community. With the four of us from the very beginning in our efforts have been business executives for National Security, the National Federation of Independent Business, and the National Taxpayers Union. I should like to acknowledge the efforts and credibility these groups have contributed to the evolution of this proposal, both procedurally and substantively.

Recently—right now—at a time when their support was critical, our proposal has received strong endorsements from the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. We have also received a strong endorsement from former Treasury Secretary William Simon, one of the country's most noted and respected experts on financial and fiscal policies.

I know that particularly on my side of the aisle there are many Members who respect the judgment of William Simon, who served as Secretary of the Treasury during the Ford administration. He probably has even grown in tremendous respect since going back to the private sector, because of his writings and his speaking out. Perhaps those who have some doubts about the Senator from Iowa would look to the leadershp of William Simon over the last 3 or 4 years, in getting this budget deficit under control, and decided whether or not they really should be on the side opposite that of Bill Simon.

We also are endorsed by the Council for a Competitive Economy, and we have received qualified support from the National Association of Home Builders and the National Association of Realtors.

These endorsements represent a far-reaching cross-section of the Nation's most productive sectors, as well as representing the views of their membership at the grass roots. It is an indication of broad support across the country, support which many of our colleagues have failed to recognize.

I should like to draw the attention of my conservative Republican colleagues to a letter signed by 30 of their conservative colleagues on the House side in support of the freeze. A copy of this letter has been placed on the desk of each Senator.

I should like to thank Representative DENNY SMITH of Oregon for coordinating this letter and for all his support and effort in this issue.

I hope my conservative colleagues in the Senate realize that this is as much a conservative budget as will ever come before us with a chance to pass. Most important, this support is an indication of the desire to take a very dramatic step right now, this very year, toward reducing the Federal deficit. It is an indication that we are not going to make any more of those mistakes that we made in 1982 and 1983 and that we might make in 1984.

Such widespread support for this freeze gives us the opportunity to do what we have been telling our constituents all along we want to accomplish: to reduce deficits and interest rates.

Mr. President, if we allow this opportunity to slip through our fingers, this opportunity at real deficit reduction, we will regret it. I fear that the unfolding fiscal disorder may reach unmanageable proportions.

Surely, if we fail to freeze this year, our decisions next year would have to be drastic, and perhaps imprudent.

I urge my colleagues to support this freeze now, so that we can get busy on long-term structural changes needed to sustain this economic boom.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support and hard work in making this bold approach a viable alternative for this year's budget decisions.

I thank Senators KASSEBAUM, BIDEN, and BAUCUS for their leadership from the outset in this regard and Senators EVANS, MATTINGLY, MELCHER, and TSONGAS for their efforts now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the "Dear Colleague" letter, dated May 1, 1984, to which I referred, urging support for this budget plan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1984.

DEAR SENATE REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUE: As Republican Members of the House extremely concerned about the giant projected federal deficit, we are writing to urge you to vote for the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden budget plan currently under consideration in the Senate.

The Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden budget plan calls for a one-year, across-the-board budget freeze. It is a plan that is fair. It is a plan that is fiscally responsible. And it is a plan that has our complete support.

We are cosponsors of House Resolution 468, a bill calling on all House committees to apply an across-the-board budget freeze in their formulation of the FY 1985 budget. We are convinced that a one-year budget freeze at FY 1984 authorization levels is the most significant first step the Congress can take to address the deficit problem.

A vote for the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden budget plan is the strongest signal you can send to the American people that Congress is serious about cutting the huge projected federal deficit.

The Congress must make a substantive effort to cut the deficit now. Next year is too late. Please cast your vote in support of the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden budget plan.

Sincerely,

Denny Smith, Hank Brown, Henry Hyde, Hal Daub, Manuel Lujan, James Broyhill, Don Young, Mike Oxley, Tom Hartnett, Pat Roberts, Ron Marlenee, Ed Zschau, Dan Schaefer, Chalmers Wylie, William Dannemeyer, Ken Kramer, James Hansen, Newt Gingrich, Mark Siljander, Tom Bliley, Larry Craig, Mike DeWine, Webb Franklin, Ron Packard, Judd Gregg, Tom Kindness, Tom Tauke, Howard Nielson, Lynn Martin.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank you, and I am happy to yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I only wish to briefly comment on a couple of things that have been said about the 1-year freeze.

I greatly respect the leadership of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) on this issue, to which he has devoted much time and effort not only this year but in the last several years.

It has been said that this is unrealistic, that this approach is simplistic, that we cannot accomplish it this year, but its time is coming, we are a year ahead of ourselves on this.

Mr. President, I say to you that the public is ready to see us do something responsible now. It is not easy for any of us, because we are all concerned about various aspects of the budget. How do we and can we effectively assure those who are on retirement income that they will not be hurt? How can we assure those who care about the strength of our defense system that it will not be undermined by capping the budget authority for defense to last year's funding level?

These are questions I think that we have answered and we will continue to answer during the course of this debate.

But, Mr. President, let me assure you that the public as a whole feels very strongly about the need to do something now and they are willing to accept what reductions might occur if they feel it is equitable and it is across the board.

I do not think any of us would prefer to take an approach such as this which in many ways is somewhat simplistic, but we have reached a point where I am not sure we can deal with it any other way.

I only wish briefly to comment on defense spending. The defense budget under this proposal will be $264 billion, the second largest item in our budget.

I think many of us who have studied the defense issue closely and who feel strongly about a strong defense system realize that what this simply does is say we have to look to the priorities of our defense spending. The day of reckoning is here upon us now.

Everyone realizes that at some point this will have to be done because in many ways our elaborate systems that we have voted for and projected out are underfunded and at some point we are going to have to be realistic and drastically increase the spending or we will have to force ourselves into making decisions about the priorities that we feel are important and when they are important.

It is a case of just good, sound efficient management.

Many of us feel that actually the strength of our Nation does rest on sound fiscal policy. It is not only for our own domestic programs and the protection of the elderly and the young from increasing interest rates, from escalating inflation, but it is also our trade relationships with the rest of the world. Third World nations have enormous debt burdens which can only be significantly improved and strengthened in their relations of strategic importance in the world if indeed we lead the way on this type of budget approach which guarantees, I think, a real shot in the arm for the economy and interest rates will go down or remain steady.

I feel, Mr. President, this is the best time for us to take this type of action. It is 1 year. But it is at a time that we can say hold a minute and let us analyze where we are going. It is at a time that the inflation rate has remained low. It is at a time when there is a lot of vitality and confidence in the country that indeed we have turned the corner.

But there is a lingering doubt if we have the will and the commitment to really govern here or if we will continue to do business somewhat as usual.

I applaud those who worked long and hard on the leadership efforts to get a budget which they feel does reflect a wide variety of interests. But there are a great number of people not only here, in the House of Representatives and the Senate, but in the country who think it is not enough, that indeed we need a major boost in our economy at this time.

I cannot tell you, Mr. President, how important it is for a Senator from a farm State to address what is really an extremely crucial concern to farmers. It is one weak spot in the economy, and farmers do not know how they are going to get out of the crunch they find themselves in if they cannot see some relief in interest rates and some future ahead for being able to stay alive in the marketplace. This is true for many small businessmen as well.

As I say, it is not an easy step to take and each of us will have to ask ourselves if we can, as a matter of fact, for one more year manage an efficient budget on the same moneys that we have over this past year.

I think we can, Mr. President, and I think the signal it would send would be immediate, and dramatic and give the country a great deal of confidence that we can continue what has been started, and that is major change in fiscal policy and in good governance.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, we have been in a quorum call for 15 or 20 minutes. I just have some brief remarks to make on this matter myself. I do not know whether the Senator from New Mexico has any remarks to present. I

wondered if anyone else wanted to speak.

Now that I have the floor, I think I might go ahead and make a tabling motion. But if anybody else desires to speak——

Mr. BIDEN. I would like to suggest the Senator make the tabling motion and I will make a tabling motion immediately upon the offering of his amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I think that would be fine.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator from New Mexico likes that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOSCHWITZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I have not and will not make a practice of quoting my own remarks which I previously presented in this Chamber, but I think it is appropriate under the current circumstances to make this one-time exception.

Last week I presented a statement in strong support of the bipartisan, 1-year freeze as the only balanced and equitable proposal, which results in substantial and immediate budget deficit reduction. As part of that statement, I suggested, "For our elderly citizens, immediate actions to reduce the deficit should result—and I strongly believe will result—in lower interest and lower inflation rates. That has a direct, decisive impact on the cost of the food and energy and shelter, which are the major elements of these persons' incomes.

"Lower inflation rates, incidentally, when you think about it, are nontaxable benefits. No tax is taken from the benefits accuring from lower prices. This benefit then spreads to all sectors."

To further quote, "We are constantly hearing requirements for substantial real growth as opposed to current dollar growth in defense expenditures. But that comes in two ways: from budget dollars which are appropriated, but also from the purchasing power of those dollars.

"What we can buy for our military establishment as well as all other functions of the Federal Government is as much determined by future rates of inflation as by new budget authority."

Mr. President, let me digress for a moment on the question of defense spending.

During my term as Governor, we lived through periods of economic boom followed by substantial and immediate economic distress. During that period of economic and budgetary distress, I directed all agencies of State government to prioritize programs as to their importance to their departments, but moreover to the citizens of Washington State. In turn, each agency was to live within the resources available.

I moved from that experience to this Washington and find myself frustrated with discussions that suggest that the Department of Defense cannot prioritize its spending, saying, "We need everything that is requested." But this bipartisan, 1-year freeze—and let me emphasize the 1-year nature of it, 365 days—will force the Department of Defense to do just what they suggest is impossible: To prioritize, to live within a reasonable level of committed resources.

We can no longer afford to give any department of this Government a blank check.

Let me return to a discussion of economic concerns.

Econometric models suggest that a reduction in the deficit will provide for decreased rates of interest and inflation. Beyond the academic exercise of predicting what economic factors will result, we are all aware of the psychological influence and message of confidence that Congress will send by substantially reducing the Federal deficit. I believe with all my heart that if the job is done well, we will move inflation and interest rates downward.

I think there is perhaps no better judge as to the future direction of interest rates than the controller of money supply in this country. Federal Reserve Chairman Volcker, during February 10, 1984, testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, urged swift action on cutting deficits, saying, "You take increasing chances with the American economy" the longer deficit cuts are deferred.

Mr. Volcker urged cuts of $50 billion in fiscal 1985, saying that that would cause interest rates to drop by 2 full percentage points. He is making a prediction like anyone else can make a prediction, but he sits in an unusually sensitive position of authority.

The freeze which has been suggested, coupled with the revenues which have already been adopted by this body, will save $48 billion, or reduce the Federal deficit by $48 billion from the modified baseline which other Members are using.

That is close to the $50 billion that Chairman Volcker suggests is appropriate. Moreover, it is substantially more—substantially more than the proposal of the leadership and of the President.

I have said before that I will vote for that package if it is the only alternative remaining, but I do not believe it is sufficient. Chairman Volcker apparently does not believe it is sufficient. I think it is important for us to take bold enough action to insure that the results really occur.

Figures on rising employment, real income, production, consumer and business confidence, productivity and progress against inflation all "go a long way toward setting the stage for a long period of greater prosperity—I believe we now have a rare opportunity to set in train a long period of growth and stability."

With the level of interest rates playing a major role in insuring continued economic growth and continued containment of rising inflation, we have the opportunity to present to our citizens a dollar that purchases programs that range from a strong defense to that which provides stable payments to those recipients of social security.

It allows us to purchase more with each budget dollar for the many programs of our domestic as well as foreign responsibilities. I firmly believe in the bipartisan 1-year freeze and hope that some of my questioning colleagues will join me and other supporters in this commitment: A 1-year commitment, an immediate commitment, a substantial commitment, and one which I believe will bring results.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it may be that the concept of the freeze is too new in some respects for Members of the body to consider. I think we have established a case for why it needs to be done at this particular time. We have already instituted, just within the last month, a freeze on one aspect of the budget and one very large segment of the American economy. That is in regard to farm programs. I wish to point out to the Members of this body the mini farm bill that passed here just before the Easter recess. In that bill, we froze 1985 target prices for feed grains and wheat at the 1984 level, even though things are very tough in the agricultural areas and income there is not very good because of drought and particularly because of high interest rates. But it has been received generally favorably in the farm community, and I think that is evidence that a very large segment of our economy is, right now, showing self-sacrifice and willing to go along with the concept of a freeze. I am sure, though, that they would expect all of us to share in that. That means all Government programs, defense and nondefense. As a matter of fairness to the agricultural sector of this economy, those of us who voted for a freeze on target prices ought to consider whether or not we can go home to our farmers and justify a freeze there without also going home and saying, "You know, we adopted a very dramatic budget; we really took dramatic action to get the budget deficit under control, and even though it

was very dramatic, all sections of the Federal budget and all segments of the economy bore a fair share; it was fair and equitable."

I wish to have my colleagues think about that as they go about the rest of the day analyzing what they want to do in regard to this.

I am sorry also, Mr. President, that I did not get a chance before he left the floor to say that Senator EVANS of the State of Washington just delivered a brilliant statement on the subject of the freeze. As a cosponsor of this amendment, he has been very supportive of that effort.

I think, too, that what we do not often think about is that the laboratories of government are State governments. They have had to take even more dramatic action than we are doing here. I am sure that maybe even when Senator EVANS was then Governor EVANS, he indicated in his remarks that he had to take fairly dramatic action in an instance or two. I know in my own State of Iowa, not only have budgets been frozen, in many respects they have been reduced several times in the last 3 or 4 years as further evidence that if governments must do something, it can be done.

States are different from our Federal Government in the sense that they have constitutional requirements for a balanced budget that we do not have. As I stated in my remarks, what happens when our projections do not work out as we anticipated? We just add to the deficit. State governments cannot do that. That is an argument not so much for my freeze as it is an argument for a constitutional requirement for a balanced budget.

It does show that it can be done there, if we have the experience. Senator EVANS stated it from experience better than others can, and I understand 10 to a dozen Members of this body are former chief executives of their respective States. We ought to be willing to bite the bullet as people at other levels of government have to do and are willing to do.

Mr. President, I only add one additional point to comment on something that Senator EVANS stated. He referred to Chairman Volcker's response to the Rose Garden leadership proposal that everybody is trying to find some excuse to vote for. He said that it really would not help much with the problem of interest rates. I, myself, did not hear Chairman Volcker say that, but rather his general statement that we have to do something about the deficit and particularly the long-term trends of deficit if we are going to get interest rates down.

But I can say that last night at a reception I had an opportunity to have a short conversation with another member of the Federal Reserve. I shall not state his name, but he is a member that I have had occasion to have some conversations with often the past couple of years. His comment was that what is going to be done by this Congress if it follows the direction of the Rose Garden proposal is not enough—not because, collectively, it might not be enough, but because so little is happening in each one of the years and because there is not anything dramatic being done up front, in fiscal year 1985. So I wish to add one other person's reaction from the Federal Reserve to what is considered to be the leading proposal around here for budget reduction. I would like to tell my colleagues that for most of those who support the leadership plan and think it is the answer to our problems as an effort to get interest rates under control, there is ample evidence from the economic community, the best of it coming from the Federal Reserve Board, that it is not going to do the job.

I think at this point, it just reemphasizes what so many of us have previously said, that we need to do something very dramatic. We need to send a signal and the rose garden proposal is not sending any signal at all.

From that standpoint, Mr. President, again, I urge consideration by my colleagues of a more dramatic proposal, a 1-year across-the-board freeze, something that is fair and equitable.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I take the floor to compliment Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator BIDEN on offering this amendment. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

The reason we are offering this amendment is very simple. In a nutshell, it is because we believe that the other budget proposals before Congress, particularly those before the Senate, are inadequate.

The other budget proposals before the Congress are good-faith efforts and good-faith attempts to reduce deficits. The budget proposal proposed by the President and the majority party, the plan proposed by the House Democrats, and third, the plan proposed by the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) are all very laudable. They all, as much as they can, strive to reduce deficits. But still, the fact is that these plans do not go far enough. That is the sole reason why Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator BIDEN, and I are offering our 1-year budget freeze.

Mr. President, I do not have to dwell on figures and statistics in order to demonstrate the difficult position we are in, how difficult it will be for our country to continue recovering, how difficult it will be to get interest rates down, unless we bring deficits down more quickly than we seem to be doing.

In the first 208 years of our country's history—that is, from the birth of America to today—our country has accumulated a total national debt of about $1.5 trillion. Contrast that with the accumulated debt that is projected for the rest of the 1980's: During the next 7 years, our total accrued national debt will virtually double. In 1990 it will be close to $3 trillion.

Federal deficits are increasing exponentially. The national debt is already much bigger than anyone would have predicted several years ago.

What does all this mean? No one knows for sure.

To pay this debt off all at once, every American would have to contribute $13,000.

These deficits hurt us dramatically:

They take money out of the pocket of each working man and woman.

They inflate the value of the dollar.

They make U.S. exports more expensive.

They make foreign imports cheaper.

They drive up interest rates.

They rob us of jobs.

Over the next few years, the Federal Government will borrow more than half of our net domestic investment capital to finance the deficit.

There would not be much left for people who want to build a house, a factory, or a shopping center.

That will send interest rates through the roof.

And that will end the chance for a sustained recovery.

And, worst of all, these deficits mortgage our children's future.

We will force them to pay for our mistakes.

INTEREST RATES

Mr. President, let me just talk for a few minutes on how high interest rates are hurting one sector of our economy: agriculture.

It was not too long ago when the interest rate that most farmers paid on loans was about 7 percent. That was the common rate in 1970. What is it now? The rate has doubled, to 15 and 17 percent.

We all know, Mr. President, that farmers have to borrow. Most businesses have to borrow. Small businesses have to pay whatever the market rate is.

Today some would have us believe that interest rates have come down a little compared to what were a few years ago. In fact, real interest rates are today at an alltime high. The real rate of interest, the difference be-

tween the interest rate and the rate of inflation, is at an all time high.

In addition to the cost of borrowing money for this year's operations, today farmers are paying about $20 billion interest on loans that they have outstanding. That is equivalent to the net income of America's farmers. The $20 billion of income farmers are earning this year is offset by $20 billion in the interest payments farmers have to make. And this is not just a problem on paper—in my State of Montana, 51 percent of all farmers who have Farmers Home Administrator loans are delinquent on those loans.

In addition to hurting important sectors of our domestic economy, high interest rates threaten our ability to export American products.

Let us look at the international side of the equation.

In 1977, America exported about $20 billion in total agricultural exports. The European Economic Community in that same year exported about $12 billion in agricultural exports. Thus in 1977 we had about a 2-to-1 advantage.

What is the situation today? Look at the 1983 totals. The United States has exported in 1983 about $33 billion in total agricultural exports. What has the EEC exported in that same year? In 1983, alone $33 billion in total agricultural exports.

While the United States had a near 2-to-1 advantage in 1977, we have now a 1-to-1 ratio in total agricultural exports with the European Economic Community.

So it is clear that the United States is losing out in agricultural exports.

Mr. President, you might ask why. What has happened? Well, in part, the problem is high interest rates in America which are caused by high budget deficits.

High interest rates push up the value of the American dollar. The American dollar is now highly overvalued compared to other countries' currencies.

What does this mean? Well, for one thing it means that American exporters have to add on a surcharge to the price of the products they are trying to sell overseas. Most economists say that the differential between the U.S. dollar and other countries' currencies average between 20 to 30 percent. That is, the U.S. dollar is now overvalued by about 20 to 30 percent compared to other countries' currencies.

That means that we in America, we who are trying to export, have to try to compete in international markets despite a 20- to 30-percent surcharge on the products we are trying to export overseas. It also means, correspondingly, that we Americans—and this is the good news—find that we are subsidizing imports to the tune of 20 to 30 percent.

It should be no surprise that American agricultural exports have declined, and that we are losing jobs.

We are exporting about 2 to 3 million jobs overseas because of high interest rates and a highly overvalued dollar.

What worries us, the cosponsors of this amendment, is that unless this trend changes, next year and the year after our economy is going to be in much worse shape than it is today. Any problems we are suffering this year will pale in comparison with the economic devastation we will probably experience in future years.

In fact, Mr. President, these are not only my views. They are the views of a lot of people who follow these matters much more closely than I do. One is Paul Volcker, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System. It is his view and it is my view, and I think it is the view of most Americans, that the longer we postpone the day of reckoning, the longer we postpone significantly getting these budget deficts down, the more likely we are going to experience, some kind of severe economic dislocation.

On February 24, 1983, over a year ago, Paul Volcker, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, testified before the Senate Budget Committee about the deficit threat. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of his remarks be entered in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF REMARKS OF MR. PAUL VOLCKER

The most obvious obstacle to sustained recovery is the prospect of huge federal deficits even as the economy expands. In the last fiscal year, the Federal Deficit was a record $111 billion. The President's new budget report projects a deficit in the current fiscal year nearly double last year's figure and further growth into the foreseeable future in the absence of determined action to alter that outlook.

The members of this Committee, of course, are aware of the enormity of these projected deficits, but there may be a danger that numbers in the $200 billion range have been cited so frequently as to make them seem almost comfortable and familiar. No matter how readily $200 billion slips off the tongue, the hard fact remains that deficits of that magnitude would preempt an unprecedented share of our net savings, keep "real" interest rates high, and divert funds from the investment and the housing we need and want.

To be sure, a substantial part of the current deficit—projected at about 6.5 percent of the GNP—reflects the impact of the recession on the budget. Slack economic activity and higher unemployment have cut deeply into revenues and boosted outlays for unemployment benefits and other automatic stabilizers. At a time when investment is weak and private credit demands have slackened, these cyclically induced deficits have helped support spendable income and buoy the economy. They have not, in the midst of deep recession, been inconsistant with declines in interest rates—but interest rates have, as you know, remained high relative to the current rate of inflation.

As the economy recovers, the cyclical portion of the deficit will recede. But as things now stand the deficit itself will not. Higher revenues from economic growth and reduced spending for unemployment compensation will be offset by—and possibly more than offset by—growth in other spending programs and the effects of earlier tax changes. In other words, through the mid- and late-1980s, a huge imbalance would remain even if the economy were operating at much lower levels of unemployment—and assuming inflation remains under control.

All that is familiar to you—and it is equally familiar to the financial markets, where the prospect of a major structural imbalance in the government's finances has an impact on current interest rates. It is not just the direct demand for funds to finance the Treasury that is of concern but the fear that ballooning federal borrowing needs will, in effect, bring extraordinary pressure on the Federal Reserve to monetize the deficits, with implications for inflation itself, for inflation expectations, and for inflation premiums in nominal interest rates.

One implication is that, to the extent the budget deficit appears to be intractable, the burden placed on monetary policy to demonstrate the government's resolve to follow a non-inflationary course is intensified. The converse is equally true: meaningful action to demonstrate the government's economic discipline on the fiscal side would reinforce confidence that monetary policy over the years ahead can do its job in maintaining a course consistent with price stability without intolerable market pressure.

It is tempting for some to suggest that the budget problem and its consequences for the performance of the economy could be solved by monetary policy. But excessive money creation to meet the needs of the government would only reinforce and validate the fears of renewed inflation, and sooner or later, higher interest rates. In the end, excessive monetary growth would put us in an even more unsatisfactory situation, with still more deeply ingrained inflation expectations and greater skepticism about the ability of our nation to manage its economic affairs. Nothing real would be gained for long, and hard-won ground in the battle against inflation would be lost.

In concept, any inflationary impact from the budget can be contained by appropriate monetary policy. But the harsh implications of excessive deficits for other credit-dependent sectors of the economy would clearly remain.

I don't want to suggest there is a simple trade-off, as sometimes suggested, between future budget policy and current monetary policy. Reducing the threat of these large structural deficits stretching out to the end of the decade in and of itself should have favorable effects on current interest rates and in damping concerns about future increases. In that real sense, budgetary virtue will provide its own tangible reward.

But those benefits would ultimately be lost if monetary policy were to abandon its continuing and necessary concern with restoring reasonable price stability. That point remains central.

What can be said is that a better fiscal outlook, with all it implies, would certainly provide a better environment in the financial markets today, reduce concern about future inflation and an early rebound in interest rates, and moderate preoccupations that the Federal Reserve itself might some-

how be forced to retreat from its basic anti-inflationary course. As things stand, with monetary policy assumed to be the only bulwark against renewed inflation and a high degree of sensitivity to the past failures in efforts to contain inflation, every twist and turn in the monetary aggregates or short-term policy actions interpreted as "easing" is closely scrutinized as a sign or symbol of intentions over a longer period. Clear progress in dealing with the budget could, in that sense, somewhat enhance our operating flexibility, so long as we succeed in reinforcing the basic point that the effort to sustain the progress against inflation is intact.

As you know better than I, the process to cut down those future deficits must start now, and with energy and force. Basic budget trends take time to change, but the knowledge that they will be changed will affect markets now. The amounts involved are large, but certainly not beyond our capacity.

It is obviously beyond my competence, or the province of the Federal Reserve, to deal with all the particular priorities that must be balanced. The Administration has set forth its program in that respect. The general order of magnitude seems to me appropriate, although some of the measures proposed would, in my judgment, be more effective if brought forward in time. Others have proposed different specifics, and I am sure they will receive consideration.

From the standpoint of general economic policy, the more that can be done in restraining expenditures the better. You, of course, have to reconcile that with other priorities, and the basic point is that the sheer arithmetic of the problem does suggest that changes will be necessary over a broad range of programs—both on the spending and revenue side. I believe recognition of that fact is becoming increasingly widespread both in and out of Washington.

Your Committee is in the critical position of converting that wide consensus on generalities into a specific program, and I have some idea how difficult that is. But I also have some idea how important it is to our future.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, several months later, on November 30, Martin Feldstein, President Reagan's Chief Economic Adviser, addressed the deficit issue in a speech delivered to the Tax Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of his remarks appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF REMARKS OF MARTIN FELDSTEIN

Despite the revolutionary reduction in government spending and the fundamental improvement in the character of our tax system, the economy still faces the serious problem of a long string of budget deficits. Solid economic growth can eliminate the cyclical component of the budget deficit by 1988 but the structural deficit is likely to grow just as fast as the cyclical deficit shrinks. The Administration's economic forecast implies that the budget deficit will remain roughly $200 billion a year—or about 5 percent of GNP—for the rest of the decade unless there is legislative action to reduce spending or raise revenue.

Of course, a rate of economic growth for the next five years that is sufficiently greater than the growth forecast by the Administration and by virtually all private forecasters could in principle eliminate the deficit without legislative action. But it would clearly be unwise to assume such an improbably fast rate of growth. A prudent policy at this point must assume that it will not be impossible to grow our way out of these deficits.

The likely budget deficits are as serious as they are unprecedented. If legislative action is not taken, a cumulative budget deficit of more than $1,000 billion over the next 5 or 6 years will double the privately held national debt. The annual interest on this extra debt alone would represent a permanent cost of about $180 billion a year, an amount equal to 17 percent of the personal income tax revenue now projected for 1988. This growth of the national debt and of the interest of the national debt show that budget deficits do not eliminate the need for spending cuts or tax increases but just postpone the day of reckoning when extra spending cuts or larger tax increases must take effect to pay for current excesses.

The most important long-term economic effect on the prospective deficits is to absorb a large fraction of domestic savings, thereby reducing the rate of capital formation and the potential long-term growth of the economy. A budget deficit of 5 percent of GNP would absorb about two-thirds of all the net domestic saving that would otherwise be available to finance investment in plant and equipment and in housing. Although the 1981 tax changes and the reduced rate of inflation will direct a higher share of the remaining capital formation to business investment and away from owner-occupied housing, the effect to the budget deficits nevertheless is a lower rate of investment in business and equipment.

In the near term, large budget deficits are also producing a lopsided recovery. The most conspicuous example has been the sharp decline in U.S. net exports to the rest of the world. The projected budget deficits raise our real long-term interest rate, attracting funds from the rest of the world and causing the exchange value of the dollar to rise. The over-strong dollar makes it difficult for U.S. products to compete in world markets and makes foreign products more attractive to American buyers. More generally, key industries in the capital goods sector and in construction as well as in the production of internationally traded goods and services will fail to share fully in the overall economic recovery. The longer that large deficits are expected to persist, the greater will be the danger and the risks to our economy.

That's why the President sent a budget to Congress earlier this year that proposed to cut the 1986 fiscal year deficit nearly in half and to reduce the 1988 fiscal year deficit to only about 1.5 percent of GNP.

There is, I know, some doubt these days about the President's commitment to reducing the budget deficit and in particular about his willingness to include additional tax revenue in an overall budget package that includes domestic spending restrictions. Some skeptics say that it looks like the President has been convinced that deficits don't matter. Frankly, that's nonsense. The President believes that deficits are harmful and that it is wrong to leave an enlarged national debt to our children.

The President's budget plan called for a balanced package with a contingent tax increase and a nearly equal amount of spending cuts over the next 5 years. The President believes that progress in reducing the budget deficit requires strong bipartisan support for significant spending cuts as well as for tax increases.

Mr. BAUCUS. Finally, Mr. President, late last year on December 13, 1983, Alice M. Rivlin, director of the economic studies program at the Bookings Institution, testified before the Senate Finance Committee on which I serve. Her remarks are particularly appropriate as we in the Senate decide whether to act now and what to do. I ask unanimous consent that a motion of her remarks appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF TESTIMONY BY ALICE RIVLIN

No one would seriously propose bringing the deficit to zero in 1 year. The problem is too large to be solved immediately. The required increases in taxes and cuts in spending would be too disruptive. What is needed is a firm plan to bring the deficit down substantially over several years and to enable interest rates and the value of the dollar to fall gradually at the same time.

The time to enact such a plan is now. The economy is growing strongly. A phased program of tax increases and spending cuts could be absorbed without risk to continued expansion. Reduction in interest rates and more favorable exchange rates would stimulate investment, housing, and net exports, off-setting the slower growth in consumption and government spending and insuring more balanced and sustained growth.

Waiting until after the election—which realistically means mid-1985—to enact such a plan is risky. No one can be sure that the expansion will continue to be vigorous for another 18 months, especially in the face of high real interest rates. Recent recoveries have tended to be short. One should not have a high degree of confidence in a prediction that this one will still be going strong well into its third year. It seems more likely that, by the Spring of 1985, growth will have slowed substantially, and perhaps even turned negative.

If the economy is sluggish or entering recession, it would be both economically undesirable and politically impossible to raise taxes or cut spending in order to reduce the deficit. Waiting until 1985 to take action on the deficit entails the risk of having to wait until after the next recession.

The deficits in prospect have no single cause and should have no single cure. To blame the deficit problem solely on tax cuts, or defense spending increases, or domestic spending growth is to oversimplify recent history. Over the last two decades, the Federal Government took substantial new spending responsibilities in the domestic arena. Spending for nondefense programs rose from about 9% of the gross national product in 1961 to about 16% in 1976. Most of this increase was for payments to individuals, especially social security and other pensions, and for health care for the aged, the disabled, and the impoverished. For a while we paid for these increases by shifting resources out of defense—outlays for defense declined from 9% of gross national product in 1961 to 5.5% in 1976. But in the late 1970's we began the expensive process of modernizing our Armed Forces and reversed the decline in defense spending. We paid for simultaneous increase in defense

and domestic spending by allowing federal revenues as a percent of gross national product to creep up, mostly through the impact of inflation on a progressive income tax. Then we ran out of patience with high taxes and cut tax rates substantially. We also cut domestic spending significantly, but not by enough to off-set the combined increases in the deficit brought about by tax cuts, defense spending increases, and continued increases in entitlement spending and interest charges on the debt. That's how we got the deficits; what can we do about them?

Recent CBO projections suggest that without further action of the Congress, the deficit for fiscal year 1986 is likely to be about 4.4% of the gross national product in that year. My guess is that this is optimistic, but it is as good a starting point as any. Reducing this 1986 deficit to 2% of the gross national product—the ratio that was obtained in 1981—would be an ambitious but not unreasonable goal. It would imply cutting the deficit to about $84 billion in fiscal year 1986, or finding about $100 billion in spending reductions or revenue increases in that year. Such a program is only realistic if the Congress acts decisively early in the next session. It would send a strong signal to financial markets and the voting public that Congress is determined to reduce deficits and it could bring about a substantial pre-election reduction in interest rates.

Such a plan would have to be extremely simple and perceived as fair. It would have to spread the pain over a large number of taxpayers and recipients of government spending so that no one group or type of program bore the brunt. It would have to be perceived as an emergency belt tightening, in which everyone is asked to give up something, and not as an effort to restructure the federal tax system or redesign government spending programs.

I share the widespread view that government spending programs, both defense and domestic, could be made more effective and that the federal tax system could be redesigned to make it both fairer and more conducive to balanced economic growth. With respect to taxes, for example, I believe that either of two types of major tax reform—a substantial shift to consumer taxation or broadening of the base of the income tax with a lowering of the rates—could give us a substantially better tax system than we have now. Over the next several years, I believe we should move in one of these two directions, but doing so will take time, thought, and serious deliberation in this Committee and elsewhere. The deficit crisis is too urgent to be put off until that deliberative process can bring us an improved tax system. Therefore, I believe that it is appropriate to enact a near-term temporary revenue increase in a way that would not involve restructuring the tax system, through, for example, an income tax surcharge or a delay of indexing or both. Let me make clear that I do not regard either of these suggestions as desirable long-run tax policy. They would, however, be legislatively simple across-the-board ways of raising temporary revenue while the more difficult process of restructuring the tax system proceeded.

Similarly, on the spending side, I believe a deficit reduction package to be enacted in the next session of Congress would have to consist of rather arbitrary across-the-board cuts, some of which might be of a temporary nature pending restructuring of major programs. For example, a moratorium on cost-of-living increases in all programs might be combined with a moratorium on medical fee increases in Medicare and Medicaid and a percentage cut in other appropriations (including defense), in which the size of the cut was related to the rapidity with which the program has been growing.

Such a program might seem draconian, but its size should not be exaggerated. According to CBO estimates, government spending will be close to a trillion dollars in 1986. Cutting $50 billion form this anticipated spending level would involve cutting somewhat less than 5% of government spending and would still leave spending at more than 22% of gross national product. Similarly, on the tax side, a tax increase of $50 billion in 1986 would increase revenues about 6% and would bring revenues as a percent of gross national product back up to 20% or still below the 21% reached in 1981.

Enactment of such a program would only be possible if there were a strong will in the Congress to show that the Congress can function effectively and responsibly to solve a serious problem. I believe that the risk of delaying action on the deficits is great enough to justify a maximum effort on the part of Congress. I also believe that the conventional wisdom about the politics of the situation may be wrong. It is just possible that the voters would admire and reward a courageous demonstration of bipartisan determination to get the finances of the United States back on a sound footing.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the point I wish to stress is this: the sponsors of this amendment are worried about the trend of these budget deficits. We are worried about what will happen in the future if we do not act decisively today.

Essentially, it is our view that not only is an ounce of prevention worth a pound of cure, but a pound of prevention is worth a ton of cure. Because what we are proposing today is a freeze, is to freeze all spending in 1985 for 1 year.

I have come to the conclusion that this is the only way we can build a consensus this year to bring the deficit down.

The plan would freeze all Federal spending for 1 year and raise $10 billion in new revenues. This would lower the deficit by $23 billion more than a plan proposed by the administration and Senate leaders.

This freeze is the most fair and balanced approach to take.

The freeze applies to everyone, it's equally shared sacrifice, across the board. Furthermore, this will give Congress a 1-year opportunity to get our act together.

This 1-year pause will give us time to make realistic, efficient and fair long-term budget decisions to permanently stop the growth of the Federal deficit.

What we are spending in 1984, let us freeze it at that level for 1985—every one, all sectors of the budget: defense, nondefense discretionary entitlements, every one.

Now, why are we doing this? We are doing this because the pending budget proposals do not do enough.

What do I mean by that? I mean that the others are 3-year proposals. They are end loaded. They are not front loaded, they are end loaded. By that I mean they are postponing the problem to future years. They are saying: "Sure, we will reduce budget deficits by a certain amount over 3 years, but we are not going to do much in 1985. We do not want to rock the boat. We do not want to cause any problems." But in a very self-righteous, high, and mighty tone, they will say: "In future years we will start getting budget deficits down."

What is going to happen is that next year we are going to meet here in April 1985 and talk about these same problems. We will have another 3-year budget proposal. It does not do very much in 1985 and 1986, but in 1987 and 1988, again, in high and mighty self-righteousness, we will pledge to get that budget deficit lower and we will get it under control. These budget plans I am talking about, other than the pending amendment, are 3-year proposals which are end loaded. They postpone the problem. They sweep the problem under the rug. That is one problem with those proposals.

In addition, they do not do very much. Their totals are not very high. In the first year, 1985, the Republican leadership plan reduces the deficit only around $16 billion; the Chiles plan cuts the deficit by $25 billion in 1985. Ours reduces it by $38 billion in 1985.

It is a start. It is not a giant step. But it is a step forward. It is a start.

So, not only are the other budget proposals end loaded, not only do they postpone the problem to future years, sweep the problem under the rug, but in addition, they are inadequate. They do not do very much. And that is, I think, a point that has to be very strongly underscored here.

Mr. President, our proposal is also bipartisan. An equal number of Republicans are sponsoring this amendment along with an equal number of Democrats. We have intentionally kept it that way. We think it is important to keep it that way.

Why? Very simply because our country can no longer afford the luxury of name calling. It can no longer afford the luxury of finger pointing, of blaming the other guy for our mutual problem.

We can no longer afford to point the finger of blame at the White House, the President, or the Congress, Republicans or Democrats, Liberals or Conservatives.

It reminds me, Mr. President, of the Pogo cartoon, that essentially made the following point: "We have met the enemy and he is us."

We are all in this boat together. Both sides of the aisle, both House of Congress, both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. Throughout the country, as Americans, this is our problem. Therefore, this is a bipartisan proposal.

This is not a proposal against the leadership. It is a proposal that provides leadership.

Mr. President, there have been several complaints about our proposal. One is: "My gosh. Do you mean to say you are going to freeze defense spending? Do you really mean that?" That is a question we have all been asked.

Mr. President, the answer to that is yes. We do mean to in this proposal. We also mean to freeze everybody else, too; all Americans for 1 year.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, the Defense Department can stand some savings. The first point is that the defense budget has increased about 100 percent since 1980.

How much have other programs increased since 1980? Nonentitlement domestic spending has increased, if anything, zero percent since 1980. There is even a slight decline since 1980.

Second, Mr. President, there is already money in the pipeline. Some say the Defense Department has a budget authority that is already available to the tune of $18 billion.

Third, Mr. President, the Grace Commission talks about waste in the Pentagon, and waste in defense spending. The numbers are high, too; billions of dollars of waste. I think they are close to the mark. There is waste in most other Federal spending, but there certainly is waste in defense spending.

We all know confirm this when we speak privately with members of the military. They will tell us there is waste in the military, and there is significant waste in defense spending. I have talked to generals. I have talked to admirals. I have talked to enlisted men. They all will tell you this and point out where the waste is.

Let me give you one example. It was not too many years ago—2 or 3 years ago—when I was speaking to a group in Montana. It was a local Kiwanis Club. I talked generally about defense spending, and the Federal budget. I stated that there was waste in defense spending, as well as in other Federal programs. When I finished speaking and the meeting broke up, someone in the audience—I did not know who he was—walked up to me and said: "Max, let me tell you something. You are absolutely right." He said: "I was in charge of medical programs in the Navy. When I was in the Navy—I am retired now—we had Congress buffaloed. They did not know what we were doing. We could do anything we wanted to do. We had OMB buffaloed. We had them fooled. We just ran circles around them." That fellow volunteered that.

And as I have said I have had additional conversations with generals and others that confirm that view: there is waste in defense spending.

And let us not forget that defense spending has gone up 100 percent, has doubled in the last 4 years, and second, there is already money in the pipeline, above and beyond the freeze.

Finally, Mr. President, even if this freeze passes—I am not sure that it will—I will say this: I think most Americans and most Members of the Senate know that this proposal is right. We are today with this pending amendment trying to establish the principle that we must stop spending increases for a year to let us get our act together.

There is another reason for this amendment; that is, it is a chance for all America to share together. Nobody is getting cut more than anybody else. Nobody is getting increased more than anybody else. This amendment says no cuts for anybody. It also says no increases for anybody. It is a coming together amendment. It is a sharing amendment. It is a time for all of us as America to come together, begin as Americans to be proud of our country, and to do something which we know we really should do.

Our motto is "E pluribus unum." That is the motto of America. "One out of many." I think too often we accent the "many," and infrequently the "one." Too often we act as if we are separate Americans, apart from each other; different sections of the country, different groups of the country; minority groups, against each other and so forth.

I think it is time to accent the togetherness of America. This amendment helps accomplish that because everyone will know that the other person is not getting anything more or anything less than others.

Mr. President, this is a good amendment. It makes sense. It will also send positive signals. One signal it is going to send is to Government agencies to get their spending under control. It also sends a signal to the country. It tells the country that the Government is beginning to get its act together.

What is going to happen when America thinks Congress finally is getting some control over something? It is going to cause good will. It is going to cause more confidence. It is going to cause more belief and faith in our Government.

I think we need a little of that in our country.

Mr. President, then I think we are going to find the economy doing a lot better, because psychologically Americans are going to be thinking and feeling, "Hey, those guys back there are finally getting down to business."

Mr. President, too, because this amendment reduces the deficit $40 billion in 1985, it will also reduce interest rates. Chairman Paul Volcker has said many times that for every $50 billion decrease in the national deficit, there is probably a 1-percent drop in interest rates.

So if this amendment is adopted, that means close to a 1-percent drop in interest rates. And maybe more. That will help a lot. It will help our country very much. People will be in a better position to buy a home, to buy a car. Businesses will be in a better position to invest in jobs. And what does such a drop in the deficit do to foreign trade? It means we are able to export more products overseas because the value of the dollar will start coming down from its lofty perch. We are going to find a lot more American products going overseas, products going overseas and jobs remaining at home.

With these kinds of positive consequences likely to flow from this proposal it is no wonder many groups and newspapers have endorsed our proposal.

Editorials I have seen on this proposal are all favorable from all over the country.

Mr. President, I believe we in Congress have underestimated the degree to which Americans are concerned with the growing problem of Federal budget deficits.

When I was back in Montana over Easter recess, I found many Montanans were troubled by the deficits, and equally troubled by Congress failure to address them.

This concern is reflected in two recent editorials that appeared in the Montana press. The first is a December 18, 1983, editorial that appeared in the Billings Gazette entitled "Fiscal War Demands End of Petty Fights."

It reads as follows:

America is suffering a hemorrhage of debt, and the two men best able to staunch that wound are avowed enemies.

The story of federal deficits draining the strength of our nation is now a familiar one.

With $1.4 trillion in debt, the government is spending $200 billion more than it receives each year.

The government borrows the difference, taking half the cash available for loans of any kind. Interest rates soar. Industrial growth slows. Unemployment rises. Home buyers are priced out of the market. Loggers are laid off. The chain reaction seems to have no end.

Ronald Reagan campaigned against Jimmy Carter's $30 billion annual deficits.

Now Reagan is sending budgets to Congress asking for $200 billion annual deficits.

The supply siders' grand plan for recovery has proven to be not worth the bar napkin on which the Laffler curve was first drawn. The Kemp-Roth tax cuts will trim federal revenues by $750 billion over five years.

Supply siders claimed that taxpayers given a break would save their money, making it available for industrial growth.

It hasn't worked. Savings have actually decreased.

Meanwhile, the U.S. share of the export market is shrinking and its balance of trade deficit is growing.

The solution is not to be found in Republican supply side magic. Nor does it lurk in a revised Democratic New Deal.

The solution is painful, but it lies within the grasp of two men, two men from opposite sides of the political spectrum—Ronald Reagan and Thomas "Tip" O'Neill.

The President and the Democratic leader of the House are two stubborn men, men married to opposing ideologies.

Both want the deficit reduced.

O'Neill is ready to raise taxes and cut defense spending but not to cut domestic spending.

Reagan opposes a tax increase, demands increases in defenses spending, but is eager to cut domestic spending.

But the deadlock need not be. The two arch-foes could become history's heroes without compromising their principles. The crisis is too great and too grave to admit partisan squabbles. There is blame enough to go around and work for all willing hands.

All areas must be attacked.

Not even Reagan can defend Pentagon contracts that allow a manufacturer to charge the military $200 for a 49 cent wrench.

Not even O'Neill can justify Social Security payments to millionaires.

But no recent American president has ever been in a better position to wage peace aggressively and trim the need for military buildup than the super hawk Ronald Reagan. He, more than anyone else, should want that military machine that is his pride to be efficient.

And few liberals have ever had the political strength to insist that social services must be adquate but rigorously policed for waste. O'Neill has a chance, perhaps a vanishing opportunity, to save this nation's social conscience from fiscal catastrophe.

Senator Max Baucus, D-Mont., said it simply this week. "The problem is too great for partisan politics. We have to act as Americans, not Republicans or Democrats."

If the two most powerful party leaders do not bury the hatchet, they could bury the country.

But there is an alternative. They could be remembered as the great adversaries who delivered their nation from adversity.

The second editorial is an April 3, 1984, editorial in the Butte Standard which was entitled "No Painless Way to Reduce the Deficit."

It read as follows:

If Montana's congressmen look to poll results to guide them to decisions regarding the budget deficit, taxes and federal spending, the latest Montana Poll must be frustrating.

According to the poll, Montanans would like their congressmen to reduce the federal deficit, but not if it means increasing personal income taxes or cutting expenditures for Medicare, Medicaid or Social Security.

Poll respondents did agree that some federal spending should be reduced, primarily in the military budget. And, they agreed that the government should go slow in increasing retirement benefits for federal employees.

But when it comes to personal sacrifices, Montanans apparently aren't interested. And that, according to a national Louis Harris poll, means Montanans are in step with their countrymen. Everyone, it seems, wants the government to be fiscally responsible, but preferably at somebody else's expense.

The Montana Poll is cosponsored by the University of Montana Bureau of Business and Economic Research and the Great Falls Tribune.

A large majority of respondents—61 percent—favored raising business and corporation taxes. Raising taxes on business is often favored as handy way to generate more revenue. But, when asked if they would be willing to see those higher taxes passed on to consumers, respondents had misgivings. Only 47 percent would be willing to do that.

What's a member of Congress to do when faced with attitudes like these? Almost all budget-balanced proposals call for spending cuts and tax increases.

The answer may be to share the misery. Congressman Pat Williams, to his credit, has listed in some detail spending cuts he'd support to help balance the budget. But, since some of the cuts would affect Montana, Williams has attached a condition to his support. Members of Congress from other states, he says, must agree to support cuts that will affect their states, too.

What makes this difficult is that members of Congress from other states have constituents who think just like Montanans. They don't want higher taxes, and they don't want spending cuts that will affect them.

There are growing indications that some sort of bipartisan deficit-cutting plan will be agreed on late this year or early next year. President Reagan also has ordered Treasury Secretary Donald Regan to come up with a tax simplification plan this year. According to reports, the plan will call for a national consumption tax, which would mean higher prices for all consumers. The proposal probably will have tough sledding in Congress.

It's no secret why Reagan wants the tax overhaul plan to be submitted late this year. He wants it to be made public after the election. Similarly, major deficit-cutting legislation isn't expected to be passed until after the election.

What Montanans, and other Americans, will discover when and if a real plan to reduce the deficit is passed, is that they can't have their cake and eat it, too. That attitude is one reason why the deficits have been so large in recent years.

If Congress can summon the nerve to make significant cuts in spending and thus in the deficit, a lot of citizens are going to feel the pinch—through reduced federal benefits, higher taxes or both.

The Reagan economic program has produced the largest deficits in the country's history, and it's going to take strong medicine to shrink them.

Mr. President, these editorials reflect the growing concern in this country with the deficit problem.

More importantly, these editorials reflect a willingness to weather the tough solutions it will take to address the problem.

The bipartisan freeze is stiff medicine, but as the editorials suggest, I am convinced that is just what Americans want.

Mr. President, I see a consponsor seeking recognition at this point and I will yield the floor. Before I do, however, I strongly urge Members to listen to their consciences, to listen to their hearts. Let us adopt this amendment today to send the right signals to the country and do what we know we have to do to start getting our economic house in order.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: "Act.

"LIMITATIONS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY

"SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order in the Senate or House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution making appropriations, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $264,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

"(b) It shall not be in order in the Senate or House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution making appropriations, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $137,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, budget aurhority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

"(d) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

"(e) It is the sense of Congress that the unprecedented magnitude and persistence of current and projected Federal budget deficits must be addressed in a comprehensive strategy to moderate increases in defense spending while continuing the effective constraints on nondefense discretionary programs. To assure the success of such an initiative, the foregoing procedural restraints, in addition to the total aggregate spending limitations pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are necessary on budget authority both for defense and for nondefense discretionary programs for fiscal year 1985.

"MEDICARE FREEZE

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (or any amendments made by this Act) or any provision of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the "applicable percentage increase" under section 1886(b)(3)(B) of the Social Security Act for any 12-month cost reporting period or fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1984, and before October 1, 1985, shall be zero percent.

"(b) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall report to the Congress within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to suggested methods for assuring that hospitals will not increase amounts charged to patients who are not entitled to benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to compensate for amounts not paid by reason of the limitation under subsection (a).

"LIMITATIONS ON COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

"SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no increase shall be made in payments or benefit amounts under any provision of law which would otherwise require such increase to become effective

during fiscal year 1985 as a result of changes in—

"(1) the Consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

"(2) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages.

"(b) No person shall be entitled to any increase in payments or benefit amounts under any provision of law if payment thereof is denied by reason of this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any change in—

"(1) the Consumer Price Index (or any component thereof); or

"(2) any other index which measures costs, prices, or wages,

which would have resulted in any increase in payments or benefit amounts during fiscal year 1985 but for the provisions of subsection (a) shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining any increase in payments or benefit amounts during fiscal year 1986 or any fiscal year thereafter.".

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, add the following:

PART B PREMIUM

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 901 of this Act, the amendments made by such section 901 shall not become effective, and the provisions of the Social Security Act shall remain as though such section 901 had not been enacted.

(b) Section 1839(e) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the monthly premium for each individual enrolled under this part for each month after December 1983 and prior to January 1987 shall be an amount equal to 25 percent of the monthly actuarial rate for enrollees age 65 and over, as determined under subsection (a)(1) and applicable to such month.

"(2) Any increases in premium amounts taking effect prior to January 1987 by reason of paragraph (1) shall be taken into account for purposes of determining increases thereafter under subsection (a)(3).".

(c) Section 1839 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof, the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) If no cost-of-living increase becomes effective under section 215(i) in December of any year, the monthly premium of each individual enrolled under this part for the succeeding year shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)) be the same as the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) of the individual for such December.

"(2) If paragraph (1) does not apply to the monthly premiums for a year, if an individual is entitled to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for November and for December in that preceding year, and if the monthly premium for that December and for the following January is deducted from those benefits under section 1840(a)(1), the monthly premium for that individual for that January and for each of the succeeding 11 months for which he is entitled to benefits under section 202 or 223 shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)) be the greater of—

"(1) the monthly premium amount determined under subsection (a)(2) or (e) for that January reduced by the amount (if any) necessary to make the monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for that January after the deduction of the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that January at least equal to the monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for the preceding November after the deduction of the premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that individual for that November, or

"(2) the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that individual for that December.

For purposes of this subsection, retroactive adjustments or payments and deductions on account of work shall not be taken into account in determining the monthly benefits to which an individual is entitled under section 202 or 223.".

PHYSICIAN FEES

SEC. . (a) Section 1842(b) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 904 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(13)(A) During the 24-month period beginning July 1, 1984, the Secretary shall monitor physicians in order to determine—

"(i) the proportion of physicians, by specialty and geographic area of practice, whose claims under this part are not pursuant to an assignment under paragraph (3)(ii), grouped as follows: fewer than 25 percent, 25 percent to 49 percent, 50 percent to 74 percent, 75 percent to 89 percent, 90 percent to 99 percent, and 100 percent, of the claims submitted by such physicians, or for such classifications of physicians as the Secretary may deem to be more informative;

"(ii) the average difference between the actual charges and the reasonable charges recognized for purposes of this part, for each classification of physicians referred to in clause (i); and

"(iii) any changes in the per capita volume and mix of services provided to beneficiaries under this part by each classification of physician referred to in clause (i).

"(B) Information on changes in the elements monitored pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be provided to Congress every sixth month beginning with January 1985 and ending with January 1987.".

(b)(1) The report which the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress on January 1, 1987, shall include recommendations in sufficient detail to serve as the basis for legislative action which Congress can take to assure that any burden of effectively constraining the growth of costs in the medicare part B program, which Congress intends to be borne by providers and physicians, is not transferred (in whole or in part) so as to become an additional burden on part B beneficiaries in the form of increased out-of-pocket costs, reduced services, or reduced access to needed physician care.

(2) Such report shall also include analyses of other methods of payment which might be utilized under part B to constrain the costs of the part B program, including prospective payment systems such as fee schedules (both global and per service), capitation payments, case management, and the use of preferred provider organizations.

(c) In addition to any funds otherwise provided for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for payments to carriers under agreements entered into under section 1842 of the Social Security Act, there are transferred from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Fund such additional amounts for payments to such carriers under such agreements as may be necessary to conduct monitoring of physicians under section 1842(b)(13) of the Social Security Act.

PART B DEDUCTIBLE

SEC. . Notwithstanding the provisions of section 916 of this Act, the amendments made by such section 916 shall not become effective, and the provisions of the Social Security Act shall remain as though such section 916 had not been enacted.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Montana for his help in this amendment. He came on very early. This is really a strong stand which the Senator from Montana has taken to get the budget deficit under control. I know that he has many programs in the budget that he would like to see not be frozen, just as all of us do. But he is taking a very sound position. He is doing this because of the necessity for getting the deficit down and for getting interest rates under control.

I have had the opportunity to serve with Senator BAUCUS both as a Member of the other body and also as a member of the Finance Committee since we have been in this body. I have found him easy to work with, a person who, as far as the budget deficits are concerned, has been willing to raise revenue to take care of some of the deficit problems. He has been very brave and forthright in adjusting some of the programs that are under the jurisdiction of our Finance Committee so that they would be less costly to the taxpayers and more sound, particularly as they relate to some of the trust funds which are involved.

All of those are issues that can become politically volatile. I think he has demostrated his willingness to not be narrowminded but to be very broadminded, in fact, as he looks at this problem. I hope that many Members of this body will follow his example as we wind toward a vote on this issue.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I have just a few brief remarks occasioned by the thoughtful comments of my colleague from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS). I find much to agree with in the concern he has expressed about the prolonged, unaddressed deficits and their effect upon the national recovery. To that, I hope every Member of this body could stipulate. I guess what we disagree with has to do with the proposal that is before us, which is a simple freeze.

I have to commend the candor of my colleague from Montana. He has described this proposal as a cover for the weak-kneed. I do not think that is really what we want to encourage, though. When he asks, What signal does this measure send? It tells us that Congress lacks the will and the wit to

do the job properly because, quite clearly, we are dealing with a multiplicity of programs which differ in merit, which differ in magnitude, which differ in their importance to the American people. Certainly, people differ with respect to the kind of pruning job or lack of pruning that has been done by Congress. I frankly think that is the job the American people want us to do.

When the Senator says that newspapers in his home State commend this approach, I think what they are commending is an attitude that Congress should do something about the deficit to reduce it, to eliminate the perils which it proposes; but I doubt they would express a preference for this kind of approach which he quite properly calls a cover for the weak kneed. I think they would ask us instead to have the courage and the wisdom to differentiate between programs, to do the hard job of analyzing which are in need of trimming and which really cannot afford the kind of cut this proposes.

It is, in effect, a cut when growth is required, and growth does not occur because of a freeze imposed by this proposal. It is as though, Mr. President, we had a room full of 30 children, half of them grossly overweight and half of them much too thin, and we announced that we were all going on a diet and all going to lose 20 pounds. That might be a very salutary thing for those who are overweight, but it might seriously impair the health of the thin children who are, in fact, in need of gaining weight.

I admit the metaphor has its limitations. There are few who would find very many thin children in the entire range of Federal programs. But I would say, Mr. President, that this approach has an appealing simplicity about it. It is convenient for the Members of Congress because it excuses us from doing the harder job, the job which really is required of each of the committees upon which we spend so much time.

So I say I think this sends an incorrect signal, Mr. President. It is a signal that, rather than doing the difficult thing, which requires a greater amount of courage and, certainly, a greater amount of analysis, we are instead, in order to achieve what is a desirable goal, going to do the kind of thing required by a simple freeze.

I say to my colleague from Montana, if admirals and generals who have now retired had come in and told him of waste and abuse, then the thing to do is make specific proposals attacking the specifics of that waste and abuse and not simply impose an overall cut which will penalize beneficial programs, needed programs, in defense or elsewhere. The attitude that we should have, Mr. President, is that we should ferret out the specific waste and abuse and also, very frankly, admit that the thing that is difficult about this job is not choosing between good and evil but, rather, weighing comparative goods and choosing those that have priority.

That is why we are here, Mr. President. Frankly, this proposal is a default on our responsibility.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILSON. I am happy to yield to my friend from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am not saying I am disagreeing with the premise of the distinguished Senator from California. I wish we could do the things he talks about.

I have been in this body now practically 6 years. I was on the other side for 4 years. That is roughly 10 years in the Congress. For some of those years in the House, I was on the Appropriations Committee. I tell the Senator from California that it is my experience as a practical matter that it is very, very hard, if not impossible, to do what the Senator from California wants done. I wish we could do it, but it has not happened.

It has not happened for various reasons. The fact of the matter is that, in a representative democracy, because different groups come to different Members of both the House and the Senate for their programs as a collective whole, we in the House and the Senate, on Capitol Hill, have a very difficult time resisting.

This amendment that the Senators from Iowa, Kansas, and Delaware and I are offering, is really a statement that the usual ways are just not working; we have to try something else that is different.

This, in many respects, is a pragmatic amendment. We call it the pragmatic amendment, the realistic amendment, the nonpartisan, get-the-job-done amendment. It is a recognition that the usual way of trying to attack appropriations and budget matters does not work very well.

I'm not blaming anybody. I am not blaming Republicans, Democrats, the White House, Congress. I am just being descriptive. That is why we have come to the conclusion that we have to do this.

Let me share with the Senator an experience I had in 4 years on the other side of Capitol Hill, when I was on the Appropriations Committee in the House.

We on that committee were charged with the budgets of various agencies. We spent our time trying to understand various programs—for example, HUD, EPA, NSF, the Department of Agriculture. These were some of the Federal agencies that went through the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of which I was member.

I can tell the Senator there are thousands of Federal employees who spend their time game planning budget proposals to OMB and to the Congress. That is their job, their job description.

Compare that with our resources in the Congress. We in the House Appropriations Committee had one or two computers. I was entitled to one staff person to try to dig into these budgets to find where the fat and waste was.

What I am saying is that it was a mismatch between the Appropriations Committee and the agencies.

Everybody wants power. Lord Acton said, "Power tends to corupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely." Every Federal agency wants more dollars. I have never seen one that did not. It is their responsibility to figure out how they can get more dollars. I suppose we would try to do the same thing if we were in their shoes.

But what I am saying is that because of all this, "business as usual" does not work very well. Sure, we should try to find the fat and the waste, but as a practical matter, that is not enough. I am not blaming anybody. I am just describing the process and the system and what really goes on, and that is why the Senator from Iowa and myself and the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Delaware and others who have joined us, propose a freeze.

I know that really it would make more sense if each of us sat down and worked together and agreed where the fat and waste was. The Senator from California is absolutely correct; that is the preferable process. But as a practical matter, as a pragmatic matter, I submit we have to find something else and something different. President Truman once said:

> Try something. If it does not work, try something else. If that does not work, try something else again.

Well, we are trying to do something else.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I am entirely sympathetic to the goals expressed by my friend from Montana as well as those of the cosponsors of this proposal. There is no argument as to what it is they are trying to achieve or the rightness of that effort. While I sympathize as well with the acute frustration which understandably my colleague from Montana has experienced over the years at the process and its failure to produce the kind of setting and keeping of priorities of which political discussions so often speak, notwithstanding that frustration I think this proposal, well intended though it may be, is not the proper way to address it.

He says it is the result of that frustration, the result of a realistic assessment, a pragmatic assessment that the process of authorization and appropriation simply does not distinguish between the deserving and the less de-

serving in a sufficiently effective way to remove the peril in which we find ourselves, that of a growing deficit.

There is a way to avoid that, and I agree entirely with his not at all unfair assessment of the process. It has not worked well. It is right he and other serious-minded Senators address that process. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that shortly we may have not only the opportunity but, indeed, the obligation when the States end their frustration with the process and send us not just a message but a mandate that we either act ourselves or convene a constitutional convention to amend the Constitution to bring about a balanced budget so that the Federal Government, like other public agencies in this land, is compelled to operate within a balanced budget and spend no more than we take in as revenue.

I assume that many who are cosponsors of this measure and those who will vote for it probably will support that effort by the States. I know some have voted for it in the past in the Senate.

On that day, Mr. President, when there has been an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to require the Federal Government, like other public agencies in the United States, operate within a balanced budget, my friend from Montana and I will behold a change in the process because then, whether anyone likes it or not, all of us with our differing priorities will be compelled to live with the reality and the requirement that we set priorities; that we either raise taxes or cut spending in a way which will balance the budget.

I am not suggesting that when such a day comes perfect equity will be done, but at the very least the peril that we now address, that of deficits, will be made unconstitutional. It will have been removed from us because of our own collective inability to come to an agreement upon the setting of priorities. It will remove from us the failure of the week-kneed having the courage to make that analysis, to set priorities and keep them. But I do not think in the interval, as faulty as that process is, we should simply default upon our responsibilities and take the easy way out by making a cut across the board that works inequitably, inevitably in the cause of what is a desirable goal, the elimination of the deficit.

So my friend from Montana and I agree upon much. We simply are disagreed on this proposal. While it is proper that the Congress spend a good deal of its time addressing this deficit, the real question which should concern us long term is the solution to the problem. It will not be solved, in my view, for precisely the reasons the Senator from Montana has eloquently described, until that day when we are compelled to live within a balanced budget.

That will require, in my view, the amendment of the Constitution, which can be done, focusing exclusively upon that subject. I think the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from California, and the Senator from Washington will find constituents in our States who will applaud that effort and urge we, indeed, allow the States to have the privilege of ratifying such an amendment so that never again will Congress be troubled with this problem of an unbalanced budget or how we right the ship after yielding for so long to the deficits.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I have listened to everything the Senator from California has had to say. I have two or three comments I should like to make at this time, not in total disagreement with what he said; in fact, in some instances, in total agreement with what he said—for instance, his support for the constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, changing the basic thought process by which we arrive at expenditure figures and the discipline that comes with a constitutional amendment.

To add to some of the things he said and to get him to think in terms of what our amendment is really all about, it is not just a set of figures here for 1 year, in which we are reducing the budget's deficit by $23 billion more than the rose garden proposal. There is a lot more to it than that.

I should like to have the Senator from California answer the question as to how he cannot be for our proposal, which is going to get the deficit under control, if he is for a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. Those of us who anticipate a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget know that it has to pass Congress, and then it will be before the State legislatures 2, 3, or 4 years before it actually is ratified by three-fourths of the States and becomes a part of the Constitution.

We have to do something very dramatic right now to prepare ourselves for the day when we are going to be able to meet the mandate of such a constitutional amendment. It the Senator from California is not willing to take this dramatic action now, all I can say is that when we get down the road to the point where we do have to meet the mandates of the balanced budget amendment, we will have to make such horrendous adjustments in the budget that, instead of talking about freezing, we will be talking about actually cutting programs below levels that exist for that specific fiscal year.

So anybody who is for a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget has to be farsighted enough to know we have to meet that commitment someday; and now is the time to prepare ourselves for that.

However, more important than that point is this: As I listened to the Senator from California, I heard him say something to the effect that this excuses us from doing a harder job. Those are his words.

If you look at the figures that are in the budget and look at what we are doing to the level of expenditure for 1985, I think I would have to agree with him. But if that is all he is looking at, or if that is all he heard the Senator from Montana and me say about this, then he has missed the main point of the amendment.

The main point of the amendment is not just to reduce the level of expenditure, but to give us a breathing spell, a period of time in which we will have an opportunity to step back from the programs, take a look at them, much as a doctor trying to diagnose the illness of a patient: step back, put the patient to sleep for a while, make the diagnostic interpretations of the situation as it exists. That is what we would do for that year with the various Government programs; operate and make the changes that need to be made, and then go back to the process of doing the job as we have been doing it—but, of course, doing it differently.

The difference would be this: We have the Federal budget for the last 20 years out of control. Much of it is on automatic pilot. Nobody can stop it. For 3 years we, as Republicans, have known there is a problem and something should be done about it. But we kept looking through rose-colored glasses, we always saw a rosy future out there, and we always said growth is going to take care of the problem.

However, as I pointed out this morning, and as I should like to emphasize to the Senator from California and other Members who have not had a chance to look at the charts, if you look at the charts, you can see that every year we expected things to get better, and every one of the statistics we used as a basis for making budget judgments always looked rosy for the future. But what happened? You can look at every page of these charts, and in each instance the situation deteriorated from what we anticipated. We just added to the budget deficit.

We did not take any contrary action, or at least took very little contrary action, and what was done, such as in the recent year, was basically timid, particularly on entitlements and defense. The situation just kept getting worse.

We are on automatic pilot; we are out of control.

31-059 O-87-20 (Pt. 8)

The budget freeze has several purposes: To get the deficit down and to give us an opportunity to stop the moving target. In each of the last 3 years, we have been shooting at a moving target, and we have not been hitting that target. It has been getting away from us. This is an opportunity to stop that target so that we can see what we are shooting at and bring about the necessary reforms that need to be done. It is not only in defense. It is across the board.

There is still another problem and this speaks to the basic, practical problem that the Senator from California addressed: How do you accomplish this? He says, and rightly so—the Senator from Montana even agreed to that—that we should make these necessary changes, that we should not have to freeze the budget in order to accomplish it.

The Senator from Montana addressed his experience with that, and correctly so, and I associate myself with his remarks. Let us look at it from a strictly political standpoint.

The Senator from California is a Republican, as I am, basically in support of the general direction this administration has taken in a large share of its programs, but now disagreeing on what is being done on the budget. But that is a small aspect. Most of it has been in agreement. We wanted a lot of the changes that have been brought about. But we have a President who says that defense is a sacred cow and it cannot be touched. So 29 percent of the budget is off-limits so far as the President of the United States is concerned.

Then we have the second most powerful person in Washington, the most powerful Democrat, the Speaker of the House, who says that entitlements and social programs are off-limits. So he carves out 42 percent of the budget that is off-limits.

Then, we all know the inability to borrow money to pay the interest on the national debt. That is kind of determined by the marketplace. So there is 13 percent of the budget that is off bounds because of the way the free market works.

So you have 42 percent and 29 percent, which is 71 percent, and then you have 13 percent, which is 84 percent of the budget. We have only 84 percent of the budget that we are willing to deal with and have dealt with. But we even have supporters of those programs who consider those programs sacred cows. The Senator from Connecticut, on our side of the aisle, has been very eloquent in defense of those programs.

We have a situation in which we have so many sacred cows that we have become overpopulated with cows, and nobody is willing to make changes.

The House of Representatives will not do anything because TIP O'NEILL does not want to touch entitlement programs, and that has been the situation for 3 years. President Reagan does not want to touch defense, and that is the way it has been for 3 years. That is why nothing dramatic has been done. The President's program has been labeled as unfair and inequitable.

So in an attempt to deal with this problem, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from Iowa have been trying to address the practical political problems as well, I wish to tell the Senator from California, and that is that we have to draw the line on sacred cows. There cannot be any sacred cows.

We have to say that there is no part of this budget that is off limits for reform and for bearing a fair share of the budget reductions.

It is from the standpoint of fairness, equity, and understanding the history of the past 3 years of attempts to get the budget under control, the last 3 years looking at rosy projections, and having them not materialize, learning from past experience.

And if you and I as human beings cannot understand from history, then who can? And if we cannot learn from the mistakes of the past, then who will? And if we do not do something in learning from the mistakes of the past, are we bound to repeat the mistakes of the past?

Mr. President, I say to you that that is exactly where we are headed unless we take this opportunity of making a dramatic change in the level of expenditure and also we buy time to stop the moving target, to get the budget off of automatic pilot, and step back and look at the patient and try to operate on that patient and to cure that patient.

We need a "wellness" program in the Federal budget. All we have been trying to do is practice medicine on the budget, the same way as the medical profession of the United States practices medicine, and that is trying to cure an ill patient. We should be looking at the budget the same way that we should be practicing medicine in America. We should be practicing preventive medicine. We should be making the necessary changes that should be made so that we prevent the mistakes of the past from recurring.

I do not know how many more times we are going to have an opportunity. We thought we were doing it in 1981. We thought we were doing it in 1982. We thought we were doing it in 1983. And each time the situation got worse.

Here we are in 1984 and it looks as if we are headed right down that same road, really not doing anything dramatic to entitlements, still going with a rate of growth of defense expenditures that is going to put us at the highest level in constant dollars since the Korean war. We are going to continue going right down the same road of the same coalitions in both bodies of this Congress that have wanted to spend unlimited amounts for entitlements and unlimited amounts in defense and then come back here a year from now and realize we should have done something last year.

As Americans, we have been a people who have learned to a considerable extent from history. That is why we have gotten to 200 years as a Nation. There are not very many powerful societies and nations that have lasted that long in the history of mankind, and it has to be because of our form of government and our ability to respond.

I plead with my colleagues to listen to the mistakes of the past, study them themselves, and ask if they want to repeat those mistakes.

I think we are about to repeat them if we do not take dramatic action as through this proposal, the only one that is really going to get this deficit down, the only one for sure, regardless of the level of expenditures, that is going to give us an opportunity to take this budget off automatic pilot, study what the problem is, and make the necessary changes.

VOICES FROM THE PAST—ON NATIONAL DEBT

Today our coalition behind the bipartisan budget freeze has presented endless economic data documenting the economic tragedy we court if we refuse to take decisive action on the deficit.

If we have failed to convince you that we will doom this Nation with our own lack of decisiveness and courage without drastic fiscal reforms, perhaps some voices from the past may better build a case. I quote from a best seller, which I believe most of you can pull from your own shelves.

That ancient sage and political wonder, King Solomon, warned that debt enslaves those who fall into its trap. Indeed, our own people are economic slaves, with their security and prosperity severely jeopardized by $200 billion deficits which will soar much higher without decisive action now.

Solomon's father had even harsher words for debt: King David said those who borrow money they refuse to repay are wicked. Our children may well agree with him someday, when they find themselves crushed by the national debt we bequeath them.

If you will indulge one more such reference, hear the moaning and groaning of Nehemiah's contemporaries. He reported a "great outcry of the people," who said, "we have borrowed money to pay the king's tax on our fields and on our vineyards * * * now * * * we are forcing our sons and daughters to be slaves * * * we are

helpless because our fields and our vineyards belong to others."

The plight of his people, confessed Nehemiah, made him furious with an irresponsible government, and he held a mass protest against politicians of his day. * * * There is, indeed, nothing new under the Sun. We should beware lest we find our own people making their own mass protest at the polls next November.

Mr. President, if no one else seeks the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I gain the floor at this time to ask unanimous consent that Senator PRYOR and Senator HUMPHREY be added as cosponsors to our amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, is there any time agreement on this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time agreement.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I will be brief. Incidentally, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to join as a cosponsor of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke and voted for the Hollings amendment. At that time, there were some charts over here in this corner of the Chamber that showed the differences in the propositions that are being submitted to the Senate.

Now, it seems to me that we are taking these things in the order that will determine the courage of the Senate. The Hollings amendment was the most Draconian of the propositions we are going to have an opportunity to vote on, because it would have made a dramatic reduction in the deficit in 1985 and beyond. It has now been defeated, having received 38 votes, which incidentally is 22 more than almost precisely the same amendment received last year.

Now we are on the KGB amendment originally offered by Senators KASSEBAUM, GRASSLEY, BIDEN, and BAUCUS. And I intend to support it and I am going to cosponsor it because I consider it the next most drastic deficit reduction plan. If it fails, and I fully expect it to, then I will support the amendment of the Senator from Florida, Mr. CHILES, the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee. And if it fails, which I fully expect it to, I may support the President's proposal simply because it is the only thing left to support and not because I have any enthusiasm for it.

I said yesterday, and I say again, this is an election year and Congress is paralyzed by fear. Fearful of alienating a constituency, fearful that their opponent, whether he be Democrat or Republican, is going to pick out one or more sections of any one of these proposals and say, "Why, my opponent even voted against social security," or "My opponent voted to cut medicaid so that the poor people of this country would not receive health care."

I heard an interesting story the other day—I will share it with you—about the fellow who was running for office. He said:

> I want to say at the outset, I am going to run a clean, positive campaign. I want to say now that my opponent is an intelligent, articulate man. I have no quarrel with him. We are going to talk about the issues. And his wife is one of the most beautiful, charming, intelligent women I have ever known. As a matter of fact, I do not know what he sees in that other woman he is running around with.

[Laughter.]

And so it goes in this business.

But when I think about that famous question about "Are you better off now than you were 4 years ago," 4 years ago there was a resounding no. Everybody in 1980 decided that they were worse off than they had been in 1976. And everybody on this side of the aisle lost about 10 points in the polls from that magic moment until the day of the election. And this is one of the Senators that lost about 10 points.

But if you were to ask the same question today on national television, there would probably be a pretty large number that would say, "Yes, I am better off than I was 4 years ago, because the stock market is up and the economic growth rate is running along at 7 percent, one of the hottest rates in the history of the country." And so, as of this moment, if you belong to the "me" generation, you would say, "Yes, I am better off."

But what you are literally saying is what we used to say in the Marine Corps, "Pull up the ladder, Jack, I'm on board." Because if you follow that question with a much more sobering and relevant question, "Do you think what has happended in the past 4 years has provided a more secure future for your children and your grandchildren, and my yet unborn grandchildren?" I believe there would be a substantial number of people that would say "No."

How can you possibly say, by increasing every man's, woman's, and child's share of the national debt in 4 years by $3,000—from $4,400 to $7,700—is going to be good for my children and future generations?

And despite that, despite these dramatic predictions, not by partisan Democrats who want to kick the President, but by no less an authority than the chief economist for the President, Martin Feldstein, no less an authority than Prof. Milton Friedman—who seems to have considerable credibility in certain quarters in this country—and Paul Volcker, who may not be perfect but whom I think is trying to walk the line as best he can and maintain that delicate balance between the amount of money necessary to keep interest rates from going up or going down, we are not serious about reducing the deficits. When Henry Kaufman says that interest rates are going to go up, the stock market goes down 20 points. And Henry Kaufman is saying that obviously Congress is not serious about reducing the deficit.

I presume that at some hour of this day we are going to vote. The KGB amendment is going to be defeated because everybody is waiting to vote for the President's package, which is no downpayment on the deficit at all. The distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. CHILES, who sits on the floor at this moment will tell you that and he is simply quoting CBO figures. CBO is the nonpartisan group whose figures are tested and tested and which has no political ax to grind, and which say that when we adopt the President's plan the budget deficit in 1985 is going to go up another $10 billion to $21 billion.

What in the name of all that is good and holy are you going to say to your constituents this fall, if you are running for reelection—or right now, if you are not—about Congress interest and seriousness about budget deficits?

No politician wants to incur the wrath of his constituents. I am not up for reelection this year, happily. But, if you think you are going to deal with the budget crisis and these deficits without raising taxes, you are deceiving your constitutents. We cannot get this deficit under control by cutting out social spending.

You can take all social spending, from food stamps to child immunization, everything from student aid to the National Cancer Institute, and eliminate every single function of Government except about five, and you will still have a $50 billion deficit. There are about 500 governmental

functions in the budget. Eliminate 495 of them and you still have a $50 billion deficit. That is how serious this is.

Everybody raves about the recovery. Recovery from what? Recovery from the depression, and they say: Is it not wonderful? The economy is really moving along. Listen, I can move this economy any time you will let me write $200 billion worth of hot checks every year. There is no trick to that.

People love to kick the so-called Keynesian theory of economics. Lord Maynard Keynes was not a great genius. He simply said what the Bible says: Store up in the good years, so that you have something for the lean years. When the economy is down and out, spend money you do not have to stimulate it. But once you get it stimulated, stop the deficit spending. Increase taxes and do whatever you have to do to bring the deficit into line.

Here we are with a 7-percent growth rate, the hottest growth rate since 1962, one of the hottest growth rates in the history of the country, and next year when every economist worth his salt says the economy is going to turn downward if you cannot keep $200 billion deficits from occurring. When we are growing at one of the fastest rates in history, I invite anyone in this body to tell me what we are going to do next year when the growth rate drops to the area of 2 to 4 percent.

We are spending $600 million a day that we do not have. I hate to even repeat these figures. They have been said on this floor so many times, that I know they are sickening to all of us. It is not an easy chore. I have never met a politician who did not want to be loved. I have met a very few that do not want to be carried out of the U.S. Senate in a pine box.

All I am saying is that I have not known very many politicians who were beaten because they demonstrated a little courage and statesmanship. It is not easy, I admit, to make people like it when you are dealing with something that is very precious and important to them.

I spoke to a couple hundred small businessmen at breakfast this morning from mostly the Midwest and Northeastern part of the country. Small businesses are on the endangered species list in this country. One of the reasons they are is because the Government is not enforcing the antitrust laws any more. The antitrust laws are designed primarily to protect small business. The bankruptcy rate among businesses, as of this moment and all during 1983 when the recovery was so hot, was greater than it was in 1932 during the Great Depression, and we still have a staggering unemployment rate in this country.

This morning the Energy Committee reported a bill which sets aside 117,000 acres of land in my State in a national forest as wilderness area. I can tell you that 50 years from now somebody will look back and say: I am so glad somebody had the foresight to set aside a little of the very best of this country for us. I never go to New York and look at, or walk through, Central Park that I do not think: Is it not wonderful that somebody had the foresight to set aside these thousands of acres of land right in the middle of Manhattan. Think of the endless pleasure Central Park has given millions of people through the years.

I remember taking my daughter to Boston Children's Hospital in 1966. I had never been there. My brother was educated there. I could not help but wonder to whom the people of Boston, and Massachusetts, and this Nation are indebted for having the foresight to set Boston Common aside? Why, Boston would not be Boston without the Common, would it?

One time when I was Governor of my State, I was seated by Lady Bird Johnson. She said, "You know, Governor Bumpers, I was in your great city of Little Rock just the other evening. I stayed in a hotel overlooking the Arkansas River."

She said, "You know, Little Rock is the only city I have ever been in on a major waterway with no park of any kind on the river." I want Lady Bird to come back now and see the magnificent park we built right behind that hotel where she stayed. We take great pride in that in our State.

Is it not interesting that we take pride in all of these areas that we have set aside and they are usually controversial originally. But I can tell you that those things are not going to amount to much if we do not deal with two things in this country: One is the threatened nuclear holocaust. We can intensify the rhetoric, harden our position, and be tough. But the truth of the matter is the arms race is going at a pace that is unprecedented. And the nuclear holocaust threatens civilization every second of our lives. You have seen the bumper sticker that says: "When you've seen one nuclear war, you have seen them all." The other major problem, of course, is the economic apocalypse. I do not see how we are going to avoid it much longer. I cannot believe that what we are doing here is saying this is a terrible issue, it is one of the most difficult issues Congress has ever confronted, but we are not going to deal with it until after November 1984.

That is where the Senate is headed.

But I am going to take my stand here on this amendment because I do not want my children or yours to say that in that fateful year 1984 when we still had a chance to save this great system we did not do it.

Let me make one final statement. I am always making a statement talking about how much taxes we pay in this country. If you were to walk down the streets of Washington, D.C., or Little Rock, Ark., and you tell somebody that the President has just submitted a $925 billion budget to the U.S. Congress for 1985, $925 billion, and then ask, "How much of that do you think we are going to collect in personal and corporate income taxes?" Most people would say, "Well, I assume all of it."

Do you know what? In 1985 it will be about $400 billion. Way under half of the $925 billion will be collected in personal and corporate income taxes. About $404 billion in both next year. We collect another $100 billion or $100 billion in oil royalties, timber sales, excise taxes and so on. But about $400 billion will be personal and corporate taxes.

Do you know how much interest we are going to pay on the national debt next year? In 1985 it will be $125 billion. About 28 percent of all the personal and corporate taxes collected in this country.

I am going to give you another theory, one you do not hear very often, about what the deficit does. We all go home and speak to the chamber of commerce and the Rotary Clubs and say, "These deficits are terrible. You are going to have this terrible crowding out. Here is the Government borrowing $200 billion. The savings rate is at an alltime low. And the business demand for money is just now picking up as a result of the so-called economic recovery. And when Government and business start competing for the limited savings, interest rates are going to go up. It is going to stop housing, automobiles, and the recovery is going to come to a screeching halt."

Well, I will tell you something worse than that. When the American people who have money to invest realize that Congress does not have the will to raise taxes and continue to spend $200 billion a year it does not have, and that in 1988, 45 percent of all the personal and corporate taxes collected in this country is going to go for interest on the national debt, it is not going to be a question of crowding out. It is going to be a question for the institutions and people of this country who buy Treasury bills, Treasury bonds, and Government obligations. Are they going to want paper representing debt from a government which is only collecting twice as much money as is necessary to service interest on the national debt? No, they are not. They are going to want something they can kick the tires on. They are going to buy land. They are going to buy diamonds. They are going to buy art work. They are going to buy gold and silver. They are going to buy anything except Government obligations because Congress does not have the courage and the will to deal with the problem.

When that unhappy day comes, we are going to have to say to Paul

Volcker, "Nobody is willing to buy this paper any more so you start the printing presses and do not quit until I call you." That is the only way we will be able to finance the deficits in the future. It will not be by borrowing but by printing money. There will be nobody to borrow from. The American people will have lost confidence in their own Government.

And where will we be? Not in an unprecedented situation, but precisely the same situation Germany found itself in the 1920's when it took a wheelbarrow full of money to buy a loaf of bread.

Mr. GRASSLEY. And the people would steal the wheelbarrow.

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, I do not know of anything else I can say. A lot of what I have already said is old hat.

I do want to repeat one thing for my colleagues. If there is anybody listening, I want to tell them this story:

The other day most of us in this body went out to the National Cathedral for the memorial service for our departed former colleague, Frank Church. Frank died at the age of 58 from pancreatic cancer.

But I remember Senator McGovern was one of the eulogizers. There were five people there who delivered eulogies in remembrance of a truly great man. Senator McGovern talked about how Frank Church was one of the first people in the Senate to resist the Vietnam war, and he comes from one of the most conservative States in the Nation—Idaho. But Frank Church said he did not understand the war, he thought it was wrong, and he tried to stop it.

Senator McGovern said one time that Frank Church put his arm around him after they had just lost another battle in the Senate. He said, "George, isn't it interesting, we are always right but we always lose."

Finally, it was the American people, not the people in the Congress but the American people, who demanded an end to that war. That is the reason it stopped.

Congress never had the will to deal with that war.

But he went on to say that Frank Church introduced the first wilderness bill, and was the first person to oppose the Vietnam war, always fought for nutrition programs for children, nutrition programs for pregnant poor women, health care for the elderly.

As I sat and listened to that, I could not help but think of the difference between the value system we live by on a daily basis and the value system we want our eulogizers to talk about at our memorial services.

Frank Church apparently told George McGovern a long time ago about how he had cancer when he was a 23-year-old student at Harvard Law School, and how he realized for the first time as a young man how fickle and transitory life is and how senseless it is to shave and hedge and avoid the truth and responsibility.

So, it was good for me. I got a great deal out of that memorial service, more than anything else in a very long time, and I renewed my own vows to try to do the best I could for the country. One of the vows is that I am going to vote as responsibly as my intelligence allows me, and in this particular case it dictates to me that I do the very best I can to protect the greatest country on Earth from what I know is going to be the abysmal failure if we do not do something responsible.

Mr. President, I see no other Senator who wishes to speak. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. Before he leaves the floor, I wonder if he would think out loud with me a minute.

I heard him speak of taxes. I heard him talk about the need for courage, and I applaud the Senator from Arkansas; he has never been short of that quality.

I know that he supported the Hollings freeze amendment. I wonder, when the Senator from Arkansas looks at the proposal we have before us now which is more drastic in the cuts it makes in domestic programs, certainly more drastic in the cuts it makes in defense, I wonder if he has looked at the revenue side of this proposal.

This proposal, as I understand it, would include $10 billion in unspecified, additional revenues—not telling us why, not telling us how. It freezes programs; assigns no new funds to them. But there is no other mention of revenues—beyond the implied $10 billion—in this plan.

I assume somebody is holding a Finance Committee bill that raises some money. I remember hearing the White House insist all the time there would be no new revenues without further spending cuts. But I look at this plan, and I see what it cuts on spending, and I see what it raises on revenue, and I can tell you, Mr. President, I can quickly understand why the telegrams are coming from the National Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers. This plan is certainly in keeping with the idea that everything ought to happen on the spending side while nothing happens on the taxing side; $10 billion is in the finance bill. It says nothing more than that in the way of revenues.

Is that fair, Mr. President, to go and tell the people—the aged, the halt, the lame—it was necessary for us to do something? I have been preparing them for that. When I was running for election last time, I said "We have tried to protect you, but if there is a chance to do something overall about inflation, we are going to have to do it and everybody is going to have to share some pain."

I wish the Senator would tell me if this is a fair sharing of pain, when those people who get over $80,000 a year get the big tax cut while that is where the deficit has come from. The Senator from Arkansas has talked about that so eloquently over a period of time. We passed the "10-10-5" tax plan, all the additional shelters, the increased depletion allowance, accelerated depreciation, the investment tax credits—all of those were heaped in, and the top 3 percent of high-income people get $9,000. Are we asking them to share any pain in the plan?

Will the Senator tell me, where is there any pain for the people in the top 3-percent income level when they get $9,000 a year?

Maybe there is some pain if they are defense contractors, because some military spending is trimmed. Maybe there is some pain if they are on social security and they are over 65, because they will suffer just a little bit. They will lose a few hundred dollars in social security. But when I look at people who are at the bottom of the ladder, who are disabled veterans, 100-percent disabled—in this bill, that veteran is going to take a $2,000 cut over 3 years.

To get the deficit down, to see that inflation does not start again, I am ready to tell that man he has to take some kind of pain. But I am not ready to tell him that he deserves to take a $2,200 cut over 3 years when there is not going to be anything done to the guy in the upper 3 percent, nothing except the reward that we give him—the reward I say—by the fact that we put all these tax cuts in.

Mr. President, if that is the kind of fair plan we are talking about, I think we better consult a different dictionary. I would like to have the views of the Senator from Arkansas on that.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Florida. I think the Senator knows that I agree with everything he has said. The reason I like his proposal, at least in one respect, much more than I like this KGB proposal is, first of all, he postpones indexing. That is worth $51 billion over the next 3 years. That is a very significant cut.

The reason I preferred the Hollings amendment yesterday is that it postponed indexing. The reason, I assume,

that the postponement of indexing is not in the KGB amendment is that there is absolutely no chance of its passing, if that is in there.

Let me say to the Senator, if I could have everything the way I would like it, I would do what he urges and more. I am going to support a 15-percent surtax, a corporate tax, provided we can get about a $250,000 exemption for small business. I will support a reasonable surtax on personal income taxes. I did my very best last year to cap the third year of the 1981 tax cut at $720. I am one of three Senators in the Senate, along with Senator HOLLINGS and Senator BRADLEY, who voted for the President's first reconciliation bill that cut $56 billion in spending and voted against the tax cuts.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator had a little of that once. He is usually a person who only has to have a lesson taught to him one time. We passed reconciliation, but we got the tax cut, too. The tax cut gave to those at the top, and the reconciliation took from those at the bottom. The Senator has had an opportunity to read the CBO report, I believe.

Mr. BUMPERS. I have, Mr. President.

Mr. CHILES. It shows the disparity out there now between those people at the top and those people at the bottom. We have already had that once. What he is telling me is we are going to go in this trap once again. He knows it will not pass. He is going to vote for this and maybe give it enough to pass, but he is telling me he does not think the corporate tax is going to pass, either, and some of those others. I am surprised he would walk into that trap again.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, it is not easy, and based on the logic, which I inescapably conclude from what he said is, since we cannot have indexing, let us do nothing——

Mr. CHILES. No, sir, not at all. As the Senator said, we have a more balanced plan coming up after this one that we will have a chance to vote on.

Mr. BUMPERS. I am going to support the Senator and I fully expect to have the opportunity, because I do not think this amendment is going to pass.

I will say one other thing. I was cosponsor of Senator CHAFEE's amendment the other night where indexing was brought up singly, by itself. I am not all that opposed to indexing. I think there is a good case to be made for it. But, as Senator CHAFEE so eloquently said, we cannot afford it.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CHILES. I shall be happy to answer.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Being a member of the Budget Committee and sharing that responsibility with him, I am very cognizant of the interest on both sides of the aisle in trying to bring fiscal responsibility to this country. The country needs it, we need it, to show, as a matter of fact, that we are aware.

I am confused by what I hear on the floor, that we are cutting with this particular budget proposal. That is almost an Orwellian term of rhetoric, because what we are doing is simply holding the line. We are not cutting, we are just saying, let us hold it for 1 more year at the same funding level at which we have already been operating.

As I said earlier, I find strong support for this particular approach from those who want to do something and who are very worried about the future of our country and our inability to take some really strong, meaningful action and are supportive of it, even the elderly, who do have to struggle with the income, if they see it as equitable across the board. But I would only ask the Senator if he views this as cutting when, indeed, it is simply holding the line?

Mr. CHILES. Well, you can certainly characterize that two ways. When I look at a program like drug enforcement involving the Coast Guard and the Justice Department, a freeze with no allowance for inflation tends to sour the position of the proponents. What you are saying is they have to lay off personnel and when you lay off personnel, you diminish the extent of the program. I call that a cut.

Now, you can say they are getting the same dollars they got 2 years ago, but I would say to the Senator, if there are fewer agents out there in the field, if there are fewer hours that the Coast Guard can patrol, if there are fewer dollars allowable for the Coast Guard cutters, then to me that is a cut.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I would say, Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator from Florida, as he knows, we do not cap according to particular line item. We simply cap, as I believe the Senator's budget recommendation does, as well as the chairman's recommendation, the discretionary amounts of funding in total to last year's. What it would do would be, of course, essentially a decision of whatever department, whether it is Justice or Transportation or Treasury, to decide the priorities within their departments. I think the Senator would share, as I, a desire to see some funding levels increased over last year because it would be my choice or the Senator's to see certain priorities given an emphasis in funding. But what we have always attempted to do but really avoided was making some of the hard decisions. I think that time has come, and I think the public wants it. It then becomes a responsibility not only of the Appropriations Committee and its process but, more importantly, other departments and agencies. I share the concern of the Senator about the need to increase enforcement because it is exceptionally important that we have increased personnel for drug enforcement.

Mr. CHILES. The argument I was making to the Senator from Arkansas is that if you attempt to impose this kind of freeze, I am going to fight for those programs that I just mentioned, Coast Guard, and DEA, and Justice. Somebody else is going to fight, and I will probably help, for the veterans functions to see that they are not cut because a freeze means a reduction of doctors or nursing staff. If someone else is going to fight for one area, it is not going to work without somebody being cut when you have this limited amount of money.

I am saying that if wits are necessary—and I am prepared to say that they are—my plan requires some wits, too. But is it not fair, and should we not be closing the gap with revenues as well as spending cuts?

Mr. President, 18.9 percent of the GNP is going for taxes, 24½ percent is going for spending. That is our problem. We have that gap.

Now, this plan sure takes a whack at bringing the spending down, but it does not do anything to bring the revenue up. If I am going to invoke the kind of pain this plan is going to invoke, I want to be able to look the people in the eye and say we shared that pain. We did not absolve the upper 3 percent that get $9,000 a year as a result of a tax cut. We put a little burden on them, too. We let them pay a little something, too.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I agree with the Senator on that point. That is almost past history because we have adopted the tax portion of this package already. So, of course, we assume the work has been done for which we have already voted.

Mr. CHILES. Well, that may be past history, but then I guess the Senator is saying that she is satisfied that the revenue we have raised is fair, and that it matches. If I look and see the amount raised by that and the amount of spending cut in the Senator's plan, I do not think it is fair.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. It does match.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator from Florida in his plan has a 2-year freeze on indexing that provides another $31 billion. That is not a heck of a lot of money, but fairer, I think, in saying there is going to be more of a sharing of this burden than saying we are going to make a drastic cut on the spending side but we are not going to pick up any money on the revenue side.

Mr. PRYOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise at this time to support the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden amendment which is

now before the Senate. Mr. President, my remarks will be very short, but I compliment the very distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), the very distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), and the very distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) because they have basically taken the lead and brought this issue to the forefront in the Senate at this moment.

Mr. President, I think that an unprecedented deficit is going to call for an unprecedented remedy. I think what we are considering this afternoon may well be an unprecedented remedy. I do not fear an unprecedented remedy at this moment to deal with this deficit because I believe that if a poll could be taken of the American people as to how they might or might not vote should they be in the well of the Senate this evening or tomorrow when the amendment's fate is resolved, I truly believe we would see a vast majority supporting this concept of a budget freeze. Not only last May of 1983 did I support the Hollings amendment to freeze the 1984 appropriations at the 1983 levels—if I am not mistaken, I was one of 16 Senators in this body to support the Hollings amendment at that time—but I also was one of 38 Senators who supported a Hollings amendment which was offered last night. I think we can see, Mr. President, there is a growing concern and certainly a growing worry about not what we would call a troublesome deficit any longer, but an astronomical deficit which is going to take this country under unless we do something now.

I also feel, after visiting in 22 different counties during the Easter recess period in my home State, when I not only held town meetings but also coffees, meetings with retirees and senior citizens, just about every type of group imaginable in our State of Arkansas, I can report without a great deal of reservation that the people of our State—and I think this is true in this country—are worried sick about this deficit. But the greater worry, I think, is their worry about us. They are worried about our inability and our unwillingness and our lack of commitment to address this issue.

I predicted for the last several months that we would not deal with this issue until after the election. I have always said in those public statements that I hoped this would not be the case. But my fear is that we are headed to have a lameduck session of Congress that can be convened on December 1. At that point, unless we do something in the nature of what the distinguished Senator from Kansas and her colleagues have asked us to do, we will be on the brink of going over the cliff; and at that time, my fear is that it will come too late.

We still have an opportunity, we have a window of opportunity, to do something that is not only fair and timely but also something that is right. It is correct.

I believe, very respectfully, that our people back home want us to do something, and they want us to take dramatic and drastic steps to do something about a deficit which all of us in this Chamber know is totally out of control.

I think that, first, our people would like us to consider something that is fair, and this is one reason why I rise in support of the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. It is fair because all of us are going to share equally in whatever happens. That applies to the President's salary. It applies to each agency and department of Government. It applies across the board.

I know that a lot of people say, "My goodness, what are we going to do about the Federal retirees? What are we going to do about the social security recipients? What are we going to do about the military?"

I know it is easy to take a simple freeze resolution such as that offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas and pick it to pieces and find little areas of concern where it might be troublesome to us, as politicians, to vote in an election year for such a sweeping amendment as the distinguished Senator and her colleagues have offered.

Mr. President, I think today is a grand opportunity for this body to demonstrate not only our will but also our commitment to recognize a problem and do something about it before it is too late.

If there is one observation I have after 5½ years of serving in the Senate, 6 years in the House, 4 years as Governor, and 6 years in the State legislature, it is that our political institutions, especially those parts of our political institutions that are under what we call the legislative branch, very seldom act. We react. We react to crisis after crisis; and from 1 week to another we see that crisis talked about, whatever the case may be, on the floor of this great deliberative body.

I think this is a grand opportunity today for all Members of this body to recognize the fact that this is a golden opportunity not to react further. It is an opportunity to act before it is too late.

I believe there is something else our people want to see us do, and that is to do something immediately. This can be an immediate addressing of this problem of the deficit. It will be unprecedented, and it will be, in my opinion, a very pleasant surprise for the American people to wake up tomorrow and read on the front page of every newspaper across this country that the U.S. Senate, finally, in its wisdom and its courage and whatever, resolved to do what was necessary to meet the task.

Whatever is necessary sometimes means doing what is unpopular and what might be misunderstood and to do what, in my opinion, might not be good politics. But I truly believe that we have to put politics aside. We have to put partisanship aside.

I have never been one who has gone along and blamed the President, this President, for the deficit we have now. I think there is enough blame to go around for all of us. I truly believe that in this bipartisan approach, in a fair and equitable approach, we have at least a partial solution to an immediate crisis that we must address at this time.

Yes, we can pick this legislation to pieces. We can bring up arguments about it that might deflect the basic argument. We can bring up those concerns that apply in our own States, such as agriculture, and right down the line.

Mr. President, this is a larger problem than just part of the whole. We have to look at the whole picture, and the whole picture right now is that we are in deep trouble. We are in deep trouble because we have allowed this situation to linger, to fester, to become malignant. It is now time to address this problem, and it is time to address it in the freeze as proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, and the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Once again, I compliment these three fine Senators for addressing this issue in a fair and bipartisan approach, dealing with a deficit with which we must be concerned. Not only must we be concerned, but also, we must be careful this afternoon that we send the right signal to our people and to the financial markets.

Finally, Mr. President, I also compliment the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), who also has been a prime mover of the amendment which is before the Senate this afternoon. His work and his leadership in this area have been absolutely tremendous. As a member of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS recognizes definitely the problems we face, and he recognizes what we have to do in dealing with this problem at this time.

So I say in closing, Mr. President, let us give the American people a pleasant surprise in the morning. Let us do something they do not expect of us. Let us do something that is going to take all our will and all our courage, and try to summon up whatever efforts we can, in order to make certain that the people have credibility in our action and to make them realize that

this body considers the deficit the No. 1 problem in this country at this time, and that we are willing this afternoon to address it head-on and to do something about it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) for his very thoughtful remarks and his support of this proposal, which is not easy for any of us.

I have to wonder how much people care. We have been in this debate since 10:30 this morning, and very few of our colleagues have been on the floor. Maybe nobody really does care. I think the public does. But I wonder where my colleagues are.

I have heard a lot about capping defense and how we simply cannot live with that, that it would damage our defense system; that, as the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said, it would be unilateral disarmament.

I would appreciate someone coming to the floor and moving this debate along. I think we very much need to be able to hear some of the reasons why this is going to be such a terrible plan, and I am certainly looking forward to engaging in that debate.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will yield for a question on the issue of defense, it is my understanding that even should this particular freeze proposal be adopted at this time and be adopted in the other body and be signed into law by the President, this freeze would still entitle a $16 billion growth in our defense outlay. Am I correct?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. The Senator from Arkansas is exactly correct. That is outlays which already have been appropriated and passed, which will be there as an outlay increase in 1985.

In the defense cap, of course, as in all caps, it is just a reflection of budget authority. So it does not stop any program midway. It does not stop a ship that is half built, for example. But it will require some tough decisions of that outyear spending.

Mr. PRYOR. I have one final comment in response to the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I was not on the floor yesterday afternoon when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Senator STENNIS, was speaking. I think the subject at that moment was the Hollings amendment then pending before the Senate. But it was my understanding, and I certainly do not want to misquote my colleague and dear friend, Senator STENNIS, but it was my understanding that in some areas Senator STENNIS, who I do not think has any equal in the Senate on armed services matters, stated some of these procurements of the DOD could be postponed without jeopardizing our national defense. Once again I do not know whether he was speaking directly to this point—I am not saying he is a supporter of the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, but I think generally I understood his statement to be that some of these procurement items could be postponed without jeopardizing our national defense posture.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Not being a member of the Armed Services Committee I would not want to comment. I certainly believe so. Many thoughtful analysts of the defense budget, as a matter of fact, feel very strongly that they should be actually in order to strengthen our defense posture, that we only weaken ourselves if we become so flabby, so to speak, that we have a technology and systems that have outran manpower to operate those systems, or vice-versa.

I think actually what this simply does for 1985 is focus on some of those very important decisions that will have to be made by the Department of Defense, and none of us want to see our defense posture weakened. As a matter of fact, I think good arguments can be made, if there were those on the floor who disagree with this plan, that this strengthens our defense system.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABDNOR). The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, in the Middle Ages persons who were accused of witchcraft were bound hand and foot and the veracity of the charges of witchcraft against them were proven by throwing this person bound hand and foot into the nearest lake or stream.

It was believed that if the person so bound sank and drowned, it was deemed to be proof that the charge was baseless and the person was innocent of the charge of witchcraft, but if the person floated, then it showed that the person was in fact a witch and was plucked out of the water and burned at the stake.

Senators, I believe, as they consider this amendment, may have some difficulty trying to figure out whether they want to float or sink, because we are presented with really a choice which is at best unpalatable on either side and really quite risky from a political standpoint and which, in fact, from a deeper sense than how it may affect the fortune of any political party or any candidates really has an element of risk. Whether we pass or defeat this amendment, it has an element of risk for our country as well.

I think most Senators understand the issue very clearly and so I am not trying to persuade anyone, but I wish to explain how I am going to vote and how I decided whether I wanted to float or sink.

I have decided, and I did so not easily, I must say, but after very careful thought and reflection of the risk on both sides, that I am going to support the proposal brought forward by our colleague, Senator KASSEBAUM, and Senator GRASSLEY, Senator BIDEN, and Senator BAUCUS, and I wish to at the outset——

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORTON. Does that constitute a sink or a float?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I invite the Senators and others who may be tuned in to stay tuned in and judge for themselves.

I wish, before I explain the basis of my vote, to congratulate my colleagues for the initiative that they have taken. They have succeeded, whether it passes or not, in bringing to the Senate the most persuasive, most serious alternative to the so-called Rose Garden plan that has been presented or that is likely to be presented.

Starting so far as I know with just three or four Members of this body, it has now assumed the proportions of a nationwide movement, enjoying the support and endorsement of some of the most thoughtful and influential organizations in this country, membership organizations with millions of members in agriculture, business, the professions, the arts, in every State and many communities across this country.

I think to bring that kind of issue forward, particularly something as basically difficult as an alternative budget and something which shows as much courage as a budget freeze, to bring it from ground zero to the kind of support it is going to have here today I think is an extraordinary achievement, and I congratulate them for it.

I do not know whether this thing is going to pass or not. I hope it does pass. But whether it does or not, they have succeeded in bringing into focus for the first time really the seriousness of this issue.

Mr. President, I also wish to acknowledge especially my colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle who have stood up to be counted on this issue, and I say so as a lifelong Republican and a loyal member of my party and a person who has stumped, I think, in practically every State of the Union as well as my own State of Colorado for the candidates of my party, and I will bet on 500 occasions I have criticized the other party for being irresponsible in the treatment of taxpayer funds and in the failure of the Democratic Party to balance the budget, but I must say that within the last month I have seen greater signs of true statesmanship from the other

side of the aisle than at any time I can recall. I listened with great interest to the presentation of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) a day or two ago on this freeze proposal when he spoke so eloquently about this issue, and I must say I found it very persuasive. Indeed my own decision to support this measure came during the deliberations of the Budget Committee when I heard the presentation made on this matter by Senator BIDEN and, as he reeled off all the reasons that he was supporting as someone who has not been previously deeply associated with drastic budget cutting efforts, it just came to me if he could take that kind of step of faith as a Democrat to come as far as he is comming toward balancing the budget, then Republicans should be able to do at least as well, and I personally will be very much embarrassed if there are not at least as many Republicans who stand up to be counted on this issue on this day at this moment in the history of our country as there are Democrats. I do not know how it is going to turn out. I have not seen the whip check. But I will just tell you that I believe that the Democracts in this Chamber have done a great service to their country and to their party by the thoughtful and responsible way that they have approached this, and I intend to approach it with what I hope will be a similar degree of responsibility and thoughtfulness.

Then briefly just to explain why I am going to vote for this, it is very simple. I think we have reached such a desperate situation in this country that the risks of voting for this and even of adopting this, of enacting it into law, are far less than the risk of adopting a lesser measure of budgetary restraint.

I do not want to cut defense. I do not even want to freeze defense. I think we live in a very dangerous world which is made safer to a measurable degree by the defense buildup of the last 2 or 3 years. I do not happen to think that the security and peace of the world hinges solely on U.S. defense preparedness. It also depends in large measure upon our strength of purpose, on our adherence to the highest ethical and moral traditions of our country, upon the persuasiveness and ingenuity of our diplomacy and indeed upon the strength of our economy which is so greatly threatened by the budget deficits but, nonetheless, after everything else is said and done talk about the war of ideas and about diplomacy in the United Nations, and so on, I still think the cornerstone of peace in the world is U.S. military preparedness. That is essential, and I am loathe to restrain the growth of defense spending, particularly since we went through a decade in which defense was, as the Senator from Texas loves to say, and properly, when defense was underfunded, and we have just had a couple of years now in which we have begun to make back some of the gains that were needed to make up for losses that we suffered during the 1970's.

We are beginning to modernize the fleet. We are beginning to bring on line new weapons systems in the Air Force that we need. We are deploying the new M-1 tank, which has proven to be enormously capable in its deployment in Europe. We have given the troops a long overdue pay raise and have restored a degree of fair treatment for them. And I am loathe to do anything which would undermine our efforts in that respect.

Yet I am willing to make a big sacrifice on something I think is important by freezing defense spending in order to get the other freezes in this bill.

I do not like to see us freeze some of the domestic programs, either. There are some that I do not have much trouble about freezing. There are some that I would not have any trouble abolishing; some that I think are obviously wasteful and extravagant.

But, for the most part, that is not the case. Most of the programs, even the ones that are not particularly near and dear to me, are useful, are meritorious, do some good for somebody. Probably every program in the budget, even those that I might think are foolish or ill-considered or extravagant, are important to somebody.

But I am just convinced that there is a certain point at which you cannot try to fine tune, that you have got to make a gaged policy decision of how important do you think it is to balance this budget. Is it important enough to take some chances? I think it is. Is it important enough to make some compromises? I conclude that I am ready to compromise almost anything. I am ready even to restrain the growth of defense. I am ready to vote, as I did last week, for the tax component of this package. It is just a matter of how important I evaluate the problem.

Now, why is it so serious that we do something more about the deficit than is suggested by the Rose Garden budget or the leadership budget, as it is called? The reason, I think, is very simple and certainly does not require any explanation from me.

Our economy is in very shaky shape. Business is good; employment is good around the country. There are a lot of favorable straws in the wind. But there is also evident, in conversations with businessmen and women, investors and economists, a growing realization that this thing could unravel very quickly; that, indeed, with the enormous deficits that are in prospect—$200 billion this year, next year, and the year after that—that if we do not do something to get those under control, increased interest rates are inevitable and with that there will surely come rising inflation, rising unemployment, and perhaps a prolonged period of economic stagnation. Indeed, that process is already well underway.

You know, interest rates today are not the same as they were 6 months or 1 year ago. As a matter of fact, they are about 2 full percentage points higher than they were 12 months ago. I am talking about the prime rate; I am talking about mortgage lending rates. And it appears to me that we have had the last uptick in interest rates that we can stand before this thing really begins to fall apart, the last uptick in interest rates that we can stand before homebuilding just comes to an absolute stop, automobile sales really begin to fall apart, and we see a serious rise in unemployment which, indeed, already haunts many areas of the country. That is why it is so serious.

The second reason why I am in favor of a different plan than the rose garden plan is not just that I think we need to do more in the way of deficit reduction than is suggested by the Rose Garden budget, but because we need to do something which is effective at once. Now, one of the features of the leadership plan, which was narrowly recommended by the Budget Committee, is that it is heavily backloaded; that is, most of the real savings and deficit reductions occur not now, but after the next election, in the second and third year of the projected plan, at a time when many people suspect that the savings will be undone.

The plan brought forth by Senators KASSEBAUM, GRASSLEY, BIDEN, and BAUCUS does not work that way. It makes the savings now when they will do the most good from an economic standpoint and when they are the most credible.

In my opinion—and you can all make your own judgment—but in my opinion, anything which happens in the way of budget savings before the election is about 500 times as credible as anything which is scheduled to take place after the election.

Up on Wall Street and out on Main Street, frankly, they are laughing at our efforts to control the Federal deficit. And all this talk about how brave we are going to be after the election, about all the budget cuts that are going to go into effect after the election, that does not impress anybody.

I guess I do not want to overstate it, and I certainly do not mean to give offense to my colleagues, but all of this agonizing over making large budget cuts that do not go into effect for 2 or 3 years does not enhance the reputation of this body, either for economic horsesense or credibility. They are laughing at us out in the country where decisions are being made about interest rates and investments and the

things that are the economic future of this country.

So, in summary, that is why I like this plan, because it is bolder than what has been proposed, because it acts sooner, because it is before the election, and because it affects virtually every program of Government. It does not exempt any of the ones that are the most sensitive.

Now, it would be so tempting to say "Couldn't we carve out this particular program because it is so sensitive? The dollars are not very big. It affects millions of people. There is an election coming up." On that basis we could exempt practically every single spending function in this budget, because to somebody everything is sensitive. I could do without any more bus depots in Miami, but I doubt if the Senators from Florida could. And maybe they could say let us do away with something out in Colorado, and I might find that hard to do. Indeed, that is how we got into this mess is by horse trading for increased spending for every category and function of the Federal budget.

What our four colleagues have done is brought us a budget proposal which, for the first time, gets us into a horse trading process for budget restraint in which I have to put on the table things that are near and dear to my heart in order to get other Senators who have pet projects that they feel keenly about to come to the table and say, "I am willing to make a sacrifice in those." I think that is about the only way we are going to do it.

Now, I wish to comment briefly on the defense issue from the standpoint of how it will really affect our ability to cope with our adversaries, especially with the Soviet Union, or other threats. I am very much concerned about that.

While I do not share the belief that some have expressed, particularly the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that this constitutes unilateral disarmament—indeed, I would hope, upon reflection, that he would not so characterize it—nonetheless, I do think freezing the budget, even freezing it at the highest levels we have ever seen in peace or war, nonetheless, is a serious step. And before I was ready to take it, I sought advice from people whose judgment I respect.

I want to tell you what one person who served in the President's Cabinet—he does not presently serve in the President's Cabinet—who served in the Pentagon, who has a lifelong association with the defense establishment of this country, who is an authority, who is a graduate of one of our military academies, and who, I stress, has served in the position of cabinet level responsibility, told me about defense spending. He told me everything except, "Go ahead and quote me directly."

He said:

> If you went through the Pentagon and fired half of the people over there, the result would be to strengthen, not to weaken our defense. The reality of it is we have got so many people running around shuffling papers, creating priorities, monitoring these programs, that they are impeding, not enhancing, the defense capability of this country.

Now, I do not know whether this is really true or not. I sense that it is. I have been through a few business reorganizations. I once had the unhappy job 25 years ago of taking over a company that some people had driven right to the brink of bankruptcy. And, like a darn fool, I stepped in and said, "Well, I think I can straighten this thing out," and finally I did.

But, out of that experience, and some others I have had, I am convinced that, in many cases, a leaner staff is a stronger staff; a leaner staff is a more effective staff, not just more cost effective, but actually more mission effective.

I believe that there is at least a possibility that large savings can be made in the Defense Establishment in a way that would not only not harm but might actually enhance our defense preparedness. But, even if I did not think that was true, I would still vote for this budget because I think at this point the overriding consideration is to avoid the kind of financial catastrophe which I believe is in prospect.

Mr. President, I was thinking as I walked over here of that soliloquy of Hamlet where he said, "To be or not to be." And I cannot quote it. I have not looked at it since I was in school, but I remember one of the lines out of that was the question of whether it is nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune or whether to take arms against them, or something to that effect.

And the point it comes down to—and I see the Senator from Washington, who is an authority on such matters, is on his feet—but does the Senator not recall that Hamlet summed up by saying something to this effect:

> Thus does conscience make cowards of us all and rather we bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of?

That is really the issue in this amendment. Shall we just keep going on down the road we have been on? Shall we just bear the ills we have? Shall we leave this thing on autopilot? Shall we have deficits of $200 billion or $300 billion every year out into the future? Or is it at long last time for us to do something that is bold enough to really make a dent in this?

Now, 5 years ago, I got up on this floor and I argued as forcefully as I could that it was time to start getting this thing back on track. And I could not persuade a majority then. And I did it 4 years ago, and I was joined by the Senator from Iowa and many who are in the Chamber. And, time after time, many of us have warned, including, I note, the Senator from Washington, who is the acting manager of this legislation, have warned that we would finally come to the point where the situation would be truly desperate.

And, unfortunately, Congress had declined to deal with this problem when it could have done so easily, and relatively without pain. Now we find ourselves with what may turn out to be the last chance to cope with this before we drive the Nation's economy off the cliff. Maybe this is not the last chance. Maybe there is one more chance in the debt. Maybe there is one more opportunity. Maybe we can put another band-aid on it, and come back in 6 or 8 months after the election when it is alleged we will have a lot more courage because we will all have been reelected, the President will have been reelected and there will still be time to save the country from permanent damage as a result of these horrendous deficits. Maybe—I do not think there is any dead certainty that is true.

Personally, I say as one who is a candidate for reelection in November, I do not think the Senate is going to be any more courageous after some of us have been elected than now because there is going to be another crop of people running for reelection in 1986. There is also an election coming up. The best course and the best politics for the country is to do the best we can; that, in my opinion, is to vote for the freeze amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. I would be happy to ask the Senator a question. The Senator quoted a reliable source. That is what the press does all the time. I wish we could know the names of the person quoted because, quite frankly, I find some of the reliable sources quoted by the press from time to time are not very reliable.

Did this reliable source tell the Senator how much could be saved by cutting the civilian bureaucracy in the Pentagon in half? Incidentally, I would like to do that. The Armed Services Committee is undertaking quite a massive study which will be released pretty soon. It will indicate there is some reorganization that needs to be done. But he specified a saving that could be achieved over 3 years by cutting the civilian bureaucracy in the Pentagon in half.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me make it absolutely clear that the point which I was making—and I was quoting a source which I am not privileged to name but I may call him on the

phone, and ask if I may not only mention him publicly but in fact insert in the RECORD——

Mr. TOWER. I have been trying to get him on the phone all morning. He is out of pocket——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. A letter which he has written me. But his point is not that we would make large dollar savings. We might do that. His point was that we would improve the effectiveness of the Pentagon and the military operation. Here is his reasoning. His reasoning is that we have layered in so many additional points of reference, points of approval, checks and cross-checks, so many bureaucratic imperatives that it becomes impossible to produce new weapons, to develop new strategies, to organize and reorganize, or even to fight a war, if it should ever come to that. I do not know whether that is true. I am not an authority on that. I do not claim it is true. But it sounds true.

Mr. TOWER. I do not necessarily disagree with everything the Senator said, but did he make reference to how much of this is congressionally mandated?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not.

Mr. TOWER. Congress has gotten into the micromanagement of the Defense Department. The Congress created the Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs position.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the Senator would yield, let me tell the Senator from Texas that I am in the process of writing an article on this subject because it is evident to me that an enormous part of the extra cost of running the Pentagon has been mandated by the Congress of the United States, by people who have bases in their States or districts which they do not want to see closed, and by people who have manufacturing operations in their States or districts which they want to continue in operation. I am turning over in my mind the propriety of mentioning specific examples of weapons systems which year after year have been recommended for no funding by the Air Force which somehow show up in the budget year after year, specifically in the appropriations bills as they come over from the House, and airplanes that continue to be built long after they have been recommended for disapproval by the Air Force, and other weapons as well. The point that is made by the Senator from Texas is absolutely right.

I say that as one who in his own State military installations which I would not like to see closed. But I would say to the Senator, and to my colleagues, if there are military functions or other functions in my State which we can do without, or missions which can be more effectively or more economically performed elsewhere, I say close them down in Colorado. Put them in where this could be best done for the country.

Mr. TOWER. That is what the Senator from Colorado says. I know him to be a man of his word, that he would perhaps vote to shut down all the commissaries, would vote to permit the Department of Defense to close bases with no notice to Congress, to shut them down and walk away from them; he would be prepared to vote to eliminate Davis-Bacon as it applies, and he would be prepared to eliminate the restraints of contracting out. There are a number of things that I am sure the Senator from Colorado would be willing to vote for, including voting against all the congressional add-ons on the defense budget, and all the congressionally mandated waste. But what assurance can he give me that the majority of the Congress will do that? Can you realistically assume that Congress is going to eliminate all of the congressionally mandated waste? The Congress will not, I can assure you. If you make the Draconian cuts in defense, you can bet your bottom dollar that everybody is going to be protecting his own interest. That will make sure that the cuts do not come out of his hide.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield, I would be happy to respond to that. I will do so briefly. It is very possible that the Senator from Texas is correct. He is among the most experienced Members of this body in the process he has described. He has personally seen it over and over again. He has been a leader in trying to bring some degree of coherence, commonsense to our defense requirements, and to preclude the kind of log rolling that he has just described. I honor him and congratulate him for it.

I will admit there is a good chance the kind of cynical approach that he has describe would prevail. But let me urge him to consider that there might be another outcome: that a new day could be dawning, even in this Chamber. The amendment, which our four colleagues bring us, may in fact be the evidence of this. If this gets as big a vote as I think it is going to—I do not know whether it is going to be passed, and I would be amazed if it did not get 30, 35, or maybe 40 votes—it will be a turning point, whether it passes or not, of extraordinary significance. It will mean a truly bipartisan group is sticking their necks out in a way that Senators to my recollection have never previously been known to do. If an impossible dream can come true on this bill, perhaps an impossible dream could come true in the kind of process that the Senator from Texas describes.

Mr. PRYOR. Will the Senator yield? I hope the Senator from Colorado takes note that this Democratic Senator has crossed over the aisle and has joined his rank over here temporarily to say how much——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Could we strike that "temporarily" from the RECORD?

Mr. PRYOR. It was temporary. Maybe my colleagues do not like the temporary part on my side. I say sincerely to the Senator from Colorado how very much I appreciate his statesmanlike approach to this issue, and laying partisanship aside. Getting where we must go to pass such a resolution or such an amendment as this is going to take a bipartisan approach. The Senator from Colorado has so well set the stage, as have the four cosponsors of this legislation, to bring it to the Senate's attention at this time. I truly believe this is one of the most statesmanlike addresses or speeches that I have heard in this body for a long time. I am deeply appreciative of the Senator from Colorado for making that statement.

If I could just add this: As I go home and talk about this deficit, as I know all of us do, the thing that rings the bell more than anything else with any audience is when I say let us put partisanship aside and let us approach this on a bipartisan nature. This deficit, this issue, and this concern belongs to all of us. The blame is on all of us.

I want to thank the Senator from Colorado. I will return to my side of the aisle. I wanted to come over here and make that statement.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I say thanks to the Senator from Arkansas and tell him that I hope his brief visit to our side of the aisle has been something which he found rewarding, that he felt at home here, and that he will come back often. I thank him for his leadership and statesmanship as well.

Mr. BAUCUS. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My intention is to yield the floor. May I do that?

Mr. BAUCUS. I want to congratulate the Senator, too, on his statement. I know, as has been stated by the Senator from Arkansas, what a difficult decision this was for the Senator from Colorado. I can tell from the statement the Senator from Colorado has made that he has spent a lot of time thinking about it. I want to thank the Senator for taking the time; and I want to compliment him for joining us in a very bipartisan way, in a nonpartisan way to try to get the ball moving in the right direction. All of us as Americans have to make the sacrifice. I want to compliment the Senator.

The second point I would like to make is in response to the statement made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I think in some sense all of us in this Chamber appear to agree with a large portion of what the chairman said. Many Members of

the Congress will be tempted to keep their local commissaries open, their local bases open. Many Members of the House and Senate would be tempted to propose add-ons for home consumption purposes. However, Members of the House and the Senate would be much less inclined to vote for those add-ons, much less inclined to try to keep their own local pork barrel, if for a greater goal and a greater purpose they wanted a stronger national economy.

What I am saying is that the days of pork barrel are over, or almost over. I say that because we can no longer afford those excesses as much as we were able to. We cannot do that any more.

I submit that most Members of the House and Senate will be much less inclined to support pork barrel proposals in this new era.

I want to underscore what the Senator from Colorado has said. This country wants to maintain our national security. But the country also wants us to attack the budget deficit. And therefore Senators will become less inclined to vote for frills and appropriations that are not essential. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his kind words. I congratulate him on his leadership and statesmanship, and tell him what a tremendous encouragement it is to me to tell him that there is at least one more man from La Mancha in this Chamber. I think the Senator is right. I think times are changing. There are going to be a lot of Senators who will be coming through. Some are starting now.

My guess is when the world sees the vote we are going to get on this amendment, a lot of the old attitudes he has referred to will begin to crumble and today or some day soon the attitudes in this Chamber and country will change very much on logrolling, on porkbarrel projects.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of floor managing for the proponents of the bill, the opponents to the present resolution, for a period of something more than 2 hours at this point. I have listened to the eloquence of the Senator from Iowa, I may say before I mention anyone else, also to the magnificent point he made about sacred cows, about those things which the President tells us we cannot touch, about those things which the Speaker of the House of Representatives tells us are beyond limit, to the point at which there is practically nothing in the budget which is not a sacred cow.

I have listened to my very good friend, the Senator from Kansas, who was a spearhead in reaching the pattern of this amendment; to the distinguished Senator from Montana and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. And now, perhaps most eloquently of all, to the Senator from Colorado.

I guess my reaction has to be that I agree, for all practical purposes, with everything they say about the condition of the country and the necessity for a sharp, decisive and perhaps an overwhelming attack on budget deficits.

As each of them know, I have been a part of just such attacks myself, including the authorship of the budget resolution which was ultimately successful last year.

I regret to say, however, that I cannot follow them to the conclusion which they have reached, that this specific amendment should be supported.

I say to the Senator from Colorado that he referred to two sections of Hamlet, I believe the third soliloquy. The first part of the quote was whether in the mind it is better to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, and at that point he lost the drift of it. The next line, as I understand it, goes "or to take arms against a sea of troubles and by opposing end them."

I must say to him despite his statement about a secret source as background in the Department of Defense, more than anything else the concern I have with this amendment is whether or not should it pass we will have arms to take against that sea of troubles.

Generally speaking, I have been something of a thorn in the side of the Senator from Texas since I have been here, at least since 1981, and have consistently voted——

Mr. TOWER. Only a very small one, like a rose

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from Texas. That was not the way I was described by him last year, however.

In this case, it seems to me that there are two overwhelming effects to this budget resolution as it relates to defense.

The first is there is not a Member of this body who has not given at least lip service to having some kind of plan which goes for a period in excess of 1 year with respect to our defense priorities, our planning, even 3, or 3 years not being truly long-range planning. And yet year after year, starting long before I became a Member of this body, we have vascillated from one extreme to another, a panic which has caused us to increase the defense budget at a rate which at times may be too much to be efficiently absorbed by the economy, or for that matter by the Defense Department, to one in which the defense budget seems to be the symbol of all that is wrong with budgeting in the United States, at which point we freeze it, or drop it, or increase it slightly, very little from the mark of zero.

Even the Senator from Colorado would be forced to admit that this is just another chapter in exactly that kind of process.

Second, it seems to me that while I cannot subscribe to everything which I suspect the Senator from Texas is about to say, that some, at least a very significant portion, at least, of the savings proposed in this amendment are likely not to be realized by reason of liabilities pursuant to contracts which have already been signed.

As a consequence, I have labored long and hard to find it in my heart to support this amendment because it does very dramatically attack budget deficits. But I do not think that with respect to the defense of the United States, or with respect to the national security of the United States, which, after all, must be the most fundamental of all the concerns with which we deal here as Members of the Congress of the United States, that this is a responsible proposal, that is to say a proposal which can appropriately become part of the law of the United States.

There is a second area of criticism about this proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, the ranking minority member of the Budget Committee. That is that it seems to me that when we attack seriously these budget deficits we must look at both sides of the equation.

The President's proposal, which I believe to be inadequate, nonetheless is reasonably balanced among tax increases, domestic spending cuts, and cuts in the defense budget. Because there are no additional revenues in this proposal, it is disproportionate enough so that it seems to me highly unlikely that it can be passed or accepted in its present form by the Congress or the President of the United States or, for that matter, that it would be just to do so. As a consequence, it is with great regret that I find myself unable to vote for a proposal which is backed by a significant number of the Members of this body whom I most significantly, most greatly, respect.

I have to say one other thing, Mr. President. It seems to me that, in the deepest and most profound sense, this amendment is a confession of frustration and failure. Not a single Member here, whether he or she favors the amendment or opposes it, believes that the proper way to deal with a budget deficit is to deal in an identical fashion with every single spending program of the United States. Important and unimportant, social and defense, infrastructure-oriented, education-oriented, or the like, the proponents of the amendment say, "Well, we would like to evaluate each program. We would like to treat each of them differently,

but we cannot; there are too many sacred cows. The only possibility of passing anything is to freeze everything." I have gone through the same experiences during the course of the last 3 years that they have. I am not yet, however, ready to admit that we simply have to throw up our hands, that we can no longer make value judgments of any kind.

I believe—I firmly believe, Mr. President—that there is a way much more significantly to reduce budget deficits than would be the case should the rose garden package be accepted and adopted by the Senate, but one which, nevertheless, treats different categories of expenditures in a different fashion; one which, nevertheless, at the very minimum, meets our treaty obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance with respect to defense, which deals decisively with entitlement programs, which deals somewhat differently with nondefense discretionary expenditures, and which deals with the very real need for some additional revenue. I have worked on such a proposal. I cannot even tell the Members of the Senate at the present time precisely what it is going to include, but I must say that I do not believe that this body, this body elected by the people of the United States to make value judgments, to take hard votes and make difficult decisions, need throw up its collective hand and simply say the only thing we can do is freeze everything, vital and unimportant, essential to the future of the United States and to social justice in this country or totally irrelevant to those ends.

I believe that even though it may take us a little longer, we must struggle on, that we must find a way to do more than the proposal which is before us and than the Baker amendment may do, but which nevertheless does more carefully evaluate the various programs and the varied responsibilities of the Members of this body.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, with great regret and having been exceedingly tempted to support this proposal, that I must say that I do not think it is the best of which we are capable and that I am afraid that it should be defeated.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the so-called Rose Garden proposal was the product of a series of meetings in the Cabinet room which, I can assure the Senate, would in no way have resembled a rose garden. That was a hard-headed negotiation dealing with all aspects of the national budget. The result of that was that the President agreed to come down substantially in his request for defense expenditures. It was not an easy agreement to make, and I want to comment a little on that.

The effect of the amendment that is before the Senate now would be to freeze defense expenditures at the level of appropriations to date. The cap that is in the amendment does not include $1.2 billion for the 1984 pay raise or the other pending supplemental requests that are before us. The cap before us does not provide anything for inflation. So it is not a cap. It is an $11 billion program cut, or even more, depending on how you want to deal with inflation.

Beyond that, it would foreclose the savings that would be brought about by such procurement initiatives as multiyear contracting. It would require the termination, for instance, of the current B-1 bomber contract. That termination would cost the taxpayers $1 billion in liabilities, penalties, and lost savings—nearly more money than the increase needed to continue it. The impact of this, to say the least, would be that, while it might appear to make a savings for 1985, it would actually increase the cost of this program for defense.

I remind the Senate that the defense portion of the budget bore 50 percent of the reduction that came to the Senate by virtue of the so-called rose garden proposal. This would add considerably to the reductions in the availability of money for defense.

One of the things that it would do would be to prevent our complying with agreements we have made with our NATO partners—the cruise missile deployment, for instance. In my judgment, the passage of this amendment would require the withdrawal of substantial numbers of troops from Europe.

Mr. President, I have been one of those arguing against the increase in troops, in Europe, but I have never advocated the immediate withdrawal of troops. This would start the process of withdrawing troops at a level the Senate really cannot even contemplate. The reason is that we would have to fold into this budget the cost of inflation, cancellation of contracts, and other expenses. Some 50 major systems would be affected by this freeze, but military personnel will also be reduced.

In the process last year, Mr. President, we dealt with a budget limitation of growth of 7 percent. By virtue of the appropriations process, the final growth in 1984 is 3.7 percent. What I am saying is that the budget limitations have been ceilings. Congress has never exceeded those ceilings.

Last year or the year before, I argued against the battleship, I argued against ramping up to the four attack submarines, I argued against increasing the tanks from 720 to 840. I argued against several other increases in procurement under existing programs. I did not categorize the decision of the Senate or the Congress as wasteful or as some sort of congressional giveaway; it was a judgment of the Nation that was made here that the next battleship should be brought out. Each ship will cost $100 million to operate. I ask the sponsors of the amendment, did they vote for the battleship?

When we went into the fourth attack submarine, we increased the cost of the submarine program. I warned that by doing so, we would reach a point where we would vote drastic reductions in future years. Did the sponsors of the amendment vote against the fourth submarine?

What about tanks? We had the request to increase from 720, to ramp up the production. Again, we warned that the increased cost would strain the budget. Again, I ask those who might want to vote for this, did they vote for increasing the 720 tanks to 840?

This amendment will now require us to go back and, as a ceiling, set a 1985 limit that is $36 billion below even the Rose Garden figure. It is $50 billion below the President's budget. That impact will be substantial. It will be substantial, and I do believe that the Senate must address it. I know my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, will address some specifics.

I am concerned about the impact of this amendment on the appropriations process primarily. That is a process that requires us to adopt some forms of savings such as multiyear contracting. We have argued about that in this Chamber, and we adopted multiyear contracting which will bring about significant savings on some of these major weapons systems. This amendment destroys multiyear contracting.

I hope the Senate will take a look at it from the point of view of what it will do. Look at the Black Hawk helicopter and the F-16 fighters. Those are stable, ongoing production programs. Together they offer more than $600 million in savings if we proceed in 1985 under multiyear procurement. If we put on ceilings such as this we cannot afford the front-end investment for multiyear. If we are going only year by year, we cannot make multiyear contracts without incurring these cancellation charges that would come from an amendment such as this, we will be forced to go year by year by year and the cost of these systems will go up and up and up. The only way to achieve modernization is through the savings of multiyear procurement, fixed price contracts, and other practices, and through a constant program which does not ramp down in accordance with whether it is an election year.

I appreciate that there are heavy pressures on the defense budget. We have already conceded a severe reduction. The President has twice indicated a willingness to reduce the original programed level of the budget for defense.

In my opinion, the defense of this Nation ought to be foremost in our mind. Look at the Constitution. It requires us to provide for the common defense and then to think about the general welfare. If we are to follow our constitutional duties, we must think about defense. I hope that everyone will think about the impact of a ceiling which is totally unreasonable from the point of view of ongoing programs. If anyone wants to talk about them after my friend from Texas has completed his statement, I would be pleased to go into some of the systems that will be affected by this amendment.

I am first and foremost, however, worried about manpower. Manpower is still right around 50 percent of the budget. If we mandate a $50 billion reduction in the budget for defense, there is no way that manpower can be exempted. And we cannot achieve any sizable reduction in manpower expenditures without reducing the commitment of forces that we have to NATO and other areas overseas.

Now, this proposed freeze as we interpret it would cut some $5.6 billion from military personnel in the first instance. That does not take into account the redundant costs which must be absorbed if we have to pay the cost of contract cancellation. It will create an unfunded shortage in retirement costs. It will reduce the personnel change-of-station type of move which takes place annually. It will eliminate the pay raise entirely for the military forces. We now have seen the House wishes to keep that to a 3.5-percent level equal to the proposed civilian increase.

Now, I urge the Senate to consider very carefully what it is doing with regard to this concept. We are prepared to come before the Senate and defend each weapon system individually. We know we are going to face attacks on each one of these systems. Let the Senate be the judge of which systems it wants to cut out, which systems it wants to reduce. And does the Senate really want to vote no pay increase for the military for 1985?

There are many other things we could talk about, but I do not think we should afford ourselves the luxury of saying well, we might be willing to take a base closure in our State or someone else's State. That is not the important thing. The effect of this amendment is so drastic that it would require a drawdown of our troops committed to the defense of our interests abroad. Having just returned from a meeting over the weekend with the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) and others dealing with some of our English friends, Members of the Parliament of Great Britain, and facing some of the questions that they have asked us concerning our intentions on NATO. I think it is very unfortunate the first thing we face is an amendment that would undermine our NATO support.

They were asking us if we were going to allow the funds for increasing the stationing of personnel to man the cruise missile sites and to support other NATO modernizations that have been committed to Europe. We assured them that at least we felt there would not be any serious reduction in forces. If this amendment passes, I tell Senators in my judgment it could not have any other result than to mandate a withdrawal of troops in sizable number from our NATO strengths, because the effect would be to reduce our military strengths all over the world.

Now, I urge the Senate to deal with the question of these programs on a basis of the ceilings that have been established under the leadership amendment which incorporates the agreement reached with the President and to deal with each one of these systems individually. I will say again to my friend from Texas, who I see is on his feet and I do want to listen to his remarks, we have reached an understanding that there will be no vast differences between the authorization process and the appropriations process this year so far as the Senate bills are concerned. We are going to work these out in accordance with the agreements we entered into representing our respective committees in the meetings which took place with the President and the Secretary of Defense. The cornerstone of the whole concept we were dealing with in the rose garden proposal was savings in the defense area and we have committed ourselves to those. But to be mandated to make cuts that we know are going to cost more than they will achieve in the long run I think would be improper. I urge the Senate to take a look at this and to listen to my good friend from Texas as he outlines even further the impact of this amendment on the Nation's defense.

Mr. TOWER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER). The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, what has been done in preparation of this plan is to not give proper attention to national security considerations. Now, it is suggested that we must spread the misery equally, so to speak. That is to say they talk about fair shares of reductions in spending. There is nothing fair about this. I will get into that matter later on. I think we make a great error when we think just purely in terms of short-term budgetary considerations, short-term political expediency because what we are talking about now is something that is politically expedient.

I have talked to some who say that nobody wants to cut defense this much. They have tried to cut these things and failed, and therefore they are going to cut defense. That is expediency.

First let us note what this plan will do. This would freeze the defense function at a level of $264 billion, which represents a 6-percent—to be accurate, a 5.9-percent—reduction in real terms. In other words, we are reducing defense spending this year.

We are talking about sending signals. This is a magnificent signal to send to our NATO allies and the Japanese, whom we have been urging to increase their real defense expenditure. Some have done it, but not as much as we would like. The British, in a far worse situation than we are, have increased their defense spending in real terms.

This would place enormous political pressures on those governments to reduce or at least not increase in real terms their defense spending. So we are having an impact on the total military capability of the Western World.

The plan allows 5 percent real growth in fiscal year 1986 and 1987 over a spending level in 1985 which is less in real terms than was provided in 1984.

This is not a 1-year plan. Everybody says it is a 1-year plan. It is not a 1-year plan, because outyear spending is calculated on a drastically reduced fiscal year 1985 baseline. Defense spending will never catch up to the levels contemplated by the President and, may I say, will never catch up to the levels contemplated by Congress itself over the past 3 years.

We have underfunded the Presidential request over 3 years by $41 billion. In any case, we increased it over the previous year in real terms each time.

What we are doing is retreating from the original position of Congress established over the past 3 years, that we have to build up and modernize our defense capability. This is a 180-degree turn for Congress. We are changing national security policy in the name of trying to control the budget. So we will not catch up. We will not even catch up to the levels anticipated by President Carter. We will be well below what the Carter administration's projections were for requirements for defense in this period.

Over the 1985–87 period, the KGB plan cuts $179 billion in budget authority and $118 billion in outlays. This compares with $57 billion in budget authority and $40 billion in outlays for the leadership plan. This represented a substantial compromise for the President, who feels very strongly his responsibility to provide for the security of the United States. I know that he will publicly say that if we are saddled with this kind of spending ceiling, the security of the American people cannot be guaranteed, and

we have gone well below acceptable risk. And he will certainly be right.

This proposes to cut more in defense this year, below the Presidential request, than has been cut in the last 3 years in the aggregate. I do not know where it is going to come from, but let us look at the first year impact: $49.3 billion in budgetary authority and $19.3 billion in outlays from the President's request for fiscal 1985.

It has been argued that DOD could operate in 1985 under the freeze just as it did in 1984; but inflation, as I noted earlier, will reduce the actual buying power of defense dollars by 5.9 percent, which, translated into dollar terms, will cause a real loss of almost $16 billion in purchasing power. That is what we are taking out of defense—$16 billion less than we spent last year; and last year we spent $5 billion below what the first concurrent resolution permitted us to spend.

Only $14 billion of the first year outlay savings, some $5 billion short of the freeze target, could be realized if the entire fiscal year 1985 procurement budget of $108 billion were completely eliminated.

I have to pause for a moment. I apologize. But when my majority leader speaks, I always listen. (Laughter.)

Now, to take up where I was.

Everybody says: "Let's take it out of procurement, not out of operation and maintenance, not out of readiness accounts. Don't dock the military pay. Let's take it out of procurement." We have a very slow spendout in procurement—about a 14-percent spendout in the first year. So if we eliminate the whole $14 billion in outlays for procurement, by eliminating the procurement accounts entirely, we would still be $5 billion short of the outlay figure. Where does that come from? That would mean no new aircraft, missiles, tanks, ships, electronic equipment, rockets, no spares to replenish supplies.

I might note that the distinguished Senator from Alaska has made a very good point. I do not believe it has been calculated here what the stretchouts will cost us, what program cancellations will cost us. We will have to renegotiate some multiyear funding, and that is going to be costly.

What has not been calculated here, either, is that for every billion dollars you spend on procurement, there is about a $40 million or $50 million return to the Treasury. Has anybody considered the Treasury impact, the revenue impact, of cutting procurement? A lot of that money comes back to the Treasury.

I remind Senators that during the recession, the only area in which there was an increase in spending for capital goods was in defense. So if we are worried about economic impact, let us worry about the economic impact of our failure to capitalize adequately our defense industry. Let us consider that. What is it going to cost in jobs and tax revenues? I do not think anybody has calculated that.

Let us look at the economic considerations. It has been suggested that this plan is a fair one because it spreads the burden of cuts evenly. Well, it does not. The only aspect of Federal spending that probably benefits every American equally is defense, because it guarantees each of us the same amount of security from our external enemies, from those who threaten our vital interests abroad. There is nothing fair about a plan that allows Congress to avoid its constitutional responsibility to provide for a strong national defense.

Where in the Constitution is it mandated that we spend money on some of these other things that are not being cut in a greater amount than defense? Where is our sense of priorities? Is defense to be treated equally with Endowment for the Humanities and Endowment for the Arts? They are worthwhile things, but should it be treated equally?

Actually, defense is a primary function of National Government, and National Government has the sole responsibility for defense. It has no responsibility for a number of these other things.

This differs greatly from a program like education. Education is enormously important, but education is a primary responsibility of State and local government, and it has been assumed, too, by private institutions.

If you cut out all the Federal spending on education, it would be a relatively small percentage of what is spent on education in this country.

I submit, if you cut out spending for some of these other things entirely, somehow someone would move in to fill the void.

But if the Federal Government does not spend money on defense, no one does. Defense is the sole responsibility of National Government, a constitutionally mandated authority and responsibility, and one that we appear not to be taking as seriously as we should these days.

Let us look at this business of fairness. Rather than building up, the United States is just now catching up after the sorry record of the 1970's when defense spending as a percentage of GNP hit a low point of 4 percent.

In discussing fairness, it is important to look at what has really driven the deficit. From 1970 to 1983 domestic spending rose from $111 billion to $544 billion, an increase of $433 billion or 390 percent. Defense spending in the same period rose from $82 billion to $210 billion, an increase of $128 billion, or 156 percent.

If you are going to be fair, if you are talking about fairness, why not take 2½ times as much out of domestic spending as you take out of defense spending?

Look at this: Defense spending went up, from 1970 to 1983, 156 percent. Nondefense spending went up 390 percent—390 percent, 2½ times as much.

So what is driving the deficit? Do we not have the guts really—maybe we do not have the guts—to get at the real problem, get a handle on those things that are driving the deficit in the first place?

This is a meat ax approach. The meat ax approach is a copout. It means we do not want to decide what to cut. So we will just have a freeze or cut across the board and therefore we can avoid making the difficult political decisions involved in where the cuts come from.

The proponents of this amendment do not have to make a difficult decision of where the defense cuts are coming from. That is the Armed Services Committee that is saddled with that one. We get that one on our backs.

But we might come to the floor with some recommendations a lot of people are not going to like.

But the Senator from Colorado frankly said a while ago that he could give me no assurance that congressionally mandated waste would be dealt with by this Congress. I wonder if the sponsors of the amendment would amend their amendment or their proposal to provide that Davis-Bacon could be repealed as it applies to military construction, that all statutory restraints on contracting should be removed, that the Department of Defense would be authorized to close a base within 30 days notice to Congress without having to go through environmental impact statements or economic impact or anything like that, that all commissaries would be shut down? Would the sponsors be prepared to add that to their proposal?

That seems to me to be reasonable. It means that the proposers are serious about eliminating some of the congressionally mandated waste. So I challenge them to do that.

Looking again at the period from 1970 to 1983, the economic burden of domestic spending rose from 11.2 percent of GNP to 16.4 percent of GNP; while defense's share fell from 8.2 to 6.3 percent of GNP.

If you are talking serious economics, why not look at the economics of nondefense spending and deal with that?

Let us see where these cuts are going to come from. In order to make intelligent national policy decisions, we should have the highest quality of information available. But in making their proposals, the proponents of the freeze have not explained the source

of the $179 billion reduction. Oh, there have been some vague references to the waste and bureaucracy, but no one has put a dollar figure on it.

Someone suggested spare parts cost too much and cost overruns. What is the dollar figure if we eliminate all cost overruns? As a matter of fact, if we eliminated the purchase of spare parts altogether, you would be surprised how little we would save.

The best way to avoid any cost overruns is just not buy any. But, you know we are doing a lot better in that connection. We have fixed price contracts now. Now we are making contractors eat part of these cost overruns. We are making progress. We are not all the way there yet. But to the extent there is cost overruns, waste, abuse, and fraud, what is the dollar figure on it? How much of that $179 billion can you actually in dollar figures tell me can be amortized?

One way to specify this would be to assume that the proportion of the fiscal year budget allocated to different defense accounts would stay the same over the 1985-87 period. Applying this percentage to the freeze plan, defense budget authority would yield specific account totals. This is compared to the President's request for each account. The cuts in each account over fiscal year 1985-87 would be: Procurement—$80 billion; O&M—$33 billion; RDT&E—$46 billion; and other accounts—$21 billion.

Canceling $80 billion of procurement will mean that a cost growth of approximately $15 billion will occur in these procurement programs because of delayed programs, broken contracts, procurement of weapons systems, and uneconomic production rates, and that has not been figured in what has been proposed here.

I do not know if the proposers of the amendment can tell us what they anticipate in the way of cancellation costs, increases per unit costs, renegotiated contracts, as a result of severe cuts in procurement, and the abolition of multiyear funding. Obviously we cannot have the capitalization of multiyear funding with the freeze proposal. It means actually if you are going to look at economics we are cheating the American people. We are saying we are spending less on defense now and your defense dollar is going to go not nearly so far as it did before. Either we are going to pay $2 billion worth a copy for an airplane, for example, and we are going to have a lot fewer airplanes at a higher price. That is what you are saying. You are not really achieving any savings. What you are doing is reducing the expenditure for 1 year. You are not making any savings.

You are making things cost more, and adding on to it in the outyears, picking up outyear inflation along with the increase per unit cost.

Many Senators on both sides of the aisle who support the freeze will probably object to this proportional cut approach. I noted earlier no one wants to cut readiness and force structure. Then by definition, the procurement account has to bear the brunt of the cuts. That is what you do. Otherwise, you are going to have to reduce steaming days, field days, flying hours, and now, my friend, and this sounds tough, this sounds tough, you are going to accuse me of demagoguery on this one, but I am going to say it anyway, because now you are getting to the point where you are trading blood for money because as we have increased flying hours, we have increased defense funding over the past 3 years, we have had fewer crashes, fewer fatal accidents. It stands to reason the better rehearsed, the better practiced, the better trained our people are, the less likelihood there is of accidents, and when you have to go into combat, the less likelihood that you are going to get killed.

Now, that is a fact of life.

Will anybody tell me that if there are two football teams of virtually equal talent, one of them trains 3½ days a week, the other one trains 5 days a week, which is likely to win the ball game on Saturday, given the fact that they are of roughly equal capability? I began to say the Cowboys and Redskins, but I will not do that.

One thing we could do is take the most controversial of the systems. Let us just wipe out the most controversial of the systems. Let us include the B-1, the MX, the Divad gun, the DDG-51 destroyer, the Trident submarine, battleship reactivations, the Bradley fighting vehicle, the KC-135 reengining program, and the strategic defense initiative.

Now, there are some big ticket items. Those are the most controversial. Let us say we can knock all of those out because they are controversial or at least have been in recent years.

Then, what, in fact, does that save? For fiscal year 1985 cancellation of those programs would yield $22 billion in BA cuts compared to the freeze target of $49 billion, and only $4.2 billion in outlay cuts, compared to the target of $19 billion.

So you still have a long way to go on BA and outlays. Where is the outlay money coming from? Where is it coming from? Operations and maintenance? Pay? Take it out of pay?

Taking all $179 billion of cuts out of procurement would be an immense undertaking. To give some sense of the magnitude of weapons reductions necessary to achieve this total, I ask unanimous consent to have the following table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEZING NATIONAL SECURITY: CUTTING TOP 50 DEFENSE PROGRAMS CRIPPLES DEFENSE BUT STILL MISSES FREEZE TARGET

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	Quantity	Amount
Eliminate the "Top 50" defense programs for three consecutive years including:		
Tactical aircraft (F-14, F-15, F-16, AV-8B, JVX, AH-64, HH-60D, UH-60, P-3C, SH-60B, E-2C, EA-6B, derivative fighter, trainers, AHIP)	2,350	$53.5
Combat vehicles (M-1, Bradley FVS)	4,700	9.9
Ships (SSN-688, DDG-51, CG-47, TAO-187, AOE, LPD, LPH, and CV SLEP's)	39	30.3
Tactical missiles and torpedoes (Patriot, Maverick, Stinger, Phoenix, HARM, AMRAAM, MLRS, MK-48)	54,930	16.2
Strategic programs (SDI, Trident sub, Trident II missile, MX, B-1)		53.0
Other (C3I, C-5B, KC-135 reengine, C-17, Tomahawk, Divad, Lantirn)		19.4

Mr. TOWER. What is most apparent in all of the debate is that the Soviet threat has simply not been addressed. We have heard nothing from the supporters of this plan concerning this assumption about current and future Soviet military developments.

Can the proposers of the plan—and I invite their attention to what I am about to say—can the proposers of this plan guarantee me that the United States will not be more vulnerable to attack, that our vital interests abroad will not be more vulnerable to a challenge by Soviets and Soviet surrogates? Can they guarantee me that?

We have heard nothing about the effect on future arms control negotiations if we make these substantial cuts. Can the proposers guarantee me that this will be an incentive to the Soviets to negotiate arms reductions with us? Why should they? If we are going to unilaterally agree to disarm ourselves, what incentive is there to the Soviets to negotiate arms reductions?

Now, some have suggested that the freeze would give us time to sort out the fundamental causes of our predicament. While we grow weaker and weaker sorting things out, the Soviet Union knows exactly where it is going. As Harold Brown, former Secretary of Defense once said: "When we build, they build. When we stop, they build."

Even given the President's funding, we are well behind Soviet production in weapons systems. You cut out that funding or reduce it substantially, and you can see what happens. The threat against the United States increases. Our ability to meet that threat decreases.

Let us look at some examples. Over the next 3 years the USSR will build 6,900 tanks, 13,650 armored vehicles, 2,520 tactical combat aircraft, 21 attack submarines, and 9 SSBN craft. Under the President's original request, the United States would build 2,160

tanks, 2,510 armored vehicles, 1,050 tactical combat aircraft, 12 attack submarines, and 3 SSBN craft. If all of the U.S. effort were canceled, it would only yield 3-year spending cuts of $34 billion—far short of the $179 billion freeze target.

How can any of the proponents of this amendment say that this enhances our ability to deter attack against us, our ability to protect our vital interests abroad, our ability to support our foreign policy objectives? I would be delighted to engage in a colloquy on that subject with them if they can explain to me how we benefit in that regard.

Mr. MELCHER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MELCHER. I have been listening to the distinguished Senator's comments. I may have missed a part of them, but I have not heard research and development funds mentioned. Is it not true, as we occasionally read, that that is about $28 billion a year?

Mr. TOWER. We can put the chart back up that shows the percentage that would come out of R&D. We can show you the dollar figure on that. Research and development would be docked about $46 billion. That is over a 3-year period.

Mr. MELCHER. I think the figure we read occasionally is $28 billion a year. Is that accurate?

Mr. TOWER. $34 billion is in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985 RDT&E.

Mr. MELCHER. $34 billion?

Mr. TOWER. Yes. That is a fairly fast spendout item. So you could achieve some immediate outlay savings by a severe reduction of research and development.

It seems to me we would really be mortgaging the future in that instance because the Russians are acquiring our technology by various means and incorporating it into their weapons systems faster than we can.

Now, the Senator from New Hampshire wanted me to yield to him and he has been waiting patiently. So I will be delighted to yield to him at this point if he would like to make a comment.

Mr. RUDMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for one comment?

Mr. RUDMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just want to say to my good friend from Texas that I compliment him on his remarks today. It has been a privilege to work with him on this issue and I hope the U.S. Senate was listening.

I do have a question. I was not here all afternoon. Did I hear that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports this freeze?

Mr. TOWER. That is what I have been told; that the U.S. Chamber supports it.

Mr. DOMENICI. They did not make an exception for defense? They want to freeze everything, is that correct?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield; yes, that is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand that the National Association of Manufacturers supports it, is that correct?

Mr. TOWER. I understand they support the KGB amendment, as well.

Mr. DOMENICI. I would like them, if they are within earshot, to know that I will have something to say about their position before the afternoon is over. I am very disappointed, having supported them in many causes in the past, for them to be here today in the name of fiscal sanity, asking us to perform the kind of insanity on defense. They are usually up here asking us to make sure we protect their freedom. I hope they are listening because I will have some more to say about it before the afternoon is over.

Mr. SYMMS. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. RUDMAN. I am not even sure the Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. SYMMS. I keep hearing it said here that this is necessary and it is all fair and all even. But if it is a freeze and all fair and all even, how come half of the cuts come out of 25 or 30 percent of the budget, or is it really not a freeze?

Mr. TOWER. Actually, it is about 43 percent. As I understand, they calculate the 3-year deficit reductions at about $270 billion. And the outlays out of defense would be about $118 billion. But that is 43 percent out of 29 percent of the budget. And it is that portion of the budget that has grown slowly. The fact is nondefense spending has increased at a far greater magnitude. But we treat everything as equal. This is supposed to be fair. There is nothing fair about it, obviously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. RUDMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas. I will not speak for very long.

Mr. President, this amendment has probably caused me more personal anguish in terms of how to vote on it, because it is a very appealing amendment and it is an amendment that does, in total, what I really believe ought to be done.

For instance, I do not believe that the so-called rose garden proposal is adequate. Chances are that if the other amendments that I understand may be coming on the floor are, in fact, proposed, then there is a good chance I will vote for them, as well as, in the final analysis, voting for that proposal which is described as a leadership proposal.

Mr. President, I serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I would say, not in any way of being boastful, but just as a matter of observation, that I believe in 3½ years, I have missed exactly 1 hour of one hearing that that subcommittee held.

I consider it probably the most grave of the responsibilities that I bear in this Senate. This morning I took all of the information that I had on the hearings of the past 2 years and tried to analyze what happens here. If there was any chance that in good conscience without violating my own principles I could support this amendment, I would like to have supported this amendment. But, Mr. President, I cannot. I will tell you why I cannot.

I look at the chart here that the Senator from Texas has posted in relation to his remarks. I make one observation. It may not be an observation that people here in this Chamber want to hear, but it is an observation. We all know it is true. If there is a choice between some indeterminant allocation of this kind of freeze that has to be decided politically, we all know where it is going to fall. The uniformed men and women in the services, and the people retired in essence are a constituency and are represented. But I would say they have rather minor representation. Operations and maintenance, which during the years of 1977 to 1980 was nearly decimated, in my view looking at historical perspective, has very little constituency.

When you look at procurement, there is not a Senator in this Chamber, or a Member of the House of Representatives, who does not have in his or her district jobs, manufacturing defense items, some of which are necessary and some of which are not. There is not a Member of this Senate, or a Member of the House, who does not have some defense facility in their State, some which are necessary and some which are not.

I have no doubt that if we adopt this unspecified, total freeze what we will do is decimate personnel, and the quality of personnel. We have a volunteer force that finally has reached a level most of us can be proud of. Readiness is the heart of our Armed Forces. Those funds will be cut back but you had better believe we will find some way to buy some airplanes, some ships, some submarines, and some other goodies that maybe we do not need because that are where the jobs are. That is where the political pressure is. Let us all tell the truth. What we will really have in the defense bill in the eyes of the Members of this body is not so much national defense as it is one great big jobs bill.

Mr. President, let me paraphrase what the Senator from Texas said. If a democracy has one priority that is higher than any other, it is its own preservation. The defense of the country has to be the first priority.

Yet, I am sure that many of my colleagues have had the same experience. If you want to walk around your State and ask people, shall we reduce COLA's on social security or cut defense, or shall we reduce student loans or cut defense, or should we cut back the National Institutes of Health or cut defense, or cut the farm programs or cut defense, I can guarantee you—and I have seen polls that prove it—they will tell you to cut defense. The people of Great Britain, the people of France, and the people of the low countries in 1937 and 1940 cut defense. Were it not for this country and their determination, the history of the world after 1945 would have turned out quite differently than it did.

Mr. BIDEN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUDMAN. I would be happy to.

Mr. BIDEN. Are you serious? Are you serious in implying, if we in fact say to the Defense Department that you have the same amount of money next year as you have this year, that America will be in the posture that France was prior to World War II? Is that what you are saying? Is that what my distinguished friend from Texas is saying? Are you serious? That is my question.

Mr. RUDMAN. I would be happy to answer it. It may take longer than a yes or no answer because I obviously had not quite finished what I was saying.

Mr. TOWER. If the Senator will yield, it is not the same amount of money because with the inflationary factor it is $16 billion less. It is a reduction.

Mr. RUDMAN. What we do, if we adopt this amendment, in my view is totally reverse where we have been going and totally reverse it. It will not cut it back nor change it, but it will totally reverse it. The normal expectation, if we adopt this, is to reverse something that I believe—the Senator from Delaware may disagree with me freely—was the right thing to do in 1981; that was, to improve readiness, improve quality of personnel, and to do some procurement that was sadly overdue.

I ran for election in this body on that statement. I will continue to make the statement because I believe that it is true. I believe every empirical bit of evidence that we have will prove that point. I am not saying that a 1-year freeze will impoverish this country and make us susceptible to the exploitation by those who may wish to exploit us. But I am saying that to make this kind of a radical change in a policy that was set in 1981 is hardly responsible. That is what I am saying.

If this amendment contained growth figures that are, frankly, less than the Senator from Texas would like, and probably quite a bit less than the leadership would like, I would vote for it because I think it would be a time for very modest growth. I frankly do not agree with the numbers that are contained in the leadership proposal. But I believe this is the other extreme.

Mr. BIDEN. Can the Senator show us what figure that might be?

Mr. RUDMAN. I believe that this year's real growth figures that we will finally end up with in the Congress after much negotiation is in the area of possibly four, four, and four of real growth, not nominal growth. I believe that is where we will end up. That is a fairly educated guess.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me simply say that I regretfully cannot vote for this amendment because it seems to me that this amendment sets an entirely new policy of the Congress in the area of defense. I cannot agree with the numbers that are contained in the leadership proposal.

I would be reasonably sure that over the next 3 months, or 60 days or less, we will finally come up with numbers in the defense appropriations bills which will more closely approximate a far more modest growth. But to adopt this, end up essentially gutting everything but the procurement budget, and then having to gut that at this time considering what is going on in the world, Mr. President, is not the way in my view that this Senate ought to vote.

I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPECTER). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I ask the Senator from Texas? I understood the Senator from Arizona might want to speak. I will yield the floor. I might have something to say. I will wait.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I will say a few things to my chairman, and particularly to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee with whom I am honored to serve. I have listened to his remarks. He is absolutely right. The Constitution charges us with providing security for this country before it charges us with doing anything else. I remind my colleagues that the whole purpose of America is freedom. It is not welfare. It is freedom. What we are trying to do here today will result in the cutting down of our ability to insure that freedom.

Let me take a quick look at a few things that my chairman from Texas mentioned. I have been traveling around the world. I just returned from the Far East. I make it a point wherever I go to visit the commanding officers, and to visit the troops. I ask the commanders: "Are your forces in better shape today than they were 3 years ago?" I have never heard any answer but, "Yes." I can tell you after visiting the DMZ I have never seen morale so high in my life in the Armed Forces. I spent 37 years in that outfit myself.

It is not that the pay is higher, but it is more secure. Our men in uniform have a feeling that the Congress has finally realized that a Volunteer Force can work. We have the highest quality of people in uniform now than we have ever had, almost universally in the armed services No. 4, which is a high school graduate. We are getting more and more college graduates as we go along.

Over 50 percent, or maybe it is 55 or 57 percent, of the defense budget, Mr. President, goes to pay the troops. When you get to talking about freezing or cutting the amount of money that we are talking about, where do you think it is going to come from?

Let us take another look. I suggest it is going to have to come, to some extent, out of the money that we provide for the benefit of the men and women in uniform.

I am chairman of the Tactical War Committee, I think my subcommittee is probably responsible for spending more money in the armed services than any other committee. What are we looking at? The F-16 fighter plane, which we have agreed to take a rather sizable cut in. The F-15 aircraft, which is not only one of our best inteceptor aircraft, but we are now going to make it into a ground support aircraft. We have taken a cut in that.

The new C-17 troop transport that we have to have for a rapid deployment force, on which we have cut no metal yet but which we want to build, is threatened.

The military airlift command portion of our whole military structure is still about 20-percent deficient, Mr. President, on D-Day.

If we are talking about rapid deployment and our ability to get tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of troops from this country to some other spot in this world, we are going to have to rely, as of today, as we relied forever in war, on ships. We do not have any ships. Our merchant marine does not exist.

So when we talk about transporting weapons, transporting troops around this world, I would laugh out loud if I were allowed to, because I will tell you, Mr. President, we cannot do it. It is that simple.

We were willing to take these cuts. We are working now in every subcommittee in the Armed Services Committee to try to get cuts, to try to extend the program, to try to cut here and there and the other place.

Mr. President, I have to say this: It sort of rankles me to hear that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers come into this town and want to cut defense. If you want to put the blame on any two groups of people for the high cost of the military, do not put it on the Pentagon; do not put it on the man in uniform who is put over there for 2 or 3 years to learn the business and then he is transferred someplace else; do not saddle it on the Secretary of Defense who is in there maybe for 3 or 4 years. Put it on these two great associations of business people.

No business people in the world have had it so good since World War II as the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Why? Because they have never been said no to. Every one of us are deluged by the attempts of people representing different manufacturers, "We have to have this" and "We have to have that." They do not need that, and I think it is time that we made up our minds here.

Here is where I have been making suggestions for a long time, where we can save money in defense.

We can do several things, Mr. President. We can prolong the stay of uniformed generals in the Pentagon not for just the 3 years but keep them there long enough for them to learn the business; long enough for them to know that they can tell these people to go to hell and nobody is going to give them any trouble; long enough to allow us to sit down with them and to work out their aid; allow us to tell manufacturers, "I did this once, and I got away with it." I told one of the biggest manufacturers in this country, "My subcommittee will not buy" that particular piece of equipment "at the price you are asking." And they said, "Ha, ha, ha, listen to him. We make it 15 miles from his front room."

Well, came the day to write the bill up and we did not put it in. Do you know what happened? In 2 days they cut $2.5 million off each piece of that equipment. I do not know what it added up to. Maybe $800 million.

We can do that. We can do it and do it and do it. I think it is time that we tell these people who are, as I say, the fat cats who have never been so fat in their lives, that we are sick and tired of tossing away the American taxpayers' money.

I am not going to go on this. It gets me so lathered up I do not know when to quit.

I remember in World War II flying the best aircraft we ever had, not in combat. It was $37,500. Do you know what that will buy today, Mr. President? One rocket for one airplane.

A bomber? The biggest one we had was $225,000. I know that will not buy the navigation system for the B-1. In fact, it will not buy the navigation system for any airplane.

The B-1 started out, and I recall seeing the blueprints being made, as a $27 million airplane. What has happened to it? One President shot it down, another President was not sure, now it is back on the track, and it is up to over maybe $220 million.

That is not our fault. That is not the fault of the Pentagon. That is the fault of politics, pure and simple.

What we are doing here today is trying to pass an amendment which, in my mind, has a lot of sex appeal. I thought of this thing myself once in a while. Why not freeze? Then I got to looking at what would happen. It has taken us years to put in the idea of the continuing buy idea of containing an inventory of parts and equipment for the military.

How much would it cost to settle that? I have no idea. Billions of dollars. Will we ever get this money back? No.

We are not buying today, we have not bought in 20 years, in 1 year, enough tactical aircraft to replace the tactical aircraft we have lost through accidents.

Brought out on the floor by my distinguished friend from Texas was the fact that since this committee has allowed more flying hours per pilot all through the services, the safety records have improved and the accident rate has gone down. But still, in this year's authorization, we are not going to be able to authorize as many aircraft as we will lose.

Is that any way for us to prepare? No; it is not. I think it is rather criminal to come in here and suggest willy-nilly cuts in the defense budget without being specific. If they do not want the B-1, pick it out and we will argue about it. If they do not want the MX, pick it out and we will argue about it. If you want to argue about the pay for the troops, we will argue about that. But I do not think anybody has the courage to stand up and say, "Let us cut the pay and sustenance of our troops." If you want to say, "Let us cut the pay of the forces in Korea," suggest it. If you want to cut back the troops in NATO, suggest it and see how far you get.

I think we are toying, I think we are playing with the security of our country. As I have said many times on this floor, while I was not here by any means, I was in the service and I recall back in the 1930's it took us 7 years to buy the B-17. I am not saying the B-17 won the war, but I am sure it did a hell of a job. It took us vote after vote to get the draft, and we finally won it by one vote.

What is the message we are giving to our allies and to our enemies? The message, to me, what I would be hearing if I were over there, is the United States is sort of a paper tiger, and we are coming apart.

Mr. TOWER addressed the Chair.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I cannot help commenting on some of the remarks that have been made. Particularly, I would like to comment on the remarks just completed. In it, there was a statement that it is criminal to come in here with a suggestion to freeze the defense budget and, at the same time, talk about what $37,000 used to buy and what it will not buy today. I can tell you what $37,000 will buy today. It will buy 37 plastic stool caps that fit on the legs of a B-1 navigator's stool. That is what I call criminal activity.

That is not politics, Mr. President. That is just plain bad management. That is not the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's fault, that is not the National Association of Manufacturers' fault. There is something wrong with the way business is done.

I am not going to take a second seat to anybody in this Chamber about having the will or political fortitude to cut expenditures. I may not have as many defense plants in my State as some of the people in this Chamber have, but just a month ago, I voted to freeze target prices for farmers. There are 112,000 farm families in my State that are going to pay a price for my freezing target prices. That is going to save $3 billion, I was told.

In this proposal is a freeze on COLA's for pensions. There are 13 or 14 percent of the people in my State who are senior citizens drawing from one of those pension systems. For people here to challenge this budget because it fails to suggest where the savings would be made, forget that this is affecting every segment of the population of our country. That includes my constituents as well as the constituents of the Senator from Texas or the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from New Hampshire.

All of a sudden, we have, after 3 or 4 hours of debate, everybody coming out of the woodwork, coming in to talk about defense. Simultaneously, there are all those calls coming from Air Force 1. Simultaneous with that is a lot of lobbying being done that we Republicans would consider the "liberal lobby." And obviously, too, the Chamber of Commerce and the National As-

sociation of Manufacturers are calling. I hope all the other groups that are supporting our cause are calling. What I say applies to people who support my position as well as people supporting the position in opposition to us.

I say it all resembles business as usual, whether it is the defense industry and the DOD coming out of the woodwork or whether it is the "liberal lobby" coming out of the woodwork, or whether it is White House pressure; it does not make much difference. It is still the very same activity that has been going on for years that has gotten us to the point where we have $200 billion deficits. I can speak about defense. I suppose I could speak about anything. I spoke generally this morning about the problem of planning.

In regard to planning and the things that have been said on the floor recently about defense, I hope that all of my colleagues, whether they are here or back in their offices, were listening to the debate. Because what the leadership is telling us is that we are locked into a defense budget now and well into the future which happens to be higher in constant dollars than any defense budget since the Korean war. Being locked into it, being unable to do anything about it—and that is the impression that has been given to me in this debate—is a pretty sad situation. For if any organization or any institution which cannot live for 1 additional year, 365 days, with the same budget, that institution, whether it be public or private, has pretty severe planning problems, especially at a level that, in peacetime, is actually more than at the peak of the Vietnam war.

What the leadership is telling us is that the situation in defense is so desperate that Congress cannot cut anything and must continue, in fact, to forever feed an irrational, underfunded approach to national defense. Everybody, including the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has admitted the defense budget is underfunded. We have tied our hands in defense, as we have in the entire budget.

Sooner or later, Mr. President, we are going to have to face the fact that the system that gives us less and less defense at unprecedented cost will have to be untangled. The longer we put that off, the tougher it will be to make any change.

I, for one, appreciate all the time that the Senator from Texas and his staff have put into these various charts that have been brought before us to demonstrate what their position is. The Senator from Colorado, when he spoke earlier this afternon, said it very well when he said that the reason we are in the current deficit predicament is all the horse trading that we do to accommodate all the spending. He is absolutely correct. I do not care whether we are talking about new programs getting started, bases to close, whatever the house trading is that might go on. We encounter this problem when asked to respond to the challenge of the Senator from Texas as he would say, "How would you cut and where would you cut?" We have to put ourselves above that level of decisionmaking.

But I would add another reason why we are in this predicament. It is a reason that borders on what I would call extortion. This does not just apply to the defense budget; this would apply to any aspect of the budget. It is an old ploy that I call the Washington Monument ploy. When you want more money, you fabricate a need. When you want to prevent cuts, you offer up the Washington Monument in sacrifice. For those of my colleagues off the floor, listening in their offices and not having an opportunity to see them, I would just like to indicate that the best way to describe the charts in the back of the room for those is that they show the Washington Monument dressed in battle fatigues.

I have been in politics for 25 years, since I was 25 years old. I know how this game is played, and each Senator knows how it is played, or should know. The leadership apparently has not yet uncovered massive amounts of information which would show that in some defense programs they are funded at such a level that they cannot spend the money that we give them. There are a lot of other programs outside of defense that are funded as high as well. Just look at every fiscal year and you will find a large percentage of your budget spent in the last month or 6 weeks, whether it be defense—and it was $4 billion in defense this year put under contract in the last few days—or any other Department of Government. That should be ample evidence that we are appropriating more than needed, and that we ought to be able to get by for 365 more days.

Somehow I think we have gone overboard trying to respond to what this freeze will do. There is not one of us—Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator BAUCUS, or Senator BIDEN—in this Chamber who has to take a second place seat to anybody on whether or not we are patriotic, whether or not we fear the Soviet threat, whether or not we are concerned about keeping NATO together, whether or not we want to send the right signal around the world. There is not a one of us who pretends or desires to be a paper tiger. People overseas are as smart about our defense as we are. They know the weaknesses of our system. More important, they know our staying power.

Do you know what the advice of the admiral was who spoke to the warlords in Tokyo warning they should not bomb Pearl Harbor? That advice was that they ought to be concerned about the "sleeping giant." It was not the massive amount of military weaponry that we had at Pearl Harbor or elsewhere in the world. He feared our economic infrastructure, our industrial infrastructure, that backs up our military. Do you think that our potential enemies do not know about the weakness of our industrial infrastructure? Do you think they do not keep an eye on how closely knit our social fabric is?

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRASSLEY. They do.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield for a question at this time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. If it does not detract from the point I am making.

Mr. TOWER. I do not think so, because the Senator mentioned Pearl Harbor. I think he makes my point in the process. The reason the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor is that we were not prepared. I happen to be privileged to have participated in that war. It went on for much longer than it should have. If we had been prepared, they probably would not have attacked us in the first place. Had we been more prepared when they attacked us, the war would have been over sooner.

I submit to the Senator from Iowa that if there is a next war it will be because we are not ready. We are not going to have 4 years to build up our defense capability to try to win it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, may I say, first of all, they bombed Pearl Harbor because we had poor military planning. What sort of good military planning has all your ships in a single harbor? Second——

Mr. TOWER. They bombed us because they were militarily superior to us at the time, I say to the Senator.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Second, I would suggest to you, Mr. President, that if we are so well prepared today, how come we only build, with the massive amount of money we are spending on defense, two tanks a day? We are spending more on defense now in current dollars than at any time since the Korean war. We are building two tanks a day. Our entire country produces just two tanks a day. Our entire Air Force is getting only 200 tactical fighters per year. That is less than one plane per day. We are told that readiness is up in the Air Force, are we not? Our pilots get to fire just two missiles per year, one infrared missile and one guided missile.

Now, that is absurd. That is like giving each one of our marksmen one bullet or each one of our infantrymen just one grenade to throw. If that is the best that we can do with 5 straight years of unprecedented spending in defense, then we are in a sad situation.

And last, as I was speaking about Pearl Harbor, our industrial infra-

structure and our social fabric, we ought to know that the strength of our staying power is as important an element of our national defense as the measurement of the number of tanks and ships we have. Unless we do something dramatic to get this budget deficit down, unless we do something dramatic to keep interest rates down and to keep people employed, we are not going to build our industrial infrastructure and we surely are not going to keep our social fabric as strong as it ought to be to meet our worldwide defense responsibilities. That is what is at issue as much as the amount of money we are spending on defense. We have to do something very dramatic and we have to do something different. Everything you see here today in opposition to this amendment is ample evidence of business as usual in this body as far as the budget process is concerned. I think it is time that we change the direction of our policymaking and change the direction of our budget deficits from upward to downward.

Mr. DENTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMENICI). The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. DENTON. I say to the Senator from Iowa that I respect his motives. I do not wish to accuse him of politics. I do not wish to accuse the Senator from Delaware of any but the best of motives. I have had experience with both men. I like and respect them.

I submit that the argument is not who is being political, not whether we want to improve the management of the Defense Department, not whether we want to reduce the deficit, not whether any of us is patriotic, or that we want to maintain security. The argument is about understanding whether or not this amendment is harmful or helpful to the well-being of the United States of America.

I should like to define our survival, if you will, in two terms: One, national security, and the other well-being. And I ask the Senator from Iowa to listen to this as carefully as I listened to him.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will.

Mr. DENTON. I take that with good faith. I am going to say it again. Survival equals national security plus well-being. Well-being equals the economic well-being, the social well-being, the educational well-being, the health well-being, and all of the things that we have been noticing and taking care of with great attention in a trend that is clear since the time of President Kennedy.

The word "security" means two things, generally speaking—first, military forces; second, foreign policy. And it includes the intelligence establishment.

I should like to offer my version of what has been business as usual since Kennedy's time and business as usual since about 1970, both of which trends I think are essential for our understanding of the argument. I offer this in good faith and with some sense that I, too, have an investment and a degree of understanding in the question before us today, though I offer it with no feeling that I have more or less than any of my colleagues. I have listened to them with great respect, and I ask them to listen to me with the same respect, because we are talking about an extremely vital matter, not a small matter.

In President Kennedy's time, we were spending for defense $49 billion, or 45.9 percent of the budget. For human resources we were spending $30 billion, or 28.8 percent of the budget—roughly twice as much on defense as we were spending on welfare related matters.

In 1982, under the merciless President Reagan, we were spending $187 billion on defense and $372 billion on welfare-related matters, roughly twice as much on welfare-related matters as on defense matters.

So you can talk, if you wish, about real money, real dollars. These are real dollars of which I am now speaking.

We are talking about a factor of four exchange, going from a spending ratio of 2 to 1 on defense over welfare to a ratio of 2 to 1 on welfare over defense.

Now let me ask you to picture a scene in 1975 when a general whom I respected very much, General Dixon, then commander of the Tactical Air Command, was talking about the fall of Vietnam, which was taking place because Congress had just shut off American aid to South Vietnam while Soviet aid to North Vietnam was being increased. We cut off our aid to South Vietnam, breaking the word of four Presidents, breaking the credibility of our own understanding about what the honor of this country should be, about what our own perception is of maintaining our interests.

General Dixon was talking to my class at the Armed Forces Staff College. He said: "Ladies and gentlemen, how can the Soviets have this tremendous buildup going on in armed services and military power, from an industrial base less than ours?"

Our defense was shrinking. We were cutting defense left and right in those days.

He flashed a picture on the screen and said: "Here is how."

The picture on the screen was of a typical middle-sized Soviet town with mud streets and no automobiles, but with television antennas so that they could get Big Brother's word. But nothing else. The people were drably dressed. It was a typical village.

He then showed a typical town in the United States, with all the wealth and evidences of what we apportion to our well-being, to our standard of living. He said. "That is how they do it."

In Kennedy's time, and I ask attention to this, we had practically a first-strike capability against the Soviet Union. Maybe not quite, but I would not want to risk it, and I would not recommend it even if we could do it. I think we could survive in the long term without killing any of them. I think that is why Eisenhower did not go in during the Hungarian revolution in October 1956. I think we can prevail over them, but we have to maintain some kind of credibility in terms of military posture and in terms of our foreign relations successes.

In Kennedy's time, he was able to look Khrushchev in the eye and say, "Get those missiles out of Cuba." He got them out, after calling Khrushchev a liar because he said they were not there. Kennedy showed him pictures and said, "Get them out."

We all know that, during those days, all the chips were in the middle of the table. My wife was packed, ready to move before the balloon went up, to someplace in South Carolina, with some of the cans of what we still refer to as "Cuban missile crisis stew."

In those days, we were able to stare them down. We were spending twice as much on welfare as on defense.

Since Kennedy's time, the Soviets learned a lesson. They learned that they have to have the wherewithal to back up their moves and their bluffs, wherewithal in terms of military power, understanding, and will.

We started forgetting the lesson. In the long, drawn-out war in Vietnam, which need not have been drawn out or lost, we proved the deterioration of our understanding. We proved the erosion of our credibility around the world. Even before we did it, the rest of the world could see it happening, to the extent that Saudi Arabia and OPEC believed that it could with impunity triple the price of oil in 1 day.

In discussing that point, let me say that I am not against Saudi Arabia. I helped to pass the AWACS bill. But they, as did other nations, perceived that the United States simply did not have the understanding or guts to back up our own interests, as we proved in Vietnam. They tripled the price of oil in 1 day. Did they need it for the sake of justice? No.

I watched 82 ships, with cargoes rotting at anchor off Jidda in 1975, when they could not import the stuff as fast as they could buy it. The cargoes were rotting. They saw in 1973 that we lost sight of our understanding of what it takes to back up our interests and what it takes to back up foreign policy.

I say to the National Association of Manufacturers and to the chamber of commerce, as I say to my colleagues

today, with humility but with emphasis that there is a cost to independence and liberty. We have been paying for failures in foreign policy because we did not understand what it takes to sustain on effective foreign policy.

Let me give a concrete example of the economic cost of foreign policy failures. When the Saudis tripled the price of oil in 1973, and without considering the multiplier effects, here is what happened to the U.S. domestic economy. For every year from 1973 on there was a price, and it is not well known. We just dug this out of Department of Energy statistics, and the figures are there. Each year during the 1970's, we lost $40 to $50 billion in gross national product, in constant 1972 dollars, because of rising energy prices.

In addition, we suffered 2 to 3 percentage points of inflation and lost 1 to 2 million jobs each year because of rising energy prices.

At least one-fourth of our decline in productivity growth and one-half of the decline in investment during the 1970's was attributable to rising energy costs.

Do I have to draw pictures? I will admit I do not have all the figures for all the costs with respect to the minerials we must have. I admit I do not have the figures as to the increased cost that we must pay to buy those items at increased prices because the Cubans, on Russian ships, went over and took over the African National Congress in South Africa and SWAPO in Namibia, and they are turning a major part of South Africa into Communist surrogate states.

I wish all of you could have been at the hearings of the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism. One man sacrificed his life to blow the whistle on the ANC. He told me, before the subcommittee, "They will kill me for saying it, but this is the way it is." He went home to South Africa and they killed him. The Communists have coopted ANC and SWAPO. It is a Communist move that is going on now. I think the Senator from Iowa has some insight into that already.

Africa has 86 percent of the world reserves of the platinum group of minerals, 53 percent of manganese, 64 percent of vanadium, 95 percent of chromium, 52 percent of cobalt, and significant diamond and gold output.

The people on Wall Street better note this, as they did that day in New York when oil prices went up.

Mr. President, I guarantee you that Ollie Delchamps, who is the political man for the national chamber of commerce, would come on this floor if necessary and testify that he will come off that position, if you will give me 2 days to give him the facts.

So I do not believe that the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce are going to stick with a position in favor of this amendment because they will come to understand what inadequate defense is costing the United States day by day in terms of trade. I am not saying that the Japanese are necessarily ripping us off in a certain way, or that the West Germans or the French are, but on balance we are being ripped off in world trade today because they think we will not back up our own real interests.

We are cutting our own throats by a syndrome that Jeanne Kirkpatrick has enunciated on many occasions, and I cannot say it as well as she can, but she talks about a syndrome in which we are caught up in self-guilt, condemning ourselves to the fate that our enemies would assign to us.

Mr. President, I ask you to recognize that there is a tremendous cost to the lack of credibility that we already have in terms of backing up our foreign policy, a cost that is affecting our domestic economy for more than could be offset by the false savings that Senators are recommending today. I submit that general piece of information, along with the fact that President Carter would have spent more on defense than you are going to have us spend, by several tens of millions of dollars this year.

I am asked to limit my remarks, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMMS). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While I find considerable merit in the pending amendment, I regret that I cannot support it. The sponsors of this amendment, Senators KASSEBAUM, GRASSLEY, BIDEN, and BAUCUS, have put together a very attractive budget proposal. Their budget freeze would produce rapid and dramatic reductions in our projected deficit. I commend them for their hard work and diligence in developing this initiative and bringing it to this body.

Mr. President, a proposal which would reduce the deficit by an additional $23 billion, as this one does, certainly deserves the closest study and careful consideration. The amendment achieves these savings in a most desirable way, as I shall explain hereafter. It attacks spending, instead of seeking to impose new and heavier tax burdens on our already overtaxed population. Furthermore, it spreads the spending limitations across the board by limiting outlays to fiscal year 1984 levels in all areas.

Although any plan for budget savings should be spread across the broadest possible range, in order to minimize the impact on individual, worthwhile programs, it is not in the national interest, in my judgment, to impose an absolute freeze on national defense program expenditures. This is not to say that no cutbacks should be imposed on defense. However, in seeking to reduce deficits, it would be most unwise for us to simply freeze defense spending at last year's level.

An absolute freeze of this nature would pose serious dangers to our national security. The net result would not be to maintain status quo, but, rather, to effect an estimated 6 percent—and I repeat—6 percent real reduction in our level of defense expenditures due to the effects of inflation.

Mr. President, we cannot allow the national defense rebuilding program initiated by this administration to be stopped in its tracks as would be done under this amendment. After years of neglecting the security needs of our Nation in the face of an unprecedented Soviet military buildup, we are hardly at the point where we can rest on recent accomplishments, although considerable progress has been made. We must maintain a strong and viable military system for the sake of our freedom, and that of our children. This is not to say that defense spending is untouchable during budget debate. The President has previously agreed to substantial reductions in growth which were incorporated into the leadership package. Perhaps additional cuts in growth may be attainable. But, a real net reduction in our defense program is not acceptable.

Mr. President, I would again like to commend the sponsors of this amendment for their valiant efforts toward deficit reduction. They are working, as I said, I think in the right direction, as I have specified. However, because of the drastic and dangerous effects on our national security. I must oppose the amendment.

I merely mention this, Mr. President, that a $179 billion reduction in budget authority alone over 3 years would require eliminating all funding requirements, all funding, that is procurement, R&D and military construction for all—I repeat all of the top 50 defense programs. And what does that include? That includes the MX, the B-1, the Trident submarines and missiles, and the strategic defense initiative. It would include 2,000 tactical combat aircraft. It would include 4,700 track vehicles. It would include 39 major ships and almost 55,000 tactical missiles.

Mr. President, in the past 3 years Congress has reduced the President's defense program a total of $41 billion.

We cannot take this chance. We must not take this risk. We know the goal of the Soviets has not changed and if we are going to protect the people of this country we must provide the necessary defense to do that, and I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DENTON). The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, while I cannot tell the Senate with any certainty when we are going to vote, I have been talking to the various interested parties and I do think a vote is relatively close. It could be a matter of an hour or slightly less unless something comes up that I am unaware of.

Mr. President, I would like to know when I use 10 minutes because I do not want to talk too long.

I have a table that I wish to make part of the RECORD, and I think it is self-explanatory. I have the 50 largest major weapons systems that are contained in the 5-year plan U.S. of the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the 1985 budget authority and outlays for each of those and then the subsequent years, 1986 and 1987, and then the 5-year total which is the cumulative total at the end of this sheet.

I would only put it in the RECORD with this statement: The freeze that is suggested here would reduce the outlays of the Defense Department by $118 billion. These 50 systems that I am putting in the RECORD over that 3 years, will result in a total of $90.1 billion in outlays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that summary be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR DEFENSE WEAPONS PROGRAMS

	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Fiscal year 1987	3 yr total	5 yr total
SDI [1] (strategic defense init.):					
QTY					
BA	1.8	3.8	5.0	10.6	24.2
O	0.8	2.5	4.1	7.4	19.4
F-16 (fighter aircraft):					
QTY	150	216	216	582	1164
BA	4.2	4.7	4.2	13.1	21.9
O	0.5	2.4	3.7	6.6	14.7
Trident II (missile):					
QTY			27	27	171
BA	2.3	3.1	3.7	9.1	17.1
O	1.1	2.2	2.6	5.9	12.0
SSN 688 (submarine):					
QTY	4	4	4	12	20
BA	3.0	2.9	3.1	9.0	15.8
O	0.2	0.6	1.2	2.0	6.0
F-18 (fighter aircraft):					
QTY	84	102	120	306	546
BA	2.8	2.9	3.3	9.0	15.4
O	0.4	1.6	2.5	4.5	10.6
CG-47 (cruiser):					
QTY	3	3	3	9	13
BA	3.2	3.3	3.5	10.0	15.4
O	0.2	0.7	1.3	2.2	6.4
MX:					
QTY	40	48	48	136	202
BA	5.0	3.8	3.1	11.9	15.4
O	1.7	2.8	3.0	7.5	12.6
DDG-51 (destroyer):					
QTY	1		3	4	14
BA	1.3	0.4	3.2	4.9	14.5
O	0.1	0.3	0.6	1.0	4.1
F-15 (fighter aircraft):					
QTY	48	60	72	180	372
BA	2.3	2.5	2.8	7.6	14.5
O	0.3	1.3	2.1	3.7	9.2
B-1B (bomber aircraft):					
QTY	34	48		82	82
BA	8.2	6.0	0.1	14.3	14.4
O	1.2	4.4	4.8	10.4	13.5

MAJOR DEFENSE WEAPONS PROGRAMS—Continued

	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Fiscal year 1987	3 yr total	5 yr total
M1 (tank):					
QTY	720	720	720	2,160	3,600
BA	1.9	2.1	2.2	6.2	10.5
O	0.2	0.9	1.7	2.8	6.8
Trident II (submarine):					
QTY	1	1	1	3	5
BA	1.9	2.0	2.1	6.0	10.3
O	0.1	0.5	0.9	1.5	4.2
F-14 A/D (fighter aircraft):					
QTY	24	24	12	60	96
BA	1.3	1.5	1.2	4.0	7.6
O	0.3	1.0	1.2	2.5	5.0
C-5B (transport aircraft):					
QTY	10	16	19	45	45
BA	2.2	2.6	2.3	7.1	7.2
O	0.3	1.3	2.0	3.6	6.5
KC-135 reengine:					
QTY	53	65	72	190	334
BA	1.0	1.3	1.5	3.8	7.0
O	0.1	0.6	1.0	1.7	4.5
C-17A (transport aircraft):					
QTY				0	6
BA	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.1	6.5
O	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.8	3.8
Bradley FVS (infantry fighting vehicle):					
QTY	710	900	900	2,510	4,310
BA	1.1	1.3	1.3	3.7	6.3
O	0.1	0.5	1.0	1.6	4.1
Patriot (missile):					
QTY	585	815	920	2,320	4,160
BA	1.3	1.4	1.3	4.0	5.7
O	0.2	0.8	1.2	2.2	4.5
AV-8B (aircraft):					
QTY	32	46	47	125	233
BA	1.0	1.2	1.1	3.3	5.6
O	0.2	0.6	0.9	1.7	3.8
BGM-109 (Tomahawk):					
QTY	180	180	190	550	1,628
BA	0.7	0.7	0.6	2.0	4.6
O	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.1	2.6
LPH ship (service life extention):					
QTY		1		1	3
BA	(1)	1.4	0.1	1.5	4.6
O	(1)	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.3
AMRAAM (missile):					
QTY	174	1,042	1,944	3,160	7,360
BA	0.6	0.9	1.1	2.6	4.3
O	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.4	3.1
Maverick (missile):					
QTY	4,500	8,000	12,000	24,500	48,500
BA	0.6	0.7	0.9	2.2	4.0
O	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.1	2.6
AH-64 (attack helicopter):					
QTY	144	144	56	344	344
BA	1.5	1.3	0.5	3.3	3.3
O	0.2	0.8	1.1	2.1	3.1
JVX					
QTY	0	0	0	0	18
BA	0.2	0.6	0.5	1.3	3.3
O	0.1	0.4	0.5	1.0	2.0
TAO-187 (ship):					
QTY	3	3	3	9	14
BA	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.9	3.0
O	(1)	0.1	0.2	0.4	1.2
Blackhawk (helicopter):					
QTY	78	78	78	234	415
BA	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	2.9
O	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.8	1.9
P-3C (aircraft):					
QTY	9	9	9	27	45
BA	0.5	0.6	0.5	1.6	2.9
O	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.9	2.0
LANTIRN (electronics):					
QTY	4	34	172	210	594
BA	0.3	0.5	0.8	1.6	2.9
O	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.7	1.9
AIM-54 (Phoenix missile):					
QTY	400	567	567	1,534	2,668
BA	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.6	2.6
O	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.7	1.8
HARM (missile):					
QTY	871	1,682	2,278	4,831	8,817
BA	0.3	0.5	0.6	1.4	2.7
O	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.7	1.8
MLRS (rocket artillery):					
QTY	44	29	0	73	133
BA	0.5	0.6	0.5	1.6	2.5
O	(1)	0.3	0.5	0.9	1.9
Stinger (anti-tank missile):					
QTY	2,360	6,467	6,675	15,502	31,101
BA	0.2	0.6	0.5	1.3	2.3
O	(1)	0.2	0.4	0.6	1.6
T-46A (aircraft):					
QTY	10	33	99	142	430
BA	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.0	2.4
O	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	1.4
HH-60D (helicopter):					
QTY		3	25	28	111
BA	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.9	2.3
O	(1)	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.3
EA-6B (aricraft):					
QTY	6	6	6	18	30

MAJOR DEFENSE WEAPONS PROGRAMS—Continued

	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Fiscal year 1987	3 yr total	5 yr total
BA	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.2	2.2
O	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.7	1.5
AOE (support ship):					
QTY		1		1	3
BA	(1)	0.8	(1)	0.8	2.2
O	(1)	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.7
Derivative fighter (aircraft):					
QTY		4	48	52	196
BA	0.2	0.6	0.6	1.4	2.2
O	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.7	1.6
SINCGARS (radio):					
QTY	8,595	23,650	23,193	55,438	125,638
BA	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.9	2.1
O	(1)	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.1
LPD (ship):					
QTY	(1)	(1)	1	1	7
BA	(1)	0.1	0.3	0.4	2.2
O	(1)	(1)	(1)	0.1	0.4
E-2C (aircraft):					
QTY	6	6	6	18	30
BA	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.2	2.1
O	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.6	1.5
T-4STS (aircraft):					
QTY	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	32
BA	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.8	2.1
O	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.6	1.4
CV SLEP (ship overhaul):					
QTY	1	(1)	1	2	2
BA	0.8	0.2	0.8	1.8	2.1
O	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	1.1
SH-60B (helicopter):					
QTY	18	18	18	54	90
BA	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.3	2.0
O	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.8	1.5
DSP (satellite):					
QTY	(1)	(1)	1	1	2
BA	0.2	0.4	0.5	1.1	2.0
O	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.3
DIVAD (gun):					
QTY	132	144	66	342	342
BA	0.7	0.7	0.4	1.8	1.9
O	(1)	0.4	0.6	1.0	1.7
MK-48 (torpedo):					
QTY	144	144	144	432	720
BA	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.6	1.9
O	(1)	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.7
HARM (Navy missile):					
QTY	803	779	997	2,579	5,438
BA	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.9	1.8
O	(1)	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.2
AHIP (helicopter improvement):					
QTY	44	56	92	192	442
BA	0.3	0.3	0.4	1.0	1.8
O	(1)	0.1	0.2	0.4	1.2
AE (ship):					
QTY	(1)	1	1	2	4
BA	(1)	0.5	0.4	0.9	1.8
O	(1)	(1)	0.1	0.1	0.6

[1] Fiscal year 1987 to 1989 program levels for SDI obtained from Aerospace Daily, Feb. 3, 1984, page 192.

Note: Budget authority shown is amount programed for procurement, RDT&E and military construction.

No estimate is provided for cost of termination liability.

Outlay estimates shown are CBO estimates (outlays from prior years are excluded).

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have another chart that shows the cost impact of eliminating the 20 largest, 40 largest, or 50 largest systems contained on the previous list. It indicates that eliminating the 20 largest systems will result in outlay savings over 3 years of $70.7 billion, eliminating the 40 largest will result in outlay savings of $85 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget authority shown is amount programed for procurement, RDT&E, and military construction.

No estimate is provided for cost of termination liability.

Outlay estimates shown are CBO estimates—outlays from prior years are excluded.

COST IMPACT OF ELIMINATING MAJOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			Total—	
	1985	1986	1987	3 yr	5 yr
largest systems:					
Budget authority	−46.6	−47.9	−46.2	−140.7	−239.9
Outlays	−8.2	−25.7	−36.8	−70.7	−154.3
largest systems:					
Budget authority	−54.0	−59.9	−56.7	−170.7	−296.8
Outlays	−9.6	−30.6	−44.5	−85.0	−188.5
largest systems:					
Budget authority	−57.1	−63.6	−61.0	−182.1	−316.3
Outlays	−10.1	−32.4	−47.3	−90.1	−200.7

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do this only to put into dimension the size of the cuts that are being recommended here in the name of "symmetry of freeze," or for the "good of the country." "Let us treat every one the same." Since we are freezing, let us freeze defense also.

Mr. President, I wish to make just three or four points.

I probably became acquainted with the distinguished Senator from Iowa only recently. Over 3 years, as chairman of the Budget Committee, I can tell him, if he were here, I have grown to respect him. As a matter of fact, I have great admiration for him. I was part of making sure he developed the expertise which he has been using down here on the floor I am glad I did it.

However, let me summarize what I think he is saying to the Senate.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on one point right there? Will the Senator yield just to clarify one point?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield.

Mr. BAUCUS. I hope the Senator would confine his remarks to what this amendment is about, not what this amendment is not about. This amendment is a 1-year freeze. It is not a 2-year freeze. It is not a 3-year freeze. It is not a 4-year freeze. It is not a 5-year freeze. It is a 1-year freeze.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand.

Mr. BAUCUS. I am disappointed, frankly, that the chairman of the Budget Committee is characterizing this amendment as something that it is not.

It is a 1-year freeze. We are only talking about 1 year. The chairman is talking about 3-year figures to exaggerate the number, to use scare tactics.

In the spirit of constructive debate, I hope that the Senator will stay with what this amendment is about, which is a 1-year freeze. We do not talk about things to do in year 2, in year 3, and year 4. This is only a 1-year freeze.

I hope the Senator from New Mexico, when he talks about what the result of our amendment would be, would confine himself to the thrust of this amendment

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me say to my good friend, I am sorry he is disappointed in me, but if he thinks I have been misstating the facts, he is going to remain disappointed, because I have not been.

Let me tell you when you freeze social security for 1 year, what you put down in the budget is the effect for 3 years. When I tell you what it is going to do in the third year, I was using CBO estimates of what is it going to cost in the third year.

I am disappointed that the Senator really thinks there is no impact in the third year of a 1-year freeze in 1985. As I look at it, your own amendment and the numbers that you put with it indicate that there is a rather significant reduction in defense over 3 years.

As a matter of fact, as I speak to this, I am reminded that those who propose this amendment speak of the 3-year effect on the budget deficit. And I suggest they must be using 3 years of defense savings. I suggest that they are using $118 billion in outlays as the amount that they are reducing the deficit. That is all I am telling the Senate.

I want to finish because we are in a hurry. I would be pleased to yield not only to the Senator but to yield the floor in about 3 or 4 minutes.

Here is what I think has happened to my good friend from Iowa. And I have already said, I have great respect and admiration for him.

In our free society, a bureaucracy called a defense establishment which is spending over $250 billion, is doing some things he does not like. And I assume that if we took that defense establishment and each one of us looked at it and said we would like to manage it better, boy, we would find some things we would change. If we had Spinneys around to tell us how poorly it is being managed, we would be angry and mad.

Well, let us have all those emotions, but let us not kid ourselves that we are going to fix that by freezing the defense budget authority at the 1984 levels in the middle of what we all understand to be a dramatic rebuilding of America's military strength, which the American people and an overwhelming number of U.S. Senators and U.S. House Members found in 1980 and 1981 to be absolutely necessary for the freedom of the Western World.

Now, in the middle of that rebuilding, we observe that the Defense Department is paying too much for a screwdriver. And Mr. Spinney tells us we are not planning things correctly. And our good friend from Iowa has noted all of that. And so he says, if I read him right, freeze the defense budget and they will learn a lesson. Freeze it and they will fix it.

Let me suggest to you, we make the reductions in the weapons systems that this kind of proposal is going to bring about, we will fix it all right. If you do not take it out of operations and maintenance and salaries and force reductions, we will not have any of those weapons systems. They will all be canceled.

So if the intent is to fix it so they will not be doing things wrong any more, you will fix that. You will fix that because there will not be very many left.

Now, I say in all honesty there are some things that ought to be straightened up, but I would submit that any establishment as large as that one, especially in a free society, and especially with Congress involved from year to year, and especially with annual appropriations and all the other things that are characteristic of our defense establishment, there is going to be abuse, there is going to be fraud, there is going to be waste, and there is going to be some planning that we do not like.

We are part of it under 1 year appropriations. The defense establishment is part of it. The private sector is part of it. But I submit, in the interest of fixing the problems, that we do not have to freeze things and not even know what we are doing, we are just guessing what cutting $118 billion in outlays out of the next 3 years is going to do and saying, "Well, it really has got to work because what is wrong with the freeze? It sounds so good."

Now I am not up here as one who gives the Defense Department whatever they want. I think in the last 3 years I have taken my share of the problem that the defense establishment brings to Congress. I think I have taken my share of heat.

I remind my friends on the Budget Committee, I am the Senator that last year got called out of the meeting by the President when we were about to vote on the defense number, after I had waited 7 weeks for Cap Weinberger to do something. He did not, and I get called by the President who said, "Wait some more." You know, I had to tell our President, "I can't do that. We are going to vote now and you are going to lose, because you wasted 7 weeks and didn't work with anybody."

So I am not one down here now as a Johnny-come-lately to try to get something out of defense or pleading to give them everything they want. In fact, I figure from time to time that they can do it for less; in fact, a lot less.

But I am telling the Senate that this is a drastic mistake, to send a signal to our allies, to send a signal to our men and women in the military, to send a signal to our enemies, that we just decided in the middle of this American military buildup to freeze things for 365 days.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. TOWER. This is not actually a freeze, it is a reduction.

If it were a freeze, it would have given the inflationary factor.

In fact, it is a reduction of $16 billion in real terms. For fiscal year 1985.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is right.

Well, I am speaking of freeze in the sense that the budget authority is exactly the same as it was the previous year and inflation, whatever it is, is not added on. And in anybody's understanding, it obviously will not even buy as much as the previous year.

And if you are in the middle of procuring things, what do you do? I mean, do you stop? You have ordered some airplanes and the budget authority is there for all 400. Do you just quit and say we will freeze it? Well, where do you freeze them? Halfway built? What about those that are just starting and you are about to spend the real money because you have got the first one built? Do you stop?

Let me suggest two other things. A lot of people talk about the great John Kennedy confrontation with the Soviets. Somebody has already compared the American military in terms of our GNP in that day versus now.

I heard an Assistant Secretary of Defense from that era say this: "We made the Soviet bear blink when we called their bluff about the missiles in Cuba. And, strangely enough, after we made them blink, the United States had a nervous breakdown for about 10 years." Now, that is about where things are, as I see it. In the decade of the seventies, after we made them blink, we somehow got so fearful and so scared and so concerned about this bad old America, that we might do things so wrong in this world, we just said we do not know whether we ought to have the right kind of military.

Then along came 1980 and 1981 and we decided that was a bunch of bunk. This is a great country. We were good players, not poor players, and we better get serious because our adversaries were. And we started this military buildup.

And now today, because it makes sense to somebody that we freeze the domestic side of this budget—and I am not even going to talk about that today, I did that yesterday, as well as I can. It just makes good sense, it is sort of American style to freeze everything since we are freezing the domestic side.

The point I would like to make is that this is not the way to do business. With all respect for the wonderful people who have cosponsored this, it is really a desperate move for America's military preparedness. Those men and women in the military, our allies, our friends, and, yes, our enemies are all going to take this in about the same way. Those who like it are going to clap. America's military preparedness and resolve are down the tubes, and our enemies who were hoping for just such a turnaround are going to sit there and say," we knew one if we waited, America would lose its resolve."

I hope the Senate does not do something today that it will regret. I do not think we will freeze defense this year when we are finished. I do not think we are going to freeze the rest of these items. It is not in the cards. The U.S. House is not freezing defense. The House Subcommittee that appropriates the money is not going to freeze defense. They and their chairman are not disposed to spend a lot of extra money on defense. As a matter of fact, it is quite the opposite.

It would be a strange day if our conferees went to conference with the U.S. House and the U.S. House had to add substantial amounts of money to the defense budget approved by the U.S. Senate. That is what would happen, if this amendment passes. We would put up the flag in the House, and say "you were right all the time." You have to put in enough money to make America strong because the U.S. Senate decided some kind of symmetry of freeze was a good thing, so the Senate froze defense and we sure hope the U.S. House will put money back so we will be on the right track.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I have been here 11½ years, unlike the Senator from Texas, but about the same time as the Senator from New Mexico. But I find this one of the most interesting, colorful, and humorous debates I have heard as long as I have been here.

We have two very distinguished Senators, the chairmen of two very important committees, telling us that this is all about defense, and America is about to pull down the flag. I have not heard yet, "turn tail and run." I have not heard that one yet. I have not heard, if we do this, we are going to be capitulating to our enemies. I find it fascinating that we are talking about how we are not going to be fair to our allies, and will break faith with our allies.

The signal that we are all talking about sending here is not about defense. It is about the economy. Let me tell you something. I find it fascinating that all of my distinguished colleagues who have made their VFW speeches here on the floor—all of them, I assume—assume that next year, we are not going to be doing anything with defense, that when in fact we have a deficit, when interest rates have gone up, when the cost of defense is even more, when we are moving in the direction that most people predict will occur, we are going to have a stymied growth, and we are just not going on with business as usual.

I heard the Senator from New Mexico make an eloquent speech about what FRITZ HOLLINGS was doing to the elderly, and about how we are not going to do anything about social security. I hear him say we are not going to do anything about defense. We are just going to roll right along next year. We are not going to touch entitlements, and we are not going to touch defense.

I am going to fly out of here. Does anybody believe that? Does anybody believe that next year with the reelection of Ronald Reagan—if that is what occurs—we are not going to see a fundamental change in either the tax structure, the entitlement programs, or defense? We are just going to go right on along. No change. I just think that is wonderful, if that is going to be the case.

I find it really interesting that we are going to cripple America's defense system by only spending $264 billion next year, if this amendment passes. My God, what a penalty. We will be prostrate; $264 billion. That is all we are going to do.

I assume what my colleagues are saying is we will pose this based on the defense portion of the amendment, that the real problem here is we do not want to make any hard choices about any weapons system. I assume they mean that we are not going to have to reconsider every single system underway. That is fascinating to me.

By golly, we have done damage, have we not? We have gone in outlays over the last several years—I will read them. In 1979, we spent $118 billion; 1980, $136 billion; 1981, $160 billion; 1982, $187 billion; 1983, $210 billion; 1984, $235 billion. What a terrible burden to place upon defense. I notice some of my conservative colleagues on the other side, and some of my liberal colleagues on this side, for political reasons have said, God bless the Grace Commission. Did it not have a wonderful idea to save money? Was not President Reagan right about waste, fraud, and abuse?

By the way, I suggest to my good friend from Idaho, who likes that Grace Commission report from what I have heard him say, that it says $93 billion in defense savings. Mr. Grace says $93 billion in 3 years. Well, I guess we are going to be selective. He says $93 billion. We are prepared to believe those figures in other areas, but not defense. He was only kidding. He did not really mean that.

I heard a moving speech last year from one of the most qualified debaters in the U.S. Senate—the distinguished Senator from Texas, not too many months ago—saying if we go below 13 percent, we will jeopardize America's future. We will be breaking

faith, and then out came the flag, and we ran it up the pole. We were told this was absolutely essential. And today he can buy 7 percent. I find that curious, Senator. You went from 13 to 7. Yet I guess with 7 percent we are not dropping to our knees before the Communist horde. I do not know. I find that kind of fascinating. Now we hear the same speech that you made at 13 and 7 and saying if you go to zero, it is the end.

By the way, a lot of folks are talking about how this is going to cripple us. I found it fascinating the Senator from Texas, when we have a $90 billion drug problem in America, permeating every single pore of the fiber of America, is prepared to cut, and did vote to cut money for drug interdiction, money for the Justice Department. If I were going to engage in this frivolous tactic, my friends, in opposition, I would stand on the floor and say you are putting the heroin and needle into the arm of the American public. The reason why my dear sister was robbed was because of you. I cannot believe you people are not willing to protect the streets of America. God forgive you for what you have done. I do not do that to you. [Laughter.]

I do not say that. And I am almost as adept on my feet as the Senator from Texas. I did not stand on the floor when you all said, "No Hawkeye for drugs. Take it out of Coast Guard."

To say on the floor of the Senate, "Does my friend from Texas understand that he is increasing crime in the streets of Waco? Does my friend from Alaska understand"——

Mr. TOWER. The streets of Waco are relatively crime free.

Mr. BIDEN. They will not be, if you do not jump on the bandwagon and help me fight crime. You folks are so soft on crime over there. My friend from Alaska and my friend from New Mexico go home and make speeches about that brown heroin from Texas, the cocaine from Colombia, and then they vote against BIDEN's increases for funding.

Well, the murder rate goes up. I really do not hold you personally responsible, as you seem to be prepared to hold me on defense.

I think we should have a challenge in the art of demagoguery. I am ready. Let us go.

You are right, the Senator would say I would win.

The Senator from New Mexico voted against the increases I proposed in the Budget Committee over the last 3 years in the name of the economy.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. No, I will not yield. In the name of the economy he voted against those increases, in the name of interest rates, a sound economy.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I will not yield. I am just getting started. I have not spoken all day.

So, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I think it is time that we talked about what this amendment is about. It is not the denuding of America's security. If we are going to play that game, we can all play that game. It is about the future, hard choices and difficult decisions.

I went out to a place where I am unaccustomed to travel, to Chicago and New York, to the Mercantile Exchange, the Chicago Board of Trade, to Bear Stearns and E. F. Hutton and others. I met with, over the last 3 weeks, the leaders of those communities.

Guess what they told me to a person. "BIDEN, if the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Montana are successful and this amendment were to pass, interest rates would drop 1.5 to 3 percent in the next 4 months."

They said to me, everyone I have spoken to, and the indications seem to be in this direction, that interest rates are likely to go up under the Republican leadership plan.

Let me ask you another question. I have heard this speech in the Budget Committee so many times, about the street does not believe us, we do not have willpower. So when the Senator from Iowa comes along and says, "We have 1 year to give us all time to stop and breathe and think and reorder some of our priorities before the future has totally slipped from our grasp," we did it because we did not want any pie in the sky. Then along comes someone and we say, "We are going to give you a big one. We are going to have a reduced package, the leadership package or the Democratic package, back-end loaded, not front-end loaded." And we wonder if they are going to believe us.

The reason why the Senator from Delaware is so supportive of this amendment, and I must say not only supportive but worked so hard to come up with it along with the Senator from Kansas and others, it is because I believe if we do not do something drastic to demonstrate that we have the resolve to tackle some of these problems, that we are going to be moving into a recession the first quarter of next year and moving down. Budget deficits under the Republican budget plan, 3 years out, start to go up. The President says he wants no new taxes, the Republican leadership says they want no new taxes, and the President says he wants no change in defense, and with a commitment there will be no change in entitlements—poof, the magic dragon. We are going to do all that. You know that, do you not?

The reason I believe so strongly in this amendment is for reasons maybe slightly different than my Republican cosponsors, for I predict to you that if we do not turn around this deficit in a convincing way to keep interest rates from going up and keep the economy from going to Hades in a handbasket, we are going to be presented with the following scenario next year whether or not it is a Republican or Democratic President who is elected. The issue no longer will be the capping of COLA's or not, but the issue will be eliminating COLA's for social security. The issue will not be whether or not we deal with eliminating people on disability rolls who are malingerers but whether or not disability should be cut. The issue will not any longer be whether we maintain the medicare system by putting some of the cost on the doctors and the hospitals, but cutting the medicare system. The issue will be not whether or not we keep or increase WIC but whether or not we have it at all. The issue will not be whether or not education is something the Federal Government should be increasing, but whether or not the Federal Government should be doing it at all.

Guys like me will be hard pressed to be able to make a case in the face of staggering budgets and sluggish economic growth that we increase them. Then, my friends in opposition will be able to stand up and say, "Does the Senator realize that what he is doing is increasing the deficit, increasing it badly?"

I will not be able to stand on the floor and say we need new major tax increases because how can you increase taxes at the time of recession?

So I think this is our last best chance.

I find it curious when we talk about this. Let us talk about some historical defense spending totals. The annual rate of growth in total defense spending from 1981 to 1984 was 10 percent or a total of 29-plus percent real growth over that 3-year period. The annual real growth in defense procurement for 1981–84 was 17 percent, or about 50 percent over a 3-year period of time. The annual real rate of growth in defense R&D for 1981 to 1984 was 13 percent.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator state the source of those figures?

Mr. BIDEN. The source of the figures is the staff from the Budget Commitee on the Democratic side.

Mr. STEVENS. That is nowhere near it. The publication on the House side shows it to be 3.5 percent real growth. If you want to talk about nominal growth, that is another matter.

Mr. BIDEN. This is the real growth in those areas.

We are not cutting defense. We are denying a $50 billion increase next year, following a number of years of steady increases.

We are not requiring any specific cuts——

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield for a clarifying question?

Mr. BIDEN. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator said we are not cutting defense. In fact, in real terms, we are, because the inflationary factor is not added.

Mr. BIDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. So, in fact, we are cutting $16 billion. In other words, $264 billion in 1984 money would mean $248 billion.

Mr. BIDEN. The Senator is correct. If we use the CBO figure, he is right. If we use the President's figure, it is $13 billion, his economic assumptions, and $3 billion in outlays. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that we are at a point where I find it very difficult to understand how anyone is going to be able to tell me that they truly believe that we are not going to have to make significant changes next year in defense and weapons programs and changes in entitlement programs, and changes in other spending programs. I would hope that we also keep our perspective, not that it is all that relevant, but since it has been raised so many times, on the charge relating to the share of GNP that the distinguished Senator from Alabama made.

In constant dollars in real terms, we shall spend more in 1985 on defense than in any year since 1946, the end of World War II. But more importantly, in 1984, which is the outlays we want to be in the budget, the outlay in 1984 is greater in real terms than in any year since 1946, save two, 1968 and 1969, the height of the Vietnam war. Outlays under our amendment would exceed the 1969 and only be $3 billion less in real terms than in 1968, and we are not at war.

We are not spending less for defense, in fact: we are spending more. We have, in fact, a real growth that has occurred on a fairly consistent basis over the last several years.

Mr. President, I want us, if my colleagues would, to keep our eye on the ball. How can we say that we are willing to deal with entitlements and unwilling to deal with defense and suggest that we are willing to do something significant about the deficits? We see the dire predictions that are being made, and they are probably wrong in being as dire as they are, and those rosy predictions about the economic prospects are probably equally off base. But I wonder if anyone in here truly believes that we are going to have such a robust growth, low interest rates, low inflation, and all without making some drastic changes in the way we are going.

It seems to me that it is not merely the symmetry of this amendment that makes sense, it is the substance of the amendment that makes sense.

We are asking for 1 year. Everybody will live on what they lived on last year. If anyone suggests to me that that means we shall have sent a signal to all the world that we have reneged on our requirement for a strong defense, I would suggest that that is not a reasonable assumption that anyone could make.

(Mr. WALLOP assumed the chair.)

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, did the Senator support the deployment of cruise missiles to Europe?

Mr. BIDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator knows they were not there in 1984. They have to be paid for in 1985.

Did the Senator support the B-1 bomber?

Mr. BIDEN. No, Mr. President.

Mr. STEVENS. Did he support the multiyear contract for the B-1 purchase?

Mr. BIDEN. No, he did not.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Delaware believes that the cost of the B-1 should be increased by $1 billion because of this amendment?

Mr. BIDEN. I believe it would be cut.

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment will cause a $1 billion increase in acquisition cost of the B-1 because it will cost $1 billion to terminate the contract.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, let me say if that were the alternative, I am prepared to spend more money for the same program in 1986 than I would have in 1985 if, in fact, the effect will be, as I believe it will be, that interest rates will come down because the net effect of not doing what I am doing will in fact cause interest rates to go up and in fact, we will be spending more money, not less money, in the total budget.

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator will yield for another question, I wonder if the Senator from Delaware realizes that this will put a limit on the payment of cost-of-living allowances for military personnel? The authorization exists for a 3.5-percent increase. This would pay zero. Does the Senator from Delaware intend that that be so?

Mr. BIDEN. That is what is assumed. We cannot, in the budget resolution, dictate that. It could be that, it could be cutting the program. It could be either.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct, Mr. President. Instead of maintaining the current level force, he could take the position, I assume, and I wonder if the Senator wants to take the position that we should reduce our Armed Forces by at least the amount that is necessary to achieve the saving from a reduction in force that would then allow us to pay the cost-of-living allowance——

Mr. BIDEN. Let me respond to the question. We all know, as the Senator from New Mexico points out constantly to us in the Budget Committee, in budget documents like this, we cannot line item. I can have an agenda to tell you how I cut it. I would cut the B-1 bomber, I would cut the MX missile. That would take care of all of it. The Senator may argue to cut other things. I suspect the Senator from Idaho would say, get Mr. Grace in and he will take care of it.

The fact of the matter is that this document does not allow us to line item and dictate to those on the authorizing and appropriating committees where in fact that money will or will not be spent. The exercise, although I can tell you how I could do it, is not a particularly relevant exercise, as the Senator from New Mexico points out at least four times in every budget meeting we have.

I can do it. I would take out the MX and the B-1.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I know the Senator is correct in terms of his interpretation that it is no direction, but if the direction is to delete $50 billion from the program and we can show him that that deletion leads to other costs due to cancellations under existing procurement contracts, which make it an even deeper cut, I wonder how the Senator would face up to that.

Did the Senator vote for the fourth submarine? Did he vote for the 840 tanks per year? Did the Senator vote for the return of the three battleships that this Senator opposed?

My memory is the Senator supported them.

Mr. BIDEN. That is right, Mr. President. I told the Senator how I would get my savings. I have already told him; I already answered the question, Mr. President.

The Senator from Iowa talked about the Washington Monument argument. I call this the old rathole theory, that once you have something bad in process, because it costs money to stop it, we keep it going.

Anyway, does the Senator have any more questions for me?

Mr. STEVENS. The one last question I would have, Mr. President, is that the statement that disturbs this Senator most was the statement the Senator from Delaware made about the visits to Wall Street and to the various sectors of American industry. I, too, made those calls not too long ago. I was urged to bring about a reduction in defense spending, which we have brought about by virtue of the

leadership's amendments before the Senate.

Does the Senator really wish to convey the impression to this body that it is the wish of the entitles he mentioned to cut defense expenditures with all the resultant bankruptcies and failures that would come about in the private sector? Is that really their message, to cut $50 billion plus in 1 year from the defense budget?

Mr. BIDEN. Let us make two things clear, Mr. President. One is the question is not cutting. It is whether or not we are going to add the $50 billion the Senator wants added, not cutting from where we are. We have not passed the budget yet. So we are not cutting. The question is how much we add, if anything. And I am arguing for 1 year we do not add, No. 1.

No. 2, the folks that I spoke to in fact said to me nothing about defense, nothing about entitlements. They said they need to come up with savings that in fact in 1 year would be in the $40 billion range and what the effect would be if we had that kind of cut in 1 year, the first year.

That is what they were talking about. They did not presume to suggest whether or not it be an MX missile or a slowdown in the entitlement programs or the food stamp program. They were talking about deficit reduction in the first year. That is what they were talking about, and that is what the Senator from Delaware was referring to.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask, if the Senator will respond to one other question, if the Senator realizes that to maintain a production rate of 840 tanks or 4 attack submarines or the level of the other production that is under contract, the increases mentioned in the leadership amendment are necessary just to maintain the rates of production? Does the Senator realize that I know of no new initative in this budget for the expenditure of funds other than the proposal to continue C-17 R&D? It is not in production. But does the Senator realize that this funding bill is essential to maintain the existing rates of procurement, the existing level of production of American industry at the existing level of employment? Does he realize that the impact of the bill we have before us compared to the amendment that he is endorsing would be just to continue the level of production of the current year?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the Senator is saying two things to the Senator from Delaware.

Again, it makes no difference what my response to that answer is in terms of whether or not we can incorporate that notion into this budget resolution, but I will answer it.

The Senator is saying that next year we are going to have to, if we do not do it this year, face the question of whether or not we are going to keep all of those programs going, some of which the Senator from Delaware voted for, in light of changed economic circumstances, just as the Senator from Delaware is standing up saying notwithstanding the fact we promised cost-of-living increases to senior citizens, the changed economic circumstances are so dire we have to reconsider that for 1 year, just as the Senator from Delaware, who spent 10 years of existence in this body trying to increase money for the Justice Department and fighting organized crime and interdicting drugs is saying that we cannot, because of the state of the economy, afford to do it this year. That is what the Senator from Delaware is saying.

The Senator from Delaware would like also to say something else, if I may. We heard from the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Texas and other Senators talking about the requirement of the Constitution to provide for the common defense, the implication being that the common defense of the United States could not be sustained for 1 year at the level of $264 billion.

And the second thing it fails to take into consideration is a document which I should like to read. It says:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare.

That is another item in that little matter that is mentioned. And then in section 8 of the Constitution:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

They always drop that "general welfare" portion, but again I want to make a point. I do not concede the implicit assumption in the statement made by the opposition to this amendment that to go on $264 billion for 1 more year jeopardizes national security and the ability to provide for the common defense.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the bipartisan budget freeze proposal is now before the Senate. As you know, it is being offered jointly by Senators KASSEBAUM, GRASSLEY, BAUCUS, and myself. Despite opposition by the leadership, support for this proposal has grown during the past several weeks. By the time we have discussed it here on the floor, I believe its chances for passage are excellent.

But it has already served several important purposes. It has alerted the Senate of the magnitude of the problem this country faces in preserving its fiscal stability and it economic health. It has also demonstrated clearly, I believe, that the Republican leadership plan is not adequate to stem the flow of red ink in our national budget. Finally, it has served to alert the country to the crisis atmosphere that could exist during consideration of the budget next year, if our freeze is not adopted this year.

At the beginning of this year, it was not clear to many people just how great our deficit problem was or what actions it would take to deal with it. The President offered only a down payment which was little more than his original budget with defense spending trimmed slightly. And it was widely predicted that Congress had no will to try to solve the mounting deficit problem in a election year.

All that is changed now. Recent action in the Senate Budget Committee, where our budget freeze was nearly adopted, shows that many Senators realize that the time for business-as-usual is over. This year may be our last chance to take effective action against deficits without risking serious adverse consequences on the lives of millions of Americans.

Mr. President, we have traveled a long way, in the wrong direction, since the day in February 1981 when the President, in his program for economic recovery, confidently predicted a balanced budget in 1984. At that time, deficits were running about $60 billion. And now that 1984 is here, the current year's deficit is estimated to be about $190 billion.

Since 1981 we have been taking many actions aimed at closing the gap between spending and revenues. But we have always underestimated the virulence and persistence of the deficits and the speed with which they could grow. I hope that we have now learned our lesson. I hope we now realize that deficits of $300 billion by 1989—and nearer $400 billion if the economy slumps—must be treated with an immediate freeze to stop the growth of deficits for long enough to put in place a permanent deficit control package. If we do not freeze deficits right now, their exponential growth will make it impossible for any longer term plan to take hold and become effective.

Mr. President, we will soon be talking about increasing the limit on the national debt here on the floor. When that bill comes up for consideration, there will be many voices raised in protest. And well there might be. The national debt is expected to be about $1.9 trillion in fiscal year 1985 and a staggering $3.3 billion in fiscal year 1989. By 1989, the interest payments necessary to service such a debt will have more than doubled to $219 billion. I, myself, am outraged by those numbers. I hope that all those other Senators who share my outrage will also share my determination to do something about those deficits before the debt limit increase comes up. Now

is the time when we can do something about the national debt. We can vote, as I propose to do, to freeze our Government is fiscal year 1985.

If we do not take bold, dramatic action on deficits right now, we are risking an economic disaster, probably some time next year. As deficits persist, and grow larger, interest rates are certain to rise also. And it is quite likely that the inflationary tendencies that still exist in our economy, may be unleashed again. These events, in turn, will depress economic activity, and we could well find ourselves in yet another recession again.

These dire predictions are not yet fact. But 10 years under the new budget process should have taught us at least one thing. If one waits until the next economic stage is clearly visible, it is too late to do anything about it. So we must act now, while only a few signals foretell the economic problems ahead. Interest rates have been climbing for some time now. The prime rate has risen from 11 to 12 percent—and many expect it to go higher soon. Mortgage rates are nearing 14 percent and there is real danger that homebuyers will soon become discouraged by high rates. The most recent Treasury borrowing—a 2-year note—went for a very high 11.8 percent.

Housing starts, in sympathetic reaction, plunged 26.5 percent in March to 1.6 million units. While bad weather surely played a part in this, as the administration claimed, the realtors also had a strong point when they said that "long-term mortgage rates of 13 percent or higher are not compatible with a—housing—starts rate of 2 million-plus units."

Inflation is fortunately still restrained. But there have been predictions of CPI increases of 8 percent next year. Factories, at 81 percent of capacity, are nearing the point where bottlenecks may increase pressures on interest rates and inflation. And the soaring GNP of 8.3 percent in the first quarter can only reinforce inflationary pressures.

What can we do, Mr. President, to avoid an economic calamity? Of course, there is never any guarantee that Government action will have the desired result. But in this case, the action we need to take is one that must be taken in any event. We must freeze the Federal budget and stop the deficits in their tracks. This will ease the pressures on interest rates and calm inflationary expectations. This, in turn, will greatly improve the outlook for continued economic health.

What will the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden-Baucus budget freeze do to deficits. I have a table here that demonstrates clearly how much more forcefully our plan deals with deficits than any other viable alternative. Next year deficits under our plan would fall from the current policy baseline of $197.3 billion to $161.5 billion. That is $19.3 billion lower than the leadership plan and $12.3 billion lower than the Democratic alternative.

By fiscal year 1987 our deficit would still be only $162 billion as compared with $245.2 billion if no deficit reduction actions were taken. This is $41.5 billion lower than the leadership plan—under which deficits actually continue to rise. And it is $7 billion lower than under the Democratic alternative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following brief table demonstrating the effectiveness of the Kassebaum - Grassley - Biden - Baucus budget freeze be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICITS

[In billions of dollars]

	1985	1986	1987
Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden	161.5	148.5	162.0
Republican leadership	180.8	185.4	203.5
Democratic alternative	173.8	170.7	169.0
CBO current policy baseline	197.3	216.9	245.2

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, how does the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden-Baucus budget freeze accomplish this? It does it by freezing the Federal Government for a year. And let me emphasize that this is only a 1-year action, a 1-year freeze. This is intended to stop the rise of deficits so that there is time to plan a long-range strategy of deficit control. But the 1-year feature is critical. This stops the deficits immediately, not over the 3 years that the Democratic alternative requires. And it certainly does not allow them to climb in 1986 and 1987 as the leadership alternative does.

It stops them immediately, in fiscal year 1985. And it also stops the climb for at least 3 years. And it does this so effectively that in fiscal year 1987, if no other action than a 1-year freeze is taken, spending will be $73.2 billion lower than it would otherwise have been. The Republican or Democratic alternatives reduce spending in fiscal year 1987 by only $46.4 billion or $39.5 billion respectively.

But let there be no mistake about it. A 1-year freeze will not be enough to solve our problem. The 1-year freeze gives us time to plan an effective future strategy. Further actions will be necessary, in 1986 and 1987, to push the deficits below $162 billion. But while we work on further actions, at least deficits will not be climbing. There will be a firm ceiling on deficits. We will have stopped swimming against the ever-rising tide of deficits.

How does our budget freeze accomplish this? The freeze actions are clear, simple, and effective. We would freeze budget authority for defense programs for 1 year at the fiscal year 1984 baseline level of $264 billion. There would be no Defense Department civilian or military pay raises in fiscal year 1985. In the same way, there would be no cost of living adjustments in any indexed program in fiscal year 1985. And medical costs would be contained by freezing doctor and hospital fees for 1 year. In fiscal year 1985, we assume that agricultural target prices and loan levels will be frozen at the 1984 crop year levels. Nondefense, discretionary programs would also be frozen at the fiscal year 1984 baseline level for budget authority—or program level, where relevant. On the revenue side, we had originally proposed to limit revenue increases to a $10 billion figure. Now that the Senate has overwhelmingly adopted a revenue package, we have dropped any revenue increase from our amendment.

While this program is severe, it is the only proposal that will halt the upward spiral of deficits. It is fair also—a form of shared sacrifice. But the sacrifice only runs for 1 year, and then other formulas will have to be found for further deficit reductions—as will be the case with any plan adopted this year.

This 1 year of sacrifice should prevent many future years of needless suffering. Because it is clear that such a freeze may be necessary to protect many programs—defense and nondefense alike—that are essential to the future of our country. The Reagan administration has already made it clear what kinds of actions it envisions next year to reduce deficits. The targets include indexed programs like social security, farm programs, medicare, and medicaid, veterans health programs, student aid, and higher education, and many others.

And one other thing I confidently predict to you. While the Reagan administration does not list defense as a target for cuts, it will be a target next year if we do not freeze this year. It will not be possible to cut back many important domestic activities without cutting back defense also. And the reaction against defense could last for years and be much more harmful than our proposed 1-year freeze. After all, the 1-year freeze can actually be useful, according to Charles Spinney, in reforming Pentagon budget practices. Under the freeze, DOD outlays continue to grow at an 8-percent rate. And there is a $43 billion backlog of unobligated funds that provides some cushion, if needed. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news clipping from the Washington Post dated April 18, 1984, describing an analysis of the defense budget by Mr. William W. Kaufman be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONGTIME PENTAGON ANALYST REPORTS '85 REQUEST COULD BE CUT $45 BILLION

(By Fred Hiatt)

The Pentagon budget request for fiscal 1985 could be reduced by $45 billion without affecting military capability, according to a Brookings Institution analysis by longtime Pentagon adviser William W. Kaufmann.

Kaufmann, who wrote annual posture statements for Republican and Democratic defense secretaries throughout the 1970s, said the Reagan administration had skewed military spending dangerously toward procurement, which increased by 92 percent in three years, and away from operations expenses, which rose only 30 percent.

In addition, he said, so much money has been committed for future weapons purchases that the administration and Congress will have "a heavy mortgage" for the next five years. Even if Congress cuts the proposed 1985 budget from the $305 billion to about $290 billion, more than a third of the following year's defense outlays will be "committed and uncontrollable," he said.

"It's already late to put the budget easily on what Bill is suggesting is a stablized track," Brookings analyst John D. Steinbruner said in releasing the Kaufmann study yesterday. "There's going to be a surge in investment, like it or not . . . But it's never too late to adjust on the margins . . ."

In the past, Defense Department officials have vigorously denied that they have slighted readiness at the expense of hardware. They also have said that the "surge" in weapons purchases is needed to counter a perceived growing Soviet threat and to compensate for what the Reagan administration says was a "decade of neglect" after the Vietnam war.

Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger told Congress this year that his proposed budget could not be reduced from $305 billion without threatening national security.

President Reagan, under pressure from Republican senators, then agreed to a $291 billion level that he said would not reduce national security "to a point of unacceptable risk." Kaufmann said yesterday the budget request could be reduced further, to $260 billion, "without any additional risk." Most of the savings would come from eliminating what the Brookings report said was duplication caused by Weinberger's unwillingness to control the military services, which in many cases have each bought weapons systems that perform the same task.

"The planning process has really been running in an unusually undisciplined manner," Steinbruner said. "The increases have not had strings attached to them, they've been spread across the board, and no one's had to argue very hard for them."

For instance, Kaufmann said the Army did not need the Divad antiaircraft missile, new weapons that have not performed well in tests, when it also was upgrading existing Vulcan, Chapparal and Hawk guns and missiles and when the Air Force was buying F16 fighters for the same anti-aircraft mission. Canceling Divad and Patriot would save $2.2 billion, he estimated.

Similarly, Kaufmann said, the Army could save $1.5 billion by canceling the AH64 Apache helicopter, designed to perform the same ground-attack mission as the Air Force A10 attack plane. Last night, the Pentagon said the AH64 "complements" rather than competes with the A10 because the former would be controlled by ground commanders while the latter would be "managed at a much higher level."

Kaufmann was particularly critical of the administration's nuclear weapons program, saying the Pentagon could scrap both the MX intercontinental ballistic missile and the smaller, mobile Midgetman.

He said the Midgetman, the darling of many liberals in Congress, "may sound attractive as an alternative to the MX" but would be so restricted in its mobility—presumably by political or environmental constraints—that it "would be vulnerable to relatively simple and cheap attacks by an enemy."

Weinberger has not presented a convincing case that the Soviets could wage war on many fronts simultaneously, the threat for which the administration says the Pentagon should prepare, Kaufmann said.

Mr. BIDEN. As I was saying, Mr. President, these are prudent actions that in the long run will strengthen the many worthwhile Federal activities that many of us support. If deficits are allowed to climb, as they would do under the Republican leadership plan, next year we will be besieged to make deep cuts in the programs we need only freeze this year. So it is only prudent to act now, before even more painful action is required.

Because, Mr. President, I think one thing is clear. Congress and the President are going to have to act on this deficit issue sooner or later. The President and the Republican leadership have shown a preference for later action. I do not understand that position. In the first quarter of this year, the economy was booming. The gross national product grew in real terms by 8.3 percent. Everyone knows that the easiest time to deal with deficits is when the economy is booming—when entitlement spending is restrained and revenues are up. To deal with deficits in slack times is not only more difficult, but deprives the economy of needed stimulus and may drive it into recession. Many economists are predicting slower economic activity in the future. So it only makes sense to take decisive actions now, not later as the leadership apparently favors.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I applaud the efforts of the sponsors of this amendment. It is refreshing to see a bipartisan effort to reduce the deficit that does not depend upon massive tax increases. Generally around here, bipartisan budget means tax increases matched by defense spending cuts.

This budget would address the heart of the deficit problem—the continued expansion of spending, despite our efforts of the last 3 years to control the Federal budget. The effect of their budget freeze is to reduce spending by $226 billion over fiscal years 1984-87, including a cut of $120 billion in defense, $72 billion in nondefense outlays and $34 billion in debt service savings.

I wish it were possible this year to cut spending by $226 billion. But to the Senator from Kansas this budget has one fatal flaw—it has no chance of being enacted.

One reason is that most of the spending cuts are in defense. This budget plan cuts military spending by $80 more than the Baker amendment. By holding budget authority constant, this would amount to a real reduction in the Pentagon's budget for 1985. It seems to this Senator that such a defense cut is both dangerous and unrealistic.

There is a broad bipartisan consensus that defense spending needs to be increased—not by the amount that the President has proposed, but in the range of 3 to 6 percent real growth. Let me emphasize that the KGB budget does not allow for zero real growth in defense. By freezing actual budget authority real defense spending will decline by 5.6 percent. I cannot believe that the President would or should accept such an appropriation.

A second reason why this budget is not going anywhere is that it freezes COLAs, including social security, without any assurance from the Speaker of the House that he is willing to go along. Of the nondefense savings, $23 billion in this budget come out of social security. Now I do not believe that any area of the budget is untouchable, and our actions in the Finance Committee over the past 3 years bear this out. We have reduced spending in programs under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee by $73 billion over fiscal years 1982 through 1986, and these are entitlement programs. But I have been around here long enough to know that a $23 billion reduction in social security spending is not going anywhere in an election year without the Speaker's endorsement.

Just recall 2 years ago. The Senate Budget Committee was attacked for doing so little as suggested that the social security trust funds were approaching insolvency. The issue became so politicized that it is dangerous to even stand here and talk about social security. This amendment is a political land mine that the Speaker of the House would love to see us step onto. Any Republican who votes for this plan will be accused of trying to dismantle the social security system. I will bet the Democratic fundraisers already have the letter in their computer.

I would also remind Members that this amendment would cut medicare spending by an additional $6.7 billion on top of the $9 billion in cuts already in the Finance Committee package. The additional savings come from freezing hospital payments. Some Senators may have the impression that the hospital freeze would substitute

for the Finance Committee medicare package. But as the legislation is drafted, the freeze is in addition to our provisions, for a total reduction of $15.7 billion.

We attempted to make greater savings in medicare in our committee markup. But we encountered strong opposition to further cuts. We also believe that completely freezing hospital payments seriously jeopardizes our efforts to implement the prospective payment system.

The Finance Committee provisions include a modification in hospital payments that would result in a reduction of about 1 percent in those costs. Such a reduction would still permit an increase to account for the changes in the prices of the goods and services hospitals must purchase, helping to insure that medicare recipients continue to have access to high quality services. This amendment would permit no adjustment in hospital payments.

In conjunction with this proposal to further reduce payments to hospitals, the amendment before us would modify two additional provisions in the Finance Committee amendments. First, it would strike the provision indexing the part B deductible, and second, it would maintain the part B premium at 25 percent of program costs for only 1 additional year. These modifications reduce the savings resulting from the Finance Committee amendments by $588 million.

PART B PREMIUM

Part B premiums have increased by less than 270 percent since 1970 while there has been an increase of 1,720 percent in the Government's share of program costs and an increase in overall program costs which exceeds 960 percent.

The part B premium proposal contains a hold harmless provision so that an individual's social security check will not be reduced when their premiums increase.

The committee proposal is designed to accomplish one major objective: To provide for a more equitable balance between general revenue and premium financing of medicare part B.

The KGB amendment allows the balance between general revenue and premium financing to continue to tilt toward increased Federal financing after 1986. Rather than a year-to-year fix as has happened before and is being proposed again—we should stand by the committee's proposal which holds the Governments subsidy of this program at 75 percent.

INDEX PART V DEDUCTIBLE

The original Finance Committee proposal would be for 3 years only. The 1981 Reconciliation Act increased the part B deductible by 25 percent from $60 to $75. Prior to this amendment the deductible had remained at $60 since 1972 despite a more then 430-percent increase in total program benefit payments between 1972 and 1981. Since 1981 benefit payments have increased by an additional 80 percent.

The deductible was originally intended to reflect a portion of program costs, and has, because it has been fixed, failed to do so. The real value of the deductible will continue to erode if no increase takes place.

Indexing the part B deductible makes it more consistent with the part A deductible since both would change on an annual basis and reflect the increasing costs of the program.

The incremental increase in the deductible is small on an individual-by-individual basis, but results in significant cost savings to the program as a whole.

In 1985 the deductible would increase by $3, or less than 4 percent, while part B program costs are expected to increase by 16 percent.

CONCLUSION

Just so there is no misunderstanding, let me repeat that this budget would reduce social security spending by $23 billion and medicare by nearly $16 billion over the next 3 years.

This is much more drastic than anything considered by the House. They took up a weak freeze that would have allowed spending to rise only by the rate of inflation. This proposal just to limit spending got only 308 votes. How can anyone believe that this budget freeze has any chance in the House, when a much more modest attempt was defeated by 3 to 1?

The Senator from Kansas reluctantly recommends that this amendment be defeated. Our job this year is to get as much deficit reduction as we can. I believe the Republican leadership budget does as well as we can hope this year. While it would be great to lower the deficit even further, particularly through spending cuts, if this amendment were passed, the chance of getting any deficit cuts enacted this year would be slim.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the budget freeze proposal advanced by the Senators from Kansas, Iowa, and Delaware. In many ways, I agree wholeheartedly with the authors of the amendment. I agree that the budget deficits facing this Nation are truly extraordinary and demand extraordinary and bold action from this Congress. And I agree with the authors that we could go well beyond the budget reductions contained in the leadership amendment which is pending before this body. I agree that savings in fiscal year 1985 are much to be preferred to savings in the outyears of 1986 and 1987. The savings need to be front-loaded as the Senator from Colorado has said here on the floor. And I will also reluctantly agree that the KGB amendment is the best opportunity to achieve these objectives in an election year.

But, Mr. President, although I share many concerns and objectives with the authors, I cannot agree to the method of budget discipline that their amendment employs. I am opposed to the freeze approach. The deficits we face are structural—that is they are built into the laws which govern this Nation. The deficits are authorized by this Congress and the policies that we have agreed to pursue.

We may freeze those authorizations for 1 year as this amendment suggests. But what do we do next year, when we face the same problem all over again—huge deficits built into the law? Do we just freeze again? And for how many years do we abrogate our responsibility to address policy while we take the easy path of an across-the-board freeze year-after-year, how long will it be before the budget of the U.S. Government is grossly out of balance with the priorities and needs of the Nation?

I have been saying since I came to this body in 1978 that the Congress needs to review and adjust the underlying policies that create these budget deficits. We cannot solve the budget problem by simply crunching numbers. It is not a numbers problem. The problem is policy and until we bring those policies—health care, pensions, housing, defense, agriculture—to the floor of the Senate and debate policy reform—under the discipline of a budget resolution, but in the context of a policy debate—we cannot resolve the fundamental problems which cause the deficits which threaten our economy.

We have on rare occasions faced those policy debates in this Congress. For instance, early in the 1st session we reformed and according to some, saved the social security system. We made sure that social security was put on a sound financial footing for the foreseeable future. Tax revenues collected under that legislation will support benefit payments. But the social security example is rare. We have tried in my Subcommittee on Health which has jurisdiction over medicare and medicaid to make the savings required through rational policy adjustments rather than mindless numbers crunching. The principal example of this effort is the prospective payment system for hospitals participating in medicare which was adopted in the social security package last year.

So there have been some policy changes. But they have been too few and far between. We seem each year to spend more and more of our time on the budget process and less and less on the authorization bills which are the building blocks of the budget.

Furthermore, we find the compromise reflected in last year's social security legislation undone by this amendment. We raised payroll taxes, we increased the tax on the self-employed,

we brought thousands of the employed under the social security system for the first time and we did all that to make sure that benefits, including cost-of-living increases, could be provided. But now, just a year later, we find under this amendment that the COLA would be denied, frozen. It is as if we imposed those new payroll taxes, not to save social security, but to balance the budget. And that we find ourselves forced to do so because we have failed to apply the discipline of our social security legislation to other areas of the Federal budget.

Mr. President, beyond my objection to the methodology of the amendment—little more than number crunching in the absence of policy considerations—I must also object to this amendment, because it is only half a freeze. It freezes that part of our policy which is implemented by direct spending. But as Members of this body well-know, that is only half of our spending. The other half is accomplished through the Tax Code. The credits, deductions, and exemptions which make up the vast bulk of the Code, cost the U.S. Treasury very nearly as much as we collect in tax revenues every year.

Shall we freeze our spending programs for housing while we allow the tax expenditures for mortgage interest deductions to go unchecked? Shall we freeze our assistance programs for small business, while we continue unchecked the substantial depreciation and investment tax credits found in the Tax Code for large and profitable companies? Will we—as we did in the tax package last week—continue a moratorium on taxing fringe benefits for the employed while we freeze the spending programs for food stamps and job training that benefit the unemployed?

This amendment is only half a freeze. Those who depend on Federal spending will be frozen. Those who achieve substantial benefit through the Tax Code are left unaffected by this new found discipline.

So, Mr. President, I will oppose this amendment for two reasons. Although it is attractive in the short term, it is not a reasonable response to our budget problem over the long run. And our budget problems are long run. Second, even in the short term, the amendment is unfair in that it deals with only half of the spending decisions that we make. The other half—the expenditures made through the Tax Code—are left completely untouched by this amendment.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, someone commented the other day that the solution to the deficit problem depends on whom you ask. And as I study the details of this proposal to freeze all Federal spending, I am reminded that each of us has our own notion as to how the deficit should be reduced.

Just last week, I offered a budget plan that would have cut funding for all Federal programs—except social security, medicare, and national defense—by 10 percent over current levels. My plan was not approved, but it gave Senators a chance to vote for substantial and meaningful spending cuts without harming our senior citizens or jeopardizing our national security.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated my budget plan would have saved the taxpayers roughly $200 billion in 3 years, time.

Mr. President, Senators know I do not make a habit of voting against legislation that would cut Government spending. In fact, some might say I have taken more than my share of swings with the budget ax.

However, there comes a time to draw the line between cutting waste and extravagance from a bloated Federal bureaucracy and cutting funds for programs which are worthwhile to millions of Americans.

I must draw the line here, Mr. President. I cannot support a 1-year freeze on spending for all Government programs—the worthwhile, as well as wasteful—and accordingly will vote against this plan.

Congress simply must reduce Federal spending, but it should not do so at the expense of citizens who are truly needy and depend on Government assistance for their survival.

As I understand this freeze proposal, it would hurt millions of senior citizens and disabled Americans in North Carolina and elsewhere by denying them an annual cost-of-living adjustment this year. By freezing medicare funding, it would jeopardize the ability of elderly citizens to get the medical attention and hospital care they desperately need.

Supporters of this plan claim it is "fair," but I see nothing fair about spending cuts which have this kind of impact on those Americans who can least afford it.

If this plan passes, Mr. President, our efforts to restore the national defense capability of our Nation would be severely crippled. During the decade before President Reagan was elected, our defense capability was allowed to deteriorate to a dangerous level. The United States is no longer No. 1 in its ability to defend itself from foreign aggression. There is an urgent need to catch up.

By supporting a reasonable amount of defense spending, Mr. President, I am certainly not advocating waste by the Pentagon. We must move quickly to cut out wasteful spending practices in all Federal agencies—including the Pentagon.

The Grace Commission—formally known as the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control—studied Federal waste and extravagance for 3 years and has presented Congress with more than 2,400 recommendations for cutting down on the cost of Government without eliminating worthwhile programs. The panel estimates $425,000,000,000 could be saved in 3 years if President Reagan and Congress implemented them. That is roughly half of the entire Federal budget for the current fiscal year.

Sad to say, the Grace Commission report has been all but ignored by Congress and the news media.

Mr. President, there have been many times during my nearly 12 years in the Senate that I have encouraged the use of a "buzz saw" to cut excessive spending. But each time, I have been careful to tailor the proposal so as not to harm the most necessary and worthwhile Federal programs. While I commend my distinguished colleagues for their hard work and courage in putting this budget plan together, regretfully I cannot join with them in support of it.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden budget proposal currently under consideration by the Senate. I fully sympathize with the intentions of my colleagues offering this amendment: however, I believe that its impact will be inequitably distributed throughout our society.

Certainly, I do not dispute that the budget is a disaster. I call it a disaster because that is exactly the state of our budget process. The Federal Government may incur a $180 billion deficit in fiscal year 1985 if action is not taken soon. In fact, budget deficits may total $500 billion between 1986 and 1988. This is outrageous: it will mortgage the future of our children.

I was one of 28 Senators to support a budget amendment. That would have cut the 1985 budget for all programs by 10 percent, except for social security recipients. I subscribe to the notion that all sectors of the budget must be cut. However, I think that social security recipients must be treated separately.

This is the crux of my concern with the current amendment. It does not distinguish between the poor, the middle class, and the wealthy. It will eliminate the COLA for social security recipients. The end result will be that 5 million senior citizens will be pushed below the poverty level.

Where will these people turn? Last year they had to sacrifice their COLA for 6 months. Under the pending proposal, they would have to wait another full year. This would create a whole new class of impoverished Americans. Consequently, I must vigorously oppose this amendment.

The authors of the pending budget proposal are right to be concerned about the deficit, but I believe that their amendment either must be modi-

fied to exempt senior citizens or must be defeated.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have listened closely to the debate on the Kassebaum-Biden-Grassley amendment, and my concern about the effect of the deficit on future economic growth is so strong that I seriously considered voting for the amendment. However, in the final analysis I cannot support it.

I agree that we must have a program of shared sacrifice which will lead to substantial deficit reduction. It is for that reason that I voted for the Hollings plan yesterday. But the program before us is not one of shared sacrifice. Unlike the Hollings plan, it calls for a major sacrifice by social security recipients but for no sacrifice by the wealthiest members of our society. Right now there are thousands of people in this country who make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year and pay nothing in taxes because of tax shelters and loopholes. Tens of thousands of profitable corporations pay nothing in taxes for the same reasons. The Hollings plan would have allowed for tax reform to change these inequities. The plan before us, however, would allow them to continue at the same time we are asking recipients of social security to make do with less after taking into account inflation. I cannot accept this.

In addition, I find the 4½-percent reduction in defense spending in real terms too drastic of a step. I have come to this floor over and over again to offer amendments to cut military waste and to terminate unwise weapons programs. But the plan before us today goes beyond cutting waste and terminating unwise programs. I am concerned about the impact of this amendment on operations and maintenance. I am also concerned what a cut of 4½-percent would do to our arguments with the allies that they should keep our mutual commitments to increase defense spending by 3 percent after taking into account inflation. If the allies take this vote today as a signal that we are no longer serious in our efforts to insist that they share the burden of defense, then in the long run this amendment may cost us more in defense spending if we have to further pick up the slack in their own defense efforts in order to protect our own security.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, since the Senate did not support, as I think it should have last night, the Hollings, Exon, Andrews proposal for truly meaningful deficits reductions, I find it necessary to cast a vote for the Grassley - Biden - Kassebaum - Baucus amendment. As the issue now stands it is the only option now available to attack the deficit problem for those of us very much concerned about it. However, Mr. President, I am concerned about the zero increase in our defense needs. That is simply not realistic in my judgment. Should this measure pass, I will subsequently be offering a proposal to make the defense number increase at least 4 percent.

It is with that understanding that I will cast an affirmative vote.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether or not there are any additional Senators he knows of who wish to speak in opposition to this amendment? I will make the same inquiry on my side, whether there is any Senator who wishes to speak in support of this amendment and to determine how much longer we should continue.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say to my friend from Delaware, Senator DOLE has just returned. I might ask if he cares to speak further.

Does the Senator from Delaware have anyone else?

Mr. DOLE. I do not feel compelled to speak, but I would be happy to speak.

Mr. DOMENICI. He does not feel compelled to.

Mr. BIDEN. I do not think there is anyone else. If Senator DOLE speaks, I would be happy to speak again.

Mr. DOLE. We can speak at the same time.

Mr. BIDEN. It would probably be equally understood.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have no further Senators who want to speak in opposition. If the Senator is ready to vote, we are.

Mr. BIDEN. I am ready to vote. Let us vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) would vote "Yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 65, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Andrews	Exon	Mitchell
Armstrong	Grassley	Nickles
Baucus	Hatfield	Pressler
Biden	Hollings	Proxmire
Bingaman	Humphrey	Pryor
Boren	Inouye	Randolph
Bumpers	Jepsen	Sasser
Burdick	Kassebaum	Simpson
Dixon	Kasten	Specter
Dodd	Mattingly	Tsongas
Evans	Melcher	Zorinsky

NAYS—65

Abdnor	Glenn	Moynihan
Baker	Goldwater	Nunn
Bentsen	Gorton	Packwood
Boschwitz	Hatch	Pell
Bradley	Hawkins	Percy
Byrd	Hecht	Quayle
Chafee	Heflin	Riegle
Chiles	Heinz	Roth
Cochran	Helms	Rudman
Cohen	Huddleston	Sarbanes
Cranston	Johnston	Stafford
D'Amato	Kennedy	Stennis
Danforth	Lautenberg	Stevens
DeConcini	Laxalt	Symms
Denton	Leahy	Thurmond
Dole	Levin	Tower
Domenici	Long	Trible
Durenberger	Lugar	Wallop
Eagleton	Mathias	Warner
East	Matsunaga	Weicker
Ford	McClure	Wilson
Garn	Metzenbaum	

NOT VOTING—2

Hart	Murkowski

So the amendment (No. 3043), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it has been called to my attention by the distinguished Senator from Oregon that he has a misunderstanding and an error in respect to the vote just cast.

He has consulted, I believe, with the minority leader, and has advised me of that situation.

I yield, if the Senator wishes to make a request at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to make two statements. One, the vote which I cast in opposition to the Kassebaum amendment was intended as a vote "aye." The vote was announced before I had the opportunity to vote for the amendment. Two, this will not change the outcome of the vote. Therefore, I would ask unanimous consent that I may be recorded as voting "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon will be recorded as having voted "aye."

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the leadership.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

31-059 O-87-21 (Pt. 8)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have order in the Senate? Senators please cease conversation.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senator CHILES, is prepared to offer his amendment at this time. I also understand that, while debate will proceed this evening, Senator CHILES does not wish to have the vote on or in relation to that amendment tonight, but rather to take it up tomorrow, which is satisfactory with me.

I wonder if I could inquire of the two managers now as to when they would like to resume consideration of this and how soon we might be able to get to a vote approximately on the CHILES amendment. I am not trying to get a time agreement, I am just trying to get an estimate so I can make a further announcement about the schedule of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, my understanding was that we would lay it down tonight. I have tried to tell some Members that I did not think there would be any votes tonight. I do not think that we will debate it very long tonight, just lay it down and take it up tomorrow.

While I would not at this time like to enter into a time agreement, I am not going to try to delay it any great length of time. I want there to be a free-flowing debate on the amendment as there was on this amendment and as there was on the Hollings plan.

I would think sometime toward midafternoon we could see where we stand in the debate at that time. That is what I can indicate to the Senator now. I do not want to lock myself in but, at the same time, I think there should be a meaningful debate.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I think that is a fair analysis of the situation as best we can do.

Let me say it is still the hope of the leadership on this side that we can finish tomorrow night. I do not think we can, perhaps, but we ought to try, because otherwise we are going to be on this bill when we return on Monday. We have many, many other things that have to be done.

But in any event, it is the intention of the leadership to ask the Senate to remain late on tomorrow evening to get as far as we can and finish if possible.

Mr. President, based on the colloquy that we have now had, I wish to announce that I do not foresee any further record votes this evening.

AMENDMENT NO. 3044

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) proposes an amendment numbered 3044.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(a) "SEC. . It is the Sense of Congress that total Budget Authority available for appropriations for Budget Function 050 (National Defense) and for non-defense discretionary programs shall not exceed $431.3 billion for FY 1985; and which $290.8 billion is intended to be for National Defense and $140.5 billion is intended to be for non-defense discretionary programs; that for FY 1986, the Total Budget Authority for these activities shall not exceed $462.8 billion, of which $321.0 billion is intended to be for National Defense and $141.8 billion for non-defense discretionary programs; and that for FY 1987, the total Budget Authority for these activities shall not exceed $497.5 billion, of which $354.3 billion is intended to be for National Defense and $143.2 billion is intended to be for non-defense discretionary programs."

(b) "SEC. . DELAY FOR 2 YEARS OF COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS TO TAX TABLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to adjustments in tax tables so that inflation will not result in tax increases) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) Special Rule for 1985 and 1986.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1987, no increase shall be made under clause (ii) of paragrah (2)(A) of this subsection and no adjustment shall be made under paragraph (2)(C) relating to such increase."

(b) BASE YEAR.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(3) of such Code (relating to cost-of-living adjustment) is amended by striking out "1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "1985".

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1986.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, this is the Chiles amendment, or the Chiles package. It will be the pending business, I understand, when we come back on the bill tomorrow.

I yield now to the distinguished majority leader.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business not past the hour of 7 p.m., in which Senators may speak for not more than 1 minute each, with the exception of the majority and minority leaders who shall have no restriction in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDING THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA FOR ITS WORK IN COMBATING THE SPREAD OF COCAINE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have a few items that are cleared for action by unanimous consent on this side.

First, there is a matter that we provided by unanimous consent would be placed directly on the calendar by order of last evening; that is, Calendar 828, House Concurrent Resolution 275.

If the minority leader has no objection, I ask the Senate to proceed to consideration of that item at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275), commending the Government of Colombia for its recent seizure of record amounts of cocaine, congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication, expressing the hope that the Government of Colombia will carry out a sustained eradication program, and deploring the assassination of the Minister of Justice of Colombia.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 275, which commends the Government of Colombia for its efforts to control drug trafficking in that country and which deplores the recent assassination of a government official who fought to rid his country of drug dealers.

Rodrigo Lara-Bonilla, the Minister of Justice in Colombia, was gunned down on April 30 when he stopped by the side of the road to assist two apparently stranded motorcyclists. One of the paid assassins died in the exchange of gunfire and one was seriously wounded by Mr. Lara's guards.

President Betancur has declared a state of siege and has convened his full Cabinet in response to the assassination and its connection with Colombia's illicit drug business. He said martial law was ordered so that Columbia could "recover its national dignity that has been trampled by drug traffickers, giving us a black image throughout the world." I applaud President Betancur's swift reaction to this murder. Mr. Lara spoke out vigoruously and bravely about the threat to his country that drugs and the criminal element pose. Courage and duty, whether on the field of battle or in the war against drugs, should not be forgotten. Neither should the Colombian people forget this man's fight to warn and to rid Colombia of the devastation caused by drugs—the cost of

life, productivity, integrity, and freedom itself.

In 1979, I visited Colombia and talked with the President and Attorney General of that country. They provided convincing evidence of the magnitude of drug production there and their difficulty in trying to cope with it. Their resources obviously were inadequate. When I returned, we saw to it that aid was forthcoming to help them begin. Sixteen million dollars helped to establish a 1,200-man special narcotics control unit with the Colombian National Police. This special unit was in charge of the recent successful attack on cocaine laboratories and the huge confiscation of 13.8 metric tons of coke on March 10. That is estimated to be one-fourth the cocaine consumption yearly in the United States. Our aid also helped to train Colombian customs personnel and pilots and provided aircraft and equipment necessary to narcotics control.

Foreign aid is often critized, but here is a case where assistance we have provided is certainly cost beneficial. We have seen this money fight the drug flow at its source. Just last year, we gave Colombia $3.5 million for narcotics control efforts; this lone successful raid on March 10 at Tranquillandia removed $1.2 billion from drug dealers' pockets and from the drug traffickers' underground economy. The more we can help in endeavors like that, the less we have to spend for drug law enforcement in this country. Money can be saved which otherwise would be needed for overcrowded courts, prisons, and drug rehabilitation programs.

That Colombia is the processing and the distribution center for about 75 percent of the cocaine entering the United States is reason enough for us to lend support and assistance. The fact that the drug industry there alledgedly is promoted and protected by the Communist guerrilla force and that guerrillas and traffickers work together in drugs-for-guns deals threatening the Democratic Government of Colombia is reason enough for Colombia to welcome our support. Sadly, this has not always been the case. However, the commitment of the Colombian Government to their treaty obligations regarding the eradication of cannabis and coca is encouraging. The cautious but positive progress made to date by the administration of President Betancur in this regard, especially in the face of the ruthless and lawless challenges of the criminal elements within the country, is to be commended.

The return of the fugitive Harold Rosenthal to the United States by Colombia is another indication of their determination to rid their country of the blight of international criminals. Rosenthal was a key figure in the mass movement of tons of cocaine into this country with a total disregard for the laws of his own country of the United States as well as those of Colombia.

We strongly encourage the government of President Betancur to expeditiously process the international extradition requests for our Government. This process, directed at the highest levels of the international drug trafficking cartels, will serve notice to these criminals to terminate their activities or suffer the scourge of a modern judicial system, loss of their freedom, and all of their resources. The deterrent quality of this kind of bilateral cooperation will benefit the societies of both countries for generations to come.

The pervasive cancer of drug abuse and trafficking has reached into the heart of the Colombian society. Violent criminal acts with direct connection to the major drug traffickers in Colombia has become a daily occurence. The most recent outrage by these drug kingpins is the assassination of Justice Minister Rodrigo Lara-Bonilla. He was a man committed to ridding his county of the menace of these parasites. His loss shocks the conscience of all law-abiding people throughout the hemisphere, especially the dedicated men and women in the law enforcement community. The total desregard that these drug traffickers have for life and the laws of their country as well as other countries points to the need for a renewed dedication to the ideals of this fine man.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join with the House in deploring the assassination of Rodrigo Lara-Bonilla, Minister of Justice of Colombia. I ask also that the Senate join the House and the Senators who cosponsored my resolution of commendation, Senate Resolution 358, to commend Colombia's efforts to eradicate drugs at the source and to applaud Colombia's world record drug bust of March 10. The Government of Colombia has embarked on a difficult journey to make this hemisphere a safer place, free of drugs and free of the criminal element which lives off the profits of those drugs. Colombia deserves our pat on the back and our encouragement to go forth as its President announced "unleashing a war without quarter against the crooks that sow terror in cities, the countryside, and towns."

Mr. President, this is very significant. Colombia recently made the biggest cocaine bust that we have seen happen anywhere. The country of Colombia has more and more been taking a serious concern in regard to drugs. We had some differences for a while. Much of the marihuana was coming from Colombia. Then cocaine was being processed there. Our concern was whether the Government in Colombia was expressing sufficient concern.

It is clear from their recent actions they took in the tremendous drug bust that they have taken this more seriously. This terrible thing has happened, the assassination of the Minister of Justice. They are now beginning a real war on crime.

This resolution helps us stand with Colombia, support them for the recent actions they have taken, and tells them that we stand ready to assist them in any way in this dreadful, dreadful war that is going on.

Mr. President, I introduced a similar concurrent resolution after the occasion of their successful cocaine bust.

This certainly takes the place of that. Now we want to take this further action of expressing our sympathy for the assassination of Mr. Lara by our resolve to stand with President Betancur in his all-out war on these underworld factions.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the resolution now under consideration by the Senate addresses one of the most significant international narcotics control issues now facing the United States—how to reduce dramatically the flow of cocaine and marihuana from Colombia to the United States. As the resolution makes clear, one of the most effective ways to achieve this objective is by herbicide eradication done in cooperation with the host government. It is my hope that Colombia will soon implement an ongoing herbicide eradication program aimed at reducing its illicit marihuana crop. The Committee on Foreign Relations supports this kind of effort. To this end, the committee has approved the Department of State's international narcotics control budget for fiscal year 1985 which includes the authority to fund an effective Colombia eradication program.

The Government of Colombia has made some progress on the narcotics problem in recent months. Its most dramatic success was the March crackdown on cocaine processing and warehousing facilities in the country. That major law enforcement effort by the Colombia Government demonstrated that when there is sufficient will to take action, the drug profiteers can be beaten. But the human costs can be very high. Sadly, 2 days ago the Justice Minister of Colombia, one of the strongest supporters in the Colombia Government of increased antinarcotics efforts, was assassinated. It appears that his assassination may have been the work of drug traffickers.

I am told that President Betancour has said publicly that his government will continue to move forward in its efforts to deal more effectively with the narcotics problems. I applaud him for this statement and pledge my support for any serious efforts by the Colom-

bia Government that will help reduce the amount of Colombia marihuana and cocaine coming into the United States. I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 275. It is my hope that it will be a call to action for the Colombia Government to move forward vigorously on both the eradiction program and the apprehension and prosecution of drug producers and traffickers in that country.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER TO PLACE H.R. 5222 ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5222, Controlled Substances Registrant Protection Act of 1984, and it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER TO HOLD H.R. 5287 AT THE DESK

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate receives from the House H.R. 5287, a bill to amend title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit additional funds to be used to continue awards under certain multiyear grants, it be held at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have a series of calendar items on the Calendar of Business which are cleared on this side for action by the unanimous consent. I will ask the minority leader if he is in a position to similarly clear all or any portion of the following items: Calendar Orders numbered 775, 776, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, and 824.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the items that have been enumerated by the distinguished majority leader have been cleared on this side.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader. I wonder if the minority leader would object if we proceeded to consider these items en bloc?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my answer is in the negative.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COTTON STATISTICS AND ESTIMATES ACT AMENDMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2085) to amend section 3a of the Cotton Statistics and Estimates Act to provide continuing authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for recovering costs associated with cotton classing services to producers which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, effective for the period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1988, section 3a of the Cotton Statistics and Estimates Act (7 U.S.C. 473a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3a. Effective for the fiscal years ending September 30, 1985, September 30, 1986, September 30, 1987, and September 30, 1988, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make cotton classification services available to producers of cotton and shall provide for the collection of classification fees from participating producers, or from agents who voluntarily agree to collect and remit the fees on behalf of producers. Such fees, together with the proceeds from the sales of samples submitted under this section, shall cover as nearly as practicable the cost of the services provided under this section, including administrative and supervisory costs: Provided, That (1) the uniform per bale classification fee to be collected from producers, or their agents, for such classification service in any year shall not exceed the uniform fee collected in the previous year by more than the percentage increase in the Implicit Price Deflator for Gross National Product as indexed during the most recent twelve-month period for which official statistics are available, and (2) the uniform per bale classification fee shall not be increased for any year if the accumulated reserve exceeds 20 per centum of the cost of the classification program in the previous year. Special classification services provided at the request of the producer shall not be subject to the restrictions specified in clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence. All samples of cotton submitted for classification under this section shall become the property of the United States, and shall be sold: *Provided*, That such cotton samples shall not be subject to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.) Fees collected under this section and under section 3d of this Act and the proceeds from the sales of samples shall be credited to the current appropriation account that incurs the cost and shall remain available without fiscal year limitation to pay the expenses of the Secretary incident to providing services under such sections. Such funds may be invested by the Secretary in insured or fully-collateralized, interest-bearing accounts or, at the discretion of the Secretary, by the Secretary of the Treasury in United States Government debt instruments, with the interest earned and any late payment penalties to be credited to the appropriation account for use by the Secretary of Agriculture in providing services under this section and section 3d of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section to the extent that financing is not available from fees and the proceeds from the sales of samples.".

SEC. 2. Section 203(h) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C 1622(h)) is amended by inserting after "service authorized by this subsection" the following: ": *Provided*, That any operating balances from the collection of fees under this subsection may be invested by the Secretary of Agriculture in insured or fully-collateralized, interest-bearing accounts or, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, by the Secretary of the Treasury in United States Government debt instruments, with the interest earned and any late payment penalties to be credited to the trust fund account that incurs the cost of the services rendered under this Act and to be available without fiscal year limitation to cover the expenses of the Secretary of Agriculture incident to providing such services".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, S. 2085 extends through fiscal year 1988 the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to recover from cotton growers the costs associated with providing cotton-classing services. The Department of Agriculture began charging user fees for cotton-classing services on October 1, 1981, pursuant to authority contained in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. This bill will allow the Department of Agriculture to continue to recover the costs of such services and, thus, maintain equitable treatment to all users of commodity grading activities.

I urge the support of S. 2085 since the user fee concept has now been effectively integrated into the cotton classification system without any detectable adverse effect. Participation by producers in the program during fiscal years 1982-83 remained at the same high level as it had been in previous years—about 97 percent. The Department of Agriculture predicts the same level of participation in fiscal year 1984 as well. Additionally, Mr. President, passage of S. 2085 will result in a continued savings in appropriated funds of $12 to $14 million annually.

In addition to providing for the collection of classification fees from participating producers, the bill will specifically allow agents who voluntarily agree to do so to collect and remit the fees on behalf of producers. This provision is consistent with the intent of Congress as expressed in the conference report on the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 and is now incorporated into the bill to clarify the Department's authority to continue billing voluntary collection agents for the fees, rather than producers. By directly billing the approximately 1,200 ginners and warehousemen, rather than billing individually about 50,000 producers that receive classing services, annual cost savings under the cotton classification system of about $800,000 will result.

S. 2085, as reported, also makes improvements to the current program. The bill places a cap on the total fee per bale that correlates to annual in-

creases in the rate of inflation. Specifically, the bill provides that the uniform per bale classification fee in any year may not exceed the fee collected in the previous year by more than the percentage increase in the implicit price deflator for gross national product as indexed during the most recent 12-month period for which statistics are available. The change, requested by the cotton industry, replaces the current overall dollar limit on total revenues that may be raised from the assessment of cotton-classing fees.

Mr. President, the bill also assures the cotton industry that fee increases will be based on need and that large reserves will not be accumulated from the collection of fees. Thus the bill provides that the uniform per bale fee may not be increased for any year if the accumulated reserve exceeds 20 percent of the cost of the classification program in the previous year. Special classification services provided at the request of the producer, such as high volume instrument classification, would not be subject to the restrictions on fee increases.

Additionally, S. 2085 continues the current authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to invest, in interest-bearing accounts, the operating balances of the cotton classing and cotton service testing programs user fee accounts to help offset program operating costs. The Secretary could also request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest these funds in U.S. Government debt instruments.

Finally, S. 2085 will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to invest operating balances from the collection of fees for all voluntary inspection and grading programs being conducted by the Department of Agriculture under authority of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. These programs involve various agricultural commodities such as meat, poultry, eggs, and fruits and vegetables. The ability to invest collected fees in interest bearing accounts or U.S. Government securities will allow these programs to help pay for themselves as well as offset future revenue requirements. This provision places all voluntary inspection and grading programs of the Department of Agriculture on a comparable basis.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of S. 2085. The continuation of the user fees for cotton-classing services and the close coordination of the program with the cotton industry will result in the program being administered by the Department of Agriculture in the most efficient manner possible. S. 2085 will directly benefit cotton growers and users and will provide equitable treatment to all users of commodity grading activities. In addition, the recovery of these costs removes the burden of paying for these specialized services from the general taxpayer.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, S. 2085 extends, for 4 years, the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to charge fees for cotton classification services provided to producers by the Department of Agriculture. The bill will also permit the Department to invest, in interest-bearing accounts, cotton-classing fees, and other fees for commodity inspection and grading services that are held for use in covering the costs of the services.

Enactment of the bill is needed to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to collect fees to offset costs associated with providing cotton-classing services to producers. Without enactment of the bill, authority to charge for cotton-classing services will expire at the end of fiscal year 1984. Under S. 2085, the authority is extended through fiscal year 1988.

The Department first implemented a fee for cotton classification services on October 1, 1981, under the provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Initially, the fee was established at a level that covered only about two-thirds of the cost of the classing services, including administrative and supervisory costs. In fiscal year 1982, the established fee was 60 cents per bale, and, in fiscal year 1983, the fee was increased to 67 cents per bale. The balance of the cost of the classing system was financed by appropriated funds and by proceeds from the sale of cotton samples accumulated by the Department of Agriculture. For fiscal year 1984, the Department of Agriculture increased the user fee to $1.15 per bale, which is estimated to be sufficient to recover the full cost of the cotton-classing program. This last increase placed all agricultural commodity grading services on a full cost-recovery basis.

Under S. 2085, in fiscal year 1985 and following years, the Department will be able to adjust the 1984 user fee for cotton classing as appropriate to reflect inflation, thus enabling the Department to keep fee income at levels sufficient to cover inflationary increase in its cost of providing the services.

The cotton classification user fee system started in 1981 has been well received by cotton producers. Participation in the classification program by producers has remained at the same high level as in previous years—about 97 percent. In that regard, I urge the Department to work closely with the cotton industry, as it has in the past, to insure that the program continues to operate efficiently.

S. 2085 also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to invest, in interest-bearing accounts, the operating balances of the trust fund containing fees collected for voluntary commodity inspection and grading services provided under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. Under that act, inspection and grading services are provided for various agricultural commodities, such as meat, poultry, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. The interest earned on deposits will be applied against the cost of providing the inspection and grading services.

This new authority to earn interest on fees collected under the Agricultural Marketing Act will place all voluntary commodity inspection and grading programs of the Department of Agriculture on a comparable basis, and help offset future revenue requirements.

Mr. President, this bill is necessary to maintain the effective operation of the cotton classification and other commodity inspection and grading programs without adding to the Federal budget. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as amended.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide continuing authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for recovering costs associated with cotton classing services to producers and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to invest funds derived from fees for certain voluntary grading and inspection services.".

TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 287) establishing a task force on agricultural credit, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should appoint a task force on agricultural credit to examine agricultural credit problems, report to the President and Congress on the credit problems confronting agricultural producers and related businesses, and make recommendations for resolving any problems that are identified.

SEC. 2. The task force should—

(1) identify and describe the components of the existing agricultural credit system;

(2) identify and describe the credit needs of agricultural producers and related businesses;

(3) evaluate the ability of the existing agricultural credit system to meet the credit needs of agricultural producers; and

(4) develop, for the President and Congress, specific policy and legislative recommendations to ensure the availability of adequate agricultural credit at reasonable cost.

SEC. 3. The task force should have a balanced membership composed of not fewer than fifteen persons representing all major segments of agriculture, such as farmers, suppliers, marketing personnel, and lenders.

SEC. 4. The task force should prepare and transmit a report to the President and Congress containing a detailed statement of its findings and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The task force should submit its report as soon as practicable, but not later than January 1, 1985, and should terminate not later than twelve months after being established.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his leadership in this and other efforts on behalf of our farm community.

There is no doubt that many farmers and agri-businessmen are facing financial difficulty, most through no fault of their own. I am sure every Member in this Chamber is sympathetic to these problems and would support any reasonable effort to provide meaningful assistance.

However, Mr. President, the avenues open to the Congress and others to deal with the stresses occurring in the agricultural economy are far from clear. Wide differences of opinion exist among those involved with agriculture as to what are the most effective means to help producers and agricultural businesses with their credit problems.

The Federal Government is involved directly with agricultural credit through the Farmers Home Administration. This agency is supplying an ever increasing amount of capital to our farmers and is an integral component in insuring that their agricultural credit needs are met. However, FmHA is by no means the sole credit source, or even the largest. This fact seems to be lost on many who claim that radical changes in the policies of this agency would provide a panacea for all of our troubles in the farm economy.

This administration has a policy of "going the extra mile" with troubled borrowers and through liberal use of the various servicing authorities of FmHA, has been able to keep many producers in business who otherwise would be forced to liquidate. Last year, over 65,000 servicing actions including deferrals, reschedulings, reamortizations, and consolidations were made on behalf of FmHA borrowers. I commend this effort and want to insure that this Agency has every reasonable tool to assist our farmers who use FmHA for credit. Recent legislation enacted by Congress made several significant contributions to this effort which I believe will prove quite helpful to FmHA borrowers experiencing temporary difficulty because of last summer's drought and other causes not under their control.

However, Mr. President, FmHA provides only about 12 percent of our Nation's credit for agriculture. The Farm Credit System, commercial banks, insurance companies, and private individuals provide essential sources of capital for all segments of the farm community. These lenders have been able to meet, for the most part, the credit needs of our farmers. Now, it is apparent from information from these lenders and other sources that a careful, comprehensive review of the financial difficulties of American agriculture and recommendations to deal with them is necessary.

A task force, made up of representatives from all areas of agriculture including farmers, suppliers, marketers, and lenders would provide essential insights into our farm credit problems and what might be done to alleviate them. This report will be instrumental in guiding Congress and others in providing for responsible and adequate sources of credit to insure the continuation of this Nation's most basic industry—agriculture.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is taking final action today on Senate Resolution 287, which calls on the President to establish a task force on agricultural credit. The task force would develop policy recommendations designed to insure the availability of credit to farmers at reasonable rates of interest.

The last several years have been most difficult for our Nation's farmers. The declining value of farm assets, high interest rates, and low farm income have combined to create a severe credit crisis for many farmers.

Although the farm credit situation has been deteriorating for several years, the administration has refused to take timely measures to improve conditions. Each day the administration allows to pass without applying some remedy, it becomes that much more difficult to reverse the trend.

INDICATORS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY FAILURES

The threat of foreclosure is the most serious and demoralizing aspect of the current depressed agricultural economy. Although some would say that the media has sensationalized the financial problems of farmers, I believe there is an abundance of evidence to support the headline on a story that recently appeared in one of the newspapers in my State: "Losers are long gone; now it's good farmers going under."

During the last 2 years, over 15,000 farmers with Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) loans have been forced to liquidate their operations for financial reasons. In overseeing record numbers of farm liquidations since 1981, FmHA has taken over 2,200 farms into its inventory. Prior to the current administration, the number of farms held by FmHA had never exceeded 260. The farms held by FmHA consist of about 488,000 acres having a value of several hundred million dollars.

I have written the Comptroller General asking him to investigate the procedure and policies used by FmHA to manage this enormous amount of farmland. It is clear that FmHA cannot put the property up for sale because that would further depress the value of farm assets. However, the agency is poorly equipped to manage the large number of farms in the agency's inventory.

FmHA borrowers are not the only farmers experiencing difficulty. In 1983, the Farm Credit Administration reported that Production Credit Association (PCA) loan losses for the previous 3 years exceeded the combined losses for the preceding 47 years.

In his annual report to Congress, submitted in February of this year, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration said that PCA's in 1983 were "subject to the worst financial pressure since the 1930's. The estimated $240 to $250 million in losses sustained by PCA's in 1983 represents, in 1 year, approximately 40 percent of all losses throughout their 50-year existence." Further, the report stated that the system "will likely face more difficulty in 1984 than in 1983."

In addition, a survey conducted by the Independent Bankers Association of America found that, among its mostly rural member banks, the lenders expect that about 17 percent of their present farm borrowers will not be able to meet all of their loan payments in 1984.

A survey conducted by the agricultural division of the American Bankers Association found that nearly 66 percent of the bankers surveyed estimated that the net worth of their farm borrowers declined during 1983.

Department of Agriculture official forecasts confirm the fears of many agricultural lenders that farmers will have difficulty making their loan payments during 1984. A report issued on March 1, 1984, by the Department states that farmers can expect increased cash flow problems during 1984 due to an expected drop in net farm cash income from the 1983 level that could be as steep as 16 percent.

ACTION BY CONGRESS NEEDED

Earlier this year, I outlined an agenda for action that should be taken by Congress this year to meet the needs of the hard-pressed agricultural economy. Senate Resolution 287, calling for the establishment of a Presidential task force to study agricultural credit problems and make recommendations on policy changes, is one of a series of proposals I have developed or sponsored as part of that agenda.

My other credit proposals include the Emergency Agricultural Credit Act of 1984, which recently was enacted into law, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 99, legislation designed to curb the number of agricultural loans being classified as "problem loans" by Federal bank examiners.

The enactment of the Emergency Agricultural Credit Act of 1984 and favorable action today by the Senate on

Senate Resolution 287 are steps in the right direction. However, I am disappointed that other actions on agricultural credit, needed for some time, have not been taken.

For example, existing law requires Congress specifically to reauthorize every 3 years, and set lending limits for, the FmHA farm credit programs, which provide family farmers with an essential safety net. Although the previous 3-year authorization under this requirement expired at the end of fiscal year 1981, a new 3-year reauthorization has not been enacted. Reauthorization legislation was reported by the committee during the 97th Congress (S. 2314) but was never considered by the Senate. No action has been taken on the matter during the current Congress and agricultural credit legislation was not mentioned in the committee's 1984 agenda, released on December 22, 1983, by the chairman of the committee.

It is my hope that the enactment of the Emergency Agricultural Credit Act of 1984 and the Senate's approval of Senate Resolution 287 are signs that the administration and Congress are beginning to take cognizance of the agricultural credit crisis, and that we will see further action on needed agricultural legislation in the coming months.

It must be said, however, that a major source of the credit problems facing U.S. farmers—high interest rates—cannot be easily dealt with in agricultural credit legislation. Any comprehensive solution to agricultural credit problems must include action by the administration to reverse the dangerous economic policies that threaten to perpetuate excessive interest rates.

LARGER ECONOMIC PROBLEMS ADVERSELY AFFECT AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

Beginning in the 1970's, we have seen what are normally considered financial and banking issues growing in importance to the agricultural economy. Prior to about 1970, farmers and agricultural lenders did not have to concern themselves with such things as the value of the dollar or the financing of the national debt. Today, those matters have a direct bearing on commodity prices and on interest rates, and thus on the profitability of farming and the financing of farm operations.

In the 1970's, farmers began to see that their ability to earn a living was directly related to our Nation's ability to export agricultural products.

More recently, the farm economy has been affected by another international event—the influence of foreign investment on U.S. interest rates.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, since 1981, the Federal deficit has gone from 2 percent of the gross national product to 6 percent. The burden on U.S. business and on agriculture caused by this crushing debt load has, so far, been lessened by the flow of foreign capital into the United States. Nearly half of the increase in the deficit has been directly or indirectly financed with funds from overseas.

Regarding the significance of financing the deficit with funds from overseas, in a report issued in February, the Congressional Budget Office said this:

> For now, foreigners seem willing to continue acquiring U.S financial claims, spurred by high yields on dollar assets and by optimism as to the economic and political stability of the United States. The longer-run outlook is less certain. Even if interest rates remain high, foreigners may hesitate to continue investing in U.S. assets if massive U.S. trade deficits make them fear a depreciation of the dollar, or if they grow concerned over U.S. fiscal policy. If the inflow of foreign funds were to cease because of such a lack of confidence, substantial upward pressure on domestic interest rates would result, intensifying the crowding out of interest-sensitive domestic expenditures and making it even more difficult for developing countries to service their dollar debts. Another consequence would be a depreciation of the dollar, imparting an inflationary impulse to the American economy.

Further, investment in the United States by foreigners is not limited to Treasury securities. Significant amounts of foreign funds are flowing directly into farm communities as a result of purchases by foreigners of farm credit system securities, issued to obtain funds for the system.

Farm credit system officials estimate that about 18 to 20 percent of the system's $70 billion in outstanding securities is held by foreign investors.

The Congressional Budget Office has issued a warning to the administration about the consequences of relying on foreign capital to finance the Federal deficit and meet other domestic credit needs. The following statement was included in another report recently issued by that office:

> Fortunately, very large capital inflows from abroad have so far limited the rise in interest rates. It should be emphasized that these capital inflows are not a costless remedy for deficits. If capital inflow continued for a long time, foreign claims on U.S. output (interest and dividend payments to foreigners) could rise to such a level that they would reduce the U.S. standard of living significantly below what it would be with less government borrowing and lower capital inflows.

It should be noted that the economic and political conditions that have attracted foreign capital to U.S. investments have increased the value of the dollar and hampered export sales. If the value of the dollar decreases relative to other currencies, as is necessary to improve export markets, foreign investors can be expected to withdraw their investments from the United States and interest rates will rise sharply.

It is evident, then, that the administration's fiscal policies are taking our Nation's farmers down a road to bankruptcy.

Because of already dangerously low profit margins, farmers cannot afford higher interest rates that would result if foreign investors withdraw their funds; nor can farmers continue to survive with annual decreases in the volume of farm exports due to the high value of the dollar.

Higher interest rates, in particular, would be devastating for our Nation's farmers. Few other industries are so sensitive to interest rates. Information provided by the Department of Agriculture illustrates this point.

In 1972, farm production expenses totaled $52.8 billion. In 1982, they totaled $140 billion. That represents a 165-percent increase in 10 years. During that same time, interest expenses for production went from $2.2 billion to $10.4 billion, an increase of 376 percent.

Also, total farm debt is currently about $215 billion. If the average interest rate on that debt was reduced by 2 percent, that would translate into over $4 billion in lower farm expenses. An additional $4 billion in net farm income would be almost a 15-percent increase over projected net from income for 1984 and that would be a significant difference for many marginal operators. Further, the Department of Agriculture estimates that each additional $1 billion in net farm income would generate 65,000 new jobs.

Of course, an increase in interest rates would have the opposite effect on farm income. In that regard, I will note that within the last several weeks, the prime rate of interest has been raised twice by the large banks.

It is clear the administration needs to take steps to reform its fiscal policies so that interest rates can be reduced without relying on foreign investment. Fiscal policies that would result in lower interest rates for an extended period of time would be an effective means of stabilizing the farm economy and improving farm income.

CONCLUSION

The many problems surrounding farm credit are complex and serious, and are related to other aspects of the national economy. Federal farm credit programs cannot address the weaknesses in the overall economy caused by the administration's bankrupt fiscal policies, but they must be adjusted to reflect the credit problems for farmers stemming from these policy failures.

These considerations provide a strong argument for the creation of a Presidential task force to analyze the situation and make recommendations on changes in agricultural credit policy, as provided in Senate Resolution 287.

A careful, unbiased examination of our Nation's agricultural credit industry and Federal agricultural credit policies will assist the administration and Congress in developing legislative remedies.

To enhance the credibility of the task force, the President should follow the precedent established with the formation of the Task Force on Social Security, as I have urged him to do. By working with Members of Congress to define task force objectives and in making appointments that represent the diverse groups involved with agricultural credit, the President will insure the objectivity of the task force. It would be a serious mistake for the administration to attempt to use the task force to justify discredited policies.

Also, it is important that the work of the task force be completed quickly. It has become clear to me that decisive action to meet agricultural credit needs cannot be delayed any further if we are to avoid irreversible injury to our Nation's family farm system of agriculture.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter to the Comptroller General requesting an investigation of FmHA's farm management procedures be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 26, 1984.

HON. CHARLES A. BOWSHER,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BOWSHER: We are very concerned about the large number of farms that the Farmers Home Administration has taken possession of during the last three years as the result of loan foreclosures or other actions. We believe that the General Accounting Office should examine the agency's management of farm property that is in inventory and the procedures used to sell or lease that property.

Prior to 1981, the agency never held more than 260 farms in inventory at any time. It is our understanding that the Farmers Home Administration is currently in possession of over 2,200 farms valued at over 400 million dollars.

Congress never intended the Farmers Home Administration to be one of our Nation's biggest farm landlords. Further, the agency was created to assist family farmers with their credit problems and is poorly equipped to act as a real estate agent or manage hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land.

We request that you review this situation and provide us with your recommendations on any management improvements or revisions of policy needed to protect the substantial interests of the taxpayers and Farmers Home Administration borrowers.

Sincerely,

THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations.
EDWARD ZORINSKY,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification.
DAVID L. BOREN,
Member, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.
THOMAS EAGLETON,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations.
ALAN J. DIXON,
Member, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am happy the Senate has passed Senate Resolution 287, legislation I introduced requesting the President to establish a task force on agricultural credit. I think this action by the Senate indicates how broad the scope of the agricultural credit problem really is.

We face a very serious crisis on the farm unless something is done to improve the terms and conditions for obtaining operating funds. This crisis is not years away either, it has already begun to show signs of its presence. Farmers Home Administration currently is in possession of over 2,000 farms, but prior to 1981, it never held more than 260 in inventory at any time. This trend worries me considerably.

The current debt load farmers are trying to service is an enormous burden that is simply going to require time to reduce to a satisfactory level. Profits to the farmer just are not enough, even in the so-called good years anymore, to make substantial payments on outstanding debt. We use to refer to profits in farming as though they revolved around a boom to bust cycle. Today they seem to cover only a bust to get-by cycle. Because of the high capital requirements, losses during the bad years tend to be greater and greater while profits in the good years tend to be smaller and smaller.

One of the most important factors, if not the most important, in a successful farm plan is an adequate and reliable source of credit. I know of no other factor that will have any greater impact on the future direction of the structure of the farming industry. Without sufficient credit at reasonable rates and terms, farming, especially family farming, will have an uncertain future.

I urge the President to carefully consider the Senate's concern, as evidenced by the passing of this resolution, about the impact current credit conditions can have on farmers. I think it is imperative that the President appoint the task force requested by this legislation. I hope, in establishing the task force, the President will strive to insure its objectivity by making appointments that represent the diverse groups involved with agriculture. Every effort should be made to enhance the credibility of the task force because its recommendations will be directed at the largest industry in the United States—an industry that has the potential to contribute significantly to the recovery and maintenance of a healthy and growing economy in this country.

The amendment was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 287) and the preamble, as amended, are as follows:

S. RES. 287

Whereas agriculture is the Nation's most basic industry, and its associated production, processing, and marketing segments, together, provide more jobs than any other single industry;

Whereas United States agriculture is the world's most productive and the world's largest exporter;

Whereas it is in the Nation's interest to carry out an agricultural policy that will ensure an adequate, dependable supply of food and fiber at reasonable prices;

Whereas producers are the basic element in the food and fiber system and their ability to make a profit and meet their financial obligations is critical to their remaining in business;

Whereas technological developments have greatly increased the capital requirements of agricultural production;

Whereas agricultural-related debt has risen from $50,000,000,000 in 1970 to $215,000,000,000 in 1983;

Whereas a general decline in the financial condition of producers, as evidenced by increases in the average debt-to-asset ratio and debt-to-equity ratio, threatens the ability of producers to obtain the credit needed to continue their operations;

Whereas it is essential that producers be able to obtain adequate credit at interest rates conducive to debt servicing and profit making; and

Whereas the foundation of the Nation's agricultural system will be adversely affected if produers are unable to obtain a return on their investment that enables them to service their debt and continue their operations: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should appoint a task force on agricultural credit to examine agricultural credit problems, report to the President and Congress on the credit problems confronting agricultural producers and related businesses, and make recommendations for resolving any problems that are identified.

SEC. 2. The task force should—

(1) identify and describe the components of the existing agricultural credit system;

(2) identify and describe the credit needs of agricultural producers and related businesses;

(3) evaluate the ability of the existing agricultural credit system to meet the credit needs of agricultural producers; and

(4) develop, for the President and Congress, specific policy and legislative recom-

mendations to ensure the availability of adequate agricultural credit at reasonable cost.

SEC. 3. The task force should have a balanced membership composed of not fewer than fifteen persons representing all major segments of agriculture, such as farmers, suppliers, marketing personnel, and lenders.

SEC. 4. The task force should prepare and transmit a report to the President and Congress containing a detailed statement of its findings and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The task force should submit its report as soon as practicable, but not later than January 1, 1985, and should terminate not later than twelve months after being established.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 107) authorizing the rotunda of the Capitol to be used from May 25, 1984, through May 28, 1984, for the unknown American of the Vietnam era to lie in state, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. CON. RES. 107

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the rotunda of the United States Capitol may be used from May 25, 1984, through May 28, 1984, both dates inclusive, for the remains of the unknown American of the Vietnam era to lie in state, and for appropriate proceedings and ceremonies in connection therewith.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF PRAYERS BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

The resolution (S. Res. 375) authorizing the printing of prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., as Chaplain of the Senate during the 97th Congress, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 375

Resolved, That there be printed with an appropriate illustration as a Senate document, the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., the Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Ninety-seventh Congress, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed such additional copies not to exceed $1,200 in cost of such document for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF PRAYERS BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

The resolution (S. Res. 376) authorizing the printing of prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., as Chaplain of the Senate during the 98th Congress, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 376

Resolved, That there be printed with an appropriate illustration as a Senate document, the prayers by the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., the Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Ninety-eighth Congress, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed such additional copies not to exceed $1,200 in cost of such document for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

GRATUITY TO CAROL JEFFERY TOLIVER, AND OTHERS

The resolution (S. Res. 377) to pay a gratuity to Carol Jeffery Toliver; Norman Lee Toliver; Marvin Lewis Toliver; Catherine Amelia Henderson; Ruth Louise Toliver; Mary Etta Samuel; Phyllis Jean Pelham; Alvin Windell Toliver; and Grace Ann Toliver was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 377

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Carol Jeffery Toliver; Norman Lee Toliver; Marvin Lewis Toliver; Alvin Windell Toliver, brothers of James R. Toliver and Catherine Amelia Henderson; Ruth Louise Toliver; Mary Etta Samuel; Phyllis Jean Pelham; and Grace Ann Toliver, sisters of James R. Toliver, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to one-ninth of five months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO RUTH M. FIRSHEIN

The resolution (S. Res. 378) to pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Firshein, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 378

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ruth M. Firshein, widow of Benjamin H. Firshein, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to nine months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO ERIC SWANSON AND KRISTAN BOOTH

The resolution (S. Res. 379) to pay a gratuity to Eric Swanson and Kristan Booth, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 379

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eric Swanson, son of Ruth B. Swanson and Kristan Booth, daughter of Ruth B. Swanson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to one-half of seven and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO PATSY L. FUNK

The resolution (S. Res. 380) to pay a gratuity to Patsy L. Funk, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 380

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Patsy L. Funk, daughter of Thomas L. Maloney, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty on the Senate side of the Capitol grounds at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO WALTER M. STICKELL

The resolution (S. Res. 381) to pay a gratuity to Walter M. Stickell, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 381

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Walter M. Stickell, widower of Rita L. Stickell, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO LAURA DUDLEY PAGE

The resolution (S. Res. 382) to pay a gratuity to Laura Dudley Page, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 382

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Laura Dudley Page, widow of Stanley H. Page, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to four months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GRATUITY TO DANIEL T. FOLEY, MAUREEN C. CANNY, AND EILEEN P. TWIGG

The resolution (S. Res. 383) to pay a gratuity to Daniel T. Foley, Maureen C. Canny, and Eileen P. Twigg, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 383

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Daniel T. Foley, brother of Joan V. Foley and Maureen C. Canny and Eileen P. Twigg, sisters of Joan V. Foley, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to one third of seven months' compensation at the rate she

was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the several items were passed and/or agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, that concludes my list of routine items to be disposed of this evening.

THE EL SALVADOR ELECTIONS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, El Salvador is scheduled to hold Presidential elections next Sunday, May 6. Based on some disquieting events of the last several weeks in that country, I believe strongly that the elections should be postponed until the conditions exist for a fair and workable electoral system. Furthermore, I have written to President Reagan and asked that the U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Thomas Pickering, be recalled immediately.

It is essential that Mr. Pickering be recalled before the elections on Sunday, if those elections are to have any credibility, either in El Salvador or in the United States. Ambassador Pickering has consistently taken actions in support of one candidate, and has thereby attempted to manipulate the electoral process in unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation. It is an open secret that Mr. Pickering demanded that Provisional President Magana veto the Constituent Assembly's plan to return to a more viable election system.

Mr. President, the first round of voting last month in El Salvador demonstrated courage and enthusiasm on the part of the voters; but, chaos and disorder reigned in the actual procedure. It is tragic but true that an estimated 300,000 people who voted in the March 1982 elections were not able to vote on March 25, 1984. About 10 percent of the people who lived in areas where the Marxist guerrillas were in a position to prevent voting, could not vote; and about 20 percent of those who showed up at the polls were unable to vote due to the complicated and deeply flawed system. For example, people were given incorrect information about where to vote; some places never received any ballots at all; and voter registration lists for whole cantons were lost. Toward the end of the day, some of the counterproductive procedures had to be relaxed in many areas.

Mr. President, after the first round it became apparent that the computer system—imposed and implemented by the U.S. Agency for International Development, and paid for by the U.S. taxpayers—needed to be either corrected or eliminated for the second round of voting. In the Legislative Assembly, the elected representatives voted to do just that. It was agreed upon that the incomplete and inaccurate voter registry lists would not be used again; rather, the voter would be able to cast his vote by showing his voter identification card, and by dipping his finger in indelible ink.

Last week, Provisional President Magana surprisingly vetoed the measure after he had declared that he would do so only if he found the new law to be unconstitutional. There is reason to believe that President Magana was forced into making such a decision. He did not find the measure to be unconstitutional; rather, he stated unconvincingly that all the irregularities, and inaccurate voter registry lists of the first round would be corrected. Now, just a few days before the final round, the incomplete and inaccurate registration lists remain unchanged. This means that most of the Salvadorans who were not able to exercise their constitutional right 1 month ago will once again be left out of the decisionmaking process. In El Salvador there are approximately 1.4 million elegible voters; it is not insignificant that about one-fifth of those voters will be precluded from voting, because of procedures that cannot be implemented in that war-torn country.

Mr. President, at the highest levels of this Government, the United States has declared that it is neutral in the Salvadoran elections. Yet hardly a day goes by where we do not find the Washington Post or the New York Times quoting an unnamed high level source saying that the United States would clearly prefer a victory by the moderate Jose Napoleon Duarte. These same sources are notorious for influencing public opinion by telling the liberal press that Duarte is the only candidate who would be able to bolster the U.S. Congress to supply the necessary funds to El Salvador.

Mr. President, I am convinced that precisely the opposite is true. If the U.S. Embassy is allowed to throw the Salvadoran elections to the socialist candidate, it is doubtful if either developmental or military assistance will be approved by the U.S. Congress.

OTHER INCIDENTS

I am deeply concerned, Mr. President, about other reports indicating that the State Department has not remained neutral during the political campaign in El Salvador. For example, there is the very reliable report of the incident that occurred in the department (State) of Sonsonate, where Mr. Timothy Howard, Third Secretary of the U.S. Embassy, arrived by helicopter to meet with officials of one political party to tell them that the United States would not support their candidate. I have received numerous reports from Salvadoran citizens who say that they have been told, or led to believe, that only Mr. Duarte would be able to have the full support of the U.S. Government.

Mr. President, there are still other reports indicating that the U.S. State Department has bent over backward to facilitate a Duarte victory in El Salvador. It is known that Mr. Pickering went so far to meet with the candidate of a major party to pressure him to withdraw from the race. After the first round of voting, Mr. Pickering also met with Jose Francisco Guerrero, who placed third, to tell him that the United States wanted him to remain neutral in the final round of balloting—an obvious move to favor Duarte.

THE IMPACT

Mr. President, the immediate impact of the interference of the U.S. State Department is obvious. By forcing President Magana to veto the election plan, the desire of the majority of the constituent assembly was thwarted; the elections will be carried out without a complete or accurate voter registration list; the whispering campaign by certain U.S. officials has intimidated the Salvadoran voters; and finally, there have already been reports in the Salvadoran press of fraud by the Christian Democrat Party in several zones—they were caught with polling boxes in their possession before election day. What will be the long-term result of all this? Will we find one more socialist country in the Western Hemisphere, and one more pawn of the Soviet Union at our doorstep?

A U.S. ENDORSEMENT

Mr. President, the scenario is all too clear. The United States has subtly, yet effectively, endorsed one candidate, Jose Napoleon Duarte, a leftist, even by Salvadoran standards. The U.S. media have managed to confuse the American people by failing to report the accurate facts about Mr. Duarte and the Salvadoran Christian Democrat Party. One need only look back to 1979 when Duarte and his other socialist allies ran El Salvador in a U.S.-sponsored junta. Duarte effectively destroyed El Salvador politically, socially, and economically in just 2 short years.

Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that it was Jose Napoleon Duarte who systematically imposed socialist reforms when he succeeded Guillermo Ungo as head of the Salvadoran junta in 1980. Duarte enthusiastically carried out the socialist land reform scheme created by the U.S. State Department. Duarte nationalized all private banks in order to give the central government control of all credit. Duarte nationalized significant parts of the export sector, which caused enormous losses, unprecedented corruption, and a serious further decline in foreign exchange earnings.

It will be worthwhile to examine the record. The facts, as I shall demonstrate, show that Duarte was and is the compliant agent of a network of international forces ranging from the Socialist International, to international banking groups, to left-wing foundations and media in the United States and Europe, all of them seeking to impose socialism in Central America.

DUARTE'S POLICY OF NEGOTIATION

Mr. President, President Reagan has stated a clear policy of not negotiating with the Marxist-Leninist groups in Central America, whether they be guerrillas or illegitimate regimes. Yet Mr. Duarte—and his party, the Christian Democrats—seem to have a special kinship with the leftists in the region. Last year in an interview, Duarte stated that if he lost the Presidential elections he might be forced to go to the hills and fight with the Marxist guerrillas. Then, on January 13, 1984, in an article in El Salvador's largest newspaper, Diario de Hoy, the second ranking member of the Christian Democrat Party, Julio Adolfo Rey Prendes, said, "We do not need to crush the enemy, we need to integrate him." The enemy of which he speaks is, of course, the Marxist-Leninist guerrilla organizations attempting to seize political power by violent revolution, and backed by the Soviet Union and its surrogates.

Mr. President, more recently Mr. Duarte made an even more significant announcement. On April 21 of this year, Drummond Ayres of the New York Times reported that Duarte asked two U.S. Senators to take a message with them to the Marxist-Leninist Sandinista dictatorship in Nicaragua. Duarte had his emissaries inform the Sandinistas that if he became President in El Salvador, he would seek negotiations with their regime. This, of course, should come as no surprise to those who remember that the political front man for the Salvadoran guerrillas, Guillermo Manuel Ungo, was Duarte's running mate in the 1972 elections. Statements such as these indicate that Duarte would once again share power with his socialist and Marxist allies, regardless of the fact that they are linked to the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and its satellites in this hemisphere.

Consider a recent statement by Mr. Ruben Zamora, an active member of the Christian Democrat Party for more than 12 years, now a Salvadoran guerrilla leader. An April 24 Baltimore Sun article written by John Lantigua quotes Zamora: "In private he tells people he is willing to negotiate with us." It should be noted that guerrilla violence increased more under the Duarte junta than during any other period. And this Senator is one who cannot and will not support sending large sums of money to a country that insists on a plan to make a deal with the Communists.

DUARTE AND COMMUNITARIANISM

Mr. President, in his own book "Comunitarismo Para Un Mundo Mas Humano (Communitarianism for a More Human World,)" Duarte simplistically attacks the American system. He states:

Capitalism is not acceptable because it considers the individual to be in a struggle against collectivity . . . preaches the predominance of the individual . . . is based on the indifference of the State toward human truth . . . and has created a structure of antagonistic classes fomenting a conception that permits the preponderance of a dominant capitalist class, one that molds the conduct of the State anti-socially, and feeds on the misery and injustice of the exploited classes.

Many Salvadorans call Duarte's ideology undigested Marx.

Mr. President, we must not ignore what Mr. Duarte has said about private enterprise. On May 31, 1983, the Miami News carried a story written by Karen Stanley after a telephone interview with Duarte. The article reads:

Duarte criticized the Diario de Hoy's economic positions as "extremely right-wing, against the intervention of the State on any matter, and absolutely for private enterprise."Duarte said his Christian Democrats "believe that the State should be the director of society."

LINKS WITH SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

Mr. President, it is a fact that the Christian Democrat Party in El Salvador has a history of clear-cut links with the Socialist International, with the Salvadoran Communist Party, and with the various subversive groups in El Salvador. In 1971, the Christian Democrats formed a legal alliance with the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR), which is affiliated with the Socialist International, and with the National Democratic Union (UDN) which has been the politically front of the Salvadoran Communist Party. Together, this coalition participated in the 1972 elections. In 1979, the Christian Democrats alined themselves with the Revolutionary Popular Bloc (BPR), which is the mass political front of the Marxist-Leninist guerrilla group, the Popular Forces of Liberation (FPL).

Mr. President, when the Christian Democrats were in power—from 1980 to 1982, with Duarte at the helm—there were people in key government posts who are recognized as militant Communists. For example, Jorge Alberto Villacorta was the Secretary of Agriculture; he is now the spokesman for the guerrillas and operates out of Costa Rica. Hector Trujillo was the Ambassador to Germany, in spite of the fact that he was and is a member of the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR). Sergio Lama was the general consul in Santiago, Chile, and is the brother-in-law of the Salvadoran Communist Party head, Shafik Handal. In Mexico, Benjamin Guzman was named as cultural attaché, in spite of his direct participation in the Communist uprising of 1932.

During the Duarte junta, Roberto Castellanos Figueroa was sent by Duarte as Ambassador to Nicaragua, though he later resigned from his post as a protest, "because the Salvadoran oppressive regime is walking hand in hand with Yankee imperialism." Duarte's Ambassador to Italy was Avo Priamo Alvarenga, who was founder in the University of the Democratic Movement of the Left (MID), and was later a founder of the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR). This movement is now integrated with the revolutionary guerrilla forces.

Mr. President, we cannot ignore the fact that in the official U.N. speeches of El Salvador's current Foreign Minister, Fidel Chavez Mena, a high ranking member of the Christian Democrat Party, he defended the positions of the nonalined countries and defends the cause of the terrorist Palestinian Liberation Organization. These speeches can be found in the archives of the U.N., although I understand the Salvadoran newspapers refused to publish them because the speeches are considered embarrassing to the Salvadoran nation.

Mr. President, the links between the Christian Democrat Party in El Salvador, the Salvadoran Communist Party, and the Maxist-Leninist guerrilla organizations are real and definitive. Before the State Department meddles any further in the El Salvador election process, we should consider the consequences if the United States successfully forces a socialist victory in that country.

That is why I have urged President Reagan to recall immediately the U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Pickering. It is essential that this action be taken if next Sunday's elections are to have any credibility, either in El Salvador or in the United States.

All Americans agree that it should be a prime goal of our policy to support free and fair elections in El Salvador. But Ambassador Pickering has gone beyond that consensus, consistently taking actions which support only one candidate, and manipulating the electoral process in a way that can be considered only as unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation.

El Salvador has suffered for years from persistent interference by the United States in its democratic process. Despite this, the Salvadoran people have continued to keep faith in democracy, even when, as after the Constituent Assembly elections in 1982, the obvious intent of the electorate and the numerical result were thwarted by U.S. diplomatic pressures to impose the unelected provisional

President, Alvaro Magana, on El Salvador. Now, at a crucial moment in the electoral process, the U.S. Embassy has used this unelected provisional President as a tool to set aside the majority will of the elected Constituent Assembly.

There has been much talk about the "death squads" of the right and the left threatening the democratic process. I wrote to President Reagan on February 27 about that problem. As I stated in that letter:

> Mr. President, you and I are gravely concerned about such violence—wherever it happens and regardless of who is responsible for it. . . . Once we learn, beyond a reasonable doubt, that any individual or group is engaged in extra-legal "death squad" activity—whether from the violent left or the violent right, with whatever motivation—we must take the position as a nation that we will not countenance it.

The point is this, Mr. President: Violence can be directed not only against persons and property; violence can be done to the democratic process as well—and we must not countenance it there either. In his actions designed to rig the electoral outcome, Ambassador Pickering is the leader of the death squad against democracy. It is an open secret that Ambassador Pickering has met with electoral candidates in an attempt to influence their decisions, and that he demanded that President Magana veto the Constituent Assembly's plan to return to a fair and workable electoral system. The effect of this will be to cast doubt over the validity of the electoral process, and make the hope of social reconciliation infinitely remote. Mr. Pickering has used the cloak of diplomacy to strangle freedom in the night. He should be removed from the scene of the deed immediately.

It is clear that the consensus on foreign aid to El Salvador has failed in the Senate. The Foreign Relations Committee was unable to report out either developmental or military aid. If Mr. Pickering is allowed to throw the Salvadoran elections to the candidate of his choice, it is doubtful if either developmental or military aid will be approved by the U.S. Congress. In order to restore U.S. credibility, remove the appearance of U.S. partisanship, and maintain hope of social reconciliation in a troubled country, it is essential, in my judgment as chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, to recall Mr. Pickering at once.

HISTORY OF U.S. INTERVENTION

El Salvador has become a case history of the destruction of a country through the means of U.S. assistance programs. Using foreign aid as a club, the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador have constantly intervened in the internal affairs of El Salvador since 1962. This intervention has always been to push the country to the left, toward Marxist socialism.

In 1962, the United States insisted that El Salvador nationalize its central bank, nationalize the Salvadorean Coffee Co., adopt a system of price controls, exchange controls, high tariffs, strengthen left-wing trade unions, and install a burdensome "social security" system. The effect of the U.S. intervention was to slow down capital formation and economic growth, thereby making it more difficult to raise the standard of living for the poor of El Salvador. The U.S. Embassy also insisted upon a "progressive income tax" and the imposition of the highest property taxes in Latin America.

In 1965, the U.S. Embassy insisted that the Salvadorean Government tolerate the Communist takeover of the university there. The Embassy argued that by allowing the takeover, it would "contain" the subversive action. Of course, what it did was to give a base to subversion, strengthen the hand of the subversives by giving them a headquarters from which to operate. The U.S. Embassy even invited some of the Communist faculty members to go to the United States for Government-approved seminars.

Moreover, U.S. Ambassador Murat Williams was reported to be deeply involved in the organization of the Christian Democratic Party, the one that still remains the favorite of the State Department. His successor, Ambassador Raul Castro, was frequently heard to make disparaging remarks about the business and agricultural leaders of El Salvador; and Ambassador Ignacio Lozano was so obnoxious in his behavior, that then President Romero asked for him to be recalled even before Lozano took office. Ambassador Frank Devine was vocal in insisting that terrorists, who had been involved in violent crimes, were "political prisoners" and had to be released.

Ambassador Devine and Ambassador Bowdler openly worked with the opposition to overthrow the government of President Romero. They demanded that President Romero resign, and that new elections be called, even though the Salvadorean Constitution provided for election at regular intervals, similar to U.S. procedure. Assistant Secretary of State Viron Vaky and Ambassador Christopher van Hollen—who was only an inspector of embassies—made the same demands during visits to El Salvador.

Once the constitutional government of El Salvador was overthrown in 1979, a left-of-center military junta was installed with U.S. approval. On March 5, 1980, the unconstitutional junta suspended the constitutional rights of the people of El Salvador, and ordered the military to occupy the lands of the first properties targeted for "reform." Although it was widely publicized that "14 families" were responsible for controlling the country, the actual owners turned out to number in the thousands. The United States put $22.5 million into the land reform program in 1980, and $10.5 million in 1981. Legislative action by Congress put a stop to further funding in 1981 through direct action, but U.S. policy has continued to support the program ever since.

At the time of the destabilization of El Salvador by the United States in 1979, El Salvador was a model of economic progress for a developing country—contrary to the myths which are widely published today. Of course a "developing country" is one which by definition is one which is still moving forward. One would not expect to find progress evenly distributed. It is not in the nature of a free society that the fruits of progress are evenly distributed all at once. Only in a coercive society can everyone be forced to live on the same level. Yet even by every measure of redistributive thinking, El Salvador in 1979 stood head and shoulders above other developing countries in the region. Despite the lack of resources, and despite the burdens of high taxes and economically repressive measures demanded by the U.S. State Department, the strong work ethic which characterizes Salvadoran society was already paying off.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN EL SALVADOR—THE RECORD IN 1979

I submit that there is no evidence that the situation in El Salvador is one of economic oppression. It is well known, for example, that income distribution statistics in the United States show that the top 20 percent of American families receive 41 percent of the national income, and the lowest 20 percent get only 5.4 percent of the national income. Yet no one calls this oppression in the United States.

In El Salvador, the top 5 percent of the population received 24 percent of the national income, and the lowest 20 percent received 5.7 percent, according to the 1977 statistics of the OAS Economic and Social Council.

Moreover, the OAS figures for El Salvador look especially good compared to those for all of Latin America: The top 5 percent got 32.7 percent for all Latin American countries, and the lowest 20 percent got 3.7 percent.

Indeed, the situation has been improving rapidly, despite the efforts of the terrorists to wreck the economy. The minimum wage in agriculture has increased 37 percent between 1976 and 1979, and for those workers in seasonal crops, 77 percent.

The United Nations has an economic indicator called the Gini which measures concentration of wealth. For El Salvador, the Gini is 0.50, which the U.N. classifies as "moderate," compar-

ing it with Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, and Venezuela.

A recent World Bank study shows that in El Salvador, 20 percent of the urban population and 30 percent of the rural population live below the poverty line. Of course, as we have discerned in our own country, poverty lines can be manipulated by political interpretation.

But for all Latin America the figures are 43 percent as calculated by the ILO and 41 percent as calculated by ECLA—U.N. Latin American Economic Commission. So again El Salvador is doing far better than most, or, at least, it was until the Marxists began to move in and take over.

Indeed, the World Bank study shows a dramatic improvement in income distribution between 1965 and 1977, despite the rapid growth of population in El Salvador. Most of the increased distribution has affected the lower 40 percent of the people, incomewise.

As far as the tax burden is concerned in El Salvador, between 1971 and 1977, tax collections as a percentage of the GNP increased from 11 to 17 percent. This is one of the highest in Latin America. In 1962, direct taxes accounted for 28 percent of the revenues. In 1977 they accounted for 55 percent of the revenues. The indirect taxes, those which presumably affect the poor the most, decreased accordingly, from 71 percent in 1962 to 45 percent in 1977.

The myth has been perpetrated that the moderate-sized farms that were nationalized were exclusively in the hands of wealthy "absentee landlords" who did little or nothing to improve the productivity, or to better the lot of their workers. It was said that 78 percent of the land was in the hands of 10 percent of the landowners. But is such a "concentration" unjust? Those who cite it neglected to say that: "many of these landowners were corporations, such as we have in the United States, that have the capital to invest in long-range plans, and to provide greater benefits for their employees, precisely as it is in the United States. Moreover, the trend is slowly moving away from concentration, with the present level down from 83.8 percent in 1967."

But is such a system unjust? I doubt that many Americans would find it so, if they put it in an American context.

The Library of Congress states, for example, that in Illinois only 5 percent of the landowners own 57 percent of all the land; in North Carolina, the top 5 percent of the landowners own 69 percent of the land. Indeed, if we compare the total for the U.S. figures to those of El Salvador, we find that they actually exceed the concentration of land ownership in that country.

One should also compare the official statistics from the Natural Resources Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The pattern of land ownership varies, as we might expect. In almost every State, less that 5 percent of the landowners own more than 50 percent of the land. In fact, the national average for the United States is that 75.1 percent of the land is owned by only 5 percent of the landowners. In fact, 48 percent of the land is owned by less that 1 percent of the landowners. That means that nearly one-half of the United States is owned by 1 percent of the landowners.

It should be emphasized, that this is 5 percent and 1 percent of the landowners, not the population as a whole. If the statistics were worked up on ownership as a percentage of the population, the results would be even more dramatic.

But what if you consider only farm and ranch land? The statistics show that over half of all U.S. farm and ranch land is owned by only 5 percent of the landowners—in fact 52 percent. Finally, 30 percent of the farm and ranch land is owned by 1 percent of the landowners.

The bottom line, is that 75.1 percent of the land in the United States is owned by 5 percent of the landowners, while in El Salvador the figures cited are 78 percent of the land owned by 10 percent of the landowners. So it is fair to assume that the situation is worse in the United States—providing we agree that such statistical analyses tell us anything about social justice. Perhaps we should have land reform in the United States before we impose it on hapless smaller nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two tables illustrating these facts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—CONCENTRATION OF LANDOWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES OF ALL LAND BY REGION AND STATE

[In percent]

State and region	Proportion of acreage held by: Largest 5 percent of landowners	Largest 1 percent of landowners
Northeast:		
Connecticut	57	35
Maine	87	73
Massachusetts	63	37
New Hampshire	79	53
New Jersey	63	38
New York	80	45
Pennsylvania	64	29
Rhode Island	56	30
Vermont	37	14
Northeast States	76	46
North Central:		
Michigan	65	34
Minnesota	31	11
Wisconsin	53	19
Lake	55	23
Illinois	57	21
Indiana	49	18
Iowa	34	12
Missouri	39	15
Ohio	59	25
Corn Belt	51	20
Kansas	43	18
Nebraska	47	25
North Dakota	37	12
South Dakota	58	28
Northern Plains	41	22
North Central	58	26
Southern:		
Alabama	72	46
Arkansas	72	49
Delaware	60	32
Florida	90	77
Georgia	73	45
Kentucky	53	23
Louisiana	80	58
Maryland	59	27
Mississippi	62	36
North Carolina	69	42
Oklahoma	61	35
South Carolina	67	42
Tennessee	58	36
Texas	71	47
Virginia	69	39
West Virginia	67	41
South	74	48
Western:		
Arizona	84.7	74.4
California	87.0	68.3
Colorado	83.2	49.7
Hawaii	98.2	97.2
Idaho	86.1	60.0
Montana	64.0	32.5
Nevada	89.4	73.8
New Mexico	90.7	70.3
Oregon	90.3	73.5
Utah	84.2	59.4
Washington	87.1	65.9
Wyoming	90.6	59.0
West	91.2	70.5
U.S. total [1]	75.1	48.0

[1] Revised, excluding Alaska.

Source: Natural Resources Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—CONCENTRATION OF LANDOWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES FOR FARM AND RANCH LAND BY REGION AND STATE

[In percent]

State and region:	Proportion of acreage held by: Largest 5 percent of landowners	Largest 1 percent of landowners
Northeast:		
Connecticut	36	14
Maine	46	25
Massachusetts	42	19
New Hampshire	33	11
New Jersey	40	18
New York	30	12
Pennsylvania	32	12
Rhode Island	39	18
Vermont	18	6
Northeast	35	14
North Central:		
Michigan	29	11
Minnesota	22	7
Wisconsin	20	7
Lake	24	8
Illinois	25	8
Indiana	27	9
Iowa	24	6
Missouri	28	10
Ohio	25	9
Corn Belt	25	8
Kansas	31	14
Nebraska	39	19
North Dakota	21	8
South Dakota	38	16
North Plains	33	15
North Central	34	14
Southern:		
Alabama	46	23
Arkansas	43	21
Delaware	31	11
Florida	67	47
Georgia	42	18

TABLE 2.—CONCENTRATION OF LANDOWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES FOR FARM AND RANCH LAND BY REGION AND STATE—Continued

[In percent]

	Proportion of acreage held by:	
	Largest 5 percent of landowners	Largest 1 percent of landowners
Kentucky	35	15
Louisiana	51	29
Maryland	27	9
Mississippi	45	20
North Carolina	43	19
Oklahoma	38	18
South Carolina	35	17
Tennessee	34	15
Texas	57	36
Virginia	46	18
West Virginia	37	16
South	52	31
Western:		
Arizona	67	46
California	72	45
Colorado	51	26
Hawaii	99	89
Idaho	62	33
Montana	47	22
Nevada	89	73
New Mexico	78	50
Oregon	67	47
Utah	66	41
Washington	62	31
Wyoming	67	31
West	72	43
U.S total [1]	52	30

[1] Revised, excluding Alaska.

Source: Natural Resources Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HELMS. Furthermore, 61 percent of the land in 1979 was under cultivation in farms of less than 100 hectares. There was already a land distribution program in operation, which in 1978 awarded 8,300 hectares, and in 1979 awarded 36,200 hectares to cooperatives representing 5,000 persons. Unfortunately, the productivity of such distributions has declined.

Some persons have asserted that the concentration of land in the hands of a small group and the emphasis on exportation of agricultural products were responsible for the large part in the poverty in El Salvador.

Just the opposite is the case; in so far as national earnings were increased and have achieved better distribution, it was because of the earnings from agricultural exports. The notion that emphasizing exports somehow induces poverty is completely wrong. The fantasy that taking a nation back to stone-age socialism is progress is either the result of ignorance or of callous disregard for the sufferings of the poor.

Indeed, it is also wrong that exports were overemphasized. In 1978, basic food production increased 38 percent, making El Salvador self-sufficient in food.

It is often asserted that the most modern countries in the region are Costa Rica, Venezuela, Colombia, and Ecuador. Yet in the 1978 statistics published by the Inter-American Development Bank, that, to take just two significant indices of social welfare, El Salvador surpasses all of them in the percentage of governmental spending either for education, or public health, or both. Specifically, the figures are:

[In percent]

	Education	Public health
El Salvador	22.4	9.6
Colombia	13.2	6.6
Venezuela	13.6	5.2
Costa Rica	34.3	4.0
Ecuador	30.4	9.5

Similarly, although El Salvador has a tragic rate of infant mortality, it is no worse than most Third World countries, and, in deaths per thousand, is about the same as such relatively rich Latin American countries as Colombia, Venezuela, and Mexico, according to the LADB figures. When the statistics for deaths under 5 years due to malnutrition are examined, El Salvador is comparable to Argentina, Colombia, Brazil, and Mexico.

Despite this record of progress, a case could be made that an even better record could have been accumulated if there had been considerably less intervention by the government in the economic sector. The socialist measures which have been forced upon El Salvador by U.S. pressure have impeded progress, rather than encouraged it. Moreover, they have contributed enormously to the atmosphere of increasing politicization that has devastated political life in El Salvador, and encouraged terrorism. The first steps that should be taken should be the depoliticization of the economy of El Salvador. The most effective and efficient method for increasing the distribution of wealth is to remove political values from the system of destribution. Only a value-free economy can raise the standard of living of the poor.

But all of this was swept away—both by the economic terrorism imposed by the U.S. State Department, and the guerrilla terrorism of the left. The State Department aimed to sweep away the productive social structure through policies mislabeled "reform"; but the guerrillas went straight to the infrastructure which made an ordered society possible. Both contributed equally to the disaster.

NEGOTIATE WITH WHOM?

Mr. President, it is fashionable in some quarters to insist that the solution to the violence is to negotiate with terrorists. If this has ever been a solution, anywhere in the world, it has yet to come to my attention. Mr. Duarte's ties to the left are not ties to some indigenous fighters for social justice. On the contrary, they are tied to a very sophisticated Marxist-Leninist apparatus which is the result of a conscious program of exploitation of weaknesses and a carefully planned program of subversion.

When the U.S. press extolls the virtues of Mr. Duarte's erst-while political partner Guillermo Ungo, who now heads up the political arm of the Communist guerrilla movement, they conveniently ignore both the former close association between Duarte and Ungo, and Ungo's present role of putting a respectable front on the gang of leftist cutthroats and murderers who are trying to seize power.

When Reuben Zamora travels to the United States and is courted by press and universities alike, they fail to point out that he has a dual role as representative of a unit especially set up to disseminate foreign propaganda, and an actual guerrilla role in the terrorism.

There is, indeed, a very elaborate interlocking network, which was formalized and activated by Castro at a meeting in Havana in 1980. In order to see with whom negotiations might be carried out, I have pulled together the results of investigations carried out by my staff group assigned to this area. This information is based on field investigations and direct interviews in the region with appropriate experts.

EARLY SOVIET INFLUENCE IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned that in all the debates in Congress and in all the media coverage of the situation in El Salvador one central fact has been neglected. It is certainly no secret that the Soviet Union has been fomenting revolution in this hemisphere for almost seven decades. The strategic objective of the Soviet leadership to promote world revolution has been a central feature of international reality since the Bolshevik coup d'état in Russia in 1917. The question today, as it has been for most of this century, is what are we going to do to halt and to roll back Soviet global aggression?

Back in 1918, three Soviet agents—Guraski, Glabauf, and Kavanov—entered El Salvador to work with Esteban Pavletich to establish the first Communist cells in El Salvador. Subsequently, Salvadorans such as Luis Felipe Recinos, Enrique Conde, and Augustin Faribundo Marti entered the Communist Party network. Enrique Conde fled to Costa Rica after President Maximiliano Hernandez Martinez launched his campagin against the Communist uprising in El Salvador in 1932. Conde continued his subversive activities against El Salvador from his base in Costa Rica and worked closely with key Costa Rican Communists such as Manuel Mora Valverde.

The penetration of the labor movement worldwide has always been a standard Communist tactic. In 1922, the Central American Labor Confederation (COCA—Confederacion Obrera Centroamericana) was founded and was based upon the Communist Party sections and organizational structures

in Central America. The Salvadoran group that became a member of COCA was the Regional Federation of El Salvadoran Workers (FRTS—Federacion Regional de Trabajadores de El Salvador).

In 1929, the Soviet Communist Party sponsored a meeting in Havana, Cuba, of the heads of the Communist Parties of Central America and the Caribbean. In this October meeting, the Soviets brought Faribundo Marti under stricter discipline. The Soviets viewed his plans for a revolution in El Salvador in 1929 as premature and wanted the Communist Party and supporters in El Salvador to take more time to work out the plans for a more detailed strategy and to make better preparations.

The Komintern organization based in Moscow had a number of delegates at this meeting. At the time, the Komintern had a special department for Central America and the Caribbean whose central objective was fomenting revolution in the region. The Komintern directors at the Havana meeting wanted the Communist uprising in El Salvador to commence on October 17, 1932, and worked with the Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS) to assist in the coordination of the Communist elements in the labor movement, the peasant movement, and even within the military. The PCS had the support of Communist front operations controlled by Moscow such as Red Aid International based in New York, the International Labor Federation based in Amsterdam, the Komintern organization based in Moscow, the Communist Congress of Buenos Aires, and the Latin American Labor Confederation based in Montevideo.

The Communist rising in El Salvador did erupt in 1932 as planned but under the strong leadership of President Hernandez Martinez it was suppressed. Today, five decades later, we are again confronted by a Communist onslaught backed by Moscow in El Salvador.

STRUCTURE OF THE SOVIET BACKED COMMUNIST FORCES IN EL SALVADOR

The principal directing organ of the Communist revolution in El Salvador is the Unified Revolutionary Directorate (DRU—Direccion Revolucionaria Unificada) which controls the military, diplomatic, political, and economic aspects of the revolution. Five organizations are represented in the DRU: The Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS), the Popular Forces of Liberation (FPL), the Armed Forces of National Resistance (FARN), the Revolutionary Army of the Poor (ERP), and the Revolutionary Party of Central American Workers (PRCT).

The Communist Party of El Salvador started to be organized in 1918 as I mentioned earlier. In 1925, the party took on a formal and overt character. In 1930, Faribundo Marti returned from abroad to El Salvador and became the Secretary General of the party and picked as his chief lieutenants Alfonso Luna and Mario Zapata. Two factions within the PCS developed during the 1960's. One was headed by Shafik Handel who allowed for penetration of the electoral process as tactic to achieve power. The other faction was headed by the late Cayetano Carpio and it emphasized violent armed revolution as the road to power.

In April 1970, the FPL was formed when the Cayetano Carpio faction broke away from the official Communist Party which remained in the hands of Shafil Handel. In August 1975, the FPL established a mass front organization called the Popular Revolutionary Bloc (BPR). This front was formed through a coalition of FPL supporters and primarily those groups organized by Father Bernard Bourlang, a French Jesuit priest. Three of the four members of the central command within the FPL National Masses Committee—Juan Chacon, Facundo Guardado, and Julio Flores—became the leaders of the BPR. A fourth member of the committee, Oscar Bonilla, became secretary general of AGEUS (Association of University Students of El Salvador). Both the BPR and AGEUS were housed in the same office in the National University of El Salvador. The clear cut Marxist-Leninist ideology of the BPR and AGEUS are revealed in their publications such as "Red Star," "Popular Combat," "Guerrilla," and "The Rebel."

The Revolutionary Army of the Poor (ERP) was formed in March 1972 by a number of members of the El Salvadoran Communist Party. Under the leadership of Joaquin Villalobos, the EPR has had close working relationships with several guerrilla organizations in Latin America including the Tupamaro National Liberation Movement of Uruguay, the People's Revolutionary Army of Argentina, the leftist Revolutionary Movement of Chile (MIR).

The mass front organization for the ERP is called the Popular Leagues of February 28 (LP-28) which has been concerned with propaganda, mobilization, and recruitment. The clear-cut Marxist-Leninist ideology of the ERP and its LP-28 is found in their publications such as "Proletariat Thought," "Communist Press," "Red Flag," "Wake Up Peasant," and "The Power is Born from the Gun." It is significant that an ERP member, Norma Guevara, was placed into a leadership position in the Communist supporting Salvadoran Commission of Human Rights.

The Armed Forces of National Resistance (FARN) was formed in 1975 after the assassination of an ERP member Enrique Dalton which precipitated a split in the ranks. FARN's former leader, Ernesto Jovel, was replaced by Ferman Cienfuegos after the former's death. Cienfuegos' real name is Eduardo Sancho.

FARN took over the Unified Popular Action Front (FAPU) which has been formed in 1974 by two Catholic priests, Higinio and Jose Inocencio Alas. FAPU has been especially close to the Union of Workers of the Salvadoran Institute of Social Security (STISS). The Marxist-Leninist ideology of FARN and FAPU are clearly identifiable in their publications such as "Pueblo" and "For the proletarist Cause."

The Revolutionary Party of Central American Workers (PRTC) was also spawned by the Communist Party of El Salvador. Its mass front organization is the Movement of Popular Liberation (MLP).

For its part, the Communist Party of El Salvador has operated through a mass front called the National Democratic Union (UDN) which was formed in 1970 and which participated in the 1972 and 1977 elections through a coalition of opposition parties known as the National Opposition Union (UNO). The UDN is composed of several Marxist-Leninist labor and peasant organizations including the salvadoran Workers Confederation (CUTS).

The labor laws of El Salvador require that 10 unions are necessary to form 1 federation and that 3 federations are necessary to form a confederation. The Communist Party of El Salvador controls three federations: the United Trade Union Federation of El Salvador (FUSS); the federation Union of Food, Garment, and Textile Industry Workers (FESTIAVTSCES); and the National Trade Union Federation of Salvadoran Workers (FENASTRAS). CUTS is the confederation in which these three federations are joined and it operates in close cooperation with the guerilla front organizations such as the BPR, LP-27, and FAPU.

THE UNIFIED REVOLUTIONARY DIRECTORATE (DRU)

In May 1980, at a meeting in Havana, Cuba, the Unified Revolutionary Directorate of the El Salvadoran revolution was formed at the direction of Fidel Castro as a precondition for larger scale Cuban aid. The DRU is composed of three representatives of each of the five major Communist organizations in El Salvador.

According to information reaching my office, the membership of the DRU is as follows. The members from the FPL are: Leonel Gonzalez (a pseudonym); Dimas Hernandez (a pseudonym); and the third name is unknown. The members from the ERP are: Joaquim Villalobos; Jorge Melendez; and Sonia Medina. The members from the FARN are: Ferman Cienfuegos (a pseudonym for Eduardo Sancho);

Oscar Armando Acevedo; and the third name is unknown. The members from the PRTC are: Roberto Roca (a pseudonym); Mario Lopez; and the third name is unknown. The members from the Communist Party of El Salvador are: Jorge Shafik Handal; Roberto Castellanos Calvo; and Mario Aguinada Carranza.

The DRU operates two key Commissions: The Commission for Finances (COFIN) and the Commission for International Relations (CORINTER). The Commission on Finances is composed of one member from each of the five organizations comprising the DRU. The head of the Commission is Farid Handal, the brother of Shafik Handal who is the head of the Communist Party of El Salvador. The mission of COFIN is to amass the financial support for the Salvadoran revolution from the international contacts. The Commission was located in Mexico City until late 1982 when the Mexican Government nationalized the private banks and the financial situation was unstable. COFIN was charged with handling the donations which came in the form of various currencies such as U.S. dollars, German marks, French francs, and so forth. The Commission then changed the foreign currencies into dollars for use inside of El Salvador by the DRU as well as for external purchases of arms. COFIN is now located in Panama taking advantage of the sophisticated network of international banking services in that country for the movement of moneys for the support of the Salvadoran revolution.

The Commission for International Relations, CORINTER, has had its base in Managua, Nicaragua, but now operates in a number of countries. Its offices in Mexico City are said to be the most important in terms of organizing international support and establishing logistical support for the Salvadoran revolution. The head of this Commission is Ferman Cienfuegos, whose real name is Eduardo Sancho. The delegate to CORINTER from the El Salvadoran Communist Party is reported to be Dr. Miguel Angel Saenz Varela.

In Costa Rica, the Salvadoran revolutionary complex maintains a similar operation to that in Mexico City. The head of this operation is reported to be Dr. Renan Rodas Lazo.

In Prague, Czechoslovakia, the Salvadoran revolutionary complex maintains an operation which interfaces with the Soviet Union and other satellite countries. The head of this office is reported to be Dr. Jorge Arias Gomez.

In Havana, Cuba, the DRU naturally maintains a key operational center whose head is reported to be Julio Cesar Salazar.

THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTIONARY FRONT (FDR)

Subordinate to the DRU is the Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR) which was created in April 1980 to disseminate propaganda outside of El Salvador. The FDR is composed of the Revolutionary Coordinator of the Masses (CRM) which was formed in January of 1980 and the Democratic Front (FD) which was formed in April of 1980.

The CRM is composed of the overt mass organizations of the five Marxist-Leninist revolutionary organizations. The BPR is the mass organization for the FLP. The LP-28 is the mass organization for the ERP. The FAPU is the mass organization for the FARN. The MLP is the mass organization for the PRTC. The UDN is the mass organization for the Communist Party of El Salvador.

The Democratic Front is composed of organizations which do not take part in the armed military struggle on an overt basis. Three small political parties form the basis of the FD. They are the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR); the Popular Social Christian Movement (MPSC); and the Independent Movement of Professionals and Technicians of El Salvador (MIPTES).

Guillermo Ungo, the leader of the MNR which is a member of the Socialist International organization, is the head of the Democratic Revolutionary Front. It should not escape notice that Dr. Ungo went to Moscow during the 1960's to sign a cultural exchange agreement with Lomonosov University. He was representing the National University of El Salvador and traveled with its rector Dr. Fabio Castillo Figueroa. Dr. Castillo is the head of the Movement of Popular Liberation (MLP) which I mentioned earlier was the front organization for the PRTC which is one of the five Marxist-Leninist revolutionary organizations comprising the DRU.

According to information reaching my office, the Executive Council of the FDR is composed of one member from each of the eight organizations comprising the FDR. The BPR representative is Oscar Bonilla; the LP-28 representative is Galindo Marisol; the FAPU representative is Jose Napoleon Rodriguez Ruiz; the MLP representative is Fabio Castillo; the UDN representative is Dagoberto Gutierrez. The MNR representative is Guillermo Manuel Ungo; the MPSC representative is Ruben Zamora; the MIPTES representative is Eduardo Francisco Calles who acts as the vice-president of the FDR.

THE FARIBUNDO MARTI NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT (FMLN)

Also subordinate to the DRU is the Faribundo Marti National Liberation Front which was formed in November 1980 to coordinate and execute the armed revolutionary insurgency in El Salvador. The FMLN is composed of the five Marxist-Leninist revolutionary groups which form the DRU. They are: the Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS); the Popular Forces of Liberation (FPL); the Armed Forces of National Resistance (FARN); the Revolutionary Army of the Poor (ERP); and the Revolutionary Party of the Workers of Central America (PRTC). The FMLN has a general command which integrates and coordinates the armed insurgency of these groups.

COMMUNISM IS THE ENEMY IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. President, as I said at the outset I am deeply concerned that the Congress and the media are refusing to come to grips with the central fact in El Salvador. That fact is that the Soviet Union directly and through its satellites and surrogates is fomenting Communist revolution at our very doorstep.

The facts about the Soviet thrust into El Salvador and the Soviet-Cuban orchestration and manipulation of the revolutionary forces in El Salvador are clear for all to see. The facts about seven decades of Soviet subversion in our hemisphere are available to anyone who would care to study them. It is inconceivable to this Senator that at this late hour these facts are not being recognized for what they are and that truly effective steps are not being taken to exclude the Communist menace from our hemisphere.

We must be absolutely clear that communism is the enemy in Central America whether it hides behind a Socialist face or whether it stands plainly out in the open for all to see.

Mr. President, there is no substitute for military victory over the Communist forces in Central America and there is no substitute for free enterprise to bring prosperity and a better life for all in the region. It is at our peril that we forget these fundamental truths.

Mr. President, in today's Washington Post there appeared an article by Roland Evans and Robert Novak which describes the activities of our Ambassador to El Salvador, Thomas Pickering, and the attitude of the U.S. Embassy in favor of Jose Napoleon Duarte. I ask unanimous consent that this important article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MAN IN EL SALVADOR

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

SAN VINCENTE, EL SALVADOR.—The quiet glee of American diplomats that Christian Democrat Jose Napoleon Duarte seems certain to win El Salvador's May 6 presidential runoff would be restrained if they carefully weighed the opinion of an army captain operating in this guerrilla-menaced area.

"Duarte ruined this country before," he told us, referring to Duarte's tenure as une-

lected president. "My brother officers and I think it would be a disaster for our country for this to happen again." Concerns that Duarte will not pursue the war vigorously are commonplace in San Vincente Province and other areas bloodied by communist insurrection. That explains why Duarte's conservative opponent, Roberto D'Aubuisson, will win handily here.

Helped by a huge majority in the capital of San Salvador, however, Duarte looks like a certain winner nationally—with some forecasts giving him two-thirds of the vote. That cheers U.S. policy makers, who fear a D'Aubuisson victory would cause Congress to cut off military aid.

But Duarte has yet to instill confidence in Salvadoran businessmen and hard-line anticommunists such as the army captain here. They fear the Reagan administration favorite pursues a non-Reagan agenda of appeasing the communists and further socializing the economy. The danger is not an army coup, but deepening economic decay, political instability and the calamity of right-wing insurgency amid left-wing revolt.

Duarte has never more clearly been Washington's man in El Salvador. "Without any doubt," D'Aubuisson told us in an interview broadcast over the Cable News Network, "the American Embassy under Mr. [Thomas] Pickering [U.S. ambassador] has tended to favor the election of Mr. Duarte." Contact between the embassy and D'Aubuisson is now at the level of assistant political officer.

Unsubstantiated accusations linking D'Aubuisson to right-wing "death squads" are less at issue than war-fighting strategy. There is unofficial opinion within the embassy the guerrillas never could be overcome militarily by D'Aubuisson and that the only hope is that Duarte can draw the insurrection's more moderate leaders into the political process. That requires a Christian Democratic government clearly to the left.

Although the U.S. news media routinely call Duarte "moderate" (while stigmatizing D'Aubuisson as "far right"), the Duarte regime expropriated land, nationalized banks and socialized the coffee import business. Salvadoran businessmen believe these "reforms," much more than ravages of war and worldwide recession, are responsible for economic stagnation that between 1979 and 1982 saw the gross national product revert to the level of 1962.

Even some of Duarte's admirers at the U.S. Embassy hope he will consider proposals by D'Aubuisson's National Republican Alliance (ARENA) to reinvigorate the economy with private credit. Far from hoping for such market-oriented policies under a second Duarte administration, businessmen fear new expropriations. Their cautious optimism about this country's future we observed last summer has turned to gloom, deepened by what they considered D'Aubuisson's failed campaign.

By sticking to patriotic, nationalistic themes, D'Aubuisson has welded support in San Vincente and other endangered areas. We want to a rally for him here attended by leaders of all parties other than the Christian Democrats. But nationwide, he has built no such coalition, and his business backers blame him for not preaching economic growth and jobs under democratic captalism.

In contrast to his prior tenure when he treated businessmen with haughty contempt, Duarte recently sent an emissary to them offering a hand of friendship. It was made clear, however, that hand does not extend to Duarte's most prominent private-sector critics, adding to the air of foreboring.

The businessmen can head for Miami, further debilitating the economy. D'Aubuisson and friends can head for the hills, guns in hand. This would be no traditional military coup. The high command, liberally pepered with Christian Democrats, distrusts ex-Maj. D'Aubuisson and does not want to displease Washington.

But the bulk of the 28,000-man army likely would support D'Aubuisson, were it not for the fact that the high command does not let them vote. Their course may be determined by Roberto D'Aubuisson's conduct in defeat. "I believe in the sovereign will of the people," he told us, pledging adherence to the election. But he confides to friends he will become a Salvadoran "contra" if Duarte makes a deal with the guerrillas.

Campaign invective is now unrestrained, with mutual accusations of political murder and labels of "communist" and "fascist." That raises doubts whether a victorious Duarte can display true conciliation toward conservative views about prosecuting the war and encouraging the private sector. If he cannot, the election outcome long dreamed of at the State Department could yield bitter fruit for President Reagan's fight against communism in Latin America.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:10 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution redesignating the Saint Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine as the "Saint Croix Island International Historic Site".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3739. An act to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4176. An act to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation;

H.R. 4406. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate Wildcat Brook in the State of New Hampshire for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4616. An act to amend the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 to require States to use at least 8 per centum of their highway safety apportionments for developing and implementing comprehensive programs concerning the use of child restraint systems in motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4921. An act to provide for the selection of additional lands for inclusion within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5051. An act to improve the operation of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 2597. An act to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughters of Harry S Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel;

H.R. 3376. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington; and

H.R. 3555. An act to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 11:19 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution; in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution commending the Government of Colombia for its recent seizure of record amounts of cocaine, congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication, expressing the hope that the Government of Colombia will carry out a sustained eradication program, and deploring the assassination of the Minister of Justice of Colombia.

At 2:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one if its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of May 1984 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution designating April 27, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day".

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3472. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to permit the control of the lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River;

H.R. 3787. An act to amend the National Trails System Act by adding the California Trail to the study list, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4585. An act to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality and the Council on Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4596. An act to amend section 1601(d) of Public Law 96-607 to permit the Secetary of the Interior to acquire title in fee simple to McClintock House at 16 East Williams Street, Waterloo, New York;

H.R. 4666. An act to provide for the recovery by the United States of the costs of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States in certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4952. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to certain Indian tribes for expenses incurred for community impact planning activities relating to the planned deployment of the MX missile system in Nevada and Utah in the manner that State and local governments were provided assistance for such expenses;

H.R. 4968. An act to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of Energy of surface rights to certain parcels of land located on Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2 in the State of California on which private residences are located;

H.R. 5027. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify procedures for payment of military retired pay to spouses and former spouses of members of the uniformed services in compliance with court orders;

H.R. 5050. An act to extend until October 1, 1986, the authority and authorization of appropriations for certain programs under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5076. An act to designate certain areas in the Allegheny National Forest as wilderness and recreation areas;

H.R. 5147. An act to implement the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, signed in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 15, 1983;

H.R. 5188. An act to authorize appropriations for the United States International Trade Commission, the United States Customs Service, and the Office of the United States Trade Representative for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 451. Joint resolution designating the month of November 1984 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month"; and

H.J. Res. 537. Joint resolution designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the initiatives of the Contadora Group and the resulting agreements among the Central American nations.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3472. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to permit the control of the lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3739. An act to provide certain authority to reduce erosion within the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3787. An act to amend the National Trails System Act by adding the California Trail to the study list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4585. An act to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality and the Council on Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4596. An act to amend section 1601(d) of Public Law 96-607 to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire title in fee simple to McClintock House at 16 East Williams Street, Waterloo, New York; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4666. An act to provide for the recovery by the United States of the costs of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4921. An act to provide for the selection of additional lands for inclusion within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4952. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to certain Indian tribes for expenses incurred for community impact planning activities relating to the planned deployment of the MX missile system in Nevada and Utah in the same manner that State and local governments were provided assistance for such expenses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4968. An act to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of Energy of surface rights to certain parcels of land located on Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2 in the State of California on which private residences are located; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5027. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify procedures for payment of military retired pay to spouses and former spouses of members of the uniformed services in compliance with court orders; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5050. An act to extend until October 1, 1986, the authority and authorization of appropriations for certain programs under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 5051. An act to improve the operation of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5076. An act to designate certain areas in the Allegheny National Forest as wilderness and recreation areas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 5147. An act to implement the Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement, signed in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 15, 1983; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5188. An act to authorize appropriations for the United States International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the United States Trade Representative for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.J. Res. 451. Joint resolution designating the month of November 1984 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the initiatives of the Contadora Group and the resulting agreements amoung the Central American nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar.

H.R. 4176. An act to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation;

H.R. 4406. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate Wildcat Brook in the State of New Hampshire for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4616. An act to amend the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 to require States to use at least 8 per centum of their highway safety apportionments for developing and implementing comprehensive programs concerning the use of child restraint systems in motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 1, 1984, the following concurrent resolution was read and placed on the calendar by unanimous consent:

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution commending the Government of Colombia for its recent seizure of record amounts of cocaine, congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication, expressing the hope that the Government of Colombia will carry out a sustained eradication program, and deploring the assassination of the Minister of Justice of Colombia.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 1, 1984, the following joint resolution was read the first and second times and placed on the calendar by unanimous consent:

H.J. Res. 537. Joint resolution designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary reported that on today, May 2, 1984, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2597. An act to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughters of Harry S. Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3128. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Guidelines for Rescuing Large Failing Firms and Municipalities"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3129. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to require furnishing of hospital services to certain uniformed service dependents and retired personnel at medicare rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3130. A communication from the Treasurer of the D.C. Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disability retirement rate for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3131. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the comments of the General Accounting Office on the annual report on the disability rate of District of Columbia police officers and firefighters; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3132. A communication from the Special Counsel, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a summary of the report by the Veterans' Administration on an investigation of allegations of a violation of regulations, abuse of authority, and a substantial and specific danger to public health and safety at the Veterans' Administration Medical Center, Murfreesboro, Tennessee; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3133. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to reform the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3134. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Freedom of Information Act report of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3135. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law the annual report of the Office under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3136. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Department under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3137. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General (Legislative Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3138. A communication from the Chairman of the National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, their support of the conclusions of the National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference on liver disease and transplant surgery; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3139. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on Selected Acquisition Reports for the quarter ending March 31, 1984; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3140. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth quadrennial review of military compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3141. A communication from the Director of Manpower Planning and Analysis, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 1983 actuarial report on the military retirement system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3142. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain property to be included in the property transfer to the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3143. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Defense Industrial Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3144. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transactions with Communist countries during March 1984; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3145. A communication from the Comptroller of the Currency transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on activities of Depository Institutions Deregulation Committee; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3146. A communication from the Comptroller of the Currency transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on consumer complaint processing activities for 1983; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3147. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of the U.S. Railway Association transmitting, pursuant to law, the Association's report to Congress for FY 1981-1983; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3148. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require tonnage measurement of vessels engaged on international voyages and within the jurisdiction of the U.S.; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3149. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the receipt of a project proposal for Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1, Texas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3150. A communication from the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System transmitting, pursuant to law, the nineteenth quarterly report on significant project developments January-March 1984; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3151. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a lease prospectus to consolidate 14 Washington, D.C. Department of Justice leased locations; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2458: A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-423).

By Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2174: A bill to provide for more effective motor carrier safety regulations and enforcement, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-424).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1201. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to protect semi-conductor chips and masks against unauthorized duplication, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 98-425).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOLE, from the Committee on Finance: Bruce E. Thompson, Jr. of Maryland to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ANDREWS (by request):

S. 2619. A bill to extend programs under the Indian Education Act through fiscal year 1985; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MATTINGLY:

S. 2620. A bill entitled the "Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1984;" to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2621. A bill to designate the Delta States Research Center in Stoneville, Miss., as the "Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center;" to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. DENTON (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2622. A bill to revise and extend title X of the Public Health Service Act, relating to family planning; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. DENTON) (by request):

S. 2623. A bill to implement the Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2624. A bill to implement the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2625. A bill to permit the payment of rewards for information concerning terrorist acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2626. A bill to prohibit the training, supporting, or inducing of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. WILSON):

S.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate January 27, 1985, as "National Jerome Kern Day;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

S. Res. 385. A resolution urging continuation of tax deductibility of residential mortgage interest payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. NUNN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. PERCY):

S. Con. Res. 109. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government take immediate steps to support a national STORM program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ANDREWS (by request):

S. 2619. A bill to extend programs under the Indian Education Act through fiscal year 1985; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXTENSION OF INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS

● Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to extend the authorization for title IV, Indian Education Act programs through the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, by request of the administration. This bill will allow the administration to begin planning the fiscal year 1986 budget for these programs, and will continue the programs for 1 more year.

During the coming months, the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, which I chair, will be taking a look at a comprehensive reauthorization of the title IV programs, holding field hearings, and analyzing possible changes to the law. Based on what we learn, I plan to introduce a comprehensive, 5-year, reauthorization of title IV next session. For now, I agree with the administration's position that a 1-year reauthorization be made by Congress, so that planning for the fiscal year 1986 title IV budget can begin.●

By Mr. MATTINGLY:

S. 2620. A bill entitled the "Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1984;" to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

FEDERAL RESERVE REFORM ACT OF 1984

● Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1984. This legislation contains several provisions which would open the decisionmaking process of the Federal Reserve's monetary policy. However, the traditional relationship between the Federal Reserve and the Congress would be unchanged.

Specifically, the Federal Reserve Reform Act would accomplish the following:

First, the 4-year term of the Chairman of the system shall begin in February of the calendar year after the year in which the President's term begins. This would make the President's and the Chairman's terms concurrent except for a 1-year lag.

Second, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors shall be made ex officio members of the Federal Open Market Committee. The Treasury Secretary was a member of the Federal Reserve Board for many years, until the 1930's. This provision would restore his or her earlier status and would also include the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors. In doing so, it would increase the input of the administration into the making of monetary policy.

Third, the terms of the seven members of the Board of Governors would be reduced from 14 to 7 years each. This would permit a somewhat faster turnover of the membership. However, a 7-year term would still provide continuity in policymaking, since it is longer than the terms of U.S. Senators, Presidents, or Congressmen.

Finally, the Federal Open Market Committee shall announce changes in its policy on the day the decisions are adopted. This provision would end volatile speculation in the financial markets due to rumors and uncertainty about Federal Reserve policy. Under current law, there is no requirement that decisions be published. By custom, a brief summary of FOMC proceedings is released a month or two after each meeting. The new provision would end this delay.

Mr. President, the Joint Economic Committee and Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Senate Banking Committee, which I chair, will hold a joint hearing on Federal Reserve accountability. At that hearing, the Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1984 will be considered and discussed. This measure would modernize the Federal Reserve, bringing its practice of decisionmaking to the threshold of the 21st century.

Mr. President, I ask for the appropriate referral of this legislation.●

By Mr. DENTON (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2622. A bill to revise and extend title X of the Public Health Service Act, relating to family planning; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1984

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, today, Senator HATCH and I are introducing S. 2622, the proposed "Family Planning Services and Population Research Amendments of 1984."

The bill authorizes the continuation of the family planning services and population research program authorized under title X of the Public Health Service Act, with some changes, for an additional 2 years. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35, extended the program for 3 years, until September 30, 1984. During the last 3 years, the Subcommittee on Family and Human Services has conducted six hearings on the title X program. As chairman of that subcommittee, I have had the opportunity to explore closely the implementation and administration of the programs authorized under title X.

I will say candidly that, unfortunately, hearings on the family planning program during the past 3 years have raised several serious questions about the way that federally funded family planning clinics operate. First, there is the widespread, as well as deeply held, view that some family planning clinics receiving title X funds are doing little to reduce the incidence of abortion. Second, I and many other parents have strong convictions that most adolescents should not receive "sexuality counseling" and prescription contraceptive drugs and devices from federally funded family planning clinics without the involvement of their parents. I am convinced that the bill that we are introducing today will help remedy these problems, even as it extends the title X program.

In 2 days of hearings held during this session, the subcommittee heard testimony from the administration, State officials, representatives of the family planning community, and concerned individuals about the continued need for family planning services to low-income families. Moreover, the subcommittee received suggestions about how we can make improvements in the family planning program. When combined with the findings of the five other hearings that the subcommittee has held in the last 3 years, the results of these hearings, I believe, point toward the formulation of several important changes in the title X program. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have joined the chairman of the full committee to introduce a piece of legislation that, I believe, both supporters and critics of title X will find acceptable.

What follows is an outline of the more important changes to the program contained in S. 2622.

First, the bill will contine to authorize the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to make grants to and enter into con-

tracts with family planning projects across the country. We know that the majority of women receiving family planning services under title X programs are poor and that the Federal Government can and should assist in making comprehensive voluntary family planning services available to those couples who otherwise might not be able to afford them.

In addition, the bill will establish two independent demonstration projects that will enable the Secretary to make grants to entities able to provide pregnancy testing and counseling and to entities able to help alleviate the problems of infertility.

Pregnancy testing is one of the most frequent reasons for an initial visit to a family planning facility. The current title X law makes no special provision for pregnancy diagnosis and counseling and it is time to codify and emphasize the importance of these services.

Likewise, involuntary childlessness is a problem which affects a growing number of couples. Yet, comprehensive infertility services are still beyond the reach of most average- and low-income couples, because of the complexities and high costs of diagnosis and treatment.

Although all title X grantees are required by law to make basic infertility services availabe to clients, they have been cautioned by regulations to exercise great care in budgeting for infertility services. Title X grantees, however, have a good basic capacity suitable for expanding infertility care to low- and middle-income couples. Again, the time has come to provide permanent statutory incentives to those clinics willing to provide higher levels of infertility services.

As a part of the continuation of current family planning grants and the establishment of demonstration projects in pregnancy testing and counseling, the new law will establish basic guidelines for patient counseling. In the sensitive area of human sexuality, government agents and grantees must exercise extreme care when offering advice or direction to patients.

The title X act should spell out clearly that individuals requesting services are entitle to information on the risks and benefits of all methods of pregnancy prevention. Furthermore, if the individual is pregnant, she should be presented with the courses of action that she may take on her own initiative, including the benefits and services available to her in carrying the fetus to term, and in raising and caring for the child or in placing the child for adoption.

Second, the bill will repeal the unused section of the law which permits formula grants to States for family planning.

Third, the bill will expand the section in the law which permits the Secretary to provide funds for training personnel to include the training of obstetric-gynecological nurse practitioners, educators, and counselors. This expansion of the training authority will be particularly important as it relates to the establishment of the demonstration projects in infertility and pregnancy testing and counseling.

Fourth, the research provisions of the law will be modified to specify that research in infertility and natural family planning methods is permissible. In addition, it will clarify that research in program implementation intended to improve the management and delivery of family planning services is permissible.

Fifth, in line with the family involvement amendment passed in 1981, the bill will place special emphasis on the production of family planning educational materials that emphasize the role of the parents in transmitting values of family life and sexual responsibility.

In 1981, the subcommittee held a hearing that focused on education curricula produced under title X. The material was critiqued by mental health professionals on the basis of educational merit, appropriateness for the designated age groups, psychological implications, and overall quality of both content and design. The witnesses raised serious concerns about the appropriateness and the quality of the curricula. Based on these findings, we have added a language to the information and educational materials section of title X to prohibit the production of curricula designed for use in public elementary and secondary schools.

Sixth, with regard to the regulations and payments section of the law, the bill we are proposing will continue to guarantee that unemancipated minors will not be denied services on the basis of economic status, but that the financial base of parental support and the discretionary income of the teen will be considered in determining the amount of subsidy that the Federal Government will provide. There are large numbers of low-income adult women who are in need of subsidized family planning services. In a time of budget constraints, we need to be particularly concerned that we are not diverting resources away from those least able to bear the cost of family planning services.

Seventh, the bill will provide two subsections to reassert the principles embodied in the "conscience clause" amendments adopted in the past to govern all programs authorized by the Public Health Service Act. Together, these clauses would assure that the Secretary could not require a grantee or an individual to advise regarding, refer patients for, or provide, particular birth control methods, abortion or sterilization procedures when such activity would be contrary to the religious or moral principles of either the grantee or the individual.

Eighth, the legislation will place a strong prohibition against any funds being used to promote, encourage the use, refer for, or provide abortion as a method of family planning. The General Accounting Office, in its 1982 report entitled, "Restrictions on Abortion and Lobbying Activities in Family Planning Programs Need Clarification," made the following recommendations:

> We recommend that the Secretary establish clear operational guidance by incorporating into the Title X program regulations and guidelines, HHS' position on the scope of the restriction in section 1008; and,
>
> In doing so, we recommend that the Secretary consider the grantee practices discussed in this report and in the Inspector General's reports with a view toward providing as explicit guidance as possible on the activities that are and are not allowed.

No official guidelines governing the separation of nontherapeutic abortion activities have been published by the administration and no steps have been taken to implement the recommendations made by the General Accounting Office. It is painfully obvious, however, that some grantees are currently performing abortions on the same site as the family planning clinic. Furthermore, many title X grantees are actively involved in encouraging and promoting the use of nontherapeutic abortion as a method of family planning. This is not what Congress intended when it created the title X program in 1971, nor should we countenance such behavior after rejecting direct Federal funding of abortions year after year. Our national policy on this issue must be consistent and clear.

Ninth, the bill will specify that the Secretary has the duty to collect annual data on the number of individuals served, the types of services chosen, and the sources of funding for subsidized family planning.

Tenth, we will add a provision to the law that would permit the States to establish their own policies with respect to the provision of services to minors. The State of Utah was declared ineligible for the receipt of all title X funds because its State legislature passed a law requiring parental notification before an adolescent could receive contraceptives. The sovereign States ought not face a loss of vital family planning funds on this basis.

Finally, Mr. President, the bill will establish authorization levels indicated by a chart that I ask be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		
	1984 appropriation (estimated)	1985 authorization proposed under S. 2622	1986 authorization proposed under S. 2622
Family planning project grants	133.0	136.0	142.0
Training	3.1	3.25	4.250
Information and education	.53	.63	.690
Infertility projects		3.0	5.0
Pregnancy testing and counseling projects		1.0	1.5

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. DENTON) (by request):

S. 2623. A bill to implement the Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2624. A bill to implement the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2625. A bill to permit the payment of rewards for information concerning terrorist acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2626. A bill to prohibit the training, supporting, or inducing or terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATION DEALING WITH INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today, I am joined by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., and the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism, Senator JEREMIAH DENTON, in introducing, on behalf of the administration, four bills dealing with international terrorism.

During the last two decades, the methods used to change governments and public policy have become increasingly violent. A compilation of information on terrorist activity in the United States by the Federal Bureau of Investigation shows that acts of terrorism committed in the country during 1983 included bombings, an assassination, arson, as robbery, and a rocket attack, Of equal importance is the fact that those who use violent and life-threatening means have shown that no place in this country is safe from such lawlessness. This stark reality was brought home to the Members of this body by the November 7, 1983, bombing here in the U.S. Capitol Building by the so-called "Armed Resistance Unit."

While these violent acts have in the past almost always been perpetrated by organizations or cadres operating without offical support, a new and extremely worrisome brand of terrorism has begun to surface. This new strain of terrorist activity, called official or state terrorism, consists of acts of violence that have either the direct or indirect support of a national government. As pointed out by President Reagan in his message accompanying the four bills which I am introducing today, state terrorism accounts for the great majority of the terrorist murders and assassinations which have occurred around the world in recent months. The senseless bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, which took the lives of over 250 American servicemen, is a prime example of such state-supported terrorist activity.

Another more recent example of government-sanctioned terrorism occurred only last month when a London police officer was killed by a gunman who opened fire on an anti-Libyan student demonstration. The perpetrator of this wanton act was given refuge in the Libyan Embassy and eventually allowed to leave Britain with impunity because he was protected by the diplomatic immunity accorded representatives of the Libyan Government.

While the aims of some of the organizations who are responsible for acts of violence may have some merit, the means which they have chosen to enable them to reach those goals are immoral and cannot be condoned. We must, however, do more than simply deplore acts of terrorism which often kill or maim innocent people. As members of the National Government, it is our responsibility to take every step necessary to ensure that American citizens, wherever they may be, are kept as free from the threat of terrorist attack as is humanly possible. Our citizenry must have this security when they travel outside this country, as well as when they are at home.

Accordingly, the administration has formulated a package of proposed legislation designed to accomplish several things. First, two of the four bills introduced today will implement international accords militating against the taking of hostages and affecting the safety of civilian aircraft. The United States has previously ratified the Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation dealing with terrorist acts such as air piracy and aircraft sabotage. However, specific legislation is needed to counter the increase in incidents of airplane hijacking because these actions jeopardize the lives of innocent persons, threaten the overall security of our Nation, and operate as a detriment to the smooth conduct of interstate and foreign commerce. Passage of this implementing legislation will bring this country into full compliance with the principles of this international accord both in this country and within our special aircraft jurisdiction.

The United States has also become a party to the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages. However, since September 1981, the need for implementing legislation has prevented this treaty from being officially recorded. Needless to say, the taking of hostages—whether civilian, military, or diplomatic—is an offense against the rule of law among nations and places our national security in serious jeopardy. Approval of this measure will amend the Federal kidnaping statute so that it would apply to this common terrorist tactic. Enactment of this legislation will allow this country to meet its obligation to the world community to change its domestic law to make hostage-taking an offense against the United States.

A third measure would provide for the payment of rewards by the United States for information leading to the prevention of terrorist acts or the apprehension of persons having committed them, whether in this country or abroad.

The fourth proposal would make it a Federal offense to provide training, mechanical, logistical, or maintenance support to any international terrorist group or foreign government acting in support of terrorist activity.

Mr. President, the implementation of these measures will demonstrate to international forums and other members of the world community that the United States is serious about its efforts to combat international terrorism. I believe that these are important proposals necessary to bring us into the forefront of those nations committed to counteracting international terrorism. I strongly urge my colleagues to study these pieces of legislation and join in support of their prompt approval.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I proudly join with my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to introduce, on behalf of the administration, four bills to address the growing problem of terrorism.

Mr. President, we are seeing a disturbing and alarming trend in the use of terrorism. It is the direct use of terror by a number of sovereign foreign states. We have seen several examples of that state-sponsored and state-executed terrorism during just the past year: The bombing of our Embassies in Beirut and Kuwait, the bombing of the headquarters of the U.S. Marine peace-keeping unit in Beirut, and most recently the machinegun killing, by someone inside the Libyan Embassy in London, of a British policewoman and the wounding of 11 Libyans who were peacefully demonstrating against the Qadhafi regime. That act of terrorism was, according to recent press accounts, ordered by the Libyan Government.

In addition, state-provided training, financing, and logistical support for terrorists and terrorist groups is a pro-

foundly serious and growing source of danger to the United States, and to our friends and allies abroad.

The legislative package proposed by the President complements and augments several pieces of antiterrorist legislation that I introduced earlier in this session: S. 2395, which would amend the Freedom of Information Act by providing an exemption for information relating to terrorism and foreign counterintelligence; S. 2469, the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1984, which would make terrorism a Federal crime and give the FBI primary investigative jurisdiction over the crime of terrorism; and S. 2470, the Anti-Nuclear Terrorism Act of 1984, which would give nuclear power reactor licensees access to the FBI's national criminal history files and thus enable licensees to check for criminal histories of potential employees who would have unescorted access to nuclear power facilities.

I want to outline the President's proposals:

ACT FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF HOSTAGE TAKING

In September 1981, the President signed the instrument ratifying the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, which was adopted by the United Nations on December 17, 1979. The convention has not, however, been implemented domestically through enabling legislation. This bill would implement the 1979 convention by amending the Federal kidnaping statute to provide for Federal jurisdiction over any kidnaping in which a threat is made to kill, injure, or continue to detain a victim in order to compel a third party to do or to abstain from doing something. When the President signed the instrument of ratification, the Congress was informed that the instrument of ratification would not be deposited with the United Nations until enabling legislation had been enacted. To demonstrate to other governments and international organizations that the United States is serious about its efforts to deal with international terrorism, it is essential that the Congress approve the enabling legislation required for our full implementation of the Hostage-Taking Convention.

AIRCRAFT SABOTAGE ACT

The United States became a party in 1969 to the Tokyo Convention, which covers certain offenses or acts committed aboard aircraft, and in 1971 to the Hague Convention, which concerns the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft. The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation was adopted at Montreal in 1971 and ratified by the United States in November 1972. It requires that all states party to it establish jurisdiction over certain offenses affecting the safety of civil aviation.

The Congress has approved enabling legislation for the first two conventions, but not for the Montreal Convention. In consequence, certain criminal acts related to aircraft sabotage or hijacking are not adequately covered by U.S. law. The gap in the law sends a false signal to terrorists. It also indicates to other governments that we may not be as serious as we should be, and as in fact we are, in our efforts to combat international terrorism. Action by the Congress now would provide the basis for the long-overdue implementation of the Montreal Convention.

ACT FOR REWARDS FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING TERRORIST ACTS

Current law authorizes the payment of rewards for information concerning domestic crimes, but it is outdated. The maximum rewards are inadequate, and terrorism is not specifically included as a basis for paying a reward. Moreover, there is no authority for the payment of rewards for information about acts of terrorism abroad.

The proposed legislation, which is modeled on an existing statute that allows payment of rewards for information concerning the unauthorized manufacture of atomic weapons, recognizes that payment of a reward in connection with acts of domestic terrorism raises a matter of law enforcement that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, but that the payment of a reward in connection with an act of terrorism abroad poses a political and foreign relations problem within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. By increasing the amounts of rewards that may be paid, and by authorizing rewards for information about terrorist acts committed abroad, the bill would markedly improve the ability of the Departments of Justice and State to obtain information leading to the freeing of hostages or the capture of the perpetrators of acts of terrorism. By passing this legislation, the Congress can further underscore the intent of the United States to take every appropriate and necessary step to protect its citizens and property from terrorist acts.

PROHIBITION AGAINST THE TRAINING AND SUPPORT OF TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS ACT OF 1984

The training and support of terrorist groups and activities by a number of countries has reached alarming proportions. In addition, the increase in the number of states now using terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy is highly disturbing. Activities by U.S. nationals to provide assistance to countries that support terrorism and use terrorism as a foreign policy tool has thus become a matter of grave concern to our national security. This bill, together with revised and strengthened regulations that the Department of State intends to issue shortly, would enhance the ability of the Department of Justice to prosecute persons involved in the support of terrorist activities and of states using terrorism. Enactment of the legislation would be a strong contribution to the effort to combat terrorism.

The time has come, Mr. President, for the Congress to take forceful and effective measures against terrorism by passing the four legislative proposals as soon as humanly possible. In an effort to expedite that effort, the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism, which I chair, has already scheduled a series of hearings on the bills. The first hearing will be held on June 5.

I believe it vital, Mr. President, that at those hearings we have a full and fair airing of the pros and cons of the legislation and make sure that we hear views from every responsible quarter. We certainly should not rush to judgment as the Washington Post did in its lead editorial on May 1 in which, without benefit of any hearings on the issues, it termed the President's package "Bad legislation" and an effort "to fight terrorism with hysteria."

One of the problems with the Washington Post editorial, Mr. President, is that it only addresses one of the four bills in the President's legislative package—the Prohibition Against the Training or Support of Terrorist Organization Act of 1984. The Post editorial completely ignores the three other bills in the package, two of which are enabling legislation for treaties to which the United States is already a signatory.

Instead of hasty and ill-considered reactions, like those manifested by the Post, the country deserves a dispassionate, objective review of the President's proposals. An editorial that appeared on April 24 in the Florence Times Daily in my home State of Alabama reaches the heart of the problem that we face by pointing out that, like other terrorists, Col. Qadhafi of Libya——

> Must be taught that the more civilized nations of the world will not tolerate his militaristic tactics. His threats must be countered with adequate protections. His actions must be reprimanded. His use of Embassies to carry out intimidation of his exiles must stop. His lawlessness must end or at least be confined within the borders of Libya.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Times Daily editorial, entitled "Get Tough With Libyans," be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

I believe it vital, Mr. President, that after full and fair hearings we move the bills through committee and on the floor for action.

I urge all of my colleagues to lend their support to the four bills in an effort to weaken, if not eliminate, the

growing threat posed by international terrorism.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET TOUGH WITH LIBYANS

Britain has rightfully decided to end diplomatic relations with Libya.

Last week, an occupant of the Libyan Embassy in London poked a machine gun out the window and fired on a group of protesters. A policewoman monitoring the protest was killed. Ten other people were wounded.

British police surrounded the embassy. The killer remained inside, protected from justice by diplomatic immunity. The British government could not storm the embassy, because under international law permission of Libya is required before entry to the embassy is allowed.

At the same time, the Libya government put troops around the British Embassy in Tripoli. Later, those troops were removed. The police around the Libyan Embassy in London remained.

Libyan leader Moammar Khadafy continued to refuse permission for British police to enter the embassy. The British wanted to question the occupants and look for weapons.

Some reports said that just before the deadly shots an American spy satellite picked up a message from Libya to the embassy. The message instructed the embassy staff to use force in response to the taunts from the protesters outside.

By Sunday, British diplomats in Libya will return home and Libyan diplomats in Britain are supposed to go home. The standoff will be over. Until then, however, the police will continue to surround the embassy.

When the Libyan diplomats come out of the embassy, a killer will be walking with them. It seems unfair to the family of the slain policewoman. She was protecting the Libyans and now she is dead at the hands of a Libyan.

However, we must praise Britain's decision to cut diplomatic relations. It is tough action. It may not match the crime, but it puts the radical Khadafy regime on notice.

Khadafy must be taught that the more civilized nations of the world will not tolerate his militaristic tactics. His threats must be countered with adequate protections. His actions must be reprimanded. His use of embassies to carry out intimidation of his exiles must stop. His lawlessness must end or at least be confined within the borders of Libya.

Our prayers go to the 8,000 British citizens living in Libya. We hope that they will be unharmed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these four bills and the message of the President to Congress which accompanied these proposals be printed in the RECORD in their entirety following the conclusion of my remarks.

Thank you.

S. 2623

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Aircraft Sabotage Act."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that:

(a) The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation (ratified by the United States on November 1, 1972) requires each contracting State to establish its jurisdiction over certain offenses affecting the safety of civil aviation;

(b) Such offenses place innocent lives in jeopardy, endanger national security, affect domestic tranquillity, gravely affect interstate and foreign commerce, and are offenses against the law of nations;

(c) The purpose of this Act is to implement fully the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation and to expand the protection accorded to aircraft and related facilities.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 31 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph by

(A) striking out "and" before the term "spare part" and inserting "and 'special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States'" after the term "spare part"; and

(B) striking out "Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal Aviation Act of 1958";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of the third undesignated paragraph thereof;

(3) by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ";" ; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'In flight' means any time from the moment all the external doors of an aircraft are closed following embarkation until the moment when any such door is opened for disembarkation. In the case of a forced landing the flight shall be deemed to continue until competent authorities take over the responsibility for the aircraft and the persons and property on board; and

"'In service' means any time from the beginning of preflight preparation of the aircraft by ground personnel or by the crew for a specific flight until twenty-four hours after any landing; the period of service shall, in any event, extend for the entire period during which the aircraft is in flight.".

(b) Section 32 of Title 19, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever willfully—

"(1) sets fire to, damages, destroys, disables, or interferes with the operation of or makes unsuitable for use any aircraft in the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States or any civil aircraft used, operated, or employed in interstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce;

"(2) places or causes to be placed a destructive device or substance in, upon, or in proximity to, or otherwise makes or causes to be made unworkable or unusable or hazardous to work or use, any such aircraft, or any part or other materials used or intended to be used in connection with the operation of such aircraft;

"(3) sets fire to, damages, destroys, or disables any air navigation facility, or interferes with the operation of such facility, if such fire, damaging, destroying, disabling, or interfering is likely to endanger the safety of any such aircraft in flight;

"(4) with the intent to damage, destroy, or disable any such aircraft, sets fire to, damages, destroys, or disables or places a destructive device or substance in, upon, or in proximity to, any appliance or structure, ramp, landing area, property, machine, or apparatus, or any facility or other material used, or intended to be used, in connection with the operation, maintenance, loading unloading or storage of any such aircraft or any cargo carried or intended to be carried on any such aircraft;

"(5) performs an act of violence against or incapacitates any individual on any such aircraft, if such act of violence or incapacitation is likely to endanger the safety of such aircraft;

"(6) communicates information, knowing the information to be false, thereby endangering the safety of any such aircraft in flight; or

"(7) attempts to do anything prohibited under paragraphs (1) through (6) of this subsection—

shall be fined not more than $100,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years or both.

"(b) Whoever willfully—

"(1) performs an act of violence against any individual on board any civil aircraft registered in a country other than the United States while such aircraft is in flight, if such act is likely to endanger the safety of that aircraft;

"(2) destroys a civil aircraft registered in a country other than the United States while such aircraft is in service or causes damage to such an aircraft which renders that aircraft incapable of flight or which is likely to endanger that aircraft's safety in flight;

"(3) places or causes to be placed on a civil aircraft registered in a country other than the United States while such aircraft is in service, a device or substance which is likely to destroy that aircraft, or to cause damage to that aircraft which renders that aircraft incapable of flight or which is likely to endanger that aircraft's safety in flight; or

"(4) attempts to commit an offense described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of this subsection—

shall, if the offender is later found in the United States, be fined not more than $100,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.".

(c) Section 101(38)(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1301(39(d)), relating to the definition of the term "special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States", is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking out "; or " and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon;

(2) at the end of clause (ii), by striking out "and" and inserting in lieu thereof "or;" and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(iii) regarding which an offense as defined in subsection (d) or (e) of Article I, Section I of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation (Montreal, September 23, 1971) is committed if the aircraft lands in the United States with an alleged offender still on board; and".

(d)(1) Chapter 2 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 36. Imparting or conveying threats

"Whoever imparts or conveys any threat to do an act which would be a felony prohibited by section 32 or 33 of this chapter or section 1992 of chapter 97 or section 2275 or chapter 111 of this title with an apparent determination and will to carry the threat into execution shall be fined not more $25,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.".

(2) The analysis of chapter 2 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"36. Imparting or conveying threats.".

SEC. 4. (a)(1) Section 901 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1471) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Whoever imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a crime prohibited by subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of section 902 of this Act, shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 which shall be recoverable in a civil action brought in the name of the United States.

"(d) Except for law enforcement officers of any municipal or State government or officers or employees of the Federal Government, who are authorized or required within their official capacities to carry arms, or other persons who may be so authorized under regulations issued by the Administrator, whoever while aboard, or while attempting to board, any aircraft in, or intended for operation in, air transportation or intrastate air transportation, has on or about his person or his property a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, which is, or would be, accessible to such person in flight shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 which shall be recoverable in a civil action brought in the name of the United States.".

(2) That portion of the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the side heading "Sec. 901. Civil penalties." is amended by inserting at the end thereof:

"(c) Conveying false information.

"(d) Concealed weapons.".

(b) Section 901(a)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1471(a)(2)) is amended by inserting the words: "penalties provided for in subsections (c) and (d) of this section or" after the words "Secretary of Transportation in the case of".

(c)(1) Section 902(l)(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1472(l)(1) is amended by striking the term "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "$10,000".

(2) Section 902(l)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1472(l)(2)) is amended by striking the term "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

(d)(1) Section 902(m) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1472(m)) is amended to read as follows:

"FALSE INFORMATION AND THREATS

"(m)(1) Whoever willfully and maliciously, or with reckless disregard for the safety of human life, imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a felony prohibited by subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of this section, shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(2) Whoever imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed any threat to do an act which would be a felony prohibited by section (i), (j), (k), or (l) of this section with an apparent determination and will to carry the threat into execution shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.".

(2) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the side heading "Sec. 903. Criminal penalties." is amended by striking out

"(m) False information."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"(m) False information and threats.".

(e) Subsection (a) of section 1395 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end of such subsection and adding the following at the end thereof: ", and in any proceeding to recover a civil penalty under section 35(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code or section 901(c) or 901(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, all process against any defendant or witness may be served, regardless whether authorized under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, in any judicial district of the United States upon an ex parte order for good cause shown.".

(f) The second sentence of section 903(b)(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1473(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "Such" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except with respect to civil penalties under sections 901(c) and (d) of this Act, such".

SEC. 5. This Act shall become effective on enactment.

S. 2624

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Act for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Hostage-Taking".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that:

(a) the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages (adopted by the United Nations, December 17, 1979) requires all States parties to it to prohibit the offense of hostage-taking as defined in the Convention;

(b) hostage-taking affects domestic tranquility, interstate and foreign commerce, and foreign relations, endangers national security, and is an offense against the law of nations;

(c) the purpose of this title is to fully implement the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by deleting in subsection (a)(3) the words "section 101(36) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1301(36))" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 101(38) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1301(38))";

(2) by deleting "or" at the end of subsection (a)(3);

(3) by deleting the comma at the end of subsection (a)(4) and inserting "; or" in lieu thereof;

(4) by adding a new subsection (a)(5) after subsection (a)(4) as follows:

"(5) a threat is made to kill, injure or to continue to detain the person in order to compel a third party to do or abstain from doing any act as an explicit or implicit condition for the release of the person,";

(5) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) Whoever attempts to violate subsection (a)(4) or subsection (a)(5) shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than twenty years.";

(6) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) If the victim of an offense under subsection (a) is an internationally protected person, or if a threat is made to kill, injure, or to continue to detain the victim in order to compel a third party to do or abstain from doing any act as an explicit or implicit condition for the release of the victim, the United States my exercise jurisdiction over the offense if the offense was committed within the United States; the alleged offender is a national of the United States; the victim or purported victim was a national of the United States; or the offender is present within the United States, irrespective of the place where the offense was committed or the nationality of the victim or the alleged offender. As used in this subsection, the term "United States" includes all areas under the jurisdiction of the United States including any of the places within the provisions of sections 5 and 7 of this title and section 101(38) of the Federal Aviation Action of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1301(38)) and the term "national of the United States" has the meaning given to it in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)).";

(7) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(f) In the course of enforcement of subsection (a)(4) or subsection (a)(5), and any other sections prohibiting a conspiracy or attempt to violate subsection (a)(4) or subsection (a)(5), the Attorney General may request assistance from any Federal, State, or local agency, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, any statute, rule or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding."; and

(8) by inserting a new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to prevent any State, commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, from exercising jurisdiction over any offense over which it would have jurisdiction in the absence of this section, nor shall anything in this section be construed as depriving State and local law enforcement authorities of responsibility for prosecuting acts that may be violations of this section and that are violations of State and local law, nor shall anything in subsection (a)(5) of this section be construed as authorizing the United States to exercise jurisdiction over an offense occurring in the United States in which the alleged offender is the parent, child, spouse, brother or sister of any victim or in which the alleged offender and any victim live in the same household and are related by blood or marriage.".

(b)(1) The heading of section 1201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1201. Kidnaping and hostage-taking"

(2) The analysis for chapter 55 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting the item relating to section 1201 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new item:

"1201. Kidnaping and hostage-taking:"

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 4. Sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall become effective only when the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages has come into force and the United States has become a party to it.

S. 2625

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "Act for Rewards for Information Concerning Terrorist Acts".

SEC. 2. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 203:

"CHAPTER 204—REWARDS FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING TERRORIST ACTS

"Sec. 3071. Information for which rewards authorized; maximum amount.
"Sec. 3072. Determination of entitlement; consultation; Presidential approval; conclusiveness.
"Sec. 3073. Aliens; waiver of admission requirements.
"Sec. 3074. Hearings; rules and regulations.
"Sec. 3075. Protection of identity.
"Sec. 3076. Exception of governmental officials.
"Sec. 3077. Authorization for appropriations.
"Sec. 3078. Eligibility for witness security program.
"Sec. 3079. Definitions.

"SEC. 3071. INFORMATION FOR WHICH REWARDS AUTHORIZED; MAXIMUM AMOUNT.

"Any individual who furnishes information—

"(a) leading to the arrest or conviction, in any country, of any individual or individuals for the commission of an act of terrorism against a United States person or United States property; or

"(b) leading to the arrest or conviction, in any country, of any individual or individuals for conspiring or attempting to commit an act of terrorism against a United States person or property; or

"(c) leading to the prevention, frustration or favorable resolution of an act of terrorism against a United States person or property

may be rewarded in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

"SEC. 3072. DETERMINATION OF ENTITLEMENT; CONSULTATION; PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL; CONCLUSIVENESS.

"The Attorney General shall with respect to acts of terrorism primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and the Secretary of State shall with respect to acts of terrorism primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, determine whether an individual furnishing information pursuant to section 3071 is entitled to a reward and the amount to be paid. Before making a reward under this chapter in a matter over which there is federal criminal jurisdiction, the Secretary of State shall advise and consult with the Attorney General. A reward of $100,000 or more may not be made without the approval of the President or his designee. A determination made by the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, or the President under this chapter shall be final and conclusive and no court shall have power or jurisdiction to review it.

"SEC. 3073. ALIENS; WAIVER OF ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS.

"If the information which would justify a reward under this chapter is furnished by an alien, the Attorney General, after consulting with the Secretary of State, may determine that the entry of such alien into the United States is in the public interest and, in that event, such alien and the members of his immediate family may receive immigrant visas and may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, notwithstanding the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. sec.1101 et seq.].

"SEC. 3074. HEARINGS; RULES AND REGULATIONS.

"The Attorney General and the Secretary of State, respectively, are authorized to hold such hearings and make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. The provisions of subchapter II, chapter 5 of title 5 United States Code do not apply to this chapter.

"SEC. 3075. PROTECTION OF IDENTITY.

"Any reward granted under this chapter shall be certified by the Attorney General or the Secretary of State, respectively. If it is determined that the identity of the recipient of a reward or of the members of the receipient's immediate family must be protected, the Attorney General or the Secretary of State, respectively, may take such measures in connection with the payment of the reward as deemed necessary to effect such protection.

"SEC. 3076. AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS.

"Such sums as necessary are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of this chapter.

"SEC. 3077. EXCEPTION OF GOVERNMENTAL OFFICIALS.

"No officer or employee of any governmental entity who, while in the performance of his official duties, furnishes the information described in section 3071 shall be eligible for any monetary reward under this chapter.

"SEC. 3078. ELIGIBILITY FOR WITNESS SECURITY PROGRAM.

"Any individual who furnishes information which would justify a reward under this chapter and his immediate family may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, participate in the Attorney General's witness security program authorized under Title V of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970.

"SEC. 3079. DEFINITIONS.

"As used in this chapter the term—

"(a) 'Act of terrorism' means an activity that—

"(1) involves a violent act or an act dangerous to human life that is a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or of any State; and

"(2) appears to be intended—

"(A) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

"(B) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

"(C) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnaping.

"(b) 'United States person' means—

"(1) a national of the United States as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)];

"(2) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(2)];

"(3) any person within the United States;

"(4) any employee or contractor of the United States Government, regardless of nationality, who is the victim or intended victim of an act of terrorism by virtue of that employment;

"(5) a sole proprietorship, partnership, company, or association composed principallly of nationals or permanent resident aliens of the Untied States; and

"(6) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States and a foreign subsidiary of such corporation.

"(c) 'United States property' means any real or personal property which is within the United States or, if outside the United States, the actual or beneficial ownership of which rests in a United States person or any federal or State governmental entity of the United States.

"(d) 'United States'—

"(1) When used in a geographical sense, includes Puerto Rico and all territories and possessions of the United States; and

"(2) when used in the context of section 3073 shall have the meaning giving to it in the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.].

"(e) 'State' includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other possession or territory of the United States.

"(f) 'government entity' includes the government of the United States, any State or political subdivision thereof, any foreign country, and any state, provincial, municipal or other political subdivision of a foreign country.

"(g) 'Attorney General' means the Attorney General of the United States or that official designated by the Attorney General to perform his responsibilites under this chapter.

"(h) 'Secretary of State' means the Secretary of State or that official designated by the Secretary of State to perform his responsibilities under this chapter."

(b) The chapter analysis of Part II of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to chapter 203 the following new item:

"204. Rewards for information concerning terrorist acts ..... 3071".

S. 2626

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Prohibition Against the Training or Support of Terrorist Organizations Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 113:

"CHAPTER 113A—TERRORISM

"Sec. 2331. Military and intelligence assistance to certain foreign governments, factions, and international terrorist groups.

"§ 2331. Military and intelligence assistance to certain foreign governments, factions, and international terrorist groups

"(a) Except as provided in subsections (h) and (i), it shall be unlawful for any national of the United States, any permanent resident alien of the United States, or any United States business entity to willfully perform or attempt to perform anywhere in the world any of the following acts:

"(1) serve in, or act in concert with, the armed forces or any intelligence agency of any foreign government, faction, or international terrorist group which is named in a determination in effect under subsection (d);

"(2) provide training in any capacity to the armed forces or any intelligence agency, or their agents, of any foreign government, faction, or international terrorist group named in a determination in effect under subsection (d);

"(3) provide any logistical, mechanical, maintenance, or similar support services to the armed forces or any intelligence agency,

or their agents, of any foreign govenment, faction, or international terrorist group named in a determination in effect under subsection (d); or

"(4) recruit or solicit any person to engage in any activity described in subparagraphs (1) through (3) of this paragraph.

"(b) Except as provided in subsections (h) and (i), it shall be unlawful for any person or entity within the boundaries of the United States, its territories or possessions, to willfully perform or attempt to perform any of the following acts:

"(1) provide training in any capacity to the armed forces or any intelligence agency, or their agents, of any foreign govenment, faction, or international terrorist group named in a determination in effect under subsection (d);

"(2) provide any logistical, mechanical, maintenance, or similar support services to the armed forces or any intelligence agency, or their agents, of any foreign government, faction, or international terrorist group named in a determination in effect under subsection (d); or

"(3) recruit or solicit any person to engage in any activity described in subparagraphs (1) or (2) of this paragraph.

"(c) Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than five times the total compensation received for such violation, or $100,000, whichever is greater, or imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both, for each such offense.

"(d) Whenever the Secretary of State finds that the acts or likely acts of international terrorism of a foreign government, faction, or international terrorist group are such that the national security, foreign relations, or the physcial security of the person or property of a private entity of the United States warrant a ban on the foreign government's, faction's or international terrorist group's receipt of services or other assistance in support of such acts as described in subsections (a) or (b), he may issue a determination naming such foreign government, faction, or international terrorist group for which such finding has been made. If the Secretary of State finds that the conditions which were the basis for any detemination issued under this subsection have changed in such a manner as to warrant revocation of such determination, or that the national security or foreign relations of the United States so warrant, he may revoke such determination in whole or in part. Any determination issued pursuant to this subsection shall cease to have any effect one year from the date of its publication unless renewed at or before that time by the Secretary of State. Any determination, or the renewal or revocation thereof, issued pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register and shall become effective immediately on publication. Any revocation or lapsing of a determination shall not affect any action or proceeding based on any conduct committed prior to the effective date of such revocation or lapsing.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, any finding of fact made in any determination or renewal issued pursuant to subsection (d) shall be conclusive. No question concerning the validity of the issuance of such determination or renewal may be raised by a defendant as a defense in or as an objection to any trial or hearing if such determination or renewal was issued and published in the Federal Register in accordance with subsection (d).

"(f) An affirmative defense shall exist with respect to any act committed outside of the United States within thirty days after the effective date of any determination affecting such person if the act was performed pursuant to an agreement or contract entered into prior to the effective date of the determination.

"(g)(1) Whoever has been convicted of a violation of this section, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by this section, shall forfeit to the United States—

"(A) any property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds he obtained, directly or indirectly, as a result of such violation; and

"(B) any of his property used, or intended to be used, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, such violation.

"(2) The procedures in any criminal forfeiture under this section, and the duties and authority of the courts of the United States and the Attorney General with respect to any criminal forfeiture action under this section or with respect to any property that may be subject to forfeiture under this section, are to be governed by the provisions of section 1963 of this title.

"(h) This section shall not be construed to prohibit the provision of medical services or medical training for humanitarian purposes, or the recruitment or solicitation thereof.

"(i) Nothing in this section shall be construed to create criminal liability for any activities conducted by officials of the United States Government, or their agents, which are properly authorized and conducted in accordance with federal statutes and Executive orders governing such activities.

"(j) for the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'foreign government' has the meaning given it in section 1116(b)(2) of this title;

"(2) the term 'armed forces' includes any regular, irregular, paramilitary, guerrilla, or police force;

"(3) the term 'faction' includes any political party, body of insurgents, or other group which seeks to overthrow the government of, become the government of, or otherwise assert control over or influence any foreign country or territory, possession, department, district, province, or other political subdivision of any such foreign country through the threat or use of force of arms;

"(4) the term 'group' means an association of persons, whether or not a legal entity;

"(5) the term 'international terrorist group' means a group which engages in international terrorism;

"(6) the term 'international terrorism' has the meaning given to it in section 101(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(c));

"(7) the term 'intelligence agency' means any entity which engages in the collection, analysis, or dissemination of information concerning the activities, capabilities, plan or intention of governments, organization, or persons, in whole or in part by covert means;

"(8) the term 'United States business entity' means any sole proprietorship, partnership, company, association, or corporation organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business within, the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States;

"(9) the term 'national of the United States' has the meaning given to it in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22));

"(10) the term 'permanent resident alien of the United States' means an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States as defined in Section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)); and

"(11) the term 'private entity of the United States' means

"(A) an individual who is

"(i) a national of the United States; or

"(ii) a permanent resident alien of the United States;

"(B) an employee or contractor of the United States Government, regardless of nationality, who is the victim or intended victim of an act of terrorism by virtue of that employment;

"(C) a sole proprietorship, partnership, company or association composed in whole or in part of nationals or permanent aliens of the United States; or

"(D) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States and any foreign subsidiary of such corporation.".

SEC. 3. The chapter analysis of part I of title 18 is amended by adding the following new item after the item relating to chapter 113:

"113A. Terrorism ..... 2331".

SEC. 4. Section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the"; and

(2) adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) The trial of any offense under section 2331 of this title which is committed out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district may be in any district. Nothing contained in this subsection may be construed to restrict any right of a defendant under any rule in effect under section 3771 of this title.".

SEC. 5. Section 11 of title 18 is amended by striking out the phrase "as used in this title except in sections 112, 878, 970, 1116, and 1201," and inserting in lieu thereof: "as used in this title except in sections 112, 878, 970, 1116, 1201, and 2331,".

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending to the Congress today four separate bills to attack the pressing and urgent problem of international terrorism.

In 1983 more than 250 American citizens were killed in terrorist attacks, the largest number in any year of record. In the wake of the tragic deaths of our diplomats and Marines, as well as French and Israeli soldiers in Lebanon, in light of the cynical murder of four South Korean cabinet officers and many others by North Korean terrorists in Burma, and as a result of the attack on our embassy in Kuwait, it is essential that we act immediately to cope with this menace and to increase cooperation with other governments in dealing with this growing threat to our way of life.

In the past fifteen years, terrorism has become a frightening challenge to the tranquility and political stability of our friends and allies. During the past decade alone, there have been almost 6,500 terrorist incidents. Over 3,500 people have been killed in these incidents, and more than 7,600 people have been wounded. American citizens have been the victims of more than 2,500 terrorist incidents. Of special concern to me has been the toll inflicted on our diplomats and members of the Armed Forces. I am also deeply concerned, however, about attacks against other American citizens, who have been the victims of forty percent of the terrorist incidents over the past decade.

In recent years, a very worrisome and alarming new kind of terrorism has developed: the direct use of instruments of terror by foreign states. This "state terrorism," starkly manifest in the recent dreadful spectacles of violence in Beirut, Rangoon, and Kuwait, accounts for the great majority of terrorist murders and assassinations. Also disturbing is state-provided training, financing, and logistical support to terrorists and terrorist groups. These activities are an extremely serious and growing source of danger to us, our friends and our allies, and are a severe challenge to America's foreign policy.

The protection of our citizens, our official personnel, and our facilities abroad requires the close cooperation and support of other governments. We depend on other governments to provide security protection to more than 250 United States diplomatic and consular posts abroad. We look to other governments to maintain the normal protections of law in their countries for our citizens living and traveling abroad and for our business representatives and business properties.

In 1983, this Administration sent to the Congress legislation to enable us to provide adequate protection for foreign officials in the United States. Not only is their protection essential to meet the obligations of the United States under international treaties, it is equally important to demonstrate to officials of other governments that they can count on full protection while they are in the United States.

I also asked the Congress to provide legislative authority for anti-terrorism training, and in some cases equipment, to foreign governments in order to enhance cooperation with governments on whom we must depend for protection abroad. In my view, the more effective and knowledgeable local law enforcement officials and officers are, the greater will be their ability to provide the kind of security both they and we need. I commend the Congress for providing a two-year authorization for this program and an appropriation of $2.5 million for 1984.

I am determined that my Administration will do whatever is necessary to reduce the incidence of terrorism against us anywhere in the world and to see that the perpetrators of terrorist acts are brought to justice. I believe it is essential, however, that the Executive branch, the Congress and the public clearly understand that combatting terrorism effectively requires concerted action on many different fronts. With trained personnel, effective laws, close international cooperation, and diligence, we can reduce the risks of terrorism to our people and increase the deterrent to future acts of terrorism.

Dealing with the immediate effect of terrorist violence is only part of the challenge, however. We must also assure that the states now practicing or supporting terrorism do not prosper in the designs they pursue. We must assure that international forums, such as the United Nations, take a balanced and practical view of who is practicing terrorism and what must be done about it. We must assure that governments that are currently passive—or inactive—respecting this scourge understand the threat that terrorism poses for all mankind and that they cooperate in stopping it. We must work to assure that there is no role in civilized society for indiscriminate threatening, intimidation, detention, or murder of innocent people. We must make it clear to any country that is tempted to use violence to undermine democratic governments, destabilize our friends, thwart efforts to promote democratic governments, or disrupt our lives that it has nothing to gain, and much to lose.

The legislation I am sending to the Congress is an important step in our war against terrorism. It will send a strong and vigorous message to friend and foe alike that the United States will not tolerate terrorist activity against its citizens or within its borders. Our legislative package consists of four separate bills, each of which is outlined below.

Act for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Hostage Taking

In September 1981, I signed the instrument ratifying the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, which was adopted by the United Nations on December 17, 1979. The convention has not been implemented domestically through enabling legislation, however. This legislation would implement the 1979 convention. It would amend the Federal kidnapping statute to provide for Federal jurisdiction over any kidnapping in which a threat is made to kill, injure, or continue to detain a victim in order to compel a third party to do or to abstain from doing something. This is a common ploy of terrorists. At the time I signed the instrument of ratification, the Congress was informed that the instrument of ratification would not be deposited with the United Nations until enabling legislation had been enacted. To demonstrate to other governments and international forums that the United States is serious about its efforts to deal with international terrorism, it is essential that the Congress provide the necessary enabling legislation, so that we may fully implement the Hostage-Taking Convention.

Aircraft Sabotage Act

The United States became a party to the Tokyo Convention, which covers certain offenses or acts committed aboard aircraft, in 1969 and the Hague Convention, concerning the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft, in 1971. The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation was adopted at Montreal in 1971 and ratified by the United States in November 1972. The Montreal Convention requires all states party to it to establish jurisdiction over certain offenses affecting the safety of civil aviation.

The Congress has approved enabling legislation for the first two of these conventions but not for the Montreal Convention. This means that certain criminal acts related to aircraft sabotage or hijacking are not adequately covered by United States law. This gap in the law sends a false signal to terrorists, and it also indicates to other governments that we may not be as serious as we should be, and as in fact we are, in our efforts to combat international terrorism. Action by the Congress now would provide the basis for long-overdue implementation of this convention.

Act for Rewards for Information Concerning Terrorist Acts

Current law authorizes the payment of rewards for information concerning domestic crimes but is outdated. Maximum rewards are inadequate, and terrorism is not specifically included as a basis for paying a reward. Moreover, there is no authority for the payment of rewards for information on acts of terrorism abroad.

The proposed legislation, which is modelled on an existing statute that allows payment of rewards for information concerning the unauthorized manufacture of atomic weapons, recognizes that payment of a reward in connection with acts of domestic terrorism raises a matter of law enforcement that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, but that the payment of a reward in connection with an act of terrorism abroad poses a political and foreign relations problem within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. By increasing the amounts of fines that may be paid, and by authorizing rewards for information concerning terrorist acts committed abroad, this Act would markedly improve the ability of the Departments of Justice and State to obtain information leading to the freeing of hostages or the capture of the perpetrators of acts of terrorism. In passing this legislation, the Congress can further underscore the intent of the United States to take every appropriate and necessary step to protect its citizens and property from terrorist acts.

Prohibition Against the Training or Support of Terrorist Organizations Act of 1984

The training and support of terrorist groups and activities by a number of countries has reached alarming proportions. In addition, the number of states now using terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy is both increasing and highly disturbing. The provision of assistance to countries that support terrorism and use terrorism as a foreign policy tool has thus become a matter of grave concern to national security. This Act, together with revised and strengthened regulations that the Department of State intends to issue shortly, would enhance the ability of the Department of Justice to prosecute persons involved in the support of terrorist activities and of states using terrorism. Enactment of this legislation would be a strong contribution to the effort to combat terrorism.

We must recognize that terrorism is symptomatic of larger problems. We must dedicate ourselves to fostering modernization, development, and beneficial change in the depressed areas of the world. We must renew our commitment to promoting and assisting representative and participatory governments. We must attack the problem of terrorism as a crime against the international community whenever and wherever possible, but we must strive to eradicate the sources of frustration and despair that are the spawning places and nutrients of terrorism.

The legislative proposals that I am sending to the Congress today will, when approved, materially benefit our Nation and help us to assist friendly countries. I believe that they are extraordinarily important, and I strongly urge that the Congress undertake their timely consideration and speedy passage.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 26, 1984.*

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. WILSON):

S.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate January 27, 1985, "National Jerome Kern Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL JEROME KERN DAY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a Senate joint reso-

lution to declare January 27, 1985, "National Jerome Kern Day."

Jerome Kern is internationally recognized as one of the foremost Broadway composers. Indeed, he is considered to be "The Father of the American Musical Theatre." Jerome David Kern was born in New York City in 1885. January 27, 1985, will mark the 100th anniversary of his birth.

As indicated in the resolution, Kern composed over 1,000 songs and 108 complete theatrical scores during his lifetime. The pinnacle of the composer's career was reached in 1927 with the production of his most popular score, "Show Boat." That score contains five songs well known by all of us: "Bill," "Can't Help Lovin' Dat Man," "Make Believe," "Why Do I Love You,?" and "Ol' Man River."

This brief space does not allow the listing of all of the composer's songs but a few which will bring back memories are: "Lovely to Look At," "Smoke Gets in Your Eyes," and "Look For the Silver Lining."

Jerome Kern died at the age of 60 on November 11, 1945. As predicted in the New York Times editorial, his "music will not die." President Harry Truman spoke for the Nation at the time with these words:

"I am among the grateful millions who have played and listened to the music of Jerome Kern, and I wish to be among those of his fellow Americans who pay him tribute today. His melodies will live in our voices and warm our hearts for many years to come, for they are the kind of simple, honest songs that belong to no time or fashion. The man who gave them to us earned a lasting place in his nation's memory."

These words hold true today as Kern's music still entertains us. The music industry is planning a centennial year-long tribute to the composer's memory in 1985. Plans for the tribute include stage productions in New York City and Washington, D.C. featuring the composer's works, television and radio shows, the programing of Kern movies featuring Kern's scores, and a Songwriter's Hall of Fame tribute.

I would hope the Congress would come forth and join in the celebration of Jerome Kern's life and the work which has enhanced the esthetic quality of all of our lives.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 719

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 719, a bill to amend subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the social security offset against annuities provided for under such subchapter to the extent that the social security benefits of the annuitant are based on the annuitant's own employment.

S. 1059

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1059, a bill to provide that it shall be unlawful to deny equal access to students in public schools and public colleges who wish to meet voluntarily for religious purposes and to provide district courts with jurisdiction over violations of this act.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1651, a bill to amend title 38, United states Code, to provide for presumption of service connection to be established by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for certain diseases of certain veterans exposed to dioxin or radiation during service in the Armed Forces; to require the Administrator to develop, through process of public participation and subject to judicial review, regulations specifying standards for the presumptions applicable to the resolution of claims for disability compensation based on such exposures; to require that such regulations address certain specified diseases; and to require that all claimants for Veterans' Administration benefits be given the benefit of every reasonable doubt in claims adjudications, and for other purposes.

S. 1730

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1730, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase small business participation in the procurement process, thereby reducing costly noncompetitive procurements and increasing defense preparedness, and for other purposes.

S. 1942

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. QUAYLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1942, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to provide that Government generated cargoes transported on U.S.-flag or foreign vessels shall be shipped at the lowest landed cost, and that the transport of such cargoes shall be subject to a competitive bidding system.

S. 2014

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2014, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide for assistance in locating missing children.

S. 2116

At the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2116, a bill to accept the findings and to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.

S. 2358

At the request of Mr. PROXMIRE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2358, a bill to prohibit the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation from making new awards of financial assistance before the comprehensive strategy (as set forth in the Energy Security Act) is approved.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit a rail carrier from denying to shippers of certain commodities, with intent to monopolize, use of its track which affords the sole access by rail to such shippers to reach the track of a competing railroad or the destination of shipment.

S. 2433

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2433, a bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, relating to the coordination of Federal information policy, and for other purposes.

S. 2436

At the request of Mr. GOLDWATER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2436, a bill to authorize appropriations of funds for activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes.

S. 2563

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2563, a bill to amend section 1201 of the National Housing Act to extend the crime insurance program.

S. 2565

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2565, a bill to extend programs under the Head Start Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2568

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2568, a bill to clarify the application of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

S. 2616

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), and the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2616, a bill to extend the adolescent family life demonstration program.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 129

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 129, a joint resolution calling upon the President to seek a mutual and verifiable ban on weapons in space and on weapons designed to attack objects in space.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 229

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. QUAYLE), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 229, a joint resolution to proclaim the week beginning April 22, 1984, as "National Dance Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 246

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 246, a joint resolution strongly urging the President to secure a full accounting of Americans captured or missing in action in Southeast Asia, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 253

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 253, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate September 16, 1984, as "Ethnic American Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 270

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 270, a joint resolution designating the week of July 1 through July 8, 1984, as "National Duck Stamp Week" and 1984 as the "Golden Anniversary Year of the Duck Stamp."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 273

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 273, a joint resolution to designate the week of May 13, 1984, through May 19, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 274

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HECHT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 274, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 275

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 275, a joint resolution to designate the month of October 1984 as "National Spina Bifida Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 279

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 279, a joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 62

At the request of Mr. MATTINGLY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62, a concurrent resolution to direct the Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a plan outlining the steps which might be taken to correct the social security benefit disparity known as the notch problem.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 100

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 100, a concurrent resolution concerning the drilling ship *Glomar Java Sea.*

SENATE RESOLUTION 127

At the request of Mr. ANDREWS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. EVANS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 127, a resolution to make the Select Committee on Indian Affairs a permanent committee of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 368

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 368, a resolution condemning chemical warfare wherever it occurs and calling for a ban on chemical weapons.

SENATE RESOLUTION 372

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. WALLOP) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 372, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding exposure of members of the Armed Forces to ionizing radiation and to herbicides containing dioxin.

AMENDMENT NO. 3043

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mr. EVANS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN) were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 3043 proposed to H.R. 2163, a bill to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109—NATIONAL STORM PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. NUNN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. PERCY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. CON. RES. 109

Whereas the most severe weather problem in the United States is the unanticipated, destructive, and hazardous occurrence of small-scale weather disturbances, which disrupt the economy through serious impacts on transportation, agriculture, and industry, and which result in a staggering average annual economic loss of $20 billion and an average annual loss of life approaching 1,000;

Whereas the Congress finds that recent advances in atmospheric science and related technology make it possible to improve the protection of the public and increase the productivity of the Nation's economy through modernization of the Nation's weather services over the next decade by improved observation and prediction of storm-scale weather phenomena such as squall lines, thunderstorms, flash floods, freezing rain, and dense fog;

Whereas an increased capability in storm-scale weather prediction and services for the people of the United States will require implementation of observation, data collection, processing, and dissemination technology and an associated research effort aimed at the development of improved forecasting procedures and field programs to acquire the necessary data to test procedures and technology;

Whereas there is a widespread consensus in the scientific community that recent developments in technology and scientific understanding of storm-scale wheather phenomena make it timely to undertake a national storm-scale operational and research meteorology program (STORM) which can yield the desired improvements over the next decade in the Nation's weather services;

Whereas the Federal Government is currently pursuing plans to modernize the Nation's operational weather capability by implementing new technology such as Next Generation Radar (NEXRAD) and the next generation of Geostationary Operational Environment Satellite (GOES);

Whereas significant improvements in storm-scale weather prediction can be achieved by a modest but sustained annual increase over the next decade in the Nation's present investment in weather services and research; and

Whereas a national STORM program should be implemented by the Federal agencies involved, including the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Interior, and Transportation; the Environmental Protection Agency; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the National Science Foundation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (1) it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government take immediate steps to support funding for such a program under the leadership of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, with the cooperation of other interested and appropriate departments and agencies; (2) on or before January 1, 1985, and each fifth year thereafter the President should transmit to the Congress a plan setting forth the proposed activities of the national STORM program and the budgetary requirements needed to meet the program's goals and objectives; (3) such plan should contain a statement of the activities to be conducted and specify the department or agency of the Government which will conduct the activities; and (4) on or before January 1, 1986, the President shall transmit to the Congress a report on progress made in implementing the national STORM program.

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I introduce today the STORM concurrent resolution that will greatly benefit the citizens of the United States. The STORM resolution proposes a program to increase our capabilities to predict storm-scale weather through a national storm program. Storm-scale weather consists of weather systems as large as 300 to 400 miles or as small as a mile square. Tornadoes, downbursts, severe squall lines, thunderstorms, flash floods, and local heavy snows are some of the damaging types of storm-scale weather. These disrupt transportation, agriculture, industry, and national security, and account for a staggering annual economic loss of $20 billion. The average annual loss of life approaches 1,000. The STORM resolution proposes that the Federal Government act as the catalyst in a nationwide system of coordinated weather reporting, prediction, and research for storm-scale weather. Most important, this program will provide better and more precise prediction capability so that lives can be saved and economic damage from severe storms can be drastically reduced.

I am deeply saddened, Mr. President, by the recent events in Mississippi, South Carolina, and North Carolina. On late Wednesday, March 28, 1984, a severe storm system moved into the eastern seaboard. The southern part of the front spawned a series of damaging tornadoes in northern Georgia. The storm also left a large swath of destruction in my own State of South Carolina, from our capital of Columbia through eastern North Carolina to the Virginia border. The death toll has already reached 63 people, with hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage. Then on Easter weekend, April 21-22, a series of tornadoes struck four Southern States with Mississippi taking the brunt of the weather. The death toll has reached 15 people with over 100 people injured. The tornadoes almost completely flattened the town of Water Valley, MS, and damage will be in the tens of million of dollars. More recently, areas in Illinois, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Minnesota have been subjected to similar fates. These are precisely the types of weather-related disasters that the storm program will address, and it is these tragic effects it will mitigate.

WHAT IS STORM-SCALE WEATHER?

Storm-scale weather consists of localized weather systems that may be as large as 300 to 400 miles or more, or as small as a mile square. Storm-scale weather—or mesoscale weather as it is called scientifically—includes such things as tornadoes, downbursts, severe squall, or thunderstorm lines, rain-caused flash floods, and local heavy snows.

In an average year approximately 800 tornadoes strike the United States killing 95 people. On April 3-4, 1974, a series of tornadoes struck a broad area from the Mississippi River eastward to the Appalachians and northward to New York. In that brief period over 5,000 people were injured, and 315 people were killed. Property damage was estimated at $600 million.

Downbursts are storm-scale weather phenomena associated with thunderstorms. Masses of cold air drop creating a downdraft of damaging wind on or near the ground. The winds from a downburst are capable of reaching 200 miles an hour; and the damage from downbursts has, until recently, often been mistaken for tornado damage. On July 16, 1980, a series of downbursts cut a destructive 30-mile-wide swath from Chicago, IL, to Detroit, MI. The four identifiable downbursts on that day caused an estimated damage of $500 million. Downbursts are of particular concern to the aviation community. On July 9, 1982, a Pan American World Airways flight from New Orleans crashed on takeoff with the loss of all 145 people aboard the plane and 8 persons on the ground. The National Transportation Safety Board determined that the probable cause of the accident was wind shear caused by a the plane's encounter with a small downburst. Weather-related aviation accidents annually cause the loss of a minimum of $50 million and 800 lives.

About 100,000 thunderstorms occur each year in the United States. Hail often accompanies these storms. A number of these thunderstorms reach severe levels and cause on the average 400 deaths per year with damage exceeding $2 billion. Lightning alone kills approximately 100 people each year and is responsible for more than 10,000 fires. Hail damage to crops from these storm-scale systems runs to over $4 billion. On May 7, 1978, a large thunderstorm system produced severe weather in an area covering most of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The severe weather included electrical storms, hail, tornadoes, downbursts, and flash floods. Several people were killed, and property damage exceeded $100 million.

Flash floods are brought about by intense thunderstorms or severe rain where large volumes of rain fall in a very short period of time. The volume of rain is too great for adequate ground drainage, and flash floods result. These cause over 200 deaths per year. Damages from floods and flash floods now average about $4 billion per year, with over 90 percent of all Presidential declarations of disaster being flood related. In 1976, an intense storm dropped more than 12 inches of rain in 4 hours into Big Thompson Creek, CO. One hundred and thirty-nine people lost their lives and the property damage was over $500 million.

As you can see, the economic damage from storm-scale weather is mammoth. The toll on human lives and suffering is incalculable. We are at a crossroads. We can go on coldly ignoring these losses. We can stand by mutely while people continue to be injured or killed, and billions of dollars are lost to our economy and not develop and deploy the technology available to us now. Or we can recognize that these catastrophic circumstances can be mitigated. We can voice our strong support for a national program which will further understanding and prediction for storm-scale weather.

But, before I go any further, let me briefly recount some of the advances

made by the atmospheric sciences and the strong guiding role that the Federal Government played in those advances.

THE BACKGROUND OF SCIENTIFIC WEATHER PREDICTION

In 1961 when the science of weather prediction was in its infancy, the United States and other countries established the world weather program. This was a cooperative international program under the auspices of the World Meteorological Organization. I remind my colleagues that a concurrent resolution was passed by Congress at that time recognizing the value of that program and Congress went to support the world weather program with funding. This laid the foundation for understanding global weather patterns.

Much has occurred since the inception of that program. In 1966 the National Academy of Sciences called for a global experiment on worldwide weather data collection. This led to an international experiment that took place over 15 months in 1978 and 1979. The experiment collected a vast amount of meteorological information. It has advanced our scientific capabilities for predicting large-scale weather patterns, from systems covering 700-800 miles to those thousands of miles wide that span continents.

In contrast to these large-scale global weather systems is storm-scale weather. We are simply not as well equipped in our understanding and prediction of these smaller systems. That lack, as we saw recently, can have terrible consequences.

We have laid the foundation for understanding storm-scale weather. The first step was the introduction of weather radar after World War II. The second step was the launching of a satellite based weather monitoring system in the mid-1960's. This gave us radically new platforms to observe storm-scale weather. Further research has been carried out at universities and laboratories across the Nation. In spite of these steps, real progress has been painfully slow and severely limited by lack of both funding and a comprehensive, coordinated program.

But onetime revolutionary equipment is now outdated and obsolete. The National Weather Radar System, installed 26 years ago, must be replaced—an antiquated vacuum tube-type system, parts are no longer available. Maintenance must be carried out by cannibalizing other old radar units, and we are running out of them.

The old radar was technically superseded several years ago by new types of radar that can far more accurately measure atmospheric motion. This capability makes it possible to monitor storm-scale weather systems and issue far more accurate severe storm warnings, ranging from the spotting of tornadoes well before visual sighting to the detection of downbursts around airports. The technical superiority of the new radar systems has already been recognized by the Federal Government. Under the leadership of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Department of Defense, the Government made a commitment to replace the aging system with the long overdue new technology. But the full installation of the system has been pushed back to at least the mid-1990's because of major difficulties in obtaining appropriations for the modernization effort.

WHAT ARE OUR NEEDS

Our scientists strongly believe that we are on the verge of making radical progress in storm-scale weather analysis and prediction to the same degree as the phenomenal advances in understanding global weather patterns. But, those advances will not come about without a firm commitment to take full advantage of technology now on hand rather than wait 10 to 15 years. In view of the costs to human lives and property, it is simply too foolish to wait any longer.

The substantial array of technology now available makes it possible to solve the basic problems of storm-scale observation and prediction. But two essential elements are missing. The first is a well thought out plan of action including a detailed design for a national system of coordinated research and operations. The second is a funded procurement program. Each of these needs will be met by the national STORM program.

WHAT IS THE STORM PROGRAM, AND HOW WILL IT MEET THESE NEEDS

The STORM program—STORM, derived from Stormscale Operational and Research Meteorology—is a national effort aimed at increasing our knowledge and ability to respond to dangerous storm-scale weather. The program has two major components. The first is STORM operations. The operational aspect of the STORM program is designed to use existing knowlege of storm-scale weather and available technology in the service of society. This part of the overall program will deploy the technology required to observe, analyze, predict, and disseminate storm-scale weather information. It will also train forecasters in the use of new predictive techniques. The second component is STORM research. This will improve our abilities to understand storm-scale weather by developing better conceptual and mathematical of storm-scale weather. The research and operations efforts will include the final development or deployment of the following technologies: a modern radar network—NEXRAD—additional remote sensors for our existing weather satellites; ground-based remote sensors to measure wind motion; automated surface weather stations; refined communication systems that yield rapid forecasts and warnings; and refined digital computer systems necessary for rapid analysis and prediction.

The new radar system will measure the intensity of rain and other forms of precipitation necessary for the forecasting and warning of flash floods; find the precise location of tornado-spawing clouds so warnings can be issued 30 minutes to an hour in advance to cities and towns in the path of the weather system—presently we may have only a few minutes of warning before a tornado hits; identify specific wind gusts associated with squall lines or downbursts, information essential for aviation safety.

With existing and new remote sensors on our weather satellites, we can measure atmospheric and surface temperatures—particularly important to agriculture for predicting killer frosts—and with the finalization of sensors using microwaves and lasers, we can anticipate more detailed information from inside these storm systems. NASA had been pursuing this research, for installation of these sensors on NOAA's weather satellites, NASA has now abandoned this effort due to lack of funds. Ground-based remote sensors, based on the new radar development, can be used in clear air to find turbulence and wind motion.

Automated surface weather stations, ranging from simple, inexpensive stations that take a limited number of measurements, to stations equipped to measure the full range of meteorological parameters.

The present communications system operating in the National Weather Service—AFOS—cannot now transmit or display either radar or satellite pictures to show the development and motion of weather systems; however, existing technology can be utilized, with additional software development and engineering, to accomplish this task.

With storm-scale weather often short lived, it is essential that the digital computer systems respond to provide information necessary for more precise prediction in an extremely rapid manner. Developing the modeling capability and making it operational is central to the STORM program.

WHO WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM?

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will be the lead agency charged with carrying out the STORM program, in conjunction wiironmental Data and Information Service, and the National Earth Satellite Service.

For national security reasons there are operational weather forecasting services and research activities in the Department of Defense. The Air Weather Service of the Air Force and

the Oceanography Command of the Navy now participate in ongoing weather observation programs. The Army maintains an active R&D program concerning battlefield environments. Storm-scale meteorology is of major importance to our national defense.

The Department of Interior is active in research concerning the improvement of the Nation's environment and water supply. Interior's Bureau of Reclamation supports a substantial effort in weather modification and was a cosponsor with the National Science Foundation in a project to analyze rain-producing storm-scale weather systems.

The Federal Aviation Administration is a major user and supplier of local weather information. The ability to detect downbursts on or near airfields or to determine the severity of squall lines, for example, are capabilities currently being sought by the FAA. These would be provided by the STORM program. In addition, the FAA has proposed a network of automated weather stations at less-used airfields. This network would play a vital role in the national STORM program.

The Environmental Protection Agency works to assure adequate air quality. The EPA relies on NOAA's Air Resource Laboratory and, as such, is involved in environmental impact statements and the relation between weather processes and air quality.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration handles the procurement and launching of weather satellites. In addition to this role, NASA plays a role in increasing our understanding of severe storms and the scientific modeling of weather patterns.

The National Science Foundation is the Federal agency that supports basic scientific research. It funds atmospheric-related projects at universities across the Nation and at the National Center for Atmospheric Research. This research covers a broad spectrum of storm-scale weather phenomena. The results of this research have played and will continue to play—under the STORM program—a central role in our knowledge about and ability to predict storm-scale weather.

WHAT ARE THE COSTS AND THE BENEFITS?

This is an era of tight fiscal policy—at least in many budget areas. In view of this, it is prudent to take a close look at any suggested program increases. In hard dollars, the total incremental cost of the national STORM program over the next decade—the installation period—will be from $60–$100 million per year.

While this appears to be a substantial cost, remember that the annual economic loss to this country from storm-scale weather is on the order of $20 billion. And the average annual loss of life approaches 1,000 with countless thousands more injured. In fact, the annual cost of the STORM program represents only one-quarter of 1 percent of the cost of the MX missile system, or one quarter of the cost of only one B–1 bomber. That is about one wing, part of the engine and tail section, and two wheels of a B–1. Surely we can spare that.

The benefits from the STORM program will be immense. For example, if we are able to reduce property damage by storm-scale weather by a mere 5 percent, the total saved in damages is estimated to be $1 billion—1982 dollars—per year. In all likelihood, the savings would be greater than that. If we were able to make more informed weather-related economic decisions and could reduce economic damage by 1 percent each year, the savings would still be more than enough to cover the entire yearly projected cost of a national STORM program. That should make good economic sense.

More importantly, a rapid dissemination of warnings about dangerous storm-scale weather is going to save lives by providing people with time to find safety from dangerous weather conditions. We cannot put a price on the hundreds of human lives lost each year from storm-scale weather. But we can make the decision to do something to reduce the toll on human life and suffering.

CONCLUSION

The STORM program represents a major program initiative. But it is exactly the type of program that is a proper function of government. It is not a pork barrel program that will benefit only one State or region. It is a national effort, and its benefits will be felt nationwide.

The new technology is at hand or under development. We are faced with staggering and unnecessary costs in both the economy and human misery. We can sit back and be a cold witness to more of this pointless tragedy, or we can set our feet on the path to a coordinated comprehensive program that will reduce these costs and more than pay for itself doing so. Not to act is unconscionable, in my opinion. I urge my colleagues to support this effort and cosponsor Senate Concurrent Resolution 109, the STORM resolution.●

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of this resolution being introduced today by my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS.

Mr. President, over the last 2½ decades we have greatly enhanced our ability to predict weather patterns. This enhanced ability is the result of installation of weather radar, the deployment of a satellite-based weather monitoring system, and research efforts.

For 26 years now, our weather radar system has served us well. Hardly any one could question the benefits derived from this system since its installation in 1958. However, along with this progress have come technological developments that have made the current weather radar and monitoring system obsolete. Technology exists today that, if utilized, would greatly improve our prediction capabilities.

Mr. President, as my distinguished South Carolina colleague has indicated, there is particular concern with regard to our ability to predict so-called storm-scale, or mesoscale weather, including tornadoes, downbursts, severe squall or thunder storm lines, rain-caused flash floods, and local heavy snows. I recently had the painful experience of viewing first-hand the massive destruction inflicted upon my home State of South Carolina as a result of a series of tornadoes occurring on March 28, 1984. The loss of life and destruction of property in both South Carolina and North Carolina was devastating.

While I am acutely aware of the resulting hardships the citizens of South Carolina have experienced and are still enduring as they attempt to recover from these traumatic events, disasters such as the one that occurred in South Carolina in March are not limited to any one State. They are a national problem and can only be addressed by a concerted national effort.

Mr. President, the Storm-scale Operational and Research Meteorology (STORM) program is designed to increase our knowledge and ability to react to storm-scale weather. Once fully implemented, our ability to anticipate, predict, and prepare for dangerous weather conditions should be greatly improved. This concurrent resolution is a step toward implementation of this important program. It expresses the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should take immediate steps to support funding for a STORM program.

This is the type of program that is a legitimate function of the Federal Government. The program of predicting storm-scale weather is a national problem and one that can only be addressed by a concerted effort by the Federal Government. Much of the technology needed for advancing our current prediction capabilities is available and should be utilized. New technologies for enhancing our capabilities should likewise be developed and deployed.

I join with Senator HOLLINGS in commending this resolution, and the proposed STORM program, to my colleagues.

31-059 O-87-22 (Pt. 8)

SENATE RESOLUTION 385—RELATING TO DEDUCTIBILITY OF RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE INTEREST PAYMENTS

Mr. BENTSEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 385

Whereas a prime social responsibility of the Federal Government is to promote the maintenance of an adequate supply of reasonably priced housing for all Americans;

Whereas, the maintenance of that supply is directly jeopardized by the soaring budget deficits which will total nearly $900 billion in fiscal years 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987 on a rising trend;

Whereas, Treasury financing of these deficits are crowding out private investment in the midst of a rebounding demand for funds to rebuild inventories and renew aging plants, with interest rates rising one percentage point since February and two percentage points in a year, and mortgage rates exceeding 13 percent and rising;

Whereas, the National Association of Home Builders has predicted an increase in mortgage rates to 15 percent in 1985 due to soaring deficits and crowding out, which will reduce new housing construction starts to 1.5 million units annually, and push new housing costs above 40 percent of the typical family's income;

Whereas, the projected reduction in housing construction will result in fewer than eight additional housing units being provided for every ten additional households from 1984 to 1989;

Whereas, a critical component of the Federal responsibility to promote adequate housing is the deductibility from individual income taxes of interest paid on residential mortgages;

Whereas, the Administration is evaluating a wide variety of proposed changes to the individual tax system under direction of the Department of the Teasury and the President by his statement of April 12 during public discussion in Dallas has not ruled out elimination of the home mortgage interest deduction which would severely reduce housing supply and increase housing costs; and

Whereas, the federal government should promote home ownership, should respect home ownership as the largest and most viable form of individual wealth in the United States, and should honor its basic commitment to affordable, decent housing for all citizens; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that it is the sense of the Senate that the Administration honor the basic obligation to promote affordable and decent housing by retaining the current home mortgage interest deduction as an essential component of an equitable tax system intended to promote national living standards.

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, for the first time within my memory, a sitting President of the United States is waivering in his support for decent and affordable housing. And that diminished commitment is occurring when the availability of such affordable decent housing is rapidly approaching crisis proportions. The Senate resolution I am offering today is designed to buck up the President's courage to honor that commitment when it is most needed.

THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION

Three weeks ago, on April 12, during a public discussion in Dallas, the President refused to promise to retain the deductibility of home mortgage interest in the tax system. That provision has been and remains pivotal to ensuring a flow of national resources sufficiently large to keep home ownership costs within reach of many families. Yet, the President was quoted as offering a rationale for eliminating this key housing incentive in the tax system should administration officials reviewing the tax system "come in with some entirely different form of taxation aimed at something different than income."

I will be the first to acknowledge that we need fair and equitable tax reform. And, it may be that other economic factors—consumption expenditures is one prominently mentioned—could serve some complementary role to income as an equitable tax base. That prospect may warrant examination. After all, the administration is studying tax alternatives, in part under pressure created by a resolution I introduced in June, 1982 (S.J. Res. 206) calling for a simpler tax system. Yet, the basic national commitment to encourage adequate housing for all Americans through the deductibility of mortgage interest is a strong one. And the key component of that policy certainly need not be sacrificed in order to improve and simplify the Tax Code. Indeed, it is misleading to suggest that the tax system can only be improved at the expense of this Nation's traditional commitment to fair, affordable, and decent housing or to homeownership. The two goals are not mutually exclusive. They can be pursued together—and should be, I believe. The President is flat wrong in refusing to support retention of the singlemost important Federal policy to promote homeownership.

THE HOUSING CRISIS

Inadequate supply. That refusal is particularly distressing in light of the housing crisis facing our Nation. Both the supply and price of housing are moving to limit access to home ownership for years to come. This crisis has its roots in our burgeoning deficits.

The President has not honored his commitment to hold Federal spending down. Indeed, in his third budget it is approaching 24 percent of GNP when the President had promised to shrink it to 19 percent. In combination with his foot dragging on taxes, this failure caused deficits to double and then nearly double again since the President took office. And, the swelling flood of red ink would be even larger had not Congress exercised reasonable restraint in military spending.

These deficits are being financed by the Treasury with borrowed savings. During the 1981-82 recession, Treasury deficit financing did not actually increase interest rates. Demand for capital was sufficiently soft that interest rates diminished and remained relatively stable. However, let me hasten to add that Treasury deficit financing pressure prevented interest rates from falling to their traditional low levels during recessionary periods. Indeed, the prime interest rate never fell below 10.5 percent due to the deficit, and mortgage rates never even dropped to 12 percent for the same reason. The current administration scarcely warrants praise for lower interest rates when the lowest interest rate level attained by the Reagan administration was far above the highest levels ever recorded in the Nation prior to 1974.

The administration failed to aggressively propose steps to balance the Federal budget and eliminate these deficits, which grew from $58 billion in 1981 to $111 billion in 1982 and $195 billion last year. Moreover, the President actively opposed congressional action to shrink deficits while proposing to put fiscal responsibility on the back burner by studying it to death. In combination with diminished income during the recession, this policy has spelled disaster for housing as costs continued rising while incomes fell.

Since January, the debilitating impact on the housing outlook of the deficit has become even more apparent. Genuine crowding out has begun to occur with interest rates climbing a point or more. The Federal funds rate, the prime rate, mortgage rates, and CD's have all risen at least 1 percentage point in the last 3 months and they are continuing to increase.

The housing industry knows what this means. They can see past the White House rhetoric of recovery and good times ahead to the falling sales and recurring recession being foreshadowed by today's rising mortgage rates. Housing was off in 1981. It was off again in 1982; 1983 was a good year for housing—as the first year of recoveries invariably are. But 1984 may be down—and the surge of interest rates due to deficit crowding out guarantees that 1985 will be a bad year. Michael Sumichrest, of the National Association of Home Builders, has predicted that crowding out will push the prime rate to 15 percent by 1985, with mortgage rates hitting 15.75 percent.

Henry Kaufman of Salomon Bros. has made a similar interest rate prediction. It is awfully hard to counter these predictions based on the $900 billion in deficits facing this Nation over the next 4 years. That is especially true in light of the only weak assault on them proposed by the administration.

Both Lehman Bros. and the Joint Economic Committee's econometric simulations found that the administration's proposed $144 billion deficit re-

duction package does not have the muscle even to reverse the rising deficit fund. By 1987, it will still be in the $200 billion range. Interest rates will remain high. And the JEC report projects that housing starts through 1989 will sag and remain at the low 1.5 million unit rate widely predicted by others for 1985.

This predicted impact of the deficit on housing activity will be disastrous for some families. As the attached table shows, the 1980–82 recession cut growth in the housing supply to only 37 percent of the growth in new family formations. From 1984 to 1989, the stagnation in housing due to the deficit will continue that pattern. According to a JEC analysis, fewer than 8 additional housing units will be supplied for every 10 new households. This week housing outlook for the balance for the decade is in sharp contrast with that sector's experience during the two previous decades.

From 1960 to 1979, the housing stock grew an average 2 percent faster than the number of households. From 1984 to 1989, however, better than 20 percent of all new families will be forced to double up with relatives or friends. By 1989, the term "crowding out" will come to have a uniquely different meaning to millions of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, for a table entitled "The Housing Outlook" to appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUSING OUTLOOK

	1960–79	1980–82	1984–89
Change in the Housing Stock [1]	1.3	0.78	1.25*
Change in total households [1]	1.27	2.07	1.63
Ratio of housing stock/household change	1.02	0.37	0.77*

[1] Million of housing units per year.

Source: Bureau of the Census and (*) Simulations by Joint Economic Committee.

RISING COST

Mr. President, the declining availability of housing argues powerfully for retention of the present deductibility of home mortgage interest payments despite administration objections. An equally powerful argument is economic: Deficit-driven rising mortgage costs are pricing homeownership out of the reach of all but the very wealthy.

The median new house sells today for $78,000. Most new families would finance that home with a $60,000 mortgage. Mortgage lenders realize that no more than 25 percent of a family's income can be safely set aside for housing costs. As a result, rising interest costs are forcing more and more families to forgo homeownership and the stabilizing ties to a community they create. The U.S. League of Savings Institutions reports that the number of first-time home buyers needing a second income to afford housing has risen above 65 percent. As Ellen Goodman put it in a recent column, "Today we need two jobs to support one mortgage."

The culprit is the deficit and its impact on interest rates. With interest rates at 8 percent, 30 percent of all families can meet mortgage requirements while devoting no more than one-quarter of their income to housing and related costs. At a 10-percent mortgage rate, the share drops to 22 percent. And if mortgage rates move as predicted to 15 percent, the deficits since 1979 will have cut the number of families able to afford homeownership by over one-half. Indeed, the impact of crowding out on mortgages will reduce the number of families able to afford homeownership to a scant one in nine.

Failure to rapidly reverse the deficit trend will reduce the flame of homeownership to a flicker. It will be doused by Treasury red ink to the detriment of new families and our society. Homeownership has a remarkably stabilizing influence on communities and families. That influence should be promoted, for it means more involvement in public affairs, ranging from school matters to political issues. The Federal Government has an obligation to maximize that influence. Indeed, the President has just spent nearly a week expounding on these same virtues to the People's Republic of China. And well he should, for homeownership gives a family a greater stake in their community and our Nation. And integral to promoting that stake is the present tax treatment of homeownership.

The deductibility of home mortgage interest should be retained to continue promoting community stability and involvement. Moreover, it should be retained for equity considerations. Homeownership is the most diverse and largest form in which household wealth is held in the United States. So, for current home owners, when, where and how to purchase a home were decisions made in years past based on a wide variety of factors, including tax considerations. It is simply not good public policy to whimsically yank the rug out from under the feet of tens of millions of homeowners, as the President has hinted he may do.

It is not good public policy. It is not good economic policy. It is not good social policy. It was not good policy in 1981 when the Senate unanimously adopted my resolution in support of continuing the deductibility of home mortgage interest. That sent a message.

My resolution is designed to send that same message again in a clear and strong voice to the President. The deductibility of home mortgage interest should remain in place. It achieves its purposes well. And Congress will not permit him to change it. My father once told me, "if it isn't broken, don't fix it." That is good advice for President Reagan, too.●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT

CHILES AMENDMENT NO. 3044

Mr. CHILES proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, an act to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act, and for other purposes, as follows:

Strike all matters appearing on page 19, and insert in lieu thereof:

(a) "SEC. . It is the Sense of Congress that total Budget Authority available for appropriations for Budget Function 050 National Defense) and for non-defense discretionary programs shall not exceed $431.3 billion for FY1985; of which $290.8 billion is intended to be for National Defense and $140.5 billion is intended to be for non-defense discretionary programs; that for FY1986, the total Budget Authority for these activities shall not exceed $462.8 billion, of which $321.0 billion is intended to be for National Defense and $141.8 billion for non-defense discretionary programs; and that for FY1987, the total Budget Authority for these activities shall not exceed $497.5 billion of which $354.3 billion is intended to be for National Defense and $143.2 billion is intended to be for non-defense discretionary programs."

(b) SEC. . Delay for 2 years of cost-of-living adjustments to tax tables.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to adjustments in tax tables so that inflation will not result in tax increases) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR 1985 AND 1986.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1987, no increase shall be made under clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection and no adjustment shall be made under paragraph (2)(C) relating to such increase."

(b) BASE YEAR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(3) of such Code (relating to cost-of-living adjustment) is amended by striking out "1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "1985".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1986.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public, the scheduling of a public hearing before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to consider Senate Joint Resolution 286, to approve the "Compact of Free Association," and

for other purposes. The hearing will be held on Thursday, May 24, beginning at 10 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements for the hearing record should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

For further information regarding this hearing you may wish to contact Mr. Jim Beirne or Ms. Becky Barbour of the committee staff at 224-2564.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the public that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding hearings on May 9, 1984, beginning at 1:30 p.m., in Senate Dirksen 124 on S. 2614, a bill to amend the Indian Finance Act of 1974, and S. 2619, a bill to reauthorize title IV, Indian Education Act programs, and to be followed by a business meeting on the following bills, and for other purposes:

S. 1735. A bill entitled the "Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe-Dexter by the Sea Claim Settlement Act".

S. 1999. A bill to provide for the statutory designation of the position of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs, eliminate the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, make conforming amendments, repeal unnecessary provisions of law referring to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

S. 2166. A bill to reauthorize the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for other purposes.

Those wishing additional information should contact Paul Alexander of the committee at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate on Wednesday, May 2, to hold a business meeting to mark up the following bills:

S. 1994, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to reinstate income eligibility criteria for family or group day care home participants in the child care food program;

S. 2545, Nutrition Programs Reform Act;

S. 1913, a bill to provide for improvements in the school lunch and certain other child nutrition programs; a proposed measure by Senator Dole; and

S. 2599, a bill to simplify the administration, contain escalating costs and create greater flexibility in the operation of programs under the National School Lunch and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 2, at 10 a.m., to hold an oversight hearing on the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 2, to hold a hearing on the nomination of Mr. Frank Casillas to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE AMERICAN STEEL INDUSTRY: MYTH VS. REALITY: 1

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, today I begin a series of brief statements that will appear periodically in an effort to elevate the level of debate on the crisis in the steel industry.

One of the things I have observed in the Senate is that many people have little experience with and therefore little understanding of the steel industry. Instead of such understanding we get cliches and stereotypes—the industry is poorly managed; its workers are overpaid; it has been protected from imports but has squandered the opportunity. All these statements are misleading, yet they represent what passes for debate on steel issues in Washington.

In an effort to provide a better factual basis for that debate—which will be a major topic of discussion in the Congress and the executive branch this summer—I want to explore, one at a time, some myths and realities about the industry. This exercise will not produce agreement about what course of action is appropriate for the industry or even on what the problems are, but it may help to provide a common set of facts from which we can all work.

MYTH

American steel producers are not as efficient as foreign steel producers.

REALITY

Despite aging equipment and a lower percentage of continuous casting than either Japan or Europe, American steelmakers are more efficient in their use of some inputs than their foreign counterparts.

In 1983, American steel producers had a higher percentage yield at actual operating rates than either France or the United Kingdom.

At actual operating rates, labor productivity for American steel manufacturers is higher than that of Japan and Europe.

The strong raw materials position of U.S. producers, together with the basic strengths of the American economy (for example highly developed capital markets, access to advanced technology, large home market) still provide American steelmakers with significant long-run production advantages over foreign producers.

MYTH

The American steel industry has been protected from imports for the past 10 years.

REALITY

In 1974, foreign imports claimed 13.4 percent of the American steel market. Last month foreign steelmakers claimed over 26 percent of the U.S. market. Such penetration, in absolute terms, hardly constitutes protection.

In relative terms, U.S. steel producers have been protected much less than Japanese and European steel makers. In Japan, the Government restricted steel imports to 1 million tons yearly from 1950-78. (In contrast 1983 U.S. imports were 17 million tons.) Nontariff barriers excluded both European and American producers from the market. In Europe, the European Community has sought to coordinate an extensive program of market controls since 1975. Prices have been regulated by the Government and markets have been strictly allocated. By 1978, moreover, agreements had been reached with all major exporters to the European market, stringently limiting imports into the Community. A bilaterial agreement with Japan limits Japanese imports. (It is significant to note that Japan sold 75 times as much steel to the United States as it did to Europe in 1981.)

MYTH

In the face of stiff competition, U.S. steel producers have failed to improve their operations.

REALITY

The American steel industry has made vigorous efforts to improve operations in recent years. Many technological innovations have been introduced, including recycling and resource recovery from waste materials, process control and sensor development and rapid in process analysis of liquid metal. Significant improvments include the following:

Average blast furnace output has increased by over 50 percent since 1971.

Continuous casting capacity will double in the next 5 years.

Overhead costs have been reduced by approximately 25 percent.

Stringent energy conservation measures have been adapted by the industry.

MYTH

American steel producers are suffering losses because the United States can no longer produce steel competitively. Inefficiency, not foreign imports, lies at the heart of the industry's problems.

REALITY

The major cause of the American steel crisis is the existence of excess capacity abroad and foreign government interference in the steel industry. Instead of cutting back production in the face of lower global demand, governments are subsidizing continued production in inefficient steel plants in order to avoid the political problems associated with increased unemployment.

Fully 70 percent of all the steel companies in Europe are dependent on the state. Since 1975, these companies have received over $25 billion in subsidies. Before 1985, these producers will receive an additional $20 billion. In Japan, the Government has aided steelmakers by controlling raw materials prices (including oil) through buying cartels.

Massive governmental interference in foreign steel industries has distorted the operation of the market mechanism in steel trade. Private steel producers in the United States cannot compete with the resources of foreign governments. As a result of European government subsidies for steel during the period of 1979–81, American steel shipments dropped by 6.5 million tons and gross revenue losses totaled $3.2 billion.●

MISSING CHILDREN

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, missing children represent a growing national tradgedy. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has estimated that each year approximately 1.8 million children are missing from their homes for varying periods of time. Of that number at least 100,000 children are abducted by parents locked in child custody and visitation disputes; 70 percent of these children will probably never be seen by the other parent again.

Marian C. Abram, an attorney with the Cleveland, OH, law firm of Walter, Haverfield, Buescher & Chockley, has authored a timely article entitled "How To Prevent or Undo a Child Snatching" which was published in the May 1984 edition of the American Bar Association Journal.

I ask that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the American Bar Association Journal, May 1984]

HOW TO PREVENT OR UNDO A CHILD SNATCHING

(By Marian C. Abram)

The marriage of Nicholas and Susie Bonis was in trouble. She left their home in Colorado and moved to Brooklyn with their young daughter. Nicholas filed an action in Colorado for dissolution of the marriage. Susie got notice of the petition but was not formally served with it. She moved to Miami Beach with their daughter and filed her own dissolution petition there.

When he was served with the Florida petition, Nicholas quickly traveled to Miami, and in what Susie called a "devious fashion" snatched the six-year-old girl from a day care school. He took the child to Massachusetts for a month. When they returned to Colorado, police took custody of the girl, acting on a court order Susie had obtained in Florida. He contended that Susie had previously snatched the girl while the youngster was in Miami for a visit.

A Florida appellate court, noting that "child snatching is one of the evils" of custody fights, decided to let the Colorado courts decide the internecine feud. *(Bonis v. Bonis,* 420 So.2d 104 (1982).)

THE 100,000 CHILD SNATCHINGS

Estimates indicate that more than 100,000 children each year are abducted by parents locked in child custody and visitation disputes; 70 percent of these children probably will never see the other parent again.

Many child snatching incidents involve confrontation or violence. The child is often reluctant, and the abducting parent often carries away a kicking, screaming and weeping youngster.

The parental kidnap victim is rarely placed in a stable environment. Spite, revenge or pride—and not love and genuine concern—are the reasons why most parents kidnap their children. The potential for harm is increased if the abducting parent is abusive or alcholic or both.

The abducting parent lives in constant fear of discovery by law enforcement officers or private investigators. He or she, therefore, may change his or her name and the name of the child and obtain new social security numbers. The fleeing parent may stay constantly on the move, perhaps living in motels and working odd jobs to obtain the bare essentials.

Lawyers easily can learn how to prevent the abduction of a client's child or respond to a successful child snatching. There are several basic, yet often ignored, strategies that can be employed to prevent or undo a parental abduction.

Several federal statutes have been enacted to help a parent whose child has been snatched by the spouse or former spouse, but the effectiveness of these laws will be no better than the lawyers who use them.

PREVENTING ABDUCTIONS

Until recent years, the legal system's response had been passive and ineffective. The Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act (UCCJA) was promulgated in 1969, recognizing that child snatching was encouraged by the ease with which an abducting parent could obtain a conflicting custody decree. The UCCJA utilized the "established home principle" of custody jurisdiction to confine child custody jurisdiction to one state.

The UCCJA now has been adopted in 48 states. However, judicial interpretations of the act have undermined its utility by expanding the opportunities for jurisdiction to rest in more than one state. Furthermore, the act fails to provide effective enforcement procedures and offers no means to locate and punish an abducting parent.

Congress responded to the recognized need for a comprehensive, national solution by enacting the Parental Kidnapping Prevention Act (PKPA) in 1980. Its general purposes are to "promote cooperation among the states in enforcement of custody and visitation orders, discourage continuing interstate controversies and conflicts, and deter interstate abduction of children," and it sets up a four-part scheme to fulfill these purposes.

First, the act directs states to give full faith and credit to valid foreign state custody decrees. 28 U.S.C. § 1738A(a). Second, it adopts the language of the UCCJA in establishing proper state jurisdiction over child custody orders. 28 U.S.C. § 1738A(b-g). Third, it expands the services available under the Federal Parent Locator Service, thus providing a national system for locating parents and children. 42 U.S.C. § 653. Finally, the act expands the Fugitive Felon Act to aid enforcement of existing state parental kidnapping felony laws. 18 U.S.C. § 1073.

The preventive aspects of the PKPA include the uniform child custody jurisdiction requirements and the full faith and credit requirement. The expansion of the Federal Parent Locator Service and the Fugitive Felon Act, however, apply in post-snatch situations and are geared to enhance the success of locating and punishing parental child abductors.

INITIAL STEPS AFTER A SNATCHING

When a child snatching has occurred, the best advice a lawyer can give the client is to remain calm. Although that is understandably a difficult request, extreme emotionalism thwarts calculated logic and constructive planning.

The attorney also should impress on the client the importance of refraining from illegal actions. Not only might that behavior subject the client to legal sanctions, it also may reflect adversely on the searching parent's fitness to retain custody. The chances of locating the child are greatly enhanced when a recovery strategy is adopted to make the most of every available legal measure.

The first essential step is for the client to report the abduction to local police. The sooner the police are contacted, the better the chances that promote investigation will uncover worthwhile clues. You also should consider if a criminal prosecution will be appropriate. In states where child abduction by a parent is a felony, criminal charges are necessary to trigger the investigative provisions of several federal statutes. Nonetheless, the client's feelings on the matter take priority.

If criminal charges are appropriate, the client or the lawyer should submit to the local authorities a missing persons report and a request for an "NCIC entry." The National Crime Information Center (NCIC), operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, can prove helpful once a warrant has been issued in a state where child snatching is a felony. Local officials enter identifying information into NCIC, and if an absconding parent is stopped in antoher state, the parent can be arrested and extradited to the original state.

PERSISTENT FOLLOWUP

Local prosecutors often are reluctant to institute criminal charges, even in states where child snatching is a felony. You must be persistent in following up on the criminal complaint filed by or on behalf of the client. The attorney should inform the client of any snags encountered in the criminal process and what action has been taken in response. This may minimize the feelings of

frustration and helplessness that often cause a client to resort to illegal measures.

The investigative services of the FBI may be utilized through the provisions of the Fugitive Felon Act (18 U.S.C. § 1073), which was expanded by the PKPA to encompass parental kidnapping.

Although the prerequisites for triggering the provisions of the Fugitive Felon Act are numerous, they are more liberal than those in effect before 1982. First, parental kidnapping must be a felony in the state in which it occurred. Second, a state felony prosecution must have been initiated and a warrant issued. Third, the local prosecutor must apply to the U.S. attorney general for issuance of a federal "unlawful flight to avoid prosecution" warrant, which will issue if the first two prerequisites have been satisfied.

Once the federal warrant is secured, the FBI will try to locate the abducting parent. After being found, the abducting parent can be extradited to the original state, and the pending criminal prosecution can then proceed.

INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES

Another option available to the searching parent is the Federal Parent Locator Service (FPLS, 42 U.S.C. § 663). The PKPA also expanded the coverage of this federal statute to assist existing state parent locator services.

Again there are a number of prerequisites. First, a voluntary agreement must exist between the state and the federal government allowing the state to utilize the FPLS. Second, only an "authorized person," not the client or the attorney, may apply directly to the FPLS for assistance. An authorized person may be the court or agent of a court having jurisdiction to make or enforce a child custody decree, or an agent or attorney of the United States or a state that has the duty to investigate, enforce or prosecute the wrongful taking or restraint of a child. Thus, the role of the attorney is to petition the court or to prompt the local prosecutor to request FPLS assistance.

Unfortunately, a computer search through the FPLS may have limited success. The search uses the known social security number of the abducting parent to provide the home and work addresses of that parent. Unless the present employer of the abducting parent has updated an active employee list, the FPLS will show the abducting parent unemployed, or employed at the job held prior to the abduction. If the abducting parent changes identities and obtains a new social security number, the search will be fruitless. So the FPLS, although theoretically useful, should not be relied on as the exclusive means to locate the abducting parent.

The attorney also may encourage the client to use other investigative practices. First, the client may employ a reputable private investigator. The searching parent should also contact his or her friends, neighbors and close relatives—as well as the friends, neighbors, relatives and co-workers of the abducting parent. These people may supply helpful information concerning the plans and whereabouts of the abducting parent, and they should be encouraged to offer any additional information they may receive if the abducting parent contacts them.

School officials should be contacted to determine if and where the child's records were transferred. The bank, post office or credit card companies that served the abducting parent should be contacted. A state bureau of motor vehicles recently may have registered a car and issued a new license in the abducting parent's name. Finally, once a particular state of locale has been identified, telephone and utility companies may be able to provide a new listing for the abducting parent.

PREVENTING A SNATCH

When your client fears that a child snatching may occur, you should respond as quickly as possible to prevent it. The attorney should petition the court for a temporary custody order or an ex parte possession order if a divorce or legal separation proceeding is pending and a child custody decree has not yet been issued. A court decree also gives leverage to the parent who later seeks return of the child, should an abduction occur.

Because the client may not recognize that an abduction is imminent, the attorney must review the facts to be able to foresee that possibility. Marshall Wolf, a Cleveland lawyer who testified at the UCCJA legislative hearings in Ohio, offers several helpful guidelines. He believes that the key is the flexibility of the suspected parent's lifestyle. For example, the abducting parent may have the kind of skills or career that make it easy to find a job elsewhere. The individual may hold no stable tie to his or her present community and have a support system of out-of-state friends or close relatives.

The practitioner should look beyond the obvious question of how the suspected parent relates with the children and discover, if possible, how the individual behaves outside the home environment. For example, if the suspected parent is financially irresponsible and has several creditors pressing delinquent bills, the chances of abduction are increased.

THE CHILD CUSTODY DECREE

If the threat of child snatching exists, the child custody decree should anticipate and comprehensively address the abduction issue. Almost without exception, removing the child should require the custodial parent's written consent. Custody decrees may require the removing parent to post a surety bond. A liquidated damage clause also may be included to compensate the custodial parent for any expenses incurred in enforcing the custody provisions.

Finally, the circumstances may warrant a provision specifying the custodial parent's right or intention to seek police assistance on the parent's wrongful taking of the child. For additional suggestions, you should read Hoffman, Schulman, Volenik and O'Daniel, Interstate Child Custody Disputes and Parental Kidnapping, American Bar Association, Child Custody Clearinghouse and Information Exchange, Washington, D.C. (1982).

An additional safeguard may be found in the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA, 20 U.S.C. § 1232 et seq.), which allows either parent to inspect and review their child's educational records. The right of the suspected parent to have the records transferred to another school may be restricted by a court decree. This is a rather drastic measure, however, which should be employed only when the threat of child snatching is great, because of the potential for engendering deeper hostility between the parents.

Where the child custody decree limits the noncustodial parent's rights under the FERPA, the custodial parent must file a copy of the decree with the school to ensure that it will be obeyed. Even if the custody decree does not restrict the noncustodial parent's FERPA rights, should the child be abducted, the other parent may obtain the name, address and telephone number of the school to which the child's educational records have been transferred.

FLEEING THE COUNTRY

Several approaches are available to minimize the possibility of international flight. First, removal limitations in the custody decree may be drafted to cover both interstate and international travel. The custody decree also may prohibit the noncustodial parent from seeking a passport for the child or may require prior written consent from the custodial parent. A copy of the custody decree should be filed with the State Department Office of Passport Services to ensure compliance. In addition, the custodial parent may retain a passport issued in the child's name; thus precluding the issuance of another passport in the child's true name.

The attorney, however, should be cautious not to draft a custody decree that is so adverse, threatening and demeaning to the noncustodial parent that child snatching is encouraged rather than avoided. The provisions already discussed should be drafted in neutral terms to minimize the frustration and anger of the potential abductor.

For example, a clause completely prohibiting the child's removal from the locale or state is rather threatening, but it is sometimes necessary. Usually, however, removal and visitation rights may simply be restricted as to place, time or duration, or some other reasonable contingency, such as the age of the child.

JOINT CUSTODY ISSUES

Using joint custody decrees to prevent child snatching has generated much commentary. Proponents argue that joint custody reduces the frustration and anger that lead a parent, whose rights have been ignored by the court, to seek revenge through child abduction. Opponents, however, contend that joint custody is a legal cop-out. Joint custody often covers up and prevents the parents from addressing important issues concerning the child's welfare. In addition, the problems that led to the divorce may remain unresolved, and parental frustration and anger may be intensified rather than dissipated.

Marshall Wolf opposes the indiscriminate use of joint custody. He believes that joint custody works only in those rare situations when both parents overcome their personal differences to recognize and address the needs of the children. Joint custody, according to Wolf, only prolongs the inevitable. "One who will snatch their child, will snatch," he says, regardless of what label is attached to the custody decree.

Other available preventive techniques are worthy of mention. Perhaps the simplest solution, although not always the most practical, is to instill in the child an obligation to notify the custodial parent of his or her whereabouts. In this manner, even if in the company of the other parent, a responsible child will attempt to contact the custodial parent. Likewise, if the abducting parent has told the child that the other parent is dead or seriously injured, the insightful client will have instructed the child to call a relative, neighbor or friend "just in case anything ever happens to me."

The client should take periodic photographs of the child, such as school pictures. If the child is abducted, efforts by law enforcement officers to locate the child will be

enhanced greatly if the authorities are supplied with a recent photograph of the child. The younger child should be photographed more often than the older child. Success in locating the child also will be enhanced if the local police are provided with a set of the child's fingerprints, which should be taken periodically as the child grows.

WHISKED AWAY DESPITE PLANS

No prevention plan is foolproof. Despite thorough planning, a child may still be kidnapped by one parent and whisked across state lines. The best a practitioner can do is anticipate that possibility, strive to prevent it and hope that the worst never occurs.

All is not lost, however, if the client's child is kidnapped. The PKPA offers several investigative aids that, in combination with local enforcement efforts, may help in locating the abducting parent and child. In addition, the jurisdictional and full faith and credit requirements of the act strengthen the legal right of the custodial parent to have the child returned. In the final analysis, however, responsibility for reducing the incidents of parental child abduction rests in the hands of the practitioner.

STATE PARENT LOCATOR SERVICES

Here are some of the parent locator services among the 24 states that may use the Federal Parent Locator Service in parental kidnapping and child custody cases.

CALIFORNIA

Child Support Management Branch, Robert A. Barton, Chief, Department of Social Services, 744 P St., Sacramento, Calif. 95814, 916/323-8994.

COLORADO

James O. Galeotti, Director, Division of Child Support Enforcement, Department of Social Services, 1575 Sherman St., Room 423, Denver, Colo. 80203, 303/866-2422.

GEORGIA

Jerry Townsend, Director, Office of Child Support Recovery, State Department of Human Resources, P.O. Box 80000, Atlanta, Ga. 30357, 404/894-5194.

MINNESOTA

Bonnie Becker, Director, Office of Child Support, Department of Public Welfare, Space Center Building, 444 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, 612/296-2499.

MISSOURI

Paul Nelson, Administrator, Child Support Enforcement Unit, Division of Family Services, Department of Social Services, P.O. Box 88, Jefferson City, Mo. 65103, 314/751-4301.

NEW JERSEY

Harry Wiggins IV, Director, Child Support and Paternity Unit, Department of Human Services, CN 716, Trenton, N.J. 08625, 609/633-6268.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jack Stuff, Director, Child Support Program, Bureau of Claims Settlement, Department of Public Welfare, P.O. Box 8018, Harrisburg, Pa. 17105, 717/783-1779.

TEXAS

Lewis Zegub, Director, Child Support Enforcement Branch, Texas Dept. of Human Resources, P.O. Box 2960, Austin, Texas 78769, 512/835-0440 ext. 2121.

VIRGINIA

Jean White, Director, Division of Support Enforcement Program, Department of Social Services, 8007 Discovery Drive, Richmond, Va. 23288, 804/281-9108.

WASHINGTON

Jon Conine, Acting Chief, Office of Support Enforcement, Department of Social and Health Services, P.O. Box 9162-FU-11, Olympia, Wash. 98504, 206/459-6481.

Further information may be obtained from the Federal Parent Locator Service, Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement, Rockville, Md. 20852 (telephone 301/443-4950).●

TOURISM IS OUR LARGEST BUSINESS

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, as a founder and a cochairman of the Senate Tourism Caucus, I want to take this occasion to herald what might be another first: The emergence of travel and tourism as the Nation's largest and most important business, and as the Nation's largest employer.

Eric Friedheim, the editor of Travel Agent magazine, makes a convincing case for this claim in an editorial contained in a recent issue of the publication. I shall submit the text of the article for the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

If this is indeed the case and if travel and tourism is the largest business in America, it lends added significance to the commemoration later this month of National Tourism Week. Appropriately, it is the Memorial Day holiday weekend that launches National Tourism Week; it is this same holiday weekend which launches the summer vacation season—and all the travel and tourism it entails—for most Americans.

For those Americans who are a part of the industry, and for those of us concerned about the vitality of the industry, the 1984 Memorial Day weekend and National Tourism Week, 1984, will provide us with an occasion to emphasize the industry's importance.

First or second in size, the travel and tourism industry's significance has never been lost on the members of the Senate Tourism Caucus. Nor has it been anything but paramount among my own concerns.

Take my home State of Tennessee for instance. My family and I spend a great deal of vacation time in the State. During 1981, we traveled across the State, visiting and staying at some of the hundreds of tourist attractions Tennessee has to offer, and attending some of the festivals and events one will find at any time of the year in the State.

The U.S. Travel Data Center says that during that year—the most recent for which such figures are available—travel and tourism generated 73,000 jobs in Tennessee. This is 4.2 percent of all the jobs in the State, making it the States second largest employer. The industry's payroll exceeded a half-billion dollars; represented over $2.7 billion in expenditures; provided $113.4 million in taxes to the Federal Government, $97.5 million to the State, and $30.1 million to Tennessee's local governments; and made the State realize $25.09 for every dollar it budgeted for tourism.

First or second largest, the significance and importance of the industry to my home State is clear—as it is to the 26 other States in which the industry is the first or second largest.

It should not really matter whether such an economic force is first or second largest. For Americans in 1984 the establishment of travel and tourism as the Nation's largest industry could help, however, to promote greater appreciation and understanding of the industry's role during National Tourism Week. Toward that end, I commend the case made in Travel Agent magazine.

The article follows:

THE FIGURES PUT TRAVEL ON TOP

(By Eric Friedheim)

Is tourism America's largest business and employer? Yes, says Somerset Waters, veteran economist and author of the authoritative Travel Industry World Yearbook.

In his 1984 edition, Waters disagrees with President Reagan who put travel in second place among the nation's trades. The president offered this assessment while signing a proclamation fixing May 24-June 2 as National Tourism Week.

The chief executive conceded that tourism is extremely important to the U.S. because of its substantial contributions to employment, prosperity, international understanding and world commerce.

Waters and a few others, including this magazine, challenge the way the government gathers its statistics on how much money and how many jobs our industry generates.

Since few congressmen and policy-makers display more than a smattering of facts and figures. Waters supplies data from several federal bureaus to back up his claim putting travel on top of the heap. Up to now, the principal sources of computing how much is spent on travel have been the Census Bureau and the U.S. Travel Data Center, a national non-profit research center for travel and tourism.

For its estimates, Census only computes trips of at least 100 miles from home. This is fine as far as it goes. But what about trips closer in, say 25 to 99 miles?

People just don't remember such trips when filling out questionnaires, claims Census.

This is not only ridiculous, arbitrary and a disservice to the trade, it flies in the face of some rather authoritative definitions of what constitutes a trip.

Congress came up with its own when it passed the National Tourism Policy Act in 1981. It describes the travel industry as one that provides services to those journeying outside the same community for any purpose not related to day-to-day activity.

Some years earlier, the National Tourism Resources Commission defined a tourist as one who travels at least 50 miles from home for any purpose except commuting.

The Travel Industry Association of American (TIA) accepts the congressional definition which has no minimum mileage.

Based on Census' 100-mile concept, the industry provides 4.5 million jobs. However, if

all travel except local and commuter traffic is counted, the figure is more like 11 million.

Waters builds his case on a rather solid statistical foundation. He uses Canadian travel patterns as well as a new study by the General Accounting Office.

The Canadians not only count journeys of more than 100 miles, they also tabulate trips of 25 to 99 miles. These shorter hauls account for 39 percent of the country's entire domestic expenditures, say officials north of the border.

Now consider America's short-haul picture. Substantial numbers of Americans also take trips of less than 100 miles. Waters notes, for example, that in California 80 percent of the population lives less than 40 miles from the beach, to which thousands of local vacationers flock. For that matter, the Census Bureau itself says that nearly a third of all Americans live within 50 miles of either the East or West Coasts.

Waters offers more ammunition for the short-haul argument. He points out that there are mainly two classes of travel: city to city and city to resort. Many are less than 100 miles apart such as Washington and Baltimore (each with many attractions. Waters points out); New England and Cape Cod; Midwest cities and the Great Lakes; New York and Atlantic City. Many U.S. attractions, state fairs and other events depend on luring residents of nearby communities. Short-haul motorcoach trips and tours, car rentals and weekend hotel and resort packages are proliferating.

Though there has been no significant U.S. research on the dollars and jobs generated by short-distance touring, Waters believes valid assumptions can be made out of the Canadian experience.

"If we accept the Canadian figure of 39 percent as representing this traffic, then we have an estimate of total domestic travel spending in the U.S. for trips over 25 miles from home that comes to $298 billion in 1982," says Waters.

"We arrive at this by using the accepted figure produced by the U.S. Travel Data Center of $182 billion for trips over 100 miles (representing 61 percent of the total), and $116 billion (representing 39 percent of the total).

"Is this Canadian percentage applicable in the U.S.? One way to check is to use data produced by the U.S. Department of Transportation. According to DOT surveys, 30.1 percent of all domestic passenger miles, by all modes of transportation, take place on trips 21 to 100 miles from home."

Waters says that $13 billion spent by foreign visitors in 1982 should be added to the $298 billion in domestic spending on trips of at least 25 miles for a grand total of $311 billion.

For his research, Waters induced a Senate committee to ask the General Accounting Office to estimate how many jobs tourism creates. GAO computed that each $1 billion created 35,602 jobs.

"With total spending for travel and tourism reaching approximately $311 billion in 1982, the industry represents 10 percent of the GNP," Waters concluded. "This puts tourism spending well ahead of spending at food stores ($253 billion) or at auto dealers ($182 billion). In fact, even if our estimates are not precise, it is safe to conclude that the business of travel and tourism is by far the largest private business in America."●

WESTERN MEDIA MISSING MESSAGE IN SOUTH AFRICA

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, a young graduate student at the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Journalism, recently shed some new light on the South Africa question. What is interesting about Mr. Louis Heyneman's article is that he presents the policy issues in an honest, forthright manner, something other journalists would do well to try once in a while, especially when dealing with matters that need careful study and wisdom, not prejudicial polemicism.

I commend Mr. Heyneman. He is a new brand of journalist who, unlike the easy journalists of hollow rhetoric, seeks to stimulate his readers to consider real answers.

I ask that the article, "Western Media Missing Message in South Africa" by Louis Heyneman be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Columbia (MO) Daily Tribune, Apr. 1, 1984]

WESTERN MEDIA MISSING MESSAGE IN SOUTH AFRICA

(By Louis Heyneman)

When it comes to the violation of human rights, the Republic of South Africa probably has the worst reputation among all nations. The South Africa domestic policy of separate development, known as apartheid, had driven a wedge between the Western world and South Africa. Worldwide, South Africa has become a symbol of repression.

But how many people outside South Africa have first-hand knowledge of that country's situation?

The mass media form the opinions of millions of U.S. citizens, who have no reason not to accept the views and analysis of journalists about South Africa. But as a South African journalist, I have become disillusioned by the manner in which events in South Africa are reported in the U.S. media. Their views are so biased that U.S. citizens are simply not getting the full picture of my country.

A prime reason is that the news media and the outside world expect discrimination and racial conflict in South Africa—a perception that has been built up during years. Therefore, any event that might point to conflict or racial disharmony in South Africa is widely reported. Events like these fulfill the expectations and are conceived by the public as credible and newsworthy.

I am not trying to defend South Africa's apartheid policy in any way, but I strongly object to the media's lack of balanced coverage. The Western world is not being informed about the new generation in South Africa—people with a strong sense of moral obligation toward their fellow man regardless of the color of his skin.

While reporting about the Middle East, Central America or Northern Ireland, the mass media choose to objectively describe the facts and, perhaps, predict the outcome of conflicts in those places. But when reporting about South Africa, correspondents always make judgments. And a result, the South African government is almost always presented as the villain and bully.

As a result of this bias, peace initiatives by the South African government traditionally never receive any credit. Instead, any steps toward domestic peace or away from racial discrimination are described by "observers" as calculated steps to improve the government's image and credibility.

For instance, during the past months, South Africa initiated a peace drive with its neighboring countries. South Africa declared its willingness to resolve the Namibia border dispute "without any conditions except the realization of peace."

Recognizing the positive aspects of the South African peace drive, however, wouldn't be in the U.S.' interest; the Third World might perceive such support as favoring racism. Because of this thinking, the media never report progress made by the South African government, nor are its attempts to eliminate discrimination reported. To report that South Africa has increased the per capita expenditure for black education by 230 percent during 1975–1980 and again by 51 percent in 1981–82, to mention one example, would appear as if the United States is favoring South Africa in the dispute.

Financial disinvestment is a direct result of this attitude. The policy in the United States has been for years that economic sanctions and isolation are ways in which U.S. citizens can show their solidarity with the struggling and oppressed blacks in South Africa. In fact, any kind of investment by a U.S. company in South Africa is looked upon as approving and supporting racism and is subsequently heavily criticized.

What is overlooked, however, is this: Disinvestment harms South Africa, but it harms black South Africans first. Continued divestment would mean that thousands of black workers will lose their jobs.

Economic growth is an important key to social change.

The well-known South African industrialist Harry Oppenheimer, chairman of the Anglo-American Corp. of South Africa, summed it up in an interview with a Zurich financial newspaper: "Many people, particularly in the U.S. and Britain, are demanding two totally contradictory things. On the one hand, they want to help the blacks by not investing in South Africa, and on the other hand, they demand that wages and other conditions are improved. But you cannot achieve improvements in the field of wages and other working conditions if industry is not registering a steady growth."

In an interview with the London Daily Express, Oppenheimer said: "The only way to bring about peaceful change is to allow a modern economy to build up which cannot exist without the participation of vast numbers of black people holding skilled and highly paid jobs."

What is ironic, perhaps, is that local companies, influenced by the U.S. example, are struggling to follow it. After Henry Ford visited South Africa in 1976, he said: "We regard training and education as the key element in opening doors to equal opportunity. Equal pay for the same work is a firm policy of ours."

Even those who oppose apartheid the most have to realize that changes don't come overnight. The economic implications of a completely new order make immediate change a revolution when it could have been a peaceful evolution.

If the Western world demands an instant new order, they're demanding an immediate redistribution of wealth. That is a matter of choice between capitalism and socialism.

It's interesting to note that U.S. citizens would have been in a situation similar to

South Africa's if 800 million native Americans were living in this country today.

If the native American community had a strong desire to keep its own language, culture and traditions—which are the right of all human beings—how many U.S. citizens would be convinced that the social values, language and education of Western civilization should be forced upon these people to ensure the economic development of the United States as a world leader in technology and production?

The crux of the matter is, have white South Africans changed in their hearts and minds? My answer is: yes.

Does everybody really believe that a civilized nation that reads books and newspapers and studies at schools and universities is not aware of the social implications and inhumanity of racial discrimination? Does the Western world really believe we are not trying to reform and that we are not committed to change to ensure a peaceful coexistence for both black and white in South Africa?

At the moment, South Africa is a handy scapegoat with which the Western world can clear its conscience of its own history of racial discrimination. No wonder some South Africans think they have to carry the blame for all the racism in the world today—as if racism doesn't exist in other parts of the world.

You can imagine how difficult if is for us to understand why one of the presidential candidates is telling voters he would like to close all U.S. airports to South African Airways. We see this as the politician's lip service to gain black support for his compaign.

My own experience in Columbia has been positive. I have met many people and have talked to students from various countries on this campus. In many ways, I think that I have broken through the barriers of isolation from which most young South Africans suffer.

Judging from the attitudes of people here, I have no reason to believe that the people of the United States are not willing to build bridges between their country and South Africa.

Even those that hold ideas different from mine and those who have preconceived ideas about South Africa are willing to discuss problems in a mature, civilized and understanding way. I have also had contact with black students from other African countries, and I have learned just as much from them as I hope they have learned from me.

Despite the problems, I still believe white South Africans can bring a complete about-face in that country and that a bloody revolution doesn't have to be the answer. History has shown us that power gained by violence is never freedom. It just becomes a new kind of oppression.●

MAINLAND HIGH SCHOOL RECOGNIZED FOR EXCELLENCE

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I want to share with my colleagues two articles written about the same school, Mainland High School in Daytona Beach, FL.

Mainland High School has been nominated as one of the top schools in the country; 10 of the 263 schools nominated nationwide are from Florida. The other schools nominated are: St. Petersburg High, Hialeah American Senior High, Jacksonville Terry Parker High, Hialeah Junior High, Dixie Hollins High of St. Petersburg, North Miami Beach Highland Oaks Junior High, Jacksonville's John Gorrie Junior High, Largo Middle School, and Thomas Jefferson Junior High of Merritt Island.

I ask that the editorial from the Daytona Times and news article from the Daytona Beach Evening News be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Daytona (FL) Times, Apr. 12-18, 1984]

MAINLAND HIGH SCHOOL: SYMBOL OF INTEGRATION

We would like to doff our hats in honor of Mainland Senior High School, and to congratulate the students on their inclusion as finalists in the 1984 Secondary School Recognition Program, announced last week in Washington, D.C., by Education Secretary T. H. Bell.

For Volusians, particularly Daytonans, who have been following progress in the school over the past years, the selection of Mainland Senior High in the nationwide school recognition program, comes with very little surprise. As Bell announced Tuesday, the recognition program is an effort to select and honor the nation's outstanding public and private secondary schools. The recent visit to the school by Dr. Joseph Richardson of Georgia State University, who is also a member of the recognition project, gives credence to the outstanding characteristics of Mainland Senior High.

In view of this, one wonders why the United States Department of Education has been so long in officially recognizing the meritorious work being done in the school. Mainland Senior High has long deserved national attention.

Mainland Senior High has clearcut academic goals, higher expectations for students, a positive school climate, and a well-articulated curriculum. Student performance on standard achievement tests and minimum competency tests have been outstanding. The percentage of students who pursue post-secondary education and training is unexcelled. A good number of students who graduate from the school have been successful at finding jobs.

Of particular importance to Daytonans is the cordial atmosphere under which students carry out their work in the school. Contrary to the atmosphere in some other schools in the city, Mainland Senior High draws no dichotomy between Black and white students of the school. It is the school where "students are students."

The philosophy of progress through harmony and racial interaction practiced at Mainland Senior High is worthy of emulation. At a time when some schools in the city, Seabreeze Senior High School, for example, are prosecuting a Black administrator for no justifiable cause, mainland Senior High has maintained excellent human relations with students, staff and faculty, under the leadership of Jack E. Surrette, principal. Through administrative efficiency, Surrette has created a network of family relationships within the school.

For Surrette, no incident is too small to be attended to. No student is above the law. Discipline, fairness and justice are the watchwords. Under Surrette's administration, the school recognizes the importance of student involvement and participation in every aspect of school activity. Lawlessness, tardiness and acts of licentiousness have no place in the school. The greatest concern of the Surrette administration is to train students to become responsible citizens of the community in which they live.

As the search for the nation's top schools continues, Daytonans would like to congratulate Surrette, student, staff and faculty on their achievements, hoping that other schools will learn from their good example.

[From the Daytona Beach (FL) Evening News, Mar. 21, 1984]

MAINLAND HIGH NOMINATED AS ONE OF NATION'S BEST SCHOOLS

(By John Carter)

Mainland High School is one of only 10 secondary schools in Florida and 263 nationwide selected as a finalist in a federally sponsored search for the top public schools in America.

The Daytona Beach School was included on a list released Tuesday in Washington by Education Secretary T. H. Bell. The finalists were chosen from a list of 555 nominees submitted by state school superintendents.

Selection teams composed of nongovernment officials will visit each of the 263 schools between now and mid-May, then convene in Washington in early July to pick the winners. If last year's results are a guide, about half of the schools on the list will earn a visit to the White House for their principals and the right to fly 4 by 6 foot "Flags of Excellence" on their flagpoles.

Other Florida schools honored with Mainland, according to The Associated Press, are St. Petersburg Dixie Hollins High, St. Petersburg High, Hialeah American Senior High, Jacksonville Terry Parker High, Hialeah Junior High, North Miami Beach Highland Oaks Junior High, Jacksonville John Gorrie Junior High, Largo Middle School and Merritt Island Thomas Jefferson Junior High.

"We're elated," Mainland Principal Jack Surrette said of the selection this morning, "This recognition belongs to the total school family."

Criteria for the awards program cover every facet of school operation, with special emphasis on the demographics of the student population, how many students go on to college and how they fare in higher education and student scores on standardized tests. There is heavy emphasis on quality of the faculty and whether teachers are being assigned work that is in harmony with the specialties for which they have been trained. "We rank very high in that category. We have excellent teachers," Surrette boasted.

Also measured is the school's success in human relations, its treatment of minorities and the amount of support it receives from parents and others in the community. The nominees' short term and longrange academic goals also come under scrutiny.

Surrette said he plans no special preparation for the visit of the examining team. "It will be business as usual. There won't be any fanfare. We want them to observe us as we are. We believe that the way we operate every day is the right way and we can meet inspection requirements," the principal said.

Last year, President Reagan honored 152 schools chosen from a list of 396 nominees. The Department of Education is sponsoring a separate program to recognize outstanding private schools and recently awarded a $370,000 grant to the Council for American Private Education to carry out that search in the near future.●

DELAY OF TELEPHONE SERVICE COSTS

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, a major issue facing small businesses across this country is the prospect of increased telephone service costs.

As my colleagues know, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) and I recently invited our fellow Senators to join us in writing to the Federal Communications Commission to urge that implementation of telephone access charge costs on small businesses be delayed.

At this time, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter from Mr. John Sloan, Jr., president of the National Federation of Independent Business to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. On behalf of the 560,000 members of this distinguished organization, Mr. Sloan carefully and persuasively presents the reasons for such a delay.

I ask that Mr. Sloan's letter to the Commission be printed in the RECORD and that my colleagues give his comments their careful attention. I also ask that a copy of the letter Senator KASTEN and I initiated be printed in the RECORD.

The letters follow:

APRIL 26, 1984.

Hon. MARK S. FOWLER,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FOWLER: The decision by the FCC to impose access charges on businesses with more than one telephone line, by June of this year, has raised concerns within the small business community. Preliminary results of a survey of NFIB members show 60 percent with more than one line, indicating that a significant number of small businesses will be affected by this decision.

I am writing, on behalf of the 560,000 members of NFIB, to ask that you consider delaying these access charges, as the FCC has done for residential and single-line businesses, until June of 1985. Comments from the FCC indicate that the decision to delay the charges for residential and single-line business was based on a need for further study of the impact these charges would have. I am asking that you accord the same consideration to businesses with more than one line. Why should the independent business community be singled out at this time to bear these additional costs?

There are alternatives to the access charge approach and NFIB believes that these alternatives should be fully examined. Our members do not object to cost-based pricing, but whatever approach is taken they feel it is only fair that it be applied across-the-board. Delaying the access charges for businesses with more than one line would allow time for full consideration of alternatives and potentially more equitable solutions.

The impact that these additional charges will have on small business underscores the need for equitable treatment. In a mid-1983 study done by NFIB, small business owners ranked "telephone rates" as their fourth most severe problem. As small businesses do not operate with the same margin and flexibility as larger companies, the overall increases in telephone costs could be devastating in some cases. Is it fair to add costs for only one segment of the public, particularly given the difficulties which many will encounter in absorbing those costs?

NFIB is currently conducting a survey of its members asking such questions as how many telephone lines they have, what percentage of their calls are local or long-distance, and what level of monthly cost increases would cause them to reduce service. I will be in Washington the week of May 14th, at which time the full results of the survey should be in. I would like to arrange a meeting with you at that time in order to share these results with you.

I appreciate your consideration of this matter and hope that we will be able to meet and discuss the issue in more detail.

Sincerely,

JOHN SLOAN, Jr.,
President.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MARK S. FOWLER,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FOWLER: We are writing to express our concern regarding the long distance telephone access charges for all businesses with more than one line, scheduled to go into effect in June of this year.

The effect this decision will have on small and medium-sized businesses appears to have been overlooked, as most businesses of this size have more than one line. These additional charges, coupled with the rise in local phone service costs, would place a substantial monthly burden on their already limited resources.

While the FCC has already delayed imposition of these fees for residential customers and businesses with only one phone line until June 1985, we are asking that small businesses with more than one line also be included in that provision. This interim period would allow the FCC to consider the development of a more equitable alternative.

We believe that to do so would be in the best interest of this country's millions of small businesses and the phone system as a whole.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bob Kasten, Quentin N. Burdick, William Proxmire, Spark M. Matsunaga, David Pryor, Paula Hawkins, Larry Pressler, Robert T. Stafford, Wendell H. Ford.●

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that H.R. 3249, companion legislation to S. 2102, a bill to charter the National Academy of Public Administration was signed into law by the President on April 10, 1984. I introduced this legislation on November 16, 1983, together with Senator EAGLETON, ranking minority member of the Committee on Governmental Affairs. It was unanimously reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary on March 15, 1984, and passed the Senate on April 10. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of my colleagues for the strong support which they have given this bill.

Such charters are awarded carefully. No academy has received a Federal charter since 1863, when President Abraham Lincoln signed legislation to charter the National Academy of Sciences. I believe that the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) is fully deserving of joining this distinguished institution in holding a Federal charter.

NAPA is a nonprofit collegial society which was founded in Washington, D.C., in 1967 by James E. Webb, then Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It was created to provide a trusted source of counsel on public management concerns. Its mission is to help the Government at all levels to work more effectively. NAPA is an experienced, nonpartisan management and operations research organization that Congress and the President may call upon for assistance.

Through countless studies conducted for Federal Government department and many agencies, the Congress, the courts, and State and local governments, the National Academy has carried out its mission admirably. Dealing with issues as diverse as the role of the Presidency in the 1980's, commercialization of space, state welfare reorganization, and civil service reform, the National Academy has seen many of its recommendations become public policy.

The unique resource of NAPA is its membership; it is composed of more than 300 practitioners and scholars of public administration—former Cabinet members and Governors, White House officials, professional government managers, and scholars specializing in public affairs. The National Academy's members are elected by their peers. Dr. Phillip S. Hughes, Under Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, lends his expertise to the organization by serving as Chairman of the Board.

I commend the National Academy of Public Administration for this honor, the Federal charter, and I congratulate its members wholeheartedly.●

COMMEMORATING THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, on May 7, 1984, we commemorate the 36th anniversary of Israeli independence, declared by David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister, on May 14, 1948. As the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel stated in its opening paragraph,

Israel was the birthplace of the Jewish people. Here their spiritual, religious and political identity was shaped.

The Hebrews settled in the territory during the 18th century B.C. After a period of enslavement in Egypt, the Israelites, led by Moses, began their arduous journey back to the promised land. It was King David who consolidated the tribes of Israel into a unified kingdom and established Jerusalem as its capital. It was here that the first temple was built—the very center of Judaism. Despite the destruction of the temple, conquest by foreign powers, and centuries of dispersal, Israel has continued to have significance for Jews throughout the world. The history of Israel and her people have been marked by struggle, a struggle which continues to this day.

Many men and women sacrificed their lives in order to win independence for the Jewish State. Many more have fought to preserve Jewish heritage and identity. The enduring spirit of the Jewish people and their quest for freedom and liberty has not been broken and will not be broken.

I have visited Yad Vashem, the Israeli memorial to the 6 million Jews senselessly slaughtered by the Nazis during World War II. This site serves as a testament to the Holocaust and those who perished because of their Jewish faith.

Today, millions of Soviet Jews still are persecuted by Soviet authorities: They are denied the freedom to train their children in the Jewish faith, banned from teaching Hebrew, and denied the right to emigrate to Israel. As a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I am painfully aware of the plight of Soviet Jewry. I have repeatedly spoken out for those denied even the most basic of human rights.

Israel is our only reliable ally in the Middle East. It is a nation dedicated to democratic principles and the preservation of freedom.

The Middle East has played, and will continue to play, an important role in the security interests of the United States. The continued instability of this region serves to highlight the importance of the United States-Israel relationship. The influx of terrorist organizations, such as the Palestinian Liberation Organization, into the Middle East has only exacerbated the current destabilized situation. In addition, the fierce fighting in the Iran-Iraq war points to the volatile character of the region.

In the midst of this hostile environment, Israel has offered us the use of military bases, as well as storage facilities for the American rapid deployment force, an important facet in U.S. security planning. It is important to the strategic interest of both the United States and Israel that this cooperation continue. We cannot forsake our commitment to Israel, a democracy which faced constant adversity.

Since 1948, the United States and Israel have developed strong bonds of friendship and cooperation. The United States was the first nation to recognize the State of Israel and has consistently supported that nation. It is appropriate that during this time of commemoration of Israeli independence we renew our commitment to this faithful friend and loyal ally.

I thank the Chair.●

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, this Sunday marks the 193d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791, one of the great achievements in Polish history and one of the world's great historic documents of political freedom and religious tolerance. The Polish people's indomitable spirit and their dedication to freedom allowed them to create, just 2 years after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, a document abolishing class distinction and declaring the equality of all citizens under the law. It is with deepest respect and admiration that I join with citizens across the Nation in paying tribute to the gallant Polish people and their heritage of heroic dedication to freedom.

As Americans throughout the land celebrate Polish Constitution Day, we share a deep concern over the problems confronting Poland today and recall with sadness the tragic history of the Polish nation, which has been marred so often by partition and suppression. A brave people, long recognized for their chivalry and compassion, Poles have for generations struggled for liberty, a struggle which led them to carry on their national banner the motto "For Our Liberty and Yours." Though time and time again their land has been attacked and occupied by aggressive neighbors, the Poles repeatedly fought bravely against threats to their homeland. In 1683, King Jan Sobieski exemplified Polish determination when he and his 40,000 troops rescued Europe from invasion by turning back the Turkish onslaught at Vienna. Victories such as this are rare in Polish history, however; the nation has suffered many crushing defeats at the hands of foreign invaders. But through these tragic events—through Genghis Kahn's invasion of Europe in 1250, Turkish aggression in the 15th century, the partitioning of Poland in 1792 and 1795 which completely dissolved their independent State, and, more recently, Soviet occupation after World War II—the spirit of this great people has never died, neither in Poland nor in the lands where Poland's sons and daughters began life anew.

In recent years, we have seen a tragic injustice inflicted on the gallant people of Poland in the suppression of the broad movement within Polish society toward guarantees of basic human rights and a more open society, a movement both symbolized and led by Solidarity. Despite the brutal suppression of that movement, and the suspension of individual liberties, the unsinkable will and determination of the Polish people survives.

On Polish Constitution Day, we not only commemorate the proud triumph of 1791 when Poland immortalized her people's love of freedom in a democratic constitution, we also gratefully acknowledge the many contributions of the Polish people to this Nation. The Polish presence in America dates back to earliest colonial times when Polish artisans arrived in Jamestown and built America's first glass factory. During the American Revolution, two of Poland's most beloved sons, Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Count Casimir Pulaski, rallied bravely to the banner of our newborn country. We recall with respect the great Polish contributions to our Nation in the fields of science and the arts.

The contributions which Polish Americans made to colonial settlements in America and in the War for Independence have been repeated in each succeeding generation and have immeasurably enriched our national, political, cultural, and social life. Americans of Polish descent, who today number well over 10 million, contributed significantly to the growth of American industry at the turn of the century and greatly strengthened American labor. Polish Americans have distinguished themselves in every walk of life and have served our democratic institutions in countless positions in Federal, State, and local governments. Above all, they have always championed our Nation's freedom and honor.

In joining with Polish Americans throughout our land in commemorating Polish Constitution Day, let us recall the great contributions that Americans of Polish descent have made to our country. Let us recall that our national heritage is rich with the gifts of the Polish people, and let us hope that we will all see again a free Poland, fulfilling its heritage and destiny.●

COSPONSORSHIP OF S. 2565, A BILL TO REAUTHORIZE HEAD START PROGRAMS

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor with Senators DENTON, DOMENICI, THURMOND, HECHT, and EAST of S. 2565, the Head Start Amendments of 1984. Through supporting the reauthorization of the Head Start program, we not only renew the lease on life for this worthy legislative achievement, but we also reaffirm our commitment to what I believe are funda-

mental principles on which Head Start must be based.

First, the Head Start program is an example of how the public and private sectors can work together. Unlike all too many public sector programs, the Head Start program has not dissuaded but encouraged local initiative. Today, there are over 500,000 citizens who volunteer their time and talents to local Head Start centers. In fact, there are seven volunteers for every paid staff person. These include high school and college students, homemakers, senior citizens, professionals, local and State business leaders, and workers of all trades. In Mississippi alone, private citizens have donated over $1.5 million in cash, merchandise, properties, and facilities.

Second, the Head Start program recognizes that the parents are the most important influence on a child. At a time when potential influence is too often ignored or circumvented, the Head Start program recognizes that the parent is and should be the child's primary teacher. Head Start regulations require parental participation at all levels. For every three children enrolled in Head Start at least two Head Start parents are giving volunteer time. Head Start administrators spend a good deal of their time actively encouraging and organizing parental participation in the program.

Furthermore, I am impressed with evidence that suggests that children, as adolescents, in programs like Head Start, are less likely to need remedial services as they grow older; that they are more likely to hold jobs after school hours; and that they demonstrate less antisocial and delinquent behavior. As the Head Start program matures and as the children of Head Start grow in age, they are also expected to increase in their employability. After all, the success of this program, as with any other federally funded social program, should be measured by the rate in which the program's beneficiaries become fully independent, productive, and contributing members of our national community.

This is why I believe reauthorizing the Head Start program is so important. The Utah Head Start program is a model success story with strong support by Utah citizens. S. 2565 provides a straightforward 3-year reauthorization of Head Start at an increased funding of $79 million. There are at present no statutory changes in this reauthorization bill; although the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Family and Human Services, Senator DENTON, and I are amenable to discussing amendments to further improve the Head Start program.

A hearing on our reauthorization bill has been scheduled for May 3 in the Family and Human Services Subcommittee chaired by Senator DENTON. This legislation is a credit to Senator DENTON and his very fine legislative staff. It is worthy of our support, and I encourage my colleagues to expeditiously enact the bill in order to best meet the goals and objectives of the Head Start program.●

OLDER AMERICANS ACT REHABILITATION

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senator GRASSLEY and many other of my distinguished colleagues in introducing legislation to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965 for the years 1984 through 1987. I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aging and his able staff for their dedicated efforts to draw up effective reauthorization legislation.

Since 1965, the Older Americans Act has gone through substantial changes. These changes have come about as a result of the Congress increased sensitivity to the variations in the needs of our elderly from region to region, sensitivity greatly honed by the information that the network of aging agencies has provided to us. The Older Americans Act has been gradually adapted and revised so that, over time, it has become increasingly responsive to senior citizens' needs.

This year's reauthorization legislation goes even further in responding to those needs. Among its major provisions are the following:

Includes in its statement of purpose an emphasis on the importance of development and maintenance of a continuum of care for serving the vulnerable elderly.

Requires the Commissioner on Aging to consult with the Bureau of the Census for purposes of publishing timely information on the demographics of aging and the social and economic characteristics of our aging population.

Changes the appointment procedures for members of the Federal Council on the Aging so that the President, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House each appoint a portion of the Council's members.

Includes provisions relative to age discrimination in employment.

Requires the Commissioner on Aging to coordinate with peer review organizations to strengthen policies related to community-based long term care.

Requires the publication of certain information relative to states' intrastate funding formulas.

Gives priority status for funding for supportive services for families of elderly individuals with Alzheimer's and other neurological diseases, and training for service deliverers.

Provides greater flexibility for the transfer of funds between supportive services and nutrition services (35 percent, as opposed to 20 percent under current law).

Requires improved procedures for reporting on claims for reimbursement under the USDA commodities program.

Gives priority status for Title IV grants to Long Term Care Gerontology Centers which develop models for care and assistance to victims of Alzheimer's disease, and their families.

Requires the Commissioner to make available information on grant awards made under Title IV of the Act, and to share the results of such studies.

Limits the amount of Title V monies which can be used for administration purposes.

Requires state agencies to submit to the Secretary of Labor an annual report on the distribution of Title V employment slots throughout the state.

Requires the development of programs to identify, treat, and prevent cases of elder abuse where an established need is not being met.

Mr. President, as I have said, this legislation seeks to adapt the mechanisms within the Older Americans Act to better serve our aging population, with a minimum of changes. The legislation preserves the original intent of the Congress back in 1965 to develop an effective network of nutritional and social services, employment opportunities, and a substantive information base on issues affecting the elderly of our Nation.

While the Senate and House versions of this legislation differ in several ways, I am hopeful that both Houses will move quickly on their respective packages, so that the conference committee can meet and we will see final passage in early May.

Once again, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his efforts on behalf of older Americans.●

OLDER AMERICANS ACT REORGANIZATION

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of S. 2603, legislation to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965. This law has proved most successful in assuring our senior citizens improved health, housing, employment, community service, cultural and recreational opportunities. Today the Older Americans Act supports 662 area agencies on aging, over 8,600 service providers, over 13,000 congregate nutrition sites, and over 6,000 home-delivered nutrition providers. Senior citizens also participate in 54,000 community service jobs because of this important law.

In my home State of South Dakota, 13.2 percent of the population is made up of individuals 65 years of age or older. These individuals depend on their senior citizen centers, their nutrition programs, and the employment and community service jobs provided through programs established by the Older Americans Act. These programs literally serve as a lifeline to retired South Dakotans.

The Older Americans Act programs which were once only a dream of the 89th Congress are now a key means of assisting senior citizens in carrying out independent, productive, and healthy lives. I am pleased to join as a cospon-

sor of S. 2603 and to work with the Members of the 98th Congress in continuing a tremendously successful effort.

The key change proposed by this year's bill is one of which I am most supportive. As a member of the Special Committee on Aging, I have been a leader in the fight against Alzheimer's Disease. Last year, I requested hearings on the tragedies of this disease and the research and training needed to deal with it. Two excellent hearing records on the need for increased research funding are now available to my colleagues because of that effort.

After those hearings, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Health and Human Resources Appropriations Subcommittee, urging the committee to increase funding for research. Senators HEINZ and D'AMATO cosigned that letter requesting an additional $15 million for basic research and $4 million to support five centers specializing in research on Alzheimer's disease.

As a result of that effort, the committee provided $24 million for Alzheimer's disease in fiscal year 1984. The Senate also agreed to add $3.5 million for Alzheimer's research centers. While this is far from sufficient, it is a beginning step.

Increased attention and improved research have gone forward in 1984 because this Congress and administration have given Alzheimer's disease the priority consideration it requires.

Three bills offering answers to the staggering effects of the disease are currently before the Senate. As a cosponsor of all three measures, I am most pleased that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources has included the concepts of S. 2221 in the legislation reauthorizing and extending the Older Americans Act.

Passage of S. 2603 will thus result in State area agencies on aging giving priority funding to supportive services for families of Alzheimer's patients. Support will also be given to improved training for personnel needed to care for patients suffering from this form of dementia.

This encouraging step forward has my strong support. I am honored to be a supporter of S. 2603 which extends and improves an act which is vital to our country's future.

Through the foresight of the Older Americans Act, all Americans will face their golden years with increased hope that they can live independent, productive, and healthy lives. I urge my colleagues to speedily approve this important legislation.●

BILL GIANELLI'S RETIREMENT

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, in the past 3 years, the debate over water resource development policy was given direction and guidance by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Bill Gianelli. At the end of this week, Bill returns to his California home, having served as the most accomplished Assistant Secretary in history.

Mr. President, Bill Gianelli's legacy to those of us who must continue to toil in the thorny garden of water policy is his clear vision that water resource development in the future cannot take place without changing the way in which water projects are funded and financed. Mr. President, as chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee, I have heard Bill Gianelli testify on this subject many times. I will not soon forget the warmth of his personality, the courage of his convictions, and the depth of his intelligence. Mr. President, the Congress, the American people, and this Senator are going to miss Bill Gianelli's leadership.

Mr. President, Bill Gianelli also leaves a legacy of administrative leadership over the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. In a period of severe budget and personel restraint, Bill has improved the management of the corps program in numerable ways.

He led the negotiations for an agreement with private industry establishing a reserved dredging fleet, he revitalized the corps' defense mobilization capability, he improved the response time of the corps permitting programs and he has led the corps in its mission as the Federal engineer.

I know my colleagues join me in thanking Bill Gianelli for a superb job as Assistant Secretary of the Army, in urging him to stay active in water resource development policy, and in wishing he and his wife Shirley our best wishes for their future endeavors.●

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON SMALL BUSINESS

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, small businesses provide not only the heart of our communities, but the backbone of our Nation's economy as well. Over 44 percent of the gross national product can be directly attributed to the small business community. In 1981 and 1982, it was reported that all net new jobs in this country were created by small businesses. The vital role small businesses play is often overlooked in spite of these statistics.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the resolution calling for a second White House Conference on Small Business. The first White House Conference, the authorizing legislation for which I also cosponsored, was a tremendous success, bringing together over 50,000 small business owners from each of the 50 States. The major areas of concern as outlined by the Conference participants were articulated in the form of 60 specific recommendations from which small business legislation for the past 3 years has been shaped.

As other difficulties within the small business community have arisen, it has become clear that another forum is needed for a thorough discussion of these problems, as well as an attempt to develop solutions.

I particularly want to commend the chairman and the ranking minority members of the Small Business Committee, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) and the senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) for their leadership on this issue. I am pleased that the Senate has approved the White House Conference on Small Business Authorization Act, and hope that the Conference will mean a fresh commitment to small businesses throughout the Nation.●

S. 1739, THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1983

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, recently, I joined Senators DOMENICI, EVANS, HUMPHREY, MITCHELL, and MOYNIHAN in writing to the majority leader to express support for S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act of 1983.

New authorizing legislation for water resource development programs is crucial in order for our Nation to press forward with important and long/delayed projects and to assure the future efficient management of water resources.

S. 1739 provides for a continued Federal role in water resource policy at a time when our Nation must become increasingly selective in its water development investments. The bill encourages careful water resource planning by placing a greater emphasis on the commitment of non-Federal resources in many activities.

It is imperative for the Senate to end the 8-year delay in addressing water policy issues by taking up S. 1739 as soon as possible. There is broad bypartisan support for this omnibus legislation, and I hope my colleagues will join in working for the bill's speedy approval.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of our recent letter to the majority leader be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1984.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: The Committee on Environment and Public Works has reported S. 1739, the Water Resources Development Act of 1983. The bill now awaits floor action, and we respectfully urge that you provide for early consideration of this measure.

It has been over seven years since Congress last enacted authorizing legislation for water resource development programs. This omnibus legislation was approved by the

Committee in November following an exhaustive and painstaking effort by Senator Abdnor, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, to arrive at a responsible approach to water development policy.

It would be impossible for any comprehensive water policy legislation to reconcile completely the many competing interests in this area. S. 1739 is a carefully crafted compromise. It reflects a recognition of the need for a continued federal role in water resource development and for a more narrow targetting of scarce federal dollars toward those projects for which a genuine need exists.

S. 1739 provides for the authorization of a number of important new projects and also places a greater emphasis on the commitment of non-federal resources in future activities. The bill increases non-federal cost-sharing obligations in a variety of water project categories and encourages a gradual move toward cost-recovery through charges on users of federally supported waterways.

These reforms are absolutely essential in order for our nation's efficient management of water resources to continue in the midst of pressing budgetary constraints.

We believe it would be extremely unfortunate for Congress to adjourn this year without examining water resource policy. S. 1739 offers a sound approach to water development, and we earnestly hope that this measure can be considered in the Senate at the earliest feasible time.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
GORDON J. HUMPHREY,
JOHN H. CHAFEE,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
DANIEL J. EVANS.●

LEFTY GORDON: A FRIEND OF YOUTH

● Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to your attention a man who has earned the respect and admiration of countless San Franciscans.

Leonard "Lefty" Gordon has contributed years of selfless dedication to the youth of San Francisco. Currently the executive director of the Ella Hill Hutch Community Center, Mr. Gordon has served also as the program director of Youth for Service; as senior group worker, Booker T. Washington Community Center; and as recreation director, San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department.

Additionally, Mr. Gordon dedicates countless hours as a board member of many of San Francisco's charitable youth organizations.

He has received numerous awards for his efforts, incuding: Outstanding Service Award, South Park Community; Certificate of Recognition for Dedicated Service, Booker T. Washington Community Center; Certificate of Appreciation, United Way of the Bay Area; Outstanding Service Award, San Francisco Residential Support Center; and the Leadership to Youth and Dedicated Service Award, Adult Citizens of the Western Addition Community.

It is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the achievements of this remarkable individual who has contributed so mightily to our youth. Through Mr. Gordon's hard work, we are reminded of the enormous impact one person can have on the lives of so many.●

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on tomorrow after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be recognized under a special order not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, after the execution of the special order, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 10:30 a.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 2 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, having concluded the list of routine items to be disposed of this evening, let me state the program for tomorrow. I am advised that neither the manager of the bill nor the author of the amendment wish to proceed further with debate this evening. After the statement of the program, I will ask the Senate to stand in recess until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, when the Senate completes its business today, it will stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. on tomorrow.

After the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) will be recognized on a special order of not to exceed 15 minutes.

After the execution of the special order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, to extend no later than 10:30 a.m., or sooner, if there is no requirement for morning business of that length.

At the expiration of the time for the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, at which time the Chiles amendment will be the pending question.

Mr. President, it is the hope of the leadership that we can finish this bill on tomorrow. It is anticipated that we very well may be in late tomorrow in an effort to do so. In any event, we are going to stay as long as productive work can be accomplished and as long as we can make progress toward completion.

As previously announced, there will not be a session of the Senate on Friday.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I see no other Senators seeking recognition. I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate, at 7:03 p.m., recessed until Thursday, May 3, 1984, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, May 2, 1984*

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, gracious God, to know Your blessings in all the occasions of life. Encourage us when we know success and remind us of the need to be grateful, and when we experience disappointment, support us with Your presence and may Your spirit give us strength. In all the seasons of life, whether in joy and happiness or at moments of pain and loss, may we not feel alone or without recourse, but acknowledging Your love, may we by faith go from day to day with the awareness that You are always with us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 27, answered "present" 9, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—353

Ackerman	Beilenson	Boxer
Addabbo	Bennett	Breaux
Albosta	Bereuter	Britt
Anderson	Berman	Broomfield
Andrews (TX)	Bethune	Brown (CA)
Annunzio	Bevill	Brown (CO)
Anthony	Biaggi	Broyhill
Archer	Bilirakis	Burton (CA)
Aspin	Bliley	Burton (IN)
AuCoin	Boehlert	Byron
Badham	Boggs	Campbell
Barnard	Boland	Carney
Barnes	Boner	Carper
Bartlett	Bonker	Carr
Bateman	Borski	Chandler
Bates	Bosco	Chappell
Bedell	Boucher	Cheney
Clarke	Hillis	Moody
Clinger	Holt	Moore
Coats	Hopkins	Moorhead
Coelho	Horton	Morrison (CT)
Coleman (MO)	Howard	Morrison (WA)
Coleman (TX)	Hoyer	Mrazek
Collins	Hubbard	Murtha
Conable	Huckaby	Myers
Conte	Hughes	Natcher
Conyers	Hunter	Neal
Cooper	Hutto	Nelson
Corcoran	Hyde	Nichols
Courter	Ireland	Nielson
Craig	Jeffords	Nowak
Crane, Daniel	Jenkins	O'Brien
D'Amours	Johnson	Oakar
Dannemeyer	Jones (OK)	Obey
Darden	Jones (TN)	Olin
Daschle	Kaptur	Ortiz
Daub	Kasich	Owens
Davis	Kastenmeier	Oxley
Dellums	Kemp	Packard
Derrick	Kennelly	Panetta
DeWine	Kildee	Parris
Dicks	Kleczka	Pashayan
Dingell	Kogovsek	Patman
Dixon	Kolter	Patterson
Donnelly	Kostmayer	Pease
Dorgan	Kramer	Pepper
Dowdy	LaFalce	Perkins
Downey	Lagomarsino	Petri
Dreier	Lantos	Pickle
Duncan	Latta	Porter
Dwyer	Leach	Price
Dyson	Leath	Pursell
Early	Lehman (CA)	Quillen
Eckart	Lent	Rahall
Edgar	Levin	Rangel
Edwards (AL)	Levine	Ratchford
Edwards (CA)	Levitas	Ray
Edwards (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Regula
English	Lipinski	Reid
Erdreich	Lloyd	Ridge
Erlenborn	Loeffler	Rinaldo
Evans (IL)	Long (LA)	Ritter
Fazio	Long (MD)	Robinson
Feighan	Lowery (CA)	Rodino
Ferraro	Lujan	Roe
Fiedler	Luken	Rogers
Fields	Lundine	Rose
Fish	Lungren	Rostenkowski
Flippo	Mack	Roth
Foglietta	MacKay	Roukema
Foley	Madigan	Rowland
Ford (TN)	Marlenee	Roybal
Fowler	Marriott	Rudd
Frank	Martin (IL)	Russo
Franklin	Martin (NC)	Savage
Fuqua	Martin (NY)	Sawyer
Gaydos	Martinez	Schaefer
Gekas	Matsui	Scheuer
Gephardt	Mavroules	Schumer
Gilman	Mazzoli	Seiberling
Gingrich	McCain	Sensenbrenner
Glickman	McCandless	Sharp
Gonzalez	McCloskey	Shaw
Gore	McCollum	Shelby
Gradison	McCurdy	Shumway
Gray	McDade	Shuster
Green	McEwen	Siljander
Gregg	McGrath	Simon
Guarini	McHugh	Sisisky
Gunderson	McKernan	Skeen
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Skelton
Hall, Ralph	McNulty	Slattery
Hall, Sam	Mica	Smith (IA)
Hamilton	Michel	Smith (NE)
Hammerschmidt	Mikulski	Smith (NJ)
Hansen (UT)	Miller (CA)	Smith, Denny
Harrison	Mineta	Snowe
Hatcher	Minish	Snyder
Hayes	Moakley	Solarz
Hefner	Molinari	Spence
Hertel	Mollohan	Spratt
Hightower	Montgomery	Staggers
Stangeland	Torres	Whittaker
Stark	Torricelli	Whitten
Stenholm	Towns	Williams (OH)
Stokes	Traxler	Winn
Stratton	Udall	Wirth
Studds	Vander Jagt	Wise
Stump	Vento	Wolf
Sundquist	Volkmer	Wolpe
Swift	Vucanovich	Wortley
Synar	Watkins	Wyden
Tallon	Weaver	Wylie
Tauke	Weber	Yatron
Tauzin	Weiss	Young (FL)
Taylor	Wheat	Young (MO)
Thomas (CA)	Whitehurst	Zschau
Thomas (GA)	Whitley	

NAYS—27

Chappie	Harkin	Roberts
Coughlin	Hartnett	Roemer
Crane, Philip	Hawkins	Sabo
Dickinson	Jacobs	Schroeder
Durbin	Lowry (WA)	Sikorski
Emerson	Miller (OH)	Solomon
Evans (IA)	Mitchell	Walker
Frenzel	Murphy	Yates
Gejdenson	Penny	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9

Alexander	Oberstar	Smith (FL)
Daniel	Ottinger	St Germain
Dymally	Schneider	Vandergriff

NOT VOTING—44

Akaka	Gibbons	Lott
Andrews (NC)	Goodling	Markey
Applegate	Gramm	Paul
Bonior	Hall (IN)	Pritchard
Brooks	Hance	Richardson
Bryant	Hansen (ID)	Schulze
Clay	Heftel	Shannon
Coyne	Hiler	Smith, Robert
Crockett	Jones (NC)	Valentine
de la Garza	Kazen	Walgren
Fascell	Kindness	Waxman
Florio	Lehman (FL)	Williams (MT)
Ford (MI)	Leland	Wilson
Frost	Lewis (FL)	Wright
Garcia	Livingston	

□ 1510

Mr. OBERSTAR changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2733. An act to extend and improve the existing program of research, development, and demonstration in the production and manufacture of guayule rubber, and to broaden such program to include other critical agricultural materials; and

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in

which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1135. An act to consent to the Goose Lake Basin Compact between the States of California and Oregon;

S. 1196. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Claims Court with respect to certain claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe;

S. 2184. An act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to impose certain limitations with respect to the administration of such act and to authorize appropriations under such act for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the last week in June 1984 as "Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Week."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of sections 276h-276k, as amended, appoints Mrs. HAWKINS as a member of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group during the 2d session of the 98th Congress, to be held in Washington, D.C., on May 17-20, 1984.

PERMITTING 1984 OLYMPIC TORCH RELAY TO BE RUN THROUGH U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 295) to permit the 1984 Olympic torch relay to be run through the U.S. Capitol Grounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of California). The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 295

That, on May 14, 1984, or on such other day as the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives may jointly authorize, the 1984 Olympic Torch Relay may be run through the United States Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Olympic Torch from Olympia, Greece, to the XXIII Olympic Games in Los Angeles, California.

SEC. 2. The Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the first section of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this summer the United States is once again privileged to host the summer Olympic games.

In keeping with the tradition of the modern Olympics, a torch lighted in Olympia, Greece, will be carried in a relay to the site of the 23d Olympic games in Los Angeles.

That relay will carry the Olympic flame through Washington, DC, on May 14.

This presents an appropriate occasion for the Congress, on behalf of the American people, to welcome the summer games to our country.

The resolution before us permits the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to permit the torch relay to cross the Capitol Grounds.

Section 193 of the United States Code title 40, prohibits the transportation of firearms, dangerous weapons, explosives, and incendiary devices through the Capitol Grounds.

Clearly the Olympic torch is not the kind of incendiary device that Congress meant to prohibit. The law does allow this provision to be suspended for appropriate occasions by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, and I hope it is the desire of the House to suspend the provision in this case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1520

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY, AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit on Thursday, May 3, 1984, should the House be reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule at the time.

I am advised that this request has been cleared through the minority, and that there is no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GREED, FAIRNESS, AND SELF-RESTRAINT

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, in 1983 Bill Anderson received $13.3 million in compensation; Phil Caldwell, $7.3 million; Dave Tendler, almost $7 million; Tom Murphy, over $6 million; Dan Burke, Bill Cook, and Ed Telling over $4 million each.

The names of these seven corporate executives are not exactly household words, yet the $46 million in compensation these seven men received last year is more than the total combined salaries of our President, Vice President, the 13 members of the President's Cabinet, the nine Justices of the Supreme Court, all 100 Members of the U.S. Senate, and all 435 members of the House of Representatives. It is also more than the combined salaries of over 3,000 average Americans.

Mr. Speaker, if top corporate executives cannot control their greed, how dare they expect the average American to heed their hypocritical calls for self-restraint and moderation?

INTEREST RATES BEGINNING TO CLIMB AGAIN

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, interest rates are beginning to climb again, and while the President may feel that the budget deficit is large enough to take care of itself, the Federal deficit may soon be big enough to do us all in. But two additional factors which help shore up high interest rates have been identified. They are: America's low saving rate and the high cost of money to American banking institutions. It should be no wonder that interest rates are in the midteens when the cost of money to American banks and savings and loan and credit unions now approximates 10 percent, as American savers have generally abandoned passbook savings for high yield certificates.

It is time, indeed, for a new idea. This month I and the other Members will be offering a bill which aims at producing more private savings, lower cost of money to American lending institutions, and lower interest rates for our country. It is a plan to give American savers a break and American borrowers a fair interest rate. In the days ahead I will have a lot more to say about it. Tune in tomorrow and feel free to contact my office for additional information.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4103

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 4103.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BULLETPROOF VESTS SAVE POLICE LIVES

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Justice Department reports that "an estimated 400 police lives" have been saved by bulletproof vests since 1975. William Johnson, an Alexandria, VA, deputy sheriff is one of those fortunate 400.

Deputy Johnson's close brush with death occurred on September 27, 1982, and the Washington Post described the incident this way:

> William Johnson struggled for the .357 magnum revolver held only inches from his chest. He watched the gun as it fired seconds later. He saw his shirt tear as the bullet struck. He felt its crushing force. And because the 62-year-old Alexandria deputy sheriff was wearing a bulletproof vest, he was alive yesterday to help convict the man accused of trying to kill him.

Like Deputy Johnson, more and more police officers are becoming convinced that bulletproof vests are worth wearing. They know the vests are confortable—weighing only about 3 pounds—and they know the vests will stop most handgun bullets used by criminals.

Yet, the police community also knows that bulletproof vests are totally useless against armor-piercing "cop killer" bullets that are legally available at gun shops across the country. That is why the police community is lobbying hard for a Federal ban against those high-powered projectiles. My bill, H.R. 953, seeks to enact such a ban. This legislation deserves prompt and favorable action.

AMERICA STANDS UNITED

(Mr. TORRICELLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, during these last months I have risen in the well to speak of the uses of military power. On each occasion, I have tried to cite where I have found inappropriate use. Today I rise to speak of the essence of a new challenge to America. It is a challenge not to our Army; it is a challenge instead to civilization itself. The challenge is terrorism, and the weapons range from the cowardice of assassination to the possible future uses of nuclear weapons.

I have tried to use this floor in the past to send a message to the President; today I rise to send a different message. The message is that a free people need not wait to be struck. A free people need not wait for terrorism to act; a free people can go to the source of terrorism itself.

Let the Israeli raid on Baghdad serve as a guide. We will act prudently, we will act properly, we will act responsibly. But we will, as a nation, act. Let those who host terrorism know that America stands united.

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE THUNDERBIRDS

(Mr. REID asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, in 1983 more than 16 million onlookers experienced the thrill of the precision aerobatics of the U.S. Air Force Thunderbirds.

That sense of excitement and exhilaration was nothing new for audiences. Since 1953 more than 170 million people in 46 countries have enjoyed this air team's precision performances.

The Thunderbirds, stationed at Nevada's Nellis Air Force Base, are the unofficial honor society of the Air Force.

Working on a 2-year rotation, 115 volunteers maintain and pilot the team's aircraft. The standards are high. Pilots, for example, must have at least 1,000 hours of flying time and no more than 10 years in commissioned service.

As far as equipment, the F-16 can fly at more than twice the speed of sound, has a 650-mile-per-hour cruising speed, and can climb at 30,000 feet per minute.

Because of these continuing top performances from man and machine, I am proud to salute the Thunderbirds on behalf of Nevada and the Nation.

□ 1530

GALLIPOLIS CAN'T WAIT

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, economic tragedy has struck again on the Ohio River. This week a 15-barge unit trying to negotiate the tricky turn through the antiquated Gallipolis locks crashed into a partially opened lock gate. The structural damage will close the lock for 4 weeks.

This is only the latest in a long series of accidents in and around Gallipolis. The latest closure was from April 2 until April 26, with a total repair cost of $2.4 million. As you know, the authorization to rebuild Gallipolis has been reported by all committees and awaits floor action. I urge the leadership to bring this vital legislation to the floor immediately.

Built in 1937, the locks cannot accommodate modern barge traffic, and have become the worst bottleneck in our inland waterway system. Products from 19 different States move through Gallipolis. Congestion delays at Gallipolis are prolonged and mounting. It is conservatively estimated that in 1990, with a 60-percent increase in traffic expected, a resultant 32-hour delay per lock, per barge is anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait. The Ohio River is losing millions of dollars in business. The time to move is now let us fix Gallipolis this month. Let us rebuild it next year.

PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY HOMELESS

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the Select Committee on Aging held hearings today dramatizing the terrible plight of elderly people who are homeless. Ironic because these hearings were held against the backdrop of a HUD study which minimizes the total homeless problem almost to the point of extinction.

One wonders if HUD continues to study the homeless, maybe it can eliminate them altogether by simply studying them to death.

Perhaps this is what we should expect from Ronald Reagan's HUD, after the chief Executive's heartless statement that people are homeless "by choice." What a tragic interpretation of the homeless problem in this Nation by President Reagan.

I have actively worked on this issue for 3 years. At my urging, and with bipartisan support, the House has passed measures providing $140 million in emergency assistance to assist the homeless. The Congress last year finally enacted into law a $60 million authorization in homeless shelter assistance and I know that the House Appropriations Committee intends to try to add money for the homeless again this year. Hopefully we can force it through the Senate. But the Reagan administration still reflects total indifference, not requesting initially or even at this late date a dime for homeless emergency assistance or shelters.

The record of committees of the Congress are replete with the staggering dimensions and growth of the homeless problem by some of the most qualified social scientists and professionals. But the Reagan administration seems to have a penchant for not letting the facts get in the way of its ideology—whether the subject is the homeless, the hungry, or the unemployed.

Nevertheless, if the Reagan administration believes its own propaganda on these numbers: Where is the program? Where is the housing? Where is the humanity? Based on the good work of the past administration and Congress, some public and assisted housing has

been available in the pipeline, but the legacy of the Reagan administration will be less than 100,000 public and assisted starts a year. And yet Reagan's HUD defines in a single instance 350,000 people who are homeless. The challenge is yet to meet even this limited number, much less reality.

THE MARIE ANTOINETTE "LET THEM EAT CAKE" AWARD

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous winner of this year's Marie Antoinette Let Them Eat Cake Award is the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which yesterday announced a study showing that there are only 250,000 to 350,000 homeless people in America, almost 80 percent below previous estimates. In fact, the administration's own estimate was 2 million as recently as last November, when HHS Secretary Heckler announced a Federal food and shelter campaign. Has the campaign been enormously successful? Has economic recovery finally trickled down to those most in need of help?

Guess again. Instead, the Reagan administration which has steadfastly opposed any Federal legislation to help the homeless, it has discovered a more innovative way to solve a problem: define it out of existence. The way it works is simple: When you want to emphasize your compassion for the needy, exaggerate the size of the problem. Then, when the PR benefits of your announcement have died down, and when you want to make it seem like there's really nothing to worry about, wait a few months and reduce your estimate of the problem.

Who are these 350,000, the ones who could not even find room on a subway grate? Mr. Speaker, we should not be fooled by this numbers game. The main point is that whether there are 2 million or 250,000 homeless, or even if there are only 10,000, this administration just has no interest in doing anything about the problem. Mr. President, stop redefining the problem, do something about it.

TRADE RESTRICTIONS ON CORN GLUTEN AND SOYBEANS

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have submitted a House resolution which calls on the President to firmly oppose any trade restrictions which will injure the U.S. corn gluten and soybean industries. If unilateral action is taken by the European Economic Community to inhibit the importation of corn gluten feed or vegetable fats and oils, the resolution calls on the President to restrict European Community imports of at least the aggregate value of the reduced and potentially reduced U.S. export products.

I introduced this resolution to counter European Community proposals to impose a consumption tax on vegetable fats and oils and a recent request by the EC Council of Ministers to enter into formal negotiations with the United States with the intention of changing the duty-free status of corn gluten.

Corn gluten is a nongrain feed ingredient popular in Europe as well as the United States; 3.6 million metric tons, valuing $562 million, were exported to Europe last year. Currently, while grains imported to the European Community are subject to tariffs, imported corn gluten, which does not compete directly with European agricultural products, is subject to no duty.

Despite claims to the contrary, it is not the duty-free binding on corn gluten feed which causes livestock producers to choose this feed stuff over European produced grains. Rather, it is the artificially high EC support prices which have made the European grain products noncompetitive within Europe. Another reason corn gluten feed is chosen for animal feeds is that it provides a better protein base which grain cannot provide.

To a large degree, the United States has been willing to sacrifice its own economic interests for the sake of desirable stabilization of the Western World. But, the European Community is now a large and growing agricultural exporter which threatens to impose new restrictions on its imports from the United States. It is time to insist that the Community act responsibly in trade and not transfer its internal agricultural policy burdens to our country. The crux of the matter is that the EC must find domestic solutions to the simultaneous farm-income and public-budget problems it faces.

By asking the President to continue to reject attempts by the European Economic Community to impose quantitative or tariff restrictions on corn gluten imports, we are drawing a line. We cannot afford to take any steps backward in our trade negotiations with Europe. It is time to insist on fair trade agreements, and the resolution I introduce today attempts to take an important step in that direction.

PROTECTIONIST POLICY ON JAPANESE AUTO IMPORTS

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Bill Brock's announcement that import quotas on Japanese cars will not be renewed next year is just wrong. It proves that the administration's shell game on trade policy is a sham. If the Brock policy becomes effective—an unlikely possibility—it will cause massive amounts of unnecessary pain.

The illogic of this policy is monumental. Just because greedy auto executives are getting big bonuses, he is ready to jeopardize the jobs of thousands of auto workers. They were not the ones who decided to give the executives the bonuses.

What we need is a trade policy that will make America more competitive. Import restrictions should be temporary and predicated on specific commitments from American industry to modernize and adjust behavior to become competitive. That was not done 3 years ago, yet, the domestic auto industry has made a lot of progress in the past few years, but it still has a long way to go.

The administration strategy of coupling a rhetorical free trade policy with a real protectionist policy has yielded only confusion. Our trading partners do not know what we really want. Domestic industry does not either. This new irrational move will yield an irrational result and make things worse.

If Ambassador Brock is serious about this issue, we should all—Government, industry, and labor—get together and start some serious negotiations about the future of the American auto industry. Press threats are not an adequate substitute for creditable policies.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 38, LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 38) entitled the "Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act," with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, CLAY, MILLER of California, KILDEE, MARTINEZ, OWENS, and HARRISON, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Messrs. ERLENBORN, PETRI, PACKARD, and MCCAIN.

There was no objection.

GREEN INTRODUCES BILL TO ELIMINATE SEX DISCRIMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES CODE

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, together with my colleague from New York (Mr. FISH) I am today reintroducing a bill which will revise or eliminate over 150 gender discrimination provisions of the United States Code. A companion bill was introduced in, and was unanimously passed by the other body on April 26.

I have had major concerns about the ramifications of the gender discrimination provisions within our laws for a long period. As many of you are aware, I introduced a bill addressing these concerns during the lameduck session of the 97th Congress, and reintroduced it on February 17, 1983, as H.R. 1527. I am pleased to report that today's bill incorporates all of the provisions of H.R. 1527 and, further, addresses approximately 50 additional references subsequently identified as discriminatory by the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. A large portion of the laws being amended involve the extension of family benefits in recognition that sex distinctions are obsolete, since women can be the primary wage earners and are no longer barred from entering certain career fields. In addition, inequities related to educational, training, and employment opportunities are covered, and unfair preferences to male family members and sex-based distinctions in definitions of criminal sexual activity are eliminated.

It is important to note, however, that this bill does not address every gender-based statute and purposely does not include sex references of a very controversial or highly technical nature. For example, the Selective Service and combat limitations found in title 10 and various statutes that require affirmative action on behalf of women are not addressed. These difficult issues need careful consideration and are more appropriately the subject of separate study and further action.

Although I sincerely believe that passage of this bill is extremely important and an essential step in insuring the equal treatment of women under the law, I do not feel that enactment will solve all the inequities women have faced in the past and continue to face each day. Additional legislative actions and attitudinal changes will be necessary to insure equality, and I intend to continue my strong support of women's rights, including advocacy of the ERA.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation attracted 81 bipartisan cosponsors when introduced last year and was passed by unanimous consent in the other body. This legislation transcends partisan politics, and I am confident that my House colleagues will agree that gender discriminatory laws can no longer be ignored, and join me in cosponsoring this important effort to eliminate unfair, unnecessary, and outdated sex distinctions in the United States Code.

REFORM THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE

(Mr. McCANDLESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remark.)

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, it is time to do something about the irrational application of the fourth amendment prohibition against unreasonable search and seizure. In a recent case in my district in southern California, the police, armed with a search warrant, seized 5 pounds of cocaine. Was there a trial and conviction? No. Because of a minor technical defect in the warrant itself, all charges were subsequently dismissed.

This common misuse of the intent of the fourth amendment destroys the confidence of our constituents in the criminal justice system. The Senate has already done its job, and passed legislation to reform the system, and the time has come for House consideration, instead of keeping this important bill bottled up in committee.

LYCOMING COUNTY, PA, RESIDENTS ONCE AGAIN DECLARED "NATIONAL CHAMPIONS IN ANTILITTER"

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, last year at just about this time 20,000 people of Lycoming County, PA, in my district, conducted a week-long antilitter campaign which resulted in tons and tons of debris and litter being removed from the roadsides of that county. I took the floor then to declare those people the "National Champions in Antilitter" and to this moment that declaration on my part has remained uncontradicted, unchallenged, and undenied.

I am here this year to do the same, only with new statistics even more remarkable, because 25,000 people this time participated, covering 1,100 miles of State and local roads, and 107 tons of litter were collected, 1,600,000 cans were collected from the homes of residents for recycling, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my challenge and hope that we can engage in a contest with the remainder of the number of Members in the House of Representatives to see if we can clean up America in this fashion.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 22D MARINE AMPHIBIOUS UNIT FOR THEIR SERVICE IN GRENADA AND LEBANON

(Mr. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, they are home. After 7 months of duty in Grenada and Lebanon, the 22d Marine Amphibious Unit has returned to the United States.

The men of the 22d Marine Amphibious Unit—the most experienced combat unit since Vietnam—were reunited with family and friends yesterday after serving their Nation with honor, dignity, and pride.

This is the unit which was one of the first to land on Grenada and helped free a country from the grips of communism. This is the unit which was then immediately sent on to Lebanon to serve the cause of the peace, and this is a unit which deserves the thanks of this Congress and the people of the country.

Just before we went on the Easter break, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 289 which calls on President Reagan to present the 22 MAU a Presidential unit citation for their heroic and unselfish duty in combat.

This is an opportunity for Congress to show appreciation for the efforts of those who serve in the Armed Forces. This is a small thing to ask for Americans who put their life on the line in defense of freedom and the ideals for which our Nation stands for.

PAC CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE MONDALE CAMPAIGN

(Mr. THOMAS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1983, Walter Mondale announced he was a candidate for President of the United States. In his speech he said, "Where I grew up, we believed in some old American values * * *." He went on to say in his announcement speech, "My campaign will accept no contributions from political action committees. And I will work to slap controls on PAC's, clamp ceilings on campaign spending, close the independent committee loopholes * * *."

Candidate Walter Mondale, when faced with a possibility worse than death—defeat—lost sight of his values, turned his back on his promises, and held his hand out to labor political action committees. Apparently one of those values he learned so well was

that the end justifies the means. That is, the law is meaningful only if you feel comfortable with the delegate count.

All you Mondale supporters gather over there under the banner that reads: "Let's put a hypocrite in the White House."

CANDIDATE MONDALE RETURNS PAC CONTRIBUTIONS BUT KEEPS THE DELEGATES

(Mr. FRENZEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this year's Democratic Presidential campaign has exploded the myth of expenditure limits under taxpayer financing of elections.

Committees supporting former Vice President Mondale raked in contributions from political action committees which allowed his campaign to exceed the expenditure limitations, and apparently allowed friendly labor PAC's to avoid contribution limits as well. Most of all they allowed Mondale to stop the Hart surge, while at the same time posing as a pure PAC-free candidate.

With his hand in the cookie jar, his foot in his mouth, and GARY HART at his throat, Mondale finally recanted. He ordered committees previously described as "autonomous" to return PAC contributions. But they did not give the delegates back. They cannot return momentum. And they cannot scrub off the taint, nor banish the odor.

Supporters of taxpayer financing laws ought to thank the former Vice President for showing them the error of their ways. It took one of their own to demonstrate how easily their favorite law could be subverted.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOE BURCH, A CAPITOL HILL EMPLOYEE

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, Joe Burch, a Capitol Hill employee, passed away. He was one of those unsung Federal employees who faithfully, courageously, and patriotically performed his duties without publicity or acclaim.

I knew Joe Burch for the entire 19 years he worked on the Hill. He was a friendly, nice, highly respected man, who, for the most part, was stationed in the basement garage of the Rayburn Building at the South Capitol Street entrance.

Over the years, Joe was the first person I would see as I would drive in to park in the Rayburn garage. He was always congenial and courteous, but more than that, he was a good friend.

In recent years, because of his illness, I would miss him when he was not at his usual place. Each time, he would return. Earlier this year, he was not at his usual post and then after an illness for several weeks, he passed away. Much is written about Federal employees, Members of Congress, and the Federal bureaucracy and most of it is not complimentary. The vast majority of Federal employees are hard working, faithful, and feel they have an important job to perform, which they do. Joe Burch was one of those and he will truly be missed not only by me but by other Members of Congress and employees on the Hill. To his wife, Patricia, and family, Nancy and I extend our deepest sympathy. Also, our pride in the job well done by Joe Burch.

□ 1550

IF YOU CAN'T BEAT THEM, JOIN THEM UP

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have expressed my dismay at the Democratic leadership's seeming lack of interest in dealing with criminal reform issues this year. Well, I was, at least in part, wrong.

Indeed, the Monday, April 30 edition of the Washington Times reports that a group of Democrats, under the banner of "The Committee to Abolish Prison Slavery", are working with civil liberties groups and convicts in nearly a dozen States to persuade eligible prisoners to register to vote. According to the sponsors, these incarcerated citizens are natural candidates for registration in the Democratic Party.

Now, I am assuming that this must be part of a Democratic plan to get tough on crime. First, register the prisoners and then subject them to a tirade of candidate speeches. But while this will certainly serve as a deterrent to those unwary individuals now contemplating a life of crime, will not it be considered cruel and unusual punishment for those already in prison?

Mr. Speaker, maybe we should, instead, be offering these Democrats an award for their efforts to promote participatory Democracy. The Committee to Abolish Prison Slavery has stated that its long-term goal is to amend certain 13th amendment restrictions on prisoners, and extend voting rights to all robbers, rapists, and highwaymen. In 1986, we may even see a host of new candidates on the Democratic ticket campaigning before jail cells.

Whatever the reason behind this effort one thing is for certain: If you cannot stop crime you can at least register the criminals.

THE HOUSE HAS IGNORED PRESIDENT'S COMPREHENSIVE CRIME CONTROL ACT

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, each of us has been victimized by the bombing of this beautiful building in which we have the privilege to serve. Yet this body has in the most deplorable, casual fashion simply ignored the President's Comprehensive Crime Control Act. S. 1762 is designed to protect all Americans by updating our criminal law.

The most important measures in S. 1762 improve the efficiency of existing resources. For example, bail reform, sentencing reform, and forfeiture reform improve the existing procedures now in place. The current processes in these areas are in shambles and negatively impact on the entire criminal justice system:

What good are 1,000 police when a person arrested is immediately released to the streets and commits additional crimes?

What good are stiff sentences enacted by this Congress if criminals are soon released on probation or parole?

What good is the forfeiture of drug trafficking assets when they are vandalized or fall apart during the many years this process takes?

This budget conscious body should be favorably disposed toward any effort to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of existing resources. The President's Comprehensive Crime Control Act is just such a bill and we should be allowed to seriously consider it now.

INACTION OF CONGRESS ON NATIONAL CRIME PROBLEM

(Mr. SHUMWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, many people believe the inaction of this Congress is in and of itself a crime.

Unfortunately, inaction is not a part of our voting record. I cannot comprehend a constituency that would prefer that Congress ignore the national problem of crime. Yet, that is exactly the current course of action for this body.

Ten months ago the Judiciary Committee passed insanity defense reform. Why has this important bill not been brought to the floor in over 10 months? The Senate passed a compromise child pornography bill 3 weeks ago. Why has the House, which passed

its version by a vote of 400 to 1, refused to act on the completely negotiated child pornography reform compromise?

I sincerely wish that our voting record included those bills avoided as well as those bills voted. S. 1762 is before this Congress today. To ignore this measure is simply to stick our heads in the sand while our constituents are victimized.

THE FAMILY FARM MUST BE PRESERVED

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the family farm must be preserved. The family farm is just another one of our American institutions that is under attack.

In the State of Wisconsin, we had a total of 195,000 farms in 1954. Today, we have 95,000 farms. That is a loss of more than half of our farms in only 30 years. Other States are experiencing a similar frightening trend.

The best friend the American consumer has is the American farmer. In America we spend only 18 cents out of every earned dollar on food. That makes food the consumers best bargain. We are the best fed and best clothed Nation in the world because our farmers are so productive. The productivity of the American farmer is the envy of the world.

The family farm is a unique American institution, a unique American blessing; however, this institution is being hard pressed by the corporate milk factories. Many of these corporate milk factories, I suspect and fear, are producing largely for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

To save our family farmer, this Congress must address two issues of vital importance: First, we must continue the dairy diversion program; and second, tap the amount that dairy processors can sell to the CCC.

GLACIER-LIKE SPEED OF DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP ON PRESIDENT'S COMPREHENSIVE CRIME CONTROL ACT

(Mr. WEBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1984, the President's Comprehensive Crime Control Act was introduced in this and the other body. Yet it was not until almost one full year later on March 7, 1984, that the President's bill was even referred to the relevant subcommittees for consideration. Such glacier-like speed captures the level of commitment that the Democratic leadership of this body has displayed with respect to the need for reform of our criminal laws.

The inaction of this Chamber on crime legislation evidently reflects the low priority attached to the crime issue by those who control the agenda of this place. Not only have we not had the opportunity to debate the President's comprehensive crime control bill, but the leadership has not brought the insanity defense bill that passed the Judiciary Committee on November 11 of last year to the floor for a vote either. It is almost 2 months since the Judiciary Committee reported drug forfeiture legislation. Similarly, we have yet to be given the opportunity to vote on the child pornography compromise that recently passed the other body on March 30.

There is thus an unfortunate pattern and practice of foot dragging on criminal justice reform that is in a metalphorical sense a crime in and of itself. The American people have elected us to display leadership in the formulation of public policy. Comments to the effect that this body will not act on important crime control measures because they are too controversial bring into question the capacity of the Democratic leadership to fulfill that responsiblity to lead.

It is time for this body to show the people of this country that it cares about the problem of crime.

ACID RAIN

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who want to get on the comprehensive Federal program to combat acid rain are often given two arguments by the people who say, "Hey, fellows, go slow."

First, we are told that we need more research. We do not know enough about the problem.

Then second, we are told it is a regional problem, not a national problem. They say, "You guys in New York and New England, you better get on with the solution. Do not come to us in Washington."

Well, Mr. Speaker, acid rain was not created in Heaven by divine providence. It has been manufactured here on Earth by we mortals. We have got all the scientific information we need to document the cause. Now we have to get on with the solution.

I would suggest that it is truly a national problem, and that has been confirmed by the National Wildlife Federation, which has just issued a very comprehensive report, entitled "Acid Rain" that documents that it is national in scope; California, Colorado, Florida, New York, from coast to coast, acid rain is a serious national problem. Let us get on with the solution.

OTTERBEIN COLLEGE'S DR. HAROLD HANCOCK RETIRES AFTER 40 YEARS

(Mr. WYLIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that a person cannot graduate from Otterbein College until taking a class from Dr. Harold Hancock.

Dr. Hancock, who has taught history at Otterbein for more than 40 years, is retiring this June. By his estimate, he has taught more than 10,000 students during that time—and gets to know every one of them personally, no matter if the class is small or large.

Anyone who has had him for a professor knows it is not an exaggeration to say he is a "combination of a ham, a preacher, actor, and humorist." Students don't suffer" through his history classes; he makes history interesting by his entertaining teaching methods.

Hancock, a native of Delaware, came to Otterbein in 1944. An authority on Delaware history, he has written 17 books and more than 50 articles, and has written extensively about the history of Westerville, OH, and Otterbein. Chairman of the department of history and political science since 1953, he has also received numerous awards for his work.

As an Otterbein alumnus, I am proud of Dr. Hancock's accomplishments in our college community. He has been a leader in college government, active in the Westerville Historical Society, and is presently working to restore the Philomathean—literary society—room in Towers Hall, the oldest building on campus. His dedication to his students, the college, and Westerville is indeed commendable.

Thomas J. Kerr IV, the president of Otterbein College, and the city of Westerville proclaimed Sunday, April 1, as "Harold Bell Hancock Day." The Otterbein Woman's Club honored the always jovial professor with a "roast," the first man ever honored by this organization.

Last year, I was honored at Otterbein's commencement with an honorary doctorate of laws degree. This year, Dr. Hancock will be the commencement speaker, and will be bestowed with an honorary degree.

I wish Dr. Hancock well in his retirement, although everyone back home knows he will not be slowing down one bit. He will still be the same history sleuth, digging for more information about Ohio and Delaware.

□ 1600

ATTEMPT TO OBTAIN CONSIDERATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER, BALANCED BUDGET, AND LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. GREGG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would hope to offer unanimous-consent requests calling for consideration of amendments to permit voluntary school prayer, balanced budget, and line-item veto.

The Chair has ruled that in order to make these requests I must have the clearance of the majority and minority leaderships.

This request has been cleared by the minority leadership.

I would now yield to a spokesman from the majority leadership for appropriate clearance.

Mr. Speaker, I hear no response. That should make it clear to the American people who stand in the way of these three important issues—the Democratic leadership in this House.

DELAYS IN CONSIDERATION OF ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans think that crime is so out of hand in this country that it is time to put handcuffs on the criminals and get them behind bars for a good, long time. Most Americans think that way.

Not so the House Judiciary Committee. While they hold the President's anticrime package hostage in that committee they vote instead to handcuff one of the country's most effective crimefighting organizations: the FBI. That is right, the same committee that cannot find time to get an anticrime bill to the floor has time to undercut the FBI's capacity to go after official corruption.

We have heard the protests in this Chamber in recent days that it is unfair to brand the Democrats as soft on crime but how else does one explain the actions of the majority leadership of the committee in charge? Let us get tough on crime, not tough on the crimefighters.

10-PERCENT FLAT TAX RATE

(Mr. SILJANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, an amazing thing happened in Massachusetts. They offered amnesty to all those in the underground economy who did not pay taxes in their State. They estimated a $7 million windfall profit from this endeavor. Only 6 months after the project was implemented nearly 10 times that amount has come in.

That is why I introduced in House Resolution 5432, the countdown tax reform, a 10-percent simple, flat rate income tax, a national amnesty. The IRS estimates this measure could bring in almost $100 billion a year. What an incentive a 10-percent simple, flat rate income tax would have to those driven underground by facing a 40- or 50-percent tax rate.

I urge the membership to cosign and urge adoption of House Resolution 5432, the simple and fair flat rate income tax with a amnesty provision.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF CRIME LEGISLATION

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party managed to get a 3 for 1 yesterday. In 1 day one of its subcommittees managed to state that the FBI should not go after corrupt Congressmen unless they first get the court's approval, thus weakening the FBI's ability. They decided not to go to conference with the other body on stopping communism in Central America, and they voted as a majority against trying to stop Soviet slave labor from exporting goods to the United States.

To have in 1 day been against crime, against stopping communism and forced slave labor is a remarkable achievement, even for the Democratic leadership of this House.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GINGRICH (when the Committee on the Judiciary was called). Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I spoke when the Clerk mentioned the Judiciary Committee. I want to ask the Speaker if he could advise me, is it true as the parliamentary situation where if the chairman of the Judiciary Committee wanted to, he could bring up any bill which had been reported out of the committee for the requisite amount of time such as the insanity defense if he wanted to bring it up at this point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GINGRICH. So it is correct—I just want to make sure I understand—that if the chairman of the Judiciary Committee wanted to bring up those anticrime bills that have been reported out of the committee this would be the appropriate point to do that, without having to go to the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, if the bills have been reported.

The Clerk will continue the call of the committees.

The Clerk concluded the call of the committees.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT MANAGERS ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 492, URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1984

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONTE moves that the managers on the part of the House be instructed to meet with the managers on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 492.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and pending that, I yield 30 minutes to my chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered a motion which is of the highest privilege under clause B of rule XXVIII.

I have sent for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to be here and I expect him to be here momentarily. We were in a meeting in the Speaker's office across the hall.

I now give notice that whenever I yield during consideration of this motion, I yield for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered a motion which so far as I know is unique in the history of the House of Representatives; namely, to instruct conferees simply to go to conference.

Under clause B of rule 28 of the House, after conferees have been appointed for 20 calandar days, and have failed to make a report, it is highly privileged to move to instruct conferees, or to discharge and appoint new conferees.

This clause of rule 28 was intended to be used to break a deadlock between House and the Senate conferees.

The current situation, and the motion, are unique because we do not have a deadlock. We have not even had a conference.

On March 6, the House passed House Joint Resolution 492, which appropriated $150 million for food assistance for Africa through title II of Public Law 480, and made available another $90 million in commodities from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for barter or sale on a competitive bid basis.

□ 1610

On April 5, the Senate passed that bill with 36 amendments, appointed conferees, and requested a conference with the House.

On April 11, I asked my chairman, in a letter and in a statement on the floor, to appoint conferees and to go to conference with the Senate before the Easter recess. Later that day we did appoint conferees, 6 days after the Senate had passed the bill.

Three weeks later we have not gone to conference.

This morning, during a meeting of the committee, I asked the chairman to explain why we have not gone to conference with the Senate. His answer did not make sense to me.

The Senate has added 36 amendments to the bill, many of them are special-interest provisions that do not belong in a supplemental. But I said this morning and I say now, what is new?

On July 13, 1983, we went to conference on H.R. 3069, supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1983 with 254 amendments.

On November 4, 1983, we went to conference on H.R. 3959, supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1984 with 67 amendments.

On November 11, 1983, we went to conference on House Joint Resolution 413, further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1984 with 47 amendments.

On June 9, 1982, we went to conference on H.R. 5922, the urgent supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1982 with 65 amendments.

On August 12, 1982, we went to conference on H.R. 6863, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1982 with 183 amendments.

On September 30, 1982, we went to conference on House Joint Resolution 599, continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1983 with 100 amendments.

On December 19, 1982, we went to conference on House Joint Resolution 631, further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1983 with 132 amendments.

On May 28, 1981, we went to conference on H.R. 3512, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1981 with 432 amendments.

On July 1, 1980, we went to conference on H.R. 7542, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1980 rescinding certain budget authority with 344 amendments.

On December 12, 1980, we went to conference on House Joint Resolution 637, continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1981 with 148 amendments.

On June 27, 1979, we went to conference on H.R. 4289, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1979 with 182 amendments.

On August 9, 1978, we went to conference on H.R. 13467, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 with 83 amendments.

On April 4, 1977, we went to conference on H.R. 4877, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1977 with 237 amendments.

On November 1, 1977, we went to conference on H.R. 9375, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1978 with 53 amendments.

So now I do not see why we should be afraid to go to conference on 36 amendments.

Several of the amendments are legitimate supplementals, which should be brought back to the House for action.

The Senate reduced the appropriation for title II of Public Law 480 to $60 million, so that the total appropriated for title II, including the $90 million enacted in an earlier supplemental and signed by the President, would be $150 million the amount that originally passed the House of Representatives.

The Senate added $100 million for the summer youth program which we are for.

The Senate added $545.5 million for child nutrition programs, the amount of the budget request.

The Senate added $300 million for women, infants, and children feeding programs, $133 million over the budget request.

Of course the Senate added both funds and conditions for Central America.

The chairman not only refuses to go to conference, he has introduced a so-called clean bill, which was reported by the full committee this morning, and which contains funds for Public Law 480, the child nutrition program, the WIC program, and the summer youth program.

What will happen if we pass that bill and send that bill to the Senate? The Senate will add all of the same amendments, that they had before, and we will be right back where we started, and there will be 3 or 4 weeks of debate and then we are going to go to conference, right where we are today. We have wasted a month with no action on summer youth employment, child nutrition program, WIC, and additional funds for the starving people of Africa.

I do not think we ought to waste another month. Certainly the Congress has been out for 2 weeks, but we could have gone to conference before we had taken the 2 weeks off for the Easter recess.

All right, that is water over the dam. We could go to conference tomorrow morning with the Senate and meet Thursday, Friday, and Saturday if we have to, and get rid of this bill one way or another. I am ready to confront the Senate on the issue of Nicaragua; I am ready to confront the Senate on the issue of military aid to El Salvador; I am ready to confront the Senate with any amendment that they have added to this bill.

This is the way we have done it in the past. I do not and I will not agree with many of the Senate amendments. But that is not the question in point. The question is point is, Will we meet these issues head on? Or will we avoid our responsibility to meet with the Senate and make recommendations to the House? That is the question that is before the House today.

If you believe that we should act responsibly, meet the conference with the Senate, then vote "yes." If you believe that we should avoid that responsibility, prolong this bill at least another month, then you should vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) has consumed 10 minutes of his time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy job that we have here dealing with appropriations. Thirteen subcommittees, each of which conducts many, many weeks of hearings and there are different points of view. But may I say in this case, I hope you will vote against this motion, telling us to do what we are going to do anyway.

May I point out that in connection with the single purpose bill passed by the House that the Senate added 36 amendments. At a time when we get so many calls from the President, or from the Budget Director, they added $1.3 billion to a bill that had nothing much left but a House identification number.

You will recall that we introduced on this side two bills; one item to each, so as to come under the special rules dealing with one item appropriation bills.

We provided relief for the starvation facing the people of many African nations in one instance and in the other instance we provided for emergency fuel assistance. In going to conference with our colleagues on the Senate side we took the heart out of the African assistance bill and put it in the emergency fuel assistance bill which we agreed on, House and Senate.

You acted on it. But it left only the number of the other bill over there. And to our number they added over 30 amendments. Let me read some of the things that our friends on that side added.

□ 1620

Before I proceed the Members should understand I talked to Senator HATFIELD this afternoon and we are going to get together and see what we need to do to work it out. We have not delayed it in any way. And if we had had a conference in the last 2 weeks, many of our friends would not have been able to participate. We would have had to have held it almost by ourselves.

Let me point out what was added.

The Customs Service air interdiction program was added; Farmers Home Administration and Rural Housing; the sense of Congress language on commodities for Guatemalan refugees; bankruptcy judges; CIA covert aid to Nicaragua; military facilities in Honduras; Bonneville lock and dam and Gallipolis; juror protection in El Salvador; provision on Presidential certification, El Salvador; provision on refugees El Salvador; limitation regarding Panama elections; Presidential report on military equipment in El Salvador; sense of Senate language on El Salvador; sense of Congress language on Seabees in Africa; Colorado tailings site; Cumberland Gap deferral disapproval; set-aside of OMB regulations on the National Park Service; set-aside of allocation formula for the summer youth program; higher education facilities provision; work incentive program; impact aid provision; sense of Senate resolution regarding oil company mergers; money for a history of the Senate and other items. There were 36 amendments that include legislation on about everything under the Sun and go to $1.4 billion at a time when they are to freeze everything where it is.

Now, that does not mean that our friends over there are not doing the best they can. Our friend, Senator HATFIELD, voted against many of these things, but he finally had to start accepting them so they could pass a bill and get to conference.

Now may I say that I had a discussion with him and with the recess schedule, I understand they could not hope under their rules to act in time to do anything. That is what they told me and I agree with them.

So relying on that the things that I considered, and after listening to my colleagues I put together a bill that included time-sensitive items which required action. There are items in which Members on both sides are interested. I included a provision giving the rest of the famine relief money to Africa, which had language of CCC making commodities available for sale at competitive prices; a provision for jobs in the cities with hot weather coming on, and money for child nutrition and women, infants, and children. I included those things that were essential and I put them together there because we were trying to show that we were not trying to delay with the recess coming up.

With respect to my friend from Massachusetts, may I say I have enjoyed working with him through the years. Understandably, we have some differences now and then about how to proceed, but we have worked together mighty, mighty well. I tried to share my thoughts about our problems with the Easter break before us. We were all very busy and there was some uncertainty.

I had 107 Members of the House ask me to do something that showed we wanted action. So I wrote this bill. And with respect to El Salvador, I provided that for 30 days they could go ahead as is at the same level and with the same restrictions.

To me as a lawyer who writes a settlement from time to time, I thought it was very reasonable. I sent copies to 107 Members in one case and about 100 in another and I did not have a single word of criticism. I had many nice letters.

So I am telling you do not make us go to conference as though we did not want to. There had not been anybody here to confer with.

I am going to talk again with the Senate chairman, who is a fine person and easy to deal with, and see what we can work out. Most of these things were put in there against his wishes. We are going to invite my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) to participate. We have always worked together.

Let us vote down this motion and count on him working with me, and me with him, as we have heretofore. Let us not come in here and tell us, "Go to conference," when we have not delayed. We just have not had anybody to confer with.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Then the gentleman is requesting a "no" vote on the privileged motion?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would hope the gentleman would oppose a motion which would thus instruct the conferees.

I would like to talk to Senator HATFIELD before we go. So do not make us go before we are ready.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not going to prolong this debate. I just said and restate my position that we should go to conference tomorrow morning. I wrote my chairman before the recess and urged that we go to conference. There were a lot of accusations against the administration that they were holding up that bill over in the Senate because of El Salvador and Nicaragua and how cruel it was to the people of Africa.

Here we are on May 2 and we still have not completed our supplemental.

In regard to the question about the Senate adding $1.4 billion, the chairman is absolutely right, but he files a bill which he is going to be taking up here on the floor of the House, if my motion is defeated—and I am sure it will be defeated—which provides for $567 million that the House never acted upon.

So we are not laying our cards completely on the table. If they are wrong for $1.4 billion, we are pretty wrong in adding $567 million.

However, I am not opposed to some of these programs. I am for a lot of these programs. In fact, I think that if the chairman was going to put a lot of worthwhile projects in should have put $75 million that the Senate passed for public broadcasting for the next 3 years. A very, very worthwhile program. That was left out.

But I am not going to pursue this argument. I just feel the proper way to go and the reason why I am making this motion is that we should go to conference. Why dillydally around? Why wait until next week and bring this other bill? I do not know what kind of a rule he is going to get. He was given permission this morning to seek a rule of his choosing. If it is an open rule, there are going to be all kinds of amendments offered here on the floor of the House on El Salvador, on Nicaragua, and everything else.

Here is we go to conference we could meet these things head on. And if we do not do our job in conference, this House of Representatives can knock down that conference report, which they have done from time to time in the 26 years that I have been in the Congress.

This is the first time I have ever seen this procedure and I think we are losing the whole month.

All I say is that about a month from now read the RECORD, read what I said, that is what we are doing, we are wasting time.

□ 1630

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. In the years that the gentleman and I have worked together, we have been in tough situations many times. I have handled many lawsuits. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts has reached many settlements on various types of issues.

One of the best ways in the world to get somebody else to hold the line is to have something in your pocket that takes care what needs to be so that you can fall back on it if you have to.

And I think when we go to conference, the best thing will be to have a bill that takes care of what has to be done, and as long as we have that, we have a much better bargaining position. It has worked many, many times.

So I hope the gentleman will not think that we were unwise to have a bill of our own. It just means we will be in a stronger position when we go to conference. We have not refused to go to conference. I believe this is the first time the gentleman has asked us to go to conference. I don't recall the gentleman asking me to go to conference before today.

Mr. CONTE. Oh, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Let us read my letter here that I wrote to the gentleman on April 11. I will ask the gentleman to look in his records. I say: "I don't believe we can simply leave for the recess without going to conference on the supplemental and bringing our agreements and disagreements to the House for a vote."

Mr. WHITTEN. What day did you leave?

Mr. CONTE. I do not know what day we left.

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe the recess began on the 12th. So if we had gone to conference, I would have been by myself.

Mr. CONTE. I would stick with you, Mr. Chairman. Do not worry about that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, I stayed here during the time of the jobs bill last year and wrote the bill while the Congress was in recess. This time during the recess I thought I was entitled to go to my district in Mississippi.

Mr. CONTE. Well, I agree with the gentleman there. But the letter would not have taken 2 days. It was hand delivered to the gentleman on the 11th, when we were here. But that is neither here nor there. And I have seen the gentleman. The gentleman is a master. When the gentleman says something about being unwise, I would be the last guy in the world to say that you were not one of the wisest owls in this House.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say that I have been privileged to serve with the gentleman from Massachusetts for my 22 years. Everybody in this House has seen him here for 26 years. I do not know of anybody who has ever suggested that he was not here when he was needed to meet the needs of the country, ever, at any time, and that is true today and that was true when we should have gone to conference before the recess occurred. You know it and everybody in this Chamber knows it. I think it demeans the House to begin to suggest anything like that. We could send one page to the Senate and they will send us back a telephone book. They have done it time and time again. And what we ought to do is what my friend from Massachusetts has suggested repeatedly, we should have gone, and you are the chairman, Mr. Chairman, you are the chairman of the committee, you should have called the conference before the recess, you should have taken the committee over there, we should have met with the Senate. It does not do us any good to get into this kind of a discussion.

I applaud my friend from Massachusetts as one of the ablest legislators in this body, one of the most conscientious, and one who is regarded highly on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of a similar kind. I have the highest regard for both of you. But may I say I have been in communication with the Senate, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I talked to him this afternoon. We have not delayed anything. We have been waiting for us all to be back.

Mr. McDADE. We could have gone before.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the preferential motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONTE) there were—ayes 13, noes 10.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 159, nays 245, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—159

Archer	Chandler	Dannemeyer
Badham	Chappie	Daub
Bartlett	Cheney	Davis
Bateman	Clinger	DeWine
Bereuter	Coats	Dickinson
Bethune	Coleman (MO)	Dreier
Bilirakis	Conable	Duncan
Boehlert	Conte	Edwards (AL)
Broomfield	Corcoran	Edwards (OK)
Brown (CO)	Coughlin	Emerson
Broyhill	Courter	Erlenborn
Burton (IN)	Craig	Evans (IA)
Campbell	Crane, Daniel	Fiedler
Carney	Crane, Philip	Fields
Fish	Marlenee	Roukema
Franklin	Marriott	Rudd
Frenzel	Martin (IL)	Sawyer
Gekas	Martin (NC)	Schaefer
Gilman	Martin (NY)	Schneider
Gingrich	McCain	Schulze
Goodling	McCandless	Sensenbrenner
Gradison	McCollum	Shaw
Green	McDade	Shumway
Gregg	McEwen	Shuster
Gunderson	McGrath	Siljander
Hammerschmidt	McKernan	Skeen
Hansen (UT)	McKinney	Smith (NE)
Hartnett	Michel	Smith (NJ)
Hillis	Miller (OH)	Smith, Denny
Holt	Molinari	Snowe
Hopkins	Moore	Snyder
Horton	Moorhead	Solomon
Hunter	Morrison (WA)	Spence
Hyde	Myers	Stangeland
Ireland	Nielson	Stump
Jeffords	O'Brien	Sundquist
Johnson	Oxley	Tauke
Kasich	Packard	Taylor
Kemp	Parris	Thomas (CA)
Kindness	Pashayan	Vander Jagt
Kramer	Petri	Vucanovich
Lagomarsino	Porter	Walker
Latta	Pritchard	Weber
Leach	Pursell	Whitehurst
Lent	Quillen	Whittaker
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Williams (OH)
Loeffler	Ridge	Winn
Lott	Rinaldo	Wolf
Lowery (CA)	Ritter	Wortley
Lujan	Roberts	Wylie
Lungren	Robinson	Young (AK)
Mack	Rogers	Young (FL)
Madigan	Roth	Zschau

NAYS—245

Ackerman	Dixon	Jacobs
Addabbo	Donnelly	Jenkins
Akaka	Dorgan	Jones (OK)
Albosta	Dowdy	Jones (TN)
Alexander	Downey	Kaptur
Anderson	Durbin	Kastenmeier
Andrews (TX)	Dwyer	Kennelly
Annunzio	Dymally	Kildee
Anthony	Dyson	Kleczka
Applegate	Early	Kogovsek
Aspin	Eckart	Kolter
AuCoin	Edgar	Kostmayer
Barnard	Edwards (CA)	LaFalce
Barnes	English	Lantos
Bates	Erdreich	Leath
Bedell	Evans (IL)	Lehman (CA)
Beilenson	Fascell	Lehman (FL)
Bennett	Fazio	Levin
Berman	Feighan	Levine
Bevill	Ferraro	Levitas
Biaggi	Flippo	Lipinski
Boggs	Florio	Lloyd
Boland	Foglietta	Long (LA)
Boner	Foley	Long (MD)
Bonior	Ford (TN)	Lowry (WA)
Bonker	Fowler	Luken
Borski	Frank	Lundine
Bosco	Fuqua	MacKay
Boucher	Gaydos	Martinez
Boxer	Gejdenson	Matsui
Breaux	Gephardt	Mavroules
Britt	Gibbons	Mazzoli
Brown (CA)	Glickman	McCloskey
Burton (CA)	Gonzalez	McCurdy
Byron	Gore	McHugh
Carper	Gray	McNulty
Carr	Guarini	Mica
Chappell	Hall (OH)	Mikulski
Clarke	Hall, Ralph	Miller (CA)
Clay	Hall, Sam	Mineta
Coelho	Hamilton	Minish
Coleman (TX)	Harkin	Mitchell
Collins	Harrison	Moakley
Conyers	Hatcher	Mollohan
Cooper	Hawkins	Montgomery
Coyne	Hefner	Moody
Crockett	Hertel	Morrison (CT)
Daniel	Hightower	Mrazek
Darden	Howard	Murphy
Daschle	Hoyer	Murtha
Dellums	Hubbard	Natcher
Derrick	Huckaby	Neal
Dicks	Hughes	Nelson
Dingell	Hutto	Nichols

Nowak	Rowland	Tallon
Oakar	Roybal	Tauzin
Oberstar	Russo	Thomas (GA)
Obey	Sabo	Torres
Olin	Savage	Torricelli
Ortiz	Scheuer	Towns
Ottinger	Schroeder	Traxler
Owens	Schumer	Udall
Panetta	Seiberling	Vandergriff
Patman	Sharp	Vento
Patterson	Shelby	Volkmer
Pease	Sikorski	Walgren
Penny	Simon	Watkins
Pepper	Sisisky	Waxman
Perkins	Skelton	Weaver
Pickle	Slattery	Weiss
Price	Smith (FL)	Wheat
Rahall	Smith (IA)	Whitley
Rangel	Solarz	Whitten
Ratchford	Spratt	Wirth
Ray	St Germain	Wise
Reid	Staggers	Wolpe
Richardson	Stenholm	Wright
Rodino	Stokes	Wyden
Roe	Stratton	Yates
Roemer	Studds	Yatron
Rose	Swift	Young (MO)
Rostenkowski	Synar	

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews (NC)	Hall (IN)	Livingston
Bliley	Hance	Markey
Brooks	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Bryant	Hayes	Shannon
D'Amours	Heftel	Smith, Robert
de la Garza	Hiler	Stark
Ford (MI)	Jones (NC)	Valentine
Frost	Kazen	Williams (MT)
Garcia	Leland	Wilson
Gramm	Lewis (FL)	

□ 1650

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Robert F. Smith for, with Mr. Ford of Michigan against.

Mr. Lewis of Florida for, with Mr. Leland against.

Mr. Gramm for, with Mr. Hayes against.

Mr. Bliley for, with Mr. D'Amours against.

Mr. Paul for, with Mr. Garcia against.

Messrs. STRATTON, ERDREICH, and MARTINEZ changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 5564, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1984

Mr. WHITTEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-729) on the bill (H.R. 5564) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS reserved all points of order on the bill.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 64, IRISH WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 64) to establish the Irish Wilderness in the Mark Twain National Forest, Mo.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House, page 8341 of April 9, 1984.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve this afternoon this sound and solid bill which is a product of a bipartisan effort over the last several years. This is a small wilderness area as wilderness areas go, but we compromised with the Senate and split the difference so that we end up with something like 16,500 acres.

This bill was approved by a substantial margin in the House committee. It passed the House earlier with overwhelming support. The House actually gained a little bit more, I think, from the viewpoint of the opponents of the bill in the conference. The Senate bill included 17,562 acres; the House bill 15,500 acres, and the conference agreed on 16,500 acres. We made a few compromises, but this is a good, sound bill and it ought to be approved. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report and support the committee.

Mr. SEIBERLING, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY).

Mr. HUCKABY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the conference report and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

I think this is a classic example of reaching what I consider to be a fair, a reasonable, compromise. Even though this is a relatively small bill as far as the acreage involved, certainly the people in the area were vitally concerned about the mineral development, the potential for development in the future, the potential for future jobs being denied.

A compromise was reached in such a manner so that it says, "You cannot have everything that you want for wilderness. Let us look and strike a reasonable balance."

I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for working on these efforts, and I also would like to commend my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Missouri. I know he was somewhat disappointed with the final outcome, but yet he did win a victory, I think a significant victory, in the fact that some land is being left outside the wilderness area, the land with the greatest potential for commercial development. Certainly this is what was very important in reaching the compromise in this legislation.

I would like to commend the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle for working together. Even though they are still not in total agreement, I feel that we have arrived at an adequate compromise.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his contribution in working out this bill, and we certainly do appreciate the support that he has generated for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership, and also the ranking member on the minority side.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MCNULTY).

● Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a sponsor of the Arizona Wilderness bill, I am pleased to note that this measure, the Irish Wilderness Act, was passed by this body, and passed by a substantial majority. I know the difficulties and the deliberations that are involved in developing a wilderness bill.

□ 1700

The House version of this bill—and I played a part in producing it—contained 2,000 acres less than the bill the Senate passed. That difference might seem inconsequential, but the acreage in question located in the upper northwest corner of the area has a high potential for mineral extraction, and because of those concerns the acreage was not included in the House bill.

The conference report today splits that difference between the House and Senate bill and adds 1,000 acres to the House version for a total of 16,500 acres. Excluded from the designation is the land containing that with the most significant mineral value. My good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, with whom I sided in this matter, shares a lot of the same kind of interests I do with respect to miner-

als, and had I had my way, I would have preferred the House version.

Let me repeat my last two sentences, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I would have preferred the House version to come back here. I have a lot of the same interests my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, does, and he fought a gallant fight in this matter. But politics is the art of compromise and the science of the achievable. The bill in front of us today in this conference report is fair and decent, and it is as good a piece of legislation as the system is capable of producing.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report on S. 64, the Irish Wilderness Act.●

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON), the Member in whose district this bill arises.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on S. 64, the Irish Wilderness Act, and I want to take a few brief moments to review with the Members the history of this issue and to go through a few of the recent developments here because I think there are some important principles involved here relating to the integrity of the action that was taken by the House of Representatives. This proposed wilderness area was designated a further planning area during the RARE II process due to the high potential of lead and zinc deposits within its boundaries.

This morning I was speaking to the chairman of our committee in the committee, and we were visiting very briefly about the fact that the Irish Wilderness proposal was going to be up today. He told me that he understood I had taken a strong, unyielding, and rigidly inflexible position on this subject. I hope that was said in the spirit of good humor in which the chairman of the committee usually speaks, but lest there be any doubt about it, let me tell the House that in trying to work out a compromise here I have gone fifteen-seventeenths of the way from my original position.

When the Senate-passed bill was considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a compromise was reached between the deletion of 4,000 acres and no deletion of acreage whatsoever. The members of the committee decided to delete 2,000 acres rather than 4,000 acres as had originally been proposed, and obviously I think the compromise was reached at this point between the House and the Senate.

When that bill came to the House of Representatives, I supported it. I supported it because it contained at least two-seventeenths of what I was trying to get for my constituency. I had come at that point fifteen-seventeenths of the way. I voted for it, together with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING), and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), and I had every expectation that when we went to the conference, the House position would at least be spoken for. Subsequent to the committee action, though, when a vote of the whole House was recorded on August 2 of last year, 406 Members of this House voted for the bill, as amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and only 18 Members of this House opposed it. Among those voting for the bill, as amended, was every member of the House-Senate conference that voted to put 1,000 acres back into the wilderness proposal, and not one of those members save me on the conference insisted on the House version. And I have the transcript of the deliberations in the conference here if anyone cares to look at it. When we went over to the conference, the Senate did not even ask us to give them 1,000 acres, but the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the subcommittee, moved immediately. "I say, let's have a compromise, Senate. We offer you here an additional 1,000 acres." So then the Senate had sixteen-seventeenths of what it wanted as opposed to the fifteen-seventeenths to which I had agreed here.

I think it is important to point out that this legislation would affect Missouri's Eighth Congressional District, and that congressional district alone. I voted for S. 64, as amended, because I felt it represented a compromise that was indeed more than reasonable. My earlier preference on this would have been to have left the whole 17,500 acres under the exemplary management of the Forest Service, but working in a spirit of compromise, I gave up fifteen-seventeenths of what was my real druthers, and I feel that that was about as far as I could go.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I just want to make clear what this is about. I am not on top of these issues obviously as much as the gentleman is. I have tried to be a supporter in the past of wilderness legislation, including the Irish Wilderness.

I just want to make clear, though, where we stand now. The measure we are voting on now is not precisely the same as the bill I voted for before?

Mr. EMERSON. No, it is not.

Mr. WEBER. Would the gentleman explain quickly the differences?

Mr. EMERSON. Well, it gives up a thousand more acres than what we had agreed on in the House here by a vote of 406 to 18, and the House position in the conference was not spoken for save by me as the Member who represents the affected district. The chairman of the subcommittee offered to give the Senate 1,000 additional acres before the Senate even asked for it.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. And the manner in which we supported it before was supported by the members of the Interior Committee on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. EMERSON. Absolutely. It was supported by the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, and, I believe, by every member of the committee. There may have been one or two exceptions, but the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) supported it, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) supported it, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) supported it, and I supported it.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I will not take a lot more of the gentleman's time. Even though we do not always agree on wilderness issues, it seems to me that the gentleman has not been treated fairly. It seems to me that the House did a good job in the first place, and I for one, as a supporter of wilderness, intend to support the position of the gentleman from Missouri. I am sorry that he has been treated so shabbily by his colleagues on that side.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WEBER).

Moving on to another point, Mr. Speaker, one big issue that is involved here that gets very little attention is the issue of jobs. The counties in the area surrounding the proposed Irish Wilderness have unemployment rates that range from 13.9 percent in Carter County to 25.3 percent in Shannon County. The unemployment rates in Oregon and Ripley Counties are 14.7 and 18.3 percent respectively.

Mr. Speaker, all of the host evidence indicates that this proposed wilderness area is the best place in the world to look for a new deposit of lead ore. Although this very region accounted for 92 percent of all the domestic lead produced in 1982, the known deposits are expected to be depleted within the next 10 to 15 years, and no one knows whether there are any more domestic lead ore deposits.

Mines would mean jobs and pay checks for the people who live in this area, and they would mean a tax base for these financially strapped counties.

I would like to take a little time to explain how lead is mined. Lead mines cause minimal surface disturbances. Lead ore is located several hundred feet below the face of the Earth. The surface buildings and equipment necessary for a lead mine take up only a few hundred acres, really about 100 acres at best.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of my constituents really do not want any wilderness at all in this area.

□ 1710

I might say that this proposed wilderness area does not by any standard of definition meet the qualifications of the 1964 Wilderness Act. It is not untrammeled by man. It does have roads in it. There was a mine in there one time. It has been inhabited, so it is not the pristine area that some would like you to believe that it is.

My constituents are delighted with the manner in which this land has been managed by the Forest Service and can find no reason for which it should be taken from their stewardship, and I agree with them. In fact, only one elected official in the whole area has publicly expressed support for this legislation and I might point out that that person is not running for reelection.

In addition, every Member of Congress who has ever represented the district in which this area is located has opposed wilderness designation, and that includes Republicans and Democrats; however, my constituents are willing to accept the version of the bill that was passed by this House, but they are not willing to give them everything.

I think having preserved two-seventeenths is going far enough, but now the Senate by the action of the House conferees are proposing to leave my constituents with only one-seventeenth of what they really want.

This body has the opportunity to show how sincere its Members really are when they speak of wanting to provide jobs for Americans, wanting to help people improve their own lot in life and let some people in the local areas have control over their own destinies.

Finally, I want to point out to the House, to those who may be concerned about it, there really is no Irish issue involved here. There have been some comments that the Ancient Order of Hibernians might be upset if we did not designate the Irish Wilderness as a part of the wilderness system. The Irish Wilderness has been called the Irish Wilderness for about 150 years, long before anybody knew anything about wilderness, and I assure you that this area will be called the Irish Wilderness into time immemorial, irrespective of what happens here; so there is not a matter relating to the designation of the "Irish factor" here.

The question is how much wilderness are we really going to have.

I want to repeat for emphasis. I compromised, and this is only in my district; I compromised fifteen-seventeenths of the way. We went to conference and the House conferees, before the Senate even spoke, offered to give you another 1,000.

I do not think that is a responsible representation of the House position. I urge my colleagues to vote "No," to oppose this further step.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. VUCANOVICH).

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the Irish Wilderness bill, S. 64.

Throughout Interior Committee consideration of the bill we struggled with the issue of wilderness versus mineral values. I was pleased with the agreement we reached to remove 2,000 acres from the wilderness proposal. I am well acquainted with the important role that mining can play in local economies and strongly supported the removal of that acreage. I voted for S. 64, as amended.

I think it is extremely unfortunate that some of that acreage has been added back in conference. I simply cannot support this conference because I feel very strongly that mineral values, and the important role that mining plays in local economies, must be recognized when we consider the designation of wilderness areas. I also think that the wishes of the Congressman whose district the wilderness area is in should be respected. After all, it is his constituents who must bear the burden of our actions here in Washington.

By the way, I am Irish.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the conference on the Irish Wilderness bill. Thank you.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the report of the conference. You will notice on one side that there is only the chairman of the committee and the majority side signing the conference report. None of the Republicans signed the report, none of the Republicans and those who are listening to this in your offices now, keep that in mind, because the intent and the integrity of the committee, the compromise that was reached in the committee itself, that was voted by the chairman of the subcommittee and voted by the chairman of the full committee and I believe there was not but one person on the full committee that voted against the compromise that came out of the committee; 408 House Members voted for it, and yet when we went over to the Senate side, what did the House do, led by my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio? He proposed the amendment to further compromise the Irish Wilderness, to further compromise the Irish Wilderness that my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON) worked so hard on, and may I say he has worked diligently for the last 4 years on this issue, has worked hard to make sure that his constituents were heard, and they were.

I can suggest that the committee itself, the conference, is a farce. Yes, I can have you say that the Senators wanted it. We have to speak for the House and when we voted in that subcommittee and in the full committee and on the floor of the House, that was the House position, and no chairman on this side should compromise the House position and offer that amendment, and that is what happened.

As my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON) has said before, this is not a new issue. The Irish Wilderness has been with us when Mr. Bailey was here, our former colleague. The Irish Wilderness was defeated at that time. We tried to work a compromise and we did reach that compromise through the efforts of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON); but as we went to conference, the House position was sold out, sold out to those other Members outside of the district that the Irish Wilderness resides in; again by the special interest groups, and for those who are listening to this on the floor and in your offices, I want to remind you that this is not the only wilderness bill that is going to be on the floor of the House this year and the next year, and each time the Sierra Club, the Friends of the Earth, et cetera, et cetera, say, "Oh, don't listen to the land experts, listen to us, forget the Representative. He doesn't know what he is talking about just because he was elected by the people. After all, this is no longer a government of the people. It is a government of the special interests, a government of those who disregard the experts, disregard the information given to us by the Forest Department."

They will put in an area as a wilderness that has mines in it, roads, barbed wire, farms and probably, yes, a still someplace out there, I am not sure, but very likely a still or two still operating.

And why is it being proposed as a wilderness? I can tell you why, because all of a sudden there was the possibility of a find of a great world lead deposit that might have created jobs; in fact, would have created jobs, and all

of a sudden that area which has been mined, farmed, logged and, yes, produced those hard beverages that we indulge in once in a while, became qualified for wilderness, because they do not want jobs for Americans. They do not want us to have the opportunities proposed, that they can prosper and have opportunities for use. They want this Nation to become stagnated; no drilling for oil, no gas, no lead, none of the minerals, none of those things that this nation became great with.

May I say this about the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON). He has tried and he has been successful in the committee. He has told us, we have worked together, and after we had won and he had agreed and he told us, let us vote because we have reached a compromise, we went down to the conference and that gentleman there proposed the amendment and compromised us to the Senate.

My friends, again I want to ask you to vote no on this conference. Let us for once stand up for the House. Let us send this bill back. Let us go back to conference. Let us vote no and if it does pass, let us get a veto and sustain the veto.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER).

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me.

I just would like to briefly comment that some of us from Missouri and many others that preceded me here and other people in Missouri have been trying to get the Irish Wilderness designated a wilderness for a good many years. It goes back for a good many years.

This legislation is not the first time it has been introduced in the Congress and by the way, this legislation before us, the original sponsors in the Senate where both the Senators, one from each party in the other body supporting it.

I would also like to point out on the conference report that the Senators who signed it are from the other party as well as from this party.

□ 1720

This is basically a compromise. It is true that we started out with 17,000 acres in the legislation that was passed by the other body. But I think we should also remember that back when the Irish Wilderness was originally proposed as a wilderness area we were talking about 30,000 acres back then, and it came down and came down. And then It came down as it passed the House to approximately 15,500. And some of us felt that it was worth a compromise to end up with 16,500, even though we would have preferred to have the full 17,500 of the acreage.

One thousand acres has been set aside and basically that area under this legislation could be immediately filed for claims for those who wish to explore for lead in the area. That is the area specifically that they first wanted and proposed to file claims on and is the area set aside in that 1,000 acres. So we are not trying to deprive anyone of jobs.

We are hoping that the House will pass this legislation and will give to Missouri the last area that is qualified for a wilderness area. It will be the largest, even though it is only 17,000 acres, it will be the largest in the State of Missouri. And it was recommended for a wilderness area in the RARE II studies. And I think it would behoove the House to vote for and pass this legislation.

I am afraid that if we do not that the Senators will decide that they want the full amount, and if we stick and say we have to have the full amount then we get no legislation. And as a spirit of compromise, those of us who feel strongly on it are willing to take the 16,500 acres and hope that the Members will pass the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the Irish Wilderness legislation. As the sponsor of the House companion bill in both the 97th and the 98th Congress—bills which were cosponsored by my friends and colleagues Mr. CLAY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. UDALL—I am pleased to see this legislation so near the end of its long journey.

Adoption of this conference report and enactment of S. 64 will culminate an effort to preserve the beautiful Irish Wilderness which began many years ago with an original proposal of some 30,000 acres. Thanks to countless hours of tireless efforts by those who want to preserve a bit of our Ozark scenery for all Missourians and our neighbors to enjoy, we have reached the point we are at today.

The Irish would be the seventh area designated as wilderness in Missouri. At 16,500 acres, it would also be the largest, and is regarded by many as the crown jewel of our Ozark Wilderness.

As has been noted by speakers before me, the Senate-passed version of S. 64 designated some 17,500 acres of national forest land in Missouri as wilderness, to preserve the area from mineral exploration and mining. The bill was amended in the House Interior Committee, and the area protected was cut to 15,500 acres. The only difference to be worked out by the conferees was the size of the wilderness area.

I support the rather obvious and commonsense compromise which split the difference between the two versions. One thousand acres was removed from the Senate-passed bill, and 1,000 acres was added to the House version. The 1,000 acres removed from the wilderness designation are located in areas most likely to contain any lead deposits that might be present and for which mineral prospecting permits were first requested.

The agreement further allows the immediate consideration of prospecting permits in the areas deleted from wilderness designation, which is currently prohibited for the remainder of the fiscal year.

This commonsense compromise was agreed to by a 6-to-3 vote of the House conferees, and with the assent of the three Senators present. The agreement does not strictly adhere to the 15,500-acre area adopted by the House last year, nor does it yield to the Senate's strong preference for a 17,500-acre area. The split-the-difference compromise represents a version of the bill which supporters in both Houses can accept.

At the request of residents of my district, I have sponsored and worked for legislation to designate the Irish Wilderness. I am pleased and proud that we are so near success. I support the conference report and would urge its speedy adoption.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. I doubt I will take that much.

We are talking about a 1,000-acre difference between the Senate bill and the House bill and the compromise bill.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. EMERSON. We are talking about a 1,000-acre difference between the House bill and the Senate bill. But we are talking about the view of my constituency having moved from wanting to give up zero to having given up now 16,500 acres. I say when they went beyond the House position, which was 15,500 acres, they went 1,000 acres too far.

The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, speaks very plaintively about how the proponents had hoped for many years to have this bill, and I agree; I voted with the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Ohio in giving the wilderness proponents fifteen-seventeenths of what they want. But that is not enough. Now they have to have another 1,000 acres.

I realize 1,000 acres does not sound like very much. But I ask you to bear in mind the point and the principle here.

Compromise? I have given up fifteen-seventeenths in order to reach a compromise, but now, no, they still have to have another 1,000 acres.

I feel that I worked for the genuine compromise which was ratified by this House by a vote of 406 to 11.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Let me say that as the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, pointed out, the original Irish Wilderness area that was studied by the Forest Service was approximately 30,000 acres, so on the one hand the environmental groups came down and on the other hand the people that wanted no wilderness in that area came up, and they met about midway.

Now, it is significant to me that both the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. HUCKABY, who offered the original amendment, and the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MCNULTY, who offered the final version that the House adopted, support this compromise.

This is a compromise by splitting the difference between the House and Senate bill but it preserves the essence of what the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. EMERSON, wanted, which was the opportunity for the St. Joe Lead Co. and other people who are interested in lead exploration to take the areas of most favorable lead possibilities and continue to explore. And that is the area that is in the 1,000 acres that we have excluded from wilderness in this committee report.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. EMERSON. I am puzzled as to why there was no effort at all to present and to maintain the House position. We went there and you said, "OK, Senate, here is another 1,000." You could hardly wait to give that 1,000 acres away.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I heard what the gentleman said, and the fact is that when we came to conference it was perfectly clear that the other body preferred its position and that the gentleman from Missouri preferred the House position. But when you are talking about something as minute as 2,000 acres, and when we came up with a compromise which preserves the mineralized zone for exploration by dropping it out, we are talking about something that should not even be debated. We should have settled it in 5 minutes and walked out of there.

So I am simply suggesting that the gentleman has the privilege of demonstrating to those in his district, and they are the majority, let us say, in the county concerned, but certainly not everyone, if he wants to demonstrate to them that he is going to fight to the bitter end, he has that privilege. But I do not think we ought to take up further time of this body to debate something as trivial as the question of whether the House and the other body should have split the difference between the two bills or insisted upon another 1,000 acres being excluded from wilderness.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. No, I do not yield any more. The gentleman can get time on his side.

So let me merely say we should not even be taking up the time of the House now debating this issue. This should be routine. We have worked out a very simple compromise that preserves the important parts that the lead industry wanted to explore and at the same time tries to put the areas that do not have high mineralizing in wilderness. And it resolves the issue, and we ought to get on with it and support the conference report.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to just make one comment about the chairman saying this is a trivial matter. Nothing is trivial. It is a matter of what you call interpretation.

A 1,000 acres one way or the other you say makes no difference. A 1,000 acres this gentleman worked so hard to reach a compromise in committee and, in fact, I even voted for a wilderness bill and that really bothers me, to be really honest with you. We tried to have a recreation area made out of it, which it should be. That was denied.

So it is not trivial matter. This is a position the House must maintain. If we are just going to hand the Senate what was voted on that side, then I think we ought not have the conference. Let us just pass the Senate bills.

It was our responsibility in the conference to represent the House position. That did not happen. In fact, the House offered the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON).

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding.

Just a couple of important points here. I do not mean to belabor.

The gentleman from Ohio suggests that by speaking in defense of this little county down in southern Missouri that has a population of about 10,000 people that it is hardly worth talking about. You know, Daniel Webster admitted that Dartmouth was a small college, but he felt compelled to defend it.

Oregon County is a small county in my district and I feel compelled to defend her interests.

One further point that I want to make and I do not think it is just Oregon County. I think it deserves the time of this House. We are doing something to the future of the people of this tiny county. And to the gentleman from Missouri, my good friend, Mr. VOLKMER, and he is my friend, I think he is not on the floor right now, but in view of his advocacy, his strong advocacy of wilderness for Missouri, I want him to come up with a proposed list of areas that ought to be designated wilderness in his district, because he does not have any wilderness in his district. This is all in my district, and I want to cooperate with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER) to see that they get some bona fide wilderness up in northeast Missouri.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER).

Mr. VOLKMER. I would just like to say if the gentleman could find any area in northeast Missouri to qualify for wilderness, I will be more than happy to sponsor the legislation. The only area that even comes close, that is also within the Mark Twain National Forest, is not qualified. A RARE II study showed that it was not.

The people in the area would support a designation. When the administration proposed to sell off these excess lands, that was one of those little fingers, that was one of them, and the people got up in arms about that.

And I support the continuation of that area within the national forest.

□ 1730

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EMERSON. I want to work with the gentleman to find appropriate areas, some appropriate areas in northeast Missouri, given his overwhelming interest in my district in southeast Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would be more than happy if the gentleman can find some.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DAUB).

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute to ask the subcommittee chairman a question, if he would care to respond, and to ask him if in his opinion this is small and trivial, to quote the conference report, effort somehow to find out a way out of this box of a difference of 2,000 acres between 17,000 and 15,000, if indeed the chairman in the conference committee felt that he fought for the position of the House in this conference committee on behalf of the gentleman in whose district this piece of property is?

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. DAUB. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I fought for what I considered to be the interests of the people of Oregon County to the extent they were involved in this 2,000-acre difference. And I was going to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he could explain to me how the 1,000 acres that this conference report would put back into the wilderness area are going to make an economic difference in view of the fact that the area of high lead mineralization is the area which the St. Joe Lead Co. is most interested in, and which is the area that we dropped out of the wilderness? I would be interested to know that.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the response from my colleague.

I would say to all of my colleagues, in conclusion, that maybe the point is that some folks did not know what the value of that 1,000 acres might or might not be, that if the person, as a matter of principle, in whose district this issues resides is not given the benefit of all doubt by any of the Members of the House that have to take issues like this to conference, then the very principle of the matter becomes much more important than the question itself.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, be there no mistake, I would like to have one other comment about the conference, they not only stopped at giving 1,000 acres back to the Senate, they also have a statement which was not signed by the Republican side that instructs the Forest Service to protect the area that the Congress left out of wilderness, to protect its wilderness character, no activities except mining, and I do not know how you can mine if you cannot have other activities such as transportation by mechanized vehicles, and so forth, will be allowed.

Now it is my experience that these special restrictions make it impossible to do any mining.

So what we have done is not only given the Senate 1,000 acres; the 30,000 acres which was not asked for by the Forest Service, was asked for by the Senate, the 30,000 acres that will be treated as wilderness de facto.

So what we have really done in this conference is totally negate the compromise we reached in the committee. So I really want to stress and urge a no vote on this legislation in recognition of the Member who represents that area and in recognition that the conference did not uphold the House position.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I want to commend him on his earlier statement with regard to how much special interest power is playing a role in this body. Sitting here listening to this debate, it becomes clear to me how much we are abandoning the representative process in the House of Representatives.

The Member from the district that is involved is totally ignored, his pleas are called trivial here. And yet evidently what we have is the advent of special interest power that is going to tell us what we should do in areas represented well by the people of that area.

It just does not make much sense that representative government should have come to this day when special interests play a much more important role than the representatives of the people play.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement because if anybody forgets that this is happening not only to Mr. EMERSON, I have a little booklet back in my office called the Wilderness Aside Proposal for ALKA-II, that is the Alaskan Wilderness proposal for the nineties.

Now I thought we were finished with that, but they want to put 76 million acres, not 1,000 acres; 76 million acres into additional wilderness plus 147 million acres they already have, they want to stop the borax mining which is the only employment we have in the Southeast, they want to stop the 480 million board feet cuttage that we have in the Southeast, they want to stop the boot across the Arctic, they want to do everything that we reached a compromise on, agreed to by my good friend from Ohio, and voted, by the way, by my good friend from Ohio, he voted for it. All of a sudden it is coming back at us. We have the special interest groups sending out flashy, slick brochures saying, "We have to save the wilderness."

What happened to jobs in America? What happens to the independence that we need on minerals which we are importing from the Third World?

Yes, one-third of our oil yet is still coming from the Far East where we have the Ayatollah and everybody else dictating to us. Is it time we start waking up to the fact of what these groups are saying. Who can be against wilderness? No one. But we have to remember what we are locking up when we do it. That is not being told to the public. And many Members of this House do not know it.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been sitting and listening to the debate on this point. I represent California. I have a large district. I have a number of acres of wilderness already established and we are in the process of attempting to establish more wilderness. I have tried to operate in a fair and open manner, negotiating with the Sierra Club, negotiating with the Members of this House on particular committees, assuming that the agreements that we made that were honored in committee and that were honored on the floor by an overwhelming vote of the House would at least be minimally defended by those people who represented this body in negotiations with the other body.

And when I hear the reply from the chairman of the subcommittee that what the gentleman from Missouri is fighting for is inconsequential, I can tell you that not the 1,000 acres but the thousands of acres that the gentleman from Ohio is interested in putting in wilderness in California, and some of that in my district, are certainly going to be challenged, that the willingness to negotiate and to compromise is no longer there if the gentleman from Missouri's thousand acres is inconsequential.

I am very much concerned about the attitude presented on this floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If the gentleman will yield, he will be happy to know that there has apparently been a compromise reached, I am not sure behind closed doors, by one of the Senators and the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee on the California wilderness bill, the Washington wilderness bill, the Oregon wilderness bill, and I would suggest respectfully the gentleman had better check those borders and those boundaries because I would have a sneaking suspicion that they were much larger than what was passed on the House floor. I am not sure. I do know that there is soft release language in them.

It is ironic to me that you bring up this point after we brought it up, but I would suggest to the gentleman that he be very aware in California. We do not know what is in that package. But I am not sure the House position is being strongly defended.

I would suggest respectfully that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON) brings out a valid point here. This is his district. Some say it is only 1,000 acres, but I am suggesting that the House position was not defended. In fact, it was put in the position of compromise beyond anything we had

any imagination, without any true defense.

We owe him a "No" vote on this compromise. We owe this House a "No" vote if we are to be a separate body from the other body.

I urge my colleagues to vote "No."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY).

Mr. HUCKABY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have not planned on commenting further, but I would like to point out to my colleagues, and I worked with the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle initially in this, in passing a package in the House of Representatives. I worked with St. Joe Minerals looking at the areas with the most potential, the far future mineral development, and we arrived at a package in the House of Representatives. We went to conference. Unfortunately, although I was a conferee, I was not able to be there that day, I was at an agriculture conference that day.

There are two Senators from Missouri, one from either party. Both of the Senators from Missouri took the position of the Senate, which was 2,000 acres more in wilderness than the House position.

So the conference—what came out of the conference is a compromise. The House's position was further compromised by 1,000 acres. We did not get it all, but we got some of it.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUCKABY. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not dispute the point of the gentleman from Louisiana.

The gentleman from Louisiana, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MCNULTY), have been most helpful and accommodating in this matter. But I think we do get down ultimately here to a point of principle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman (Mr. HUCKABY) has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON).

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

I think we do ultimately get down to a point of principle here. As I think the gentleman from Louisiana knows, we did strike the compromise in our committee. It was overwhelmingly ratified here in the House, with the principle being there was no attempt to defend the House position when we went to conference.

Having come fifteen-seventeenths from zero, to fifteen-seventeenths of what the Senate is asking, I think that is more than what can reasonably be expected in a compromise.

□ 1740

Mr. HUCKABY. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to point out that the Senate position did not prevail in conference either. And that the two Senators from Missouri were on the oppostie side of the view from the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. That is correct, but they got—out of the conference—sixteen-seventeenths of what they wanted, and I got one-seventeenth. I would suggest that a reasonable compromise across the board would to have been to split the 17,500 acres down the middle and leave me with 8,750 acres for exploration and development and them with 8,750, for wilderness, if we want to talk about really striking it down the middle, in the true spirit of compromise.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this has been blown up all out of proportion. I, of course, did not say the gentleman's concerns were trivial, I said the differences between the conference report and the bill, as passed by the House, are trivial.

I have here a map, the map is a USGS map. There are lines drawn on it showing the trend lines of potential mineralization. Those are the areas that were of interest to the St. Joe Lead Co. and probably other lead companies. Of course, they are not special interests, they are economic interests. They are the people that have the potential of providing jobs, if they find a lead deposit.

That is the area that they were most interested in, plus a small area that they had already requested a permit for over on the east side of this proposed wilderness. Those are the areas that the conference report drops out of the wilderness. Those are the areas of potential interest to the people of Oregon County. The rest of it is simply land like the rest of this. It has no special designation by the USGS.

So what interests were accommodated were the very interests of the gentleman's own county of Oregon County that he was most concerned about.

So the fact is that he got everything that was of significance that was excluded from wilderness by the House bill.

I say the differences between the House bill, the 1,000 acres, are trivial. I stick with that. I did not say the gentleman's concerns were trivial, as some Members tended to imply. I merely indicated that the gentleman's concerns were met. The Senators, who also happen to represent Oregon County, they did not want to make any concessions, but they agreed to compromise, too, as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY) has pointed out. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY) was the author of the original House amendment.

I do not know how else we can ever resolve differences between the House and Senate if we are going to give a particular Congressman a veto.

Therefore, I merely suggest that the House, your conferees, made a reasonable effort to accommodate the concerns of the people in the gentleman's district, and at the same time, the concerns of the two Senators who also represent that district and to do it in a way that met the economic interests involved and, at the same time, took care of the interests of conservation, which is also of interest to the people of Missouri, including those of Oregon County.

I might say as long as we are talking about special interests that I have a letter here from the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, dated May 1, 1984, in which they strongly support the conference report. I suppose we could get other special interests of that sort into this act.

I suggest again, gentlemen, that this is a tempest in a teapot and it is time we voted and put this issue to bed so that the people of Oregon County know where they stand, so that the lead industry can go ahead and, incidentally, they are blocked now from any activity in this area until we settle it.

So I suggest that it is in everyone's interest to settle this and pass the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "No" on this. The Irish Wilderness has never been a wilderness to begin with. It has been mined, it has been roaded, it has been logged. It just happens to have a mineral deposit.

It is also in one Member's district. The people of that area are definitely opposed to this legislation.

I urge a "No" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my support of S. 64 to designate some 17,500 acres of land within the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri as the Irish Wilderness Area. It is my understanding that this bill constitutes an effective compromise between the house and Senate bills and therefore should be enacted.

I take a special interest in this legislation because of my being chairman of the bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs. In that capacity I work closely with the Ancient order of Hibernians, the Nation's oldest and largest Irish American or-

ganization. The AOH and especially their national president, Joseph Roche support this legislation and have called for our approval of it. I want to convey this message to my colleagues in the House at this time.

The 17,500 acres to be called the "Irish Wilderness" will be both magnificent and beautiful. It will be a place of great honor for the Irish American community and I hope we will take the step today to make it a reality.●

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds and say unlike the gentleman from Alaska I happen to have been down there a year ago and visited this area, walked around it. It is not true that there are mines in it. There are no mines. There are no farms. There are no roads. It is entirely a natural area.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We know. We had the information. There are roads, there have been mines, there have been farms, there have been trees cut. So do not tell us that that has not happened. I may not have been there, but this gentleman represents that district. I have seen the films. Do not tell us that is not there.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The records of the Geological Survey indicate that there was an iron mine in the midst of the Irish——

Mr. SEIBERLING. Once upon a time.

Mr. EMERSON. That there are roadbeds, there are railroad beds. There are nine manmade ponds. This is my point about saying by no standard of definition does this area meet the wilderness criteria of the 1964 act.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Once upon a time there were mines, once upon a time there were roads, once upon a time there were farms, but nature has a way of taking care of those things. I would only say to the gentleman from Alaska, "Vas you der, Charlie?"

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 142, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—254

Ackerman	Fuqua	Olin
Addabbo	Gaydos	Ortiz
Akaka	Gejdenson	Ottinger
Albosta	Gephardt	Owens
Alexander	Gibbons	Panetta
Anderson	Gilman	Patterson
Andrews (TX)	Glickman	Pease
Annunzio	Gonzalez	Penny
Applegate	Gore	Pepper
Aspin	Gradison	Perkins
AuCoin	Gray	Petri
Barnes	Guarini	Porter
Bates	Hall (OH)	Price
Bedell	Hall, Sam	Pritchard
Beilenson	Hamilton	Pursell
Bereuter	Harrison	Rahall
Berman	Hawkins	Rangel
Bethune	Hefner	Ratchford
Bevill	Hertel	Ray
Boehlert	Hightower	Regula
Boggs	Howard	Reid
Boland	Hoyer	Richardson
Boner	Huckaby	Rinaldo
Bonior	Hughes	Rodino
Bonker	Hutto	Rose
Borski	Jones (OK)	Rostenkowski
Bosco	Kaptur	Rowland
Boucher	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Boxer	Kennelly	Sabo
Breaux	Kildee	Savage
Britt	Kleczka	Sawyer
Brown (CA)	Kogovsek	Scheuer
Broyhill	Kolter	Schroeder
Burton (CA)	Kostmayer	Schumer
Carper	LaFalce	Seiberling
Carr	Lantos	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Leach	Sharp
Clarke	Lehman (CA)	Shaw
Clay	Lehman (FL)	Shelby
Clinger	Levin	Sikorski
Coelho	Levine	Simon
Coleman (MO)	Levitas	Sisisky
Collins	Lipinski	Skelton
Conable	Lloyd	Slattery
Conte	Long (LA)	Smith (FL)
Conyers	Long (MD)	Smith (IA)
Cooper	Lowry (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Coughlin	Luken	Solarz
Courter	Lundine	Spratt
Coyne	MacKay	St Germain
Crockett	Martin (IL)	Staggers
D'Amours	Martinez	Stokes
Darden	Matsui	Stratton
Daschle	Mavroules	Studds
Dellums	Mazzoli	Swift
Derrick	McCloskey	Synar
Dicks	McCurdy	Tallon
Dingell	McDade	Tauzin
Dixon	McGrath	Thomas (GA)
Donnelly	McHugh	Torres
Dorgan	McKernan	Torricelli
Dowdy	McKinney	Towns
Downey	McNulty	Traxler
Durbin	Mica	Udall
Dwyer	Mikulski	Vandergriff
Dymally	Miller (CA)	Vento
Early	Mineta	Volkmer
Eckart	Minish	Watkins
Edwards (CA)	Moakley	Waxman
English	Mollohan	Weaver
Erdreich	Moody	Weiss
Evans (IL)	Moore	Wheat
Fascell	Morrison (CT)	Whitley
Fazio	Morrison (WA)	Whitten
Feighan	Mrazek	Williams (OH)
Ferraro	Murphy	Wirth
Fish	Murtha	Wise
Flippo	Natcher	Wolpe
Florio	Neal	Wright
Foglietta	Nelson	Wyden
Foley	Nichols	Yates
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Yatron
Ford (TN)	Oakar	Young (MO)
Frank	Oberstar	Zschau
Frenzel	Obey	

NAYS—142

Anthony	Hansen (UT)	Packard
Archer	Hartnett	Parris
Badham	Hatcher	Pashayan
Bartlett	Hillis	Patman
Bateman	Holt	Pickle
Bennett	Hopkins	Quillen
Bilirakis	Horton	Ridge
Broomfield	Hubbard	Ritter
Brown (CO)	Hunter	Roberts
Burton (IN)	Hyde	Robinson
Byron	Ireland	Roemer
Campbell	Jacobs	Rogers
Carney	Jenkins	Roth
Chappell	Johnson	Roukema
Chappie	Jones (TN)	Rudd
Cheney	Kasich	Schaefer
Coats	Kemp	Schulze
Coleman (TX)	Kindness	Shumway
Corcoran	Kramer	Shuster
Craig	Lagomarsino	Siljander
Crane, Daniel	Latta	Skeen
Crane, Philip	Leath	Smith (NE)
Daniel	Lent	Smith, Denny
Dannemeyer	Lewis (CA)	Snowe
Daub	Loeffler	Snyder
Davis	Lott	Solomon
DeWine	Lowery (CA)	Spence
Dickinson	Lujan	Stangeland
Dreier	Lungren	Stenholm
Duncan	Mack	Stump
Dyson	Madigan	Sundquist
Edwards (AL)	Marlenee	Tauke
Edwards (OK)	Marriott	Taylor
Emerson	Martin (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Erlenborn	Martin (NY)	Vander Jagt
Evans (IA)	McCain	Vucanovich
Fiedler	McCandless	Walker
Fields	McCollum	Weber
Fowler	McEwen	Whitehurst
Franklin	Michel	Whittaker
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Winn
Gingrich	Molinari	Wolf
Goodling	Montgomery	Wortley
Green	Moorhead	Wylie
Gregg	Myers	Young (AK)
Gunderson	Nielson	Young (FL)
Hall, Ralph	O'Brien	
Hammerschmidt	Oxley	

NOT VOTING—37

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (ID)	Paul
Barnard	Harkin	Roe
Biaggi	Hayes	Russo
Bliley	Heftel	Schneider
Brooks	Hiler	Shannon
Bryant	Jeffords	Smith, Robert
de la Garza	Jones (NC)	Stark
Edgar	Kazen	Valentine
Frost	Leland	Walgren
Garcia	Lewis (FL)	Williams (MT)
Gramm	Livingston	Wilson
Hall (IN)	Markey	
Hance	Mitchell	

□ 1800

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Bliley against.

Mr. Hayes for, with Mr. Paul against.

Mr. RIDGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SLATTERY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their re-

marks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO SHOW LOW, AZ

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 597) entitled "An act to convey certain lands to Show Low, Arizona," with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 597

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the text of the bill (S. 597) entitled "An Act to convey certain lands to Show Low, Arizona", with the following Senate amendment to House amendments:

Page 2, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive.

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the title of the above-entitled bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object; I just want some explanation of what we are doing here.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) for purposes of his response.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that originated in the Senate. Its purpose is to transfer to the city of Show Low, Ariz., in the district represented by the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. RUDD, some land now used by the city but which is owned by the Federal Government and managed by the U.S. Forest Service.

Between the time of its initial passage in the other body and consideration in our committee, the city and Forest Service had worked a number of problems so that the bill could be changed to encompass a smaller tract. Accordingly, the committee amended the bill that was returned to the Senate. The Senate has now further redefined it by narrowing its scope still further. We believe the Senate's latest changes are acceptable and so the House should now concur and thus clear the bill for the President, and I believe the changes are not only acceptable to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. RUDD, but to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of S. 597, a bill to convey a small 52-acre park site to the city of Show Low, AZ. The bill is totally noncontroversial.

Originally, the bill provided for a no-cost transfer of two parcels of land, an airport and park site. But as a result of negotiations between the city and the Forest Service, recommended by our committee the city agreed to exchange a parcel of land and pay approximately $80,000 in cash for the airport property. Therefore, only the remaining park site will still be transferred without compensation to the city for continued use as a city park.

As the chairman has explained this case is similar to ones in which we have transferred national park land for local park purposes at a discounted or zero cost. The only difference in this case is that the land is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service.

I commend the chairman for his bipartisan approach to this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House recedes from its amendment to the title of S. 597.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on amendments to the Senate bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5172.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5172) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 and for related purposes with Mr. KILDEE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1810

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, April 26, 1984, title II was open for amendment at any point.

Are there any further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG: On page 6, line 6, strike "$4,121,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,871,000".

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is technical in nature and I do not believe there are any objections to it.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the Chairman of the Connittee, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding this is a clarifying amendment on page 6 of the bill that conforms the amendment that the gentleman had offered when this bill was last considered, and it corrects a technicality in that amendment.

Mr. GREGG. That is correct.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment and urge an "aye" vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

The amendment was agree to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to title II? If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III

COST RECOVERY AUTHORITY

SEC. 301. (a) Section 12(f) of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 278b(f)), is amended by striking out "first", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and to ensure the availability of working capital necessary to replace equipment and inventories".

(b) Fees for calibration services, standard reference materials, and other comparable services provided by the National Bureau of Standards shall be at least sufficient to meet the requirements set out in paragraph (a) of this section, and any funds recovered

in excess of these requirements" shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 302. In addition to the sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act, such additional sums as may be necessary to make any adjustment in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits which may be provided for by law are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 and, if the full amount necessary to make such adjustments is not appropriated, the remainder of the amount necessary to make such adjustments shall be taken proportionately from the amounts appropriated pursuant to sections 103 and 203 and pursuant to the line items in sections 101(a) and 201(a) in a manner reflecting the extent to which the amount appropriated pursuant to such sections 103 and 203 and each such line item in sections 101(a) and 201(a) is attributable to employee benefits of the type involved.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 303. Appropriations made under the authority provided in this Act shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure for periods specified in the Acts making such appropriations.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 304. Funds may be transferred among the line items listed in sections 101(a) and 201(a) but neither the total funds transferred from any such line item nor the total funds transferred to any such line item may exceed 10 per centum of the amount authorized for that line item in sections 101(a) and 201(a) unless (1) thirty calendar days have passed after the Secretary of Commerce or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President of the Senate, to the Chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, and to the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete explanation of the transfer involved and the reason for it, or (2) before the expiration of such thirty calendar days the Chairmen of both the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate have written to the Secretary to the effect that they have no objection to the proposed transfer.

ACTIVITIES PERFORMED FOR OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 305. The Secretary of Commerce shall charge for any service performed by the Bureau at the request of another Government agency in compliance with any statute (enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) which names the Secretary or the Bureau as a consultant to another Government agency, or which calls upon the Secretary or the Bureau to support or perform any activity for or on behalf of another Government agency or to cooperate with any Government agency in the performance by that agency of any activity, regardless of whether the statute specifically requires reimbursement to the Secretary or the Bureau by such other Government agency for such service, unless funds are specifically appropriated to the Secretary or to the Bureau to perform such service. The Secretary may, however, waive any charge where the service rendered by the Bureau is such that the Bureau will incur only nominal cost in performing it. Costs shall be determined in accordance with section 12(e) of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 278b(e)).

DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU

SEC. 306. Section 5 of the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C 274), is amended by deleting the period at the end of the first sentence and by inserting the following, ", and shall serve at the level IV on the Executive Schedule.".

INVESTIGATION OF STRUCTURAL FAILURES

SEC. 307. (a) The National Bureau of Standards, on its own initiative and in accordance with this section, shall initiate and conduct investigations to determine the causes of structural failures in structures which are used or occupied by the general public, and in other public structures, and shall collect and disseminate information on the causes of structural failures in such structures.

(b)(1) Within twenty-four hours after the occurrence or detection of any structural failure (in a structure described in subsection (a)) which the Director of the Bureau determines should be investigated in order to promote public safety in future construction, the Bureau (subject to paragraph (2)) shall initiate a full and complete investigation of the causes of such failure. During the course of the investigation the Bureau shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce such reports on the progress thereof as it may deem appropriate (including a preliminary report no later than thirty days after such occurrence or detection); and at the conclusion of the investigation the Bureau shall submit to the Secretary a final report setting forth its findings and recommendations in detail.

(2) This section shall not apply with respect to any structural failure which the National Transportation Safety Board, the Corps of Engineers, or the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has authority to investigate under applicable Federal law, unless such Board, Corps, or Administration requests the assistance of the Bureau.

(c) In any case where the Bureau's own staff does not include persons possessing the technical skills or expertise in a particular discipline which would be required to conduct an investigation under subsection (b) or any part of such an investigation, the Bureau shall take such steps as may be necessary to obtain and utilize for purposes of such investigation (on a consulting basis) the services of one or more persons possessing such skills or expertise.

(d)(1) The Secretary of Commerce shall develop and maintain a comprehensive file of information on structural failures (in structures described in subsection (a) and in other structures), including both information derived from investigations conducted under subsection (b) and information derived from other sources, and shall widely disseminate such information for the purpose of helping to prevent future structural failures. Reports submitted under subsection (b) and all other information derived from investigations under this section shall in any case be made reasonably available to the public.

(2) No part of any report submitted to the Secretary of Commerce by the Bureau under subsection (b), with respect to any structural failure or the investigation thereof, shall be admitted as evidence or used in any suit or action for damages growing out of any matter mentioned in such report.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 11, line 17: strike ", or" and insert a period; and page 11, lines 18 through 23: delete subsection 304(2).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, these amendments clarify the report and weight provisions in the bill. The language is being removed by the amendment as written as a convenience to the executive branch. We have learned that they do not wish it retained in the bill; therefore, I urge acceptance of the amendments.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there other amendments to title III?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FUQUA: On page 12, line 23, insert "(a)" after "306.".

On page 13, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, these amendments are offered to comply with our agreement with the Committee on the Budget that the level must be provided in advance in appropriation acts.

I urge the adoption of the amendments.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments and urge their adoption.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LONG of Louisiana) having assumed the chair, Mr. KILDEE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5172) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 and for related purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 481, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4275, FEDERAL RECLAMATION HYDROELECTRIC POWERPLANTS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1983

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 491 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 491

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4275) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric power-plants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be considered for amendment by titles instead of by sections and each title shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a), rule XXI are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as is the custom, I yield 30 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1820

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 491 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act of 1983. It is an open rule, providing 1 hour of debate to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution specifies that the Interior Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill shall be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. To facilitate the amendment process, the substitute shall be considered as read.

In addition, the resolution waives points of order against consideration of H.R. 4275 for failure to comply with clause 5, rule XXI, which prohibits appropriations in legislative bills. The waiver is necessary because the bill allows the Bureau of Reclamation to receive money advanced by non-Federal entities for the purpose of constructing facilities of the Central Arizona Project authorized by title III of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, and to spend these funds without further appropriations for such purpose.

Finally, upon conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, one motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4275 authorizes the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to construct and operate hydroelectric generating plants at seven existing dams in California, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. The bill also would enact into law an agreement reached among the Federal Government and several States regarding the allocation of electric power produced at the Hoover Dam powerplant. In addition, the bill provides for the upgrading of Hoover Dam electric generation and visitor facilities.

Powerplant construction is expected to be completed by fiscal year 1992. Moneys appropriated under this bill will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest from revenues generated from the production of power. It is expected that the amount repaid will be $14 million annually beginning in the 1990's.

All of us can recall the dire consequences of the oil crisis during the decade of the 1970's. Our dependency on foreign energy sources posed a very real threat to our Nation's—and the world's—security. The specific projects covered by H.R. 4275 were among the recommendations included in the Department of Interior's 1977 report on ways in which this country could move toward energy independence. The projects are expected to produce an annual energy equivalent of 690,000 barrels of oil. Clearly hydropower is a key component of our national program to decrease our dependency on energy from abroad. In 1983, the most recent year from which statistics are readily available, hydropower accounted for nearly 15 percent of the Nation's electric generation capacity—and in that year it provided Western States with nearly half of their electricity needs.

Hydropower is an economical energy source. Indeed, this bill requires that the Secretary of the Interior must determine that any construction project authorized is economically feasible from a cost-recovery standpoint. The bill also requires that any projects undertaken must be environmentally sound. In this regard, it should be noted that these projects are at existing reclamation sites. No new dams are authorized.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and move forward to consider H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplant Authorization Act.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, it would be redundant for me to go into detail on the rule since it has been ably explained. I think it is fine that we are adding hydroelectric generating plants to seven existing dams. This saves gas and oil now used for the production of electricity. I think it is time that we used more of our water resources for hydroelectric production, and I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to talk about the worthwhile nature of the bill rather than to get too involved in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act of 1983 that was reported from the Rules Committee last week.

Of particular importance in this bill is title II. This title does the following: First, authorizes an uprating program at Hoover Dam on the Colorado River to renovate the existing generators at the dam; second, allocates capacity and energy from the existing plant and the upratings to customers in Arizona, Nevada, and California; third,

authorizes construction of a highway bridge across the Colorado River at a site downstream from the dam as well as improvements to the Hoover Dam visitor's center; fourth, authorizes the addition of a rate component to power sold from the dam to Arizona that will be used to help repay the cost of the Central Arizona Project, another Federal project; fifth, provides for the dismissal of the pending lawsuit regarding power allocation at the dam; and sixth, authorizes the sale of surplus power from the federally built Navajo powerplant in Page, AZ, to Arizona entities.

This bill allows the Federal Government to improve and renovate one of this Nation's greatest resources, the Hoover Dam. It also has provisions which allow for repayment by power users for another Federal project, the Central Arizona Project, which will bring money into the Treasury as a return on both the investment in power at Hoover Dam and water for central and southern Arizona. This bill is fair and well planned compromise for the use and marketing of power generated at Hoover Dam and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON TRIP TO CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I returned yesterday, together with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FOWLER) from a 6-day trip to Central America where we visited the countries of Honduras, Panama, and Colombia.

The three of us joined in a news conference this morning, during which we reported on the findings of our trip, centering on the U.S. buildup in Honduras and the possibility of a peace settlement under the leadership of the Contadora countries.

I include the text of my statement to the news conference, together with addenda, for the RECORD.

The statement and addenda follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. BILL ALEXANDER, MAY 2, 1984

Thank you ladies and gentlemen for joining us.

We have called this news conference to report to you the observations we have brought back from our recent six day visit to Honduras, Panama, and Colombia.

This situation in Central America is complicated, sensitive, fluid and potentially explosive.

The purpose of our trip was two-fold.

First, we were attempting to evaluate the ongoing American military presence in Honduras with particular emphasis on military construction which has taken place under the umbrella of recent military training exercises.

Second, we were trying to determine precisely what American foreign policy is in that region. We wanted to know how the United States is affecting the search for peace in Central America. We wanted to hear from the Contadora nations how the United States could assist them in bringing stability to the region through negotiations rather than violence.

The first three days of the trip were devoted exclusively to a detailed examination of military construction in Honduras. We examined nearly nine key sites where the United States has funded construction of military installations. Among those we reviewed were Comayagua, the Regional Military Training Center at Trujillo, Camp Sea Eagle, Puerta Castilla, Aguacate, Jamastran, Cerro La Mole, Tiger Island, and San Lorenzo. At each site we were accompanied by representatives of the General Accounting Office, who have been monitoring these sites at Congressional request.

After extensive meetings with foreign ministers, leaders of numerous political groups, American ambassadors, political and military officers, I feel that we came no closer to discovering the objectives of American policy than when we started. Confusion over American policy is rampant, and there appears to be little optimism for change in the near future.

However, there is no confusion on one point:

Our growing military presence in the region is completely overshadowing any diplomatic policy we may have toward our Latin neighbors. The diplomatic initiatives in the region come totally from the Latin nations themselves. The United States offers only a military solution and that solution, according to one foreign minister, is failing us in every respect.

Stated simply, the United States has amassed a military force in Central America that is poised for war, and we have allowed no equal force for peace.

General Gorman leads a strong and effective miltary presence. There is no equal diplomatic presence. There is no clear diplomatic strategy. There is no reflection of coordination with our democratic friends in Latin America. There is little understanding of the advice of our allies. Even the Contras seem to be offended by the degree of unilateralism in our policy.

In the capital of Tegucigalpa, we held extensive meetings with Ambassador Negroponte, and various representatives of Honduras' political parties in an effort to assess the ramifications of U.S. policy.

The delegation then traveled to Panama, where we were briefed by General Paul Gorman of the Southern Command and General Frederick Woerner, Commander of the 193rd Infantry. While visiting Panama, we also held private talks with the foreign ministers of Mexico, Costa Rica, and Colombia. Prior to our meeting with General Gorman, the delegation issued the statement which has been furnished for you.

To close out our trip we met for nearly two hours with President Betancur of Colombia, who has been a leader in promoting the Contadora process. We also met extensively with Ambassador Tambs, our ambassador to Bogota.

Some of our findings are summarized in the bipartisan statement issued Sunday in Panama. In a moment, I will call on Congressman Regula and Congressman Fowler to share with you their impressions of the trip.

For myself, however, there was one pervasive question that clouded our entire trip. And that question was this: What is American foreign policy in Central America?

American diplomatic leadership, backed but not replaced by military force, is urgently needed. Only clear and coherent diplomatic leadership can win the support and friendship of the vary nations in which we seek to combat the spread of communism. The actions of the Contadora nations, and the vote in El Salvador, are statements of a desire for peace. I believe the respective nations and factions are closer than ever before to accepting a verifiable, negotiated end to the bloodshed.

I believe there is an appropriate role for the American military to play in cooperation with our Latin neighbors. Indeed, we saw evidence of many positive and constructive joint training efforts between our countries. But military action can not substitute for diplomatic initiative—particularly in Central America where the Contadora process offers a meaningful opportunity to achieve some measure of peace in the region.

Our meetings convinced us of widespread support for the Contadora process. After all, it is a process by which the nations of the region are seeking to write the rules by which they themselves might live in peace.

I was deeply disappointed to discover that the United States is not perceived as encouraging of this process. Indeed we saw clear indications that the United States is disparaging of the entire process, looking instead to its military power as the key to the future of Latin America.

I do not understand this unhealthy reliance on brute force. It is inconsistent with the traditions of our people to resort to a foreign policy of sabotage and covert operations when there is an opportunity to lend our Nation's greatness to peaceful negotiations.

I was deeply moved by the passionate conviction of President Betancur on this point. Raising his fist in the air, he likened American foreign policy to a mighty hammer crashing down upon a resounding anvil—accompanied only by a faint prayer to God Almighty.

Permit me now to turn to the issue of the military installations in Honduras. The nature of the construction at these sites has become a kind of litmus test in determining the intention of the United States with regard to future military involvement in the region.

The question has been distilled down to whether these sites are temporary or permanent.

I am not certain that this is the proper context in which this issue should be placed. As many of you know, I have asked the Comptroller General to examine the status of the bases from a legal standpoint and issue an opinion on the propriety of the construction under existing law. A team of GAO investigators accompanied us on this trip specifically for the purpose of examin-

ing these sites for that report. Today I have written the Comptroller General and asked that his opinion be expedited in light of the serious and immediate concerns that have been raised over construction in the region. Many of you also know that I have commented publicly on this question already.

Rather than embarking on a finely turned examination of what constitutes permanent construction, let me suggest that the more appropriate question is that of our country's intentions for future utilization of these sites.

Yes, the Administration can argue that it intends the bases to be used only for limited support for training exercises.

However, having examined these sites in detail, I must also report that—in my opinion—these bases appear to have been constructed in such a way as to make them suitable for long-range usage with relatively minor additional work. In many cases, simple maintenance is only necessary to preserve these facilities for longer-range uses. Construction has been extensive—far more extensive to my layman's eye—than should be required for simple military training.

I am not convinced that the millions of dollars we have poured into these construction sites are purely in support of military exercises. The preponderance of evidence leads me to the tortuous, difficult conclusion that there is more here than meets the eye. While the Administration's interpretation may be reasonable in an isolated context, the fact is that the larger picture suggests there is more at stake.

For example, it troubles me that the Administration has not produced the comprehensive regional plan for military construction that was required by the 1984 Defense Appropriations bill before any further construction was to take place.

It troubles me that the exercises in Honduras appear to have no end.

It troubles me that the scope and size of the exercises appear to exceed those of any other similar exercises the United States has ever conducted.

It troubles me that U.S. military personnel are assuming increasingly significant and dangerous roles in the operations of the Salvadoran and Honduran forces.

Finally, let me add that the conduct of the military personnel we saw in these countries was second to none. I know my two colleagues join me in saying that we have nothing but praise for them. My own concern is that we are now dangerously close to thrusting the burden of foreign policy on the shoulders of professional soldiers. We did that in Lebanon less than one year ago. We must not do it again.

The three of us have appealed to Secretary Shultz for a meeting—a meeting at which we could share these concerns and urge him and the President to come forward with an honest and open foreign policy. Debate in a democracy is not to be feared, but embraced. Bipartisan support for foreign policy is possible, if the policy-makers are willing to let the American people know what they are trying to do.

MEMORANDUM ON FACILITIES VIEWED AT MILITARY FACILITIES SITES IN HONDURAS, MAY 2, 1984

This memorandum does not itemize all facilities observed at all sites.

This memorandum should not be taken as labeling any site visited as the property of the U.S. Government since the information provided to the Congressional Delegation is that the U.S. activities at these sites are related to training exercises and, in the instance of Palmerola Air Force Base at Comayaqua, a Honduran air base, the facilities are also associated with what the Delegation was advised is a contingency use agreement.

There are some points which must be taken into account in evaluating the U.S. military construction observed by the Delegation:

When Department of Defense designs facilities as "permanent" facilities, it designs for a forty-year use life;

There are in existence in both the United States and Panama wooden facilities which have been in use for forty or more years;

The only facilities observed which have been constructed or are being completed under specific Congressional authorization and funding in laws naming the site and facilities are located at Palmerola Air Force Base, Comayaqua, Honduras;

There remains the underlying, vitally important question of why Congress was not adequately informed about the extent of U.S. involvement in Central America; and,

In each location where wood facilities were built these facilities are one step nearer long-term use facilities than are the tents originally installed at the sites.

COMAYAQUA

This is the site of the Honduran Palmerola Air Force Base. It is also one of the two sites at which the Congress has authorized specific military construction by the U.S. government using specifically appropriated military construction funds. The second site for which the Congress has authorized U.S. military construction using appropriated military construction funds is La Ceiba, a second Honduran air base. The Congress has prohibited DOD from using the $8 million appropriated for La Ceiba prior to the Administration providing to the Congressional Committees on Appropriations with the complete U.S. construction plan for the Central American region.

The authorized construction, with U.S. military construction funds, at Palmerola is for airfield improvements, fuel storage and lighting. When completed this would be the first airfield in Honduras with lighting for night landings of aircraft.

Additional construction has taken place at this site, funded with DOD operations and maintenance money. This includes approximately 175 wooden, Central American Tropical (CAT) huts. These are used for barracks, and base support camp facilities. Under construction at the time of the Delegation's visit were a small recreation building and a barber shop. These buildings are not the type normally designated for "permanent" installations in the United States, but, with maintenance, could have a use-life ranging from two to twenty-five years. These buildings replace wooden tent platforms. In the Honduran climate tents are considered to have a use-life of six months and are considerably less comfortable for military forces than are tents.

TRUJILLO

There were three separate facilities visited in this area. At Trujillo itself is located a hard-surfaced landing strip. The work financed by the U.S. at this site was carried out by both U.S. military forces and by a private sector contractor. It included the extension of the landing strip and the construction of a hard surfaced parking apron for aircraft.

The second site in this area is Camp Sea Eagle. At this site Navy Seabees, using operations and maintenance funding, built SEA huts used for a base camp and troop housing. During the two Honduran rainy seasons this site floods. The Delegation saw this site during the dry season. The camp is not in use although the SEA huts remain in place. During his March 7 appearance before the House Subcommittee on Military Construction, General Paul Gorman, commander-in-chief of the U.S. Southern Command headquartered in Panama, testified that it was then expected that these wooden buildings would be sold to the Honduran government. The information provided to the Delegation is that this anticipated sale may not actually take place.

The third facility in this area visited by the Delegation was the Regional Military Training Center (RMTC). It is at this site that a U.S. Military Training Team, financed by a U.S. Security Assistance grant is training both Honduran and El Salvadoran troops. Using operations and maintenance funding, the U.S. Corps of Engineers constructed 27 wooden CAT huts at this site which continue to belong to the U.S. government. The Honduran government constructed additional CAT huts at this site. Like those at Comayaqua, the CAT huts at this site are being maintained and used.

AQUACATE

Prior to the beginning of Big Pine II there was already in place at this site a dirt landing strip capable of being used by C-130 aircraft. During Big Pine II, the U.S. Corps of Engineers, using operations and maintenance funding, added a 4,000 foot extention to the existing airfield. This work included the installation of culverts of alleviate a flooding problem occurring during Honduran rainy seasons. This visit to this site was by C-130 aircraft. The landing strip appears to be receiving appropriate maintenance. In addition, at this site the U.S. Engineers built three CAT huts.

It has been estimated that most U.S. aircraft could land on an 8,000 foot airfield, which is the length of the Aquacate landing strip, although not all U.S. military aircraft can use a dirt landing strip.

NOTE.—Dirt landstrips such as this one are termed "hasty" air strips. The U.S. Corps of Engineers build them to take 20 to 40 C-130 landings during the rainy season.

JAMASTRAN

The Corps of Engineers are currently working at this site building a "hasty" C-130 capable landing strip. There is a base camp in place here, built by the Corps which includes perimeter earthworks as a security measure. Troops are housed in tents. There are five CAT huts at this site which were moved here from San Lorenzo, where they were originally built during Big Pine II. The work being done at Jamastran is part of Grenadaro I, a training exercise involving U.S. and Honduran military forces.

Grenadaro I began in late March and is scheduled for completion in late June.

Jamastran landing strip is one of two being built or improved to C-130 capability during Grenadaro I. The other is at Cucuyaqua near the Hondoran/El Salvador border. Due to unfavorable weather the Delegation was unable to visit Cucuyaqua.

SAN LORENZO

Due to poor flying conditions, the Delegation was able only to overfly this location. During Big Pine II, which ended in February, the U.S. Corps of Engineers built a "hasty" airfield and a base camp of CAT

huts at this location. Except for the CAT huts moved to Jamastran the base camp remains in place. The Delegation was told this landing strip was not being maintained and is now closed to C-130 traffic.

It is estimated that a "hasty airfield" which has not been maintained could be reconditioned for C-130 use in a time period ranging from two days to three weeks.

TIGER ISLAND

This is currently the site for a low-altitude radar system operated by the U.S. Marines, an airstrip improved by the U.S. military during Big Pine II and a pier jutting into the Bay of Fonseca which was improved by the U.S. military during Big Pine II.

According to the information provided the Delegation the radar at this site is scheduled for removal with its mission to be assumed by ships operating off-shore.

CERRO LA MOLE

The U.S. has a medium to high altitude radar site at this Honduran installation. This radar, along with the one at Tiger Island, are currently the only radar in existence in Honduras. The Honduran government does not currently own radar. At this site, as at all other sites, the Government of Honduras provides the security forces.

The Delegation was not advised of any schedule for removing the radar at this site.

The tents which originally housed U.S. forces at this site have been replaced with metal buildings.

□ 1540

THE SEX DISCRIMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES CODE REFORM ACT

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I join Representative BILL GREEN in introducing legislation, at the request of the administration, that will eliminate gender-based distinctions from the Federal Code. This bill removes from the laws of the United States archaic statutory provisions which contain a substantive sex bias. These provisions can be divided into five categories: family benefits, barriers to educational training and employment opportunities, family relationships, the definition of criminal sexual activity and provisions that were enacted to protect women. I will briefly discuss each of the categories of provisions.

Those provisions that pertain to family benefits effect various rights or privileges that exist for the "wives, widows" or dependent children of male workers, but make no provision for the families of similarly situated female workers. Generally, these distinctions were based on the assumption that benefits would not be needed by women's families because it was presumed that a wage-earning husband was present.

Many of the provisions that are addressed by this bill pertain to discrimination against women with regard to certain educational, training, and employment opportunities. Our proposal addresses the problem created by statutes that consider men to be the dominant or more important member of a family. For example, many statutes give preference to fathers over mothers.

This bill eliminates sex-based distinctions that exist in the definition of criminal sexual activity. For example, rape and statutory rape have been defined as offenses which can only be committed by a man against a woman.

The final category of provisions that this bill would amend includes laws which were enacted to protect women from discriminatory treatment. For instance, the statute that makes the citizenship status of a woman dependent on that of her husband.

This proposal would remove over 147 statutory provisions from our laws. These provisions were identified by President Reagan's Task Force on Legal Equity for Women.

The President's Task Force on Legal Equity for Women was established "to provide for the systematic elimination of regulatory and procedural barriers which have unfairly precluded women from receiving equal treatment from Federal activities." The task force was established by Executive Order 12336. The Attorney General was responsible for reviewing Federal laws, policies, regulations and practices and reporting to the President on any language or provision that "unjustifiably differentiates, or which effectively discriminates, on the basis of sex."

On June 28, 1982, the Attorney General transmitted his first report to the President's Cabinet Council on Legal Policy. This report listed more than 100 statutes which made substantive distinctions based on gender. The statutes were identified by a computer search that was conducted by the Justice Department.

In July 1983, another report was transmitted from the Attorney General to the President. This report identified over 47 additional sex-based laws which were not included in the Attorney General's report of June 28, 1982. The President's Cabinet Council on Legal Policy reviewed the additional provisions that were identified in the July 1983 report, and the Cabinet Council agreed that the sex-based distinctions in these statutes should also be eliminated.

Over the past several years progress has been made in revising statutes that provide for inequitable treatment. Some distinctions have been eliminated by agency action or by court decisions. Congress has enacted rules of construction designed to provide for equal treatment of the sexes. Despite these past efforts, there are still numerous provisions that provide for substantive differences in the treatment of our citizens. I am committed to working for the swift enactment of the President's proposal. These obsolete provisions have no place in our society. We must eliminate sex-based distinctions from our laws.

PRESIDENT REAGAN RIGHT ON LIBYA

(Mr. WINN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, "Early on, the Reagan administration branded Colonel Qadhafi a pariah and started using its influence to thin out American ties with his regime. Other nations, some of them mocking Mr. Reagan for his 'overreaction,' took up some of the slack. He was right and they were wrong."

This quote from the Washington Post editorial of April 24 which follows justly praises President Reagan's approach to Libya. While most would agree with President Reagan that Colonel Qadhafi is a madman, they often use this as a pretext to dismiss him as harmless. Libya and its terrorist campaign are considered nuisance factors but no more.

This is incorrect. Qadhafi with his large arsenal of advanced Soviet military equipment is an important factor in the strategic balance in the Mediterranean and North Africa. In Chad and in the Sudan, he has demonstrated that he is willing to use his military capability to subvert governments friendly to the West. Through terrorism he seeks to intimidate Middle Eastern leaders away from peace; to suppress dissent and human freedom at home and abroad. He respects no international standards or codes. He kills and maims at will.

With the apalling murder of a British policewoman and the wounding of 11 others in London, it should now be apparent to all Western nations that Colonel Qadhafi is a menace which all should join forces to curb.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1984]

THE LIBYAN TERROR

Many countries, including Britain; that have no use for the terroristic nature of Col. Qaddafi, have nonetheless decided over the years to maintain regular ties with Libya. They have done so for business reasons and also on the theory that contact promotes understanding. You can make a strong argument for such a position, but in this case it didn't work. These countries have been forced by their decision to gamble on Col. Qaddafi's whim. The most recent result is the humiliation Britain has just incurred.

Last Monday, as Bob Woodward reported in The Post yesterday, the Libyans hauled out two students who had been tried earlier by what is described as a student court and publicly hanged them. The next day some outraged exiles demonstrated outside their country's London "people's bureau," as Col. Qaddafi calls his embassy. One of his minions fired a machine gun out the window,

killing a police officer and wounding 11 other persons—this in a country where guns are rigidly controlled and where the killing of a police officer is a rare and grave offense.

The British demanded that the Libyans permit them to search for the killer. The Libyans stonewalled, demanding diplomatic immunity even for embassy occupants it insists are not diplomats. And finally the British, who have 8,000 nationals working in Libya and conduct an annual trade of nearly half a billion dollars there, abandoned the quest for the killer, covering their retreat by breaking off diplomatic relations. They really had no choice.

The fact is that the international rules are not easily invoked against rogue nations unless there is an overwhelming consensus, which there is not in this case. An adequate defense cannot be mounted against an outlaw such as Libya unless the defender is willing to pay a cost in jobs, oil, and business foregone. Britain's economic troubles and general diplomatic strategy have inclined it to give an array of hostages—human and economic—to Col. Qaddafi, who has treated the British with contempt. Even Egypt, with more reason than most to retaliate against this wild man, has found its hands tied.

Early on, the Reagan administration branded Col. Qaddafi a pariah and started using its influence to thin out American ties with his regime. Other nations, some of them mocking Mr. Reagan for his "overreaction," took up some of the slack. He was right and they were wrong.

RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM R. GIANELLI

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, William R. Gianelli returns to California this week after completing 3 years of outstanding service as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

Since he arrived in Washington during the first days of the Reagan administration to assume oversight of the Army civil works program, Bill Gianelli has demonstrated his strong commitment to an effective Federal water resources development program.

During that time, he has worked hard to find new ways of financing Federal projects that will allow Federal water project construction to proceed in this time of necessary Federal budgetary austerity and changing national priorities.

Both Houses of Congress have made substantial progress on omnibus water resources development authorization legislation, and while the final form of that legislation has yet to be shaped, all who are familiar with the versions awaiting floor consideration in both bodies know of the important input provided by Assistant Secretary Gianelli.

There is, in fact, a renewed commitment within the Congress and the administration, acting as partners, to work out our differences in this area so that we can revitalize the Federal water resources program.

Bill Gianelli has made giant strides in reforming the Corps of Engineers' regulatory program. Largely through his efforts, the average processing time has been cut almost in half for the over 15,000 citizens who must obtain Corps of Engineers' permit decisions annually. Few things do more to restore a citizen's confidence in his government, and Bill Gianelli has gone a long way toward achieving that objective.

In his role as leader of the Arlington National Cemetery, he has done a great deal to make this national monument the institution we all know our veterans and our Nation deserve. He has broken a 10-year deadlock over funding of a permanent Visitors' Center at Arlington to service the 3½ million visitors annually. This much-needed facility will be built in 1986.

He has also been instrumental in the successful effort to inter an Unknown Soldier from the Vietnam era, a recently announced and long-awaited salute to those who paid the ultimate price in that conflict. This Memorial Day, the Vietnam Unknown will join the Unknown National Heroes of previous wars.

As Bill Gianelli leaves Government service, he will long be remembered for his readiness to make decisions and his vision of the potential contributions of water development to the Nation's economic health. He came well-equipped for the task before him, with over 40 years experience in the water resources field. He possessed a unique grasp of the political realities in a time of budget austerity, deep insights into the President's philosophy and political beliefs, and a westerner's sense of how precious water is and what the wise or unwise use of water can mean to a region and to the Nation.

Bill Gianelli showed that even in the huge Government bureaucracy we have today, one man can still make a difference. He took his job of being the civilian head of the Army Corps of Engineers seriously and challenged the corps from top to bottom. Because of the high esteem in which he has always held the corps, he knew what could be done if the corps were thoroughly challenged.

I am sure my colleagues join me in expressing to Bill Gianelli our deep appreciation for the service, insights, and call to action he has given the Nation, and in wishing him and his wife, Shirley, every success and happiness as they return home to California.

□ 1830

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON. WALTER FLOWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak of our former colleague Walter Flowers with a mixture of sadness and joy. Sadness because he is no longer physically with us. Joy because he enriched our days, and lives on in our lives and in the lives of his wife, Beverly, and his family. He was a leader, a gentlemen, and a friend.

Walter Flowers and I came to Congress together and served together on both the House Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Science and Technology. We worked together, played together, traveled together, threaded through life's problems together and indeed lived much of life together. He was a leader, a gentlemen, and a friend.

On Judiciary, Walter was known nationally for his agonizing but decisive role in the Watergate hearings, yet his contribution went far beyond that. He was a lawyer's lawyer with the great diligence to match his great intellect. On the Science Committee, Walter was one of the first to recognize the impending energy crisis—even before the Arab oil embargo. He sought knowledge and solutions.

He loved his work, he loved his committees, he loved this House. His State of Alabama and the Nation are the better for his life. He was a leader, a gentlemen, and a friend.

Walter Flowers was a patriot. We visited Vietnam together and his pride in our servicemen and women was unfailing. He knew this Nation and its people and rejoiced in being an American.

Walter was never one to hide his light under a bushel. Not to be deterred from serving our constituents during Vietnam demonstrations that threatened to close Washington bridges to traffic, we took a canoe down the Potomac, I paddled the bow, our former colleague Bob Mathias the stern, and Walter sat in the middle holding a sign with the slogan "Cannon Building or bust." The photograph appeared on front pages from Selma to Singapore.

He was an athlete. The House gymnasium will never be quite the same without his shouts and curses. Neither will SONNY MONTGOMERY.

He was always searching out new restaurants for some "good old heart burn sausage" just as he was always searching out new mountains to climb and challenges to overcome. He was a leader, a gentleman, and a friend.

Walter Flowers never turned away from a friend in need or from any individual who needed his help. He was dedicated to his fellow men and in helping resolve their problems. Whether you were a long-time friend or newly met, Walter greeted and

treated a person with warmth and kindness.

Walter Flowers exemplified life, and with his wife, Beverly, lived every minute of every hour of every day to its fullest. He lived with verve and panache. He took his job seriously but never himself. He could disagree without being disagreeable. He could laugh at himself.

There are so many fond memories of Walter and Beverly. His office was the gathering place during late evening sessions. We drank and sang on the Chesapeake with his friends Otis Pike and Lou Frey.

Walter, we will all miss you but are all better for what you have given us. You taught us how to live with zest and serve with honor. You were a leader, a gentleman, and a friend.

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the news of Walter Flower's sudden death was a complete shock to all of us.

For 10 years, Walter served in the House with distinction and dedication on behalf of a State and a people he truly loved.

Many will remember Walter as an important member of the Judiciary Committee during the Nixon impeachment proceedings—but those of us who knew Walter well will remember him most as an extremely bright and talented person with undisputed integrity and a deep sense of patriotism and purpose.

I was sorry Walter left the House in 1978 to run for the U.S. Senate—and I was always happy to see him on his occasional visits to the Capitol. Walter was a sensitive human being with a tremendous heart and good humor. I will miss him.

Millie and I extend our love and share the sorrow of the Flowers family.●

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great depth of feeling today that I offer my remarks on Walter Flowers, a former Congressman and very dear friend, whose death is mourned by many. Walter was a man with a rare warmth and love for his fellow man, who reached out to others and who retained a quiet dignity which he comingled with his enormous zest for life, which he lived to the fullest.

I was particularly pleased that he has recently been remembered for his critical decisions which weighed so heavily upon him at the time during the proceedings in the House Judiciary Committee for the three articles of impeachment, two of which he supported.

In those days, Walter was a key Member entrusted with great power and the decision he and others were faced with was very difficult. As he said at the time, "I wake up nights on those nights I've been able to sleep lately, wondering if this could not be some sordid dream." He knew, and expressed it from time to time, that those days and that moment marked one of the pinnacles of his particular role as a man elected to represent the Seventh District of Alabama. History will remember that event as one where he displayed a great deal of courage and conviction, and indeed his judgment and ability still serve as models to us all.

In the work of the Science and Technology Committee, Walter Flowers also played a very key role. First elected to the House in 1968, Walter joined the Science Committee in his second term. At that time his interests were concentrated on NASA, which has an important function in the State of Alabama, and on science policy as well as scientific education.

Tuscaloosa, Walter's hometown where he practiced law, is a university town. Since his days as president of the student body at the University of Alabama, Walter had always had a particular interest in the educational process. During his years in the Congress he worked to broaden the role of Federal expenditures for science education and for science in general. The process is still going on today.

Walter's interest in the committee activities blossomed further in 1977 when he turned down the opportunity to serve another term as subcommittee chairman on the Judiciary Committee, in favor of taking the Science and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Fossil and Nuclear Energy. It was at that time that the committee's jurisdiction for energy R&D had been expanded with the abolition of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Walter's leadership was absolutely vital in reviewing the initiatives undertaken by the Joint Committee and in putting the imprint of the Science Committee on those activities and on fossil and synthetic fuel activities.

Walter Flowers would also rate as the finest storyteller of the committee, a man who could go very quickly to the heart of any problem, yet whose air of casual unconcern masked a finely-honed legal mind. For all these reasons we remember him, and for these same reasons we mourn his death.

To his wife Beverly and his children, Nancy joins me in extending our heartfelt sorrow.

Walter we miss you.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague very much, indeed.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS), an associate of Congressman Walter Flowers.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for taking this special order and giving us all a chance to have a few words to say about our dear friend, Walter.

I suppose we will hear the word "shocked" several times today, because we were all shocked when Walter was dead at the age of 51. As a matter of fact, it was on his 51st birthday. That is too young. I guess it made all of us slow down just a little bit as we thought about such a fine specimen of a man dying on the tennis court.

I remember Walter. I had known him probably for 35 years. We were classmates at the University of Alabama. I first knew him in the student government down there when I was president and 3 years later he became president and in all those years we worked closely together.

I remember him as a young man, even in those days, who knew what he was about, a man of great intelligence and great ability; so I was particularly pleased later on when he did come here to the House of Representatives.

I guess we could all hope that having spent 10 years here, as he did, that we could leave the kind of mark that Walter Flowers did.

I remember sitting right over here many afternoons during the so-called impeachment hearings when he would sit there and really agonize. I do not say he was the only one on the committee who did, but he really put everything he had into that decision, because there was a lot of pressure on him in our State to pretty well whitewash the thing; so I was very proud of the way he handled it.

My sympathy certainly goes to Beverly and his family. I certainly shall miss him. He was an asset to this House. One of the few things he ever did wrong was to run for the other body and leave us here.

We do miss him and again I thank the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, for those words. He will be missed, as he is already missed, and still I think he is in one real sense still a part of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding and for taking this time to pay recognition to our close friend, Walter Flowers, and the gentleman from Alabama who also has a special order, RICHARD SHELBY, who now represents the congressional district that Walter Flowers did represent at one time.

As the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) said, I really still

cannot believe that Walter Flowers is not with us. He was so full of life that we just expected to look around and there would be Walter Flowers.

I am proud to believe that I was one of Walter Flowers' good friends. Our districts joined each other on the Mississippi-Alabama line. We had the same type of people, climates, and also the land was similar, so we became very, very close in working in our congressional districts. In fact, Walter Flowers, to cover the western part of his congressional district on the Alabama line, had to come to my hometown to use our news media over there and I accused Walter on several occasions of maybe thinking about running over in Mississippi. He had done well over there. He had a lot of friends and had a lot of kin people in that part of the State.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned, Walter liked sports and we certainly enjoyed being with him in the gym. He was a leader down there.

□ 1840

He was just part of everything that took place. He was an excellent athlete, and it is ironic that he lost his life in playing a sport, playing tennis, and he was playing with some of his family.

As I said earlier, he liked sports. He was a good athlete and he was always a winner. He believed really that he could win in most everything he participated in and he almost did that.

He was successful in politics, in business, and in life.

Certainly our prayers go out to Beverly, his wife, and to his three children, and to the other members of his family.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman. I think you knew Walter Flowers as well as anyone in this House as a person and as a friend, and I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. BROWN of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I shared the shock which I am sure was felt by all Members of this House when the gentleman from Pennsylvania entered the well and announced the death of Walter Flowers. I had known him since he entered the House, had served with him on the Science and Technology Committee, and had enjoyed those many hours down in the gym that we used to share together.

I will never claim, of course, to be in the same class with an athlete like Walter. But I think we approached the hours down there with the same spirit, both trying to do our best. And while his best was considerably better than mine, it was a great pleasure to join with him down there.

We perhaps exemplify in the regard which we held for each other something that occurs frequently here in the House, people of different backgrounds, different regions of the country, different political philosophies who learn to respect and even to love one another for the contributions that each makes to this House. I remember Walter particularly in the Science and Technology Committee for his assiduous and continuous effort to make sure that his State and his region shared in the distribution of those funds which were distributed by the National Science Foundation and other agencies for the improvement of science throughout this country.

Walter did not see any reason why Alabama should not have the same opportunities and nourish the same kind of excellence that was nourished at Harvard or Stanford or some of the other great institutions, and he made his point very well.

I could not always agree with him because if he had prevailed, California would have lost. But I admired and respected the efforts which he made because it showed a true understanding of the all prevalence of human ability throughout this great country of ours, and he was perhaps the best representative of that himself, being a great leader from the State of Alabama.

I will sorely miss him. There are few people in the years that I have been here that I respected more than Walter Flowers, for all of the reasons that have been cited here. It is just a great tragedy that we have lost him.

I know that I continued to meet with him and discuss many policy problems after he had left the Congress.

There was another thing that we shared. We had both left the Congress at one point to seek not higher but different office and we both failed to achieve that. And it gave us a sort of a bond, I think, in our discussions about the problems that face this country.

But I will miss him very much, and I know there are many others who feel the same way that I do. I do not know what more we can say.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my distinguished friend and colleague from California who certainly worked very closely with Walter Flowers over a period of many years. We appreciate his remarks very much indeed.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I now yield to my colleague from New York (Mr. LENT).

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, throughout my years of public service, I have met countless individuals known for many qualities. Yet, I have come to realize the most essential and valuable attribute an elected Representative can possess is a sense of duty and responsibility to the people of this great Nation. If I had to single out one man who epitomized such qualities, I would select our late colleague, Walter Flowers of Alabama.

Walter was elected to the House of Representatives for his first term in 1968. His sense of duty and responsibility was never more clearly demonstrated than during the dramatic House Judiciary Committee hearings in 1974 on the impeachment charges brought against President Richard Nixon. His conduct in these critical proceedings typified his career in the House of Representatives and won him the deep respect and admiration of his colleagues. I am grateful for the opportunity to have worked with him for so many years.

Despite all of his legislative duties, Walter worked tirelessly for the benefit of his Alabama constituents, through his 5 years in the U.S. Congress.

In remarks which summed up the essence of his philosophy of government, Walter Flowers once said, "The institutions of the country have been set up by the people to serve them, to carry out those functions that are necessary to a peaceful and free society. They are not created to serve the interests of one man or one group of men."

Walter and I were not what could be called close friends, but I had the privilege and pleasure of being in his company on several social occasions over the years we served together in Congress. He was possessed of a great sense of humor and a warm and friendly personality. He was a man we all admired and respected. We all will miss him. His lovely wife, Beverly, has my deepest sympathy.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague who has also worked long and hard with Walter over the years and appreciate his remarks.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. And I now yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL).

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Walter Flowers was a man of uncommon dedication and intense determination. His service in the Congress was filled with enthusiasm, vigor, and sincerity. His constituents were proud of his efforts on their behalf and demonstrated their admiration for him by returning Walter to the House in each election for 10 years.

Walter received national recognition for the fairness, independence and sense of justice he exhibited during the impeachment hearings for President Nixon. He immersed himself in those hearings and studied the issues with a dogged determination to do what was constitutionally proper and what was best for the Nation. His vote

was a decisive one and one which has been credited with having turned the course of history. Although he could have chosen the politically expedient route, his sense of duty to the Nation overrode any self-interest. That's the kind of person Walter Flowers was.

I came to admire Walter, not only for his love of this Nation, but also for his brilliant legal mind. He was a person of principles and of purpose who contributed so much to America.

I remember flying with him to Alabama, several years ago, when we were both returning home to our districts for a summer work period. On a stopover in Knoxville, we learned that Alabama's junior Senator, Jim Allen, had died. Walter had already decided to run for retiring Senator John Sparkman's seat.

On the flight to Alabama, we had a long discussion about Jim and his dedication to the people of our State. We talked about Jim Allen's tireless efforts, having given his all fighting against the Panama Canal Treaty. We both admired his legislative ability and his willingness to go to the wall for what he perceived to be the right cause.

Walter Flowers was similar to Jim Allen. Both men worked tirelessly in their jobs. And both men gave all they had to the people they served.

After leaving Congress, Walter excelled in private industry, as he had in public service. He was a highly respected voice in Washington even after leaving Congress. We continued to seek his advice and his opinion on issues vitally important to America. And he remained a friend to all of us who so deeply respected him.

I shall miss Walter and I join with all my colleagues from our state in expressing my deepest sympathy to Beverly and to Walter's children.

The tragedy of Walter's death struck doubly hard, coming when he had so much ahead of him. His future seemed so bright and he was at the crest of his success. It is much too early for it to have ended.

Walter Flowers served his Nation with distinction and was a friend to his fellow man.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague from Alabama and yield to another distinguished colleague from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS).

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words in behalf of a former colleague of mine who was tragically removed from our midst by a heart attack on Thursday, April 13.

Walter Flowers' death is certainly a loss to his profession and to the many of us who knew him and respected him greatly.

Walter represented a rather conservative constituency in west Alabama, including the city of Tuscaloosa where he attended college at the University of Alabama. He loved that institution greatly and was a tireless worker in behalf of educational programs which benefited his alma mater. It was my privilege to serve with Walter for 10 years in the House of Representatives and I found him to be an astute student of the judicial process. My own background being totally devoid of legal matters, I always sought out Walter's advice in voting on all issues pertaining to judicial matters.

His finest hour without question came during the debate in the House of Representatives concerning the impeachment of the President of the United States and I knew that that particular vote he would have to make in Judiciary Committee troubled him mightily. Every Member of Congress was receiving a great deal of mail and many of us, including this Member, were reluctant to call for impeachment as we did not have all the facts. Each of us realized that impeachment of a President was a monumental decision.

Those of us from Alabama and many other Members of that Congress who respected Walter Flowers' good judgment withheld any final decision until Walter Flowers had declared his intention and, after his announcement, I had no hesitation.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bob Ingram, a mutual friend of Walter Flowers and myself, who formerly was political reporter for the Montgomery Advertiser and currently is editorial director for WSFA-TV, Montgomery, AL, has said it better than any of us could in his April 13 editorial, "A Man of Courage," which I insert at this point in my remarks.

A MAN OF COURAGE

It seemed from the beginning of his political career that Walter Flowers was going to be dealt more than his share of bad hands. Flowers was elected to congress on May 7th, 1968. On a normal news day, this would have been a big story. It would have received a lot of play. But May 7th, 1968, was not a normal news day. Gov. Lurleen Wallace died that day, and it was this tragic event that got most of the air time on TV and most of the space in the newspapers. The election of Flowers was scarcely mentioned.

Six years later fate dealt Flowers yet another no-win hand. He was a member of the House Judiciary Committee which had before it a resolution calling for the impeachment of Richard Nixon. Flowers knew full well the sentiments of the people of his district . . . they were overwhelmingly in support of the President. Flowers was flooded with calls and letters demanding that he stand by the President. But as the case against Nixon was presented to the committee, it became increasingly clear to Flowers that this man should not remain as President.

Flowers had several options. He could do the politic thing and vote no . . . he could simply pass . . . or he could absent himself when the roll was called. Walter Flowers conscience would not permit him to exercise any of these options. And who can ever forget that dramatic moment . . . with the whole world watching . . . when a deeply moved, terribly anguished Flowers cast his vote for impeachment. It was a display of courage rarely seen in the political arena.

There is no way to know what effect this vote had in Flowers ill-fated race for the U.S. Senate in 1978. It's unlikely he would have defeated Howell Heflin under any circumstance, but the impeachment vote didn't help.

Walter Flowers died yesterday. He was 51. It's not likely that any building will ever be named in his honor . . . any monument raised in his memory. But if anyone should ever chisel into marble the names of Alabama's politically courageous, it might not require a very big slab of marble, but it should be big enough to include the name of Walter Flowers.

And that's the way we see it tonight.

My deepest sympathy to the family of Walter Flowers and I would want each of them to know that I have indeed lost a good friend and Alabama has lost one of its most able citizens.

□ 1850

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my distinguished colleague and friend from Alabama. I yield to another gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FLIPPO. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for having this special order.

All of us today come with heavy hearts to pay tribute to our late friend and colleague, Walter Flowers. Since his tragic and untimely death, numerous tributes have been paid to Walter and almost without fail, all of those tributes refer to his courage in the vote that he cast in that impeachment trial.

I submit to you that it was indeed a courageous vote but it was also not unusual for Walter Flowers to cast a courageous vote. When I first came to the Congress, Walter was on the Policy and Steering Committee, and he assisted me on serving on the Science and Technology Committee with him. He served on that committee.

And as the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) talked about earlier, Walter's work in behalf of trying to create centers of excellence throughout the Nation so that all could share in the benefit of that education and outstanding research and development, I learned with him on that committee the short time that I served with him there, and Mr. BROWN failed to mention but earlier this year that same committee at my request and with the help of Mr. BROWN succeeded in reestablishing those centers of excellence. So Walter's work was effective in that regard.

I think BILL NICHOLS mentioned a few minutes ago about the editorials that have been mentioned about Walter and his great service and great courage. The gentleman pointed out that the stone that records all coura-

geous men's names will probably not be very big, but it should certainly be big enough to contain the name of Walter Flowers.

Walter did serve the State of Alabama with great distinction for 10 years. I have on many occasions been the recipient of his kindness and his wisdom. Alabama is a better place today because of his service and I prefer to remember Walter in his vitality and humor and wisdom. He was my good friend, and I, like other thousands, will dearly miss him.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague and friend from Alabama.

I yield to my colleague and friend from Georgia.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, the 12th day of last month was a day of poignant tragedy for those of us who knew Walter Flowers. On that date, he reached his 51st birthday; and on that date, he died. Unexpected and untimely, his loss has stirred in many of us feelings of the unfairness of it all—the unfulfilled potential, the unused energy, the unfinished works, the unmet goals, the undreamed dreams.

Though incomplete, Walter Flowers lived a good life. He prepared himself, he worked hard, he gave much, he influenced many.

Walter Flowers was a scholarly man. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, he held a A.B. degree as well as a law degree; he was a Rotary Foundation Fellow at the University of London, England, for additional graduate study.

He was a man who practiced his profession and served his community. His interests and active support ranged from the Boy Scouts of America to the Red Cross to the Tuscaloosa County Mental Health Association to the Federal court appellate system to the United Way to the National Democratic Party. He involved himself in numerous and varied causes. He saw many needs and he tried to do his part to meet them.

Walter Flowers was a man who served his country. He held a Reserve officer commission, and he served on active duty in the U.S. Army. He is now a part forever of his country in Arlington National Cemetery where he was buried with full military honors.

Walter Flowers was a man who participated in his Government in the dual role of servant and leader. I first met him in this capacity. My initial 2 years of service here in the House of Representatives coincided with the last two sessions of his decade of representation of the people of the Seventh District of Alabama. He sat on the House Judiciary Committee during one of our Nation's most dramatic, yet most tragic times. I was aware of his eloquent and equitable participation in the hearings which resulted from the Watergate disaster. I knew of his concern for the elderly, even as a young man, his vision in the area of aging—its needs and its problems. I knew of his work on the House Select Committee on Aging. I soon, too, became aware of his dedication to scientific research in our country and his view of our Nation's role in space.

And, I was fortunate enough to get to know Walt Flowers on a personal basis. He was a man worth knowing. During the 10 years he was a part of the Congress, Walter Flowers was a man involved, an innovative man, an active man. He did his best for his district, his State, his party and his Nation. He was a man who enjoyed a fine reputation and the respect of his colleagues. He also had their affection which continued on even after he left this body.

The life of Walter Flowers has ended though it was not completed. There is so much more that he could have done and that he would have done. But we are grateful for his time here, for his contributions, his influence and for the privilege of calling him friend. Our sympathy goes out to his wife and to his children who can take comfort in knowing that Walter Flowers was a man who was loved, admired, respected, and appreciated by many people.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent comments and appreciate his being here.

I yield to another distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FOWLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the privilege of joining with my colleagues to mourn the passing, while celebrating the life, of Walter Flowers, Jr.

Our Nation produced a fine public servant, and no better friend, than Walter Flowers. His public career is, of course, a matter of record, and it is an exemplary record. The decade of his service in this body was a challenging time in the life of this country, and Walter Flowers was more than equal to the challenge.

He brought his exceptional skills as a lawyer to the important work of the House Judiciary Committee, and his good judgment and practical bent of mind were invaluable to that committee on a host of difficult issues during his tenure.

No issue was more difficult, or more important to the constitutional integrity of this Nation, than the impeachment proceedings in the Judiciary Committee brought in the wake of Watergate. The personal struggle of Walter Flowers during those difficult days was widely chronicled, and his resolution of that struggle did as much to confirm the character of this institution as it did to demonstrate the personal integrity and courage of this dedicated public servant. For a moment the burden of our history rested on his shoulders, and we are a better and prouder Nation for the way he carried that burden.

These are matters of public record, but many of us will remember Walter Flowers most for his loyalty and friendship, and for his quiet good counsel. He was a man of conscience, and he had a gift for unselfish friendship. He has been missed as a colleague since his retirement from the Congress, and his untimely passing now leaves an incomparable void in the lives of his many, many friends.

His death is an occasion of grief, but his life is a cause for celebration. We are grateful to the people of Alabama for sending him to us, and to the gentleman from California for giving us this opportunity to salute a departed colleague who made us all better for knowing him.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague from Georgia and yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of my good friend and our honored former colleague, Walter Flowers, creates a sad void in the body politic that cannot be filled. He was a gentleman of the first order, and he was widely recognized as an eminent scholar.

From his early days in Greenville, AL, and Tuscaloosa, AL, Walter Flowers developed a great love of knowledge. He excelled at the University of Alabama in both undergraduate and law school. He was named a Rotary Foundation Fellow at the prestigious University of London where his academic thrust was international law. In addition to his election as president of the student body at the University of Alabama, he was also a phi beta kappa.

During our service together, I gained a tremendous appreciation for his academic abilities as well as his commonsense approach to difficult and trying issues. We served together on the Judiciary Committee where his knowledge and love of the law came shining through. He could play an adversarial role without being an adversary in the cynical sense of the word that is so often associated with politics.

At one point in his career here in the House, Walter Flowers served as chairman of the subcommittee that I now chair—the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Government Relations—which is, of course, a source of much pride to me.

In fact, as many of us are aware, Walter Flowers was a leader and early pioneer in the matter of regulatory reform. Long before regulatory reform gained attention as a national issue, Walter Flowers was taking the lead in advocating legislation to streamline

Government and reduce the bureaucracy.

Of course, he will always be remembered for the historic role played during the Watergate impeachment hearings before the House Judiciary Committee. His conduct, demeanor, and adherence to good law and sound constitutional practices during those tumultous times was exemplary. The same can be said of his participation in hearings associated with the nomination of both Gerald Ford and Nelson Rockefeller to serve respectively as Vice President.

Walter Flowers was also an early leader in elevating the subject of high tech and warning that America's lead in scientific and technological achievement must be maintained. As a valued and respected member of the House Science and Technology Committee his contribution to America's defense and economic well-being through science and technology is well established.

After five terms of distinguished service, Walter Flowers entered the private sector in 1979 where he had an opportunity to continue his interest and leadership in science and technology. At the time of his death, he was a vice president of the Signal Cos.'

Walter Flowers is survived by his wife, Beverly, and three children, Vivian, Walter, and Victor. I shall miss his good counsel. The Nation and this Congress has lost a distinguished friend and patriot. To his family, Madeleine and I extend our deepest sympathy with the thought in mind that Walter Flowers gave much to his country and his country will miss him.

□ 1900

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend from Texas and appreciate his participation.

One of our former Members, Hon. Lou Frey, a distinguished Representative from the great State of Florida, has this to say about Walter Flowers, which I think is important and should be in the RECORD.

He said:

At the first briefing for new Members of the 91st Congress I met a young Democrat from Alabama, Walter Flowers. Walter was a graduate of the University of Alabama, a lawyer; attended the London School of Economics and was a veteran. He was also like me, very green, never previously holding elective office.

For what ever reason we immediately became and stayed the closest of friends. Our offices over our 10 years in the Congress were either next to each other or nearby. We served on the Science Committee together. We traveled around the world together including two trips to Vietnam. We played together including paddleball every day we could, for a dollar a game. We roomed together many years and even owned a fishing boat together. We grew up through some of the most difficult and emotional years in our Nation's history and never lost our mutual respect and affection.

Walter was a many dimensional person. He could be the lawyer's lawyer in the Judicial Committee, the nuclear expert on the Science Committee, the poor country lawyer effectively pleading his cause on the floor of the house, the song leader singing, "Amazing Grace," at a party while hoisting a beer or two, or the understanding friend when a personal problem needed to be solved or shared. Whatever the situtation he was always principled, fair and honest. He never lost his sense of humor or his perspective.

His many qualities never shined more brightly then during the dark days of the Watergate hearings. His reasoned statements and questions, his understanding of the issues made him stand out on a most distinguished Judiciary Committee.

Walter loved life. His laugh was infectious whether it was at himself or at the world. He had an uncanny ability to get some interesting press coverage. Once he received front page national coverage chewing bubble gum and blowing bubbles during the Congressional Marble Tournament.

He was a fierce competitor in any situation. During one of the congressional baseball games he didn't start and was put in as a pinch runner in the last inning. He was upset about not playing and after he stole second base he called me over from my position as the Republican shortstop, "Kid," he said, "let's do something exciting. I need to get my uniform dirty so my children will know I played." We mutually decided that we'd go through the motions of attempting to pick Walter off second base. I walked in and told our pitcher, Congressman Bob Michel, what we were about to do so that Walter could get some action. Bob dutifully lobbed the ball to me. Walter charged back to second base, slid into me, knocking me head over heels. The AP photo sent nationwide showed Walter on the ground with a wide grin on his face and me, two feet in the air, with my backside to the camera. He never stopped laughing about that play and how he managed to steal all the press even though he was in the game for one inning.

No one could ever accuse Walter of being a spectator. He was a dice roller who didn't cry when the dice didn't come up the way he hoped, such as the 1978 Senate race in Alabama. He was down briefly but never out. In a few short months he established himself as an outstanding lawyer and businessman and became vice president of Wheelabrator-Frye, Inc.

He had it all going for him. He worked hard and it was paying off and then his great heart gave out on his 51st birthday while playing tennis. Its just so hard to believe. Walter was so vital, so full of life and energy. I keep expecting to hear him yell, (because no one ever accused him of being quiet) "Hey kid—let's go to the Botts committee—hiyakaho!" But although his voice is now still, his legislative accomplishments, his principles, the way he lived his life speaks more clearly and eloquently to those of us who are his friends. He asked no quarter from life and gave none. It wasn't always smooth and easy for him but it was never boring or dull. He gave it his very best shot.

Obviously life goes on, but for some of us it won't ever be the same. I hope the love and respect Walter was held in in some way helps his wife, Beverly, and his family now and in the years ahead. I know my life is richer, better and fuller because of my friendship with the gentleman from Alabama Congressman Walter Flowers. Hiyakaho.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS).

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, no one really could add to what has been said about Walter Flowers in these proceedings. The words that were just read express so much of what I feel.

But then it is not possible to say too much about Walter Flowers.

Walter's tenure in Congress was a formidable one but it was not here where his actions were first felt. They reach far back to his days as student-government president of the University of Alabama during the turbulent 1950's. These were troubled times. Walter Flowers was one who resisted the urge to join with the popular majority at that time—to take the easy route. He was noted, even then, for following his own conscience when trying to determine what was right. This trait was most apparent during the controversial Nixon impeachment proceedings.

Faced with the prospect of becoming the swing vote during the deliberations, Walter weighed the issue carefully. His final decision, one he felt truly comfortable with, was not reached without the realization of its long-lasting ramifications. He regarded the agonizing impeachment issue as "the single most important event" he was involved in.

We all know his abilities as a legislator, his scholarliness, and his integrity, a person who once sifted through conflicting information and argument and found what he believed to be the truth, was a person who was unswerving in his commitment, regardless of what the consequences might be to stand up for what he believed to be was right.

His sense of humor, his dedication to this country and all it stood for, his persistence in seeking to achieve what he believed in all of these things are well known, have been recalled and will not be forgotten.

But on a personal note, I remember when I came to the Congress as a new Member of this House. I was looking around to find someone to advise and counsel with me on matters relating to this legislative process and in particular a piece of legislation that I thought was important. Walter Flowers literally sat down with me and spent hours, days and weeks working with me, befriending me and helping me, not because it meant anything that would further his career or further his efforts, which were already well established by that time, but as an act of true friendship to another person.

In the years following that I got to know Walter in many contexts, particularly admiring his work on the Ju-

diciary Committee, playing games and sports with Walter, and finding in all aspects of his life that he maintained a great enthusiasm for everything he did.

Walter Flowers lived all too brief a life and spent all too short a time in the Congress of the United States.

Although the time we served together, from 1974 to 1978, was relatively short, it was one which I enjoyed spending with a person of Walter's caliber. His leadership, evident in his daily activities, was one that commanded respect and admiration from his fellow colleagues.

Walter Flowers' years were all too few. But in those few years on this Earth and in this House he gave much that improved and enriched the land in which he lived, the people with whom he came in contact, and left this place a better world. He shall be remembered.

So it is for these and many other reasons that I again, wish to express my sorrow for, and extend my condolences to, the Flowers' family and friends.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for taking this time.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, another one of our former colleagues and friends from the great State of Georgia was Congressman Dawson Mathis, and Congressman Dawson Mathis had this to say about Walter Flowers:

What a keen sense of loss we feel, and how deep the empty space that Walter's death created. I am sure that you, and many of Walter's friends and colleagues who still continue service in the House will eulogize and commemorate his life and passing far better than anything I might say. However, there are some things, as one who loved him, that I would add for the record.

It is trite to say that Walter Flowers' contributions to the institution were many, and that he had a deep and abiding love for the House, and for its traditions. Of all his actions, however, he will probably be longer remembered by Historians and Scholars for his role on the House Committee on the Judiciary during those dark days of what was probably our most severe Constitutional Crisis, certainly of this century. Walter Flowers spoke during those days of the "Agony" endured, not only by him, but by others who found themselves in his circumstances as a result of their service on that distinguished Committee. While political pressures from his own constituency, and from outside Alabama, were weighing heavy on his shoulders, he was also faced with other sorts of pressure, not the least of which was his deep respect and love for the Office of the Presidency. In the midst of the swirling storm—political and constitutional—Walter arrived at his decision. And he did so in the same fashion that he ever made any other important decision of his life. He did it with prudence, with intelligence, with reason, and with integrity. In the final analysis, Walter Flowers did what he believed to be the right, and that was the essence of his soul.

It is perhaps ironic that within the timeframe of weeks surrounding Walter's death, we have witnessed the broadcasting of many recollections of that former President, and a great deal of air time was focused on those days before he resigned the Presidency. In one broadcast, the former President recalled that during the days when the Judiciary Committee was proceeding with its work on the Articles of Impeachment, he personally called Gov. George C. Wallace of Walter's beloved Alabama, and asked that Governor Wallace attempt to intercede with Walter on behalf of the President. According to the former President, Governor Wallace refused to do so, and that, said the President, is when he knew his Presidency was over. What was not said during those broadcasts, and what needs to be said now, is that it would not have mattered at all whether Governor Wallace had called Walter Flowers. Walter Flowers would have done what he believed to be right if he had every Governor in the Country calling him. That is not to say that he did not have the deepest respect for Governor Wallace, but it is to say that Walter placed his Oath of Office, and his obligations associated with that oath far above any political, or personal, considerations.

We shall miss Walter Flowers. He was a rare individual and a unique man. He was, by any yardstick one might use, a Statesman in the truest sense of that word, and the eulogy that was written by his life is the most eloquent that could be written. He was our friend.

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a tremendous sense of sorrow and deep personal loss that I join in today's special order in honor of our departed colleague, Representative Walter Flowers.

Walter had a distinguished career as a Member of this body and as a member of the House Judiciary Committee. I know that there is no need to remind my colleagues of the courage and wisdom demonstrated by Walter Flowers during the greatest constitutional crisis of our time. We all remember how, during the impeachment inquiry, Walter anguished about the weighty decision he was forced to make. We recall how he followed his own conscience, even though it meant risking the favor of his constituents. To think about that time now, we recall the words he spoke before the entire country, as he said:

The institutions of this country have been set up by the people to serve them, to carry out those functions that are necessary to a peaceful and free society. They are not created to serve the interests of one man or one group of men or the political gain of anyone.

It was during that time, 10 years ago, that Walter Flowers showed that he was, above all else, a man of deeply held principles. During those difficulty days I can remember sharing long hours of conversation with Walter as we both struggled with the solemn issues being considered by the impeachment inquiry. We came through that experience, I believe, with a strong mutual respect for one another and, more important, a strong and lasting bond of friendship.

Walter Flowers will be remembered for his role in history, but those of us who knew him will remember his sense of humor, his commitment to the people he represented, and his dedication to the principles that govern this country.

I feel fortunate to have had Walter Flowers as a friend and colleague. I join in sending my deepest sympathies to Walter's wife, Beverly, and the rest of his family.●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the loss of our colleague Walter Flowers.

I served with Walter on the Judiciary and Aging Committees until his retirement in 1978. He was an able lawyer who possessed a keen analytical mind, and a refreshing sense of humor.

In his decade of service in the House of Representatives, Walter earned a reputation for his commitment to our free enterprise system and his detailed knowledge of trade regulations and antitrust law. During the Watergate impeachment inquiry, Walter gained prominence as a wise and judicious legislator, who never let go of his integrity and sense of what was right. Indeed, Walter was always a kind and thoughtful human being.

Walter Flowers was a fine man and a dear friend. I will certainly miss him.●

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply saddened by the death of former Alabama Representative Walter Flowers. He was one of Alabama's most distinguished Representatives, and served the people of Alabama with intelligence, integrity and independence. Without a doubt, the people of Alabama have never had a finer, more dedicated and well-respected Representative in Washington.

The integrity and judiciousness of Walter Flowers, which received national attention during the House Judiciary Committee hearings on the impeachment of former President Nixon, exemplified his political courageousness which he displayed throughout his life as a public servant. His sense of fairness and strength of character were qualities that we as Representatives of the States of this land should all strive to acquire.

Walter Flowers felt strongly that the Government, as he so well put it, was "not created to serve the interests of one man or one group of men or the political gain of anyone."

Walter Flowers' untimely death was truly a tragic loss, not only for his family and for me on a personal level, but also for the people of Alabama, whose well-being and interests he placed above his own. He will be sorely missed by all those who loved him as a

man and respected him as a legislator.●

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we conduct this special order today on our late colleague, Walter Flowers of Tuscaloosa, AL.

Even though this is a sad occasion because Walter Flowers is no longer with us, it is my great privilege to join in the celebration of the high character and great service with which Walter Flowers served the people of Alabama and our Nation.

As I remember Walter, I see a brilliant man, the product of Alabama public schools and the University of Alabama and its law school, of which I am also a graduate. Walter achieved a high reputation and many honors at the University of Alabama. Although I attended the university ahead of Walter, I was always impressed at his record of accomplishments at the university including the student body presidency and such honors as selection for Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Kappa, and the Jasons. I am proud that he was my fraternity brother in the mother chapter of Sigma Alpha Epsilon.

As a brilliant scholar, Walter was a rotary fellow, following graduation from law school, to the University of London.

Following completion of Walter's formal education, he served our Nation as an Army intelligence officer with 2 years' active duty after which he returned home to Tuscaloosa to enter the practice of law. During the time before he was elected to Congress, Walter was extremely active in a multitude of civic affairs including Boy Scouts, YMCA, mental health associations, the United Fund, the Red Cross, and the bar association.

I first got to know Walter well and on a personal basis after he was elected to Congress in 1968. I quickly learned that Walter Flowers completely measured up to the great reputation that preceded him to Congress. He quickly developed into a highly effective legislator and respected statesman. I personally knew that I could count on the soundness of Walter's counsel and advice on issues handled by his committees—Judiciary, Science and Technology, and Aging.

I know of no man who better served his district, State, and the Nation than did Walter Flowers. He was an influential, respected, and most effective member of the House of Representatives. He was brilliant; a man of charm and wit; intelligent, personable and generous; a true product of the new South—a statesman of great character. I greatly enjoyed the 10 years as his colleague in the House.

I feel a very deep loss in Walter's death. He will be sorely missed by all of his colleagues, friends, and loved ones. However, his memory will live because of his character, his service to others, and the achievements and accomplishments he left as his living memorial. ●

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to my former colleague and dear friend, Walter Flowers.

Walter served on the Judiciary Committee with me during the impeachment hearings. He was a voice of calm and reason in a very tragic and confusing time in our history. Walter and I were part of a bipartisan group of seven Judiciary Committee members who joined together to draft the first two articles of impeachment. We were nicknamed the "fragile coalition" even though some members of the media preferred to call us "the unholy alliance." Walter's independent judgment and deliberative nature coupled with a soft-spoken manner were admired by everyone on the committee and in the House. His wife Beverly recently wrote to tell me that the last letter Walter wrote was a response to my letter on the fragile coalition. Needless to say, this exemplary son of Alabama renamed the group "the magnificent seven".

Walter Flowers served with distinction as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations of the Judiciary Committee. During his tenure on that committee, he worked diligently on the Government in the Sunshine Act requiring Federal regulatory agencies to hold their meetings in public. He also worked diligently to enact stronger lobbying disclosure laws.

Walter was highly respected by Members on both sides of the aisle as a man of integrity and fairness. I send my deepest sympathy to his wife, Beverly and family.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to our former colleague, the Honorable Walter Flowers of Alabama, whose untimely death on April 12, is a tremendous loss to the people of this Nation.

Walter Flowers served in the U.S. House of Representatives for 10 years, and he represented his constituents from the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama with distinction, deep compassion, and courage.

During his career in Congress, he compiled an outstanding record of achievement as a member of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, the House Select Committee on Aging, and the House Science and Technology Committee. His dedication to the highest standards, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, was an inspiration to his friends and fellow citizens alike.

Congressman Flowers was a man devoted to the people of his district, to his State, and to his country, and was highly respected by his colleagues for his honesty and integrity. He will be long remembered by those of us who had the privilege to serve with him in the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our deepest sympathy to the members of his family who survive him.●

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I recall the days of 1975 when a young and somewhat lost freshman Illinois Congressman was challenged trying to learn his way around the Halls of the buildings, much less the workings of the Judiciary Committee to which he had been assigned. It is a story we can all tell—we all recall our first overwhelming weeks in Congress. And for me—that particular Congressman from Chicago in the Judiciary Committee—I also recall the kindness and patience of a premier Congressman who took the time to help.

The Honorable Walter Flowers was a friend and there to help at an especially crucial time. It is important for new legislators to have someone to show them the ropes, and if that someone is as knowledgeable and thoughtful as Representative Flowers always was, it is a special bonus. I also came to appreciate the thoughtfulness Representative Flowers extended to everyone in his work. He was very fair, understanding and had the respect of people from across the political spectrum. His moderation of tone did not diminish the strength of his convictions or talents of persuasion

He was a gentleman, a kind and decent human being, a fine legislator. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to him and in extending my sympathy to his family.●

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of our former colleagues, Walter Flowers, who died at age 51 on April 12.

Walter is probably best known to the American people as one of 38 Members of Congress who served on the House Judiciary Committee during the Watergate hearings in 1974. However, his colleagues in the House knew him as a man of courage, wisdom, honesty, and charity long before his name was known outside of the State of Alabama and the U.S. Congress. He worked with a dedication and commitment to excellence as a member of the Committee on Science and Technology and chairman of its Energy Research and Development Subcommittee, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Law of the House Judicary Committee.

When he left the House in 1978, he enriched the legal community just as he had enriched the House of Representatives with his knowledge and experience. He possessed a grace and sophistication which at once offered friendship and commanded respect. His talents and his contributions to the public good will long be remembered. Walter Flowers, the man, will long be missed.●

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my colleagues, I was shocked by the announcement on April 12 of the death of Walter Flowers. I remember so well the friendship that we formed when I came to Congress in 1969. Walter's warm personality made him beloved by all of us in the 91st Congress. In the difficult years of the Watergate crisis that followed, we came to appreciate Walter's strength of character. Calm in the face of enormous political pressure, Walter Flowers never deviated from his goal of duty and constitutional responsibility. I cannot count the times during that period when I sought his counsel. He was indeed a pillar of strength for all of us.

Even though Walter has been gone from the Congress for some time, his death still leaves a void in our lives. The world is a poorer place for his leaving.●

● Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who knew and served with Walter Flowers during his all too brief years in the House were saddened by his sudden death on April 12.

I happened to make his acquaintance during his very first days as a Member of the 91st Congress back in January 1969. He was an engaging, attractive young lawyer who arrived here with a commitment to serve the people of his district and to contribute all he could toward a healing and pacification of a country that was badly torn apart by the Vietnam war.

Walter's voice was a quiet voice of reason. He was a solid, sensible, unruffled man who was not inclined to fly off on tangents. No matter how much emotional and oratorical debris was floating around in the air, Walter could still see the main point of an argument and make his decision on what he thought was good for this country.

Like all reasonable men, Walter Flowers listened more than he talked. He was not one to close his mind without listening to the other person's point of view. I remember talking with him many times about legislation from the Committee on Education and Labor which he might have been expected to oppose. But Walter would listen, and if he thought a piece of legislation had merit, he would support me. I always appreciated that quality of fairness and openmindedness that he possessed in such great measure.

I was sorry when Walter decided to retire from the House a few years ago and return to his law practice and other interests. But I recognized then, as now, that he had weighed all the angles and opted for what he was convinced was best.

Now this good and decent man has gone from us, and we are the poorer. I hope his family realizes that in his few short years here he made an impact on the Congress and on the country, and that he has left behind a legacy of warm friendship and fond recollection.●

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of Walter Flowers earlier this month is a shock which saddens us all.

Walter Flowers was a good man and a good Member. He worked hard for his district, for the State of Alabama and for the Nation.

As a colleague I knew Walter Flowers to be a man of strength and convictions, of humor and insight, of action and deeds. He was an able legislator who weighed carefully all sides of a question before making up his mind. Nothing evidences this better than his performance as a member of the Watergate panel.

It is this work which made him a national figure—one required to make difficult choices affecting the course of our Nation. The decisions were not easy, but he met the challenge of the task with responsibility.

His dignity and demeanor held Walter Flowers in the highest esteem by his colleagues. I am proud to have had the privilege and pleasure to work with and to know this gentleman.

Walter Flowers' passing is a blow we all feel—no one more than his wife, Beverly, and his children, Vivian, Walter III, and Victor. To them I extend my sympathy.●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in warm tribute to our former colleague, Walter Flowers of Alabama, whose recent death at age 51 comes as such an unexpected shock.

Walter was one of the most widely respected and best liked Members of this body.

A brilliant Phi Beta Kappa graduate, he was a dedicated, able, and conscientious legislator. I had the privilege of serving with him on the Science and Technology Committee where he ably chaired the Fossil, Nuclear Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Subcommittee. He was always knowledgeable, well prepared, and reasonable in his approach to the often controversial matters over which he presided. He was tolerant of the differing viewpoints of members such as myself on nuclear power, assuring we had a fair opportunity for input.

Walter demonstrated his high principles as a member of the Judiciary Committee, voting for articles of impeachment of President Nixon even though that was unpopular in his district and jeopardized his reelection.

Walter demonstrated his humanity and compassion as a member of the Select Committee on Aging. He did what he thought was right, often supporting national Democratic issue positions that were more liberal than his constituents.

Most important, Walter was a good friend, to me and probably to more of his associates than most members. He was always full of fun, caring, and helpful.

Even after he returned to private life, he maintained his congressional friendships and helped many of us raise campaign funds, even those like me who often disagreed with him and his clients.

Walter was a wonderful person. I join in condolences to his wife and children. He will be sorely missed by them and by his many friends, in Congress and without.●

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

Mr. LUJAN. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join today in paying a special tribute to our late colleague, Walter Flowers, who recently passed away.

Walter and I entered the House together in the 91st Congress. He was always very friendly and kind and went out of his way to be considerate with all his colleagues.

Through the years, we served together on the Science and Technology Committee and I always had great respect and admiration for Walter's ability to get things done. Walter worked diligently on behalf of his district and his country. He had an overriding concern for Alabama, and for Walter his constituents came first.

Walter always championed legislation that would benefit the Nation. This was particularly evident in the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production.

Walter was hard working, knowledgeable, and dedicated. We will all miss him. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his family. The House of Representatives has lost one of its best loved, most able and respected friends.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Mexico and classmate of Walter Flowers, for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), Congressman Walter Flowers' successor in office.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and great pride that I rise to pay tribute to Walter Flowers. Sadness because this tribute is occasioned by his untimely death on April 12. Pride because he was my friend, my very dear friend.

Many here in the House of Representatives knew Walter as a highly respected, valuable Member of this body for five consecutive terms. They remember him most vividly for his pivotal and courageous role during the impeachment proceedings by the House Judiciary Committee in 1974. That was surely his finest hour, the climax of his career as a statesman. He will also be remembered as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Ad-

ministrative Law and Governmental Relations and for his effective leadership on the Science and Technology Committee and the Fossil and Nuclear Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Subcommittee which he chaired. He made many lasting friendships during his tenure here, and I know many of my colleagues are sharing the sharp sense of loss that I feel since his death.

As law partners in Tuscaloosa for several years prior to Walter's service in Congress, Walter and I developed a friendship, a camaraderie that grew deeper over the years and has been particularly valuable to me during my years as his successor here in the House.

While Walter served the Seventh District for those 10 years, I watched him as he faced controversial decisions head on. He anguished over many of them privately, and he occasionally drew public criticism for them, but I cannot remember a single decision that he would have changed had he had the opportunity. He was a man of strong principles—principles that guided him through the difficult times and that were an inspiration to those of us around him.

Those who knew him were impressed by Walter's superior intelligence. And yet he was one of the most unpretentious people I know. He was everybody's "buddy," and he was as strong an advocate for his meekest constitutent as he was for the most influence-wielding one.

Walter gave up his House seat to run for the Senate in 1978. It was one of his rare endeavors that was not successful, but he turned even defeat into advantage. He began making a name for himself in the Washington business community, first as a valuable member of a respected law firm here, then as vice president of a successful engineering and energy conglomerate, organizing and serving as first chairman of the National Council on Synthetic Fuels.

In the meantime, he was providing valuable counsel to me as I took over this House seat. He had an insight into my experiences here that was unique. He had that perspective that no one else around me could offer—not my staff, not my wife, not other House members—because none of them were solely accountable to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama. But Walter had been there, and he was big enough to share the benefits of that experience with me. My colleagues here know how lonely this job can be sometimes, and knowing that, can appreciate what it was like to have a friend like Walter Flowers—and what a deep sadness I feel at losing him.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to the family he left behind—to Beverly; to the children, Vivi, Walter, Jr., and Victor; to his father, Walter W. Flowers, Sr.; and to his brother, Bob.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank my distinguished colleague and friend from Alabama for his remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable Walter Flowers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FLAT RATE TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus my remarks this evening on the benefits of the concept of a flat rate tax as it would apply to the traditional family structure. In particular, I would like to focus on the flat rate tax prospects for strengthening the survival of families at the lower end of the income spectrum.

Let me say, to begin with, that I think the flat tax plan recently submitted by Congressman KEMP and Senator KASTEN, which I cosponsored, is a flat tax proposal which is particularly family oriented because it is structured in a way to insure that families will be the beneficiaries of the benefits of the flat tax.

We have all read or heard about numerous studies which detail the increasing instability and poor health of the American family. It is my firm belief that whatever problems all families are facing, they are in a large part a direct result of the declining economic opportunities caused by marginal tax rates which are still too high and Government regulations which deny legitimate employment opportunities to individuals, particularly those at the bottom of the economic ladder of opportunity.

□ 1920

The Census Bureau recently released a report which details some of the problems faced by the American family. It indicated that although the number of marriages has begun to rise of late, the number of divorces has been increasing even faster.

Their figures indicate that the divorce rate has increased between 1960 and 1980 from 2.2 per 1,000 population, to 5.2 per 1,000, more than doubling during that time frame. As a result, nearly one out of every two marriages today statistically can be expected to end in divorce.

More frightening from my standpoint, and from the standpoint of anyone concerned about future family stability is the statistic which indicates that the number of children involved in divorces has more than tripled since 1970, from roughly 400,000 to over 1.2 million. A recent study by the Center of Study of Social Policy established a link between marital breakup and poverty rates.

In 1960, 21 percent of black families with children had a single parent living at home. By 1981, that percentage had doubled to 47 percent; nearly half of all black families had only one parent living at home.

In 1960, the median income for black families was 55 percent of that for white families. In 1981, after one War on Poverty, and after the launching of numerous Government-based to equalize the income ratios between the races, the median income of black families had risen all of 1 percentage point to 56 percent.

The Civil Rights Commission reports that following marital breakup, 25 percent of white families can be expected to fall into poverty; while 55 percent of black families do so. So it should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with what has happened over the last 20 years in the welfare policy, that while the poverty rate for all children rose from 15 to 20 percent during the 1970's, for black children the rate has risen from 42 to 45 percent, and by 1980 was twice as high as it was for white children.

Again, one of the principal causes was the number of children with no fathers. Sixty-eight percent of black children living in female-headed households, 2 out of every 3 children were poor in 1981, compared to 43 percent of white children who lived in similar circumstances.

We have here a problem of truly tragic proportions and far-reaching scope. The full dimensions of which will not become fully apparent until many years from now. The central question, of course, is why? Why did fathers leave their families? What were the contributing factors? What role did Government play in the breakup of those families?

Tom Joe, the director of the Center of Study of Social Policy, thinks he has the answer: The increase in the percentage of female-headed households and the stagnation of the median income for minorities is directly attributable to this administration because they have made, "low wage employment opportunities less profitable than welfare," and actually discourage people from working.

Let me say about that analysis, it is the right cure; it is wrong diagnosis. Certainly increasing marginal and average tax rates, which penalize the incentive to work and invest in the

future have played a significant role in discouraging employment opportunities. But is is not this administration which is to blame. Families, and particularly large families, have been increasingly discriminated against by the Tax Code. As a result of the Kemp-Roth tax reform passed in 1981, single people and married people with no dependents will have in 1984 essentially the same average tax rates as they had in 1960. However, a couple with 2 dependents will experience a 43-percent increase in average tax rates while a couple with 4 dependents will be paying 223 percent more in taxes than they were in 1960.

If our children are essential to the creation to future wealth, as I believe anyone would admit they are, then clearly the present Tax Code discriminates against both. In terms of actual dollars paid between 1960 and 1980, the median family income has had a tax liability increase of 300 percent; almost a 50-percent increase over and above the increase in their incomes. What family, especially at the lower end of the income scale, can withstand that kind of pressure and strain?

Certainly not families that most of us have in our districts; they simply cannot put up with that kind of pressure. By not updating and revising the Tax Code to keep pace with changing economic and social conditions, the IRS is administering a discriminatory toll which by increasing the disincentive to work, is playing a major role in driving a wedge into the family fabric.

From that angle, a flat rate tax would have obvious benefits in terms of restoring to the code a needed element of moral equity. So long as it would not result in any family paying more taxes than they currently do, a broad-based, low flat rate tax would allow more people to succeed and to attain financial independence, and would not punish them for doing so.

There is another less visible yet equally insidious element at work which not only increases the disincentive to work, but actually prevents people from working: As hard as it may be to believe, there are now on the Government books numerous labor laws and Government restrictions which, through faulty administration, effectively bar people from entering the labor market.

In general, we as a nation have inadvertently managed to build into our governmental system institutional barriers which limit and in many cases eliminate economic opportunity. We know that when opportunities are limited or destroyed, dreams perish, lending support to George Guilder's contention that, "Poverty is a state of mind, not of income."

For over 50 years the creation of wealth has been seen by our Government as a vehicle to take from the rich and give to the poor. As the economic pie has been shrinking over the past few years, it has become a case of taking from the independent and giving it to the dependent. As the Government's redistributionist tentacles have expanded, too often the independent have become the nonwealthy, including those families who are living on the margin barely making it themselves.

Under the paternalistic programs adopted by the modern day liberal establishment, those families must continue to hand over larger and larger chunks of their income to finance the liberals' failing vision of a welfare state. As we have seen from just a few statistics that I cited earlier, the cost of financing that dream has come in the form of the destabilization of the family unit, and for those directly affected, the vision has become a nightmare.

Think, for instance, about the reports we have had in recent days about hunger in America and about the homeless in America. That is an indictment of the present welfare state. We have been operating now for 40 years under a welfare state philosophy and for at least the last 20 years have been expanding it. Yet what we hear today is the fact that you have more homeless and more hunger.

What has happened? Something has failed. What has failed is the liberal welfare state, and it seems to me that failure needs to be pinned upon the people who brought about that kind of devastation, the people right here in this Congress who have voted to take from independent people out there, working people, and give to dependent people and thereby destroyed the ability to work and the ability to produce in this society.

One general measure, the control extended by the Government over the lives of those families who have become dependent on assistance, is the increased share of the gross national product going to pay for transfer payment programs. Between 1965, the first year of the War on Poverty, and 1980, the percentage of our total national resources going to Federal transfer payments increased from 4.8 percent to roughly 11.5 percent. In other words, we have nearly triple just the Federal commitment, to say nothing of State and local governments' increased commitment to eradicating poverty, yet according to the most recent census figures, poverty is higher now than it was in 1965. So what is going on here? Something is failing.

The liberal welfare state vision is failing. One of the principal problems with the current Government subsidy programs is that they do not stress or in many cases even allow work.

Thomas Sowell, writing in the book "Markets and Minorities," outlines the nature of the trade-off involved in accepting Federal assistance.

> The amount necessary to life every man, woman and child in America above the poverty line has been calculated and it is one-third of what in fact is spent on poverty programs. Clearly, much of the transfer ends up in the pockets of highly paid administrators, consultants and staff, as well as higher income recipients of benefits from programs advertised as anti-poverty efforts.

□ 1930

Think about that for a minute. What Sowell is saying and what can be shown statistically is that what we are doing in this country is paying three times more to eradicate poverty than is actually getting to the poor. His figures look something like this:

We spend in this country about $36,000 per person for every poor family in the country. The amount of money actually going in income and benefits to those poor people is around $12,000. What happens to the other $24,000? The other $24,000 is going to pay highly paid bureaucrats, highly paid administrators and staff and consultants, all kinds of people who are not poor themselves; in fact, who are living off poverty people and living very well off poverty people.

The question for us as a society is whether or not we ought to trim the $12,000 going to the poor, and the answer to that question is no. We ought to make certain that they get every dime of it. But should we not be doing something about the $24,000 that is going to the nonpoor, the people who are either ineligible for the benefits, or should be ineligible for the benefits, or to highly paid bureaucrats.

There I think the answer to the question is clear. Yes, we should begin trimming back on that. That is the liberal welfare state that has gone wild and should be trimmed back.

In order to qualify for many Government programs, one must be unemployed, earning below the official poverty level, or otherwise disadvantaged. This provides incentives to forego present earnings, and with it forego human capital formation for the future. In other words, in order to qualify for Government assistance, recipients must agree to give up work and the ability to provide, then, for one's own future.

As a result of those conditions, the share of the gross national product going to finance the expansion of the welfare state can essentially be viewed as the nonproductive portion of the total national output, from which, as currently constituted, we can expect virtually a zero return on investment.

The macroeconomic effect of the spending and taxing policies characteristics of the past few decades has produced a gross national product which is, according to current esti-

mates, operating approximately $600 billion short of full capacity. Since the current gross national product is at about $3.1 trillion, full capacity gross national product would be around $3.6 trillion or $3.7 trillion.

I am a car buff, and from a car buff's point of view, one might say that our economy is comparable to driving a six-cylinder car on only five cylinders. You do not get very far in cars like that, just as we do not get very far in a war on poverty with policies like that. In order to refire that six cylinder and get the economy operating at a full capacity, we need to revamp our tax system so that it rewards work, and we need to overhaul our approach to social and welfare programs so that our Government allows work.

Opportunity begins with hope, and hope springs from an ability to provide for oneself, which means having a job. Government programs which limit access to employment or specifically deny job opportunities must be either modified or eliminated.

Walter Williams, the distinguished economist, has done a tremendous amount of work in the area of labor market barriers, focusing on their effect on minorities and other groups located on the bottom rung of the income ladder. His findings about the effect of increases in the minimum wage law should be a lesson to us all about Louis Brandeis' warning that—

Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when Government's purposes are beneficial. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding.

Williams begins his analysis in 1948, when both black and white youth unemployment rates were roughly equivalent. In fact, if anything, the rate for white unemployment was marginally higher than it was for blacks. Anyway, the rate remained about the same from 1948 until the mid-1960's, but from the mid-1960's to the last 2 key indicator years, labor force participation and unemployment rates deteriorated sharply, particularly for minority youth unemployment and for minority youth employment opportunities.

For black youth, the labor force participation rate fell from 52 percent in 1965 to 40 percent in 1982. During the same period, the labor force participation for white youths actually increased. The unemployment rate for white youths increased from 13 percent in 1965 to over 23 percent in 1982, while the rate for black youths literally went through the roof, increasing from 23 percent in 1965 to 44 percent in 1982.

Imagine that: 44 percent in 1982. That means that in 1982 almost half the black youth in this country who wanted to work were denied the opportunity to work.

What explains that dramatic falloff in the labor force participation rate for minority young people and the dramatic increases in the unemployment rate for both groups? Can it be attributed to Reaganomics, as some of the critics like to charge? Hardly. The deterioration in the minority youth labor market began before Ronald Reagan was elected Governor of the State of California, much less President. Can it be said that the lower unemployment rates in the past were because blacks had the educational levels equal to or higher than whites? Clearly not. Can racial discrimination explain that deterioration? Probably not.

It would be extremely difficult for anyone to sustain the argument that employers are more discriminatory now than they were 25 years ago.

One of the answers to this dilemma is the minimum wage law which, since 1965, has increased by over 150 percent, far outstripping comparative increases in consumer prices, other wage rates, and productivity indicators. In other words, increases in the minimum wage rates have the effect of pricing labor out of the market which, in effect, has had the most damaging impact on those at the lower end of the income ladder and those who are less skilled and trained than other workers with higher productivity.

Interestingly, the message that increases in the minimum wage law have had and are having a negative impact on minority youth employment opportunities is beginning to spread to the black community. A recent poll done by the Data Black Public Opinion firm, a national black polling firm, revealed that 37 percent of those questioned favored the youth opportunity wage, while 36 percent were afraid it would have a negative impact on adult employment. In other words, there were more people who think that the youth opportunity wage ought to be implemented than those who were opposed to it, and that is within the black community. Recently the Conference of Black Mayors endorsed the youth opportunity wage concept, again because they see what is happening in their own communities.

Yet, supporters of the minimum wage increases and opponents of the youth opportunity wage cling to the contention that minimum wage increases have not had a serious effect on youth employment. To back their contention up, they often rely on the findings of the Minimum Wage Study Commission, which concluded that increases in the minimum wage have had only minimal impact on employment. In general, they found that a 10-percent increase in wage levels reduces youth employment opportunities by only 1 or 2 percent.

In rebuttal, a 1- or 2-percent reduction in youth employment is not minimal. There were approximately 6.5 million teenagers in the 1982 labor market, so a 1- or 2-percent reduction translates to between 65,000 and 130,000 lost jobs for those young people. Also, assuming that each 10 percent increase in the minimum wage rate results in an average loss of 100,000 jobs, it can be assumed by logical extension that since the wage rate has been increased by 150 percent since 1965 that the cumulative number of jobs lost just through increases in the minimum wage could easily exceed 1 million jobs.

How much of a factor has that cumulative job loss had on minority youth unemployment and to the decline in family stability over the years?

The Commission has also estimated that establishing a youth wage would produce between 250,000 and 350,000 jobs. The Commission's own staff economists, in a minority report, say that that figure is conservative and put the increase in the 450,000-job range.

So it should be clear that minimum wage increases, just as one of numberous labor market barriers administered by the Federal Government, are having a negative impact on youth employment opportunities, the cumulative effect of which is probably playing a major role in the decline of family stability.

But I must add that we in the Government are not only guilty parties in this particular scheme. Business, too, must accept its share of responsibility for becoming part of a corporate welfare equally dependent upon Government handouts for its protection, and equally, if not more so, afraid to take risks.

The business world has been all too willing to accept and even promote regulations designed to insulate itself from the rigors of competition and from its own self-imposed inefficiencies. The clearest example of this is in the area of occupational licensing procedures.

□ 1940

Walter Williams examined the role of occupational licensing in the taxicab industry. He found that only 2 or 3 percent of all taxis in Philadelphia are owned by blacks; 40 percent of the city is black; while in Washington, DC, 75 percent of the taxis are black owned. Does this mean that Philadelphia is a hotbed of racism and Washington is utopia?

Obviously not; the answer can be found in elementary economics. The cost of obtaining a taxicab license in Philadelphia is 100 times higher, $20,000, than it is in Washington. More minorities can afford the lower license costs, so therefore more minorities become an entrepreneur

owning their own taxicabs and making their own living.

In other words, occupational licensing procedures have been used as a tool to spawn, and in some cases perpetuate, economic discrimination.

Or as Thomas Sowell puts it:

> With the rise of government-supported labor unions having complete dominance over particular occupations, union membership was tantamount to occupational licensing, and was used to keep out or drive out blacks.

In short, the rules of the economic game have been changed for minorities. Whereas in the past, particularly during the 19th century, other economic groups used the economic game to advance themselves by exploiting the opportunities available to them, those same opportunities, often in the name of social justice and reform, have either been eliminated or severely curtailed.

Winston Churchill once said that in social policy, government has two roles. One is to build a net through which no one can fall. The other is to build a ladder up which all can climb.

Of course, the many instances in which government laws, regulations, and other restrictions have produced economically detrimental results for various ethnic groups, the fact is that we should not imply any particular ineptitude or depravity. The essential point is that government has limits as to how much it can do to assist individuals; beyond those limits, government often becomes a well-intentioned, but negative force in society.

The combined effect of government's efforts in the social arena has been to saw the bottom rungs of the economic ladder of opportunity. Although the full ramifications of declining economic opportunities are difficult to measure, in terms of jobs lost, credible estimates indicate that approximately 2 million jobs are denied, mostly to minorities and other groups dependent on the Government for assistance. The result is economic discrimination of the worst kind. Some may question it on the grounds of the Constitution's equal protection of the laws or property rights provisions, but it is all the more disturbing because we have invested so much and made such heroic strides in erasing political discrimination from the Government's books.

As a side note, it is interesting to note, as Thomas Sowell points out, that traditionally it has been groups that have consciously avoided the political arena that have made the most economic progress in terms of rising out of poverty and achieving relative levels of wealth. Sowell cites such groups as the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Jewish community as evidence. By contrast, the Irish, while politically successful, were among the slowest rising economic groups in the economy during the 19th century.

In effect, what we have managed to do is trade the political slavery imposed for economic reasons as it was utilized during the 18th and 19th centuries for economic slavery imposed for political reasons, vote-buying reasons.

That is interesting, because one is no less insidious than the other. One of the worst chapters in this country's history was that 18th- and 19th-century period during which we made a conscious determination that we would politically impose slavery on the country for the economic benefit of the plantation owners.

Today what we are doing is imposing economic slavery for the benefit of a few politicians so that they can go out and get elected by promising more assistance to people that they are freeing into ghetto plantations.

In Churchill's eyes, it could be said that we have been busy building nets everywhere, but have forgotten about the ladder up which people can climb out of economic poverty.

What this Nation needs is a social policy that offers an escape from 20th-century slavery. Along with an economic policy that rewards work and makes it possible to climb higher on the economic ladder, we need an escape route, an above-ground railroad, if you will, that will rebuild the bottom rungs of the economic ladder. A flat rate tax would be a vast improvement over the current Tax Code in terms of equity. It would be an economic reform assuring that families could afford to provide for their own futures.

We need a similar social agenda so those Americans who want to work, but cannot because of government restrictions, are allowed to pursue their own dreams and aspirations.

Carl Sandburg once wrote: "The nation is a dream. Nothing happens unless first the dream."

Government has the capacity to enhance dreams or to trample dreams. Let us become a nation with a government that allows our dreams to know no limits.

THREE DECISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes, I shall not take 60, but I would like to take a few minutes to tie together three decisions that occurred yesterday that I mentioned earlier today in my 1-minute speech, which I found encapsulated the problems of the Democratic Party and particularly its liberal wing in confronting reality.

Yesterday we had three events occurring: First a decision not to go to conference with the Senate, a decision that was designed to kill aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua; second, a vote by the majority of the Democrats to allow Soviet slave labor products to be imported into the United States, a vote against an effort to try to introduce an amendment which would have permitted the Customs Service, would have required the Customs Service to stop slave labor imports, and third, a decision by the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee that one of the major problems of crime in America was the FBI entrapping Congressmen who were corrupt.

Now, I think there is a linkage between the Democratic Party's position on killing aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, the Democratic Party's position not allowing an amendment to require us to stop importing slave labor products from the Soviet Union, and the decision by the Democratic leadership on the Judiciary Committee to report out a bill whose primary effect would be to cripple the FBI.

Let me turn first to the Judiciary Committee decision. In the New York Times for today it was headlined, "House Panel Assails FBI Undercover Operations." I think that says it all. When the American people are worried about being mugged, when the American people are worried about organized crime, when just this last few days the people of Colombia saw the drug dealers so powerful that they assassinated the Justice Minister, literally drove up next to him and killed him, fired six shots into him while he was driving down the road, forced the President of Colombia to declare a state of national emergency because there are so many drug dealers; at a time when the Wall Street Journal just yesterday reported that Cuba is consciously promoting drug dealing as a way of earning money for its operations and also as a way of corrupting America, what does the House Judiciary Committee think is the major problem in America? It is protecting Congressmen from being entrapped by an FBI agent. In order words, the response to the famous Abscam scandal in which several Congressmen turned out to be corrupt and were willing to be bribed by foreigners was that it is unfair for the FBI to tempt them; that the FBI should only be allowed to do something after a Federal judge supervises them and makes sure.

I would suggest that it is remarkable that the Democratic leadership of the House, looking at every survey that tells them that the American people are worried about their children becoming drug addicts, we have seen report after report of violence in schools, about seventh, eighth, and

ninth graders buying drugs, seeing all the concern about violent crime in America, that the major effort of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights would be to further weaken the FBI. I think it tells us something about the liberal mind set of the Democratic Party in the House.

Let me go a stage further. On the very same day, the House decided not to meet with the Senate on a bill which would have allowed continued financing for the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. The article in the Washington Times quotes the Speaker, TIP O'NEILL, as saying:

I am opposed to funding for guerrillas in Nicaragua all the way. Nicaragua is not going to get through this House.

Now, let me be clear what is at stake here. There are people in Central America risking their lives to promote freedom in Nicaragua. There are people in Central America risking their lives to stop Communism in our backyard. There is a serious effort to try to preserve the Government of El Salvador which is being systematically undermined and attacked by Nicaragua with Cuban and Soviet help.

Now, what is the Speaker's position? I quote again:

I am opposed to funding for guerrillas in Nicaragua all the way. Nicaragua is not going to get through this House.

□ 2050

So yesterday the Democrats in the House decided not to confer.

Now, the third decision is more obscure because, frankly, liberals in the West do not like to think about it. There are millions of people still in Soviet slave labor camps, the terrors that Solzhenitsyn wrote about in "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch" and in "First Circle" and in other publications including "The Gulag Archipelago," that pattern of locking people up for 10, 15, 20, 30 years, sending them to Siberia, having them work on projects still exists today.

Frankly, we are not enforcing an existing law against using slave labor. We are not stopping products from coming into America that might have been made by slave labor. And yesterday there was a serious effort by TOM BLILEY, the gentleman from Virginia, to offer an amendment which would have required the Government to stop products made by Soviet slave labor from coming into the United States, and a majority of the Democrats in this House voted against the efforts by the gentleman from Virginia Mr. (BLILEY), and in effect, to permit the importation of products that involve slave labor.

Now, let me carry all of this one step further. We live in a very dangerous time. The primary problem we face in this House is a basic disagreement about the nature of reality. Those of us who are more conservative, both Democrat and Republican, would argue that the world is dangerous, that there is evil abroad, whether the evil is drug dealers, corrupt Congressmen, Communists in Central America, or the Libyan who shot the policewoman in London last week, but that evil is out there, that evil will try to get us, that evil will devour freedom if we permit it.

Let me read from today's Wall Street Journal an editorial entitled "Terrorism and the West," because it explains why this is all so serious.

I quote:

Britain's standoff in London with the diplomatic thugs and murderers representing Libya's Col. Qadhafi has once again set people to thinking about the terrorism problem. The problem is that the world is now full of groups and even nations who for political reasons are willing to murder government officials, the pope, prominent citizens and however many innocent bystanders happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. They gun down people in crowded city streets. They blow up buses, department stores and passenger planes. The civilized world gapes while people die who didn't deserve to die. An effective solution to political terrorism is nowhere in sight.

They go on to say:

If there were ways to effectively wipe out terrorism, you can be pretty certain the Israelis would have discovered them. They haven't. Acts of terror persist in Northern Ireland and on the streets of Paris despite the fact that neither the British nor French have ever been particularly squeamish about playing rough if there's some likelihood of success.

But we don't want to give the impression that eliminating terrorism is impossible. You can kill terrorism. There are no terrorist acts to speak of in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, North Korea, Vietnam, Iran, Syria or Cuba. And if the West's negotiators and diplomats succeed in calling off Jonas Savimbi in Angola, the Matabeleland rebels in Zimbabwe and the contras in Nicaragua, three more cradles of totalitarianism will grow into safe havens from terrorism.

Let me go back through this for a second. Notice if you are a Communist colony there is no terrorism. If you are a totalitarian government with a Gestapo of the left in charge, there is no terrorism. The leftwing Nazis and the Soviet Union know how to use brute force in such a way that their colonies, whether it is Cuba or the colony they are trying to establish in Nicaragua, there will be no terrorism.

Let me go on.

Based on the foregoing list of totalitarian nations, let us try to state clearly what so many of the free world's best minds adamantly refuse to acknowledge: The planned political murder of noncombatants and innocent civilians—terrorism—is carried out today by individuals and nations representing two ideas, Marxist-Leninism and Islamic fanaticism. Aside from their faith in totalitarianism, these two ideas have only one thing in common—a shared abhorrence of democratic freedoms. These terrorists are not blowing people up because they are on some sort of homicidal joyride. They blow people up because they expect, over time, to replace liberal systems of government and society with illiberal systems.

Now you would think that for all their freewheeling contentiousness, Western elites dealing with the terrorist phenomenon could at least agree on who the good guys and bad guys are. But in fact, the modern terrorist is assaulting a Western world that is very much unsure of the essential superiority or even goodness of its own system.

Let me repeat that, because if there is any problem with the radical Democrats who increasingly control the House, it is the fact that they literally fit this phrase: "The modern terrorist is assaulting a Western World that is very much unsure of the essential superiority or even goodness of its own system."

I am confident that America is a country that deserves to be free and that freedom is worth doing something about. I am confident that living in a safe neighborhood is worth having the FBI find corrupt Congressmen and, in fact, I think it is worth having the FBI find drug dealers who are putting our children in touch and making them addicted to drugs.

I think freedom is something worth defending because I am confident that life in America is that much better than life in Iran or life in Cuba or life in the Soviet Union or life in a Communist-dominated colony in Nicaragua.

But let me continue:

Outside of France, many European intellectuals, typified by West Germany's Gunter Grass, argue that there is little moral difference between the foreign policies of the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Western political writers still compare U.S. actions in Grenada to what the Russians are doing in Afghanistan.

Let me stop and say again not only are Western political writers comparing U.S. actions in Grenada, but on day after day in case after case, radical Democrats in this House compare the U.S. liberation of Grenada with tremendous regard for saving lives with the brutal, vicious, harsh, ruthless Soviet assault on Afghanistan which Morton Kondracke just yesterday wrote brilliantly about.

When you read what a liberal writer like Morton Kondracke says about the Soviet deliberate use, for example, for toys that are terrorists bombs to blow off children's hands and arms, and this is Morton Kondracke, a liberal who writes in The New Republic, not NEWT GINGRICH, a conservative who says this, when you look at the Soviets in Afghanistan and compare it either to our efforts in South America or Grenada you can only be struck with the savage unreality of comparing what the United States did in Grenada with the Soviets.

Let me continue:

American-educated priests across Latin America preach Marxism and then have to

explain away their students' tendency to spend years blowing up the nation.

Let me go back and cite for just a moment something which was said in the pastoral letter in reconciliation from the Nicaraguan bishops this Easter. It is very important. Across America there are radical ministers and liberal ministers who, frankly, have become, I think have fallen for the radical line. And this is what the Nicaraguan bishops of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua just this last few weeks said:

One, albeit small, sector of our church, has abandoned ecclesiastical unity and surrendered to the tenets of materialistic ideology. This sector sows confusion inside and outside Nicaragua through a campaign extolling its own ideas and defaming the legitimate pastors and the faithful who follow them. Censorship of the media makes it impossible to clarify the positions and offer other points of view.

In other words, what the Nicaraguan bishops are saying to us, the leaders of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua, is that the Communist Government of Nicaragua censors the press and that pro-Communist members of the church spread what are essentially falsehoods. And the next time you have a minister tell you how we should get out of Nicaragua and we should get out of El Salvador, ask them whether they have read the pastoral letter form the Nicaraguan bishops and why they would oppose people who represent the legitimate church and are there.

But let me go on:

In a letter to this paper, Rep. Jim Wright approves of efforts to help El Salvador but denounces "externally supported terrorism against the government of Nicaragua," apparently equating planting acoustical mines in harbors handling Soviet military shipments with shooting the pope or spraying a London street with machine-gun fire.

We would like to be able to think the Reagan administration's legislative campaign against terrorism might deter the anti-Western activities of Col. Qadhafi, the Soviet Union, North Korea, Bulgaria and Iran. But if more of our political leaders and intellectuals don't start showing a better understanding of the basic reason for resisting Marxist and Islamic terrorism, the West will some day need a lot more help than it's going to get from four new anti-terrorism laws.

□ 2000

Let me put this back in the context of the U.S. House of Representatives. Next week we are going to take up this amendment, the Fascell-Moakly amendment, which is in effect the unilateral disarmament amendment for Central America. It does just about everything bad you could do to fighting for freedom and trying to protect freedom in Central America.

It fits precisely the world view that thinks the United States is the same as the Soviet Union; that thinks that somehow there is never a good reason to defend freedom, precisely the attitudes the Wall Street Journal talked about today in its editoral entitled "Terrorism in the West."

Furthermore, one of the major consequences of the Fascell-Moakly amendment is going to be a dramatic increase in the number of refugees who come to America. But this has already been provided for.

H.R. 4447, House of Representatives bill No. 4447, "to provide for the temporary suspension of deportation for certain aliens who are nationals of El Salvador and to provide for Presidential and congressional review of conditions in El Salvador and for other purposes," introduced back on November 19, 1983.

What does this bill do? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Do I understand correctly what the gentleman is saying is that if we enact the Fascell-Moakley amendment that is going to be before us next week, what we will do is unilaterally disarm in Central America, we will turn over large portions of Central America, possibly, to Communist domination, which will result in a wave of refugees headed north into the United States?

Some people predicted it could be as many as 11 million refugees. Then what we have is a bill that has been introduced that would legalize all of those refugees; almost doubling the number of people today that are classified today as illegal aliens; we are going to legalize those with the bill being introduced.

Mr. GINGRICH. My understanding is that the bill introduced by one of the two gentleman cosponsoring the amendment to cripple us in Central America is a very clear bill; which as I read it clearly would legalize the 500,000 El Salvadoran nationals who are already here and would set the base, I would think, for legalizing the 13 million or so refugees we can expect if Central America and Mexico go Communist.

So this bill sort of creates the framework for the United States to absorb I think between 13 and 15 million refugees over the next 10 years.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. So in other words, our refusal to put money into the defense of freedom in Central America will result in enormous costs to this country, both in terms of an increased unemployment rate because obviously those people are going to come here without jobs; and we do not have the capacity in our economy at the present time to absorb them into the labor market, and which means that if they are legalized under the kind of bill that is contemplated here, that we would have to pay them welfare benefits as well.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think the gentleman is right. We have to figure that if in fact the Fascell-Moakley amendment passes and we unilaterally disarm in Central America, making it impossible to stop communism, because human beings love freedom, we can expect—and I should explain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania how I arrive at these figures; so anyone listening will understand these are not just made up.

The number of refugees from communism in Afghanistan is about 16 percent of the population of Afghanistan. They do not have places as nice as Los Angeles, El Paso, San Antonio, and Phoenix to go to; they are going into refugee camps in Pakistan.

Even so, in order to get away from communism, 16 percent of the population of Afghanistan has fled.

The figures for Cuba were around 10 percent; but in Cuba you have to get on a boat and cross 90 miles of water. The thing people do not realize about Central America is that it is only 2 days ride by car from El Salvador to the Texas border; that in fact El Salvador is closer to Miami than Miami is to Washington, DC.

So my guess, basically all we did was take the Afghanistan numbers; about 16 percent, though I think it would be higher because the United States is a more desirable place to flee to than is Pakistan; my guess is if you take those figures and apply them to the current populations of Central America and Mexico and you understand we have clearly, we have the statement of the Nicaraguans and the statements of the guerrillas in El Salvador, that they are fighting for all of Central America; this is not a national war; that is war for control of the region; then I think you have to count on the same percentage of refugees coming to the United States as a minimum; our base line figure and the base line figure I arrive at is something on the order of 13 million, 12.8 million people.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. And that is a figure which is somewhat equal to the figure of illegal aliens that are now in the United States which we have been wrestling with around here for some years now, not knowing what to do with that number.

Mr. GINGRICH. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. So we would almost overnight double the figure of illegal aliens that we have already been wrestling with?

Mr. GINGRICH. I think that is probably about right. I think you have to go a step further and say to yourself, that means we have to create 15 million additional jobs over and above the jobs we need to employ the people who are already here who want to work. So it is potentially an enormous problem, a problem of tremendous proportions.

And as I said, House of Representatives H.R. 4447 is a bill which would permit them to stay in the United States. But it goes beyond that. As the gentleman started to talk about welfare, I think frankly we should not expect people to live badly. But this bill would direct the President to report to the Congress how many refugees there are; and let me read the rest of this because I think everybody in America has been down this road before; also the President should report the living conditions of such persons with particular attention to their personal safety and availability of food and medical assistance.

What does that mean? That means that the U.S. Government should provide all the medical care they need; all the food they need; all the housing they need.

Let us go on: "The resources available for humanitarian assistance, including the methods and policies respecting distribution of such assistance and obstacles which may prevent the efficient and equitable distribution of such assistance."

In other words, more bureaucracy, more welfare workers, more delivery systems, more money. "Furthermore, steps that can be taken to improve the status of such persons."

What does that mean? More special education, more special training, more costs. Furthermore, it goes on to suggest that we should not only be concerned about the Salvadorans who are living here but we should also look at the number of Salvadorans living in Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico, and report how much foreign aid we need to give to those three countries to take care of the additional refuges.

So in addition, during the transition when those countries will be collapsing, which they will if we keep losing the war in Central America, then we will see even more effort involved.

Let me go on and say that we have to confront the fact that there is already in the radical wing of the Democratic Party a willingness to accept refugees in enormous numbers and they are already putting bills in that would make that happen.

But let us look for a moment at the Fascell-Moakley amendment and why I would say it is unilateral disarmament. What does it do? It is interesting the words they use. It prohibits President's use of section 506, defensive equipment drawdown authority; it prohibits use of section 21(d) delayed billing authority; restricts use of section 614 authority to waive other prohibitions.

Notice the first three operative words; prohibits, prohibits, restricts.

But let me go on. It restricts the number of U.S. military advisers broadly defined in El Salvador. It has restrictive conditions on all aid. It allows the second payment only if Congress adopts another joint resolution. It prohibits joint military operations in Honduras and Guatemala. It restricts the number of U.S. military in Honduras, prohibits the use of U.S. military in Guatemala, limits military aid to Honduras, prohibits credits and guaranteed loans to Honduras, prohibits military aid and sales to Guatemala.

Let me just read the words. Notice what the Wall Street Journal was talking about. We face a world crisis. Almost every American has seen the film from London of this policewoman who was killed standing there on a peaceful street in a great city.

We have seen how bad it is. Everyone who walks into the Capitol to vote, walks right by pillars that have been built, concrete, just to stop trucks from running into the Capitol and setting off a bomb.

In the middle of a dangerous world, are we authorizing the President to make America safe? Are we authorizing the President to do w'ıat it takes in Central America to preserve freedom and allow people to live in their own country in freedom?

No. These are the code words; prohibits, prohibits; restricts; restrictive; restricts; prohibits; restricts; prohibits; limits; prohibits; prohibits.

In other words, what we are saying, what the radical Democrats are saying is that the United States should be totally handicapped in its ability to act, should be totally tied up, should have its hands locked; should have no capacity to act and this is in a region, let me remind you, where there are 55 American advisers in El Salvador, and there are close to 3,500 Cuban and Soviet advisers in Nicaragua.

□ 2010

This is a region where the Soviets alone are sending $114 million in military aid to Nicaragua in the form of equipment. This is in a region where the Soviets are engaged in $300 million in military construction in over 40 bases in Nicaragua.

Faced with that crisis, faced with the fact that the only tanks in Central America are Soviet tanks in Nicaragua, there are three battalions of them and tanks are an offensive weapon, what is the response of the radical Democrats?

Their response is to restrict and disarm and cripple the United States. And they have already prepared a bill to accept the refugees once we guarantee by the collapse of our will in Central America that the refugees are coming.

A recent analysis tells us a lot about this. It is an analysis by Frank Grigorski, the editor of the Republican Study Committee bulletin in the April 30 edition in an article entitled "American Foreign Policy and the Crisis of Democratic Party Incompetence." He said the following thing. I want to quote Mr. Grigorski because I think it is an exactly accurate statement of what is happening with the radical wing of the Democratic Party.

He goes on to say:

What is really fascinating about this letter, about House debates on Central America since Reagan became President and indeed about so many foreign policy comments by so many Democrats since 1974 is the implied world view of the Democratic Party. Since August, the Republican Study Committee has collected Democratic commentary on Southeast Asia, Angola, Nicaragua, Granada, and El Salvador. We have compared predictions with results and sifted through dozens of statements to derive the unifying themes. We found a way of viewing the world that is simplistic, defeatist and simply not competent when applied to the dangers the U.S. faces. Here are its five elements stated as postulates.

These are the views of the radical Democratic world view which I think is characterized in the Fascell-Moakley amendment, which is characterized by the bill to admit more refugees, which is characterized by the actions that we have seen day after day here on the House floor. This is the radical Democratic world view as described by Mr. Frank Grigorski.

1. There are no evil ideologies or governing systems in the world except apartheid. Communists are at heart are reformers who are too rough in their tactics. They are not inherently bad, but the U.S. is so clumsy in its dealing with communist forces that we facilitate or give them excuses for their excesses.

2. Left wing extremism is caused by a right wing tyranny and the U.S. makes both worse. We finance rightist forces and make the leftist ones worse by not competing with the Soviets to finance them. There is always hope that Cuba, Nicaragua, Vietnam, et cetera, will behave if only we treat them as sincere nations run by people not too different from us.

3. Foreign policy conflicts get worse when America intervenes. The lesson of Vietnam is the United States cannot impose its will anywhere. And what Presidents call "vital interests" usually are not worth fighting for. To ease world tension the United States should keep a low profile wherever it wants to maintain influence.

4. Military force is proper only to defend the United States and perhaps a few democratic allies against an attack already underway. But threatening force to prevent a feared attack is always too risky. Force never really settles anything, and if it does, it should not.

5. Political negotiations and military force have nothering to do with each other. Klauswitz was wrong. Conservative Presidents who subsidize or threaten force prove they are not serious about negotiations. Liberal Democrats and peace activists who forswear force make better negotiators because the other side knows they are sympathetic. These postulates are blandly stated, but they still seem astounding. They are the unifying themes in Democratic analysis including the Carter administration thinking right up to Afghanistan, of world hot spots where Communist forces are a major factor.

The study the NRSC is doing will argue that it is time to stop challenging or seeming to challenge the patriotism of Demo-

crats and liberals. Enough historical evidence exists. Their cut-and-run formula having been tried enough places that the question for 1984 can be one of the competence. Simply put: Can you trust the Democrats to safeguard U.S. interests in a dangerous world? If they keep saying romantic things about people who despise America, can they tell who our friends are and who are enemies are? The evidence is they can't.

Now that is from Mr. Frank Grigorski, who is the editor of the Republican Study Committee bulletin and clearly a partisan.

Therefore, it was with some surprise that I found today the following editorial in the Wall Street Journal entitled, "The Newest Gary Hart." This Wall Street Journal editorial, I think you will agree, says the same thing about one of the two leading candidates for the Democratic nomination. It says in effect radical Democrats—and they are now the dominate Democrats, the George McGovern Democrats have decisively defeated the John F. Kennedy wing of the Democratic Party—radical Democrats literally cannot figure out what is going on.

From the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Newest Gary Hart":

Voters in the Democratic caususes in primaries yet to be held will now have a choice of four instead of three candidates. There will be Walter Mondale, Jesse Jackson, Gary Hart the dove, and Gary Hart the hawk. Gary Hart the hawk emerged at Texas A&M Monday bidding for the 169 delegates to be selected at the Texas Democratic Precinct caucuses Saturday. He dredged up the days of shame of the Carter-Mondale Administration when Americans felt helpless outrage over the holding of U.S. hostages in Iran.

Having thus dispatched Mr. Mondale, Mr. Hart did a number on Ronald Reagan for the fiasco in Lebanon. Then he launched into his coda.

This is quoting GARY HART:

As President I will not hesitate to use force when vital American interests are threatened, but I will not hazard American lives where our purpose is unclear, our goals unattainable, or negotiations have been left untried.

Let me go on to quote from the Wall Street Journal:

What kind of real world situation would meet Gary Hart's criteria for bold action is not answered. Would he have nuked the Ayatollah? But at least it has a hawkish sound. Contrast the melody with Gary Hart the dove. On a television panel just before his ill-fated outing in the New York primary April 3rd, quoting Gary Hart. "I would end military assistance to the El Salvador Government immediately and only resume it if and when the death squads were ended. That is not withdrawal."

The Wall Street Journal went on to argue:

Voters in Texas like the voters in New York probably won't overtax themselves seeking the real Gary Hart. To the extent they do, they will probably go by the one specific thing he said in the above foreign policy pronouncement that he would jerk the rug out from under El Salvador. In other words, he proposes to back away from El Salvador's elected government the way Jimmy Carter backed away from the Shah of Iran. The hostage crisis that Mr. Hart so glibly pins on Walter Mondale followed from just such a show of weakness and moral doubt. The Shah, too pro-American to suit his Soviet neighbors, was being portrayed as a tyrant by the American left, generating political pressure on Mr. Carter.

Similarly Mr. Hart has fallen for the death squad propaganda being used by American leftists against not only El Salvador's right wing terrorists, but against its government and people.

The interesting thing is that there is even less justification for the Hart position in Central America than there was for Mr. Carter's position in Iran, given the low state of U.S. intelligence gathering at the time.

Let me make a comment here because the Wall Street Journal frankly could have made a stronger point. It was the radical Democrats in this House who gutted the Central Intelligence Agency, who crippled our intelligence capacity, who stopped us from helping freedom in Africa, and who then turned and complained because the Central Intelligence Agency they had crippled did not do its job, when it was the radical Democrats who crippled it.

Let me continue with the Wall Street Journal:

Given the low state of U.S. intelligence gathering at the time, Mr. Carter had some excuse for not knowing that the Ayatollah and his followers were blood-thirsty maniacs. There was also some question whether the Shah could have controlled them, even with U.S. support.

Central America, however, is known to be under attack from the Soviet Union, a well known force that seeks well known results, primarily the weakening of U.S. power and influence in the world. The attack could be defeated with a little more backbone among Mr. Hart's Senate and House colleagues.

□ 2020

Let me repeat that one key word so that Members of the House will understand it was not me but the Wall Street Journal that suggested "the attack could be defeated with a little more backbone among Mr. HART's Senate and House colleagues."

The Wall Street Journal goes on to say:

Mr. Hart would use force some day, somewhere, but not where it would make a difference today. Gary Hart the dove wants to pull out of the Central American fight. Gary Hart the hawk would be a tough guy, providing our purposes are clear. Gary Hart the hawk we think has entered the campaign too late. Gary Hart the dove got there first.

Now, let me make a very clear statement here, by closing the quote in the Wall Street Journal. Radical Democrats never want to be tough anywhere that is real. There is always good reason. Either the regime is too pro-American, the regime has too narrow a basis of support, the regime is too violent, the regime is too distant, it is as though they borrowed Neville Chamberlain's code book on Czechoslovakia. There is always some reason why that is a distant country about which we know little.

Now, the distant country in the case of El Salvador, as I said, is 2 days' drive from Texas. There are already 500,000 El Salvadorans in America. The number of El Salvadorans in Los Angeles alone is enough that it would be the second largest city in El Salvador after the capital. And yet we are not sure. In fact, as I said, the Fascell and Moakley amendment would clearly be a unilateral disarmament amendment that would cripple our capacity to survive.

But are our purposes clear? After all, Mr. Hart has said he would do something if our purposes were clear.

Let me read briefly from the U.S. Department of State, January 19, 1984, what the United States seeks from Nicaragua. Four points.

"To remove any possible ambiguity, let me say again what these measures are."

This is an address by Langhorne Motley, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs:

The establishment of a genuinely democratic regime, a definitive end to Nicragaua's support for guerrilla insurgencies and terrorism, severance with Nicaraguan military security ties to Cuba and the Soviet Bloc, and reductions in Nicaraguan military strength to levels that would restore military balance between Nicaragua and its neighbors.

Now, Mr. Motley, speaking for the State Department, raises four issues. Are we for a genuinely democratic regime? The Reagan administration is. The radical Democrats think it is not worth worrying about.

Are we for a definitive end to Nicaragua's support for guerrillas in Honduras, in Costa Rica, in Guatemala, in El Salvador? The Reagan administration is. The radical Democrats do not think it is worth worrying about.

Do we want Nicaragua to stop having a military alliance, a military relationship, with Communist Cuba and Communist Russia? The Reagan administration does. The radical Democrats do not think it is worth the effort.

Finally, and this is something most Americans do not realize, the Nicaraguan Communist army is now larger than all of the other armies in Central America combined.

They are, in effect, the Nazi Germany of Central America, an incredibly powerful country compared to all of the other countries. If you add up Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica together, they are weaker in military force than Nicaragua.

Should there be some balance of power? The Reagan administration thinks there should. The radical

Democrats do not think it is worth worrying about.

Why are we worried about the Communist Government of Nicaragua? And you will notice I do not talk about the Sandinistas, and I want to explain why.

There was once a Sandinista government. It was established on July 19, 1979, as the government of national reconstruction, formed in exile as a coalition of both Communist and civic leaders. It had five members running it as a junta or a committee. Slowly, systematically it changed.

Originally, on July 19, 1979, in the Declaration of San Jose, the government of national reconstruction promised a democratically elected government and a fair, pluralistic society. It was widely supported. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly were guaranteed by the Declaration of San Jose.

Gradually, over time, that free Sandinista government was destroyed.

The Government of Nicaragua today is not the Sandinista government and, in fact, in April 1980, less than a year after the Declaration of San Jose, the Sandinista government was killed, for on that date in April 1980, the two non-Communist members of the five-member committee resigned.

What has happened since April 1980 is that the Communists have systematically increased their power.

Examples: In March 1982, the Communists imposed a state of emergency, severely limiting dissent and establishing prior censorship of the news media. The newly rejuvenated judiciary is now a Communist judiciary. Several thousands political prisoners remain in prison awaiting trial after 2 years. For 2 years they have been imprisoned by the Communist government. Do any radical Democrats complain? Is there any demonstration in the streets for the political prisoners of a Communist government? Not at all.

The fact is that the Communist Government of Nicaragua is antireligion, antifreedom, and anti-American. The national anthem of the Communist Government of Nicaragua talks about the United States as the worst enemy of mankind.

But let me go on. Let me quote about that government from a statement from Secretary of State Shultz on March 15. This is a letter in a report to Congress. Let me quote about how bad this government has become:

> The Nicaraguan government's tentative moves in the domestic front have lacked substance. The amnesty program for the Miskito Indians was ill-received by the Miskito people, 1,200 of whom fled to Honduras in December 1983, claiming mistreatment and torture by Nicaraguan authorities.

Let me ask again: Do any radical Democrats get up and complain? Is there any sense of outrage about how horrible it is that the Communist government is torturing Miskito Indians? Not a word.

Let me go on:

> Although the Sandinistas—

And I think it should read Marxist—

> finally announced a date for elections, a first step to potentially fulfilling its 1979 pledge to the Organization of American States, the Nicaraguan opposition remains convinced that the Nicaraguan electoral system now being devised will not permit a true contest for power to occur.

It goes on to say:

> Sandinista leaders have said that armed opposition leaders will not be allowed to run for office, and it now appears possible that the state of emergency in effect since March of 1982 will not be lifted for a long enough period to allow the opposition a fair chance to compete. A possible clue as to the type of election planned by the Sandinistas came from a comment of Minister of Planning Henry Ruiz on February 3, 1984, when he said the Nicaraguan people had a right to "pluralism but with a Sandinista hegemony."

Now, if you replace the word "Sandinista," which I think is just a State Department stupidity, with the correct word "Communist," what Ruis is saying is that, "Oh, they can have a vote as long as we win."

Now, is this a new thing to us? Is it a surprise to us to see the Communists take over? Well, let me think.

In 1917, the Communists used this same technique in Russia. In the late 1940's they used this exact technique in Eastern Europe. In 1959, they used this exact same technique in Cuba. And, in fact, Fidel Castro has been quoted explaining the technique. And yet it surprises the radical Democrats when once again a Communist government knocks out the free citizens and imposes a dictatorship.

But let me quote again from Shultz:

> Meanwhile, the Nicaraguan government periodically offers vivid reminders that despite occasional relaxation, press censorship remains very much in effect. New crackdowns led the independent newspaper La Prenza not to publish on three occasions in January and February of 1984. Nor has the government relaxed its control over news programing by the remaining independent radio stations.

In other words, this is a Communist government. It is a dictatorship. It censors the press, it censors the radio, it is against the church, it oppresses political leaders, it has 2,000 political prisoners, and yet the radical Democrats do not think it is worth worrying about.

Well, if we do not necessarily want to believe the Secretary of State of the United States, what about the Kissinger Commission, a bipartisan commission that included a former chairman of the Democratic National Party?

I quote again from Secretary Shultz:

> It is worth noting that 10 of the 12 members of the national bipartisan Commission on Central America chaired by former Secretary of State Kissinger concluded: "We do not believe it would be wise to dismantle existing incentives and pressures on the Managua regime except in conjunction with demonstrable progress on the negotiating front."

What does that mean? It means that the Fascell-Moakley unilateral disarmament amendment is exactly the opposite of the Kissinger commission, that when we brought together 12 national experts, Democrats and Republicans, and they looked at what was going on in a Communist colony, the country increasingly taken over by the Cubans and the Soviets with their local front people, the Nicaraguan Communists, the Kissinger commission said, "You've got to put pressure on them."

But yet what did the Speaker of the House say, as I quoted earlier? The Speaker of the House does not want to put pressure on them. He said,

> I am opposed to funding for guerrillas in Nicaragua all the way. Nicaragua is not going to get through this House.

Now, we have GARY HART saying he would sure like to be for something if the principles are clear, we have the U.S. Government making the principles clear, GARY HART does not get the message. We have the Kissinger Commission saying you have got to put pressure on the Nicaraguan Communists, the Speaker does not get the message.

Well, let us not just trust the Reagan administration. Why do we not go back to the bishops, the bishops of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua in their Easter statement? And what do they say?

□ 2030

From the bishops, last week:

> Our country too is plagued by a beligerent situation pitting Nicaraguan against Nicaraguan and the consequences of this situation could not be sadder. Many Nicaraguan youths and men are dying on the battlefields. Many others look toward the future with the fear of seeing their own lives prematurely ended. A materialistic and atheistic educational system is undermining the consciences of our children. Many families are divided by political differences. The suffering of mothers who have lost their children which should merit our great respect, is instead exploited to incite hatred and feed the desire for vengeance. Farm workers and Indians, for whom the church reserves a special love are suffering, living in constant anxiety and many of them are forced to abandon their homes in search of a peace and tranquility that they do not find.
>
> Some of the mass media using the language of hate, encourage a spirit of violence.

The bishops went on to say, well, let me stop for a second before I go on and say that one of the radical Democrat arguments is, Oh, it is all the United States fault. If only we were not pressuring the Nicaraguans. Let me say first of all that when the Nica-

raguan Sandinistas took over, the United States provided more aid to Nicaragua than we have provided so Somoza, the dictator, in 20 years. In a brief period we have provided millions of dollars and the Communists knocked out the free Sandinistas and imposed a Communist government. The next time you hear a radical Democrat or for that matter a radical minister tell you, well they would not be so bad if it were not for the United States putting pressure on them, quote to them from the bishops, the Catholic bishops in Nicaragua at Easter, who said, "It is dishonest to constantly blame internal aggression and violence on foreign aggression."

Let me repeat this because notice how powerful a word they use. The Catholic bishops of Nicaragua say, that when somebody tells you it is all the United States fault, that if we were not putting pressure on them there would not be a dictatorship; that there would not be Communists in Managua if we were not responsible. This is what the Catholic bishops in Nicaragua said:

> It is dishonest to constantly blame internal aggression and violence and foreign aggression. It is useless to blame the evil past for everything without recognizing the problems of the present. All Nicaraguans, inside and outside the country must participate in this dialogue regardless of ideology, class or partisan belief; furthermore we think that Nicaraguans who have taken up arms against the government must also participate in this dialogue. If not, there will be no possibility of a settlement, and our people, especially the poorest among them, will continue to suffer and die.

Now, let me remind you those quotes are from the Nicaraguan Catholic bishops in a Communist country and they were attacked by the government for what I read you. The government savaged them; called it a criminal statement. The government has had mobs that it has organized to beat up Catholic priests; to threaten the Catholic bishops.

This is the standard, precise Communist pattern which we have seen in Poland, in Hungary, in Romania, in the Soviet Union, in East Germany, in Czechoslovakia, in Cuba, in North Vietnam, in North Korea, and one has to ask the question: Will we never learn.

Let me close with this summary: Yesterday, in deciding to oppose the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than to root out corrupt Congressmen, in deciding to vote to allow Soviet slave labor imports in the United States, rather than to stop it; in deciding to kill any effort to provide aid to the freedom fighters in Central America, the radical Democrats in this House proved that they still have power in this House.

The people of the United States face a real choice. There is already a bill in this House which would allow a half-million refugees to come to America and be legalized. If we fail in El Salvador, if we fail in Nicaragua, if communism takes over Central America, we can expect to have 13 million or more refugees in the United States before 1990. That is approximately 6 percent of the population of the United States.

Sit down for a moment this evening, I hope every Member will do this, and figure out what that means for your neighborhood. Now, of course we know that California and Texas and Arizona and New Mexico will get more than their fair share of refugees. But let us say for a minute that we were going to be fair; that we have learned the lesson from the Cuban boat people back in 1979, under Jimmy Carter, when we had a total disaster and we had a crisis of what to do with all the refugees, and certainly everyone in south Florida can report what it is like to have a sudden crisis without planning.

Let us say that we can expect 6 percent of the population of the United States in refugees by 1990. That means for the average Congressman we can expect something on the order of 33,000 refugees in our district. But every American citizen should just take the population of their town or their country and multiply it by 6 percent. That means for the city of Atlanta, which has about a half-million people, that Atlanta's share will be about 29,500 refugees in Atlanta.

What are we going to do? As the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) said earlier, are we going to find enough jobs? Are they all going to be on welfare? Now some people say I am raising a false alarm, but let us look at the lessons of history. Every time Communists take over, everyone who can runs away.

People ran away to Western Europe from East Germany, from Poland. There is now a Polish engineer in my hometown of Carrollton, who fled recently during the Solidarity fight. There are 2,500 Laotians in my district in Clayton County who fled from communism. There are today, there is a Vietnamese restaurant in my district; people who fled communism. Will we never learn?

So, I would simply say to you, the choice for the American people is simple: If the American people allow the radical Democrats to cut off aid to the freedom fighters; if the American people allow the radical Democrats to continue this process; if the American people allow the radical Democrats to prepare for the refugees, then when the American people have 6 percent more folks in their neighborhood; 6 percent more folks in their town; 6 percent more folks in their county, it will be the American people who permitted it; because in the end, this House does nothing without the permission of the American people. That is why tonight I wanted to tie together the radical world view as it relates to crime, to refugees, to tyranny, and to communism and to say that next week we are going to have one of the most important votes in modern American history; a vote which may well decide the fate of freedom in Central America.

BANK FEES SHOULD BE KEPT IN CHECK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking Committee study on bank fees contains some shocking statistics on fees currently being charged throughout our Nation. As I predicted when bank deregulation was first discussed in the House, prices on service items have increased dramatically. Due to deregulation, banks are now free to charge astonishingly high rates to bank customers. And as I alone forecast, the new charges on basic bank services are undercutting any benefit the consumer might have gained from the proliferation of new accounts and savings plans.

From 1979 to the present, the average cost of bouncing a check has increased a whopping 87 precent. The charges soared from an average of $5.07 in 1979 to $9.49 in 1983. In some cities, current fees range from $17.50 to $30 for a single bounced instrument. These charges are outrageous. The actual cost to the bank for handling a bounced check is usually under 40 cents. While some penalty for a bounced check may be understandably imposed upon a customer as a deterrent, the charge should bear some relationship to the severity of the customer's error and the cost to the bank.

In the past I have warned against possible high fees brought on by deregulation of the banking industry. I anticipated that the advantages of high interest rates and money market accounts would be countered by banks which would set their fees at unjustifiable levels. Regrettably, I proved correct in my assessment of the situation. And the consumer is forced to pay for the Congress mistake. Banks should never have been afforded the opportunity to assess these high service fees. As I argued then, we should have respected that old adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." The proposal that increased competition among banks would benefit consumers was totally off the mark, while my fears were right on target.

Low or no cost bank services have virtually disappeared with the onset of deregulation. Before Congress interfered with the banking structure, many banks offered free services to

the consumer. Today, only 5 percent of American banks offer unrestricted free checking, and only about 50 percent allow consumers to maintain savings accounts without meeting specified minimum balance requirements. Many banks currently adhere to a rigid system which charges the customer for every bank service performed, including responding to balance inquiries and aiding checkbook reconciliation. This terrible situation is one that I alone battled to prevent.

According to the committee study, basic banking service cost the average household more than $180 last year, double the cost 4 years before. Some banks have already raised their prices to unbelieveable levels. One bank in the District of Columbia charges up to $675 to rent a safety deposit box. At that fee, the rent is probably higher than the value of the goods placed within.

Ironically, the rise in bank fees comes at a point in time when bank costs are actually decreasing. Increased computerization of accounts has made account access less expensive and less time consuming. But the rise in bank fees is unrelated to the cost of providing service. When deregulation occurred, banks raised the rates on interest bearing accounts in order to remain competitive with money market funds. Because banks now pay their highest interest rate on approximately two-thirds of all deposits, banks are using service fee profits to recoup some of the interest paid out to depositors. I warned against just this type of bank reaction to deregulation. I saw this coming, yet the Congress, in the rush to deregulate, did not.

As it stands, the situation is certainly unfair to consumers. Banks are attracting customers with high interest accounts, and then nickel and diming them to death. Banks' noninterest income is now at an amazing average high of almost 25 percent, and climbing steadily. Bank fees are rising. The net effect on the consumer equals confusion and misunderstanding. By being charged exorbitant prices for every transaction, the consumer who thinks he is earning a good return on his money finds his profit dwindling away. I am appalled that any bank would profit off the good will of the consumer in this manner, and I deeply regret that the Congress did not follow my repeated warnings.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday for rollcall No. 109, the final passage of the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1984. I am a supporter of this bill, as it will restore some of the funds cut from the child nutrition programs since 1981 and will increase authorizations for the successful WIC program. I would like the record to reflect that had I been present I would have voted "Aye."●

A MAJOR-LEAGUE TALENT WHO STAYED HOME

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I want to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute, published in the Rochester Times-Union, to a man I consider to be among the truly outstanding sportswriters in the United States and a personal friend for years—George Beahon. George is an institution in Rochester and upstate New York. His sharp writing style and sports commentary have won him praise and recognition from writers across the country.

Rochesterians love sports and George Beahon is our city's spokesman, whether it be baseball, basketball, horse racing, football, or hockey. It was a great pleasure for me personally to work with George during my tenure as president of the Rochester Red Wings—our city's outstanding International League baseball team.

George, we are going to miss you. You have been an integral part of our city's life for more than 40 years. I know that Rochester and upstate residents everywhere join in wishing you well.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to enter into the RECORD an article published in the Times-Union highlighting George's career:

A MAJOR-LEAGUE TALENT WHO STAYED HOME

(By Bob Matthews)

That's as far as George goes.

George Beahon, the dean of Rochester's sportswriters, is retiring from the Times-Union as of tomorrow.

"I've lived in the fast lane for a lot of years and I want to slow down," says Beahon.

"I'm going to lower my golf handicap from 26 to 25 and spend more time with my grandchildren. I might even cut the grass myself instead of paying the kid across the street."

Fortunately for his thousands of devoted fans (including this one), George will continue his weekly sports column for Rochester magazine after a well-deserved vacation. His next column will appear in about a month.

Beahon, 63, has been reporting local and national sports for Rochester newspapers or TV stations (WOKR-TV), Channel 13 and WROC-TV, Channel 8) since 1941.

He has covered every major sporting event, including 20 World Series, the Super Bowl, the Indy 500, the Kentucky Derby and The Masters. He used to spend more time on the road than in Rochester.

"I wasn't home for the births of three of my four kids," he says.

But Beahon wouldn't have had it any other way.

"Not many people are fortunate enough to get paid for doing something they enjoy so much they'd probably do it for free," he says.

Besides, the event he says he most enjoyed covering was baseball spring training. When that was over he generally took two weeks off and vacationed in Florida with his family.

Beahon's only professional regret was leaving the Democrat & Chronicle in 1969 for a two-year stint as publicity director at Finger Lakes Race Track and two more years of free-lance work.

"Leaving the paper was a snap decision and the next four years were not personally gratifying," he says. "Getting into TV in 1973 (Channel 13) revived me."

Beahon was at Channel 13 for four years and Channel 8 for two years. Admittedly "not just another pretty face," George made his mark with well-written commentaries and his sign-off trademark, "That's as far as I go."

Beahon often was described as "the Howard Cosell of Rochester," and he didn't object to the label. "I respect Cosell," George has said. "And I'd like to have one-tenth of his money."

Channel 13 news anchor Dan Alhart recalls his four years working with Beahon: "We always felt good knowing George was on our team. I think it was good for the broadcasting industry to have a person on television because of what he knew and not because of how he looked or talked. George had sports credibility and the viewers recognized it."

Beahon was fired by both stations in controversial moves unpopular with a majority of his viewers and fellow workers.

He left Channel 13 when "Bowling for Dollars" went off the air and popular host Ron DeFrance returned to his former role as sportscaster. The station decided one full-time sportscaster was enough and DeFrance had seniority.

Channel 8 hired Beahon shortly after he was dumped by Channel 13. He was there for two years, then abruptly fired.

"I was a victim of the 'TV doctors,' " says George. "Some guys from out of town came in, watched a few newscasts, and decided I should be replaced."

The firings were bitter pills for George to swallow, but he recalls them with characteristic wit: "Bing Devine (baseball executive) once told me that every great man gets fired once. So when Channel 13 let me go, it didn't bother me.

"Channel 8 fired me at 2 p.m. If they had told me a few hours earlier, I could've played golf. It was a heckuva nice day."

George joined the Times-Union Dec. 3, 1979 and was the Press-Radio Club's Sportswriter of the Year in 1979 and 1980.

"I had a few other jobs, but I've always been a newspaperman at heart," he says.

"There is nothing more satisfying than to look at a story or column you've written, something you know is good. TV commentaries are all over in 60 seconds. Seeing your thoughts in print is a special feeling."

George has written thousands of columns (many under the banner In This Corner), many of them controversial. He was sued only once.

"A guy won a $15,000 Twin Double at Finger Lakes and he didn't want to pay $2 to get into the track the next day to pick up

his check," Beahon recalls. "I wrote he was cheap and he sued for libel—$50,000 against me and $50,000 against Gannett.

"My good friend and boss, Al Neuharth, who is chairman and chief executive officer of Gannett Company Inc., called me and said, 'I've got my $50,000. Where's yours?' He was kidding. But we went to court and won. The judge agreed the guy was a cheapskate."

George was born and raised in Rochester, and from a very early age he knew he wasn't cut out to be a pro athlete.

"On a scale of 1 to 10 as an athlete. I was about a ½," he says. "I realized that if I wanted to be in sports I'd have to write about other people."

Beahon's first job was in an electronics shop in 1940. When a co-worker refused to tune in the World Series on the radio, George quit.

He joined the Times-Union as a full-time sportswriter in late 1941, enlisted in the Navy, then returned to a steady job with the Democrat and Chronicle when World War II ended.

He began covering the Red Wings home and away in 1946 and traveled with the National Basketball Association Royals during their peak years.

"The late 1940s and the early 1950s were the Glory Years for Rochester sports," he says. "That's when this really was an exceptional sports town.

"The Red Wings had some strong teams in a terrific league with cities like Montreal, Toronto and Baltimore. The Royals were among the NBA's top teams. Aquinas played the strongest prep football teams in the nation in a new stadium. We had all sorts of boxing. Sammy Urzetta won the U.S. Amateur Golf Championship in 1950. The Hickok Belt Dinner started the same year.

The Royals moved. Aquinas de-emphasized football. Boxing declined. The Hickok Belt became just another sports dinner.

The Glory Years are gone and Beahon knows it.

"Hockey is the shining light. This is a good hockey town," he says. "But the lack of Division I football or basketball hurts and I'm concerned about the future of the Red Wings.

"Baseball used to be a class act for Rochester, but that image has been tarnished. The proxy fight was shameful. Bill Farrell got shafted. The new board replaced more members in two years than the old board did in 10.

"Silver Stadium has lots of tradition, but you can't have a team unless you have a place to play, and how much longer will Silver be there?"

Red Wings fans hope Silver Stadium will be around for at least a few more decades, with George Beahon in the press box. That's where he belongs. The place wouldn't be quite the same without him.

He's a major-leaguer in a good minor-league town; a big-city talent who chose to stay home.

He'll be proud to know that a lot of his peers consider him to be "the Red Smith of Rochester."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS of Florida (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. LELAND of Texas (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today and May 3, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SUNDQUIST) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri for 60 minutes, on May 7.

Mr. WHITEHURST, for 30 minutes, on May 7.

Mr. HUNTER, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. REGULA, for 15 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 7.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 7.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 7.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 8.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 8.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 8.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 10.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 10.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 10.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, for 60 minutes, on May 8.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SUNDQUIST) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. LATTA.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. MCGRATH.
Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. ROBINSON.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. JEFFORDS.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.
Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of California), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. BYRON.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Ms. FERRARO in four instances.
Mr. HUTTO.
Mr. ADDABBO.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. AUCOIN.
Mr. DYSON.
Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. BARNES.
Mr. ACKERMAN in three instances.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. LELAND.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. DE LUGO.
Mr. SYNAR.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. SHELBY.
Mr. COELHO.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1135. An act to consent to the Goose Lake Basin Compact between the States of California and Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1196. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Claims Court with respect to certain claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the last week in June 1984 as "Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3376. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington; and

H.R. 3555. An act to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 3, 1984, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3239. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on a fiscal year 1981 Anti-Deficiency Act violation by the Department's Regional Office I (Boston), pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3240. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on a fiscal year 1979 Anti-Deficiency Act violation by the Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3241. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on a fiscal year 1981 Anti-Deficiency Act violation by the Southeastern Power Administration, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on the adequacy of pay and allowances for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1008(a) and 1009(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3243. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter of offer to Canada for defense articles estimated to cost in excess of $50 million (Transmittal No. 84-44), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize the forfeiture of accrued leave by certain members of a uniformed service discharged prior to serving satisfactorily on active duty for 6 months, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3245. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on loan, guarantee and insurance transactions supported by Eximbank during March 1984 to Communist countries, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1945, chapter 341, section 2(b)(2) (88 Stat. 2334); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3246. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the annual report on the economic viability of depository institutions, pursuant to Public Law 96-221, section 206; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3247. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 5-125, "D.C. Unemployment Compensation Act Amendments Temporary Act of 1984," pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3248. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 5-124, "Health-Care Assistance Reimbursement Act of 1984," and report, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3249. A letter from the Chairman, D.C. Retirement Board, transmitting copies of the personal financial statements of the members of the Board, pursuant to Public Law 96-122, sections 162 and 164(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3250. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting the 12th annual report of the Commission for the period ending September 30, 1983, pursuant to Public Law 91-345, section 5(a)(7); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3251. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Panel on financing Elementary and Secondary Education, transmitting the Advisory Panel's comments on the school finance project report that was previously submitted to Congress (EC2837—March 8, 1984), pursuant to Public Law 95-561, section 1203(f); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3252. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the 1983 annual energy review, pursuant to FEAA, section 57(a)(2) (90 Stat. 1139; 91 Stat. 572); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3253. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, U.S. Railway Association, transmitting the Association's activities and recommendations for fiscal years 1981 through 1983, pursuant to Public Law 93-236, section 202(d)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3254. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter of offer to Canada for defense articles and services estimated to cost $113 million (Transmittal No. 83-44), pursuant to AECA, section 36(b) (90 Stat. 741; 93 Stat. 708, 709, 710; 94 Stat. 3134; 95 Stat. 1520); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3255. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter of offer to Canada for defense articles and services estimated to cost $41 million (Transmittal No. 84-43), pursuant to AECA, section 36(b) (90 Stat. 741; 93 Stat. 708, 709, 710; 94 Stat. 3134; 95 Stat. 1520); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3256. A letter from the Freedom of Information Officer, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report of the Agency's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3257. A letter from the Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on its compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act) for 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3258. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3259. A letter from the Chief Immigration Judge, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the suspension of deportation of certain aliens of good character and with required residency when deportation causes hardship under section 244(a), Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to INA, section 244(c) (66 Stat. 214, 76 Stat. 1247); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3260. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the annual report on the applications for court orders made to Federal and State courts to permit the interception of wire or oral communications during calendar year 1983, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3261. A letter from the Director, National Institute of Corrections, Department of Justice, transmitting the eighth annual report of the Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3262. A letter from the President, American Council of Learned Societies, transmitting the Council's annual report for the year 1982-83, pursuant to Public Law 88-504, section 3 (36 U.S.C. 1103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3263. A letter from the Treasurer General, Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting the society's report and financial audit for the year ended February 29, 1983, pursuant to Public Law 88-504, section 3 (36 U.S.C. 1103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3264. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of State, transmitting information that was omitted from a previous communication, (EC3067—April 3, 1984), on property transferred under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3784, (Public Law 96-70, section 1504(b)) Executive Order 12215, section 1-401; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3265. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a lease prospectus, pursuant to Public Law 86-249, section 7(a) (86 Stat. 217); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3266. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting the results of a survey of the shores of the Atlantic Ocean in Worcester County, Md., and of that portion of the Assateague Island in Virginia, in the interest of beach erosion control, hurricane protection and related purposes, which was requested by a House Public Works Committee resolution (June 19, 1963); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3267. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on the disposition of cases granted relief from administrative error, overpayment and forfeiture during 1983, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 210(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3268. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans and to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children of veterans; and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3269. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on the funds

expended for trade adjustment assistance training during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1983, pursuant to Public Law 93-618, section 236(a)(2) (95 Stat. 885); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3270. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authorization of appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3271. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the annual report on the consumer affairs division's activities during 1983, pursuant to the act of September 26, 1914, chapter 311, section 18(f)(6) (88 Stat. 2197; 93 Stat. 95; 94 Stat. 174); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

3272. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on abnormal occurrences at or associated with any facility licensed or regulated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 or the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 for the third calendar quarter of 1983, pursuant to Public Law 93-438, section 208; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

3273. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to remove certain burdensome and unnecessary Federal administrative requirements on State programs, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

3274. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1985 and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5564. A bill making supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 98-729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3788, a bill to designate various areas as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the national forests in the State of Texas; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than May 4, 1984, for consideration of such provisions of the amendment as fall within that committee's jurisdiction pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X (Rept. No. 98-730, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 5564. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself and Mr. PARRIS):

H.R. 5565. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol and the District of Columbia to enter into an agreement for the conveyance of certain real property, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to permit the District of Columbia and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to construct, maintain, and operate certain transportation improvements on Federal property, and to direct the Architect of the Capitol to provide the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority access to certain real property; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia and House Administration.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 5566. A bill to require the Attorney General to include in the uniform crime reports information describing the incidence of certain offenses involving the expression of racial, ethnic, or religious prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 5567. A bill to simplify the administration, contain escalating costs and create greater flexibility in the operation of programs under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. FERRARO (for herself, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. OTTINGER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. VENTO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GREEN, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.R. 5568. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Transportation may exempt segments of the Interstate System from the requirement that double trailer trucks be allowed to operate on all interstate highways and from certain truck length and width limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 5569. A bill to amend the laws of the United States to eliminate gender-based distinctions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 5570. A bill to require that the U.S. Postal Service provide mailboxes for certain residential public housing authority buildings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GREEN, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. YATES, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 5571. A bill to provide for a mutual and verifiable moratorium on the testing and deployment of new nuclear ballistic missiles and antisatellite weapons and the testing of nuclear warheads; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 5572. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for more useful and effective disclosure by officials of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Rules, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 5573. A bill to clarify the application of the Federal antitrust laws to local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 5574. A bill to exempt certain veterans of the Armed Forces from registering for Military Selective Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAIG:

H.J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to designate June 13, 1984, as "Harmon Killebrew Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising on August 1, 1944; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAUB:

H. Res. 495. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal program of impact aid with respect to the children of military personnel should be transferred to the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H. Res. 496. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the negative effects of the European Community's request for consultations with the United States under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to renegotiate the duty-free binding on corn gluten feed and other nongrain feed ingredients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

381. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to amending the Staggers Rail Act of 1980; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

382. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the intent of the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

383. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to the procedures by which the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers licenses land to the Kansas fish and game commission; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 225: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1008: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1315: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. COELHO, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1657: Mr. SIMON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. COURTER, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1784: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 1918: Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 1942: Mr. MINISH.

H.R. 1991: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 2105: Mr. HANCE.

H.R. 2118: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 2128: Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2300: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2715: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 3137: Mr. ECKART and Mr. REID.

H.R. 3455: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 3684: Mr. HOYER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 4097: Mr. OWENS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BARNES, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 4375: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4402: Mr. KASTENMEIER and Mr. MCKERNAN.

H.R. 4571: Mr. GRADISON.

H.R. 4589: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 4631: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 4676: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 4760: Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 4828: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 4966: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 5006: Mr. MINISH and Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 5008: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 5078: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. GORE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 5084: Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. MACKAY, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 5111: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 5159: Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. DEWINE.

H.R. 5196: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 5197: Mr. STUDDS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 5206: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 5272: Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 5335: Mr. OWENS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 5376: Mr. COYNE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. BEDELL, and Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 5377: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SABO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 5391: Mr. BONKER, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. OTTINGER.

H.R. 5418: Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 5450: Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

H.R. 5489: Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 5501: Mr. BIAGGI and Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.J. Res. 239: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LENT, and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

H.J. Res. 463: Mr. CONTE, Mr. TALLON, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MACK, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MARTIN, of New York, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COURTER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 485: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. SABO, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.J. Res. 499: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. SABO, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.J. Res. 509: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. ALBOSTA.

H.J. Res. 528: Mr. PETRI.

H.J. Res. 546: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROE, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. CORRADA.

H.J. Res. 547: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. STOKES.

H. Con. Res. 245: Mr. TAUKE.

H. Con. Res. 270: Mr. WILSON, Mr. GORE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RITTER.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 286: Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. BATES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ECKART, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H. Con. Res. 289: Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. ROE, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WINN, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. LUKEN, and Mr. HORTON.

H. Res. 45: Mr. KOSTMAYER and Mr. HEFNER.

H. Res. 458: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GORE, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4103: Mr. MARTINEZ.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

350. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council of Florissant, Mo., relative to H.R. 4103, the Cable Telecommunications Act of 1983; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

351. Also, petition of the board of aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., relative to sulfur dioxide emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

352. Also, petition of the Worcester Area Council of Lithuanian Organizations, Shrewsbury, Mass., relative to regaining freedom for Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

353. Also, petition of the city council of Stow, Ohio, relative to the nuclear arms race; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

354. Also, petition of the Olyphant Borough Council, Olyphant, Pa., relative to the recognition of giardia as a water pollutant; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

355. Also, petition of the International Executive Board, the Newspaper Guild, Washington, D.C., relative to the misuse of pesticides; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Rules.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4275

By Mr. FRENZEL:

—Page 6, line 23 through page 7, line 6, strike out section 107 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 107. For those projects authorized in section 104 of this Act and financed by the Federal Government, the interest rate used for computing interest during construction, and interest on the unpaid balance of the interest-bearing reimbursable cost of the project, shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the reimbursement period of the project during the month preceding the fiscal year in which the costs are incurred. To the extent that more than one interest rate is determined pursuant to the preceding sentence, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish for repayment purposes an interest rate at a weighted average of the rates so determined.

Page 15, strike out lines 5 through 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "taking into consideration average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the reimbursement period of the project during the month preceding the fiscal year in which the costs are incurred. To the extent that more than one interest rate is determined pursuant to the preceding sentence, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish for repayment purposes an interest rate at a weighted average of the rates so determined.".

By Mr. UDALL:

(Amendments to be offered en bloc.)

—Page 1. Change title of bill to read "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain certain facilities at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes.

—Page 2, line 1. Delete through line 3. Substitute "Section 1. This Act may be cited as the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984".

—Page 2, line 4. Delete "Title I" and all that follows through to page 9, line 22. Renumber following sections and internal cross references therein accordingly.

—Page 14, line 25. Delete the comma and the words "respectively, for the uprating program and".

—Page 15, line 5. Delete "as of the beginning" and all that follows through line 10, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "taking into consideration average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the reimbursement period of the program during the month preceding the fiscal year in which the costs of the program are incurred. To the extent that more than one interest rate is determined pursuant to the preceding sentence, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish for repayment purposes an interest rate at a weighted average of the rates so determined.".

—Page 21, line 5. Delete "(d)" and all that follows through p. 22, line 3; and reletter the following subsections accordingly.

—Page 22, line 5. Change the word "may" to "shall" and delete the words "with appropriated funds or".

—Page 22, line 8. After the word "section" delete the comma and the words "or a combination thereof.".

—Page 22, line 9. Delete the word "Any" and change the word "funding" to "Funding".

—Page 24, line 10. Delete the word "appropriated" through the words "any funds" on line 12.

—Page 24, line 13. After "purchasers", delete the comma, and insert "for the uprating program".

—Page 24, line 15. Delete "the installation, except that the" and insert "each segment thereof. The".

—Page 27, (Union Calendar No. 368), after line 11, add the following:

TITLE III

SEC. 301(a). Each long-term firm power service contract entered into or amended subsequent to one year from the date of enactment of this Act by the Secretary of Energy acting by and through the Western Area Power Administration (hereinafter "Western"), shall contain an article requiring the development and implementation by the purchaser thereunder of an energy conservation program. A long-term firm power service contract is any contract for the sale by Western of firm capacity, with or without energy, which is to be delivered over a period of more than one year. The term "purchaser" includes parent-type entities and their distribution of user members. If more than one such contract exists with a purchaser, only one program will be required for that purchaser. Each such contract article shall:

(1) contain time schedules for meeting program goals and delineate actions to be taken in the event such schedules are not met, which may include a reduction of the allocation of capacity or energy to such purchaser as would otherwise be provided under such contract; and

(2) provide for review and modification of the energy conservation program at not to exceed five year intervals.

(b) For purposes of this Title, an energy conservation program shall:

(1) apply to all uses of energy and capacity which are provided from any federal project;

(2) contain definite goals;

(3) encourage customer consumption efficiency improvements and demand management practices which ensure that the available supply of hydroelectric power is used in an economically efficient and environmentally sound manner.

SEC. 302. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, Western shall amend its existing regulations (46 Fed. Reg. 56140) to reflect—

(1) the elements to be considered in the energy conservation programs required by this Title, and

(2) Western's criteria for evaluating and approving such programs.

Such amended regulations shall be promulgated only after public notice and opportunity to comment in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 551-706).

(b) The following elements shall be considered by Western in evaluating energy conservation programs:

(1) energy consumption efficiency improvements;

(2) use of renewable energy resources in addition to hydroelectric power;

(3) load management techniques;

(4) cogeneration;

(5) rate design improvements, including:

(i) cost of service pricing;

(ii) elimination of declining block rates;

(iii) time of day rates;

(iv) seasonal rates; and

(v) interruptible rates; and

(6) production efficiency improvements.

(c) Where a purchaser is implementing one or more of the foregoing elements under a program responding to federal, state or other initiatives that apply to conservation and renewable energy development, in evaluating that purchaser's energy conservation program submitted pursuant to this Title Western shall make due allowance for the incorporation of such elements within the energy conservation program required by this Title.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EX-AGENTS WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a former special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I would like to share with my collegues the remarks delivered last month at the Ex-Agents Western Regional Conference by another former agent, our colleague Mr. RUDD of Arizona. I believe Members will find the gentleman's remarks most enlightening.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ELDON RUDD TO THE EX-AGENTS WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE

Gatherings such as this are cherished by all of us who remember with pride our service in the FBI.

We took an oath of office. We pledged our lives. We eagerly submitted to the discipline of duty.

We are drawn together. We are held together by something more than nostalgia. We are united by love of country, by reverence for decency and truth, and peace and honesty.

We do not gather here as warriors in a common cause anxious to revive the past. This association is more than a gathering of the old grads, an alumni meeting to revise past victories and renew that sense of fraternity which once bound us.

We may have retired from or left active service with the FBI but we have not retired from active participation in the affairs of the Republic—in the defense of freedom—in the proclamation of liberty—in the war against injustice—or in the struggle for truth.

We have survived an agonizing decade of constant assault on law enforcement in general, and on the Bureau and the intelligence gathering agencies of the United States in particular.

Under President Jimmy Carter the politicians, in a great frenzy of self-righteousness, succeeded in emasculating the CIA, the Bureau and most of the military intelligence organizations.

On two of the major television networks, NBC in a mini-series entitled "Kennedy" and ABC in an hour-long program entitled "J. Edgar Hoover," the networks presented a distorted, dishonest description of Mr. Hoover and the Bureau. As I reviewed these programs my anger turned to sadness. I was overwhelmed by a sense of frustration. How could it be? How could it be that those two major networks would resort to calumny? With all the artistry at their command, ABC and NBC pictured the Bureau as an almost terrorist organization.

Director John Edgar Hoover, the man who single-handedly elevated law enforcement to a professional status, was by innuendo and direct accusation presented as a petty tyrant, a homosexual, a willful breaker of the law, a blackmailer of presidents and members of congress, a bigot, a racist, an incompetent bumbler.

My friends, if we believed what ABC and NBC said about our director and about us we should be meeting secretively and underground, wearing masks and swearing to false identities, something these networks apparently welcome in interviews with their masked and anonymous sources in Central America.

Surely this past decade will live in infamy as the time when faithful, competent defenders of the public safety were persecuted for following orders, for their efforts to penetrate the secrets of a terrorist organization.

I do not know what inspired these assaults. I have no way of judging motives. For I was trained to deal with facts and to base my conclusions on the facts available.

And I must sadly conclude that in the past ten years the efforts to discredit law enforcement and, particularly, to destroy the reputation of J. Edgar Hoover have served the interest of those who would destroy this Republic and enslave the American people.

If it was a sin to serve in the FBI, to follow the instructions of the director, to attempt to apprehend the real wrongdoers, and to prosecute the criminal syndicates, then I am an unrepentant sinner.

The media, print and electronic, sanctimoniously maintain their mission is to hold up a mirror so that society may see itself. If this be their aim, then I must say their mirrors are like the bent and crooked glasses in a funhouse, dedicated to distortion.

I am proud and pleased to report that in the Congress of the United States these distortions have not gone unchallenged. In the House of Representatives, where I now serve this nation, H.R. 3142, the Federal Tort Claims Reform, which I co-sponsored will, in my opinion, rule out any repetition of the charges and allowing the prosecution of Mark Feldt, Edward Miller and Pat Gray. (This bill is now in committee and I am confident it will eventually be reported out and adopted).

I am co-sponsoring 11 measures to correct some of the evils which have threatened the existence of the Republic. There is not space here to itemize each of these pieces of legislation but all of them taken together represent a return to sanity. And in my opinion such a return is long overdue. Three of these measures—the Control Substance Robbery Act, the Federal Anti-Tampering Act and a bill to close loopholes and increase penalties against child pornography—have been passed by the House.

On March 26, President Ronald Reagan conferred the Medal of Freedom posthumously on Whitaker Chambers, which took a lot of guts for the President in a political year to tell the story the way it is. He recognized Whitaker Chambers' act on behalf of our country in identifying espionage by the Soviets against the U.S. Chambers provided contrivable evidence to uncover espionage despite efforts to denounce him.

The Weathermen, for so long the darlings of the liberal press and the liberal academic community, were but prologue to the growing terrorist threat throughout the world.

I do not remember the character who popularized the phrase "you ain't seen nothing yet," but in my considered opinion the evidence of increased terrorism in the United States gives new meaning to that phrase "You ain't seen nothing yet."

But then I guess we have seen something, for we have seen the White House now guarded by concrete barriers. There are more guards and new devices on Capitol Hill.

The tragedy is that in a free society, and may we continue to be that, the law is virtually helpless to protect the citizen from the dedicated terrorist: the suicide driver of that bomb truck in Lebanon; the fanatic assassins in Western Europe.

The almost successful attempt on the life of President Reagan.

All these suggest that unless we greatly strengthen the power of the intelligence-gathering and law enforcement agencies in the United States, the future will be continually darkened by successful acts of terrorism.

I was in Los Angeles a few weeks ago, where all of the enforcement agencies involved were gathered to consider how terrorism at the Olympic Games can be prevented.

I slip back in memory to that moment in 1942 when eight Nazi saboteurs were landed on our shores by submarine.

You will remember the ABC news report used this as an exhibit to promote the notion that the FBI was a bumbling bunch of bureaucrats unable to stop the entrance of the saboteurs.

In a letter to The Arizona Republic by Dr. William Helm, M.D., who is now a Phoenix neurological surgeon and a former agent of the FBI, Helm states "that a number of FBI agents, including myself, arrested Herbert Hoff and Herman Neubauer on June 27, 1942, and the other six saboteurs were arrested by Bureau agents in the East."

Thanks to the politicians and the media, the Bureau is not now in a position to identify and apprehend potential terrorists. And where the politicians have not prevailed in shackling the Bureau, the courts have.

In late January the FBI managed to have video tape recorders and cameras photographing the illegal activities of four members of the FALN in Chicago. These terrorists were making bombs and assembling weapons. But after their arrest a Chicago U.S. District Judge, George N. Leighton, banned the use of the video tapes on the grounds that they were unreasonable search and seizure. Judge Leighton said "the home is a sacred place in this country."

Indeed it is, judge, so long as it is a shelter for law abiding peaceful citizens. When it becomes a laboratory for the preparation of bombs and weapons, it is ridiculous to claim the home privacy protection.

The courts, no less than the Congress, have contributed to the immunity which now surrounds the active terrorists in this nation.

To complain about a condition without proposing a remedy is an exercise in futility. What then is the remedy? The remedy, my friends, is to speak up. For you have special

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

31-059 O-87-24 (Pt. 8)

understandings of this terror which threatens us all. Speak out at public meetings. Seek a forum where your voice can be heard. Recite the dismal facts.

Write letters to your congressmen—after all Congress is the government of all of the U.S., they must listen to citizens. Write letters to your newspapers. Talk to your neighbors in the barber shop and at the corner grocery store, and in the tavern, and at your work place.

Enlist again in the cause you have always served.

It is told that Chou En-lai once declared "give me two men in a village and I will take that village."

Long ago we were warned that all that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing. Knowing what we know—being who we are—we dare not now keep silent.

There is a saying: the majority is inevitably inspired by the vocal minority.

In this hour of danger we can be the vocal minority. Will we? Will we speak up? Will we make the peril known? Or will we after this pleasant reunion return to our familiar ways and keep silent?

I thank you.●

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF DORIE MILLER COOPERATORS COUNCIL

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the 30th anniversary of the Dorie Miller Cooperators Council to the attention of the Congress. This festive occasion will be celebrated on Friday evening, May 4.

The Dorie Miller Cooperative, a 300-family residential complex, was founded in 1953 and is one of the premier housing developments in the city of New York. For 30 years, the Cooperators Council has been dedicated to the stability and enhancement of its Corona, Queens, community and the surrounding area.

In its three decades, this exemplary organization has run numerous programs of great benefit to the families of Dorie Miller. The council's efforts have secured quiet indoor recreation areas in each of the six buildings in the cooperative; the council's active playground committee insures that the youngsters, too, have room to play. The council has also supervised summertime activities, to keep the community's children safe and constructively occupied when school is out.

In addition, the families of the Dorie Miller Cooperative have demonstrated their commitment to helping those individuals who are less fortunate than themselves. The council has been a frequent contributor to numerous local charitable activities, and has actively participated in community projects to assist the people and neighborhoods of Queens.

Mr. Speaker, the Dorie Miller Cooperators Council helps its community and membership maintain a vibrant and healthy environment, and sets an example for other organizations to emulate. I ask that the Members of the Congress of the United States join me in congratulating the Dorie Miller Cooperators Council; John Henry Jones, president; Robert J. Wonson, vice president; Adele Fields, secretary; Wilbur J. Edwards, treasurer; and all the families of the Dorie Miller Cooperative.●

CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1984

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the administration's Child Nutrition Amendments of 1984.

This bill is designed to streamline programs, simplify administrative requirements and procedures, contain escalating costs, and increase State flexibility in operating programs authorized by the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts.

Among the major provisions incorporated in this measure are:

Reauthorization of the expiring supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC), the State administrative expenses authority, and the commodity distribution program for 1 year, or through September 30, 1985;

Termination of the summer food service program for children and the child care food program, and in lieu thereof, authorization of nonschool food program grant, affording States greater flexibility in developing programs tailored to meet the nutrition needs of the low-income children in nonschool settings;

Termination of the nutrition education and training (NET) program which has served well its original purpose;

Allocation of up to $3 million annually in State administrative expense funds to assist States in defraying costs incurred in the verification of food stamp household eligibility for free school lunches and breakfasts;

Modification of the State administrative expenses authority to preclude States from retaining unobligated funds in excess of foreseeable needs;

Reduction of WIC program State and local administrative cost allowances from 20 to 18 percent of total program funds provided, thereby encouraging greater operational efficiency;

Establishment of an independent special assistance payment for reduced-price lunches and breakfasts insuring that subsequent adjustments in the reduced-price reimbursement levels more accurately reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for food away from home; and

Elimination of direct Federal administration of child nutrition programs in States which do not now administer these programs through their own agencies.

I have certain reservations as to the impact that the requirement for State administration of all child nutrition programs will have in those States which may have constitutional prohibitions against State agency administration of programs operating in private schools and institutions.

On balance, however, I believe that the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1984 contain a number of sound child nutrition policy changes which should be given serious consideration and acted upon favorably during this Congress.●

CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY SEAT INCENTIVE GRANTS

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the Senate to act swiftly on legislation passed recently by the House under suspension of the rules—legislation addressing an important area of highway safety and of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

The fact that automobile crashes are the leading cause of death for American children is frightening. Each year, approximately 900 children under the age of 5 are killed while riding in passenger vehicles. In fact, more children are killed or crippled as a result of motor vehicle accidents than by the combined total of all the diseases for which they now are routinely immunized. Most of those deaths and injuries could be avoided if parents only would take the time to buckle their children properly into a proper child restraint device (CRD).

CRD's, which include booster seats, padded shells, or safety harnesses, have been available for some 50 years. Only in the past 10 to 15 years, however, has the full safety potential of CRD's been realized, with 43 States and the District of Columbia having enacted laws mandating their use. This is a tremendous step in the right direction; however, the misuse of CRD's is a significant and widespread problem resulting in unnecessary deaths and injuries.

National surveys show that only about one-half of the Nation's children under 5 years of age are secured by child restraints, and that over 70 percent of these seats are used incor-

rectly. In the opinion of highway safety experts, the effectiveness of child passenger safety laws would increase dramatically were they to be complemented by comprehensive support programs at the State level.

In recognition of this situation, House Public Works and Transportation leaders and other concerned Members drafted H.R. 4616, legislation which would require States to use 8 percent of their highway safety apportionments for developing and implementing comprehensive child restraint programs under guidelines to be established by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. I want to commend Chairman JIM HOWARD and his staff for having brought together the ideas of several House Members on this matter, as well as Surface Transportation Subcommittee Chairman GLENN ANDERSON and ranking minority member BUD SHUSTER for having considered this issue when they held hearings on an array of vital highway safety matters last February.

Being an original cosponsor of this legislation, I would like to point out to Members on my side of the aisle that Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Hanford Dole firmly believes that States should indeed spend an appropriate percentage of their section 402 funds on child restraint programs, although she has not personally endorsed the authorization levels established in this bill.

Under this legislation, a portion of each State's section 402 highway funding would be earmarked for child passenger seat distribution, enforcement, public information, and education programs—all of which are vital if we are to improve and increase overall usage rates of CRD's nationwide.

Toward these ends, H.R. 4616 first and foremost addresses the need for State distribution programs and backs this up with a financial commitment. CRD's in their various configurations cost from approximately $25 to $100. This cost simply is unaffordable for the disadvantaged and is a key reason for parents failing to use CRD's. To aid those who cannot afford the availability of child safety seats, CRD rental programs have been established throughout the country. These safety seat loan programs, established by hospitals, community groups, and public agencies, encourage safety seat use by making them widely available at a nominal cost while providing parents and motorists with an accurate understanding of the need for a proper use of a CRD. These existing programs can be expanded and improved with innovative approaches determined by NHTSA with the funding provided.

Comprehensive programs as envisioned in this legislation also could make section 402 funds available for State law enforcement training programs, which highway safety experts insist are necessary in order to increase the role of highway troopers in insuring that more child safety seats are used on the roadways—and used properly. Law enforcement officials are in a unique position to spot seats being used incorrectly and inform motorists on the proper use of these devices. By participating in training programs conducted by local pediatricians, troopers could better serve as child safety seat advocates.

Finally, H.R. 4616 recognizes the need for information campaigns and education programs. Experience from public campaigns such as the anti-smoking effort indicates that well designed and orchestrated media campaigns can contribute significantly to changes in public attitudes and behavior. Such programs could promote child safety awareness among a broad cross-section of Americans, including parents, the purchasers and users of these devices, and importantly, the "under-fives"—the children riding in CRD's. Teaching children from an early age the importance of riding in a car seat will result, it is hoped, in youngsters automatically "buckling up" seatbelts when they grow older.

Likewise, educational programs which are more comprehensive in scope and targeted to smaller, individual groups would further increase public awareness of child passenger safety and might be funded by this legislation. These might consist of brochures, pamphlets, films, posters, bumper stickers, and seminars. And, conceivably, existing programs developed at hospitals, community and civic organizations, and State public health and safety agencies which have been dissolved for financial purposes could be resurrected by funding from this legislation.

I want to protect our future—our most precious natural resource—from senseless mortality rates and from crippling injuries, and thus I support incentive grants to the States for child passenger safety programs. While child passenger safety seat laws are appropriately enacted at the State level, no one can dispute the fact that automobile fatalities and injuries are a national epidemic. With incentive grants as envisioned in this legislation, we can improve and increase the proper use of CRD's in those States which already have these laws—while, at the same time, encouraging the remainder to enact such statutes promptly.●

DUKE ELLINGTON MONTH

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 4, York College and the Black American Heritage Society will hold a brief ceremony commemorating Duke Ellington Month.

Duke Ellington was one of the finest musicians that ever lived. Fine musicians are unique breed of mankind. They have the ability to reach out and communicate to so many different people.

As I grew up studying the piano, I emulated Duke Ellington. Because what he could do in a few notes was to reach out and touch men from every land. While critics say that the Duke made the most pervasive contribution to the development of jazz in the United States, I believe his contribution was to mankind. Through his development of the language of music, mankind was elevated and elated.

Remembering Duke Ellington is easy, remembering that he introduced the wordless voice as a jazz instrument or put together compositions from miniature concerto's is not that difficult either. What is difficult is searching and striving as the Duke did all his life to find new ways of sensitizing ourselves to our fellow man. By doing this, we not only insure that Duke's contributions are remembered, we guarantee that they are advanced for the future generations of mankind.●

CANTOR BERMAN HONORED ON GOLDEN JUBILEE

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1984 Temple Beth-El, of Jersey City, will honor its cantor, Abraham Berman, who has served the congregation without interruption for the past 50 years.

According to Rabbi Samuel A. Berman, D.D., and members of the congregation, this unique achievement is unparalleled in any synagogue in the United States and perhaps the world.

Temple Beth-El has enjoyed the leadership of my dear friend, Rabbi Berman and many outstanding community leaders including Morris Pesin, Raymond Chasen, George Clott, the Honorable Benjamin Chodash, Leonard Casner, Judge Alan Horowitz, Norman Roth, Josephine Taube, Matthew Weisenfeld, and Sadie and Isi-

dore Hornstein and others who are currently active.

Many of its members over the years have led our community in the areas of education, law, medicine, business and cultural affairs.

I have been fortunate to have the input of Milton Gottlieb, a dedicated member of Temple Beth-El, who has provided important information about Temple Beth-El and this golden anniversary tribute.

It will be my privilege to present to Cantor Berman a framed copy of these remarks from today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for his family use.

Temple Beth-El has received wide acclaim in recent years for its innovative ideas and leadership in civic affairs. Only last year, it received national recognition by creating its own Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island fund as part of the national effort to rehabilitate our two most famous shrines. It set an example for other religious institutions throughout the country by raising thousands of dollars for the fund in honor of one of its members, Morris Pesin. This year, for the first time in its 120-year history, it elected a woman, Blanche Dohrman, to serve as president of its congregation thereby recognizing the important role that women play in the religious life of the community.

Abraham Berman became cantor of Temple Beth-El in 1934. Three years later, the present rabbi, Samuel A. Berman (no relation to Cantor Berman) was engaged by the congregation, and the two have been close friends ever since.

The golden anniversary celebration of Cantor Berman's affiliation with Temple Beth-El will be a 3-day event culminating in a ceremony on Sunday, May 6 in which a bas relief of the cantor, fashioned by the world famous sculptor, Nathan Rapoport, will be unveiled. Nathan Rapoport is renowned for his sculptures in parks and museums in many cities throughout the world, having just completed a 15-foot statute exemplifying the liberation of Europe from Nazi oppression by the American soldier, which will be placed in Jersey City's Liberty State Park.

The principal speaker at the ceremonies will be Gov. Thomas H. Kean, of New Jersey, and a proclamation will be read by Mayor Gerald McCann of Jersey City, in recognition of the extraordinary service rendered by Cantor Berman to his congregation and the community of Jersey City.

The importance of the cantor to the synagogue, the integral part of the Jewish community, deserves a brief discussion. In the years of the ghettos, there were no social outlets for Jews, no places of entertainment insofar as music, drama, or the arts were concerned. As a result, the yearning to express themselves artistically remained unsatisfied. The community, therefore, demanded that the cantor fulfill these longings and perform a dual role; that of "Hazzan" catering to the religious needs, and that of entertainer satisfying the need for relaxation and artistic expression. He sang for the sake of the song. However, cantorial music did not destroy the liturgical purposes, and yet music had its own reason for existence.

Today, the cantor in the modern synagogue bears the responsibility of stimulating devotion to Judaism. He is invested with the honor of leading the service and officiating on behalf of the entire congregation. In the words of the Concise Code of Jewish Law:

> The one designated to lead the congregation in prayer must be a worthy person. He should be one who has a good reputation and is not known as a transgressor, even as a youth. He should be modest and agreeable to the congregation. His voice should be pleasant, melodious and pleasing. He should, of course, be conversant with the prayers and the order of the service.

Abraham Berman more than satisfies these criteria that are the hallmark of the ideal cantor. He is a graduate of the Rabbi Jacob Joseph Yeshiva in New York City. He received bachelor degrees from City College of New York and Brooklyn Law School, and is a member of the New York Bar. He laid the foundation of his love for music at Columbia University after which he arranged and orchestrated Israeli and Yiddish folk songs for a variety of radio programs. He organized a gala musical commemorative broadcast in observance of the centenary of the birth of Abraham Goldfaden, father of the Yiddish musical theater. This multitalented man served as choral director for the most celebrated cantors of this era from foreign countries as well as the United States. And throughout his career, he has been the musical voice of his beloved Temple Beth-El in faith, prayer, and hope.

Cantor Berman has been honored by the dedication of a nursing facility in his name in the Jewish Hospital and Rehabilitation Center of New Jersey, and on display in its main lobby is a valuable collection of Judaica which he donated.

In June 1980, he was the guest of honor at a testimonial breakfast in recognition of his dedication to the Jewish community and the State of Israel.

I have visited Jersey City Temple Beth-El on many occasions. Indeed it is an important anchor in our society, constantly reiterating the importance of family living and happy home life, where character is built, where sacrifices are made, and where love has taken residence.

Every time I visit Temple Beth-El I am reminded of our first President George Washington's speech before the first synagogue in Newport, R.I., in 1790 where he spoke out against bigotry:

> Happily the government of the United States gives to bigotry, no sanction. To persecution, no assistance.

Washington's wish that:

> The children of the stock of Abraham who dwell in this land continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths . . .

Cantor Abraham Berman indeed has been a tree in our lifetimes, growing upward to the heavens providing shade and shelter to many of us and by being an excellent servant of both God and man.

Indeed many of the thousands of individuals he has touched have gone to the four corners of the world, exercising leadership roles. They have been woven deeply into the fabric of America. Their contributions are reflected in the famous words of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver:

> God built him a continent of glory, and filled it with treasures untold. He studded it with sweet-flowing fountains, and traced it with long-winding streams. He carpeted it with soft-rolling prairies, and columned it with thundering mountains. He graced it with deep-shadowed forests, and filled them with song.
>
> Then He called unto a thousand peoples, and summoned the bravest among them. They came from the ends of the earth, each bearing a gift and a hope. The glow of adventure was in their eyes, and in their hearts the glory of hope.
>
> And out of the bounty of earth, and the labor of men; out of the longing of heart, and the prayer of souls; out of the memory of ages, and the hopes of the world, God fashioned a nation in love, and blessed it with purpose sublime.
>
> And they called it America.

I am sure that my colleagues here in the House of Representatives join me in this tribute to Cantor Berman for a job well done.●

NEW POLL ON NORTHERN IRELAND SHOWS LITTLE SUPPORT BY BRITISH PEOPLE FOR POLICY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the bipartisan 104-member Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I wish to place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the April 20, 1984, Irish Echo newspaper entitled "Three of Four Londoners Favor a United Ireland."

The article discusses the findings of a recent poll conducted by an independent radio station in London—LBC. The poll asked its listeners the

question "should Northern Ireland remain part of the United Kingdom?" This was the main question asked and out of some 7,000 who responded, 84 percent said no.

This is not the first poll of this type that I have seen. It causes me to wonder how and why the British Government continues to conduct their present direct rule policies over the north of Ireland when there is so much popular opposition. In addition, the costs of their policy is economically staggering—estimates point to a cost of more than $1.5 billion a year.

I have long contended that the most significant catalyst for a political solution in Northern Ireland would be for the British Government to declare its intention to commence a phased and orderly withdrawal of their entire presence from Northern Ireland. Once this process began, all sides to the conflict could begin to conduct discussions on the new Northern Ireland. Then the United States together with other concerned nations should develop an economic aid program for the north.

It is said that those of us in political life in America read and study polls very carefully. I am hopeful that the same practice occurs in the United Kingdom and that this particular poll is given very serious consideration.

The article follows immediately:

THREE OF FOUR LONDONERS FAVOR A UNITED IRELAND

LONDON.—Less than two in every ten Londoners believe that Northern Ireland should remain in the United Kingdom, according to a survey conducted by an independent radio station, LBC.

Almost three in every four people in London think that the North should become part of the Republic, and fewer than one in every four think that Northern Ireland should become an independent state, the same survey found.

The vast majority of voters (6,791) responded during the first 24 hours of the survey, when the question was: "Should Northern Ireland remain part of the United Kingdom?" The overwhelming majority—84 percent—voted No and the remaining 16 percent voted Yes.

Voting on the two remaining questions was confined to two two-hour periods on the succeeding days. The first of these questions was: "Should Northern Ireland become part of the Irish Republic?" Of the 1,229 people who responded, 72 percent voted Yes and the remaining 28 percent voted No.

The final question was: "Should Northern Ireland become an independent state?" It attracted the smallest number of replies—884 during the two-hour period. Only 24 percent of these voted Yes and the remaining 76 percent voted No.●

THE CORONA-EAST ELMHURST BRANCH CELEBRATES 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAACP

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Corona-East Elmhurst branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will celebrate the 75th anniversary of the founding of the NAACP. This diamond jubilee will be held in the First Baptist Church of East Elmhurst, Queens, on Sunday, May 6.

The NAACP was founded in 1909 in New York City to "achieve equal rights through the democratic process and eliminate racial prejudice for all American citizens * * *," and quickly became an influential force for social justice. The NAACP is the oldest civil rights organization in the United States, and has consistently worked to achieve equality of opportunity for all Americans. As an active participant in the historic Supreme Court case Brown against Board of Education, the NAACP helped to end legal segregation in education.

The Corona-East Elmhurst branch of the NAACP has served the Queens community for 35 years. Its current president, Harry T. Stewart, also served as its first president in 1949. This active and important branch and its 600 members have provided day care facilities for working parents since 1972 at the Malcolm X Day Care Center in Corona. The Corona-East Elmhurst chapter has led the fight for community rights and neighborhood concerns. This branch also monitors local civil rights cases so that it may help to defend victims of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the Corona-East Elmhurst branch of the NAACP helps its community and membership maintain a vibrant and healthy environment, and sets an example for other organizations to emulate. I ask that the Members of the Congress of the United States join me in congratulating President Harry T. Stewart and the many members of this fine organization.●

WALL STREET JOURNAL PUBLISHES LETTER OF MAJORITY LEADER JIM WRIGHT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal yesterday published a letter from our distinguished majority leader, JIM WRIGHT, in response to the Journal's editorial about an earlier letter from him and a number of other Members of Congress to the Nicaraguan Government.

I wish to call this excellent letter to the attention of my colleagues in the House. The issue of Central America is a critical matter on which the Congress will be required to take a number of actions this session. Our majority leader's views are thoughtful and reasoned; they deserve our careful consideration.

As his letter concludes:

Change is coming to Latin America. We cannot prevent that. We should not try. We can help to shape the direction of that change by patience, by understanding, by deeds of good will, by a steady long-term commitment to peaceful cooperation.

The tone and direction of his letter provides a good point of departure for the decisions we in the Congress face.

THE EPISTLE TO THE SANDINISTAS

Your editorial of April 17 ("Dear Comandante") questions my motives, and those of Senator Moynihan, regarding Central America. The editorial accuses us of "posturing," of "hypocrisy," of crass political pandering, of lacking courage. Harsh indictments, indeed.

While I certainly do not object to being linked with Pat Moynihan, I will not attempt to speak for him. Anybody who knows the Senator from New York is aware he can speak quite adequately in his own behalf.

The basic charge against me is that I signed, with nine others, a letter to Daniel Ortega, head of the Nicaraguan governing junta. The thrust of that letter is not that we are satisfied with Nicaragua's scheduling of elections and its promise to lessen press censorship and allow greater freedom of assembly. The point of the letter is that these steps, while commendable, are not enough. Quoting from the letter: "We write with the hope that the initial steps you have taken will be followed by others designed to guarantee a fully open and democratic electoral process."

It was in the hope of encouraging a truly free and fair election and with it a fundamental change in the direction of Nicaraguan policy that we wrote the letter of March 20. That hope may be naive, but surely worthy of an effort.

Your editorialist saw a basic inconsistency between this effort and my support for the electoral process and the freely elected government in El Salvador. If we truly believe in political decisions by ballot rather than by bullet, then my position is consistent. It upholds that principle in both countries.

The two elections in El Salvador, which I have observed at first hand, convince me that the people of that country deeply desire and richly deserve a democratic government. We must support their right to sustain one. We are committed to do so by the Rio Treaty. We are pledged to respect and help protect the rights of local non-violent self-determination.

By the same logic, as we assist Salvadorans to defend the integrity of their institutions against externally supported terrorism, how shall we defend financing and directing external terrorism against the government of Nicaragua? It is a poor rule that

doesn't work both ways. Is ours a policy of principle or of expediency?

There is much to criticize in the behavior of the Sandinistas. I have found fault with many of their policies. But we may not dictate their form of society. To attempt to do so is counterproductive. It breeds resentment. Financing terrorist attacks against that country merely feeds the fires of nationalistic resistance. It inflates the bogey man of "U.S. imperialism" and inflames the public against our country.

To foreclose all possibility of a peaceful reconciliation with Nicaragua would be to narrow our choices to two; the permanence of a hostile Marxist state in Central America, or the need to overthrow it by force of arms. To settle for either of those alternatives is to admit to a failed policy, bankrupt of creative ideas.

Our relations with Central America are vital. No other region is more important to our national future. The challenge is for patience and consistency. We must be willing to deal with Latin Americans as partners, not subordinates. Too often we've acted like a fire department. We ignore all of Central America until trouble erupts. We rush down to put out the fire, then return to a posture of benign indifference, distracted by other concerns.

That policy won't work anymore. Change is coming in Latin America. We cannot prevent that. We should not try. We can help to shape the direction of that change by patience, by understanding, by deeds of good will, by a steady long-term commitment to peaceful cooperation.

JIM WRIGHT,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives.●

LAND REFORM IN EL SALVADOR

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1984, the Secretary of State issued yet another report on land reform in El Salvador. Although the report indicates that there are some problems with land reform, it does not focus on the source of the problems or on the extent of the misery which exists as a result of Government impediments to land reform.

The basic plan for land reform in El Salvador is to provide a mechanism for the farmers who work the land to purchase the land as individuals or as members of cooperatives. In order for the farmers to plant crops, earn a living, and begin to pay for the land, credit is necessary to put in seed and fertilizer. The farmers must rely upon the Government banks for this credit. As a practical matter, the credit must arrive in time to get the crop in. This has not occurred, leading to reduced crops.

The second problem which the farmers face is how to sell the crop. According to those who have investigated the situation, the farmers say that they are required to sell their crops to the Government at low prices and that the Government resells the crop at higher prices. If one assumes that it is necessary for the Government to purchase all crops because of the breakdown in the marketing system, it does not follow that it is necessary for the Government to depress prices and leave the farmers with so little income that they are worse off than they were with the landlords.

It is clear that the farmers of El Salvador must become organized so that they can exercise sufficient control over the credit, production, and marketing needed to realize reasonable profit from their work. Organization efforts have been hindered, the farmers say, because the Government forbids them to speak with organizers from the United States and other parts of Latin America. One can suggest that the farmers might well ignore such directives, but one must remember that they live in a land where death through Government violence is all too common and they would be foolhardy to ignore this ever-present danger.

Where does this leave many of the farmers on the issue of land reform? They look to the conditions of their lives, the hunger of their families, and wish for the old days of the landlords when they had higher incomes and when the living conditions were somewhat better. From the perspective of an individual who is hungrier than he was before, the experiment has failed.

The overall situation in El Salvador is such that agricultural production has fallen by 8.1 percent since the beginning of land reform. The drop in export crops has been 1.6 percent. These realities make it clear that there is less food available for local consumption. The farmer is paying the price of hunger for this decline. Those who are responsible for the basis of this debacle, the tardy credit, and the lack of a nongovernmental marketing system, are not the farmers who are hungry.

What can the United States do to correct this situation? First of all we can stop approving a land-reform process which has so many built-in causes for failure. The point of land reform was to improve the standard of living for the farmers and not allow the Government to manipulate the system so that the reform measures would fail. Counting the farmers who are involved in land reform is no subsitute for looking at how the system is working. When the Secretary of State certifies that the Government has done nothing to alter, suspend, or terminate land reform, it seems a bit cynical to ignore whether or not the Government has managed the process in such a way as to effectively lower the standard of living of the farmers and create untold suffering.

The people of El Salvador will endure this latest hardship. Poverty will continue and people will become more and more distrusting of their neighbor to the north who is, in part, the author of their misery. This pattern must cease if our goal is to nurture fragile democracies through their infancy. One of the best ways to nurture the beginnings of a democracy is to support economic justice and to improve the standard of living for all of the people. We are not succeeding in doing this in El Salvador.●

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES M. HULSE

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to James M. Hulse, a man of noteworthy distinction whose quest for peace and human rights spans almost 30 years and several continents. This week James Hulse will be honored for what President Dwight Eisenhower once described as impossible, earning three Combat Infantry Badges.

Combat Infantry Badges are awarded to servicemen who served in an infantry unit under actual combat conditions. Infantrymen can earn only one of these badges in each war. For his courage on the front lines during a 27-year military career that included World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam conflict, Hulse earned three Combat Infantry Badges.

James Hulse and 214 other servicemen who are the sole recipients of three Combat Infantry Badges will be honored in a special ceremony on Friday, May 4, at Headquarters U.S. Infantry Center at Fort Benning, GA. A plaque bearing the names of the triple badge holders will be unveiled at the cermony expected to be attended by 130 of the recipients and their families. The plaque will later be placed in the National Infantry Museum at Fort Benning.

Jim Hulse joined the Army following the attack on Pearl Harbor at the age of 20. His duties as a rifleman in World War II took him to North Africa, Italy, Sicily, Normandy, Holland, and Berlin. Though his paratrooper unit was under enemy fire for 367 days in 39 months, this great patriot was not wounded and returned home.

He was seriously wounded in the Korean war while a member of the 187th Airborne Brigade. A third of his unit died trying to capture one hill. Hulse made it to the top of the hill, but Chinese artillery wounded him and killed his friend. Peace was declared while he recuperated in a Japanese hospital.

James Hulse retired in 1964 but was called back in 1966 to join the Army's Special Forces, known as the Green Berets, in Vietnam. He made three tours of duty in Vietnam and was shot down twice in helicopters. He survived, though, and retired for good in 1970 when he was sent home with pneumonia.

James Hulse serves as an inspiration to all who believe in the strength of the human spirit and the benefits of a free society. On behalf of all who have benefited from his dedication and perseverance, I would like to commend James for his accomplishments and wish him a healthy and rewarding future.●

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S NEW DIRECTIVE AGAINST TERRORISM MOST WELCOMED

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Santa Barbara News Press, dated Wednesday, April 18, 1984. The editorial praises President Reagan's new directive to implement a tough antiterrorism package.

We are all aware of the increasing use of terrorism by various religious and political factions across the globe. And, as can be witnessed in the recent terrorist bombing attacks against the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, followed by the truck-bomb attack on our Marines Headquarters also in Beirut, the United States is a prime target for such attacks. The President's decision is "a welcome commitment of American resources" against these fanatical groups and individuals."

I recommend this editorial to all my colleagues.

WAR ON TERRORISM

The United States has been a long time coming to the recognition that terrorism is a form of warfare to be prepared for and defended against as systematically as any more traditional call to battle. The tough new anti-terrorism policy signed this month by President Reagan is a welcome commitment of American resources to guard U.S. interest and values against increasing terrorist attacks launched against democracy abroad and at home. The United States will go on the offensive with this policy, striving to identify potential terrorist attacks and stop them before they occur.

U.S. officials don't delude themselves about the difficulty of sniffing out would-be attackers before they explode the bomb or kidnap the targeted diplomat; terrorists operate in small groups dedicated to secrecy and hard to infiltrate. But the alarming growth in attacks against American property and people demands a more active response than simply wondering—always afterward—whether and how the United States should strike back.

In the last decade, nearly 39 percent of some 6,500 terrorist attacks worldwide were directed against U.S. citizens or property. In the last five years, attacks on persons rather than property increased by 30 percent. In 1983 and this year, terrorist attacks on Americans have mounted monthly, in a rash of bombings, murders and kidnappings in the Middle East and in the United States.

Such attacks are apparently being planned, directed and financed by foreign governments, among them Libya, Syria, Iran, North Korea and Cuba.

Against such concerted global "warfare," the United States will now fight back with increased collection of intelligence data, reinforced security for potential American targets, specially trained antiterrorist squads, and a policy that holds nations that sponsor terrorism accountable through public exposure and the threat of military, paramilitary, political, economic or other action.

A package of proposed legislation submitted to Congress by the administration would provide for much of the anti-terrorist strategies. Most needed is high-level support for the nation's intelligence and law enforcement agencies. One proposed law would permit payment of huge awards for good information on terrorists. Using knowledge aforehand to prevent violence makes the best kind of business sense, and an excellent use of American resources against the war on democracy.●

THE NOT SO INVISIBLE POOR

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation held hearings today on a recent GAO report, which studied how the Reagan administration's budget cuts affected individuals receiving AFDC benefits. According to GAO, approximately 493,000 fewer families are receiving AFDC as a result of those cuts.

This tragic result is only a small segment of the Administration's overall design to eliminate the Government's responsibility for providing some economic security for poor Americans. The changes in AFDC have hit women who work particularly hard and left many, who continued to work, in worse financial shape due to lost eligibility for AFDC, food stamps, and medicaid.

This body recently took steps to ameliorate this problem, however. The budget reconciliation bill, recently adopted by the House, included a series of amendments to the AFDC program. These changes would assure these families of minimum AFDC coverage and the medicaid benefits they sorely need.

Concern for the plight of those in poverty is shared by a large segment of the American population and not just policymakers in Washington. Several major newspapers have editorialized about the cruel thud of poverty and its debilitating effects on those who have slipped through the Reagan administration's oft referred to and seldom seen social safety net. I especially would like to share recent editorials from the Atlanta Constitution, the Boston Globe, and the Washington Post with my colleagues at this time.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 3, 1984]

THE THUD OF POVERTY

One of the great successes of conservatives generally and the Reagan Administration in particular has been to capture the high ground on the issue of welfare, to successfully characterize welfare as an unmitigated evil, a program through which parasites feed off the rest of society. According to this view, any initiative that reduces welfare payments is an unalloyed good.

Thus one can reasonably expect President Reagan to begin touting the results of a new study by the General Accounting Office on the impact of welfare cuts initiated at his urging in 1981.

That study, based on a survey in five cities, found that the cuts in welfare programs for the working poor have reduced welfare payments to that group by more than 9 percent; that those affected have not quit work to reestablish welfare eligibility; that, in fact, they have increased their working hours slightly and that their earnings have thus increased.

Who could object to a welfare cut that produced these results? Those who read no further in the GAO study.

What the study found, in fact, was that despite the increased work effort by those whose benefits were reduced in 1981 and despite their increase in actual earnings, many of them are economically much worse off than they were in 1981 and many of them are now living in poverty. Their increased earnings have been more than offset by the decreases in welfare benefits and by the loss of such supplemental benefits as food stamps.

What the study does show, contrary to much of Reagan's rhetoric, is that welfare recipients—at least the working poor affected by the 1981 cuts—are not interested in a free lunch; are willing to work and want to work; and do not deliberately take steps that make them eligible for welfare but, in fact, endeavor as best they can to stay off the rolls.

The study illustrates that when all the rhetoric about welfare cheats and the culture of poverty is exhausted, welfare often serves its intended and beneficial purpose. It makes the social safety net work, it raises the economic floor above the poverty level and its saves Americans from the debiliating thud of impoverishment.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Wednesday, Apr. 4, 1984]

HIGH PRICE OF SAVING PENNIES

President Reagan's 1981 cutbacks in social programs have done exactly what he said they would: saved some money and reduced welfare caseloads. But they have done so at a devastating cost to the working poor, who have seen their chances of climbing out of poverty all but dashed.

Separate studies on the effects of the cutbacks by the General Accounting Office and by the Center for the Study of Social Policy

in Washington detail the damage. It is extensive.

Despite working longer hours at higher wages than they enjoyed prior to the 1981 cuts; the working poor in five cities surveyed have experienced a substantial loss in net incomes, according to GAO, the investigative arm of Congress.

Their average monthly income dropped from $744 in Dallas to $515 and from $870 in Syracuse, N.Y. to $720. Similar patterns were found in Boston, Memphis and Milwaukee. Most have not been able to earn enough money to make up for the loss they suffered when welfare and food stamp assistance was removed.

The cutbacks have pushed more families, especially ones headed by working women, into poverty and made those who were already poor even poorer. Before 1981, the benefits had provided small but crucial assistance to people near the bottom, often just the boost the working poor needed to pull themselves up to better living standards. Timely aid helped thousands climb out of poverty.

After a decade of slow but steady progress in returning America's permanent underclass, the nation's poverty rate jumped dramatically between 1979 and 1982, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. During that period, the poverty rate rose from 11.7 percent (26 million poor people) to 15 percent (34 million). Some of the blame belongs to the recession, but analysts also assign part to administration policies that have undermined the working poor.

Under guise of rendering "fat" from social programs, Reagan reversed the trend toward helping those on poverty's borderline. Many have no private or public health insurance and some report they have been denied medical or dental care because they could not pay for it. And this for "savings" that have been trivial when measured against the $200 billion federal deficits that the administration has piled up from tax cuts and increased military spending.

The nation is saving a few pennies now—and buying long-range problems. Many who cannot afford food, medical attention or pay their rent will, sooner or later, wind up on the streets, on the welfare rolls or in hospitals with serious maladies. Those costs will be borne by taxpayers.

And the growing frustration created among those who see no way out of their poverty could cost us even more in social alienation, potentially another setback after years of progress in that area. With the cutbacks, the government has realized only a 9.3 percent savings in its monthly welfare outlays, while running up long-term bills that are almost certain to be far costlier.

[From the Washington Post, Saturday, Apr. 7, 1984]

SINK OR SWIM

Here's a surprise. It turns out that when you take money away from poor people they are worse off. Just like rich people. Except that the poor, not having had much to begin with, tend to be driven to doing things like standing in food lines, bargaining for discarded produce at grocery stores, outfitting their kids at the thrift shop, pawning their belongings and collecting discarded bottles and cans. They neglect medical care for their children—and are often refused care because they can't pay. And, of course, they fall into debt if they're lucky enough to find anyone who will extend them credit.

These findings come from two new studies of the Reagan administration's policy of throwing most working welfare recipients off the rolls. The sink-or-swim philosophy guiding this policy held that if these families were put to the test, they would be able to keep their heads above water on their own. The studies—by the General Accounting Office and the Center for the Study of Social Policy—confirm that most of the heads are still visible out there, but their owners are having to paddle hard to stay afloat.

Both studies found that most of the families had not returned to welfare in the year following their removal from the rolls. This is not surprising, since working poor families generally stay on welfare for less than a year, and most don't return. Still, the return rates were somewhat lower than usual in most sites. The GAO found that this was not because the families were better off as a result of the changes but simply because the tighter rules had made it harder to qualify for welfare aid.

Both studies found that these welfare mothers—almost all the families affected were headed by women with children—were eager to work. Relatively few were able to find additional hours of work, and some lost jobs or suffered pay cuts. All the same, many were able to increase their earnings in the low-paying service or clerical jobs they typically held. But these earnings increases were far from adequate to make up for the losses in welfare aid—not to mention medical and food aid—so that many of the families fell into poverty. Others, already poor, became poorer. For example, in Memphis 86 percent of these families are now in poverty, in Dallas 75 percent, in New York 46 percent.

Finally the good news. The GAO estimates that the cutbacks saved the government about $93 million a month. Alas, those savings, modest as they were in federal budget terms, seem to be disappearing—for reasons the GAO can't explain. Still, think of the satisfaction these struggling mothers must feel knowing that their efforts have helped—however slightly—to lighten the tax burden on the wealthiest families in the country.●

NEW YORK STATE ASSEMBLY URGES REPEAL OF TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BONDS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, support continues to grow against section 121 of the Social Security Act which allows for the income from tax-free municipal bonds to be taxed as part of income under social security.

I believe that inclusion of this particular provision was ill-considered for it strikes at the heart of the intent of the program—which is to encourage the purchase of these bonds based upon their tax-free status. The revenues generated by the sale of these bonds are critical to municipalities which rely upon them in order to improve services in local communities.

Legislation has been introduced in the House, H.R. 3028, which I have cosponsored, that repeals this provision. This legislation has been the subject of congressional hearings in the Senate where companion legislation has been introduced. For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to insert into the RECORD a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the New York State Assembly which underscores my concern in this matter. I direct my colleagues' attention to this resolution and once again call for speedy action on H.R. 3028 so that we reverse this back-door attempt to drain the retirement incomes of our senior citizens.

The material follows:

ASSEMBLY OF STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, NY, April 2, 1984.

DEAR MARIO: I urge the repeal of Section 121 of the Social Security Law.

The enclosed Resolution on this subject, introduced by myself in the Assembly and in the Senate by Senator Marchi, was unanimously adopted in both houses.

I would appreciate you responding to this Resolution.

Sincerely,

IVAN C. LAFAYETTE,
Member of Assembly.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Congress amended the Social Security laws in 1983 to require the taxing of Social Security Benefits for recipients whose adjusted gross annual income reaches a threshold of $25,000 for a single taxpayer or $32,000 for a married couple; and

Whereas the formula for calculating combined income will now be computed by including adjusted gross (taxable) income plus one-half of his or her social security benefits; and

Whereas in addition to the taxing of Social Security Benefits, tax exempt municipal bond interest must also be added as part of any tax calculations; and

Whereas the Federal government is projecting an increased income of 27.5 billion dollars over the next 5 years; and

Whereas eight percent, (two billion dollars) of the expected federal revenue will come from the senior citizens of New York State; and

Whereas financial writer Sylvia Porter explains that "Social Security recipients will be the only taxpayers required to include income from municipal bonds when computing income tax liability"; and

Whereas the burden of increased taxes is falling on senior citizens, who are on fixed incomes and have made specific plans for retirement; and

Whereas to illustrate this point, a social security recipient's $20,000 taxable income plus $5,000 interest from municipal bonds will total $25,000, the minimum amount that will cause a taxpayer to pay tax on his or her social security; and

Whereas in this case the taxpayer will suffer a $602 tax burden; and

Whereas this would result in an effective tax rate of 12.04 percent on those bonds; and

Whereas a social security recipient with zero dollars in taxable income and $100,000 interest from municipal bonds, will pay only $238, or one quarter of one percent; and

Whereas these illustrations clearly show that tax exempt income will cause a higher tax liability on social security income; and

Whereas as a result, tax exempt income will thus become identified with higher taxes; and

Whereas revenues from tax free municipal bond sales are used by municipalities for the betterment of our communities; and

Whereas the interest on tax free municipal bonds is lower than many other investments, but are purchased for their tax free advantage; and

Whereas according to securities experts, the new laws will have a chilling effect on the State, its subdivisions, authorities, special districts, and population and on the purchase of these tax exempt and formerly non-reportable forms of income; and

Whereas at a hearing held by Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Jim Lebenthal, Chairman of the Board of Lebenthal and Co., Inc., testified "tax exemption is part of the rate the investor bargained for"; and

Whereas allowing interest from tax free municipal bonds to be figured into combined taxable income is an indirect tax on the purchase of municipal bonds; and

Whereas Prudential-Bache Securities, Inc., has warned that the tax will make it difficult to float the amount of bonds necessary for smooth state administration; and

Whereas a lower demand for tax free municipal bonds will result in the interest rate of these bonds to rise perhaps at least one-half percent; and

Whereas New York State and its subdivisions floated $30 billion in tax free bonds during the fiscal year ending 1982; and

Whereas a one-half percent rise in interest rates on $30 billion of tax free municipal bonds will cost New York State and its subdivisions 150 million dollars a year; and

Whereas the amount of debt incurred in New York State rises annually; and

Whereas the loss of scores of millions of dollars in revenues derived from tax free municipal bonds would have a devastating impact on cities, towns, villages and special districts; and

Whereas this impact would increase the inflation rate of New York State; and

Whereas the Supreme Court ruled in McCullock v. Maryland (1819) that the power to tax is the power to destroy; and

Whereas taxation of the exempt municipal bonds would be the first step in destroying the states ability to issue low interest debt; and

Whereas although many have questioned the validity in a constitutional sense of the new measures, we will leave the courts to make such constitutional determinations; and

Whereas this new federal tax burden is a repugnant interference into the economy of New York State; and

Whereas the Legislature of New York State has voiced bi-partisan objection to this issue by the Senate passing a bill to uncouple with the federal government for the purposes of taxing social security and tax free municipal bonds income; and

Whereas the Assembly is expected to follow suit promptly by passing one of four uncoupling bills presently being considered by the Assembly; and

Whereas Senator Alfonse D'Amato and Representative Major R. Owens have introduced legislation (S. 1113/H.R. 3028) to repeal Section 121 of the Social Security law. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives and the Senate recognize the harsh and unnecessary burden that has been placed on the citizens of New York State and other taxpayers across the country; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress act quickly to rectify this horrible situation by passing the D'Amato/Owens bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution, suitably engrossed, be submitted to the President of the United States and the New York delegation of the United States House of Representatives and the Senate.●

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. LUCY PETREE

HON. EARL HUTTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great lady in the community of Escambia County, Fla., Mrs. Lucy Petree. She is a pioneer in the field of education for handicapped children.

Mrs. Petree found herself a widow in 1946 when her husband, Eugene, was killed in an automobile accident. In 1947, as a memorial to her husband, she began Escambia County's first school for mentally and physically handicapped children and dedicated it to her husband.

Originally, the school was in Mrs. Petree's garage. Later, with the help of many volunteers, she had a one-story building built behind her home. As an outgrowth of the school, the first public school kindergarten class for mentally retarded children was started and the Association for Retarded Children (ARC) was created in Escambia County. Today, the ARC consists of an infant and preschool program, the Pollak Training Center and Rehabilitation Workshop, a very active recreation program, the men's group home, and the residential training center for women.

In 1956, Mrs. Petree was chosen the outstanding career woman of the year. Among her many other civic achievements, she founded the crippled children's home in Pensacola.

She has contributed so much to the handicapped child and also to the handicapped adult in her work. Mrs. Petree is a most enthusiastic supporter of education and employment opportunities for those who are physically and mentally less fortunate. She is a tremendously compassionate humanitarian.

It is indeed a pleasure to pay a special tribute to this extraordinary lady who has spent years working to make life fuller and richer for the handicapped.●

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. MARK SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the 10th anniversary of the St. Mark Senior Citizens, Inc., of East Elmhurst, NY, to the attention of the Congress. This festive occasion will be celebrated on Saturday afternoon, May 5.

St. Mark Senior Citizens was founded in 1974 with the guidance and assistance of the then-pastor of St. Mark's African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Reverend William Faush. Over the past 10 years, the senior citizens group has been involved in many noteworthy activities that enhance the quality of life in the East Elmhurst and Corona communities of Queens County, NY. The center's most important service is to provide lunches to thousands of senior citizens each year, at the church in East Elmhurst, at a satellite program at the Elmcor Senior Citizens Center in Corona, and through delivery to the homebound elderly in the community.

But, Mr. Speaker, the activities of the St. Mark Senior Citizens go far beyond nutrition. The center is also a major recreational facility for the senior members of the north Queens community. The center provides a conducive atmosphere for socializing, offers an arts-and-crafts program, and sponsors frequent trips and outings around New York and other States.

I am proud to inform my colleagues in the Congress that the group has recently embarked on a new project which will greatly enrich the community. On Saturday, April 21, the St. Mark Senior Citizens, Inc., broke ground for its new building, which will allow this fine organization to expand its activities and better serve the senior citizens of northern Queens County.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Mark Senior Citizens helps its community and membership maintain a vibrant and healthy environment, and sets an example for other organizations to emulate. I ask that the Members of the Congress of the United States join me in congratulating St. Mark Senior Citizens, Inc.; Barbara Wingate, executive director; Stanley Leach, chairman of the board; the Reverend Terrence Carl Hensford, pastor of St. Mark's Church; the Reverend William Faush, former pastor of St. Mark's; the entire board of directors of St. Mark Senior Citizens, Inc., and the many individuals who are served by this fine organization.●

SISTER ROSE THERING TESTIFIES FOR MOVING THE U.S. EMBASSY IN ISRAEL TO JERUSALEM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee and the International Operations Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee held historic joint hearings on the bill to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, which I introduced with my friend from New York, Congressman BEN GILMAN.

One of the outstanding witnesses at this hearing was Sister Rose Thering, professor at Seton Hall University; board member of the National Coalition of American Nuns; and vice president of the American-Israel Friendship League.

Sister Rose typifies the kind of intelligent, thoughtful support that our legislation to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem has received from Roman Catholics and other groups throughout the United States. For the benefit of my colleagues in the House, who were unable to participate in these hearings, I place in the RECORD the statement of Sister Thering:

I am Sister Rose Thering, a Catholic, a Dominican Sister from Racine, Wisconsin and since 1968, a Professor of Education at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. I am most grateful that you have granted me this opportunity to testify today.

In my own name, and as a member of the Executive Board of the National Coalition of American Nuns, and as Vice-President of the American-Israel Friendship League, I speak in support of Congressman Lantos' Bill: that the United States Embassy in Israel and the residence of the American Ambassador to Israel shall hereafter be located in the City of Jerusalem.

Israel is the only country in the world in which our embassy is located outside the capital city.

Jerusalem, the capital of Israel is today, truly, an open city where almost 420,000 people—300,000 Jews, 100,000 Muslims and 12,000 Christians, as well as 8,000 others—live, work together and pray. It is a unique city not only because of the diversity of its population, but because of its holiness, its sanctity for Jews and also because within its boundaries lie the places sacred to Christians and Muslims.

Jerusalem is today for Jews, as it has always been, an indivisible part of an unbroken history of three thousand years. Jerusalem is today and always has been the capital of Israel. That is where our United States Embassy should be located.

The Jews of Jerusalem today are the inhabitants with the longest unbroken historical association with the city of Jerusalem. Their memory of it is recorded in the Bible, the Mishna, and the Talmud; in prayer and in poetry. Three times a day, for nineteen hundred years, Jews have prayed for their return to Jerusalem.

From birth until death, during these past 3,000 years Jews in Jerusalem and around the world are reminded in each of their liturgical functions of their attachment to Zion—Jerusalem. Each Passover Seder, the concuding words are: "L'shona ha'ba'a b' yerushalayim;"—"Next year in Jerusalem."

The traditional words of comfort to a mourner are: "May the Lord comfort you and all those who mourn for Zion—Jerusalem."

At the Jewish wedding ceremony, the breaking of the glass which commemorates the destruction of the Temple is followed by the recitation of Psalm 137—a prayer dear to Jews and Christians:

"If I forget Thee O Jerusalem
Let my right hand lose its power
Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I remember thee not,
If I do not place Jerusalem above my greatest joy."

The return to Jerusalem is symbolized even at the burial of each observant Jew by the placing of a small bag of soil from Jerusalem in the coffin.

Jerusalem is the heart and soul of the Jewish People! Jerusalem, not Tel Aviv, is the capital of the State of Israel.

Within the city of Jerusalem are found the holy places of Christians and Muslims. Again, the historical record reveals the scrupulous care given the Church of the Holy Sepulchure—all Christian Holy places—and to the Dome of the Rock and all Muslim sacred shrines when under the jurisdiction of the Israel government. Israeli law, passed by the Knesset in 1967 and reaffirmed in 1980, protects the holy places from desecration and guarantees free access to them for all people. In the years of Jordanian control of the eastern part of Jerusalem, no Jews had access; there was no freedom of movement for Christians to their Holy Places. In fact, desecration of the holy places took place during Jordanian occupation.

Having visited Israel and traversed the Holy City of Jerusalem (East and West) twenty-one times since 1970, I know for a fact that today Jerusalem is, indeed, a free, open city for Jews, Christians, and Muslims. The holy places of all Faiths have never before received such loving care, attention and maintenance. Jerusalem, today, under Israeli jurisdiction, is the center and example of religious freedom. Jerusalem is the capital of the State of Israel.

The National Coalition of American Nuns, on whose board I serve, and the America-Israel Friendship League (non-sectarian) which I serve as Vice-President, support Congressman Lantos' bill that the United States Embassy be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Other nations of the world look to the United States for leadership—leadership in working for Peace—leadership in recognizing Israel as a member of the family of nations. In fact, recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital would facilitate the peace process, not hinder it.

I, and those for whom I speak, respectfully request that our administration recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move the United States Embassy to the city of Jerusalem.

Thank you,

Respectfully submitted,

ROSE THERING, *O.P., Ph. D.*

P.S.—Jerusalem is ardently loved by the Jews who have always preserved her memory, emphasized through many signs and monuments from the time of David who had chosen it as his residence, and of Solomon, who had built the Temple. Jerusalem is thought of daily by the Jews, and for them it signifies the existence and freedom of this nation—Israel. Pope John Paul's Apostolic letter on Jerusalem released April 19, 1984.●

THE COCAINE ALLIANCE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that Cuba, under Fidel Castro, is in no small fashion involved in drug trafficking into the United States. It is also becoming more certain that he is involved in the drugs for guns trade.

The following outstanding investigative report appeared in the April 29, 1984, edition of the Ventura County Star-Free Press. In it, reporter Ernest Volkman uncovers the cocaine alliance between Castro and Robert Vesco, known for his shady underworld dealings.

It has been long known that Castro is determined to undermine U.S. credibility in the Western Hemisphere. One can now begin to see the whole picture of Castro's interest in poisoning our populace with cocaine, marihuana, and qualudes.

I urge my colleagues to read this important and outstanding piece of investigative journalism.

The article follows:

[From Family Weekly, Apr. 29, 1984]

THE ODD COUPLE

(By Ernest Volkman)

(In November 1982, a Federal grand jury in Miami took the extraordinary step of indicting four Cuban Government officials, including an admiral in the Cuban Navy, on charges of smuggling drugs into the United States. The indictments caused a worldwide sensation, but the real kingpin of the smuggling operation was not among those charged. He is Robert Vesco, the fugitive financier who has led a shadowy existence in the Caribbean region for the past eight years.

(Family Weekly assigned investigative reporter Ernest Volkman the job of tracking down how and why Vesco and the "Cuban connection" came about. Volkman, who last year in Family Weekly exposed Nazi butcher Klaus Barbie's connection with American intelligence, spent two months, in this country and the Caribbean, tracing an extensive drug-smuggling empire that has been masterminded by Vesco. What follows is the result of Volkman's investigative effort, which included interviews with many U.S. intelligence and narcotics agents, Cubans and others directly involved with the cocaine conspiracy.)

The villa is one of the luxurious homes that dot the breath-takingly beautiful seaside area about 17 miles east of Havana, Cuba. Complete with private dock and beach, the sprawling white house with the red tile roof currently belongs to the Cuban Communist Government, which seized it when its wealthy owner fled to the United States nearly 20 years ago.

The villa is used by the Government for VIP guests of Fidel Castro. Ordinarily, it would not be worthy of mention, except that its current occupant—at this writing—is a very special guest of the Cuban Government.

His name is Robert Vesco, and his presence there is tangible evidence of one of the most unusual partnerships in the history of crime. Simply put, Vesco and Fidel Castro have gone into the drug-smuggling business.

How this bizarre partnership came about involves an extremely tangled tale, the bottom line of which is money—and lots of it. According to admittedly imprecise estimates, believed to be on the conservative side, Castro and Vesco sit at the center of a huge drug-smuggling operation that is responsible for a significant portion of the illegal narcotics coming into the United States. The operation has generated nearly $20 billion in profits during the past four years alone, and Castro is believed to have made about $50 million thus far on his end of the deal.

"Fundamentally," says one U.S. narcotics agent, "the story of Vesco and Castro is a story of pure, unadulterated cynicism. These are people who deserve each other."

THE BAHAMIAN CONNECTION

The story begins with Robert Vesco, a criminal mastermind who has been eluding U.S. authorities for years. Probably the most wanted white-collar criminal in recent U.S. history, Vesco was indicted in 1971 for looting $224 million from investors who had put their money into a Swiss-based mutual fund known as Investors Overseas Services (I.O.S.). Additionally, Vesco is wanted on charges that he made an illegal $200,000 contribution to President Nixon's 1972 reelection campaign—in the hope of having the I.O.S. charges dropped.

Since then, Vesco has popped up all over the Caribbean, living at various times in Antigua, Costa Rica and, most significantly, the Bahamas. It was while residing there three years ago, according to U.S. law-enforcement officials, that Vesco began smuggling drugs.

As Vesco could not have failed to notice, the Bahamas have been notorious for years as a prime trans-shipment point for marijuana, cocaine and other narcotics moving northward from production centers in South America, primarily Colombia and Bolivia. Dotted with tiny islands and secluded anchorages, and only 50 miles from the United States, the Bahamas are ideally suited for drug-smuggling operations. Fast boats regularly run the gauntlet of the U.S. Coast Guard and Drug Enforcement Administration (D.E.A.) attempts to stop them. The potential profits, however, are worth the risks: A boat loaded with 100 kilos of cocaine can being up to $25 million in street sales.

The hundreds of millions of dollars passing through this Bahamian connection—the single most important entry point of illegal drugs being shipped to the United States—attracted Vesco's interest, and by 1981, U.S. officials became aware that a new sophistication and style seemed to have entered the Bahamian trade. They were right: Vesco was organizing the traffickers into a much more efficient business organization, and, in the process, subverting Bahamian Government and police officials with an extensive bribery scheme that soon converted some Bahamian bureaucrats into virtual partners. "It's almost indescribable what goes on out there," says one U.S. agent of the Bahamas.

Vesco's most sophisticated contribution was the solution of a problem that had been bedeviling major narcotics traffickers for years: What could they do with all the money they were earning? This may not seem much of an obstacle, but in fact it is. Some traffickers have so much money, they tally it up in pounds. More importantly, bundles of unaccounted-for money tend to attract the attention of Federal agents, especially from the I.R.S.

Vesco devised a solution that Federal agents concede was nothing short of brilliant: He set up a series of small banks in the Caribbean, where secrecy laws make it easy to protect the identities of depositors. Working in concert with corrupt lawyers and accountants in the Southeastern United States, Vesco then devised a complex scheme to launder all that drug money through a series of bank transactions that converted cash into holdings in offshore corporations based mostly in the Caribbean.

But although the drug business was flourishing, Vesco had some worries. One was an escalating U.S. effort to stop it, including a crackdown on big dealers in this country and an increasingly successful effort to infiltrate the major drug-smuggling rings. More significantly, the advent of the Reagan Administration brought a renewed campaign to block smuggling routes, using increased air and ship patrols. Clearly, the smugglers would need a lot of help if they were going to be able to evade U.S. patrols.

One of Vesco's most important partners, a notorious trafficker named Carlos Enrique Lehder Rivas, is believed to have provided the answer: the Government of Cuba.

A COCAINE PARTNERSHIP

U.S. agents were well aware of Lehder. For years, the Colombian had been listed as one of the world's major cocaine traffickers. Operating out of the Bahamas, he virtually took over one small island, Norman's Cay, setting up landing strips and a sophisticated communications system (including a 120-foot radio antenna, which probably allowed for contact with most of the U.S. East Coast) in order to run cocaine into the United States via a small fleet of boats. U.S. agents say Lehder and Vesco met in 1980, when the Colombian was trying to figure out a way to hide the money from his drug profits. He decided to go into partnership with Vesco, and by 1981 the two men were the most important suppliers of cocaine to this country—in the process, ranking in nearly $300 million a year.

By 1982, Lehder had established contact with agents of the D.G.I., the Cuban intelligence service, operating in Colombia. The Cubans needed Lehder; they were trying to run guns to leftist MI9 guerillas in the Colombian countryside. Lehder, with his extensive smuggling operation, was perfect for the job, and a deal was struck: Lehder would aid Cuban arms smuggling into Colombia, while the Cubans would provide protection, anchorages and other help for his drug-smuggling operations into the United States.

As a highly successful smuggler, Lehder attracted a lot of attention from U.S. drug agents. It was an interest that increased substantially when the agents noticed Lehder in deep conversation with known D.G.I. agents in Colombia. "You didn't have to be much of a genius to figure out that the Cubans were cooking up a deal with Lehder," says an American intelligence official. "The formula was simple: For the Cubans to be talking to Lehder could mean only that their orders came straight from the top. In other words, Castro. Lehder worked with Vesco, which meant that sooner or later, Vesco and Castro would be working together too."

It was not long before U.S. officials had proof of the Cuban involvement: tracking of drug-laden boats revealed that some of them were operating in Cuban waters and berthing at Cuban ports. Obviously, there was official Cuban Government sanction for the drug boats. What the Americans did not realize then was that the Lehder-Cuban connection was only the beginning of what would become a much more extensive business partnership.

As Vesco realized, the Lehder-Cuban deal was important, but given the Castro Government's apparent willingness to work with drug smugglers, there was potential for an even greater business arrangement. Before Vesco could make a move, however, the Cubans themselves acted. In late 1981, D.G.I. operatives in Colombia contacted another Vesco drug business associate—Johnny Crump, an American with a severe stutter, whose family had settled in Colombia years before. After his cattle-ranching business failed in 1979, Crump went into the narcotics racket, running a large-scale cocaine and marijuana-smuggling operation with Vesco in the Bahamas.

Crump knew Jaime Guillot-Lara, another Colombian listed by U.S. agents as one of the biggest and most successful marijuana smugglers in the world. It turned out that Guillot and Crump shared a problem: U.S. agents were consistently knocking off their associates and seizing their boats. There were heavy losses, and Crump—who at one point was making $3 million a year from drugs—was in trouble. So was Guillot, who had lost six ships.

Apparently aware of their problems, the Cuban D.G.I. agents had a proposition: official Havana protection for the drug ships, in exchange for which Guillot and Crump would obtain American arms in the United States, then smuggle them into Chile to be used by anti-Government forces. Both men accepted the deal, and the Cubans then proposed a more efficient method for smuggling drugs. The problem, the Cubans noted, centered on the large "mother ships" (big merchant vessels) the Colombians were using to move drugs into the U.S. Those ships, loaded to the gunwales with tons of narcotics, represented a huge investment; if the American agents seized such a craft, the loss would be considerable. The solution, the Cubans noted, would be for the mother ship's load to be transferred into a number of smaller and faster boats. The Americans could not hope to intercept every craft. Thus, the traffickers could afford to lose a small boat or two, as long as the other boats got through.

Since transferring drugs from a big ship to smaller ships is difficult on the high seas, the key to the scheme was the use of Cuban ports. The mother ships would dock at several Cuban Navy bases (most often at Cayo Largo), where the drugs would be transferred to smaller boats, anything that could make the run. The large ships involved in the operation would have the name "Viviana" painted on their sterns, a signal to Cuban Navy warships that they were to be protected and escorted into Cuban ports. ("Viviana" was the name of Crump's infant daughter.)

The "Viviana" operation was a key piece of evidence about the entire conspiracy. "We learned," says a U.S. official familiar with the case, "that the D.G.I. agents in Co-

lombia had established a very close relationship with Crump. So close, in fact, that one of the senior D.G.I. men served as godfather for Viviana, Crump's daughter. Crump may have thought it was clever to use his daughter's name as a codeword in the operation, but it ultimately backfired, providing an important link between the Cubans and Crump. When Crump was arrested last year in this country for drug trafficking, it was the Viviana business that indicated an undeniable tie with Crump and his Cuban friends. Obviously, it can be fairly deduced that it was all a D.G.I. operation, with the D.G.I. men taking their orders from Castro himself. There's no way the D.G.I. and the Cuban Navy would have carried out drug smuggling without Castro's official permission, that's for sure."

The deal was somewhat similar to the one worked out with Lehder, but with an important difference: This time, the Cubans demanded a cut of the drug profits, according to U.S. agents, amounting to $500,000 to $700,000 for each large boatload sailing in Cuban waters, depending on the size and type of cargo.

ENTER CASTRO

The Cuban insistence on money caught Vesco's attention immediately, for it suggested that Castro might be willing to do real business with drug smugglers, despite the Cuban Government's official (and stiff) prohibition against all narcotics. As Vesco further noted, the Cuban involvement initially seemed mainly political, connected with smuggling arms to leftist guerillas. But the Cubans were now looking for a cash piece of the action.

No one is quite certain exactly when it came about, but some time late in 1982, Vesco established contact with Castro's representatives and apparently suggested that there were a number of attractive business propositions to be discussed, all of which could lead to extensive profits for the regime. At first glance, there is cause to wonder why the Cubans, officially a revolutionary government firmly opposed to having anything to do with drugs, would want to get involved with an especially notorious capitalist like Vesco and his drug traffickers.

It is probable that Vesco did not know the real answer to that question, but the C.I.A. did. The answer, the agency discovered, had nothing to do with capitalism, but a lot to do with a very serious problem Castro was facing. The problem was the D.G.I. itself. Created, nurtured and funded by the Soviets, the D.G.I. had been taken over by the K.G.B. in 1967, and since then, operated as a virtual K.G.B. branch office. Its Moscow-trained leaders were total Soviet puppets, and Castro fretted that as long as Moscow controlled the D.G.I. purse strings, he would never have his own intelligence service.

Castro concluded, say U.S. agents, that he would have to form his own intelligence agency, one loyal only to him. To do that, however, required money—lots of it—and money was in very short supply in Cuba. Operating the country on a Russian dole estimated by the State Department as $1 million a day, Castro had no access to the very large amount of cash that would be required to fund and operate a competing intelligence agency.

The connections with drug runners provided one source of secret income, and Vesco then proposed another lucrative scheme. Cuba was the target of an American trade embargo, which meant that Castro lacked the kind of high technology he needed for modernization of the Cuban economy, especially the sugar industry, the country's staple. Vesco proposed a plan under which he would arrange to smuggle into Cuba advanced American technology, the kind the Soviets could not provide—in exchange for which Castro would protect the drug traffickers. As an added bonus, the Cubans would be paid a cut of the cocaine and marijuana traffic moving into the United States.

It is unknown at this point how much advanced technology Vesco was able to procure for Castro, but it must have been extensive, for by last year, U.S. agents had begun to receive reports that Vesco had taken up residence in Cuba, where he was being treated like royalty, at the magnificent seaside villa just outside of Havana.

Further confirmation of the extent of the Castro-Vesco partnership surfaced last year, when U.S. Customs agents, investigating a case of illegal shipment of goods out of Texas ports, unearthed a businessman from that state who had shipped a load of bull semen—vital for breeding high quality cows that are especially suited to tropical climates—to Cuba in an arrangement with Vesco. But as the agents dug deeper, they found that the illegal shipment of semen was evidence of a larger conspiracy: In an extensive arrangement involving four countries, Vesco had contrived to smuggle out of the United States a large amount of embargoed equipment to Cuba, including computers and $700,000 worth of sugar-processing technology.

The investigation also provided intriguing peeks into Vesco's special status in Cuba. For example, the agents found a man whom Vesco used as a conduit for money to be given to several men charged in the United States in connection with the illegal shipments. According to the man, he flew in a private plane hired by Vesco into Havana, where despite the fact he had no visa or passport, Vesco waved him through customs and took him to the large villa mentioned earlier. Vesco, he told U.S. agents, handed him $240,000 with instructions to use it raising bail for defendants in the case involving illegal shipments.

Some time before this incident, Federal narcotics agents in Florida had uncovered another part of the Vesco operation. The key was the arrest of Crump while he was trying to unload cocaine in Florida. Crump agreed to become a Government informant, and equipped with a new identity and under round-the-clock protection, has since been revealing the connections between the Vesco drug operations and the Cuban Government.

Crump's revelations—along with other information from several defectors from the D.G.I.—have led the Reagan Administration to publicly accuse Castro of running a drug-smuggling operation. In testimony before a Senate subcommittee in April 1983, James H. Michel, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, said: "We have a report that the Communist Party Presidium, and specifically Fidel Castro, in early 1979 considered a scheme to begin dealing with narcotics smugglers, using Cuba as a bridge and support base for the networks to the United States."

The Cuban Government has consistently refused to discuss such allegations.

Although the arrests in Texas and Florida may have put a crimp in Vesco's operations, it would be an illusion to think that they have slowed him much. For one thing, U.S. agents have no real idea how much American technology Vesco has managed (and is still managing) to smuggle into Cuba. For another, the drug traffic northward into this country continues at even greater levels (it is now estimated that traffickers in Colombia alone ship about 50 tons of cocaine here each year. Further, despite indictments of crooked lawyers and bankers who have worked with Vesco in his scheme to hide drug profits, money is still pouring into new banks that Vesco seems able to create overnight.

The problem is the enormous potential profit to be made in smuggling. Vesco's standard payment of 7 percent of a drug deal to those willing to run the risk of laundering the money in Bahamian banks is tempting to anyone who wants to take a chance on becoming a millionaire overnight. And to the traffickers, who also stand to make millions, trying to get boats past the U.S. bloodhounds seems a risk well worth taking.

More importantly, the gamble is still appealing to Fidel Castro, who, thanks to Vesco, has found a source of the money he so desperately needs. As U.S. authorities are the first to concede, stopping men of the ruthlessness, shrewdness and sheer amorality of Fidel Castro and Robert Vesco is not easy. After all, they are proven survivors.●

THE TAX GAP

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, May 2, 1984, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Tax time for 1983 is over, as millions of Americans scurried to meet the April 16 deadline. For 1983, Uncle Sam will pull in $290 billion in revenue from 170 million individual income tax returns. However, an extra $100 billion will be lost because of tax evasion. Closing this "tax gap" would be enough to cut the federal deficit in half, but despite repeated attempts by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to beef up its collection procedures, even the agency's Commissioner admits that the problem is getting worse. By 1985, the tax gap may be half again as big as it is today. Although the recent tax cuts were expected to curb evasion, Americans seem more determined than ever to beat the system.

The problem is not just the billions lost due to illegal underground activities and questionable corporate behavior. The most significant tax evasion by far arises among the ordinary individuals who account for most of the $300 billion in unreported income. The tax system works well when aided by mandatory collection tools, such as payroll withholding by employers and information reporting by third parties. But when the system relies on voluntary compliance, collection drops. The failure to report is high, for example, for investors' capital gains (41 percent unreported) and royalties (39 percent unreported), and even higher for off-the-book services (such as home repairs) and farm proprietors' income.

Many reasons have been offered to explain why people cheat on their taxes. Several relate to basic changes in Americans' attitudes about their civic responsibilities.

There is the growing feeling that "everybody cheats, so why shouldn't I?" Tax evasion is no longer kept a secret, but is widely admitted, even joked about. There is probably some spillover as well from the "me first" attitude of the 1970s. In addition, many taxpayers believe that they are being required to pay more than their fair share, as inflation pushes them into higher brackets. There is also a suspicion among taxpayers that they are not getting their money's worth. Strong public statements from the President on down about the government's ineffectiveness are convincing people that their money is simply being wasted. Overall, there has been a general erosion of the old-fashioned idea that citizens ought to pay their taxes because it is the patriotic thing to do.

A second reason for cheating is the belief that "nothing will happen to you if you do." People no longer seem to share the once common impression that the IRS is invincible. Budgetary restraints have dropped the number of audits from 5 percent in the 1960s to 1.4 percent this year. In addition, it is well known that auditors focus primarily on abusive tax shelters. There is also the belief that even if a taxpayer is caught cheating, he will face only minor penalties. The dockets of the tax courts are clogged with slow-moving cases, and although stiff penalties are possible, last year only 1,800 people were prosecuted. In the final analysis, most individuals found to be underreporting income or overstating deductions usually have to pay only the taxes owed plus 11 percent compound interest. This has led observers to remark that the evader's main punishment is a low-interest loan from the IRS.

A third reason for cheating is the incredible complexity of the tax code. President Carter called it a national disgrace a few years ago, but it has only gotten worse in the interim. Today, it covers 5,105 pages, a document longer than the Bible, the Koran, and the Talmud put together. The code's complexity fosters evasion in several ways. People will not obey laws that they cannot understand, but even IRS officials interpret the code's provisions differently. Compliance falls as people lose confidence that the code treats everyone equally. By putting hundreds of credits and incentives into the code, the government encourages people to be as creative as possible in trying to escape taxes. Overall, the code's complexity adds a gaming aspect to tax time, as people try to outwit the IRS. This has made some feel ashamed of paying what they really owe, as if compliance were a sign of stupidity.

Because the reasons for cheating are so varied, we must attack the problem on several fronts. We have to raise the number of audits, increase the likelihood that evaders will be prosecuted and punished, upgrade our ability to match information by computer, and eliminate abusive tax shelters. Our leaders must set an example of honest compliance, avoiding the spectacle that may be created by corner-cutting and personal greed. Also, we must show taxpayers that their money supports many worthy programs, from health research and highway repair to higher education and pollution control.

Although these steps are helpful, a major simplification of the code may be the best way to reduce cheating. It is not surprising to me that Congress has a growing interest in a simpler tax system with lower rates and a broader base. Several proposals under consideration would cut the number of brackets and mandate lower rates with a degree of progressively (higher rates for higher incomes) while repealing most itemized deductions, credits, and exclusions (except those generally available to most people, such as the home mortgage interest deduction). General tax reform and increased enforcement would make tax shelters less appealing and noncompliance easier to discover, as well as less profitable. Also, it would make the code more understandable and would help ensure that people who earn the same amount pay the same tax.

Our staggering federal deficits will be putting pressure on Congress to narrow the tax gap. Nonetheless, my feeling is that major simplification of the code will come hard and slowly. Ideas for reform take some time to be digested, and special interests will fight hard to retain their tax breaks. However, there is a growing realization that the code is becoming too complex to function. The President has called on the Treasury Department to make recommendations by December on how to simplify the code, and all three Democratic presidential candidates support simplification. We will be hearing much more on the issue in the months ahead.●

UNFAIR TREATMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents, like yours and those of our House colleagues, have had to undergo a review of their eligibility for continued disability benefits. These people—many heavily dependent on their disability benefits for survival—have suffered anguish and traval when their benefits are challenged even when the review process yielded a result in their favor.

The original intent of the disability review process—to make sure that only those who are actually disabled and unable to work receive social security disability benefits—was correct and necessary. However, the zeal and the methods by which these reviews have been conducted leave much to be desired.

Deserving people have lost their disability benefits on the basis of an initial review. They have been found guilty without a trial so to speak. And, as I said earlier, even if the benefits are restored, the person loses out and is much worse for the wear.

Therefore, I applaud Chairman JAKE PICKLE of Texas and his Social Security Subcommittee in drafting H.R. 3755, the Social Security Disability Benefits Reform Act. And, I commend the House on passing his measure overwhelmingly. It was one of the more satisfying votes I have cast since coming to the House.

Despite the welcome recent moratorium placed on these disability reviews by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the need for firm and conclusive legislative action remains. I hope that the Senate will move expeditiously on H.R. 3755.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Washington Post which further testifies to the need for reforms in the social security disability review process.

The article follows:

HARDSHIPS AND HEARTBREAKS

The House has now passed—by a walloping 410 to 1 vote—amendments to the Social Security disability program that would put a stop to the harshest effects of the review of disability rolls begun in March 1981. The strength of the House vote, and the fact that the amendments are a cautious and well-balanced compromise, increase chances for prompt action in the Senate, where a similar measure has already gained bipartisan support.

Health and Human Services Secretary Margaret Heckler, arriving in office after the review was well under way, had hoped to head off legislation by proposing an 18-month hiatus in further reviews and by instituting administrative reforms. But continued White House and OMB opposition to her efforts should remind the senators that her more moderate views need reinforcing. Without a clear legislative check, an administration so minded might revert to the slipshod, insensitive purging of the rolls that, as Mrs. Heckler has acknowledged, brought "hardships and heartbreaks" to many disabled people.

The Senate will no doubt note that an 18-month moratorium on disability reviews is likely to cost more than modest reforms passed by the House. The House bill—and the one proposed in the Senate by William Cohen, Carl Levin and John Heinz—would allow the overdue review of disability rolls to continue. These measures would leave unchanged the current strict rule that denies benefits to disabled people as long as there is—anywhere in the economy—a job they could conceivably hold.

The measures would simply require that HHS follow a few common-sense guidelines. HHS could not terminate disability benefits unless recipients' medical conditions had improved sufficiently to enable them (at least in theory) to support themselves. This rule would not apply if it were found that the recipient should never have qualified for benefits, or if medical advances could now enable recipients to work. Can anyone really believe that it makes sense to throw people with long-term continuing disabilities into a job market in which millions of able-bodied people can't find jobs?

The other safeguards—requiring face-to-face interviews before benefits are terminated, continuing benefits during appeals (with required payback if the appeal is lost) and other procedural safeguards—are similarly uncontroversial. In fact, the only fault in the measures is that they would deny these protections to many people whose benefits were cut off during the last three years. The administration says that including these people would greatly increase costs. But most of the cases in which benefits were initially terminated have either been reversed or are still on appeal. Unless the review was totally disreputable, most of the cases actually closed can be presumed to have merited their closing even if stronger safeguards had been applied.

It's hard to imagine that the administration would be well served in an election year

by the continued threat of another outcropping of horror cases. Congress would do both the White House and the nation's disabled people a great favor by passing the proposed reforms promptly.●

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET ELLEM McCULLY

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Ellen McCully, from Selma, Ala. has been named the fourth annual Kathryn T. Windham Girl of the Year. The highest congratulations are certainly in order for this outstanding young person, and I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives the editorial that appeared in the Selma Times Journal about her selection:

The article follows:

A CREDIT TO HER COMMUNITY

Margaret Ellen McCully has set the example of what a young woman should be.

She was selected as the 1984 recipient of the Kathryn T. Windham Girl of the Year award. The fourth Selma student to be so honored, Miss McCully was named Girl of the Year Saturday night.

A list of her accomplishments is evidence of why the Selma High School senior was named by Delta Kappa Gamma members for the honor. She also received a $1,000 college scholarship from the national education honorary, which was made possible by support from local residents and business.

Already the recipient of a $4,000 presidential scholarship to the University of Alabama, Miss McCully has maintained a 4.5 grade point average on a 4.0 scale. She was a National Merit semifinalist and secretary of the National Honor Society.

A Bible School leader who has worked in "Clowns for Christ," sung in the youth choir and been president of her church's youth group, Miss McCully is also a member of the school band and student council.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert A. McCully, Miss McCully is a credit to her family and her community.

Like the other 15 girls who were nominated for the Girl of the Year honor, Miss McCully represents what's good, descent, conscientious and moral in young people today.

We are proud that she and others like her are a part of Selma. We congratulate her and her family. And all of Selma's appreciation should go to Delta Kappa Gamma for promoting this type of achievement in our young women.

It is young people like Margaret Ellen McCully that help to make Alabama the excellent State it is. I know that she will go far in life and I wish the very best for her in all future endeavors.●

REMEMBERING "HANK" PALEY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of regret that I wish to note the passing of Henry D. Paley, president of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities of the State of New York. For those of us who had the pleasure—and privilege of knowing "Hank"—the news of his passing brought on a deep sense of remorse in those of us who valued his work on behalf of higher education. More importantly, those of us who worked with him on matters related to education, have come to realize that his passing also means that one of our Nation's most effective advocates on behalf of private and independent colleges and universities is lost.

Today a memorial service is being held in Albany in remembrance of Hank and it is fitting that one should take this opportunity to recall the many contributions that he made to many people and institutions during his lifetime.

Since 1975 he held the post of President of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities in New York which serves as the statewide coordinating body and public policy forum for our 116 independent colleges and universities. His tenure during his 9 years at CICU was marked by an unfailing dedication to fair and equitable treatment of students at these schools—both at the State and the Federal level of Government.

In addition to being an advocate on behalf of higher education—he was also a scholar, although those of us who know him also know that he would laugh at such a label. He earned his baccalaureate degrees from Antioch College in Yellow Springs, OH, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, NY. He held a special place for the Merchant Marine Academy and never missed an opportunity to tell me so—knowing of my position on the House Merchant Marine Committee and Chairman of its Merchant Marine Subcommittee. When I say Hank was a scholar I meant it in the most literal sense since he was also awarded a senior Fulbright fellowship from the London School of Economics. In addition to his academic training, he has been the recipient of numerous honorary degrees including doctor of laws, New York Institute of Technology (1975); doctor of humane letters, College of St. Rose (1979); doctor of laws, College of Mount St. Vincent (1982); doctor of laws, Skidmore College (1982); and doctor of humane letters, Canisius College (1983).

His activities on behalf of academia have been numerous. He served as a trustee of Antioch College from 1974 to 1976; cofounded and directed the State Legislative Institute of Baruch College, from 1973 to the present; served as a member of the New York State Education Commissioner's Advisory Council on Higher Education from 1975 to the present; chaired the State Association Executive's Council of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities during 1981; was a member of the board of directors of the Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution, was a member of the American Society for Public Administration, a member of the Public Relations Society of America and a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

In the early years of his career, Hank began a life of public service that was characterized by a fierce devotion to human rights, including fair treatment and equitable opportunity. He held a variety of news reporting and editing positions and later served as an organizer for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union in Wilkes-Barre, PA, and for the San Francisco-Oakland Newspaper Guild.

Prior to his appointment as president of CICU, Hank began his career in education as deputy to the chancellor and director of university relations at the City University of New York from 1968 to 1975. In that position, he was responsible for overall university relations, including legislative activities at the State and Federal levels.

I will personally remember Hank for his active work during the 1980 Higher Education Act amendments where we forged our interests on behalf of New York students and the independent schools they attend. We were effective, in joining forces with then Senator Jacob Javits, in revising the distribution formula under the supplemental education opportunity grant program to assure more equitable treatment to nonpublic schools which rely heavily upon the SEOG program. While no one could even accuse Hank of not being aggressive—for the record, I admired him for his ability to argue his position effectively. While he aggressively pursued his interests and those of independent schools in our State—he was a fair man and a man who was willing to compromise. He sought to bring balance to our higher education policy and recognized the need to temper his own interests with those who held differing agendas.

The fact that the 1980 education amendments were a bipartisan product that shared the support of the entire higher education community was, in part, a result of his leadership. We are always fond of saying "As New York

goes, so goes the Nation." In this case it was true for his leadership qualities were not only evident in New York—but he was recognized by his colleagues all across the Nation—as a man who stood head and shoulders above many—but equal to all.

Hank Paley recognized the role of government in providing educational opportunity to all citizens—regardless of their income, race, creed or color. His life was dedicated to breaking barriers—barriers that cause the human spirit to falter, and often die. He recognized that government can and should protect those who cannot afford to help themselves and he learned to utilize the tools of government for the benefit of many, many people.

There are probably hundreds of thousands of students who have graduated from schools in New York that never heard of the name of Hank Paley. Hank would have never cared about that. What he cared most about was that those students who were given an opportunity as a result of the policies he helped shape—would work to bring back to society but a small piece of what he himself put into it. That is what he should remember about Hank—that the achievements of his lifetime—his very short lifetime—will be multiplied many times over by others who have been given a window of opportunity in life.

My special condolences go out to Hank's wife Cabot, his five children and his sister. My thoughts and prayers are with them now. I would hope that they might receive some small comfort in the fact that the contributions which Hank has made to all our lives will live on through us and others.●

OUTDOOR AMERICA ASSESSES WINTER NAVIGATION

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3678 was ordered reported by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation on August 3, 1983, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources. Section 1123 authorizes the Corps of Engineers to implement a full-year extension of the navigation season on the Upper Great Lakes and a 10-month extension on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Traditionally, the navigation season in the Upper Great Lakes has ended on December 15, plus or minus 2 weeks. The corps proposal extends the navigation season through the construction of bubblers, icebooms, underwater dams, harbor and channel dredging and widening, and the use of a fleet of new icebreakers. The corps presently estimates the project's initial investment cost to the United States at over $600 million.

The corps' 1979 draft "Survey Study for Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway Navigation Season Extension" prompted extensive criticism. A series of major studies raised substantial questions about the corps' analysis of the project's economic benefits, its real costs, and its potential environmental impact.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to share with my colleagues an analysis of the current proposal, prepared by Geraldine Strozier for Outdoor America, the publication of the Izaak Walton League of America. Ms. Strozier correctly analyzes the discrepancies between the various corps and private reports devoted to a Great Lakes season extension. She does a fine job, as well, addressing the numerous problems and lack of support for the current proposal.

[From Outdoor America]

WINTER NAVIGATION—A BILLION-DOLLAR BOONDOGGLE?

(By Geraldine Strozier)

At this moment there is a struggle going on in Congress over one of the most ambitious—and potentially environmentally damaging—public works projects ever undertaken by this nation. In a unanimous vote last summer, the House Public Works Committee authorized the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to undertake the task of keeping the Great Lakes open to commercial shipping year round.

Because of severe winter conditions, the lakes are typically closed from mid-December to early April. The shipping extension has the backing of some influential Great Lakes congressmen, in particular, Rep. Arlan Stangeland (R-Minn.). Supporters claim that year-round lake shipping would provide a cheaper way of transporting Midwestern grain, steel, coal and other commodities to Eastern markets. And, they say it would revive a sagging Great Lakes shipping industry while aiding recession-wracked port cities.

The proposal, however, has brought a storm of protest from a wide array of opponents, including environmentalists, some other Great Lakes congressmen, Canadian officials, the governors of Michigan, Ohio, New York, Wisconsin and Minnesota, homeowners, fishermen and taxpayers. Incredibly, the list of opponents even includes most of the groups supposed to benefit from winter shipping.

The proposal's critics believe that its extraordinary cost, estimated by some experts to be as high as $50 billion, makes no sense at a time when the country has severe economic problems. The steel industry, which is in a recession, doesn't have the shipping volume to warrant an extension of the navigation season. The Lake Carriers' Association, which represents shippers, and the National Grange, which represents agricultural interests, have both gone on record opposing the proposal because of its extraordinary cost to the public.

But cost isn't the only controversial aspect of the proposal. If approved, it will involve massive environmental destruction. According to Michigan United Conservation Clubs (MUCC), which is spearheading the opposition, "Winter navigation would be disastrous for the Great Lakes. It would usher in a new era in manipulation and degradation of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River ecosystem."

The winter navigation proposal has been around for years. It was initially introduced by influential members of Congress from Minnesota in the booming days of the steel industry to promote their state's iron ore business and to make U.S. Steel Corp.'s new giant ore boats economical by allowing them to operate year round. In 1970, Congress asked the Detroit District of the Corps to undertake a demonstration project to see whether the idea was feasible. In a 1979 report, the Corps concluded that winter shipping on the Great Lakes was economically viable.

The Corps determined that winter navigation would require the use 22 new icebreakers to smash up the ice; a massive rebuilding of locks and erection of huge underwater dams and dikes to control the breakup and movement of the ice; and the dredging and widening of the St. Mary's River and the virtual redigging of the St. Lawrence River in order to accommodate both ships and the displaced ice. Even with these expensive modifications, the Corps estimated that profits from the increased shipment of commodities and the creation of new jobs aboard the vessels and in Great Lakes ports would produce a return of $4 for every $1 invested in the project.

Virtually every other study of the project, however, has contradicted the Corps' conclusions. A series of reports—including one commissioned by the state of New York, one by the Canadian Seaway Authority, another by the U.S. General Accounting Office and even one commissioned by the Corps itself and then ignored—found that the Corps had overstated the benefits, understated the costs, simply ignored the environmental damage involved in tearing up the ice cover and assumed that roughly half the cost would be borne by Canada although that government has expressed its opposition to the project. Most damaging of all, the Corps' own oversight board recognized many of these problems and refused to recommend the project to Congress. The Corps claims the project will cost $1 billion, but other studies put the figure anywhere from $9 billion to $50 billion, the wide variation due to the Corps' own contradictory statements of exactly what is involved.

From every independent analysis, it is clear that winter navigation would become far and away the nation's most expensive public works water project, representing an enormous subsidy to the shippers using the Great Lakes and an enormous loss to those who hunt and fish there, as well as to the general taxpayer footing the bill—all for a handful of benefits that virtually every study, even including one sponsored by the Corps, has cast doubt upon.

The economic benefits the Corps attributes to the project are arrived at partially by ignoring environmental costs. To make the deal look less costly, for example, the Corps has not made clear the details of its massive construction plans, according to Bob Haas, a biologist with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and an expert on the effects of winter navigation on the Great Lakes. The hidden agenda, he said, includes huge dikes on the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers and the dredging of the Middle Neebish Channel in the St. Mary's

River, all prime fishing areas. The Corps is hiding the specifics, he said, to prove that winter navigation is economically beneficial, a position that is "ridiculous," he said. "They haven't even begun to estimate potential losses in aquatic habitat and productivity due to the project."

Moreover, even though recreation is a primary industry in Michigan, the Corps has failed to assign it an economic value, he pointed out. The Corps has, therefore, totally failed to estimate "losses in recreational benefits, whether they be economic, esthetic or whatever. I submit to you that these could be very substantial losses."

The Corps' argument against including the cost of environmental damage rests on its promise to study potential environmental problems as the project progresses and correct them as they are identified. Hence, the Corps argues, there will be no environmental damage. If a problem arises that cannot be resolved, the Corps promises it will halt construction. However, many conservationists believe that once substantial money and time have been invested in the project, the Corps will not easily abandon it.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is among those that have challenged the Corps' reasoning. In 1979, the agency's Midwest regional administrator officially told the Corps, "We have serious reservations about potential environmental impacts that could result" from the "inherent uncertainty of this type of approach."

While no one can prove with absolute certainty the harm winter navigation will do to the environment, conservationists point to a number of different ways in which the project could do serious damage.

SHORELINE IMPACTS

In order for vessels to make their way through the frozen lakes and connecting passageways, channels would have to be broken through the ice. According to the MUCC, "the most serious environmental impacts will be in connecting channels (St. Mary's, St. Clair, Detroit and St. Lawrence Rivers and Lake St. Clair), harbors and shallow bays (e.g. Saginaw Bay)." When navigation channels are cut through narrow areas such as these, the displaced ice piles up against the shoreline in huge chunks that can gouge out the shoreline while scouring out vegetation that provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife.

OIL SPILLS

Conservationists are also concerned about the threat posed by oil spills, asking how an oil spill that occurs under the ice during a winter storm could be contained or cleaned up. Even the Corps has admitted that a "spill could be locally devastating to fisheries and wildlife." In a 1982 report, it calculated that the chances of a tanker accident in the Whitefish Bay/St. Mary's River area during the winter would be one in five in any given year, and of an actual spill, one in 100 in any given year. In 1979, the U.S. EPA told the Corps that a spill during winter navigation is "very probable" and would be extremely difficult to clean up. "In the St. Mary's River, for example, a spill of molten #6 fuel oil, being less dense than water, will float until it cools. At zero degrees Celsius, after collecting solids and silt, its density will increase and it will likely sink to the river bottom where it will remain until the spring warmup," when it will be too late to save the fish and vegetation contaminated for so long.

EFFECTS OF WINTER BOAT TRAFFIC

The vessels themselves can do still further damage. a report by Northern Michigan University for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the Corps' demonstration project described the effects of the waves generated by the ships and the shattering of the ice cover. According to the report, the powerful icebreakers and transport vessels operating in the narrow ice-free channels churned up the lake bottom and clouded the normally still water. As a result, fish were forced to travel far greater distances for food than they could easily tolerate in winter when their metabolism is lower. In addition, by stirring up bottom sediments, winter navigation would allow the release of toxic chemicals and heavy metals that have settled down into the silt of lake bottoms—substances that pose risks both to fish and to human health.

Testifying before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee last October, Dr. Gale Gleason, a scientist at Lake Superior State College in Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., said that the Corps has admitted that it could take 10 or more years before the effects of winter navigation on fish populations could be quantified. In that time, he said, "four generations of spawning whitefish, 10 generations of mayflies and 20 generations of caddisflies could be destroyed or seriously decimated, changing the genetic composition to the point that it could no longer be compared with the system as it exists today."

Winter shipping may also hurt the St. Lawrence River's cherished bald eagle population that was brought back by the devotion of conservationists. According to a report by the State University College of Environmental Science in Syracuse, N.Y., eagles feed in winter on the waterfowl that swim in the open channels between ice floes. With increased traffic in the channels, waterfowl may find the river a less attractive stopping place; along with reducing the eagles' food source, the increased traffic will disrupt the river's tranquility—a factor that is important to the birds' continued nesting in the area. Together, these changes might bring about the destruction of the handful of eagles there, the report concludes.

Breaking open channels through the ice may also have a serious impact on animal populations that currently travel across the ice to wintering areas or among lake islands looking for winter food. Migration routes for timber wolves and moose may be affected. The Northern Michigan University study found that deer attempting to swim across open channels routinely drown. Removal of the ice cover can also disturb the habitat and feeding patterns of other animals such as foxes, coyotes and hare.

The winter navigation proposal is contained in an omnibus water projects bill that is expected to come up for debate later this year in the House. This huge public works bill includes "pork barrel" projects for improvements in harbors, rivers or lakes in nearly every Congressional district. Congressmen are typically reluctant to rock the boat in such a case, and historically, the chances of getting a major provision removed from such a bill have been slim. However, observers say that because of the strength of the opposition and the extravagant cost of the proposal, perhaps the winter navigation proposal will prove to be the exception.

The economic value of the Great Lakes lies not only in their ability to transport goods economically. They also have immense value as a resource for the recreation of their millions of citizens and as a place where their wild inhabitants can renew themselves. Rep. David Bonior (D-Mich.), who plans to lead the fight against the project when it comes up for debate later this year in the House, said it most clearly. His constituents "don't want their environment ruined, their beaches destroyed, their wildlife harmed, their tourist economy damaged and their tax dollars used in the name of a project that will add nothing to our economy."●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE: ALEXANDER PEVZNER

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jewry continues again this year with the dedicated support of many Members of Congress who will persist in the battle for freedom for Soviet Jews. As we are all aware, the number of Jewish people allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union has declined sharply in recent years. In light of this, our combined efforts here in the Congress have become even more meaningful for those who still cannot escape Soviet oppression.

Alexander Pevzner is a Soviet refusenik, and for over 5 years has suffered the humiliating and harsh consequences of requesting permission to emigrate. Although Alexander's parents and sister were granted permission to leave the Soviet Union, Alexander and his family have been repeatedly denied. They are still waiting, and they are still hoping.

From the beginning of my service in Congress I have corresponded personally with Alexander's father, Lev Pevzner, who is residing in the United States. As a friend, I have pressed his son's case with Soviet officials and I continue to hope for the day when we can bring Lev's son home for him. I thank all of my colleagues who join in the conscience vigil. The work that each of you are doing is also helping Alexander.

As I have done so often in recent years, I have again written to Soviet officials urging them to reconsider their restrictive emigration policies and permit Alexander Pevzner and his family to leave the Soviet Union. I have appealed to them to make a humanitarian effort on behalf of Alexander Pevzner and allow him and his family to fulfill their dream of being together once again with their entire family.

I am sure that Alexander will never give up his struggle to leave the Soviet Union, and we here in Congress who have taken on a personal responsibility to see our way through to success

for at least one individual, among many, must also never abandon our most sincere efforts to reunite this loving family. We must continue to call on the Soviet Union to relax their burdensome and unnecessarily restrictive emigration policies that have so tragically prevented families like the Pevzners from being together.

As Members of Congress, our strong protests to the Soviet Government on behalf of those who are powerless to change their unfortunate situation must continue. For Alexander, and the many like him who wish to leave the Soviet Union, we are perhaps their greatest advocates and our efforts must continue.

Today, more than ever, my most sincere hopes are for Alexander Pevzner and his quest for freedom.●

CWO JAMES P. MEADE, JR., SURVIVES INJURIES, RECEIVES DEGREES

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, in these times of budgetary constraint, we sometimes tend to forget the human element behind the programs we are funding—or attempting not to fund. I recently received a letter from a constituent of mine, CWO James P. Meade, Jr., retired, which seems to me to be quite pertinent. Mr. Meade will be receiving his doctor of philosophy degree in clinical psychology at end of May. This in itself may not be noteworthy, but it is the story that culminates in the awarding of this degree that is.

In 1967 Mr. Meade felt a strong obligation to go to South Vietnam to fight for his country, and became a helicopter pilot. After 4 months of heroic service his helicopter crashed, and the still spinning rotor smashed through the cockpit and severely injured him in the head. Doctors saw his condition as hopeless, but somehow he survived. Over the course of 30 months of intense pain and determination, Mr. Meade was able to learn to read, write, talk, and walk again.

In 1969 he enrolled in a community college, while he and his family were supported by social security disability insurance. He had to work much harder than an average student, but persevered. With the Federal Government's financial assistance, Mr. Meade earned his bachelor of science degree in psychology "with honors." He continued on to achieve a master of arts degree in counseling, and will soon receive a doctor of philosophy degree in clinical psychology.

In Mr. Meade's own words, "I could never have done what I have without the financial help the Federal Government has given me." Mr. Meade wrote to me to express his gratitude for the Federal assitance which enabled him to become a productive member of society again. His story should be an inspiration to all of us: He is living proof of the success of programs such as social security disability insurance. I hope that all of us will give serious consideration to the comments and suggestions Mr. Meade makes in his letter:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COELHO: Almost seventeen years ago on May 8, 1967, I was critically wounded in the then Republic of Vietnam when my helicopter was shot down. Over the next six years I spent almost three years in military, Veterans Administration, and civilian hospitals for reasons directly related to the wounds suffered in Vietnam. Almost half of this time was spent at Madigan General Hospital in Ft. Lewis, Washington, where I was (unconscious) medivaced from Vietnam.

As I mentioned starting this letter, that was the situation beginning almost seventeen years ago. Over most of the years, except for a three year period I did work, I have been a recipient of Social Security Disability Insurance benefits for my children and myself.

I have been very thankful for these monies because if it was not for this generous assistance from the federal government, I would not have been able to take advantage of opportunities to attempt to improve myself and hopefully someday not need S.S.D.I. assistance any longer.

A great deal of the past seventeen years has been more physically and emotionally painful and frustrating than is probably imaginable by most people. Indeed, many tears have been shed during these years as I struggled to regain a semblance of humanism that was almost irrevocably (and violently) taken away from me.

There have been moments when I no longer wanted to continue. It was so very important to me to be accepted again, and my early failures were so very many that there were times when suicide seemed the only possible road away from the frustration of trying and failing. Still, I would not give up. Becoming a tax payer again continually propelled me against odds that many people (including my physicians) have said were insurmountable. My family was once told I would never be more than a helpless vegetable.

On May 31, 1984, however, I will earn a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Clinical Psychology. Because of federal disability benefits, I was able to spend almost five years earning a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Portland State University, Portland, Oregon. The Veterans Administration allowed me to return to college despite the fact that I could barely read or write, and, subtract, multiply or divide, etc. The faith the V.A., my family and many professors had and showed me supplied the strength that caused me to earn my baccalaureate degree "With Honors." It was not until eight years later that I was able to earn a Master of Arts degree in Counseling from California State University, Fresno.

I will earn the Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology from International College/University Without Walls, an "Approved" institution of Higher Education in the State of California. Since this is an "Approved" institution, I will be able to legally serve as a Psychology Intern or Assistant and, after earning 3,000 internship hours, sit for the California Psychology Licensing Examination.

I have worked hard, Sir, very hard. And, I think my pains and efforts have nearly prepared me to become a tax payer again.

The true purpose of this letter, however, is to thank you, as a Representative of the federal government, for helping this moment to occur. I could never have done what I have without the financial help the federal government has given me.

It seems that President Reagan has serious doubts concerning the worth of spending federal moneys on people who cannot seem to make it on their own. Still, I wish you would thank him for me. Please tell the President that I have worked very hard to better myself, and I think I have succeeded. As a matter of fact, although the doctors at Madigan General Hospital were going to amputate BOTH of my legs in 1967, I have learned to walk without necessitating any support at all.

Because I spend most of my time counseling or simply talking to people who are disabled, I have become aware that most disabled individuals seem to feel that President Reagan is trying to make us the "second-class citizens" most disabled persons try desperately not to become. Indeed, the present Administration's policies have done more to frighten disabled people than any other Administration ever has. Telling people that your new rules and regulations will always help the "truely needy" does not seem to mean very much when you change the rules to decide who is truely needy and who is not.

Two years ago, I was "truely needing," I will admit that. After earning a Ph.D. I am going to do my very best to find a job, to show other disabled people that they can be "successful" and productive human beings again. That they can be useful and productive.

One important (to me) step I have made in reclaiming my rights as a "first class citizen" occurred in February when I swore an oath as an officer in the California State Military Reserve. The CSMR is state and is not the federal military and does not pay a salary, but being able to qualify meant more to me than I could express. (Napoleon suffered epileptic seizures).

Again, Rep. Coelho, I thank you (as a Representative of the federal government) for making it possible for me to continue "The Long Return of Warrant Officer Meade." Possibly, I will never be able to pay back in taxes the amount equal to the S.S.D.I. I have received. Because of this federal aid, however, I am ready to try. I may "fall-flat-on-my-face," but finally having the chance to succeed on my own means more to me than I could ever express.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MEADE, Jr.,
Chief Warrant Officer (Retired).

Mr. Meade, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your efforts and to wish you continued success. You are a model for all of us to follow.●

IN THIS NEW AGE OF ENTREPRENEURS, WE'RE NO. 1 AGAIN

HON. LES AuCOIN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention, and the attention of our colleagues, a very interesting and timely article which appeared in the Sunday edition of the Washington Post. Entitled, "In This New Age of Entrepreneurs, We're Number One Again," the article focuses on the fact that Japanese industralists and economists are viewing the Silicon Valley phenomenon as a model they want to employ in their industries.

When someone mentions Silicon Valley, CA, comes to mind. My home State of Oregon, however, has its own silicon valley, located primarily in my congressional district. The largest single private employer in the state, Tektronix, is based in my home county. And new high technology ventures are springing up on what seems like a daily basis. One of them, Floating Points Systems, has shown an increase in net sales from just under $30 million in 1979 to over $100 million in 1983 and its chairman of the board, Norm Winningstad, was Small Businessman of the Year in 1981.

Oregon's economy, for so long so dependent on the forest products industry, must be diversified and expanded to meet the needs of its people. The timber industry in Oregon will always be crucial to Oregon. But if Oregon is to grow, it must diversify its economic base and intensify its efforts to attract new industries. The high technology industry in Oregon is already a solid portion of Oregon's economic foundation. It should, and will, become an even more important factor in Oregon's economic resurgence.

The article I have presented for the RECORD presents a new way of viewing this industry—but more so, I commend it to our colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1984]

IN THIS NEW AGE OF ENTREPRENEURS, WE'RE NO. 1 AGAIN

JAPAN AND EUROPE PREFER OUR 'SILICON VALLEY WAY' TO 'INDUSTRIAL POLICY'

(By Joel Kotkin)

At the very time that "industrial policy" has become the rage among many of our professors and policy makers searching for ways to salvage America's place in the world economy, their role models abroad are looking enviously at what the Japanese call "the Silicon Valley way."

On this side of the ocean, the chorus of industrial-policy advocates argue that America should take its cue from Japan, where government plays an active role in deciding which industries to nurture and promote with financing, subsidies, retraining and protection from foreign competition.

Yet European and Asian business and government leaders, increasingly impressed by the vitality of a U.S. economy that has enjoyed higher growth rates over the past 18 months than any other major industrial nation, are looking towards America's dynamic, if somewhat chaotic, entrepreneurial economy as their role model for the future.

"Coordination is all right if you're building a steel and car industry on the model of other people. But now we're in an era of rapid change, of integrated circuits and microprocessors," observes Jiro Tokuyama, dean of Tokyo's Nomura School of Advanced Management and a longtime confidant of Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone. "I don't think our large organizations can move quickly enough to make the changes. We must find our model among the entrepreneurs like [those] in your Silicon Valley."

Of course, innovating in the field of high technology and managing the decline of old, smokestack industries are not the same. But where the growth industries of the future are concerned, U.S entrepreneurism is the world's model.

Enthusiasm for "the Silicon Valley way" is based largely on the remarkable performance of the young, entrepreneurial U.S. companies, particularly in such burgeoning industries as microelectronics, telecommunications and biotechnology. Due in part to the innovative and competitive spark provided by these upstart firms, America between 1977 and 1981 doubled its trade surplus in these technology-based industries.

To meet the challenge posed by America's entrepreneurs, Tokuyama and other influential foreigners are urging their governments to move away from the industrial policy which served them well in the past. Even the elite bureaucrats at Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI)—often cited by American enthusiasts of industrial policy as the ultimate model for a planning agency—now advocate wide-scale deregulation of the economy and devote considerable resources to promoting small start-up companies known in Japan as "venture businesses."

In addition, the Ministry of Finance, long a bastion of bureaucratic controls, recently fostered the opening up of Japan's traditionally conservative equity markets, including the development of a special, small-issues market consciously modeled on the U.S. "over-the-counter" stock exchange which has played such a key role in the financing of such American entrepreneurial companies as Apple Computers, Federal Express and Tandem.

"Nothing happens in Japan unless there's a crisis and we feel there's a crisis now in our industries," remarks Hiroshi Kato, a 29-year veteran of MITI who is now an adviser to Yamaichi Securities, one of Japan's leading investment banks. "Our talent is queued up in the big bureaucracies of the giant companies.

"Their talents are being wasted. They must be forced to become more independent. Being an entrepreneur in Japan must become more respected, like it is in America, if we wish to compete in the future."

Computer chips—"the crude oil of the '80s," as one 'American industrialist describes them—aptly reflect the Japanese dilemma. Beginning in the late 1970s, Japan became a formidable competitor in this area, reducing the American share of the world market to 53 percent last year.

There was talk that the small, entrepreneurial U.S. companies which had provided many of early breakthroughs in silicon computer chip technology (and which gave the Silicon Valley its name) were in serious jeopardy.

But now U.S. firms have staked out commanding leads in new chip technologies which promise to constitute the key growth sectors of the future.

For instance, they hold an almost complete monopoly on the future generation of large, complex memory devices known as EPROMs and EEPROMs, which are used to store the programs for microcomputers. The advantages of these devices is that they are erasable, and therefore allow the programs recorded on them to be modified. This feature, for example, allows a user to easily change the function of a robot on an assembly line. The market for these chips is expected to nearly double annually in coming years—a growth rate five times the industry average.

Another U.S.-dominated growth area is in customized or semicustomized computer chips, the specialized devices that serve as the brains, or controls, in thousands of pieces of equipment, from the most advanced scientific instruments to systems that control the energy consumption and fire detection for an entire building complex. In this market, American firms now hold a commanding 2-to-1 lead over the Japanese. As little as 5 percent of the world computer chip market in 1981, these chips could account for most of the projected $100 billion chip market (up from $25 billion today) by decade's end.

Although the Japanese can be expected to challenge the American hegemony in custom chips, as they did earlier in RAMs (random-access memories), their prospects for success seem sharply less promising.

In producing RAMs, Japan could exploit its advantages: its skills at mass producing a single, high-volume product while holding down price and achieving high quality.

But custom or semicustomized chips allow U.S. companies to exploit their advantages: marketing and management flexibility and superior technology. These highly complex devices, which have to be specially tailored to the job they perform, are frequently sold in small batches to makers of expensive and complex products. Success in custom chips has far less to do with price and much more with technology and design—traditional American strengths.

Bolstered by a series of alliances with larger (and less technologically dynamic) European and American companies, and backed by the now $3 billion American venture-capital industry, over 30 new computer chip firms have started operation since the late 1970s. In the new and fast-paced chip markets of the 1980s, these "start-ups" enjoy clear advantages over their larger competitors both at home and in Japan.

Concentrating only on particular market niches, usually in new and rapidly expanding fields, these firms are not slowed down by the bureaucratic inertia of giant, diversified corporations. Also, facing big risks but also the hope of huge profits, they are driven by a sense of "existential challenge" rarely found in the corridors of giant companies.

Thus, the changes sweeping the chip world have lured back some who once conceded the industry to the Japanese. In the late 1970s, L. J. Sevin looked on with horror as his Dallas-based Mostek computer chip firm was almost annihilated by the Japanese RAM blitzkrieg. But today, "the game has changed suddenly," claims Sevin, who now chairs Cypress Semiconductor, a Silicon Valley-based chip firm. "The technol-

ogies are exploding and driving the markets here. When it was a question of selling chips by the bagful, it was playing to their [Japan's] strength. Now that there are so many new niches, it's becoming a marketing game and that gives the smaller U.S. firms the advantage."

These changes are also likely to work against the targeting strategies which played a major role in Japan's previous industrial triumphs, observes Michael Borrus of the University of California's highly regarded Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy. Borrus states it succinctly: "You can't target a moving target."

Under current circumstances, it is unlikely that Japan will produce anything like the explosion of start-ups now revitalizing the American computer-chip industry. Takeshi Ogata, manager of the industrial electronics division of the giant C. Itoh trading company, and Dr. Atsuyoshi Ouchi, senior executive vice president of NEC Corp, believe the big-business bias of Japan's large financial institutions will prevent start-ups from garnering the $20 to $50 million needed to start a new chip firm.

Equally important, the much ballyhooed Japanese "corporate culture," with its ethos of lifetime loyalty to the company and its worship of bigness, makes it virtually impossible for a start-up to attract the necessary talented technicians and managers.

"It would be very difficult even for me to start a [semiconductor] firm here," Ouchi, one of Japan's preeminent electronics industry figures, admits. "Now, if I were young and spoke better English, maybe I would go to California and try it."

As long as Japan's computer chip industry remains the exclusive province of the giants, observers such as Ogata fear Japan will continue to lag behind more competition-minded American companies in the development of new technologies. Despite all the hysteria associated with such projects as the "fifth-generation" computer, many Japanese fear that the technological gap between the two nations has been widening in recent years. Indeed, a 1980 survey of 200 top Japanese managers involved in technical innovation at major companies found 73 percent convinced that their nation lagged behind the U.S. in revolutionary new technologies.

"I am sorry to say that in the leading-edge technologies, there is a continuing advantage for the States," says Ogata. "Our social environment, the personality and character of our people and institutions is to constantly improve on a process, say from the 16K RAM to 64K RAM to 256K RAM. But to develop a whole new technology, to get on the leading edge, you have to look to the American firms. It's a cultural thing."

Eager to break down these "cultural" constraints, many younger Japanese are adopting "the Silicon Valley way" as their own business creed. To them, the idea of young Americans in their 20s, such as Apple Computer's Steve Jobs and Microsoft's Bill Gates, building giant companies based on their technological vision contrasts favorably with the situation in Japan, where a seniority-oriented system relegates most executives to relatively minor positions well into their 40s.

During the 1970s, for instance, the number of male college graduates wanting to change companies during their careers—almost unthinkable in traditional Japan—doubled to nearly 20 percent. Those interested in going out on their own jumped to nearly one-third.

To many of this generation, "the Silicon Valley way" expresses more than a path to success: it reflects a new, free-wheeling, democratic approach to capitalism, expressed by such things as the widespread ownership of equity by workers and a relative dearth of hierarchical corporate structure.

"When I first came to America, I was shocked to see a company president wearing jeans and having his feet on the desk," recalls Shigenobu Nagamori, the 39-year old founder of Nippon Densan, a fast-growing Kyoto-based firm which last year sold $35 million worth of small motors used in such products as high-speed cassette recorders and computer disc drives. "To have workers call you by your first name would be unthinkable in Kyoto. But I liked it very much."

Today, companies like Nagamori's, one-third of which is owned by its employes, are injecting this new democratic spirit into a hierarchical business culture where owners are frequently viewed as quasi-deities with unchallenged rights to the sweat and intelligence of their workers. The American model is also captivating the new enterepreneurs in other Asian nations such as Korea, Taiwan and Singapore.

"Asian societies are at a turning point," observes Yasunobu Nagura, an Osaka-based small-business consultant to over 500 companies both in Japan and Taiwan. "There is a new spirit, a willingness to try new things. We are becoming Americanized."

Like their Asian counterparts, Europeans are also undergoing Americanization. Aware that their economies have actually lost jobs over the past decade—while the United States created a remarkable 20 million new jobs, mostly in small- and mid-sized companies—European leaders are beginning to question the efficacy of "industrial policy" over the free-wheeling U.S. system.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the United Kingdom, birthplace of the first industrial revolution. Under the government of Margaret Thatcher, tax incentives for investment in small, entrepreneurial companies have lured such American-based venture capitalists as Jean Deleage, Peter Brooke and Brian Haslett into what has long been considered the stodgiest of industrial cultures.

"I learned the trade in the United States—a way of doing business that was quite different than traditional in Britain," observes Haslett, who now shuttles between London and Boston serving as a consultant to venture capitalists on both sides of the Atlantic. "There's not been very close contact between the City of London [the financial district] and the dirty-fingernail guys. They didn't talk to each other. What I learned in America was that a venture capitalist can have a positive professional relationship with the entrepreneurs where the class thing—the void—doesn't get in the way."

Due in part to the efforts of Haslett and other venture capitalists, Britain is slowly emerging from its established role as the proverbial sick man of the European Community. Indeed, with the emergence of such entrepreneurial firms as Sinclair Research, a leading maker of computers as cheap as $30, and Kleentech International, an engineering services firm, Britain astoundingly is now even regarded by other Europeans as "something of a role model," according to Bank of Paris analyst Phillipe Sahut D'Izarn.

Fundamentally, D'Izarn's comment represents something more of an indictment of the continent's sloth than a reflection of the grandeur of Britain's still-modest resurgence. Although American "industrial policy" advocate Robert Reich praises the "sophisticated tools for industrial policy-making" used in France and West Germany, all the elite planning institutions and "targeted" investment to promising new industries have succeeded in doing so far is to turn those nations into technological backwaters.

Indeed, with the exception of Nixdorf Computers, Germany seems to have slept through the entire microelectronics revolution, despite millions spent on government aid to research. Nor has France, despite its well-deserved reputation for superb engineering, done much better. IBM continues to dominate Europe's computer industry, dwarfing its nearest European competitor by nearly 4 to 1. Untroubled by local Apple-style upstarts, Big Blue faces no sizeable European competition in such growth fields as personal computers.

Searching for the reasons behind their disappointing performance and prospects, a growing number of Europeans point to the very sort of corporate-government partnership which so excites the imaginations of American advocates of "industrial policy." "Even before [French President Francois] Mitterrand, our government was 'helping' private industry far too much," says D'Izarn, who served in the powerful Ministry of Industry during the conservative regime of Valery Giscard d'Estaing. "We missed the mini, then the micro, in part because our government wanted to have mainframes like IBM. Our policies directed huge amounts of money to our large electronics firms which didn't have the innovative spark we needed."

So pervasive has this analysis become that even France's socialist government has placed greater emphasis on entrepreneurism—as evidenced by Mitterrand's recent pilgrimage to Silicon Valley—than its more conservative predecessors. At first determined to turn France into "the Japan of the West," the Mitterrand regime now seems to be following a play book composed in San Jose rather than Tokyo.

Over the past year, the socialist regime has developed major encouragements for young entrepreneurial firms, including an over-the-counter stock market and a three-year tax holiday for start-up firms. Prodded by the government, venture capital investments have doubled to $37.5 million during the last three years.

"We know perfectly well that the growth we want depends on the entrepreneurial spirit," concedes Bernard Attali, a leading socialist intellectual, government official and adviser to President Mitterrand. "Only entreprenuers create jobs and new opportunities. The world is changing and we are all entering an era of profound decentralization and the entrepreneur. We are now interested in helping people go out there and help themselves."

"We are seeing a new mentality among the people 30 to 35," observes Jean Fonteneau of Soffinova, the French government's venture-capital fund. "They realize that the job situation is no good, that the bureaucracy at companies like Thomson [an electronics giant nationalized in 1981] or the government isn't the safe haven it used to be. People are getting more into building their own companies and making profits like in the States."

Yet despite these changes, the French and Japanese, as well as other foreigners, will no

doubt face a tough time in tring to emulate "the Silicon Valley way." Despite the rhetoric, America's recent entrepreneurial explosion was not detonated by Ronald Reagan's speeches or supply-side policies. The path leading from the robber barons and Andrew Carnegie to Steve Jobs and Steve Wozniak founding Apple Computers in a California garage represents the continuity of a unique history, people and culture.

Constantly replenished by both foreign immigrants and the development of new regions, America's entrepreneurial spirit remains the one irreducible competitive edge that this nation possesses over all others. It should not be squandered at the altar of an ill-considered "industrial policy."

"It's incredible that some Americans are going to heavy state planning when I'm being asked to go to Europe to help them disband theirs," remarks Boston venture capitalist Peter Brooke, who has also been summoned to Japan to spark entrepreneurial growth. "We shouldn't follow their mistakes. Hell, we're the ones with the answers."●

GRIEF

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, something special happens when a child faces illness or injury, whether life-threatening or minor. The impact is intense to the body and emotions of the child and the family. Caring for, curing and saving these young lives is the very special responsibility and mission of the renowned children's hospital in Memphis, Le Bonheur Children's Medical Center.

Le Bonheur started as a small, 89-bed children's hospital in 1952. Since that time it has become a comprehensive center for the diagnosis and treatment of pediatric diseases, disorders and injuries. Through the years Le Bonheur's commitment to education, research and specialized health care for children has attracted outstanding medical personnel. Le Bonheur currently has a medical staff of 350, boasting a modern 225-bed facility, with 50 pediatric specialists having offices in the hospital.

Le Bonheur is also the principal pediatric teaching hospital of the University of Tennessee Center for the Health Sciences and part of one of the world's largest medical complexes. Students in medicine, nursing and numerous other allied health fields receive training here.

Almost every pediatric medical and surgical subspecialty is represented at Le Bonheur. From the tonsillectomy to open heart surgery and liver transplant surgery, the latest in specialized techniques is offered to the more than 30,000 children treated each year in one of the 30 specialty clinics and ambulatory center. Le Bonheur Children's Medical Center is a nontax supported, nonprofit hospital offering the finest in medical care to children. From the beginning Le Bonheur, which means "happy feelings", opened its doors to all sick children.

It is a pleasure for me to bring the outstanding work of this facility, dedicated to saving the lives of children, to the attention of my colleagues. As a father of three children, I found the following article which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal quite moving and would like to take this time to share it with you.

The article follows:

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, TN, Mar. 18, 1984]

GRIEF

(By Anna Byrd Davis)

"Death is not an accepted part of medical practice anymore," says Dr. Greg Stidham, who spends his days and nights taking care of very, very sick children.

He is director of critical care services at Le Bonheur Children's Medical Center. And he knows about saving children, and he knows about losing them. Ten to 15 children die each month at Le Bonheur.

What doctors do today, he likes to point out, is make children well.

Example:

"The death rate of kids with Reyes Syndrome (a mysterious illness that can strike children who are recovering from a viral illness) in the late 1950s was near 90 percent. Then in the mid-'70s it had dropped to 50 percent, and now it's about 25 percent."

And, he points out, most doctors and nurses who work with children do so because they like to make them well.

"So we would prefer not to think about kids who die."

But if you work with very sick children, you soon learn that you have to deal with death, and that means dealing with bereaved parents.

"It's a logical extension of taking care of families who are in stress," said Dr. Stidham, explaining that at Le Bonheur the staff attends not only the child but also the child's family.

After awhile, he said, you begin to see that a lot of the problems that parents go through when a child dies are predictable and follow certain patterns.

"Some physicians who don't work with them regularly don't realize this, and certainly the family who has never lost a child before doesn't. They think they are going through something bizarre and terrible."

Working with grieving parents "became an unanticipated part of my job, that even during my fellowship I took pretty seriously," Dr. Stidham said.

At Le Bonheur, where committees keep the hospital running smoothly, Dr. Stidham and others who work with dying children and their parents formed a committee on death. The doctors, nurses and social workers wanted to come up with ways to help families, especially during that first six months of bereavement.

One of the first things they decided to do was develop a routine for getting the autopsy results to families as quickly as possible, said Abigail Sperry, a social worker.

These autopsies, she explained, provide information that helps the family in many ways. For one thing, they may not know the exact cause of death until the autopsy is done. And, an autopsy will sometimes provide the kind of information parents need before deciding to have another child.

"And sometimes parents get some satisfaction knowing an autopsy might help another child," Ms. Sperry said.

Glenn Ann Martin, a mental health clinical nurse specialist, said they decided to develop a better record-keeping system on children who die at Le Bonheur.

"The parents are contacted at three weeks after the child's death, at three months and six months, and longer, if needed," said Ms. Martin. "Mostly it's to assess the family's level of functioning and to identify any needs. We make referrals when appropriate, offering the option of return visits. We keep the door open for the families."

And, Dr. Stidham said, helping the families helps the staffers who have built a caring relationship with the parents.

"This is a process that doesn't begin at the death of the child," he said. "It's a continuation of a relationship that began when you first started taking care of the kid in the intensive care unit.

"You can form an intensive relationship that is different from any other relationship. It's a professional relationship; at the same time it has the intensity and intimacy about it that is almost the same kind of intensity as a husband-wife or mother-son relationship, because you are sharing something so important, (and) awesome as the impending death or survival of their child.

"If the physician is responsible in dealing with these parents, there is a closeness that can develop quickly that is not unprofessional but that makes his job easier and can make things easier for the parents, too.

"Follow-up with these families gives you, Glenn Ann uses this word, 'closure.' It somehow gives you a sense of completeness of caring for that child and his family. There is something about that, some resolution to that relationship that is coming to a close."

The more the committee members talked, the more they realized they wanted to do something to help parents through those really bad days—anniversary dates, birthdays, holidays.

"Usually time does help" Ms. Martin said, "but there's something of a buildup before a special date and that buildup can be worse than getting through the hours in the day itself."

Three years ago, Le Bonheur sponsored its first Day of Sharing early in December, aiming at Christmas, probably the hardest day of the year for grieving parents after the child's birthday. It is a four- to five-hour experience on grief directed at parents, grandparents, surviving siblings and what Ms. Martin calls "significant others."

The Day of Sharing offers separate morning sessions—one for children, one for mothers and one just for fathers.

"It's a totally different experience," said Ms. Martin. "By separating the parents, it breaks up the pattern of the mother openly expressing the grief and the fathers having to be the rock. The fathers feel more comfortable showing feelings if they are not in a coed group.

"It works. Its incredible," she said.

Parents whose children have died have been especially helpful with the Day of Sharing, she said.

"Some whose children died five and six years ago are still coming back to help others. They are a living testimony to survival."●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 1984, I was unable to be here in Washington because I was traveling on official business. I am sincerely sorry that I was not able to record my votes on H.R. 5172 and the two conference reports, S. 1129 and S. 64, that the House was considering on the floor.●

PROVIDING BASIC SERVICES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS OF ST. HELENS, OR

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the efforts undertaken by some of my constituents in St. Helens, OR, in providing senior citizens with the basic services they need and deserve.

St. Helens is in a part of the Nation where the unemployment rate has consistently hovered around the 10-percent level for the past 4 years. With the loss of tax revenue, the closing of many small businesses, and now, finally, the migration of several thousand residents from the surrounding county, St. Helens has been hard-pressed to make any kind of social service available to the community's residents.

Through the efforts of people like Dorothy Churchill, a longtime activist for senior social services, and Mike Sykes, one of the directors of St. Helens Senior Citizens Center, the town has been able to provide some of the functions necessary for senior citizens to carry out their daily activities. When they came to me for help, I was able to use my seat on the Appropriations Committee to obtain funds allowing the center to buy vans for a senior citizens' door-to-door ride service.

I recently rode one of the routes with Elizabeth Karst, who began driving the route when the center bought the vans. Seniors in need of a ride to buy groceries are picked up and returned to their homes. Seniors in need of their medical prescriptions are able to have them delivered. Seniors just needing some human contact are able to get to social centers or to places at which they volunteer their time. Seniors in certain emergency situations have a service they can count on as a lifeline.

While current fiscal realities require Congress to restrain growth in Federal spending, we must not blindly cut programs because they are social in nature. The door-to-door ride service for senior citizens is cost effective, vitally important, and deserves Congress support.

As a Member of the House, I will continue to fight for funding for programs such as the one I have just described, and I want to commend my friends in St. Helens, OR—Dorothy Churchill, Mike Sykes, Elizabeth Karst, and all their colleagues—for their unwavering commitment and assistance to so many senior citizens over the years.●

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN O. MARSH, JR., SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, DEDICATION OF THE ERNIE PYLE MEDIA CENTER, FORT JACKSON, SC

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, last month, on Wednesday, April 18, the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable John O. Marsh, Jr., delivered a memorial address at the dedication of the Ernie Pyle Media Center at Fort Jackson, SC. Ernie Pyle, this "buddy of the 77th Infantry Division," was respected, loved and remembered because he, himself, so closely identified with the very men about whom he wrote. The Secretary's remarks, I feel, captured the spirit of one of the world's truly great wartime correspondents, and I am pleased to include at this point the full text of his remarks on the anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle 39 years ago.

Shortly we will mark the 40th Anniversary of the Invasion of Normandy.

The day after D-Day, Ernie Pyle walked along the beach which was still receiving sporadic artillery and mortar fire. And writing to Americans back home he said:

"I took a walk along the historic coast of Normandy in the country of France. It was a lovely day for strolling along the seashore. Men were sleeping on the sand, some of them sleeping forever.

"Here is a jumbled row for mile on mile are soldiers' packs. Here are socks and shoe polish, sewing kits, diaries, Bibles, and hand grenades. Here are the latest letters from home . . . and snapshots of families back home staring up at you from the sand."

It is fitting the Ernie Pyle Media Center is located here at Fort Jackson—a great military post and infantry training center. The 77th Division—the Statue of Liberty Division—was trained here. The exploits of these soldiers were the last Ernie Pyle was to cover.

This Center honors an outstanding American news man. A great journalist and war correspondent for Scripps-Howard.

Ernie Pyle was born in Indiana. Like Booth Tarkington, he never lost his Hoosier background, and the stories he wrote reflected the down-to-earth soundness of mid-Western America.

He was 44 years of age when he was ambushed by a Japanese machine gunner and died instantly on a small island near Okinawa. He was buried in a combat zone in a hasty row of soldier graves, an American infantryman on his right and a combat engineer on his left.

In the main Ernie Pyle did not write of the war in terms of the great moral issues of freedom and democracy, of totalitarianism, and world domination. Rather, he wrote in terms of the American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines—the individuals who collectively embodied the causes for which America fought.

Like the foot-soldier, he learned what it was to be terrorized by being caught in an artillery barrage. He expected the ordeal of a rain of bombs on a unit's position, and wrote of clawing the ground in fear, knowing at any moment he might be blown into eternity.

If he did not dwell on the greater causes of human freedom, including those of speech and press, it was because the stuff of most of his stories related to the cause of human survival in combat—not because he didn't know what the real stakes were.

His being able to write of such experiences, experiences published and read, and re-read, across war-time America, was eloquent testimony to the greater cause those cold, dirty, bone tired, and hungry GI's were fighting for. He respected them, and they respected him. Ernie Pyle wrote the GI's story of a GI's war.

He was a friend of generals and flag officers, but he lived the soldier's life, accepted the soldier's risks, and died the soldier's death.

In a war that was a journalists war with thousands of correspondents, he was the war correspondent the fighting men knew best because he became a one man press corps for the combat solider.

His beat was the battlefield and he told it like it was—the story of men at war, the tough, foot slogging, slug it out infantry—their hopes, their fears, their tears, and their anger, and their courage.

In America where the electronic media was the radio, his word pictures and vivid portrayals brought the foxhole and the invasion beach into the living rooms and kitchens for parents and families back home.

His columns were read in the country stores and in the bars. They were read during the breaks on the assembly lines. They were so accurate, so direct, and so human they won a Pulitzer Prize.

Ernie Pyle had a mission and a message. He set it out in a reply to a letter from General Eisenhower. In explaining to the General how hard it was for people to understand war who were not in it, he said:

"Some of them tried hard to understand. But the world of the infantryman is a world so far removed from anything normal that it can be no more than academic to the average person.

"As you know, I've spent two and a half years carrying the torch for the foot-soldier, and I think I have helped make America conscious of, and sympathetic toward him, but I haven't made them feel what he goes through. I believe it's impossible. But I'll keep on trying."

He was still trying, with the soldiers of the 77th Division, that night on the 18th of April, 39 years ago today when he was cut down by a machine gunner's bullet.

And at the place where he fell, his GI friends erected a crude marker with these

words upon it: At This Spot, The 77th Infantry Division Lost a Buddy, Ernie Pyle, April 18, 1945.●

IT IS TIME FOR THE REUNIFICATION OF CYPRUS

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 years since the Turkish invasion force shattered the peace on Cyprus and split that island nation in two. For 10 years, we have been hoping the intercommunal talks would yield positive results. But the Turkish-Cypriots, and their sponsors in Ankara, have done nothing to help bring peace.

Instead of progress toward peaceful reunification of the island, the Turkish minority, with the open support of the Turkish Government, has moved provocatively to deepen the divisions. Last November, the Turkish-Cypriots issued a declaration of independence. With all the disappointments and setbacks to the cause of peace, this was a particularly grievous blow. The UDI was a clear statement of Turkish intent to prolong the crisis.

The world community, including the United States and the United Nations, was quick to condemn the UDI and to call for its rescission. Ignoring the weight of world opinion, the Turkish Government betrayed its true intentions with respect to the future of Cyprus by immediately extending diplomatic recognition to the secessionist state.

Despite the entreaties of world leaders, including U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar, there has been no effort by the Turkish officials to resume negotiations to resolve the crisis. Instead, the situation has worsened in recent weeks with the decision of the Ankara government to exchange ambassadors with the Turkish Cypriots.

The division of Cyprus is a tragedy. The principal victims of the tragedy are the people who have been forced from their homes, made refugees in their own land, by the continuing occupation of Cyprus by Turkish forces. I have twice visited Cyprus, and the longing of the Greek-Cypriots to return to their homes and resume their lives in peace is heart-rending.

But there is another victim of the continuing crisis. The NATO alliance is seriously weakened along its southern flank by the continuance of the dispute. Greece and Turkey are both valuable allies of ours, both important to our security needs in the eastern Mediterranean. The United States has a strong interest in having good relations with both countries.

But we must insist on responsible actions from our allies. We cannot carry on as if the invasion and occupation of Cyprus by the Turkish Government, carried out illegally with American arms, had not happened or was somehow justifiable. It was not.

Later this month, the House will be debating the foreign aid authorization bill. The Foreign Affairs Committee, seeking to send a signal of United States displeasure with Turkish actions, has already cut $50 million from the Reagan administration's request for military aid to Turkey. I believe we should take further action on the House floor, perhaps by making a share of the military aid contingent on some specific act of conciliation by the Turkish-Cypriots. The formulation that has been proposed in the other body, to make aid contingent on the return to Greek-Cypriot control of the tourist area of Varosha, is one approach we should consider.

About all, we must find ways to put events on Cyprus back on the path to peace.●

$300 IN FEES STEMMING FROM A SINGLE DELAYED DEPOSIT

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, a story in the Boston Globe, Tuesday, May 1, illustrates—in a dramatic fashion—two key problems which the Banking Committee has been wrestling with for weeks—the heavy impact of service fees and the inordinate delays in giving customers access to their deposits.

Because her bank failed to give her timely credit for a $1,413.45 deposit, Mrs. Lucy Cody of Boston, had a series of checks bounce, ending up being charged $296.30 in fees, and suffering extreme embarrassment. Even a check Mrs. Cody had written for her son's Boy Scout uniform was returned.

"If you've deposited a check, then wrote checks against it before its cleared, you'll know how Lucy Cody feels," the Boston Globe story, written by Jan Wong, states.

The amazing thing about Mrs. Cody's experience is the fact that the great majority—more than $1,000—of the deposit was in cash—only $400 was in the form of checks and, in reality, $300 of that sum was an American Express money order, according to the Boston Globe story. So even a deposit largely in cash combined with a money order on one of the Nation's best known firms—American Express—is subject to delay.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 5301 which would require timely crediting of deposits so that customers will not be forced to face the situation experienced by Mrs. Cody.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the story from the Boston Globe describing how Mrs. Cody was treated by her bank:

HELD UP AT THE BANK? ONE WOMAN'S STORY

(By Jan Wong)

Lucy M. Cody writes a lot of checks. Recently, she switched from a neighborhood bank to the Boston Five Cents Savings Bank because she wanted to bank all around the city.

No longer.

Cody deposited enough to cover the amount of her checks. But within weeks, the bank bounced 11 checks in rapid-fire succession, four of them twice. In all, it hit her with nearly $300 in penalties. Meanwhile, her landlord and the supermarket were clamoring for payment. The gas company threatened to turn off the gas.

"What really hurt me was the Boy Scouts called me where I bought my son's uniform. I nearly died," said Cody, 31, a Hyde Park mother of two boys.

If you've ever deposited a check, then wrote checks against it before it's cleared, you'll know how Lucy Cody feels.

"They just sucked my money out. I'm ready to have a nervous breakdown," said Cody. "Worst of all, the bank treats me like it's all my fault."

The Boston Five says that indeed it is Cody's fault. "You have to play within the rules," said the bank's spokesman, Sally Goodick.

What happened to Lucy Cody at the Boston Five, could have happened at any bank. Banks across the country write their own check clearing rules. Not surprisingly, each bank has its own set.

When a rule is broken, the penalty is usually a bounced check charge. In Boston, that averages $12 a check, according to a survey by Bank Rate Monitor, a weekly trade publication.

Legislators and regulators are taking an increasingly dim view of the arbitrary delay banks impose on clearing checks. At the moment, with check clearing left to the discretion of banks, customers have access to their money anywhere from immediately to 30 days.

"Banks move slower than the old Pony Express in processing checks, and I may be libeling Pony Express by suggesting it moved as slowly," says Rep. Fernand St Germain (D-R.I.)

St Germain, chairman of the House banking committee, has sponsored legislation to set ceilings on check-clearing times. A bill is also pending before the Massachusetts Legislature. Regulators, however, prefer a law that would require simply disclosure of check-clearing policies.

"Banks haven't done a good job of disclosure," says Paul E. Bulman, Massachusetts bank commissioner. "That's tough for a consumer who's been hit with a charge. They want you to handcuff them and put them in jail."

Lucy Cody might have something more violent in mind. Last November, Cody, the wife of a truckdriver, opened a checking account at the Boston Five. Over the next five weeks, she deposited $1,413.45. Most of it was in cash. But more than $400, including a $300 American Express money order, was in checks.

She proceeded to write checks against her deposits. But because some of her deposited

checks hadn't cleared, Boston Five ruled that her funds were "uncollected" and bounced her checks.

Cody began to be bombarded with slips from the bank, notifying her that her checks were bouncing. Each time she was charged the $12 fee. She assumed it was a computer error.

"I knew I had enough money in the account," she said.

In mid-December, she bought the $300 American Express money order from her old bank, Hyde Park Savings Bank, and deposited it in her checking account at Boston Five. That made a bad problem worse.

Cody considered it "as good as cash." The bank didn't. It put a two-week hold on her money.

"That was the beginning of the nightmare," she said. "I kept making deposits. And my checks kept coming back. It was almost as if my money was no good."

One $10 check bounced twice, costing her $24 in penalties. In all, Boston Five slapped her with $296.30 in penalties. Ultimately, it refunded her $228.

"She just never understood she had to wait until her checks cleared," said Jacqueline Reed, vice president of branch administration.

Reed called Cody's case a "real exception." The average bank customer writes 15 checks a month. Cody wrote 42 in five weeks.

Cody said she wasn't told she would have to wait for access to her money. Boston Five says that it tells all new customers about its check clearing policy "in general terms." Its deposit slips, for instance, state in small print at the bottom that "Deposits other than cash are credited subject to final payment in cash."

But customers never see the bank's two-page check clearing policy statement. "That's for internal use," said the bank's lawyer.

Although as a result its customers may never know it, the Boston Five's check-clearing policy isn't all that bad. In fact, it's about average for Massachusetts banks.

"We're just like any other bank," said spokesman Goodick. "I think most customers understand check cashing policy and live by it."

Lucy Cody didn't understand.

Banks say they need the delay because they don't receive the money right away. They say they have to wait until the check makes its way through the system.

Since Cody's American Express money order was sold by a local bank but issued by a Colorado bank, the money order went first to Boston Five's correspondent bank, which is Bank of Boston. At that point, within a day or two, Boston Five got $300 in provisional credit, according to Ray McCabe, a vice president and the bank's operations officer.

Bank of Boston then sent the check to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, which sent it by plane to the closest Reserve Bank to the Colorado bank. Finally, it reached the Colorado bank, which paid the $300. At that point, two to four days later, Boston Five collected the funds.

If Boston Five collected the funds within three to six days, why did it hold Cody's funds for 10?

The reason is that if the check is fraudulent, the schedule "goes out the window," according to McCabe. "Everyone has to put their hands on it. It has to be returned manually, through every bank it went through on its way in."

If Boston Five allows a bad check to be drawn on, it would be left holding the bag. About 1 percent of checks are bounced. Even fewer are fraudulent. But to be safe, banks assume all checks are bad.

"We just know that if we allow ourselves 10 days, 99 percent of the time that check will come back," said McCabe. A more efficient way, he concedes, is for the Colorado bank to Telex or call the Boston Five if a check is bad.

"It's a lot cheaper [for banks] not to," McCabe said.

For Cody, the final indignity, hundreds of dollars in penalties later, was the monthly checking charge. The service cost her $1 a month. Incidentally, the bank now charges $2.

Asked where she's banking now, she said, "I'm not. I'm afraid to even get near a bank."

HOW LUCY CODY WAS CHARGED $296.30 IN FEES

(By Jan Wang)

What happened to Lucy M. Cody could happen to any customer with a checking account.

Last November, the Hyde Park housewife opened a checking account at the Boston Five Cents Savings Bank in Roslindale. She deposited enough to cover her checks. But within five weeks, because some of the checks she deposited hadn't cleared, the bank has bounced 11 checks and charged her nearly $300 in fees. It also closed her account four times.

"They have been putting me through hell," said Cody.

After several meetings with Cody, the bank agreed to refund her $228 in fees. Cody, who no longer banks with Boston Five, thinks she's still owed an apology and nearly $600. The bank disagrees.

"The bank has not made an error." Boston Five told Cody in a four-page letter. Indeed, it hasn't according to a check clearing rules it sets for itself. This is how it happened:

Cody deposited $1,413.45 in cash and checks over a period of five weeks. More than $900 was in cash. An American Express money order accounted for $300, government checks for about $150 and personal checks for $26.50.

She then wrote $1402.36 worth of checks. But the bank bounced nearly $300 worth of checks. In four cases, checks were bounced twice after Cody insisted to Star Market, for instance, that her account had sufficient funds.

The check bouncing—and the subsequent fees—sparked a chain reaction. As her balance was eroded from the fees, more checks bounced. And more fees were levied.

When the dust settled, she had been charged a toal of $296.30 in fees.

The real trouble started when Cody deposited the $300 American Express money order she bought from Hyde Park Savings Bank.

"I considered it as good as cash," she said.

The bank saw it differently. Unknown to Cody, that money order is ultimately cleared through a Colorado bank. As an out-of-state check, that automatically meant Boston Five slapped a 10-business day hold on her money.●

THOUGHTFUL CRITICISM OF $208 BILLION DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL BY OUR COLLEAGUE, RON DELLUMS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Committee's 399 page report on the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1985 is now available.

I want to commend the committee for making a number of cuts—$16 billion worth—in the President's unprecedented and mindless requests for weapons increases.

But I must say that the most thoughtful and useful pages in the entire committee report were the dissent of our colleague, a member and subcommittee chairman of the committee, RON DELLUMS.

For the benefit of the many readers of the RECORD, I would like to include Congressman DELLUMS' dissent in the RECORD at this point:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

I voted against the fiscal year 1985 defense authorization bill reported by the Armed Services Committee because I do not believe it addresses our real national security needs. If increased spending is necessary to ensure national security, then sufficient money should be provided; but we must analyze what are our true objectives. I strongly disagree with the committee view as to what is necessary for national security.

The national security role of the United States should be to exert international leadership to bring the world closer to peace. Military tensions must be eased, detente must be revived, and the threat of nuclear war must be reduced.

I would restructure our defense budget along these major themes: (1) to lessen the threat of nuclear war through support for a nuclear freeze and for arms control initiatives leading to major weapons reductions; (2) a non-interventionist conventional (nonnuclear) national security policy; (3) a reduced U.S. military role in Europe and East Asia, (4) a redirection of procurement policies to reduce waste, fraud, abuse, and massive cost overruns; and (5) a stronger national security through a policy of conversion to an economy which is less dependent on military spending.

Implementation of these themes would result in substantial savings sufficient both to reduce significantly the unprecedented budget deficits and to make resources available for selective increases in social spending.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL AND REAL GROWTH

National defense is not some abstract number to be auctioned up or down. Unfortunately, last year's debate was such an auction: 10 percent real growth (the President); 6 percent real growth (the House Armed Services Committee); 4 percent (the House); and 5 percent (the compromise). This year the auction continues: the President re-

questing a 12.5 percent real increase (19 percent in current dollars), the House Armed Services Committee using a 6 percent figure, and the House Budget Committee proposing 3.5 percent real growth. What is the meaning of this real growth?

A zero percent real increase means complete acceptance of the extraordinary military budget approved last year. A zero percent real increase means that the policy embodied in the fiscal year 1985 budget should be essentially identical to that of fiscal year 1984.

To give these numbers some life: the difference between zero real growth (that is, last year's complete budget in this year's prices) and the President's request, is about $35 billion. With that amount of money, the country could find a 50 percent increase in all food programs (eg., food stamps, women, infants and children (WIC), a 50 percent increase in aid-to-families-with-dependent-children (AFDC), a 50 percent increase in Medicaid, a 50 percent increase in supplemental security income payments, fully fund the International Development Bank/World Bank program for the poorest countries, create a quarter of a million new jobs, and still have $1 billion left over for petty cash.

DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR PROPOSALS

My proposal includes the following principal changes from that of the bill as reported by the committee.

(1) To lessen the threat of nuclear war

We must insist on aggressive arms control initiatives and negotiations. The proposal contemplates a nuclear freeze, followed by major arms reductions.

The alternative proposal would eliminate procurement and research and development for destabilizing weapons systems (the M-X, the Trident II, Pershing II and Cruise missiles). These are weapons which are a threat to, rather than an enhancement of, our national security. While we may have to reluctantly accept some existing nuclear weaponry as necessary to deter nuclear war, we must reject the current nuclear buildup whose purpose is to arm the U.S. to fight, win and survive a nuclear war. The present U.S. nuclear arsenal (10,000 strategic 15,000 tactical warheads) is more than sufficient for any "deterrent" objective. Funding for the expensive and unnecessary B-1 bomber program is also eliminated.

In addition, funding is eliminated for the Department of Defense's misguided Star Wars proposals. The defensive capability of this strategic defense system is illusory; it will only lead to a false sense of security; and it will seriously distort the allocation of both human and financial resources. By funding the initial research and development for this program we will be committing the American taxpayer to pay for a program without having any estimate of the ultimate cost.

(2) To bring about a noninterventionist convention (nonnuclear) policy

We must insist that the proper U.S. defense policy is to defend U.S. security interests; not to intervene militarily in and against Third World countries around the world.

The committee seeks to increase the number of aircraft carrier battle groups from the present 13 to 15. The principal purpose of such battle groups, however, is to intervene against Third World countries. These battle groups would serve little purpose in any confrontation with the Soviet Union; devoting such an extensive part of our Naval budget to these expensive and useless forces is inappropriate. I would initially maintain the current level of 13 battle groups with phased reductions to 10 groups over the next five years. Significant cuts are made in the procurement of battle group escort and support ships (where the bulk of the task force spending occurs) and in the reduced carrier air wings.

I also reject the build-up of the Rapid Deployment Force and eliminate all funds for this program. The only role of the Rapid Deployment Force, now called the U.S. Central Command, is to promote an interventionist U.S. policy against small countries and to "protect" the oil fields of the Middle East and Southwest Asia. We have the Marines; the role of the Marines is to be a RDF, but even this role should be limited, and not increased.

(3) To reduce the number of troops stationed in and for Europe and Asia

Many of those proposing nuclear constraint advocate an expansion of our ground forces in Europe. This idea should be rejected on two grounds: it would vastly increase military spending, thereby escalating the deficit and reducing social spending; moreover, it makes no sense in terms of our national defense.

Approximately, some 35-45 percent of the military budget currently is predicated on the United States fighting a prolonged land war in Europe. The possibility of the United States again fighting a major land war there is unlikely. Given that there is no such thing as a truly "conventional" force, and that all United States and Soviet forces are now nuclear-equipped, most analysts believe that there would be a virtually automatic escalation to nuclear exchanges; first "tactical" (Hiroshima scale) levels, then world-threatening "strategic" levels. Even making the incredible assumption that a war involving the Soviet Union, Europe, and the United States might avoid a nuclear confrontation, an extended European land war would still require a general mobilization. There is no need to maintain such a large standing Army to protect our national security interests. I propose reducing the number of Army divisions from 16 to 13 by fiscal year 1988.

(4) To seriously redirect procurement policies to reduce waste, abuse, and massive cost overruns

Cuts are made in various weapon systems which are redundant, ordered in larger than necessary quantities, having serious cost overruns, or simply too expensive for their military purpose. The recent publicity surrounding the Department of Defense's purchase of various dime-store hardware items for thousands of dollars per item are only recent examples of this outrageous practice.

(5) To move toward funding a major "conversion" employment program ($45 billion over the next five years)

The burden of a decision to eliminate or reduce certain weapon systems should be a national one and not concentrated in those cities and towns where those particular systems are produced. Thus, monies are included for approximately 300,000 jobs for fiscal year 1985 in areas where workers on military programs are displaced as a result of weapon systems cuts.

Even these proposed cuts are constrained by the nature of the present Defense debate. The bulk of monies authorized in the last few budget years for military weapons and hardware is only now being disbursed. For example, it is interesting to note that even if all new procurement were cut this year, the fiscal year 1985 spending for procurement would only be reduced by $13 billion.

This is because the focus of concern in the Congress with regard to the massive military spending program is its impact on the deficit. Since outlays, not budget authority, affect the current year budget deficit, the reduction of current year outlays takes congressional precedence. Since procurement outlays take place over 5-7 years, cutting procurement provides few outlay reductions and the pressure to cut procurement lessens. Given this, the Congress then makes its reductions in precisely those accounts where spending should be the highest: readiness, personnel and military construction. Yet, in subsequent years, procurement comes back to haunt the budget process and the operational readiness of our forces is lessened, despite the massive increases in spending.

In sum, what is needed is a policy based on the defense of United States interests, not an arming for nuclear war or for intervention around the world. Such a policy would allow greatly reduced levels of military spending, would create fewer distortions in the economy at large, and would significantly enhance the prospects for peace and real arms reductions.●

HOLOCAUST

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the attempted extermination of the Jewish people by Nazi Germany some 40 years ago still raises certain questions about the essence of human nature. How could any member of the human race inflict the sort of pain and torture as was experienced by the Jews in the 1940's? How could others, not directly involved in the murders, stand by and condone such activity? Last, during this commemoration of the Days of Remembrance for the Victims of the Holocaust, we must ask ourselves whether such a barbaric act could reoccur in today's modern and sophisticated world? Even after years of discussion and documentation, the answer is still unfortunately yes.

It is not my intent to send shock or fear through the minds of those reading this statement. However, atrocities against mankind have occurred throughout history, the Jews not being the only target. Such acts continually transpire over time because the world community cannot remember its mistakes. Prof. Elie Wiesel has often said that a world unable to remember its mistakes is destined to repeat those same errors. Thus, an extremely dangerous seed is planted by those who advocate that the Holocaust was an exaggeration of the Jewish mind.

The work of Professor Wiesel and the Holocaust Council is especially im-

portant because they make us pause from our everyday routine to remember. The slaughter of 6 million identities is a thought many of us have difficulty comprehending. Yet if we do not take the time to understand, to fathom what actually took place, each one of us is at fault. Collectively, we must work to insure that those who have forgotten the agony suffered by so many Jewish families remember what took place in the concentration camps of Germany. It is only in this sense that such an unthinkable act against humanity can be prevented from occurring in the future.●

GET SERIOUS ABOUT POPULATION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently ran an editorial on the importance of international population assistance and family planning. I believe that this article is particularly important, and I would like to commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

GET SERIOUS ABOUT POPULATION

Family planning isn't murder. But that's not obvious to American right-to-lifers who contend that efforts to defuse the population bomb in poor countries support forced abortions in China. On this tangential ground, they would wreck a promising aid program that actually strengthens families. That is morality going haywire.

Over 20 years the United States has spent about $2 billion to help poorer countries lower the fertility rate that threatens in 16 years to increase the world's population of 4.5 billion by a third. Such birth rates destroy economic growth and threaten social stability.

In these circumstances, less is more. The crucial corollary of birth control is improved infant care; smaller families tend to be healthier and stronger. American aid has contributed significantly to this sensible end, in places like Mexico, Thailand, South Korea, Jamaica, Sri Lanka and Indonesia, and through the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. By law, not a penny can be spent on forced sterilizations or abortions.

When first begun, the effort was attacked by Moscow as an imperialist plot to sap the strength of poor societies. Now that argument has been adopted by the Moral Majority and its allies, led in Congress by Senator Helms. They detect an "anti-growth philosophy" and urge delays and conditions before Congress votes the next $265 million.

The campaign's emotional kicker is the charge that a contribution of $38 million to the U.N. fund pays for forced abortions in China, a practice deplored in a recent book by Steven Mosher. China denies his assertions and the facts are in dispute, but there's no dispute about the U.N. fund's policy. Rafael Salas, its executive director, insists it has never funded abortions anywhere.

But that is waved away on the ground that money for China's population program indirectly supports abortion. And so it may. By the same token, aid to any U.N. agency indirectly serves some alien purpose. By this absurd measure, there's no program that does not threaten some American's sensibility.●

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO ALBERT J. EYRAUD, JR.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 11 the many friends of Albert J. Eyraud, Jr., will gather in Los Angeles at the Jonathan Club to honor him in conjunction with the California Trucking Association's First Golden Eagle Award Dinner.

Al Eyraud, a third generation Californian, is a graduate of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). In 1934, he joined Asbury Transportation Co. and later was to serve in virtually all its departments. Today, Al is president and principal stockholder of Asbury System; Asbury Transportation Co.; Asbury Contractors, Inc.; and Asbury Freight Lines. Under Al's leadership and keen business sense, the Asbury name is well-known and respected throughout the Western half of the United States.

Over the years, Al has furthered the advancement of the transportation industry through his affiliation in numerous civic and business organizations. These include: Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority; Southern California Rapid Transit District; Motor Truck Association of Southern California; Western Highway Institute; American Trucking Association; Western Motor Tariff Bureau; Drivers' Safety Center; and Transport Clearings of Los Angeles.

I personally believe that Al's proudest accomplishment was the merger of the Motor Truck Association of Southern California with the Truck Owners' Association of California, which had represented carriers in norther California, into the present California Trucking Association (CTA). Al served as president of the CTA in 1977 and chairman of the board in 1978. Today, it is the largest and most prestigious trucking association in the country.

It is also important to note that Al has generously devoted much of his time to charitable activities and civic organizations. These include: Boys' Club of Hollywood; Boys' Club of Wilmington; American Cancer Society; Los Angeles County Heart Association; Arthritis and Rheumatism Association; and the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. He has also been extensively involved with the University of Southern California; Pepperdine University; Los Angeles County Museum of Art; and the Los Angeles County Museum.

Mr. Speaker, Al Eyraud is an exceptional American. He has always worked in making the community a better place to live and work. We are all grateful for all he has done and confident that he will continue these efforts in the years ahead.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Al on this special occasion and we wish him and his lovely wife, Sherry, and their four sons, Frank, Stephen, A. J. Eyraud III, and Barron the best in all their future endeavors.●

IN SUPPORT OF THE RULE ON THE FEDERAL RECLAMATION HYDROELECTRIC POWERPLANTS AUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act. It is extremely important that this bill be brought to the floor, and passed.

The bill would authorize construction of powerplants at seven existing dams. I beleive that constructing powerplants at existing facilities is a cost effective and environmentally sound approach to energy development.

The bill would also legislate a solution to a long standing controversy over the allocation of power from Hoover Dam. The parties were in court over this issue but have decided that negotiation is preferable to litigation. I, for one, do not want to see this controversy back in the courts for two reasons.

First, litigation is extremely expensive to all involved including the Federal Government. This means that the taxpayer will bear the ultimate burden if we fail to pass this rule, and eventually the bill itself. Second, the Hoover contracts expire in 1987. We have an opportunity now to insure a firm energy supply to the people in Arizona, California, and Nevada. If we fail to act, and the controversy is not resolved, these States would experience extreme economic hardship.

There has been talk of amendments to the bill. Though I think the issues should be debated, and supported this rule that provides for debate, I do not support any amendment to the bill that has not been accepted by my chairman on the Interior Committee. These amendments would cripple the bill and would have much more wide-ranging effect than just the projects in this bill. I hope that all Members

will keep this in mind when we begin consideration of the bill.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule so that we can move on to consideration of a very important piece of legislation.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, long-held commitments outside of Washington, D.C. prevented me from being able to vote on rollcalls 91 through 106 during the week of April 23. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 91, passage of S. 373, to provide comprehensive national policy dealing with national needs and objectives in the Arctic, "yea."

Rollcall No. 92, quorum call.

Rollcall No. 93, an amendment to reduce certain authorizations for university advanced scientific computers, "no."

Rollcall No. 94, an amendment to reduce the authorizations by 3.9 percent across the board in National Science Foundation programs, "no."

Rollcall No. 95, passage of H.R. 4974, to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, "aye."

Rollcall No. 96, approval of the journal of the last day's proceedings, "yea."

Rollcall No. 97, agreeing to House Resolution 490, the rulemaking in order S. 2570, to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, "yea."

Rollcall No. 98, motion to recommit the bill S. 2570 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to extend its provisions until May 24, 1984 instead of until May 26, 1984, "no."

Rollcall No. 99, passage of S. 2570, a bill to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, "aye."

Rollcall No. 100, agreeing to House Resolution 481, the rulemaking in order H.R. 5172, the National Bureau of Standards authorization, "yea."

Rollcall No. 101, quorum call.

Rollcall No. 102, a substitute amendment to reduce funding for National Bureau of Standards programs by $2.4 million, "yea."

Rollcall No. 103, an amendment to reduce funding for National Bureau of Standards programs by $7.25 million, "no."

Rollcall No. 104, an amendment to reduce funding for National Bureau of Standards programs by $2.4 million, "yea."

Rollcall No. 105, an amendment to strike the metric evaluation provisions, "no."

Rollcall No. 106, motion that the Committee of the Whole rise, "aye."●

THE SOVIET VIEW OF CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be most important, as we move toward further authorizations and appropriations relative to the military and economic support of friendly nations in Latin America, and, in particular, Central America, that we give thought to just what our objectives are in the Western Hemisphere—what are we trying to accomplish, in the interest of true self-determination in the countries of the hemisphere, and in our own national interest.

It has been contended by some, including commentators in the news media, that we have no coherent policy in Central America. I submit that we do have such a policy, and that it is both logical and defensible.

The President has set forth the four basic goals of the United States in Central America:

We will support democracy, reform, and human freedom.

We will support economic development.

We will support the security of the region's threatened nations.

We will support dialog and negotiations.

I think we should look also at the goals of the Soviet Union in Central America as evidenced by their actions:

First, the Soviets seek to exploit the social, economic, political, and military situation in Central America and to expand the Cuban and Nicaraguan totalitarian footholds in the Americas.

Second, the Soviets seek an offensive strategic capability in the Caribbean aimed at United States use of the seas in times of crisis.

Third, the Soviets seek to promote turmoil in Central America to tie up American resources, permitting the Soviets a freer hand in other areas central to their global strategy.

The United States stands for a just peace in Central America, insuring self-determination for all the peoples of that region through fully democratic processes. The Soviet Union stands for totalitarian exploitation of the peoples of that region to advance its global hegemonic designs.

The first Soviet objective, expansion of its Cuban-Nicaraguan totalitarian footholds is well underway, as the Soviets pursue the objective through their Cuban and Nicaraguan proxies. The judgments of the House Intelligence Committee in May 1983 make this clear:

A major portion of the arms and other material sent by Cuba and other Communist countries to the Salvadoran insurgents transits Nicaragua with the permission and assistance of the Sandinistas.

The Salvadoran insurgents rely on the use of sites in Nicaragua, some of which are located in Managua itself, for communications, command-and-control, and for the logistics to conduct their financial, material, and propaganda activities.

The Sandinista leadership sanctions and directly facilitates all of the above functions.

Nicaragua provides a range of other support activities, including secure transit of insurgents to and from Cuba, and assistance to the insurgents in planning their activities in El Salvador.

These, remember, are the judgments of the House Intelligence Committee, where the majority party has numerical control. It is clear to all that the Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan axis is exporting totalitarian revolution by military force in Central America. Thus, the Soviets are well on their way toward achieving their first strategic objective.

The Soviets are also achieving their second objective, an offensive strategic interdiction capability in the Caribbean aimed at United States use of the seas in a crisis. The importance of the Caribbean to the security of the United States and its allies can hardly be overstated. As the President has said, two-thirds of U.S. foreign trade, including oil, passes through the Caribbean. In the event of a crisis in Europe, half of our supplies for NATO must pass through these waters. In the event of actual war in Europe or the Middle East, areas vital to U.S. interests, elements of the Pacific Fleet may need to transit the Panama Canal and the Caribbean to join the Atlantic and Mediterranean Fleets. The Panama Canal and the Caribbean combine as a throat of U.S. commerce and naval logistics which the Soviets would dearly love to choke.

The Soviets are off to a dangerously effective start in developing the capability to choke us in the Caribbean. Soviet military aircraft regularly visit bases in Cuba. A submarine base exists in Cuba capable of servicing Soviet submarines. The Soviets also have a combat brigade in Cuba. The Soviets have stepped up the scale of their naval exercises in the Caribbean, including one recent major exercise 75 miles off the coast of Louisiana in the Gulf of Mexico.

In addition, the Soviets have provided Cuba with substantial air and naval forces, which have engaged in inte-

grated large scale exercises with Soviet ships in the Caribbean. The Soviets are thus on the way to achieving their second objective in the Caribbean region, a strategic offensive interdiction capability directed at the United States.

The Soviets are not doing quite as well with their third objective of tying up American resources in Central America, permitting the Soviets a freer hand elsewhere. The administration has been quite careful to avoid playing into Soviet hands by committing the U.S. Armed Forces to combat in Central America. The President has instead given more limited, measured repsonses to the Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan efforts.

Instead of intervening with its Armed Forces, the United States is providing economic and military assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, the countries the Cubans and Sandinistas seek to subvert. The United States is also assisting the Nicaraguan resistance in efforts to hinder the ability of the Sandinistas to export totalitarian revolution by force in neighboring countries. In this measured manner, the United States is helping the embattled free peoples of Central America to help themselves.

Those in the Congress who seek to undermine these limited measures for assistance to El Salvador, other Central American nations, and the Nicaraguan resistance must understand that the alternatives to these limited measures may ultimately mean the use of the U.S. Armed Forces, at some future date, or acceptance of inevitable domination of Central America by the Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan axis. Such domination is, I am confident, not acceptable to the American people, since it would represent a grave threat to the security of the United States. Commitment of the U.S. Armed Forces to combat in Central America, however, is also unwise, as it contributes to achievement of the Soviet objective of tying down the United States in Central America so the Soviet Union can advance its interests in other regions, such as the Middle East and Central Europe. It is thus clear that the best response in the current situation is the measured one of continuing economic and military assistance to El Salvador, other embattled nations in the region, and the Nicaraguan resistance.

The administration's response to Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan activities in Central America will advance U.S. objectives and counter Soviet objectives with the least cost and risk of war. The administration deserves our bipartisan support for its Central American program.●

COMMEMORATING THE 14TH RECOGNITION OF ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, Armenian Martyrs' Day has been observed by this body for 14 years. This day is a time for reflection on the great suffering that was inflicted on the Armenian people during the genocide of 1915 to 1923, which drove most of the survivors into exile. The many contributions that Armenian-Americans have made to this country is further testimony to the strength of the Armenian people.

I would like to add my voice to the numerous voices of my colleagues who have spoken out in indignation, both at the grevious genocide of Armenians and the consistent denial of the Turkish Government that this incident ever occurred. Even as recently as last month, our own administration, not wanting to "muck up relations with the Turkish Government," expressed doubt that there is sufficient evidence to prove that the massacre happened.

In my mind, this is inexcusable. This refusal to face the facts of history not only prevents atonement for such terrible actions, but also stands in the way of learning from history. In order to prevent the recurrence of such genocide, including that of the Jews in World War II, we must recognize and study these incidents. Only by facing head-on the consequences of man's inhumanity to man can we attempt to move beyond such gross atrocities.

Recent events have proven that we cannot afford to forget either the victims or the causes of this genocide. Not only must we continually reaffirm historical fact to prevent denial of the past, but we must also force attention to the results of human excess and hatred. We cannot afford to lull ourselves into believing that we are now not capable of such genocide. But rather we must hold up before all nations historical proof of what one nation has done to another. Only through this constant reminder can we hope to prevent a recurrence of the Armenian tragedy somewhere else in the world.●

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF AZA OF B'NAI B'RITH

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a widely known and esteemed American Jewish institution, B'nai B'rith. This year, B'nai B'rith, the first international service organization, is celebrating its 140th anniversary. This year also marks the 60th anniversary of the Aleph Zadik Aleph (AZA) youth fraternity of B'nai B'rith.

For the past 60 years, AZA has contributed to the lives of over 300,000 men making them richer in mind and body. As the oldest and largest youth organization in the United States. AZA is proud to boast that its alumni are active leaders of their communities: politicians, doctors, and lawyers. AZA was founded in the Midwest and, even today, it is still recognized as a grassroots organization committed to youth in America.

Through AZA's fivefold program—social, athletic, community service, educational and cultural, and religious—high school age Jewish youth learn the true meaning of Aleph Zadik Aleph: brotherly love, benevolence, and harmony. AZA provides young men with an opportunity to participate and develop their own programs. A democratic functioning organization, AZA selects its own officers, plans an agenda, and carries out its own activities.

The youth leadership training program is AZA's major accomplishment. In leadership training camp, AZA trains young men and women how to become prime movers in society. They learn how to motivate and work with others. The training program reinforces AZA's fivefold program, and the students gain an insight into their self-worth as they become well-rounded individuals.

The religious part of the AZA program is important but not dogmatic. Jewish youth are united together by their Judaism, however, they transcend this common bond to become better human beings. These young men choose their Jewish identity through experience and knowledge. AZA provides them with the groundwork for them to understand Judaism, but each individual must come to terms and decide for himself how he will identify and live his life as a Jew.

On May 5, the Florida Association of B'nai B'rith is holding their annual convention on Miami Beach. Local B'nai B'rith chapters nationwide are honoring AZA at their opening ceremonies and will focus on the theme of youth during their respective conventions. On May 3, 1984, a balloon launch is taking place at 3 p.m. in celebration of AZA's anniversary. Over 100 communities throughout the United States and Canada are participating in this symbolic act of unity. Each balloon will have a card attached to it, and B'nai B'rith has asked that if the balloon is found, to please fill out the card and mail it to them.

I strongly feel that programs such as AZA of B'nai B'rith are very important in the character building and molding of our children. My son Grant is an active member of AZA Brandeis Chapter. B'nai B'rith is devoted to youth education, and inspirational programing in pursuit of developing mature young adults to inherit our Earth. I express my gratitude to B'nai B'rith for supporting the strengthening of our youth and for imbuing in them the values that will allow them to function as Americans and as Jews in our society.●

A TRIBUTE TO LT. COMDR. RICHARD SCHNEIDER

HON. THOMAS R. CARPER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the outstanding achievements of Lt. Comdr. Richard Schneider, of Delaware. Lieutenant Commander Schneider was selected by the Board of the Reserve Officers Association as the first annual recipient of the Outstanding Coast Guard Reserve Junior Officer Award of 1983.

Lieutenant Commander Schneider graduated from the Coast Guard Academy in 1968 and then, served on active duty for 7½ years. While on active duty, Lieutenant Commander Schneider earned the Coast Guard Achievement Medal as well as the Naval Commendation Medal. As a reserve officer, Lieutenant Commander Schneider earned the U.S. Coast Guard Unit Commendation Medal and recognition from the Delaware Legislature as the Commanding Officer of the Coast Guard Reserve Unit Station—Indian River, Rehoboth Bay, Del.

Presently, Lieutenant Commander Schneider serves as the executive director of the College of Marine Studies at the University of Delaware, which also includes management of the Marine Studies Complex at Lewes. His civic involvement includes serving as choirmaster at Faith Baptist Church in Wilmington, DE, as well as being a member of the Boy Scout's Eagle Review Board.

I ask you to join with me and the residents of Delaware in commending Lieutenant Commander Schneider for his ongoing public dedication and outstanding performance as a Coast Guard Reserve Officer. As an officer and a citizen, Lieutenant Commander Schneider has set a high standard for dedication and service for Delaware and the country.●

DALTON CHESS TEAM PLACES SECOND IN NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievement of the Dalton School chess team, representing the Dalton School—a private school within the district I represent. In the recent national primary school chess championship tournament, held in Syracuse, NY, the Dalton team missed winning first place by only half a point.

This in itself is an extraordinary victory, and is made especially worthy of our attention by the fact that the Dalton chess team has been playing for only 6 months; this year's participation in the national tournament is the team's first.

Under the direction of Coach Svetozar Jovanovic, 8 of the 10 students who competed placed in the top 40 of all those who played. I think the names and rankings of those who played are worthy of mention: Naomi Spiro (3), Josh Powe (18), Mickey Silvers (20), Spencer Rosscoff (21), David Arnett (24), Morgan Pehme (31), J. P. Lall (32), and Paul Kaplan (40); Giorgio Handman and Gordiana Spiro also participated in these games.

In this Chamber, where our debates are often long and dry, and where our moves rarely appear as elegant and deliberate as those moves made by a chess player, it is a pleasure for me to devote these few minutes to the victories of those on the Dalton chess team.●

A SALUTE TO THE SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, next month, the senior companion program will celebrate its 10th anniversary nationwide. As we know, this initiative is the newest of ACTION's Older American volunteer programs and its operation has certainly brightened and strengthened many communities. As we also know, the senior companion program provides meaningful opportunities for low-income elderly citizens to interact with their peers who have special needs. Additonally, the program provides a small stipend, which is particularly helpful to our elderly since they must bear the pressure of a fixed income in the face of rising costs of living.

As a Representative from the State of Maryland, I want to offer a special commendation for the Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee which administers the Senior Companion program. This committee operates in St. Mary's, Calvert, and Charles Counties. It is so reassuring to point to this operation and know that it is being run efficently, and with a genuine dedication to maximum service delivery.

It is important to note that this type of program goes far beyond the provision of routine companionship and services. The emotional security derived from this type of contact is imperative to our elderly; their usefulness is prioritized and their value to our society is clearly demonstrated. All too often, we quickly assume that our elderly cannot help themselves or each other. The Tri-County Community Action Committee rejects this notion and we are all beneficiaries of their continued dedication.

Let me again congratulate the committee on this glorious occassion and stress that their efforts serve as a shining example of what can be accomplished through courage, hard work, caring, good management, and a true dedication to the community.●

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO ALLOW STATES TO EXEMPT SEGMENTS OF THEIR HIGHWAYS TO LONGER, WIDER TRUCKS

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced H.R. 2530, a bill to allow States to seek exemptions for segments of the Interstate Highway System that they believe cannot safely accommodate the longer, wider trucks now permitted to operate nationwide.

When the bill was first introduced, there were many people who did not know that a number of Interstate segments, especially in the Northeast, are woefully inadequate by today's design and safety standards. We have made a lot of progress in the past year in making people more aware of the problem, and the approach embodied in my bill has been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the American Automobile Association (AAA), and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

The biggest change has been the Reagan administration's recent decision to support this essential safety legislation. Testifying before the Senate Commerce Committee on S. 2217, the Senate version of my bill, DOT Deputy Assistant Secretary

Philip Haseltine said, "* * * legislation such as S. 2217 would make our job easier."

In his testimony, Assistant Secretary Haseltine also made several suggestions that would, in my judgment, improve the legislation. Accordingly, today I am introducing, along with 15 of my colleagues, a revised version of the bill, entitled the Truck Safety Act of 1984, that incorporates a number of suggestions made by the administration.

The principal changes are:

Permitting the DOT Secretary to authorize exemptions on her own initiative, should the need arise. (H.R. 2530 required that a Governor initiate the exemption process.)

Authorizing exemptions of interstate segments from the width requirements in section 416 of the STAA (H.R. 2530 dealt only with safety problems related to truck length).

Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation represents a reasonable and responsible approach. It does not challenge the new Federal truck size and weight standard. It does not return regulatory authority to the States. It does not provide for the granting of blanket exemptions. It does not impede interstate commerce.

What it does is recognize what we all know to be true—that there is tremendous variation among segments on the Interstate System with respect to their age, design features, and traffic volume. When the local transportation officials—the ones who are on the scene and who are responsible for the highway network—when they feel that an interstate segment may be unsafe for larger trucks, I believe we should provide a mechanism for carefully reviewing their concerns. We have done this for the Federal-aid primary system; we should do no less for the Interstate System.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 26, I was absent and consequently missed consideration of S. 2570 and H.R. 5172. Here is how I would have voted had I been present for the following recorded votes:

Rollcall No. 99, "yes."
Rollcall No. 100, "yes."
Rollcall No. 102, "yes."
Rollcall No. 103, "no."
Rollcall No. 104, "no."
Rollcall No. 105, "yes."
Rollcall No. 106, "yes."●

IN HONOR OF THE MONTEBELLO WOMEN'S CLUB 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1984, the Montebello Women's Club celebrated their 75th anniversary of their first meeting of May 6, 1909. This was the first civic club organized in the city of Montebello.

The Montebello Women's Club has always played an active role in community affairs. They are political, but nonpartisan. Through their local, State, and national affiliation they are kept well informed of the legislation that would affect women, children, and our Nation's well-being. They have taken an active part in child welfare issues such as child pornography and child labor laws.

The first library in Montebello was established by the Montebello Women's Club. They furnished the location and staffed it until the county assumed responsibility.

To celebrate our Nation's Bicentennial, they raised the funds to purchase and install an electronic flagpole in Acuna Park through community projects.

This fine group has many other accomplishments to boast of. They are responsible for the placement of the Memorial gunsite on Bluff and Washington which commemorated the final skirmish between California and Mexico. For 25 years they have run the well-baby clinic in Montebello, which they initially established. We can thank them for many of the lovely trees planted in the city park. Each month they provide food, gifts, and entertainment for the veterans at Sawtelle.

They have been instrumental in furthering the education of Montebello youth by providing scholarships, sponsoring speech contests, music students, and arts and crafts shows.

The Montebello Women's Club is a cultural as well as civic club. They provide speakers to their members on a wide variety of topics. The club's garden section enjoys studying and planting. Members participate in the annual district sewing contest and enter their art work in the district art show.

The Montebello Women's Club has a long, distinguished history of which they can be very proud. I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending past and present members of the Montebello Women's Club for their 75 years of dedicated service to their community.●

OUTSTANDING JOURNALISTS

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to the outstanding achievements of the Beall High School yearbook staff in Cumberland, Md., and their adviser, Mrs. Ellen Arnone. The Mountaineer was one of nine high school yearbooks to receive the prestigious Gold Crown Award of the Columbia Scholastic Press Association, while Mrs. Arnone was one of 13 teachers nationwide to receive the "Certificate of Merit" for "continuous and devoted service as an adviser to student publications."

The Gold Crown award is the highest honor given to a student publication by the CSPA, an organization founded in 1924 by Columbia University. It represents the top 1 percent of the 2,776 publications evaluated by the CSPA in 1983.

Mrs. Ellen Arnone has taught in Allegany County for 18 years, and is a member of several journalism organizations. She is a fine example of a dedicated teacher who gives her students the benefit of years of experience.

Our educational system has come in for substantial criticism recently. While seeking to improve, we should also encourage excellence. The Mountaineer staff and Mrs. Ellen Arnone have achieved it, and I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating them.●

DR. ARMENTA D. THORNTON—45 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to one of the truly outstanding citizens of my congressional district, Dr. Armenta D. Thornton. Recently, Congressman HAWKINS and I had the privilege of joining a multitude of Dr. Thornton's friends to pay tribute to her for 45 years of service to her church and her community. Now I want to make my colleagues aware of the many contributions this much loved and much respected woman has made.

Born in Topeka, Kans., in 1913, she made the Los Angeles area her home in 1938. In our area she has been a member of the Mount Zion Baptist Church, the Israel Baptist Church, and is presently a member of the Citizens of Zion Baptist Church. Her skill-

ful touch has benefited all levels of activity in the church. She has given Bible instructions through numerous auxiliaries. She has been State president of the Baptist Training Union. She has been an instructor at Reed Christian College and Providence Theological Seminary. And she has lectured widely at the local, district, State, and national levels.

In addition to being a magnificent teacher of Christian theology, she is a musician of considerable merit. She has organized many choirs, served as choir director, pianist, organist and has coordinated statewide choir workshops. At Citizens of Zion Church she has been assistant minister of music. It is one thing to direct or play music. It is quite another to compose. Dr. Thornton is renowned for the operettas she has composed for the B. T. Newman choir.

Her leadership skills have been long recognized, and the trust of her colleagues is reflected in the number of responsible posts she has held. She organized the mission department of her church and has been mission president. She has been chairwoman of deaconesses as well as superintendent of Sunday school. She is now a member of the Ladies of Grace Deaconess Board, assistant minister of music, and a member of the senior choir.

Her respect for Christian as well as secular education has been an inspiration to others. In addition to her Christian teaching, she has for 20 years been a teacher at 92d Street School. She holds six degrees, including the doctorate and has studied at three colleges. For a woman as active and civic minded as Dr. Armenta Thornton, church work and teaching have not been enough. She has also been deeply involved in local community work through her membership in civic groups and societies. She is a member of Eastern Star, Senior Citizens, and is a Toastmistress. I expect, however, that Dr. Thornton would count as her greatest joy and her greatest accomplishment the fact that she is an outstanding mother. Her regard for the high calling of motherhood is reflected in her membership on the mother's board of citizens of Zion Baptist Church.

In a time when our sense of values and our dedication to others is tried daily, Dr. Thornton has stood as a beacon to all of us. For 45 years she has given of herself to better the station of others. We can only hope to emulate her example.●

THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE TRINITY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH IN PORT CLINTON, OH

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the members of the Trinity United Methodist Church in Port Clinton, OH, on the occasion of the sesquicentennial of the Port Clinton church and to honor the bicentennial of Methodism in the United States.

On December 24, 1784, 60 circuit-riding preachers were called together in Baltimore to consider John Wesley's Methodist plan for ordaining preachers. This historic conference gave birth to the first denomination to be organized in America. As the Methodist movement was in its infancy in America two other churches were being formed—the Church of the United Brethren and the Evangelical Association. These two churches were to be united with each in 1946 and with the Methodist Church in 1968 to form the United Methodist Church of the United States.

In 1833, 50 years after the celebrated conference in Baltimore, the Reverends Austin, Wilcox, and Allen came from Lower Sandusky, now the city of Fremont, and conducted meetings with such success that Port Clinton, which was founded 7 years earlier, became a regular preaching appointment for Methodism in northwestern Ohio.

The story of this Port Clinton church is the classic story of a group of dedicated people brought together by the work of the Lord and determined to create a living memorial in their work. It was a small beginning in Port Clinton as these circuit riders were sent to hold these meetings—they traveled on horseback through the wilderness. The circuit started in Fremont, and came to Port Clinton, Danbury, Marblehead Peninsula, and reached 7 miles up the Portage River embracing 22 different appointments. In 1838 there were 76 members, and the village of Port Clinton, had fewer than 60 homes.

Soon the number grew and it was realized that a new building was needed for the worshippers. In the early history of Ottawa County, OH, no man took a more prominent part or did more to mold and influence the work of his time than Henry T. Miller, the first class leader who helped organize the Methodist Society. As was the custom, the first class was formed in 1834, the year Port Clinton became a regular preaching point.

The first Methodist Church in Port Clinton was built in 1852. It was a wooden structure. Three ministers were initially paid a total salary of $485 in 1854. The new building only fueled this dedicated people's desire to grow.

The purchase price for the lots where the church and parsonage stood was $200 and the cost of the church was $1,500. Much of the labor was donated by the faithful members. The building was a single room without a basement and was heated by two wood stoves and lighted by kerosene.

In the meantime, the earlier years of the 19th century were marked by the spread of the Sunday school movement in America. By 1835 Sunday schools were encouraged in every place where they could be started and maintained. Methodists formed a Sunday School Union to promote the extension of these schools for the religious training of the young and move to guarantee suitable literature for them. Hence, the Sunday school became a principal source of prospective members for the Port Clinton church.

By 1888, the membership of the church had increased considerably and a new structure was needed. A new church, costing $12,000, was officially dedicated on November 19, 1890, which was raised and paid for in 6 years. Former President Rutherford B. Hayes, who lived in Fremont and whose wife, Lucy, was a staunch Methodist sent $1 explaining that he received many such requests and sent the single note only because he was a neighbor.

The ministry of the new church approached their jobs with the same vigor and zeal which has earned today's church its place of leadership. Groundbreaking on the current building was done in June 1964, and, construction continued until its dedication on September 26, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Trinity United Methodist Church is a story of growth and a story of people dedicated to furthering their beliefs. On May 20, 1984, the congregation of this marvelous church will celebrate its 150th anniversary. Many things have happened in the last 150 years since that first small group of Christians gathered to worship but the quality of the leadership of its members has never ceased being intertwined in the making of Port Clinton a better place in which to live.

In closing, it is my fervent hope that the Port Clinton Trinity Methodist Church and its dedicated servants of God will be blessed with continued success. Their dedication should be a beacon to be followed by all people desiring to carry forward the work of the Lord.●

DOUGLAS FILES' CONSTITUTION COMPOSITION

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a composition written by Douglas Files of Springboro, OH, entitled "My Role In Upholding Our Constitution." Mr. Files advocates Americans need to take a more responsible role regarding the duties of their citizenship. I believe that his essay illustrates the refreshing attitude of our young adults and warrants the consideration of all Americans.

The composition follows:

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

A long chain of cars was speeding on the interstate. Suddenly, a police car came into view with its siren blaring and its lights flashing. One man saw the policeman signal to him to pull over to the side of the road. He did so and when the officer came to his car window, the man protested. "Everyone else in that line of cars was going just as fast as I was; why did you pull me over?" "Well," replied the officer, "you were the only one who would stop."

This short anecdote illustrates the attitude of all too many Americans today. We, like the people who would not stop for the policeman, do not take enough responsibility toward the duties of citizenship. One of the best ways for us to uphold our Constitution is to take responsibility. This may be done in the school, in the church, or in the community. In my opinion, one of the best ways to fulfill your duties as a citizen is to vote. If you do not bother to vote, apathy is shown and this is a very bad trait for a person to possess. Worse, however, would be for this to occur throughout an entire nation. This is true because if it were to become too great on a national level, many things that might have been accomplished normally would not be with a large proportion of apathetic citizens.

I believe that it is a good idea to involve oneself in many activities and I have participated in school, church, and community organizations. Involvement in these ways shows a commitment to our Constitution through people sharing their individual talents. When I am an adult and parent I am sure I will join many organizations for children such as scouting and sports groups. These activities make me feel as if I have done my part to improve America by sharing my talents.

I very much appreciate the rights I have according to our Constitution although I am afraid many people take these rights for granted. Do you realize you can belong to any religion you wish and worship openly? Do you realize that if you are dissatisfied with something, even within the government, that you can criticize it? Do you realize that you can vote for the candidates for public office that you support, and that you can even campaign for them? Even if you are not old enough to vote, you can write to your Representative or Senator and express your opinion. I have done this on numerous occasions. These and many more rights belong to you and I, and we often take them for granted. This, I believe, is sad when you consider the men who sacrificed their lives so that we might have these freedoms. The very least we can do is acknowledge them.

I see two basic ways that I, as a citizen, can uphold our Constitution. I can fulfill what I feel are my responsibilities toward this nation through (1) keeping its laws and voting, and (2) sharing my individual talents with others, thus demonstrating my concern for the people of this country.

When the policeman stopped the man speeding on the interstate, the man protested, saying "Everyone else in that line of cars was going just as fast as I was; why did you stop me?" The officer replied, "Well, you were the only one who would stop." Instead of being irritated, the man should have felt as if he had done his duty. Obviously, the best answer would have been to not speed at all. However, if something of this nature does turn up I call upon you to be that one to stop, be that one to show responsibility, and be that one to care. Thank you.●

EXTENSION OF THE TARGETED JOBS TAX CREDIT

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 5094, which would extend the targeted jobs tax credit for 5 years, I am hopeful that my colleagues and the prospective conferees will carefully consider the merits of this legislation. While I also support the Senate proposal to extend the TJTC for 3 years, I believe the 5-year period gives employers the needed time and assurance that a tax law will be on the books. This will allow the employers to fully commit personnel to screen applicants for eligibility and commit people to jobs without fear of the program's termination.

The TJTC was enacted in 1978 to encourage employers to hire individuals with special employment needs. These general groups include vocational rehabilitation referrals, economically disadvantaged youth, economically disadvantaged Vietnam-era veterans, economically disadvantaged cooperative education students, SSI recipients, and other targeted groups.

I know that the TJTC has assisted many disadvantaged people in my State. The South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department considers the TJTC crucial as an incentive for employers to consider hiring the handicapped. They have made extensive use of the TJTC, and they believe that a longer extension time period would be beneficial. I believe that maximum efficiency has not been attained in this program, and that a longer extension will enable more disadvantaged people to find gainful employment.

Mr. Speaker, the TJTC will be utilized to employ more than 300,000 workers nationwide in fiscal year 1984. This is a significant number of employees, many who most likely would not be employed without this program. I urge my colleagues to consider the merits of this legislation and support a longer extension period.●

CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I, along with my colleagues Mr. REGULA of Ohio and Mr. FOWLER of Georgia, held a news conference to discuss our recent trip to Honduras, Panama, and Colombia. I include their news releases as part of the official RECORD of today's proceedings:

NEWS RELEASE OF RALPH REGULA

After having visited the country of Honduras and the Southern Command Post in Panama with my colleagues, Mr. Alexander and Mr. Fowler, it has become evident that a bipartisan approach to the conflicts in the area is advisable and possible.

The presence of U.S. military personnel in Honduras for training exercises has greatly improved the preparedness of U.S. troops. The humanitarian acts in which they are also involved reinforces the strong relationship being established between the United States and Honduras. In addition, the work of the Peace Corps has been very effective and is a valuable asset to improving conditions for the people of Honduras.

One disturbing fact which became apparent during the trip is the lack of a clearly defined U.S. policy in Central America. What are our goals and what steps are we taking to achieve them? We need to develop a clearly defined bipartisan policy which is complimentary to the Contadora negotiations already in progress. The presence of a diplomatic element equal to its military counterpart is needed if the United States expects a negotiated settlement.

I believe there are certain steps which can be taken in the area. We should continue our pressure on El Salvador in the area of human rights and land reform. The Caribbean Basin Initiative as well as elements of the Kissinger Commission recommendations should be supported. I would also like to see a policy developed which includes the participation of our allies. A stable Central America is also in their best interests. By assisting these countries with economic aid, our allies would be contributing to the effort.

I also strongly believe that U.S. military personnel should not be introduced into the region in a combat capacity. Any fighting that is occurring between countries or particular groups within those countries needs to be discouraged by diplomatic means. Their problems are regional and should be solved in that context. The U.S. can assist this process by developing a stable atmosphere in which to negotiate.

We are requesting a meeting with Secretary Schultz to discuss U.S. policy in the area. In this regard, I would also like to dispel the feeling that the U.S. Congress is the enemy of our administration's foreign policy. We need to work hand in hand in developing a coherent policy. If the initiative

is taken between the two branches, I firmly believe cooperation will be forthcoming from this body.

PRESS CONFERENCE REMARKS OF HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

At the outset, I would like to extend condolences to the President of Colombia, Belisario Betacur, and to the Colombian people over the assassination of the Colombian Minister of Justice Rodrigo Lara Bonilla on Monday evening. Our delegation had held talks with President Betacur earlier that very day at which Minister Lara Bonilla's stepped up war against the insidious drug trade had been a major topic. We told President Betacur, and we reaffirm today, that the United States government, on a bipartisan basis, stands strongly behind any and all effective measures for controlling the drug trafficking that poses a severe threat to the well-being of both of our societies.

Aside from the drug issue, our trip to Honduras, Panama and Colombia focused on the U.S. Military presence in Honduras, and the current status of the Contadora peace process. Briefly stated, we found that the United States is committed to an enhanced, if not permanent, military presence in Honduras. We also found that while our friends in Central America disagree over many things with regard to U.S. policy in the area, they agree with virtual unanimity that they are extremely unsure of the U.S. commitment to a negotiated settlement. Furthermore, they agreed that it would be helpful to the peace process if the U.S. had serious bilateral talks with Nicaragua with an eye toward resolving our differences with the two governments which we claim are the primary sources of the region's instability.

As constitutionally-sworn policy-makers our primary concern must be to preserve and protect the interests of the United States. Today we are at a critical juncture in our Central American policy. If we continue our present course, we run substantial risk of regional war—with or without direct U.S. combat participation. An alternative is the advancement of our national interests through the negotiation process. Negotiations may not give us everything we as a nation would prefer, but in my opinion the military options produce fewer benefits at a much higher cost.

As the foreign minister from one of our Central American allies said to us, the military option is not working for anyone. In the short time that we were in Central America we saw 14 year olds being trained in combat tactics. We heard requests for more military aid from countries whose standards of living are among the lowest in the Western Hemisphere. We received reports of military stalemate, arms build-ups, and increasing violence.

We did encounter a number of encouraging signs within the region of a willingness to peacefully resolve internal and external differences. Some of the Contadora foreign ministers expressed guarded optimism about the possibility of their producing a comprehensive and verifiable regional peace treaty. But we have heard such indications before, and they have always evaporated before a new military action.

Though the hour is late, and though in the past we have had serious differences with the Administration, it is not too late to commit our full support to the Contadora process and to re-examine the policy ramifications of our nation's present course in Central America.●

THE DAILY NEWS—A COMMUNITY INSTITUTION

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for the past century the Daily News of McKeesport has been the well of information for residents of at least 22 communities in southwest Pennsylvania.

The logotype at the top of each day's front page proudly proclaims "The News" to be "more than a newspaper—a community institution." And, so it is. Its readers long ago adopted the philosophy: "If it's not in The Daily News, it didn't happen."

Next month, however, the tables are to be turned on "The News." Public attention will be focused on the paper itself. A "Salute to the The Daily News," commemorating 100 years of publication, is being planned by the Mon-Yough Chamber of Commerce for May 16 in the Youghiogheny Country Club.

"The News" began building its reputation back in July 1884, when the first issue of four pages rolled off an old-style cylinder press. Its founders were Harry S. and Wesley B. Dravo. Three years later they sold the paper and, in 1891, the Daily News Publishing Co. was incorporated under J.L. Devenny and J. B. Shale. Ownership changed again in 1905, when the paper came under control of J. Denny O'Neil, E.W. Pitts, and George Altmeyer.

In 1925, the paper was purchased by State Senator William D. Mansfield, Dr. H.S. Arthur, Charles R. Shaw, and Will J. Cox. Senator Mansfield served as president and editor until his death in 1952, when his son, W.D. Mansfield, Jr., became the publisher and served in that capacity until his death in 1966.

Today, the Daily News is led by Thomas D. Mansfield as publisher and editor. It has continued to grow and is considered one of the most widely respected newspapers in Pennsylvania. Under his direction, the paper recently completed a computerized production system that culminated more than 5 years of research and planning. The expenditure of time, effort, and major capital investment is a strong testimonial to the company's devotion to its goal of presenting its readers with a superior publication.

Current Officers of the Daily News Publishing Co. are William J. Cox, president; Mary Hunter Mansfield, vice president; and M.A. Cancelliere, secretary treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Congress of the United States to join me today in extending official congratulations to the officers and employees of the Daily News upon reaching this milestone in the company's history. It is, indeed, more than a newspaper. It is, in truth, a community institution.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, the annual observance in this body of Armenian Martyr's Day is an important time for reflection on this century's repeated instances of the most vile human rights abuse imaginable—genocide. On April 24, 1915, the Turkish government arrested—and eventually executed—hundreds of leaders of the Armenian community in that country. Those executions marked the start of a campaign of extermination that would last 8 years and would claim the lives of 1½ million Armenians.

The horrible crime of 69 years ago remains important today. In this modern age, so far removed from the Turkey of 1915, the current Turkish Government continues to attempt to expunge the historical record. There was no genocide, we are told. It was just part of a civil war, we are told. There were atrocities committed on both sides, we are told.

We must not be deceived or lulled into accepting these distortions. We must resist the urge to say, in the interests of modern geopolitical considerations, that perhaps the events of 1915 to 1923 in Turkey were not as the historical record shows them in fact to have been.

The record must be kept intact, and must be protected against whitewash. The purpose of remembering is not to castigate any particular nation. We do not remember the Holocaust against the Jews because we wish to impute guilt to the German nation.

The reason we recall these horrors is that we wish to prevent them from reoccurring. The best chance the human race has of preventing future genocides is by facing the truth.

We have already seen the results of the failure to remember the truth. In 1939, as he prepared to begin his "Final Solution" against the Jewish people of Europe, Adolf Hitler said, "Who today speaks of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

The failure to remember the massacre of 1915 made it easier for Hitler to conduct his war against the Jews. The words of the philosopher Santayana state the chilling postscript to these most inhuman chapters in history: "Those who do not remember the mistakes of the past are condemned to repeat them."

We must not permit those mistakes to be repeated.●

A VOTE FOR HUMANITY

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, while the advent of spring reawakens us to the simple joys of life, there is one segment of our society for whom this is especially true. Yet it is a time for mixed emotions—reveling in life, but also somberly reflecting upon that part of human nature which inflicted a cruel and vile death upon victims of the Holocaust.

For survivors of the Holocaust, memories of the death camps never go away. The faces, the voices, the cries—the stench of death, never disappear.

Throughout the Days of Remembrance of the Holocaust it is essential for all of us to recall the sordid deeds of Nazism which has left its evil scar upon all humanity.

In this great democracy we have taken a large step in easing the pain of the victims and the survivors with the passage of H.R. 5100, which makes authorizations for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council. We have taken hold of a part of the responsibility which we all must share. We must remember, and therein pledge never again.

As members of the New York City Holocaust Memorial Commission have stated, the urgency for this type of institution is great, greater than ever.

The world has become too technologically advanced for selective annihilation. The victims of the next Holocaust are not likely to be only Jews—but everyone.●

A TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR TERENCE TODMAN

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, the people of the Virgin Islands commemorated the 67th anniversary of Transfer Day, that day in 1917 on which the United States of America formerly took ownership of the Virgin Islands from Denmark. To mark the anniversary this year, Virgin Islanders United paid tribute at a special testimonial dinner to the Honorable Terence A. Todman, the U.S. Ambassador to Denmark. That decision could not have been more appropriate and I highly commend Edward Phillips, the President of this new organization, and its membership for their decision.

For Ambassador Todman is a Virgin Islander, born on St. Thomas 9 years after that historic Transfer Day, 1917. He is the highest ranking Virgin Islander in the diplomatic corps, and indeed, the highest ranking black diplomat in the United States. That this native son of the U.S. Virgin Islands should now be the U.S. Ambassador to Denmark is a historical full circle, and speaks volumes of our achievements as Virgin Islanders and as citizens of the United States.

Ambassador Todman is a career diplomat of the highest caliber. He began his diplomatic career in 1952 in the State Department's Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs as Desk Officer for India, Ceylon, and Nepal. He was then assigned to the Trusteeship Branch on the Bureau of International Organization Affairs and served as the U.S. Representative on the Petitions and Rural Economic Development Committees of the U.N. Trusteeship Council. This was followed by assignments as Political Officer in New Delhi, Tunis, and as Deputy Chief of Mission in Togo, and then a return to Washington as Country Director for Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and the Seychelles.

He served as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and was Ambassador to Chad from 1969 to 1972, to Guinea from 1972 to 1975 and to Costa Rica from 1975 to 1977.

In July of 1978 be became Ambassador to Spain, and performed so admirably and ably in that office, particularly in his negotiations on the defense treaty with Spain, that he was asked to stay in his post in 1981. That his special abilities and professionalism were recognized by President Reagan in retaining Ambassador Todman at his post until the treaty negotiations were completed is a credit to this administration. But that Ambassador Todman received from Spain one of its highest awards, the Grand Cross of the Highest Order of Isabela la Catolica, in 1983 in recognition of his service, and yet received no special recognition from our Government is indeed a disappointment.

I would urge that the President give every consideration to singling out the achievements of Ambassador Todman. For his career is a tribute to what America stands for, to the very best of our democratic way of life. He is a credit to the people of the United States, to the Department of State, and especially to the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands. We in the U.S. Virgin Islands are rightly proud of Terence Todman and we would hope that we could join with our fellow Americans in paying tribute to this outstanding man through a national honor that he so well deserves. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues support me in asking the President to consider this request.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 3, 1984, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 4

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on S. 2414, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for military procurement programs of the Department of Defense, focusing on the Navy nuclear propulsion program, and in open session on civil defense programs.
SR-222

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for April.
SD-106

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 2494, to clarify and revise certain provisions of the impact aid program (Public Law 81-874).
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the low-energy assistance block grant program.
SD-562

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124

31-059 O-87-25 (Pt. 8)

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Department of Justice.
SD-226

3:00 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2573, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for developmental disability programs.
SR-428A

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-253

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on pornography issues.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant workers' union (HEREIU).
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, including title X (family planning), and title XX (Adolescent Family Life Act), proposed legislation authorizing funds for the head start program, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act.
SD-430

Small Business
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-428A

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.
SD-138

Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, to markup proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the revised constitution of American Samoa.
SD-366

MAY 9

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Rosemary M. Collyer, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.
SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the environmental restoration program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold hearings on penalties involving the transportation of hazardous materials.
SD-342

Judiciary
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 233, to grant the President's Commission on Organized Crime subpena power to require attendance and testimony of witnesses before the Commission or to require the production of information relating to a matter under investigation.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up a committee resolution to authorize certain construction projects of the Veterans' Administration contained in the Administration's budget for fiscal year 1985.
SR-418

1:30 p.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2614, to authorize funds for programs of the Indian Financing Act, S. 2619, to authorize funds for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the Indian Education Act; to be followed by a business meeting, to mark up S. 1735, to provide a settlement of a conflict between the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe and owners of private property within the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation, S. 1999, to provide for the statutory designation of the position of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs and to eliminate the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and S. 2166, to authorize funds through fiscal year 1988 for Indian health care programs.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1935, proposed Cigarette Safety Study Act.
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-124

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 and the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar besiness.
SD-406

10:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the impact of drugs on crime.
SD-430

MAY 14

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act (Public Law 95-190), with respect to public water supply systems and standards, and underground injection.
SD-406

MAY 15

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the joint weapons program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on child sexual abuse issues.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on title IX of the Higher Education Act relating to educational equity.
SD-430

MAY 16

10:00 a.m.
*Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1913, S. 1994, S. 2545, and S. 2599, bills to authorize funds for and to reform certain child nutrition programs.
SD-328A

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposals to extend and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund).
SD-406

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for space programs of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the nomination of Jacqueline E. Schafer, of New York, to be a member of the Council on Environmental Quality.
SD-406

MAY 18

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1069, H.R. 555, and S. 817, bills to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve the inclusion in the rate base of a public utility of the costs of construction work in progress.
SD-366

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact to certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2157, to clarify the treatment of mineral materials on public lands.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on alleged corruption by officials of the Boilermaker's Union.
SD-430

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 10, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women and men.
SD-562

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

11:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1405, proposed Federal Neutrality Act of 1983.
SD-226

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on cost estimating and cost accounting in the Department of Defense weapons program.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for defense programs.
SD-192

JUNE 5

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review the transfer of information by the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration to other Federal and State government agencies and the examination of the collection of data by the Internal Revenue Service from private sector sources to identify cases of nonfiling or underreporting of income.
SD-342

Small Business
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of Government competition on small business.
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Inspector General and Medical Inspector of the Veterans Administration.
SR-418

JUNE 7

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 138, to establish a National Commission on Teacher Education.
SD-430

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of drugs on women.
SR-325

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review the sharing agreement between the Veterans Administration and the Department of Defense, and to discuss the Veterans Administration's supply and procurement policy.
SR-418

JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation relating to veterans' compensation.
SR-418

JUNE 26

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the status of college athletic programs.
SD-430

SEPTEMBER 18

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.
SR-325

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 3

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the Public Buildings Services, General Service Administration.
SD-406

SENATE—*Thursday, May 3, 1984*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 30, 1984)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable DAN QUAYLE, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

Mr. QUAYLE. The prayer this morning will be delivered by Dr. Elton Trueblood, president of the Yokefellow International of Richmond, Ind. He is sponsored by Senator LUGAR and Senator EAST.

PRAYER

Dr. D. Elton Trueblood, president and founder of Yokefellow International, Richmond, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Bow your heads reverently in prayer.

O Thou who hast brought our beloved Nation into existence, and who hast sustained it for so many years, help us to understand Thy purpose in this wondrous experiment. We are grateful that we have been enabled to endure through many dangers; we are glad to be part of a nation that is not ashamed to pray. Teach us to value the pattern of life which combines the secular and the sacred in a fashion that is truly unique. We are confident that Thy guidance will continue through all vicissitudes, so that we can pass on our heritage undiminished.

Give wisdom, we pray, to our President and to the makers of our laws that they may be faithful in this holy calling. Use us, unworthy as we are, as the instruments of Thy purpose, not merely for ourselves, but for all mankind. May this National Day of Prayer confirm our faith, establish our hope, and enlarge our charity. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1984.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN QUAYLE, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. QUAYLE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

WELCOME TO DR. TRUEBLOOD

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, may I first welcome Dr. Trueblood to our midst. He is our guest Chaplain today, another in a distinguished list of guest Chaplains that occasionally grace this Chamber.

I was especially taken with the words in Dr. Trueblood's prayer about the unique combination of the secular and sacred. I believe that and I congratulate him on that observation. I think it is fundamental to the essence of our system. We are happy to have Dr. Trueblood.

I am also told by my staff—I hope this information is correct—that Dr. Trueblood is a professor emeritus at Earlham College in Indiana and that Senator JOHN EAST and his wife both attended that college. So we are doubly in Dr. Trueblood's debt for his prayer this morning and for his good training of our colleague from North Carolina, who does such an extraordinarily good job in the Senate.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, today after the two leaders, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) will be recognized for 15 minutes, followed by morning business until 10:30 a.m. Then we shall be back on the pending business which is H.R. 2163. The Chiles amendment will be the pending question.

I hope, Mr. President, that we can finish that amendment today at a fairly early hour. I have no reason to hope that other than hoping it. We still have a lot to do and as Members know and the minority leader knows, for some days now, I have expressed my pining desire to see this bill finished today.

Mr. President, we still have a lot to do. We have this amendment and we have—I speculate that we have a medicare-medicaid sequence of one or more amendments to be offered, which were preserved and protected by unanimous consent when we were considering an earlier amendment to this bill. There will be one or more cap amendments and goodness knows what else.

I should say, Mr. President, that the Senate will be in late today and we shall do our very best to finish. If we do not finish, we shall be in on Monday on this bill, but I hope we can finish.

The Senator from Oklahoma reminds me that there is another package dealing with a minor CPI proposal. There are a number of those and similar amendments that will be offered as well.

THE SECRET

I urge Senators to consider that we should keep the number of amendments down as far as we can. I think we should resist the temptation to talk excessively. We should not say everything we know. I sometimes think I am the only man in town who still has a secret. It is not a very good secret, but it is mine, and I am going to keep it, because it has the unique status of being the only kept secret in Washington. That is another subject for another day.

For those of the press who are wondering about my secret, I have no secret at all; I only say that. That is the only way I can keep the secret.

Mr. President, I expect to ask the Senate to adjourn today until next week. I shall negotiate with the minority leader on the usual boilerplate language with which to accomplish an adjournment. I suppose that the Senate will convene on Monday at 11 a.m., but I shall refrain from making those arrangements until a little later. I do not expect the Senate to be in session tomorrow, as I announced on Monday.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO CHINA

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity on the return of President Reagan and Secretary Shultz from China to commend the President for his historic visit from that country. It is apparent to me that the trip was an enormous success and a significant demonstration that the relationship begun by President Nixon 12 years ago with the world's most populous country continues to evolve in ways that serve the interests of both the United States and China.

Obviously, the United States and China continue to have different perspectives on a number of issues. However, it is a measure of the maturity of the relationship that the President can travel to Peking, adhere to his

principles, speak candidly and forthrightly on issues of importance to the United States, be treated with equal candor by the leadership of China in return and still depart with the relationship amicably and realistically enhanced.

I would observe as well that the substantive accomplishments of the visit are important and add to the growing number of practical benefits of a bilateral nature. In addition to over 7 hours of formal meetings, the President's visit included agreement on such matters as peaceful nuclear cooperation, taxation, and cultural exchanges. These achievements clearly demonstrate that there is much on which the United States and China can cooperate. Although there are certainly limits to what we should expect and our expectations must be realistic, I am confident that these areas of cooperation will continue to expand.

Finally, Mr. President, having just returned myself from Japan, I am reminded of the incredible potential that exists in the aggregate among the nations in the Pacific Basin. It is becoming almost a cliche to say that the 21st century will be the "century of the Pacific," but it is no less true. For that reason alone, it was important that the President visit China, be exposed to the Chinese people, and have the opportunity to express to them the abiding friendship of the American people. I congratulate both the President and Secretary Shultz on the success of the trip and welcome them both back to Washington.

Mr. President, I believe that is all I have this morning. I thank the minority leader and all Senators. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KASTEN). Under the previous order, the Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

AFGHANISTAN: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, recently I addressed the Senate on the subject of the latest Soviet onslaught in Afghanistan. I noted at the time that the Soviet's massive ground attacks and their resort to heavy bomber assaults indicated a desperation after 4 years of unsuccessful occupation. The use of heavy bombers is particularly noteworthy because it seems to be the first time since World War II that Soviet planes attacked targets from bases within the Soviet Union.

These bombers are concentrating on civilian targets north of Kabul in the hopes of breaking the will of the Afghan people. This is part of the Soviet plan which includes destruction of crops and livestock. Taken together, these moves are calculated to force the Afghans to flee from their country. Since the Soviets cannot subjugate the freedom-loving Afghan people, they are trying to depopulate the countryside by a brutal and repressive policy.

This policy reflects a near total failure for the Soviet military after 4 years of occupation. The most recent drive into the Panjshir Valley north of Kabul marks the seventh attempt by the Soviets to establish themselves in the area of the Panjshir Valley, and there is some indication that they will fail for the seventh time. They have been unable to engage the resistance army headed by Mr. Massoud. That army waits to pick its targets and comes down from the safety of the hills only to plague the Soviets with night attacks and surprise raids. The Afghans continue to fight the massive Soviet military buildup by picking the terms of battle. The Soviet military has achieved a near stalemate after 4 years of this kind of warfare, and they are feeling the strain.

The events in the Panjshir Valley are documented in several recent reports. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Afghan Rebels Said To Elude Soviets," which appeared in the Washington Post, May 2, 1984, and the article entitled "The Bear Descends on the Lion," appearing in the May 7 edition of Time magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1984]

AFGHAN REBELS SAID TO ELUDE SOVIETS

(By William Claiborne)

NEW DELHI, May 1.—Soviet ground forces have pushed more than halfway north through the strategic Panjshir Valley in Afghanistan but, for the most part, have been unable to engage Afghan anticommunist guerrillas in battle despite the most aggressive spring offensive yet, according to western diplomatic reports from Kabul that reached here today.

Reports from two diplomatic missions in Kabul said that the Afghan guerrillas had withdrawn into side valleys and mountain hideouts, leaving a force of up to 15,000 Soviet troops and 2,000 Afghan government troops, supported by 400 to 600 tanks and armored vehicles, largely unopposed, except for hit-and-run attacks.

The Soviet and Afghan forces, according to the diplomatic sources, reached the town of Rokha, about halfway up the winding, 70-mile corridor northeast of Kabul, and were advancing toward the town of Bazarak. The Panjshir is the main supply link between Kabul, the Afghan capital, and the Soviet Union.

The diplomatic missions received unconfirmed reports that the Soviet force had reached Anjuman Pass, at the northern end of the valley, but had not yet attempted to enter any of the side valleys into which the rebels have retreated.

Diplomatic sources described as false the claims by the Soviet-supported government of Babrak Karmal that the Panjshir guerrilla leader, Ahmed Shah Massoud, had been killed or captured. The sources said that Massoud, who had rejected Soviet moves to renew a 15-month truce in the valley, left Panjshir about April 18, three days before the Soviet offensive began, and was hiding in the vicinity.

Massoud's tactical withdrawal, the diplomatic sources said, followed the capture of an agent of Khad, the Afghan secret police, who had infiltrated the ranks of the *mujaheddin* guerrilla forces. The agent, the sources said, was a local commander and cousin of Massoud, and was believed to have already passed to the Soviet information about the guerrilla leader's movements.

The guerrillas' strategy, the diplomatic sources said, appears to be to remain sheltered in the mountains and peripheral valleys and engage the Soviet and loyalist Afghan troops only on the fringes of the Panjshir, and at night.

The diplomatic reports contrasted sharply with claims in the state-controlled media in Afghanistan that Soviet and Afghan forces were engaged in "mopping-up operations" in the Panjshir, and that the valley had been secured.

Because of the inaccessibility of the region it has been difficult to obtain current and accurate information about the Soviet ground thrust, dilomatic sources conceded, while also questioning the accuracy of claims by the rebels that thousands of Soviet troops have been killed in the latest battles.

One diplomatic source said that casualties of combatants on both sides were probably relatively low because of the guerrillas' tactical withdrawal, although civilian casualties are said to be high as a result of high-altitude bombing by Soviet TU16 Badger bombers and SU24 fighter-bombers for the first time in the Soviets' four-year occupation of Afghanistan.

The Kabul diplomatic missions said they had received reports that the advancing Soviet troops have been destroying crops and livestock as they have done in previous offensives in the Panjshir.

As recently as yesterday, the diplomatic sources said, guerrilla resistance in and around Kabul was intense, with frequent rocket and mortar attacks on Soviet and Afghan government installations south and west of the capital.

Soviet helicopter gunships were said to be staging nightly attacks on Mujahedin strongholds around Kabul, and conducting house-to-house searches for guerrillas.

In the western province of Herat, near the Iranian border, and in Kandahar, in the southern part of Afghanistan, heavy fighting was reported, along with frequent bombing attacks by Soviet warplanes.

[From Time Magazine, May 7, 1984]

THE BEAR DESCENDS ON THE LION

(By Pico Igee)

Ever since Soviet tanks rolled into Afghanistan on a cold day more than four years ago, the treacherous terrain of the Panjshir Valley has served local rebels as both sanctuary and symbol. The determined Mujahedin guerrillas have been nurtured by grain from its verdant hills, water from its mountain streams and shelter within caves in the shadow of its snow-capped peaks. Above all, the 70-mile-long valley has been the hideout and headquarters of Ahmad Shah Massoud, the charismatic 30-year-old Mujahedin leader who has united more than 5,000 squabbling resistance fighters

under his shrewd and well-organized leadership.

Known as the Lion of Panjshir, Massoud has established a local political and judicial system, organized his own tax system, instituted classes in the use of rocket launchers and heavy artillery, and even set up schools and bus services throughout the valley. His Mujahedin have also hounded their Soviet invaders. Recently they captured and reportedly killed 23 Soviet agents disguised as Mujahedin. By persistently ambushing military convoys traveling between Kabul and the Soviet border, they have caused a severe fuel problem in the capital, a mere 40 miles to the south. Only two weeks ago they compounded that shortage by blowing up four strategically vital bridges. Small wonder, then, that the Soviets have shattered their 13-month truce with Massoud and mounted their fiercest attack since the invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979.

The Panjshir Valley has already survived six punishing assaults, but never has it faced more men or heavier air strikes. As many as 100 Soviet Tu-16 Badger bombers and Su-24 Fencer fighters saturated the area with high-altitude carpet bombing. In their wake came some 80 Mi-24 Hind assault helicopters, more than 500 tanks and armored personnel carriers and, according to Western diplomats, more than 20,000 troops, almost a fifth of the entire Soviet force in Afghanistan. The target of this unprecedented show of force was not so much the rebels as the civilians, who have apparently been lending them support. "The Soviets," charged Karen McKay, director of the Washington-based Committee for a Free Afghanistan, "have launched a genocidal program that Genghis Khan would have admired."

Government-run Radio Kabul was soon trumpeting victory, and the offical Soviet news agency TASS implies that Massoud's men had been routed and their leader captured or killed. Noted one Western diplomat in Moscow: "They would hardly claim anything that specific unless it were at least partly true." Others were not convinced. Afghan resistance spokesmen in Paris acknowledged that two attempts had been made upon the Lion's life, including one by an undercover agent who took aim from only 30 feet away. But they also insisted that rumors of Massoud's downfall were as overblown as those put about by Kabul two years ago. "There are no casualty figures, no reports of capture of arms and no description of clashes," said a Mujahedin official in New Delhi. "That makes me very doubtful of the claims."

Shortly after Yuri Andropov succeeded Leonid Brezhnev as Soviet leader in November 1982, there was talk in Moscow of a face-saving pullout from the costly war of attrition. But Konstantin Chernenko, who replaced Andropov after that leader's death last February, seems uninterested in the notion. "We detected a hardening once Chernenko came to power," say Abdullah Osman, head of the Mujahedin-run Union of Afghan Doctors. Sure enough, Soviet troops recently stepped up patrols along both the southeastern border with Pakistan and the western border with Iran. "If the enemies of the motherland do not surrender," warned TASS, "the state will crush them, no matter where they are and on what reactionary and imperialist forces they rely."

But all that is easier said than done. What the guerrillas lack in modern equipment and medicine they make up for in fierce patriotism and fiery Islamic zeal. British authorities estimate that the 100,000 rebels have taken as many as 12,000 Soviet lives during the 52-month campaign. Time has also learned that U.S. officials received reports last week that the insurgents managed to shoot down at least one enemy bomber. Meanwhile, they remain in control of nearly all of the countryside. In the Panjshir Valley, Massoud's men had reportedly sustained a healthy economy through a clandestine trade in semiprecious stones, while keeping their strongholds well stocked with munitions and food.

By the time the Soviet troops arrived last week, the Mujahedin had evacuated all civilians and were hunkering down in the relative safety of their mountain redoubts. "If the Soviets really want to dominate Afghanistan," said a Pentagon official, "it will take a million men." In the absence of such forces, foreign observers suspect that this year's annual spring offensive may last through the summer, then peter out in the usual stalemate. Says a defense analyst in Washington: "The Soviet will kill a lot of people and get even more Afghans enraged with them. But in the end, the situation will remain pretty much the way it is."

SENATOR BUMPERS' REMARKS BEFORE THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we know our colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas, to be among the most eloquent Members of this body. On Monday of this week, Senator BUMPERS delivered a very thoughtful and powerful speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in full in the RECORD so that our colleagues and those throughout the country who have the opportunity to peruse the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might benefit from our colleague's persuasive and eloquent remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR DALE BUMPERS BEFORE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 3, 1984

We Americans don't handle subtleties very well. We prefer clear, simple solutions, even when they're wrong, to subtle or complicated solutions which are either misunderstood, distasteful or alien to our experience. So it was that in 1980 every adversity in our personal lives was blamed on Government; every conceivable failure, from drought to floods was blamed on Government. And so when the now-famous question was put: "Are you better off now than you were four years ago?" The answer was a resounding no, and the question galvanized political thought and dealt the Democrats the most resounding defeat ever. We were left in disarray, and we are still not a cohesive party, with an agreed platform, but there are some things we strongly believe.

If I were to repeat the 1980 question now, the answer would probably be a resounding yes. But if I ask the more sobering question, "Do you believe your children and grandchildren's future will be better as a result of this past three and a half years?"—you surely pause before answering.

If someone had told you four years ago that the national debt would be doubled in the next four years, you would have insisted on a saliva test for that person. If I had asked you four years ago would you vote for Ronald Reagan if you knew your share of the national debt, as well as every American's share, would rise from $4300 to $7700 in just four years, the answer would unquestionably have been no. Can this situation have developed under a President the linchpin of whose entire public career has been fiscal responsibility and elimination of deficit spending? Now David Stockman says we can anticipate $200–300 billion deficits as far as the eye can see.

I'm not blaming the American people, because the message was simple, beautiful and reassuring. But the flesh and blood reality is that we are facing an economic apocalypse, and the avoidance of this nightmare will not be by rhetoric, but by bold and drastic action.

The plan was doomed from birth. We were seduced into believing we could somehow cut taxes $750 billion, spend $1.8 trillion on defense in the same five-year period, and balance the budget. It was like the diet that promised a loss of weight by eating five chocolate sundaes a day. But we Democrats can't and shouldn't win by out-promising or offering simpler solutions than theirs.

If you believe the budget deficits can be remedied without a substantial tax increase, then you shouldn't vote Democratic. If you believe that cutting social spending is the only answer, don't vote Democratic because if you eliminate every single dime of social spending, from food stamps to the National Cancer Institute, from school lunches to immunization for children, we will still have a $60 billion deficit.

If you believe we can continue exorbitant and senseless spending on defense, 100 percent increases every four years, don't vote Democratic. The fight over defense spending is not between the patriotic and the unpatriotic, anymore than the school prayer fight was between the Godly and the ungodly. The fight is over whether we are growing stronger or weaker by buying every weapons system in sight—and encouraging waste and fraud by throwing such inordinate sums of money at an institution ill-prepared to spend it wisely.

If you believe it's fair to give people making over $80,000 per year an average tax break of $8,390 and those making $10,000 or less a $20 tax break, don't vote Democratic.

If you believe optimism is a substitute for reality and logic, don't vote Democratic.

The only honest promise to America now is for sacrifice, burdens, sweat and tears. It worked for New York City, it worked for Chrysler and it will work for us if we are bold and courageous enough to do it. But the equally important promise is that all the burdens be evenly shared. We must be tough enough to tell the truth, and we deserve your contempt if we try to seduce you with still more glittering promises than our opponent.

The President's down-payment proposal on the deficit is no down payment at all. If Congress passes his program to the letter, the deficit still goes up $20 billion to well over $200 billion in 1985 and more in '86 and '87. But White House aides wink and nod and hint that more drastic tax proposals are on the drawing boards, and the President can be persuaded in 1985. I don't argue with the politics of this, but economically it is devastating.

If this were a partisan Democrat saying these things—you would not be persuaded—but I speak for Gerald Ford, Marty Feldstein and Paul Volcker, George Will, Henry Kaufman and Milton Friedman.

As to our foreign policy, the President has indicated by suggestion, and the Secretary of State has said outright, that our policy in Lebanon failed because of Congress. How can that be? The President made the decision to deploy marines in Beirut without so much as a "by your leave" to Congress. Then when many of us spoke out and called it wrong-headed, a potential for disaster, and asked the President to invoke the War Powers Act, he said it was not Congress prerogative to meddle in this Presidential decision, and that the War Powers Act was unconstitutional anyway. Stung by this open rebuke, responsible Republican leaders in Congress, notably Howard Baker and Chuck Percy, but others also, warned the President that his position carried considerable risk in ignoring the law. And so he grudgingly agreed to allow Congress to invoke the War Powers Act, conditioned on the resolution giving him 18 months to accomplish the mission. The mission was (1) to bring political stability to the area and (2) to make certain all foreign forces were out of Lebanon.

First, the accomplishment of such a mission would have required not 1500 marines, but 200,000. But it was not Congress who forced our withdrawal within five months after the adoption of the resolution. It was a political decision to limit the political damage and to trust that the people of America have short memories. For whatever reason, I'm glad we're out.

Our involvement in Central America has already become a Hobson's choice between withdrawing and handing El Salvador to the Communists or becoming more deeply involved with money and men and probably losing anyway. We never seem to learn that dealing with oppressive dictators, such as Somoza, the Shah and others, is effortless and easy, but invariably costs us dearly. Now the Philippines are just ripe for a Communist take-over because of the now all-too-familiar conditions—intense poverty and oppression, while Imelda Marcos becomes one of the world's richest people.

I have never understood a foreign policy, the linchpin of which is the belief that every event in the world perceived to be adverse to us was hatched up in the Kremlin dining room; that every civil war, no matter how endemic, must become an East-West battleground with an American-imposed solution, usually military; and we never seem to learn that our weapons, sent so freely, last longer than our friendships. We left Vietnam the third most powerful nation militarily on Earth.

Finally, the threat of a nuclear apocalypse grows daily. While neither side negotiates, positions harden, and the rhetoric intensifies, the world waits for a terrorist, a computer malfunction or a madman to start the war that will end all wars. We Democrats favor a nuclear freeze, if nothing else, as a manifestation and simple affirmation that peace is preferable to war and life preferable to death. It is difficult to believe the President, who has roundly condemned all eight treaties we have ever signed with the Soviets, wants another one. Now he seeks a new Star Wars anti-ballistic missile system that will cost $25 billion just for the research; that will abrogate an existing, ratified ABM Treaty; that the Office of Technology Assessment and the most reputable scientists in the U.S. say won't work. It assumes that the Soviets will sit still and do nothing during the 15-20 year period of development and deployment. It assumes that cutting the decisionmaking time from 20 minutes to three minutes is not destabilizing, and as always, that this is the last hard strategic decision we'll ever have to make.

Congress is not anxious to approve this system, so you can expect a bipartisan commission to be appointed any day to study the pros and cons of the new Star Wars concept, and I'll save you the breathless anticipation now by telling you that the commission will report that there are indeed risks and that the costs will be great, but that we can't afford not to do it because the Soviets are well along with their system, etc., etc.

Bear one thing in mind: That if the system was 99 percent effective, 100 warheads would still get through—enough to begin the "nuclear winter" from which no plant life would survive and very little human life.

One of this Nation's most compelling problems is the indifference and apathy of our people toward our political system. Fed and nurtured by trendy, anti-Government rhetoric plus the always broken promises and lack of accountability, we are now to the place where only little Colombia in South America, of all the nations which allow their people to vote, votes a smaller percentage of its eligible voters than the United States. It is one of the most serious indictments of our society, and surely Jefferson must be weeping.

Why is it we exalt Government when it builds bombs and missiles, and condemn Government when it spends money to vaccinate children, provide health care to the poor and the elderly, fund crippled children's clinics and aid students who are bright and yearn for a college education but who come from families that can't possibly afford it. If this becomes an acceptable code of conduct, acceptable Government policy, if it becomes our national character, we will soon find, and maybe too late, that guns, tanks, planes and ships are only one element of our strength, and that our inner strength, equally important to our survival, has been sapped in order to bloat our military strength.

In 1980 Ronald Reagan said, "Government can't solve your problem, because government is the problem." It was the surest applause line of that campaign. I know how intrusive and inefficient and wasteful Government can be. But I also know how chaotic and unfair life would be without it. I know all the votes to cast and all the applause lines to use if my only goal is to be carried out of the Senate in a pine box. But I have already had more good fortune and more honors than I or anyone else could have hoped for in this life. Frank Church said one only need live with cancer all one's life to know that life is fickle and we will live to regret a value system that permits us to shave and hedge and rationalize.

Born poor, but to devout and loving parents, my father was a small-town merchant whose business was barely surviving when REA came to the rural southland. It enabled him to start selling electrical appliances to a new market.

In a small town where we choked on dust in the summer and bogged down in mud in the winter, where sewage ran down the ditches from overflowing outhouses and a few septic tanks, it was a caring Government in the 30's that gave us loans and grants to pave our streets and build a waste treatment facility.

And when I returned from three years in the Marine Corps following World War II, it was a thankful and magnanimous Government that allowed my brother and me to attend the best universities in this Nation on the G.I. Bill—without which I would not be standing here today.

And when Betty and I returned to our little hometown to begin my law practice and small business, and raise our beautiful children, we raised them free of the fear of polio and other childhood diseases that had been conquered because of vaccines developed with Government grants.

And it was a free and open political process guaranteed by the Constitution that allowed me, totally unknown, to run for Governor of my beloved State.

I believe in our economic system—even though like Government it can at times be abusive, inefficient, wasteful, and yes, repressive of small business. And while we Democrats believe that Government's role in the economy should be limited and selective, we also believe our national character as well as our cherished Judeo-Christian teachings demand that those of us at the top of the ladder must not step on the hands of those reaching for the first rung. This is not because we are tolerant or indolence and laziness, but because we believe we honor ourselves and strengthen our Nation when we honor the traditions that have made us great. If we would admit it, most of us who consider ourselves to have been rather successful have been so because of inordinate luck, a little help from Government, or because we chose our parents so well.

I believe in the politics of hope. This Nation's failures have invariably been caused by our leaders either deceiving us or manipulating us in order to conceal a hidden agenda; substituting rhetorical phrases as justification for broken promises. A constitutional amendment to balance the budget is no substitute for balancing the budget. A constitutional amendment, not to permit voluntary prayer in school, but to mandate "official" prayers, may be a dynamite election year campaign issue, but it polarizes us in an area we have always guarded most jealously, our religious beliefs and practices.

We can talk of peace while we double our defense budget and stonewall arms control.

We can make it an acceptable code of conduct to ignore or be insensitive to the less fortunate, or just dismiss those who care, as bleeding heart liberals. But our children will pay a high price for our indifference.

Democrats must quit being reticent about entitlements. No part of the budget can be sacred, and a tax system which has lost America's confidence must be overhauled—but it must be fair and perceived to be fair.

We can and we must remove the cancer of deficits, which left unattended will surely kill us. They can and must be eliminated by the end of this decade.

The people, as always, not the politicians, are the ones prepared to be realistic. We can argue forever about who has been worst in the past. I feel sure I would lose that argument to this audience. But that argument doesn't resolve anything either. It is the future that we must debate. The challenge we must accept is one that bodes well for both the weakest and the strongest among us; one that will provide the greatest hope for freedom, happiness and peace.

WEIRTON, W. VA. STEEL MILL—LARGEST ESOP

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the May 7, 1984, issue of U.S. News & World Report carries an article about one of the largest 100 percent employee-owned stock-ownership plans or ESOP in the world, the steel mill in Weirton, W. Va. The success of this heroic and, at the time, risky undertaking by the employees to save the plant and preserve their jobs has, according to the workers, far outweighed any drawbacks that have been encountered. This venture is a tribute not only to American ingenuity, but also to the spirit and determination of the West Virginians who continue to take pride in the mill's reputation for quality steel production. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN EMPLOYEES RUN THEIR OWN STEEL MILL

In this gritty, old steel town along the Ohio River, an experiment in employee ownership is trying to pump new life into one of the nation's most troubled basic industries. It is not easy.

By buying the sprawling 400-acre Weirton Steel plant here 3½ months ago, 9,000 workers hope to save their jobs and make a go of a shaky business. At a time when many big steelmakers are withdrawing from the industry, Weirton is betting it can succeed by making workers into owners.

"With the foreign competition we're facing, it's simply not possible for us to earn enough profit in the steel industry to pay the kind of wages we as American workers expect and also take care of stockholders," says Weirton Executive Vice President Carl Valdiserri. "Here, we're combining the two groups to have enough to go around."

Early result of the venture are encouraging. The company recently reported a profit of 9.7 million dollars in the first quarter of 1984—its first since 1981—and steel shipments are expected to exceed 2 million tons this year, up from 1.7 million tons in 1983.

Another payoff is a change in attitude. In their new role as owners of the mill, workers identify more closely than before with the day-to-day business of making a profit, company officials say. Notes Valdiserri: "We're 10 times more interested in doing the job. Welders who used to throw a welding rod away when it got down to 4 inches now wait until it's 2 inches."

Success is not coming cheap, however. To make a buyout possible, the 7,900 workers now actively employed at the mill and the 1,100 awaiting recall took a 20 percent cut in pay and benefits when they bought the mill from National Steel Corporation in January for 386 million dollars. They also agreed to a freeze on general wage increases for six years.

Not acquiring the plant would have cost them more. National, citing Weirton's deteriorating profitability, planned to convert it into a smaller finishing mill and trim its work force to no more than 1,500 employees. Most of Weirton's 26,000 residents expected National eventually to close the plant entirely—an act that would have wiped out the town's single biggest employer and devastated the community.

"The alternative to employee ownership was nothing at all," says Walter Bish, president of Weirton's Independent Steelworkers Union.

Even with the mill running at 80 percent of capacity, as it is now, the plant payroll is thousands of jobs below peak levels and unemployment in the area tops 12 percent. Many residents worry about the community's ability to provide steady employment in the years to come.

Father Charles Schneider, pastor of St. Joseph the Worker Roman Catholic Church, says young people, unlike their parents, no longer look to the plant for work after graduation from high school. They are fleeing Weirton for other parts of the country, where jobs are more plentiful and of greater variety.

Of 10 couples recently enrolled in premarriage classes at the church, three will be moving to Rhode Island, where the men found work as welders, while three others will make their homes in Louisiana, Texas and Arizona.

Workers see the change inside the mill. "I'm one of the youngest guys there now," says 29-year-old laborer Frank McMahon, an 11-year veteran. "You don't see 18 years olds around the plant any more."

Even those who still have jobs with the firm are not immune to the lure of greener pastures. Management is having trouble keeping valued mid-to-upper-level employees in the face of the wage freeze. Although the company can hold out the prospect of greater earnings potential from future profit-sharing and stock ownership, such incentives to stay often fall short compared with job offers from other companies where pay is not frozen.

"We're losing talent—that's one of our biggest problems," says Valdiserri. "It's a struggle to retain key people, especially in technical fields like electrical engineering and computers, where demand is greatest."

Observes Joe Mayernick, a former labor-relations supervisor at the plant and now executive director of the Weirton Chamber of Commerce: "It's sort of a chicken-and-egg problem. They need the talent to get the profits, but they need the profits to get the talent."

SAVED BY ESOP

Still, current problems pale in comparison with the effort required to pull off the purchase in the first place. Arranging the deal took more than a year and drew labor, management and townspeople together in a grass-roots campaign to save the plant by using a device known as an employee-stock-ownership plan, or ESOP.

Although more than 5,000 of these plans are in effect around the country, most are relatively small-scale profit-sharing programs set up for tax advantages, and none come close to involving as huge an operation as does the one in Weirton.

Besides being the biggest employee-owned company in the country, Weirton ranks among the nation's 10 largest steel producers, with an annual capacity of 2.5 million tons.

Because of the project's scope, high powered consultants such as the New York investment firm of Lazard Frères & Company were retained. Blue-chip lenders, led by Citicorp, lined up credit for the buyout.

Under the plan finally worked out, stock will be allocated to employees as debt is repaid and will ultimately be distributed after five years if Weirton's financial performance meets predetermined criteria. Overseeing the operation will be a 14-member board of directors composed of three representatives from management, three from labor and eight from outside the company.

A major reason the project managed to get off the ground was the mill's credibility as a top-notch steel supplier. For years, the plant has enjoyed a reputation among its beverage and food-container customers for producing high quality tin products, which account for 40 to 45 percent of its shipments. The rest is made up of flat-rolled steel for the automotive, appliance and construction industries.

While demand for tin plate is expected to fall 2 to 3 percent a year over the next five years before leveling off, analysts think Weirton's quality gives the company a good shot at increasing its share of a smaller market.

Another challenge: Competition from alternative forms of packaging, such as aluminum, laminated paperboard and plastic. To help counter this, Weirton is looking for new markets. The company recently completed its first successful trial of tin plate for use in oil-filter casings and is going after film-cartridge business. Since November, the firm has signed up 100 new customers.

RENOVATION A KEY

Still more pressing is the need to make major capital investments to upgrade the plant and its equipment. Feasibility studies on the employee buyout estimated that a billion dollars will have to be spent on the mill over the next decade to maintain its competitiveness.

This year alone, 62 million dollars is budgeted for modernization. "Our biggest hurdle is to generate sufficient profits to make these capital investments and get us as technologically efficient as our competitors," says Valdiserri. "To do that, we need five solid years."

Much depends on holding down labor costs for a work force long acknowledged to be the highest paid in the steel industry. Under the buyout agreement, Weirton's hourly labor costs—wages and benefits—were cut from $24.91 to $16.94 for hourly workers, from $19.80 to $13.46 for unionized salaried workers and from $21.93 to $14.91 for guards, with comparable percentage sacrifices by management. Cost-of-living adjustments were eliminated and holidays trimmed back from 11 to five.

Altogether, across-the-board cuts in total compensation are expected to reduce labor costs by 120 million dollars in 1984. Savings of 30 million dollars in 1984. Savings of 30 million dollars are expected from improved efficiency, with net operating profit of 88 million forecast this year.

Most workers are convinced that preserving their jobs through the buyout is well worth the givebacks. Nearly 90 percent of Weirton's employees voted last year for the plan, and union officials say feelings in favor of the move are even stronger now.

"Giving up something in my paycheck doesn't bother me," says 30-year-old electrician Bill Underwood. "At least I know my money's going back into the company."

Union officials think that overall labor-management relations are noticeably better. "We still have some problems, but there has been a great deal of improvement," says Bish.

With first-quarter results in, business and community leaders say residents are becoming more and more convinced that the plant will survive. At First National Bank of Weirton, car and mortgage lending is on the rise.

Says Harry Scammell, the bank's executive vice president: "There's confidence again in the community."

Still, no one minimizes the task ahead or the risk of failure. "People understand what they have to do," says Underwood, the Weirton electrician who just returned to work. "They know if they don't do it, it's their own fault—they can't blame anyone else. There are no scapegoats any more."

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES ANNOUNCE THAT IT WILL NOT BE THE FIRST TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some of the country's most thoughtful, senior foreign policy experts including George Kennan and McGeorge Bundy have urged the President of the United States to announce that the country will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. Indeed, George Kennan, who, incidentally, comes from Milwaukee, Wis., pleaded with the Truman administration way back in 1950 to abandon the principle of first use all together. Kennan contended then as he contends now that we cannot knowingly argue against nuclear proliferation as long as we believe and encourage others to believe that we in the Western World could never rely on our defense except by initiating the use of those nuclear weapons or at least basing our defense plans upon such initiation.

On the other hand, President Reagan insists on retaining the first use principle as a central tenet of our military policy. Indeed, first use has been an accepted and rarely challenged American military principle since we, in fact, initiated nuclear warfare against the Japanese in 1945. All eight Presidents of the United States who have served since then have indicated that we will not renounce the first use of nuclear weapons. What prospect is there that this country will renounce this principle? As we face the 1984 Presidential campaign, the Democratic candidates have competed strenuously for the antinuclear arms vote: the peace vote. That Democratic Presidential candidate field has now dwindled down to three candidates: Mondale, HART, and Jackson. These three seem likely to stay in the race all the way to the July Democratic Convention in San Francisco.

The general expectation today is that either HART or Mondale will win the Democratic nomination. So what chance is there that the American people will have a chance next November to elect a President who will favor a no first use of nuclear weapons policy? The answer is absolutely none. Both Senator HART and former Vice President Mondale made it clear in the New York CBS Democratic Presidential debate in March that they would not commit this country to a no first use of nuclear weapons.

Why is it that in every one of the eight administrations since President Truman this country has never waivered from this doctrine of first use? Democratic and Republican Presidents in varying attitudes toward arms control have not been willing to renounce our first use of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has announced its commitment to no first use. Why do we not do the same? Why do we not take this step that could show countries throughout the world that this superpower will not rely on nuclear arms to stop a conventional assault by the Soviet Union in Europe or elsewhere? Why do we not remove the incentive for nuclear proliferation—the message that the cheap way for military defense is to build a nuclear arsenal?

The answer is that since the dawn of the nuclear arms era 39 years ago, this country has never been willing to rely solely on conventional arms for the defense of its vital security interests. A couple of years ago when Bundy, Kennan and others made their proposal to abandon first use, then Secretary of State Haig vigorously opposed it. Secretary Haig, a former general, former top commander of the North Atlantic Treaty forces, contended that the Soviet Union's heavy preponderance in tanks, manpower, and fighter planes could overwhelm conventional NATO forces in Europe. Only by resorting to tactical nuclear weapons could the military assure a successful defense against it.

Both Mondale and HART have tacitly agreed with that Haig argument. Both have acknowledged the key to a U.S. embrace of the no first use doctrine. That key is the same military policy that Secretary Haig called necessary. What is that policy? It is a major build up of U.S. conventional arms. Haig argued that this would require instituting military draft to increase our military manpower substantially. It would take a major commitment of greatly increased military equipment and material—especially to Europe. Haig's argument seems to have won surprisingly broad support. It pins Mondale and HART into a painfully difficult trap. Both have made a major commitment to holding down military spending. Both oppose a draft. Both also recognize that the threat to use tactical nuclear weapons represents a far cheaper answer to a potential Soviet invasion than a decision to go the conventional route. So it appears that this supreme and shocking irony would continue even in a liberal, pro-nuclear freeze administration. The peace loving United States will continue to insist on the right to the first use, that is, the initiation of the use of nuclear weapons. It is a first use that would almost certainly trigger the final war and the extermination of civilization. What an irony that it is a Communist regime, the Soviet Union, that has renounced the first use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this country sets such a profound, far-reaching example to the rest of the world, and we have to face the fact that we do, and that our military intelligence services tell us that within 16 years, that is, by the year 2000, 31 nations will have nuclear arsenals, it seems to this Senator we have to examine this question much more carefully. It is a terrible dilemma. It may mean that we will have to spend more on our conventional weapons. But it is something that, after all, if we set the example, we will be the first to use nuclear weapons. What example does that set, as I say, for many, many other countries which will have nuclear weapons, if our military intelligence is correct, within the next 16 years, by the 2000.

THE HOLOCAUST: AN EVENING OF COMMEMORATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on April 29, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council commemorated the victims of the Holocaust at the Kenndey Center for the Performing Arts.

The evening drew on the legacy of the Holocaust through readings and music. Guest speakers included actress Helen Hayes; actors Lorne Greene, Michael York, and Joseph Wiseman; and television newsmen Ted Koppel and Tom Brokaw.

This was not solely an evening to entertain, but more importantly to inform and remember. "Tonight we ask that you hold your applause," Sigmund Strochlitz, chairman of the Holocaust Days of Remembrance Committee told the audience, "in respect for those who died whispering * * * or shouting in defiance."

In a letter read by Marshall Breger, the special assistant to the President for public liaison, President Reagan called the Holocaust "the ultimate horror" in which "it is virtually impossible to grasp the enormous amount of suffering felt by victims and survivors."

Striking accounts and performances included actress Meg Tilley's narration of the suicide of the young Jewish girls who preferred death to the nighttime visit of German soldiers. The Giora Fiedman Trio's folk music from the concentration camps and Nazi-controlled ghettos brought tears to the eyes of many in the audience.

Tom Brokaw of NBC News pointed out that "never before in our history had genocide been an all-pervasive government policy. Incredibly, the Jewish population's destruction took precedence over Germany's war efforts."

Mr. President, our sacred task is to insure that the memory of the Holocaust never fades—that its lessons are not forgotten. We must act in every way possible to prevent the recurrence of genocide, the most disgusting crime known to man.

The Senate has the opportunity to act. The Genocide Convention, written in response to the Holocaust, acknowledges that the international crime of genocide is morally wrong and must be punished. In 1948, the General Assembly, at the request of the United States, gave its unanimous approval 55 to 0, to the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, the ratification of the Genocide Convention would be the most important, concrete commitment to Holocaust victims and survivors. Let us act now to support ratification of the Genocide Convention.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is 10:30 a.m. past, and we are not quite ready yet to go on with the pending business and the pending question.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the transaction of routine morning business be extended until not later than 11 a.m. under the same terms and conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONG KONG BLUES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, an editorial in the May 1, Wall Street Journal, discusses a major area of disagreement between Communist China and the United States that has been unreported in all the glamour about President Reagan's trip to the China mainland. Apparently the subject of Hong Kong was ignored or glossed over during the President's visit, yet talks between Great Britain and Red China to settle the future of Hong Kong after 1997 are nearing the final stages and Peking has put a deadline on those talks.

The population of Hong Kong, including the main island and the Kowloon Peninsula on the mainland and the adjoining new territories, is over 5 million people. The success of the private enterprise economy is an economic miracle story and ironically Hong Kong is the major source of foreign exchange for Communist China.

Can Hong Kong recover from or survive the latest crisis as it has from past reverses? The Peking regime has promised to allow Hong Kong to continue as a free port and business center as it is today with the status of an autonomous zone in China proper. But these pledges have the ring of earlier assurances given the people of Tibet before Red China cruelly suppressed all independence in that territory. Not many people remember it, or even want to think about it, but Red China was found guilty of committing genocide in Tibet by the International Commission of Jurists. Is that what is in store for Hong Kong, too?

The people of Hong Kong, 98 percent of whom are Chinese, can take no comfort in repeated suggestions that Red China's new Constitution will protect them. Several provisions of the Constitution retain all ultimate power in the Communist Party. According to article 67 of the new Constitution, for example, the standing committee on the so-called National People's Congress, a rubberstamp body for the party, may "annul any local regulations or decisions of autonomous regions which are found to contravene the Constitution, statutes, or the administrative rules and regulations." And article 89 of the Constitution warns similarly that the state council, which is the Cabinet, has the power "to alter or annul inappropriate decisions and orders" issued by any local authorities, including special administrative zones.

Since the four cardinal principles which govern each of Red China's constitutional provisions include a mandate to (1) follow the Socialist road, (2) retain Communist Party leadership, (3) follow through with what is called the "People's Democratic Dictatorship," and (4) follow "Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung thought," I do not see how Hong Kong has the slightest chance of keeping its present economic system. Red China is not known for its consistency of policy. At some time in the future, the administrative leaders of Hong Kong are bound to be accused by Peking of not following Socialist principles and be branded as counterrevolutionaries.

And this is not all. Article 17 of the Constitution provides that "all organizations and individuals are prohibited from disrupting by any means whatsoever, the orderly functioning of the Socialist economy or of the economic plans of the state." Article 22 makes it very clear what the plans must be. Article 22 provides that "the state opposes the influence of capitalist ideas."

So if I were a citizen of Hong Kong, I would not put too much faith in what Communist promises say I could do in the future. And, if this administration believes what it says about finding a new pragmatism among the dictators on Mainland China, then I think the President's advisers should examine what is happening to the free people of Hong Kong and show some concern about it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article of May 1 on this subject appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: THOSE HONG KONG BLUES

We've been following President Reagan's China tour, and it has been a good show: Mr. Reagan viewing that incredible clay army uncovered at Xian, the first lady hugging the adorable pandas, the president joking with students about the benefits of an acting course in college. The pundits, too, are praising China's "free-market reforms" and "pragmatic" leadership.

But White House spokesman Larry Speakes said yesterday that Mr. Reagan hadn't changed his fundamental views towards communism. And China's leadership cadres, for their part, made sure that May Day pictures of Stalin and Mao were up in Peking even as the president departed for Shanghai. Maybe reality has been preserved, but just barely.

A sense of reality about the U.S.-Chinese relationship is important because there are issues yet to be resolved between China and the West that are far more serious than trade and cultural exchanges. A week before Mr. Reagan arrived in China, British Foreign Minister Howe ended a visit and admitted publicly for the first time that Hong Kong will become a part of China in 1997, when the British lease on most of the colony expires. The five million free citizens of Hong Kong watched the American president's tour from a very different perspective, no doubt wondering if they were being sold out.

The news that Britain had ceded sovereignty had merely confirmed the worst suspicions. It also reinforced the need for China to do something to convince Hong Kong's people that it won't destroy their free-market achievements. Increasingly, Hong Kongers are saying that the answer is self-rule.

That may sound unrealistic. Even the benign British haven't permitted self-rule. And China doesn't put up those Stalin and Mao posters for nothing. But democratic stirrings have been growing in Hong Kong, and for good reason. It seems like the only solution for that very large proportion of the colony's people who can't flee a Chinese takeover, either for lack of money or lack of passports and visas. Some already have fled the communists once. Life in China has recently improved, certainly, but the government remains totalitarian, the Communist Party brooks no dissent and the economy still runs largely by state command. Any il-

lusions ought to have been shattered when the Chinese twice censored President Reagan's comments on the virtues of capitalism and the danger posed by the Soviet Union.

No free nation has ever willingly accepted communist rule, and Hong Kongers are probably the least likely people in the world to willingly succumb. Already, the appointed Legislative Council, which helps the British governor write laws, has voted to debate any agreement signed by Britain and China. Unofficial citizens groups have also formed, arguing for some voting rights. Ironically, China itself once endorsed this idea: Early in its negotiations with Britain, communist commentators spoke of "Hong Kong people governing Hong Kong" in order to discredit British rule. A few Hong Kongers took them at their word. But China has since backtracked, even publicly rebuking talk of democracy.

The time is ripe to challenge Peking's obstinacy. Having conceded sovereignty, Britain now will ask China for specific promises about the way it will rule Hong Kong. A vocal, self-governing Hong Kong population could help explain to Peking what those promises should be—for example, a free press, its own currency and the right to travel freely. China has already made Hong Kong a "special administrative zone" in its new constitution, allowing it to have laws distinct from the mainland's. But by itself this legalism isn't worth much; Tibet has been a similar "autonomous zone" but was trampled on anyway. Offering Hong Kong people the rights of self-rule might be enough substance to make that promise believable.

The only sure way to preserve Hong Kong's prosperity is for China to convince the Hong Kong people it won't meddle with their lives. Hong Kongers already are holding a referendum of sorts, voting with their wallets by reducing private investment and with their feet by scrounging for foreign passports. Without any better guarantees from China, that exodus will continue, a deterioration not unlike Zimbabwe's since Robert Mugabe took power. How China reacts to Hong Kong's demands for self-rule will tell the world much more about the real China and its prospects for liberal reform than the good show put on these last six days.

SUPPORT FOR PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM CONTINUES TO GROW

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, we have a problem that has resulted in billions of dollars in unnecessary costs to consumers and businesses alike. In an attempt to reform our confusing product liability system, I introduced the Product Liability Act—S. 44—on January 26, 1983. The bill was reported favorably on March 27, 1984, by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation by a strong bipartisan vote of 11 to 5. I am urging all those Senators who have not already done so to join S. 44's 25 cosponsors in supporting the Product Liability Act. Your support is needed for quick passage of a uniform product liability act that will create fair product liability standards for the future. Every day that we delay creates extra costs and confusion for consumers and businesses across the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials endorsing S. 44—one by the Washington Post, dated April 17, 1984, and another by Business Week, dated April 30, 1984, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1984]

SUING THE MANUFACTURER

In the past 10 years, product liability suits against manufacturers have increased sixfold. Damage awards, both compensatory and punitive, have grown to the point where entire industries have been severely strained and many more are concerned about the uncertainty of their legal liabilities.

The confusion is due in part to the fact that each state has its own rules, usually evolving over time in the courts of the state, for handling negligence cases. This works perfectly well to establish whether Mr. Doe was negligent when he sideswiped Mr. Roe's car, or whether Dr. Jones exercised due care in operating on Mrs. Smith.

It is a lot more difficult, though, when Mr. Doe sues General Motors for producing the car involved in the accident or Mrs. Smith sues a drug manufacturer for her reaction to the medicine she received in the recovery room. In both cases, the product is made in a standard way and sold nationally, but each state has its own standard of liability.

Can an injured party collect, for example, if the product was safe at the time of manufacture but years later was found to have caused some harm the manufacturer could not have predicted? Suppose the user had not followed specific warnings—"Do not dive in this 3½-foot pool"—or had altered the product by removing protective shields or safety devices. What if the product was used for a purpose other than that intended by the manufacturer—spraying perfume on a lighted candle? Can an injured party collect under any of these circumstances? Yes and no, depending on what state you're in.

A bill reported by the Senate Commerce Committee seeks to bring some order to this situation by establishing federal standards in product liability cases. The bill contains a number of controversial provisions, some designed to aid a particular industry. Not surprisingly, it is opposed by the legal establishment: far more money has been spent litigating these cases in multiple, diverse forums, than has been paid to victims.

It is a good idea, nonetheless, to establish some uniformity and set reasonable standards of liability. Some of the more outlandish product liability suits would fail under these standards. State juries could no longer find a crane manufacturer liable for injuries caused when the equipment was driven into a power line. A single-control shower faucet manufacturer wouldn't be blamed if the user turned it all the way in one direction and was burned. But the uncertain and enormous liabilities facing manufacturers who can be sued in 51 diverse jurisdictions is a real problem. Congress can and should bring some order to the situation.

[From Business Week, Apr. 30, 1984]

MAKE PRODUCT LIABILITY FAIRER

It is nothing unusual these days to read that a jury has just awarded a plaintiff several million dollars because of injuries caused by some company's defective product. An estimated 110,000 product-liability suits are filed every year. Lawyers who represent the plaintiffs go into court knowing that they stand a far better chance of winning a substantial payment for their client—and, not incidentally, a large fee for themselves—than does the product manufacturer of defending itself. The main reason: Product liability rules are heavily stacked against business. To correct the balance, Senator Bob Kasten (R-Wis.) has introduced a bill to establish a uniform federal statute on product liability that would replace the often differing rules of the 50 states. The bill is a careful compromise that provides protection to consumers while removing some of the most punishing inequities against business. It should become law.

The bill's most significant reforms for business concern company negligence and punitive damages. A few states now permit people injured by a defectively designed product to collect awards, even though the manufacturer was in no way negligent. By contrast, in suits against individuals, a plaintiff must prove negligence. The Kasten bill would apply the same standard to businesses. To collect compensation, an injured consumer would have to show that the company was at fault, that it had failed to act reasonably in designing the product that caused the injury or to warn about potential hazards.

As for punitive damages, under the present rules, a company may have to pay them repeatedly in suit after suit. The Kasten bill limits such damages to the first suit. After that, the company may have to pay compensation in other suits, but it is immune to additional punitive damages.

Predictably, consumer groups and liability lawyers are fighting the new bill. But it leaves business at substantial risk in liability suits and in no way shields a company against having to compensate people injured through its own negligence. The bill strikes a better balance of fairness to consumers and business than the present plethora of state laws.

"MAY DAY BREAKFASTS" MARK RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this Friday, the Fourth of May, nineteen hundred and eighty-four, the residents of my State will celebrate Rhode Island Independence Day—the date on which Rhode Island beat the other colonies to the punch by 2 months and declared independence from the British.

Throughout Rhode Island residents will mark the event with traditional May breakfasts during what we call Heritage Month. These breakfasts begin at the end of April and continue through most of May.

Thanks to the hard work of the Rhode Island Department of Economic Development, and particularly to the work of Kay Tucker of that department, word of Rhode Island's annual month-long celebration has been spreading rapidly.

I commend a recent article from the New York Times of April 15, 1984, to my colleagues. It captures some of the flavor of our May Day Breakfasts and

even includes a list of the scheduled events for those who may wish to join us in our celebration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles "Rhode Island's May Breakfasts Keep Sizzling" and "When and Where To Sample Some Typical New England Fare"—both from the New York Times—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RHODE ISLAND'S MAY BREAKFASTS KEEP SIZZLING

(By Betsy Wade)

Although quiche and croissants seem poised to overwhelm regional breakfast habits the way that motel chains have crushed tourist homes, citizens of Rhode Island are sending their annual message that the New England Breakfast is alive and hot, bursting with protein and tradition.

A plate of clamcakes—a Yankee version of hush puppies—ham and scrambled eggs and a dome-roofed wedge of apple pie would probably make an exercise teacher's eyes roll back. But at the season that Rhode Island marks as May Breakfast time, a trip to tuck in such a meal, if not exactly slimming, is certainly a spring tonic. The nurseries' offerings in the way of begonias are visible; a walk along an inlet of Narragansett Bay or in a wildlife refuge lets a sense of history, in the form of a home-cooked breakfast, remind the walker of what stoked the stomachs of the New Englanders who pulled stumps, moved rocks, hauled nets and built a nation.

May is to Rhode Island what July is to the rest of the country. On May 4, 1776, Rhode Island beat the other colonies to the punch by two months and declared itself independent of the British crown. To mark the event, and possibly to help everyone ignore its record as the last of the 13 original states to ratify the Constitution, the smallest state is host to celebrations all through what it calls Heritage Month.

At the parish house of the Oak Lawn Community Baptist Church in Cranston last year, sun poured through clear glass windows on long white tables where guests at the May Breakfast sat family style and consumed all within arm's reach. Church members in Quaker costume, a memorial to the meeting-house that preceded the church on the site, had started working when the buyer for ticket No. 1 arrived at 5 A.M., and they kept egg platters filled from 6 until 11.

Customers holding tickets numbered as high as 1,000 listened to organ music while awaiting their turn at the trencher, and little kids wandered under still other tables laden with homemade crafts for sale, baked goods, plants and May baskets.

At a moment near 10, Ann Jervis, co-chairman of the breakfast, discovered with joy and sorrow that she had to send out for another case of 24 dozen eggs to fulfill a pledge to provide "all you can eat," but no doggie bags, please, at $3.75 for adults and $1.75 for children.

The state's annual May Breakfasts, which begin at the end of April and continue into mid-May, are usually fund-raising events. Sometimes talks or nature walks are added. The purpose has become more diverse in other ways, too. On May 1 the Governor always invites every Rhode Islander over 100 years of age to breakfast with him at the Capitol. Those who are over 60 are invited to senior nutrition centers in their communities for what is called a Governor's May Breakfast, but without the Governor. These events, at 11 o'clock, have a standard menu and accept contributions, however modest.

Beyond the Governor's breakfasts, the state estimates that 60 private organizations, schools, clubs, churches and philanthropies hold fund-raising breakfasts, some with simple menus, some more elaborate, all with hot food that sticks to the ribs and that no one, not even in a moment of carbohydrate overload, would dare call brunch.

Menus for this year mention baked beans, pie, clamcakes, scrambled eggs, pancakes, doughnuts, muffins, Frenchtoast, sausage, ham, coffee and all the rest. Jonnycakes or johnnycakes (griddle-baked cornbread), a Rhode Island tradition, are served at many breakfasts.

Adult prices range from $2.50 to $12, the higher price being for what organizers call a "really rather classy" if untypical event at Belcourt Castle in Newport on May 6. This offers champagne, blintzes and crepes, but no meat because the sponsor is the Defenders of Animals.

Many breakfasts are scheduled for weekends, but unless May 1 falls on Sunday, conflicting with religious services, the Oak Lawn Church, generally acknowledged to have begun the custom in 1868, hews to May Day.

By one account, the first breakfast was part of a two-day Oak Lawn May Fest that included the crowning of a May queen and several spasms of eating. Clamcakes were served at the first breakfast, the historian recorded, "because Aunt Hannah Babcock made them so well." In World War II, when deep fat was precious as gasoline, hash-brown potatoes were offered, but the clamcake has since resumed its place at Oak Lawn.

In time, other organizations seized upon the idea. In East Greenwich, the United Methodist Church has been holding breakfasts for more than 50 years and will do it again on May 1; the Park Place Congregational Church in Pawtucket will hold its 102d annual breakfast on April 28. The North Tiverton Volunteer Fire Department is scheduling its 53d breakfast on May 6. The Rhode Island Yacht Club in Cranston has revived its custom and will hold one on May 6, as will the East Greenwich Yacht Club, on the same day. Both clubs, not surprisingly, have settings on the water.

In the history of the Oak Lawn breakfast, the author wrote of the first event: "Oak Law was a farming community and many dozens of fresh eggs, butter, hams, homemade jellies and pies poured into the meetinghouse. In the very early hours of the morning, the back lot filled up with horses and carriages. There were some buggies from livery stables in Providence, too."

More recently, the visitors' conveyances were again from far afield: Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont.

For those who want to make a day of it in Rhode Island, no distance is very far, so things to work off a New England breakfast are not hard to find.

Birders may want to walk it off right on the site. They can select the breakfast on May 20 at the Norman Bird Sanctuary in Middletown, just north of Newport. Guided bird walks begin at 6:30, and there are bird exhibitions and slides as well as a Maypole.

Three other popular places for spring visits are in Washington County, known to all except the road signs as South County. This county forms the 18 miles of southern coast of the state west of Narragansett Bay, from Point Judith, a jumping-off spot for Block Island, to Watch Hill, on the Connecticut line. U.S. 1 and periodically scenic U.S. 1A serve the county's coast.

On the Old Post Road, which drifts away from U.S. 1, nearly next door to Ninigret Park, is the Fantastic Umbrella Factory, a 19th-century farm that still operates, although in a limited way, and shelters a variety of things to buy and look at. The house nearest the parking lot contains stoneware, leather and loomed, quilted and basketry products of a crafts commune called Small Axe Productions. Small stoneware crocks in the old dark-in-sides style are $6 to $12; a nest of stoneware mixing bowls is $55.

A bit farther back is a barn, which children generally prefer, packed nearly to the rafters with everything from birthday cards to soap and leaded glass, plus real eggs from the farm with intensely yellow yolks, definitely laid by chickens that have freedom to roam.

The Umbrella Factory (401-364-6616), which a sign says was named "because," increases the number of days a week it is open as the weather improves. By the end of this month, it is likely to be open all week. Hours are 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

A walk in Ninigret Park and the adjoining Federal Wildlife Preserve offers isolation, water and salt air. A parcel of 172 acres of the deactivated Charlestown Naval Auxiliary Air Station on the South County coast, complete with a freshwater pond, it was opened as a park by the town of Charlestown last year and forms a gateway to the older wildlife refuge and the barrier beach beyond.

To keep motorists from going in hopeless circles on vast runways, routes of sorts were denoted by sweeping furrows plowed into the tarmac, an almost perfect enactment of the biblical notion of beating swords into plowshares. At a certain point on the runway, most people park their cars and go walking in the company of wildlife, wind off Block Island Sound and the whisper of tall grasses.

The park is open, free, from 8 a.m. to sunset. Nature programs are arranged for groups. Information is available by calling George Bliven, Charlestown parks commissioner, at 401-364-6244 or the Federal refuge manager's office at 401-364-3106.

To play tag with the spring surf, a good place is Napatree Point in Watch Hill. Before the Watch Hill summer season opens, it's possible to park on the street or the public parking area at the edge of the harbor. At the far western corner is a narrow pedestrians-only entrance to the mile-long point, which was dense with summer houses until the 1938 hurricane. Since then it has been a preserve. Although pilings of old porches stick out of the sand and the bones of old shipwrecks poke up after storms.

Walkers can take either the ocean beach or the less windy bay side, or walk one out and the other back. There are occasional boardwalks over the dune for those who want to get to the other side.

Beachcombers will want to take along a sack for shells, beach glass and driftwood; Napatree has plenty of each. It also has ospreys, oyster-catchers and migrating shorebirds.

WHEN AND WHERE TO SAMPLE SOME TYPICAL NEW ENGLAND FARE

Here are dates, times, organizations and prices for some May breakfasts. Eggs, coffee, tea and milk are not mentioned since almost every place offers them.

SATURDAY, APRIL 28

Chepachet, Union Church, State Route 44, 6 to 10 A.M. Bacon, jonnycakes, pancakes. Adults $3; Children under 12, $2.

Cranston, Pawtuxet Baptist Church, 2157 Broad Street, 7 to 10 A.M. Jonnycakes, baked beans, apple pie. Adults $3.50; children $1.75.

Cranston, Phillips Memorial Baptist Church, 565 Pontiac Avenue, 7 to 10 A.M. Jonnycakes, ham, baked beans. Adults $3.75; children 4 to 12, $1.50.

Lincoln, Lime Rock Baptist Church, Great Road, 6:30 to 10 A.M. Jonnycakes, ham. Adults $3; children under 12, $1.75.

Pawtucket, Bethany Baptist Church, 178 Sayles Avenue, 7 to 11 A.M. Jonnycakes, ham. Adults $3; children 5 to 12, $2.

Pawtucket, Park Place Congregational Church, 71 Park Place, 6:30 to 9:30 A.M. Ham, apple pie. Adults $3.75; children 5 to 12, $1.25.

Providence, Church of the Redeemer, 655 Hope Street, 7 to 11 A.M. Ham, muffins, baked beans. Adults $3.50; children 5 to 12, $1.

Providence, Roger Williams Baptist Church, 201 Woodward Road, 6:30 to 9:30 A.M. Jonnycakes, sausage, danish. Costumed servers. Adults $3.25; children $1.75. Reservations: 401-331-4288.

Providence, Second Presbyterian Church, 500 Hope Street, 7 to 10 a.m. Jonnycakes, ham, fried potatoes. Adults $3; children under 10, $1.50.

Tiverton, Old Stone Church, Stone Church Road, 7 to 10 a.m. Jonnycakes, bacon, home fries. Adults $2.50; children 5 to 12, $1.25.

SUNDAY, APRIL 29

Central Falls, St. George's Church, 12 Clinton Street, 8 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Sausage, home fries, baked beans. Adults $3.95; children 5 to 12, $2.75.

Cranston, Palestine Shrine Clowns, Shrine Club, 1 Rhodes Place, off Broad Street, 7 a.m. to noon. Ham, sausage. Entertainment by clowns and a hurdy-gurdy with a monkey. Adults $3.75; children over 6, $1.75.

West Kingston, Richmond Grange, Grange Hall, Route 138, 6 to 10 a.m. Jonnycakes, ham, doughnuts. Adults $4; children under 12, $2.

TUESDAY, MAY 1

Barrington, St. John's Episcopal Church, 191 Country Road, 6:30 to 9 a.m. Jonnycakes, baked ham, muffins. Adults $3.35; children 6 to 12, $2.

Cranston, Oak Lawn Community Baptist Church, 229 Wilbur Avenue, 6 to 11 a.m. Cornbread, clamcakes, apple pie. Adults $3.75; children under 10, $1.75.

East Greenwich, First Baptist Church, Peirce and Montrose Streets, 6 to 10 a.m. Ham, baked beans, pie. Adults $3.25; children under 12, $1.50. Reservations suggested: 401-884-5269 or 401-884-2322.

East Greenwich, United Methodist Church, Main Street at Queen, 6:30 to 9:30 a.m. Jonnycakes, muffins, bacon. Adults $3.50; children 5 to 12, $1.50.

Foster, Foster Center Baptist Church, Howard Hill Road, 6 to 10 a.m. Jonnycakes, bacon, pie. Adults $3; children over 5, $1,25.

Greystone, Greystone Primitive Methodist Church, corner of Waterman and Oakleigh Avenues, 6 to 9 a.m. Oatmeal, bacon. Adults $3.50; children under 12, $1.50.

Olneyvill, Church of the Messiah, 10 Troy Street, 7 a.m. to noon. Jonnycakes, pancakes. Adults $3; children under 10, $1.

Providence, Rhode Island School for the Deaf, Corliss Park, 7 to 10:30 a.m. Ham, sausage, pancakes. Adults $3; students and children $1.50.

Warwick, Greenwood Community Presbyterian Church, 805 Main Street, 6 to 10 A.M. Jonnycakes, ham, doughnuts. Adults $3.50; children 5 to 12, $1.50.

Westerly, Christ Church, 7 Elm Street, 6 to 9 a.m. Bacon, pancakes. Adults $2.50; children under 10, $1.50. Reservations: 401-596-0197.

SATURDAY, MAY 5

Barrington, Holy Angels Church, 341 Maple Avenue, 7:30 to 10:30 a.m. French toast, doughnuts, muffins Adults $2.50; children under 12, $1.50

Cranstron, Ebenezer Baptist Church, 475 Cranstron Street, 6 to 9 a.m. Hominy, pancakes, home fries. $2.75.

Cranston, Edgewood Congregational Church, 1788 Broad Street, 7 to 11 a.m. Bluberry pancakes, apple pie, muffins. Adults $3.50; those over 65 and children 7 to 12; under 7, $1.50. Reservations: 401-461-1314 (mornings).

Cranston, Woodridge Congregational Church, 546 Budlong Road, sittings at 8 and 10 a.m. Ham, home fries, strudel. Adults $3.50; children under 12, $2.

Jamestown, Rotary Club, Jamestown Elementary School, Lawn Avenue, 7 to 10 a.m. Baked beans, apple pie, hash brown potatoes. Adults $3.50; children under 7, $2.50.

Lincoln, Wesley United Methodist Church, Woodland Street, 6 to 10 a.m. Bacon, home fries, baked beans. Adults $2.50; children under 12, $1.75.

Pawtucket, Smithfield Avenue Congregational Church, 514 Smithfield Avenue, 6 to 9 a.m. Ham, home fries, muffins, Adults $2.50; children under 12, $1.25. Reservations suggested: 401-722-7962, 401-722-4659.

Providence, Cranston Street United Methodist Church, 689 Cranston Avenue, 8 to 10 a.m. Jonnycakes, oatmeal, muffins. Adults $2.75; children $1.25.

Providence, St. Peter's and St. Andrew's Church parish hall, 25 Pomona Avenue, 6:30 to 9:30 a.m. Sausage, pancakes, bacon. Adults $2.99; children 6 to 12, $1.50. Reservations: 401-461-1624, 401-273-5085.

Warwick, Central Baptist Church, 3270 Post Road, 6 to 10:30 a.m. Ham, baked beans, muffins. Adults $3; children 5 to 12, $1.25.

Warwick, Norwood Baptish Church, 48 Budlong Avenue, 6 to 9:30 a.m. Baked beans, ham, pie. Adults $3.50; children under 12, $2.

Warwick, Oakland Beach Congregational Church, Fellowship Hall, 715 Oakland Beach Avenue, 7 to 10 a.m. Home fries, apple pie, sausage. Adults $3; children under 12, $1.75.

Warwick, Shawomet Baptist Church, 1642 West Shore Road, 7 to 11 a.m. Jonnycakes, ham, baked beans. Adults $3.25; children under 12, $1.50.

Woonsocket, St. James Episcopal Church, 24 Hamlet Avenue, 7:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Sausage, ham, French toast. Adults $3.50; children under 8, $1.50.

SUNDAY, MAY 6

Cranston, Rhode Island Yacht Club, 1 Ocean Avenue, 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. Eggs benedict, baked ham, sweet rolls. Adults $6. Reservations: 401-941-0220.

East Greenwich, Yacht Club, Water Street, 7 to 11 a.m. Jonnycakes, pancakes, apple pie. About $4. Details: 401-884-7700.

Johnston, Post 92, American Legion, 509 Greenville Avenue, 7 to 11 a.m. Ham, hash-brown potatoes, bacon. Adults $2.50; children under 12, $1.50.

Newport, Defenders of Animals, Belcourt Castle, Bellevue Avenue, 9 a.m. Blintzes, fried potatoes, fruit bowl, Champagne. $12. Tour of castle $3 extra. Reservations by April 25: 401-738-3710.

North Tiverton, Volunteer Fire Department, 85 Main Road, 7 A.M to 12:30 p.m. Baked beans, ham, muffins. Adults $2; children under 12, $1.25.

Providence, St. Bartholomew's Church, 297 Laurel Hill Avenue, 10:30 a.m. Ham, sausage, danish. $4.50. Reservations: 401-944-4466.

Providence, St. Martin's Church, 24 Orchard Avenue, 7 to 11 a.m. Buffet. Jonnycakes, creamed beef, pies. Adults $4.50; children under 12, $2.50. Discount of 50 cents offered for making reservations (401-751-2141).

Warren, St. Mark's Church Parish Hall, 16 School Street, 8 to 11 a.m. Pancakes, home fries, muffins. Adults $3; children 5 to 10, $1.50. Reservations suggested; 401-245-3161, 401-245-8960.

Wakefield, Rotary Club, Elks Hall, Main Street, 7 to 11 a.m. Ham, rolls, pies. Adults $4; children under 12, $2.50.

SATURDAY, MAY 12

Newport, Channing Memorial Church parish house, 135 Pelham Street, 7:30 to 11 a.m. Sausage, cheese and egg soufflé, coffee cake. Adults $4; children $2.

SUNDAY, MAY 20

Johnston, Lions Club, Johnston High School, Route 5, Atwood Avenue, 7:30 a.m. to noon. Ham, baked beans hash-brown potatoes. Adults $3.50; children $2.50

Middletown, Norman Bird Sanctuary and Museum, Third Beach Road, sittings at 7:30, 8:30 and 9:30 a.m. Eggs florentine, pancakes, egg and sausage casserole. Adults $5; children $3. Guided walks starting at 6:30 a.m., slides. Reservations: 401-846-2577.

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY, MAY 4

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations was the first of the Thirteen Original Colonies to declare its independence from Great Britain.

On May 4, 1776, the general assembly officially broke its ties with King George, and declared itself free and independent from any allegiance to him.

To commemorate and celebrate this occasion, the Rhode Island Heritage Commission will conduct a ceremony at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, May 4, 1984, in the State house rotunda.

On this occasion, the Heritage Commission, also is asking all churches and other buildings in Rhode Island that may have bells or chimes to ring them in unison for 2 minutes at 1 p.m.

As a part of that celebration, I would like to remind my colleagues of Rhode Island's leading role in the struggle for independence.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Rhode Island's original Renun-

ciation of the Crown be reprinted in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the renunciation was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENUNCIATION OF THE CROWN

An act repealing an Act entitled, "An Act for the more effectually securing to his Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects, in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations;" and altering the Forms of Commissions, of all Writs and Processes in the Courts, and of the Oaths prescribed by Law.

Whereas in all States existing by Compact, Protection and Allegiance are reciprocal, the latter being only due in Consequence of the former: And whereas George the Third, King of Great-Britain, forgetting his Dignity, regardless of the Compact most solemnly entered into, ratified and confirmed, to the Inhabitants of this Colony, by His Illustrious Ancestors, and till of late fully recognized by Him—and entirely departing from the Duties and Character of a good King, instead of protecting, is endeavouring to destroy the good People of this Colony, and of all the United Colonies, by sending Fleets and Armies to America, to confiscate our Property, and spread Fire, Sword and Desolation, throughout our Country, in order to compel us to submit to the most debasing and detestable Tyranny; whereby we are obliged by Necessity, and it becomes our highest Duty, to use every Means, with which God and Nature have furnished us, in Support of our invaluable Rights and Privileges; to oppose that Power which is exerted only for our Destruction.

Be it therefore Enacted by this General Assembly, and by the Authority thereof it is Enacted, That an Act entitled, "An Act for the more effectual securing to His Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Clerk of the house, Josias Lyndon, wrote: "Resolved that the aforementioned written pass as an act of this assembly."

It was read and approved in the upper house the same day, as attested by Henry Ward, secretary.

For the first time the session closed with the words, "God save the United Colonies."

INTERNATIONAL USE OF ARMED FORCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Richard N. Gardner, former Ambassador to Italy and now professor of law and international organization at Columbia University entitled "Sovereignty and Intervention: A Challenge of Law-Making for the Industrialized Democracies." Ambassador Gardner explores the legal and moral aspects of the international use of armed force by citing examples of military intervention, especially the U.S. action in Grenada this past October. The article points out the need for a broad consensus on the concept of intervention in international law in light of the changing world situation. I commend to my colleagues Ambassador Gardner's perceptive and timely article.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Trialogue, March 1984 (Trilateral Commission quarterly)]

SOVEREIGNTY AND INTERVENTION: A CHALLENGE OF LAW MAKING FOR THE INDUSTRIALIZED DEMOCRACIES

(Richard N. Gardner)

The controversy over the U.S. military action in Grenada is of the deepest significance for the trilateral countries of Western Europe, North America and Japan for two reasons. One is obvious; the other had been almost totally ignored.

The obvious reason is the political cost of the unprecedented isolation of the United States from its allies and friends on a military action deemed in the national interest by the American government and overwhelmingly supported by the American people. When the U.N. General Assembly voted by 108 to 9 with 27 abstentions on November 2, 1983, to "deplore" the occupation of Grenada is a "flagrant violation of international law," the United States could not muster a negative vote from a single trilateral country. Only Israel, El Salvador and six small Caribbean countries joined the United States in opposition. The United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, Belgium and Japan abstained. France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Portugal all voted to deplore the U.S. action.

The less obvious significance of Grenada is the confusion it revealed among trilateral governments and leaders of public opinion over a question of central importance to the solidarity and survival of the trilateral countries: Just what legal and moral principles governing the use of armed forces are the trilateral countries prepared to live by and ask others to live by at this point in the nuclear age?

It is not a new question, nor an easy one. It is a question that was raised at the time of U.S. military actions in the Cuban missile crisis, in the Dominican Republic, and in Vietnam; by the Soviet military actions in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan and Soviet interference in Poland; by Soviet and Cuban interventions in Central America; by Israel's raid on Entebbe, its invasion of Lebanon and its attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor; by the Argentine-British conflict in the Falklands; by French military actions in Africa; and by Chinese and Vietnamese attacks upon their neighbors. It arises today in El Salvador and Nicaragua. And it will undoubtedly arise in unforeseen ways in the years ahead.

But let us begin with Grenada. When armed forces of the United States occupied Grenada on October 25, 1983, accompanied by forces from six English-speaking Caribbean countries, the avowed purpose was to protect American citizens, restore order and liberate the country from Soviet-Cuban domination.

The military action of the United States was triggered by the murder on October 19 of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and other elected leaders by a militant communist faction led by Deputy Prime Minister Bernard Coard, an event accompanied by civil strife and the collapse of government authority. The United States declared that it acted in response to two requests for assistance: a formal request on October 23 from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), a regional grouping of seven Caribbean mini-states, and a confidential appeal from the Governor-General of Grenada as the sole remaining source of lawful government authority.[1]

Speaking in the United Nations Security Council on October 27, U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick emphasized that Cuban and Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Grenada was a major factor in the American decision. "Grenada's internal affairs," she said, "had fallen under the permanent intervention of one neighboring and one remote tyranny." Ambassador Kirkpatrick added that the U.S. action was justified by a "unique combination of circumstances" that included "danger to innocent United States nationals, the absence of a minimally responsible government in Grenada and the danger posed to the OECS by the relatively awesome military might that those responsible for the murder of the Bishop Government now had at their disposal."

"The United States response," she concluded, "was fully compatible with relevant international law and practice."[2]

If this was the American justification for its action in Grenada, on what basis could the U.N. General Assembly find that the same action was a "flagrant violation of international law?" And why did so many leaders of public opinion in the industrialized democracies—quite a few in the United States itself—rush to the judgment expressed by the Times of London: "There is no getting around the fact that the United States and its Caribbean allies have committed an act of aggression against Grenada. They are in breach of international law and of the Charter of the U.N."

Clearly on explanation for these divergent judgments was lack of agreement on the facts. Were American citizens really in danger? Were the "invitations" by the Governor-General of Grenada and the OECS spontaneous—or made under pressure from the U.S.? Were those who overthrew the Bishop government really acting on behalf of the Soviet Union or Cuba to destroy the independence of the country? Did the Soviet-Cuban military build-up in Grenada constitute an imminent danger to the security of Grenada's tiny and defenseless neighbors? Was the purpose of the U.S.-led occupying forces exclusively to restore order and assure the free exercise of sovereignty by the people of Grenada—or was it to impose a government to the liking of the United States? Finally, would the occupying forces really leave once order was restored and the conditions for free elections assured?

It is not my purpose in this essay to resolve these factual issues. Authoritative judgments on them in any event, are difficult to make now on the basis of publicly available evidence. I will only note in passing that if the trilateral countries failed to support the United States because they disbelieved the U.S. version of events, this in itself is a commentary on the state of trust and confidence between countries that are supposed to be allies and close friends. The trilateral countries were not prepared, to put it mildly, "to give the U.S. the benefit of the doubt."

It would be even more ominous for their future relations, however, if the trilateral countries were in fundamental disagreement over the principles to be applied in judging the legality and morality of the use of armed force by themselves or other nations.

Footnotes at end of article.

If that should be the case, it would place in doubt one of the premises of the trilateral concept—that there is, in fact, a real community of industrialized democracies capable of common action based on shared concepts not only of national interest, but of fundamental human values.[3]

The rules of international law governing the use of force may be found in treaties and in international customary law, that is the rules nations follow in practice out of a sense of legal obligation. The most authoritative statements of the rules are to be found in the following provisions of the United Nations Charter:

All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered. (Article 2(3)).

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations. (Article 2(4)).

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations . . . (Article 51).

Another source of applicable law is the Charter of the Organization of American States, which declares in Article 15: No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state.

Although the OAS formulation set forth above does not appear in the U.N. Charter, the General Assembly has adopted the identical language in a resolution in 1970 purporting to be an authoritative interpretation of the U.N. Charter, the Declaration of Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The search for principles to govern the use of armed force does not end, however, with the recitation of these broad propositions. International constitutions are not self-interpreting any more than national constitutions—nor are phrases like "armed attack," "self-defense" or "intervention" any more self-explanatory than "cruel and unusual punishments," "interstate commerce" or "due process of law." The process of interpretation requires sophisticated human judgement, which means at a minimum that interpretation of any single provision must take into account other provisions of the same document, the purposes of the international instrument as a whole, the drafting history, subsequent state practice and the applicability of rules of customary international law, possibly co-existing with the international agreement. Moreover, careful judgement must be used in the application of broad constitutional provisions in a variety of unique instances, many of which could not have been foreseen when the international constitution was drafted. As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once put it: "General principles do not decide concrete cases."

The simple truth is that international law on this subject is far from clear, as evidenced by the widespread disagreement between government decision-makers and respected scholars both within and between nations. As everyone knows, international law differs from domestic law in that there is no court of compulsory jurisdiction for its authoritative interpretation, nor is there a legislature to adjust the law to changing circumstances or a police force to secure universal enforcement. This does not necessarily mean that international law does not exist; there are mutual restraints and reciprocal concessions embodied in treaties and customary international law that nations choose to regard as legally binding out of perceived self-interest. Indeed, on a large number of subjects ranging from the Law of the Sea to diplomatic immunity, the rules of international law are observed by almost all nations almost all of the time. But clearly the interpretation of these rules in the decentralized international system is a more difficult matter than in the domestic legal order, particularly when we are dealing with an issue like the use of force which touches vital national interests. What we are really talking about is "word politics"[4] between nations—a struggle to shape norms to govern national behavior in support of certain national interests and values.

The challenge to trilateral countries is one of creative and purposeful international law-making—among themselves as a kind of "law-bloc"—and with other members of the international community. This means, first of all, looking carefully at those various formulations governing the use of armed force that have some basis of support in contemporary international law and deciding which ones should be espoused or rejected in the interest of promoting the values the trilateral countries share—among which are certainly those of peace, justice, national self-determination, and human rights.

A second stage would be a concerted effort—now so notably lacking—to observe these formulations in their own behavior and to press for their wider recognition through bilateral and multilateral diplomacy. What these formulations might be, at least in barest outline, I shall suggest in a moment.

CHALLENGES TO A "RULE OF LAW" APPROACH

There are, however, a number of very fundamental objections to this "rule of law" approach. The starkest objection comes from those who believe, as the Wall Street Journal suggested in the aftermath of Grenada, that international law simply does not exist. A variant of this view would be that although international law exists in the majority of international situations, it does not exist, or does not apply, when armed force is used by nations in what they conceive to be their supreme national interests. No less a figure than Dean Acheson drew that conclusion at the time of the U.S. quarantine of Cuba in 1962:

I must conclude that the propriety of the Cuban quarantine is not a legal issue. The power, position and prestige of the United States had been challenged by another state; and law simply does not deal with such questions of ultimate power—power that comes close to the sources of sovereignty . . . The survival of states is not a matter of law.[5]

This statement has powerful appeal in an age when the Soviet Union and its allies have violated traditional international law principles with impunity—and when nations like Iran, Libya and Syria have raised terrorism to the level of state practice. But do we really want to take the view that there are no legal rules applicable to judge the actions of the Soviet Union and its allies, or the smaller terrorist nations, which threaten the safety of free nations and the achievement of a decent world order? We would do well to remember the wise observation of one of Britain's greatest international lawyers, J.L. Brierly: "The ultimate explanation of the binding force of all law is that man, whether he is a single individual or whether he is associated with other men in a state, is constrained, so far as he is a reasonable being, to believe that order and not chaos is the governing principle of the world in which he has to live."[6]

In the nuclear age, it is precisely in dangerous confrontations of power that some ground rules are needed to preserve "order" and avert "chaos." A conclusion that "no law" is applicable would generally serve the interests of the Soviet Union and other challengers to the peace of free nations; it would create even more uncertainty and instability than we already have. There is no nation that denies the existence of international law, and all feel constrained to find legal justifications for their behavior. It is surely better to have nations arguing over what international law is than to assert that no international law applies at all.

I spoke earlier of "international law and morality." International law often codifies national interest and convenience, as in the Law of the Sea. In the sensitive area of the use of armed force, it seeks to codify morality as well. But it is precisely here that we come to a second fundamental objection to the "rule of law" approach: May there not be exceptional situations where the law may be disregarded if necessary to achieve some greater good? In real life, we all recognize extreme situations where violating the law may be appropriate to achieve some valid purpose—e.g., going through a red light to take an injured person to the hospital for urgent medical treatment.

Moreover, where traditional international law fails to take account of new realities and cannot be changed through negotiation and diplomacy, there may be exceptional situations where "law-making" through new state practice requires some temporary "law-breaking." A successful example of this phenomenon was the Truman Proclamation of 1945 taking jurisdiction over the resources of the continental shelf, a unilateral action that "broke" the old law before the new legal principle was "made" by general acceptance. Nevertheless, if we are to accept violations of traditional rules in exceptional cases, we should carefully consider whether the consequences are beneficial not just for the acting country, but for the majority of mankind as a whole—and whether the value of the objective being served outweighs the damage that the unilateral change in the rules may do to the future conduct of international relations. I do not suggest that this legal-moral calculation is an easy one. But I do reject the notion that in international affairs the end always justifies the means, a proposition that is readily available to totalitarian powers, as well as to free nations.

There is yet another objection to the "rule of law" approach, from those who argue that the rules of international law, particularly those governing the use of armed force, are capable of almost any interpretation, and should simply be manipulated by nations in each case to achieve whatever foreign policy goal seems valid at the moment. But the U.N. Charter and other sources of international law cannot be treated as pieces of India rubber to be stretched one way and then another in light of the short-term political necessities of each situation. There has to be some continuity in our day-to-day interpretation. If we "bend" the principles to fit one case, we must be willing to live with the new configu-

ration in the next. The Soviet Union cannot very well be denied the same freedom to resort to force which the United States claims through "liberal interpretations" of existing norms. As Justice Robert Jackson once put it in a domestic context:

A military order, however unconstitutional, is not apt to last longer than the military emergency . . . But once a judicial opinion rationalizes such an order to show that it conforms to the Constitution, or rather rationalizes the Constitution to show that the Constitution sanctions such an order, the Court for all time has validated the principle . . . The principle then lies about like a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need.[7]

Yet another challenge to the "rule of law" approach comes from the believers in "spheres of influence." According to this view, the United States must be conceded the same freedom to defend its interests in Latin America as the Soviet Union claims in Eastern Europe. In other words, accept the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty for Eastern Europe in return for a "reverse" Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty for Latin America, with perhaps other such doctrines for China, Vietnam, Britain, France, Japan and other countries in areas of historic interest to them.

It scarcely needs emphasis that this approach does violence to the principles of sovereign equality and self-determination embodied in the United Nations Charter and other treaties in force, and that it would never be accepted by the small nations of the world, least of all by those in the "spheres of influence" that are principally at issue. Nor is such a concept likely to appeal to the citizens of the United States and other industrialized democracies, most of whom profess a principled concern for freedom and human rights in all parts of the world, from Poland and Grenada to Tibet and Cambodia.

A similar challenge to the "rule of law" approach might be described as a rough and ready theory of "reciprocity." It is a principle well-recognized in the common law—and perhaps more generally in all legal systems—that when one party violates a material provision in a contract, the other party is relieved of its obligations under the same instrument. It is argued by analogy that as long as the Soviet Union and other totalitarian powers persistently violate the norms laid down in the Charter and other sources of international law, the United States and other free nations must have the right to do so when necessary to defend their interests. To quote Dean Acheson again: "We must never forget that between an opponent who is prepared to use force to gain his end and one who is not prepared to use force to defend his interests—the former is usually the winner."[8]

International law clearly permits the United States to refuse to perform its commitments in a bilateral agreement with the Soviet Union if the Soviet Union has breached a material provision of that same agreement. It may also permit the United States to take broader measures against the Soviet Union—measures that might otherwise be considered illegal—in response to Soviet violations of international law directed against the United States. But it is quite another thing to claim that the United States should be released from its obligations to innocent third countries because the Soviet Union is disobeying the rules.

The concept that we must be free to "fight fire with fire" has undoubted political appeal and certainly would make it easier for the industrialized democracies to defend their security interests in particular situations. But if the trilateral countries accept the Soviet standard of international behavior as their own, do they then forfeit any claim before the rest of the world to stand on a higher plane of morality? Do they abandon all legal restraints on the use of force or only some, and do they cast aside the restraints on forcible intervention everywhere or only in countries where the rules have already been violated by their adversaries? A "tit-for-tat" rejection of legal restraints on the use of force—"you invaded Afghanistan so we can invade anyone we like"—will encounter violent opposition from almost everyone but the superpowers and will quickly bring the standard of international behavior down to the lowest common denominator. As I shall suggest in a moment, most of the benefits of the "reciprocity" approach can be achieved with less cost to the trilateral countries by a judicious use of the concept of "self/defense" consistently with respect for international law.

In this catalogue of challenges to a "rule of law" approach there is one, however, that merits more sympathetic consideration. This is the view that reads as interdependent and correlative the provisions of the U.N. charter restraining the use of force by member states and the provisions of the Charter placing on the United Nations the duty to establish international peace and justice. With the frustration of the Charter system for collective security and the peaceful settlement of disputes, it is argued, the member states must recover their preexisting freedom of action to protect their interests by means of individual or collective self-help. As Professor Arthur Goodhart of Oxford put it during the Suez crisis of 1956: "The renunciation of the use of force in Article 2(4) is not of an absolute character, but is dependent on the proper enforcement of international order by the United Nations." If a different view were accepted, he argued, U.N. members would be obliged to stand idly by in the face of the most extreme violations of their rights and "membership in the United Nations would be a source of danger and of weakness to the law-abiding nations."[9]

This "frustration of Charter purposes" concept, however, still leaves us with some of the same problems that we found with the other challenges to a "rule of law" approach. If Article 2(4) of the Charter is set aside, what norms are then applicable? To abandon all restraints in the Charter because of the U.N.'s weakness would serve neither peace nor justice, nor would it advance the cause of rebuilding the U.N.'s collective processes. At the same time, there is merit in the view that the Charter restraints on the use of force must be interpreted differently in today's world than they would have been in the world envisaged at San Franciso. How this might be done is the question to which we now turn.

ELEMENTS OF A "RULE OF LAW" APPROACH

If it is in the interest of the industrialized democracies, subject to the qualifications noted above, to follow a "rule of law" approach to the use of armed force, what should be the applicable legal principles? Volumes of learned scholarship have been written on this enormously difficult and complex subject. What follows is a brief review of five concepts of varying degrees of persuasiveness from which the trilateral countries will need to fashion a common approach.

Self-defense

The United Nations Charter codifies "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations." There is general agreement in the international community that this gives a nation the right to use force when its territory or its armed forces are attacked or when an attack is made on the territory or armed forces of another nation to which it is bound in a collective self-defense arrangement like NATO.

There are some specific questions about the self-defense concept, however, that are more difficult to resolve. For example: Can the concept of self-defense be stretched to legitimize a use of force in anticipation of an "armed attack?" In the Cuban missile crisis, the United States deliberately declined to use "anticipatory self-defense" as a justification for the quarantine of Cuba, and with good reason. If the deployment of Soviet missiles in Cuba could provide a legal basis for a blockade of Cuba in 1962, could not the Soviet Union use "anticipatory self-defense" to justify forcible action to stop the deployment of the Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe in 1984? It would be a dangerous doctrine, particularly in an age of nuclear weapons, to say that the mere deployment and readying of weapons justified the preemptive use of force by others. Yet international law before the U.N. Charter did recognize the right of anticipatory self-defense when the "necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation."[10] It is doubtful that the U.N. Charter was intended to deny a nation the right to defend itself against an armed attack that was already underway. Where to draw the line between permissible response to an imminent attack and impermissible response against the readying of weapons will not always be easy, but the principle seems clear enough and finds support in existing practice. Israel, for example, received no support in the United Nations for its preemptive strike against Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981, but it received widespread support (and no U.N. condemnation) when it began hostilities in 1967 after President Nasser blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba.

Another question concerns self-defense in the face of "indirect aggression." In today's world, an "armed attack" can occur not only through the marching of troops or the launching of weapons across borders, but by the forcible seizure of power within one country by persons acting as agents of another country with the aim of destroying the first country's independence. This would suggest that "collective self-defense" should also embrace military action to defend the freedom and independence of a country that is being subjected to a previous indirect aggression by others. Putting it another way, "counter-intervention" in response to a prior illegal intervention should not be regarded as illegal provided it has as its motive and actual consequence the preservation of the freedom and independence of the people on whose behalf the "counter-intervention" is carried out. John Stuart Mill was an advocate of this principle as far back as 1848 in an eloquent passage that has particular application today:

The doctrine of non-intervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profes-

sion of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue: that the wrong side may help the wrong but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce non-intervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent.

Since the first Hague conference in 1899, the international community has sought to develop rules of warfare to limit the destructiveness of conflicts and particularly the damage to innocent civilians. When armed force is used in self-defense or under any other legal theory, therefore, there is not only the question of when force may be used, but how it is used. One principle of continued vitality is that of "military necessity"—that is, a use of force in self-defense or on some other basis should be limited so far as possible to military objectives. No doubt this is a difficult principle to apply in the nuclear age; yet in its human purpose it is a principle that merits support from the community of nations.

Protection of Nationals

The United States and other trilateral countries have long asserted a right to use force on the territory of another nation to protect their nationals from an imminent threat of injury where the territorial sovereign was unable or unwilling to protect them. The U.S.-Belgium rescue effort in the Congo in 1964, Israel's raid on Entebbe, and the initial phase of the American landings in the Dominican Republic in 1965 and in Grenada all relied on this principle. To avoid abuse of the concept, it is generally conceded that the measures taken must be strickly confined to the purpose of protection—thus there would be no justification in occupying a country after endangered citizens had been removed. Most developing countries still challenge this legal concept, even when so strictly limited. Yet it seems evident that the industrialized democracies should continue to support it in an age where terrorist acts and the collapse of civil authority are all too frequent occurrences.

Military Assistance Upon Request

Traditional international law has recognized the right of one country to give military assistance to another at the latter's request, including the deployment of armed forces on its territory. It is still a widely held view that it is legal to assist the established government in a civil war situation, but not the insurgent group, at least not until the insurgents have become sufficiently established that other countries may appropriately grant them belligerent status. But this whole question of assistance upon request and intervention in civil wars is one of the most controversial areas of international law, with the Soviet Union, Cuba, and many developing countries challenging the traditional customary law rule and insisting on a right to support "wars of national liberation" against established governments. Here is an area where the U.N. Charter is silent and the practice of states offers no clear guide for judgement, for the evident reason that no clear consensus exists within the international community.

It seems clear that the trilateral countries have a common interest in supporting the traditional international law rule prohibiting outside military support on behalf of revolutionary movements seeking to overthrow existing governments. They also have a common interest in affirming the right to provide military support to established governments defending themselves against a foreign-supported revolution. A closer question for the trilateral countries is whether, in the absence of any foreign intervention whatsoever, they should continue to assert a right to assist established governments to put down indigenous revolutionary movements. One problem with this traditional doctrine is that it provides ready justification for the use of armed force by the United States and other trilateral countries in support of any government, no matter how dictatorial or unpopular, to help it suppress popular forces seeking political and social reform. Moreover, it may help the Soviet Union to justify its uses of force to achieve the permanent incorporation into the Soviet orbit of any country which has once been taken over by a Soviet-supported communist coup. Soviet troops went into Hungary and Afghanistan, after all, in response to "requests" by pro-Soviet leaders falsely purporting to speak for the legitimate government of the country. Had they gone into Poland, they could probably have produced a request from General Jaruzelski.

On the other hand, military assistance upon request aimed merely at the restoration of law and order and not at the suppression of an indigenous revolutionary movement would seem to offer less problems as a legal concept for the trilateral countries and others. Here again, it will not always be easy to draw the line.

Regional Action

Article 52 of the United Nations Charter permits regional organizations to deal with "such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action," provided that their activities "are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations." Article 53 further provides that no "enforcement action" shall be taken by regional organizations without the authorization of the Security Council.

The United States has sought to justify as a legitimate use of regional peacekeeping the OAS-authorized quarantine of Cuba in 1962 and the OAS-authorized peace force which occupied the Dominican Republic in 1965 after the collapse of order in that country. It has also sought to justify the occupation of Grenada as a valid regional peacekeeping effort by the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. In the Dominican and Grenada cases, the United States argued that no "enforcement action" requiring Security Council approval was involved, since force was not being exercised against the will of a state, but only to maintain order after the collapse of government authority. In the Cuban quarantine, the U.S. argued that there was no "enforcement action" because the members of the OAS acted pursuant to a recommendation rather than a mandatory decision—a questionable theory to say the least, since certainly there was "enforcement" of the blockade against the ships of the Soviet Union and other countries.

It is not clear that the concept of regional peacekeeping adds to the uses of force that would otherwise be legally available to individual countries. Article 52 requires that actions by regional agencies must be consistent with United Nations principles. One of those principles is the prohibition in Article 2(4) of the use of force against the "territorial integrity or political independence of any state." Uses of force that would be illegal if undertaken by a single nation are not validated therefore simply because they are undertaken by several states pursuant to recommendations by regional agencies. In the Grenada and Dominican Republic cases, reliance on the concept of regional action would require a demonstration that the "territorial integrity" or "political independence" of those nations was not violated. In short, the prohibition in Article 2(4) could be given a limited interpretation. But in that event, action by the United States alone would have been just as lawful (though less politically attractive) as action by the regional group.

"Humanitarian" or "Democratic" Intervention

Some scholars now argue that international law permits one or more countries to use force in the territory of another to put an end to human rights abuses or vindicate the rights of the people to democratic institutions. Indeed, Ambassador Kirkpatrick has used this argument to justify U.S. military support for the "Contras" seeking to overthrow the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua.[11] The concept of "humanitarian" or "democratic" intervention is undeniably attractive when the world is faced with extreme situations such as Hitler's campaign of genocide against six million Jews or Idi Amin's wanton slaughter of his own countrymen. It is, however, a principle that finds little support in treaty law or the customary rules that derive from consistent state practice. It is also vulnerable to an obvious practical objection. Two thirds of the members of the international community are less than fully functioning democracies and at least one third engage in gross and persistent human rights violations. A legal principle that would authorize unilateral or collective intervention against such a large number of countries would be an invitation to an unrestrained world civil war—too threatening to international peace and stability to command broad support within the international community or by the trilateral countries themselves.

What is the application of the five concepts outlined above to the Grenada situation? If the facts as given by the United States government are accepted, the principle that force may be used to protect endangered citizens clearly justifies the initial Grenada landings. The continued occupation of Grenada once that purpose had been accomplished can be justified on the basis of the invitation by the Governor-General to put an end to foreign intervention and/or maintain domestic order, assuming the constitution of Grenada provides him with the necessary authority to issue such an invitation.

For the reasons given earlier, the concepts of "regional action" and "humanitarian" or "democratic" intervention are not good legal arguments for the Grenada action. But "collective self-defense" is a concept that can apply to Grenada. This is not the "anticipatory self-defense" of Grenada's neighbors, which would stretch the concept too far since no attack upon them was imminent. Rather it would be the murder of Bishop and the seizure of power by persons allegedly acting as agents of the Soviet Union or Cuba for the purpose of subordinating Grenada's sovereignty to one or both of those countries that could be regarded as a "use of force" against the political independence of Grenada, justifying a collective self-defense action by the United States and Grenada's neighbors. To put it another way, and assuming over again that the facts presented by the United States are accepted, the Soviet Union and Cuba "intervened" illegally in Grenada to suppress freedom; the United States lawfully "counter-intervened" with Grenada's neighbors to restore free-

dom. The use of force observed the requirement of military necessity since a genuine effort was made to avoid harm to innocent civilians.

This brief exposition of applicable legal theories,[12] simplified in the extreme for the purpose of brevity, may well raise more questions than it resolves. Some will challenge the validity of my necessarily abbreviated formulations and subjective judgements. Fair enough. The basic purpose of this essay is not to suggest that the answers to these questions are clear, but rather that the trilateral countries should accord high priority in thinking about them at senior levels of government in an effort to develop a trilateral consensus.

The Soviet Union and its allies in the developing world are actively promoting legal doctrines to serve their interests in international fora like the United Nations, in their bilateral diplomacy and in their unilateral official pronouncements. Their purpose is obvious—to prohibit all "imperialist interventions" by the trilateral countries while legitimizing all Soviet-sponsored uses of armed force in support of "wars of national liberation." If the trilateral countries wish to shape a world order conducive to the promotion of peace and freedom, they will need in their turn to develop a more unified and purposeful approach on these questions than they have thus far.

A trilateral report on the international law of armed force, written by scholars from Western Europe, North America and Japan, on the basis of broad consultation with governmental and private authorities throughout the world could be a useful first step toward achieving some consensus on an issue of central importance to the industrialized democracies and all other free nations.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Grenada—A Preliminary Report*, Released by the Departments of State and Defense, December 1983.

[2] Provisional Verbatim Record of the U.N. Security Council meeting of October 27, 1983, S/PV.2491, pp. 28-43.

[3] The issue raised is when the use of force is legal and moral, not when it serves the national interest. The two issues should be clearly distinguished: There may be cases where the use of armed force by one or more of the trilateral countries would find a clear basis in law and morality but would be politically inexpedient. Conversely, a use of force may be politically expedient but neither legal nor moral.

[4] The phrase is that of Professor Thomas Franck of New York University.

[5] *Proceedings* of the American Society of International Law (1963), p. 14.

[6] J.L. Brierly, *The Law of Nations*, pp. 55-66 (6th edition, 1963).

[7] *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214, 246 (1944).

[8] "Foreign Policy and Presidential Moralism," *The Reporter*, May 2, 1957.

[9] A.L. Goodhart, "Some Legal Aspects of the Suez Situation." *Tensions in the Middle East*. Philip W. Thayer, Ed., Johns Hopkins University Press, 1958.

[10] Daniel Webster's famous communication to the British government in the *Caroline* case, August 6, 1842, cited in 2 Moore, *Digest of International Law* 412 (1906).

[11] *The New York Times*, June 30, 1983.

[12] In the interest of brevity, there has been no discussion of a sixth possible justification for the use of armed force—reprisal by one nation against the illegal action of another. As a practical matter, this justification is not usually invoked in the major uses of armed force with which we have been concerned here. There is much disagreement, in any event, on whether and under what conditions armed reprisals are permitted under the U.N. Charter.

A TRIBUTE TO L. M. GREGG

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 31, 1984, the city of Tuskegee, Ala., lost one of its most outstanding citizens when L. M. Gregg passed away. Mr. Gregg was chairman pro tempore of the city council at the time of his death.

Mr. Gregg was a native of North Carolina. While serving in the U.S. Air Force in World War II, he was assigned to Tuskegee's Molton Field as a flight instructor and went on to settle there after the war.

In 1947, he opened Gregg's Cleaners which he operated until his retirement. His political career began in 1960 when he was elected to the city council for the first of six consecutive terms. He was unopposed for the last three of those terms, during which he served as chairman pro tempore.

An involved civic leader, Mr. Gregg was a member of the American Legion, a Master Mason and a member of Tuskegee's Lodge No. 57. In honor of his dedication to the Tuskegee community, the local young Volunteers in Action has proposed that the new YVA Youth Center be named the L. M. Gregg Memorial Youth Center. This would truly be a fitting tribute to this fine individual.

Mr. President, L. M. Gregg was an unselfish public servant, giving of himself at every opportunity. During his lifetime, he served as a stabilizing force in bringing unity to Tuskegee and its people. He will be sorely missed.

I extend my most sincere sympathies to his wife, Maude Gregg, his mother, Mrs. Charlotte Gregg, and his sons, Jeff and Bill.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Tuskegee newspaper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tuskegee News, Apr. 5, 1984]

CITY MOURNS PASSING OF L. M. GREGG

Flags were flown at half-mast Monday as the City of Tuskegee mourned the passing of Chairman Pro-Tem L. M. Gregg.

Gregg passed away Saturday night at Baptist Hospital in Montogomery.

A native of Watauga County, North Carolina, Gregg came to Tuskegee in 1942 as a flight instructor at Moton Field. He was elected to the City Council in 1960 and served six consecutive terms (24 years) the last three of which he ran unopposed and served as Chairman Pro Tempore.

Those who did not know him through his work with the Council knew him as the owner of—Gregg's Cleaners which opened for business in 1947 and is located on South Main St. in Tuskegee.

Mayor Johnny Ford said Monday, "We lost a very dedicated public servant. L. M. Gregg was a stabilizing force here on the Council and he did much to heel the wounds that existed between the races during and following the civil rights struggle here in Tuskegee. L. M. Gregg will long be remembered as a most unselfish public servant who gave his best to this city and all of her people.

Gregg is survived by his wife Maude Godfrey Gregg; his two sons, Jeffrey A. Gregg of Tuskegee; and William M. Gregg of Athens, Ga.; two grandchildren, Jeffrey and Jason; one sister, Jackie Gregg Ward of Ashville, N.C.; and his mother Mrs. Ellen Gregg.

A memorial service was held for Gregg at the Municipal Complex Monday morning. Graveside services were held in Society Hill.

In honor of Chairman Pro-Tem Gregg, the City of Tuskegee Young Volunteers in Action is proposing to name the new YVA Youth Center, presently under renovation, the L. M. Gregg Memorial Youth Center.

"We feel it fitting that a facility dedicted to the youth of this community be so named because of his zestful life and energetic sense of fairness, futuristic visions and noble principles." YVA staff members stated.

A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today, May 3, 1984, has been proclaimed by President Reagan as a "National Day of Prayer." All across our land, millions of Americans of various faiths will unite with one voice and one purpose in beseeching God's blessing on this great nation.

Prayer is the channel by which we communicate our thanks to God for the freedoms he has provided Americans, and is the means by which we express our greatest needs to Him. We know that courageous leaders such as Washington, Lincoln, and others faced our Nation's most difficult challenges by looking to God in humble prayer. Today, Americans are no less dependent on God, and should follow the example of their forefathers in recognizing our Creator as the greatest source of strength and sustenance during these equally trying times.

Mr. President, because prayer is important in our lives, I will continue to work diligently toward the passage of my constitutional amendment allowing voluntary prayer in public schools, which the Senate failed to approve only months ago. The denial of prayer for our schoolchildren today could very well be a stumbling block for tomorrow's leaders.

Without question, prayer is an essential element in the spiritual life of our Nation. Let us join together on this "National Day of Prayer," as we should every day, to offer our praise to God and seek His continued guidance for America.

TERMINATION OF INQUIRY CONCERNING FORMER SENATOR HARRISON WILLIAMS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HEFLIN and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the Select Committee on Ethics terminating its inquiry into allegations that former Senator Harrison Wil-

liams may have converted campaign contributions to his personal use be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDER

FACTS

In April 1982, Bernard Mondi, Treasurer of the Williams' Project 76 Committee, filed an Advisory Opinion Request with the Federal Election Commission. The Commission's guidance was sought on the closing of the Senator's campaign committee account. Attached to the ruling request, and cited in it, was a March 26 letter to Mr. Mondi from Robert Flynn, Senator Williams' attorney, asserting that the Federal Election Campaign Act at 2 U.S.C. 439a permitted the Senator "to use excess campaign funds for any purpose he wishes . . ." The Commission's Response (AO 1982-33) concluded that the Federal Election Campaign Act made it possible for Members serving prior to January 8, 1980 to convert campaign contributions to their "personal use." The Commission noted, however, that it took no position on the application of Senate rules presented by the request, such rules not being within the Commission's jurisdiction.

The Senate Ethics Committee became aware of the Senator's campaign committee's Advisory Opinion Request and the Commission's action when newspaper articles appeared stating that Senator Williams intended to "pocket" about $70,000 in campaign contributions. Since Senate Rule 38.2 precludes Members and former Members from converting campaign contributions to their personal use, the Committee sought from Senator Williams an explanation of the use to which the campaign funds were to be put.

In December of 1982, Senator Williams and Mr. Flynn, appeared before the Committee. Senator Williams testified that all funds received from his campaign committee had been used to defray legal expenses related to the ABSCAM matter. In subsequent discussions with Ethics Committee attorneys, and in materials submitted to the Committee, Mr. Flynn has provided additional assurances that all funds derived from the campaign committee were used to defray legal expenses. He further stated that an automobile belonging to the campaign committee was either given directly to charity, or raffled off, the proceeds going to charity.

DISCUSSION

While the Committee has not received from Senator Williams and Mr. Flynn an accounting of campaign committee expenditures in complete detail, as we desire, we have seen no evidence indicating that Senator Williams' testimony was incorrect or that he "pocketed" campaign contributions. Since Senator Williams is now incarcerated in a Federal penal facility, we do not believe that Mr. Flynn will be able to secure all the relevant material that would be required to construct a full and complete accounting of expenditures from the Senator's campaign committee and further, we do not believe that this matter should remain unresolved for an indeterminate period of time.

HOLDINGS

1. We reaffirm our Interpretative Ruling No. 206 of December 11, 1978, which held that the donation of excess campaign contributions to a charitable organization is not a conversion to "personal use" prohibited by Rule 38.2. We extend that ruling to include assets held by a Senator's campaign committee.

2. We hold that the use of funds derived from Senator Williams' campaign committee to defray necessary and appropriate expenses incurred in legal proceedings related to the ABSCAM matter is not a conversion to personal use prohibited by Rule 38.2.

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that the Committee's inquiry into this matter is terminated.

DIANA HOPE HAMILTON

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to salute an outstanding public servant, Diana Hope Hamilton, the executive director of the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition.

Diana is leaving the coalition to pursue a master's degree in business.

She has worked effectively with 38 Senators representing diverse political philosophies, which is no small accomplishment. She has also been able to galvanize representatives of our legislative staffs into working toward common goals that benefit the Northeast and Midwestern regions of the Nation.

Diana is an exceptional individual. She has mastered the techniques of the legislative process, while at the same time expanding the influence of the coalition.

I know of very few people who could accomplish what she has in 3 years.

The coalition is now interviewing candidates to replace Diana and we are having a difficult time finding a replacement because of the standards she met.

Along with my colleagues, I wish her well in her future endeavors and want Diana to know that we are going to miss her.

THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE IN 1985

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Mr. Ralph Hofstad, president of Land O' Lakes, Inc. This article entitled, "50-Year-Old Attitude Is No Longer Acceptable," presents a succinct overview of our Nation's agricultural policy and directions for the 1985 farm bill.

Mr. Hofstad states that in some respects agriculture is overlooked or taken for granted by the general public and policymakers alike. Considering that agriculture provides jobs for 23 million people and contributed $35 billion in exports last year to offset our national trade deficit, many U.S. citizens have yet to realize and appreciate the value of our agricultural economy.

An idea endorsed by Mr. Hofstad and others called for the establishment of a Presidential commission to study the intertwining of our agricultural policy with national policies. The result of the commission findings would be a benchmark for policy considerations included in the 1985 farm bill.

The President found favor with this idea and announced in January that the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture would conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of current food and agricultural policy. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Block, chairs this Council.

In March, I questioned Secretary Block on the progress being made by the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture pertaining to preparation of the 1985 farm bill. He provided me with this information and an agenda, which outlines the objectives of the Council and the principal players involved.

Mr. President, I ask that the article written by Mr. Hofstad of Land O' Lakes, Inc., and Secretary Block's statement before the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

50-YEAR-OLD ATTITUDE IS NO LONGER ACCEPTABLE

(By Ralph Hofstad)

A half a century ago, with the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, our nation put into effect a set of farm policies and programs to meet the needs of the times. As a consequence, we have for the past 50 years tended to view ag policy as a self-contained body of ideas and programs with little relationship to our national and international policies and other interests. But times have changed. Significant relationships have developed.

Now, during discussion of the 1985 Farm Bill, is the time to set the situation right by producing a comprehensive, long-term food and agricultural policy that more adequately meets our current and future needs.

This new policy, in my view, must become an integral part of our foreign, trade, monetary and other policies so that various programs do not conflict with one another but, rather, recognize the interdependent relationship of one to the other. Additionally, this policy must be isolated from changes in administration and must help promote full and responsible utilization of our primary capability as a nation: the production of food.

The United States leads the world in food production for two basic reasons:

(1) Entrepreneurship of our family farm system encourages innovation and productivity.

(2) Our natural resources—vast land areas and friendly climate—provide an environment well suited for crop and animal production.

Agriculture and our entire food industry are natural treasures, our crown jewels. They regularly provide jobs for 23 million people and contributed $35 billion in exports last year as the single biggest offset to our mammoth trade deficit.

And yet, in some respects agriculture seems to be overlooked or taken for granted by the general public and policymakers alike. Even President Reagan neglected to mention our food and agricultural industry

in his State of the Union address earlier this year.

Agricultural policy must address this lack of appreciation for the contribution our food system makes to the national economy, along with three other equally significant concerns:

Widely fluctuating farm prices.

High interest rates.

Weak export marketing program.

So where do we begin in drafting such a policy? I believe we start with the establishment of a presidential commission made up of cabinet-rank officials who are concerned with domestic and foreign affairs, as well as with leaders from all sectors of the nation's food and agricultural system, including farmers and consumers.

Senator Bob Dole endorsed just such an idea in his address to the Land O'Lakes annual meeting. The senator put it this way: "I have written President Reagan to recommend creation of a presidential task force on agricultural trade and food assistance policy, to report after the November elections and before debate begins on the new farm bill. The group would be asked to set out a long-term agenda and comprehensive policy statement, and also to rationalize the cost and purpose of existing export and assistance programs."

I applaud Senator Dole's stand. One idea I believe the commission should pursue is the formation of a Federal Food and Agriculture Board patterned after the Federal Reserve Board. This board could be given wide-ranging authority and responsibility in the areas of supply, distribution, pricing and other factors. The board, like the Federal Reserve Board, wouldn't be tied to the political fortunes of a particular administration and could operate in the best interest of agriculture. I believe that the consumer, the farmer, and representatives of our food and agricultural system would very much appreciate the opportunity to get involved in such an endeavor.

The President and the Congress must act now, establish the commission, and call for its findings before the final review of the 1985 Farm Bill but after the fall election so it's not a political commission. This select group of individuals chosen to participate in this important study must be able and willing to step back and take a good, hard look at our food and agricultural treasure and all of our national policies which impact on it.

Developing a Comprehensive Dialog and Review of Agriculture and Food Programs

(By John R. Block)

Unprecedented events in the U.S. and world economies over the last three years have brought current farm policy to the forefront of discussion. The growing interdependency of agriculture and the international market over the past two decades has rendered present farm policy tools ineffective in dealing with the resultant volatility and uncertainty. It is time to look at basic policy changes that agriculture must face realistically in the long run, particularly with respect to the new omnibus farm legislation that will be up for renewal in 1985.

While there are no clear answers to what changes should be made, I know everyone feels that the policies adopted during 1985 will affect agriculture through the turn of the century. There is a genuine need for all concerned parties—farmers, consumers, and those who supply the farmer with inputs as well as process and market the product from the farm gate to the retail store—to become involved in order to find the answers to the problems confronting agriculture.

This must be a long-term effort in which everyone listens to and learns from one another about the new realities facing agriculture both domestically and internationally. We must expose misconceptions to factual evidence and consider all viable options, disregarding philosphical differences. Agriculture is the largest and most important industry in our nation we must seek to ensure it a healthy future. The evolution of the current state of agriculture highlights some of these new realities.

Evolution of the Current Crisis in Agriculture and Food Policy

During the decade of the 1970's, the volume of U.S. exports increased 150 percent in response to a growing world demand. This growth in world demand is evidenced by an increase of nearly a third in world grain consumption and a rise in oilseed consumption of over 50 percent. Spurred by improved technology, U.S. agricultural output grew about a third during the decade in order to meet the heightened demand. Farm production assets more than tripled in that time of heavy investment. As a result, principal crop acreage harvested in the U.S. increased by about 55 million acres and livestock production made a substantial gain.

This was generally a time of increasing inflation worldwide. By the end of 1980 the annual rate of inflation in the U.S. was running 12 to 14 percent and interest rates were several percentage points higher. With heavy investment and high interest rates, farm debt soared, growing from $50 billion to over $150 billion in the decade of the 1970's.

In this inflationary period, farm market prices increased substantially and support levels, tied to the costs of production, were ratcheted up to unprecedented levels. At the same time, during the 1970's a relatively weak dollar enhanced our competitive position in world trade and helped lead to major gains in world markets, most notably grain and soybeans.

This was the setting at the time the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 was being formulated. We had just come through a period of major expansion in the export earnings of the U.S. agricultural sector. It was widely believed that the United States was the only country that could produce enough food to satisfy the world's needs. Events of the 1970's were taken as precursors of things to come. Because of inflation, high and rising world oil prices, and a weak dollar, forecasts of continued strong export demand, rising production costs, and full production seemed reasonable expectations.

We should have reasoned that there would be times when we would move off trend, due in large part to the international influence on the farm economy. International and domestic economies had become increasingly interdependent, and we had little control over some major variables such as exchange rates, growth rates, and the like. While greater volatility was a reasonable expectation in an expanding world agricultural system, we were not prepared for the events that began unfolding in 1981 and have continued through the present.

First of all, the world experienced the worst and most pervasive recession in recent memory. With this came a downturn in world demand that saw our export volume decline for the first time in 13 years. The downturn in world demand had a dramatic impact upon many of our fastest growing markets in middle and lower income countries. The decade of the 1970's had witnessed tremendous increases in debt worldwide as the rapidly growing industrial countries and the dollar-rich OPEC countries provided large volumes of credit to many of these countries. With the downturn in world trade, these countries have had great difficulty earning sufficient hard currency through their own exports to pay the interest on their debt much less maintain import levels. Concurrently, less credit was available as growth rates in major industrial countries weakened and the OPEC trade surplus disappeared. Thus, as the financial condition of many of our prominent foreign customers such as Eastern Europe, Mexico and Brazil steadily worsened, their purchases from us plummeted. Our agricultural export volume for 1983 is estimated at 12 percent below 1980—the third straight year of decline—even though value may go up by close to $3 billion.

Meanwhile, the value of the dollar steadily increased as foreign investors sought the security and high rates of return from American investments. The increase in the value of the dollar meant that our products were becoming more expensive in terms of the local currencies of our foreign customers. Thus, American products became less competitive in world markets and our volume of trade suffered.

To make matters worse, the downturn in world demand was accompanied by increased tariffs and subsidization practices by some of our major foreign competitors—most notably the European Community (EC). For example, the EC just recently increased its subsidy for wheat flour in order to take over a larger portion of the Egyptian wheat flour market. Other countries such as Japan continue their policies of limiting access of certain agricultural products through quotas and non-tariff trade barriers.

Other factors beyond anyone's control, such as the weather, also compounded our problems during this period of stagnant demand. Unusually good weather worldwide during the 1981 and 1982 growing seasons resulted in record crops at home and good crops abroad. While we are appreciative of bountiful harvests, the record harvests of 1981 and 1982 came at a time of slack demand and resulted in the largest surpluses in history. The large surpluses continued to overhang the market as we approached the 1983 crop year, and this led to reduced prices and incomes for many farmers.

By the fall of 1982, it became obvious that the traditional commodity programs were insufficient to deal with the huge surpluses on hand. In fact, certain aspects of these programs were encouraging more to be produced. A special program was needed to specifically address the immediate needs of agriculture. As a stopgap measure, the payment-in-kind program (PIK) was the best alternative avilable to deal with the record surpluses. It did not short the market and was the least costly approach since it used government stocks and secured loans as payment for the acreage taken out of production.

The worst drought in 50 years followed on the heels of the PIK program and sharply reduced 1983 crop production, especially for feed grains and soybeans. For example, the estimates of corn production was 2 billion bushels higher in July than the harvested crop. Because of record carrying, crop supplies for 1983/84 are adequate for domestic and foreign needs. However, in addition to many unprotected crop producers, livestock

and poultry producers have been financially squeezed by smaller feed supplies and rising feed prices as a consequence of the drought.

While the cause and effect of the various events that influence agriculture are often a matter of opinion, two fundamental facts are clear. First, the future is unpredictable. After witnessing world recession, record annual world grain, output, the largest acreage reduction even and the worst drought in a half a century—all in just over two years—I think few would disagree. Second, U.S. agriculture and the factors affecting it are changing as the sector becomes increasingly integrated into the domestic and internatioal economy. The agriculture and food sector has become an export sensitive sector that employs over 20 percent of the U.S. labor force and generates one-fifth of our nation's economic activity. It is no longer isolated from the development or policies of other sectors of our economy or the policies and events in other countries.

PRESIDENT REAGAN TAKES ACTION

President Reagan is well aware of the importance of agriculture in the economy. He has made special efforts to reassure the world of our role as a reliable supplier and he has eliminated the policies which have so damaged our image in major foreign markets. But he recognizes that we are in a watershed period for agriculture and food policy and we must act if we are to use this time effectively.

One of the first groups invited to meet with President Reagan at the White House in 1984 was a group of farm leaders. At that meeting on January 5, the President announced that he was charging the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of current food and agriculture programs. The President indicated that the purpose of this endeavor was to better prepare the Administration to participate in the debate on the future of Federal food and farm programs and policies. The President emphasized that his Administration would be seeking information and ideas from people inside and outside of government during this comprehensive review and assessment.

To understand the priority that President Reagan has placed on this review and assessment of future agriculture and food policy, it is necessary to know something about the President's decision-making process. The organizational structure that the Reagan Administration has devised for formulating policy advice builds upon a "Cabinet Government" approach.

Broad issues affecting the entire government and overall budgetary and fiscal matters are reviewed at meetings of the full Cabinet. Other issues that cross agency lines are reviewed, as appropriate, before the National Security Council or the Cabinet Councils on Economic Affairs, Commerce and Trade, Human Resources, Natural Resources and Environment, Food and Agriculture, Legal Policy, and Management and Administration.

The membership of the Cabinet Councils varies with department and agency responsibilities. The Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture has the following membership: President Reagan, Chairman; Secretary of Agriculture, Chairman Pro Tem; Secretary of State; Secretary of Interior; Secretary of Commerce; Secretary of Transportation; U.S. Trade Representative; Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The Cabinet Councils have three levels of operation. At the highest level, their meetings are chaired by the President. At working sessions, the lead Cabinet member on each Cabinet Council presides as chairman. The third level of Cabinet Council meetings involves a staff secretariat made up of representatives of each of the Cabinet Council members and headed by an executive secretary who is an employee of the White House Office of Policy Development. Once an issue is assigned to the appropriate Cabinet Council, issues should percolate upward through the system.

THE CABINET COUNCIL WORKING GROUP

In order to carry out the President's directive, we have established a Cabinet Council Working Group on Future Food and Agriculture Policy. The Working Group's mandate is three-fold; to initiate a dialogue on the future course of food and agriculture policy with interested parties inside and outside of government; to review and assess current food and farm programs; and to prepare a list of food and agriculture policy options for 1985 for consideration by the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture.

The Working Group is chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, Richard E. Lyng, and consists of high-level officials from the Departments of State, Treasury, Interior, Commerce, and Transportation, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the White House Office of Legislative Affairs and the White House Office of Policy Development. The Executive Secretary of the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture serves as the executive director of the Working Group.

SETTING THE AGENDA

In February and March, the Working Group will begin an intensive internal discussion of the problems facing agriculture from the perspective of the various departments and agencies. The Department of Agriculture will begin the review and assessment with a comprehensive overview of the current conditions of the U.S. food and agriculture sector. The other agencies and departments will present their perspective on events shaping agriculture as viewed from their area of responsibility. For example, some of the issues to be discussed by respective agencies include:

Department of Treasury

What has been the impact of fiscal and monetary policy on developments in agriculture markets? What influence do exchange rates have on agricultural exports?

Department of State

What has been the contribution of aid programs to U.S. agricultural exports? Are aid recipients buying from U.S. competitors with U.S. aid dollars?

Department of Commerce

How important is agriculture to the U.S. economy? How have agricultural developments shaped the related input sectors such as machinery, fertilizer, chemicals, etc.?

Office of U.S. Trade Representative

How have current trends in protectionism shaped agriculture and what are the prospects for the future? What is the proper response to current trade problems? How have the GATT rules on international trade affected U.S. agricultural exports? Are the interests of agriculture, steel, textiles, autos and other industries compatible with a single position on trade issues?

Department of the Interior

Have commodity programs contributed to or detracted from efforts to conserve our natural resources?

Department of Transportation

How do transportation policies affect the domestic and international marketing of farm products? Do our transportation policies adequately serve the needs of rural America?

Office of Management and Budget

What has been the impact of agriculture on the budget?

Council of Economic Advisers

How important is agriculture to the U.S. economy? How much have consumers benefitted from agricultural programs? Do their outlays as taxpayers exceed their benefits as consumers in terms of abundant low cost, high quality food?

This process will give each member of the Working Group a broader perspective on the various agencies' views of agriculture. Most importantly, it will provide an opportunity to inform members of the Working Group on the new realities of the U.S. food and agriculture system. It will permit a clarification of any misconceptions concerning agriculture and its role in the economy and identify the highly controversial areas in which the Working Group may wish the subcommittees to concentrate their efforts in developing background materials. Critical unresolved differences of opinion among departments and agencies on how basic events impact agriculture warrant special attention.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE WORKING GROUP

In order to facilitate the development of basic factual information, the Working Group will be supported by the following subcommittees composed of representatives of interested agencies and departments:

Farm Commodity Programs (chaired by the Assistant Secretary for Economics, USDA);

International Trade and Foreign Food Assistance (chaired by the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, USDA);

Resource Conservation (chaired by the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, USDA);

Research (chaired by the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education, USDA);

Farm Credit and Rural Development (chaired by the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development, USDA); and

Feeding and Nutrition Programs (chaired by the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services, USDA).

The chairpersons of the subcommittees will assure that interested departments and agencies have an opportunity to participate in the subcommittees' work. The chairpersons also will report the results of the subcommittees' deliberations to the Working Group.

The basic responsibility of the subcommittees will be to develop detailed, factual background papers to focus the dialogue on future food and agriculture policies in areas of greatest significance. The papers should create a factual base from which to evaluate the forces shaping U.S. and world agriculture. For example, the subcommittee on farm commodity programs would develop background material on the structure of each basic commodity industry, including production characteristics, supply/use

trends, market development trends, history of government programs and the overall importance of the commodity in the U.S. and world economy. The subcommittee on international trade and foreign assistance would provide a profile of U.S. agriculture trade patterns to identify the key factors responsible for the current state of U.S. export markets. Similar factual papers will be prepared on credit programs, rural development programs, feeding programs, conservation programs and research. Subcommittee chairpersons may wish to invite expert subject matter specialists to develop background papers or make presentations to the subcommittees in the more complex and controversial areas identified during the internal Working Group review.

The subcommittees' background papers will be reviewed by the Working Group and released to the public as a basic educational document to facilitate an informed dialogue on farm program and policy options. The papers will contain no recommendations but will serve to present the issues in a factual context. The papers should be completed by the end of June.

THE SUBCOMMITTEES ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

In July through October, the subcommittees will provide an opportunity for a more detailed exchange of views on identified topics. Members of Congress, leaders of major farm organizations and commodity groups, representatives of key related industries such as fertilizer and machinery, consumer representatives and other subject matter experts will be invited to participate in these roundtable discussion sessions to further delineate the problems and options facing agriculture.

These discussions will be focused on the broad issues which affect all subsectors of the food and agriculture system. For example, in the area of commodity programs, the focus would be the impact of a selected policy tool, such as loan rates, on farm income, grain prices, livestock returns, consumer prices, exports and trade share.

SUBCOMMITTEES PREPARE LIST OF PROPOSED OPTIONS

During November, the subcommittees of the Working Group will develop detailed option papers on the basis of the dialogue at the roundtable discussions. All viable options will be carefully analyzed and the pros and cons of each alternative carefully stated to facilitate consideration by the Working Group.

WORKING GROUP PREPARES RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET COUNCIL

In December, the Working Group, utilizing the information provided by the subcommittees, will complete its deliberations and submit a list of recommended food and agriculture policy options to the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture for its consideration. After reviewing the Working Group's recommendations, the Cabinet Council will submit its recommendation on future food and agriculture policy to the President in early January 1985.

Our success in this endeavor will depend upon our commitment. We all know that our decisions are only as good as our own judgment and the information and counsel we receive from our trusted advisors. President Reagan recognizes that the strength of this nation lies with its people. Agriculture is a critical part of this nation, and food and farm programs and policies can only be enhanced by the forthright exchange of ideas whether it be in the wheat fields of Kansas, the cornfields of Illinois, the halls of Congress, the Cabinet Room of the White House or the Oval Office. The success of future foods and agriculture policies will reflect the commitment that each of us as individuals makes to ensuring the future health of agriculture.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TRIBUTE TO BURT WIDES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with the departure of Burt Wides, the Senate Judiciary Committee is losing one of its most dedicated and talented counsels, and I am losing one of my most respected and valued aides. Burt is leaving the Senate for private law practice after more than a decade of outstanding service to the Senate and to the committee, and he will be greatly missed.

During his years in the Senate, Burt has dedicated himself to a wide range of issues, but most especially to civil rights. His outstanding work has earned him the gratitude of the Senate.

I and the other members of the Judiciary Committee and the Senate are deeply indebted to Burt Wides for his unique ability and his dedicated assistance to all of us. We will miss him, and we wish him well.

Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee honored Burt in a special resolution we approved at our meeting this morning, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION COMMENDING BURT WIDES

Whereas, Burt Wides has been an outstanding and valued counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee for thirteen years;

Whereas, Burt Wides has dedicated himself unselfishly to the highest ideals of the Constitution and laws of the United States;

Whereas, Burt Wides has rendered service of special excellence to the cause of civil rights and equal justice under law;

Whereas, but for the efforts of Burt Wides, there might not be a Voting Rights Act of the United States;

Whereas, Burt Wides has demonstrated a superiority of intellect, a consistency of purpose, a tirelessness of industry, a mastery of detail, a boldness of imagination, a richness of persistence, and an uncommonness of talent for public service in his manifold contributions to the Senate Judiciary Committee; and

Whereas, the Senate Judiciary Committee hereby notes and will long remember the longsome analyses, in-depth representations, exhaustive briefings, and permanently bent ears that Burt Wides has ceaselessly and singlehandedly conferred on each and all of us as members of the committee; now, it is therefore

Resolved, that the Senate Judiciary Committee extends its appreciation and gratitude to Burt Wides for his unique dedication to the rule of law and his superb service to the Senate Judiciary Committee and the United States Senate.

Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, Chairman; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland; Paul Laxalt, of Nevada; Orrin G. Hatch, of Utah; Robert Dole, of Kansas; Alan K. Simpson, of Wyoming; John P. East, of North Carolina; Chuck Grassley, of Iowa; Jeremiah Denton, of Alabama; Arlen Specter, of Pennsylvania.

Joseph R. Biden, Jr., of Delaware, Ranking Minority Member; Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia; Howard M. Metzenbaum, of Ohio; Dennis DeConcini, of Arizona; Patrick J. Leahy, of Vermont; Max Baucus, of Montana; Howell Heflin, of Alabama.

THOMAS WOJSLAWOWICZ

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I would like to call my colleagues attention to an unusual individual in my State who was recently selected for a special honor in his community. Mr. Thomas Wojslawowicz will receive tonight the Brotherhood Award of the Bayonne Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This award is a fitting recognition of his outstanding service—particularly to the young people of Bayonne.

Mr. Wojslawowicz has served as a teacher in the Bayonne school system and varsity swimming coach for the last 20 years. He has also been the manager of the city's swimming pools for the last 11 years. In those capacities he has given unselfishly of his time and energy to help the young people of Bayonne develop their skills as well as their character.

In addition to his professional activities, Mr. Wojslawowicz has given his time and energy to church and civic activities in particular those that have responded to the needs of older Americans and have supported the rights of the Polish people to live in freedom. He has been cited many times by different groups in Bayonne and throughout the State of New Jersey for his leadership and service.

I join with his many friends and neighbors in recognizing the efforts of Thomas Wojslawowicz.

JULIA AND GEORGE HERMANN

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 28, the Beth Tikvah New Milford Jewish Center in New Milford, N.J., honored Julia and George Hermann for many years of extraordinary service to their community. Independently, Mrs. Hermann has served as president of the Sisterhood of the center and held almost every chairmanship on its board. Mr. Hermann has been president of the congregation's men's club, held many positions on the board of directors, and is now a member of the Board of Governors. As formidable as they are individually, they have joined forces to cochair the Israel bond drive. Their successful effort was honored by the State of Israel.

The Hermanns have exhibited unselfish dedication and service to their synagogue and to their community at large. I am pleased that their friends have chosen to recognize their record of accomplishments.

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD P. BOLAND WINS JOHN F. KENNEDY AWARD

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on St. Patrick's Day last March, Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND of Massachusetts delivered an eloquent and inspiring address to the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee in Holyoke.

The occasion was a special one, because Congressman BOLAND was being honored this year as the recipient of the committee's John F. Kennedy National Award, which is presented each year to that person of Irish descent whose life and career have made an indelible impact on society.

I know that President Kennedy would have been especially proud of the award this year to his friend EDDY BOLAND. Over the years, Congressman BOLAND has secured an outstanding reputation of service to Congress and the country. He is a respected friend and colleague to all of us, and I congratulate him on this richly-earned and well-deserved honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Congressman BOLAND's St. Patrick Day address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN EDWARD P. BOLAND, ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE COMMITTEE, HOLYOKE, MASS., MARCH 17, 1984

At the outset, let me say that no greater honor has been accorded me in public life than that which the Holyoke St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee has bestowed on me tonight.

I accept the John F. Kennedy Award with pride and humility—and shall cherish it always in memory of that great patriot whose name it bears—and in remembrance of all of you here, who are so dedicated to the great heritage with which we have been enriched.

Indeed, it's a heartwarming and exhilarating experience to share with you that great intimacy of spirit which—through the ages—has satisfied the proudest insticts of men.

That is the spirit, the faith if you will, that makes the Irish what they are.

It is a faith that down through the centuries of suffering has been the essence of Ireland's greatness.

It embedded in her nature a devotion to God, that could never be extinguished, and a love for learning, that never failed, even when access to the sources of knowledge was denied for hundreds of years.

That faith conserved for the Irish the soul of civilization.

Where nations under lessor oppression have fallen, she stood bloody but unbowed—true to her creed and true to her God.

It was the Irish poet Moore who wrote:

"Other nations have fallen and thou are still young,
Thy Sun is but rising when others have set.
And through slavery's cloud o'er thy morning hath hung,
The full moon of freedom shall beam round thee yet
Erin, O Erin, though long in the shade.
Thy star will shine out when the proudest shall fade."

In 1963, I had the special privilege of traveling to Ireland with President Kennedy.

I remember, as clearly as if it had occurred this morning, the long drive from the airport through Dublin—down O'Connell Street to the United States Embassy in Phoenix Park—and the sheer joy and adulation of the hundereds of thousands who lined the way to greet their yankee boy, was a sight that had never been seen before, and perhaps never will be again.

I stood with him in the square at New Ross where his great grandfather Patrick Kennedy was born—and in a soccer field at Wexford where a choir of boys and girls serenaded him with "We're the Boys From Wexford."

We went to Cork City and met his mother's people, the Fitzgeralds—and it was there he told the crowd:

"Coming in I met four rather angry Fitzgeralds, they said they were tired of hearing about the Kennedys in New Ross—and what about the Fitzgeralds."

"I said, that was because of my grandfather who was mayor of Boston, John F. Fitzgerald, who used to tell everybody he was from Limerick, Donegal, Donnybrook, anywhere."

At the city hall, the president introduced to the mayor and council and crowd, Larry O'Brien and Dave Powers.

He presented, "the pastor of the church I go to, who comes from Cork, Monsignor O'Mahoney.

He is the pastor of a poor humble flock in Palm Beach, Florida.

Also a congressman who represents about 85 members of the House of Representatives who are Irish, Congressman Boland from Massachusetts came with us."

On June 28th we went back to Dublin where he spoke to the Irish Parliament.

In one of his finest speeches he said:

"In an age when history moves with the tramp of earthquake feet—in an age when a handful of men and nations have the power literally to devastate mankind—in such an age, it may be asked,—how can a nation as small as Ireland play much of a role on the world stage?

"I would remind people who ask the question, including those in other small countries, of the words of one of the great orators of the English language:

"All the world owes much to the little 'five feet high' nations. The greatest art of the world was the work of little nations. The most enduring literature of the world was the work of little nations. The heroic deeds that thrill humanity through generations, were the deeds of little nations fighting for their freedom. And, oh yes, the salvation of mankind came through a little nation."

And then it was on to Eyre Square in Galway where he told the thousands gatered there:

"If the day was clear enough and if you went down to the bay and you looked west, and your sight was good enough, you would see Boston, Massachusetts.

"You send us home with the warmest memories of you and your country. So I must say that, though other days may not be so bright as we look toward the future, the brightest days will continue to be those in which we visited you in Ireland."

And finally at Shannon—as he bid his farewell and spoke about a ballad immortalized by the great Irish tenor John McCormack, the 100th anniversary of whose birth we celebrate this year:

"Last night somebody sang a song, the words of which I am sure you know: "Come back to Erin Mavourneen, Mavourneen, come back aroun' to the land of my birth. Come back with the shamrock in the springtime Mavourneen."

"This is not the land of my birth," he said, "but it is the land for which I have the greatest affection and I certainly will come back in the springtime."

There was no springtime for Jack Kennedy.

The promise is gone, but today, and for all days we shall remember the splendor of example and inspiration that, in just 1,000 days, brought reassurance and hope to all people everywhere.

I shall carry with me always the memories of that marvelous journey—with all its joy, its camardarie, and magnificence.

But the emotions that were to touch me most deeply came when I left the Presidential party at Galway.

In the early morning of June 30th, I rented a car and took off for Kerry—down through the rolling hills of Galway—across the farmlands of Clare—through Limerick to Tralee—past Anascoul and Lispole into Dingle—and then on to Glen Faun, to the west of Dingle, where my father was born.

The Sun had been shining brightly all day—but just as I arrived at Faun, the rain clouds began to hang on the horizon over the Atlantic Ocean.

I parked my car and looked out across the broad expanse of ocean—savage and restless, cold and gray—the ocean that had beckoned to my people and yours and offered the promise of a new life in a new world.

As I stood there—in the place my forebearers had inhabited for centuries, I understood that the essence of Ireland is the story of her people, and the great leaders whose lives have been indelibly etched on the pages of Irish history:

The great saints of Ireland who spread the message of the gospel—St. Patrick whose feast day we celebrate today, and who brought Christ to Ireland and changed its eternal destiny.

St. Bridget, the beloved Mary of the Gael; Bridget of Kildare—who walked the hills and dales of Ireland sowing the seeds of Christianity.

St. Colm'cille—the founder of monasteries—whose extraordinary missionary activity took him not only all over the Emerald Isle, but to the other countries of Western Europe as well.

And so many others—Wolf Tone—who, 200 years ago, preached that Ireland would never be prosperous—would never be able to take her rightful place among the nations of the world—unless she was independent—free men and free women living under their own flag.

The immortal Robert Emmett, and the dream of freedom for which he sacrificed his fortune and his life—standing in the dock of Green Street in Dublin before he was publicly beheaded—uttering that magnificent oration—and in dying becoming a symbol of heroic sacrifice on the altar of liberty.

Daniel O'Connell—that great Kerryman whose birthplace in Charicaveen I was to visit the next day—whose voice in the last century was the voice of Ireland.

Long before anyone ever heard the phrase "Human Rights", he invoked the rights of his people against the tyranny and intolerance of the crown and, with the eloquence of eternity, caused trembling in the seats of the mighty and brought dignity to the people of Ireland.

And Eamon Devalera, whose leadership rallied a struggling nation and who unified and strengthened it by the plain force of his character.

I thought of those dreadful days of the 18th century when the hunted schoolmaster, with a price on his head and hidden from house to house, gathered his little class behind a hedge, in some remote mountain glen, and fed his eager pupils the forbidden fruit of knowledge.

I thought of the hunted priest—hiding like a thief among the hills—celebrating mass for his people in some clearing while faithful sentries watched from nearby hilltops for the approach of British soldiers.

And I thought of the days of the great famine when thousands were dying, and tens of thousands of those who survived wandered aimlessly over the land—or gazed hopelessly into infinite darkness and despair.

As I stood there—with the shadows lengthening and the first drops of rain beginning to fall, I marveled at their preserverance; how they kept the flame of freedom glowing through the centuries of struggle.

Ireland bred her scholars, her artists, her statesmen, and her saints—and when they could not wage war for Ireland, they became like wild geese, and fought for freedom elsewhere in the world.

The history of the United States is replete with examples of the contributions made by the Irish to the cause of justice and human freedom.

They came here, many of them—your people and mine—in the hold of a ship; part of the "tired, the poor, the huddled masses who yearned to breathe free." They came to Holyoke and to Hungry Hill—to Boston and New York and Philadelphia—to the North, South, East and West.

They attained little of life's worldly possessions—very few ever became wealthy, powerful or famous.

They worked in the mills—in the foundries—on the railroads—they built the bridges and dug the tunnels—they carried the bricks and they shoveled the coal.

They brought up their families, went to church, and most of them, lived and died without ever acquiring those things, the world has come to associate with success.

Many of them could not read or write and yet, in their unlettered, untutored way, they inspired their sons and daughters with the deep conviction that truth cannot be circumscribed by man-made boundaries, that there are values that transcend material considerations—and that above all, love for their god and respect for each other were essential to an enduring social order.

This was their legacy of love.

This indeed is the spirit that has preserved the soul of Ireland and has brought us to this day.

I must tell you that I made my way at last to the farm of my cousin, John Boland, in Faun.

It was dusk when I knocked on the door.

It was opened by his wife, Kate, whom I had never seen before in my life and who looked at me and said: "You're Eddie Boland." I asked, "how do you know?"

"Sure", she said, "we knew Jack Kennedy was coming, and we knew he wouldn't come without you."

I entered the house and in the front room, in the most prominent place on the far wall there were three pictures—Jesus Christ, on one side—Pope Paul VI, on the other side—and in the middle, a picture of John F. Kennedy.

After visiting the Bolands, I went to Carrig to see the Cavanaughs—my mother's people.

When I parked the car and started up the path to the house, a tall, lean man about 70, stepped out of a barn about 30 yards away—he looked at me and said, "you're a Boland."

I said, "Yes, I'm Eddie Boland."

He said, "we've been waiting for you."

I went into the House with him and sure enough there were three pictures on the wall—the Savior, Pope Paul VI and Kennedy in the middle.

And so it went, For the next two days I was taken to Bally-Ferriter and Bally David, to Ventry and Dunquin, to Dingle and Charicaveen to meet everyone and anyone who wanted to shake the hand of the guy who knew Jack Kennedy.

Yes, it was a great journey, and tonight, as I draw upon those memories, I pray for Ireland, for its people and for the day when they can live in peace in a United Ireland.

That unity must come through the union of hearts and minds, not by bloodshed, conquest, or fear.

It is toward that time of peace and unity, that all of us must work, in the spirit of President Kennedy to bind up Ireland's wounds, and see Ireland one nation, prosperous and strong, nourished in peace by the great traditions that make us all proud to call ourselves Irish.

I pray also for America, this Nation of ours that has long been a beacon of hope in an uncertain and troubled world.

May we never forget that the strength of this country has been the diversity of its people—the way in which men and women of a hundred different nationalities have joined in the pursuit of a common goal while keeping alive the traditions of the homeland of their ancestors.

No group in this country has been more effective in preserving the heritage of Ireland than the Holyoke St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee.

The spirit of Ireland lives for many who will never visit that fair isle because of the magnificent annual celebrations produced by this organization.

The honor you have paid me tonight will never be forgotten. My wife Mary thanks you. My daughters Martha and Kathleen thank you. My sons Edward and Michael thank you. And I thank you from the bottom of my heart. You have touched the Boland family deeply, and we are very grateful.

REPORT OF THE NEW IRELAND FORUM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the report of the New Ireland Forum, released yesterday in Dublin, is the most promising initiative toward peace in more than a decade of violence and conflict in Northern Ireland.

In a sense, the document is a "declaration of interdependence" for a future in which Catholic and Protestant, Nationalist and Unionist can respect each other's aspirations and live and prosper together in a better Ireland. The report may well be the last best chance to break the intensifying cycle of killing and violence in Northern Ireland and achieve true reconciliation between the two great traditions of that land.

I hope that all sides of the conflict—in Dublin and London, in Derry and Belfast—will give this opportunity for peace a chance. And I also hope that President Reagan, in his visit to Ireland next month and in his talks with British and Irish leaders, will offer the full assistance of the United States in achieving this long-sought goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report of the New Ireland Forum may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

2 MAY 1984

NEW IRELAND FORUM REPORT

CHAPTER 1

Preface

1.1—The New Ireland Forum was established for consultations on the manner in which lasting peace and stability could be achieved in a new Ireland through the democratic process and to report on possible new structures and processes through which this objective might be achieved.

1.2—Participation in the Forum was open to call to all democratic parties which reject violence and which have members elected or appointed to either House of the Oireachtas or the Northern Ireland Assembly. Four political parties took part in the Forum: the Fianna Fail Party, the Fine Gael Party, the Labour Party and the Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP). These four parties together represent over ninety per cent of the nationalist population and over three-quarters of the entire population of Ireland. The parties which participated in the Forum would have greatly preferred that discussions on a new Ireland should have embraced the elected representatives of both the unionist and nationalist population. However, the Forum sought the views of people of all traditions who agreed with its objectives and who reject violence. The establishment and work of the Forum have been of historic importance in bringing together, for the first time since the division of Ireland in 1920, elected nationalist representatives from North and South to deliberate on the shape of a new Ireland in which people of differing identities would live together in peace and harmony and in which all traditions would find an honoured place and have equal validity.

1.3—The leaders of the four participating parties met on 14 and 21 April, 1983 to consider arrangements for the Forum. Those present were the Taoiseach, Dr. Garret FitzGerald, TD, Leader of the Fine Gael Party; Mr. Charles J Haughey, TD, Leader of the Fianna Fail; the Tanaiste, Mr. Dick Spring, TD, Leader of the Labour Party; and Mr. John Hume, MP, MEP, Leader of the Social Democratic and Labour Party. The Party Leaders made the following arrangements: the Chairman to be Dr. Colm o hEocha, President of University College Galway and

the Secretary to be Mr. John R. Tobin, Clerk of Seanad Eireann; the Forum would be assisted by an independent secretariat; membership of the Forum would comprise 27 members and 14 alternate members from the four parties.

1.4—The members and alternates nominated were:

Fianne Fail Party Members and Alternates:

Charles J. Haughey TD; Brian Lenihan TD; David Andrews TD; Gerry Collins TD; Eileen Lemass TD; Ray MacSharry MD; Rory O'Hanlon TD; Jim Tunney TD; John Wilson TD; Paudge Brennan TD; Jackie Fahey TD; Jimmy Leonard TD; John O'Leary TD.

Secretary: Veronica Guerin.

Fine Gael Party Members and Alternates:

Garret FitzGerald TD; Taoiseach; Peter Barry TD, Minister for Foreign Affairs; Myra Barry TD; Senator James Dooge; Paddy Harte TD; John Kelly TD; Enda Kenny TD; Maurice Manning TD; David Molony TD; Nora Owen TD; Ivan Yates TD.

Secretary: John Fanagan.

Labour Party Members and Alternates:

Dick Spring TD, Tanaiste and Minister for Energy; Frank Cluskey TD; Senator Stephen McGonagle; Frank Prendergast TD; Mervyn Taylor TD; Eileen Desmond TD; Senator Mary Robinson.

Secretary: Diarmaid McGuinness.

Social Democratic and Labour Party Members and Alternates:

John Hume MP, MEP; Seamus Mallon; Austin Currie; Joe Hendron; E. K. McGrady; Sean Farren; Frank Feely; Hugh Logue; Paddy O'Donoghue; Paschal O'Hare.

Secretary, Denis Haughey.

Proceedings of the Forum

1.5—The first session of the Forum was held in public in Dublin Castle on the 30th May 1983. It was opened by the Chairman, Colm o hEocha and was addressed by the Leaders of the four participating parties. There was a total of 28 private sessions and 13 public sessions and there were 56 meetings of the Steering Group, comprising the Chairman and the Party Leaders. In addition, sub-groups of the Forum examined in detail economic issues and the structures outlined in Chapters 6, 7 and 8.

1.6—Since the Forum was concerned to hear the widest possible range of opinion, in particular from Northern Ireland, written submissions were invited through advertisements in a wide range of newspapers, North and South. A total of 317 submissions was received from both parts of Ireland and from Britain, the United States of America, Belgium, France and Canada. These reflected many views, including those of the nationalist and unionist traditions, and covered a wide constitutional, legal, religious, educational and cultural matters. The Forum invited oral presentations from 31 individuals and groups in order to allow for further elaboration and discussion of their submissions. These sessions took place at 11 public meetings of the Forum from 20 September, 1983 to 9 February, 1984. The proceedings of these sessions have been published by the Forum. Appendix I lists the publications containing these proceedings and Appendix II lists individuals and groups who made written submissions.

1.7—A forum delegation from the four participating parties visited the North on 26/27 September, 1983, and met groups representative of a wide range of opinion. On 23/24 January, 1984, another Forum delegation held discussions in London with groups from the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, the Liberal Party and the Social Democratic Party.

1.8—The following reports, which analyse in detail different aspects of the problem, were prepared by the Forum and have been published separately: "The Cost of Violence arising from the Northern Ireland Crisis since 1969"; "The Economic Consequences of the Division of Ireland since 1920" and "A Comparative Description of the Economic Structure and Situation, North and South". These reports contribute to an understanding of the problems involved and provide an important point of reference. The following studies were commissioned by the Forum and have been published: The Macroeconomic Consequences of Intergrated Economic Policy, Planning and Co-ordination in Ireland by DKM Economic Consultants; and The Legal Systems, North and South by Professor C. K. Boyle and Professor D.S. Greer. Studies on the implications of integration in the agriculture, energy and transport sectors, prepared for the forum, are being published separately.

Acknowledgement of assistance received

1.9—The Forum records its gratitude to all who made submissions, written and oral. It acknowledges with thanks the contributions of those who acted as consultants on many aspects of the Forum's work. The very positive response to requests for assistance by the Forum and the large number of submissions and offers of help received bear striking testimony to the widespread and urgent desire among all traditions in Ireland that the Forum should succeed in contributing to peace and stability.

CHAPTER 2

Introduction

2.1—The Forum has been imbued with an overriding sense of the importance and urgency of its task. It was established against a background of deep division, insecurity and violence that threatens society, primarily in Northern Ireland but also in the Republic and to a certain extent in Britain. The continuing crisis in Northern Ireland has reached critical proportions, involving intense human suffering and misery for many thousands of people. The persistence of division and of conflict on such a scale poses a fundamental challenge to those who support and practise democratic principles as a means to resolve political problems; in particular, since Britain exercises direct responsibility, it is a serious reflection on successive British Governments. More than thirty years after European statesmen successfully resolved to set aside their ancient quarrels and to work together in the European Community, the continuation of the conflict in Northern Ireland represents a dangerous source of instability in Western Europe and a challenge to the democratic values which Europe shares in common with North America and the rest of the Western World.

2.2—The analysis by the Forum of the crisis in Northern Ireland (Chapters 3 and 4) illustrates the inherent instability of the 1920 constitutional arrangements which resulted in the arbitrary division of Ireland. Each generation since has suffered from the discrimination, repression and violence which has stemmed from those constitutional arrangements.

2.3—The study of DKM Economic Consultants shows that the economic outlook for the North is very bleak as long as the present political paralysis and violence continue. This study indicates that on the basis of foreseeable economic trends, and in the absence of a political settlement leading to an end to violence, there would be virtual stagnation in the economy and a further substantial increase in unemployment. Unemployment in the North would increase from an estimated 122,000 in 1984 to as much as 166,000 (about 32 percent of civil employment) by the 1990's. Without political progress the scale of economic and social problems will increase greatly, exacerbating a highly dangerous situation. This will make increasingly intolerable the social and economic burden for both sections of the community in the North. It will also lead to a major increase in the financial burden on Britain because of the mounting cost of security and the increased expenditure necessary to shore up the economy and living standards of the area. For the South, there will be a further diversion of resources to security where expenditure is already disproportionately greater than that of Britain, while the adverse effects on the economy, particularly of the border areas, will be prolonged.

2.4—The immediate outlook for the North is extremely dangerous unless an acceptable political solution is achieved. The long-term damage to society worsens each day that passes without political progress. In political, moral and human terms there is no acceptable level of violence. There are at present no political institutions to which a majority of people of the nationalist and unionist traditions can give their common allegiance or even acquiesce in. The fundamental social bonds which hold people together in a normal community, already tenuous in the abnormal conditions of Northern Ireland, have been very largely sundered by the events and experiences of the past fifteen terrible years. However, despite the drawing apart of the two traditions since 1969, respect for basic human values was for a time maintained within each tradition. But as sensibilities have become dulled and despair has deepened, there has been a progressive erosion of basic values which is in danger of becoming irreversible. The immense challenge facing political leaders in Britain and Ireland is not merely to arrest the cancer but to create the conditions for a new Ireland and a new society acceptable to all its people.

2.5—The need for progress toward this objective is now so urgent that there can be no justification for postponing action. A major reassessement by Britain which at present exercises direct responsibility for Northern Ireland is required. There is an overwhelming need to give urgent and sustained priority to the initiation of a political process leading to a durable solution.

2.6—The conflict inherent in the Northern situation has surfaced dramatically in the last 15 years and the situation is progressively deteriorating within the present structures. The alienation of nationalists in Northern Ireland from political and civil institutions, from the security forces and from the manner of application of the law has increased to major proportions. There is fear, insecurity, confusion and uncertainty about the future in the unionist section of the community. Northern Ireland today is characterised by the fact that neither section of the community is happy with the status quo or has confidence in or a sense of direction about the future. It is essential that any proposals for political progress should remove nationalist alienation and assure the identity and security of both unionists and nationalists. Accordingly, in the search for the basis of a political solution the British

and Irish Governments must together initiate a process which will permit the establishment and development of common ground between both sections of the community in Northern Ireland and among all the people of this island.

CHAPTER 3

Origins of the Problem

Failure of 1920 settlement

3.1—The existing political systems in Ireland have evolved from the 1920 constitutional arrangement by Britain which resulted in the arbitrary division of the country. Prior to 1920 and during many centuries of British rule, Ireland was administered as an integral political unit. The establishment of Northern Ireland as a separate political unit was contrary to the desire of the great majority of Irish people for the political unity and sovereignty of Ireland as expressed in the last all-Ireland election of 1918. That election also confirmed that the Protestants of North-East Ulster, fearful for the survival of their heritage, opposed separation of Ireland and Britain. Although the (British) Government of Ireland Act 1920 contemplated the eventual establishment of an all-Ireland Parliament within the United Kingdom, the settlement in fact entailed the partition of Ireland into two separate political units.

3.2—The Government and Parliament set up in the North were broadly acceptable to the unionist majority in the North and to the British Government; while maintaining their desire for Irish unity, when this was not attained, nationalists in the South dedicated themselves to building up the Southern state. Two groups found that their interests were not accommodated—the Northern nationalists and the Southern unionists. However, the constitutional, electoral and parliamentary arrangements in the South specifically sought to cater for the minority status of Southern unionists and did so with considerable, if not total, success. The intention underlying the creation of Northern Ireland was to establish a political unit containing the largest land area that was consistent with maintaining a permanent majority of unionists. Since they were now in a minority, the Northern nationalists were the principal victims of the arrangements and, although some hoped that the Boundary Commission would bring within the jurisdiction of the South areas of predominantly nationalist population, this did not take place.

3.3—Because of the failure of the British government to accept the democratically expressed wishes of the Irish people and because of the denial of the right of nationalists in the North to political expression of their Irish identity and to effective participation in the institutions of Government, the 1920 arrangements did not succeed. The fundamental defects in the resulting political structures and the impact of ensuing policy led to a system in the North of supremacy of the unionist tradition over the nationalist tradition. From the beginning, both sections of the community were locked into a system based on sectarian loyalties.

3.4—The failure of the arrangements was clearly acknowledged by the British Government and Parliament of Northern Ireland, established under the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, with direct rule. The subsequent Northern Ireland Constitution Act, 1973, was intended to provide a framework for agreed government in Northern Ireland but, following the collapse in 1974 of the ensuing Sunningdale arrangements, many of the provisions of the 1973 Act have been effectively in abeyance. Thus, over 60 years after the division of Ireland, workable and acceptable political structures have yet to be established in the North.

Consequence of the division of Ireland up to 1968

3.5—During the Home Rule for Ireland debates in the British Parliament in 1912, many arguments were advanced by British political leaders in favour of maintaining the unity of Ireland. The British Government had introduced a Bill that proposed to give Ireland a separate Parliament with jurisdiction over her internal affairs while reserving power over key issues. However, faced with the unionist threat to resist this Bill by unlawful force, the British Government and Parliament backed down, and when the Government of Ireland Act of 1914 was placed on the statute book in Westminster, there was a provision that it would not come into operation until after Parliament had an opportunity of making provision for Ulster by special amending legislation. The message—which was not lost on unionists—was that a threat by them to use violence would succeed. To the nationalists the conclusion was that the democratic constitutional process was not to be allowed to be effective. This legacy continues to plague British-Irish relations today.

3.6—Although partition was established by the British Parliament in the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, that Act also made provision for the two parts of Ireland coming together again, and it sought to encourage this process through a Council of Ireland. In the period immediately after 1920, many saw partition as transitory. It soon became clear, however, that successive British Governments were in practice willing to allow a system of untrammelled one-party rule in Northern Ireland to be exercised by and on behalf of the majority unionist population. Not only were the wishes of the people of the rest of Ireland as a whole discounted but the identity of nationalists in the north were disregarded.

3.7—Since its establishment, partition has continued to overshadow political activity in both parts of Ireland. The country as a whole has suffered from this division and from the absence of a common purpose. The division has absorbed the energies of many, energies that otherwise would have been directed into constructing an Ireland in which nationalists and unionists could have lived and worked together. Instead of a positive interaction of the unionist and nationalist traditions, the emphasis in both parts of Ireland was on the predominant value system of each area, leading to a drifting apart in laws and practices. The most tragic measure of the Northern Ireland crisis is the endemic violence of the situation. Moreover, the situation has persistently given rise to tensions and misunderstandings in the British-Irish relationship in place of the close and harmonious relationship that should normally exist between neighboring countries that have so much in common.

3.8—In its report, The Economic Consequences of the Division of Ireland since 1920, the Forum noted that division gave rise to considerable economic costs, North and South. For example, in the absence of co-ordinated long-term planning, capital investment in areas such as energy, education and health has entailed considerable duplication of expenditure. The impact on areas contiguous to the border was particularly adverse. Not only were they detached from their trading hinterlands, but the difficulties of their location were worsened by their transformation into peripheral regions at the dividing line of two new administrative units. Had the division not taken place, or had the nationalist and unionist traditions in Ireland been encouraged to bring it to an end by reaching a mutual accommodation, the people of the whole island would be in a much better position to benefit from its resources and to meet the common challenges that face Irish society, North and South, towards the end of the 20th century.

3.9—Since 1922, the identity of the nationalist section of the community in the North has been effectively disregarded. The symbols and procedures of the institutions to which nationalists are required to give allegiance have been a constant reminder of the denial of their identity. Apart from a few local authorities and the power-sharing Executive which was briefly in being following the Sunningdale Agreement in 1973, they have had virtually no involvement in decision-making at the political levels. For over 50 years they lived under a system of exclusively unionist power and privilege and suffered systematic discrimination. They were deprived of the means of social and economic development, experienced high levels of emigration and have always been subject to high rates of unemployment. The consequences of this policy became particularly evident in those areas which have a predominantly nationalist population.

3.10—Unionists had to cope with a situation which was not their first choice. Originally, they opposed change and sought to keep all of Ireland in the United Kingdom. They later opposed Home Rule and then independence for the whole island. In the event, the South became a Dominion, and later a Republic outside the Commonwealth. Provision was made for the two parts of Ireland to come together in a Council of Ireland but the North was also given the option not to be part of the New Irish State and to revert to the United Kingdom. This option was exercised at once and the North found itself with a Home Rule devolved government which it had not sought. From the beginning, unionist insecurity in regard to their minority position in the island as a whole had a profound effect on the manner in which political structures were organised in the North. Political dialogue with the nationalist was avoided for fear of undermining the unionist system of exclusive power and privilege. Fears were stimulated of forcible absorption of unionists into an all-Ireland Republic, dominated as unionists saw it by a Roman Catholic and a Gaelic ethos. Those fears led many unionists to equate Roman Catholicism with nationalism and to regard the nationalist minority in the North as a threat to the survival of their power and privilege.

3.11—As a result, the people in both sections of the community lived under the shadow of sectarian politics and the fear of domination of one tradition by the other.

3.12—Irish nationalism found sovereign and international expression in partial fulfilment of its objectives through the establishment of an independent, democratic state in the South. Since 1922, the primary efforts of successive Governments have been concentrated on consolidation and development of the State which has a record of significant achievement. The process of development of an institutional and legal framework, of international assertion of sovereignty, and of concentration on industrial, economic and social development resulted, however, in insufficient concern for

the interests of the people of Northern Ireland. Efforts were made from time to time by all nationalist parties to highlight the effects of the partition of the country, and the injustices which the nationalist population of the North had to suffer, without response from successive British Governments. Moreover, the experience of partition has meant that for two generations there has been no unionist participation in political structures at an all-Ireland level. Rather, the Southern state has evolved without the benefit of unionist influence.

Consequences of the crisis since 1969

3.13—Since 1969, Northern Ireland has endured a sustained political crisis. This crisis has been different from previous manifestations of the underlying problem, not only because of the scale of the violence, but also because the crisis has shown no signs of early resolution. On the contrary, the political conflict underlying the violence has worsened and will continue to so unless there is urgent action to bring about significant political progress.

3.14—The present crisis in the North arose when non-violent campaigns in the late 1960's for basic civil rights and for an end to systematic discrimination in the areas of electoral rights, housing and employment were met with violence and repression. Even modest steps towards dialogue and reform undertaken by the unionist administration of Northern Prime Minister, Terence O'Neill met with vigorous opposition from certain sections of unionist opinion. Some of that opposition found expression in sectarian attacks against nationalists and bomb attacks on public utilities. The partial attitude of the local institutions of law and order, especially the B-Special Constabulary, resulted in failure to protect the nationalist population against sectarian attacks, which were particularly virulent in West Belfast. The conditions were thus created for revival of a hitherto dormant IRA which sought to pose as the defenders of the nationalist people. The resulting conflict gave rise to the deployment of the British Army on the streets of Northern Ireland in 1969.

3.15—The British Army was initially welcomed by the nationalist population as providing protection from sectarian attacks. However, the relationship between the nationalist population and the British Army deteriorated shortly afterwards. This was due to insensitive implementation of security measures in nationalist areas and a series of incidents in which the British Army was no longer perceived by nationalists to be acting as an impartial force. 1970 was thus a critical turning point and the experience of nationalists then and subsequently has profoundly influenced their attitudes, especially in regard to security. Among the major incidents which contributed to this alienation were the three-day curfew imposed on the Falls Road in June 1970; the internment without trial in August, 1971 and of hundreds of nationalists; the subsequent revelation that some of those taken into custody on that occasion were subjected to treatment later characterized by the Strasbourg Court of Human Rights as "inhuman and degrading"; the shooting dead of 13 people in Derry by British paratroopers in January 1972; and the beatings and ill-treatment of detainees in Castlereagh Barracks and Gough Barracks in 1977/78, subsequently condemned in the official British Bennett report.

3.16—Some hope of an improvement in the plight of nationalists followed the introduction of direct rule by Westminster in 1972. Negotiations in 1973 between the Northern parties and subsequently at Sunningdale between the Irish and British Governments, with Northern nationalist and unionist participation, brought about the short-lived Executive in which nationalists and unionists shared power in Northern Ireland. Provision has also been made as part of the Sunningdale Agreement for a new North-South dimension through a Council of Ireland. Both the Irish and British Governments made declarations on the status of Northern Ireland in which the Irish Government recognized that there could be no change in the status of Northern Ireland until a majority there desired it and the British Government affirmed that if in the future the majority of the people of the North should indicate a wish to become a part of a united Ireland, the British Government would support that wish. However, faced with extremist action by a section of the unionist community, a new British Government in 1975 failed to sustain the Sunningdale Agreement. The collapse of the Sunningdale arrangements dashed the hopes of nationalists and seriously damaged the prospects of achieving peace and stability in Northen Ireland. It recalled the earlier backdown of 1914: to unionists it reaffirmed the lesson that their threat to use force would cause British Governments to back down; to nationalists it reaffirmed their fears that agreements negotiated in a constitutional framework would not be upheld by British Governments in the face of force or threats of force by unionists.

3.17—Until the Downing Street Declaration in 1969, the plight of Northern nationalists was ignored by successive British Governments and Parliaments. However, notwithstanding the attempts to remedy some of the worst aspects of discrimination and the introduction of direct rule from London in 1972, the structures in Northern Ireland are such that nationalists are still discriminated against in social, economic, cultural and political terms. Their representation and influence in the private and public structures of power remain very restricted. There is, in practice, no official recognition of their identity nor acceptance of the legitimacy of their aspirations. In the economic sphere, as the reports of the Fair Employment Agency have shown, discrimination against Catholics in employment persists. Their day-to-day experience reinforces nationalist convictions that justice and effective exercise of their rights can come only from a solution which transcends the context of Northern Ireland and which provides institutions with which they can identify.

3.18—Despite the British Government's stated intensions of obtaining political consensus in Northern Ireland, the only policy that is implemented in practice is one of crisis management, that is, the effort to contain violence through emergency measures by the military forces and the police and through extraordinary judicial measures and a greatly expanded prison system. The framework within which security policies have operated and their often insensitive implementation have, since 1974, deepened the sense of alienation of the nationalist population. Inevitably, as during the 1980/81 hunger strikes when the warnings of constitutional nationalists were ignored by the British Government, security issues have been exploited by the paramilitaries in order to intensify alienation and with a view to increasing their support. Such alienation threatens the civilized life and values of entire communities and undermines the belief that democratic policies alone can offer peace, justice and stability.

3.19—The paramilitary organizations of both extremes feed on one another and on the insensitivity of British policy and its failure to provide peace and stability. Their message is one of hatred and of suppression of the rights of those of the other tradition. Their actions have caused appalling loss of life, injury, damage to property and considerable human and economic loss to the people of both traditions. They succeed only in sowing fear, division and distrust within the whole community.

3.20—The negative effect of IRA violence on British and unionist attitudes cannot be emphasized enough. Their terrorist acts create anger and indignation and a resolve not to give into violence under any circumstances. They have the effect of stimulating additional security measures which further alienate the nationalist section of the community. They obscure the underlying political problem. They strengthen extremist unionist resistance to any form of dialogue and accommodation with nationalists. Similarly, terrorist acts by extreme loyalist groups which affect innocent nationalist people have a correspondingly negative impact on nationalist attitudes. The involvement of individual members of the security forces in a number of violent crimes has intensified this impact. Every act of murder and violence makes a just solution more difficult to achieve. The greatest threat to the paramilitary organizations would be determined constitutional action to reach and sustain a just and equitable solution and thus to break the vicious circle of violence and repression. No group must be permitted to frustrate by intimidation and threats of violence the implementation of a policy of mutual accommodation.

3.21—The Forum's report, The Cost of Violence arising from the Northern Ireland Crisis since 1969, has attempted to quantify the human loss and economic costs of violence and political instability in the North. The most tragic loss is that of the deaths of over 2,300 men, women and children. These deaths in an area with a population of one and one half million are equivalent in proportionate terms to the killing of approximately 84,000 in Britain, 83,000 in France or 350,000 in the United States of America. In addition, over 24,000 have been injured or maimed. Thousands are suffering from psychological stress because of the fear and tension generated by murder, bombing, intimidation and the impact of security measures. During the past 15 years, there have been over 43,000 recorded separate incidents of shootings, bombings and arson. In the North the prison population has risen from 686 in 1967 to about 2,500 in 1983 and now represents the highest number of prisoners per head of population in Western Europe. The lives of tens of thousands have been deeply affected. The effect on society has been shattering. There is hardly a family that has not been touched to some degree by death, injury or intimidation. While the South and Britain have not suffered on the same scale, they too have been affected directly by the violence—by bombings, armed robberies and kidnapping and by other acts resulting in deaths, maiming and threats to security; they have also had to bear a significant price in terms of extraordinary security and judicial measures.

3.22—As that report also shows the economic and financial costs have been very high. They include additional security costs

and compensation for deaths, injuries and considerable damage to property. Since 1969 the estimated total direct costs, in 1982 prices, is IRL 5,500 million (1) incurred by the British Exchequer in respect of the North and IRL 1,100 million (2) incurred by the Irish Exchequer in the South. Over the past 15 years the violence has destroyed opportunities for productive employment, severely depressed investment that could have led to new jobs and greater economic well-being, and greatly damaged the potential of tourism. These further indirect costs in terms of lost output to the economies of the North and the South could be as much as IRL 4,000 million (3) and IRL 1,200 million (4), respectively, in 1982 prices.

(1) Equivalent to Stg.4,507m. or US$6,501m at current (30 March 1984) exchange rates.

(2) Equivalent to Stg.901m. or US$1,300m at current (30 March 1984) exchange rates.

(3) Equivalent to Stg.3,278m. or US$4,728m at current (30 March 1984) exchange rates.

(4) Equivalent to Stg.983m. or US$1,418m at current (30 March 1984) exchange rates.

CHAPTER 4

Assessment of the Present Problem

Assessment of recent British policy

4.1—The present formal position of the British Government, contained in Section 1 of the Northern Ireland Constitution Act, 1973, is that the only basis for constitutional change in the status of Northern Ireland within the United Kingdom is a decision by a majority of the people of Northern Ireland. In practice, however, this has been extended from consent to change in the constitutional status of the North within the United Kingdom into an effective unionist veto on any political change affecting the exercise of nationalist rights and on the form of government for Northern Ireland. This fails to take account of the origin of the problem, namely the imposed division of Ireland which created an artificial political majority in the North. It has resulted in a political deadlock in which decisions have been based on sectarian loyalties. Sectarian loyalties have thus been reinforced and the dialogue necessary for progress prevented. The Sunningdale Agreement of 1973 introduced dialogue and partnership to the Government of Northern Ireland. However, the hopes thus raised were dashed by a number of factors, amongst them the refusal of the then British Government to support the power-sharing Executive in the face of loyalist extremist disruption.

4.2—Since the Sunningdale Agreement of 1973, several initiatives have been undertaken, in response to circumstances, with the states aim of resolving the problem in a context limited to Northern Ireland. These initiatives foundered largely because the problem itself transcends the context of Northern Ireland. It is only in a fundamental change of context that the effective exercise on an equal basis of the rights of both nationalists and unionists can be permanently ensured and their identities and the traditions accommodated. Although the policy of the British Government was to favour power-sharing, there was no firm determination to insist on implementation of this policy in practice. Nor was recognition of the Irish identity of Northern nationalists given any practical expression. Thus it is that initiatives, which may give the appearance of movement and flexibility to domestic and international opinion, have been inadequate though not addressing the fundamental nature of the problem. Instead the crisis has been addressed as a security problem and the political conditions which produced the conflict and sustain the violence have in effect been ignored.

4.3—The immobility and short-term focus of British policy—the fact that it has been confined to crisis management and does not take account of fundamental causes—is making an already dangerous situation worse. There is increasing frustration with the state of political paralysis, uncertainty as to long-term British intentions and growing mutual distrust between both sections of the community. The failure to provide the nationalist population of the North with any constructive means of expressing its nationalism and its aspirations is undermining constitutional politics. The net effect of existing policy is to drive both sections of the community in Northern Ireland further apart, alienating them from each other and providing a breeding ground for despair and violence. It has thus contributed to the emergence in both sections of the community of elements prepared to resort to violence, on the one side to preserve, and on the other to change the existing constitutional position.

4.4—The problem of security is an acute symptom of the crisis in Northern Ireland. Law and order in democratic countries and, in particular, the introduction of emergency measures depend on a basic consensus about society itself and its institutions. Present security policy has arisen from the absence of political consensus. In Northern Ireland, extraordinary security actions have taken place that call into question the effectiveness of the normal safeguards of the legal process. This has led to harassment of the civilian population by use of abnormally wide powers of arrest and detention, exercised not for the purpose of bringing suspects before a court of justice and making them amenable to a process of law but for the purpose of gathering information and unjustifiably invading the privacy of a person's life; e.g. between 1978 and 1982 more than 22,000 people were arrested and interrogated, the vast majority being released without charge. This has the consequence that the availability of legal remedy of habeas corpus in Northern Ireland is in practice extremely limited. It has also at different periods led to the use of internment without trial combined with inhuman interrogation methods that have been found to be in breach of the European Convention on Human Rights; the trial and conviction of people on evidence of paid informers; the use of plastic bullets; and killings by some members of the security forces in doubtful circumstances. The various measures were introduced on the basis that they were essential to defeat terrorism and violent subversion, but they have failed to address the causes of violence and have often produced further violence.

4.5—Nationalists, for the most part, do not identify with the police and the security forces. It is clear that the police will not be accepted, as they are in a normal democratic society, by the nationalist section of the community nor will they themselves feel confident in their relations with nationalists, until there is a change in the political context in which they have to operate.

Nationalist identity and attitudes

4.6—The parties in the Forum, representing a large majority of the people of Ireland, reaffirm that their shared aim of a united Ireland will be pursued only by democratic political means and on the basis of agreement. For nationalists, a central aim has been the survival and development of an Irish identity, an objective that continues in Northern Ireland today as nationalists seek effective recognition of their Irish identity and pursue their rights and aspirations through political means. For historical reasons, Irish nationalism may have tended to define itself in terms of separation from Britain and opposition to British domination of Ireland. The positive vision of Irish nationalism, however, has been to create a society that transcends religious differences and that can accommodate all traditions in a sovereign independent Ireland united by agreement. The aim of nationalists, therefore, in seeking Irish unity is to develop and promote an Irishness that demonstrates convincingly to unionists that the concern of the unionist and Protestant heritage can be accommodated in a credible way and that institutions can be created which would protect such concerns and provide fully for their legitimate self-expression.

4.7—The division of Ireland inevitably gave rise to the unconscious development in both parts of Ireland of partitionist attitudes on many political, economic, cultural and social questions of importance, diminishing significantly the development of a prosperous democratic society on the whole of the island. Such attitudes persist up to the present day. However, the tragedy of Northern Ireland and the suffering of the people there has stimulated among nationalists in both parts of Ireland a new consciousness of the urgent need for understanding and accommodation. The work of the Forum has underlined the urgent need for sustained efforts and practical steps in the political, economic, cultural and social spheres to transform the present nationalist/unionist relationship and to promote and secure consensus. In addition, both parts of Ireland, North and South, face a number of economic and social realities which contribute to the sense of urgency in providing for a political solution. These include the demographic profile of the population and the very high unemployment rate in both parts of the island and the problem of steady emigration from Northern Ireland of a substantial proportion of educated young people.

Unionist identity and attitudes

4.8—Unionists have tended to view all form of nationalist self-expression as being directed aggressively against them and the North's status within the United Kingdom. Although the true nationalist ideal rejects sectarianism and embraces all the people of Ireland whatever their religion, Northern Protestants fear that their civil and religious liberties and their unionist heritage would not survive in a united Ireland in which Roman Catholicism would be the religion of the majority of the population. They base this fear on a number of factors including the diminution of the numbers of Southern Protestants since partition and the perception that the Constitution and certain laws in the South unduly favour the ethos of the predominant religion. The Forum has attempted not only to determine "what do unionists seek to prevent?" but also "what do they seek to protect?". What they seek to prevent varies to some degree but includes: an all-Irish State in which they consider that the Roman Catholic Church would have undue influence on moral issues, the breaking of the link with Britain; and loss of their dominant position consequent upon giving effective recogni-

tion to the more important question of "what do unionists seek to protect?" and to identify what qualities in the unionist ethos and identity must be sustained, nationalists must first of all acknowledge that unionists, sharing the same island, have the same basic concerns about stability and security as nationalists. The major difference between the two traditions lies in their perceptions of how their interests would be affected by various political arrangements. These perceptions have been largely formed by different historical experiences and communal values.

4.9—In public sessions of the Forum, contributors who put forward the unionist point of view were asked "what is it that the unionists wish to preserve?". Three elements were identified in their replies:

(1) Britishness;

(2) Protestantism;

(3) The economic advantages of the British link.

The degree of emphasis on each of these three elements varied among those who made submissions.

4.9.1—Unionists generally regard themselves as being British, the inheritors of a specific communal loyalty to the British Crown. The traditional nationalist opposition to British rule is thus seen by unionists as incompatible with the survival of their own sense of identity. Unionists generally also regard themselves as being Irish even if this does not include a willingness to live under all-Ireland political institutions. However, many of them identify with Ireland and with various features of Irish life and their culture and way of life embrace much that is common to people throughout Ireland.

4.9.2—The Protestant tradition, which unionism seeks to embody, is seen as representing a particular set of moral and cultural values epitomised by the concept of liberty of individual conscience. This is often accompanied by a Protestant view of the Roman Catholic ethos as being authoritarian and as less respectful of individual judgement. There is a widespread perception among unionists that the Roman Catholic Church exerts or seeks to exert undue influence in regard to aspects of the civil and legal organisation of society which Protestants consider to be a matter for private conscience. Despite the implicit separation of Church and State in the 1937 Constitution, many unionists hold the view that the Catholic ethos has unduly influenced administration in the South and that the latter, in its laws, attitudes and values has not reflected a regard for the ethos of Protestants living there.

4.9.3—There is also an economic concern in the perception of unionists in the North which is shared by nationalists. Studies by the Forum show that while living standards, North and South, are now broadly comparable, the North is heavily dependent on and its economy sustained by, the financial subvention from Britain. While a settlement of the conflict entailing an end to violence and the dynamic effects of all-Ireland economic integration would bring considerable economic benefits reconstruction of the Northern Ireland economy and the maintenance of living standards in the meantime would require the continued availability of substantial transfers from outside over a period of years, whether from Britain, the European Community, and the United States of America, or from Ireland as a whole.

4.10—There are other factors that are important in understanding the unionist opposition to a united Ireland. Among unionists there are fears, rooted in history and deriving from their minority position in Ireland as a whole. In more recent times the campaign of IRA violence has intensified those fears. Tensions have also arisen in regard to the South's extradition laws. There are similar fears in the nationalist tradition, based on experience of discrimination, repression and violence. In modern times, the unionist sense of being besieged has continued. Unionist leaders have sought to justify their opposition to equal treatment for nationalists in Northern Ireland on the basis that the demand for political expression of the nationalist identity, no matter how reasonable and justified, would lead to nationalist domination over the unionist population in a united Ireland.

Need for accommodation of both identities in a new approach

4.11—The Forum rejects and condemns paramilitary organisations and all who resort to terror and murder to achieve their ends. It strongly urges people in Ireland of all traditions and all those who are concerned about Ireland elsewhere in the world to refuse any support or sympathy to these paramilitary bodies and associated organisations. The acts of murder and violence of these organisations and their denial of the legitimate rights of others, have the effect of undermining all efforts to secure peace and political progress. Constitutional nationalists are determined to secure justice for all traditions. The Forum calls for the strong possible support for political progress through the democratic process.

4.12—Before there can be fundamental progress a major reassessment by Britain of its position is now essential. Underlying British thinking is the fear that the risks of doing something to tackle the fundamental issues are greater than the risks of doing nothing. This is not the case. The situation is daily growing more dangerous. Constitutional politics are on trial and unless there is action soon to create a framework in which constitutional politics can work, the drift into more extensive civil conflict is in danger of becoming irreversible, with further loss of life and increasing human suffering. The consequences for the people in Northern Ireland would be horrific and it is inconceivable that the South and Britain could escape the serious threats to stability that would arise. With each day that passes, political action to establish new structures that will resolve the fundamental problems become more pressing. Such political action clearly carries less risk than the rapid growing danger of letting the present situation drift into further chaos.

4.13—The new Ireland must be a society within which, subject only to public order, all cultural, political and religious belief can be freely expressed and practiced. Fundamental to such a society are freedom of conscience, social and communal harmony, reconciliation and the cherishing of the diversity of all traditions. The criteria which relate to public legislation may not necessarily be the same as those which inform private morality. Furthermore public legislation must have regard for the conscientious beliefs of different minority groups. The implementation of these principles calls for deepening and broadening of the sense of Irish identity. No one living in Ireland should feel less at home than another or less protected by law than his or her fellow citizen. This implies in particular, in respect of Northern Protestants, that the civil and religious liberties that they uphold and enjoy will be fully protected and guaranteed and their sense of Britishness accommodated.

4.14—It is clear that a new Ireland will require a new constitution which will ensure that the needs of all traditions are fully met. Society in Ireland as a whole comprises a wider diversity of cultural and political traditions than exists in the South, and the constitution and laws of a new Ireland must accommodate these social and political realities.

4.15—The solution to both the historic problem and the current crisis of Northern Ireland and the continuing problem of relations between Ireland and Britain necessarily requires new structures that will accommodate together two sets of legitimate rights: The rights of nationalists to effective political, symbolic and administrative expression of their identity; and the right of unionists to effective political symbolic and administrative expression of their identity, their ethos and their way of life.

So long as the legitimate rights of both unionists and nationalists are not accommodated together in new political structures acceptable to both, that situation will continue to give rise to conflict and instability. The starting point of genuine reconcilation and dialogue is mutual recognition and acceptance of the legitimate rights of both. The Forum is convinced that dialogue which fully respects both traditions can overcome the fears and divisions of the past and create an atmosphere in which peace and stability can be achieved.

4.16—A settlement which recognises the legitimate rights of nationalists and unionists must transcend the context of Northern Ireland. Both London and Dublin have a responsibility to respond to the continuing suffering of the people of Northern Ireland. This requires priority attention and urgent action to halt and reverse the constant drift into more violence, anarchy and chaos. It requires a common will to alleviate the plight of the people, both nationalists and unionists. It requires a political framework within which urgent efforts can be undertaken to resolve the underlying causes of the problem. It requires a common determination to provide conditions for peace, stability and justice so as to over come the inevitable and destructive reactions of extremists on both sides. Both governments, in co-operation with representatives of democratic nationalist and unionist opinion in Northern Ireland, must recognise and discharge their responsibilities.

CHAPTER 5

Framework For A New Ireland: Present Realities and Future Requirements

5.1—The major realities identified in the Forum's analysis of the problem, as set out in earlier chapters, may be summarised as follows:

(1) Existing structures and practices in Northern Ireland have failed to provide either peace, stability or reconciliation. The failure to recognise and accommodate the identity of Northern nationalists has resulted in deep and growing alienation on their part from the system of political authority.

(2) The conflict of nationalist and unionist identities has been concentrated within the narrow ground of Northern Ireland. This has prevented constructive interaction between the two traditions and fostered fears, suspicions and misunderstandings.

(3) One effect of the division of Ireland is that civil law and administration in the South are seen, particularly by unionists, as being unduly influenced by the majority

ethos on issues which Protestants consider to be a matter for private conscience and there is a widespread perception that the South in its laws, attitudes, and values does not reflect a regard for the ethos of Protestants. On the other hand, Protestant values are seen to be reflected in the laws and practices in the North.

(4) The present formal position of the British Government, namely the guarantee, contained in Section 1 of the Northern Ireland Constitution Act, 1973, has in its practical application had the effect of inhibiting the dialogue necessary for political progress. It has had the additional effect of removing the incentive which would otherwise exist on all sides to seek a political solution.

(5) The above factors have contributed to conflict and instability with disastrous consequences involving violence and loss of life on a large scale in Northern Ireland.

(6) The absence of political consensus, together with the erosion of the North's economy and social fabric, threatens to make irreversible the drift into more widespread civil conflict with catastrophic consequences.

(7) The resulting situation has inhibited and placed under strain the development of normal relations between Britain and Ireland.

(8) The nationalist identity and ethos comprise a sense of national Irish identity and a democratically founded wish to have that identity institutionalised in a sovereign Ireland united by consent.

(9) The unionist identity and ethos comprise a sense of Britishness, allied to their particular sense of Irishness and a set of values comprising a Protestant ethos which they believe to be under threat from a Catholic ethos, perceived as reflecting different and often opposing values.

(10) Irish nationalist attitudes have hitherto in their public expression tended to underestimate the full dimension of the unionist identity and ethos. On the other hand, unionist attitudes and practices have denied the right of nationalists to meaningful political expression of their identity and ethos.

(11) The basic approach of British policy has created negative consequences. It has shown a disregard of the identity and ethos of nationalists. In effect, it has underwritten the supremacy in Northern Ireland of the unionist identity. Before there can be fundamental progress Britain must re-assess its position and responsibility.

5.2.—Having considered these realities, the Forum proposes the following as necessary elements of a framework within which a new Ireland could emerge:

(1) A fundamental criterion of any new structures and processes must be that they will provide lasting peace and stability.

(2) Attempts from any quarter to impose a particular solution through violence must be rejected along with the proponents of such methods. It must be recognised that the new Ireland which the Forum seeks can come about only through agreement and must have a democratic basis.

(3) Agreement means that the political arrangements for a new and sovereign Ireland would have to be freely negotiated and agreed to by the people of the North and by the people of the South.

(4) The validity of both the nationalist and unionist identities in Ireland and the democratic rights of every citizen on this island must be accepted; both of these identities must have equally satisfactory, secure and durable, political, administrative and symbolic expression and protection.

(5) Lasting stability can be found only in the context of new structures in which no tradition will be allowed to dominate the other, in which there will be equal rights and opportunities for all, and in which there will be provision for formal and effective guarantees for the protection of individual human rights and of the communal and cultural rights of both nationalists and unionists.

(6) Civil and religious liberties and rights must be guaranteed and there can be no discrimination or preference in laws or administrative practices, on grounds of religious belief or affiliation; government and administration must be sensitive to minority beliefs and attitudes and seek consensus.

(7) New arrangements must provide structures and institutions including security structures with which both nationalists and unionists can identify on the basis of political consensus; such arrangements must overcome alienation in Northern Ireland and strengthen stability and security for all the people of Ireland.

(8) New arrangements must ensure the maintenance of economic and social standards and facilitate, where appropriate, integrated economic development, North and South. The macro-economic and financial implications are dealt with in a study by DKM Economic Consultants published with this Report, which is based on a range of assumptions with regard to the availability of external financial transfers.

(9) The cultural and linguistic diversity of the people of all traditions, North and South, must be preserved and fostered as a source of enrichment and vitality.

(10) Political action is urgently required to halt disillusionment with democratic politics and the slide towards further violence. Britain has a duty to respond *now* in order to ensure that the people of Northern Ireland are not condemned to yet another generation of violence and sterility. The parties in the Forum by their participation in its work have already committed themselves to join in a process directed towards that end.

5.3.—It is clear that the building of a new Ireland will require the participation and co-operation of all the people of Ireland. In particular, it is evident that the people of the South must wholeheartedly commit themselves and the necessary resources to this objective. The parties in the Forum are ready to face up to this challenge and to accommodate the realities and meet the requirements identified by the Forum. However, Britain must help to create the conditions which will allow this process to begin. The British Government have a duty to join in developing the necessary process that will recognize these realities and give effect to these requirements and thus promote reconciliation between the two major traditions in Ireland and to make the required investment of political will and resources. The British and Irish Governments should enter into discussions to create the framework and atmosphere necessary for this purpose.

5.4.—Among the fundamental realities the Forum has identified is the desire of nationalists for a united Ireland in the form of a sovereign, independent Irish State to be achieved peacefully and by consent. The Forum recognizes that such a form of unity would require a general and explicit acknowledgement of a broader and more comprehensive Irish identity. Such unity would, of course, be different from both the existing Irish State and the existing arrangements in Northern Ireland because it would necessarily accommodate all the fundamental elements in both traditions.

5.5—The Parties in the Forum are convinced that such unity in agreement would offer the best and most durable basis for peace and stability. In particular, it would have a number of advantages and attractions:

It would restore the historic integrity of Ireland and end the divisions in the country.

It would enable both traditions to rediscover and foster the best and most positive elements in their heritages.

It would provide the most promising framework for mutual interaction and enrichment between the two traditions.

It would give unionists the clearest sense that all of Ireland, in all its dimensions, and not just Northern Ireland, is their inheritance and the opportunity to share in the leadership and shape the future of a new Ireland.

It would end the alienation and deep sense of injustice felt by nationalists.

It would provide a framework within which agreed institutions could apply economic policies suited to the particular and largely similar circumstances and interests of both parts of the country, and in which economies of scale and the possibilities of integrated planning could be fully exploited.

It would best allow for the advancement internationally of the particular and largely common interests of Ireland, North and South and for the contribution, based on distinctive shared values, which the people of all traditions can make to the European and international communities.

It would end the dissipation of energies in wasteful divisions and redirect efforts towards constructive endeavour, thus giving a major impetus to the social, cultural and economic development of the entire country.

5.6—The parties in the Forum will continue to work by peaceful means to achieve Irish unity in agreement. There are many varying constitutional and other structures of political unity to be found throughout the world, for example, Australia, France, Italy, Spain, Switzerland and the United States of America which recognize to the extent necessary the diversity as well as the unity of the people concerned and ensure constitutional stability. It is essential that any structures for a new Ireland must meet both these criteria.

5.7—The particular structure of political unity which the Forum would wish to see established is a unitary state, achieved by agreement and consent, embracing the whole island of Ireland and providing irrevocable guarantees for the protection and preservation of both the unionist and nationalist identities. A unitary state on which agreement had been reached would also provide the ideal framework for the constructive interaction of the diverse cultures and values of the people of Ireland. A broad outline of such a unitary state is set out in Chapter 6.

5.8.—Constitutional nationalists fully accept that they alone could not determine the structures of Irish unity and that it is essential to have unionist agreement and participation in devising such structures and in formulating the guarantees they required. In line with this view, the Forum believes that the best people to identify the interests of the unionist tradition are the unionist people themselves. It would thus be essential that they should negotiate their role in any arrangements which would embody Irish unity. It would be for the British and Irish Governments to create the

framework and atmosphere within which such negotiations could take place.

5.9.—The Forum in the course of its work, in both public and private sessions, received proposals as to how unionist and nationalist identities and interests could be accommodated in different ways and in varying degrees in a new Ireland. The Forum gave careful consideration to these proposals. In addition to the unitary state, two structural arrangements were examined in some detail—a federal/confederal state and joint authority—and a broad outline of these are set out in Chapters 7 and 8.

5.10.—The Parties in the Forum also remain open to discuss other views which may contribute to political development.

CHAPTER 6

Unitary State

6.1—A unitary state would embrace the island of Ireland governed as a single unit under one government and one parliament elected by all the people of the island. It would seek to unite in agreement the two major identities and traditions in Ireland. The democratic basis of a unitary state in Ireland has always existed in modern times. Historically up to 1922 Ireland was governed as a single unit and prior to the Act of Union in 1801 was constitutionally a separate and theoretically equal kingdom. Such a state would represent a constitutional change of such magnitude as to require a new constitution that would be non-denominational. This constitution could only be formulated at an all-around constitutional conference convened by the British and Irish Governments. Such a constitution would contain clauses which would guarantee civil and religious liberties to all the citizens of the state on a basis that would entail no alteration nor diminution of the provisions in respect of civil and religious liberties which apply at present to the citizens of Northern Ireland. These guarantees could not subsequently be changed, except in accordance with special procedures.

6.2—The rights of all citizens woud be guaranteed in the constitution. Reinforcing guarantees would incorporate in the constitution the clauses of the European Convention of Human Rights with a right of access to the European Court of Human Rights.

6.3—In a unitary state, there would be a single legal and judicial system throughout the island. The study by Professors Boyle and Greer, *The Legal Systems, North and South*, shows that there would be no significant technical obstacle to the creation of a unified legal system.

6.4—Political and administrative arrangements in a unitary state would be devised to ensure that unionists would not be denied power or influence in a state where nationalists would be in a majority. For example, provision could be made for weighted majorities in the parliament in regard to legislation affecting changes in provisions on issues agreed to be fundamental at the establishment of the new state. In the Senate unionists could be guaranteed a minimum number of seats. The powers of the Senate could include effective blocking powers in regard to the issues agreed to be fundamental. Mechanisms for ensuring full Northern participation in an integrated Irish civil service would have to be devised.

6.5—A unitary state would have a single police service recruited from the whole island so designed that both nationalists and unionists could identify with it on the basis of political consensus.

6.6—A redefined relationship between Britain and Ireland would take account of the unionist sense of Britishness. In a unitary state, persons in Ireland, North and South, who at present hold British citzenship would continue to have such citizenship and could pass it on to their children without prejudice to the status of Irish citizenship which they would automatically acquire. The state could develop structures, relationships and associations with Britain which could include an Irish-British Council with intergovernmental and interparliamentary structures which would acknowledge the unique relationship between Ireland and Britain and which would provide expression of the long-established connections which unionists have with Britain.

6.7—All the cultural traditions in Ireland, North and South, would be guaranteed full expression and encouragement. The educational system would reflect the two main traditions on the island. The Irish language and culture would continue to be fostered by the state, and would be made more accessible to everyone in Ireland without any compulsion or imposition on any section.

6.8—A unitary state achieved by agreement between the nationalist and unionist traditions would for the first time allow full participation by all traditions in the affairs of the island. This would require a general and more explicit acknowledgement of a broader and more comprehensive Irish identity. A unitary state would promote administrative and economic efficiency in the island by ending duplication and separate planning and investment programmes and by facilitating integrated promotion of investment, exports and tourism. Natural resources, oil, gas and minerals will be developed for the benefit of all the people of Ireland and could make a significant contribution to securing the economic basis of the state. With no scope for conflicts of jurisdiction and with single taxation and currency systems, the implementation of an integrated economic policy suitable to the largely similar needs of the economies, North and South, would be facilitated, with consequent benefit. Integrated economic policies would ensure a united voice in advancing vital interests of both parts of Ireland, especially in the European Community, within which both North and South have common interests in areas such as agriculture and regional policy which diverge from the interests of Britain.

CHAPTER 7

Federal/Confederal State

7.1—A two state federal/confederal Ireland based on the existing identities, North and South, would reflect the political and administrative realities of the past 60 years and would entrench a measure of autonomy for both parts of Ireland within an all-Ireland framework. While protecting and fostering the identities and ethos of the two traditions, it would enable them to work together in the common interest.

7.2—In a federal/confederal constitution would be non-denominational and capable of alteration only by special procedures. There would be safeguards within each state and in the country as a whole for the protection of individual and minority rights. There would be a federal/confederal Supreme Court to interpret the constitution and to adjudicate on any conflicts of jurisdiction between federal/confederal and state governments, which could be made up of an uneven number of judges, one of whom could be from another country—possibly a Member State of the European Community—with the remaining judges coming in equal numbers from North and South. There would either be a special Bill of Rights or, alternatively, all the rights already defined and accepted in international conventions to which Ireland and the U.K. are signatories would be incorporated in the new federal or confederal constitution. This constitution could only be formulated at an all-round constitutional conference convened by the British and Irish governments.

7.3—In a federation, residual power would rest with the central government. Certain powers would be vested in the two individual states. A confederation would comprise the two states which would delegate certain specified powers to a confederal government.

7.4—In a federal/confederal arrangement, each state would have its own parliament and executive. Authority for security would be vested in the federal/confederal government in order to gain widespread acceptability and to ensure that the law and order functions were administered in the most effective and impartial manner.

7.5—In a federation, the federal parliament could have one or two Chambers, a House of Representatives, and/or a Senate. Laws relating to previously agreed fundamental issues could be passed only if they received the support of a weighted majority of the Senate in a two chamber system or of the House of Representatives in a one chamber system. The federal government would be approved by and be responsible to the federal parliament. The powers held at the federal level would be a matter for negotiation but in an Irish context matters such as agriculture, industry, energy, transport, industrial promotion and marketing might be more efficiently administered on an island basis at federal level, while other services such as education, health, housing and social welfare might best be administered by the individual states. The functions of Head of State could be carried out by a President, the office altering between persons representative of the Northern and Southern states.

7.6—In a confederal arrangement, the powers held at the centre could be relatively limited, (for example, foreign policy, external and internal security policy and perhaps currency and monetary policy), requiring a less elaborate parliamentary structure at the confederal level. It might suffice to have an arrangement whereby the representatives of the two states would determine jointly issues of policy relating to the powers of the confederation. The decisions taken by the confederation would, as appropriate, e.g. implementation of EEC directives, fall to be implemented by the authorities in the individual states.

7.7—A federal/confederal arrangement would, in particular, provide institutions giving unionists effective power and influence in a new Ireland. The Northern parliament would have powers which could not be removed by an Act of another parliament. Existing civil and religious rights in the North would be unaffected. With a federal/confederal framework unionists would have parallel British citizenship and could maintain special links with Britain. Mechanisms for ensuring full North participation in the federal/confederal civil service would have to be devised. Provision would be made for the full recognition and symbolic expression of both traditions.

7.8—A federal/confederal arrangement would allow the retention within the North and South of many laws and practices reflecting the development of both areas over the past 60 years. All the cultural traditions

in Ireland, North and South, would be guaranteed full expression and encouragement.

7.9—A federal/confederal arrangement would allow all those living on the island to share and give expression to the common aspects of their identity while at the same time maintaining and protecting their separate beliefs and way of life. The central authority would promote their common interests while the state authorities protected individual interests.

CHAPTER 8

Joint Authority

8.1—Under joint authority, the London and Dublin governments would have equal responsibility for all aspects of the government of Northern Ireland. This arrangement would accord equal validity to the two traditions in Northern Ireland and would reflect the current reality that the people of the North are divided in their allegiances. The two governments, building on existing links and in consultation with nationalist and unionist opinion, would establish joint authority designed to ensure a stable and secure system of government.

8.2—Joint authority would give political, symbolic and administrative expression of their identity to Northern nationalists without infringing the parallel wish of unionists to maintain and to have full operational expression of their identity. It would be an unprecedented approach to the unique realities that have evolved within Ireland and between Britain and Ireland.

8.3—Joint authority would involve shared rule by the British and Irish Governments. Although this could be exercised directly, there would be enabling provision for the exercise of major powers by a locally-elected Assembly and Executive.

8.4—There would be full and formal recognition and symbolic expression of British and of Irish identity in Northern Ireland and promotion of the cultural expression of the two identities. Joint citizenship rights would be conferred automatically on all persons living in Northern Ireland, resulting in no diminution of the existing rights of Irish or British citizenship of persons living in Northern Ireland.

8.5—A comprehensive and enforceable non-denominational Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland would be promulgated ensuring the protection of both individual and communal rights and freedoms.

8.6—The overall level of public expenditure would be determined by the two Governments. Problems of external representation of Northern Ireland would be resolved between the two governments.

8.7—Under joint authority the two traditions in Northern Ireland would find themselves on a basis of equality and both would be able to find an expression of their identify in the new institutions. There would be no diminution of the Britishness of the unionist population. There identity, ethos and link with Britain would be assured by the authority and presence of the British Government in the joint authority arrangements. At the same time it would resolve one basic defect of (a) the failed 1920-25 attempt to settle the Irish question and (b) the present arrangements for the government of Northern Ireland—the failure to give satisfactory political, symbolic and administrative expression to Northern nationalists. Structures would thus be provided with which the nationalists in the North could identify, which might reverse their progressive alienation from existing structures. Security arrangements in which for the first time both nationalists and unionists could have confidence could be developed, thus providing a basis for peace and order. The climate would thus be created for the emergence of normal political life, of compromise and of mutual confidence based on security in the reciprocal acceptance of identify and interests.

A PROFILE OF TED JOHNSTON AND OTHER VIETNAM VETERANS

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, it has often been said on the floor of the Senate that our debt to this Nation's veterans is enormous. This is indisputably true.

Our Vietnam veterans have borne the special burden of having participated in an unpopular war, and of returning home to face the occasional scorn of their countrymen.

Vietnam may forever bear the label of having been an unpopular war. But the men who fought in Vietnam were not asked whether they thought the war was popular or not. They were motivated by the same true and honorable faith which leads a soldier to sacrifice his life in a cause he might not fully understand.

Remembering Vietnam is painful. It forces us to think of the hearts that beat high with hope, of young lives snuffed out well before their time, of fields not planted, of homes not built, and of children not born. It forces us to remember the hundreds of thousands of selfless acts of patriotism by Americans whose individual courage and deeds will be forever unknown to us.

I am privileged to have a special Vietnam veteran as a member of my staff in Maine. Ted Johnston has served me very well for several years. His story is one of trial and triumph, of a Vietnam veteran who has struggled with success to reenter society.

The Sunday, a newspapèr in Lewiston, Maine, recently profiled Ted and other Vietnam veterans, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS STILL FIGHTING A DIFFERENT KIND OF WAR

(By Mark Mogensen)

Ted Johnston is leaving Vietnam behind.

The green forests hiding North Vietnamese snipers, the native children he saw blown up by land mines, the river patrol boat on which he was ambushed, the epileptic seizures, the close friend who committed suicide and the bad dreams—he's leaving them all behind.

Like almost every other veteran of America's longest war, Johnston has been walking a long and treacherous road away from the ghosts of Vietnam—a road often littered with lives waylaid by divorces, suicides, unemployment, alcoholism and drugs, physical ailments and mental anguish.

While plagued by his share of setbacks and frustrations, Johnston has gained the border and has joined the majority of veterans who have either successfully left Vietnam behind or are far enough down the road to see the light.

America's Vietnam veterans are growing up; and they're contributing to a society that once alienated them, but which now appears more willing to welcome them back.

Johnston looks comfortable in a suit. He has his own spacious office in Lewiston. As a representative for Sen. William Cohen, he has the necessary warmth, affability and professional attitude to deal effectively with people and their problems.

He has come a long way.

In 1972, as an 18-year-old draftee, his river patrol boat was blown out of Vietnamese waters. He was knocked unconscious and believes he was kept afloat by his sergeant, who lost his left leg and right shoulder in the raid.

One of only seven who survived the raid and the only non-amputee, Johnston spent the next year in a U.S. Naval hospital suffering from severe head trauma and epileptic seizures.

"It was the pits. I was manic; I was elated, I was depressed. I couldn't relate to people. I got down on myself a whole lot for not being able to deal with my problems, to the point where I was suicidal. No goals. No objectives. No rhyme or reason. I went down to 135 pounds. I'm 180 and I don't think I'm fat," he says, leaning back in his office chair and patting his stomach. "I started to abuse alcohol . . . It was the pits. When people think of the slimy veteran, that's what I was."

"When I came home, my mother would say, 'What's wrong with you?' because I would sit and stare blank or play solitaire. I wasn't angry. I was just totally stunned. Dazed. Everything was overwhelming."

He was slowly recuperating when a close war friend stepped in front of a truck on Interstate 95 in Miami and killed himself. "That's when I took flight and left and went to Aroostook," said Johnston.

For eight months, Johnston lived by himself in the woods, skiing for supplies and then skiing back into the woods.

"It wasn't because I hated anybody. I just was not at all healthy. I wasn't crazy, but I was on the verge, that's for sure. My perspectives were way out of whack. A horn (blowing) would send me flying on the floor—things like that. I (went to live in the woods) just to think. To have quiet. Peace. Not to escape from (people), but to escape from everything else. So I would have no responsibilities and I could deal with my own mind-set, which took a long period of time."

Slowly, over the next decade, Johnston would come out of the woods, get a degree in political science from the University of Maine at Presque Isle, begin working in Cohen's local office there and even get married. A year-and-a-half ago, he moved to take a job in Cohen's Lewiston office, specializing in veterans' issues.

Johnston cites the therapy, medication and treatment he received from the Veterans Administration during those last 10 years for helping him take control of his life and ridding him of his seizures.

"If you had talked to me six years ago," he says, "I would have been real down on the government, I think. It's hard now (to be critical) because my life is good. I'm happily married. I'm a homeowner, drive a fairly new vehicle. I have a motorcycle that's paid for. You know. Life's pretty easy . . . But it's all a matter of perspective. I have a lot of empathy for the veteran who's having a hard time. Particularly if they're

unemployed (because) I can't think of anything worse."

Saying he considers himself extremely lucky, Johnston said his remaining problems involve talking about some of his experiences and an occasional "surge of emotion" that washes over him, recreating the fear he felt in Vietnam.

"Sometimes I'll get a surge of emotion . . . I don't know why. It used to precipitate seizures. Today, I go for a walk, I run, I have a beer, I'll talk to my wife, start wrestling, something, anything."

Johnston, who hesitated to talk about his experiences, fearful of making an example of myself, is just one of the estimated 16,000 Vietnam combat troops in Maine and 3 million nationally who returned to piece their lives back together.

His story of success is the rule, not the exception.

There are wonderful success stories and some horrible stories of failure. But basically speaking, people have been able to get on with their lives . . ." said Phil Vampatella, executive director of Maine's Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program headquartered in Portland.

Vampetalla, a Vietnam veteran whose program is designed for successful veterans to help still-troubled ones, said only 15 to 20 percent of the veterans who returned from Vietnam still have serious problems psychologically or physically.

The other 80 to 85 percent, he said, have successfully merged into society with some rarely thinking about their experiences and others battling tough-but-manageable problems on a daily basis.

However, he said the public still has the perception that all the veterans returning from Vietnam are violent and unstable.

"The way I see it . . . we have been depicted as everything from a bunch of druggies to baby killers to pot heads," said Vampatella. "A lot of us have just hidden out so as not to have to put up with the nonsense and garbage that's been cast on us. But we're just like everybody else. We have our houses, and mortgages and kids with braces."

"I think there's a stigma out there about the Vietnam veteran," added Jon Guay of Lewiston, "as the guy with the Army fatigues, the ponytail, a ring in his ear and a chip on his shoulder. But most of the time, he's your neighbor or the local doctor or dentist or school teacher."

Guay, a former prisoner interrogator who served during the Tet offensive, is assistant director of the Marine Job Service in Augusta. Very few scars from Vietnam remain with Guay.

He can talk about his experiences—although he has only begun to talk about them in the past year or two. He is employed in a high-level job. He no longer suffers flashbacks or nervousness at night.

Guay says he was luckier than some. He came from Bingham, a small, still-patriotic town where many people knew him, wrote to him while in Vietnam and welcomed him home on his return.

Like Johnston, "I also had the advantage of spending some time by myself, getting reoriented to civilization. I have a log cabin on a stream in Somerset County and I spent about two-and-half months in that cabin by myself . . . mostly hunting. But I also needed that time to kind of rearrange myself. I think that time was very valuable for me . . . I think that was an adjustment many veterans missed."

"The other thing, too," said Guay, "is I didn't have any pressures on me when I came back. While I hadn't selected a career yet, I had many avenues open to me. And I also didn't have a girlfriend I was writing to or anything, or my own wife and children that I was coming back to. I think that would have added to the pressure of being over there . . ."

Guay added, "It's my feeling some of the veterans who have come back who haven't been able to adjust haven't had that break."

Even with the advantages he had, Guay says vivid memories remain with him, particularly about the week-long Tet offensive in his Central Highlands area.

"There were bullets flying overhead. There were flares going off. Nobody slept. Nobody ate.

"(When I first returned) I would wake up when I heard a noise like a car backfire. There are some residual things that to this day probably still stay with me."

"Even to this day," he continued, "when I go into a restaurant, I have to sit so I know where the door is and the exits are. That was something you always did there. You would sit strategically so that you wouldn't be caught with your back to the door because there were always people throwing in (small bombs) and blowing up places where Americans were. So even today, it's very important where I sit."

Guay said the transition back to life in the United States was not helped by the reception most veterans received from a war-weary, cynical America, wracked internally by protests.

"When I was over there in Vietnam and when I came back, if I ever ran into one of those (protesters) I was always looking forward to confronting one of them because I had physical plans for him," he said, with a quick laugh.

"This is very interesting for me," Guay added after a thoughtful pause. "All the time I didn't want to go over there because I was scared. All the time you're over there you can't wait to get back. All the time you were over there you hated it. But when you came back, there was a sense of pride you had that did not allow you to emphathize with those people who were protesting the war. At least that was my own experience."

Guay's reaction was typical. Many of the men spoke of returning and hating the war for the physical and emotional toll it had taken; hating the South Vietnamese for often acting as if they did not care who won the war; hating the U.S. government for not taking the obvious steps needed to win the war; and often even disliking themselves for the actions they were forced to take.

They were confronted by a vocal segment of the population that often blamed the returning veteran for abetting the war.

The reception was a blow to the already reeling veterans, many of whom entered the war either because they had to or because they felt it was the right thing to do for their country.

Talking about their experiences quickly became a major problem for many veterans, either because they couldn't vocalize their feelings or because no one wanted to listen.

"One major problem I found was that I was not able to talk, even to fellow veterans, about Vietnam. I was angered . . . by the protests and what not," said Merrill Morris, organizer and program director of Maine's new Veteran Employment Training Service.

"When I came back, I just tried to forget about it, because people at home were tired of it and didn't want to hear any more about it," said Steve Bentley, a 37-year-old veteran who is seeking his master's degree in rehabilitation counseling at the University of Southern Maine.

"But," Bentley added, "you stuff things like that away and it's got to come out somewhere."

The pent-up frustrations and emotions held by many veterans did show themselves—often in the form of emotional instability, the inability to hold down a job, disrespect for authority, dependency on drugs, guilt, remorse, strained personal relationships and the need for support.

Relying on their own tenacity and internal strengths, the support of friends and family and the growing number of state and federal programs available during the past decade, 80 to 85 percent of the veterans now fit well into society. But manageable problems remain, they say.

Vampatella remarked, "There's probably something like that hiding in each of us. I think we all have that hidden thing in each of us that needs to be taken care of."

Such remnants of Vietnam depend on each man's experiences, the intensity and duration of those experiences, the period of war when those experiences occurred and each man's own internal strengths, veterans say.

Johnston occasionally has surges of emotion.

Guay is aware of where he sits in public places.

Morris will forever lack some of his innocence and his soul. "I quit caring and I had no anticipation of ever leaving (Vietnam)," he said. "To this day, I feel like a part of me died there. It's like you left a part of you there. Other veterans who were there say the same thing; that they seemed to leave a piece of their soul there. I believe it's true."

Bentley, while unmarried, says that because of the war he will never consider having children. "I feel the world is too crazy to bring children into it. In general, I feel the way living, breathing people treat each other is madness."

Bentley's high-risk job, which he volunteered for, was to operate a Rome Plow, a tractor-like machine used to clear the jungle of vegetation and eliminate enemy hiding places.

With only thin wire mesh around the driving compartment to protect him from vegetation, Bentley and other machine drivers would often be the targets of bombs and booby-traps. He survivied. But he knew other drivers killed and maimed by snipers, 250-pound bombs planted under the ground and concussion bombs suspended by string between trees.

"I went over there for two tours. You know, I really bit into it. I was there for a Hemingway-experience kind of thing, plus the mom-and-apple-pie thing. You know, my father said to me before I left, 'go over there and earn some medals and be a man. . . ."

"But after a while, it began to occur to me how insane this all was. I began to see that the enemy was a human being. Pretty soon, I was in an immense state of confusion, so I began to—well—there were plenty of chemicals to numb yourself with and I poured them into the boiling cauldron of emotion and then things really got bad,"

Bentley returned and spent six years wandering through 20 or more jobs from Minnesota to Maine, Nebraska to Florida.

"I couldn't stay in any one place. I couldn't get a grip. I was floundering. I was also drinking heavily and using other drugs . . . But if you spend a year killing people and having people trying to kill you and

31-059 O-87-26 (Pt. 8)

watching people around you die, that is going to have an effect on you on some level."

He finally stopped long enough to begin going to the U.S. Veterans Administration at Togus for group therapy and enrolled at USM seeking a master's degree in rehabilitation counseling.

"I think a lot of veterans could grow by group and by going through the process," noted Bentley, saying he has met many veterans who have yet to cope with their experiences.

"I run into (veterans who haven't talked about their feelings) all the time. I run into that at school and at meetings . . . Mostly what you get is, 'Yeah, I was there and I haven't really talked about it.'"

But after more than 11 years and many long miles on the road away from Vietnam, the veterans say they are beginning to talk about both their triumphs and remaining problems. What's more, they say society seems to be increasingly willing to listen.

"I think that from the time the war ended to now, the nation has had time to adjust," said Guay.

"I would say, at least at face value (the veterans' public image has gotten better) especially in the last few years," Morris added. "I think it's because the conscience of this country—of our parents' age group particularly—realized that Vietnam was a lot worse and a lot crazier for us than they ever gave us credit for when we first came back."

"I think they've matured," said Johnston, referring to the protesters of yesterday, "and realized that you're often in circumstances beyond your control."

"We don't blame the American people with being upset with the situation. After 10 years, given the best fighting machine ever developed in the world, the national treasury and 3 million young men, we lost. we didn't even have a stated clearly defined goal," said Vampatella.

"We can't blame the American people. And we can't blame them for blaming us. We symbolized all the things that were painful to them. But they were wrong about putting the blame on us. The blame was clearly on our civilian leaders in Washington," he said, saying his hope is that "people realize that hatred was misdirected."

"The most important thing to get across . . . is that the Vietnam veterans desire to have people understand they were doing a job just like all other veterans and they were doing a job for the American public," said Jim Wyatt, a decorated veteran who now works as a National Service Officer and veteran advocate at Togus.

"All they want is for that hand to be extended and people to say a silent thank you so that they're just like those people who didn't have to go," he added.

If the growing number of newspaper and magazine articles, television newscasts and programs and movies more favorably depicting the plight of the Vietnam veteran are an example, the hand is finally, hesitantly, being extended say veterans.

In addition, some say the government, long criticized by Vietnam veterans for its lack of support, seems to be making an effort.

Vampatella's Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program, Morris' Veteran Employment Training Service, Guay's involvement with the Veteran Affairs Committee of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies and the recently erected Vietnam Veterans memorial in Washington, D.C., indicate growing government awarness, some acknowledge.

But perhaps the most important change is occurring within the veterans themselves.

"The experience you had, had to sit there for a while, and now we're able to look at it a lot more rationally," said Guay.

"Many pretty much feel the time is right to come out of the closet. We have prospered despite the image," said Vampatella.

Vietnam veterans like Guay and Johnston are finding successful careers in the private and public sectors.

Vietnam veterans like Vampatella and Merrill are discovering satisfaction and success working in executive-level positions helping other Vietnam veterans.

Many Vietnam veterans are working to develop the mental stability and educational background needed to work in the public or private sectors.

Many others say they are now finding the courage and desire to voice their long-stilled emotions, considered one of the first steps in the healing process. "Many veterans still having difficulty have decided to come out for treatment," said Morris.

Some have found an inner strength from their experiences. "Fortunately, the majority of us that went over are back in society now and would never want to go back, but would never trade in the experience," said Wyatt, who lost both his legs to a "bouncing Betty" land mine. "It showed me the value of life, loved ones and family."

And some veterans are even finding an inner strength—pride—from their experiences, particularly as the American public becomes more accepting of the Vietnam veterans' role in the war.

"I think history will certify that those of us who went to Vietnam are going to prove to be some of the greatest warriors and leaders of this country," said Wyatt.

Guay, talking quietly about the Bronze Star Medal he earned for his contribution to the war, commented, "It didn't mean that much to me when I first got it. At the time, I didn't feel I was decorated. Now, I feel kind of proud of it."

THE FUTURE OF TAIWAN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to call to your attention an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal, on April 24, entitled "The U.S. Should Encourage a 'Republic of Taiwan.'" The article, written by Trong R. Chai, professor of political science at the City University of New York, questions the wisdom of trusting China to keep its promises regarding Taiwan's future status. As you know, China repeatedly insists that the people on Taiwan have nothing to fear from reunification with the People's Republic. Professor Chai quotes Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang's assertion that:

> After the country is unified, Taiwan, as a special administrative region of China, can retain much of its own character and keep its social systems and life style unchanged. The existing party, government and military setups in Taiwan can also remain unchanged.

But Professor Chai also correctly points out that China made similar promises in a 1951 written agreement with Tibet only to break its word a few years later in a brutal invasion. I believe the question Professor Chai poses deserves our careful consideration because the wrong decision on Taiwan's part could result in a repeat of Tibet's fate.

Professor Chai, after posing the difficulties associated with reunification, argues that the better choice for the United States is to encourage the formation of a Republic of Taiwan. Being a native-born Taiwanese, he prefers that any new republic formed be democratic and established by and for the benefit of all the people on Taiwan. But he would also favor a republic controlled by the present KMT government rather than accept the imposition of a Communist system by China.

His recommendations may strike some as being provocative. I frankly am saddened by reactions of this sort. Fearing to speak out for democracy and freedom of choice for the 18 million people on Taiwan runs counter to everything we as a people stand for. I urge my colleagues to judge for themselves by reading this article in its entirety.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD Professor Chai's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 24, 1984]

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ENCOURAGE A "REPUBLIC OF TAIWAN"

(By Trong R. Chai)

During his visit to the U.S. in January, Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang asserted that "the Taiwan question is the main obstacle in the growth of Sino-U.S. relations." The prime minister's solution to this problem? "After the country is unified, Taiwan, as a special administrative region of China, can retain much of its own character and keep its social systems and life style unchanged. The existing party, government and military setups in Taiwan can also remain unchanged."

Would the Chinese keep their promise and allow Taiwan to maintain its own social and political systems if they took over the island? The current status of Tibet provides an answer.

In 1951, China and Tibet signed an agreement governing relations between them. Article 4 stated that "the central authorities will not alter the existing political system in Tibet. The central authorities also will not alter the established status, functions and powers of the Dalai Lama." Article 7 promised that "the religious beliefs, customs and habits of the Tibetan people shall be respected." The Chinese even pledged that "in matters related to various reforms in Tibet, there will be no compulsion on the part of the central authorities; the local government of Tibet shall carry out reform of its own accord."

Less than eight years later, China invaded Tibet. This touched off massive uprisings, and the Dalai Lama fled to India. Since that time, killings by the Chinese and the whole-

sale destruction of Tibetan culture have been well documented.

The case of Tibet demonstrates China's failure to translate its words into deeds. Premier Zhao's formula for Taiwan should thus be seen as nothing more than an empty promise.

The people of Taiwan have more than the heavy hand of Chinese rule to fear, however. For the past 35 years, they have been living under Kuomintang martial law. Basic human rights, such as freedom of speech, assembly and association, have been denied. Native Taiwanese, who constitute 85% of Taiwan's total population, occupy less than 10% of the seats on national legislative bodies. The president and the governor of Taiwan, along with the mayors of the two largest cities, aren't elected by the people.

In its 90-year separation from China, first under the Japanese and then the KMT, Taiwan has developed its own distinctive character. For example, the Taiwanese illiteracy rate is less than 5%, compared with more than 30% in China. Taiwan's per-capita income is five times higher than China's.

The difference between the two societies is so great that the Taiwanese people wish to establish a new nation independent of China. Evidence came in a supplementary congressional election last December in which the joint platform of the non-KMT candidates stressed that "the future of Taiwan should be determined by the people on Taiwan." Self-determination is a code word for Taiwanese independence—discussion of which is prohibited by the KMT.

Instead, the Taiwanese people suffer from international isolation. Only about 20 countries maintain diplomatic relations with Taiwan.

When a nation establishes formal ties with Peking, it invariably agrees to the Chinese demand that Taiwan be recognized as part of China. Consequently, the Taiwanese people fear that China will eventually try to annex the island by force.

This fear has precipitated a growing flow of wealth from Taiwan. In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last November, Lo Fu-Chen, a visiting professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania, stated: "Already a so-called Hong Kong phenomenon is experienced in Taiwan. Based on a banker's estimates, some $3 billion in capital, equivalent to 7% of [the] GNP of Taiwan, has flown into Los Angeles alone. In the last three years, the investment index has experienced a steady decline for the first time in three decades of rapid growth."

The U.S. was deeply concerned about Taiwan's security until 1972, when President Richard Nixon and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai issued the Shanghai Communique, in which Washington acknowledged that there is "but one China and . . . Taiwan is a part of China." Since then, the U.S. has cut its formal ties with Taipei and pledged to reduce its arms sales to Taiwan over time "to a final resolution."

It is vital that the U.S. continue to protect the independence of Taiwan. President Reagan should keep in mind the following points during his visit to China this week:

First, as the U.S. has been involved with Taiwan for four decades and champions freedom and democracy everywhere in the world, it has a moral obligation to prevent the mainland Chinese from imposing their communist system upon the island's 19 million people.

Second, American corporations have invested over $12 billion in Taiwan, and a Chinese takeover would threaten their investments.

Third, by taking over Taiwan, China's submarines would pose a threat to peace and security in the Pacific region.

Clearly, it is necessary to create a Taiwan that is independent of Peking's rule. How can the U.S. help this aim?

One alternative would be for the U.S. to help the Taiwanese people overthrow the KMT, which represents neither China nor Taiwan.

Another alternative would be to encourage the KMT to declare Taiwan a new political entity, separate and independent from China. In this regard, the Reagan administration sent a positive signal to Taipei at the November Senate hearing. Asked by a senator whether the U.S. expected China to apply military force to Taiwan if independence is declared, a State Department spokesman said that "a decision to use force would have an impact on U.S. policy." Citing a provision in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, the official added that "the president and the Congress shall determine, in accordance with constitutional processes, appropriate action by the United States in response to any such danger.

The third alternative would be for the U.S. to urge the KMT to release all political prisoners, lift martial law and call for free elections. Only when the Taiwanese people have political freedom will they have sufficient power to change the Republic of China into the Republic of Taiwan.

In light of current U.S. involvements in Central America and the Middle East, it is unlikely that the Reagan administration would take the first alternative. The KMT would oppose the second alternative simply because it is afraid of losing power to the Taiwanese people after independence.

Therefore, the third alternative appears to be the most feasible. The KMT would certainly resist American pressure for democracy in Taiwan, but the U.S. could still use arms sales, foreign trade and cultural exchanges as weapons to press the KMT to cooperate.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Routine morning business is closed.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOMS MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2163, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Baker amendment No. 3027, to further reduce deficits by including reconciliations and appropriations caps for defense and nondefense discretionary spending for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

(2) Chiles amendment No. 3044 (to Baker amendment No. 3027), to reduce deficit reduction for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and to provide for a delay for 2 years of cost-of-living adjustments to tax tables.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the Baker amendment. My proposal is not perfect. It does not provide as much saving as the Senator from Florida would like or as much as I have proposed in a number of other forums. But the issue today is, how does the Chiles amendment compare to the Baker-Rose Garden amendment?

On that question, Mr. President, I do not have any problem defending my proposal. In fact, I feel quite confident about it. It compares very favorably.

The exercise we are now going through is an attempt to make some deficit reductions which will allow us to get by until next year.

Everyone was upset, this being an election year, that we were not going to be able to make any major changes—major changes to the tax bill, major changes to a number of the spending programs, major changes in entitlements. Yet, we find ourselves facing this horrendous deficit. It is somewhere in the neighborhood of $170 billion to $180 billion. And it is a deficit that continues to grow every year, a deficit that is no longer cyclical, but is now structural.

That cyclical term, I recall, was developed during the Nixon administration in an attempt to show that if we were at full employment, we really would not have to worry. We would still have sufficient revenues while there would be a reduction in what we would have to say for unemployment compensation, food stamps, and other stimulative programs. The budget deficit was not supposed to be a problem under those circumstances.

But now, all the projections indicate that even if we were at full employment—and we certainly are not—we would have a deficit. And the deficit would be structural.

Now we find ourselves in a situation where our revenues are approximately 18.9 percent of the gross national product, our spending is over 29.5 percent. The gap has widened.

Revenues, under the existing tax cut plan, will continue to decrease somewhat if no action is taken. Spending will continue to increase by virtue of the baselines we have adopted, and by virtue of the entitlement program increase.

So the gap will become wider and wider, and we will see those deficits going up above $350 billion in just a few short years. The national debt is now over $1 trillion, and the second trillion dollars will come about in several years. It took us almost 200 years to reach the first trillion dollars, but in just a short of time, it will double.

The exercise we are in now, both in the rose garden plan and in the pending amendment is a time-buying enterprise.

It would be nice if we could go further. I think we should. I believe it is pretty clear, from the votes we had on the Hollings freeze and the Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden freeze that the votes are not here to take more drastic action. Even those plans, of course, would not go as far as we need to go.

Why has that happened? Why are we unable to go further? Primarily we find ourselves as an army without a leader. We do not have a general who is ready to lead the troops. The general has said: "Steady as you go. Stay the course. Have confidence in me."

It reminds me of the story about the fellow who fell off a cliff. As he was falling, he stuck out his hand, and he finally was able to grasp a branch. It was shaking, and dirt was falling off the roots, and he did not know whether the branch was going to hold him.

He cried out: "Help! Help!" There was no reply. He said: "Is anybody up there?"

Finally, a voice said: "I am here."

He said, "Who is there?"

The voice said, "It is I, the Lord. Have faith."

The fellow said: "I have faith."

The voice said: "Turn loose."

The fellow said: "Is anybody else up there?" [Laughter.]

That, I think is where we find ourselves in this body. The leader has said, "Have faith. Steady as you go. We are going to grow our way out of this." But I hear this Chamber and the other body saying: "Is anybody else up there?"

Well, nobody has answered yet. So we find ourselves as this ragtag army, trying to march a little on our own. We have one side trying to march in winding lines and we have the other side trying to march in uneven ranks. We are down to two plans; the rose garden plan and the plan of the humble corporal from the imperial Polk County trying to get us by until next year.

Well, which of these plans should we adopt, and how do these plans stack up one against the other? Both make some savings.

The rose garden plan purports to save $150 billion, according to the author's figures. If we ask the Congressional Budget Office to tell us how much comes off the bottom line, they tell us it is only about $89 billion. If we use the arithmetic of the rose gardeners, our plan would save about $200 billion. If we ask the Congressional Budget Office to tell us how much comes off our bottom line, they say approximately $150 billion.

Well, what is the difference? Perhaps it is hard to see. I think what we are trying to say to the financial markets and what we are trying to say to the decisionmakers who will determine whether they are going to lend money for housing, or for farm credit and how much it will cost, is that we are concerned about this deficit. Both sides are trying to tell them the same thing.

But we want to do more. We know that we have to do more. Yet we are asking for some time. We seem to be saying, "You have to allow us to get these elections behind us. You have to allow the leader, the general, the President, a little more time to make up his mind that he really wants to fight these deficits—whoever that President might be next year. But to show your good faith, we are going to take a step this year.

How much of that step do we have to take? That is really what we are talking about here. Is $89 billion enough? Is $150 billion enough?

I do not know the answer to either one. But I do know that $150 billion is more than $89 billion, and I do know that we have a better chance of sending that signal with $150 billion than we have sending it with $89 billion.

I know from the votes taken yesterday and the day before that there are not sufficient votes in this Chamber to send a bigger signal. We have had 38 votes for the Hollings plan and 32 votes for the Kassebaum-Biden-Grassley plan.

The question is, Can we send that signal at $150 billion? I hope that we can. I think that it gives us the best chance to buy the additional time.

What happens if we do not send either one of these signals? What happens if the signal is not enough?

What I think happens, Mr. President, is that interest rates will continue to rise. We have seen interest rates go up since the rose garden plan was announced, since an economist of Shearson/American Express Co. said that the rose garden plan is "chicken feed." Interest rates have ticked up since then.

I think if we do not pass a plan that has sufficient restraints—and I hope the one we are on, does—then those interest rates are going to go up. If the economy turns around and goes sour on us, if we start another recession before this year's actions take hold we are in big trouble. Most of us recognize that if you take action for 1985 it will be 1986 before that action begins to bite. If we are in a recession in 1986, we may have to undo steps we took previously. We might have to stimulative spending, the conventional way of pulling out of a recession. Usually we take action in Congress, but even if we did not, there are automatic stimuli that come into play. So we could find ourselves going into a recession with a $200 billion deficit. If that happens, hang on to your hats.

Who knows where we would come out of something like that or what the problems would be if we go into that kind of recession?

That is a risk we are loathe to take. And that is why we are here working on these plans.

I intend to repeat this a number of times today, but our cardinal responsibility is to adopt a plan that leaves us, in 1987, better than we find ourselves going in during 1984. Simply put, I think our deficits must be going down under any plan we adopt rather than going up. That, Mr. President, is a basic difference between my amendment and the rose garden plan.

The deficits in the rose garden plan will go from $181 billion in 1985 to $204 billion in 1987. That I fear is the worst of all signals to send the financial markets. That I think is why the Shearson economist described the rose garden plan as "chicken feed." That is why I think that the market has not responded since the rose garden plan was announced. Interest rates have gone up because what money managers are looking at is the bottom line. They are not much concerned about rhetoric. They want to know what the plan does to the bottom line. And the rose garden plan has the bottom line going up.

My plan, contained in the pending amendment, will have the deficits going down, to $169 billion in 1984. That is still very high, still much higher than I would like. But if you compare that to deficits rising to $204 billion under the rose garden plan, I think you see there is a great difference.

I think my plan is fair. It restrains defense as well as domestic spending. And it also provides some additional revenue.

We find $31 billion in additional revenue. We find about $26 billion in spending restraints, a combination of defense and domestic restraints, or $26 billion more than we have in the rose garden plan. Comparing it to the rose garden plan, $20 billion more in outlays, $47 billion more in budget authority and below the baseline our amendment would be $53 billion in budget authority and a $26 billion reduction in outlays. Those are our savings.

You match that with $31 billion in revenue and I think you have a fair and a balanced plan. It is not exactly like the Hollings plan that tried to do it all with revenue. It is not like the Kassebaum plan that tried to do it all with spending. We have struck a bal-

ance between the two plans. We are down to a choice between the rose garden plan and the Chiles plan.

I hope the Senate will consider seriously that choice. I hope that they will consider what the bottom line looks like in the deficits of the two plans. I think they will recognize that we do not have a complete budget resolution. We are not getting a chance to vote on the bottom line because of the procedural situation. The budget resolution will be handled perfunctorily after this. so, here, right now, is really where the main ball game is.

We better be looking and seeing what the bottom line will be because here, right now, will determine whether and to what extent we affect the deficit.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(During the quorum call Mr. ARMSTRONG occupied the chair; subsequently, Mr. GORTON occupied the chair.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida has requested that we see if there is another amendment that we could work on and perhaps vote on today. The distinguished junior Senator from the State of Georgia is here and he has a line-item veto amendment.

It is may understanding that we might set aside the pending matter by unanimous consent and let the distinguished Senator from Georgia take up his amendment. Does the distinguished Senator from Florida have some comment on that?

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. BAKER. Will the Senator withhold his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CHILES. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am pleased to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, let me say that I do not have any objection to this. I talked to the distinguished Senator from Florida and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico. I admit to a degree of chagrin that we are not going to have a vote on this today, but I understand the circumstances.

I do not doubt the representations made by the Senator from Florida. I was grateful last evening that he would lay down his amendment. I know he did so in good faith, expecting to dispose of it today, and we discussed that. But, he was equally candid and frank with me—and I am sure he will not mind me repeating this—in saying that a number of people have necessarily left the Senate and that he would prefer not to vote on the matter today. Goodness knows, I understand that, because the name of the game in the legislative arena is learning how to count. So I do understand that.

While it would be possible, I suppose, to move to table the amendment, notwithstanding, I hardly think that that would be an appropriate thing to do. The distinguished Senator from Florida is the ranking Democratic member of the Budget Committee. His proposal is a major Democratic initiative and it deserves better than that in terms of consideration of the Senate.

So I made the decision not to try to table the amendment, not to try, thus, to force a vote today. I do so with great reluctance because I had hoped we would even finish today.

But, Mr. President, that is the way things are. You have to take the bitter with the sweet. So I am not going to object to moving off this amendment for the moment.

But I would like to inquire of the Senator from Florida to see if he would consider giving us a time certain on Monday—frankly, I do not care how late Monday—to have a vote on his amendment. I am perfectly willing to have a vote up or down, if the chairman of the committee is agreeable.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are referring to the Chiles amendment, and not any other that we might take up.

Mr. BAKER. That is correct; the Chiles amendment. I am certainly not talking about final passage.

I am now abandoning the idea of finishing today. My question to the Senator from Florida is whether or not we can vote on the amendment on Monday.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his indulgence and patience. He has always intended to try to accommodate everyone in a fair way. The Senator is right.

Yesterday, I looked forward to a vote early this afternoon on this amendment. I came in this morning thinking that was going to happen. I thought we could start the debate.

But as the day wore on, there was something about the announcement that there was not going to be a Friday session that tended to make people start making early reservations, and some are leaving today.

I found that a number of people were leaving. I was trying to find out exactly how we stand on Monday. That is the reason I did not want to make an arrangement. But again I am not trying to delay.

I want to get a vote on our proposition. I thought the packages should stay together, move together, and that we should vote before we take up the underlying Baker amendment. I want to accommodate the desire to get this debate going forward. Certainly I will try to do that Monday. If not, we will try to have other matters to dispose of. We will not delay.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

If the Senator from New Mexico will yield further, I hope the Senator can give us a time to do this amendment on Monday. Even though we might be doing things, we are postponing the inevitable and that is, to deal with the major Democratic initiative. I would like to deal with that on Monday, if we can.

I have been handed a note reminding me that the next item which might be taken up is the Mattingly amendment. That is a matter that is uniquely within the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. The distinguished chairman of that committee, Senator HATFIELD, wishes to be on the floor before any action is taken in respect to proceeding with the Mattingly amendment.

While we wait for Senator HATFIELD to arrive, we could buy a little time by a quorum call, and perhaps in the meantime the Senator from Florida could futher pursue the possibility of a time certain for passage.

Mr. CHILES. I would be glad to do that.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have been advised by the staff director of the Appropriations Committee that Senator HATFIELD indicates he is agreeable to go to the Mattingly amendment. He wishes to speak on the subject, and will be here in a few moments.

In view of that information, I ask unanimous consent that the pending question, the Chiles amendment, be temporarily laid aside; and that the Senate turn to the consideration of the Mattingly amendment with the understanding, Mr. President, that after the consideration of the Mattingly amendment—Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: In the form that I have put the request that the Senate temporarily lay aside the Chiles amendment and proceed to the consideration of the Mattingly amendment after the disposition of the Mattingly amendment, the pending question will

recur as the Chiles amendment. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I put the request.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, might I ask our good friend from Florida when he thinks he would be ready to talk with us about a possible time certain to vote on his amendment?

Mr. CHILES. I hope to do it soon.

Mr. DOMENICI. Perhaps by the time we are finished with the Mattingly amendment, you will have some information.

Mr. CHILES. I hope so.

Mr. DOMENICI. I would suggest, Mr. President, that just as we found there are some people who could not be here this afternoon because of the announcement regarding Friday's session, that maybe the same thing will apply if we do not have some agreement for a time certain to vote in the afternoon or evening of Monday, inviting less attendance rather than more. I am merely suggesting that. I could be wrong. I seems to me that is what happens.

I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BAKER. I put the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank all Senators.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3045

(Purpose: To authorize the President to veto items of appropriation relating to fiscal year 1985 and items of appropriation relating to fiscal year 1986)

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY) proposes an amendment numbered 3045.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following new section:

LINE-ITEM VETO

SEC. . (a) The President may disapprove any item of appropriation in any Act or joint resolution, except any item of appropriation for the legislative branch or the judicial branch of the Government.

(b)(1) If an Act or joint resolution is approved by the President, any item of appropriation contained therein which is not disapproved shall become law.

(2) The President shall return, with a statement of objections, any item of appropriation disapproved to the House in which the Act or joint resolution containing such item originated.

(c) The Congress may reconsider any item of appropriation disapproved under this section in the same manner as is prescribed under section 7 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States for reconsideration by the Congress of Acts disapproved by the President, except that only a majority vote of each House shall be required to approve an item which has been disapproved or to restore an item which has been reduced by the President to the original amount contained in the Act or joint resolution.

(d) The Provisions of this section shall apply to items of appropriation for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1984 and to items of appropriation for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1985.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, today I am offering an amendment to grant the President authority to veto individual items in appropriations bills. This amendment, however, is more tightly controlled than earlier proposals introduced in the Senate. There are important safeguards in this amendment that should allay the fears of those who say the line-item veto would alter the balance of power between the executive and the legislative branch.

Specifically, my amendment would: First, grant the President authority by legislation rather than a constitutional amendment to veto individual items in appropriations bills; second, allow Congress to override items vetoed by the President under this authority by a majority vote rather than the traditional two-thirds override requirement; and third, contain a provision to sunset the line-item veto authority after 2 fiscal years.

For many years, there has been a need for some form of spending control. With deficits projected at near $200 billion for the next several years, that need has reached the crisis point. We are facing a test of the legislative and executive will. Together, we must put aside partisan politics and not worry about the next election. What may be even harder for us to do, is to put aside our jealous guarding of every scrap of power and influence we, individually may have cornered in the legislative process. We all swore an oath to defend this country against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I say to all my fellow Senators that the massive deficit this country now faces is a powerful domestic enemy. We created this enemy and we must now take strong action to destroy it.

While I strongly support a constitutional amendment that would require a balanced Federal budget, we cannot wait for the enactment and ratification of such a proposal. It may take a call for a constitutional convention to prod Congress into putting the balanced budget amendment to our State legislatures for ratification. On that subject, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a recent article by former Attorney General Griffin Bell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MATTINGLY. Just as we cannot wait for a constitutional amendment on the balanced budget, we cannot wait on a constitutional amendment on the line-item veto. We need an interim response and enactment of my amendment will serve that purpose.

There are those who will say the line-item veto will undermine our budgeting process. To that I say our budgeting process needs change. It needs improvement. when we passed the Budget Act in 1974, the Federal Government was spending 18.5 percent of the gross national product. Now Government is spending nearly 25 percent of the gross national product. If the process is working, why is Government spending so completely out of control?

If we were running a business that went into the red ink year after year, our stockholders would not expect us to continue business as usual. They would demand change in the process. They would probably also demand a change in their leadership.

As Senators, we have perhaps the most long suffering stockholders in history. They are the American taxpayer. But if we do nothing in the face of the deficit disaster, the public will be justified in seeking a new board of directors.

What the line-item veto will do is put a magnifying glass on the budget and spending. It will be a tool to draw a clear focus on items that may or may not be worthy.

The budget has grown so large that no one person can know every item included. Its very size precludes a proper study and an informed vote. I serve on the Appropriations Committee. I know how hard our chairman and the rest of my fellow committee members work to bring forth reasonable legislation. It is a Herculean task and I marvel at the accomplishments of our chairman in the last 3 years. Some departments have their first appropriations bills in many years. But one excellent committee chairman will not solve the problem.

We need to look at the States and learn from their experience. The Governors of four-fifths of the States have line-item veto authority. They exercise that authority and as a result, most States have a balanced budget. Governors have to balance their State's budget. If they did not they would be voted out of office. It is long past time we brought the same authority and commonsense to Washington.

Mr. President, some will argue that enactment of my amendment will disrupt the constitutional balance of powers. I disagree. Under my amendment, the ultimate authority for spending will remain with the legislative branch. Any Presidential line-item veto can be overriden by a simple majority vote.

If any appropriations item cannot get a majority vote in both Houses of Congress, it does not deserve to be passed. In theory that is what the appropriations item had to have to be passed in the first place. So this is not adding any new burden. This will just let any doubtful or hidden project be judged on its own merits—not on the fact that it is attached to the funding for other popular and necessary programs. As I stated before, my amendment will just allow a magnifying glass to be focused on certain items in the budget.

The simple majority override also answers the questions of those who fear that a President with the support of just one-third of one House behind him could prevent the funding of any program. I have heard conservatives worry about defense funding and liberals worry about their social programs under the line-item veto. The simple majority override should calm those fears.

There is another safeguard against altering the balance of powers. My amendment will sunset in 2 years. I say let us try this approach and see how it works. If you do not trust the experience of nearly every State government in the Union, let us give the line-item veto a 2-year trial. If it is not successful, it will automatically die at the end of 2 years.

So we have two safeguards on the balance of power between the executive and the legislative branch: First, is the simple majority overide. Second, is the automatic 2-year sunset.

There are those who will say we should not rush into enacting the line-item veto. They will say there should be much more study given to the proposal first. To that I answer, this is not a new idea. Far from it. Most Presidents since the Civil War have favored the line-item veto. In 1790, appropriation bills were so small and acted on in such a timely manner, that the President did not really need a special veto. But once the Government grew to even the level of 1870, it became apparent that the threat of vetoing an entire appropriations bill was no longr enough to control the congressional appetite for spending. From Ulysses S. Grant to Franklin Roosevelt to Dwight Eisenhower, the call for the line-item veto has gone out.

Hearings have been held on the issue through the years including one last month before a Senate judiciary subcommittee where I discussed this very amendment we are considering today.

Until 1974, the President had the power to not spend or to impound moneys appropriated by Congress. By taking that right away from the President through legislation, Congress made a bad problem worse. It is time we returned to the President through another piece of legislation, some tool in which he can bring more control to Federal spending.

This is not a partisan effort. There are Members of both parties on both sides of the issue. This is not even a conservative/liberal issue. There are conservative and liberal opponents and supporters. Let me say right now, that I am not doing this for the benefit of the Reagan administration. I am doing it because I believe it would be the best for our country.

Mr. President, I know I am asking Members of this body to commit what some would consider heresy by voting for this amendment. But some times it is necessary to move in new directions. The adoption of my amendment would be the first step toward returning responsibility to the congressional budget process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several items and editorials on the line-item veto.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal, Apr. 11, 1984]

MATTINGLY TAKES THE LEAD IN FIGHT FOR LINE-ITEM VETO

Sen. Mack Mattingly is proving to be an effective watchdog on federal spending practices. He has used his committee appointments to expose pork-barrel projects and unnecessary partronage employees. Georgia's junior senator also has fought effectively against the murky budget lines for consultants in every federal department.

But his most recent fight is his biggest. Mattingly is taking the point on the restoring the balance of federal spending by giving the president the power to veto individual budget items. The line-item veto is the best proposal we've seen to discipline a profligate Congress. Our definition of "profligate;" is the uninterrupted river of red-ink passed by Congress since 1974.

The line-item veto has flaws, for certain. But those flaws seem a far more acceptable risk than current practice. Look to last November, for instance, when President Reagan had only "up" or "down" options on a $316-billion continuing resolution passed out of Congress. To veto to it was to shut down the government. To sign it, as Reagan did, was to approve billions in pork-barrel spending.

How much more effectively we would operate if Reagan had the opportunity to veto individual spending lines, passing them back to Congress for justification and debate (and into the public spotlight). A Congress certain of its priorities should be able to muster a two-thirds vote to overturn the veto.

Mattingly's plan, either by law or constitutional amendment, carries precedent. The governors of 43 states have such power. Gov. George Deukmejian of California vetoed $1.2 billion in spending last year. It is no accident that Deukmejian has restored his state's economy, held the line on taxes and now boasts a huge surplus.

Most governors use the process to trim 1 percent to 3 percent of their legislatures' spending requests. An analyst with the American Enterprise Institute points out that Reagan could easily trim $10 billion from the budget each year at that modest rate. At 2 percent, the president could trim close to $100 billion in five years. Federal deficits would be manageable soon if such a tool were in place.

For those who fear a presidential meat-ax aimed at social programs, it is worth noting that 55 percent of the budget is permanently appropriated in the form of interest payments and entitlements. Because of other limitations, only about 20 percent of federal spending would be subject to the line-item scalpel. Entitlement reform awaits another vehicle.

But Congress has proven it cannot manage responsibly its current grip on the budget. The line-item veto will restore budget balance. And it will give Congress an out for its lack of courage and discipline.

[From the Savannah Ga. Morning News, Apr. 11, 1984]

"HERESY" SOMETIMES NEEDED

Georgia's Senator Mattingly admits to "heresy" in proposing that the Congress surrender some of its power in the President of the United States. It's time, though, for a little of the heresy he's talking about.

Our senator is the sponsor of one of the several proposals that would allow the president to veto line items in spending measures. His proposal, in spite of the heretical character he assigns it, would help to restore some fiscal sanity to the federal government.

Instead of a constitutional amendment, as several lawmakers have proposed. Mr. Mattingly's proposal is for a law that would give the president line-item veto authority only for two fiscal years. If the law proved unworkable, then it would expire in two years; if it proved workable, Congress could extend the measure.

The line-item feature, while strange to Congress, is nothing new. Forty-three states, Georgia included, have such a law on the books. It gives governors a safeguard against reckless legislative spending.

The proposal has merit because of the way Congress attaches amendments to various pieces of legislation, amendments sometimes wholly unrelated in subject or substance to the measures to which they're attached. Also, Congress has a way of tacking pork-barrel projects onto more serious spending measures—a dam out West, or a post office down South, for example. Congress can do all sorts of things with a piece of legislation.

Well, why can't a president share some of that authority? And the Mattingly measure has built into it a safeguard for Congress against reckless presidental vetoes. It would require only a majority vote to override a line-item veto, rather than the two-thirds majority now required for any override.

The Mattingly proposal would provide a safeguard in both directions, and it makes sense. It bucks the system at a time when the system begs for bucking.

[From the Athens (Ga.) Daily News, Apr. 11, 1984]

LINE-ITEM VETO COULD CUT DEFICIT

Economically, the nation's deficit is the greatest problem facing the United States today. So far little, if anything, has been done to solve this problem. All anyone wants to do is blame someone else.

Congress blames the president, who in turn blames Congress. Democrats say the deficit is larger than ever under a Republican administration. Republicans say it is the legacy of Democratic administrations that has created this monstrous problem.

Meanwhile, each side tenaciously clings to every ounce of power it can muster, which is not to be confused with struggling to solve the problem.

Georgia's own Republican senator, Mack Mattingly, however, has introduced a measure we have discussed here before—the line-item veto. We think the idea deserves positive action.

The Associated Press story that reported Mattingly's bold move stated that he had "committed political heresy" by urging Congress to turn over some of its power of the purse to the President. Considering the federal deficits of late, we think that political heresy is just what is needed. Martin Luther, father of the Protestant reformation, was considered a heretic too.

President Reagan asked for a line-item constitutional amendment in his State of the Union address three months ago. He pointed out that 43 states allow their governors the freedom to single out individual appropriations for veto rather than approve or veto an entire spending measure as sent to him by Congress.

The beauty of a line-item veto is that it would make Congress more prudent in its spending priorities if it were aware that the president could delete individual programs.

Mattingly is not the first to propose the line-item veto, but his proposal is not for a constitutional amendment, which would have to be ratified by the states to take effect. Instead, Mattingly has proposed that Congress pass a law giving the president line-item veto authority for two fiscal years. Congress could override budget items vetoed by the president by a simply majority vote, rather than with the two-thirds vote required to override other vetos.

The two-year duration of the bill, if nothing else, would be a practical lesson in civics to prove that the proposal will really work. We have no doubts it will work, and we urge its implementation. And while Mattingly's bill is being tested, let's go ahead and start the process to amend the Constitution to give the president this power permanently. It will bring some fiscal sanity to the federal budget process.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times Union, Apr. 10, 1984]

PRESIDENTIAL LINE-ITEM VETO IS NEEDED TO CONTROL SPENDING

Hearings begin today before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee on the question of an executive line-item veto. Properly controlled, it would be a useful device that could help hold down federal spending.

As the system works today, the president is presented with bills proposing the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars and must accept them or reject them en toto.

They may contain billions of dollars of pork-barrel projects that fatten the deficit but do nothing for the vast majority of hard-working, taxpaying Americans. But he can't root out those projects.

In 43 states, the chief executive can pare bills one item at a time. Ronald Reagan had the power himself when he was governor of California. But, like virtually every president since the Civil War, he has asked for and been refused the line-item veto.

Currently, the president has one option. He can ask Congress for recission of a spending measure. But unless both houses approve the recission by two-thirds vote within 45 days, the original appropriation stands.

In fairness, Congress has not been insistent in this regard. It has gone along with the president 59 percent of the time since 1975.

Sen. Mack Mattingly, R-Ga., would give the president the power to use a line-item veto by a constitutional amendment, which some authorities believe is necessary.

Another proposal would give Reagan limited power to defer or rescind spending whenever the federal debt exceeds limits set by Congress.

Another reason the line item veto is only a limited tool is that 55 percent of federal spending such as interest payments and entitlements is permanently authorized and not subject to presidential review. Another 20 percent of the budget is carried over from previous years and cannot be vetoed. So about 30 percent, or $200 billion in the 1985 budget, would be subject to veto.

There are several reasons to be cautious. Advocates of a strong defense would note that two-thirds of the $200 billion is defense spending that would be subject to veto. Also, there is the possibility that any antagonistic Congress could load up bills with items they knew Reagan would veto, making them the hero and him the villain.

There is concern that it would upset the balance of power. But Mattingly's proposal would allow a line-item veto to be overridden by majority vote instead of two-thirds, which might help to maintain that balance.

The proposal would give the country some defense against the congressional propensity for slipping terrible pork-barrel projects into bills that otherwise are necessary and desirable. If Congress would act responsibly, the line-item veto would not be needed; but the line-item veto is needed.

[From the Gainesville (Ga.) Times, Apr. 16, 1984]

NEW LINE-ITEM VETO IDEA DESERVES A CAREFUL LOOK

"We can tuck all manner of spending goodies into legislation knowing the president will swallow the unwanted in order to receive the approval of funding for the vital elements of government."

Sen. Mack Mattingly described succinctly the root of the problem of budget-busting federal spending. The process by which "Christmas tree" projects get included in the budget is a vital part of the legislative checks and balances that prevent the smaller states from being run over by the few large ones whose delegations can make up a majority.

Today's problem is that like so many worthwhile processes, this one has been terribly abused in ways unintended. A cure is needed, but let's not destroy the process in prescribing the cure. The line item veto has been proposed a number of times as a cure. As previously proposed, it was more like cutting off the arm to cure the finger.

Mattingly has conceived a modification that could make the line item veto more palatable. He would give the president line item veto powers over spending legislation, but Congress would be able to override the veto by simple majority vote rather than by the now-required two-thirds majority.

If a majority passed the objectionable appropriations in the first place, isn't that same majority likely to override the veto? Probably. But the veto would have the effect of subjecting those vetoed line items to more intense public scrutiny and debate. Sometimes specific spending measures sail through unnoticed by the public as part of a larger package. Our representatives don't hesitate to vote for them knowing we probably won't find out about it. Subjected to individual attention, the vote might be different.

In other words, if our representatives believe we know what they're doing, they're apt to do differently.

Mattingly's proposal deserves a close study before it is summarily rejected.

[From the Savannah Morning News, June 24, 1983]

THE LINE-ITEM VETO

While Mack Mattingly has caught on fast and made good inroads since Georgians sent him to the Senate in 1980, some of his congressional colleagues must wonder if he's forgotten so soon that the members of Congress hold certain special-interest and bondoggling tools. He sometimes acts more like a taxpayers' advocate than a senator.

There's nothing wrong with being a taxpayers' advocate. But it's somewhat strange for a member of Congress to want to give up a special privilege whereby he can tack on to a major piece of legislation some special-interest amendment that may benefit only a small part of his constituency. Bravo, Senator Mattingly.

What the Senator has proposed is a bill that would permit line-item presidential vetos on an appropriations bill.

The change that would create has some members of Congress worried, especially Texas Jim Wright, the House majority leader. Goodness gracious, to allow a president to veto certain items in a bill would upset a lot of apple carts.

Under the present system, a president must sign or veto a bill in its entirety. If he objects to an appropriation for an unneeded dam in Podunk, the president still must approve it or an entire bill containing some very essential and worthwhile appropriations will suffer from a veto. Especially is this true when Congress fails to override a veto, and overriding is a difficult process.

Majority Leader Wright and other Democrats contend the power of line-item veto would make the president a dictator of sorts. Georgia's governor has line-item-veto power, but no one's called him a dictator, or any of his recent predecessors. Governors of 42 other states also have that power.

The line-item veto may be just one of the things this nation needs to harness the growing national deficit. One of its effects

would be to place a heavier burden of responsibility on the president's shoulders. Also, it would not remove the authority of Congress to take back any vetoed line item and make an attempt to override. If the sponsor of a dam in Podunk can convince his colleagues that the course of civilization will change tragically, if the dam isn't built, they'll override. Otherwise, it will be good riddance to a worthless project.

Senator Mattingly may have upset some of his colleagues on Capitol Hill, but the people of America probably would welcome such a change as he has proposed. Wish the measure success.

[From the Augusta Herald, Oct. 18, 1983]

DICTATORIAL VETO?

Sen. Mack Mattingly, R-Ga., has introduced a sensible measure that would permit the president a line-item veto of appropriations bills. As it stands, a president each year receiving only a handful of multibillion-dollar bills that cover everything from A to Z. He must either approve such bills or veto them in toto. In effect, this means that a president if forced to be the bag man for a lot of special-interest whoopee money, because a veto would deprive many crucial federal agencies of funding.

Of course, opposition to the "surgical" veto will be fierce. Rep. Jim Wright, D-Texas, the House majority leader, charges that giving the president a line-item veto would confer on him "dictatorial powers." Well, the governors of 43 states, including South Carolina and Georgia, enjoy line-item privileges, and as far as we know none of them has begun to resemble Idi Amin. Also, as Lloyd Cutler, former counsel to President Carter has stated, "We are the only country where the legislature can vote a larger budget than the executive proposes."

To be sure, instituting a line-item veto would shift political heat, as well as power, to the president. Yet congressmen who have built careers on brokering for various interest groups won't change their ways willingly. But they shouldn't resort to this "dictatorial powers" guff. A president (with his party) would be judged on his use of line-item-veto power in the next election. That is democractic, not dictatorial.

Naturally, anyone who favors expanding the president's powers in this fashion ought to remember that the sword cuts both ways. Faced with an omnibus appropriations bill, a president might cheerfully approve much needless social-welfare spending, while smacking down funding for national defense. Even so, the public could call one individual to account. Now responsibility for federal expenditures is spread 536 ways—that is, spread so thin it's invisible. That's no way for a democracy to operate.

Reaganomics generally is working, but interest rates are still too high because of huge federal deficits that are deepened by ungoverned federal spending. A line-item veto could solve that problem, too, and make President Reagan an economic wizard in the public eye. Could that prospect explain much of the opposition to the veto reform?

[From the Atlanta Journal, 1983]

MATTINGLY MOVES OUT AHEAD ON START FOR LINE-ITEM VETO

Sen. Mack Mattingly of Georgia has moved out ahead of the Reagan administration with what we have suggested should be a major issue in the coming presidential campaign.

He has introduced a bill to allow the president a line-item veto inside appropriations bills. The Journal has urged a constitutional amendment granting the president those powers, but if it is legally permissible for Congress to pass such a measure, it would be a less cumbersome process.

We view the line-item veto as a far more sure control on federal spending than the constitutional amendment mandating a balanced federal budget. That amendment lacks only the approval of two more states before it becomes the trigger for a constitutional convention. Such a convention, without controls, could be a divisive morass. An amendment for a line-item veto is a way to avoid that.

Virtually every state gives its governor the power to strike individual budget items. It is far more vital that the president have that power, given the complexity of the federal budget process and the profligacy of a Congress whose subcommittees are increasingly the hostages of special interest groups.

The president would by no means have the last word. Any veto can be overridden by a two-thirds vote.

In the monstrous federal budget process, the President gets only 13 choices—he must vote them up or down. That's the number of appropriations bills Congress sends to the White House. Too often, one or more of those bills is needed "to keep the government running," or it carries a program or rider the president considers vital.

Too often as well, those 13 appropriations bills are far beyond overall spending targets. But by their very size and complexity, the president has little choice but to sign them.

This week Treasury Secretary Donald Regan said he was prepared to push the issue as a campaign theme. White House Counselor Edwin Meese is behind it as well. Sen. Mattingly has done well to put the issue before his colleagues.

LINE-ITEM VETO: TRIMMING THE PORK

(By John Palffy, Policy Analyst)

INTRODUCTION

Congress begins consideration of President Reagan's call for a line-item veto April 10th with hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee. The proposal could come to the Senate floor by late April, when an increase in the debt ceiling is debated. The controversial initiative to strengthen presidential control over appropriations recently has earned surprising, if tentative, respect—largely because Congress seems unable to control the budget process it created ten years ago.[1]

The problem is that under current law the President is faced with only two unpleasant options when unacceptably large appropriations bills, such as last November's $316 billion continuing resolution, land on his desk. He can "rubber stamp" the bills in their entirety, replete with billions of dollars of special interest spending. Or he can shut down government operations by vetoing the bill. No middle ground is available. A line-item veto would permit the President to "blue pencil" individual items from congressional appropriations, so that pork-barrel or special interest spending is not approved merely by "riding the coat-tails" of essential appropriations.

There is nothing new about the line-item veto. Forty-three state governors have the power, and the veto has been requested by virtually every President since the Civil War. Many bills to give the President line-item veto power have been put before Congress—and failed. The line-item veto has not been considered seriously by Congress as a budget control device until today.

Opinions are divided, however, on the merit and legality of the proposal. Opponents claim that the line-item veto would be unconstitutional, and that it would grant the President undue power over spending priorities—without significantly reducing the deficit. Proponents respond that it would be constitutional, that safeguards could be added to control White House power, and that the cumulative impact on spending could be considerable. If Presidents during the last ten years had used line-item veto to cut just 1 percent from yearly spending, the FY 1985 deficit could be half its projected level.

Many practical concerns and constitutional objections need to be answered before the line-item veto is enacted. Despite such problems, however, greater control of federal spending is a legitimate responsibility of the President. And more effective executive control of spending is needed to counter the current institutional incentives for Congress to spend taxpayers' money so freely. The line-item veto, therefore, deserves very serious consideration.

WHY ACTION IS NEEDED

Because, under current law, the President must approve or disapprove entire appropriations bills, Congress is able to pass special interest and non-germane "riders" by incorporating them into major last-minute funding bills and resolutions. If the President refuses to sign such "Christmas tree" bills, he often must shut down the government agencies covered by the legislation. The President can, of course, petition Congress to cancel any spending plans, but unless both Houses of Congress approve the rescission by a two-thirds vote within 45 days, the President must spend the funds. Since the Budget Control Act went into force in 1975, 41 percent of all such presidential rescission requests have been ignored by Congress. None of President Reagan's 1983 rescissions were approved.

A line-item veto would strengthen the President's rescission powers. The President would be able to rescind individual appropriations and allow the rest of the bill to pass. This rescission would stand unless Congress explicitly overrode the veto.

Senator Mack Mattingly (R-GA) has proposed two methods to convey the line-item veto power to the President—a constitutional amendment (S.J. Res. 178) and a legislative rule (S. 1921). The amendment would involve the lengthy amending process, requiring approval by 34 states after passage through both Houses of Congress S. 1921 would grant the President statutory power for the line-item veto. In theory at least, this could become law in time to give the President line-item veto power for the FY 1985 budget. But this could face serious constitutional challenges and, of course, it would be subject to repeal at any time.

A modification of the line-item veto proposal, offered last November by Senators William Armstrong (R-CO) and Russell Long (D-LA), failed in the Senate by only three votes. Armstrong has promised to present it for a vote again this spring, when Congress debates the debt ceiling. A similar proposal (H.R. 5000) has been introduced in the House by Minority Leader Robert

[1] See John Palffy, "Giving the Budget Process Teeth," Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 305, November 11, 1983.

Michel (R-Ill.) Under the Long-Armstrong proposal, the President would be required to defer or rescind spending whenever the federal debt exceeds quarterly limits imposed by Congress. This power would be limited, however. He could not eliminate an entire program or project, or reduce any program by more than 20 percent. Nor could he restrict payments to individuals.

Because the President would still have to accept or reject entire appropriation bills under the Long-Armstrong proposal, and because there would be precise limits on the occasions when the President could employ it, the amendment technically is not a line-item veto. Rather, it strengthens existing rescission powers. Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM) has noted,[2] however, that tying the line-item veto to the debt ceiling may not be very effective; Congress, for instance, could simply raise the ceiling to prevent presidential action.

THE CASE FOR A LINE-ITEM VETO

Deficit reductions

The fiscal effects of the line-item veto would be limited because 55 percent of federal spending (interest payments and most entitlements) are permanently authorized, not "appropriated," and thus are not subject to presidential review. Moreover, a President cannot veto appropriations committed from previous years—and these appropriations make up approximately 20 percent of each fiscal year's spending. So less than 30 percent of federal spending (or $260 billion in the proposed FY 1985 budget) would be subject to line-item veto. The House Budget Committee, in a recent analysis, has argued that even 30 percent might prove an over-estimate.[3] By assuming that President Reagan would not veto any defense spending, the Committee concluded that less than $90 billion would actually be subject to a Reagan line-item veto in FY 1985.

The House Budget Committee analysis is subject to at least two criticisms, however. It is not clear, for instance, that defense spending would be exempt from a Reagan line-item veto. The Administration knows well that the defense budget is not immune from pork-barrel spending—Pentagon and White House officials have tried for years to close a number of unneeded military installations, for example, only to be ignored by Congress. And, while President Reagan might focus the line-item veto on the non-defense side of the budget, the converse would likely be assumed the case during a Democratic administration.

American Enterprise Institute budget analyst Norman Ornstein contends that a President would use the line-item veto to cut only 1 percent a year from the budget. While a 1 percent cut in the FY 1985 budget would amount to only $9.2 billion—a tiny fraction of the projected $200 billion deficit—the compounding effects of cutting 1 percent from the budget every year soon would become signficant.

Table 1 illustrates such cumulative effects. The table indicates what federal spending might have been in past years if the President had used a line-item veto to make very modest cuts in the budget every year, beginning in 1974. As the table indicates, a line-item veto of just 1 percent of total spending would have reduced the projected FY 1985 deficit by $105 billion. If the President had cut 2 percent of discretionary, or "controllable," government spending ($265 billion in FY 1985), the projected deficit would be reduced by $49 billion.

TABLE 1.—THE LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF A LINE-ITEM VETO

[In billions of dollars]

	Actual spending	Assuming 1 percent cut of all spending per year	Assuming 2 percent cut of "controllable" spending per year
1974	268	265	266
1975	324	318	320
1976	365	354	361
1977	401	386	394
1978	448	426	438
1979	491	462	477
1980	577	538	561
1981	657	687	636
1982	728	665	702
1983	796	720	764
1984 (estimated)	854	764	816
1985 (projected)	928	823	879
Reduction in fiscal year 1985 deficit		105	49

Note.—1984 and 1985 "actuals" are CBO estimates.

Table 2 illustrates the likely consequences of instituting a line-item veto for FY 1985. If the President cut 1 percent from the budget each year, the total savings over the next five years could amount to $174 billion, and the FY 1989 spending would then be reduced by $65 billion. If the President were to cut two percent from only "controllable" items, the total five year savings would still be $99 billion, and the fiscal year 1989 spending reduction would be $37 billion (assuming controllable outlays remained at 27 percent of total budget outlays).

TABLE 2.—THE LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF A LINE-ITEM VETO

[In billions of dollars]

	Projected spending	Assuming 1 percent cut of all spending per year	Assuming 2 percent cut of "controllable" spending per year
1985	928	919	923
1986	1,012	992	1,001
1987	1,112	1,080	1,093
1988	1,227	1,179	1,200
1989	1,342	1,277	1,305
Reduction in fiscal year 1989 deficit		65	37

Source.—Calculations based on CBO budget projections.

It is not clear which constituency has the most to lose from a line-item veto. For instance, of the $260 billion that could be made subject to the line-item veto in FY 1985, two-thirds would be defense spending. That means that for every $1 of non-defense spending open to the line-item veto, the Pentagon would risk up to $2. Moreover, the fastest growing segments of the budget, interest and entitlements (constituting 55 percent of the budget) would not be affected by the veto. Advocates of a strong defense are understandably cautious about a line-item veto that puts at risk twice as much defense spending as non-defense spending.

Cuts in pork-barrel programs

The line-item veto could be an effective deterrent to the practice known as "logrolling." This occurs when members of Congress vote with one another on a *quid pro quo* basis to pass appropriations for programs benefitting local areas and interest groups—even though each program would fail to win a majority on its own. The result is that Congress passes appropriations bills loaded with costly amendments and riders that provide benefits to local constituencies.

A line-item veto specifically would allow for the President, the only official in the U.S. who must answer to the country as a whole, to cancel such spending on a case-by-case basis according to national interests. By returning these projects to Congress for reconsideration on an individual basis, the President would have the power to break the logrolling coalition. The line-item veto seems to be the best available defense against logrolling and omnibus spending resolutions.

OBJECTIONS TO THE VETO

Passing the buck

The line-item veto is viewed by some, however, as just an excuse for Congress to abandon the search for a responsible appropriations process. Senator Lawton Chiles (D-FL), for instance, fears that Congress: "would add to program after program, making all our constituents happy and never have to look at the bottom line. We could pass that responsibility over to the President. He would cut the bill back down to size and be the spoilsport."[4]

State experience gives some support to this view. Political observers argue that the Illinois legislature, for instance, adds funds to the budget in hope that the governor will veto them. But strong institutional constraints on total spending, such as balanced budget legislation, reduce such politicizing at the state level. At the federal level, a strong binding budget resolution would also reduce such opportunities. But it should not be forgotten that the line-item veto is an executive branch responsibility, with potentially significant political liabilities as well as benefits.

Presidential pork-barrelling

State experience also suggests that "just by having [the line-item veto], you can avoid getting a bill you don't want," says Robert Wilburn, former Pennsylvania budget secretary. "Exactly," retort opponents—the President could use the threat of a line-item veto to further his political interests. He could, for instance, hold hostage discretionary projects supported by Congress to force significant increases in defense spending, they argue, or he could target his veto against political opponents in election years.

Upsetting the balance of power

Many congressmen claim the line-item veto violates a literal interpretation of the Constitution—which vests spending power in the Congress. No state or federal court has handed down any decision to this effect, and the Law Division of the Congressional Research Service has determined that Senator Armstrong's beefed-up rescission proposal would be constitutional.[5] Since there seems to be little difference in principle between Armstrong's rescission proposal and a line-item veto, the veto's constitutional critics need to marshall better evidence to support their case. Moreover, there is historical precedent for a presidential refusal to accept specific appropriations. Between 1921 and 1974, the President possessed unilateral

[2] *Congressional Record*, November 16, 1983, p. S16331.

[3] *The Line-Item Veto: An Appraisal*, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, January 1984.

[4] *Congressional Record*, August 4, 1983, p. S11729.

[5] Letter from Raymond Celada, Congressional Research Service, to Senator William Armstrong, October 17, 1983.

and absolute impoundment powers; he could refuse to spend appropriations without any explanation to Congress. The 1974 Budget Control Act stripped the White House of such power.

Opponents also fear that the line-item veto would grant nearly unilateral authority to the President, because he could veto a program if he could hold the backing of just one-third of one chamber of Congress. But if the veto could be overridden by a congressional vote of only fifty percent, as Senator Mattingly's proposal provides, this objection might be overcome—since any program of truly national importance presumably could win majority support.

The general argument that a line-item veto would circumvent the intent of the Founding Fathers holds less weight when viewed in the context of the structural changes that have altered the institutional balance of power firmly in favor of Congress. Moreover, although the Constitution specifically limits the president's veto powers to entire bills, it is not exactly clear, according to some experts, what the Founding Fathers meant by a "bill." In early years "bills" were limited in their scope of authorizations and financing—it is unlikely that the Founding Fathers envisaged the passage of single bills with $316 billion of spending authority (a tenth of the nation's entire output). As Senate Finance Committee Chairman Robert Dole (R-KS) noted in congressional debate during the Carter Administration, "the growth of the size of appropriations bills has eroded the intent of the original veto provision of our Constitution and I believe that erosion should be reversed." [6]

The balance of power has also shifted away from the President in the last ten years as the rules on germaneness have become largely ineffective.[7] The Constitution did not intend for Congress to attach non-germane authorizing language to critical appropriations bills in order to pressure the President into accepting those special interest additions.

Moreover, while Congress has assumed more extensive budgetary powers, it has failed to assume the corresponding fiscal responsibilities. The line-item veto proposal offers a means to effect such fiscal responsibility, and to restore the balance of power existing prior to 1974. It is not a revolutionary attempt to create an "imperial" presidency.

STATE EXPERIENCE

Forty-three state governors now have line-item veto power over appropriations. These states adopted the veto after the Civil War and none of the states subsequently has withdrawn it—clear evidence that the veto is both popular and workable.

California Governor George Deukmejian "popularized" the line-item veto in the media last summer when he "blue pencilled" $1.2 billion in legislative requests to avoid tax increases. But Deukmejian has not been the only governor to flex his line-item muscles. In Illinois, Governor James Thompson routinely slices about 3 percent off appropriations bills each year to keep the budget balanced. And during his eight years in Sacramento, Ronald Reagan used the line-item veto to reduce the legislature's spending plan by an average of 2 percent a year.

Learning from the States

The simple fact that no line-item veto law has been repealed in any of the 43 states that enacted it is clear testimony to its success and acceptance. But state experience also suggests that some problems would need to be solved before a federal version of the veto would be successful.

The primary hurdle would be the ambiguity over the term "item." Opponents of the proposal contend that the vagueness surrounding the term would mean granting the President uncertain power. The issue could be a stumbling block in the line-item veto initiative. Litigation in the states has centered on the precise meaning of the term "item" and whether it would encompass reductions as well as disapprovals. Contradictory decisions have been handed down in different states; for instance, in Oklahoma and Illinois.[8] A bill that specifies that the President must approve or reject an entire line appropriation, might lead to such questions as: Would individual projects within a military construction or mass transit appropriation be subject to line-item scrutiny, or would the President be confined to action only on major appropriation headings?

Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker (R-TN) is concerned that this confusion would allow Congress to manipulate the language of bills to avoid the line-item veto. Says Baker: "I am really afraid if we had line-item vetoes Congress would start sending the President appropriations bills with just one line."

Senator Mattingly's bill may deal with this problem by granting the President sweeping authority to reduce or disapprove any part of an appropriation. This would eliminate any ambiguities and potential court conflicts over presidential power, but it would also grant the President very extensive power over the federal purse-strings—and so is not likely to receive congressional approval in its present form. The senator has sought to balance this sweeping power, however. A recently introduced amended version of S. 1921 would allow Congress to override a line-item veto with a simple majority. It would also require the veto to be "reapproved" after two years.

CONCLUSION

The line-item veto faces considerable opposition from two groups within Congress. Legislators who wish to protect their ability to force acceptance of pork-barrel spending and non germane authorizations have every reason to oppose the proposal. In addition, legislators who are concerned that critical defense systems could be the primary targets of future presidential vetos understandably hesitate supporting the device.

Senator Dole has reminded the first group that they have clear obligations to the country. "I do not impugn those members of the Senate who support such (pork-barrel)," says the Finance Committee chairman, "because it is our duty to do as much as we can for our states. However, as a group I believe that we could all endorse an institutional change which would eliminate some of this."

The fears of the second group, however, must be weighed carefully in assessing the full political costs and benefits of the line-item veto. Moreover, critics of the line-item veto should remember that the Constitution was written in the context of one set of political parameters and institutional conditions and that those parameters and conditions have changed. The budgetary process can only achieve the purposes of the Constitution if it is adopted to these new circumstances. A legislated line-item veto could restore the balance of power originally intended by the Founding Fathers, without intruding on the clear intent of the Constitution.

Most concerns over the constitutionality of the line-item veto appear to be little more than political rhetoric. The President enjoyed unilateral impoundment powers for over fifty years during this century.

Yet the line-item veto proposal is still wrought with practical problems. Conservatives, for instance, must ponder the fact that a liberal President could block certain weapons systems approved by Congress. And the best mechanism for introducing such a veto is by no means clear. State experience suggests that the least problematic method of instituting a line-item veto would be to accompany it with a statutory rule granting the President the right to disapprove or reduce any part of any appropriation bill. Such language would carry the principle of executive review to its logical conclusion. A rule of this kind could be achieved by amending existing rescission powers such that a rescission would stand unless Congress explicitly overrode it. In order to make such sweeping executive review palatable, and to reduce the danger of a President preempting spending priorities, it would be prudent to allow congressional override with less than a two-thirds vote.

A line-item veto would be no fiscal panacea. It does not even address the primary federal spending problem—the spiraling growth of entitlements. Nor would it deal with many of the serious shortcomings of the congressional budget process. But by taking the handcuffs off the President in the appropriations process, the line-item veto would constitute an important first step toward fiscal responsibility.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, there was a speech given not too long ago before the New York Economic Club, on April 3, 1984, by Senator DOLE. I will submit the entire speech for the RECORD. Mr. DOLE said:

But if we fail to beat the deficits, we will once again be plunged back into boom-and-bust, inflation-and-recession cycles.

The huge borrowing needs of the Treasury will force the Federal Reserve to choose between inflation and high interest rates. Either way, the chance for extended prosperity will be lost.

He said:

Some see the deficit as a problem, but I see it as a tremendous opportunity. We can work together and remove this last impediment to a secure, prosperous America. And if we can pull it off, we will have done more than strengthen our economy. We will have made a major contribution to restoring the faith and trust in our political institutions.

Mr. President, that is the purpose of this line-item veto, to help beat the deficits.

---

[6] *Congressional Record*, March 10, 1977, p. S7199.

[7] The standing rules of the Senate provide that "no amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriations bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter of the bill be received. . . ." Congress typically ignores these rules in order to attach politically controversial amendments to critical appropriations bills.

[8] See *State University* v. *Trapp*, 28 Okla. 81, 1911, and *People ex rel. State Bd.* v. *Brady*, 227 Ill. 124, 1917.

EXHIBIT 1

HOW THE PEOPLE CAN FORCE CONGRESS TO CURB DEFICIT

(By Griffin B. Bell)

(Griffin Bell, who served as U.S. attorney general during the Carter administration, now practices law in Atlanta.)

Like most Americans, I am deeply concerned by the federal government's continuing failure to control budget deficits. The interest payments on the debt now amount to 12 percent of the current budget. Basic to this failure is that no counterforce exists against the special-interest groups that are the driving force behind excessive government spending.

Because Congress has failed to control runaway deficits, the people have acted through their state legislatures, 32 of which have called for a constitutional convention to draft a federal balanced-budget amendment. When 34 states have so acted, Congress, under Article V of the Constitution, must call a convention.

We are now hearing predictions of doom and gloom that have not been heard since the passage of the 17th Amendment 72 years ago. In our original Constitution, Senators were appointed by the state legislatures rather than elected by the people. By 1912, the people had concluded by a wide margin that the Senate should be elected, not appointed. The House of Representatives agreed, five times passing a proposed Constitutional amendment to make the Senate elective.

But five times the Senate killed the amendment in committee, thereby forcing the people to take action. State legislatures began passing conditional calls for convention, if Congress did not approve the amendment.

At that time, the two-thirds required was 32 legislatures. When 31 states had acted, the Senate read the handwriting on the wall and passed the amendment. Without the use of the alternative route in Article V of our Constitution, the 17th Amendment would not have been passed and senators would still be appointed.

This is precisely what the founding fathers had in mind. They provided for amendment through action of state legislatures to deal with situations in which the people and the legislatures saw the problem and the need for change, but in which Congress was part of the problem and would not act. That situation prevailed in 1912. It prevails equally in 1984.

Aside from the specious argument that a convention is "alien" to the constitutional process, we hear other objections. It is argued that our friends abroad would recoil in horror at the prospect of a constitutional convention that would presumably destabilize America.

But the free world has been decimated by our interest rates and the dollar exchange rate, which foreign financial experts attribute to our huge deficits and general fiscal profligacy. A serious effort to install long-term constitutional control over U.S. fiscal practices would be welcomed by our friends abroad.

Also, we are bombarded with ominous stories about a "runaway" constitutional convention which, presumably, would repeal the Bill of Rights, dismantle the Constitution and install some sort of totalitarian regime. Well, while we have not had a federal convention since 1787, there have been more than 200 conventions held in various states, many of whose constitutions provide for periodic conventions to propose amendments. Such gatherings have brought out the best, not the worst, in people's government.

It is claimed that James Madison said that a "new" constitutional convention would be a cloud over the Constitution. He did indeed utter those words, but in response to critics who declared that the Constitution written in Philadelphia in 1787 should be rejected and a new convention be held immediately. Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, assumed that we would have a new convention about every 20 years.

In fact, fears about a "runway" convention are groundless. The various state applications to Congress not only exhort Congress to pass the Tax Limitation-Balanced Budget Amendment but limit the scope of a convention to the sole and exclusive purpose of the balanced-budget issue.

Those who wring their hands over the prospects of a convention run the risk of exposing their elitism, implying that the average citizen cannot be trusted. At the same time, they are willing to place their full faith in Congress, the very institution that has precipitated the fiscal mess which, in turn, has prompted the constitutional Tax Limitation-Balanced Budget movement.

But suppose that other resolutions were offered at the balanced budget convention. Congress would not be compelled, nor would it have any incentive, to send along to the states for ratification any proposals emanating from the convention that exceeded the scope of the call. And 38 states are not about to ratify any proposal that does violence to or seeks to dismantle fundamental constitutional protections and guarantees.

Finally, it is important to understand that a convention will not necessarily take place upon the application of 34 states. The state calls have said: If Congress does not pass the amendment, then a convention for that purpose is called. The calls are conditional, not absolute.

I believe there will not be a balanced budget constitutional convention. Congress simply will not abide letting mere citizens decide its taxing and spending power. Congress will act, I predict, as it did on the issue of the direct elections of senators—when overwhelming pressure from the states and the people can no longer be ignored.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Yes; I will.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, is it the Senator's understanding that the line-item veto, as he has proposed it, would allow the President not only to strike in entirety a particular item of appropriation, but line through and reduce the amount of a particular item?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Yes; I think that would be the implication. I am familiar with what the former Governor, now Senator from Washington, is referring to, the authority permitted in his State, I believe.

Is that correct?

Mr. EVANS. Not in my particular State, although I had very strong item veto authority. In a number of States, that particular authority, in precisely that form, does exist.

I further ask the Senator from Georgia, that if this was done, would not this reflect, in essence, just an enhanced rescission authority? In other words, the President would have the opportunity to initiate by reducing an appropriation and Congress would have the authority by majority vote to deny that to the President whereas under present law, the President must request a reduction and Congress has to take a positive action of approval.

Mr. MATTINGLY. That is correct, Mr. President. By implication, I would say that that is the intention.

Mr. EVANS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold, I wish to endorse the proposal of the Senator from Georgia. He has pointed out that I had the opportunity to serve as Governor and I find myself, of course, in a different position now as a Member of a legislative body. I understand the difficulty of a legislative body appearing to give up some of its authority and expanding the veto authority of the President. But I believe in this case, it is appropriate to do so.

The President has a more stringently restricted veto authority than almost any other chief executive in the United States. Virtually every Governor has broader veto authority than the President in terms of items or sections of particular pieces of legislation. I would truly view this not as increasing the authority of the President as some of our colleagues would suggest, but as an evenhanded rescission authority that gives to the President an opportunity to initiate action, with the opportunity for Congress to deny it. Whereas today, the President must ask, Congress must initiate, and that is a much more difficult task in terms of getting control of the budget, which is now very much out of control.

Some suggest that this is not really effective because it applies to a relatively small percentage of the budget. After all, no President can reduce our obligations to pay interest on the national debt; no President, through veto, can change the obligations we have made to our entitlement programs—which take almost half of our total Federal budget. But even if the opportunity to use this tool is restricted to a relatively small part of the budget, it is still an important tool and should be viewed just as that. We need a whole kit, we need a large number of tools to deal effectively with a budget now out of control. That may not be a hammer; it may be a pair of pliers. Whatever it is, it is one tool and, I suggest, Mr. President, an important tool as we move ahead on the budget reduction package we are now debating.

The Gallup poll of last November, in asking about this question, had a 67-percent affirmative reply from citizens who were asked whether they thought

the President ought to have veto authority. I believe strongly that, as we look at specific ways either to close tax loopholes or to reduce expenditure, we ought to be looking quite seriously at the other tools we can use to control budget expenditures now and in future years.

These tools clearly should include an item veto or an evenhanded rescission authority. It ought to include, I believe personally, a commitment to move toward a 2-year budget with stronger congressional oversight responsibilities. And there may well be other tools. We ought not to ignore those procedural acts as we deal with the dollars that we have been debating over the past weeks.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, this issue has been before us several times. Now we find it again in the guise of a statute. I think this avoids the real deficit issue. We are talking about a deficit problem in which only about 18 percent of the budget in nondefense discretionary programs would fall within the ambit of the line item proposal. If you look at these programs, you will see they are not growing faster than the gross national product. They are all growing slower. Congress and the President together have already restrained the growth of these programs. So either the existing veto is working, or the present budget system is working. We do not see a problem there. The major problems are coming from our entitlements. The line item veto is not going to help in that area.

With the interpretation that has been placed on this by the Senator from Georgia, we see that the President will have the right to really take the basic power Congress has, the power to write legislation. If he can reduce items or modify them, I take that he could strike a legislative prohibition; he could reduce any of the amounts proposed by Congress. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the one power that Congress has, that ability to write legislation, would be taken away.

Legislation like this would make Congress less responsible. I can envision that it would be a lot easier to vote for programs, saying, "The President will take care of this; he will line-item veto this. I can go ahead and please the home groups that want us to put in more for veterans, for example, knowing that. Somebody in the administration will take care of that. They will reduce that item." That would be safer for us than being held responsible.

The other thing that has always concerned me, Mr. President, is that a line-item veto is not going to be exercised by the President of the United States. It is not even going to be exercised by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. It is going to be exercised by some faceless, nameless bureaucrat, who wears a little green eyeshade. He sits down in the bowels of the building somewhere. He does not change whether the Republicans are in power or the Democrats are in power and generally, he "ain't never liked that program nohow." He has always wanted a chance to "get it." So he puts it on the list for the line-item veto.

That will happen time after time. Then a Member of Congress, who has had some program brought to his attention by his constituents or through an oversight hearing, may find himself facing the fact that he got the Congress of the United States to override the President's veto on this little line item. It may be the Mississippi Seashore gatehouse at the park.

How in the world are you going to be able to deal with that? A gatehouse is something the bureaucrat has never felt they needed, and so he gets it put on the list.

Just multiply that by the number of items that may be involved. That has always concerned me.

The other thing that has concerned me is that you would be giving tremendous power to the executive and his team. If they do not think that CHILES has been behaving lately, they can ask the computer to give them a list of the things in which CHILES is now interested. They would look for the "little one," and send him a message. The administration might look at CHILES or some other Senator and decide he is not answering our calls right now. He is not paying attention to us right now. We do not like his record right now. So let us send him a message, but we will not do anything real big, nothing prominent. We will just find a few here and there. The printout will come through, and they can look over it and circle a few things. That is a tremendous power.

Mr. President, I am seriously concerned that we are talking about rewriting the Constitution of the United States. We are going to do it with a statute. There have been attempts before to try to amend the Constitution. There have been constitutional amendments proposed. They have been going on since the time of President Jackson and before, urging the administration to change the veto power. Thus far that has not happened. I would hate to see us now attempt to achieve that change with a statute. I do not think it would be a very wise thing to do. I think we would be altering the separation of power.

States have evolved differently from the U.S. Congress and Constitution. They have different powers. Generally speaking, in the States they have had citizen-type legislators who do not operate full time. Their budgets are much smaller and the line items are fewer. In my State, we had so-called legislative courtesy. Any time there was a line-item veto, the Senate would go into executive session and say, "What does the Senator from Polk County want to do on this item? And you would just indicate up or down, and that was what determined whether that line-item veto was overridden or not. It was a perfunctory thing. So the States have worked their will on what they would do on this particular matter.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MATTINGLY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may not object. The Senator has a right to ask for the yeas and nays.

Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I wonder if my distinguished friend and colleague from Georgia will yield for a question or two from the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. May I ask my colleague from Georgia whether his amendment concerning a statutory line-item veto power provides in essence that if there was a line-item veto of any appropriation item by the President, an override could take place in both Houses by a constitutional majority as distinguished from the two-thirds majority now required when the President fully vetoes a bill?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. May I further pursue the question by asking my friend from Georgia whether he has made some inquiries of respected legal counsel as to the opinion of those individuals of the constitutionality of a statutory as distinguished from constitutional approach to the question?

Mr. MATTINGLY. There are different opinions on that, as the Senator well knows. I think the 1974 Budget Act probably raises similiar difference of opinions.

Mr. DIXON. May I say to my colleague from Georiga that I am delighted to see him present this amendment. At the appropriate time, I would like to speak, Mr. President, in favor of this point of view, although I share

the very serious legal reservations as to the constitutionality of the approach he is taking. In view of the overriding importance of addressing all of these fiscal problems when we face a $1.5 trillion budget deficit, I should like, Mr. President, when my friend has concluded, to express my supporting point of view on this matter.

Mr. MATTINGLY. I will not take long, I say to the Senator from Illinois. I have just a few very brief comments.

I suggest, in order to respond to some of the questions by the distinguished Senator from Florida, that this or any other President will not be unduly influenced by the green eyeshade people. The buck still stops in the Oval Office when a decision is made on vetoing line items or anything else.

In reference to the line-item veto only addressing a small part of this Federal budget, the line-item veto is really a scalpel approach rather than a meat ax approach or cleaver approach. That seems to really be an argument in favor of the adoption of this technique rather than to be opposed to it.

According to some students of the line item-veto, they make the comment that if the line-item veto had been applied against only the so-called controllable items of the budget for the last 5 years, cutting no more than 2 percent each year, the savings would be $99 billion.

So the line-item veto is not being offered as a panacea for all the budget miseries we have. It is only one solution to our fiscal problems. A balanced budget amendment would be another asset.

In addressing the comment made about items that may be under question that were possibly from Mississippi or from Georgia or from any other State, I think it would require justification of such items. I think, so long as it were justified, it would stand the scrutiny of the magnifying glass.

Is it a tremendous power we are giving to the President of the United States, since it applies to so little of the Federal budget? I do not think we are giving away tremendous power. I think, rather, what we see are those who oppose this legislation because they fear losing some of their own personal power, which I really do not think would happen at all. I think it would probably end up making us stronger representatives in the Congress.

As far as the constitutional amendment addressing that issue, with a $200 billion deficit today and facing deficits down the road of $200 billion, you cannot wait on a constitutional amendment. You cannot wait on the $200 billion deficits. So why not try to address it legislatively by statute?

I yield to may friend and colleague from the State of Illinois.

Mr. DIXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. First, I ask my colleague from Georgia whether he has any objection to my joining him as a cosponsor of this amendment?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I am happy to have the Senator as a cosponsor.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that I have not introduced any of the bills to achieve a statutory line-item veto power in the President because, as a lawyer, I have some difficulty about the constitutional viability of this approach. But since my friend from Georgia has done it, I want to support it, at least to make it clear on the record how supportive some of us are of the concept involved.

Let me make this statement on the constitutional issue.

I was in the Illinois Legislature for 20 years—12 years in the house and 8 years in the senate—in leadership capacities in both places, and during all those years, we used to discuss the question of an income tax in Illinois. Throughout the years, it was accepted as a constitutional fact that if you adopted an income tax in Illinois, it had to fall on corporations with the same percentage effect as on people.

Finally, when Richard Ogilvie was Governor of our State, there was such a tremendous revenue drop that the Governor, who happened to be a Republican, suggested an income tax. The whole session was devoted to debating the question of an income tax.

Finally, it became apparent that no tax could pass unless corporations were taxed at a higher rate than people. Everybody said: "You can't do that constitutionally. We all know that. For decades we have not done it because we know you can't do it that way." Everybody said, "Well, we'll try, anyhow."

The bill was passed. The question which was supposed to be a constitutional given was taken to the supreme court of the State of Illinois, and the supreme court said: "It is a reasonable way to do it. You can do it that way."

So, after all the decades that had not been done because it was an article of faith that you could not, when it was finally done as a compromise, because it was the only course to follow, the supreme court said it was OK.

Why do I tell that story? For this reason: Because there is a lot of difference between trying to get a two-third majority in the House and in the Senate to accomplish a line item and reduction veto in the Constitution, on the one hand, or to adopt the amendment of my colleague and friend from Georgia, which requires only a simple majority, on the other hand.

In other words, if my friend from Georgia can prevail here today by a simple majority in this place, we can send this question to the House. If it prevailed there, at their tender mercy—and I have some doubts that it would—it would go to the President, and then we would let the Supreme Court of the United States decide.

So I dispose of the constitutional question by saying it is for the courts, not the Senate. Nobody knows, because the courts have never ruled. This country is more than 200 years old, and this question has never been dealt with in court, so nobody really knows.

It comes down, then, to the question of whether this is a good idea. I do not know whether we even are a simple majority in the Senate for the support of the idea of a line item and reduction veto in the President. But I want to answer the objections to it one point at a time.

The first is this: Are we really giving away our powers as a legislative body, as a Congress, as a House of Representatives, as the U.S. Senate, if we give a line item and reduction veto power to the President of the United States? I say, positively no, we are not. We do not because, under this amendment, a simple constitutional majority in both places could override the President of the United States. Since it takes that kind of vote in the first place to pass legislation, what in the world is the matter with saying that we should give the President of the United States a fiscal tool to address the problem, leaving to us the strength, under the democratic system we live in, to override in both places? It makes good sense.

Will it save money? That is a reasonable question.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I merely want to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DIXON. I thank my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. President, based on the Illinois experience with the item veto, we can save between $25 billion and $30 billion by giving to the President of the United States a line item and reduction veto power. I think it makes good sense to give this power to the President.

I suggest once again that 43 of the 50 States of the Union have given this power to their Governors, and it has worked well. There has not been one effort in those States to attempt to take away from the Governors of those States the power for a line item and reduction veto.

The other night, when we debated the tax bill, we spent a good deal of time debating the question of changing the depreciation allowance on real estate from 15 years to 20 years. I opposed changing it from 15 to 20 years. My distinguished friend the chairman of the Finance Committee said it would be a terrible thing. We would lose a billion dollars if we did not go along with the Finance Committee's tax recommendations. One billion dollars—and we fought all night. Here is a chance to save $25 billion to $30 billion if it can be done constitutionally.

I suggest that we should bite the bullet and try it. I suggest that we should not be so jealous of our prerogatives. I suggest that we should do what we can to save money in this budget and to give everybody in Government effective tools to save money.

So I am delighted to join my friend from Georgia, even though I have some reservations about the constitutionality of the amendment in suggesting that we should try to put a majority vote on this amendment and to put it in this bill, send it to the House, call upon the House to put up or shut up, send it to the President, and say to the President:

"Now, Mr. President, you put up or shut up. You take this power. You show us where you will make the cuts, reserving to us the right to look at it again in our wisdom as a Congress and by a majority, a simple majority in both places express our points of view."

I say this is fair. It makes sense. It will save money and an overwhelmingly majority of the people of this country whenever they have been polled on this question have favored doing this.

I should think it ought to be an issue that is before us as long as these outrageous deficits are before us, and I call upon the Senate to take this opportunity to express its point of view and let the courts ultimately decide the constitutional question.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY). This proposal would grant the President statutory authority to veto individual items in appropriations legislation.

For at least the last decade, the problem of deficit spending by the Federal Government and the concomitant problem of a compounding national debt have been the focal point of criticism of Federal fiscal practice. This increased awareness of the severity and persistent nature of these problems has spawned various suggestions as to how this situation could be corrected. One of the possible solutions which has been proffered is the line-item veto.

Simply stated, the item would place in the Chief Executive the power to disapprove a line item or individual statement of the Government's allocation of funds to a particular purpose. This power would apply to appropriations contained in both acts and joint resolutions. However, this authority would not apply to appropriations for the legislative and judicial branches of the Government.

Further, under this measure, only a simple majority vote of each House would be necessary for the Congress to override an item veto, as opposed to the two-thirds vote normally required to reverse such a Presidential act.

As of this time, 43 States have this budgetary device available in some form. When I was Governor of South Carolina, the line-item veto proved to be a most useful fiscal tool. On January 25, 1984, President Reagan gave the concept of an item veto his endorsement in his state of the Union address. I, also, support it and believe it would be most helpful, particularly at this time when there is a great urgency to reduce Federal spending, for the President to have this authority.

On April 9, 1984, the Constitution Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 26 and Senate Joint Resolution 178, line-item veto constitutional amendments, and S. 1921, A statutory proposal with a similar purpose, the latter two of which have been introduced by Senator MATTINGLY and which I have cosponsored. As a member of that subcommittee and chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I was pleased to participate in the hearing and to give my endorsement to this important legislation. As I indicated during the hearing, I support either the proposed constitutional amendment, which would have greater permanency, or the statutory approach, such as is embodied in the pending measure.

Since the statutory change can be enacted by simple majority vote of both Houses and signature of the President, it would seem to offer the most expeditious means of granting the President this enhanced authority over discretionary spending. I urge the Senate to act favorably on this important, much-needed change in the legislative process with respect to appropriations measures.

Mr. President, it has been said that billions of dollars could be saved if this line-item veto is passed. I would prefer the constitutional procedure, but I am not too sure we can get two-thirds of both bodies to submit that to the people for consideration and ratification.

We can pass this. We can try it out for 2 years. If it does not work, then we will let it expire. A majority of both bodies would be able to override the President. If you do not get a majority that would end it.

I see no harm in this. It might give us a testing ground, it might be a forum in which we can determine whether we should give the greater authority later and place this matter in the Constitution which then under Senate Joint Resolution 178, would require two-thirds vote to override. Now if we can just enact a statute in which a majority vote can override the President on a line item, we can decide later whether to go farther and put it in the Constitution.

It seems to me that the meritorious claim for this, that it will save billions of dollars, is certainly worth trying.

I remind the Senate again the budget had not been balanced but once in 23 years. If this will assist in helping us to get a balanced budget, I certainly think it is worth making a test out of it and trying it out.

I hope the Senate will see fit to pass this measure.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I think it is important to note a few other items.

First, I appreciate the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) cosponsoring and speaking on this legislation.

In addition, Mr. President, I wish to add Senator DIXON, Senator EVANS, and Senator EXON, as cosponsors, and ask unanimous to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MATTINGLY. As I said, Mr. President, I think it is important to note that the line-item veto would restore the balance of powers between the executive and legislative branches. Much of the President's constitutional veto power has been taken away by the congressional practice of passing continuing appropriations bills containing riders and other nongermane amendments.

Currently, Congress is subject to pressure from all manner of well-organized, vocal, and demanding special interest groups, all interested in continuing their favorite spending programs. Those interested in reducing the Federal spending are represented by no such lobbying group, meaning the taxpayer. Thus, the line-item veto will help to remedy that imbalance.

I wish to read a quotation from the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg. He said:

The line-item veto does not give the President one single additional, affirmative power. He cannot start anything as a result. He can only stop something long enough to focus the attention of the country on it.

Mr. President, I think faced with $200 billion deficits we have a plan

before us, a deficit reduction plan of approximatly $145 billion over a 3-year period of time. It is however backloaded. If I am not mistaken there is something around somewhere between $15 billion and $20 billion in fiscal year 1985 in this deficit reduction package. That is not much. That borders on being insufficient.

I think putting the line-item veto in for 2 years, trying it, seeing if it will work, trying to apply it in this appropriations process would be one tool that we could use to help make certain that we do control the Federal budget, that we do control this defict.

Mr. President, I find it intriguing that some of the opponents of this proposal appear to be attacking it on the basis of its presumed constitutional deficiences rather than on its specific content and intent. The debate over its constitutionality is an interesting one and has been going on for some time.

With all due respect, I suggest that we will not be able to resolve that matter on the floor today, despite the fact that there appear to be worthy arguments on both sides of the issue. In particular, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the study conducted by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Hatton W. Sumners, in 1938, in which Chairman Sumners studied the question of the constitutionality of an item veto through ordinary legislation and advised that he thought the power existed in Congress to enact a bill.

One might argue that by giving the line-item veto authority to the President, the Congress is merely ceding back to the Executive the constitutionally approved veto powers that to a great degree have been removed by the congressional practice of passing such legislative hybrids as continuing resolutions, omnibus appropriation bills, nongermane provisions, and similar items and thus making it next to impossible for the President to exercise his veto powers without shutting down Government agencies or creating similar disruptions.

Furthermore, some of those who have studied the question believe that the necessary and proper clause contained in article 1, section 7, clause 18 of the Constitution provides the authority needed to legislate a line-item veto.

But the question that we should be debating today is the $200 billion deficits reaching as far as the eye can see and what steps this Senate and this Congress is going to take to put our fiscal house in order. I am willing to let the constitutional questions be decided in their proper judicial forums: Is this Senate willing to make the critical decisions necessary to reduce ballooning deficits?

(Mr. RUDMAN assumed the chair.)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment which would grant the President new authority to item veto appropriations. I have repeatedly spoken out against this notion and my views are hardly new at this time, but I am forced to restate them. I will be very brief and merely highlight what I believe to be the most fundamental reasons to reject this proposal.

A colleague of ours describes the line-item veto as "more power than a good man would want, and more than a bad man should have." This may be a little bit of hyperbole, but it is also, I believe, something that goes to the heart of the issue.

There can be no dispute that the line-item veto represents a significant grant of power to the Chief Executive at the expense of the legislative branch. And equally true at this time, and perhaps more arguable, is that there is no sound reason why this shift of power should be seriously considered and certainly none which outweighs the profound and untoward impact it may have.

First, it should be made clear in any discussion of the line-item veto that it is not a mechanism to achieve meaningful reductions of the Federal deficit.

Mr. President, I want to reiterate, this is totally false. Somehow we are reaching blindly for a way to control this deficit, and we have lost our sense of reason in doing so when we expect that the line-item veto is going to have any meaningful effect on this deficit. That is just false.

Proponents of this scheme play on a misperception of the composition of the Federal budget, either out of ignorance or out of the fact they do not want to face the truth.

The line-item veto cannot be applied against some of the largest and fastest growing portions of the budget, such as the permanently funded entitlement spending, which is $300 billion, and other mandatory costs, such as the interest on the Federal deficit, which will be $140 billion. Nor can this veto be used to reduce entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts, which represents another $100 billion.

These items, these few items that I have enumerated constitute about 55 percent of the total budget. Of the remaining 45 percent, two-thirds is defense spending. What is left, with less than 15 percent of the budget, is nondefense discretionary programs. That is a simple analysis of the budget.

This small fraction of the budget has always borne the brunt of spending reductions, and it is obvious that it will be the target of any line-item vetos. These activities include education assistance, community and regional development, law enforcement, environmental protection, health and safety research, securities and economic regulation, energy development and a host of other vital Federal responsibilities. They could all be eliminated and you still would have a substantial deficit. Furthermore, since there has been virtually no growth in this portion of the budget, reductions here will not curb the spiraling cost increases projected for Federal programs in future years.

That is an elementary, simple, almost childlike analysis of where we are and why this has absolutely no relevance to the proposition that somehow we are going to cure the deficit with this idea of a line-item veto for the President.

As a means to balance the Federal budget, the line-item veto is meaningless—but this is not to say that it has, I suppose, no scintilla of significance. In fact, it will make a substantial shift in the balance of power between the executive and the legislative branches of Government. That is the impact. It is not on the budget.

Currently, the President very effectively uses his veto power to enforce his aggregate budgetary plan on congressional spending bills. The line-item veto, however, will empower the President to go beyond simple control on overall spending, and allow him to virtually dictate spending priorities over individual programs and activities. With this power the President can frustrate a decision of the Congress on any individual program, be it for political or ideological reasons—or simply because of personal bias.

Now if that is what the Members want, why do they not review their role here in the Senate? Maybe they ought to go home and find a job in business or maybe they ought to go home and run for Governor. I think it is really ridiculous to think they want to be U.S. Senators unless they want only the title and be a figurehead and prance around and make fancy speeches. Maybe that is all they believe a Senator should do.

But if they believe in the Constitution, that there is a responsibility here in the Congress instead of trying to find someone else to blame and someone else to take the action and bite the bullet on the tough decisions on this budget, they ought to review their roles as a Senator.

Perhaps, more significantly, this is more than a question of who prevails on whether any particular activity is funded. The line-item veto has wide ranging ramifications on the gamut of decisions made by the Congress. We have all witnessed the power of the President when he lobbies Congress by telephone. It does not take much imagination to consider how much more persuasive he would be if his words were buttressed with a veto stamp over individual projects and activities within our States or districts.

Much has been made of the fact that 43 States currently grant their Governor some form of line-item veto authority. The argument here is that it works for the States and what works for the States ought to work for the Federal Government. I was a Governor for 8 years, and I had a line-item veto.

Without getting into the question of how well this authority works in the States, this rationale ignores the major differences between Federal and State responsibilities. The most obvious difference is simply the size and power of the Federal Government. The greater the scope and reach of the power the more critical it is that such power be held in check, balanced between the three, coequal, branches of Government.

Furthermore, unlike States, the Federal Government bears the responsibility for national defense, foreign policy, and broad-based social welfare entitlement activities like social security. States do not have this. These costs drastically alter the structure of the Federal budget from that of the States, so while a line item veto in the hands of a Governor could be used as an effective tool to make large budget reductions, such application at the Federal level is impossible.

Little concrete data is available on the actual effect that the line item veto has had in State budgeting. But what we do know is instructive. President Reagan, for example, reduced the California State budget by an average of less than 2 percent per year when he was Governor. If this rate of reduction were applied against the amount in the Federal budget for all nondefense discretionary programs, the projected Federal deficit would be reduced by only 1 percent. We also know that the legislatures in States which have the line-item veto routinely "pad" their budgets with projects which they expect or even want their Governors to veto. This is certainly not a practice which we would like to see in Congress, but if we abdicate our budget responsibilities to the President, should not he also take the blame as well?

Ten years have elapsed since the Congressional Budget Act was passed. That measure's principal goal was to make Congress more effective in its discharge of its constitutional role to control the purse strings of the Treasury. It is indeed ironic that 10 years later, when confronting the largest and most challenging budgetary problems ever, we find proponents of a scheme to diminish the responsibility of Congress over the budget. They would have us pass open ended shopping lists of spending items, to be culled through and selectively implemented by the President.

Mr. President, I am not arguing that the budget process we now employ in Congress is the best or the most effective in terms of assuring responsible spending decisions. Our difficulty in grappling with the current deficit is evidence enough of its shortcomings. But I am equally certain that the answer to our problems is not to delegate further responsibility to the executive branch. Our representative democracy should not and cannot risk such a concentration of power in one man. The prolonged and tortuous debate over the Federal budget reflects the enormous significance this issue has for our Nation. Let us get on with that debate, and put aside these notions of finding simple solutions to our budget problems.

Mr. President, the Mattingly amendment attempts to change the constitutionally established authority of the President to approve or disapprove legislation passed by the Congress, by a simple statutory device. This raises serious constitutional questions and while I am not a lawyer, I have grave doubts whether this amendment is a legally sound or permissible strategy, beyond the fundamental policy issues involved. Less than a year ago the Supreme Court affirmed the principle of Presidental presentment. That decision, I.N.S. against Chadha, struck down a wide variety of legislative veto statutes because they failed to provide for final legislative action at the time of presentment of a law to the President. The Mattingly amendment is merely a variation on that same constitutionally impermissible theme, and in effect, would allow Congress to veto what constitutes an impoundment of budget authority by the President.

Mr. President, I will recount briefly in closing that it is interesting to me that history is so poorly recalled, and so frequently forgotten. I can remember when the Congress was really sort of nothing but a rubberstamp to the President of the United States during the early part of the New Deal when the Republicans had 17 Members on this side. In fact, the Democrats went around this whole Chamber, and encircled the minority—that handful, stalwart bunch led by Oregon Senator McNary of 17 Republican Senators. That is all they had. The battle cry was Mr. Roosevelt had so much power that he was running the country singlehandedly, and they could not get much excitement about that until Roosevelt presented a proposal to pack the Supreme Court. Then some of those Democrats began to rise. Millard Tydings, Senator Russell, Senator George, and some of the other great constitutional lawyers of the South began to focus on this question of the balance of power between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of government.

Let us remember our heritage. We hung to that small minority because we believed in the check and balance, and not to put everything into the hands of any President. This was Mr. Roosevelt sitting in the White House. What a cry would come up from this Chamber's Republican side.

The Democrats were trying to grant Mr. Roosevelt with more and more power. Here we are now with a delightful President, a Republican President, and one I support. But it is not a question of whether his name is Reagan, Roosevelt, or Republican, or Democrat. The question is the institutional question; that Congress was walked over, the Congress was a rubberstamp, the Congress was little other than an amen quarter for Mr. Roosevelt in his whole New Deal up until they began to realize that Congress had certain constitutional responsibilities.

Let us bear in mind that we are not trying to solve the budget problem here. It is really not honest to even raise this as a point to try to solve this budget problem.

Second, let us bear in mind that we have to look beyond the Republican President we trust with such power, and think in terms of Presidents that we may not have trusted in the past, or we might not trust in the future, and realize it is also not a question of just personal trust. It is a question of institutional checks and balances. We ought to bury this, forget it was ever even raised, and maybe ask for forgiveness for even having had such a thought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I do not know how far I should respond to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He is a distinguished Senator and a friend. In his comments he referred to my honesty, and about the honest approach to this piece of legislation. He referred to it however as being a silly idea, and a simple solution. I think he suggested I go back home. I had written some of those comments myself. I was not however going to use them. So I am certainly glad he did, and I did not. But I would like to introduce for the RECORD an article in U.S. News & World Report, by Joseph Bower. He said, "Run the Federal Government Like a Business? Forget It." I would like to submit that for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIKE A BUSINESS? FORGET IT

TWO DIFFERENT WORLDS OF MANAGEMENT

Business and political leaders have a hard time understanding each other because they operate in very different management systems. For the technocratic manager, the most pressing problem is getting the work done. The name of the game is efficiency. The legitimacy of businesses is grounded in their performance.

In politics, by contrast, the goal is to get consensus, not to achieve efficiency. The political system works on the distribution of costs and benefits. It's a world in which fairness and accountability, not return on investment, are key. Politicians have to explain themselves to the public, and it is what the public thinks that counts.

MECHANISMS FOR DEALING WITH REAL PROBLEMS

The higher the level of elected government, the less likely it will be efficient. The top levels shouldn't be given jobs that require efficiency. Just as in a big company, you've got to push decision making closer to the market. In many ways, you can't make government more efficient except by getting parts of it out of Washington. You can't run anything that big that well, and its limited ability is needed for macroeconomic policy, foreign policy and defense. Though local government is not always efficient either, it is more likely to be.

In order to get more efficiency, you need a certain stability in what government is trying to achieve. But the last two decades have seen a tremendous shifting of goals. Adding to the problem is turnover at the top. Several thousand key people come and go with each administration. When people change jobs in companies, the enterprises run extensive programs of acculturation. A lot of effort is made to bring people together socially so they know each other and know that they play on the same team. But in government what would happen if you took 50 senior managers to a nice place, let them eat decent food for a while and socialize—and work didn't dominate 92 percent of the agenda? It would be a scandal!

Despite all of its problems, government does give us mechanisms for dealing with real problems. The U.S. is very heterogeneous. Parts of the country are now Spanish speaking and have a totally different attitude than, let's say, New England. Government provides a way of trading those disparate interests and keeping us together, and it does respond. It's quite remarkable.

WHEN WALL STREET GOES TO WASHINGTON

When businessmen go into government, the differences in management approaches between the two spheres can lead to difficulties. I don't know that anybody has made a systematic survey of how business leaders have fared in Washington, but my sense is that those who come from manufacturing and service backgrounds have not had a very good record.

Businessmen out of Wall Street, however, have had remarkable success because they are accustomed to a deal-to-deal, day-to-day way of doing things. That's much closer to political management than the chemical or auto industries, where you make a decision today that's going to work out five years from now.

SACRIFICING EFFICIENCY FOR "DEMOCRATIC VALUES"

At the top of the corporate structure, the work is more like that of managing a political organization than at middle-management levels. In a healthy company, there are constituencies both within the organization and outside of it. The head of such a company is constantly aware of the need to mobilize those who will support him and try to meet their needs—or at the very least keep at arm's length those who can block the accomplishment of goals.

Still, the head of a corporation is given a lot more leeway than a political leader. The presumption is that affected constituencies give up a lot of democratic values to let corporate heads get on with it—unless they really make a mess of things—whereas in government we'd rather see a mess of things than give up democratic values.

Mr. MATTINGLY. I will quote from the article. He says, "When businessmen go into Government, the differences in management approaches between the two spheres can lead to difficulties." I guess that is the difference between a professional politician and somebody who has not been in politics all their life, and comes into this arena from the private sector.

He went on in the last paragraph—and said, "Still, the head of a corporation is given a lot more leeway than a political leader. The presumption is that affected constituencies give up a lot of democratic values to let corporate heads get on with it—unless they really make a mess of things—whereas in Government we would rather see a mess of things rather than give up democratic values."

The bottom line, Mr. President, irrespective of whether you like the amendment, support it or do not support it, or you think it is a simple solution or a complicated solution, or whether you think it is a shift of power—there is a lot of fear in people about something they have not seen before in the Federal Government. But I think what the overriding question again is what are we going to do about the deficit. Nobody has said the line-item veto would dissipate a $200 billion deficit.

But this approach is to try to get a technique into Government practice to try to impose responsible spending by the Federal Government. This is just one tool. If we used it, that could lead to responsible action by the U.S. Congress. And the solution is simple enough. It only requires a majority override.

Once again, as I said in the beginning, what it does is focus the attention of the public, and the attention of the Congress like a magnifying glass upon different items in the Federal budget that would not be brought out in the open unless that focus or attention was directed to it. That is the purpose of this legislation. That is the purpose of trying to control spending by our Government.

Mr. President, speaking from experience, I can state that one of the problems facing those Americans who are in fact currently involved in the business sector, and who daily struggle in the marketplace, are the enormous problems created by the Federal spending that has run amuck. It appears to have defied all attempts at using the tools to impose control. As I stated earlier, it is time to move in some new directions with such useful tools as the line-item veto.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. HATFIELD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Yes.

Mr. HATFIELD. If the Senator thinks this is another important tool for the control of the budget, would the Senator be willing to amend his amendment to include the line-item veto for the President on revenue measures?

Mr. MATTINGLY. It is probably worth discussing.

Mr. HATFIELD. Pardon?

Mr. MATTINGLY. It is probably worth discussing.

Mr. HATFIELD. If the Senator would not oppose it, would the Senator consider entertaining an amendment to his amendment for that purpose?

Mr. MATTINGLY. No; I do not believe this amendment is amendable. It is not amendable.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the Senator from Oregon, my colleague. He suggested that perhaps his colleagues here in the Senate ought to go back home and run for Governor. Mr. President, I did that three times. During the first 2 years of my service, I had the privilege of serving as a neighbor to the distinguished Senator from Oregon as neighboring Governors.

There is a difference between this Congress and State legislatures, between a President and a Governor. But what I find most disturbing is the fact that we here in Congress lay on the President's desk huge trainloads of pork attached to vital pieces of legislation. We make it almost impossible for a President to veto what is absolutely necessary to carry on the operations of Government, but may be required to sign that legislation and accept a whole series of expenditures which could not stand on their own merits.

If we are frightened by the concept of a line-item veto, then it seems to me that this Congress, and particularly the Senate, might well be more careful in insisting on the germaneness of amendments to pieces of legislation before this body. That question of germaneness is constantly brought to the fore, at least in the State Legislature of Washington. With the Governor having line-item veto authority, which serves as a check for germaneness, he is seldom presented a bill that is not clear and consistent and within the framework of the title under which it passed.

The suggestion has been made by the Senator from Oregon that this is not an effective tool, that it only applies to a small piece of the budget. He also suggests that it is a major shift in

the relative responsibility between the Congress and the President.

I think that he overlooks something that is terribly important. That is, this amendment is in the nature of a trial. It sunsets after 2 years. If it does not work, we do not have a permanently disabling piece of legislation under which we must live. If it does not work, we simply do not extend this legislation.

But if we try it and if it does work, and if it has the effect even of a small tool in helping bring this as well as future budgets under control, then I suspect this Congress might well continue such a proposal. Perhaps on a 2-year basis, so that Congress would always retain control as to whether it continued or died, but would allow a President the privilege and the opportunity of using this small tool, in conjunction with others, to bring our budget deficits under control.

I do not think there is anyone in this body who believes that in the next 2 years we are going to attain a balanced budget. But if this tool works; then in 3 years, 4 years, 6 years, or 10 years from now it may well be continued and, in being continued, offer some future administration and some future President an opportunity to deal with, perhaps, a broader spectrum within the budget than that which the current administration might be interested.

Let me just reiterate in closing that it is only a trial, it is only for 2 years. It gives us the opportunity to see if it works. If it does not, it gives us the opportunity to cast it aside. But if it does work, to be more certain at the end of 2 years whether this provision is worth continuing: not just for the present, not just for this administration, not just for this Congress, but for the future.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is my understanding that if there are no other Senators who desire to speak—does the Senator from Georgia know of other Senators who want to speak in favor?

Mr. MATTINGLY. No; but I wanted to have an opportunity to present concluding remarks.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will speak for about 5 minutes and then my good friend from Mississippi will speak. Then perhaps the Senator from Georgia can conclude.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have quiet?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am not going to speak very long. We have had this issue before us on a number of occasions. It has always failed to pass. We have had a much more elaborate proposal by the distinguished Senator from Colorado and it did not pass. We had a line-item constitutional amendment and it did not pass. We had a legislative line-item proposal and it did not pass. Frankly, I do not think this ought to pass today either.

First of all, I am convinced that it is unconstitutional. I do not agree at all with my good friend, the junior Senator from Illinois, that something as patently unconstitutional as this ought to be passed anyway, by using the analogy that in his State a tax law for years was used in one way and then used the other way and the courts said it was all right.

Clearly, the framers of our Constitution did not have this in mind. One might argue that if they knew what kind of government we have today they might have had a different U.S. Constitution. Perhaps. But we address that issue all the time. That is what constitutional amendments are all about.

When you read the simple language of the U.S. Constitution with reference to this, it says, "Every bill * * * shall * * * be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves he shall sign it but if not he shall return it."

I just cannot believe that that means line item veto. In fact, I have looked over this legislation and I do not know what it will mean if the President has the line-item veto. What is the "item?" We do not have things called items. Read the defense appropriations bills and see if you can find what the items are. There are some items that are so long that the whole bill could be called an item. Maybe it means he can edit it, that he can go through it and put in parentheses or strike something where we do not write English too well. That sounds like a line item. I do not think the Senator has that in mind because that will not reduce the deficit.

On the other hand, I do not think this proposal will reduce the deficit substantially either.

I would like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question: Are defense appropriations included in this?

Mr. MATTINGLY. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I was thinking that if I were to propose and argue for a line-item veto, it would involve the item of defense because this President might use it on some things that we put in which the military would not want, and that veto would stick. I would congratulate the Senator from Georgia for including it, but that would not change my mind. If you pick up a couple of weapons systems that we might put in because we like jobs and not because it is what the military needs, the President might fix those up.

On the other hand, the arguments have been made as to why it really will have very little effect. There is not that much Federal spending which is appropriated other than defense, in terms of percentages. Nobody would argue that it applies to entitlements like social security, medicare, medicaid. Nobody would argue that it applies to any of the pension programs. So it is pretty obvious to me it is not going to have any serious effect on this growing deficit.

I really do believe, however, that it has the potential for dramatic change in the relationship between the President and Congress. Frankly, I am not ready to make that change in a statute. I think it clearly speaks for a constitutional amendment if we want to do it at all. The country ought to have a full debate across this land about what that might mean in terms of Congress and its powers to tax and appropriate, and how they relate to the President's.

I also think it is very interesting to note that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations raised the issue of taxes and suggested that perhaps line-item vetoes should be involved in revenue bills. He was talking about a very interesting concept. If we are talking about spending money, many think that every tax bill that comes along has a type of pork in it. We talk about pork here as if the only pork is a bridge or a street. You know, when you put all those little loopholes in there, that is in effect spending tax dollars. Should the President have the right to veto those? I do not know. Frankly, I am not for that, either, but I just raise the point.

I think the proposal is unconstitutional; I think it is unclear; I think it has the potential for dramatically shifting the relationship between the President and the Congress.

I was thinking the other day, not that the President who is currently in the White House would ever have done anything like this, but when we had the Panama Canal question, there arose an interesting question. I was one of those who thought about it a long time. It seems to me that the line-item veto in the hands of a President with a Panama Canal Treaty, needing one or two votes, could produce some rather dramatic results. I would like to point out that my State is tremendously dependent on the Federal Government because we have all the national labs that provide services for the entire country. I could enumerate, but it would take a long time. I am not implying that anybody would do anything about those. I am not so sure I would like Presidents to be able to look over those facilities, especially when they have favorite legislation down here they would like me to consider.

In summary, I do not think we ought to vote for the proposal, but I also

think we ought to decide ourselves here today whether we think it is constitutional or not. There is such a process, there is a way to propose a line-item veto that would be constitutional, and I hope somebody does that and that we pass judgment on it.

Just remember, the language of the Constitution is so clear. Then we have this amendment that says, "Send it to the President, and if he vetoes it by line item, whatever that means, it comes back over here and a simple majority could put that item back in whole or in part." I think that is really a rather strange process. Clearly, the Constitution did not envision it. I do not think it will work, so I think we ought to dispose of the question rather quickly.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the time is not controlled, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be very brief, Mr. President.

We have had a wonderful debate here the last few days on these different plans that are submitted, one by the President of the United States, another one by the Senator from South Carolina, a member of the Budget Committee, another plan by the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) also a valued member of the Budget Committee, and one by the chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator from New Mexico, who is opposed to this proposal.

Having really gotten into this meritorious debate, one of the the best I have ever heard here, frankly, we stop now and go to arguing about the legislative proposal tacked onto this budget question, reconciliation and so forth, setting out a plan, one might say, of how to veto a bill or an item in the bill. Let us see what the Constitution of the United States is. With all deference to the author, and he is a very valuable Member of this body and a hard worker, I do not believe this proposal touches top, side, or botton of the real Constitution that we have and live under.

The Constitution provides that all revenue bills shall originate in the House of Representatives, period. That is clear and unmistakable, that they meant at least everything those words say. That is the way the Government operated, totally that way, for a long time, as I understand. In the House of Representatives, the bills raising revenue and the bills appropriating the money were all handled by the same committee. They were jealous and they are still jealous of that power, the sole power of originating an appropriations bill. I think they have a basis for it. I have always been on their side in maintaining that as part of the Constitution.

They finally created a second committee on the general subject, with the understanding that the new committee, which is now called the House Appropriations Committee, would be considered a revenue committee for those purposes and things would go on the same way, that the House has the authority, the only authority, to originate a bill of that kind. We respect that generally. I am not meaning it violates the law; it is no violation, but it is an abrogation of the law. We cannot turn aside in one of the times of peril to our Nation, and that is what is in reference to these fiscal affairs, a time of peril, not only in my opinion but in the opinion of people like Mr. Volcker and others who have basic knowledge and background and experience in that field. Mr. Volcker said we are fast approaching a position of a debtor nation.

With deference again to the author of this amendment and those who might favor it, I do not think there is any doubt that it does not have a constitutional thread in it, that it is something that has some appeal that maybe this will help balance the budget and maybe it will be a step that will help out. There has been no hearing on it, not on this identical proposal. There has been no committee consideration of it. There has been no special study of it made by people who are versed in the field, including Members of this body.

Right here, when we are in a critical time, a crucial time, I suggest that we dispose of this amendment when all speak who wish to, forthwith dispose of it, and get on with the passage of this highly important legislation. It will be all right to come back to this in a formal way sometime.

I thank the Chair.

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I support substantial deficit reduction. I voted for the Hollings budget plan which would produce a deficit almost $100 billion lower in fiscal year 1987 than the President's most recent proposal. This was real deficit reduction through a program of shared sacrifice.

The proposal we have before us now to give the President a line-item veto should be unnecessary and would be unwise. It should be unnecessary because the President already has the primary budgetary power—he proposes the budget in the first place. If he wants to have a budget which substantially restrains spending, he already has the power to propose a budget which sets the benchmark against which that restraint can be measured. It is somewhat disingenuous for a President to propose budgets with $200 billion deficits and then claim that he needs a line-item veto to restrain spending on the grounds that Congress is fiscally irresponsible. In a very real sense, the buck not only stops at the White House—it begins there as well.

The line-item veto would also be an unwise step because it would make Congress less accountable and would be a substantial shift of power to the executive branch. It would allow Congress to abdicate its responsibility in budgetmaking while at the same time it frees the President from the need to compromise as he participates in the process. It is clear from all the budget proposals which we have looked at during this debate as well as the ones which have yet to be offered, that substantial deficit reduction will require sacrifice and possibly pain. If this is the case, the Members of Congress should be forced to put their names on the line in support of spending reductions. They should not be able to hide behind the President's line-item veto when asked by their constituents why one spending reduction or another took place. Otherwise, Members of Congress could pass all the spending programs they wanted, please whatever constituencies they wanted, and then leave the dirty work up to the President. However, this would not be consistent with responsible or accountable government.

At the same time, giving the President the line-item veto would give him a preeminent, if not unassailable, position in the budget process. All the Members of the Congress have to compromise when it comes to spending bills. Within a particular bill, there are frequently some projects or programs which they prefer, some to which they are neutral, and some which they outright oppose. In the last case, Members always have the opportunity to offer amendments to strike those provisions. But if they fail with these amendments, they must analyze the bill and weigh the good against the bad, and cast their vote. The line-item veto would exempt the President from this process. He alone would be able to pick and choose and enact his preferences without compromise. Further, reversing his veto of particular projects which affect only one or two congressional districts may very well be impossible, even if it is a majority veto as provided for by the Mattingly amendment.

A line-item veto would, thus, neither be an appropriate nor wise solution to our budgetary crisis.●

Mr. MATTINGLY and Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, first, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his good work. He is a valued Member of this body, the Senate, and of the committee on which he serves. I think his effort here is another example of his initiative and good thought on how to get

the budget situation under control. But, Mr. President, I have three points to make; then I shall state that I shall not support this amendment. If a point of order is made, which I expect it will be, I intend to support the point of order.

The first point is a little story that does not take long to tell. I believe it really happened, but if if did not, it should have. I am told that at the time we passed the War Powers Act, the President of the United States called in one of his advisers and said, "I have got to decide whether to veto this or sign it."

His adviser, who told me this story and whom I shall not identify, said, "Let us see, Mr. President; the Constitution says here that you are Commander in Chief. Is that right?"

The President said, "Yes."

"And you are manager of the foreign policy of the United States?"

He said, "Yes, that is right, too."

"And this act apparently either removes part of that authority or limits it. Is that correct?"

He said, "Well, it appears to."

The adviser said, "Mr. President, what I would recommend you do is don't either sign it or veto it, but send a nice note back to the Congress and say, 'Gentlemen, thank you for your interesting idea.' "

The point is, Mr. President, that there is a doctrine of the separation of powers. One of the powers that is separated is the power to appropriate money.

As the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, it is vested in the House to originate such measures and the Senate to concur or to decline to concur and the President to approve or disapprove. It is a nice symmetry, and it has worked pretty well. But if we get into a line-item veto, I believe we have created a new constitutional power, and that is the power of a President to originate and appropriate an item, or the equivalent of that.

Now, my President does not agree with that. He argues with me at leadership meetings at the White House about it, but we remain good friends on most issues. And someday I may regret saying this. It may be someday that I will have a different view on what a President ought to be able to do, perhaps not. But right now I feel constrained to tell you really what I think, and what I think is this is a bad idea.

Now, let me tell you something else, Mr. President. This proposal, as I understand it, says that the President can veto an item, a line item. I will promise you, Mr. President, that I do not care whether it is Senator STENNIS or Senator HATFIELD, Republican or Democrat, who is chairman of the Appropriations Committee; one way or the other they will get around that. The way which occurs to me, just off the top of my head, is every appropriation bill from now on, if this were to pass, would have one item, just one line. It might have a lot of exhibits and references. But I will promise you that will not work.

The third item, Mr. President, I would make is I do, indeed, think that by this amendment we are attempting to deal with a constitutional issue in a statutory form. That is what prompted my story about the War Powers Act.

I do not think we can do that. I think you could by constitutional amendment. Maybe I would have a different view of that. But I am convinced, Mr. President, we are dealing with an item that violates the fundamental tenents of the Constitution in this respect, and that if a point of order is made on the constitutionality of this proposed statute, it should be sustained.

Mr. MATTINGLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. MATTINGLY. In conclusion, nobody can be more eloquent than our majority leader, of course, but I would like to make a couple of brief comments to what the Senator from New Mexico said in reference to this amendment.

If we look at last year, we did not have one single appropriation bill vetoed by the President of the United States, and there were some bills that were over the budget. If we had had a line-item veto, I am certain that many in this body would have seen the President use that line-item veto authority.

The Senator from New Mexico said he would not be able to figure out what an item is on that appropriation bill, but I think most people would understand what an item is. I do not think you would end up with just one big item, no matter what he may say. The Senate does not move that fast where you could conjure up everything into one big item. They have not figured out how to put the M-1 tank in with the F-16, although I figure they might be able to do it within a few years.

The Senator from New Mexico also made a comment about we need a debate across the land. There is a debate now going on across our land. That debate is, "What is Congress going to do about the deficit?"

Well, we need to use every tool that we can, and once again that is the purpose of the line-item veto.

As far as the constitutionality of this issue today, that is what we have the courts for. Let the courts decide if this amendment is constitutional or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the bill is legislation which changes the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advised the Senator from Florida that under Practices and Precedents of Senate Procedure the Chair does not have the power to pass on such a point of order. The Chair, therefore, under the precedents of the Senate submits the question to the Senate: Is it in order to offer such an amendment to the pending bill? That point of order is debatable.

Mr. CHILES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I move to table the point of order. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. WALLOP) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPECTER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 86 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Abdnor	Goldwater	Nunn
Armstrong	Grassley	Percy
Biden	Hecht	Pressler
Boren	Heinz	Proxmire
Boschwitz	Helms	Quayle
Chafee	Humphrey	Roth
Cochran	Jepsen	Simpson
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Specter
Denton	Kasten	Stevens
Dixon	Laxalt	Symms
Dole	Leahy	Thurmond
East	Lugar	Trible
Evans	Mattingly	Warner
Exon	McClure	Wilson
Garn	Nickles	Zorinsky

NAYS—46

Andrews	Danforth	Huddleston
Baker	DeConcini	Inouye
Baucus	Dodd	Johnston
Bingaman	Domenici	Kennedy
Bradley	Durenberger	Lautenberg
Bumpers	Eagleton	Levin
Burdick	Ford	Long
Byrd	Gorton	Mathias
Chiles	Hatch	Matsunaga
Cohen	Hatfield	Melcher
Cranston	Heflin	Metzenbaum

Mitchell	Riegle	Stennis
Moynihan	Rudman	Tower
Packwood	Sarbanes	Weicker
Pell	Sasser	
Randolph	Stafford	

NOT VOTING—9

Bentsen	Hawkins	Pryor
Glenn	Hollings	Tsongas
Hart	Murkowski	Wallop

So the motion to lay on the table the point of order was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, is it in order to offer this amendment to this bill?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays on the point of order be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members cannot hear what is going on in the well of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will someone please tell Senators who are seated what is going on in the well of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call is in progress.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request. Would the Chair restate the matter pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request has been made for a restatement of the pending question.

The question is: Is the point of order well taken? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, a point of inquiry. My friend and colleague from Florida has raised a question of whether this is, in fact, in violation of the Constitution. Was that the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. BAKER. The Chair does not rule on that.

Mr. DIXON. On a prior occasion, it was my understanding that the Senator from Florida had asked for that ruling from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents and practices of the Senate, the Chair has no power or authority to pass on such a point of order raising a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DIXON. So the question is for each Senator as to whether it is in violation of the Constitution, or ultimately the question for the courts, is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the practices of the Senate, the Chair submits the question to the Senate. The Chair did that and there was a motion to table the point of order and the motion to table failed.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, may I be heard briefly on the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order submitted to the Senate is debatable. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I just want to briefly state what I said on a prior occasion in supporting my friend, the Senator from Georgia, and that is this: The Chair has not ruled on this question and the court has not ruled on this question.

We have a $1.5 trillion national debt, and we are trying to convince the people of this Nation that we want to do something about it. It is therefore a reasonable idea to pass this amendment, and let it be a question for the Supreme Court of the United States as to whether you can legislatively address this problem.

Now, you can keep on sweeping these things under the desks, but the question of a line item and reduction veto power is going to be before us as long as there is burgeoning national debt, which is increasing at the rate of almost $200 billion a year as far as the eye can see.

Now, you can go home once or twice and say that this is not anything but a procedural question, but that is a lot of baloney. This is a substantive question about how to balance this budget.

Let every Senator understand, this Presiding Officer has not ruled on this question. It is up to 100 Senators about whether this violates the Constitution.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the point of order raised by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I hope we will get on. Let me frame the question now. We are not voting on the merits of the proposal. We are voting on the point of order made by the Senator from Florida that this amendment violates the Constitution of the United States.

It is true that the Supreme Court of the United States can review and pass on the enactments of the Congress, but it is equally true, and the precedent is just as old, that the Senate of the United States must first exercise its own judgment as to whether a matter before it conforms with or violates the Constitution. It is a precedent as old as the Republic.

Mr. President, I submit that this does. I hope that the point of order will be sustained.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader is correct. I would say to the Senate the point of order specifically is very easy to understand and does not address the substantive issue of a line-item veto. It is this: Is this legislation changing the Constitution of the United States? The Constitution states:

> Every bill . . . shall . . . be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves, he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it.

It is a rather overwhelming proposition to change that with a line-item veto. We may want to do that some day, but the issue here is whether you do it with a piece of legislation that patently flies in the face of the Constitution. That is the point of order. Are you changing the Constitution?

Mr. DIXON. Will the chairman yield for a question on that?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHILES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. Ervin, a fine constitutional lawyer, had a statement he was fond of. He said, "I understand English. It is my mother's tongue." And if you can understand English, you can read the language in here and it says:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it.

Now, that is just about as clear as it can possibly be. If you think the deficit is too big and you want to overrule the Constitution of the United States, fine. If you want to do anything else if the end justifies the means, fine. But if you can read your mother tongue, you will know that this is unconstitutional.

Mr. MATTINGLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I think everybody knows we are not going to vitiate the yeas and nays; that we are going to have another vote on it.

The Senator from Illinois put it very clearly. You have a $200 billion deficit out there. The vote was 46 to 45 on the previous vote.

You are not talking about it being a constitutional question. What you are talking about is whether you are going to try to control the Federal spending of this Government. That is what it is. That is the botton line. You can talk about doing it in the same old way. Well, the same old way "ain't" been working.

Now, what we are trying to do is put a new tool, and now you constitutional lawyers are talking about this as not having any impact on the budget because it only impacts just a small part. If it impacts just a small part, then let us try it.

Mr. DIXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator form Illinois.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I want to ask by distinguished friend, the ranking Member on this side, the Senator from Florida, if either he or my colleague, the distinguished former Supreme Court judge from Alabama, or any Senator can cite one single case in America that says what we are trying to do is unconstitutional. Everybody knows that there is settled law on many, many questions. There is no case on this question.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator is right. It is so clear that no court, from a justice of the peace on, has ever had to rule on it.

Mr. DIXON. Well, if my colleague thinks that any protion of the law is so clear, then that amazes me, as a practicing attorney who practiced for many years.

This question of law is unsettled. The only question is whether we have the courage to let the Supreme Court of the United States decide. This Senate is not the place where 100 separate Senators make that kind of judicial decision, and we desperately need to reduce these deficits.

Mr. EVANS. Will the Senator yield?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIXON. Yes; I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois still has the floor and has yielded for a question from the Senator from Washington.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, not being an attorney, I seek the advice of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. Everyone is talking about whether or not this proposal is constitutional. We have just heard an exchange which indicates that no court has ruled on the question.

Is it possible for a court to overrule on this question unless Congress takes action, puts the bill into effect to see whether the court can say it is constitutional?

Mr. DIXON. Well, there may be possibilities for doing that under other methods. But the best method, may I say to the Senator as a Member who is a lawyer, is to pass legislation and let the Supreme Court of the United States determine that.

There are people here that would argue that the War Powers Act is unconstitutional. They say that is a clear case of something that flies in the face about what the Constitution says about the President being the Commander in Chief. But this Senate passed a War Powers Act and the Constitution has never been challenged yet by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I say to my friend from Washington that until such time as we pass legislation there is no determination about whether we can constitutionally do this. I say to my friend from Washington as a lawyer that I have doubts and reservations about whether we can do it. But I want to do something to reduce our budget deficits. I want to pass this amendment, send it to the House, have them pass it, have the President sign it, and let the Supreme Court decide whether it is constitutional to do this.

Mr. EVANS. I agree with the Senator from Illinois, and I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I notice in this bill there is the provision that in the event Congress wishes to override the veto of the President, it provides for a majority vote. The Constitution provides for a two-thirds vote to override a President's veto. I believe there is a difference in fractions. The President has requested a legislative veto. He requested it in the form of a constitutional amendment. I think that clearly reflects the views of the people that have studied it. Therefore, I think is not proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, very briefly since we are discussing the substance of the issue as the Senator from Illinois has eloquently described, and the Senator from Georgia has proposed, it ought to be recognized that this Congress during the past several years has cut the President's budget. A line-item veto allows the budgetmakers to veto. The President is not going to be the one that makes vetoes of small amounts. It is going to be the Office of Management and Budget, or one of the Federal agencies, that is going to make the small line item vetoes to make it conform to what their budget was when it was submitted, even though Congress has cut their budget below the total amounts.

So much for the argument that we have the huge deficit, and we have to do something about it. We do something about it every Congress. We have been cutting those budgets. But the real question on the substance is can somebody in the Office of Management and Budget—or one of the agencies who really does not care and does not want a small irrigation project, a small water project—have the opportunity for a line-item veto that might have been worked in the Senate for 6 or 8 years before it was finally appropriated, and finally gained enough votes out of both the Senate and the House to get in the appropriation bill.

I ask my friends who proposed this whether they really have considered what happens to some of these agricultural appropriations that finally get into a bill, whether it is on one of the nutrition programs such as summer feeding programs for youth, or whether it is on soil conservation.

These are small items. They do not get the President's attention. They get the attention of the bureaucracy. That is where a line item veto really, truly lies and where the benefit is, if there is a benefit. I do not subscribe that there is a benefit to this on balance because for the most part it will knock out small items that Members of both the House and the Senate have worked on for a long time—years in many instances—to have an appropriation bill contain the amount necessary to carry out the will of Congress.

I would just as soon vote on the substance myself. But it patently is unconstitutional, and for those who want to have that opportunity for the President, they should submit a constitutional amendment so it would be valid. But on the substance of it, I say, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I must say that I find the arguments made by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Georgia profoundly disturbing. It seems to be their position not that the proposal for this amendment is constitutional. I have not heard either of them make any argument in the form that they claim it is constitutional. The most that has been stated by the Senator from Illinois is that because Congress has never tried this before, because therefore there has not been a court decision on it, we ought to go ahead with it even in the face of the plain words of the Constitution, because the substantive issue involved is important.

That argument goes to the proposition that, if Congress is frustrated and does not feel it can solve the problem

in one way within the Constitution of the United States, it may ignore the Constitution. It may ignore the necessity to amend the Constitution in a particular fashion. It is analogous to going before a U.S. district court, or even a U.S. court of appeals, and saying to the judges of that court because you do not have the final authority to interpret the Constitution, because your judgment may be appealed, go ahead and do this good idea, come up with a judgment in favor of me because I have a good idea, and, if you are wrong on the Constitution, you can be reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I say quite profoundly to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Georgia that you swore an oath, as I did, when you became Members of this body to uphold the Constitution of the United States. You cannot hide behind the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has final authority on constitutional questions. You cannot hide behind that proposition to ignore your own duty properly to interpret the Constitution, which you have inherited after 200 years of history. It is your duty to make a judgment as to whether or not this amendment is constitutional.

If you can in good faith say you believe that it is, you can vote in the way which the Senator from Illinois has made a claim. But to duck your responsibility on the ground that sometime, at some future date, the Supreme Court will have final authority over the question is to ignore the oath which you swore when you became a Member of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, who has just spoken. I hope Members will stop for a moment, and think very seriously about the issue that is before us. No one I have heard has advanced any case containing any reasonable argument that this legislative proposal before us is constitutional. It clearly alters the Constitution. If that is to be done, you need a constitutional amendment. Then we are told there is no case making that point.

The distinguished Senator from Florida is absolutely right. The reason there is no case is that the proposition is so patently unconstitutional that it has never been put. Suppose someone submitted a legislative proposal to change the term of the President to 2 years, or the Senate to four, or the House to three. Suppose I put in that legislative proposal; then say, well, the Supreme Court has never ruled on this question.

There has never been a case saying that a statute changing the term of the President of the United States to 2 years is unconstitutional, and, therefore, you ought to pass this legislation changing the President's term to 2 years, and let the Supreme Court of the United States decide the case.

What happens to our own responsibility to make a judgment to uphold the Constitution, and make a judgment with respect to whether a proposition before us has any slim claim to constitutional validity? That is the issue that is put here. The Senator from Florida is absolutely right, in my judgment, to press a point of order. I hope the Members of this body will support that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I can only echo what the distinguished Senator from Washington and the distinguished Senator from Maryland have said. This is a very important debate, and I think the points that have been made here today have been highly edifying.

Each one of us held up our hand, took the oath of office, and said we will uphold the Constitution of the United States.

There was no caveat. You did not say, "I will uphold the Constitution of the United States only on those cases where precedent is well-established." You did not say, "I will uphold the Constitution unless something is presented to the Senate that the Court has never ruled on, in which case I will vote for it so the Supreme Court can rule."

You say you will uphold the Constitution.

The Senator from Maryland has made a very poignant case, that if we were trying to change the term of the President, to change the term of a Senator, if I were to offer an amendment to this body that said, "Henceforth and forever more the Roman Catholic Church will be the official church and the official religion of this country," what language would you have concerning the first amendment? But that amendment is no clearer on the hypothetical case which I have just stated than it is on this case.

Ben Franklin and all the Founding Fathers, Madison especially, when they got down to the question of how shall the Constitution be amended, made it tough. They did not want Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives to wake up every morning and just, by whim and caprice, change the fundamental organic law of this Nation. So they said, "You have to have a two-thirds vote by both houses."

This is the law that has made this country great for 200 years. I will be eternally grateful to our Founding Fathers because they made it very difficult to change it. They wanted every proposed change in the Constitution to be thoroughly aired, and the American people totally informed on all the possible implications of changing that document.

To come in here and say by a simple majority vote you are going to change the fundamental law of this Nation, which effectively abolished Congress, at least the Appropriations Committees of the two houses, and say we have to do this in the interest not because we have a consitutional responsibility but because we have the responsibility to duck it and kick it up to nine people on the Supreme Court.

I did not come here for that purpose, and I do not intend to vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I hasten to suggest to my colleagues that I am somewhat bothered by protracting this argument, but I think something tremendously specious has been suggested by some of my friends, whom I greatly respect, when they tell you that this is so clear that that is the reason it has never been tested before.

I do have some reservations about whether you can do this statutorily. But the fact is that there is a respectable body of opinion in this country by respectable attorneys and others who have written on this that suggest that you can do it by statute. There is a difference of opinion about it.

I have not been in this place long, but I do know that an issue is not necessarily settled simply because it is said to be settled. I want to tell you about two experiences in my lifetime that were supposed to be settled that were absolutely reversed in my time in public service.

The first is this: When I went to the Illinois Legislature in 1950, the year that Everett McKinley Dirksen beat Scott Lucas, for all of those years, for a half century, they had not reapportioned Illinois. We represented by area in the Senate and in the House by population, and everybody said that is the way it is constitutionally. You cannot change it.

But while I was there the Supreme Court of the United States said one man, one vote was the way you did it and they did change it.

In all those years I was there, we argued about an income tax and they said it had to be the same percentage on people and the same percentage on corporations. There are people from the press in my State in the balcony that know that. When Governor Ogilvie proposed the State income tax he wanted a flat 4 percent on people and a flat 4 percent on corporations. Everybody said you had to do it that way, it was the only way that it was constitutional. We Democrats fought it and it ended up being 4 percent on corporations and 2½ percent on people. They said, "You cannot do

that. It is unconstitutional. Everybody knows that you cannot do that." It went to the supreme court of our State and they said, "Absolutely you can do it. Sure you can do it. It makes good sense to do it."

Let me tell you, I respect the Senator from Washington, I respect the Senator from Alabama, and I respect the Senator from Arkansas. But not one of the three of them is on the Supreme Court of the United States.

I practiced law all my life. I do not know any more about the Constitution than them, but I do not believe there is not any man or woman sitting in this place who positively knows what the Constitution says on this.

There is only place in the world that can decide it and that is the Supreme Court of the United States.

I do not mind if Senators cop out on the issue. I copped out on a couple in my life myself. But do not tell me you are not voting for this because you think it is settled.

I want to come in your State and debate that question in any public place. It is not settled. It is only going to be settled when the Supreme Court of the United States decides.

Mr. CHILES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIXON. Sure.

Mr. CHILES. The Senator would not imply that because some Member of the Senate did feel that this was unconstitutional and so voted to uphold the Constitution that the Senator was copping out, would he?

Mr. DIXON. No. Each Senator should vote the way they please, according to their own conscience. But I suggest the constitutional question is not settled.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIXON. Sure.

Mr. MELCHER. The two instances that the Senator from Illinois presented to us in favor of his argument——

Mr. DIXON. Do you want another? I will give you more.

Mr. MELCHER. In those two instances, the Senator will admit where the Supreme Court of the United States directed the State of Illinois that they had flaws in their laws.

Mr. DIXON. One case involved the Federal Constitution; the other was solely an Illinois constitution issue. And let me cite another case. Separate but equal was OK in the schools for a long, long time, for decades and decades. But a new case was brought back to the Court again and the Court said, "We changed our mind, it is not."

There are all kinds of things that have changed in the history of this country, and this question is open to doubts.

Mr. BOREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, it is a little difficult to follow the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I do not know whether he argues with passion or with conviction. I happen to be one of those who supports the concept of line item veto but now feels compelled to vote in the negative as to whether or not this proposal is constitutional.

A few moments ago I voted to table the point of order because I wanted us to be able to get a full debate on the substance of the issue of whether or not we should give the President the power of line-item veto.

I believe very strongly that we should. As Governor of Oklahoma, I had the opportunity under the State constitution of our State to have the power of line-item veto on appropriations bills. I utilized that power, I believe, more than all the Governors of Oklahoma combined in the State history during the 4 years that I served, to try to keep spending under control in our State at that time.

I think given the economic conditions of the country, this is a power that the President of the United States should have. Therefore, I wanted to see us have an opportunity to discuss this question.

But now, the question on which I must vote is not whether or not I support the line-item veto. I do support it. The question on which I must vote is, is the current proposal to make this change by statute rather than constitutional amendment consistent with the Constitution of the United States?

On that particular question, as much as I favor the line-item veto, I feel I have no choice but to vote that it does not comply with the Constitution of the United States. I say with all sincerity to my colleague from Illinois that I do think, as the Senator from Washington said earlier, that each of us has a responsibility under our own oath to read the Constitution and to uphold the Constitution. I do not believe that we can evade that responsibility to read the Constitution and study its meaning very carefully by simply saying that it is an issue that the courts must ultimately decide. I am one who has been concerned from time to time by what I thought was a misreading of the Constitution of the United States by the Supreme Court and other Federal courts. I think the Constitution of the United States does have clear meaning, and I think we have a responsibility to read it closely.

This is an economic emergency, I grant, and I admire the concern of the Senator from Georgia. On many occasions, he has led valiant efforts to bring spending under control. I think he has expressed on many occasions the fact that if we do not get these deficits under control, we are going to destroy our entire economy and we threaten to tear apart the social fabric as a result.

But, Mr. President, this is a dangerous and slippery slope on which we have embarked. Are we to declare, if an emergency exists in this country for one reason or another, social unrest or otherwise, that we should suspend the Bill of Rights, guaranteed by the Constitution to take care of that emergency? Are we to say that the right of free exercise of religion or the right of freedom of speech is something that we have no individual responsibility as elected officials to preserve, protect, and defend, that we should simply allow some court to decide whether or not the language of the Constitution means what it says it means? I think not.

This is not a situation, I say to may friend from Illinois, like the question of legislative apportionment, as to whether or not the apportionment of a State legislature based upon area rather than population violates the equal protection clause. We are not here interpreting a nebulous clause like that clause of the Constitution which says no citizen shall be denied equal protection of the law. We are here dealing with language of the Constitution under the legislative articles of the Constitution that spells out with great clarity the manner in which the laws of the United States shall be enacted, and the President of the United States shall consider a full bill under the legislation of the Constitution. And if the President vetoes a bill, it is not a simple majority of the Houses of Congress that is called upon to overrule such a veto.

If the Senator from Georgia were offering a constitutional amendment, I would be a cosponsor of it. I believe in giving the President line-item veto authority. If we were to research and find other ways, perhaps limited powers of rescission to be granted to the President of the United States in a manner that could pass constitutional muster, I would be supporting it.

I sympathize in terms of substance with what he is urging us to do, but I cannot say that I think anything, any current issue, any current emergency, any prevailing opinion in the country, any Gallup poll, anything that brings me political gain in the short term or political loss in the short term, overrules the responsibility that I have to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

I urge my colleagues who feel as I do that the line-item veto is a good idea to seriously consider this matter. I urge my colleague from Illinois and my colleague from Georgia, who are very sincere in their views, to consider it and to ponder whether or not we should return to this issue on another day, in another forum, with language drafted in another way.

I say to both of them that if we come back on another day, either with a constitutional amendment or with a different kind of statutory language

that more arguably would pass constitutional muster, this Senator would be firmly in their corner. But as of today, I have to vote not on the legislative veto question but on the question of whether or not the proposal before us passes muster under the Constitution of the United States. I cannot delegate to another individual the responsibility which I have as an American to uphold the constitutional process.

I must with regret, Mr. President, say I think it is my duty as I see it—I cannot define anyone else's duty for them. I know how I understand the Constitution, I know how I read the Constitution. To me, personally, it is clear; therefore, I must do my own individual duty as I see it and vote that this does not pass constitutional muster.

Mr. MATTINGLY and Mr. McCLURE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his statement and I think he is perfectly right in voting his conscience as he sees it. My conscience tells me exactly the opposite and I shall vote exactly the opposite way. That does not mean he is right or that I am right. He is doing what his judgment tells him is his responsibility as a Member of the Senate of the United States and every one of the 100 Members here should do it. Nobody should vote for the point of order because he is against the line-item veto provision; equally, no one should vote against it because he is for the line-item veto. I happen to be against the Mattingly amendment and shall vote against it if we get to that point. I do not, however, believe that it is clearly unconstitutional.

We have had recent attempts on the part of the Congress of the United States to enact legislative veto and many within this body, including the Senator from Idaho, felt the courts were wrong in saying that the legislative veto was an improper exercise of legislative authority. I think there is another reasonable interpretation that the courts should have found and could have found. To suggest that there is only one point of view available or only one point of view possible begs the question about whether or not the Supreme Court should decide on this issue. If it were that easy, we would not need a Supreme Court. But the Supreme Court is not final because it is infallible; it is infallible because it is final. This body is neither infallible nor final and each of the 100 Members must exercise his own judgment.

I am against the line-item veto in this particular instance, because I agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon outlining its deficiency. It is not the appropriation process that is failing in this body; it is the fact that we have created entitlement programs and do not have the courage to change them.

It is not the appropriations process, which could be reached by line-item veto, that is going to solve the budgetary problem. We shall have done something but have done something virtually meaningless if we grant the President of the United States the authority to reach those things that are governed by appropriations and not able to touch at all, all those other questions which are beyond the ability of the appropriations process to constrain.

I am opposed to the line-item veto because I think it deals with the wrong end of the problem. However, I do believe that we are not violating our oath of office if we vote against the point of order to say that it could be constitutional and we could, with good conscience, vote in favor of it if we are so disposed.

I shall vote against the point of order. I am pleased that we have the opportunity to vote against that point of order and I hope the point of order will be turned down. Then in turn, we shall vote on the substance, which I hope we shall get to before long.

Mr. MATTINGLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, let me read from a study conducted by the chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee of an earlier Congress. Hatton Sumners stated that it is constitutional for the legislature to enact the line-item veto. He said:

> Members of Congress are sent to the seat of Government by the people charged with the responsibility of enacting the laws and fixing public policy, and are by general and specific grants as well as by implication given all the power and discretion essential to complete responsibility to the people for the discharge of those duties. When, therefore, the Houses of Congress, in order to add to their efficiency, guided by their judgment and acting under their responsibility to the people in the discharge of their constitutional responsibility, so draw an appropriation bill that in their judgment each item may be separately considered by the President and approved or disapproved, and as drawn and approved items may stand as complete and harmonious items of legislation while the items disapproved may be sent back to the Congress for further consideration, they act, it seems clear to me, within their constitutional powers and discretion.

Mr. President, if we are to begin legislating on the basis of what the courts may rule in the future, then it seems to me we unilaterally relinquish much of our constitutionally mandated authority. Some of us in this body believe that certain provisions of the War Powers Act and the Budget Act of 1974 are unconstitutional. That does not mean, however, that we should preempt whatever court challenges may be made to those acts and repeal them today. The question should be, should we substitute ourselves for that constitutionally approved judicial review system?

What this debate has done—and wish my colleague from Oklahoma was still in the Chamber when we were talking about going through the process of the constitutional amendment on the line-item veto, which I think we need to consider in the future—is to show that something must be done immediately. The deficits are not going to wait for a constitutional amendment to run its merry way through this Congress and the land to be approved or disapproved. Once again, I think what has happened is this debate today on the line-item veto has placed us and this budget deficit under a magnifying glass. It has created the focus where it belongs. If we lose, those who would try to include different items into an appropriation bill which, believe me, are not justified and should not be there, will probably think twice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD that letter by Mr. Sumners.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1937.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, M.C.,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: With reference to House Joint Resolution 515, introduced by you, proposing an amendment to the Constitution authorizing a veto of separate items in appropriation bills, which resolution has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, beg to advise that after an examination of the applicable provisions of the Constitution I have reached the conclusion which I submit for your consideration that the Houses of Congress, without an amendment to the Constitution, may authorize the President to veto separate items in an appropriation bill.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution provides:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Each of the Houses of Congress is authorized under the Constitution to establish its own rules of procedure. (Art. I, sec. 5, clause 2.)

Article 1, section 7, clause 2, of the Constitution provides:

"Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be

reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law."

This section, as you will observe, is a limitation upon the general powers of Congress and is to be strictly construed. Does the word "bill" necessarily mean all the separate items assembled under one caption, each of which might have been the subject matter of a separate bill but which for convenience sake in expediting the public's business are assembled under one caption? It is clear that the sole purpose of this section is to make certain that no item of proposed legislation shall be law until it is approved by the President, or, if disapproved by the President, is again passed by both Houses by two-thirds vote, the objections of the President notwithstanding.

To hold that the word "bill" necessarily means all the items assembled under one caption would be a construction operative against the purpose and plan of the Constitution. That construction would compel the President officially to approve items which he does not in fact approve in order to avoid striking down other items which he does approve. On the other hand, such a construction would force him to disapprove items which in fact he does approve in order to reach other items which he disapproves. If, however, Congress draws an appropriation bill so that without doing hurt to the effectiveness of legislation the President is permitted to disapprove separate items and approve the remainder, permitting those items which have been agreed to by the Houses of Congress and approved by the President to become law, that would be in harmony with the plan and purpose of the Constitution. Under that arrangement the items which are disapproved by the President would be cut away from the rest of the bill and returned to Congress, with his objection, for reconsideration, as in other cases of veto, which arrangement likewise would be in harmony with the plan and purpose of the Constitution.

It would be necessary, as I view it, before the President would be authorized to veto a separate item in an appropriation bill, for the Houses of Congress by appropriate resolution to indicate to the President that they have drawn the bill so that each item may be regarded as a separate bill for the purpose of his examination and approval or disapproval, and that it is the will of Congress that the bill be thus examined and acted upon. Otherwise, we would have a situation under which the President could cut away parts of a bill, leaving as the law an incomplete item of legislation which the Houses of Congress would not have approved in that form as an original proposition. The Houses of Congress must have control over legislative processes in order that the people may hold them to full responsibility for the results of legislative processes. The power to do is always essential to the right to hold responsible for the fact and the method of the doing. Hence, the rule of strict construction of limitations upon general powers.

It would not seem necessary for the determination of this question to do more than examine, in the light of the general plan and philosophy of our system of government, the directly applicable provisions of the Constitution referred to. However, the general scope and character of the responsibility and discretion conferred by the Constitution upon the Houses of Congress by general and specific grants throw light upon the question being examined.

Congress is given the power to lay and collect taxes (there can be no more far-reaching power than that) to pay the debts; to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States; to borrow money without limit on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States; to coin money and regulate the value thereof; to constitute public offices and provide for officers; to declare war and raise and support armies and navies (which is a great power and a great discretion) and to make rules for their government; to exercise entire legislative jurisdiction over territories, forts, arsenals, etc. In addition to that, the Senate exercises a veto power over the President's appointments. The personnel which constitutes the two Houses of Congress, functioning as separate entities under the impeachment provisions of the Constitution, is given the power to remove the entire judicial personnel from the Chief Justice down and the entire executive personnel from the President down.

In addition to making the rules for their procedure, the House and the Senate judge of the election and qualification of their respective Members and may remove them. They may not be questioned anywhere else as to what they say in debate. In other words, except for a few limitations upon the general powers contained in the Constitution, Members of Congress are sent to the seat of Government by the people charged with the responsibility of enacting the laws and fixing public policy, and are by general and specific grants as well as by implication given all the power and discretion essential to complete responsibility to the people for the discharge of those duties. When therefore, the Houses of Congress, in order to add to their efficiency, guided by their judgment and acting under their responsibility to the people in the discharge of their constitutional reponsibility, so draw an appropriation bill that in their judgment each item may be separately considered by the President and approved or disapproved, and as drawn and approved items may stand as complete and harmonious items of legislation while the items disapproved may be sent back to the Congress for further consideration, they act, it seems clear to me, within their constitutional powers and discretion.

Respectfully submitted.

HATTON W. SUMNERS.

I asked the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress to give me a statement as to the number of States and the provisions of each State on this subject. They have complied with my request, giving me the exact language of the constitutional provision of each one of the 39 States that have this provision in their Constitution. Under my leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose those provisions herewith:

ITEM VETOES—TEXT OF STATE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

1. Alabama (constitution, art. V, sec. 125):

"Every bill which shall have passed both houses of legislature, except as otherwise provided in this constitution, shall be presented to the Governor; if he approve, he shall sign it; but if not he shall return it with his objections to the house in which it originated, which shall enter the objections at large upon the journal and proceed to reconsider it. * * * If the Governor's message proposes amendment, which would remove his objections, the house to which it is sent may so amend the bill and send it with the Governor's message to the other house, which may adopt, but cannot amend, said amendment; and both houses concurring in the amendment, the bill shall again be sent to the Governor and acted on by him as other bills. If the house to which the bill is returned refuses to make such amendment, it shall proceed to reconsider it; and if a majority of the whole number elected to that house shall vote for the passage of the bill, it shall be sent with the objection to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by a majority of the whole number elected to that house, it shall become a law. If the house to which the bill is returned makes the amendment, and the other house declines to pass the same, that house shall proceed to reconsider it, as though the bill had originated therein, and such proceedings shall be taken thereon as above provided * * *."

Alabama (constitution, art. V, sec. 126):

"The Governor shall have power to approve or disapprove any item or items of any appropriation bill embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law and the item or items disapproved shall be void, unless repassed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto; and he shall in writing state specifically the item or items he disapproves, setting the same out in full in his message, but in such case the enrolled bill shall not be returned with the Governor's objection."

2. Arizona (constitution, art. V, sec. 7):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriations of money, he may object to one or more of such items while approving other portions of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill at the time of signing it, a statement of the item or items which he declines to approve, together with his reasons therefor, and such item or items shall not take effect unless passed over the Governor's objections as in this section provided. * * *"

3. Arkansas (constitution, art. VI, sec. 17):

"The governor shall have power to disapprove any item or items of any bill making appropriation of money, embracing distinct items; and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law, and the item or items of appropriations disapproved shall be void, unless repassed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills over the executive veto."

4. California (constitution, art. IV, sec. 16):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more items, while approving other portions of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill at the time of signing it, a statement of the items to which he objects, and the reasons therefor, and the appropriation so objected to shall not take effect unless passed over the Governor's veto, as hereinbefore provided. If the legislature be in session, the Governor shall transmit to the House in which the bill originated a copy of such statement, and the items so objected to shall be separately reconsidered in the same manner as

bills which have been disapproved by the Governor."

California (constitution, art. IV, sec. 34):

"* * * In any appropriation bill passed by the legislature, the Governor may reduce or eliminate any one or more items of appropriation of money while approving other portions of the bill, whereupon the effect of such action and the further procedure shall be as provided in section 16 of this article * * *."

5. Colorado (constitution, art. IV, sec. 12):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money, embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be law, and the item or items disapproved shall be void, unless enacted in manner following: If the general assembly be in session, he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of the item or items thereof disapproved, together with his objections thereto, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered, and each item shall then take the same course as is prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto."

6. Connecticut (constitutional amendments, art. XXXVII):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money embracing distinct items while at the same time approving the remainder of the bill, and the part or parts of the bill so approved shall become effective and the item or items of appropriation so disapproved shall not take effect unless the same are separately reconsidered and repassed in accordance with the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto. In all cases in which the Governor shall exercise the right of disapproval hereby conferred he shall append to the bill at the time of signing it a statement of the item or items disapproved, together with his reasons for such disapproval, and transmit the bill and such appended statement to the secretary. If the general assembly be then in session he shall forthwith cause a copy of such statement to be delivered to the house in which the bill originated for reconsideration of the disapproved items in conformity with the rules prescribed for legislative action in respect to bills which have received executive disapproval."

7. Delaware (constitution, art. III, sec. 18):

"* * * The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money, embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law, and the item or items of appropriation disapproved shall be void, unless repassed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills, over the executive veto. * * *"

8. Florida (constitution, art. IV, sec. 18):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bills making appropriation of money embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law, and the item or items of appropriations disapproved shall be void, unless repassed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills over the executive veto."

9. Georgia (constitution, art. V, sec. 1, par. XVI):

"* * * He may approve any appropriation, and disapprove any other appropriation, in the same bill, and the latter shall not be effectual, unless passed two-thirds of each house."

10. Idaho (constitution, art. IV, sec. 11):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money embracing distinct items, and the part or parts approved shall become a law and the item or items disapproved shall be void, unless enacted in the manner following: If the legislature be in session, he shall within 5 days transmit to the house within which the bill originated a copy of the item or items thereof disapproved, together with his objections thereto, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered, and each item shall then take the same course as is prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto."

11. Illinois (constitution, art. V, sec. 16):

"* * * Bills making appropriations of money out of the treasury shall specify the objects and purposes for which the same are made, and appropriate to them, respectively, their several amounts in distinct items and sections, and if the Governor shall not approve any one or more of the items or sections contained in any bill, but shall approve the residue thereof, it shall become a law as to the residue in like manner as if he had signed it.

"The Governor shall then return the bill, with his objections to the items or sections of the same not approved by him, to the house in which the bill shall have originated, which house shall enter te objections at large upon its journal and proceed to reconsider so much of said bill as is not approved by the Governor.

"The same proceedings shall be had in both houses in reconsidering the same as is hereinbefore provided in case of an entire bill returned by the Governor with his objections; and if any item or section of said bill not approved by the Governor shall be passed by two-thirds of the members elected to each of the two houses of the general assembly, it shall become part of said law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. * * * "

Indiana: The Governor has no power to veto items.

Iowa: The Governor has no power to veto items.

12. Kansas (constitution, art. II, sec. 14):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more of such items, while approving the other portion of the bill; in such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the item or items to which he objects, and the reasons therefor, and shall transmit such statement, or a copy thereof, to the house of representatives, and any appropriations so objected to shall not take effect unless reconsidered and approved by two-thirds of the members elected to each house, and, if so reconsidered and approved, shall take effect and become a part of the bill, in which case the presiding officers of each house shall certify on such bill such fact of reconsideration and approval."

13. Kentucky (consitution, sec. 88):

"* * * The Governor shall have power to disapprove any part or parts of appropriation bills embracing distinct items, and the part or parts disapproved shall not become a law unless reconsidered and passed, as in case of a bill."

14. Louisiana (constitution, art. V, sec. 16):

"The Governor shall have the power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations for money, embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be law, and the item or items of appropriation disapproved shall be void, unless repassed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills over veto."

Maine: The Governor has no power to veto items.

15. Maryland (constitution, art. II, sec. 17):

"* * * The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bills making appropriations of money embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law, repassed according to the rules or limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills over the executive veto."

16. Massachusetts (constitutional amendments, art. LXIII, sec. 5):

"The Governor may disapprove or reduce items or parts of items in any bill appropriating money. So much of such bill as he approves shall upon his signing the same become law. As to each item disapproved or reduced, he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated his reason for such disapproval or reduction, and the procedure shall then be the same as in the case of a bill disapproved as a whole. In case he shall fail so to transmit his reasons for such disapproval or reduction within 5 days after the bill shall have been presented to him, such items shall have the force of law unless the general court by adjournment shall prevent such transmission, in which case they shall not be law."

17. Michigan (constitution, art. V, sec. 37):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money embracing distinct items; and the part or parts approved shall be the law; and the item or items disapproved shall be void, unless repassed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills over the executive veto."

18. Minnesota (constitution, art. IV, sec. 11):

"If any bill presented to the Governor contain several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more of such items, while approving of the other portion of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the items to which he objects, and the appropriation so objected to shall not take effect. If the legislature be in session, he shall transmit to the House in which the bill originated a copy of such statement, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered. If, on reconsideration, one or more of such items be approved by two-thirds of the members elected to each house, the same shall be a part of the law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. All the provisions of this section, in relation to bills not approved by the Governor, shall apply in cases in which he shall withhold his approval from any item or items contained in a bill appropriating money."

19. Mississippi (consitution, sec. 73):

"The Governor may veto parts of any appropriation bill, and approve parts of the same, and the portions approved shall be law."

20. Missouri (constitution, art. V, sec. 13):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contain several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more items or portions of items while approving other portions of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill at the time of signing it a statement of the items, or portions of items, to which he objects, and the ap-

propriations, or portions thereof, objected to shall not take effect. If the general assembly be in session, he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of such statement, and the items or portions thereof objected to shall be separately reconsidered. If it be not in session, then he shall transmit the same within 30 days to the office of the Secretary of State, with his approval or reasons for disapproval: *Provided, however,* Nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing the Governor to reduce any appropriation for free public-school purposes."

21. Montana (constitution, art. VII, sec. 13):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money, embracing distinct items, and the part or parts approved shall become a law, and the item or items disapproved shall be void, unless enacted, in the manner following: If the legislative assembly be in session, he shall within 5 days transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of the item or items thereof disapproved, together with his objections thereto, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered, and each item shall then take the same course as is prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto."

22. Nebraska (consitution, art. IV, sec. 15):

"* * * The Governor may disapprove any item or items of appropriation contained in bills passed by the legislature, and the item or items so disapproved shall be stricken therefrom, unless repassed in the manner herein prescribed in cases of disapproval of bills."

Nevada: The Governor has no power to veto items.

New Hampshire: The Governor has no power to veto items.

23. New Jersey (constitution, art. V, sec. 7):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriations of money, he may object to one or more of such items while approving of the other portions of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the item to which he objects, and the appropriation so objected to shall not take effect. If the legislature be in session, he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of such statement, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered. If, on reconsideration, one or more of such items be approved by a majority of the members elected to each house, the same shall be a part of the law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. All the provisions of this section in relation to bills not approved by the Governor shall apply to cases in which he shall withhold his approval from any item or items contained in a bill appropriating money."

24. New Mexico (constitution, art. IV, sec. 22):

"* * * The Governor may in like manner approve or disapprove any part or parts, item or items, of any bill appropriating money, and such parts or items approved shall become a law, and such as are disapproved shall be void unless passed over his veto, as herein provided."

25. New York (constitution, art. IV, sec. 9):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more of such items while approving of the other portion of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the items to which he objects; and the appropriation so objected to shall not take effect. If the legislature be in session, he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of such statement, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered. If, on reconsideration, one or more of such items be approved by two-thirds of the members elected to each house, the same shall be part of the law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. All the provisions of this section, in relation to bills not approved by the Governor, shall apply in cases in which he shall withhold his approval from any item or items contained in a bill appropriating money."

New York (constitution, art. IV-A, sec. 3):

"* * * The legislature may not alter an appropriation bill submitted by the Governor except to strike out or reduce items therein, but it may add thereto items of appropriation provided that such additions are stated separately and distinctly from the original items of the bill and refer each to a single object or purpose. None of the restrictions of this provision, however, shall apply to appropriations for the legislature or judiciary. Such a bill when passed by both houses shall be a law immediately without further action by the Governor, except that appropriations for the legislature and judiciary and separate items added to the Governor's bills by the legislature shall be subject to his approval as provided in section 9 of article 4."

North Carolina: The Governor has no power to veto any bill or part of bill.

26. North Dakota (constitution, art. III, sec. 80):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items, or part or parts, of any bill making appropriations of money or property embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law, and the item or items and part or parts disapproved shall be void, unless enacted in the following manner: If the legislative assembly be in session he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of the item or items or part or parts thereof disapproved, together with his objections thereto, and the items or parts objected to shall be separately reconsidered, and each item or part shall then take the same course as is prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto."

27. Ohio (constitution, art II, sec. 16):

"* * * The Governor may disapprove any item or items in any bill making an appropriation of money and the item or items so disapproved shall be void unless repassed in the manner herein prescribed for the repassage of a bill."

28. Oklahoma (constitution, art. VI, sec. 12):

"Every bill passed by the legislature, making appropriations of money embracing distinct items, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor; if he disapproves the bill, or any item, or appropriation therein contained, he shall communicate such disapproval, with his reasons therefor, to the house in which the bill shall have originated, but all items not disapproved shall have the force and effect of law according to the original provisions of the bill. Any item or items so disapproved shall be void, unless repassed by a two-thirds vote, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the preceding section in reference to other bills: *Provided,* That this section shall not relieve emergency bills of the requirement of the three-fourths vote."

29. Oregon (constitution, art. V, sec. 15a):

"The Governor shall have power to veto single items in appropriation bills and any provision in new bills declaring an emergency without thereby affecting any other provision of such bill."

30. Pennsylvania (constitution, art. IV, sec. 16):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money, embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law, and the item or items of appropriations disapproved shall be void unless repassed according to the rules and limitations prescribed for the passage of other bills over the executive veto."

Rhode Island: The Governor has no power to veto items.

31. South Carolina (constitution, art. IV, sec. 23):

"* * * If the Governor shall not approve any one or more of the items or sections contained in any bill, but shall approve of the residue thereof, it shall become a law as to the residue in like manner as if he had signed it. The Governor shall then return the bill with his objections to the items or sections of the same not approved by him to the house, in which the bill originated, which house shall enter the objections at large upon its journal and proceed to reconsider so much of said bill as is not approved by the Governor. The same proceedings shall be had in both houses in reconsidering the same as is provided in case of an entire bill returned by the Governor with his objections; and if any item or section of said bill not approved by the Governor shall be passed by two-thirds of each house of the general assembly, it shall become a part of said law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. * * *"

32. South Dakota (constitution, art IV, sec. 10):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items of any bill making appropriations of money embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be law, and the item or items disapproved shall be void, unless enacted in the following manner: If the legislature be in session, he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of the item or items thereof disapproved, together with his objections thereto, and the items objected to shall be separately reconsidered, and each item shall then take the same course as is prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto."

Tennessee: The Governor has no power to veto items.

33. Texas (constitution, art, IV, sec. 14):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriation, he may object to one or more of such items and approve the other portion of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the items to which he objects, and no item so objected to shall take effect. If the legislature be in session he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of such statement and the items objected to shall be separately considered. If, on reconsideration, one or more of such items be approved by two-thirds of the members present of each house, the same shall be part of the law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. If any such bill containing several items of appropriation, not having been presented to the Governor 10

days (Sundays excepted) prior to adjournment, be in the hands of the Governor at the time of adjournment, he shall have 20 days from such adjournment within which to file objections to any items thereof and make proclamation of the same, and such item or items shall not take effect."

34. Utah (constitution, art. VII, sec. 8):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contains several items of appropriations of money, he may object to one or more such items, while approving other portions of the bill; in such case he shall append to the bill at the time of signing it a statement of the item or items which he declines to approve, together with his reasons therefor, and such item or items shall not take effect unless passed over the Governor's objection as in this section provided."

Vermont: The Governor has no power to veto items.

35. Virginia (constitution, art. V, sec. 76):

"* * * The Governor shall have the power to veto any particular item or items of an appropriation bill, but the veto shall not affect the item or items to which he does not object. The item or items objected to shall not take effect except in the manner heretofore provided in this section as to bills returned to the general assembly without his approval. If he approve the general purpose of any bill, but disapprove any part or parts thereof, he may return it, with recommendations for its amendment to the house in which it originated, whereupon the same proceeding shall be had in both houses upon the bill and his recommendations in relation to its amendment as is above provided in relation to a bill which he shall have returned without his approval, and with his objections thereto; provided, that if after such reconsideration, both houses, by a vote of a majority of the members present in each, shall agree to amend the bill in accordance with his recommendation in relation thereto, or either house by such vote shall fail or refuse to so amend it, then, and in either case the bill shall be again sent to him, and he may act upon it as if it were then before him for the first time. * * *"

36. Washington (constitution, art. III, sec. 12):

"* * * If any bill presented to the Governor contain several sections or items, he may object to one or more sections or items while approving other portions of the bill. In such case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the section or sections, item or items, to which he objects and the reasons therefor, and the section or sections, item or items, so objected to, shall not take effect unless passed over the Governor's objections, as hereinbefore provided."

37. West Virginia (constitution, art. VII, sec. 15):

"Every bill passed by the legislature making appropriations of money, embracing distinct items, shall before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor; if he disapproves the bill, or any item or appropriation therein contained, he shall communicate such disapproval with his reasons therefor to the house in which the bill originated; but all items not disapproved shall have the force and effect of law according to the original provisions of the bill. Any item or items so disapproved shall be void, unless repassed by a majority of each house according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the preceding section in reference to other bills."

38. Wisconsin (constitution, art. V, sec. 10):

"* * * Appropriation bills may be approved in whole or in part by the Governor, and the part approved shall become law, and the part objected to shall be returned in the same manner as provided for other bills. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of the members present shall agree to pass the bill, or the part of the bill objected to, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of the members present it shall become a law. * * *"

39. Wyoming (constitution, art. IV, sec. 9):

"The Governor shall have power to disapprove of any item or items or part or parts of any bill making appropriations of money or property embracing distinct items, and the part or parts of the bill approved shall be the law, and the item or items and part or parts disapproved shall be void unless enacted in the following manner: If the legislature be in session he shall transmit to the house in which the bill originated a copy of the item or items or part or parts thereof disapproved, together with his objections thereto, and the items or parts objected to shall be separately reconsidered, and each item or part shall then take the same course as is prescribed for the passage of bills over the executive veto."

It will appear from that statement that there are only nine States that do not have that provision, those being the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Nevada, Tennessee, North Carolina, Iowa, and Indiana. I look upon this matter as one of the most important subjects that Congress could consider. That provision has brought about savings of hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the various States, and I believe it would be many times more important to the Federal Government than it is to the States. In my judgment, Congress should first decide whether or not the House and Senate could agree to the policy of giving the President that authority; and if so, secondly, as to whether or not they want to undertake it by a constitutional amendment, which would possibly require many years before it could become effective, or by a legislative act, which could be passed at this session of Congress and could be determined by the Supreme Court very expeditiously thereafter if the constitutionality of such an act was brought into consideration. I could give extensive references to the recommendations of the various Presidents and the activities of various committees and speeches on the subject, but I deem it would not accomplish anything that would be materially helpful.

If I may be pardoned for a personal reference, my recollection is that the very first bill I passed when I came to Congress in March 1909 was promptly vetoed by President Taft. I spoke to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Hon. James A. Tawney, about it, and he said the bill was meritorious and that he would insert it in an appropriation bill. He did so, and President Taft was required to sign that bill containing the identical language that he had vetoed some 10 days before. From that day to this I have been forcibly impressed with the very great importance of this matter. If Congress would adopt this policy, it will very materially aid in balancing the Budget.

Mr. DIXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Washington has suggested that we all take a solemn oath to support the Constitution. We do. I took that solemn oath, as my friend from Washington took his solemn oath. And I assure him and every Senator that I will do everything during my time in the Senate to keep that solemn oath.

Now, here is an eight-page document from the Congessional Research Service of the Library of Congress by J. R. Shampansky, legislative attorney, American Law Division, dated October 23, 1981. I am going to read one page as follows:

Although the Constitution does not on its face grant the President an item veto, there was no discussion of the possibility of an item veto at the Constitutional Convention, and the President has apparently never attempted to exercise an item veto (see Item Veto Hearings, *supra*, at 65 n. 16), it has been suggested that a President might be able to exercise the item veto power without the necessity of either a constitutional amendment or a statutory enactment. See Item Veto Hearings, *supra*, at 50-51. This view is based on the fact that Art. I, Sec. 7, permits the President to veto a "bill." Although today "omnibus bills" dealing with many unrelated matters are commonplace, it has been said that when the framers of the Constitution used the term "bill," they meant a measure relating to only one individual item. Thus, the argument goes, the framers intended for the President to be able to review each provision of law passed by the Congress, and the President's power to do so should not be restricted merely by Congress' practice of packaging in one bill numerous unrelated items. See Item Veto Hearings, *supra*. However, the view that the President currently possesses the item veto power apparently has few adherents, and given the fact that no President has ever attempted to exercise such a power, it would seem that the better view is that enabling legislation or a constitutional amendment is required.

The argument that a statutory enactment would be sufficient to grant the President the item veto is based on several provisions of the Constitution. Art. I, Sec. 1, grants all legislative powers to the Congress. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18, the "necessary and proper clause," grants to the Congress the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in Government of the United States . . ."

So I say to my friends, make any argument you want, but I say the question of law and constitutionality of this item veto amendment is unsettled, and this document speaks to that as eloquently as any Senator ever can.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICKLES). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, with all due respect to those who concluded that to wait to see and review this issue we must have a point of order, I think the discussion we have had thus far is evidence in retrospect that that was not such a good idea.

We found, as the discussion has taken place since the last vote, that

there is a Senator, who is for this line-item veto and voted for the motion to table, who is now going to vote for the point of order because he is for the line-item veto but because he thinks a legislative version is unconstitutional.

We have a Senator who voted for the motion to table, who is going to vote for the procedural motion on the Mattingly amendment, who is going to vote against the line-item veto.

You have a Senator speaking now who is not sure whether he likes the line-item veto but is sure that he does not like the idea of deciding whether this amendment is or is not constitutional before we fully debate it.

The problem is we debated around the question of whether or not it was constitutional prior to the last vote. We debated the merits of whether or not it made any sense more than we debated, from what I was able to listen to, the constitutionality. I wonder whether it is possbile—and maybe not—I am not asking unanimous consent for this—for us to get straight to the merits, a vote up and down on the merits and avoid another vote on a precedural matter because although I think it is probably unconstitutional, I believe there is a legitimate point that is distinguishable from that raised by my articulate friend from Arkansas, who said what would it be like if he rose to the floor and asked for the official religion of the United States of America to be Roman Catholicism.

The point is, he might in fact get somebody to vote that way but we all acknowledge that is clearly, patently unconstitutional. I am not sure this is. I think it is.

Now, I voted on tabling, but there has not been nearly enough discussion along the lines that the Senator from Illinois was just pursuing.

I am contemplating the following course of action as far as this Senator goes, either to keep this debate going long enough for us all to do the research to be able to make a sound judgment on the constitutionality question or vote up and down on the issue.

I hate like the devil to be in the spot of voting to say unequivocally that I am absolutely and positively certain that this is unconstitutional and leave it at that, because I am not certain. I have not spent a great deal of time examining the constitutionality of it.

With all due respect to my friend from Georgia, he quoted a Member of Congress from the 1930's talking about a situation different from the one he is now suggesting.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLURE. If I understand the Senator correctly, he is suggesting delaying a vote until he can be absolutely, unequivocally certain.

Mr. BIDEN. No; the Senator is saying delay the vote until we can have an enlightened debate. With all due respect to my colleagues, not many of them know a lot about this.

Mr. McCLURE. That, too, is not a requirement in this body. [Laughter.]

Mr. BIDEN. I understand that. But I should like us at least to be able to debate to the point so that we can deal with the merits of the constitutionality, if that is what we are going to do.

I may be mistaken, but I have heard only one citation on the question of constitutionality raised here, and that was raised by a staffer at the Library of Congress.

Really and truly, I think we are making a mistake here. We are making a mistake by saying with finality what the Chair has said. I have great respect for the Parliamentarian. I have great respect for the ability of the Chair to interpret the Constitution.

Mr. GORTON. He did not interpret.

Mr. BIDEN. Maybe I am wrong. Was not the matter we voted on last time that the Chair declared that this is legislation amending the Constitution.

Mr. GORTON. No.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I yield.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Why does the Senator not ask the Senator from Florida if he is willing to withdraw the point of order, and we will vote up and down on the Mattingly amendment?

Mr. BIDEN. Maybe the Senator from Washington can answer.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Delaware may not have been on the floor.

Mr. BIDEN. I was not on the floor.

Mr. GORTON. The Chair declined to rule on the constitutionality of the amendment, on the basis of long-established precedent, and submitted the question to the body.

Mr. BIDEN. With the same result, though. We have to decide, on a single vote, without debate, whether this is or is not constitutional. I am not prepared to say—forget certainty—with any reasonable body of knowledge at my disposal, whether or not it is.

So I suggest that if we can find the Senator from Florida, maybe he will withdraw his point of order and let us vote up and down, because I have a number of questions for the Senator from Georgia.

For example, this is a question I do not ask him to respond to now, unless he is so inclined. The amendment reads:

(a) The President may disapprove any item of appropriation in any Act or joint resolution, except any item of appropriation for the legislative branch or the judicial branch of the government.

Why does that exempt us? I assume it is because the Senator believes separation of powers is important. How is that separation of powers exemption much different from the separation of powers as it relates to appropriations? That is a distinction on which I should like to hear the difference. I am not sure there is a distinction with a difference.

I do not want to belabor the point; but if I am compelled to vote on the constitutionality, which is what I am being asked to vote on here, I am not sure what I am going to do.

Quite frankly, I do not plan on being in this body the rest of my life. There are a lot of people on the other side of the aisle who do not plan for me to be here after next January. When I leave here I have to go back to do the thing I did before—be a lawyer. I value very much my intellectual integrity, and I value very much whether or not I conduct myself in a way that reflects upon a very significant portion of the thing I am supposedly professional at, and that is the law, at the bench and the bar.

I do not like to vote like this on something that has not been aired fully.

Mr. President, I have no desire to keep the floor. I ask the Senator from New Mexico: Is there any possiblity, in his mind, of the point of order being withdrawn and our voting up and down?

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not think so. I have talked with a few Senators, and there are a number who think it is a very pertinent issue, that two-thirds does not equal 50 percent. They take it as a very serious proposition that we should consider legislating a constitutional change. So it was not raised in any manner other than a serious one, and they would like to vote on that.

I suggest to my friend from Delaware that the issue is whether this proposal attempts to change the Constitution by statute. If the Senator is uncertain, it seems to me that he should vote against the point of order and reserve his vote for an up and down vote on the issue.

The way I am going to handle it is that I am clear in my mind that 50 percent does not equal two-thirds, and that is on the override provision. I am not suggesting that that is the right position for everyone, but it makes it clear for me that this is an attempt to legislate a constitutional change. That is the issue. So I say, yes, that is what it is, and I do not know that we are going to clarify that very much with more time.

I have great sympathy for the fact that we did not do this in an orderly manner. There are no legal briefs here. But I think we have heard about as much on it as we are going to hear, and I urge that the Senator let us vote.

There are those who have very difficult explanations, as the Senator has described, and are not able to guess on

the vote, based upon the first two votes, but I think that is all right. That has happened a number of times.

The Senator can explain his views, and everyone will know exactly what his vote means. But I think the Senate would like to go ahead and vote on the constitutional issue of legislation attempting to change the Constitution. If the Senator from Florida does not win, we will go to an up and down vote on the substance. I hope the Senator from Delaware can accommodate us. We have been waiting for this a long time and have accommodated a number of Senators.

Mr. BIDEN. I have been here close to 12 years, and on not one occasion in that time have I delayed the Senate. I have spoken at times longer than some of my colleagues wanted to hear me.

I guess we all have to wrestle with our conscience. There is no reflection on anyone who spoke on this, and I can say sincerely that we are not going to get a very scholarly discourse on the constitutionality of this question. Everybody is saying what they think their instinct tells them and how they reach that conclusion. I am not at all certain. I want it to be clear. I do not know how I am going to vote. I have to wrestle with my conscience in the next 3 minutes. I guess that is about all I will have.

If I vote against the point of order, I want to make it clear that I am not voting to say I am certain that this is constitutional. But when I vote, if I vote for the point of order, it seems to me that I find myself in the position of saying that I am pretty well certain that this is unconstitutional. Maybe, for the first time, I should vote "present." I hate to fool around with constitutional issues like this, out of our hip pocket.

I just do not like it. But I understand the dilemma. I understand the nature of the business and the nature of the place. Because of that dilemma, I am voting to uphold the point of order that this amendment, which proposes to give the President line item veto authority, is legislation amending the Constitution.

Two issues have been raised. First is the question as to whether the Congress can legislatively grant line item veto authority to the President. While Congress probably cannot do so, the issue is not entirely clear and cannot be clarified in the short time available today.

However, the second issue is more clear although it has been little debated this afternoon. If Congress could grant line item veto authority through legislation, it could not change the percentage to override such a veto from two-thirds to 50 percent, as this amendment proposes to do. Clearly, therefore, this limited portion of the amendment is unconstitutional. Therefore, I am voting to uphold the point of order on the amendment as a whole.

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I will support the point of order raised against consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia which would have the effect of altering the Constitution of the United States by legislation.

Article I, Section 7 spells out in detail the President's veto powers and the congressional power to override Presidential vetos. There is absolutely no indication in that section that the Framers contemplated allowing a President to pick and choose which sections of the laws he could approve. Indeed, granting that power in effect usurps the constitutional power of the Congress to enact the laws.

An issue of this gravity ought not be debated as an amendment to this budget bill or to any other legislation. It ought to be the subject of extensive inquiry, both as to its constitutional implications and its practical effects. And the Congress ought to debate whether or not we wish to amend the Constitution in the way properly set forth in the Constitution. We cannot change the Constitution legislatively because we lack the authority to do so.

We have debated other kinds of bills that attempt to make legislative changes in the Constitutionl. We have rejected them, because we lacked the authority to enact them. We should do the same to this proposal.●

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the point of order well taken?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. WALLOP) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Andrews	Bradley	Cohen
Baker	Bumpers	Cranston
Baucus	Burdick	Danforth
Biden	Byrd	DeConcini
Bingaman	Chafee	Denton
Boren	Chiles	Dodd
Domenici	Lautenberg	Pell
Durenberger	Leahy	Percy
Eagleton	Levin	Randolph
Ford	Long	Riegle
Gorton	Mathias	Rudman
Hatch	Matsunaga	Sarbanes
Hatfield	Melcher	Sasser
Heflin	Metzenbaum	Simpson
Huddleston	Mitchell	Stafford
Inouye	Moynihan	Stennis
Johnston	Nickles	Tower
Kassebaum	Nunn	Weicker
Kennedy	Packwood	

NAYS—34

Abdnor	Grassley	Quayle
Armstrong	Hecht	Roth
Boschwitz	Heinz	Specter
Cochran	Helms	Stevens
D'Amato	Humphrey	Symms
Dixon	Jepsen	Thurmond
Dole	Kasten	Trible
East	Lugar	Warner
Evans	Mattingly	Wilson
Exon	McClure	Zorinsky
Garn	Pressler	
Goldwater	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—10

Bentsen	Hollings	Tsongas
Glenn	Laxalt	Wallop
Hart	Murkowski	
Hawkins	Pryor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote there are 56 yeas and 34 nays. The point of order is well taken. The amendment fails.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the point of order was well taken.

Mr. BAKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have conversed with the minority leader, and with the two managers of the bill. I am happy to say that I believe we can now arrive at a time certain to vote on the Chiles amendment.

ORDER FOR VOTE ON CHILES AMENDMENT ON TUESDAY NEXT AT 3 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on the Chiles amendment at 3 p.m. on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PRO FORMA SESSION TOMORROW AND RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M., TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1984

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, with that nailed down, I am now prepared

to say something that I did not want to say. But I have a long, unbroken record of saying things that I did not want to say.

As best I can tell, we are going to be decimated by absentees on Monday to the point where I would recommend against the Senate considering matters of great importance for fear that the outcome might be so unpredictable, or distorted, that it would not be truly representative. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on tomorrow, at which time the Senate will be convened in pro forma session; and that as soon as it is convened without any business being transacted without any opening prayer, without any intervening business, and without any debate, that the Chair will place the Senate then in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CELEBRATION ON TUESDAY OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, Senators are reminded that also on Tuesday at 10 a.m. there is a centennial celebration of the birth of the former President Harry Truman. But I believe that will not interfere with the convening of the Senate, and the routine business that always occupies the Senate in the beginning hours.

With that arrangement, Mr. President, I also wish to say that there will be no more record votes today.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr BAKER. Mr. President, unless some Senator is seeking recognition to speak on the bill, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend not later than 6 p.m., in which Senators may speak for 1 minute each, with the exception of the two leaders who shall not be restricted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is a little bit of business that can be transacted by unanimous consent, I believe. While our able assistants are pulling that together, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have a few items in my folder that appear to be approved for action by unanimous consent.

I would inquire of the minority leader if he is in a position to consider the following three items: First, I will propose to indefinitely postpone S. 1979, Calendar Order No. 785; then to pass by unanimous consent H.R. 4176, Calendar Order No. 826; and also to pass House Joint Resolution 537, Calendar Order No. 829.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am happy to say to the distinguished majority leader that those three items are cleared on this side for action.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

ORDER TO INDEFINITELY POSTPONE S. 1979

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1979 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the minority leader does not mind, I ask unanimous consent that the two remaining measures, H.R. 4176 and House Joint Resolution 537, be considered en bloc.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOUNDARIES OF THE SOUTHERN UTE INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (H.R. 4176) to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWIN B. FORSYTHE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The Senate proceeded to consider House Joint Resolution 537 designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, Senators BRADLEY and LAUTENBERG introduced a similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 280, in the Senate. For the record, I would like to note that that resolution was mistakenly referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It is properly the jurisdiction of the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, last month, we marked the passing of a respected citizen of New Jersey and valued Member of the Congress, Ed Forsythe. I am pleased that the Senate is taking such prompt action on House Joint Resolution 537, which was approved by the House of Representatives earlier today. The language is very similar to the language of Senate Joint Resolution 280, which I sponsored with my colleague from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY. The bill would designate the Brigantine and Barnegat Units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge. This is a fitting memorial to Ed Forsythe, and his contribution to his district, our State, and the public at large.

Ed Forsythe was in the midst of his seventh term as Representative for the 13th and old 6th Districts, when he passed away. The people of Moorestown, in Burlington County, perhaps know him best of all. Born in Pennsylvania, Ed was reared in Burlington County and was a longtime resident of Moorestown. His family owned a dairy farm nearby. He began his political career in Moorestown as a secretary to the board of adjustment. He rose to other local positions and was elected to the State senate in 1963, where he served in leadership positions until his election to the House of Representatives in 1970.

This measure acknowledges Ed Forsythe's contributions to preserving our precious wildlife and natural resources. He was a defender of our coast. He was a leader in the passage of the Endangered Species Act, the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and the Nongame Wildlife Act. As ranking member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he occupied a valued role in the protection of the State's natural resources. The House resolution was sponsored by Congressman JOHN BREAUX, Ed's colleague in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and was cosponsored by the entire New Jersey delegation in the House as well as many others.

I urge the Senate to adopt the resolution as it was passed in the House today.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 537) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the measures were passed and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the final item, perhaps, is a conference report to accompany S. 64. If the minority leader is prepared to do so, I will ask the Chair to present that matter to the Senate.

IRISH WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on S. 64 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 64) to establish the Irish Wilderness in Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 9, 1984.)

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, today is not March 17, but nonetheless, it is a great day for the Irish—the Irish Wilderness, that is.

Since 1973, the Senators from Missouri have been trying to win wilderness designation for this small area in the southern part of our State, bordering the Eleven Point River. It is a place of special beauty, very dear to those in Missouri and throughout the Midwest who want to preserve and protect our rare enclaves of wildness unspoiled by man.

The House has now approved the conference report on S. 64, and we have reached the point of final congressional action. This Senator would like to express his special appreciation to the chairman of the Energy Committee (Mr. MCCLURE) and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands (Mr. WALLOP) for their enormous patience and perseverence in moving this bill along its tortuous track toward enactment.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the conference report on the Irish Wilderness, S. 64. It is the culmination of 10 years work to preserve some 16,500 acres of wilderness in southern Missouri. This is the final parcel in Missouri's wilderness system, and has been called the "crown jewel" of the Missouri system.

The conference report is a fair compromise between the House- and Senate-passed bills, and I believe represents an equitable balance between the conservationists and mining interests. The conference report splits the difference of acres deleted from the Senate bill, and provides for 1,020 acres to be left open for mining exploration and mining should lead or other valuable gems be found. I would have liked to have protected all of the 17,000 acres, but I believe it is a fair tradeoff.

I am delighted that after 10 years of congressional work on this legislation that the Senate is now ready to take the final vote on protection for the Irish Wilderness.

This could not have taken place without the tireless efforts of so many throughout the years. I would like to thank my colleague Senator DANFORTH for his work; Senator MCCLURE and Senator WALLOP for their efforts in sheparding the bill through the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Congressman HAROLD VOLKMER and Congressman JOHN SEIBERLING have also provided invaluable time and leadership on this bill.

I would be remiss if I did not also recognize the valiant efforts of all Missourians, and especially note the leadership of Mr. John Karel, Mr. Greg Iffrig, and Mrs. Dorothy Ellis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS ON MONDAY, MAY 7, 1984

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have not discussed this with the minority leader, but I think he will not object. I ask unanimous consent that the committees be permitted to file reports on Monday from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HARRY TRUMAN CENTENNIAL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, may I say that there will be a centennial celebration of the birth of former President Harry Truman on Tuesday. While there is no provision for a joint session or a joint meeting of the two bodies, there will be an assembly of Members in the Hall of the House of Representatives. Members are urged to attend that ceremony and to assemble here, in the Senate Chamber, so we may proceed together to the House Chamber for that purpose.

Once again, it is not a joint meeting or a joint session, but it appears desirable that those who are going to attend might assemble in this body so we may proceed to the House together instead of separately.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have not conferred with the minority leader about the Executive Calendar. According to our notes, there has been only one item cleared for action at this time. I refer to the nomination of Bruce E. Thompson, Jr., of Maryland, to be Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury. May I inquire of the minority leader if he is prepared to consider that item at this time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the minority is so prepared.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed into executive session to consider that nomination.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Bruce E. Thompson, Jr., of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was considered and confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified that the Senate has given its consent to this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 133

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I hereby transmit the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1983.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1984.*

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 134

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to Section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. Section 1703(c), I hereby report to the Congress with respect to developments between my last report of November 4, 1983, and mid-April 1984, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979.

1. The Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, established at The Hague pursuant to the Claims Settlement Agreement of January 19, 1981, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims of U.S. nationals against Iran. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered 36 more decisions for a total of 118 final decisions. Eighty-five of these decisions have been awards in favor of American claimants. Sixty of these were awards on agreed terms, authorizing and approving payment of settlements negotiated by the parties and 25 were adjudicated. Total payments to successful American claimants from the Security Account stood at over $193.1 million, as of March 31, 1984. Of the remaining 33 decisions, 16 dismissed claims for lack of jurisdiction, 3 partially dismissed claims for lack of jurisdiction, 11 dismissed claims on the merits, two approved withdrawal of a claim and one was an award in favor of the Government of Iran. As of March 31, the Tribunal had held 143 prehearing conferences and 88 hearings on the merits and had scheduled another 19 perhearings and 17 hearings through the end of September.

2. The Department of State continues to coordinate the efforts of the concerned government agencies in presenting U.S. claims against Iran as well as U.S. responses to claims brought by Iran. The Department continues to devote a great deal of time to responding to cases brought by Iran under Articles II(3) and VI(4) of the Claims Settlement Agreement, which establish Tribunal jurisdiction over questions of interpretation and implementation of the Algiers Accords. Since my last report, the Tribunal has issued an award in favor of the United States in one of these cases, holding that it had no jurisdiction over Iran's standby letter of credit claims except as counterclaims to claims brought on the underlying contract. The Full Tribunal has also determined that it does have jurisdiction over claims by individuals possessing both U.S. and Iranian nationality, as well as claims by nonprofit organizations. In both instances, the Tribunal's decisions largely accorded with the position taken by the United States. Although the United States has filed replies in all of the interpretive cases, Iran has failed to do so and most of the hearings scheduled for the past six months have been cancelled.

3. Since my last report, a few government-to-government claims based on contracts for the provision of goods or services have been resolved. The United States withdrew three claims following the receipt of payment from Iran for each claim. In addition, the Tribunal dismissed on jurisdictional grounds one claim filed by Iran and one claim filed by the United States, stating that neither was based on contract. It also issued an award in favor of Iran in one claim arising from monies deposited by the Iranian Department of the Environment with the Environmental Protection Agency. In all three claims, the Tribunal based its decision solely on the pleadings. It will most likely continue this practice with most of the remaining official claims.

4. Over the last six months, the Tribunal has continued to make progress in arbitrating the claims of U.S. nationals for $250,000 or more. More than 25 percent of these claims have been disposed of through adjudication, settlement, or voluntary withdrawal, leaving 381 claims on the docket. The Tribunal has rendered a number of significant decisions for American claimants. It has held that expropriation may be either *de facto* or *de jure* and that compensation for expropriated property must be prompt, adequate and effective. It has also decided that noncontractual Iranian counterclaims based on taxes allegedly owed by the U.S. claimant are outside its jurisdiction. As I reported in my last report, the Tribunal has requested Iran to stay court proceedings in Iran against at least eight U.S. nationals who have filed claims at the Tribunal on similar issues, but to date Iran has not complied with these requests.

5. In December 1983, the Tribunal adopted a test case approach for arbitrating claims for less than $250,000 which, as a result of withdrawals, terminations, and settlements, now number 2,706. (The procedure to be used was described in my last report.) Two additional legal officers have joined the Tribunal's staff to work exclusively on these claims. The Tribunal has selected 18 test cases and has begun to set deadlines for Iran's Statements of Defense and, in some cases, has requested Supplemental Statements of Claim from the United States. In March 1984, the Tribunal selected an additional 50 claims at random for which the United States has been requested to file Supplemental Statements of Claim. The Department of State is accordingly in the process of preparing the factual and legal argumentation for all of these claims.

6. In the last six months, there have also been some changes in the composition of the Tribunal. Richard M. Mosk, one of the three U.S. arbitrators, resigned effective January 15, 1984, and Charles N. Brower has replaced him. Mr. Brower, who had previously been named a substitute arbitrator, is a well-known international lawyer who has served as a senior member of the Office of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State. Mr. Mosk is now acting as a substitute arbitrator. In addition, Carl F. Salans and William H. Levit, Jr. have been appointed substitute U.S. arbitrators. Mr. Salans, a member of the law firm of Salans Hertzfeld Heilbronn Beardsley & van Riel in Paris, France, has an extensive background in international adjudication, arbitration and negotiation. Mr. Levit, an experienced litigator, is a senior partner in the law firm of Godfrey & Kahn, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

7. The January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran also provided for direct negotiations between U.S. banks and Bank Markazi Iran concerning the payment of nonsyndicated debt claims of U.S. banks against Iran from the $1.418 billion escrow account presently held by the Bank of England. Since my last report, only one additional settlement has been reached. The Bank

of America received $472 million in settlement of its claim, of which $289.1 million was subsequently paid to Iran, primarily for interest on Iran's domestic deposits with the bank. Thus, as of March 31, 1984, there have been 25 bank settlements, totaling approximately $1.4 billion. Iran has received $616 million in settlement of its claims against the banks. About 24 bank claims remain outstanding.

8. On December 22, 1983, the Department of the Treasury amended Section 535.504 of the Iranian Assets Control Regulations to continue in effect indefinitely the prohibition of that section on any final judgment or order by a U.S. court disposing of any interest of Iran in any standby letter of credit, performance bond or similar obligation. The prohibition was promulgated to facilitate the ongoing implementation of the Algiers Accords and, especially, to allow the resolution before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal of the many claims and issues pending before it involving letters of credit. The prohibition was extended indefinitely because it is not possible to predict how much time will be required in order to resolve these claims.

9. Although the Tribunal has made some progress over the past six months in arbitrating the claims before it, significant American interests remain unresolved. Iran has challenged the validity of four more of the Tribunal's awards in favor of U.S. claimants in the District Court of The Hague and has attempted to delay the arbitral process through repeated requests for extensions and failure to appear at Tribunal proceedings.

10. Financial and diplomatic aspects of the relationship with Iran continue to present an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1984.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:52 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1212. An act for the relief of 16 employees of the Charleston Naval Shipyard.

At 1:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill (S. 597) to convey certain lands to Show Low, Ariz.; and that the House recedes from its amendment to the title of the bill.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 64) to establish the Irish Wilderness in Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 38) entitled the "Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act disagreed to by the Senate; it agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PERKINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HARRISON, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. MCCAIN as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7. An act to make permanent certain of the authorizations of appropriations under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1963;

H.R. 4263. An act to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, as wilderness areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness; and

H.R. 5041. An act to promote research and development, encourage innovation, and make necessary and appropriate amendments to the antitrust laws.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

H.R. 2733. An act to extend and improve the existing program of research, development, and demonstration in the production and manufacture of guayule rubber, and to broaden such program to include other critical agricultural materials;

S.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of May 1984 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; and

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean".

The enrolled bill and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 5:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolutions, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 20, 1984, through May 26, 1984, as "National Arts With the Handicapped Week"; and

S.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5100. An act authorizing appropriations to the Executive Director, United States Holocaust Memorial Council, for services necessary to perform the functions of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council;

H.R. 5172. An act to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, and for related purposes;

H.R. 5287. An act to amend title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit additional funds to be used to continue awards under certain multiyear grants.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution to permit the 1984 Olympic torch relay to be run through the United States Capitol Grounds.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7. An act to make permanent certain of the authorizations of appropriations under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 4263. An act to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, as wilderness areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 5041. An act to promote research and development, encourage innovation, and make necessary and appropriate amendments to the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5172. An act to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5100. An act authorizing appropriations to the Executive Director, United States Holocaust Memorial Council, for services necessary to perform the functions of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution to permit the 1984 Olympic torch relay to be run through the United States Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 2, 1984, the follow-

ing bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar by unanimous consent:

H.R. 5287. An act to amend title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit additional funds to be used to continue awards under certain multiyear grants.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary announced that on today, May 3, 1984, he presented to the President of the United States the following joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of May 1984 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3152. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on abnormal occurrences at licensed nuclear plants for the third calendar quarter of 1983; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3153. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, jointly transmitting a report on the activities of the two Departments with respect to the Emergency Striped Bass Research Study during 1982 and 1983; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3154. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authorization of appropriations for the United States International Trade Commission for fiscal year 1986; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3155. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly report on the expenditures and need for worker adjustment assistance training funds under the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3156. A communication from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States in the sixty day period prior to April 23, 1984; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3157. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5 125, adopted by the Council on April 10, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3158. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 5 124, adopted by the Council on April 10, 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3159. A communication from the Adminstrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the procurement actions of the Department of Defense for the one week period ending September 30, 1983; to the Committee on Govenmental Affairs.

EC-3160. A communication from the Freedom of Information Officer, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Freedom of Information Act report of the Agency for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3161. A communication from the Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3162. A communication from the Chairman of the Advisory Panel on Financing Elementary and Secondary Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the comments of the Panel on the School Finance Project report submitted on February 29, 1984; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3163. A communication from the Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant discretion to the Administrator to administer garage and parking appropriations and fees as a revolving fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3164. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a fiscal year 1981 Anti-Deficiency Act violation by the Southeastern Power Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3165. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second annual report on accomplishments under the Airport Improvement Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3166. A communication from the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administration entitled "Annual Energy Review 1983"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3167. A communication from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey property to the Committee for a National Museum of the Building Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3168. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Assistant Secretary Designate of the Treasury for Legislative Affairs, transmitting jointly, pursuant to law, a report on progress toward achieving the goals of Title VII Human Rights of the International Financial Institutions Act for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3169. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3170. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an altered Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3171. A communication from the Chief Immigration Judge, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on grants of suspension of deportation under sec. 244(a) (1) and (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3172. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3173. A communication from the Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on DOD procurement from Small and Other Business Firms on October 1983; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC-3174. A communication from the Administrator of the Veterans Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue major programs whose continuity is vital in meeting commitments; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-630. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Iowa Bankers Association of Iowa concerning the distressed economic problems experienced by some of Iowa's farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

POM-631. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 111

"Whereas, the state of Iowa, one of the major agricultural states in the United States, is suffering from a financial crisis in agriculture that affects not only the economic health of this state, but also the economic health of the midwestern and national economies, due to forces beyond the power of the state to control or abrogate; and

"Whereas, the viability of Iowa agriculture rests upon the 115,000 farms in this state, and a percentage of these farms have been beset by circumstances beyond their control including sustained high interest rates, declining land values which have eroded farm equity, commodity prices below the cost of production, and successive years of weather-related problems; and

"Whereas, a survey of farmers and financial institutions in Iowa conducted by the Iowa Department of Agriculture indicates that forty percent of the farms with land and operational loans have a debt-to-asset ratio of 41.7 percent when the state average is 29.5 percent, as compared to a state average of 14.3 percent in 1977, and that possibly ten percent of the farms in Iowa will not survive, resulting in the loss of 11,000 farms and 60,000 farm residents; and

"Whereas, the need for additional credit and refinancing for farmers through federally and state-chartered financial institutions has been exhausted, and the state government's budget reflects the fact that eight out of ten jobs in Iowa depend on the agricultural economy, leaving the state with insufficient resources to address this problem at a time when spring planting is only a few weeks away; and

"Whereas, there are federal emergency assistance programs available, that with

proper and immediate modification, will allow those farms with the greatest need to qualify for additional and necessary assistance; now therefore,

"*Be it resolved by the Senate, the House concurring.* That the Seventieth General Assembly requests the following actions be immediately taken by the federal government to assist the state in providing this emergency assistance:

"1. Modify the Farmers Home Administration Emergency Loan Program for the 1983 drought disaster to include the following:

"a. Allow farmers with negative cash flows but sound equity positions and reasonable prospects of success to participate.

"b. Use 1982 price levels in the calculation of the loss and valuation of equity for collateral.

"c. Waive the 30 percent minimum loss criteria so that more farmers would have the opportunity to obtain some funding for 1984 at advantageous rates.

"d. Extend the sign-up period for an additional 60 to 90 days.

"2. Make additional credit available through the Farmers Home Administration under the low resource category to farmers with negative cash flows but with prospects of survival, especially when the interest rate savings will return their operation to a profitable basis.

"3. Allow deferral of the repayment for the advanced 1983 deficiency payment due in 1984 for at least one year.

"4. Modify the emergency feed grain program to make higher grades of corn available at lower costs, and lower the 30 percent loss criteria to expand the eligibility of livestock producers so that government corn can be utilized and at the same time improve 1984 farm profitability.

"5. Mandate the Small Business Administration to increase the number of loans accepted under disaster applications from agricultural businesses.

"6. Mandate the Internal Revenue Service to allow farmers the opportunity to sell their accumulated capital losses or investment tax credits to outside investors, thus encouraging investment in agriculture at a time when it is critical that new funds be found.

"7. Include grass and hay crops in the Federal Crop Insurance Program.

"8. Lower Federal Crop Insurance premiums for those farms which qualify for emergency disaster assistance.

"9. Pay the deficiency payments due for the 1984 feed grain program in advance.

"10. Allow grazing or baling of diverted acres under the 1984 Farm Program.

"11. Increase funding for the study of alternative uses for corn and soybeans; and

"*Be it further resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Agriculture, and each member of the Iowa Congressional delegation."

POM-632. A resolution adopted by the Town of Provincetown, Massachusetts opposing the use of United States tax dollars for any type of military aid to any government of Central America, or for any overt or covert military activity aimed at destabilizing the government of any Central American nation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

POM-633. A resolution adopted by the Committee of the Township of Green, New Jersey relating to cable television; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM-634. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Florissant, Missouri relating to the Cable Telecommunications Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM-635. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 1658

"Whereas, Federal law and regulation permits the formulation of discriminatory freight contracts involving agricultural commodities which unduly favor certain shippers; and

"Whereas, These discriminatory freight contracts generally have been offered to large shippers while small shippers are offered contracts that are not nearly as economical or advantageous; and

"Whereas, This discriminatory practice has placed so large a burden on small shippers trying to remain competitive in the marketplace, that they may be forced out of the shipping business; and

"Whereas, The Staggers Rail Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-448) and the discriminatory freight contracts that have been formulated thereunder have caused rural communities to lose rail service altogether due to the abandonment of rail branch lines; and

"Whereas, In addition, these discriminatory contracts have greatly increased the transportation of agricultural commodities to the large shippers on our highways which places a large burden on the states and their citizens to keep the highways in good condition; and

"Whereas, The Staggers Rail Act of 1980 has allowed the ICC to approve unreasonable high rates on captive coal traffic; and

"Whereas, These discriminatory contracts violate the concept of a competitive economy by providing a chosen few with noncompetitive advantages: Now, therefore,

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring therein:* That we memorialize the President and Congress to amend the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 as follows:

"(1) Require the full disclosure of all economic terms of rail contracts involving agricultural commodities;

"(2) apply a standard of reasonableness to market dominance by a rail carrier so that rail rates may be challenged as unreasonable at some level;

"(3) require mandatory joint-line rates and routes between rail carriers whose lines intersect and join;

"(4) require adequate notice of rail rate changes;

"(5) protest against discriminatory pricing and promote competitive, effective and economical transportation services by and between all modes;

"(6) establish new procedures permitting entry of additional rail carriers onto lines dominated by a single carrier;

"(7) grant agricultural shippers the right to reciprocal switching at reasonable cost to protect competition in all markets where more than one carrier is operating;

"(8) establish a national system of compensation and use that fairly and equitably treats both carrier-owned and shipper-owned and leased rail cars;

"(9) deny the ICC authority to exempt grain and oilseeds from rail regulation;

"(10) require that before an agricultural branch line may be abandoned the railroad must first prove to the ICC that the rate of return on investment on that branch line is less than the overall rate of return on investment of the entire railroad company as determined in the latest ICC's revenue adequacy determinations;

"(11) direct the ICC to interpret the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 in a manner which will be more receptive to the regulation of rates of captive coal shippers which was originally intended by Congress; and

"*Be it further resolved:* That the Secretary of State be directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Kansas Congressional Delegation."

POM-636. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL No. 11

"We, your Memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho assembled in the Second Regular Session of the Forty-seventh Idaho Legislature, do hereby respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the latest U.S. Department of Interior Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf (Canis lupus irremotus) Recovery 'Technical Review Draft' identifies as 'The Idaho Recovery Area' the Selway Bitterroot, River of No Return, Sawtooth and the Gospel Hump wilderness areas totaling about 3.75 million acres as well as about 3 million acres of U.S. Forest Service lands now managed as multiple use; and

"Whereas, the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Draft Management guidelines call for extreme curtailment of multiple use activities on those lands incorporated into any wolf recovery plan; and

"Whereas, the vast majority of testimony given at public hearings held in Idaho in regard to a wolf recovery project as well as comments submitted by the public on the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Plan overwhelmingly oppose any wolf recovery plan on lands now managed for multiple use and, indeed, to the entire Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Plan itself; and

"Whereas, the environmental conditions that existed a century ago that were conducive to wolf habitat no longer exist today, particularly on lands now managed for multiple use; and

"Whereas, the Minnesota Wolf Recovery Plan has shown that the State has no effective control measures once the wolf population is restored: now, therefore,

"*Be it resolved by the members of the Second Regular Session of the Forty-seventh Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein,* That the United States Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service is hereby urged to terminate any program to reestablish wolf populations in the State of Idaho that would deny Idahoans their historic rights and privileges on federal lands now managed as multiple use.

"*Be it further resolved:* That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward copies of this Memorial to President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of the Interior William Clark, Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the Chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Chairman of the House Interior and In-

sular Affairs Committee, the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States, and the Governors of the western states."

POM-637. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"SENATE RESOLUTION No. 128

"Whereas, the State of Hawaii is dependent on imported oil for approximately 90 per cent of its energy requirements and the development of alternative energy sources is a high priority in the State's efforts to increase energy self-sufficiency and to stimulate economic development; and

"Whereas, the BioEnergy Development Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of C. Brewer and Co., since 1978 has had a cooperative agreement with the United States Department of Energy and later a subcontract with Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., to demonstrate the technical and economic feasibility of developing eucalyptus plantations for energy production in Hawaii; and

"Whereas, the project has received $2.3 million in federal funds through March 1984 and C. Brewer and Co. has contributed resources totalling $630,625; and

"Whereas, the project is unique in the United States because it involves a very short crop rotation time of 6 years in contrast to other tree crops with rotation periods of several decades, and extensive experimentation is being conducted to determine the optimum cultivation and operation practices necessary for commercialization; and

"Whereas, an assessment after the first five years of the project found that '. . . production of biomass for fuel in short rotation eucalyptus planatations on existing land can have returns competitive with alternative land uses'; and

"Whereas, a crucial point has been reached in the project as the first crop is ready for harvest; however, additional funds are needed to verify harvesting costs and to determine further the economic feasibility of the concept; and

"Whereas, BioEnergy Development Corp. has requested a five-year extension of its subcontract with Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., and $314,150 in funds for the year June 1, 1984 to May 31, 1985, and extension of the subcontract and continued funding would result in the greatest possible benefit from the eucalyptus tree demonstration project; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twelfth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1984, That this body expresses its enthusiastic support of BioEnergy Development Corp.'s eucalyptus tree farm demonstration project as an important effort in alternative energy resource development in Hawaii and the nation; and

"Be it further resolved, That this body urges the United States Department of Energy and Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., to provide additional funding to the BioEnergy Development Corp.'s eucalyptus tree farm project on the island of Hawaii, in order to allow continuation of the research and development efforts of six years so that results of the demonstration can benefit other biomass development efforts in the nation; and

"Be it further resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy, the Chief Executive Officer of Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., the Manager of BioEnergy Development Corp., the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chairpersons of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and the members of Hawaii's congressional delegation."

POM-638. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 1644

"Whereas, The United States Army Corps of Engineers has acquired over 340,000 acres of land pursuant to the Federal Flood Control Act of 1941, as amended; and

"Whereas, The United States Army Corps of Engineers has licensed over 106,000 acres of land it has acquired pursuant to the Federal Flood Control Act of 1941, as amended, to the Kansas fish and game commission; and

"Whereas, Upon acquisition of such land by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, such land is removed from the property tax rolls resulting in substantial loss of ad valorem property tax revenues to the local taxing units in which such land is located; and

"Whereas, The Federal Flood Control Act provides the 75% of all revenues derived from the land under the management of the United States Army Corps of Engineers be paid to the local taxing units in which such land is located as payment toward lost tax revenues from such land after it is removed from the tax rolls when acquired for flood control projects; and

"Whereas, Upon licensing of flood control land to the Kansas fish and game commission, payments to the local taxing units by the United States Army Corps of Engineers cease; and

"Whereas, The present licenses between the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Kansas fish and game commission required that revenues derived from the land licensed to and under the management of the Kansas fish and game commission be expended on the flood control project of the licensed area, thereby prohibiting any payment to compensate the local taxing units for lost property tax revenues: Now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring therein: That we urge the President and Congress to amend the procedures by which the United States Army Corps of Engineers licenses land to the Kansas fish and game commission to allow the commission to pay to the local taxing units in which flood control land is located a portion of the revenues derived from the land under the management of the Kansas fish and game commission to compensate the local taxing units for lost property tax revenues; and

"Be it further resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Senator Robert Dole, Senator Nancy Kassebaum, Representative Pat Roberts, Representative Jim Slattery, Representative Larry Winn, Representative Dan Glickman and Representative Bob Whittaker."

POM-639. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance.

"RESOLUTIONS

"Whereas, the introduction of industrial robots in the United States workplace is occurring without public policies in place to protect American business industry and American workers; and

"Whereas, certain studies indicate that 1.4 American jobs are displaced for every one job created by industrial robots; and

"Whereas, the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) of the Congress of the United States convened an "exploratory workshop on the social impacts of robotics" in 1981; and

"Whereas, said OTA workshop noted that robots are being produced at a rate of about 1,500 per year, with predictions that this will probably increase to between 20,000 and 60,000 robots per year by the year 1990; and

"Whereas, the OTA identified major users of industrial robots, or planned major users, to include the domestic auto makers and large manufacturers such as General Electric Company; and

"Whereas, there are no national policies in place to help retrain workers displaced by industrial robots, to create public incentives for development of alternate technology systems designed around human beings, to create public incentives to help domestic employers compete fairly with foreign competitors who are more advanced in the use of robotics; and

"Whereas, there are no national policies in place to finance retraining of workers and public incentives for business and industry; and

"Whereas, a transaction tax on foreign and domestic made robots may be deemed to be in the public interest; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby urges the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to move expeditiously to develop a national policy to protect American employers and American workers by providing retraining for displaced workers affording public incentives for alternate technology systems for displaced businesses and industries, and by determining the most appropriate tax policies to achieve protection of American businesses, industries and workers displaced by robotics; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the clerk of the House of Representatives to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the United States Congress and the Members thereof from this commonwealth."

POM-640. Recommendations and resolution adopted by the North Atlantic Assembly at their 29th annual session; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-641. A resolution adopted by the Western States Land Commissioners Association concerning issues which affect significantly the land resources of the West; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-642. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1021

"Whereas, Between 1960 and 1975 more than three million American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines served their country in Southeast Asia; and

"Whereas, The great majority of such veterans were neither professional soldiers nor volunteers but merely young men called by this country to do their duty; and

"Whereas, Unlike the honored veterans of past wars, the Vietnam veterans returned to indifference, embarrassment, and even hostility; and

"Whereas, A nation ambivalent about the war in which its young men fought and died has gradually increased its recognition and has recently honored the Vietnam veterans for their sacrifice by the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C., in November, 1982; and

"Whereas, The debt owed the Vietnam veterans by their country derives not from the success of its policies but from the nobility of their sacrifice; and

"Whereas, The deeds and actions of these Americans need to be remembered so that all present and future generations may recall their sacrifices; and

"Whereas, The Congress of the United States has declared May 7, 1975, as the termination date of United States involvement in Vietnam; now, therefore;

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein: That May 7 shall be designated Vietnam Veterans' Recognition Day to honor those who served their country bravely and honorably in Southeast Asia.

"Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Veterans Administration."

POM-643. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

"SENATE RESOLUTION No. 149

"Whereas, There currently exists on the part of the United States government a desperate need to accelerate its commitment and attention to programs and services for the prevention, treatment, and cure of arthritis and other musculoskeletal disorders. Regarded as the most widespread of diseases afflicting Americans, arthritis debilitates nearly one out of every seven of our countrymen; and

"Whereas, Presently, the federal government arthritis programs are grouped with several unrelated diseases in the National Institutes of Arthritis, Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases. However, the prevalence of arthritis and related diseases among Americans, and its financial, social, and personal toll, make it imperative that a separate institute be established to concentrate solely on this problem; and

"Whereas, During the Ninety-seventh Congress, both the House of Representatives and the Senate passed separate legislation, supported by the Arthritis Foundation, which contained provisions to create an Arthritis Institute. However, time expired before a single bill could be passed by both houses. Under the proposed legislation, the new institute would conduct, assist, and foster research coordination within the institute and among other research programs in the National Institutes of Health and elsewhere. Moreover, it would operate an information clearinghouse and administer programs of research training in the international exchange of experts. Furthermore, the creation of an Arthritis Institute would result in major advances in the prevention, treatment, and cure of this disease. Certainly, the great human and economic benefit that this institute would offer to the citizens of our nation make it incumbent upon the members of the Michigan Senate to call on the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation establishing such an institute; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate,* That the members of this legislative body memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation establishing an Arthritis Institute within the National Institutes of Health; and be it further"

* * * * *

POM-644. A petition from Citizens of Illinois relating to Vietnam Veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 768: A bill to amend the Clean Air Act (Rept. No. 98-426).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1841: A bill to promote research and development, encourage innovation, stimulate trade, and make necessary and appropriate amendments to the antitrust, patent, and copyright laws (Rept. No. 98-427).

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 329: Resolution expressing the support of the Senate for the expansion of confidence building measures between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., including the establishment of nuclear risk reduction centers, in Washington and in Moscow, with modern communications linking the centers (Rept. No. 98-428).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S.J. Res. 258: Joint resolution to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984 as "National Safety in the Workplace Week".

S.J. Res. 260: Joint resolution designating the week beginning on November 11, 1984, as "National Blood Pressure Awareness Week".

S.J. Res. 273: Joint resolution to designate the week of May 13, 1984, through May 19, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week".

S.J. Res. 274: Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day".

S.J. Res. 279: Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week".

S.J. Res. 283: Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for the terms indicated:

For the remainder of the terms expiring July 13, 1984:

William Clark Durant III, of Michigan, vice William J. Olson.

Paul B. Eaglin, of North Carolina, vice Robert Sherwood Stubbs.

Pepe J. Mendez, of Colorado, vice Peter Joseph Ferrara.

Thomas F. Smegal, Jr., of California, vice David E. Satterfield.

Basile Joseph Uddo, of Louisiana, vice Howard H. Dana, Jr.

For the remainder of the terms expiring July 13, 1986:

Hortencia Benavides, of Texas, vice Ronald B. Frankum.

Leaanne Bernstein, of Maryland, vice Albert Angrisani.

For the terms expiring July 13, 1986:

Lorain Miller, of Michigan, vice Milton M. Masson, Jr.

Claude Galbreath Swafford, of Tennessee, vice Robert E. McCarthy.

Robert A. Valois, of North Carolina, vice Donald Eugene Santarelli.

For the terms expiring July 13, 1987:

William Clark Durant III, of Michigan. (Reappointment)

Paul B. Eaglin, of North Carolina. (Reappointment)

Pepe J. Mendez, of Colorado. (Reappointment)

Thomas F. Smegal, Jr., of California. (Reappointment)

Basile Joseph Uddo, of Louisiana. (Reappointment)

(The above nominations were reported from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

Michael B. Wallace, of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 13, 1984; and

Michael B. Wallace, of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for the term expiring July 13, 1987. (Reappointment)

(The above nomination was reported from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, without recommendation subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

Fred William Alvarez, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the term expiring July 1, 1988.

(The above nomination was reported from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources with the recommendation that it be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. Tower, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the following nomi-

nations: Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., to be appointed to serve for a second term as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Lt. Gen. James A. Abrahamson, U.S. Air Force, to be reassigned in the grade of lieutenant general, and Lt. Gen. William I. Rolya, U.S. Army, (age 56) to be placed on the retired list. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in addition, in the Army there are 10 permanent promotions to the grade of lieutenant colonel and below (list begins with Pamela K. Burns), in the Army there are 978 appointments to the grade of second lieutenant (list begins with Troy A. Aarthun), in the Naval Reserve there are 454 permanent promotions to the grade of captain (list begins with Edward Ronald Abel), in the Naval Reserve there are 25 permanent appointments to the grade of ensign and below (list begins with Richard P. Anderson), and in the Marine Corps there are 166 permanent appointments to the grade of second lieutenant (list begins with Daniel J. Adams). Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to save the expense of printing again, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The nominations ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk were printed in the RECORD of April 24, 1984, at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 2627. A bill to establish a system of natural resources research institutes within the States of the United States-Mexico border region; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DENTON:

S. 2628. A bill to authorize appropriations for title X of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HART, Mr. PELL, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 2629. A bill to amend the Energy Conservation in Existing Buildings Act of 1976 to provide for the weatherization of the remaining eligible low income dwelling units throughout the United States, to create additional employment in weatherization related industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. BYRD (for Mr. HART) (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. PELL, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. COHEN):

S. 2630. A bill to amend the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank Act to authorize appropriations for the provision of financial assistance through fiscal year 1990 and to provide financial assistance to builders of highly energy efficient buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. HART, Mr. PELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. COHEN):

S. 2631. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve the administration of the Federal energy conservation program for consumer products, to enhance consumer information programs to encourage the purchase of more energy efficient appliances, and to implement efficiency standards for furnaces, central air-conditioners, and water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. PELL, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. HART, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 2632. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve consumer information and fuel efficiency with respect to passenger automobiles, light trucks, and tires, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on noncomplying manufacturers (in lieu of penalty), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. PELL, and Mr. TSONGAS):

S. 2633. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act so as to authorize the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study for the purpose of determining the extent of contamination of certain fish and whether such contamination creates a threat to public health; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. MITCHELL):

S. 2634. A bill to provide for a mutual and verifiable moratorium on the testing and deployment of new nuclear ballistic missiles and antisatellite weapons and the testing of nuclear warheads; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

S. 2635. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration for fiscal year 1985; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SASSER (for himself, Mr. PELL, Mr. NUNN, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. SABRANES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. BUMPERS):

S. 2636. A bill to require the Administrator of General Services to notify State and local governments and agencies thereof prior to the disposal of surplus real property; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. MELCHER):

S. 2637. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to modify the amount of dependent care and excess shelter expense deductions which are allowable under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. Res. 386. A resolution entitled the "Mandela Freedom Resolution"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. NUNN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HART, Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. Con. Res. 110. A concurrent resolution in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Brown V. Board of Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. DURENBERGER):

S. Con. Res. 111. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a mutual and verifiable moratorium on any further deployment of sea launched cruise missiles equipped with nuclear warheads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 2627. A bill to establish a system of natrual resources research institutes within the States of the United States-Mexico border region; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

BORDER STATES NATURAL RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1984

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, today I an introducing legislation to support and continue research into the wise management, use, and development of natural resources in the United States-Mexico border region. I am prompted to introduce this legislation because of the extreme pressures that are presently, and will be in the future, placed on this rapidly growing and developing region.

In the United States, the Sunbelt of the Southwest has grown at extraordinary rates, and all projections point to continued substantial growth. On the Mexican side of the border, a national population growth rate of 3.2 percent per year is projected, which translates into a doubling of the national population every 20 years.

This population growth on both sides of the border will place tremendous pressures on the natural resources of the area—including water, land, and air resources. Coupled with the demands of the burgeoning population will be continued development of the substantial energy reserves in the Colorado River Basin. Further development will place additional demands on the limited water resources which will directly affect water users downstream from the development.

Water quality, as well as quantity, is a critical concern of the border region. Recent media attention has focused on the pollution traveling from Mexico to southern California in the New River. This pollution threatens public health in California. Contaminated water of the San Pedro River is traveling from Mexico into Arizona. That pollution threatens agricultural lands and crops, and residents are concerned about possible adverse health effects.

Air resources are similarly threatened. For example, NO_x emissions are significant in the border region. In fact, one study estimates that those border emissions represent 37.7 percent of the national emissions of nitrogen oxide. Additional growth and development will simply place an even further strain on air resources of the region.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation to establish a system of Border Natural Resources Research Institutes within the institutions of higher education of the four border States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. The institutes would devote research efforts into developing strategies to effectively manage and develop the resources of the border region. They are eligible for grants from the Department of Education to support such research. The legislation authorizes $1,200,000 for fiscal year 1985, $1,600,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1987 for grants, and appropriated funds must be awarded equally among each of the four border States.

Mr. President, this is a modest program, but one that is essential for one of the most rapidly growing areas of the country. The legislation envisions research into problems that presently exist in the area, but also affords us the opportunity to address and avoid problems that could arise in the future because of the demands placed on the area. I believe that this is an exceedingly important program, and urge its adoption.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2627

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Border States Natural Resources Research Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) natural resources in the United States-Mexico border region constitute a far-reaching asset of immense significance to the United States;

(2) it is in the national interest of the United States to develop the skilled manpower (including scientists, engineers and technicians) and the knowledge necessary for the prudent utilization and management of these resources; and

(3) the wise management of the border natural resources can substantially benefit the United States and people of the region by providing greater economic opportunities, including expanded employment and commerce, and the enjoyment and use of these resources.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to establish a system of border States natural resources research institutes to—

(1) stimulate, sponsor and assist present research programs on management and utilization of natural resources in the United States-Mexico border region; and

(2) train specialists in natural resources in the United States-Mexico border region.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this Act:

(1) The term "border State" means the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas.

(2) The term "institute" means a natural resources institute, center, or other equivalent division of an institution of higher education.

(3) The term "institution of higher education" has the same meaning given such term by section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(4) The term "natural resources" means physical, chemical, geological and biological resources.

(5) The term "natural resources research" includes scientific, engineering, legal, social, political and economic studies relating to the management, use, development, recovery and control of the natural resources in the United States-Mexico border region.

(6) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

GRANTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 4. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, to make grants to one or more institutions of higher education to establish and support border natural resources research institutes in each border State.

(2) In order to receive assistance under this Act an institution of higher education must—

(A) be located in a border State, and

(B) have a competent and qualified natural resources institute.

(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated $1,200,000 for fiscal year 1985; $1,600,000 for fiscal year 1986; and $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1987 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(2) The Secretary shall distribute amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) of this subsection in each fiscal year equally among the border States.

USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. (a)(1) Grants under this Act shall be used to initiate and support natural resources research programs and provide for the training of specialists of border States natural resources problems.

(2) Such research may include—

(A) examination of aspects of water resources, land resources, air resources, and other border natural resources problems; and

(B) information dissemination activities (including identifying, assembling, interpreting and publishing the results of research deemed potentially significant for the solution of border States natural resources problems); providing means for improved communication reggarding such research results (including prototype operations); and ascertaining the existing and potential effectiveness of such research for aiding in the solution of practical problems (taking into account the varying conditions and needs of the respective border States and the research projects being conducted by agencies of the Federal and State governments in border States, the agricultural experiment stations, and others).

(b) Funds paid to an institution of higher education for use by an institute may be used for any allowable costs within the meaning of the Federal procurement regulations that establish principles for determining costs applicable to research and development under grants and contracts with educational institutions (41 CFR 1-15.3), including future amendments to such regulations.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Each institution of higher education located in a border State desiring to receive assistance under this Act shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Each such application shall—

(1) describe the activities of the institution of higher education for which assistance is sought;

(2) describe the programs and activities for which assistance is sought;

(3) designate an officer of the institution of higher education as the officer responsible for the administration of the program assembled under this Act;

(4) provide such fiscal control and funds accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursal of and accounting for Federal funds paid under this Act;

(5) provide assurances that the institution of higher education will prepare and submit an annual report to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year, on work accomplished and that status of project underway, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursement; and

(6) such other assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(b) The Secretary shall approve an application from each institution of higher education which meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH

SEC. 7. Each institution of higher education receiving assistance under this Act, shall, to the extent practicable, plan and conduct programs of each institute receiving assistance under this Act in cooperation with other agencies which may contribute to the solution of the border States natural resources problems. Funds made available under this Act may be used for paying the necessary expenses of planning, coordinating and conducting such cooperative research.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 8. From allocations made pursuant to section 4(b)(2), the Secretary shall pay to the institutions of higher education located in each border State the cost of applications approved under section 6.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this Act, and encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of cooperation among institutions of higher education located in the border States receiving assistance under this Act and other

research organizations located in border States.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HART, Mr. PELL, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 2629. A bill to amend the Energy Conservation in Existing Buildings Act of 1976 to provide for the weatherization of the remaining eligible low-income dwelling units throughout the United States, to create additional employment in weatherization-related industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

WEATHERIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1984

● Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, the weatherization of older, drafty, and poorly insulated homes is crucial to the ability of low-income, elderly, and unemployed individuals who, out of economic necessity, want to reduce their home energy costs. In addition, weatherization is one of the most cost-effective ways we can reduce our national and regional dependence on costly imported oil.

For these reasons, I am sponsoring legislation reauthorizing the weatherization program and setting up a 10-year, $13 billion program aimed at weatherizing an estimated 13 million homes now eligible and in need of such assistance.

Through this legislation, additional jobs will be created and further energy savings will be achieved, enhancing significantly the long-term security of the United States. An important need on the part of the elderly, low-income, and unemployed will also be met through the weatherization program.

As a Senator from a cold-weather State, I have long been sensitive to the severe personal hardship increases in home energy prices have had on many households over the past several years. The cost of residential fuel oil has tripled from the 1976 average price of 40.6 cents a gallon to the present average price of $1.19 per gallon. Just when the cost of home heating oil began to stabilize, the price of natural gas began to soar.

This past winter in Maine again demonstrated the vulnerability of certain segments of our population to rapid increases in energy prices. In a 6-week period between mid-December and the beginning of February, prices rose an average of 18.5 cents a gallon for heating oil, and, in some areas of the State, they rose by 25 cents.

A recent study published by the National Consumer Law Center concludes that low-income, elderly, and unemployed residents of Maine pay a proportionally greater amount of their income for energy purposes than do residents of other States. Fully 71 percent of monthly income is spent by some poorer residents of Maine on their winter energy costs. That figure assumes added significance when one considers the low and often limited incomes on which these individuals depend. This study is the latest evidence validating the need for an expended weatherization assistance program.

It is with concern for such affected individuals and families that supporters of the Federal weatherization program seek to extend it for another 10 years, demonstrating the Federal commitment to this program and aiming to achieve the goal of improving the energy efficiency of the remaining 13 million eligible households in America.

The key provisions of this legislation are the following:

First, the establishment of a 10-year goal for the weatherization of all eligible units. To reach this goal, $500 million is authorized in fiscal year 1985, $850 million in fiscal year 1986, $1.15 billion in fiscal year 1987, and $1.5 billion in each of the next 7 fiscal years;

Second, strengthened language to insure that adequate funds are used for evaluation, monitoring, and information transfer, with the goals of identifying the costs of weatherization and the amount of energy that can be saved, identifying ways to cut program costs and enhance energy savings, and developing recommendations for program improvements; and

Third, the earmarking of $40 million for a 2-year low-income rental housing weatherization pilot program. Grant candidates would submit proposed housing projects to DOE, which would award grants on a competitive basis after review by a public advisory committee. The results of the pilot would then be circulated to all low-income weatherization program officers for their information and possible emulation.

I believe these provisions of the bill will result in a strengthened Federal weatherization program, increased availability and dissemination of important program-related information, and a more cost-effective energy savings program.

The Federal weatherization program has resulted in the weatherization of over 1 million homes since the program's inception in 1977, contributing energy savings of 15 to 30 percent for enrolled households.

Much work remains to be done if we are to achieve the twin objectives of reduced dependence on imported sources of energy and increased energy savings for those who can least afford the costs of heating or cooling a home.

The Federal weatherization program is an extremely valuable one and its reauthorization deserves the attention of the Senate this year.●

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am delighted to join in cosponsoring S. 2629, the Weatherization Amendments of 1984.

The development of programs designed to meet the weatherization needs of low-income persons in this country has long been an area of special concern for me. In 1974, I coauthored legislation creating in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, a special program for "emergency energy conservation services." This became the sole Federal authority for low-income energy aid at that time. In 1975, as a member of the Banking Committee, I authored in the Senate the Residential Insulation Assistance Act of 1975, which was ultimately enacted as the Energy Conservation in Existing Buildings Act of 1976, title IV-A of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (Public Law 94-385). This measure authorized the Federal Energy Administration to establish the national weatherization assistance program for low-income households, the program which is being extended and expanded in the legislation being introduced today. This weatherization program, operated by the Department of Energy—DOE—since the old Federal Energy Administration was incorporated into the new DOE, is the sole Federal categorical grant program for weatherization assistance. A similar program in the Community Services Administration was phased out in 1978. The authorization for appropriations for this DOE weatherization program was extended by the National Energy Conservation Policy Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-619) and the Energy Security Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-294). Appropriations for this program are currently authorized through fiscal year 1984 under the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 95-35).

The low-income weatherization assistance program provides grants to States, which work through local governments, community action agencies, and nonprofit organizations, to weatherize the homes of low-income persons. Weatherization funds are used to purchase materials for insulating homes, as well as for associated labor costs. Currently, up to $1,600 may be spent in areas of high labor costs—such as many areas of California—on a single household for weatherization materials and labor. The measure we are introducing today would raise that ceiling on expenses to $2,000.

Mr. President, recipients of weatherization grants from States are directed to give priority to households with older Americans or disabled persons. Other eligible individuals include those with incomes at or below 125 percent of poverty guidelines issued by the Department of Health and Human Services—households with a member who received benefits under the aid to families with dependent children or

supplemental security income programs within the previous year, and recipients of State and local assistance programs.

Mr. President, approximately 1 million eligible homes have been weatherized since the implementation of DOE's weatherization program. According to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, it is estimated that there are 13 million more eligible units that are still in need of weatherization. The legislation we are introducing today has an ambitious goal: to weatherize the remaining 13 million units over the next 10 years.

NEED FOR WEATHERIZATION OF REMAINING UNITS

Mr. President, no segment of society has been more profoundly affected by the high energy costs of the last decade than low-income families. The high fuel bills which plagued the entire Nation have demanded a disproportionate share—sometimes ranging up to 40 percent—of a low-income family's income. Although frequently in need of substanital weatherization efforts because of their older, energy inefficient housing, low-income families are the least able to afford the initial expense of weatherizing their homes. These families face the frustrating cycle of high fuel bills year after year because they lack the means to make their homes more energy efficient.

Weatherization of low-income persons' homes is clearly a way of breaking this catch-22 cycle of recurrent, overwhelming fuel costs. For example, a 1981 study by the Consumer Energy Council found that weatherization resulted in an average savings of 27 percent in the fuel bills of low-income persons. In some cases, modifications costing only $500 made to existing energy equipment may result in a 20- to 25-percent savings in fuel costs for these households.

In addition, the benefits of weatherizing the 13 million remaining eligible units are not limited to the cost-savings that would accrue to low-income households. The Federal Government is currently spending almost $2 billion annually to help low-income families pay for energy costs through the low-income home energy assistance program—a program I strongly support. But many of the recipients of this assistance are the same individuals whose homes are eligible for weatherization. A one-time expenditure for weatherization of these homes is a cost-effective measure that would decrease both the demand for energy in the short and the long term and the consequent need for Federal assistance in paying the energy bills.

Finally, weatherization of the homes of eligible low-income Americans not only will assist these individuals and families in coping with high energy costs, but will help reduce the overall national demand for energy.

In short, committing ourselves to the weatherization of the remaining 13 million eligible units occupied by low-income families would be sound fiscal and social policy and an integral part of a comprehensive plan for attaining a more energy independent America.

DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATION

Mr. President, as I have indicated, the legislation we are introducing today is aimed at expanding and extending the existing weatherization program in order to weatherize the remaining eligible units in the next 10 years. To accomplish this goal, the measure would authorize appropriations of $500 million in fiscal year 1985 with increases in authorization levels in the subsequent 9 years. The authorization levels represent a significant increase over the fiscal year 1984 authorization of $399 million—under which actual appropriations were $190 million—but they are increases which are fully justifiable given the long-term savings that will result from decreased demand for fuel and for low-income home energy assistance as the homes are made more energy efficient.

An important provision of the bill requires the Secretary of DOE to develop a plan for implementation of the 10-year weatherization program and to report to Congress every 2 years on the progress being made under this measure. This would provide Congress the opportunity to evaluate on a regular basis the operation of the program. In addition, it would provide incentives to States that perform well under the program by setting aside 10 percent of the annual appropriation for a special performance fund to be distributed by DOE on the basis of the States' performance in weatherizing homes in the previous years. It would also earmark up to $40 million for a demonstration project concerning the weatherization of rental units.

Mr. President, the weatherization program expansion contemplated by this legislation is ambitious, but it represents a challenge which our Nation must address adequately in the years ahead. We have the opportunity to begin an aggressive campaign to alleviate the heavy fuel bills that claim a disproportionate share of millions of low-income Americans' income. This is a campaign that is in our national interest to undertake. It is one which I support wholeheartedly as an investment in the long-term needs of our Nation.

I urge all of my colleagues to join with us in support of this important legislation.

By Mr. BYRD (for Mr. HART) (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. PELL, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. COHEN):

S. 2630. A bill to amend the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank Act to authorize appropriations for the provision of financial assistance through fiscal year 1990 and to provide financial assistance to builders of highly energy efficient buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SOLAR ENERGY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION BANK REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1984

● Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am introducing today, together with Senators MARK O. HATFIELD, ALAN CRANSTON, CLAIBORNE PELL, PAUL E. TSONGAS, CARL LEVIN, PAUL S. SARBANES, and WILLIAM S. COHEN, legislation to reauthorize and expand the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank.

Our bill will authorize appropriations for the Solar Bank, as it is commonly known, at levels totaling nearly $5 billion over the 6 fiscal years 1985 through 1990. The legislation also makes an important expansion in the mission of the Bank, authorizing it to provide assistance to homebuilders constructing "super-insulated" houses—residential buildings incorporating state-of-the-art thermal energy efficiency features which, at an extra construction cost of only about 3 to 5 percent, can reduce the energy needed for home heating and cooling by as much as 90 percent.

This legislation is part of the Energy Efficient America Act, a package of four bills being introduced today in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, with bipartisan support. This package of bills represents the most important effort in recent years to put America on a new energy course, toward a new energy future in which we have become highly efficient in our use of energy. Achieving this new future will help all in our country in many important ways; becoming wiser and more careful in our use of energy will let us overcome the personal hardship and economic stranglehold of high energy, reduce unemployment as people without jobs go to work retrofitting existing homes with energy conservation measures and renewable energy systems, and become more secure as we reduce our dangerous dependence on unreliable supplies of foreign oil.

The Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank Reauthorization Act of 1984 would resurrect the best part of the Energy Security Act of 1980—title V of that act, which initially created the Solar Bank. That title was a bold and innovative effort to improve residential energy efficiency, and to expand the use of nonpolluting, renewable energy resources in residences, by using and supplementing existing market mechanisms so they are available to low-income and middle class Americans. The Bank subsidizes

loans made by private financial institutions, States, and local governments for the installation of energy conserving improvements or renewable energy systems in residences, and to a limited extent makes grants for energy conservation retrofits. The amount of Federal assistance depends on the income of the homeowner or tenant making the energy investment, varying in amounts designed to insure the Federal funds are carefully targeted to make it possible for people to improve their residential energy efficiency who otherwise could not afford to do so. Because the Solar Bank's funding is used primarily for subsidizing loans, three non-Federal dollars are "leveraged" for every dollar spent for the Bank. This makes the Solar Bank one of the most highly cost-effective ways to use Federal funds to achieve greater energy efficiency.

The Congress initially intended the Solar Bank to be one of our country's foremost energy programs, authorizing a level of expenditures that was to reach more than $1 billion in fiscal year 1983. Tragically, however, the Bank became one of the major targets of President Reagan's assault on the domestic budget. The President has repeatedly tried to eliminate all funding for the Solar Bank, and indeed refused to even start up the Bank until ordered to do so by a Federal court. In the face of this strong administration opposition, the Congress has provided only minimal funding for the Bank, totaling about $60 million over the past 3 years.

Just as there was good reason in 1980 to establish a Solar Bank with the resources necessary to accomplish its purpose, so, too, there is good reason in 1984 to fully fund the Bank. Our legislation would do so, by authorizing appropriations of $300 million in fiscal year 1985, $450 million in fiscal year 1986, $650 million in fiscal year 1987, $925 million in fiscal year 1988, and $1.275 billion in each of fiscal year 1989 and fiscal year 1990. The need for this level of funding is compelling, for three reasons.

First, the Solar Bank is one of our best weapons against the high costs of energy used in our homes. All of us who pay today's fuel bills know how much they have soared in recent years. The burden of these bills hurts all of us, but the low-income and middle-class families who will be helped by the Solar Bank are hit especially hard. At the lowest end of the income scale, families pay as much as one-quarter of their total income on home heating and cooling, and during the winter months in Northern States the fuel bills often exceed monthly income. As a result, we have a new national crisis of people being forced to go without heat. Millions of families each year have their utility service cut off because they are unable to pay their bills. Most arrange to be reconnected, but the burden of the high bills threatens to condemn them to permanent poverty. Middle-class Americans, while more able to pay their bills, still must forego other goods and services because of their increased fuel costs.

The only long-term solution to high fuel costs is to reduce the amount of fuel needed to heat and cool our homes. Fortunately, very substantial improvements in thermal energy efficiency are possible. Experts tell us we can reduce by 50 percent, or more, the amount of energy needed to keep our existing housing stock comfortably warm in the winter and cool in the summer. Also, renewable energy systems can be retrofitted in residences to use the free energy of the sun and the wind to supply much of our heating and cooling needs. Taking either, or both, steps can make substantial reductions in the amount of expensive fossil-fuel energy a family needs.

The one major obstacle to achieving this greater energy efficiency is the often-high original investment needed to improve a building's thermal efficiency or to install a new renewable energy system. It is this obstacle which the Solar Bank is designed to overcome, by providing the marginal funding necessary to enable low and moderate-income families to borrow money for residential energy improvements. At the level of funding authorized in our bill, 11.7 million American families—1 out of every 7 in the country—will be able to improve their homes to reduce their energy consumption. A very conservative estimate of the total savings to these families—an estimate using current fuel costs—suggests they will save about $70 billion because of their lower fuel bills over the next two decades.

The second compelling reason to expand the Solar Bank is to create jobs and economic growth. The Solar Bank is not only a good energy conservation program, it is a good jobs program. Funding the Bank at the level authorized in our bill would create 240,000 new work years of employment as people are hired to install energy conservation and renewable energy systems, and to supply materials for those operations. This is a ratio of direct job creation 50 percent better per dollar than traditional public works programs. And many of these jobs will be precisely the kind our country most needs: Entry-level construction jobs, in which such unemployed people as minority teenagers, of whom half are unemployed, can learn construction job skills that can be used in other jobs. But this is only the beginning of the economic benefits of the Solar Bank program. Conventional analyses show that each new job that is created ends up creating another job as the first salary is spent and respent in the community. Using this conventional multiplier, the level of funding authorized in our bill would create an additional 240,000 jobs, for a total of nearly half a million. But this program will set in motion another kind of multiplier, as the consumer savings from the lower fuel bills gets spent or invested elsewhere. Since other goods and services are much more labor-intensive than energy, this shift in consumer spending will create substantial additional economic growth, representing an additional 2.6 million work years of employment over the next two decades.

The third, final, and most compelling reason for fully funding the Solar Bank is to reduce our reliance on insecure supplies of foreign oil. This is the primary purpose stated by the Congress for the creation of the Solar Bank. And that purpose is just as important today as it was in 1980. Despite the temporary surplus in the world oil market, there are several ominous signs indicating the continued dangers posed by our energy dependence. Domestic oil production is likely to fall shortly, as the Prudhoe Bay field is exhausted, unless another major reserve is discovered to replace it. Additional domestic discoveries are likely to be inadequate, because half the oil and natural gas industry's drilling rigs are inactive because of unfavorable economic conditions in that industry. The level of our imports of foreign oil has stopped its decline, and has now increased to 30 percent above last year's level. And, most disturbingly, a major war is now being waged in the Persian Gulf, with oil tankers getting set afire, and the world waiting daily for the half-expected news that Iran has blocked the Strait of Hormuz to the oil traffic that supplies one-sixth of the Western World's oil supply. Clearly, this is a time to renew our efforts to achieve energy security, not abandon those efforts.

The Solar Bank can play a major role in our energy security program. As the Congress stated when establishing the Bank, "It is the purpose of this subtitle to encourage energy conservation and the use of solar energy, and thereby reduce the Nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy supplies." If funded at the levels authorized in our bill, the Solar Bank will be able to achieve that purpose well enough to save the equivalent of more than 1 billion barrels of oil over the next 20 years. This could reduce by more than one-half the amount of oil we import from the Persian Gulf, greatly improving our Nation's economic and national security.

For all these reasons, I commend this legislation to the attention of my colleagues, and urge them to join Senator HATFIELD, myself, and others in pushing for its prompt enactment.●

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Colorado today in sponsoring legislation amending the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank Act.

This bill extends the authorization for the Bank for 6 additional years beyond 1984 at funding levels which should be adequate to weatherize and equip homes with renewable energy devices at a more accelerated pace than is the case today. This proposal also improves the existing law by raising the energy efficiency standards for new home construction, provides secondary financing for energy conservation loans, and allows lenders, not now eligible to loan funds, to come under the program.

The Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank was created in 1980 to provide low-interest funds to middle- and moderate-income homeowners for energy conservation and renewable energy investments. The program was also designed to provide loan funds for small commercial and agricultural buildings. The Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank makes payments to local financial institutions which in turn provide funds, at low interest rates, for the programs described above.

Unfortunately, the Bank has not functioned as was envisioned by Congress in 1980. Forty-eight States and territories have signed up for the program and $20 million has been appropriated for the current fiscal year. However, the Bank itself has not been supported by the personnel operating the program and only through court order has the Bank been able to implement regulations and begin making funds available to the States and territories.

The proposal I am cosponsoring today reaffirms the congressional intent demonstrated in 1980. The provisions of this bill, as described earlier, will authorize funds at levels which will begin the process of equipping homes and small commercial and agricultural buildings with renewable energy systems and energy conservation measures.

Mr. President, I have always believed, and rightfully so, that energy conservation should be treated as an energy resource, thus diminishing the need for future conventional energy sources. This bill will help us attain that goal. The Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank is a key part of our commitment to energy security today, and in the future. I hope the Senate will move quickly to enact this important piece of legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to give it their full support.●

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am delighted to cosponsor S. 2630.

In 1980 Congress established the Solar and Conservation Bank to provide loans at subsidized interest rates for conservation and renewable energy improvements on residential, agricultural and small commercial buildings. We knew then, as we know now, that the marketplace alone does not encourage energy efficiency improvements and innovation quickly enough. High market interest rates and the front-end costs of this equipment prevent most middle- and moderate-income Americans from buying it to save energy. Financed by the Government and administered through private institutions, the Bank was created as an innovative way of encouraging energy efficiency improvements among those Americans who could not qualify for low-income weatherization assistance and for whom energy tax breaks were not adequate incentive.

Unfortunately, the Reagan administration has never permitted the Bank to function properly. The administration has impounded its funds, transferred its personnel, and unsuccessfully tried to write it out of the budget. The funds Congress has been able to reinstate constitute only a small fraction of the funds originally authorized in 1980.

The Solar and Conservation Bank Act Amendments of 1984 would reauthorize the Bank through 1990 and establish funding levels sufficient to allow the Bank to function as Congress intended. This bill would also spur innovation by providing builders with incentives to construct superinsulated, energy-efficient buildings.

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. HART, Mr. PELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. COHEN):

S. 2631. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve the administration of the Federal energy conservation program for consumer products, to enhance consumer information programs to encourage the purchase of more energy efficient appliances, and to implement efficiency standards for furnaces, central air-conditioners, and water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CONSUMER PRODUCTS ENERGY EFFICIENCY AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to introduce S. 2631, the Consumer Products Energy Efficiency Amendments of 1984, a bill to promote the use and continued improvement of energy efficient appliances. One-third of the energy used in our homes operates electrical appliances. Congress supported Federal programs to improve consumer appliance efficiency since 1975. And legislation mandating national appliance efficiency standards was first adopted late in 1978, after the Iranian oil crisis began.

When Congress acted, several States—including my own State of California—had already enacted fairly tough appliance efficiency standards, forcing manufacturers who chose to do business in the lucrative California market to produce more efficient appliances. Firms like Amana responded with significant energy efficiency improvements in their refrigerators, freezers, and in room air-conditioners.

By making these standards—for refrigerators alone—national, we could save enough electricity to eliminate the need to build 15 new nuclear powerplants, at a cost of more than $45 billion, according to the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

If the 16 million refrigerators and freezers in use just in California in 1982 were all exchanged for high-efficiency models the State's electric consumption would decline an estimated 5 percent, about 1,700 megawatts, the equivalent of the output of two new nuclear plants. The new appliances would cost about $750 million—some of which people would spend routinely for appliance replacement.

Moreover, Mr. President, the alternative of building the two nuclear plants would cost upward of $6 billion—more than six times as much—and would produce radioactive waste and other problems.

Congress mandated national appliance efficiency standards for each of 13 major household appliances in the National Energy Conservation and Policy Act, enacted in November 1978, requiring regulations implementing national standards by December 1980.

When adopted by the Secretary of Energy, these regulations would preempt existing State standards.

Even though the national standards were expected to be less stringent than California standards already in place, the Nation would still gain from adoption of national standards which would become progressively stricter.

And, at the same time and thereafter, I fought to make sure that adoption of the Federal statute did not preempt the existing State standards before the Federal standards took effect.

Despite the clear congressional mandate, the Carter administration left office without adopting appliance efficiency standards, and DOE under the current administration has purported to meet the requirement for efficiency standards by adopting a standard that says no standards are necessary.

In terms of encouraging increased efficiency these standards are meaningless, if not counterproductive. Meanwhile, to avoid preemption by this nonstandard, States such as California, New York, Florida, and Kansas, among others that have their own standards, must petition the administration for exemption.

Mr. President, the energy savings we can realize from effective standards are considerable. By the turn of century, California alone expects to save energy equivalent to 21¼ million barrels of oil each year from residential and commercial appliance efficiency standards.

The Department of Energy, currently relying on its philosophical biases rather than facts, believes that consumers will purchase energy-efficient appliances in response to market signals as energy prices rise in times of energy shortage.

But there is an increasing pile of evidence that things simply do not work that way. Consumers can only buy what they are offered.

Market forces do not work for several reasons:

First, because the connection between rising fuel or crude oil prices and consumers using appliances operated by electricity coming from a regulated utility is too indirect.

Second, because 80 percent of the major residential appliances are not bought by those who ultimately use them, but by builders, apartment house owners, and others.

Third, because even though a consumer will realize economic savings over the life of an energy-efficient appliance greater than the increased cost of the appliance, few consumers are able to calculate the life-cycle cost savings of energy efficiency, and the information to do so is often not available.

Finally, energy prices do not rise in constant trend lines. They fluctuate. And the results will be disastrous if we wait until the next energy crisis to begin to produce energy efficient appliances.

DOE's analysis is refuted by the evidence that—despite the dramatic increase in energy prices over the last decade—the average efficiency of major household appliances has remained virtually constant since 1973 nationally.

The improvements that have occurred have all occurred as a result of the State standards now in place.

Moreover, DOE's policy of neglect is not without malignant consequences. The alternative to energy efficiency is the nightmare DOE currently projects: Hundreds of new central powerplants will be needed to accommodate increased demand for electricity, costing utility ratepayers—by DOE's own estimates—upward of $1.8 trillion dollars. These costs will take an increased share of all consumers personal disposable income and will severely handicap the ability of American industry to compete effectively on a world market.

And the environmental consequences will be catastrophic.

The Consumer Products Energy Efficiency Amendments of 1984 is straightforward. While leaving DOE great flexibility in implementing standards, it prevents the Department from indefinite delay in promoting efficiency. The bill makes four basic changes to strengthen current law.

First, it requires the Department of Energy within 180 days of enactment to establish interim standards no less stringent than the 1980 median efficiency for central air-conditioners, furnaces, and water heaters. These three appliances consume the lion's share of home energy use and have shown little efficiency improvement over the last 9 years. This provision would get rid of the biggest energy guzzlers from the market without unduly burdening manufacturers.

Second, the bill would improve product labeling to enable consumers to make informed energy decisions when purchasing new appliances. It calls on DOE to make available consumer buying guides indicating product energy efficiency and projected annual operating costs. The guide would also contain a simple worksheet allowing consumers to calculate the life-cycle costs of each appliance. Further, this bill would require manufacturers to advertise the efficiency ratings of their products.

Third, the bill prohibits automatic preemption of State standards when the Federal Government fails to enact national standards. National standards would preempt State standards only when DOE establishes Federal standards, and even then States could petition for more stringent standards on a case-by-case basis, if such standards would not unduly encumber interstate trade.

Fourth, the bill would require the Department of Energy to encourage continuous appliance efficiency even if the Secretary finds that no standards are necessary. The act would require DOE to propose efficiency targets for appliances in the absence of standards, and, if expected improvements failed to materialize, require a rulemaking procedure to reconsider whether minimum standards are necessary.

Mr. President, we can no longer afford to waste energy. The experience of my own State of California, which established phased-in standards back in 1976 and which is currently fighting to maintain those standards, has been overwhelmingly positive. Manufacturers have been able to meet the standards without undue hardship, and consumers, utilities, industry, and the environment have all benefited. The California Energy Commission estimates efficiency standards have already reduced the utility bills of Californians by $1 billion. By 1987 California's standards will have saved enough energy to enable utilities to forgo building one large, 1,750 megawatt powerplant.

Increased use of efficient products would save consumers billions of dollars, ease utility load management problems, especially during peak periods, enable society to avoid construction of large, expensive powerplants holding down future energy costs and freeing capital for other purposes, cut our dependence on foreign oil, and significantly reduce the severe and growing environmental impacts of increased reliance on fossil fuels.

We have the technology available now to provide for our energy needs without endangering our environment. We owe the American people the effort to focus on preventing future energy crises instead of just managing them.

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. PELL, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. HART, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 2632. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve consumer information and fuel efficiency with respect to passenger automobiles, light trucks, and tires, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on noncomplying manufacturers (in lieu of penalty), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

AUTO EFFICIENCY STANDARDS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am happy to be an original cosponsor of S. 2632. The gains in auto efficiency over the past decade are perhaps the most successful conservation achievements to emerge from the energy crises of the 1970's. When corporate auto efficiency averages level off next year at 27.5 mpg, the cars Americans drive will be almost twice as efficient as those of a decade ago. But improvement will continue only so long as Federal standards and competitive pressures require new fuel efficiency improvements from manufacturers.

We must continue to make cars and light trucks more fuel efficient. The transportation sector by far the most vulnerable portion of society to disruptions of foreign oil supplies is also least able to utilize alternative fuels.

By the end of the century, I believe all the oil we import will be used exclusively in the transportation sector. To relieve our foreign oil dependence we must keep improving the fuel efficiency of our motor vehicles. This bill will continue progress in auto and light truck efficiency improvements.

Foreign manufacturers have already demonstrated five-passenger automobiles which average over 60 mpg on the highway. The technology exists today to make our cars and trucks more efficient. This bill sets new future efficiency targets to spur auto efficiency. It establishes a corporate average fuel efficiency rating of 45

mpg by 1995, and a light truck average of 35 mpg. It would also improve the accuracy of auto efficiency labeling and institute tire efficiency labeling, and encourage States to restructure vehicle registration fees and excise taxes to reward fuel efficiency.

It makes no sense to allow fuel efficiency standards to lapse. Failure to make progress now will only insure that in the future American automakers will once again find themselves unable to compete with foreign manufacturers.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. PELL, and Mr. TSONGAS):

S. 2633. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act so as to authorize the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study for the purpose of determining the extent of contamination of certain fish and whether such contamination creates a threat to public health; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

STUDY OF THE CONTAMINATION OF CERTAIN FISH

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, we know that PCB's are harmful to the public health. PCB's can cause cancer and can induce genetic defects as well. There is also evidence that some species of Atlantic coastal fish are contaminated with PCB's. Yet, there is no coordinated public policy to guide State fisheries administrators on how to respond to PCB contamination of fish. If the State administrators simply forbid the consumption of these fish without proper analysis, they could damage an important industry and cut off a significant source of food when that might not be appropriate. What we need is a reliable appraisal of the extent of the PCB contamination so that health officials can calculate the danger to which people are being exposed, so that they can assess the threat to public health. Today I am introducing a bill to collect the missing data.

Since 1981, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has analyzed fish caught in New Jersey coastal waters. DEP found that five species of fish were contaminated by PCB's, which are known to cause cancer, at levels comparable to the proposed U.S. Food and Drug Administration tolerance. The five species are striped bass, bluefish, white perch, white catfish, and American eel. In upper New York Bay and tributary waters, two species of fish, striped bass and American eel, showed average levels above the existing FDA tolerance. In March 1983, New Jersey prohibited the commercial sale of affected fish taken in upper New York Bay and its tributaries.

For the five species of fish that showed lower PCB levels in coastal waters, New Jersey advised limitations on consumption and recommended cooking methods that reduce human absorption of PCB's. New Jersey DEP also recommended that pregnant women, nursing mothers, women of childbearing age, and young children should abstain from eating the affected species of fish.

This problem is not confined to New Jersey. In November 1983, the Massachusetts Department of Public Health issued recommendations on the consumption of bluefish based on its own data. The department recommended cooking methods to minimize absorption of PCB's and recommended abstention by women who are breastfeeding, pregnant, or considering becoming pregnant.

Bluefish are migratory; they move up the Atlantic coast each spring and return to southern waters in the fall. Because of this migration, it is likely that bluefish taken in other coastal waters may also be contaminated with PCB's. But most State health departments lack the funds or commitment to sample and analyze fish. Thus, people in other States may also be exposed to PCB's because their State health departments have not investigated the problem.

Other problems beset State officials who seek to evaluate whether a health hazard exists:

Different investigators who study PCB contamination in fish use different procedures to prepare and analyze them. This makes it difficult to compare results.

State officials would also benefit from uniform guidelines for the regulation of fish consumption.

It is clear that Federal action is needed to provide for:

Analysis of fish from the coastal waters of other States that may be affected.

Development of uniform sampling and analysis procedures to allow easier comparison and interpretation of contamination data.

When there is such a disparity among the States on a matter of public health their citizens suffer. They suffer lower levels of protection. And related businesses in more vigilent States suffer economic losses. New Jersey party and charter boat fishermen have lost business when the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection issued its warnings. Our fishing industry is a responsible one and they are willing to accept this sacrifice if it is necessary to protect public health. But they are frustrated that neighboring States have issued no warnings when those same migratory fish do not observe State boundaries.

The bill I am introducing authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to conduct an interagency effort to accomplish two purposes:

First, it provides for collection and analysis of fish from Atlantic coastal waters in sufficient numbers to determine PCB levels. We will then be able to assess the public risk and know whether the problem is coastwise, or whether it only affects specific, limited areas.

Second, uniform sampling and analysis procedures will be developed so that we can accurately assess public exposure to PCB contamination.

I anticipate the program can be carried out for approximately $900,000.

EPA is authorized to enlist the help of the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the States, and other agencies with jurisdiction over this problem.

EPA is also encouraged to incorporate efforts by individual State environmental or fisheries agencies in the planning, conduct, and evaluation of this program.

EPA is given 2 years to complete this study and submit its report to Congress with any recommendations for further action. This report will also contain the comments and recommendations of NOAA, FDA, and the States.

It is important for us to find out whether PCB contamination is a real threat to public health. This study will tell us. And if it is a threat, the study will give data on which to base rational regulatory measures. I hope that my colleagues will join me in its support.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2633

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661), is amended by inserting immediately after section 5A the following new section:

"SEC. 5B. (a) The Environmental Protection Agency is directed to conduct a study to identify and measure residues of various toxic contaminants in estuarine and marine fish species along the Atlantic coast to determine whether contamination by polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) or other toxicants constitute a public health hazard, and if so, the extent of such contamination and hazard.

"(b) In carrying out such study, the Environmental Protection Agency shall have authority to utilize the facilities, equipment, and personnel of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service and Federal Food and Drug Administration, and the States, with the consent of such Service, Administration or State, on a reimbursable basis.

"(c) On or before the expiration of the twenty-four month period following the date of the enactment of this section, the Environmental Protection Agency shall report the results of its study, together with its comments and recommendations, together with the comments and recommendations of the US FWS, National Marine Fisheries

Service, the Federal Food and Drug Administration and the States, if any, to the Congress.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for Fiscal Year 1985 and 1986 such sums as may be necessary to remain available until expended.".

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) in proposing a bill to reduce the potentially serious hazards from polychlorinated biphenyls, commonly known as PCB's, in fish. The problem crosses State boundaries and requires the coordinated attention of Federal environmental agencies.

PCB's constitute a group of chemicals used by a variety of industries, especially by the electrical industry as an insulating fluid. Three characteristics of PCB's cause considerable concern. First, some scientific evidence indicates that PCB's are toxic and carcinogenic. Second, unlike biodegradable materials, they are persistent in the environment. Finally, PCB's have a chemical affinity for fats and therefore appear in high concentrations in the fatty tissues of fish.

New York's Hudson River contains in its sediments one of the world's largest reservoirs of PCB's. Many species of fish commonly contain PCB concentrations far in excess of the acceptable limits established by the Food and Drug Administration. As a result, New York has banned all fishing in the upper Hudson and most commercial fishing in the lower Hudson.

In 1980, I secured passage of an amendment to the Clean Water Act providing Federal funds to reduce the contamination of the river. The dredging project has yet to be implemented, but progress toward this goal has been made.

Yet the problem extends far beyond one river. Species such as the striped bass spend part of the year in the Hudson, the Chesapeake Bay, and other estuaries, where they can absorb or ingest PCB's. During other seasons, they migrate along the Atlantic coast. Furthermore, runoff and the disposal of dredged materials adds PCB's to coastal waters. As a result, fish taken from a large geographic area are liable to be contaminated.

We are asking the Environmental Protection Agency to cooperate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Food and Drug Administration in a scientific study of the extent of toxic contamination in Atlantic coast fish. Such a study will indicate the geographic extent of the problem and the risk to public health. It will also aid the establishment of uniform methods of sampling and chemical analysis. The bill deserves each Senator's support.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with senior Senator from New Jersey (Senator BRADLEY) in introducing S. 2633. This legislation mandates that the Environmental Protection Agency, in coordination with other Federal and State agencies, perform a sampling of coastal fish to determine the levels and extent of chemical contamination. This bill will promote and insure uniformity in testing and analysis methodologies in order to place individual State findings in perspective.

Massachusetts has long treasured its connection to the sea, both for its beauty and for its bountiful provision of seafood. Along with our neighboring coastal States, however, we have at times used our technologies toward achievement of economic advancements without recognition of the burden these technologies may place upon this invaluable resource. Scientists from eastern seaboard States, including Massachusetts and New Jersey, have detected potentially harmful chemicals such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) in fish and other species in our coastal waters. Since many of the fish species found to contain contaminants are mobile, such as bluefish, a coastwide effort is necessary to determine the extent and severity of chemical contamination. Unfortunately, States have differing abilities and commitments to investigation of this problem. In addition, States and Federal agencies use diverse methods of sampling and data analysis, making comparison of technical data and results difficult. For these reasons, I believe that the Federal Government must work with all of the affected States in performing a coastwide assesment of the potential public health risks from the existing levels of chemical contamination in ocean species. In this way, the Government can safeguard both the public health and the viability of the fishing industry.

Within 2 years of the bill's enactment, EPA, assisting agencies, and States are required to issue a report presenting the results of this study. This report would also offer recommendations to Congress concerning the implications of its findings for individual States.

Such a uniform approach is necessary to protect seafood consumers from excessive levels of potentially harmful chemicals. It also protects crucial recreational and commercial fisheries from unnecessary hardships resulting from inaccurate and alarmist assessments of the potential for hazards from uncertain levels of chemicals such as PCB's.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this modest but important legislation, for the sake of protecting our Nation's public health and the fishing industries of the Nation's eastern seaboard.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. MITCHELL):

S. 2634. A bill to provide for a mutual and verifiable moratorium on the testing and deployment of new nuclear ballistic missiles and antisatellite weapons and the testing of nuclear warheads; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ARMS RACE MORITORIUM ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today Senators HATFIELD, CRANSTON, DURENBERGER, EAGLETON, STAFFORD, MITCHELL, and I are introducing the Arms Race Moratorium Act. Each of us is also a principal sponsor of the nuclear weapons freeze resolution in the Senate. Our proposal today is intended to buy the time we need to achieve a freeze.

The United States and the Soviet Union are entering a dangerous new phase of the arms race. Both superpowers are preparing to deploy more accurate and more devastating nuclear weapons that will increase the risk of nuclear war.

Even more dangerous is the fact that both superpowers are launching a new arms race into space with unforeseeable consequences. If these new developments continue unchecked, we will soon cross a threshold into a future in which both nations could conceivably launch a successful first-strike attack. Clearly, immediate measures by both the United States and the Soviet Union are needed to prevent a destabilizing new escalation of the arms race.

The Arms Race Moratorium Act calls upon the President to initiate a bilateral and verifiable moratorium with the Soviet Union on the testing and deployment of new nuclear ballistic missiles and antisatellite weapons, and on the testing of nuclear warheads. The moratorium is intended to prevent technological modernization from carrying the United States and the Soviet Union over the first-strike threshold into the land of nuclear no return. By providing a negotiator's pause, the moratorium will also allow both nations to pursue meaningful reductions in existing arsenals. The moratorium can be easily and quickly implemented, because the United States has the independent means adequately to verify Soviet compliance, without onsite inspection or any other action by the Soviets.

If the President declines to issue a call for a moratorium and if the Government of the Soviet Union announces that it is willing to halt the testing and deployment of these weapons, this act would then suspend funds for the testing and deployment of these weapons. The Government of the Soviet Union will have 90 days after the enactment of the bill to com-

municate to the Government of the United States that it intends to implement such a moratorium. If the Soviet Union makes such a commitment, funding will be suspended for all programs covered by the moratorium beginning at the end of the 90-day period.

Under this bilateral moratorium, the United States will halt the flight testing and deployment of the MX missile, the Trident II missile, and other new nuclear ballistic missiles that might be planned. The Soviet Union will halt the flight testing and deployment of the SSX-24, SSX-25, SSNX-23 and other new nuclear missiles it also might have planned. Both countries will halt the testing and deployment of antisatellite weapons capable of hitting targets in space. Both countries will also halt further underground testing of nuclear explosive devices.

If at any time during the moratorium the President certifies that the Soviet Union is violating its terms by testing or deploying these weapons, then funding for U.S. testing and deployment will be immediately resumed. This bill will not require trusting the Soviet Union to adhere to the moratorium. The programs that it covers are now being monitored by both nations with high confidence. Rather we will be testing Soviet willingness to slow down the arms race and to pursue deep reductions in the nuclear arsenals of both sides.

There in an inherent risk in any specific arms control proposal, but there is far greater risk in doing nothing at all.

This bilateral moratorium will prevent new technologies from igniting a qualitatively new and different arms race. If this legislation is enacted, essential equivalence between the United States and the Soviet Union will be maintained, while the development of dangerous new weapons on both sides will be curtailed.

The testing and deployment of a new generation of first strike, nuclear war-fighting weapons with pinpoint accuracy, higher speed, and depressed trajectories will be halted.

United States and Soviet antisatellite programs that take the arms race into outer space will be stopped. Satellites are essential to nuclear balance. They are the heart of our early warning system to detect the launching of enemy missiles. Since the United States has just begun to test its antisatellite weapon, and since the existing Soviet antisatellite weapon is severely limited in its capability, a mutual halt on Asat testing and deployment will stop this destabilizing arms race in its infancy.

By halting nuclear testing, the act will also prevent new and more deadly weapons and warhead technology.

If the new technologies now being developed and tested were deployed they could fundamentally undermine mutual deterrence which has thus far prevented either nation from launching a nuclear attack against the other. The development of first-strike capabilities on both sides will completely undermine deterrence by placing the nuclear arsenals of both nations on a hair trigger. Contrary to what the Reagan administration argues, building a U.S. nuclear war-fighting capability will not enhance deterrence by intimidating the Soviets. It only makes it more likely that the Soviets will be driven to use nuclear weapons first in a crisis.

And, contrary to what the President would have us believe the next war will not be settled by a single duel between Luke Skywalker and Darth Vader. It will not be a simple battle between a good and an evil empire that is confined to outer space. This war, if it happens, will not be limited to the two superpowers or even the Northern Hemisphere. It will not be a winnable war, and there may not even be survivors.

Indeed, the recent scientific discovery of the nuclear winter now points overwhelmingly to this stark truth: A third world war will be the last world war because it will be a war against the world itself.

Many diplomats and scholars say that the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union is the worst that it has been since the Cuban missile crisis. This downward spiral in United States-Soviet relations gives every regional conflict the potential for a United States-Soviet nuclear showdown.

The nuclear threat sets before us a basic choice. The question is not whether nuclear weapons will cease multiplying and then be reduced. Someday they almost surely will be. The choice is not whether but when? Not if but how? By rational agreement or by the most irrational act of violence in human history?

Another round in the arms race is already moving off the drawing boards and into action. Congress should take a stand now, before it is too late. The only sane choice is to continue the peaceful battle for nuclear arms control—for a freeze and then reductions—until it is won.

It is the height of human folly for the President to preach peace in Peking while preparing for nuclear war with Moscow. If the Reagan administration cannot show restraint, Congress can. If the Reagan administration cannot initiate an end to the arms race, Congress can. And the moratorium is the way to do it.

This bill is no substitute for negotiated arms control agreements. But at a time when neither the Reagan administration nor the Soviets are willing to negotiate, this is a practical step toward a safer world.

There are obvious precedents for our action. In 1963, President Kennedy initiated a U.S. moratorium on the atmospheric testing of nuclear warheads. This action led to the expeditious and successful negotiation of the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union. It is now time for the President—or Congress—to take an equally innovative, timely, and courageous step.

The Arms Race Moratorium Act will provide a guarantee against continued failure of Presidential initiative for arms control. We introduce this Arms Race Moratorium Act as a first step toward the achievement of bilateral and verifiable arms control agreements that alone can steer the superpowers—and our planet—toward the path of lasting peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the test of the bill and a set of questions and answers on it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Arms Race Moratorium Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the arms race is entering a dangerous new phase that increases the risk of a nuclear holocaust that would be humanity's final war;

(2) immediate action must be taken by the United States and the Soviet Union to halt the flight testing and deployment of new nuclear ballistic missiles and anti-satellite weapons and the testing of nuclear warheads;

(3) the flight testing and deployment of new nuclear ballistic missiles and anti-satellite weapons and the explosive testing of nuclear devices by the Soviet Union are adequately verifiable by the United States through the use of existing national technical means;

(4) a United States-Soviet Union moratorium on the flight testing and deployment of new nuclear ballistic missiles and anti-satellite weapons and the testing of nuclear warheads is not an end in itself but rather is a means to prevent new destabilizing technologies from further complicating future negotiations to reduce the risk of nuclear war; and

(5) while the President is constitutionally empowered to make international agreements with foreign nations, the responsibility to provide for the public welfare through the allocation or withholding of public revenues resides with the Congress.

BILATERAL MORATORIUM

SEC. 3. (a) It is the sense of Congress that the President should immediately communicate to the Government of the Soviet Union the willingness of the United States to enter into a mutual United States-Soviet Union moratorium on the flight testing and the deployment of new ballistic missiles and

anti-satellite weapons and the testing of nuclear warheads.

(b)(1) If within 90 days of the date of the enactment of this Act the President has not made a communication to the Soviet Union described in subsection (a) and if within that 90-day period the Government of the Soviet Union communicates to the President that, effective at the end of such 90-day period, it will observe a mutual United States-Soviet Union moratorium on the flight testing and deployment of new ballistic missiles, the flight testing against objects in space and the deployment of anti-satellite weapons, and the testing of nuclear warheads, then after the end of such 90-day period no funds may be obligated or expended by the United States for the flight testing or the deployment of new ballistic missiles, the flight testing against objects in space or the deployment of anti-satellite weapons, or the testing of nuclear warheads.

(2) If the President certifies to Congress at any time after the beginning of the moratorium that the Soviet Union has conducted a test or deployed a missile or anti-satellite weapon or tested a nuclear warhead inconsistent with the moratorium, then funds may be obligated or expended by the United States for such testing and deployment. As part of any such certification, the President shall submit to Congress an unclassified report summarizing the basis for the certification and a classified report describing in detail the activities of the Soviet Union that are the basis for the certification.

(3) One year after the moratorium described in paragraph 1 enters into force and annually thereafter, the President shall report to the Congress:

(a) on the progress being made by the United States in negotiating nuclear arms control agreements with the Soviet Union; and

(b) on whether the President believes that continuation of the moratorium is in the best national security interests of the United States.

If the President states in any such annual report that he believes that continuation of the moratorium is not in the best national security interests of the United States, then the Congress may enact a joint resolution which terminates the moratorium and permits funds to be used for the testing and deployment described in paragraph (1).

(c) For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "new ballistic missile" means any ballistic missile (including any modification of an existing missile type that increases its throw-weight or number of reentry vehicles) with a range exceeding 600 kilometers that was not flight-tested by the United States or the Soviet Union before August 1, 1982.

(2) The term "anti-satellite weapon" means any interceptor vehicle intended for and capable of damaging an object in space.

(c) The term "testing of nuclear warheads" means the detonation of any nuclear explosive device."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE "ARMS RACE MORATORIUM ACT"

(1) Why a moratorium now? Why not now? The burden of proof properly belongs with those who argue that the current nuclear arsenals numbering in the tens of thousands of weapons are somehow insufficient to deter a nuclear war. The burden of proof rests on those who maintain that a costly race to develop new nuclear warfighting capabilities will improve rather than threaten our security.

The case for a moratorium rests on the wholly defensible proposition that it is better to seek agreement with the Soviet Union on what we might jointly avoid doing before lunging into a race to construct a whole new generation of nuclear weapons systems, with all the heightened political tension, economic burden, and renewed fears of surprise attack that inevitably accompany a stepped-up arms race.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States are gearing up to squander hundreds of billions of dollars and rubles over the next decade to develop and deploy a new generation of more accurate weapons and more efficient nuclear warheads, all the better to intimidate each other with the threat of "limited" and "protracted" nuclear wars. Before agreeing to fund this dangerous and unwinnable race for "nuclear war-fighting capability," which the current Administration now wants to extend into space, the Congress should at least afford the American people the opportunity to test the Soviet Union's willingness to avoid such a fruitless competition through arms control.

(2) What does the moratorium cover? Since the moratorium is bilateral, both Soviet and American weapon systems are involved, but only certain testing and deployment activities which are currently being monitored with adequate confidence by National Technical Means are covered by the moratorium. The following activities on both sides are included:

The flight-testing and deployment of ballistic missiles (including modifications to existing missile types which increase throw-weight or number of reentry vehicles) with a range exceeding 600 kilometers which were not flight tested by the United States or the Soviet Union before August 1, 1982.

The flight-testing and deployment of "exoatmospheric" interceptor vehicles intended for and capable of damaging an object in space.

The detonation of any nuclear explosive device.

(3) Which current nuclear missile programs on both sides would be affected?

On the Soviet side: the SS-X-24 and SS-X-25 ICBMs; the SS-NX-23 SLBM, and any other new medium- to long-range ballistic missile the Soviet Union might be planning.

On the U.S. side: the MX ICBM; Trident II SLBM, and any other new medium- to long-range ballistic missile the United States might be planning.

(4) Which current ASAT and ABM programs would be affected? Any ASAT or ABM program involving the flight-testing of an interceptor vehicle against a target object in space would be affected by the moratorium, which would suspend such testing.

On the Soviet side, this would involve testing of the F-LV/SS-9 orbital ASAT and the Galosh ABM system against target objects in space.

On the U.S. side, this would involve testing of the Prototype Miniature Air-Launched System (PMALS) and its derivatives, and the Homing Overlay Experiment (HOE) interceptor and its derivatives, against target objects in space. Both of these programs involve the testing of a miniature homing vehicle (MHV) type warhead, and have no current equivalent on the Soviet side.

(5) Which current nuclear warhead programs would be affected? Any nuclear warhead program involving the underground detonation of a nuclear device would be affected by the moratorium, which would suspend such testing. In particular, the current administration's effort to gain the technological edge over the Soviets by developing and testing a so-called "third-generation" of "directed energy" nuclear devices—such as Livermore Laboratory's "Excalibur" nuclear bomb-pumped X-ray laser—would be suspended by such a moratorium while U.S. and Soviet negotiators completed the pending draft treaty for a Comprehensive Test Ban.

Experts involved in such negotiations in prior administrations estimate that CTB negotiations could be wrapped-up with only six months to a year of additional effort, and that current national technical means of verification would be adequate to safeguard U.S. national security for at least this interim period while additional verification provisions are negotiated.

(6) Doesn't Congressional action to facilitate a bilateral moratorium impinge on the Constitutional powers of the President? Not at all. The President is exclusively empowered to negotiate treaties. The power to declare war, and the power to appropriate the funds necessary to prepare for war, are solely the province of the Congress, and the Congress may attach whatever conditions it deems necessary when it authorizes these preparations. Surely, if the Congress is vested with the power to fund war preparations, it is also vested with the power to specify those conditions under which it is willing not to fund them. The President, of course, would retain his right to veto any act of Congress, thereby requiring passage by a two-thirds majority of both houses before the "Arms Race Moratorium Act" could become law.

(7) Could this moratorium be adequately verified? Yes. The United States intelligence community is already conducting extensive monitoring of the Soviet activities included in this moratorium. Provisions defining and limiting the deployment of new intercontinental ballistic missiles are part of the unratified SALT II agreement now being adhered to, and monitored intensively, by both sides. Unlike SALT II, which permits modifications of existing missiles to vary by as much as 5 percent from their predecessors in length, diameter, launch-weight, and throw-weight before they are regarded as "new," under the proposed moratorium any modification that would increase throw-weight, or number of reentry vehicles would be considered inconsistent with the mutual suspension of flight tests of new ballistic missiles. Thus the Soviets could not continue testing of the SS-25 mobile ICBM, as they are now doing, by claiming that changes in its key parameters do not exceed permitted variances from the older SS-13. Under the moratorium, the only "SS-13s" the Soviet Union would be permitted to test would be those produced and deployed in the late 1960's, long before the August 1, 1982 cutoff date contained in the moratorium. Clearly, fifteen years later, that is not the same missile they are testing today.

Despite the irresponsible statements of certain administration officials regarding the impossibility of an ASAT ban that would be adequately verifiable, most technical experts agree that a ban on the testing of rocket-boosted ASAT interceptors against target objects in space can be verified by National Technical Means.

A moratorium on the testing of nuclear warheads can be reliably monitored by long-range seismic methods down to explosions in the 2 to 5 kiloton range. Ambiguity sur-

rounding seismic events with magnitudes corresponding to tests below this threshold would be diminished somewhat by other means of monitoring Soviet activity, such as communications activity emanating from the test site area, and stepped-up overhead photo-reconnaissance of likely test areas. The remaining uncertainty would be tolerable for several years, but would need to be reduced, and would be reduced, by installation of the regional "remote on-site" seismic monitoring networks called for in the draft Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

In general, because the threat to American security from some undetected "residual" Soviet weapons capability accumulates slowly, requiring several or many years before it could pose a serious threat to our national security, the standard of adequacy for verification of a moratorium can be somewhat less demanding than the standard one would want to apply to a negotiated agreement intended to last a decade or more. The proposed moratorium is intended to facilitate—not substitute for—carefully designed arms control agreements.

(8) What happens to the funding for weapons systems covered by the proposed moratorium? The authorization and appropriation of funds for the research, development, testing evaluation, procurement, deployment, operations, and maintenance of any military system would not be constrained by the provisions of the "Arms Race Moratorium Act." After enactment of this bill, and pending a new arms control agreement codifying the terms of the moratorium, Congress could elect to set aside funds for continuing weapons programs in the designated categories, but the contractual obligation or expenditure of funds by a government agency to test and deploy these weapons would be suspended for the duration of the moratorium.

Under the proposed moratorium, research and development activities which do not involve the observable field-testing of missiles or warheads would not be affected. For example, the United States could continue to obligate and expend funds for the engineering development of a small ICBM, such as Midgetman, but could not proceed to flight-testing or deployment of such a missile while the moratorium remained in force.

Similarly, the reliability of the current stockpile of nuclear weapons could continue to be checked by detonating the high explosive implosion device with instruments replacing the fissile material—thereby avoiding a nuclear explosion which would contravene the moratorium—and by thorough inspection and testing of its non-nuclear component parts.

(9) What if the Soviet cheat on the terms of the moratorium? Would this bill tie the hands of the Congress or the President? Not at all. If at any time during the moratorium the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union is conducting tests or deploying weapons which are inconsistent the moratorium, then the "fence" restraining the obligation and expenditure of previously appropriated funds for those designated activities would be automatically lifted. As part of any such certification, the President must substantiate his finding with a detailed report describing the activities of the Soviet Union that are the basis for the certification.

(10) What if the Soviets did not cheat in any major way that we could detect, but merely chiseled in a systematic way over a longer period while stringing out negotiations for enhanced verification procedures which would allow us to detect such "low-level cheating."? This possibility is fully provided for in the bill. At the end of each year that the moratorium remains in force, the President is required to report to Congress on the progress, or lack thereof, in arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union, and on whether continuation of the moratorium is in the best national security interests of the United States. If the President requests cancellation of the moratorium at that time on grounds other than evidence of Soviet cheating—such as lack of progress in arms control or the need to modernize the U.S. nuclear deterrent—and the Congress indicates by enactment of a Joint Resolution that is concurs with the President, then the moratorium would be terminated.

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators HATFIELD, KENNEDY, STAFFORD, and CRANSTON in introducing the Arms Race Moratorium Act, which is popularly known as the "Quick Freeze." I believe that this measure, if it is enacted and if it is successfully pursued in Geneva, will provide for a major increase in the security of the United States.

I am sure that a number of my colleagues are curious about my cosponsorship of this measure. After all, I spoke out against the original Kennedy-Hatfield freeze resolution at the time it was first introduced, and I later voted to table consideration of that amendment. I continue to believe that the freeze resolution will not assist in the deadly serious business of pursuing successful and meaningful arms agreements. Why, then, would I cosponsor this act? Briefly, because the Arms Race Moratorium Act is a comparatively simple summary statement of views which I have repeatedly enunciated both in my voting record and in my statements.

The Arms Race Moratorium Act addresses itself to the urgent and pressing problem of weaponry which is the most destabilizing—rapid and accurate ballistic missiles which can threaten a first strike; antisatellite weaponry; and new developments in nuclear warheads. In other words, the quick freeze recognizes that the most important goal of arms negotiations is to foster crisis stability by distinguishing between weaponry which is needed for a secure second-strike deterrent and weaponry which raises the prospect of a first strike.

As has repeatedly been pointed out by critics of the freeze, ranging from the New York Times to Congressman LES ASPIN, the issue in arms control is not just whether there are too many nuclear weapons. There are. The issue instead is how to reduce the chances of war by focusing on those weapons which are most likely to be used in a crisis. In other words, the problem in arms negotiations is to focus on qualitative as well as quantitative measures of stable and sufficient deterrence.

The quick freeze—which is a bill with the binding force of law, and not a sense of Congress resolution like the freeze—creates the impetus for a mutual moratorium between the Soviet Union and the United States on three dangerous thrusts of the arms race: the flight testing and deployment of new ballistic missiles like the MX or the SS-X-24; the flight testing and deployment of antisatellite systems which could blind a country and deprive it of the confidence needed to withhold a nuclear strike as long as possible; and the testing of new nuclear weapons which are the basic factor in the arms race.

As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I am confident that we can adequately monitor and verify compliance with these provisions, for the focus of the quick freeze is on readily observable phenomena like flight-testing and deployment, not on research and development.

Just as important, there are clear provisions in the bill for safeguards in the event that the Soviets should violate the moratorium. Moreover, the initial period of the moratorium is limited to 1 year, after which the President may recommend to Congress that it be continued in full, continued in part, or canceled. This means that, should we wish to deploy the single-warhead Midgetman missile which is an important step toward de-MIRVing our deterrent and adding to crisis stability, we can do so. The Midgetman missile is still in the early stages of development, so a 1-year moratorium will not preclude its deployment if such a move were to be in our interest. The same applies, of course, to the Trident II missile, which many people believe is, on balance, an improvement in our overall force posture.

It should be clear, in other words, that the Arms Race Moratorium Act stands in distinct contrast to the original freeze resolution. It is binding law rather than hortatory language. It is focused and specific rather than sweeping and potentially vague. It is fully verifiable. And it is—or it can be, if properly used—fully complementary to the broader thrust of the START negotiations.

Fundamentally, I had—and continue to have—three objections to the Kennedy-Hatfield freeze resolution, in contrast to the Arms Race Moratorium Act. First, the freeze resolution will stall rather than enhance an agreement. Second, it will disrupt relations with our allies. Third, it will increase rather than freeze or decrease the tendency toward greater and greater reliance on counterforce weaponry.

The original freeze resolution, which threw the problem of definition and duration into the laps of United States and Soviet negotiators, was fundamen-

tally a change in the "rules of the road" which have been worked out over many years in United States-Soviet negotiations. From the SALT I accord through the last round of the START negotiations, arms control has been focused on distinguishing between stabilizing second-strike weaponry and destabilizing first-strike weaponry. So radical approach as was suggested by the freeze would require a total redefinition of arms control, and the result would be delay—delay during which the arms race goes forward.

The quick freeze, by contrast, is fully consonant with both traditional and emerging definitions of arms control. In particular, by putting a moratorium on the deployment of new and highly MIRV'ed ICBM's, the quick freeze supports rather than undercuts the logic of the build-down approach which originated here in Congress and was later adopted by the administration. To this day, I find it impossible to square the build-down, which I support, with the MX, which I do not. The entire thrust of the build-down is to provide a self-policing incentive against the deployment of MIRV'ed systems. To argue that the MX should be the political quid pro quo for adoption of the build-down is to overlook the compelling logic behind the initiative. So when the quick freeze anticipates a moratorium on the MX, it both sustains the position I have held over time and bolsters the logic of the build-down.

But the American strategic nuclear arsenal is designed to do more than deter a direct attack on the United States alone. It is designed to extend deterrence to our treaty allies, and in so doing, to reassure them that they are secure. One of the little-recognized benefits of this posture of extended deterrence is that it helps dampen incentive for an arms race among European or other nations. In other words, extended deterrence is one of the costs we pay for nonproliferation.

That is why it is so crucial that our arms negotiations take into full account the views and concerns of our allies. We are not in this alone, and we do little to provide the reassurance needed to hold the alliance together if we act unilaterally on matters which directly affect the European members of NATO. Unilateralism is not just arrogant. It is disruptive and potentially destabilizing as well.

So a major concern I had with the original freeze resolution was that it clearly was intended to halt the deployment of the long-range theater nuclear forces now being used to replace existing weaponry in Europe. The Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles are not simply American weapons being gratuitously emplaced in foreign soil. They are NATO weapons designed to bolster deterrence by enhancing the survivability of the theater nuclear forces. The decision to develop and deploy them was taken by the entire NATO alliance, and it was made contingent on Soviet unwillingness to address the urgent problems raised by the SS-20 and comparable systems which are being deployed at an unprecedented rate.

Even though the freeze resolution is not binding, it is clear that it contemplates a freeze on the NATO weapons. As such, it signals unilateralism to the NATO alliance. And as such, it cannot gain my support.

But the quick freeze, by contrast, focuses on those weapons which are both most destabilizing and solely under U.S. control. I continue to believe that the MX missile or the SS-X-23 and SS-X-24 are far more destablizing than the ground-launched cruise missile, which is deployed far to the rear in order to avoid preemption, which is slow in its flight time, and which carries only one warhead per missile. Since the quick freeze deals with the real problems in arms control, it is a vast improvement over the original freeze in the area of allied relations as well as the area of negotiability.

Finally, an unintended consequence of the original freeze, if it were fully implemented as written, would be an increase rather than a decrease in the first-strike potential of the nuclear forces deployed by the United States and the Soviet Union. That is because the original freeze resolution, by focusing on all nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, would preclude modernization of our manned bomber force. Again, as is the case with the rules of the road and with the issue of NATO weaponry, the fundamental failing of the original freeze resolution is that it does not distinguish among various categories of nuclear forces. The quick freeze avoids that pitfall.

There is general agreement among the arms control community that, until we can obtain full disarmament, such nuclear forces as are held by each side in the United States-Soviet arms race should be unambiguously second-strike in nature. In other words, they should be "slow to anger": able to avoid preemption through such devices as basing; capable of recall after launch; and slow enough to avoid any suggestion of a surprise attack. The manned bomber force alone is uniquely suited to this role.

It is not fully understood just how fragile our existing fleet of B-52's really is. The last plane rolled off the production line in 1962. Although every plane in the force has undergone extensive rehabilitation and updating, only so much can be done. The airframe was not designed for the low-level flight profile which the plane has flown for nearly a quarter century. Engines are wearing out and spare parts are no longer produced. On any given day, large numbers of B-52's are deadlined for overhaul, and even those on full alert are often incapable of taking off on time.

In short, it is overwhelmingly clear that if the United States does not soon begin to replace the B-52's with another plane—whether a B-1 such as I support along with freeze advocates like Senator CRANSTON or the advanced technology bomber known as "Stealth"—we will soon have no bombers at all. Aside from the fact that this will move us away from the safety of the Triad which we have deployed for years, it will mean that such nuclear forces as we deploy will be based on ballistic missiles, whether land-based or submarine-based. Consequently, if we were to freeze our arsenal so as to preclude the adoption of a new bomber, we would actually decrease rather than bolster crisis stability. The quick freeze, with its focus on ballistic missiles, does not fall into this trap.

One final point should be stressed about the quick freeze. As I argued 2 years ago, the quickest way to put a meaningful brake on the arms race is to ratify the existing threshold test ban treaties and to pursue a comprehensive test ban treaty. New developments in warhead design are truly menacing. Only a test ban can insure that they are not later deployed. With its emphasis on a moratorium on nuclear warhead testing, the quick freeze will put a halt to some of the most disturbing developments on the horizon.

Mr. President, it bears emphasis that this act was authored with the assistance of many people, including the leadership of the National Freeze Campaign. There was a time, not long ago, when the patriotism of many people in the freeze movement and in related organizations was called into question by some people in public life. Such imputations rightly angered the vast majority of Americans. The fact that the leadership of the freeze campaign has demonstrated its willingness to learn from others while teaching others speaks legions about the integrity and patriotism of these dedicated Americans, who share with all of us the desire for a safer world.

Mr. President, as my remarks have made clear, I strongly believe that the Arms Race Moratorium Act represents a significant approach to arms control and a distinct improvement over the original freeze resolution. I urge my colleagues to study this bill carefully, and I hope that the Senate will have the chance at the earliest possible opportunity to debate and pass this important measure.●

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, today I am joining with several of my colleagues in sponsoring important arms control legislation. The Arms

Race Moratorium Act. I urge all Senators to examine this legislation closely, to evaluate it in the context of the present state or arms control negotiations and to give it their active support.

Though authored by Senators HATFIELD and KENNEDY—who originated the nuclear freeze resolution—the Arms Race Moratorium Act, differs considerably from the freeze resolution. The freeze would place the Congress on record in support of an arms control negotiating approach.

The Arms Race Moratorium Act goes a step further in proposing a way in which the ultimate objective of the freeze resolution may be achieved. It should be considered in concert with the earlier resolution. They are complementary.

Arms control negotiations on nuclear weapons are now at a standstill. In the absence of progress in these talks, both the United States and the Soviet Union are moving ahead with their nuclear weapons development efforts and are entering a new phase of potentially deadly competition.

The Reagan administration is planning to substantially increase the number of its nuclear warheads and is vigorously preparing for the flight testing and the development of the MX missile. In addition, it is organizing a massive effort to establish superiority in space-based antisatellite weapons.

For its part, the U.S.S.R. is developing several new intercontinental ballistic missiles a new submarine missile and its own inventory of antisatellite systems.

In the absence of effective arms controls, both the United States and the U.S.S.R. perceive a national security need not to be left behind as the other moves ahead. These perceptions are as dangerous as they are easy to understand. Unless each nation' perception is changed—unless both are convinced that a nuclear weapons freeze will not alter the existing balance of nuclear war power—the superpower arsenals will continue to grow. In the process, what stability exists will erode while the stakes in the nuclear weapons game will increase.

The bill we are offering today is innovative. It proposes that the United States ask the Soviet Union to forego the kinds of development I have mentioned. In return for a moratorium agreement by the Soviets, the United States would reciprocate.

If the U.S.S.R. agrees within 90 days of passage of this bill and our President refuses to direct a reciprocal U.S. moratorium, the bill provides that Congress would suspend funds for the testing and development of new ballistic missiles and antisatellite weapons and the testing of new warheads.

In early January, President Reagan said of nuclear arms control: "Now is the time to move from words to deeds." That is precisely what the Arms Race Moratorium Act proposes to do.

Some will suggest that this bill is heavy-handed, that it involves the legislative branch too directly in international negotiations, that it is drastic. Such suggestions undoubtedly will be made by the same people who oppose the nuclear freeze resolution, which they claim to be simplistic, lacking in substance and ultimately ineffective.

There is a message here.

If the President is truly committed to action on arms control and if he really believes that "now is the time to move from words to deeds," he will not reject the bill we propose today. Instead, he and his national security advisors will work with us in a cooperative way to reopen the nuclear arms control dialog with the Soviet Union and to insure that something meaningful comes of it. I, for one, would welcome such cooperation between the President and Congress. I would do so because, in my opinion, the need to put a halt to the nuclear arms race is the most serious issue facing our people.

A key consideration in all arms control discussions is verification. Those of us who offer this bill believe that the United States possesses the means by which it can verify a Soviet decision to halt the development, testing and deployment of new weapons. If we did not believe this, we would not be presenting the bill today nor would we have included in it a provision which permits immediate funding of U.S. weapons efforts if the President determines that the Soviets have breached the moratorium agreement.

In July 1945, in the darkness of an early morning, the first atomic bomb was exploded. That explosion, which ushered in the atomic age, was one of the great turning points in human history.

For the first time since the dawn of civilization, man acquired the power to destroy life on Earth.

Over a century age, the German diplomat, Baron von Clausewitz, advanced the idea of war as an extension of diplomacy. He said that "War is a political act, . . . a continuation of political relations, a carrying out of the same (policy) by other means."

That maxim is accepted and acted upon by governments today, as it was then. There has been no decrease in the willingness of nations to resort to armed force when political means fail. We need look only to Afghanistan, to Southeast Asia, to Central America, to the Middle East for recent examples of this unfortunate reality.

But there is a major difference between the time in which von Clausewitz lived and the time in which we live. Wars have always injured and killed human beings. Wars have cost nations their treasuries. Wars strengthened the hatreds and deepened the divisions between people.

But until very recently no country, no person, had the power to annihilate an entire nation, even the world as we know it. That is something man can do today.

That destructive power makes von Clausewitz's formulation of war as an arm of diplomacy dangerous and irrelevant.

Most scientists agree that it would take at most a few hundred nuclear weapons to totally destroy either the United States or the Soviet Union. We and our allies now possess over 30,000 nuclear warheads. The Soviet Union and its allies possess over 20,000.

As these figures make clear nuclear war would not be just another conflict. It prevents for the first time the prospect of the ultimate holocaust. Nuclear war, accordingly, is not and cannot be acceptable. Most importantly it is not inevitable.

The fundamental illogic of an unrestrained nuclear arms race has not escaped the American people, who are saying, ever more clearly, that enough is enough. And they are right.

I believe in a strong America. Plainly, American military strength plays an important role in deterring aggression. But maintaining, even improving our strength, is not inconsistent with reaching fair, balanced, verifiable agreements with the Soviet Union to halt the increase in nuclear weapons and bring about a reduction of such weapons.

Not long ago, George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Russia and a lifelong student of relations between these two nations put it well when he said:

> At the end of our present path of unlimited confrontation lies no visible destination but failure and horror. What is needed is only the will, the courage, the boldness, the affirmation of life, to declare our independence of nuclear danger, and to turn our minds and hearts to better things.

Mr. President, the bill we introduce today is a sound proposal which I commend to my colleagues and our President. I look forward to working with the other sponsors of the bill in an effort to secure its passage.●

By Mr. STAFFORD:

S. 2635. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration for fiscal year 1985; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, the Committee on Environment and Public Works—in addition to its better-known jurisdictions in clean air, clean water, highways, and waterways—is responsible for the activities of the Public Buildings Service of the

General Services Administration. In recent years, public buildings has been a full committee responsibility which I have shared with my friend from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, and which has also attracted the particular interest and attention of Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator SIMPSON. Each has been most attentive and made substantial contributions to our effort, with other Members, to define Federal buildings policy and to guide GSA to effective implementation of a national building program—as currently embodied in S. 452.

Pursuant to the policies first established by our committee in 1979, and consistent with S. 2080, S. 533, and S. 452, each of which were adopted in the Senate by large majorities, our committee has each year since 1979 recommended to the Senate an annual authorization bill for the agency.

Most recently, the committee scheduled a hearing on the 1985 authorizations for the Public Buildings Service—which will be our fifth such authorization—being held today. The proposal that has been developed follows very closely, and is substantially identical to, the agency's program as contained in the President's budget.

This authorization, like the fiscal 1985 authorization for other programs within the jurisdiction of the committee, must be reported to the Senate by May 15 if it is not to be subject to a waiver under the budget reform act. In order to fulfill that requirement, the committee is scheduled to meet in business session on Tuesday and on Thursday of next week to complete action on the various authorizations, including that for the Public Buildings Service.

So that Members of the Senate, affected agencies, and the public may be informed, and in order to place it formally before the committee prior to markup, the proposed fiscal year 1985 authorization for the Public Buildings Service as it has been prepared and submitted to Members should be a matter of record. For these reasons, I send to the desk the bill drafted prior to the hearing which proposes fiscal 1985 authorizations for the Public Buildings Service.

Mr. President, while this annual exercise provides an opportunity for a rather cursory examination of the intentions of the Public Buildings Service, I do not wish to imply it completes our oversight or permits a thorough examination of the operations of the agency. The Public Buildings Service is currently making several changes in policy, is reexamining existing programs, and is continually confronted with decisions of significant importance—not only on specific projects but also in carrying out Federal building policy. The committee continues its interest in these policies and decisions, and will continue to follow them closely with the assistance of staff and through additional meetings and public hearings as necessary.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Buildings Authorization Act of 1984."

SEC. 2. No appropriation, including any appropriation from the fund established pursuant to section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, shall be made by Congress or obligated by the Administrator unless it has been authorized by Congress in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) No public building construction, renovation, repair, or alteration shall be commenced unless an appropriation has first been made in the same fiscal year for which such appropriation has first been made in the same fiscal year for which such appropriation is authorized and for the estimated cost of completion of such construction, renovation, repair, or alteration.

(b) Beginning in fiscal year 1986, no lease shall be entered into unless the authority to enter into contracts has first been made for the maximum cost of such lease over the entire term in such amounts as are specified in annual appropriations Acts and in the fiscal year for which such lease is authorized.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 not to exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,227,802,000 from revenues and collections deposited into the fund pursuant to section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(f)), for the real property management and related activities of the Public Buildings Service of which:

(a) Not to exceed $91,877,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1985 as follows:

(1) For construction of public buildings (including funds for sites and expenses) at the following locations and maximum construction costs:

District of Columbia, Old Post Office (Internal Revenue Service Courtyard)	$2,000,000
Texas, El Paso, Border Station	6,893,000
Washington, Lyden, Border Station	2,386,000
Washington, Sumas, Border Station	4,618,000

(2) $1,000,000 for construction of public buildings of less than ten thousand gross square feet of space;

(3) $3,063,000 for deficit balances relating to fiscal year 1982 construction projects;

(4) $71,917,000 for purchase of sites and buildings at the following locations and maximum acquisition costs:

Virginia, Newport News, Post Office-Courthouse	$1,700,000
Other selected purchases including options to purchase	70,217,000

(b) Not to exceed $226,404,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1985 as follows:

(1) For renovations, alterations, and repairs of public buildings at the following locations and at the following maximum project costs of $1,000,000 or more:

California, San Francisco Appraiser Stores	$9,711,000
Colorado, Denver, Federal Center #20	6,210,000
Colorado, Denver, Federal Center #810	8,590,000
District of Columbia, Archives	4,696,000
District of Columbia, Auditors	8,980,000
District of Columbia, Blair House	6,611,000
District of Columbia, Health and Human Services, North Building	1,504,000
District of Columbia, Interior	4,131,000
Iowa, Des Moines, Federal Building	3,083,000
Maryland, Suitland, Naval Intelligence Command #1	8,809,000
Michigan, Detroit, McNamara Federal Building	1,532,000
Michigan, Detroit, Parking Garage	1,832,000
Nevada, Las Vegas, Federal Building	1,123,000
New York, New York, 201 Varick Street	1,508,000
Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Post Office-Courthouse	8,672,000
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 5000 Wissahikon Avenue	2,635,000
Virginia, Alexandria, Post Office, Courthouse	1,370,000
Virginia, Arlington, Pentagon	4,602,000

(2) $140,805,000 for renovations and repairs of public buildings at project costs of less than $1,000,000 including the public buildings at the following locations and maximum project costs:

Iowa, Sioux City, Post Office Courthouse	$809,000
Missouri, Kansas City, 1500 E. Bannister Road	907,000
Texas, Fort Worth, Warehouse #5	710,000

(3) $9,000,000 for alterations of leased buildings, the maximum cost for a single building being less than $250,000.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3(a) of this Act, not to exceed $53,572,000 shall be available for design and construction services.

(d) Not to exceed $865,000,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1985 as follows:

(1) $25,700,000 for rental increases due to lease expirations and for expansion space, and

(2) $839,300,000 for payments in fiscal year 1985 to provide for space under lease prior to fiscal year 1985, including increases in operating costs and taxes.

(e) Not to exceed $694,998,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1985 real property operations.

(f) Not to exceed $117,040,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1985 program direction.

(g) Not to exceed $178,911,000 shall be available for fiscal year 1985 for payment of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligation for public buildings acquired by purchase contract.

SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated under section 4 of the Act for construction, renovation, repair, or alteration shall remain available for obligation and expenditure without regard to fiscal year limitations: *Provided,* That construction, renovation, repair or alteration has commenced in the same fiscal year which funds are made available.

(b) Commencement of design using funds authorized pursuant to section 4(c) of this Act for projects authorized by sections 4(a) and 4(b) shall be regarded as complying

with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 6. Ten per centum of the funds made available pursuant to this Act to the Public Buildings Service for renovation, alteration, and repair of public buildings and for payment of leases on buildings shall be available for repair or alteration projects and leases, respectively, not otherwise authorized by this Act, if the Administrator certifies that the space to be repaired, altered, or leased resulted from emergency building conditions or changing or additional programs of Federal agencies. Funds for such projects may not be obligated until thirty days after the submission by the Administrator of an explanatory statement to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives. The explanatory statement shall, among other things, include a statement of the reasons why such project or lease cannot be deferred for authorization in the next succeeding fiscal year.

By Mr. SASSER (for himself, Mr. PELL, Mr. NUNN, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. BUMPERS):

S. 2636. A bill to require the Administrator of General Services to notify State and local governments and agencies thereof prior to the disposal of surplus real property; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL POLICY ACT OF 1984

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise to introduce, for myself and Senators PELL, NUNN, MATHIAS, SARBANES, LEVIN, PRYOR, BINGAMAN, and BUMPERS, S. 2636, legislation to clarify and amend procedures to be followed by the General Services Administration in the disposal of surplus Federal real property. The main purpose of this measure is to strengthen notice and comment procedures to be followed by GSA when State or local governments or their instrumentalities are eligible to acquire such property to use for schools, hospitals, airports, parks, or similar public uses.

This measure builds upon Senator PELL's approach in S. 102 to opening up the process for the conveyance of parks and recreational areas. I would like to note the invaluable work that Senator PELL did in this area. It has been very helpful to me to work with him in drafting the bill I introduce today.

I also note the legislative work of Senator BUMPERS in S. 891 to encourage the transfer of Federal properties, particularly those managed by the Bureau of Land Management, to State and local governments to be used for parks and other public purposes. I am pleased that he joins me in cosponsoring S. 2636.

I think it is important to state that the provisions of my bill are designed to make sure State and local governments are notified that they have an opportunity to obtain property declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government—when such property is needed for specific public purpose. It is certainly not my intention to stop appropriate marketing of Federal surplus property to the private sector. In fact, many local governments are very eager to work with the General Services Administration in promoting auctions of surplus property in their jurisdictions. Commercial sales to the private sector are often of great benefit to local communities because they add property to the local tax rolls. Private ownership of such real estate increases opportunities for industrial development and the creation of jobs. For that reason, I know that local and State governments are willing and valuable partners with the Federal Government in carrying forward appropriate property sales.

However, I am among many Members of Congress who have been very concerned about the recent decline in Federal real property conveyances for the public benefit. The transfer of surplus real property to State and local government for use for educational and public health purposes, for parks and historical markers, for recreation and wildlife refuges, and for public airports has been backed repeatedly by Congress in law. With unanimous consent, I request that an appendix citing these laws be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the appendix was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the General Services Administration brochure: "Disposal of Surplus Real Property for Public and Private Use." April 1978]

APPENDIX "A"

LAWS AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND INSTITUTIONS

Historic Monument.—Section 203(k)(3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(3)) authorizes conveyance to any State, political subdivision, instrumentalities thereof, or municipality, of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus real and related personal property which in the determination of the Secretary of the Interior is suitable and desirable for use as an historic monument for the benefit of the public. Conveyances of property for historic monument purposes under this authority shall be made without monetary consideration to the United States: Provided, that no property shall be determined under this authority to be suitable or desirable for use as an historic monument except in conformity with the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments established by section 3 of the Act of Congress approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666) and only so much of any such property shall be so determined to be suitable or desirable for such use as is necessary for the preservation and proper observation of its historic features. Property conveyed for historic monument purposes may under certain circumstances be used for revenue-producing activities to support the historic monument. Deeds conveying any surplus real property disposed of under this authority shall provide that the property shall be used and maintained for the purposes for which it was conveyed in perpetuity and may contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator to be necessary to safeguard the interest of the United States.

Public Parks and Public Recreational Areas.—Section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2)), authorizes the Administrator of General Services, in his discretion, to assign to the Secretary of the Interior for disposal, such surplus property, including buildings, fixtures, and equipment situated thereon, as is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior as being needed for use as a public park or recreation area. The Act authorizes the Secretary to sell or lease such properties to any State, political subdivision, instrumentalities thereof, or municipality, and to fix the sale or lease value of the property to be disposed of, taking into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by any such State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or municipality.

Deeds conveying any surplus real property disposed of under this authority provide that the property shall be used and maintained for the purpose for which it was conveyed in perpetuity and may contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be necessary to safeguard the interest of the United States.

Public Airports.—Section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)), which is continued in effect by section 602(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and amended by Public Law 311, 81st Congress (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(a)-(c)), authorizes the conveyance or disposal of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus real property or personal property (exclusive of property the highest and best use of which is determined by the Administrator to be industrial) to any State, political subdivision, municipality or tax-supported institution without monetary consideration to the United States. Such property must be determined by the Secretary, Department of Transportation to be suitable, essential, or desirable for development, improvement, operation, or maintenance of a public airport as defined in the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1101), or reasonably necessary to fulfill the immediate and foreseeable future requirements of the grantee for development, improvement, operation, or maintenance of a public airport, including property needed to develop sources of revenue from non-aviation businesses at a public airport. This section provides specific terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon which such conveyances or disposals may be made.

Health or Educational Use.—Section 203(k)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(1)), authorizes the Administrator of General Services, in his discretion, to assign to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for disposal such surplus real property, including buildings, fixtures, and equipment situated thereon, as is recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as being

needed for school, classroom, or other educational uses, or for use in the protection of public health, including research. The Act authorizes the Secretary to sell or lease such properties to States or their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, and tax-supported medical and educational institutions, non-profit educational institutions, hospitals, or other similar institutions not operated for profit which have been held exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to fix the sale of lease value of the property to be disposed of taking into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of the property by any such State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or institution. The principal restrictive provision in the instrument of conveyance requires the property to be used continuously for a specified period for the specific purpose stated in the application for the property made to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Wildlife Conservation.—Public Law 537, 80th Congress (16 U.S.C. 667b-d) provides that, upon request, real property which is under the jurisdiction or control of a Federal agency and no longer required by such agency (1) can be utilized for wildlife conservation purposes by the agency of the State exercising administration over the wildlife resources of the State wherein the real property lies or by the Secretary of the Interior; and (2) is valuable for use for any such purpose, and which, in the determination of the Administrator of General Services, is available for such use may, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, be transferred without reimbursement or transfer of funds (with or without improvements as determined by said Administrator) by the Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of the property to (a) such State agency if the management thereof for the conservation of wildlife relates to other than migratory birds, or (b) to the Secretary of the Interior if the real property has particular value in carrying out the national migratory bird management program. Any such transfer to other than the United States shall be subject to the reservation by the United States of all oil, gas, and mineral rights, and to the condition that the property shall continue to be used for wildlife conservation or other of the above-stated purposes and in the event it is no longer used for such purposes or in the event it is needed for national defense purposes title thereto shall revert to the United States.

Negotiated Sales to Public Agencies (without use restrictions).—The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(e)(3)(H)) authorizes the negotiated sale of surplus real property, subject to obtaining such competition as is feasible under the circumstances to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions thereof, or tax-supported agencies therein, provided the estimated fair market value of the property and other satisfactory terms of disposal are obtained by negotiation. Deeds conveying surplus real property under this section contain no restriction on the use of properties conveyed. In accordance with further provisions of the section, an explanatory statement of the circumstances of each disposal by negotiation is prepared and submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress in advance of each disposal when the property involved has a fair market value in excess of $1,000.

Other Specific Uses.—For other laws authorizing disposition of property under GSA's control, including excess and surplus property, see:

Federal aid and other highways—(23 U.S.C. 107 and 317).

Widening of public highways, streets, or alleys—(40 U.S.C. 345(c).

Power transmission lines needful for or adaptable to the requirements of a public power project—(50 U.S.C. App. 1622(d)).

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, with such extensive legislative backing, it is no wonder that for 32 years, intergovernmental transfers of property for the public benefit were commonplace. More than 3,000 such properties were conveyed for the public benefit between 1949 and 1982.

In 1982, though, the Reagan administration decided that such transfers of surplus real property should be brought to a virtual halt—so that more of these properties could be sold commercially to help retire the national debt. Early projections by the administration raised the expectation that $1.2 billion could be raised in 1983 through land sales. However, this optimistic projection was soon revised to $646 million by the General Services Administration. The actual sales contracts for 1983 were just $190 million. Some reports place cash receipts for the year at as little as $35 million.

At a time when the administration policies are adding to the debt at an unprecedented rate of $200 billion per year—contributing the small amount of money actually brought in by real property sales sounds a little like trying to drain the ocean with a teacup. While the goal seemed worthy, the realities of the situation have made the land sales program fall far short of realization of the objective of reducing the debt.

On the other hand, the benefit of the use of suitable properties for hospitals, schools, parks, and colleges can not be measured in dollars and cents. Ask the little league team about the value of the public park where the baseball diamond is located. Or question the young mother in rural community about the worth of the health clinic where she takes her baby for pediatric care. Or quiz the elderly widower about the price tag he would place on the senior citizen center where he meets friends and learns useful skills. Each will tell you that properties put to such public uses are priceless.

In 1980, there were 110 properties transferred to other levels of government to be used for the public benefit. In fiscal 1983, there were only 30 such conveyances. For the same period of time, sales jumped from 196 in 1980 to 396 in 1983. This rapid decline in conveyances for the public benefit I find a source of concern. With unanimous consent, I ask that a table showing the decline in intergovernmental donations of property and the accompanying increase in sales be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC BENEFIT PROGRAMS DISCOUNT CONVEYANCES—PARCELS DONATED

[By fiscal year]

Agency	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
NPS	50	44	9	14	117
HHS	10	8	7	4	29
ED	28	32	10	3	73
FAA	5	6	4	-	15
OTHER	17	20	15	9	61
Total	110	110	45	30	295

NPS = National Park Service.
HHS = Department of Health and Human Services.
ED = Department of Education.
FAA = Federal Aviation Administration.
OTHER = Highways, historic monuments and wildlife reservation areas.
Note.—This is the time frame for which this type of data is readily available.

PARCELS OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY DONATED AND SOLD

[By fiscal year]

	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Donated	110	110	45	30	295
Sold	196	191	150	396	933
Total	306	301	195	426	1,228

Note.—For fiscal year 1984 the General Services Administration estimated that it would sell 557 parcels and make 18 public benefits conveyances.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the pattern of conveyances for the public benefit to other levels of government has been drastically altered by the General Services Administration operating under Executive Order 12348 issued by President Reagan on February 25, 1982. Very little property is conveyed at discounted or no cost. If State or local governments are to acquire Federal property, they must be prepared to compete with the commercial sector in paying fair market value.

According to a report (H.R. 98-576) issued in 1983 by the House Government Operations Committee, the General Services Administration circulated internal memoranda in March of 1982 instructing its regional offices to first determine a given property's "highest and best use" independently and then either decide that the property should be sold or recommend it to GSA's Washington Office as suitable for public benefit conveyance. The term "highest and best use" is real estate terminology that refers exclusively to commercial value.

This procedure departs from the prior practice of GSA of giving program agencies such as Health and Human Services or Education the opportunity to comment—along with local interests—on the public benefit potential of surplus Federal property. And non-Federal public agencies are no longer afforded a reasonable—and early—opportunity to apply for surplus property in which they may be interested.

The General Services Administration, rather than HHS or Education, determines whether a property has merit for educational or health purposes. And most of those that are recommended for public purposes require reimbursement to the Federal Government at full market value.

I feel that this policy discourages the Federal Government from recognizing the many legitimate situations that still exist where the conveyance of real property to benefit the public is in the national interest. Since this real estate has already been paid for by the taxpayers, it seems unfair to ask that it be paid for again. The public benefit is the same whether the property is administered by the National, State or local government.

I should mention here that the procedures followed for the evaluation of property for park or recreational use differ from those used in assessments for other public purposes. Section 303(c) of Public Law 95-625 requires procedures to be established to give the Department of the Interior "full and early opportunity" to comment on potential park uses of surplus Federal property. However, this 1978 statute was not implemented until September of 1983—and then it was at the insistence of a House Government Operations Subcommittee. The procedures set forth by GSA, the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Interior allow Interior to comment on the park and recreational values of property during the review by GSA. These comments can then be considered by GSA in making the highest and best use determination for the property.

The procedures followed by the General Services Administration are particularly important since GSA now has the full responsibility for decisions concerning ths potential public benefit of property under consideration for disposal. I ask that the February 6, 1984, letter of John Svahn, Chairman of the Federal Property Review Board, notifying GSA that the Board will no longer review such decisions, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1984.

Hon. GERALD P. CARMEN,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CARMEN: In accordance with agreed upon procedures, you have asked the Property Review Board for advice concerning proposed public benefit discount conveyances in advance of acting on such requests.

On April 6, 1982, the Board provided you with policy guidance criteria for the granting of public benefit discount conveyances. Over the past eighteen months the proposed public benefit discount conveyances which you have submitted to the Board for policy advice have demonstrated that those guidelines are clear and have been effectively applied by the General Services Administration. As you know, the Board has concurred in every proposal for a public benefit discount conveyances which was referred to it.

Further, notwithstanding the Board's advice, since statutorily you retain discretion in decisions concerning such applications, it is clear that further participation by the Board in this process is unnecessary and duplicative of the efforts of the General Services Administration.

Accordingly, it is no longer necessary for you to solicit the Board's advice prior to acting on requests for public benefit discount conveyances.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. SVAHN,
Chairman, Property Review Board.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, there have been several cases in my State of Tennessee where worthy requests for conveyances—or for the retention of property by the Federal Government—have been held hostage to the push at GSA to meet sales quotas. One that I would like to highlight here is the situation at Oak Ridge. I believe it demonstrates that the current emphasis on commercial sale of Federal property has created an atmosphere were important considerations other than economics are ignored.

The General Services Administration sought to sell 12.5 acres of land in front of the Federal Building at Oak Ridge, Tenn. The city government—and the citizens of Oak Ridge—protested the sale strongly. People in the Oak Ridge community felt that the land had historical value and that the open space provided by this "lawn" in front of the Federal Building was needed in the congested city setting. So, before the sale by GSA could take place, the city government rezoned the property so that its use would continue to be appropriate to community needs.

The General Services Administration went ahead with the auction—but the bid offered was much lower than anticipated. As a result, GSA withdrew the property from the commercial market.

On September 26, 1983, the General Services Administration requested the Department of Justice to bring suit on behalf of the United States against the city of Oak Ridge. The GSA proposed that Justice seek a declaratory judgment or writ of mandamus by which the reclassification of this parcel of land from "Office" to "Residential, Open Space and Reserved" would be declared unconstitutional.

I think this action by GSA—especially if Justice agrees to the suit—sets a dangerous precedent for the future in GSA's management of Federal property in local jurisdictions. It is possible that local governments will no longer have any voice in the disposal of Federal property in their jurisdictions. However, I do not believe that is what the Congress intended in enacting the detailed procedures for working with local governments when disposals are contemplated under the Federal Property and Administration Services Act.

Both the National Association of Counties and the National League of Cities have adopted policy statements urging that the established program of discounted transfers of surplus Federal property be continued. With unanimous consent, I request that these policy statements be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL POLICY—1983

F. Federal Surplus Property.—The federal government holds title to many land parcels and properties, some unused and some underused, in localities across the nation. Authority in law exists for these properties that are in excess of federal agencies' needs to be made available to local governments at reasonable cost for the purpose of providing low and moderate income housing and related public, commercial, or industrial facilities. We urge the federal Executive Branch to use these authorities vigorously and sensitively: agencies should reassess their needs for unused or underused properties, especially those located in cities that have shortages of land for development, and should list such properties for disposal by the General Services Administration: GSA should facilitate the transfer of otherwise unneeded properties; and HUD should use assertively its authority to reduce the cost of the property and otherwise assist local governments to develop appropriate projects.

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL LAND SALES

Whereas, both the Administration and Congress are proposing initiatives to sell federal lands to help reduce the federal deficit; and

Whereas, the President has already created a Property Review Board within the Executive Branch to carry out this initiative, *i.e.*, the development and review of federal real property policies, including disposal; and

Whereas, both Congress and the Administration recommend the elimination of the no-cost discounted conveyances of federal lands to local governments for public purposes, and selling all federal lands at fair market value; and

Whereas, State and local governments are most attuned and sensitive to the long-term land use needs of the public within their various jurisdictions, to the extent that these needs relate to the use of surplus federal lands; and therefore, State and local government input in the selection and disposition of unencumbered surplus federal lands by the Federal Property Review Board would effectively implement the desired policy; and

Whereas, elevating to the status of legislative policy the thirty-three-year federal practice of offering to the State and local governments surplus federal lands at no cost or with a public benefit discount would also enable these governments to meet the long-term social and economic land use needs of the public in a manner consistent with the desired policy;

Now therefore be it resolved, That the National Association of Counties requests that the President create an advisory board of

local officials to work with the Property Review Board; and

Be it further resolved, That the Administration insure local involvement in every step of the federal property disposal process because the Property Review Board will need information as to how its policies and activities will affect the economic and social fabric of impacted communities; and

Be it further resolved, That Property Review Board decisions be consistent with local land use planning and zoning; and

Be it further resolved, That the National Association of Counties opposes proposals to eliminate no-cost and discounted conveyances of federal lands to local governments for public purposes because such results could seriously impede county ability to acquire land for public purpose activities; if such lands go only to the highest bidder such an outcome might not serve the public interest; and important public values could be lost; and

Be it further resolved, That the National Association of Counties strongly urges Congress to adopt legislation mandating no-cost and discounted conveyances of unencumbered surplus federal lands to state and local governments; the right of first refusal on their part regarding such conveyances; and participatory input by these governments in the selection and disposition of surplus federal lands by the Property Review Board to ensure their use and management in a manner consistent with the aforementioned policy.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, in light of this situation, I am today introducing legislation to:

Require GSA to give reasonable notice to States and local governments when they are entitled to receive property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act;

Make it incumbent on GSA to file a statement prior to the disposal of property worth over $50,000. The statement must be sent to the appropriate committees of Congress 30 days in advance of the disposal action. And other Federal agencies and the levels of Government must also receive a copy; and

Require GSA to certify to Congress that the disposal action under consideration is consistent with the purposes of the law.

It is my intention that this measure will reaffirm the policy already set by Congress that, in appropriate situations, intergovernmental conveyances of property to benefit the public are in the national interest.

With unanimous consent, I ask that my bill, S. 2636, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Real Property Disposal Policy Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the Federal Government owns many surplus real properties in State and local jurisdictions across the Nation, and many of these properties have not been used by the Federal Government;

(2) legal authority exists for the disposal of surplus real property to a State or local government at reasonable or no cost when such property can be used for the benefit of the public;

(3) the current policies of the General Services Administration discourage transfers of property to State and local governments, and such policies are inconsistent with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and

(4) State and local jurisdictions in which surplus real properties are located should be given sufficient notice when the Administrator of General Services considers the disposal of such properties and an adequate opportunity to incorporate such properties into the zoning and land use plans of such jurisdictions.

PROCEDURES FOR THE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

SEC. 3. Section 203(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting "(1)" before "Except" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act whenever the Administrator considers—

"(A) disposing of any surplus real property for or on behalf of any executive agency, or

"(B) authorizing any executive agency to dispose of any surplus real property,

the Administrator shall, prior to offering such property for disposal or authorizing such agency to dispose of such property, give reasonable notice of, and an opportunity to comment on, the disposal of such property to any State, political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of a State, municipality, educational institution, medical institution, hospital, or other institution, which may be eligible to receive such property under subsection (e)(3)(H) or subsection (k) of this section.

"(3) At least 30 days before the disposal, by the Administrator or any executive agency, of any surplus real property which has a fair market value in excess of $50,000 and to which paragraph (2) applies, the Administrator shall prepare and transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress, appropriate executive agencies, and the governing body responsible for zoning or land-use planning of the locality in which such property is located, a statement—

"(A) describing the surplus real property intended for disposal and the method intended to be used in such disposal;

"(B) summarizing any comments made by a State, political subdivision, agency, instrumentality, institution, or hospital under paragraph (2);

"(C) explaining the basis for any determination of the Administrator or an executive agency to dispose of such property; and

"(D) certifying that the disposal of such property in the manner determined by the Administrator or the executive agency is consistent with the purposes of this section and is in the best interests of the United States.".●

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator SASSER in introducing the Real Property Disposal Policy Act. As one who has been long concerned with the current administration's efforts to auction off large blocks of surplus Federal lands, I believe this bill is well designed to protect the interests of State and local governments—as well as taxpayers—in preserving surplus land that is really best suited for park and outdoor recreation, and not private development.

This problem first surfaced in my own State of Rhode Island, where the Government sought to sell, for private development, several parcels of unneeded Federal land in the midst of the beautiful Narragansett Bay Islands Park. The proposed commercial sale of these scenic resources aroused great concern and opposition within my State. I joined with other members of our congressional delegation in an effort that ultimately persuaded the Property Review Board and the General Services Administration to turn these beautiful properties back to the State of Rhode Island for park use. In the midst of the problem, I introduced—with the support of 14 other Senators—S. 102, legislation that is similar in approach to the legislation Senator SASSER is introducing today. Both bills emphasize the fundamental importance of first notification to the States and local governments when Government property in their jurisdiction is declared surplus, and second, maximizing opportunities for State and local government to obtain unneeded Federal property, at little or no cost, for public benefit purposes. I welcome Senator SASSER's legislation as a companion to my own bill and look forward to working with him in presenting these bills to the Governmental Affairs Committee.

I believe we all want to see a continuation of the park and outdoor recreation programs that enrich the quality of life of our people. Many resources owned by the Federal Government are a part of our national heritage and have a value to the American taxpayers—and their descendants—far in excess of the amount of money the Government would realize from public sales of those properties. I commend Senator SASSER for his leadership in this area, and I hope that all of my colleagues will join in supporting this important legislation.●

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. MELCHER):

S. 2637. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to modify the amount of dependent care and excess shelter expense deductions which are allowable under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

FOOD STAMP ACT AMENDMENTS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, hunger is increasing in the United States. After more than 20 years of progress, we now witness a dramatic increase in the demand for emergency food assistance. More and more people need the help of soup kitchens, food

pantries, and emergency food distribution centers. Many of these people receive food stamps but find themselves without food by the third or fourth week of every month. Their limited resources simply cannot be stretched far enough to pay for food, shelter, and the other necessities of life.

I rise today to introduce legislation to ameliorate the terrible choices poor people face, by improving the responsiveness of the food stamp program to the dire economic circumstances of many low-income American families. This bill would reform the food stamp program, so that no poor family will be forced to choose between food and shelter. Specifically, this bill would establish separate deductions for child care and excess shelter expenses, capping the dependent care deductions at $160 a month and the excess shelter expense deduction at $175 a month. We must take due account of the rapid increases in the costs of shelter and child care, when calculating how much food stamp assistance a poor family can receive.

The food stamp program rests on the tenet that food stamps should make up any difference between a family's costs for a minimally adequate diet and 30 percent of the family's income—with some adjustments for unusual expenses. A family is expected to expend 30 percent of its income for food, but if this sum is not enough to provide an adequate diet, then the family may be eligible to receive food stamps to make up the difference.

We determine how much money a family has available for food by first excluding income used for certain expenditures that are unusual, excessively high, or more or less beyond the family's control. Current law includes the following exclusions: a standard deduction of $89 per month; 18 percent of all earned income, to take account of taxes and work expenses; certain expenses for the care of a dependent while the parent is working; and shelter expenses that exceed 50 percent of all income remaining after other deductions. Under current law, however, the total exclusion for dependent care and shelter cannot exceed $125. Only elderly and disabled recipients are not bound by this $125 ceiling.

It is painfully clear, Mr. President, that this ceiling for shelter and child care expenses bears little relation to the burden actually borne by many low-income families. Between 1980 and 1983, for example, household utility costs for all Americans increased 33 percent, while rents increased 24 percent. The food stamp program ignored these increases. The ceiling on income exclusion for food stamp recipients remained frozen at $115 per month through September 1983.

Studies of residential energy use by the U.S. Department of Energy, moreover, show that low-income families suffer more from rapid increases in energy costs than do families who are better off. Home energy expenses consume about twice as large a share of the incomes of families receiving food stamps, than they do for households at the median income. Stated simply, poor families have little flexibility in their energy consumption. They have already reduced their consumption as much as possible; the heat cannot be turned down any further, and they cannot buy a new heating system to take advantage of price changes for different fuels.

These deductions were designed to take account of unusually high shelter expenses, and therefore one might expect that only a small fraction of food stamp recipients would find themselves at or near the ceiling. This is not the case. More than one-fourth of all households receiving food stamps, and more than 30 percent of public assistance households on food stamps, had child care and shelter expenses exceeding the $125 cap. The conclusion is clear, the deduction is too low.

This legislation would implement a one-time special adjustment, raising the ceiling to $175 for fiscal year 1985. This adjustment would increase food stamp benefits by as much as $14 per month for a family with very high shelter costs. The test for this additional shelter deduction is quite strict, granting the deduction only to the extent that shelter costs exceed half of net income, so as to target the benefit increase on those most in need. While the bill increases the benefits for recipients already on the rolls, it will not increase the number of recipients receiving benefits.

This bill also would allow a family to deduct its child care expenses, separately from the excess shelter expense deduction. Congress established a single cap for both deductions in 1977, to limit participating by families with relatively high gross incomes. Today, however, families with incomes significantly above the poverty line cannot receive food stamps because a family with gross income of 130 percent of the poverty level automatically is disqualified. In light of this change, it is appropriate and fair to establish separate shelter and child care deductions, to recognize the special needs of low-income families with high child care and high shelter expenses.

It is more difficult to document the increase in child care costs with precision, but cuts in title XX funds have reduced significantly the availability of low-income American families. The 1981 Omnibus Reconciliation Act eliminated the $200 million set-aside for subsidized day care and dropped the requirement that 50 percent of all title XX funds be used to provide services such as day care, to the poor. As a result of these changes, 10 States have reduced the numbers of low-income working families eligible for title XX child care and 20 States have been forced to tighten eligibility requirements for low-income mothers in training programs to receive title XX child care. In my own State of New York, the numbers of children receiving subsidized day care have dropped from 94,000 children in fiscal year 1981 to 82,400 in fiscal year 1983. A separate child care deduction, capped at $160 a month as I propose, could offset some of the adverse effects of these title XX cuts and provide food stamp recipients the incentive and opportunity to week work or job training.

Surely, Congress does not intend to force poor Americans to choose between food and shelter. This legislation would permit our poor families to pay their rents and child care costs without fear of going hungry. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2637

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014 (e)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Households, other than those households containing an elderly or disabled member, shall also be entitled, with respect to expenses other than expenses paid on behalf of the household by a third party, to (1) a dependent care deduction, the maximum allowable level of which shall be $160, for the actual cost of payments necessary for the care of a dependent, regardless of dependent's age, when such care enables a household member to accept or continue employment, or training or education which is preparatory for employment, and (2) an excess shelter expense deduction to the extent that the monthly amount expended by a household for shelter exceeds an amount equal to 50 per centum of monthly household income after all other applicable deductions have been allowed, except that the amount of such excess shelter expense deduction shall not exceed $175 a month in the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia, and shall not exceed, in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, $305, $250, $210, and $130, respectively, adjusted on October 1, 1985, and each October 1 thereafter, to the nearest lower dollar increment to reflect changes in the shelter (exclusive of homeownership costs), fuel, and utilities components of housing costs in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as appropriately adjusted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics after consultation with the Secretary, for the twelve months ending the preceding June 30."; and

(2) by striking out "the same as that for the excess shelter expense deduction contained in clause (2) of the fourth sentence of this subsection" in subclause (B) of the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$160".●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 384

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to aid State and local governments in strengthening and improving their judicial systems through the creation of a State Justice Institute.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1201, a bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to protect semiconductor chips and masks against unauthorized duplication, and for other purposes.

S. 1935

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1935, a bill to establish an interagency task force on cigarette safety.

S. 2266

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2266, a bill to grant a Federal charter to Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

At the request of Mr. ABDNOR, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2266 supra.

S. 2375

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) was added as cosponsor of S. 2375, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration.

S. 2378

At the request of Mr. ABDNOR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2378, a bill to provide authorizations of appropriations for the impact aid program under Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 2423

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2423, a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for the purpose of compensating and otherwise assisting victims of crime, and to provide funds to the Department of Justice for the purpose of assisting victims of Federal crime.

S. 2532

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) were added as cosponsors of S. 2532, a bill entitled the "Computer Education Assistance Act of 1984."

S. 2564

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2564, a bill to grant the consent of Congress to a high speed passenger rail interstate compact between the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania and to authorize the Department of Transporation to cooperate with such States in implementing the compact.

S. 2623

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2623, a bill to implement the Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation, and for other purposes.

S. 2624

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2624, a bill to implement the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages.

S. 2625

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2625, a bill to permit the payment of rewards for information concerning terrorist acts.

S. 2626

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2626, a bill to prohibit the training, supporting, or inducing of terrorism, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 246

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 246, a joint resolution strongly urging the President to secure a full accounting of Americans captured or missing in action in Southeast Asia, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 258

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 258, a joint resolution to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984 as "National Safety in the Workplace."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 270

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 270, a joint resolution designating the week of July 1 through July 8, 1984 as "National Duck Stamp Week" and 1984 as the "Golden Anniversary Year of the Duck Stamp."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 273

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Washington (Mr. EVANS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS),and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. DANFORTH) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 273, a joint resolution to designate the week of May 13, 1984, through May 19, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 279

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 279, a joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 283

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 283, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 372

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 372, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding exposure of members of the Armed Forces to ionizing radiation and to herbicides containing dioxin.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 110—RELATING TO THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNANIMOUS DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN BROWN VERSUS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. NUNN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HART, and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 110

Whereas May 17, 1984 marks the thirtieth anniversary of the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in the Brown v. Board of Education decision which invalidated the doctrine of "separate but equal";

Whereas the Brown decision was rooted in the principles of individual freedom and equality of all persons before the law which lie at the heart of American democracy;

Whereas the Brown decision provided the catalyst for an end to legally mandated racial segregation in all segments of American society;

Whereas in the 30 years since Brown, the nation has made great strides toward achieving true equal educational opportunity for all Americans of all races and colors, though much remains to be done;

Whereas the thirtieth anniversary of Brown provides an appropriate time to reaffirm the support of the American people for the principles articulated in the Brown decision, the nation's commitment to the ultimate goal of a color blind society, and the elemental importance of equal educational opportunity to that end: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That the Congress—

(1) expressing the sentiments of the people of the United States, extolls the unanimous decision of Brown v. Board of Education;

(2) designates May 17, 1984 as a "National Day of Commemoration for the Brown v. Board of Education Decision"; and

(3) authorizes and requests the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the designated day with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise to submit a Senate concurrent resolution designating May 17 as a national day of commendation for the Brown versus Board of Education decision.

Mr. President, 34 years ago, a little girl named Linda Brown from Topeka, Kans., asked her parents why she had to be bused 2 miles to attend an all-black school, when her white playmates attended another school only a few blocks away. Linda's parents petitioned the Federal courts for an answer. After 4 years of litigation, Linda's question was finally posed to the members of the Nation's Highest Tribunal. And on May 17, 1954, they gave an answer which shook the Nation.

Linda's question forced the Supreme Court and the country to come to grips with the warped hypocrisy of the doctrine of separate but equal. The "separate" had proved to be nothing more than a way to tell black Americans they were second-class citizens. The "equal" had proved to be nothing more than lipservice to the dictates of the 14th amendment. Linda Brown gave the Court an opportunity to expose the cruel hoax of Plessy versus Ferguson. "Separate," the Court wrote, was "inherently unequal." The Nation's schools were to be desegregated with all deliberate speed.

Kansas was able to avoid the trauma and violence which plagued some other jurisdictions in the wake of the Brown decision. Perhaps this was because Kansans remembered their unique heritage as "Bleeding Kansas"—A State forged in the white-hot glue of the Civil War. So it was more with regret than resistance that Kansans came to recognize the irony of a dual educational system, in a State given birth by a war fought in the name of slavery's extinction. It was with complete and immediate acceptance that Kansas responded to the Supreme Court's directive.

In 1955, Kansas ended its system of segregated elementary schools and by 1961, not one black child in Topeka continued to attend an all-black school. As with so many other jurisdictions which share our tragic history, we still have a way to go. But our record of progress is one of which we can be very proud. For instance, over 70 percent of all black students in Kansas now attend fully integrated schools, as compared to 40.8 percent for all border States, and 37.1 percent for the Nation.

To mark the 30th anniversary of Brown versus Board of Education, Washburn University in Topeka will be holding a 2-day program commemorating that landmark decision. It is my hope that by passing this resolution, Congress can encourage others to follow Washburn's lead, either through formal activities or simply private reflection. Perhaps we have all become too distracted by disagreements over how best to remedy lingering vestiges of de jure segregation, and too consumed by debate about the degree to which our current obligations arise from constitutional mandate or moral imperative. May 17 would be an appropriate time for all to come together in reaffirming our dedication and commitment to the basic tenets of the 1954 Brown decision, to take heart in the progress that has been made, and to look forward to the day when there are no longer "black schools," nor "white schools," but just schools.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 111—RELATING TO THE DEPLOYMENT OF SEA-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILES

Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. DURENBERGER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON RES. 111

Whereas the Soviet Union has yet to return to the strategic arms reduction talks (hereafter in this concurrent resolution referred to as "START") or the intermediate nuclear force reduction talks (hereafter in this concurrent resolution referred to as "INF");

Whereas an early resumption of these negotiations is in the interest of all mankind;

Whereas the United States has both demonstrated flexibility in the START and INF negotiations and expressed a willingness to consider any reasonable Soviet proposals;

Whereas the President has repeatedly emphasized his willingness to negotiate limits on or reductions in the stocks of all nuclear weapons with a view toward the complete elimination of all such weapons from the earth;

Whereas sea-launched cruise missiles equipped with nuclear warheads, if further deployed, will greatly complicate the prospects for such nuclear arms control agreements; and

Whereas sea-launched cruise missiles equipped with nuclear warheads could create unforeseen and undesirable military and diplomatic consequences for the United States, its allies, and adversaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President should, at the earliest possible date—

(1) urge the Soviet Union to return to the START and INF negotiations;

(2) include in the appropriate negotiations a discussion of sea-launched cruise missiles equipped with nuclear warheads with a view toward the complete elimination of such missiles from the arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union; and

(3) propose to the Government of the Soviet Union, as an interim means of advancing the goal described in paragraph (2), a mutual and verifiable moratorium on any further deployment of sea-launched cruise missiles equipped with nuclear warheads pending the implementation of a final START or INF agreement, as appropriate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the United States is on the verge of making a grave mistake. The United States is about to pull the rug out from under the whole arms control process that has been so painstakingly constructed over the past two decades.

Sometime between now and the end of June, without benefit of congressional hearings, the United States will begin to deploy the nuclear-armed, sea-launched cruise missile [SLCM]. As weapons go, the nuclear SLCM is appealing: It is cheap at just over $3 million per missile; it is easy to transport and conceal; it is identical in most respects to its air- and ground-launched cousins. But, as weapons go, it is also about as foolish as a weapon can be: It will make only a marginal contribution to our national security, and it may kill all hope of verifiable arms control agreements in the future.

This weapon will be ours within 60 days, maybe even earlier. All this body has to do is exactly what it has done about this type of missile in the past—nothing.

I am here today with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DURENBERGER, in a last-ditch effort to try to do something to prevent nuclear

folly—SLCM deployment. Today we submit a concurrent resolution designed to put the brakes on the American and Soviet nuclear SLCM programs. Tomorrow and the next day, and every day until we either win or lose this fight, we will take every opportunity to remind our colleagues, the President of the United States, and the American people of the dangerous step we are about to take. We will speak out against SLCM deployments, and we invite interested colleagues to do the same until this system is defeated, or until we reach the dreadful point of no return signaled by the first SLCM deployment.

This is not the first time I have attempted to focus the attention of this body on the dangers posed by the nuclear SLCM, and I am deeply concerned that time—once my ally in this debate—is no longer on my side.

The current U.S. program, the Tomahawk land attack missile (nuclear), known as TLAM-N, is due for initial deployment in June of this year. It is intended to provide a diversification of our naval tactical strike capability and a strategic reserve, whatever that means. The Soviet nuclear SLCM program, while ongoing, is unimpressive by comparison, and is confined for the most part to a 600 kilometer range.

Many people find apparent comfort in the fact that our SLCM technology currently outstrips Soviet capabilities, but historically we know that there is little comfort to be found in such superiority. In the late 1960's, the United States enjoyed a similar clear lead in MIRV technology. Our reluctance to relinquish MIRV's then created the land-based ICBM vulnerability that the United States is now experiencing. By refusing to include MIRV's in the SALT talks, we virtually invited the Soviet Union to match our MIRV capability in the fastest manner possible. They accepted that invitation, and matched our MIRV technology within 6 years.

I am fully aware of and increasingly concerned by anticipated deployments of Soviet long-range nuclear SLCM's on submarines cruising off our east and west coasts. Such activity only increases the sense of urgency I feel. Pentagon planners evidently shared my concern when, earlier this year, they moved the Presidential airborne command post from Andrews Air Force base to an inland area that is safer from Soviet submarine-launched nuclear missiles. Not only is there very little time before large-scale nuclear SLCM deployments occur on both sides, but those deployments will further reduce the time either country would have to react to a missile attack.

The manifold dangers posed by nuclear SLCM deployments are not military alone. Their deployment would entail significant arms control and diplomatic costs as well.

There is virtual unanimity among the arms control community and the defense establishment that American and Soviet sea-launched cruise missile activity will be, and in fact already is, difficult to verify. Once deployed on submarines and surface vessels, the small, easily transported and concealed cruise missile will make future arms control agreements almost impossible. There is also the problem of distinguishing between a cruise missile carrying a conventional or a nuclear warhead. I do not have to remind my colleagues that such ambiguity will make home porting and visits to friendly ports a potential diplomatic nightmare.

At present, we can estimate the numbers and capabilities of Soviet nuclear SLCM's with a reasonable degree of certainty. But a new generation of these weapons will make this task almost impossible. It is not unreasonable to imagine a time in the not-too-distant future when the United States would have to assume that every Soviet fishing trawler is a potential cruise missile launch platform.

As long ago as September 1981, Supreme Allied Commander Bernard W. Rogers warned:

> We have always, in the past, maintained that if you put cruise missiles with nuclear warheads on submarines you are, in fact, fuzzing up the distinction between tactical and strategic nuclear weapons.

Since this country began negotiating about nuclear weapons with the Soviet Union, it has avoided fuzzing up the distinction between tactical and strategic forces. In this respect, the nuclear SLCM is a giant step backward. The time to tackle such problems is now, before major deployments have occurred, and not after the fact.

I am painfully aware of the difficulties associated with verifying a moratorium or an eventual ban on nuclear SLCM deployments. Neither I nor Senator DURENBERGER would support an accord that we did not find to be adequately verifiable. But I do not see how we or the U.S.S.R. will be in a position to judge what might constitute adequate verification until we are talking to one another. An a priori assumption on either side that an agreement limiting nuclear SLCM deployment is unverifiable suggests gross disregard and disdain for the diplomatic process. I for one am not prepared to make such an assumption.

The alternative to negotiation, in this case, is not acceptable. Once both sides are engaged in massive deployment of nuclear SLCM's President Reagan's search for an arms control agreement incorporating verifiable deep cuts in nuclear arsenals will become a practical impossibility. A Congressional Budget Office study from March 1984 notes that:

> Unless an agreement embraces emerging weapons like the sea-launched cruise missile, it may be obsolete before it is signed.

So I say, Mr. President, let us not repeat the negotiating errors of the past. Let both the United States and the Soviet Union make an effort to address the nuclear SLCM question before it becomes an insurmountable obstacle to negotiated progress, to future arms control agreements. Let us talk while there is still time to talk.

As the astute British statesman, David Ormsby Gore, once said:

> It would indeed be a tragedy if the history of the human race proved to be nothing more than the story of an ape playing with a box of matches on a petrol dump.

We may not be able to eliminate the petrol dump. We may not be able to confiscate the matches all at once. But we could start taking them away from the ape one by one—and we must.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, Senator MATHIAS and I are today submitting a Senate concurrent resolution which we hope will give us one last chance to avoid a needless, senseless, and potentially dangerous arms race. We are confident that, as the facts emerge about the nuclear version of the sea-launched cruise missile (SLCM), it will become clear that this is a weapon which has comparatively little military worth but which, if deployed, will create some profound problems. Our resolution is a straightforward proposal that, if the Soviets come to their senses and return to the INF and START talks, the President should propose incorporation of the nuclear SLCM in the appropriate forum and should also propose an interim moratorium on any further deployment of this particular weapon.

Mr. President, the history of arms control is a history of lost opportunities. It is a tragic irony that we seldom recognize the full implications of a given technology in its earliest stages. Only as engineering development gives full shape to a concept does there emerge a more thorough understanding of the pros and cons of deployment. But by that time, the development program often seems to have developed a life of its own.

Unfortunately, this seems to have been the case with the nuclear-armed SLCM, just as it was earlier the case with the MIRV warhead system. In retrospect, there are few who would argue that the deployment of MIRV's has enhanced our security. In fact, the entire thrust of the build-down concept, which originated here in Congress and which I fully support, is to "de-MIRV" both our own missiles and those of the Soviets. What Senator MATHIAS and I hope will happen is that we will avoid the necessity, at some later date, to make a Hobson's choice between living with the nuclear-armed SLCM or abandoning any

version of the sea-launched cruise missile. In other words, we strongly feel that the time for action is now, not later. We cannot plan to de-nuclearize the SLCM after the fact. We must control this weapon now, or not at all.

If the history of arms control is a history of lost opportunities, it is also a history of what might be called one-way thinking. By this, I mean that we frequently tend to recognize that a given weapons system might prove useful if we deploy it ourselves, but we seldom think through the consequences of a Soviet deployment. Conversely, we ourselves occasionally recognize that a given weapon system might be interesting or useful to the Soviets, given their unique geostrategic setting, but we fail to understand that a comparable weapon in our own hands can be a foolish mismatch of technology to our own military requirements. The first illustration is an example of naive ethnocentrism—the failure to understand that what our engineers can do, Soviet engineers can also do, even if later and not as well. The second illustration is an example of mirror-imaging—the belief that if the Soviets have something, we too should have it.

The result, at the minimum, is an offsetting series of actions and reactions which leave us in the same comparative military situation as when we started, but billions of dollars poorer. At the worst, the result is a measurable degeneration in our overall security. Again, the case of the MIRV proves instructive.

Mr. President, we have heard much, and we will hear much more, about the threat posed by the Soviet nuclear-armed SLCM. Over the past few weeks, we have seen several news stories suggesting that, thanks to the diversion of U.S. technology, the impending version of the latest Russian SLCM will be as capable as—or more capable than—the Tomahawk Land-Attack Missile, Nuclear (TLAM-N) which is slated for initial operational capability this June. These are valid points. But they do not detract from the need to control these weapons as soon as possible. Instead, they bolster it.

As the Navy has correctly pointed out for many years, the Soviets have been deploying sea-launched cruise missiles since the early 1950's. Many of these weapons are designed as anti ship missiles. Others are designed to carry a nuclear payload to shore-based targets. In the case of the cruise missile, it is simply incorrect to say—as so many people do—that the United States will start an arms race. Quite the contrary, the United States is belatedly catching up with the Soviets. The question is whether it is appropriate for us to catch up in every possible application of this technology.

When cruise missiles are used as anti shipping weapons, armed with conventional warheads, they constitute an enormous force multiplier. For a maritime nation such as the United States, they are a vital element of the strong Navy which we need. So it was foolish of the United States to overlook this potential for so long at a time when the Russians were arming every possible vessel with anti shipping missiles. We should do nothing which would derail the Tomahawk Anti-Ship Missile program, for it permits us to match—and exceed—Soviet capabilities in a crucial area and to add to the punch of our Navy. In fact, whether or not the Soviets had developed such a weapon on their own, it would have been a smart investment for us to develop this capability, for we are far more dependent than most nations on freedom of the seas and our Navy must be capable of meeting any possible threat to our ocean-going commerce.

But if it is sensible to develop the anti-ship missile for the U.S. Navy, it is questionable indeed to press ahead with the TLAM-N. And it is simply vital that we make one last concerted effort to prevent the planned deployment of the Soviet SSN-X-21.

The current fleet of Soviet nuclear-armed SLCM's, many of which are now on station off our east coast, represents an undeniable hazard to the security of the United States. Any nuclear warhead aimed at our territory carries with it the potential to inflict damage beyond imagination. So I do not want to minimize the threat posed by the current generation of Soviet nuclear-armed SLCM's.

But I would point out to my colleagues, Mr. President, that these weapons present a hazard with known boundaries. The Soviets, as we know, tend to keep everything they have ever built, whereas we tend to retire older generations of weaponry in order to improve our command and control, to reduce unintended or collateral effects, and to ease the burden on the taxpayer. The current generation of deployed Soviet nuclear-armed SLCM's derives from the days before the Soviets had developed a ballistic missile capability. These weapons are of comparatively short range and are thought to be very inaccurate.

For the Soviets, investment in such weapons made a considerable degree of sense, given the geographic asymmetries between our two countries. For a comparatively modest investment, the Soviets could threaten a huge proportion of the population of the United States, since so many of our citizens live within a few hundred miles of each coast. For the Soviets, in other words, the first generation of nuclear-armed cruise missiles represented a means of obtaining what their technology could not give them: Weaponry with which to threaten the United States with countervalue strikes.

Had we chosen to respond in kind, it would have been a waste of money. First, beginning in the 1950's, we were able to develop several generations of increasingly capable ballistic missiles.

Second, given the range constraints on cruise missiles, there were relatively few targets in the Soviet Union which could be reached by cruise missiles. So we would have gained virtually nothing, and expended a lot of money. Under the circumstances, the decision to cancel the Bomarc and other such nuclear-capable cruise missiles was eminently sensible.

The fundamental case against our own deployment therefore remains as strong today as it was 25 years ago. Even though the range and accuracy of our planned TLAM-N is much better, the fact is that these weapons are simply redundant given our current robust nuclear arsenal. In fact, the best case the Navy seems able to offer for the TLAM-N is that it will be a strategic reserve. This phrase is a de facto admission that the TLAM-N is redundant to our strategic deterrent requirements.

The Soviets, on the other hand, might gain a new capability if they should deploy the SSN-X-21, or any other system comparable to our planned TLAM-N. Based on public accounts of the expected capability of the next generation of Soviet nuclear-armed SLCMs, it is not unreasonable to believe that such weapons could pose the threat decapitating strikes aimed at our national command centers or a first strike aimed at our bomber bases deep in the interior of the United States. If so, it clearly serves our interest to limit this threat. If the price of doing so is to forego the TLAM-N, then it is well worth the bargain.

Some people might ask, therefore, why we should not wait until after the TLAM-N has achieved its initial operational capability before raising the idea of a moratorium. The answer is both simple and complex.

The simple way to answer this is to point out that, in past arms negotiations, it has customarily been the rule that once a weapon has demonstrated a given capability, all further such weapons are assumed to have the same capability. This has been the only feasible way to handle the problem of verification.

What this means is that were we to go ahead with deployment of a TLAM-N, we would most likely face the prospect that any attempt to limit further deployments of nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missiles like the TLAM-N or the SSN-X-21 would mean that we would also be forced to limit the conventional variants of

these launchers, for there is no clear way to distinguish between a conventionally-armed antiship cruise missile and a nuclear-armed land-attack missile. We would thus face the impossible choice I mentioned at the outset—to live with the threat of nuclear-armed SLCM's in order to gain the high military advantage of an antiship cruise missile, or to lose the antiship missile in order to control the nuclear SLCM. Either way, our security would suffer.

The issue, in other words, hinges on the verifiability of the cruise missile. The current generation of Soviet sea-launched cruise missiles can adequately be monitored, for they are primitive weapons launched by primitive means. But the impending generation will pose nearly impossible problems for those who wish to monitor that limits are being met. The only way to handle the issue, in other words, is to stop it before it starts. Hence the need for an interim moratorium pending final resolution of this issue in the appropriate arms control forum.

The complex answer to the question of why a moratorium now is really a derivative from the simple answer. Simply put, deployment of the TLAM-N will constitute a foolish decision in terms of our own unilateral military requirements.

First, deployment of the TLAM-N, even temporarily, runs the risk that we will severely complicate the deployment of the Pershing II and Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles. As General Bernard Rogers argued nearly 3 years ago, "we have always, in the past, maintained that if you put cruise missiles with nuclear warheads on submarines you are, in fact, fuzzing up the distinction between tactical and strategic nuclear weapons." In other words, the verification issues posed by this weapon are unique, and they could overwhelm our hopes for a "zero option" or some similar outcome at the INF talks.

Second, and in a related vein, it is conceivable that deployment of this weapon will pose some tough questions for our European allies. To some people, the TLAM-N might suggest overkill, given the ongoing deployments in Europe. To others, they might suggest a convenient escape valve from the necessity to base the Pershing II and GLCM in Europe as a visible symbol of NATO resolve. In other words, the TLAM-N is uniquely capable of suggesting both overkill and decoupling simultaneously.

Third, if the Navy continues with its plans to put the TLAM-N aboard a variety of vessels in order to diversify our tactical nuclear capability, we may well face the prospect of controversy every time a U.S. vessel visits a foreign port, regardless of whether it carries a TLAM-N or not.

Finally, we will in essence disarm our fleet of attack submarines. Every TLAM-N—a weapon justified as a strategic reserve—which we put aboard an attack sub means one less torpedo or SUBROC or other such weapon which can be carried in the ship's magazine. As I saw for myself when I was at the launching and later at the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Minneapolis-St. Paul*, SSN-708, our submarine fleet is already stretched thin and each boat has only a finite magazine capacity. To add to those problems for the sake of a strategic reserve strikes me as simply foolish. And Senators should not look to the planned vertical TLAM launchers for a way out of this problem. Those launchers will not be added to the fleet for several years.

So, Mr. President, we are faced with a fundamental question here. Does it make sense to proceed with the TLAM-N, and to let the Soviet proceed with the SSN-X-21, unencumbered by any sense of reality? Does it make sense to diminish the capability of our submarine fleet, to undermine our anti-ship missile program, to pose potential diplomatic issues of the first order, and to make future agreements difficult if not impossible to reach? Or, does it make sense to try to use the arms control process to do what it is supposed to do: enhance our security?

The issue is not matching a Russian capability. We have already done that. The issue is not adding to our naval strength, for we will not. The issue is not enhancing our deterrent, for the best that can be said of this weapon is that it is a reserve. The issue is simply one of using the arms control process and the impending deployment of TLAM-N to obtain an outcome which is better than any other alternative.

SENATE RESOLUTION 386—RELATING TO THE MANDELA FREEDOM RESOLUTION

Mr. LEVIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 386

Whereas the Republic of South Africa has excluded blacks and other nonwhites from participation in the government of their country by means of a system of racially discriminatory laws and practices known as the apartheid system;

Whereas the South African practice of apartheid is based on violence, exploitation, and deprivation of basic human and civil rights, is incompatible with the dignity of mankind, and contravenes the most fundamental human and political rights as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas the Government of the United States, the United Nations, and virtually every country in the world condemns the practice of apartheid by the Government of South Africa.

Whereas in 1944, Nelson Mandela joined, and later led, the banned African National Congress, which is committed to eradicating the South African Government's official policy of racial apartheid and in its place erecting a society in which the rights of all South African citizens shall be the same, regardless of race, color, or sex;

Whereas in 1962, when he was already in jail under a five-year sentence for inciting strikes and leaving the country without a permit, Nelson Mandela was again brought to trial and sentenced to life imprisonment for seeking to overthrow the government with violence and has been incarcerated ever since that time;

Whereas now, after twenty years in prison, Nelson Mandela nevertheless remains the leading symbol of resistance to political oppression, race and color prejudice in South Africa and the most widely recognized leader of that country's black majority population;

Whereas Winnie Mandela, the wife of Nelson Mandela and one of the most prominent and highly respected leaders of the anti-apartheid movement of South Africa, was arrested twenty years ago and, despite the fact that she has never been convicted of any offense except violations of her banning orders, has been systematically banned, detained, harassed, and abused by South Africa's security police and has spent less than eleven months of the past twenty years in freedom;

Whereas Winnie Mandela, as a banned citizen of South Africa, is confined to a home designated by the State and far removed from her friends and family, is not permitted to meet with more than one person at a time, may not be quoted or write any material for publication, and is prohibited from having her name or photograph appear in print anywhere in South Africa; and

Whereas the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa exemplifies the loftiest ideals and aspirations of the American people and all freedom-loving peoples the world over: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Government of the Republic of South Africa should immediately release and free Nelson Mandela from prison and should revoke and cancel Winnie Mandela's banning order;

(2) the President of the United States should use his good offices to secure the release and freedom of Nelson and Winnie Mandela; and

(3) the President of the Senate is requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa.

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am today introducing Senate Resolution 386, the Mandela Freedom Resolution, calling for the immediate release, by the South African Government, of Nelson and Winnie Mandela, leaders in the struggle against apartheid.

Nelson and Winnie Mandela are a couple of extraordinary principle and courage. Nelson Mandela led demonstrations against apartheid over 20 year ago, as leader of the African National Congress (ANC) which he joined in 1944 and subsequently became the founder of the ANC Youth League.

Nelson Mandela was admitted to Fort Hare University in South Africa

in 1938, but expelled in 1940 for being one of the ringleaders in a student strike. He later went on to study law at the University of Witwatersrand, and in December 1952 established with his friend Oliver Tambo, the first firm of African attorneys in Fox Street, Johannesburg. In 1952 he was appointed National Volunteer-in-Chief to head the Defiance Campaign, which resulted in 8,500 people voluntarily challenging race laws to go to jail as a protest against discrimination. Elected president of the Transvaal ANC, he was served with orders on September 4, 1953, banning him from public meetings for 2 years—restrictions reimposed for 5 years in March 1956. These curbs did not prevent him from organizing a massive 3-day stay-at-home campaign in 1961 in protest against the all-white referendum held on the question of turning South Africa into a Republic.

On the run from May 31 until his arrest on August 8, 1962, Nelson Mandela managed to address a conference of nationalist leaders outside of South Africa and to meet with journalists. After his capture in August 1962, he was sentenced to 5 years imprisonment—3 for incitement to strike and 2 years for illegal exit from the country.

At the Rivonia sabotage trial which opened on October 20, 1963, while serving his 5-year sentence, Mandela and seven others faced charges of plotting violent revolution. On April 20, 1964, he gave a memorable 4½-hour speech in his defense. Saying, in part that he did not "have any love of violence" and that he acted because of the "political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny, exploitation, and oppression of my people by the whites."

Nelson Mandela refused to appeal against the sentence of life imprisonment. As a prisoner on Robben Island he has spent nearly one-third of his life there. He has rarely seen his wife Winnie or his children. In 1982, he was moved to Pollsmoor maximum security prison on the mainland near Cape Town.

Since 1962, Winnie Mandela has been either banned or imprisoned for violations of her banning orders. She was first banned the same year that her husband was arrested. She was never convicted on any charges except violations of her banning orders. She was prosecuted eight times with two convictions for such violations. Under the banning orders, Mrs. Mandela is prohibited from being in the company of more than one person at a time. She cannot be quoted in South Africa, she cannot visit educational institutions, and she is confined to her home during evenings—6 p.m. until 6 a.m.—and Sundays—3 p.m. Saturdays to 6 a.m. Monday. She must obtain permission to visit her husband. For such visits she must use air transportation since she is prohibited from using cheaper buses, trains, or cars. During each visit she is allowed only 30 minutes.

In addition to these restrictions, Winnie Mandela is under constant police surveillance and is frequently harassed by the security police. The latest incident occurred in January 1983, when police charged her with breaking her banning order while two Members of Parliament were visiting with her in her home. Police also confiscated several items from her home, including a bedspread. The following March, Members of the U.S. Congress sent a quilt to her to replace the bedspread and to express support for her fight against apartheid. Mrs. Mandela has also been occasionally threatened and attacked by unidentified individuals.

Mrs. Mandela believes that her banning orders and her banishment to Brandfort were calculated to break her spirit. Instead, she has used her training as a social worker to set up a soup kitchen and an unofficial clinic. She has also defied the segregation laws at the supermarket and other Brandfort shops. In November 1982, despite a severe illness, she refused to be treated at the nearby hospital for blacks. Because she was refused admittance to the all-white hospital, her lawyers obtained permission for her to receive treatment at a private multiracial clinic in Johannesburg.

Mr. President, this resolution is the opportunity for the Senate to make a significant foreign policy statement—we must do so. Let us stand united and resolute for the principles we hold so dear to in the United States. I urge my colleagues to join in support of the Mandela freedom resolution. A similar resolution sponsored by my good friend in the House, Congressman GEORGE CROCKETT with over 100 cosponsors was recently unanimously reported out of the Africa Subcommittee.●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

MATTINGLY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3045

Mr. MATTINGLY (for himself, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EXON, AND MR. D'AMATO) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following new section:

LINE-ITEM VETO

SEC. . (a) The President may disapprove any item of appropriation in any Act or joint resolution, except any item of appropriation for the legislative branch or the judicial branch of the Government.

(b) (1) If an Act or joint resolution is approved by the President, any item of appropriation contained therein which is not disapproved shall become law.

(2) The President shall return, with a statement of objections, any item of appropriation disapproved to the House in which the Act or joint resolution containing such item originated.

(c) The Congress may reconsider any item of appropriation disapproved under this section in the same manner as is prescribed under section 7 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States for reconsideration by the Congress of Acts disapproved by the President, except that only a majority vote of each House shall be required to approve an item which has been disapproved or to restore an item which has been reduced by the President to the original amount contained in the Act or joint resolution.

(d) The Provisions of this section shall apply to items of appropriation for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1984 and to items of appropriation for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1985.

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 3046

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. NICKLES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, add the following new title:

TITLE —COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT LIMITATIONS INCOME TAX INDEXING

SEC. . (a) Paragraph (3) of section 1 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to cost-of-living adjustment) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Cost-of-living adjustment.—

"(A) Calendar years 1985 through 1987.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the cost-of-living adjustment for any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1984, and before January 1, 1988, is the excess of—

"(i) the percentage (if any) by which—

"(I) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, exceeds

"(II) the CPI for the calendar year 1983, over

"(ii) 3 percentage points.

"(B) Calendar years after 1987.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the cost-of-living adjustment for any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1987, is the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for the calendar year 1983.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS IN BENEFIT PROGRAMS

SEC. . (a)(1) Any increase in benefits which would occur by law under any of the provisions of law described in subsection (b) during the period beginning on October 1, 1984, and ending on September 30, 1987, on

the basis of any percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index or the SSA average wage index, shall be limited as though the relevant percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index or the SSA average wage index was equal to the actual percentage increase in such index minus three percentage points.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply only to the increases in benefit amounts, and shall not be applied in determining whether a threshold CPI increase has been met or in determining increases in amounts under other provisions of law which operate by reference to increases in such benefit amounts.

(3) Any increase in benefit amounts which would have occurred but for the provisions of paragraph (1), and any increase in the CPI or SSA average wage index which is not taken into account by reason of paragraph (1), shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining benefit increases occurring after September 30, 1987.

(b) For purposes of this section the applicable provisions of law are the cost-of-living adjustments for—

(1) old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits under section 215(i) of the Social Security Act (but the limitation under subsection (a) shall not apply to supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of such Act);

(2) armed services retirement and retainer pay under section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, retired pay and retainer pay to members and former members of the Coast Guard, and retired pay of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the Public Health Service;

(3) civil service retirement benefits under section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, foreign service retirement benefits under section 826 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, Central Intelligence Agency retirement benefits under part J of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for certain employees, Comptroller General annuities under section 777 of title 31, United States Code, cash relief payments under section 1245(c) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979, and retirement benefits for Federal Reserve Board employees;

(4) Federal workers' compensation under section 8146a of title 5, United States Code;

(5) railroad retirement benefits under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974, including cost-of-living adjustments under such Act which operate by reference to title II of the Social Security Act; and

(6) any other benefits payable under a Federal law, the amount of which and the eligibility for which are not determined on the basis of need or income level, which are automatically increased by law on the basis of an increase in the Consumer Price Index.

(c) In the case of any cost-of-living adjustment which is subject to the provisions of section 301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982, the percentage by which the annuity or retired or retainer pay is increased with respect to any increase occurring by law during the period beginning on October 1, 1984, and ending on September 30, 1987, shall be the percentage increase as determined after the application of such section 301, minus three percentage points.

(d) Prior to October 1, 1985, the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report legislation to direct that savings achieved in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under section 215(i) of the Social Security Act as a result of this section shall be transferred to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(e) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

● Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a factsheet on the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the factsheet was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET—CPI MINUS 3 PERCENT

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT

(1) Indexing: Reduce the current law indexing of income tax brackets and exemptions by 3 percent through 1987. In 1988, indexing would be resumed as under current law.

(2) Cost of Living Adjustments: Reduce CPI-indexed non-means-tested entitlements by 3 percent through 1987. In 1988, COLAs would resume.

SUMMARY OF SAVINGS

[By fiscal year]

	1984	1985	1986	1987	1984–87
Baseline deficit [1]	192.7	206.7	235.0	269.0	
CPI minus 3 percent					
Receipts	0	−3.9	−10.8	−19.0	−33.7
Outlays	0	−4.8	−11.5	−18.5	−34.8
Net interest	0	−.4	−2.1	−5.4	−7.9
Total savings					
CPI minus 3 percent	0	−9.2	−24.4	−42.9	−76.4
Leadership plan	−2.7	−25.9	−49.6	−65.5	−143.7
Total	−2.7	−35.1	−74.0	−108.4	−220.1
Remaining deficit	190.0	171.6	161.0	160.6	

[1] Senate Budget Committee Estimate.

Source: CPI minus estimate: CBO.●

DENTON AMENDMENT NO. 3047

Mr. DENTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra, as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following new section:

SEC. . (a) Within thirty days after the first day of each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1985, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall determine (1) the amount of the deficit of the Government for the preceding fiscal year, if any, (2) the outlays of the Government for such preceding fiscal year, and (3) the percentage computed by dividing the amount of such deficit by the amount of such outlays.

(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law enacted before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act (other than paragraph (2)), effective beginning on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after the date on which the Director of the Congressional Budget Office makes the determinations required by subsection (a) in any fiscal year—

(A) each rate of pay payable during such fiscal year for a position referred to in section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the product of the rate of pay paid for such position during the preceding fiscal year and the percentage computed by such Director pursuant to subsection (a)(3) for such preceding fiscal year;

(B) the rate of pay payable during such fiscal year for the position of any officer or employee of the Government for which the rate of pay during the preceding fiscal year was not less than the rate of pay payable for a position in Executive Level V under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, during such preceding fiscal year (other than an individual serving in a pay grade in the uniformed services, as defined in section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code) shall be reduced by the amount equal to the product of the rate of pay paid for such position during the preceding fiscal year and the percentage computed by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to subsection (a)(3) for such preceding fiscal year;

(C) the maximum rate of pay payable during such fiscal year to any officer or employee of the Government (other than an individual serving in a pay grade in the uniformed services, as defined in section 101(3) of title 37, United States Code, and an officer or employee to whom clause (A) or (B) applies) may not exceed the rate of pay payable during such fiscal year for a position in Executive Level V under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code;

(D) the total amount of the sums available for such fiscal year for pay disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be reduced by the amount equal to the product of such sums and the percentage computed by the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to subsection (a)(3) for the preceding fiscal year; and

(E) the total amount of the sums available for such fiscal year for pay disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall be reduced by the amount equal to the product of such sums and the percentage computed by the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to subsection (a)(3) for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of any officer or employee of the Government whose rate of pay may not be reduced under the Constitution.

(c)(1) In addition to any other tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, there is hereby imposed on each Member of Congress for any taxable year, a tax equal to the product of—

(A) the gross income of such Member of Congress for such taxable year to the extent such gross income exceeds $150,000, multiplied by

(B) the deficit percentage.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "deficit percentage" means for any taxable year the percentage determined by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to subsection (a) based on the fiscal year in which such taxable year begins.

(3) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the tax imposed by this subsection shall be treated as a chapter 1 tax.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Export Promotion

and Market Development has scheduled a hearing on May 10, 1984, on the Eximbank's administration of the small business set-aside provisions of Public Law 98-181. The hearing will begin at 9:30 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. Senator BOSCHWITZ will chair. For further information, please contact Stewart Hudson of the committee staff at 224-0840.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 3, at 2 p.m., to consider the nomination of Robert Hennemeyer to be Ambassador to Gambia, and S. L. Abbott to be Ambassador to Lesotho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 3, at 2 p.m., to consider the nomination of Michael Armacost to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 3, 1984, in order to receive testimony concerning recommending fiscal year 1985, defense funding reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 3, to hold a closed business meeting on intelligence procedures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 3, to hold an executive session to consider the following nominations and legislation:

Nomination of Joel Gerber, judge, U.S. Tax Court;

Nomination of Joseph Dennin to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce;

Increase limit on public debt;

Three authorization bills: Office of U.S. Treasury; U.S. Customs Service; and International Trade Commission.

Modifications of the Disability Insurance Review Procedures;

Extension of the Generalized System of Preference contained in S. 1718;

Retroactive relief from the Dickman case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION WEEK

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, during the week of May 13 to 19 the National Trust for Historic Preservation will be celebrating National Preservation Week.

During this time it is expected that over 5,000 preservation and neighborhood groups and organizations will participate in local programs to increase public awareness of the importance and economic potential of historic preservation programs.

The theme of this year's program is "Preservation Is Taking Care of America" and, indeed, it is. As a strong supporter of historic preservation programs, I am pleased by the wide interest and active involvement of millions of Americans in a variety of historic preservation programs.

In my State of South Dakota, we have one of the most active historic preservation programs in the Nation. South Dakotans are actively involved in numerous restoration, rehabilitation, and miantenance efforts. I am proud of the commitment of South Dakotans and other Americans to preservation programs.

I should also like to commend the work of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. It has made an incalculable contribution in assisting States, communities, and localities with financial support, technical assistance and resource development.

In addition the Historic Trust is bringing new life to many urban and rural communities through its national main street center program. I am proud that the community of Hot Springs, S. Dak. served as a pilot city for this national program. Since 1977, numerous other cities and towns have been selected for participation in this effort.

The National Trust helps organize local support for efforts to renew downtown corridors in small towns, cities, and metro areas. These efforts have brought together local leaders, bankers, chambers of commerce, merchants, and individuals in a combined effort to revitalize their main streets. Each community tailors its program to meet its own needs. It is based on refocusing a community on its own image and redeveloping its center. This has proven to be a phenomenal success and brought new life and vitality to many downtown areas.

As always, I am certain that this year's historic preservation week will be a huge success. However, more importantly, efforts to restore and protect our Nation's heritage will continue through all the other weeks of the year as well. Given the dedication of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the countless individuals, groups, organizations, and agencies that promote these programs, we look forward to even greater participation in the coming years.●

DESIGNATION OF MAY 1984 AS NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND MONTH IN SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, recently the Governor of South Dakota declared May 1984 as National Federation of the Blind Month in South Dakota. The National Federation of the Blind is the largest organization of blind persons in our country. We in South Dakota are extremely proud of the work of our NFB affiliate to insure equality, security, and opportunity for the blind citizens of our State. It's outreach efforts extend to all parts of South Dakota. I commend them as they continue to provide essential services to the blind across South Dakota and the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that the executive proclamation designating May 1984 as National Federation of the Blind Month in South Dakota be printed in the RECORD

The executive proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the National Federation of the Blind of South Dakota is a vital advocacy group that represents the interests of thousands of blind citizens statewide; and

Whereas, this invaluable organization is an effective voice of the blind for it seeks to enhance the dignity and increase the independence of our state's visually handicapped; and

Whereas, as the largest organization of the blind in America, the NFB strives to educate the public about the capabilities of the visually impaired; they are a group of individuals who see themselves not as blind people, but as people who just happen to be blind; and

Whereas, the National Federation of the Blind of South Dakota is a group whose blind members don't ask for sympathy, but for empathy * * * they wish not to be pampered, for they only desire to be given a chance to prove how much they CAN do and how little they can't do; and

Whereas, the NFB not only seeks to educate the sighted, but works as well to inform the visually handicapped of their rights and of the many services available to them:

Now, therefore, I, William J. Janklow, Governor of the State of South Dakota, do hereby proclaim the month of May 1984, as "National Federation of the Blind of South Dakota Month" in So .th Dakota. As citizens of this great State, it is important we all recognize the blind as fellow human beings who desire only to live full, rich lives in dignity and equality.●

THE SIXTH STREET FESTIVAL MARKETPLACE

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I congratulate the people of Richmond on the award of a $4.2 million UDAG grant for the construction of the "Sixth Street Festival Marketplace." I was honored to join in the groundbreaking celebration for the marketplace held in Richmond, Va., on April 23, 1984 along with Secretary Pierce of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Senator TRIBLE, Governor Robb, and Congressman TOM BLILEY, as well as thousands of other enthusiastic Virginians.

Albert G. Dobbins III, the economic development planner for the Richmond Renaissance Board—the organizers for the marketplace project—has prepared an outstanding analysis of the impact of the marketplace. I submit for the RECORD Mr. Dobbins' analysis.

The analysis follows:

6TH STREET FESTIVAL MARKETPLACE—IMPACTS ON BLACK COMMUNITY INTERESTS

The 6th Street festival marketplace project will impact Richmond's black community in a variety of ways. There will be physical and economic impacts which will affect its image and local economy. Also, there will be social impacts which will affect how blacks and whites live and interact with one another. The black community is diverse, therefore impacts will be felt differently. Specific "groups" of blacks will be affected according to their proximity to the development, their roles in the community, their vested interest in the area and their socio-economic status.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: POLITICS AND RACE

Since the formation of the Richmond Crusade for Voters in 1956, Richmond has been struggling to overcome its reputation for racial separation and arch-conservatism. Under the leadership of Dr. William S. Thornton, the Richmond Crusade of Voters has sustained a major campaign to increase black participation in the local decision-making process. After a series of battles going all the way to the United States Supreme Court, Richmond's voting structure was changed to a Ward System resulting in a 5-to-4 black majority on City Council in 1977. Since this change in local political power, Richmond's majority black City Council has attempted to implement a variety of programs designed to enhance the social and economic opportunities for all its residents.

DOWNTOWN INITIATIVES

The development and implementation of a downtown economic development plan has been a major item on City Council's agenda. In 1980, Council launched its first downtown initiative known as Project One. This development is to be a major office-hotel-convention center complex located north of Broad Street—a major thoroughfare often described as the dividing line separating blacks from whites. About $70 million of public funds will be committed by City government to support this mixed-use development.

A second initiative began in 1982. Richmond Renaissance, a no profit corporation, was organized as a biracial, public/private partnership to facilitate negotiation and cooperation between the business community and local government. City Council named a 60-person Board of Directors (evenly divided between blacks and whites) and committed $1.75 million in Community Development Block Grant CDBG) funds for eligible economic development projects. This amount was quickly matched by a $2 million pledge by the private sector.

In 1983, City Council agreed to a $3.5 million Section 108 loan to assist in the development of a festival marketplace project proposed by Richmond Renaissance. This was a bold step for City Council because these funds were to come from future CDBG allocations. Many in the community felt that CDBG money should only be spent for neighborhood projects. Nevertheless, Council decided that this downtown project would have substantial benefits for the entire city.

THE 6TH FESTIVAL MARKETPLACE

Richmond Renaissance's top priority project has been the 6th Street festival marketplace. More than a physical linking of the north and south sides of Broad Street, this project will be a glass and steel bond between the public and private sectors—blacks and whites. With the creation of a festival market stetching across Broad Street, the city's development efforts and the business community will be linked physically, economically and symbolically. Richmond's public officials, business and civic leaders perceive this project as a "bridge of unity" that will bring widely differing sectors of the community together.

The 6th Street project offers the black community a number of very positive direct benefits. During the design and construction of the project; 20% of the dollar value of design services and 30% of construction subcontracts will be let to minority firms. Also, minorities will comprise 30% of the construction labor force. During the operation of the marketplace, 20% of the dollar value of all service contracts will be let to minority firms, 30% of the management and administrative personnel will be minorities, 50% of clerical and maintenance personnel will be minorities and 30% of all permanent full and part-time employees of all tenants will be minorities. Most importantly, 15% of all tenants in the marketplace will be minority vendors and 51% of the capital stocks in the $6.0 million parking garage will be owned by local blacks.

THE SECOND STREET BUSINESS DISTRICT AREA

The 6th Street project also offers the potential for at least one major indirect benefit to the black community. Richmond's historic center of black business and culture is located adjacent to the Project One/6th Street marketplace site. This area, known as the Second Street Business District, is a 14-block commercial-residential community in the downtown area (see map). After the Civil War, this area became the home of black fraternal organizations, cooperative banks, insurance companies, and other commerical and social institutions. However, since the 1950's the Second Street Business District—like many small commercial areas in and near central business districts—has been affected adversely by loss of population and disinvestment.

In January 1983, Richmond Renaissance established a biracial subcommittee comprised of Second Street area merchants and property owners to investigate the potential for revitalizing this important black community. From the beginning, it was clear that the redevelopment of this area would be closely tied to the development of Project One and the 6th Street festival marketplace. Anticipating indirect social and economic benefits, the Second Street committee has begun a short-range development project. Predevelopment work is underway for a $2.5 million office building to be phased with the opening of the marketplace. This project will be financed from private sources including equity from the black community. It will attract a growing secondary office market among small service and professional firms who wish to locate outside of the high cost downtown financial district. Its feasibility is linked to the positive impacts expected from Project One, the 6th Street project and the nearby Medical College of Virginia complex.

THE "BOTTOM LINE"

The 6th Street project holds the potential for stimulating growth, jobs and more opportunities—with traditionally disenfranchised groups, i.e. blacks, included in the partnership. The project signals a new assertive direction for a city whose earlier leadership had projected an antebellum mystique where change and innovative ideas were viewed with suspicion. The "Bottom Line", is that the development of Richmond's 6th Street festival will favorably impact the social and economic well-being of all its citizens, but there are very major benefits to the black community that should be recognized.

SECOND STREET BUSINESS DISTRICT—CLAY STREET OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT

Predevelopment work is underway for a four-story, $2.5 million office building to be located at the northwest corner of Clay and Third Streets. This project wil¹ be financed with equity from the city's black community and debt from local lending institutions. It will require about 26,000 square feet of land and will offer over 28,000 square feet of leasable building space renting for roughly $12.00 per square foot. The project will attract a growing secondary office market among small service and professional firms who wish to locate outside the high cost financial district. Eighty-two on-site parking spaces will be provided and the surroundings will be designed to create a safe and attractive environment.

The Clay Street office building project is linked to nearby development initiatives. Its feasibility is based upon the development of both Project One and the 6th Street festival marketplace. If successful, this office building will be the first of many development projects leading to the revitalization of a historic black business area.●

RALPH FOSTER—PIONEER RADIO BROADCASTER

● Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, last week Mr. Ralph Foster celebrated his 91st birthday. For everyone in southwestern Missouri, Ralph is known as "Mr. Conservation," and a pioneer in radio broadcasting.

Ralph Foster's success in radio broadcasting is attributed to his ability to provide wholesome family programs and innovative programming techniques. He started his first station in St. Joseph, Mo., in 1926. Ralph's radio station was the first to originate "Weather Bureau" direct forecasting and to syndicate radio shows national-

ly. The "Ozarks Jubilee" was the first regular country music show on television and one of the biggest tourist attractions in Missouri in the mid-1950's. Through this program and other programs he produced for KWYO in Springfield, Ralph Foster has brought many an outstanding entertainment personality to the Ozarks.

It was Ralph's love for the outdoors that brought him to the Ozarks in 1933, where he has lived with his wife Harriet for over 53 years. In addition to his outstanding achievements in the field of radio and television, Ralph has been the catalyst in establishing good conservation practices for the State of Missouri. Mr. Foster helped establish the Conservation Commission in 1936 and has been collecting Native American artifacts for years. In the mid-1960's Mr. Foster donated his collection to the School of the Ozarks museum, and in 1967 the college changed the name of the museum to the Ralph Foster Museum.

Ralph Foster has dedicated his life to his fellow man. He currently is vice chairman of the Ralph Foster Museum Board, member of the Board of Trustees of the School of the Ozarks, and a member of the Board of the Lester E. Cox Medical Center.

I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Foster a very special 91st birthday. Ralph Foster has given Missourians so much joy through his caring and happiness through his radio programming.●

RADIO AMATEURS LAUNCH TESTING BY VOLUNTEERS

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on the weekend of April 28-29, amateur radio examinations were administered to approximately 350 applicants by volunteer members of the Dayton Amateur Radio Association in Ohio. This was the first large-scale testing to be carried out by volunteers with FCC direction, rather than by the FCC itself.

This occasion marked the culmination of a process begun when Public Law 97-259 was enacted in September 1982, authorizing volunteers to administer amateur radio examinations. As the sponsor of the authorizing legislation, I want to congratulate Mrs. Judy Frye, chairwoman in charge of administering the examinations, and all the volunteers who assisted her in planning and carrying out the large scale effort to administer the examinations.

For fiscal year 1981, the latest figures available, the FCC estimated the cost of administering each amateur examination to be $7.26 per examination. The Dayton association estimates their costs to be under $3 per examination. The cost to the taxpayers is nothing. In addition, this volunteer system enables persons to obtain their amateur licenses on weekends and evenings, instead of having to lose a day of work in order to take the examination during normal FCC business hours.

I especially wish to note that the Dayton Amateur Radio Association under the very able leadership of Judy Frye and the assistance of her husband Charles, has taken the lead in coordinating examinations throughout the states of Ohio, Michigan, and West Virginia. Furthermore, they are ably advising and assisting other groups around the country, and thereby spreading the knowledge obtained by their hands-on experience in pioneering the first large-scale volunteer examinations.

I also wish to congratulate the Anchorage, Alaska, Amateur Radio Club, which was the first approved examination coordinator and also has held a testing session in that State. Other testing sessions will be held soon in Chicago, Ill., coordinated by the DeVry Amateur Radio Society, and Rochester, N.Y., by the Metroplex Amateur Communications Association.

Across the entire country, other volunteers are preparing to administer the amateur technical and Morse code examinations. Even as this occurs, the FCC has announced that they will have completely phased out their own testing by the end of 1984.

As a radio amateur myself, I am proud to report these events to my fellow Senators. The radio amateurs of this Nation are once again demonstrating their dedication and abilities. The taxpayers benefit by not picking up the tab for amateur examinations, and the amateurs benefit by having examinations more readily available and a more direct role in the amateur service.●

TRIBUTE TO ENOLIA P. McMILLAN

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, Ms. Enolia P. McMillan, an energetic and dedicated civil rights activist, has recently been elected as national president of the NAACP. It is my firm belief that there is no one more qualified or more deserving of this honor. After nearly 15 years as head of the Baltimore branch of the NAACP, and after a lifetime of commitment to the cause of civil rights, Ms. McMillan is sure to bring new life and renewed commitment to the organization.

As the daughter of a slave, Enolia McMillan realizes better than most just how far we have come in the struggle for civil rights, and how far we have yet to go. During her long tenure as a teacher and then as a school administrator in Baltimore City and southern Maryland, she struggled long and hard to gain equality for blacks in the public school system. Her attempts to improve facilities and the quality of education for young black students and her struggle to obtain equal pay for black teachers were met with frequent disappointments, but she never gave up until her goals were accomplished.

Ms. McMillan has, in the past 15 years, built the Baltimore chapter of the NAACP into one of the most successful and effective chapters in the country. She has disproved assumptions that the NAACP is no longer an effective tool in the fight for civil rights, and has succeeded in dramatically increasing its declining membership. She has the rare ability to lead effectively, redirecting chapter goals to meet the changing demands of the times. Ms. McMillan's selection as president of the NAACP is indeed a great honor for Baltimore and for Maryland, and we wish her great success in her continued quest for equality under the law.

I ask that the following articles about Ms. McMillan be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Jan. 13, 1984]

WAY TO GO

Enolia McMillan, the Baltimorean who has just been elected president (as distinct from the office of board chairman) of the NAACP, is hailed for her zest, her energy. Something, for a person in her 80th year. But, ever so slightly, people may be missing the point. Denton Watson of NAACP headquarters in New York says this is the first time since 1909 and its start that the organization has been presided over by a woman.

During her 35 years as a Baltimore schools teacher and administrator, McMillan somehow never got to be a principal. Lots of schools and lots of vacancies as principal; somehow, men were chosen.

Shirley Chisholm has gone into the quotation dictionaries with her remark that, throughout her career, being female was to her a bigger handicap than being black. At NAACP, recently, much of the advancement of civil rights and equal opportunity has gone on offstage, in extended court struggles. This is to predict that, to whatever extent the new president takes her case to the public, eye and minds will open as to more than one form of ancient American bias.

Enolia P. McMillan, who was elected national president of the NAACP last week, is the daughter of a man who was born a slave.

The 79-year-old Baltimorean says her father, John Pettigen, was a child working as a field hand on a Virginia plantation when slavery was abolished in 1863.

That's how close we are to slavery in our history in this country.

But Mrs. McMillan, a retired teacher and assistant principal, say she is "too busy concentrating on the branches" of her family to pay much attention to its roots.

"If I could get the branches to behave, I'd be satisfied," she says, laughing.

Actually, Mrs. McMillan does not seem to have any serious problems with the branches. Her only child is a successful engineer married to a college professor, and their children, Mrs. McMillan's grandchil-

dren, face a future of possibilities unimaginable in 1863.

"Things have changed tremendously," Mrs. McMillan said the other day, reflecting on the 130-odd years between her father's childhood and that of her grandchildren. "Some things I never expected to live to see I have seen, like integration in the schools and in motels and restaurants.

"When I was in school I couldn't even sit down on the stool at the counter in the 5-and-10 cents store. Segregation was such a very strong tradition in this country, I was surprised that we were able to break it as quickly as we did."

Mrs. McMillan began her education in a rural, Harford county elementary school. She remembers driving to the segregated one-room school house in a horse-drawn buggy.

Her mother was a cleaning lady with an eighth-grade education. Her father, who had only six weeks of schooling in his life, became a farmer after he was freed.

But Mrs. McMillan says her parents wanted their children to have a better education than they had, so they moved to Baltimore, where Mrs. McMillan eventually graduated from what was then called Baltimore Colored High School.

She says she got a good education at that school, despite segregation. "Those schools had much more dedicated teachers than you find, on the whole, nowadays," she said. "The classes were quite small and the teachers took a real interest in pupils who showed some promise."

After high school, Mrs. McMillan went to Howard University in Washington, because, she says, "There wasn't a single first-rate college in Maryland that was open to blacks."

She couldn't afford to move to Washington so she commuted by train five days a week for four years, a trip which she says took her two and a half hours each way, door to door.

Despite the commute and the need to work part-time waiting on tables and selling stockings, Mrs. McMillan graduated with honors and went on to get a master's degree in education administration from Columbia University in New York.

Her dream was to become a doctor and work as a missionary in Africa, but she couldn't afford to go to medical school or to Africa, so she started teaching. She says she soon realized "there was plenty of good work to be done right here."

The good work included 19 years of class room teaching and more as an administrator, in Southern Maryland and Baltimore city.

During those years, Mrs. McMillan found herself fighting for equality at almost every turn.

The first big battle came when she discovered that white teachers were being paid twice as much as blacks. It took a number of years and the threat of a law suit, but eventually Mrs. McMillan and her colleagues won that fight.

She was rewarded for her efforts by being elected president of the Maryland State Colored Teachers Association.

From that position she became involved in the establishment of the Baltimore chapter of the NAACP and has remained active in that organization for nearly half a century now.

During those years, she says, she has seen the organization's power and prestige rise and fall and rise again.

"When other blacks called us 'Uncle Toms' during the sixties, we stuck to our original principles," she says. "We never changed. We've never advocated violence. We've always worked for change through negotiation, legislation and litigation. Our critics changed, but we've always stayed the same."

If the NAACP was threatened by black militancy in the sixties, now Mrs. McMillan says the organization is threatened by complacency.

"A lot of successful blacks think we've arrived just because they have. They've got a good job, a nice car, a lovely home. The civil rights laws are on the books. They say, 'We've made it. Who needs the NAACP anymore?'"

This is how Mrs. McMillan answers that question:

"There are still millions of blacks who need us. Even where there is no more overt discrimination, there is covert discrimination. There is economic discrimination. There is black unemployment running twice as high as white unemployment."

"I may be old, but I can still see," she says, "and I see a lot of racism still with us here in America, and a lot of back-sliding in Washington, a lot of battles that we thought we'd won and now we have to fight them all over again."

"Well, we've won some of those battles, and we've come a long, long way, but the war is not over," says Enolia P. McMillan, the daughter of a man who was born a slave. "It would be real nice to sit back after 79 years and say 'Praise the Lord. It's done. The war is over.'"

"But in my heart," she says, "I know it's not."

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Jan. 12, 1984]

ENOLIA MCMILLAN: NAACP LEADER KNOWS THE PRICE OF PROGRESS

(By Jeffrey W. Peters)

Enolia P. McMillan, retired teacher, veteran civil rights activist and rookie national president of the NAACP, studied in the shadow of prejudice and learned well the price of progress.

From a youth spent in search of education, through the time she joined the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, through 40 years as a city school teacher and 14 more at the helm of Baltimore's NAACP, McMillan battled an intransigent establishment and apathetic members of her own race.

But the sacrifice of her ambition and privacy as been repaid—collectively, in the growth of opportunities for all blacks, and personally, in her elevation to the national presidency of the NAACP this week, even though the job is unsalaried.

"Maybe this is just the shot in the arm I need to keep me going a little bit longer," said McMillan, 79, as she reflected on a half-century of struggle studded with success.

Even as well-wishers jammed McMillan's living room and telephone line, reminders of past efforts surrounded her.

Her husband, Betha M. McMillan, proudly pointed to the plaques and parchments that mark her contributions to a host of social, charitable and educational organizations. Delta Sigma Theta recognized her outstanding citizenship, the Maryland State Teachers Association commemorated her dedication to education and former Gov. Marvin Mandel congratulated her for years of service on the Morgan State University board of trustees.

In 1962, when the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. was just becoming nationally prominent, the NAACP thanked McMillan for her many years of dedicated service.

"We've had successes over the years, and that proves that progress is possible," McMillan said. "It may not be as fast or as complete as you want, but it is possible. And unless you believe that, you'll just fold up your arms and say 'Come on, death.'"

Prodded by questions, she remembered the arguments and the protests, the sit-ins and the walkouts. The recounted stories chart a map of social progress in the black community and offer a blueprint for future fights.

"The most important change over the years has been in the types of jobs blacks are able to get. Now, we just don't have enough of them [blacks] getting jobs," McMillan said. "But when I got out of college the only thing I could get was teaching, or domestic work."

Four years of daily, five-hour journeys to Howard University in Washington had prepared the former Enolia Pettigen of Baltimore for a teaching career. In 1927, she entered the profession as a teacher at Denton High School in Carolina County. Then came eight years as a principal in Charles County, followed by a 35-year career as a teacher and administrator in the Baltimore school system.

Despite the discrimination and harassment she would encounter, McMillan had broken the bonds of ignorance. Neither her mother nor sister had gone to college; both labored for a lifetime in the homes of others. The child whose father had been born a slave was the first member of her family to attend college—although Maryland's segregated schools forced her to leave the state to do so.

She in turn communicated a love of learning to her own child, Betha M. McMillan Jr. Nearly 30 years after his mother graduated, Betha Jr. earned his engineering degree from Lehigh Univesity in Pennsylvania. He now works for Westinghouse Co.

In her quest to extend the benefits of education to all blacks, McMillan found little support and much opposition. From buildings to buses, textbooks to teacher salaries, black schools ranked a very poor second to the supposedly "separate but equal" white systems.

Charles County, with a population almost equally divided between whites and blacks, maintained five white schools but funded only a single secondary institution for blacks. McMillan found that few teen-age blacks could afford to attend the school that was tucked away in a distant tip of the county.

"So we got together and bought a little, used yellow bus and named it Amos," she remembered. "It gave us fits but it also got out to students for almost 40 miles around. The next year we bought a second bus and, by the third year, we were up to having a brand new bus. By the time I left, we had three buses running through the county."

Similar struggles awaited when McMillan returned to her native Baltimore in 1935, armed with a master's degree from Columbia University in New York.

Already known as a radical for her efforts to boost the pay of black teachers, she brought her feisty energies to bear on the serious overcrowding that had plagued the city's black schools for years.●

DIANA HOPE HAMILTON

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to salute an outstanding public servant, Diana Hope Hamilton, the executive director of the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition.

Diana is leaving the coalition to pursue a master's degree in business.

She has worked effectively with 38 Senators representing diverse political philosophies, which is no small accomplishment. She has also been able to galvanize representatives of our legislative staffs into working toward common goals that benefit the Northeast and Midwestern regions of the Nation. Diana was responsible to 38 Members of the U.S. Senate and many of them have told me how much they respect her work.

Diana is an exceptional individual. She has mastered the techniques of the legislative process, while at the same time expanding the influence of the coalition.

I know of very few people who could accomplish what she has in 3 years.

The coalition is now interviewing candidates to replace Diana and we are having a difficult time finding a replacement because of the standards she set.

Along with my colleagues, I wish her well in her future endeavors and want Diana to know that we are going to miss her.●

THE 1984 AAA SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL LIFESAVING MEDAL RECIPIENTS

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this month, the American Automobile Association is presenting 10 young people, including a Virginian, the highest award given to members of school safety patrols throughout the United States, the AAA School Safety Patrol Lifesaving Medal.

The lifesaving award program was initiated in 1949 by the American Automobile Association to recognize and honor selected school patrol members for their heroic lifesaving contribution to their communities.

Since its inception, there have been more than 260 boys and girls from 28 States and the District of Columbia who have been honored with the lifesaving medal.

An award review board, composed of representatives from active national organizations in the fields of education, law enforcement, and safety, selects deserving medal recipients from those candidates who have been officially nominated for consideration.

As a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 172 last year, designating the week of October 3 to 8, 1983, as "National Schoolbus Safety Week of 1983," I heartily commend these young people for their achievements.

I an particularly proud that a young Virginian, Terezia C. Rauch, is an award winner this year, and I am pleased to list for the RECORD the 1984 recipients of the AAA School Safety Patrol Lifesaving Medal:

Terezia C. Rauch, 11, Glebe School, Arlington, Virginia; John M. Aleksa, 11, Public School No. 107, Flushing, New York; Robert Bodine, 11, South Daytona Elementary School, South Dayton, Florida; Iliana Cintron, 11, Public School No. 26X, Bronx, New York; Annie L. Kustelski, 12, Stuart School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Pablo D. Lues, 11, Public School No. 107, Flushing, New York; Chadwick W. Macfie, 12, South Daytona Elementary School, South Daytona, Florida; Deron Spigner, 12, James E. Stephens Elementary School, Bartow, Florida; Gary J. Thomas, 10, Fairhome Elementary School, Lorain, Ohio; Ken Wetherington, 12 James E. Stephens Elementary School, Bartow, Florida.

I know my colleagues join me in congratulating these fine young people for their achievements.●

HUMAN SERVICES REAUTHORIZATION ACT

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I recently returned from a visit to several Head Start programs in my State and would like to take this opportunity to impress upon my colleagues the tremendous job this program is doing to enhance the long-term growth and development of the young people the program serves.

As Senators know, Head Start has been widely recognized as one of the Federal Government's most cost effective and successful Federal programs. It has been in existence since 1965 and currently serves over 400,000 children enrolled in full-time programs throughout the country. The programs provide for education, counseling, food and nutrition services, health care, volunteer opportunities, and training and jobs for parents and members of the community.

A great deal of research and several studies have clearly documented the positive effects on children and their parents resulting from involvement in the Head Start program. One such study concluded that Head Start's benefits outweigh its costs by 235 percent.

I have been, and will continue to be, a strong supporter of this valuable program. Recently, I cosponsored legislation, S. 2374, the Human Services Reauthorization Act, along with Senator STAFFORD and over 34 of my colleagues, which would extend the authorization for the Head Start program for 5 years. This legislation includes several provisions which will strengthen the ability of the program to continue to deliver high quality, cost-effective services to an additional 60,000 children during fiscal year 1985 alone.

Language in the bill strengthens existing local community Head Start programs, while allowing flexibility in the designation of new Head Start programs in areas where such services are not now being provided. Funding for training and technical assistance, child development associate training, as well as assessment and credentialing programs for such personnel, is included. This is a very important matter for a program that depends so heavily on volunteers and parents for staff.

The performance standards, which must be met by each local program, are strengthened so that the quality and scope of services will be maintained at a level equal to those standards in effect in November 1978.

Much of Head Start's continued success, in Mississippi and throughout the country, will depend on the effective implementation of these, and other, provisions contained in the Human Services Reauthorization Act.

I urge the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Senator HATCH, to act on S. 2374 and assist in its passage. This will certainly allow the Head Start program to continue to build upon a well established, solid record of accomplishments.●

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S VISIT TO FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

(By request of Mr. STEVENS, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to explain my absence from this week's Senate business.

This week, I had the honor and privilege of hosting President Ronald Reagan on his 32-hour visit to Fairbanks, my hometown.

In addition to hosting President Reagan and his wife, Nancy, I had the pleasure of greeting Secretary of State George Shultz and Secretary of Interior William Clark.

I also had the honor to represent the U.S. Congress during the visit between President Reagan and His Holiness, Pope John Paul II.

This business was a once-in-a-lifetime event for the estimated 12,000 Alaskans who attended the meeting at the Fairbanks International Airport. I believe it will also have a tremendous impact on the world's perception of Alaska.●

JACK KASSEWITZ WAS ONE OF A KIND

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, the heading on this tribute was taken from the headline on the obituary for Jack Kassewitz in the Miami News, the newspaper with which he was associated since 1954. In my opinion the headline describes him beautifully.

Jack died of cancer April 16 in Miami at age 70 following an outstand-

ing newspaper career and an active role in the community that will long leave its mark there. He will be sorely missed.

In his memory and in recognition of his contributions I offer several excerpts from the News obituary which help define the man:

Jack Kassewitz felt at home in the elite downtown Miami Club and just as comfortable helping out derelicts who wandered into his office and walked out with money in their hands.

He loved practical jokes and practical jokers, and he looked at the world with an oft-bemused stare. But he also was a respected thinker who wrote prize-winning editorials. And . . .

Forced to drop out of college during the Depression to take a $15-a-week job as a part-time reporter in Mercer, Ga., Kassewitz was a lifelong advocate of higher education. He served 13 years on Miami-Dade's board of trustees, often as chairman or vice chairman. He was appointed to the State Community College Council and taught journalism classes at Miami-Dade in the late 1960's. A data processing building on Miami-Dade's south campus is named after him. And . . .

Kassewitz was a member of the News' editorial board for 15 years. In those years the newspaper won the Florida Society of Newspaper Editors' first place award for editorials. He also won a special award from the Florida Bar for an editorial policy sensitive to public issues "in the administration of justice." And . . .

Long active in the Jewish community, Kassewitz was a three-term chairman of the Florida Regional Board of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in the 1970's. He is listed in Who's Who of World Jewry.

In recognition of his achievements Kassewitz was awarded the Anti-Defamation League's Leonard L. Abess Human Rights Award in 1979.

Kassewitz served for years as a member of the county's Community Action Agency and was an active Mason.

Kassewitz held a number of civic posts . . . and former president of the Greater Miami Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi.

And, most important—

"He was probably the greatest family man that God ever made," his wife said, "He was the most unselfish and generous man. He never considered himself over anyone else."

All of this says a lot about the man that Jack Kassewitz was, but it does not say it all. For his kind, words are not enough.●

TRIBUTE TO ANSEL ADAMS

● Mr. JEPSEN. Mr. President, today it is my privilege to pay tribute to Ansel Adams. His death on April 22 brought an end to his brilliant era as one of America's best known photographers. For over half a century, Mr. Adams captured the majesty of the American West on film with amazing clarity and precision.

As an innovator of landscape photography, he researched and perfected techniques for the development of modern landscape photography. His contributions of insight into photography education taught many to see through the camera lens the same wilderness beauty he admired.

It was this love for the American West and especially the Yosemite Valley that inspired Adams to dedicate a great portion of his life to the preservation and conservation of our environment. His efforts as a true conservationist earned him awards of such magnitude as the Sierra Club's John Muir Award in 1963 and the Conservation Service Award for the Interior Department in 1968. In 1980, Adams received the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, for being both an artist and an environmentalist.

Ansel Adams took his talents and brought them in picture form to millions of Americans to enjoy and appreciate the grandeur of the American wilderness.

In January of 1975, Adams said of himself: "As I became more and more interested in the mountains, my natural impulse was to have a visual diary." We are fortunate to have this extraordinary visual diary of a man who was so in tune to the natural beauty and grace of the American West.

Ansel Adams was a photographer, educator, conservationist, and American whose impact will always be felt and whose presence will definitely be missed.●

PHELMON SAUNDERS RETIRES

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize today a fine person who recently celebrated his retirement.

Born and raised in Detroit, Phelmon Saunders attended the Detroit public schools and Marygrove College, where he took classes in printing and graphic art. He gained valuable experience in the printing field, working for the Detroit Tribune and several print shops. He was admired by his coworkers and made many friends while employed by the Ford Motor Co. and later at the Wayne County General Hospital, where he was promoted to duplicating machine supervisor in 1969. In 1982, Mr. Saunders transferred to the Wayne County Cooperative Extension Service, where he worked diligently until his retirement a few weeks ago.

Phelmon Saunders has been an active member of various union organizations. He was elected financial secretary of local 25 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees and held that position from 1968 to 1979. He was also a delegate to AFSCME Council 25 and the Metro Detroit AFL-CIO.

Phelmon Saunders will continue to be active in the Smith Chapel AME Church in Inkster, Mich. He is a trustee of the church, organized and directs the choir, and is vice president of the Men's Club—MOVE—Men Organized in Volunteer Endeavors.

I wish to congratulate Phelmon Saunders on this happy occasion and to wish him continued happiness and fulfillment.●

RHODE ISLAND DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations was the first of the Original 13 Colonies to declare its independence from Great Britain.

May 4, 1984, marks the 208th anniversary of the general assembly's declaration of independence from King George. In order to commemorate that day, I ask that Rhode Island's original renunciation of the Crown be printed in the permanent RECORD.

The material follows:

RENUNCIATION OF THE CROWN

An act repealing an act entitled, "An Act for the more effectually securing to his Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects, in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations;" and altering the Forms of Commissions, of all Writs and Processes in the Courts, and of the Oaths prescribed by Law.

Whereas in all States existing by Compact, Protection and Allegiance are reciprocal, the latter being only due in Consequence of the former: and whereas George the Third, King of Great-Britain, forgetting his Dignity, regardless of the Compact most solemnly entered into, ratified and confirmed, to the Inhabitants of this Colony, by His illustrious Ancestors, and till of late fully recognized by Him—and entirely departing from the Duties and Character of a good King, instead of protecting, is endeavouring to destroy the good People of this Colony, and of all the United Colonies, by sending Fleets and Armies to America, to confiscate our Property, and spread Fire, Sword and Desolation, throughout our Country, in order to compel us to submit to the most debasing and detestable Tyranny; whereby we are obliged by Necessity, and it becomes our highest Duty, to use every Means, with which God and Nature have furnished us, in Support of our invaluable Rights and Privileges; to oppose that Power which is exerted only for our Destruction.

Be it therefore Enacted by this General Assembly, and by the Authority thereof it is Enacted, That an Act entitled, "An Act for the more effectual securing to His Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Clerk of the house, Josias Lyndon, wrote: "Resolved that the aforementioned written pass as an act of this assembly."

It was read and approved in the upper house the same day, as attested by Henry Ward, secretary.

For the first time the session closed with the words, "God save the United Colonies."●

IN REMEMBRANCE OF ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 69 years ago, in 1915, the Armenian

people were subjected to unprecedented brutality. Innocent Armenians were massacred. Those years of darkness for the Armenian people must never be forgotten. It is one of the saddest chapters in the history of the human race. In an effort to keep the memory of this tragedy alive, I have cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 83—designating a day of remembrance for the victims of Armenian genocide—and Senate Resolution 241, expressing the sense of the Senate that the foreign policy of the United States should take account of the genocide of the Armenian people.

I am disturbed that the Department of State is reluctant to recognize these unspeakable mass murders as genocide. All who respect the dignity of human life must condemn these killings and similar abuses without equivocation.

We will recall these tragic events again and again, so that public leaders and private citizens the world over will remember that mankind has a collective responsibility to insure that such abuses never recur. Also, we must do everything possible to liberate the human race from these terrible cycles of violence. Armenian Martyrs Day plays an important role in these efforts.●

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY WAGE

● Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a resolution endorsing a youth opportunity wage program by the National Conference of Black Mayors and a statement issued by the National Conference of Black Mayors explaining their support for the program.

The Reagan administration has announced that it soon will send a bill to Congress to establish a youth opportunity wage for youth under the age of 22 at $2.50 an hour. The National Conference of Black Mayors, by endorsing the administration's efforts courageously has shown that the "Black Mayors" are willing to try an innovative approach to the age-old problem of chronic youth unemployment in the black community.

I am proud that the "Black Mayors" were led in passing this resolution by the President of the conference, Mayor Johnny Ford of Tuskegee, Ala. Mayor Ford's conscientious leadership is well-known in Alabama and the rest of the country. I congratulate Mayor Ford and his colleagues for their wise statement of policy.

The material follows:

RESOLUTION —

"The National Conference of Black Mayors (NCBM) believes that everyone should earn the minimum wage or above. However, given the tremendous problem of youth unemployment and particularly the problem of minority youth unemployment and given the persistence of the tragedy of youth unemployment, despite a history of programs designed to reduce youth unemployment, be resolved the NCBM supports an experimental summer youth opportunity wage program which increases youth employment opportunities which would not displace youth or adults currently employed at or above the minimum wage, and which provides sanctions sufficient to prevent abuse."

STATEMENT BY BOARD OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BLACK MAYORS, APRIL 20, 1984

"In a dramatic opening session of the National Conference of Black Mayors, the urgent need for new national policies to reduce unemployment among minority youth led to the passage of a resolution in support of an experimental summer youth opportunity wage program.

"The resolution came in the face of strong arguments against relaxing any aspect of the standard wage floor.

"At issue was the Mayors' concern that any lessening of wage standards versus the compelling need to develop new solutions to get minority youth off the streets and into gainful employment be addressed immediately. Present estimates of black teenage unemployment range as high as 75 percent.

"A critical element in persuading the National Conference of Black Mayors' membership to go along with the ground-breaking resolution was the experimental character of the initiative, as well as the crisis in black teenage unemployment.

"The real-life experience of black mayors at the grass roots level of government—seeing more and more structurally unemployed minorities and especially young blacks—and less and less money for summer employment—dictated that there be some effort—some experiment to help now to solve the problem.

"The mayors hope that their leadership on the subject will lead to a constructive dialogue within the national and local black communities on how best to assure mainstream employment for black youth.

"The fear expressed by some mayors was that support for this youth measure might be misread or misconstrued to suggest weakened support for full adult employment at full wages. To meet these concerns, clear provisions were insisted upon to bar any adult worker displacement, under pain of civil and criminal penalties."●

TOWARD AN ENERGY EFFICIENT AMERICA

● Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, despite the severe oil shocks of the seventies which demonstrated our tremendous vulnerability to precipitous cutoffs of foreign oil supplies, the United States has seen much of its progress toward eliminating foreign oil dependence reversed by administration policies over the past 3 years. A temporary surplus of oil stocks created by a worldwide recession in the industrial nations has lulled us into complacency, and a shortsighted reliance on fossil fuels and nuclear power—no matter how costly, dangerous, polluting, or unreliable—has replaced the long-range programs initiated in the seventies to increase conservation and provide clean, reliable energy alternatives.

Enactment of S. 2629, S. 2630, S. 2631, and S. 2632, the four bills comprising the Energy Efficient America Act will go a long way toward reestablishing our commitment to energy conservation and the use of renewable energy sources as the best way to provide affordable, safe, and reliable energy to all our people in the future.●

ORDER FOR AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE AND REFER

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, since we are not going to be in session on Monday, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate on Friday until Tuesday, May 8, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives and they be appropriately referred, and that the Vice President and President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE AND DESIGNATING A PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON TUESDAY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be recognized on a special order of not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not more than 10 minutes in length, in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1984

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, when the Senate completes its business today, it will stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, at which time the Senate will be in session only pro forma and will be recessed then until the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday next.

On Tuesday next, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there will be one special order for the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), to be followed by a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, after which the Senate will resume the consideration of the unfinished business. At that time, the Chiles amendment will be the pending question.

Since there is an order for a time certain to vote on the Chiles amend-

ment at 3 p.m. on Tuesday next, it is entirely possible that other matters in addition to the debate on the Chiles amendment may be taken up prior to that time.

Mr. President, Senators should be on notice that Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week at least will be very busy days and that there will be votes on each day and perhaps late sessions.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to announce.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, just for the record, the majority leader, I believe, has stated—he has not suggested otherwise—that there may be votes on Tuesday prior to the 3 p.m. vote. By virtue of the fact that the Senate has entered an order that there will be a vote on the Chiles amendment at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, the majority leader agrees with me, does he not, that this does not in and of itself mean no votes prior to that?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. President; that is entirely correct. I thank the minority leader for making that statement and drawing the attention of all Senators to that possibility.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., recessed until Friday, May 4, 1984, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3, 1984:

National Transportation Safety Board

James Eugene Burnett, Jr., of Arkansas, to be the chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of 2 years (reappointment).

In the Air Force

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

Gen. Robert T. Marsh, [redacted], U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be reassigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be general

Gen. Lawrence A. Skantze, [redacted], U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be reassigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Larry D. Welch, [redacted] U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8218, 8362, and 8373, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Herman J. Carpenter, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William L. Harper, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Alan G. Sharp, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier general

Col. Ronald C. Allen, Jr., [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Boyd L. Eddins, [redacted] Air Force Reserve.

Col. George D. Eggert, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Richard L. Hall, [redacted] Air Force Reserve.

Col. William N. Rowley, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Stuart L. Schroeder, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

Col. David S. Trump, [redacted] Air Force Reserve.

Col. Walter G. Vartan, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

Col. Richard A. Wood, [redacted] Air Force Reserve.

Col. Duane A. Young, [redacted], Air Force Reserve.

In the Army

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be reassigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Donald M. Babers, [redacted], U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William E. Odom, [redacted], U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Lawrence F. Skibbie, [redacted] U.S. Army.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 3, 1984:

Department of the Treasury

Bruce E. Thompson, Jr., of Maryland, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, May 3, 1984*

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

If My people, who are called by My name, will humble themselves and pray and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.—II Chronicles 7: 14.

Gracious God, as we mark this National Day of Prayer, may our prayer be for ourselves, our Nation, and all people who need Your protection and care. Encourage us to be the people You would have us be and do those good things that are worthy of Your creation. May Your blessing be upon us this day and every day. That justice and mercy and peace will abide with us and all Your people. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 28, answered, "present" 3, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—344

Ackerman	Barnes	Boehlert
Addabbo	Bateman	Boggs
Akaka	Bates	Boland
Albosta	Bedell	Bonior
Alexander	Beilenson	Bosco
Anderson	Bennett	Boucher
Andrews (TX)	Bereuter	Boxer
Annunzio	Berman	Britt
Archer	Bethune	Broomfield
Aspin	Bevill	Brown (CA)
AuCoin	Bilirakis	Brown (CO)
Badham	Bliley	Broyhill
Burton (CA)	Hayes	Molinari
Burton (IN)	Hefner	Mollohan
Byron	Heftel	Montgomery
Campbell	Hertel	Moody
Carney	Hightower	Moore
Carper	Hiler	Moorhead
Carr	Hillis	Morrison (CT)
Chandler	Holt	Morrison (WA)
Chappell	Hopkins	Murphy
Cheney	Horton	Murtha
Clarke	Howard	Myers
Clinger	Hoyer	Natcher
Coats	Hubbard	Neal
Coelho	Huckaby	Nelson
Coleman (MO)	Hughes	Nichols
Coleman (TX)	Hunter	Nielson
Collins	Hutto	Nowak
Conable	Hyde	O'Brien
Conte	Ireland	Oakar
Conyers	Jeffords	Obey
Cooper	Jenkins	Olin
Corcoran	Johnson	Ortiz
Courter	Jones (OK)	Owens
Coyne	Jones (TN)	Oxley
Craig	Kaptur	Packard
Crane, Daniel	Kasich	Panetta
D'Amours	Kennelly	Parris
Daniel	Kildee	Patman
Darden	Kindness	Patterson
Daschle	Kleczka	Pease
Davis	Kogovsek	Pepper
Dellums	Kolter	Perkins
DeWine	Kostmayer	Petri
Dicks	Kramer	Pickle
Dixon	Lagomarsino	Porter
Donnelly	Lantos	Price
Dowdy	Leach	Pritchard
Downey	Leath	Pursell
Dreier	Lehman (CA)	Quillen
Duncan	Lehman (FL)	Rahall
Dwyer	Lent	Rangel
Dyson	Levin	Ratchford
Early	Levine	Ray
Eckart	Levitas	Regula
Edgar	Lewis (CA)	Reid
Edwards (AL)	Livingston	Richardson
Edwards (OK)	Lloyd	Ridge
English	Loeffler	Rinaldo
Erdreich	Long (LA)	Ritter
Erlenborn	Long (MD)	Robinson
Evans (IL)	Lott	Rodino
Fascell	Lowry (WA)	Roe
Fazio	Lujan	Rogers
Ferraro	Luken	Rose
Fields	Lundine	Rostenkowski
Fish	Lungren	Roth
Flippo	MacKay	Roukema
Florio	Madigan	Rowland
Foglietta	Marlenee	Roybal
Foley	Marriott	Rudd
Ford (TN)	Martin (IL)	Sawyer
Fowler	Martin (NC)	Schaefer
Frank	Martinez	Schneider
Franklin	Matsui	Schulze
Frenzel	Mavroules	Schumer
Fuqua	Mazzoli	Seiberling
Gaydos	McCain	Sensenbrenner
Gekas	McCandless	Shannon
Gilman	McCloskey	Sharp
Gingrich	McCollum	Shaw
Glickman	McCurdy	Shelby
Gonzalez	McDade	Shumway
Gore	McEwen	Shuster
Gradison	McGrath	Siljander
Green	McHugh	Simon
Gregg	McKernan	Sisisky
Guarini	McKinney	Skeen
Gunderson	McNulty	Skelton
Hall (OH)	Mica	Slattery
Hall, Ralph	Michel	Smith (FL)
Hall, Sam	Mikulski	Smith (IA)
Hamilton	Miller (CA)	Smith (NE)
Hansen (UT)	Mineta	Smith (NJ)
Hartnett	Minish	Smith, Denny
Hatcher	Moakley	Smith, Robert
Snowe	Taylor	Wheat
Snyder	Thomas (CA)	Whitehurst
Solarz	Thomas (GA)	Whitley
Spence	Torres	Whittaker
Spratt	Torricelli	Whitten
Staggers	Towns	Williams (OH)
Stark	Udall	Winn
Stenholm	Vander Jagt	Wirth
Stokes	Vandergriff	Wise
Stratton	Vento	Wolpe
Studds	Volkmer	Wright
Stump	Vucanovich	Wyden
Sundquist	Walgren	Wylie
Swift	Watkins	Yatron
Synar	Waxman	Young (FL)
Tallon	Weaver	Young (MO)
Tauke	Weber	Zschau
Tauzin	Weiss	

NAYS—28

Chappie	Goodling	Roemer
Coughlin	Harkin	Sabo
Dannemeyer	Jacobs	Schroeder
Daub	Lipinski	Sikorski
Dickinson	Martin (NY)	Solomon
Dorgan	Miller (OH)	Walker
Durbin	Mitchell	Yates
Emerson	Pashayan	Young (AK)
Evans (IA)	Penny	
Gejdenson	Roberts	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Dymally	Oberstar	St Germain

NOT VOTING—58

Andrews (NC)	Fiedler	Leland
Anthony	Ford (MI)	Lewis (FL)
Applegate	Frost	Lowery (CA)
Barnard	Garcia	Mack
Bartlett	Gephardt	Markey
Biaggi	Gibbons	Mrazek
Boner	Gramm	Ottinger
Bonker	Gray	Paul
Borski	Hall (IN)	Russo
Breaux	Hammerschmidt	Savage
Brooks	Hance	Scheuer
Bryant	Hansen (ID)	Stangeland
Clay	Harrison	Traxler
Crane, Philip	Hawkins	Valentine
Crockett	Jones (NC)	Williams (MT)
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Wilson
Derrick	Kazen	Wolf
Dingell	Kemp	Wortley
Edwards (CA)	LaFalce	
Feighan	Latta	

□ 1110

Mr. SEIBERLING changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution commending the Government of Colombia for its recent seizure of record amounts of cocaine, congratulating the Government of Colombia for its decision to test herbicidal eradication, expressing the hope that the Government of Colombia will carry out a sustained eradication program, and deploring the assassination of the Minister of Justice of Colombia.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL TO HONOR THE UNKNOWN AMERICAN VIETNAM-ERA VETERAN SELECTED FOR BURIAL AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) authorizing use of the rotunda of the Capitol to honor the unknown American who lost his life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era and who has been selected to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 296

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That during the period beginning on May 25, 1984, and ending on May 28, 1984, the rotunda of the United States Capitol may be used for the lying in state of the remains of the unknown American who lost his life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era and who has been selected to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery, and for the conduct of ceremonies in connection with that use.

SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe appropriate conditions for physical preparations with respect to the use of the rotunda authorized by the first section.

SEC. 3. The Speaker shall be authorized to appoint a delegation representating the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate shall be authorized to appoint a delegation representing the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this carries out the mandate voted by the Congress in the 93d Congress. This will permit the ceremony to be held and the body to lay in state from May 25 until May 28 in the rotunda, preparatory to burial in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery of a young American whose life was taken in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era.

On May 17, the Unknown will be officially designated with great ceremony in Hawaii where the remains now are. The Navy, with a Coast Guard escort, will move the Unknown by ship from Hawaii to San Francisco arriving there on May 24. The next day the Air Force will fly the remains from Travis Air Force Base to Andrews Air Force Base, and there a multiservice ceremonial unit, under the lead of the U.S. Army, will move those remains to the Capitol where it will be authorized here to lie in state, and this resolution provides that the Speaker shall be authorized to appoint a delegation representing the House and the majority leader of the Senate shall be authorized to appoint a delegation representing the Senate.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while this is certainly a worthy tribute to our missing in action, I want my colleagues to know, that there is some concern amongst some of our veterans groups throughout our Nation that this may be perceived as a closing of the book on our missing in action. We certainly hope that there is no basis for that perception and that that will not occur.

I want my colleague to know that there were some reservations by some of the leadership of our veterans organizations with regard to this initiative. While we recognize that it is a worthy tribute to our missing in action, and I hope and pray that we will continue in our efforts to try to bring about a full and final accounting of our missing in action in Southeast Asia, who still number over 2,400.

The issue of the Unknown Soldier from the Vietnam war is an issue that is of major importance to many of our veterans across the Nation—not only to our Vietnam-era veterans, but to all the veterans in America. As chairman of the House Task Force on American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, I believe that while the internment of the remains of a soldier from the Vietnam war is a worthy tribute, it is premature. With some 2,500 Americans still missing in Southeast Asia, and with the thousands of families of those unaccounted for in Asia still waiting for word on the fate of their loved ones, such internment could be perceived that our search for the missing is no longer a high priority. Many Americans will question the timing of this internment, and will wonder why we are closing the book on our Vietnam experience at a time when some progress is being made in the search for our MIA's and POW's.

We have worked long and hard for a full and final accounting of our missing Americans. I hope that if the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is to contain the fragments of a Vietnam-era soldier, we will not forget the valiant struggle that our Americans have made in Southeast Asia—and may still be making there. In my mind, and in the mind of many Americans, the Vietnam war will not be over until all of our Americans—including all 2,500 still unaccounted for—come home. The repatriation of remains, and the return of live Americans will signal the final chapter in the Vietnam story. With increasing evidence that some Americans may still be alive in Southeast Asia, we cannot afford to close the book at this time. With the increasing public awareness that has been focused on the MIA/POW issue, it is my hope that placing unidentifiable remains in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at this time will not send a signal to the American people that the MIA question no longer has the urgency and the importance that it once had.

Along with many of our colleagues in the House, our MIA task force intends to continue working to secure a full and final accounting of our missing Americans, and we urge our fellow Americans to continue this effort with us.

Thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I generally support what the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has said, but I would like to make it clear to my colleagues that in my position that after thorough study and after heading up two select committees from the House of Representatives, it seems that no Americans are still being held captive in Southeast Asia who fought in the Vietnam war.

There could be a few deserters over there living with the Vietnamese or living in Cambodia or Laos, but I think it should be made clear, that in my opinion no Americans are still being held captive. I think it is unfair to the families of the missing to give the families false hope when there is no information that any of these brave men are still alive. I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that we need to continue to gather as much information as we can on what happened to those Americans and not stop our search for what happened to these Americans.

We made a good accounting in Southeast Asia; we have accounted for all but 4 percent of those who were

killed or did not come home. In World War II, we did not account for 22 percent of those, and in the Korean war, 22 percent were not accounted for.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, that we should not give the families hopes that any Americans are still alive in Southeast Asia and being held captive. I would certainly hope I was wrong and Americans are being held captive; but all the signs point that no Americans are being held against their will. I think this is the right step to honor the Unknown Soldier, and the reason it has taken 10 years to have an Unknown Soldier for the Vietnam war is that under the technology that we now have, we have been able to identify all the Americans who came into the identification center in Honolulu. This American was not identified and it is only proper that this Unknown be honored as we have honored those in other wars.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I do not believe that this administration or anyone else views this as a closing of the chapter of our missing in action. I understand the remarks that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) just made, but I still would not want us to forget that we must continue to make every effort to receive a full accounting for those 2,400 who are missing in action.

I do not view, nor do I believe anyone should view this particular long overdue ceremony of recognizing the Unknown Soldier from Vietnam as a closing, but possibly, a refocusing of attention on this issue and a recognition that we need to resolve it and continue to make every possible effort.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman in enumerating the schedule that the actual lying in state would be in the Capitol Rotunda beginning when, May 25?

Mr. WRIGHT. May 25, and continuing into May 28.

Mr. MICHEL. Then would the interment in the Arlington National Cemetery be on what date?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; on the 28th of May.

Mr. MICHEL. I think it a very appropriate time of the year, Memorial Day, for such a ceremony to take place, but with only one caveat.

The Members were advised, as we agreed on a schedule early on in the year, that we would take our Memorial Day recess from the 25th of May through the 29th, which I am sure most Members have obligated themselves to appearances on Memorial Day occasions back in their respective districts.

I would certainly not want it to appear in any way disrespectful to what is taking place here in the Nation's Capital during that period that there will not be a great number of Members of Congress, all of whom would probably want to participate in that ceremony. I do note that the gentlemen's resolution, however, does call for the Speaker authorizing the appointment of the delegation representing the House and majority leader of the Senate to do likewise, so that the Congress, both Houses, will be appropriately represented at those ceremonies, and I am grateful for that consideration in the resolution.

I am sure, if put to a vote, each and every one of us would want to be present on that very solemn occasion.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is most certainly correct. That official delegation appointed by our Speaker and by the majority leader in the Senate will formally represent the Congress.

□ 1130

Undoubtedly every Member would desire to be present, were it possible so to do. There is no date, however, upon which we might select a more appropriate time than during the Memorial Day period, and probably no date on which we could find an occasion when all Members were free of obligations previously entered into.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WRIGHT. Surely. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman intend to request leave for Members to enter further remarks in the RECORD with regard to this resolution?

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly do.

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 296 authorizing use of the rotunda of the Capitol to honor the unknown American who gave his life while serving his country during the Vietnam conflict and who has been selected to be buried in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Arlington National Cemetery. The interment ceremony is scheduled for Memorial Day, May 28, 1984.

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is our Nation's most sacred national monument to those who served, fought, and died during World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and now the Vietnam war. Those brave men and women who gave their lives during these conflicts deserve the highest recognition and honor we can bestow upon them. We are now able to honor those who gave their lives in Southeast Asia and those still missing in action, by placing one of their fallen comrades-in-arms alongside the national heroes of previous wars at the Tomb of the Unknowns.

It is especially appropriate that the Unknown from the Vietnam war be honored in the rotunda of the Nation's Capitol. This is a deserved tribute on the part of all Americans to all of those who served in that long, anguished conflict and to the 2,500 American servicemen still missing in action in Southeast Asia.

This important occasion should renew our sense of obligation to all who have answered their country's call to service in time of war and heighten our dedication to be worthy of their sacrifices.●

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a fitting commemoration for the missing patriots of the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, this Memorial Day will be very special. The remains of a young American soldier who died in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam war will be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery. That Amphitheater is better known as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

In 1973, Congress directed the Department of Defense to honor those Vietnam servicemen still missing in action by returning one of their number in the Memorial Amphitheater. Since then, our technology has enabled us to identify the remains of all Americans who came into the identification center in Honolulu. Now, after more than 10 years, the congressional directive will be fulfilled.

On May 17, 1984, the unknown soldier will be officially designated with great ceremony in Hawaii, where the remains are now located. The Navy, with a Coast Guard escort, will move the unknown soldier by ship from Hawaii to San Francisco, arriving there on May 24. The next day, the Air Force will fly the remains from Travis Air Force Base, near San Francisco, to Andrews Air Force Base, outside Washington, D.C. A ceremonial unit composed of members from each branch of the armed services will move the unknown soldier to the Capitol where he will lie in State. On Memorial Day, a procession will take the unknown soldier to Arlington National Cemetery. Duly appointed representatives from the House and Senate will be in attendance. Ultimately, the young man's remains will be interred and the ceremony will end—the symbolic conclusion of a tragic era in our history.

If I recall one thing from that era it is the statistics. The routine nightly broadcasts recounting the number of

dead and missing. I used to imagine the families of the soldiers and how they must have felt when a news commentator reported that 147 more young men had perished. Commentators quickly reported the casualties on the other side like the results of some ghastly baseball game.

The statistics still haunt me: nearly 58,000 Americans died during the Vietnam war; over 2,400 Americans are listed as missing in action. I feel the horror of that war every time I think of the families or hear about another troubled Vietnam vet.

The ceremonies this Memorial Day will be a fitting commemoration to the patriots of the Vietnam war only if they stimulate our renewed commitment to the families of the dead and missing and to the Vietnam vets themselves. We must continue to work toward a full accounting of those 2,400 who are still missing in action. We must continue to provide educational, vocational, and health services for our Vietnam vets. Above all, we must not allow this country to suffer through another tragedy like Vietnam. Let us make this Memorial Day a time to remember.●

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO AWARD MEDAL OF HONOR TO UNKNOWN AMERICAN VIETNAM ERA VETERAN SELECTED FOR BURIAL AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era and who has been selected to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if our chairman would explain what is contained in the resolution to be discussed.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5515 is similar to acts approved in 1921, 1948, and 1957 authorizing awards of the Medal of Honor to unknown American servicemen who lost their lives in the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean conflict. H.R. 5515 would recognize the gallantry of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who gave their lives in Southeast Asia.

This Vietnam Unknown Soldier will be officially designated on May 17, 1984, in Hawaii, where the remains are now located. Following the ceremonies in Hawaii, the Navy, with a Coast Guard escort, will move the Unknown Soldier by ship to San Francisco. The Air Force will then fly the Unknown Soldier to Washington, D.C. A multiservice ceremonial unit will move the Unknown Soldier to the Capitol to lie in state. Finally, on Memorial Day a procession will take the Unknown Soldier to Arlington National Cemetery for interment at the Tomb of the Unknowns.

If authorized by the Congress, the medal would be presented in connection with the interment ceremony on Memorial Day. For that to be possible, the Congress must act without delay.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, let me say that:

I wholeheartedly support this bill, and endorse what the chairman has just said about it. This particular recognition of those who made the supreme sacrifice in Southeast Asia has been a long time in coming.

We should note, however, that this is the first time the Department of Defense has been confronted with remains that are identifiable only to the extent of being those of an American serviceman killed in Southeast Asia. The Department has been properly reluctant to give up efforts to identify all the remains it recovers.

Now that it is clear that we are unable to identify this unknown American, we can with assurance move swiftly to honor him and all those he represents.

And so I join with the chairman in urging my colleagues in the House to support passage of H.R. 5515.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Unknown Soldier is now a long one. It began in 1921, when the Congress authorized the selection of an unidentified American soldier to receive national honors as a representative of all American soldiers who died in the First World War. The tradition was continued in 1948 and in 1957 for the Second World War and the Korean conflict. In 1973, the Congress authorized the designation of an Unknown Soldier of the Vietnam conflict. Remains have now been selected for that designation, and the Unknown Soldier of the Vietnam conflict may be laid to rest with appropriate honors.

I wholeheartedly support H.R. 5515. This particular recognition of those who made the supreme sacrifice in Southeast Asia has been a long time in coming. It should be noted, however, that this is the first time the Department of Defense has been confronted with remains that are identifiable only to the extent of being those of an American serviceman killed in Southeast Asia. The Department has been properly reluctant to give up efforts to identify all the remains it recovers.

It is unfortunate that the effort to identify this brave American has been unsuccessful. But now that it is clear that we are unable to identify him, we can with assurance move swiftly to honor him and all those he represents. I can think of no honor more fitting than the Medal of Honor, to be awarded to the Unknown Soldier as the representative of all those who served their country so bravely in Southeast Asia.●

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the designation of an Unknown Soldier for interment in the Memorial Amphitheater of the Arlington National Cemetery is a highly symbolic event. It honors not only the unidentified serviceman whose remains are designated but also all those servicemen whose remains have gone unrecovered or unidentified.

The award of the Medal of Honor to the Unknown Soldier is yet more symbolic. By honoring the gallantry of the Unknown Soldier we honor as well the distinguished service of all who served this Nation in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict. This Medal of Honor is a fitting measure of the esteem in which a grateful nation holds not only those who gave their lives but also those many others who served so unselfishly.

Let all those who served this Nation in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict and all those whose loved ones sacrificed their lives in that war view the ceremonies this coming Memorial Day as tribute not to one but to all.

It is of the utmost importance that H.R. 5515 be enacted without delay, so that the Unknown Soldier and all those he represents may be honored this Memorial Day.●

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5515

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the

President may award, and present in the name of Congress, the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and who has been selected to lie buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Virginia, as authorized by section 9 of the National Cemeteries Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-43).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 additional days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on H.R. 5515, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EL CINCO DE MAYO

(Mr. McNULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the 122d anniversary of the battle De Puebla, Mexico, in which a small but determined and inspired group of Mexican fighters fought and defeated the French Army, which eventually led to Mexico's independence from France. The event is commemorated in Mexico and the Southwestern United States as "El Cinco De Mayo"—the 5th of May.

It is appropriate today that we salute the people of the Republic of Mexico for the tremendous success they have achieved as President Miguel de la Madrid strives to bring that nation back from the brink of economic disaster. His Presidency inherited the most serious political and economic crisis since the revolution of 1910.

We should be proud of our southern neighbor's continuing fight for economic independence which is coming about thanks to considerable sacrifice on the part of the Mexican people. Today, her inflation rate has been cut in half, she has renegotiated her international debt, and integrity and trust are being restored in her Presidency. Mexico can look forward to advocating, leading, and setting a model for the rest of the developing Third World.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Mexico's continuing independence.

"Que viva Presidente de la Madrid."

"Que viva Mexico y su gente."

"Viva Los Estados Unidos."

WE CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT HIGH INTEREST RATES

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, interest rates are too high and they are going up again. We have just seen the first negative results, I believe, in the drop in the index of leading economic indicators.

It is time for this Congress to do something about high interest. We obviously are not doing a great job controlling Federal spending and borrowing, but we still can do something about high interest rates.

This month a number of my colleagues will join with me in offering a bill to give every American a chance to earn a significant amount of tax-free interest, provided that interest is earned in the traditional passbook account. Among this bill's purposes and its many good results is the aim of reducing the high cost of money in America's lending and savings institutions, now estimated at 10 percent, and dramatically improving America's low savings rate which, by the way, for 1983 was 4.8 percent, the lowest since 1929.

If we can cut the cost of money to our savings institutions, we can cut the high mortgage rates down to size, and we can do it by giving every American a chance to earn some tax-free income in a passbook savings account.

NO MORE CUBAS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(Mr. DANIEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let go unchallenged remarks attributed to some of our colleagues. These statements, made subsequent to visits to Latin America, lead me to believe that some of these Members visited a Central America far removed from that which I visited in mid-April.

As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, I walked the areas where we have put up temporary structures and airfields to support maneuvers in Honduras. Plainly, they meet, but do not exceed, the regulatory requirement of minimum and essential construction for military training exercises.

I can tell you that I approached the first site with the thought I had stepped backward in time. The structures—one could scarcely call them buildings—were almost identical to the ones in which I lived during my stint with the Civilian Conservation Corps. They in no way resembled the kinds of permanent buildings we regularly erect when it is our intent to become a permanent presence.

I invite those who have an interest to visit those places and draw their own conclusions.

If we are to debate the issue, let it be on the merits of whether we believe it is appropriate to assist the weakened nations of Central America in their fight against imported totalitarianism; let us not muddy the waters with opinions on the architecture, or conjecture on its use.

"No more Vietnams" has become an overworked phrase of our times. Let this President, and whomever the next President might be announce to the world there will be no more Cubas in the Western Hemisphere. Then all of us can make our own decision as to where we come down on the issue.

AUTO COMPANY EXECUTIVE BONUSES ARE AN AFFRONT

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the multimillion-dollar bonuses which have been given to American automobile company executives are an affront to consumers who have been asked to pay higher prices for cars, and for plantworkers who have been asked to do without pay raises to save their companies.

During the Kennedy administration, the President called the leaders of the steel industry into his office to let them know that their corporate decisions were not in the best interests of the United States. I think President Reagan should call the presidents of the major automobile companies in the United States into the Oval Office for some straight talk.

Government help to the automobile industry was meant to give them an opportunity to get their companies back on their feet, put people back to work, and to make sure that our cars were more competitive with the Japanese. It was never meant to give these indefensible corporate bonuses.

□ 1140

THE EDUCATION FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN AND YOUTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1984

(Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce along with my colleagues the Education for Gifted and Talented Children Youth Improvement Act of 1984. This legislation will launch a national effort to assist States in maximizing public and private resources and talents to develop, expand, and improve educational opportunities for gifted and talented

students. While the Congress has over the past decades, developed, defined, and maintained Federal roles for various students with unique learning needs, there is at present no Federal leadership directed at improving educational opportunities for gifted and talented youth and children. The modest Federal role that this legislation provides is designed to fill that gap. The National Commission on Excellence in Education calls upon our Federal Government in cooperation with our State and local government, private enterprise, and our American citizens to share the responsibility for improving education. This gifted and talented legislation will provide the limited Federal role that the Commission on Excellence in Education recommends.

FINAL REPORT OF THE "NEW IRELAND FORUM"

(Mr. DONNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was an historic day in the search for a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

The "New Ireland Forum" published its final report, recommending specific steps that can be taken to bring peace and reconciliation to Ulster.

The report recognizes the need to respect the rights, the preferences, and the loyalties of all parties to the long and bitter conflict.

Much hard work and soul-searching has gone into the Forum's report. Much more remains ahead before the consent of all parties can be achieved.

I applaud the courageous work of the Forum's members, and urge the British Government and all the parties in Northern Ireland to carefully consider the Forum's work in the spirit it is presented—a good-faith effort to find a peaceful, political, democratic solution to the bitterness and violence.

Fifty-two members of this House have now agreed to cosponsor the resolution presented by the distinguished majority whip, Mr. FOLEY, and myself endorsing the effort of the forum and urging careful consideration of their report. I urge the other Members of this House to join us as cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 276.

WEST VIRGINIA JOINS IN CELEBRATING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this week we are paying a special salute to the nurses across America. National Nurses Week, highlighted by National Nurses Day this Sunday, is a fitting tribute to the largely unsung heroines and heroes of American medicine.

In West Virginia, we are blessed with nearly 15,000 nurses statewide. This important group of professionals provides vital life-saving services. They put in long hours and work hard serving the health needs of all citizens.

In our veterans centers, in our community hospitals and clinics, and in the home, this special group of individuals is working to make a difference in the lives they touch. In setting aside this special time to acknowledge the contribution made by the nurses of our communities and across the Nation, we are saying that their hard work is appreciated not just this one week, but every day of the year.

Additionally, the contribution made by groups such as the West Virginia Nurses' Association, on the State level, and the American Nurses' Association, on the national level, is significant. The legislative initiatives promoted by these groups have demonstrated a dedication to vision and innovation. The substantial recommendations made by these organizations have provided the Congress with valuable insight into the impact of legislation being debated in the Congress.

I join in saluting the nurses of America, during this their special week.

THE VULNERABILITY OF THE MX MISSILE

(Mr. PENNY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I believe in a strong defense and recognize that the United States must maintain a stable deterrent—a nuclear arsenal powerful enough to discourage anyone else from using nuclear weapons. But effective deterrence requires stability. The MX missile will not increase stability, because it is a destabilizing first strike weapon and it is vulnerable to attack.

Since development of this system began, dozens of basing modes have been considered and rejected. More than $1 billion have been spent to find this missile a home. Now the decision has been made to place the MX in the same vulnerable silos which were the source of the problem in the first place. This is money literally down the tubes.

Last year despite strong, bipartisan opposition, money for the first 21 weapons was appropriated. This year President Reagan has requested $5 billion for the next 40 missiles. The total cost of this system may approach $30 billion.

I believe that we can preserve America's deterrent strength and maintain our military capability without the MX missile. When it comes to matters of defense spending, we must make wise decisions. While fighting the problems of a huge Federal deficit, all areas of spending must be carefully evaluated. Therefore, this body must choose what we can afford and what we need. This country neither needs nor can it afford to waste billions on an unnecessary and destabilizing weapons system.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this year's funding request.

THE ALARMING TREND TOWARD HIGHER INTEREST RATES

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw my colleagues' attention to some news that I feel should be alarming to all of us. Interest rates in this country are rising, and rising rather dramatically.

Today the 90-day T-bill rate is 9.68 percent; a year ago it was 8.04 percent. The prime rate today is 12 percent; 1 year ago it was 10.5 percent. Mortgage rates today are 13.73 percent, and a year ago mortgage rates were 12.75 percent. The municipal bond rate today is 9.94 percent, and a year ago the rate was 8.78 percent.

Interest rates are rising, Mr. Speaker, because of our Nation's huge deficit. The 3-year $150 billion downpayment plan that has been much discussed is a political cop-out. It is just simply not enough. Now is the time for all of us to take decisive action if we want to prevent another round of high interest rates which will be devastating to our farmers, home builders, small businessmen, and businesswomen.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely essential for us in the remaining weeks of this session to dramatically reduce the deficit by at least $220 billion over the next 3 years.

AMERICA CONTINUES ITS ROMANCE WITH THE AUTOMOBILE

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, in love with the automobile in America. For two generations Americans have been in love with the car, and although the ardor has cooled, the central romance has continued.

Add to that the importance of the automobile industry to jobs in our country, and it should surprise no one

that the administration has rediscovered the car.

Headlines abound that auto quotas are bad. What took them so long?

The administration's current policies are wrong. Bad politics, worse economics.

Current policy emphasizes arbitrary quotas and denies long-term domestic content. These policies work a tremendous economic hardship on the American consumer, allow current manufacturers an ad hoc oligopoly, and put no pressure on foreign manufacturers to follow their products to America.

For more than 2 years, I and others have advised the administration to revise current policy.

Let me say it again publicly. Wise economics and sound politics demand a quota-free marketplace combined with a transition toward majority domestic content. It will work to the benefit of the consumer, the worker, and the manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking love again.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask for my colleagues' support for legislation I have just introduced to reauthorize the National Health Service Corps. I would like to extend my appreciation to Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment for his hard work and skilled leadership in this important health care area.

The National Health Service Corps provides medical personnel to health manpower shortage areas. These young doctors, in return for Government scholarship aid, make a commitment to serve in a health care clinic in one of these medically underserved areas for a limited period of time. The clinics then pay back the Government for its costs in educating the individual in addition to a salary.

Nationwide there are over 500 of these small National Health Service Corps clinics and there are 28 of them in New Mexico.

This is a vitally needed national program that makes a major difference in the lives of over 100,000 New Mexicans in my district who depend on these clinics for their principal source of health care.

I would remind my colleagues that this is the program the Reagan administration tried to kill last year by imposing a new, onerous payback policy that would have forced them to close their doors. But the Congress, in a sharp rebuke to the White House, approved my legislation which reversed the administration's policy.

This new legislation which I have introduced not only assures that these clinics' doors will remain open, but that the entire program will be strengthened in the years ahead by authorizing 2,200 new medical scholarships for young doctors. As a result, many of these doctors will be serving the people in my district in northern New Mexico in the 1990's. There have been virtually no new National Health Service Corps scholarships since President Reagan took office and without any new doctors in the pipeline, this valuable program would eventually die. I do not believe the Congress will permit that to happen.

There are many of us in the Congress who believe there is a rather positive role for the Federal Government in seeing that some measure of justice and fairness is insured in the way the Federal budget is divided and in the way Government does its work. The National Health Service Corps is a classic, textbook example of commonsense government at its best. A high percentage of the patients who use these rural health care clinics are older Americans living on small fixed incomes who have chronic health problems. This legislation benefits not only my State of New Mexico, but the Nation as a whole. It is a creative, low cost, sensible way to successfully deliver quality health care to those in need.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 1150

NICARAGUAN MOTHERS' SIGNATURE BOOK

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, a group of American women visiting Nicaragua was given a signature book. This book contains over 2,000 signatures of Nicaraguan women who lost loved ones in the war against Somoza and in the continuing war against the Contras. The Nicaraguan women asked that the book be presented to the Congress of the United States of America as a symbol of their suffering and as a plea to the United States to stop the aggression against their country.

These signatures remind us of the human aspect of war. Sometimes, I think we forget that our millions of dollars in military aid result in the deaths of sons, daughters, husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, and other loved ones. A Nicaraguan mother who lost two sons said, and I quote:

As a mother suffering for her children, I ask you to take the message to Mr. Reagan and ask him to leave us in peace. We've already cried a lot for our children * * * so we as mothers ask you to tell your country and your people that here we see thousands of mothers asking that there be peace.

I would ask my colleagues to weigh this cry for peace. I am placing the signature book in the Speaker's lobby for your review. A letter to us accompanies the book and is worthy of your attention. The book will be in the lobby until the end of next week's legislative session. I urge all of my colleagues to read the letter and review the book.

FIFTY DAYS OF SILENCE

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for 50 consecutive days now that we have been in session, Members of the minority have asked the majority leadership to provide clearance for various unanimous-consent requests. Those requests have dealt with a variety of issues, ranging from permitting voluntary school prayer to a line item veto. These requests have been greeted by 50 consecutive days of silence from the majority.

Now, we have all heard about the silent majority, but this is rather ridiculous. The majority leadership reacts like Charlie McCarthy without Edgar Bergen.

The silence which greets requests from our side says a lot. Members of this body who want to debate issues, who want to vote on issues, cannot. Members of our minority are muzzled, and because they are, so are millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we were sent here to work, not wait. We were sent here to vote, not vacillate. We were sent here to deal with issues, not defer them.

We Republicans do not want to wait for the Democratic Convention to dictate our legislative agenda, and let us not let the California primary dictate immigration policy.

We are legislators, not the lackeys of campaign consultants.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AMERICAN AND SOVIET POLICIES

(Mr. BETHUNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, when the President sent the Marines and the Rangers into Grenada to liberate the Grenadians and free the medical students, many liberals were quick to criticize and often they used as the centerpiece of their argument that they were concerned that this country was becoming like the Soviets in Afghanistan.

Well, let us look at the record just a minute. The Soviets have been in Af-

ghanistan for more than 4 years and they are still there. There are over 150,000 combat troops there. The government is in control, the Soviet Union, and just this week they launched a new offensive, high-altitude bombing, a major offensive through the Panjur Valley, where they are wreaking havoc on the poor Afghans.

Contrast that, if you will, the United States was in Grenada for 2 months, 7,500 troops and now out, a few MP's and Coast Guard there to help train the Grenadians, almost universal acceptance by the Grenadians, even sold out of T shirts that say "God Bless America."

Just recently, a couple of days ago, it was May Day. We need to remember the lesson of Hanna Aaron, who wrote the great book on totalitarianism, that totalitarian governments cannot survive without exterior expansion.

Now, I ask my naive liberal colleagues who were making their points and who were the nay sayers on Grenada, are you still really worried that the United States is like the Soviets in Afghanistan?

CONGRESS SHOULD AMEND TITLE IX OF 1972 EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

(Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, it was an accepted practice for many colleges and universities to require female applicants to score higher on their entrance exams than their male counterparts in order to get into school. Athletic scholarships were for men only. Female students were strongly advised to pursue "women's fields" and leave math, science, law, and medicine to men. Female professors were paid far less than their male counterparts.

In short, Mr. Speaker, educational institutions discouraged women from getting the opportunities they needed to have an equal opportunity to succeed in our society.

But 11 years ago Congress passed title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, and the results have been significant. Women are studying professional and technical fields in far greater numbers. Athletic scholarships for women have grown to over 10,000 per year. Female professors are no longer denied paying positions.

The formula for title IX is simple; if an institution fails to end discriminatory policies, it faces a total cutoff of Federal funds, including student loan assistance.

We have made a great deal of progress in ending gender-based discrimination since title IX became law, but a Supreme Court decision earlier this year threatens this progress. In deciding Grove City against Bell, the Court severely restricts the scope and effectiveness of title IX, making a significant cutoff of funds to a violator institution all but impossible. Congress should take immediate action to restore this legislation.

The language that the Court found wanting is the exact same language in legislation guaranteeing equal opportunities and access for senior citizens, minorities, and the handicapped. Laws guaranteeing these rights are now vulnerable as well.

Together with colleagues from both sides of the aisle, I have introduced legislation to amend title IX to satisfy the Court so that title IX enforcement can continue today as it has for the last decade.

During past debates on women's issues, everyone has professed their commitment to equality for women, even if they have opposed measures on other grounds. There can be no equivocating on this issue. Title IX works for women by mandating equal treatment. We should take action now to make sure that it continues.

FORFEITURE REFORM WOULD REDUCE DRUG TRAFFICKING

(Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, drug trafficking has become a major problem in every State, county, and city of this great Nation. This problem reaches into the homes of the rich as well as the poor; and something must be done to curtail this epidemic.

Boats seized from drug traffickers by the Federal Government are usually vandalized and looted by criminals before they have to be sunk in the river. The hundreds of seized and rotting vessels, aircraft and autos are a national embarrassment because the law now prevents Government officials from confiscating and selling the vehicles intact until after conviction and by then they are usually worthless.

Forfeiture reform, which would correct the current problems in our law enforcement tool of forfeiture are contained in S. 1762. This is the single most important legislative tool before us to reduce the drug trafficking into every congressional district. The only way to reduce drug trafficking is to take the profit out of the crime. To reach this result, forfeiture allows the Government to seize the assets used to commit the crime and those assets which are the criminal's illegal profits.

We cannot enforce this punishment correctly as long as current procedures are so inefficient and time consuming that the assets rot in the interim.

Forfeiture reform is just one of the many desperately needed reforms that are in the President's Comprehensive Crime Control Act. The American people deserve this reform measure today.

ACID RAIN

(Mr. GREGG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, political positioning has claimed acid rain control legislation as its most recent victim. Yesterday's defeat of H.R. 3400 on a 10 to 9 vote in the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the full Committee on Commerce and Energy was a defeat for the health of this country. This vote is an unfortunate example of the regional trench warfare that has prevented us from conducting constructive dialog on the issue of acid rain.

Is it not time that we acknowledged that acid rain is one of the Nation's most pressing environmental probelms? Unfortunately, we have not acknowledged that in this House today. The environment is too precious to squander and yet this House appears to have decided to do so.

THE OMNIBUS CRIME BILL

(Mr. SAWYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, today Americans consider crime to be one of the most crucial issues affecting their lives. It has taken nearly 14 years, but finally the Senate has adopted the initiative and enacted a major omnibus crime bill, comprising some 44 different sections. It passed the Senate 91 to 1 on a strictly bipartisan basis; however, if the House leadership has its way, the House will never get to vote on this issue and it will die before it is ever born.

A number, a handful I might say, of subcommittee chairmen are exercising their power to keep the House from ever having an opportunity to vote on this bill.

I urge the Democratic leadership to intervene, because these Members and I am sure their districts are no freer of crime than many of the rest of us.

This is an urgently needed bill. I think refusing to allow the House to vote on this issue is in itself a crime.

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY SHOULD NOT MEAN DIPLOMATIC IMPUNITY

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday one of my staffers was run off the road by a driver who made an illegal lane change. Damage to my staffer's car will probably total $200. The D.C. police would not even investigate, respond or come to the scene of the accident.

What recourse does my staffer have? None.

This wild driver was a diplomat from the French Embassy. The police couldn't write the diplomat a ticket, nor would the police even come investigate the accident. Diplomatic immunity should not mean diplomatic impunity.

Somehow, someway, there should be a method developed which at very least investigates and records these diplomat-caused accidents. We do not have to prosecute, but we should keep records. At the end of a year these records should be examined. Perhaps those diplomats who have trouble operating a motor vehicle in this country without running everyone else off the road could be given a warning to either learn how to drive or take a taxi.

□ 1200

ANOTHER DELAY?

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I take the well to inform you that my constituents are going to be angry—very angry. There is a report in today's Washingon Post that you have once again delayed floor action on the immigration bill. This time until after the June primary elections in California.

Perhaps the Speaker still does not realize how important this issue is to California. But what I find to be even more disturbing is the fact that it was my own California colleagues from the other side of the aisle that requested this delay. This is most interesting considering the fact that their Presidential primary will probably be sewn up by then, and thanks to their diligent efforts during the reapportionment process, it appears that not one of them faces serious election threats.

Until now I was telling my constituents that action was being delayed because the national democrat leadership just did not understand the real concerns of the Southwest. How am I going to explain that it seems fellow Californians are now prompting the delay?

Can anyone seriously believe that we will have time between mid-June and adjournment to consider this issue fully? Does the Speaker have a particular time in mind? I need to know, Mr. Speaker, because my constituents are going to want to know.

REPLACEMENT OF VITAL LOCKS AND DAMS ON THE OHIO RIVER

(Mr. McEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, yet another accident at the locks and dam at Gallipolis has interrupted the flow of vital commerce up and down the entire Ohio River system. Consumers and jobs dependent on the Ohio River for the delivery of goods and products are now faced with two poor options:

First, the main locks can be closed for 30 days while the faulty gate is repaired. This would require tows and boats to use the much smaller auxiliary gates, this would back up and delay traffic and in some instances require the costly dismantling of larger barges so they can fit through the small gate.

The other option is to replace the main gate with parts from the auxiliary gate. This, would mean that all traffic on the river will come to a halt for a week while this exchange is made.

During the past year, at least 12 such accidents have taken place at the Galliapolis locks, causing damage and halting traffic on the Ohio River system.

Every day that we here in Congress delay in authorizing the needed relacement of these vital locks on this one of the most important water transportation systems in the world—the Ohio River—we are costing consumers and our Nation time and money.

Let us act on Congressman ROE's water authorization legislation before we recess this summer.

SCHEDULING OF IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because the question was raised by one of the gentlemen who spoke just a moment ago with respect to the immigration bill and its scheduling for consideration on the House floor.

It is our purpose to schedule that bill for consideration during the week of June 11. We expect to devote the entire week to its consideration, Monday through Friday. Therefore, Members may expect to be here if they are interested in voting on the numerous amendments which may be made in order to that immigration legislation during the week of June 11.

And it is our full intent and specific purpose that at the conclusion of that week we shall vote on the bill, voting it up or down, but completing action on that bill before we go to any other matter.

MONDALE WON'T BITE THE BULLET

(Mr. THOMAS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1983, Walter Mondale announced he was a candidate for President of the United States. In his announcement he said that he had the experience and the strength to deal with world leaders.

Candidate Mondale cannot even take the heat of pending immigration legislation in this House. The Speaker has put off consideration of the immigration bill until after the California primary.

Just disregard any publicly offered explanations for the delay. No California Democrats are in primary election trouble. Phil Burton made sure of that.

It is true, though, that the AFL-CIO supports the immigration bill and powerful Hispanic Members in this House from California oppose the immigration bill.

Candidate Mondale, despite his claimed superior experience and alleged resolute strength, wants no bullets to bite in the California primary on his way to the Democratic nomination. That is the real reason why this House will not consider immigration legislation until after the California primary.

All you Mondale supporters gather over there under the banner that reads, "Let's Put a Hypocrite in the White House."

SCHEDULING IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, the issue of immigration has come up once again and it is very interesting that it has come up again. But I hope you do not mind if I do not hold my breath waiting for its actual action.

I was here a little over 2 years ago when we were given time from 10 at night to 2 in the morning to discuss this important issue, and because it was pushed down to the last week and 200 amendments were in order, it died of its own weight.

I was here when you, Mr. Speaker, told us in October of last year that this was not a national issue, there was no national problem, there was no national constituency for it.

I was here, Mr. Speaker, when you said in January you changed your mind and it was going to be one of the first things we would bring up this year.

I was here, Mr. Speaker, in February when we were told it was going to be the first thing we took up after the February break.

I was here, Mr. Speaker, just before Easter when we were told it was going to be the first thing brought up after Easter.

I was here when we were informed that it was going to be brought up the very first thing in May.

Mr. Speaker, I sat in a rules committee meeting 2 days ago when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) informed us that it would be brought up the week of May 21 and we would have 2 weeks committed to it. In that same meeting, we were told we could not deal with it after those dates because there would not be time as we had all of the appropriation bills to consider.

Imagine my surprise, Mr. Speaker, when I opened up the paper today and found out that now you tell us that we will have to put it into that period when we have no time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame Mr. Mondale called you and asked you to put it off. I remember Mr. Mondale's speeches. He tells us he should be President of the United States because he is a leader.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that anybody that needs nighttime fiction reading ought to take Mr. Mondale's speeches to bed with them.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

One of the greatest frustrations since first coming to this House is to see the shabby treatment which the majority party, the Democrat Party, has treated the borders of this country by continuously throwing ever possible block in front of a meaningful immigration bill for our country.

I would remind the Speaker in setting forth the policy of this House in the form of a schedule, that this is not a partisan issue. This is a carefully crafted, thought-out bill that was molded very very carefully in the Judiciary Committee by both the Democrat and Republican members working together.

Now that we are getting closer to election it does appear that it is becoming a more partisan issue. As we have seen the Democrat's Presidential roadshow rolling across this country like a bowl of loose jello, caving in on every issue of a local nature, we now see that this particular type or brand of politics is making its way into the scheduling of issues on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is not right.

The borders of this country are not a political issue. They are not to be made into a political football, even though this is an election year. This House has a responsibility to go forward with responsible legislation.

ACID RAIN LEGISLATION

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a democratically controlled House subcommittee pulled the plug on acid rain legislation for the 98th Congress.

The approach advocated by the subcommittee chairman and the New England Congressional Caucus is a fair and good faith offer to our colleagues from the Midwest. The Conte/D'Amours bill (H.R. 4404) requires each region to pay its fair share of the total costs based on total sulfur dioxide emissions, the documented cause of acid rain. The victims of acid rain—my constituents in western Massachusetts—are willing to participate in a national cost-sharing program designed to spread out the costs of reduction.

Instead of working to develop an acceptable control program, the subcommittee rejected our offer, ignoring the mounting environmental damage caused by acid rain. Just this morning, the Springfield Union ran a front-page story on the effects of acid in the Quabbin Reservoir. A recent study found that feeder streams to the reservoir—which supply the city of Boston with drinking water—are "contaminated with such lethal levels of acidity that 100 percent of the fish died in an experiment conducted last month." I will include the full text of the article for the RECORD.

How long will the Congress wait before a control program is adopted? How long will the acid rain of terror ravage the environment? A democratically controlled subcommittee answered those questions yesterday.

[From the Springfield Morning Union, May 3, 1984]

TEST SHOWS HIGH ACIDITY KILLING FISH IN QUABBIN

(By Donna Parker)

BELCHERTOWN.—Feeder streams on the western border of Quabbin Reservoir are contaminated with such lethal levels of acidity that 100 percent of the fish died in an experiment conducted there last month.

The alarming results have prompted state Fishery and Wildlife researchers to investigate the survival rate of fish in the vast reservoir itself.

Early experiments at reservoir coves near the mouths of the streams found that 90 percent of the rainbow trout turned belly-up in less than six days.

"This experiment has proved conclusively that the western streams of the reservoir are toxic to the rainbow trout, and that increased acidity has created toxic zones in the reservoir," reported Dick Keller aquatic biologist for the state Fishery and Wildlife Division, Wednesday.

The killer streams cited by Keller included Cadwell Creek, Army Camp, Gulf, Atherton, Cobb, and Briggs brooks, and the western arm of the Swift River.

Keller said that these streams are typical of an estimated 20 percent of the streams in the state judged to have critically high acid levels.

A healthy stream normally has a ph level of 6 to 7.5, while a ph level of 5 is considered toxic to fish. High acidity in the streams surveyed reduced ph levels to as low as 4, Keller said.

"This experiment was a very good indication of the impact of acid rain on our streams," he said.

In a separate survey, it was found that the upper Millers River and its feeder streams in the Wendell and Orange area have lost all non-game species due to a total loss of alkalinity in the water.

The Chicopee, Blackstone and Nashua Rivers are slated for similar studies.

However, Keller was more alarmed by the toxic effects the contaminated water had on fish even when diluted in the 800 million gallons of reservoir water.

"I expected the fish to die in the streams. I did not expect them to die in the coves," he said.

The study was prompted by a severe drop in the number of rainbow trout caught at Quabbin Reservoir in the past two years.

Normally, the state stocks the reservoir with 15,000 rainbows, and 25 percent are retrieved by anglers annually. However, since 1981, only 10 percent of the fish have been caught.

"We wanted to find out if the diminished numbers were caused by increased predation or increased acidity," he said.

Researchers placed 1,500 fish in porous cages sited in feeder streams and reservoir coves last month when acidity levels are normally high from increased spring rainfall.

The results, yet to be published, showed that increased acidity and aluminum content in the water caused severe gill irritation, killing the fish.

Aluminum levels, lethal to fish at .1, were measured as high as .9 in some streams, Keller said.

"The aluminum is leached from the soil by increased acidity. When both are present in the water, the toxicity increases dramatically," he explained.

Keller fears that during the summer, the aluminum content settling on the bottom of the reservoir will be reactivated by the cooler water temperatures there, threatening the survival of species that live in all areas of the Quabbin.

□ 1210

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission to Preserve

Social Security and Medicare—now that is a noble-sounding organization, and certainly the stated goal is worthy, one that we all share; preserving social security and medicare.

But when we pose questions about the organization and upon closer examination of what is being done to whom, a dark cloud hangs over the nobleness and worthiness associated with it. Millions of Americans across this country are being told, through a slick mail order house operation, that the way to save social security and medicare is to send $10 to some post office box.

Do not do it. Do not send your hard-earned money to this slick mail order operation. Congress has preserved social security because it was the right thing to do and Congress will preserve medicare because it is the right thing to do.

THIS IS A REDUCED DEFICIT

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Earlier today, the gentleman from Kansas complained about the high-interest rates and how they are going up. He further compared the current rates with last year's. He noted they are up slightly and we should be concerned about this. I wholeheartedly agree as do most Americans.

But what he failed to do was to tell you that 3½ years ago, when this administration took office, interest rates were at 21½ percent, and that was one of the main reasons we reached excessively high unemployment, because the previous administration did not pay attention to the economy and to the interest rates.

He also talked about the huge deficit and remarked something must be done to reduce it. He remarked, President Reagan's $148 billion downpayment is too little. But the Democrats have proposed very little as an alternative.

As a matter of fact, last year in this body, they voted for $49 billion more in spending than was finally realized. That means that instead of having an $180 billion deficit we would have had a $229 billion deficit had they had their way.

So I think the people of America should look to the Democratic Party for some leadership because they sure have not shown it thus far.

HOUSE SHOULD TAKE UP CRIME CONTROL ACT

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, a Comprehensive Crime Control Act was introduced in the House and in the other body earlier last year and, as of today, only the other body has taken action on that important piece of legislation referred to as S. 1762.

The House version, H.R. 2151, languishes, bottled up in the Judiciary Committee with no action yet taken and no indication of hearings yet planned.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the House may not view this legislation as an important item, important enough to warrant our prompt attention. Nothing should be further from the truth. Americans are concerned about serious crime and the Congress' seeming inability to deal with it effectively on this Federal level.

The reforms suggested in that Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983 would arm our Federal enforcement officials with the means to help protect the safety of our citizens more effectively.

We, in the House, the people's body, have a duty to debate and take action on the matter which is of great concern to our constituencies.

I hope my colleagues will join me in calling upon the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to schedule hearings with an idea in mind to move this bill to the floor for a vote before the summer recess; bail reform, insanity defense, determinate sentencing, all very critical to better law enforcement in this America, and this House has it bottled up, and may it rest in peace in the Judiciary Committee.

AN ANNIVERSARY OF SORTS—AND THE LAMPREY EEL

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, today is an anniversary day—of sorts—but not one that provides much cause for celebration. The House has been in session now for some 52 days this year. During that time, we have passed a budget resolution and a couple of important measures, but not much else.

Earlier this week, the House acted on a bill to control the lamprey eel population in the Pere Marquette River, and I am hopeful that the other body will act on that measure soon.

But when it comes down to action on such measures as a balanced budget constitutional amendment, immigration reform, criminal law reform, or consideration of the school prayer issue, somehow, the majority leadership just has not been able to find the time to schedule these important issues.

Time and time again, Republican Members have attempted to bring these issues to the floor for consideration, but each time they are met with a wall of silence from the majority leadership, reflecting an indifference to the demands of the majority of the American people who want this Congress to act on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, what is good for the lamprey eel is good for the American people. Let us bring these issues up for a vote. I applaud my colleagues' efforts to draw the attention of the American people to the inaction of this House on such critically important issues.

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S COMPREHENSIVE CRIME PACKAGE

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more shocking to the American public than the spectacle of a known violent criminal or the drug-peddling felon to have been arrested and then to sit in jail for about 1 minute or 1 day at the most, and then be accorded bail and the day after to recommit the same type of offense for which he was arrested and put in prison awaiting trial.

We need in this Congress immediate action on bail reform. We want to end the practice of a known drug pusher going to jail for bail, paying what ever is necessary to get out on bail, and then fleeing the country altogether and never coming to trial or going back to his same business-as-usual practices of pushing that vile product and then going to jail again, and putting up bail, simply paying a fine; so to speak, or paying dues, so that he can keep on doing his evil business.

The President of the United States has offered a comprehensive crime package bill which includes bail reform in which the President insists that we ought to be tougher on these repeat criminals and to make bail tougher to obtain.

We need action on this and I urge the majority leadership to bring it to the floor. Thank you.

DAY OF RECKONING, BALANCED-BUDGET AMENDMENT IS COMING

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, soon the Senate is going to consider and pass a balanced budget amendment. Your time is coming. The day of reckoning will soon be here.

We will see if the born-again budget busters on the liberal side of the aisle translate their rhetoric into action.

Of course, if the majority is really concerned about deficits and balanced budgets, they would approve the unan-

imous-consent request and bring the amendment to the floor immediately.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make that request. The Chair has ruled that in order to make such a request, I have to have the clearance of the majority and minority leadership. I have obtained the clearance of the minority leadership and ask for the majority leadership to give us unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, of course I hear none.

The polls show that America certainly knows that the liberals are responsible for the massive national debt and the current high deficits. The American people know that the reelection strategy of the past 30 years of the liberals in this Congress to tax and spend, tax and spend for reelection must come to an end.

Concerning the balanced budget amendment, it will soon be here and the liberals in this House will be unable to hide behind their rhetoric any longer.

As for this side of the aisle, we have just begun to fight for the passage of the constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget.

DEMOCRATS RESPONSIBLE FOR DELAYING AGENDA FOR AMERICA

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if out across this country a work supervisor asked an employee on 50 consecutive days to do something and for 50 consecutive days that employee refused, in most workplaces that would be grounds for firing the employee. Let us hope the same standard applies to this Congress.

There can be little doubt that our employers, the American people, want to see us act on a balanced budget, school prayer, and the line-item veto.

For 50 days some of us have been asking this House to do what our employers want. On 50 consecutive days this House has refused.

Maybe the only way to correct this kind of insubordination is to fire the people responsible come this November.

Let us be clear, it is not the Republicans who have been negligent. The Republican leadership made clear day after day they are willing to see these important matters debated. It is the Democrats and their leadership who are the negligent parties.

Finally, let me thank all of those who have come to the floor for the last several weeks asking the will of the American people be carried out.

Over the past 50 days we have seen a contrast between the political parties develop in this House: The Republicans who want to work on those kinds of things of great concern to the vast majority of the American people and the Democrats who do not want to go about such work.

ONE MINUTES NOT SUITABLE SUBSTITUTE FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment that frankly, those of us on our side of the aisle would just as soon not give any more 1 minutes. We would love to have the Speaker decide that we represented a force as important as Big Labor or that we were as important as the front runner for the Democratic Presidential nomination. But when a bill can be written on Monday, taken to the Rules Committee on Tuesday, voted on on Wednesday because Big Labor wants it. When a major bill can be pulled because a Democratic front runner for the Presidency wants it and we cannot bring a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget or a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer or a very important package to stop crime and drug use in America, then we have no alternative except to come to the floor day after day and make sure the American people know that it is the Democratic leadership which on issue after issue does what the big bosses want and on issue after issue hides from the American peoples' true desires.

□ 1220

And we would hope the leadership would quit what they are doing, meet with us, work out a common schedule and let us have a decent, fair chance to pass the American people's agenda.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, May 3, 1984.)

FEDERAL RECLAMATION HYDROELECTRIC POWERPLANTS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4275.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4275) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes, with Mr. FLIPPO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. CHENEY) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4275. The bill as reported by the Interior Committee contains two titles. Title I authorizes the construction of additional generating capacity at seven existing Bureau of Reclamation dams. This program would provide an additional 188 MW of clean, relatively inexpensive power.

Since the committee reported H.R. 4275, title I has become the subject of some controversy. Some of the projects are the subject of pending FERC applications. Others are in the midst of discussion about financing arrangements. Although I support the development of this additional capacity, and I believe that hydropower is an important component of our national energy mix, I am convinced that we should defer authorization of these seven projects for awhile. Therefore, I intend to offer an amendment at the appropriate time to strike title I and to proceed to consideration of the rest of the bill.

Title II of the bill contains a settlement of contract rights for power generated at the Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River. Hoover was authorized by Congress in 1928, and was originally known as the Boulder Canyon Dam. When it was constructed it was awesome, because of its massive size—600 feet—and because of the enormous amounts of power that it could generate and the water that could be stored in its reservoirs.

Today, more than 50 years later, Hoover is still an awesome structure. The benefits of its power system and its reservoir system are distributed to millions of people in the States of Arizona, California and Nevada.

In 1930, in order to guarantee the repayment of the Federal investment in Hoover Dam, the Secretary of the Interior solicited customers for the

power to be generated there. Although the power was offered to many customers, the Metropolitan Water District, Southern California Edison, the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Burbank, Glendale and the States of Arizona and Nevada signed up. In some cases, those customers had to agree to contracts for more power than they could actually use. They took that risk, and their repayment agreement enabled the United States to construct the project. Part of the agreement between the Government and the power customers was the original purchasers would be entitled to renewal of their contracts after the original 50-year period expires.

The reason we are here today is that those original contracts expire in 1987. In 1979 the Western Area Power Authority (WAPA) began the process of reallocating the power. In the course of the marketing process, a bitter fight erupted among the three States and the United States. California had one theory of how the power should be reallocated, Nevada and Arizona had another, and WAPA had a third strategy. The dispute was heightened by the filing of a lawsuit by Nevada in 1981. Arizona joined in, and today we are faced with a complex suit that threatens to disrupt the power future of customers in all three States.

Luckily, cool heads have prevailed, and the legislation before us represents a negotiated settlement of the legal issues involved in the power allocation program. As is the case in most compromises, no one gets exactly what he wanted: but all the parties get a fair share of the power, and a potentially lengthy, costly and very bitter lawsuit is avoided.

As a veteran of the Arizona-California wars, I can tell you very honestly that I am very relieved that we have been able to reach this settlement.

The agreement has several parts: First, the power from the existing capacity from Hoover is reallocated to the original purchasers. This fulfills the provision of the Boulder Canyon Project Act that guarantees a right of renewal to the original contractors.

Second, the bill authorizes the renovation of the existing generators at Hoover through an uprating program. The uprating will provide an additional 500 MW of power. This power will be allocated roughly equally among the three States.

In order to spread the benefits of Hoover power to more customers, the bill provides that California's share of the uprating (about 127 MW), may not be sold to customers that now receive 20 MW or more. That means that the city of Los Angeles and MWD will not be able to buy the new power. Instead, WAPA will market it to preference entities in California. Several municipalities, including Anaheim, Banning, Colton, Azusa, and Riverside have applied to WAPA for this power.

There has been considerable discussion over the financing of the uprating program. The bill now provides that funds may be advanced by the power purchasers, or appropriated by the Federal Government. Today, I will offer an amendment that deletes the authorization for Federal funds and says, instead, that funds shall be advanced by the purchasers. This is 100 percent of the costs. The power purchasers have agreed to this financing arrangement, they are capable of raising the moneys, and they will enter into contracts with the United States to advance costs. The contracts will provide for the repayment of the advanced funds, plus interest, from revenues generated by the uprated generators.

Third, the bill provides that power from the Navajo Generating Station in Page, Ariz., will be marketed first to the Arizona power customers. This marketing program is in accord with the proposed WAPA marketing criteria. The revenues from that power will assist the repayment of the central Arizona project, in accord with the provisons of the 1968 act that authorized the project.

The settlement contained herein is the result of many years of debate and negotiation. It is supported by the Governors of Nevada and Arizona, by all parties to the litigation, and by the Reagan administration. Although the bill is complex, I am convinced that it provides an equitable allocation of the Hoover resource among cutomers in the three States, and that it permits the Department of Energy to go forward with the contracts smoothly and without controversy. I urge your support of this settlement.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act of 1983. As members know, the committee will offer amendments this morning to delete title I of the bill. I will focus my comments on title II, the amendments relating to Hoover Dam Powerplant.

Hoover Dam is one of the greatest American engineering achievements. The dam is one of the largest in the world, and controls for beneficial use one of our major rivers, providing flood control, irrigation water, power generation, recreation and other benefits to millions of Americans throughout the West. Ironically, when Hoover Dam was built, concern was expressed about the Federal Government's engineering ability to construct the project.

There were also doubts about the economic feasibility of Hoover Dam. To resolve these latter doubts, contracts for power were signed with various contractors, designed to recover the Federal Government's costs of construction, with interest. Contracts for power generation from Hoover Dam were signed in 1937, and will expire in 1987. These contracts have been fully performed. Under the original authorization, the Boulder Canyon contractors are entitled to renewals of their contracts—a statutory recognition of their investment in the facility. Contractors at Hoover Dam took power under contracts which required them to buy power even if they could not resell it.

When the time for renewal approached, the three lower basin States which had traditionally been served by the facility began to disagree about their relative shares of future output. At the same time, the Bureau of Reclamation, in a commendable manner, began to consider the proper method of modernizing the facilities at Hoover Dam Powerplant. The Bureau of Reclamation proposed to expand, or uprate, the power generation capacity at Hoover Dam.

After the inevitable law suits began, the parties recognized that a negotiated solution would better provide certainty with respect to the future use of Hoover Dam, and they negotiated such an agreement. The basic purpose of title II of H.R. 4275 is to ratify this agreement. Briefly, the agreement shares out power both from the original output and from the uprating, among various entities in Arizona, Nevada, and California. The parties are convinced, and the committee agreed, that this is a fair settlement of their legal rights under the original authorization for Hoover Dam. The administration supports this proposed compromise as well. After carefully reviewing the proposal, I believe it is fair to the parties, and fair to other sections of the country as well, and I am happy to support it.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentlewoman, from California.

This amendment raises a very basic question about the proper management of our national resources.

Over the last several years, this Congress has told a lot of people in this country that the wastefulness, the largesse, the benefits of a generous past must change.

We have taken away services from senior citizens; food from children; funds from our schools; housing away from the poor.

Today the issue is whether we—in 1984—can continue to live as we did five decades ago, when the Hoover power was first allocated.

Fifty years ago, Franklin Roosevelt was President, gasoline was 25 cents a gallon, a candy bar was less than a nickle—and Hoover Dam power was contracted away at enormously subsidized rates.

The cost of that subsidy is staggering. Hoover power costs about a half-a-cent per kilowatt hour. Consumers who are not so fortunate to have a Hoover power contract pay 10 times that amount or more elsewhere in the Southwest.

But that subsidy is not free. It is paid for by the taxpayers represented by every Member of this house who are not Hoover customers.

The bill we are considering today would perpetuate that subsidy for another 30 years. In just the first decade of that extension, the cost to the taxpayers of the Nation would be $3.5 billion.

By what rationale should Southern California Edison, a private utility, continue to enjoy subsidized rates, while customers of San Diego Gas and Electric, also a public utility, pay 12 times as much?

Why should Los Angeles receive benefits, but San Francisco be prohibited from sharing in Hoover's power?

Why should the shares of Arizona and Nevada be increased, but nothing be allocated to New Mexico, Utah or Colorado?

The original customers claim a special right to renewed contracts because they supported the project during the early years, when the success of the Hoover project was in doubt. As the San Francisco Chronicle and Examiner noted recently, 50 years of preferential, subsidized power would seem an adequate appreciation for past loyalty.

Today, there are many other potential purchasers for this power, many willing to pay market price for the power.

We do not give away the public energy resources of the United States. We competitively lease our offshore tracts.

We do not give away our coal resources; yet some of those who castigated former Interior Secretary Watt for his failure to secure fair market value for coal now endorse this 30-year subsidy of hydroelectric power.

We do not give away irrigation or municipal water. In fact, this Congress recently enacted tough reforms to make irrigators pay the real cost of the water the Federal Government delivers to them.

So let us not make special rules for Hoover power contractors. We are not punishing or penalizing them by asking that they leave behind the power prices of the 1930's and enter the real world of the 1980's. We are not suggesting that they give up their right to Hoover power.

We only ask that they purchase power on the open market, through competitive bidding, and that they pay their own utility bills instead of passing along the multibillion-dollar cost of their subsidies to the other power users of the United States.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act of 1983. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain hydroelectric generating facilities in seven existing Bureau of Reclamation projects and it provides for the relocation of the output of Hoover Dam power.

Because of the growing need for the development of hydroelectric resources due to the rising cost of fossil and nuclear electrical generation, legislation was introduced in Congress in 1977 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct additional generating units at several sites. Unfortunately, no action was taken.

Again in the 97th Congress legislation was introduced to expand power generation facilities at a number of existing reclamation projects, including Hoover Dam. At that time, however, the Hoover allottees in California, Arizona and Nevada were in disagreement as to the disposition of any additional power at Hoover. Therefore, the Hoover provision was dropped from the bill and the bill was not acted upon.

At the beginning of the 98th Congress interest was again focused on hydroelectric powerplants. Again the Bureau of Reclamation recommended rewinding or uprating the Hoover generators, along with the other essential replacement work at other Bureau projects.

Overlapping congressional efforts to authorize the hydroelectric facilities, the Western Area Administration, which is responsible for the marketing of power available to the United States from the Hoover Dam, the Navajo generating station and the Parker Davis project began developing criteria for the marketing of power from Hoover beyond the May 31, 1987, expiration date.

The original contracts commencing June 1, 1937, for a period of 50 years, allotted approximately 64 percent of Hoover power to users in California and 18 percent to each of the States Arizona and Nevada. In addition to the renewal of the contracts was the criteria for the marketing of the additional power which would be produced through the renovation or uprating program at Hoover. However, attempts to resolve the differences among the three States in determining the criteria resulted in bitter controversy, which has already been described by Chairman UDALL, which erupted and ended in a lawsuit in 1982. A settlement was urgent. Failure to reach one would result in lengthy and costly litigation, as well as an uncertain energy future for millions of American consumers.

Mr. Chairman, after a great deal of negotiation and compromise, an agreement was reached and is embodied in title II of this legislation. This legislation continues the authority which Congress reserved to itself in the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 to prescribe terms and conditions for the renewal of Hoover power contracts.

Another major ingredient of this settlement relates to power surplus to the pumping needs of the Central Arizona project produced at the Navajo generating station in Arizona. This is to go initially to Arizona, as Arizona does not share as fully in firm Hoover power, and is expected to provide supplemental funds to assist in making possible the timely construction of the authorized Central Arizona project facilities.

□ 1240

This will permit the development of a plan for the optimization of the Navajo power resource and making supplemental funding for CAP available.

This legislation provides a significant step in the further development of the Nation's water resources through utilizing existing dams and reservoirs to maximize the efficient use of Federal facilities. I would like to at this time quote from a letter from the Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, addressed to Hon. MORRIS K. UDALL, and it states, in part:

"Mr. Chairman, we strongly support enactment of H.R. 4275, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate and maintain hydroelectric powerplants a various existing water projects and for other purposes," if amendment as suggested.

The letter goes on to say that there are two areas which the Bureau would like to see amended. One, substitute Treasury market interest rate language for the interest rate provisions in the bill as exist. That will be addressed by an amendment which Congressman UDALL will propose, and a tax-exempt status to obligations issued to finance the Palisade power enlargement project. That will also be addressed by Congressman UDALL.

We in Arizona have paid for the projects; the users have paid for the projects, and will continue to pay for these projects. We understand the need to conserve energy. We understand the need that we cannot just

expend any of our energy. The absolute requirement for this Nation to conserve our very scarce energy resources, particularly those that we obtain through the use of falling water, which is really the only clean and noncontroversial energy resource this Nation has.

Congressman UDALL will have an amendment which will impose strict conservation measures on the use of this power, and I believe that we will be able to attain that goal.

The American people do not need to be told of the need to conserve; they have seen utility rates go to 57 percent in the past decade, and I am convinced that the American people do not need to see further increases, particularly those who can least afford it, our elderly and poor and handicapped, because we are trying to impose some sort of free market value on the electricity which comes from the Hoover generating plant.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MCNULTY).

Mr. MCNULTY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as it will be signficantly amended by the Udall amendment, is a prudent, intelligent and farsighted piece of legislation, and it ought to be passed. The Boxer amendment which will be proposed, ought to be defeated.

The premise of the Boxer amendment is that folks are not paying enough for electricity; the 10 million of them in the Southwest of America, and that consequently the power should be auctioned off to the highest bidder. The stockholders? I suggest not, but rather in increased rates.

You know, there is a place in California called Yosemite where people seek permits to visit and camp over weekends and more folks want to go there than there are permits. Now, if you want to follow this theory to its ultimate absurdity, we ought to auction off the permits to Yosemite and let the highest bidders have them.

We do not need the Boxer amendment, and we do not need arbitrarily to force higher prices for this electricity. This comes right out of the same school of thought that says that hardship is good for the character, so let's administer some.

I would urge all the Members to vote against the Boxer amendment to preserve the fragile but sensible compromise that has been worked out, especially insofar as the United States is an important part of this litigation which could be expensive and protracted.

Defeat the Boxer amendment.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. VUCANOVICH).

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act. Title I of the bill would authorize construction of hydropower facilities at seven existing dams. Title II would provide for the uprating and allocation of power at Hoover Dam.

As maintained by previous speakers, an amendment will be offered to delete title I. So I will address title II.

I am sure there are few Members present today who are not familiar with the half century of courtroom battles over the allocation of the water from the lower Colorado River. I think that long and involved controversy provides the appropriate background for understanding the significance of the consensual agreement set forth in title II of H.R. 4275. That the three States, as well as the Federal agencies, are able to join in supporting the enactment of title II demonstrates that a lesson was learned from the battles over water in the lower Colorado River. Honorable agreement and compromise are far better than pursuing in the courts that illusory goal of complete victory.

I want to emphasize that the agreement represented by title II was not easily achieved and came about only because of the willingness of the parties to sit down at the negotiating table and hammer out their differences. But that conflict is now in the past. The important matter now is to get the bill passed, with title II in its present form, so that the parties involved can return to the negotiating table and begin the long process of working our specific power contracts prior to the 1987 deadline.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important bill.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PATTERSON).

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my support for H.R. 4275. The Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Power Plants Authorization of 1984. Title II of this bill memorializes an agreement between Arizona, California, and Nevada regarding the supply of energy generated by the Hoover powerplant. There have been several years of litigation and debate over this issue, and I am pleased that these three great States have resolved their differences. I encourage all Members to support H.R. 4275.

However, I must oppose the amendment introduced by the gentlewoman from California. Although Congresswoman BOXER'S amedment is well intentioned, her amendment will do consumers a great disservice and set a sweeping precedent without the benefit of committee review.

For almost 50 years, the national policy for pricing Federal hydroelectric power has been based on the principle that prices must be the lowest possible consistent with sound business principles and the public interest. The Boxer amendment would undermine that policy by allowing the Federal Government to auction Hoover power to consumers at the highest possible price.

The Federal Government is not in the power business to make a profit at the expense of consumers. The primary purpose of the Federal hydropower program is not to maximize revenue at taxpayer's expense but to sell power at the lowest possible rates to consumers and recover the Government's investment and operating expenses. Selling Federal power at an artificial market rate would place an intolerable burden on consumers.

Based on 1982 sales to public bodies, costs to consumers would jump by an incredible 440 percent or nearly $2.2 billion a year. During the last decade, electricity rates have already increased over 57 percent. I have never received a constituent letter commending the cost of electricity, and I suspect that no other Member has either.

Jacking up the costs of Federal hydroelectric power can only discourage public utility companies from relying on one of nature's purest forms of energy. The Federal Power Act of 1920 makes no attempt to favor one region of the country over another. Rather, consumers in upstate New York, the Tennessee Valley, and in the West have all shared the benefits of cheap, clean, renewable hydropower. Hydropower is generated by falling water and is produced without dire public health and safety problems or adverse environmental consequences.

Ironically, supporters of the Boxer amendment are in fact arguing for a penalty to over 11 million consumers in only one region of the country—the Western United States. This kind of regional bias has no place in a body that is charged with the responsibility of representing the entire Nation. If supporters are serious about market pricing, then, this change in policy should be analyzed in a national context.

Finally, supporters of market pricing claim that increasing energy costs to consumers will stimulate conservation. I am in complete agreement that we need to encourage all energy users to be conservationists. The increased cost of electricity has already served to encourage consumers to conserve. The demand for electricity has been cut in half over the last few years and there is every indication that this trend will continue.

In my home State of California, this amendment will cause a dramatic increase in the cost of water to southern Californians and will jeopardize the water supply of northern Californians.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG).

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of H.R. 4275, and also strongly oppose any amendment that would change major national policy without comprehensive hearings in the appropriate committees of this Congress.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO), a member of the committee.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act.

The primary component of this legislation is the authority to increase the hydroelectric power capacity at Hoover Dam. This amazing structure is one of the largest power production facilities in the world. It currently provides 1,450 megawatts of power to consumers in California, Nevada, and Arizona. However, increasing power demands, as well as the U.S. movement toward energy independence, dictates the need to expand this important and clean energy source.

An even more important aspect of this legislation, though, is the settlement of a longstanding dispute over the renewal rights to Hoover Dam power which is currently in litigation. The agreement contained in H.R. 4275 was carefully worked out and approved by the Hoover allottees and the Departments of Interior and Energy. In addition, the legislation was unanimously approved by the interior committee. Similar legislation has already passed the other body. It would be tragic to lose such a carefully crafted compromise through failure to enact this bill. The result would be prolonged litigation and the creation of uncertainty over future power supplies for the affected States and, no doubt, no increased power supplies for many years to come.

This legislation would also result in a substantial savings of oil each year. As a nation, we must work together to reduce our dependence on foreign oil supplies, especially given the volatile nature of the Mideast. Hydroelectric power is a clean, inexpensive, and more importantly, renewable, energy source. For these reasons, it is imperative that we expand the use of our water resources for hydroelectric generation.

I would also like to comment on the Boxer amendment or market pricing amendment to require the auctioning off of the uprated power capacity at Hoover Dam. At a time when we are all hearing complaints from our constituents about increasing utility rates, it would be tragic to demand higher rates for this power. This amendment would have a drastic impact on power consumers. In addition, as we all know, or I hope we do, the Federal Government is not in the power business to make a profit. This longstanding policy should definitely not be abandoned, especially at the expense of electric consumers, and especially without adequate hearing and consideration.

Before I close, I would like to compliment my colleague, MO UDALL, for the excellent job he has done on this bill. I know he has put in many hours of hard work to strike such a significant compromise.

Finally, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important energy legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) that he has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in my party in the Presidential campaign this year we have had a lot of argument about new ideas. Let me tell you about the lousiest new idea that has come along here in the last few weeks in Congress. It is called the Boxer amendment or, as somebody said, the Second Boxer Rebellion.

Suppose I came to you and said, "I have a great new idea."

"What is the great new idea, Udall?

"Well, the great new idea is, let us soak the electric power customers, the people whose home electricity bills have already gone up 50 or 60 percent in the last few years. Let us soak them for another $4½ billion in electric rates."

That is exactly what this amendment proposes. Some people say that the environmentalists want this amendment and some environmental groups do. They have the idea that somehow the way to save power or conserve power is to jack up the rates to customers. But when you have decided to lower the national debt by generating more money back for Uncle Sam, you have decided that somebody is going to pay it, and you put in nomination for that great honor the names of the electric power consumers in that area.

Let me give you another election year idea here. A vote against the Boxer amendment is a consumer vote. This is a consumer bill. And this is not my impression alone. I read from a letter to me dated April 30 from the Consumer Federation of America on this bill. They say in part, and I quote:

The Consumer Federation of America strongly opposes both of these ideas.

The other being the Bates amendment.

In view of high charges for energy and the essential nature of electricity, it would be unconscionable for the Congress to endorse a policy of whatever the traffic will bear in pricing Federal power.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, would destroy 50 years of public power development, 50 years of having hydropower play a part in our national energy mix, 50 years of the idea that cities and local communities that want to own their own electrical distribution systems can do so. You may make some points with some environmental organizations, but you are not going to make any points with consumers and you are not going to improve the quality of American life by going for this amendment.

So I strongly urge support of the bill and opposition to the Boxer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. CHENEY) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, today we have under consideration H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act.

I had intended, Mr. Chairman, to offer an amendment to this legislation restructuring the interest rate formula in section 107 with the intent of recovering the full cost to the Government of constructing the various powerplants contained in H.R. 4275.

My amendment would have had the interest rate set at whatever the current market yield was on the Treasury notes at the time the money for these projects was appropriated. This would have replaced the method contained in the original draft of the bill which computed the interest rate by determining the weighted average of previous borrowing on Treasury notes with at least a 15-year maturity period. Such a practice would be, in my judgment, a bad policy for Congress to fall into. Using previous low interest borrowing rates in the formula would drag down the final computation, and the result would be a lower interest rate not reflective of the actual cost to the Treasury to borrow this money.

I was informed yesterday, however, that my colleague, Mr. UDALL is planning to offer his own amendment striking title I from the bill, which contains the authorization for construction for six and seven powerplants. The seventh affected plant is at the Hoover Dam, however, I understand that the financing for this construction will be paid up front.

With no repayment involved there seems little need for me to waste this body's time any further arguing over interest rate computations. Also, since the only thing better, in my view, than attempting to readjust the repayment terms, is to avoid them altogether, I plan to give my full support to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

If the Udall amendment is passed, Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer my own.

There is another amendment, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to address at this time also. It is the one offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER) and affects title II of this bill. My understanding of it is imperfect. I hope it will be improved by this debate. At the moment, it seems rational and fair.

When the Hoover Dam was first constructed, it was successfully argued in the 1930's that it was necessary for the growth of that region of the country which, like the rest of the Nation at that time, was struggling out of a depression, that it be provided with cheap power. However, the Federal Government can no longer afford to carry the burden of the Southwest's power needs, nor should it. It is, I would contend, time for the recipients of Hoover Dam power to begin helping with the national fiscal crisis by paying for its own power.

Currently, the power sold now is undervalued when compared to the market value of power around the country. This legislation would perpetuate this situation for the next 30 years. As I now understand it, the Boxer amendment will undo a special interest subsidy to specific customers which has been provided at the expense of all the taxpayers.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER) would end this practice and auction off the power to the highest bidder. This would return in the first 10 years approximately $3.5 billion to the U.S. Treasury and would bring a fair market value and some equity to our national power policy.

I think, unless someone can make a contrary case, that we owe this vote to the taxpayers. I am especially surprised that many of my colleagues who argue for a fair market price of other energy forms still want to cling to the crutch of their own subsidy.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill supported by the committee provides that all funding for the uprating of Hoover power generation will be provided by local interests. In return, these local interests will receive the power under an agreed-upon formula. This seems eminently fair.

Some concern has been expressed about the fact that power from Hoover Dam will continue to be sold at below-market rates. First, I think it should be clear to everyone that this cannot fairly be characterized as a subsidy. There are no direct Federal appropriations involved and the power is being provided under contracts which have provided for repayment of Federal costs. The Federal Government made long-term contracts to provide this power in return for repayment of the facility.

This is not a subsidy under any normal definition of the term. If this were a subsidy, then any long-term contract which did not for its term completely reflect market conditions would be a subsidy. If Government treated such charges as subsidies, then the public which buys Government bonds would periodically have its return on such bonds reduced because they represented a subsidy. It does not take much to see that this argument would threaten most public facilities financing in the United States.

Second, the power at Hoover Dam has been provided on the same basis that public power has been provided throughout the United States—at Federal cost. This reflects the fact that public resources should be provided to the public without an effort to reap profits from their sale, since by definition if this were the goal it would be appropriate to have private interests organize the resource.

For these reasons, the public interest has been and will be protected by the use of Hoover Dam power for the benefit of the taxpayers of Arizona, California, and Nevada. The bill deserves your support.

□ 1300

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SWIFT).

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am sometimes amazed at how short the public memory is, and I am astonished to see the Boxer amendment coming from the Democratic side of the aisle. It is exactly the kind of amendment based on exactly the philosophy that fought the concept of public power originally 50 to 60 years ago. It is an amendment that is based upon a philosophy that was exactly that which the anti-public-power people used all those years when they saw public power as a Communist plot. It is based on exactly the philosophy carried on in the last great public power debate in the Pacific Northwest during the Eisenhower administration on the high Hells Canyon Dam.

It is precisely the kind of anti-public-power amendment that one would expect to come out of and in fact has been proposed by David Stockman down at OMB, and it is precisely the kind of anti-public-power proposal that we found in the Grace Commission report.

Now, all of those things did not come from the Democratic side of the aisle, and yet this proposal does. I have asked myself why, and the only answer I can come up with is that there are those who believe that all utilities, public or private, are bad, "so let's soak the utilities."

I would remind my colleagues that all the Boxer amendment would do is to take low-cost power away from a lot of people and see that no one gets it. The prices for everyone will go up. This does not mean low-cost power is going to go to someone else; it does not mean low-cost power is going to be spread around. It means that the rates for everyone will go up and the lights that go out first will be the lights of the poor.

Mr. Chairman, the philosophy of public power was valid originally, it is valid now, and the Boxer amendment must be defeated for that reason.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. They are precisely on target as far as those of us from the Northwest are concerned. I will join the gentleman in opposition to the amendment he described.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I am happy to yield to my good friend, the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, for yielding.

Is the gentleman aware that the Reagan administration is in opposition to my amendment, not supporting it?

Mr. SWIFT. Yes; but I have never found the Reagan administration to put a high priority on consistency.

Mrs. BOXER. All right. Is the gentleman aware that we do have programs with lifeline rates for people who have problems paying their utility bills, and that that is a separate issue apart from this issue?

Mr. SWIFT. Does that mean that everybody who is just above where you draw the line is then going to have to pay higher rates for no other reason than because you have a marketplace concept that is anti-public-power?

Mrs. BOXER. No. The point I am trying to make—and obviously I am not making it to the gentleman—is that that issue of power to people with low incomes is another issue and does

not necessarily mean that those who are supporting the Boxer amendment oppose those kinds of programs.

Lastly, I want to be sure the gentleman is aware that some of the people in the Hoover Club are private utilities. I just wanted to make sure the gentleman is aware of that.

Mr. SWIFT. I am aware of that, but they come after the preference clause customers get their shot at the power, and what the gentlewoman is doing would simply mean that everybody, public, private, poor, and rich, would pay more. Nobody gains anything. Everybody loses with the Boxer amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I would make the point to the gentleman, if I might, that there are public power companies that would love to get into the Hoover Club, and they cannot; the private utilities are in ahead of them.

Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

Mr. SWIFT. I was really happy to have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am not really the spokesman for the Reagan administration, but I want to correct the impression here that the Reagan administration supports the Boxer amendment. The fact is that the administration's policy, as I understand it, is very clearly that they are against the Boxer amendment.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would be happy to be a spokesman for the administration, and it is my understanding that the administration enthusiastically supports the bill as advocated by the chairman of the committee and would oppose the Boxer amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY).

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Washington who was just in the well that we in the State of Louisiana today have some of the highest utility rates in the entire Nation. We have coal plants built on some of the Nation's most lucrative natural gas fields. Because of public policy, we now have to import coal from out West. So if you are going to penalize one section of the country for public policy, in this case, not letting us use natural gas as a boiler fuel, why should you reward another section of the country with a public policy.

I do not know how the gentleman voted on that amendment several years ago, but certainly one must also consider the fair market value of the electricity that can be produced and what people are willing to pay. And, of course, we all know that all of our renewable resources, including our water resources, are dwindling over time.

What is wrong with the section of the West that has historically had cheap public power paying fair market values just like we have to do in the rest of the country?

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUCKABY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, there are two answers to that.

First of all, the whole concept of public power was one in which we said Government was not going to make a profit on the power. Now, maybe the gentleman philosophically disagrees with that 60-year history; I do not.

The second problem is that I think every region of the country has some advantages and every region of the country has some disadvantages. For example, if you would like to pay freight rates from the west coast when virtually everything is manufactured on the east coast, then you are dealing with some of the deficiencies that exist in the Pacific Northwest.

So I think if you want to homogenize America economically, I suppose we can, but I do not see where anyone gains by taking away some of the advantage that one region of the country may have if you are not going to take care of the economic disadvantages that that region of the country may have.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, it certainly appears to me that at a time when this Nation is as desperate as it probably ever has been for resources, dollar resources, to reduce the size of the Federal deficit, here we have a potential spreadout over a number of years of several hundred million dollars of increased revenues to the Federal Government, that we should not let slip away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY) has expired.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4275, a bill that will provide authorization to increase the hydroelectric power capacity at Hoover Dam, title II.

H.R. 4275, approved unanimously in the Interior Committee in March 1984, is important to California, as well as other Western States, in that this bill reauthorizes the allocation of electric power from Hoover Dam, a large part of which now flows to California. This reauthorization is necessary since the original 50-year contracts signed for Hoover power in 1937 will expire in 1987. The bill will renew these contracts for the next 30 years, well in advance of the deadline, so as to permit the immediate modernization and upgrading of the existing generators at Hoover Dam.

This is good, sound legislation, meriting support for many reasons:

This measure would make possible an increase in the generating capacity of the Hoover powerplant by about one-third. The existing output from Hoover Dam is about 1,450 megawatts. The upgrading of the existing generators will increase the total power output from Hoover by approximately 500 megawatts.

This upgrading portion should be funded by up-front cost sharing from all Hoover allottees. The additional power from the upgrading will be made available to the States of Arizona and Nevada, and certain California municipalities not now having Hoover allocations. Allocations of existing Hoover power to California entities, however, will remain approximately the same after 1987.

This increase in capacity, in turn, makes possible the settlement of an existing lawsuit, brought by Arizona and Nevada against the United States and the California power contractors. Should the bill become law, the litigation that Nevada and Arizona initiated in 1982 to enjoin renewal of the California contracts can be dismissed.

As this controversy will be settled, if this bill is enacted, it is not necessary to describe it in detail. Suffice it to say that it arose from conflicting interpretations of provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act controlling the disposition of power after expiration of the original contracts in 1987. Without this bill, there is every prospect of another long drawn out lawsuit. The last Colorado River suit took 10 years to reach a decision.

But the parties have agreed to settle. The Departments of Energy and Interior have given their blessing to the settlement, and this bill carries it out.

As in most settlements, no one gets all that he wanted. The present contractors are to receive renewal of their contracts for 30 years, but for somewhat less quantities of power in the past. Arizona and Nevada will get most of the increase in capacity of the powerplant, but a substantial quantity is reserved for smaller publicly owned power systems in California.

H.R. 4275 would authorize "uprating"—increasing—the generating capacity of the Hoover powerplants by about one-third through the modernization of the existing generators. In its present form, the bill would also remedy the very serious objections of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank to the original proposal of the Department of Energy. The bill would allocate to Arizona and Nevada

about 75 percent of the capacity added by "uprating."

The Government's original investment in Hoover Dam, made 50 years ago, is being repaid, on time, with interest. Its new investment in the enlargement of the capacity of the Hoover powerplant will be either paid for in advance by those who are to receive power, or its repayment will be assured by contracts made in advance of construction if Congress decides to proceed by way of appropriations.

Federal electric power should be sold at the lowest cost consistent with sound business principles and the public interest. This principle is enshrined in all Federal power legislation since the 1944 Flood Control Act. Thus, power can be sold at rates which will keep the Government whole, and, in addition, will provide funds for desalting and improving the quality of the Colorado River's water.

As existing contracts are to be substantially renewed, some 12 million people, in the three States, will continue to receive the benefits of Hoover power.

Early enactment of H.R. 4275 is in the national interest in every respect. I urge my colleagues to vote for this essential piece of legislation.

□ 1310

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN), the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, particularly because I have an interest generating capacity which this bill will do, certainly with the Hoover Dam.

I liked the original part of the bill where we would also construct additional generating capacity for seven other projects, but I am sorry to see that there is going to be a move to eliminate that.

Really, Mr. Chairman, these days we must move ahead with energy projects because although we now have an excess of generating capacity, we have problems in all kinds of other areas. The nuclear generating industry is in trouble, as we have seen lately with four different powerplants just in the last few days stopping, some because of different kinds of problems that have been brought on, many of them because of the cost, and the utilities simply run out of money.

In the area of fossil fuel, we are not doing that well, either, in replacing our generating capacity. We have problems with acid rain that will be brought up before this body shortly; so as we look to the future, while we may not need that additional generating capacity today, we certainly will need it in the years to come. We have no plans for replacing existing powerplants that are wearing out.

In addition to that, we will have, of course, an increased demand as the years go on and our population grows.

So, Mr. Chairman, for that reason I rise in support of this legislation and hope that this body will overwhelmingly support that position.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEHMAN).

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I greatly admire and respect my colleague from California (Mrs. BOXER), and it is also with great reluctance that I would oppose an amendment she wanted to offer. However, I would like to make several important points regarding the amendment which she will soon propose.

First, the amendment really is anticonsumer. It would contribute to the escalation of energy costs and result only in a windfall to the Government at the expense of the consumer. Auctioning electricity to the highest bidder would provide the same type of market instability that consumers have suffered through during the oil energy fluctuations of the last decade, and the same price uncertainties posed by natural gas deregulation. We need to support incentives to keep energy costs down, not incentives to raise them.

Second, this amendment would establish a precedent that could drastically affect the way the Federal Government markets and sells the power it produces not only in the West, but throughout the Nation. It could alter a structure which already insures that low-cost wholesale power is provided to those public utilities which express the need.

Finally, and most importantly, this amendment casts doubt on the integrity of those individuals who helped shape this agreement. This includes those water and energy interests from the States along the Colorado River Basin, the distinguished Members of the other body, and our colleagues here in the House. As we in the West, and certainly in California realize, water and energy wars often pit region against region and State against State. With H.R. 4275, it is important to note that those regional interests have put aside their differences and reached an agreement. And this agreement adequately addresses the needs of southern California, while insuring that the interests of northern California are met and protected.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment and support H.R. 4275.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act of 1983".

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 1 and title I be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at existing reclamation project facilities at locations in the approximate capacities set forth in section 104 of this Act: *Provided*, That construction by the Secretary of the Interior of a powerplant designated in subsection (a), (c), (d), or (g) of section 104 of this Act may not proceed prior to October 1, 1985, or if a license has been issued prior to such date to a non-Federal entity pursuant to section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 797) to construct such powerplant. Federal construction of any powerplant authorized in section 104 of this Act shall not be deemed to be authorized until such time as the Secretary of the Interior has made findings of the economic and financial feasibility of the powerplant, and has complied with applicable environmental laws. In carrying out this title I, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to modify the capacity of a powerplant designated in section 104 as determined to be necessary or desirable during postauthorization study and design, and after consultation with the Secretary of Energy. If the Secretary proposes to make any significant modification of a powerplant designated in section 104, he shall submit a report of the proposed modification to Congress. No funds shall be obligated for carrying out the proposed modification prior to sixty days from the date the Secretary has transmitted the report.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of Energy, consistent with any existing law which enables the Secretary to construct such facilities, may construct, operate, and maintain transmission facilities as required physically to connect the hydroelectric powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act to existing power systems and as he determines necessary to accomplish distribution and marketing of power generated by powerplants constructed pursuant to section 104 of this Act, and to purchase replacement capacity, energy, or both in order to maintain contractual deliveries to customers during unit outages which result from Federal construction of the powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act: *Provided*, That this authority shall not extend to the projects to be marketed through the Federal Columbia River Power System unless the Pacific

Northwest Electric Power and Conservation Planning Council ["Council"] has determined that each project is consistent with the Council's regional conservation and electric power plan required by section 839b(d) of title 16, United States Code, and with its program to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife required by section 839d(h) of title 16, United States Code. The Council shall determine whether each project is consistent with the power plan and the fish and wildlife program under the procedure set forth at section 839b(d)(1) of title 16, United States Code, for amendments to the power plan.

SEC. 103. During Federal construction of powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy shall seek to minimize the loss of capacity, energy, or both to power customers due to unit outages which result from such construction. The Secretary of Energy shall seek to maintain contractual deliveries of capacity, energy, or both at contract prices to customers affected by unit outages resulting from such Federal construction.

SEC. 104. (a) Whiskeytown powerplant unit, Central Valley project, California, consisting of a turbine generator unit of three thousand kilowatts on the outlet works of Whiskeytown Dam.

(b) Yellowtail Afterbay powerplant unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program, Montana, consisting of a turbine generator unit of ten thousand kilowatts on the outlet works of Yellowtail Afterbay Dam.

(c) Red Bluff powerplant unit, Central Valley project, California, consisting of four turbine generator units of two thousand five hundred kilowatts each at Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

(d) Palisades powerplant enlargement, Palisades project, Idaho-Wyoming, consisting of one or more turbine generator units so as to increase the powerplant capacity by ninety thousand kilowatts.

(e) Anderson Ranch powerplant unit, Boise project, Idaho, consisting of a turbine and generator unit to increase the powerplant capacity by thirty thousand kilowatts.

(f) Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement, Minidoka project, Idaho-Wyoming, consisting of two turbine generator units of fifteen thousand kilowatts each in replacement of existing units one through six.

(g) Guernsey powerplant enlargement, North Platte project, Wyoming, consisting of one turbine generator unit to increase the powerplant capacity by fifteen thousand kilowatts.

SEC. 105. (a) Hydroelectric power generated by Federal facilities constructed pursuant to section 101 of this Act shall be delivered to the Secretary of Energy for distribution and marketing through Federal hydroelectric power marketing programs in accordance with existing law and policy consistent with the provisions of this title.

(b) The Federal powerplant constructed pursuant to section 101 of this Act shall be financially integrated with, and the power marketed under rate schedules in effect for the several programs as follows:

(1) Whiskeytown and Red Bluff powerplant units shall be marketed through the Central Valley project power marketing program;

(2) Yellowtail Afterbay powerplant unit shall be marketed through the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program power marketing program;

(3) Palisades powerplant enlargement, Anderson Ranch powerplant unit, and Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement shall be marketed through the Federal Columbia River Power System; and

(4) Guernsey powerplant unit shall be marketed through the Western Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program power marketing program.

SEC. 106. Powerplants authorized in section 101 of this Act shall be designed, constructed, and operated in such a manner as to be compatible with valid existing water rights or water delivery to the holder of any valid water service contract.

SEC. 107. The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable cost of a powerplant authorized in section 101 of this Act shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction of such powerplant commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury on its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for fifteen ye s from the date of issue.

SEC. 108. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated beginning October 1, 1984, to the Secretary of the Interior for construction of the powerplants authorized in section 101 of this Act the amounts set forth in subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of October 1983 price levels, plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of construction cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of section 102 and 103 of this Act, and to the Secretary of the Interior such additional sums as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Federal powerplants authorized in section 101 of this Act.

(b)(1) Whiskeytown powerplant units, $3,780,000.

(2) Yellowtail Afterbay powerplant, $25,600,000.

(3) Red Bluff powerplant unit, $42,100,000.

(4) Palisades powerplant enlargement, $76,000,000: *Provided*, That such sums authorized to be appropriated for construction shall be reduced by the amounts, if any, paid and contributed by the State of Idaho under the provisions of section 109 of this title. The Secretary of Interior is authorized to accept such contributions. Interest paid on bonds or other indebtedness issued by the State of Idaho to provide such contributions shall qualify for treatment under section 839(f) of title 16, United States Code.

(5) Anderson Ranch powerplant unit, $14,317,000.

(6) Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement, $73,437,000.

(7) Guernsey powerplant enlargement, $22,337,000.

SEC. 109. The Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, pursuant to section 839d(a)(2) of title 16, United States Code, may acquire the capability of the Palisades powerplant enlargement by contracting to pay to the State of Idaho an amount not to exceed the construction cost repayment requirement that would have resulted from financing of the complete project under section 107 of this title at a total construction cost equal to that assumed in the Council's determination of consistency with the power plan pursuant to section 102 of this title: *Provided*, That the project is not a major resource subject to the requirements of section 839d(c) of title 16, United States Code, as that term is defined at section 839a(12) of title 16, United States Code: *And provided further*, That any such contract shall terminate at such time as all debt obligations issued by the State of Idaho for the financing or refinancing of amounts contributed as construction costs by the State of Idaho have been retired or provision for their retirement has been made.

SEC. 110. The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Alaska Power Administration, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with respect to the Eklutna Lake hydropower project in accordance with provisions of the Act of July 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 382, as amended), the last sentence of the first paragraph of section 1 of which is amended to read as follows: "The water of Eklutna Lake and its tributaries which are required for the operation of the Eklutna project are reserved for that purpose: *Provided*, That a portion for the waters so reserved may be diverted from Eklutna Lake for public water supply purposes, if compensation for reduced electric energy production due to such diversions is made as required by the February 1984 agreement between the municipality of Anchorage and the Alaska Power Administation.".

SEC. 111. The provisions of this title shall not apply to any project authorized or affected by title II of this Act.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments to title I and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc. They have the effect of dropping title I from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. UDALL: Page 2, line 1, delete through line 3. Substitute "SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984".

Page 2, line 4, delete "TITLE I" and all that follows through to page 9, line 22. Renumber following sections and internal cross references therein accordingly.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, these amendments which I offer en bloc, strike title I of the bill and substitute a new name, the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984, and have the necessary renumbering accomplished.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, the bill as reported contained two titles; title I authorizes seven projects and title II is an Arizona-California-Nevada settlement and it also authorizes the upgrading of power production at Hoover Dam.

I supported title I in the committee because I believe hydropower is an important part of our national energy picture. In the future, we are either going to have to use a lot more nuclear or a lot more coal, or there is a third way to go, and that is hydropower, which is clean, cheap, and renewable.

The additional hydro capacity would come, all of it, from existing dams, not new ones, so I felt we did not risk any controversy.

Hydropower is free of the many problems that characterize coal-fired plants or nuclear generating stations; nevertheless, this title has become subject to some controversy and some confusion. Four of these plants are subject to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceedings to determine whether a non-Federal interest should be licensed to construct the works. There has been no agreement yet on how the other three of these plants would be financed, so perhaps we need a little more time to think about these seven projects.

Title II of the bill, however, is ready to go; it is all agreed upon. As I said, the adoption of the settlement contained in title II would resolve the pending litigation over the Hoover allocations. In order to receive contracts from the Western Power Authority, the parties to the suit have agreed to file for dismissal with prejudice. So I reluctantly conclude that we should move ahead on title II now and hope to work out the kinks in title I at a later date.

Deletion of title I will reduce the cost of the bill by $257 million if all the authorized projects were federally financed.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to drop title I from this bill and to move on to dealing specifically and solely with the Hoover Dam project.

I think the seven projects in title I still have many questions relating to the recovery of costs to the Federal Government of the expansion of those projects. While I believe very strongly that hydroelectric power is a very good, clean form of energy resource, the questions of cost, the questions of who should pay that cost and the question of recovery of that cost is an important question that would have been discussed and debated with several amendments. I think the gentleman made a good point in deleting this title and focusing his attention primarily on the Hoover Dam.

□ 1320

There will be opportunities in the future to look again at these seven projects. Hopefully, we will have some of these policy initiatives developed on exactly what the Federal Government's role should be in the whole area of hydroelectric power and cost sharing before title I of this bill returns to the House floor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in support of the amendment, reluctant support of the amendment, I might add.

I will support the amendment of my friend from Arizona, but I must say that I am rather disappointed that we had to come to this. I suppose that my reason for supporting it is because we might as well get along with the business at hand and that is Hoover Dam.

But it just bothers me that almost every time we bring a bill for the enhancement of the amount of energy that we can have in this country, there is always something that comes up that delays it.

We went through this whole thing with the Clinch River breeder reactor, and I am not putting them in the same category at all because I do not want to do any damage of my friend's intention of having these seven generating projects. But it seems like every time something like this comes up we find some reason to delay it.

One of these days we are going to have to pay the piper, Mr. Chairman, because there are plants out there right now that are having to be replaced or will have to be replaced in the very near future. And then, of course, the expansion of our industrial base will require that we have additional generating units. What better way than hydroelectric? It is the cleanest, the most acceptable, cheapest way of generating electricity.

And I do hope that some time in the future, in the very near future, that these seven projects will be resurrected and that we can move ahead with providing additional electricity for this country.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUJAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to express my agreement with most of what he has said. I will assure him that I mean business in terms of these seven projects.

I sometimes get a little unhappy with a few of my environmental friends that seem to be against everything. If there is anything that an environmentalist ought to be for, it ought to be to shift to renewable resources like hydroelectric power.

Our committee, with the help of the gentleman from New Mexico, has cranked out a number of initiatives, including small hydro projects. There are thousands of small rivers in Arizona and all over the country and in New England and in other places that will produce a few kilowatts or a megawatt or two, and we ought to be harnessing these. It is a shame to have to put off action on these seven units that are ready to go, but we just had too many bugs to work out between the different States and the Federal Government on financing these programs.

I have concluded that this is a critically important settlement between Arizona and California and we need to get on with the job of going on and moving to upgrading so that this project had to come ahead of the other seven or keeping the other projects in the bill. But I will work with the gentleman to see that we get as much hydro as we can, and particularly those seven projects just as soon as we can.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman and I would hope that we can move expeditiously on approving those seven projects and that we can work out the bugs and move on ahead with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to increase the capacity of existing generating equipment and appurtenances at Hoover Powerplant (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "uprating program"); and to improve parking, visitor facilities, and roadways and to provide additional elevators, and other facilities that will contribute to the safety and sufficiency of visitor access to Hoover Dam and Powerplant (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "visitor facilities program").

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct a Colorado River bridge crossing, including suitable approach spans, immediately downstream from Hoover Dam for the purpose of alleviating traffic congestion and reducing safety hazards. This bridge shall not be a part of the Boulder Canyon project and shall neither be funded nor repaid from the Colorado River Dam Fund or the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund.

SEC. 202. (a) Section 403(b) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 894, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1543) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) Except as provided in subsection 309(b), as amended, sums advanced by non-Federal entities for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title III of this Act shall be credited to the development fund and shall be available without further appropriation for such purpose.".

(b) Paragraph (1) of section 403(c) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 894, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1543(c)) is revised to read as follows:

"(1) all revenues collected in connection with the operation of facilities authorized in title III in furtherance of the purposes of this Act (except entrance, admission, and other recreation fees or charges and proceeds received from recreation concessionaires), until completion of repayment requirements of the Central Arizona project;".

(c) Paragraph (2) of section 403(c) is revised by inserting immediately preceding the existing proviso: "*Provided, however,* That for the Boulder Canyon project commencing June 1, 1987, and for the Parker-Davis project commencing June 1, 2005, and until the end of the repayment period for the Central Arizona project described in section 301(a) of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall provide for surplus revenues by including the equivalent of 4½ mills per kilowatthour in the rates charged to purchasers in Arizona for application to the purposes specified in subsection (f) of this

section and by including the equivalent 2½ mills per kilowatthour in the rates charged to purchasers in California and Nevada for application to the purposes of subsection (g) of this section as amended and supplemented: *Provided further,* That after the repayment period for said Central Arizona project, the equivalent of 2½ mills per kilowatthour shall be included by the Secretary of Energy in the rates charged to purchasers in Arizona, California, and Nevada to provide revenues for application to the purposes of said subsection (g) of this section:".

SEC. 203. (a) The Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 (45 Stat. 1057, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 617 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, is further amended:

(1) In the first sentence of section 2(b), by striking out "except that the aggregate amount of such advances shall not exceed the sum of $165,000,000", and by replacing the comma after the word "Act" with a period.

(2) In section 3, by deleting "$165,000,000." and inserting in lieu thereof "$242,000,000, of which $77,000,000 (October 1983 price levels) shall be adjusted plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved herein. Said $77,000,000 represents the additional amount required for the uprating program and the visitor facilities program.".

(b) Except as amended by this Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 (45 Stat. 1057, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 617 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 204. (a) The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 774, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 618), as amended and supplemented, is further amended:

(1) In section 1 by deleting the phrase "during the period beginning June 1, 1937, and ending May 31, 1987" appearing in the introductory paragraph of section 1 and in section 1(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning June 1, 1937".

(2) In section 1(b) by deleting the phrase "and such portion of such advances made on and after June 1, 1937, as (on the basis of repayment thereof within such fifty-year period or periods as the Secretary may determine) will be repayable prior to June 1, 1987" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such advances made on and after June 1, 1937, over fifty-year periods".

(3) In section 1 by deleting the word "and" at the end of subsection (c); deleting the period at the end of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

"(e) To provide, by application of the increments to rates specified in section 403(c)(2) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, as amended and supplemented, revenues, from and after June 1, 1987, for application to the purposes there specified.".

(4) In section 2:

(i) by deleting the first sentence and subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof; "All receipts from the project shall be paid into the Colorado River Dam Fund and shall be available, without further appropriation, for:

"(a) Defraying the costs of operation (including purchase of supplemental energy to meet temporary deficiencies in firm energy which the Secretary of Energy is obligated by contract to supply), maintenance and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the project, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriations Acts;" and

(ii) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund established by title IV of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, as amended and supplemented, of the revenues referred to in section 1(e) of this Act.".

(5) By deleting the final period at the end of section 6 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; *Provided,* That the respective rates of interest on appropriated funds advanced, respectively, for the uprating program and for the visitor facilities program, as described in section 201(a) of the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act of 1983, shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the initial advances for the particular program involved is made, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for fifteen years from the date of issue.".

(6) In section 12, in the paragraph beginning with "Replacements", by deleting "during the period from June 1, 1937, to May 31, 1987, inclusive" and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning June 1, 1937".

(b) Except as amended by this Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 774, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 618), as amended and supplemented, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 205. (a)(1) The Secretary of Energy shall offer:

(A) To each contractor for power generated at Hoover Dam a renewal contract for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, of the amount of capacity and firm energy specified for that contractor in the following table:

SCHEDULE A: LONG TERM CONTINGENT CAPACITY AND ASSOCIATED FIRM ENERGY RESERVED FOR RENEWAL CONTRACT OFFERS TO CURRENT BOULDER CANYON PROJECT CONTRACTORS

Contractor	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm energy (thousands of KWh)		Total
		Summer	Winter	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	247,500	904,382	387,592	1,291,974
City of Los Angeles	490,875	488,535	209,658	698,193
Southern California Edison Company	277,500	175,486	75,208	250,694
City of Glendale	18,000	47,398	20,313	67,711
City of Pasadena	11,000	40,655	17,424	58,079
City of Burbank	5,125	14,811	6,347	21,158
Arizona Power Authority	189,000	452,192	193,797	645,989
Colorado River Commission of Nevada	189,000	452,192	193,797	645,989
United States, for Boulder City	20,000	56,000	24,000	80,000
Totals	1,448,000	2,631,651	1,128,136	3,759,787

(B) To purchasers in the States of Arizona, Nevada and California eligible to enter into such contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, contracts for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, or as it thereafter becomes available, of capacity resulting from the uprating program and for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, of associated firm energy as specified in the following table:

SCHEDULE B: CONTINGENT CAPACITY RESULTING FROM THE UPRATING PROGRAM AND ASSOCIATED FIRM ENERGY

State	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
Arizona	188,000	148,000	64,000	212,000
California	127,000	99,850	43,364	143,214
Nevada	188,000	288,000	124,000	412,000
Totals	503,000	535,850	231,364	767,214

Provided, however, That in the case of Arizona and Nevada, such contracts shall be offered to the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, respectively, as the agency specified by State law as the agent of such State for purchasing power from the Boulder Canyon project: *Provided further,* That in the case of California, no such contract under this subparagraph (B) shall be offered to any purchaser who is offered a contract for capacity exceeding 20,000 kilowatts under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph; and

(C) To the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada and to purchasers in the State of California eligible to enter into such contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, contracts for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, of such energy generated at Hoover Dam as is available respectively to the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California in excess of 4,501.001 million kilowatthours in any year of operation (hereinafter called excess energy) in accordance with the following table:

SCHEDULE C: EXCESS ENERGY

Priority of entitlement to excess energy	State
First: Meeting Arizona's first priority right to delivery of excess energy which is equal in each year of operation to 200 million kilowatthours: Provided, however, That in the event excess energy in the amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated during any year of operation, Arizona shall accumulate a first right to delivery of excess energy subsequently generated in an amount not to exceed 600 million kilowatthours, inclusive of the current year's 200 million kilowatthours. Said first right of delivery shall accrue at a rate of 200 million kilowatthours per year for each year excess energy in the amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated, less amounts of excess energy delivered.	Arizona.
Second: Meeting Hoover Dam contractual obligations under schedule A of section 205(a)(1)(A) and under schedule B of section 205(a)(1)(B) not exceeding 26 million kilowatthours in each year of operation.	
Third: Meeting the energy requirements of the three States, such available excess energy to be divided equally among the States.	Arizona, Nevada, California.

(2) The total obligation of the Secretary of Energy to deliver firm energy pursuant to schedule A of section 204(a)(1)(A) and schedule B of section 205(a)(1)(B) is 4,527.001 million kilowatthours in each year of operation. To the extent that the actual generation at Hoover Powerplant in any year of operation (less deliveries thereof to Arizona required by its first priority under schedule C of section 205(a)(1)(C) whenever actual generation in any year of operation is in excess of 4,501.001 million kilowatthours) is less than 4,527.001 million kilowatthours, such deficiency shall be borne by the holders of contracts under said schedules A and B in the ratio that the sum of the quantities of firm energy to which each contractor is entitled pursuant to said schedules bears to 4,527.001 million kilowatthours. At the request of any such contractor, the Secretary of Energy will purchase energy to meet that contractor's deficiency at such contractor's expense.

(3) Subdivision E of the "General Consolidated Power Marketing Criteria or Regulations for Boulder City Area Projects" published in the Federal Register May 1983 (48 Federal Register commencing at 20881), hereinafter referred to as the "Criteria" or as the "Regulations" shall be deemed to have been modified to conform to this section. The Secretary of Energy shall cause to be included in the Federal Register a notice conforming the text of said Regulations to such modifications.

(4) Each contract offered under subsection (a)(1) of this section shall:

(A) expire September 30, 2017;

(B) not restrict use to which the capacity and energy contracted for by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California may be placed within the State of California: *Provided*, That to the extent practicable and consistent with sound water management and conservation practice, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California shall use such capacity and energy to pump available Colorado River water prior to using such capacity and energy to pump California State water project water; and

(C) conform to the applicable provisions of subdivision E of the Criteria, commencing at 48 Federal Register 20881, modified as provided in this section. To the extent that said provisions of the Criteria, as so modified, are applicable to contracts entered into under this section, those provisions are hereby ratified.

(b) Nothing in the Criteria shall be construed to prejudice any rights conferred by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, as amended and supplemented, on the holder of a contract described in subsection (a) of this section not in default thereunder on September 30, 2017.

(c)(1) The Secretary of Energy shall not execute a contract described in subsection (a)(1)(A) of this section with any entity which is a party to the action entitled the "State of Nevada, et al. against the United States of America, et al." in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, case numbered CV LV '82 441 RDF, unless that entity agrees to file in that action a stipulation for voluntary dismissal with prejudice of its claims, or counterclaims, or crossclaims, as the case may be, and also agrees to file with the Secretary a document releasing the United States, its officers and agents, and all other parties to that action who join in that stipulation from any claims arising out of the disposition under this section of capacity and energy from the Boulder Canyon project. The Attorney General shall join on behalf of the United States, its officers and agents, in any such voluntary dismissal and shall have the authority to approve on behalf of the United States the form of each release.

(2) If after a reasonable period of time as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary is precluded from executing a contract with an entity by reason of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary shall offer the capacity and energy thus available to other entities in the same State eligible to enter into such contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

(d) If by September 30, 1987, the Secretary of the Interior has not requested advances of funds under contracts entered into pursuant to subsection (e) of this section and if by that date the Congress has not appropriated funds to enable the substantial completion by September 30, 1992, of the uprating program, the Secretary of the Interior shall promptly request each non-Federal entity with a contract described in subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section to advance funds therefor pursuant to subsection (e) of this section. If an entity requested to advance these funds fails or refuses, within six months after notice from the Secretary of the Interior to agree to do so, that entity's contract shall thereupon terminate. In that event, the Secretary of Energy shall offer to another entity or entities in the same State eligible to contract under subsection (a)(1)(B) the opportunity to so do and thereby to succeed to the rights to capacity and energy under subsection (a)(1)(B) of the entity whose contract terminated: *Provided*, That an entity as a condition to entering into such a successor contract shall simultaneously with the execution thereof execute a contract with the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (e) pursuant to which it agrees to advance funds covering the deficiency. The Secretary of the Interior shall complete the uprating program, or portions thereof, as promptly as the receipt of funds permits.

(e) The uprating program authorized under section 201(a) of this Act may be undertaken with appropriated funds or with funds advanced under contracts made with the Secretary of the Interior by non-Federal purchasers described in subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section, or a combination thereof. Any funding provided by non-Federal purchasers shall be advanced to the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the terms and conditions of such contracts.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, funds advanced by non-Federal purchasers for use in the uprating program shall be deposited in the Colorado River Dam Fund and shall be available for the uprating program.

(g) Those amounts advanced by non-Federal purchasers shall be financially integrated as capital costs with other project costs for rate-setting purposes, and shall be returned to those purchasers advancing funds throughout the contract period through credits which include interest costs incurred by such purchasers for funds contributed to the Secretary of the Interior for the uprating program.

(h) The provisions of this section constitute an exercise by the Congress of the right reserved by it in section 5(b) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, as amended and supplemented, to prescribe terms and conditions for the renewal of contracts for electrical energy generated at Hoover Dam. This section constitutes the exclusive method for disposing of capacity and energy from Hoover Dam for the period beginning June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017.

(i)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any claim that the provisions of subsection (a) of this section violates any rights to capacity or energy from the Boulder Canyon project is barred unless the complaint is filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act in the United States Claims Court which shall have exclusive jurisdiction over this action. Any claim that actions taken by any administrative agency of the United States violates any right under this Title or the Boulder Canyon Project Act of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act is barred unless suit asserting such claim is filed in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction within one year after final refusal of such agency to correct the action complained of.

(2) Any contract entered into pursuant to section 205 or section 207 of this Act shall contain provisions by which any dispute or disagreement as to interpretation or performance of the provisions of this title or of applicable regulations or of the contract may be determined by arbitration or court proceedings. The Secretary of Energy or the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, if authorized to act for the United States in such arbitration or court proceedings and, except as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, jurisdiction is conferred upon any district court of the United States of proper venue to determine the dispute.

(j) It is the purpose of subsections (c), (h), and (i) of this section to ensure that the rights of contractors for capacity and energy from the Boulder Canyon project for the period beginning June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017, will vest with certainty and finality.

SEC. 206. Reimbursement of funds appropriated for construction of facilities authorized under section 201(a) of this Act, inclusive of any funds advanced by non-Federal purchasers, shall be a repayment requirement of the Boulder Canyon project beginning with the first day of the month following completion of the installation, except that the cost of the visitor facilities program as defined in section 201(a) of this Act shall become a repayment requirement beginning June 1, 1987, or when substantially completed, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if later.

SEC. 207. (a) Subject to the provisions of any existing layoff contracts, electrical capacity and energy associated with the United States' interest in the Navajo generating station which is in excess of the pumping requirements of the Central Arizona project and any such needs for desalting and protective pumping facilities as may be required under section 101(b)(2)(B) of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, as amended (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "Navajo surplus") shall be marketed and exchanged by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to this section.

(b) Navajo surplus shall be marketed by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to the plan adopted under subsection (c) of this section, directly to, with or through the Arizona Power Authority and/or other entities having the status of perference entities under the reclamation law in accordance with the preference provisions of section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and as provided in part IV, section A of the Criteria.

(c) In the marketing and exchanging of Navajo surplus, the Secretary of the Interior shall adopt the plan deemed most acceptable, after consultation with the Secretary of Energy, the Governor of Arizona, and the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (or its successor in interest to the repayment obligation for the Central Arizona project), for the purposes of optimizing the availability of Navajo surplus and providing financial assistance in the timely construction and repayment of construction costs of authorized features of the Central Arizona project. The Secretary of the Interior, in concert with the Secretary of Energy, in accordance with section 14 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, shall grant electrical power and energy exchange rights with Arizona entities as necessary to implement the adopted plan: *Provided, however*, That if exchange rights with Arizona entities are not required to implement the adopted plan, exchange rights may be offered to other entities.

(d) For the purposes provided in subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Energy, or the marketing entity or entities under the adopted plan, are authorized to establish and collect or cause to be established and collected, rate components, in addition to those currently authorized, and to deposit the revenues received in the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund to be available for such purposes and if required under the adopted plan, to credit, utilize, pay over directly or assign revenues from such additional rate components to make repayment and establish reserves for repayment of funds, including interest incurred, to entities which have advanced funds for the purposes of subsection (c) of this section: *Provided, however,* That rates shall not exceed levels that allow for an appropriate saving for the contractor.

(e) To the extent that this section may be in conflict with any other provision of law relating to the marketing and exchange of Navajo surplus, or to the disposition of any revenues therefrom, this section shall control.

SEC. 208. Recognizing the expiration of Colorado River storage project (CRSP) contracts in 1989, prior to final reallocation of CRSP power pursuant to existing law, and within one year after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Western Area Power Administration, shall report, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate, on all Colorado River storage project (CRSP) power resources, including those presently allocated to the Lower Division States, which may be used to financially support the development of authorized projects in the States of the Upper Division (as that term is used in article II of the Colorado River Compact) of the Colorado River Basin.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a series of amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. UDALL: Page 14, line 25, delete the comma and the words "respectively, for the uprating program and";

Page 15, line 5, delete "as of the beginning" and all that follows through line 10, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "taking into consideration average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the reimbursement period of the program during the month preceding the fiscal year in which the costs of the program are incurred. To the extent that more than one interest rate is determined pursuant to the preceding sentence, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish for repayment purposes an interest rate at a weighted averaged of the rates so determined.".

Page 21, line 5, delete "(d)" and all that follows through p. 22, line 3; and reletter the following subsections accordingly;

Page 22, line 5, change the word "may" to "shall" and delete the words "with appropriated funds or";

Page 22, line 8, after the word "section" delete the comma and the words "or a combination thereof.";

Page 22, line 9, delete the word "Any" and change the word "funding" to "Funding";

Page 24, line 10, delete the word "appropriated" through the words "any funds" on line 12;.

Page 24, line 13, after "purchasers", delete the comma, and insert "for the uprating program".

Page 24, line 15, delete "the installation, except that the" and insert "each segment thereof. The".

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to title 11.

The amendments do the following:

First, they state that the Hoover uprating program shall be undertaken with funds advanced by the power purchasers. The amendment eliminates the authorization for Federal funds for that program. It will be 100 percent, up front from the power customers. The parties to the Hoover settlement are able to do this, they always intended to advance the funds, and this amendment makes that advance a requirement of the program.

Second, the amendment changes the interest rate formula for repayment of the costs of the improvements to the visitors center at Hoover Dam. The tourist center there receives millions of visitors each year. H.R. 4275 authorizes improvements to that center, and makes the repayment of those costs an obligation of the Boulder Canyon Project. In effect, the Hoover power customers pick up the tab for the improvements. The costs are repaid, with interest, by the power customers. The bill as reported by the committee stated that the interest rate would be a cost rated formula. The administration has recommended a different formula, and I am prepared to accept that change for the repayment of the visitor center costs.

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment on this side of the aisle. We think it is an excellent amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BOXER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BOXER: On page 15, strike out line 19 and all that follows thereafter through page 24, line 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 205. The power generated at Hoover Dam that is made available by this Act shall be auctioned off at market rates, with auctions conducted by the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary of Energy is authorized to grant to the highest responsible bidder or bidders by competitive bidding, under regulations promulgated in advance, contracts for such power. Such systems of bid, variables, terms, and conditions which the Secretary determines to be useful to accomplish the purposes and policies of this Act shall be submitted to Congress and published in the Federal Register. Within six months after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall report to the Congress with respect to the recovery from the various bids. The Secretary of Energy shall consider whether to auction winter and summer peaking capacity separately, and firm and non-firm energy separately and develop rules and regulations accordingly.

Mrs. BOXER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOXER. Colleagues, my good friend from Arizona has referred to the Boxer amendment or the Boxer rebellion, as he affectionally called it, as a bad idea. I would like to give you Members a list of some of the people who are supporting the Boxer amendment, which we consider to be a good idea:

The National Taxpayers' Union, the Environmental Defense Fund, the National Audubon Society, the National Wildlife Federation, the Environmental Policy Institute, the Sierra Club, the American Rivers Conservation Council, Friends of the Earth, Utility Consumer Action Network.

These are just some of the organizations, Mr. Chairman, who are supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have good and respected friends on both sides of this issue and that always makes it difficult. But, Mr. Chairman, my amendment, introduced on behalf of many Members of this House, who you will hear from, addresses the issues of fairness, wisdom, and fiscal responsibility in our water and power policy.

The purpose of my amendment is to correct an inequity and to recognize reality in the way the Federal Government is selling power from the Hoover Dam. My amendment would open up this source of power to competitive bid, broadening the Hoover Dam market and lowering the Federal deficit by $3.5 billion over 10 years.

Back when the Boulder Canyon Project Act was passed in 1928, contracts were negotiated to divide up that power that was generated by Hoover Dam, and 50-year contracts were put in place in 1937 to provide

for the sale of that power at a cost to a selected group of entities identified in H.R. 4275, which is before us today.

H.R. 4275, without my amendment, Mr. Chairman, continues to subsidize power by renewing these contracts for 30 more years to those same entities.

I come from California which had 6 million people in the 1930's and was the sixth largest State. Now we have 25 million people and we are the largest State. We have grown fourfold.

Lower prices from the Hoover Dam contributed to this growth. And in the days, Mr. Chairman, when the West was being settled, it may have made sense for the Government to promote growth by subsidizing water and power projects.

Today the West has dramatically changed and water and power are in short supply. Without our amendment, Mr. Chairman, energy conservation is discouraged and these valuable resources are squandered due to a pricing policy which is older than most Members in this Chamber.

Without our amendment, H.R. 4275 is wrong environmentally, it is wrong economically, and it is not fair. The power allottees that are identified in this legislation will receive 30-year contracts at depression era prices for a 21st century resource.

My amendment would open up the door for others who were not part of these negotiations 50 years ago and would allow them to make a bid on this resource.

□ 1330

This would also allow all the residents of California, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, who have never had access to this Hoover power, it would give them a chance to bid on it.

Fifty years of bargain basement benefits would seem long enough for the members of the exclusive Hoover club to tap the Federal Treasury and continue to receive benefits.

The average rate of electricity is 10 times the Hoover price. What is this underpricing of Hoover's energy costing the taxpayers of our Nation? According to reputable studies quoted in the New York Times, in the 8 years, 1980 to 1987, the last few years of the original contract period, the cost to the U.S. Treasury is nearly a billion dollars.

Looking forward for the proposed 30-year contract before us, the subsidy to Hoover's beneficiaries will be even more massive and the loss to the Treasury even more drastic. In 1984 dollars, just for the first 10 years of the proposed contract period, the subsidy is over $3.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the San Diego Tribune has summed up the economic argument the best. It says, "The Federal Government, while running a record deficit of $200 billion a year, is preparing to review sweetheart contracts to sell Hoover Dam electric power for peanuts." Our amendment would bring fairness to consumers; revenues to ease the Federal deficit and a sound approach to the Nation's water and power resources.

Quoting from the New York Times, it says, "Unless the House has the courage to put national interests ahead of regional, the giveaway will continue for 30 years."

I thank you and I ask support for this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very straightforward. This amendment simply asks the question: Whether or not we are going to continue a privilege for a few power customers of the Hoover Dam, a privilege that is not shared equally with others, a privilege that others do not have an opportunity to participate in. The cost of that privilege to the rest of the taxpayers of this country could be some $3.5 billion over the next 10 years.

I think at a time when this House has anguished over budgets, when this House has anguished over deficits, when we have cut back health care to get a billion dollars, when we have cut back nutrition programs to get a quarter of a billion dollars, when we have cut back programs for highways, when we have cut back programs for education, for hundreds of millions of dollars, trying to make a downpayment on the deficit, the issue here is: Are we going to continue the policies of 50 years ago and are we today going to plunge ahead long for another 30 years to continue those power policies that will be picked up by every ratepayer, every taxpayer, who is not privileged to belong to the Hoover club?

Let us look at what that means. That means that 30 years from now, we will be selling power based upon practices that are 80 years old. One of the people who is opposing the Boxer amendment, said that the theory is that the Federal Government should not make a profit from the sale of power.

Why not? Why not, when all other ratepayers in the area must pay the going price? And if Hoover power is put out to bid, what will be the results? Those utilities who seek to participate will bid to the point where it reaches the replacement power, which they could generate by building their own facility. That will bring it up to the market rate.

I sat on the Interior Committee for 8 years prior to going to the Budget Committee, and what we are airing here today is basically what has been done behind closed doors. We talked about the Bureau of Reclamation—dams, waterways, and canals—as if they are the sole purview of the Western United States.

I just want to say to my colleagues who come from the rest of the United States, we have enjoyed these programs, that you can see the Western migration of crops and peoples and profits and jobs. We thank you for paying it.

The question you must ask yourselves is: Do you want to continue to send the bill to your ratepayers who are purchasing coal, who are purchasing home heating oil, who are purchasing oil to fire electric generating capacity. Do you want to continue to send them the bill for the next 30 years to perpetuate the privileges for the purchasers of Hoover power? Or should we simply ask these people to do what other utility customers has been required to do; to realize that this is an energy world that is different than it was 50 years ago; to realize that it is a resource-different world than it was 50 years ago. The only thing that the Boxer amendment requires is that those taxpayers pay their fair share. That is all. There is no penalty, there is no prejudice, there is no favoritism.

Some charge this is a break with the past. Yes; it is, and you should look at those past practices. Because if you look at the history of reclamation, if you look at the history of the western dam-building program, those who got there first got the most.

What we have been doing in this Congress is protecting that privilege with 40-year fixed price contracts, with 50-year stretched-out, interest-free repayments, costly privileges that are not extended to anybody else in the rest of the United States.

We have an opportunity to review those pricing practices or to plunge on for the next 30 years, and lock in the practices of 50 years ago. Go home and tell your constituents that you exercised oversight when you vote against this amendment. It will be laughable to call that oversight, because we will have done nothing to correct the pricing policies of 50 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. When you go home and tell the elderly, when you tell the schoolchildren, the people in nutrition programs how we shared the burden for the downpayment on the deficit, how we shared the price, and the pain, and the suffering. I want you to remind them that there was a select group of people that when we had the opportunity to raise the revenue, to share the cost among

millions of ratepayers, we did not have the courage to parcel it out.

I would hope that is not what you would take home this weekend as you go back to your constituents. I would hope that you would be able to say that where we found privilege that could no longer be justified, we sought to make those individuals pay their fair share.

This is in the best interests of the Federal Treasury, it is in the best interests of the power consumption, it is in the best interest of resource use in this country, and I would hope that all Members of this Congress would support the Boxer amendment.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUCKABY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for his statement. I think he is right on target with his remarks. I think if anyone in this House considers himself a fiscal conservative, if anyone in this House is seriously concerned about the deficits, the fiscal monetary status of this country, this vote here corrects as much of an injustice as the most glaring of loopholes in our tax code.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his remarks. I would like the gentleman to reflect where else we could go in the budget and get $3.5 billion, as we can in this single amendment, as painlessly as this is, by asking the people be treated no differently than others in the United States.

Mr. HUCKABY. The gentleman is exactly right. All we are asking people to do is to pay the fair market price for their electricity.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN).

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it my understanding from the gentleman that he is advocating that a fair market, a formula that involves fair-market price, supply and demand, competing in a marketplace, that that would determine the cost?

□ 1340

Mr. MILLER of California. That is, in fact, what the Boxer amendment does. And I assume that those utilities who sought to participate in the pool of power that is provided by Hoover Dam would bid up to the point to which it would be the cost of replacing that power. At that point, they would make a determination whether or not to build their own facility, because if the bidding went beyond that level, the economics would dictate that they build their own facility or buy it from another source.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Speaking of economics, the gentleman is aware that a certain water agency in his district pays a cost of $3.50 per acre-foot of water and I am sure the gentleman is aware that if we added the actual operation and maintenance to that, that would raise that by 200 percent and if we added the actual cost of the capital that would raise it again by 200 percent and I have not even calculated what the interest would be——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. MILLER of California. There is one thing about the gentleman, he is always predictable. I am well aware of that water rate in the Contra Costa Water District. And if the gentleman would have listened in the Interior Committee over the years, I have time and again said that when that contract comes up for review, as this one is now, I expect those water rates to be raised to reflect the cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. PASHAYAN. The actual costs?

Mr. MILLER of California. That has been historically my position throughout the debate on the reclamation program, throughout the debate on the Central Valley project.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I accept that. I just wanted to be sure the gentleman was on record that the cost would go up at least $14 an acre-foot, if not more.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman who just left the well said that when the contracts are up on his water he will expect a price rise to the cost to the Federal Government. That is all in the world that is going on with Hoover Dam right now. It is being sold at cost to the Federal Government. So apparently all he will do when his particular interest comes up is agree to the costs going up as much as we are trying to maintain them on this particular project.

We have also used the word "subsidy" rather loosely. The dictionary has the definition of the word "subsidy" and by that dictionary definition I think that the Members will find that there is no subsidy being paid. It gives the impression when they say you are going to save $3½ billion that we are paying $3½ billion out of the Federal Treasury, subsidizing ratepayers in the Southwest. And that is absolutely absurd.

In fact, the ratepayers of the Southwest have paid for Hoover Dam with interest. Now that they have paid for it with interest, this amendment wants to make them pay for it all over again.

We have said that these rates are too low. And then we say that the rates are not adequately shared. So the Boxer amendment comes up with a proposal which will assure that no one will get low rates. And that is done in the name of the consumer, come on.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Also, in addition to that, we are discussing, I believe, a large increase in rates that now somehow we have the perception that is going to be borne by the utilities. Those increases in rates will be passed on to the consumer.

The consumer happens to be the old, the elderly, the handicapped, and others in our society who cannot afford further increases in their utility prices.

I anticipate someone like the previous speaker in the well tells us what to tell our constituents when we go back to our districts, a bit gratuitous I might add. But the fact is that I am not going to go back and tell the older people and the handicapped and the elderly that their rates are going up, that they may not even be able to afford these increases in utility bills because we are going to reduce the deficit and balance the budget.

Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. SWIFT. Certainly, I would agree with that. I would agree with the gentleman.

Making one last point, Mr. Chairman, I just said to the chairman of the committee a little while ago you might be able to divide the old people from the young people around here by finding out who knows what the preference clause is. I find myself, under those strictures, an old person.

What this amendment will do, without benefit of any hearings, is change a 60-year-old policy of this country that said that public utilities, in effect cooperatives, utilities owned by consumers shall have preference to publicly generated power.

Now, maybe that is a policy that in some people's judgment is a policy whose time is gone. Some people might argue that is no longer relevant.

If that is the case, then introduce legislation and let us hold hearings and understand it. But we would hear today I think an amendment that is thought out to be something that is going to bring equity, but which

simply does not understand what it is tinkering with. We would carelessly eliminate a policy without any serious consideration to what we are doing and the implications of it to publicly owned facilities that serve customers who are their owners. That simply cannot be done on the floor with an amendment such as this that is not thoroughly examined.

If we want to change fundamental policy, there is a process to do that in this country. But let us not change radically a fundamental policy of this century in this Congress, on the floor, with an amendment that has never held any hearings.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Washington, for yielding.

I would like to point out that the Congress in its wisdom, 50 years ago, said that we, the successors of those Members, have the obligation to take a look at these 50-year-old contracts. We are doing that. I think we are doing it in a thoughtful way because what we are basically saying is an issue of fairness the Hoover club pays one-half cent per kilowatt-hour and everyone else pays 6 cents average.

The fact of the matter is that if we were to use the fairness argument, it would redound to the benefit of taxpayers throughout this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SWIFT) has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. SWIFT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman.

The preference clause. Does the gentlewoman know what the preference clause's purpose was?

Mrs. BOXER. If the gentleman would yield further, the gentleman certainly has explained it to us today. I wanted to point out to the gentleman on that clause that the fact is there are many public power companies in the State of California, in the State of Colorado, who would like to have a shot at that power who are now unable because of the private utilities.

Mr. SWIFT. I understand that, but the gentlewoman's amendment says that you will sell this power to the highest bidder, public or private.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct.

Mr. SWIFT. That violates the preference clause. That changes U.S. policy with regard to public power and it does so, I think, unintended, but it, nevertheless, does it and that is a radical change in fundamental policy with regard to energy generation in this country.

Mrs. BOXER. I think the gentleman is perfectly right in suggesting that this is a change. It is a change for good reason. This Congress cannot be bound by what Congress did in the 1930's, 50 years ago. This Congress has an obligation to look at policies and I think when we do——

Mr. SWIFT. I am not disagreeing with the gentlewoman on that.

Mrs. BOXER. Oh, I thought the gentleman was.

Mr. SWIFT. No; what I am suggesting is that if we are going to make that fundamental a change, we clearly have the authority to do it and if the majority of us think it is the right thing to do, we can do it. But we should not be doing it in an amendment that was drawn up by someone who did not even know what the preference clause is.

My point is that unintentionally the gentlewoman's amendment does violation to something I do not think the gentlewoman even intended to touch. The processes of this institution provide a mechanism by which we can examine the preference clause and if we want to, sure, we can change it. But we should not be doing it inadvertently by an amendment on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SWIFT) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SWIFT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. BOXER. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact of the matter is that we are taking another look as the Congress so instructed us to do way back 50 years ago. If the gentleman is suggesting that by this process today, in which many Members of this House, perhaps more than I have seen on the floor in a long while, can participate and give their views is not an adequate discussion, that the gentleman is right, but I would further say that in the settlement that has been discussed by the fine gentleman from Arizona, only a few Members of Congress were involved in that, in coming up with a settlement.

□ 1350

And I say that this is more democratic, what we are doing here today, taking a look as the Congress asked us to, after 50 years, at these contracts and suggesting that in fairness to the taxpayers from all over this great Nation that we open this up to competitive bid.

Mr. SWIFT. If I can reclaim my time, what the gentleman from Arizona did was to take this legislation through the subcommittee, through the full committee and to the floor of the House in the normal open process that we use regularly in this body. And I am merely suggesting that if the gentlewoman from California wants to eliminate the preference clause, it should go through the same process as well.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Is the gentleman suggesting that the Interior Committee is prepared to bring such legislation to the floor? It is a little hard on us who are not on the committee to tell us we should not try to do things through amendment if that is their only option. It was not my understanding that the Interior Committee was ready to bring such a bill through, but if we were to get some assurances that some such fundamental legislation might come forth, perhaps that might then be a more appropriate forum.

Mr. SWIFT. If the gentleman will allow me to reclaim my time. I think I understood the gentleman. That is always a problem with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman will yield again, I will be glad to repeat it.

Mr. SWIFT. If the gentleman would like to introduce legislation to repeal the preference clause, I am sure the gentleman from Arizona would be happy to discuss it with him and probably hold hearings.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman will yield, I have only been here 3½ years, but I do know the difference between discussing, holding hearings, and getting a bill to the floor. I take the gentleman's answer to be the negative pregnant, and that is why we are doing it in an amendment, because the gentleman knows that any bill looking at the whole thing would not see the light of day.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SWIFT) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SWIFT was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is a superb debater, knows he has just made a debating point. But I do not think the gentleman would argue with the principle that a fundamental change in a basic policy that has stood over half a century should not be changed without thoughtful consideration by this body through the normal process. That is all I am saying. As a responsible legislator, I know the gentleman would agree with me.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman not think we are engaging in thoughtful consideration right now? I think the gentleman is.

Mr. SWIFT. Not through the totality of the process, with the special expertise of the committees. If the gen-

tleman argues that we can do everything automatically here on the floor, then we should abolish all of the committees and subcommittees. Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. FRANK. Not automatically.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The people of California, Arizona, and Nevada and many areas of the West have very serious power and water problems that are not present in many parts of the country. This legislation was designed after many months of negotiations between the water and power leaders of the Western States trying to work out many of their mutual problems with each other. Arizona and Nevada desired more power from Hoover Dam than they had been getting in the past. It was necessary to work out something so that they could get that, which their tremendous growth has entitled them to and which they need.

This amendment really would destroy that agreement that has been prepared. I know many of my friends from the San Francisco area feel that they are not involved, that their interests are not involved by this legislation. But they are. Because if you raise the price of electric power at Hoover Dam, as this amendment would do, you are going to make the cost of pumping the water from the Colorado River to the Los Angeles and San Diego areas and other places extremely expensive, and it will be cheaper for southern California then to get their water through the aqueduct from northern California. The people from northern California will be very definitely affected. They have been trying to get southern California to buy their water from the Colorado River and to get it from that source. But to force the price up beyond the price of northern California water, which this amendment would do, will force us to be in competition with them and to depend upon northern California for a larger share of water than we are now getting.

I do not think that will be beneficial to California or any part of it. And I hope that the Members of the House will realize that this is specifically a Western problem. We try to help other parts of the State with their problems. But to single out Hoover Dam as the only area where we are going to violate the long-time established principle for the sale of electric power and to charge what the market will bear, when that is contrary to all of the principles we have ever followed with federally produced power, would be a mistake, it would be unfair and it would be harmful to the San Francisco area as well as to the rest of the State of California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat reluctant to intervene in this amendment because I have not been on the floor to hear all of the debate and I may have missed some important points. I also am not on the committee and I am not as familiar with all of the details as perhaps I should be. And, of course, I have a very high regard and admiration for the author of the amendment and for the distinguished gentleman from northern California (Mr. MILLER), whose eloquence, as I observed it on the tube, is what drew me over here to participate in the debate.

But although I recognize that the amendment was offered as a matter of high principle, I have not yet figured out what the principle is. I do not know whether it is one aimed at the restoring of free market forces, in which case I am sure the gentlewoman will support the deregulation of natural gas and allow that price to rise astronomically to her constituents, as her amendment would allow electricity prices to do for my constituents. I suspect that the principle that is really at stake in her mind is the one that I think she referred to, whether we should continue to have economic and population growth in California. I think I probably agree with her that we have too many people in California, and I would like to do something about it, but I am not sure that this is the proper vehicle to use in that connection.

I was struck by the eloquence of her arguments and the eloquence of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). I would have been much more struck if they were proposing something that adversely affected their constituents, which it does not. And I would have been much more struck if they were willing to apply this principle of devotion to the free market and its operation to some of the other areas involving energy pricing, which they do not. Since they do not take those positions, I felt that their eloquence perhaps was not quite as effective as it should be.

I have lived in the shadow of Hoover Dam and the Colorado River all my life. I was raised a few miles from the river. My constituents depend upon the dam for both water and for power. I am deeply concerned about the future of this entire operation. As I have indicated many times, there are many problems here, with regard to the distribution and pricing of both power and water, and I would like to approach them and to solve them. But to adopt this amendment at this time is not the proper way to go about resolving the problems of the Southwest. Whether it is pricing problems or growth problems or power distribution problems, or whatever, the kinds of serious policy issues that are raised by this amendment deserve far more consideration. If we were to adopt this amendment, of course, it goes without saying that we would have to look at the pricing of power for the whole of the Northwest. It is going to be affected. We would have to look at the pricing of power for other dams around the country, other Federal projects. All of them would be affected. This is not something the implications of which only involve a few public jurisdictions in southern California. The implications, the ramifications of this, extend throughout the United States.

While I might even agree with the gentlewoman as to the direction in which she is moving, I would not want to move in this direction without the opportunity for full examination of all of the ramifications in every part of the country and for a full exploration of how this could be done in a reasonable and rational way. This amendment does not achieve that.

So I would urge the gentlewoman to press her case—and I am sure that she will after this amendment is defeated—in the form of legislation which will address the whole problem of the pricing of federally generated power throughout the United States. I would be willing to consider some changes. But I am not willing to consider changes which would drastically raise the prices of electrical energy for my constituents, and for 1 million others in southern California, at the same time I am trying to keep natural gas prices down and keep oil prices down and keep other kinds of energy prices down. It flies in the face of practicality and reality.

□ 1400

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I see that we have 8 or 10 additional Members that would like to be heard, and I know that some of my colleagues are concerned about getting out at a reasonable hour. This is one of two amendments that will take some time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments——

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment proposed by our distinguished colleague from California.

Once again, we have an opportunity to put national interests ahead of regional, to reduce the deficit, promote energy conservation, protect the environment, and guarantee fair play for consumers. For 50 years the Federal

Government has recovered only operating costs and capital at low interest for power production from the Hoover Dam, while those allotees who got the output have not had to pay the true value of the power.

Today Hoover Dam power is being sold to a few lucky utilities at one-tenth of its value on the open market. This issue is crystal clear. This sweetheart deal has gone on long enough. If we do not put a stop to it, we will be giving away literally billions of dollars that should belong to all the taxpayers of this Nation. Today, we have a real chance to make a dent in the Federal deficit, by having those who benefit from Federal hydroelectric power pay what it is worth.

It makes no sense, nor is it fair, for those who live in Florida, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Wisconsin, or any State or community that is not a beneficiary of a Federal hydropower contract to subsidize the electric bills of those who do.

Furthermore, such subsidies actually discourage energy conservation and foster its waste. When the price of electric power is kept artificially low, the incentive to conserve disappears and waste becomes more likely. Those environmental groups which have worked to make everyone aware of the consequences of this simple truth are to be commended.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment which would allocate the energy resources of the Hoover Dam on the basis of open competition at a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER) to require that the power generated be auctioned off rather than sold at 1930's prices.

The gentleman from California who preceded me in the well raised some important issues. The most important issue is that he did define the issue, and that is for those few people in southern California to get a ripoff price on a Federal resource. Now, the last person who tried that was Secretary Watt, who attempted to sell the coal under our national parkland at a cheap price to the energy companies, and we put an end to that. I do not think we are creating any new Federal policy today; we are just saying that you cannot steal national, Federal resources for a little group of people and the rest of us are not going to pay the freight.

That includes, as my distinguished colleague, Mr. MILLER, from Contra Costa County indicated, he is willing to see the farmers in the delta pay their full price for the water, and we are all willing to see those corporate farmers who are ripping us off even worse than Los Angeles, in the central valley of California, pay their fair share when that time comes.

So we are establishing a policy here today, and that is no more free lunch for special groups of people to get something that belongs to all of us. I might parenthetically point out that I have been besieged, my office is knee deep in lobbyists right now, looking for a special alternate energy tax credit which will cost us another couple of billion dollars if they have their way, in an upcoming tax conference. Their idea is that they just need this extra couple of billion dollars until they can gets their costs down and they can collect the full price. We cannot have it both ways; we have got a couple of billion dollars for the people of Los Angeles, and a couple of billion dollars for the wind farms in the Altamont Pass in my district, they are all wrong. We ought not, in a country where power is fungible, power can be transmitted from one coast to the other; if it is Federal power and a Federal asset, all Americans ought to share in it at the same price or at the same cost.

I would urge the adoption of the Boxer amendment on the principles of fairness and equity and preserving our national resources.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's original point was right on. If this House cannot establish policy, who can? I remember last year or the year before last, we established a diesel tax for river operators which undid a 70-year-old policy in the Panama Canal Act. We did not have hearings on the Panama Canal Act; we decided it was good policy to make those people pay for Federal resources they were using, and it is good policy today to do what the gentleman says.

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALBOSTA

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALBOSTA to the amendment offered by Mrs. BOXER: After the final sentence of the amendment offered by Mrs. BOXER, add the following: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Act, any revenue generated from the sale of power at Hoover Dam in excess of expenses of operation and maintenance of said dam incurred by the United States, shall be paid into the United States Treasury.".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARNARD). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ALBOSTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California, BARBARA BOXER, is in the general interest of the public. The amendment I am offering to Congresswoman BOXER's amendment perfects and clarifies her amendment, and will increase the probability of my colleagues' amendment passing. Members from both sides of the aisle agree with me that we have to reduce the Federal deficit. I do not believe that any one area of the country should unfairly benefit from a Federal facility. The 50-year agreement signed in 1937 gave the utilities that participated in the Hoover project 50 years of cheap electricity. These contracts should not have been signed in the first place. By selling this power at cost we have already lost billions of dollars in revenue. The giveaway has to stop now.

Some Members have questioned whether the Boxer amendment should be discussed before the full House. My colleagues have suggested that this is a matter for the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. As the gentleman from Massachusetts said, this issue needs to be discussed before the full House because regional interests would prevent the committee from reporting out legislation containing this amendment to the House floor for consideration.

Let me point out a few other things, Mr. Chairman, that I believe are very important. I believe all Americans should benefit from our Nation's natural resources. We need to construct and expand hydroelectric facilities, putting our rivers to work to benefit all citizens.

The Hoover Dam, one of the largest dams in the United States was built with tax payers' money. Michigan taxpayers, Massachusetts taxpayers, taxpayers from all over the country contributed to the building of this dam. Why should not the people who paid for this dam, benefit from the power this dam produces? Why should just residents of California, Arizona, and Nevada receive all of the benefits? They should not. I strongly oppose giving cheap power to this small region of the country while the rest of the Nation pays over 1,000 percent more for their electricity. To meet the future energy needs in my State consumers power has begun building a nuclear plant in Midland, Mich., but we can no longer finance it. We need the power. There is no question about that. Some people have suggested that we go to Canada and buy it. Fine, Canada is a good neighbor, but Michigan does not want to become reliant upon Canada for electricity even though it is less expensive. America should rely on resources within our own boundaries.

□ 1410

For example, Mr. Chairman, in my own particular we are paying approximately 11 cents per kilowatt-hour. In addition to paying outrageous utility bills, my State is facing a possible energy shortage in 1990.

I suggest that we find a way to help build nuclear plants in this country. It is a source of natural energy that can benefit all of us. Those of us who do not have the facilities like the Hoover Dam in our States, should be able to benefit somehow from other sources of energy. We should develop a national energy policy that benefits all areas of our country.

Michigan is looking at a 60-percent rate increase if this plant is built. That is what they are talking about right now, a 60-percent rate increase. Businesses and homeowners alike cannot already afford these increases, several groups of business people in Michigan, including General Motors and Ford are saying that they do not want that plant finished, they want to buy the power from Canada instead. If they get power from Canada, Michigan will lose thousands of jobs and become dependant on Canada for our energy needs.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we should adopt Congresswoman BOXER's as amended by my amendment. I would hope that the gentlewoman from California would accept my amendment. After she accepts or rejects my amendment, I would like to continue my discussion of her amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBOSTA. I would yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment is a perfecting amendment. Basically, it says that the taxpayers who paid for the Hoover Dam, once we have covered all the costs to maintain that great facility, anything above that would go into the Federal Treasury.

I want to say on the record that I appreciate this amendment. It is what we had in mind. I think it makes our amendment stronger. I definitely accept it.

Mr. ALBOSTA. I thank the gentlewoman for accepting my amendment. I would move for adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBOSTA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman mind covering the point again that he was making on the nuclear installation in his district, or near his district, that would increase rates by 60—was that percent? I did not quite get that.

Mr. ALBOSTA. By 60 percent. Commercial rates in Michigan right now in most utilities are about 11 cents per kilowatt-hour. The Hoover power is being sold at about six-tenths of 1 cent per kilowatt-hour. I am talking about the prospect of our rates being raised from 11 cents a kilowatt-hour to about 17 or 18 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. PASHAYAN. All right. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of raising it?

Mr. ALBOSTA. I am not in favor of raising rates. What I am saying is that we should be able to find a way to share all of our natural resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ALBOSTA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ALBOSTA was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. PASHAYAN. If the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman is not in favor of raising rates by 60 percent in Michigan, why is he in favor of supporting an amendment that will raise rates in California? That is why I thought the gentleman was in favor of raising the rates.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, the time is mine, and I would reclaim it and answer the gentleman from California.

Michigan is in a dilemma. There is no question about it. We do not have a public powerplant, such as Hoover Dam, that generate large amounts of electricity at unbelievably low rates.

Mr. PASHAYAN. That is why you build utilities.

Mr. ALBOSTA. That is very true. A good example of Federal funds being used to increase our country's energy production is the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe that energy projects are a wise use of Federal funds.

Clearly Michigan's residents are going to have to pay more for our electricity one way or the other. What I fear is the mass exodus of businesses from Michigan to States such as, Arizona, California, and Nevada who have dramatically lower electricity rates. Utility rates are one of the main factors businessmen consider when choosing a State to set up their business.

Michigan or Ohio or some other State that does not have that access to these natural resources, will experience a huge increase in unemployment. For every percentage point unemployment increases the Federal Government spends $28 billion in financing efforts to help people who are unemployed. It makes no sense at all to continue that process, an energy policy, that increases unemployment in my State.

Not only are we in trouble in that sense, but problems will arise. When businesses move to those particular areas, wherever those areas might be, we will find that the infrastructure is not large enough to meet the increased demand. Soon my colleagues from these areas will come back to the Federal Government and say "Now we have to have more water canals, and now we have to have more natural gas or we have to have more streets or roads," or something else.

It does not make any sense. Hospitals in my State have been built to accommodate a certain population as were the schools and the educational institutions. All of these things are in place. Why displace thousands of people because the Federal Government provides one region of the country with low-cost electricity attracting businesses from other areas of the country.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBOSTA. I will yield to the gentleman from California for a moment. I am running out of time and I want to yield time to my colleagues on this side.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I understand. Just one more point, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, I still am a bit confused by the position of the gentleman when he says it is fair not to raise the rate in Michigan by 60 percent, but it is fair to raise the cost in California by whatever percent. I just do not understand that the gentleman is being consistent.

Mr. ALBOSTA. I believe that the Boxer amendment would create a fair energy policy and let those utility companies bid on this power, and if it would generate another $3½ billion, put that back into the Federal Treasury to help reduce our deficits. I think that is very important that we concentrate on that and stop subsidizing cheap electricity paid for by my constituents for the benefit of California and other Western States.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBOSTA. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct some statements that have been made here.

Both the gentleman in the well and the gentlewoman from California said that those who paid for the dams should get the benefit of the dams and that it was the taxpayers of the United States generally who built dams in the Western part of the United States.

Let me tell the gentleman that that is not correct. The ones who end up paying for those dams are the users. There is a reimbursement to the Federal Government and, as a matter of fact, in the case of Hoover Dam, it has

been paid for already by the users, not by the general taxpayers.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, I am running out of time. I reclaim my time.

Let me say to the gentleman from New Mexico that I am on the Public Works Committee and I know how we use the cost-benefit ratios. I know how we build water projects. There is no question about it. The money does come from the taxpayers, my constituents in Michigan. This is one of the reasons, Michigan is 49 out of 50 States in terms of how much the State gets back compared to how much tax dollars are sent to Washington from Michigan. This has to stop and one of the best ways to start is by ending the subsidy for cheap public power. My State will no longer be sacrificed on the altar of economic development for the West. Enough is enough and I urge passage of the Boxer amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending Boxer amendment and all amendments thereto close at 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, under my reservation, I have been seeking the Chair's recognition for some time and I think there are others who have also been trying to get their 5 minutes.

I wonder if I might ask the chairman if he would defer that motion for another 10 or 15 minutes and see how the land lies. I think when a Member is not a member of the committee, it becomes very difficult to get a word in. So I wonder if you could hold up on your request.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENZEL. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I would be glad to accede to his request. I thought that there was a general feeling that a number of Members only wanted a minute or two to get on the record. I will agree with the gentleman's request and withhold.

I will send all the Members who are worried about getting to the airport over to him for comfort.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the chairman for his cooperation, and I will lend any of them my car who need special transportation. It is only 14 years old.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

□ 1420

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that both the amendments, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ALBOSTA) and the underlying amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER) are adopted.

This is a difficult issue for many of us who count ourselves as liberals. On the one hand, we have some important principles of truth and fairness and equity, and on the other hand we have the enormous respect and affection we feel for the gentleman from Arizona.

I would just say, Mr. Chairman, at this point to those who have found me insufficiently supportive of the principle of prayer in public places that I guess I am almost ready to address a prayer to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, who has been my leader on so many issues for so many years: Lead us not into temptation any longer on the question of water projects.

The principle that the gentlewoman from California is adopting is one which in most circumstances would not be controversial, that energy today, in 1984, not in 1934, ought to be priced at its cost. This is not meant in denigration of the great works that were done in the New Deal or in the immediate post-New Deal periods. This is no denigration of the important role that public power played as a yardstick. It is no denigration of the need to promote through collective activity Government sponsorship of development in places where it is difficult.

I welcome the latter day conversion of many of the more conservative Members of this House to what was once deemed a terribly radical set of policies. We all now agree that those played a very important role. But today conditions are different, and it is not a repudiation of the past to understand that things have changed. It is simply a recognition of change.

What we are saying is that today the kind of prodevelopment policies, the kind of regional subsidy that was embodied in this particular policy, is no longer relevant. That does not mean that it was originally erroneous. We are not here to lament the growth of California, albeit one or two of our old congressional districts out in California now—and maybe I might be considered almost an honorary California myself for these purposes.

But those things succeeded. The question today is, with an energy crisis, with an understanding of the scarcity of resources, and with an enormous budget deficit, should we ask that energy here be priced at the price the market will bear, which means that we will get a more efficient use of the energy if we do not subsidize it and we will get some reduction in the deficit?

I was glad to hear—not glad, but interested to hear that the Reagan administration is against this amendment. Once again we have—and I think the technical term for it is a "choke" on the part of the administration when it comes to putting into practice the principles they preach to the poor: The virtues of austerity, the virtues of the free market, the virtues of self-sufficiency, and the virtues of cutting the deficit. They are apparently to be very selectively applied because we are being told by this administration that they oppose an amendment which would apply free market principles and garner revenues to cut the deficit in this particularly apparently politically favored spot.

The elderly can pay more for medicare, young people can pay more to go to school and in some cases not be able to go to school, we cannot afford adequate funds to deal with hazardous waste, we cut back on social security cost of living, but we subsidize power for this particular group of people to the detriment of a rational energy policy and to the detriment of efforts to reduce the deficit.

The Grace Commission appears to be a Commission that will go down in history as an entity which received more praise and less support from this administration than anything else. It is going to rank with the virtue of chastity as one of those things about which much is said and little is done when it gets right home, because here we have a vote on one of the principles in the Grace Commission. and I am not a believer in everything the Grace Commission said, and maybe not in most of what they said—I have not read the whole thing yet—but here I think they are making sense. They are saying that we ought not to have, at the expense of the entire Treasury of the United States, a substantial subsidy to one particular group of people who benefit from this dam. Yet they have had it for 50 years.

It has never seemed to me that having provided for people a very significant benefit for 50 years, we are somehow now to be obligated to continue to provide it to them in the future. Those who, having once benefited from a policy, argue that because they once benefited, we have to continue to give it to them, seem to me to not have a great deal of logic on their side. I understand they would rather have it than not have it, but I do not understand why the rest of us feel that that subsidy should be made available.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think you can make money by selling this power today at today's rates. I think that there is no question about that. But could that same argument be carried to other types of powerplants that were built in the thirties

or forties which now provide the cheaper base of power that each of us has in our various jurisdictions?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

(On request of Mr. VENTO, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I mean that seriously, because there is a problem here. We are not really talking in this instance about the cost of building this particular project. It has been built. We are really talking about what we are going to do with the power in the future that is generated from it.

As someone who has worked on utility rate regulation at the State level and other places, I think all of us have to recognize that in each of our constituencies, we have a low-cost base of power. If we were to take that power today which is being sold in this instance at a very reasonable rate, about a cent a thousand kilowatts, and bring it to the marketplace at 5 or 6 cents, surely we could raise a lot more revenue.

The question is, of course, that I do not hear anyone on the floor offering it. I am certainly not offering it to my constituency and our power rate base on that basis. And they have benefited in not precisely the same way. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts and I agree about a lot of water projects, but, after all, we are really not talking about a water project in this instance.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I understand that, and I think an appropriate degree of regulation ought to come in.

The point that I would make here, though, is that this is different from all those other power projects, at least any of the ones that I am familiar with in my area. They were not built under the same circumstances. They were not built with the same kind of advantages and subsidies in terms of interest loans and tax-free interest, et cetera. So what you get is bad energy policy, and I do not know of any utility or any State utility regulatory body that would apply to its own State the principles that apply here.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has been very kind to me, and as he knows, he is one of my favorite legislators around here. I know that he would not mind if I try to clear up a little bit of the inconsistency here. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Does the gentleman agree that the deregulation of natural gas is a bad idea for consumers because it might drive the rates up?

Mr. FRANK. I believe that total deregulation would be a bad idea, yes.

Mr. UDALL. Well, it seems to me that you cannot have it both ways. You cannot say that jacking up the cost to consumers out in the Southwest for these big hydroelectric projects is a good thing and that holding down the price of natural gas is a bad thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRANK was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I will use this extra time just to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I think in the first place we are talking about a very different level of prices with the deregulation of natural gas. We are talking about a very different beneficiary, the Federal Treasury versus some private companies, and I think there is a certain advantage there.

I would just like to point out that we are talking on the one hand about gettig benefits to the Federal Treasury. The Reagan administration is apparently opposing, I am told, a proposal by the Appropriations Subcommittee which they talked about to put another $60 million in for the homeless, a subject the gentleman from Minnesota has done great work on. The amount of money we are talking about here annually would be greater than the amount for the homeless.

How do we begrudge that to people who are literally homeless but say instead that we can give many times that in availability to subsidize the particular power rates.

Let me say this to the gentleman. If he is saying that the ultimate goal is that it be completely unregulated, no, I do not think that is necessarily the case, and if the committee would like to bring in some legislation that says, well, maybe there is some median here, maybe there is some form of regulation with the Treasury benefiting, and we can take into account lifeline and other things, I think that would be perfectly reasonable. But I do not think it is analogous to natural gas when we are talking about the Treasury benefiting versus private companies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

The Chair would like to know if there are additional Members who would like to be heard on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ALBOSTA) to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Albosta amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I do this partly for technical reasons. I think the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER) is entitled to have her amendment presented in any way she wants, and I would defer to her if she wants to accept the Albosta amendment. But I think a couple of things ought to be said before we get to a vote on that issue.

Let me straighten out one thing, if I can. I have heard this said this afternoon at least 20 times: They talk about a subsidy. There is no subsidy involved. What is involved here is that the whole philosophy of Federal power production is that get cost recovery. We payback the cost of the dam plus interest we payback the cost of transmission lines, and we payback all the costs out of the power generation. That is the whole idea. The idea is, let us build a big dam and the revenues of that dam will build canals to get out of the water, they will build electric transmission lines, and they will give us recreation.

The multipurpose dams in the West and all over this country have been a great success. The Albosta an endment which has come in today written on the back of an envelope has never been to our committee. It upsets very complicated arrangements between seven Colorado River Basin States.

For example, in the Lower Colorado Basin project, legislation which authorizes the Central Arizona project provides that after you have paid off the necessary costs, the money goes into the Treasury and then into the Lower Colorado development fund to have salinity programs and to have augmentation of the river, in addition to paying off the cost of the project.

So I think that anybody who has got an irrigation project where payment is underway in any part of the country ought to know that the Albosta amendment does not just take the money back to the Treasury; it destroys complicated financial arrangements that have been made over a long period of time and have been counted on by a lot of people.

□ 1430

I fear, my friends, as I look around these last few months that I see a kind of regional polarization in America and the debate is taking on that cast here today, that here is a privileged few in the Sunbelt out in California, Arizona, and Nevada, who are getting a big ripoff from the Treasury and all of that.

Well, you pass this thing today, you have not just affected Arizona. Let me warn some of you of what is coming

up. Upstate New York has a public power system, Niagara and some other rivers up there. this Boxer amendment deals with that.

The Western Power Marketing Administration, which has California and Arizona, has a counterpart in Texas.

The whole Bonneville system, too—anybody here from the Northwest, you are crazy if you vote for the Boxer amendment, because if Hoover power ought to be sold at cost to the highest bidder, then Bonneville power ought to be sold at cost. If the city of Chicago can outbid you, if you are in the Missouri basin with all these great hydroelectic dams in the Missouri basin, somebody in the city of Detroit or Chicago may outbid the local folks.

The whole idea of these western projects, of TVA and Franklin Roosevelt, was to have a yardstick, to have some public power generated.

We have a preference clause which says that it is good for municipalities and local governments and rural electric co-ops who want to provide cooperative service to the customers to get a preference on public power, on power generated in public facilities; so you are going to make a big mistake if you pass Boxer and it is compounded by adding Albosta. You are going to make a big mistake. You are going to change a major national policy.

Our committee has never refused to have hearings. Introduce a bill that makes the Boxer amendment national policy for everbody, not just for the southwest. We will hold hearings on it. We will give the committee a chance to vote it out; but to do this in this forum today, this week, with no hearings and no understanding, I have not even seen the Albosta amendment to this moment, but I am told by those who have been privileged to have a look at it that it has devastating consequences that could upset arrangements in all the seven States and eventually all over the country.

So let us take a rational view. There are 11 million people who are going to benefit from this. They are not a privileged few, there are 11 million at least involved in this one amendment at this time.

I had an old Democrat who used to say about Ronald Reagan that he changed the slogan, "Power to the People," to read, "Power to the Following People."

Well, the people involved in this set of amendments here are all the American people and we are going to make a big mistake if we change in this drastic way an established public policy.

I would urge defeat for the Boxer amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to my friend.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. I would just like to thank the gentleman very much for agreeing to allow me to make the Albosta amendment part of my amendment. It would be helpful to us. I appreciate that, and to say that the New York Times really picked up the gentleman's theme of power to the people when they described the current bill pending, they called it "Power to Some of the People" and I think that is part of the problem.

Mr. UDALL. I regret to say that the New York Times is wrong.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Albosta amendment and in opposition to the Boxer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have stood on this floor and argued against water projects from time to time because I felt that they were an improper use of the fiscal resources of this Nation, but the issue that we have before us today is not the water projects. In other words, the Hoover Dam has been built. It is being utilized.

The issue today is whether or not we ought to take the power generated from the Hoover Dam, and I guess in a broader sense from a whole host of nationally funded and financed dams and projects that generate electric power.

I suppose we could carry this to the conclusion with respect to where we allowed depreciation, where indeed the National Government through various tax expenditures has benefited utilities in the construction of their power generating facilities, and therefore, suggest that really these facilities that are being used in a sense, although markedly different, I admit from the genesis of the Hoover Dam and for instance the REA and other projects that we have assisted from a national perspective, but really this power ought to be rated and sold at what are market rates today, then to sell them; but we are doing that with a select group today. We are not doing it across the line.

I do not hear anyone rising to support this amendment saying that we are going to take our low cost base of power and share that and put that up for bid on a bid basis for everyone else that needs power and the extra revenue generated from that then can go to reduce the deficit.

Well, it is a great idea. If we were doing it on a national basis, we might want to look at that thing. Most of us recognize that there are problems with regard to the existing revenue code and that obviously tax and revenue may very well be needed if we do not get the growth and we do not limit the spending in terms of our various programs, that we are going to need a significant increase in the injection of revenue.

But is this really the way to do it? Do we want to solve our deficit problems by increasing utility rates so that we can pay for our national debt?

That is really what the gentleman from Michigan is suggesting, that ought to be the source in terms of which we attempt to come to reconcile expenditures and spending programs and taxing programs by virtue of placing that particular responsibility on utilities and on consumers.

I guess I am troubled by that and by the nature of what has been happening here in the discussion.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I would be happy to yield to my good friend.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I want to express my concern that I do not come down to the floor with this amendment to attack any one particular area of the county or to aline myself against that particular area of the country.

I respect the gentleman from Arizona (MO UDALL) as much as I do any Member of this body and I understand where he is coming from; but I would say to the gentleman from Minnesota, would the gentleman be willing and would all the other people that support these projects wherever they may be where you are getting cheap power, would the gentleman be willing to help us in some way to reduce our power costs in terms of building nuclear plants? Would that be agreeable to the gentleman?

Maybe we can find a common ground where we can all agree somehow.

Mr. VENTO. Well, if I can reclaim my time, I think the gentleman raises a concern. I think we have to look for ways to try to bring down the costs of the construction of various types of power plants. In spite of the heavy subsidies that we have provided for nuclear power, to this date we still find the costs exorbitant. That is generally true across the line because of the tremendous new capital costs that are associated. I mean, interest rates have gone up.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBOSTA. The gentleman said subsidies for nuclear power, do I understand correctly?

Mr. VENTO. That is right. The assistance that is provided, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBOSTA. Where do we get any subsidies in building a nuclear power plant?

Mr. VENTO. Well, the National Government has absorbed considerable cost. There are a variety of resources, and I would be happy to share them with the gentleman, with regard to the inspections we provide, the li-

censing process; in fact, the gentleman from Minnesota has in various instances attempted to try to isolate those costs to pass them on indeed and to allocate them properly so that we get a true picture.

Indeed, the total cost of nuclear power today has almost made it prohibitive, I guess it is one of the reasons that we have not had new construction of nuclear powerplants, in spite of everything that this Congress and this national policy has led to; but I am just suggesting to my colleagues that they ought to take a look at what they are doing here with respect to this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BROWN of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, on the question of subsidies for nuclear power, the whole industry has been subsidized since its inception. There is probably $1 billion or more in this year's budget subsidizing research and development to improve the efficiency of nuclear powerplants, and the taxpayer is paying that bill completely.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I just did not want to get into a debate on that. I am just trying to point out that we have in various ways tried to, and I think we are going to have to continue to try to reduce the costs of new powerplants.

The question is what we do with the old ones. I think it is unfair, we know it is tighter or it is cheap, but it is unfair just to limit this to one group that we are going to take away their old plants, reduce costs, have a lower cost base, and at the same time everyone else is not similarly affected.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

□ 1440

I will cancel my request for your ophthalmologist.

I take a look at this bill, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of the budget and our current economic distress. I am not an expert in environmental work or developmental work, nor in energy nor power. But I have listened to the debate with great interest. I came here with a bias in favor of the Boxer amendment and that bias has merely been strengthened.

The arguments in favor of the current system that is against the Boxer amendment are, one, that we have always done it. I do not think we need to discuss that particular argument. The second one is that it is public power and in quotation marks, and we should somehow genuflect. Unfortunately, most of us do not have public power, and to those of us who do not, it seems ridiculous that a taxpayer subsidy should go to the lucky few that do.

The third argument is that it is not a subsidy. Generally, it is said that when it looks like a subsidy, has webbed feet like a subsidy, feathers like a subsidy, and quacks like a subsidy, it is likely to be a subsidy, and until somebody can show me something different, I am going to consider it a subsidy.

Another argument is that we will soak the consumers if we pass the Boxer amendment. In my judgment, we would unsoak the taxpayers by liberating a multibillion-dollar figure over a number of years from our deficit and save us all from the standpoint of high interest rates and inflation.

Another argument against it was that there might be a poor person somewhere who is taking advantage of this subsidized rate. There probably are, just as there are poor people in other high-cost energy districts of the country who are also paying rates that are too high.

Our job is not to preserve the status quo unless the status quo happens to be the best policy.

I think the gentlewoman from California has shown quite clearly that it is not.

I am very sorry that it was the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) who had to repeat the old Republican formula that there is no such thing as a free lunch. Unfortunately, there is. What he should have said was that there should not be such a thing as a free lunch.

For those who believe in a free market and believe that energy from whatever source ought to be freely priced in that market, it seems to me that they can do nothing else than to vote for the Boxer amendment.

It comes to me as a matter of some surprise that folks who around here have exposed that theory now believe that somehow it is invalid because the subsidies go to their district. I suppose that is normal and it should not be a matter of concern. A subsidy by any other name would still be a subsidy.

And if Members of this House happen to be on the gravy train or the Hoover Club or however they are recipients of public power benefits, I am sure that they will vote against this.

On the other hand, for those Members who believe that it is important to reduce the deficit, that it is important when we are distributing subsides around the United States that they be faced head-on in the appropriations process and that the benefits go to the most deserving, I think they will want to vote for the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER).

I believe that often we are consumed with our regional urges, our baser instincts to take care of our constituents to the misfortune or to the lower estate of other national taxpayers. Normally, the majority in this body is able to overcome those baser instincts and certainly none of us is without stain; none of us is perfect in this area. We want to do the best we can for our own constituents and our own taxpayers.

However, in my judgment, this is one time when we ought to think of the larger issue. Can we sustain in our own minds that this subsidy is not a subsidy, that these recipients are especially deserving, more so than the other 200 million Americans who are not getting them?

In my judgment, there has been no showing.

It is time to change the policy and I urge this body to accept the Boxer amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I appreciate the logic of his remarks. I hope that his stand is not based upon the fact that he does not have any subsidized power projects in his district, which he probably does not.

But I would like to point out to the gentleman that he does have extensive rural electrification facilities in his district. He probably has wheat or corn or other farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRENZEL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. The principle the gentleman is supporting on the Hoover Dam could be applied precisely to rural electrification. We could market that power going to your farmers in the same fashion and their rates would go up. I trust the gentleman will support that when the measure comes before the House.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and would repeat I do not want to take anything away from anybody. But I am terribly concerned about our deficit, about our willingness to give things without thought of cost to various beneficiaries because they happen to be our friends.

I think it is time, at least in one instance, to stand up and say, let us take this money in for the benefit of all of the taxpayers of the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks that I normally have made in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from California (Mrs. BOXER). But time does not necessarily permit that and most of these arguments have already been made.

But I would much prefer to use the balance of my time to focus in upon the major argument that has been established on this floor in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from California, and that argument has primarily been a procedural argument. This is an argument that was raised by a number of our colleagues, including the distinguished chairman of the committee. That is that this amendment affects policy in a very profound and dramatic way and that it should not be done on the floor of Congress and, indeed, the chairman of the subcommittee indicated a willingness to hold hearings and allow the subcommittee to work its will on a major piece of national policy.

But let us look further. This piece of legislation will approve contracts for 30 years into the future, the year 2014. Many of us, unfortunately, will probably not even be alive and well in the year 2014. Thirty years into the future is an enormous amount of time to make a decision.

So if there is significant good will with respect to the offer of allowing debate to go forward on this policy, then I would ask the Members of the subcommittee in general on both sides of the aisle, and the chairman of the subcommittee in specific: Would you not accept an amendment that would allow these contracts to go forward, not for 30 years precluding an opportunity for any significant debate on these matters, but in good faith and as an expression of good will accept an amendment that would allow these contracts to go forward for only 1 year? And during the course of that 1 year, you would then hold hearings and work your will on a piece of national policy.

If you really do not want to challenge the gentlewoman's amendment except on procedural grounds, then it would seem to me in the spirit of fairness, in the spirit of high integrity, that you would accept an amendment that would say the provisions of this bill would only apply for 12 months.

If the gentlewoman's amendment did not prevail in attempting to affect national policy in a dramatic way, then bring a piece of legislation to extend it for the additional 29 years. A number of my colleagues who said procedure is the issue here, if you are talking about procedure and efficacy and ethics, then it would seem to me that we would not be talking about a piece of legislation into the year 2014. If you would agree that there ought to be some honest way to significantly debate these matters, then I would ask the Chair would he be willing, and the other gentleman who also made a procedural argument, as to whether they would agree to an amendment reducing the impact of this legislation to 12 months as opposed to 30 years.

It would seem to me that would be in the spirit of fairness and openness.

Mr. UDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1450

Mr. UDALL. I wish the suggestion had been made earlier. There might have been some ability on our part to accede.

I wish the gentleman made the suggestion earlier, we might have worked something out. I doubt it, however. Long negotiations, years of negotiations involving your State, my State, the key water people in the Governor's office and everybody, have resulted 3 or 4 years ago in a bunch of lawsuits; Nevada sued Arizona and California; we sued you, you were going to sue back against us. Some delicate negotiations carried out among the three States and it is all agreed to.

I cannot upset contracts, major negotiations with a suggestion of this kind. I had promised, and I reiterate to the gentleman, we will try to get to this. If someone will introduce a bill along the lines of the Boxer amendment, hearings will be held, the committee will have a chance to vote. But to put a 12 months' stay on this thing would confuse and perhaps could badly damage the complicated arrangement.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I may ask just for clarification: If, for example, there were hearings, the subcommittee and the full committee decided in their wisdom to act favorably.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. I would not prolong this, but I want to get this one clarification. And if the gentlewoman's concept prevailed, the gentleman saying that that would have no effect on the contracts that are presently being entered into at this moment?

Mr. UDALL. If the Boxer amendment is passed, in my judgment it will create chaos and utter confusion in California and Arizona, but in the whole country because there are millions of Americans who rely on public power. We are saying, unlike private utilities, we are going to have a new rule and we are going to get all the traffic can bear.

PG&E does not operate on that principle. The Government would be required to operate on getting all the traffic would bear for all of the Federal power.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate the gentleman's response. But I am assuming your response is to the amendment offered on the floor.

The question I am raising is if the gentlewoman were to prevail in a major policy change, if I heard the gentleman's earlier response, is he suggesting that even in that context that would preclude any of the contracts that are presently being inked. In other words, if she came to the committee and won, is he really saying that the practical effect would be that it would have no impact on the contracts being signed now for 30 years?

Mr. UDALL. No; favorable action on the Albosta amendment would destroy the Lower Colorado River Basin fund for one thing, and would destroy the arrangements that have made between Arizona, California, and Nevada.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to my colleagues from Illinois.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the time has come for the beneficiaries of the Federal water and power programs to pay their way. No longer can the Nation afford to subsidize one small group of people at the expense of fiscal responsibility for a goal of dubious value.

The original intent of the legislation before us, like most reclamation legislation in the Western States, was to promote growth. This was certainly a valid goal 50 years ago when this legislation's 50-year contracts were signed into law. But look around—how many more people can California, Nevada, or Arizona accommodate? How much more in benefits can this Government afford for the goal of Western population growth? This legislation was written as if the past 50 years never happened.

In the days when the West was being settled, it may have made sense for such a program to exist. But this is the 1980's—the days of $200 billion deficits—the days of record high unemployment and decaying infrastructure in the Northeast and Midwest.

Even though there is no direct cash coming from the taxpayers, does not selling power at one-tenth the market price constitute a subsidy?

If in the next 10 years of the contracts for this power we could receive $3.5 billion more by charging market rates rather than charging rates based on the cost of production, so be it. This Nation cannot afford to continue such unsound programs, where the

few are subsidized at the expense of the many.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to include an excellent editorial on the Hoover Dam which appeared in the New York Times on May 2, and I recommend it to our colleagues.

I urge my colleagues to support the Boxer amendment.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, May 2, 1984]

POWER TO SOME OF THE PEOPLE

Who owns the Hoover Dam, and the electricity it produces?

In theory, the answer is the American people who built the great dam on the Colorado River a half-century ago. In practice, however, the answer is only some of the people, a few million lucky residents of Arizona, California and Nevada who are permitted to buy the power for a fraction of its value.

Unless the House has the courage this week to put national interests ahead of regional, the give-away will continue for 30 more years.

When Boulder Dam (later renamed to honor Herbert Hoover) was completed in 1937, the Federal Government signed a long-term contract to sell the hydroelectricity for prices near cost to public and private power authorities in the region. That contract doesn't expire until 1987. But Senator Laxalt of Nevada and Representative Morris Udall of Arizona, the chairman of the House Interior Committee, saw the Presidential election year as an ideal time to ram through a 30-year renewal.

"If there's one kind of energy we need," argues Mr. Udall in support of his bill, "it's hydroelectric power." He is right, of course, that clean, infinitely renewable hydropower is an ideal energy source. But since no one suggests abandoning Hoover Dam, that's hardly relevant. The issue is who gets the power, and at what price.

According to the Environmental Defense Fund, Hoover customers are currently charged a half-cent a kilowatt hour, roughly one-tenth the price of electricity from new coal-fired plants in the region. Under the proposed concessionary renewal terms, the Federal Government would lose an estimated $6 billion in revenues over the next decade.

That means $6 billion more in Federal deficits. Worse, it means that users of Hoover power will have little or no incentive to conserve tens of billions of kilowatts of scarce electricity.

These arguments were rejected by an Administration currying favor with Western voters. And they had no effect on the Senate, which passed the renewal bill last August by voice vote. That leaves it to the House to represent the interests of the rest of the nation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, with the few remaining seconds I would simply say there is one additional area of concern that we have. For example, before one of the distinguished committees of this House, a bill on the Tuolumme River, as to whether or not it will be a wild and scenic river is now being acted upon. This legislation puts that in great jeopardy in extraordinary danger. This is one of the great wonders of this country. Certainly one of the great wonders of the State of California.

To act on this legislation, it seems to me, would have dramatic and negative impact on our ability to preserve that river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. ALBOSTA and by unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ALBOSTA).

Mr. ALBOSTA. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is important to understand that the Albosta amendment simply says that the money that is not needed for the maintenance, operation, and whatever else is required there at that particular unit of Hoover Dam, to keep it in proper repair, would go to the U.S. Treasury. It does nothing else than that. It is that simple; it simply says those funds in excess of all maintenance costs from the contractual agreements reached from the Boxer amendment would then go to the U.S. Treasury.

That would be about $3.5 million and that would reduce the deficits hopefully by about $3.5 million.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Representative BOXER for several reasons: First, because it fairly compensates the taxpayers of America; second, because it treats all potential customers of power from Hoover Dam equally, and third, because it will assure that the power generated at Hoover Dam is not wasted by being priced at less than one-tenth its market value.

More particularly, I also support the amendment because if it is not passed, the result would be great potential harm to San Francisco Bay, the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta, and California's north coast rivers, which are now federally designated wild and scenic rivers. It simply is unfair to ask taxpayers in my district to subsidize the price that the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California pays for power to pump its water so that the Metropolitan Water District can take away from northern California water that is needed in my region for municipal, industrial, agricultural, recreational, and esthetic uses.

H.R. 4275, as written, does require the Metropolitan Water District to use its subsidized Hoover power to pump Colorado River water rather than northern California water when water is available from the Colorado, but that too will result in the waste of water in Metropolitan Water District's service area.

Members of the House, only if the power from Hoover is auctioned will the resources Hoover produces be used in a proper and efficient manner.

I thank the gentleman. I thank the committee for their indulgence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments relating thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Could I ask the Chair to recognize Mr. BERMAN, who has a time problem, first on the limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members standing at the time of the unanimous-consent request will be recognized for 30 seconds each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment. It is important that we recognize that it is the consumer who has the biggest stake in today's debate.

Should the benefits of public projects be auctioned off to the highest bidder? The answer is "yes" only if you want to stick electricity customers with $4.5 billion rate hike over the next 10 years. If southern California's share of electric power from Hoover Dam is put out to bid, power and water costs will be inflated by as much as $400 million a year.

The Federal Government is not in the power business to make a profit—but to stimulate private development of energy resources. The purpose of the Federal power program has never been to maximize revenue but to sell power from public projects at the lowest possible rates that will recover the Government's investment and pay all operating expenses. The projects should pay their own way—and Hoover does.

Proponents of this amendment contend that the Government should charge whatever the buyer will pay in order to dampen electric demand. In the past decade, the cost of electricity has risen nearly 57 percent. Consumers do not need skyrocketing prices to conserve—they have already had that message and they are conserving. Energy growth has slowed from 7 percent annually to approximately 1.2 percent.

There is no doubt that California, Arizona, and Nevada have particularly benefited from Hoover Dam. But it is not without a price. Without commitments from these States to purchase the power Hoover Dam produces, the project would never have been built. Furthermore, they have operated the facility since its construction.

We should adopt today a power-allocation plan that will allow the original

contractors to substantially retain their Hoover supplies while making additional power available to other utility companies. This is what H.R. 4275 does.

What we do not want to do is embark on a course that will not only break the backs of western consumers but will open the gates to market pricing nationwide. The end result will be drastically inflated electricity costs for consumers of every region.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject market pricing and vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PATTERSON).

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to say in 30 seconds what one needs at least 5 minutes for. But let me say I support the Chairman, Mo UDALL, this is an important bill; the Boxer amendment defeats the bill. Those who oppose the bill support the Boxer amendment. It makes consumers pay more; it will apply to 50 States.

The bill itself applies to only three. There is no Government subsidy. Let us remember our consumers, forget your regional differences; let us vote against the Boxer amendment and for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. MCCAIN. We are not talking about Arizona here or California and Nevada; we are talking about TVA, Bonneville Power, Niagara, and every other public power source in this Nation. We are talking about an increase in utility rates of dramatic fashion to the consumers of these States and all others throughout the Nation.

I urge strongly the rejection of the Boxer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY).

Mr. HUCKABY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of the Boxer amendment. I think what we are talking about here, as the chairman from Arizona has pointed out, is a major change in policy, a change that is long overdue. It is time that all of the American taxpayers had the opportunity to quit subsidizing the privileged few who happen to live in an area where they receive public power. This bill only applies to the Hoover Dam. It sets a good precedent.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LUJAN yielded his time to Mr. CHENEY).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVINE).

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, as difficult as it is for me to oppose any amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER), I do rise in opposition to her amendment.

I include in the RECORD at this point a very good article by Carl Boronkay from yesterday's Los Angeles Times:

HOOVER DAM BENEFITS COULD CRUMBLE FOR SOUTHLAND

(By Carl Boronkay)

California consumers have an enormous stake in the answer to a question being considered in Congress this week: Should the benefits of public projects be auctioned off to the highest bidder?

At this issue is allocation of the electric power that will be generated by Hoover Dam for the next 30 years. If Southern California's share of that power is put out to bid, power and water costs here will be inflated by as much as $400 million a year, and the concept that the benefits of public projects should be distributed in a not-for-profit manner will be undermined.

For a half-century Hoover Dam has been part of the Southwest's lifeblood. That mass of concrete poured across the Colorado River near Boulder City, Nev., tamed the river's floods, opening vast tracts of downstream land to productive use. Water stored behind the dam irrigates millions of acres of farmland and quenches thirsts in California, Arizona and Nevada. Billions of kilowatt-hours of electricity produced by Hoover's hydroelectric turbines meet the needs of business and industry and millions of urban dwellers.

Southern California has particularly benefited from Hoover. But these benefits didn't come without a price. When the dam was proposed at the depths of the Great Depression, the federal government needed assurances that the costs of construction would be repaid. Utilities in Southern California—including the Metropolitan Water District, which uses electricity from the dam to pump water into the Southland—agreed to purchase two-thirds of the power produced at Hoover. The remaining one-third was assigned to utilities in Arizona and Nevada.

These power purchases, pledged in renewable 50-year contracts, have been paying for the dam down through the years. In 1987 these payment obligations will have been substantially satisfied. The utilities that underwrote the project then are now seeking to renew for 30 years their rights to purchase Hoover's power. This is power that by today's standards is considered inexpensive. The savings are realized by utilities serving many millions of people: In Southern California alone more than 13 million water and electricity customers enjoy lower bills because of the commitment made 50 years ago by the utilities.

A Berkeley-based group is proposing a plan that would inflict an economic injustice on the people of Southern California and possibly establish a precedent of private-public competition. The Environmental Defense Fund is suggesting that Hoover's inexpensive hydroelectric power should be priced at the same level as power produced at considerably more expensive coal or fossil-fuel plants, causing water and power rates to increase drastically. The EDF would pinch the consumer in an attempt to force further energy conservation.

Arbitrarily raising the price of Hoover's power would be inflationary. It would drive up electricity and water bills and raise prices of goods and services produced in Hoover's three-state distribution area. Even the EDF acknowledges that Hoover's customers would pay over a 10-year period $3.5 billion in additional costs if the price of the dam's electrical output were artificially increased. Most of these added costs would be borne by the Greater Los Angeles area. It is not likely that Southern Californians are ready to accept these economic hardships being proposed by a handful of self-appointed guardians of the public purse. Nor is it likely that government free enterprise, once established, would stop at Hoover. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of government projects that could, if Hoover power is free-marketed, be free-marketed themselves.

Congress should enact a power-allocation plan that will allow the original contractors to substantially retain their Hoover supplies while making some additional power available to other utility companies. Such a plan is now before Congress.

Hoover Dam was financed by the Southwest and is part of this area's utility infrastructure. Its benefits should remain here—helping the people served by the utilities that made it all possible 50 years ago.

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN).

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Boxer amendment. It is going to cost the consumers too much.

Mr. Chairman, there are many aspects of the amendment that might be addressed, but I should like to touch on only two. Both of them shall make it clear that this amendment should be defeated.

We have developed in this country a diverse network of entities supplying electrical energy. Some are owned by shareholder-owned companies. Some are owned by agencies created by the U.S. Government. Others are owned by State and local agencies.

Philosophical arguments may rage over whether the municipal systems or the investor-owned systems better serve the public interest. What is important for purposes of considering this amendment, however, is that uniformly all the power systems are required to assess their rates on the cost of service. The regulatory bodies that set the rates for the investor-owned utilities determine what it costs the utilities to deliver the service and then allow an additional increment for rate of return. In no event is the utility allowed to charge whatever the traffic will bear, which is what the proposed amendment would do.

There is a popular economic fiction that in some way, costs to a provider of goods of services can be increased—whether in the form of taxes or whatever—without the costs being passed on to the purchasers of the goods or services. It simply cannot be done. And in the case of the amendment now under consideration, the increased costs will be passed on to the users of the service—in other words, the home owners who need electricity to run their television sets, their air conditioners, and all their other appliances that are so much a part of their lives.

The customers are captives of the suppliers in this situation and have no other place to turn for their electricity; now is there any other commodity that they can substitute for electrical energy. If the price of beef gets too high, the homeowner can substitute chicken or fish, but if the price of electricity gets too high, the homeowner cannot run his television set on natural gas or sawdust.

This brings me to the second point I should like to make: The absence of a market in the accepted sense of the word. For most commodities and services, a market exists. The buyer of the service has many suppliers from which to choose, and competition will keep prices at the optimum level. Enough will be produced to meet the demand at a profitable level if the demand is strong enough. Furthermore, the consumers have paid for the facilities at Hoover—the consumers have paid through electric rates.

In the case of utilities, however, there is no market in that sense. We do not have competing local telephone companies with duplicate sets of poles all over town. We do not have competing cable television companies. We do not have competing natural gas companies servicing the same area; nor do we have competing local electric service. It has been determined that the public interest is best served by institutions that are granted monoply rights to serve a given area; and in return for this right the rates they charge for the service are regulated to the cost of service plus an additional amount for return on investment, in the case of the investor-owned companies.

This amendment now before us will result in increases in the cost of power to some areas served by municipal systems by as much as 440 percent. Privately owned utilities will also be hit with staggering increases. And who will pay the increased costs? It is the homeowners that will pay and pay and pay.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY).

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Chairman, the Members who support the amendment do so out of a sense of pain of their constituents. But I say to the Members this: You cannot address somebody's pain by inflicting pain on anybody else any more than you can make somebody rich by making somebody else poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. VUCANOVICH).

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Boxer amendment.

(By unanimous request, Mrs. VUCANOVICH yielded her time to Mr. CHENEY).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARPER).

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the respect and affection I have for the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona, I rise in strong support of the amendment by the gentlelady from California. I also stand in support of reasonable development of our hydroelectric resource in this country—a clean, renewable energy supply whose importance rises with every pulse of unrest in the Middle East.

Our need for this power, however, does not mean that we should continue to practically give it away to privileged users. The sale of Hoover Dam power by the Federal Government for one-tenth the cost of electricity provided by other sources is an aberration—indeed some would call it an abomination—in a free market society facing $200 billion to $300 billion deficits.

If the proposed giveaway continues for 30 more years, the Federal Government could in the first decade alone, lose over $3.5 billion. That is no small potatoes.

This amendment also addresses the equity question head on. The auctioning of this energy will provide all utilities with an opportunity to share in the allocation of power from Hoover Dam.

Furthermore, this amendment would provide the natural incentive for energy conservation—a higher, unsubsidized price.

I applaud this commendable proposal, and urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Boxer amendment.

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from California to reform the manner in which power at the Hoover Dam is marketed.

Mr. Chairman, under current law, power produced at Federal projects is sold at rates set to recover only project costs. Municipalities and irrigation districts are given preference in allocation of the power.

The policy of only recovering project costs—and in the case of Hoover Dam, of selling power at less than one-tenth of its market value—can only be regarded as a special interest plum for certain select users in the area. The days when cheap power was essential to the development of the West are long gone. By allowing local authorities to repay project costs over several decades at artificially low interest rates, the Government is encouraging overconsumption of energy—and at a subsidized rate.

The amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from California would auction off this power to the highest bidder. It would break the stranglehold over this cheap power that has been held by a few select interests over the years. Realistic, market pricing would provide the proper market signals so that people would use energy only in an amount that is needed. And perhaps best of all, as we continue to seek ways of reducing the deficit, this amendment would result in an additional $3.5 billion flowing into the Treasury over the first 10 years of the new contract.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is supported by a diverse group of taxpayer, environmental, and energy conservation groups as an effort to reform and rationalize our hydroelectric power sales policy. It has been endorsed by a diverse group of newspapers, including the New York Times, the San Diego Union, and the Sacramento Bee.

I am pleased to support this amendment, and urge my colleagues to do the same.●

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG and Mr. COATS yielded their time to Mr. CHENEY).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SWIFT yielded his time to Mr. UDALL).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. CHENEY).

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the ranking Republican on the Water and Power Subcommittee in opposition to the Boxer amendment.

I think the gentlewoman's amendment is well intentioned, but if she really wants to pursue this line of argument, perhaps what she ought to suggest is that we sell off these kinds of assets such as the Hoover Dam and the Bonneville Power Administration, and the TVA to the highest bidder. There is no reason to keep the public interest in or the Federal Government involved at all in operating that.

Of course, the last time anybody suggested that it was the distinguished Presidential candidate of my own party, Senator GOLDWATER, in 1964.

I think it is a singularly bad idea at this point. I think the gentleman from Arizona stated the case very well, you will not save any money by adopting that amendment.

The bill does not involve a subsidy. It does involve the reallocation of power that was paid for in a project that was developed by the people of the Southwest.

My State does not benefit directly from this project, but I rise in strong opposition to the Boxer amendment and would urge my colleagues to support the bill and the position of the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I suspect the vote will come first on Albosta. And as I said earlier, I do not care one way or the other. If the gentlewoman wants the amendment—she says she does—I think it ought to be passed by voice vote and I would have no objection.

This is not an environmental bill, it is a consumer bill, if it is anything. I will put all of these in the record at the appropriate time.

The Consumer Federation of America says it would be outrageous and unconscionable to go to a system for the Federal of all the traffic will bear when the investor owned utilities do not do that. All they ask is for cost recovery.

The National League of Cities, a strong letter in support of the public power laws and against the Boxer amendment and in favor of the bill.

The National Rural Electric Co-op people think this is a very bad idea, the Boxer amendment, and say so at some length in their letter.

The American Public Power Association believes this is one of the most important issues and I think they would agree with me that this would destroy the whole idea of public power as a yardstick and would destroy the perference clause that has served us so well.

I urge defeat of the Boxer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ALBOSTA) to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BOXER), as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 214, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

AYES—176

Ackerman	Boehlert	Conable
Albosta	Boland	Conte
Alexander	Borski	Conyers
Andrews (TX)	Boucher	Corcoran
Archer	Boxer	Coughlin
Aspin	Broyhill	Courter
Barnes	Burton (CA)	Coyne
Bartlett	Burton (IN)	Crane, Daniel
Bateman	Byron	D'Amours
Bates	Carney	Darden
Bedell	Carper	Dellums
Bennett	Carr	DeWine
Bethune	Chappell	Downey
Bilirakis	Coats	Durbin
Bliley	Collins	Dwyer
Early	Kleczka	Roukema
Eckart	Kostmayer	Schneider
Edgar	Leach	Schroeder
Edwards (CA)	Lent	Schulze
Erlenborn	Lipinski	Schumer
Evans (IA)	Long (MD)	Seiberling
Evans (IL)	MacKay	Sensenbrenner
Feighan	Markey	Shannon
Ferraro	Martin (IL)	Sharp
Fields	Martin (NC)	Shaw
Fish	Mavroules	Siljander
Florio	McCollum	Simon
Foglietta	McDade	Sisisky
Frank	McEwen	Slattery
Franklin	McGrath	Smith (FL)
Frenzel	McKernan	Smith (NJ)
Gephardt	Mica	Snowe
Gibbons	Mikulski	Snyder
Gilman	Miller (CA)	Solarz
Goodling	Miller (OH)	Solomon
Gradison	Minish	Spratt
Green	Mitchell	Staggers
Gregg	Moakley	Stark
Guarini	Molinari	Stenholm
Gunderson	Moody	Studds
Hamilton	Moore	Tallon
Hayes	Morrison (CT)	Tauke
Hertel	Mrazek	Tauzin
Hiler	Nelson	Torricelli
Hillis	O'Brien	Towns
Horton	Owens	Vander Jagt
Hoyer	Parris	Walgren
Huckaby	Pease	Walker
Hughes	Petri	Weaver
Hutto	Porter	Weber
Hyde	Pursell	Weiss
Jacobs	Regula	Williams (OH)
Jeffords	Ridge	Wise
Johnson	Rinaldo	Wolf
Kaptur	Ritter	Wolpe
Kastenmeier	Rodino	Wylie
Kennelly	Roemer	Yates
Kildee	Rostenkowski	Yatron
Kindness	Roth	

NOES—214

Akaka	Fascell	Livingston
Anderson	Fazio	Lloyd
Annunzio	Fiedler	Loeffler
Applegate	Flippo	Long (LA)
AuCoin	Foley	Lott
Badham	Ford (MI)	Lowery (CA)
Barnard	Ford (TN)	Lowry (WA)
Beilenson	Fowler	Lujan
Bereuter	Garcia	Lundine
Berman	Gaydos	Lungren
Bevill	Gejdenson	Mack
Boggs	Gekas	Madigan
Bonior	Gingrich	Marlenee
Bonker	Glickman	Marriott
Bosco	Gonzalez	Martin (NY)
Britt	Gore	Martinez
Broomfield	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Brown (CA)	Hall, Ralph	Mazzoli
Brown (CO)	Hall, Sam	McCain
Campbell	Hansen (UT)	McCandless
Chandler	Harkin	McCloskey
Chappie	Hatcher	McCurdy
Cheney	Hawkins	McNulty
Clarke	Hefner	Michel
Clinger	Heftel	Mineta
Coelho	Hightower	Mollohan
Coleman (MO)	Holt	Montgomery
Coleman (TX)	Hopkins	Moorhead
Cooper	Howard	Morrison (WA)
Craig	Hubbard	Murphy
Daniel	Hunter	Murtha
Dannemeyer	Ireland	Myers
Daschle	Jenkins	Natcher
Daub	Jones (OK)	Neal
Davis	Kasich	Nichols
Dickinson	Kemp	Nielson
Dicks	Kolter	Nowak
Dixon	Kramer	Oakar
Donnelly	LaFalce	Oberstar
Dorgan	Lagomarsino	Obey
Dowdy	Lantos	Olin
Dreier	Latta	Ortiz
Duncan	Leath	Ottinger
Dymally	Lehman (CA)	Packard
Dyson	Lehman (FL)	Panetta
Edwards (AL)	Levin	Pashayan
Emerson	Levine	Patman
English	Levitas	Patterson
Erdreich	Lewis (CA)	Penny
Perkins	Shumway	Vandergriff
Pickle	Shuster	Vento
Price	Sikorski	Volkmer
Pritchard	Skeen	Vucanovich
Quillen	Skelton	Watkins
Rahall	Smith (IA)	Waxman
Rangel	Smith (NE)	Wheat
Ratchford	Smith, Denny	Whitehurst
Ray	Smith, Robert	Whitley
Reid	Spence	Whittaker
Richardson	St Germain	Whitten
Roberts	Stangeland	Williams (MT)
Robinson	Stokes	Winn
Roe	Stratton	Wirth
Rose	Stump	Wortley
Rowland	Sundquist	Wright
Roybal	Swift	Wyden
Rudd	Synar	Young (AK)
Sabo	Taylor	Young (FL)
Sawyer	Thomas (CA)	Young (MO)
Schaefer	Thomas (GA)	Zschau
Scheuer	Torres	
Shelby	Udall	

NOT VOTING—43

Addabbo	Frost	Lewis (FL)
Andrews (NC)	Fuqua	Luken
Anthony	Gramm	McHugh
Biaggi	Gray	McKinney
Boner	Hall (IN)	Oxley
Breaux	Hammerschmidt	Paul
Brooks	Hance	Pepper
Bryant	Hansen (ID)	Rogers
Clay	Harrison	Russo
Crane, Philip	Hartnett	Savage
Crockett	Jones (NC)	Traxler
de la Garza	Jones (TN)	Valentine
Derrick	Kazen	Wilson
Dingell	Kogovsek	
Edwards (OK)	Leland	

□ 1520

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Breaux for, with Mr. Leland against.

Messrs. DASCHLE, SAWYER, GLICKMAN, BARNARD, and ERDREICH changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SILJANDER, BILIRAKIS, HERTEL of Michigan, and Mrs. COLLINS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYDEN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYDEN: Page 27, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to Federal reclamation law (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) and in accordance with the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2697) is authorized to design, construct, operate, and maintain fish passage facilities within the Yakima River Basin, and to accept funds from any entity, public or private, to design, construct, operate, and maintain such facilities.

Mr. WYDEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Interior acting pursuant to Federal reclamation law and in accordance with the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act to design, construct, operate, and maintain fish passage facilities within the Yakima River basin, and to accept funds from any entity, public or private, to design, construct, operate, and maintain such facilities.

This amendment will clarify the congressional purposes in section 4(h) of the Pacific Northwest Power Act and involves no expenditures of taxpayer funds.

The 1980 Northwest Power Act, recognizing the national economic and social importance of fish and wildlife in the Pacific Northwest, directs the development of a fish and wildlife program for the Columbia River basin and its tributaries. The program, adopted by the Northwest Power Council, in November of 1982, prescribes fish and wildlife measures to be implemented by appropriate Federal agencies throughout the Columbia River basin.

The Bureau of Reclamation is a key Federal player in the implementation of the council's fish and wildlife program. To carry out the program in a sound, business-like manner, cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation is essential as the program contains measures prescribing fish and wildlife improvements at Bureau of Reclamation owned and operated facilities. These improvements will be funded by the citizens of the Northwest through the Bonneville Power Administration. However, the Bureau believes it needs the authority to accept transfers of funds from the Bonneville Power Administration and authorities to carry out the Bureau's protection, mitigation, and enhancement responsibilities, at projects where it currently lacks a fish and wildlife authorization.

This amendment removes any such impediments and is vitally important to the salmon and steelhead of the Columbia River basin, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation as a whole. It provides the necessary authority to the Bureau of Reclamation so it may expeditiously fulfill the mandates of the Pacific Northwest Power Act.

Let me reiterate that this amendment will not increase the burden to the national taxpayer. The Columbia basin fish and wildlife program is a regionally funded program. The Northwest Power Act directs the Bonneville Power Administration to use its fund and authorities to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife to the extent affected by any hydroelectric project of the Columbia River and its tributaries in a manner consistent with the fish and wildlife program.

Finally, I wish to note that no additional authority is required for Bonneville to transfer funds to the Bureau of Reclamation. The Northwest Power Act authorizes the Bonneville Power Administration to use its authorities to transfer funds, as necessary, to carry out protection, mitigation, and enhancement activities for fish and wildlife in the Columbia River basin.

Bonneville obtains congressional approval to fund major fish protection, mitigation, and enhancement projects through appropriations acts. That is how Congress intended such approval would be obtained, thus no authorizing legislation is necessary for Bonneville to carry out their responsibility to fund and otherwise implement the fish and wildlife program under the Northwest Power Act.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this point a fuller explanation of Congress' intent that the act of Congress that BPA is required to obtain, pursuant to 4(h)(10)(B) of the Northwest Power Act, is an appropriations act.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL PURSUANT TO § 4(h)(10)(B) OF THE NORTHWEST POWER ACT

The Northwest Power Act requires Bonneville to use the BPA fund and other authorities available to the Administrator to implement to Fish and Wildlife Program. In certain circumstances, BPA is additionally required to abide by the processes for funding major transmission facilities established in the Transmission Act. Section 4(h)(10)(B) of the Northwest Power Act provides:

SEC. 4(h)(10)(B). The Administrator may make expenditures from such fund which shall be included in the annual or supplementary budgets submitted to the Congress pursuant to the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act. Any amounts included in such budget for the construction of capital facilities with an estimated life of greater than 15 years and an estimated cost of at least $1,000,000 *shall be funded in the same manner and in accordance with the same procedures as major transmission facilities under the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act.* 16 U.S.C. § 8396(h)(10)(B).

Section 4 of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act provides:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, acting by and through the Administrator, shall operate and maintain the Federal transmission system within the Pacific Northwest and shall construct improvements, betterments, and additions to and replacements of such system within the Pacific Northwest as he determines are appropriate and required to:

(a) Integrate and transmit the electric power from existing or additional Federal or non-Federal generating units;

(b) provide service to the Administrator's customers;

(c) provide interregional transmission facilities; or

(d) maintain the electrical stability and electrical reliability of the Federal system: *Provided, however,* That the Administrator shall not construct any transmission facilities outside the Pacific Northwest, excepting customer service facilities within any contiguous areas, not in excess of seventy-five airline miles from said region, which are a part of the service area of a distribution cooperative which has (i) no generating facilities, and (ii) a distribution system from which it serves both within and without said region, *nor shall he commence construction of any major transmission facility within the Pacific Northwest, unless the expenditure of the funds for the initiation of such construction is specifically approved by Act of Congress.* 16 U.S.C. § 8386.

Congress envisioned that the "Act of Congress" necessary to approve commencement of major transmission facility construction would be obtained in an Appropriation Act.

"The requirement for approval by Congress of initial expenditures preserves Congressional control over major investment decisions which has historically been exercised through the appropriations process. The Committee understands that the annual budget of Bonneville Power Administration will hereafter be submitted to Congress as provided by the Government Corporations Control Act. Except for approval of major new facility construction no affirmative action by Congress is required. However, Congressional approval of such major new starts will be required to be included in the Appropriation Act. Expenditures for construction in subsequent years will not require Congressional approval."

H.R. Rep. No. 93-1375, 93rd Cong. 2nd Sess., *reprinted in* 1974 U.S. Code Cong. and Ad. News 5810, 5813.

Indeed, BPA has typically obtained such approvals through the appropriations process. For instance, in 1981 Congress approved construction of the Buckley-Summer Lake transmission line through an appropriation act, 94 Stat. 1334.

The phrase "Act of Congress" includes both authorizing legislation and appropriation acts. *Friends of the Earth v. Armstrong,* 485 F.2d I, (10th Cir. 1973) (en banc); *Sierra Club v. Andrus,* 610 F.2d 581, 601 (9th Cir., 1979); *rev'd on other grounds* 451 U.S. 287 (1981).

Consequently, the only "Act of Congress" that BPA is required to obtain, pursuant to section 4(h)(10)(B) of the Northwest Power Act, is an appropriations act specifically identifying the capital fish and wildlife facility.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked by a number of my colleagues about the schedule for the completion of the bill. It is always hard to predict, but, Mr. WYDEN of Oregon has an amendment that is not controversial and I intend to accept it. The only other major amendment of which I am aware will be by Mr. BATES of California, dealing with the problems of San Diego in this legislation, and he agrees with me that that will not take more than 15 or 20 minutes. I will have to oppose it; the committee opposes it.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on conservation that I do not think is controversial, and my guess is that we can be out of here in the next hour the way things are pending now. Members who want to make plans might want to know that.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and commend him for his leadership on this matter. It is noncontroversial and follows the direction set by this Congress a number of years ago regarding the number of salmon fisheries within the Columbia River system.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this moment to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) regarding the impact of this amendment on water rights.

First, it is my understanding that there is nothing in this amendment that would provide for the appropriation of water by any entity and any derogation of water rights currently established under State water law. Is that correct?

Mr. WYDEN. It is.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. It is also my understanding that nothing in this amendment would alter or establish the respective water rights of the States, the United States, Indian tribes, or any other individual with respect to any water or water-related rights. Is that correct?

Mr. WYDEN. It is.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his responses and for clarifying these points and urge support for this amendment.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the gentleman, and I just in particular want to thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Arizona, for his graciousness and for helping us with this amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. This amendment will allow the Bureau of Reclamation to accept funds from public or private entities to finance the fish program in the Yakima River Basin. The program is designed to rehabilitate the fishing industry that is so important in the Northwest.

I support that program and this amendment.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATES

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES: On page 18, immediately before line 1, insert the following new subparagraph:

(D) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs B and C, contracts for capacity and associated energy generated at Hoover Dam as a result of the uprating program shall be offered to public and private power entities not presently served by the Boulder Canyon Project Act as specified in this subparagraph. In allocating the uprated power, preference shall first be given to those entities in those states eligible for expenditures from the Reclamation Fund (43 USC 391) serving large residential loads without regard to whether these entities own their own transmission and distribution facilities. Preference shall also be given to entities serving those areas where the retail electric rate for residential use is higher than the average for the state in which the entity or its major service area is located. As a condition for receiving the uprated power, the entity shall be required to certify that the power received will be resold at cost.

□ 1530

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, one minor point of clarification. This amendment is slightly different than the amendment which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 1.

The Bates-Hunter amendment affects only new or upgraded power in section 205 of H.R. 4275. This upgraded power, 503,000 kilowatts, will be available when the Hoover Dam is upgraded.

This amendment would make available this new power to both private and public utilities in the 17 reclamation States which were excluded from this power in the 1928 Boulder Canyon Project Act. The amendment will save consumers money. In the case of San Diego, residents could save from $26 to $43 million per year if this amendment is adopted.

The Hoover Dam power selis for less than one-half cent per kilowatt. San Diego Gas & Electric Co. pays 6 cents a kilowatthour for the electricity it currently buys from Arizona and New Mexico. By the time this energy reached San Diego, residents must pay an average of $76 per month, the highest rate in the Southwest, and the second highest rate in the Nation.

I think the key provision that we are attempting to deal with has to do with the preference clause, which does not allow private utilities without the ability to directly distribute the power to have access to it. Nevada Power Co. has a lot of the power and is a private utility.

Since 1930, power entities in California, Idaho, Wyoming, Arizona, and Nevada have been eligible for this power. The electricity has been sold at bargain prices. In the first 45 years, the price of energy averaged below 1½ mills per kilowatthour, or less than 0.15 per kilowatthour. So although the Western Area Power Administration continues to give preference to government agencies and public utilities, there are private utilities such as Nevada Power that have the benefit of obtaining cheap power for 50 years.

San Diego Gas & Electric attempted to recover some of Hoover's power, and they were told Western is mandated by reclamation law to recognize preference in the sale of Federal power and preference is given to public bodies, cooperatives, State, and Federal governments, and municipalities. Needless to say, most of this power is gone.

Unlike the previous amendment, which I think went to the fundamental issue of national energy policy, we are simply asking of the new power that becomes available, that San Diego Gas & Electric be able to bid on that and receive some of that power.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for drafting this amendment. What we are really talking about here is not the existing power that is allocated through the Hoover Dam system but, rather, the upgraded power or the new power that we will be receiving due to upgrading in the power generation system in the dam.

Is that not accurate? We are talking about essentially new power here.

Mr. BATES. That is true.

Mr. HUNTER. What we are really talking about is the criteria that was laid down in the early part of this century whereby most private entities were not allowed to participate in the system. At least one private entity was allowed to participate. Southern California Edison, for example, go in in the 1930's. Southern California Edison, I understand, is a private utility company and yet they do participate, so this is not a matter of having a pure-as-driven snow policy that should never be changed because it already has been changed to some degree.

If we break it down to the human level, we are really talking about people who live in other parts of the State, like those who live in our area in San Diego, who are paying about 11 cents a kilowatthour as compared to other places in the State that are receiving this very cheap Hoover power who are paying abut 6½ cents a kilowatthour, like the Los Angeles area.

So all we are saying is that we want a chance, not at the power that has already been allocated over the years, but at some of this new, upgraded power. We want to have an opportunity to come out and at least have a chance to secure some of that power and to allow our people who are on fixed incomes and who are paying, I believe, the second highest utility cost in the Nation in San Diego County and in other areas around the State, let us give them a chance at bidding on the new power.

I thank the gentleman. I commend him for drafting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) rise?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BATES).

Mr. Chairman, I yield first to my colleague from California if he has additional statements, and then I would yield to the gentleman from Arizona, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just add to the debate that I think the chairman of the committee is in a difficult position. The negotiations have taken place and the compromises have been reached, and San Diego comes in at the last minute and would, in effect, upset that.

I have to say that we should have been in earlier on these negotiations, and perhaps we could have been more effective. But the point remains that it is at this time unfair to not allow, because of a catch 22 in the preference clause that says if you do not have the ability to directly distribute the energy, you cannot even wait at the end of the line and have preference. It would require that we would go through another entity and, in effect, wheel the energy in order to get it to San Diego.

Because of that, I think we are being unfairly penalized and were not considered in the negotiations and would ask the House to attempt to rectify this inequity.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman and I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman. I was seeking time to oppose the amendment. The gentleman has been very active in this and if he needs additional argument, I will be glad to wait until he is through. I think the gentleman ought to make whatever arguments he has first.

Mr. HUNTER. I appreciate the gentleman stating that.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further need for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BATES).

Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic to the problems of the good people in San Diego and the fine representation they have here in the House.

It seems hard to believe that back in 1937 the Federal Government was begging people to come in and sign up for this cheap hydropower. The city of Los Angeles took a big chunk, and Southern California Edison took some when they did not really need it, thinking that they might in the future. San Diego, for reasons that probably looked valid to them at the time, did not apply for a block of Hoover power.

I do not suppose that that mistake should be pressed down upon them forever, but it explains why we are where we are.

One of my great difficulties in doing anything for San Diego, and I think we can and I want to try, I hope the amendment is defeated and we can then try to work something out, but I do not think it is up to Arizona or people from other States to impose some kind of a settlement on the State of California. When there is war in California between north and south, or San Diego and Los Angeles, we hope for a hard, tough fight with no survivors.

□ 1540

But the officials of California, the Governor, the power people, and the water people negotiated for the last several years what we were going to do when 1987 comes and the contracts run out, and they agreed upon a distribution. It is up to California to change that, as far as I am concerned. If we can work out some arrangement where San Diego gets a piece of this action, it would make me very happy, and I would be glad to participate in negotiations.

It may comfort my friends from San Diego to know one thing, however. One of the major purposes of the hydroelectric power produced at Hoover Dam has been to use the power to pump the water to Los Angeles and San Diego, and the tremendous increase in population in San Diego and Los Angeles has been possible only because during all of these years they were taking a huge chunk of Colorado River water and pumping it up over the mountains and through tunnels and downhill to San Diego and Los Angeles.

Thirteen percent of the whole Hoover power output—I repeat that—today and for the last 30 years, 13 percent of all the Hoover power output has gone to pump water to San Diego. So it is not as though San Diego were getting no benefit whatever from this project. They have benefited somewhat already.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I would like to try to work out with the California people, maybe acting as a peacemaker, some kind of participation in this, but at this time I have to oppose this amendment.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment.

It is with reluctance, I say to my good friends from San Diego, that I rise in opposition to the amendment because I have great respect for and understanding of the problems that are facing a city that is growing as San Diego is, with the increasingly high costs for utilities and energy. But I just do not believe, as our distinguished chairman of the committee has said, that this is the vehicle for solving that problem.

I believe that it must be settled within the State of California. I would, along with the committee chairman, assist in any way to see that these agreements are made so that San Diego would receive its share. They are receiving 13 percent of the Hoover power output now which is pumping the very badly needed water to San Francisco.

Finally, the consequences of an amendment of this sort would be terribly disruptive to the agreements that have been made throughout the West, not to mention this very carefully crafted agreement over a long period of time. It could drive all three States back into court again, with the very serious prospects of litigation rather than benefiting from the meaningful negotiations that have taken place.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and my constituents who shoulder some of the highest utility rates in America. The rates, dependent as they are on fossil fuel and nuclear sources, are appalling.

San Diego, the second largest city in California, receives no direct allocation of hydroelectric power despite the fact that 65 percent of all Hoover Dam electricity is transmitted to California.

Why? Because the orginal allocation formula which has developed 50 years ago—and perpetuated by this bill—and does not meet today's energy realities.

A new allocation mechanism is needed and this amendment provides it. The inequitable distribution of hydropower will be corrected.

I urge your "aye" vote for the consumers of our community—a community that has long since outgrown the Depression-era allocation for Western hydropower.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BATES).

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. UDALL), there were—ayes 6, noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which adds a new title III, and I will offer it now if this is the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. First the Chair will inquire, are there further amendments to title II?

If not, are there further amendments?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk adding a new title III, and I offer it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: Page 27, (Union Calendar No. 368), after line 11, add the following:

TITLE II

SEC. 301. (a) Each long-term firm power service contract entered into or amended subsequent to one year from the date of enactment of this Act by the Secretary of Energy acting by and through the Western Area Power Administration (hereinafter "Western"), shall contain an article requiring the development and implementation by the purchaser thereunder of an energy conservation program. A long-term firm power service contract is any contract for the sale by Western of firm capacity, with or without energy, which is to be delivered over a period of more than one year. The term "purchaser" includes parent-type entities and their distribution or user members. If more than one such contract exists with a purchaser, each such contract article shall:

(1) contain time schedules for meeting program goals and delineate actions to be taken in the event such schedules are not met, which may include a reduction of the allocation of capacity or energy to such purchaser as would otherwise be provided under such contract; and

(2) provide for review and modification of the energy conservation program at not to exceed five year intervals.

(b) For purposes of this title, an energy conservation program shall:

(1) apply to all uses of energy and capacity which are provided from any federal project;

(2) contain definite goals;

(3) encourage customer consumption efficiency improvements and demand management practices which ensure that the available supply of hydroelectric power is used in an economically efficient and environmentally sound manner.

SEC. 302. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, Western shall amend its existing regulations (46 Fed. Reg. 56140) to reflect—

(1) the elements to be considered in the energy conservation programs required by this title, and

(2) Western's criteria for evaluating and approving such programs.

Such amended regulations shall be promulgated only after public notice and opportunity to comment in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551-706).

(b) The following elements shall be considered by Western in evaluating energy conservation programs:

(1) energy consumption efficiency improvements;

(2) use of renewable energy resources in addition to hydroelectric power;

(3) load management techniques;

(4) cogeneration;

(5) rate design improvements, including;

(i) cost of service pricing;

(ii) elimination of declining block rates;

(iii) time of day rates;

(iv) seasonal rates; and

(v) interruptible rates; and

(6) production efficiency improvements.

(c) Where a purchaser is implementing one or more of the foregoing elements under a program responding to Federal, State, or other initiatives that apply to conservation and renewable energy development, in evaluating that purchaser's energy conservation program submitted pursuant to this title Western shall make due allowance for the incorporation of such elements within the energy conservation program required by this title.

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, when this bill first came to our committee for hearing, some objections were made, particularly by the Environmental Defense Fund group, that we did not have adequate measures for conservation, and that the effect of all this cheap power was encouragement for consumers to waste power.

I have strongly believed in energy conservation. I think the American people have gotten the message. We have slowed down the growth of electric power, and I think in large part that is due to conservation.

So this amendment requires that each contract for long-term power supply contain a provision stating that the power customer will develop and implement a conservation program. And that "customer" means the utility or the public power group. And in evaluating the energy program, the Federal Marketing Agency shall look at energy consumption efficiency improvements, use of renewable energy resources, load management techniques, cogeneration, and rate design improvement.

In other words, they do not get any of this Hoover hydropower unless the company or the utility has in place a conservation program that meets these tests.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this strengthens the conservation program, and that this amendment will enable us to stretch out the benefits of hydropower further than at the present time, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) for including title III in this legislation at this time. This amendment has strong conservation provision and forces those who are in use of this power to take a look at ways in which they can conserve that resource.

I note as part of the amendment that it indicates in paragraph (b) that "the following elements shall be considered by Western in evaluating energy conservation programs:" The first is energy consumption efficiency improvements; second, the use of renewable energy resources in addition to hydroelectric power; third, load management techniques; fourth, cogeneration; fifth, rate design improvements, including cost of service pricing, elimination of declining block rates, time of day rates, seasonal rates, and interruptible rates; and, sixth, production efficiency improvements.

I believe that this amendment drafted by the chairman of this committee adds a new feature to this legislation and begins to move in a positive policy direction for the distribution of the power. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this conservation amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDGAR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, may I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in commending the gentleman from Arizona for offering the amendment. I think it has far-reaching implications.

I would like to see the gentleman consider the possibility that similar language could be added in connection with other public power projects, and that this be called to the attention of all of the State utility regulatory commissions as a possible feature to include in their own regulatory programs in connection with requests for rate increases from private utilities throughout the country. I think the country would be considerably better off if this kind of approach were used on a widespread basis throughout the United States.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDGAR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) for his kind remarks, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EDGAR) for working on this conservation amendment. It is a real step forward and it is a tribute to his tenacity that we are where we are today on energy conservation. I look forward to working with him on this kind of thing in the future.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee very much.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDGAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I take this time only to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) for offering this amendment. This is the

kind of amendment every Member ought to support. Everybody wins with conservation of energy, and I again compliment the gentleman from Arizona for offering the amendment.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from new Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

Just in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this conservation amendment is a policy initiative that is placed on this legislation.

□ 1550

Earlier we had some discussion about the need to have some policy discussions and hearings on the issue of cost sharing. There is a need to have policy discussions on a whole host of issues and I really commend the chairman for at least taking the first step in this area of conservation. I hope all our colleagues will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNTER: On Page 18, immediately before line 1, insert the following new subparagraph:

(D) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs (B) and (C), contracts for 10 Megawatts of the California share of capacity and associated energy generated at Hoover Dam as a result of the uprating program shall be offered to public and private power entities not presently served by the Hoover Powerplant as specified in this subparagraph. In allocating 10 Megawatts of the uprated power, preference shall be given to entities servicing those areas where the retail electric rate for residential use is higher than the average for the state in which the entity, or its major service is located, without regard to whether these entities own their own transmission and distribution facilities. As a condition for receiving the uprated power, the entity shall be required to certify that the power received will be resold at cost plus distribution costs. The remaining California share of the uprated power shall be allocated proportionately to California entities which would be entitled to receive such power under existing law as amended by this Act.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. McCAIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. McCAIN. I believe that that amendment is to title II which we have completed in the regular course of considering legislation. I believe the amendment is out of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HUNTER. I wish to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

It is true that after the amendment before last, I rose. The chairman, the gentleman from Arizona, rose also and was heard and his amendment went into title III.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent—and I think the chairman would speak to this issue—I would ask unanimous consent that this amendment be considered. I was on my feet and apparently was overlooked, so I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be made in order.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment adding a new title having been adopted. The gentleman from California can only offer this amendment by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will complete the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk continued the reading of the amendment.

Mr. HUNTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being allowed to offer this amendment. I will make it very brief. This amendment deals with the problem that we have again in California and I know the gentleman from California (Mr. BATES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWERY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) have been contributing to this effort. This amendment deals with the fact that in California generally speaking private entities, like San Diego Gas & Electric, and many others throughout the State, are not allowed to participate in Hoover power simply because the original enacting legislation back in the thirties set the preference only to public entities.

I realize that a system has been built up, that deals have essentially been executed and everybody knows what their share of the pie is going to be, including a number of California communities.

So this amendment would cut down the scale of the attempt that was made in several other amendments to open the bill up to some degree. There would be no effect whatsoever on the State of Arizona, on the State of Nevada, or any other State except California, and the only effect of the bill is this. Essentially upgrading our power and we are going to be producing some 500 extra megawatts because of the upgrading in power. Of those 500 extra megawatts, about 127 of them will go to California and these communities, Anaheim, Banning, Colton, Riverside, Azusa, Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank, under the negotiations that have been undertaken will participate and will receive and split up those 127 megawatts; so all that we are asking in this amendment is to take 10 of those 127 megawatts and allow those 10 to be applied for by entities throughout the State, whether they are public or private, who happen to have high rates for energy. For example, in San Diego it is now 11 cents a kilowatthour. Many of our senior citizens are in very difficult shape, are paying a lot of money for energy. Other parts of the State have very high energy costs.

So this would only take about 5 percent of that upgraded power, 10 megawatts, and make it available to those entities in the State that have high energy costs. The remaining 117 megawatts for the State of California would be divided with exactly the same apportionment as has already been entered into; so that means, for example, if one of these cities, Anaheim, Banning, Colton, or Riverside, was going to receive maybe 9½ megawatts, they might receive 8.5 megawatts instead, or 8.7 megawatts. They will not have a drastic reduction. Nobody will be eliminated, but it will give these communities with very high power costs a chance to participate.

I would ask the chairman of the committee if he would comment on this amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. Certainly.

Mr. UDALL. I appreciate the difficulties the gentleman and his colleagues in southern California, the gentleman from California (Mr. BATES) are in and I appreciate the aggressive way the gentleman has tried to take on the problems of San Diego and do something about them in this legislation; but this amendment has all the vices of the Bates amendment.

I am not going to referee a California water fight or electric power fight. If I were in California, I think I would sit down and see if I could not find some way along this line where we might get some power for San Diego; but long and tedious negotiations were held inside California, intra-California, before they ever came out to deal with Arizona and Nevada.

I will help the gentleman all I can down the road in the future to try to get something done. The suggestion the gentleman makes does not bother me; you take a little bit here and a little bit there and add up to a small block for San Diego; but this again would destroy the preference clause, would destroy the agreement reached by the California interests and heavily impact on the three-State agreement that brings us here today.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the chairman for his comments. Perhaps I should not have asked for them; but in the

least it would not affect Arizona and it would not affect Nevada.

Mr. UDALL. Exactly, and we do not care. If there is an agreement in California, fine; if there is a war, not so fine.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition with great regret.

I only wish we could have had this kind of dialog during the committee hearings and markups as we went through this bill. I think we could have addressed it a lot better. I would hope there is some vehicle we could have to address the serious concerns of the city of San Diego on this issue.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LONG of Louisiana) having assumed the chair, Mr. FLIPPO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4275) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 491, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 279, nays 95, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—279

Akaka	Evans (IA)	Markey
Albosta	Fascell	Marriott
Alexander	Fazio	Martin (NY)
Anderson	Feighan	Martinez
Andrews (TX)	Ferraro	Matsui
Annunzio	Fiedler	Mavroules
Applegate	Fields	McCain
Aspin	Fish	McCandless
AuCoin	Flippo	McCloskey
Badham	Foley	McCurdy
Barnard	Ford (MI)	McDade
Bartlett	Ford (TN)	McNulty
Bateman	Fowler	Mica
Bates	Franklin	Mikulski
Bedell	Garcia	Mineta
Beilenson	Gaydos	Minish
Bennett	Gejdenson	Mitchell
Bereuter	Gekas	Moakley
Berman	Gephardt	Mollohan
Bevill	Gibbons	Montgomery
Bilirakis	Gilman	Moorhead
Blliley	Gingrich	Morrison (WA)
Boehlert	Glickman	Murphy
Boggs	Gonzalez	Murtha
Boland	Gore	Myers
Bonior	Guarini	Natcher
Bonker	Hall (OH)	Neal
Borski	Hall, Ralph	Nichols
Bosco	Hall, Sam	Nielson
Boucher	Hansen (UT)	Nowak
Britt	Harkin	Oakar
Broomfield	Hatcher	Obey
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Olin
Brown (CO)	Heftel	Owens
Burton (CA)	Hightower	Packard
Byron	Hillis	Panetta
Campbell	Hopkins	Pashayan
Chandler	Horton	Patman
Chappell	Hoyer	Patterson
Chappie	Hubbard	Penny
Cheney	Hunter	Perkins
Clarke	Hutto	Pickle
Clinger	Hyde	Price
Coelho	Ireland	Pritchard
Coleman (MO)	Jenkins	Pursell
Coleman (TX)	Johnson	Rahall
Collins	Jones (OK)	Ratchford
Conyers	Kaptur	Ray
Cooper	Kastenmeier	Reid
Corcoran	Kennelly	Richardson
Courter	Kleczka	Ridge
Coyne	Kolter	Rinaldo
Craig	Kramer	Roberts
Daniel	LaFalce	Robinson
Dannemeyer	Lagomarsino	Rodino
Daschle	Lantos	Roe
Daub	Leath	Rose
Davis	Lehman (CA)	Rostenkowski
Dickinson	Lehman (FL)	Roth
Dicks	Lent	Roukema
Dixon	Levin	Rowland
Donnelly	Levine	Roybal
Dorgan	Levitas	Sabo
Dowdy	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer
Downey	Lipinski	Schaefer
Dreier	Lloyd	Schneider
Duncan	Loeffler	Schroeder
Dwyer	Long (LA)	Schulze
Dymally	Lott	Sharp
Dyson	Lowery (CA)	Shelby
Edwards (AL)	Lowry (WA)	Shumway
Edwards (CA)	Lujan	Shuster
Emerson	Lundine	Sikorski
English	Lungren	Simon
Erdreich	Mack	Sisisky
Erlenborn	MacKay	Skeen
Skelton	Sundquist	Wheat
Smith (FL)	Swift	Whitehurst
Smith (IA)	Synar	Whitley
Smith (NE)	Tallon	Whittaker
Smith (NJ)	Taylor	Whitten
Smith, Denny	Thomas (CA)	Williams (MT)
Smith, Robert	Thomas (GA)	Williams (OH)
Snowe	Torres	Winn
Snyder	Torricelli	Wise
Solarz	Udall	Wortley
Spence	Vander Jagt	Wright
Spratt	Vandergriff	Wyden
St Germain	Vento	Yatron
Staggers	Volkmer	Young (AK)
Stokes	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Stratton	Walgren	Young (MO)
Stump	Waxman	Zschau

NAYS—95

Ackerman	Hayes	Parris
Archer	Hertel	Pease
Barnes	Hiler	Petri
Boxer	Huckaby	Porter
Broyhill	Hughes	Rangel
Burton (IN)	Jacobs	Regula
Carney	Jeffords	Ritter
Carper	Kasich	Roemer
Carr	Kemp	Scheuer
Coats	Kildee	Schumer
Conable	Kindness	Seiberling
Conte	Kostmayer	Sensenbrenner
Crane, Daniel	Leach	Shannon
D'Amours	Livingston	Shaw
Darden	Long (MD)	Siljander
Dellums	Madigan	Slattery
DeWine	Martin (IL)	Solomon
Durbin	Martin (NC)	Stangeland
Early	McCollum	Stenholm
Eckart	McEwen	Studds
Edgar	McGrath	Tauke
Evans (IL)	McKernan	Tauzin
Florio	Michel	Towns
Foglietta	Miller (OH)	Walker
Frank	Molinari	Weaver
Frenzel	Moody	Weber
Goodling	Moore	Weiss
Gradison	Morrison (CT)	Wolf
Green	Mrazek	Wolpe
Gregg	Nelson	Wylie
Gunderson	O'Brien	Yates
Hamilton	Ottinger	

NOT VOTING—59

Addabbo	Gray	McHugh
Andrews (NC)	Hall (IN)	McKinney
Anthony	Hammerschmidt	Miller (CA)
Bethune	Hance	Oberstar
Biaggi	Hansen (ID)	Ortiz
Boner	Harrison	Oxley
Breaux	Hartnett	Paul
Brooks	Hawkins	Pepper
Bryant	Holt	Quillen
Clay	Howard	Rogers
Coughlin	Jones (NC)	Rudd
Crane, Philip	Jones (TN)	Russo
Crockett	Kazen	Savage
de la Garza	Kogovsek	Stark
Derrick	Latta	Traxler
Dingell	Leland	Valentine
Edwards (OK)	Lewis (FL)	Watkins
Frost	Luken	Wilson
Fuqua	Marlenee	Wirth
Gramm	Mazzoli	

□ 1610

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Breaux against.

Messrs. HUGHES, SCHEUER, FOGLIETTA, WEAVER, HERTEL of Michigan, ECKART, D'AMOURS, TOWNS, LONG of Maryland, SLATTERY, PEASE, and RANGEL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WHITTEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 268) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes, a measure similar to the bill just passed, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 268

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Acts of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388 and Acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at existing reclamation project facilities at locations and in the approximate capacities set forth in section 104 of this Act: *Provided,* That construction by the Secretary of the Interior of a powerplant designated in subsection (a), (c), or (g) of section 104 of this Act may not proceed prior to October 1, 1985, or if a license has been issued prior to such date to a non-Federal entity pursuant to section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 797) to construct such powerplant. In carrying out the purposes of title I of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to modify the capacity of a powerplant designated in section 104 as determined to be necessary or desirable during postauthorization study and design, and after consultation with the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of Energy is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain transmission facilities as required physically to connect the hydroelectric powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act to existing power systems and as he determines necessary to accomplish distribution and marketing of power generated by powerplants constructed pursuant to section 104 of this Act, and to purchase replacement capacity, energy, or both in order to maintain contractual deliveries to customers during unit outages which result from Federal construction of the powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act.

SEC. 103. During Federal construction of powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy shall seek to minimize the loss of capacity, energy, or both to power customers due to unit outages which result from such construction. The Secretary of Energy shall seek to maintain contractual deliveries of capacity, energy, or both at contract prices to customers affected by unit outages resulting from such Federal construction.

SEC. 104. (a) Whiskeytown powerplant unit, Central Valley project, California, consisting of a turbine generator unit of three thousand kilowatts on the outlet works of Whiskeytown Dam.

(b) Yellowtail Afterbay powerplant unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program, Montana, consisting of a turbine generator unit of ten thousand kilowatts on the outlet works of Yellowtail Afterbay Dam.

(c) Red Bluff powerplant unit, Central Valley project, California, consisting of four turbine generator units of two thousand five hundred kilowatts each at Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

(d) Palisades Powerplant enlargement, Palisades project, Idaho-Wyoming, consisting of one or more turbine generator units so as to increase the powerplant capacity by ninety thousand kilowatts.

(e) Anderson Ranch powerplant unit, Boise project, Idaho, consisting of a turbine and generator unit to increase the powerplant capacity by thirty thousand kilowatts.

(f) Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement, Minidoka project, Idaho-Wyoming, consisting of two turbine generator units of fifteen thousand kilowatts each in replacement of existing units one through six.

(g) Guernsey powerplant enlargement, North Platte project, Wyoming, consisting of one turbine generator unit to increase the powerplant capacity by fifteen thousand kilowatts.

SEC. 105. (a) Hydroelectric power generated by Federal facilities constructed pursuant to section 104 of this Act shall be delivered to the Secretary of Energy for distribution and marketing through existing Federal hydroelectric power marketing programs in accordance with existing law and policy consistent with the provisions of title I of this Act.

(b) The Federal powerplants constucted pursuant to section 104 of this Act shall be financially integrated with and the power marketed under rate schedules in effect for the several programs as follows:

(1) Whiskeytown and Red Bluff powerplant units shall be marketed through the Central Valley project power marketing program;

(2) Yellowtail Afterbay powerplant unit shall be marketed through the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program power marketing program;

(3) Palisades powerplant enlargement, Anderson Ranch powerplant unit, and Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement shall be marketed through the Federal Columbia River Power System; and

(4) Guernsey powerplant unit shall be marketed through the Western Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program marketing program.

SEC. 106. Powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act shall be designed, constructed, and operated in such a manner as to be compatible with valid existing water rights or water delivery to the holder of any valid water service contract.

SEC. 107. The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable cost of a powerplant authorized in section 104 of this Act shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction of such powerplant commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for fifteen years from the date of issue.

SEC. 108. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated beginning October 1, 1983, to the Secretary of the Interior for construction of the powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act the amounts set forth in subsection (b), on the basis of October 1983 price levels, plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of construction cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of sections 102 and 103 of this Act, and to the Secretary of the Interior such additional sums as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Federal powerplants authorized in section 104 of this Act.

(b)(1) Whiskeytown powerplant unit, $3,780,000.

(2) Yellowtail Afterbay powerplant, $25,600,000.

(3) Red Bluff powerplant unit, $42,100,000.

(4) Palisades powerplant enlargement, $76,000,000.

(5) Anderson Ranch powerplant unit, $14,317,000.

(6) Minidoka powerplant rehabilitation and enlargement, $73,437,000.

(7) Guernsey powerplant enlargement, $22,337,000.

SEC. 109. The provisions of this title I shall not apply to any project authorized or affected by title II of this Act.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to increase the capacity of existing generating equipment and appurtenances at Hoover Powerplant (hereinafter "Uprating Program"); and to improve parking, visitor facilities, and roadways and to provide additional elevators, and other facilities that will contribute to the safety and sufficiency of visitor access to Hoover Dam and Powerplant (hereinafter "Visitor Facilities Program").

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct a Colorado River bridge crossing, including suitable approach spans, immediately downstream from Hoover Dam for the purpose of alleviating traffic congestion and reducing safety hazards. This bridge shall not be a part of the Boulder Canyon Project and shall neither be funded nor repaid from the Colorado River Dam Fund or the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund.

SEC. 202. (a) Clause (1) of subsection (c) of section 403 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968 (43 U.S.C. 1543(c); 82 Stat. 894) is revised to read as follows:

"(1) all revenues collected in connection with the operation of facilities authorized in Title III in furtherance of the purposes of this Act (except entrance, admission, and other recreation fees or charges and proceeds received from recreation concessionaires), until completion of repayment requirements of the Central Arizona Project;".

(b) Clause (2) of said subsection (c) is revised by inserting immediately preceding the existing proviso: *"Provided, however,* That for the Boulder Canyon Project commencing June 1, 1987, and for the Parker-Davis Project commencing June 1, 2005, and until the end of the repayment period for the Central Arizona Project described in section 301(a) of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall provide for such surplus revenues by including the equivalent of 4½ mills

per kilowatt-hour in the rates charged to purchasers in Arizona for application to the purposes specified in subsection (f) of this section and by including the equivalent of 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour in the rates charged to purchasers in California and Nevada for application to the purposes of subsection (g) of this section as amended and supplemented: *Provided further*, That after the repayment period for said Central Arizona Project, the equivalent of 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour shall be included by the Secretary of Energy in the rates charged to purchasers in Arizona, California and Nevada to provide revenues for applications to the purposes of said subsection (g) of this section:".

SEC. 203. The Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617 et seq.; 45 Stat. 1057), as amended and supplemented, is further amended:

(a) In the first sentence of section 2(b), by striking out "except that the aggregate amount of such advances shall not exceed the sum of $165,000,000", and by replacing the comma after the word "Act" with a period.

(b) In section 3, by deleting "$165,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$242,000,000, of which $77,000,000 (October 1983 price levels) shall be adjusted plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved herein. Said $77,000,000 represents the additional amount required for the Uprating Program and the Visitor Facilities Program.".

SEC. 204. The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618 et seq.; 54 Stat. 774), as amended and supplemented, is further amended:

(a) In section 1 by deleting the phrase "during the period beginning June 1, 1937, and ending May 31, 1987" appearing in the introductory paragraph of section 1 and in section 1(a), and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning June 1, 1937".

(b) In section 1(b) by deleting the phrase "and such portion of such advances made on and after June 1, 1937, as (on the basis of repayment thereof within such fifty-year period or periods as the Secretary may determine) will be repayable prior to June 1, 1987" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such advances made on and after June 1, 1937, over fifty-year periods".

(c) In section 1 by deleting the word "and" at the end of subsection (c); deleting the period at the end of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu therof "; and", and by adding subsection (e) to read:

"(e) To provide revenues from and after June 1, 1987, for application to the purposes specified in section 403(c)(2) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, as amended and supplemented.".

(d) In section 2:

(1) By deleting the first sentence and subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"All receipts from the project shall be paid into the Colorado River Dam Fund and shall be available, without further appropriation, for:

"(a) Defraying the costs of operation (including purchase of supplemental energy to meet temporary deficiencies in firm energy which the Secretary of Energy is obligated by contract to supply), maintenance and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the project, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriations Acts;" and

(2) By deleting existing section 2(e) and inserting in lieu thereof a new section 2(e) reading:

"(e) Transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund established by Title IV of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, as amended and supplemented, of the revenues referred to in section 1(e) of this Act.".

(e) By deleting the final period and placing a colon at the end of section 6 and adding: "*Provided*, That on appropriated funds advanced, respectively, for the Uprating Program and for the Visitor Facilities Program as defined in section 201(a) of [S. 268], the rate of interest for advances for each shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the initial advance for the particular program involved is made, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for fifteen years from the date of issue.".

(f) In section 12, in the paragraph beginning with "Replacements", by deleting "during the period from June 1, 1937, to May 31, 1987, inclusive" and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning June 1, 1937".

SEC. 205. (a) Capacity resulting from the Uprating Program and associated energy shall be allocated for use in Arizona, California, and Nevada in the respective amounts specified in the applicable power marketing criteria promulgated by the Secretary of Energy. Such allocated capacity and associated energy shall be disposed of only pursuant to contracts effective June 1, 1987, and expiring on September 30, 2017, between the Secretary of Energy and purchasers in Arizona, California, and Nevada eligible to enter into such contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act: *Provided, however*, That in the case of Arizona and Nevada, such contracts shall be made with the agency designated by State law as the agent of such State for purchasing power from the Boulder Canyon Project.

(b) The Uprating Program authorized under section 201(a) of this Act may be undertaken with appropriated funds or with funds advanced under contracts made with the Secretary of the Interior by non-Federal purchasers described in subsection (a) of this section, or a combination thereof. Any funding provided by non-Federal purchasers shall be advanced to the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the terms and conditions of such contracts.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, funds advanced by non-Federal purchasers for use in the Uprating Program shall be deposited in the Colorado River Dam Fund and shall be available for the Uprating Program.

(d) Those amounts advanced by non-Federal purchasers shall be financially integrated as capital costs with other project costs for rate-setting purposes, and shall be returned to those purchasers advancing funds throughout the contract period through credits which include interest costs incurred by such purchasers for funds contributed to the Secretary of the Interior for the Uprating Program.

SEC. 206. Reimbursement of funds appropriated for construction of facilities authorized under section 201(a) of this Act, inclusive of any funds advanced by non-Federal purchasers, shall be a repayment requirement of the Boulder Canyon Project beginning with the first day of the month following completion of the installation, except that the costs of the Visitor Facilities Program as defined in section 201(a) of this Act shall become a repayment requirement beginning June 1, 1987, or when substantially completed, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if later.

SEC. 207. This Act shall not be construed to either support or prejudice—

(a) claims concerning the existence or scope of any right to renew a contract in effect on the date of this Act for purchase of electrical energy generated at Hoover Dam, including, but not limited to, any right to increased capacity resulting from the Uprating Program,

(b) claims concerning the existence or scope of preference in the purchase of electrical energy generated at Hoover Dam, including, but not limited to, any right to increased capacity resulting from the Uprating Program, or

(c) any right to determine by arbitration or court proceedings any dispute or disagreement as to the interpretation or performance of any provisions of this Act or any other laws of the United States in effect on the date of this Act, or the Criteria or Regulations, either to be published or subsequently amended relating in any way to allocation of energy generated at Hoover Dam from capacity existing on the date of this Act or increased capacity resulting from the Uprating Program.

□ 1620

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UDALL moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 268, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 4275, as passed, as follows:

S. 268

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Hoover Powerplant Act of 1984".

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to increase the capacity of existing generating equipment and appurtenances at Hoover Powerplant (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "uprating program"); and to improve parking, visitor facilities, and roadways and to provide additional elevators, and other facilities that will contribute to the safety and sufficiency of visitor access to Hoover Dam and Powerplant (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "visitor facilities program").

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct a Colorado River bridge crossing, including suitable approach spans, immediately downstream from Hoover Dam for the purpose of alleviating traffic congestion and reducing safety hazards. This bridge shall not be a part of the Boulder Canyon project and shall neither be funded nor repaid from the Colorado River Dam Fund or the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund.

SEC. 102. (a) Section 403(b) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 894, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1543) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) Except as provided in subsection 309(b), as amended, sums advanced by non-Federal entities for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title III of this Act shall be credited to the development fund

and shall be available without further appropriation for such purpose.".

(b) Paragraph (1) of section 403(c) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 894, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 1543(c)) is revised to read as follows:

"(1) all revenues collected in connection with the operation of facilities authorized in title III in furtherance of the purposes of this Act (except entrance, admission, and other recreation fees or charges and proceeds received from recreation concessionaires), until completion of repayment requirements of the Central Arizona project;".

(c) Paragraph (2) of section 403(c) is revised by inserting immediately preceding the existing proviso: *"Provided, however,* That the Boulder Canyon project commencing June 1, 1987, and for the Parker-Davis project commencing June 1, 2005, and until the end of the repayment period for the Central Arizona project described in section 301(a) of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall provide for surplus revenues by including the equvalent of 4½ mills per kilowatthour in the rates charged to purchasers in Arizona for application to the purposes specified in subsection (f) of this section and by including the equivalent 2½ mills per kilowatthour in the rates charged to purchasers in California and Nevada for application to the purposes of subsection (g) of this section as amended and supplemented: *Provided further,* That after the repayment period for said Central Arizona project, the equivalent of 2½ mills per kilowatthour shall be included by the Secretary of Energy in the rates charged to purchasers in Arizona, California, and Nevada to provide revenues for application to the purposes of said subsection (g) of this section:".

SEC. 103. (a) The Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 (45 Stat. 1057, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 617 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, is further amended:

(1) In the first sentence of section 2(b), by striking out "except that the aggregate amount of such advances shall not exceed the sum of $165,000,000", and by replacing the comma after the word "Act" with a period.

(2) In section 3, by deleting "$165,000,000." and inserting in lieu thereof "$242,000,000, of which $77,000,000 (October 1983 price levels) shall be adjusted plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved herein. Said $77,000,000 represents the additional amount required for the uprating program and the visitor facilities program.".

(b) Except as amended by this Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 (45 Stat. 1057, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 617 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 104. (a) The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 774, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 618), as amended and supplemented, is further amended:

(1) In section 1 by deleting the phrase "during the period beginning June 1, 1937, and ending May 31, 1987" appearing in the introductory paragraph of section 1 and in section 1(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning June 1, 1937".

(2) In section 1(b) by deleting the phrase "and such portion of such advances made on and after June 1, 1937, as (on the basis of repayment thereof within such fifty-year period or periods as the Secretary may determine) will be repayable prior to June 1, 1987" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such advances made on and after June 1, 1937, over fifty-year periods".

(3) In section 1 by deleting the word "and" at the end of subsection (c); deleting the period at the end of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

"(e) To provide, by application of the increments to rates specified in section 403(c)(2) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, as amended and supplemented, revenues, from and after June 1, 1987, for application to the purposes there specified.".

(4) In section 2:

(i) by deleting the first sentence and subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof: "All receipts from the project shall be paid into the Colorado River Dam Fund and shall be available, without further appropriation, for:

"(a) Defraying the costs of operation (including purchase of supplemental energy to meet temporary deficiencies in firm energy which the Secretary of Energy is obligated by contract to supply), maintenance and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the project, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriations Acts;" and

(ii) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund established by title IV of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, as amended and supplemented, of the revenues referred to in section 1(e) of this Act.".

(5) By deleting the final period at the end of section 6 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That the respective rates of interest on appropriated funds advanced for the visitor facilities program, as described in section 201(a) of the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act of 1983, shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the reimbursement period of the program during the month preceding the fiscal year in which the costs of the program are incurred. To the extent that more than one interest rate is determined pursuant to the preceding sentence, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish for repayment purposes an interest rate at a weighted average of the rates so determined.".

(6) In section 12, in the paragraph beginning with "Replacements", by deleting "during the period from June 1, 1937, to May 31, 1987, inclusive" and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning June 1, 1937".

(b) Except as amended by this Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 774, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 618), as amended and supplemented, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 105. (a)(1) The Secretary of Energy shall offer:

(A) To each contractor for power generated at Hoover Dam a renewal contract for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, of the amount of capacity and firm energy specified for that contractor in the following table:

SCHEDULE A: LONG TERM CONTINGENT CAPACITY AND ASSOCIATED FIRM ENERGY RESERVED FOR RENEWAL CONTRACT OFFERS TO CURRENT BOULDER CANYON PROJECT CONTRACTORS

Contractor	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm energy (thousand of kWh)		Total
		Summer	Winter	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	247,500	904,382	387,592	1,291,974
City of Los Angeles	490,875	488,535	209,658	698,193
Southern California Edison Company	277 500	175,486	75,208	250,694
City of Glendale	18,000	47,398	20,313	67,711
City of Pasadena	11,000	40,655	17,424	58,079
City of Burbank	5,125	14,811	6,347	21,158
Arizona Power Authority	189,000	452,192	193,797	645,989
Colorado River Commission of Nevada	189,000	452,192	193,797	645,989
United States, for Boulder City	20,000	56,000	24,000	80,000
Totals	1,448,000	2,631,651	1,128,136	3,759,787

(B) To purchasers in the States of Arizona, Nevada and California eligible to enter into such contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, contracts for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, or as it thereafter becomes available, of capacity resulting from the uprating program and for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, of associated firm energy as specified in the following table:

SCHEDULE B: CONTINGENT CAPACITY RESULTING FROM THE UPRATING PROGRAM AND ASSOCIATED FIRM ENERGY

State	Contigent capacity (kW)	Firm energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
Arizona	188,000	148,000	64,000	212,000
California	127,000	99,850	43,364	143,214
Nevada	188,000	288,000	124,000	412,000
Totals	503,000	535,850	231,364	767,214

Provided, however, That in the case of Arizona and Nevada, such contracts shall be offered to the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, respectively, as the agency specified by State law as the agent of such State for purchasing power from the Boulder Canyon project: *Provided further,* That in the case of California, no such contract under this subparagraph (B) shall be offered to any purchaser who is offered a contract for capacity exceeding 20,000 kilowatts under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph; and

(C) To the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada and to purchasers in the State of California eligible to enter into such contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, contracts for delivery commencing June 1, 1987, of such energy generated at Hoover Dam as is available respectively to the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California in excess of 4,501.001 million kilowatthours in any year of operation (hereinafter called excess energy) in accordance with the following table:

SCHEDULE C: EXCESS ENERGY

Priority of entitlement to excess energy	State
First: Meeting Arizona's first priority right to delivery of excess energy which is equal in each year of operation to 200 million kilowatthours: Provided, however, That in the event excess energy in the amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated during any year of operation, Arizona shall accumulate a first right to delivery of excess energy subsequently generated in an amount not to exceed 600 million kilowatthours, inclusive of the current year's 200 million kilowatthours. Said first right of delivery shall accrue at a rate of 200 million kilowatthours per year for each year excess energy in the amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated, less amounts of excess energy delivered.	Arizona.
Second: Meeting Hoover Dam contractual obligations under schedule A of section 205(a)(1)(A) and under schedule B of section 205(a)(B) not exceeding 26 million kilowatthours in each year of operation.	
Third: Meeting the energy requirements of the three States, such available excess energy to be divided equally among the States.	Arizona, Nevada, California.

(2) The total obligation of the Secretary of Energy to deliver firm energy pursuant to schedule A of section 105(a)(1)(A) and schedule B of section 105(a)(1)(B) is 4,527.001 million kilowatthours in each year of operation. To the extent that the actual generation at Hoover Powerplant in any year of operation (less deliveries thereof to Arizona required by its first priority under schedule C of section 105(a)(1)(C) whenever actual generation in any year of operation is in excess of 4,501.001 million kilowatthours) is less than 4,527.001 million kilowatthours, such deficiency shall be borne by the holders of contracts under said schedules A and B in the ratio that the sum of the quantities of firm energy to which each contractor is entitled pursuant to said schedules bears to 4,527.001 million kilowatthours. At the request of any such contractor, the Secretary of Energy will purchase energy to meet that contractor's deficiency at such contractor's expense.

(3) Subdivision E of the "General Consolidated Power Marketing Criteria or Regulations for Boulder City Area Projects" published in the Federal Register May 9, 1983 (48 Federal Register commencing at 20881), hereinafter referred to as the "Criteria" or as the "Regulations" shall be deemed to have been modified to conform to this section. The Secretary of Energy shall cause to be included in the Federal Register a notice conforming the text of said Regulations to such modifications.

(4) Each contract offered under subsection (a)(1) of this section shall:

(A) expire September 30, 2017;

(B) not restrict use to which the capacity and energy contracted for by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California may be placed within the State of California: *Provided*, That to the extent practicable and consistent with sound water management and conservation practice, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California shall use such capacity and energy to pump available Colorado River water prior to using such capacity and energy to pump California State water project water; and

(C) conform to the applicable provisions of subdivision E of the Criteria, commencing at 48 Federal Register 20881, modified as provided in this section. To the extent that said provisions of the Criteria, as so modified, are applicable to contracts entered into under this section, those provisions are hereby ratified.

(b) Nothing in the Criteria shall be construed to prejudice any rights conferred by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, as amended and supplemented, on the holder of a contract described in subsection (a) of this section not in default thereunder on September 30, 2017.

(c)(1) The Secretary of Energy shall not execute a contract described in subsection (a)(1)(A) of this section with any entity which is a party to the action entitled the "State of Nevada, et al. against the United States of America, et al." in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, case numbered CV LV '82 441 RDF, unless that entity agrees to file in that action a stipulation for voluntary dismissal with prejudice of its claims, or counterclaims, or crossclaims, as the case may be, and also agrees to file with the Secretary a document releasing the United States, its officers and agents, and all other parties to that action who join in that stipulation from any claims arising out of the disposition under this section of capacity and energy from the Boulder Canyon project. The Attorney General shall join on behalf of the United States, its officers and agents, in any such voluntary dismissal and shall have the authority to approve on behalf of the United States the form of each release.

(2) If after a reasonable period of time as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary is precluded from executing a contract with an entity by reason of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary shall offer the capacity and energy thus available to other entities in the same State eligible to enter into such contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

(d) The uprating program authorized under section 201(a) of this Act shall be undertaken with funds advanced under contracts made with the Secretary of the Interior by non-Federal purchasers described in subsection (a)(1)(B) of this section. Funding provided by non-Federal purchasers shall be advanced to the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the terms and conditions of such contracts.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, funds advanced by non-Federal purchasers for use in the uprating program shall be deposited in the Colorado River Dam Fund and shall be available for the uprating program.

(f) Those amounts advanced by non-Federal purchasers shall be financially integrated as capital costs with other project costs for rate-setting purposes, and shall be returned to those purchasers advancing funds throughout the contract period through credits which include interest costs incurred by such purchasers for funds contributed to the Secretary of the Interior for the uprating program.

(g) The provisions of this section constitute an exercise by the Congress of the right reserved by it in section 5(b) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, as amended and supplemented, to prescribe terms and conditions for the renewal of contracts for electrical energy generated at Hoover Dam. This section constitutes the exclusive method for disposing of capacity and energy from Hoover Dam for the period beginning June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017.

(h)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any claim that the provisions of subsection (a) of this section violates any rights to capacity or energy from the Boulder Canyon project is barred unless the complaint is filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act in the United States Claims Court which shall have exclusive jurisdiction over this action. Any claim that actions taken by any administrative agency of the United States violates any right under this Title or the Boulder Canyon Project Act or the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act is barred unless suit asserting such claim is filed in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction within one year after final refusal of such agency to correct the action complained of.

(2) Any contract entered into pursuant to section 105 or section 107 of this Act shall contain provisions by which any dispute or disagreement as to interpretation or performance of the provisions of this title or of applicable regulations or of the contract may be determined by arbitration or court proceedings. The Secretary of Energy or the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, if authorized to act for the United States in such arbitration or court proceedings and, except as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, jurisdiction is conferred upon any district court of the United States of proper venue to determine the dispute.

(i) It is the purpose of subsections (c), (i), and (j) of this section to ensure that the rights of contractors for capacity and energy from the Boulder Canyon project for the period beginning June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017, will vest with certainty and finality.

SEC. 106. Reimbursement of funds advanced by non-Federal purchasers for the uprating program shall be a repayment requirement of the Boulder Canyon project beginning with the first day of the month following completion of each segment thereof. The cost of the visitor facilities program as defined in section 101(a) of this Act shall become a repayment requirement beginning June 1, 1987, or when substantially completed, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if later.

SEC. 107. (a) Subject to the provisions of any existing layoff contracts, electrical capacity and energy associated with the United States' interest in the Navajo generating station which is in excess of the pumping requirements of the Central Arizona project and any such needs for desalting and protective pumping facilities as may be required under section 101(b)(2)(B) of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, as amended (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "Navajo surplus") shall be marketed and exchanged by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to this section.

(b) Navajo surplus shall be marketed by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to the plan adopted under subsection (c) of this section, directly to, with or through the Arizona Power Authority and/or other entities having the status of preference entities under the reclamation law in accordance with the preference provisions of section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and as provided in part IV, section A of the Criteria.

(c) In the marketing and exchanging of Navajo surplus, the Secretary of the Interior shall adopt the plan deemed most acceptable, after consultation with the Secretary of Energy, the Governor of Arizona, and the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (or its successor in interest to the repayment obligation for the Central Arizona project), for the purposes of optimizing the availability of Navajo surplus and providing financial assistance in the timely construction and repayment of construction costs of authorized features of the Central Arizona project. The Secretary of the Interior, in concert with the Secretary of Energy, in accordance with section 14 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, shall grant electrical power and energy exchange rights with Ari-

zona entities as necessary to implement the adopted plan: *Provided, however,* That if exchange rights with Arizona entities are not required to implement the adopted plan, exchange rights may be offered to other entities.

(d) For the purposes provided in subsection (c) of this section, the Secretary of Energy, or the marketing entity or entities under the adopted plan, are authorized to establish and collect or cause to be established and collected, rate components, in addition to those currently authorized, and to deposit the revenues received in the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund to be available for such purposes and if required under the adopted plan, to credit, utilize, pay over directly or assign revenues from such additional rate components to make repayment and establish reserves for repayment of funds, including interest incurred, to entities which have advanced funds for the purposes of subsection (c) of this section: *Provided, however,* That rates shall not exceed levels that allow for an appropriate saving for the contractor.

(e) To the extent that this section may be in conflict with any other provision of law relating to the marketing and exchange of Navajo surplus, or to the disposition of any revenues therefrom, this section shall control.

SEC. 108. Recognizing the expiration of Colorado River storage project (CRSP) contracts in 1989, prior to final reallocation of CRSP power pursuant to existing law, and within one year after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Western Area Power Administration, shall report, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate, on all Colorado River storage project (CRSP) power resources, including those presently allocated to the Lower Division States, which may be used to financially support the development of authorized projects in the States of the Upper Division (as that term is used in article II of the Colorado River Compact) of the Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 109. The Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to Federal reclamation law (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) and in accordance with the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2697) is authorized to design, construct, operate, and maintain fish passage facilities within the Yakima River Basin, and to accept funds from any entity, public or private, to design, construct, operate, and maintain such facilities.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) Each long-term firm power service contract entered into or amended subsequent to one year from the date of enactment of this Act by the Secretary of Energy acting by and through the Western Area Power Administration (hereinafter "Western"), shall contain an article requiring the development and implementation by the purchaser thereunder of an energy conservation program. A long-term firm power service contract is any contract for the sale by Western of firm capacity, with or without energy, which is to be delivered over a period of more than one year. The term "purchaser" includes parent-type entities and their distribution or user members. If more than one such contract exists with a purchaser, only one program will be required for that purchaser. Each such contract article shall—

(1) contain time schedules for meeting program goals and delineate actions to be taken in the event such schedules are not met, which may include a reduction of the allocation of capacity or energy to such purchaser as would otherwise be provided under such contract; and

(2) provide for review and modification of the energy conservation program at not to exceed five year intervals.

(b) For purposes of this title, an energy conservation program shall—

(1) apply to all uses of energy and capacity which are provided from any Federal project;

(2) contain definite goals;

(3) encourage customer consumption efficiency improvements and demand management practices which ensure that the available supply of hydroelectric power is used in an economically efficient and environmentally sound manner.

SEC. 202. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, Western shall amend its existing regulations (46 Fed. Reg. 56140) to reflect—

(1) the elements to be considered in the energy conservation programs required by this title, and

(2) Western's criteria for evaluating and approving such programs.

Such amended regulations shall be promulgated only after public notice and opportunity to comment in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551-706).

(b) The following elements shall be considered by Western in evaluating energy conservation programs:

(1) energy consumption efficiency improvements;

(2) use of renewable energy resources in addition to hydroelectric power;

(3) load management techniques;

(4) congeneration;

(5) rate design improvements, including—

(i) cost of service pricing;

(ii) elimination of declining block rates;

(iii) time of day rates;

(iv) seasonal rates; and

(v) interruptible rates; and

(6) production efficiency improvements.

(c) Where a purchaser is implementing one or more of the foregoing elements under a program responding to Federal, State, or other initiatives that apply to conservation and renewable energy development, in evaluating that purchaser's energy conservation program submitted pursuant to this title Western shall make due allowance for the incorporation of such elements within the energy conservation program required by this title.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4275) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CHANGES IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 4275.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 4275, be authorized to make numerical, clerical, and technical changes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on H.R. 4275, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2085. An act to provide continuing authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for recovering costs associated with cotton classing services to producers and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to invest funds derived from fees for certain voluntary grading and inspection services; and

S. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing the rotunda of the Capitol to be used from May 25, 1984, through May 28, 1984, for the unknown American of the Vietnam era to lie in state.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed one of yesterday's suspension votes, that of H.R. 4952, which would aid Indian tribes in Nevada and Utah relating to the planned deployment of the MX missile. I would like to go on record as favoring passage of this measure. I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 124.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, because I was unable to be in Washington on April 24, 25, and 26, I missed several votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 91, "aye."
Rollcall No. 92, (quorum call).
Rollcall No. 93, "no."
Rollcall No. 94, "no."
Rollcall No. 95, "aye."
Rollcall No. 96, "aye."
Rollcall No. 97, "aye."
Rollcall No. 98, "no."
Rollcall No. 99, "aye."
Rollcall No. 100, "aye."
Rollcall No. 101, (quorum call).
Rollcall No. 102, "aye."
Rollcall No. 103, "no."
Rollcall No. 104, "aye."
Rollcall No. 105, "no."
Rollcall No. 106, "aye."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 953

Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 953.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MARY WOODARD LASKER CENTER FOR HEALTH RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 5576) to designate certain land and improvements of the National Institutes of Health as the "Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, could someone tell me when this bill was introduced?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This bill was introduced today and it designates certain land at the National Institutes of Health as the Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it sounds to me like the kind of bill that would normally be on the Consent Calendar, that would come up through the regular processes on the Consent Calendar and would give some of us a chance to review the legislation before it comes to the floor.

Can the gentleman tell me why we are using this procedure rather than going the route of the Consent Calendar?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested and given the honor by both the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), to make this request. It was suggested to bring it up in this way.

I have no knowledge of the Consent Calendar or any other way. This is, I believe, a noncontroversial proposal.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, it simply seems to me an unusual procedure to be using, that the bill is introduced on the same day, brought to the House floor before those of us who would typically be reviewing the Consent Calendar would have an opportunity to look at it.

The gentleman assures me it is a noncontroversial matter, and so on, that has been cleared by the Speaker.

Has there been clearance on this side of the aisle?

Mr. WAXMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I am informed that the administration, as well, supports the proposal.

Mr. WALKER. What about our side of the aisle?

Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN) also agree.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to assure the gentleman, and I just checked. Both the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL), the ranking Republican member of the committee, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN), the ranking Republican member of the appropriate subcommittee, have cleared the request.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the land and improvements purchased from the Order of the Visitation for the National Institutes of Health and located at 9001 Old Georgetown Road in Bethesda, Maryland, is designated as the "Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such land and improvements shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education".

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would do honor to a gracious and significant woman. In 1942 Mary Lasker and her late husband Albert began a crusade for this Nation to assume world leadership in biomedical research.

Mary Lasker is an unusual philanthropist. Many philanthropists direct their funds to worthy groups and at that point stop. But Mary Lasker has become one of America's most sophisticated leaders in the medical research field. She brings to the health sciences not only her generosity but also her keen intelligence and visionary gifts.

Few Americans realize that many of our country's most important medical research projects have their origins in the pioneering work initiated at the urging and with the help of Albert and Mary Lasker. It is only in the past few decades that the Federal Government has reflected the Laskers' view that research to diminish human suffering is deserving of massive government support.

Mary has championed this cause in the Halls of Congress and has prodded Presidents to recognize that investments in health research can yield enormous dividends.

Her accomplishments are legion. She is noted for her work with the American Cancer Society and advocacy on behalf of a commitment to cancer research. She has also been a leader in recognizing the benefits of preventing heart disease through hypertension screening. Most recently, Mary Lasker focused public and congressional attention on the need to expand our Nation's research commitment to the disease of arthritis. The House adopted her suggestion and last year passed legislation establishing a National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal Diseases.

To me Mary Lasker is not just a key figure in the history of biomedical research but a valued personal friend. During my years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, she has been a source of wisdom, guidance, and inspiration.

H.R. 5576 would designate a parcel of land, newly purchased for the NIH campus in Bethesda, Md., as the Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education. The naming of this facility is a small token of a debt this country can never fully repay her. It is a fitting and long overdue recognition of Mary's incalculable contribution to our Nation.

I urge support for the legislation.

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, today I lead my colleagues in offering a fine tribute to a beautiful lady.

Mary Lasker is a giver, not just of what she has, but of herself. Through the Mary and Albert D. Lasker Foundation, she has given millions to the urgent work of health research. But she has given far more of what cannot be measured. Through her tireless efforts and generous determination, she has given spirit and guts to the battle against cancer and other diseases.

The Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education will be a fitting tribute to this wonderful person. I cannot count the number of times Mary has come to me championing the cause of health research. Whenever she comes, I know it is for a vital and important reason. I know that she wants to contribute not just her resources but her courage and her spirit and her love of people.

The center dedicated by this bill will be of great value in the development of the National Institutes of Health clinical and laboratory research program. It will be a fine tribute to a person who has given her whole life to the cause of her fellow man.●

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Mary Woodard Lasker (Mrs. Albert Lasker) has contributed more to the prevention and cure of disease and to the promotion of biomedical research than any other private citizen in the history of this country. The Lasker Foundation, which she founded with her husband, has aided medical research and public health. She has worked tirelessly for the American Cancer Society and dozens of other health groups. The National Institutes of Health are what they are today in large part because she was able to galvanize the efforts of health organizations across the country to support research.

Last year the National Institutes of Health acquired the convent located on the northwest corner of the campus. The bill we are considering today would rename these buildings the Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education. It would give me great pleasure if the Congress were to honor this great American in this way and do it at the institution she dearly loves, the National Institutes of Health.●

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mary Lasker is a woman in whom we can all be proud. Although not a scientist, her contributions to the fields of science and medicine are too numerous to mention.

She is a woman who dedicated her life to one of humankind's noblest pursuits—the prevention and treatment of human illness.

She began her efforts at a time before there was a National Institutes of Health. Today, NIH is regarded as the finest biomedical research agency in the world.

Every American can take great pride in its accomplishments. Every American can take pride in the role Mary Lasker played in its growth and success. Its fitting, in fact long overdue, that we honor her with the passage of this legislation.

Mary Lasker demonstrates that one woman can make a difference. The difference she made cannot be measured in terms of dollars, but must be judged by the thousands of Americans alive today due to advances in medicine brought about through the research and researchers Mary Lasker motivated.

Designation of the Mary Woodward Lasker Center for Health, Research, and Education recognizes Mary Lasker's contribution to science. More importantly, it represents a lasting tribute to the selfless causes to which Mary Lasker has dedicated her life.

I urge support for the legislation.●

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5576, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FOR THE RELIEF OF MARINA KUNYAVSKY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3131) for the relief of Marina Kunyavsky, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3131

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Marina Kunyavsky shall be held and considered to have satisfied the requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to required period of residence and physical presence within the United States and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 310(d) of that Act, may be naturalized at any time after the date of enactment of this Act if otherwise eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Kunyavsky is a 19-year-old refugee who escaped from the Soviet Union with her family fleeing possible persecution under that repressive Government. After many years of attempting emigration, the family left the Soviet Union and entered the United States in 1981 under provisions of the Refugee Act of 1980. Since arrival Ms. Kunyavsky has attended school and diligently worked in both her scholastic and athletic endeavors.

Ms. Kunyavsky has demonstrated exceptional talent as a rhythmic gymnast and has qualified in various competitions for final Olympic tryouts and seeks to participate as a U.S. citizen. She placed fourth at the 1983 USA national championships and second in the country hoop events as well as winning first place in certain club routines. I submit for the record statements from the U.S. Olympic Committee and U.S. Gymnastics Federation outlining her accomplishments. There is every indication Ms. Kunyavsky possesses the unique skills and determination which would enable her to represent our country in a most outstanding manner.

As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, the House has precedent for action to waive certain naturalization requirements. Just this year, the Congress moved expeditiously to grant U.S. citizenship on behalf of an Olympic skier, Auden Endestad, so that he could compete in the winter games.

While the committee is always reluctant to take this extraordinary step, the precedent set earlier this year cannot be ignored. I believe Ms. Kunyavsky represents a compelling case for favorable congressional action.

At this point in the RECORD I include the following:

U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE,
Colorado Springs, Colo., February 20, 1984.

Re Marina Kunyavsky, Citizenship.
Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WAXMAN: I am the volunteer chairman for the United States Olympic Committee in Southern California, and have been fortunate to meet Marina at many demonstrations, the gymnastic team has given at our fund raising events, including a luncheon we had with President Reagan last March.

She is a fine young lady and I'm sure she would make a fine United States citizen . . . thus should be given high consideration from our country. I would personally be pleased to see Marina, a new citizen, perform in the 1984 Olympics representing her new country . . . another showcase to the world.

Make 1984 an outstanding year for Marina—citizenship and an Olympian . . . dreams come true.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD P. CRIVELLONE.

U.S. GYMNASTICS FEDERATION,
November 5, 1982.

To: Mr. HENRY WAXMAN.

This letter is being written in support of the application of Marina Kunyavsky for citizenship in the United States. Miss Kunyavsky has worked diligently as an athlete in the United States in the area of Rhythmic Gymnastics. She has shown a great deal of promise as an outstanding athlete and through she diligence is doing very well, learning rapidly, accomplishing much and is definitely an Olympic potential.

At the present time, Miss Kunyavsky is studying under the tutelage of Ms. Alla Svirsky who is the United States National Coach for Rhythmic Gymnastics in California. Any consideration that can be given to

Miss Kunyavsky's application would be greatly appreciated and a gesture of support for American Olympic efforts. I thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROGER L. COUNSIL,
Executive Director.

LOS ANGELES
SCHOOL OF GYMNASTICS,
Culver City, Calif., February 16, 1984.

To: Congressman HENRY A. WAXMAN, 2418 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

From: Alla Svirsky, 1984 USA Olympic Coach, Executive Director, LASG.

Re Marina Kunyavsky.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WAXMAN: It is with deep concern that I write to you about Marina Kunyavsky. She is one of the finest young Rhythmic gymnasts that I have had the opportunity to work with. Her exceptional talent and unrelenting drive and determination led her to a 4th place All-Around finish at the 1983 USA National Championships. At these championships she placed 2nd in the country in the Hoop event, 3rd in the ribbon, and won the 1st place Gold medal with her spectacular Clubs routine. Few athletes work as long and as hard as Marina does. But without her United States Citizenship she will be barred from further competition. If only you could help her obtain these important papers. It would be a final stimulation she would need to reach the highest goals.

Unlike a doctor who can wait for a license to be issued without any loss to his skills, age and time is very limited for an athlete of this caliber. If Marina cannot compete at the 1984 National Championships May 2, 1984, a lifetime of dedication and hard work may be forfeited, for Marina is nearing the peak of her abilities. To lose her chance of representing the United States at the 1984 Olympic Games would shatter a life-long dream and certainly break the spirit of this thoroughbred among the athletes in this sport.

If there is any way you can help Marina, I would be in your debt. It would certainly be a sponsorship that will make you proud. I know in my heart that Marina will someday make all of us very glad to have helped her with her citizenship.

Sincerely,

ALLA SVIRSKY,
1984 USA Olympic Coach,
Executive Director, LASG.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5119, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-731) on the resolution (H. Res. 497) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5119) to authorize international development and security assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3457, SOIL CONSERVATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 493 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 493

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land from wind and water erosion, to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands from cultivation, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 401(a) and 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be considered for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1630

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. WHEAT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 493 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute which is recommended by the Committee on Agriculture and is now printed in the bill. This amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title instead of by section for amendment and each title shall be considered as having been read.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the rule waives all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with sections 401(a) and 402(a) of the Budget Act.

Section 401(a) of the Budget Act prohibits the consideration of any measure which provides new contract authority unless such authority is limited to amounts provided in advance in an appropriation act.

Title IV of H.R. 3457, as introduced, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts for the purpose of carrying out a conservation reserve program.

Since this contract authority is not limited to amounts provided in advance in an appropriation act, the bill violates section 401(a) of the Budget Act and a waiver is necessary.

Section 402(a) of the Budget Act prohibits the consideration of any bill which authorizes the enactment of the new budget authority for a fiscal year, unless the bill was reported on, or before May 15, preceding the beginning of such fiscal year.

H.R. 3457, as introduced, authorizes appropriations for the purposes of carrying out the act effective upon enactment.

Since the bill was not reported by May 15, 1983, it violates section 402(a) of the Budget Act and again, a waiver is necessary.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's growing concerns is the erosion of our farmlands. In 1977, the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) conducted a study and found that 41 million of the country's 413 million acres of cropland consisted of highly erodible soil.

H.R. 3457 attempts to remedy this problem. First, the legislation provides that a farmer who plows land which was previously uncultivated and that is determined by the SCS to be highly erodible, shall be ineligible for certain agricultural benefits. There are, however, certain exceptions to this provision and they are enumerated in the bill. The exceptions were deemed necessary because Federal farm policy since 1973 has at times encouraged

farmers to plant as much of their land as they could.

The bill also provides that a cropland base protection study be conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture and that a soil conservation reserve program be established.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we adopt the rule so that we may proceed to consideration of this important legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 493 is an open rule under which the House will consider legislation to promote soil conservation by penalizing farmers who plant on highly erodible land.

The bill made in order by this rule, H.R. 3457, is somewhat controversial because of the extent to which it seeks to stop the so-called practice of sodbusting.

This rule is an open rule, allowing germane amendments under the 5-minute rule, so the rule itself is not controversial.

The rule does waive two provisions of the Budget Act, in order to allow the House to consider the bill.

The waivers are for section 401(a) and section 402(a) of the Budget Act, and were provided in the rule by the Committee on Rules because the amendment to be offered by the Committee on Agriculture cures the violations.

Mr. Speaker, the major Budget Act problem raised by the bill deals with contract authority. A provision of H.R. 3457, as introduced, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts for a new, conservation reserve program. Since this contract authority is not limited to amounts that may have been provided for in advance by an appropriation, the bill would be subject to a point of order.

The committee substitute cures this violation by limiting the contract authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to amounts as provided in appropriations acts.

The other Budget Act problem with this bill has to do with the reporting date of this bill from the Committee on Agriculture. As introduced, the bill authorizes appropriations effective upon enactment; that is during fiscal year 1984. The bill was not reported prior to May 15, 1983, and thus violates the Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, farm groups and others interested in soil conservation have been attempting to deal with the issue of sodbusting, a practice whereby highly erodible land is used to produce crops.

Most of the farmers in this country support the idea of preventing sodbusting by prohibiting various forms of Government assistance for commodities grown on highly erodible land.

As reported by the Committee on Agriculture, however, H.R. 3457 goes beyond this concept and expands that prohibition to all commodities produced by an individual if any commodity is grown on highly erodible land.

As a result, some farmers—most notably the American Farm Bureau Federation—oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided, and provides for an open amendment process. I urge adoption of the rule, so the House may consider this bill next week.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) for the purpose of getting the program for next week.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we will have soon completed the legislative schedule for this week. There are two pending unanimous consent requests of which I am aware, and perhaps others. Having completed those, we will adjourn and adjourn to meet on Monday next, there being no legislative business for tomorrow.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon and recess for a brief period to receive former Members of Congress. This is an annual ceremony which has become a matter of some considerable interest to our former colleagues.

After the completion of that, the House will reconvene and take up two suspensions. H.R. 5278, the Federal Reserve Bank Directors Act of 1984, and House Joint Resolution 548, subpena power for the President's Commission on Organized Crime.

Then under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate, the House will take up the general debate on the Soil Conservation Service Act of 1984. All we plan to do on Monday is to complete general debate on that bill.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. Let us bear in mind that Tuesday is the day of primary elections in many States, Ohio being one of them, North Carolina being another, Indiana being a third, and various others being involved as well. Therefore, we will hope not to have votes until perhaps 2 o'clock on Tuesday in order that Members may be home Monday evening, vote Tuesday, and come back if they desire to vote on bills up for consideration on that day.

We will recess early for a 10 a.m. Truman centennial ceremony. Our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, has been preparing, along with a committee, a very interesting program for us. I hope all Members will find it worthwhile for them to be in attendance on the House floor at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning for the centennial of the birth of Harry S. Truman.

After the completion of that ceremony, the House will take up two more bills on suspension, H.R. 5121, Virginia Wilderness, and H.R. 3788, Texas Wilderness, and then perhaps go to the conference report on S. 1129, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act amendments, then take up the rule and general debate on H.R. 5119, foreign aid authorizations.

On Tuesday, we will have recorded votes on suspensions debate on Monday and Tuesday.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at noon. On Thursday and Friday, if it is necessary to have a session on Friday, we shall meet at 11 a.m.

We will continue the consideration through Wednesday and what part of Thursday may be necessary of the foreign aid authorization bill and complete its consideration.

□ 1640

There are several amendments that will be offered to that bill of which I am sure most of the Members are aware; others will be made aware.

Then we would hope to return to the Soil Conservation Act of 1984 and complete its consideration. Aside from that, and the fact that conference reports may be brought up at any time, the Chair would announce any additional program later.

Mr. REGULA. What time does the gentleman anticipate that we might start legislative business on Tuesday?

Mr. WRIGHT. One o'clock on Tuesday would be the anticipated hour for the beginning of legislative business, and we would hope that votes might not occur until perhaps 2 o'clock and later.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman from Texas and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Notably missing on the list of suspensions that we are going to take up was the equal access bill that had originally been scheduled for consideration, I think, on Monday. Do we have some assurance that that is going to get on the calendar pretty soon?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for his response.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman asked about that bill. It was indeed scheduled for consideration on

21-059 O-87-30 (Pt. 9)

suspension of the rules next week; however, a certain number of Members petitioned the Democratic caucus for the scheduling of a caucus on Wednesday for the purpose of discussing that bill, and requested that the leadership postpone its formal consideration until that caucus has been completed.

In deference to those Members, and under the rules of the Democratic caucus which compel us to call a caucus upon the signatures of 50 Members petitioning us to do so, we have postponed consideration of that legislation until the following week.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, then it is my understanding that we expect to have it on the Suspension Calendar on Monday next?

Mr. WRIGHT. It would be my expectation that we would probably have it on suspension the week after the coming week. It may be that Members would prefer to debate it under a regular rule; but it would seem plausible to me, in the absence of an overpowering desire on a great many Members' parts, that it would be something that might come under the suspension of the rules.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 7, 1984

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday next, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE CONCERNING SOLIDARITY SUNDAY FOR SOVIET JEWRY

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 450) to express the sense of the House of Representatives concerning Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not object, but I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objections to the legislation being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in staunch support of House Resolution 450 which recognizes May 6, 1984, as Solidarity Sunday with Soviet Jewry. On this Sunday at Dag Hammarskjold Plaza opposite the United Nations, over 100,000 people will once again peacefully protest the Soviet Union's inhumane actions against their own citizens. I was pleased to have sponsored last year's Solidarity Sunday resolution, and welcome working this year with the gentlelady from New York (Ms. FERRARO) in gaining House passage of this year's measure.

Mr. Speaker, Solidarity Sunday illustrates both hope and anguish.

The pain, obviously, is the fact that such inhumane conditions exist in the world today. Prisoner of Conscience Anatoly Shcharansky has become the symbol of the plight of Soviet Jewry. But, Anatoly and thousands of other Soviet Jews are refuseniks and/or Prisoners of Conscience not because of any crime they committed, but rather because they are Jewish and seek to emigrate in order to openly practice their religion.

I would like to relate to my colleagues the plight and struggle of another Soviet Jew, that of Mark Nashpitz. Mr. Nashpitz is a stomatologist who first applied for an exit visa in January 1970. He was refused permission to leave the U.S.S.R. in March 1971, because his father, who illegally emigrated from the Soviet Union, was branded a traitor. Mark has been made to answer for his father's emigration. However, his mother was allowed to emigrate to Israel in 1974.

On March 31, 1975, Mark Nashpitz was convicted and sentenced to 5 years internal exile in Siberia for "active partaking in group activities that are disturbing public order." Actually, all Nashpitz was guilty of was peacefully protesting the Soviet Government's policy on emigration. It has been over 13 years since Nashpitz first applied for emigration. Now married, with a young man son, Nashpitz reapplied again for emigration in July 1979. He, his wife, and their son still await permission to leave the Soviet Union to be reunited with Mark's mother in Israel.

The scenario for other Soviet Jews is much the same. Very few are allowed to emigrate and all are persecuted and harassed for even trying to practice Judaism. In 1979, some 51,320 Soviet Jews were allowed to leave the U.S.S.R. But in 1983, a scant 1,314 were able to emigrate to freedom.

But, Mr. Speaker, the real anguish resides in those thousands of Soviet Jews who have filed for exist visas and have been denied them. As a result, not only are these refuseniks not allowed to emigrate, they lose their jobs, their friends, and any privileges they may have had before applying. Typically, they become targets of KGB harassment. They anguish in pain but with hope.

This hope, this glimmer of light at the end of the long tunnel to freedom is why we are here today in support of House Resolution 450 and why hundreds of thousands will gather Sunday at the United Nations in New York. There is hope that the Soviet Union will recognize that the free world cares about human rights, supports freedom of religion, and abides by international codes of conduct such as the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 and the Universal Code on Human Rights.

The Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry has been active in writing and calling refuseniks and prisoners of conscience, monitoring Soviet activity and American response, and overall, educating the general public about the atrocity of the whole situation. It is through their efforts that we gather here in this Chamber today and that thousands of citizens will unite at the United Nations on Sunday, May 6.

I applaud their devoted efforts. I urge my colleagues and fellow Americans to adopt a refusenik and to write him or her faithfully. I also wish to thank my colleagues for their continued support of Soviet Jewry. On March 15, over 180 Members joined in recognition of the International Day of Concern for Soviet Jewry.

Tragically, we learned the consequences of silence during World War II when Hitler murdered 6 million innocent Jews only because they were Jewish. A somewhat similar situation of oppression exists today in the Soviet Union and the situation is getting worse as evidenced by the low emigration numbers.

However, there is still hope. The issue of Soviet Jewry is paramount on the U.S. negotiating agenda. And, if it were not for the continued support of my colleagues and citizens of the free world, the Soviet Jews could very well

be in an even worse situation—they could be simply forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget. We must not be silent. We must continue to speak out and act and do all we can to free the Soviet Jews from their oppression. Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to join in reaffirming and redoubling our commitment to Soviet Jewry by supporting House Resolution 450.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 450

Whereas, on May 6, 1984, the eighty-five constituent agencies of the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry will sponsor "Solidarity Sunday" to reaffirm the resolve to secure freedom for Soviet Jews and beleaguered people everywhere;

Whereas Americans of all faiths and from all regions of the country will join with the Conference on that day in activities expressing the solidarity of our people with the almost three million Jews in the Soviet Union;

Whereas the right to emigrate freely and to be reunited with families abroad is being denied Soviet Jews and others, in clear violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 and the Final Document of the Madrid Conference, signed in 1983;

Whereas Soviet Jewish emigration has dropped alarmingly from a high of fifty-one thousand three hundred and twenty in 1979 to just one thousand three hundred and fourteen in all of 1983;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union has implemented new emigration restrictions designed to make the process of obtaining a visa even more arduous;

Whereas those Soviet Jews and other persons who have applied to leave the Soviet Union have been subjected to expulsion from jobs and schools, exile from major Soviet cities and constant surveillance and harassment;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union is denying all its Jewish citizens even those rights and privileges accorded other recognized religions in the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union discriminates against Jewish culture and religion by arresting Hebrew teachers, attacking Hebrew teaching circles as "subversive," and promoting anti-Semitic ideology under the cloak of "anti-Zionism;'

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union will not succeed in isolating Soviet Jews from friends in the West so long as those who cherish liberty and human rights continue to speak out on behalf of beleaguered people everywhere;

Whereas "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry" will serve as an expression of our determination to continue efforts to obtain freedom for Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, to have exit visas granted to veteran refuseniks who have sought permission to emigrate for up to fourteen years, and to secure the free exercise of religious beliefs and cultural expression for all minorities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry" on May 6, 1984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. OAKAR) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. FERRARO).

Ms. FERRARO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this Sunday thousands of Americans will gather in New York City in solidarity with the 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union.

I would today like to thank my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Ms. OAKAR and all the other Members who have made it possible for this House to add its powerful voice to the outrage all Americans feel at the treatment of Soviet Jewry.

The importance of our action here today cannot be overestimated. Twenty Jews are imprisoned in the Soviet Union today for the "crimes" of teaching Hebrew and speaking out against the human rights policies of the Kremlin. Some 20,000 Jews who have been denied exist visas live in constant fear of harassment by an unrelenting bureaucracy which has deprived refuseniks of jobs, housing, even medical care. And no Jew in the Soviet Union is safe as long as the regime pursues policies of anti-Semitism, under the guise of opposition to Israel.

The Jews of the Soviet Union need to know they are not alone in their struggle. And this demonstration of solidarity is one of the most effective means we have for showing them—and showing the Soviet Government—that their plight will never be forgotten or ignored.

This Sunday's march to the United Nations will be the 13th Solidarity Sunday organized by the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry and its 85 affiliated groups and agencies.

These organizations—and thousands of individuals in New York and all over the United States—have worked tirelessly to make known the conditions of fear and persecution in which the Soviet Jewish population lives.

They have brought to public consciousness the cases of such human rights heroes and heroines as Anatoly Shcharansky, Iosef Begun, Ida Nudel, Vladimir Feltsman, and others, less famous, who are nonetheless fighting for the right to practice their religion and express their ethnic heritage.

The Soviet authorities have attempted to discourage these people by telling them "No one in the West cares." Today, this body makes it clear that we do indeed care very much.

We care that Soviet Jewish emigration has been cut 98 percent since 1979. We care that in March just 51 Jews were granted visas for Israel. We care about Soviet violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, and the final document of the Madrid Conference of 1983—all of which affirm the right of family reunification.

We care that prisoners of conscience like Anatoly Shcharansky, Aleksandr Paritsky, and Felix Kochubievsky are in failing health as a result of their harsh and unfair prison sentences.

We care that former prisoner Ida Nudel, an economist, has been refused permission to live in Moscow, her home, and is working as an amusement park attendant.

I will take part in Sunday's march and rally and expect to see many of my colleagues there. And I think we can all be proud that this House today is telling our own Government leaders and the Kremlin that we will never forget or abandon the Jews of the Soviet Union in their fight for the most basic of human rights.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to commend the two Members from New York for raising this issue, and I would like to speak a little bit and use this issue as a vehicle to briefly speak about a trip that Congresswoman SCHROEDER and I took to the Soviet Union took during the Easter recess.

The purpose of our trip was to discuss arms control, and we did do that. In addition to that, we brought up issues that relate to human rights, we talked about the oppression that exists in the Soviet Union. We talked about the Lithuanian clergymen, Father Alphonse Svarinkas and Father Tamkevicus who are imprisoned illegally; we talked about the Ukrainian 80-year-old woman, Oksana Meshko who is imprisoned. We feel it is a great violation of human rights, and we raise the issue of oppression as well concerning the plight of the Soviet Jews.

□ 1650

One of the most moving experiences for me when I was there was to meet with Mrs. Anatoly Shcharansky, who is the mother of the imprisoned human rights advocate and hero, Anatoly Shcharansky, whose only crime was to speak out about the lack of enforcement of the Helsinki accords.

Congresswoman SCHROEDER and I had to meet with her in a parked car lest we have our conversation bugged. While we were there meeting with this elderly woman, whose only concern and major concern was the plight of her son who is in prison, who is very, very ill we were told by her, she asked us if we would personally deliver a letter to Secretary Chernenko. We

agreed to try to do that, and we are going to do through using the vehicle of the Soviet Ambassador here in the United States, and give to him the handwritten letter of Mrs. Shcharansky.

This letter is a mother's plea to have her son removed and released from prison. He has served 7 years and he is up for a form of parole of the 14-year sentence that he has and they, of course, have refused to release him.

So it was a very moving experience to see this 76-year-old woman who had such courage, who was not afraid to try to meet with us in the back streets of Moscow to ask our support, and we only hope that in some small measure we are able to help her.

In addition to meeting with Mrs. Shcharansky, we also met with other so-called refuseniks who are courageously engaging in their attempt to be released from the Soviet Union. I want to tell my colleagues a little bit about the other individuals with whom we met.

We met with Valeriy Soyfer, who is a former professor of molecular genetics; Aleksandr Lerner, who is a former professor and a senior leader of the refusenik community. He is a well known scientist. We met with Boris Gulko, who is an internationally known chess player; with Mark Reytman, who is a member of the Independent Peace Committee, not the peace committee controlled by the Soviet Government, but he and his colleagues courageously oppose the nuclear buildup and are trying to form an international community related to peace.

We also met with Lev Blitshtein, whose wife and son are in the United States, but he, himself, is not able to leave the Soviet Union and he has not seen them for more than 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, none of these individuals are able to practice the profession that they are trained to practice. What a great reminder to me it was that we do, indeed, live in the greatest country in the world. Certainly in the Soviet Union they have their physical needs met. They have enough food, it appears. They do have housing. They do have health care and things of that nature. But they lack something very fundamental to what we value, and that is our value of freedom. We do, indeed, live in the freest country in the world, and if our citizens desire to go to another country, we do not have those kinds of problems.

So these people are courageously protesting that and have asked to leave the Soviet Union. Because of that, they are being absolutely unduly penalized. I, for one, was very touched by meeting with them.

We also raised the human rights issue because Congresswoman SCHROEDER and I are both on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and chair various subcommittees. We brought up the failure of delivery of mail to the Soviet citizens by those living in other countries. We have had many, many hearings on that issue and we know that one of the real forms of oppression is to be closed in so that you have no communication with the outside world. It is another form of thought control. I think in many ways, 1984, as verbalized by the great novelist and essayist and journalist, George Orwell, is alive and well with respect to the suppression of these people.

So I want to join with my colleagues, obviously, in supporting this resolution and I ask, again, for their consideration in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that we are delighted with this resolution and we ask that it be voted upon unanimously.

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in speaking out for House Resolution 450 which calls for an official recognition of Solidarity Sunday, a day to reaffirm the resolve to secure freedom for Soviet Jews and beleaguered people everywhere.

Whan Anatoly Shcharansky spoke the following words at his trial several years ago, I believe he expressed the very essense of that which we are seeking for those imprisoned or persecuted because of religious, ideological, and racial preferences:

> Now, I'm further than ever from my dream. It would seem to be a cause for regret. But it's absolutely otherwise. I am happy. I am happy that I have lived honestly in peace with my conscience. I never compromised my soul even under the threat of death.

While we freely speak our minds here today, thousands of Soviet Jews live in fear simply because they wish to practice the tradition of their forefathers. Anatoly Shcharansky is one of those who openly voiced his commitment to his Jewish heritage. We are all aware of his cruel punishment by the Soviet and worry whether he can survive his imprisonment.

Solidarity Sunday provides an opportunity for all of us who can speak out to do so for those who cannot. By raising our collective voices each year at the massive Solidarity Day rally, we send a powerful message to both the persecutors and the oppressed. To the Soviet authorities, we say that we remain aware of their inhumanity and that the grim present outlook has strengthened our commitment to the cause of Soviet Jewry.

More importantly, Solidarity Sunday communicates to the Soviet Jews our heartfelt concern for their plight. Last summer, several colleagues and I visited a number of refuseniks during a congressional trip to the Soviet Union. The refuseniks explained to us that it is precisely our vocal concern that provides them with the encouragement and confirmation of the justness of their cause, and that allows them to go on. We who are free are their lifeline and bear a responsibility to live up to their confidence. And in the absense of meaningful concessions by the Soviets, it is the unbroken spirit of the refuseniks that must remain our greatest fulfillment.

Our efforts are required now more then ever. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the resolution before us today.●

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry will hold its 13th annual Solidarity Sunday. More than 100,000 people from throughout the Northeast are expected to join the march down Fifth Avenue and the rally across from the United Nations to protest the Soviet Union's repressive treatment of its 2½ million Jews, who comprise the world's third largest Jewish community.

This rally, which promises to be the largest manifestation of support for Soviet Jews anywhere in the world this year, comes at a critical time. Emigration of Soviet Jews is at a 16-year low. Only 303 Jews have been allowed to leave the Soviet Union this year; fewer than would have been allowed to leave in a single day as recently as 1979. In the meantime, at least 20 Prisoners of Conscience are rotting in Soviet prisons and camps. Those Jews not incarcerated in body are in fact trapped in spirit—prohibited from observing even their most basic rituals like reading the Torah, and becoming increasingly isolated from their cultural and religious heritage. In nearly every aspect of their daily lives, they must confront the harassment and anti-Semitism that are part of the systematic effort to rob them of their cultural identity.

We must not let up in our demands that the Soviet Union end the oppression of its Jews. On Sunday we will march for the bravery of the refuseniks who continue their struggle for freedom and the liberty of their Jewish countrymen. We will demonstrate that we have not forgotten the tyranny and degradation that the Soviet Government is imposing on its Jewish citizenry, nor the Soviet disregard for every international standard of law and decency. And we will show not only the Soviet Union but the rest of the world that we have not given up in our fight for the freedom of Soviet Jews.●

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this resolution has a dual significance. It represents the continued struggle of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union and throughout the world. It also signifies the continued victory of the community and its sup-

porters and our ability to make this an issue of real importance.

We will not forget this struggle. We will not forget our friends locked in the grip of the Soviet state. Their rights will be remembered.

It is difficult to understand how hard it must be to be a refusenik. The depression and fear that must go along with being refused a visa is hard to imagine. Yet, these courageous individuals continue to struggle, and that struggle is not a sign of defeat but of victory.

We must continue to support these individuals with our letters, our rallies, or vigils, and our days of remembrance. It is not only the right thing to do, it is our responsibility.

As members of a free society we are responsible for keeping their hopes alive.

Solidarity Day is a reminder for all of us of how lucky we are to be free. This country was founded, in part, as a haven for religious freedom. That freedom is the most fundamental kind of freedom; freedom of the spirit.

This Sunday represents a lashing out against those who would crush the spirit of the countless refuseniks. They use us as their light, as their hope, their means of escape. It is a small gesture on our part. They are the heroes and heroines.

Their courage represents a moral victory. Their strength is an inspiration. Solidarity Day is their symbol.●

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Ressolution 450. As a cosponsor of this resolution, I am pleased to participate in this expression of congressional support for Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry, which will take place on May 6. The march for Soviet Jewry demonstrates the firm determination of the American people to force the Soviet Union to abide by internationally recognized standards on human rights, and to allow Soviet Jews to emigrate.

Athough we may become frustrated at times by the decrease in the number of Jews allowed to leave the Soviet Union, we have a moral obligation to insure that this issue remains prominent on the United States-Soviet agenda. Americans of all religious backgrounds join forces on Solidarity Sunday, thus proclaiming our invincible commitment to the Soviet Jews who bear the sacrifices that inevitably result from their decision to emigrate.

The poster recently distributed by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry gave me reason to pause and reflect. It provides a most poignant sketch of a Soviet Jewish woman. The deep lines in her face show the anguish she has endured in her sad journey to acquire freedom. Above her picture are a few words we should remember each time we become discouraged: "Take my picture. Show my face. Tell everyone I'm still here." While these words are very simple, they reflect the pain of the Soviet Jews who hope and pray that they will not be forgotten and allowed to languish indefinitely in the Soviet Union. Indeed, for our brothers and sisters in the Soviet Union, the world is a very lonely place. For many of the refuseniks, we are their hope and inspiration.

By adopting House Resolution 450, the House of Representatives today reiterates its fervent support for the thousands of brave Soviet Jews who seek to flee oppression. As Americans, we cannot fully appreciate the personal courage of these people who sacrifice so much by making the decision to fulfill their right to emigrate as delineated in the Helsinki accords and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is our moral obligation to stand in solidarity with the Soviet Jews as they endure in their battle to secure freedom. Solidarity Sunday is a firm expression of our determination to remain faithful in this struggle.●

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 6, over 100,000 Americans will gather for the 13th year in New York City to express their solidarity with the oppressed Jews of the Soviet Union.

On Solidarity Sunday, the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry will sponsor the largest public manifestation of support for Soviet Jewry in the world. I, as well as many of my colleagues, will be attending the march and rally near the United Nations headquarters. We will be joined by Americans of all races, religions and walks of life in a truly nonsectarian display of concern for those Soviet citizens denied their most basic rights.

This year's rally is an especially important event because the current plight of Soviet Jews is at its worst since the time of the infamous Leningrad trials of 1970–71. Fewer than 100 Jews per month are now allowed to leave, a 98-percent drop in the emigration rate from 1979. Harassment of refuseniks and anti-Semitism, against even nonactivist Jews, have risen sharply. Jewish religious services are regularly discouraged or disrupted. This persecution cannot continue.

Participation in Solidarity Sunday is a practical step that many of us can take to improve the deteriorating condition of Soviet Jews. First, we will be urging the Kremlin to cease its counterproductive and discriminatory policies against is Jewish citizens. These practices have contributed to the recent decay in our ties to the Soviet Union. Second, we will remind the administration that human rights should be a priority issue in our relations with the Soviets. Our Government must never slacken its commitment to Soviet dissidents and Prisoners of Conscience. Finally and, perhaps, most importantly, we will convey a sense of hope and encouragement to our many suffering friends who merely want to exercise their basic rights of religion, speech, assembly, and movement.

I would like to thank the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry for offering all of us this opportunity to convey our continued support for Soviet Jewish refuseniks and Prisoners of Conscience. We will persevere in our solidarity until all Soviet Jews are allowed to live their lives as Jews in the Soviet Union or are allowed to emigrate to Israel. I am confident that Solidarity Sunday will bring us one step closer to that day.●

● Mr. GREEN. I rise in support of House Resolution 450, expressing the sense of the House concerning Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry, May 6. I would also like to commend my distinguished colleagues from New York, Representatives FERRARO and GILMAN, for their time and effort in bringing this resolution to the floor.

The theme of this year's Solidarity Sunday is "Take my picture. Show my face. Tell everyone I'm still here." It is an especially poignant message as the emigration numbers continue to decline and the Jews still trapped in the Soviet Union must begin to feel like the forgotten people. By all reliable accounts, there are still more than 2½ million Soviet Jews, many of whom have waited for over a decade to emigrate.

According to the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry, the number of Jews allowed to emigrate in April was 74, bringing the total for 1984 to a pitiful 303. Those who remain are faced with new laws each day, each one more repressive. The latest law states that, as of February 1984, a person who receives material valuables from a foreign source is subject to arrest for anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. Such persons face up to 10 years in labor camp and 5 years Siberian exile. As Greater New York Conference points out:

> The language of this law is so vague that when a well-intentioned person sends a package or gift to relatives in the Soviet Union, the recipient will be vulnerable to arrest.

As we continue in our capacities as Members of Congress and human rights advocates, I urge that we remember the pleas of those captive in the Soviet Union: "Tell everyone I'm still here." And let us tell the world also that we shall not forget them.●

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, May 6, marks the 13th annual demonstration of Solidarity Sunday with Soviet Jewry. New Yorkers 100,000 strong will march to Dag Hammarskjold Plaza to demonstrate their concern for the plight of Soviet Jewry.

Recent experience has taught us the price of silence. As long as the Soviet Union thinks no one is watching, it

will feel free to continue its brutal practices. Only when the rest of the world expresses its outrage do the Soviets respond.

Solidarity Sunday provides a forum for all Americans to express their outrage over the continuing abuses of the human rights of Soviet Jews. In all of 1983, the number of Jews permitted to leave the Soviet Union totaled just over 1,300—only one-third the monthly rate of 1979. Officially sanctioned anti-Semitism is on the rise as well. Last summer, the Soviet Government began promoting a pamphlet titled "The Class Essence of Zionism," a virulent anti-Semitic piece thinly disguised as a historical treatise.

This resolution sends an important message to the Soviet Union that the Congress has not forgotten the plight of Soviet Jewry. I urge my colleagues to express their solidarity with Soviet Jewry by voting for this resolution, and I commend the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry for this sponsorship of Solidarity Sunday.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today as a cosponsor and advocate of House Resolution 450, a resolution expressing congressional support for Solidarity Sunday, a day when over 100,000 Americans rally in New York City to signify their unity with Soviet Jews. This year's event marks the 13th annual Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry, and it will be held on May 6, 1984, beginning with a march down Fifth Avenue.

Solidarity Sunday is sponsored each year by the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry (GNYCSJ) an organization dedicated to improving the plight of the more than 2,500,000 Soviet Jews. Under the able leadership of Chairman Herbert Kronish and Executive Director Zeesy Schnur, the GNYCSJ serves as a vital communication link and information source for Soviet Jews and those of us who support their cause. Having worked closely with the GNYCSJ over the years, I can attest to the substantial contribution they have made to the Soviet Jewry cause, and particularly to the many efforts undertaken by Congress.

According to the GNYCSJ:

> This year's Solidarity Sunday march and rally will be the largest public manifestation of support for Soviet Jews in the world in 1984 * * * Solidarity Sunday 1984 comes at a critical time for the more than 2,500,000 Soviet Jews, and it represents a unique public opportunity to demand that the new Soviet leadership reopen the gates of emigration and restore the basic human rights of the Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience and refuseniks.

To understand the special significance of this year's Solidarity Sunday it is necessary to reflect on the dramatic and continuing rise in Soviet anti-Semitism during the past year. Consider, for example, that Soviet Jewish emigration dropped sharply in 1983 to its lowest level in modern history. Only 1,315 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union in 1983, down from the previous low of 2,688 who were allowed to emigrate in 1982. The 1983 figure represents a 98-percent decline from the record high number of Soviet Jews—51,330—who were permitted to emigrate in 1979.

Further, it should be noted that this disturbing trend has continued into 1984. Through April of this year, only 303 Jewish citizens were allowed to leave the Soviet Union. This figure is significantly lower than the 435 Soviet Jews who were permitted to emigrate during the same period last year. Significantly, the 4-month totals for both 1983 and 1984, when added together, do not even represent one-third the number of Soviet Jews who emigrated during the single month of April 1980—when 2,469 Soviet Jews emigrated.

A historical view of modern day Soviet Jewish emigration reveals the following figures: 1971, 13,022; 1972, 31,681; 1973, 34,733; 1974, 20,628; 1975, 13,221; 1976, 14,261; 1977, 16,736; 1978, 28,864; 1979, 51,329; 1980, 21,471; 1981, 9,249; 1982, 2,684; 1983, 1,315; and 1984 (through April), 303.

In addition to the record low emigration figures, 1983 also marked the Soviet Government's formation of an Anti-Zionist Committee which has intensified what was already a vicious anti-Semitic campaign.

The Anti-Zionist Committee has even gone so far as saying that the Jews who wanted to leave the Soviet Union have already left. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, over 400,000 of the approximately 3 million Soviet Jews have begun the emigration process, and some 20,000 have been denied permission to emigrate on more than one occasion.

Particularly distressing are the considerable number of Soviet Jews who have been arrested, imprisoned, and denied freedom of religious expression in retaliation for requests to emigrate. These Prisoners of Conscience now total 19, with five new Soviet Jewish activists imprisoned in 1983. The new prisoners included Iosif Begun, who was imprisoned for the third time; Simon Shnirman; Yuri Tarnopolsky, who is now suffering through a hunger strike to protest his terrible mistreatment at the hands of Soviet authorities; Aleksandr Panaryev, and Levi Elbert, who was further harassed during the past year on trumped up drug charges that were later dropped. Only one long-term refusenik—Eitan Finkelshtein—received an exit visa during 1983.

The past year was particularly noteworthy for perhaps the most prominent of the Prisoners of Conscience, Anatoly Shcharansky. On September 15, 1983, my home State of New York celebrated "Anatoly Shcharansky Day." The date was chosen for a special reason—it marked the halfway point in Mr. Shcharansky's 13-year sentence as a Soviet Prisoner of Conscience. This was a significant day in Anatoly Shcharansky's terrible ordeal since, under Soviet law, prisoners who have served at least half their sentence can be released for medical reasons. Mr. Shcharansky, who has been in very poor health due to his severe mistreatment, is eligible for such an early release. Tragically, Anatoly Shcharansky, who was arrested on March 15, 1977, on trumped up charges of treason, anti-Soviet agitation, and propaganda, remains imprisoned.

It should also be noted that while Anatoly Shcharansky's treatment has been particularly harsh, other Prisoners of Conscience are similarly treated, and are often popular targets for Soviet forced labor practices. One of the others reported to be suffering poor health during the past year was my adopted Prisoner of Conscience, Feliks Kochubievsky. Mr. Kochubievsky has been the target of constant Soviet Government harassment since he attempted to organize a U.S.S.R-Israel Friendship Society in 1978. He is currently serving a 2½-year prison sentence for his effort, which the local KGB has maintained is anti-Soviet. Mr. Kochubievsky and his wife, Valentina, have been waiting more than 6 years to be granted visas to emigrate to Israel where both of their sons reside.

Other Soviet Jews, who have required special expressions of concern from myself and other Members of Congress this past year, include Rimma and Vladimir Bravve, Zachar Zunshein, and Vladimir Tsukerman, to name just a few.

During the past year I have also joined my House colleagues in approving a resolution calling on the Soviet Union to comply with certain international agreements it has signed requiring the observance of basic human rights, including the right to emigrate; approving a resolution condemning the use of forced labor in the Soviet Union, a practice often directed against Prisoners of Conscience; sending a letter to then-Soviet President Yuriy Andropov urging the Soviet Union to release the Prisoners of Conscience in response to the 269 passengers killed on Korean Air Lines flight 007, which was shot down by the Soviets in September; and forming the International Parliamentary Group for Human Rights in the Soviet Union, which offers another important forum to focus attention on the horrendous human rights situation in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, while it is difficult to assess the impact of any one of these actions in support of Soviet Jews, the message I have received both directly

and indirectly from the Soviet Jewish population is that these efforts offer a great deal of much needed hope to the 2.5 million Soviet Jews who are denied any sense of hope by their own Government. As leaders of the free world it is our duty to insure that these efforts in support of the Soviet Jewry cause continue. Solidarity Sunday is without question one of the most visible displays of our support for Soviet Jews and I strongly urge that we formally and unanimously endorse that even through the passage of House Resolution 450.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 6, marks a significant event in the fight for religious freedom and human rights. On that day, over 100,000 people will march in New York City to demonstrate their sympathy and support for Soviet Jews. Our solidarity with Soviet Jews will send a powerful message that these brave men and women are not forgotten. It will also send a powerful message to the Soviet regime that the Western World will not turn its back on the plight of these courageous people who have long suffered under the Kremlin's persecution and harassment.

Throughout my service in the U.S. Congress, I have worked with my colleagues on behalf of the thousands of Soviet Jews whose only crime is seeking the freedom to practice the religion of their choice in the country of their choice. Never in those years has their plight been as serious as it is today. Jewish emigration has almost completely halted. In 1983, only slightly more than 1,300 Soviet Jews were permitted to obtain visas to emigrate, far fewer than those given visas in a month's time in the 1970's.

Even worse, officially sanctioned abuse, harassment, and persecution of the cruelest sort has increased alarmingly. Within the past week, Soviet hooligans administered a brutal beating to a young Soviet Jew, Karmi Elbert, whose family seeks to emigrate to Israel. There is no question in my mind that this vicious beating was directly linked to our efforts in America to win freedom for the Elbert family. Such outrageously anti-Semitic attacks must be protested by everyone who respects religious freedom.

In this context, it is my prayer that this year's march for Soviet Jewry will be even more successful than last year's and will increase public awareness to the very serious anti-Semitic violence encouraged by the Soviet regime.

This is the goal of Solidarity Sunday. We in the West who are blessed with the freedom to practice our religious beliefs as we choose must never forget those who are denied this basic right, those who must daily struggle under tyranny's dark oppression.

Solidarity Sunday will help each and every Soviet Jew know that he or she is not forgotten. Our unity, our solidarity, with them in the spirit of human rights and religious freedom joins us in the prayerful belief that the day of freedom will come for all who seek it.●

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ASTHMA AND ALLERGY AWARENESS WEEK

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 244) designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. OAKAR) for bringing up this resolution on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, as recently as 10 years ago, millions of American children and adults with asthma and allergies lived as had their forebearers, struggling without much hope against these very common, choice-limiting and sometimes life-threatening diseases. Hopes for improved health were for them, as they had been for generations before, slight.

But, throughout the 1970's and continuing today, our investments in the science of immunology have paid remarkable dividends, elevating the base of scientific knowledge, raising standards throughout our Nation in medical diagnosis and treatment.

Today, I am proud to say, knowledge is combining with clinical care and practical measures to dramatically increase the possibilities for better health for over 35 million Americans with asthma and allergic diseases. Our challenge today is to promote the spread of this knowledge throughout medicine and to patients, their families, their employers, and their teachers. The payback to one of every six of us will be significant: Better results at school, fewer workdays lost, and reduced economic hardships.

These are the basic reasons for our passage of a joint resolution this evening, requesting the President to proclaim next week, May 6 to 12 as America's first National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week, a special emphasis period during which the many unfortunate myths surrounding asthma and allergies can be broken, and better knowledge widely disseminated to millions of Americans. Volunteers and professionals throughout the Nation are tonight poised to begin the most extensive program of information and educational events ever developed to inform the public about the true nature of asthma and allergies, as well as to help millions create new and better choices leading to more healthy lives. And, as a definite result of this resolution and the week it will help proclaim, the growth of immunologic research will be further stimulated, providing new knowledge in our fight against a host of other major diseases with immune system complications.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 244

Whereas asthma and allergic diseases result in physical, emotional, and economic hardship for more than thirty-five million Americans and their families;

Whereas thousands of Americans, many of them young, die each year from asthma even though sufficient medical knowledge and resources exist to prevent many asthma-related deaths;

Whereas student absenteeism is due in significant part to asthma and allergic diseases;

Whereas environmental conditions in the workplace often cause or exacerbate asthma and allergic diseases among employees;

Whereas many hospital patients suffer allergic reactions to prescribed medications;

Whereas it is estimated that the American public pays $2,000,000,000 per year in medical bills directly attributable to the treatment and diagnosis of asthma and allergic diseases and pays another $2,000,000,000 per year as a result of the indirect social cost of such illnesses;

Whereas, because of recent developments in the study of immunology, health care providers are better equipped to diagnose and treat asthma and allergic diseases; and

Whereas increased public awareness of recent scientific advancements in the study of immunology will help dispel many of the common misconceptions concerning asthma, allergic diseases, and the victims of those illnesses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning on May 6, 1984, is hereby designated as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. OAKAR) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. O'BRIEN) and ask for the adoption of this resolution.

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1984, Representative GEORGE O'BRIEN and I introduced House Joint Resolution 463, which designates the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week." I am pleased that the House is considering this bill today, and I want to commend all of my colleagues who cosponsored our bill.

Asthma and allergic diseases result in physical, emotional, and economic burdens for more than 35 million American children, adults, and their families. Tragically, thousands of Americans, many of them young, die each year from asthma despite the fact that knowledge and resources exist to prevent many of these deaths.

Scientific knowledge about asthma and allergic disorders is growing and making remarkable gains. Unfortunately, misconceptions concerning asthma and allergic disorders still persist, creating hardships for millions of our citizens. In order to emphasize the importance of public education and awareness and to encourage the continued public and private support of research, I am hopeful that my colleagues will support and adopt this resolution.●

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to consider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ARTS WITH THE HANDICAPPED WEEK

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 220) to designate the week of May 20, 1984, through May 26, 1984, as "National Arts With the Handicapped Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I would like to commend the gentlewoman for bringing this resolution up and also for the sponsors of the resolution, and at the same time I would like to raise the body's awareness of the National Committee Arts With the Handicapped, an educational affiliate of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, as our Nation's coordinating agency for the arts programs for disabled people.

□ 1700

This year the NCAH will celebrate its 10th anniversary with a national very special arts festival in Washington, D.C. Over 750 disabled persons from all 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, will demonstrate their outstanding accomplishments in the visual and performing arts.

The National Committee conducts arts programs on a year round basis for over 500,000 disabled people. Over a million students, educators, parents, and others participate in the NCAH sponsored workshops, performance and in-service training programs. With this kind of vibrant leadership, NCAH has pioneered the arts with the handicapped movement. The committee continues to develop innovative projects and through the very special arts festival programs, NCAH conducts a nationwide program which is unlike any other in the country.

I think it is important to emphasize the need and also the tremendous potential of our handicapped in this area.

I commend the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, the official designation of May 20–26, 1984, as National Arts With the Handicapped Week recognizes the strong commitment of our country's leaders to providing opportunities for disabled and nondisabled children, youth and adults to participate in the arts.

The National Committee, Arts With the Handicapped, an educational affiliate of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, is our Nation's coordinating agency for arts programs for disabled people. This year, NCAH will celebrate its 10th anniversary with a national very special arts festival in Washington, D.C. Over 750 disabled persons from all 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will demonstrate their outstanding accomplishments in the visual and performing arts. The National Committee conducts arts programs on a year-round basis for over 500,000 disabled people. Over a million students, educators, parents, volunteers, and others participate in NCAH sponsored workshops, performances and in-service training programs.

With vibrant leadership, NCAH has pioneered the arts with the handicapped movement. The committee continues to develop innovative projects, and through the very special arts festival programs, NCAH conducts a nationwide program which is unlike any other in the country.

During the past decade, hundreds of thousands of handicapped people have experienced for themselves and have shared with others the joy and the beauty that dance, theater, music, painting and sculpture bring to the human spirit. The arts provide a noncompetitive opportunity for handicapped people to enter the mainstream of society.

President John F. Kennedy once said, "the life of the arts . . . is very close to the center of a nation's purpose and is the test of the quality of a nation's civilization." The National Committee, Arts With the Handicapped has contributed to the strength of American cultural and educational life, insuring that each child, youth and adult—whether disabled or nondisabled—has the opportunity to participate in and contribute to the life of the arts in the United States.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I just would like to commend the gentleman for his remarks. I want to just add my support to this resolution.

There is no question that if there is one thing that would heal the wounds of people and the esthetic needs of our country, it has to do with the arts. I am proud to be a member of the Arts Caucus. I am proud of this resolution, because we ought to be able in this great country of ours to support arts for the handicapped, and the handicapped, as a matter of fact, are great contributors to art forms in this country.

So I am very, very pleased with this resolution and the work that is being done at the Kennedy Center and elsewhere in the country.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio (MS. OAKAR)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 220

Whereas programs involving the arts enhance the learning and enrich the lives of disabled persons;

Whereas arts with the handicapped is a means of integrating disabled persons into the mainstream of education and cultural society;

Whereas programs bringing arts to the handicapped inform the general public, parents, volunteers, and the business community of the value of arts to the disabled;

Whereas emphasis is needed to expand support for arts programs with the handicapped and to increase participation and commitment of the community and educators to these activities;

Whereas the National Committee Arts With the Handicapped, an educational affiliate of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, will celebrate its tenth anniversary as the coordinating agency for arts programs for disabled children with a very special arts festival in Washington, District of Columbia, during the week of May 20, 1984; and

Whereas the committee conducts education programs in all fifty States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to assure that all disabled persons have access to programs which bring the arts into their lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 20, 1984, through May 26, 1984, is designated as "National Arts With the Handicapped Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the several resolutions just considered and passed or agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 953

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 953.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 98-214)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, May 3, 1984.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed ahead of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. WALKER) on special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CHILDREN'S DEFENSE ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, on April 11 I introduced the Children's Defense Act of 1984 (H.R. 5486). This legislation, which deals with the sexual abuse of children outside their home environment is long overdue.

Over the past decade, the exposure of the heinous crimes of sexual assault, molestation, and/or rape against our children have become more and more pervasive in our society. The American Humane Association's 1984 National Report stated that the estimated number of sexual maltreatment victims in the United States, as reported to child protective services, in 1982 numbered 56,607. This figure is a drastic sevenfold increase from the 7,559 child victims reported in 1976.

The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) has recently released a report stating they estimate that "This year, over 100,000 children in the United States will be sexually abused." The same report by the NASW has also found, among other things, that:

The incidence rate for sexual abuse is highest among adolescent females ages 12-17, but half the victims of sexual abuse are between birth and age 11;

National estimates show that at a minimum, one in eight girls is a victim of sexual abuse before the age of 18, usually by someone she knows and trusts;

In one retrospect survey of 1,200 college-age females, 28 percent reported sexual experience with an adult prior to the age of 13; only 6 percent of the incidents had been reported to authorities.

However, we do not need statistics to verify this increase; we only need to look at the headlines in the newspapers. Just a few of these read as follows:

"Brutalized: Sex Charges at a Nursery"; "Preschool Investigated"; "Counselor Faces More Sex Charges"; "SE Teacher, 43, Accused of Indecency With Pupil"; "Charges of Aggravated Sexual Battery Against Elementary School Principal"; "Aide Accused of Sexual Abuse at State School"; "Counselor Accused of Molesting Choir Boys"; "Teacher Held on Child Porn Charges"; and, "13 Year Term for Molesting Day-Care Kids."

There are basically two reasons for this dramatic increase in the exposure of these crimes: One, it is not to say these incidents have increased, simply that they have been reported and brought out into the open more frequently. Two, we have become a two salary-per-family society where both parents either find it financially necessary or simply want to work. Because of both parents working it is necessary for them to depend on services and organizations for the care of their children. And they have found it increasingly difficult over the past years to be totally confident in the services and organizations created to care for their children.

Contrary to what most of us like to believe, the stranger is not the most common perpetrator. In fact, it is estimated that only 9 percent of the perpetrators are strangers. Most of these children are abused over an extended period of time by someone they know and trust, and by someone they are often physically and emotionally dependent upon such as a parent, neighbor, teacher, or camp counselor.

Dr. Ann Burgess, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, one of the Nation's leading experts on child sex victims and the individuals who abuse our children has recently testified on this issue before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Dr. Burgess stated she has found through her extensive studies of child sex rings that "the most common method of access used by offenders was their occupation." Dr. Burgess stated that these individuals often seek employment where they will necessarily be in contact with children, choosing such occupations as school bus driver, teacher, camp counselor, babysitter, physician, minister, social worker, or photographer. Dr. Burgess also stated that these people also use hobbies such as coaching little league teams to gain access to children. The abuser is not a stranger.

Neither is the popular conception of the abuser—that of being a dirty old man—correct. A study conducted by Rivers Keith Carpenter, coordinator of a child abuse awareness program called Project Safe, states that half of all known abusers were under the age of 31; only 10 percent were past the age of 50. Additionally, although the abuser is most often male, women also can be sexual abusers of children.

These individuals, known as pedophiles—people who are stimulated by sexual activity with children—have their own underground network of information to assist one another in not only obtaining pornographic material of children but in actually accessing children. I would like to quote from one of these magazines for pedophiles called Hermes to highlight the danger our children are in.

From your (the man's) point of view, there are many satisfying ways of making contact with boys, ways which are not only socially approved but encouraged! Big Brothers, Boy Scouts, church groups—the list of organizations goes on . . . Whether or not you have a criminal record or other "problems" in your past, there is very little chance that anyone will ever know of your interests or check into your background. And it is rare, no matter what you have heard, for people to "suspect" the man who is unmarried of improper activities or thoughts, unless there is glaring evidence to the contrary.

Dr. Gene Abel, director of the Sexual Behavior Clinic at the New York State Psychiatric Institute found

that the child molestors or pedophiles he studied were responsible for molesting an average of 68.3 victims. Additionally, many of these pedophiles will, as shown in their underground publication mentioned above, seek out children in the most obvious places. And what are the most obvious places outside the child's home environment? Our schools, day care centers, camps, and other child organizations.

I am not trying to say that everyone who shows a keen or excessive interest in children are pedophiles, they are not. However, as I have already mentioned, there will be an estimated 100,000 children sexually abused this year, a large percentage of those children will be abused outside their home environments. We must be cautious with our children.

Yes, we already have laws against child abuse. But the penalties for child abuse take place after the abuse. And yes, we already have laws against the distribution of pornographic materials. But again, the penalties for the distribution of these materials take place after the distribution. Additionally, even though pornographic material is a great precipitator of sexual abuse, sexual abuse is not always predicated upon pornographic material. A large number of studies have already proved that when a child is abused, in any manner, there is an excellent chance of that child becoming the abuser as an adult, without any outside assistance such as pornographic material.

Can we in good conscience tell the children of our Nation and the parents of these children we cannot help them until after they have been horrendously abused?

The Federal Government has a responsibility to protect our children to the best of its ability. Through the Federal financial assistance given, we have the means to insure that access to our children is neither encouraged nor easy for the pedophiles. It is time we acted.

The Children's Defense Act of 1984 will go a long way in stopping these crimes. It will insure that no individual who has been convicted for a sexual offense, consisting of rape, carnal knowledge, sexual assault, or any other sexual contact, perpetrated against a child, shall be hired as an employee, volunteer, or consultant in certain agencies or other organizations, be they public or private, which receives Federal financial assistance established for the primary purpose of engaging in any activity involving direct contact between the personnel of that agency or organization and at least 20 children outside their home environments during any 7-day period.

To achieve this goal, these organizations, known as youth-oriented organizations, must request, through a State-funneling agency provided for in my legislation, the FBI to conduct a criminal records search for all prospective employees and volunteers mentioned above. The State attorney general and the director of the State's funneling agency may allow any other youth-oriented organization which does not receive Federal financial assistance to also access these records through the funneling agency. The Federal Government will not be responsible for any of the cost of the searches for those organizations which do not receive Federal financial assistance.

Once the FBI receives the record check request from the State-funneling agency, on behalf of the youth-oriented organization, the ID division will search fingerprint card submissions against its criminal file and furnish to the State-funneling agency the information found. The State-funneling agency will then inform the youth-oriented organization whether or not the prospective employee or volunteer has a past conviction of sexual offenses.

This legislation will not be creating a new service or division within the FBI. The FBI is already authorized to conduct licensing and employment records checks as a result of Public Law 92-544, 86 Stat. 1115 which was passed by Congress in 1972. This law enables FBI to exchange identification records with officials of State and local governments.

The youth-oriented organizations will not have direct access to the FBI's records, nor will they be given the complete record of the individual in question. It will be the responsbility of the State-funneling agency to screen the information provided by the FBI. Only the information requested by the youth-oriented organizations—whether or not the applicant has a prior conviction record of sexual offenses—will be given to the organization.

For the youth-oriented organizaiton to avoid unnecessary invocation of formal enforcement procedures, which will include termination of the Federal financial assistance granted to that youth-oriented organization, this act includes provisions that the organization must first be notified and given a chance to comply voluntarily. Although the act does not provide specific limits of a time period within which voluntary compliance may be sought, it is clear that requests for voluntary compliance, if not followed by responsive action on the part of the youth-oriented organization within a reasonable time, does not relieve either the Federal agency having authority to extend Federal financial assistance to that organization or that State's funneling agency of the responsibility to enforce this act. Those agencies and/or organizations consistent failure to do so will be termed dereliction of duty and subject to review in court.

A policy of excluding from employment individuals who have suffered a number of arrests without any conviction is unlawful and, therefore, only those individuals for whom a conviction has been found will be denied a position in the youth-oriented organization under this act.

This act expressly disclaims the intent to provide, by virtue of the cessation of Federal assistance as provided for in sec. 2(b) and (c) (1) and (2) of this act, a forum for the youth-oriented organizations to discriminate or refuse employment of any applicant on the basis of any conviction of crimes other than sexual offenses, or to discriminate or refuse employment of any applicant who has been alledged or arrested, but not convicted, of the crimes of any sexual offenses.

Court records are frequently excepted form confidentiality requirements and concern over separation of powers usually accounts for the exclusion of court records from the privacy acts.

I believe that criminal justice data, although contained in Government records, is potentially sufficiently harmful as to require additional disclosure control. Therefore, the Freedom of Information Act and public record/sunshine laws shall not negate disclosure, privacy etc. as provided for under sec. 4(c)(1) and (c)(2) of this act.

I have attached a table, provided by the American Humane Association, showing the estimated number of sexual maltreatment victims in the United States reported to child protective services and a list of States which currently conduct this type of security check for certain jobs. Reading recent articles in the news media is heartrending. We must do something. I believe the Children's Defense Act of 1984 can and will defend our children and protect them against these pedophiles.

Mr. Speaker, banks, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and various other financial institutions already use the services of the FBI to conduct this very same type of check for prospective employees to insure that their money is safe. Can we do any less for the safety of our children?

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SEXUAL MALTREATMENT VICTIMS IN THE UNITED STATES REPORTED TO CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES PROVIDED BY AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION

	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Total victims	7,559	11,617	12,257	27,247	37,366	37,441	56,607
Percent of:							
Male victims	15	14	13	14	16	16	17
Female victims	85	86	87	86	84	84	83
Male perpetrators	79	81	79	79	80	78	78
Female perpetrators	21	19	21	21	20	22	22
Estimates are based on the following:							
States in data base	27	28	27	25	28	23	20
Percent of child population of the United States	27	36	43	42	43	47	40

We must stop this travesty which maims the physical, emotional, and psychological well being of the child.

Thank you.

STATES CURRENTLY CONDUCTING FBI SEARCHES

STATE AND TYPE OF JOB

Alaska: School bus drivers.

Arizona: Persons applying for pre-adoption certificates, state welfare employees, and licensed school bus drivers.

Georgia: School bus drivers.

Illinois: Foster parents, child care workers and school bus drivers.

Nevada: Teachers aides or other non-professionals who assist in institutions.

New Jersey: School bus drivers, child adoption applicants and abuse investigators.

New York: NY city school system employees.

Most police departments are already sending fingerprints to the FBI. Many states also conduct this search for potential employees of banks, law enforcement applicants, government agencies, and the military.

Specifically for children, the FBI fingerprint checks of employees of Federal and state facilities for the detention, correction, care or treatment of juveniles are authorized by Title 28, U.S. Code, Sec. 534. Additionally, Executive Order 10450 requires a fingerprint check of the ID Division's Criminal File on all Federal job applicants. FBI fingerprint checks of employees of state/local governmental and business organizations which have regular contact with children are also authorized (although not always done) under P.L. 92-544, if the states pass statutes requiring such checks and the Attorney General of the U.S. approves them.

□ 1720

POLITICS AND SPECIAL INTERESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is now recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks, I and a number of my colleagues have been raising the concern that the legislative schedule of this House of Representatives is far more controlled by greedy special interest power than by public interest concerns.

We have raised the concern that the House of Representatives has become a special interest arena where money and clout play far more of a role than the interests of our constituents across the country, that an agenda that the American people want to see addressed in this body gets ignored while special interests are able to get their agenda acted on with great immediacy.

We have pointed out, for instance, in the bankruptcy case how big labor clout could come in here and in a matter of days assure that their concerns were taken care of, despite the fact that the bankruptcy court problem existed around here for a year or more and had not been addressed in a responsible fashion by this House.

But when big labor wanted their way, boy, they got immediate action and they got it within days.

This week, we had a Member of Congress come to the floor on a bill in which what he was trying to do was defend his district against outside special interest encroachment, he was trying to present the viewpoint of his constituents about big special interests coming into his district and determining what was best for his district without consultation with the people, without agreement by the people.

And his concerns were described on this floor by the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bills as being trivial; that that is a trivial concern, when the outside special interests want something and the Member of Congress from that district says that it is not in the best interest of his district, that is a trivial concern, we were told on the House floor this week.

But this week also brought with it a number of other actions, some of them not on this floor but actions taken behind closed doors which also showed how special interest power is having a devastating impact, how greedy special interests have gotten a handle on the legislative process and are pulling it, and tugging it, and tugging it away from where the American people would wish the country to go.

We had a delay on consideration of a bill that many Americans regard as important; the immigration bill. Now, there are many of us in this House, as there would be many people out across the country who are not happy with all aspects of that bill. But the American people, seeing the advent of millions upon millions of illegal aliens impacting on our labor markets, impacting on our welfare system, impacting on the many aspects of our lives, are concerned that we do something to stop illegal immigration into this country.

This House has refused to act on that bill. We have been assured on many different occasions we were going to get action on that bill, but this week we learned once again it was going to be delayed. Why? Was it going to be delayed for some good conscionable reasons?

No. It was being delayed because the Democratic Party was going to play politics with the bill a little while longer; it was being delayed evidently because of the California primary coming up soon. Was it being delayed because of any Members of Congress were concerned over the Democratic primary? Well, no, because no Democrats are regarded as being in major trouble in their primaries.

What evidently happened was that the former Vice President of the United States, who is now a candidate for President, called the Speaker and said that it might not be a good idea to have this vote just prior to, that it might cost him some Hispanic votes, and after all what we had here was the fact that finally his special interest problems were coming back to haunt him.

He has promised everybody everything. So, he promised the Hispanics something and he promised labor something; he has taken money from all kinds of special interests powers and now all of a sudden, he finds two of them clashing with each other. The Hispanics are clashing with organized labor and he is caught in the middle, and he did not want to have that resolved prior to running in a California primary where, in fact, there might be real problems for him if that kind of clash took place.

Well, it tells you something about who has the clout around here. What happens when special interests take power? And it is one more case of the fact that in the Halls of this Congress, special interest power has become a dominating power. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, I worked on this immigration issue for 6 years now; have had hopes raised and dashed on innumerable occasions, and obviously am seeing some frustration

visited upon myself at the present time.

But that really is not all that important; what is important is the corrosive influence of special interest considerations on the legislative processes.

The gentleman mentions the immigration issue and mentions that we have been promised time and again an opportunity to deal with it. And here we are 2 years, almost, after we last dealth with it on the floor in the last throes of the previous Congress, in a lameduck session, when we were given time to debate it from 10 at night until 2 in the morning; when 200 amendments were introduced.

The real irony of this is that this has been a bipartisan effort all the way through. It was President Carter's administration that established a Select Commission on Immigration Policy. And they went out and they got Democrats and Republicans, got Members of the House, Members of the Senate to serve on it; they had representatives of organized labor, Hispanic community, representatives of the religious community; they had representatives of the academic community, and they looked at this thing for 2 years.

As often is the case, they made sure that the commission would not report until after the next Presidential election, which is, I guess, one guide to how sensitive things are around here.

But, nonetheless, that occurred, carried over to the Reagan administration. President Reagan did not exercise his ability to change the membership of that Commission but rather allowed that Commission to finish its business; then set up a Cabinet-wide task force to review those recommendations.

They then sent them to both the House and the Senate. We started working on them. We passed out a bill out of our committee in the previous Congress. The Senate passed it by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. We passed it out of our committee this last year, a year ago May, the Senate passed it by an overwhelming vote; bipartisan support, so you would think we had the opportunity to deal with a very difficult issue; complex issue, one that is fraught with emotion, one that is fraught with controversy, in a reasonable, responsible way.

The problem is the longer you delay a bill and do not allow full consideration in open forum on the floor of the House, the longer you allow certain myths to be created by the bill; you have Presidential candidate, Mr. Jackson, suggesting that the bill is going to make us like South Africa where you have to carry an internal passport.

You have Mr. Hart, the candidate, saying that this bill is discriminatory. You even had on occasion TIP O'NEILL saying this would treat Hispanics the way Hitler did the Jews and make people wear dog tags. You would have all of these extraordinary emotion-filled myths created that absolutely undercut the ability to deal with a very tough issue in a reasonable way.

I want to say we have had bipartisan efforts in this House and it is a shame that the leadership in this House has allowed politics to be played with this issue that makes it ever more difficult for us to address it in a responsible way.

□ 1730

Mr. Mondale, evidently—and this was acknowledge to a reporter in the New York Times—placed a personal call to the Speaker of the House, TIP O'NEILL, and personally asked him not to allow this to come to the floor because, as the gentleman said, it might cause him some problems in the California primary.

My question is this: Mr. Mondale started his campaign saying that he ought to be President of the United States, not only because he sat there, and he knows where the phone is, because if that were the criteria I suppose the people who clean the Oval Office would be qualified for President, but because he somehow has exhibited leadership and it is decisive leadership that is necessary, if we are going to take care of the problems and the challenges of the future.

So what does Mr. Mondale do on a tough issue, the type of issue that any President of the United States is going to have to deal with on a regular basis, an issue that is controversial, an issue that has people on all sides of it, an issue to which there is no perfect solution only an imperfect solution, but an issue to which there must be addressed a solution? What does he do? He falls back 10 yards, and he punts. He basically said.

Do not make me be challenged on the question of leadership when the voters might have an opportunity to decide whether I pass or fail that test of leadership. Put it off until I have garnered sufficient numbers of delegates in the delegate search on the Democratic side.

Because I suppose after Mr. Mondale gets the number of delegates necessary who are pledged to him, then voters will not have an opportunity to respond to what he does, or what he says or the decisions that he makes.

All I can ask is how is that leadership? How can he criticize the President of the United States, Mr. Reagan, who has taken positions on tough issues and who has taken a position on the tough issue of immigration? Mr. Mondale is criticized for being part of the Carter-Mondale administration and there is a lot to criticize in that administration. At least President Carter had the guts to appoint a Commission to deal with this issue and now Mr. Mondale is going to run away from it.

The question I have is: Since when is a qualification for President of the United States the fact that you can most delicately tiptoe through the tulips of all the special interest groups so that you do not offend any single one of them by bruising any of their petals? And that is what we have here.

The other point I would like to make and I think it is an important point here, we are talking about Hispanic organizational groups. The reason that is very important is consistently we have heard that the Hispanics are against the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration reform package.

If you look at the polls, that is not true. The polls show overwhelming support in the Hispanic community, overwhelming support in the Anglo community, overwhelming support in the black community for not the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, but for the elements of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill when they are specifically asked about those elements. When they are asked, "Do you think we ought to bolster the border patrol?" Over 70 percent of all those groups say "yes." When you say, "Should we stop illegal aliens from coming into this country and deport them?", over 70 percent of all three groups say "yes."

If you then say, "Should we legalize those who have been here for a significant period of time in an illegal status and have not broken the law, have been good members of our society," and the question has always been asked, "Have been here for a 5-year period of time," over 70 percent of all groups say "yes."

When you ask the question, "Ought we to have employer sanctions?" with all the problems that people can bring up about that, over 70 percent of the American people say "yes." And the latest poll shows among Hispanics it was as high as 83 percent.

Now, what has happened? We have had some people say the poll was slanted. The Lance Terrance-Peter Hart poll, and those are two people who are used by Democrats and Republicans, "The poll was slanted. The questions were not asked properly."

Let us go to the Gallup poll. The Gallup poll is the one that shows the 83-percent figure and it is consistent with the Lance Terrance and the Peter Hart poll. They are not satisfied with that, let us go to the Field Foundation poll in California, where it shows a commonality of results all across the board.

The point I am making is that when you raise special interests to the altar of infallibility what you do is create an atmosphere in this House where it is virtually impossible to do the people's work in a responsible fashion. That is the tragedy.

Sure, I am upset about this. Obviously, I am upset and frustrated about this. But I am far more frustrated about the American people's inability to have responsive action in the House than I am over my own frustration. And what message does it send to responsible members of the Democratic party who have worked diligently on this bill or on this issue for 4, or 6, or 8, or 10 years? It says to them,

If you take on a dirty job and you work and you work on a bill that really is not going to give you any political benefits, when push comes to shove, we are going to kick you in the teeth.

And when Walter Mondale calls, and when the special interests come calling, we are going to ignore the work that you have done.

So the message here is one that was articulated by, of all people, the distinguished majority leader, JIM WRIGHT, just this week in an article that appeared in the Washington Post. When asked why there were not sufficient members of the Democratic party here to defeat certain amendments that were brought forward by Republicans on the Bureau of Standards bill, he said, basically, "I don't know. It doesn't look like they are interested in what we are doing."

It seems that many Members are more concerned about making sure they come back for the next Congress. That is a terrible indictment of this institution. But the fact of the matter is that you can have immigration reform promised to you in October, promised to you in January, promised to you in February, promised to you at the end of March, promised to you in May, and now promised to you again in June. I do not think that I am being overly delicate or overly sensitive when I suggest that I still have some very grave questions about whether we will be given the opportunity to deal with this issue.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On that point I just want to ask my colleague from the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman is correct in saying we were promised this in February and we have been promised it since then, but we should not lead people to believe that that is the first time that the bill was under consideration.

The bill has been in committee for far longer, has it not? I recall in the lameduck session after the 1982 election we were permitted through the benevolence of the Speaker to debate the immigration reform bill. Of course he would not let us vote on it, so it did not do any good.

But how long actually has the immigration bill been in the works in the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. LUNGREN. The Carter Commission recommendations came to us——

Mr. WEBER. The Carter Commission?

Mr. LUNGREN. The Carter Select Commission on Immigration Reform came to us about 3 months after the Reagan administration came into office. So we have been working on it at least since that time. Our committee in the House, as well as the committee in the Senate, were working with that Commission and following that Commission. We had Representatives on it. The distinguished chairman of the Judicary Committee, Mr. RODINO, was a member. The distinguished ranking member, Mr. FISH, was a member. Mr. McClory, the former distinguished ranking member was a member of that Commission.

Mr. WEBER. Do I understand correctly the gentleman from New Jersey and the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee was a member of the Commission and signed off on its recommendations?

Mr. LUNGREN. Absolutely.

Mr. WEBER. And still we have not seen that bill brought from his committee to the floor of the House in now well over a year?

Mr. LUNGREN. Well, as I say, as the gentleman knows, we had it in November, late November/December 1982. We were not given enough time to deal with it. We have been dancing around the legislative process with it ever since. I am afraid that the criticism that many Americans raise about this institution may be borne out by this experience. There are those who criticize this institution by suggesting that we duck the tough issues, that we look for the easy issues.

If there is a proclamation that we want to pass here condemning this action or that action by a foreign country, I am not saying that those are not important, we do that without much difficulty.

If there is some tough consideration of an amendment that says we will not allow products produced by slave labor, we not only do not successfully present that on the floor, we do not even get the opportunity to have it presented on the floor.

When you deal with the tough issue of immigration, which States and localities cannot deal with themselves, by the Constitution immigration is a Federal responsibility, you cannot get the Congress to move.

□ 1740

Florida knows that we need action on immigration. California knows that we need action on immigration. The great Southwest knows that we need action on immigration. Chicago, Ill., knows that we need action on immigration. Virtually every State in the Union knows that we need action on immigration, and yet we do not do the people's work here. I just think it is a black eye to this institution and ill serves the American people when we allow, first, just merely governmental inertia to prevail here, but then to find the hoary head of special-interest politics directing itself into this institution. It really means that somehow we are not doing the people's work.

If we are being paid $72,000 to come here to Washington and deal with noncontroversial issues, then we are far far more paid beyond what is necessary, I do not think we are overpaid, but it is apparent that, unless we start working, that argument can be made.

I had thought that the Democratic Party had learned that the American people are turned off by the great genuflection to special interest that Mr. Mondale showed at the beginning of his campaign for the Presidency. Evidently they have not learned that lesson because that it appearing more and more a part of what we are doing in this House.

The extraordinary thing is that just 2 days ago Mr. WRIGHT, the majority leader, I think told us in good faith, those of us who were gathered in Chairman PEPPER's office there next to the hearing room for the Rules Committee, that they intended to bring it forward on the floor on May 21 and give us 7 full legislative days to work on it. And I believe that he was as startled as the rest of us when he learned that Mr. Mondale has not discovered that special-interest politics is not in the national interest. But unfortunately his view did not prevail. Mr. Mondale did. And what we have here is direct action taken by Mr. Mondale to insure that for partisan political purposes we will not have an opportunity to address a major issue that the American people desperately need to be addressed. We just have no excuse. We stand before the American people I think embarrassed, and I would hope that the American people would let us know how they feel on this.

Since Mr. O'NEILL announced in October that we would not deal with this issue we have had more than a congressional district full of illegal entries into the United States, more than 500,000 illegal entries into the United States just since October. We will have well over 1 million people apprehended this year, we will have more than 2 to 4 million successful illegal entries into the United States. Maybe the purpose is to build up the census in certain parts of the country so we can have more Members of Congress of a particular party, I do not know. I do not think that makes much sense. But the fact of the matter is that the American people cannot stand for it much longer, and I think they have just got to be scratching their heads today when we say, "Look, in 24 hours

this House could have a bill introduced and we could adopt a resolution here on the floor in 24 hours."

The Speaker told us when we debated the ERA that one of the prerogatives of the Speaker is control of the calendar and "I bring up bills when I want to bring up bills."

Mr. WALKER. Let me give the gentleman an example. We had a bill out here today that we passed today. It had been introduced in the House for the first time today. We had it introduced and passed here today. Why? Well, it happened to be to take care of a big contributor to the Democratic Party. If you contribute a lot of money to the Democratic Party, you get your bill introduced on 1 day and passed the same day. But if you want to take up immigration, if you want to take up equal access, if you want to take up acid rain, if you want to take up all of these kinds of things you cannot do that. "No, sir, boy, we cannot get those out on the floor to talk about because you do not have enough clout, you are not a big enough special interest, you have not signed into the Walter Mondale special interest campaign. Therefore, you cannot get your action on the House floor." That has to be one of the most disturbing aspects of what is taking place in the devastation of the legislative process.

Mr. LUNGREN. If the gentleman will yield further, I have had Members of the other party in this body come to me and suggest that we keep up the pressure on immigration reform, because they say we need to do something. I have had Members on the Democratic side say to me and encourage me that we ought to keep up the pressure on dealing with comprehensive legislation on crime. I have had Members come forward and say keep the pressure on because we have to do something on the insanity defense.

The problem is that this place is run in a partisan fashion. There is one party that dominates this House, there is one party that decides what will be brought up and what will not be brought up. As much as those Democratic Members encourage us and suggest that we ought to put the pressure on to force these things to the floor, there seems to be an inability of many Members on the Democratic side to move their party to allow these things to be brought up.

My fear is that the Democratic Party, one of the two greater political parties, unfortunately has been captured by the interests of the far left, that if the ACLU says, "we have problems with crime legislation," crime legislation does not come to the floor. If certain people say, "we have problems with immigration reform," immigration reform does not come to the floor. If the ACLU said, "Don't deal with insanity defense," it does not come to the floor. If the ACLU said, "Don't deal with bail reform," it does not come to the floor.

Now, those are genuine groups, those are sincere groups. The ACLU certainly has every right to be entitled to their own opinion. But I did not know that the American people elected the ACLU to determine what legislation should be considered in the area of crime. I think the American people ought to know that.

Mr. WALKER. Let me give the gentleman just another example. The ACLU and the National Education Association have jointly decided that the equal access bill that would allow religious organizations the same access to the public schools as political organizations or cultural oranizations or social organizations have, the NEA and the ACLU have decided that that legislation is in the bad interest of the American people, even though vast members of the American people would be for it. And so what did they do? Even though that bill was scheduled to be considered next Monday on the calendar, they prevailed upon the Democratic Caucus to pull it off, to have a meeting of the Democratic Caucus next Wednesday so that it could not be taken up next Monday, and thereby assure that the legislation that had been previously scheduled would be off the calendar for Monday. These same groups are impacting on the ability of children to have meetings in school that have a religious purpose as well as being able to have a meeting that has a political purpose.

It seems strange to me that the Young Communists League can meet in the schools and the Youth for Christ Organization cannot. That is precisely what is happening, because the people in the Democratic Caucus are listening to the NEA, a left wing organization, and the ACLU, another left wing organization.

Mr. LUNGREN. One of the real concerns I have about the equal access bill is that they might require it to have a very easy but closed off or hidden death, and that is send it to the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee, a committee on which I am privileged to serve, a subcommittee on which I formerly served. Unfortunately, that has, in the words of Mr. HYDE from Illinois, become the Bermuda Triangle of legislation the American people are concerned about. You send it there and it is never seen again. It disappears off the legislative radar screen. and we have seen that on issue after issue. Virtually every constitutional amendment goes to that subcommittee and is never seen again.

There were announced to be hearings on the question of school prayer, as the gentleman will recall, it was announced that those hearings had been canceled because they polled the majority Members on that subcommittee and found out there was a lack of interest. That kind of makes you wonder where our priorities are and whether or not we are just going to give an opportunity, a simple opportunity for debate and consideration of some of these questions.

The question has to be raised. If this body does not accept the responsibility for dealing with these issues, where do the American people turn? I do not know where they turn, because this is the place that is established by the Constitution to ventilate those ideas, to have the vigorous debate that is necessary as opposed to the hidden-door trick that we happen to see prevailing more and more here with any issue that the majority of the American people apparently support.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman makes an absolutely devastating case and he is absolutely right. What is happening is that behind closed doors deals are being cut which advantage the special interests and ignore the public interests, and that is an indictment of the legislative process which the American people cannot ignore this year.

□ 1750

I would like to switch gears here if I could, and talk about another matter that this Congress has tended to ignore, which we ignore at a great price to our Nation, because the recovery of our economy and the ability to put people to work is by far the greatest issue that we face now and for our future.

One of the issues that we have got to address as part of that is the whole issue of reform of our monetary system, and I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I particularly appreciate his taking the floor today on behalf of an issue which has an overwhelming interest to all of the American people, irrespective of their political party. That is, what goes on behind closed doors.

Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the gentleman from my office and I walked over with some information that I wanted to share with he and our colleagues who are here because yesterday, in the Washington Post, there was an article, and let me say, parenthetically, it is interesting that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is in the Speaker's chair today, because this is a bipartisan issue. I do not know if I am violating the rules of the House, but I just wanted to take a moment to pay tribute to the gentleman in the chair, as well as his daddy, who, for many years fought a battle to open to the American people the process within which the Federal Reserve Board uses to decide the value of our currency; what

our interest rates are going to be; what the cost of money is; what the dollar is going to do; and a champion of democratizing the Fed was Mr. PATMAN of Texas, and now his son is here sitting in the chair, and while I apologize if I have violated the very strict rules of the House, I could not pass up the irony of some Republican Members of the Congress talking about an issue in front of a Democratic House which really affects all of the people.

Let me get to it: The Washington Post, as I said, revealed yesterday morning, in an article by John Berry that the Federal Reserve Board tightened monetary policy in late March in order to slow down what it considers to be a too-rapid growth of the economy.

Now, this was a quote of Mr. Frank Morris, the President of the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston. That has gone unnoticed by many of our colleagues. I am sure it did not escape the attention of our colleague from Texas, and it certainly did not escape the attention of my colleague from Pennsylvania and those who are here participating in this democratization of the Fed effort.

This morning Mr. Paul Blustein of the Wall Street Journal takes this further and says, not only did Mr. Morris of the Boston Fed reveal what the Fed had done in secret in late March, but he was chastised by another Governor of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Henry Wallach, who said it was an indiscretion.

Let me quote: "Fed Board members decline to comment on Mr. Morris' statements," but one quotation says, "I would only be compounding the indiscretion" said one Fed Governor, Henry Wallach.

Now, imagine a group of 11 men and 1 woman meeting in March, in secret, without any accountability, and not releasing the minutes of that meeting, changing the policy of the Fed to slow down the growth of the economy, and then one member apparently indiscreetly talks to some of his clients and suggests that the Fed has moved to slow down the economy and is called on the carpet by another member of the Board of Governors, and it has gone unnoticed except for these two articles: one in the Post and one in the Wall Street Journal.

Imagine if the Federal Reserve Board last March had loosened its policy to try to stimulate the economy. You would hear people all over the country, and I am going to depart from this bipartisanship for just a moment and say, incidentally, we have not heard much from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, other than the gentleman from Texas, because frankly, no one seems to care that the Fed is tightening and raising interest rates and allowing the Federal funds rate to go up, which of course, affects the prime rate, and 30-day paper, and 90-day paper, and Government bonds, and it is all done in secret. That is the point the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Florida, and several of us made last April 11 when we introduced a bill to require that the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Open Market Committee of the Fed release its minutes immediately so that the markets, the capital markets of this country, which some of us think was the eighth wonder of the world in terms of its efficiency to raise capital, and to provide oxygen to the farmers and the small businessmen and women and to the equity and venture capital markets of America. Our bill received scant attention, but I just want to say to my colleagues those lonely few Republicans and that one lonely Democrat who joined us in this bill, I think today it is obvious that what we are doing is on the right track.

I do not say that we have found the Holy Grail; that we have absolute truth at our fingertips; but I think we are on the right track. The Federal Reserve Board should simultaneously to any change in policy tell the American people precisely to offset the fact that rumors and gossip and innuendos and indiscretions and leaks are made.

Imagine now for a moment if you knew the Fed was going to tighten; you could sell bonds short; you could buy dollars; you could sell gold; you could intervene in foreign exchange markets; you could make a killing, in other words. Who gets the information? Some people sitting up in the 8th or 9th or 10th floor of a Wall Street building. But the American people, what about the American people? What about the worker in Buffalo, N.Y., who has to pay higher interest rates for the home mortgage? What about the small businessman or woman in Florida or in Pennsylvania? How about the farmers of Minnesota or Pennsylvania or western New York or wherever they are in this country.

It is unbelievable what has happened and I just want to say to my colleagues that we should redouble our efforts; we should bring to the attention of our colleagues in the Congress on both sides of the aisle this situation which leads to a bond market, I will not say collapse, but you cannot look at the bond market over the past few weeks and not recognize that it has been very sour. People say, so what? Of course, that is only the oxygen supply that provides much of the seed corn that goes to finance our economic growth.

What is worse, as I pointed out, the Fed now is on record as targeting nominal GNP, and the growth in the economy, apparently, in the first quarter. Nominal GNP was 11.5, 12 percent, and they do not want it to grow over 9 percent. So what they are saying is that the economy is not only growing too fast, they think inflation is caused by too many Americans going back to work. Imagine the thinking in an elitist Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve who are determining the course of the American and the world economy, simply because they are worried that growth causes inflation.

I just want to say to my colleagues as I close and allow for some dialog on this issue, we should press on; we should alert more and more people to what is happening; we should bring this to the attention of the press and the American people. If the American people have the information, they know, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, how to make the right decisions, but, if it is all done in the dark at midnight, with those minutes not being released for 6 months, and rumors and gossip and innuendo driving our markets, it seems to me that it acts to the detriment of not only our districts, but to the whole United States, indeed, all our trading partners, and the whole world and profits a few and impoverishes the whole.

□ 1800

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time for a moment to point out the correctness of what the gentleman says.

The gentleman makes the point that at the end of March such a decision was made in secret; that in secret a small group of elitists got together and decided that they were going to slow down economic growth. Suppose that same decision had had to come in open session in the House of Representatives. Would any real Representative of the people have had the guts to stand up and say that one of the things we ought to do as a matter of national policy is slow down economic growth?

Very, very few votes would be cast on this House floor for that kind of policy, and because it would be done in the open and because we would be accountable. The problem with that is that it is neither accountable, and it is doing its unaccountable activities in secret.

So the gentleman is just absolutely correct in what he has to say.

Mr. KEMP. The point that the gentleman makes, if he would yield just another second, is that they did it in secret. I do not want to accuse them of being elitists, but it is certainly an attitude of elitism to suggest that they know what is better for the American people than the American people themselves.

Second, what bothers me is the secrecy point, I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania. They meet over 48

hours. They decide the value of money, the interest rates, 30-day and 90-day paper, and the Federal funds rate to a large degree. They determine all of these things. They determine what the cost of money is going to be in Argentina and in Sudan and in Moroco and other countries who are heavily indebted to the United States, and they turn around and say that no one can have any information about what they did for 6 weeks.

It really points up what we have been trying to say: that this information should be released simultaneously.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and our colleague from New York for taking this issue on for such a long time.

What all this says to me, though, is to point out the tremendous confusion that exists about monetary policy at the highest levels of our Government.

When the two bills were introduced on April 11 by the gentleman from New York, with the cosponsorship of all of us on the floor and a number of others, the criticism that we heard from many quarters was, "Well, we cannot let the Congress get involved in monetary policy," as if there is this divinely inspired monetary policy out there and if we mere mortals get involved with it, somehow we are really going to screw things up.

It is time to say that the emperor has no clothes. We had one monetary policy during the 1970's, which was to target interest rates. In the view of the people who were running the Fed at that time, that led to high inflation.

So then in 1980 we switched to another monetary policy. Then we were going to strictly target monetary growth, and we fixed it to a set of aggregates and we were going to manage the money supply very precisely according to a Milton Friedmanesque view of monetary policy.

Then a couple years later, that was not working quite right, so we decided we were going to change the monetary aggregates, raise the level of growth of the money supply, so we made that change in policy.

Now, as the gentleman from New York has pointed out, we have initiated another basic change in Fed policy, and all those monetarists who say they do not want us to interfere with the Fed because they believe in controlling the money supply should not fool themselves. We are not controlling the money supply as the target of Fed policy any more.

Let me just quote from the Post article that the gentleman from New York referred to earlier.

> Morris said similar steps should be expected if current dollar Gross National Product continues to grow faster than the Fed's goal of between 8 percent and 9 percent for 1984.

On the other hand, if economic growth is "more sluggish," presumably a good thing, "you can expect the Fed to lean in the other direction."

That is an explicit change in policy away from targeting the monetary aggregates, whatever they may be, and that is another question, toward targeting GNP. Of course, we have to target GNP retroactively. So we have a basic, fundamental shift in monetary policy, actually the fourth monetary policy in as many years, which illustrates to me that there is tremendous confusion again at the highest levels of our Government and that we are long overdue for a basic debate and reformation of that whole policy.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a couple of additional comments related to the comments of our colleague from New York.

I have said this before, but just to put it in context, I came from the banking community before I came here, and I felt very strongly that there needs to be that separation between the private industry and also what is happening as far as public decisions made about monetary and fiscal policy.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman was always suspect in the beginning.

Mr. MACK. I know, and you gentlemen keep an eye on me. I have noticed that, too.

It seems to me that what we have done, though, by having these behind-closed-doors discussions about what happens with monetary policy is that we have really taken monetary policy off the level of discussion. We have said it is off limits; that those kinds of discussions ought to be held behind closed doors.

So what do we do? We spend all of our time here in Congress talking about fiscal policy, how much we raise taxes, how much we lower taxes, how much should we spend, how much should we not spend. But when it comes to the real issue, and let us face it, the economics of what happens in this country are based on several things, one of which is monetary policy and the other of which is fiscal policy, but we never get into those discussions here.

So what has happened is, as the gentleman mentioned a few moments ago, the vote that took place behind closed doors never would have taken place on the floor of this House, but a great debate could have taken place and maybe we would have learned some things that we should be doing, that we, as legislators, people who make decisions about who gets jobs in this country, that type of thing, maybe that discussion should take place on the floor of this House, and I think that the way to see that it does happen is to open up the policy decision that much more.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from Florida and Minnesota made real key contributions to our dialog here. None of us are suggesting that we telecast the Federal Open Market Committee meetings. We are not suggesting that the public and the press sit there and watch over their shoulders. No one is challenging the respect or the integrity or the independence of the central bank and the need to have a fiduciary role for that bank.

But what bothers us all is that, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, they meet in secret, then the leaks go out, and decisions are being made around which some people are profiting that ultimately impoverish others. It seems to me that this is untenable in a democratic society.

Our bill would open up the process to the extent only that they would have to, within 24 hours, release the minutes if there is a change in policy. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States requires that the Congress be responsible for coining money and controlling the value thereof. The people have placed in the Congress the ultimate responsibility for the value of our money, and if the value of the money shifts daily and millions, if not billions, of dollars are speculated upon in markets around the world, notwithstanding what happens in Boston and Buffalo and New York and other places where the Federal Reserve has its regional centers, it seems to me that it is obvious that something has gone askew, notwithstanding the idea that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WEBER) brought up that the Fed will tighten if the economy is sluggish and it will loosen if it is growing.

Imagine trying to manipulate the economy by printing money or extinguishing money, or buying bonds or selling bonds around a backward-look-

ing market that is nominal GNP that you only know about once it has already happened.

How can people make a plan for the future? How can a young couple buy a home and have some confidence that the interest and the money that they have to invest in that mortgage is going to sustain the ability of that family to buy a home.

It is an outrage and the American people on both sides of the political fence ought to be rising up in righteous indignation and sending letters and postcards to their Congressmen and Congresswomen and telling us to do something along the lines of what KEMP and WALKER and WEBER and MACK and KASICH and PATMAN and others would like to do.

□ 1810

Mr. WALKER. Let me yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. The point the gentleman just made, how can anyone make plans for the future if they do not know what is going to happen; but yet, you know, we just spent the last 4 months planning fiscal policy for the next 3 years and have to guess what monetary policy is going to be.

The second part of that is again suppose we had to have the other half of the debate here on the floor of the House. Let us suppose that we made a case about strong fiscal policy, maintaining tax levels, holding spending levels at a certain point, and we found out that the other side of the debate was, "My heavens, if you do that, we are going to reduce the money supply and we are going to do that by raising interest rates," what do you think the response on the floor of the House would be?

Again, I think we would have some meaningful dialog in trying to put together an economic policy.

Mr. KEMP. Imagine what would happen if the Fed had privately and secretively and surreptitiously eased, they would be accused to trying to help Ronald Reagan get reelected and influence the economy; but the Fed tightened to slow down the economy and not a word is being said in the editorial pages of the Post or the Times and other newspapers.

I will guarantee this. Had the Fed eased and accommodated the recovery and allowed for unemployment to continue to drop and the nominal GNP to continue to climb at 11 and 12 percent a year to bring down the deficit, does anybody doubt that the deficit would not come down if unemployment dropped to 6 and 5 or 4? Obviously it would; so no one said a word because they tightened. They do not mind, but I will tell you this, you and I are going to be talking about this day after day until we can get a monetary policy that will give the American people what they desperately need, a stable, sound, honest dollar, a dollar that maintains its value, a dollar that is predictable over time, that can bring down the risk premium and the high interest rates that are being charged borrowers by this policy of confusion and unpredictability.

I think the integrity of our dollar is the single most overriding economic issue at the moment and it is something that is causing not only a lot of pain and anguish in our Third World neighbor friends who have big debts, it is causing a lot of pain and anguish in my district of western New York among home buyers and small business people, farmers and entrepreneurs.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time just for a moment to remind the gentleman that we do have Members of the opposition party who have been coming to the floor here in recent days, as a matter of fact just today we had at least one gentleman out on the floor talking about the fact that interest rates are going up and how the economic recovery is being aborted and so on. In other words, it has become a political heyday for the Democrats to suggest that somehow something is going wrong here. What is going wrong is that the Federal Reserve has tightened the monetary policy of the country.

Mr. KEMP. Absolutely. Will the gentleman yield for just a second?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. KEMP. The Federal funds rate, which is the targeted overnight cost of money by member banks of the Federal Reserve went from 8 and 8½ percent roughly during the 1983 growth period. It was 11 yesterday. It has gone from 8 to 9, to 10 and 11. What has happened to the prime rate? The prime rate has gone up a full point in about 90 days.

Now, what does that do? That raises the cost of debt service. If you keep interest rates at 12 percent, that will double the national debt every 6 years.

The deficit today in large part is a result of the credit crunch and the high interest rate policy of the Federal Reserve which shuts off housing and autos and agriculture and exports and is causing so much impoverishment of the Third World. I think it is an absolute issue for all of us to take consideration of.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I wonder if the gentleman from New York could comment on something that he really brought before the Federal Reserve in his testimony several months ago. Not only do we have a problem when we talk about the Fed being shrouded in secrecy, but I think the gentleman brought the issue before the Fed that was important and something that needs to come out in the light for purposes of debate, and that is that at one point we have the Fed targeting M1 and excluding M2 and M3 and then you turn around and find out, well, they think they had better include everything. Then they turn around from that and they say, well, we had better target interest rates rather than targeting M1 and M2.

Does that not in the gentleman's opinion create problems in the capital marketplaces of this country? They are always complaining that they do not know what the Congress is going to do, and justifiably so.

On the other side of the question, is it not true that when the Fed has an inconsistent policy toward the way in which it is going to run its monetary train, that also creates great uncertainty within the capital markets. I wonder if the gentleman would respond to that.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEMP. It is not just the inconsistency, although that is a problem. A consistently bad policy would be just as perverse as an inconsistent other policy, so I would rather the policy of giving us what we desperately need, stable prices, sound money and the type of low interest rates that we had under the Bretton Woods International Monetary System for almost the last half century, at least from World War II.

You know, I have been here 13 years. We have all been here different times, some very short times, others longer times. I am not an old veteran, but I have been here for more than a decade.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is getting there.

Mr. KEMP. Yes; I am starting to believe in the seniority system very strongly.

But I will say this. I really believe, my friends, that in all the time that I have been here, this has never happened. I have never seen anything like this.

I called one press person and he was laughing. He said, "Oh, that doesn't mean very much."

Imagine someone in the press suggesting that this can go on. If you or I held a meeting in secret that had this much impact on markets, capital markets and other markets, to be sure, they would be screaming and knocking down our doors. How can the press allow the Federal Reserve do this? We do not let an agency of the Federal Government get away with what we allow them.

You know, the fault is not with the press. The fault is right here in the U.S. Congress for allowing an agency

that is a creature of the U.S. Congress to get away with it.

Now, I say to my colleagues, not the ones who are here and sitting in the chair, but I say to my colleagues who may read the RECORD, I do not think they are going to be allowed in this election to get away with the secrecy that shrouds or surrounds this issue. I think that is an issue of populism, if you will.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman will remember when we tried to hold a somewhat secret meeting with regard to tax policies a couple years ago and the press jumped on that immediately and had TV cameras at the door by the time we left the meeting, because you know that is something that evidently they recognized has some impact and yet cannot understand the impact of secret meetings here which determine this.

Mr. KEMP. Let me say to my friend, I would like to make one last point just to get it on the record before we go any further.

The gentleman from Ohio raised a good point and I think it is one that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WEBER) had brought up a little earlier, which is that from 1979, October, until about 1982, June, the Fed was targeting a very narrow definition of money. They call it M1. M1 basically is checking deposits and currency in circulation. It now includes super NOW accounts, but then it did not.

Then in 1982, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, they followed M1. From 1971 to 1979 they targeted interest rates. From 1982 until I would say probably the latter part of 1983 they were targeting a combination of interest rates, the economy, et cetera.

Now apparently they have changed again and they are targeting nominal GNP.

Now, what we are saying here today, we are not asking the Fed to print more money. I do not want the Fed to go down there and just buy bonds and inject reserves into the system and try to flood the markets with paper money and expand our credit supply and the reserve base of this country to force down interest rates. That is not what we are talking about. Each and every one of us on this floor believe in sound, honest money, in money that will maintain its value. So having said that, our bill, just to explain it a step further, requires that the Fed not loosen or tighten around a narrow target, such as M1 or a narrower target and a backward looking market, such as nominal GNP, or a Keynesian target, which would be interest rates. What we are calling for in our bill is for the Federal Reserve Board, as I said a little bit earlier, to give us what the purpose of monetary policy is, to provide a stable, honest unit of account, a dollar that will maintain its value over a long period of time and will not be inflated, that is, devalued or deflated, that is, strengthened. We want a dollar that is sound and stable. You measure that not by how many angels can dance on the head of M1. You measure that, I would say to my colleagues, by some price. What that is there is much debate over.

□ 1820

I personally believe that we should stabilize the dollar price of gold. I think when President Kennedy in 1962 said that we want to keep the dollar as good as gold, he said that was the linchpin of the national financial trading system, I think President Kennedy was right. I will tell you one thing, we had 4 and 5 percent interest rates.

But I do believe we have got to rebuild this international monetary system. We have to have a domestic monetary policy that gives us stable prices and the best gauge of stable prices is not how many dollars in M1 or M2 or M3 or L or any of the other partial equilibrium models. The only real index that you can use is those forward looking markets such as precious metals, commodity prices at the top, or future levels, and ultimately using gold as a proxy, as a proxy for the price level, and then buy and sell bonds, or inject and drain reserves on that type of a price rule. That is what we are talking about, price stability to give the American home buyer and the American working men and women, and the American entrepreneur, and our friends in the world that stability and confidence in the American dollar.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I think what is so amazing, and I do not think anybody has a clear answer for what the appropriate monetary policy is, but we know this: at one point in time, and I wish the gentleman from New York would comment on this, at one point in time the Federal Reserve was setting monetary policy on the basis of M1's, which includes money in circulation and checking accounts.

If you took your money from a checking account on Monday and put your money in a super NOW account on Tuesday, in the eyes of the Fed we had a shrinkage in the monetary supply. If you turned around on Thursday and took your money out of a super NOW account and put it in a checking account, then in the eyes of the Fed the money supply would grow tremendously.

Now, does that really have an impact on the proper way to gauge it?

Mr. KEMP. The gentleman has raised the fundamental problem with measuring monetary policy. I think that the bills which several of my colleagues have joined in offering provide a first step toward a solution.

So that the Members may have an opportunity to study some of the ideas which we have put forward in these bills and so that these ideas may be correctly associated with my 23 cosponsors, I include the text of a "Dear Colleague" letter which we circulated by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1984.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Recent events, including the rise in the discount rate and the prime rate, have thrown the spotlight upon the adequacy of two aspects of Federal Reserve policy—the policy itself, and how it is determined.

We are seeking your cosponsorship and support for two bills which address these concerns. The first bill is designed to make Federal Reserve decisions more open to the public, irrespective of their content. The second bill is designed to restore long-term price stability as the goal and target of Federal Reserve policy, with the object of bringing down interest rates.

PROCESS

When the Federal Reserve System was established in 1913, the discretion of its executives was limited, both by its charter and by the system within which it operated. Over the years, both of these constraints were first weakened and then removed. Yet the Federal Reserve continues to formulate monetary policy under conditions of relative secrecy and lack of accountability to the public which have long since become obsolete.

There is a manifest need to allow the markets and the American people more—and more timely—information about policy decisions affecting them. Today there is not even any legislative requirement for the policymaking Federal Open Market Committee's minutes or decisions to be publicized, although it has become customary for the Committee to release a summary after waiting one or two months.

Recently, this delay has engendered extreme uncertainty in the world's stock, bond, commodity, and currency markets, as they have reacted to each rumor or perception of monetary policy changes. It is axiomatic that the efficiency of markets depends on the degree of accurate information which is available. The recent uncertainty over Fed policy has undoubtedly damaged the stability which is necessary for economic and investment decisions. This benefits no one but those who trade upon rumor and real or imagined inside information. The continuation of Fed secrecy under these circumstances is an anachronism.

All agencies of government have undergone similar democratic reforms in the last ten or fifteen years. Disclosure naturally tends to be resisted by those within the institutions themselves. But "sunshine" and freedom of information measures have been applied to countless other agencies, with positive effect. Clearly, it is a positive benefit where no overriding national security interest is involved. The time has come for the United States' central bank to participate in this general openness. Its decisions are too important to be withheld from the knowledge of the American people.

We also believe that the responsiveness of policymaking can be improved by other

measures. Our first bill, The Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1984, proposes the following changes:

First, the four-year term of the Chairman of the System shall begin in February of the calendar year after the President's term begins. This provision is supported by Chairman Paul Volcker and by the Administration.

Second, the Secretary of the Treasury shall be made an *ex officio* member of the Federal Open Market Committee, as he was for many years. Thus, the Administration could no longer disclaim responsibility for monetary policy in which it had no part.

Third, the terms of the Governors of the System shall be reduced from 14 to seven years—which is still longer than the term of a U.S. President, Senator, or Congressman.

Fourth, the Open Market Committee shall publicly announce all policy decisions on the day on which they are adopted.

These measures would modernize the Federal Reserve, bringing its practice of decision making to the threshold of the twenty-first century.

POLICY

Just as important as the way in which policy is made is the effectiveness of the policy itself. Much of the current uncertainty over Federal Reserve policy reflects the unlimited discretion of the Federal Open Market Committee, and the absence of any established rule for guiding its policy.

This is partly a failure of the law. Surprisingly, the legislation authorizing the Federal Reserve contains no direction stating that the integrity of our currency should be the central bank's primary goal. Our second bill, the Balanced Monetary Policy and Price Stability Act of 1984, corrects this omission by instructing the Federal Reserve to make long-term price stability its overriding objective, which would avoid inflationary as well as deflationary swings in prices.

Also, in the absence of a firm monetary standard like the precious metals, the Fed needs stricter guidelines for its discretion in setting intermediate policy. Accordingly, our second bill would direct the Fed to abandon its on-again, off-again policy of "targeting" measures of the money supply which are constantly being shifted, changed, and redefined. Nor would it be permitted to "peg" interest rates, as it did for many years, without reference to its overriding objective of price stability.

If the central bank's objective is price stability, we believe it should actually target some proxy for the general price level. Our second bill directs the Fed to devise a price index for this purpose; to set a target range for the index; and to conduct its policy according to this target. No other guide can possibly determine whether monetary policy is too loose (inflationary) or too tight (deflationary).

Specifically, this second bill does the following:

It states clearly for the first time that the overriding goal of Federal Reserve is the integrity of the dollar, which necessarily means long-term price stability. The central bank directed to aim for strong economic growth, low interest rates, and stable exchange rates, in so far as this policy is consistent with long-term price stability.

As an intermediate target for conducting this policy, the Treasury Secretary and the Fed Chairman shall devise an index of prices for use as its intermediate monetary target. The index shall contain one or more commodities, chosen for their sensitivity to long-term trends rather than transitory or cyclical price movements. Once established, a decline of the index below its target range shall signal the central bank to ease its monetary policy, while a rise in the index above its target range shall signal a need to tighten.

The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to seek the establishment of an advisory task force and an international conference, made up of our major trading partners. The purpose of the task force and the conference would be to consider reforms of the international monetary system which would result in greater world wide price stability, more stable exchange rates, and a liberal trading system. It would lay the foundation for making honest money the foundation of a sound international economy.

If the policy outlined above had been in place, in all probability it would have prevented the wild swings in prices, interest rates, world monetary reserves, exchange rates, and economic growth during the past dozen years. In particular, it would have prevented the wild and inflationary fall of the dollar of the late 1970s and the debilitating rise since 1980 which has hurt U.S. industries relying on exports or competing with foreign imports. We believe interest rates would be lower today.

These monetary reforms are long overdue, and we urge you to support them. Please contact Mac Carey at x55265 if you have any further questions, or if would like to be an original cosponsor of either or both of these measures.

Sincerely yours,

Trent Lott, Henry Hyde, John Hiler, Jim Courter, Dan Lungren, Barbara Vucanovich, Jack Kemp, Newt Gingrich, Connie Mack, Vin Weber, Dan Coats, Mickey Edwards, Stan Parris, Bill McCollum, Mark D. Siljander, John R. Kasich, Ed Bethune, Denny Smith, Hank Brown, Dan Burton, Howard C. Nielson, Frank R. Wolf, Bill Dannemeyer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) has expired.

MONETARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WEBER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WEBER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. The gentleman from Ohio has raised an interesting issue which is how do you measure the money supply.

First of all, you have raised a very important point. If it is cash and checking deposits, what happens if you go into a super NOW account, what happens if you put it in a money market deposit account? There are money market deposit accounts that are cash money market deposit accounts, there are money market deposit accounts that might be savings. How does the Fed determine what is M1 or M2?

Let me ask you another question rhetorically. We have a banker on the floor of the House from Florida. He can perhaps inform us. This is the ultimate rhetorical question to our friends who just want to measure monetary policy by the money aggregates.

What is the money supply of Washington, D.C.? What is the money supply of Sarasota, Fla? What is the money supply of Columbus, Ohio? What is the money supply of the United States?

You cannot measure, I would say to my friend from Ohio, you cannot measure the supply of money because you do not know what the demand for money is. You do not know what our friends are doing with their money. You do not know what our wives are doing and what is the lag. Some say 6 months, some say a year.

Incidentally, money is fungible. It comes across borders. It electronically shifts across borders. We do not live in a partial economy. We live in a global economy and you must measure monetary policy by what happens to prices. And if prices are rising, that is inflation and they should be tightening. If prices are falling, that is deflationary and we should be easing, and we should buy and sell bonds around the best proxy for prices, which is not the Consumer Price Index, it is not the Wholesale Price Index; it is not M1.

The best price index, frankly, and I know I am probably going further than some of my colleagues would go at this point, but I think the best proxy for prices is what is happening to gold.

But imagine this morning if you knew that the Fed had tightened and no one else knew it. What would you do with your gold? You would sell gold and buy, you might buy something, you might buy dollars. You would take a non-interest-bearing asset and buy an interest-bearing asset.

Conversely, if prices are rising, people will sell their interest-bearing assets and buy a precious metal and they will speculate in gold.

Mr. WEBER. If I can reclaim my time a minute, because I want to accentuate a point the gentleman from New York touched on but did not elaborate, as difficult as it is to define the money supply, and I think that is impossible, as the gentleman pointed out, it is far more difficult to begin to measure aggregate demand for money in that we are in an international marketplace, because all the decisions the gentleman is talking about are now made on an international basis. People in Tokyo decide if they are going to buy things in the New York marketplace, so when you try to measure demand for money, even if you could do that in this country, you would not even be beginning to scratch the surface.

Mr. KEMP. Velocity is a commonly recognized measure of the demand for money. But, unfortunately, measuring the velocity of money, that is a back-

ward-looking indicator. The gentleman from Minnesota pointed out that nominal GNP was a backward-looking market and so is velocity. You do not tell what happens to velocity and nominal GNP until after it has happened, so what does the Fed do.

We are operating on Paul Volcker's personal standard. We do not have a gold standard. We do not have a standard. There is no measure and there is no guideline. There is no rule. There is no intellectual guideline around which anybody can make a decision about the future of the dollar.

You have to wait for the gossip and the leaks.

It seems to me that we have two obligations to the American people. A, we have an obligation to allow all of the American people to be let in on what the Fed is doing within 24 hours of their changing policy; and B, we have an obligation to the American people to give them a sound monetary policy which will keep interest rates at their historically average level, whatever that may be. I think it is single digit. It is much closer to single digit than it is to double digit.

The way to do that is to stabilize the price level around some forward-looking economic index. And I would hope that we have started at least raising the consciousness of some of our colleagues about this very important issue facing all of us in the Congress.

Mr. WEBER. Let me reclaim my time.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York particularly on what he just said, and that is for far too long we have concentrated exclusively on fiscal policy without paying any attention to the monetary policies that are conducted in the country. And while the American public has only been faced with the issue of fiscal policy, and most people in this Chamber in my judgment are only concerned about the issue of fiscal policy, to ignore monetary policy is like trying to peddle a bicycle with only one peddle. They have to work in sync. If you have an irregular, inconsistent monetary policy, but the greatest fiscal policy in the world, you are still going to have severe problems within your economy.

What is essential is for the American people and the press, which I think the gentleman from New York has perhaps awakened the sleeping giant, for the press and the public to start asking the question about what is this powerful body, one of the most powerful bodies that exists in the world today, the Federal Reserve, which is shrouded in secrecy, which at least at best has inconsistent monetary policy within the period of the last 4 or 5 years. We need to be in debate on this. We need to be discussing what is appropriate monetary policy.

Is JACK KEMP right? Is CONNIE MACK right? Is VIN WEBER right? Is JIM WRIGHT or TIP O'NEILL right? Who is right? We have to start discussing this, because up until now we have had no discussions on really what monetary policy is all about and what the Fed has been all about. All of the discussion, most of the people within the national newspapers or the magazines or radio or on TV, except for an occasional appearance by Mr. KEMP on the "McNeill-Lehrer Report," is to focus exclusively on fiscal policy. If we do that, the American people suffer and the people in my district suffer, and the people in Youngstown suffer. The people across this country suffer because we do not have the kind of policy that can help us solve this severe economic problem that we seem to come in and go out of.

So I guess that I think the bill is excellent. I was an original cosponsor. Let us end the secrecy and let us continue the debate, and hopefully putting good minds together we will come up with a policy that makes sense, that will ultimately help the American people.

□ 1830

But please let us not just concentrate exclusively on fiscal policy because we are missing a large part of the ball game. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would like to turn to a little different aspect of this whole debate, but it relates very much to what the gentleman from Ohio just said. We focus in this body almost exclusively on fiscal policy, when it comes to talking about interest rates we focus almost exclusively on the deficit.

I have a pretty good conservative record, as does the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke, the gentleman from New York and everybody else participating in this debate. But in my district which is a rural, agricultural district, the interest rate situation is literally life threatening right now to a lot of small businessmen and family farmers.

So I have come to the conclusion that we need to look a little more closely at what exactly is the cause of the high-interest rates crippling certain sectors of our economy.

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the comments. I also appreciate the gentleman's hospitality, giving up so much of his precious time, particularly on television, to allow for this discussion. But imagine for a moment, seriously for just a moment, imagine what the deficit would be if interest rates were at 6 percent.

What do you think would happen in housing and autos and agriculture and to small business opportunities? And we have all been pleased about the fact that in 1983 there were 4.5 million new jobs created. Imagine what this economy could do? Talk about a sleeping giant, the sleeping giant is the free enterprise American system.

If we had the historical level of interest rate, 6, 7, 8 percent; I think $125 billion of this deficit is clearly associated with the unemployment that has been the result of an artifically high interest rate policy prescribed for the American economy for almost 3½ years.

It is time to give the American people what they desperately need; not only honest money but a level of interest rates that will allow for this great economy to move to ever-higher levels of output and growth and production and savings and capital formation.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WEBER. Let me reclaim my time.

I want to go through a few statistics, a little analysis. As I stated the point we keep debating around here, is the impact on interst rates. The theory is they are crowding out; when the Federal Government has to borrow a certain amount of money it is in competition with private borrowers; that competition increases demand for money and that pushes up the price of money and interest rates.

There is of course something to that theory. But it is worth pointing out that Federal Government borrowing of course is not the only kind of government borrowing that crowds out private borrowing, crowds out savings. State and local governments as well crowd out private savings.

So we really should be talking about total government borrowing.

In that context, I would like to enter into the RECORD the following statistics from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's current publication "Economic Outlook," in a column by the chief economist for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Richard Rahn.

Quoting from this article, Mr. Rahn says:

> Many politicians and commentators continue to pound away with the assertion that we are running $200 billion deficits. If the assertion were true, and if it were not used as an excuse to justify destructive tax increases, no harm would be done. However, the fact is the $200 billion number is mythical. It is mythical in that it does not conform with accepted accounting practices. Also, the federal deficit number is of limited relevance because it is only part of the total government deficit or surplus.
>
> Currently, state and local governments are running a surplus estimated to be approximately $68 billion for 1984, and much of this surplus results from a transfer of monies from the federal government to state and local governments. Hence, the

total deficit from all levels of government is a much more meaningful number.

Adding federal spending of approximately $913 billion to state and local government spending of about $464 billion on a calendar year basis, gives a total of $1.377 trillion. Expected tax receipts at the federal level are $724 billion, and state and local governments are expected to bring in some $532 billion. Total anticipated tax revenue, then, is $1.256 trillion.

Subtracting total revenues from total spending yields an aggregate projected budget deficit for all government of $121 billion. This is equivalent to 3.5 percent of GNP, down from 5.5 percent of GNP in 1983.

The deficit number for all government spending is more meaningful if we distinguish between government spending on long-lived assets, or capital spending, and current expense items. Such a distinction is made by all businesses. If a business buys a new building or durable machine, the cost would be recorded as an asset in the capital account. Capital spending is capitalized and depreciated over the useful life of the building, machine or automobile. Paper clips and employee wages would be recorded as expenses.

Similar distinctions between capital and expense outlays can be made when looking at government spending at the federal, state and local levels. The bulk of government spending is in the form of transfer payments to individuals, and these items should be expensed just as a private firm would expense wages and salaries. Government at all levels also spends money on capital goods, such as automobiles, with three year useful lives, aircraft carriers, with 30 year lives, and bridges and dams which may have useful lives beyond 50 years.

The point of this discussion is merely to illustrate that if government used appropriate accounting standards, the deficit numbers would appear very different. In fact, if sinking funds, for the presently unfunded or underfunded federal retirement system, Social Security system, Medicare, and so forth, were established (as private business is required to do), the situation would have appeared to be much worse for many years.

Reviewing past reports of the Council of Economic Advisors or the projections of the Congressional Budget Office reveals that budget deficit projections, even for the current year, are notoriously inaccurate. Hence, to develop policy on the basis of mythical numbers that cannot be forecast with reasonable certainty can only be characterized as foolhardy.

The current discussion in the media, and emanating from politicians, concerning the deficit tends to confuse the real problems facing our economy with their symptoms. Economists and political leaders should learn from the medical profession that one must treat the disease, not the symptom. The widespread failure of many politicians, commentators, and even some businessmen to understand the real reason deficits are undesirable is seen in the counterproductive solutions they advocate for the deficit problem.

If one assumes that the major goal of economic policy should be to increase real per capita income for all of our citizens, then it follows that we need to increase our rate of productive savings and investment for capital formation. Increasing productivity is the key to increasing the standard of living, and the single most important factor to increasing productivity is to add to the productive capital that each worker utilizes. Thus, if the deficit absorbs a major share of our national savings which would otherwise go to productivity and capital formation, real economic growth is reduced. In additon, deficits themselves, while symptomatic of the Congress' inability to control the growth of spending, do present several problems in and of themselves.

First, mounting deficits increase the interest payment expense of the federal budget. Already, payment of interest on the existing national debt is roughly $108 billion per year. It is the third largest budget item after national defense and Social Security. This problem could be partially alleviated by issuing inflation-indexed or gold-backed government bonds. Such bonds could reduce total interest charges substantially by reducing the interest rates demanded by holders of the bonds.

Second, as discussed above, large amounts of government borrowing is believed to "crowd out" private borrowing by individuals and businesses. This reduces the capital available to business and individuals, or at least raises the cost of capital to them.

There are two possible solutions to the problem of "crowding out." First, reduce the deficits themselves by cutting the growth rate of the government spending. Or second, increase the total stock of saving available to both government and private borrowers. Assuming that the Congress is unwilling to address the question of serious budget restraint in the near future, as now seems likely, the question becomes, how can we increase the savings pool available to borrowers?

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (ERTA) provides one example. By increasing the depreciation allowances and cutting the marginal tax rates facing businesses, the internal cash flow of corporations has increased and now finances over 97% of corporate capital outlays. This is up from only 85% during the 10 years prior to the Economic Recovery Tax Act. Thus, lower corporate taxes reduces the borrowing demands of American business and thereby reduces the "crowding out" of government borrowing. Conversely, if the advice of some politicians is followed to raise corporate taxes, then, we would see the problem of crowding out increase.

For individuals, the same analysis holds true. Since individuals tend to consume at constant rates over short periods of time, higher tax rates will simply reduce individual savings and investment and thus exacerbate the problems posed by budget deficits.

As was true with business, ERTA phased in lower marginal tax rates for individuals allowing them to finance more of their capital needs out of their own increased savings. It is worth noting that the tremendous increase in the value of individual stock holdings due to the bull market has greatly increased wealth and, therefore the effective savings of individuals.

Thus if we are to seriously address the problem of deficit spending, we have no choice but to slow the growth rate of all government spending—federal, state and local—and at the same time reduce, not increase, the tax bias against productive savings and investment.

Now the point that I want to make here is that we are all presuming that reducing the Federal budget deficit will bring down interest rates. That is the sole focus of discussion and activity in the Congress of the United States. I think deficits are important; I think we should get deficits down. But Mr. Volcker came and testified before a committee of the Congress that if there were a $50 billion reduction in the Federal deficit, it would result in his judgment in a one point decline in the prime rate of interest.

We have in that period of time seen more than a $30 billion reduction in the projected Federal deficit and far more than that if you count in State and local governments as well and what has happened to interest rates? They have gone up.

Now I think that when we start talking about deficits and focus on deficits as a key to lowering interest rates, we are very much in the position of the man who lost his wallet in the alley but looked for it under the streetlight, because the light was better. We do not want to talk about monetary policy because it is difficult and complex.

But there is zero evidence based on the experience of the last 12 to 18 months to suggest that further reductions in the deficits alone will solve our interest rate problem.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to comment relating to our colleague from New York about what would happen or just what would happen if we had a 6-percent interest rate today and how it would affect housing and auto sales and jobs and the things related to that?

Also, do you know what would happen to the Federal budget deficit if you dropped interest rates to 6 percent in a 5-year period which is the period of time that we use around here to judge policy amd make decisions? You would reduce the deficits during that period of time by $296 billion, that one factor alone.

Mr. KEMP. Over 5 years?

Mr. MACK. Over 5 years.

Mr. WEBER. Is it not ironic in view of this, the only thing that has happened to reduce the deficit, the only thing has been economic growth. And the Fed policy now is specifically to slow down economic growth which has been the only thing we have done to reduce the deficit.

I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. MACK. One more point, because again you have hit on the other thing. Everyone wants to run around here and either increase taxes or reduce spending to solve the problem. What we just said was a 3-percent drop in interest rates is $296 billion. A 1-percent higher level of real economic growth over that same period of time reduces deficits further by approximately $394 billion. That is $650 billion.

Mr. WEBER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman.

I spoke to the gentleman from Florida's experience visiting here this week; bunch of fresh-faced high school students from his district in Florida, the salt of the Earth, sweet, idealistic, young high school students from Florida visiting. They really owe their Congressman a great deal of gratitude for his effort to put together an interesting program.

He did not just have me; he had all sorts of Members, he brought them over, allowing them to look at different processes and watch the Congress in action, listen to great minds like—well, I will not mention some of the great minds.

But I kept saying to them: The answer to the deficit is to put this country back to work. At full employment what would the deficit be? It would be at least $140 to $150 billion lower than it is today. And one of the young students, I would say to my friend from Florida, said, "Gee, that sounds so compassionate, that sounds so"—I think he was about ready to say biblical, and I do not mean to put it in that term, but is it not much more compassionate to look at the people on this deficit issue as an economic growth issue? That is why the gentleman from Minnesota touched a very responsive chord in my heart because I am comvinced that our political and intellectual capital should be aimed at continuing the economic recovery, should be continuing at high levels of productivity, the rate of increase in the gross national product, the rate of new business formations that provided 4.5 million new jobs in the last 16 months; we talked about it before but more jobs in America in the last 1½ years than in Europe in the last 10 or 12 years.

The gentleman from Minnesota put his finger on the key issue of this deficit mania. With interest rates at normal, historical, single digit levels, the housing and auto and agricultural, think of exports.

The gentleman from Georgia, who is walking around the Chambers right now, Mr. GINGRICH, pointed out the other day that 1-percent increase in the prime rate, the 1-percent increase in the prime rate cost Argentina more money in debt service than the total bridge loan of $300 million that they were negotiating with the U.S. Government to help provide them some maneuvering room with the International Monetary Fund.

□ 1840

I was in Panama giving a speech recently to the Central American Exposition for 1984 and the Finance Minister, on the very day that the prime rate went up one-half point, told me that that one-half point increase in the prime rate wiped out the total security assistance to the Government of Panama for 1 year.

Imagine Brazil and Sudan and Morocco, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, all of our friends are impoverished because monetary policy in the United States is causing so much pain and hardship, notwithstanding what it is doing to the U.S. deficit.

So this is an issue of overriding national and international concern and I just want to say how much I appreciate my colleagues' interest, A and B, I appreciate the fact that it is interesting that there are some younger Members of the Congress talking today about not just these domestic issues, but what is happening to the world, because I think this is causing—we can really help our allies and our friends around the world, help our balance of payments, help our exports, and help other countries grow again, from Africa and Central America, if we could put in order the monetary stability that we enjoyed in 1946, after the war, until about 1971 before we just totally abolished the whole international monetary system, that was called the Bretton Woods system, and devalued the dollar and suspended the convertibility of the dollar from gold and went off on this track, that we could follow a zero sum policy in order to boost our exports by devaluing the U.S. dollar.

I want to again thank the Members and look forward to working with you and other Members of Congress to bring some sanity to the Federal Reserve policy and the monetary policy, to bring back to the American people what they desperately need, sound, honest stable money, low interest rates, a growing economy, and move us toward that full employment without inflation, which I think is not a dream, although some people think it is. I think it is a policy. I think it is a goal that we should have as Members of Congress. I think it should be a bipartisan goal.

Think of the budget. The budget would be an equilibrium if the economy was in equilibrium, if monetary and fiscal policy were pursuing full employment and price stability, there would be no debate over the deficit. That is really what we should be giving the American people, full employment, honest money, low-interest rates, price stability.

There are other problems, to be sure. But I will tell you what, we go a long way toward reducing some of even our social problems if we could give the American family a belief once again in the long run future of our policies that were in the best interest of all people becoming what God meant them to be.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

I just will make a comment in terms of the international ramifications of this. It is interesting that we just concluded, prior to the beginning of this debate on monetary policy, about 40 minutes of discussion on the immigration problem. Our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) and our colleague from California (Mr. LUNGREN) spent a good deal of time discussing the failure of the House of Representatives to enact immigration reform legislation.

The immigration problem, of course, is a growing one. But the immigration problem is directly related to the issue we are discussing right now which is monetary policy.

It is estimated that between now and the year 2000 in Mexico, given normal rates of growth, there will be 7 million Mexicans added to the unemployment rolls. Now that means there is going to be increased pressure on those people to come into this country, legally or illegally, and ultimately there is no set of immigration laws alone that can solve that problem, only rapid economic growth will provide those people with some hope and some opportunity in their homeland is going to solve that problem.

This is genuinely an issue that affects most other issues.

Mr. MACK. If the gentleman will yield, I just want to expand on that point. The impact of higher interest rates, as the gentleman knows we went through quite a debate last year about the role of the International Monetary Fund and the conditionality that they place on countries in trying to work out their financial problems, it is interesting that just a single change in interest rates as to how that affects their balance of payments and how it affects their relationships with the International Monetary Fund and how it forces them to carry out such negative policies that affect the people of their countries to the point that it ferments revolution, which drives people to the United States and worsens the immigration problem.

As the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) said there are other problems that we do need to talk about, but it is interesting how much revolves around the question of economics, the question of fiscal policy, the question of monetary policy.

So it is not just for those of us here in the United States that this affects, it affects our friends abroad. Again, I think we need to force the debate on monetary policy.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his comments.

I want to conclude here just by thanking all the Members who have participated in this debate on monetary policy, which is the first real debate on monetary policy that I can remember in the House of Representatives in the short time that I have been here.

I would issue a challenge to our colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to

enter this debate. One of the things that strikes me is that we see all of this emotional highly charged rhetoric about fiscal policy. Our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle beat up on the President constantly over what they call the unfairness of his policies.

I would just say to friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, the ultimate unfairness is to endorse a policy that lets a small group of people meet behind close doors and dictate the course of the American economy to the disadvantage of working people, small businessmen and farmers. That is exactly what the monetary policy of our country is today, the policy that was again enunciated by the Federal Reserve fairly recently is worth reviewing.

Mr. Moore said, as I quoted earlier, in the Washington Post: "Similar steps should be expected if current dollar gross national product continues to grow faster than the Fed's goal of between 8 and 9 percent for 1984. Current dollar GNP rose at 12.8 percent rate in the first quarter."

What that means, after you cut through all the economic jargon, is very simply this: The Federal Reserve is now deciding behind closed doors that the economy is too healthy, too strong, they are going to have to bankrupt a few people, throw a few people out of work in order to get it slowed down.

That is a policy that is endorsed by those in this chamber who refuse to discuss monetary policy and put all the burden on fiscal policy.

I think to the extent that they are unwilling to discuss monetary policy they are endorsing high interest rates, they are endorsing higher unemployment, they are endorsing bankruptcies in small business and agriculture, and that is the ultimate unfair policy.

So I challenge my colleagues again on both sides of the aisle to enter the economic policy debate on monetary policy that we have initiated tonight.

NICARAGUAN WOMEN'S SIGNATURE BOOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening I guess with as much sadness as I have ever had talking in this House.

This evening it was brought to my attention that in the Speaker's lobby was a book with a sign that said, "Nicaraguan Women's Signature Book." I looked at this book. This book is purely and simply Communist propaganda. It is propaganda by the Marxist dictatorship in Nicaragua, it is propaganda aimed against the United States of America, and I find it incredible that the House of Representatives and the Speaker of the House of Representatives could have permitted this book to have been placed in the Speaker's lobby as propaganda against the United States.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Where did the gentleman say he found it?

Mr. GINGRICH. It was in the Speaker's lobby, which is the area right behind us, the area that the press normally uses, the area directly off the House floor. It was, in fact, sitting on a table backed up against the House Chamber. It is where most Members walk by, it is where all of the national press that covers the House walks to interview Members of the Congress.

As I look at it and read the English translation on the front piece, it is unbelievable.

Let me read one thing which I did not understand the other night. I have talked several nights about a very important pastoral letter and reconciliation from the Nicaragua bishops, the Easter letter, by the Catholic bishops in Nicaragua, and there was a paragraph I did not understand.

They said and I quote, and I am quoting the Catholic bishops of Nicaragua:

> The suffering of mothers who have lost their children which should merit our great respect is instead exploited to incite hatred and feed the desire for vengence.

□ 1850

I was not sure that what the Catholic bishops were referring to. And now I see a document, which is clearly an example of what they were talking about, this document called The Year of the United Front Against the Aggression, written by a group who describes themselves as the Committee of the Mothers of Heroes and Martyrs, is, in fact, straight old-fashioned Communist propaganda.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield to the Chair?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have knowledge as to who placed the book or the sign in the Speaker's lobby?

Mr. GINGRICH. All I can say to the Chair is that we checked through our staff, and our staff was informed that the Speaker's office permitted it, gave permission for it to be placed there. That is all I can tell the Chair at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. But I appreciate the Chair's inquiry. I share the same perplexity that the Chair does.

I want to read several passages from this because it is incredible, it is the grossest distortion, the most explicit lies, and yet it was in the Speaker's lobby in the House.

It says:

> Since the triumph of our popular Sandinista revolution and during this period, we have worked in the building of grassroots democratic organizations which have permitted the wide participation of the various sectors of the country.

That sentence is a lie. There is no other word for it except that it is a lie. It is deliberate propaganda, and I will presently introduce into the RECORD evidence that it is a lie. And to have that kind of deliberate Communist lie in the Speaker's lobby is beyond me.

Mr. MACK. That last comment, the last paragraph, the last sentence that the gentleman read——

Mr. GINGRICH. The paragraph says this:

> More than 2 years have gone by since the triumph of our popular Sandinista revolution, and during this period we have worked in the building of grassroots democratic organizations which have permitted the wide participation of the various sectors of the country.

Now, anyone who has talked to any of the freedom fighters, anyone who has talked to anyone who has been down there and looked at the country will tell you that it is increasingly a Cuban and Soviet dominated colony, that it is increasingly a police state, that there is increasing censorship, that in fact there is no possibility at all that that sentence is true, and yet that sentence in the book that contains it is sitting right out here to propagandize congressmen and to propagandize members of the news media.

It says here, and I quote:

> The new government has provided a special interest in the hope of the future, the infants, by supporting laws which, being the laws of popular concern, come to benefit in the first instance the condition of the children. Such is the case of the recently approved law of relations between mothers, fathers and children.

That is what the Communist propaganda says. However, that is not what we hear from the Catholic bishops, because the Catholic bishops have a very different approach to this.

The Catholic bishops say, for example, in terms of freedom and in terms of what is happening:

> Considering that freedom of speech is a vital part of the dignity of the human being and as such is indispensable to the well being of the nation inasmuch as a country progresses only when there is freedom to generate new ideas, the right to free expression of one's ideas must be recognized.

In other words, they are talking very directly about the problems that they face in dealing with a government which stops freedom of speech.

They also talk in here, in the letter of Easter from the Catholic bishops in Nicaragua, about the way in which the current Communist government is an-

tifamily and is antichildren. Quoting from the Catholic bishops:

A materialistic and atheistic educational system is undermining the consciences of our children. Many families are divided by political differences.

They went on to say, and I quote from the Catholic bishops:

Farm workers and Indians for whom the church reserves a special love are suffering, living in constant anxiety, and many of them are forced to abandon their homes in search of a peace and tranquility that they do not find.

Now, do we have out here a large sign from the Catholic bishops? No. Do we have out here any indication of what the Catholic bishops have said about this situation? No. What we have instead is pure, plain, old-fashioned Communist propaganda.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WEAVER. I was wondering, the gentleman mentioned a book that he had?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes.

Mr. WEAVER. Is this book of unknown authorship?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes; I would be delighted to answer the gentleman. This book is a book—it is sitting right here, and I will be glad to share it with the gentleman—which had a sign over it, sitting in the Speaker's lobby, entitled, "Nicaraguan Women's Signature Book." And this book is in Spanish but it has an English translation as part of the book, entitled, "Year of the United Front Against Aggression." It then has in classic Communist and Nazi style thousands of signatures, which in a dictatorship are rather easy to get, imprisonment and being shot being the two alternatives, and it purports to be a voluntary statement by people in Nicaragua in praise of the Communist dictatorship, explaining what a wonderful place it is and how horrible Ronald Reagan is and what a terrible thing it is that we are doing.

Now, I would say to you that this document, by any reasonable standard, is absolute straight, traditional Communist propaganda.

Mr. WEAVER. If the gentlman will yield, I had heard the gentleman say it was Communist propaganda. I do not know anything about the book, but I thought perhaps that President Reagan had brought the book back from Communist China. Is that a possibility?

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, I think it is an amusing point for the gentleman to make, but since we are not currently engaged in hostilities with Communist China, I am not sure that it is very relevant.

Mr. WEAVER. If the gentleman will yield, has the United States officially declared war against Nicaragua?

Mr. GINGRICH. In fact, the United States is clearly engaged, as the gentleman knows, in hostilities in Nicaragua through covert means. Those covert means are not very secret, since they have been on page 1 and on the evening news. But clearly the gentleman knows that this Congress—I might remind the gentleman we are legally engaged under the laws of the United States. We have legally authorized and legally appropriated money. It is the policy of the U.S. Government. And in that period, for someone to bring in this kind of propaganda, is remarkable.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MACK. Since the gentleman brought up the question about authorship, maybe it would be appropriate to pursue the question a little bit further.

How did this—or who gave permission for this book to be placed in the Speaker's lobby?

Mr. GINGRICH. To the best of our understanding, as I told the Chair a while ago—and again I am relying on our staff's having talked to the Democratic staff—the Speaker's office, presumptively the Speaker, gave permission for this book to be put in the lobby.

Mr. MACK. At this point we have no idea who requested that permission?

Mr. GINGRICH. At this point we are not certain who requested it and, frankly, it is amazingly bad judgment. Whoever requested it had remarkably bad judgment, and whoever approved it had worse judgment.

And all I can say is, literally within the last hour we discovered this book was sitting out here, we read the English translation, I went back and picked up the Catholic bishop's letter from Nicaragua and began to piece together how this worked, and all I can say is that this is one of the most remarkable examples of naivete on the part of Members of this Congress I have ever seen. To pretend that a Communist dictatorship, with Soviet and Cuban advisers, has a freely written petition, to pretend that this document is a sincere document, would be like in 1938 accepting a letter from Adolf Hitler signed by 12,000 of his closest friends.

Mr. MACK. Let me raise this point again. There was a paragraph that I think the gentleman read from the bishop's letter, it was written, I believe, on Good Friday, that made some reference to the use of women. Would you mind repeating that?

Mr. GINGRICH. I might say—and this may also answer the other gentleman's question, in a sense—this letter is signed, "Committee of Mothers and Martyrs of the Popular Sandinista Revolution." And the bishops, in their letter of Easter, said:

The suffering of mothers who have lost their children, which should merit our great respect, is instead exploiting to incite hatred and feed the desire for vengeance.

In other words, the bishops are describing precisely the kind of exploitation by the Communist government that this book presumably represents.

I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEAVER. I was going to say to my dear friend from Georgia that he keeps saying "Communist propaganda." I wonder what would happen to a book that President Reagan brought back from Communist China. If the President wanted a book that he brought back from Communist China out there, would that also be Communist propaganda? I just ask this question. Perhaps that book is Nicaraguan propaganda. I deplore propaganda of any kind, particularly Communist or fascists propaganda.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am going to get to that in a minute. There are—and I think we ought to quit being naive about it in the West—specific patterns of Communist behavior that are institutionalized and go back to Lenin in 1917 that are very clearcut. And I will cite two examples of recent parallels that we saw that are very precise. In Afghanistan a pro-Soviet Government tried to rebel, the Soviets stepped in and shot everybody who was in charge, including their families, and took over. In Grenada, a pro-Soviet regime tried to rebel, and they shot Maurice Bishop, and had we not intervened, they would have imposed a Communist dictatorship.

There are certain patterns to all this. I am going to, in a minute, walk through some specific documentation about precisely those patterns in Cuba and in Nicaragua and suggest that we are remarkably naive to have to relearn this lesson every 20 years.

Mr. WEAVER. If the gentleman will yield briefly, I agree, everything the gentleman has said is absolutely true. Lenin was perhaps the most evil man that I know of in history. He was absolutely brutal, cruel, cold, merciless, and he killed many of his fellow countrymen in the name of communism. But Communist China did the same thing.

Mr. GINGRICH. Absolutely.

Mr. WEAVER. Millions of peasants were slaughtered or murdered in Communist China, and we have President Reagan going there last week. Why is this? Do we have a double standard?

Mr. GINGRICH. My opinion is, candidly, that that is a mistake.

Mr. WEAVER. Does the gentleman like communism in one place and dislike communism some other place?

Mr. GINGRICH. No; in my opinion, that was a mistake. If you would be

willing to join me in condemning communism in Nicaragua, I would be perfectly willing to stipulate with you that communism is no more desirable in China than it is in Nicaragua.

Mr. WEAVER. I absolutely abhor communism anywhere, facism, communism, totalitarianism of any kind.

Mr. GINGRICH. The question then becomes: In addition to abhorring, what do we do about it? Now, if I might, having said that this Congress has so far decayed I think in terms of its sense of awareness of communism—and I accept the gentleman's point—I think one of the reasons we are having trouble in Central America is because this administration has not been clear enough of what it is doing.

□ 1900

It has not got its own act together. But I think a deeper reason is because, frankly, in all candor, the radical wing of the gentleman's party does not even understand that there is communism anymore.

Now this document is not a book about communism, let me make that clear. We have the greatest library in the free world across the street; Members should be allowed and encouraged to read anything they want to. This book is a specific act of propaganda by the Nicaraguan Government, and a document which frankly contains several items which I think can at best be called lies, and are clearly designed to distort reality.

Having said that, let me explain why I take this so seriously. Let me introduce into the RECORD a letter written and published in the Washington Post on April 28 by Adriana Guillen. She was a former correspondent for La Prensa. She was accused of being a counterrevolutionary. She was told she would be killed if she went back. This is what she wrote:

Alma Guillermoprieto quotes Sergio Ramirez, a member of Nicaragua's civilian/military junta, as follows: "The phrase 'freedom of the press' here refers to 'freedom of La Prensa,' and La Prensa thinks its role is to contribute to the overthrow of the government." She then adds, seemingly supporting Ramirez's view: "Certainly, La Prensa's editorial line is often sympathetic to the U.S.-financed counterrevolutionaries fighting the Sandinistas from Honduras. Several La Prensa reporters have left the country to work with counterrevolutionary groups. Others, still at the paper, speak optimistically about a victory for the 'armed opposition.'"

Guillermoprieto neglects to mention that a significant portion of today's armed opposition is also composed of ex-Sandinistas, former government officials and FSLN militants. The facts are that a widespread national movement has arisen in repudiation of the Sandinista betrayal; any Nicaraguan citizen may justly support the rebellions not because he or she is "counterrevolutionary," but because the military suppression of civil rights in Nicaragua, imposed by the Marxist-Leninist FSLN, has made it impossible to obtain the democracy promised by the revolution in any other way.

In the specific case of former La Prensa journalists, myself included, it is not the case that these people have voluntarily left the country to join the rebellion. They have in fact been forced to leave by the FSLN as part of a systematic policy of repression aimed at all remaining vestiges of free journalism in Nicaragua. I cite the cases of a number of my former colleagues who, like myself, each strongly supported the overthrow of Somoza and the democratic aspirations of the Nicaraguan revolution:

Abelardo Sanchez, La Prensa correspondent in Ocotal, was the victim of a massive campaign in the Sandinista press, was entrapped by the FSLN, accused and condemned on June 16, 1981, as a "counterrevolutionary," sentenced to three years and imprisoned, brutally abused and finally released in deplorable condition.

Maximo Alonso, Leon correspondent, was attacked and beaten by a Sandinista mob on the premises of the Leon Court House on June 30, 1981. This was followed by the threat of further mob violence against him and his family at home.

Victor Medina, Managua reporter, was harassed in October 1981 by Sandinista state security agents on the premises of the Sandinista Council of State.

Horacio Ruiz, an editor of La Prensa, was kidnapped and, as reported in The Miami Herald of June 26, 1982, was "beaten severely . . . his life threatened by four masked men, one of them carrying a machine gun" and told "now you are going to know what mobs are."

Luis Mora, Managua reporter, was unjustly imprisoned for three months during 1983.

Auxiliadora Echegoyen, Managua reporter, was threatened by Sandinista activists in the dead of night with loud-speakers blaring promises of a firing squad. She was apprehended without charge by Sandinista security agents and interrogated during the early morning hours at "house No. 50," a notorious FSLN interrogation center.

I, who formerly served as La Prensa reporter and correspondent for Central America, was accused in absentia of being a counterrevolutionary in January 1982. The Sandinista Ministry of Culture (from which I resigned after serving as Coordinator of Popular Centers of Culture from July 1979 to February 1980) caricatured me as an "enemy of the revolution" during a Sandinista anniversary parade on July 19, 1981. FSLN commander William Ramirez, minister for the Atlantic Coast, stated that "if I were to decide, journalists like Guillen would cease to exist." Bayardo Arce, a member of the nine-man FSLN national directorate, privately warned in July 1981 that "what happened to Jorge Salazar"—Nicaraguan opposition leader murdered by Sandinista security forces—"could well happen to Adriana if she stays with La Prensa."

Now, that letter, published in the Washington Post on April 28, is a personal testimony by a former reporter on what was once a free newspaper in Nicaragua, about the systematic brutality, and the systematic censorship by the Communist dictatorship in Nicaragua. The very same dictatorship which, while threatening to kill, and in some cases killing people in its own country, is allowed to send propaganda to sit in the Speaker's lobby.

What really frustrates me, and maybe it is because I was a history teacher; maybe it is just because commonsense would seem to do better; is that none of this is new. Lenin established a pattern by which Communist governments take over.

Hugh Seaton-Watson, a very famous historian, studied that pattern and wrote a book on it 25 or 30 years ago and said, "Here is what will happen. A Communist government will come in with a lot of popular front supporters, then it will systematically kick out, shoot, and jail its supporters."

Lest you think I am just a conservative Republican, let me share with you the historical documents that have come in recently. In connection with the continuing debate, permit me to call to your attention a most revealing book review which appeared in the Washington Post of April 29, 1984.

The book in question, "Family Portrait with Fidel, a Memoir", is by Carlos Franqui, who was a close associate and fellow revolutionary of Fidel Castro in the 1950's, but who is now a Cuban liberation fighter.

I choose the label for Mr. Franqui and associates of his alike, Hubert Amatos and David Salazar, both mentioned in the review, because their tragic cases run so parallel to those of the Nicaraguan freedom fighters of today.

In each instance, these true reformers and civil libertarians helped overthrow existing rightwing dictatorships, only to find themselves in the clutches of new and even more vicious and tenacious dicatorships of the Gestapo left.

Let me point out that Ambassador to the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick, in several articles in 1979, made the argument that it does not help people to get rid of a rightwing military dicatorship if, in return, you establish an even more vicious, even more brutal, even more horrible leftwing dicatorship.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. I think to back up what the gentleman is saying, is an interesting case history of a gentleman who is a constituent of mine right now who fought alongside Castro, as Castro was taking power in Cuba. He, in fact, was so close to Castro that he was made Ambassador to Great Britain in the Castro regime.

He came to the conclusion that that is precisely what was taking place in Cuba. That Cuba was becoming a leftwing tyranny, and he got out, and escaped to this country. He became a political refugee in this country because he understood what was taking place in his home country. He has related to me precisely the kind of trend that the gentleman is pointing out.

So there is a living, breathing example of somebody who considered himself a compatriot of Fidel Castro who eventually had to leave the government, leave his home country behind, and escape to freedom in the United States.

Mr. GINGRICH. This case goes on over and over again. In each instance, these men who genuinely believed in freedom; who genuinely wanted to establish a democratic country, found themselves kicked out, destroyed by the Gestapo left tactics of what can only be called leftwing Nazis: The Soviet Union and their allies.

Let me go on. When the freedom fighters begin to protest in favor of civil and human rights, in Cuba and in Nicaragua, they are immediately classified as counterrevoluntionary. They are either killed, imprisoned, or have to plead for their lives.

Written specifically about Castro, Mr. Franqui's book paints an equally accurate portrait of what has been going on in Nicaragua. Just as happened in Cuba 25 years ago, the broad-based and popular Nicaraguan revolution of 1979 has been totally co-opted and corrupted by the ruthless, Communist minority: the people we call the Sandinistas, and who, I frankly think, are better called just plain Communists or Marxists.

□ 1910

I think when we look at Franqui's memoir, it explains why all advocates of basic human rights, liberal and conservative, should unite in an effort to prevent all of Central America from becoming a dismal clone of Castro's Cuba, which is precisely what will happen if we do not provide adequate aid to both the freely elected government in El Salvador and the freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

Let me include in the RECORD at this point a review by Ronald Radosh entitled "Castro and Cuba: A Dream That Failed," from the Washington Post.

The review follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1984]

CASTRO AND CUBA: A DREAM THAT FAILED

[Family Portrait With Fidel: A Memoir. By Carlos Franqui. Translated from the Spanish by Ralph MacAdam. Random House. 262 pp. $17.95]

(By Ronald Radosh)

Until Carlos Franqui's "Family Portrait With Fidel," we have not had an insider's look at how the Sovietization of the Cuban Revolution occurred, and precisely what goals Fidel Castro had in mind for Cuba after the revolution. Franqui was in a position to know. Official archivist of the revolution from the guerrilla days, when he ran the official clandestine rebel radio station, Franqui became editor of the influential newspaper Revolución, which distinguished itself by printing a wide assortment of cultural matter, including the most eclectic Western writers and intellectuals.

Reading Franqui is comparable to reading George Orwell's "Homage to Catalonia"—a classic study of how the authentic revolutionary euphoria of a people in arms is slowly ground down by bureaucratic Stalinists. Make no mistake about it. Franqui is an unreconstructed revolutionary—a democratic exile whose anguish over the failure of the revolution is matched only by his animosity for the upper middle class and counterrevolutionaries who were opposed to change in Cuba. He conveys with power the dignity and strength of the popular militia—the bearded former guerrilleros who represented the hope of the future, and whose romance caught the imagination of so many. Franqui sees them as the collective heroes of Cuba, a cross-section of the island's society, an "armed democracy" composed of a million members.

Those Americans who think that Fidel Castro believed in a democratic revolution, but was forced to turn to the old-line Cuban communists solely for organizational purposes, given U.S. hostility to his revolution, will be shocked to find that the Cuban el jefe wrote approvingly to Franqui of Stalin, whom Castro regarded as a model, repeating to Franqui his "definition of Stalinism as the dictatorship of a revolutionary minority during difficult times, a minority that functions like a father who must deny his children something he has promised them." And Castro is quoted as telling Franqui that he must understand that "all criticism is opposition. All opposition is counterrevolutionary."

With the common enemy gone, the disparate groups which composed the July 26 movement broke into differing factions. What divided them, Franqui points out, was not radicalism or anti-imperialism, but the simple issue of communism. Four currents which fought for control of Cuba and which favored opposing Batista now fought among themselves: radical antiimperialist, democratic reformist, conservative pro-United States and Marxist-Leninist pro-Soviet Union. The fourth group—Franqui reveals—was composed of Che Guevara, Rau'l Castro, other comandantes and old communists and fellow travelers.

At first Castro stood between the groups, holding them together on the basis of his charisma and charm. But as the tension deepened and conflict with the United States loomed large, Fidel quickly turned to the communists. The results were predictable—the people's militia was replaced by the new regular army, by the repressive security police and neighborhood defense committees—and the July 26 organization itself by the Communist Party of Cuba. It was, Franqui says, a new "elitist power structure: the people were organized into cadres, watched over and administered by Security, the army and the bureaucracy. There was only one chief who held all power." In wielding that power, Castro's admonition was only to obey—not to think for oneself. The revolutionary spirit of initiative and struggle was replaced by the purge and militarization.

Franqui tried to oppose conservatives and the pro-Soviet left at the same time, but he found that task harder and harder to accomplish. Franqui gives us the details of how Fidel moved to oust Huber Matos—the only serious rival for leadership among the revolutionary coalition, who was therefore falsely accused of counter-revolutionary activity—but whose real danger was his vast popularity in Camaguey province and his committment to anti-imperialism, agrarian reform and democracy. Franqui tells us how Castro, supposedly guardian of a new worker's state, moved to tame the long-established independent and radical union movement. The Cuban proletariat, which Franqui characterizes as "socialist, antimilitarist, anti-Batista" and at one with the revolutionary 26 July movement, refused to give up their treasured independent union. In November 1959 the workers voted for a union federation that was anticommunist but pro-revolution. Once again, Cuban "conservatives were looking toward Washington, the Party faithful toward Moscow." With Raul Castro orchestrating events, the ministry of labor acted and disfranchised the new CTC, freely chosen by the workers. Its elected leader, David Salvador, was thrown into prison.

The revolution also brought repression of intellectuals to the island. It was but a prelude for the necessary obedience of the masses—Lunes, the cultural supplement of Revolutión, published not only the approved political figures, but Faulkner, Trotsky, Borges, Brecht and Breton—it was an inconoclastic combination of the avantgarde in literature, style and politics. Condemned as the Trojan horse of the revolution, its future was to be brief. A paper shortage was invented as the excuse to close the supplement down. In a short time no vehicle existed from which to report and protest new departures from humanism—torture by the police, and suppression of worker's rights

One example stands out. Simple women from the town of Ćardenas marched in protest against the new Red Terror and demanded food and freedom. The result, Franqui relates, was that "Many people were jailed, and the poor black women were magically transformed into middle-class ladies, enemies of the revolution." Ćardenas was but a few kilometers from the famous Varadero beach, where comandantes and revolutionary tourists reveled in the sun. The Party acted against the people, taking "the old Stalin line that if the people were not ready for socialism, a revolutionary minority would have to impose it on them." On his way back to Havana, Franqui passed the radicial tourists, including those from America, and he wondered what they were seeing "while ten minutes away there was a carnival of persecution in full swing." What they saw was a "stage-set Cuba, not the reality we had to live in every day, and they took the part for the whole."

Readers of Carlos Franqui have no fears—they are getting the whole. His book will not be well received by the mindless supporters of Fidel Castro—those who Franqui notes "think that any crime committed in the name of socialism is no crime at all." Nor will it be welcomed by the right-wing exiles, who will not excuse Franqui for his dream of a socialist but Democratic Cuba—free from dependence on both superpowers. He is clear, however, that the major force interfering with a free Cuba today is Fidel Castro, "a calculating man who believes in terror as a means of government," and who Franqui charges has brought the island to its current fate: "the caudillo, monoculture, militarism, an adaptation of local conditions based on the Soviet model." In deciding to testify to how the revolution ended in such an outcome, Franqui is in the tradition of revolutionary dissidents from Trotsky to Orwell. He offers the ever recurring story of another revolution betrayed—a charge that is one thing when said by the pundits of various American administrations, who preferred the old order, another when coming from a revolutionary like Carlos Franqui. One can only hope that in some far distant

future, the Cuban people will also be given the chance to read his powerful memoir.

(Ronald Radosh is a co-editor of El Salvador: Central America in the New Cold War and the co-author of The Rosenberg File. He teaches history at the City University of New York.)

Mr. GINGRICH. When we read the record, it is clear that communism ends up as a dictatorship which survives by sheer terror. In this case, it is, and I quote, "A classic study of how the authentic revolutionary euphoria of a people in arms is slowly ground down by bureaucratic Stalinists."

The Communist system permits no opposition. Let me quote:

Castro is quoted as telling Franqui that he must understand that—

And I quote Castro:

all criticism is opposition, all opposition is counter-revolutionary.

In other words, if you criticize the government for anything in a Communist government, you are bad, you are a counterrevolutionary, you are the enemy, you should risk going to jail.

Furthermore, it does not matter what the people want, despite all this Communist propaganda from Nicaragua that has been in the Speaker's lobby. Let me quote again from the review:

The Party acted against the people, taking "the old Stalin line that if the people were not ready for socialism, a revolutionary minority would have to impose it on them."

In other words, we will establish—we the Communists, will establish a dictatorship. We will force you to become Communists, and those of you who do not like it, we will shoot or imprison.

How is Castro described? As "a calculating man who believes in terror as a means of government," and who, Franqui charges, has brought the island to its current fate: "the caudillo, monoculture, militarism, an adaptation of local conditions based on the Soviet model."

And how does the reviewer end this review? Ronald Radosh, co-editor of "El Salvador: Central America in the New Cold War," and the co-author of "The Rosenberg File," a man who teaches history at the City University of New York, closes by saying:

One can only hope that in some far distant future, the Cuban people will also be given the chance to read this powerful memoir.

But if America is weak, if America is afraid, if America does nothing, there is little hope for the Cuban people. And if we do nothing now, there is little hope for the El Salvadoran people and little hope for the Nicaraguan people.

We are not just seeing book reviews. The Village Voice, not normally regarded as a rightwing publication, published in December 1983 an article entitled, "Cuba and Repression: Castro's Victims," by Saul Stern. This article, again, I think, is a direct challenge to the radical Democrats who think it is fine to have Communist propaganda in the Speaker's Lobby, who think it is fine to vote against aid for El Salvador and to vote against aid for Nicaragua.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thought the gentleman said he did not know who put the book in the Speaker's lobby.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think I can promise the gentleman without any question of challenge that it was not put in the Speaker's lobby by a Republican.

Mr. WEAVER. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman does not know who put it in, and yet the gentleman is accusing one or another of the parties, it does not matter which, Republican or Democrat, the gentleman is accusing somebody of putting the book in and he does not know who put it in. It could have been put in by President Reagan, who brought it back from Communist China, could it now have?

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman has great fun with that particular analogy, but the fact is that the Democratic Speaker of the House permitted it to be put there. The fact is that, I think the gentleman knows full well, it was almost certainly placed there by a Democratic Member of the House, and I will be glad next week when we are back, if the Speaker will tell us—the Speaker may not wish to tell us, which is his prerogative. The Speaker may wish to decide that it was on his own right.

Mr. WEAVER. It could have been put there by a covert Republican.

Mr. GINGRICH. It is conceivable that in the gentleman's mind the world works that way.

Mr. WEAVER. It does not work that way for me.

Mr. GINGRICH. I do not think it does in reality.

Mr. WEAVER. Usually when I say something has been put there by somebody, I know who put it there. I would not say that somebody put a book in the Speaker's Lobby when I did not know who put it there.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the way we often operate around here is, the person who authorizes the placement of the book is the one who has to take the responsibility. We know at this point that evidently, at least through the Speaker's office, this was authorized, and that, I think, makes the gentleman's contention perfectly correct. We have it in the Speaker's lobby as a result of the Speaker giving permission for it to be there. We have Communist propaganda that is placed in the Speaker's lobby, given a prominent position in the Speaker's lobby, because the Speaker deemed that he was going to do that.

That is what the complaint is, and I think it is a legitimate complaint for the gentleman from Georgia to raise.

Mr. GINGRICH. Before I go on to talk a little more about Cuba, in case the gentleman would like more evidence as to why I might reach that conclusion, today's Washington Times headline: "House Sends Reagan Latin Aid to Limbo."

A House panel has stripped the last vestiges of the Administration's Central American military aid package from a key bill, pushing the money the Administration wants to resist Communist encroachment into a parliamentary bog, with little hope for a rapid recovery of it.

Quoting the Speaker, the Democratic Speaker of the House:

"We are following a plan, and the plan is working all right," said House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill, Democrat of Massachusetts. During the day, House Republicans were defeated twice in party-line votes on efforts to force consideration of a related bill.

The vote on the floor, by the way, was 245 to 159.

The Speaker also set up a new obstacle yesterday to President Reagan's plan, saying he wants all Central American bills delayed until the administration of El Salvador's new president, to be elected Sunday, is stabilized. Earlier in the day, one of Mr. O'Neill's most important subcommittee chairmen on the Central America issue, Representative Clarence Long, Democrat of Maryland, of the Foreign Operations Panel, said, "Congress may want to wait until after the new Salvadoran president is sworn in on June 5th. We ought to wait and see whether the Salvadoran military will honor an election," Mr. Long said.

Let me suggest to you that the radical wing of the Democratic Party has been systematically undercutting and trying to stop the aid to Nicaragua. It has been systematically opposing and undercutting the effort on El Salvador. Therefore, it seems reasonable to guess that since their Speaker permitted it to be put in, it was probably done by a member of their wing.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that there was a 1-minute speech that was delivered that said who put the book in the lobby. The book was put in by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) who in a 1-minute speech delivered in the

House Chamber said that he was the one who put the book there.

So if the gentleman from Oregon was concerned, we now have the mystery solved and we now know that, in fact, it was a Democrat, in fact a subcommittee chairman, a member of the Democratic leadership, who put it in the Speaker's lobby.

Mr. GINGRICH. And, in fact, I might note, a gentleman who yesterday, as I understand it, and I do not have the document right here, but as I understand it yesterday in his subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, managed to stop American spending for certain bases in Honduras; is that not correct?

Mr. WALKER. That is my understanding. I am not privy to the information within that subcommittee, but that is my understanding, based upon reports that I have heard. But we do have the mystery solved with regard to the book, anyhow. It was evidently announced proudly on the floor by this Member of the Democratic leadership, that he was in fact putting Communist propaganda into the Speaker's lobby.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think we might check in the next few moments and determine if the gentleman who put the Communist propaganda in the Speaker's Lobby is also the gentleman who, as a chairman of an Armed Services subcommittee, stopped yesterday American efforts to build appropriate facilities in Honduras. I think that is the case, but we will check that in the next few minutes and see if we can find for sure. I just think it is a pattern.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I find this information all very interesting. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he felt that the Reagan administration should sign a nuclear materials agreement with Nicaragua as they did with Communist China, an agreement to give Nicaragua nuclear materials, as they did sign an agreement with Communist China to give them nuclear materials.

□ 1920

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me pick this up for a minute. I am trying frankly to walk through this and decide precisely. The gentleman is scoring a nice technical point.

The fact is that Yugoslavia is a country which has a Communist, although a relatively open Communist type of government that we have some relations with. China has a Communist government, which frankly I think in some ways has a worse record of human rights than even the Soviet Union, not an easy thing to achieve.

On the other hand, there are two differences that I would state to the gentleman very flatly. One is that Communist China is far more afraid of Russia than it is of us. Therefore, in the grim world of reality, there are reasons for us to try to work with them, because the greatest danger to the world is the Soviet Union, not China.

Just as we worked with the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany, because as Winston Churchill once said, "If the Devil himself were with us, I would at least try to say a few kind words about hell," I think it is reasonable for us to say that in exactly the same tradition in which Franklin Roosevelt worked with the Soviet Union against a more immediate and a greater evil, that there are grounds for us to work with the Chinese Communists because they are less dangerous and less of a threat.

Second, it is fair to say that Deng Xiaoping has attempted to move the Chinese Communist Government in some ways toward a more open and a more moderate position.

Now, having said that, let me come back, because the gentleman seems to want to take what is clearly a Soviet colony, and Nicaragua is a colony of the Soviet Union now, they have over 2,500 Cuban and Soviet advisers sitting there. They are increasingly taking over the government. It is exactly the pattern that we have seen everywhere else.

Let me read again from the Washington Times in the editorial today:

> From the outset the Democratic leaders have dug in their heels. They briskly spurn requests to fund the programs recommended by the Kissinger Commission. Ten key committee chairmen in the House recently flayed administration policy in a bootlicking letter in Nicaragua's Communist rulers. The three Democratic presidential hopefuls agree on abandoning Central America. They dispute only who would bug out fastest. Tip O'Neill arrogantly flaunts his defiance, "I am opposed to Nicaragua all the way," he says. "Nicaragua is not going to get through this House." So much for bipartisanship.

The Washington Times goes on to say:

> If as Reagan says the advance of the Soviet empire in this hemisphere threatens our vital interests, he cannot continue to let things drift. He must brush aside the timid among his entourage who counsel caution and compromise. Their imperatives are political, not strategic. They are worried about his man of peace image for the fall campaign. They forget that President Ford was never more popular than after the Mayaguez incident and that Mr. Reagan's popularity soared after the liberation of Grenada. The Democrats pussyfooting isolationist leaders do not speak for millions of their rank and file members. The American people regardless of party have always rallied behind bold presidential leadership and they are ready to do so again. The Vietnam trauma is an obstacle, but leadership overcomes obstacles. If it is difficult to forge a national consensus now, what hope will there be if America suffers a long morale sapping and ultimately futile effort to defend our vital interests in Central America.

Let me say to the gentleman from Oregon, El Salvador is 2 days' drive from Texas. It is closer to Miami than Miami is to Washington, D.C. This is not some distant country about which we know little. These are direct, immediate interests of the United States.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I just wanted to inform the gentleman that we now have the information with regard to the subcommittee action and, indeed, that subcommittee did knock out all money for the bases in Honduras in the military construction bill. So in fact the gentleman's information was precisely correct. That took place.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GINGRICH. So the gentleman who is a chairman of the Armed Services Committee under the Democratic leadership, who has asked the Speaker's permission and gotten the Democratic Speaker's permission to place what is in effect Communist propaganda in the Speaker's lobby, is also in the process of using his position then to stop the development of bases that might help us in stopping communism in Honduras. Is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, that certainly seems to be the implication of everything we know here based upon those facts.

Mr. GINGRICH. This is part of the Democratic elected leadership of committees and subcommittees of the House.

Mr. WALKER. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point, because this is not then just a minor incident. We have a Member of the elected Democratic leadership and a subcommittee chairman who is involved in all this, which means that he serves at the sufferance of the Democratic Caucus and we have the involvement of the Democratic Speaker of the House of Representatives, elected by the entire Democratic Caucus, in fact by the entire House of Representatives.

Are the individuals involved in the scenario that the gentleman outlines saying that on the one hand we can have bases knocked out in Honduras aimed at trying to protect us from Communist aggression, headed toward this country, and at the same time we supplement that with an action taken to put Communist propaganda in the Speaker's lobby evidently so it can be used to influence every Member of this House? There is something awfully strange and awfully disturbing about that.

Mr. GINGRICH. I will yield in just a moment, but let me first ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania something, because the gentleman has made a point that I think is fascinating.

Honduras is, in fact, between the United States and Nicaragua.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is precisely correct. As a matter of fact, it is on the way up the peninsula toward Mexico and then on to the United States, which is one of the reasons why it is strategically important for us to have some bases there and to have an arrangement with Honduras, because if you fear what is taking place in Nicaragua may, in fact, spread to some of the neighboring countries, the immediate problem being El Salvador, and if you fear that that kind of Marxist domination of that part of the world could, in fact, make a problem on the U.S. borders at some point, it might be well to have some U.S. bases stationed strategically to prevent that.

What the subcommittee did was knocked out the efforts to do that yesterday. I think it raises some very disturbing questions.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me carry this a step further for just a second, and I will get to the gentleman from Oregon in a moment but I first want to finish this because I think it is a very important framework to establish here. I want to make sure I understand this.

John F. Kennedy once wrote a book called While England Slept which was an analysis of why the British people drifted into World War II.

Winston Churchill called World War II the most unnecessary war, because he said it was so easily avoidable if only we had been awake.

In other words, if 5 or 10 years from now there is a total disaster in Central America and there are millions of refugees in the United States and all of Central America has gone Communist and a committee comes back to investigate, that committee will find that one of the people that the Democratic leadership in this House helped in 1 day stop aid to the freedom fighters, stop aid to El Salvador, stop aid to Honduras and put Communist propaganda in the Speaker's lobby.

Mr. WALKER. That sounds precisely like what happened on 1 day this week.

Mr. GINGRICH. Actually, I guess it was 2 days. It was a very busy period.

Now I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, I am pleased at my good friend from Georiga yielding.

My friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, made the point that he was afraid that this Communist propaganda would influence Members of Congress. I wondered if either of these two gentlemen are afraid that the Republican Members of Congress would have their minds changed by this propaganda. Does the gentleman think they could be influenced by this Communist propaganda?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes; sure, of course.

Mr. WEAVER. Republicans could be?

Mr. GINGRICH. Of course.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, I am shocked and shattered, I really am.

I thought better of the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say something to the gentleman from Oregon. The gentleman may make fun of this and the gentleman may take it lightly, but let me say that the people who have fled their countries to come to America do not take it lightly, that the people who have had their ears cut off, and there is literally a gentleman in this city who is a Pentacostal minister who had both ears cut off by the Communists in Nicaragua. He does not take it lightly, that the people who are locked up in jail do not take it lightly, and the families of those who have been killed by Communists do not take it lightly.

The fact is that the American news media and American politicians are on occasion influenced by Communist propaganda, that if you read it long enough, if you would walk by it does not say anything, this does not say anything about Communist propaganda. It says Nicaraguan women's signature book. It does not say anything unless you stop and read it and pay attention to it and do the research and then you are horrified. Of course, if we surround ourselves with propaganda it has an impact.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What worries me and what should concern the American people is that the attitude of the gentleman from Oregon, a very flippant attitude toward this whole problem, is precisely the attitude that has been characteristic of his side of the aisle. His attitude is not all that surprising, because that is precisely the way in which we are approaching the whole problem of Central America, as kind of a flippant attitude that there is nothing really to worry about down there, that there are just no problems whatsoever and we ought to really be recognizing Nicaragua and encouraging them on and as a matter of fact, many people in his wing of the party want to recognize Cuba and forget all the past there, too. If Nicaragua happens to be exporting revolution to El Salvador, well so be it. We can accept that as well. We can accept nearly anything, because we really do not regard it as all that important. As a matter of fact, we regard it as very amusing.

I guess many of our problems are that it is no longer amusing. The Communist revolution throughout this world that is attempting to bring tyranny to democracies all over the world, that is attempting to subjugate people throughout the world, is something that is no longer amusing. It is no longer something we smile about. It is no longer anything to be laughed about. We need to be doing something. We need to be standing strong and we need to be standing up to terrorism that is going across the globe as a result of the Soviet mind set.

□ 1930

I think that we are seeing revealed here precisely one of the problems in this House which is that there is a kind of an almost note of amusement as we cancel bases in Honduras, as we shut off aid to freedom fighters, as we cancel out aid to El Salvador. We do so with a smile on our face as though everything is all right.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me put into the RECORD here, because I think it fits exactly the whole crisis of the radical left in America, this article by Sol Stern from the Village Voice. I ask permission that all of it go in the RECORD, but let me cite specific parts, because it shows you how bad it is.

The new dictator seized power by shooting the chairman and most of the other members of the military junta during a meeting at the national palace. Then, when the Marxist student movement organized demonstrations against what they called his "fascist" regime, he unleashed his death squads. On the eve of a planned May Day demonstration in the capital, the dictator's security forces murdered 500 young people. The killings continued for weeks. The secretary general of the Swedish Save the Children Fund testified that "one thousand children have been massacred, and their bodies, lying in the streets, are ravaged by roving hyenas . . . the bodies of murdered children, mostly aged eleven to thirteen years, can be seen heaped on the roadside when one leaves the capital."

Readers of the *Voice* might guess it happened in some country like Guatamala or El Salvador, where the Reagan administration is trying to prop up murderous right-wing regimes with arms and advisers.

In this case it was Ethiopia. The dictator's name is Lieutenant Colonel Haile Mariam Mengistu. And it wasn't Ronald Reagan but Fidel Castro who embraced the bloody tyrant and sent an expeditionary force to keep him in power.

The story of Cuba's complicity in that crime is one that some people may still prefer not to hear about. I well understand why. Many of us once believed that Cuba was going to be different. That presumed "difference" was central to the ideological elan of the early New Left Cuba proved that we did not have to be strait jacketed by the horrible choice between repressive communism or "end of ideology" liberal capitalism. Cuba meant new possibilities, a new humanistic radicalism.

C. Wright Mills, the early New Left's most important writer, put the following words into the mouth of one of his Fidelista char-

acters in his book *Listen Yankee:* "We are new radicals. We really are, we think, a New Left in the world

And so forth.

Now, this is a very leftwing publication, the Village Voice, printing an article from a former, and I think still ideologicaly very leftwing person, but a man with the courage intellectually to say what if it is not working, what if the world is not the way we hoped it would be, what if Communists are bad. And he said we were not sure what happened.

Listen to what he says:

No longer Cuba today is a fully totalitarian state. Its "difference" now is a rather melancholy one. The Castro regime actually suppresses opposition and ideological deviation with a ruthlessness unmatched anywhere in Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union.

To see this clearly, one need only note that certain phenomenon associated with the post-Stalin period in the Soviet Union—"dissidents" and *"Samizdat,"* for example—are simply unthinkable in today's Cuba. In the Soviet Union, an Andrei Sakharov can be harrassed, stripped of his work, driven out of the capital—yet he is still able to communicate with the West, thus able to speak. A Sakharov could not survive in Cuba. There is not even the possibility of a Cuban Roy Medvedev, the dissident Communist historian who supports the revolution and the basic outlines of the Soviet system but calls for changes in party policies and a more honest rendering of the Soviet past.

Cuba's potential Sakharovs and Medivedevs were either lucky enough to get out of the country (the novelist Edmundo Desnois or the journalist Carlos Franqui) or they wound up in prison.

Huber Matos, a leader of the insurrection against the Batista dicatorship, committed the crime of protesting the imposition of a Communist system. For that he was sentenced to 20 years in prison, seven of which were served in solitary confinement. Similarly, the poet Armando Valladeres expressed nonviolent opposition to the regime and was sentenced to 30 years. As a result of mistreatment in prison, he was left an invalid.

Matos served to the very last day of his sentence. Valladeres managed to get out a few years early only through the intervention of the socialist president of France.

Matos and Valladeres, because they were "famous" prisoners, were lucky. Scores of other long-term politicals have been kept locked up years after their sentences expired. Amnesty International has reported on one of them, Oscar Rodriquez Terrero, whose 20-year sentence was up in February 1981 and who was than "summoned to the office of the director of Boniato prison . . . where he faced a non-judicial 'trial,' without legal representation or the opportunity to present his defense. He was charged with participating in hunger strikes and refusing to participate in the 're-education, program. A few days later he was informed that he had been sentenced to a further two years imprisonment."

The human rights organization Americas Watch recently approached the Cuban government and requested permission to send an official delegation to visit Cuba to investigate the human rights situation. The Cubans refused, despite the fact that Americas Watch has a clear record of opposing human rights violations by right-wing regimes throughout Latin America.

Americas Watch went ahead and investigated anyway, based on the best available information. This is the way its report summarized the state of human rights in Cuba today:

"At least 250 long-term political prisoners are confined in Cuban prisons under brutal conditions, many after their original sentences had been completed.

"1500 to 2000 former political prisoners languish as pariahs in Cuban society, denied decent work and respect, longing to leave.

"Freedom of expression does not exist.

"Civil liberties do not exist.

"Deviations from socially accepted norms, such as homosexuality, are extremely circumscribed and in some cases are not tolerated.

"No human rights monitoring group is able to operate in Cuba, and international human rights groups—such as Americas Watch—are not permitted to visit to conduct inquiries."

(The report also strongly criticized the Reagan administration's hard-line posture in refusing to process immigration visas for the 1500 to 2000 former political prisoners—whom the Cubans have agreed to allow to leave the country—until Cuba also takes back some of the hardened criminals sent to the U.S. during the Mariel boatlift.)

This is not a right wing group. This is a legitimate group looking at human rights in Cuba.

I go on to quote from the article by Sol Stern:

The writer of the report was Gregory Wallance, a New York attorney, human rights activist, and *ex-Village Voice* contributor. He spoke to me of the shock he experienced as he gathered the data.

"I've been to Czecholsovakia. I've been to Russia," he said. "But these sentences are the worst I've seen. They are terrible sentences.

"I was in Czechoslovakia in 1981 on a human rights mission and someone named Rudolf Battek was sentenced to seven and a half years. The European socialist community was just outraged. Willy Brandt and Kreisky, the Socialist International—they all issued statements. Ultimately, the sentence was cut to five years, which was still the harshest sentence since the Stalin period in that country. Even in Russia, Shcharansky gets 10 years and Orlov gets seven. But these people [the Cuban long-term prisoners] have been down there since 1961, '62, or '63. It's unbelievable, but nobody really gets that outraged. They are simply forgotten."

Sol Stern goes on to say, and I quote:

The Cuban "difference" is even more pronounced in the area of cultural freedom. Throughout the Soviet bloc writers are censored, harassed, sometimes arrested. Yet they continue to write. If they can't be published at home, they are often published in the West, both in their own language and in translation. They can still be read by their countrymen through smuggled copies of their works published overseas, or through *Samizdat.* It's not a pleasant situation. Still, at least some critics have suggested that Soviet bloc writers are producing superior literature because of their situation of "extremity."

But such speculations are not even applicable to Cuba. Most of the best writers have had to leave the country. For those left behind who still aspire to write honestly, Cuba is indeed, as one writer puts it, "The Island of Dangerous Manuscripts." Writers go to jail not just for smuggling literary works abroad, but for the mere possession of unacceptable manuscripts in their own homes.

For a novel and poems critical of the regime, the journalist Gomez Boix was sentenced to eight years in prison. The Americas Watch report highlighted the case of Rene Ariza, sentenced to over three years for possessing unacceptable manuscripts. According to the state prosecutor's charge, Ariza was guilty of "devoting himself to writing short stories . . . the content and point of view of which are based on the amplest sort of ideological diversionism . . . that all this literary material lacking artistic value is written against the interests of our people, or our first minister Comandante Fidel Castro Ruz. . . ."

Let me say can you imagine a dictatorship which would sentence a writer to 3 years in jail for writing funny stories? This is the Cuba which has 2,500 to 3,500 advisers, military advisers in Nicaragua. This is the Cuba which is the training ground for the Nicaraguan Communists.

This description says that Cuba is worse than any country in the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe. This is the Cuba which some radical Democrats would recognize.

□ 1940

Let me continue quoting from Sol Stern:

No one really knows for sure how many political prisoners are now being held in Cuba. At one point the government denied there were any political prisoners at all. Later Castro admitted to 15,000.

Let me make this point, because it is back to why I am so angry that Nicaragua, and Communist propaganda was in the Speaker's Lobby. Here you have Fidel Castro, who lied about having any political prisoners at all then said, "We have 15,000, but we are just funny." Now these people are bad people; they lie regularly; they send out propaganda regularly. These are not nice people. They do not play by the rules of liberal Western democracies.

They are in fact the Nazis of the left and their secret police are the Gestapo of the left. The longer we kid ourselves and the longer we play games as though they are reasonable, the more trouble we are in.

Let me go on and quote from Sol Stern:

During 1978, during a period of improving relations with the Carter administration, the regime officially conceded it was then holding 4,500 political prisoners. This became the basis for what came to be known as the "Dialogue" with 75 prominent Cubans residing in the United States. As a result of negotiations with the emigré group, 3,500 prisoners were subsequently released.

There is another category of people, however, who have been arrested and held for

up to six months without trial under Cuba's preventive-detention laws. These people may be suspected of ordinary crimes, but many also fall into the political or "antisocial" category. The Harvard political scientist and highly regarded expert on Cuba's political system, Jorge Dominguesz, has estimated (based on official Cuban sources) that as many as 10,000 people are detained each year.

Another uncertain area involves the use of the death penalty. Under the new Cuban penal code, the death sentence can be imposed for a number of crimes, such as "sedition," "sabotage," "terrorism," or "acts against the security of the state." Several hundred executions were carried out in the early years of the revolution, but the government has never released any official figures on the number of death sentences. Emigré groups now claim that political executions are carried out every year—but there is no way of confirming this. In a letter smuggled out of prison in July 1981, Armando Villadares testified that three fellow prisoners were executed for trying to burn buses.

Let me try to put this in a framework that Sol Stern develops, because I don't think we can appreciate the horror of this. For a country the size of the United States, the Cuban political system would have the following:

As many as 425,000 political prisoners held in jail at one time or another.

250,000 people arrested each year and held without trial.

6,000 "long-term" political prisoners presently serving sentences of 15 to 20 years. (With 1,000 getting extra years at the end of their terms.)

Several hundred writers serving jail terms for writing poems or stories that displeased the country's political leaders.

Let me go back to Sol Stern's words:

It should be emphasized that these are conservative estimates and that the situation likely is worse, including the possibility that death sentences have been carried out. Of course, one reason we don't know more is that Cuba is one of the few countries that actively prevents any kind of independent monitoring of human rights violations.

Let me go back and repeat, because it is important to understand just how bad Castro and Cuba are. Not only are they a Communist tyranny, not only do they have their own Gestapo, not only do they do all sorts of bad things, not only are they a colony of the Soviet Union, they systematically prevent any kind of independent monitoring of human rights violations.

Now we have an election in El Salvador, every American who wants to goes down there. ABC, CBS, NBC, all are filming it live; the New York Times has reporters wandering all over the place; that is our side, but it is not good enough for the radical Democrats. They want to cut off aid.

We have Honduras, wide open, you can go in and film virtually anything. But that is not good enough for the radical Democrats. We have Costa Rica; no army, a completely democratic country; is it going to be protected? Well, we are not going to put the bases into Honduras to try to help, are we, because of the radical Democrats?

But what about Nicaragua? Nicaragua, which is a Communist-trained, Communist-developed, Communist-run colony of the Soviet Union with Cuba and totalitarians in there helping, well for the radical Democrats, Nicaragua is good enough to put a petition right here in the House Chamber, right in the Speaker's lobby. Nicaragua is good enough for the Speaker to say we are going to stop any aid from getting through to the freedom fighters. Nicaragua is good enough that the Speaker was quoted today as saying he has a plan and the plan is working.

It is an absolutely unbelievable situation.

Let me go back to quoting Sol Stern.

Still, what we do know is sufficient to conclude that the Castro regime has treated its dissenters with extreme vindictiveness and cruelty; that having began as the great alternative to Stalinism, the revolution has fallen back on standard Stalinist methods to maintain social and political control.

Given its human rights record at home, it is not surprising that the Castro government should be less than scrupulous about the kinds of regimes it supports abroad. Among the recipients of Cuban largess (including military support) have been Libya's Colonel Qaddafi and Syria's Hafez-el-Assad.

Let me stop for a moment, closing the quote on Mr. Stern and point out: Cuba helps the very same Qadhafi, who all of us saw with one of his diplomats killing a London policewoman on television 10 days ago.

Cuba helps the same Syrian dictator, Assad, who is involved in supporting and arming and training the people who were killing American marines in Lebanon. Systematically around the world, if you are a free religious Western society, there is an alliance of increasingly radical countries, which includes the Soviet Union, its colony in Cuba and allies in Libya and Syria.

Mr. Stern continues, and I quote:

But Castro's ally in Ethiopia, Mengistu, is in a league all by himself—and the story of their emergent friendship is a depressing companion piece to the chronicle of Cuba's internal repression.

Military interventions always come with wonderful-sounding testaments to humanity. When the Cubans marched into Ethiopia six years ago, they justified it as a selfless act of "revolutionary internationalism." In reality there hasn't been a recent case of interventionism that was more cynical or opportunistic.

Let me summarize because I do not want to read all of this; and I ask it all be included in the RECORD.

What Mr. Stern says is that 30,000 to 50,000 civilians were killed or wounded by the Ethiopian troops, aided and advised by the Cubans, nearly 1,000,000 more Ethiopians were turned into refugees; he just cites case after case after case. He cites an Amnesty International report on Ethiopia, October 1978, which Mr. Stern calls "One of the most gruesome documents it has ever published."

Here is an excerpt, quoting from Amnesty International:

"The government's 'Red Terror' campaign, beginning in mid-November 1977, was directed at alleged supporters of the EPRP and involved mass arrests of young people, the systematic use of torture and the summary killing of large numbers of those arrested. This was mostly carried out by kebele [local revolutionary committees] armed guards or 'revolutionary defense squads' attached to factories and other institutions. Killings took place arbitrarily when groups of young people were seen on the streets, during house searches for EPRP activists, and as a result of *kebele* tribunal decisions following hearings unregulated by legal formalities. In the case of those 'condemned' in this way the 'execution' followed immediately. It took place at night, the victim's body being left until morning with a warning placard attached to it, stating, "This was a counter-revolutionary," "The Red Terror will flourish," or some slogan. After these 'executions,' victims' relatives were either forbidden to mourn and ordered to join in public condemnation of those who had been killed, or were allowed to buy back the bodies for burial—'paying for the bullet,' as it was called.

"It is estimated that about 5000 young people aged between 12 and 25 were killed in this way in Addis Ababa during the Red Terror.

This is the ally of Cuba, the same Cuba undermining us in Nicaragua, the same Communist Nicaragua which today had propaganda placed in the Speaker's Lobby.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The document referred to follows:

[From the Village Voice, Dec. 6, 1983]

CUBA AND REPRESSION: CASTRO'S VICTIMS

(By Sol Stern)

The new dictator seized power by shooting the chairman and most of the other members of the military junta during a meeting at the national palace. Then, when the Marxist student movement organized demonstrations against what they called his "fascist" regime, he unleashed his death squads. On the eve of a planned May Day demonstration in the capital, the dictator's security forces murdered 500 young people. The killings continued for weeks. The secretary general of the Swedish Save the Children Fund testified that "one thousand children have been massacred, and their bodies, lying in the streets, are ravaged by roving hyenas . . . the bodies of murdered children, mostly aged eleven to thirteen years, can be seen heaped on the roadside when one leaves the capital."

Readers of the Voice might guess it happened in some country like Guatamala or El Salvador, where the Reagan administration is trying to prop up murderous right-wing regimes with arms and advisers.

In this case it was Ethiopia. The dictator's name is Lieutenant Colonel Haile Mariam Mengistu. And it wasn't Ronald Reagan but Fidel Castro who embraced the bloody tyrant and sent an expeditionary force to keep him in power.

The story of Cuba's complicity in that crime is one that some people may still prefer not to hear about. I well understand why. Many of us once believed that Cuba was going to be different. That presumed

"difference" was central to the ideological élan of the early New Left. Cuba proved that we did not have to be straitjacketed by the horrible choice between repressive communism or "end of ideology" liberal capitalism. Cuba meant new possibilities, a new humanistic radicalism.

And for a time Cuba did appear freer, more open than other Communist countries.

No longer, Cuba today is a fully totalitarian state. Its "difference" now is a rather melancholy one. The Castro regime actually suppresses opposition and ideological deviation with a ruthlessness unmatched anywhere in Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union.

To see this clearly, one need only note that certain phenomenon associated with the post-Stalin period in the Soviet Union—"dissidents" and "samizdat," for example—are simply unthinkable in today's Cuba. In the Soviet Union, an Andrei Sakharov can be harassed, stripped of his work, driven out of the capital—yet he is still able to communicate with the West, thus able to speak. A Sakharov could not survive in Cuba. There is not even the possibility of a Cuban Roy Medvedev, the dissident Communist historian who supports the revolution and the basic outlines of the Soviet system but calls for changes in party policies and a more honest rendering of the Soviet past.

Cuba's potential Sakharovs and Medvedevs were either lucky enough to get out of the country (the novelist Edmundo Desnois or the journalist Carlos Franqui) or they wound up in prison.

Huber Matos, a leader of the insurrection against the Batista dictatorship, committed the crime of protesting the imposition of a Communist system. For that he was sentenced to 20 years in prison, seven of which were served in solitary confinement. Similarly, the poet Armando Valladeres expressed non-violent opposition to the regime and was sentenced to 30 years. As a result of mistreatment in prison, he was left an invalid.

Matos served to the very last day of his sentence. Valladeres managed to get out a few years early only through the intervention of the socialist president of France.

Matos and Valladeres, because they were "famous" prisoners, were lucky. Scores of other long-term politicals have been kept locked up years after their sentences expired. Amnesty International has reported on one of them, Oscar Rodriguez Terrero, whose 20-year sentence was up in February 1981 and who was then "summoned to the office of the director of Boniato Prison . . . where he faced a non-judicial 'trial,' without notification, and without being allowed legal representation or the opportunity to present his defense. He was charged with participating in hunger strikes and refusing to participate in the 're-education' program. A few days later he was informed that he had been sentenced to a further two years imprisonment."

The human rights organization Americas Watch recently approached the Cuban government and requested permission to send an official delegation to visit Cuba to investigate the human rights situation. The Cubans refused, despite the fact that Americas Watch has a clear record of opposing human rights violations by right-wing regimes throughout Latin America.

Americas Watch went ahead and investigated anyway, based on the best available information. This is the way its report summarized the state of human rights in Cuba today:

"At least 250 long-term political prisoners are confined in Cuban prisons under brutal conditions, many after their original sentences had been completed.

"1500 to 2000 former political prisoners languish as pariahs in Cuban society, denied decent work and respect, longing to leave.

"Freedom of expression does not exist.

"Civil liberties do not exist.

"Deviations from socially accepted norms, such as homosexuality, are extremely circumscribed and in some cases are not tolerated.

"No human rights monitoring group is able to operate in Cuba, and international human rights groups—such as Americas Watch—are not permitted to visit to conduct inquiries."

The writer of the report was Gregory Wallance, a New York attorney, human rights activist, and ex-Village Voice contributor. He spoke to me of the shock he experienced as he gathered the data.

"I've been to Czechoslovakia. I've been to Russia," he said. "But these sentences are the worst I've seen. They are terrible sentences.

"I was in Czechoslovakia in 1981 on a human rights mission and someone named Rudolf Battek was sentenced to seven and a half years. The European socialist community was just outraged. Willy Brandt and Kreisky, the Socialist International—they all issued statements. Ultimately, the sentence was cut to five years, which was still the harshest sentence since the Stalin period in that country. Even in Russia, Scharansky gets 10 years and Orlov gets seven. But these people [the Cuban long-term prisoners] have been down there since 1961, '62, or '63. It's unbelievable, but nobody really gets that outraged. They are simply forgotten."

The Cuban "difference" is even more pronounced in the area of cultural freedom. Throughout the Soviet bloc writers are censored, harassed, sometimes arrested. Yet they continue to write. If they can't be published at home, they are often published in the West, both in their own language and in translation. They can still be read by their countrymen through smuggled copies of their works published overseas, or through samizdat. It's not a pleasant situation. Still, at least some critics have suggested that Soviet bloc writers are producing superior literature because of their situation of "extremity."

But such speculations are not even applicable to Cuba. Most of the best writers have had to leave the country. For those left behind who still aspire to write honestly, Cuba is indeed, as one writer put it, "The Island of Dangerous Manuscripts." Writers go to jail not just for smuggling literary works abroad, but for the mere possession of unacceptable manuscripts in their own homes.

For a novel and poems critical of the regime, the journalist Gomez Boix was sentenced to eight years in prison. The Americas Watch report highlighted the case of Rene Ariza, sentenced to over three years for possessing unacceptable manuscripts. According to the state prosecutor's charge, Ariza was guilty of "devoting himself to writing short stories . . . the content and point of view of which are based on the amplest sort of ideological diversionism . . . that all this literary material lacking artistic value is written against the interests of our people, of our first minister Commandante Fidel Castro Ruz. . . ."

No one really knows for sure how many political prisoners are now being held in Cuba. At one point the government denied there were any political prisoners at all. Later Castro admitted to 15,000. In 1978, during a period of improving relations with the Carter administration, the regime officially conceded it was then holding 4500 political prisoners. This became the basis for what came to be known as the "Dialogue" with 75 prominent Cubans residing in the United States. As a result of negotiations with the emigré group, 3500 prisoners were subsequently released.

There is another category of people, however, who have been arrested and held for up to six months without trial under Cuba's preventive-detention laws. These people may be suspected of ordinary crimes, but many also fall into the political or "antisocial" category. The Harvard political scientist and highly regarded expert on Cuba's political system, Jorge Dominguesz, has estimated (based on official Cuban sources) that as many as 10,000 people are detained each year.

Another uncertain area involves the use of the death penalty. Under the new Cuban penal code, the death sentence can be imposed for a number of crimes, such as "sedition," "sabotage," "terrorism," or "acts against the security of the state." Several hundred executions were carried out in the early years of the revolution, but the government has never released any official figures on the number of death sentences. Emigré groups now claim that political executions are carried out every year—but there is no way of confirming this. In a letter smuggled out of prison in July 1981, Armando Villadares testified that three fellow prisoners were executed for trying to burn buses.

It should be emphasized that these are conservative estimates and that the situation likely is worse, including the possibility that death sentences have been carried out. Of course, one reason we don't know more is that Cuba is one of the few countries that actively prevents any kind of independent monitoring of human rights violations.

Still, what we do know is sufficient to conclude that the Castro regime has treated its dissenters with extreme vindictiveness and cruelty; that having begun as the great alternative to Stalinism, the revolution has fallen back on standard Stalinist methods to maintain social and political control.

REPRESSION ABROAD

Given its human rights record at home, it is not surprising that the Castro government should be less than scrupulous about the kinds of regimes it supports abroad. Among the recipients of Cuban largess (including military support) have been Libya's Colonel Qadhafi and Syria's Hafez-el-Assad. But Castro's ally in Ethiopia, Mengistu, is in a league all by himself—and the story of their emergent friendship is a depressing companion piece to the chronicle of Cuba's internal repression.

Military interventions always come with wonderful-sounding testaments to humanity. When the Cubans marched into Ethiopia six years ago, they justified it as a selfless act of "revolutionary internationalism." In reality there hasn't been a recent case of interventionsim that was more cynical or opportunistic.

It's not that the 1974 revolution that toppled Ethiopia's emperor Haile Selassie was undeserving of international support. Indeed, it is hard to think of a country more desperately in need of a revolution than Ethiopia at that time. Under Selassie's

feudal and corrupt tyranny Ethiopia was one of the world's poorest, most backward nations. While thousands of people died of starvation, emergency food stores sent by international relief agencies rotted in warehouses because of corruption and mismanagement.

The group of army officers that finally ousted the emperor in 1974 constituted themselves as a national military council, called the Dergue (the committee), and instituted a series of radical and widely supported reforms. The revolution was moving in a socialist direction, but Cuba showed little interest or sympathy during its first two years. (Ethiopia's principal supplier of arms and foreign aid during that period was the United States.) The reasons for Cuba's distance were partly geopolitical, partly ideological. In coordination with Soviet policy, Cuba was heavily committed to socialist Somalia, which had irredentist designs on Ethiopia's Ogaden region, populated by ethnic Somalis. Cuba also supported the liberation movement in the province of Eritrea, which had been waging a guerrilla war for independence from Ethiopia for nearly 15 years.

Cuba had particularly good cause for supporting the Eritreans. Ethiopia's claims to sovereignty over the contested territory were juridically and historically very weak. Eritrea had been an Italian colony from the end of the 19th century until 1941, when Britain captured it and held it for 10 years. Under pressure from the United States, the UN voted in 1951 to turn Eritrea over to Ethiopia in a federated status. By 1961, Selassie unilaterally annexed the territory, with U.S. backing. The Soviet bloc supported independence for Eritrea—by any standard of international justice, the Soviets were right.

For the Cubans, support for the Eritrean guerrillas had another ideological dimension: the leaders of the Eritrean movement were sophisticated Marxists. Gerard Chaliand, the highly regarded French socialist writer, and expert on the third world, has called the Eritrean insurgents "by far the most impressive revolutionary movement produced in Africa in the last two decades." Cuban support for the Eritreans was not merely verbal. It also involved training the guerrillas.

All this turned around suddenly in February 1977, after Lieutenant Colonel Mengistu emerged from the bloody shoot-out at the national palace, proclaimed himself the new chairman of the Dergue and announced that the Ethiopian revolution henceforth would be Marxist-Leninist. The smoke at the palace had hardly cleared when Mengistu received a congratulatory telegram from Fidel Castro. Soon a top Cuban general was in Addis Ababa surveying Mengistu's military needs. Within months, Cuban military advisers were in the country training the expanding Ethiopian army with their new Soviet weapons.

It was the most abrupt foreign policy flip-flop in recent history. The Somalis and the Eritreans were abandoned. The big geopolitical prize in the area was Ethiopia, but in order for the Soviets and Cubans to savor their prize, the empire—the same empire ruled over by Haile Selassie—had to be held together.

Accordingly, when the Mengistu regime met its first serious challenge, in the form of a Somali military incursion into the Ogaden, 17,000 Cuban combat troops went in to counter the Somalis. After repulsing the threat from the east, Mengistu turned his forces north to finally stamp out the Eritrean rebellion. He proved that he could be more ruthless and determined to maintain the empire than even Haile Selassie. Estimates are that half of Mengistu's 300,000-man army (the largest in black Africa) was thrown into a brutal drive to "pacify" Eritrea. The military techniques were straight out of Vietnam—napalm, air assaults on defenseless villages, arrests and torture of thousands. By Mengistu's own admission, in a June 7, 1978, radio broadcast, 30,000 to 50,000 civilians had been killed or wounded by his troops. Nearly a million more were turned into refugees.

In this endeavor the Cubans were Mengistu's loyal, if occasionally embarrassed, helpers. Gone were the days of solidarity with the Eritrean rebels. Now Castro spoke of the necessity of maintaining Ethiopia's "territorial integrity," and of the Eritreans as "secessionists." Though Castro begged off on a direct combat role for his troops, there is considerable evidence from a number of journalistic sources that the Cubans were supplying logistical and technical support for the Ethiopean army offensive.

At the time the Cubans moved into Ethiopia in force, Mengistu was also directing a campaign of terror against his domestic opposition. The principal civilian opposition movement was the Ethiopian Peoples Revolutionary Party (EPRP), with a strong base in the urban centers, among students and civil servants. The EPRP was a Marxist movement which had played a significant role in the agitation against Selassie but which now opposed the militarization of the revolution. In its escalating opposition to the Dergue, the EPRP also began turning toward terrorism. Mengistu responded with what he unashamedly and officially called the "Red Terror campaign." In 1977-78, indiscriminate killings by the Dergue's security forces were so extensive that it put Ethiopia into a class with the worst human rights violators in the world, according to Amnesty International. AI issued a special 16-page report on Ethiopia in October 1978—one of the most gruesome documents it has ever published. Here is an excerpt:

"The government's 'Red Terror' campaign, beginning in mid-November 1977, was directed at alleged supporters of the EPRP and involved mass arrests of young people, the systematic use of torture and the summary killing of large numbers of those arrested. This was mostly carried out by kebele [local revolutionary committees] armed guards or 'revolutionary defense squads' attached to factories and other institutions. Killings took place arbitrarily when groups of young people were seen on the streets, during house searches for EPRP activists, and as a result of kebele tribunal decisions following hearings unregulated by legal formalities. In the case of those 'condemned' in this way the 'execution' followed immediately. It took place at night, the victim's body being left until morning with a warning placard attached to it, stating, 'This was a counter-revolutionary,' 'The Red Terror will flourish,' or some slogan. After these 'executions,' victims' relatives were either forbidden to mourn and ordered to join in public condemnation of those who had been killed, or were allowed to buy back the bodies for burial—'paying for the bullet,' as it was called.

It is estimated that about 5000 young people aged between 12 and 25 were killed in this way in Addis Ababa during the Red Terror, particularly during December 1977, January and February 1978, when . . . an average of about 100 people were killed each night."

In April 1978, with the killings still going on, chairman Mengistu made a triumphal state visit to Cuba. He was received as a hero, embraced by Fidel Castro as a fellow revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist and awarded the Playa Giron (Bay of Pigs) medal. Half a million Cubans turned out at a rally to hear Mengistu and Castro compliment each other and toast their military alliance sealed in blood. The next day virtually the entire issue of Granma, the only daily newpaper Cubans are allowed to read, was devoted to the Mengistu visit.

The spectacles of Mengistu being hailed in Havana as an exemplary Marxist would make for a nice bit of comic opera were it not also the venue for so much human misery. A career army man with no serious education, Mengistu knew nothing of Marxism but a good deal about survival. To that end he had managed to kill most of the actual Marxists in his own county. Yet in his brief immersion in international politics he had also learned that there are times when it helps to fly the red flag. In the spring of 1977 the Carter administration cut off military aid to Ethiopia because of human rights violations. But the Cubans came with no assistant secretaries for human rights, no human rights commissions.

Twelve thousand Cuban troops remain garrisoned in Ethiopia today though the country faces no external threat. The "revolution" they are there to defend has kept the people of Ethiopia as miserable as ever. In fact Mengistu is another emperor in all but name. His military policies have kept the empire together, but the price has been the most massive and desperate refugee problem anywhere in the world. According to a report to the UN high commissioner on refugees, approximately two million people have fled Ethiopia to neighboring states, where they are kept in miserable camps. Another two million have been displaced within Ethiopia. Partly as a result of the dislocations caused by the wars and the enormous military burden, drought and famine are once again plaguing Ethiopia. As for political freedoms and human rights, the people can only look back longingly to the days of Haile Selassie. Gerard Chaliand offered perhaps the saddest epitaph for the Ethiopian revolution when he wrote: "By killing many of the nation's students, the revolution may have killed its own and the country's future."

The approaching 25th anniversary of the Cuban revolution will be a time for judgments on its accomplishments. We are likely to hear a good deal about advances in health and eduction, about the popularity of the regime, about Cuba's determination in the face of American efforts to topple or strangle the revolution. All this is worth consideration, and I do agree that American policy toward Cuba has been both immoral and stupid, and may have contributed to the climate of repression there.

Yet it is also appropriate to pause and reflect on the Cuban revolution from the point of view of its victims. I believe that those of us who once supported the revolution as a "humanist alternative" have a special obligation to say something regarding their plight.

Unfortunately, too many people on the left refuse even to acknowledge the victims, preferring still to celebrate the jailers. Such a left will continue to discredit itself and is all the less likely to be taken seriously when

it protests the many moral outrages committed elsewhere in the world.

□ 1950

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE PEOPLE OF HONG KONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 60 minutes.

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the 5 million inhabitants of Hong Kong, both on Victoria Island and in the New Territories, are facing a fundamental change in the nature of their governing authority upon the expiration of the United Kingdom's 99-year leasehold in 1997.

Although we are 13 years away from that expiration date, Great Britain and the People's Republic of China are currently negotiating questions of sovereignty as well as the political, economic, and social institutions that will emerge after 1997. Since Great Britain has signaled its intention to abandon all claims to Hong Kong, including Victoria Island, the people of Hong Kong are apparently to be left to the will of the very government from which most of them fled as refugees.

Of all the rights with which we as free people are concerned, the inalienable right of self-determination is most dear. This right is not open to negotiations between the British and the PRC. Free nations must promote respect for the fundamental human rights and freedoms of all people.

Accordingly, my colleague TOM LANTOS and I are introducing the following concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the right of the people of Hong Kong to self-determination should be respected, and that no new government should be instituted in Hong Kong absent the consent of the governed. We urge all of our colleagues to join us in this effort to support the rights of the people of Hong Kong.

I would also like to call my colleagues' attention to Tuesday's editorial in the Wall Street Journal, which compellingly presents the democratic and humanitarian perspective on the crisis facing the people of Hong Kong. As the Journal editors point out, "How China reacts to Hong Kong's demands for self-rule will tell the world much more about the real China and its prospects for liberal reform" than the warm reception accorded President Reagan during his 6-day visit.

Also reprinted below is an article from the Financial Times to provide background information on Hong Kong and the status of the negotiations:

H. CON. RES. 299

SUPPORTING SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE PEOPLE OF HONG KONG

Whereas the United States supports the principle that all people should have the right to determine the form of government under which they live, and

Whereas this principle is embodied in the Declaration of Independence which reads that "governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed", and

Whereas the principle of self-determination is an integral part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which has been endorsed by the great majority of states in the world, including the People's Republic of China and Great Britain, and

Whereas the five million inhabitants of Hong Kong are facing a fundamental change in the nature of their governing authority, upon the expiration of the United Kingdom's leasehold over the New Territories in 1997, and

Whereas the best evidence available indicates that a majority of the population of Hong Kong are refugees from the mainland, who in leaving the mainland after 1949 rejected the mainland government's authority over their lives, and

Whereas Hong Kong has a separate and distinct international identity, and a unique and prosperous economic and social heritage and potential, and

Whereas the sovereign government intimately touches and affects the daily lives of each individual citizen of Hong Kong, and

Whereas uncertainty concerning the future of Hong Kong, and frustration over their inability to choose their future political course, have caused many individuals and many key business enterprises to leave the island,

Now therefore be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the right of the people of Hong Kong to self-determination should be respected, and that no new government should be imposed on Hong Kong absent the consent of the citizens of Hong Kong.

THOSE HONG KONG BLUES

We've been following President Reagan's China tour, and it has been a good show: Mr. Reagan viewing that incredible clay army uncovered at Xian, the first lady hugging the adorable pandas, the president joking with students about the benefits of an acting course in college. The pundits, too, are praising China's "free-market reforms" and "pragmatic" leadership.

But White House spokesman Larry Speakes said yesterday that Mr. Reagan hadn't changed his fundamental views towards communism. And China's leadership cadres, for their part, made sure that May Day pictures of Stalin and Mao were up in Peking even as the president departed for Shanghai. Maybe reality has been preserved, but just barely.

A sense of reality about the U.S.-Chinese relationship is important because there are issues yet to be resolved between China and the West that are far more serious than trade and cultural exchanges. A week before Mr. Reagan arrived in China, British Foreign Minister Howe ended a visit and admitted publicly for the first time that Hong Kong will become a part of China in 1997, when the British lease on most of the colony expires. The five million free citizens of Hong Kong watched the American president's tour from a very different perspective, no doubt wondering if they were being sold out.

The news that Britain had ceded sovereignty had merely confirmed the worst suspicions. It also reinforced the need for China to do something to convince Hong Kong's people that it won't destroy their free-market achievements. Increasingly, Hong Kongers are saying that the answer is self-rule.

That may sound unrealistic. Even the benign British haven't permitted self-rule. And China doesn't put up those Stalin and Mao posters for nothing. But democratic stirrings have been growing in Hong Kong, and for good reason. It seems like the only solution for that very large proportion of the colony's people who can't flee a Chinese takeover, either for lack of money or lack of passports and visas. Some already have fled the communists once. Life in China has recently improved, certainly, but the government remains totalitarian, the Communist Party brooks no dissent and the economy still runs largely by state command. Any illusions ought to have been shattered when the Chinese twice censored President Reagan's comments on the virtues of capitalism and the danger posed by the Soviet Union.

No free nation has ever willingly accepted communist rule, and Hong Kongers are probably the least likely people in the world to willingly succumb. Already, the appointed Legislative Council, which helps the British governor write laws, has voted to debate any agreement signed by Britain and China. Unofficial citizens groups have also formed, arguing for some voting rights. Ironically, China itself once endorsed this idea: Early in its negotiations with Britain, communist commentators spoke of "Hong Kong people governing Hong Kong" in order to discredit British rule. A few Hong Kongers took them at their word. But China has since backtracked, even publicly rebuking talk of democracy.

The time is ripe to challenge Peking's obstinacy. Having conceded sovereignty, Britain now will ask China for specific promises about the way it will rule Hong Kong. A vocal, self-governing Hong Kong population could help explain to Peking what those promises should be—for example, a free press, its own currency and the right to travel freely. China has already made Hong Kong a "special administrative zone" in its new constitution, allowing it to have laws distinct from the mainland's. But by itself this legalism isn't worth much; Tibet has been a similar "autonomous zone" but was trampled on anyway. Offering Hong Kong people the rights of self-rule might be enough substance to make that promise believable.

The only sure way to preserve Hong Kong's prosperity is for China to convince the Hong Kong people it won't meddle with their lives. Hong Kongers already are holding a referendum of sorts, voting with their wallets by reducing private investment and with their feet by scrounging for foreign passports. Without any better guarantees from China, that exodus will continue, a deterioration not unlike Zimbabwe's since Robert Mugabe took power. How China reacts to Hong Kong's demands for self-rule will tell the world much more about the real China and its prospects for liberal reform than the good show put on these last six days.

[From the Financial Times, Apr. 25, 1984]

HONG KONG'S FUTURE—HOW CHINA GOT ITS WAY

(By Robert Cottrell)

The veil of secrecy covering Hong Kong's future was lifted just enough last week for Sir Geoffrey Howe, the Foreign Secretary, to tell the territory that its days of British administration are numbered. In 1997, when Britain's lease over most of Hong Kong expires, British authority will cease, and the colony will become once more a part of China.

"The Chinese government," Sir Geoffrey said, "have made it clear publicly that they recognise the special circumstances of Hong Kong, and that they want its social and economic systems and lifestyle—in many ways so different from those of mainland China—to remain unchanged. We share with the Chinese Government the strongest possible common interest in these objectives."

Amid the confidence and enthusiasm marking this final leg of Sino-British negotiations, it would be easy to assume that this is exactly what Britain has been negotiating for ever since Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister, went to Peking and raised the Hong Kong question in September 1982.

The fact is, however, that the settlement now in the process of being reached contains precisely those elements which produced such fear and volatility in Hong Kong only a few months ago—withdrawal of British administration, and the subjection of the territory to Chinese sovereignty with only a paper agreement to separate the territory's liberal capitalism from China's socialism. What has changed?

To start with, the Hong Kong issue has been an extraordinary public relations triumph for China. Its tactics have been an unsophisticated stratagem of carrot-and-stick, but far in advance of Britain's silent shuffling.

While Britain was observing the confidentiality which it was agreed should surround the Sino-British negotiations China was announcing regularly through quasi-official channels the state of the talks, the good fortune which would be Hong Kong's under Chinese sovereignty, and the perils of supporting a continued British administration.

China had the immense negotiating advantage of a simple declared objective—reunification of the motherland, described as a "sacred duty" in the preamble to the Chinese constitution.

Britain, by contrast, has been negotiating on behalf of a territory which it manages at arm's length, in which it has no direct economic interest, and which has itself no substantial democratic means of expressing an opinion of its own.

With the coming into force of the British Nationality Act, Britain publicly underlined the limits of its commitment to the people of Hong Kong while in the middle of negotiating their future. This, together with rows over overseas student's fees, and the negotiation of world textile quotas, in which the interests of Britain and Hong Kong were opposed, did nothing to win popular sympathy for Britain in the territory.

Until Mrs. Thatcher's visit 18 months ago to Perking, Chinese leaders had set out two objectives: resumption of sovereignty and maintenance of Hong Kong's prosperity.

It seems unlikely that China would have been willing to negotiate some indefinite form of continued British linkage but Mrs. Thatcher's public defence of the legality of Britain's claim to sovereignty over Hong Kong effectively foreclosed that option. From that point onward, China's two main objectives seemed to become: resumption of sovereignty, and the ousting of British administration.

China appears to have conceded nothing of significance at the negotiating table. In July 1983, when regular rounds of formal diplomatic talks began, Chinese leaders issued a "10-point plan" for Hong Kong to a delegation from the Hong Kong Federation of Students (HKFS) on a visit to Peking. The HKFS document is regarded as containing the basics of the settlement which Britain as likely—a year or so later—to initial.

At first, Britain argued that a continued British-linked administration would be the best guarantee of maintaining Hong Kong's "stability and prosperity."

Even then, Britain probably saw its role in Hong Kong being very gradually phased out. But it wanted this to be done over the long term, without a deadline only 14 years away.

China's public anger at Britain's proposals strained the confidence of Hong Kong's businessmen and investors, culminating in the collapse of the Hong Kong dollar in September 1983, which in turn helped bring down a local bank. Both the dollar and the bank were eventually rescued, but China's evident willingness to jeopardise Hong Kong's social and economic stability persuaded Britain to drop its own plans for continued British administration.

The game was effectively over: China had prevailed.

Britain appears to have nursed some hopes early on that China's promises of autonomy to Hong Kong could be in some way "guaranteed," though quite how is not clear. To judge by Sir Geoffrey's comments on Friday, Britain is now looking for "assurances" rather than "guarantees"—those assurances would amount simply to the publication of China's promises in the form of a detailed agreement between the two countries.

China would prefer a shorter, more general, more abstract document. It regards the "basic law" of post-1997 Hong Kong as something to be drawn up by China in consultation with the people of the territory, not as something to be negotiated by Britain in exchange for a cession of sovereignty.

It is therefore far from certain, that Britain will get as detailed an agreement as it might like on Hong Kong's future. But if this situation seems more "acceptable" to Hong Kong than it did two years ago, it is probably for several related reasons:

China convinced Hong Kong relatively early in the negotiations that a cession of British sovereignity and administration was inevitable.

China greeted any British opposition to its plans with outbursts of public anger calculated to frighten Hong Kong and destabilise its financial markets.

Hong Kong people are so tired of uncertainty that the prospect of a settlement is welcome if only as something to plan towards.

At least China will not touch Hong Kong until 1997, leaving 13 more years of the status quo.

To some Britain has seemed weak and aloof while China's strength has been clear for all to see.

Britain has no real negotiating cards left to play now—not even withholding its approval of an agreement. China has set its September deadline, not necessarily for reaching an agreement with Britain, but for announcing unilaterally its own plans for Hong Kong's future if agreement has not been reached. If anything, Britain may need an agreement more than China, if it wants a sure and stable basis on which to rest its administration of Hong Kong until 1997.

When an agreement does come, it may be as much what is left unsaid, as what is said, which will determine how well the territory works after 1997. The agreement will no doubt promise Hong Kong people a succession of "freedoms." It is not likely to mention in passing that such freedoms are already promised to China's people under China's existing constitution, but go unobserved in what remains a totalitarian State.

The agreement may promise Hong Kong a "democratic" government—though Sir Geoffrey spoke on Friday of a "representative" government, and ducked a request to distinguish between democracy and representation. If so, it will be worth bearing in mind that Xu Jiatun, Peking's senior representative in Hong Kong, has said that socialism as practised by China represents democracy in its widest sense.

The agreement is likely to include words to the effect that China will not send down cadres from Peking to interfere with Hong Kong's autonomous government. But it can hardly speak of other, more subtle, ways of influencing the territory through fear or favour.

What of Peking's already-extensive business presence in Hong Kong? Will such firms, and their respective ministries, be able for example to restrain themselves from using political "clout" in commercial transactions?

By the time any Sino-British agreement on Hong Kong's future comes into force, it will already be 13 years old. Most of the administrators who negotiated or ratified it will have retired. Hong Kong's autonomy will ultimately depend not on negotiations, nor agreements, but on the strength and impartiality of its future administrators, and the extent to which those virtues command respect in Peking.●

BANKING ON SUCCESS WITH OLYMPIC COINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, when we started the Olympic coin program, I knew that once we promoted the fact that all profits go to the athletes and made the coins available to the public, Americans would purchase the coins with enthusiasm. I anticipated that a large sector of the American public shared my concern that our athletes receive enough funding to maintain necessary training levels. As the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics approach, I can see my prediction becoming reality. The Olympic coin program which I introduced is in place, and I predict that sales will be at such high levels that banks will barely be able to order enough coins to satisfy the public's demand.

In Louisiana, the Rayne State Bank & Trust Co. did not even get a chance to offer its initial order of the coins to the public. When the bank received

the first shipment, Rayne State Bank's own employees and friends purchased all coins available. As the bank's customers clamored for the coins, director of marketing, Linda Brooks placed a second order for 1984 silver and gold commemorative coins. She expects this shipment to be a sell-out as well. The bank is pleased to be a participant in this successful program, and plans to actively promote Olympic coin sales by advertising the coins on Rayne State Bank's marquee and by displaying Olympic coin literature in the lobby.

Over 1,800 banks throughout our country have agreed to display and encourage the sale of Olympic coins. By making the coins so available to the consumer, banks are fast becoming active contributors to the Olympic effort. We have already raised over $35 million for the American Olympic athletes through the coin program. If banks everywhere lend the same enthusiasm to Olympic coin sales as Rayne State Bank and its customers and employees, we will reach the $100 million mark in no time.

The Olympic athletes will be giving their best for our country in Los Angeles this summer. We can all show our appreciation and support for these wonderful young Americans through the purchase of Olympic coins. Financial institutions, such as Rayne State Bank, can have a significant positive impact while encouraging our Olympic team. And as the world watches the XXIII Olympiad, financial institutions and their customers can feel proud of the contribution made to the American Olympic effort.●

MONETARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WEAVER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I came on the House floor tonight with the intent of engaging in debate the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) in monetary policy, but we have intervened with a debate on our policy in Central America and on the Cuban Government and I would just like to comment briefly that the case made by the gentleman from Georgia and the facts that he outlined shows very clearly that the world is fast going toward totalitarian brutality of both the left and the right, and it is a very dangerous thing for the people of the world, for our own security.

The polarization in this world today by the extremist forces, the totalitarian forces of both communism and fascism lead me to believe that the era of 1930 when we had the rise of Stalin, the rise of Hitler, is coming again.

So we must, by all odds, assure ourselves of freedom here in this Nation.

I only want to make one comment on what the gentleman from Georgia has said tonight. He outlined very carefully and in great detail the brutality of certain Communist governments. And, indeed, this is tragic and horrible.

But he had little to say about the brutality of what is happening in San Salvador where the Americans, American nuns of the Catholic Church have been murdered by rightwing death squads and those murderers have not been brought to justice by that government. We have had reported as many as 37,000 people killed, murdered, by death squads that have at least the acquiescense of the Government of El Salvador and little has been done about it.

But the tragedy here is while we do not support the totalitarian regimes and brutality of other countries, we are supporting this brutal regime in El Salvador and I do not believe this country should enforce the double standard. if we oppose, as we should, brutality and repression and tryranny in one form, we should oppose brutality, tyranny, and repression in another form.

But just the opposite is occurring. The gentleman from Georgia tonight said that we should be sending this regime in El Salvador money, taxpayers' money, millions and hundreds of millions of dollars of it and possibly even troops of our Army. I think that this would be tragic. It would exacerbate the condition that this world is finding itself in of brutality and tyranny on both sides. A precarious situation for our world.

But I want to mention, as my intent was to debate monetary policy, because there was so much time taken by only one point of view tonight on monetary policy, and debate on monetary policy is very healthy. I think we should be talking a lot about it. My own district in Oregon has heavy unemployment. Lumber prices that the economy of my district depends upon in its wood products industry have fallen drastically in the last few months to a point where it is going to be difficult for our mills to remain open. We have never even come out of the depression for the last 4 years.

It was said that the Federal Reserve Board is the problem today. I hold very little brief for the Federal Reserve Board. I think that they are an accumulation of people who represent the large banks in this Nation and very little else.

Because Mr. KEMP of New York felt that all problems revolved about the Federal Reserve Board, I feel that Mr. KEMP, the author, or at least the promoter of supply-side economics, is using the Federal Reserve Board in this instance as a scapegoat for the failure of his own supply-side economics.

There is no question that supply-side economics has failed and failed miserably. It was supposed to, as debate of 3 years ago before the House had promised, it was supposed to bring in additional revenues to the Federal Government from income tax from people who are making much more money because supply-side economics would boost our economy so greatly. This, of course, has failed abysmally. The income has not been produced.

On the contrary we face terrifying deficits of $200 billion a year and it is those deficits that is giving the economy right now its temporary and very false and ephemeral boost. If you pour $200 billion of borrowed money into an economy right now, of printed money, you are going to have prosperity for a while. It will not last long, but you will. You take any community and suddenly bring a great deal of printed money into that community and give it to people and let them spend it in the stores and the places of business in that community and you will have a sudden prosperity. But then you have to pay the piper, because you are going to get inflation and higher interest rates and things will start closing down.

Indeed, that is what is happening today because of those $200 billion deficits interest rates are rising sharply. I think people are not aware that long-term U.S. Treasury bonds today are at over 13 percent in return. Now that is higher than Treasury bond interest rates were in 1979, in the year that we began to go into the recession, or that led to the recession. It is a very dangerous thing.

The gentleman from New York had mentioned that our economy is booming but is now being curtailed by the Federal Reserve Board.

On the contrary, manufacturers' orders reported this week were up, yes, and it looks like the economy is booming, manufacturers' orders being up. But if we look at what those orders were, 57-percent increase in military orders caused that rise. If we took all other orders, they actually fell. In the general economy, manufacturers' orders fell for the month of March.

But because of the enormous amounts of money, the billions of dollars that we are spending today on the military, this money being pumped into the economy is giving us a false sense of prosperity that will not last. And it cannot last because, as I say already interest rates are going up with U.S. Treasury bond long-term rates that affect the mortgage rates so critical to my district up above 13 percent today.

So I say that supply-side economics has failed miserably. It has led to these huge deficits as supply-side economics with its tax cuts for the wealthy and the increase now in mili-

tary spending are really what is undermining our economy today.

I feel that the Federal Reserve Board is certainly not helping things because all it is concerned about, without any question, are the largest international banks and they will represent the large international banks as they did over 2 years, when the Mexican Government could not make its payments to the banks. The Federal Reserve Board called an emergency meeting on that famous 13th of August and after that meeting wrote out a check for $2 billion to Mexico which was handed to the international banks in New York City.

I wish they had the same concern, the Federal Reserve Board, for our various businesses and manufacturers in this country, including the ones so critical to my own district, the timber industry.

With that, I wanted just simply to say these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, in response to the debate earlier this evening by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP), who I commend for introducing a debate on monetary policy.

I think it is critical, but I wanted to show that there are other aspects to it. That is why I make the remarks tonight.

□ 2020

RESULTS OF POLL OF NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ON BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, during the coming weeks, Members of the House will be called on for a number of difficult votes in the areas of military spending, foreign aid, and the conference report on the tax reform bill.

All of these bills are key to finding ways to reduce the budget deficits. I believe a recent poll which I took in my congressional district should add some strength to our resolve to make necessary reforms and budget cuts.

I still do not think the Congress has gotten the word on how very much the American people want deficits reduced and military waste stopped.

In mid-February, I polled the Ninth California Congressional District on whether they would increase, decrease, or keep the same spending levels in the major budget categories. I then asked these voters to add up their tax totals and spending totals and see what deficit figure they came up with.

There was a good response to the poll. Results are still coming in, because it was a somewhat hard poll to complete and because hundreds of people chose to write additional letters and comments. We have tabulated about 2,700 responses.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the average deficit these voters came up with?

Thirty-nine billion dollars.

And here we sit debating how to amend the President's proposals just to reduce the deficit from $180 billion to $170 or $165 billion.

We sit here worrying about what people will say about tax increases. But the response in my district clearly shows that citizens are willing to raise taxes to reduce the deficit. For example, 71 percent of the respondents tabulated support a rise in corporate income taxes. An even larger percentage, 77 percent, favor raising excise charges, such as those on tobacco.

As our country sinks deeper and deeper into debt, citizens plead for Congress to act courageously. To close tax loopholes, to crack down on unfair tax giveaways, and, ultimately, to raise taxes in a fair and evenhanded way.

The poll results send another urgent message: Reduce military spending. The people of California's Ninth District understand all too well that the Pentagon budget is out of control. And they are angry about it; 86 percent of those who responded want defense spending reduced; 86 percent. It is hard to imagine a clearer mandate for congressional action.

My constituents are willing to pay their fair share to reduce the deficit, but they will not blindly support more huge increases for the Defense Department. And, after all, how can Congress in good conscience ask citizens to help raise revenues while Pentagon spenders pay $9,000 for a 12-cent wrench?

On other points, overwhelmingly, people want reductions in funding of agricultural programs, especially price supports. Similarly, the vast majority of respondents favor a decrease in international affairs spending, with many expressing outrage at U.S. support of corrupt dictatorship. In other areas of Federal expenditures, such as education, health, welfare, and transportation, constituents were more supportive of current spending levels, though many urged a redoubling of efforts to eliminate waste and inefficiency.

I want to express my appreciation to all who responded to the survey. People gave serious thought to the questions and provided many interesting and useful insights. I hope the exercise was as educational for them as it was for me.

I also hope that we can do better than we have done to date. My budget votes will be cast for sharper reductions in the deficit totals.●

THE COURTS AND EMPLOYER SANCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues attention to a recent editorial that appeared April 23 in my hometown paper, the Louisville Times, commenting on a recent Supreme Court decision, Immigration and Naturalization Service against Delgado.

This decision upheld the legality of "factory sweeps" by the Immigration Service in which immigration officers sweep through places of employment asking for immigration documents. Many undocumented aliens are apprehended through this method.

The Louisville Times editorial correctly points out that while such searches may have a place in immigration law enforcement, the effort lacks balance so long as the employer—who often exploits the undocumented worker—goes scot-free.

Mr. Speaker, that the employer is not now a player in this drama makes no sense. Mr. Justice Powell, in a concurring opinion in Delgado, agrees. There, he writes that while illegal workers are penalized "our law irrationally continues to permit U.S. employers to hire them. Many employers actively recruit low-paid illegal immigrant labor, encouraging—with Government tolerance—illegal entry into the United States. This incongruity in our immigration statutes is not calculated to increase respect for the rule of law."

Mr. Speaker, Congress has before it the vehicle to solve that incongruity. H.R. 1510, the Immigration Reform and Control Act would properly balance the legal burdens of enforcing the Nation's immigration laws by penalizing those employers who knowingly hire undocumented workers as well as the undocumented alien.

These employers hurt American labor just as much as the illegal workers do. Employer sanctions such as those contained in H.R. 1510 would balance the solution to our current immigration problems. Any reform that does not include employer sanctions is no reform at all.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the Louisville Times editorial of May 23, 1984. Once again, the editors are to be commended for their timely and thoughtful analysis of this complex issue.

TARGETING WRONG LAWBREAKERS

Advocates of the Mazzoli-Simpson immigration bill have a new U.S. Supreme Court decision to support the need for the reform legislation.

The ruling, which is soundly based in existing law, allows authorities to "sweep" farms, factories and other workplaces to de-

termine whether illegal aliens are employed in them. The illegal workers are subject to penalties, including deportation.

Certainly such searches have a place. But the burden ought to be shifted from the workers—many of whom are poorly educated and are working at jobs that American citizens shun. Instead, the penalty should be paid by employers, who in most cases now escape sanctions. Mazzoli-Simpson, which is cosponsored by Louisville Rep. Romano Mazzoli, would crack down on the exploiters.

Certainly the sweeps seem to be effective. Immigration and Naturalization Service officials, according to The New York Times, say they are the source of 20,000 arrests a year in Los Angeles alone. However, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in that city struck down the procedure as an unconstitutional "seizure," violating the Fourth Amendment.

When the case reached the Supreme Court, Justice William Rehnquist, in his majority opinion, held that "mere questioning" fails to constitute a seizure. Six other justices came to the same conclusion. In a concurring opinion, Justice Lewis Powell suggested that sweeps should be considered essentially the same as border inspections, where the authority of immigration officials is not disputed.

But dissenters William Brennan and Thurgood Marshall made a valid point. They claimed that the sweeps create a "frightening picture of people subjected to wholesale interrogation" under essentially captive conditions.

However, those who violate the law should be punished. Congress has an obligation to crack down on employers—not just those whom they hire. When that happens, the exploitation of illegal immigrants can be reduced, thus making U.S. borders more secure by cutting the temptation to sneak into the country to find work.●

LEGISLATION TO ADVANCE THE CONTADORA PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House joined in unanimous approval of legislation (H. Con. Res. 261) expressing support for the Contadora regional peace efforts. That vote, reaffirming House passage of similar legislation last November, demonstrates this body's continued commitment to making the negotiated settlement of the conflict in Central America a central aspect of U.S. foreign policy. I rise at this time to offer legislation to bring tangible meaning to our words of support.

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the American people have watched with growing alarm each chapter in the deepening quagmire of U.S. military involvement in Central America. The recent revelation of the secret U.S. role in the mining of three Nicaraguan ports came as a great shock to Congress, as it did to the Nation as a whole. Yet the mining ought not to be viewed as an isolated incident, but rather as indicative of the administration's focus on military solutions to the complex challenges posed by the unrest in Central America.

In recent months we have witnessed a dramatic expansion of the U.S. military presence and role in Central America. In addition to its much publicized involvement in the fighting in Nicaragua and El Salvador, it is now reported that the United States has developed plans for and is in the position to assume a direct combat role in Central America. Just last week the Navy began a series of extensive exercises in the Caribbean—Ocean Venture I—which will eventually involve 350 ships and 30,000 American servicemen. Likewise, recent incidents of hostile fire directed at Americans in Honduras have drawn increasing attention to the presence of several thousand U.S. troops and an ambitious military construction program in that country.

With the details of its military strategy unfolding at a rapid rate, the lack of any real diplomatic initiative in the administration's Central American policies has become increasingly apparent. Without question the United States has an overriding security interest in promoting stability in this hemisphere. It is equally clear, however, that if the means used to achieve security are primarily military, the outcome will be decided—if only in the short term—by the balance of military strength. Such a policy inevitably moves the spectre of a direct U.S. combat role in Central America closer and closer to reality. In such a contest, moreover, the forces of moderation have little chance of making themselves heard.

Mr. Speaker, the dangers of such a course are evident from the record of past U.S. involvement in Central America. Periodic U.S. military intervention in the region has not provided a foundation for lasting peace and stability. In fact, our experience in Central America has shown that military force is a poor substitute for foreign policy. America's best prospect for reasserting its leadership lies in promoting a collective approach to the region's economic and security problems. This approach would seek to involve our Latin neighbors as economic partners and sovereign equals, working in concert with the United States to advance shared national goals.

The idea of a peace based on regional cooperation is more than an idle dream: it is the promise embodied in the 21-point agreement already accepted by the key Central American states under the sponsorship of the Contadora nations—Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama. As my colleagues are aware, the Contadora effort reached a significant milestone earlier this year when the participating foreign ministers agreed to establish three working commissions to prepare proposals for treaties based on the framework for peace first established last fall. These commissions seek to:

Establish agreed upon limits on the levels of military force in the region;

Eliminate foreign military advisers from the region and all forms of support for insurgents;

Perfect mechanisms of communications for resolving incidents among states;

Promote national reconciliation on the basis of justice, freedom, and democracy with full respect for human rights;

Create independent electoral bodies to insure popular participation under conditions of equality; and

Foster greater cooperation among states in pursuing regional economic development and refugee assistance efforts.

Those negotiations are entering an extremely delicate stage and American activities in the region will inevitably play a powerful role in determining their success or failure. For its part, the administration has pledged full U.S. support for the Contadora process. In fact, the President's Bipartisan Commission on Central America concluded that U.S. support for the development of regional relations such as those proposed under the Contadora plan ought to be a "key objective" of U.S. policy.

But despite its professed support, the administration continues to withhold the kind of substantive backing which could lead to the fulfillment of the Contradora process. Moreover, by choosing to pursue policies which emphasize military solutions, the administration makes the goal of a comprehensive peace settlement ever more remote.

Mr. Speaker, by definition the United States cannot be supporting the Contadora initiative and at the same time stepping up the "secret" war against Nicaragua, escalating the war in El Salvador, and preparing to fight a regional war. This inconsistency was underscored in a recent communique issued by the four foreign ministers of the Contadora Group decrying the grave deterioration in Central America caused by the U.S. mining of Nicaragua's ports.

If the United States is committed to the Contadora process, then we ought to act now to enforce its conditions. We must match our deeds with our words by bringing to an immediate halt those policies which run counter to the spirit of the Contadora process.

The legislation I am proposing today attempts to reestablish diplomacy as the central priority of United States-Central American policy by calling for direct consultations with and support for the Contadora Group and by suspending all military activities—overt and covert—in Central America for a period of 3 months.

With regard to the former, my bill directs the President to initiate direct dialog with the Contadora Group for the purpose of developing a common strategy for peace, and to make available such advisory and technical services as may be requested. In addition, it calls upon the President to work actively to persuade other governments involved in the region to join in observing the conditions for peace established by Contadora.

The second component of this legislation provides for a temporary suspension of U.S. support for or participation in military or paramilitary activities in Central America in order to promote a favorable climate for the Contadora negotiations. This 90-day respite would afford the peace process time essential to reaching an agreement, free from the threat of escalating conflict.

To conform with the conditions laid down last January, this suspension necessarily would apply to: First, U.S. military assistance and construction programs in the region; second, military training exercises; third, reconnaissance flights on behalf of the armed forces of other nations; and fourth, support for military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua. In addition, the measure would cap the number of U.S. personnel stationed in Central America at the current level.

No single actor in the Central America drama has a greater capacity to shape the future direction of events in that region than the United States. The success of the Contadora process cannot, of course, be brought about solely by U.S. action. For these reasons, the legislation I propose also directs the President to report to Congress by the end of the 3-month period on the progress of the Contadora negotiations and on the good faith demonstrated by the participating states in adhering to the agreed-upon conditions. In proceeding, it is clear that the United States must take into account whether those nations have demonstrated equivalent restraint on the military buildup of the region. This will provide a basis for future U.S. initiatives in Central America.

Mr. Speaker, this country has an essential role to play in the Americas, but that role must be one of leadership and cooperation, not of domination. It is the purpose of this legislation to lead us away from the morass of military intervention in Central America by seizing the opportunity presented by the Contadora process. We must act now, before the military escalation in the region precludes the option of diplomacy and makes direct U.S. military intervention all but inevitable.

The President recently spoke of the need for a consensus with regard to U.S. policy in Central America. If that consensus exists, it exists in the opposition of the American people to a U.S. combat role in Central America. I urge my colleagues to join this effort to avert the unfolding tragedy in Central America.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 5577

A bill to provide for direct consultations between the United States Government and the participants in the Contadora process in order to develop a common policy for promoting peace in Central America, and to provide for a temporary suspension of United States support for or participation in military and paramilitary activities in Central America in order to provide a favorable climate for the Contadora process

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress finds that—

(1) the achievement of security in Central America depends on the resolve and the cooperation of the people and governments of the hemisphere in working through peaceful means to resist subversion and destabilization, as exemplified by the diplomatic efforts of the Contadora nations of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela in working with the nations of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua;

(2) a significant and hopeful milestone in the development of a system of regional relations was reached with the adoption by the foreign ministers of those five nations on January 8, 1984, of "Principles for the Implementation of the Commitments Undertaken in the Document of Objectives", establishing three working commissions to prepare proposals for treaties which would—

(A) establish agreed-upon limits on the levels of military force in the region;

(B) eliminate foreign military advisers from the region and eliminate all forms of support for insurgents;

(C) perfect mechanisms of communication for resolving incidents among states;

(D) promote national reconciliation on the basis of justice, freedom, and democracy with full respect for human rights;

(E) create independent electoral bodies to ensure popular participation under conditions of equality; and

(F) foster greater cooperation among states in pursuing regional economic development and refugee assistance efforts; and

(3) the United States can make a significant contribution in facilitating the translation of the agreed principles into practical and concrete arrangements by offering such assistance and support as may be requested and by pursuing policies toward the countries of that region which are sensitive to the principles embraced by the participants in the Contadora process and which promote a climate of peace.

(b) Therefore, it is the purpose of this Act to provide—

(1) for direct consultations between the United States Government and the participants in the Contadora process in order to develop a common policy for promoting peace in Central America; and

(2) for a temporary suspension of United States support for or participation in military and paramilitary activities in Central America in order to promote a favorable climate for the Contadora process.

SEC. 2. (a) The United States—

(1) shall initiate a dialogue with the participants in the Contadora process for the purpose of developing a common strategy for promoting regional stability; and

(2) should assist, through nonmilitary means, efforts to implement of the objectives established in the "Principles for the Implementation of the Commitments Undertaken in the Document of Objectives" by offering such advisory services as may be requested in accordance with the terms of that agreement and by exerting vigorous diplomatic efforts to persuade other governments involved in the Central American region to observe these conditions.

(b) In order to help achieve a regional peace agreement, the United States should announce its willingness to pursue multilateral negotiations with the Central American countries for the purpose of obtaining agreement on the treaties described in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) During the 3-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the United States shall suspend—

(A) all assistance under chapter 2 or chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or under the Arms Export Control Act for Central American countries, and

(B) all sales of, export licenses for, and other transfers of defense articles or defense services under the Arms Export Control Act for Central American countries,

except that this paragraph does not apply with respect to the provision of medical facilities or supplies (which may not include any equipment which will be armed or otherwise used for combat, troop support, or any other nonmedical purpose) or to the provision of medical training or services;

(2) the United States shall suspend all construction activities with respect to military facilities in Central American countries, including any construction, modification, or improvement of any existing or new military facility;

(3) United States Armed Forces shall not participate in any training exercises in or off the shores of Central American countries, and any such participation occurring on the date of enactment of this Act shall be terminated immediately;

(4) the number of members of the United States Armed Forces in any Central American country may not exceed the number in that country on the date of enactment of this Act, except that this paragraph shall not preclude the introduction of United States Armed Forces into a Central American country in order to meet a clear and present danger of hostile attack upon the United States or to meet a clear and present danger to, and to provide for the essential and immediate evacuation of, United States citizens;

(5) the United States shall suspend all air reconnaissance flights by aircraft operated by or in behalf of the United States Government for the purpose of providing tactical intelligence information for combat operations by the armed forces of any Central American country; and

(6) there shall be no obligation or expenditure of any funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, or any other agency or entity of the United States involved in intelligence activities, for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "Central American countries" means Costa Rica, El

Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

SEC. 4. Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report—

(1) describing the steps he has taken to carry out section 2(a)(1) of this Act;

(2) discussing the progress being made in bringing about a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Central America on the basis of the Contadora process;

(3) assessing whether, durng the temporary suspension pursuant to this Act of United States support for and participation in military and paramilitary activities, the Central American countries conducted themselves in a manner consistent with the "Principles for the Implementation of the Commitments Undertaken in the Document of Objectives"; and

(4) making recommendations on the actions the United States should take in the future to promote the peaceful resolution of the conflict in Central America.●

EXPLANATION OF TITLE X—CENTRAL AMERICA—OF H.R. 5421

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is a section-by-section analysis of title X of H.R. 5421. When the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported H.R. 5119, the fiscal year 1985 foreign assistance bill, on March 21, the committee did not include any provisions on or assistance for the countries of Central America. It was determined that the committee needed additional time to review developments in the region and to reach agreement on the appropriate congressional response.

Subsequently, a majority of the members of the Democratic caucus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs reached a consensus agreement on the issues involving Central America. A clean bill was introduced, H.R. 5420, which includes the committee-reported bill, H.R. 5119, titles I–IX, plus the caucus position on Central America, title X. H.R. 5421, which is to be the text for floor consideration, is identical to H.R. 5420 with one exception. H.R. 5420 includes a provision, section 1003(h), for expedited procedures for consideration of a joint resolution approving the second portion of security assistance for El Salvador. Mr. MOAKLEY introduced H.R. 5421, which deletes subsection (h) of secton 1003, in order to meet the concern of members of the Rules Committee that this expedited procedure provision would circumvent the role of that committee.

I am placing the following section-by-section explanation in the RECORD in order that Members be fully informed on the provisions in title X on Central America of H.R. 5421, which is scheduled for floor action the week of May 7.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—TITLE X (H.R. 5421)

This title contains recommendations on H.R. 4874, the Administration's request for Central America, which was entitled "Central America Democracy, Peace and Development Initiative Act of 1984" and which comprises both the normal bilateral assistance program for Central America and the Administration's requests pursuant to the recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America (the "Kissinger Commission").

Title X authorizes the appropriation of funds for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for economic and security assistance to the countries of Central America as follows:

COMPARISON OF CENTRAL AMERICA SUBSTITUTES, FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985, TITLE X

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1984				Fiscal year 1985			
	Supplemental authorization request	H.R. 5421	Studds amendment	Broomfield substitute	Executive request	H.R. 5421	Studds amendment	Broomfield substitute
Military assistance:								
FMS direct credits					30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
(FMS guaranties)								
Guarantee reserve								
Grant MAP	129,350	0	0	129,350	222,000	199,800	180,700	222,000
IMET					3,900	3,510	3,510	3,900
Peacekeeping								
Subtotal	129,350	0	0	129,350	255,900	233,310	214,210	255,900
Antiterrorism								
Economic support fund	119,750	18,250	18,250	119,750	640,600	479,000	479,000	640,000
Development assistance:								
Bilateral:								
Agriculture					69,800	65,562.5	65,562.5	69,800
Population	400	0	0	0	15,000	14,183.75	14,183.75	15,000
Health	9,600	7,200	7,200	9,600	40,000	38,975	38,975	40,000
Child survival fund								
Education	5,000	4,000	4,000	5,000	64,000	81,803.75	81,803.75	64,000
SDA–PVO's	20,288	19,088	19,088	20,288	84,000	82,275	82,275	84,000
Subtotal, bilateral	35,288	30,288	30,288	34,888	272,800	282,800	282,800	272,800
Housing guaranty					10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Subtotal	35,288	30,288	30,288	34,888	282,800	292,800	292,800	282,800
Other programs:								
Operating expenses (AID)					6,016	6,016	6,016	6,016
USIA					20,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
Refugees					15,000	0		
Subtotal					41,016	23,016	23,016	23,016
Peace Corps	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Reconstruction fund		250,000	250,000					
Grand total	285,388	299,538	299,538	284,988	1,229,316	1,037,126	1,108,026	1,227,316

SECTION 1001—FISCAL YEAR 1985 AUTHORIZATIONS

This section authorizes the appropriation of funds for fiscal year 1985 for Central America. These authorizations are in addition to those contained in earlier titles in the bill, which do not include any money for Central America.

Subsection (a)(1) authorizes $30,000,000 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for on-budget direct credits for foreign military sales, in addition to amounts otherwise available, and increases the aggregate ceiling on such credits by $30,000,000. This amount is the same as the Executive branch request, and includes $15,000,000 for El Salvador, $10,000,000 for Guatemala, and $5,000,000 for Panama.

Subsection (a)(2) authorizes, in addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts to carry out provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: $199,800,000 under chapter 2 of part II for grant military assistance programs (a 10 percent cut from the Executive request); $3,510,000 under chapter 5 of part II for international military education and training programs (a 10 percent cut from the Executive request); and $479,000,000 under chapter 4 of part II for Economic Support Funds (the ESF level

reflects the following cuts: −$30,000,000 from Guatemala, −$50,000,000 from El Salvador, −$20 million from Honduras, and −$61,600,000 from regional programs). All funds cut in this subsection were transferred to the Reconstruction Fund established in Section 1007.

Subsection (a)(3) amends section 515(c)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act to allow more than six military personnel to manage security assistance programs in El Salvador and Honduras.

Subsection (b)(1) authorizes, in addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts to carry out provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: $65,562,500 under section 103 for bilateral agriculture, rural development, and nutrition programs; $14,183,750 under section 104(b) for bilateral population assistance programs; $38,975,000 under section 104(c) for bilateral health assistance programs; $81,803,750 under section 105 for bilateral education and human resources development programs; and $82,275,000 under section 106 for bilateral energy, private voluntary organizations, and selected development activities programs. These amounts reflect a $10,000,000 cut from the Executive request for development assistance for Guatemala, spread over the five accounts, and a $20,000,000 increase in the education account for scholarship programs. The subsection also authorizes $6,016,000 under section 667 for AID operating expenses.

Subsection (b)(2) increases the ceiling on housing guaranties outstanding at any one time under title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by $80,000,000, the same as the Executive request.

Subsection (c) authorizes, in addition to amounts otherwise available, $9,000,000 for the Peace Corps, the same as the Executive request.

Subsection (d) provides that amounts appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

SECTION 1002—SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATIONS

This section authorizes the appropriation of supplemental funds for fiscal year 1984, and for fiscal year 1985. These authorizations are in addition to those previously enacted.

Subsection (a)(1) authorizes the following amounts to be appropriated for fiscal year 1984, in addition to funds otherwise available, to carry out provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: $7,200,000 under section 104(c) for bilateral population assistance programs; $4,000,000 under section 105 for bilateral education and human resources development programs; and $19,088,000 under section 106 for bilateral energy, private voluntary organizations, and selected development activities programs. These amounts relect a $5,000,000 cut from the Executive request for development assistance for Guatemala, spread over each of the accounts. This subsection also authorizes $18,250,000 under chapter 4 of part II for Economic Support Funds for fiscal year 1984, a $101,500,000 cut from the Executive request.

Subsection (a)(2) authorizes an additional $1,000,000 for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1984, the same as the Executive request.

Subsection (a)(3) authorizes an additional $10,000,000 (the same as the Executive request) for fiscal year 1985 for the purposes of the reserve fund established pursuant to section 223 of the Foreign Assistance Act (the housing guaranty program).

Subsection (a)(4) authorizes an additional $17,000,000 for fiscal year 1985 for the United States Information Agency to carry out international information, educational, cultural, and exchange programs for Central America. This amount is $3,000,000 less than the Executive request.

Subsection (b) provides that amounts appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

SECTION 1003—CONDITIONS ON SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO EL SALVADOR

This section provides that security assistance for fiscal year 1985 may be provided to El Salvador only if certain conditions are met. Basically, this section provides that one-third of the military aid and one-half of the economic aid approved by the Congress will be available if the President can certify that the Salvadoran government has made demonstrated progress in achieving all the objectives set out in this section. The remainder of the aid would be available only if the President certified, and the Congress agreed through a joint resolution of approval, that the Salvadoran government has achieved certain objectives (relating to control of death squads, compliance with the Geneva Convention, and good faith negotiations), and has made additional demonstrated progress on the remainder of the objectives (relating) to detention of political prisoners, judicial reform, freedom of the press and freedom of association, and land reform).

Subsection (a) states that the President shall ensure that military assistance and economic support assistance are furnished to El Salvador in a manner which fosters demonstrated progress toward the political development, economic development, and security of that country.

Subsection (b)(1) requires that not later than September 30, 1984, the President shall submit to the Congress a detailed report fully describing the policies of the Government of El Salvador for achieving the objectives referred to above. This report shall also include a determination by the President whether the Government of El Salvador has made demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives outlined in subsection (c), the President's detailed assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the policies of the Government of El Salvador in protecting and advancing human rights in that country with respect to each of those objectives, and a comprehensive review of the factors contributing to the political, economic, and security situation in that country.

Subsection (b)(2) requires that if, at any time during fiscal year 1985, the President determines that the Government of El Salvador (A) has achieved the objectives described in paragraphs (1) (death squads), (2) (Geneva Convention), and (3) (negotiations) of subsection (c), and (B) since the report was submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1) has made additional demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (c), then the President shall submit a second report to the Congress containing the material described in subjection (b)(1).

Subsection (c) states that the objectives for the Government of El Salvador referred to in the previous two subsections are the following:

(1) Removal from military, security, and police forces of those individuals repsonsible for or associated with the death squads, and establishment of effective control over those forces and over paramilitary groups which receive any assistance or support from those forces.

(2) Compliance by the Government of El Salvador with the 1949 Geneva Convention and the 1977 Protocol relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts.

(3) Participation by the Government of El Salvador in negotiations with all major parties to the conflict in El Salvador, in good faith and without preconditions, for the purpose of achieving an equitable political solution (elements of which would include free and fair elections determined through negotiations and reforms within the security and police forces), unless the Government of El Salvador is unable to engage in such negotiations because of the refusal of the major opposition parties to participate.

(4) Elimination of the practice of detaining political prisoners, and repeal of legislation or decrees providing for such detention.

(5) Establishment of the rule of law and an effective judicial system, as demonstrated at a minimum by vigorous steps to bring to trial and discipline (A) all those directly or indirectly responsible for the murders and disappearances of U.S. citizens or for any related coverup; and (B) substantial numbers of those directly or indirectly responsible for the abduction, torture, or murder of Salvadoran citizens.

(6) Protection of effective freedom of the press and freedom of association.

(7) Documented progress in implementing the land reform program, with no action taken which would modify, suspend, or terminate the land reform program in a manner detrimental to the rights of the beneficiaries or potential beneficiaries.

Subsection (d) states that military assistance and economic support assistance may be provided for El Salvador for fiscal year 1985 only as follows:

(1) Up to $64,800,000 of military assistance and up to one half ($80,000,000) of the economic support assistance approved by the Congress for El Salvador may be provided if the President determines and states in the first report required by subsection (b) that the Government of El Salvador has made demonstrated progress in achieving all the objectives described in subsection (c).

(2) Not to exceed an additional $124,500,000 of military assistance, and the remaining amounts ($80,000,000) of economic support assistance approved by the Congress for El Salvador, may be provided if the President submits a second report pursuant to subsection (b) stating his determination that the Salvadoran Government has achieved the objectives described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) and, since the first report was submitted, has made additional demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in the remaining paragraphs of subsection (c); and if the Congress enacts a joint resolution stating that the Congress agrees with the President's determinations.

Subsection (e) provides a definition of the term "military assistance and financing" and "economic support assistance".

Subsection (f) limits the total number of U.S. military advisers in El Salvador to 55 at any time. U.S. military advisers are defined to include any members of the U.S. Armed Forces performing defense services, conducting international military education and training activities, or performing management functions under the Foreign Assistance Act or the Arms Export Control Act,

and to exclude members of the Armed Forces who are in El Salvador solely for the purpose of performing medical training or services.

Subsection (g)(1) prohibits the use of the special drawdown authority in section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act with respect to El Salvador for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

Subsection (g)(2) prohibits the use of section 21(d) of the Arms Export Control Act for El Salvador for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, unless the President first reports to the Congress that an emergency has arisen which requires immediate military assistance to that country and which cannot be met under any other law.

Subsection (g)(3) provides that if section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act is used to waive any provision of this section, such waiver shall cease to be effective thirty days after the President submits the written notification required by that section, unless during that thrity-day period the Congress enacts a joint resolution approving the waiver.

SECTION 1004—ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDS FOR EL SALVADOR

This section establishes certain additional conditions for providing economic support funds to El Salvador for fiscal year 1985.

Subsection (a)(1) requires that all local currencies generated in El Salvador by ESF funds shall be deposited in a special account established by the Government of El Salvador (in accordance with Section 609 of the Foreign Assistance Act) and shall be available only for purposes of agrarian reform, employment generation, restoration of public services, policy development, assistance for displaced persons, and other humanitarian assistance. (Section 609 requires that local currencies generated in a commodity import program be placed in a special account or be used to fund specific programs.)

Subsection (a)(2) prohibits ESF funds provided to El Salvador from being credited directly to its Central Reserve Bank or mixed in any way with its foreign exchange reserves.

Subsection (a)(3) requires that not less than one quarter of the balance of payments support provided under ESF to El Salvador shall be in the form of a Commodity Import Program. This provision would allow a gradual phase-in of that program if adequate controls on balance of payments assistance cannot be implemented.

Subsection (b) establishes the following criteria for the Commodity Import Program for El Salvador for fiscal year 1985:

(1) Eligible importers under the program shall include agencies charged by the Salvadoran Government with implementing the land reform program, and Salvadoran businesses which employ less than 25 people.

(2) All imports under the program shall be appropriate to the development needs of El Salvador.

(3) The prices charged in El Salvador for imports acquired under the program shall be their fair market value.

Subsection (c) requires A.I.D. to report on the activities and commodities financed pursuant to this section as part of the annual congressional presentation materials.

Subsection (d)(1) requires that each fiscal year, prior to expending any ESF funds to El Salvador for economic stabilization purposes, the President shall be satisfied that the Central Reserve Bank has implemented or taken appropriate steps toward implementing the major recommendations contained in the report entitled "Foreign Exchange: Policy and Management Within the Central Reserve Bank of El Salvador".

Subsection (d)(2) requires the President to report to the Congress not later than January 31, 1985, on the implementation of this report and on ongoing efforts to improve the management, allocation, and control of foreign exchange.

This section was included as a result of reports by the General Accounting Office, the Inspector General of the Agency for International Development, and Arthur Young and Company, that U.S. aid funds have not been expended for the intended purposes and that controls over the use of U.S. funds are weak.

SECTION 1005—RESTRICTIONS ON THE INTRODUCTION OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES INTO HONDURAS AND LIMITATIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR HONDURAS

This section limits the purposes for which U.S. Armed Forces may be introduced into Honduras, and sets a ceiling on military assistance to that country.

Subsection (a) prohibits the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into Honduran territory for training exercises or (except as provided in subsection (d)) for any other purposes unless: (1) they are responsible for providing security at the U.S. Embassy in Honduras, or (2) they are performing functions pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act or the Arms Export Control Act, except that not more than 300 members of the Armed Forces may be in Honduras under this paragraph at any one time.

Subsection (b) prohibits the obligation or expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress for the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into Honduran territory except as provided in this section.

Subsection (c) requires any members of the U.S. Armed Forces in Honduras on the date of enactment of this Act who are not covered by one of the exceptions provided in this section to be immediately withdrawn from that country.

Subsection (d) states that, consistent with section 3 of the War Powers Resolution, the President shall consult with the Congress before introducing U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities in Honduras or into situations in Honduras where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.

Subsection (e) limits the aggregate total of grant military assistance and international military education and training grants provided to Honduras to $56,000,000 for fiscal year 1984 and to $41,000,000 for fiscal year 1985. It further prohibits the issuance of foreign military sales credits and loan guarantees for Honduras for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

SECTION 1006—LIMITATIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES FOR GUATEMALA AND ON JOINT MILITARY EXERCISES WITH GUATEMALA

This section prohibits military assistance for Guatemala except under special circumstances.

Subsection (a) prohibits military assistance, training, and sales to Guatemala for fiscal year 1984 and 1985 under the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, and the Export Administration Act, except as provided in subsection (b). It further prohibits the assignment or detailing of members of the U.S. Armed Forces to Guatemala to carry out functions under the Arms Export Control Act or the Foreign Assistance Act, or to participate in joint military exercises with the armed forces of Guatemala. It also provides that funds appropriated by the Congress may not be obligated or expended for participation by U.S. Armed Forces in any such exercises.

Subsection (b) states that the prohibitions contained in subsection (a) do not apply with respect to (1) sales of construction equipment and mobile medical facilities to assist in development programs that will directly assist the poor in Guatemala, (2) sales of training, to be provided outside Guatemala, which is related to the sales of construction equipment or mobile medical facilities, or (3) a total for both fiscal year 1984 and 1985 of no more than $10 million in FMS loan guaranties and direct credits for sales described in (1) and (2) above. It further states that the exceptions to the prohibition on military assistance and sales for Guatemala provided by this subsection are provided only to enable the military forces in that country to obtain equipment and training for civilian engineering and construction projects and mobile medical teams.

SECTION 1007—FUND FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CENTRAL AMERICA

This section establishes a fund for the reconstruction and development of Central America, and provides guidelines and requirements for its use. The amounts for the Fund taken from a portion of the funds requested for other accounts. The purpose of the Fund is to encourage a comprehensive settlement to the conflict in Central America.

Subsection (a) states the sense of the Congress that the achievement of democracy, human rights, peace, and equitable growth in Central America depends primarily on the cooperation and the human and economic resources of the people and governments of Central America, and that the Congress recognizes that the United States can make a significant contribution to such development through a consistent and coherent policy which includes a long-term commitment of assistance. This policy should be designed to support democracy, political reform, and human rights; to promote equitable economic growth and development; and to foster dialogue and negotiations to achieve peace based on a reduction in armament and on national reconciliation.

Subsection (b) states that in recognition of the principles described in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated $250,000,000 for fiscal year 1984, to be used for bilateral and regional economic assistance programs of reconstruction and development with respect to Belize, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. These funds may be obligated only if the President determines and reports to the Congress that, (1) the countries of the region have entered into a comprehensive peace agreement based on the principles of noninterference in the affairs of another country, national reconciliation, and democracy; (2) a regional development plan has been formulated by the countries of Central America which includes detailed proposals for each country and includes plans for the reestablishment of the Central America Common Market; and (3) a donor coordination group has been established which includes individual donor countries as well as multinational development institutions and which is responsible for coordinating all development and reconstruction assistance funds for the region.

Subsection (c) states that the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this section are in addition to amounts otherwise available for the purposes specified in subsection

(b), may be appropriated in subsequent fiscal years if not appropriated for fiscal year 1984, and are authorized to remain available until expended.

Subsection (d) states the expectation of the Congress that in seeking the goals described in subsection (b), the efforts of the Contadora countries (Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia) will be encouraged and supported and the United States will actively assist these countries in seeking a regional settlement to the conflict in Central America.

Subsection (e) states the expectation of the Congress that, consistent with the recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America (the "Kissinger Commission"), once the goals described in subsection (b) have been attained, U.S. economic assistance for Central America will continue at a level comparable to the aggregate level authorized by this section and other sections of this Act.

SECTION 1008—CENTRAL AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

This section sets forth Congressional findings on and requirements for the proposed Central American Development Organization.

Subsection (a) states a Congressional finding that participation by Central American countries in an effective forum for dialogue on Central America's political, economic and social development would foster cooperation between the United States and Central American countries.

Subsection (b) states the sense of the Congress that, (1) the President should enter into negotiations with the countries of Central America to establish a Central American Development Organization, and (2) the establishment of such an organization should be based on the following principles: participation in the organization should be open to the United States, other donors, and those Central American countries that commit themselves to progress on human rights, building democracy, and encouraging equitable economic growth through policy reforms; the organization should be structured to include representatives from both the public and the private sectors; the organization should meet periodically to carry out its functions and should be supported by a limited professional secretariat; the organization should make recommendations affecting Central American countries on such matters as political, economic and social development objectives, mobilization of resources and external assistance needs, and reform of economic policies and structures; the organization should have the capacity for monitoring country performance on the recommendations issued; for each fiscal year after that in which the President has agreed to participate in the organization, the disbursement of 25 percent of the economic assistance funds allocated by the United States for each Central American country should be deferred until the United States and the organization have both approved disbursement; the President should encourage other donors to designate a percentage of their direct economic assistance for Central American countries for joint approval with the Organization; and the U.S. AID Administrator, or his designee, should be chairman of the organization.

Subsection (c) authorizes the President to participate in the Central American Development Organization, subject to certain limitations.

Subsection (d)(1) states that the AID Administrator, under the supervision of the Secretary of State, shall prepare a detailed proposal to carry out this section and shall keep the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations fully and currently informed concerning the development of the proposal.

Subsection (d)(2) states that to facilitate full congressional involvement in the establishment of this organization, the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee shall each designate at least three members of their respective committees who shall be kept fully and currently informed of all developments concerning the establishment of that organization.

Subsection (d)(3) requires the President to transmit to the Congress any agreement for the establishment of and United States participation in the Central American Development Organization no less than sixty days prior to signing such agreement. It futher provides that the United States shall not participate in the implementation of any such agreement for at least 60 days after such transmittal, and that during that 60-day period there shall be full and formal consultations with the Congress and review by the Committees in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications.

SECTION 1009—LAND REFORM PROGRAMS

This section amends section 620(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act to permit U.S. assistance provided to a foreign government in accordance with a land reform program to be used for compensation of nationals of the recipient country whose land has been expropriated, if the President determines that monetary assistance for such a land reform program will further the national interests of the United States.

SECTION 1010—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

This section amends Chapter 4 of Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act by adding a new section 538.

Subsection (a) states that the President may provide ESF funds to countries and organizations in order to strengthen the administration of justice in Central American and Caribbean countries. Such assistance may only include support for specialized professional training, scholarships, and exchanges for continuing legal education; programs to enhance prosecutorial and judicial capabilities and portection for participants in judicial cases; strengthening professional organizations in order to promote services to members and the role of the bar in judicial selection, enforcement of ethical standards, and legal reform; increasing the availability of legal materials and publications; seminars, conferences, and training and educational programs to improve the administration of justice and to strengthen respect for the rule of law and human rights; and revision and modernization of legal codes and procedures.

Subsection (b) provides that not more than $20,000,000 of the ESF funds available in any fiscal year shall be available to carry out this section, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

SECTION 1011—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

This section states the sense of the Congress that funds appropriated for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for bilateral agricultural assistance programs should be used for a comprehensive rural electrification program in Central America in order to establish conditions of stability and a foundation for economic development.

SECTION 1012—TRADE CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM

This section authorizes special credits for U.S. exports to the countries of Central America and the use of Economic Support Fund monies for the payment of defaults.

Subsection (a) authorizes the Agency for International Development to provide guarantees and insurance to cover the risk of loss or nonpayment of short-term trade credits to finance goods and services for use by the private sector in the countries of Central America. These guarantees and insurance shall be such as cannot be extended by the Export-Import Bank because they do not meet the criteria of the Bank that there be a reasonable assurance of repayment.

Subsection (b) restricts the repayment period on the credits to not longer than one year.

Subsection (c) terminates the authority to issue these guarantees and insurance on September 30, 1989.

Subsection (d) authorizes the use of such sums as may be necessary from Economic Support Funds for the payment of any default.

Subsection (e) requires that guarantees and insurance may be issued only in such amounts as provided in appropriations Acts, but not to exceed $300 million in fiscal year 1985.

Subsection (f) provides that any recoveries, after deduction for expenses, from the payment of guarantees and insurance shall be deposited in the Treasury.

Subsection (g) provides that the Export-Import Bank shall provide such administrative and technical assistance to the Agency for International Development as is necessary and appropriate to carry out this section. It is assumed that the Export-Import Bank will process applications and undertake the necessary review and evaluation of applications, and transmit the appropriate applications to AID only after the normal Export-Import review is completed and it is determined that there is no reasonable assurance of repayment.

SECTION 1013—ELECTIONS IN PANAMA

This section states the sense of the Congress that the United States should support, in the strongest terms possible, elections in Panama which are free, fair, and honest. It further states the sense of the Congress that if the upcoming elections are not held or if there is an attempt to tamper with the election results, the President should consider options to demonstrate to the Panamanian authorities the deep concern of the United States, including the option of whether it is in the interest of the United States to terminate military assistance to Panama.

SECTION 1014—RELATIONS BETWEEN BELIZE AND GUATEMALA

This section states the sense of the Congress that the United States should use its good offices and influence to encourage the Government of Guatemala to recognize the independence of Belize and to enter into a mutual nonaggression treaty with Belize.

SECTION 1015—EFFECTIVE DATE

This section provides that this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY COUNTRY

Country	Fiscal year 1984 [1]		Fiscal year 1985	
	Supplemental request	Recommendation	Executive request	Recommendation
Belize:				
MAP			0.5	0.5
IMET				1.1
Total, military			.6	.6
DA			6.0	6.0
ESF	10.0	10.0	4.0	4.0
Total aid	10.0	10.0	10.6	10.6
Costa Rica:				
MAP	7.85	7.85	9.8	9.8
IMET			.2	.2
Total, military	7.85	7.85	10.0	10.0
DA	8.0	8.0	20.0	20.0
ESF	60.0	60.0	160.0	160.0
Total aid	75.85	75.85	190.0	190.9
El Salvador:				
FMS credits			15.0	15.0
MAP	178.70		116.0	[2] 172.8
IMET			1.5	1.5
Total, military	178.70	0	132.5	189.3
DA	30.0	30.0	80.0	80.0
ESF	90.0	45.0	210.0	160.0
Total aid	298.7	75.0	422.5	429.3
Guatemala:				
FMS credits			10.0	10.0
IMET			.3	0
Total, military	0	0	10.3	10.0
DA	20.0	15.0	40.0	30.0
ESF			35.0	5.0
Total aid			85.3	45.0
Honduras:				
MAP	37.5	15.0	61.3	40.0
IMET			1.2	1.0
Total, military	37.5	15.0	62.5	41.0
DA	8.0	8.0	45.0	45.0
ESF	72.5	55.0	75.0	55.0
Total aid	117.0	78.0	182.5	141.0
Panama:				
FMS credits			5.0	5.0
MAP	10.0	10.0	14.4	14.4
IMET			.6	.6
Total, military	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0
DA	4.2	4.2	19.8	19.8
ESF	30.0	15.0	20.0	20.0
Total aid	44.2	29.2	59.8	59.8
Regional programs:				
DA	2.8	2.8	62.0	82.0
ESF	28.0	14.0	136.6	75.0
Total	30.8	16.8	198.6	157.0
Regional military training center (MAP)	25.0	0	20.0	0
Miscellaneous [3]	4.49	4.49	60.016	42.016
Reconstruction fund		250.0		

[1] Due to already existing and unused authorizations for fiscal year 1984, the supplemental request and the recommendations for each country are higher than the total amounts authorized in this bill.

[2] Under section 1003, up to $172,300,000 could be provided in fiscal year 1985 if additional approval were obtained in a joint resolution of approval pursuant to subsection (d) of that section.

[3] For fiscal year 1985, includes $17,000,000 of the $20,000,000 requested for USIA; $9,000,000 for the Peace Corps (the same as the Executive request); $6,016,000 for AID operating expenses (the same as the Executive request); and $10,000,000 for the Housing Guaranty program (the same as the Executive request).●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAY (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for this week, on account of official business.

Mr. LELAND (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for May 2 and 3, on account of official business.

Mr. RUSSO (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COATS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEMP, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 60 minutes, May 9.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AUCOIN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MRAZEK, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. LOWERY of California, immediately preceding the vote on the Bates amendment to H.R. 4275 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. FASCELL, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,576.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COATS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOLINARI.
Mr. LUJAN.
Mr. CORCORAN.
Mr. KEMP in three instances.
Mr. COUGHLIN.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. LENT.
Mr. WINN.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE in two instances.
Mr. GOODLING in two instances.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. FRANKLIN.
Mr. JEFFORDS.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. PURSELL.
Mr. MCDADE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DONNELLY.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Ms. MIKULSKI.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. WIRTH.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. TRAXLER.
Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
Mr. STOKES in two instances.
Mr. LEVINE of California.
Mr. LANTOS in three instances.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. DYSON.
Mr. MAVROULES.
Mr. DOWNEY of New York.
Mr. SIKORSKI.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. GORE.
Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Mr. OBERSTAR.
Mr. MRAZEK in two instances.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. SYNAR.
Mr. PANETTA.
Mr. HOWARD.
Ms. FERRARO.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. AUCOIN.
Mr. SHELBY.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. KOLTER.
Mrs. BYRON.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. BROWN of California.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2733. An act to extend and improve the existing program of research, development, and demonstration in the production and manufacture of guayule rubber, and to broaden such program to include other critical agricultural materials; and

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the

month of May 1984 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 7, 1984, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3275. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed plan to make changes to domestic spending programs, revenues and defense, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 98-213); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3276. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of certain strategic and critical materials from the national defense stockpile, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3277. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a) (92 Stat. 993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3278. A letter from the Director, Manpower Planning and Analysis, Department of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 1983 actuarial report on the military retirement system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3279. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the second annual report of accomplishments under the airport improvement program, pursuant to Public Law 97-248, section 521; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3280. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United Statees Code, to extend the authority of the Veterans' Administration to conduct certain health care programs, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Commitee on Veterans' Affairs.

3281. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission safety research program for fiscal year 1985, pursuant to AEA, section 29 (91 Stat. 1483); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 497. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5119, a bill to authorize international development and security assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-731). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5404. A bill allowing William R. Gianelli to continue to serve as a member of the Board of the Panama Canal Commission after his retirement as an officer of the Department of Defense. (Rept. No. 98-732). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 89. A bill to permit the transportation of passengers between Puerto Rico and other U.S. ports on foreign-flag vessels when U.S. flag service for such transportation is not available; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN of Florida:

H.R. 5575. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate any individual who, in association with the Nazi government of Germany or a government allied therewith, participated in the persecution of any person because of race, religion, national origin, or political opinion; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 5576. A bill to designate certain land and improvements of the National Institutes of Health as the "Mary Woodard Lasker Center for Health Research and Education"; considered and passed.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 5577. A bill to provide for direct consultations between the U.S. Government and the participants in the Contadora process in order to develop a common policy for promoting peace in Central America, and to provide for a temporary suspension of U.S. support for or participation in military and paramilitary activities in Central America in order to provide a favorable climate for the Contadora process; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. BORSKI:

H.R. 5578. A bill to provide for adjustment to permanent resident status of certain nationals of Poland in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 5579. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement, for research, development, test and evaluation, and for operation and maintenance for the military functions of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1984, to prescribe personnel strengths for that fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GORE (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WALGREN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. REID, Mr. SIMON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MCGRATH, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WINN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COURTER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EWEN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 5580. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize financial assistance for organ procurement organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 5581. A bill to amend the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank Act to authorize appropriations for the provision of financial assistance through fiscal year 1990 and to provide financial assistance to builders of highly energy efficient buildings, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 5582. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve the administration of the Federal energy conservation program for consumer products, to enhance consumer information programs to encourage the purchase of more energy efficient appliances, and to implement efficiency standards for furnaces, central air-conditioning, and water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 5583. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve consumer information and fuel efficiency with respect to passenger automobiles, light trucks, and tires, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on noncomplying manufacturers (in lieu of the

penalty), and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WISE, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. REID, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 5584. A bill to improve the preservation and management of Presidential records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FLORIO:

H.R. 5585. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CLAY and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 5586. A bill to establish a program to provide assistance to professional development resource centers for teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 5587. A bill to promote dairy marketing competition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 5588. A bill entitled, the "Bank Bribery and Fraud Act of 1984"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5589. A bill entitled, the "Federal Officials Protection Act of 1984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 5590. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to control certain sources of sulfur dioxides and nitrogen oxides to reduce acid deposition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 5591. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue new regulations pertaining to the routing of shipments of hazardous materials; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.R. 5592. A bill to authorize a program to demonstrate advanced coal production and utilization technologies for reducing air pollution from coal-burning electric powerplants, including emissions that may potentially be contributing to acid rain, and to demonstrate advanced coal combustion and conversion technologies; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. LLOYD (for herself, Mr. PRICE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. BEVILL):

H.R. 5593. A bill to authorize a program to demonstrate advanced coal production and utilization technologies for reducing air pollution from coal-burning electric powerplants, including emissions that may potentially be contributing to acid rain, and to demonstrate advanced coal combustion and conversion technologies; jointly, to the Committees on Science and Technology; Energy and Commerce; and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LUNGREN (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FISH, Mr. LOTT, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. MACK, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. RUDD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. LOWERY of California):

H.R. 5594. A bill to amend titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code with respect to bail, the exlusionary rule, habeas corpus, and capital punishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to protect the benefit levels of the individuals becoming eligible for benefits in or after 1979 by eliminating the disparity—resulting from changes made in 1977 in the benefit computation formula—between those levels and the benefits levels of persons who became eligible for benefits before 1979; and to remove the ceiling on the amount of an individual's income which can be taken into account in computing in his or her benefits and in determining his or her liability for social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. ECKART, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LELAND, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. REID, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BOSCO, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 5596. A bill to establish programs of assistance to States to promote educational programs for gifted and talented children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NIELSON of Utah:

H.R. 5597. A bill to provide for the conveyance of any right, title, or interest which the United States may have in certain real property in the State of Utah to the owners of the adjacent properties; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 5598. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to provide essential benefits to certain former spouses not eligible for any benefits under that act, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 5599. A bill to authorize and direct the Librarian of Congress, subject to the supervision and authority of a Federal civilian or military agency, to proceed with the construction of the Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 5600. A bill to revise and extend the programs of assistance under titles X and XX of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 5601. A bill to revise and extend the block grant program under title XIX of the Public Health Service Act for preventive health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 5602. A bill to amend titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend the programs of assistance for the training of health professions personnel, to revise and extend the National Health Service Corps program under that act, and to revise and extend the programs of assistance under that act for health maintenance organizations and migrant and community health centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

H.R. 5603. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the authorities of that act for assistance for alcohol and drug abuse and mental health services and to revise and extend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARCIA:

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of April 23-29, 1984, as "Good Grooming Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 296. Concurrent resolution authorizing use of the rotunda of the Capitol to honor the unknown American who lost his life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era and who has been selected to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BEDELL (for himself, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. STARK):

H. Con. Res. 297. Concurrent resolution urging the Soviet Union to return to the START and INF negotiations, calling discussions on eliminating the nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missiles, and proposing as an interim measure a mutual and verifiable moratorium on further deployment of those missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. CROCKETT):

H. Con. Res. 298. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to recent actions by the South African Government to rescind the Namibian Supreme Court's jurisdiction to hear an application for the release of prisoners held in the internment camp near Mariental, Namibia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 299. Concurrent resolution supporting self-determination for the people of Hong Kong; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Con. Res. 300. Concurrent resolution in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Brown* v. *Board of Education;* to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

384. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to amending the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 656: Mr. TORRES and Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 1249: Mr. BRYANT and Mr. BOSCO.

H.R. 1964: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1965: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 3832: Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 4090: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 4095: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 4105: Mr. HIGHTOWER and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 4393: Mr. CARPER and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4402: Mr. ZSCHAU.

H.R. 4404: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 4465: Mr. OWENS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 4475: Mr. DE LUGO, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MICA, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H.R. 4500: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 4571: Mr. DYSON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. REID.

H.R. 4599: Mr. SABO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MINISH, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. REID, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 4683: Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 4685: Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 4686: Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 4740: Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PATMAN, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4772: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DYSON, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 4876: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. TAUKE, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 4877: Mr. BREAUX.

H.R. 4905: Mr. SIMON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 4965: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. OTTINGER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 5023: Mr. GORE.

H.R. 5090: Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 5092: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. AKAKA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SABO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MINISH, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BATES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REID, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 5093: Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. CORCORAN, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 5098: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DYSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. MCKERNAN.

H.R. 5180: Mrs. BURTON of California and Mr. OTTINGER.

H.R. 5185: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. KRAMER.

H.R. 5240: Mr. REID, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 5256: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PATMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ECKART, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROCKETT, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. AUCOIN.

H.R. 5321 Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 5367: Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 5452: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 5457: Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.

H.R. 5486: Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5490: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LELAND, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONKER, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 5515: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BRITT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. DYSON, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. RAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. COURTER, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 5525: Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MICA, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 5534: Mr. DIXON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARNES, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.J. Res. 206: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. REID, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. VANDERGRIFF.

H.J. Res. 272: Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. RITTER, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 420: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BREAUX, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. RAY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 460: Mr. GUARINI.

H.J. Res. 476: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. KASICH.

H.J. Res. 484: Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. WISE, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. FERRARO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ECKART, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. CONTE.

H.J. Res. 497: Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.J. Res. 505: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SABO, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.J. Res. 526: Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BRITT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. TALLON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.J. Res. 539: Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.J. Res. 540: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.J. Res. 544: Mr. CORRADA, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRITT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SUNIA, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. WINN.

H.J. Res. 554: Mr. OLIN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. REID, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DAUB, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. COELHO, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HILLIS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BEVILL, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.J. Res. 558: Mr. REID, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WISE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BATES, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. EVANS of Illinois,

Mr. HOYER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ROE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MINETA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BRITT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. ROSE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. KINDNESS.

H. Con. Res. 236: Mr. BRYANT, Ms. FERRARO, and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H. Con. Res. 237: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BATES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. GRAY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H. Con. Res. 239: Mrs. JOHNSON.

H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. UDALL and Mr. WIRTH.

H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. LELAND, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. EARLY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. STUDDS.

H. Res. 395: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. MCHUGH.

H. Res. 450: Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LUNDINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. HOLT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BRITT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 953: Mr. CORCORAN.
H.R. 953: Mr. RICHARDSON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

356. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of New York, N.Y., relative to nuclear waste and other hazardous materials; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1510

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

—Page 20, line 14, after the first period insert the following new sentence: "The task force shall monitor, review, and investigate complaints of discrimination by an employer attributable to the operation of this section without regard to the size or composition of the employer's labor force and without regard to whether or not the employer is an employer for purposes of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.".

H.R. 5119

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (text of H.R. 5421).)

—Beginning on page 80, strike out line 1 and all that follows through the end of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE X—CENTRAL AMERICA

ADDITIONAL FISCAL YEAR 1985 AUTHORIZATIONS—CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 1001. (a)(1) In addition to amounts otherwise available, there are authorized to be appropriated $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and the aggregate ceiling on credits (or participations in credits) extended under that section for the fiscal year 1985 is hereby increased by $30,000,000.

(2) In addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out the following provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961:

(A) $222,000,000 to carry out chapter 2 of part II.

(B) $3,900,000 to carry out chapter 5 of part II.

(C) $640,600,000 to carry out chapter 4 of part II.

(3) Section 515(c)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting "El Salvador, Honduras," immediately before "Indonesia,".

(b)(1) In addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out the following provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961:

(A) $69,800,000 to carry out section 103.

(B) $15,000,000 to carry out section 104(b).

(C) $40,000,000 to carry out section 104(c).

(D) $64,000,000 to carry out section 105.

(E) $84,000,000 to carry out section 106.

(F) $6,016,000 to carry out section 667.

(G) $10,000,000 for purposes of the reserve fund established pursuant to section 223.

(2) The ceiling on the total principal amount of guarantees outstanding at any one time under title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is hereby increased by $40,000,000.

(c) In addition to amounts otherwise available, there are authorized to be appropriated $9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out the Peace Corps Act.

(d) In addition to amounts otherwise available, there are authorized to be appropriated $17,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 for the United States Information Agency to carry out international information, educational, cultural, and exchange programs for Central America under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1977, and other purposes authorized by law.

(e) Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATIONS—CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 1002. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise available, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated:

(1) To carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to Central America for the fiscal year 1984:

(A) $9,600,000 to carry out section 104(c).

(B) $5,000,000 to carry out section 105.

(C) $20,288,000 to carry out section 106.

(D) $119,750,000 to carry out chapter 4 of part II.

(E) $129,350,000 to carry out chapter 2 of part II.

(2) To carry out the purposes of the Peace Corps Act with respect to Central America $1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984.

(b) Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

CONDITIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND FINANCING FOR EL SALVADOR

SEC. 1003. (a) The President shall ensure that military assistance and financing are furnished to El Salvador in a manner which fosters demonstrated progress toward the political development, economic development, and security of that country. To this end, the President in every appropriate instance shall impose conditions (in addition to those specified in subsection (d) of this section) on the furnishing of military assistance and financing to El Salvador in order to achieve those goals, including the objectives described in subsection (c) of this section.

(b) Not later than August 31, 1984, and no later than January 31, 1985, the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a detailed report fully describing the policies of the Govenment of El Salvador for achieving political development, economic development, and conditions of security. This report shall also review comprehensively the factors contributing to the political, economic, and security situation in that country, including such factors as human rights, land reform, the economy of the country, refugees and displaced persons, the military situation, and guerrilla activity.

(c) The reports described in subsection (b) shall include the President's detailed assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the policies of the Government of El Salvador in protecting and advancing the human rights, and in particular the right to security of person, of all persons in El Salvador during the period covered by the report with respect to each of the following objectives:

(1) An end to the involvement in or support for acts of unlawful violence, secret detention, abduction, torture, and murder by members of military, security, or police force.

(2) The establishment of an effective judicial system, operating under fair and efficient procedures, in which those charged

with crimes are brought to timely justice and private disputes and grievances are resolved on the basis of respect for the rule of law, free from the taint of corruption and intimidation, and in particular, the taking of necessary measures to investigate, and prosecute those responsible for, the murders of the four American churchwomen, two labor advisers, and other American citizens.

(3) Effective freedom of the press and freedom of association, including the enforcement of measures against intimidation of the press and labor and peasant union members and leaders.

(4) Participation by the Government of El Salvador in a dialogue with all major parties to the conflict in El Salvador, in good faith and without preconditions, for the purpose of achieving an equitable political solution, based upon free and fair elections and conditions which will assure the physical security of all participants before, during, and after those elections.

(5) Compliance by the Government of El Salvador with applicable rules of international law governing the conduct of armed conflict, and in particular those humanitarian principles for the protection of noncombatants.

(6) Full implementation of the land reform program, including the taking of necessary measures against illegal evictions and the furnishing of necessary credits, administrative support, technical assistance, and services to beneficiaries.

(d) Military assistance and financing may be provided for El Salvador for the fiscal year 1985 only as follows:

(1) If the President determines and states in the first report required by this section that the Government of El Salvador has made demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in subsection (c), up to one-half of the aggregate amount of military assistance and financing approved by the Congress for El Salvador may be provided after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Congress receives that report.

(2) The remaining amounts of military assistance and financing approved by the Congress may be provided if the President determines and states in the second report required by this section that, since the first such report, the Government of El Salvador has made additional demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in subsection (c) unless, within 30 calendar days after receiving the second report, the Congress enacts a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress disagrees with the President's determination.

(e) As used in this section, the term "military assistance and financing" means any funds obligated for assistance under chapter 2 or chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and any foreign military sales financing provided under the Arms Export Control Act.

(f) It is the sense of the Congress that the total number of United States military advisers in El Salvador not exceed 55 unless the Congress is first consulted. For the purposes of this subsection, United States military advisers include all members of the United States Armed Forces performing training activities under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act, but do not include members of the Armed Forces who are in El Salvador solely for the purpose of performing medical training or services.

CENTRAL RESERVE BANK OF EL SALVADOR

SEC. 1004. Prior to disbursing any assistance to the Government of El Salvador under chapter 4 of Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for economic stabilization purposes, the President shall be satisfied that the Central Reserve Bank of El Salvador has implemented or has taken appropriate steps toward implementing the major recommendations, as defined below, contained in the study entitled "Foreign Exchange: Policy and Management within the Central Reserve Bank of El Salvador" relating to management, allocation, and controls on the use of official foreign exchange. For purposes of this section such major recommendations are as follows:

(1) Further development, refinement, and application of objective and impartial criteria and procedures for the allocation of foreign exchange in relation to the needs of the economy of El Salvador. This shall consist of:

(A) publishing periodic lists of those receiving foreign exchange;

(B) publicizing foreign exchange allocation criteria; and

(C) undertaking semi-annual audits by a United States public accounting firm to determine compliance with policy, criteria, and procedures.

(2) Adoption of measures to expedite the decision-process regarding allocation of foreign exchange in accordance with availabilities and established criteria. This shall consist of:

(A) taking steps to complete the mechanization of the foreign exchange allocation process; and

(B) refining the forecasting of foreign exchange availabilities to serve as a basis for foreign exchange approvals.

(3) Continued improvement in the capacity of the Central Reserve Bank's price verification unit to reduce the potential for over-valuation of imports and under-valuation of exports. This shall consist of:

(A) increasing the price verification unit staff to at least ten and enhancing it:

(B) having in place qualified technical assistance to support the operations of the price verification unit;

(C) having the unit regularly conduct statistically-significant random samples of all import transactions approved by the Bank; and

(D) implementing a policy to levy sanctions against those who over-value imports.

MILITARY EXERCISES

SEC. 1005. For the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, the President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate 30 days in advance of assigning or detailing members of the United States Armed Forces to, or otherwise introducing members of the United States Armed Forces into, any country in Central America for the purpose of commencing joint military exercises with the armed forces of any Central American country.

LIMITATIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR GUATEMALA

SEC. 1006. (a) For the fiscal years 1984 and 1985—

(1) funds may not be obligated for assistance for Guatemala under chapter 2 or 5 of Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and

(2) letters of offer may not be issued to and credits may not be extended and guaranties may not be issued for Guatemala under the Arms Export Control Act.

(b) The prohibitions contained in subsection (a) do not apply with respect to (1) sales of construction equipment and mobile medical facilities to assist in development programs that will directly assist the poor in Guatemala, (2) sales of training, to be provided outside of Guatemala, which is related to the sales described in clause (1), or (3) a total for both fiscal years 1984 and 1985 of no more than $10,000,000 in loans and loan guaranties under the Arms Export Control Act for sales described in clauses (1) and (2). The exceptions to the prohibition on military assistance and sales for Guatemala provided by this subsection are provided only to enable the military forces in that country to obtain equipment and training for civilian engineering and construction projects and mobile medical teams.

CENTRAL AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

SEC. 1007. (a) The Congress finds that participation by Central American countries in an effective forum for dialogue on, and the continuous review and advancement of, Central America's political, economic, and social development would foster cooperation between the United States and Central American countries.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should enter into negotiations with the countries of Central America to establish a Central American Development Organization; and

(2) the establishment of the Central American Development Organization should be based upon the following principles:

(A) Participation in the Organization should be open to the United States, other donors, and those Central American countries that commit themselves to, among other things, progress on human rights, building democracy, and encouraging equitable economic growth through policy reforms.

(B) The Organization should be structured to include representatives from both the public and private sectors, including representatives from the labor, agriculture, and business communities.

(C) The Organization should meet periodically to carry out the functions described in subparagraphs (D) and (E) of this paragraph and should be supported by a limited professional secretariat.

(D) The Organization should make recommendations affecting Central American countries on such matters as—

(i) political, economic, and social development objectives, including the strengthening of democratic pluralism and the safeguarding of human rights;

(ii) mobilization of resources and external assistance needs; and

(iii) reform of economic policies and structures.

(E) The Organization should have the capacity for monitoring country performance on the recommendations issued in accordance with subparagraph (D) of this paragraph and for evaluating progress towards meeting such country objectives.

(F) For each fiscal year after that in which the President has completed negotiations and agreed to participate in the Organization, the disbursement of 25 percent of the economic assistance funds authorized by this title and allocated by the United States directly for each Central American country should be deferred until the United States and the Organization have both approved disbursement.

(G) The President should encourage other donors similarly to designate a percentage of their direct economic assistance for Central American countries for joint approval with the Organization.

(H) The administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or his designee, should be chairman of the Organization and should carry out his functions in that capacity under the continuous supervision and general direction of the Secretary of State.

(c) Subject to subsection (d)(3), the President is authorized to participate in the Central American Development Organization.

(d)(1) The Administrator of the Agency for International Development, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of State, shall prepare a detailed proposal to carry out this section and shall keep the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate fully and currently informed concerning the development of the proposal.

(2) To facilitate full congressional involvement in the establishment of Central American Development Organization, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall designate at least three members of that committee, and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall designate at least three members of that committee, who shall be kept fully and currently informed by the executive branch of all negotiations or discussions with donor countries and recipient countries concerning the establishment of that Organization.

(3) The President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a copy of the text of any agreement which he proposes to sign providing for the establishment of and United States participation in the Central American Development Organization no less than 60 days prior to his signature. The United States shall not participate in the implementation of any such agreement for at least 60 days after such transmittal. During that 60-day period there shall be full and formal consultations with and review by those committees in accordance with procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications pursuant to section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

LAND REFORM PROGRAMS

SEC. 1008. Section 620(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "This prohibition shall not apply to monetary assistance made available for use by a government or political subdivision or agency of such government to compensate nationals of that country in accordance with a land reform program, if the President determines that monetary assistance for such land reform program will further the national interests of the United States."

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SEC. 1009. Chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 202 and 804 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 538. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.—(a) The President may furnish assistance under this chapter to countries and organizations, including national and regional institutions, in order to strengthen the administration of justice in Central American countries and the countries of the Caribbean. Assistance under this section may only include support for specialized professional training, scholarships, and exchanges for continuing legal education; programs to enhance prosecutorial and judicial capabilities (including judicial investigations and protection for participants in judicial cases); strengthening professional organizations in order to promote services to members and the role of the bar in judicial selection, enforcement of ethical standards, and legal reform; increasing the availability of legal materials and publications; seminars, conferences, and training and educational programs to improve the administration of justice and to strengthen respect for the rule of law and human rights; and revision and modernization of legal codes and procedures.

"(b) Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds made available to carry out this chapter for any fiscal year shall be available to carry out this section, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes. The President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not less than fifteen days in advance of obligating funds for programs or activities authorized by this section which were previously subject to section 660 of this Act."

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

SEC. 1010. It is the sense of the Congress that funds appropriated for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 under section 103(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 should be used for a comprehensive rural electrification program in Central America in order to establish conditions of stability and a foundation for economic development.

TRADE CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 1011. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 224. TRADE CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAM.—(a) In order to enable the Export-Import Bank of the United States (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Bank") to determine that there exists reasonable assurance of repayment as required under section 2(b)(1)(B) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Agency") is authorized to provide guarantees to the Bank for liabilities to be incurred by the Bank in connection with guarantees or insurance provided under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 for financing for transactions involving the export of goods and services for the use of the private sector in Central American countries.

"(b)(1) Guarantees provided by the Agency pursuant to the authority of subsection (a) shall be for short-term guarantees and insurance extended by the Bank which shall be repayable within a period not to exceed one year from the date of arrival at the port of importation of the goods and services covered by such guarantees or insurance. Guarantees or insurance extended by the Bank and guaranteed by the Agency pursuant to subsection (a) shall be provided by the Bank in accordance with criteria and procedures agreed to by the Agency and the Bank. Such agreement shall also provide for the establishment of a reserve fund by the Agency, with such funds made available to the reserve as the Agency deems necessary to discharge liabilities under guarantees provided by the Agency pursuant to subsection (a).

"(2) The administrator of such agency shall transmit a copy of such agreement to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

"(c) The Agency shall not enter into any commitments to guarantee under subsection (a) after September 30, 1989.

"(d) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for chapter 4 of Part II of this Act, there are authorized to be made available such sums as may be deemed necessary by the Agency to discharge liabilities under guarantees entered into under subsection (a).

"(e) Commitments to guarantee under subsection (a) are authorized only to the extent and in the amounts provided in appropriations Acts, not to exceed $300,000,000 in the fiscal year 1985.

"(f) To the extent that any of the funds made available pursuant to subsection (d) are paid out for a claim arising out of liabilities guaranteed under subsection (a), amounts received after the date of such payment, with respect to such claim, shall be credited to the reserve fund referred to in subsection (b), shall be merged with the funds in such reserve, and shall be available for the purpose of payments by the Agency to the Bank for guarantees under subsection (a).

"(g) Beginning on a date six months after the date of enactment of this section, and at intervals of six months thereafter, the administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act and the President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the amount and extension of credits during the preceding six-month period.

"(h) The Export-Import Bank shall provide without reimbursement such administrative and technical assistance to the Agency as the Bank and the Agency deem appropriate to assist the Agency in carrying out this section.".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 1012. This title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. STUDDS:

Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (text of H.R. 5421).

—Page 80, line 15, strike out "$199,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$180,700,000".

Page 84, line 7, strike out "during" and insert in lieu thereof "prior to the end of"; and beginning in line 11, strike out "since the report was submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) of this section, has made additional" and insert in lieu thereof "has made".

Page 87, beginning in line 1, strike out "$64,800,000 of military assistance and financing, and up to"; line 3, strike out the comma; line 9, strike out "an additional $124,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$132,500,000"; and begining at the end of line 17, strike out ", since the first report was submitted, has made additional" and insert in lieu thereof "has made".

H.R. 5167

By Mr. DELLUMS:

—Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985.

PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985 at levels consistent with a strong national defense and a sound national economy;

(2) to minimize the risk of nuclear confrontations;

(3) to eliminate areas of waste and abuse in the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985;

(4) to provide for improved military personnel policies designed to enhance readiness and morale; and

(5) to make other improvements in the management of the Department of Defense.

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons and tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, and for other procurement for the Army as follows:

For aircraft, $2,214,800,000.

For missiles, $909,200,000.

For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $1,308,700,000.

For ammunition, $1,876,400,000.

For other procurement, $4,823,800,000

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 102. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), naval vessels, and for other procurement for the Navy and Marine Corps as follows:

For aircraft, $6,137,600,000

For weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), $2,702,200,000

For naval vessels, $1,807,000,000

For other procurement, $4,805,600,000

For procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons), $1,711,200,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force as follows:

For aircraft, $11,032,100,000

For missiles, $4,207,400,000

For other procurement, $7,597,500,000

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement by defense agencies in the amount of $729,000,00

LIMITATION ON ARMY PROCUREMENT

SEC. 105. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be obligated or expended for the Pershing II missile program.

LIMITATIONS ON NAVY PROCUREMENT

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be obligated or expended for the sea-launched cruise missile program.

LIMITATIONS ON AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be obligated or expended for the MX missile program, the ground-launched cruise missile program, for the B-1B bomber program, or for antisatellite weapons.

PROHIBITION OF ACQUISITION OF BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS

SEC. 108. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 101 may be obligated or expended to purchase binary chemical weapons.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $4,074,600,000.

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $6,190,800,000.

For the Air Force, $11,312,300,000.

For the Defense Agencies, $3,458,000,000.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 such additional sums as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR THE ARMY

SEC. 202. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 201 may be obligated or expended for the Pershing II missile program or the ballistic missile defense program.

LIMITATIONS ON FUNDS FOR THE NAVY

SEC. 203. None of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 201 for the Navy may be used for the Trident II missile program or for the sea-launched cruise missile program.

LIMITATIONS ON FUNDS FOR THE AIR FORCE

SEC. 204. None of the amount appropriate pursuant to the authorization in section 201 for the Air Force may be used for the MX missile program, the ground-launched cruise missile program, for the B-1B bomber program or for antisatellite weapons.

LIMITATIONS ON FUNDS FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 205. None of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 201 for the Defense Agencies may be used for antisatellite weapons.

PROHIBITION OF DEVELOPMENT OF BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS

SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 201 may be obligated or expended for research, development, test, or evaluation of binary chemical weapons.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fisal year 1985 for the military functions of the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance in the amount of $70,366,000,000.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 such additional sums as may be necessary—

(1) for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employes of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in such subsection;

(2) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs; and

(3) for increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a).

ELIMINATION OF NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

SEC. 302. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 301 may be obligated or expended of the National Board for the Promoton of Rifle Practice.

TITLE IV—PERSONNEL

PART A—ACTIVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS

SEC. 401. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1985, as follows:

(1) The Army, 751,300.

(2) The Navy, 541,050.

(3) The Marine Corps, 192,500.

(4) The Air Force, 565,800.

PART B—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF AVERAGE STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 402. (a) For fiscal year 1985 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programed to attain average strengths of not less than the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 398,010.

(2) The Army Reserve, 351,850.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 94,000.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 38,540.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 100,100.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 63,736.

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 10,700.

(b) The average strength prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such components who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR MEMBERS ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

SEC. 403. (a) Within the average strengths prescribed in section 402, the reserve components of the Armed Forces and the National Guard are authorized, as of September 30, 1985, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or, in the case of members of the National Guard, full-time National Guard duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components or the National Guard:

(1) The Army National Guard and the Army National Guard of the United States, 19,750.

(2) The Army Reserve, 10,700.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 11,680.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 975.

(5) The Air National Guard and the Air National Guard of the United States, 6,815.
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 545.

PART C—MILITARY TRAINING

AUTHORIZATION OF MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 404. (a) For fiscal year 1985, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as follows:
(1) The Army, 57,990.
(2) The Navy, 65,130.
(3) The Marine Corps, 18,300.
(4) The Air Force, 46,300.
(5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 7,500.
(6) The Army Reserve, 8,500.
(7) The Naval Reserve, 1,050.
(8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,840.
(9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 2,380.
(10) The Air Force Reserve, 1,405.

TITLE V—PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

WAIVER OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL CEILING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985

SEC. 501. The provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1985 or with respect to the appropriation of funds for that year.

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 502. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force shall provide that of all persons originally enlisting in the Regular Air Force during the period beginning on October 1, 1985, and ending on September 30, 1988—
(1) not less than 19 percent of those enlisting during fiscal year 1986 shall be women;
(2) not less than 22 percent of those enlisting during fiscal year 1987 shall be women; and
(3) not less than 25 percent of those enlisting during fiscal year 1988 shall be women.

(b)(1) Chapter 7 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 179. Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services

"(a) There is in the Department of Defense an advisory committee known as the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'committee').

"(b)(1) The committee shall be composed of 30 members appointed by the Secretary of Defense from persons who are not members of the armed forces on active duty or in an active status and who are particularly qualified by training, education, or experience for service on the committee. In selecting members of the committee, the Secretary shall ensure that the membership of the committee is fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed by the committee and that there is broad geographic diversity among the membership of the committee.

"(2) Members shall serve for a term of three years, except that a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the end of a term shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

"(3) The chairman of the committee shall be designated by the Secretary of Defense.

"(c) The committee shall provide the Secretary of Defense with advice on matters relating to service of women in the armed forces and shall recommend measures to ensure effective use of the capabilities of women in the armed forces. The committee shall consider all aspects of military service as it relates to women, including recruitment, training, categories of assignment, housing, health, and morale and general welfare.

"(d)(1) The committee shall meet not less often than twice a year at the invitation of the Secretary.

"(2) The Secretary shall supply such staff assistance, facilities, and other administrative support as is necessary for the performance of the committee's functions.

"(3) Members of the committee shall serve without compensation but may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5.

"(e)(1) The committee shall submit an annual report on its activities to the Secretary. The Secretary shall transmit a copy of each such report, together with any comments of the Secretary on the report, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(2) The committee shall continue in existence until terminated by law.".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"179. Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services.".

(3) Each individual serving on the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services as constituted on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to serve on the committee as constituted under the amendment made by paragraph (1) in accordance with the appointment of such individual.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall study the propensity of young women to serve in the military and shall submit a report to Congress with the Secretary's review and analysis of that propensity not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION MATTERS

MILITARY PAY RAISE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985

SEC. 601. (a) Any adjustment required by section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, in elements of the compensation of members of the uniformed services to become effective during fiscal year 1985 shall not be made.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services and the rates of monthly cadet pay and midshipman pay under section 203(c)(1) of title 37, United States Code, are increased by 3.5 percent effective on January 1, 1985.

(2) The increase in rates of basic pay provided for in paragraph (1) shall not apply to the rate of basic pay for pay grade E-1.

TITLE VII—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

NEW EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 701. (a)(1) Title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting before chapter 31 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 30 — ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

"Subchapter I—Purposes; Definitions

"Sec.
"1401. Purposes.
"1402. Definitions.

"Subchapter II—Basic Educational Assistance

"1411. Basic educational assistance entitlement for service on active duty.
"1412. Basic educational assistance entitlement for service in the Selected Reserve.
"1413. Duration of basic educational assistance.
"1414. Payment of basic educational assistance.
"1415. Amount of basic educational assistance.
"1416. Inservice enrollment in a program of education.

"Subchapter III—Supplemental Educational Assistance

"1421. Supplemental educational assistance for additional service.
"1422. Amount of supplemental educational assistance.
"1423. Payment of supplemental educational assistance under this chapter.

"Subchapter IV—Authority To Allow Transfer of Entitlement to Defendents

"1431. Authority to allow members of the Armed Forces with critical specialties to transfer entitlement to dependents.
"1432. Regulations.
"1433. Status of dependents to whom entitlement is transferred.
"1434. Definition.

"Subchapter V—Time Limitation for Use of Eligibility and Entitlement; General and Administrative Provisions

"1441. Time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement.
"1442. Limitation on educational assistance for certain individuals.
"1443. Bar to duplication of educational assistance benefits.
"1444. Program administration.
"1445. Allocation of administration and of program costs.
"1446. Reporting requirement.

"Subchapter I—Purposes; Definitions

"§ 1401. Purposes

"The purposes of this chapter are—
"(1) to provide a new educational assistance program to assist in the readjustment of members of the Armed Forces to civilian life after their separation from military service;
"(2) to promote and assist the All-Volunteer Force program and the Total Force Concept of the Armed Forces by establishing a new program of educational assistance based upon service on active duty or a combination of service on active duty and in the Selected Reserve (including the National Guard) to aid in the recruitment and retention of highly qualified personnel for both the active and reserve components of the Armed Forces; and
"(3) to give special emphasis to providing educational assistance benefits to aid in the retention of personnel in the Armed Forces.

"§ 1402. Definitions

"For the purposes of this chapter—
"(1) The term 'basic educational assistance' means educational assistance provided under subchapter II of this chapter.
"(2) The term 'supplemental educational assistance' means educational assistance provided under subchapter III of this chapter.
"(3) The term 'program of education' has the meaning given such term in section 1652(b) of this title.
"(4) The term 'Selected Reserve' means the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of any of the reserve components (including the Army National Guard of the United

States and the Air National Guard of the United States) of the Armed Forces, as required to be maintained under section 268(b) of title 10.

"(5) The term 'Secretary concerned' means the Secretary of Defense with respect to members of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of a military department and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

"(6) The term 'active duty' does not include any period during which an individual (A) was assigned full time by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, (B) served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or (C) served under the provisions of section 511(d) of title 10 pursuant to an enlistment in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, or as a Reserve for service in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve.

"Subchapter II—Basic Educational Assistance

"§ 1411. Basic educational assistance entitlement for service on active duty

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, each individual who—

"(1) after September 30, 1984—

"(A) serves at least three years of continuous active duty in the Armed Forces; or

"(B) serves in the Armed Forces and (notwithstanding section 3103A of this title) is discharged or released from active duty for a service-connected disability, for hardship, or, in the case of an individual who completed not less than 30 months of active duty, for the convenience of the Government;

"(2) before completion of the service described in clause (1) of this section, has received a secondary school diploma (or an equivalency certificate); and

"(3) after completion of the service described in clause (1) of this section—

"(A) is discharged from service with an honorable discharge, is placed on the retired list, is transferred to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, or is placed on the temporary disability retired list;

"(B) continues on active duty; or

"(C) is released from active duty for further service in a reserve component of the Armed Forces after service on active duty characterized by the Secretary concerned as honorable service;

is entitled to basic educational assistance under this chapter.

"(b) An individual who receives a commission as an officer in the Armed Forces upon graduation from the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, or the Coast Guard Academy or upon completion of a program of educational assistance under section 2107 of title 10 is not eligible for educational assistance under this section.

§ 1412. Basic educational assistance entitlement for service in the Selected Reserve

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (c), each individual who—

"(1) after September 30, 1984—

"(A) serves at least two years of continuous active duty in the Armed Forces characterized by the Secretary concerned as honorable service; and

"(B) subject to subsection (b) of this section and after completion of the service on active duty described in clause (A) of this paragraph, serves at least four years of continuous duty in the Selected Reserve during which the individual participates satisfactorily in training as required by the Secretary concerned;

"(2) before completion of the service described in clause (1) of this section, has received a secondary school diploma (or an equivalency certificate); and

"(3) after completion of the service described in clause (1) of this section—

"(A) is discharged from service with an honorable discharge, is placed on the retired list, or is transferred to the Standby Reserve or an element of the Ready Reserve other than the Selected Reserve after service in the Selected Reserve characterized by the Secretary concerned as honorable service; or

"(B) continues on active duty or in the Selected Reserve;

is entitled to basic educational assistance under this chapter.

"(b)(1) The requirement of four years of service under clause (1)(B) of subsection (a) of this section is not applicable to an individual who is discharged or released from service in the Selected Reserve for a service-connected disability, for hardship, or (in the case of an individual discharged or released after three and one-half years of service) for the convenience of the Government.

"(2) Continuity of service of a member in the Selected Reserve for purposes of such clause shall not be considered to be broken—

"(A) by any period of time (not to exceed a maximum period prescribed by the Secretary concerned by regulation) during which the member is not able to locate a unit of the Selected Reserve of his Armed Force that he is eligible to join or that has a vacancy; or

"(B) by any other period of time (not to exceed a maximum period prescribed by the Secretary concerned by regulation) during which the member is not attached to a unit of the Selected Reserve that the Secretary concerned, pursuant to regulations, considers to be inappropriate to consider for such purpose.

"(c) An individual who receives a commission as an officer in the Armed Forces upon graduation from the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, or the Coast Guard Academy or upon completion of a program of educational assistance under section 2107 of title 10 is not eligible for educational assistance under this section.

"§ 1413. Duration of basic educational assistance

"(a) Subject to section 1795 of this title and subsection (b) of this section, each individual entitled to basic educational assistance under this chapter is entitled to (1) one month of educational assistance benefits under this chapter for each month of active duty served by such individual, and (2) one month of educational assistance benefits under this chapter for each four months served by such individual in the Selected Reserve (other than any month in which the individual served on active duty).

"(b) No individual may receive basic educational assistance benefits under this chapter for a period in excess of 36 months (or the equivalent thereof in part-time educational assistance).

"§ 1414. Payment of basic educational assistance

"The Administrator shall pay to each individual entitled to basic educational assistance who is pursuing an approved program of education a basic educational assistance allowance to help meet, in part, the expenses of such individual's subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, equipment, and other educational costs.

"§ 1415. Amount of basic educational assistance

"(a) Subject to section 1442 of this title and except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section a basic educational assistance allowance under this subchapter shall be paid—

"(1) at the monthly rate of $300 for an approved program of education pursued on a full-time basis; or

"(2) at an appropriately reduced rate, as determined under regulations which the Administrator shall prescribe, for an approved program of education pursued on less than a full-time basis.

"(b) In the case of an individual who has a skill or specialty designated by the Secretary concerned as a skill or specialty in which there is a critical shortage of personnel or for which it is difficult to recruit, the Secretary concerned, pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, may increase the rate of the basic educational assistance allowance applicable to such individual to such rate in excess of the rate prescribed under subsection (a) of this section as the Secretary considers appropriate, but any such increase may not exceed $400 per month.

"§ 1416. Inservice enrollment in a program of education

"A member of the Armed Forces who has completed at least two years of service on active duty after September 30, 1984, has continued on active duty or in the Selected Reserve without a break in service (except as described in section 1412(b)(2) of this title), and who but for section 1411(a)(1) or 1412(a)(1) of this title would be eligible for basic educational assistance may receive educational assistance under this chapter for enrollment in an approved program of education while continuing to perform the duty described in section 1411(a)(1) or 1412(a)(1) of this title.

"Subchapter III—Supplemental Educational Assistance

"§ 1421. Supplemental educational assistance for additional service

"(a) The Secretary concerned may be regulation provide for the payment of supplemental educational assistance under this subchapter to any individual eligible for basic educational assistance under section 1411 of this title who—

"(1) serves five or more consecutive years of active duty in the Armed Forces in addition to the years of active duty counted under section 1411(a)(1) of this title without a break in such service; and

"(2) after completion of the service described in clause (1) of this subsection—

"(A) is discharged from service with an honorable discharge, is placed on the retired list, is transferred to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, or is placed on the temporary disability retired list;

"(B) continues on active duty without a break in service; or

"(C) is released from active duty for further service in a reserve component of the Armed Forces after service on active duty characterized by the Secretary concerned as honorable service.

"(b) The Secretary concerned may by regulation provide for the payment of supplemental educational assistance under this subchapter to any individual eligible for basic educational assistance under section 1412 of this title who—

"(1) serves two or more consecutive years of active duty in the Armed Forces in addition to the years of active duty counted

under section 1412(a)(1) of this title and four or more consecutive years of duty in the Selected Reserve in addition to the years of duty in the Selected Reserve counted under such section without a break in service; and

"(2) after completion of the service described in clause (1) of this subsection—

"(A) is discharged from service with an honorable discharge, is placed on the retired list, is transferred to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, or is placed on the temporary disability retired list; or

"(B) continues on active duty or in the Selected Reserve.

"(c) Continuity of service of a member in the Selected Reserve for purposes of subsection (b)(1) of this section shall not be considered to be broken—

"(1) by any period of time (not to exceed a maximum period prescribed by the Secretary concerned by regulation) during which the member is not able to locate a unit of the Selected Reserve of his Armed Force that he is eligible to join or that has a vacancy; or

"(2) by any other period of time (not to exceed a maximum period prescribed by the Secretary concerned by regulation) during which the member is not attached to a unit of the Selected Reserve that the Secretary concerned, pursuant to regulations, considers to be inappropriate to consider for such purpose.

"(d) A period of active duty or duty in the Selected Reserve that occurs before the period of duty by which the individual concerned qualifies for basic educational assistance may not be counted for purposes of this section.

"§ 1422. Amount of supplemental educational assistance

"(a) Subject to section 1442 of this title and except as otherwise provided under subsection (b) of this section, supplemental educational assistance under section 1421 of this title shall be paid—

"(1) at a monthly rate of $300 for an approved program of education pursued on a full-time basis; or

"(2) at an appropriately reduced rate, as determined under regulations which the Administrator shall prescribe, for an approved program of education pursued on less than a full-time basis.

"(b) In the case of a member of the Armed Forces for whom the Secretary concerned has provided for the payment of supplemental educational assistance who has a skill or specialty designated by the Secretary concerned as a skill or specialty in which there is a critical shortage of personnel, the Secretary concerned, pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, may increase the rate of the supplemental educational assistance allowance applicable to such individual to such rate in excess of the rate prescribed under subsection (a) of this section as the Secretary considers appropriate, but any such increase may not exceed $300 per month.

"§ 1423. Payment of supplemental educational assistance under this subchapter

"The Administrator shall increase the monthly basic educational assistance allowance paid to an individual who is entitled to supplemental educational assistance under this subchapter by the monthly amount of the supplemental educational assistance to which the individual is entitled.

Subchapter IV—Transfer of Entitlement to Dependents

"§ 1431. Authority to authorize members of the Armed Forces with critical specialties to transfer entitlement to dependents

"(a) Under regulations prescribed under section 1432(a) of this title, the Secretary concerned may authorize a member of an Armed Force who—

"(1) has served 10 or more continuous years on active duty;

"(2) has a skill or specialty designated by the Secretary concerned as a skill or specialty in which there is a critical shortage of personnel; and

"(3) is entitled to basic educational assistance,

to transfer to one or more of such member's dependents all or any part of such member's entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter.

"(b) Subject to regulations prescribed under section 1432(b) of this title, a transfer of entitlement under this section, once authorized, may be made at any time and may be revoked, in whole or in part, or may be modified at any time.

"§ 1432. Regulations

"(a) The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations for the establishment of eligibility of members to transfer entitlement under this subchapter, and any transfer of entitlement under this subchapter shall be made in accordance with such regulations. In prescribing such regulations, the Secretary of Defense—

"(1) shall designate the skills or specialties in which there is a critical shortage of personnel which qualify a member for consideration for authorization to transfer entitlement under this section; and

"(2) shall establish such other terms and conditions for authorization to transfer entitlement as the Secretary considers appropriate considering the needs of the service.

"(b) The Administrator shall prescribe regulations for the administration of the transfer of educational assistance entitlement under this subchapter by members authorized under the regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to be eligible to make such a transfer and for the provision of such assistance to the dependents to whom such entitlement is transferred. In prescribing such regulations, the Administrator may place such limits upon the changing and revoking of transfers of entitlement as the Administrator considers necessary for efficient administration and may provide for any such revocation to be effective at the end of any semester, quarter, or other unit of instruction in which a dependent to whom entitlement had been transferred is engaged in at the time of the revocation.

"§ 1433. Status of dependents to whom entitlement is transferred

"(a)(1) A dependent to whom entitlement is transferred under this subchapter is entitled to educational assistance under this chapter in the same manner and under the same terms and conditions as the individual from whom the entitlement was transferred would be entitled, except that such assistance may only be provided while the individual from whom the entitlement was transferred continues on active duty or upon the death, discharge for hardship or service-connected disability, or completion of 20 years of active duty by the individual.

"(2) The period of eligibility of a child to whom educational assistance is transferred under this subchapter shall be determined in accordance with section 1712(a) of this title.

"(b) If an individual transfers entitlement under this section to two or more dependents, the educational assistance payable under this chapter shall be divided (1) in such manner as the individual specifies, or (2) if the individual is deceased or is otherwise unable to specify the manner in which the assistance shall be divided, as determined under regulations prescribed under section 1432 of this title.

"(c) Assistance may not be paid under this chapter to an individual who at the time the benefits would otherwise be paid is not a child or spouse or surviving spouse of the individual who transferred the benefits, notwithstanding that the individual was a dependent at the time the election was made to transfer the benefits.

"§ 1434. Definition

"For the purposes of this subchapter, the term 'dependent' means—

"(1) a child of an individual; and

"(2) the spouse or surviving spouse of an individual.

"Subchapter V—Time Limitation for Use of Eligibility and Entitlement; General and Administrative Provisions

"§ 1441. Time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement

"(a) Except as provided in subsections (c) through (e) of this section, the period during which an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter may use such individual's entitlement expires at the end of the 10-year period beginning on (1) the date of such individual's last discharge or release from active duty, or, (2) the date of the accrual of such entitlement, whichever is later.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, the period during which a dependent with entitlement transferred under section 1431 of this title may use such entitlement expires at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the earlier of—

"(1) the date on which the dependent begins to use such entitlement; or

"(2) the same date that applies to the individual from whom the entitlement was transferred.

"(c) In the case of any eligible individual who has been prevented, as determined by the Administrator, from pursuing a program of education under subchapter II or III of this chapter within the 10-year period prescribed by subsection (a) of this section because such individual had not met the nature of discharge requirement of such subchapter before (1) the nature of such discharge or release was changed by appropriate authority, or (2) with respect to educational assistance under subchapter II of this chapter, the Administrator determined, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, that such discharge or release was under conditions described in section 1411(a)(3) or 1412(a)(3) of this title, such 10-year period shall not run during the period of time that such individual was so prevented from pursuing such program of education.

"(d) In the case of an individual eligible for educational assistance under the provisions of this chapter who, after such individual's last discharge or release from active duty, was detained by a foreign government or power, the 10-year period described in subsection (a) of this section shall not run (1) while such individual is so detained, or (2) during any period immediately following such individual's release from such detention during which such individual is hospitalized at a military, civilian, or Veterans' Administration medical facility.

"(e) In the case of an individual eligible for educational assistance under this chapter (including a dependent to whom entitlement under this chapter has been transferred pursuant to section 1431 of this title)—

"(1) who was prevented from pursuing such individual's chosen program of education before the expiration of the 10-year period for use of entitlement under this chapter otherwise applicable under this section because of a physical or mental disability which was not the result of the individual's own willful misconduct, and

"(2) who applies for an extension of such 10-year period within one year after (A) the last day of such period, or (B) the last day on which such individual was so prevented from pursuing such program, whichever is later,

such 10-year period shall not run with respect to such individual during the period of time that such individual was so prevented from pursuing such program and such 10-year period will again begin running on the first day following such individuals recovery from such disability on which it is reasonably feasible, as determined under regulations which the Administrator shall prescribe, for such individual to initiate or resume pursuit of a program of education with educational assistance under this chapter.

"(f)(1) If an individual eligible for educational assistance under this chapter (including an individual to whom entitlement has been transferred) is enrolled under this chapter in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system and the period of such individual's entitlement under this chapter would, under this section, expire during a quarter or semester, such period shall be extended to the end of such quarter or semester.

"(2) If an individual eligible for educational assistance under this chapter (including an individual to whom entitlement has been transferred) is enrolled under this chapter in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system and the period of such individual's entitlement under this chapter would, under this section, expire after a major of the course is completed, such period shall be extended to the end of the course or for 12 weeks, whichever is the lesser period of extension.

"§ 1442. Limitation on educational assistance for certain individuals

"(a) In the case of an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter (including an individual to whom such entitlement has been transferred) who is pursuing a program of education—

"(1) while on active duty; or

"(2) on less than a half-time basis,

the amount of the monthly educational assistance allowance payable to such individual under this chapter is the amount determined under subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The amount of the educational assistance allowance payable to an individual described in subsection (a) of this section is the lesser of (1) the amount of the educational assistance allowance otherwise payable to such individual under this chapter, or (2) the established charges for tuition and fees that the educational institution involved requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same program to pay.

"§ 1443. Bar to duplication of educational assistance benefits

"(a) An individual entitled to educational assistance under a program established by this chapter (including an individual to whom such entitlement has been transferred) who is also eligible for educational assistance under a program under chapter 31, 32, 34, or 35 of this title or under chapter 106 or 107 of title 10 may not receive assistance under both programs concurrently but shall elect (in such form and manner as the Administrator may prescribe) under which program to receive educational assistance.

"(b) A period of service counted for purposes of repayment under section 902 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1981 (10 U.S.C. 2141 note), of an education loan may not also be counted for purposes of entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter.

"§ 1444. Program administration

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the provisions of sections 1663, 1670, 1671, 1673, 1674, 1676, 1682(g), and 1683 of this title and the provisions of subchapters I and II of chapter 36 of this title (with the exception of sections 1777, 1780(a)(5), 1780(b), 1786, 1787, and 1792 of such chapter) shall be applicable to the provision of educational assistance under this chapter. The term 'eligible veteran', as used in those provisions, shall be deemed to include an individual who is eligible for educational assistance under this chapter.

"(b) An educational assistance allowance for any period may not be paid to an individual enrolled in or pursuing a program of education under this chapter until the Administrator has received—

"(1) from such individual a certification as to such individual's actual attendance during such period; and

"(2) from the educational institution a certification, or an endorsement of the individual's certificate, that such individual was enrolled in and pursuing a program of education during such period.

"(c) Regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense under this chapter shall be uniform for the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of a military department.

"§ 1445. Allocation of administration and of program costs

"(a) Except to the extent otherwise specifically provided in this chapter, the educational assistance programs established by this chapter shall be administered by the Veterans' Administration.

"(b)(1) Except to the extent provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, payments for entitlement earned under subchapter II of this chapter shall be made from appropriations made to the Veterans' Administration.

"(2) Payments for entitlement earned under subchapter II of this chapter which is used by an individual to whom such entitlement was transferred under subchapter IV of this chapter, or which is used by the individual earning such entitlement after an election under such subchapter to transfer such entitlement which was subsequently revoked, shall be made from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund established under section 2006 of title 10 or from appropriations made to the Department of Transportation, as appropriate.

"(3) Payments for entitlement earned under subchapter II of this chapter that is established under section 1415(b) of this title at a rate in excess of the rate prescribed under section 1415(a) of this title shall, to the extent of that excess, be made from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund established under section 2006 of title 10 or from appropriations made to the Department of Transportation, as appropriate.

"(c) Payments for educational assistance provided under subchapter III of this chapter (whether used by the individual to whom the right to the assistance was provided by the Secretary concerned or by an individual to whom that right was transferred under subchapter IV of this chapter) shall be made from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund established under section 2006 of title 10 or from appropriations made to the Department of Transportation, as appropriate.

"(d) Funds for the payment by the Administrator of benefits under this chapter that are to be paid from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration from such Fund as necessary and in accordance with agreements entered into under section 2006 of title 10 by the Administrator, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury. Funds for the payment by the Administrator of benefits under this chapter that are to be paid from appropriations made to the Department of Transportation shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration as necessary. The Administrator and the Secretary of Transportation shall enter into an agreement for the manner in which such transfers are to be made.

"§ 1446. Reporting requirement

"(a) The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator shall submit to the Congress at least once every two years separate reports on the operation of the program provided for in this chapter.

"(b) The Secretary shall include in each report submitted under this section—

"(1) information indicating (A) the extent to which the benefit levels provided under this chapter are adequate to achieve the purposes of inducing individuals to enter and remain in the Armed Forces and of providing an adequate level of financial assistance to help meet the cost of pursuing a program of education, and (B) whether it is necessary for the purposes of maintaining adequate levels of well-qualified active-duty personnel in the Armed Forces to continue to offer the opportunity for educational assistance under this chapter to individuals who have not yet entered active-duty service; and

"(2) such recommendations for administrative and legislative changes regarding the provision of educational assistance to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and their dependents, as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(c) The Administrator shall include in each report submitted under this section—

"(1) information concerning the level of utilization of educational assistance and of expenditures under this chapter; and

"(2) such recommendations for administrative and legislative changes regarding the provision of educational assistance to members fo the Armed Forces and veterans, and their dependents, as the Administrator considers appropriate.

"(d)(1) The first report by the Secretary of Defense under this section shall be submitted not later than April 1, 1985.

"(2) The first report by the Administrator under this section shall be submitted not later than April 1, 1987.".

(2) The tables of chapters at the beginning of such title and at the beginning of part III of such title are each amended by inserting above the item relating to chapter 31 the following new item:

"30. All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program ..... 1401".

(b) Subchapters III and IV of chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, as added by

subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER VETERANS' EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 702. (a) Section 1508(f)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting "30 or" before "34" the first place it appears; and

(B) by striking out "chapter 34" the second place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "either chapter 30 or chapter 34"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "30 or" before "34".

(b)(1) Section 1602(1)(A) of such title is amended by inserting "and before October 1, 1984," after "January 1, 1977," both places it appears.

(2) Section 1623 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) If a participant becomes entitled to educational assistance under subchapter II of chapter 30 of this title, the participant may elect to disenroll from the program under this chapter effective on the last day of the month in which the participant becomes entitled to such assistance.".

(c) The third sentence of section 1673(d)(1) of such title is amended by inserting "30," after "or chapter".

(d)(1) Section 1781 of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting "30," after "chapter" the first place it appears;

(B) by striking out "36," and inserting in lieu thereof "36 of this title or 106 or 107 of title 10,"; and

(C) by striking out the comma after "chapter 31".

(2) Section 1795(a) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting "30," in clause (4) after "chapters"; and

(B) by striking out "Chapter 107" in clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "Chapters 106 and 104".

TERMINATION OF RIGHT TO ENROLL IN CHAPTER 32 PROGRAM

SEC. 703. No individual on active duty in the Armed Forces may initially enroll in the educational assistance program provided for in chapter 32 of title 38, United States Code, after December 31, 1984.

REVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR THE SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 704. (a)(1) Chapter 106 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 106—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE

"Sec.
"2131. Educational assistance program: establishment; amount.
"2132. Eligibility for educational assistance.
"2133. Time limitation for use of entitlement.
"2134. Termination of assistance.
"2135. Failure to participate satisfactorily; penalties.
"2136. Administration of program.
"2137. Reports to Congress.
"2138. Savings provision.

"§ 2131. Educational assistance program: establishment; amount

"(a) To encourage membership in units of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve, the Secretary of each military department, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation, under regulations prescribed by him with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall establish and maintain a program to provide educational assistance to members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of the armed forces under his jurisdiction who agree to remain members of the Selected Reserve for a period of not less than six years.

"(b) Each educational assistance program established under subsection (a) shall provide for payment by the Secretary concerned to each person entitled to educational assistance under this chapter who is pursuing a program of education and educational assistance allowance at the following rates:

"(1) $140 per month for each month of full-time pursuit of a program of education;

"(2) $105 per month for each month of three-quarter-time pursuit of a program of education; and

"(3) $70 per month for each month of half-time pursuit of a program of education.

"(c)(1) Educational assistance may only be provided under this chapter for pursuit of a program of education at an institution of higher learning and may not be provided to a person after the person has completed a course of instruction required for the award of a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent evidence of completion of study.

"(2) Subject to section 1795 of title 38, the maximum number of months of educational assistance that may be provided to any person under this chapter is 36.

"§ 2132. Eligibility for educational assistance

"(a) A person who—

"after September 30, 1984—

"(A) enlists, reenlists, or extends an enlistment as a Reserve for service in the Selected Reserve for a period of not less than six years; or

"(B) is appointed as, or is serving as, a reserve officer and agrees to serve in the Selected Reserve for a period of not less than six years in addition to any other period of obligated service in the Selected Reserve to which the person may be subject; and

"(2) before completing initial active duty for training has received a secondary school diploma (or an equivalency certificate);

is entitled to educational assistance under section 2131 of this title.

"(b) Educational assistance may not be provided to a member under this chapter until the member—

"(1) has completed the initial period of active duty for training required of the member; and

"(2) has completed 180 days of service in the Selected Reserve.

"(c) Each person who becomes entitled to educational assistance under subsection (a) shall at the time the person becomes so entitled be given a statement in writing summarizing the provisions of this chapter and stating clearly and prominently the substance of sections 2134 and 2135 of this title as such sections may apply to the person.

"§ 2133. Time limitation for use of entitlement

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the period during which a person entitled to educational assistance under this section may use such person's entitlement expires (1) at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which such person becomes entitled to such assistance, or (2) on the date the person is separated from the Selected Reserve, whichever occurs first.

"(b)(1) The provisions of section 1441(f) of title 38 shall apply to the period of entitlement prescribed by subsection (a).

"(2) The provisions of section 1441(e) of title 38 shall apply to the period of entitlement prescribed by subsection (a) in the case of disability incurred in or aggravated by service in the Selected Reserve.

"§ 2134. Termination of assistance

"Educational assistance may not be provided under this chapter—

"(1) to a member receiving financial assistance under section 2107 of this title as a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; or

"(2) to a member who fails to participate satisfactorily in required training as a member of the Selected Reserve.

"§ 2135. Failure to participate satisfactorily; penalties

"(a)(1) A member of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who fails to participate satisfactorily in required training as a member of the Selected Reserve during a term of enlistment or other period of obligated service that created entitlement of the member to educational assistance under this chapter shall, at the option of the Secretary concerned—

"(A) be ordered to active duty for a period of two years or the period of obligated service the person has remaining under section 2132 of this title, whichever is less; or

"(B) be required to refund to the United States an amount determined under subsection (b).

"(2) The Secretary concerned may waive the requirements of paragraph (1) or may reduce the amount of any refund under clause (B) of such paragraph, in the case of any individual member when the Secretary determines that the failure to participate satisfactorily was due to reasons beyond the control of the member.

"(3) Any refund by a member under this section shall not affect the period of obligation of such member to serve as a Reserve in the Selected Reserve.

"(b)(1) The amount of a refund under subsection (a) shall be the amount equal to the product of—

"(A) the number of months of obligated service remaining under the agreement entered into under section 2132(a)(3) divided by the original number of months of such obligation; and

"(B) the total amount of educational assistance provided to the member under this chapter,

as increased by interest determined under paragraph (2).

"(2) The amount computed under paragraph (1) shall bear interest at the rate equal to the highest rate being paid by the United States on the day on which the refund is determined to be due for securities having maturities of 90 days or less and shall accrue from the day on which the member is first notified of the amount due to the United States as a refund under this section.

"§ 2136. Administration of program

"(a) Educational assistance under this chapter shall be provided through the Veterans' Administration, under agreements to be entered into by the Secretary of Defense, and by the Secretary of Transportation, with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Such agreements shall include administrative procedures to ensure the prompt and timely transfer of funds from the Secretary concerned to the Veterans' Administration for the making of payments under this chapter.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the provisions of sections 1663, 1670, 1671, 1673, 1674, 1676, 1682(g), and 1683 of chapter 34 of title 38 and the provisions of subchapters I and II of chapter 36 of such title (with the exception of sections

1780(a)(5), 1780(b), 1786, 1787(b)(1), and 1792) shall be applicable to the provision of educational assistance under this chapter. The term 'eligible veteran', as used in those provisions, shall be deemed for the purpose of the application of those provisions to this chapter to refer to a person eligible for educational assistance under this chapter.

"§ 2137. Reports to Congress

"The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report not later than December 15 of each year concerning the operation of the educational assistance program established by this chapter during the preceding fiscal year. Each such report shall include the number of members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each armed force receiving, and the number entitled to receive, educational assistance under this chapter during the preceding fiscal year.

"§ 2138. Savings provision

"A member who entered into an agreement under this chapter before October 1, 1984, shall continue to be eligible for educational assistance in accordance with the terms of such agreement and of this chapter as in effect before such date.".

(2) The items relating to such chapter in the table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A of such title, and in the table of chapters at the beginning of part III of such subtitle, are amended to read as follows:

"106. Educational Assistance for Members of the Selected Reserve... 2131".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1984, and shall apply only to members of the Armed Forces who qualify for educational assistance under chapter 106 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), on or after such date.

ACCRUAL FUNDING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LIABILITIES

SEC. 705. (a)(1) Chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2006. Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund

"(a) There is established on the books of the Treasury a fund to be known as the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Fund'), which shall be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Fund shall be used for the accumulation of funds in order to finance Department of Defense education liabilities on an actuarially sound basis.

"(b) In this section:

"(1) 'Department of Defense education liabilities' means liabilities of the Department of Defense for benefits under chapter 30 of title 38 and for benefits under chapter 106 of this title.

"(2) 'Normal cost', with respect to any period of time, means the total of the following:

"(A) The present value of the future benefits payable from the Fund for amounts attributable to increased amounts of educational assistance authorized under section 1415(b) of title 38 to persons who were not on active duty on October 1, 1984, and who during such period enter on active duty.

"(B) The present value of the future benefits payable from the Fund for amounts attributable to educational assistance authorized under subchapter III of chapter 30 of title 38 to persons who were not on active duty on October 1, 1984, and who during such period—

"(i) enter a fourth year of active duty, in the case of persons eligible for basic educational assistance under section 1411 of such title; or

"(ii) enter a period of service that will establish entitlement to such educational assistance under section 1421(b) of such title, in the case of persons eligible for basic educational assistance under section 1412 of such title.

"(C) The present value of the additional future benefits payable from the Fund by reason of eligibility authorized during such period for members of the Armed Forces who were not on active duty on October 1, 1984, to transfer educational assistance entitlement to dependents under subchapter IV of chapter 30 of such title.

"(D) The present value of the future benefits payable from the Fund for educational assistance under chapter 106 of this title to persons who during such period become entitled to such assistance.

"(c) There shall be deposited into the Fund the following, which shall constitute the assets of the Fund:

"(1) Amounts paid into the Fund by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (g).

"(2) Any amount appropriated to the Fund.

"(3) Any return on investment of the assets of the Fund.

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Fund to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Administrator to make required payments of Department of Defense education liabilities. The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator shall enter into an agreement as to how and when, and the amounts in which, such transfers shall be made. Except for investments under subsection (h), amounts in the Fund may not be used for any purpose other than transfers as described in this subsection.

"(e)(1)(A) There is established in the Department of Defense a Department of Defense Education Benefits Board of Actuaries (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall consist of three members, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense from among qualified professional actuaries who are members of the Society of Actuaries.

"(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), the members of the Board shall serve for a term of fifteen years, except that a member of the Board appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the end of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall only serve until the end of such term. A member may serve after the end of his term until his successor has taken office. A member of the Board may be removed by the Secretary of Defense for misconduct or failure to perform functions vested in the Board, and for no other reason.

"(ii) Of the members of the Board who are first appointed under this paragraph, one each shall be appointed for terms ending five, ten, and fifteen years, respectively, after the date of appointment, as designated by the Secretary of Defense at the time of appointment.

"(C) A member of the Board who is not otherwise an employee of the United States is entitled to receive pay at the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay of the highest rate of basic pay then currently being paid under the General Schedule of subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, for each day the member is engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Board and is entitled to travel expenses, including a per diem allowance, in accordance with section 5703 of title 5.

"(2) The Board shall report to the Secretary of Defense annually on the actuarial status of the Fund and shall furnish its advice and opinion on matters referred to it by the Secretary.

"(3) The Board shall review valuations of the Fund under subsection (g) and report periodically, not less than once every four years, to the President and Congress on the status of the Fund and shall recommend such changes as in the Board's judgment are necessary to protect the public interest and maintain the Fund on a sound actuarial basis.

"(4) The Secretary shall keep, or cause to be kept, such records as necessary for determining the actuarial status of the Fund.

"(f) Not later than six months after the Board of Actuaries is first appointed, the Board shall determine the amount (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'original unfunded liability') that is the present value (as of October 1, 1984) of future benefits payable from the Fund to persons who on October 1, 1984, are on active duty (and to dependents of such persons to whom entitlement to such benefits is transferred). The Board shall determine the period of time over which this amount should be liquidated and shall determine the amortization schedule for the liquidation of such amount over such period.

"(g)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out periodic actuarial valuations of the educational programs described in subsection (b)(1).

"(2) Based on the most recent such valuation, the Secretary of Defense shall estimate the normal cost for the next fiscal year.

"(3) If at the time of any such valuation there has been a change in benefits under an education program described in subsection (b)(1) that has been made since the last such valuation and that increases or decreases the present value of benefits payable from the Fund, the Secretary of Defense shall determine an amortization methodology and schedule for the liquidation of the unfunded liability (or negative unfunded liability) thus created such that the present value of the sum of the amortization payments equals the increase or decrease in the present value of such benefits.

"(4) If at the time of any such valuation the Secretary of Defense determines that, based upon changes in actuarial assumptions since the last valuation, there has been an actuarial gain or loss to the Fund, the Secretary shall determine an amortization methodology and schedule for the liquidation of such gain or loss through an increase or decrease in the payments that would otherwise be made to the Fund.

"(5) Based on the determinations under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and the determinations made by the Board of actuaries under subsection (f) the Secretary of Defense shall determine the amount needed to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for the next fiscal year for payments to be made to the Fund under subsection (h). The President shall include not less than the full amount so determined in the budget transmitted to Congress for the next fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31. The President may comment and make recommendations concerning any such amount.

"(6) All determinations under this subsection shall be made using methods and assumptions approved by the Board of Actuaries (including assumptions of interest rates and inflation) and in accordance with generally accepted actuarial principles and practices.

"(h)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall pay into the Fund each month the amount that, based upon the most recent actuarial valuation of the education programs described in subsection (b)(1), is equal to the actual total normal cost for the preceding month.

"(2) The Secretary of Defense shall pay into the Fund at the beginning of each fiscal year (or as soon thereafter as appropriations are available for such purpose) the sum of the following:

"(A) The amount of the payment for that year for the amortization of the original unfunded liability, as determined by the Board of Actuaries under subsection (f).

"(B) The amount of the payment for that year, if any, for the amortization of any liability to the Fund resulting from a change in benefits, as determined by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (g)(3).

"(C) The amount of the payment for that year, if any, for the amortization of any actuarial gain or loss to the Fund, as determined by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (g)(4).

"(3) Amounts paid into the Fund under this subsection shall be paid from appropriations available for the pay of members of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of a military department.

"(i) The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not in the judgment of the Secretary required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments shall be in public debt securities with maturities suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary, and bearing interest at rates determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. The income on such investments shall be credited to and form a part of the Fund.".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2006. Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund.".

(b) The first payment into the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund under section 2006 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be made not later than three months after the Board of Actuaries determines the amounts needed to be paid into the Fund for the fiscal year beginning on October 1, 1984. The first payment shall be made in a lump sum equal to the total of the amounts that would have been paid to the Fund each month between October 1, 1984, and the time such first payment is made.

EDUCATIONAL LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 706. (a)(1) Chapter 40 of title 10, United States Code, relating to leave, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 708. Educational leave of absence

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary concerned may grant to any eligible member (as defined in subsection (e)) a leave of absence for a period of not to exceed two years for the purpose of permitting the member to pursue a program of education.

"(b)(1) A member may not be granted a leave of absence under this section unless—

"(A) in the case of an enlisted member, the member agrees in writing to extend his current enlistment after completion (or other termination) of the program of education for which the leave of absence was granted for a period of two months for each month of the period of the leave of absence; and

"(B) in the case of an officer, the member agrees to serve on active duty after completion (or other termination) of the program of education for which the leave of absence was granted for a period (in addition to any other period of obligated service on active duty) of two months for each month of the period of the leave of absence.

"(2) A member may not be granted a leave of absence under this section until he has completed any extension of enlistment or reenlistment, or any period of obligated service, incurred by reason of any previous leave of absence granted under this section.

"(c)(1) While on a leave of absence under this section, a member shall be paid basic pay but may not receive basic allowance for quarters or basic allowance for subsistence or any other pay and allowances to which he would otherwise be entitled for such period.

"(2) A period during which a member is on a leave of absence under this section shall be counted for the purposes of computing the amount of the member's basic pay, for the purpose of determining the member's eligibility for retired pay, and for the purpose of time in grade for promotion purposes, but may not be counted for the purposes of completion of the term of enlistment of the member (in the case of an enlisted member) or for purposes of section 1421 of title 38, relating to entitlement to supplemental educational assistance.

"(d)(1) In time of war, or of national emergency declared by the President or the Congress after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary concerned may cancel any leave of absence granted under this section.

"(2) The Secretary concerned may cancel a leave of absence granted to a member under this section if the Secretary determines that the members is not satisfactorily pursuing the program of education for which the leave was granted.

"(e) In this section, 'eligible members' means a member of the armed forces on active duty who is eligible for basic educational assistance under chapter 30 of title 38 and who—

"(1) in the case of an enlisted member, has completed at least one term of enlistment and has reenlisted; and

"(2) in the case of an officer, has completed the officer's initial period of obligated service on active duty.".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"708. Educational leave of absence.".

(b) Section 708 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

PRESEPARATION COUNSELING

SEC. 707. (a)(1) Chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1043. Preseparation counseling requirement

"Upon the discharge or release from active duty of a member of the armed forces, the Secretary concerned shall provide for individual counseling of that member. That counseling shall include a discussion of the educational assistance benefits to which the member is entitled because of the member's service in the armed forces and an explanation of the procedures for and advantages of affiliating with the Selected Reserve. A notation of the provision of such counseling, signed by the member, shall be placed in the service record of each member receiving such counseling.".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of that chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1043. Preseparation counseling requirement.".

(b) Section 1043 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

TITLE VIII—CIVIL DEFENSE

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 801. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 to carry out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1985 (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.) the sum of $143,200,000.

PROHIBITION OF CRISIS RELOCATION PLANNING

SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 801 may be obligated or expended for planning for population relocation in time of crisis.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

REPORT ON EFFECT OF DEFENSE SPENDING ON ECONOMIC GROWTH

SEC. 901. Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to Congress a report on the effect of the current and projected levels of defense spending on the economy, including the effect on rates of growth in the economy, the rate of inflation, interest rates, and the availability of capital for private productivity enhancement investment.

PROGRAMS FOR CONVERSION FROM MILITARY ECONOMY TO PEACETIME ECONOMY

SEC. 902. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall establish programs to provide economic readjustment assistance to communities and workers affected by the reductions in weapons programs and other defense programs provided for under this Act. Such readjustment programs shall provide the means to promote orderly economic adjustment which will (1) minimize the dislocation of workers, communities, and industries, (2) assure that such dislocations do not compound recessionary trends, and (3) encourage conversion of technologies and managerial and worker skills developed in defense production to projects which serve the civilian sector.

(b) Assistance which may be provided under programs established under this section includes—

(1) job training programs and job relocation expenses for workers displaced by termination of defense contracts affected by the reductions in defense expenditures required by this Act;

(2) emergency economic assistance and health care benefits for workers and their families directly affected by such reductions in defense expenditures; and

(3) emergency economic assistance to the communities directly affected by such reductions and defense expenditures, to be made in the form of grants designed to assist in the conversion of industrial plant facilities in the community to use in the civilian sector.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984, the sum of $5,000,000,000.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A COURAGEOUS FATHER AND SON BATTLE NF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in Massachusetts, the Governor has proclaimed May 1984 as "Neurofibromatosis Awareness Month." Even though over 100,000 Americans are afflicted with this genetic disorder and a major Broadway play, later made into a movie, focused on a man suffering from the disease, public awareness of NF is minimal, and scientific research into its causes and cures is just beginning.

"Elephant Man's Disease," as NF is commonly called, is a genetic disorder of the nervous system affecting both sexes and all national origins or races. Symptoms usually appear in early childhood or adolescence, but can occur as late as age 50. Usually progressive, symptoms may include small and large pressure-sensitive tumors just under the skin, curvature of the spine, enlargement and deformation of bones, tumors on the auditory and optic nerves resulting in deafness or blindness, and tumors of the brain or spinal cord. In about 5 percent of cases, these tumors become cancerous.

At present, little is known about the mutant gene responsible for this terrible disease or how to prevent it. The Federal Government has had some activity in this area. Three years ago, the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke at the National Institutes of Health set up a Neurofibromatosis Clinical Research Unit to try to identify the gene responsible for the disease. In fiscal year 1983 a total of $750,000 was spent specifically on NF research.

Last July, I sponsored report language in my subcommittee markup of the fiscal year 1984 Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill, encouraging NIH to vigorously pursue research and research training in this area. The language also directed NIH to provide the committee with a report on what has been done up to this point and what needs to be done. It was submitted earlier this year. The report sets out, for the first time by an organization like NIH, a comprehensive set of goals for the future. As the report states:

There is still much more to learn . . . these goals are ambitious. Yet, if the lives of neurofibromatosis patients and their families are to be improved we must try to achieve them. The NINCDS and the other NIH institutes, along with the Inter-Institute Genetics Clinic, have taken the initial steps.

The report noted that NIH is currently devoting about $3 million to research in some way related to NF.

The impetus for these programs and research are the thousands of children and adults afflicted with this deforming disease. Despite the ultimate results and symptoms of NF, the victims in many cases face the disease with courage and determination to lead a normal life—as they should. The movie, "Elephant Man," is an inspiring and thought-provoking statement about these victims. Claudette Kiely and her family, constituents of the First District, are such individuals. Mrs. Kiely's husband and four of her five children have NF. Her work on the behalf of H.R. 1676, the NF Commission bill and other measures, has inspired many.

At this point in the RECORD, let me call the attention of my colleagues to another family afflicted with the disease. The Boston Globe ran an article entitled "A Fighter's Lifelong Battle With the Crippling Disease NF." The short article describes the daily struggles of Barry Geer and his son, Timothy. I urge my colleagues to review this article and cosponsor H.R. 1676, a bill to create an NF Commission.

The text of the article is as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, July 3, 1983]

A FIGHTER'S LIFELONG BATTLE WITH THE CRIPPLING DISEASE NF

(By Jean Caldwell)

MONSON.—"I've been laughing since I was born," says 34-year-old Barry Geer of Monson. There is the slightest pause before the father of four adds softly, "I've had to."

The pause and the postscript are acknowledgement that the laughter is part of a decision made long ago that he would live a happy, productive life despite the obstacles fate put in his path.

A little more than two years ago, doctors told Geer that many of the physical ills that have plagued him from birth are due to neurofibromatosis (NF). They also told him that 12-year-old Timothy, second of his four children, has the same ailment. Then they said NF would kill them both at an early age.

Barry Geer's tumors affect his sight and his hearing, and those that press along his carotid artery and those lodged in his brain have caused him to have four strokes, leaving him with a limp and a tendency to mix up words occasionally.

In Timothy's case, the multiple tumors have destroyed most of his muscles and affected his voice. He wears leg braces and has frequent sessions with a physical therapist who is trying to prevent him from losing more strength and motion. What distresses him most are the tumors on his vocal chords, which make his voice barely more than a high-pitched whisper. It leads to teasing from the other kids at school, he says.

The elder Geer was just four hours old and weighed only 4 lbs. 2 ounces when he underwent the first of many operations. He was 30 years old when he suffered his first stroke. "A nurse put her arms around me. The doctor said it was going to be fatal. I laughed at it. I've been told that a lot of times and I'm still here. Being told you're going to die is nothing. Everyone is going to die. I had been in hospitals so many times as a kid and had seen so many friends die. . . .

"Someone always has something worse than you. As long as you can say I'm not that bad off, I think you can keep your head. If you get concerned and bite your nails, you're going to make yourself worse. I try to do what I can while I can."

His disease is a paradox. NF is the most common of the neurological genetic diseases, more common than muscular dystrophy or multiple sclerosis and yet, until recently, the public knew little, if anything, about it, according to Joan Rudd of New York City, president of the National Neurofibromatosis Foundation, Inc. The severest case on record and the most celebrated is that of John Merrick, whose life was portrayed in the Broadway play and movie. "The Elephant Man."

There are 100,000 men, women and children with NF in the United States, according to Rudd. For most, the ailment is not life-threatening and may consist of nothing more than a few *cafe au lait* spots—brown marks that look like oversized freckles.

SYMPTOMS OF THE DISEASE

NF is characterized by the formation of tumors, generally benign, along nerves in the body. The tumors may be external, as in John Merrick's case, or predominantly internal as they are in the Geers.

Dr. Robert Martuza, head of the NF clinic at Massachusetts General Hospital, one of only five such clinics in the United States, says one child in every 3000 is born with NF. About one-quarter to one-third of all NF patients are seriously affected. This can be cosmetic, as when large tumors or discoloration appears on the face. It can be orthopedic, as in the case of a pre-school girl whose legs swelled to such gigantic proportions that she was anchored to one spot. Or it can be neurological, as in Barry Geer's case, where tumors press on arteries or critical nerves.

There is no screening test for NF, according to Martuza, no way to detect its presence through amniocentesis and no way to predict at birth whether a baby identified as an NF child will have severe or mild involvement.

Although it is considered a genetic disorder, about half the cases appear to arise from a spontaneous mutation of a gene. Once a person has NF, however, it can be passed to offspring. Since the NF gene is dominant, there is a 50-50 chance any child born to an NF parent will have the disease.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Often a parent learns he or she has NF only after a child is diagnosed, according to Martuza. The disease can be mild in the parent and devastating in the child or the reverse. The disease seems to grow worse with the onset of adolescence and during pregnancy, perhaps because of hormonal changes.

There is no cure and no treatment in the usual sense of the word, Martuza says. Troublesome tumors may be removed through conventional surgery, by laser beam or by radiation, but they have a tendency to grow back.

Although NF was first described in 1786, there was no concentrated effort to study the disease or to help its victims and their families until five years ago when the National Neurofibromatosis Foundation Inc. was formed. Dr. Allan Rubenstein, associate professor of neurology at Mr. Sinai School of Medicine in New York City, remembers announcing that he was doing a research project on NF. "I was overwhelmed by the hundreds of people who sought us out. They were absolutely desperate. They never had access to any accurate, up-to-date information." Although textbooks stated that NF was common, Rubenstein is convinced that no one really believed it until the foundation was formed.

When Geer married his wife Evelyn, she was 16 and he 18. All went well for a year and a half. Then he suffered a hernia at work that couldn't be repaired because his muscles had deteriorated. Later he was told he had a brain tumor. Despite his desire to work, he was considered unemployable. He could not pass the physical exam required for many jobs. In addition, he says employers' assurances that they will hire the handicapped fly out the window when the handicap is neurological.

Geer says, "I don't let things like that get me down. If I sat and said that's it, that's what would happen." Instead, he has focused his attention on home and family. He has turned a house that was shabby when they moved in a couple of years back into an attractive neat-as-a-pin dwelling with a bountiful garden. He cans the vegetables he grows and has won prizes for canning and flowers at local fairs.

He remodeled his kitchen. When his blind eye kept him from seeing well enough to cut the paneling he wanted to install, his wife took over with the saw.

ENCOURAGES HIS SON

Geer encourages Timothy to keep going. In bright light, Timothy is considered legally blind. The boy gets frustrated because it's hard to do things that he once did easily such as ride his bike. A physical therapist visits the home twice each week to exercise Timothy in an effort to keep the muscle tone he has left.

Perhaps it is Evelyn Geer who has the hardest time. She simply cannot bring herself to talk about NF. What's more, she really does not want their other children tested to see if they have it. "My husband has it. My son has it. That's enough," she says.

As his way of fighting back against NF, Geer has been busy trying to get more publicity for the NF foundation in the hope that research will lead to a cure. Like other families coping with NF, the Geers hope Congress will pass a bill to establish a national commission on neurofibromatosis. The commission would assess the nature and extent of current research into NF and identify the research that would be needed to develop a cure.

In the meantime, Geer takes comfort from being in touch at last with other families with NF—some 300 of them in Massachusetts. He treasures a letter from one member of a local NF foundation chapter which ends. "We need each other to fight NF."●

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER FLOWERS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of former Congressman Peter Kyros and myself I would like to add my sentiments and deep regret at the loss of our colleague and friend, Walter Flowers.

Walter was a dedicated and effective legislator who served his State and the Nation with vigor and pride. His constant optimism revealed the deep and genuine love he had for the people he represented and their values.

He was a man of great intelligence who possessed that precious virtue which permitted him to be immensely persuasive yet always patient and gentlemanly.

He gave of himself unremittingly to serve the Nation and this was made abundantly clear in pursuing his duties on the Committee on Judiciary during those difficult days a decade ago. Of Walter it can be said, that his integrity and courage stand as an example to all of us who seek to serve with honor in the House.

We shall miss him not only because he was a great American but because his friendship and experience enriched and touched our lives.

I want to express my deepest sympathy to his family at this sorrowful time.●

SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, once again I have the great pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Small Business Administration has chosen for the second year in a row a business from the 17th District to receive the Small Business Administration's Small Business Person of the Year Award for the State of California. Last year's State winner also was chosen to receive the National Small Business Person of the Year Award during a ceremony presided over by President Reagan.

Motion Designs, Inc., of Clovis, Calif., is this year's State winner. The Small Business Person of the Year Award is given annually by the U.S. Small Business Administration to recognize the outstanding small business person of the year and to honor the individual contribution which a particular business has made to the community.

But Motion Designs, Inc., a new and rapidly growing small business that manufactures the lightweight "Quickie" wheelchair, is more than a success story of a small business venture. It is an example of personal achievement that can be attained by dedication and friendship, and is an illustration of strength and bravery of which all Americans can be proud. The success of both the people who are involved and the product that they manufacture is the result of the kind of innovation, hard work, and determination that has earned the United States a reputation as the land of opportunity.

The business was begun by three friends who transformed a great tragedy in their lives into a remarkable achievement. One of the business' founders, Marilyn Hamilton, who was an active sports enthusiast and expert skier, had a tragic accident when she fell more than 100 feet onto a rocky cliff while hang gliding. She became permanently paralyzed from the waist down. However, when Maryiln remained determined not to give up her active life, her two close friends, Don Helman and Jim Okamoto, helped her to design a lightweight high performance wheelchair that could be used in daily as well as in sports activities.

Thus, Motion Designs, Inc., was born as a backyard operation 4 years ago. Today it employs 32 people producing over 300 Quickie wheelchairs a month in a 17,000 square-foot building. The wheelchairs are sold throughout the United States, Canada, and northern Europe—a testament to initiative and perseverance.

I am therefore particularly honored to join in recognizing Motion Designs, Inc., because of the contribution that the business has made to the handicapped community. I should like to think that the example which these three people have set in strength and perseverance alone will be a guide to other business entrepreneurs who are struggling to make their ideas a similar success.●

REAGAN'S VOTE PLOY ON CRIME

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in our dealings with the administration it is sometimes difficult to separate the facts from the rhetoric. This was especially true recently when President

Reagan criticized Congress for stalling anticrime legislation. Ironically, it was this President who last year vetoed a package of tough anticrime bills, most of which he had requested, because he disliked one of the bills. His opposition to this one particular bill had never been conveyed to the bill's chief sponsors, Judiciary Chairman PETER RODINO and Crime Subcommittee Chairman WILLIAM J. HUGHES.

I recommend that my colleagues read the following column printed in the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press of April 6, 1984:

REAGAN'S VOTE PLOY ON CRIME

(By Robin Goldstein)

Its scary when Ronald Reagan turns his considerable powers as a communicator on you. This President is very good at saying what people want to hear, and those who disagree with him can end up sore from his tongue-lashing.

The president is talking a lot lately about law and order. He thinks the Democrat-controlled House of Representatives is stalling the passage of anti-crime bills, and he is mad about it.

The brunt of his message has been falling on two New Jersey Congressmen with strong reputations for law and order—Rep. Peter W. Rodino, hero of the Watergate impeachment hearings, and Rep. William J. Hughes, a stern former county prosecutor.

The two Democrats are in charge of most anti-crime bills in the House, Rodino as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and Hughes as head of the subcommittee on crime.

They are still smarting from a March 27 speech Reagan delivered to a group of insurance agents.

"Many of our citizens peer out of their dwellings, relying on bolts, chains and even metal bars propped grotesquely against their door . . . And even with all this, they do not feel safe," the president said. "It is about time the American people start asking who is to blame for this."

In that and other speeches, the president lays the blame on Democrats in the House of Representatives, who he says are dawdling instead of passing a package of anti-crime bills already approved by the Republican-dominated Senate.

"Maybe it's time to move some politicians out of office in order to get criminals off the streets," Reagan said.

The line got a lot of laughs from the insurance agents. But it belies the rather calculated and hypocritical way that the Reagan administration is pumping up the law-and-order issue as a reliable crowd-pleaser in an election year.

Reagan has taken some strange steps for a president who claims to worry so much about law-and-order bills.

In 1982, for example, Hughes and Rodino scrambled in the waning days of the congressional session to save a bunch of crime bills that would have died, abandoned, when Congress adjourned. Most were bills that Reagan had requested, and represented months of hearings and legislative haggling. Congress worked into the night to approve the package of crime bills Hughes and Rodino put together.

But when the package arrived on President Reagan's desk, he killed the whole thing with a pocket veto. It turned out that the president, unknown to Hughes, disliked one of seven bills in the package so he vetoed the whole thing.

"I was sick when I saw a year and a half of my work go down the drain with that veto," Hughes said.

The veto didn't stop the president from complaining in a February radio address that Congress hadn't passed a bill to seize the profits and assets of drug traffickers. "Why should any right-minded person oppose it?" he asked.

Reagan didn't tell his radio listeners across the country that the drug profits bill was part of the package of bills he had vetoed.

Hughes, a conservative Democrat often courted by the White House because he agrees with the president's law-and-order views, points to some other ways in which the administration has sent mixed signals on the law-and-order question.

The Reagan administration, he notes, has repeatedly tried to cut the budgets of various anti-crime agencies.

Republicans have been having a lot of fun with the law-and-order question lately, at the expense of the Democrats. One group brought a bottle to a press conference to demonstrate how the Democrats in the House have "bottled up" the anti-crime bills passed by the Senate.

It's hard to say whether the House is "bottling up" the Senate crime package. Things are more complicated in the House than in the Senate; on the House side, the 40 different bills in the Senate crime package have to be parceled out among seven different committees and subcommittees for hearings, consideration and a vote.

Hughes' crime subcommittee is one of the most active in Congress, moving bills on tampering with drugs and food, child pornography, and drug penalties, to name just a few. And other non-controversial bills are moving in other subcommittees.

Rodino and other members of the Judiciary Committee have constitutional qualms about some of the Senate-passed bills. One bill would prescribe the death penalty for certain federal crimes such as treason, and another would amend the exclusionary rule so that certain evidence illegally obtained by police can be used in court.

In the case of these bills, the subcommittee chairmen may be flexing their strongest muscle—the ability to keep a bill from getting voted on.●

RENT-PLUS SYSTEM DESIGNED FOR ALASKA

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned about a provision included in the House Armed Services Committee Report on the Department of Defense authorization. Section 602 of the report seeks to compensate service members who are stationed in either Alaska or Hawaii and who live off base under the variable housing allowance rather than the current rent-plus system. The rent-plus system was designed for Alaska and Hawaii in order to account for the large differences in housing costs in these States as compared with the lower 48. Seeking to treat service members who are stationed in my home State of Alaska like service members in other parts of the country overlooks the unusually high cost of living in Alaska. For example, the National Association of Realtors lists the average cost of buying a home in the United States in 1983 as $83,100. By comparison, in the Anchorage area, the average cost of buying a home is $123,204.

While section 602 does contain a grandfather clause for members already stationed in Alaska and Hawaii, I am concerned about those service members that will be assigned to Alaska in the future. The House Armed Services Committee has not been able to assure me that they will not have to endure sharp reductions in their total housing allowances and consequently suffer declines in their standard of living under VHA. I understand that the Department of Defense is opposed to section 602. While I am in favor of streamlining the operation of the Defense Department where feasible, we must not at the same time compromise the quality of life of our service members. Until a study has been completed on the probable effects of this proposed change on service members in Alaska and Hawaii, I urge the House to reject this proposal.●

ASYLUM FOR SALVADORAN REFUGEES

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 4447, legislation to impose a 3-year moratorium on the deportation of Salvadorans, I very much hope that the Congress will enact this humanitarian protection for the victims of the conflict within El Salvador.

Having been to El Salvador twice within the past 2 years, and having met with refugees in Central America, and in the United States, I know that the Salvadorans now in the United States would face grave risk if they are deported while the civil war continues in El Salvador.

H.R. 4447 offers the House the opportunity to provide temporary haven until the conflict within El Salvador is resolved.

I want to share with my colleagues a compassionate, perceptive call for enactment of this legislation which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch on April 2, 1984. The editorial reflects the kind of commonsense, humanitarian approach on this issue which I find throughout Minnesota at this time.

I urge my colleagues to read the editorial and to consider joining the 136

House Members who, in a bipartisan manner, have cosponsored H.R. 4447.

A HUMANE DEPORTATION BILL

A 26-year-old Salvadoran national with the assumed name of Rene Hurtado is living illegally in the Twin Cities. St. Luke Presbyterian Church in Wayzata has been providing him sanctuary since December 1982.

Another young Salvadoran with the assumed name of Manuel is living illegally in Minnesota with the help of the Twin Cities Friends Meeting.

Each once served in the Salvadoran army and fled the country. Manuel says his father and brother were killed by the death squads. Both Manuel and Mr. Hurtado fear that they would be imprisoned, tortured or targeted by the death squads if they returned to their homeland.

To remain in the United States legally, without the protection of churches, the two would have to qualify for asylum by proving that they are specifically wanted by the killers. Failing that, the government would attempt to deport them back to El Salvador to an uncertain future. For many like Mr. Hurtado and Manuel, the risk of being denied asylum is terrifying and so they have sought protection from churches. The district director of immigration for the Twin Cities has referred to the churches' efforts as "nothing more than a smuggling ring."

The U.S. policy, which has seen thousands of illegal Salvadoran refugees returned to their homeland, is under increasing attack in this country, as it should be. On April 12, the U.S. House Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and International Law will hold hearings on a bill that would place a moratorium on detentions and deportations of Salvadoran nationals. It is a disgrace that such a compassionate act has not been taken by the Reagan administration up to now. It is appalling that Congress would need to pass a law forcing the administration to do what should have been done long ago. But there may be no other choice.

There are an estimated 300,000 to 500,000 illegal Salvadoran aliens living in the United States. Many fled in search of safety, hoping not to be added to the list of 40,000 civilians killed in the civil war since 1979. Others came less out of fear than in pursuit of jobs, and their claims for protection are less pure.

A section of U.S. immigration law is designed specifically for those from troubled nations who neither desire citizenship nor qualify for asylum, which by the way is a costly and time-consuming process that the United States is ill-equipped to handle quickly. The alternative is called "extended voluntary departure." This status simply allows aliens facing danger in their home countries to remain in the United States temporarily and receive authorization to work until conditions improve at home. Natives of Ethiopia, Lebanon, Poland, Uganda and Afghanistan currently are in the United States under that program. Are the Salvadorans any less worthy of such treatment? No.

The Reagan administration has been reluctant to grant either asylum or extended voluntary departure to Salvadorans. To do so would be an admission that the U.S.-supported regime is repressive. Further, the administration worries that such a step would encourage new illegal immigration. Another reason is that State Department officials believe Salvadorans could find refuge in countries closer to their home.

Those all sound like lame and cold-hearted excuses from leaders of a nation steeped in humanitarian treatment of frightened and endangered refugees.

The Congress in 1983 passed a nonbinding resolution recommending that Salvadorans be granted temporary special protection in the United States, saying that deporting them was "creating potentially life-threatening situations for innocent nationals. "However, the administration continues to deport about 100 Salvadorans a week.

The bill to be heard by the House immigration subcommittee would impose a moratorium of up to three years on deportation of displaced Salvadorans. Unquestionably, the bill should be approved and should enjoy the support of congressional delegations from Minnesota and western Wisconsin.●

ADJUSTABLE RATE MORTGAGES NOT SUCH A GOOD DEAL AFTER ALL?

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, adjustable-rate mortgages or ARM's, as they are more popularly known, are held by nearly 2 million Americans. ARM's contain a provision that monthly payments change periodically along with prevailing interest rates. As interest rates go up, so do monthly payments, and as they come down, so do payment requirements. Unfortunately, the trend has been up rather than down, and as has been documented in recent hearings before the Banking Committee, the full impact of ARM's has yet to be felt inasmuch as many of these mortgages contain provisions regarding terms and constraints on the borrowers quite capable of producing delayed "payment shock" to the holder.

In an article carried in the April 27, 1984, issue of the Wall Street Journal, Joann S. Lublin has described some of the problems attendant to the ARM and has noted steps being mounted by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as recently outlined by Chairman David Maxwell, to soften or eliminate the harmful effects we anticipate will happen unless such steps are taken. So that my colleagues can be brought up to date on the implications of this development in the mortgage industry, I ask consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 27, 1984]

FANNIE MAE IS MOUNTING A MAJOR ASSAULT ON ABUSES OF ADJUSTABLE-RATE MORTGAGES

(By Joann S. Lublin)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal National Mortgage Association is mounting a major assault on some abuses in adjustable-rate mortgages, which have fueled the recent housing recovery.

With such mortgages, dubbed ARMs, monthly payments change periodically along with prevailing interest rates. Their lower initial rates have made homes available to millions of families in recent months. Roughly two million home buyers have taken out more than $120 billion in ARMs since 1981. Industry figures show that they accounted for more than 75 percent of the $13 billion in new home loans made in February.

Fannie Mae is worried because certain ARMs, largely marketed in Texas, California and the Southeast, provide first-year interest rates far below those of fixed-rate mortgages but with little or no limit on increase in future mortgage payments. With such arrangements, "consumers could be turned off on an instrument that's essential, and secondly, the issue could become politicized," warned David Maxwell, chairman of the government-sponsored, privately owned association, in an interview. Yet AMRs "are the key to the long-term solvency of our financial institutions," he added.

The association's crackdown is taking three forms: A call to the lending industry to police the problem ARMs, restrictions on the type of ARMs Fannie Mae buys and inauguration of a consumer-education program. Its efforts carry considerable clout; Fannie Mae, the nation's leading supplier of home mortgage funds, holds nearly $9 billion of ARMs in its $80 billion mortgage portfolio.

Mr. Maxwell is expected to emphasize Fannie Mae's concerns in a speech today before the Texas Mortgage Bankers Association in Fort Worth. A line exists "between helping home buyers fulfill their aspirations and encouraging them to borrow beyond their means," Mr. Maxwell's prepared remarks state. "And we who care about the long-term health of the housing and mortgage industries should be the first to turn the spotlight on abuses in the marketplace."

The low initial rates, called "teasers," often fall in the 7 percent to 10 percent range, but Mr. Maxwell said they're as low as 4⅞ percent in parts of Texas. Conventional mortgages are averaging about 13.67 percent, according to the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp. The spread of deeply discounted ARMs, without restrictions on future boosts in interest rates or mortgage payments, "carry the inevitable threat of payment shock," his speech points out.

"Payment shock" refers to the unexpected blow consumers could feel if they haven't budgeted for the possibility of much higher loan payments. A subsequent wave of defaults on ARMs "would be both an economic and political disaster for mortgage lenders," Mr. Maxwell predicts in the speech.

Fannie Mae has decided to generally stop buying ARMs with initial rates more than 2.5 percentage points below those of fixed-rate mortgages. The chairman also said the association won't purchase ARMs unless they limit interest-rate adjustment to a maximum of two percentage points a year.

"We know that the industry doesn't move in lock-step with Fannie Mae," Mr. Maxwell says in his speech. "But we hope that the market will move toward our standard—because our standard, we believe, is the right one."

In the interview, he expressed hope that lenders would eliminate deeply-discounted ARMs and better educate borrowers about their obligations under adjustable-rate mortgages. He said Fannie Mae will publish brochures to help lenders explain these responsibilities.

The lending industry likely will heed Mr. Maxwell's suggestions, as they come on the

heels of recent similar expressions of concern by mortgage insurers and the Federal Reserve Board's vice chairman, Preston Martin.

And yesterday, in a speech to the Texas Mortgage Bankers group, Kenneth Thygerson, president of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp., said the government-connected corporation also is trying to craft a model Adjustable Rate Mortgage, with fuller disclosure of terms and constraints on borrowers' payment adjustments.

"The majority of lenders understand and will work to police themselves and probably tighten up in general," said Mark Riedy, executive vice president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. They don't want "to bring down the government in the ARMs area because ARMs are seen as a good way to make housing affordable to more families." ●

WHAT ROME NEVER LEARNED ABOUT WELFARE

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber we often forget the wisdom of Confucius' advice: "Give a man a fish, feed him for a day; Teach a man to fish, feed him for a lifetime."

Liberals have ignored that aphorism, and the result is the intellectual bankruptcy of liberalism.

This is hardly the first time in history that well-intentioned social schemes have gone awry. The following article, reprinted from the Farmers' Almanac in the Farmland News, tells of another government which ignored the necessity of teaching to fish and perished. I am indebted to my constituent, Mr. Darrell Tracy of Rossville, Ill., for bringing it to my attention:

WHAT ROME NEVER LEARNED ABOUT WELFARE

History teaches us little because we always assume we are generations wiser than those who have gone before us. We take no heed, even when certain phases of history parallel our own.

History is a series of played-out dramas whose endings are known to us, yet we feel that this time the ending will be different. And because of this, we are always surprised when the curtain closes on the same ending after having followed the same plot.

History provides us, for example, with a clear look at the terrible drain the dole, or welfare, places upon a total society; worse yet, how it sometimes destroys those it professes to assist.

Almost a century before Christ, wealthy Roman landowners began driving the small farmers off the land in droves. The small, or individual, farmers could not compete with the great farms of the rich, so were forced to sell their land at whatever price the rich offered. Having then been deprived of their livelihoods, these farmers moved into Rome with their families. They were the panis frumentari, the urban unemployed. They were given grain from government stores on a regular monthly basis.

In 72 B.C., these unemployed reached a total of some 40,000. Thirty years later, under Julius Caesar, then numbers were more than 200,000.

Around 27 B.C., Augustus tried to reduce the number on welfare by refusing "those whose needs were pretended." He failed, for too many had been accustomed to free grain for too long.

Along with this great drain, Augustus had problems with the grain merchants. This group would occasionally withhold grain so as to force up the price, so a large supply of state grain was kept on hand to dump on the market whenever prices got too high.

To conduct welfare in an orderly fashion, a grain control token was issued (like our food stamps). The first of these were made of bronze and carried a portrait of the ruling emperor. Later, lead tokens were issued that could be redeemed weekly.

Under Emperor Aurelius (270-275 A.D.) the distribution of bread began instead of grain. Now, those on welfare didn't even have to grind their own grain or bake their own bread. It is recorded that on the first day bread was given out, more than 300,000 persons gathered in the narrow streets before the bakeries (which were now nationalized) to redeem their tokens. Traffic was tied up for hours.

One recorder of the times says: "Under the system, the unemployed were encouraged to multiply, for those with more children received more bread." (Sound familiar?)

The State also had to set up an army of officials and clerks to administer this program, so the program became even more costly.

What followed was ironical, but seemingly just. The large landowners were required to pay larger and larger shares of their grain in taxes so that Rome could continue to feed the unemployed. Taxes became so great that one landowner remarked: "It is no longer a privilege to be a Roman, but a burden!"

Why weren't the unemployed given jobs? The State had no means set up to do this, so as a result, children grew up without trades, without proper education and many would spend their whole lives on welfare. And because of this many turned to crime.

Rome never learned that when you give a man bread with one hand, you take away something else with the other hand—his incentive, his dignity. But when you give him work for his hands, he will supply his own needs.

Today, thousands stand around on street corners, victims of welfare, while cities decay for lack of repairs.—Martin Buxbaum.●

THOSE PENTAGON "CUTS"

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, as I recall, last year's proponents of the MX could put forth only one straight-faced argument for building this $20 billion weapon: It would serve as the stick needed to whip the Soviets to the bargaining table. We can see now how effective the MX is at forcing negotiations—for the first time in decades there are no U.S.-Soviet arms control discussions.

With the "bargaining chip" argument now dead and buried, the absurdity of placing a new and improved ICBM in existing Minuteman silos is fully apparent. There remains no justification for building the MX.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Tulsa World, which provides an excellent discussion of the relationship of the MX to the Pentagon's spendthrift budget.

The article follows:

THOSE PENTAGON "CUTS"

One would almost think, from reading recent news accounts, that Congress has finally decided to draw the reins on runaway defense spending. Last week, the House passed a budget resolution trimming defense spending. The House Armed Services Committee recently voted to cut $19 billion in defense spending.

But wait.

The "cuts" in defense spending really only trim the projected increase in Pentagon spending. It's like saying that instead of spending $30 billion more than last year on military hardware, we'll only spend $25 billion more. See, we've "saved" $5 billion.

No one contends that America does not need to rebuild its defenses. But that will not be accomplished by throwing money at the Pentagon any more than poverty was eliminated by throwing money at it.

Astronomical cost overruns on parts and equipment are well documented. By now everyone has heard of the thousand dollar screwdrivers the Pentagon is so fond of purchasing.

Beyond that, however, the U.S. is not spending money wisely. Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan has pointed out the unreasonableness of spending billions of dollars on the MX missile. The MX is supposed to be a more modern missile to replace the Minuteman, now considered too vulnerable to be an effective weapon. But plans now call for the MX to be located in old Minuteman silos, making the new missiles just as vulnerable as the old ones.

In short, there is ample room in the Pentagon budget to both cut waste and rebuild our military might. Present defense spending proposals do not accomplish either objective.●

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE CENTER ACT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Professional Development Resource Center Act of 1984. In recent years overwhelming evidence has mounted demonstrating the need for renewed efforts to assist our Nation's elementary and secondary schools in the pursuit of educational excellence. After numerous national reports, considerable media attention and many public opinion polls, two facts have become crystal clear. The first is that we have placed very high expectations on our

public schools. At a time when schools are dealing with an ever more diverse school-age population, we are also asking them to produce a better educated and better prepared generation than at any time in our history. The second fact is that in order to accomplish this ambitious goal, our schools and the people in them require the full support, cooperation, and encouragement of all levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses these needs. It responds to one very central concern: Continuing education for teachers in the classroom. My bill will provide those on the frontline of education, the classroom teachers, with essential year-round opportunities for improvement and renewal. The bill gives the Secretary of Education the authority to make competitive grants to local school districts for the establishment of locally developed professional development resource centers. These centers will design activities to assist classroom teachers in expanding their professional capabilities. Furthermore, these centers will not offer activities for teachers but will design and conduct activities with the full involvement of teachers at every stage. It is clear that unless teachers have a stake in defining the activities that will foster their own professional growth, they will be less likely to be motivated by or benefit fully from them. Activities of the centers will include updating and expanding subject matter expertise, applying the latest educational research to the classroom, exploring new educational tools and their use in instruction, teaching new technologies and their applications, and developing curriculum materials.

Mr. Speaker, to those who are all too ready to complain about incompetent teachers in our elementary and secondary schools, I would suggest that they should accept an equal if not, in fact, greater obligation to foster the conditions that enhance teaching competence. Local school systems must also be willing to undertake this obligation. However, most school systems today are hard pressed for the funds to meet their basic operating costs. Allocating additional resources to the professional development of teachers is too often near the end of a school district's "wish list." Federal leadership and assistance and modest financial support is crucial to the development of our Nation's teacher force. If we are to demand professionalism from our teachers we must provide them with the means to fulfill that demand.

While there has been considerable attention focused on critical shortages of math, science, and foreign language teachers, we must not fail to make provisions for the broader problem of the continuous development of our Nation's teaching force. Every day 2.8 million teachers face classrooms filled with 40 million students. The majority of teachers are now between the ages of 32 and 42. Although new teachers will be needed as the school-age population begins a projected slow but steady climb, the bulk of our teaching force for the next two decades is already in the profession. We must invest resources to assist today's classroom teachers in expanding their knowledge and abilities. If we want people of intelligence, spirit, and capacity for growth teaching our children, we must offer such people constructive and creative mechanisms to nurture those qualities. We cannot ask teachers to instill the love of learning in their students without providing them with the means to continue learning themselves. I believe this bill is a useful step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this piece of legislation.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN KELLY OF THE MARCH OF DIMES

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it was once said, "Every one of us is given the gift of life, and what a strange gift it is. If it is preserved jealously and selfishly, it impoverishes and saddens. But if it is spent for others, it enriches and beautifies."

In his many years of service to the Long Island chapter of the March of Dimes, John Kelly has enriched the lives of many. Through his generosity of spirit and devotion to the cause of mankind, John has made a tremendous contribution toward eliminating the incidence of birth defects in our country. John symbolized to us all the best that an individual can do to help his fellow man.

I am honored to have such a distinguished constituent as John Kelly and I am pleased that the Long Island chapter will be honoring his efforts at a dinner on May 18.

I ask that all of my colleagues join with me in paying tribute to John Kelly who has done so much to further the cause of research against childhood diseases.●

THE NATIONAL GUARD MEMORIAL: A TRIBUTE TO THE NATION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the dedication of the National Guard Memorial and the first permanent home of the National Guard Association of the United States. The occasion was celebrated with a spectacular ceremony in which every Guard organization in the country was represented. The dedication speech was delivered by a former colonel in the Officer Reserve Corps, former President Harry S. Truman.

The building is a fitting memorial to honor the brave men and women who have volunteered to serve, protect, and, if need be, to fight for their country throughout the history of the National Guard—a history that predates the founding of this Nation. To commemorate this special occasion, I would like to share with my colleagues the reminiscences of the ceremony by Maj. Gen. Bruce Jacobs, publisher of the National Guard magazine, and a noted military historian.

The article follows:

THE NATIONAL GUARD MEMORIAL: A TRIBUTE TO THE NATION

Who was the ancient philosopher who uttered those immortal words to the effect that time sure flies when you're having fun? We are constantly reminded of the great underlying truth to this sentiment. Why it was only yesterday—or was it just last week—that we came down to the nation's capital to help open the spanking new National Guard Memorial on the northest corner of North Capitol and Massachusetts just down the street, so to speak, from the glistening majesty of the seat of government. The date, for those of you who appreciate historic accuracy, was May 3, 1959. What is that you say? Twenty-five years ago? Surely you jest.

One of the perks of being an aide to a senior National Guard general officer during that period was the opportunity to journey to Washington, D.C., to take part in the dedication activities. In fact, the general had kindly volunteered my services to the Association, and I was dispatched a week or so before the actual festivities to help Colonel Jim Deerin, who was the Association's "PR" man in those days. Not that Jim, who was one of the most "unflappable" of men, needed a lot of help; but anyone can use a "gofer" when the going gets hectic. It was, for a captain, a week of intense excitement highlighted by the opportunity of a lifetime to meet and to talk with some of the legendary Guardsmen one knew about from historical accounts and to find that they really existed!

It helps to understand the occasion if you put the spring of 1959 into perspective. It was only six years since the end of the fighting in Korea and 14 years since the end of World War II. In fact, it was only 40 years since the end of World War I—which is to say that the WWI veteran was no more of a phenomenon than are WWII veterans today! How about that, sports fans?

An astonishing number of the old soldiers who made that formation on May 3, 1959, has seen service in both world wars. Unquestionably, the dean of this group was the legendary Major General Milton A. Reckord of Maryland. My boss was Major General Donald W. McGowan, then assistant chief of the National Guard Bureau (Army) under Major General Edgar C. Erickson, who was chief, McGowan loved to recall that he had served as an 18-year-old battal-

ion sergeant-major in the infantry regiment that Reckord commanded in the old 29th Division.

It is a matter of sheer coincidence that just a few weeks before getting started on this essay, we had a really nice letter from a retired major general named John C. Henagan, who had relinquished his command of the 51st Infantry Division sometime before the Memorial was opened. He is now nearly 90 years old but he was writing to ask where to find a particular history book he was anxious to read. On that date 25 years ago when the building dedication took place, he stood patiently in line behind Major Charles A. Barclay from Salem, Oregon, who gained the distinction of being the first to sign the guest register on that grand and colorful day. It also should be added that it was an incredibly hot day.

Henagan, who had come up to Washington from Dillon, South Carolina, for the occasion, was but one of the great names out of the past who took part in the stirring formation. Generals there were in platoons and many dozens of lesser rank as well. Among us captains of that day were Jim Lee of Utah (who would later be a War College classmate) and Byron L. (Barney) Dukes of Indiana. There were lieutenants, too, including Donn Devine of Delaware, Jose Canals of Puerto Rico and Nick Anacelli of Rhode Island, to mention just a few.

It is sometimes forgotten that the Guard had to come back from scratch after WW II. The Association was little more than a "Corporal's Guard" of determined but very senior people who, in many cases, had been denied the opportunity to serve in the war. They kept the Association alive, and they saw to it that the War Department included the Guard in its planning for military forces in the period after the end of hostilities.

In effect, a new National Guard Association emerged after WW II. The new Constitution & By-laws adopted at Buffalo, New York, in 1946 provided for individual memberships, it authorized the establishment of a "headquarters" in the nation's capital, and it founded the first Association publication, The National Guardsman—now National Guard magazine. From that time forward it was a foregone conclusion that one day there would be a building that would house the headquarters and would provide a National Guard Association "presence" in the city where the fortunes of the Guard would be influenced by the inclinations of the executive and legislative branches of government.

A few months after the dedication, Walsh, who had guided the affairs of the Association longer than anyone in the history of the NGAUS, had an opportunity to reflect upon the events that had taken place in the two years since he had put aside the mantle of leadership. "I think," he said in reference to the event in May, "the proudest moment in my life was when I stood at that rostrum and witnessed the dedication of probably one of the most beautiful buildings in all of America. . . ."

As we look at it, in the light of the passage of 25 years since its doors were first opened, it is indeed a beautiful edifice. We would venture to say, however, that the beauty is less in the architectural accomplishment as compared with the sacrifice and contribution of the many members of the National Guard who made it possible and whose dedicated service continues to make it a living centerpiece in the mosaic that depicts the contributions of the traditional "militia soldier" to each state . . . and to the nation.●

WALTER FLOWERS

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the able gentleman from Pennsylvania for affording Members this opportunity to pay tribute to our late colleague from Alabama, Walter Flowers.

Walter's dedicated service in the House is well known to all Members. He was an able legislator, a honorable man, and a good friend. We will all miss him.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, during the difficult and important events of 1974, he brought to bear his considerable intelligence and decency to make an important contribution.

He also offered his State and the Nation important service through his membership on the Committee on Science and Technology during the maturing years in which the legislative jurisdiction of that committee developed in importance.

In 1977, he relinquished a subcommittee chairmanship on the prestigious Committee on the Judiciary, in order to provide the leadership needed on the Science Subcommittee on Fossil and Nuclear Energy, as the committee began to exercise the expanded responsibilities caused by the abolishment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As subcommittee chairman, he provided important leadership to Congress in this important area, and contributed to the important gains made by his district and his State in the development of a strong new base of technology. I think Walter's distinguished service in this area provides all Members with a model for how a Member can fairly and intelligently balance the interests of his constituency and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join my friend from Pennsylvania in extending my deepest sympathy to Walter's wife, Beverly, and the rest of the family. They have some fine memories of Walter to sustain them over the years, as do all of us here.●

RENUNCIATION OF THE CROWN

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1776, the General Assembly of the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations broke its ties with King George III and declared itself free and independent from any allegiance to Great Britain. Rhode Island was the first of the original colonies to declare its independence and to mark the anniversary of this auspicious occasion, I am entering the following copy of Rhode Island's Renunciation of the Crown, which has been provided by the Rhode Island Heritage Commission.

RENUNCIATION OF THE CROWN

An ACT repealing an Act entitled, "An Act for the more effectually securing to his Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects, in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations;" and altering the Forms of Commissions, of all Writs and Processes in the Courts, and of the Oaths prescribed by Law.

Whereas in all States existing by Compact, Protection and Allegiance are reciprocal, the latter being only due in Consequence of the former: And whereas GEORGE the Third, King of Great-Britain, forgetting his Dignity, regardless of the Compact most solemnly entered into, ratified and confirmed, to the Inhabitants of this Colony, by His illustrious Ancestors, and till of late fully recognized by Him—and entirely departing from the Duties and Character of a good King, instead of protecting, is endeavouring to destroy the good People of this Colony, and of all the United Colonies, by sending Fleets and Armies to America, to confiscate our Property, and spread Fire, Sword and Desolation, throughout our Country, in order to compel us to submit to the most debasing and detestable Tyranny; whereby we are obliged by Necessity, and it becomes our highest Duty, to use every Means, with which God and Nature have furnished us, in Support of our invaluable Rights and Privileges; to oppose that Power which is exerted only for our Destruction.

Be it therefore Enacted by this General Assembly, and by the Authority thereof it is Enacted, That an Act entitled, "An Act for the more effectual securing to His Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Clerk of the house, Josias Lyndon, wrote: "Resolved that the aforementioned written pass as an act of this assembly."

It was read and approved in the upper house the same day, as attested by Henry Ward, secretary.

For the first time the session closed with the words, "God save the United Colonies."●

HOW TO SUCCEED IN MEDICAL PRACTICE IN 1984

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, an article in the New England Journal of Medicine, March 15, 1984, edition, has come to my attention, and I want to share it with my colleagues. The article's incisive and thought provoking content makes it worthy of your consideration. As a member of a subcommittee that has been pondering the

issues posed by this article, I found it particularly noteworthy.

Of special interest, however, is the article's author. I'm proud to note that Dr. John F. Burnum is my constituent and a valued and highly respected resident of my hometown of Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Dr. Burnum writes from a vast amount of experience. With an undergraduate degree from the University of Alabama, Dr. Burnum went to Harvard Medical School, graduating cum laude in 1950. After residencies at Cornell Medical Center and the Medical College of Alabama, and a fellowship at Duke, Dr. Burnum entered the private practice of internal medicine in Tuscaloosa in 1954. For a number of years, he has also been a clinical professor of medicine at the University of Alabama School of Medicine in Birmingham and its College of Community Health Sciences in Tuscaloosa. He also serves as a consultant to the VA hospitals in Birmingham and Tuscaloosa.

He reviews articles for several internal medicine journals as well as being a regular contributor of articles to such prestigious journals as the New England Journal of Medicine and the Journal of the American Medical Association. He has addressed numerous medical groups and serves in many advisory positions and on many professional committees.

Dr. Burnum writes not as a bureaucrat with no feel for the realities of medical practice. He writes as a seasoned practitioner, a man sensitive to the subtleties of treating the complex creatures that human beings are.

His articles follows.

[From the New England Journal of Medicine, Mar. 15, 1984]

THE UNFORTUNATE CASE OF DR. Z: HOW TO SUCCEED IN MEDICAL PRACTICE IN 1984

The following address was given by Merin Gip, the Regional Inspector Commissioner of the Bureau of Health Care Delivery, at the 1984 inaugural meeting of the Coalition of Health-Care Providers and Consumers.

As Regional Inspector Commissioner of the Bureau of Health-Care Delivery, I wish to give an account of the unfortunate case of Dr. Z. This material is drawn from the hearing in which he was stripped of his hospital privileges and placed on probationary office practice because of failure to adjust to the new medicine. The hearing was occasioned by conjoined charges brought by the National Board of Hospital Administrators and ourselves, the state, Amici curiae included the U.S. Advertising Council and Statistical Analysands, Inc.

Dr. Z's rebellious obstinacy first came to our attention in the early 1970s. His dossier was soon swollen with complaints from many quarters—from our PSRO-PRO secretarial corps and data coordinators to high officials in the business and management of the medical industry. From the very outset, he failed to submit diagnoses that matched the computer disease and procedure codes. What was more, he refused to accept the guiding principles of the new medicine; that the encounter with the patient—the illness episode—is accurately and completely defined by a disease diagnosis (along with its accompanying tests and procedures), and that for every such disease there is a corresponding technological treatment.

Dr. Z insisted that patients came to see him for many reasons other than the presence of a specific disease. According to him, some wanted to establish themselves with a physician, so that if they were to become ill, they would have someone to call on who was familiar with them and their medical history. Others came for a medical evaluation, as a wise health practice or as a practical necessity, before embarking on a new business venture. Dr. Z believed that many patients came because of fear: if a good friend had just been found to have inoperable cancer, they might wish to know whether they had the same illness or whether their chest pain was due to heart disease. Many others came for genetic counseling, for advice on precautions to take when traveling abroad, for help in trying to decide whether to have surgery or take a new drug for gallstones, or for one of the many other reasons that people seek expert knowledge from professionals. Finally, according to Dr. Z, a visit whose purpose was disguised by an account of physical symptoms may simply have been made for the purpose of talking about the patient's troubles.

Moreover, Dr. Z claimed that when a disease was present, it was often just one of many diseases, each varying in severity from patient to patient, and usually inextricably mixed with emotional distress and adjustment difficulties—all components of the illness. Dr. Z claimed that illness is therefore unique and difficult to define by disease codes. Two similar patients may have identical grades of emphysema as described by pulmonary-function tests, but one may work without complaints and the other may apply for early retirement benefits; thus, the patients' feelings, their reactions to their disease, count.

Dr. Z's heretical views and his failure to code properly struck at the very heart of the new medicine: the data-collecting computer network. I need hardly remind you that in addition to using disease codes to pay for services and define treatment, we profile all physicians by these code numbers and corresponding costs per case. As a statistician, I can assure you that this gives us a complete picture of every physician's professional life and value to the health-delivery system. There is little that happens in American medicine that is not known to us. Therefore, Dr. Z was quickly singled out as a dyscodic outlier and heterogenicist. He was exposed as the shameless statistical deviate that he is.

With PSRO-PRO and then DRGs, Dr. Z's alienation from the new medicine worsened. Patients go to hospitals for acute illnesses, and naming their disease tells us all we need to know about the patients and their treatment. Dr. Z always seemed to be bogged down in the process of health-care delivery—in taking care of the patient, as he puts it—instead of stressing outcome. When asked by the review clerk for a patient's diagnosis and treatment plan, Dr. Z was known to reply that he was thinking, that he was trying to figure out what was wrong with the patient, and that this would involve studying and choosing the most appropriate tests to reach a diagnosis. He would then spend more time reading about the best treatment of the disorder, which in some cases might be nothing—that is, no technologic intervention. How can our peer-review data collectors deal with this kind of talk?

On another occasion Dr. Z said that explanation was the treatment. A patient with vertigo, who had been rushed to the hospital on several occasions thinking that he was dying, was told of the painful but harmless nature of the attacks and that he required no subsequent hospital care. Dr. Z asserted that, in addition to providing scientific expertise, physicians should express concern about their patients, gain their confidence and cooperation, and give them—and their families—peace of mind.

My answer to Dr. Z, of course, is that we have no code or audit criteria for explanation and reassurance or for what he calls "personal care." Our audit criteria were configured by experts and have been declared accurate and complete. Dr. Z's lame defense has been to say that the patient is not a disease and that the care of the patient is what counts. Tell that to a computer!

Despite mandatory attendance at indoctrination sessions, Dr. Z seemed incapable of understanding and participating in the new mission of hospitals—thus, his loss of hospital privileges. He was never able to think of medicine as an industry and view a hospital as a business. He was rude to the hospital's vice-president for marketing and opposed the plans to operate a health spa, give free cardiovascular stress tests to executives, and sell aloe tonic in the hospital gift shop, as well as all the other numerous publicity and selling strategies proposed by the marketing department. He could not see that hospitals have to be consumer-oriented, that they must sell what the consumer wants, nor would he support the hospital's policy, determined by strict cost accounting, of providing services to the public that are profitble and eliminating those that are not. His opposition to dropping the teaching program was particularly offensive.

Dr. Z is wrong. Hospitals are businesses, and the success of a doctor depends on the success of the hospital. Professional qualifications are not enough. The bottom line is whether the doctor can contribute to the hospital's overall marketing plan. Promotions and staff privileges will depend on whether doctors are winners or losers for the hospital. Low-paying-DRG profilers must go. The practice of medicine must change. There must be greater emphasis on hospital productivity and efficiency. Cost accounting must be part of physicians' grand rounds.

In today's world doctors and hospitals cannot succeed without computers. We must think in terms of DRG trees, outliers, hardware, and software; indeed, we must learn to think like computers. We can no longer look at patients as persons, but must view them as output or input, or as products. We must learn to manage product lines, to get into the habit of defining our output by product. Heart failure and shock, DRG 127, are now products.

We have made Dr. Z a test case in behavior modification and rehabilitation. He first felt the impact of monetary disincentives when he lost his hospital privileges. After thinking-adjustment sessions, he was given training in computer coding, advertising, market analysis, and selling strategies. At first I was optimistic about his progress, but I am told that he recently turned down our suggestion that he retain a publicity agent for his practice. When requested to be a preferred provider, he pulled out the old saw that physicians should be preferred for no

reason other than their professional qualifications and abilities and that he did not like to be called a health-care provider in the first place. He has failed to understand the necessity of shifting the emphasis in medicine from personal services to a return on capital. He clings to the archaic belief that medicine is an ethical rather than a commercial enterprise. Our proposed time frame for developing his new mind set is short. If he cannot adapt to the new medicine, that is too bad; there are plenty coming along who will.

JOHN F. BURNUM, M.D.●

INTERNATIONAL LAW TAKING ITS LUMPS

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been deeply concerned about the policy of this administration—ignoring and flaunting international law.

I wanted to share with my colleagues the following article, written by Matthew Nimetz, former counselor of the State Department and Under Secretary of State:

The article follows:

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Denver Colo., Apr. 23, 1984]

INTERNATIONAL LAW TAKING ITS LUMPS

(By Matthew Nimetz)

International law, never a dominating force in world affairs has taken a battering in recent years. Many Americans seem indifferent to this years. Many Americans seem indifferent to this trend and even scornful of the rule of law. In this, they are courting disaster. They do not see that it is in the interest of the United States, which stands to lose the most in a state of world anarchy, to take the lead in upholding international law and the institutions that can protect it.

Again and again, token observance of the rule of law now gives way to cynical disregard, which in turn gives way to overt violation. The Soviet Union regularly violates human rights covenants and the Helsinki Final Act and has now added the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan to its suppression of self-government in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland. Airplane hijackings, assassinations and other acts of terrorism are increasing throughout the world without concerted international reaction. Iran and Iraq openly flout the rule of law, Iran by its torture and genocidal policies toward adherents of the Bahai faith and Iraq by its use of chemical warfare against Iran.

Nor does the United States have a much better record. The Reagan administration has at best ignored and often transgressed basic rules of international conduct. Consider, for example, the questionable embargo occasioned by the European-Soviet natural-gas pipeline, the invasion of Grenada, the active support of armed warfare to destabilize Nicaragua, the mining of Nicaraguan harbors and most recently the withdrawal of Central American disputes from the jurisdiction of the World Court.

What are we to make of this alarming trend? Many people simply dismiss international law: It has never been strictly observed, and mechanisms for enforcement are at best weak and imperfect. Moreover, this argument goes, the Soviet Union and radical third world countries are routinely cavalier about international rules of conduct. But these observations miss the important point: A world composed of 160-odd fractious nations, if it is to grope forward to a more civilized regime, needs to strengthen the fragile strands of international law, not tear them down.

When the United States petulantly refuses to play by the rules it took the lead in establishing, we lose credibility with friendly governments and world opinion. We also make it more difficult to establish ground rules for relations with the third world and the Soviet Union.

Of course, in the face of the Soviet Union's open cynicism toward international law, the United States must reserve its freedom of action, particularly where our vital interests are at stake. But the United States cannot emulate the Soviet Union in international affairs. To do so is to expose ourselves to embarrassment, domestic discord and international repudiation.

The exercise of world leadership requires us to take international law seriously, and this in turn requires an intellectual integrity and self-discipline among our leaders that has been lacking. It also requires American public opinion, reflected through the Congress and through private organizations, including the organized bar, to focus greater attention on violations of international law wherever they occur.

When America accepts this responsibility, we enhance our leadership in the world community. To try to match the Russians in deviousness or the Libyans in irresponsibility or the Iranians in brutality is not only wrong but impossible for a country with our political culture, or allies and our long-term interests.●

THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, this year, the town of North Hempstead celebrates its 200th anniversary. The story of how North Hempstead gained its separate identity tells much about its inhabitants, past and present. Today, I would like to congratulate the people of North Hempstead and tell a little of their story.

North Hempstead was originally inhabited by the Matinecock Indians. In 1643, settlers from New England purchased land along the north shore of Long Island from the Matinecocks and began farming and lumbering. Within a few years, Dutch colonists arrived from New Amsterdam and other settlements to the west. By the early 1770's, Hempstead was increasingly divided between these earlier, anti-British residents in the north and later, pro-British residents in the south.

The first clear break between the two sides came in 1774 when a committee of northern Hempsteaders was formed to cooperate with the Continental Congress. Tory opposition to this move was so strong that North Hempstead seceded on September 23, 1775, and declared itself an independent township. Within 2 weeks, North Hempstead had elected Col. John Sands to lead the local militia company in the fight for independence.

Freedom was brief for these early patriots as the British Army occupied the new town less than a year later during the summer of 1776. Over the nearly 8 years of occupation, North Hempstead's leading citizens were arrested, its thriving forest decimated, and its residents abused by enemy troops quartered in homes throughout the township. Though occupied and oppressed, the rebels continued to fight back by capturing a British sloop in 1777 and raiding the house of Colonel Ludlow in 1779. After almost 8 long years of brutal occupation and a further 6 months of uncertainty, the town members' courage and patriotism were rewarded on April 14, 1784, when New York State officially created the separate township of North Hempstead.

Since its founding as a distinct township 200 years ago, North Hempstead has gone through several phases of development. In the 1800's, the town was best known for its abundant and excellent agricultural production, particularly its milling industry and its apples, potatoes, and milk. This century's increased transportation links between the town and New York City fed local industrial growth at the expense of farming. The postwar migration to the suburbs vastly increased the town's population and opened the way for the new office complexes, distribution centers, and warehouses. Finally, North Hempstead has long been an artistic center including amongst its inhabitants the writers F. Scott Fitzgerald, P. G. Wodehouse, and Christopher Morley, and the musicians George M. Cohan and John Philip Sousa.

With such a noble history, residents of North Hempstead are justifiably proud of the 200th anniversary of their township and the badge of patriotism they earned fighting for their independence from Hempstead's Tories and Britain's King George III. The bravery and suffering of North Hempsteaders at the time of independence, including such Revolutionary War heroes as Col. John Sands and Supervisor Adrian Onderdonck as well as hundreds of ordinary citizens, continues to inspire today's residents of the town 200 years later. I am confident that North Hempstead's next 200 years will be as colorful and as inspiring as those just experienced.●

WALTER FLOWERS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened at the passing of my good friend and former colleague, Walter Flowers of Alabama.

Walter and I worked together for many years as colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee. We also worked together on the Administrative Law Subcommittee where Walter served as my chairman.

Walter and I used to have a rivalry when Alabama met Notre Dame on the gridiron. Back in the salad days of Coach Bear Bryant and Coach Ara Parseghian, when the Crimson Tide and the Fighting Irish were participants in Holiday Bowl games vying for the national championship, I even arranged for Walter to get tickets—on the Notre Dame side, of course—for one or two of these titanic meetings.

Walter was a talented athlete whose prowess on the paddleball court was matched only by his legislative prowess in the Halls of Congress, where Walter was an effective legislator and one who represented his constituency well and diligently.

His keystone role in the Watergate impeachment hearings needs no retelling here. But, it was crucial.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to my late friend and I extend to his family and loved ones my condolences.●

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, though all Americans celebrate the Fourth of July as the birthday of our Nation's independence from Great Britain, many of you here today may not realize that the State of Rhode Island and Providence plantations, whose second district I am proud to represent, was the first State to declare their independence from Great Britain by an act of the general assembly.

On May 4, 1776, 2 months before the Declaration of Independence was issued, Rhode Island voted to dissolve its association with the mother country and became the first independent Colony.

Since 1663, Rhode Island had been governing itself under a very liberal charter obtained from Charles II, upon his ascension to the throne of Great Britain. Over the next 100 years, Rhode Islanders eagerly and actively participated in the democratic process.

Though always ready to offer military and other assistance to the crown during the various colonial wars in the early and mid-18th century, Rhode Islanders began to chaff under the yoke of the British Crown beginning in the 1760's. This occurred as the crown began to intrude more and more into areas that Rhode Islanders felt their charter left in their own hands.

In 1772, Rhode Islanders took the audacious step of burning the H.M.S. *Gaspee,* to protest the revenue acts recently enacted by Parliament and signed by the crown. In this and several other incidents, Rhode Island clearly established itself in the forefront of the movement for liberty and independence.

Over the next 4 years, while all the American Colonies suffered general grievances from Great Britain which created a bond between the Colonies, Rhode Island and Massachusetts were singled out for harsher treatment at the hands of the crown for the attitudes and activities of the citizens of these two Colonies.

With their last vestiges of patience and loyalty extinguished, the citizens of Rhode Island, meeting in their general assembly on May 4, 1776, absolved themselves from all further allegiance and obedience to the crown and declared their independence.

Following is a copy of the resolution passed that day, 208 years ago. As you read the words, their courage and bravery shine clearly through—those noble citizens who took the lead in breaking the yoke of bondage that had been laid on their shoulders by the crown and Parliament. Their words and deeds will always be a source of inspiration, not only for Rhode Islanders, but for all Americans. Thank you.

An act repealing an Act entitled, "An Act for the more effectually securing to his Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects, in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations;" and altering the Forms of Commissions, of all Writs and Processes in the Courts, and of the Oaths prescribed by Law.

Whereas in all States existing by Compact, Protection and Allegiance are reciprocal, the latter being only due in Consequence of the former: And whereas GEORGE the Third, King of Great Britain, forgetting his Dignity, regardless of the Compact most solemnly entered into, ratified and confirmed, to the Inhabitants of this Colony, by His illustrious Ancestors, and till of late fully recognized by Him—and entirely departing from the Duties and Character of a good King, instead of protecting, is endeavouring to destroy the good People of this Colony, and of all the United Colonies, by sending Fleets and Armies to America, to confiscate our Property, and spread Fire, Sword and Desolation, throughout our Country, in order to compel us to submit to the most debasing and detestable Tyranny; whereby we are obliged by Necessity, and it becomes our highest Duty, to use every Means, with which God and Nature have furnished us, in Support of our invaluable Rights and Privileges; to oppose that Power which is exerted only for our Destruction.

Be it therefore Enacted by this General Assembly, and by the Authority thereof it is Enacted, That an Act entitled, "An Act for the more effectual securing to His Majesty the Allegiance of his Subjects in this his Colony and Dominion of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Clerk of the House, Josias Lyndon, wrote: "Resolved that the aforementioned written pass as an act of this assembly."

It was read and approved in the upper house the same day, as attested by Henry Ward, secretary.

For the first time the session closed with the words, "God save the United Colonies."●

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, Jewish people all over the world will celebrate the 36th anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Jewish state. Israel stands today as a beacon of hope to Jews everywhere and to people everywhere who believe in the ultimate triumph of justice.

Israel is a beleaguered country; that is true. But she is also strong. That was not always so. I want to recall a story of how we in America worked with the people of Israel to make that country strong.

On my office wall, I have a sketch of the great Israeli leader and former Prime Minister Golda Meir. In the early spring of 1948, just weeks before Israel declared her independence, Golda came to this country from what was then called Palestine. She sought funds for the tiny Jewish state so that it might fight off the assault that was sure to come from her neighbors.

She arrived with little baggage and $10 in her pocketbook. She meant to raise $25 million. She feared it could not be done and the state would die in its infancy, not for lack of courage, but for lack of funds.

This is what she told her audiences: "You cannot decide if we will fight for our freedom. We will fight. But you can decide if we will win. And if we win, the Jewish people will never again be a subject people; from now on, we will be free."

The American Jewish community heard her plea. When she left America, she had with her not $25 million, but $50 million.

When Golda arrived back in Tel Aviv, Ben-Gurion took her by the shoulders and said; "When the book of history is written, it will be recorded

that it was by the work of a Jewish woman that the Jewish state was born."

In the years since Israel won her independence, she has survived endless military assaults and economic isolation. yet she flourishes today as one of the world's few genuine democracies.

Tragically, Israel is not accorded its full rights as a sovereign nation by most countries in the world. In fact, the United States is Israel's only true friend and ally. In the Middle East, the reverse is also true: Israel is the only country we can count on. As such, she is the linchpin of our foreign policy in that volatile region.

I was in the Middle East just about a year ago and, in the meantime, I have had extensive involvement in the politics of that region. Today, I want to discuss where we have been in our foreign policy toward the Middle East in the past year; where I think we have gone wrong; and what we can do in the future to support Israel, enhance our security and advance American values.

On my trip last year, I traveled to Israel and Lebanon. I met with a wide range of people and visited many strategically important areas—from Beirut to the Golan Heights. I talked with then Foreign Minister Shamir and Defense Minister Arens. I also talked with those with a differing view—Mr. Peres; Peace Now; and the Arab mayor of Bethlehem, Elias Freij. In Lebanon, I also met with government and military officials. I also spoke with the American Ambassador and our marines in the field.

Later, as a member of the House Ad Hoc Committee on Lebanon, I was constantly plagued by the same doubts about President Reagan's policy which had first struck me on my trip to the Middle East.

In the first place, President Reagan never gave the marines a clear role. The murkiness of their mission contributed to the failure of administration policy. The 1,800 marines stationed in a highly visible and vulnerable position could never have been expected to keep the peace in a country embroiled in civil war. It was President Reagan's misguided policy, not the dissenting voices from Congress, which doomed the Marines mission. I am proud to say that I voted to invoke the War Powers Act to trigger a national debate on our policy.

In the second place, when President Gemayal came to power in Lebanon, we all had great hope. But he never showed a willingness to be the president of all Lebanon. He was and is only the president of a Christian minority.

Furthermore, the United States did not pressure Gemayal into broadening the base of his support. We should have used our authority to persuade him to bridge old differences and reach out to the entire community. Instead, he used our Marines to buy time.

Finally, we pressured the wrong country to do the wrong thing. During negotiations for troop withdrawal prior to the now defunct May 17 agreement, the Reagan administration bullied Israel to withdraw.

We publicly chastised Israel and held up a previous agreement of strategic cooperation. We refused her offer to share military intelligence vital to this country. We even refused her offer of medical assistance when our marines desperately needed immediate attention after the horrible bombing of our headquarters in Beirut.

Within 24 hours of that bombing, our committee was in a meeting with Secretary of Defense Weinberger. We asked him, "Why, why did we refuse their assistance when it was so close at hand?" He told us that we had gone by the book and airlifted wounded men to hospitals thousands of miles away. Well, what about the book of commonsense?

Meanwhile, we never put the heat on Syria to withdraw from Lebanon even though it has occupied that country for 8 long years. We gave Syria the benefit of the doubt even though it is an ally of the Soviet Union.

Syria spent a generation using the Golan Heights as a launching pad for rockets on Israeli settlements. Do we really believe they will negotiate in good faith out of the kindness of their hearts?

We must learn that we cannot count on these hostile countries to deal in good faith unless we drive a very hard bargain.

That goes for our negotiations in Lebanon and for the overall Arab-Israeli conflict. The core of the Arab-Israeli conflict is the unwillingness of Israel's neighbors, except Egypt, to recognize her and make peace with her. Israel has clearly demonstrated her willingness to negotiate and to even make concessions in return for peace. But it cannot make concessions to a country which is in a state of war with her.

We must stand up for Israel, not stand up to her. We cannot buy Arab friendship with arms. Until the day they sit at the peace table, I say: "No weapons to countries at war with Israel." When the Saudis wanted AWACS, I said: "No peace, no planes." When the Jordanians wanted missiles, I said: "No peace, no way." And I will continue to say it over and over again because support for Israel must be the cornerstone of our Middle East policy.

Let us look at the record of our so-called "moderate" Arab friends.

When we sell the Saudis weapons, they raise the price of oil. When we count on their diplomacy in Lebanon, they doublecross us and sell out to the Syrians. When they advance a peace plan, it includes peace for everyone except Israel.

And what do they do with their great wealth? Do they use their riches to educate their people? On the contrary, they fear an educated people will tire of monarchy and their women will want to come out from behind the veil.

And what of Jordan and King Hussein? How often has he missed the boat to peace? Even as the President prepared another package of military goodies for him, the king was denouncing the United States as "unprincipled" and not "evenhanded" because of our support for Israel.

Well, the United States should not be "evenhanded." In all our meetings with Secretary of State Schultz, he stressed our commitment to Israel and I agree. Who in the Middle East is our one faithful ally? Which country in the Middle East has the only democratic government? Where can the United States turn in the Middle East to find a country we can always count on? There is but one answer to all three questions: Israel.

This question of "evenhandedness" always comes up in Congress at foreign aid time. This year I will vote, as I always have, for assistance to Israel. We hope to pass a $2.6 billion package of economic and military aid this year.

Before we vote foreign aid to any country, we should ask ourselves two questions: First, is this investment in our national interest? Second, is the country we propose to help doing all it can to help itself?

In the case of Israel, the answer to both questions is emphatically yes. Israel, as a democratic ally, is strategically vital to the United States in an otherwise unstable region. Every man and woman in that country devotes a part of his or her life to military service and a sizable chunk of their income to the national defense. Israel does not ask America to shed the blood of its own men in her defense; she only asks for our help.

There is one more crucial link in the security chain in the Middle East. Until the United States is energy independent, neither our security nor the security of Israel will be sure. President Reagan has been lulled to sleep by today's lower energy costs, but tomorrow a crisis could occur to put us once again in a weak position.

Until we are energy independent, Arab sheiks will hold the energy carrot out to the West. They will accept our gifts of money and military hardware and, in turn, finance terrorism with their petrodollars.

Today, the administration's policy in the Middle East is adrift. This part of the world demands our full attention. President Reagan has delegated authority for so long that he has lost control of events. In Lebanon, we have

had as many policies as we have had roving ambassadors. Compare this to Camp David, where President Carter's personal commitment was the key to reaching agreement between Egypt and Israel.

The United States cannot solve all the problems in the Mideast. But we are a necessary broker. No other country can accomplish what we can. We must pick up where Camp David left off in our search for peace.

To advance American interests, we must have a policy that is both tough and principled. The United States, as the leader of the free world, should be a leader in the Middle East. At the same time, peace will only come if there are free leaders in the Middle East. I look forward to the day when such Arab leaders drop their swords and plough a field of peace with the State of Israel.

In the meantime, there is one constant in the Middle East: The faithful friendship of our democratic ally, Israel.

The United States is sometimes compelled to make alliances of convenience, but morality is the lasting measure of our foreign policy.

There are many strategic reasons for the United States to support Israel. But the most compelling reason to do so is because it is right. Thank you.●

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the brutal genocide of the Armenian people which began seven decades ago.

This commemoration is especially important because the massacre of the Armenian people has often been known as the forgotten genocide. It is all but ignored in history books and courses, and still denied by the Turkish Government.

Yet the facts are clear. Between 1915 and 1923, 1½ million Armenians were either murdered or perished from starvation and exposure on forced marches. In addition, more than half a million Armenian survivors were exiled from their homes in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the genocidal nature of this persecution is undeniable as over 80 percent of the then existent Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire died or were banished from their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, that anyone could deny the existence of these massacres is incredible and unacceptable as there is ample evidence that they occurred. For example, in a telegram on July 16, 1915, Henry Morgenthau, the American Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, stated that "deportation of and excesses against peaceful Armenians is increasing and from harrowing reports of eyewitnesses it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion." Front page headlines from the New York Times in 1915 included "Turks Depopulate Towns of Armenia" and "Turks Accused of Plan To Exterminate Whole Population."

The genocide of the Armenian people must not be forgotten. Continued observations of the massacres, such as the commemorative events taking place this week, and the presentation of exhibits, such as the prominent inclusion of the Armenian genocide in our capital's planned Holocaust Museum, will insure that this tragedy shall not be overlooked. In so remembering this dark episode of humanity, we contribute to the prevention of future genocide.●

CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, I have participated in the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil in an attempt to draw attention to the plight of Soviet Jews and other prisoners of conscience who are seeking freedom and emigration from the Soviet Union.

Despite the best efforts by Members of Congress, Soviet Jewish emigration continues to tragically decline each year.

Last year at this time, I noted that from 1979 to 1982, the number of Soviet Jews that had been allowed to emigrate had fallen by over 90 percent. Well, Mr. Speaker, from 1982 to 1983, that number dropped by another 50 percent. Only 1,315 Soviet Jews were granted permission to emigrate in 1983. In addition, I understand that the Soviets have allowed anti-Zionist committees to be formed to further harass Soviet Jewish citizens.

In particular, I am concerned about the plight of the Yakov Beilin family. Yakov Beilin is a forestry technician who lives in a small Jewish community in Tula. Most of his family, eight aunts and uncles who previously lived in Vilna, were exterminated with their young children during World War II.

In 1973, Mr. Beilin's father died after a long illness. Before he died, his last stated wish was that his family move to Israel where his only sister resided. This request the widow Beilin decided to fulfill.

Yakov Beilin's mother was granted permission to emigrate to Israel, but Yakov Beilin, his wife, and two children were refused. Despite her age and frailty, Yakov Beilin's mother decided to make the move.

His mother remains most distressed by being separated from her family. She writes:

> I have but one desire. I beg you to help me bring my son and his family to Israel. The few years that I have left to live, I would like to spend together with him.

Mr. Speaker, as one of many concerned Members participating in this year's vigil, I hope the Soviet Union will exhibit respect for basic human rights and privileges, as guaranteed under the Soviet Constitution and the Helsinki Accords, and reunite the Beilin family and other Soviet families in similar circumstances.●

GYPSY MOTH PROMISING RESEARCH

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the following article describing an innovative gypsy moth pesticide control development. Sponsored through the combined efforts of Temple University, The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Ben Franklin Partnership, the National Institute of Health, and Rohm & Haas, a biologist is on the verge of perfecting a pesticide to control the damage of the gypsy moth.

An insect which has plagued States throughout the Northeast, the gypsy moth predator is advancing south and defoliating thousands of acres of trees throughout the Nation. Although several years away from widespread use to combat the gypsy moth, I believe the following article which appeared in the April 9, 1984 Philadelphia Inquirer will detail some of the advances being made through genetic engineering.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 9, 1984]

DEVELOPING A SAFE PESTICIDE

(By Linda Loyd)

Soon, the voracious leaf-eating gypsy moth caterpillars will chew their way across Pennsylvania, New Jersey and much of the Northeast defoliating thousands of acres of woodland.

To date, there is no best way to kill the gypsy moth. Chemical sprays are effective but stir up opposition from environmental groups because the sprays might harm humans.

One environmentally safe alternative to the chemicals is a bacterial insecticide called bacillus thuringiensis. BT, however, has shortcomings. In spray form, it has a shorter field life and is much less potent than

chemicals such as Sevin, Orthene, Dylox and Dimilin.

A team of biologists at Temple University has been working for six years on ways to overcome BT's shortcomings. Under the direction of William R. Harvey, the biologists have isolated a crystal BT protein that could be 20 times more potent and still safe for humans.

Harvey's team has succeeded in isolating a small active protein fragment, called a peptide, that is toxic to some insects. Now that they have it isolated, they are trying to find ways to genetically implant it into seeds, which would grow into plants that are resistant to gypsy moths and other pests that destroy crops.

"We're a month or so away from getting a form of BT that will be useful and has the long-range potential to be a gene inserted into seeds," Harvey said.

When that happens, Rohm & Haas Co., which has supported the research, will obtain a patent and begin tests toward marketing the new BT as a spray insecticide and eventually putting it into seeds.

"It would revolutionize all insect control," Harvey said in his lab. "Maybe more important, in Pennsylvania there would be a whole new industry. I call it 'recombinant insecticides' because you recombine this gene into the plant."

BT works on the insect gut and not on the insect nervous system, as do most conventional insecticides. Because the insect gut works differently than the human digestive system, the BT kills insects but is not harmful to people.

"If the BT gene was put in an ear of corn, for instance," Harvey said, "then every kernel would have BT insecticide in it. If the corn borer ate it, that would be the end of it. In terms of dollars and cents, the market for seed worldwide is billions of dollars."

Rohm & Hass turned to Harvey, who has a doctorate in biology from Harvard University, because he had done pioneering work on the insect gut in the 1960s in Denmark. That work paved the way for later research on insecticides.

"Rohm & Haas has a number of options in terms of products," said Ronald Meeusen, a plant physiologist who heads Rohm & Haas' agriculture biology research at a 160-acre facility in Spring House, Montgomery County.

"Ultimately," Meeusen said, "what we would like to do is produce crops which are no longer susceptible to various insect pests. So we would be able to sell farmers crops that would have dramatically lowered requirement for insecticide. That would have environmental advantages, as well as cost advantages."

Through genetic engineering, Harvey hopes to come up with a BT gene that would kill all agricultural pests, including the corn borer, the tobacco horn worm and its cousin, the tomato horn worm, often seen in gardens.

Researchers at about 10 chemical companies across the country are searching for a more lethal BT, but Harvey said his team "will be the first people, I think, to have these BT peptides."

"We're a month away from getting ones that are 20 times as powerful," Harvey said. ". . . Other people are trying to do it, too. Whoever does it first is going to create a whole new industry. So the stakes are very high."

Harvey estimated that researchers were five years away from having a more potent form of BT that could be sprayed directly on trees. "We're about 10 years away from putting the thing in plants," he said.

Meanwhile, the gypsy moths will consume millions of acres of foliage from late spring to the end of June. In the last three years, the moths destroyed 28 million acres of forest land in the Northeast.

Gypsy moths have plagued states throughout the Northeast since 1869, when a Frenchman trying to develop a strain of silk brought them to this country. Defoliation has been on a downward cycle this year and last in New England, eastern Pennsylvania, New Jersey and eastern New York.

But the predators are advancing south, and defoliation is expected to increase in Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland and south western Pennsylvania, said Win McLane, pesticidesection leader at a U.S. Department of Agriculture center in Massachusetts.

About 43,000 acres in New Jersey will be sprayed this year under a state-funded moth-control program. Pennsylvania's $3.6 million spraying program will treat parts of 30 counties this year.

"At the moment," Harvey said, "there is no overall national program to control gypsy moths. It's left up to individual state and local governments. Once DDT was banned, the federal government didn't have any really effective weapon against the gypsy moth."

This summer the Agriculture Department will test some higher-potency strains of BT on 800 acres near Lock Haven in north-central Pennsylvania, according to James Nichols, chief of the Pennsylvania Department of Forestry's pest-management division.

But the BT tested by the Agriculture Department is only five to 10 times more potent than the present BT.

In Brownsville, Texas, where the department has based some of its BT research, Howard T. Dulmage, an Agriculture Department scientist, said that he was familiar with Harvey's research and called Harvey "a very good scientist."

"Somebody is going to come along with something, and it might be Bill Harvey," he said.

The Temple projects has received about $300,000 in financing each of the last two years, Harvey said, "divided pretty equally" among Rohm & Haas; Temple; the state, through the Ben Franklin Partnership, and the National Institutes of Health.

In another BT research project, Harvey is using similar techniques to come up with a strain of another variety of BT that kills mosquitoes, which carry encephalitis and malaria.

Through genetic engineering, Harvey is working to implant a BT gene into algae. If the work is a success, larvae would be killed immediately after eating the genetically altered algae. "You would have to introduce it only once," Harvey said, and each new generation of the algae would carry the mosquito-killing agent.

The goal is to curb malaria, one of the world's leading causes of death, especially in Third World countries.

The World Health Organization in Geneva, Switzerland, is "very interested in this approach," said Harvey, who talked with the organization about putting BT genes into algae.

"Imagine," Harvey said, "being the one who rids an area of the world of malaria. It would be exciting, wouldn't it?"●

FORMER SPOUSES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation today with the gentlelady from Colorado to offer much needed relief to former spouses of Foreign Service officers who have been shut out from any pension after years of faithful service abroad for the U.S. Government. These women have suffered financially without any recognition for their years of unremunerated, selfless service. Our bill finally addresses the needs of these former spouses who were not covered by the 1980 act, and I am proud to do my part to see that the Government at last does right by this group of women who have done so much for the United States abroad.●

THE EDUCATION FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN AND YOUTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1984

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce along with my colleagues the Education for Gifted and Talented Children and Youth Improvement Act of 1984. This legislation is designed to assist States to mobilize public and private resources and talent to develop, expand, and improve educational opportunities for gifted and talented students, support research, evaluate programs, and provide information and technical assistance. This measure is, in part, a response to the National Commission on Excellence in Education's report, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." The Commission states,

> The Federal Government, in cooperation with States and localities, should meet the needs of key groups of students such as gifted and talented, the socioeconomically disadvantaged, minority and language minority students, and the handicapped. In combination, these groups include both national resources and the Nation's youth most at risk.

The Federal Government plays a critical role in meeting the educational needs of every group of at risk students except our gifted and talented children and youth.

While the Congress has, over the past several decades, developed, refined, and maintained discrete Federal roles for the various students with unique learning needs identified in the

Commission's report, there is at present no Federal leadership directed at improving educational opportunities for gifted and talented children and youth. The very modest program proposed in this legislation is designed to fill that gap. The National Commission on Excellence in Education calls upon our Federal Government in cooperation with our State and local government, private enterprise, and our American citizens to share the responsibility for improving education.

During the 1960's, education policy and resource attention was focused on the needs of other special populations, and programs for gifted and talented students declined dramatically. In 1969, through the leadership of Senator Jacob Javits of New York, and my colleague, Congressman ERLENBORN of Illinois, the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Assistance Act (section 806 of Public Law 91-230) was passed. This act established gifted and talented youth as a Federal concern, gave them priority in several Federal programs, and required the Commissioner of Education to report to the Congress on the status of the education of gifted and talented children and youth.

The Congress again strengthened and improved the Federal role in 1978 with the passage of title IX of Public Law 96-561, the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act. While Federal funding never exceeded $6 million in any year, the use of those funds to provide information, train and support leadership personnel, educate educational decisionmakers, and demonstrate programing options, provided the catalytic base necessary for State and local program improvement. Studies done by Zettel show that during that period of time, there were increases in the numbers of students served, personnel trained and employed, and resources committed.

With the passage of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA) the Federal programs dissolved into the education block grant. For example, the Office of Gifted and Talented has been abolished and no one is presently designated to serve a leadership or advocacy function in this regard. No funding is available to support research and demonstration efforts or train personnel. It is therefore the purpose of this act to supplement the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 by providing the limited Federal role recommended by the Commission on Excellence in Education in an attempt to improve the educational opportunities for the gifted and talented children and youth of our Nation.

The gifted child in society today is in an awkward position. He is respected by the public at large, he is envied by his parents and his peers, and he is neglected by our educational system. It was reported by U.S. News & World Report on August 8, 1983, that up to 18 percent of all high school dropouts are gifted students. This is an alarming statistic when you consider that while other nations nurture their students carefully and systematically, we fail to provide Federal leadership in the education of gifted and talented children and youth.

There has been a great deal of rhetoric regarding excellence in education. This bill will go beyond this rhetoric by directing both teaching and learning toward meeting the individual educational needs of each child. We have learned with our lowest functioning students that it is critical to design an appropriate educational plan that will allow the child to reach his or her full potential. We are currently learning that if our highest functioning students are to reach their full potential, we must design programs that will meet their unique learning needs. In order to truly obtain excellence in education, we can no longer afford to neglect our students at both ends of our educational spectrum.

This legislation will serve as a catalyst to bring business leaders into partnership with educators to insure an appropriate education for America's gifted students. An example of this partnership is the Allegheny Conference which was formed in western Pennsylvania. This conference consists of a consortium of businesses including the following: IBM, Alcoa, and Westinghouse Nuclear who work with schools to improve the teaching skills of high school teachers, and improve vital technical skills of our able high school students. The successful partnership between business and education in western Pennsylvania clearly indicates that if we expand these cooperative efforts across our Nation, we will begin to adequately address the needs of the gifted and talented. This bill will provide Federal support for these private sector initiatives in order to expand the educational opportunities for these at risk students.

Educational reform in our Nation must begin with the fundamental concept that each child performs and develops in our educational system at different rates: We must commit ourselves to developing an appropriate educational plan that will allow each child to grow and reach his or her full potential. I strongly believe that this bill contributes to improving the quality of education by providing modest support for States to develop and advance programs for our Nation's gifted and talented children and youth.

It is my hope that the Education for Gifted and Talented Children and Youth Improvement Act of 1984 will spark the interest of the public and foster national attention to the needs of our Nation's gifted and talented children and youth. My Subcommittee on Select Education anticipates holding a hearing on this legislation in the summer, which will give the public the opportunity to comment on this important issue.●

TIMOTHY TOWERS, YOUTH LEGACY OLYMPIC TORCH-BEARER

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the lighting of the Olympic flame was an important ritual during the ancient Olympic games in Greece, a tradition which continues in our modern Olympic games as well. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a young man from my Fourth Congressional District in Long Island, N.Y., Timothy Towers of Levittown. He is one of the runners selected for the honor of carrying the Olympic flame to Los Angeles Coliseum for the summer Olympic games.

This is indeed a great honor for Timothy, and we are privileged to have a constituent of our Fourth Congressional District take part in this Olympic tradition for the 1984 summer games.

He will carry the torch for 1 kilometer in the 12,000-mile 1984 Olympic torch relay, which will begin May 8 in New York City and finish in Los Angeles for the start of the games on July 28.

Almost 400 Long Island boys and girls, aged 8 to 17, ran time trials around the Nassau Farmers Market in Bethpage on March 11 to qualify for the drawing. To qualify, the youngsters had to run the kilometer course (0.6 of a mile) in under 7 minutes. Timothy's time was 3 minutes and 23 seconds (3:23). The names of all qualifying runners were entered in a drawing and the winner was selected by former U.S. Olympic track coach and competitor Bruce MacDonald of Port Washington.

Timothy attends the St. James Elementary School in Seaford and competes on a Catholic Youth Organization track team.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Timothy for his participation in this exciting event as Long Island's "Youth Legacy Kilometer Olympic Torchbearer."●

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 5167

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a comprehensive substitute amendment to the Department of Defense (DOD) authorization bill.

The debate on national defense and national security policy in this Congress has focused almost exclusively on the total amount of DOD spending and the rate of real growth in that spending. In my view this is an incorrect focus. Military spending must be analyzed in terms of U.S. foreign and military objectives. If increased spending is necessary to insure our national security, then we must provide sufficient moneys; but first we must analyze the policy objectives we are trying to achieve.

The national security role of the United States should be to exert international leadership to bring the world closer to peace. Military tensions must be eased, detente must be revived, and the threat of nuclear war must be reduced.

I strongly disagree with the Reagan administration view, and the view of my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee, as to what is necessary for our national security. It is for this reason that I feel compelled to offer my substitute amendment.

The major themes of my proposal are:

First, to lessen the threat of nuclear war through support for a nuclear freeze and for arms control initiatives leading to major weapons reductions;

Second, a noninterventionist conventional—nonnuclear—national security policy;

Third, a reduced U.S. military role in Europe and East Asia;

Fourth, a redirection of procurement policies to reduce waste, fraud, abuse, and massive cost overruns; and

Fifth, a stronger national security through a policy of conversion to an economy which is less dependent on military spending.

Implementation of these themes would greatly enhance our national security. In addition, implementation would provide substantial budgetary savings sufficient both to reduce significantly the unprecedented Reagan administration budget deficits and to make resources available for selective increases in social spending.

DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR PROPOSALS

The proposal includes the following principal changes from that of the administration request for national defense:

First, to lessen the threat of nuclear war; we must insist on aggressive arms control initiatives and negotiations. The proposal contemplates a nuclear freeze, followed by major arms reductions.

The alternative proposal would eliminate procurement and research and development for destabilizing weapons systems—the MX, the Trident II, Pershing II and cruise missiles. These are weapons which are a threat to, rather than an enhancement of, our national security. While we may have to reluctantly accept some existing nuclear weaponry as necessary to deter nuclear war, we must reject the current nuclear buildup whose purpose is to arm the United States to fight a nuclear war. The present U.S. nuclear arsenal—10,000 strategic, 15,000 tactical warheads—is more than sufficient for any deterrent objective. Funding for the expensive and unnecessary B-1 bomber program is also eliminated.

In addition, funding is eliminated for the administration's misguided Star Wars proposals. The defensive capability of this strategic defense system is illusory; it will only lead to a false sense of security; and it will seriously distort the allocation of both human and financial resources.

Second, to bring about a noninterventionist conventional—nonnuclear—policy, we must insist that the proper U.S. defense policy is to defend U.S. security interests; not to intervene militarily in and against Third World countries around the world.

The administration seeks to increase the number of aircraft carrier battle groups from the present 13 to 15. The principal purpose of such battle groups, however, is to intervene against Third World countries. These battle groups would serve little purpose in any confrontation with the Soviet Union; devoting such an extensive part of our naval budget to these expensive and useless forces is inappropriate.

I would initially maintain the current level of 13 battle groups with phased reductions to 10 groups over the next 5 years. Significant cuts are made in the procurement of battle group escort and support ships—where the bulk of the task force spending occurs—and in the reduced carrier air wings.

We must also reject the buildup of the rapid deployment force and eliminate all funds for this program. The only role of the rapid deployment force, now called the U.S. Central Command, is to promote an interventionist U.S. policy against small countries and to protect the oil fields of the Middle East and Southwest Asia. We have the Marines; the role of the Marines is to be a RDF, but even this role should be limited, and not increased.

Third, to reduce the number of troops stationed in and for Europe and Asia. Many of those proposing nuclear constraint advocate and expansion of our ground forces in Europe. This idea should be rejected on two grounds: it would vastly increase military spending, thereby escalating the deficit and reducing social spending; moreover, it makes no sense in terms of our national defense.

Approximately, some 35 to 45 percent of the military budget currently is predicted on the U.S. fighting a prolonged land war in Europe. The possibility of the United States again fighting a major land war there is unlikely. Given that there is no such thing as a truly conventional force, and that all United States and Soviet forces are now nuclear equipped, most analysts believe that there would be a virtually automatic escalation to nuclear exchanges; first tactical—Hiroshima scale—levels, then world-threatening strategic levels.

Even making the incredible assumption that a war involving the U.S.S.R., Europe, and the United States might avoid a nuclear confrontation, an extended European land war would still require a general mobilization. There is no need to maintain such a large standing Army to protect our national security interests. We propose reducing the number of Army divisions from 16 to 13 by fiscal year 1988.

Fourth, to seriously redirect procurement policies to reduce waste, abuse, and massive cost overruns. Cuts are made in various weapon systems which are redundant, ordered in larger than necessary quantities, having serious cost overruns, or simply too expensive for their military purpose. The recent publicity surrounding the Pentagon's purchase of various dime store hardware items for thousands of dollars per item are only recent examples of this outrageous practice.

Fifth, in addition, we must move toward funding a major conversion employment program—$45 billion over the next 5 years. The burden of a decision to eliminate or reduce certain weapon systems should be a national one and not concentrated in those cities and towns where those particular systems are produced. Thus, we must include moneys for approximately 300,000 jobs for fiscal year 1985 in areas where workers on military programs are displaced as a result of weapon systems cuts.

Even these proposed cuts are constrained by the nature of the present debate. The bulk of moneys authorized in the last few budget years for military weapons and hardware is only now being disbursed. For example, it is interesting to note that even if all new procurement were cut this year, the fiscal year 1985 spending for procurement would only be reduced by $13 billion.

This is because the only serious focus of concern in the Congress with regard to the massive military spend-

ing program is its impact on the deficit. Since outlays, not budget authority, affect the current year budget deficit, the reduction of current year outlays takes congressional precedence. Since procurement outlays take place over 5 to 7 years, cutting procurement provides few outlay reductions and the pressure to cut procurement lessens. Given this, the Congress then makes its reductions in precisely those accounts where spending should be the highest: readiness and personnel. Yet, in subsequent years, procurement comes back to haunt the budget process and the operational readiness of our forces is lessened, despite the massive increases in spending.

In sum, what we need is a policy based on the defense of U.S. interests, not an arming for nuclear war or for intervention around the world. Such a policy would require greatly reduced levels of military spending, would create fewer distortions in the economy at large, and would significantly enhance the prospects for peace and real arms reductions.

A CONCLUDING NOTE ON REAL GROWTH

The national defense is not some abstract number to be auctioned up or down. Unfortunately, last year's debate was such an auction: 10-percent real growth, the President; 6-percent real growth, the House Armed Services Committee; 4 percent, the House; and 5 percent, the compromise. This year the auction continues: the President requesting a 12.5-percent real increase—19 percent in current dollars, the House Armed Services Committee using a 6-percent figure, and the House Budget Committee proposing 3.5-percent real growth, the figure approved by the House. What is the meaning of this real growth?

A zero-percent real increase means complete acceptance of the extraordinary military budget approved last year. A zero-percent real increase means that the policy embodied in the 1985 budget should be essentially identical to that of 1984.

To give these numbers some life: the difference between zero real growth—that is, last year's complete budget in this year's prices—and the President's request, is about $35 billion. With that amount of money, the country could fund a 50-percent increase in all food programs—that is, food stamps, WIC, a 50-percent increase in AFDC, a 50-percent increase in medicaid, a 50-percent increase in SSI payments, fully fund the IDA/World Bank program for the poorest countries, create a quarter of a million new jobs, and still have $1 billion left over for petty cash.

But even zero-percent real growth is too high. Anyone who thought last year's budget was too high, logically cannot accept even a zero-percent real increase; rather, they must seek real decreases. Last year's defense budget, however, was an increase of 85 percent in dollar terms and over 45 percent in real terms—that is over 11 percent per year real growth for each of the years—since 1980. The President's fiscal year 1985 request in current dollars is more than double the fiscal year 1980 level. If the Congress has continued President Carter's fiscal year 1980 level of military spending, in real terms, and note, these fiscal year 1980 levels were already much too weighted toward military spending—the deficit projected for the fiscal year 1985–87 period would be reduced by more than half.●

WORLD POLITICS—AND TRAGEDY

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Chernenko assumes leadership of the Soviet Union, it remains unclear what the policy of the new regime will be with regard to Soviet Jewry. Soviet Jewish emigration plummeted from a peak of 51,320 in 1979 to 2,688 in 1982. Only 1,314 Soviet Jews were allowed to emigrate in 1983. As profound as these figures are, they do not begin to express the individual tragedy experienced by the Soviet Prisoners of Conscience and their families.

In a recent article in the Denver Post, "World Politics—And Tragedy," David McQuay details the continuing tragedy of Nohim Meiman, a noted Soviet mathematical physicist, who has tried for almost 10 years to obtain an exit visa, and his daughter, Olga Plam, and her ongoing campaign to get her father out of the Soviet Union.

I commend this article to my colleagues' attention while applauding the continued efforts of this body to ease the oppression of Soviet Jews. America has long been a symbol of freedom for the oppressed peoples of the world. The recent change in power in the Soviet Union makes this a timely opportunity to renew our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the McQuay article at this point in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues' attention.

WORLD POLITICS—AND TRAGEDY

(By David McQuay)

BOULDER.—Olga Plam is creating a better flamingo in her office. It's a glass crystal flamingo with pink eyes and fragile, spindly legs, the tops of which she must thicken to strengthen the piece. A glass flamingo needs strong legs.

Near the flamingo, a small glass menagerie is herded: A clown with a red nose does a handstand. A peacock spreads crystal plumage. A half-finished pelican waits for a more graceful neck. Surrounded by the glass figurines, a black and white photograph of Plam's 73-year-old father, Nohim Meiman, keeps sentinel. He stands in a public square in Moscow frequented by dissidents, wearing a fur hat. He has the tragic eyes of an idealist.

Plam has two jobs: designing glass figurines for Crystal Zoo, a Boulder company that produces and distributes them to stores all over the United States and Europe, and engineering a campaign to get her father out of the Soviet Union. For almost 10 years her father, a noted Soviet mathematical physicist, has tried to get an exit visa, and Moscow has continually denied it, claiming that he is a security risk. Crystal can be cut and shaped; U.S.-Soviet politics is an impenetrable fog.

"Politics is so amorphic, such a mass," Plam said, "but it's amazing how it affects one person's life."

Two senators, Colorado's Gary Hart and Indiana's Richard Lugar, have sent separate letters to the Soviet ambassador to the United States, Anatoly Dobrynin, asking that Russia allow Meiman, who has angina, and Inna, Plam's stepmother, who has brain cancer, to emigrate to the United States. Moscow replies with silence, as it did when Walter Mondale told Plam during his vice presidency that he would try to help. Rep. Tim Wirth of Colorado prodded a dozen members of Congress to sign a letter to Leonid Brezhnev urging Meiman's release, and Wirth visited Meiman in Moscow, exchanging letters between him and his daughter. Wirth's colleague, Rep. Pat Schroeder, visited Meiman in 1978 and returned with a letter signed by Meiman and other Soviet Jewish dissidents that called for U.S. trade restrictions on Russia because of the oppression of emigrants.

Schroeder told a Denver Post reporter then that she smuggled out three hours of tapes of the dissidents' conversation in her underwear.

Twelve U.S. district attorneys, including Denver's Dale Tooley, met with Soviet officials in 1978 and were promised that all 883 Jewish families living in Moscow, Leningrad and Odessa who have applied for visas would be permitted to leave. In Russia, Jews can hold only 5 percent of the jobs in an office or school.

Then came the invasion of Afghanistan, the U.S. boycott of the Olympics, and a long cold silence from the Soviets.

There is silence on the telephone lines. When Meiman calls her, Plam sometimes hears the Soviet operator tell him, "There's no answer." When she got through to her father during a February rally in Indianapolis protesting Soviet treatment of Soviet Jews, she handed the phone to Sen. Lugar. Right after Lugar introduced himself to Meiman, the line went dead.

"Olga got hysterical," said Dr. Douglas Zipes, a cardiologist who directs the Soviet Jewry organization in Indianapolis. "It was an emotional experience that Hollywood could not have planned more dramatically." Somehow, they got through to Meiman again and finished the conversation. Zipes visited Meiman two years ago after being invited by Brezhnev's physician to lecture at the World Congress of Cardiology in Moscow, and Meiman gave him a Rachmaninoff record as a gift. Zipes gave it to Plam after he saw Meiman's inscription: "With love and sadness from Russia."

In a year in which the Kremlin refuses to see a U.S. ambassador and the United States mines a harbor in Nicaragua, it is unlikely that Olga Plam will see her father soon, if ever again. More than 30 years ago, Meiman headed the mathematics department of a

project directed by physicist Andrei Sakharov. The project was the H-bomb. Plam does not like to talk about this chapter of her father's life, but she said that Meiman never knew much about the total project, that the information has become general scientific knowledge. Even Harvard and Princeton students have designed A-bomb plans "as a lark," as one of them put it. But one wonders what the United States would do about a Los Alamos scientist who decided to emigrate to Russia.

Meiman's first clash with the Kremlin came in 1950, when he and several other dissidents signed a letter demanding political freedom. For years Meiman kept a low profile. Then when he applied for an exit visa in 1975, he lost his chair at the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics. In 1976, he sent a 'letter to the Soviet Academy of Science, arguing for Soviet scientists' freedom to attend conferences abroad, publish in Western magazines and correspond with Western colleagues. When he demonstrated for Jewish emigration rights a month later, he was arrested. And arrested again when he participated in a Jewish cultural conference.

And arrested again last year when he was 72. His typewriter and tape recorder were confiscated. His phone is tapped. His daughter never gets letters postmarked from Moscow. They're postmarked from all over the United States and Europe. Western visitors smuggle the letters out of Russia, just as they did a Meiman treatise that will be published in the May issue of Journal of Mathematical Physics. He cannot publish in his country.

Meiman's wife, Inna who was an English teacher until she became a dissident, has a brain tumor. She still hasn't been told how serious her illness is. Her X-rays were smuggled out of the country and diagnosed by physicians at a Washington clinic, but "Soviet surgeons say they don't have treatment for her," Plam says.

Plam, her husband Misha, and son Yegor, got exit visas in 1976, when U.S.-Soviet relations were warmer, believing that they would have a better chance of getting Meiman released by living in the United States. Their visa requests were refused four times. Soviet clerks told them, "Instead of going West, you'll go East."

Meaning Siberia.

After requesting the visas, they lost their jobs—Plam was an assistant professor at an art institute and her husband was a researcher in glaciology—and had to sell everything in their apartment.

"It was empty the day we emigrated," she said. She still doesn't know why the Soviet Union issued the visas. They were, she said, lucky. It was Sept. 16, 1976, and she has been campaigning for her father's release ever since. Misha Plam now does similar research at the University of Colorado in Boulder, and Yegor is now a 22-year-old man studying computer sciences in California. Moscow sometimes retaliates against the parents of emigrant children, and Plam isn't sure whether her flight has made things harder on her father. "I don't like to think that it's an additional punishment," she said, "but it might be."

The U.S. Department of Health is sending an invitation to the Soviet Union, offering hospital treatment for Inna Meiman, and it will probably be answered with silence. Olga Plam has run out of plans.

"All I have left is hope," she said. She shows another glass piece: A crystal heart. She wants to give one to Gary Hart, who she hopes will become president and help her father.●

COST-EFFECTIVE WATER PLANNING

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an approach to local resource management which I feel can serve as a model in terms of cooperation, efficiency, and cost effectiveness.

As my colleagues are well aware, one of the most difficult policy areas for local planners—particularly in California—is the management and protection of precious water resources. The problems encountered by local officials in Santa Cruz County, in my district in California, in addressing the issue of water resource management are, I think, typical of those found in many other communities: Overlapping agency jurisdictions; a tendency to focus on each separate community's concerns rather than those of the region; and lack of an overall perspective on both short- and long-term needs. The results: Waste and inefficient planning which fail to meet the needs and concerns of local residents.

In order to avoid those problems, a joint planning process was initiated among the nine local agencies in the Santa Cruz area—the county, cities, and water districts—with responsibility for water resource management. That process, which began with a "water summit" in December 1980, has included a comprehensive analysis of the region's needs and will soon culminate in a review of five alternative water development scenarios. The participating agencies will then have the opportunity to decide whether a large joint project is warranted, or whether the information developed over the course of the study should be used in developing smaller, more individual projects.

This joint planning process was outlined by John Laird, mayor of Santa Cruz, in an article in the March 1984 issue of Western City. While the issues are different in every community, I am convinced that the process used in Santa Cruz can help other localities to avoid the problems caused by conflicting agency jurisdictions—not only in the area of water management, but in all aspects of local planning. Accordingly I would like to insert into the RECORD the text of Mayor Laird's article, in the hope that it will prove helpful to other communities in addressing the complexities of resource management.

"SUMMIT" MEETING LEADS TO COST-EFFECTIVE WATER PLANNING

(By John Laird)

Nine local government agencies in Santa Cruz County are nearing completion of a joint planning process they hope will enable the communities they serve to develop future water supply infrastructure more cost-effectively and without the inter-jurisdictional disputes which, so often, typify relations among agencies with overlapping responsibilities.

The joint planning process began a little more than three years ago, when the City of Santa Cruz proposed a December 1980 "water summit meeting" among the agencies serving the water needs of the area.

Since that first "summit" meeting, the agencies have based their actions on a recognition that water is a regional resource and that cooperation is more desirable than altercation.

They have (1) formed a joint powers agreement for water planning; (2) agreed to fund a region-wide planning study; (3) hired an outside consultant to perform the study; (4) are developing a consistent body of data on local water use patterns; and (5) are formulating creative new methods for projecting future water needs based on differing intensities of land use. In coming months, the JPA will receive cost projections for five alternative water developments which may result in a large cooperative project or the development of small, individual projects by the agencies party to the JPA.

Since that first "summit," almost all governing board decisions have been made by unanimous vote. Such consensus decisions have pressed each agency to satisfy its needs before any decision is made.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

During the 1970's, Santa Cruz County's annual growth rate averaged over 4 percent, one of the highest in California. Local government officials were concerned about the communities' ability to meet the demand for infrastructure and services necessitated by this high growth rate.

Due to these concerns and the electorate's desire for environmental protection Santa Cruz County voters adopted a growth management program in June, 1978, and Santa Cruz City voters approved a similar measure in early 1979. These two jurisdictions cover almost 90 percent of the land mass in Santa Cruz County and about 75 percent of the population.

Key provisions in both measures require local governments to absorb only their "fair share" of population growth. This requirement was implemented through a residential permit allocation process, with annual growth rate targets set near the average statewide annual growth rate.

The key point in the county program is the Urban Services Line—a geographic boundary beyond which water, sewers, urban level streets, and fire protection will not be extended.

These voter-adopted measures and the national economic downturn led to a reduction in local growth rates over those prior to the enactment of growth management.

WATER PLANNING

Santa Cruz County has not been immune to inter-jurisdictional disputes over land use planning and water supply. This can be primarily attributed to the division of responsibilities among local agencies. Regional land use planning is the responsibility of Santa Crux County and the four cities of Santa

Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley. The cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville and five water supply agencies provide water service to the great majority of local customers.

Only the cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville have both land use and water supply authority. Each city provides water to a significant number of customers outside its municipal boundaries and future water supply for each city is expected to come from outside the city limits.

The county, which has land use authority for the large unincorporated area, is not a water purveyor. The two cities and five large water districts serve the unincorporated area.

These differing responsibilities and the enactment of growth management necessitated a rethinking of water planning processes in Santa Cruz County.

To engender cooperation rather than dispute, the City of Santa Cruz proposed the December 1980 "water summit." This meeting, attended by the governing boards of the county, cities and water districts, led to a joint review of land use and water development information and intentions for each agency.

That review, presented at a second meeting, indicated some districts used different measures of future need. Separate districts expected to capitalize on the same future water source, and some land use agencies were engaged in planning for the same areas. As a result, no firm conclusions on future water infrastructure development could be drawn from compiling existing information.

THE AGREEMENT

At this point participating local agencies, with the exception of Watsonville, committed to the development of an agreement for joint water planning.

Guided by this joint commitment, members from each elected board met regularly to develop the agreement for joint planning, a comprehensive scope of work for the region-wide supply and demand study and the process for selecting a consultant to carry out the scope of work.

Each agency had its own specific long-range and short-range concerns. It was the goal of the group drafting the agreement to incorporate as many concerns as possible in the final agreement—thus giving each agency a solid stake in the study, in the information developed, and in the possibility of participating in a joint water development when the study was completed.

The agreement raised $250,000 from the participating agencies to finance the study. Assessments were made to land use agencies on the basis of population and to water supply agencies on the basis of the number of connections in each district.

THE STUDY PROCESS

A request for proposals was issued for the study, and each agency was given an opportunity to participate in the consultant selection process. The Environmental Impact Planning (EIP) firm from San Francisco, in joint venture with Houshang Esmaili Associates, was selected to do the job. A task list and project schedule was negotiated and added to the "Scope of Work" in the consultant's contract.

Elected officials were concerned that the study be under the policy direction of a governing board made up of one elected representative from each agency. This board has met monthly, and oversees the policy issues involved with the study. Staffing the governing board was split between the two largest water purveyors.

The contract divided the study into specific task reports. Each report is placed on an agenda of the governing board, and action is taken at the next monthly meeting. This has allowed the staffs of each agency one month for review on each task report.

THE SUPPLY SIDE

The scope of work divided the assessment of local water resources into three categories: a groundwater assessment, a surface water assessment, and an analysis of resource problems.

The groundwater assessment is designed to determine the managed yield of identified structural basins and regional aquifers. Existing published and unpublished data are being supplemented by a limited water-level monitoring program.

The managed yield of each groundwater formation studied is understood to mean the yield of the information under the particular management practices specified in the groundwater study—such management policies being designed to protect, preserve, and assure the long-term viability of the formation for water supply purposes.

For those basins where sufficient data are lacking, a data collection program will be designed and recommended for future implementation by participating agencies.

The surface water study will quantify long-term yields of selected streams which are determined to have potential as significant sources of water supply, including on-stream and offstream storage. Additionally, a means will be developed to examine the effect of alternative definitions of "safe yield" on water availability for planning purposes from each stream reviewed.

A computer model has been generated to estimate monthly stream flows on selected streams at selected locations. A sixty-year record of flows has been generated at selected locations, and the model is suitable for use by any agency wishing to use it.

The analysis of resource problems will evaluate factors that might result in the degradation of existing or potential sources of water supply. Factors analyzed will include seawater intrusion, timber harvesting operations, land development, existing land uses, toxic chemical contamination, and any other surface or groundwater contamination.

THE DEMAND STUDY

The demand study is designed to develop information for setting land use and water planning policy by the participating agencies.

A more traditional method of forecasting demand has been to determine existing per capita water use and project that use against expected population and planned non-residential uses. Unlike such traditional methods, the purpose of this study is to reflect the inevitable changes over time in the mix between residential, industrial, commercial, agricultural, and other land uses.

Although limitations exist in the data base, information can be developed about different possible scenarios for growth—and the demand implications resulting from each. With this information on hand, decision-makers will be able to visualize how policies in the areas such as pricing, connection permits, service area boundaries, and type of land use permitted can affect demand.

For the purposes of the study, the two most useful units of analysis have been traffic zones and water meter book areas. The traffic zones, which reflect natural geographic barriers and city boundaries, can be correlated with County Assessor files on individual properties.

The water meter books provide information on 150 to 350 customers each and can easily be characterized by land use attributes such as lot size, zoning category, altitude, microclimate, and household income. These records can weight the significance in explaining water consumption on an annual average, peak month, and low month basis.

By using microprocessor capability, this data can be manipulated into three sets of interactive computer models. The first uses the land use files to predict land use development at various time intervals. The second will predict water demand based on the result of the land use model and a set of assumptions about factors such as water availability, prices, and conservation practices. The third model can be used to compute "before and after" states for real or hypothetical development projects.

These result, to the limits allowable by the data, will provide demand projections based on variable future land use decisions. The results will assist in matching identified water supply sources to future needs.

THE FINAL REPORT

Soon the governing body will review the task reports that have been completed to date. The consultant will be directed to prepare operations and maintenance cost projections for five alternative water development.

Following work on these alternatives, participating agencies will decide whether to pursue a large joint project, or use the information to develop small, more individual projects.

It would be premature to label this study and process a success. But the nine local government agencies can only gain from the trust that has been built by their cooperation, by the information gathered for the future, by cost savings from joint planning efforts, and by the creative new methods used to complete this study.●

HOLOCAUST VICTIMS' REMEMBRANCE DAYS

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, a half century ago, unspeakable atrocities, which would eventually claim millions of innocent lives, began in Europe. Today, I would like to discuss the observance of the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust.

As its title suggests, the essential reason for this commemoration is remembrance. We choose to remember for many reasons. First and, perhaps, foremost, we review what has happened so that it will never happen again. clearly, it is our collective responsibility to insure that our children, our children's children, and all of history's children remember the evil perpetrated by the Nazi regime.

Second, recalling and recording the Holocaust transforms its victims from an anonymous multitude into 6 mil-

lion unique human beings. Thus, this act of commemoration serves to continue the fight against the Nazi dehumanization of the Jews by reaffirming the individual dignity of each of those who were murdered or imprisoned. As Wall Street Journal editor Daniel Henninger concluded a year ago:

> The undeniable dignity of each human being may seem like an idea so obvious that any intelligent person would take it for granted. That in the end is the point. The Holocaust movement would like to make sure that a simple and obvious idea is not taken for granted.

In this spirit of remembrance, I am pleased to note that planning and fundraising for a National Holocaust Memorial/Museum are proceeding at an impressive pace. The placement of the museum in our Capital's National Mall insures it the importance and accessibility it deserves. I am also pleased by the recent announcement of a New York City Holocaust Memorial Center. The living memorial, hopefully to be housed in the historic U.S. Custom House, would present the themes of Jewish immigration to New York, European Jewish life, and the Holocaust and its aftermath. This Memorial Center will serve to acquaint New York City, with the largest Jewish population in the world and the largest number of Jewish Holocaust survivors in one community, with the memory of its rich Jewish heritage and of the Holocaust.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by our Nation's efforts to recognize the victims of the Holocaust and to educate our people to the horrors of bigotry. Certainly, this is a goal which we, as Americans, must fully support so that we may comprehend the unique lessons of the Nazi Holocaust, as well as the universal implications of genocide and persecution. I would like to thank our colleague, ROBERT GARCIA, and the other cosponsors of this special order, for their efforts in commemoration of the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust.●

ROUKEMA LAUDS CHARLES LAGOS OF GLEN ROCK, N.J., ON HIS RETIREMENT AS MAYOR

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join with me to honor the achievements and contributions of a distinguished public servant from Glen Rock, N.J. After 8 years as mayor of Glen Rock, following 7 years as a councilman, Mayor Charles Lagos has announced he will retire. This indeed is a sad note for the people of Glen Rock.

Charlie, as he is affectionately known to his friends throughout Bergen County, has a solid record of civic accomplishment and conscientious leadership. After distinguished military service in Europe during the Second World War, Mayor Lagos settled in Glen Rock in 1952. He went to work to make Glen Rock and Bergen County a superlative place in which to live.

In addition to service in the town government of Glen Rock, Charlie Lagos has served as commander of American Legion Post 145 in Glen Rock. Three consecutive Governors of New Jersey from both political parties had enough confidence in Mayor Lagos to appoint and reappoint him to the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission. He has also served as president of the Republican Mayors' Association, treasurer of the Northwest Bergen County Utility Authority, and as deputy Bergen County administrator.

But perhaps two hallmarks of his career best point to Charlie Lagos' concern for his community. He has given long service to the youth of Bergen County in the Boy Scouts. He has served as president of the Ridgewood-Glen Rock Boy Scout Council. For this the Boy Scouts have given Charlie Lagos one of its most coveted congratulations, the Silver Beaver Award. A second hallmark of Charlie's unfailing dedication is his work to improve senior citizens' housing in Glen Rock.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and our colleagues will join to congratulate Mayor Charles Lagos on an exemplary career of public service. We all wish him well in retirement, and extend also to his wife, Lillian, two children and eight grandchildren our deep gratitude for the untiring efforts they too have extended to our community life. Mayor Lagos' commitment to his community over the years should serve as shining examples to those who follow the path of public service.●

AMERICA IS NOT BECOMING LIKE THE SOVIET UNION

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, the recent May Day celebrations in the Soviet Union and other East European countries should not pass without comment. Once again, we are treated to Soviet claims of kindness and concern for all people even as they display their military might. We also noticed with sympathy Lech Walesa's attempt to show that all is not well in the Soviet-controlled countries.

For indisputable evidence, we need only look to Afghanistan. The press has been full of reports lately that the Soviets are escalating their 4-year war in Afghanistan, and have, for the first time, begun using high-altitude bombers in an attempt to crush the Afghan freedom fighters.

Incredibly, some Members of this Congress—House and Senate—have tried to equate the U.S. rescue mission in Grenada with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. I could not let this May Day pass without remarking on the naivete of these Members as well as that of the self-appointed "peace" representatives who also prematurely condemned the President for our action in Grenada.

I think such Members have forgotten the overriding principle of totalitarian governments, such as the Soviet Union. I believe the Soviet purpose and mentality has been grossly underestimated by those Members.

Hannah Arendt, in her book entitled, "The Origins of Totalitarianism" speaks of the Bolshevik movement. She says:

> At the time it seized power the danger to the movement lay in the fact that, on the one hand, it might become "ossified" by taking over the state machine and frozen into a form of absolute government, and that, on the other hand, its freedom of movement might be limited by the borders of the territory in which it came to power. To a totalitarian movement, both dangers are equally deadly: A development toward absolutism would put an end to the movement's interior drive, and *a development toward nationalism would frustrate its exterior expansion, without which the movement cannot survive.*

In other words, a totalitarian government is threatened when its freedom of movement is limited to one country. They must expand to survive, and to convince their own people that their goal or world domination is being carried out.

Some also seem to have forgotten Khruschev's infamous statement of November 18, 1956, about capitalist countries. He said, "We will bury you."

And yet, we have people saying the U.S. rescue mission in Grenada makes them wonder if we are becoming like the Russians in Afghanistan.

Let us consider a few facts: It has been estimated that there are anywhere from 105,000 to 150,000 Soviet forces in Afghanistan, and from 35,000 to 40,000 Soviet troops in Poland. In Grenada we don't have combat troops. The United States only has about 350 MP's who are functioning as policemen and 35 Coast Guard personnel who are training Grenadians for their own coast guard. All of these U.S. personnel are scheduled to be gone by the 1st of next year. I should also note here that the British will also be helping to train Grenadians.

Can we say the same thing about the troops in Afghanistan or even Poland?

Soviet combat troops have already been in Afghanistan for 4 years.

First, the Soviets tried to take over in 1978 by murdering the president and putting their own puppet in power. Soon, the Soviets found out the Afghan's were not going to accept Soviet domination without a fight. They found out it was not going to be like rolling tanks into Hungary or Czechoslovakia.

I think we should stop and ask ourselves what the Soviets wanted to gain by invading Afghanistan. Certainly they did not feel threatened by this small country that barely had a military force.

Maybe the fact that they were not strong militarily had something to do with the Soviets decision to invade. But, I would again remind Members that totalitarian governments cannot survive without expansion.

And what goals—by contrast—did the United States have for going into Grenada? First and foremost, there was grave concern for the safety of American students on the island. How could anyone doubt that the fears of the students for their lives were real when we watched those students get off the planes in the United States and kiss the ground.

Second, the United States was responding to an urgent and formal request for help from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), as in accordance with the OECS treaty. These countries were afraid for the security and safety of the region.

We must remember that most of these small island nations also barely have a military. Yet the Cubans had already trained a 2,000- to 3,000-man army of Grenadians and had plans for a 25,000-member militia. For a country whose total population is only around 80,000, that is a pretty big army.

That the Communist's attempted to take over Grenada from within was further proven by the Communist-supplied weapons and equipment found on Grenada. There were about 10,000 rifles and machineguns, millions of ammunition rounds, and even some armored personnel carriers. All this for an island in the same region as other islands who did not even see a need for a military.

And what about the reception given to the Americans in Grenada? The U.S. press is always quick to zero in on any dissention to U.S. policy, yet all we saw were pictures of Grenadians cheering U.S. soldiers, and all we heard was "thank God for America." As a matter of fact, I understand Grenadian merchants are quickly selling out of T-shirts that say "God Bless America."

The pictures coming from Poland and Afghanistan are in great contrast. May Day is traditionally a day to honor the workers movement. Yet, we saw workers in Poland who do not like the Communist government and are willing to demonstrate they do not. These honored workers got the water hoses turned on them. These honored workers got martial law from the Soviets in 1981. As a bonus, these honored workers saw the Communists outlaw Solidarity in 1982. They cannot stand to be honored much more.

The Soviets are beyond water hoses in Afghanistan. Their use of high-altitude bombers in trying to gain control of the Panjshir Valley should give us some indication of how intent the Soviets are in dominating the Afghans. For the first time, the Soviets are using bombers from the U.S.S.R., not just the fighters from the Afghan bases.

The Soviets are also increasing the number of troops in Afghanistan. We should examine the numbers of U.S. troops in Grenada again. As I said earlier, the United States now has no combat troops in Grenada. The most we ever had there were 7,500, and they were only in Grenada for 2 months at most. The Soviet troop numbers in Afghanistan have gone from 85,000 to 105,000, and now we are hearing estimates as high as 150,000.

For all these troops, the Soviets do not seem to have much control. According to the State Department, "Attacks on Soviet and regime officials are common even in areas claimed to be under government control, and Soviet personnel need extremely tight personal security because of the constant threat of kidnaping and assassination." Increased Soviet brutality against civilians has, moreover, undermined the intense Soviet/regime propaganda campaign portraying the Soviets as peacekeepers and Karmal himself as a beloved and democratically chosen leader.

Once the U.S. and Eastern Caribbean forces had restored stability to Grenada and routed out the Cubans, there was no reason to fear for safety—either on the part of the military or civilians. There has also been no attempt by the United States or the Grenadians in power to stifle dissent. Newspapers in Grenada publish freely, public rallies are held, the court system operates, and an open society flourishes.

Reports from Afghan freedom fighters say that; "not a single Afghan is untouched, not a single village unscathed. The millennia-old water systems have been deliberately destroyed by the Soviets, water and soil poisoned, flocks and herds wiped out, hospitals and schools reduced to rubble, and virtually all the educated class killed or driven out."

"But as fiercely as the Afghans fight for their freedom, they are just as determined to keep their culture intact."

Again, I think we must remember the goals of totalitarianism. Arendt says:

Evidence that totalitarian governments aspire to conquer the globe and bring all countries on Earth under their domination can be seen repeatedly in Nazi and Bolshevik literature. What is decisive is that totalitarian regimes really conduct their foreign policy on the consistent assumption that they will eventually achieve this ultimate goal, and never lose sight of its no matter how distant it may appear or how seriously its idealistic demands may conflict with the necessities of the moment. They therefore consider no country as permanently foreign, but, on the contrary, every country as their potential territory.

Now I would ask the naysayers on Grenada, does it still seem as if the United States is acting like the Soviet Union?●

ADMINISTRATION'S ARMS CONTROL RECORD

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Reagan administration on arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union is the subject of much debate and analysis. It is often difficult, however, to find authoritative facts on the specifics of that record.

Recently, though, the Center for Defense Information (CDI) has compiled a highly readable and reliable fact-sheet on the Reagan arms control record. The paper outlines the Reagan record in negotiations with the Soviet Union and goes on to compare this administration's negotiations with previous administration's achievements. It is, all told, a valuable analysis of a critical issue and I commend it to my colleagues.

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION, MAY 1984

FACT SHEET ON REAGAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS NEGOTIATING RECORD

"We are caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other and new weapons beget counterweapons. In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours."—John F. Kennedy, June 10, 1963.

"In today's world, a nation's security does not always increase as its arms increase when its adversary is doing the same, and unlimited competition in the testing and development of new types of destructive nuclear weapons will not make the world safer for either side."—John F. Kennedy, July 26, 1963.

The Reagan Administration has a singularly unsuccessful record in obtaining any measure that would control, limit, or reduce the military nuclear competition between the United States and the Soviet Union.

President Reagan is the only American President who has not met with Soviet leaders since diplomatic relations were estab-

lished fifty-one years ago by Franklin D. Roosevelt. President Reagan is the first President since Harry F. Truman not to have accomplished any agreement or treaty to limit nuclear weapons or reduce the risk of nuclear confrontation. All Presidents since Eisenhower have reached some agreement with the Soviet Union in their first term in office.

This fact sheet enumerates the Reagan record in negotiating with the Soviet Union. To give a basis for comparison with other Presidents, U.S.-Soviet summit meetings and the record of past achievements in the area of nuclear weapons control are also listed. It is useful to recall the record of other Presidents who acted in the national interest to maintain our security through cooperative measures undertaken with the Soviet Union.

REAGAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS NEGOTIATING RECORD

"Before arms control negotiations may be undertaken, the security of the United States must be assured by the funding and deployment of strong military forces sufficient to deter conflict at any level or to prevail in battle should aggression occur."—Republican Party Platform, 1980.

"Democracies will not sacrifice to protect their security in the absence of a sense of danger. And every time we create the impression that we and the Soviets are cooperating and moderating the competition, we diminish that sense of danger."—Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Newsday, February 18, 1983.

Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Talks.—Negotiations failed at the end of 1983 as the United States began to deploy Cruise and Pershing II missiles to Europe. Success of diplomatic efforts to resume these talks as a separate negotiation is now highly unlikely.

Strategic Arms Reduction Talks.—START is now at a standstill. The talks recessed at the end of round five on December 8, 1983 with no date set by the Soviet delegation for resumption. This action by the Soviet Union was a consequence of the INF Talks breaking down. In any event, the negotiations were making little demonstrable progress. The original U.S. position called for a radical restructuring of Soviet forces, centered on deep cuts in their ICBM force. President Reagan belatedly recognized that Soviet rejection was certain because of their heavy concentration of forces in ICBMs, telling TIME magazine in February 1984 that, "I never heard any one our negotiators or any of our military people or any one else bring up that particular point." Under the original proposal mutual vulnerability to a first-strike against land-based missiles would have risen dramatically because of a great increase in the ratio of accurate warheads to targets. The Reagan START proposal would have allowed the U.S. to build all the new nuclear weapons it was planning on. The Soviet counter offer was for both sides to reduce one-third below SALT II limits in total launchers. This would have required a more substantial reduction by the Soviet Union, down to 1800 launchers.

Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.—On March 23, 1983 President Reagan proposed a massive research program to develop a total defense against nuclear weapons. If development and testing proceed, this program would violate the 1972 ABM Treaty and could lead to its abandonment. It may also lead to an all-out offensive nuclear arms race to overcome defensive systems. The resulting competition between interacting offensive and defensive weapon systems and their countermeasures would likely result in a strategic and economic nightmare. The President's desire to build a defense that would render "nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete" is now a Pentagon program called the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). It carries an initial price tag of $25 Billion for research over the next five years. Development and deployment of a total defense could have a total cost of from hundreds of Billions to a Trillion or more dollars. There remains the unanswered question of where the money for adequate conventional military forces will come from if such a program proceeds.

Anti-Satellite (ASAT) and Space Weapons Negotiations.—President Reagan has failed to resume talks on an ASAT treaty since taking office. Talks by the previous Administration had made progress toward a worthwhile treaty. On April 2, 1984 the President submitted a report to Congress detailing his opposition to negotiations, claiming that a treaty could not be verified. Many experts dispute this contention. There has been no Administration interest whatsoever in domestic calls for negotiations to prohibit space weapons before it is too late to do so. There has been no response to the 1983 Soviet draft treaty which proposes a comprehensive ban on space weapons.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.—In a July 1982 meeting of the National Security Council, the Reagan Administration decided not to resume trilateral negotiations (U.S., U.K., U.S.S.R.) to end all testing of nuclear explosives underground. This was in spite of very substantial progress made toward a treaty by the previous Administration. Both the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union expressed regret over this action. An end to all testing remains largely a matter of political will. The 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty, the 1967 Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty all pledge the United States to actively engage in efforts to ban all nuclear explosions for all time.

Threshold Test Ban Treaty.—On February 17, 1983 the Reagan Administration requested the Soviet Union to reopen talks on the still unratified 1974 Treaty for the purpose of improving verification provisions that have never gone into effect. On March 28, the Soviets turned down this request, stating that if the U.S. were to ratify the treaty the verification measures contained in the treaty protocols would be instituted and verification concerns would be easily resolved. The Soviets also stated that if any problems remained, the ratified treaty could be amended.

UNITED STATES—SOVIET SUMMIT MEETINGS, 1945 TO PRESENT

Date and Individuals	Place	Agenda
February 1945: Roosevelt, Stalin (Churchill).	Yalta, U.S.S.R	End of World War II, Japan, division of Europe.
July–August 1945: Truman, Stalin (Churchill/Attlee).	Postsdam, Germany	Implementing Yalta plans, postwar policy.
July 1955: Eisenhower, Bulganin, Khrushchev (Eden, Faure).	Geneva, Switzerland	Improving international relations, peaceful coexistence.
September 1959: Eisenhower, Khrushchev.	Washinton, Camp David.	Mutual understanding reduction of tensions.
May 1960: Eisenhower Khrushchev (DeGaulle, Macmillan).	Paris, France	U.S-U.S.S.R. conciliation (Khrushchev left over U–2 incident).
June 1961: Kennedy, Khrushchev.	Vienna, Austria	Arms Control, Germany, Laos, exchange of views.
June 1967: Johnson, Kosygin.	Glassboro, N.J.	Easing of tensions, Vietnam, Middle East.
May 1972: Nixon, Brezhnev.	Moscow	SALT I, ABM Treaty signed, cooperative agreements.
June 1973: Nixon, Brezhnev.	Washington, Camp David.	Arms control, cooperative agreements.
June 1974: Nixon, Brezhnev.	Moscow	European security, economic cooperation.
November 1974: Ford, Brezhnev.	Vladivostok, U.S.S.R.	SALT II framework agreed to.
June 1979: Carter, Brezhnev.	Vienna, Austria	SALT II signed.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FORMER PRESIDENTS

President, year, and treaty or agreement

Eisenhower, 1959: *The Antarctic Treaty.*—Prohibited nuclear explosions and deployment of nuclear weapons. Internationalized and demilitarized the continent. Served as a model for later "nonarmament" treaties.

Kennedy, 1963: *Memorandum of Understanding Regarding the Establishment of a Direct Communication Link.*—The agreement that established the so-called "Hot Line" between Washington and Moscow for crisis control in time of emergency.

Kennedy, 1963: *Limited Test Ban Treaty.*—Prohibited nuclear explosive testing in the atmosphere, outer space and underwater. Pledged all parties to the treaty to achieve the discontinuance of all testing of nuclear weapons for all time. Made it much more difficult to know what nuclear effects there are from explosions in the atmosphere. Made first-strike calculations much more difficult.

Johnson, 1967: *Outer Space Treaty.*—Banned nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction from outer space. Limits the use of the moon and other celestial bodies exclusively for peaceful purposes. Modeled on its predecessor, the Antarctic Treaty. Provides a basis for further efforts to control space weapons.

Nixon, 1970: *Non-Proliferation Treaty.*—Helps prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear states. Provides assurance that peaceful nuclear programs are not diverted to military uses.

Nixon, 1971: *Seabed Arms Control Treaty.*—Banned emplacement of nuclear weapons on the ocean floors.

Nixon, 1971: *Agreement on Measures To Reduce the Risks of Outbreak of Nuclear War.*—Pledged both sides to take measures to improve safeguards against accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons. Arranged for immediate notification should a risk of nuclear war arise from any incident of accident.

Nixon, 1971: *Agreement on Measures To Improve the USA-USSR Direct Communication Link.*—Improved the technology used to implement the 1963 "Hot Line" agreement.

Nixon, 1972: *Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.*—Restricted ABM deployments to 100 launchers at one site, so that a nationwide missile defense system could not be built. Of limited duration, reviewed every five years. Prohibited development, testing, or deployment of sea-based, air-based, or space-based ABM systems and their components along with mobile land-based systems. This treaty made it possible to limit offensive weapons in the companion Interim Agreement. Established the Standing Consultative Commission to promote the objectives and implementation of the ABM

Treaty and the Interim Agreement known together as SALT I (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks).

Nixon, 1972: *SALT I Interim Agreement.*—Limited strategic offensive nuclear weapons. Froze at existing levels the number of strategic ballistic missile launchers on both sides and permits an increase in SLBM launchers only with the dismantling or destruction of a corresponding number of older ICBM or SLBM launchers.

Nixon, 1973: *Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War.*—Outlined general conduct of both countries toward each other and toward third countries regarding the avoidance of nuclear war. Committed both nations to consult with each other during situations which could lead to nuclear war.

Nixon, 1974: *Threshold Test Ban Treaty.*—Prohibited underground nuclear weapons tests exceeding 150 kilotons in explosive power. The threshold is militarily important since it removes the possibility of testing new or existing weapons going beyond the limit into the megaton range. In Article I both parties obligated themselves to continue negotiations for a comprehensive test ban treaty. Not yet ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Ford, 1974: *Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty.*—Companion to the Threshold Treaty above. Insured that no nuclear explosion for peaceful purposes would excede 150 kilotons. Provisions for on-site inspection. Not yet ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Ford, 1974: *Vladivostok Aide-Memoire.*—Major breakthrough agreement that provided basic framework for the SALT II Treaty.

Carter, 1979: *Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II).*—Most comprehensive offensive arms treaty to date. Restricted what the Soviet Union could deploy in an all out arms race. Allowed equal numbers of delivery vehicles, MIRVed ballistic missiles, heavy bombers with cruise missiles, banned mobile missiles and rapid reloading of silos, limited heavy missiles and the number of warheads (MIRVs) each may carry to 10 on ICBMs and 14 on SLBMs. Provisions for data exchange. Froze number of ICBM launchers (silos).●

INTRODUCTION OF COAL BILL

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two nearly identical bills, which differ only in the proposed funding mechanisms but have the same chief goal, to demonstrate new and emerging technologies for the environmentally clean use of coal. The first, and preferred version of this legislation, provides funding through existing appropriations and has 17 original cosponsors. The second, which I did not seek cosponsors for, provides funding through new authorization with the appropriations source yet to be determined. Both bills are entitled the "Clean Coal Production and Utilization Technology Demonstration Act."

Mr. Speaker, the enhanced use of our Nation's abundant coal resources can be made possible only if the technology is developed and demonstrated to address the acid rain and other pollution problems and broaden gasification and liquefaction options for this important domestic energy resource. These environmental problems have raised significant political concerns with many Members and it is obvious that our constituents expect leadership from the Congress in mitigating further environmental degradation from the necessary use of fossil energy resources.

Our proposed legislation is designed to address these environmental problems in a practical and politically acceptable fashion. There is a critical need for reasoned and deliberate action on acid rain with acceleration of the research program as the only clear requirement. Our goal is to initiate and expedite existing efforts to broaden the technology options for mitigating acid rain effects through application of new technologies. As regards longer-term technologies, there is a clear Federal need to encourage their acceptance in the marketplace through demonstration by initiating an accelerated and focused effort for coal technology demonstration.

Many of my colleagues have suggested enormously expensive policies for controlling pollution from powerplants and other coal burning facilities, which I cannot support at this time because acid rain is not well understood. Also, it is extremely important for every Member to recognize that we cannot simply legislate technology; it must be developed and scaled-up from the laboratory bench. If we ever expect to control pollution from coal utilization, there must be a rational program to develop the control technology in phase with achieving a better understanding of the national cost-benefit stakes in acid rain.

With all of the political furor created over acid rain and the vital national interests associated with energy independence, it seems almost incredible that the fossil energy research and development efforts in the Department of Energy budget has been cut back in each of the past 3 years. Yet, even in the face of private sector reluctance to prove out new technologies for improving environmental quality in the use of our coal resources, it has become increasingly evident that Government action is not only warranted but is necessary to protect our environment and our national security.

Our legislation establishes a technology demonstration program on advanced systems for coal burning, coal cleaning, and converting coal to liquids and gases. Its intermediate goal is to reduce air pollution from coal-burning powerplants and other facilities, and the longer term goal is to prove more efficient and environmentally acceptable processes for advanced combustion producing coal-derived fuels. The program will be administered by the Secretary of Energy in addition to his other responsibilities in coal research and development.

We have specified four near-term technologies for demonstration which seem promising at this stage, yet have not been proven at scale. We have provided for long-term, second generation technologies which may provide us with the answers to encourage cost-effective, clean coal usage.

Our preferred version of this legislation differs from all other coal technology bills principally in the specified funding mechanism. Because an intent of the legislation is to foster the technology for converting coal to synthetic fuels, we believe that it is appropriate to tap the funding for the Synthetic Fuels Corporation (SFC). Of the roughly $18 billion appropriated to the Energy Security Reserve, which is outstanding, the SFC might at best use only $4 billion through this fiscal year. Our legislation proposes to reallocate just $1.85 billion, that is, 10 percent of the overall appropriation for a cause that is most complementary to that of the Energy Security Act (ESA). In this way, we avoid asking for the appropriation of new funds and I believe since the ESA conferees expected a DOE demo program to remain in place, we support a program consistent with the intent of that act.

The other version of this legislation is exactly the same in substance as my preferred version, but provides funding through an additional authorization rather than using the Energy Security Reserve. This approach is less acceptable to me, and I know to many of you, because it raises the budget authority levels in the face of rising deficits. Although I felt constrained to offer this verison as an alternative, I am, nevertheless, hopeful that it will not be necessary to ask this body to act on it. I would remind my colleagues that budget outlays for either the SFC or this DOE program must be faced in the fiscal year 1986–87 timeframe.

Mr. Speaker. I am encouraged by the support I have gotten in the early circulation of this legislation and I would encourage other Members to join us in sponsoring this important coal bill. A summary and the text of the Clean Coal Production and Utilization Technology Demonstration Act is included for the use of all my colleagues in the House:

SUMMARY OF THE CLEAN COAL PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION ACT

SECTION 2—FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

The Congress finds that the United States has vast domestic coal resources which are in the national interest to develop and utilize in an environmentally acceptable manner. It is in the national interest to demonstrate advanced methods for reducing

air pollution (including acid rain) from coal-burning powerplants and other coal utilization facilities.

The purposes of the Act are: 1. To authorize a program to demonstrate advanced coal production and utilization technologies for reducing air pollution from coal-burning electric powerplants, including emissions which may be potentially contributing to acid rain; and 2. Develop and demonstrate technologies for reducing emissions for coal utilization in general.

SECTION 3—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

The Secretary is authorized to establish a technology demonstration program on advanced systems to reduce air pollution from coal-burning powerplants and other coal utilization facilities. The Secretary is required to prepare detailed specifications for these advanced systems, and, within six months from the date of enactment, to solicit proposals from the public to cooperatively construct, install and operate them.

Detailed specifications must be prepared for the following advanced systems:

Limestone injection multi-stage burner to reduce SO^2 and NO^2 emissions by at least 50%;

Atmospheric fluidized bed boiler to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions by 90%, NO_x emissions to a maximum of .3 pounds/million BTU, and particulate levels to a maximum of .03 pounds/million BTU;

Stack emission desulfurization unit to reduce sulfur oxide emissions by at least 90% by weight while burning coal of 2.5% sulfur by weight;

Coal processing facility to remove at least 90% of total sulfur content;

Other undemonstrated technologies emerging from research and development programs which could reduce emissions from new and existing coal-burning powerplants;

100 MW_e pressurized fluidized bed combustion boiler;

Gasification combined cycle facilities to demonstrate (1) gasification in air or oxygen of 1000 tons of coal/day capacity while meeting clean air standards; and (2) advanced gas turbines.

10–30 MW_e coal gasification fuel cell system;

15 MW_e or less coal-fired gas turbine;

MHD facility of 10–50 megawatts electric;

5–10 tons/day coal liquifaction pilot plant; and

Coal gasification system of 15 MW_e equivalent.

Other systems to demonstrate promising technologies for extracting oil and gas from shale and coal through field tests.

The Secretary is directed to report to Congress at least 45 days prior to accepting any proposal.

SECTION 4—FIVE YEAR PLAN

The Secretary is directed to prepare and submit to Congress a five year plan for achieving the goals of the Act.

SECTION 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

$1.85 billion of the funds appropriated to the Energy Security Reserve is subject to authorization and annual appropriation to the Secretary to carry out the Act.

The Secretary is authorized to spend $200 million of the $1.85 billion from the Energy Security Reserve beginning in Fiscal Year 1986.

H.R. 5592

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Clean Coal Production and Utilization Technology Demonstration Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the United States has vast domestic coal resources which can provide a long term, secure, and relatively inexpensive source of energy for meeting the Nation's electrical generating needs;

(2) it is in the national interest to find ways to utilize more of our most abundant energy resources in an environmentally acceptable manner;

(3) existing technology for reducing, or "scrubbing", sulfur emissions from coal-burning electric powerplants is energy intensive, prohibitively expensive, and results in a residue which is difficult to dispose of and is a potential source of environmental concern in itself;

(4) it is in the near- and long-term national interest to demonstrate the most technologically advanced and cost-effective methods for reducing air pollution from coal-burning electric powerplants, including those emissions which may potentially be contributing to acid rain;

(5) there must be an accelerated and focused effort to develop and introduce into the marketplace improved and advanced technologies that limit the emission of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, toxic trace elements, and particulate matter which result from coal utilization;

(6) a credible and productive Federal coal research and development program must be defined and sustained; and such a program must be adequately funded, insulated from short-term political and market fluctuations, sufficiently broad in scope to provide technology options, and executed in cooperation with the private sector and the Federal Government;

(7) the United States Synthetic Fuels Corporation is not responsible for demonstrating advanced coal production and utilization technologies at pilot-plant scale;

(8) the Nation has significant oil and gas resources in shale and underground coal which should be utilized as part of the Nation's overall fossil fuel mix;

(9) low cost hydrogen production from gasification is the key to efficient conversion of our domestic coal resource to liquid fuels; and

(10) the United States must develop a synthetic fuels capability for producing liquid fuels from coal; and the advanced liquefaction technologies involved are important for conversion of our plentiful coal resources.

(b) The purposes of this Act are (1) to authorize a program to demonstrate advanced coal production and utilization technologies for reducing air pollution from coal-burning electric powerplants, including emissions which may potentially be contributing to acid rain, and (2) to identify, develop, and demonstrate those clean coal technologies which may be developed for the long term for reducing emissions from coal utilization.

TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Energy (in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to establish a technology demonstration program on advanced systems to (1) reduce air pollution from coal-burning powerplants and other facilities, and (2) prove more efficient and environmentally acceptable processes for producing coal-derived fuels. Such program and its funding shall be in addition to the Research and Base Technology activity contained in the existing fossil energy research and development budget of the Department of Energy. The Secretary shall prepare detailed specifications for each advanced system identified in subsections (b), (c), and (d); and within 6 months from the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary shall solicit proposals from the public to construct, install, and operate these systems pursuant to such detailed specifications, on a cooperative basis with appropriate assistance from the Secretary, in one or more new or existing electric powerplants.

(b) The Secretary shall prepare detailed specifications for advanced systems to demonstrate each of the following near-term technologies:

(1) A Limestone Injection Multistage Burner (LIMB) capable of being installed in new or existing electric powerplants of at least 100 megawatts electrical capacity. The burner must be designed to reduce the uncontrolled levels of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from burning coal by at least 50 percent each.

(2) An atmospheric fluidized bed combustion boiler capable of being installed in new or existing coal-burning electric powerplants of at least 100 megawatts electric capacity. The fluidized bed combustion boiler must be designed to reduce the potential sulfur dioxide emissions from burning coal by at least 90 percent by weight, and to reduce levels of all nitrogen oxides to a maximum of 0.3 pounds per million British thermal units (BTU) and particulate levels to a maximum of .03 pounds per million Btu.

(3) A stack emission desulfurization unit which produces only dry discharges and can be installed in new or existing coal-burning electric powerplants of at least 150 megawatts electric capacity. The unit shall be designed to reduce sulfur oxide emissions by at least 90 percent by weight while burning coal of at least 2.5 percent of sulfur by weight.

(4) Coal processing facilities which would remove at least 50 percent of the total sulfur content of the coal and be designed to remove at least 90 percent of total sulfur content. The capacity of these facilities must be at least 50 tons of coal per hour.

(5) Other undemonstrated technologies emerging from United States and international coal research programs which could contribute to the reduction of sulfur and nitrogen oxides, and particulate emissions, from new and existing coal-burning powerplants. These may include (but shall not be limited to) advanced combined sulfur and nitrogen oxides control processes, advanced, dry sorbent injection, and processing and combustion of clean coal-derived fuels from advanced processes.

(c) The Secretary shall prepare detailed specifications for advanced systems to demonstrate each of the following longer-term, second generation technologies:

(1) A pressurized fluidized bed combustion boiler including repowering of existing oil or gas-fired utility boilers which are at least 100 megawatts electric in size.

(2) Gasification combined cycle facilities/technology capable of demonstrating (A) gasification in air and oxygen at a size of 1,000 tons of coal per day or greater and the use of hot gas clean-up devices which remove particulates and sulfur oxides to meet or exceed national clean air standards, and (B) advanced gas turbines capable of being integrated with various classes of gasifiers and with gas clean-up technologies

which demonstrate long-life and meet or exceed national sulfur and nitrogen emissions standards.

(3) A coal gasification fuel cell system of 10-30 megawatts electric including a state-of-the-art gasifier coupled to a phosphoric acid fuel cell. This system should be designed to demonstrate the ability of the fuel cell to function on coal-derived gaseous fuel.

(4) A coal-fired gas turbine of 15 megawatts electric equivalent or less designed to be fuel flexible, to handle various fuel forms, and to have the potential of yielding low cost power.

(5) A magnetohydrodynamics facility of 10-50 megawatts electric to demonstrate the engineering feasibility of power generation with coal-fired operation.

(6) A coal liquefaction pilot plant to demonstrate an advanced coal-liquefaction process at 5-10 tons per day.

(7) A coal gasification system of 50 megawatts electric equivalent designed for optimal production of hydrogen suitable for use in liquefaction processes and in upgrading shale oil and other feedstocks.

(d) The Secretary shall also prepare detailed specifications for systems to demonstrate any other advanced technologies which may appear promising for extracting gas and oil from shale and coal through field tests, with an emphasis on exploiting these resources in the Eastern region of the United States.

(e) At least 45 days prior to accepting any proposal for technology demonstration pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the details of such proposal and explain why such proposal should be selected in lieu of any competing proposals.

FIVE-YEAR PLAN

SEC. 4. The Secretary, within 8 months following the date of the enactment of this Act, shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a five-year national coal engineering, development, and technology demonstration plan. Such plan shall be updated annually and submitted to such committees by January 31 of each succeeding year, and shall include—

(1) an assessment of the potential usefulness of each project to be undertaken pursuant to this Act, including specifics on the potential applications for the technology involved and the amount of emissions reductions which could be achieved through the use of such technology;

(2) an identification of the cost sharing arrangements among participants, including any financial assistance to be provided by foreign allies of the United States in the projects involved;

(3) an identification and definition of the near- and mid-term options for expanding, in an environmentally acceptable manner, the use of coal in the electric utility, industrial, and other sectors of the economy;

(4) a detailed description of the specific activities which have been, or will be, undertaken by the Department of Energy to encourage the use of such options;

(5) a statement and explanation of criteria for setting specific priorities, of major project milestones, and of a technology demonstration strategy for achieving these priorities and milestones;

(6) a comprehensive management plan which includes a detailed description of the financial requirements for the implementation of the five-year plan, and a listing of the expected yearly expenditures to carry out such plan; and

(7) the methods and procedures to be used to expedite the transfer of the technology involved and the lessons learned in the demonstration program.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Of the funds appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury and deposited in the Energy Security Reserve established in the Treasury of the United States pursuant to section 195 of the Energy Security Act (Public Law 96-294, 42 U.S.C. 8795), $1,850,000,000 shall be available for use in carrying out the purpose of this Act pursuant to authorization and annual appropriation to the Secretary of Energy for those purposes. When so specified in appropriation Acts, any such funds so appropriated to the Secretary of Energy shall remain available until expended.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy, from the funds reallocated pursuant to subsection (a), $200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1986 to carry out the purposes of this Act.●

THE ABUSE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN FOREIGN POLICY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, it is now obvious that there is a serious problem concerning the role of Congress in U.S. foreign policy. While there have been other battles over the roles of each branch in the foreign policy process, this time it has reached dangerous proportions. Liberal Democrats in the Congress have not just opposed the President's policies, which is their undeniable right, but they have taken outrageous steps toward undercutting those policies. There is little hope of any policy succeeding if there are 535 Members of Congress who believe that they can operate their own little State Department.

While no one can deny that Congress does have a role in American foreign policy, it must be remembered that the Constitution specifically delegates foreign policy prerogatives to the President. Conducting foreign policy, already difficult under the best of circumstances, is complicated immensely when the Congress oversteps it's constitutional bounds. Hugh Sidney, a serious and accurate observer of the American political process, has written a column in the April 30 edition of Time magazine which indicates how serious the current situation is. I submit this article so that some of my colleague may see the devisive effect they are having upon our foreign policy. The text of the article follows:

THE PRESIDENCY—BE WARY OF THE CAUTIOUS

(By Hugh Sidey)

One worry about the great Washington shout-out over how the U.S. should stand tall in the world is that we could soon produce a feckless breed of political leaders who would spend their time debating how best to do nothing.

Secretary of State George Shultz fretted about that in his office the other day. He is partisan, of course, but his concern over America's tendency to be gun-shy about world involvement reflects a broader perspective. "I think you have to be willing to be engaged where you think you might make a difference," he said. While he talked, the arguments about our involvement in Nicaragua raged on Capitol Hill, and the memories of our withdrawal from Lebanon were all too fresh.

Shultz accepts that such failures are an inevitable part of his job. But any U.S. leader, he believes, must take these types of risks or the world will overwhelm us. "I think the Lebanon situation was one that we almost necessarily had to get into," says Shultz. "So we didn't succeed in attaining the objectives that we sought, but we haven't failed completely either." In short, the wilingness to try was an important part of the policy.

There is about Shultz a little of the Princeton halfback he once was: a bit battered but more determined than ever to keep running. He views the Democrats who assault him every day as unrealistic. Gary Hart, who wants the U.S. military out of Central America, "has the stop-the-world-I-want-to-get-off idea," the Secretary says. Criticism from allies as well as foes will always be a leader's lot, says Shultz, and so too will be internal doubts and frustrations. But much of what he hears now, he protests, is "a way of saying we should never try anything that is difficult."

There are echoes of Shultz's position in former Secretary of State Dean Rusk's accusation that Congress meddles too much in foreign policy, rarely giving a presidential initiative a full and fair chance. A former National Security Adviser to a Democratic President fears that the Democrats may this year produce a presidential candidate, a party platform and a campaign mood that will be strongly isolationist. Both Walter Mondale and Gary Hart shy too much from risk, which is always a part of leadership, this man believes.

The *enfant terrible* of the House floor, right-wing Republican Newt Gingrich, 40, of Georgia, scales the rhetorical heights by quoting Winston Churchill about the years before World War II: "The malice of the wicked was reinforced by the weakness of the virtues."

Churchill had a string of spectacular failures as well as successes. So did Franklin Roosevelt in domestic policy during his struggle to lift America out of the Depression. John Kennedy's first year was one of almost continuous defeat, but fortunately, it was a year also marked by unceasing experiment in diplomacy and military improvement. In the American legend, the discouragements with men and events heaped on Abraham Lincoln in his early years of the Civil War sent him into fits of melancholia. But he always climbed out and tried again. He did something. That is not the least of the characteristics that kept Richard Nixon at the center of our political life for nearly 40 years. Even today he runs a kind of shadow presidency that speaks with the tempering that has come from defeat after defeat but still endures, uring the likes of Shultz to come back stronger after each rebuff.

The one thing worse that unsuccessful efforts in the Middle East, Central America or anywhere might be to do nothing at all, a

pleasant prospect in the short run but a course that often invites the ultimate disaster.

A long time ago, students of power concocted a formula that has yet to be disproved: "An army of stags led by a lion would be better than an army of lions led by a stag."●

DANGEROUS PRECEDENTS EMPHASIZE THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE "DEAR COMMANDANTE LETTER"

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Morton Kondracke, "Will Soviets Meddle With Our Election?" is a clear warning to every American that there is an increasing danger of foreign countries deliberately interfering in, and manipulating, the American political process.

Mr. Kondracke cites several Soviet attempts to exert such influence. For example, he notes the Soviet efforts to influence the recent election in West Germany and their stalling on arms control negotiations. He also cites attempts by the Ayatollah Khomeini during the Iranian crisis, by guerrilla groups in El Salvador, and by the Marxists in Nicaragua. These examples serve as a chilling reminder to every American that as foreign governments grow smarter, there is an increasing danger that their attempts to exploit our open free political system will grow greater.

In particular, as Mr. Kondracke notes, the "* * * Soviets meddled deeply in last year's West German elections. They did so rather deftly for a time, too * * *" and "The guerrilla groups in El Salvador and the Sandinistas in Nicaragua also know how to affect American political institutions. They regularly time military offensives and negotiating offers to affect votes in Congress."

Mr. Kondracke notes, "There is considerable evidence to suggest that, despite Mr. Chernenko's flat denial on April 8, the Soviets are already attempting to affect the American elections."

Let me suggest that while Mr. Kondracke might not agree with my conclusions, I believe that his article reemphasizes how dangerous the "Dear Commandante letter" to Nicaragua, signed by 10 leading House Democrats, is. It also shows the need to set a precedent that such letters and behavior are unacceptable, and that Members of Congress should not invite foreign governments to manipulate American politics or to influence the balance of political power inside the United States. The text of the column follows:

WILL SOVIETS MEDDLE WITH OUR ELECTION?

(By Morton Kondracke)

This presidential election may develop into more than a contest between American parties. We may have foreign adversaries horning in—possibly violently.

Konstantin Chernenko, for one, has said specifically that he is not conducting Soviet policy to affect the American elections. Undoubtedly the Ayatollah Khomeini would say the same, as would left-wing revolutionary leaders in Central America.

Yet, judging by the record, why should anyone believe them? The Soviets meddled deeply in last year's German elections. They did so rather deftly for a time, too, inventing one peace overture after another to support the Social Democratic Party, which probably would have rejected deployment of U.S. missiles had it been elected.

Something happened in Moscow, however, a few weeks prior to the West German voting. From soft and seductive, the Soviet line suddenly swerved and became turbulent and threatening.

One Soviet press article said a victory by the conservative Christian Democratic Union would lead Germany to "the nuclear gallows." Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko said U.S. missile deployment would lead to "an extended nuclear confrontation" amid which West Germany "cannot be ignored."

The Soviet attempt to intimidate Germany failed—the CDU won and the missiles are being deployed—but the example demonstrates that the Soviets are not averse to playing in other countries' politics. Why not in America's, too?

Meanwhile, the Ayatollah already has some experience with American elections. He helped elect Ronald Reagan in 1980 by holding onto the U.S. Embassy hostages in Tehran. He has not been adverse to medding in U.S. policy since then, either. It was an Iranian-backed Shi'ite group which perpetrated the bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut last fall. It cannot have escaped Mr. Khomeini how the bombing broke America's will to persist in Lebanon and led to cries for a withdrawal.

The guerrilla groups in El Salvador and the Sandinistas in Nicaragua also know how to affect American political institutions. They regularly time military offensives and negotiating offers to affect votes in Congress.

There is considerable evidence to suggest that, despite Mr. Chernenko's flat denial on April 8, the Soviets already are attempting to affect the American elections.

Scarcely a day goes by without a denunciation of the administration in one forum or another. Soviet diplomats, Olympic officials, and academics are all spouting the same line—that Ronald Reagan is impossible to deal with and that U.S.-Soviet relations have never been worse and are getting more dangerous by the day.

The Soviet walkout from talks about intermediate-range nuclear weapons and the indefinite postponement of strategic arms talks seem to be part of the same strategy of convincing the world (and the American public, too) that Mr. Reagan is making the world unsafe.

Yet the Soviets know that President Reagan wants—and, politically, may need—progress on arms control prior to the November election.

Mr. Reagan totally altered his rhetoric in January, offering to show flexibility in negotiations and to consider any Soviet proposal. Behind the scenes, the word has been out for weeks that the United States would be willing to reach a quick interim agreement on strategic weapons instead of pushing for a full START treaty.

Such an option was suggested on a Sunday talk show in January by former Natinal Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, a Democrat. The next day, Mr. Brzezinski received a phone call from President Reagan, who said: "This is one of your fans calling."

Extensive administration study of Mr. Brzezinski's ideas ensued, and the Soviets know full well that such a deal as Mr. Brzenzinski proposed could be had more or less for the asking.

The deal involves American acceptance of the Soviet START proposal of limiting ballistic missile launchers to 1,800 on each side, and the Soviets' agreeing to the American idea of cutting back on the number of nuclear warheads in each side's arsenal. Mr. Reagan originally suggested a limit of 5,000 warheads (down from 8,000 on each side at present), but Mr. Brzezinski is suggesting 7,000 as a START starter, and the administration would go along.

Such a deal could be sealed at a Reagan-Chernenko summit just like the one that former President Gerald Ford held in 1974 with Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev at Vladivostok. The agreement would not have to be ratified by the Senate, and Mr. Reagan could come back saying—with justification—that it was a better deal than either Vladivostok or President Jimmy Carter's SALT II Treaty, both of which left each side with more than 2,250 launchers.

Why doesn't the Soviet Union agree to the deal? Three plausible reasons have been discussed: (1) the Soviets are waiting for a better offer from Reagan, (2) they don't want to help Reagan's political chances, and (3) they do not have their own internal politics sorted out yet.

Mr. Chernenko's elevation to the Soviet presidency more or less eliminates point three. One other possibility is a variation of points one and two—that the Soviets are waiting to see how American politics are developing and won't make a deal if Mr. Reagan looks like a loser, but will if he seems certain to win.

In other words, Soviet policy may not affect the election outcome, but be affected by it. If the Ayatollah or Central American guerrillas try to determine the outcome of the election, they may not succeed, either, but it would not be surprising if they tried.●

CRS STUDY: PRODUCTION OF BINARIES COULD LEAD TO CW PROLIFERATION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS) just released a report entitled "Binary Weapons: Implications of the U.S. Chemical Stockpile Modernization Program For Chemical Weapons Proliferation," which concludes that producing binary chemical weapons undermines a variety of mili-

tary, technical, political, psychological, and moral constraints now prohibiting other nations from producing or using chemical weapons.

The CRS study refutes the argument of binary proponents that chemicals used to produce binary chemical weapons are harmless. DF, a precursor chemical needed to produce the deadly nerve gas, "has a chemical structure similar to that of many phosphorus-based insecticides." DF is toxic and is lethal in relatively large amounts. Those working with the chemical would need to take safety precautions.

Binary chemical weapons, the study reports, are not more militarily efficient than unitary weapons. In fact, binaries are inefficient in ways that unitaries are not. For example, the reaction within the binary system cannot be relied upon to go to completion if suboptimal reaction conditions are present during its flight toward the target.

Mr. Speaker, this report is additional proof that the Congress should stand behind our 15 year commitment not to produce costly and unnecessary binary chemical weapons. I strongly recommend that my colleagues obtain a copy of this most worthwhile report. Wayne Biddle's article, "New Chemical Weapons Reported Less Efficient," from the Monday, April 30 New York Times is an excellent outline of the highlights of the report. Mr. Biddle's article follows:

NEW CHEMICAL WEAPONS REPORTED LESS EFFICIENT

(By Wayne Biddle)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—New chemical weapons sought by the Reagan Administration may be less efficient as weapons and more conducive to arms proliferation and terrorist use than existing types, according to a study by a nonpartisan Congressional organization.

The new weapons, called binary because they rely on two nonlethal chemicals that would mix to become lethal after the ammunition had been fired, are part of a $1.1 billion chemical warfare program requested for the 1985 fiscal year by President Reagan. Of this sum, $105 million is to prepare for production of binary artillery shells and aerial bombs called Bigeye that would release nerve gas.

The American chemical warfare stockpile consists of weapons that contain lethal nerve gas. No new chemical arms have been produced in the United States since 1968.

Congress has consistently denied the Pentagon money to produce binary weapons, though it has approved funds for a factory in Pine Bluff, Ark., that would manufacture binary weapons. The fiscal year 1984 budget authorization act allowed preparations for binary production, but prohibited the final assembly of any weapons until Oct. 1 1985, when the President would have to certify that it was in the national interest to make binary chemical weapons.

On the issue of chemical weapons proliferation, the study, conducted by the Congressional Research Service, said that the "chemistry of binary weapons makes them easier to produce than unitaries," or weapons that use a single gas. The study said that binary weapons "require lower investments of capital, skilled labor, and expertise than their unitary counterparts."

"A move by the U.S. or any other state to produce, stockpile and deploy binary nerve gas weapons will not necessarily cause terrorists to want binaries per se, but it would probably reduce the political and motivational factors inhibiting their decision" to seek chemical arms, the report concluded.

The Congressional study also said there were "significant misperceptions regarding binary technology." For example, it said, all binary ingredients are not harmless. Of the two chemical precursors of a nerve gas known as GB or sarin that would be formed in the artillery shells, one is toxic and would require safety precautions, the study said.

MAY NOT MIX PROPERLY

Moreover, "Binaries are inefficient in ways unitary weapons are not," the report found. It said that the chemical ingredients in the weapons may not mix properly if a shell's flight is too brief or if a bomb's glide path is too long.

An additional problem exists for Bigeye bombs, the report said. The two chemicals that form a nerve gas known as VX in a Bigeye are mixed once a plane carrying the bomb is airborne and ready to drop the bomb. An aircraft would not be permitted to return to base with a bomb onboard in which the gases have mixed to become lethal, the report said. Pilots returning with an unused Bigeye "would have to find a place to safely jettison it," the report said.

In testimony last week before a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Theodore S. Gold, head of chemical warfare programs in the Defense Department, said the Administration's 1985 budget request "does not include funds for complete facilities, for all the component parts, nor the load, assembly, and pack" of binary weapons. He said that about $90 million more would be required to complete production facilities at Pine Bluff, and about $10 million more would be needed to finish weapons that would be started if the 1985 request were approved by Congress.

Mr. Gold said the American stockpile of chemical artillery shells, produced from 1955 to 1968, "appears to be in good shape today." He said that an investigative panel had determined that "at least 50 percent" of the nerve gas, which is older than the munitions themselves, should still be usable by 1990.

SIZE OF STOCKPILE A SECRET

The size and composition of the American chemical weapons stockpile are military secrets, though professional journals estimate that there are between 30,000 and 40,000 tons of usable lethal chemicals. About half of this is thought to be GB and VX nerve gas, with the rest being mustard gas of World War II vintage. The Soviet arsenal is presumed by experts to be comparable.

In addition to the $105 million for preparations to produce binary weapons, Mr. Gold said the Administration was requesting $431 million for protective equipment, $26 million to maintain the current stockpile, $150 million to destroy obsolete weapons and $20 million for a new scientific laboratory at Edgewood Arsenal, Md., with the balance of the funds requested going for research and development.

The Congressional study noted that "other systems for the delivery of chemical agents are in various stages of research and development, including the Multiple Launch Rocket System, cruise missiles, and ground-launched and air-launched missiles."●

THE UNEQUAL ACCESS BILL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in the near future the House will consider the "Equal Access Act" (H.R. 5345) under suspension of the rules. The Washington Post has twice published editorials which expressed grave concern about the bill. The April 13 editorial pointed out that my distinguished colleague from New York, GARY ACKERMAN, offered a number of amendments which would have prohibited discrimination against minority religions and prohibited outside religious leaders from conducting religious activities in the public schools. Unfortunately, these amendments were defeated.

I encourage all of my colleagues to read carefully the Washington Post editorial prior to House action on H.R. 5345.

The editorial follows:

THE UNEQUAL ACCESS BILL

We publish today letters from proponents of the so-called Equal Access Bill reported by the House Education and Labor Committee last week. The bill would require any secondary school that allowed any student groups to meet during free time on school property to allow religious groups the use of similar facilities. Failure to comply would result in the loss of all federal funding for the school system.

There are a number of specific reasons why this simple-sounding bill is objectionable. First, public secondary schools are not usually, during the school day, used as public forums. Laurence Tribe mentions in his letter the Widmar case, which we had cited, though not in the context he suggests. In Widmar, the Supreme Court allowed religious student meetings on the campus of the University of Missouri. Students at that institute are adults, they are not attending classes under compulsion of law, and the university had a policy allowing more than 100 groups of all varieties to use their meeting rooms. As the Supreme Court carefully pointed out, the university was a true open forum, and religious groups could not, therefore, be excluded. The bill under consideration, however, deals with children and would allow school administrators to bar all sorts of groups—political, social, ethnic—while still requiring that religious groups be allowed to meet.

It is clear from the legislative history of the bill that some religious groups with only a few adherents could be denied the use of school facilities and that ministers and laymen representing religious organizations could attend these meetings—on school property and on school time—and lead students in prayer and workship. Testimony before Congress is replete with expressions of this understanding. Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-N.Y.) offered amendments at both the subcommittee and full committee markups

to prohibit both practices. His amendments were defeated.

Many well-meaning people in Congress do not seem to understand what is so troubling about this measure. "The practical result of the bill," said Linda Tarr-Whelan of the National Education Association in opposition, "would be extraordinarily divisive." Public schools should simply not be in the business of encouraging children to separate into groups for religious purposes. Each American is free to follow the tenets of the Rev. Sun Myung Moon, Louis Farrakhan or Pope John Paul II. That is guaranteed by the free exercise clause of the First Amendment. But when these religious leaders or their surrogates are given time and space to promote their beliefs in the public schools, while others may be cut out because their group is small, we run directly into the prohibitions of the establishment clause of the First Amendment.

This bill creates a risk that children will believe that their teachers, school administrators and the government are promoting religion, and even in some cases favor some religions over others. The way to avoid this risk is to keep religion in homes and churches and to spend school time on education.●

CRIME CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1983, the administration transmitted to the Congress its proposed comprehensive crime control legislation. It was introduced in the House and Senate on the same date—in the House as H.R. 2151 and in the Senate as S. 829. The Senate has already passed its version of the legislation, S. 1762, and I strongly urge the House to do the same. This legislation has been called the most significant Federal anticrime measure in over a decade. We owe it to our constituents to move this legislation promptly, because it is a thorough and comprehensive proposal for reform of certain aspects of our Federal criminal law and because it is a vitally important subject, impacting strongly on the lives and well-being of all our citizens.

The Senate bill, S. 1762, contains 10 titles, all of which are especially critical reforms in combating violent crime. They include bail and sentencing reform, criminal forfeitures and revision of the insanity defense. All of these areas address specific problems in current law. For example, the measure would make it more difficult to grant pretrial release to those particular defendants who pose a serious threat to the safety of the community. Currently, under chapter 207 of title 18, it appears that when considering pretrial release in noncapital cases, the judicial officer may consider only whether the defendant will appear at trial or other judicially required proceedings. Danger to the community and to others is only specified as a consideration in postconviction or capital cases. This proposal includes measures that would take into account safety of others and the community when considering pretrial release.

I am sure my colleagues would agree that this and other areas of the Federal criminal law are in urgent need of reforms such as the one just described—reforms which have long been urged by those who are concerned with our ability to deal with violent crime and repeat offenders. Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by urging my colleagues to move this legislation promptly. The matter is too urgent and of too great an importance to our law-abiding constituents to be allowed to remain in committee. I am certain that all of us who take our responsibilities seriously would agree that the House should stop deliberately stalling on S. 1762 and allow it to reach the floor so that we might all have the opportunity for full and fair debate.●

HISPANIC REGIONAL BUSINESS CONFERENCE

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, 1984, I had the pleasure of participating in the Los Angeles Hispanic Regional Business Conference. The conference provided a unique opportunity for Hispanic business organizations to meet and exchange ideas. It also allowed these organizations to begin developing future strategies to enhance and promote their businesses.

The Los Angeles Hispanic Regional Business Conference was sponsored by the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and cosponsored by five other Hispanic business organizations. Among its cosponsors was the Los Angeles Latin Business Association.

At this time I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks that were made by the president of this organization to the participants of the conference.

Statement of Raymond Rodriquez, president, Latin Business Association follows:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The city of Los Angeles was founded on September 4, 1781 as (El Pueblo de la Reina de Los Angeles, The Village of the Queen of the Angels). This tiny settlement was originally populated by a group of 11 families comprising 44 persons recruited from Mexico whose purpose was to establish outposts for Spain. In two centuries this dusty pueblo has gradually transformed into a huge urban complex of world wide importance and Hispanic influence.

Because Los Angeles has belonged to three countries, Spain, Mexico and The United States, The Latin Business Association also represents Latino business owners from every Spanish speaking country in the world. Our current 1984 officers come from Colombia, Peru, Mexico, Santo Domingo, U.S.A. just to name a few.

During the last 50 years the Los Angeles area has witnessed the development of some of the most important influential associations of our time. The contributions of these Hispanic associations of Los Angeles has reached international acclaim.

On behalf of our officers, directors, Board of Trustees and general membership, we invite you to join us in networking with the USHCO. The Hispanic Bankers Association, Mexican Chamber of Commerce, Mexican-American Grocers Association, not just a force for the 80's, but as a united voice calling upon those who are in decision policy making, that the Hispanic business owners of America will indeed make the difference in this country.

RAYMOND RODRIGUEZ, *President, Latin Business Association.*●

THE NICARAGUAN PEOPLE ENDURE 5 YEARS OF EMPTY SANDINISTA PROMISES

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Sandinistas ruling Nicaragua have been in power almost 5 years, but have yet to deliver on any of their promises to provide free elections, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and uphold the sanctity of human rights.

Never has this been clearer than during the Easter season when on Good Friday, more than 100,000 Nicaraguans turned out in Managua to observe the holy day and loudly protest the Sandinista government's attempts to stifle religious worship.

On Easter Sunday, a pastoral letter from Nicaragua's nine Roman Catholic bishops was read during worship services asking that all Nicaraguans enter into negotiations for peace. The Sandinista's Interior Minister Tomas Borge promptly denounced this suggestion of peace saying:

This is a criminal suggestion. The pastoral letter seeks confrontation and violates the law of the land.

Clearly the Sandinistas have demonstrated that peace does violate the law of their land, as does the freedom to worship and the right to a free press. A Nicaraguan pastor who visited the United States last month told of the atrocities the Sandinistas have commited against the Nicaraguan people and their religious leaders.

Prudencio Baltodano, a pastor in the Unified Pentecostal Mission in Nicaragua, was attacked and tortured by a Sandinista army unit who bayoneted his neck and cut off one of his ears, saying:

We are Communists and don't believe in God.

This is another example of the perverted view the Sandinistas have of human rights for the Nicaraguan people.

In the most recent attack on religion, the Sandinistas, through their government sponsored newpapers, have launched a propaganda campaign against Managua's Roman Catholic Archbishop Obando y Bravo. The Sandinistas have attempted to link the archbishop to former Nicaraguan President Somoza through old photographs and false headlines.

The Sandinistas believes that by controlling the Nicaraguan press and scaring people away from the churches, the Communist control of Nicaragua will flourish. Instead, the Sandinista government is finding that the Nicaraguan people will stand up and fight for their rights and will not be silenced until the Government fulfills its promises of 1979:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1984]

ARCHBISHOP RAPS MEDIA IN NICARAGUA

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA.—Managua's Roman Catholic archibishop issued a letter accusing the government-controlled news media of conducting a campaign against him and saying the media would be responsible for his safety.

The office of Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo said in the letter dated Saturday that the media of the left-wing Sandinista junta was trying to "darken" the church leader's reputation by making him appear to be a rightist.

It said the church was holding "the official means of communication" responsible for "anything that might happen in terms of the personal safety" of the archbishop.

Archbishop Obando y Bravo has frequently been critical of the Sandinistas, who gained control of the country after winning the civil war against the government of the late President Anastasio Somoza in July 1979.

Church-state tensions increased after a pastoral letter was read in Catholic churches on Easter Sunday calling for negotiations between the government and anti-Sandinista rebels.

The archbishop's office said the prelate was in Rome on Saturday, meeting with Pope John Paul II and other church leaders.

Articles and broadcasts critical of Archbishop Obando y Bravo have beome prominent since the Easter statement.

On Tuesday, the government newspaper Barricada published old photographs of the archbishop meeting with Mr. Somoza. On the same day, the pro-government newspaper El Nuevo Diario carried a picture of the archbishop with the headline, "Guess Who's in Florida?" Many Nicaraguans consider Florida a haven for ex-members of Mr. Somoza's national guard.

"Not having any meaningful argument against (the pastoral) call for reconciliation, they have begun to attack the archbishop . . . trying to darken his image as pastor," the statement from Archbishop Obando y Bravo's office said. "They (the government media) have manipulated mere meetings and acts of protocol from the past" in a way that makes the archbishop appear as a Somoza supporter, it added.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1984]

NICARAGUAN, IN WASHINGTON, SAYS HE WAS TORTURED BY SANDINISTAS

WASHINGTON, April 23.—Prudencio Baltodano wears a white cloth over his ears to cover scars that he said remain from being tortured by Nicaraguan Army forces in February.

Mr. Baltodano, who says he was a Pentecostal preacher and farmer in El Tendido near the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua when he was attacked, came to Washington recently under the sponsorship of Nicaraguan rebels to tell his story of torture to Congress, the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Mr. Baltodano is the latest Nicaraguan or Salvadoran to come to Washington under the auspices of an organization either favoring or opposing United States policy in Central America, to bear witness to atrocities said to have been committed by government forces or rebels in the region. The goal of these visits is to try to influence public and Congressional sentiment about Central America.

Last year, several Nicaraguans who said they had been mistreated by United States-supported rebels were brought to Washington by opponents of United States covert activities and were made available to reporters for interviews.

WANTS TO TESTIFY

Mr. Baltodano said in an interview that he wants to testify about repression in his homeland, and about how one of his ears was cut off and he was bayoneted in the neck for no apparent reason other than his religious beliefs.

A spokesman for the Nicaraguan Embassy, Isolda Hurtado, said that the Government had no knowledge of Mr. Baltodano or of the attack he described. "It is another story made up by the contras to discredit Nicaragua," she said, referring to the Nicaraguan rebel forces by the name under which they are known in Central America.

The Nicaraguan Permanent Commission on Human Rights has interviewed Mr. Baltodano and considers his story authentic, according to Marta Patricio Baltodano, the commission's national coordinator.

Mrs. Baltodano, who is no relation to Mr. Baltodano, said by telephone from Managua that the commission expects to present his case to the Nicaraguan Government this week.

Miss Hurtado, the embassy spokesman, said the commission had no legal standing as a human rights organization. She said the legitimate human rights organization in Nicaragua is the National Commission to Promote and Protect Human Rights.

ABUSES ARE ALLEGED

Roberto Ferrey, a spokesman for a Nicaraguan rebel group based in Costa Rica, said that the treatment of Mr. Baltodano was a reflection of abuses by Government forces against religious leaders and Miskito Indians in Nicaragua. Mr. Ferrey, who came with Mr. Baltodano to Washington from Costa Rica, said his rebel organization, the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance, was paying for the visit to publicize the Sandinista Government's misdeeds.

Reagan Administration officials and leaders of the alliance have said the organization is supported in part by the Central Intelligence Agency. Guerrilla leaders in Costa Rica said last week that this aid has included cash, it was not clear whether money provided by the C.I.A. was used to bring Mr. Baltodano to Washington

TIED TO A TREE

Mr. Baltodano, who has scars on his forehead and neck and no left ear, said he had done nothing to provoke the attack. "I was a farmer and preacher," he said. "I was not interested in politics."

Mr. Baltodano, 40 years old, said a unit of the Nicaraguan Army seized him and a friend early in February—he does not recall the exact date—while they were building a shelter for their families. He said the families were fleeing from fighting between Government forces and rebels.

Mr. Baltodano said several of the soldiers tied him to a tree, warning him. "You don't know what we do to evangelical pastors. We are Communists and don't believe in God." Mr. Baltodano said he was a pastor in the Unified Pentecostal Mission, one of a number of evangelical groups in Nicaragua that have attracted a large following.

He said he did not know the identities of the soldiers who assaulted him, but said they came from a Nicaraguan Army unit.

Mr. Baltodano said that although he bled profusely from the wounds inflicted during torture, he was able to escape with difficulty through the forest when the soldiers departed.

Mr. Baltodano said he now lives in Costa Rica. Mr. Ferrey said that Mr. Baltodano would present his case to members of Congress and talk to officials from the United Nations and Organization of American States.●

FEDERAL GRAND JURY REFORM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to reform the Federal grand jury. My bill is patterned upon the American Bar Association's Model Grand Jury Act. The ABA's Model Act implements some 30 principles and was developed during a 7-year study by a committee that included Federal and State prosecutors, public and private defense counsel, academicians, and judges. The ABA is to be commended for its work in this area.

The grand jury is a venerable part of our Anglo-American system of jurisprudence and was developed in part to protect individuals from the power of the prosecutor. Over time, however, the Federal grand jury has ceased to serve that function. It has become a tool that the prosecutor can, and sometimes does, use unfairly to intimidate, harass, and malign putative defendants. My bill reforms the Federal grand jury by: authorizing a witness to be accompanied by counsel in the grand jury room; providing transactional immunity to a witness who is compelled to give self-incriminating testimony; requiring that the target of

an investigation be permitted to testify before the grand jury if the target so wishes; precluding the use of evidence seized in violation of the constitutional rights of the target; and requiring that exculpatory evidence be presented to the grand jury.

The reforms in my bill are realistic responses to valid criticisms and their implementation is long overdue. If enacted, my legislation will insure that the Federal grand jury is not merely a tool of the prosecutor but can serve its historical function of protecting individuals from prosecutorial overreaching.

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Grand Jury Reform Act of 1983".

SEC. 2(a) Chapter 215 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3321. Number of grand jurors; summoning additional jurors

Every grand jury impaneled before any district court shall consist of not fewer than sixteen nor more than twenty-three persons. If fewer than 16 of the persons summoned attend, they shall be placed on the grand jury, and the court shall order the marshal to summon, either immediately or for a day fixed, from the body of the district, and not from the bystanders, a sufficient number of persons to complete the grand jury. Whenever a challenge to a grand juror is allowed, and there are not in attendance other jurors sufficient to complete the grand jury, the court shall make a like order to the marshal to summon a sufficient number of persons for that purpose.

"§ 3322. Grand jury; rules of evidence

The attorney for the government shall not present to the grand jury evidence against a target which such attorney knows was obtained in violation of that target's constitutional rights.

"§ 3323. Duty to disclose exculpatory evidence to the grand jury

"(a) The attorney for the government shall disclose to the target, and if feasible present to the grand jury, all evidence that tends to negate one of the material elements of the crime.

"(b) The attorney for the government shall alert the grand jury to the existence of, and inform the grand jury of such grand jury's right to call for, evidence that bears upon a possible affirmative defense and that raises a reasonable doubt about the target's guilt.

"(c) After arraignment upon an indictment, the court, upon motion of the defendant made within 30 days after the defendant or defendant's attorney knew or reasonably should have known of the ground for such motion, shall dismiss an indictment if the court finds that—

"(1) the attorney for the government knowingly failed to comply with subsection (a) of this section; or

"(2) the attorney for the government knowingly failed to comply with subsection (b) of this section, and that, had that subsection been complied with, the grand jury would not have been justified in returning an indictment.

"§ 3324. Rights of the target of a grand jury investigation

"(a) Except as hereinafter provided, the attorney for the government shall advise a person upon whom such attorney or the grand jury has begun to focus an investigation, either personally, through counsel, or at such person's last known address, that such person is—

"(1) a target of the grand jury investigation;

"(2) entitled, upon waiver of immunity, to a reasonable opportunity to testify before the grand jury; and

"(3) entitled to present the attorney for the government with exculpatory evidence and the names and addresses of others who possess exculpatory information.

"(b) An indictment that issues without the notice required by this provision shall be dismissed, unless the court finds that the attorney for the government is unable with reasonable diligence to notify the target or that there are reasonable grounds to believe that giving such notice would create an undue risk of danger to other persons, flight of the target, or other obstruction of justice.

"§ 3325. Grand jury subpoena

"(a) Unless the court finds special need upon a showing by the attorney for the government or unless the witness consents to a shorter notice period, no subpoena to appear before a grand jury may require any witness to testify or produce a book, paper, document or other object designated therein at any time before 72 hours after service of the subpoena.

"(b) A subpoena to appear before the grand jury shall—

"(1) state the general subject matter of the grand jury investigation;

"(2) set forth any substantive provision of law, violation of which is under consideration by the grand jury, if such provision is known at the time of issuance of the subpoena;

"(3) warn that anything a witness says or any evidence given to the grand jury by a witness may be used against such witness in a court of law; and

"(4) advise the witness of the privilege against self-incrimination and of the right to the advice of an attorney as provided in section 3326(a)(1) of this title while appearing before the grand jury.

"(c) A subpoena shall be returnable only when the grand jury is sitting.

"(d)(1) A motion relating to a subpoena, including a motion to quash such subpoena, may be made at any time to the court that issues such subpoena, and such court shall take appropriate action upon such motion.

"(2) A motion made under this section at least two days before the subpoena commands the witness to testify or to produce a book, paper, document or other object designated therein shall upon appropriate application stay such witness' appearance until the court has ruled on such motion.

"(4) Upon motion, the court may quash a subpoena if the court finds that—

"(A) a primary purpose or effect of the witness' appearance is to secure testimony or other information in preparation for the trial of any person who is already under indictment or formal accusation by the United States, a State, or a subdivision of a State, for such activities; provided, however, that this provision shall not limit the grand jury from investigating other potential offenses of the same or other defendants;

"(B) a primary purpose of the witness' appearance is to secure information for purposes other than investigation of criminal activity;

"(C) the witness has not been advised of such witness' rights, as specified in subsection (b) of this section;

"(D) the evidence sought is not relevant to any proper aspect of the grand jury investigation;

"(E) compliance with the subpoena would be unreasonable or oppressive;

"(F) a primary purpose of the subpoena is to harass the witness;

"(G) the witness has given written notice (that such witness will) exercise the privilege against self-incrimination unless a grant of immunity is obtained or unless the court determines that the witness is not entitled to assert the privilege; or

"(H) the grand jury is inquiring into events that were under consideration by another grand jury that affirmatively refused to return an indictment based on such events, unless there is additional, newly discovered evidence relevant to such inquiry or unless the court determines that the interests of justice require reconsideration of the matter by the grand jury.

"§ 3326. Rights of grand jury witnesses

"(a)(1) A witness before a grand jury shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel during such witness' appearance before the grand jury, but such counsel shall not address the grand jury, raise objections, make arguments, or otherwise disrupt proceedings of the grand jury and may disclose matters which occur before the grand jury only to the same extent as such attorney's client is permitted to make such disclosure.

"(2) If the court determines that counsel for a grand jury witness has violated subsection (a)(1) of this section, then the court shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure compliance with such subsection including exclusion of the offending counsel from the grand jury room.

"(b) Immediately prior to being called into the grand jury room, a witness shall be informed of such witness' rights as set forth in subsection (b) of section 3325 of this title, and if such witness is a target, that such witness is a target of the investigation.

"(c)(1) Any witness who has previously testified before a grand jury shall, upon request and under such conditions as the court deems reasonable, be entitled to examine and copy a transcript or electronic recording of that testimony before such witness is required to testify again before a grand jury considering matters relating to the witness' previous testimony. A witness proceeding in forma pauperis shall upon request be furnished a copy of such transcript without cost. Such transcript shall be made available for inspection and copying not later than forty-eight hours before the witness is required to testify, unless, for cause shown, the court finds that more time is required to prepare such a transcript. The disclosure requirement of this subsection shall not apply to the continuation of testimony interrupted by a routine recess of the grand jury.

"(2)(A) Upon a showing of good cause, the court may, at any time, order that the disclosure of the recorded proceedings of a grand jury be denied, restricted, or deferred, or make such other order as appropriate.

"(B) Upon motion, the court shall permit the attorney for the government to make such showing, in whole or in part, in the form of a written statement to be inspected by the judge alone. If the court enters an order granting relief following such a show-

ing, the entire text of the statement shall be sealed and preserved in the records of the court to be made available to the appellate court in the event of an appeal.

"(d)(1) An attorney for the government shall not call before the grand jury any witness who has notified the attorney for the government 48 hours before the scheduled time for the witness' appearance that such witness will invoke the privilege against self-incrimination, unless such attorney obtains a grant of immunity for such witness. In the absence of such notification, the witness shall appear before the grand jury at the time and place specified in the subpoena.

"(2) If the attorney for the government contests the availability of the privilege under the circumstances, such attorney shall file under a seal a motion to compel the witness to testify or give evidence. In such event, the court shall hold a hearing in camera, unless the witness requests a public hearing, to determine whether the witness must appear before the grand jury and assert the privilege against self-incrimination to specific questions asked by the grand jury.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 215 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

"3321 Number of Grand Jurors; summoning additional jurors.
"3322 Grand jury; rules of evidence.
"3323 Duty to disclosure exculpatory evidence to the grand jury.
"3324 Report of the target of a grand jury investigation.
"3325 Grand jury subpoena.
"3326 Rights of grand jury witnesses.

SEC. 3. Section 6002 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "no testimony or other information compelled" and all that follows through "any criminal case, except" and inserting in lieu thereof "such witness shall not be prosecuted or subject to any penalty or forfeiture on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which such witness is compelled to testify under the order, except in".

SEC. 4. (a) Chapter 121 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1893. Recalcitrant witnesses

"(a)(1) Whenever a witness in any proceeding before or ancillary to any grand jury appearance refuses to comply with an order of the court to testify or to produce a book, paper, document or other object designated therein, the attorney for the government may apply to the court for an order directing the witness to show cause why such witness should not be held in contempt.

"(2) After submission of such application and a hearing, at which the witness is entitled to be represented by counsel, the court shall, upon a finding that such refusal was without just cause, hold the witness in contempt and order the witness to be confined.

"(3) No hearing under this subsection shall be held unless 72 hours' notice is given to the witness who has refused to comply with the court order, except that a witness may be given a shorter notice if the court, upon a showing of special need, so orders.

"(b)(1) Any confinement for refusal to comply with an order to testify or produce other information shall continue until such time as the witness is willing to give such testimony or provide such information. No period of such confinement shall exceed the term of the grand jury, including extensions, before which such refusal to comply with the court order occurred, and in no event shall such confinement exceed one year. This subsection shall not prohibit confinement for longer than a year for criminal contempt for such refusal.

"(2) No person may be held in contempt and confined more than once under this section for refusal to comply with an order to testify or produce a book, paper, document or other object designated therein if the order concerns the same event, transaction, or set of transactions.

"(c) Any person confined pursuant to this section may be admitted to bail or released in accordance with chapter 20 of title 18, United States Code, pending the determination of an appeal taken by such person from the order of confinement unless the court finds that the appeal is frivolous or taken for delay. Any appeal from an order of confinement under this section shall be disposed of as soon as practicable, pursuant to an expedited schedule, and in no event more than thirty days from the filing of such an appeal.

"§ 1894. Rights and duties of grand jury and attorney for government

"(a) Upon impaneling a grand jury, the court shall instruct and charge the grand jury on the rights, responsibilities and duties of the grand jury, including—

"(1) the duty to inquire into criminal offenses that are alleged to have been committed within the jurisdiction;

"(2) the right to call and interrogate witnesses;

"(3) the right to request production of a book, paper, document or other object, including exculpatory evidence;

"(4) the necessity of finding credible evidence of each material element of the crime charged before returning a true bill;

"(5) the right to have the attorney for the government draft indictments for less serious charges than those originally requested by such attorney;

"(6) the obligation of secrecy; and

"(7) such other rights, responsibilities, and duties as the court deems advisable.

"(b)(1) Any person, including a witness who has previously appeared before the grand jury, may present the attorney for the government with exculpatory evidence and request that such evidence be disclosed to the grand jury, or request to appear personally before the grand jury to testify or present evidence to that body. The attorney for the government shall promptly forward any request under this subsection to the grand jury and may make a recommendation as to such request.

"(2) The attorney for the government shall keep a confidential record of all such requests and the action taken on each such request.

"(3) The grand jury shall not be required to hear any witness, or consider any book, paper, document or other object, but shall consider all requests forwarded to such grand jury by the prosecutor. The grand jury may, upon an affirmative vote of a majority of such grand jury's members, hear the testimony or consider any book, paper, document or other object offered by a person under this subsection. If the grand jury decides not to hear such testimony or consider a book, paper, document or other object offered, the attorney for the government shall notify the person making such request, in writing, of the refusal.

"(c) The attorney for the government shall not bring before the grand jury any witness who has given notice in compliance with section 3326 (d)(1) of title 18, United States Code, that such witness intends to exercise the privilege against self-incrimination, unless such witness has been given a grant of immunity or a court has determined that such witness must invoke the privilege in response to specific questions.

"(d) The attorney for the government shall not initiate, and a grand jury shall not conduct, an inquiry into a transaction or event if another grand jury has refused to return an indictment based on the same transaction or event, unless the court finds, upon a proper showing, that additional evidence relevant to such inquiry has been discovered or that the interests of justice require reconsideration.

"(e) The attorney for the government shall not make statements or arguments in an effort to influence grand jury action in a manner that would be impermissible at trial before a petit jury.

"§ 1895. Unindicted coconspirators

The grand jury shall not name a person in an indictment as an unindicted coconspirator to a criminal conspiracy. Nothing herein shall prevent supplying such names in a bill of particulars.

"§ 1896. Grand jury reports

A grand jury should not issue any report that singles out a person to impugn such person's motives, holds such person up to scorn or criticism or speaks of such person's qualifications or moral fitness to hold an office or position. No grand jury report shall be accepted for filing and publication until it submits in camera a copy thereof to all persons named or identifiable and such persons are given the opportunity to move to expunge any objectionable portion of said report and have final judicial determination prior to the report's being published or made public. Such motion to expunge shall be made within ten days of receipt of notice of such report. Hearings on such motions shall be held in camera.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 121 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1893. Recalcitrant witnesses.
"1894. Rights and duties of grand jury and attorney for the government.
"1895. Unindicted coconspirator.
"1896. Grand jury reports.●

H.R. 1234: THE SANER ECONOMIC ALTERNATIVE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in light of Ambassador Brock's announcement yesterday that the administration will not seek an extension of the Japanese voluntary restraint agreement for its automobiles, I would like to speak on behalf of H.R. 1234, the domestic content legislation, as a far better economic alternative to the quotas.

The U.S. Trade Representative pointed to the unprecedented profits which the auto companies have reaped as proof that they no longer need pro-

tection from imports. The administration is misled by this fact. These profits are not only a result of the protection these quotas bring American companies, but these companies rely on the extension of the quotas to continue reaping such profits. This is what is wrong with quotas. They protect the domestic industry from competition unlike the domestic content bill which will encourage foreign companies to build plants in the United States. Quotas also encourage foreign companies to increase their prices and sell only high price, high profit models within their quota allotment. The quotas have been similarly unsuccessful in meeting their stated goals:

The Vras have not curbed import penetration. Instead the percentage of imports increased from 16.5 percent in 1979 to 22 percent in 1983. A report released by the Department of Commerce in January, 1983 predicted that if the restraints are lifted Japanese penetration could increase 35 to 40 percent.

The quotas have not provided the U.S. companies with the incentive to produce a competitive small car. The purpose of the quotas was to give the U.S. "breathing room" to produce a small car which would compete with the Japanese counterpart. Yet, three years later, the American companies are meeting Japanese competition by moving their production overseas. GM alone, in its bid to import 300,000 Isuzus and Suzukis, would jeopardize the jobs of 71,400 American workers.

The inherent problem with quotas is they create a barrier behind which the American manufacturers can be sheltered from imports. These barriers protect the companies from damaging imports but do not induce them to produce a competitive product. Instead, the U.S. companies are able to raise their profits without substantially increasing their productivity. Also, it is not just the American companies who have reaped enormous profits from these the quotas, so to have the Japanese. Though Honda, Toyota and Nissan sell only 30 percent of their total production in the United States, 50 to 70 percent of their profits are earned in this market. The ultimate loser is the American consumer who is forced to pay higher prices because of the decreased competition.

The domestic content legislation would not have these adverse economic effects. The purpose of this legislation is not to protect the American companies from competition but rather to maintain a healthy auto industry—a vital cornerstone of our economy. The bill simply requires that every company, foreign or domestic, be required to invest a certain percentage of their production in this country to meet their sales. The result will be decreased import penetration and a revitalization of our domestic industry.

Domestic content will also succeed where the quotas have failed by creating a fair and level playing field for competition among auto companies. Because all manufacturers will be required to produce a certain percentage of their cars on American soil, all the factors which have given the Japanese an advantage such as lower taxes and a weaker yen will be eliminated. Its companies will be manufacturing under the same economic conditions as their American counterparts.

Under this scenario competition will increase and the price of cars will decline. The American companies will have to improve their productivity in order to compete with those products manufactured by foreign producers on this soil. This in turn will lower prices as producers vie for the same consumers.

The domestic content legislation would assist the American auto market to regain its competitiveness while maintaining consumer choice. The enactment of this bill will create an expanded auto market, which automobile companies must manufacture inexpensive, efficient and well-built cars in order to maintain their market position. The winners under these conditions would be the American workers, who will keep their jobs, and the American consumers who will be assured of good cars at reasonable prices.●

A TRIBUTE TO FATHER BRUCE RITTER

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to a truly special man, Father Bruce Ritter, a Franciscan priest who has devoted his life to reducing the pain and suffering of thousands of runaways, homeless and exploited young people.

Father Ritter began his ministry to these suffering children in 1968 and opened Covenant House Under 21 in New York in 1972. Since 1977, Father Ritter and his army of committed staff and volunteers have helped rescue more than 50,000 troubled young people from a life of drugs and prostitution. He has dared to go right where the problem is most acute—amid the sleazy shops in Times Square and in similar locations in Houston and Toronto. He is now in the process of establishing shelters in Boston and Fort Lauderdale. He also founded a long-term home for street youth in Guatemala.

Mr. Speaker, Father Ritter is indeed practicing what our Christian faith teaches. Like the Good Samaritan in the Gospel, he has not only recognized our "neighbor" in the shattered lives and dashed hopes of runaways and homeless children, but has responded magnificently with practical help and care. He does not just talk about love, he practices it. He is a doer of the word of God, not just a hearer. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, Father Ritter's ministry has afforded thousands of young people who have been abused and exploited by the pushers and the pimps a fresh start, a glimpse of hope, renewed self-respect, the forgiveness of Christ and a taste of unconditional love. When I think of Father Ritter's outreach, I am reminded of our Lord's words "For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink. I was a stranger and you welcomed me, naked and you clothed me. I was ill and you comforted me, in prison and you came to visit me. Then the just will ask Him, when did we see you hungry and feed you or see you thirsty and give you drink? When did we welcome you away from home or clothe you in your nakedness? When did we visit you when you were ill or in prison? The King will answer them: 'I assure as often as you did it for one of the least of my brethren, you did it for me.'"

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that President Reagan recently recognized the outstanding contribution made by Father Ritter. In his state of the Union address the President called Father Ritter an "unsung hero" who is in the vanguard to "soothe the sorrow and heal the wounds of our children." Pope John Paul II recently summoned Father Ritter to the Vatican to discuss his ministry to runaways and the homeless so that his work can be duplicated elsewhere in the world.

I am pleased to inform my colleagues that Father Ritter will be honored in my hometown next week. Father Ritter, a native son of Hamilton Township, N.Y. will be honored at a testimonial luncheon in Hamilton sponsored by Mayor Jack Rafferty. I am also happy to note that May 8 has been declared "Father Bruce Ritter Day" by Mayor Rafferty.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by pointing out that no earthly honors could ever adequately recognize the unselfish accomplishments of Father Ritter. As our Lord said in the Gospel. His true treasure will be in Heaven. But I hope Tuesday's testimonial—and the funds raised by the lunch—will serve as some encouragement to Father Ritter. To let him know that he, his ministry is much appreciated not just by the runaways and the homeless, but by us all.

Father Ritter, you are truly an inspiration.●

HOLOCAUST VICTIMS

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep empathy for those victimized and a strong commitment to the dignity of human life, that I join my colleagues in commemorating Yom Ha'shoa—the Days of Remembrance of the Jewish Holocaust. Last year we observed this dark chapter in world history through the first American gathering of Jewish Holocaust survivors who reunited in our Nation's Capital—15,000 strong.

Although they are not gathered together this year, their spirit and moral force are everpresent. Each is a living witness to the horror of the Holocaust. Each reminds us that we should never forget the 6 million innocent Jews who perished at the hands of the Nazis forces 40 years ago. Each reminds us of the need to remain vigilant against prejudice and repression.

A Holocaust survivor from my State of Oregon, Hannelore Wanderer, recalls that Jews at first were issued identification cards, then ordered to wear Jewish stars, then not allowed to sit on park benches or even go to the movies. And we all know how much worse it got.

In Buchenwald, Germany, over 56,000 people were killed. At the Dachau concentration camp in Munich, there were more than 40,000 deaths. The most abhorrent were the death camps in Poland where gas chambers and ovens were used to exterminate the Jews as part of the Nazi's campaign to eradicate Jewish life. At Auschwitz the estimated total number of deaths run as high as 2.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, the memory of the Holocaust is painful. But we cannot let ourselves forget this horrific example of man's inhumanity to man. We must engrain this event in our memories not only to pay tribute to the lives so brutally lost, but to insure that a similar atrocity is never revisited upon any people, anywhere.

That's why Congress approved in 1980 the creation of a U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum to serve as a permanent reminder. It is the reason I support the establishment of such a museum. The theme of the Holocaust Museum is to remember. The purpose to learn.

The museum will help sensitize those of all ages and backgrounds to the lessons of the Holocaust. In testimony before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on which I serve, my friend, Mark Talisman, vice chairman of the Holocaust Memorial Council, put it this way:

. . . [the] museum will be able . . . to preserve the record, to memoralize the world that was and is no more, and teach all the generations to come, so that none may ever distort or deny the truth, and so that another Holocaust will never again happen to any people.

As a country that stands foremost in the protection of human rights and civil liberties, I believe it is only fitting that we build a monument to the Holocaust and the moral cause it represents.

I look forward to the day when the doors of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial open and all those who come to visit will leave with a better understanding of the Holocaust and a resolve to fight for the protection of human rights and human dignity the world over.●

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is Polish Constitution Day. I would like to share with the House the remarks I will make this Sunday at the Polish Constitution Day celebration which will be held at the Shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa in Doylestown, Pa.

Reverend Father, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: Today, we are celebrating the Polish Constitution of May 3rd, 1791, one of the greatest documents known to man. It reminds us that the Polish nation and the American nation are bound together by a deep respect for the rights of men. As Polish Americans, I believe that we are the children of a great common heritage.

We can be very proud of the Constitution of 1791. We can also be proud of what Polish Americans have accomplished since the first immigration of Polish settlers to Jamestown in the 17th Century. We can be proud of Kazimierz Pulaski, Tadeusz Kosciuszko and other sons of Poland who came to America to fight for freedom. We can be proud of Poland's greatest native son, His Holiness Pope John Paul II. We can be proud of Lech Walesa, a recent recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize and the man who founded the Solidarity labor federation. We can be proud of the Solidarity labor federation, the Catholic church and the people of Poland who are continuing the struggle for a free and independent Poland. For these reasons and many more, I am introducing legislation naming August 1984 as Polish American Heritage Month.

Unfortunately, the people of Poland can celebrate their heritage only in their hearts. The iron curtain which cast its shadow upon the Polish nation after World War II is drawing even tighter. General Jaruzelski is carrying out a campaign of domination against the Polish people and their church.

When Martial Law was imposed in Poland in December of 1981, the United States government took steps to punish the communist leadership of Poland. The United States placed very strict economic sanctions on Poland because of the outrageous human rights and political liberty violations. Our goals were to have Martial Law lifted and the rights of the people restored.

Despite the good intentions of the United States government, Poland is no freer today than it was before American sanctions were imposed. Solidarity is still outlawed. The rights of the people are still ignored. In fact, our sanctions have caused a great deal of suffering for the people of Poland.

United States policy toward Poland must be reevaluated. It is correct to take actions against the Jaruzelski government, but not at the expense of the people of Poland. We should use available means to persuade the Polish government to restore basic liberties. However, our actions must take into consideration what the effects will be on the people. Our priority should be helping the people of Poland, not causing them more hardship.

I have written to the President urging him to make available new economic aid credits which will help the people of Poland. These credits would allow for the purchase of United States surplus farm products so that the people would have food. One important condition I strongly suggested is that representatives of the Catholic church in Poland and the Solidarity labor federation be included in the negotiations and in the distribution of the food and other American aid. This will guarantee that the people will gain the benefits of the aid. It will also make clear to the Jaruzelski regime that the United States will not tolerate its abuses of the church, Solidarity and the people.

Another problem that I believe should be addressed is the future of Polish nationals, who left Poland before the imposition of Martial Law. Presently, these people suffer the uncertainty of not knowing if they will be allowed to stay in the United States or if they will be forced to return to Poland. Although the Administration has placed them in Extended Voluntary Departure status—which allows them to stay in the United States for the time being—I believe that we must give them permanent relief.

Based on this belief, I have introduced legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives entitled the Polish Nationals Adjustment Act. This bill would allow the Attorney General to grant legal resident status to all Polish nationals presently in the United States who left Poland on or before December 13, 1981—the date Martial Law was imposed. This bill will guarantee that these people will be protected. It will send a clear message to General Jaruzelski that the United States will not abandon these people.

That is how the United States should formulate its policy: helping the people. The United States has the moral responsibility to stand against the outrageous abuses of the Polish government and to help the people who are suffering.

That is the deep respect for the rights of men that we—as Polish Americans—gain from both of our heritages. Today is the day to remember those who have fought so hard for our liberty. Today is the day to remind us that we should be proud of our beliefs in freedom and justice. Today is the day to recommit ourselves to the struggle for a free and independent Poland.

Each step we take will bring us closer to the day when the Constitution of 1791 will once again be the law of freedom for the Polish people.●

PUTTING VIOLENT CRIMINALS BEHIND BARS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the recent decision of the Federation of New York State Judges which adopted a resolution on April 23, 1984, calling on its members to send those convicted of serious crimes to prison regardless of the fact that such sentences could add to the overcrowding in the State's prison system.

The message here is clear and direct: Jurists who have long coddled violent criminals now realize that a violent offender ought to go to jail and that prison overcrowding is irrelevant to the sentencing decision.

I agree, totally, with the position of the New York Federation. The fear of crime and the insistence that violent offenders be put behind bars where they belong rank high on the list of concerns of the people of the Third District whom I am privileged to represent.

Emphasis must continue on rehabilitation and on finding alternatives to incarceration for nonviolent offenders, and we must continue to appropriate the funds to build prisons which offer appropriate housing and rehabilitation facilities.

But, prison overcrowding is simply no excuse to let violent and rapacious criminals roam the streets and do continuing harm to innocent citizens.

While this action involves only New York State and its criminal-justice system, I hope and pray it acts as a pattern and an example for other States and the Federal judicial system to emulate.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 23, 1984, New York Times detailing the judges' decision.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1984]

STATE JURISTS ASK THAT MORE FELONS BE SENT TO PRISON

(By David Margolick)

ALARMED BY CRIME, FEDERATION CALLS FOR FIRM SENTENCES DESPITE LACK OF CELLS

New York State's largest organization of judges has called on its members to send to prison anyone convicted of a serious crime even if there is not enough space.

In a formal resolution to be officially released today, the group—the Federation of New York State Judges—declared that with crime remaining at high levels in the state, judges can no longer afford to take the shortage of prison space into account when they mete out sentences. The state's prison system now houses more than 32,000 inmates—116 percent of capacity.

The streets of New York have become "lawless marches of robbers, rapists and felons of every kind," in part because of a "true and common perception of a failing criminal-justice system," the resolution said. The organization represents more than 2,000 judges, including those in State Supreme Court, Criminal Court, Family Court and the four Appellate Divisions of the Supreme Court.

PUNISHMENT ONLY DEFENSE

"When the safety of the people of this state cannot be assured except by the severe punishment of those who brutalize them," the statement continued, "then the prisons to which such defendants should be sent should be built. Swift and severe punishment is the only defense against predators."

The judges' resolution brought a quick reaction from the Cuomo administration, which predicted that prison overcrowding would soon ease. It also renewed the debate over the relative efficacy of incarceration and other anticrime measures.

REHABILITATION TERMED FAILURE

The federation's president, Justice Francis T. Murphy Jr. of the Appellate Division, First Department, said in an interview that in the past judges had sometimes been "reluctant" to send people to overcrowded prisons and instead had approved plea bargaining. He declined to estimate how many criminals had avoided incarceration in this fashion.

"The federation has called on all judges in New York State not to be concerned with lack of space, but to sentence firmly and fairly any of those who would be a danger to society," he said. "This is mandated by our oath of office and our sense of justice."

In a statement accompanying the resolution, Justice Murphy said increased imprisonment was necessary in part because society had no other remedy for crime. Rehabilitation, he said, had proved to be a failure.

"Society is pressed to its ancient defense against the violent criminal: the fear of swift and severe punishment," he stated. "Either we take that road now, or we will live in the sickly twilight of a soulless people too weak to drive predators out of their own house."

For example, Justice Murphy said in his statement, judges need not approve plea bargains struck between the prosecution and the defense. Such agreements, he noted, account for 90 percent of all dispositions in State Supreme Court and often allow the defendant to receive a suspended sentence or to be put on probation without serving any time in prison.

While the resolution did not specify which crimes should require imprisonment, it called upon the judges to impose severe sentences upon people "who, if at liberty, would be at threat to the lives of the men, women and children of this state."

OVERCROWDING DOWNPLAYED

Lawrence T. Kurlander, Governor Cuomo's Director of Criminal Justice, said he saw nothing to suggest that judicial sentencing decisions had been affected in any way by prison overcrowding.

Mr. Kurlander noted that there were 4,000 more criminals in prisons in New York than there were when Mr. Cuomo took office, adding that the system had "removed from the streets of New York a whole lot of very, very bad people."

The Governor has put forward a three-pronged prison reform package that, Mr. Kurlander predicted, would help allay the judges' concerns. That plan calls for increased prison capacity, revisions in the state sentencing law, and greater reliance on alternatives to incarceration for nonserious offenders.

The plan provides for more determinate sentencing—under which inmates would have to serve a specified minimum number of years in prison—for particular crimes, and transfering decisions on parole for prisoners from parole officials to judges. The alternatives to prison would include increasing probation programs, removing drug offenders from prison one year early and placing them in therapeutic community facilities, and community service and restitution programs.

MORE CELLS BEING READIED

The Legislature has already appropriated $700 million to build an additional 8,600 prison cells by 1986. About 2,500 of those, Mr. Kurlander said, will be available by the end of this year.

In November 1981 voters rejected a $500 million bond issue to build additional prisons. The New York Civil Liberties Union, which opposed that measure, challenged the judge's resolution.

"I do not think that what Judge Murphy proposes will substantially protect anyone," said Salvador Tio, executive director of the civil liberties group. The resolution, he said "deals with crime once it has been committed rather than seeking explanations for aberrant, antisocial conduct," and was "an easy, law-and-order prescription for complex social problems."

"People from whom one would expect a greater degree of magnanimity have chosen to favor the warehousing of more and more people," he said. "Judges have a role beyond what they do in the courtroom, to enlighten public opinion."

CRIMINALS HAVE TAKEN CITY

In his statement accompanying the resolution, Justice Murphy said that the climate of fear in New York would have been "unthinkable" only a generation ago.

"If then someone had said that in 1984 hundreds of thousands of apartment windows in New York City would be covered with metal gates, and that private security guards would patrol the lobbies, hallways and rooftops of apartment buildings, we would have thought him insane," he said.

Ordinary men and women, he continued, "tell us that criminals have taken the city, that crime has beaten government to its knees, that the moral passion for justice has been drained out of society and, in its place, there is an overwhelming sense of helplessness."

Mr. Kurlander speculated that the resolution stemmed in large part from the judiciary's frustration over criticism that it has treated criminals too lienently.

"They have been silent, and been subjected to quite a lot of abuse," he said. "This is a good-faith way of letting the public know that they are no different from the rest of us, that their children, wives, husbands and families are as much the victims of crime as anyone else's."

Melvin H. Miller, a Brooklyn Democrat and chairman of the Assembly Codes Committee, said: "The Judges are tired of taking flak, and I don't blame them. But the present building program is adequate, and may even provide for some excess space somewhere down the line."

The resolution was approved by a unanimous vote of those present at the March 28 meeting of the federation's board of directors, which consists of the heads of various organizations of judges across the state.

In addition to Justice Murphy, the members of the board include the following judges:

Michael F. Dillion, Presiding Justice, Appellate Division, Fourth Department. Raymond Harrington, County Judges Association. Milton Mollen, Presiding Justice, Appellate Division, Second Department. A. Franklin Mahoney, Presiding Jusice, Appellate Division, Third Department. Maxine K. Duberstein, Council of Judicial Associations, State of New York. Edwin, Kassoff, Association of Supreme Court Justices, State of New York. Thomas R. Jones, Association of Supreme Court Justices, City of New York. Betram R. Gelfand, Surrogate's Association, State of New York. Marilyn R. Friedenberg, Association of Judges of the Family Court, State of New York. Leon Deutsch, Association of Judges of the Family Court, City of New York. Daniel McMahon, Association of Court of Claims Judges, State of New York. Harold Fertig, District Court Judges Association, State of New York. Anthony Corso, District Court Judges Association, State of New York. Samuel Greenstein, Board of Judges, Civil Court, City of New York. Robert W. Cacace, New York State Association of City Court Judges. Carol Berkman, Association of Criminal Court Judges, City of New York. Nicholas F. O'Shea, New York State Association of Magistrates.●

THE IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY HISTORY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, military history is the key to developing a sound professional officer corps. For too many years, Americans have focused on quantitative analysis and computers for analysis of warfare. The recent renaissance in the use of history at the Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and at the Marine Command and General Staff College at Quantico, Va., are both to be commended.

I am pleased to include a report on the resurgence of military history in the Marine Corps. The article by Lieutenant Colonel Bittner follows:

MILITARY HISTORY AT "COMMAND AND STAFF"

(By Lt. Col. Donald F. Bittner, USMCR, Military Historian, Marine Corps Command and Staff College, Quantico)

During the 1982-83 academic year, the study of military history has been reemphasized at the Command and Staff College. This renewed stress on serious study of man's ability to wage war—which goes all the way back to the roots of our profession—is part of a general trend in professional military education in the United States. Military history, although never neglected at the college, has moved from elective status to a central place within the core curriculum.

The "Battle Studies Program"—at the center of this renewed emphasis—has three main elements: campaign analysis studies; historical perspective presentations; and a symposium, "War Since 1945." The primary focus is on the campaign analysis studies, in which each of the 12 permanent conference groups studies a significant campaign which has occurred in the modern era. The product of each conference group of 13 or 14 officers is a two-hour presentation to the College, in which the students discuss the results of their research and analysis. Their framework of analysis is applicable in studying any of past campaigns, contemporary problems, or future situations.

The campaign analyses are objective. There are no "good guys" or "bad guys" in the studies; rather, all sides are studied in a detached manner, to ascertain what occurred and why. The analyses try to determine why commanders and their staffs acted as they did, and to identify consequences of command decisions and staff recommendations.

Three campaigns of particular interest to Marines, which were studied in the 1982-83 academic year, reflected these goals. The analyses of Belleau Wood (1918) and Peleliu (1944) scrutinized the operations of the Germans and Japanese, as well as the Marines. The students soon discovered the reality behind familiar generalizations of high combat professional effectiveness, that has long been associated with the armed forces of Germany and Japan: their leaders were skilled in application of tactical doctrine, the use of terrain, the art of command, the coordination of supporting arms, and in personal preparation for their responsibilities. Furthermore, the study of the projected invasion of Japan in 1945-46, "Operations Olympic/Coronet," revealed that the Japanese had thoroughly studied the amphibious operations of the United States forces as they moved through the South and Central Pacific between 1942-45; hence, they correctly anticipated the nature of the projected invasion of their homeland, and where the landings would take place.

One conference group also studied the Marine involvement in Haiti between 1915 and 1934, as a means of reemphasizing to the current generation of field grade officers the Marine Corps' heritage in nonconventional warfare conflicts. The Haiti case also reaffirms the continued relevance of this form of potential commitment of the Corps in the future.

The Battle Studies Program has made a fast start. No program, however, can remain unchanged; it must undergo continual evolutionary change to avoid any hint of stagnation, to remain intellectually challenging, and to shift orientation as appropriate. Accordingly, some of the campaigns to be studied must change each year. For the 1983-84 academic year, nine of the 12 campaigns are new. Five are of special interest to students of Marine Corps history:

"Gallipoli" focuses on the major amphibious assault of World War I and the subsequent Marine Corps analysis of its lessons in the inter-war era.

"Wake Island" draws attention to another element of our amphibious mission: the defense of an advanced naval base.

"Saipan" Discusses that famous amphibious assault of World War II, plus the thorny problem of command in battle and inter-service relationships through the "Smith versus Smith Controversy."

"Nicaragua" like "Haiti," draws attention to the Marine heritage in nonconventional warfare and to a country much in the current news and in which Marines have an historical relationship.

"Operation Dewey Canyon" is a study of a key regimental-level military operation of the Vietnam War.

To compare and contrast the campaigns studied in the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years reveals a growing emphasis on the American military tradition—and within that, the diverse heritage of the Marine Corps in the profession of arms. In addition, significant campaigns of both our allies and foes, past and present, provide new perspectives and further materials for reflection.

Two other points should be noted about the campaigns under study. Anzio is a classic study of an amphibious landing where subsequent operations ashore are tinged with controversial interpretations. Consequently, there can be no absolutely "correct" answers to the historical questions posed by that campaign. In addition, the British assaults in 1944 on Walcheren Island stresses the amphibious mission of the College, but from different perspectives. The operation is analyzed from the viewpoint of our allies in their conduct of the assault, to include the use of naval and air assets. But this analysis also examines German preparations to defend against an amphibious attack. The Royal Marines have granted complete access to their archival holdings for this operation, and the Command and Staff College has copies of all pertinent operational records, planning documents, and after-action reports from Canadian and British military archives.

To enable the students to place their campaign analysis studies within a proper context, the second element of the Battle Studies Program is organized around the concept of "Historical Perspectives." This instruction consists of presentations by the military historian, with a special focus on the nature of history and the field of military history. This is followed by a two-hour filmed interview with one of Britain's foremost post-World War II soldiers, Field Marshal the Lord Carver. Lord Carver, while drawing upon historical examples of World War II operations in North Africa, Italy, and Western Europe (as well as his own experience), makes interpretative observations on the profession of arms, leadership, training, and combat operations. This interview is also part of the instructional program at the British Army Staff College, Camberley, and the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth.

In addition, six distinguished historians are invited to the College to speak on subjects pertinent to the field of military history.

The topics of each speaker are specifically selected so that they add perspective to each student's awareness of military history and relate to the campaigns being studied. For the 1983-84 academic year, three speakers will also address the military traditions of our major North Atlantic allies: France, Germany, and the United Kingdom.

A two-hour military history readings seminar is also part of the course of study. All the students will participate in this seminar, conducted through their permanent conference groups under the direct cognizance of each faculty advisor, with the military historian serving as the general coordinator and advisor.

It should be noted that major works on strategy, such as those by Clausewitz and Mahan, are part of another readings seminar which is a key element of the strategy instruction program of the College.

The final element in the historical perspectives segment of the Battle Studies Program is the historical introduction to each major student operational problem exercise. This presentation outlines the major learning objectives of each problem. Each historical introduction also has an additional purpose: to make students realize that many situations they will later confront as com-

manders and staff officers have already been encountered by their predecessors. This causes the elements of some problems to remain similar, even though the specifics may have been altered by the passage of time between campaigns. Two general examples illustrate this point:

1. In comparing contemporary and future operations with those of the past, weather and climate are always key factors—especially in the extremes of cold, tropical, and desert environments; and

2. In maintaining military transportation systems, animals have had to be fed and watered, and vehicles have had to be fueled; over the years, the problems of logistical support have changed in form but not in substance.

The historical introductions for operational problem exercises are taught by the College's Landing Force Operations Division. Examples include the linkage of "Frequent Wind" (the evacuation of Saigon in 1975) with "evacuation of U.S. citizens . . . Eastern Mediterranean" and Alexander the Great's Persian campaigns with a present-day Persian Gulf amphibious assault and subsequent operations ashore scenario.

The last element of the Battle Studies Program is the "War Since 1945" symposium. This is a one-day activity in the spring which consists of seminars, panels, and a guest speaker presentation.

Between 22-24 students with demonstrated writing skills are selected to enroll in the "War Since 1945" seminar, which is taught by the College's military historian. For eight months they research, analyze, and write about conflicts since 1945. In the spring, these officers in turn conduct separate seminars for the rest of the students.

The symposium focuses on warfare since the end of World War II in which the United States was not actively or directly involved. This exclusion is deliberate to make the students aware of events and trends in warfare and the profession of arms that are independent of the continuing East-West conflict. The wars are separated into conventional and nonconventional ones.

For 1983-84, the students could not select a war that had been studied in the previous academic year or undertake a joint effort on a particular conflict unless it could be analyzed from a fresh perspective. To cover the war in the Falklands, for example, three officers are studying that conflict independently, from three different viewpoints. The 22 officers in the seminar, then, will have covered 22 separate topics by year's end.

In the "War Since 1945" symposium, each student participates in one conventional war seminar conducted by the designated officers. In the later stages of the symposium, students can question panels that compare conventional and nonconventional warfare, and can also listen to a guest speaker address a particular aspect of warfare since 1945. In June 1983 the speaker was the noted soldier-scholar Col Trevor Dupuy, who addressed the interrelationships of human and technological factors in war.

The Battle Studies Program is designed to acquaint the students with significant factors in warfare and the evolution of the profession of arms, with special emphasis on the modern era. The mental processes involved are similar to those involved in analyzing contemporary problems, and field grade officer students soon recognize the similarities in past, current, and future military situations. Certain key factors tend to emerge as "constants": command, control, and communications; logistics; terrain; and, possibly the most important of all, the human element.

The ultimate objective of this program is to develop the innate abilities of each student. There is no way a study of military history can make an officer into another Lee, Pershing, Lejeune, Patton, or Vandergrift. It can only reinforce the capability he already possesses.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1984

● Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and sorrow that I join my colleagues in commemorating the Days of Rememberance of the Victims of the Holocaust. The 6 million Jewish men, women, and children that died at the hands of the Nazis must not be forgotten. Their legacy should serve as a constant reminder of the dark side of human nature. The savagery of the Holocaust should never be understated and, yet, it may never be fully comprehended by rational, compassionate, and just men and women.

The survivors of the concentration camps are a living reminder that each of us must be our brother's keeper. None of us can expect to remain silent while others are persecuted and still be absolved of any responsibility in crimes against humanity. Silence on the Holocaust might invite a repetition of that unprecedented humiliation and degradation by man toward his fellow man.

Elie Wiesel, a noted Holocaust historian has eloquently stated why we must remember this systematic slaughter:

> Not only because of the dead; it is too late for them. Not only because of the survivors; it may even be too late for them. Our remembering is an act of generosity, aimed at saving men and women from apathy to evil, if not from evil itself.

The evil that inspired the Nazis' final solution may still lurk in human nature and we must not permit it to ever again gain the upper hand in the affairs of men.

There are some who would have us believe that the Holocaust never occurred. Such distortion of the truth is at the very least a cruel hoax. This commemoration serves to remind us of the constant human rights violations that continue to occur in many nations. As such, we must remain vigilant and refuse to participate in any activity that undermines the human rights of any man, women, or child anywhere on this planet.

It is for these reasons, and many others, that we observe the Days of Rememberance for the Victims of the Holocaust. We must draw strength from their deaths and assure that future generations will be guaranteed their human dignity.

Indeed, the past is prolog; and, we are the guardians against the evil that obliterated millions of innocent victims in the infamous death camps of the Third Reich. We will therefor continue to pledge ourselves as the protectors—unselfishly and determinedly—of the peaceful aspirations, dreams, and goals of our children and the yet unborn generations of all nations.●

ACID RAIN

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's defeat of acid rain control legislation in the Health and Environment Subcommittee abruptly dashed the hopes of those of us who have strived to pass an effective and equitable control program in this Congress. The opponents of acid rain control have dismissed the gravity of the acid rain threat to our environment, our economy, and our health; they have in effect ignored the findings and recommendations of eminent scientific bodies supporting the need for immediate controls; they have disregarded the widespread public support for effective action to control acid rain; they have turned away from tangible, good faith efforts by Members of this body and, in particular, members of the New England congressional delegation, to respond to legitimate regional concerns. In short, the opponents of acid rain control have shirked their responsibility to this Nation as stewards of our common environment and guardians of the national interest.

Ultimately, this outcome is largely the product of failed national leadership. Clearly, strong national leadership is necessary to overcome the sharp regional divisiveness that has characterized the acid rain debate in the past. As cochairman of the New England Congressional Caucus Task Force on Acid Rain along with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman SILVIO CONTE, I remain committed to seeking a comprehensive national solution to acid rain problem, and pledge to continue to pursue a dialog with my colleages. I call upon the leadership of the House and Senate to fill the void of leadership and join with me in this bipartisan effort.●

IN CELEBRATION OF CINCO DE MAYO

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday I will happily join our neighbors in Mexico in celebration of their independence day, Cinco de Mayo. On that memorable day in the town of Puebla, another victory was won in the name of freedom and equality.

As Americans who have also struggled for the protection of those inalienable rights of every person, we empathize emphatically with that small but determined army as they fought the tyranneous French. They fought for the same democratic ideals of justice and liberty in 1862 as we had in 1776. Thus, this day not only marks a joyous occasion for those of Hispanic descent but for all Americans who uphold these ideals.

As a nation comprised of peoples from diverse backgrounds let us rejoice not only in Mexico's independence but also in the variety they have added to our multifaceted culture. Today not only is our food flavored but our language and customs reflect this rich heritage. By sharing the heritage and traditions of our great neighbors to the south, it is my hope that we will develop a better understanding and cooperative spirit as we work to solve our similar problems. At a time when news of divisiveness and conflict pervades, let us not forget the commonalities that bind us together.●

VOLUNTEERS WORK TO REBUILD SALMON RUNS

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the volunteer efforts by a group of my constituents from Depoe Bay, Oreg., a fishing community on the Oregon coast, to rebuild our dwindling ocean salmon fishery.

Despite the Government's ongoing investment in fisheries research, hatchery production, and management activities, salmon harvests in Oregon's waters have been declining steadily for many years. Last year was the worst season in memory because of the devastating effects of El Nino—a calamity which this House rightly defined as a physical disaster in approving recent legislation to enable fishermen, processors, and other small businessmen hurt by El Nino to obtain low-interest operating loans to tide them through very difficult times.

Many of us in the Northwest delegation have exerted much effort during the last 4 years to keep longstanding Federal investments in our region's fisheries resources from being eliminated or severely cut. Given the budget priorities of this administration, it has been difficult, to say the least, just to maintain level funding for fisheries production, research, development, and management activities.

That is why I want to salute the homegrown work of Vaughn Taunton of Depoe Bay and his friends, city council member Ray Osuna, Fire Chief Jay Williams, fisheries biologist Steve Mamoyac, and the employees of the Depoe Bay water treatment plant, in helping to rebuild Oregon's anadromous fish stocks. Their story is told well by reporter Peter Sleeth in an article which appeared recently in the Newport, Oreg., News-Times, and I ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of volunteerism at its best:

DEPOE BAY VOLUNTEERS GROW THEIR OWN

(By Peter Sleeth)

More than a year ago, Vaughn Taunton noticed something a little fishy in Depoe Bay.

Perched above the bay in his restaurant, the Spouting Horn, he has a clear view of the dam and fish ladder on South Depoe Bay Creek.

"We've never noticed fish going over the dam," Taunton said. "Finally this year I've seen two fish go up it, but (before) I hadn't seen any in five years.

So Taunton, along with Ray Osuna and other local volunteers, decided to do something about it. They started their own salmon hatchery program, a program that depends on volunteers and donations to keep a steady supply of fish pouring into local streams.

Now, sitting behind the city's water treatment plant, 12,000 squirming chinook fry feed off their egg sacks while Taunton waits. Soon, when the egg sacks are gone and the fry are ready for release, they'll be scooped into buckets, slid into streams and sent on their way. Taunton and others are proud of the community spirit that put the program together and keeps it going.

"There's a real true spirit of volunteerism in this community throughout," said Depoe Bay Fire Chief Jay Williams.

"Williams, the Coast Guard, and a host of others all have chipped in on the effort, Taunton said. Just how the program started was with the help of the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and its Salmon and Trout Enhancement Program (STEP). The program encourages volunteers to start programs like the one in Depoe Bay. The success of such a program hinges on those volunteers, said Dave Loomis, who helped with the program in Depoe Bay.

"It's interesting they've gotten a whole community to cooperate on this," Loomis said. "They've done a real good job."

To date, 52,000 salmon fry have gone through the five hatching boxes that were built at the expense of Taunton and Osuna. Only the coho salmon were released in the Depoe Bay streams; the steelhead and chinook were released on tributaries to the Siletz and Salmon Rivers.

"They don't really feel this is much of a chinook stream," said Taunton, pointing to North Depoe Bay Creek.

The hatching project is of benefit to the entire community, Taunton said. In a town that draws its lifeblood from the fishing industry, fresh supplies of what is becoming a scarce commodity are vital to the community health. Taunton points to his own sons who left Depoe Bay due to a poor fishing industry.

"And these guys had to go to Alaska to do anything," he said. "So what we're doing is trying to get more fish for everybody."

And everybody seems to be chipping in. The city workers insure fresh water pours through the hatch boxes that swallow up eight to 10 gallons per minute and keep the fry healthy as they squirm among the rocks. If Taunton should find he needs help in maintaining the fish or clearing a stream, he rarely has to ask. The help is waiting.

But what impresses Taunton most is that the whole project required only one meeting more than a year ago. No long, boring committee meetings, no taxpayers money being spent (other than the cost of the fry that the ODFW pays) and plenty of fish for Depoe Bay's future, at least Taunton hopes so.

"That's the only thing—you've got to wait four years to see if you're doing anything right," he quips.●

ELIE WIESEL—CONSCIENCE OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday at noon in the rotunda of this Capitol Building, hundreds gathered in a solemn and heart wrenching service to remember the nightmare of the Holocaust. There were survivors, whom this generous and great Nation accepted with open arms, their second generation American-born children, and other Americans committed to the prevention of a repetition of this ultimate example of man's inhumanity to man.

Elie Wiesel delivered a moving statement on that occasion. More than any other he has helped us to understand—to the extent that understanding is possible—the significance of that nightmare. His voice has been the clearest in calling for us to create conditions to prevent the repetition of that outrage.

His thoughtful and moving words have significance for all of us. I place his remarks in the RECORD so that my colleagues in the House may benefit from his insight:

REMARKS BY ELIE WIESEL, CHAIRMAN, U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

Mr. Vice President, Congressman Yates, Distinguished Members of the House and Senate, Fellow Survivors, Friends:

For some of us, this is the most solemn and awesome day of the year. We delve into the darkest recesses of our memory only to confront and evoke a vanished universe surrounded by flames and penetrated by silence. The living and the dead locked to-

gether as they are during Kol Nidre services, young and old, pious and secular, princes and madmen, sages and wanderers, beggars and dreamers. On this day, Mr. Vice President and friends, we close our eyes and we see them—an erie procession which slowly, meditatingly, walks toward angels of death carried on wings of night into night. We see them as you see us. We are the link between you and them.

And, therefore, we thank you, Members of the House and Senate, and Mr. Vice President, for allowing us to be that link. We thank you, people of the United States, for creating a framework in which we could share visions and memories that intrude, defy language and comprehension. On behalf of the Holocaust Memorial Council, its members, its Board of Advisers, its Second Generation Advisers, its staff, its friends and allies, we thank all of you for joining us today.

It is symbolic that our commemoration takes place in this august hall of legislation and commitment to law, and commitment to truth, and commitment to humanity. What we are teaching the world from this room, thanks to you, Members of the House and the Senate is, that laws must be human. Laws are to serve humanity and not destroy it. Laws are given to human beings to perfect life and not to profane it. Laws, too, became corrupt once upon a time. And here with your deed and our words, we shall shield laws in the future.

And so once more, as we have done since 1979, on this Day of Remembrance we gather from all the corners of exile to tell tales—tales of fire and tales of despair and tales of defiance—tales that we must tell least we are crushed by our memories. In remembering them, remembering the victims in the ghettos and camps and the prisons, we become aware of man's singular vulnerability but also of his stunning ability to transcend it.

We remember the killers and we loose our faith in humanity. But then we remember the victims and, though scarred, our faith is restored—it must be. The fact that the Jewish victims never became executioners, that they never victimized others, that they remained Jewish to the end—human to the end—that inside ghettos and death camps, my God, inside gas chambers, they could speak of God, to God. They could say: S'hma Yisroael Adonai Elohenu, Adonai Echad—God is God and God is One and God is the Lord of Creation. To say those words there on the threshold of death and oblivion must restore our faith in them and therefore in humankind. We think of the victims and we learn that despair is not the solution. Despair is the question. And that is why we gather year after year—to fight despair; and only mine—ours.

As a son of the Jewish people, as a citizen who is proud to be a member of the American people, I live with a memory of Jewish children and their parents. It has been our task, it will remain our task, to maintain that memory alive. But then we remember not because we seek vengence; we don't believe in it. We only seek justice. We do not aim to hurt, only to sensitize. We believe that by retelling our tales we might help our contemporaries by making them aware of what could happen to human beings when they live in an inhuman society surrounded and penetrated by indifference on one hand, evil on the other, with so few opposing evil and indifference. That is why I allow myself at times to see in the Holocaust an analogy only to itself, meaning that nothing should be compared to it but that everything must be related to it. It is because of what we endured that we must try to help victims everywhere today: the Bahais in Iran who are being murdered by the dictatorship in Iran; the Miskitos on the border of Nicaragua; we must help the Boat People who are still seeking refuge; the Cambodian refugees; and the prisoners, so many of them, in Communist jails. It is because we remember what has been done to our people that we must plead at every opportunity, in this House and in all other houses, for Anatoly Shcharansky, Iosif Begun, Vladmir Slepack, and all the dissidents and prisoners who are in jail waiting for someone to shake off humankind's indifference. If they were to loose faith in us, we should be damned. It is because we remember the solitude of Jews in those times that we feel so linked to and proud of the State of Israel today. We Survivors, our friends and allies, are grateful to Israel, grateful to a people simply for existing, for inspiring us to keep faith in a certain form of humanity and tradition.

While we remember the victims we also remember those who tried to help us—the Raoul Wallenbergs and the Oskar Shindlers as Congressman Yates said. They were so few and they were so alone. It breaks our heart to think of their solitude, of their sacrifice. Memory is not exclusive. Memory is inclusive. It is because we remember the singular aspect of the tragedy that we remember its universality. We must also think of tomorrow as though it would be part of our memory. I think the world unleashed madness 40 years ago and that madness is still dominating spirits and minds of too many countries. There are too many signals of danger—racism, anti-Semitism, bigotry, fanaticism. We are scared of what humankind could do to itself. Therefore we tell the story.

In conclusion, Mr. Vice President, may I quote to you a legend of the great master work of human civilization and culture, The Talmud. The Talmud tells us that when God gave the law to the people of Israel he lifted up Mount Sinai over the heads of the Jewish people and said: "If you accept the law, you shall live. If not, you shall die." And so, we accepted the law.

I have the feeling today, Mr. Vice President and friends, that God has lifted above our heads a mountain of fire, and it is as though God were to say to us: If you obey the law—if you remember that we are all children of one father, if you remember that whatever happens to one people must affect all other people, if you remember that stupid cruelty is absurd and grotesque, and it is not in hurting people that one can redeem oneself—if you remember, you shall live and if not—But, we must remember.●

CONGRESSIONAL SURVEY RESULTS

HON. ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, today I would like to share with you and with every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD nationwide, the results of my most recent opinion survey in my Second Congressional District of Oregon.

Like many Members of this body, I conduct an annual poll of my constituents during the first months of the year. I ask 10 questions on subjects which I expect will come before this body during the forthcoming session, and I put my constituents on the same spot that we in Congress often occupy by asking for pure "yes" and "no" responses. There is no opportunity for "undecided" votes.

Again this year, I have been extremely pleased with the responses of my constituents. More than 20,000 questionnaires were returned, representing the opinions of more than 34,000 persons. Though congressional questionnaires are admittedly not done with the same scientific calculation as professional pollsters, I have been happy to find in the past and again this year that the percentages in my own poll track right along with national, much more elaborate polls.

Which leads me to an extremely important conclusion: I believe in the results of this poll and I am anxious to see that everyone in this Chamber read the results.

This year, the Federal Government's crippling deficit and the ways to solve it occupied much of my questionnaire. I think the results are worth special attention in this Chamber. Those results are contained in the first three questions listed here.

I would be delighted to share the questionnaire itself with anyone who wishes it, but more than anything, I urge my colleagues here to read carefully these results. I am most grateful to my constituents for their help.

The following are results of this year's questionnaire:

1984 CONGRESSIONAL SURVEY RESULTS

Question/response percentages (numbers of individuals)

Question 1: "Do you favor an increase in taxes to reduce the federal deficit?" Yes: 15.3 percent (4,981); No: 84.7 percent (27,623).

Question 2: "Do you favor a decrease in government spending to reduce the federal deficit?" Yes: 96.1 percent (31,691); No: 3.9 percent (1,278).

Question 3: "Would you favor a combination of spending cuts and tax increases to reduce the federal deficit?" Yes: 34.2 percent (10,972); No: 65.8 percent (21,066).

Question 4: "Do you agree with the government's increased spending for defense?" Yes: 42 percent (13,717); No: 58 percent (18,949).

Question 5: "Should Congress repeal a law to 'index' taxes which is now scheduled to take effect in 1985 (the law will prevent automatic inflation-caused tax increases without a specific vote)?" Yes: 37.3 percent (11,373); No: 62.7 percent (19,082).

Question 6: "Should federal funds be used to pay for abortions?" Yes: 21.2 percent (7,046); No: 78.8 percent (26,153).

Question 7: "Should there be an amendment to the Constitution to allow voluntary silent prayer in school?" Yes: 68.4 percent (22,365); No: 31.6 percent (10,312).

Question 8: "Do you believe the use of merit pay for teachers would improve education in the United States?" Yes: 47.2 percent (15,397); No: 52.8 percent (17,230).

Question 9: "Should a share of long-distance charges be used to help pay for rural and local telephone service?" Yes: 62.3 percent (19,498); No: 37.7 percent (11,803).

Question 10: "Should there be a federal mandatory, minimum jail term for persons convicted of selling drugs to youths under the age of 18?" Yes: 92.7 percent (30,669); No: 7.3 percent (2,405).

Total questionnaires returned: 20,097; total respondents: 34,049.●

RECOGNITION OF H. LEE POWELL, JR.

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an American who has led a distinguished life of service to those in need throughout years of dedicated volunteer work. On this day, Mr. H. Lee Powell, Jr., a resident of Haverhill, Mass., is rightfully honored in the naming of the new addition to the Union Mission Nursing Home as the "H. Lee Powell, Jr. Pavilion."

Mr. Powell has set a high standard of volunteer leadership in giving his time, his talents, and his full measure of commitment. As president of the board of directors of Haverhill's Union Mission Nursing Home, he has provided the finest quality care to the elderly poor of the Merrimack Valley. Fully accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, Union Mission has consistently elevated its standards while carrying out its motto of "people who love people."

Over his lifetime, Mr. Powell has served his church and community with a unique focus on the well-being of the less fortunate and a profound dedication that has inspired all those who have followed. All age groups and ethnic and racial groups have benefited in countless ways from his admirable philosophy of public service. Mr. Powell is truly a man of all the people: Working with equal vigor in support of the Kiwanis International sponsored Pediatric Trauma Center in Boston, to the improvement of a Boy Scout campground in Kingston, N.H., and in support of the frail and elderly.

It is both an honor and a pleasure for me to call the Nation's attention to citizens such as H. Lee Powell, a patriot and veteran leader, a man of principle and personal compassion, and an exemplary citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.●

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 295

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 295. The Olympic torch since the days of the ancient Greeks has been a symbol of sportsmanship, fair play, and dedication to brotherhood among mankind.

As we move into this Olympic year of 1984 with the games being held in one of our great cities—Los Angeles—once again one of the great moments of Olympic history is enacted when a mass assemblage in the Coliseum in Los Angeles will rise when the torch bearer in the tradition of the Greeks enters the stadium and lights the Olympic flame.

It is also fitting and proper as this torch moves around our Nation this symbol of sportsmanship be allowed to cross this bastion of freedom—our own Capitol Grounds.●

HAPPY 30TH ANNIVERSARY UC RIVERSIDE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 6, 1984, the University of California at Riverside will be 30 years old. The campus that started out in 1907 as a citrus experiment station, is now the collegiate home for 5,000 students, and a major employer for the Inland Empire.

Throughout the years, UCR has maintained its unique "personality." It cannot boast of its winning football team—it does not have one. Nor does it have the reputation of its free spirited, sometimes radical sister campus, UC Berkeley. It does not share the open grading system of Santa Cruz. And it cannot point with pride to the beachfront property that adds to the lure and beauty of UC San Diego, UC Santa Barbara, and UC Irvine. If you read the campus brochures, they will tell you UCR's attraction is its ability to give one a "damn good education," and indeed it does that and more, with a style all its own.

The 1,200-acre campus is beautifully landscaped with the best California has to offer—botanic gardens, palm trees, orange trees, and tropical plants with a backdrop of rolling foothills and the mountains of San Bernardino behind them. It looks good, and its inhabitants work hard. In addition to the two colleges—humanities and social sciences, natural and agricultural sciences—research continues at the Air Pollution Research Center and the agricultural experiment station among many others. The main campus library—there are four—boasts a collection of 980,000 bound volumes and is also a depository for U.S. publications and receives most California State documents.

The sunny weather makes the 48-bell carillon tower a natural gathering place and serves as a central focus on the campus. The Wednesday "nooner" series draws such varied campus activities as political speakers and jazz bands. The campus theater can host a ballet on the same evening the wood-beamed campus night club, the Barn, provides a country band and sells beer to drink on the patio.

The classes are small, the pace leisure, and no one is surprised if the professors and staff actually know the names of their students. "Traits like close student-faculty relationships and personal interaction don't happen by accident; they're developed over time and maintained because they work" the campus brochure says, and the campus is proud of that distinction. The teaching and research is solid if not flashy, and if all UCR can give you is a "damn good education" then it is indeed deserving of a sincere congratulations on a job well done.

With every best wish on the anniversary of your first 30 years and continued success for the next 100.●

THE CLEAN COAL PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION ACT PROVIDES SENSIBLE ALTERNATIVES TO SCRUBBERS IN OUR EFFORTS TO REDUCE SULFUR EMISSIONS FROM COAL-BURNING FACILITIES

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join Congresswoman MARILYN LLOYD and several other colleagues in introducing the Clean Coal Production and Utilization Technology Demonstration Act.

This legislation would establish a technology demonstration program within the Department of Energy that would be funded with about $2 billion from the Energy Security Act's energy security reserve. As my colleagues know, these funds are now under the jurisdiction of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

The legislation being introduced today identifies specific near- and long-term technologies to be demonstrated with the objective of ascertaining "* * * the most technologically advanced and cost-effective methods for

reducing air pollution * * * including those emissions which may potentially be contributing to acid rain." I believe that this approach represents a reasonable alternative to the existing scrubber technology. Scrubbers, which are in effect mandated by the Clean Air Act, are costly and inefficient. These costs are of course passed on to our constituents in the form of higher utility bills.

It seems to me that the provisions of this legislation present the most reasonable approach to continuing to clean up our environment in a way that will allow the production and utilization of coal, especially high-sulfur coal. We have vast reserves of coal in this country, and we must promote its use if for no other reason than to decrease our dependence on insecure foreign sources of energy. Furthermore, funding this program, with its specific list of technologies to be demonstrated, with synthetic fuels money makes much greater sense than throwing money at the "pie-in-the-sky" demonstration projects that have been pursued by the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Congresswoman LLOYD for initiating this legislation, and, especially as the senior Republican member of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee, I look forward to working with her and other members in pursuing this approach. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the Clean Coal Production and Utilization Technology Demonstration Act.●

A SALUTE TO MRS. EDWARDINA RIGGANS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, as you know, May has been designated National Senior Citizen Month by the Congress. It also marks the beginning of our annual congressional senior citizen intern program, which will be held May 7 to 11, 1984. At this time, I would like to salute an outstanding senior citizen from my congressional district who will be serving as one of my congressional senior citizen interns for 1984—Mrs. Edwardina Riggans.

Mrs. Riggans was born in Cleveland, Ohio, on August 27, 1902. Her family moved to neighboring Cincinnati when she was a young girl. However, Mrs. Riggans later returned to Cleveland where she married and raised two children.

Throughout her 81 years, Mrs. Riggans has been an active and integral part of the community.

This sense of commitment to the community is demonstrated through Mrs. Riggans' unceasing membership and active participation in various organizations. In 1934, Mrs. Riggans joined the Wellman Club. For over 50 years, Mrs. Riggans has been associated with the club and has been a leading advocate in creating greater political awareness and voter participation in the Cleveland metropolitan area.

In 1960, Mrs. Riggans embarked on still another long-term community affiliation with her membership in the Karamu Golden Agers Club. The Golden Agers have been instrumental in providing a combination of social, cultural, and educational programs for the elderly in the community. Additionally, the Golden Agers have developed a number of supportive social services to enhance the quality of life for seniors in that particular community.

Perhaps Mrs. Riggans' greatest challenge and achievement came in 1969 when my brother, Carl Stokes, the former mayor of Cleveland, asked her to organize a senior citizen coalition. The purpose of the coalition was to boost senior citizen participation in government affairs and to provide a mechanism by which the concerns of our Nation's elderly could be expressed to government officials.

Mr. Speaker, through Mrs. Riggans' efforts, a permanent organization, Seniors of Ohio, was born. Under the leadership of Mrs. Riggans, the organization grew to, at one time, a membership of over 3,000. Amongst its many projects, the Seniors of Ohio devised and implemented a series of town meetings specifically for senior citizens and a variety of social programs to assist the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Riggans is not resting on her laurels. Today, she is still a visible force in the community. She maintains memberships in the Federation for Community Planning, the Police Board, and the Western Reserve Area Agency Board on Aging. In 1982, she was appointed to the State of Ohio Commission on Aging. Her membership at Antioch Baptist Church spans four decades and she serves today as the Secretary of the Sunday school class.

Subscribing to the philosophy, "there's no such thing as can't, get out there and try," Mrs. Riggans is an 81-year-old positive catalyst for the young and old as well as for the successful and the struggling.

The residents of the city of Cleveland are proud of Mrs. Riggans and her accomplishments. She is a mother, teacher, grandmother, philosopher, and inspiration to us all. I am proud to have Mrs. Riggans serve as my congressional senior citizen intern. It is an honor for me to salute her at this time.●

WENDELL GUNN ON THE BALANCING DOWN BUDGET STRATEGY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not undertaxed, and they do not want tax reform as a cover for a back-door tax increase. They favor broadening the tax base as an opportunity for further cuts in marginal tax rates to enhance tax equity and encourage economic growth. Ending tax preferences, without lowering marginal tax rates is not only economically wrong; it threatens the chances for both Democratic and Republican efforts on tax simplification. It leaves less tax base which can be broadened.

I commend to my colleagues the following excellent essay by Wendell Wilkie Gunn from the Wall Street Journal on the importance of a budget strategy that avoids tax increases in order to keep this promising recovery moving and to continue lowering marginal tax rates for working Americans.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 25, 1984]

BALANCING DOWN AND BREAKING FREE

(By Wendell Wilkie Gunn)

"The real question America must face is not whether we should work toward a balanced budget, but how. As we look to the future, we can 'balance up' with tax increases and lock ourselves into economic bondage, or we can 'balance down' with lower tax rates and spending, permitting our economy to break free." These were the words of President Reagan in his March 27 speech to the Independent Insurance Agents of America. It is a clear statement of the budget strategy he has chosen for 1984 and beyond, i.e., a determined adherence to the strategy he initiated in 1981. It is called "balancing down."

Balancing down embodies the notion that a vital part of the goal of a balanced federal budget is the goal of achieving balance at a low level of taxes and spending. More specifically, it is a rejection of the idea that balancing up achieves any real benefits at all. Balancing up stifles economic activity. Balancing down permits it to break free.

Those who oppose the president on this issue come from both ends of the political spectrum. Liberal economists and politicians have always believed that deficit spending has a beneficial, stimulative effect on the economy, boosting aggregate demand and employment. But opponents also include conservative economists and politicians who have always decried budget deficits.

The political argument made by the liberals is that anyone who insists upon a balanced budget at the expense of "human" programs is inhumane, totally lacking in compassion. Needless to say, the conservatives have consistently lost the political fight against spending increases and concluded after each round that the only prudent thing to do under the circumstances is

to increase taxes to finance them. The irony is that the conservatives put themselves into the awkward position of financing the spending that they opposed in the first place, all the while advancing their own reputation as austere and uncaring. That reputation persists. The most important result, however, was the upward spiral in spending and taxes that we have witnessed over the past 50 years.

For the taxers, particularly the conservatives, there is no way to reverse this destructive trend. For example, Fed Chairman Paul Volcker told the Senate Finance Committee in September 1979 that it was a shame that we had allowed tax rates to reach "such a high level that economic growth and productivity are stifled." Yet later, in response to a question, he said, "we cannot afford to cut tax rates substantially because the resulting increase in the deficit will fuel inflationary expectations." The implication is that the U.S. is permanently trapped. Increasing taxes produces stagnation; reducing taxes creates inflation. Balancing down embraces the first half of this notion but soundly rejects the second half.

Balancing down seeks to reverse this trend, while preserving the essential improvements in our national security without which no economic policy can produce its intended benefits. Of course, the taxers, presuming incorrectly that balancing down is simply a call for spending cuts, say that they, too, would rather reduce spending than increase taxes. But because they think that it is politically impossible to achieve significant additional spending reductions at the present time, they conclude that the only prudent thing to do is to increase taxes.

Thus the president's refusal to consider tax increases is regarded as "a lack of concern" about deficits. This is not the case. The reason the president insists upon balancing down is that he knows that the deficit itself is not the problem, but merely the reflection of a larger problem. The problem is that the government, through its spending activities, is diverting an excessive amount of resources away from private productive enterprise, a malady that cannot be corrected by increasing taxes. In fact, tax increases would serve only to mask the problem at best.

Balancing down recognizes that there are two financing sources for the government's spending—current taxes and future taxes (borrowing)—and the difference is important. We can increase current tax rates beyond their current high levels, then hope that we actually collect the increased revenues. This would surely slow down the recovery and abort any significant expansion of the tax base. We might even balance the budget in the process (although that is unlikely)—but at a very high level of spending and taxes.

On the other hand, we can give the tax base room to grow by reducing the tax barriers that stand between entrepreneurial dreams and real economic activity. Balancing down chooses the latter course. The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 was its beginning, declaring that tax-rate cuts would lead the way. The ERTA tax-rate reductions were a signal to investors and workers that this administration's preferred method for generating tax revenues is growth. At the same time, that fraction of the government budget called the deficit was left exposed as a reminder that our budget work was not yet finished. Of enormous importance, too, was the innovative tax-indexing provision, telling low-income and middle-income taxpayers that, in the future, if the government uses inflation to rob them, they won't also automatically be punished for it by being pushed into higher tax brackets. The economic recovery is clear evidence that the strategy is working, and it must be permitted to continue.

Then comes phase two of balancing down, as the climate of growth and expanding opportunities provides our first real hope for developing the political support necessary for achieving serious and substantive reductions in government spending. This will begin as people who previously depended for subsistence upon government support programs find what they wanted in the first place—productive opportunities in the marketplace—and government dependents become taxpayers. Balancing down reverses the cruel policies that, however well-intended they were, have served to destroy opportunities for people to improve themselves by their own efforts. It is therefore the most humane and compassionate policy of all.

Through balancing down, the president is simply helping us to discover again what made America great in the first place—economic freedom, pure and simple.●

COMMENTS OF CONGRESSMAN JIM MOODY AT THE FUNERAL OF CHERYL AND JEANNETTA ROBINSON APRIL 9, 1984

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD the following:

COMMENTS OF CONGRESSMAN JIM MOODY AT THE FUNERAL OF CHERYL AND JEANNETTA ROBINSON, APRIL 9, 1984

We are gathered here today to share the sorrow and grief of the Robinson family—one of the most humane, committed and productive families in our community. When any family suffers a loss this heavy, we must all grieve, for we are all reduced.

God has a purpose and a lesson for us in all things. But when death occurs as a result of a senseless act of violence, such at this one, His message is particularly hard to fathom.

One lesson we do learn from the death of Cheryl and Little Miss Jeannetta is what a fragile hold on life we all have, and how brief our stay here on Earth really is. For although the difference in the length of our stay on Earth and that of Cheryl and little Jeannetta seems very large to us now, it is in fact but a twinkling of the eye compared to the eons of time that have passed before we arrived here and will pass after we leave. For we are judged not by how long we are here, but by what we do while we are here.

The second lesson we learn is how important it is to be always ready, since our own time of death may come at any moment. As the great philosopher and writer William Shakespeare wrote:

"There is divine providence even in the fall
of a sparrow.
If it be now, 'tis not to come.
If it is to come, it will not be now.
If it is not now, yet it will come.
The readiness is all."

I am sure that Cheryl Robinson and Little Miss Jeannetta were ready. And that they now rest in eternal peace.

Let us all remember the blessings we have, and may we do our best to serve our fellow man and God during our brief time here on Earth, and to be ready when our own time does come.●

FOREIGN SERVICE SPOUSES

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. MICA) in introducing legislation to provide annuity and health care benefits for divorced Foreign Service spouses.

The Foreign Service Act of 1980 recognized the unpaid service of Foreign Service spouses by providing retirement and survivor benefits for those who become divorced. Because that act only provided benefits for those divorced after the effective date, many deserving former spouses who were divorced before the 1980 act were excluded from its benefits.

There are numerous cases where divorced Foreign Service spouses are surviving on the charity of church and family or on Government welfare payments because of inadequate retirement income. We are all familiar with the case of Jane Dubs, the divorced spouse of the late Ambassador to Afghanistan, who was left with no survivor benefits after the tragic assassination of her former husband.

The legislation Representative MICA and I introduce today would provide annuity and health benefits for these former spouses. Since 1965, certain widowed Foreign Service spouses have been eligible for grants of annuity benefits. The dollar amount is small, yet it keeps many of these spouses, most of whom are women, from destitution. This legislation would provide the same amount for divorced Foreign Service spouses who are not eligible for any other annuity. The number of divorced Foreign Service spouses eligible for this benefit is estimated to be less than 200.

We can neither forget the contributions these women have made to the United States nor ignore the poverty which many of them now face.

I am also aware of Foreign Service spouses in the Washington area who suffer from serious health problems, some resulting from inadequate medical care and living conditions abroad. Three are going blind, one from lack of money for a needed operation, two have Hodgkins disease, several have minor children with severe physical or mental disabilities.

The legislation introduced today allows divorced Foreign Service spouses to participate in the Federal employee health benefits program by paying a sum equal to the agency and employee share of the health plan premium. There are virtually no costs to the Government for providing this benefit.●

"NATIONAL TUBEROUS SCLEROSIS WEEK" MAY 6-13, 1984

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to your attention the first observance of "National Tuberous Sclerosis Week" which will occur the week of May 6-13, 1984.

First discovered over a century ago, it is thought to afflict as many as 1 in every 5,000 births. Its symptoms include mental retardation, epilepsy, developmental delay, and other handicaps. In spite of its frequency, and the severity of the disease, very little meaningful or sustained research has ever been conducted on it.

Fifteen years ago, Raymond and Linda Connors of Rockland, Mass., formed the Tuberous Sclerosis Association of America, Inc. Since then, they and their organization have been the source of help and support for other families in their position. They have been instrumental in increasing awareness of this disease to the medical community and researchers in this country.

To assist in this worthy effort, last year, I introduced a resolution to designate the week of May 6 as "National Tuberous Sclerosis Week," and am pleased to say that this resolution was signed into law on April 13, 1984. I am hopeful that next week's observance will serve to draw the attention of the public and the medical community to the tragedy of this crippling disease, and the need for sustained research.●

M. SLADE CALTRIDER RETIRES

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1984, Maryland's State highway administrator, M. Slade Caltrider, will retire after having served the State with honor and distinction for the past 36 years.

Mr. Caltrider's career with the State began in 1948 when he worked as a road inspector for the State road commission. Beginning in 1960, and until his appointment as State highway administrator in 1978, Mr. Caltrider worked on and supervised engineering projects in Maryland's Montgomery and Prince Georges counties. As State highway administrator, he directed a staff of 4,100 employees and operated a budget of over $500 million.

Those of us fortunate enough to have worked with Slade know him as an inexhaustible source of knowledge and expertise concerning the State's 5,200 miles of highways as well as countless urban and country roads. Mr. Caltrider and his staff have readily shared their considerable technical judgment and advice with me and my staff on many Federal road projects including such major thoroughfares as the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

Mr. Caltrider is a man held in high esteem by his colleagues. He holds the honor of having received the first certificate of recognition for outstanding and exemplary leadership in the field of equal employment opportunity ever awarded by the Maryland State Highway Administration in 1974. In addition, Mr. Caltrider is a member of several professional organizations including the National Society of Professional Engineers, the Maryland Society of Professional Engineers, and the Maryland Association of Engineers.

He is the epitome of a dedicated professional, and his leadership and technical skill in his field have been an invaluable part of the effectiveness of the Maryland Highway Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in congratulating Mr. Caltrider on his well-deserved retirement. I am sure he and his wife of 34 years, Doris, will enjoy this opportunity to focus on new pursuits, and in the years to come, reflect with pride on Slade's many accomplishments and invaluable service to our State.●

PRESTON TRUCKING: ONE OF THE BEST

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post's Washington Business Section of April 30, includes an article about Preston Trucking Co. of Preston, Md., concerning the company's inclusion in a new book entitled "The 100 Best Companies to Work For."

I am proud that the Nation's 12th largest freight hauler is headquartered in Maryland's First Congressional District. The Preston Trucking Co.'s success story is truly one of labor-management harmony and cooperation at a time when many companies suffer from internal strife. I find the feature enlightening, stimulating, and recommend it to my colleagues:

"BEST 100": FIRMS THAT OFFER WORKERS THE RIGHT STUFF

"THEORY Y" STEERS PRESTON TO SUCCESS

PRESTON, MD.—Preston Trucking Co.'s Howard Bradshaw pauses after replacing a freshly oiled truck piston, reaches into his red tool cabinet, and pulls out a smudged spiral notebook where he records worker productivity.

By his account, productivity at Preston's shop on the Eastern Shore is up 30 percent since 1980, when it took 51.9 man-hours to rebuild an engine. Last year the figure was 35.5 man-hours.

Why? "We don't have to spend so much time waiting for the foreman to make a decision," says Bradshaw. "There's more time to work on an engine."

During Bradshaw's first 12 years rebuilding truck engines at the shop next to Preston's corporate offices, he worked under the standard system, with managers watching every move. But in 1980, Preston shifted its management gears, gave its workers more control over their work and made the 41-year-old mechanic "team leader" of a self-managed unit of mechanics.

Now Bradshaw, his machine-shop counterparts and the drivers who ply the highways of the Northeast in Preston's orange truck cabs talk as if they were in business for themselves. In the front office, the people who run the company sound more like philosophers than managers of the nation's 12th-largest freight hauler.

The changes have been good for profits too. At a time when many established trucking companies are succumbing to a freight-haul recession and stiff competition spawned by deregulation, Preston is reporting higher revenue based on rising productivity. In this best of all possible trucking worlds, the labor-management love-fest has resulted in:

A 7.9 percent increase in productivity over the base year of 1978.

An overall savings of $19 million in costs since 1978, including a reduction of 4.8 million gallons of fuel in that period.

A 50 percent increase in the number of truck terminals since 1978, to 81 nationwide, with a corresponding 18 percent drop in the number of top executives and a 4 percent drop in supervisors.

Record 1983 revenue of $272.3 million, a 22.5 percent increase over 1982, translated to a 23.9 percent increase in earnings per share.

How did they do it? Billy G. Terrell, 41, Preston's ruddy-faced senior vice president for operations, attributes the company's recent success to "reflective listening, conflict resolution, non-threatening communication, assertiveness versus aggressiveness."

And from Preston's 1982 annual report comes this clue, a message from Goethe: "Treat people as though they were what they ought to be and you help them become what they are capable of being."

It seems to have worked. A series of interviews found no detractors, not even at the union hall.

Says Cliff Atkinson, the Teamsters' shop steward at Preston's Landover terminal, "Preston is just like a family. We can talk to the management, and they can talk to us. This is one helluva company. Heck, we don't even need a shop steward."

Working conditions and profit reports were not always so gleaming. It took some major gambles and a form of capitalism that some describe as creeping socialism to steer the company toward success.

Preston Trucking was founded in 1932 by A. T. Blades, who bought his first truck with a $500 loan, still heads the board at age 75 and still lives a mile down Highway 331 from corporate headquarters. In 1947, the company's annual revenue exceeded $1 million, and by 1961 the corporate net worth had passed the same milestone.

After growing gradually by hauling freight up and down the East Coast, in 1976 Preston acquired Shippers Dispatch Inc., which allowed it to branch out to the Mississippi River. Annual revenue exceeded $100 million that year for the first time.

In those years, when the Interstate Commerce Commission regulated routes, profits were all but ensured. Preston and its competitors could sit back and raise rates every time the unions asked for more money. But in the late 1970s, deregulation loomed, and Preston was forced to reassess its management philosophy after an incident in Detroit.

The Detroit terminal was one of the company's worst for productivity, and in 1978, the Preston brass dictated some policy changes. The union balked and organized a slowdown. According to company President William B. Potter, one driver who sat in his truck for two hours at a loading dock told a customer: "We're going to show those SOBs in Preston who runs this company."

Preston swiftly closed the terminal. But at the same time senior executives began studying other companies, and they hired a consulting firm, Behavior Systems Inc. of Atlanta, to examine working conditions at several Preston terminals, including the one in Detroit. The answers were uniform and unexpected: Workers complained that they frequently were disciplined but rarely praised; foremen aired the same complaints and added that they had no idea of the company's goals.

The consultant's prescription was retraining—from A. T. Blades on down to terminal janitors—in the arts of listening and communicating. Says Senior Vice President for Finance Sean Callahan, "We introduced two parties who had been dying to meet: drivers and supervisors."

Gradually, the company opened the lines of communication. Profit-and-loss statements were posted monthly. "Coordinators" (supervisors) met with "associates" (employes) at the beginning of each shift. Workers organized into teams that met often to discuss problems and solutions. Changes in policy that could be handled locally were made by consensus and implemented. Workers were encouraged to talk with management, even if that meant a call to corporate headquarters.

Now, top executives circulate continuously among the 81 terminals. Company newsletters sing the praises of employes who improve efficiency or simply go beyond the call of duty. Potter writes quarterly reports on the company's status to every employe. Each terminal has a television monitor to show videotapes describing, for example, how drivers can help sell Preston and expand routes. Drivers are encouraged to chat up their customers and take responsibility for quality service.

In business school terms, Preston changed from so-called "Theory X" management, which is autocratic, to "Theory Y" style, which is based on consensus. Some managers couldn't make the shift, according to Terrell, who says 25 percent left, either by choice or by pink slip.

"I was a 'Theory X' manager for 16 years," says Terrell. "So when we were asked to change, I was very confused at first. Now I'm a convert. There's been a cultural change in the organization. I find the job to be a lot more fun.

"It's carried into personal relationships," Terrell adds. "The wife of one of our drivers grabbed me at the Cleveland awards banquet and thanked me for the way her husband is treated at work. She said, 'He treats me and the kids better now, too.'"

Potter is enthusiastic about the new order. "Everybody can get the use of a man's hand," he says. "We want to get the use of his mind."

Preston also has decided to distribute some of the profits. On Jan. 1, the company adopted what is known as the Scanlon Plan, which calls for distribution of any profits derived from increased productivity, computed by comparing wages with net profits. Preston apparently is one of the first trucking companies to offer a Scanlon plan. Management also instituted a stock-option program in which employe purchases of Preston Trucking stock are subsidized at a rate pegged to the company's annual performance.

Meanwhile, other companies are making pilgrimages to Preston headquarters to find out what's going right. To date, representatives from Caterpillar Tractor Co., General Electric Co., Rubbermaid Inc. and Ford Motor Co. have inquired about the truckers' management style.

Potter believes more benevolent and open management at other companies could help boost the nation's sagging productivity.

"If we're going to go out and beat the Japanese," says Potter, "there's no question that we'll have to rely on better participation from the person doing the job."●

MOVING THE U.S. EMBASSY IN ISRAEL TO JERUSALEM—TESTIMONY OF REV. JOHN PAWLIKOWSKI

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee and the International Operations Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee held historic joint hearings on the bill to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, which I introduced with my friend from New York, Congressman BEN GILMAN.

One of the leading witnesses at this hearing was the Rev. John T. Pawlikowski, professor of social ethics at the Catholic Theological Union, which is a constitutent institution of the University of Chicago. Father Pawlikowski is also a member of the National Christian Leadership Conference for Israel, and his testimony was presented on behalf of the conference.

Father Pawlikowski typifies the kind of intelligent, thoughtful support that our legislation to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem has received from Roman Catholics and other groups throughout the United States. For the benefit of my colleagues in the House, who were unable to participate in these hearings, I place in the RECORD the statement of Father Pawlikowski.

[The statement follows:]

TESTIMONY OF REV. JOHN T. PAWLIKOWSKI, O.S.M., PH.D. ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE FOR ISRAEL

Members of the House of Representatives. My name is Father John Pawlikowski of the Servite Religious Order. I serve as Professor of Social Ethics at the Catholic Theological Union, a constituent school of the Chicago Cluster of Theological Schools at the University of Chicago. For some fifteen years I have studied the varied facets of the Middle East political conflict through personal research and multiple visits to the region. My reflections have been expressed in a number of American and foreign publications including Worldview and Commonweal. I have in the past been part of a Middle East reconciliation group sponsored by the World Without War Council and am presently part of the Executive Committee of the National Christian Leadership Conference for Israel headquartered in New York City. The Leadership Conference represents a broad coalition of Christian groups and individuals from all parts of the country. My testimony this morning in support of the bill is presented in the name of this organization though the line of argumentation is my own as a professional scholar.

From my long-time analysis of issues involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict a number of firm convictions have emerged. One of these is particularly relevant, I believe, to the issue at hand—moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. Put succinctly it is simply this: Arab recognition of Israel must be seen as the lead card, not the trump card, in any resolution of the current impasse. This is a point clearly underscored by Dr. Aaron David Miller, a U.S. State Department analyst and author of the 1983 volume "The PLO and the Politics of Survival" (Praeger). In a recent interview in the peace-oriented Israeli monthly New Outlook, Miller says the following:

—future meaningful progress between Israel and its Arab neighbors will continue to be blocked unless there is nothing less than a fundamental change in the attitudes and policies of both Israel and the remaining confrontation states. The Arab states will have to recognize in an unambiguous fashion that recognition of Israel, far from being the final trump card of the game, is the opening card in negotiations. Israel, for its part, will have to come to the realization, no matter how painful, that this conflict will be interminable unless the Palestinians achieve a homeland of their own. (January 1984, p. 25)

I fully agree with Dr. Miller that both parties bear a responsibility for the current impasse. I have spelled out my thoughts on what Israel needs to do and not do in other writings (cfl., for example, "Rethinking the Palestinian Question," Worldview, October 1974 and "Initial Views of Invasion were Exaggerated," Subject to Change, Washington University's Quarterly Review of Politics and the Arts, December 13, 1982). They generally second Dr. Miller's contention that the impetus for a breakthrough must come from all parties to the present conflict. There are responsible Palestinian claims to justice that I am obliged to affirm morally and politically. But these observations are

not directly related to the immediate question before us—the embassy move. For I strongly support judging this issue on its own merits, apart from any assessment of Israeli policies on the West Bank.

It is Dr. Miller's first point, formal recognition of Israel as first step from the Arab side, that is relevant in my judgment to our deliberations about this bill, especially so in light of the fact that neither Dr. Miller nor New Outlook can in any way by considered mere apologists for the present government in Israel. The continued refusal of our government to transfer the embassy to Israel's historic capital of Jerusalem continues to encourage in my view Arab refusal to undertake this necessary precondition for peace. There can be no State of Israel without Jerusalem and without Jewish sovereignty in Jerusalem. Let us never pretend otherwise. Let us impress upon our Arab brothers and sisters that any other position is politically suicidal pretense. This we would do by relocating our embassy.

Sometimes one needs to tell those he truly respects the painful truth. And that truth for the Arab world is that there is no hope for meangingful negotiations on the Middle East without unqualified recognition of Israel's existence and clear admission of its sovereign claims in Jerusalem. Those in our religious and political establishments who oppose this bill on the grounds that it will harm our friendship with the Arab nations may in fact not be the true friends of the Arab peoples in the last analysis. For so long as they contribute to the continued illusion that Israel may yet be wiped away, still so prevalent in parts of the Arab world, which is subtly undergrid by keeping our embassy in Tel Aviv, they may in fact be harming the long-term interests of the Palestinian people in particular and of the Arab world generally.

But let me make my position on one crucial point, the sovereignty question in Jerusalem, very clear. Never have I endorsed the view that only Israel has claims on Jerusalem. That is why I have consistently argued that some formula must be found of expressing a measure of joint sovereignty in East Jerusalem. I do not pretend for one moment that this will be an easy task. I fully concur that this cannot happen without an overall peace agreement for it would require significant trust on both sides. In this vein I would never support this bill if it intended to locate our embassy in East Jerusalem. That part of the city I still consider a question of further negotiations. Jewish claims there I regard as historic and politically legitimate, but these claims cannot be exclusive but meshed with those of its Arab citizens. I should add that I am totally opposed to my scheme for internationalization or re-division of the city. Only a physically united Jerusalem makes any sense and only government by its citizens should be retained in any further discussions of political models.

Obviously our Government cannot be totally deaf to the protests from Arab governments regarding this bill. But neither should it succumb to what amounts to a threat of blackmail. I would consider it quite proper, in fact I would consider it wise, for the U.S. Government to accompany any move of our embassy to Jerusalem with a public statement that such a transfer in no way prejudices our consistent position that the status of East Jerusalem remains unresolved politically nor in any way signals a blanket approval of all Israeli policies on the West Bank.

Let me add that apart from my main justification for the embassy move—the cessation of any further subtle American support for politically dangerous Arab illusions—it can be defended on the basis of the line of argument developed by Congressman Tom Lantos of California in the Los Angeles Times (March 21, 1984). He correctly points out that successive administrations have carried on official business with Israel in Jerusalem—so why not formally acknowledge the fact. And though the status of the city, it is true, remains undetermined in terms of a strict interpretation of international law we had no hesitation in establishing our embassy in the German Democratic Republic in a city whose status is even more complicated legally—East Berlin, and where we join France and Great Britain in maintaining allied claims even at the risk of death for our soldiers. So the argument about Jerusalem's unresolved status strikes me as wholly unconvincing in terms of opposition to the present bill. Why then is Israel the only country with whom we maintain diplomatic ties, and one of our most reliable allies at that, whose choice of capitals we refuse to honor? Prejudice or blackmail, neither acceptable answers, seem the only logical explanation.

To conclude, it is my firm belief that the Members of the House of Representatives would be performing a service, not a disservice, for the peace process by approving this bill. I strongly endorse such action. It is an excellent way of telling our Arab friends, "the time has come for you to play the inevitable lead card."●

FREE ELECTIONS IN PANAMA

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 6, the Panamanian people, for the first time in 16 years, will go to the polls to vote in a democratic election. This is a significant and historical event not only to the people of Panama, but to all of Central America. It is a milestone to the Panamanian people becuase it is the culmination of the process of transforming their government from one of military rule to one which is democratically elected according to their Constitution. This election will also signal hope to other nations in that region that long for true democracy, peaceful coexistence between a strong military which can defend the country and a strong democratic government which can rule the country, and the kind of economic prosperity that can only come about when conflicts are resolved and all of the people of the nation can start working toward common national goals.

The people of El Salvador will also be voting on Sunday. These elections will help fulfill the aspirations of the freedom loving people of these countries and hopefully will signal a brighter future for them and their children.●

NEGOTIATIONS ON START

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be introducing a concurrent resolution aimed at urging the Soviet Union to return to both the START (Strategic Arms Reduction Talks) and INF (Intermediate Nuclear Forces) negotiations, as well as to agree to an interim measure—until those talks can be resumed—on a mutual and verifiable moratorium on the further deployment of nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCM's). I am also pleased to inform you that I am joined in this effort by Representatives LEACH and STARK here in the House and that Senators MATHIAS and DURENBERGER have introduced a similar resolution in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, cruise missiles are not automatically destabilizing weapons systems. They are, after all, subsonic in speed and have no first strike attack potential. Nevertheless, in terms of verification, SLCM's are an arms controller's nightmare because of the inherent similarities between the nuclear armed and conventional versions of this weapons system.

The Navy Department has informed us of its intention in the years ahead to deploy some 7,000 to 8,000 launch tubes for various weapons on various types of ships within our fleet. In addition to carrying conventional loads, these tubes will also be made capable of firing both nuclear and conventional SLCM systems. Thus, from an arms control perspective, the continued deployment of SLCM's could create a Pandora's box from which future verifiable arms control agreements might not be retrievable. Arms control might indeed become a dream of the past.

Under conditions that would be created in this new environment, the Soviets could demand that every SLCM system be counted as a nuclear system, but under traditional strategic arms counting rules, it would be sheer folly for us to accept such a demand. We could be backed into a corner in which the only nuclear systems remaining in our arsenal would be SLCM's. Clearly, this does not make any sense at all.

I also think that we all must ask ourselves serious questions as to the ultimate utility of SLCM's and whether SLCM's would really contribute to the national security interests of the United States and its allies. When I look upon any map of the world, it seems to me that they do not. Most of our cities, industrial centers and population—as much as 75 percent of our population—are within easy reach of SLCM's launched from the waters

that surround our Nation—on the other hand, most Soviet cities are well inland and thus, less threatened by SLCM's.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the waters that surround our Nation. In the past, those waters have insulated us from our adversaries. Today, however, the Pentagon would appear willing to allow those waters to become safe havens for a full array of ships that could be equipped with SLCM's threatening the security and survival of our Nation. Thus, the potential for hundreds, even thousands, of mini-Cuban missile crises is precipitated and because of our acceptance of the laws of the freedom of the seas, we would be powerless to stop their occurrence.

Mr. Speaker, does it make any sense for us to push ahead with yet another technology in which we appear to have a temporary edge when we know full well that the Soviets will mimic us yet another time and put our security at greater risk and peril than it already is? I think not and I believe that to be the purpose of our efforts to achieve a mutual and verifiable moratorium on further SLCM deployments. This is not a question of unilateral disarmament but rather an effort to preclude a unilateral deployment which we know will only gain us a temporary and fleeting edge over the Soviet Union. I believe that the growing momentum of the nuclear arms race must be slowed. In my view, a mutual, verifiable moratorium on the further deployment of SLCM's is one step toward accomplishing this aim and, perhaps, getting the Soviet Union back to the bargaining tables at Geneva. I urge my colleagues to join with us in support of this effort.●

MISS ELIZABETH POIARKOFF—52 YEARS OF TEACHING AND STILL GOING STRONG

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my pleasure today to honor Miss Elizabeth Poiarkoff for unwavering dedication to the Aliquippa Area School District for the past 52 years, the longest term served in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As a native Aliquippan, Miss Poiarkoff has served her community tirelessly. She began her elementary education at $50 a month in 1933 and has worked, without leave or interruption, ever since. Years of service alone, however, are not all for which Miss Poiarkoff is to be commended.

She has been an influence to her pupils as well as her community through more than academics. For over 30 years, she led a Girl Scout troop and has been active in her church's union at the Saint George Byzantine Catholic Church. She also taught Sunday school and intramural sports.

It is my honor, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to Miss Poiarkoff for her selfless dedication and tremendous concern for her community. Her community is richer for her commitment, and I wish her 52 more years of involvement.●

A UTILITY TWISTS IN THE WIND

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, The following article appeared in the Livonia Michigan Observer on April 26, 1984, concerning the controversy which has developed in Michigan over the construction of a nuclear power facility.

In light of similar situations which are occurring throughout the country I would like to share this article with my colleagues.

A UTILITY TWISTS IN THE WIND

(By Tim Richard)

There's a new twist to the Consumers Power Co. story this year.

It's nothing new for professional second guessers such as Attorney General Frank Kelley and Joe Tuchinsky—the former college English teacher who became an expert on utilities the minute he got a job as the voice of the Michigan Citizens Lobby—to carp at Consumers.

The Kelleys and Tauchinskys have long held that Consumers should abandon its Midland nuclear generating plant.

The new twist is that now Wall Street and industry have turned against Consumers Power.

Already the Midland plant is nine years behind schedule, the cost overruns have been astronomical, and the plant is only 85 percent complete.

The utility can raise the $1 billion-plus in new capital funds to complete Midland in one of two ways: selling securities on Wall Street or asking the state for a rate hike sufficient to generate enough income that can be reinvested internally.

Wall Street says new securities are out of the question, given the climate in Michigan.

And a group of industrial giants under the collective name of ABATE is telling Consumers Power to forget about completing the Midland plant.

Finally, last week the company set up a traveling road show to sell "community leaders" on their plight and got told off firmly by small business types who say they could never operate the way Consumers Power has.

And in a way, it's fun to see obtuse executives get kicked around.

But more is at stake here than seeing an unpopular company twist slowly in the wind.

Even though Consumers Power sells only natural gas and not electricity in these suburbs, the company is essential for all of Michgan's economic revitalization.

When it comes to recruiting industry, politicians may pass the rezoning and get in the middle of ribbon-cutting photos, but it's the electric and gas utility which has done the lion's share of the recruiting work.

If Consumers Power can't convince outstate industrial prospects that it can generate enough power to satisfy them without buying from outside sources, then outstate Michigan has a dim chance of sharing in our economic recovery. And a lot of welfare checks go to the Jacksons, Kalamazoos, Saginaws and Bay Citys of this state, not only to Detroit.

It's impossible for the average industrialist, retailer or news reporter to grasp the enormous complexity of running a power company.

Only a railroad expert could appreciate it, and there aren't too many railroad people around any more.

An electric utility is so capital-intensive that it boggles the mind. Its biggest costs are not wages and materials but capital—interest on the bonds, dividends to cautious stockholders, depreciation of buildings and machinery.

Electric companies—not government—really invented long-range regional planning. They have to calculate customers' needs many years into the future. A simple coal plant takes eight years to bring on-line. A nuclear plant takes 10, 15 or goodness knows how many years to complete and begin operating.

So the whole thing is not as simple as telling John Selby and his several thousand stockholders to write off $5 billion as a bad investment and ask the chaplain to punch their tough luck cards.

Yes, it's fun in 1984 to see Consumers Power officials suffer and stockholders sweat. But it won't be fun in 1990 or 2000 if Michigan winds up with a knee-high economy because a utility has been brutalized.●

THE ULTIMATE CURE IS COURAGE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, The May 7 Forbes magazine contained a splendid editorial on the strong dollar and how to cure it.

The ultimate cure is neither monetary policy nor interventions. It is courage. That is what is needed to reduce the deficit.

For those Members who may have missed it, the editorial follows:

THE DOLLAR IS UNLIKELY TO WEAKEN SOON

Logic says that the dollar's unprecedented rise against other currencies since mid-1980 (by no less than 45 percent after inflation) must reverse sometime. The questions are: By how much, and by when?

The answers, assuming present Federal Reserve monetary policies hold through the election: (1) by much less than the 20 percent many economists expect; and (2) later than they think.

Strictly speaking, of course, the dollar is strong but not overvalued. With floating exchange rates, the dollar's value is what the

market says it is. It will stay relatively strong because of the circular relationship between the federal budget deficit and the Fed's tight money policy.

A combination of factors operating at home and abroad is keeping the dollar buoyed. Economic recovery here is cutting down on U.S. investment overseas. The belief that the United States is a safe haven for monetary values, and that Paul Volcker will keep it that way by not printing more money, will continue to draw money from abroad.

These same factors have their flip side, of course. If the dollar were weaker, U.S. interest rates would have to be even higher than they are in order to attract and hold capital. Thus, strange as it may seem to the very young, some interest-rate sensitive sectors like housing have been helped a bit, albeit indirectly, by the strong dollar. But companies depending on exports are obviously suffering, as are those competing with imports. Farm products, one of the biggest U.S. exports, are obviously hurt. Two other examples:

Aerospace, a top industrial export, is affected three ways by the strong dollar: (1) U.S.-made planes are made relatively more costly; (2) finance deals in currencies other than dollars can be more attractive; and (3) airlines in weak-currency countries are postponing buying.

Chemicals-and-fibers-conglomerate Du Pont reckons that last year, because of the strong dollar, pretax earnings from exports (excluding energy operations) were more than $200 million lower than in 1980.

Put these together and you have the elements contributing to the U.S. mounting trade deficit—$69.4 billion in 1983, an estimated $100 billion or more in 1984.

Most populist nostrums for curing the dollar's ills would be of dubious usefulness, at best, and might be positively harmful.

Printing money would push the dollar down sharply and disruptively, as it did in the late 1970s, with a 10 percent decline adding about 1.5 percent to the rise in price levels. Government intervention in world money markets works, but only so long as the Treasury keeps spending billions of dollars. Protectionism helps import-fighting industries but leaves exporters vulnerable to retaliation.

The way to tame the dollar is to make serious cuts to the budget deficit. That would trim the dollar by the 20 percent to 30 percent by which most exporters think it is too strong, but slowly and without adverse side effects. But that takes political courage, which is in short supply.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, circumstances did not allow me to be on the floor during the vote for S. 2750, a bill to extend the current bankruptcy court system from April 30 to May 26. I take this opportunity now to express my support for this measure.

The restructuring of our Nation's bankruptcy courts is an important issue and one which deserves careful deliberation by Congress. This extension will enable us to carefully review all points of controversy still existing between the House and Senate on this issue. I am hopeful that a sensible compromise will be reached during this extension.●

WESTERGAARD: REAGAN WILL BURY MONDALE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential election of 1984 will have a tremendous impact upon the direction this Nation takes for the remainder of the decade. A clear-cut choice will be made between a conservative opportunity society offered by President Reagan and the Republicans and a return to the failed liberal welfare state programs offered by the Democrats.

Columnist Nick Poulos writes about John Westergaard, one of Wall Street's most respected and successful stock market strategists. Mr. Westergaard has made a forecast that President Reagan will be reelected in 1984 by a "1936-type margin." What makes this forecast even more impressive is the fact that it comes from a registered Democrat who has worked in the past for a Democratic Senator. Westergaard's insights are extremely interesting and accurate and I would like to present them to my colleagues.

The text of the article follows:

[From the Atlantic Constitution, Apr. 24, 1984]

WESTERGAARD: REAGAN WILL BURY MONDALE

(By Nick Poulos)

John Westergaard is the kind of man who can separate his politics from his business—and do it in rather dramatic fashion.

Westergaard is one of Wall Street's most respected, and therefore successful, stock market strategists. He is president of the Westergaard Fund and editor and publisher of a market newsletter produced by his firm, Equity Research Associates Inc.

Westergaard also is, by his own admission, a registered Democrat; a political activist who twice served as campaign treasurer for his good friend, Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York.

But in his recent market letter to clients, Westergaard forecast that President Reagan will win re-election this November by a "1936-type margin" great enough to establish a Republican majority in the House.

"Walter Mondale will be the Alf Landon of our time," Westergaard asserted. "Reagan will destroy him. He will lay low until the Republican convention at which point he will confront the American people with the simple proposition that if the budgetary process is not brought under control, the dollar will be worth 20 cents in five years.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

"To rescue the dollar, he will ask the public to return a Republican Congress and the public will comply.

"The election of a Republican Congress will thus be the great unexpected event of 1984 that will lift the psychological malaise stemming from the public's deep-seated fear over the federal deficit.

"Reagan's mandate will be so convincing as to remove this fear overnight. This will in turn touch off a raging bull market. In fact, the market will probably anticipate our scenario by starting its upswing four to six weeks before election day.

"As for the Democrats, Mondale is just what the doctor ordered if one takes the long view. He epitomizes the outdated manifestoes and obsolete coalitions from which the party must free itself. His massive defeat will serve as an intellectual house cleaning from which a rebuilding process can begin."

Westergaard added in a phone interview that it would probably take about eight years for the Democratic party to develop a new political ideology that would appeal to the electroate.

"Right now, I don't see a new leader on the horizon who can do this," said Westergaard.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

"It's unfortunate that the majority party of the country in terms of registration can't develop a political philosophy that will appeal to the majority of the electorate."

Westergaard went on in his newsletter to assert that 1984 will be a watershed year in American politics, that it will be the most significant election year since 1936 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt carried all but two states.

"It is important to keep in mind that in American politics, a mandate is rarely established with the first-term election of a president," he said.

"FDR's victory in 1932, for example, was not a mandate for anything except change. There was. . .not a hint of what would subsequently become the New Deal.

"In the same manner, 1980 was a year of change—Jimmy Carter was the Democrat's Herbert Hoover, and Ronald Reagan's campaign, like Roosevelt's in 1932, was more thematic than programmatic."

Westergaard said that if Sen. Gary Hart were to become the Democratic candidate it would "obscure" the issues.

"He would also lose to Reagan, but his loss would not carry the symbolic impact of a Mondale wipeout and would thereby delay the revitalization process," he concluded.●

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a "Voice of Democracy" contest for high school students. The students are given a theme in keeping with the ideal of American democracy and asked to submit an essay on the subject.

I am honored to share with you today the winning speech from the

State of Tennessee for 1984. It was submitted by Brooks Moore of White House, Tenn., who is currently a senior at Beech Senior High School. Brooks expresses a firm commitment to our Constitution, the foundation of our Government, and a keen understanding of the importance of this document to all Americans in his essay.

I commend his words to you.

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

(By Brooks Moore)

Probably the most important document ever written is the Constitution of the United States of America.

Written in 1789 by colonial men tired of the oppression of the monarch they lived under, the Constitution outlined a unique system of government, and introduced into the politics of the era a completely new idea—freedom!

This form of government, which allowed the people to govern themselves, so new and unheard of that no one thought it would work. But, as the world watched with growing amazement and grudging admiration, our government not only worked, it flourished! So much did it flourish, in fact, that in time other countries came to copy it—overthrowing their tyrannical rulers and selecting from among the people someone to do what the people wanted.

Today, looking around, one can see that a major portion of the world has a form of government which is based on the government of the United States, which in turn is based on ideas of freedom written down in a document composed by men who had shaken of the tyranny of a hereditary ruler.

It can be said, then, that the Constitution of the United States, by setting an example of liberty for other countries to follow, began the metamorphosis of the world, into a better place. In my opinion, that makes it the most important document ever written.

And who am I? I am a citizen of the United States. I live and flourish under that same constitution. My rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are sacred, uninfringable, I am free!

The Constitution allows me to say what I want, think what I want, and do what I want, so long as I do not infringe upon the liberty of others.

Because of the Constitution I am free, and so that I may remain free, and so that it may safeguard the liberty of future generations, I uphold the Constitution with all my might.

How do I do this? By obeying and supporting the laws of my country which were passed to safeguard my rights. By using my freedom of speech and action to speak and act for reform when I see a need for it. But most importantly, by simply remaining free. I guard jealously the rights the Constitution has given me, and in so doing I guard the Constitution itself. As long as I remain free, as long as every citizen of the United States remains free, the Constitution stands; for it is the Constitution that keeps me free.

Yes, I stand upon the Constitution as my firm pedestal of freedom from which I cannot be dislodged; and in so doing, I stand behind the Constitution, supporting it, upholding it, keeping it firm.●

A SALUTE TO MR. WILLIAM L. WOOD

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, next week, we will convene our annual congressional senior citizen intern program. Seniors from across the country will travel to Washington to learn more about the Federal Government and how it operates—especially in the area of legislation and programs affecting our Nation's elderly. At this time, I would like to pay special tribute to an outstanding senior who will be participating in the program and serving as my senior citizen intern for 1984.

Mr. William L. Wood was born in Guthrie, Okla., on October 8, 1908. His family moved to Cleveland in 1920 seeking better employment opportunities. He is a graduate of Central High School and is married to the former Bernice Williams.

In 1947, Mr. Wood assumed a position with the Cleveland Postal Service. He recently retired from the Postal Service after 37 years of service.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wood has been a positive force in the Cleveland area for many years. Despite working long hours and raising three children, Mr. Wood was a leading advocate for a number of important causes.

In the Postal Service, Mr. Wood and other black postal officials broke the racial barriers by becoming one of the first minority employees to secure routes in the business section of Cleveland. As a result of his pioneering experiences in this area, Mr. Wood became active with the postal workers union and has logged many miles traveling to postal conventions.

His commitment to the young and old in the community also has been unceasing. Mr. Speaker, he joined the Ohio Youth Commission and Big Brothers many years ago. Under these programs, disadvantaged youth were given opportunities for employment, counseling and career guidance to prepare them for the outside world.

My senior citizen intern is also a former member of the Community Club for Homes, Retirees of Branch 40, Postal Employees and holds a life membership with the NAACP. His membership with the St. John A.M.E. Church in Cleveland spans 50 years.

Mr. Wood embraces the philosophy that the elderly "must keep active and viable in order to survive." He has not only been active but has also demonstrated an uncanny sensitivity to the well-being of his fellow man. He is the source of support and guidance for the young and the old alike.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the many contributions Mr. Wood has made to the people of my congressional district. I am pleased that he has accepted my invitation to serve as my senior citizen intern.●

MOTHER'S DAY

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Mother's Day approaches, I would like to share with you something Hubert Humphrey once said:

No government program, no social service, no speech by a public official is a substitute for interest at home, inspiration at home, encouragement at home.

I worked hard to create and become appointed to the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families because of my desire to protect the home and strengthen the family. And there is no more important key to strong families than mothers. That is what Mother's Day is all about.

Recent shifts in our society and economy have created new patterns of life for many American mothers and families. Our 6th Congressional District has the second highest percentage of two-career families in the Nation, and we know 68 percent of adult women in our district work outside the home.

I am concerned that nationally the number of children living with their mother only has risen by 68 percent since 1970. Now almost 13 million children live in households headed by their mother; nearly 3 million of these children are under the age of 6. One-third of all households headed by women live in poverty—five times the rate of all households. Today there are over 23 million children under the age of 14 whose mothers are in the workforce, yet affordable day care is scarce.

The stamina and dedication of America's mothers are demonstrated by how they are often single-handedly meeting the challenge of change with intelligence and dignity. Today's mothers are involved in every aspect of business, politics, education, sports, the arts, sciences, and government, and yet they still remain at the core of this Nation's greatest natural resource: They shape the character and dreams of our children.

That is why our observance of Mother's Day is so important. It provides us not only with an opportunity to honor our own mothers, but also to thank all of America's mothers who make our Nation stronger through their children.●

SOUTH CAROLINA TOASTMASTERS PROMOTE LEADERSHIP SKILLS

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the Duke of Wellington once advised a new member of Parliament as follows: "Don't quote Latin; say what you have to say, and then sit down." Those of us who do not have a Duke to advise us often rely on toastmasters.

It was my privilege recently to participate in the winter conference of the Toastmasters of South Carolina, who epitomize the goals of the more than 100,000-member international club which is devoted to promoting effective communication and effective leadership.

Of particular importance at this time is the South Carolina Toastmasters emphasis on youth leadership/success educational programs to encourage our young people to develop better listening, thinking, and speaking skills.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate the Toastmasters of South Carolina and toastmasters everywhere on taking the initiative to acquire and share the skills demanded for a growing, prospering Nation.●

THE ENTERPRISE ZONE EMPLOYMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1983

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, Maryland has been a leader among States in the utilization of enterprise zones. Through the tax, loan, and grant incentives that these zones offer, economically depressed areas are able to attract the establishment of new businesses. Within my district alone, the cities of Hagerstown and Cumberland have designated enterprise zones which are intended to both combat high unemployment and strengthen the overall economy. However, economic development in this northwestern region of Maryland continues to lag behind the rest of the country and sorely needs the boost that Federal legislation would provide.

It is my understanding that the conference on the Senate Deficit Reduction Act of 1984—which contains the enterprise zone bill—will take place sometime next week. I am firmly convinced that, if enacted, this legislation will provide enterprise zone programs with the support they need through special tax incentives and regulatory relief on the Federal level. Businesses located in the designated enterprise zones would be eligible for investment and employment tax credits; employees of such firms could claim a nonrefundable income tax credit as well. I believe that the Nation, in its effort to recover from its recent economic depression, badly needs to see the passage of this legislation.

I am currently one of 257 House cosponsors of the Enterprise Zone Employment and Development Act of 1983. In view of the overwhelming support that this legislation had received within the House, I wish to urge the conferees to retain the Senate's enterprise zone language within the Deficit Reduction Act conference report. In doing so, I believe that the conferees will allow the majority of the House to express its will on this issue and pass this worthwhile piece of legislation.

For interested colleagues, I have included an informative article on enterprise zones which was recently published in the Baltimore Business Journal.

[From the Baltimore Business Journal, Apr. 2-8, 1984]

ENTERPRISE ZONES

(By Rebecca McReynolds)

It's been just over a year now since the state legislature decided to work a little magic and breathe life back into Maryland's dying areas by using an old Oriental trick called enterprise zones. And the jury is still out on how well this sleight of hand is working, with wide variations in the results experienced by the zones.

The detractors cry that there have been little or no significant turnabouts in the economically stricken parts of the state as a result of all the financial incentives. But leaders in the enterprise movement point proudly to the $18 million in private and public investments in these areas that is to serve as the foundation on which the 10-year program will be built.

Maryland's version of the enterprise zone is an interpretation of British economist Stuart Butler's observations from a trip to the Orient. When visiting Japan, he noticed that sections of the country denoted as 'free trade zones" enjoyed health and growing economies.

Bringing the idea back to the United Kingdom, Butler was able to persuade his country to take a shot at using special government incentives to stir the economic flames in its decaying neighborhoods.

Maryland, along with 21 other states, borrowed this idea and has put together a package of economic incentives designed to draw new enterprise into sections of the state that have been hit with high unemployment and a sinking population. These are the trademarks of dying areas.

Maryland is offering several carrots to businesses that would locate in a designated enterprise zone:

There is a special 80 percent property-tax credit based on the difference between the taxable assessment on the land before it was designated and the current assessment of any improvements on the land for no more than five consecutive taxable years.

Income-tax credits are provided to employers for wages paid to new employees in the zone. For employees who would have qualified under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), the maximum credit is $1,500 for the first year of employment, $1,000 for the second and $500 for the third. For other employees, employers get one-time $500 tax credit.

Loan limits on the Maryland Industrial Land Act are increased to $1 million and 100 percent of market value for land acquisitions; to $2 million and 50 percent of property costs for industrial parks; to $2 million for a shell building and to $100,000 on a matching basis for acquiring land or park site options.

The Marlyland Industrial and Commercial Redevelopment Fund increased the precentage of loans or grants made available to any city or county to 50 percent from the previous 40 percent provided the extra 10 percent is restricted to enterprise zones.

When all of this bait was approved by the General Assembly in October of 1982, there were 10 contenders for the four positions opened up for enterprise zone designation. Chosen were the City of Baltimore's Park Circle, the City of Hagerstown/Washington County, the Town of Capitol Heights, and the City of Cumberland/Allegany County.

Areas that have received enterprise zone classification since then but haven't celebrated their first anniversaries yet are West Baltimore, the Town of Accident/Garrett County, Calvert County and the City of Salisbury.

According to Edward Wise, deputy director of the division of local and regional development for the Maryland Department of Economic and Community Development, these zones have spawned 330 new jobs in the state. They also have generated $12.5 million in private investment for new construction, rehabilitation, machinery and equipment.

Public investment in the areas total $5.5 million.

But unfortunately for areas such as Allegany County and Capitol Heights, these numbers don't divide up evenly among the different zones. And the effect of the state's new classification is just as varied and difficult to categorize as the locations themselves.

Probably the most successful enterprise zone in the state—in terms of capital improvements and new jobs created—is the Park Circle enterprise zone in northwest Baltimore.

"But Baltimore has BEDCO (Baltimore Economic Development Corp.)," says Richard N. Funkhouser, an economist for the division for research at DECD, who sits on the designation evaluation committee. "It is a lot easier for a Baltimore to get new business than say a Salisbury.

You have to bear in mind that areas that get enterprise zones are distressed. Nobody expects them to become poles of development in one year."

This becomes evident when studying the development of the state's three other year-old zones.

HAGERSTOWN/WASHINGTON COUNTY

With the closing of the Fairchild Industries plant in Hagerstown, Washington County's unemployment rate hit 11.1 percent in December, 1983. This is nearly double the state's rate of 6.2 percent.

Since being designated as an enterprise zone, however, the area has seen $7.5 million in rehabilitation and new construction. But Wise says most of that capital investment was completed within the zone just to take advantage of the tax assessment incen-

tives. A total of only five new jobs have been created so far.

Wise points to an accounting firm that bought an old A&P warehouse within the enterprise zone that spent "a great deal of money" renovating it, and moved its employees there without creating one job.

But, according to the zone's first annual report to the state, all of this is expected to pay off with 75 to 80 new jobs by the end of 1984.

CITY OF CUMBERLAND/ALLEGANY COUNTY

In the 10,000-acre zone in Allegany County, there are seven companies taking advantage of the tax incentives offered in the area. More than 100 new jobs have been created there through the expansion of existing businesses within the zone, and two new businesses have opened there.

There has been more than $1.3 million in private capital investment in the area, but no public monies spent in improving the zone.

But Wise says there is still a lot that can be expected to come into the 10,000-acre zone. So far, the emphasis has been just in getting organized, "but they've got a big play pen now to concentrate on," he says.

CAPITOL HEIGHTS

The only zone in the state that hasn't seen any new jobs or businesses come in since qualifying for the tax breaks is Capitol Heights in Prince George's County. But Wise says the newly committed public funds in the area are a heartening sign of good things to come.

The town has allotted $286,000 for the reconstruction of Quire Avenue in the hopes of making it more attractive to businesses looking at moving into the area. And $108,000 has been earmarked for property acquisition that would leverage private investment in the town's enterprise zone.

EVALUATION

Now comes the hard part for the state—sitting down and evaluating the success of the zones, both quantitatively and qualitatively. And Funkhouser says his research department has just begun the monumental task of putting together a set of formulas that will plug into the varying mold of each zone.

"A great deal of the impact evaluation will be the qualitative part," Funkhouser says. "But we don't know which questions need to be asked."

The Federal Government has come up with two ratings systems because there is no real way to compare the rural areas with cities like Baltimore.

Funkhouser says he hopes to have a complete evaluating system set up by May to help direct the department in declaring new enterprise zones and grade the zones in existence.

"I would give very high grades on the program," he says.

BALTIMORE'S BOOMTOWNS STILL HAVE A LONG ROAD AHEAD

On the surface, Baltimore's Park Circle enterprise zone could stand out as a shining example of how the state's incentive program can work toward the revitalization of the city. But 34 vacant acres could tell a different tale to outsiders.

Park Circle was one of the first areas in the state to receive enterprise-zone classification from the Maryland Department of Economic and Community Development.

The stricken area had an unemployment rate of more than 18 percent—more than 25 percent for youths—and was considered one of the city's poorest neighborhoods.

Enter Mayor Schaefer and the state legislature, making the stricken area a safe harbor from business taxes; planting seeds that are to sprout new business, new jobs and new hope for Park Circle's poor.

Last year, the city spent more than $2.6 million in the area acquiring land and making improvements. Baltimore spent $650,000 buying up 23 acres of surplus land from the state. And then it pieced together more property to create a 40-acre, city-owned industrial park.

After that came $2 million worth of improvements including the widening of Druid Hill Park Drive, a new access road for the area and the clearing of the 3400 block of Reisterstown Road.

The pay-off? Sixty new companies bringing in around 250 new jobs for the area.

But all of these jobs and businesses have come in under the umbrella of the single private investment in the enterprise zone—Control Data Corp.'s Business and Technology Center.

The center works as a nurturing ground for fledgling companies. It supplies a set of shared services for tenants including computers, a secretarial staff and copying facilities for businesses that are just starting out and don't have deep enough pockets to put all this together themselves.

"It really says something about the mayor, the city and the community for a Fortune 500 company to move into an area like this," says David Paulson, administrator of the zone and project director of Park Circle for the Baltimore Economic Development Corp. [BEDCO].

The Control Data center represents a $3.5-million investment in Park Circle. The company also has constructed a shell building behind the center using a $1.5-million Maryland Industrial Land Act (MILA) loan.

Paulson says this is prime example of what the city would like to see moving into its enterprise zones. Of all of the employees hired in the facility, 65 percent of them qualified for the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) and 85 percent of them live in or around the zone.

But there is still a long way to go to fill up the rest of the industrial park, and Paulson says he has some fish on the line that could fill up the vacant lots very quickly.

According to his annual report to the state, one company on the hook is Gill Co., a distributor of commercial stainless-steel kitchen equipment.

The company now is located in Beltsville and Greenbelt, but contacted BEDCO when it heard of the enterprise zone. On behalf of the company, the city applied to the state for a $150,000 MILA loan.

Gill could create 59 jobs in Park Circle, 51 of which would be new. Paulson's report says the commitment represents a total investment of $1.5 million.

Another company looking at the area is Earth Engineering Sciences. It is proposing to develop 5,000 square feet of office space on a one-acre site. It now is renting space in Baltimore City and employs 40 people.

The move would create 10 to 20 new jobs with a total investment of $200,000. If all goes well, construction could start there this spring.

There is also hope for The Palladium, a catering facility that is the brainchild of two local minority businessmen. The facility would contain about 30,000 square feet on a six-acre site on Druid Park Drive and Liberty Heights Avenue.

The estimated price tag is $1.8 million, and the project would create 60 new jobs.

BEDCO also is in negotiations with Mellin Ice Cream Co. to locate its new 50,000-square/foot, $8-million plant in the zone. And two developers have expressed interest in building a 50,000-square-foot speculative industrial building there.

According to the annual report, "both developers feel that the availability of the zone benefits is the key to the implementation of their plans."

Paulson says that, even though there isn't much to see there now, development for the area is right on schedule.

"I think if you look at Park Circle, this is really the first season that we've had a truly marketable commodity," he says. "We've done all of our acquisitions, all of our public improvements, all of our relocating.

"When talking about a place like Park Circle, it is hard to visualize what it will look like for businesses considering moving in."

He says if these new businesses should decide to move in it would create "sizable local employment."

But now the city's attention to enterprise zones will have to be divided. In December, the 400-acre West Baltimore enterprise zone was certified. And according to Paulson, it's a completely different animal.

Where as Park Circle has the wide open space for big companies to come in with lots of construction, West Baltimore is a collection of empty store fronts and small buildings.

Paulson says that area will be developed for mixed uses creating an opportunity for developing new businesses and giving small companies a place to grow.

Even though the zone has only been around for three months and the city hasn't had a chance to really push the project, one company already has staked a claim in the zone.

The president of Nautical and Aviation Inc. called Paulson the same week the area was designated, saying he wanted a permanent home for his company and wanted to be located in an enterprise zone.

Paulson says he wasted no time in matching a site up with the company's needs. The move will create 10-to-12 new jobs for the area.

But now the biggest task before Paulson and the city is marketing these new zones—letting companies know they are there and what the city and state can do for them if they choose to locate in one of them.

The first major undertaking along these lines is a seminar being planned by BEDCO for sometime in the next two months. Businesses from all over will be invited to meet with officials from the city and state to explain just what lies ahead for these zones.●

SOUTH AFRICA SHOULD IMMEDIATELY RELEASE MARIENTAL PRISONERS

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which condemns the recent actions of the Government of South Africa which terminated an American-sponsored court

suit seeking the release of prisoners captured during the 1978 raid on the Cassinga refugee settlement located some 150 miles within the Angolan border. During that raid the South African military forces killed over 600 Namibian refugees, many of whom were women and children, and further forcibly abducted more than 100 refugees from Angola and took them to a military internment camp near Mariental, 175 miles south of Windhoek, the Namibian capital.

South Africa initially denied the existence of the detainees, but as the result of international pressure, finally conceded it was holding survivors of the raid on Cassinga. Although recently the International Committee of the Red Cross and certain relatives were allowed restricted visits, for several years no relatives or legal representatives were permitted to leave the camp.

An urgent application was filed by the Namibian law firm of Lorentz and Bone on March 5, 1984 in the Supreme Court of Namibia—South West Africa. The application, which was in the nature of a writ of habeas corpus charged the captives were "unlawfully seized by the South African Defence Forces outside the territory of South West Africa across an international frontier in the sovereign state of Angola . . . that such seizure was ultra vires the functions and powers of the South African Defence Forces . . . and contrary to international law and to the laws of Namibia."

No charges have ever been brought against the captives. There are reports that the detainees have been tortured, physically multilated and subjected to harsh conditons and hard labor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in this appeal to the South African Government to release the Mariental detainees and further to abide by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Geneva Conventions of 1949.●

MEXICO COMMEMORATING EL CINCO DE MAYO DAY

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to convey to our neighbors in Mexico the best wishes of this body as they prepare to commemorate an important date in their history—el Cinco de Mayo.

On May 5, 1862, the ill-equipped Mexico forces successfully held off the invading French troops, at Puebla, Mexico. This decisive battle demonstrated the courage and strength of Mexico's desire for freedom and self-determination. This quest intensified during the French occupation, and almost 5 years to the day after the victory, Mexico defeated Maximillian and expelled the French. The Mexican spirit—committed toward maintaining its national sovereignty and dignity—had triumphed. Benito Juarez, the Mexican patriot who orchestrated the French defeat, captured this spirit in the words "* * * among individuals as among nations the respect for the rights of others in peace."

Today, the city that served as Benito Juarez' headquarters during the French occupation bears his name. Many of my constituents in West Texas join their neighbors in Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua in celebrating this holiday. I am proud to say that interwoven in the culture which bonds citizens on both sides of the border is the spirit which holds democracy and independence as a way of life for free people.●

SOUTH AFRICA'S WITHDRAWAL OF NAMIBIAN COURT'S JURISDICTION

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Government of South Africa took action last Friday that flaunts the rule of law and destroys any faith that Pretoria subscribes to the concept of an independent judiciary.

South African Minister of Justice Kobie Coetsee withdrew the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Namibia from a case brought on behalf of a group of Namibians and Angolans who have been unlawfully imprisoned by South African military forces for the past 6 years.

These prisoners are survivors of a 1978 South African military attack in which at least 600 persons were killed at the Cassinga refugee camp in Angola. These survivors have been denied access to friends and relatives and allegedly subjected to extreme hardships, physical mutilation and torture. They have never been charged with any offense nor brought to trial.

The Government of South Africa says it is acting under a security regulation that allows the detention of individuals who pose a threat to the nation's security. It says it rescinded the court's jurisdiction under a provision of its national defense law that protects the nation from terrorism.

No evidence that these refugees threatened South Africa's security has ever been presented. But in any case, they are entitled due process under the law and other internationally accepted human rights.

The Reagan administration has asserted that the rule of law is a "precious inheritance" in South Africa. But any civilized society which honors the rule of law would allow the refugees to be charged and tried in a court of law.

Namibian church leaders and friends and relatives of the detainees filed an urgent application in March 1984 in the Namibian Supreme Court charging that at least 100 survivors of the attack are still being held illegally at Mariental, 160 miles south of the Namibian capital of Windhoek.

Within the past few days, the outcry over the cancellation of court jurisdiction over the case has elicited an announcement by the Administrator General of Southwest Africa that 54 detainees will be released gradually from time to time.

I fear that this announcement is merely a means of assuaging the public outrage and may result in no action at all. The announcement raises critical questions: Are the individuals on whose behalf the application was filed among the 54 mentioned in the announcement? What will happen to the remaining detainees? Do the words "gradually" and "from time to time" imply weeks or months or even years?

In my view, the rescission of the Supreme Court's authority over this case underscores the irrationality and illegality of South African rule over Namibia and calls into question the claims that the Reagan administration's policy of "constructive engagement" is helping to achieve progress in solving the overwhelming problems of the region.

It is imperative that we continue to closely monitor this tragic situation and to exert pressure on the Government of South Africa until freedom is granted to every one of the detainees.

Today my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, WILLIAM GRAY, is introducing a resolution calling on South Africa to quickly release all the Mariental detainees and to comply with the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions of 1949 concerning both prisoners of war and civilians in war. Further, it calls on the United States to reaffirm and continue its policy of not recognizing South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. I call on my colleagues to cosponsor and support this resolution.●

PRESIDENT'S CRIME PACKAGE

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills which represent portions of the President's Crime Package upon which the Criminal Justice Subcommittee has been

conducting hearings during the past several weeks. The first bill deals with bank fraud and bribery and the second with assault against Federal officials.

My legislation addressing bank fraud and bribery is exactly the same as that passed by the Senate earlier this year as a part of S. 1762 and differs from H.R. 5405 (Conyers) in several respects with the administration feels significant. I feel that the subcommittee should have before it the two alternatives in order to facilitate the sharpest delineation of the issues.

The legislation dealing with assault against Federal officials is the same as that passed by the Senate as a part of S. 1762 with additional language which applies protection to former Presidents and their families, the lack of which is a clear anomaly from current law. This bill differs more markedly from H.R. 5150 (Conyers) than my bank bribery legislation does from H.R. 5405. For this reason, I think it essential that the subcommittee consider its approach contrasted to H.R. 5150.

For example, the legislation I am proposing to protect Federal officials does not contain the burdensome proof of a specific intent which the Conyers bill places upon prosecutors using (18 U.S.C. 111), the general obstruction provision protecting many Federal officials. The policy behind the revision of (18 U.S.C. 111) wrought by the Conyers bill appears to overrule the 7 to 2 decision of the *U.S.* v. *Feola* 420 U.S. 671 (1975), and I do not feel that this is the correct way to protect Federal officials.●

OPPOSE FURTHER STUDY OF METRIC CONVERSION

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona, to delete the $500,000 for the study of metric conversion. The bill before us today authorizes half a million dollars to appoint a panel to study metric conversion in this country and report back to Congress 2 years from now.

This Congress is facing a $200 billion deficit and recently passed legislation to raise taxes to make a downpayment on this deficit. It is inconceivable to me that we can seriously consider throwing a half a million to study a system opposed by the vast majority of Americans.

We have had a Metric Board since 1975, when we passed the Metric Conversion Act. The policy intent of the Congress is based on the principle of voluntary participation. The Board has spent millions of dollars in taxpayers' money and done no more than confirm the fact that this whole issue is best left to the private sector.

What difference does it make if other countries use it and we don't? Are we to follow like sheep? I suggest to you that both our science and health communities know how to convert and have been doing it for years. No additional study is going to change this. Furthermore, this country leads the world in buying and selling products in international trade. This does not indicate to me that we are at a disadvantage because of our system of measurement. I find the argument that our trade suffers because of our system totally without support. It appears clear to me that if it is in the interest of a particular business to convert, that business will do so.

In 1978, the General Accounting Office completed a thorough objective study and found that very little benefit would be achieved at a cost of billions of dollars. What has changed that now requires us to spend half a million tax dollars on another study? I believe we should strike the funding for this study and leave the decision whether to convert or not, to the private sector where it belongs. I cannot justify to my constituents the expenditure of an additional half a million of their tax dollars to further study conversion to a system which was always intended to be purely voluntary. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona.●

WELCOME TO WASHINGTON DURFEE HIGH SCHOOL BAND

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the performance in Washington of the Durfee High School marching band. The 150 students who traveled from Fall River, Mass. played a wide variety of musicial compositions for the crowd of guests and passersby who gathered on the east front steps of the Capitol. It was a pleasurable performance in keeping with Durfee High's long tradition of excellence and long history of contributing their talents for the benefit of the community in Fall River, and in Washington as well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Durfee High School marching band for their excellent show on the Capitol steps today. The band represents the exemplary tradition of high school marching bands that contribute their musical talents and bring enjoyment to us all when they play.

I look forward to Durfee High School's ongoing contribution to the Fall River community. We can be proud of their accomplishments and their contributions today.●

FOOD AID TO AFRICA

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, in early March, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved a $150 million supplemental appropriation for emergency food aid in response to the drought in Africa. Unfortunately, that legislation was later stalled in the Senate, but we were able to pass a $90 million supplemental which was attached to another piece of legislation.

That supplemental was passed by the House and Senate on March 27, 1984. In a little more than a month, I am pleased to report that $63 million of aid has already been approved, amounting to 177,000 tons of food aid. I would like to share with my colleagues where these funds will be used in the days ahead:

	Amount
Senegal	$13,200,000
Zimbabwe	10,967,000
Upper Volta	9,500,000
Somalia	7,300,000
Mali	7,300,000
Gambia	4,000,000
Guinea-Bissau	3,400,000
Zambia	3,300,000
Chad	2,700,000
Benin	850,000
Madagascar	300,000
Mozambique	200,000

In addition, it is expected that the remaining funds will be approved by the end of this month, allowing for fiscal year 1985 processing to begin shortly thereafter, as scheduled.

I believe that the expediency of AID in approving this amount of aid demonstrates once again the commitment of the United States in answering the call for help which has arisen from the continent of Africa. It also confirms the urgency of the situation and the fact that this Congress took the right and necessary action in approving the $90 million of emergency food aid.●

GROUND THE MX

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the following editorial, recently published by the Los Angeles

Times, urging that production of the MX missile be halted.

GROUND THE MX

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a U.S.-Soviet agreement on the Reagan Administration's "build-down" proposal for strategic arms reduction would save American taxpayers $30 billion between now and the end of this century. Congress could save $14 billion over the next five years merely by refusing to vote funds for further production of the MX missile.

These numbers should be kept in mind as the people's elected representatives wrestle with the problem of how to reduce the massive federal budget deficit—an enterprise that is essential to the nation's economic health.

President Reagan's budget for fiscal 1985, beginning next Oct. 1, called for $305 billion in defense spending authority—an increase of about 13% in inflation-adjusted dollars over the military budget for the current year. President has since said that he would accept a cut of $57 billion spread over three years, a concession that would still allow a 7% increase after inflation in defense spending next year. Many members of Congress in both parties assume that the final figure will be less.

The question, then, is not whether the defense budget will be cut but how.

The temptation, as usual, is to take a big bite out of funds for training, maintenance and the building of adequate inventories of ammunition and spare parts instead of making the hard decisions to reduce or eliminate entire weapons systems. That is folly.

As a ranking admiral said the other day, "If I have to, I can make do with fewer ships. But it is imperative that the forces I have be combat-ready."

The Army, Navy and Air Force each has weapons systems whose cost-effectiveness is open to challenge. But it would be difficult to find a better candidate for elimination than the MX missile.

As things stand, the Administration plans to deploy 100 MXs—big missiles that would carry 10 warheads each—beginning in late 1986. Congress last year approved production of 21 MXs; flight-testing of prototypes has already begun. The Pentagon wants to buy 40 more in fiscal 1985 and the remainder the following year.

At the same time, however, the Administration has officially embraced the "build-down" approach to strategic missile negotiations in response to pressures from Capitol Hill. This approach calls for retiring two old land-based strategic warheads for each new warhead deployed. The ratio would be 3-to-2 for warheads mounted on submarine-launched missiles and 1-to-1 for single-warhead missiles.

The very sensible idea is to discourage dependence by either side on multiple-warhead missiles and encourage a transition to less vulnerable—but also less threatening—single-warhead missiles.

Simple arithmetic tells you that the MX is inconsistent with the build-down negotiating proposal. If this country actually deploys 100 MXs, that will use up 1,000 warheads of whatever ceiling is ultimately negotiated. Those same warheads, mounted on the single-warhead Midgetman missile that is now under development, would make far less vulnerable—and therefore less tempting—targets for a surprise Soviet attack.

Indications are that congressional critics, as of now, are inclined toward freezing the MX production rate at 21 per year instead of halting the project altogether. That would be a mistake for both budgetary and military reasons.

The Midgetman itself is an expensive project, but that is all the more reason not to spend money unnecessarily on the MX. Congress should kill the MX and move forward with the development and deployment of the Midgetman.●

WHY A CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAM?

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, the Space Shuttle is a Federal program of which we all can be proud. The Shuttle is living up to its expectations and we now have a routine, dependable transportation system to carry people and payloads into orbit. As the development portion of the Space Shuttle program winds down, it becomes appropriate to consider what this country's next step in space should be.

NASA believes that the next step should be a permanently manned space station, a place, if you will, to shuttle to. President Reagan has endorsed NASA's view and the House of Representatives, in passing the fiscal year 1985 NASA authorization bill, has approved the authorization of a down payment for the space station endeavor.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that provides funding for NASA programs, I intend to examine the space station proposal carefully, for such a project clearly sets a course for this Nation to follow in the arena of space.

The success of the Space Shuttle and the advent of a permanently manned space station focus our attention upon a basic question: why do we have a civil space program? Why do we concern ourselves with rockets and satellites? My own view is that we have a space program not because of the excitement the program engenders and certainly not because the Russians have one. You have a space program because there are things you can do in space that you can't do on the ground or that you can do far better in space than on the ground. What things? Astronomy, materials research, navigation and communications, and earth observations are all activities that lend themselves to space, and there are others. Space has become simply a place where we do useful things.

Today, we are dependent upon our activities in space for many things. I suspect that in the future, we will become even more so.●

JEWISH IMMIGRATION

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, with Soviet Jewish emigration at an all time low and new leadership taking hold in the Soviet Union, it is imperative that we in Congress make clear our continued commitment to Soviet Jews.

The resolution introduced by my colleagues from New York, Ms. FERRARO and Mr. GILMAN reasserts our belief in human freedom, freedom to keep families together and the freedom to practice one's religion without persecution. It is crucial that we send this message to the Soviet leadership, to the people of the Soviet Union, and to the people of this country who have been so supportive of efforts to reverse the tide of Soviet emigration which has fallen dramatically in the last 5 years.

But more disturbing even than the statistics is the anti-Semitic campaign being waged in the Soviet Union. Under an official sanctioned Anti-Zionist Committee, the Soviets have mounted a deliberate campaign to discredit the practice of Judaism, linking zionism with Naziism and telling the world that no more Soviet Jews wish to emigrate. What is more, religious classes have been broken up, ceremonies disrupted and families threatened if they spoke out.

Anatoly Shcharansky, for whom the House unanimously passed my resolution of support last year, still languishes in prison for this efforts on behalf of Soviet Jews. His mother, who has seen him most recently, says he will not live to see the end of his sentence. Mr. Shcharansky is not alone, refuseniks like him who have the courage to stand up for their rights are given harsh sentences on trumped-up charges and made to live in squallid and unsanitary prisons, or perform hard labor far from their families.

Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry is a day of protest and a message of hope from the people of this country to the oppressed Jews of the Soviet Union. On that day with one voice we reaffirm our resolve to see an end to religious persecution. I urge very Member of Congress to vote for this resolution expressing support for the greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry whose unflagging commitment to the plight of Soviet Jews has done so much for so many families. Let us join them in protesting the drop in Soviet Jewish emigration from 51,320 in 1979 to just 1,314 this year and the systematic denial of religious rights which other faiths in the Soviet Union enjoy. Let us take this opportu-

nity to show the 300,000 Soviet Jews who have applied for emigration that we will not stop fighting for their freedom. I commend this initiative and strongly urge its unanimous passage.●

GORDON SCANLON

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to honor, Mr. Gordon Scanlon, upon his retirement as the deputy police chief of the Montclair, N.J. Police Department.

Gordon joined the Montclair Police Department 38 years ago. Since then, he has worked in all areas of the department and has always served the force with distinction. Throughout his tenure, Gordon provided Montclair with leadership, ability, and integrity on their police force.

Officer Scanlon has served on patrol and traffic, radio, and motorcycle patrol, in the juvenile and detective bureaus and in the administrative office of the department. He is presently in command of the uniform and traffic divisions and in the absence of the chief, has assumed command of the department on occasion since 1965.

Montclairites also remember Gordon as the star center of the 1939 Immaculate Conception High School basketball team. This championship team played in the National Catholic Invitational Tournament in Chicago.

Born and raised in Montclair, Gordon, and his lovely wife, Anne, also raised their three children there. Now Gordon and Anne are looking forward to starting a new life in Florida and I am pleased to send them my best wishes. Gordon's ability and professionalism in his job has set a standard for future police officers to attain.●

DALTON CHESS TEAM PLACES SECOND IN NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievement of the Dalton School chess team, representing the Dalton School—a private school within the district I represent. In the recent national primary school chess championship tournament, held in Syracuse, N.Y., the Dalton team missed winning first place by only half a point.

This in itself is an extraordinary victory, and is made especially worthy of our attention by the fact that the Dalton chess team has been playing for only 6 months; this year's participation in the national tournament is the team's first.

Under the direction of Coach Svetozar Jovanovic, 8 of the 10 students who competed placed in the top 40 of all those who played. I think the names and rankings of those who played are worthy of mention: Naomi Spiro (3), Josh Powe (18), Nicky Silvers (20), Spencer Rascoff (21), David Arnett (24), Morgan Pehme (31), Jyoti Lall (32), and Paul Kaplan (40); Giorgio Handman and Gordana Spiro also participated in these games.

In this Chamber, where our debates are often long and dry, and where our moves rarely appear as elegant and deliberate as those moves made by a chess player, it is a pleasure for me to devote these few minutes to the victories of those on the Dalton chess team.●

ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS IN MISSISSIPPI

HON. WEBB FRANKLIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Speaker, every year, the Mississippi Department of Economic Development recognizes and honors the economic contributions of one industry in each of Mississippi's five congressional districts. This year's award winner in my district is Delta Catfish Processors, Inc. of Indianola, Miss., and I think few industries could have had such a tremendous impact on an area's economy in such a short time.

Delta Catfish Processors, Inc. is a relatively new business. It opened in 1981, employed 200 people after only 1 year of operation, and added over 100 more workers by the end of 1982. In 1983, the plant added an additional 275 new jobs and $7 million in new capital.

I think there are several lessons that can be learned from this economic success story.

First and foremost, this illustrates what private enterprise can do when given a healthy and recovering economy. These represent permanent jobs. They are not dependent upon Government funding, and they are not going to go away. Delta Processors is one of numerous Mississippi companies which has been allowed to prosper now that we have reasonable interest rates, and now that the level of inflation has been brought under control.

Second, this points out the phenomenal growth of the farm-raised catfish industry. The farming of catfish is relatively new, but there are tremendous growth opportunities for the catfish industry. Farmers in my district produce over 200 million pounds each year, and the demand is growing each year.

Finally, Delta Catfish is a prime example of what can be accomplished when the entire process from growing to marketing takes place in Mississippi. For years, Mississippi farmers have produced agricultural commodites which are second to none, and we are seeing a growing recognition of the economic benefits that can result when those commodities are processed inside the State. Mississippi has no shortage of honest, hard-working citizens, and I am pleased that this industry had done so much to help put our people to work.

Delta Catfish was conceived, founded, and is owned by Mississippians. Sam Hinote and his colleagues there have reason to be proud of what they have accomplished.●

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, It gives me great pleasure to join in celebrating the 193d anniversary of the signing of the May 3 Polish Constitution. It is an occasion when the people of Poland, and those of Polish heritage, can renew and reflect upon the principles of freedom, justice, equality, and liberty.

This day commemorates the special moment in history when Poland established itself as a free and sovereign nation. The May 3 Constitution, modeled after the Constitution of the United States, serves as an important reminder that freedom and liberty served as a founding principal for the Polish people. The authors of the Polish Constitution were greatly influenced by the American document, and the similarities abound. It appears remarkable that the two nations, different in so many ways, could have such similar important documents. However, it is clear that our nations share so much in the areas of desire for freedom, liberty, justice, and equality.

The history of Poland, and its people, has shown tremendous personal courage under the most adverse of situations. This courage remains strong today, despite the present tyranny inflicted upon its people by the Communist government. There remains an indelible determination to fight for the principles established in the May 3 Constitution. This determination was again shown by Nobel Prize winner Lech Walesa, while risking personal safety, participated in a May Day march that was to exclude such freedom fighters. I have no doubts that through nearly two centuries, the

ideals embodies in the May 3 Constitution remain strong with the people of Poland.

Polish Americans have an important obligation this May 3, to speak out in support of a free and independent Poland. Our voices must be heard since the brothers and sisters of Poland have their words muffled under the repressive Communist regime. Many people of the Fifth Congressional District join me in rememberance of the May 3 Polish Constitution that sought freedom and hope for the people of Poland. I believe that one day soon the realization of that goal can occur and pledge to continue efforts toward achieving that goal.●

HONORING THE VIETNAM UNKNOWN SOLDIER

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1984

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the House took action which in my belief has been long overdue and which I fully support: I am speaking of the passage of H.R. 5515 to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to that unknown American soldier who died in the Vietnam conflict and is to be interred at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery, and also of the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 296 to allow that same unknown soldier to lie in state in the Capitol rotunda. These two bills passed under unanimous consent this morning to the great honor of this legislative body. The interment of an unknown soldier from the Vietnam conflict is something that I have long fought for, and am now pleased to witness.

Almost 4 years ago, one of my constituents, Mike Wherley, a former Green Beret and Vietnam vet, brought to my attention that fact that there was nothing to commemorate an unknown soldier from the Vietnam conflict at the Tomb of the Unknown at Arlington National Cemetery. There was nothing at the tomb to indicate that an Unknown from the Vietnam conflict would ever be interred, or that Congress had enacted Public Law 93-43 to allow for the interment of an unknown from Vietnam. In the amphitheatre at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier there was, however, a plaque honoring all those Americans who had served in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict, which my dear colleague HENRY HYDE of Illinois worked to get installed. But this was the only evidence of our involvement in Vietnam, and as Mike Wherley pointed out to me, whenever there is a ceremony, such as the changing of the guard at the Tomb or the laying of a wreath, everyone is facing the Tomb with their backs to the amphitheatre and the plaque honoring veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

At Mike's instigation, I began to agitate for the interment of a Vietnam Unknown Soldier. There were many obstacles along the way, and many meetings with DOD officials both in the Pentagon and in my office. Verbal promises and assurances were bandied about and I even introduced two concurrent resolutions to help the effort along. Last year, we met with some measure of success when the Department of Defense installed two outside plaques at the Tomb, commemorating those who served in Vietnam and explaining that Public Law 93-43 authorized the interment of an Unknown from Vietnam. Now the provisions of Public Law 93-43 will at last be fulfilled.

Veterans of the Vietnam conflict have long suffered injustices; recognition of their brave and heroic efforts was long in coming. The interment of an Unknown Soldier from this conflict recognizes the sacrifices that our Nation's fine young men made in Southeast Asia. This recognition is fully merited and long overdue. And while this interment will honor all those who served in Vietnam, we must not think that it represents the end of that era: there are still far too many unaccounted for. We must not forget, and must not rest in our efforts to get a full accounting for those who are still missing because until such a time the Vietnam conflict will not be truly ended.●

SENATE—*Friday, May 4, 1984*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 30, 1984)

The Senate met at 9:30 and 3 seconds a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday next.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M., TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1984

Thereupon, at 9:30 and 10 seconds a.m., the Senate recessed, under the order of Thursday, May 3, 1984, until Tuesday, May 8, 1984, at 10 a.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, May 7, 1984*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Today we have a guest chaplain, the former Chaplain of the House so beloved by all of us, former Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Edward G. Latch.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., former Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Teach us to do Thy will, for Thou art our God: Thy spirit is good; lead us into the land of uprightness.—Psalm 143: 10.

O God, our Father, in whose presence our spirits are renewed, our minds restored to clear thinking, and our hearts receive the warmth of Thy love at the beginning of a new day we pause in silence before Thee. Incline our souls to seek wisdom and truth and mercy at Thy hands. Reveal to us the way we should go, the decisions we should make, the plans we should follow and may all our work be based upon intelligent conviction and dynamic faith.

Bless our President, our Speaker, these Representatives of our people and all who work with them and for them under the dome of this glorious Capitol. Make this building a center of good will and may a passion for the right and the true keep us dedicated to our beloved land. Bless the former Members of this body who are with us this day. May their presence warm our hearts. Lead us all in the ways of unity and good will. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC, *May 4, 1984.*

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, May 4, 1984, the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate:

(1) That the Senate passed H.R. 4176;

(2) That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 537; and

(3) That the Senate agreed to the conference report to the bill S. 64.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Representatives of April 26, 1984, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair to receive the former Members of Congress.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Speaker of the House presided.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the Chair and the Chamber, I consider it a high honor and distinct personal privilege to have the opportunity of welcoming so many of our former Members and colleagues as may be present here on this occasion. We all pause to welcome them.

This is a bipartisan affair, and in that spirit the Chair is going to recognize the floor leaders of both parties.

The Clerk will now call the roll of the former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of former Members of the Congress, and the following former Members answered to their names:

FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ATTENDING 14TH ANNUAL SPRING MEETING, MAY 7–8, 1984

Hugh Q. Alexander of North Carolina;
Elizabeth Andrews of Alabama;
Leslie C. Arends of Illinois;
Robert Ashmore of South Carolina;
William H. Ayres of Ohio;
Laurie C. Battle of Alabama;
J. Glenn Beall, Jr. of Maryland;
John Blatnik of Minnesota;
J. Caleb Boggs of Delaware;
Donald G. Brotzman of Colorado;
Charles W. Brownson of Indiana;
John H. Buchanan, Jr. of Alabama;
Wm. Burlison of Missouri;
William T. Cahill of New Jersey;
Charles E. Chamberlain of Michigan;
James C. Cleveland of New Hampshire;
Jeffery Cohelan of California;
Albert M. Cole of Kansas;
W. Sterling Cole of New York;
Paul W. Cronin of Massachusetts;
Isidore Dollinger of New York;
Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina;
Michael A. Feighan of Ohio;
L. H. Fountain of North Carolina;
J. Allen Fear, Jr. of Delaware;
Charles K. Fletcher of California;
Lou Frey, Jr. of Florida;
Edward A. Garmatz of Maryland;
Robert A. Grant of Indiana;
Robert P. Hanrahan of Illinois;
Ralph R. Harding of Idaho;
Porter Hardy, Jr. of Virginia;
Chet Holifield of California;
William L. Hungate of Missouri;
A. Oakley Hunter of California;
J. Edward Hutchinson of Michigan;
Jacob K. Javits of New York;
Jed Johnson, Jr. of Oklahoma;
Walter H. Judd of Minnesota;
Hastings Keith of Massachusetts;
Martha Keys of Kansas;
David S. King of Utah;
Horace R. Kornegay of North Carolina;
Theodore R. Kupferman of New York;
Peter N. Kyros of Maine;
Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin;
John V. Lindsay of New York;
Robert McClory of Illinois;
John Y. McCollister of Nebraska;
Gale W. McGee of Wyoming;
Clark MacGregor of Minnesota;
Hervey Machen of Maryland;
William S. Mailliard of California;
D. R. (Billy) Matthews of Florida;
Wiley Mayne of Iowa;
George Meader of Michigan;
D. Bailey Meprill of Indiana;
Helen Meyner of New Jersey;
John S. Monagan of Connecticut;
Frank E. Moss of Utah;
Alvin E. O'Konski of Wisconsin;
Shirley N. Pettis of California;
Howard W. Pollock of Alaska;
James M. Quigley of Pennsylvania;
Wm. J. Randall of Missouri;
John J. Rhodes of Arizona;
John M. Robison, Jr. of Kentucky;
Philip Ruppe of Michigan;
Fred Schwengel of Iowa;
Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania;
William L. Scott of Virginia;
Armistead Selden of Alabama;
Garner Shriver of Kansas;
Henry P. Smith III of New York;
Lynn Stalbaum of Wisconsin;

Roy A. Taylor of North Carolina;
Lera Thomas of Texas;
Andrew J. Transue of Michigan;
Victor V. Veysey of California;
Charles E. Wiggins of California;
Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas.

□ 1210

The SPEAKER. A quorum having been established, the House at this time will recognize the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JIM WRIGHT.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for saying on behalf of all of us, to our former colleagues and our always friends, a very hearty welcome back to this Chamber. Here in this Hall we have shared many common experiences, we have thrilled to many common successes. Sometimes those among us here today have been on opposite sides, but here we have learned as in no other forum that one can disagree without being disagreeable.

We have enjoyed those things that unite us far beyond that artificial boundary that separates our two parties. The camaraderie that has developed here in this Chamber, the traditions of civility, or courtesy, or mutuality, or respect, are traditions that I think have been the glue and the cement which have held together the Union.

So as I look out among you, I am always impressed, and whenever I meet any one of you, impressed with how relaxed you appear to be, and almost envious.

We welcome you back. We are delighted to renew old acquaintances. I see among you people who have been my mentors and my inspiration, chairmen of committees on which I have served, people who have been to us great leaders, and we are just simply enjoying more than we can properly express to you the opportunity to say hello to all of you again.

Keep coming back. Some of us will be joining you in this association.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the Republican whip, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. TRENT LOTT.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Speaker.

I hope my colleagues will not mind my speaking from this microphone, but there are very good reasons for it. First, the whip emeritus has the other microphone that I might speak from. We are glad to see the gentleman from Illinois here again. And it is a great honor and privilege for us to yield our position in the well to the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Javits. So with your permission, I will speak from this position.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second year in a row I have had the honor of standing in for our distinguished Republican leader, BOB MICHEL, as we honor former Members.

I guess this makes me the first official designated greeter in the history of the House.

But I am glad to once more have this chance to greet good friends and former colleagues.

It occurs to me that this distinction between current and former Members is an artificial one.

After all, what is a current Member, but a former Member waiting to happen?

Thinking of things in that way helps to put matters in proper perspective.

I know I speak for all our Members when I say yours is a praiseworthy and admirable group. Belonging to it must be quite an honor.

But in this election year, I am reminded of the prayer of the young man who was troubled by temptations of the flesh.

"Lord," he prayed, "make me good—but not just right now."

And that, I guess is our prayer as present sitting Members of the House: make me a Member of this illustrious group—but not this year, please.

In preparing for these remarks, I read what I had said last year. And I noted I had mentioned our friend and former colleague, Walter Flowers. His untimely death since then leaves us all with a feeling of sadness.

His passing reminds us of the richness of experience, the vast resources of knowledge, the unparalleled collection of legislative skills your group represents.

It is sad to lose any of these.

So it is good for the Congress and good for the country that you are willing to share all of this with us. It is good to know that once a year we renew our acquaintances, remember old times and, most important, refresh our institutional memory.

Speaking for myself, each time I meet with you, I get a clearer picture of the continuity and sense of tradition that characterizes this House.

As I suggested, there are no dividing lines around here—present and former Members all belong to the same legislative family.

We all revere Members who did so much for America before we came here.

And we all look forward to helping our country, whether we are a present or former Member. There is no statute of limitations on patriotism—or ability.

And so, whether we look backward in nostalgia or forward in hope, present and former Members are united in loving this country.

Partisanship fades away when the essential things are at stake. It is good to see so many of our legislative family here, united by love of country instead of divided by party labels. We can all learn something from this.

So, once again, it is an honor for this "designated greeter" to say: Welcome back—it is good to be together at this annual family reunion.

□ 1220

The SPEAKER. The other evening I by chance ran into Tom Kleppe, a former Member of the Congress, and Tom said, "I remember the day I walked up to you, TIP, and introduced myself. I said, 'I am Tom Kleppe of Dakota. I am a Republican.' We mutually shook hands and you said, 'In the House, in Congress, there are two groups, the good fellows and the other fellows. Tom, that is the way we divide them. We don't divide them by a middle aisle.' "

I just came back from visiting five countries in Europe and Africa, and it is very interesting that as you meet the leaders, the majority will be in one section of the room and the minority in the other section, and they hardly speak to each other. They do not understand how SIL CONTE and his wife can be so friendly with Millie and me even though we are on opposite sides of the aisle, or, when we are out traveling, how BOB MICHEL and I can play a game of golf on Saturday, or with Jerry Ford in the past, how we can be so friendly and yet have so many tough political debates along the line.

One of my closest and dearest friends in my 30-odd years in the Congress of the United States is a gentleman who came in with me. We had many an argument and many a great debate. We were always the closest of friends, and still are. For many years he had his eye on my seat.

Well, the interesting fact is that I have to go to a press conference now, and I would be delighted if that gentleman would step forward and be the acting Speaker while I go to the press conference.

John Rhodes, will you please come up here and take the gavel?

After having his eye on this seat for so many years, he now has the opportunity to place something else on it.

Mr. RHODES (presiding). The Chair now recognizes the great former Senator from the State of Utah, Frank Moss.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, you seem to fit the Chair very well. I am delighted, of course, to be here with all of our Members and prospective Members of the Former Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is a moving experience for all of us to be back in the Capitol where we have spent so much time and where so much of importance to our Nation's history, and the welfare of our people, has occurred. We are deeply honored that you and all the Members who are on the floor this morning are sharing this occasion with us. We are grateful to you and Congressman MICHEL, the minority

leader, for making this visit possible, to make our annual report to Congress as required by our Federal charter. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is a bipartisan, nonprofit, educational, research, and social organization. Called together 14 years ago by our foresighted cofounders, Dr. Walter H. Judd, who is here with us today, and the late Brooks Hays, we have grown to a membership of some 600 strong. Each of us has served in either the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives, and some have served in both.

When Congress granted a Federal charter to the association it officially approved our purpose which is:

To promote the cause of representative government by improving understanding of the Congress as an institution and of democracy as a system of public life.

Mindful of its responsibilities, the association is impeccably bipartisan, selecting one-half of our board of directors from our Republican members and one-half from our Democratic members. We also balance our officers between the approximately 500 former House Members and the 100 former Senators who form the association.

Our backgrounds are as varied as those of the present Members of Congress. We come from the far-flung places across the country which we represented. Many of us are now active in business, professional, or other pursuits of life, but we continue to have one interest in common: The pursuits of ways to be of service to the working and the spirit of the institutions of a free society. We have discovered that, by working together, we provide a human resource of our Nation that can build on the successes of previous years of service and contribute to the future of our country in a growing number of meaningful ways.

VISITOR HOSTS

For example, I am very happy to announce that, with your encouragement and that of Foreign Policy Committee leaders in the Congress, we are about to expand our association activities to include a liaison service in this country for the members of foreign parliaments and other foreign dignitaries who visit the United States. This service of our association, as combined protocol and surrogate host, is being funded by a 2-year grant of $135,250 from the Ford Foundation. Our association agrees to assure an adequate welcome and appropriate introduction to Congressmen and to executive branch leaders, whom these important visitors wish to see. We intend it also to be a genuine service to the U.S. Congress in assuring that its Members have access to those visitors who are of particular interest to them, whether because of country of origin, subject expertise, or for any other reason.

FELLOWS PROGRAM

I am pleased to report, and I know the Congress will be happy to learn, that our congressional fellows program is growing in scope and content. This program makes available congressional alumni to visit college and university campuses throughout the Nation. Initiated over 6 years ago, the program is being enthusiastically received by students and faculty alike, as evidenced by the reviews that come back to us.

The congressional fellow is selected by each college or university from a register of nearly 300 volunteers of former Members of Congress. Our only restriction—to insure maximum objectivity—is that a fellow will not be sent to a campus in the same State he or she represented in the Congress.

Each fellow spends 3 to 5 days on a campus, talking to students about representative government and how the Congress actually functions.

In most instances he or she is housed on campus and thus is totally identified with the students. Given our reservoir of practical experience and expertise, former members are especially well-qualified to interpret the Congress as an institution. And, freed from the burden of office, we can address issues with detachment and with the advantages of both insight and hindsight.

Former Congresswoman Martha Keys, a colleague from Kansas and a former Assistant Secretary of Education, is the able director of the program. Visits have now been completed to 157 campuses in 48 States, under continuing support from foundations such as the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Moreover, with a planning grant from the Carnegie Corp. of New York, we are undertaking a pilot project of having related visits of four different congressional fellows integrated into a single academic course next fall at the Atlanta University Center, five-college consortium. If successful as an academic innovation, this pattern may later be extended to other areas.

INTERNATIONAL FELLOWS

Last year our then president, Charles E. Chamberlain, told you of our initiating an international campus fellows program with a grant from the Ford Foundation which brought two former Parliamentarians—Alan Lee Williams of the United Kingdom and Georg Kahn-Ackermann of the Federal Republic of Germany—to participate in seminars at 11 of our colleges from coast-to-coast.

Since then, former Minister Alastair Gillespie of Canada and Dr. Jacques Soustelle of France have visited nine campuses in our country. During the coming academic year, with support from the Rockefeller Foundation, we will be programing an additional four Parliamentarians from other democracies to meet with American college students, faculty, and townspeople.

Obviously, such distinguished visitors provide a resource heretofore unknown on many of our smaller campuses and contribute to a greater understanding among students, faculty, and local communities of the political, economic, and cultural realities of other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a list of the colleges and universities visited by our U.S. congressional fellows together with the names of the former Members who were fellows at these campuses. I believe it would be of great interest to the Members of Congress, many of whose States and districts are reflected in this list. I ask your kind permission to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and to include also some of the comments we have received from these campuses as well as list of the sponsors whose donations have made all of our work possible.

STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICY

Another area of activity in which we are engaged is a study of a subject of great and continuing importance to the safety of our country. It was initiated by our colleague and active association member, former President and former Congressman, Gerald R. Ford, out of his experience at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, and it is directed to the subject: "The Presidency, the Executive Branch and the Congress in Foreign Policy." Under the joint sponsorship of our association and the Atlantic Council, 11 leading authorities are now completing papers or chapters on different aspects of the subject which are being critiqued by distinguished leaders of both the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government, which includes several of the members of our association. We look forward to publication of these papers in a book to be made available at the beginning of 1985.

Also, work has begun on another book, plans for which were reported here last year. This is the comparative study of the functioning of the Bundestag and of the Congress, being conducted under the direction of Dr. R. Gerald Livingston. We hope to publish it in the languages of both countries, as we did with our comparative study of the Japanese Diet and the U.S. Congress. Copies of the Japanese study were made available to the Members of Congress, and so will be the German book. The Bundestag-Congress study is being supported by funding from a variety of sources, including a grant of 98,000 deutschemarks from the German Ministry of Research and Technology as well as

support from the U.S. National Endowment for the Humanities.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE VISITS

The calls upon us for international activity are increasing very rapidly, as we receive requests from both governmental and private institutions here and abroad to conduct or help facilitate exchanges. Many of these are in relation to the successor generation legislators and government leaders. The association is becoming a major instrument of transmission of knowledge and democratic values, not only to young people on campuses and elsewhere in our own country, but also to younger legislators and other political leaders around the world.

We are very happy and highly honored to have in the Chamber on this occasion a number of colleagues who have been Members of the Italian Parliament. Also, we have with us a representative of our counterpart association in the Federal Republic of Germany. The number of counterpart associations like ours is growing and the interaction with them is developing very fruitfully. The Italian and German associations are now part of a network of seven such associations in Western Europe, including Austria, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Following visits to Brazil during this past year by Bob Griffin of Michigan, Bill Mailliard of California, Gale McGee of Wyoming, and myself, a Brazilian former parliamentarians association has been formed with several hundred members and is beginning its work from offices in their national congress building. And a resurgent association is now becoming active again in the new Argentine democracy, opens the possibility of an early formation of a Latin-American network of such associations.

Each of our sister associations is developing its program in accordance with its members' perceptions of the needs and opportunities in their own country. However, all are finding, as we have found, that they can have a successful and creative role in establishing links between sitting legislators and other active leaders in the democratic world. We, for example, are hosting, this month, our second major conference in Salzburg, Austria, between a bipartisan delegation of younger Members of the Congress of the United States and a multipartisan delegation of younger members of the German Bundestag. This year's important topic is: "German and American Perceptions of the Soviet Union." Scheduled for the Memorial day weekend, this conference is being supported by the German Marshall Fund of the United States, among others: and will include the participation not only of distinguished sitting Members of the Congress and Bundestag, but also of leading academic, military, and administration experts from both countries.

STUDY TOURS

This week, a study tour by some of our own associstion members, to the United Kingdom will include participation in the dedication of new Grosvenor Gates across from the American Embassy in London erected to commemorate the bicentennial of the Treaty of Paris. We will then attend a meeting in Westminster Hall with members of the British-American Parliamentary group and participate in the first international meeting of the new British association of former members of Parliament. Previous study tours of our association have been made to Australia and New Zealand, to China, to the Middle East and to Western Europe. And plans are now underway for a second study tour to the Soviet Union. All of these study tours are made at the personal expense of the members who go on the tour.

JAPANESE STUDIES

Additionally, we are continuing our programs with our counterparts in Japan. Following a series of successful seminars at the East-West Center in Hawaii, we are preparing for a bilateral conference next February to assess how the United States and Japan are meeting the problems of demographic and social changes associated with what has been called our graying society. Experts in both countries have begun to focus on the implications of ever larger proportions of senior citizens in the industrial countries, and to weigh the social problems inherent in this fact. If we are to handle these problems humanely and constructively, it is important that we share each other's experience and insights. Thanks to the financial support of the Carnegie Corp. Aging Society Project and the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, this process of communication has begun.

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTED MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker, at this moment of celebration of the growths and vigor of our representative institutions and of the continuing role being played by former Members of Congress, it is fitting that we pay tribute to our colleagues who have passed away since our last meeting in this Chamber. They served their country, they enriched the lives of all of us, they will be sorely missed. I sadly call the role:

Lindley Beckworth, Texas;
Reva Beck Bosone, Utah;
John A. Carroll, Colorado;
Frank Church, Idaho;
Joe L. Evins, Tennessee;
Walter Flowers, Alabama;
Aaron Ford, Mississippi;
James P. Geelan, Connecticut;
Robert K. Goodwin, Iowa;
Walter B. Huber, Iowa;
J. Oliva Huot, New Hampshire;
Len B. Jordan, Idaho;
William E. Miller, New York;
Will Rogers, Oklahoma;
Don L. Short, North Dakota;
Anthony F. Tauriello, New York; and
Herbert B. Warburton, Delaware.

□ 1240

I know you would like to have a moment of reflection.

Mr. RHODES. May we rise for a moment of silence in memory of our departed colleagues.

(The Members rose for a moment of silence.)

Mr. MOSS. I thank you.

Now I want to talk about distinguished service. I am sure that our departed colleagues would take equal pleasure with us in what is now my happy task of making a very special presentation. Each year our board of directors selects a person who best exemplified the spirit of the Congress and honors that person because he or she has honored our country by distinguished legislative service. We alternate these awards between the parties, and it is testimony to the vitality and genius of our system that each of our parties provides many outstanding persons who have made great contributions to the legislative process.

The selection is often difficult because many are worthy. This year's honoree stands out.

I am personally delighted and we are all honored that the recipient of this year's Distinguished Service Award is with us today. He served in the House of Representatives from 1947 to December 1954, and in the Senate from 1957 to 1981 where I had the opportunity and occasion to admire his patriotism, selflessness, and creativity in the national interest. A brilliant mind, total integrity of purpose, and tenacity of commitment marked the service of Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York in the Congress of the United States. His efforts inspire all of us who know him and are a beacon to those who will follow us.

His devotion to the well-being and safety of his countrymen consumed his energies in the swiftly passing legislative years. His service brought honor to our country.

Today, despite physical limitations, he continues to make a contribution to our national life.

It gives me great honor and pleasure to present our 1984 Distinguished Legislative Service Award to Senator Javits. [Applause.]

I also might explain I have two looseleaf books full of letters to Senator Javits that have been written by his colleagues from the House and from the Senate, and I know he will enjoy reading those. It is going to take you several evenings, Jake. There are quite a few of them there.

I asked Senator Javits if he could not respond briefly from his chair, and I think he will do that.

Mr. RHODES. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you very much, president of the association to which I belong, Ted Moss. My thanks to the Speaker, my thanks to the majority and minority leaders of the House and to the whip on the Republican side who stood in for BOB MICHEL. I think it is a great privilege to sit here.

Thirty years ago was my last appearance in this body, and if veteran status rates awards, I certainly have it, having spent, as Ted has said, 8 years here and 24 in the Senate.

I am very grateful to the association. It brings tears to my eyes to hear the rollcall which is so solemn because so many names are recorded and will be recorded in the history of our country, and then to hear the roll of those that are passed away, some names very surprising to me, with whom I have been associated in my legislative life, and there must be to all of you.

If I may, and I will not be long. In the spirit of this award which I deeply treasure, and my children will, and their children after them, I express great pleasure, satisfaction for my family and myself to the president, Ted Moss, to Glenn Beall, the vice president, and to my dear friend, fellow New Yorker, John Lindsay, who first apprised me of this honor. And I have heard a record of extraordinarily gifted work being done by the association, as is properly called for by the dedication its members have shown to the public service, and by its own desire, as members who are determined, as I am, notwithstanding difficulties, to persevere in their service to what our country still represents to the world in its status as the only nation as yet truly dedicated to freedom and justice, notwithstanding its mistakes.

I have been inspired throughout my career by the accomplishments, the traditions, and the sacrifice represented by what I understand to be something over 10,000 men and women who served our country in this body.

I have always been inspired by three precepts. Lincoln's dictum that a government should do for the people only what they cannot do at all or as well for themselves; and in the division between the Federal Government and the States Nelson Rockefeller's dictum that States rights also means States responsibilities; and my own principle that the Federal Government makes every person a citizen of that Government with rights and responsibilities, and that also it protects the citizen in the exercise of his rights and the discharge of his responsibilities as a citizen of a State.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have experienced in my own career here what it meant and what were its high points, and it may be helpful to those who now exercise these great responsibilities and of interest to the former Members like yourselves to let me enumerate them very briefly.

In my own career I had two collegiate duties and two legislative successes of significance. Collegiately, I have always been loyal and proud to sustain the authority and to advance the prestige of the House in which I served. I was a man of the House in this Chamber, and I was a Senator, a Senate man for years and years in the Senate. And so I tried to forge, formulize, what were not only solutions for issues in which I was involved but which also served my Senate colleagues in their effort to solve issues in which they were involved.

Second, and very importantly, I was very jealous and very vigilant that the conduct of our Members and their interpretations of their public responsibility brought honor, not disgrace, to the Senate or the House, as the case may be. And I was deeply gratified that JAKE GARN of Utah and MAC MATHIAS of Maryland and PAUL SARBANES of Maryland came to join us this morning.

Finally, of the major legislation in which I was involved, two stood out which I hope will be pursued by those who will follow us. One is the Employees' Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 which protects the private pensions of 60 million American workers. Those pension funds now have resources of $900 billion and it is expected by 1999 and into the next century that those funds will control 50 percent of the voting power in American private business. And thus we may be approaching not only the success of our political democracy, but perhaps of a new economic democracy as well.

And the other piece of legislation which is a sacred trust in the hands of the Congress is the War Powers Resolution of 1973. This for the first time in 200 years legislates the sharing of the awesome power to use force as an instrument of policy between the Congess and the President.

My colleagues, unless the Congress stands up and fights for this power, peace is far more imperiled than it otherwise would be.

This law is a method by which the twilight zone that has allowed Presidents to put us into war may be pierced with some light. We have all served here. Presidents are no greater geniuses than we are. And this power is so awesome that it must be shared. And I hope that the Members of Congress who are there now will not be intimidated by the Presidents who think they know better or know more.

Having served here for 32 years, I can tell you that is baloney. We know as much as they do, or if we do not we can easily find out if we want to work at it. And let us remember that we in the Congress represented and those who are here now represent the people who die and the people who pay.

So let us not be bashful about asserting an equal authority as the Constitution intended.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my gratitude for this gift, this award, which epitomizes my services, which is very deep to the Nation, equaled only by my gratitude to the people of the State of New York who gave me for so long the opportunity to serve here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause.]

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed today a demonstration of courage and determination exemplified by our colleague, Jake Javits, and we have partaken again of some of the brilliance of that mind and that tongue that spoke so eloquently in this Chamber and the Chamber on the other side of the Capitol over those years.

We admire you and love you, Jake. Thank you. [Applause.]

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, one final pleasure will conclude this 1984 report to the Congress by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. And that is to announce the passing of the mantle of leadership of our association, as is our practice every year. Our president-elect and I served together in the Senate of the United States in friendship and mutual respect despite what I may call our occasional partisan difference.

Senator Glenn Beall of Maryland, who served in both Houses of the Congress will officially take office in July and be our leader for the next 12 months. I can assure him—as he must already know—that he will have the support of all the members of our association, such as John Lindsay, where he sits right now. John Lindsay of New York is chairman of our finance committee and we salute him.

He also, the new incoming president, will have the services of a skilled and devoted staff, including our executive director, Jed Johnson, himself a former Member of Congress. And our faithful secretary manager, Dorothy Bageant.

When it becomes Senator Beall's turn next year to announce the name of the successor to this office, I hope and trust that he will be able to do it with the same affection and confidence with which I now turn to him.

Senator Beall, would you rise? [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this concludes our annual report to the Congress. We thank you and every Member of both bodies. The welfare of our country and, in a large degree, of the world, is

in your hands. We support you in the faithful discharge of your responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES VISITED UNDER THE CONGRESSIONAL ALUMNI CAMPUS FELLOWS PROGRAM

College, university, State, and fellow	State
Alaska Pacific University, Alaska: William S. Mailliard	California.
Albion College, Michigan: David S. King	Utah.
Albion College, Michigan: Ted Kupferman	New York.
Albion College, Michigan: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Alfred University, New York: Frank E. Moss	Utah.
Arizona State University, Arizona: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Arizona State University, Arizona: Jacques Soustelle	France.[1]
Assumption College, Massachusetts: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Auburn University, Alabama: William L. Hungate	Missouri.
Bainbridge Junior College, Georgia: Gilbert Gude	Maryland.
Baylor University, Texas: James Roosevelt	California.
Bradley University, Illinois: Charles W. Whalen, Jr	Ohio.
Brandeis University, Massachusetts: Abner J. Mikva	Illinois.
Brandeis University, Massachusetts: L. Richardson Preyer	North Carolina.
Brigham Young University, Utah: James Soustelle	France.[1]
California Poly State, California: Frank E. Evans	Colorado.
Cameron University, Oklahoma: William L. Hungate	Missouri.
Cameron University, Oklahoma: Dick Clark	Iowa.
Carleton College, Minnesota: William S. Mailliard	California.
Carroll College, Montana: Ralph W. Yarborough	Texas.
Chaminade College, Hawaii: Catherine M. Bedell	Washington.
Chatham College, Pennsylvania: Catherine M. Bedell	Washington.
Chatham College, Pennsylvania: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Colgate University, New York: William S. Mailliard	California.
College of the Seguoias, California: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Colorado State University, Colorado: Alastair Gillespie	Canada.[1]
Columbia College, South Carolina: Catherine M. Bedell	Washington.
Concordia College, Michigan: Walter H. Moeller	Ohio.
Connecticut College, Connecticut: Ralph W. Yarborough	Oklahoma.
Converse College, South Carolina: Jed Johnson, Jr	Oklahoma.
Dartmouth College, New Hampshire: John O. Marsh, Jr	Virginia.
Dartmouth College, New Hampshire: William S. Mailliard	California.
Davis & Elkins College, West Virginia: J. Glenn Beall, Jr.	Maryland.
Davis & Elkins College, West Virginia: Frank E. Moss	Utah.
Denison University, Ohio: Frank E. Moss	Utah.
DePauw University, Indiana: Hugh Scott	Pennsylvania.
Dillard University, Louisiana: Georg Kahn-Ackermann	Germany.[1]
Duke University, North Carolina: Georg Kahn-Ackermann	Germany.[1]
Eckerd College, Florida: William L. Hungate	Missouri.
Elmira College, New York: Charles W. Whalen, Jr	Ohio.
Friends University, Kansas: Henry P. Smith III	New York.
Furman University, South Carolina: Jed Johnson, Jr	Oklahoma.
Grinnell College, Iowa: Neil Staebler	Michigan.
Guilford College, North Carolina: Gale W. Mc Gee	Wyoming.
Gustavus Adolphus College, Minnesota: Charles W. Whalen, Jr.	Ohio.
Hamilton College, New York: William S. Mailliard	California.
Hartwick College, New York: Ralph W. Yarborough	Texas.
Hiram College, Ohio: Howard H. Callaway	Georgia.
Hiram College, Ohio: Roman L. Hruska	Nebraska.
Hope College, Michigan: Walter H. Judd	Minnesota.
Hope College, Michigan: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Hope College, Michigan: Catherine M. Bedell	Washington.
Idaho State University, Idaho: John R. Schmidhauser	Iowa.
Indiana State University, Indiana: Gordon Allott	Colorado.
Indiana Univ. Northwest, Indiana: Neil Staebler	Michigan.
Jackson State University, Mississippi: Allard K. Lowenstein	New York.
Johns Hopkins University, Maryland: Hugh Scott	Pennsylvania.
Kansas-Newman College, Kansas: Henry P. Smith III	New York.
Kansas State University, Kansas: Paul N. McCloskey, Jr	California.
King College, Tennessee: Charles W. Whalen, Jr	Ohio.
King's College, Pennsylvania: Philip Hayes	Indiana.
Kirkland College, New York: William S. Mailliard	California.
LaGrange College, Georgia: Ralph W. Yarborough	Texas.
Lake Forest College, Illinois: Ralph W. Yarborough	Texas.
Lindenwood College, Missouri: Gaylord Nelson	Wisconsin.
Longwood College, Virginia: Paul W. Cronin	Massachusetts.
Luther College, Iowa: Gilbert Gude	Maryland.
McNeese University, Louisiana: William S. Mailliard	California.
Marshall University, West Virginia: John J. Gilligan	Ohio.
Mary Hardin Baylor, Texas: Brooks Hays	Arkansas.
Matanuska-Susitna Community College, Alaska: William L. Hungate.	Missouri.
Meas Community College, Arizona: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Miami University-Middletown, Ohio: James Roosevelt	California.
Miami University-Middletown, Ohio: James W. Symington	Missouri.
Mid-America Nazarene, Kansas: John Dellenbeck	Oregon.
Millsaps College, Mississippi: Allard K. Lowenstein	New York.
Montclair State College, New Jersey: Walter H. Judd	Minnesota.
Montclair State College, New Jersey: Ralph W. Yarborough	Texas.
Mount Vernon College, District of Columbia: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Murray State University, Kentucky: Brooks Hays	Arkansas.
Northern Ill. University, Illinois: William L. Hungate	Missouri.
Northern Kentucky University, Kentucky: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma: Ralph W. Yarborough	Texas.
Oregon State University, Oregon: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Otterbein College, Ohio: James Roosevelt	California.
Randolph-Macon College, Virginia: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Randolph-Macon College, Virginia: Hugh Scott	Pennsylvania.
Rose Hulman Institute of Technology, Indiana: Gordon L. Allott.	Colorado.
St. Cloud State University, Minnesota: Charles W. Whalen, Jr	Ohio.
St. Lawrence University, New York: Roman L. Pucinski	Illinois.
St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana: Gordon L. Allott	Colorado.
St. Mary's College, Indiana: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
St. Michael's College, Vermont: Walter H. Judd	Minnesota.
St. Norbert's College, Wisconsin: Martha Keys	Kansas.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES VISITED UNDER THE CONGRESSIONAL ALUMNI CAMPUS FELLOWS PROGRAM—Continued

College, university, State, and fellow	State
St. Olaf College, Minnesota: William S. Mailliard	California.
Salem College, North Carolina: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Sangamon State University, Illinois: Andrew J. Biemiller	Wisconsin.
Sangamon State University, Illinois: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Sangamon State University, Illinois: Alan Lee Williams	Great Britain.[1]
Sangamon State University, Illinois: Alastair Gillespie	Canada.[1]
Siena College, New York: Frank E. Moss	Utah.
Southeast Community College, Kentucky: Donald E. Lukens	Ohio.
Southwestern College, Kansas: Henry P. Smith III	New York.
SUNY-Binghamton, New York: John B. Anderson	Illinois.
SUNY-Plattsburg, New York: Richardson Preyer	North Carolina.
State University of Oswego, New York: Martha Keys	Kansas.
Syracuse University, New York: Charles W. Whalen, Jr	Ohio.
Talladega College, Alabama: Ted Kupferman	New York.
Tougaloo Southern Christian College, Mississippi: Allard K. Lowenstein.	New York.
Transylvania University, Kentucky: James M. Quigley	Pennsylvania.
U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado: Alan Lee Williams	Great Britain.[1]
U.S. Coast Guard Academy, Connecticut: Ralph W. Yarborough.	Texas.
U.S. Naval Academy, Maryland: John S. Monagan	Connecticut.
U.S. Naval Academy, Maryland: William S. Maillard	California.
University of Alaska, Alaska: William S. Mailliard	California.
University of Alaska-Anchorage, Alaska: William L. Hungate	Missouri.
University of Arkansas, Arkansas: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
University of Arkansas-Monticello, Arkansas: Frank E. Moss	Utah.
University of Delaware, Delaware: John J. Gilligan	Ohio.
University of Delaware, Delaware: Henry S. Reuss	Wisconsin.
University of California-Berkeley, California: Henry S. Reuss	Wisconsin.
University of California-Berkeley, California: Newton I. Steers, Jr.	Maryland.
University of Georgia, Georgia: Georg Kahn-Ackermann	Germany.[1]
University of Georgia, Georgia: Otis Pike	New York.
University of Nevada, Nevada: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
University of New Mexico, New Mexico: Alastair Gillespie	Canada.[1]
University of New Orleans, Louisiana: Georg Kahn-Ackermann	Germany.[1]
University of New Orleans, Louisiana: Jacques Soustelle	France.[1]
University of North Dakota, North Dakota: Neil Staebler	Michigan.
University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma: Catherine M. Bedell	Washington.
University of Oregon, Oregon: Martha Keys	Kansas.
University of Redlands, California: Catherine M. Bedell	Washington.
University of South Carolina, South Carolina: Alan Lee Williams.	Great Britain.[1]
University of South Carolina, South Carolina: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
University of South Dakota, South Dakota: William L. Hungate.	Missouri.
University of Texas, Texas: Alastair Gillespie	Canada.[1]
University of Utah, Utah: Robert N. Giaimo	Connecticut.
University of Utah, Utah: Jacques Soustelle	France.[1]
University of Utah, Utah: Alan Lee Williams	Great Britain.[1]
University of Washington, Washington: Alan Lee Williams	Great Britain.[1]
University of West Virginia, West Virginia: Georg Kahn-Ackermann.	Germany.[1]
University of West Virginia, West Virginia: Jacques Soustelle	France.[1]
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Georg Kahn-Ackermann.	Germany.[1]
University of Wyoming, Wyoming: Frank E. Moss	Utah.
Urbana College, Ohio: David S. King	Utah.
Vanderbilt University, Tennessee: Ralph W. Yarborough	Texas.
Virginia Military Institution, Virginia: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Wake Forest University, North Carolina: William L. Hungate	Missouri.
Wake Forest University, North Carolina: Georg Kahn-Ackermann.	Germany.[1]
Washington & Lee University, Virginia: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Wayne State College, Nebraska: Gale W. McGee	Wyoming.
Westmont College, California: Ronald A. Sarasin	Connecticut.
Wheaton College, Massachusetts: Charles A. Vanik	Ohio.
Whitman College, Washington: Frank E. Moss	Utah.
William & Mary College, Virginia: Hugh Scott	Pennsylvania.

[1] Pilot project funded by the Ford Foundation for visit of former Member of the British Parliament, former Member of the German Bundestag, former Member of the French Parliament, and former Member of the Canadian Parliament.

SAMPLE COMMENTS ON 1983 CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWS PROGRAM

"Faculty and students in both the Political Science Department and the Graduate School of Public Policy appreciated his (Henry Reuss) willingness to spend several days participating in our programs, and found his insights and views on current political and economic issues quite interesting. . . . Most of his time was spent speaking to students in public policy or political science classes, ranging from a graduate seminar to various undergraduate classes including a large freshman lecture course. He also met with several advanced doctoral students currently writing dissertations on such topics as bank deregulation and the federal budget process. . . . In sum, the three day visit of a former member of Congress was quite full and very informative for all participants."—Beverly Russell, Associate Dean, Graduate School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley, California, March 3, 1983.

"Just a note to say thank you again, and to tell you that Frank Evans' visit to our campus was thoroughly successful. Indeed, it is the best experience our department has ever had with a guest speaker. . . . He was candid, cooperative, accessible, and a very good sport. He did everything we asked of him, and with style and grace."—Carroll R. McKibbin, Department of Political Science, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, California, March 9, 1983.

"We have just concluded with our visit from Mr. (Gilbert) Gude and I wanted to report that it all went superbly. . . . Mr. Gude got on quite well with our students and they thoroughly enjoyed meeting him both in and outside of class. . . . It was just a wonderful week. . . . We are glad to have been part of this excellent program."—Robert Thompson, Assistant Professor of Political, Science, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, March, 21, 1983.

"There was a resoundingly positive reaction on the part of both students and faculty who met with Senator (Frank) Moss. . . . Students found Senator Moss' classroom visits interesting, informative and a valuable experience that enhanced the course subject matter. . . . Faculty members that I have spoken to informally uniformly praised Senator Moss' campus visit. They found him to be not only insightful but also quite gregarious and approachable. I would state that Siena's experience with the program was an unqualified success and we are greatly appreciative of having had the opportunity to participate in it."—Leon Halpert, Department of Political Science, Siena College, Loudonville, New York, April 15, 1983.

"Otis Pike did a wonderful job for us here. I'm afraid we overscheduled him a bit, but he was charming throughout. We all learned a great deal from him, and we thank you very much for the opportunity. I hope we may continue this program in the future."—Loch K. Johnson, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, April 20, 1983.

"An excellent visiting scholar and a wonderful person. Mrs. Bedell is a walking human encyclopedia (respectfully). She has so much knowledge to impart and does a very good job of leading group discussions. Her approach in the seminar induced thought and analysis. . . . To see a teacher-scholar-person in action is quite special. . . . There is no substitute for "seeing" the American political system at its best "in person."—J. Clayton Feavor, Director, Scholar-Leadership, Enrichment Program, The University of Oklahoma, March 28, 1984.

ASSOCIATION SPONSORS

PATRONS [1]

Ford Foundation.
German Marshall Fund of the United States.
Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.
Lilly Endowment, Inc.
Charles Steward Mott Foundation.
National Endowment for the Humanities.
Rockefeller Foundation.

BENEFACTORS [2]

Anonymous Individual.

[1] Patrons have contributed at least $50,000.

[2] Benefactors have contributed between $10,000 and $50,000.

Anonymous Private Foundation.
Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.
Carnegie Corporation of New York.
Exxon Education Foundation.
Hon. Charles K. Fletcher.
FMC Corporation Foundation.
Former Members of Congress Auxiliary.
Grand Street Boys' Foundation.
Flora and William Hewlett Foundation.
John Crain Kunkel Foundation.
Hon. William S. Mailliard.
Louise Taft Semple Foundation.
U.S. Department of State.
United Parcel Service Foundation.
United States Information Agency.
University of South Carolina, James F. Byrnes International Center.

SPONSORS [3]

Albion College.
AMAX Foundation, Inc.
American Brands, Inc.
American Income Life Insurance Company.
Ashland Oil Company.
Atlantic Council of the United States.
Baltimore Gas & Electric Company.
Battelle Memorial Institute.
Hon. J. Glenn Beall, Jr.
Beech Aircraft Corporation.
Black & Decker Manufacturing Company.
Hon. J. Caleb Boggs.
Hon. Charles B. Brownson.
Howard H. Callaway Foundation.
Castle & Cooke, Inc.
Hon. Elford A. Cederberg.
Hon. Charles E. Chamberlain.
Champion International Corporation.
Hon. and Mrs. Jeffery Cohelan.
Congressional Staff Directory, Ltd.
Mr. Ralph J. Cornell.
Exxon Company, U.S.A.
Federal National Mortgage Association.
Finance Factors Foundation.
Ford Motor Company Fund.
General Electric Foundation.
Hon. Robert A. Grant.
Gulf Oil Corporation.
Richard T. Hanna Family Fund.
Hon. Ralph R. Harding.
Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr.
Hartwick College.
Hon. Brooks Hays.
H. J. Heinz Charitable Trust.
Home Federal Savings & Loan Association.
Hon. William L. Hungate.
Hon. J. Edward Hutchinson.
I.B.M.
Institute of International Education.
International Harvester.
International Union of Operationing Engineers.
Mrs. Benjamin F. James.
Johnson Foundation.
Hon. Jed Johnson, Jr.
Hon. Walter H. Judd.
Mr. J. C. Kennedy.
Luther College.
Hon. Gale W. McGee.
Matanuska-Susinta Community College.
Hon. D. Bailey Merrill.
Miami University-Ohio.
Mid-American Nazarene College.
Hon. Chester L. Mize.
Mobil Oil Corporation.
Hon. John S. Monagan.
Hon. Frank E. Moss.
Mount Vernon College.
Mr. Richard Murphy.
National Association of Independent Insurers.
National Paint & Coating Association, Inc.
National Study Commission on Records and Documents.
Pacific Federal Savings & Loan Association.
Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company.
Pan-Pacific Community Association, Inc.
Hon. Shirley N. Pettis.
Hon. Otis Pike.
Pioneer Federal Savings & Loan Association.
Prudential Foundation.
Hon. James M. Quigley.
Hon. Ben Reifel.
Relief Foundation, Inc.
R. J. Reynolds Company.
Hon. Fred B. Rooney.
Salem College.
Sangamon State University.
Dr. Scholl Foundation.
Florence & John Schumann Foundation.
Hon. Hugh Scott.
G. D. Searle & Co.
Mrs. Kay Sheppard.
Hon. Carlton R. Sickles.
Siena College.
Hon. Henry P. Smith III
SmithKline Corporation.
Sperry Corporation.
Hon. William L. Springer.
St. Cloud University.
Sun Company, Inc.
SUNY-Binghamton.
TRW, Inc.
Florrie & Herbert Tenzer Philanthropic Fund.
Hon. Herbert Tenzer.
Hon. Lera Thomas.
The Tobacco Institute.
Hon. Andrew J. Transue.
Unilever United States, Inc.
U.S. Capitol Historical Society.
U.S.-Japan Foundation.
University of Alaska.
University of California-Berkeley.
University of Delaware.
University of Oklahoma Foundation, Inc.
University of Utah.
Mr. Francis R. Valeo.
Hon. Guy Vander Jagt.
Whalley Trust.
Mr. and Mrs. James Yao.
Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough.

[3] Sponsors have contributed $1,000 to $10,000.

Mr. RHODES (presiding). On behalf of the Members, I would like to thank the distinguished former Senator from Utah for his usually fine job and thank him for the report which he has made.

I personally want to thank the Speaker for doing me the honor of allowing me to occupy this chair on this occasion, when a former colleague for whom I have the greatest personal affection and admiration was honored. And during this time when I see so many faces out here who are dear to me in the past and whose memory I will also cherish.

I particularly want to thank TIP, but I also want to say to him that if he had given me a little more practice when I was a Member of this body I might have been a little more at ease in this chair than I was. He does not do that.

The program is ended. The next item on the program, of course, is luncheon, and I think you all know where and when. The Chair, on behalf of the Speaker, now announces that the House will continue in recess until approximately 1:15 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House continued in recess until 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

□ 1310

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE CHARTER OF AMVETS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4212) to amend the charter of AMVETS by extending eligibility for membership to individuals who qualify on or after May 8, 1975.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4212

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II", approved July 23, 1947 (36 U.S.C. 67c), is amended by striking out "and before May 8, 1975," and inserting in lieu thereof "and before the membership eligibility termination date,".

(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this section, the term 'membership eligibility termination date' means whichever of the following dates is the latest:

"(1) the date of the formal termination of World War II between the United States and Germany by a peace treaty between such countries,

"(2) the date of the cessation of the Korean conflict,

"(3) the date of the cessation of the Vietnam conflict, or

"(4) the date of the cessation of any subsequent armed conflict in which Armed Forces of the United States of America are engaged.

The dates under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall be such dates as determined by the Government of the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II", approved July 23, 1947 (36 U.S.C. 67e), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Eligibility for membership in AMVETS and the rights and privileges of

members shall, except as provided in this Act, be as provided in the constitution and bylaws of the organization, and terms of membership and requirements for holding office within the organization shall not be discriminatory on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.".

● Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, the bill amends the Federal charter of AMVETS allowing the organization to establish its membership criteria in its constitution and bylaws. The purpose and intent of the bill is to allow AMVETS to open its ranks of membership to those who have served in military service since May 7, 1975. The bill brings the eligibility requirements language in conformity with standard charter language previously approved by the House and negates the need for future congressional action in establishing AMVETS' membership requirements. In addition, it requires the terms of membership and requirements for holding office in the organization to be nondiscriminatory.

As has been evidenced by recent events involving the U.S. Armed Forces, the traditional distinction between wartime and peacetime military service has been substantially obliterated, entitling many honorably discharged service members to be recognized as members of AMVETS. However, due to the current membership limitations (36 U.S.C. 67e), those veterans are not eligible to join and participate in AMVETS.

The Committee on the Judiciary has concluded that the legislative relief contained in the amended bill is clearly merited. As with all recently granted Federal charters, the organization itself should have the ability to set its membership criteria in its constitution and bylaws. Accordingly, it is recommended that the amended bill be considered favorably.●

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2079) to amend the charter of AMVETS by extending eligibility for membership to individuals who qualify on or after May 8, 1975.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2079

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II", approved July 23, 1947 (36 U.S.C. 67e), is amended by striking out "and before May 8, 1975," and inserting in lieu thereof "and before the membership eligibility termination date,".

(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this section, the term 'membership eligibility termination date' means whichever of the following dates is the latest:

"(1) the date of the formal termination of World War II between the United States and Germany by a peace treaty between such countries,

"(2) the date of the cessation of the Korean conflict,

"(3) the date of the cessation of the Vietnam conflict, or

"(4) the date of the cessation of any subsequent armed conflict in which Armed Forces of the United States of America are engaged.

The dates under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall be such dates as determined by the Government of the United States.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SAM B. HALL, JR.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. moves to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 2079, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4212, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4212) was laid on the table.

□ 1320

AUDIT REQUIREMENTS OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3115) to relieve the General Accounting Office of duplicative audit requirements with respect to the Disabled American Veterans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3115

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War", approved June 17, 1932 (36 U.S.C. 90i), is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)", and

(2) by striking out subsection (b).

● Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 3115) would relieve the General Accounting Office of the responsibility to perform a second annual audit of the Disabled American Veterans' financial accounts, which are also audited annually by independent public accountants.

In 1967, Congress amended the Disabled American Veterans' Federal charter mandating that the General Accounting Office conduct an annual audit of the Disabled American Veterans' financial records. The Disabled American Veterans requested the amendment in order to comply with and meet a series of divergent State and municipal statutes and regulations which impacted upon its nationwide fundraising efforts. Since 1967, in addition to the GAO audit, the Disabled American Veterans' accounts have been audited annually by independent public accountants.

The bill is supported by the Disabled American Veterans and the General Accounting Office.

H.R. 3115 is consistent with the GAO recommendation in a report to Congress, dated October 15, 1981. GAO will continue to perform oversight each year by reviewing the Disabled American Veterans' financial statements and auditor's report as it does for all federally chartered organizations.

The committee favorably recommends H.R. 3115 to the House for its consideration.●

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1188) to relieve the General Accounting Office of duplicative audit requirements with respect to the Disabled American Veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War", approved June 17, 1932 (36 U.S.C. 90i), is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)"; and

(2) by striking out subsection (b).

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 3115) was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE ARMY AND NAVY UNION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2464) to recognize the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2464

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CHARTER

SECTION 1. The Army and Navy Union of the United States of America, organized and

incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

POWERS

SEC. 2. The Army and Navy Union of the United States of America (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation are those provided in its articles of incorporation and shall also be—

(a) to hold true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution, laws, and institutions;

(b) to serve our Nation under God in peace as well as in war by fostering the ideals of faith and patriotism, loyalty, justice, and liberty; by inculcating in the hearts of young and old, through precept and practice, the spirit of true Americanism; by participating in civic activities for the good of our country and our community;

(c) to unite in fraternal fellowship those who have served honorably and those who are now serving honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States of America; to protect and advance their civic, social, and economic welfare; to aid them in sickness and distress; to assist in the burial and commemoration of their dead; and to provide help for their widows and orphans; and

(d) to perpetuate the memory of patriotic deeds performed by the defenders of our country.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With repect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall insure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

(f) The corporation shall retain and maintain its status as a corporation organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio.

LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right to vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(Fifty-eight) Army and Navy Union of the United States of America"

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit required by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

TERMINATION

SEC. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall expire.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 7: Strike "(58)" and insert in lieu thereof "(62)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

● Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 2464, will grant a Federal charter to the Army and Navy Union of the United States. The Army and Navy Union is the oldest veterans' organization of its type in the United States. It was founded in 1886. Membership in this organization is not restricted to any specific form, date, branch, place, or nature of military service. The Army and Navy Union has been chartered in the State of Ohio since 1888.

The Army and Navy Union has 8,400 members in 10 States. The union is organized on the State and local level with national officers elected at an annual meeting. The Army and Navy Union is a service organization. Members volunteer to help veterans and their families by assisting with benefit applications, serving in Veterans' Administration hospitals, forming honor guards at funerals, and providing transportation and other assistance to widows and orphans of veterans. The Army and Navy Union has long worked for the establishment of equitable benefits for veterans. It remains a fraternal organization intent on the promotion of patriotism in our society.

This charter is identical in form to charters enacted by the House for other organizations during this Congress.

This charter will not interfere with the operation of State law governing this corporation. It will give the organization no legal standing beyond that which it already has pursuant to the Ohio charter, and specifically requires it to maintain its Ohio charter. This charter further prohibits the Army and Navy Union from claiming the approval of the Federal Government or Congress for any of its activities, and prohibits any lobbying or political activities. The bill subjects the corporation to strict accounting and reporting requirements, prohibits certain corporate practices, and requires that it maintain its tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to recognize the longstanding service of the Army and Navy Union of the United States.●

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House will today approve H.R. 2464, legislation I introduced to grant a Federal charter to the Army and Navy Union. I want to take this opportunity to express my personal thanks to Administrative Law Subcommittee chairman, SAM HALL, for the expeditious handling of the bill before his subcommittee, and to

my chairman, PETER RODINO, for accepting the bill in full committee.

Mr. Speaker, founded in 1886, the Army and Navy Union is the oldest veterans' organization of its type in the United States. It is the only veterans' organization in which membership is not limited to any specific form, date, branch, place, or nature of the military service performed.

Incorporated in Ohio in 1888, the Army and Navy Union is dedicated to the preservation of a free and independent United States, and to providing assistance to veterans and their dependents. Since its earliest days, the Army and Navy Union has worked for the enactment of equitable laws to provide pensions, medical care, and other benefits to veterans.

The Army and Navy Union is headed by a national commander and his staff. The national corps is administered by officers elected at an annual convention. Any member in good standing is eligible to hold any office in the Army and Navy Union. Each member State has its own State department, which administers the operations of the local posts, known as garrisons. Each State department has an annual encampment. Garrisons meet once a month, and garrison members elect their own officers and their delegates to the national encampment and the department encampment.

The Army and Navy Union currently has 8,400 members, with posts in 10 States, including Ohio, New York, Georgia, Indiana, and the District of Columbia. New posts will soon be founded in Pennsylvania and Florida.

Members of the union work on a volunteer basis performing services for veterans and their families. Members of the union serve as burial escorts and ceremonial honor guards at veterans' funerals. They perform charitable work at Veterans' Administration hospitals. Members also assist the families of deceased veterans in adjusting to their loss, by, for example, escorting widows to social security or VA offices and assisting them in obtaining any benefits to which they may be entitled.

The Army and Navy Union has a long and illustrious record of service to veterans and their dependents. Forty-one recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor, including Eddie Rickenbacker and Douglas MacArthur, have held membership in the Army and Navy Union. Other members include President William McKinley, Supreme Court Justice Harold Burton, and Senator Charles Dick of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, a Federal charter of the Army and Navy Union will provide this worthy organization with the recognition it deserves, and I am delighted it will be approved today.●

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bills just passed on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS AND GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD, and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 4, 1984.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit sealed envelopes received from The White House at 3:00 p.m. on Friday, May 4, 1984 as follows:

(1) Said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the 1983 Annual Report of the Federal Council on the Aging; and

(2) Said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a further extension of the fishery agreement between the U.S.A. and Poland.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF FISHERY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND POLAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 98-215)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-265; 16 USC 1801), I transmit herewith an exchange of Diplomatic Notes, together with the present agreement, extending the Governing International Fishery Agreement between the United States and Poland, signed at Washington on August 2, 1976, until December 31, 1985. The exchange of notes together with the present agreement constitute a Governing International Fishery Agreement within the requirements of Section 201(c) of the Act.

Several U.S. fishing interests have urged prompt consideration of this agreement. In view of the July 1 expiration date of the current agreement, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this extention at an early date.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1984.*

ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1983 OF FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 204(f) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, I hereby transmit the Annual Report for 1983 of the Federal Council on the Aging. The report reflects the Council's views in its role of examining programs serving older Americans.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1984.*

FOOD IRRADIATION

(Mr. MORRISON of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today, along with 20 other Members of the Congress, I am introducing a new bill aimed at promoting commercial development and consumer acceptance of food irradiation.

We have a hearing scheduled before one of the subcommittees of the House Committee on Agriculture this Wednesday looking at this new technology as a potential substitute for the use of ethylene dibromide. This new bill builds upon a prior measure intro-

duced last November and new Food and Drug Administration proposed regulations which were published in February.

Food irradiation is an exciting and innovative technique for preserving food commodities that can substitute for fumigants like EDG. It kills insects for quarantine treatment; it extends shelf life of all foods; it kills undesirable organisms like trichinosis in pork; it can facilitate development of new export markets; it could help mitigate world hunger; and it cannot make food radioactive.

My new bill defines radiation as a process, not an additive, but still applies FDA regulations to insure safety. It allows for leasing of source material to the private sector for a charge, with profits coming back to the U.S. Treasury. It also establishes a Joint Operating Commission for Food Irradiation which would coordinate and manage all research and development.

Mr. Speaker, this is an effort to find an appropriate balance, finding the least restrictive environment for developing a new technology while still providing every necessary element of consumer protection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after the legislative business of Tuesday, May 8, 1984.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK DIRECTORS ACT OF 1984

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5278) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to increase the number of class C directors of Federal Reserve banks.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5278

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Reserve Bank Directors Act of 1984".

ADDITIONAL DIRECTORS

SEC. 2. (a) The ninth undesignated paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 302 (first undesignated paragraph)) is amended by striking out "nine members" and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven members".

(b) The twelfth undesignated paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 302 (fourth undesignated paragraph)) is amended to read as follows:

"Class C shall consist of five members who shall be designated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. They shall be selected to represent the public, without discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. Such directors shall be selected with due but not exclusive consideration for the interests of agriculture, commerce, industry, services, labor, consumers, finance, and thrifts.".

(c) The fifteenth undesignated paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 303 (third undesignated paragraph)) is amended to read as follows:

"No director of class C shall be an officer, director, employee, or stockholder of any member bank. Not more than two directors of class C shall be officers or directors (or the holder of any other similar position), employees, or stockholders of any depository institution (as defined in section 19 of this Act) which is not a member of the Federal Reserve System.".

(d) The twentieth paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 305) is amended—

(1) in the third sentence, by inserting after "experience" the following: ", but shall not be an officer or director (or the holder of any other similar position), employee, or stockholder of any depository institution (as defined in section 19 of this Act),";

(2) in the sixth sentence, by inserting after "class C" the following: "who is not an officer or director (or the holder of any other similar position), employee, or stockholder of any depository institution (as defined in section 19 of this Act)"; and

(3) in the seventh sentence, by striking out "the third class C director" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the class C director with the longest tenure on the board who is not an officer or director (or the holder of any other similar position), employee, or stockholder of any depository institution (as defined in section 19 of this Act)".

(e) At the first meeting of the full board of directors of each Federal Reserve bank after the date of the enactment of this Act, each such board of directors—

(1) shall designate one of the new class C members authorized pursuant to the amendments made by this Act to a term of office which shall expire two years after the first of January nearest to the date of such meeting; and

(2) shall designate the other class C director authorized pursuant to the amendments made by this Act to a term of office which shall expire three years after such first of January.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.). Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PARRIS) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 5278, the Federal Reserve Directors Act of 1984. This is a simple, noncontroversial bill which enjoys full bipartisan support and which was reported by a voice vote of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs on April 10, 1984. It is, additionally, supported by the Federal Reserve and the various trade associations which represent institutions affected by the bill.

Simply stated, H.R. 5278 would increase the number of Federal Reserve district bank directors by two additional persons. Specifically, the boards of directors at each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks would increase from 9 to 11 members with an expansion of the current class C membership from 3 to 5. The bill would make no change in the numbers, terms, or responsibilities of the current class A or class B members. The class C category of members, which would be affected by this bill, are appointed by the Board of Governors in Washington to represent the public and specifically, the interest of industry, commerce, agriculture, services, labor, and consumers. The chairmen and deputy chairmen of the reserve banks are also chosen from this class.

The need for this legislation has arisen out of the fact that passage of the Monetary Control Act of 1980 brought savings and loans, savings banks, credit unions, and non-member commercial banks within the purview of the Federal Reserve System through the adoption of universal reserve requirements and the direct provision to them of Federal Reserve services such as check clearing, wire transfers, currency and coin, and access to the discount window. All of these are administered by the reserve banks under the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in Washington. Without an expansion in the size of the class C directors, there would be few opportunities for these nonmember depository institutions to have any voice in the operations of the Federal Reserve System which now directly affect them. It is expected that the Federal Reserve would normally undertake to appoint at least one class C director at each Federal Reserve bank who would represent nonmember depository institutions.

The bill would also enable the Federal Reserve to fulfill the mandate of the Public Law 95-188, adopted in 1977, which stipulated that members of the boards of directors of the reserve banks should be selected without discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. The intention was to assure greater and more proportionate representation of women and minority groups on the boards of these banks. However, since no changes were made in the number of directors, efforts to broaden representation have been hampered

by the limited number of positions available. The second seat created by the bill could therefore go to any person representing the interests of the public as already set forth in the law, that is: agriculture, commerce, industry, services, labor, and consumers, including small business and housing. It is expected that this second seat would generally be used to broaden the social and economic representativeness of the boards. In that connection, your committee also anticipates that increased efforts will be undertaken to appoint women and minorities.

Finally, I would simply note that in keeping with the existing law, persons selected to serve as the chairman or deputy chairman of the Federal Reserve district bank would continue to be barred from holding any interest in a depository institution.

The bill has no cost impact. Total additional exenditures which might be required under this bill by the Federal Reserve System are expected to total less than $100,000. Much of this expenditure would be recovered through the prices charged depository institutions by the Federal Reserve for services such as check clearing, currency and coin transportation, and wire transfers.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs support passage of H.R. 5278, a bill which was reported out of our committee on April 10 of this year with overwhelming bipartisan approval.

We endorse this legislation primarily because its enactment would enhance the opportunities for the appointment to the Federal Reserve district bank boards of additional directors with experience and ties to the thrift industry and other financial institutions that are presently not members of the Federal Reserve System and not represented on these boards. We feel that such representation is appropriate because these thrift and other nonmember financial institutions—particularly State-chartered commercial banks—have become subject to Federal Reserve regulation and reserve requirements under the Monetary Control Act of 1980. It is only reasonable, therefore, to afford them a measure of representation on these Federal district bank boards. I should add that it is most likely that the Federal Reserve System as a whole and its Board of Governors will benefit from the insights and suggestions of these additional directors on the governing bodies of district banks.

We Republicans see still another reason for endorsing the proposed legislation. Public Law 95-188, enacted in 1977, called for selection of bank directors on a nondiscriminatory basis. The addition of the two positions among the class C directors of each of the 12 district banks will speed up the process of including qualified directors drawn from the ranks of women and minorities. The enactment of this legislation, therefore, would further the clear intent of the Congress.

Finally, the bill has the support of those most involved—the thrift industry, commercial bankers, credit unions, and the Federal Reserve. We are not aware of significant reservations by other groups that might be affected by the legislation.

Accordingly, Republicans on the House Banking Committee urge favorable consideration by the full House of this proposed amendment to the Federal Reserve Act.

We have no further requests for time on this measure, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, while I join my colleagues on the Banking Committee in supporting H.R. 5278, the Federal Reserve Bank Directors Act of 1984, I still have concerns about the structure of the Federal Reserve Board. The bill has a valuable purpose in increasing the number and adding additionally qualified people as class C directors at each of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks. Regrettably, this Congress is not making much progress in making the Fed accountable in its overall operations.

An article on the front page of the Wall Street Journal today highlights the problem: "What's the Fed Up To? It's Still a Secret." I am worried that the Fed is now planning the next recession for the American people. According to testimony before the Banking Committee, the last recession that the Fed caused cost our country $1 trillion. We need to look at the way the Fed exercises the enormous powers they have and curtail those powers that are being abused. I would hope that we could pass more meaningful legislation than this very, very small step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RON PAUL, expressed his misgivings about this bill in his dissenting views contained in the committee report. Since he is not present today, I offer them for the RECORD at this point for inclusion with my remarks, as follows:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. RON PAUL

The Federal Reserve District Banks were originally conceived, in 1913, as regional clearinghouses. The Federal Reserve Act was supposed to be a compromise, promoted by the administration of Woodrow Wilson, to reduce the power of New York City banks over the financial system of the United States. The Nation was not going to have one government-run central bank but rather as many as 12, coordinated and regulated in the national interest by a Board of Governors in Washington.

Of course, exactly the opposite was achieved. Some have argued that the whole Federal Reserve plan was a gimmick to create a "bankers' bank" in New York to prevent any recurrence of the panic of 1907, which for about 6 months seriously affected the fortunes of some financial houses in New York. The disaster that followed the crash of the stock market in 1929, and affected the entire Nation for over a decade, should prove to anyone that the Federal Reserve Act was a huge historical error.

What function do the 12 District Banks serve today? If you believe the Federal Reserve System is somehow like a "representative government" in the financial sector of our economy, then you might advocate having a nice mixture of delegates—a few bankers, a few industrialists, a few retailers, some labor unions, and of course the fashionable, illiberal idea that the sex or race or religion of someone should be taken into account as a qualification for public office.

I cannot support this bill for the same reason I would not support a bill requiring the Capitol gardens to give equal representation to every variety of tulip. The gardens are nice, but they have nothing to do with representatives government—and the Federal Reserve District Banks have nothing to do with "financial government" in our monetary system. For all practical purposes, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington is an autocrat whom everyone fears.

It is tragic we have such an autocracy dominating a system of free-market capitalism, because it continually causes great economic turbulence. How many billions of dollars in the capital assets of our workers' pension funds were destroyed in the past 10 years by the Federal Reserve's inflationary and shifting policies? The costs we suffer from this experiment in "financial government" are staggering. Yet, rather than offering us the repeal of the Federal Reserve Act, the committee here offers a bill to plant more varieties of tulips in the gardens.

The meetings of the Directors of the Federal Reserve District Banks may be valuable, private seminars in applied economics for those who sit on them. The Directors surely work very hard, on a volunteer basis, and seriously debate important questions about economic conditions in their respective areas of the country; but are they not merely decorative, like the tulips?

The various District Banks have different economic models and by studying and debating the course of our economy, both nationally and regionally, they may add something to the similar work that is carried on in the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, and Labor; the President's Council of Economic Advisers and Office of Management and Budget; and, of course, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Economic Committee. There are several hundred graduate schools of economics in the United States. Economic forecasting services are available by the dozens, and some are almost as expensive as the Federal Reserve's. It is indeed a puzzle why, with so much serious effort devoted to studying and forecasting the behavior of our economy, the free market continues to fool them so often.

I regret that a section of this bill that would have abolished the anachronism requiring member banks to invest in District Bank shares, and to elect various classes of Directors, was deleted at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. It is cer-

tainly an interesting comment upon his autocratic power that a mere suggestion like that would lead to a complete rewrite of legislation making such a small change.

His argument, however, is interesting: The symbolic detail of private ownership of District banks, and independently elected Boards of Directors, tends to broaden public support for the Federal Reserve System. In other words, the autocrat Chairman of the Fed has more freedom of action if it looks like he is merely a minor figure among many who participate in debating and deciding upon policy.

This crafty use of symbols to hide real political power is a very old—and dangerous—trick. From Augustus Caesar to Machiavelli, to Bismarck and 20th century pseudo-democracies, leaders who wield unchecked, discretionary power have found it most wise to hide their mailed fists under the velvet gloves of "participatory democracy." This legislation is nothing more than an example of that ancient ruse—in this case, to mollify thrift industry executives so they won't pose a political threat to the power of the Federal Reserve Board, which since 1980 has been imposing the "reserve tax" upon them.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5278.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SUBPENA POWER FOR PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 548) authorizing the President's Commission on Organized Crime to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 548

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TAKING OF TESTIMONY AND RECEIPT OF EVIDENCE

SECTION 1. The Commission established by the President by Executive Order 12435, dated July 28, 1983 (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "Commission") may hold hearings. The Commission, or a member of the Commission or member of the staff of the Commission designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive documentary or other information in evidence.

SUBPENA POWER

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall have the power to issue subpenas, under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission or, if authorized by the Commission, under the signature of another member or the staff director of the Commission, requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses before the Commission, or before a member of the Commission or a member of the Staff of the Commission designated by the Commission for such purpose, and the production of information relating to a matter under investigation by the Commission. A subpena may require the person to whom it is directed to produce such information at any time before such person is to testify.

(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to a person under this section, a court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the person is directed to appear or produce information, or within the jurisdiction of which the person is found, resides, or transacts business, may upon application by the Commission after the Commission notifies the Attorney General, issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, or before a member of the Commission or a member of the staff of the Commission designated by the Commission for such purpose, there to give testimony or produce information relating to the matter under investigation, as required by the subpena. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) Process of a court to which application may be made under this section may be served in a judicial district wherein the person required to be served is found, resides, or transacts business.

TESTIMONY OF PERSONS IN CUSTODY

SEC. 3. A court of the United States within the jurisdiction in which testimony of a person held in custody is sought by the Commission or within the jurisdiction of which such person is held in custody, may, upon application by the Commission after the Commission notifies the Attorney General, issue a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum requiring the custodian to produce such person before the Commission, or before a member of the Commission or a member of the staff of the Commission designated by the Commission for such purpose.

IMMUNITY

SEC. 4. The Commission is an agency of the United States for the purpose of part V of title 18 of the United States Code.

SERVICE OF PROCESS; WITNESS FEES

SEC. 5. (a) Process and papers issued by the Commission, or by a member of the Commission or a member of the staff of the Commission designated by the Commission for such purpose, may be served in person, by registered or certified mail, by telegraph, or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. When service is by registered or certified mail or by telegraph, the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor shall be proof of service. Otherwise, the verified return by the individual making service, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of service.

(b) A witness summoned before the Commission, or before a member of the Commission or a member of the staff of the Commission, shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witness in the courts of the United States, and a witness whose deposition is taken and the person taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

ACCESS TO OTHER RECORDS AND INFORMATION

SEC. 6. (a)(1) The investigative activities of the Commission are civil or criminal law enforcement activities for the purposes of section 552a(b)(7) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The Commission is a Government authority, and an investigation conducted by the Commission is a law enforcement inquiry, for the purposes of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3401 et seq.).

(b) For the purposes of section 2517 of title 18, United States Code, and as limited by subsection (c), the members and members of the staff of the Commission are investigative or law enforcement officers, except that in the case of a disclosure to or by any member or member of the staff of the Commission of any of the contents of a communication intercepted under section 2516(1) of such title, such disclosure may be made only after the Attorney General or the Attorney General's designee has had an opportunity to determine that such disclosure may jeopardize Federal law enforcement interests and has not made that determination, and in the case of a disclosure to or by any member or member of the staff of the Commission of any of the contents of a communication intercepted under section 2516(2) of such title, such disclosure may be made only after the appropriate State official has had an opportunity to make a determination that such disclosure may jeopardize State law enforcement interests and has not made that determination.

(c)(1) A person to whom disclosure of information is made under this section shall use such information solely in the performance of such person's duties for the Commission and shall make no disclosure of such information except as provided for by this joint resolution, or as otherwise authorized by law.

(2) A disclosure or use by a member or a member of the staff of the Commission of the contents of a communication intercepted under chapter 119 of title 18 of the United States Code may be made solely in the course of carrying out the functions of the Commission as such functions were established by Executive Order 12435, dated July 28, 1983.

FEDERAL PROTECTION FOR MEMBERS AND STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. Conduct, which if directed against a United States attorney would violate section 111 or 1114 of title 18, United States Code, shall, if directed against a member of the Commission or a member of the staff of the Commission, be subject to the same punishments as are provided by such sections for such conduct.

CLOSURE OF MEETINGS

SEC. 8. The functions of the President under section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 10(d)) shall be performed by the Chairman of the Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is a second demanded?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES).

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reports House Joint Resolution 548 as amended and recommends that the joint resolution do pass. This resolution gives the President's Commission on Organized Crime, established last summer, the authority necessary to subpena witnesses, to compel their testimony if necessary, and to obtain information from law enforcement and other agencies and from financial institutions to carry out its mission. The Commission on Organized Crime has been established to make a full and complete national and region-by-region analysis of organized crime; to define the nature of traditional and emerging organized crime groups; to identify the sources, amounts, and uses of the income of organized crime; and to evaluate the Federal laws we are now using to combat organized crime.

To carry out this responsibility will take a great deal of hard work. It is only possible if the Commission is able to obtain up-to-date and sensitive law enforcement intelligence. The Commission must be able to interview witnesses and examine documents under circumstances that assure their reliability. This resolution gives the Commission the powers to carry out its mission.

The President has appointed a very able and distinguished Commission. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New Jersey, is one of the best known members. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the other body is also one of the outstanding members, as well as retired Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Potter Stewart. The Chairman of the Commission is Judge Irving R. Kaufman, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Judge Kaufman has had over 35 years of notable service on the Federal bench.

The resolution before us today is balanced. It has been carefully drafted to give the Commission the necessary tools to carry out its job and at the same time maintains without compromise the necessary protections of privacy and civil liberties when establishing an investigative authority whose work product will not be tested immediately in a criminal prosecution.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

□ 1340

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1983, the President created the Commission on Organized Crime by Executive order. The Commission is chaired by Judge Irving Kaufman and is made up of 20 distinguished members including Chairman PETER RODINO, Chairman STROM THURMOND, and retired Associate Justice Potter Stewart.

The Organized Crime Commission has the awesome task of collecting meaningful data on the impact of organized crime in the United States. This important Commission will benefit the American people and our Federal law enforcement community by making a full and complete national and region-by-region analysis of organized crime. This information, along with the Commission's assessment of Federal law in light of its findings, will provide us with pertinent information regarding the unacceptable organized crime phenomenon in the United States.

The purpose of the legislation before us today is to provide the necessary tools to the Commission which are essential in its ability to complete this important task. The Commission's ability to collect data from certain individuals is directly tied to it's ability to issue subpoenas and grant immunity. This resolution sets forth the circumstances in which such processes can be relied upon by the Commission. The Department of Justice has one concern which rests with the Commission's ability to represent itself in court under House Joint Resolution 548, rather than rely on the services of Department of Justice attorneys as is traditionally done. I am certain we can reach accommodation on this issue as we progress with this legislation.

For these reasons, I find House Joint Resolution 548 to be an important measure. This resolution provides the Commission with the additional authority necessary to accomplish its mission.

I urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 548.

At this time I would like to insert in the RECORD the statement of the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, HAMILTON FISH, Jr.

I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, and in fact support the general purpose of House Joint Resolution 548, which is to authorize subpena power for the President's Commission on Organized Crime. However, I am concerned about those provisions of House Joint Resolution 548, which would authorize the Commission to conduct its own litigation in the courts.

As a general matter, I believe that the litigation of the United States should be under the control of the Attorney General. This helps to insure not only that the Government's position is conducted in a coordinated and effective manner, but that it is conducted with uniformity and consistency, so that the law is enforced equally and fairly. It is even more important to have litigation which may arise from House Joint Resolution 548 conducted by the Attorney General. The mandate of the Commission is a broad directive to make a full and complete national and region-by-region analysis of organized crime. By the very nature of this mandate, this implicates ongoing Federal and local law enforcement efforts. To avoid any inadvertent disruptions which could result, as well as safeguarding sensitive constitutional and privacy concerns, any litigation resulting from House Joint Resolution 548 should be conducted by the chief law enforcement officer of the United States—the Attorney General.

While I do not object to House passage of House Joint Resolution 548, I believe that prior to enactment the legislation should be amended to provide that any resulting litigation be conducted by the Attorney General. At this time, I include in the RECORD a letter of the Department of Justice, which sets forth their position on this matter:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1984.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter presents the views of the Department of Justice on sections 2(b) and 3 of H.J. Res. 490, a resolution "authorizing the President's Commission on Organized Crime to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of information," as reported by the Subcommittee on Crime on April 11, 1984. Because we believe the adoption of these sections has the potential for undermining the law enforcement efforts of the Department of Justice, we strongly oppose their inclusion.

Section 2(a) of H.J. Res. 490 authorizes the President's Commission on Organized Crime, which was established by Executive Order No. 12435, to issue subpoenas compelling the testimony of individuals before the Commission, a member of the Commission, or the Commission's staff. Subpoena au-

thority compelling the production of information is also included in section 2(a). We fully support this authority as a necessary instrument for the Commission to fulfill its mandate. Section 2(b), however, provides that the Commission, after notification to the Attorney General, may request an appropriate court to enforce a subpoena of the Commission. Additionally, section 3 of H.J. Res. 490 would authorize the Commission, after notification to the Attorney General, to seek a court order issuing a writ of habeas corpus to the custodian of an individual and requiring the custodian to produce the individual to the Commission. In our view, this assignment of litigation authority for the enforcement of Commission subpoenas is inconsistent with sound principles reflected in existing law and could seriously undercut the Department's on-going law enforcement activities.

As you know, the Attorney General has historically exercised plenary responsibility over the conduct of legal affairs of the United States. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 516 and 519. *See also United States* v. *San Jacinto Tin Co.*, 125 U.S. 273, 279 (1888); *Confiscation Cases*, 7 Wall, (74 U.S.) 454, 457-58 (1868). This centralized control facilitates the presentation of uniform positions in court on important legal issues, provides for greater objectivity in the handling and filing of cases by attorneys who are not themselves affected litigants, and helps to ensure that the law is enforced equally and fairly. In light of these considerations, both Congress and the Executive branch have traditionally resisted the delegation of government litigating authority to persons outside the control or supervision of the Attorney General.

Sections 2(b) and 3 of H.J. Res. 490 seek to bestow litigating authority on the Commission and therefore amend, in effect 28 U.S.C. § 516. This is inconsistent with the salutory function of the Attorney General and, if carried to an extreme, would permit each agency of the government to make its position the government's position of the day. As the Fifth Circuit has indicated in *I.C.C.* v. *Southern Railway Co.*, 543, F.2d 543, 535 (5th Cir. 1976), such a result is not in the interest of the government, nor would it be well received in the courts. The litigation of the United States is unique from that involving solely private parties. Its impact extends beyond those individuals connected with a particular lawsuit. Its precedential value is significant. To ensure that the law is enforced equally and fairly, the government's litigation must be conducted with uniformity and consistency. Only the Attorney General is in a position to perform such a task.

Moreover, we believe the unusual mandate of the Commission raises special and compelling reasons for not providing an exception to the Attorney General's general jurisdiction. As set forth in Executive Order No. 12435, § 2(a), the Commission is to "make a full and complete national and region-by-region analysis of organized crime; define the nature of traditional organized crime as well as emerging organized crime groups, the sources and amounts of organized crime income, and the uses to which organized crime puts its income; develop in-depth information on the participants in organized crime networks; and evaluate Federal laws pertinent to the efforts to combat organized crime."

Under this directive, almost any area relating to organized crime which is currently the subject of on-going Departmental law enforcement efforts could possibly fall under the Commission's scrutiny. For this reason, granting the Commission power to subpoena documents and witnesses raises the possibility that ongoing Department law enforcement investigations and prosecutions could be inadvertently but seriously prejudiced by the actions of the Commission. Thus, while we fully support and welcome the broad scope of the Commission's activities, we believe it is crucial that the Attorney General, as the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, have the authority to disapprove attempts by the Commission to enforce the subpoenas.

There is an additional factor counselling in favor of review by this Department of the Commission's efforts to obtain documents and the testimony of witnesses. In seeking to obtain a fresh perspective on the problem of organized crime, the President has named to the Commission distinguished individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds in public and private life, none of whom are officers of the Executive branch and only a few of whom are full-time federal government employees. While we believe this independent viewpoint is a valuable asset to the Commission's undertaking, it also suggests that the Attorney General should be responsible for the exercise by the Commission of any coercive authority. Any attempt by the Commission to enforce subpoenas ordering citizens to testify or produce documents may raise sensitive constitutional and privacy concerns. In our view, it is inadvisable that these questions should be resolved by the Commission alone, without approval by the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, the Attorney General.

The Department of Justice endorses the purpose of H.J. Res. 490 in providing authority to issue subpoenas and to seek writs of habeas corpus for the Commission to accomplish the mandate established by Executive Order No. 12435. However, to authorize the Commission to conduct its own litigation would depart from sound policies underlying present law, and potentially undermine the law enforcement efforts of this Department. Accordingly, we strongly urge that H.J. Res. 490 be amended to provide that any litigation involving the Commission be conducted by the Attorney General.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised this Department that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's position.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. MCCONNELL,
Assistant Attorney General.
By: C. MARSHALL CAIN,
Acting Assistant Attorney General.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 548, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 493 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3457.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land from wind and water erosion, to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands from cultivation, with Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3457, as reported by the Committee on Agriculture. As the introducing sponsor of this legislation, I commend my colleagues on the committee for producing what I believe is a bold new approach to combating the national problems of soil erosion and water quality.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1984 is part of the committee's continuing and serious concern over the erosion of the Nation's resource base. All evidence available to the committee indicates that our topsoil is being eroded at an unsustainable rate.

The average erosion rate on our Nation's cropland is more than 14 tons of topsoil per acre each year, and an acre is less than 5,000 square yards of cropland. Conservation experts tell us that

most cropland regenerates less than 5 tons of organic matter annually, so you can easily see what an overwhelming net loss we will continue to face each year that passes unless we begin to act now.

As I said, the committee has maintained a long-term concern and interest, and H.R. 3457 is simply the next logical step. In 1977, the Congress passed the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act which has provided us with much needed data, monitoring and analysis of our resources. Out of the first cycle of reporting data we developed numerous conservation initiatives which were enacted in the 1981 farm bill. Unfortunately, the administration has failed to implement any of the meaningful provisions contained in that act.

However, I am glad to report that at least some elements of H.R. 3457 are supported by the administration, and a bill has already passed the Senate which is similar to one major provision of this bill. Therefore, I am hopeful of prompt House passage and eventual enactment of this legislation.

At this point, I believe it would be useful to mention some of the many organizations which have expressed support for this bill. They include:

The National Farmers Union;
The National Farmers Organization;
The Independent Bankers Association of America;
The National Association of Conservation Districts;
The Soil Conservation Society of America;
The American Farmland Trust;
The National Association of Counties;
The Natural Resources Defense Council;
The Land Improvement Contractors of America;
The National Audubon Society;
The Center for Rural Affairs;
The Sierra Club;
Bread for the World;
The Wildlife Society;
The Tennessee Valley Authority; and
The National Governor's Association.

Title II of this legislation has been commonly referred to as the "sodbuster" provison. It would deny eligibility to most Agriculture Department farm programs to farmers who put highly erodible land into production which has been in production since 1973. However, nothing in this bill prohibits such sodbusting. It in no way dictates to farmers what they can or cannot do with their land. This bill simply would deny subsidies to farmers who engage in this practice unless they adopt approved conservation systems on the fragile land.

Title III of this bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to provide the Congress with information we will need during consideration of the general farm bill in 1985. Some of us feel that good conservation farmers who routinely devote some of their land to conservation uses are being inadvertently penalized during annual set-aside programs. The cropland base protection study required in this bill will help determine the extent of the problem and suggest solutions if appropriate.

The conservation reserve program established in title IV is in my opinion the most important element of this bill, and—unfortunately—the one most opposed by the administration. Keep in mind that sodbuster is aimed at potentially eroding land which is not in production—thus not eroding at this time.

Conversely, the conservation reserve is targeted at erosion-prone land which is now in production and eroding at heavy rates. The program would assist in converting this land to more conserving but probably less profitable uses such as pasture, hay, seed, or timber production. It addresses a here and now problem which is a clear and present threat to our long-term ability to produce.

The program would establish 7 to 15 year contracts with individual farmers, providing them with annual rental and cost sharing assistance to convert eligible cropland to more conserving uses. Rental payments would be determined on a bid basis so that we get as much conservation for each tax dollars as possible. In my personal opinion, this program should be funded at $1 to $2 billion a year, and that would be a bargain in the long term. However, the funding authorized by H.R. 3457 is only a fraction of that amount—$225 million over a 3-year period.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the committee has been careful to consider the rights of private landowners in this legislation. H.R. 3457 requires that the USDA establish an appeals process under which any person may seek a review of any adverse determination made against him under the programs created in this bill. In addition, we have included a provision requiring the Secretary to complete soil surveys as soon as possible on private lands where such surveys have not yet been completed.

However, I do not personally believe this problem to be as severe as some may think. In fact, a recent report by the Department of Agriculture indicates that more than 75 percent of all non-Federal lands have already been mapped and classified.

At this point I would like to have printed in the RECORD a table which demonstrates the extent to which soil surveys have been completed throughout the United States.

SOIL SURVEY ACREAGES SUMMARIZED SEPTEMBER 1983 FROM STATE WORKSHEETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984

State	Non-Federal land			Federal land			Cropland (acres)	Cropland mapped (acres)	Percent cropland mapped	Percent of all land mapped
	Total acreage	Acreages mapped	Percent mapped	Total acreages	Acreages mapped	Percent mapped				
Alabama	31,567,997	21,104,000	66.8	876,200	825,200	94.2	5,514,000	4,245,000	77.0	67.6
Alaska										
Arizona	22,372,000	15,149,000	67.7	50,316,000	13,816,000	27.5	1,454,000	1,323,000	91.0	39.8
Arkansas	30,198,716	27,348,912	90.6	3,136,597	2,233,241	71.2	8,000,000	7,920,000	99.0	88.7
California	52,562,426	38,549,440	73.3	45,017,504	25,815,909	57.3	10,158,000	7,618,000	75.0	63.4
Colorado	43,060,161	32,527,748	75.5	23,558,020	12,981,361	55.1	5,996,000	4,676,000	78.0	68.3
Connecticut	3,122,310	3,122,310	100.0	9,850	9,850	100.0	282,000	282,000	100.0	100.0
Delaware	1,203,527	1,203,527	100.0	33,177	29,592	89.2	542,000	542,000	100.0	100.0
Florida	31,340,000	18,834,000	60.1	6,015,000	1,349,000	22.4	3,136,000	2,415,000	77.0	57.9
Georgia	35,123,616	28,241,209	80.4	2,026,016	1,841,706	90.0	6,687,000	5,684,000	85.0	81.0
Hawaii	4,275,728	4,025,489	94.1	388,746	341,494	87.9	1,306,000	1,306,000	100.0	93.6
Idaho	18,921,009	13,462,671	71.2	34,063,024	11,085,516	32.5	7,948,000	5,961,000	75.0	46.3
Illinois	35,258,900	21,277,850	60.3	491,377	408,469	83.1	23,953,000	14,372,000	60.0	60.7
Indiana	22,634,404	20,428,478	90.3	469,606	449,487	95.7	13,400,000	12,194,000	91.0	90.4
Iowa	35,689,688	28,891,176	80.9	170,393	148,306	87.0	25,819,000	20,913,000	81.0	81.0
Kansas	51,688,505	47,557,861	92.0	665,818	633,716	95.2	29,318,000	26,387,000	90.0	92.1
Kentucky	24,190,162	17,090,527	70.6	1,239,498	1,080,949	87.2	6,611,000	1,322,000	20.0	71.5
Louisiana	27,400,000	18,400,000	67.1	1,500,000	300,000	20.0	8,670,000	6,936,000	80.0	64.7
Maine	19,527,792	8,754,786	44.8	320,208	65,341	20.4	595,000	565,000	95.0	44.4
Maryland	6,611,000	6,412,000	97.0	152,000	78,000	51.3	1,677,000	1,677,000	100.0	96.0
Massachusetts	4,944,220	4,008,705	82.8	88,780	72,962	82.2	302,000	269,000	89.0	81.1
Michigan	33,150,893	19,280,231	58.2	3,103,644	1,386,120	44.7	9,063,000	6,798,000	75.0	57.0
Minnesota	47,566,541	27,306,198	57.4	3,343,459	1,011,181	30.2	22,909,000	18,327,000	80.0	55.6
Mississippi	28,530,444	24,254,039	85.0	1,684,246	1,409,640	83.7	6,949,000	5,906,000	85.0	84.9
Missouri	42,508,897	23,234,980	54.7	2,097,272	1,522,906	72.6	14,720,000	8,243,000	56.0	55.5
Montana	63,352,848	38,680,851	61.1	29,805,104	18,383,251	61.7	24,221,000	14,532,000	60.0	61.3
Nebraska	48,308,716	37,893,706	78.4	641,160	360,580	52.6	20,559,000	17,680,000	86.0	78.1

SOIL SURVEY ACREAGES SUMMARIZED SEPTEMBER 1983 FROM STATE WORKSHEETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—Continued

State	Non-Federal land			Federal land			Cropland (acres)	Cropland mapped (acres)	Percent cropland mapped	Percent of all land mapped
	Total acreage	Acreages mapped	Percent mapped	Total acreages	Acreages mapped	Percent mapped				
Nevada	9,002,000	5,845,000	64.9	61,345,000	35,771,000	58.3	703,000	492,000	70.0	59.2
New Hampshire	5,045,044	4, 052,246	80.3	706,966	170,779	24.2	287,000	273,000	95.0	73.4
New Jersey	4,666,486	4,490,265	96.2	143,481	143,481	100.0	769,000	769,000	100.0	96.3
New Mexico	44,550,202	41,041,673	92.1	33,316,038	24,725,389	74.2	2,336,000	2,266,000	97.0	84.5
New York	30,127,639	20,279,754	67.3	303,527	219,004	72.4	9,433,000	8,018,000	85.0	67.4
North Carolina	29,283,105	19,785,638	67.6	1,924,082	815,759	42.4	8,738,000	5,679,000	65.0	66.0
North Dakota	41,948,832	26,525,510	63.2	3,213,225	1,365,100	42.5	26,913,000	16,148,000	60.0	61.8
Ohio	26,037,874	21,715,884	83.4	168.126	20,971	12.5	11,793,000	10,023,000	85.0	82.9
Oklahoma	43,028,922	42,972,038	99.9	1,252,689	1,155,905	92.3	11,956,000	11,956,000	100.0	99.7
Oregon	28,734,799	18,252,003	63.9	32,890,779	5,064,567	15.4	4,930,000	3,845,000	78.0	38.0
Pennsylvania	28,287,794	27,779,583	98.2	590,230	574,230	97.3	7,508,000	7,358,000	98.0	98.2
Puerto Rico	2,164,000	2,164,000	100.0	110,000	110,000	100.0	363,000	363,000	100.0	100.0
Rhode Island	673,474	673,474	100.0	3,646	3,646	100.0	34,000	34,000	100.0	100.0
South Carolina	18,182,268	16,867,081	92.8	1,146,451	935,654	81.6	3,285,000	3,092,000	94.1	92.1
South Dakota	40,711,191	33,863,658	83.2	7,875,201	6,599,749	83.8	17,491,000	14,168,000	81.0	83.3
Tennessee	24,640,196	20,907,235	84.8	1,499,804	1,195,242	79.7	4,966,000	3,725,000	75.0	84.6
Texas	164,883,688	146,418,162	88.8	2,898,079	2,281,838	78.7	30,201,000	25,671,000	85.0	88.6
Utah	16,361,081	10,925,815	66.8	37,974,407	18,588,631	49.0	2,173,000	1,412,000	85.0	54.3
Vermont	5,618,229	3,450,619	61.4	315,064	162,316	51.5	593,000	475,000	80.0	60.9
Virginia	23,184,636	12,198,600	52.6	2,273,364	1,060,300	46.6	3,309,000	1,820,000	55.0	52.1
Washington	26,855,733	24,935,460	92.8	15,769,547	4,452,277	28.2	9,377,000	9,190,000	98.0	68.9
West Virginia	14,322,000	9,949,000	69.5	1,080,000	771,000	71.4	1,078,000	884,000	82.0	69.6
Wisconsin	32,695,593	24,031,493	73.5	2,162,135	1,189,970	55.0	10,806,000	9,725,000	90.0	72.4
Wyoming	30,775,324	14,368,915	46.7	31,889,616	9,945,342	31.2	3,133,000	2,099,000	67.0	38.8
Total	1,456,890,610	1,100,632,800	75.5	452,063,156	214,961,927	47.6	431,964,000	334,578,000	78.1	68.9

□ 1450

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984, which the chairman of the Conservation Subcommittee, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, and I introduced last year truly is a conservation bill. Each of its three substantive titles is aimed at conserving America's most precious resource, soil, and assisting in keeping our water resources clean and useful.

The bill consists of five titles, the first of which defines our terms. I should be clear from the outset that H.R. 3457 deals with farmland generally marginally suitable or unsuitable for row crop production without applied conservation practices. However, I would be remiss if I did not point out that when we debate amendments to this legislation in a few days, one of those contentious items will be the definition of "highly erodible" and "erosion-prone" land.

Title II is the so-called sodbuster provision. Here, the committee attempts to end the Federal subsidization of breaking new land that is not generally suitable for cropping. The bill does allow for certain exemptions—for instance, it does not apply retroactively and land classified as highly erodible may be cropped if the land has an appoved conservation plan in effect.

Title III requires the Secretary of Agriculture to study the issue of protecting the crop bases of conservation-minded farmers. A farmer participates in Federal programs according to this cropland base. Farm policy and economic survival on the farm has meant fence-row-to-fence-row cultivation, but many farmers throughout the country practice conservation by not cropping their marginal lands or following a crop rotation system that calls for fields to be devoted to conserving uses on a regular basis. Simply stated, the farmer who cleared fence rows, cut down timber along waterways and plowed up every acre of his farm is rewarded when USDA decides to implement a stabilization program to reduce production. That farmer—and he does it generally for pure economic survival—who has contributed to our surpluses and created a need for crop reductions benefits when those reductions are implemented. I do not think that is sound Federal policy, and I would hope USDA will agree when it has completed its study of this issue.

Title IV is the conservation reserve, and I believe it is most important to our conservation effort. It requires the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with producers and landowners to retire farmland from row crop production. This program is needed; it is wanted by farmers in the Midwest whose resource base is suffering depletion. Under this title farmland will be retired for 7 to 15 years and planted to grasses and trees. I should point out here that the conservation subcommittee originally contemplated authorizing $300 million a year in an open-ended program. In full committee markup, the Members accepted my amendment to have a 3-year signup with $50 million authorized the first year, $75 million the second, and $100 million in the final year of signup. With this commitment 7 million acres of land can be saved. While I am as concerned as any Member about the budgetary impact of all our programs, this is needed—and it is by no means a budget buster.

Title V establishes the procedure for implementation of the substantive titles and also writes an appeal procedure for any determination made under the bill.

Now, let me outline the reasons why this legislation is needed:

Agricultural circumstances of the mid-1970's called for increased production, fence-row-to-fence-row production; and farm economics of the latter part of the 1970's and into the 1980's continued this practice even though it has been harmful to our future production capabilities.

While this bill will affect each agricultural area of the country in some way, I want to speak today about its effect on the Midwest, my State of Missouri and, specifically, the 27 counties of north Missouri that comprise the Sixth Congressional District, an important farming region which I represent.

This area is called the northern Missouri River tributaries basin and it drains parts of southern Iowa and northern Missouri. In Missouri, this basin makes up 20 percent of the State's geographical area. These counties which have some of the most productive soils in the world, according to the Soil Conservation Service, also can claim to be some of the worst areas in the United States as far as soil erosion is concerned. The deep loss hills and heavy till plain soils account for approximately 40 percent of Missouri's corn production, 30 percent of the State's annual soybean harvest, and 15 percent of the wheat and grain sorghum production; 140 years ago when this land first was cultivated the top soil measured 16 inches; today, our farmers are plowing up lands with about half that amount of topsoil. We simply cannot sustain that kind of soil loss over time.

The SCS claims that more than 100 million tons of soil are washed off the fields in north Missouri annually. This erosion causes depletion of the soil resource, pollution of water, and deposition of sediment in our streams, rivers, and lakes. In terms of economics, in opportunity costs, the total is difficult

to determine, but in terms of dredging rivers to get rid of sediment and of building new water impoundments to replace those filled up by soil erosion, the direct costs run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

CONCENTRATION OF SOIL EROSION IN SELECTED STATES IN 1977 FOR MOST ERODIBLE AGRICULTURAL LANDS [1]

State	Millions of acres	Percent of State total	Millions of tons	Percent of State total	Average rate (tons per acre per year)
Illinois	1.7	6	76	41	45
Iowa [2]	3.5	11	148	53	42
Kansas [2]	6.2	13	137	53	22
Missouri	3.1	8	131	53	42
New Mexico [2]	5.0	10	234	60	12
Oklahoma [2]	2.6	6	55	42	21
Oregon [2]	1.4	5	10	26	7
South Carolina	.6	4	8	45	15
South Dakota [2]	2.3	6	49	39	21
Tennessee	1.2	5	55	55	48
Texas [2]	15.1	10	794	68	53
Vermont	.3	5	3	56	9
Washington	1.1	4	25	44	24
Wisconsin	.8	3	25	39	31

[1] Includes cropland, pastureland, rangeland, and forestland.
[2] Includes wind erosion.
Source: Soil Conservation Service/USDA, 1977 National Resource Inventory.

According to a 1982 USDA report on the Missouri portion of the northern Missouri River tributaries basin, More than half of the 2.052 million acres of cropland in this area is farmed without conservation methods. In other words, this land is farmed in straight rows using conventional tilling methods. SCS estimates sheet and rill erosion on this land at an average annual rate of 31 tons per acre.

It is not accurate to say Missouri farmers do not care about conservation. They do, and they have been turning to conservation practices as they have found that the economics of farming have allowed it. Not only do these farmers use the traditional methods such as contour farming, terracing, and strip cropping, they also have begun minimum and no-till practices that cut soil erosion markedly.

But, there also is another problem, and that is much of the land now being cropped should never have been plowed in the first place and a great deal of this hill land, traditionally in hay and pasture for livestock production, should not be farmed regardless of what kind of conservation practice is used. There simply is no cost-effective conservation measure that would make this land productive over the long term as row cropland. As grain farming became more of a moneymaker in the 1970's and the raising of cattle less so, many of these hills, composed of the loess soils of the river plains, were plowed. These hills should be returned to grasslands.

So, how do we get these lands back in grass and trees as they were once a decade or so ago? I firmly believe the first step is contained in title IV of this bill, the conservation reserve program which I have outlined. This kind of program is supported by my farmers in north Missouri, and by those taxpayers who understand that soil erosion is dangerous to the general welfare of our Nation.

Certainly, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Secretary of Agriculture John Block have supported the long-term budgetary commitment to retire erosion-prone farmland from row crop production.

Late last fall, the Secretary announced his own conservation reserve program, and on April 20, 1984, he declared it a successful new initiative that retired more than a quarter of a million acres. This land retirement program took highly erodible land out of production. This is land eroding at least twice the tolerance level—which is generally thought to be around 5 tons per acre annually. I might add that of the 12 States with the largest acreages enrolled, Missouri farmers had far and away the most acres retired at 32,769. The next State, Iowa, enrolled 20,700 acres.

To further point to the USDA's commitment to this kind of conservation program, I quote from the recently released report from the Office of Rural Development Policy, entitled "Rural Communities and the American Farm: A Partnership for Progress":

> Soil erosion has brought extensive damage and danger to rural roads, bridges, and buildings. It reduces the productive capacity of American agriculture. And it represents a major water pollution problem for the Nation. Siltation from such erosion has reduced the water storage capacity of reservoirs and the flood control capacity of community water removal systems, and it has endangered the health of fish and wildlife.
>
> To help improve the management and protection of rural natural resources, the Department of Agriculture will spend a greater share of its conservation budget on erosion control, flood protection, and water conservation.

I believe one way the Department can attain this is by retiring erosion prone cropland from production. As I have stated previously today, some farmland in crop production will be destroyed even with traditional conservation practices in place. This land must be put back to grass and trees.

Conservation in mid-America's farming communities is supported widely. My State of Missouri has increased funds at the State level through bond initiatives—and will place on the ballot this summer a sales tax proposal—to supplement Federal dollars devoted to soil and water conservation. The job is a big one, and no matter where Americans may live, they must understand they have a stake in conserving our natural resources that produce food and fiber for this country.

Let me take a moment to describe just how much work there is to be done. In the four States of Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas, there is an 80-county area that includes 27.8 million acres, about half of which is cropland. This area—northwest Missouri, southwest Iowa, southeast Nebraska, and northeast Kansas—needs a great deal of soil and water conservation, and this special areas proposal, as authorized by the 1981 farm act, calls for a 20-year program spending about $3 billion. Such a program is a massive undertaking, and one that budgetary constraints probably will not allow. But that is no reason why the Federal Government in cooperation with the States should not continue the task of getting these highly erosive croplands out of production. Title IV of H.R. 3457 is a good step in that direction.

My final remarks concern title II, the sodbuster title. Again, this language reacts to the fact that Federal farm policy encourages the plowing out of thousands of acres of land that is not suitable for cropping. Generally, the problem and the potential for disaster may be more likely in the arid and semiarid Western States where rangeland—fragile even for that purpose—is being turned over and planted to a cash crop. Most everyone agrees some Federal action must be taken because it is Federal policy that encourages it. There is disagreement as to how much cross-compliance is too much Federal interference. On the other hand, the Federal Government is not telling an individual what to do with his land, only that the Federal Government will no longer support that kind of activity.

The Department of Agriculture and the American Farm Bureau Federation both have expressed legitimate concerns as to the effect of title II as the full Committee on Agriculture passed it last month. The Secretary of Agriculture maintains that there is sufficient disincentive to plowout marginal lands in language that comprises S. 663, and that H.R. 3457 goes far beyond the original concepts of the sodbuster proposal. As the Farm Bureau notes:

> A farmer could plow up 10 acres of highly erodible land, plant it to corn and thus find himself ineligible for any Federal farm benefits on any other land that he may cultivate that year.

We will hear a great deal during this debate about this legislation setting the precedent for Federal land controls, and the intervention of the Federal Government into private ownership rights. Admittedly, any kind of cross-compliance strikes at most farmers' attitudes that the Federal Government has no right to intervene in the uses of privately held land.

Let me point out so that none of my colleagues misunderstand: The administration opposes several aspects of this legislation. The administration seeks a less restrictive sodbuster title, and apparently believes funds devoted to land retirement are not wisely spent.

Finally, I believe this legislation is needed now—not next year in the farm bill because there it will be lost in other, bigger issues, and frankly, I think this is a big issue that has been put for too long. I urge passage of H.R. 3457.

□ 1410

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN), for a very fine explanation of the entire bill and also for his wonderful cooperation that he has offered in putting this bill together.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BEDELL), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to promote soil conservation in the United States.

At the outset I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. JONES, for his tireless efforts to promote soil conservation, and Mr. COLEMAN from Missouri, which we all know is one of the most important responsibilities of this Government.

My district in Iowa is farmland. Farmers there grow grain and produce cattle and hogs. I have heard from many, many people about their concern for conserving soil and preventing erosion.

They express two major concerns. First, they say they need help if they are to continue to conserve their soils. They say that many farmers are careful stewards of the land. But some of their neighbors are not conservation farmers. Yet the careful stewards and the other farmers both have access to the Federal agricultural programs. They tell me this should not be so.

I know that the soil erosion problem is a threat to American agriculture, which is the most important industry in our Nation. Almost daily the extent of the erosion problem is documented. We see the soil erosion problem in news articles, on radio, on television documentaries, in magazine, and in books.

There was dramatic evidence of wind erosion in April of this year when people in Ohio saw and felt soil from the Southwest during a strong windstorm. I hear from my constituents about their concerns for the soil. I hear this not only from farmers but from the people in the towns and cities.

I believe our Nation is blessed with the best agricultural land in the world. And we in Iowa may be the fortunate ones to have some of the best of the best. In Iowa over 90 percent of all our land is in agricultural uses. Three out of every four acres are used for crops. From this you can see that soil erosion is indeed a major issue to Iowans. They tell me that much erosion could be prevented with better land management.

And it is right that Iowans are concerned. For along with being blessed with some of the world's best soils, we have the burden that these same soils wash away at an astonishing rate. For every acre of Iowa land that is cropped we lose, on the average, 12 tons of soil a year. That is three dump trucks of soil from every acre of erodible land that grows our corn and soybeans and other crops. Erosion depletes the land that feeds people in our country. Erosion depletes the land that produces grain for export and the land that produces feed for livestock.

Mr. Chairman, not only does this erosion take away the soil that grows the food. The eroded soil does further damage to water and other land. The soil that washes from the 30 million acres of Iowa farmland fills harbors, rivers, streams, reservoirs, and ponds. It damages roads and maybe even a neighbor's farm. It costs uncounted dollars to repair or clean up after this damage.

I know that the Corps of Engineers estimates $2 a cubic yard to dredge sediment from a river or a harbor. And that is after the dredging operation is all set up. It costs even more for cleaning up the results of erosion when this is not a continuous cleanup operation.

I believe that we must take further actions than those we have taken so far to stop erosion and to keep our farmland productive. For this reason I speak in support of H.R. 3457, a bill to promote soil conservation in the United States.

Since coming to the Congress I have continuously supported soil conservation programs. I am proud that I had a part in strengthening this bill.

This bill is important because it would help to assure that our soil conservation efforts and Federal farm programs no longer work at odds with one another, as they sometimes do today. As you know, H.R. 3457 would deny farm price supports to those who put fragile lands into row crop production, and would recognize those who currently put erosion-prone acres into grass and legumes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3457 takes three new approaches to soil conservation. It corrects the continuing problem of our farm programs working at cross-purposes with soil conservation programs. The bill also asks for a study of voluntary set-aside methods. And it calls for long-term contracts for landowners to retire their erosion-prone land into a conservation reserve.

Farming on highly erodible land requires special attention if soil productivity is to be maintained. The special attention is farming according to an approved conservation system. Many farmers already follow conservation systems, but not all farmers do.

Under the first provision of this bill, if in the future a person begins to farm highly erodible land and does not follow an approved conservation system, then that person will be ineligible for some Federal farm benefits. These programs are price support or similar payments, crop insurance, disaster payments and some types of loans.

I mentioned earlier that I had helped to strengthen this bill. The change was to this provision which now applies to all crops on all of the person's land. If we are serious about preventing erosion, Mr. Chairman, and we must be serious about this, then I feel that the Federal Government should not benefit the person who brings highly erodible land into cultivation. This is the first of the three approaches for soil conservation that are included in this bill.

For some time now farm organizations and conservation groups have been proposing programs where people would voluntarily set aside cropland that is erodible. This land would be planted in grass or legumes instead of crops in order to build the soil's productivity or to conserve the soil. In the legislation before us, the Congress asks the Secretary of Agriculture to study proposals such as these. The study would look at designating these set-aside lands for inclusion in a normal cropland acreage base, or conservation-use acreage, and at the effects on water quality of set-aside programs.

In the earlier version of this bill a voluntary set-aside program is included. This provision was watered down so that it now calls for a study. It is a disappointment that the program had to be put off to a later year. The study I have just described is the second new approach to soil conservation in H.R. 3457.

Mr. Chairman, the third approach is the conservation reserve program. In this program the owner or operator of erosion-prone cropland enters into a contract with the Secretary of Agriculture to plan to convert this cropland to less intensive use. In return the Secretary will provide technical assistance, share the cost of the conservation measures and pay an annual land rental fee for the period of the contract. Or the owner could alternatively choose to permanently retire the cropland base and allotment history for such land.

The importance of this is that land not presently needed for food production may be retired for a specified time period, conserving the land while at the same time bringing crop production into balance with demand. If land in the conservation reserve is needed at a later date for food production, the contract can be modified to allow this.

These three new approaches are consistent with each other. They also assure that taxpayer dollars spent for agricultural programs do not undercut the conservation being accomplished under other programs. Time for conserving our soil is running out. We need to deal more aggressively with this problem. With this legislation we have begun to implement more effective conservation programs.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES) for what he has done with this bill. In my opinion it is only a first step in what needs to be done for our total soil erosion problems, but at least this committee has now moved forward, stepped forward, to say that we are not going to sit by and let this continue.

I am proud to be a part of the committee that has taken this step and I am very pleased that I have been able to have a part in what is being done here. I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES) as well as our colleagues on the committee for their action.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GUNDERSON).

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but begin by observing that if Samuel Clemens were alive today, I am sure that his commentary on the erosion problems facing our country would be that soil conservation is second only to the weather in problems that we all talk about, but do nothing to remedy. The bill before us today goes far to alter that oversight and strengthen our national commitment to effective soil conservation. That is why I rise in support of H.R. 3457.

Now, I know that there are going to be a lot of facts, figures, and statistics thrown around today and one does not have to have a crystal ball to predict that, by the time we have finished, most Members will not want to hear about this subject again for a long, long time.

Yet, there is no issue more vital to our country's future strength and stability—and here is why.

American prominence and leadership in agriculture is no accident—we have had the edge on production from the beginning because there is more high quality land available for agriculture in the United States than in any other country in the world.

On the other hand, we will maintain that edge only so long as our greatest natural resource—our soil—remains intact. And, the way things are going right now, that will not last long.

The General Accounting Office tells us that we are losing 6.5 billion tons of topsoil annually to erosion and that somewhere around 70 percent of our cropland and rangeland is in need of positive conservation methods. And the problem is getting worse, not better.

Now, we throw the word "billion" around so much in this Chamber that I sometimes feel we have become numb to it. Accordingly, allow me to translate that last statistic into more tangible numbers. Simply stated, it means that we lose over 2 bushels of topsoil for every bushel of corn we produce each year.

If that erosion rate is not minimized, the cost of producing food in the United States will double in the next 50 years. I am sure that there is not anyone here today or listening to these proceedings on their televisions who is not concerned about that fact.

In the very long run, this uncontrolled erosion may not only increase the cost of producing food but ultimately threaten our very ability to produce that food. The day that occurs, it will be the beginning of the end for our country—for if history teaches us one thing, it is that a government remains strong only so long as it can feed its people.

□ 1420

Mr. Chairman, I have an uncle who teaches Greek at one of the colleges in our country. You might say, "What does a professor of the Greek department have to do with something dealing with agriculture?" He suggested that a study of world history will show that a country has remained the leading country of the world only as long as it had a policy to serve food to its people. If we are not concerned about soil conservation and active productive land in this country, we may jeopardize not only our ability to serve our people but, more importantly, our ability and potential as a world leader. That is why the bill before us today is so important.

H.R. 3457 addresses the serious soil erosion problem our country faces by creating two new conservation programs and ordering a study of an existing program to see if greater accommodation can be made for those who wish to participate in acreage-reduction programs yet practice an important conservation technique—crop rotation.

First, title II of the bill discourages future cultivation of highly erodible lands—Soil Conservation Service classifications IVe, VIe, VII, and VIII. This is a significant policy change from current Federal commodity programs that often encourage production on highly erodible land when target prices exceed market prices.

This is especially troublesome in a time of surplus production such as that we presently face. For example, approximately one-fifth of the rural land in my home State of Wisconsin is highly erodible—some 6.6 million acres. Now, despite the fact that we have a significant surplus in virtually every feed grain area, 20 percent of this highly erodible land is currently cultivated—1.3 million acres.

Given this surplus, one fact is obvious—we certainly do not need more highly erodible land cultivated at this time. And title II of H.R. 3457 would discourage such activity by denying eligibility for Federal commodity price support programs to producers who place newly cultivated highly erodible land into production.

Now, it is important to point out that the sodbuster title will not remedy the current erosion problems we face. However, it will prevent those problems from getting worse in the future.

Title IV of the bill, on the other hand, attacks the current erosion problems head on by creating a paid conservation reserve program in which USDA would contract with producers to take "erosion-prone" lands out of production for between 7 and 15 years. Erosion-prone lands include all highly erodible classifications plus SCS classification IIIe.

From a Wisconsin perspective, 3.2 million acres—some 30.7 percent—of our 10.5 million acres of erosion-prone land is currently under cultivation. Such a long-term paid diversion would provide additional incentives for producers to take this most erodible land out of production and, thus, so far toward solving the overall erosion problems we face.

Now, I realize that the $225 million authorized for this program is a lot of money in a time when we are facing $180 billion Federal deficits. At the same time, I am reminded of the television commercials for oil filters where the mechanic says, "you can pay me now, or pay me later." Clearly, that is the situation we face in the soil conservation area, for what we save in outlays today we will pay ten, twenty, and even one hundred-fold in consumer food subsidies in the future.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, title III of the bill provides for a USDA study of the feasibility of permitting producers who engage in crop rotation to participate in future acreage diversion and payment-in-kind programs. Presently, it is virtually impossible for these producers to establish the commodity base necessary for participation.

Crop rotation is quite possibly the most commonly used soil conservation method in Wisconsin and it is not only unfair to bar producers who rotate crops from the benefits of payment-in-kind programs but such a prohibition also discourages the future use of this conservation technique. As such, I look forward to receiving the positive recommendations of this study and implementing them in the 1985 farm bill.

In conclusion, then, Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate my support for the legislation before us today. It is indeed the ounce of prevention that will be worth a pound of cure in future years. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3457.

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to join in support of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984.

H.R. 3457 contains several interrelated provisions that make an important contribution toward soil conservation on our more highly erodible land. The first portion of the bill, commonly known as sodbuster legislation, would provide incentives to keep highly erodible land not now in production from being used to cultivate crops. The other major portion of the bill, the conservation reserve program, would provide authority for assistance to be made available to farmers and ranchers who convert erosion-prone land, which currently is in production, to less intensive uses that conserve and improve soil and water resources.

H.R. 3457 was introduced by Mr. ED JONES of Tennessee, chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development, and jointly sponsored by Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and many other Members of the House. In all, it is sponsored by 35 Members. It enjoys broad support on both sides of the aisle and was reported by the committee by a recorded vote of 38 ayes to 1 nay.

Before I proceed further, I wish to pay tribute to ED JONES. The bill is before the House in large part because of his dedication and tireless efforts. Mr. JONES has been in the forefront of the conservation movement and has largely been responsible for much of the conservation legislation enacted into law since he became chairman of the subcommittee in 1977. In addition, through the oversight activities of his subcommittee, he has done much to focus national attention on the need for improved methods of soil conservation and to prod the administration to take seriously its obligations to this end.

At this time I would like to describe in detail the provisions of H.R. 3457.

Title II, the sodbuster provisions, would deny benefits on agricultural programs to persons who, after the date of enactment of the bill, bring highly erodible land into cultivation on a field in which the predominant class of land is highly erodible, as defined in this act. Each such person would be ineligible, as to any agricultural commodity he produces during that crop year, for any type of Federal price support, any type of Federal income assistance or production adjustment payment, any farm storage facility loan, any Federal crop insurance, any disaster payments, or any new loan from the Farmers Home Administration if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the loan will contribute to excessive erosion on highly erodible land.

The bill provides several exemptions from these requirements. There is an exemption for those producers whose commodities produced on highly erodible land were produced under an approved conservation system. This exemption is in recognition of the fact that these landowners will not be contributing to excessive erosion on fragile lands. The bill provides additional exemptions to avoid imposing any retroactive restrictions on agricultural producers who made farming decisions prior to the implementation of this new program. Thus, the bill makes it clear that the provisions would not apply to a producer if all the crops he produced on highly erodible land were produced during the 1973 through 1984 crop years, or were planted before enactment of the bill or during a crop year beginning before the date of enactment. Finally, the committee bill also would not apply to any agricultural loan made before enactment of the bill.

I want to make clear to the Members that nothing in this bill imposes demands on any farmer or rancher concerning what may or may not be done with his or her land. What the bill does do is simply state that the Federal Government will no longer subsidize producers who choose to cultivate highly erodible land using farming practices that are not in conformity with an approved conservation system.

The committee believes that efforts, such as those contained in title II, to prevent excessive amounts of additional soil erosion make sense in terms of the national economy and the environment.

Soil erosion is a serious national problem which has resulted in the loss of valuable topsoil in many agricultural areas. The most reliable estimates of soil erosion in the United States obtained in 1977, the latest date for which such data are available from the Department of Agriculture, showed that 38 million acres of cropland—11 percent of the total cropland in the United States—was eroding in excess of 15 tons per acre annually. In any key wheat-producing areas the soil loss averages about 30 tons per acre, reaching as much as 100 tons per acre in some areas under extreme conditions. In 1982, the acres of highly erodible land already under cultivation amounted to about 45 million acres. There is the potential of another 247 million acres of highly erodible land not now in cultivation that could be brought into production unless checked.

When fragile lands are converted into cropland without the installation of a conservation system, the Nation pays the costs of this conversion in several ways. First, the Government often subsidizes the production from these erodible lands through various farm support programs and subsidized irrigation water. In addition, many individuals, farms, industries, and fish and wildlife resources located downstream of the converted land end up paying the most significant costs. For instance, the sediment resulting from erosion is costing the Nation hundreds of millions of dollars a year as it fills up valuable reservoirs, increases the frequency and seriousness of floods, clogs navigation facilities and canals, interferes with industrial hydraulic equipment, increases the cost of treating drinking water supplies, destroys valuable aquatic wildlife, and substantially diminishes the recreational potential of downstream waters. The nutrients, pesticides, and other contaminants carried into waterways with the eroded soil exacerbate all of these problems and create still others.

Title II of H.R. 3457 will not stop erosion, and in fact it will not correct the problems which already exist. However, this initiative is clearly a reasonable and much needed step in the direction of slowing down the rate at which future conversions of fragile lands add to these problems.

H.R. 3457 requires the Secretary to establish, by regulation, an appeal procedure under which a person who is adversely affected by any determination made under the bill may seek review of the determination. This provision was included to protect producers against arbitrary decisions made by the Department. It would assure that producers are provided an opportunity to obtain review of determinations of land classification that trigger the application of the program ineligibility provisions as well as a review of determinations as to specific denials of program benefits. The committee recognizes that legitimate differences of opinion may occur on these issues. It should be noted that H.R. 3457 does not make determinations of the Secretary final, and thus any person that is aggrieved by administrative determinations, after conclusion of the appeal process may seek judicial review in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Title III of the bill would require the Secretary before February 16, 1985, to submit to the congressional agricultural committees a report on various voluntary set-aside programs. It is primarily addressed to an issue which many persons claim results in unfairly penalizing farmers who divert land to conservation uses under those programs. To assist in handling this issue in future farm legislation, the report is required to include an analysis of a program under which persons who set

aside cropland to perennial grasses or legumes as part of a crop rotation pattern may qualify under future commodity programs to have the lands designated: First, as cropland in rotation for the purpose of establishing a normal acreage base for the farm; or, second, as set-aside or conserving-use acreage under those programs.

For several years conservationists have contended that Federal Government farm price support and production control programs unfairly reward farmers who have overutilized their marginal lands through row crop production, while penalizing farmers who have kept marginal lands in conserving uses or practiced a conservation-oriented crop rotation program. The committee hopes that the study and recommendations resulting from title III will suggest solutions to this problem that could be included in the 1985 farm bill if legislation is needed.

Title IV of H.R. 3457, as reported by the committee, establishes a program under which farmers would agree to carry out conservation measures on erosion-prone lands under contracts with the Department of Agriculture for periods of 7 to 15 years.

In the conservation reserve contract with USDA, the farmer would agree to take specified erosion-prone land out of annual row crop production and put it in a more conserving but productive pursuit such as pasture, hay, or timber. The farmer would be paid an annual rental to compensate him for the transition to a less profitable but more soil-conserving use. Farmers could also be assisted with cost sharing for installing conservation practices, establishing grasses, or planting trees.

At present the annual production adjustment programs have some serious shortcomings with respect to achieving conservation. First, the programs operate on a year-to-year basis, making it virtually impossible for farmers to incorporate a long-term conservation system into short-term program requirements. Also, no attempt is now made to selectively enroll erosion-prone cropland into the current set-aside programs.

The program would allow farmers to reap commercial benefits from land entered in the conservation reserve. Some commercial uses which would be considered include grazing or the use of the land for hay, seed, or timber production. The rental rate paid to the farmer for entering the program is based on bids offered by the farmers. The committee is of the view that coupling a commercial use with the bid procedure will result in the lowest cost to the Government and smooth a permanent transition to conservation uses.

Under the bill, payments to producers would not exceed $50 million for contracts entered into during fiscal year 1985, $75 million for contracts entered into during fiscal year 1986, and $100 million for contracts entered into during the fiscal year 1987. The committee recognizes that this level of funding is insufficient to meet the overall national need. At a rental rate of $30 per acre annually for a contract term of 10 years, the authorized funding of $225 million over 3 years would divert 750,000 acres to more conserving uses.

Without question, the program will vary greatly in its utility, cost per acre, and effectiveness from one region to another. However, H.R. 3457 provides a prudent and cautious start which the committee is anxious to have initiated.

In summary, H.R. 3457 provides an integrated approach to protection of our Nation's soil resources—it deserves the support of the Members.●

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act. This legislation, which would prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land, is very much needed. It is of importance to all Americans—rural, suburban, and urban—with a stake in our Nation's ability to retain its agricultural resource base and productivity.

The drought last summer combined with the PIK program have diminished our crop surpluses and the resulting increase in prices has provided economic incentives to farmers to bring into production previously uncultivated lands that are susceptible to erosion. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that of the approximately 421 million acres of land under current production, more than 40 million are erosion prone. It is estimated that another 250 million acres of marginal and fragile land could be converted to production to meet the economic incentives that are presently operating. Today, we face an erosion problem, which some are comparing to the dust situation which plagued our Nation in the 1930's.

This measure would set up counter-incentives by denying access to several types of Federal farm assistance programs to those farmers who choose to convert fragile land to production. Under this legislation, access to Federal price supports, crop loans, farm facility loans of Commodity Credit Corporation, disaster payments, and new loans from the Farmers Home Administration to farmers who choose not to cooperate in soil conservation. Erodible land would be defined under this legislation utilizing the Soil Conservation Service classifications, or as any land which has an erosion rate equal to or greater than the average erosion rate in the State for the same type of soil. Farmers would be able to request judicial review of a finding that land brought under cultivation is highly erodible.

Additionally, this measure would establish a soil conservation reserve program which would direct the Department of Agriculture to enter into 7- to 15-year contracts with farmers to remove erosion prone crop land from production, shifting it to use as pasture land, or soil conserving planting, utilizing trees or grasses.

Finally, H.R. 3457 would establish through the Department of Agriculture a study to evaluate voluntary set-aside programs that seek to enhance soil conservation.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is very important to urban Americans, who depend for their food supply upon a productive and conserving agricultural sector. The protection and enhancement of our natural resources and our soil is of the utmost importance to the constituency I represent and indeed to all Americans and the world.

As cosponsor of this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3457.●

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we will complete debate on this bill on another legislative day. Is that correct?

I would ask the subcommittee chairman if he would respond.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is the plan. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I plan to reserve the balance of the time on this side because there are a number of members of the subcommittee who are not here today who would like to have time.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Tennessee) having assumed the chair, Mr. SAM B. HALL, Jr., Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentive to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land from wind and water erosion, to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands

from cultivation, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 3457.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAM B. HALL, Jr.). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed with my special order prior to the special order of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

□ 1430

MARXIST SANDINISTA REGIME IN NICARAGUA IS ATTEMPTING TO MANIPULATE THE CONGRESS AND AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have heard many of my colleagues, as well as the press, refer to "poverty-stricken" Nicaragua. The implications have been that it is a small, helpless nation beset by outside forces under the aegis of the United States—that it is somehow a David to our Goliath through no fault of its own. This is a measure of the success of the well-financed propaganda campaign being carried out by the Sandinistas.

Indeed, the Marxist Sandinista regime of Nicaragua is not only exporting its violent revolution to neighboring free states, it is exporting its Marxist propaganda to the United States. The Sandinistas are working hard to manipulate U.S. public opinion and to lobby the Congress. In fact, they even have an assistant to the President from the Carter administration among those doing their bidding. The Nicaraguans have spent, and are spending, a great deal of money for political propaganda activites in the United States.

Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy, a major Washington law firm, has engaged in political propaganda and lobbying activities for the Sandinista regime. From September 1983 to February 1984 alone, the firm handled nearly $100,000 in services and expenses for the Sandinista regime.

What have the Sandinistas bought from this important Washington firm in the last few years?

According to the records of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, the law firm has been acting as a foreign agent for the Nicaraguans. The following items from the records of the Internal Security Section of the Criminal Division indicate the nature of the law firm's activities for the Sandinistas:

Preparing or disseminating political propaganda by advertising campaigns, magazine or newspaper articles, press releases, pamphlets or other publications, letters or telegrams, and lectures or speeches.

Disseminating political propaganda to public officials, legislators, Government agencies, newspapers, editors, civic groups or associations, libraries, and educational institutions.

Representing Nicaragua in connection with legislation that may affect the interests of Nicaragua, including contacts with Members of Congress.

Efforts to pressure the U.S. Government in criminal law enforcement activities against Nicaraguan exiles living in the United States.

The records of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department detail the intensive effort made by the Sandinista surrogates to lobby Members of Congress. Indeed, one could say that the Sandinistas are intervening in the internal affairs of the United States, but the diplomatic principle of nonintervention in domestic policies is, at best, a matter of diplomatic niceties anyway.

In addition to their Washington law firm, the Sandinistas have engaged a New York public relations firm, Agendas International.

Again according to the records of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, this firm has acted as a foreign agent for the Sandinista government's Embassy and U.S. mission to the United Nations. Let me quote from their contract, which calls for the following services to be performed:

Agendas International will perform public affairs/public relations services for the various missions of Nicaragua in the United States for a period of six months, which term of service shall begin on this date [September 20, 1983]. These services shall consist of the following:

A. INFORMATION, MONITORING AND ANALYSIS

1. A minimum of biweekly briefing papers and sessions with Embassy personnel on U.S. public opinion of the critical military, political, moral, social and economic issues regarding international relations with Nicaragua.

2. A monthly summary in abstract form of news articles in the press and leading magazines on computer print-outs.

3. A weekly custom-edited videocassette tape of the more than 50 hours of major network television news and public affairs programs during each seven days, and will include a one-hour edited tape of the news program segments on Nicaragua and fully taped specials or news interviews on Nicaragua or with Nicaraguan personalities.

4. The monitoring and retrieval of important documents, reports and special publications with direct bearing on Nicaragua's interests from sources throughout the U.S. and abroad to be presented to the Commission as they are received.

5. A bi-monthly analysis of U.S. federal and states' legislation that may have a positive or negative impact on Nicaragua, with and emphasize this *strategy planning and recommendations as necessary.*

B. COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

1. Design and maintenance of a mailing list of an estimated 5,000–7,000 names drawn from U.S. Government, business, financial community, church and news media with subcategories.

2. Edited quarterly updates on developments in Nicaragua, including the economy, foreign policy and other news of interest to U.S. readers to be mailed to Congress, the media and other special segments of the above mailing list.

3. A minimum of two mailings of reprints of news media materials on Nicaragua, speeches, reports and statements of importance concerning Nicaragua.

4. And again emphasis, *the placement of Nicaraguan officials on U.S. radio/TV news and public affairs programs, maintaining constant contacts with the media, strategy and recommendations for press releases and press conferences, the promotion of op-ed pieces and other articles in major publications and in sectors of the United States other than the East Coast.*

5. Maintaining contact with key staff aides and Members of Congress to organize briefings, respond to requests for special information, arrange meetings between officials of Nicaragua and Members of Congress both in the United States and in Nicaragua, and make recommendations for lobbying specific issues.

C. STRATEGY PLANNING AND COUNSELING

1. Weekly meetings with Embassy and mission personnel in the U.S. to review developments, discuss specific issues, obtain guidance and approval on various aspects of the program and insure proper channeling of information on plans and policies relating to public affairs issues. At least one Senior Consultant will be available in Washington for these meetings three days each week.

2. Monthly meetings in Managua with the Foreign Ministry officials and others to review events, issues, strategy and programming. Both Senior Consultants will be available for three days each month for these meetings and to develop further aspects of the program.

In summary, then, since September 1983, this New York public relations firm has been under contract to the Sandinista regime's embassy to the United States to engage in overt intelligence collection and processing; the design and maintenance of a mailing list for propaganda mailings; the placement of Sandinista regime officials on U.S. radio and TV news and public affairs programs, the promotion of op-ed pieces and other articles in major publications, and the maintenance of constant contact with the media; and the maintenance of contact with key staff aids and Members of Congress to organize briefings, re-

spond to requests for special information, and arrange meetings between Sandinista officials and Members of Congress both in the United States and in Nicaragua. For this purpose, the Sandinistas' Embassy established a special $250,000 bank account in the United States to insure completion of the public relations project.

Former senior U.S. Government officials, amazingly enough, are engaged in work for the Marxist Sandinista regime. Stuart E. Eizenstat, an assistant to the President on President Carter's White House staff, is a registered foreign agent for the Sandinista regime. He is involved in the Powell, Goldstein law firm's activities on behalf of Nicaragua, which are anticipated to include contacts with the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have by no means presented an exhaustive list of Nicaraguan agents active in the United States. I have tried only to highlight examples of the extent to which the Marxist Sandinistas are trying to influence the Congress and the American people through agents in the United States. Of course, I have said nothing at all concerning any clandestine activities in which the Sandinistas might be engaged in the Unites States.

Mr. Speaker, it would be disingenuous at best to claim that the information which we receive concerning Nicaragua through the media is unbiased; much of it has been produced by a highly effective public relations campaign. I hope that Members of Congress and the American people will keep in mind the extent to which the Sandinistas are trying to influence us through political propaganda and lobbying. Let us not hand the Marxist Sandinistas a victory by force of propaganda in the United States which will lead to Sandinista victory by force of arms over their neighbors in Central America.

□ 1440

THE SALVADORAN LEFT: POLITICAL ASSASSINATIONS AND TERRORIST ACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to take this time for a special order to detail the atrocities of the Salvadoran left, the political assassinations and terrorist acts which have been perpetrated by the leftwing in El Salvador because many of these go unreported in the press or we do not take very much note of them in the press and they may have been in a small article.

I might say that all of the information that will be presented today in the special order has been obtained from press accounts in this country or press accounts in El Salvador, and we have documented in all instances where we got the information.

Certainly in the controversy surrounding U.S. policy in Central America, much of this Congress debate has tended to focus on El Salvador and its Government. Ongoing concern for the irresponsible actions of the rightwing death squads has served as the focal point of much of Congress attention on this issue, and rightfully so. Universal approbation and opposition to these politically motivated murders has never wavered, whether it be in Congress or in the administration. Furthermore, congressional opposition to these actions has been reflected in the multitude of conditions that we have imposed in this House on the aid which is sent to El Salvador, most of which is designed to end these rightwing killings.

However, the level of concern for the equally reprehensible killings by the leftist elements in El Salvador has gone largely unreported and unnoticed in the United States. Congress, particularly our more liberal Members of this body, has almost completely ignored this issue, thus skewing our debate in this House to a one-sided consideration of the problems in Central America.

Today in this special order we hope to document from a variety of sources exactly why the U.S. support for democratic institutions in El Salvador is so important. Our aid, particularly our military aid, performs two functions: One, it limits the activity of the rightwing elements, and two, equally important—and this is something we do not remember and we ought to pause and consider today—it is instrumental in protecting those people in El Salvador who have a love for democracy and want a life free from the unrestrained violence not only of the right but of the left.

As this special order will indicate, the leftist guerrillas in El Salvador have waged a continuing campaign of terror, economic sabotage, political assassination, and simple murder, all for the purpose of terrifying and intimidating the people of El Salvador into accepting their revolutionary rhetoric.

This list of murders, political assassinations, bombings, and other terrorist acts speaks for itself:

On April 1, 1984, a former member of the Central Election Council and conservative journalist was murdered. His name was Rafael Hasbun. He was 56. He was shot seven times as he entered his office. The responsibility for this murder was claimed by the Revoluntary Workers Party, as documented by the New York Times on April 2, 1984, page 11.

On March 15, 1984, a retired army colonel was shot and killed, and his 4-year-old daughter was wounded. His name was Tito Adalberto Rosa, an official of the Salvadoran Authentic Institutional Party. And this was reported in the Washington Post on March 16, 1984.

A day earlier, March 14, 1984, a National Assembly deputy was killed. He was serving a member of their Congress, I suppose. Hector Flores Larin of the conservative National Conciliation Party was shot after he stepped out of his car in front of a law school where he was to take an examination. How ironic that a member of the General Assembly going to a law school examination, one who believes in the rule of law, would be shot dead in his tracks on his way to that examination by leftist Marxist Communists. He was not shot just once, he was shot seven times in the face just to make sure he was dead. Responsibility was claimed by the Clara Elizabeth Ramirez Front, or the Workers Revolutionary Movement. This was reported in the Washington Post on March 15, 1984.

On March 10, 1984, a Constituent Assembly deputy was killed—another one. Roberto Ismael Ayala, who was 47 years old, was shot at a point-blank range as he walked from his house to his car to drive his daughter to school. This was reported in the Washington Post.

On March 1, 1984, a judge was killed. He was Jose Montenegro, an Arena sympathizer, who had presided over the trials of hundreds of leftist guerrillas as a military judge. And this was reported in La Prensa Grafica in San Salvador on March 2.

Earlier in the year, on February 27, 10 civilians and 8 soldiers were killed. One of the dead was an 8-year-old child, and another was 14. Leftwing guerrillas attacked two trains near San Antonio Grande, 25 miles north of San Salvador. This was reported in the Washington Post on February 29.

On January 27, an Arena legislator was killed. He was Ricardo Arnoldo Pohl, 35 years old, who was elected in March 1982 to the National Constituent Assembly. Gunmen halted his car in El Salvador. Responsibility was claimed by the Clara Elizabeth Ramirez Front. This was reported by the New York Times on January 30.

In December 1983, a former National Confederation of Workers director was assassinated. Salvador "Bobby" Jimenez Molina was assassinated by the Popular Liberation Front. And again, how ironic that it should be called the Popular Liberation Front when apparently the results of this weekend's elections indicate that there is absolutely no popularity for the leftwing in El Salvador.

The Department of State Country Human Rights Reports for 1983—February 19, 1984—reported and documented this assassination.

On July 9, 1983, 13 members of the civil defense force and 2 civilians were

killed in Nueva Granada by rebel forces, as reported by the New York Times on July 11.

On July 13, 1983, the Rio Lempa Executive Commission powerplant was attacked, and this was reported in El Mundo, a newspaper in San Salvador.

On June 9, 1983, seven persons were killed during a guerrilla attack on a military base in San Vincente and a bread factory in San Salvador. This was reported in Panama City on June 9.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to a Member who has spoken up on the floor of the House before on the atrocities of the left in El Salvador and in Central America, the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, following through on what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) has said, throughout 1983, the leftist guerrillas in El Salvador continued their murderous action, killing, among numerous others, an American. In addition to these assassinations, the guerrillas tried to destroy the economic infrastructure of El Salvador by targeting factories, power stations, roads, and bridges.

Before I begin to delineate these things, I think it is important for us to realize what happened this past weekend in El Salvador where elections took place again within a very short period of time. And this was in contrast, of course, to what is happening in Nicaragua. In addition, it is a tremendous compliment to the El Salvadoran people and their heartfelt wants and needs in the area of true democracy that they would vote in the tremendous numbers they did this past weekend, despite the fact of direct death threats from these guerrillas who claim that all they want to do is speak for the people.

Mr. Speaker, in June 1983, the Arena deputy and former labor leader was assassinated. Rene Barrios, one of the founders of the National Federation of Workers, was assassinated, not by the right but by the Popular Liberation Front.

□ 1450

The citation for this is the Department of State Country Human Rights Reports for 1983—February 19, 1984.

Leftists attacked the Oromantique coffee processing plant on May 26, 1983. That was reported in El Mundo, May 26, 1983, edition in San Salvador.

That same day, the U.S. military adviser was assassinated; Navy Lt. Comdr. Albert A. Schaufelberger, who was attached to the American Embassy, was shot three times in the head while he sat waiting in his car for his girl friend. Responsibility for that was claimed by Clara Elizabeth Ramirez Front. That was reported in the Washington Post on May 27, 1983, as well as the Washington Post on June 1, 1983.

Forty-two government soldiers were executed by rebels after they had surrendered to those same rebels. This was reported in the Washington Post on June 4, 1983. The incident occurred on March 25, 1983.

On March 10 of that same year, guerrillas placed several bombs at the Montealegre coffee processing plant in Chinameca, San Miguel, destroying the plant completely.

On May 8, 1983, 16 civil defense fighters were executed by guerrillas. Civilians were also executed at that time, including Mr. Avalos, 61 years of age. All had, according to the article that appeared in the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Post, all had surrendered to the guerrillas prior to their execution. That was reported in the Los Angeles Times on May 12, 1983, and the Washington Post on June 1, 1983.

Guerrillas paralyzed all traffic along the railway between San Diego and San Vicente, and from El Coyolito to Valle San Juan. This was reported in El Mundo in San Salvador on May 2, 1983, as having occurred on the previous day.

Carolos Hernandez Hernandez was shot to death in his home in Cara Sucia Canton, San Francisco. This was reported on April 11, 1983.

Vincente Rivas Gonzalez was killed in San Diequito, El Paisnal, in San Salvador, after being robbed of 3,000 colones and a .38-caliber revolver. This was reported on April 11, 1983.

Then on April 29, 1983, the Liberation Front destroyed the El Delirio electricity substation and dynamited the bridge at the entrance of Santa Rosa de Lima. This was reported in La Prensa, San Salvador, on that date, on pages 4 and 31.

Now, obviously, Mr. Speaker, this is not an exhaustive list of all the instances of killings and assassinations and destruction of economic infrastructure throughout El Salvador during that period of time. No, Mr. Speaker, it is merely a recitation of some of the events to try and bring some balance into the comments that are often made on the floor and sometimes unfortunately what appears in the news media as to what is ailing the El Salvadoran society.

We often hear of these atrocities, and there are atrocities committed by the right, but we seldom hear of the atrocities committed by the left. We seldom see that the atrocities of the left are very political in nature, with an attempt to try to blackmail a whole population against the exercise of their democratic processes. No one on this floor would suggest that El Salvador has blossomed into full democracy and has the full fruits of the democratic tree, but nonetheless, it seems to all of us that if we are going to look at what happened in El Salvador we must recognize that there is brutality taking place and that now much of that brutality is directed against the first emergence of democracy in action down there.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman from Missouri for taking this special order and allowing us to bring this to the attention of our colleagues and the American people.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Well, I thank the gentleman for his contribution and his leadership. In fact, I know that he might have even further detailed accounts later on in this special order to bring to our attention.

The hope was to present these left-wing atrocities in a chronological order, but because of demands made upon the time of the various Members who want to participate, they may be taken out of sequence today, but all of them are detailed accounts, accurate accounts of things that happened.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), because I know the gentleman is quite concerned about this.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for calling this special order and commend him for trying to illustrate what a serious problem we have down in El Salvador and throughout Central America. So many times we see the focus of this House of Representatives and the other body and the U.S. media calling attention to the atrocities which go on certainly on behalf of the right in El Salvador and in other places, but they just simply do not focus on what is happening at the behest of those who are deliberately trying to bring force and violence throughout Central America, and take it over on behalf of the people that run the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Nicaragua.

I think it is important that we focus on some of the atrocities of the left. We cannot overlook those wrongs that are committed by the extreme right, absolutely not. They are wrong, and we have to admit them freely, and we have to deal with them. We have to try to suppress them. The U.S. Government is working around the clock to try to bring them under control. This administration has pushed the Government in El Salvador to change those errors. We accept that all is not well with the Government in El Salvador over the last few years, but we are working to change those wrongs. If the Government of El Salvador does not clean up its act, there is no doubt that our colleagues in the U.S. Congress will attempt to cut them off and pull the purse strings and not fund them; but that is not in the best interests of the people of El Salvador.

I think to illustrate that fact, simply look at what happened in the province of Morazan. As a part of the activities

of the "liberating army," the group foisted by the Marxist movement that is trying to impose its will by force throughout Central America, that liberating army decided to poison the water supply of the people of Morazan, cut off its electricity, and blow up all the bridges to make escape impossible.

Now, just imagine how glad the people of Morazan were for this brave and enlightened act by people who aspire to be their leaders, not by election, but through the force of violence and intimidation.

In keeping with the theme set forth by the gentleman from Missouri, let me also illustrate a number of other incidents that happened in the year 1981 throughout El Salvador.

March 25, 1981, the U.S. Embassy was attacked for the third time in 3 weeks; terrorists opened fire with bazookas and grenades; two persons traveling in a bus were injured. The People's Liberation Forces claimed the credit for that act. Now, those are people who want to rule El Salvador. That all is from Acan, which is the newspaper in Panama City, dated March 25, 1981, and Latin in Buenos Aires, on the same date.

On March 21 of 1981, there was an attempted killing of Interior Minister Ovidio Hernandez while he was driving through the center of San Salvador. There was an explosive projectile thrown at the car's windows. That is from the French Press Agency in Paris on that same date.

On March 18, 1981, subversives poisoned the potable water supply sources in Jocoaitique, in Morazan Province, and cut telephone and telegraph lines. They toppled electric towers, blew up supports and bridges with dynamite, and they left the area entirely cut off and without vital supplies. That is according to El Diario de Hoy in San Salvador of that same date.

On March 6, 1981, the residents were executed when extremists occupied the village of San Lorenzo. They were accused of collaborating with the armed forces, so they were killed. That is according to El Mundo, San Salvador, March 6, 1981.

□ 1500

On March 5, 1981, the day before, a local commander was executed when Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front guerrillas occupied the town of El Jipijal, Santa Ana, and that is according to Radio Venceremos, March 7, 1981.

March 4, again the day before that, Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front forces blew up the bridge over the San Salvador-Chalatenango highway at the Limon detour. That is according to the French Press Agency in Paris, March 4, 1981.

On February 24, 1981, 20 people were killed in an ambush of a truck by the leftists near Suchitoto, according to the French Press Agency again in Paris, February 26, 1981.

On February 23, 1981, eight civilians were killed near Santa Ana by leftists for apparently not paying a war tax, extortion, according to the LATIN, Buenos Aires, February 23, 1981.

On February 12, 1981, 100 guerrillas took over the towns of El Casco de la Hacienda and La Ceiba, and burned 25 peasant homes, nice activities by the people that would take over that country by force, and who do not particularly care to participate in the free and open elections that have just taken place in El Salvador. That is according to ACAN, Panama City, dated February 12, 1981.

Finally, on February 9, 1981, 18 people were killed and 24 were wounded when guerrillas attacked, with contact bombs, a bus carrying tobacco, vegetables, and clothing. Again that is according to ACAN, Panama City, February 10, 1981, and La Prensa Grafica of San Salvador, February 10, 1981.

If the gentleman will indulge me, when I was in San Vicente only a month ago for the elections, watching the people stream to the polls, we were in the middle of the town and it was in the square, and the polling precinct was on one end of the square and as I looked over my shoulder on the other end of the square I saw several hundred people gathering on either side of the street. And as they gathered, the first coffin went by, and then a second, and then a third, and so forth.

What had happened there was that those people were going to bury at least 8, because I saw 8 coffins, but as many as 25 or 30 soldiers who were ambushed by the leftist squard guerrillas of El Salvador the day before in that region. And they were carrying their young men off to the burial ground.

Death is an unfortunate and daily occurrence in that tragic area. And there are some in this country that would just as soon let them live with their unpleasantness and totally withdraw U.S. support from the people of El Salvador and let them fight among themselves and not worry about it.

What I am concerned about, if the gentleman would indulge me, is simply we cannot close our eyes to the unpleasantness, for it simply is not going to go away. We have got to do something about it.

And I would rather not be sending our soldiers down there. What I would really prefer to be doing is simply sending them the economic wherewithal so that they could try to protect themselves against these atrocities.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. The gentleman has indicated in his eloquence the types of problems that exist, and he has detailed in 1981 the leftwing terrorist activities.

Can you imagine going through 3 years of terrorist activities and people being killed indiscriminately, women and children, and going through this process? It is amazing that the El Salvadoran Government has existed. And I think the point is that this weekend they just had an election and can you imagine us having an election after 3 years of open hostilities in this country, and to be able to stream to the ballot boxes as they did this weekend? It is truly amazing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The people go to the polls, of course, to protest this type of violence and attempt to guide their country through the processes of democracy. Unfortunately, when you have extremists that will not participate in the elections, it becomes hardly possible. They have been facing this kind of activity for 5 years. In the process, the unemployment level has gone from about 7 percent in 1979 to well over 40 percent today. The per capita income has declined to about 30 percent of what it was 4 or 5 years ago.

The people who are really suffering are the innocent people of El Salvador, all because of a small band of unsupported extremists who want to take over the country by force rather than by the ballot box.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. The gentleman, like this gentleman, had a little difficulty pronouncing some of the names in this special order. They are foreign names to us and they are of Spanish heritage. They are not the language we speak here on the floor.

But I think we all in the United States ought to recognize that this is not some far-away country. It may be a different language, but it is a very close country. The people of El Salvador, the country of El Salvador is probably closer to the gentleman's district in Louisiana than my people are to our Nation's Capital in Missouri.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman's point is well taken. As a matter of fact, I have made that point frequently on my trips back home. We in New Orleans are closer to the people in San Salvador, the capital of El Salvador, then we are to the people in New York or Los Angeles. And, of course, you can walk from San Salvador to any place in the United States if you had to. They are our neighbors. Whatever happens to them could ultimately happen to us, and so it is very much in our interest to make sure that they get the protection and the peace and the freedom that they are looking for so that we do not ultimately suffer the same kind of terrorism that we are illustrating here today.

I commend the gentleman for his special order.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his contribution.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I will now call on another gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLINGER), who has been very involved and very concerned about leftwing terrorists attacks on the people of El Salvador.

Mr. CLINGER. I thank the gentleman from Missouri very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to carry on with detailing some of the events, some of the acts of terrorism that have occurred. I think the point we are making here is that this is not some recent or limited activity. This has been going on over a long period of time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I would just once like to have those who have opposed the administration's policies in El Salvador to tell us exactly what they would do and how things could be better for the people of El Salvador in specific terms rather than in generalized rhetoric.

As we have heard from the previous speakers, my colleagues who spoke earlier, bombs and murder and terrorism are useful and frequent tools of the FMLM. I have documented evidence of additional acts of terrorism, more killings and bombings by the FMLN which I am going to read into the RECORD in just one moment.

But the point, I think, that we are trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we have got to really try to bring a balance to the discussions of our debate over El Salvador, which is heated and emotional. The focus I think is too often on the problems which the current government, and never mind what current government, never mind the realities of the existing situation, but substituting one government that must answer to us, or that does answer to us, for another that listens only to the Soviet Union is certainly not going to help the United States. And, more importantly, it is certainly not going to help the average citizen in El Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, I deal a lot with economic development in this body and I am very sensitive to the direct connection that exists between the quality and extent of our infrastructure, highways, bridges, power stations, et cetera, and the ability of a society to have economic growth, to create jobs and grow. There is a very direct linkage between the quality of that infrastructure and the ability to have economic growth. And one of the greatest tragedies that I have perceived in El Salvador is that we are destroying the economic infrastructure that makes any kind of economic growth possible in that country.

We have seen a sustained, systematic campaign to make it impossible for economic growth to take place. And it just seems to me that it is very deliberate, and those that say that the problem in Central America, and specifically in El Salvador, is not a military problem but is one of poverty, that is true. Poverty is a very real factor that the Communist Marxists-Leninists are counting on to bring themselves to power. And they are making it almost impossible for any other kind of regime to succeed.

So I think that from my point of view the most really reprehensible thing they are doing there is to destroy the ability of that country to grow.

But let me just mention that perhaps one of the best examples of that was on February 6 of 1981 when a high powered bomb explosion destroyed the Delirio Bridge and damaged the national electric power station and left the entire eastern part of El Salvador without power, and that was reported in ACAN, Panama City, on February 6, 1981. And this, as you have heard other speakers say, was not an isolated incident. They have made a point of targeting those power stations and infrastructure that would make it impossible for growth to take place.

On November 3, 1981, an international fair manager was killed by Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front members as he was traveling in downtown San Salvador toward the fairgrounds. That is reported by Radio Cadena YSKL, San Salvador on November 3, 1980.

On October 10, 1980, the secretary of the executive committee of the party, Melvin Rigoberto Orellana was assassinated by terrorists identified as belonging to the Farabundo Marti Popular Liberation Front.

□ 1510

And on July 3, 1980, the People's Revolutionary Army claimed support for the murder of members of the Nationalist Conciliation Party, Nationalist Democratic Organization, and the local commanders in Morazan and San Miguel; again reported by Radio Cadena Central, in San Salvador on July 30.

Then on June 23, 1980, 215 persons were threatened with death. This was threatened by the ultra leftist armed forces of National Resistance, who released a list of threatened which included three former presidents of El Salvador:

Fidel Sanchez Hernandez, Arturo Armando Molina, and Carlos Humberto Romero; as well as junta members Napoleon Duarte and Antonia Morales Erlich, and on April 14, 1980, the guerrillas occupied Soyanpango, near San Salvador in clashes with the army troops at the time Mayor Jose Estrada Mayorga was caught in the crossfire and killed.

On April 1, 1980, the Guatemalan Ambassador, Carlos Lemus Gallardo, was attacked in front of the Salvadoran high school, and the Revolutionary Party of Central American Workers claimed responsibility as reported again by the French Press Agency on April 1, 1980.

February 14, 1980, leftwing militants took over the office of the Agriculture and Livestock Development Bank; 600 employees were taken hostage by the Salvadoran Christian Peasants Federation and the Farmworkers' Union, both belonging to the People's Revolutionary Party, as reported in ACAN in Panama City.

On November 28, Mr. Speaker, Jose Guzman, former mayor of San Martin, was machinegunned to death by Farabundo Marti Popular Liberation Forces as he was driving toward San Salvador with his 13-year-old son, who was slightly injured.

Mr. Speaker, this is a litany of terror, or horror, of murder that is too long, far too long, but I think it is extremely important that we present this litany; that we detail these events which, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) has pointed out, have taken place over not 6 months, 1 year, but over a 5-year period. And I think that it is incumbent upon us to attempt to redress the balance here; that this is a situation where we have seen systematic, deliberate, ongoing acts of terrorism to try to disrupt and overturn the Government in El Salvador.

So I would just like to add my commendation to the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this special order in order that we may put into the RECORD some of these events which are so tragic.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his contribution and the points that he made about the destruction of the infrastructure as well as loss of lives by the left, the Communist-Marxists in El Salvador. He has been certainly a Member who has contributed much to this body on this issue. We look forward to having him and his advice as we debate these issues, probably this week here in this House, later on this week, when various bills are proposed for foreign aid and also for the appropriations bills that will be coming through.

Mr. Speaker, leftist guerrillas have systematically terrorized the people of El Salvador. And while the most immediate threat has been to the lives of many innocent people, the leftists have also targeted the local economies of these peasant villages, clearly at-

tempting to make more people homeless and jobless.

Because when people are homeless and jobless they get very frustrated and they get ripe for revolution. That is what they are hoping, these Communists and leftists down there. They do not want to settle things at the ballot box, but they do want to shoot people. They want to provide terrorist activities and an atmosphere of intimidation in order to convince these people of El Salvador that their method and their way is right.

If you are going to intimidate the whole country then you will have a lot of people who are afraid to speak up and come forward.

That did not and has not happened yet. This weekend again, I emphasize, the people of El Salvador streamed to the voting booths to cast their vote for their democracy, for their own president. They decided to go through the ballot box and not the bullet. I think it is obvious this type of activity is the only recourse that the rebel guerrillas, the Nicaraguan-supplied front in El Salvador, this is the only success they have had; these terrorists activities, they have had no success where it counts, at the ballot box.

I would like to continue detailing these atrocities of the left. On April 18, 1983, FMLM guerrillas attacked a La Paz electrical substation and blew it up; April 17, 1983, the guerrillas attracked the San Sebastian Mining Complex where 400 guerrillas attacked the richest gold mine in El Salvador, killing in the process six national guards. And once they were in control of that facility, the guerrillas placed dynamite charges and set fire to the complex.

What happened? Hundreds of jobs were lost as well as the loss of those six guards. They set fire to the complex. Those jobs were lost for many months. The mine will be out of service for years. This was reported in El Mundo, San Salvador, April 18.

On April 10, 1983, a civil defense chief and deputy chief were murdered; residents of the town of El Pajal, San Juan Nonualco, witnessed as Rodil Calderon and Rodolfo Herrera were put up against a wall and shot by extremists who had taken over the town; the extremists stole money, food, and jewelry.

This was reported in La Prensa Grafica in San Salvador on the 11th of April.

Same day, 200 subversives attacked the town of Comatepeque, San Pedro, and killed 3 civil defense guards and the son of the local commander. They looted homes and stores. This is reported in El Diario de Hoy, San Salvador, on April 11.

Two days before that, guerrillas occupied the town of Cancasque for two and a half days, killed 12 civilians, while there in those two and a half days, reported in El Mundo, San Salvador.

April 4, 1983, seven people were killed including the mayor. Guerrillas occupied four townships including Guadalupe, Verapaz, San Lorenzo, and San Cayetano; in San Cayetano Istepeque, they dragged Mayor Eleazar Cruz, 55, from his home to the municipal building and shot and killed him. This is the mayor of that town. Certainly not any way to conduct an election, but these people are not interested in elections; they are interested in killing people who are in positions of control. This was reported in Latin, Buenos Aires.

March 13, 1983, guerrillas sabotaged powerlines in San Salvador and caused a blackout not only in San Salvador but also in Usulutan, San Miguel, La Union, and Morazan. French Press Agency of Paris reported this on March 14.

February 16, 1983, guerrillas took over seven radio stations and forced the operators to air guerrilla transmissions. This was reported February 17, 1983.

Previous month in January 26, 1983, three civilians were shot to death when the Salvadoran urban guerrillas attacked guards at the northern section of the San Carlos garrison in northern San Salvador. ACAN, Panama City and other press reports on that day.

January 26, 1983, Rebel groups destroyed two high-voltage transformer poles in the southern part of San Ana, 65km west of San Salvador. Reported on Radio Cadena YSKL, San Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) who also has articulated here on the floor his opposition and concern of the leftist movement in Central America and ask him if he has any remarks he would like to make at this time.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me and also for taking this special order during which we have an opportunity to point out that the terrorism of the left in El Salvador has been a major story of the violence in that country.

□ 1520

All too often what we hear is the report to the human rights organizations that are pointing out, justifiably so, that large numbers of people are losing their lives to terrorists in El Salvador.

What so often is not reported, however, is that much of that terrorism comes from the left. It is true that the rightwing death squads operate and they are a horrendous example of what has gone wrong in that country. Their terrorism needs to be exposed. We hear these reports from the human rights group. It is usually always attributed to rightwing death squads and we have largely ignored this whole pattern of leftwing terrorism.

Yet in 1983 we had a banner year for terrorism, economic sabotage, and political assassinations by the radical left in El Salvador.

Largely unnoticed by the American press were the growing number of innocent civilians—men, women, and children—that were falling victim to this increasingly indiscriminate violence perpetrated by the left.

In January 1983, a whole series of incidents took place that were reported by the press within that country and around the world.

For example, the leftist rebels detonated a coastal highway bridge over the Lempa River. That was reported by Radio Venceremos in January 1983.

An important power tower was destroyed near San Felipe. That was reported in El Mundo.

Near San Martin, the Liberation Front rebels, the left, attacked a bus, killing one young girl and injuring seven.

One only has to wonder what kind of people attack buses with innocent civilians aboard them, including young children and end up killing a young girl as a part of their political vendetta within the country.

The terrorists also destroyed a railroad bridge near San Miguel by attaching dynamite to that bridge.

Terrorists attacked the National Telecommunications Administration and Civil Defense Headquarters. That was reported in El Diario de Hoy in San Salvador.

The rebels sabotaged high-tension wires that provide electricity to several towns. That was reported by Radio Candena in San Salvador.

The National Liberation Front rebels blew up the Salvador Beltran Luna bridge over the Torola River in Morazen. That was reported by Radio Venceremos.

The Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front rebels occupied the town of San Francisco Morazan. That was reported by Radio Venceremos.

The rebels also attacked military posts in several towns on January 11, 1983, and that was reported by the Havana International Service on January 12.

An ARENA deputy was attacked, ARENA being the rightwing party of the country. A deputy, Col. Alberto Jarquin, 64, was attacked while driving home with his son. An explosive device was thrown at his car. That was reported by Radio Cadena in January 1983.

In other words, a whole series of incidents, acts of terror against the economy of the country, acts of terror specifically against the people of the country carried out completely by leftwing terrorists.

It is a most disturbing pattern and the kind of thing that we need to be aware of when we hear talk that the United States ought to pull the rug out from underneath the Government because these people, these terrorists, being supported by the Cubans, by the Soviets, by the Nicaraguans, they are being funded to carry out just these kinds of acts in El Salvador. The purpose is very clear, the overthrow of the society in El Salvador which is at least attempting to make some moves toward a more democratization and ultimately freedom for the people.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to our special order. He has certainly hit it right on the head in his statements about the terrorist acts that he detailed to us here in January 1983. All of them that he mentioned were all within 1 month, any one of which would, in most places in the world, would certainly be the major event for many, many months, he detailed many of them all in the same month of January 1983.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, when you look down through the list what you find is that all of them took place in about a 16-day period. So that it is really a 2-week period we are talking about. All of things that I detailed took place within a 2-week period in a country as small as El Salvador. I would submit that if a series of accidents of that type all attributable to one group of terrorists took place in a country as big as the United States in a 2-week period that we would be taking all kinds of action to try to control that kind of terrorism within our own country.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. This was not too far removed, I think calendar-wise, if memory serves me correctly, that we were debating here on the floor of the House how we were going to put a fence up from Nicaragua and El Salvador to keep all these arms coming in that end up killing people, we were going to erect a fence. Of course we never did anything about it. It was probably at the same time that these people were being killed, was it not?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) has returned and has, I believe, some additional detailing accounts that he would like to share with the rest of us.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to consider, that the people that we are talking about here are real people. These are not things that happened on television. These are not things that happened to characters in some play. What we are describing here are events that happened to real human beings, people just like ourselves. They may speak Spanish instead of English, but they are people just as we would meet on the street or have in our homes. They may be relatives of ours. As a matter of fact, they are neighbors of ours.

Many were not involved in any special activity. They were not involved in politics or protests. Some were at soccer matches, some were in churches, some were in their very homes; some in their respective towns.

Illustrative of the types of atrocities that we have already described are some additional incidents.

On April 3, 1982, a deputy of the ARENA Party, which participated in the elections, which tried to contribute to democracy, his name was David Joaquin Quinteros. He had just been elected deputy and he was shot from a car and seriously wounded in the head. He died in the hospital. That according to the French news agency in Paris, April 4, 1982.

On April 22, the same month, same year, the FMLN occupied the town of Sociedad, 12 kilometers east of San Francisco Gotera, the capital of the Morazan Province. That occupation of course took place without benefit of elections, according to the Manaqua Domestic Service of that date.

On April 3, Reyes Romero, age 35, was killed by men carrying different weapons. They shot him three times in front of a store and left a sign stating that he had been executed for being an informer, according to La Prensa Grafica on May 2, 1982.

On May 5, a powerplant was dynamited by terrorists in the village of Tierra Virgen, outside of San Martin, La Palma and it caused a blackout. Now that happens day in and day out. When I was down there it happened at least three or four times. But that particular incident was reported by Radio Venceremos on May 12, 1982.

On July 15, 1982, the President of the International Trade Fair, Nicolas Nassar, was murdered by leftist guerrillas. The Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1982 reported that in February 1983.

On September 1, 1982, three peasants were killed; Ricardo Escobar and Roberto and Maria Luz Romero were killed and 1 child, Marcos Arevalo, was injured during a terrorist attack in Jucuaran, Usulutan Province, according to Radio Cadena YSKL, in San Salvador on September 1, 1982.

□ 1530

On October 8, 1982, six policemen were killed. The chief of police in Berlin, in Usulutan Province, and five policemen were all killed in an ambush, according to El Mundo, in San Salvador, on the next day.

On October 15, 1982, 10 bombs exploded in San Salvador. Bombs were placed in telephone boxes and utility poles. They disrupted the telephone and power service. One bomb went off 200 meters from the U.S. Embassy, according to ACAN in Panama City on that date.

And then on December 6, 1982, 1 person was killed and over 100 people were kidnaped. Fans at a soccer match were kidnaped by guerrilla groups in San Sebastian. One person ran and was fired upon and killed. Minors, elderly people, and women were in the group of people kidnaped, according to Radio Cadena YSKL, in San Salvador, on December 6, 1982.

And, finally, on December 21, 1982, rebel harassment led to the suspension of coffee harvesting in the provinces of Tecatan and California, according to Radio Cadena YSKL.

So, there you see murder and sabotage in a deliberate attempt to kill innocent people and sabotage the economy, constantly blowing up bridges and killing off labor union leaders. That is the type of thing being done by these people who take justice into their own hands. I call it "justice," but that is a poor word for it because, in fact, this is murderous activity of the worst sort. It is total destruction of democratic processes, and it really is incumbent upon us as citizens of the United States, just a few miles to the north of these innocent people, to stand with those who believe in peace and freedom and try to offset the threat that is constantly being imposed on a day-to-day basis by these murderous rebels who have no concern for innocent life.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I wonder what sometimes it takes to jar the American people out of some of the apathy that they have about what is happening in Central America. The gentleman mentions 100 people being kidnaped at a soccer game. Can you imagine what would happen in New Orleans, in the gentleman's district, in his city, if 100 people at a New Orleans Saints game were kidnaped? This is something that would be not only unheard of but the reaction by the American people would be tremendous against that. But the same American people feel that, well, it does not happen in our country, so we do not even hardly take note of it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, of course, the gentleman is right. It is not universal among the people of this country, but there are those, including those who are political leaders in this Nation, who would close their eyes and close their doors and their hearts and their minds to what is going on in Central America. I just cannot say it enough. I think if we continue to turn

away from the violence that is plaguing our neighbors to the south, some day that same violence will plague us.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), who I think will have some contributions to be made at this time.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his taking the time to put in the RECORD this sort of thing, because it is only by, really, laying the base of truth so that people can see where the terrorism comes from, where the weapons come from, and what is happening in Central America, that people can begin to appreciate how much trouble freedom is in our hemisphere and why it is important that we be involved.

The leftist guerrillas in El Salvador are engaging in the same kind of terror tactics that terrorist groups around the world employ in their attempt to topple the young democracy currently in El Salvador. and it is little wonder, given the immense amount of military support provided them by their Sandinista, Cuban, Soviet, Libyan, Bulgarian, and PLO patrons.

I might mention, by the way, that many of the very Members who on this floor will condemn the Palestinian Liberation Organization for its terrorism in Israel will then just shrug their shoulders at terrorism that is taking place in El Salvador.

Similarly, many of the Members who stand on this floor and say they support the freedom fighters in Afghanistan will turn their backs when the people of El Salvador are trying to fight for their freedom.

It is the Communist nations I just mentioned, Nicaragua, Cuba, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, who are the most responsibile for providing weapons and, in the case of Nicaragua, for providing training grounds, so that the terrorists can learn and be prepared to engage in killings in El Salvador.

I would like to enter into the RECORD some examples of killings in El Salvador.

On January 4, 1982, nine terrorist bombs exploded in San Salvador. Buildings attacked were the social housing fund, the homes of Capt. Roberto Alfonso Mendoza Portillo, Cesar Augusto Miraflor, the magistrate Rafael Sanchez Rodriguez, the Judith Aleman family home, the home of Manuel Rene Villacorta, and the shirt factory owned by Judith Aleman. Those were all bombed on January 4.

And I think American citizens have to ask themselves: What would our reaction be if in our National Capital or in our State Capital or in our county seat on 1 day nine terrorist bombs were to hit a social housing fund building, seven homes and a local factory? How would that disrupt and terrorize our society?

On January 12, 1982, terrorists killed four guards, one sergeant, and kidnaped children. Terrorists attacked Jocaitique, north of Morazan, ransacked and destroyed several homes.

On January 21, 1982, Communist terrorists killed two men they suspected to be death squad collaborators in the Sarti company.

On February 3, 1982, 400 people were killed.

And again I think every American citizen should ask themselves: How would you feel, how would you react, would you be afraid, would you be courageous, what would your attitude be if 500 terrorists attacked and murdered the entire population of your town? Yet on February 3, 1982, 500 terrorists attacked and murdered the entire population of Nueva Trinidad. Four hundred people were killed. Terrorists shot at random and set fire to everything in their path. Fifty men were kidnaped.

On February 10, 1982, guerrillas attacked downtown San Salvador with bazookas, damaging the largest telecommunications center in the country.

Imagine that if here in Washington ABC or NBC or CBS or the AT&T building were to be hit by guerrillas, and then you have some sense of how desperate the fighting gets and how vicious the guerrillas are.

On February 22, 1982, leftwing terrorists blew up two 115,000-volt towers of the Cerron Grande line in the Guaycume area.

Now, let me just say that we are talking about a situation in which the country is trying to survive, it is trying to have jobs, it is trying to keep its economy going, while guerrillas are systematically blowing up the primary facilities for electricity, for communication, and for transportation.

For example, on February 24, 1982, terrorists blew up a bridge on the coastal road near El Coyelito.

Again, I would say to all Americans: The next time you drive over a road on your way home, the next time you drive on a road, on the interstate, and you pass over a bridge, ask yourself: What would my neighborhood be like if that bridge were blown up today or tomorrow or the next day by guerrillas? What would happen in my town? What would happen to our economy, what would happen to our chance for a decent life if every couple weeks the guerrillas took out another bridge? And we can begin to appreciate the terror and the savagery that is being imposed on the decent, freedom-loving people of El Salvador.

On February 27, 1982, terrorists attacked Roberto d'Aubuisson on the road from Santo Domingo to San Sebastian.

Now, d'Aubuisson is an important enough political leader in El Salvador that the terrorists attacking him would be the equivalent of GARY HART or Walter Mondale, for example, being attacked by terrorists while they tried to campaign. Imagine our reaction if terrorists were that frequently and deeply involved in American society.

On March 14, 1982, guerrillas dynamited and completely destroyed the Chapeltique bridge over the Chapeltique River in northern San Miguel.

On March 28, 1982, the mayor and local garrison commander were shot. The mayor of Villa Socieded, Morazan Province, Humberto Blanco, and Comdr. Jose Perla were murdered by terrorists trying to prevent people from voting in the elections.

Imagine that every time we had a primary—last Saturday we had a primary in Texas—people were being shot going to the primary. Imagine, as I said a minute ago, here on February 24 and again on March 14 bridges were being blown up. I think that the gentleman from Missouri brings to everyone's attention the fact that the real cause of the terrorist violence in El Salvador is directly tied to the Communist aid they are getting through Nicaragua, it is directly tied to the Soviet Union and Bulgaria in Cuba, and that we in this country this week have an obligation to look honestly at the two amendments that are going to be offered to the foreign aid bill. We need to face up to our duties, as Franklin Roosevelt taught us, to be a good neighbor; that we have to be at least as concerned about El Salvador, 2 days' drive from the Texas border, as Harry Truman was about Greece, a long way from America; we have to be committed to allowing and protecting and helping the forces of freedom win so that folks who had an election on Sunday, an election which has not occurred in Communist Nicaragua, has not occurred in Communist Cuba, has not occurred in Communist Soviet Union, but in El Salvador the people had their second election this year, and it was a decent, honest election, and they deserve help from their neighbors in the United States.

I thank the gentleman for holding this special order.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his important contribution, trying to bring home exactly these cold, calculated facts that have been distilled from the reports in the media and to make them compassionate and to bring home exactly what it means and what it would mean to the people of the United States if we had to live under these types of terrorists acts perpetrated by the leftwing and the Marxist Communists in Central America, and El Salvador in particular.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, we have brought this special order because we want to not in any sort of way defend the activities of the rightwing death squads. I want to point that out and make that very clear. We are very much opposed to that, as we are to the leftwing death squads.

But the fact of the matter is that the rightwing death squads have gotten so much expression in the press in this country and within the media and in discussion here on the floor that it is almost as if we are tacitly approving of the leftwing when we do not bring up these things. Nobody in this Congress approves of these acts, and nobody in the Congress wants to support them, so I ask all my colleagues to come forward with us to convey a message that condemns both sides who use terrorists activities, who use the bullet instead of the ballot, in El Salvador, and that is right as well as left.

Simply, we are trying to provide an opportunity for people to witness what has gone on and the travesties that have gone on from the left.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few items I would like to express before we wrap up the special in detailed accounts that have occurred in June and May, and April 1981. I will leave those for the RECORD, but let me point out just one. That was March 25, 1981, when the daughter of Jose Napoleon Duarte, the man who many think, by exit polls and otherwise, has either won the election held in El Salvador for President this weekend, or will come very close to winning that election.

His daughter was attacked in March 1981 when her pick-up truck was smashed several times by a car driven by one of these terrorists. I ask anyone in this House whether or not we would have the fortitude, the courage, to go forward with our political agenda, to lead our people, if our families were being attacked as they have been in El Salvador, and say to everybody that the message is that these people have the choice, and they have chosen democracy, with whatever and whoever won yesterday, but the people of El Salvador are living under a tremendous, terrified atmosphere of both right and left, and we, as policymakers and decisionmakers in this House have got to recognize that one is not any worse or any better than the other and we ought to channel our energies and our directions and our legislation so that these people might live in freedom, freedom from both right and leftist terrorist acts.

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to outline a process that we began this afternoon which, I think, relates directly to the debate on foreign policy this week and which I think will be of some interest to all of the Members of the House and to those who watch the House both in the news media and in the country at large.

This afternoon, in a press conference, the Republican Study Committee released a study done by Frank Gregorsky of statements by key Members of the Congress on foreign policy beginning in 1970. This study indicates quite clearly that there is a systematic pattern of self-deception and of being wrong by which the members of the leftwing of the Democratic Party both in the House and in the Senate managed over a number of years to avoid learning very much out of their errors. When you read this study by Mr. Gregorsky, which the study committee is making available, and you see case after case, starting in Vietnam, then Cambodia and Laos, then in Nicaragua, in Afghanistan, in Angola, today in El Salvador, the same patterns occur over and over and over.

As a consequence, one has to ask the question: How could obviously very bright people be that wrong? How could they fail to understand what was going on, or when they failed to understand, how could they fail to learn from their own failure, because we have now had 14 years of members of the leftwing of the Democratic Party telling us that if only the United States would behave, the world would get better.

It reached, I guess, its peak of being out of touch with reality when at least two members of the leftwing of the Democratic Party said, at the time the Soviet Union shot down the Korean airliner, that it was the fault of the United States that the Soviets had had to shoot down a Korean airliner; that if we were not so aggressive, they would not be so afraid. In fact, one of them said we should be ashamed that we forced the Soviet Union to defend itself by shooting down an innocent Korean airliner.

It takes, I think, a pretty long string of excuses for the Soviet Union to get to a point where you blame the American Government because the Soviet Government shoots down innocent people.

But, in fact, the other case we have had recently is Grenada. When the President of the United States liberated some 800 American students and ended a ruthless butchery of pro-Communist dictatorship which had been imposed in a matter of days because, in fact, the former Maurice Bishop government was trying to get away from the grip of the Soviet-Cuban colony it had become, and they killed Maurice Bishop, in that pattern it is absolutely amazing that there were actually Members of this body, mostly radical Democrats, who got up and said we should impeach Ronald Reagan for kicking out a Communist government.

We have since gotten copies of the material, of the minutes, of the records of the Communist Government of Grenada, because like all governments they had their bureaucracy and they kept their records, and we find when we read the materials, the minutes of the Communist Government of Grenada, that they were, in fact, systematically working with the Soviet Union.

So, when Members of this body go back over to various radical Democrats and say to them, "Now that you know that the Grenadian Government was dealing with the Soviet Union, that it was involved in signing a contract with the Soviet Union, that it was becoming a colony of the Soviet Union, how do you feel now?"

The answer I was given on the floor in a private conversation last Wednesday was, "Those are CIA documents. How do I know they are true?"

Now, if you have somebody who will go so far to excuse the Soviet Union that if the Soviet Union shoots down an airplane it becomes America's fault, and who then, when presented absolute evidence out of Grenada about what was going on, says "Aha, that proves the Central Intelligence Agency probably doctored them," at that point I would suggest to you that you have someone who has a very great difficulty being in touch with reality.

That is the central problem we face in this body: That in fact there is an entire branch of the Democratic Party which has now adopted a radical world view. That radical world view says basically that whatever happens, it is probably America's fault; that the Soviet Union can always be excused; that Communist Governments are always in some way trying to do well whatever they happen to do badly; and that governments that are non-Communist are probably dangerous and are probably bad to their people.

A real test of that world view is coming up in the case, for example, of Costa Rica. Costa Rica has been the most honest, the most democratic, the most decent country in Central America, in all of Latin America, for that matter.

Costa Rica disbanded its army in 1948. Communist Nicaragua is now forcing a crisis on Costa Rica. We have a pretty good historical case here. We have 36 years of the least censored, most honest, least corrupt government in Latin America.

It will be interesting to see whether any of the radical Democrats can decide to side with Costa Rica, or whether, instead, we start to get arguments that say, "Well, it is really all Costa Rica's fault because, after all, they did something to antagonize the Nicaragua Communists." I suspect that there will be remarkably few radical Democrats either to provide aid to Costa Rica, although it is probably of all the countries in the New World the country which has best moral case.

After all, if you disband your army 36 years ago, you are pretty clearly indicating you want to live in peace. If we are not willing to defend a country that decent, that tiny, that unwilling to threaten anyone, then I think you begin to raise a question of where, in fact, is America willing to stand.

This whole issue of the inability to see clearly what is going on goes back a very long way in American life. What we are going to do is to release this paper, which cites Members by name, by date, starting in 1970 when one radical Democrat said, "Well, if only we would pull out of Vietnam that would force the Vietnamese to negotiate a compromise."

□ 1550

Well, of course, when we pulled out, it led to the Communists in Vietnam, and in fact it was not a compromise; it is now a Communist tyranny.

Then another radical Democrat said, "Well, you know, if we would just get out of Cambodia, then they would have peace."

Well, the peace they got was a Communist tyranny which killed one out of every seven Cambodians.

Then there was a radical Democrat who said, "We ought to stay out of Angola. It is none of our business, and we ought to let Angola decide for Angolans."

Well, the fact is that there are 25,000 Cuban Communist troops in Angola today, and they are imposing a Communist dictatorship, which is a colony of the Soviet Union. And there is a pro-freedom force called UNIDA led by Jonas Savimbi which is trying to fight its way back into freedom and which controls more of Angola than the El Salvadoran guerrillas control in El Salvador. But we do not hear a single radical Democrat jump up and say that we really ought to help the forces of freedom in Angola. Oh, no. In Angola, where there are Cuban Communist troops, we ought to stay out, and in El Salvador, where there are Communist guerrillas, we ought to stay out. In other words, if you a Communist and you are imposing a dictatorship, we should not stop you, and if you are a Communist and you are trying to impose a dictatorship, we should not stop you.

So there is in effect a double standard. If you are pro-American, you are probably corrupt, and if you are pro-Communist, you are probably all right.

It is a systematic problem. So that, for example, we get narrowly based rightwing governments. That is a common phrase. There are never any "narrowly based" leftwing governments. Yet virtually every Communist dictatorship is even more narrowly based in its power base than any conservative government or rightwing government on the planet.

After the problems in Africa, we then have the whole difficulty in Afghanistan. Remember, just a few moments ago I said that when Maurice Bishop tried to break off his alliance in his role as a colony for the Soviet Union, what happened was that he was promptly shot by the pro-Soviet dictatorship and was in effect knocked out. Their technique was: "You want to be free? Fine, we'll kill you."

That should not have surprised anyone when in 1979, in Afghanistan, the pro-Soviet dictator tried to break free from the Soviet Union; he was killed, his family was killed, his aides were killed, and a pro-Soviet dictator was imposed by force. We see in Grenada the same thing we saw in Afghanistan. It is a set pattern. It is a pattern that says that once the Soviet Union gets you in its grips, it will go to great lengths, including killing you, if necessary, in order to avoid having you get out of its grip.

In that setting you would think that the radical Democrats would begin to figure out that maybe having the Soviet KGB—what has been called the "Gestapo of the left"—is a bad thing, maybe having the Cubans there advising you is a bad thing, and maybe governments that are leaning on Soviet and Cuban advisers are in fact likely to end up as Communist dictators. We will not hear that this week on the floor of the House.

But what we are going to do is, tomorrow night we are going to take a series of special orders and read into the RECORD the Republican study committee study by Frank Gregorsky, which outlines rather clearly the historical case that there is in fact a radical world view, and that the radical Democrats are in fact addicted to that world view. We are then going to invite on Wednesday and Thursday radical Democrats who are named in the study to come and share a special order, much in the way that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) and I shared a special order several weeks ago. We think that if they want to explain it, if they want to offer an alternative version of what is going on, if they want to disagree with us, they ought to have a right to do so once we have read it into the RECORD, and that the comity of the House requires that if we are going to say something in the RECORD, we should be willing to stand up and defend what we say with our colleagues whom in effect we are criticizing. So on Wednesday and Thursday nights we are going to take special orders and offer that opportunity.

Now, in addition to that, let me say that we are going to suggest that when you read Mr. Gregorsky's study and when you look at our outline of the radical Democrats' world view, then people who want to either watch on television or read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the debate this week will have a way of keeping score.

How often will a radical Democrat get up and mention that there are Cuban advisers in Nicaragua? How often will a radical Democrat get up and protest the fact that there was $112 million in Soviet military equipment in Nicaragua last year? How often will a radical Democrat point out there there is $300 million in Soviet construction for military bases in Nicaragua going on right now in some 40 bases?

You can have sort of a check list to keep score. And what you will discover is that again and again and again what the radical Democrats will say is that it is all the U.S.' fault, that if we would only be reasonable, if we would only negotiate, if we would only get out of the way; it is our policy of force, it is our fault. It is an extension, as I said earlier, of the same rationale that led two radical Democrats to say that it was America's fault that the Soviet Union shot down a Korean airliner.

Why do people have a difficult time understanding that the Soviet Union is very dangerous, and that communism is a threat to freedom? I was very struck as a former history teacher by how far back in the 20th century this phenomenon goes, and I want to enter into the RECORD tonight some quotations from what I think is the finest history of the 20th century that has yet been written, a book by Paul Johnson called "Modern Times, the World From the Twenties to the Eighties."

Paul Johnson is an Englishman. He was educated at Stonyhurst College, Lancashire, and Magdalen College, Oxford. He was assistant editor of Realités, and then he was on the staff on the New Statesman from 1955 to 1970. He originally was very leftwing and shared the values of many people who I think would be shocked at what he said. But over time, as he studied the Soviet Union and he studied the rise of tyranny, he became concerned, so he wrote this history, and I want to talk briefly about the creation all the way back into the 1920's and the 1930's of a leftwing Western World view which just rejected negative information about the Soviet Union and about communism which said in effect, "Don't tell me about it."

After several pages in which Paul Johnson outlines the whole concept of

the purge under Stalin, the slave labor camps, and the secret police, he proceeds, and in many ways it is the Soviet Union which is the model for Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany. The Soviets had already had a secret police in place for 15 years before Adolf Hitler came to power. The Soviet's already had labor camps before Adolf Hitler came to power. In many ways the Germans studied what the Communist were doing in Russia in order to establish a truly totalitarian state.

Faced with the fact that there were enormous camps in the Soviet Union, that there was slave labor, that there was a police state, and that there were secret police, what happened in the American left and the English left? This is what Paul Johnson said:

In the outside world, the magnitude of the Stalin tyranny—or indeed its very existence—was scarcely grasped at all. Most of those who travelled to Russia were either businessmen, anxious to trade and with no desire to probe or criticize what did not concern them, or intellectuals who came to admire and, still more, to believe. If the decline of Christianity created the modern political zealot—and his crimes—so the evaporation of religious faith among the educated left a vacuum in the minds of Western intellectuals easily filled by secular superstition. There is no other explanation for the credulity with which scientists, accustomed to evaluating evidence, and writers, whose whole function was to study and criticize society, accepted the crudest Stalinist propaganda at its face value. They needed to believe; they wanted to be duped. Thus, Amabel Williams-Ellis wrote an introduction to a book about the building of the White Sea Canal, later so harrowingly described by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, which contains the sentence: 'This tale of accomplishment of a ticklish engineering job, in the middle of primeval foress, by tens of thousands of enemies of the state, helped—or should it be guarded?—by only thirty-seven OGPU officers, is one of the most exciting stories that has ever appeared in print.'

Let me digress from Johnson and say this at this point for those who may not be familiar with this. Here is a slave labor camp that may have involved 300,000 slaves, that involved deliberate brutality, and that may have had as high as a 10-percent-a-year death rate because people were not fed enough, they were working in bad clothing and bad weather and the guards were very brutal. Yet, here is a Western intellectual describing it as though it were an idyllic, wonderful place.

Let me go to quote from Paul Johnson:

Sidney and Beatrice Webb said of the same project: "It is pleasant to think that the warmest appreciation was officially expressed of the success of the OGPU, not merely in performing a great engineering feat, but in achieving a triumph in human regeneration."

Again, to deviate from Paul Johnson, Beatrice and Sidney Webb, two of the leading leftwing thinkers in Great Britain who had enormous influence in the United States, are in effect here describing this slave labor camp as though somebody were to describe Auschwitz as a place of dignity where people are redeemed. It is the most clear, total fabrication of the truth you can imagine, and yet clearly they believed it. These are not lying agents of the Soviet conspiracy. These were people who desperately wanted to believe.

Let me go on quoting from Paul Johnson:

Harold Laski praised Soviet prisons for enabling convicts to lead "a full and self-respecting life", Anna Louise Strong recorded: "The labour camps have won a high reputation throughout the Soviet Union as places where tens of thousands of men have been reclaimed." "So well-known and effective is the Soviet method of remaking human beings", she added, "that criminals occasionally now apply to be admitted."

□ 1600

Let me, if I may, repeat that last quote, because I think only by understanding how totally willing to deceive themselves the American and the British left is can we begin to understand how bad our crisis is and how difficult it is to describe what is going on in Central America.

This is from Anna Louise Strong quoted by Paul Johnson:

So well known and effective is the Soviet method of remaking human beings that criminals occasionally now apply to be readmitted.

In other words, she was with a straight face reporting that Russian prisons were so good that people asked to be allowed to go to them in order to be regenerated and rejuvenated morally. Now, a person who will believe that will believe almost anything, and if you read all of the leftwing writings about Stalin in the 1930's, you discover that in fact they did believe almost anything.

Let me go on quoting from Paul Johnson:

Whereas in Britain, wrote George Bernard Shaw, a man enters a prison a human being and emerges a criminal type, in Russia he entered "as a criminal type and would come out an ordinary man but for the difficulty of inducing him to come out at all. As far as I could make out, they stay as long as they like."

Now, notice, I am quoting here George Bernard Shaw, one of the most brilliant, cynical critics of Western civilization we have had in the last century, a man of enormous intelligence, a man of great impact, and a man who could honestly say that to the best of his knowledge, Soviet prisoners liked to stay in prison so much that they did not leave it.

Now, a man who is willing to believe that the reason people were not getting out of prison was because they liked staying there is a man who will believe almost anything.

Imagine if you will and you can appreciate a little better my sense of frustration if you can understand that we are dealing here with decent, honorable, hard working people, who honestly came to believe whatever they had to in order to apologize for the Soviet Union. They were totally unwilling to believe that Stalin was a terrorist, that Stalin killed people, that Stalin led the great purges, that Stalin had slave labor camps, because they did not want to.

Imagine that your next door neighbor had this habit of coming to your house and offering your daughter or your son a pet bunny rabbit which had an unhappy tendency to turn out to be a rattlesnake.

Now, at some point you would begin to worry about your neighbors, about this ability to deal with reality if they insisted on bringing back another rattlesnake while calling it a bunny rabbit, yet here we have evidence from the thirties, and I would add some more in a moment, that the American and British left for over 50 years now has found it impossible to deal directly with the nature of the Soviet Union.

I go on to quote from Paul Johnson:

The famine of 1932, the worst in Russian history, was virtually unreported. At the height of it, the visiting biologist, Julian Huxley, found a "level of physique and general health rather above that to be seen in England."

Shaw threw his food supplies out of the train window just before crossing the Russian frontier "convinced that there were no shortages in Russia." "Where do you see any food shortage" he asked, glancing around the foreigners only restaurant of the Moscow Metropole.

Let me close that quote and again comment. Here is the great brilliant literary leader of the left in the middle of the worst famine in Russian history who is so naive and so eager to believe that he allows the Russians to take him to a restaurant only for visitors and then assumes he is seeing what is happening in the countryside.

Now, we know because as historians we have gone back and looked, we know how bad that famine was. I say to you, if George Bernard Shaw could have been that clearly duped, does that explain why some TV and movie stars today are willing to tell you how good Nicaragua is? Does that help you understand better why some literary and leftwing figures tell you that really, Castro is reasonable? Because we know how duped they were in the thirties. We know how wrong they were in the thirties.

Let me go on. George Bernard Shaw wrote:

Stalin has delivered the goods to an extent that seemed impossible 10 years ago, and I take off my hat to him accordingly.

Quoting again from Paul Johnson:

But Shaw and his traveling companion, Lady Astor, knew of the political prisoners,

since the latter asked Stalin for clemency on behalf of a woman who wished to join her husband in America. (Stalin promptly handed her over to the OGPU).

Let me make a note that OGPU is the original term for that period for the secret police:

And she asked him, "How long are you going to go on killing people? When he replied, "As long as necessary," she changed the subject and asked him to find her a Russian nursery maid for her children.

This is typical of the modern American left. When confronted with the real brutality of the Soviet Communist system and its empire, when confronted with Soviet colonies, the American left, much like Lady Astor, wants to know if we can get a nursery maid for our children. There is no willingness to confront and deal head on with the fact that the Soviet Union really is a police state that really does lock up people.

Going on to quote from Paul Johnson:

Estimates of Stalin written in the years 1929–34 make curious reading. H. G. Wells said he had "never met a man more candid, fair and honest . . . no one is afraid of him and everybody trusts him." The Webbs argued that he had less power than an American President and was merely acting on the orders of the Central Committee and the Presidium. Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, described him as leading "his people down new and unfamiliar avenues of democracy". The American Ambassador, Joseph E. Davies, reported him as having "insisted on the liberalization of the constitution" and "projecting actual secret and universal suffrage". "His brown eye is exceedingly wise and gentle" he wrote. "A child would like to sit on his lap and a dog would sidle up to him". Emile Ludwig, the famous popular biographer, found him a man "whose care I would readily confide the education of my children." The physicist, J. D. Bernal, paid tribute both to his "deeply scientific approach to all problems" and his "capacity for feeling". He was, said the Chilean writer, Pablo Neruda, "a good natured man of principle"; "a man of kindly geniality" echoed the Dean.

Some of these tributes can be variously explained by corruption, vanity or sheer folly. Davies who persistently misrepresented the nature of Stalin's Russia to his government, was being in effect bribed by the Soviet regime, who allowed him to buy icons and chalices for his collection at below-market prices. Anna Louise Strong was well described by Malcolm Muggeridge as "an enormous woman with a very red face, a lot of white hair, and an expression of stupidity so overwhelming that it amounted to a kind of strange beauty". Self-delusion was obviously the biggest single factor in the presentation of an unsuccessful despotism as a Utopia in the making. But there was also conscious deception by men and women who thought of themselves as idealists and who, at the time, honestly believed they were serving a higher human purpose by systematic misrepresentation and lying. If the Great War with its unprecedented violence brutalized the world, the Great Depression corrupted it by appearing to limit the options before humanity and presenting them in garishly contrasting terms. Political activists felt they had to make terrible choices and, having made them, stick to them with desperate resolution. The 30's was the age of the heroic lie. Saintly mendacity became its most prized virtue. Stalin's tortured Russia was the prime beneficiary of this sanctified falsification. The competition to deceive became more fierce when Stalinism acquired a mortal rival in Hitler's Germany.

There was, indeed, an element of deception right at the heart of this rivalry between the Communist and Fascist forms of totalitarianism. They were organically linked in the process of historical development.

This was, as Johnson said, the age of the heroic lie. Today we continue to live in an age of heroic self-deception. The paper written by Frank Gregorsky written for the Republican Study Committee, I think indicates conclusively that the radical Democrats, those who follow George McGovern's philosophy and who abandoned John F. Kennedy's, those who pursue the Gary Hart-Walter Mondale policy and leave Harry Truman and Franklin Roosevelt, that this radical Democratic philosophy has almost nothing to do with the real world, that when you study the lessons of history of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Grenada, and now El Salvador, that it is almost impossible to imagine that these intelligent, worthy, competent people could really believe this kind of nonsense, and yet again and again they come back and they do believe it. Again and again we find that they are unable to confront how dangerous, how difficult the world really is.

We are going to be making the case this week, both in the debate on the House floor and in special orders, that one of the major problems of American survival is the fact that the entire leftwing of the Democratic Party has accepted what is now a 50-year-old tradition among intellectuals of misrepresenting, misunderstanding, and self-deception about the nature of the Soviet state, the nature of Soviet tyranny, and the problems of survival on a planet where one of the two great powers is a deliberate user of terrorism, a deliberate user of secret police, and a deliberate user of torture.

□ 1610

The tragedy in Central America, as in the tragedy in southern Africa and the tragedy in Vietnam, is that none of this is difficult to predict. The patterns are the same, over and over and over. Again and again we find the same kind of intervention by the Cubans who are the puppets of the Soviet Union. We find the intervention of the Soviet secret police, which is the gestapo of the left. We see the same pattern built as we are seeing today in El Salvador.

The reason it is now so critical a crisis, the reason we need to be involved now is because we do not have the entire Pacific Ocean, we do not have the long distance from here to Afghanistan or from here to southern Africa. El Salvador is 2 days' drive from the United States by car. It is closer from El Salvador to Miami than it is from Miami to Washington, DC.

The mistakes that the radical left is now forcing on the United States by their dominance of the Democratic Caucus, and by the leadership of their three candidates for the Presidency are mistakes which will come back to haunt us immediately as the American people come to realize that on the average when a country goes Communist if the distance between that country and another water is, as from Cuba to Miami, 10 percent of the country moves, leaves, becomes refugees; if the distance is by land as it is from Afghanistan to Pakistan, 16 percent of the people of Afghanistan have walked into Pakistan. The Communist guerrillas in Central America who get aid from the Soviet Union, from Bulgaria, from Cuba, from Libya, from the Palestine Liberation Organization, from a network of totalitarian terrorist states that are antidemocracy, antifreedom, and anti the Western world, those Communist guerrillas have said publicly on radio that they are not waging a national war, they are waging a war without national boundaries, a regional war that first comes El Salvador, then Honduras, Guatemala, then Mexico.

People say, well, that is the old domino argument. My answer to that is go and stand on the border of Thailand looking into Cambodia, looking into Laos. In fact, people who argued about dominoes were right. They said if you lose South Vietnam you will lose Cambodia, you will lose Laos, and we did. There are now North Vietnamese troops sitting on the Thai border. Those dominoes fell.

People warned if you allow the Communist guerrillas to learn how to succeed in Southeast Asia they will someday be in Central America. I would ask you is the burden of proof on the side of us who in fact were right? Is it on the side of us who in fact warned there would be Communists in Nicaragua, that there would be Communists in El Salvador?

What is the radical left's answer to the problems of Costa Rica? Here is a country that is not offending anyone. Here is a country that does not have an army, and yet last week they asked for military aid because the Nicaraguan Communist Government is so ruthless that not only does it threaten El Salvador and Honduras, it threatens tiny, helpless, and unarmed Costa Rica.

If there is any test of the leftwing belief that moral leadership through unilateral disarmament works, I would say to you that Costa Rica is that test and that their belief has failed.

So in closing let me say to you that this week I believe is the beginning of a great debate where the American people and the American news media and our colleagues have to decide. We have released a paper which shows pretty conclusively that for the last 14 years there has been a systematic, self-delusion by the radical wing of the Democratic Party. This paper shows conclusively that the policies of a John F. Kennedy, the policy of Harry Truman, and the policy of Franklin Roosevelt who invented the good-neighbor concept for Central America, those policies no longer exist in the radical wing of the Democratic Party and that in the end is the first great test this week. Are we going to continue to listen to people who have been systematically wrong for 14 years or are we going to start looking at reality and asking tough questions about how we can help freedom survive on a planet in which the Soviet Union is a totalitarian tyranny, on a planet where the Soviet Union is trying to build an empire with colonies, and on a planet in which the Soviet Union willingly exports violence and is using its puppets to try to kill off freedom?

INTRODUCTION OF NEW FOOD IRRADIATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MORRISON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today, along with several of my colleagues, I am introducing new legislation which promotes the use of ionizing radiation as a postharvest treatment for food commodities. Senator SLADE GORTON of Washington State is also introducing the identical bill today in the Senate.

The original House cosponsors of this new bill are: Mr. TOM FOLEY, Mr. MEL PRICE, Mr. PAT ROBERTS, Mr. WES WATKINS, Mr. BILL WHITEHURST, Mr. JOHN MCCAIN, Mr. BOB BADHAM, Mr. FRANK HORTON, Mr. COOPER EVANS, Mr. BILL THOMAS, Mr. ROD CHANDLER, Mr. HAROLD VOLKMER, Mrs. MARILYN LLOYD, Mr. JIM LEACH, Mr. TOM TAUKE, Mr. DAN BURTON, and Mrs. BEVERLY BYRON.

This new bill builds upon legislation I introduced last November (H.R 4544) and a proposed Food and Drug Administration regulation (49 Federal Register 5714) which was promulgated in February. H.R. 4544, my prior bill, changes the regulatory interpretation of food irradiation. Under current law, sources of radiation are defined as a food additive. I firmly believe that defining food irradiation as a food additive is inappropriate. Food irradiation is a process, much like boiling, freezing, or cooking in a microwave oven, and not an additive.

H.R. 4544 merely changes the definition so that food irradiation would be defined as a food process and the identical regulations which are applicable to pesticides would apply. That bill attracted nearly 50 cosponsors from both parties and all political stripes and I thank all those Members for endorsing the original bill.

This prior legislation, however, is no longer needed because the FDA promulgated its proposed rule in February. Indeed, FDA has indicated to me that the presence of the bill H.R. 4544 helped to expedite administrative approval of the regulation. The long awaited FDA rule effectively preempts much of the immediate, practical significance of my prior bill.

The regulation permits limited application of food irradiation primarily for fresh fruits and vegetables up to a dose of 100 kilorads, a dose which is one-tenth the standard now accepted by most international authorities. The public comment period for the regulation has been extended once and will expire on May 16.

This regulation is an excellent first step in gaining commercial and public acceptance of this technology. I commend Secretary Margaret Heckler for her personal leadership in developing the regulation and seeing that it was formally proposed. However, I believe that we need to build upon the regulation and that is why I am introducing new food irradiation legislation today.

The new bill, Mr. Speaker, is entitled "The Federal Food Irradiation Development and Control Act of 1984." I have struggled the past few months drafting this second generation bill in an attempt to find the judicious balance to facilitate acceptance of food irradiation and to accommodate as many interests as possible.

The bill has the endorsement of several major food organizations including the Grocery Manufacturers, and Food Processors, and United Fruit & Vegetable. I have consulted with various Federal agencies, including FDA, USDA, and DOE, the food irradiation industry, consumer and environmental groups, and agricultural associations in developing this legislation.

The bill retains the proposed definition of irradiation of food as a process or treatment and expressly excludes irradiation from the food additive definition. However, FDA would still retain authority to regulate now. The bill also provides for ongoing research and development of food irradiation, national uniformity of food irradiation regulations, and further provides explicit authority for leasing of federally owned irradiation source materials to the private sector to ensure an adequate supply while ensuring federal safety and transportation standards.

The centerpiece of the bill is the establishment of a Joint Operating Commission to facilitate acceptance of food irradiation. The Commission will operate within USDA and would coordinate and manage currently fragmented research and information exchange efforts. It will also act as a liaison to promote consumer acceptance of food irradiation and private development. My intent with the Commission is to do nothing more than provide a forum to coordinate largely existing activities and to facilitate consumer understanding of this technology.

A more detailed section-by-section summary of the bill and the bill itself follow this statement.

My experience has been that the public in general has an emotional, almost fearful response, to food irradiation. I hope that this bill, particularly the Joint Operating Commission, will promote open discussion of food irradiation so that public concerns about using radiation can be addressed.

No matter how successful and safe food irradiation proves to be, it will never obtain large scale commercial applications unless there is consumer acceptance. The consumer needs reassurance from the Federal Government and I view the Joint Operating Commission as the least restrictive way to facilitate public acceptance. The last thing we all want is for Government to get in the way of the progress in development of commercial food irradiation that we all see coming.

This legislation is aimed at promoting commercial applications and consumer acceptance of food irradiation. The impact of ionizing energy as a postharvest treatment could be revolutionary and some have already indicated that it is the most important development in food preservation since the introduction of canning and freezing last century.

The possibilities for food irradiation are unlimited and exciting. Food irradiation can protect the food from pests much like ethylene dibromide (EDB) does. But unlike EDB, it will not leave a residue on the food. If other postharvest fumigants are restricted by EPA, food irradiation is viewed by many as one of the most effective and safe substitutes.

Besides acting as a possible substitute for EDB and other fumigants, low doses of irradiation eliminate trichinosis in pork and would allow consumers to enjoy pork cooked as little as they like and could enhance the export prospects for pork. Use of irradiation stops the Medfly in citrus fruits and the codling moth in apples. Irradiation could also destroy botulinum and salmonella in red meats, poultry, and fish and extend the shelf life of fresh fruits, vegetables and grains.

There is a growing international consensus behind food irradiation. Two international organizations, the Joint FAO/IAEA/WHO Expert Committee

and the Codex Alimentarius Commission, have recommended the use of irradiation on food up to doses 10 times higher than FDA is now proposing. Twenty-eight countries are already using gamma radiation on foods. Since about a quarter of the food supply in the Third World is lost to spoilage, food irradiation could also play a major role in helping feed the world.

The food irradiation technology is not new; we have accumulated over 40 years of research data. Food irradiation has been studied in more detail than any other food preservation technique over the past four decades. Food irradiation is ionizing energy which penetrates through food killing microorganisms. The ionizing energy used to irradiate food is roughly similar to the other energy waves such as visual light, radio, TV, microwave, and ultraviolet light.

As with these energy sources, the food absorbs only the energy of the radioactive source, not the source's radioactivity. For instance, an X-ray in the dentist office does not make your teeth radioactive and the X-ray table in the doctor's office does not absorb radioactivity even after thousands of X-rays.

It is physically impossible for food irradiation to induce radiation in food at any of the dose levels now being studied. It is true that irradiation may change the food slightly, but these changes are no more significant than the changes that occur from boiling or freezing food. Food irradiation is safe and wholesome and is incapable of making the food radioactive. It is interesting to note that severely ill patients in our hospitals and our astronauts in space are sometimes served foods sterilized with gamma radiation.

I hope that this new bill and the FDA regulation will contribute to the effort of advancing the cause of food irradiation as a safe and effective food preservation technology. I want to assure my colleagues and the general public that this bill is prudent and limited and that we are taking a slow, deliberative, and cautious approach.

The section-by-section summary, a copy of the bill, and other relevant articles follow. Further information on food irradiation can be found in the November 18, 1983, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. H10570-H10576.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF FOOD IRRADIATION BILL

Section I.—Short title:

The bill is called the "Federal Food Irradiation Development and Control Act of 1984".

Section II.—Findings and purposes:

The bill declares that food irradiation at regulated doses is safe and wholesome, is effective as a food preservative technique, and is one of the substitutes for many of the postharvest fumigants including ethylene dibromide (EDB). The bill further finds that irradiation is a process and cannot induce radioactivity in food. Finally, Congress finds that a coordinated effort to advance food irradiation is needed.

Section III.—Definitional and regulatory changes:

Section 201(s) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by deleting "sources of radiation" from the definition of food additive and further exempting "food irradiation treatment" from being defined as a additive. A definition is added to the Act which defines "food irradiation treatment" as a food process.

Section 409 of FDA enabling Act is further amended to make conforming changes. These changes would generally insert "or food irradiation treatment" every time "food additive" is used. Thus, the regulatory provision of Section 409 will apply to "food additives or food irradiation treatment".

Section IV.—National uniformity:

The section declares that it is the intent of Congress to require national uniformity in the regulation of food irradiation treatment. Under this section, no state or political subdivision could establish any food irradiation requirement which is "in addition to or different from" the FDA requirements. This section essentially restates the acknowledged common law that federal law usually preempts conflicting and duplicative state law.

Section V.—Authorization for appropriations:

This section provides a permanent authorization to carry out the byproducts beneficial uses portion of the Department of Energy defense nuclear waste management program. The authorization would include research, development, and demonstration activities to promote all commercial application of byproducts beneficial uses except for food irradiation.

Section VI.—Leasing of byproducts material for food irradiation:

Section 81 of the Atomic Energy Act is amended to clarify the Department of Energy's existing authority to lease nuclear byproduct material to the private sector. The amendments would clarify current leasing guidelines so that byproducts are leased at fair market value (with profits going to the Treasury) and should be leased to encourage commercial applications of food irradiation treatment.

Section VII.—Establishment of Joint Operating Commission:

This section of the bill establishes within the Department of Agriculture a Joint Operating Commission for Food Irradiation (JOCFI). JOCFI shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall provide necessary staff and office facilities. There is also a general authorization to carry out the activities of the Commission.

JOCFI shall consist of eight members including one individual, appointed by the President, who will represent the interests of the general public. The other seven members will be one representative each from the Departments of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, Energy, and Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Agency for International Development. The appointments of the initial eight members shall be made within 90 days following the enactment of the Act and all vacancies shall be filled within 60 days. The seven members of JOCFI who are already employees of the Federal Government shall receive no additional pay and the one representative of the public shall receive a salary equivalent to grade GS-15 for each day of service.

The functions of the JOCFI Commission include: (1) to coordinate and manage all federal on-going and future food irradiation research and development activities. Additional research shall be conducted at Agricultural Research Service stations or at land-grant colleges; (2) to collect and consolidate all research data already gathered by various federal agencies; (3) to cooordinate information exchange activities on food irradiation treatment with various federal agencies, interested private organizations, and the general public; (4) to encourage investment by private sources in food irradiation treatment; (5) to encourage better understanding by the general public of food irradiation treatment; and (6) to petition FDA, if deemed appropriate, under section 409 of the FDA enabling Act to expand the scope of regulations allowing for commercial food irradiation.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1984]

TREATING FOOD WITH IRRADIATION—FDA CAUTIOUS ABOUT APPROVAL OF PROCESS

(By Patricia Picone Mitchell)

You reach for a product on your supermarket shelf and see the words "treated with ionizing radiation" printed prominently on the label. Will you put it back? Consumers may encounter such products sometime in the next two years, once the Food and Drug Administration completes consideration of a regulation to allow foods to be disinfected, pasteurized and preserved with low doses of gamma-, beta- and X-rays.

Food irradiation, as the process is called, has been feasible for more than 30 years, but it is only now that FDA has considered permitting its use in the United States on a widescale basis. In contrast, countries such as the Netherlands have already approved irradiation for many foods, among them shrimp, chicken, frog legs and bread. About 50 irradiation-processed foods have been approved by health authorities in approximately 28 countries, including Japan, where 5,000 tons of potatoes are irradiated each year to inhibit sprouting. Excluding Japan's potatoes, it is estimated that total world output of irradiated foods is 2,000 tons per year.

In fact, some Americans have been eating irradiated food on a regular basis. The astronauts have dined in space on irradiated corned beef, smoked turkey and steak. Irradiated foods have also been used for hospital patients who need the sterilized products because of immune deficiencies. The U.S. military has been interested in purchasing such sterilized foods, which it is claimed can be safely eaten years after they are processed, if properly packaged.

The FDA has been reluctant to give widespread approval for irradiation, although it has recently approved its use for spices and permits very low doses for sprout inhibition of potatoes and as a disinfectant for wheat and wheat flour. "It's a hard thing—how do you determine the safety of any process?" asks Clyde Takeguchi of FDA's Division of Food and Color Additives in the Bureau of Foods. The big question that stumped FDA staffers for years, he says, was how to conduct safety studies of food irradiation—especially in an environment where the regulatory science was rapidly changing.

Consumer groups have kept relatively silent on the food irradiation issue, aware that the process could offer significant benefits by replacing the use of dangerous

chemicals, but also concerned about still lingering safety questions. Thomas Smith of the Washington-based Public Voice for Food and Health Policy says his group has taken no formal position about the safety of the technology, but adds that he is "glad" that FDA has moved cautiously in permitting expansion of irradiation. "There are still questions that remain about the technology," says Smith, echoing the view of other consumer activists.

Concerns of a different nature have been voiced by other groups, however. The Environmental Policy Institute fears that widespread commercialization of food irradiation will lead to the transport of highly radioactive materials to food irradiation facilities located in America's neighborhoods.

Robert Alvarez, spokesman for EPI, says the federal program in which states agree with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to regulate such facilities is in "a shambles." Calling irradiation "a high technology that's fairly dangerous," Alvarez says "the jury is still out in terms of its utility." He says his group will seek a legislative remedy to block FDA's approval of the process until a more effective system for regulating irradiation facilities is in place.

The technology could be a boon for both consumers and the food industry, as long as consumers are not scared off by the fear that the foods they are eating will glow in the dark, or worse. Actually, according to researchers and proponents of the process, irradiated foods are treated with beams of radiation that are too small to allow any residual radioactivity to remain in the products. What do get "zapped" are insects, bacteria, molds, fungus and other microorganisms that each year spoil one quarter of the world's food supply. At varying dose levels, irradiation has the potential to:

Clean up spices and garlic and onion powder, replacing chemical treatments currently used, such as ethylene oxide, the safety of which has been questioned. (Spices are often contaminated with dirt and insects and conventional heat disinfecting destroys their flavors.) This irradiation use was approved by FDA last summer and is being practiced commercially by Radiation Technology Inc. of Rockaway, N.J.

Control insect infestation in cereals, flours, fresh and dried fruit. Irradiation could replace the use of the chemical fumigant ethylene dibromide or EDB, which the Environmental Protection Agency is considering banning because of tests showing its carcinogenicity.

Control pathogenic bacteria that cause public health problems. Irradiation could kill off the parasites that cause trichinosis, making possible the serving of rarer pork and opening up export markets to countries that don't accept U.S. pork because of the trichinosis problem. Irradiated poultry would be free of salmonella, a pathogen thought to contaminate at least one-third of all the fresh poultry sold in the U.S. and estimated to cause up to one million cases of gastroenteritis each year, according to a 1983 Commerce Department report.

Extend the refrigerated shelf life, through its pasteurizing effect, of products that spoil quickly (ground beef, fresh fish and seafood, and such produce as blueberries and strawberries) from several days to several weeks.

Reduce or replace the use of sodium nitrite and nitrate in cured meat products, since meats irradiated at high enough doses would be sterilized and protected from *clostridium botulinum*, one of the major reasons nitrite is used.

The major underlying safety concern of irradiated food centers on the fact that chemical substances, called radiolytic products, are formed in irradiated foods at very low levels. Such reaction products are also a byproduct of other cooking and preserving methods, but researchers are seeking to find out whether the radiolytic products in irradiated foods are unique and/or harmful. Eugen Wierbicki, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Eastern Regional Research Center in Philadelphia, who has researched irradiation for over 20 years, says radiolytic products occur very regularly and can be predicted by computer analysis, based on dose and temperature of the product during irradiation. He points out that canned foods contain three times as many reaction products as irradiated products. "They are not unique because they are present in other foods and are all natural compounds," he says.

However, according to FDA's Takeguchi, radiolytic products occur in such small quantities they are often difficult to detect. And it's also difficult to determine if they are unique since a multitude of reaction products that occur in conventionally processed foods have never been identified.

Another controversial issue facing FDA is labeling. Under current FDA regulations, irradiated foods must be labeled with the words "treated with ionizing radiation." (Products not inrradiated but which contain irradiated ingredients—like spices—require no special labeling.) Martin Welt, president of Radiation Technology, says such labeling "can only mislead people," and notes that currently there is no requirement for labeling of foods treated with chemical fumigants, even though residues of such chemicals often remain in the food. Several other countries, including Holland, Belgium and South Africa, require labeling, along with a small graphic symbol, on directly irradiated foods.

FDA in its upcoming proposal will have to decide whether to continue the current requirement for labeling and if so, in what form. A recent report by the Congressional Research Service noted that alternate names have been suggested for the technology, such as "cosmic processing," "picowave processing," or "processed with ionizing energy," which some believe may avoid the public association of irradiation with "radioactive."

"There's nothing really magic about irradiation—it's just another form of energy," says Philip E. Lewis of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industrial Economics, who recently authored a report on the subject. Once the energy source is removed from the food, the food itself emits no energy. Microwaves are another form of radiation, but with a different effect—exciting the molecules and heating up the food. Gamma rays, on the other hand, disrupt the chemical bonds of living things, killing off micro-organisms and insects but causing only a slight temperature rise in the food. Therein lies the advantage of food irradiation over conventional food preservation methods such as canning. Without the need for heat, there are fewer flavor and odor changes and nutrient losses, and the foods more closely resemble their raw state.

The source of the gamma rays, most common of the rays used in food irradiation facilities, is cobalt-60, a byproduct of the nuclear industry. In a food irradiation facility, the food is placed on a conveyor belt and passed through a shielded chamber, where it is exposed to the rays emitted by the radioactive metal.

FDA's forthcoming regulation will permit a relatively low radiation dose of 100 kilorads, which is one-tenth that allowed by a host of foreign countries. Canada, for example, strongly motivated by a desire to control salmonella in poultry, has just proposed permitting foods to be irradiated with up to one megarad (1,000 kilorads), the dose advocated by several international organizations, including the Codex Alimentarius Commission, a United Nations food standards setting group operating under the auspices of the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

For approval of foods irradiated at doses larger than 100 kilorads, the FDA proposal would require stuides in which the food is tested on animals.

One reason FDA staffers have been so cautious in conferring their blessing on the process is that the potential for use of irradiation is so great. "The agency is going to be more cautious in approving a process that could eventually be used for a substantial part of the nation's diet than it would be in approving a new food additive that may represent only a minor fraction," says Lewis in his report. Lewis also points out that once large-scale irradiation facilities becomes available, "there would be tremendous pressure to continue their use even if their safety later came into debate."

FDA has in part been stymied by a 1958 amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act that says food irradiation must be regulated not as a process like canning or fumigation but as a food additive, requiring premarket approval with stringent safety testing.

Rep. Sid Morrison (R-Wash.), an apple farmer from the Yakima Valley, recently introduced legislation to reverse irradiation's legal status, proposing to define it as a postharvest treatment. Currently Washington apples and cherries must be fumigated with suspect chemicals to rid them of coddling moths before they can be exported. An aide to Morrison says the bill has been gaining support among other sectors of the farm industry, including papaya and mango growers in Hawaii, whose produce could travel longer distances if irradiated first.

Even if FDA were to permit irradiation unconditionally, Lewis believes the process "won't take off tremendously." For one thing, he says, food companies already enjoy the advantages of an efficient food production and distribution system and may not see a tremendous opportunity for creating new products with a high profit-making potential.

The food industry is also concerned with how consumers will accept the process. Lewis notes in his report, however, that a recent Canadian study suggests that when properly informed, "the public may accept irradiated food more readily than food companies believe." He says Japanese consumers, "naturally sensitive to the issue of radiation," have accepted irradiated potatoes.

While irradiation has been touted by proponents as a cost- and energy-saving preservation process, this may not always be the case. There are the logistical problems and costs of transporting foods to a central irradiation facility. Irradiation, according to Lewis, is currently more expensive for sprout inhibition of potatoes than chemical treatment. It has other drawbacks as well: Some fresh fruits can be successfully irradiated, while others tend to soften and undergo flavor and color changes. Milk products undergo changes in taste when irradiated.

Wierbicki believes, however, that further research will overcome these problems.

The potential for widespread use of high-dose irradiation may also be limited. USDA is currently completing a wholesomeness evaluation of high-dose sterilized precooked poultry, and is expected to submit a petition to FDA for approval within a year. Because high-dose radiation requires the food to be precooked and then frozen before it is irradiated, energy savings over freezing or canning may be minimal. Such products may have considerable export potential, however, especially to countries with hot climates and poor refrigeration.

Whatever the benefits or drawbacks of the process, the extent to which food irradiation takes off will ultimately depend on FDA. And while the FDA proposal would expand the uses of this technology, it would not permit doses high enough to take advantage of all the possibilities. The day when consumers routinely store their pouches of chicken in the pantry is years or even decades away.

[From Science, Feb. 17, 1984]

RENEWED INTEREST IN FOOD IRRADIATION

By any other name, irradiation of food would probably have been sanctioned by the federal government years ago. But because "irradiation" mistakenly conjures up visions of glowing food, food manufacturers, unsure of consumer acceptance, have not vigorously pressed for federal approval. As a result, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has been less than swift to authorize the use of irradiation. However, with increasing concern about the presence of ethylene dibromide residues in food, there is renewed interest in irradiation as an alternative to the fumigation of fruits and vegetables.

Although the technology has been feasible since the 1950's, it was only last year that the FDA sent a recommendation to the Department of Health and Human Services to expand the use of irradiation. But Secretary Margaret Heckler has yet to sign off on the proposed regulation and even then, FDA would have to solicit public comment on the proposal before granting final approval. In November, Representative Sid Morrison (R-Wash.), whose constituency includes apple growers, introduced legislation that would speed up FDA approval.

FDA has already permitted some applications of irradiation of food but to a very minor extent. For years, astronauts have consumed irradiated food as have individuals who suffer from immune deficiencies and must eat sterilized food. Last summer, FDA authorized the use of irradiation to clean up spices, which are often contaminated with insect parts and bacteria in their natural state.

Proponents of irradiation envision much wider use of the treatment, contending that it can offer a significantly better food product. Irradiation has been successfully used to inhibit sprouting, kill larvae in harvested fruit and vegetables, and destroy contaminants such as salmonellas in chicken and trichinae in pork. The treatment can also kill Clostridium botulinum and eliminate the need for nitrite in bacon. The Department of Commerce speculates that irradiation could improve the quality of domestic meat and fruit for export, which could lead to a better balance of trade. And the U.S. military, which has been a principal researcher of irradiation, has long advocated it in order to provide troops with food that tastes fresher and has a longer shelf life than canned groceries.

The United States has lagged behind international acceptance of irradiation and critics of FDA say that the agency has been unduly cautious. In 1977, a joint committee of the World Health Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the Food and Agriculture Organization reviewed a multitude of studies and concluded that irradiation is safe and effective for several foodstuffs. In 1981, the same committee issued virtually unconditional approval of irradiation when applied at medium energy levels. About 20 countries now allow irradiation for various applications, processing a total amount of 2000 tons annually. The Japanese, for example, irradiate thousands of pounds of potatoes every year to prevent sprouting. Despite the international committee's recommendations, the United States still has not adopted the committee's standard. Ironically, a senior FDA scientist was a member of the joint committee that voted unanimously for the standard.

Irradiation suffers from a terrible public image in the United States. FDA has received numerous handwritten letters by individuals who have little understanding of the process, but object to it nonetheless. Irradiation uses ionizing energy to preserve food at levels that do not produce radioactivity. "It is a total misconception that you can produce radioactivity [from food irradiation]," says Thomas Cochran, a physicist at the Natural Resources Defense Council. (The council, however, has not taken an official position on irradiation per se.)

The process uses gamma rays from a cobalt-60 or a cesium-137 source, or high energy electrons from an electron accelerator. Doses up to 100 Kilorads (krad) kill insects such as the Medfly and control sprouting. Medium doses of 100 to 1000 krad reduce bacterial counts. Higher levels sterilize food and eliminate viruses, so that the food, as precooked meats, have a shelf life of up to 7 years. The shelf life of canned foods is only about 2 years.

FDA and others are concerned that irradiation might form harmful compounds after food is treated, but so far testing has uncovered nothing unusual. Sidney Wolfe, director of the Health Research Group, would like to see more through evaluation of these by-products. He says there is "still a need to identify what's in irradiated food." On the other hand, FDA has pinpointed 65 by-products of irradiated food and all of them can be found in other non-irradiated food. Debra Schechter, a spokeswoman for the Center for Science in the Public Interest, says that the group has not done an in-depth study of irradiation, but so far it "is not concerned about irradiation. We don't think there is anything wrong with it."

In 1981, the international joint committee ruled that the use of 1000 krad was safe and acceptable. But higher levels may prove to be acceptable as well. Dean Cliver, a microbiologist at the University of Wisconsin's Food Research Institute and a U.S. delegate to the joint committee, wrote FDA that "a good deal of evidence" suggests that levels of at least 5000 krad do not pose any threat. This point is apparently further supported by recent research conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Department scientists will soon submit to FDA the results of a massive study in which more than 300,000 pounds of sterilized chicken were fed to numerous experimental animal species. The chickens were irradiated using the various energy sources and then fed for 2 years to mice, rats, rabbits, and beagles. Donald Thayer, who directed the study and is head of the USDA's Eastern Regional Food Safety Laboratory, says the studies, which evaluated toxicological, birth and reproductive effects, demonstrated that irradiation is safe.

Despite the endorsement of the international committee of 1000-krad doses, the FDA in 1981 gave notice that it would consider a limit of only 100 krad for most foods. (The agency does permit doses of 1000 krad to irradiate spices.) Herbert Blumenthal, who is director of toxicology in FDA's bureau of foods and was a member of the international committee, says the agency took this position because studies of food treated at 100 krad or less have showed no adverse effects. According to FDA, foods irradiated at doses greater than 100 krad and comprise more than 0.01 percent of the diet may contain a sufficient quantity of unique by-products to warrant further toxicity testing. Blumenthal defends FDA's 100-krad limit, saying that it introduces a greater margin of error should any risks be present.

But FDA's proposal has perplexed many food specialists. Edward Josephson, who headed the Army's research on irradiation for 15 years, wrote FDA that numerous long-term animal feeding studies conducted over the past 20 years have not demonstrated any confirmed ill effects.

The difference could mean success or failure for companies interested in the process. According to Commerce Department estimates, companies investing in an irradiation plant must process several million pounds of product to be profitable. At FDA's proposed 100-krad dose, food processors are limited to killing fruit flies in food and inhibiting sprouting. This use of irradiation cannot generate enough volume of food to justify the investment, a point that Blumenthal acknowledges. The higher dose would allow broader applications of irradiation and make the venture profitable.

Proponents say that irradiation can be used successfully with a wide variety of foods, but perhaps not all. Some foods that were previously fumigated with EDB, such as papayas, do well when irradiated. Papayas are a significant export crop for Hawaii. The Environmental Protection Agency says that citrus fruit can be successfully irradiated. But Florida's department of citrus and the California Citrus Council both claim that irradiation at the levels required to destroy fruit flies in fresh citrus cause blemishes in the peel and also make the pulp mushy.

FDA approval of food irradiation has become hampered in part because Congress ruled in 1958 that irradiation must be considered a food additive, rather than a process such as heating, freezing, or canning. This designation immediately threw up several barriers to approval and "has made us the laughing stock of the world," says Cliver of the University of Wisconsin.●

CHICAGO'S POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY PARADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 was the 193d anniversary of a landmark event in the history of the people of Poland. It was on this day that Poland adopted its first democratic constitution, and assumed its

rightful place in the community of free nations. On Saturday, May 5, the Polish National Alliance sponsored Chicago's annual Constitution Day Parade, and it was a genuine pleasure and honor to participate in this year's commemorative celebration.

This magnificent parade down Dearborn Street in downtown Chicago, stepped off at noon on May 5, and consisted of numerous floats, bands, and marching units, and thousands of the marchers wore the beautiful clothing of their native Poland. Also, many dignitaries representing business, labor, and civic organizations too numerous to mention took part in this observance and at this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the 2-day program of events which took place in Chicago in commemoration of Poland's May 3, 1791 Constitution.

The program follows:

PROGRAM

SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1984

Program at Reviewing Stand, Dearborn and Washington Streets—12 Noon

Welcome: Mrs. Helen M. Szymanowicz, Vice President, Polish National Alliance; General Chairman, Poland's Constitution Day.

National Anthems: Mr. Stefan Wicik, accompanied by U.S. 81st Army Band, Fort Sheridan, Illinois.

Parade narrators: Mrs. Helen M. Szymanowicz, Mrs. Lottie S. Kubiak.

Grand marshal: Judge Frank Sulewski, Cook County Circuit Court.

Parade coordinator: Larry Rzewski.

Program at Richard J. Daley Center—1:30 p.m.

Welcome: Mr. Stanley Sciblo, Commissioner, District 13, Polish National Alliance.

Invocation: Most Rev. Alfred L. Abramowicz, Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago.

Master of Ceremonies: Honorable Aloysius A. Mazewski, President, Polish National Alliance, President, Polish American Congress.

Remarks: Honorable James R. Thompson, Governor, State of Illinois.

Remarks: Honorable Harold Washington, Mayor, city of Chicago.

Principal address: Honorable Charles H. Percy, U.S. Senator, Illinois.

Address: Honorable Frank Annunzio, Member of Congress.

Address: Honorable Jan Nowak, Former Director, Radio Free Europe.

Benediction: The Right Reverend Joseph K. Zawistowski, Bishop, Western Diocese, Polish National Catholic Church.

Closing:

SUNDAY, MAY 6, 1984

Assembly for Solemn Mass: 10:00 a.m.—Holy Trinity School Hall, 1123 Cleaver St.

March to Church: 10:15 a.m.—to Holy Trinity Church, 1118 Noble St.

Solemn Mass: 10:30 a.m.—Rev. Casimir Tadla, CR, Pastor, Principal Celebrant.

Co-Celebrant and Homolist: Very Rev. Zbigniew Gorecki S.J.

Deacon: Rev. Dr. Edward C. Rozanski.

Choir under direction of Mr. Joseph Labuda.

Executive Committee: Helen M. Szymanowicz, Chairman; Casimir Jasinski, Commissioner Dist. 12 PNA; Jean Binkowski, Commissioner Dist. 12 PNA; Stanley Sciblo, Commissioner Dist. 13 PNA; Kazimiera Pytel, Commissioner Dist. 13 PNA.

This year's parade also honored the Polish American Congress on its 40th anniversary, and observed the 40th anniversary of the Battle at Monte Cassino, which exemplified the courage and bravery of the Polish Corps, and was a historic day in man's quest for freedom and self-determination, reinforcing the values echoed in the May 3 Constitution.

The Polish American Congress for the past 40 years has maintained an outstanding record of accomplishment, and has contributed greatly to the Polish-American community, helping to make our country strong. I like to take this opportunity to congratulate, my good friend, Aloysius Mazewski, president of the Polish American Congress, and all the officers and members of this fine organization on the occasion of its 40th anniversary, and give them my best wishes for continued success in their future endeavors.

Adopted only a few years after our own Constitution, the Polish May 3 Constitution stands out as one of the great achievements in Polish history, and as a milestone in the history of mankind's quest for liberty and justice. The Polish Constitution of 1791 serves as a symbol of progressive Government under democratic principles of freedom and self-determination, and these exemplary ideals have come to represent the aspirations of the Polish people, and all people who seek to determine the course of their own destinies without interference or oppression.

With the enactment of the May 3 Constitution, the Polish people were pioneers in their heroic efforts to shake off the yoke of tyranny and oppression from Poland and from all of Europe. The Constitution provides an enduring priceless heritage of democracy, religious tolerance, and humanitarianism, which continues to be a beacon of hope for the people of Poland in their efforts to throw off the yoke of their Communist oppressor.

Inspired by the values and principles of the Polish Constitution of 1791, Americans of Polish descent have contributed mightily to the cause of freedom in this country, and Poles have sacrificed much for the cause of freedom in Poland.

All of us know too well of the brave men, women, and children who must face a dismal existence at the hands of the Communists. Nevertheless, they remain firm in their determination and resolve, as they actively struggle to achieve once again a free Poland—a country governed by the ideals embodied in the May 3 Constitution.

In commemorating Polish Constitution Day, we join hands with our brothers and sisters in Poland in their just cause to reinstate their political, cultural, and religious freedom. We recognize their inherent right to self-determination, their right to restore their national identity, and the right of Poland to reenter the community of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate this 193d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, I am honored to join with Polish-Americans in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and Americans of Polish descent all over this country, in paying tribute to those who have struggled and are continuing in their struggle to transform into reality the noble ideals expressed in the May 3 Constitution. Let us continue our solidarity, our support, and our humanitarian aid, as we join with the brave people of Poland in their prayers for justice, self-determination and freedom.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) for this week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAUB) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORRISON of Washington, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITEHURST, for 30 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, on May 8.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, on May 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAUB) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.

Mr. JEFFORDS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. MCHUGH.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. CHAPPELL.
Mr. FLORIO.
Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.
Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.
Mr. SWIFT.
Mr. BARNARD.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. LEVINE of California in two instances.
Mr. MITCHELL.
Mr. BARNES.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4176. An act to confirm the Boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation; and

H.J. Res. 537. Joint resolution designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 64. an act to establish the Irish Wilderness in Mark Twain National Forest, Mo.;

S. 597. An act to convey certain lands to Show Low, Ariz.;

S. 1212. An act for the relief of 16 employees of the Charleston Naval Shipyard;

S.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 20, 1984, through May 26, 1984, as "National Arts With the Handicapped Week"; and

S.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 4, 1984, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2733. An act to extend and improve the existing program of research, development, and demonstration in the production and manufacture of guayule rubber, and to broaden such program to include other critical agricultural materials; and

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 8, 1984, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3282. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3283. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics), transmitting notification of a recent discovery and emergency disposal of a suspected chemical agent munition at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., pursuant to Public Law 91-441, section 506(d); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3284. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the activities performed under the International Travel Act during fiscal year 1983, pursuant to Public Law 87-63, section 203 (95 Stat. 1013); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3285. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Progress in the Prevention and Control of Air Pollution in 1982", pursuant to CAA, section 313 (81 Stat. 506; 84 Stat. 1705 and 1713; 91 Stat. 771) and CAA, sections 306 and 202(b)(4); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3286. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend various health research authorities, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3287. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a) (92 Stat. 993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3288. A letter from the Acting Associate Director, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a proposed waiver of the limitation on foreign travel by a citizen who is financed by grants from the private sector program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460 nt (Public Law 98-164, section 207(a) (fiscal year 1984-85)); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3289. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notification of a proposal received under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, pursuant to the act of August 6, 1956, chapter 972, section 10; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3290. A letter from the Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce, transmitting a report on the activities of the Departments of the Interior and Commerce with respect to the emergency striped bass research study, pursuant to Public Law 89-304, section 7(b) (93 Stat. 859); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3291. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require tonnage measurement of vessels engaged on international voyages and within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3292. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's third biennial report on methods, procedures and processes to restore and enhance water quality in our Nation's freshwater lakes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3293. A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant discretion to the Administrator to administer garage and parking appropriations and fees as a revolving fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3294. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs; Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Legislative Affairs), transmitting the sixth annual report of the Secretaries of State and the Treasury: Progress in enchancing human rights through U.S. participation in international financial institutions for the period October 1, 1982 through September 30, 1983, pursuant to Public Law 95-118, section 701(c)(1) (94 Stat. 431); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

3295. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, OMB, transmitting a report on the review of Department of Defense procurement actions awarded during the last week of fiscal year 1983, pursuant to Public Law 98-191. Section 11(a)(1), jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HUGHES: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 548. Joint resolution authorizing the President's Commission on Organized Crime to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rep. No. 98-734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Submitted May 4, 1984]

The Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3788); referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H.R. 5604. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON of Washington (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WEBER, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. HORTON, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. BYRON):

H.R. 5605. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the continued development and commercialization of food irradiation through the establishment of a Joint Operating Commission for Food Irradiation Treatment in the Department of Agriculture and through other means; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, Armed Services, and Agriculture.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 5606. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1985; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SHAW, and Mrs. BYRON):

H.R. 5607. A bill to authorize and direct the Librarian of Congress, subject to the supervision and authority of a Federal civilian or military agency, to proceed with the construction of the Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

385. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to disaster relief loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

386. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to industrial homework; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

387. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to vertical price fixing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

388. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

389. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to the burial of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1092: Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina.

H.R. 1797: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 2495: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 2715: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 3950: Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 4367: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 4673: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WINN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. MCGRATH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 4800: Mr. LELAND, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 5054: Mr. SHUMWAY and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 5075: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 5261: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 5377: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 5410: Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 5479: Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 5569: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SABO, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. STOKES, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. STARK, Mr. YATES, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 475: Mr. BEVILL.

H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. COELHO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H. Res. 281: Mr. WISE and Mr. ACKERMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

357. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Bergen County, N.J., relative to cable legislation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

358. Also, petition of the township of Green, N.J., relative to cable legislation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5119

By Mr. DORGAN:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

—Page 4, line 13, strike out "$587,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$422,500,000".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute) (Text of H.R. 5421)

—Page 5, line 11, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "(a) consistent with the requirements of this section, "the"; strike out line 16; line 22, strike out the closing quotation marks and the second period; and after line 22, insert the following:

"(b) The President shall charge interest on financing under this section at such rate as he may determine, except that—

"(1) the interest rate under this section may not be less than the greater of—

"(A) 5 percent per year, or

"(B) the rate which is 7 percent less than the current average interest rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the signing of the loan agreement on behalf of the United States Government, that the United States Government pays no outstanding marketable obligations of comparable maturity; and

"(2) not more than 10 percent of the aggregate principal amount of financing provided for a fiscal year under this section and section 24 may be at a rate which is less than the current average interest rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the signing of the loan agreement on behalf of the United States Government, that the United States Government pays on outstanding marketable obligations of comparable maturity.

For purposes of paragraph (2), if a country is released from its contractual liability to repay the United States Government with respect to financing provided under this section for a fiscal year, the amount of such financing shall be included in determining the aggregate principal amount of financing provided for that fiscal year but shall not be counted toward the 10 percent limitation on financing at concessional rates of interest."

By Mr. HALL of Ohio:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute) (Text of H.R. 5421)

—Page 4, line 13, strike out "$587,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$562,250,000"; and after line 18, insert the following:

(c) Assistance may not be provided for the Philippines for the fiscal year 1985 under chapter 2 of part II of such Act.

By Mr. RAHALL:

(Amendment to the amendment in the Nature of a Substitute) (Text of H.R. 5421)

—Page 2, strike out the sentence beginning with "of this" in line 20 and ending with "program." in line 25; and page 4, after line 8, insert the following new subsection:

(a) Section 42 of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Financing made available under sections 23 and 24 of this Act may not be used to finance the procurement outside the United States of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services, including financing for coproduction or licensed production outside the United States of defense articles of United States origin.".

H.R. 5167

By Mr. MATSUI:

—At the end of the bill add the following new section:

LIMITATION ON DEFENSE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. . (a) Section 125 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense—

"(A) may not test the transfer, reassignment, or consolidation of a function, power, or duty of a military department to a component of the Department of Defense out-

side a military department unless the test has been specifically authorized by law; and

"(B) may not carry out the transfer, reassignment, or consolidation of a function, power, or duty of a military department to a component of the Defense Department outside a military department unless the transfer, reassignment, or consolidation has been specifically authorized by law after the completion of the study of such transfer, reassignment, or consolidation.

"(2)(A) Paragraph (1) does not apply to a transfer, or a test of a transfer, of a function, power, or duty of a military department if the transfer (or the ultimate transfer contemplated under the test)—

"(i) would involve reallocation of fewer than a total of two hundred military and civilian personnel positions (including temporary civilian positions) from the military departments to the component of the Department of Defense outside a military department; or

"(ii) would not result in a change of expenditures by Department of Defense entities of more than $10,000,000 in any fiscal year.

"(B) For the purpose of subparagraph (A), a personnel position shall be considered to be reallocated if the entity of the Department of Defense providing policy direction for that position is changed under the transfer involved.".

(b)(1) Clause (A) of section 125(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to tests begun on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Clause (B) of section 125(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (d), shall apply to transfers, reassignments, and consolidations after January 1, 1983.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1984:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective headings.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19.....

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client
ADDUCI DINAN AND MASTRIANI, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #250 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MUNICIPAL CASTINGS FAIR TRADE COUNCIL
ROBERT O. ADERS, 1750 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE
JOHN MICHAEL ADRAGNA, SPIEGEL & MCDIARMID 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CITY OF STARKE, FLORIDA
ROBERT S. AGMAN, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC
AKER ASSOCIATES, INC, 1341 G STREET, NW, #202 WASHINGTON DC 20005	BURNELLI CO, INC
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD, SUITE 400 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO
Do	CONSOLIDATED FOODS CORP
Do	TEXACO, INC
Do	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC
Do	ZALE CORPORATION
DONALD C. ALEXANDER, MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS 1800 M ST., NW, #800 NORTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLEGHENY INTERNATIONAL
Do	TEXAS INDUSTRIES, INC
RICHARD F. ALI, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC
PETER ALLSTROM, 400 SEWARD SQUARE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	
THOMAS H. ALTMEYER, 1575 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MINING & RECLAMATION COUNCIL OF AMERICA
AMERICAN MALTING BARLEY ASSN, INC, 735 NORTH WATER STREET, #908 MILWAUKEE WI 53202	
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	
AMERICAN WOOD PRESERVERS INSTITUTE, 1945 GALLOWS ROAD, #405 VIENNA VA 22180	
AMERISERV, INC, 3471 N. FEDERAL HIGHWAY FORT LAUDERDALE FL 33306	
MORRIS J. AMITAY, P.C., SUITE 168 400 N. CAPITOL ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMCOR GROUP, LTD
Do	CHEVRON, U.S.A.
BETTE B. ANDERSON, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL OF OMAHA)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: PORTALS, INC)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMIN BROTHERS, INC)
H. KIM ANDERSON, VIRGINIA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 1809 STAPLES MILL ROAD RICHMOND VA 23230	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE
ANDERSON HIBEY NAUHEIM & BLAIR, 1708 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	CHEVRON U.S.A., INC
Do	NATIONAL MULTIFAMILY HOUSING FINANCE ASSN
ROBERT B. ANDREWS, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #620 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOBIL OIL CORP
LORI A. ANTOLOCK, 1001 PRINCE STREET OLD TOWN VA 22314	CONSERVATIVE ALLIANCE
THOMAS ANTONE, CASSON CALLIGARO & MUTRYN 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20037	SAMARITAN HEALTH SERVICE
MARC APTER, DAVID APTER & ASSOCIATES 1625 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TOGO
JULIE L. ARNOLD, 1050 17TH STREET, NW, #1126 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TRAVENOL LABORATORIES, INC
ARNOLD STANDARD REVIEW CORP, 189 SUNRISE HIGHWAY ROCKVILLE CENTRE NY 11571	
ASSOCIATION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, 1200 17TH STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	
JOHN J. AUCIELLO, 224 E. HIGH STREET ELIZABETHTOWN PA 17022	AMERICAN ASSN OF MEAT PROCESSORS
AVIATION CONSUMER ACTION PROJECT, BOX 19029 WASHINGTON DC 20036	
ROBERT A. BACHA, SUITE 711 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)
BAKER & BOTTS, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONSOLIDATED BANK
Do	DEPOSIT GUARANTEE NATIONAL BANK
Do	INTERCONTINENTAL BANK
Do	INTERFIRST BANK FT. WORTH
Do	REPUBLICBANK HOUSTON
DAVID BAKER, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.
GERALD E. BAKER, 1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSN
BALLARD SPAHR ANDREWS & INGERSOLL, SUITE 1100 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ATLANTIC ALLIANCE FOR MARITIME HERITAGE CONSERVATION
Do	TITAN OCEAN SYSTEMS, INC
Do	TREASURE SALVORS, INC
MAURICE A. BARBOZA, 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BAR ASSN
THOMAS J. BARLOW III, 4717 DRUMMOND AVENUE CHEVY CHASE MD 20815	GEORGE PALMITER RIVER MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT CO
Do	KANALKU TIMBER MANAGEMENT CO
BARRETT SMITH SCHAPIRO SIMON & ARMSTRONG, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #821 WASHINGTON DC 20004	NEW YORK MERCANTILE EXCHANGE
WALTER F. BATCHELOR, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
JOHN L. BAUER JR., 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #702 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ARMCO
DON R. BEAVERS, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #704 WASHINGTON DC 20001	UNITED TRANSPORTATION UNION
JEAN A. BECHERER, 1800 K STREET, NW, #530 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TESORO PETROLEUM CORP
JON CHARLES BEDNERIK, 167 S. SAN ANTONIO ROAD, #11 LOS ALTOS CA 94022	WESTERN INDEPENDENT BANKERS
DONALD K. BELCH, ROYAL TRUST TOWER TORONTO DOMINION CENTER TORONTO ONTARIO CANADA M5K 1J4	STELCO, INC
MARY K. BELLAMY, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT CO INSTITUTE
DANIEL BENNET, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC
REBECCA J. BERG, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SEA-LAND INDUSTRIES, INC
BOB BERGLAND, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN
BEVERIDGE & DIAMOND, P.C., 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LA QUINTA MOTOR INNS, INC
LEONARD BICKWIT JR., MILLER & CHEVALIER, CHTD. 655 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORP
BIRCH HORTON BITTNER PESTINGER & ANDERSON, SUITE 1100 1140 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALASKA TEAMSTERS-EMPLOYER PENSION TRUST
Do	CITY OF ST. GEORGE
Do	SMITHKLINE CORPORATION
DENNIS A. BITZ, 999 MEREDITH COURT SONOMA CA 95476	BECHTEL POWER CORP
BLACK MANAFORT & STONE, INC, 324 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	SALOMON BROTHERS, INC
Do	SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRY ASSN
BARBARA S. BLAINE, P.C., 910 16TH STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSN
BLAIR & BLAIR, LTD, 1120 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	
Do	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE
Do	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN
Do	PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMERICA, INC
STEVEN R. BLAIR, 1120 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BLAIR & BLAIR, LTD
GERRY BLANCHARD, GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	BAUMANN, INC
Do	DETROIT DOCTOR'S HOSPITAL
Do	EDSI
Do	PRECISION MAGNETICS & CERAMICS
RICHARD BLISS, BLISS, CRAFT & RICHARDS 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW, 6TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20007	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA
BLUM NASH & RAILSBACK, SUITE 408 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GETTY NORTHEAST JOBBERS & DISTRIBUTORS ASSN
Do	SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSN
ROBERT A. BLUM, THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER 28TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111	MCCUTCHEN, DOYLE, BROWN & ENERSEN (FOR: PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.)
SAMUEL D. BLUNT, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, #828 WASHINGTON DC 20001	RADIO OFFICERS UNION
WILLIAM J. BOARMAN, 4626 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	COLUMBIA TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION #101, AFL-CIO
SETH M. BODNER, 386 PARK AVENUE SOUTH NEW YORK NY 10016	NATIONAL KNITWEAR & SPORTSWEAR ASSN
HAROLD BOEL, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #718 WASHINGTON DC 20001	PACIFIC BELL
IRVIN E. BOMBERGER, 550 WASHINGTON BUILDING 15TH & NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NAT'L INTERRELIGIOUS SERV. BOARD FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS
JOHN E. BOUCHARD, 1667 K STREET, NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOLLER STEAMSHIP COMPANY, INC
JAMES J. BOWE, 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC
RICHARD P. BOWLING, 1020 PRINCESS STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	TRUCK TRAILER MANUFACTURERS ASSN
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, SUITE 1200 1825 EYE ST., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
Do	RALSTON PURINA CO
BRACY WILLIAMS & COMPANY, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #304 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN SOUTHWEST FINANCIAL CO
JOAN BRADEN, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF CANADA)
PETER E. BRERETON, 900 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND OH 44101	AMERITRUST CO, NAT'L ASSN
WILLIAM BRIGGS, 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO
DAVID R. BRINK, 1800 M STREET, NW, #675 N. WASHINGTON DC 20036	DORSEY & WHITNEY
JOSEPH BROWDER, 1317 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HAZOX, INC
BROWN & FINN, SUITE 510 1920 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SATELLITE TV VIEWING RIGHTS SUPERFUND, INC
BROWN & SEYMOUR, 100 PARK AVENUE, #2606 NEW YORK NY 10017	GRAY PANTHERS
DIANE R. BROWN, 1515 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN
JAMES P. BROWN, BROWN & ASSOCIATES 301 SOVEREIGN COURT, #102 ST. LOUIS MO 63011	CITY OF ST. LOUIS - CITY HALL
R. STEPHEN BROWNING, BOX 162 HELENA MT 59624	BROWNING & KALECZYC
JAMES W. BRUNER JR., 520 CAPITOL MALL SACRAMENTO CA 95814	ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE
LANA BUCK, 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ASSN OF PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS
DAVID S. BURCKMAN, P.O. BOX 7610 BEN FRANKLIN STATION WASHINGTON DC 20044	SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSN
KEVIN BURKE, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
DENNIS J. BURNETT, 6014 WATERBURY COURT SPRINGFIELD VA 22152	SPARX CORPORATION
EDWARD M. BURNS, 14 BEACON STREET, #610 BOSTON MA 02108	
FREDERICK M. BUSH & ASSOCIATES, 2000 L STREET, NW, #702 WASHINGTON DC 20036	
CADES SCHUTTE FLEMING & WRIGHT, 740 WASHINGTON PARK BUILDING 1001 22ND STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC CO, INC

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client
CHARLES D. CALHOUN, 30 MONTGOMERY STREET JERSEY CITY NJ 07302	RADIO OFFICERS UNION
BRUCE P. CAMERON, 1411 K ST., NW, SUITE 850 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION
CAMP CARMOUCHE BARSH HUNTER GRAY & HOFFMAN, P.C., 2550 M ST., NW, #275 WASHINGTON DC 20037	HOLLYWOOD MARINE SERVICES, INC
WILLIAM F. CANIS, 1850 K STREET, NW, #925 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO
CHARLES R. CARLISLE, 1150 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MAN-MADE FIBER PRODUCERS ASSN, INC
CY CARPENTER, P.O. BOX 2251 DENVER CO 80251	FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL & CO-OPSRATIVE UNION OF AMERICA
NICHOLAS G. CAVAROCCHI, 6TH FLOOR 2010 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	
DAVID CERTNER, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS
PHILIP CHABOT, 1317 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT
CHADBOURNE PARKE WHITESIDE & WOLFF, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	
CHAMBERS ASSOCIATES, INC, 1411 K STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN
Do	COALITION OF PUBLICLY TRADED LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS
Do	U S WEST
WILLIAM CHASEY ORGANIZATION, 1800 K STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLAN RONSON CO
Do	CAMPUS CRUSADE FOR CHRIST, INC
Do	NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
Do	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES CORP
WILLIAM C. CHASEY, 1800 K STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	LIFE INSURANCE COALITION OF AMERICA
CHILI-USA, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	
LAURA CHIN, 2025 EYE STREET, NW, #926 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ORGANIZATION OF CHINESE AMERICANS
MICHAEL W. CHINWORTH, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTE OF AMERICA
CHWAT/WEIGEND ASSOCIATES, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #816 WASHINGTON DC 20001	ASSOCIATED LOCKSMITHS OF AMERICA
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF COMPANION SITTER AGENCIES & REFERRAL SERV.
PATRICIA T. CLAREY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW #507 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASHLAND OIL, INC
ROBERT A. CLARK, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
CURTIS LEE CLAY JR., P.O. BOX 24891 RICHMOND VA 23224	TOBACCO-CIGARETTE LOBBY
CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON, 1752 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PPG INDUSTRIES, INC
COHEN & URETZ, 1775 K STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DONREY, INC
COLE & CORETTE, P.C., 1100 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	JAMES D. & LOIS M. LAROSA AND JAMES J. LAROSA
SAMUEL E. COLLIER, 530 7TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL CLEAN AIR COALITION
MARY M. COLLINS, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #600 SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION PACIFIC CORP
COLUMBIA GORGE UNITED, BOX 328 STEVENSON WA 98648	
COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE, 2039 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #206 WASHINGTON DC 20009	
BERT M. CONCKLIN, 1500 PLANNING RESEARCH DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	PLANNING RESEARCH CORPORATION
JOHN J. CONNOLLY, 499 S. CAPITOL STREET, #501 WASHINGTON DC 20003	BILL HECHT AND ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA)
CONSEJO NACIONAL DE COMERCIO EXTERIOR DEL NORESTE A.C., APARTADO 2674 MONTERREY, MEXICO	
CORCORAN HARDESTY WHYTE HEMPHILL & LIGON, P.C., SUITE 510 1575 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA
LAW OFFICES, JAMES C CORMAN, 1420 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BANK AMERILEASE GROUP
Do	CALIFORNIA VISION SERVICE PLAN
Do	CONNELL FINANCE CO, INC
Do	FIRST CHICAGO LEASING CORP
Do	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON
Do	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF MINNEAPOLIS
Do	GATX LEASING CORP
Do	GENERAL ELECTRIC CREDIT CORP
Do	MANUFACTURERS HANOVER LEASING CORP
Do	NATIONAL COMM TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY & MEDICARE
Do	STATE OF MICHIGAN
MEREDITH COTE, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS
COVINGTON & BURLING, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW P.O. BOX 7566 WASHINGTON DC 20044	MORGAN STANLEY & CO
Do	PACIFIC STOCK EXCHANGE, INC
JEFFREY T. COX, 2029 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
W. O. CRAFT JR., BLISS, CRAFT & RICHARDS 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW, 6TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20008	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA
ROSEMARIE J. CRAVEN, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL INHOLDERS ASSN
DOUGLAS P. CREW, 100 N.E. ADAMS STREET PEORIA IL 61629	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO
COLLEEN CROSSLAND, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #718 WASHINGTON DC 20001	PACIFIC BELL
CROWELL & MORING, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURLINGTON NORTHERN
Do	COOK INLET REGION, INC
Do	TRUST FOR PUBLIC LANDS
MARTIN J. CURRY, 52 HILMA STREET N. QUINCY MA 02171	THORNTON AND EARLY
CURTIS MALLET-PREVOST COLT & MOSLE, 101 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10178	U.S. TRUST COMPANY
MICHAEL C. CUSHING, 8283 GREENSBORO DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	SATELLITE BUSINESS SYSTEMS
M. RUPERT CUTLER, 1302 18TH STREET, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENVIRONMENTAL FUND
D L ASSOCIATES, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW, #210 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS, INC
D'AMICO LUEDTKE DEMAREST & GOLDEN, 1920 N STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CENERGY EXPLORATION CO
Do	ENHANCED ENERGY RESOURCES, INC
Do	MITCHELL ENERGY & DEVELOPMENT CORP
Do	PITTS ENERGY GROUP
Do	TEXAS OIL & GAS CORP
Do	U.S. TELEPHONE, INC
Do	WESSELY ENERGY CORP
WILLIAM K. DABAGHI, REYNOLDS ALLEN & COOK 1667 K STREET, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COALITION FOR REGIONAL BANKING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DAKOTA LAY'D EGG CO, P.O. BOX 606 CANDO ND 58324	
COLLEEN A. DARLING, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW, #204 WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE
W. KENNETH DAVIS, 209 FAIRHILLS DRIVE SAN RAFAEL CA 94901	BECHTEL GROUP, INC
HARRY F. DAY, 1800 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC
RALPH DE LA CRUZ, 1225 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSN
MARY ELISE DEGONIA, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WEST WING, SUITE 300 WASHINGTON DC 20024	70001 LTD
THOMAS J. DELANEY, 1111 NORTH 19TH STREET, #700 ARLINGTON VA 22209	NATIONAL ASSN OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS
DELOITTE HASKINS & SELLS, 655 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ARKANSAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORP
Do	TEKTRONIX CORPORATION
Do	TRIANGLE INDUSTRIES, INC
DICKEY KNORR & MOORE, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CTI-CONTAINER TRANSPORT INT'L, INC, ET AL
Do	DEERE & COMPANY
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO & MORIN, 2101 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	GUAM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
CHARLES VERN DINGES IV , 1302 18TH STREET, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENVIRONMENTAL FUND
JOHN F. DONELAN, DONELAN CLEARY WOOD & MASER, P.C. 914 WASHINGTON BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20005	PROCOMPETITIVE RAIL STEERING COMMITTEE
JAMES F. DONOVAN, 1835 K STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	
DOW LOHNES & ALBERTSON, 1225 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LESNINA, ET AL
WILLIAM A. DOYLE, 2346 S. ROLFE STREET ARLINGTON VA 22202	HARRIS CORP
ANTHONY V. DRESDEN, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20001	JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS
JOHN P. DRING, 1875 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP
SARAH WELLS DUFFY, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
R. N. DUNAGAN III, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHILI-USA
H. STEWART DUNN JR., SUITE 600 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ESTATE OF VIRGINIA S. DU PONT
DUTKO AND ASSOCIATES, SUITE 214 412 FIRST STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	A.R.M., INC
MICHAEL J. DYER, 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #905 WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL COALITION FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
TALIS DZENITIS, 633 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20004	SEARS ROEBUCK & CO
EDEA, INC, 929 GUISANDO DE AVILA TAMPA FL 33612	AMERICAN SHIP BUILDING CO
MITCHELL H. EDELSTEIN, 1411 K ST., NW, #850 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION
WILLIAM A. EDWARDS, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE
ELY RITTS PIETROWSKI & BRICKFIELD, SUITE 915 WATERGATE 600 BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN
ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE, 1726 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	
DONALD C. EVANS JR., 214 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #560 WASHINGTON DC 20002	CONSOLIDATED FOODS CORP
Do	FREIGHT FORWARDERS INSTITUTE
Do	OLYMPIA & YORK DEVELOPMENTS LTD
Do	OLYMPIA & YORK EQUITY CORP
JOHN R. EVANS, 9208 SEVEN LOCKS ROAD BETHESDA MD 20817	MESA PETROLEUM CO
Do	NATIONAL CORP FOR HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS
RAE FORKER EVANS, SUITE 210 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HALLMARK CARDS, INC
FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION, 1355 MARKET STREET, #155 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103	
GEOFFREY A. FEISS, 1612 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ELECTRONICS ASSN

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client
JACK FERGUSON ASSOCIATES, 203 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	MIDLAND CAPITAL CORP
WILLIAM FERGUSON, 2555 M STREET, NW, #100 WASHINGTON DC 20037	IRVINE COMPANY
STEVEN I. FIER, 777 14TH STREET, NW, 5TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS
MANUEL D. FIERRO, 1555 WILSON BOULEVARD, #600 ROSSLYN VA 22209	FOND DU LAC RESERVATION
Do	GREAT LAKES INDIAN FISH & WILDLIFE COMMISSION
FINLEY KUMBLE WAGNER HEINE UNDERBERG MANLEY & CASEY, 10TH FLOOR 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL DYNAMICS CORP
Do	RCA
Do	UNITED SATELLITE ACTION
JOHN FISHER, 1140 OKLAHOMA ROAD COOK WA 98605	COLUMBIA GORGE UNITED
WILLIAM P. FISHER, 311 FIRST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSN
LAURI J. FITZ, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF CANADA)
THOMAS H. FITZPATRICK, 410 ASYLUM STREET HARTFORD CT 06103	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE
FELIPE M. FLORESCA, 67 WALL STREET, #1802 NEW YORK NY 10005	
RICHARD A. FLYE, MCKENNA CONNER & CUNEO 1575 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FERTILIZER INSTITUTE
JOHN FOCHTMAN, 801 S. PITT STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	
CORNELIUS J. FOLEY JR., 1440 MAIN STREET WALTHAM MA 02254	MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SOCIETY
LINDA J. FREEMAN, SUITE 1006 1140 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TURNER BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC
RONNA FREIBERG, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC)
Do	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: SANTA FE CORP)
RONALD A. FRIED, 2000 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ORION SATELLITE CORPORATION
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	RIGGS NATIONAL CORP
CURTIS B. GANS, ROUTE 2, BOX 60 LOVETTSVILLE VA 22190	COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF THE AMERICAN ELECTORATE
HARRY D. GARBER, 1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK NY 10019	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S.
GARVEY SCHUBERT ADAMS & BARER, 1000 POTOMAC ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SONATRACH
RUTHANN GEIB, 1156 15TH STREET, NW, #1020 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SUGARBEET GROWERS ASSN
DANIEL R. GERKIN, 1575 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MINING & RECLAMATION COUNCIL OF AMERICA
DAVID TROY SAXTON GETTY, P.O. BOX 7000-A TEXARKANA TX 75501	
THERESA GIBSON, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
WILLIAM L. GIFFORD, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #520 WASHINGTON DC 20024	GPU NUCLEAR CORP
GINN & EDINGTON, INC, 121 SOUTH COLUMBUS STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	MECHANICAL TECHNOLOGY, INC
Do	TEXAS INSTRUMENTS, INC
STUART M. GINSBERG, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #1002 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN
GLOBAL USA, INC, GLOBAL HOUSE 1823 JEFFERSON PLACE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	KYOCERA CORPORATION
GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC, 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	BAUMANN, INC
Do	DETROIT DOCTOR'S HOSPITAL
Do	EDSI
Do	PRECISION MAGNETICS & CERAMICS
MARTIN B. GOLD, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BUDD COMPANY)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL)
Do	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: QUIXOTE CORP)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SANTA FE CORPORATION)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: TOBACCO INSTITUTE)
SHARON GOLDENER, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
PATRICIA R. GOLDMAN, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN
GOODWIN PROCTER & HOAR, 28 STATE STREET BOSTON MA 02109	POLAROID CORPORATION
THOMAS P. GRAVES, 410 11TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS' ASSN, INC
ROBERT K. GRAY, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MERRILL LYNCH CAPITAL INVESTMENTS)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALEN DRY CARGO, INC)
MARY R. GREALY, 1111 19TH STREET, NW, #402 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HOSPITALS
GREAT AMERICAN RESERVE INSURANCE CO, 2020 LIVE OAK P.O. BOX 388 DALLAS TX 75221	
LAURA MARIE GREEN, 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD SPRINGFIELD VA 22160	NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE
LEON GREEN JR., 2101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CLEAN COAL COALITION, INC
DAVID I. GREENBERG, 1314 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA
JANICE M. GREGORY, 1726 M ST., #704 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ERISA INDUSTRY COUNCIL
TOM W. GRIFFITH, SUITE 100 1448 DUKE ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN
GROOM & NORDBERG, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK CITY TEACHERS RETIREMENT SYSTEM
JOHN E. GUNTHER, 1725 K STREET, NW, #1405 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MORTGAGE INSURANCE COS OF AMERICA
RAYMOND J. GUSTINI, LEFF & MASON 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #450 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GREAT WESTERN FINANCIAL CORP
Do	HERON CORP, LTD
Do	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS
DANA W. HAAS, 1112 N. STAFFORD STREET, #B-1 ARLINGTON VA 22201	KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT CO, ET AL
THOMAS M. HAGEDORN, 1201 S. JEFF-DAVIS HIGHWAY, #301 ARLINGTON VA 22202	DAKOTA LAY'D EGG CO
DEBI HALL, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC
PAUL HALLISAY, 1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSN, INT'L
HALLMARK CARDS, INC, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	
SEYMOUR HALPERN, 540 MADISON AVENUE, 23RD FL. NEW YORK NY 10022	SEYMOUR HALPERN, INC (FOR: UNIDYNAMICS/ST. LOUIS, INC)
RHONDA LEE HALVERSON, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #209 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE
HAMEL & PARK, 888 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO
HANNAFORD CO., INC., SUITE 200 655 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BHC, INC
HANSELL & POST, 1915 EYE STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMEV HOLDINGS, INC
Do	RISK & INSURANCE MANAGEMENT SOCIETY, INC
HANSEN ENGINE CORP, 14920 MINNETONKA INDUSTRIAL ROAD MINNETONKA MN 55343	
H. P. (TREY) HARBERT III, 2121 SAN JACINTO STREET, #2500 P.O. BOX 660164 DALLAS TX 75266	CENTRAL & SOUTH WEST CORP
CHARLES E. HAWKINS III, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC
PAUL M. HAWKINS, 25 AUDUBON PLACE HILTON HEAD SC 29928	COLONIAL LIFE & ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO
BILL HECHT AND ASSOCIATES, INC, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SE, #501 WASHINGTON DC 20003	GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
BILL HECHT, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SE, #501 WASHINGTON DC 20003	BILL HECHT AND ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA)
EDWARD D. HEFFERNAN, 1875 EYE ST., NW, # 1025 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHELL OIL CO
JOAN A. HEFFERNAN, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
KATHLEEN M. HENDERSON, 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MILES LABORATORIES, INC
CAROL DIANE HENDRICKS, 2601 PARK CENTER DRIVE, #C804 ALEXANDRIA VA 22302	AMERICAN MARITIME OFFICERS SERVICE
DENNIS A. HENIGAN, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY LARDNER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: VGS CORPORATION)
DAVID A. HENSON, 100 N.E. ADAMS STREET PEORIA IL 61629	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO
HERON BURCHETTE RUCKERT & ROTHWELL, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #420 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AGRI-ENERGY, INC
Do	SOLID-TEK SYSTEMS, INC
HILL BETTS & NASH, 1220 19TH STREET, NW, #302 WASHINGTON DC 20036	LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO, INC
SCOTT HODES, 180 NORTH LA SALLE STREET CHICAGO IL 60610	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE
HOGAN & HARTSON, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHRIS-CRAFT INDUSTRIES, INC
Do	HOME HEALTH SERVICES & STAFFING ASSN
Do	MERCEDES-BENZ OF NORTH AMERICA, INC
Do	SCIENTIFIC APPARATUS MAKERS ASSN
Do	SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
NIELS HOLCH, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL MULTI-HOUSING COUNCIL)
HOLTZMAN & ASSOCIATES, 214 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #340 WASHINGTON DC 20002	HOLLAND ASSOCIATES
HOOG & ASSOCIATES, 1877 BROADWAY, #405 BOULDER CO 80302	DENELCOR, INC
ANNE L. HOWARD, ANNE L. HOWARD AND ASSOCIATES 888 17TH STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	STEVEN H. WHILDEN, P.A.
GERALD M. HOWARD, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS
CLIFFORD T. HOWLETT JR , 1735 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP
HOWREY & SIMON, 1730 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	K MART CORP
DEBORAH HUGHES, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE
JEAN E. HUNGIVILLE, 1612 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ELECTRONICS ASSN
GARY HYMEL, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BUDD COMPANY)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MERRILL LYNCH CAPITAL INVESTMENTS)

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALEN DRY CARGO, INC)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SANTA FE INTERNATIONAL)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC)
ICE MILLER DONADIO & RYAN, BOX 82001 ONE AMERICAN SQUARE INDIANAPOLIS IN 46282	MARION GENERAL HOSPITAL, ET AL.
INSTITUTE OF MAKERS OF EXPLOSIVES, 1575 EYE STREET, NW, #550 WASHINGTON DC 20005	
THOMAS L. IRMEN, P.O. BOX 119 MAUMEE OH 43537	ANDERSONS
ITEL CONTAINERS INTERNATIONAL CORP, TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111	
BENJAMIN R. JACKSON, 12011 LEE JACKSON HIGHWAY, #503 FAIRFAX VA 22033	TECHLAW
GLENN JACKSON, 1660 L STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS ASSN OF AMERICA
STEPHEN JACOBS, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
ROY T. JACOBSEN, GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	BAUMANN, INC
Do	DETROIT DOCTOR'S HOSPITAL
Do	EDSI
Do	PRECISION MAGNETICS & CERAMICS
CLARENCE L. JAMES JR., 444 N. CAPITOL ST., #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)
DAVID M. JENKINS II, 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MILES LABORATORIES, INC
THOMAS C. JETTON, 2223 DODGE STREET OMAHA NB 68102	NORTHERN NATURAL GAS CO
DAVID JEWELL, DAVID APTER & ASSOCIATES 1625 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TOGO
DAVID E. JOHNSON, 1100 15TH STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN
JONES & WINBURN, SUITE 1040 1101 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	GUAM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Do	NATIONAL FISHERIES INSTITUTE
CHERYL L. JONES, 1875 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP
JONES DAY REAVIS & POGUE, 1735 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ELROY J. KULAS TRUST NO. 1
Do	WICKLIFFE PARTNERSHIP
ELAINE J. JONES, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #250 WASHINGTON DC 20004	CH2M HILL
DAVID W. JOYNER, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS
NIZAR JWAIDEH, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
ALINE KALBIAN, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
JAMES L. KANE JR., 1315 VINCENT PLACE MCLEAN VA 22101	
KAYE SCHOLER FIERMAN HAYS & HANDLER, 1575 I ST., NW SUITE 1150 WASHINGTON DC 20005	DRUMMOND COMPANY
Do	HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE CO
Do	RAYMARK CORPORATION
Do	UNITED TELEVISION, INC
ROBERT J. KEEFE, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)
JOHN J. KELLER, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
J. H. KENT, KENT & O'CONNOR 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL CUSTOMS BROKERS & FORWARDERS ASSN OF AMERICA
MICHAEL L. KERLEY, 1922 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS
BRIAN D. KIDNEY, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #718 WASHINGTON DC 20001	PACIFIC BELL
KING & SPALDING, 1915 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DAMSON OIL CORP
Do	LIFE OF GEORGIA
Do	LINCOLN PROPERTY CO
Do	MILLER BREWING CO
JANIE A. KINNEY, BLUM & NASH 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FLOATING POINT SYSTEMS, INC
KIRKPATRICK LOCKHART HILL CHRISTOPHER & PHILLIPS, 1900 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CALVERT GROUP, LTD
Do	PAINE WEBBER JACKSON & CURTIS, INC
CARLA KISH, 1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WILDERNESS SOCIETY
DAVID M. KLUCSIK, 1415 WYCKOFF ROAD, P.O. BOX 1464 WALL NJ 07719	NEW JERSEY NATURAL GAS CO
JOAN M. KOVALIC, SUITE 600 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: PARSONS CORPORATION)
RENEE R. KRAUSE, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS
ALAN G. KRAUT, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
KATHLEEN BONNER KRONMILLER, 600 WATER STREET, SW, #207 WASHINGTON DC 20024	SPACE AMERICA, INC
THEODORE G. KRONMILLER, ELY RITTS PIETROWSKI & BRICKFIELD WATERGATE 600 BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20037	JAMES RUSSELL
Do	SPACE AMERICA, INC
Do	WILLIAM K. ZIMMERMAN
THOMAS A. KUBE, 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN
PETER KYROS, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #1128 WASHINGTON DC 20036	M/A-COM DEVELOPMENT CORP, ET AL
LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC, 100 INDIANA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	
JACK L. LAHR, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY LARDNER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: VGS CORPORATION)
DAVID P. LAMBERT, 1800 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC
RAY H. LANCASTER, 1875 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP
LANE & MITTENDORF, 1750 K STREET, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ELEANOR CLARK
LATHAM WATKINS & HILLS, SUITE 1200 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSN
LAWRENCE LAUNDRY, 1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WILDERNESS SOCIETY
LISA LAUSIER, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS
ROBERT LAUTERBERG, 1707 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL
JANIE L. LAWSON, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHELL OIL COMPANY
LAXALT CORPORATION, 813 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	MORGAN STANLEY & COMPANY
LEAGUE OF AMERICAN INVESTORS, 32123 LINDERO CANYON ROAD WESTLAKE VILLAGE CA 91361	
LEFEVERE LEFLER KENNEDY O'BRIEN & DRAWZ, 2000 FIRST BANK PLACE WEST 120 SOUTH 6TH STREET MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402	CITY OF ROCHESTER, MINNESOTA
KAREN LEICHTMAN, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #319 WASHINGTON DC 20002	HALT: AMERICANS FOR LEGAL REFORM
LEIGHTON LEMOV JACOBS & BUCKLEY, SUITE 800 2033 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FAMILY-BACKED MORTGAGE ASSN, INC
THOMAS J. LENGYEL, 1625 K STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MERCHANT SHIPPING
MARTHA LESTER, 1925 K STREET, NW, #206 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY
LEVA HAWES SYMINGTON & MARTIN, SUITE 1001 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SCIENTIFIC APPARATUS MAKERS ASSN
MORRIS J. LEVIN, 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHINY ROCK MINING CORP
BERTRAM J. LEVINE, 1667 K STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ANDREA LEWIN, TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111	ITEL CONTAINERS INTERNATIONAL CORP
DAVID A. LEWIS, 530 7TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	FRIENDS OF THE EARTH
TOM LEWIS, 218 D STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE
WILLIAM J. LHOTA, 215 N. FRONT STREET COLUMBUS OH 43215	COLUMBUS AND SOUTHERN OHIO ELECTRIC CO
DUKE R. LIGON, 1575 EYE STREET, NW, #510 WASHINGTON DC 20005	CORCORAN HARDESTY WHYTE HEMPHILL & LIGON (FOR: PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA)
LINTON MIELDS REISLER & COTTONE, LTD, SUITE 200 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CENTRAL TRANSPORT
HERSHEL LIPOW, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS
JANICE C. LIPSEN, 900 17TH ST., NW, #504 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COUNSELORS FOR MANAGEMENT, INC (FOR: IMPRO)
JOHN M. LISON, 16100 SOUTH LATHROP AVENUE HARVEY IL 60426	ATCOR, INC
NEIL C. LIVINGSTONE, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF HAITI)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF KOREA)
ROBERT S. LONG, 919 18TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DIAMOND SHAMROCK CORP
LONGNECKER & ASSOC, P.O. BOX 24209 WASHINGTON DC 20024	
FRANCIS M. LUNNIE JR., 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS
CLIFF MADISON, P.O. BOX 3482 GRANADA HILLS CA 91344	CLIFF MADISON GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, INC (FOR: MARK AIR, INC)
Do	CLIFF MADISON GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, INC (FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT)
Do	CLIFF MADISON GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, INC (FOR: WESTERN AIRLINES)
CLIFF MADISON GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, INC, P.O. BOX 3482 GRANADA HILLS CA 91344	MARK AIR, INC
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
Do	WESTERN AIRLINES
MARCIA G. MADSEN, MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TEXAS INDUSTRIES, INC
JOAN A. MAHER, 1117 NORTH 19TH STREET, #600 ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN ASSN OF BLOOD BANKS
R. D. PATRICK MAHONEY, 1001 PRINCE STREET, #100 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	CONSERVATIVE ALLIANCE (CALL)
MICHAEL C. MAIBACH, 3065 BOWERS AVENUE SANTA CLARA CA 95051	INTEL CORPORATION
MALMGREN, INC, 1120 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BEVERAGE IMPORTERS, INC
MANAGEMENT INSIGHTS, INC, 5501 LBJ FREEWAY DALLAS TX 75240	
MANATT PHELPS ROTHENBERG & TUNNEY, SUITE 200 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BANKERS TRUST CO

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client
Do.	BOEING CO
LOUIS T. MARCH ASSOCIATES, INC, 1400 EYE STREET, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20005	
THOMAS P. MARINIS JR., 3418 FIRST CITY TOWER HOUSTON TX 77002	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: ARCHIE BENNETT JR.)
DEBORAH J. MARQUIS, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
CLARENCE J. MARTIN, 1200 17TH ST., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
DANEA KEHOE MARTIN, 1922 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS
DAVID F. MARTIN, 2020 14TH STREET, NORTH ARLINGTON VA 22201	TRANE COMPANY
COLIN D. MATHEWS, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: NORTHVILLE INDUSTRIES)
MAUN GREEN HAYES SIMON JOHANNESON & BREHL, 332 HAMM BUILDING ST. PAUL MN 55102	MURPHY MOTOR FREIGHT LINES, INC
MAYER BROWN & PLATT, 2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #6500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SEARS ROEBUCK & CO
JOHN L. MCCONNELL, SUITE 1100 1800 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC
DENNIS R. MCCOY, 1101 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED GAS PIPE LINE CO
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY, SUITE 500 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO
Do.	GUARDIAN AD LITEM, AIR CRASH DISASTER NEAR SAIGON
JOSEPH M. MCGARRY, MUNSON ROAD FARMINGTON CT 06032	HEUBLEIN, INC
MCHENRY & STAFFIER, P.C., SUITE 408 1300 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HUSKY OIL LTD
DENNIS MCINTOSH, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
MCNAIR GLENN KONDUROS CORLEY SINGLETARY PORTER & DIBBLE, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE
Do.	GTE SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS
Do.	MESA PETROLEUM CO
Do.	NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORP
Do.	RKO
KATHRYN M. MCNAMARA, 633 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20004	SEARS ROEBUCK & CO
PATRICK H. MCNAMARA, 1800 M STREET, NW, #700 SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CHEMICAL, U.S.A.
MILLER & CHEVALIER, CHARTERED, METROPOLITAN SQUARE 655 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BINGHAM DANA & GOULD
Do.	HALLMARK CARDS, INC
Do.	NATIONAL ASSN OF TEMPORARY SERVICES, INC
DENNY MILLER ASSOCIATES, 203 MARYLAND AVE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	BOEING COMPANY
Do.	MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSN
Do.	PORT OF TACOMA
Do.	ROCKCOR, INC
MILLER CASSIDY LARROCA & LEWIN, SUITE 500 2555 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	47TH STREET PHOTO
GRANT MILLER, 1725 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #900-ARLINGTON VA 22202	LTV AEROSPACE & DEFENSE CO
HARRIS C. MILLER, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	OCCIDENTAL CHEMICAL CORP
W. KIRK MILLER, 735 NORTH WATER STREET, #908 MILWAUKEE WI 53202	AMERICAN MALTING BARLEY ASSN, INC
JOHN H. MINER, ROOM 1414-SOUTH BUILDING, USDA WASHINGTON DC 20250	ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES OF USDA
MINING & RECLAMATION COUNCIL OF AMERICA, 1575 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20005	
EDWARD F. MITCHELL, 1900 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20068	POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO
JOANNE MITCHELL, 2020 K STREET, NW, #435 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COMMODITY EXCHANGE, INC
MMB ASSOCIATES, INC, 122 C STREET, NW, #240 WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL BANKERS ASSOCIATION
Do.	NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE CORP
Do.	NCAF
TERRENCE W. MODGLIN, 2001 S ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20009	TERRENCE W. MODGLIN & ASSOCIATES (FOR: MARITIME INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT)
DAVID T. MODL, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO
D. MOODY & CO, INC, P.O. BOX 55389 TULSA OK 74155	
WILLIAM D. MOORE, 10 DORRANCE STREET PROVIDENCE RI 02903	GREATER PROVIDENCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
TESSA MORRIS, 1819 L STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SECURITY PACIFIC NATIONAL BANK
MORRISON & FOERSTER, 1920 N STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAYS
PHILIP D. MORRISON, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BLOUNT, INC
Do.	BORG-WARNER CORP
Do.	ESTATE OF VIRGINIA S. DU PONT
MUDGE ROSE GUTHRIE ALEXANDER & FERNDON, 2121 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	MERCEDES BENZ OF NORTH AMERICA
EDWARD L. MURPHY, 2139 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	NATIONAL ASSN OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
MURPHY MOTOR FREIGHT LINES, INC, P.O. BOX 43640 ST. PAUL MN 55164	
ANNETTE NAJJAR, 2033 M ST., NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
PETER A. NALEWAJK, 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC
NATIONAL ASSN OF TEMPORARY SERVICES, INC, 119 SOUTH SAINT ASAPH STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	
NATIONAL HEALTH CARE FINANCING ASSN, P.O. BOX 946 HOLLY HILL FL 32017	
NATIONAL KNITWEAR & SPORTSWEAR ASSN, 386 PARK AVENUE SOUTH NEW YORK NY 10016	
NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL, 1150 17TH STREET, NW, #306 WASHINGTON DC 20036	
NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF AMERICA, 1951 WEBSTER STREET OAKLAND CA 94612	
GLENN NISHIMURA, 1314 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA
NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, 491 BROADWATER ARNOLD MD 21012	TERRENCE W. MODGLIN & ASSOCIATES (FOR: MARITIME INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT)
MARY JANE NORVILLE, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #695 WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FED OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS
THOMAS H. O'BRIEN, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20037	HARRIS CORPORATION
TERRENCE M. O'CONNELL II , 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)
Do.	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)
O'CONNOR & HANNAN, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DESTILERIA SERRALLES, INC
Do.	GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS
Do.	MERCEDES-BENZ OF NORTH AMERICA, INC
Do.	SPARX CORPORATION
CHARLES ALBERT O'CONNOR JR., 2300 S. 24TH ROAD, #533 ARLINGTON VA 22206	
PATRICK C. O'CONNOR, KENT & O'CONNOR, INC 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	STEEL TANK INSTITUTE
JEAN F. O'NEIL, 884 COLLEGE PARKWAY ROCKVILLE MD 20850	TERRENCE W. MODGLIN & ASSOCS (MARITIME INST FOR RESEARCH...)
O'NEILL AND HAASE, P.C., SUITE 1110 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE
Do.	BHC, INC
MICHAEL D. OLDAK, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN
ERIC OLSON, 1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WILDERNESS SOCIETY
CLARK ONSTAD, SUITE 300 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	TEXAS AIR CORP. AND CONTINENTAL AIR LINES
ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, 520 CAPITOL MALL SACRAMENTO CA 95814	
ROBERT W. OWEN, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY)
JOEL PACKER, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN
MICHAEL S. PALLAK, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
STEPHEN J. PARADISE, 1800 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC
CARL M. PARKS, 633 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20004	ALLSTATE INSURANCE GROUP
KEN PARMELEE, 1448 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN
PARRY AND ROMANI ASSOCIATES, INC, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FAMILY LIFE ASSURANCE CO
Do.	CARE ENTERPRISES
Do.	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS
Do.	LOYAL AMERICAN LIFE INSURANCE CO
Do.	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC
Do.	NATIONAL BEER WHOLESALERS ASSN
Do.	SONY CORPORATION
Do.	STANDARD OIL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
PATTON BOGGS & BLOW, SUITE 800 2550 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	BIOGEN
Do.	HAYT HAYT & LANDAU
Do.	NATIONAL MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING FINANCE ASSN
Do.	NORTH AMERICAN VAN LINES
Do.	OVERSEAS MILITARY SALES GROUP
Do.	PENNZOIL CO
Do.	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COUNCIL
Do.	RICE MILLERS' ASSN
Do.	UNITED BRANDS CO.
PAUL WEISS RIFKIND WHARTON & GARRISON, 345 PARK AVE. NEW YORK NY 10154	ORBITAL SCIENCES CORP
PERITO DUERK & PINCO, P.C., 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN SOC FOR PHARMACOLOGY & EXPERIMENTAL THERAPEUTICS
KATE M. PERRY, 1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION
MARY PETERS, 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ASSN OF PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS
CLAIRE PETTENGILL, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
DEIRDRE B. PHILLIPS, 100 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON MA 02110	BANK OF BOSTON CORP
Do.	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON
JOAN PICCOLO, 1776 K STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOROLA, INC

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client
PIERSON BALL & DOWD, 1200 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHEVRON USA, INC
Do	FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION
PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO, SUITE 900 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC
VALERIE F. PINSON, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC
POLAROID CORPORATION, 549 TECHNOLOGY SQUARE CAMBRIDGE MA 02139	
IRVING M. POLLACK, 13010 CARNEY STREET WHEATON MD 20906	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE
ANTHONY M. PONTICELLI, 2100 M STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20037	MANSFIELD & PONTICELLI
POWELL GOLDSTEIN FRAZER & MURPHY, SUITE 1050 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BEAR STEARNS & CO
Do	MID-AMERICA ASSOCIATES
Do	N & F DEVELOPMENT CORP, INC
Do	NATIONAL INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT CORP
JAMES L. POWELL, HHC, 1-33 A APO NY 09091	REVIVAL WAY HOUSE OF PRAYER OF JESUS CHRIST, INC
FREDERICK W. POWERS III, 260 SKYRIDGE DRIVE ATLANTA GA 30338	SIEMENS-ALLIS, INC
KATHY S. PRAGER, 2029 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
PRESTON THORGRIMSON ELLIS & HOLMAN, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COASTAL TRADING CO
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF STATE DIRECTORS OF COMMUN & JUNIOR COLLEGES
LEE PRICE, 1757 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INT'L UNION, UNITED AUTO AEROSPACE & AGRIC IMPLEMENT WORKERS
PROCOMPETITIVE RAIL STEERING COMMITTEE, 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20005	
PSC ASSOCIATES, 1609 BARNSTEAD DRIVE RESTON VA 22094	
QUINN RACUSIN YOUNG & DELANEY, CHTD, 1730 K STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	RECON/OPTICAL, INC
JOHN D. RAFFAELLI, 1317 F STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20004	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: BALCOR/AMERICAN EXPRESS, INC)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: DEAN WITTER REALTY, INC)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: FREEPORT-MCMORAN, INC)
Do	GULF COAST WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: JMB REALTY CORP)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: JAMES D. LAROSA)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: LIFE OF VIRGINIA, ET AL.)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: MONARCH RESOURCES, INC)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: SCHULMAN MANAGEMENT CO)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: TAYLOR & MIZELL)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: UNITED SERVICES LIFE COS)
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: VOLUME FOOTWEAR RETAILERS OF AMERICA)
RAGAN & MASON, 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WESTERN PIONEER
JAMES D. RANGE, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #607 WASHINGTON DC 20024	WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC
JOHN DANIEL REAVES, 910 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSN
RECON/OPTICAL, INC, 550 WEST NORTHWEST HIGHWAY BARRINGTON IL 60010	
ROBERT O. REDDING, 3519 S.W. 147TH LANE ROAD OCALA FL 32673	
BILL REFFALT, 1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WILDERNESS SOCIETY
REID & PRIEST, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BEAR STEARN & CO
Do	PURPLE CROSS INSURANCE CO
MARY LYNN REILLY, 3805 ALTON PLACE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF AMERICA
WILSON L. REYNOLDS, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #319 WASHINGTON DC 20002	HALT: AMERICANS FOR LEGAL REFORM
JOHN J. RHODES, CUMMINGS & LOCKWOOD 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #650 WASHINGTON DC 20005	ALLIANCE FOR CLEAN ENERGY; UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD
RICHARD RICHARDS, BLISS, CRAFT & RICHARDS 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW, 6TH FL WASHINGTON DC 20007	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA
LARRY D. RICKARDS, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
JAMES E. RITCHIE & ASSOCIATES, SUITE 400 499 S. CAPITOL ST., SW WASHINGTON DC 20003	GOLDEN NUGGET, INC.
KENNETH L. ROBINSON, 1111 N. 19TH STREET, #700 ARLINGTON VA 22209	NATIONAL ASSN OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS
NANCY RODGERS, 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, ALF-CIO
ROGERS & WELLS, 1737 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	B. ALTMAN & CO
Do	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO
Do	FRANZIA, FRED T. JOHN C. & JOSEPH S.
Do	KAMEHAMEHA SCHOOLS/BERNICE P. BISHOP ESTATE
LESTER L. ROSEN, 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MILES LABORATORIES, INC
GAIL E. ROSS, GOLDFARB SINGER & AUSTERN 918 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WASHINGTON INDEPENDENT WRITERS
LOIS ROWAN, 818 ROEDER ROAD, #702 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS
ROXTON, INC, 2000 S. EADS STREET, #1003 ARLINGTON VA 22202	GLOBAL IDENTIFICATION CORP
NICHOLAS L. RUGGIERE, 1667 K STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	JOHNSON & JOHNSON
DOMENIC R. RUSCIO, 6TH FLOOR 2010 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	
NAJWA SA'D, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
MARK B. SANDGROUND, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #405 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ARTERY ORGANIZATION, INC
KAREN SASAHARA, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
ROBERT WAYNE SAYER, 4545 42ND STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	GCA CORP
SCHLOSSBERG-CASSIDY & ASSOCIATES, INC, 955 L'ENFANT PLAZA, S.W. SUITE 1401 WASHINGTON DC 20024	BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Do	COMMUNITY CARE SYSTEMS, INC
RICHARD P. SCHWEITZER, 2022 P STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PRIVATE TRUCK COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC
THOMAS W. SCOVILLE, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20001	JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS
SCRIBNER HALL & THOMPSON, SUITE 700 1875 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONTINENTAL AMERICAN LIFE INSURANCE CO
JAMES V. SHEAHAN, 1666 MANHASSET DRIVE ATLANTA GA 30338	SIEMENS-ALLIS, INC
PATRICIA Q. SHEEHAN, 1667 K STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	JOHNSON & JOHNSON
LISA SHUGER, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
STEVEN W. SILVER, ROBERTSON, MONAGLE, EASTAUGH & BRADLEY 210 FERRY WAY JUNEAU AK 99801	U.S. CRUISES, INC
TALMAGE E. SIMPKINS, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC
ALBERT M. SIMS, BOX 872 SMITHTOWN NY 11787	PERFORMANCE ENGINEERING, INC
SKADDEN ARPS SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM, 919 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CATHEDRAL CORPORATION
CYNTHIA ELLIOT SKIFF, 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN
WILLIAM E. SKLAR, SKLAR, IDELSON 800 18TH STREET, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CITIZENS AGAINST PACS
JAMES P. SMITH, 2000 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	HOSPITAL CORP OF AMERICA
LESLIE HUGHES SMITH, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #209 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE
LARRY S. SNOWHITE, 1825 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE STUDENT LOAN AUTHORITY
FREDERICK P. SOMERS, 1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSN
SONOSKY CHAMBERS SACHSE & GUIDO, 1050 31ST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	MACKENZIE TURNIPSEED
E. RICHARD SOPER, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA
SPACE AMERICA, INC, 600 WATER STREET, SW, #207 WASHINGTON DC 20024	
JOANN SPEVACEK, 1500 PLANNING RESEARCH DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	PLANNING RESEARCH CORP
NICHOLAS J. SPIEZIO, 1709 NEW YORK AVNEUE, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS
PETER A. SPINA, 150 EAST 42ND STREET NEW YORK NY 10017	MOBIL OIL CORP
EARL C. SPURRIER, THE MADISON BUILDING, #514 1155 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ASSN
SQUIRE SANDERS & DEMPSEY, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	CAN-AM CORPORATION
COURTNEY A. STADD, 199 S. CAPITOL STREET, SW, #102 WASHINGTON DC 20003	STARSTRUCK, INC
O'CONNELL STAFFORD, P.O. DRAWER 1734 ATLANTA GA 30301	COCA-COLA COMPANY
DAVID E. STAHL, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN
STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA, 225 BUSH STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104	STANDARD OIL OF INDIANA
DAVID P. STANG, P.C., SUITE 601 1629 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BECHTEL POWER CORP
FRANK M. STASZESKY JR., 1535 SENECA LANE SAN MATEO CA 94402	GREAT AMERICAN RESERVE INSURANCE CO
JOHN HOWARD STECKER, 2020 LIVE OAK DALLAS TX 75221	MCDONNELL DOUGLAS CORP
J. C. STEEN, 412 FIRST STREET, SE, #301 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NORTHROP CORP
Do	TRW, INC
HENRY J. STEENSTRA JR., 1000 WILSON BOULEVARD, #2600 ARLINGTON VA 22209	LTV AEROSPACE DEFENSE CO
JACK L. STEMPLER, 1725 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #900 ARLINGTON VA 22202	TORCHMARK CORPORATION
ROBERT I. STEWART, 2001 THIRD AVENUE, SOUTH BIRMINGHAM AL 35233	INT'L UNION, UNITED AUTO AEROSPACE & AGRIC IMPLEMENT WORKERS
DON STILLMAN, 1757 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MANVILLE CORP
STEVEN F. STOCKMEYER, 1120 20TH STREET, NW SUITE 610, ONE LAFAYETTE CENTRE SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC
STEPHEN STORCH, 1800 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TIMES MIRROR CO
RAYMOND L. STRASSBURGER, 1875 EYE STREET, NW, #1110 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DREYFUS DOLLAR FUND
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN, 1150 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA)
JOHN H. SULLIVAN, 2924 COLUMBIA PIKE ARLINGTON VA 22204	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
JOHN B. SUMMERS, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EMBASSY OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
SURREY & MORSE, 1250 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP
Do	INTEL CORP AND DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CORP
THOMAS M. SUSMAN, ROPES & GRAY 1001 22ND STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	BLANCHARD VALLEY HOSPITAL
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN, 1666 K STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CREDIT UNION NATL ASSN, INC
Do	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client
DAVID L. SWANSON, BLISS CRAFT & RICHARDS 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW, 6TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20007	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA
Do	U.S. PHOTOVOLTAICS MANUFCTURERS' AD HOC COMMITTEE
SWIDLER BERLIN & STRELOW, CHTD, 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW #500 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN HOECHST CORP
ROBERT TAFT JR., 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: PARSONS CORPORATION)
RUBY TAKANISHI, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
JULIE TANG, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	PEACE POLITICAL ACTION COMM
KEITH TARR-WHELAN, 1201 16TH STREET, NW, #222 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SAVE OUR SECURITY
KAREN E. THEIBERT, 1750 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE
ALAN J. THIEMANN, 1199 N. FAIRFAX STREET, #801 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL ASSN OF TRUCK STOP OPERATORS
DIANE KAY THOMAS, 6962 HANOVER PARKWAY, #301 GREENBELT MD 20770	AMERICAN ASSN OF MINORITY ENTERPRISE SMALL BUS. INVEST COS
JAMES H. THOMAS, 1125 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS
RICHARD L THOMPSON, 1700 K STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SQUIBB CORPORATION
JEFFREY B. TRAMMELL, 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BUDD COMPANY)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL OF OMAHA)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SANTA FE CORP)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC)
JON R. TUMLER, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1075 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PUBLIC SECURITIES ASSN
FRANCES M. TURK, 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION CORP
RITA M. TURKIEWICZ, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)
CARL R. TUVIN, 2727 29TH STREET, NW, #733 WASHINGTON DC 20008	GUTTENBERG ASSOCIATES (FOR: NORTH AMERICAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSN)
PATRICK J. TYRRELL, 2033 M STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ARAB AMERICANS
GILMAN UDELL, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF FIRE FIGHTERS
MARK J. UGORETZ, 1726 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE
ULLMAN CONSULTANTS, INC., 1000 POTOMAC ST., N.W. SUITE 302 WASHINGTON DC 20007	PACIFIC LUMBER SALES CO
MARY UYEDA, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN
DAVID T. VAN CAMP, 225 BUSH STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA
VAN NESS FELDMAN SUTCLIFFE CURTIS & LEVENBERG, P.C., 7TH FLOOR 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	CHELAN #1, DOUGLAS #1 & GRANT #2
Do	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA
ROBERT CLARKE VARAH, 1330 BURLINGTON STREET EAST/BOX 460 HAMILTON ONTARIO L8N 3J5 CANADA	DOFASCO, INC
ANDREW VITALI JR , 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
NICK J. VOLCHEFF, 2509 E. SAN MIGUEL PHOENIX AZ 85016	AT&T
VORYS SATER SEYMOUR & PEASE, SUITE 1111 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OHIO DEPOSIT GUARANTY FUND
Do	OHIO OIL & GAS ASSN
Do	SEAGATE COMMUNITY DEVELOMENT CORP
Do	SIMPLEX TIME RECORDER CO
FRANCES PATRICIA WADE, 2000 L STREET, NW, #702 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FREDERICK M. BUSH & ASSOCIATES
WAGNER & BARODDY, INC, 1100 17TH STREET, NW, #804 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN ACTUARIES, INC
Do	MOBIL CORP
CHARLS E. WALKER ASSOCIATES, INC, 1730 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICUS SHAREOWNER SERVICE CORP
Do	CHEVRON U.S.A., INC
R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC, 1317 F STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20004	BALCOR/AMERICAN EXPRESS, INC
Do	DEAN WITTER REALTY, INC
Do	JMB REALTY CORP
Do	JAMES D. LAROSA
Do	MONARCH RESOURCES, INC
Do	TAYLOR & MIZELL
Do	UNITED SERVICES LIFE COS
DON WALLACE ASSOCIATES, INC., 232 E. CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20003	ARROW TRANSPORTATION CO
Do	SERVICE CORPORATION INTERNATIONAL
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, 412 FIRST STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN PEANUT PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS, INC
BONNIE B. WAN, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, #730 WASHINGTON DC 20004	KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP
JAMES C. WARNER, 1200 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BAILARD BIEHL & KAISER, INC
WILLIAM H. WARNER, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	CONTROL DATA CORP
BENJAMIN L. WEBSTER, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20001	JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS
DAVID M. WEIMAN, 517 ALBANY AVENUE TAKOMA PARK MD 20912	SMITH RIVER ALLIANCE
STEVEN A. WEIN, 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXTRON, INC
WESTERN FUELS ASSOCIATION, INC, 700 JEFFERSON BUILDING 1225 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	
WEXLER REYNOLDS HARRISON & SCHULE, INC, SUITE 600 1317 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	ALLIED CORPORATION
Do	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO
Do	CONSORTIUM OF PUBLIC TV STATIONS
Do	HOECHST-ROUSSEL PHARMACEUTICALS, INC
Do	HUSKY OIL
Do	NEW ENGLAND ELECTRIC SYSTEM
Do	SECURITY INVESTMENT CO
Do	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC
LEONARD P. WHEAT, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #1002 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN
WHITE & CASE, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLEGHANY CORPORATION
RICHARD M. WHITING, 730 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF BANK HOLDING COS
ROBERT P. WILL, 955 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW SUITE 1101 WASHINGTON DC 20024	ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES
Do	FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT
Do	METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
Do	SIX AGENCY COMMITTEE
Do	WILLIAMS-KUEBELBECK & ASSOCIATES
WILLIAMS & JENSEN, P.C., 1101 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	D'ANCONA & PFLAUM
Do	TEXACO, INC
Do	TEXAS AIR CORP
Do	UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN HOSPITALS
WILMER CUTLER & PICKERING, 1666 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS, AUTHORS & PUBLISHERS
Do	PEOPLE OF ENEWETAK
Do	UNITED AIRLINES
DONNIE E. WILSON, 7374 ELDORADO STREET MCLEAN VA 22102	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC
H. GRAHAM WILSON, 1330 BURLINGTON STREET EAST/BOX 460 HAMILTON ONTARIO L8N 3J5 CANADA	DOFASCO, INC
DAVID A. WINSTON, 1922 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS
WISNER & SCHWARZ, 1762 CHURCH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENERGY RECOVERY SYSTEMS, INC
ROBERT V. WITECK, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN EXPRESS CORP)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: CANADIAN ASBESTOS INFORMATION CENTRE)
Do	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: MUTUAL OF OMAHA)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALEN DRY CARGO, INC)
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC)
HOWARD E. WOOLLEY, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS
STEVEN M. WORTH, 3255 GRACE ST., NW THE POWER HOUSE WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF KOREA)
JOSEPH T. WRABEK, BOX 548 CASCADE LOCKS OR 97014	COLUMBIA GORGE UNITED
MILAN P YAGER, 727 N. WASHINGTON STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	UNITED FRESH FRUIT & VEGETABLE ASSN
ANDREA J. YANK, 1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION
BARNABY W. ZALL, 1424 16TH STREET, NW, #707 WASHINGTON DC 20036	
ELAINE ZASAFONETIS, 201 PARK WASHINGTON COURT FALLS CHURCH VA 22046	NATIONAL-AMERICAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSN
MICHAEL J. ZIMMER, WICKWIRE, GAVIN & GIBBS 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CLEAN COAL COALITION, INC

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1984:

(NOTE.—The form used for reporting is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective headings.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19.....

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $.....Dues and assessments
2. $.....Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $.....Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $.....Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $.....Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $.....Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $.....TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $.....TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $.....Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $.....Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $.....Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": .....

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through....., 19.....)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $.....Public relations and advertising services
2. $.....Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $.....Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $.....Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $.....Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $.....Telephone and telegraph
7. $.....Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $.....All other expenditures
9. $.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $.....Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $.....TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $.....TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $.....Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $.....Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
A-K ASSOCIATES, INC., 1225 8TH STREET, #590 SACRAMENTO CA 95814	DIRECTOR OF TIMBER COUNTIES COALITION	11,250.00	9,190.39
Do	GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE, HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT	6,000.00	9,603.28
Do	NATIONAL AIR TANKERS ASSN	15,000.00	9,768.56
Do	PATHOLOGIST PRACTICE ASSOCIATION	18,000.00	12,691.94
ROBERT J. AAGRE, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	1,240.00	138.00
PAUL C. ABENANTE, SUITE 850 2020 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN BAKERS ASSN	962.92	6.00
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY SR , 3973 STUART PLACE JACKSON MS 39211	U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS' ASSN	166.67	235.66
ALBERT E. ABRAHAMS, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	8,000.00	521.32
ACTION FOR CHILDREN'S TELEVISION, 46 AUSTIN ST. NEWTONVILLE MA 02160		26,816.84	299.80
ACTION, INC., 2025 EYE STREET, NW, #1022 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM		
Do	NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIAN, INC		
CHARLES F. ADAMS, SUITE 700 1899 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN ASSN OF ADVERTISING AGENCIES	2,500.00	750.00
JOHN J. ADAMS, 2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	VEPCO		
ADDUCI DINAN AND MASTRIANI, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #250 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MUNICIPAL CASTINGS FAIR TRADE COUNCIL	2,500.00	761.04
V. J. ADDUCI, 1620 EYE ST., NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC	79.00	
ADKINSON & LEBOW, 970 17TH STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. PHOTOVOLTAICS MANUFACTURERS' AD HOC COMM	10,000.00	
TERRANCE M. ADLHOCK, 1119 19TH STREET, NW, #303 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO	2,000.00	1,850.00
AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES ASSN OF AMERICA, 1725 DESALES ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		19,129.27	19,129.27
AFL-CIO MARITIME COMMITTEE, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		5,225.00	5,802.70
ELIZABETH AGLE, 530 7TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL CLEAN AIR COALITION, INC	8,311.25	214.45
ROBERT S. AGMAN, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC	1,368.00	87.96
HERBERT ALLEN AILSWORTH, SUITE 1101 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SANDOZ, INC		48.75
AIR PRODUCTS & CHEMICALS, INC, 1800 K STREET, NW, #1016 WASHINGTON DC 20006			75.56
RANDOLF H. AIRES, 633 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20004	SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO	3,150.00	106.83
MICHAEL A. AISENBERG, SUITE 614 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CORPORATION	10,300.00	
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD, SUITE 400 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR FREIGHT ASSOCIATION	650.00	19.00
Do	AMERADA HESS CORPORATION		
Do	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO	875.00	19.00
Do	AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP	100.00	
Do	AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO	150.00	
Do	ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND COMPANY		
Do	ATCOR		
Do	BENEFICIAL CORPORATION	16,250.00	304.00
Do	CELANESE CORPORATION	7,825.00	133.00
Do	COALITION OF SERVICE INDUSTRIES, INC	450.00	
Do	COMMITTEE FOR PRUDENT DEREGULATION	5,100.00	95.00
Do	CONSOLIDATED FOODS CORP	425.00	
Do	CONTINENTAL AIRLINES		
Do	DOMESTIC NITROGEN PRODUCERS AD HOC COMMITTEE	150.00	
Do	DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY		
Do	E & J GALLO WINERY		
Do	FARM LABOR ALLIANCE	19,800.00	361.00
Do	GOLDMAN SACHS & CO	1,250.00	19.00
Do	LEVI STRAUSS & CO	5,650.00	95.00
Do	LONE STAR INDUSTRIES, INC		
Do	LONE STAR STEEL CO	2,250.00	38.00
Do	MARRIOTT CORP	875.00	
Do	MESA PETROLEUM CO	23,150.00	437.00
Do	METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY OF HARRIS COUNTY	6,575.00	114.00
Do	MILITARY ACCESSORIES SERVICE ASSN, INC		
Do	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	10,325.00	190.00
Do	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN	3,625.00	57.00
Do	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE		
Do	NEW YORK AIR		
Do	PIPELINE INDUSTRY ADVANCEMENT FUND		
Do	PUROLATOR, INC	5,075.00	95.00
Do	RAUSCHER PIERCE REFSNES, INC		
Do	RINGLING BROS. BARNUM AND BAILEY		
Do	SANCHEZ-O'BRIEN OIL & GAS CORP		
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO	7,375.00	133.00
Do	TEXACO, INC	19,025.00	361.00
Do	TEXAS AIR CORPORATION		
Do	TIPPERARY CORP		
Do	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC	6,325.00	114.00
Do	WERTHEIM & CO	450.00	
Do	WESTERN GOVERNORS POLICY OFFICE	1,200.00	228.00
Do	ZALE CORPORATION	975.00	
ALABAMA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, P.O. BOX 11000 MONTGOMERY AL 36198		2,075.00	6,730.80
ALASKA LUMBER & PULP COMPANY, INC, P.O. BOX 1050 SITKA AK 99835			
JAMES J. ALBERTINE, 1660 L ST., NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	300.00	
JOHN M. ALBERTINE, SUITE 209 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC	1,875.00	59.35
H. MEADE ALCORN JR., ALCORN, BAKEWELL & SMITH ONE AMERICAN ROW HARTFORD CT 06103	HELEN WODELL HALBACH ESTATE		
FREDERICK K. ALDERSON, 1730 M STREET, NW, #607 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	696.00	325.15
DONALD C. ALEXANDER, MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS 1800 M ST., NW, #800 NORTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALIGNPAC	99.00	
Do	BALDWIN-UNITED CORPORATION	11.00	
Do	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
Do	COMMITTEE FOR CAP FORMATION THROUGH DIVIDEND REINVESTMENT		
Do	DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS	22.00	
Do	EASTERN AIR LINES, INC		
Do	FAMILY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	77.00	
Do	LUCASFILM LTD		
Do	SECURITY PACIFIC INT'L. LEASING (EUROPE), INC		
KAREN D. ALEXANDER, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	110.00	
WILLIS W. ALEXANDER, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	2,500.00	45.80
RICHARD F. ALI, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC	2,500.00	
MAXTON ALLCOX, 400 FIRST ST., NW, RM 801 WASHINGTON DC 20001	BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE OF WAY EMPLOYES	14,373.81	
ROBERT G. ALLEN, 511 C STREET, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	C.A.R.E.		
ALLIANCE AGAINST HANDGUNS, P.O. BOX 75700 WASHINGTON DC 20013			
ALLIANCE OF AMERICAN INSURERS, 1501 WOODFIELD ROAD, #400 WEST SCHAUMBURG IL 60195			4,234.75
ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY, 1925 K STREET, NW, #507 WASHINGTON DC 20006			3,090.34
ALLTEL CORPORATION, 100 EXECUTIVE PARKWAY HUDSON OH 44236			3,726.00
JOSEPH C. ALLWARDEN, 220 DANIEL WEBSTER HWY SOUTH MERRIMACK NH 03054	KOLLSMAN INSTRUMENT CO		
HARVEY ALTER, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	200.00	
THOMAS H. ALTMEYER, 1575 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MINING & RECLAMATION COUNCIL OF AMERICA	3,000.00	70.00
RICARDO R. ALVARADO, 2550 M STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20037	SIGNAL COMPANIES, INC	3,726.00	
SUSAN E. ALVARADO, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS	1,500.00	859.20
AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO, 5025 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016			8,000.00
AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, NATL CAP DIV. 689, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20001			
JEROME A. AMBRO ASSOCIATES, SUITE 719 2301 S. JEFFERSON DAVIS DR. ARLINGTON VA 22202	ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES	4,850.00	4,679.08
Do	COUNTY OF SUFFOLK, NEW YORK	7,500.00	7,318.56
ROBERT P. AMBROSE, 14615 LONE OAK ROAD EDEN PRAIRIE MN 55344	COOPERATIVE POWER ASSOCIATION	2,400.00	767.97
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FAMILY PHYSICIANS, 1740 WEST 92ND ST. KANSAS CITY MO 64114		9,727.75	9,727.75
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF OPHTHALMOLOGY, SUITE 300 1101 VERMONT AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20005			
AMERICAN ARTS ALLIANCE, 424 C ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		39,022.40	79,944.47
AMERICAN ASSN FOR COUNSELING AND DEVELOPMENT, 5999 STEVENSON AVENUE ALEXANDRIA VA 22304		47,118.14	21,273.60
AMERICAN ASSN OF EQUIPMENT LESSORS, SUITE 1010 1300 NORTH 17TH STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209			
AMERICAN ASSN OF MEAT PROCESSORS, P.O. BOX 269 ELIZABETHTOWN PA 17022		920.03	2,152.36
AMERICAN ASSN OF PORT AUTHORITIES, INC, 1612 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		61,561.00	23,746.04
AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN, 8111 GATEHOUSE RD. FALLS CHURCH VA 22047			
AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		50,330.74	50,330.74
AMERICAN BORDER BROADCASTERS FREE SPEECH COMMITTEE, INC, 2000 M STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #209 WASHINGTON DC 20036		2,600.00	1,796.51
AMERICAN CLEAN WATER ASSN, SUITE 519 2025 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		31,689.52	32,713.63

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR CAPITAL FORMATION, SUITE 520 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		17,519.00	2,039.00
AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			17,457.81
AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED, 225 TOUHY AVE PARK RIDGE IL 60068		102,359.00	102,359.00
AMERICAN FED OF LABOR AND CONG OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			126,116.03
AMERICAN FEED MFRS ASSN, 1701 N. FT. MYER DR. ARLINGTON VA 22209		3,240.00	3,240.00
AMERICAN FROZEN FOOD INST, 1700 OLD MEADOW RD., #100 MCLEAN VA 22102			6,000.00
AMERICAN HELLENIC INSTITUTE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, 1730 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
AMERICAN HONEY PRODUCERS ASSN, P.O. BOX 368 MINCO OK 73059		9,935.00	4,722.83
AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN, 840 N. LAKE SHORE DR. CHICAGO IL 60611		35,366.79	35,366.79
AMERICAN HOTEL & MOTEL ASSN, 888 SEVENTH AVE. NEW YORK NY 10019		22,078.03	10,990.50
AMERICAN INST OF MERCHANT SHIPPING, SUITE 1000 1625 K ST,. NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			545.00
AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN, 85 JOHN ST. NEW YORK NY 10038		3,539.00	3,539.00
AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM, #412 444 N. CAPITOL ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		63,731.00	88,490.33
AMERICAN LAND TITLE ASSN, 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			6,719.00
AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR EXPORTS & SECURITY ASSISTANCE, #4400 475 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024		21,210.00	20,489.40
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSN, 50 E. HURON ST. CHICAGO IL 60611		4,473.29	5,245.33
AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE, PO BOX 3556 WASHINGTON DC 20007			6,500.00
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN, 535 NORTH DEARBORN ST. CHICAGO IL 60610		1,132.50	55,975.42
AMERICAN MEDICAL CARE AND REVIEW ASSOCIATION, SUITE 210 5410 GROSVENOR LANE BETHESDA MD 20814			
AMERICAN METAL DETECTOR MANUFACTURERS' ASSN, 2814 NATIONAL DR. GARLAND TX 75401			1,314.00
AMERICAN MOVERS CONFERENCE, 400 ARMY-NAVY DR. ARLINGTON VA 22202		1,125.00	1,125.00
AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSN, BOX 17407 DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WASHINGTON DC 20041		16,776.49	16,776.49
AMERICAN NURSES' ASSN, 2420 PERSHING RD KANSAS CITY MO 64108			
AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSN, C/O DR. JOHN D. TUMBLIN SUITE 400E 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024			
AMERICAN ORTHOTIC AND PROSTHETIC ASSN, 717 PENDLETON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314			6,363.75
AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC, 260 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10016			1,000.00
AMERICAN PARATRANSIT INSTITUTE, P.O. BOX 340276 CORAL GABLES FL 33134		150,000.00	131,164.80
AMERICAN PETROCHEMICAL CONSUMERS, 1815 H STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006		307,095.58	218,365.26
AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST, 1220 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037		3,644.99	3,644.99
AMERICAN PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSN, 1111 N. FAIRFAX ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314			22,340.37
AMERICAN PODIATRY ASSN, 20 CHEVY CHASE CIRCLE WASHINGTON DC 20015		50,807.67	50,705.86
AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO, 817 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		15,780.15	15,780.15
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		18,000.00	18,000.00
AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSN, 1225 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
AMERICAN PULPWOOD ASSN, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
AMERICAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CORP, 600 WATER STREET, SW, #207 WASHINGTON DC 20024			11,350.00
AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSN, SUITE 964 1030 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			
AMERICAN SHORT LINE RAILROAD ASSN, 2000 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		11,250.00	5,653.63
AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #510 WASHINGTON DC 20024			
AMERICAN SUBCONTRACTORS ASSN, SUITE 540 8401 CORPORATE DR. LANDOVER MD 20785			
AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC, 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		10,290.06	81,344.37
AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, KOREA & VIETNAM (AMVETS) , 4647 FORBES BOULEVARD LANHAM MD 20706		6,950.47	6,960.47
AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSN, SUITE 828 1522 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			60.00
AMERICAN WATERWAYS OPERATORS, INC, SUITE 1000 1600 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209		5,723.00	181.81
AMERICAN WATERWAYS SHIPYARD CONFERENCE, 1600 WILSON BOULEVARD, #500 ARLINGTON VA 22209			
AMERICAN WOOD PRESERVERS INSTITUTE, 1945 GALLOWS ROAD, #405 VIENNA VA 22180			
MORRIS J. AMITAY, P.C., SUITE 168 400 N. CAPITOL ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMCOR GROUP, LTD	3,000.00	
Do	CHEVRON, U.S.A.		
Do	NATIONAL SATELLITE CABLE ASSN	3,500.00	
Do	NORTHROP CORP	3,000.00	
Do	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC	4,500.00	
Do	THOMPSON MEDICAL	4,000.00	
JAN S. AMUNDSON, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS		
EDWARD ANDERSEN, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL GRANGE	785.00	
ARNE ANDERSON, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	6,664.68	
BETTE B. ANDERSON, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL OF OMAHA).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: PORTALS, INC)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMN BROTHERS, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: U.S. BANKNOTE)		
H. KIM ANDERSON, VIRGINIA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 1809 STAPLES MILL ROAD RICHMOND VA 23230	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE	200.00	228.04
J. LEM ANDERSON, 4111 FRANCONIA RD. ALEXANDRIA VA 22310	TIME INC		
JAMES A. ANDERSON JR., 1725 K STREET, NW, #710 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF WHOLESALER-DISTRIBUTORS		
LINDA D. ANDERSON, 1411 K STREET, NW, #1110 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS	1,875.00	
ROBERT L. ANDERSON, JOHN DEERE RD. MOLINE IL 61265	DEERE & COMPANY		
ROMILDA R. ANDERSON, 10 WESTPORT ROAD WILTON CT 06897	RICHARDSON-VICKS	42,000.00	
STEVEN C. ANDERSON, 1700 OLD MEADOW RD. MCLEAN VA 22102	AMERICAN FROZEN FOOD INST	5,000.00	
WAYNE C. ANDERSON, SUITE 300 1050 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NABISCO BRANDS, INC	5,000.00	422.87
WILLIAM C. ANDERSON, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		68.00
ANDREWS & KURTH, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SPACE SERVICES INC. OF AMERICA		
ROBERT ANGEL, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTE OF AMERICA		
JACK R. ANGELL, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #704 WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED GAS PIPE LINE CO	222.00	6.50
JAY ANGOFF, 215 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	CONGRESS WATCH	5,249.99	
J. DONALD ANNETT, 1050 17TH ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TEXACO, INC	500.00	
TOBIAS ANTHONY, 1819 H STREET, NW, #510 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASH ASSN, INC		
PATRICK S. ANTRIM, 1800 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BANKAMERICA CORPORATION		
APARTMENT & OFFICE BUILDING ASSN OF METROPOLITAN WASH, DC, SUITE 600 1413 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			
JOHN D. AQUILINO JR., 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER		
ROBERT J. ARAUJO, 1001 22ND STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
JOHN CHRISTIAN ARCHER, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW, #213 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BROWN & ROOT, INC		
JOHN ARCHER, 8111 GATEHOUSE RD. FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CENTRAL STATES SE & SW AREAS HEALTH, WELFARE & PENSION FUNDS	115,491.06	4,656.89
Do	GUARDIAN LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA	14,689.28	143.43
Do	PUEBLO INTERNATIONAL	15.00	
Do	SITMAR CRUISES, INC	17,000.00	2,563.48
Do	TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION	25,206.80	1,009.91
JOHN A. ARMBRUSTER, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	TENNECO, INC		
R. G. ARMISTEAD, 8613 JANET LANE VIENNA VA 22180			
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE KRAMER & VAUGHAN, 611 OLIVE STREET, #1900 ST. LOUIS MO 63101	COMM ON US BUSINESS OF THE CANADIAN LIFE & HEALTH INSUR ASSN	2,003.00	42.93
ARNOLD & PORTER, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FLUOR CORPORATION	450.00	
Do	INEXCO OIL CO		
Do	NATIONAL COORDINATING COMM FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PLANS	10,940.00	517.00
Do	SACRAMENTO PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT, ET AL	7,267.25	221.28
Do	WERNER FLEISCHMANN		
CARL F. ARNOLD, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FAMILY CORP	400.00	
Do	AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE	540.00	
Do	CORPORATE PROPERTY INVESTORS	417.00	
Do	MEAD CORPORATION	150.00	
Do	MORTGAGE GUARANTY INSURANCE CORP	292.00	
Do	NATIONAL REALTY COMMITTEE	750.00	
Do	QUINTANA PETROLEUM CORP	1,125.00	
Do	SECURITIES INDUSTRY ASSN	438.00	
Do	SECURITY FIRST GROUP, INC		
JULIE L. ARNOLD, 1050 17TH STREET, NW, #1126 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TRAVENOL LABORATORIES, INC		
SANDY ARNOLD, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FED OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
NAN ARON, 600 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE	57.28	
H. L. ARONSON JR., ONE ILLINOIS CENTER 111 E. WACKER DR. CHICAGO IL 60610	NORTHWEST PIPELINE COMPANY		
ASBILL & JUNKIN, SUITE 603 1302 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COALITION ON SMOKING OR HEALTH	21,577.50	14,775.26
LUD ASHLEY, P.C., 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, 6TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP, INC	2,000.00	
Do	FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORP	25,041.00	26.60

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES, INC.		
Do	ISFA CORPORATION	4,100.00	
Do	MANVILLE CORPORATION		
Do	SAVINGS BANK OF PUGET SOUND		
Do	WITKOWSKI, WEINER, MCCAFFREY & BRODSKY, P.C.	5,250.00	
JOSEPH ASHOOH, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
ASPHALT ROOFING MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, 6288 MONTROSE ROAD ROCKVILLE MD 20852			
ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC, 729 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		12,500.00	
ASSOCIATED CREDIT BUREAUS, INC, P.O. BOX 218300 16211 PARK 10 PLACE HOUSTON TX 77084			2,123.06
ASSOCIATED EMPLOYERS, INC, SUITE 315 A 1222 N. MAIN SAN ANTONIO TX 78212			
ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
ASSOCIATION FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, 400-2 TOTTEN POND ROAD, #200 WALTHAM MA 02154		49,975.00	8,113.67
ASSOCIATION FOR BROADCAST ENGINEERING STANDARDS, INC, 2000 M STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
ASSOCIATION FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY RESEARCH, 1309 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		662.55	662.55
ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, 10 BROADWAY ST. LOUIS MO 63102			591.00
ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN SCIENCE, 1346 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #1122 WASHINGTON DC 20036		15,188.69	3,109.13
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE WOMEN, P.O. BOX 8068 WASHINGTON DC 20024		2,860.00	
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS, ONE DUPONT CIRCLE, NW, #370 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PUBLISHERS, 2005 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		8,406.01	8,406.01
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS, AMERICAN RAILROADS BLDG., SUITE 720 1920 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.		48,237.34	48,237.34
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL COLLEGES, SUITE 828 1522 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			20.00
ASSOCIATION OF DATA PROCESSING SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS, 1300 NORTH 17TH STREET, #300 ARLINGTON VA 22209			304.00
ASSOCIATION OF MAXIMUM SERVICE TELECASTERS, INC, 1735 DESALES ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			1,880.00
ASSOCIATION OF TRIAL LAWYERS OF AMERICA, 1050 31ST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007		8,812.50	8,812.50
ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES, SUITE 228 1346 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		23,938.00	10,202.22
GEORGE J. ASTE, 1825 K ST., NW, #607 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED AIRLINES	500.00	
ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO, 515 SOUTH FLOWER STREET LOS ANGELES CA 90071			1,092.04
FRITZ E. ATTAWAY, 1600 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC		
JOHN J. AUCIELLO, 224 E. HIGH STREET ELIZABETHTOWN PA 17022	AMERICAN ASSN OF MEAT PROCESSORS		
AUDIO RECORDING RIGHTS COALITION, P.O. BOX 33705 WASHINGTON DC 20033		35,152.00	31,655.68
RONALD R. AUSTIN, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OVERSEAS EDUCATION ASSN	264.00	
AUTOMOTIVE PARTS REBUILDERS ASSN, 6849 OLD DOMINION DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22101			
JOHN S. AUTRY, SUITE 810 2000 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SPERRY CORPORATION	2,100.00	1,100.00
AVENEL ASSOCIATES, INC, P.O. BOX 53131 WASHINGTON DC 20009	FLORIDA DEFENDERS OF THE ENVIRONMENT		
AVIATION CONSUMER ACTION PROJECT, BOX 19029 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
GUS AVRAKOTOS, 1522 K ST., NW #406 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE	281.54	
GEORGE C. AXTELL, 475 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #4400 WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR EXPORTS & SECURITY ASSISTANCE	6,000.00	52.82
WILLIAM H AXTMAN, RM. 160 950 N. GLEBE RD. ARLINGTON VA 22203	AMERICAN BOILER MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
CRAIG H. BAAB, 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BAR ASSN	400.00	36.50
JED L. BABBIN, 4910 NORTH 27TH STREET ARLINGTON VA 22207	SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA	16,000.00	
PATTI JO BABER, SUITE 400 919 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DIAMOND SHAMROCK CORPORATION	1,500.00	
DALE R. BABIONE, 1700 N. MOORE ST. ROSSLYN VA 22209	BOEING COMPANY	3,380.00	
ROBERT A. BACHA, SUITE 711 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)		
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)		
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP)	4,400.00	
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: YOUNGS DRUG PRODUCTS CORP)	800.00	
L. A. BAFALIS, CORPORATE CONSULTING SERVICES, INC P.O. BOX 2768 KEY LARGO FL 33037	DAVIS & MCLEOD (FOR: FLORIDA SUGAR CANE LEAGUE)		
Do	PROVIDENT LIFE & ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO	450.00	569.15
CARL E. BAGGE, COAL BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COAL ASSN	3,040.00	830.37
JOAN N. BAGGETT, 815 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BRICKLAYERS & ALLIED CRAFTSMEN	7,000.00	205.65
GEORGE F. BAILEY JR., P.O. BOX 21 MONTGOMERY AL 36101	ALABAMA RAILROAD ASSN		
WILLIAM W. BAILEY, 1050 17TH ST., NW SUITE 650 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MERCK & CO, INC	1,000.00	556.00
JUDITH L. BAIRD, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO	100.00	
JOHN BAIZE, CAPITOL GALLERY BLDG., #510 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION	1,965.00	212.91
EDWARD R. BAJER, 1015 15TH ST., NW, #802 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	450.00	
BAKER & BOTTS, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONSOLIDATED BANK		100.85
Do	DEPOSIT GUARANTEE NATIONAL BANK		
Do	HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY	3,960.00	
Do	INTERCONTINENTAL BANK		100.86
Do	INTERFIRST BANK FT. WORTH		
Do	PENNZOIL CO		
Do	PETRO-LEWIS CORPORATION		
Do	REPUBLICBANK HOUSTON		100.86
BAKER & HOSTETLER, 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CLEVELAND INSTITUTE OF ELECTRONICS		
Do	FEDERAL CARTRIDGE CORP	800.00	20.00
Do	KNIGHT FOUNDATION	800.00	20.00
Do	TIMKEN FOUNDATION	800.00	20.00
BAKER & MCKENZIE, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FAMARCO LTD, INC		
B. KIMBALL BAKER, 4647 FORBES BOULEVARD LANHAM MD 20706	AMVETS	6,800.00	150.47
DAVID BAKER, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	237.69	
EMIL F. BAKER, 1303 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FLEET RESERVE ASSN		
GERALD E. BAKER, 1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSN	5,250.00	406.40
JAMES JAY BAKER, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER	918.75	253.71
KEITH L. BAKER, 1000 POTOMAC STREET, NW, #302 WASHINGTON DC 20007	FEDERATION EMPLOYMENT & GUIDANCE SERVICE		
WALDON L. BAKER, SUITE 802 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	100.00	
ELIZABETH BALDWIN, 1346 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #1122 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN SCIENCE	2,250.00	
JACQUELINE BALK-TUSA, 1625 EYE ST., NW, #809 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BOISE CASCADE CORP	14,900.00	
BALLARD SPAHR ANDREWS & INGERSOLL, SUITE 1100 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALASKA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY		
Do	ATLANTIC ALLIANCE FOR MARITIME HERITAGE CONSERVATION		165.00
Do	DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY		
Do	ENERGY TERMINALS, INC		
Do	PHILADELPHIA PORT CORPORATION		54.15
Do	PORT OF WILMINGTON, DELAWARE		18.05
Do	SOUTH JERSEY PORT CORPORATION		18.05
Do	TITAN OCEAN SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	TREASURE SALVORS, INC		
Do	U.S. COMMITTEE FOR UNICEF		
BANK OF BOSTON CORPORATION, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110			
JUDY BARDACKE, 11 DUPONT CIRCLE,NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF TEACHERS		
ROBERT O. BARKER, 801 NORTHLAND TOWERS WEST SOUTHFIELD MI 48075	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	1,500.00	15.00
THOMAS H. BARKSDALE JR., 1220 L ST.,NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	5,500.00	433.08
THOMAS J. BARLOW III, 4717 DRUMMOND AVENUE CHEVY CHASE MD 20815	KANALKU TIMBER MANAGEMENT CO	534.00	55.00
DONNA R. BARNAKO, SUITE 1100 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF HEALTH CENTERS	1,100.00	141.50
JOHN H. BARNARD JR., 50 BEALE ST., PO BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL CORP		
BARNES RICHARDSON & COLBURN, SUITE 400 1819 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	EHA VENTILFABRIK WILHELM FRITZ KG		76.50
Do	FLORIDA CITRUS MUTUAL		784.95
Do	UNIROYAL, INC	7,605.25	
BARNETT & ALAGIA, 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSN	9,000.00	1,414.34
Do	CUBAN AMERICAN PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL	419.24	
Do	FARM CREDIT BANKS		
Do	FLORIDA FRUIT AND VEGETABLE ASSN	2,483.88	
LARRY P. BARNETT, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FLORIDA TOMATO EXCHANGE	2,571.84	
PAMELA H. BARNETT, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA	7,000.00	
BARNETT YINGLING & SHAY, SUITE 810 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	RELIGIOUS COALITION FOR ABORTION RIGHTS, INC.	5,749.98	
NEIL D. BARON, BOOTH & BARON 122 EAST 42ND ST. NEW YORK NY 10168	CITIBANK, N.A.	1,520.00	18.00
BARRETT SMITH SCHAPIRO SIMON & ARMSTRONG, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #821 WASHINGTON DC 20004	STANDARD & POOR'S CORPORATION		
Do	BEAR STEARNS & CO		
Do	CSC CLEARING CORP		
Do	HUGO NEU & SONS, INC		
Do	IRVING TRUST CO		
Do	MERRILL LYNCH PIERCE FENNER & SMITH, INC		
Do	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	NEW YORK FUTURES EXCHANGE, INC		
Do	NEW YORK MERCANTILE EXCHANGE		
ROBERT W. BARRIE, 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	2,000.00	
HARVEY BARRISON, 291 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10007	C. A. SHEA & COMPANY, INC		
DAVID S. BARROWS, 1201 S. W. 12TH, #200 PORTLAND OR 97205	ASSOCIATION OF OREGON & CALIFORNIA LAND GRANT COUNTIES	1,200.00	
JAMES E. BARTLEY, 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRANSPORTATION LEAGUE	6,000.00	20.00
WILLIAM N. BARTOLONE, 1612 K STREET, NW, #110 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ELECTRONICS ASSN	7,750.00	
WALTER F. BATCHELOR, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	1,000.00	22.78
DIANE BATEMAN, 1015 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FERTILIZER INSTITUTE	10,000.00	3,214.16
ROBERT E. BATES JR., 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOBIL OIL CORP	1,125.00	
CATHARINE R. BATKY, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURLINGTON NORTHERN, INC	750.00	330.59
DAVIS M. BATSON, 1155 15TH STREET, NW, #611 WASHINGTON DC 20005	ETHYL CORPORATION	1,600.00	
LAURIE C. BATTLE, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS	3,100.00	
LYNNE D. BATTLE, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #705 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COLLEGE PLACEMENT COUNCIL, INC		
JOHN F. BATTLES, MASSACHUSETTS PETROLEUM COUNCIL 11 BEACON ST., #515 BOSTON MA 02108	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	3,000.00	1,040.82
ROBERT J. BAUGHMAN, 717 PENDLETON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	AMERICAN ORTHOTIC AND PROSTHETIC ASSN		
BARBARA BAUMAN, 1990 M STREET, NW, #480 WASHINGTON DC 20036	DETROIT EDISON COMPANY	450.00	25.00
JAMES R. BAXTER, 2033 K ST., NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMPLOYERS COUNCIL		
BAYH TABBERT & CAPEHART, SUITE 1025 1575 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ALLIED FIDELITY CORP		
Do	AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY	16,000.00	8,200.00
Do	CUMMINS ENGINE CO, INC		
Do	LEXITEL CORPORATION	4,000.00	350.00
Do	NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSN		
Do	NATIONAL SOLID WASTES MANAGEMENT ASSN		
Do	NEW ENERGY CORPORATION	1,500.00	135.00
Do	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	1,000.00	250.00
Do	SUGAR USERS GROUP	1,500.00	400.00
Do	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC		
Do	FRANK W. WINNE & SON, INC	1,200.00	235.00
TINA MARTS BEACH, 131 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #700 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20004.	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	372.00	
BRUCE A. BEAM, SUITE 1041 1801 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER SERVICE CORP	228.96	109.75
JEFFREY L. BEARD, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
DONALD S. BEATTIE, 1815 H STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN PETROCHEMICAL CONSUMERS		100.00
Do	RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSN	2,961.04	
CHRISTINE T. BEATTY, 1627 K ST., NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ST. JOE MINERALS CORP	7,500.00	
HUBERT BEATTY, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
LAURA L. BEATY, 806 N. JEFFERSON ST. ARLINGTON VA 22205	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION	384.30	13.15
ORREN BEATY JR., 700 JEFFERSON BUILDING 1225 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	WESTERN FUELS ASSOCIATION, INC	4,011.88	721.97
DON R. BEAVERS, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #704 WASHINGTON DC 20001	UNITED TRANSPORTATION UNION		
EDWARD A. BECK III, 15TH & M STREETS, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S.		
ROBERT J. BECKER, SUITE 204 3077 W. JEFFERSON JOLIET IL 60435	JOINT COUNCIL OF ALLERGY & IMMUNOLOGY		
WILLIAM W. BEDDOW, 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL CONSTRUCTORS ASSOCIATION	1,600.00	
JON CHARLES BEDNERIK, 167 S. SAN ANTONIO ROAD, #11 LOS ALTOS CA 94022	WESTERN INDEPENDENT BANKERS	500.00	478.69
LYDIA I. BEEBE, 1700 K STREET, NW, #1204 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	150.00	
NOREEN H. BEEBE, 1016 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF PLUMBING-HEATING-COOLING CONTRACTORS	14,900.00	
RONALD L. BEEBER, 1660 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	2,500.00	3,510.73
CHRISTOPHER M. BEERMANN, 143 EAST 36TH STREET, APT. C NEW YORK NY 10115	MORALITY IN MEDIA, INC	16.47	
ROBERT M. BEERS, 2101 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSN	2,970.69	881.88
EDWIN L. BEHRENS, 801 18TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PROCTER & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO	15.00	
MAX J. BEILKE, 5535 HEMPSTEAD WAY SPRINGFIELD VA 22151	NATIONAL ASSN FOR UNIFORMED SERVICES	1,577.23	
MARK BELANGER, 805 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10022	MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYERS ASSN		
ALEXANDER B. BELL, 9618 COTTRELL TERRACE SILVER SPRING MD 20903	UNITED ASSN OF JNYMEN & APPREN. OF PLMBG & PIPEFTG INDUSTRY	3,750.00	218.67
BELL BOYD & LLOYD, THREE FIRST NATIONAL PLAZA 70 WEST MADISON STREET CHICAGO IL 60602	BOISE CASCADE CORP		
WINSTON EVERETT BELL, P.O. BOX 26543 LAS VEGAS NV 89126			
MARY K. BELLAMY, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT CO INSTITUTE		
C. THOMAS BENDORF, 3615 OVERCREEK DR. COLUMBIA SC 29206	ASSOCIATION OF TRIAL LAWYERS OF AMERICA	5,000.00	950.00
BENEFICIAL MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF AMERICA, 1100 CARR RD. WILMINGTON DE 19899			
BRUCE BENEFIELD, SUITE 2600 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,000.00	
KENNETH U. BENJAMIN JR., 1101 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	2,887.00	116.74
W. M. BENKERT, 1625 K ST., NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INST OF MERCHANT SHIPPING		
DANIEL BENNET, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC	2,500.00	
BEVERLY L. BENNETT, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	850.00	
JAMES M. BENNETT, 355 LEXINGTON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10017	SOCIETY OF THE PLASTICS INDUSTRY, INC		
WILLIAM C. BENNETT JR., 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO	310.00	
JOHN C. BENNISON, 4400 MACARTHUR BLVD., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS	8,000.00	
BENOIT SMITH & LAUGHLIN, 2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #501 ARLINGTON VA 22202	ECONOPURE		
Do	HUGHES AIRCRAFT COMPANY		
FREDERICK S. BENSON III, 1625 EYE STREET, NW, #902 WASHINGTON DC 20006	WEYERHAEUSER COMPANY		
NANCY C. BENSON, 1575 EYE ST., NW, #220 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CYANAMID CO	230.00	29.50
TOM BENSON, 501 UNION STREET, #506 NASHVILLE TN 37219	TENNESSEE RAILROAD ASSN		
JAMES E. BENTON, N. J. PETROLEUM COUNCIL 170 W. STATE ST. TRENTON NJ 08608	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	125.00	
GEORGE L. BERG JR., 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	5,775.00	68.28
REBECCA J. BERG, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	400.00	61.25
O. M. BERGE, 12050 WOODWARD AVE. DETROIT MI 48203	BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE OF WAY EMPLOYES		
EDWIN M. BERGSMARK, THREE SEAGATE TOLEDO OH 43603	TOLEDO TRUST COMPANY	59.00	5,510.28
PAUL C. BERGSON, 2550 M ST., NW, #770 WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	1,883.00	50.00
FRANK BRETT BERLIN, SUITE 201 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CRAY RESEARCH, INC		
JASON S. BERMAN, SUITE 250 2020 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS INC	15,000.00	67,096.10
RICHARD B. BERMAN, 6606 LBJ FREEWAY DALLAS TX 75230	STEAK & ALE RESTAURANTS OF AMERICA, INC	8,856.39	
WILLIAM R. BERMAN, 8111 GATEHOUSE RD. FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
CHARLES BERNHARDT, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	96.96	
GEORGE K. BERNSTEIN, 1730 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN	3,000.00	
RACHELLE B. BERNSTEIN, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	2,000.00	46.70
MAX N. BERRY, 3213 O ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN IMPORTERS MEAT PRODUCTS GROUP		
Do	CENTRE NATIONAL INTERPROFESSIONNEL DE L'ECONOMIC LAITIERE		
Do	COMMITTEE TO ASSURE THE AVAILABILITY OF CASEIN		
FRANK S. BESSON III, 1725 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY, #900 ARLINGTON VA 22202	AM GENERAL CORPORATION	1,800.00	
ROBERT L. BEVAN, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	990.00	136.47
BEVERIDGE & DIAMOND, P.C., 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MESA PETROLEUM CO		
Do	NEW ENGLAND ELECTRIC SYSTEM		
Do	TEXAS OIL & GAS CORP		
Do	UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST		
BEVERLY ENTERPRISES, INC, 1901 N. FORT MYER DRIVE, #302 ROSSLYN VA 22209			13,175.59
JAMES N. BIERMAN, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY, LARDNER, HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: VGS CORPORATION)		
MOE BILLER, 817 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO	8,321.69	
BILLIG SHER & JONES, 2033 K ST., NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	'PORT USERS'	1,500.00	210.00
Do	ADHERENCE GROUP, INC		
Do	AMERICAN BAKERS ASSN		
Do	HAPAG-LLOYD, A.G.		
Do	PRIVATE TRUCK COUNCIL OF AMER, INC	1,000.00	9.00
Do	SOUTH DAKOTA DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION, DIV. OF RAILROADS		
Do	STEAMSHIP CONFERENCES	6,850.00	125.00
LEON G. BILLINGS, INC, SUITE 713 1660 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	STATE OF MONTANA	22,500.00	
ROBERT HENRI BINDER, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL AIRFORWARDER & AGENTS ASSOCIATION	4,000.00	874.34
BINGHAM DANA & GOULD, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSUMER BANKERS ASSN	280.00	
Do	VISA U.S.A., INC		8.00
BIPARTISAN BUDGET APPEAL, P.O. BOX 9 BOWLING GREEN STATION NEW YORK NY 10004			2,220.82
BIRCH HORTON BITTNER PESTINGER & ANDERSON, SUITE 1100 1140 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALASCOM, INC		
Do	ALASKA BANKERS ASSN		
Do	ALASKA PACIFIC BANCORPORATION		
Do	ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY		
Do	ALASKA RAILROAD LEASEHOLDERS ASSN		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	AMERICAN BUS ASSN		
Do	CALISTA CORP		
Do	CITY OF WHITTIER		
Do	COASTAL CORP		
Do	COOK INLET REGION, INC		
Do	FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN ASSN OF ALASKA		
Do	JIM JONES, GOV'T RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CORP		
Do	MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO		
Do	PRUDENTIAL LINES, INC		
Do	SEALASKA CORP		
Do	ST. GEORGE TANAQ CORP		
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP		
Do	WIEN AIR ALASKA		
Do	YUKON PACIFIC CORP		
WILLIAM J. BIRKHOFER, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #802 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	875.00	
WILLIAM H. BIRTCIL JR., SUITE 2700 1000 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,000.00	
BISHOP LIBERMAN COOK PURCELL & REYNOLDS, 1200 17TH STREET, NW, 7TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALEUTIAN/PRIBILOF ISLANDS ASSN, INC	500.00	
Do	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF OPHTHALMOLOGY		
Do	AMERICAN MOTORCYCLIST ASSN		
Do	AUDIO RECORDING RIGHTS COALITION		
Do	B.A.T. INDUSTRIES, LTD	33,281.00	104.05
Do	BENENSON CAPITAL COMPANY		
Do	CNA INSURANCE CO OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS	500.00	
Do	COALITION FOR COMPETITION		41.27
Do	CONSOLIDATED NATURAL GAS CO		
Do	EMPLOYEE ORGAN. FED. EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM ASSN		
Do	ETHYL CORPORATION	1,275.00	
Do	HARLEY-DAVIDSON MOTOR CO, INC		
Do	HOME RECORDING RIGHTS COALITION		50.52
Do	ROADWAY EXPRESS, INC		
Do	TANADGUSIX CORPORATION	500.00	
Do	TEXACO, INC	2,345.00	37.55
Do	TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP	1,000.00	
Do	TOBACCO INSTITUTE	5,575.00	
PHIL M. BITTER, 1700 K STREET, NW, #1204 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	445.00	
GERRIE BJORNSON, 1800 K ST., NW, #929 WASHINGTON DC 20006	B.F. GOODRICH CO	100.00	
NEAL R. BJORNSON, 1840 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FED	2,950.00	
BLACK MANAFORT & STONE, INC, 324 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	AMERICAN PETROFINA, INC	15,000.00	475.02
Do	KAMAN AEROSPACE	75,000.00	771.66
Do	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN	37,500.00	58.17
Do	DON SHELDON & CO	36,000.00	2,352.84
Do	TOSCO CORPORATION	24,000.00	2,575.20
SPENCER BLACK, 214 N. HENRY STREET, #203 MADISON WI 53703	SIERRA CLUB	1,695.30	729.99
TOM G. BLACK, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	1,095.86	
BEV D. BLACKWOOD, 1899 L STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	EXXON CORPORATION		
BARBARA S. BLAINE, P.C., 910 16TH STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	1,500.00	
BOWEN BLAIR JR., 519 S.W. THIRD AVE., #810 PORTLAND OR 97204	FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE	29.70	
DAVID A. BLAIR, 1000 16TH STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORTAION	190.00	
ROSLYNNE BLAKE, 316 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE, #301 WASHINGTON DC 20003	SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	572.50	140.00
GERRY BLANCHARD, GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMURCON CORPORATION		
Do	BEZTAK COMPANY		
Do	BI-COUNTY CONSORTIUM		
Do	CAC ASSOCIATES		
Do	DETROIT & MACKINAC RAILWAY COMPANY		
Do	GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS		
Do	GRAND TRAVERSE DEVELOPMENT, INC		
Do	INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN, INC		
Do	LINEAR AIR MOTORS		
Do	MOVE DETROIT FORWARD FUND		
Do	NETCO		
Do	POTTER INSTRUMENT CO, INC		
Do	PRIMARK CORPORATION		
Do	RJK CONSTRUCTION COMPANY		
Do	SAFEKEEPER SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	SAFLOK/COMPUTERIZED SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	SANDERS CORPORATION		
Do	U.S. MANUFACTURING COMPANY		
Do	URBAN REVITALIZATION, INC		
HELEN BLANK, 122 C STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND	3,593.90	10.75
MELODY J. BLANK, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.		
KENNETH T. BLAYLOCK, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	21,850.57	5,150.70
VIRGINIA B. BLISS, 1725 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COURTNEY, MCCAMANT & TURNEY	300.00	
JERALD BLIZIN, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20004	HILL & KNOWLTON, INC		
ELLEN BLOCK, 3RD FLOOR 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	863.65	
L. THOMAS BLOCK, ONE WALL STREET NEW YORK NY 10015	IRVING TRUST CO	2,000.00	1,000.00
PETER L. BLOCKLIN, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	1,500.00	
HOLTON E. BLOMGREN, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #1220 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEDERATION	20,000.01	
DOUGLAS M. BLOOMFIELD, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #412 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM	15,999.98	501.96
MARK BLOOMFIELD, SUITE 520 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR CAPITAL FORMATION	438.00	
JOHN B. BLOUNT JR., 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,250.00	417.98
JACK A. BLUM, 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT GASOLINE MARKETERS COUNCIL	25,000.00	890.00
JARED O. BLUM, 1730 M ST., NW, #610 WASHINGTON DC 20036	DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION	300.00	27.80
JOANNE BLUM, 2010 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20036	PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, INC	480.48	37.50
BLUM NASH & RAILSBACK, SUITE 408 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSN		
Do	FLOATING POINT SYSTEM		
Do	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
Do	MERCK & CO, INC		
Do	SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSN		
Do	TIME, INC		
Do	TWIN COAST NEWSPAPERS, INC		
MILLY S. BLUMEL, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #760 WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA		1,151.33
CHARLES R. BLUMENFELD, BOGLE & GATES 2100 THE BANK OF CALIFORNIA CENTER SEATTLE WA 98164	PACIFIC SEAFOOD PROCESSORS ASSN	4,350.00	1,661.27
SAMUEL D. BLUNT, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, #828 WASHINGTON DC 20001	RADIO OFFICERS UNION	1,624.88	1,624.88
WILLIAM J. BOARMAN, 4626 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	COLUMBIA TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION #101, AFL-CIO	12,831.00	249.70
BOAT OWNERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., 880 S. PICKETT ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22304		35,000.00	45,425.00
DAVID A. BOCKORNY, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	2,500.00	691.78
SETH M. BODNER, 386 PARK AVENUE SOUTH NEW YORK NY 10016	NATIONAL KNITWEAR & SPORTSWEAR ASSN	1,000.00	
ROBERT SPURRIER BOEGE, 1575 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ASSN EXECUTIVES		
HAROLD BOEL, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #718 WASHINGTON DC 20001	PACIFIC BELL	800.00	
DONALD P. BOGARD, 733 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	LEGAL SERVICES CORP		
TIMOTHY A. BOGGS, 2020 K STREET, NW, #250 WASHINGTON DC 20006	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC	13,200.00	8,480.72
ROBERT Z. BOHAN, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN	162.25	614.00
PATRICIA BOINSKI, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO		
RICHARD O. BOLGER, 1010 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20007	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC	30.00	
ROBERT J. BOLGER, P.O. BOX 1417-D49 ALEXANDRIA VA 22313	NATIONAL ASSN OF CHAIN DRUG STORES, INC	1,500.00	
BERNADETTE BOLTON, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20001	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD SIGNALMEN	300.00	
IRVIN E. BOMBERGER, 550 WASHINGTON BUILDING 15TH & NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NAT'L INTERRELIGIOUS SERV. BOARD FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS	1,112.54	
JAY BONITT, SUITE 700 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIED CORP	1,100.00	236.00
SHARON LEE BONITT, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHELL OIL CO	500.00	
BONSIB, INC, P.O. BOX 1807 WASHINGTON DC 20013			
GAYLON B. BOOKER, 1918 N. PARKWAY MEMPHIS TN 38112	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER		
EDWARD T. BORDA, 1625 EYE ST., NW, #1023 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATION OF GENERAL MERCHANDISE CHAINS	6,250.00	
LAURENCE D. BORY, SUITE 802 1015 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	750.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
G. STEWART BOSWELL, 1611 NORTH KENT ST., #800 ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN APPAREL MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC	6,875.00	135.08
CHARLES G. BOTSFORD, SUITE 515 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,500.00	174.00
JOHN E. BOUCHARD, 1667 K STREET, NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION	66.00	8.00
MARY M. BOURDETTE, 4TH FLOOR 122 C STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND OF THE WASHINGTON RESEARCH PROJECT	1,078.00	28.00
ALBERT D. BOURLAND, 1901 N. FORT MYER DRIVE, 12TH FL. ROSSLYN VA 22209	COMMITTEE FOR EQUITABLE COMPENSATION	1,600.00	127.99
FRANK J. BOWDEN JR., ASSOCIATED PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES OF PA P.O. BOX 925 HARRISBURG PA 17108	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
RODNEY A. BOWER, SUITE 702 818 ROEDER RD. SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
DAVID W. BOWERS, 1801 K ST., NW, #1201 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION	1,000.00	
ROBERT R. BOWERS, WEST VIRGINIA PETROLEUM COUNCIL SUITE 714 ATLAS BLDG. CHARLESTON WV 25301	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	460.00	341.15
BOWERY SAVINGS BANK, 110 EAST 42ND STREET NEW YORK NY 10017			
BOWMAN CONNER TOUHEY & PETRILLO, 2828 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #203 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN PETROFINA, INC	3,933.75	2,419.00
BOWMER COURTNEY BURLESON PEMBERTON & NORMAND, P.O. BOX 844 TEMPLE TX 76503	TRIBAL COUNCIL OF THE COUSHATTA TRIBE OF LOUISIANA		2,447.42
JIM D. BOWMER, P.O. BOX 844 TEMPLE TX 76503	TRIBAL COUNCIL OF THE COUSHATTA TRIBE OF LOUISIANA		
JOAN COSTAIN BOWYER, 1015 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHELPS DODGE CORP	150.00	
JOHN G. BOYD, 1801 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP	280.00	47.25
ROBERT K. BOYD, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,500.00	537.76
STEPHEN S. BOYNTON, 1015 MOOREFIELD HILL GROVE VIENNA VA 22180	AMERICAN FUR RESOURCES INSTITUTE		
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, SUITE 1200 1825 EYE ST., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	ACCOUNTS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION		
Do	AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION		
Do	AUSTRIAN, LANCE & STEWART, P.C	465.00	185.54
Do	DRESSER INDUSTRIES, INC		
Do	HOUSTON NATURAL GAS CORP		
Do	LOUISIANA LAND & EXPLORATION CO	310.00	123.70
Do	PENNSYLVANIA NATURAL GAS ASSOCIATES	465.00	185.54
Do	RALSTON PURINA CO	155.00	61.85
Do	SOUTHDOWN/PELTO OIL COMPANY		
Do	U.S. TUNA FOUNDATION		
BRACY WILLIAMS & COMPANY, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #304 WASHINGTON DC 20036	VALERO ENERGY CORPORATION	930.00	371.00
Do	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSN	3,000.00	145.00
Do	AMERICAN SOUTHWEST FINANCIAL CO	3,000.00	812.00
Do	CALIFORNIA NICKEL CORP	15,000.00	300.00
Do	CITY OF TUCSON	7,000.00	200.00
Do	CSX CORPORATION	1,500.00	30.00
Do	ENERGY ABSORPTION SYSTEMS, INC	8,000.00	125.00
Do	ESTES COMPANY	3,000.00	90.00
Do	PRATT & WHITNEY AIRCRAFT GROUP	10,000.00	110.00
Do	SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION	3,000.00	270.00
JOAN BRADEN, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF CANADA).		
FRANK W. BRADLEY, 1700 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	6,900.00	
GENE BRADLEY, 1700 N. MOORE STREET ROSSLYN VA 22209	BOEING COMPANY		
WAYNE W. BRADLEY, 1101 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	500.00	
DENNIS M. BRADSHAW, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
CHARLES N. BRADY, 8111 GATEHOUSE RD. FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
HUGH S. BRADY, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	400.00	
CARREN BRAGG, 1901 L STREET, NW, #303 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COLT INDUSTRIES, INC		
CHARLES G. BRAGG, P.O. BOX 12285 MEMPHIS TN 38182	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER	1,134.00	9.74
RAYMOND F. BRAGG JR., 114 THIRD STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN INDEPENDENT REFINERS ASSN	300.00	
STUART J. BRAHS, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	726.37	4,059.18
ROBERT M. BRANDON, 1300 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITIZEN/LABOR ENERGY COALITION	2,000.00	139.25
RICHARD D. BRANNICK, R.D. #2, BOX 108 DEXTER NY 13636	NATIONAL BORDER PATROL COUNCIL	1,456.56	3,328.04
GERARD M. BRANNON, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
ROY BRAUNSTEIN, 817 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO	9,397.64	135.00
PETER ELLIOT BRAVEMAN, SUITE 2200 101000 SANTA MONICA BLVD. LOS ANGELES CA 90067	LOEB AND LOEB (FOR: JOAN IRVINE SMITH)	18,125.00	35.00
ROY S. BREDDER, SUITE 1004 1101 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN	1,000.00	
BREGMAN ABELL & KAY, SUITE 610 1900 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AFL-CIO		
Do	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA	1,200.00	
Do	AMERICAN CAR RENTAL ASSN	1,250.00	
Do	AVIS, INC	2,000.00	
Do	BUDGET RENT A CAR CORP		
Do	COMMITTEE FOR EFFECTIVE TAX INCENTIVES		
Do	CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAY CORP		
Do	HILTON INTERNATIONAL, INC	1,000.00	
Do	NATIONAL CAR RENTAL SYSTEM, INC		
Do	NORTON SIMON, INC	5,000.00	
Do	ROADWAY EXPRESS, INC		
Do	RYDER SYSTEMS, INC	2,000.00	
Do	TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC	3,000.00	
Do	TRANS WORLD CORPORATION	1,000.00	
Do	TRUCK RENTING & LEASING ASSN	1,250.00	
BRENDA I. BREGMAN, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	RELIGIOUS COALITION FOR ABORTION RIGHTS, INC	3,600.00	
MICHAEL J. BRENNAN, 1750 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF BRIDGE, STRUCT. & ORNAMENTAL IRON WKRS	10,800.00	329.39
PETER E. BRERETON, 900 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND OH 44101	AMERITRUST CO, NAT'L ASSN	794.22	1,511.00
MILES H. BRESEE JR , 50 BEALE ST., P.O. BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
ALBERT E. BREWSTER, SUITE 2300 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	NORTHROP CORP		98.23
WILLIAM BRIGGS, 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO	6,000.00	
CHARLES BRIMER, 201 PARK WASHINGTON COURT FALLS CHURCH VA 22046	NATIONAL-AMERICAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSN	3,000.00	
BELVA B. BRISSETT, 1771 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS	1,500.00	184.25
ELIZABETH Y. BRITTON, 2550 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	189.04	152.77
MARINA L. BROCKMANN, 605 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SOCIETY OF THE PLASTICS INDUSTRY		
WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD, 900 MARQUETTE BUILDING DETROIT MI 48226	PLUNKETT COONEY RUTT WATTERS STANCZYK & PEDERSEN, P.C. (FOR: COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN FOUNDATIONS).	2,731.25	1,221.47
Do	PLUNKETT COONEY RUTT WATTERS STANCZYK & PEDERSEN, P.C. (FOR: MICHIGAN CONSOLIDATED GAS CO).	7,468.75	1,211.24
Do	PLUNKETT COONEY RUTT WATTERS STANCZYK & PEDERSEN, P.C. (FOR: CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN).	3,750.00	210.15
DAVID A. BRODY, 1640 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH	3,200.00	
PHILLIP J. BROMAN, SUITE 600 919 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, USA, INC	90.00	12,190.74
MICHAEL D. BROMBERG, 1111 19TH ST., NW, #402 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HOSPITALS	4,500.00	
MARY E. BROOKS, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	3,593.89	143.05
DAVID W. BROOME, 1800 M ST., NW, #870-S WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES, INC		
MARIO BROSSI, 5713 WILSON LANE BETHESDA MD 20817	DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION	300.00	24.55
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS & STATION EMPL 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006.		11,800.00	20,860.06
DONALD G. BROTZMAN, 1400 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	RUBBER MFGRS ASSN	10,000.00	
BROWN & FINN, SUITE 510 1920 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SATELLITE TELEVISION INDUSTRY ASSN/S.P.A.C.E.	950.00	
Do	SATELLITE TV VIEWING RIGHTS SUPERFUND, INC	10,785.00	
BEN JARRATT BROWN, SUITE 103 1000 POTOMAC STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	CORPORATION FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION, INC	10,844.40	
CHARLES T. BROWN, P.O. BOX 100 MIAMI AZ 85539	PINTO VALLEY COPPER CORP		
DAVID S. J. BROWN, 1101 17TH ST., NW, #604 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MONSANTO CO	600.00	150.65
DIANE R. BROWN, 1515 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,000.00	451.50
ELLEN B. BROWN, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S	2,400.00	433.88
HOWARD C. BROWN JR., 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #702 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CENTAR ASSOCIATES		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE SCIENCE INDUSTRIES, INC		
JESSE B. BROWN, 1900 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20068	POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO		
JESSE P. BROWN JR., 1918 N. PARKWAY MEMPHIS TN 38112	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER		
RALPH BROWN, SUITE 107 701 S. 22ND STREET OMAHA NB 68102	M.O.A.A.I.O.A. & SUBS, INC	10.00	
BROWN ROADY BONVILLIAN & GOLD, 1300 19TH STREET, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITIZENS FOR GAULEY RIVER		
Do	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Do	KANSAS CITY SOUTHERN RAILWAY	3,800.00	539.67
Do	METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY	3,750.00	228.97
Do	NORTHEASTERN INTERNATIONAL AIRWAYS, INC	6,117.50	2,485.24
Do	SMITH DAWSON ASSOCS (FOR SAN FRAN. PUBLIC UTIL. COMMISSION)	2,881.26	118.74

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	WESTERN RIVER GUIDES ASSN		
BROWN TODD & HEYBURN, 1600 CITIZENS PLAZA LOUISVILLE KY 40202	BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOBACCO CORP		2.80
VINCENT D. BROWN, NEBRASKA PETROLEUM COUNCIL P.O. BOX 95063 LINCOLN NB 68509	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	500.00	18.88
WILLIAM E. BROWN, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO	171.00	251.73
WILLIAM R. BROWN, SUITE 200 122 C ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE	250.00	
STANLEY R. BROWNE, SUITE 1120 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO		
BROWNSTEIN ZEIDMAN & SCHOMER, SUITE 900 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CANADIAN FINANCIAL CORPORATION		
Do	MERRILL LYNCH HUBBARD, INC		
Do	MORTGAGE GUARANTY INSURANCE CORP		
Do	NATIONAL CORPORATION FOR HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS		
Do	NATIONAL HOUSING REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION		
Do	NEW YORK CITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORP	4,656.00	
Do	NEW YORK STATE MORTGAGE LOAN ENFORCEMENT & ADMIN. CORP	12,825.00	
Do	NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORP		
Do	REMCO ENTERPRISES, INC		
Do	SCHOCHET ASSOCIATES		
JAMES W. BRUNER JR., 520 CAPITOL MALL SACRAMENTO CA 95814	LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE TAHOE	10,000.00	
KATHRYNE M. BRUNER, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GA TECHNOLOGIES, INC	750.00	213.92
WILLIAM K. BRUNETTE, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS	377.31	126.73
ROBERT O. BRUNNER, 1909 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	415.38	71.83
J. CHARLES BRUSE, SUITE 802 1211 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLSTATE INSURANCE GROUP	900.00	359.81
BRYAN CAVE MCPHEETERS & MCROBERTS, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MICROELECTRONICS & COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY CORP		
DAWN M. BRYDON, 888 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF ICE CREAM MFRS & MILK IND. FOUNDATION		
LANA BUCK, 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ASSN OF PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS		
ROBERT D. BUEHLER, 1800 K ST., NW, #929 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BF GOODRICH CO	400.00	
SUSAN M. BUFFONE, 3604 34TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION	225.00	
BUILDING OWNERS & MANAGERS ASSN INTL, SUITE 200 1250 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			
DOUGLAS W. BULCAO, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TEXTILE MFRS INST	1,000.00	16.75
DARREL D. BUNGE, MINNESOTA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 1025 NORTHERN FEDERAL BUILDING ST. PAUL MN 55102	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	215.00	900.50
LAWRENCE E. BURCH, 1711 KING ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	POTATO CHIP/SNACK FOOD ASSOCIATION		
NORMAN D. BURCH, SUITE 401 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	COLLEGE OF AMER PATHOLOGISTS	5,220.00	71.00
DAVID S. BURCKMAN, P.O. BOX 7610 BEN FRANKLIN STATION WASHINGTON DC 20044	SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSN	1,040.00	949.38
PAUL F. BURDETT, SUITE 700 SOUTH 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MERRELL DOW PHARMACEUTICALS, INC		66.00
CLAIR W. BURGENER, P.O. BOX 8186 RANCH SANTA FE CA 92067	G A TECHNOLOGIES, INC	10,000.00	1,007.19
WILLIAM J. BURHOP, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA	10,000.00	
GERARD P. BURKE, SUITE 400 1707 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL AIR LEASES, INC		
J. J. BURKE JR., 40 E. BROADWAY BUTTE MT 59701	MONTANA POWER CO		9.42
PAUL T. BURKE, 1050 17TH STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TEXACO, INC	1,363.00	
BURLEY & DARK LEAF TOBACCO EXPORT ASSN, 1100 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		44,374.31	1,149.82
BILL D. BURLISON, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SE, #103 WASHINGTON DC 20003	EMERSON ELECTRIC CO	3,750.00	134.67
Do	MCDONNELL DOUGLAS CORPORATION	4,400.00	269.34
Do	PLANNING RESEARCH CORPORATION	250.00	41.89
DENNIS J. BURNETT, 6014 WATERBURY COURT SPRINGFIELD VA 22152	SPARX CORPORATION	3,000.00	52.44
CHARLES S. BURNS, 1015 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHELPS DODGE CORP	1,200.00	
MICHAEL BURNS, 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY	7,500.00	303.00
TIMOTHY F. BURNS, 2501 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC	300.00	
FRANK BURTNETT, 5999 STEVENSON AVENUE ALEXANDRIA VA 22304	AMERICAN ASSN FOR COUNSELING & DEVELOPMENT	1,041.87	
B. KENT BURTON, 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC	8,000.00	2,379.43
BARBARA L. BUSH, 1220 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	200.00	
JAMES J. BUTERA, 4TH FLOOR 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	6,000.00	
BUTLER & BINION, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW MEXICO PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION/ENERGY & MINERALS DEPT		
M. CALDWELL BUTLER, P.O. BOX 720 ROANOKE VA 24004	NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES	15,315.00	1,722.68
MICHAEL F. BUTLER, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ANDREWS & KURTH (FOR: HUGHES HELICOPTERS, INC)		
Do	ANDREWS & KURTH (FOR: TRANSCO EXPLORATION PARTNERS, LTD & TRANSCO ENERGY CO).		
WILLIAM A. BUTLER, 645 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY	5,000.00	150.00
C.A.R.E., 511 C STREET, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			
CADWALADER WICKERSHAM & TAFT, 7TH FLOOR 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AD HOC COMMITTEE OF FLOOR BROKERS		
Do	ASPHALT ROOFING MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION		
Do	MOCATTA METALS CORP		
Do	PHILADELPHIA STOCK EXCHANGE		
ANDREW A. CAFFEY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #707 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL FRANCHISE ASSN		
JOHN D. CAHILL, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY	8,625.00	
ROY C. CAHOON, 6100 KNOLLWOOD DR. FALLS CHURCH VA 22041	NATIONAL AUTOMATIC MERCHANDISING ASSN		
MORRISON G. CAIN, 1625 I ST., NW, #1023 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATION OF GENERAL MERCHANDISE CHAINS	4,000.00	
ALAN CALDWELL, SUITE 770 2550 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	1,200.00	53.75
CHARLES D. CALHOUN, 30 MONTGOMERY STREET JERSEY CITY NJ 07302	RADIO OFFICERS UNION	2,091.78	2,091.78
FRANK W. CALHOUN, 3400 TEXAS COMMERCE TOWER HOUSTON TX 77002	HOUSTON ENDOWMENT, INC		746.00
CALIFORNIA HOUSING COUNCIL, 1225 8TH STREET, #325 SACRAMENTO CA 95814		10,000.00	4,234.31
PETER E. CALLANAN, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HONEYWELL, INC	175.00	300.00
JOHN C. CALLIHAN, 299 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10171	WESTVACO CORP	3,150.00	2,113.12
CALORIE CONTROL COUNCIL, #500-D 5775 PEACHTREE-DUNWOODY RD. ATLANTA GA 30342			1,245.00
GORDON L. CALVERT, BOX 34-531 BETHESDA MD 20817	COMMERICIAL LAW LEAGUE OF AMER, COMM COLL. AGENCY SECTION		
DONALD L. CALVIN, 11 WALL ST. NEW YORK NY 10005	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
ARTHUR E. CAMERON, SUITE 110 499 S. CAPITOL ST., SW WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN GREYHOUND TRACK OPERATORS ASSN	2,250.00	
Do	REDLAND PRISMO CORP., ETAL	5,250.00	
Do	SAFETRAN SYSTEMS CORPORATION	6,225.00	
Do	SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS		
NANCY CAMM, 1800 K STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BANKAMERICA CORP	18.04	53.38
CAMP CARMOUCHE BARSH HUNTER GRAY & HOFFMAN, P.C., 2550 M ST., NW, #275 WASHINGTON DC 20037	GEORGE K. BAUM & COMPANY		
Do	BLYTH EASTMAN PAINE WEBBER, INC		
Do	CHAMPLIN PETROLEUM COMPANY		
Do	CHAPMAN & CUTLER		
Do	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC	150.00	
Do	CUMBERLAND SECURITIES		
Do	EASTERN CENTRAL MOTOR CARRIERS ASSN		
Do	ESSEX		
Do	FRAZIER LANIER COMPANY		
Do	GOLDMAN SACHS & CO	200.00	
Do	INTERMEDICS		
Do	KIDDER, PEABODY & CO, INC		
Do	KING & SPALDING		
Do	LEHMAN BROTHERS		
Do	MCDONALD & COMPANY		
Do	METROPOLITAN INSURANCE COMPANIES		
Do	MOBIL OIL CORP	9,975.00	
Do	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN	600.00	
Do	NORTH HASKELL SLAUGHTER YOUNG & LEWIS		
Do	OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM CORP		
Do	PAKHOED	350.00	
Do	PENNZOIL CO		
Do	PPG INDUSTRIES, INC	237.50	
Do	RAUSCHER PIERCE REFSNES		
Do	ROCKY MOUNTAIN ENERGY CO		
Do	SIGNAL COMPANIES, INC	150.00	
Do	STERN, AGEE & LEACH		
Do	TEXACO, INC	1,000.00	
Do	THORNTON, FARISH & GAUNTT	800.00	
Do	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS		
CAMPAIGN FOR U.N. REFORM - POLITICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE, 600 VALLEY ROAD WAYNE NJ 07470	WHEAT FIRST SECURITIES		
C. R. CAMPBELL JR , SUITE 900 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		10,811.43	7,593.43
CARL C. CAMPBELL, 1030 15TH ST., NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON DC 20005	GTE CORP	1,000.00	
	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER	100.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
CHARLES ARGYLL CAMPBELL, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS		15.90
CHARLES O. CAMPBELL, 1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #511 ARLINGTON VA 22202	MANUFACTURED HOUSING INST	900.00	100.00
JEANNE CAMPBELL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, #510 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, INC		
Do	NEW ENGLAND MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO		
JERRY L. CAMPBELL, 831 CHESTNUT ST. CHATTANOOGA TN 37402	TENNESSEE VALLEY PUBLIC POWER ASSN		
KEVIN B. CAMPBELL, 101 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20001	UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS & JOINERS OF AMERICA	8,700.00	3,031.88
THOMAS D. CAMPBELL, SUITE 500 1000 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)	1,500.00	504.15
CHARLES J. CAMPISI, 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ASSN OF PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS	100.00	
ALYCE D. CANADAY, 918 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT CO	740.00	1,110.65
CANADIAN COALITION ON ACID RAIN, 112 ST. CLAIR AVENUE, #504 TORONTO, ONTARIO M4V 2Y3		7,600.00	9,588.36
ROBERT P. CANAVAN, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,535.00	50.75
SHARON M. CANAVAN, 1125 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	6,000.00	
CANDLELIGHTERS, 123 C ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003			
PAUL W. CANE, 50 BEALE ST., P.O. BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
DAVE CANNARD, 113 W. 1ST VANCOUVER WA 98660	FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE		
W. DEAN CANNON JR , 9800 S. SEPULVEDA BLVD. SUITE 500 LOS ANGELES CA 90045	CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	3,000.00	2,313.47
DAVID L. CANTOR, SUITE 1200 1133 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PORTER WRIGHT MORRIS & ARTHUR (FOR: COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL-ENERGY BALANCE).	272.20	34.25
CAPLIN AND DRYSDALE, CHARTERED, 1101 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COUNCIL ON FOUNDATIONS, INC	6,250.00	262.70
CONSTANTINE G. CARAS, 2828 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #205 WASHINGTON DC 20007	OGDEN CORPORATION		
DENISE A. CARDMAN, 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BAR ASSN	400.00	50.00
NORVAL E. CAREY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW #704 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GULF OIL CORP (FOR GA TECHNOLOGIES, INC)	2,478.00	412.84
CAROLE R. CARLIN, 15TH & M STREETS, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S.		
CHARLES R. CARLISLE, 1150 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MAN-MADE FIBER PRODUCERS ASSN, INC	500.00	250.00
EDWARD J. CARLOUGH, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHEET METAL WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL ASSN	23,625.00	
J. PHILIP CARLSON, SUITE 935, WASHINGTON BUILDING 1435 G STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	EUGENE L. STEWART AND ROSES, INC	6,000.00	46.47
ROBERT E. CARLSTROM JR., 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW, #612 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ST. JOE MINERALS CORPORATION	6,000.00	316.51
GEORGE D. CARPENTER, 7162 READING ROAD CINCINNATI OH 45222	PROCTER & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO	66.04	
JOHN R. CARSON, 20 CHEVY CHASE CIRCLE WASHINGTON DC 20015	AMERICAN PODIATRY ASSN	16,000.00	
WESLEY E. CARSON, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
HANS L CARSTENSEN, 1625 EYE STREET N.W. #902 WASHINGTON DC 20006	WEYERHAEUSER CO	775.00	50.40
DAVID C. CARTER, 1156 15TH ST., NW SUITE 1019 WASHINGTON DC 20005	U.S. BEET SUGAR ASSN		
HARLON B. CARTER, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER	2,187.50	
JOSEPH L. CARTER JR , 412 FIRST ST., SE, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20003	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	843.06	340.02
JAMES P. CARTY, 1776 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	500.00	
SUSAN B. CARVER, 1130 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COAL ASSN	500.00	2,182.07
JIM CASEY, 3470 MILDRED DR. FALLS CHURCH VA 22042	LEAFFER COMPANY, INC		
JAMES B. CASH JR , 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN		
ALLEN R. CASKIE, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
EUGENE I. CASRAISS JR , 1757 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED AUTO, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS	10,159.00	82.70
WILLIAM E. CASSELMAN II , SUITE 675 NORTH 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DORSEY & WHITNEY (FOR: NORTHROP UNIVERSITY)		
DANIEL J. CASSIDY, 2925 RICHMOND AVE. HOUSTON TX 77098	GREATER HOUSTON HOSPITAL COUNCIL		
J. WARREN CASSIDY, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER	1,937.50	
LAWRENCE J. CASSIDY, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHEET METAL WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL ASSN	12,663.00	
JOHN J. CASTELLANI, 27TH FLOOR 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,400.00	
RITA L. CASTLE, 100 NE ADAMS PEORIA IL 61629	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO	3,600.00	993.88
G. THOMAS CATOR, 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NEECE CATOR & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: LATIN AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS ASSN (LAMA)).	1,600.00	
Do	NEECE, CATOR & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: NATIONAL ASSN OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPS).	200.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES (NADCO)	250.00	
Do	NEECE, CATOR & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: SOUTHEASTERN LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSN).	1,800.00	1,800.00
JOSEPH E. CAVANAGH, 1125 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO-CLC	9,800.00	1,605.25
RED CAVANEY, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
DOROTHY D. CECELSKI, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	4,902.51	
CEDERBERG & ASSOCIATES, 7100 SUSSEX PLACE ALEXANDRIA VA 22307	GRUMMAN CORPORATION	200.00	
Do	MARTIN MARIETTA CORP	200.00	
Do	RCA		
Do	UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION		
CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, INC, SUITE 500 624 9TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		356,928.00	2,737.00
CENTER FOR LAW AND EDUCATION, INC., 6 APPIAN WAY CAMBRIDGE MA 02138		3,377.01	1,103.37
CENTRAL STATES RESOURCE CENTER, P.O. BOX 577 URBANA IL 61801			
DAVID CERTNER, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	394.62	43.00
CF INDUSTRIES, INC., SALEM LAKE DR. LONG GROVE IL 60047			500.00
PHILIP CHABOT, 1317 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT		
CHADBOURNE PARKE WHITESIDE & WOLFF, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ACUREX SOLAR CORP		12.20
Do	ARCO SOLAR, INC		
Do	BERENERGY CORPORATION		1.11
Do	CRINCO INVESTMENTS, INC		8.10
Do	MANUFACTURERS LIFE INSURANCE CO AND MAINE FIDELITY LIC		1,328.49
Do	MONEGON, LTD		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS		
Do	NEWMONT MINING CORP		
Do	SOLAREX CORPORATION		.45
Do	STANDARD OIL CO OF INDIANA		
Do	U.S. PHOTOVOLTAICS MANUFACTURERS' AD HOC COMMITTEE		6,036.42
CHARLES M. CHAFER, 600 WATER ST. WASHINGTON DC 20024	WASHINGTON PSYCHIATRIC SOCIETY	7,513.70	62.05
DEBORAH M. CHALFIE, 600 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	SPACE SERVICES INC OF AMERICA		
DURWOOD CHALKER, P.O. BOX 220164 2121 SAN JACINTO ST., #2500 DALLAS TX 75222	INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC REPRESENTATION	750.00	18.00
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	CENTRAL AND SOUTH WEST CORP		
CHAMBERS ASSOCIATES, INC, 1411 K STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	COMMITTEE FOR 806.30 AND 807, INC	750.00	
Do	AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO	7,200.00	
Do	APACHE CORPORATION	1,908.32	
Do	COALITION OF PUBLICLY TRADED LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS		
Do	COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSN OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE		
Do	FACET, CORP		
Do	MANVILLE CORPORATION	6,968.75	
Do	STATE OF OREGON, DEPT. OF HUMAN RESOURCES		
ED CHANDLER, 7901 WESTPARK DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL BUILDERS' ASSN	8,580.00	500.00
J. W. CHANDLER, 1575 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	YORK DIV., BORG-WARNER CORP		531.70
JOHN M. CHAPMAN, 1000 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	ALLIED AEROSPACE SECTOR		
WILLIAM C. CHAPMAN, 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,000.00	4,512.19
CHAPMAN, DUFF AND PAUL, 1825 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ANNUAL CHARGES POLICY GROUP	825.00	11.75
CHARLES KARALEKAS MCCAHILL & WILSON, 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #318 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT INSURANCE AGENTS OF AMERICA		
RICHARD M. CHARLTON, 229 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORPORATION	160.00	88.00
PEGGY CHARREN, 33 HANCOCK AVENUE NEWTON CENTRE MA 02159	ACTION FOR CHILDREN'S TELEVISION	250.00	
WILLIAM CHASEY ORGANIZATION, 1800 K STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	LIFE INSURANCE COALITION OF AMERICA	40,000.00	40,000.00
LESLIE CHEEK III, SUITE 414 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CRUM & FOSTER CORP	16,250.00	562.00
JANE CHEEVER, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110	BANK OF BOSTON CORPORATION		
Do	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON		
CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC., 2501 M ST.,NW WASHINGTON DC 20037		5,000.00	3,000.00
CHEMICAL SPECIALTIES MFGRS ASSN, SUITE 1120 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			309.59
WILLIAM B. CHERKASKY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #707 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL FRANCHISE ASSN		
B. H. CHERRY, 100 INTERPACE PARKWAY PARSIPPANY NJ 07054	GPU SERVICE CORPORATION		
BLAIR G. CHILDS, P.O. BOX 7610, BF STATION WASHINGTON DC 20044	SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSN	1,040.00	650.00
CHILI-USA, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006		5,641.11	3,144.54
MICHAEL W. CHINWORTH, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTE OF AMERICA		
BRUCE L. CHRISTENSEN, 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS	600.00	150.00
HAL M. CHRISTENSEN, 1101 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN	3,000.00	
WILLIAM T. CHRISTIAN, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE,N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO	250.00	
JACK E. CHRISTY, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN. OF RETIRED PERSONS	418.85	244.38
CHUGACH ELECTRIC ASSN, INC, PO BOX 3518 ANCHORAGE AK 99501			

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
DONALD T. CHUNN, ROUTE 2, BOX 89 COLUMBIA TN 38401	TITLE ASSOCIATES, INC		
CHWAT/WEIGEND ASSOCIATES, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #816 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOME SEWING ASSN, INC	500.00	500.00
Do	ASSOCIATED LOCKSMITHS OF AMERICA	975.00	975.00
Do	NATIONAL ASSN. OF TOBACCO DISTRIBUTORS	3,000.00	3,000.00
Do	WINNIE M. TSE		
CIGAR ASSN OF AMERICA, INC, SUITE 1201 1100 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
CITIZEN/LABOR ENERGY COALITION, RM. 401 1300 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		7,500.00	7,159.60
CITIZENS COMM FOR THE RIGHT TO KEEP & BEAR ARMS, LIBERTY PARK, 12500 NE TENTH PLACE 1601 114TH SE BELLEVUE WA 98005.		564,163.40	104,808.09
CITIZENS FOR SENSIBLE CONTROL OF ACID RAIN (CSCAR), P.O. BOX 33729 WASHINGTON DC 20033		309,101.00	245,648.00
CITIZENS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, P.O. BOX 645 228 SOUTH A STREET, #2 OXNARD CA 93032			
CLADOUHOS & BRASHARES, 1750 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SMITH, BARNEY, HARRIS, UPHAM & CO	5,000.00	
JOHN W. CLAGGETT, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #1040 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FUTURES INDUSTRY ASSN, INC		
PATRICIA T. CLAREY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW #507 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASHLAND OIL, INC	2,000.00	
BOB CLARK, SUITE 1908 400 MADISON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	RYDER SYSTEMS, INC		
JAMES F. CLARK, ROBERTSON, MONAGLE, EASTAUGH & BRADLEY 200 NATIONAL BANK OF ALASKA BLDG. P.O. BOX 1211 JUNEAU AK 99802.	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP		
JOSEPH J. F. CLARK, 1750 K ST., NW, #260 WASHINGTON DC 20006	EATON ASSOCIATES, INC		
JULIE CLARK, 1625 K ST., NW EIGHTH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL LEGAL AID & DEFENDERS ASSN	9,347.00	175.90
PHILLIP A. CLARK, SUITE 700 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSN	3,750.00	
RUDY I. CLARK, 5342 WOODBURY WOODS LANE FAIRFAX VA 22032	AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSN		86.00
VERNON A. CLARK, 1899 L ST., NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20036	OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC	2,237.00	6,709.00
WADE P. CLARKE JR , JOHN DEERE RD MOLINE IL 61265	DEERE & COMPANY		
SCOTT CHARLES CLARKSON, SUITE 607 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC	2,000.00	550.40
CECIL D. CLAY, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHEET METAL WORKERS' INT'L ASSN	21,735.00	
JOAN CLAYBROOK, SUITE 605 2000 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PUBLIC CITIZEN, INC	255.00	
CLAYMARK CORPORATION, INC, C/O MILBANK TWEED HADLEY & MCCLOY 1825 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
CLEAR CHANNEL BROADCASTING SERVICE (CCBS), 1776 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006			
CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON, 1752 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FORMALDEHYDE INSTITUTE		
Do	PPG INDUSTRIES, INC		5.00
Do	PUBLIC SECURITIES ASSN		6.00
Do	SALOMON BROTHERS		912.91
Do	SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
JACQUELINE W. CLEMENTS, SUITE 900 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNORTH	1,500.00	
RONALD D. CLEMENTS, 1111 19TH ST., NW, 9TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	3,400.00	475.00
CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING CO., 55 PUBLIC SQUARE P.O. BOX 5000 CLEVELAND OH 44113			853.00
W. M. CLICK, BOX 719 DALLAS TX 75221	SOUTHLAND CORPORATION		
CLIFFORD & WARNKE, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AUSTRALIAN MEAT & LIVE-STOCK CORP		
Do	JOINT CORPORATE COMM ON CUBAN CLAIMS	600.00	180.00
DEXANNE CLOHAN, 1101 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	3,769.00	36.54
CHRISTOPHER E. CLOUSER, 25TH & MCGEE KANSAS CITY MO 64108	HALLMARK CARDS, INC		
COALITION FOR UNIFORM PRODUCT LIABILITY LAW, SUITE 303 1901 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		318.01	318.01
COAN COUTURE LYONS & MOORHEAD, SUITE 1015 1625 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	A - C VALLEY CORPORATION		
Do	VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA		
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION		
COASTAL PROPERTIES INSTITUTE, INC., 66 SURFWATCH DRIVE JOHNS ISLAND SC 29455			
RICHARD B. COBB, PETROLEUM COUNCIL OF GA 230 PEACHTREE ST., NW, #1500 ATLANTA GA 30303	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	600.00	1,310.53
JOHN J. COFFEY, SUITE 1204 1700 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	650.00	
DON V. COGMAN, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW SUITE 820 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MAPCO INC	4,750.00	220.58
DANIEL L. COHEN, 1050 31ST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	ASSOCIATION OF TRIAL LAWYERS OF AMERICA	2,000.00	100.00
RHEA L. COHEN, 1346 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ZERO POPULATION GROWTH, INC	109.00	17.00
HERBERT B. COHN, MORGAN, LEWIS, & BOCKIUS 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMITTEE FOR CAP FORMATION THROUGH DIVIDEND REINVESTMENT		
COLE & CORETTE, P.C., 1100 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A		
Do	DOW CHEMICAL CO	500.00	5.00
Do	GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS ANTILLES		
Do	MEDTRONIC, INC		
Do	MILLIPORE CORPORATION		20.00
Do	JAMES D. & LOIS M. LAROSA AND JAMES J. LAROSA		25.00
ANN COLE, 311 FIRST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSN		
E. WILLIAM COLE, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #760 WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA	700.00	83.00
ROBERT E. COLE, 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER ALUMINUM & CHEMICAL CORP	600.00	7.85
STACEY W. COLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PETROLEUM COUNCIL 23 SCHOOL ST. CONCORD NH 03301	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JOHN M. COLLIER, 4436 PERRIER ST. NEW ORLEANS LA 70115	SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	11,174.04	
SAMUEL E. COLLIER, 530 7TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL CLEAN AIR COALITION	3,125.00	488.71
COLLIER SHANNON RILL & SCOTT, SUITE 308 1055 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN FROZEN FOOD INST		
Do	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE		
Do	AMERICAN TEXTILE MACHINERY ASSN		
Do	CSX CORPORATION		
Do	CYLINDER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION		
Do	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE		
Do	HUFFY CORPORATION		
Do	INDEPENDENT LUBRICANT MANUFACTURERS ASSN		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF CONVENIENCE STORES		
Do	NATIONAL BROILER COUNCIL		
Do	NATIONAL HAIRDRESSERS & COSMETOLOGISTS ASSN		
Do	PITTSBURGH CORNING CORPORATION		
Do	SOCIETY OF INDEPENDENT GASOLINE MARKETERS OF AMERICA		
Do	SPECIALTY STEEL INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES	3,675.00	3,675.00
Do	WEST TEXAS LAND & ROYALTY OWNERS ASSN		
GEORGE COLLINS, 1126 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS	600.00	300.00
COLORADO RAILROAD ASSN, 236 DENVER CLUB BUILDING DENVER CO 80202			
COLORADO SKI COUNTRY USA, INC., SUITE A-201 1410 GRANT STREET DENVER CO 80203			
COMMERCIAL UNION INSURANCE COMPANIES, ONE BEACON STREET BOSTON MA 02108			
COMMITTEE FOR CAP FORMATION THROUGH DIVIDEND REINVESTMENT, C/O HERBERT COHN 1800 M ST., NW, #800 NORTH WASHINGTON DC 20036.			
COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY, 1900 L STREET, NW, #610 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
COMMITTEE FOR EFFECTIVE CAPITAL RECOVERY, SUITE 303 1901 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		300.00	300.00
COMMITTEE FOR EFFECTIVE TAX INCENTIVES, ONE FARRAGUT SQUARE 8TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20006			
COMMITTEE FOR FAIR INSURANCE RATES, 600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20003		44,538.00	74,297.69
COMMITTEE FOR HUMANE LEGISLATION, INC, 11 WEST 60TH ST. NEW YORK NY 10023		14,119.65	8,672.86
COMMITTEE FOR PROPOSITION THIRTY, P.O. BOX 915 HARTSELLE AL 35640			
COMMITTEE TO ASSURE THE AVAILABILITY OF CASEIN, 3213 O ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007		1,027.78	
COMMON CAUSE, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		2,266,565.00	637,188.21
COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT, INC, 1925 NORTH LYNN STREET, #1140 ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH (AT&T)	153,308.00	130,312.00
Do	CITIZENS FOR SENSIBLE CONTROL OF ACID RAIN (CSCAR)	245,648.00	226,775.00
Do	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN	344,528.00	362,902.00
LANCE COMPA, 1411 K ST., NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20005	UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS OF AMER	5,833.62	
COMPUTER & COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, 1500 WILSON BLVD SUITE 512 ARLINGTON VA 22209		6,695.00	6,450.00
STEPHEN R. CONAFAY, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PFIZER, INC	2,000.00	1,632.47
EDWARD C. CONE P.O. BOX 1788 FOREST PARK GA 30051	SOUTHEASTERN LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSN	69.20	
CAROLE K. CONES, SUITE 301 1515 N. COURTHOUSE RD. ARLINGTON VA 22201	DCM GROUP (FOR: AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR AMERICAN SILVER)	5,950.00	49.30
CONGRESS WATCH, 215 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003		84,774.62	83,445.29
RAYMOND F. CONKLING, 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TEXACO, INC	300.00	10.50
JOHN B. CONNALLY, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: NORTHVILLE INDUSTRIES CORP)		
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: TRAVELERS INSURANCE COMPANY)		
STEPHEN N. CONNER, ROUTE 1, BOX 506 EASTON MD 21601	FOREIGN MINISTRY OF KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA	40,000.00	1,611.42
T. GARY CONNETT, P.O. BOX 14042 ST. PETERSBURG FL 33733	FLORIDA POWER CORP	1,048.00	413.00
JOHN P. CONNOLLY, SUITE 802 2000 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	POPHAM, HAIK, ET AL (FOR CHICAGO MERCANTILE EXCHANGE)		
PAULA J. CONNOLLY, 1700 K STREET, NW, #702 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO		
RICHARD J. CONNOR JR , 425 13TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	DISTILLED SPIRITS COUNCIL OF THE US, INC	1,725.00	150.00
JERRY C. CONNORS, SUITE 511 1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY, ARLINGTON VA 22202	MANUFACTURED HOUSING INST	1,000.00	100.00
MARK R. CONRAD, 1200 PEAVEY BUILDING MINNEAPOLIS MN 55479	NORWEST CORPORATION	10,800.00	2,196.00
CONSUMER ENERGY COUNCIL OF AMERICA, SUITE 320 2000 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			2,091.00

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
CONSUMERS UNION OF U.S., INC., 256 WASHINGTON ST. MOUNT VERNON NY 10550			6,050.00
CONTACT SYSTEMS CORP, 200 MADISON AVENUE, #1207 NEW YORK NY 10016			
JOHN J. CONTNEY, 1250 E. HOLLANDALE BEACH BLVD. HOLLANDALE FL 33009	TEXTILE RENTAL SERVICES ASSN OF AMERICA		
JOHN A. CONWAY, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
ALEXANDRA W. COOK, 229 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORPORATION	384.00	532.00
FREDERCK N. COOK, VERMONT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION P.O. BOX 566 MONTPELIER VT 05602	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	900.00	771.71
HARRY N. COOK, 1130 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL WATERWAYS CONFERENCE, INC.		
K. RICHARD COOK, 777 14TH ST., NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	425.00	
THOMAS M. COOK, SUITE 1032 425 13TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSN	1,000.00	
EILEEN D. COOKE, 110 MARYLAND AVE., NE, SUITE 101, BOX 54 WASHINGTON DC 20002	AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSN	1,332.00	
BERNARD J. COONEY, SUITE 1000 1101 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO		
BENJAMIN Y. COOPER JR , 1730 NORTH LYNN ST. ARLINGTON VA 22209	PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMER, INC	7,500.00	
JESSE D. COOPER, SUITE 314 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ROCKY MOUNTAIN OIL & GAS ASSN	2,600.00	1,243.89
JOSHUA W. COOPER, 400 MADISON STREET, APT. 808 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	PORTSMOUTH-KITTERY ARMED SERVICES COMM, INC	2,400.00	930.43
KATHY J. COOPER, SUITE 1204 1700 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	100.00	
MITCHELL J. COOPER, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COUNCIL OF FOREST INDUSTRIES	3,000.00	1.50
Do	FOOTWEAR DIV., RUBBER MFGRS ASSN	13,200.00	
DARRELL COOVER, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL ST., SW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT INSURERS	2,000.00	723.00
PATRICK H. CORCORAN, SUITE 1205 1725 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATION OF OIL PIPELINES		
ALFRED C. CORDON, GORDON & JACOBS 2000 L ST., NW, #616 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BUFFALO BROADCASTING CO., INC.		
LAW OFFICES, JAMES C CORMAN, 1420 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CALIFORNIA VISION SERVICE PLAN	3,050.00	
Do	CONNELL FINANCE CO, INC	4,150.00	
Do	COOPERATIVE OF AMERICAN PHYSICIANS, INC	2,750.00	
Do	GENERAL AMERICAN LIFE INSURANCE CO	2,935.00	
Do	HOME LIFE INSURANCE CO	2,935.00	
Do	INTERNATIONAL TAXICAB ASSN	4,550.00	
Do	MUSIC CORP OF AMERICA, INC	1,875.00	
Do	NATIONAL COMM TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY & MEDICARE	2,800.00	
Do	PACIFIC MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	2,935.00	
Do	PROVIDENT LIFE INSURANCE CO	2,935.00	
Do	SHAH & ASSOCIATES	250.00	
Do	STATE MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE CO OF AMERICA	2,935.00	
Do	SYSTEMS AND APPLIED SCIENCES	4,150.00	
Do	TEXAS AIR CORP	9,625.00	
Do	UNITED ENERGY CORP	12,525.00	
CORN REFINERS ASSOCIATION, INC., 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		8,257.00	2,071.00
CORPORATION FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION, INC, SUITE 103 1000 POTOMAC STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007		30,626.95	27,369.94
ERNEST J. CORRADO, SUITE 1000 1625 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MERCHANT SHIPPING	525.00	20.00
MARY MARCOTTE CORRIGAN, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER		
RICHARD L. CORRIGAN, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #250 WASHINGTON DC 20004	CH2M HILL, INC	1,875.00	
MARTY CORRY, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	428.08	519.26
ALLAN D. CORS, 1800 K ST., NW, SUITE 1104 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CORNING GLASS WORKS	450.00	
R. H. CORY, 1005 CONGRESS AVENUE, #795 AUSTIN TX 78701	CENTRAL AND SOUTH WEST SERVICES, INC	666.80	11,431.90
COSMETIC TOILETRY & FRAGRANCE ASSN, INC, SUITE 800 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			
CLARK R. COSSE III, 2900 INDIANA AVE. KENNER LA 70062	SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	14,182.50	352.55
REGINA A. COSTA, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #510 WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSN		
JAMES R. COSTELLO JR , 1101 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TEXTILE MFRS INST	500.00	60.90
MICHAEL E. COSTELLO, SUITE 600 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION CORP		243.82
DIANE COSTENOBLE, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD & ALLIED SERVICE TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO	518.30	
PETER J. COTCH, WALTER H. WHEELER JR. DRIVE STAMFORD CT 06926	PITNEY BOWES, INC		
MEREDITH COTE, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	368.27	
J. BARRY COUGHLIN, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE.,N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO	825.00	977.77
COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD, 11 BEACON ST. BOSTON MA 02108			17,231.09
COUNCIL FOR LANGUAGES AND OTHER INT'L. STUDIES, 3520 PROSPECT ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007		7,531.66	6,200.47
COUNCIL FOR RURAL HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT, SUITE 400S 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		4,000.00	4,000.00
COUNCIL OF INDUSTRIAL BOILER OWNERS, 11222 SILVERLEAF DR. FAIRFAX STATION VA 22039			1,760.04
COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE, SUITE 200 122 C ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		4,866.66	681.99
COUNCIL ON MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION SECURITY, INC, 1000 POTOMAC STREET, NW, #103 WASHINGTON DC 20007		21,750.00	33,132.48
COURSEN & COMPANY, 910 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ESTATE OF HELEN HALBACH	15,200.00	452.00
COURTNEY & ASSOCIATES, 632 F STREET, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			
WILLIAM R. COURTNEY, P.O. BOX 844 TEMPLE TX 76503	TRIBAL COUNCIL OF THE COUSHATTA TRIBE OF LOUISIANA		
JAMES COUSINS, 1101 15TH ST., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	5,000.00	31.32
JOHN F. COVE, SUITE 702 918 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COVE ASSOCIATES INC. (FOR: ASSN. OF U.S. NIGHT VISION MFRS.)		
COVINGTON & BURLING, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW P.O. BOX 7566 WASHINGTON DC 20044	AMERICAN ASSN OF ORAL & MAXILLOFACIAL SURGEONS	650.00	5.50
Do	AMERICAN WATCH ASSN		
Do	ANCHOR NATL LIFE INSURANCE CO		
Do	ASSOCIATION OF MAXIMUM SERVICE TELECASTERS, INC	1,037.50	
Do	COALITION TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF AMERICAN TRADEMARKS		
Do	GEORGE ROWE, JR. (FOR: ESTATE OF EDMUND G. MONELL)		28.11
Do	HOUDAILLE INDUSTRIES, INC		
Do	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE		416.89
Do	MORGAN STANLEY & CO		561.25
Do	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE		
Do	PACIFIC STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		88.78
Do	POST-NEWSWEEK STATIONS, INC	75.00	
Do	SUN LIFE ASSURANCE CO OF CANADA (U.S.)	10,105.00	36.00
EUGENE S. COWEN, 2759 UNICORN LN., NW WASHINGTON DC 20015	AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO, INC	166.50	
C. DEMING COWLES, 6TH FLOOR 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP CO AND KETCHIKAN PULP CO	2,550.00	41.83
Do	RICHMOND R. FARRING		
Do	MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE	7,768.33	1,287.37
Do	UNITED FISHERMEN OF ALASKA	1,350.00	1,199.63
ARCHIBALD COX, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	5,095.02	1,327.41
C. BRYAN COX, PO BOX 139 KANSAS CITY MO 64141	KANSAS CITY LIFE INSURANCE CO	127.35	571.00
DONALD FORSYTH CRAIB III, 1211 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO	300.00	68.86
CRAMER HABER & LUKIS, P.C., 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CANAVERAL PORT AUTHORITY	18,000.00	662.98
Do	CITY OF MIAMI	8,250.00	562.89
Do	DADE COUNTY	9,000.00	
Do	REPUBLIC OF GABON		
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: CANAVERAL PORT AUTHORITY)		
Do	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: CITY OF MIAMI)		
Do	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: DADE COUNTY)		
Do	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF GABON)		
JOHN R. CRANE, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031	U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE	1,200.00	
JOSEPH S. CRANE, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS	600.00	
ROSEMARIE J. CRAVEN, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL INHOLDERS ASSN		
CHARLES S. CRAWFORD, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO)		
Do	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS)		
WILLIAM D. CRAWFORD, 400 FIRST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY CARMEN OF THE U.S. & CANADA	2,032.53	
RICHARD C. CREIGHTON, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA	5,000.00	500.00
KEN A. CRERAR, 1611 NO. KENT STREET, #900 ARLINGTON VA 22209	FOOTWEAR INDUSTRIES OF AMERICA	2,700.00	289.85
JOSEPH M. CRIBBEN, 6900 VALLEY BROOK DR. FALLS CHURCH VA 22042	UNITED ASSN OF JNYMEN & APPREN. OF PLMBG & PIPEFTG INDUSTRY	1,750.00	30.00
RICHARD E. CRISTOL, 5775 PEACHTREE-DUNWOODY RD., #500D ATLANTA GA 30342	ROBERT H. KELLEN CO (FOR: CALORIE CONTROL COUNCIL)		
PHILIP R. CROESSMANN, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS	1,300.00	
P. H. CROFT, 2000 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN SHORT LINE RAILROAD ASSN		
ROBERT W. CROMARTIE, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	100.00	
CHARLES H. CROMWELL, INC., 6709 GEORGIA ST. CHEVY CHASE MD 20815	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
Do	HUGHES HELICOPTERS		
Do	NORTHROP CORP		
DONALD J. CRONIN, 1511 K STREET, NW, #820 WASHINGTON DC 20005	FRANK G. KINGSLEY	5,000.00	125.00
Do	MILLIKEN & COMPANY		
LAUREN JEANNE CRONIN, 300 LAKESIDE DRIVE OAKLAND CA 94612	KAISER CEMENT CORPORATION	7,820.00	9,335.44
RAE E. CRONMILLER, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	140.00	
THOMAS R. CROSBY JR., 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
DONALD A. CROSIER, NEBRASKA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 334 S. 13TH ST., PO BOX 95063 LINCOLN NB 68509	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
COLLEEN CROSSLAND, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #718 WASHINGTON DC 20001	PACIFIC BELL	250.00	
CROWELL & MORING, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASARCO INC	1,595.00	10.00
Do	ASSOCIATED GAS DISTRIBUTORS		
Do	AVON PRODUCTS, INC		
Do	BROOKLYN UNION GAS CO		
Do	COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP	875.00	30.00
Do	CONTROL DATA CORPORATION		
Do	ELI LILLY AND COMPANY	2,995.00	10.00
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	1,550.00	20.00
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF WHOLESALER-DISTRIBUTORS	9,930.00	10.00
Do	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC	481.25	61.46
Do	REGIONAL AIRLINE ASSOCIATION	465.00	2.00
Do	TRW, INC		419.24
CUBAN AMERICAN PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL, 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007			
BARRY M. CULLEN, 1620 EYE ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO	45.00	
WILLIAM E. CUMBERLAND, 1125 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		
SCOTT S. CUNNINGHAM, 1100 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	UNION CARBIDE CORP		
JOHN T. CURRAN, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	LABORERS' INTL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, AFL-CIO	14,182.50	352.55
Do	NATIONAL COORDINATING COMM FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PLANS		
KATHLEEN L. CURRY, 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, #503 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES	5,243.00	213.00
EDWARD P. CURTIS JR., GENESEE PUBLIC AFFAIRS, INC 36 W. MAIN STREET ROCHESTER NY 14614	LAKE ONTARIO CEMENT LIMITED	1,500.00	696.54
Do	MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, CANADA	16,300.00	7,198.10
MICHAEL C. CUSHING, 8283 GREENSBORO DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	SATELLITE BUSINESS SYSTEMS	1,000.00	
M. RUPERT CUTLER, 1302 18TH STREET, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENVIRONMENTAL FUND	54.40	4.00
D L ASSOCIATES, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW, #210 WASHINGTON DC 20036	METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO		
Do	SCIENCE APPLICATIONS, INC	375.00	
RUDOLPH N. D'AGARIS, 4708 NORBECK RD. ROCKVILLE MD 20853			
TERESE C. D'ALESSIO, 2020 NORTH 14TH ST. ARLINGTON VA 22201	MEDIA GENERAL, INC	840.00	186.65
WILLIAM D. D'ONOFRIO, 1800 W. 8TH ST. WILMINGTON DE 19805	NATIONAL ASSN FOR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS, INC		
WILLIAM K. DABAGHI, REYNOLDS ALLEN & COOK 1667 K STREET, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COALITION FOR REGIONAL BANKING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	350.00	205.00
WILLIAM KAY DAINES, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN RETAIL FEDERATION	650.00	75.00
DAKOTA LAY'D EGG CO, P.O. BOX 606 CANDO ND 58324			4,500.00
LEWIS I. DALE, SUITE 1016 1800 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AIR PRODUCTS & CHEMICALS, INC	75.56	
DONALD W. DALRYMPLE, 1575 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CYNAMID COMPANY (FOR: LEDERLE LABORATORIES)	1,980.00	576.00
JAMES G. DALTON, 2029 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS	2,500.00	
JOHN M. DAMGARD, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #1040 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FUTURES INDUSTRY ASSN, INC		
DAMRELL DAMRELL & NELSON, P.C., 911 13TH STREET P.O. BOX 3489 MODESTO CA 95353	CENTRAL SAN JOAQUIN RIVER ASSN	110.25	
Do	CLAVEY-WARDS FERRY PROJECT, ET AL	6,469.90	1,304.59
Do	STOCKTON TERMINAL & EASTERN RAILROAD		
TRACY DANESE, P.O. BOX 14000 JUNO BEACH FL 33408	FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT CO		
JOHN E. DANIEL, 1133 15TH STREET, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	OHIO EDISON CO		
DAVID S. DANIELSON, SUITE 400 E 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSN		
A. JOAN DANNELLEY, P.O. BOX 269 ELIZABETHTOWN PA 17022	AMERICAN ASSN OF MEAT PROCESSORS		
WILLIAM H. DARDEN, SUITE 200 412 FIRST STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	637.50	190.90
ONEIDA L. DARLEY, SUITE 203 1840 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL LIMESTONE INST, INC	780.00	
DIANE DAVENNY DARNEILLE, 1100 17TH ST., NW, #1206 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SCHERING-PLOUGH CORP	10,435.00	1,184.59
THOMAS ROGER DART, ALABAMA PETROLEUM COUNCIL P.O. BOX 4220 MONTGOMERY AL 36195	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JOHN C. DATT, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	5,031.00	
M. DENNIS DAUGHERTY, 733 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	LEGAL SERVICES CORP		
JOHN B. DAVENPORT JR , 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	125.00	
LARRY C. DAVENPORT, 5775 PEACHTREE-DUNWOODY RD. SUITE 500-D ATLANTA GA 30342	ROBERT H. KELLEN CO (FOR: CALORIE CONTROL COUNCIL)		
THEODORE S. J. DAVI, P.O. BOX 131 #6 MAGNOLIA AVENUE MONTVALE NJ 07645			
EARL F. DAVID, SUITE 1107 1825 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY	1,000.00	
DANIEL I. DAVIDSON, 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	SPIEGEL & MCDIARMID (FOR: NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY)		
DAVID R. DAVIS, INDIANA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 714 HARRISON BLDG. INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	907.02	247.25
DREW M DAVIS, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN	616.46	85.00
EDWIN I. DAVIS, 1510 FIRST CITY EAST BUILDING HOUSTON TX 77002	COASTAL CORP		
FRED G. DAVIS, 1111 19TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	1,425.00	317.08
DAVIS GRAHAM & STUBBS, SUITE 500 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	MUNICIPAL SUBDISTRICT, NO. COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DIST	4,030.20	4,030.20
Do	NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT	4,743.45	4,743.45
DAVIS HOCKENBERG WINE BROWN & KOEHN, 2300 FINANCIAL CENTER DES MOINES IA 50309	NORTHWESTERN BELL (IOWA DIV.)	20,580.00	340.13
KENNETH E. DAVIS, SUITE 743 1434 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ROHM & HAAS CO	500.00	
OVID R. DAVIS, P.O. DRAWER 1734 ATLANTA GA 30301	COCA-COLA COMPANY		
DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL, 1575 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MORGAN GUARANTY TRUST CO OF NEW YORK	450.00	
Do	NORWEST CORP	200.00	12.00
Do	OTTO BREMER FOUNDATION		
ROBERT DAVIS, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO	800.00	339.00
DAVIS SIMPICH & SIENA, 1301 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	CALIFORNIA HOUSING COUNCIL	4,050.00	227.75
WILLIAM LEE DAVIS, 299 PARK AVE. NEW YORK NY 10171	WESTVACO CORP		
DAVIS WRIGHT TODD RIESE & JONES, SUITE 800 1752 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GTE SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS	3,050.00	164.31
DONALD S. DAWSON, 723 WASHINGTON BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20005	OPTICIANS ASSN OF AMER	3,000.00	
Do	VIRGIN ISLANDS GIFT & FASHION SHOP ASSN		
Do	VIRGIN ISLANDS MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION		
HARRY F. DAY, 1800 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
J. EDWARD DAY, 5TH FL. 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSN		
Do	THIRD CLASS MAIL ASSOCIATION		
DCM GROUP, SUITE 301 1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD ARLINGTON VA 22201	AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR AMERICAN SILVER	7,425.00	8,741.37
GASTON DE BEARN, SUITE 401 1050 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC		
RALPH DE LA CRUZ, 1225 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSN	5,500.00	
O. MARK DE MICHELE, 411 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE P.O. BOX 21666 PHOENIX AZ 85014	ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY		
DEALER BANK ASSN, SUITE 1014 1800 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
JOHN RUSSELL DEANE III, 1607 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	AMERICAN METAL DETECTORS MFRS., INC		
Do	AUTO INTERNACIONAL ASSN		
Do	COALITION OF AUTOMOTIVE ASSNS		
Do	SPECIALTY EQUIPMENT MARKET ASSN	1,500.00	702.48
DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON, 1777 F STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SONY CORP OF AMERICA	5,030.50	15.25
ROBERT L. DEBO, MISSOURI OIL COUNCIL 428 E. CAPITOL, #203 JEFFERSON CIY MO 65101	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JEFF DEBOER, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,750.00	526.19
EDWARD S. DEBOLT, SUITE 301 1515 N. COURTHOUSE RD. ARLINGTON VA 22201	DCM GROUP (FOR: AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR AMERICAN SILVER)	2,612.50	
ROBERT DEBRAGGA, P.O. BOX 26 STONINGTON CT 06388	PROJECT CURE, INC		
MARK O. DECKER, SUITE 1100 1707 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL	688.00	
WINSTON M. DECKER, SUITE 828 1522 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSN		
Do	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL COLLEGES		
BRIAN DEERY, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
DONALD H. DEFOE, 100 N.E. ADAMS STREET PEORIA IL 61629	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO	531.69	1,141.52
GEORGE K. DEGNON ASSOCIATES, INC., SUITE 3A 1311-A DOLLEY MADISON BLDG. MCLEAN VA 22101	ASSOCIATION OF STATE & TERRITORIAL HEALTH OFFICIALS		1,500.00
STEPHEN T. DELAMATER, 2600 SOUTHLAND CENTER 400 N. OLIVE ST. DALLAS TX 75201	HALLIBURTON CO		
JOHN W. DELANEY, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110	BANK OF BOSTON CORPORATION		
Do	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON		
JOHN L. DELANO, 7 EDWARDS - BOX 1172 HELENA MT 59624	MONTANA RAILROAD ASSN		
ROBERT B. DELANO, 225 TOUHY AVE. PARK RIDGE IL 60068	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	2,925.00	
CARTHA D. DELOACH, 700 ANDERSON HILL ROAD PURCHASE NY 10577	PEPSICO, INC		
DELOITTE HASKINS & SELLS, 655 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ARKANSAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORP	4,250.00	
Do	HALLMARK CARDS, INC	1,800.00	11.00
Do	INDEPENDENT LIFE & ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO	1,600.00	4.00
Do	TEKTRONIX CORPORATION	3,240.00	8.00
Do	TRIANGLE INDUSTRIES, INC	14,130.00	68.70
Do	UNION PACIFIC CORP	1,100.00	15.00
GEORGIA L. DELYANNIS, 1730 K STREET, NW, #903 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN HELLENIC INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE		
SUSAN C. DEMARR, 1615 H ST., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20061	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	2,500.00	
TANIA DEMCHUK, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL ST., SW SUITE 401 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT INSURERS	100.00	
BRADFORD T. DEMPSEY, 512 W. MAPLE AVE. SUITE 210 VIENNA VA 22180			

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
GEORGE H. DENISON, SUITE 400 4801 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	NATIONAL OFFICE PRODUCTS ASSN	450.00	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	900.00	
RAY DENISON, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AFL-CIO	15,191.15	231.36
JOHN H. DENMAN, MISSOURI OIL COUNCIL 428 E. CAPITAL ST., #203 JEFFERSON CITY MO 65101	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
DAVID W. DENSFORD, 1050 31ST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	ASSOCIATION OF TRIAL LAWYERS OF AMERICA	1,000.00	100.00
WELLS DENYES, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	EASTMAN CHEMICAL PRODUCTS, INC	650.00	41.55
DEPARTMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		11,711.65	11,711.65
ALPHONSE DEROSSO, SUITE 1100 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EXXON CORPORATION		39.51
LLOYD J. DERRICKSON, SUITE 906 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC	4,500.00	
MICHAEL DESANTO, 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL TIRE DEALERS & RETREADERS ASSN		
MARCIA L. DESMOND, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN	2,748.19	83.83
JAMES T. DEVINE, LAW OFFICES OF DERRIS LEONARD, P.C. 900 17TH ST., NW, #1020 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BOWLING PROPRIETORS ASSN OF AMER		
SAMUEL L. DEVINE, BRICKER & ECKLER 888 SEVENTEENTH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN SMALL AND RURAL HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, OHIO CHAPTER		
Do	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM CORP	19,999.98	
Do	PAYCO AMERICAN CORPORATION		
Do	PEPSICO, INC		
R. DANIEL DEVLIN, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC	300.00	
DEWEY BALLANTINE BUSHBY PALMER & WOOD, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN CAN CO	1,938.00	
Do	AMERICAN STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
Do	BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC		
Do	CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A		
Do	DAMSON OIL CORP		
Do	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN		
Do	INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS ASSN OF AMERICA		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF PUBLIC HOSPITALS	1,080.00	
Do	PANHANDLE EASTERN PIPE LINE CO		
Do	SHEARSON/AMERICAN EXPRESS, INC		
DORIS J. DEWTON, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 507 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASHLAND OIL, INC	2,000.00	
DGA INTERNATIONAL INC, 1225 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DIR INTL AFF OF THE GEN DEL FOR ARMEMENTS	1,440.00	263.20
Do	SOCIETE NATIONALE D'ETUDE ET DE CONST. DE MOTEURS D'AVIATION	2,669.00	639.20
Do	SOFREAVIA		
DIAMOND SHAMROCK CORPORATION, 717 N. HARWOOD STREET DALLAS TX 75201			
CHARLES J. DIBONA, 1220 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE	1,875.00	
JOHN M. DICKERMAN, SUITE 700 1015 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL LUMBER & BUILDING MATERIAL DEALERS ASSN	1,000.00	
CHESTER T. DICKERSON JR., 1101 17TH STREET , N.W. SUITE 604 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MONSANTO CO		504.11
DICKEY KNORR & MOORE, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CTI-CONTAINER TRANSPORT INT'L, INC, ET AL	330.00	
WILLIAM E. DICKINSON, SUITE 300 206 N. WASHINGTON STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	SALT INSTITUTE	250.00	250.00
DICKINSON WRIGHT MOON VAN DUSEN & FREEMAN, 1901 L ST., NW SUITE 801 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	2,610.00	30.00
Do	K MART CORP		
Do	OAKLAND COUNTY D.P.W		
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO & MORIN, 2101 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	BEAR, STEARNS & CO	2,000.00	
Do	BOUNDARY GAS, INC		
Do	CORAL PETROLEUM, INC		
Do	CUSTOM AUTOMOTIVE SOUND ASSN, INC	500.00	
Do	FEDERATED CASH MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS		
Do	GILBANE BUILDING CO		
Do	GUAM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY		
Do	HOME HEALTH SERVICES & STAFFING ASSN	1,200.00	
Do	HVIDE SHIPPING, INC		
Do	MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSN		
Do	MARINETTE MARINE CORP	1,000.00	
Do	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS	600.00	
Do	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SOCIETIES FOR CLINICAL SOCIAL WORK	600.00	
Do	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN	3,000.00	
Do	OPTIONS POLICY ASSN	3,000.00	
Do	STATE OF DELAWARE, STATE OF IOWA, STATE OF LOUISIANA, ET AL		
RICK DIEGEL, 1125 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, ALF-CIO-CLC	2,281.25	150.00
THOMAS A. DINE, 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST, NW, #412 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM	12,999.99	2,021.86
MICHAEL F. DINEEN, 600 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE, #206 WASHINGTON DC 20003	FEDERAL KEMPER LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY	981.17	57.73
Do	KEMPER INVESTORS LIFE INSURANCE CO	1,055.50	84.57
Do	LUMBERMENS MUTUAL CASUALTY COMPANY	1,800.00	63.77
CHARLES VERN DINGES IV , 1302 18TH STREET, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENVIRONMENTAL FUND	330.00	30.00
RICHARD B. DINGMAN, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SW, #101 WASHINGTON DC 20003	MORAL MAJORITY		
DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION, 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			1,994.89
HARLEY M. DIRKS, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #712 WASHINGTON DC 20002	HEALTH & MEDICINE COUNSEL OF WASHINGTON		
Do	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COUNCIL		
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, 3725 ALEXANDRIA PIKE COLD SPRING KY 41076		148,107.03	148,107.03
PATSY B. DIX, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,021.00	97.00
O. L. DIXON III, P.O. BOX 1151 PENSACOLA FL 32520	GULF POWER COMPANY		
STEVEN P. DOEHLER, SUITE 1405 1725 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MORTGAGE INSURANCE COMPANIES OF AMERICA	2,500.00	184.15
WILLIAM BARROWS DOGGETT, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
JOHN D. DOHERTY JR., 900 17TH STREET, NW, #706 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A	167.00	12.73
GREGORY S. DOLE, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	8,062.50	267.56
JULIE DOMENICK, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE	355.20	374.55
DOMESTIC WILDCATTERS ASSN, P.O. BOX 4394 HOUSTON TX 77210		35,000.00	79,973.00
BRIAN J. DONADIO, SUITE 875 122 C ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSN	2,625.00	
RICHARD M. DONALDSON, 1738 GUILDHALL BLDG. CLEVELAND OH 44115	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
SALLY S. DONNER, 4TH FL. 1710 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL FOODS CORPORATION		
JAMES F. DONOVAN, 1835 K STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006			
WILLIAM DONOVAN, 1111 N. 19TH ST, #700 ARLINGTON VA 22209	NATIONAL ASSN OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS	2,500.00	352.34
FRANCIS X. DOOLEY, 525 SCHOOL ST., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN ROAD & TRANSPORTATION BLDRS ASSN	7,500.00	410.00
IRA DORFMAN, SUITE 850 2020 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN BAKERS ASSN	556.24	2.00
MAY DEL RIO DORFMAN, 380 SECOND AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10010	PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF NEW YORK CITY, INC		71.00
JAMES A. DORSCH, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HEALTH INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC		
KENNETH W. DORSCH, 725 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL GRAIN & FEED ASSN	14.00	
DEAN R. DORT II , SUITE 808 910 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DEERE & COMPANY	400.00	
JOSEPH K. DOSS, 1840 WILSON BLVD., #203 ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL LIMESTONE INST, INC	2,530.00	
DIANE DOUGHTY, 425 13TH STREET, NW, #723 WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN, INC		1,224.18
CHARLES P. DOWNER, 7901 WESTPARK DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL BUILDERS' ASSN	1,000.00	250.00
JANE LIND DOWNEY, P.O. OC 2303 400 ARMY-NAVY DR. ARLINGTON VA 22002	AMERICAN MOVERS CONFERENCE	45.00	
CONNIE M. DOWNS, 1800 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BANKAMERICA CORP		
JOHN H. DOWNS JR., 1101 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN		
JOHN P. DOYLE, SUITE 1100 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BELL HELICOPTER TEXTRON	3,839.43	2,058.57
ROBERT H. DOYLE, 1130 17TH STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	WATER QUALITY ASSN		
WILLIAM A. DOYLE, 2346 S. ROLFE STREET ARLINGTON VA 22202	HARRIS CORP	2,550.00	2,501.08
NANCY DRABBLE, 215 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	CONGRESS WATCH	7,500.00	
RONALD W. DRACH, 807 MAINE AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS	14,799.20	98.34
JAMES E. DRAKE, 1101 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	5,272.00	
JOAN ALBERT DREUX, 600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE, #211 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL ASSN OF CASUALTY & SURETY AGENTS	2,150.00	913.23
JEROME L. DREYER, 1300 N. 17TH ST. SUITE 300 ARLINGTON VA 22209	ASSOCIATION OF DATA PROCESSING SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS		
STEPHEN D. DRIESLER, SUITE 306 1150 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL	5,775.00	438.80
JOHN P. DRING, 1875 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP	1,500.00	337.11
KEVIN J. DRISCOLL, 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BAR ASSN	400.00	50.00
DOROTHY J. DRUMMER, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #209 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC	105.00	25.00
W.H. DRUSHEL JR , 3500 FIRST CITY TOWERS HOUSTON TX 77002	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: QUINTANA PETROLEUM CORP)		
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: QUINTANA REFINERY COMPANY)		
EDWIN JASON DRYER, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY, LARDNER, HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: VGS CORPORATION)		
FRAN DU MELLE, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #402 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN LUNG ASSN	2,890.00	1,009.00
EVELYN DUBROW, 1710 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10019	INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS UNION	10,965.50	4,030.92
MORGAN D. DUBROW, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	150.00	
BARBARA S. DUDECK, 955 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW # 905 WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO, INC	200.00	38.95

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
JANE MCPIKE DUDLEY, 1101 15TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL CONSTRUCTORS ASSOCIATION	1,050.00	
ANN ANDERSON DUFF, 222 S. PROSPECT AVE. PARK RIDGE IL 60068	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS	1,200.00	
MICHAEL J. DUFF, 1101 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SCIENTIFIC APPARATUS MAKERS ASSN	1,100.00	228.39
SARAH WELLS DUFFY, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	1,145.74	47.30
C. R. DUGGAN, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS	1,100.00	1,200.00
FRANCIS J. DUGGAN, 412 FIRST ST., SE, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20003	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	432.50	347.14
EVELYN DUKOVIC, 475 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, #239 NEW YORK NY 10115	MORALITY IN MEDIA, INC.	3.57	
MERVIN E. DULLUM, 1629 K ST., NW, #204 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DELTA AIR LINES, INC.	200.00	89.90
R. N. DUNAGAN III, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHILI-USA	141.59	318.86
DON R. DUNCAN, 1825 K ST.,NW SUITE 1107 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY	4,500.00	936.00
DUNCAN WEINBERG & MILLER, P.C., SUITE 1200 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT		
Do	HURON-CLINTON METROPOLITAN AUTHORITY		
Do	MID WEST ELECTRIC CONSUMERS' ASSN, INC.		
Do	STATE OF NEVADA	312.50	
Do	STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA		
Do	WESTERN FUELS ASSOCIATION, INC.		
JAMES W. DUNLOP, 195 MONTAGUE ST. BROOKLYN NY 11201	BROOKLYN UNION GAS CO.		
MARI LEE DUNN, SUITE 520 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR CAPITAL FORMATION		
JOHN H. DUNNE, 818 ROEDER ROAD SUITE 702 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
DUNNELLS DUVALL BENNETT & PORTER, 1220 19TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ASSOCIATION	3,111.25	3,957.05
JAMES A. DUPREE, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO.	3,375.00	1,080.43
JOSEPH L. DURAN, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON		
JUDY C. DURAND, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #600S WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION PACIFIC CORPORATION	666.00	1,572.29
MICHAEL V. DURANDO, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	4,875.00	105.96
B. J. DURHAM, P.O. BOX 2121 CORPUS CHRISTI TX 78403	CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY	326.00	1,255.01
DUTKO AND ASSOCIATES, SUITE 214 412 FIRST STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	A.R.M., INC.	2,000.00	
Do	CENERGY EXPLORATION CO.		
Do	MITCHELL ENERGY & DEVELOPMENT CORP.		
Do	PITTS ENERGY GROUP		
Do	SCHLENSKER DRILLING CO.	12,000.00	
Do	TEXAS OIL & GAS CORP (TXO)		
Do	TRADE MAX, INC.	14,281.25	
Do	U.S. TELEPHONE, INC.	9,000.00	
Do	WESSELY ENERGY CORP.		
L. L. DUXBURY, 210 7TH STREET, SE, #517 WASHINGTON DC 20003	RAILROAD RETIREMENT ASSN.		277.50
DENIS J. DWYER, 700 NORTH FAIRFAX ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	RAILWAY PROGRESS INST.	375.00	
MICHAEL J. DYER, 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #905 WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL COALITION FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES		
DYKEMA GOSSETT SPENCER GOODNOW & TRIGG, 1752 N ST., NW, 6TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20036	DAEDALUS ENTERPRISES, INC.		
Do	TOTAL PETROLEUM, INC		
JACK D. EARLY, 1155 15TH ST., NW, #514 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ASSN	50.00	
CATHERINE EAST, 1411 K STREET, NW, #1110 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS	1,875.00	
GEORGE H. EATMAN, 1800 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	SLURRY TRANSPORT ASSN.		
ROBERT E. EBEL, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #1014 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENSERCH CORPORATION	1,450.00	859.00
N. BOYD ECKER, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOBIL OIL CORP.	1,500.00	45.45
ROBERT C. ECKHARDT, SUITE 1105 1750 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CERTAIN TEXAS CLAIMANTS LAWYERS		
Do	CONSOLIDATED NATURAL GAS CO.	5,000.00	
Do	CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA		
Do	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE	5,000.00	
Do	SLURRY TRANSPORT ASSN.		
Do	STATE BAR OF TEXAS		
Do	WALTON & SON, STEVEDORING COMPANY		
Do	WESTERN FUELS ASSOCIATION, INC.	9,999.99	
PATRICIA K. ECONOMOS, 15TH & M STREETS, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S.		
MITCHELL H. EDELSTEIN, 1411 K ST., NW, #850 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION	3,491.84	111.05
WILLIAM R. EDGAR, SUITE 501 1620 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	GATES LEARJET CORPORATION		
HELEN H. EDGE, 700 N. FAIRFAX ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	RAILWAY PROGRESS INST.	430.37	
ARTHUR B. EDGEWORTH JR , 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS	2,968.00	
EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE, 9TH FLOOR 1111 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		314,137.27	85,136.76
V. ANNE EDLUND, 1620 EYE ST., NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC.		
STEPHEN L. EDMISTON, 807 MAINE AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS	13,228.80	530.19
EDS CORPORATION, 229 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003			3,366.00
JOHN M. EDSALL, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #600S WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION PACIFIC CORPORATION	218.00	263.51
EDWARDS ASSOCIATES, 507 SECOND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF WARM SPRINGS		
CHRISTINE A. EDWARDS, 1211 CONNECTICUT AVE., N.W. SUITE 802 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO	367.20	97.73
J. RODNEY EDWARDS, 260 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10016	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
MACON T. EDWARDS, 1030 15TH ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER	1,250.00	10.61
MAX N. EDWARDS, 1511 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20005	FRANK G. KINGSLEY	6,000.00	70.00
MICHAEL D. EDWARDS, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,272.00	216.00
WILLIAM A. EDWARDS, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LONG ISLAND LIGHTING CO.	1,925.00	405.30
PAUL S. EGAN, 1608 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN LEGION	8,397.00	218.62
EGGERS & GREENE, 1407 MAIN ST. SUITE 335 DALLAS TX 75202	LTV CORPORATION	3,000.00	383.40
SARA EHRMAN, 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST., NW, #412 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM	690.00	
EUGENE EIDENBERG, 1133 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MCI COMMUNICATIONS CORP	5,000.00	44.33
YVONNE B. EIDER, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20001	FRIENDS OF ANIMALS, INC	4,600.00	844.97
JILL W. EILAND, 507 SECOND STREET, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.		
ALBERT C. EISENBERG, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS	9,000.00	200.29
H. J. ELAM III, 1201 MAPLE ST. GREENSBORO NC 27405	CONE MILLS CORPORATION		
JANE ELDER, SUITE 203 214 N. HENRY ST. MADISON WI 53703	SIERRA CLUB	2,025.00	1,662.00
GEORGE K. ELIADES, 1401 WILSON BLVD., #205 ARLINGTON VA 22209	SOCIETY OF AMERICAN WOOD PRESERVERS, INC.	400.00	380.00
J. BURTON ELLER JR , 425 13TH ST., NW, #1032 WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSN	1,000.00	
CHARLES W. ELLIOTT, WISCONSIN PETROLEUM COUNCIL 25 W. MAIN ST., #703 MADISON WI 53703	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JOHN DOYLE ELLIOTT, 5500 QUINCY ST. HYATTSVILLE MD 20784			
DOROTHY A. ELLSWORTH, 1300 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS	13,495.86	174.61
ELY RITTS PIETROWSKI & BRICKFIELD, SUITE 915 WATERGATE 600 BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN		
CARL F. EMDE, 1800 K ST., NW, #1016 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AIR PRODUCTS & CHEMICALS, INC.		
EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR AMERICAN TRADE, 1211 CONNECTICUT AVE. WASHINGTON DC 20036		19,846.28	49,974.39
EMERSON ELECTRIC CO, 8000 FLORISSANT ST. LOUIS MO 63136			155.32
CAROL R. EMERY, JAY STONE AND ASSOCIATES, INC 412 FIRST STREET, SE, #50 WASHINGTON DC 20003	LOUISIANA WORLD EXPOSITION, INC.		
Do	MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.	1,625.00	
Do	STATE OF LOUISIANA	14,500.00	4,950.00
EMPLOYEE RELOCATION COUNCIL, SUITE 600 1627 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			5,070.07
EMPLOYERS COUNCIL ON FLEXIBLE COMPENSATION, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		42,438.56	42,438.56
IRENE R. EMSELLEM, 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BAR ASSN	400.00	50.00
LOWELL J. ENDAHL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	65.00	
ENERGY CONSUMERS & PRODUCERS ASSN, BOX 1726 PETROLEUM PLAZA SEMINOLE OK 74868		37,145.00	7,103.31
RALPH ENGEL, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #1120 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHEMICAL SPECIALTIES MFGRS ASSN		
LEWIS A. ENGMAN, 1100 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	2,500.00	
PATRICIA HANAHAN ENGMAN, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BRISTOL-MYERS CO.		
CHRISTOPHER ENGQUIST, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
M. DALE ENSIGN, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #901 WASHINGTON DC 20037	SINCLAIR OIL CORPORATION	500.00	137.33
ENVIRONMENTAL FUND, 1302 18TH STREET, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20036		384.40	250.16
ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE, 1726 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			4,675.00
JOHN M. ERSKINE JR , 1108 LAVACA, SUITE 400 AUSTIN TX 78701	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)		
MARTHA M. ESCUTIA, 20 F STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA	1,250.00	600.00
INGOLF G. ESDERS, 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO	4,322.97	
JOHN T. ESTES, 2550 M ST., NW, #770 WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC.	1,015.00	18.00
ETHYL CORPORATION, SUITE 611 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			2,600.00
STEPHEN E. EURE, P.O. BOX 3556 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE	2,000.00	
EUROPEAN TRAVEL COMMISSION, 630 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10111			
DAVE EVANS ASSOCIATES, 160 N. CAROLINA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO.		
Do	CREDIT UNION NATL ASSN, INC.		
Do	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVING INSTITUTIONS		
DONALD C. EVANS JR., 214 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #560 WASHINGTON DC 20002	CONSOLIDATED FOODS CORP.		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	FREIGHT FORWARDERS INSTITUTE		
Do	OLYMPIA & YORK DEVELOPMENTS LTD		
Do	OLYMPIA & YORK EQUITY CORP		
DONALD C. EVANS, P.O. BOX 1496 SARASOTA FL 33577	EVANS INVESTIGATIVE & SECURITY SERVICE		
JOHN R. EVANS, 9208 SEVEN LOCKS ROAD BETHESDA MD 20817	MESA PETROLEUM CO		76.50
Do	NATIONAL CORP FOR HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS		9.50
JOSEPH O. EVANS, APARTMENT 21 4401 LEE HWY. ARLINGTON VA 22207			
RAE FORKER EVANS, SUITE 210 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HALLMARK CARDS, INC	500.00	50.00
ROBERT D. EVANS, 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BAR ASSN	400.00	50.00
WILLIAM J. EVANS JR., SUITE 901 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AMERICAN WORLD SERVICES, INC	240.00	73.70
FAWN K. EVENSON, 1611 NORTH KENT ST. SUITE 900 ARLINGTON VA 22209	FOOTWEAR INDUSTRIES OF AMERICA	4,000.00	449.30
ELLEN E. EVES, NEW MURPHY RD. AND CONCORD PIKE WILMINGTON DE 19897	ICI AMERICAS, INC		
JEFFREY P. EVES, SCOTT PLAZA PHILADELPHIA PA 19113	SCOTT PAPER COMPANY		
KY P. EWING JR., 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: ARCHIE BENNETT)		
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: ALFRED C. GLASSELL JR.)	78,806.46	35.43
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: NORTHVILLE INDUSTRIES CORP)		49.00
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF EL PASO, TX)	28,835.40	43.96
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: TRAVELERS INSURANCE CO)	251,041.08	1,539.98
WAYNE S. EWING, ASSOCIATED PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES OF PA P.O. BOX 925 HARRISBURG PA 17108	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
ROBBIE G. EXLEY, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	108.23	
F/P RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, SUITE 303 1700 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	2,500.00	
Do	WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY	1,000.00	
ROBERT R. FAHS, SUITE 205 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CARGILL INC	2,500.00	
DALE W. FALLAT, P.O. BOX 119 MAUMEE OH 43537	ANDERSONS		
F. S. FALLON JR., P.O. BOX 888-F-9 ASHLAND KY 41101			
GEORGE W. FALLTRICK, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS		
THOMAS B. FARLEY II, 1220 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	7,345.00	109.90
WILLIAM T. FARLEY, 1126 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	IUE-AFL-CIO	600.00	300.00
FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL & CO-OPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA, P.O. BOX 2251 DENVER CO 80251		154,876.10	51,263.85
JOHN W. FARQUHAR, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	300.00	
ROBERT M. FARQUHAR, P.O. BOX 130 LEVIS, QUEBEC, CANADA G6V 6N7	DAVIE SHIPBUILDING LIMITED		
DAGMAR T. FARR, 1750 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	450.00	
CHRISTOPHER G. FARRAND, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #720 WASHINGTON DC 20036	PEABODY HOLDING COMPANY, INC		185.08
MICHAEL FARRAR, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC	200.00	
JOSEPH A. FARRELL, 1600 WILSON BOULEVARD, #1000 ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN WATERWAYS OPERATORS, INC		
STEPHANIE T. FARRIOR, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL COMM AGAINST REPRESSIVE LEGISLATION	3,750.00	
PENELOPE S. FARTHING, SUITE 415 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN		
MARCUS G. FAUST, SUITE 880 2121 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	KENNECOTT CORPORATION	9,000.00	
CLINTON B. FAWCETT, NINE GREENWAY PLAZA HOUSTON TX 77046	COASTAL CORPORATION		
JANE FAWCETT-HOOVER, 801 18TH ST., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PROCTER & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO	22.91	
FEDERAL KEMPER LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, KEMPER BLDG. D-3 LONG GROVE IL 60049			
FEDERATION EMPLOYMENT & GUIDANCE SERVICE, 114 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10011			
FEDERATION OF AMERICAN CONTROLLED SHIPPING, 50 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10004		1,545.01	1,545.01
FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HOSPITALS, SUITE 402 1111 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		10,000.00	10,000.00
FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS, 307 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			2,509.61
DONALD M. FEHR, 805 THIRD AVE. NEW YORK NY 10022	MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYERS ASSN	440.00	118.81
JOEL F. FELDMAN, LAW OFFICES OF SHELDON I. LONDON 1725 DESALES STREET, NW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN HARDWARE MANUFACTURERS ASSN	1,000.00	
MARK B. FELDMAN, DONOVAN, LEISURE, NEWTON & IRVINE 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC		
JUDITH W. FENSTERER, 242 E. 80TH STREET NEW YORK NY 10021	GENERIC PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY ASSN	396.00	156.00
FENSTERWALD & FENSTERWALD, P.C., 1000 WILSON BLVD SUITE 900 ARLINGTON VA 22209	NATIONAL NUTRITIONAL FOODS ASSOCIATION	5,000.01	249.99
EDWARD T. FERGUS, 100 GOLD ST. NEW YORK NY 10292	PRUDENTIAL-BACHE SECURITIES INC	750.00	
JACK FERGUSON ASSOCIATES, 203 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	DILLINGHAM CONSTRUCTION GROUP	7,875.00	1,293.08
Do	DILLINGHAM SHIP REPAIR	600.00	680.00
Do	FOSS LAUNCH & TUG COMPANY; FOSS ALASKA LINE	2,840.00	1,121.49
Do	NORTHWEST ENERGY COMPANY	20,700.00	1,386.00
Do	U.S. BORAX & CHEMICAL CORP	10,275.00	1,303.08
BETSY FERGUSON, 1875 EYE STREET,N.W. SUITE 1110 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TIMES MIRROR COMPANY		
JOHN T. FERGUSON II , 1875 EYE STREET, NW, SUITE 400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP		
JOHN L. FESTA, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
FIDELITY UNION LIFE INSURANCE CO, P.O. BOX 500 DALLAS TX 75221			2,176.00
FRED C. FIELDING, 1725 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY, #900 ARLINGTON VA 22202	AM GENERAL CORPORATION	2,750.00	117.00
C. H. FIELDS, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	5,000.00	31.73
GARY W. FIELDS, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	1,300.00	240.80
STEVEN I. FIER, 777 14TH STREET, NW, 5TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,750.00	328.60
HERBERT A. FIERST, 610 RING BLDG. 1200 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COUNCIL OF FOREST INDUSTRIES OF B.C.	13,125.00	805.00
MATTHEW P. FINK, 1775 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE	40.38	7.00
FINLEY KUMBLE WAGNER HEINE UNDERBERG MANLEY & CASEY, 10TH FLOOR 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.	GENERAL DYNAMICS CORP		
Do	GOVERNMENT OF ANTIGUA & BARBUDA		
Do	M/A-COM, INC	3,857.00	2,209.50
Do	MAGNAVOX GOVERNMENT & INDUSTRIAL ELECTRONICS CO		
Do	POPULATION CRISIS COMMITTEE	725.00	
Do	RCA	23,680.00	
Do	STROMBERG-CARLSON CORPORATION		
Do	TELLABS		
Do	TELOCATOR NETWORK OF AMERICA		
Do	TRT TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP	1,905.00	
Do	TURNER BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC		
Do	UNITED SATELLITE ACTION	4,142.50	37.40
STEPHEN A. FINN, P.O. BOX 520783 - GENERAL MAIL FACILITY MIAMI FL 33152	BURGER KING CORP		
FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CO	3,000.00	150.00
Do	INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS ASSN	2,000.00	150.00
THOMAS D. FINNIGAN, OLD RIDGEBURY ROAD SECTION D228 DANBURY CT 06817	UNION CARBIDE CORP		
M. J. FIOCCO, 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRANSPORTATION LEAGUE	4,625.00	37.00
LAURIE A. FIORI, 1909 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	481.15	
RICHARD J. FIORINI, P.O. BOX 15278 DENVER CO 80215	NORANDA MINING INC		
FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110			8,507.00
RICHARD L. FISCHER, 1000 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)	1,050.00	
DONALD W. FISHER, 3814 IVANHOE LANE ALEXANDRIA VA 22310	AMERICAN GROUP PRACTICE ASSN, INC	258.00	
WILLIAM L. FISHER, BOX 719 DALLAS TX 75221	SOUTHLAND CORPORATION		
WILLIAM P. FISHER, 311 FIRST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSN		
LAURI J. FITZ, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF CANADA).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF HAITI).	450.00	
MARY CLARE FITZGERALD, SUITE 900-N 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GOLEMBE ASSOCIATES, INC		
THOMAS H. FITZPATRICK, 410 ASYLUM STREET HARTFORD CT 06103	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE		
HILLIARD J. FJORD, 602 MAIN ST., #600 CINCINNATI OH 45202	OHIO RIVER CO	3,000.00	1,394.64
JAMES J. FLANAGAN, 25 RESEARCH DR. WESTBOROUGH MA 01581	NEW ENGLAND POWER SERVICE CO	651.60	107.85
MICHAEL FLEMING, SUITE 1010 1300 NORTH 17TH STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN ASSN OF EQUIPMENT LESSORS		
FLORIDA BUSINESS ASSOCIATES, SUITE 200 2000 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	JACKSONVILLE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	3,930.00	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	4,300.00	
VERONICA M. FLOYD, 2001 S. JEFF DAVIS HIGHWAY, #1107 ARLINGTON VA 22202	BRUNSWICK CORP	5,700.00	772.82
RICHARD A. FLYE, MCKENNA CONNER & CUNEO 1575 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FERTILIZER INSTITUTE	8,944.00	
DAVID H. FOERSTER, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
WILLIAM J. FOGARTY, 2029 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS	2,000.00	
CORNELIUS J. FOLEY JR., 1440 MAIN STREET WALTHAM MA 02254	MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SOCIETY	500.00	600.00
FOLEY LARDNER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTORS MORTGAGE INSURANCE CO	650.00	10.49
Do	LAWYERS TITLE INSURANCE CORP	4,900.00	4.50
Do	VGS CORPORATION		220.75
R. D. FOLSOM, 1317 F STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20004	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: FREEPORT MCMORAN, INC)	250.00	
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: LIFE OF VIRGINIA, ET AL)	250.00	
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: SCHULMAN MANAGEMENT CO)		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: VOLUME FOOTWEAR RETAILERS OF AMERICA).	250.00	
FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			5,000.00
FOODSERVICE & LODGING INST, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
GORDON FORBES, 303 HANOVER BLDG., 480 CEDAR ST. ST. PAUL MN 55101	MINNESOTA RAILROADS		
LAURENCE S. FORDHAM, FOLEY, HOAG & ELIOT ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON MA 02109	C & S WHOLESALE GROCERS, INC		
DONALD D. FOREMAN, 13716 E. WELLINGTON COURT BURNSVILLE MN 55337	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)	1,050.00	
FOREST FARMERS ASSOCIATION, P.O. BOX 95385 ATLANTA GA 30347			663.97
FOREST INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE ON TIMBER VALUATION & TAXATION, 1250 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.		366.01	366.01
MARK A. FORMAN, SUITE 600 S 1120 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION PACIFIC CORP	625.00	250.25
SALLIE H. FORMAN, 1825 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO, INC	875.00	
LUISE FORSETH, 3055 OLD HIGHWAY 8 P.O. BOX 1453 MINNEAPOLIS MN 55440	MEDTRONIC, INC	543.00	1,893.83
RICHARD C. FORTUNA, 2916 STEPHENSON PL., NW WASHINGTON DC 20015	HAZARDOUS WASTE TREATMENT COUNCIL	4,000.00	4,000.00
EBERT E. FOURNACE, 3706 EATON RD., NW CANTON OH 44708	AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER SERVICE CORP		
ALBERT A. FOX JR., 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIED CORP	205.00	25.00
ALLAN FOX, KAYE SCHOLER FIERMAN HAYS & HANDLER 1575 I STREET, NW, #1150 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE		
Do	AMERICAN SOCIAL HEALTH ASSN		
ERIC R. FOX, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	APPLE COMPUTER CORP		
DAVID E. FRANASIAK, 1615 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S	2,346.80	338.73
DOUGLAS L. FRANCISCO, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		50.50
ALFRED S. FRANK JR., SUITE 320 1140 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NCR CORP		
PETER M. FRANK, SUITE 906 1625 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KERR-MCGEE CORP	2,500.00	1,194.58
DAVID C. FRANKIL, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	200.00	
WALTER L. FRANKLAND JR. 1717 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SILVER USERS ASSN, INC	1,899.80	97.10
THOMAS C. FRANKS, 604 SOLAR BUILDING 1000 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSN	1,500.00	282.24
CHARLES W. FRANZ, 1133 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MCI COMMUNICATIONS CORP	10,375.00	48.83
MARIAN C. FRANZ, 2121 DECATUR PLACE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20008	NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR A WORLD PEACE TAX FUND	450.00	138.00
CHARLES L. FRAZIER, 475 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #2250 WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION	4,458.00	4,001.83
ROBERT M. FREDERICK, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL GRANGE	4,837.50	
FREDERICK SERVICE GROUP, 102 W. CHURCH STREET FREDERICK MD 21701			
ANN TODD FREE, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	400.00	
D. MICHAL FREEDMAN, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	7,258.99	
JAMES O. FREEMAN, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS	3,827.00	27.00
LEWIS R. FREEMAN JR., 605 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SOCIETY OF THE PLASTICS INDUSTRY		
MARY ANN FREEMAN, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	80.00	
PAULA A. FREER, 1800 M ST., NW, #975 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MARATHON OIL CO		
RONNA FREIBERG, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ASARCO INC)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC.).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BUDD COMPANY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: FINANCIAL INVESTMENT ASSOCIATES, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY).		
Do	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INT'L, INC (FOR: SANTA FE CORP)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SHAKLEE CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: STROH BREWERY CO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: TOBACCO INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: WARNER COMMUNICATIONS).		
VERRICK O. FRENCH, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSN	650.00	40.00
SARA HAMRIC FREUND, 260 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10016	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
GEORGE L. FRICK, DELAWARE PETROLEUM COUNCIL 20 E.DIVISION ST. DOVER DE 19901	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
SUSAN FRIDY, 1840 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FED	2,490.00	
FRIED FRANK HARRIS SHRIVER & KAMPELMAN, SUITE 1000 600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	ASSINIBOINE TRIBE		
Do	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE	5,292.00	35.69
Do	DIAMOND DEALERS CLUB, INC		
Do	DOYON, LIMITED	1,347.00	30.90
Do	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	3,220.00	33.20
Do	MICCOSUKEE TRIBE OF INDIANS OF FLORIDA		23.40
Do	NEZ PERCE TRIBE	1,609.00	46.61
Do	PUEBLO OF LAGUNA	790.00	35.45
Do	SCHENLEY INDUSTRIES, INC		234.65
Do	SENECA NATION OF INDIANS	5,328.00	34.24
Do	UNIVERSAL MARITIME SERVICE CORPORATION		
RONALD A. FRIED, 2000 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ORION SATELLITE CORPORATION	5,600.00	350.00
MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF, 700 ANDERSON HILL ROAD PURCHASE NY 10577	PEPSICO, INC		199.44
PHILIP P. FRIEDLANDER JR., 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL TIRE DEALERS & RETREADERS ASSN	500.00	
FRIEDMAN & MANN, P.C., 3315 QUESADA STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20015	COUSHATTA TRIBE OF LOUISIANA		
JAMES M. FRIEDMAN, 700 TERMINAL TOWER CLEVELAND OH 44113	CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING CO	18,000.00	1,859.42
Do	COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL-ENERGY BALANCE	21,608.40	1,649.29
GAY H. FRIEDMANN, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #717 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO	8,140.00	260.52
FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION, 245 2ND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			20,698.45
FRIENDS OF ANIMALS, INC, 400 FIRST STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20001		9,000.00	7,993.09
FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE, 519 SW THIRD, #810 PORTLAND OR 97204		39.36	978.36
OWEN V. FRISBY, 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A.	187.50	16.46
SUSAN T. FRITSCHLER, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	400.00	217.36
ALLYN M. FRITTS, 5006 N. 34TH ROAD ARLINGTON VA 22207	NEW BEDFORD SEAFOOD COUNCIL, INC	5,001.00	248.01
CHARLES H. FRITTS, 1125 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSN	5,700.00	35.00
CHARLES H. FRITZEL, 499 S. CAPITOL ST., SE, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT INSURERS	300.00	230.00
JEFFREY FRITZLEN, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #600-S WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION PACIFIC CORP	2,000.00	
RICHARD B. FROH, SUITE 1014 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC	15,500.00	51.33
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSOLIDATED CAPITAL EQUITIES CORP	41.25	6.25
Do	CRYSTAL OIL COMPANY		
Do	HOTEL INVESTORS TRUST	277.50	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS, INC		.57
Do	RIGGS NATIONAL CORP		500.00
Do	SAMUEL GARY OIL PRODUCER, INC	7,505.00	57.88
Do	SANTA ANITA REALTY ENTERPRISES, INC		
CLAUDIA R. FUQUAY, 1401 NEW YORK AVE., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOOD PROCESSORS ASSN	500.00	24.50
JOSEPH F. FURLONG, 284 SOUTH AVENUE POUGHKEEPSIE NY 12601	CENTRAL HUDSON GAS & ELECTRIC CORP		
DAVID H. FYOCK, SUITE 520 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	GPU SERVICE CORPORATION	4,750.00	590.82
MARC P. GABOR, 5025 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO	3,000.00	278.30
TERRY GABRIELSON, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #3202 WASHINGTON DC 20024	TRANSCO ENERGY CO	1,200.00	
JAMES E. GAFFIGAN, SUITE 607 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TRAVEL & TOURISM GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS POLICY COUNCIL	1,750.00	
JOHN G. GAINE, ALSTON & BIRD 1900 M STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MEAT PRICE INVESTIGATORS ASSN		
NORMAN S. GAINES, 2550 M ST., NW, #770 WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	2,200.00	486.51
JOE H. GALIS, P.O. BOX 1100 SLOTE 1455 AVON PARK FL 33825			
MARK J. GALLAGHER, 1707 L ST., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COMM FOR A HUMAN LIFE AMENDMENT, INC	6,052.00	3,714.00
KARL GALLANT, 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD SPRINGFIELD VA 22160	NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMM	3,000.00	624.52
LARRY GALLO, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHEMICAL SPECIALTIES MFGRS ASSN		
HARRY GANDERSON, P.O. BOX 871 CHARLOTTSVILLE VA 22902	INTERNATIONAL TRADE SERVICES CORP		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
WILLIAM R. GANSER JR , 4804 FOLSE DR. METAIRIE LA 70002	SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	2,500.00	
NICOLE GARA, 1117 NORTH 19TH STREET, NW, #300 ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS		
HARRY D. GARBER, 1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK NY 10019	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S.	600.00	25.00
DAVID MCLANE GARDINER, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVE.,SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	7,569.45	143.00
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS, 1875 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FTC COMMUNICATIONS, INC.		
Do	EDWARD HINES LUMBER CO		
Do	K-A COMPANY		
Do	MIDCON CORP		
SHERWIN GARDNER, 1010 WISCONSIN AVE., NW SUITE 800 WASHINGTON DC 20007	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC.	150.00	6.00
EDWARD A. GARMATZ, 2210 LAKE AVE. BALTIMORE MD 21213	BALTIMORE GAS & ELECTRIC CO.	2,400.00	
E. JUNE GARVIN, OHIO PETROLEUM COUNCIL 88 E. BROAD SUITE 1960 COLUMBUS OH 43215	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	3,000.00	2,018.83
W. BRADFORD GARY, 1050 17TH STREET, NW, #1126 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BAXTER TRAVENOL LABORATORIES, INC		
MARY A. GARZA, P.O. BOX 152777, 5B-7 IRVING TX 75015	ZALE CORP	1,120.00	3,324.52
GAS APPLIANCE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC., 1901 NORTH FORT MYER DR. ARLINGTON VA 22209			
LILLIAN B. GASKIN, 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BAR ASSN	400.00	50.00
PHILIP GASTEYER, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW SUITE 801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS	7,214.00	
WAYNE GATHERS, 1925 K STREET, NW, #507 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY	224.68	
GEARY, STAHL & SPENCER, 2800 ONE MAIN PLACE DALLAS TX 75250	CITIES FOR RESPONSIBLE CABLE POLICY	8,000.00	196.97
MARGARET L. GEHRES, 1828 L STREET, NW, #402 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	1,000.00	10.00
RONALD L. GEIGLE, 1030 15TH STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20005	HEALTH INDUSTRY MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION		
ROBERT C. GELARDI, 5775 PEACHTREE-DUNWOODY RD. #500-D ATLANTA GA 30342	ROBERT H. KELLEN CO (FOR: CALORIE CONTROL COUNCIL)	180.00	
MORTON A. GELLER, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON		
GENERAL AVIATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, 1400 K STREET, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20005			4,038.38
GENERIC PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY ASSN., SUITE 2404 200 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10016		9,476.00	9,476.00
FRED J. GENTILE, 195 MONTAGUE STREET BROOKLYN NY 11201	BROOKLYN UNION GAS CO		
JOHN GENTILLE, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
CLAIRE M. GEOGHEGAN, 415 2ND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS	5,465.41	
NANCY WHORTON GEORGE, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20003	CELERON		
Do	TRANSCO, INC.		
GEORGE W. GEPHART, P.O. BOX 1475 BALTIMORE MD 21203	BALTIMORE GAS & ELECTRIC CO.		
JOSEPH G. GERARD, 918 16TH ST., N.W. # 402 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN FURNITURE MANUFACTURERS ASSN	1,500.00	934.45
LOUIS GERBER, 1925 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA	192.60	192.60
DANIEL R. GERKIN, 1575 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MINING & RECLAMATION COUNCIL OF AMERICA	1,000.00	
LLEWELLYN H. GERSON, 425 13TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	DISTILLED SPIRITS COUNCIL OF THE US, INC	2,000.00	300.00
PHYLLIS H. GERSTELL, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
CHRIS GERSTEN, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW, #412 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM	1,317.00	
DOROTHY F. GEVINSON, 801 18TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PROCTER & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO		
ROBERT N. GIAIMO, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL ST., S.W. SUITE 110 WASHINGTON DC 20003	AETNA LIFE & CASUALTY	9,375.00	
Do	INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT	3,750.00	
WAYNE GIBBENS, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #503 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSN	8,362.00	49.50
ANNE MARIE GIBBONS, THIRD FLOOR 2301 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN	500.00	
GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER, 1776 G STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED SPECIALTY CONTRACTORS, INC		
Do	COOPERATIVE FOR AMERICAN RELIEF EVERYWHERE, INC (CARE)		
Do	FEDERATION OF APPAREL MANUFACTURERS		
Do	INSURANCE ASSN OF CONNECTICUT	420.00	4.00
Do	MECHANICAL CONTRACTORS ASSN OF AMERICA, INC.		
WILLIAM G. GIERY, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOODSERVICE & LODGING INST.		
WILLIAM L. GIFFORD, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #520 WASHINGTON DC 20024	GPU NUCLEAR CORP	550.00	204.00
RICHARD GILBERT, 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSN	1,222.00	
MICHAEL GILDEA, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AFL-CIO	13,607.49	
JOHN E. GILES, 1600 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	550.00	452.53
NEAL P. GILLEN, 1725 K STREET, NW, #1210 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COTTON SHIPPERS ASSN	24,333.33	1,203.30
WILLIAM GILMARTIN, SUITE 500 2010 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, INC.	590.59	42.00
GINN & EDINGTON, INC, 121 SOUTH COLUMBUS STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE CORP	1,500.00	46.88
Do	HERCULES INC		
Do	LOCKHEED-GEORGIA COMPANY	7,000.00	78.14
Do	MECHANICAL TECHNOLOGY, INC.	4,583.00	
Do	PROFESSIONAL INSURANCE AGENTS	6,000.00	46.88
Do	TEXAS INSTRUMENTS, INC	4,500.00	23.44
Do	TURNER BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC	3,000.00	46.88
Do	U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS' ASSN		
STUART M. GINSBERG, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #1002 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN	1,000.00	
GINSBURG FELDMAN WEIL & BRESS, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COAL OIL PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION		
GERARD GIOVANIELLO, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	2,500.00	460.16
BRENDA M. GIRTON, 633 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20004	SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO		
MICHAEL J. GIUFFRIDA, SUITE 450 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FROZEN FOOD ASSOCIATION	2,000.00	
SOL GLASNER, SUITE 810 2000 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SPERRY CORPORATION		
CLAUDE R. GLAZE, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS		
LAW OFFICES OF THOS 90 BROAD STREET, #600 NEW YORK NY 10004	INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO		
ROBERT GLEASON, 815 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO	7,223.45	17.73
JAMES T. GLENN, 840 WASHINGTON BUIDING 15TH STREET & NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CSX CORPORATION	3,000.00	340.57
GLOBAL USA, INC, GLOBAL HOUSE 1823 JEFFERSON PLACE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FANUC, LTD		
Do	KOMATSU LTD.		
Do	KYOCERA CORPORATION		
Do	MAZAK CORPORATION		
JERE W. GLOVER, 1725 K STREET, NW, #308 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SERVICE STATION DEALERS OF AMERICA		
GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC, 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMURCON CORPORATION		
Do	BEZTAK COMPANY		
Do	BI-COUNTY CONSORTIUM		
Do	CAC ASSOCIATES		
Do	DETROIT & MACKINAC RAILWAY COMPANY		
Do	GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS		
Do	GRAND TRAVERSE DEVELOPMENT, INC.		
Do	INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN, INC		
Do	JOHN COOLEY CONSTRUCTION CO		
Do	LINEAR AIR MOTORS		
Do	MOVE DETROIT FORWARD FUND		
Do	NETCO		
Do	POTTER INSTRUMENT CO., INC.		
Do	PRIMARK CORPORATION		
Do	RJK CONSTRUCTION COMPANY		
Do	SAFEKEEPER SYSTEMS, INC.		
Do	SAFLOK		
Do	SANDERS CORPORATION		
Do	U.S. MANUFACTURING COMPANY		
Do	URBAN REVITALIZATION, INC.		
RICHARD P. GODWIN, P.O. BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL CIVIL & MINERALS, INC.		
A. JAMES GOLATO, 1701 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	H&R BLOCK, INC.	221.60	24,608.10
DONNA GOLD, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,141.00	36.10
HARVEY S. GOLD, 1015 15TH ST., NW, #909 WASHINGTON DC 20005	VELSICOL CHEMICAL CORP		
GOLDBERG & SPECTOR, 1920 N STREET, NW, #650 WASHINGTON DC 20036	EQUATORIAL COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES		
HOWARD S. GOLDBERG, 1225 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DGA INTERNATIONAL INC (FOR: SOCIETE NATIONALE D'ETUDE ET DE CONST DE MOTEURS D'AVIATION)		
Do	DGA INTL, INC. (FOR: SOFREAVIA)		
RONALD L. GOLDFARB, GOLDFARB, SINGER & AUSTERN 918 16TH STREET, NW, #503 WASHINGTON DC 20003	WASHINGTON INDEPENDENT WRITERS, INC.		
PATRICIA R. GOLDMAN, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN	428.71	
JACK GOLODNER, 815 16TH ST., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	DEPARTMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO	4,022.65	
RUTH M. GOLTZER, 1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION	4,204.78	51.75
JOHN GONELLA, SUITE 200 412 FIRST STREET, SE WWASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	849.93	108.90
RUTH GONZE, THIRD FLOOR 2301 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN	500.00	
CHARLES E. GOODELL, KING & SPALDING 1730 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DGA INTL INC (FOR SOFREAVIA)		
Do	DGA INTL, INC (FOR SNECMA)		
Do	THOMSON-CSF, INC.		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
GOODWIN PROCTER & HOAR, 28 STATE STREET BOSTON MA 02109	POLAROID CORPORATION		6,654.44
ROBERT F. GOODWIN, 1850 K ST., NW, SUITE 275 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MEREDITH CORP	40.00	23.50
DOUGLAS GORDON, SUITE 400 1401 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL FOOD PROCESSORS ASSN	375.00	
IRMGARD GORDOS, GREENWOOD 10 GREENVILLE NY 12083	AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL		
BRENDA J. GORE, SUITE 2600 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC.	1,000.00	
GORGE DEFENSE LEAGUE, P.O. BOX 780 STEVENSON WA 98648			
MILLICENT GORHAM, SUITE 400E 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSN		
DAVID W. GORMAN, 807 MAINE AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS	11,965.20	155.39
JAMES D. GORMLEY, 1400 K STREET, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL AVIATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION	2,535.00	24.66
JOHN T. GOULD JR., SUITE 805 1625 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ST. REGIS PAPER CO	400.00	900.00
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ASSOCIATES, INC., SUITE 401 1629 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER STEEL CORP	4,200.00	10,013.00
Do	GILMORE STEEL CORP	333.00	333.00
HUGH J. GOWNLEY, 1225 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DGA INTERNATIONAL INC (FOR: SNECMA)	56.40	
EDMOND GRABER, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA	1,000.00	500.00
JOHN R. GRAFF, SUITE 330 1025 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF AMUSEMENT PARKS AND ATTRACTIONS		
GRAHAM & JAMES, SUITE 1200 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NEPTUNE ORIENT LINES, LTD		
DONALD E. GRAHAM, MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 1850 K STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES		
LAWRENCE T. GRAHAM, 1819 L STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN HOTEL & MOTEL ASSN	1,555.62	
EDWARD S. GRANDIS, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	834.60	
WILLIAM W. GRANT, SUITE 710 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UTAH INTL, INC		446.85
JAMES L. GRANUM, 920 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION	1,000.00	
GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL UNION, AFL-CIO, CLC, 1900 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		38,000.00	40,214.00
KARLA L. GRAUE, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	1,000.00	
RUTH P. GRAVES, SUITE 500 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	READING IS FUNDAMENTAL, INC		
THOMAS P. GRAVES, 410 11TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS' ASSN, INC	6,076.95	76.95
JAMES A. GRAY, 7901 WESTPARK DR. MCLEAN VA 22102	NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL BUILDERS' ASSN	805.00	25.00
ROBERT K. GRAY, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN MARITIME ASSN).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ANEUTRONIX, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ASARCO INC)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BATUS)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BEVERLY ENTERPRISES).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC.).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BUDD COMPANY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: CANADIAN ASBESTOS INFORMATION CENTRE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: COLLEGE OF AMER PATHOLOGISTS).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: COMMON-WEALTH OF PUERTO RICO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: RAMZI A. DALLOUL).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: EL PASO NATURAL GAS CO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSN OF JAPAN).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: FINANCIAL INVESTMENT ASSOCIATES, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: GENERAL TELEPHONE & ELECTRONICS).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: GRAY AND COMPANY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: GRUMMAN CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: HEALTH INSURANCE ASSN OF AMERICA).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: HRH PRINCE TALAL BIN ABDUL AZIZ AL SAUD).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: HTB CORPORA-TION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS).		
Do	MARTIN BAKER AIRCRAFT COMPANY LTD		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MERRILL LYNCH CAPITAL INVESTMENTS).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MOTOROLA, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL INSURANCE COALITION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: QUIXOTE CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALEN DRY CARGO, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NICHOLAS SALGO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SHAKLEE CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: STROH BREWERY CO).		
Do	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: TOBACCO INSTITUTE)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: U.S. BANK-NOTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: WARNER COMMUNICATIONS).		
JOHN F. GRAYBEAL, SUITE 1000 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY LARDNER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: LAWYERS TITLE INSURANCE CORP)		
MARK E. GRAYSON, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HILL & KNOWLTON, INC		
SAMUEL A. GRAYSON, P.O. BOX 1745 BOISE ID 83701	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD		
GREAT AMERICAN RESERVE INSURANCE CO, 2020 LIVE OAK P.O. BOX 388 DALLAS TX 75221			11,161.58
GREATER WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE, 1129 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
JAMES R. GRECO, P.O. BOX 3151 HOUSTON TX 77001	BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC	5,000.00	1,135.66
DONALD R. GREELEY, 1101 17TH ST., NW, #307 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CELANESE CORP	1,500.00	309.30
GEORGE R. GREEN, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	450.00	
JAMES W. GREEN, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
LAURA MARIE GREEN, 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD SPRINGFIELD VA 22160	NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE	800.00	282.00
LEON GREEN JR., 2101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CLEAN COAL COALITION, INC		
ROY G. GREEN, 1709 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	1,127.00	
JANE E. GREENBAUM, SUITE 210 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HALLMARK CARDS, INC		
ALLEN GREENBERG, SUITE 708 2000 P STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HEALTH RESEARCH GROUP	5.66	
ELDON V. C. GREENBERG, GALLOWAY & GREENBERG 1725 EYE STREE, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SOUTHEASTERN FISHERIES ASSN, INC	4,500.00	1,158.28
LOUISE S. GREENFIELD, 215 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	CONGRESS WATCH	3,125.00	
ROBERT GREENSTEIN, 236 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	CENTER ON BUDGET & POLICY PRIORITIES	706.29	60.00

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
DALE W. GREENWOOD, 612 HOGE BLDG. SEATTLE WA 98104	WASHINGTON RAILROAD ASSN		
JOHN M. GREER, 1900 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL UNION, AFL-CIO, CLC	38,000.00	40,214.00
SAUNDERS GREGG, PO BOX 2628 HOUSTON TX 77001	ENTEX, INC		32.00
CHELLIS O. GREGORY, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HILL AND KNOWLTON, INC (FOR: T. RAMIREZ AND COMPANY, INC)	4,350.00	159.25
JANICE M. GREGORY, 1726 M ST., #704 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ERISA INDUSTRY COUNCIL	4,375.00	
JOHN D. GREGORY, AUSTIN & LEWIS 1529 LAUREL STREET, P.O. BOX 11208 COLUMBIA SC 29211	NATIONAL MULTIFAMILY HOUSING FINANCE ASSN		2,208.43
WILLIAM G. GREIF, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BRISTOL-MYERS CO	45,000.00	
RANDALL GRIFFIN, 1515 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,000.00	305.88
TOM W. GRIFFITH, SUITE 100 1448 DUKE ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN	7,023.00	
MARK N. GRIFFITHS, 1776 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	200.00	
JACK GRIMES, 8100 OAK STREET DUNN LORING VA 22027	NATIONAL PEST CONTROL ASSN		
NORMAN E. GRIMM JR., 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
OLGA GRKAVAC, 1300 NORTH 17TH STREET SUITE 300 ARLINGTON VA 22209	ASSOCIATION OF DATA PROCESSING SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS		
GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC., SUITE 800 1010 WISCONSIN AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007			496.73
HOWARD M. GROEDEL, 1000 POTOMAC STREET, NW, #302 WASHINGTON DC 20007	FEDERATION EMPLOYMENT & GUIDANCE SERVICE		
GROH EGGERS & PRICE, 550 WEST 7TH AVENUE, #1250 ANCHORAGE AK 99501	AMERICAN PETROFINA, INC	125.00	125.00
GROOM & NORDBERG, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AD HOC GROUP ON LIFE INSURANCE CO. TAXATION OF PENSION FUNDS		
Do	AETNA LIFE & CASUALTY		
Do	BANKERS LIFE COMPANY	200.00	6.00
Do	BAXTER TRAVENOL LABORATORIES, INC		
Do	COLORADO-UTE	100.00	4.00
Do	CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY		
Do	ELI LILLY AND COMPANY		
Do	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S.	200.00	6.00
Do	GLOBAL MARINE, INC		
Do	GOLDMAN SACHS & CO		
Do	GUARDIAN LIFE INSURANCE CO OF AMERICA	200.00	6.00
Do	GULF OIL CORP	300.00	8.00
Do	JOHN HANCOCK MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	200.00	6.00
Do	MINNESOTA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	200.00	6.00
Do	NEW YORK CITY TEACHERS RETIREMENT SYSTEM	100.00	4.00
Do	NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	200.00	6.00
Do	OCEAN DRILLING & EXPLORATION CO		
Do	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY	200.00	6.00
Do	PHOENIX MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY		
Do	PROVIDENT MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO OF PHILADELPHIA	200.00	6.00
Do	PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA	200.00	6.00
Do	READING & BATES CORPORATION		
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY	200.00	6.00
Do	TRAVELERS		
Do	UNION TEXAS PETROLEUM		
Do	WESTERN CONFERENCE OF TEAMSTERS PENSION TRUST FUND		
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	100.00	4.00
DAVID B. GROSS, P.O. DRAWER 1120 JACKSON MS 39265			
NINA G. GROSS, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	1,000.00	93.04
JEROME GROSSMAN, 11 BEACON ST. BOSTON MA 02108	COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD	3,669.72	
JOHN R. GROUNDWATER JR., 1840 WILSON BOULEVARD, #203 ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL LIMESTONE INST, INC	2,090.00	
WALTER B. GRUBBS, P.O. BOX 841 ABILENE TX 79604	WEST TEXAS UTILITIES CO	388.88	1,469.79
JOHN T. GRUPENHOFF, SUITE 306 10000 FALLS ROAD POTOMAC MD 20854	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DERMATOLOGY	1,600.00	145.70
Do	AMERICAN GASTROENTEROLOGICAL ASSN	2,820.00	402.60
Do	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR GASTROINTESTINAL ENDOSCOPY	2,820.00	402.60
Do	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN CANCER INSTITUTES	670.00	176.00
Do	COOLEY'S ANEMIA FOUNDATION		
JAMES E. GUIRARD JR., 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW, #419 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BASF WYANDOTTE CORP		330.00
Do	BELL AEROSPACE TEXTRON	1,000.00	490.00
Do	KMS FUSION, INC	3,000.00	690.00
Do	TANO CORPORATION	1,000.00	620.00
JEROME R. GULAN, 1604 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSN	4,500.00	
Do	SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	2,500.00	
GUN OWNERS OF AMERICA, INC., 5881 LEESBURG PIKE, #204 FALLS CHURCH VA 22041		324,713.21	327,539.86
DAVID GUSKY, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	9,989.58	
SUSAN L. GUSTAFSON, 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
ROBERT F. GUTHRIE, #608 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DEPARTMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO	6,645.84	
DANA W. HAAS, 1112 N. STAFFORD STREET, #B-1 ARLINGTON VA 22201	KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT CO, ET AL	2,375.00	527.20
JAMES M. HACKING, 1909 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	651.92	
CRAIG HACKLER, 412 FIRST ST., SE SUITE 214 WASHINGTON DC 20003	BENEFICIAL MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF AMERICA	3,000.00	
Do	CADILLAC FAIRVIEW U.S., INC		
Do	INTERNATIONAL CHIROPRACTIC ASSN		
Do	ST. JOE MINERALS CORPORATION		
LOYD HACKLER, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN RETAIL FEDERATION	2,000.00	97.25
CHARLES W. HACKNEY JR., 15TH & M STS., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S.		
WILLIAM F. HADDAD, 924 WEST END AVE., #91 NEW YORK NY 10025	GENERIC PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY ASSN	5,600.00	568.00
THOMAS M. HAGAN, 1510 AMERICAN BANK TOWER AUSTIN TX 78701	CENTRAL AND SOUTH WEST SERVICES, INC	2,060.08	4,338.34
THOMAS M. HAGEDORN, 1201 S. JEFF-DAVIS HIGHWAY, #301 ARLINGTON VA 22202	DAKOTA LAY'D EGG CO	4,500.00	
ANN HAGEMANN, 1150 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO, INC		
BRUCE N. HAHN, 9300 LIVINGSTON RD. WASHINGTON DC 20022	NATIONAL TOOLING & MACHINING ASSN	9,230.82	1,326.90
THOMAS F. HAIRSTON, SUITE 760 1050 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA	6,000.00	1,137.67
HALE AND DORR, SUITE 807 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	COMPO INDUSTRIES, INC	4,284.00	866.79
Do	DYCO PETROLEUM CO	5,064.64	2,109.34
Do	INDIAN LAND CLAIM COMMITTEE		
Do	INEXCO OIL CO	5,064.64	2,109.34
Do	MEOH, INC		
Do	TOWN OF MASHPEE		
Do	17TH GUAM LEGISLATURE	10,000.00	4,008.79
HALE FOUNDATION, 422 FIRST STREET, SE, #208 WASHINGTON DC 20003		25,742.00	16,168.00
RANDOLPH M. HALE, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS		
BEVERLY HALEM, 414 HIGHPOINT DR. COCA FL 32926	HALEM INDUSTRIES, INC		
HALEY BADER & POTTS, SUITE 600 2000 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PILOTS RIGHTS ASSOCIATION	747.47	46.59
CHERYL A. HALEY, 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN	1,246.72	287.11
MARTIN HALEY COMPANIES, 1015 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ENERGY INC		
Do	CENTRAL TEXAS GRAIN PRODUCTS MARKETING COOPERATIVE		
Do	M&M/MARS		
REBECCA L. HALKIAS, 1850 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BALLARD, SPAHR, ANDREWS & INGERSOLL		
DEBI HALL, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC	2,500.00	
HALL ESTILL HARDWICK GABLE COLLINGSWORTH & NELSON, SUITE 350 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WILLIAMS COMPANIES	100.00	
JOHN F. HALL, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	300.00	
RICHARD F. HALL, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #760 WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA	2,000.00	1,142.81
WILLIAM F. HALL, P.O. BOX 5880 CHICAGO IL 60680			
MARIAN HALL-CRAWFORD, 316 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE, #301 WASHINGTON DC 20003	SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	1,125.00	2,273.63
KIMBERLEY C. HALLAMORE, 1725 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, EMBASSY		
PAUL HALLISAY, 1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSN, INT'L	3,551.60	232.22
HALLMARK CARDS, INC, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004			2,000.00
JOSEPH HALOW, SUITE 610-N 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NORTH AMERICAN EXPORT GRAIN ASSN., INC		
MAURICE E. HALSEY, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #501 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NORTHERN ILLINOIS GAS COMPANY	5,000.00	
J. PHILLIP HALSTEAD, P.O. BOX 24305 OAKLAND CA 94623	CLOROX COMPANY		
PAUL T. HALUZA, SUITE 333 1120 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOTOR AND EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION	3,000.00	378.30
JERALD V. HALVORSEN, COAL BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COAL ASSN	8,300.00	2,955.07
HAMEL & PARK, 888 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BENEFICIAL FOUNDATION		
Do	COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO		
Do	ESTATE OF HELEN WODELL HALBACH		
Do	GRAEPER-VAN NOY-WAGNER, INC		
Do	SKYLINK CORPORATION, INC		
Do	TANDY CORPORATION		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	UNITED STUDENT AID FUNDS, INC		
JAMES L. HAMILTON III, 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. STEEL CORPORATION	430.50	190.52
J. LEE HAMILTON, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	190.00	
PHILIP W. HAMILTON, 2029 K STREET, NW, #603 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERS		
STANLEY HAMILTON, 1616 P ST., NW, #204 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERSTATE CARRIERS CONFERENCE	500.00	50.00
WILLIAM W. HAMILTON JR., SUITE 500 2010 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, INC.	370.79	75.23
SUSAN WOODWARD HAMLIN, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
AMY R. HAMMER, SUITE 1100 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EXXON CORPORATION		930.15
ROBERT E. HAMPTON, NEW MURPHY ROAD & CONCORD PIKE WILMINGTON DE 19897	ICI AMERICAS, INC		
TIMOTHY A. HANAN, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOBIL CORPORATION	1,500.00	
NOLAN W. HANCOCK, 1126 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OIL, CHEMICAL & ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION	5,387.00	
TED HANDEL, THIRD FLOOR 2301 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN	3,000.00	
GEORGE J. HANKS JR , 12TH FL. 1100 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	UNION CARBIDE CORP		
JAMES M. HANLEY, JAMES M. HANLEY AND ASSOCIATES 1301 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #1150 WASHINGTON DC 20004.	ALLIANCE OF THIRD CLASS NON-PROFIT MAILERS	12,501.00	600.00
ELIZABETH HANLIN, SUITE 810 2000 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SPERRY CORPORATION		
HANNAFORD CO., INC., SUITE 200 655 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP CO, INC		
Do	CENTURY 21 REAL ESTATE CORP		
Do	CHINA EXTERNAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL		
Do	COMMITTEE FOR FAIR INSURANCE RATES		
Do	FIREMAN'S FUND INSURANCE COS		
Do	GENERAL MOTORS CORP		
Do	ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORP		
Do	TOSCO OIL CORPORATION		
Do	TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC		
HANSELL & POST, 1915 EYE STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN SECURITY INSURANCE COMPANY	1,048.00	60.89
Do	AMEV HOLDINGS, INC		1,192.00
Do	ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORP		.81
ERLING HANSEN, 624 9TH ST., NW, 7TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20001	GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.		
J. E. HANSEN, 400 1ST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD SIGNALMEN	350.00	
PETER J. HAPWORTH, 1511 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SUGAR ASSOCIATION, INC.	500.00	9.00
H. P. (TREY) HARBERT III, 2121 SAN JACINTO STREET, #2500 P.O. BOX 660164 DALLAS TX 75266	CENTRAL & SOUTH WEST CORP		
RALPH HARDING, SUITE 717 WATERGATE 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	PHILIPPINE SUGAR COMMISSION	60,000.00	28,036.00
WILLIAM E. HARDMAN, 9300 LIVINGSTON ROAD FT. WASHINGTON MD 20744	NATIONAL TOOLING & MACHINING ASSN	33,665.64	
EUGENE J. HARDY, SUITE 1000 1100 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GERBER PRODUCTS COMPANY	500.00	16.50
STEPHEN J. HARDY, JR., 4409 DUKE STREET, #101			
J. RICHARD HARGIS, 2550 M STREET, NW, #770 WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	315.33	79.15
CHARLES N. HARKEY, 453 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	BENEFICIAL MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF AMERICA		
DAN R. HARLOW, 717 N. HARWOOD STREET DALLAS TX 75201	DIAMOND SHAMROCK CORPORATION	1,000.00	
DONALD L. HARLOW, 310 RILEY ST. FALLS CHURCH VA 22046	AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSN, INC		
LEON HARPER, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	250.00	41.38
WILEY C. HARRELL JR , 1211 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #502 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES, INC		
MICHAEL T. HARRIGAN, 421 KING STREET, #214 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE		10.00
MARCIA L. HARRINGTON, 110 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE, #409 WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY CAMPAIGN	4,750.00	
TONI HARRINGTON, 955 L'ENFANT PLAZA NORTH, SW, #905 WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO, INC	200.00	95.14
HARRIS BERG & CRESKOFF, 1100 15TH STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF FOOD INDUSTRIES, INC.	525.00	15.35
Do	COMMITTEE OF DOMESTIC STEEL WIRE ROPE & SPECIALTY CABLE MFRS	1,272.50	19.24
Do	P. L. THOMAS & COMPANY, INC, ET AL	2,167.65	22.11
GARY K. HARRIS, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ROGOVIN, HUGE & LENZNER (FOR: CKLW RADIO BROADCASTING, LTD)	200.00	
MARILYN A. HARRIS, 818 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. STEEL CORPORATION	800.00	45.69
ROBERT L. HARRIS, 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALUMINUM ASSN		50.00
JIM HARRISON, SUITE 228 1346 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES	5,625.00	
J. WILLIAM W. HARSCH, 1825 K STREET, NW, #503 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ANDREW L. LUI AND ASPEN TECHNOLOGY, INC		686.91
WILLIAM H. HARSHA, 1102 DELF DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22101	WILLIAM H. HARSHA & ASSOCIATES, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC) .	7,500.00	
Do	WILLIAM H. HARSHA & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: CECOS INTERNATIONAL)	6,000.00	93.81
Do	WILLIAM H. HARSHA & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: ECOLOGICAL PROFESSIONAL INDUSTRIES, INC).		
LYNN S. HART, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN		218.75
HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE CO, HARTFORD PLAZA HARTFORD CT 06115			16,649.00
MARY L. HARTMAN, 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
ARTHUR W. HARTMANN, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN		
HARTZ/MEEK INTERNATIONAL, 806 15TH STREET, NW, #210 WASHINGTON DC 20005	CHOUTEAU TELEPHONE CO & TOTAH TELEPHONE CO	1,000.00	
EDMUND E. HARVEY, CHADBOURNE, PARKE, WHITESIDE & WOLFF 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC		
EDWIN HAROLD HARVEY, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
JAY HARVEY, 815 16TH STREET, NW, #408 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD & ALLIED SERVICE TRADES DEPT, AFL-CIO	576.92	211.53
CLIFFORD J. HARVISON, 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TANK TRUCK CARRIERS, INC		
HOLLY HASSETT, 2000 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	HERSHEY FOODS CORP		
WALTER A. HASTY JR , 801 18TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PROCTER & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO	221.35	
JANET HATHAWAY, 215 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	CONGRESS WATCH	3,208.33	
GARY R. HATTAL, 818 ROEDER ROAD SUITE 702 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
MELINDA R. HATTON, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF OPHTHALMOLOGY		
BARBARA S. HAUGEN, 311 FIRST STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL ASSN OF INSURANCE BROKERS		
BARBARA J. HAUGH, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #760 WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA		1,521.96
RODNEY E. HAUGH, 1711 KING STREET, #903 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	POTATO CHIP/SNACK FOOD ASSOCIATION	600.00	
MARY W. HAUGHT, 1800 K ST., NW, #820 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SUN CO, INC	700.00	
CHARLES W. HAVENS III, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE		
KATHRYN JOANN HAWES, SUITE 702 818 ROEDER RD. SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
SIDNEY G. HAWKES, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MEAD CORPORATION	600.00	45.00
CHARLES E. HAWKINS III, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC	2,500.00	
DAVID G. HAWKINS, 1725 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC	4,202.02	7.30
JOHN H. HAWKINS JR , 600 N. 18TH ST. BIRMINGHAM AL 35291	ALABAMA POWER CO	13,515.00	1,042.36
PAUL M. HAWKINS, 25 AUDUBON PLACE HILTON HEAD SC 29928	COLONIAL LIFE & ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO	500.00	673.73
BRUCE R. HAWLEY, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	7,800.00	10.25
WESLEY F. HAYDEN, 5224 CHEROKEE AVE. ALEXANDRIA VA 22312	INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES	8,131.87	41.55
ROBERT A. HAYNOS, 4711 HUNT CIRCLE HARRISBURG PA 17112	HARSCO CORPORATION	12,250.00	964.04
HEALTH INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		279.99	279.99
HEALTH RESEARCH GROUP, SUITE 708 2000 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		22.86	22.86
PATRICK B. HEALY, 1840 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FED	543.75	
ROBERT L. HEALY, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO	300.00	
CHARLES L. HEBNER, NEW MURPHY ROAD & CONCORD PIKE WILMINGTON DE 19897	ICI AMERICAS, INC		
JAY HEDLUND, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	9,323.80	1,178.57
HEFFERNAN & MOSEMAN, P.C., 1875 EYE STREET, NW, #1025 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP CO	2,500.00	1,718.99
EDWARD D. HEFFERNAN, 1875 EYE ST., NW, # 1025 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CAMP, CARMOUCHE, BARSH, HUNTER, GRAY & HOFFMAN, P.C.	12,000.00	
Do	DUCTILE IRON PIPE RESEARCH ASSN		
Do	HAZELTINE CORPORATION	6,000.00	8.96
Do	SHELL OIL CO	2,000.00	
JOAN A. HEFFERNAN, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	1,140.00	22.78
JOHN HEFFNER, 1957 E STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
ELIZABETH W. HEILIG, 1660 L STREET, NW, #215 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CROWN ZELLERABACH CORPORATION		
JOHN F. HEILMAN, 807 MAINE AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS	16,348.80	1,847.78
ROBERT M. HEINE, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONOCO, INC	1,000.00	
JOHN R. HEISSE II , SUITE 900 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF DEMOLITION CONTRACTORS		
RICHARD L. HELLWEGE, 1911 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #1002 ARLINGTON VA 22202	LEAR SIEGLER, INC		
THOMAS M. HELSCHER, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #604 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MONSANTO CO	450.00	152.32
ALBERTA L. HENDERSON, 1100 15TH STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	2,000.00	4.00
CAROL C. HENDERSON, 110 MARYLAND AVE., NE, #101, BOX 54 WASHINGTON DC 20002	AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSN	837.00	
JOHN B. HENDERSON, SUITE 1100 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXTRON, INC		
KATHLEEN M. HENDERSON, 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MILES LABORATORIES, INC		
RICHARD DEAN HENDERSON, 2022 P STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PRIVATE TRUCK COUNCIL OF AMER, INC		40.00
CAROL DIANE HENDRICKS, 2601 PARK CENTER DRIVE, #C804 ALEXANDRIA VA 22302	AMERICAN MARITIME OFFICERS SERVICE	9,000.00	1,000.00
DENNIS A. HENIGAN, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY LARDNER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: VGS CORPORATION)		
EDMUND P. HENNELLY, 150 E. 42ND ST. NEW YORK NY 10017	MOBIL OIL CORP	1,500.00	
GEORGE F. HENNRIKUS JR , 201 N. WASHINGTON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	RETIRED OFFICERS ASSN	5,416.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
LEANN HENSCHE, 2550 M STREET, NW SUITE 770 WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	263.74	102.79
BRUCE HEPPEN, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
STEPHEN HERM, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FED OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
HERON BURCHETTE RUCKERT & ROTHWELL, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #420 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AGRI-ENERGY, INC		292.32
Do	ASSOCIATION OF FLORAL IMPORTERS OF FLORIDA	233.25	49.84
Do	CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE	2,546.25	524.81
Do	CHICAGO MERCANTILE EXCHANGE	4,402.25	1,663.47
Do	FARM LABOR ALLIANCE	32,777.50	15,185.98
Do	IMPERIAL VALLEY ASPARAGUS GROWERS ASSN	185.59	4.34
Do	INDEPENDENT CEMENT CORP	1,781.25	375.71
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS	850.00	78.14
Do	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN	525.00	2,263.58
Do	NATIONAL POTATO COUNCIL	445.40	143.53
Do	SOLID-TEK SYSTEMS, INC	3,015.88	683.68
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT	1,400.00	1,057.85
Do	SUN-DIAMOND GROWERS OF CALIFORNIA	4,197.58	1,350.74
Do	SUNKIST GROWERS, INC	10,848.55	1,679.86
Do	WESTERN COTTON GROWERS ASSN	100.00	40.31
CATHERINE L. HERON, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE	87.90	51.57
CAROL M. HERRINGTON, 1235 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON VA 22202	EMERSON ELECTRIC CO		
WILLIAM G. HERROLD, SUITE 608 1111 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL & ELECTRONICS ENGINEERS		
FRED HERVEY, P.O. BOX 20230 4500 SOUTH 40TH STREET PHOENIX AZ 85036	CIRCLE K CORPORATION		
Do	REDUCE OUR DEBT FOUNDATION		4.95
BARBARA V. HESS, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA	1,000.00	500.00
HEUBLEIN, INC., MUNSON ROAD FARMINGTON CT 06032			18,697.00
TED ALLEN HEYDINGER, 1615 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	1,400.00	159.29
G. BROCKWEL HEYLIN, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
PAUL T. HICKS, RHODE ISLAND PETROLEUM ASSN 154 FRANCIS ST. PROVIDENCE RI 02903	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
J. THOMAS HIGGINBOTHAM, ONE MELLON BANK CENTER, #2002 PITTSBURGH PA 15258	MELLON BANK N.A. AND MELLON NATIONAL CORP	2,000.00	1,448.10
LAWRENCE P. HIGGINS, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
SHARON L. HILDEBRANDT, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN		
CLIFTON T. HILDERLEY JR., SUITE 507 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASHLAND OIL, INC	2,000.00	
HILL BETTS & NASH, 1220 19TH STREET, NW, #302 WASHINGTON DC 20036	LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO, INC		
GERALD 'JERRY' HILL, 6 EXECUTIVE PARK DRIVE ATLANTA GA 30329	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)		
J. ELDRED HILL JR , SUITE 603 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	UBA, INC	2,000.00	
MORTON A. HILL, 475 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, #239 NEW YORK NY 10115	MORALITY IN MEDIA, INC		
PATRICIA HILL, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC	1,968.75	135.00
ROBERT B. HILL, 2501 M STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC	300.00	
E. JOSEPH HILLINGS, 1627 K STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FLUOR CORPORATION	15,000.00	861.74
CORNISH F. HITCHCOCK, SUITE 700 2000 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AVIATION CONSUMER ACTION PROJECT		20.00
STEPHEN HITCHNER, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	12,760.02	13.25
J.D. HITTLE, 3137 S. 14TH ST. ARLINGTON VA	VOUGHT CORP	2,500.00	131.30
SHEILA K. HIXSON, 1101 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN	1,000.00	
LAWRENCE S. HOBART, 2301 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN	1,000.00	
CLAUDE E. HOBBS, 1801 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	1,250.00	60.00
CARL D. HOBELMAN, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE (FOR: EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE)		
HOWARD E. HOELTER, ILLINOIS PETROLEUM COUNCIL P.O. BOX 5034 SPRINGFIELD IL 62705	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	333.00	740.30
IRVIN A. HOFF, 20 N. LIVE OAK RD. HILTON HEAD ISLAND SC 29928	U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS' ASSN		
JOHN S. HOFF, 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	SWIDLER BERLIN & STRELOW (FOR: HOLY CROSS HOSPITAL)		
ELMO R. HOFFMAN, PARKER, JOHNSON, OWEN & MCGUIRE 108 EAST HILLCREST STREET P.O. BOX 2867 ORLANDO FL 32801.	GLOBAL EXPLORATION & DEVELOPMENT CORP		
THOMAS F. HOFFMAN, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONSOLIDATION COAL CO	13.86	4.00
WILLIAM L. HOFFMAN, 516 FIRST ST., S.E. WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT	10,395.00	1,646.07
F. NORDY HOFFMANN AND ASSOC., INC, SUITE 327 400 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND COMPANY		
Do	INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORPORATION	1,000.00	
Do	MARINE ENGINEERS BENEFICIAL ASSN	1,000.00	
Do	O'CONNOR & HANNAN		
Do	PAGE AIRWAYS		
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC		
HOGAN & HARTSON, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHRIS-CRAFT INDUSTRIES, INC	19,290.00	
Do	CLEVELAND CLINIC FOUNDATION		
Do	COUNCIL OF EUROPEAN & JAPANESE NATIONAL SHIPOWNERS' ASSN		
Do	MEDTRONIC, INC		
Do	MEHARRY MEDICAL COLLEGE		
Do	MERCEDES-BENZ OF NORTH AMERICA, INC	3,390.00	
Do	METHODIST HOSPITAL		
Do	MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO OF NEW YORK	3,740.00	
Do	NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION		
Do	NATIONAL HOSPICE EDUCATION PROJECT		
Do	NATIONAL HOSPICE ORGANIZATION		
Do	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN	6,032.50	
Do	PILLSBURY COMPANY	262.50	
Do	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC	8,905.00	30.00
RICHARD F. HOHLT, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW SUITE 801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	5,776.00	45.10
WALTER HOLAN, 20 NORTH WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO IL 60606	PROFIT SHARING COUNCIL OF AMER		
WILLIAM J. HOLAYTER, 1300 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS	7,297.68	78.20
BRUCE E. HOLBEIN, 111 POWDERMILL RD. (B79) MAYNARD MA 01754	DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CORPORATION	12,500.00	
MICHELE O'DONNELL HOLBROOK, 10 LAFAYETTE SQUARE ROOM 900 BUFFALO NY 14203	NATIONAL FUEL GAS DISTRIBUTION CORP., ET AL	1,136.20	2,693.19
NIELS HOLCH, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL MULTI-HOUSING COUNCIL).	2,200.00	
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE).	55.00	
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN MARITIME ASSN).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ANEUTRONIX, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC.).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO).	550.00	
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: FINANCIAL INVESTMENT ASSOCIATES, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: QUIXOTE CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SHAKLEE CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: TOBACCO INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: U.S. BANKNOTE).		
PHILIP C. HOLLADAY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHELL OIL COMPANY	500.00	
KENNETH L. HOLLAND, P.O. DRAWER 940 GAFFNEY SC 29342	AMERICAN PETROCHEMICAL CONSUMERS	50,000.00	1,550.33
Do	LIBERTY CORPORATION	30,625.00	4,437.27
WENDELL M. HOLLOWAY, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO	2,490.00	1,649.50
MOSES D. HOLMES JR , 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,535.00	118.75
PETER E. HOLMES, 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	500.00	
E.Y. HOLT JR , 1111 NORTH 19TH ST., #700 ARLINGTON VA 22209	NATIONAL ASSN OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS		
A. LINWOOD HOLTON JR , 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	300.00	
PAUL R. HOLTZ, 1101 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN	3,000.00	
MARC L. HOLTZMAN, 214 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #340 WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL COALITION FOR LOWER PRICES	6,000.00	40.39
LOIS HOLWERDA - HOYT, SUITE 875 122 C ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSN	1,500.00	
HOME RECORDING RIGHTS COALITION, P.O. BOX 33576 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20033		258,954.41	224,522.92
GARY C. HONG, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20037	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF HEALTH CENTERS	385.00	6.00

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
KAREN C. HONTZ, SUITE 940 1875 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	GULF & WESTERN MANAGEMENT COMPANY	625.00	105.60
HOOG & ASSOCIATES, 1877 BROADWAY, #405 BOULDER CO 80302	DENELCOR, INC.		
ANNA MARY HOOVLER, 9300 LIVINGSTON ROAD FORT WASHINGTON MD 20744	NATIONAL TOOLING & MACHINING ASSN	5,021.95	256.45
VIRGINIA E. HOPKINS, 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: MIAMI CONSERVANCY DISTRICT)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: SHERWIN-WILLIAMS CO)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: TAFT BROADCASTING COMPANY)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: TELEPHONE AND DATA SYSTEMS, INC.)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: WALD MANUFACTURING CO, INC)		
ROBERT JACK HORN, SUITE 480 1990 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DETROIT EDISON COMPANY	730.00	30.00
HARRY J. HORROCKS II , 40 IVY STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL LUMBER & BUILDING MATERIAL DEALERS ASSN	8,334.00	28.21
SANFORD D. HORWITT, 5935 N. 5TH ROAD ARLINGTON VA 22203	COMMITTEE FOR HUMANE LEGISLATION, INC.	4,000.00	58.63
HOSPITAL CORP OF AMERICA, 2000 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20035			21,327.50
WILLIAM J. HOTES, 919 18TH ST., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DIAMOND SHAMROCK CORPORATION	1,000.00	533.01
HOUDAILLE INDUSTRIES, INC, ONE FINANCIAL PLAZA FORT LAUDERDALE FL 33394			
MARGARET A. HOULIHAN, 1620 I ST., NW, #703 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
THOMAS B. HOUSE, 1700 OLD MEADOW RD. MCLEAN VA 22102	AMERICAN FROZEN FOOD INST	1,000.00	
HOUSLEY GOLDBERG & KANTARIAN, P.C., SUITE 500 2301 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	HOUSLEY, GOLDBERG & KANTARIAN, P.C.		
MARY GREER HOUSTON, 1901 L ST., NW #804 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SIEGEL HOUSTON & ASSOC., INC. (FOR: FARM LABOR RESEARCH COMM)		
HOUSTON NATURAL GAS CORP, P.O. BOX 1188 HOUSTON TX 77001			163.45
HOVING GROUP, 2550 M STREET, NW, #695 WASHINGTON DC 20037	EAGLE-PICHER INDUSTRIES	250.00	
GERALD M. HOWARD, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,750.00	31.64
ROBERT M. HOWARD, 815 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO	1,397.40	1,081.60
GARY HOWELL, 1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #1006 ARLINGTON VA 22202	TEXAS INSTRUMENTS, INC	250.00	
J. WILLIAM HOWELL, 1801 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP.	521.55	41.19
MARY J. LYNCH HOWELL, SUITE 1100 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXTRON, INC.	1,500.00	280.00
JOHN B. HOWERTON, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW, #209 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASARCO INC.	2,000.00	
PAUL R. HUARD, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	2,000.00	
BETTY HUDSON, 1627 K STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FLUOR CORPORATION	10,000.00	270.09
HUDSON LEFTWICH & DAVENPORT, SUITE 806 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CITY OF DETROIT		
MARGARET RENKEN HUDSON, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #695 WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FED OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS	2,250.00	200.00
STEVEN D. HUFF, 111 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, #1800 MILWAUKEE WI 53202	NATIONAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS INST	2,000.00	
HARRY HUGE, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ROGOVIN, HUGE & LENZNER (FOR: CKLW RADIO BROADCASTING, LTD)		
DAVID EMERY HUGHES, 2211 CONGRESS ST. PORTLAND ME 04122	UNION MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO		
DEBORAH HUGHES, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	1,310.61	
GARY E. HUGHES, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC.		
HUGHES HUBBARD & REED, SUITE 300 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE		
Do	CONTINENTAL AIR LINES, INC.		
Do	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC.	275.00	2.00
Do	TEXAS AIR CORP		
PETER W. HUGHES, 1909 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	1,040.31	
VESTER T. HUGHES JR., HUGHES & HILL 1000 MERCANTILE DALLAS BUILDING DALLAS TX 75201	FIDELITY UNION LIFE INSURANCE CO	500.00	2,176.00
Do	SAMMONS ENTERPRISES, INC.		
VINCENT C. HUGHES, 1235 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #500 ARLINGTON VA 22202	ITALIAN AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES (U.S.A.), INC.		
WILLIAM HUGHES, 1522 K ST., NW, #836 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF FEDERAL VETERINARIANS	35.80	
EDWARD L. HUIE, WHEATON PLAZA NORTH, #415 WHEATON MD 20902	NATIONAL ASSN OF AIR TRAFFIC SPECIALISTS	5,714.52	921.84
CORDELL W. HULL, 50 BEALE ST., P O BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
DAVID C. HULL, 1918 N. PARKWAY MEMPHIS TN 38112	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER		
MARGOT SMILEY HUMPHREY, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	KOTEEN & NAFTALIN (FOR: ALASCOM, INC)	490.00	
Do	KOTEEN & NAFTALIN (FOR: TELEPHONE & DATA SYSTEMS, INC)		29.00
ROBERT R. HUMPHREYS, 1915 EYE ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION	1,025.00	515.00
Do	HELEN KELLER NATIONAL CENTER	1,250.00	160.00
K. ADRIAN HUNNINGS, 1030 15TH STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA	270.00	4.13
FRANCIS M. HUNT, 1800 M STREET, NW, #700S WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CHEMICAL CO	500.00	249.00
JAMES W. HUNT, 10210 N. CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY, #500 DALLAS TX 75231	CENERGY EXPLORATION CO		30,651.67
PETER C. HUNT, 195 MONTAGUE ST. BROOKLYN NY 11201	BROOKLYN UNION GAS CO		
JAMES C. HUNTER, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CITIES SERVICE OIL & GAS CORP	444.00	229.40
MICHAEL M. HUNTER, 1707 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORPORATION		1,025.00
MILTON F. HUNTINGTON, MAINE PETROLEUM ASSN 283 WATER ST. AUGUSTA ME 04330	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	300.00	838.23
HUNTON & WILLIAMS, P.O. BOX 1535 RICHMOND VA 23212	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	8,192.50	267.63
J. JAMES HUR, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO		
ADELE M. HURLEY, 112 ST. CLAIR AVE., WEST SUITE 504 TORONTO,ONTARIO, CANADA M4V 2Y	CANADIAN COALITION ON ACID RAIN	2,615.44	182.00
GERARD F. HURLEY, 1625 I ST., NW, #609 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL CLUB ASSOCIATION		
ROBERT R. HURT, SUITE 650 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MERCK & CO., INC.		
CATHY HURWIT, 1300 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITIZEN/LABOR ENERGY COALITION	4,500.00	107.00
BENJAMIN MELVIN HURWITZ, SUITE 200 1925 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MITCHELL ENERGY & DEVELOPMENT CORP		175.00
GEOFFREY B. HURWITZ, SUITE 743 1434 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY	500.00	148.07
RAYMOND W. HUSSEY, 29400 LAKELAND BLVD. WICKLIFFE OH 44092	LUBRIZOL CORPORATION	700.00	1,085.87
DEWEY M. HUTCHINS, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, # 705 WASHINGTON DC 20006	EASTMAN KODAK CO	500.00	178.00
PHILIP A. HUTCHINSON, 475 L'ENFANT PLAZA, #3210 WASHINGTON DC 20024	VOLKSWAGEN OF AMERICA, INC	250.00	
ROBERT E. HUTCHINSON, P.O. BOX 20230 4500 SOUTH 40TH STREET PHOENIX AZ 85036	CIRCLE K CORPORATION		
Do	REDUCE OUR DEBT FOUNDATION		4.95
JAMES L. HUTCHISON, 260 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10016	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
RANDY HUWA, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	9,770.46	1,757.28
B. F. HYDE, TENNESSEE PETROLEUM COUNCIL 211 7TH AVENUE, NORTH, 4TH FL. NASHVILLE TN 37219	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	40.00	
GARY HYMEL, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN MARITIME ASSN).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ANEUTRONIX, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ASARCO INC)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BATUS)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC.).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BUDD COMPANY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: CANADIAN ASBESTOS INFORMATION CENTRE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: FINANCIAL INVESTMENT ASSOCIATES, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: HEALTH INSURANCE ASSN OF AMERICA).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: HTB CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MARTIN BAKER AIRCRAFT COMPANY LTD.).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MERRILL LYNCH CAPITAL INVESTMENTS).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MOTOROLA, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL INSURANCE COALITION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL).	270.00	
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NIU, INC)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: QUIXOTE CORPORATION).	135.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY).	1,620.00	
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALEN DRY CARGO, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SANTA FE INTERNATIONAL).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SHAKLEE CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS COALITION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: TOBACCO INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: U.S. BANKNOTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC).		
ROBERT D. HYNES JR , SUITE 807 1825 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO, INC.	500.00	40.97
ICE MILLER DONADIO & RYAN, BOX 82001 ONE AMERICAN SQUARE INDIANAPOLIS IN 46282	MARION GENERAL HOSPITAL, ET AL.	356.50	39.77
RICHARD H. ICHORD, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20003	AAI CORPORATION	828.50	320.77
Do	EMERSON ELECTRIC CO	600.00	385.97
Do	MAGNAVOX CORPORATION	440.00	
Do	WASHINGTON INDUSTRIAL TEAM, INC.	600.00	
RONALD K. IKEJIRI, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW, #204 WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE	19,525.00	10,603.49
ANNELISE ILSCHENKO, 101 S. REYNOLDS STREET, #H-116 ALEXANDRIA VA 22304			
INDEPENDENT DATA COMMUNICATIONS MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, C/O SQUIRE SANDERS & DEMPSEY 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004.		9,536.00	9,536.00
INDEPENDENT LUBRICANT MANUFACTURERS ASSN, 1055 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007			
INDIANA RAILROAD ASSN, 143 W. MARKET STREET, #201 INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204		1,900.00	1,110.22
INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		23,775.60	23,775.60
EDWIN T. C. ING, CADES SCHUTTE FLEMING & WRIGHT 1001 22ND STREET, #740 WASHINGTON DC 20037	HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.	4,650.00	
NANCY J. INGALSBEE, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. RECREATIONAL SKI ASSOCIATION		
INGRAM TANKSHIPS, INC, 4100 ONE SHELL SQUARE NEW ORLEANS LA 70139			
ANDREA L. INNES, 1130 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COAL ASSN.	5,125.00	547.11
INSTITUTE OF MAKERS OF EXPLOSIVES, 1575 EYE STREET, NW, #550 WASHINGTON DC 20005			56.34
INSURANCE ECONOMICS SOCIETY OF AMERICA, SUITE 590 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006		340.00	5,500.00
INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF BRIDGE, STRUCT. & ORNAMENTAL IRON WKRS, 1750 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006.			10,800.00
INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS, 1300 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			27,333.78
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, 25 LOUISIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001			61,277.04
INTERNATIONAL GOLD CORPORATION LIMITED, 900 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10022			
INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO, 17 BATTERY PLACE SUITE 1500 NEW YORK NY 10004			40,058.49
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BRICKLAYERS & ALLIED CRAFTSMEN, 815 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			7,409.15
INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE, 1775 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			3,387.57
INVESTMENT COUNSEL ASSN OF AMERICA, INC., 50 BROAD ST. NEW YORK NY 10004			
CHARLES C. IRIONS, 400 ARMY-NAVY DR. ARLINGTON VA 22202	AMERICAN MOVERS CONFERENCE	1,046.00	
THOMAS L. IRMEN, P.O. BOX 119 MAUMEE OH 43537	ANDERSONS		
IRON ORE LESSORS ASSN, INC, 1500 FIRST NATL BANK BLDG. SAINT PAUL MN 55101		12,026.94	14,911.64
JOHN ISAACS, 100 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD	7,397.66	635.55
ITEL CORPORATION, CONTAINER DIVISION, #2 EMBARCADERO CENTER 24TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111			
IVINS PHILLPS & BARKER, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	EMPLOYERS COUNCIL ON FLEXIBLE COMPENSATION	42,438.56	9,606.29
ROBERT A. JABLON, SPIEGEL & MCDIARMID 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	FT. PIERCE UTILITIES AUTH OF THE CITY OF FT. PIERCE, ET AL.		
CARLTON JACKSON, FLORIDA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 111 N. GADSDEN STREET TALLAHASSEE FL 32301	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	2,062.50	2,406.50
CHARLES L. JACKSON, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHOOSHAN & JACKSON, INC (FOR: ROGERS U.S. CABLESYSTEMS, INC)		
MERCER L. JACKSON, 1101 17TH ST., NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS, INC.	1,500.00	
NEAL A. JACKSON, 1156 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CAROLINAS COTTON GROWERS ASSN, INC.	4,965.50	85.74
ROBERT S. JACKSON, 1133 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MCI COMMUNICATIONS CORP	12,375.00	80,791.23
WILLIAM P. JACKSON JR., JACKSON & JESSUP, P.C. 3426 N. WASHINGTON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22201	OSBORNE TRUCK LINE, INC, ET AL.	7,000.63	10,637.11
ROY T. JACOBSEN, GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMURCON CORPORATOIN		
Do	BEZTAK COMPANY		
Do	CAC ASSOCIATES		
Do	DETROIT & MACKINAC RAILWAY COMPANY		
Do	GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS		
Do	GRAND TRAVERSE DEVELOPMENT, INC.		
Do	LINEAR AIR MOTORS		
Do	MOVE DETROIT FORWARD FUND		
Do	NETCO		
Do	POTTER INSTRUMENT CO., INC.		
Do	PRIMARK CORPORATION		
Do	RJK CONSTRUCTION COMPANY		
Do	SAFEKEEPER SYSTEMS, INC.		
Do	SAFLOK/COMPUTORIZED SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	SANDERS CORPORATION		
Do	U.S. MANUFACTURING COMPANY		
Do	URBAN REVITALIZATION, INC.		
JOSEPH J. JACQUAY, 5025 WISCONSIN AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO		
WALTER K. JAENICKE, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	4,500.00	
E. A. JAENKE & ASSOCIATES, INC, 1575 EYE ST., NW, SUITE 230 WASHINGTON DC 20005	FARMLAND INDUSTRIES	500.00	
Do	UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	250.00	
DANIEL L. JAFFE, SUITE 1000 1400 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ADVERTISING FEDERATION		
CLARENCE L. JAMES JR., 444 N. CAPITOL ST., #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)	1,000.00	
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)	400.00	
JAPAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTE OF AMERICA, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,442.90	1,442.90
JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE, 1765 SUTTER STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118			
T. DESTRY JARVIS, 529 TENNESSEE AVE. ALEXANDRIA VA 22305	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION	444.96	33.00
EVELYN JARVIS-FERRIS, 444 MARKET STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111	SHAKLEE CORPORATION		
JERRY J. JASINOWSKI, 1776 F STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	2,000.00	
PATRICIA A. JEFFERS, SUITE 209 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC.	82.50	25.00
LINDA JENCKES, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HEALTH INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.	231.25	12.00
DAVID M. JENKINS II , 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MILES LABORATORIES, INC		
KEMPTON B. JENKINS, SUITE 702 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ARMCO, INC	600.00	214.88
JENNER & BLOCK, ONE IBM PLAZA CHICAGO IL 60611	AMUSEMENT & MUSIC OPERATORS ASSN	13,200.00	2,475.09
JAMES C. JENNINGS, 3255 GRACE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: GRAY AND COMPANY).		
JENNINGS STROUSS & SALMON, 111 WEST MONROE PHOENIX AZ 85003	SHAMROCK FOODS CO		
CHRIS L. JENSEN, FLORIDA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 111 NORTH GADSDEN ST. TALLAHASSEE FL 32301	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
NANCY H. JESSICK, 425 13TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HIRAM WALKER & SONS, INC.		
GUY E. JESTER, 2150 KIENLEN AVE. ST. LOUIS MO 63121	ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER		
THOMAS C. JETTON, 2223 DODGE STREET OMAHA NB 68102	NORTHERN NATURAL GAS CO	2,000.00	
CHARLES E. JOECKEL JR , 807 MAINE AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS	17,591.60	436.98
DOUGLAS F. JOHN, MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 1850 K STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MEDINA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC		
Do	SOUTH TEXAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC		
RONALD P. JOHNSEN, SUITE 303 1625 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COLUMBIA GAS SYSTEM SERVICE CORP	175.00	30.30
CALVIN P. JOHNSON, HOFFHEIMER & JOHNSON 2555 M ST., NW, #100 WASHINGTON DC 20037	COMPUTER SCIENCES CORP	4,750.00	
CARL T. JOHNSON, SUITE 1104 1800 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CORNING GLASS WORKS	375.00	
CLIFFORD T. JOHNSON, 1700 NORTH MOORE STREET ROSSLYN VA 22209	BOEING MILITARY AIRPLANE COMPANY		
DAVID H. JOHNSON, MISSISSIPPI PETROLEUM COUNCIL 215 LAMAR LIFE BLDG., P.O. BOX 42 JACKSON MS 39205	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JESS JOHNSON JR , SUITE 200 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHELL OIL CO	500.00	
JOEL L. JOHNSON, 475 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #4400 WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR EXPORTS & SECURITY ASSISTANCE	6,000.00	415.66
JOHN B. JOHNSON, ALABAMA PETROLEUM COUNCIL P.O. BOX 4220 MONTGOMERY AL 36195	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JOHN D. JOHNSON, SUITE 1014 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP	15,500.00	25.00
JUSTIN W. JOHNSON, P.O. BOX 970 FT. WORTH TX 76101	TEXAS ELECTRIC SERVICE CO	120.23	45.40

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
KENNETH A. JOHNSON, PILLSBURY CENTER MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402	PILLSBURY COMPANY	160.00	458.50
LARRY W. JOHNSON, P.O. BOX 3000 LEESBURG VA 22075	VOCATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CLUBS OF AMERICA, INC.		
NANCIE S. JOHNSON, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONOCO, INC.	1,200.00	
NANCY J. JOHNSON, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	700.00	84.00
NICHOLAS JOHNSON, BOX 1876 IOWA CITY IA 52244			
RADY A. JOHNSON, 1000 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)		
RICHARD W. JOHNSON JR., 219 N. WASHINGTON STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NON COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSN OF THE USA	5,417.04	
SPENCER A. JOHNSON, SUITE 411 1101 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PAPERBOARD PACKAGING COUNCIL		
STANLEY L. JOHNSON, 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TEXACO, INC.	90.00	
STEPHEN M. JOHNSON, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO)		
Do	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: MUTUAL INSURANCE COALITION)		
WALLACE E. JOHNSON, MOFFET, LARSON & JOHNSON, P.C. 1925 NORTH LYNN STREET, #700 ARLINGTON VA 22209	ASSOCIATION FOR BROADCASTING ENGINEERING STANDARDS, INC.		
WILLIAM L. JOHNSON, SUITE 301 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PRIMARK CORPORATION	1,000.00	
BARBARA W. JOHNSTON, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE. NW #710 WASHINGTON DC 20036	UTAH INTERNATIONAL INC.		
DAVID JOHNSTON, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
JAMES D. JOHNSTON, 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,600.00	9,476.83
JOINT CORPORATE COMM ON CUBAN CLAIMS, C/O LONE STAR INDUSTRIES, INC PO BOX 5050 GREENWICH CT 06830			180.00
JOINT TASK FORCE ON FED FINANCIAL ASSIST. FOR LAW STUDENTS, C/O LAW SCHOOL ADMISSION COUNCIL 11 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.			
MARY KAAREN JOLLY, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER.	828.00	49.41
HERBERT A. JOLOVITZ, 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION	1,250.00	
JONES & WINBURN, SUITE 1040 1101 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ASSN OF EQUIPMENT LESSORS	36,610.41	4,008.63
ALLAN R. JONES, 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC.	9,000.00	1,642.89
BEVERLY E. JONES, 114 3RD STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN INDEPENDENT REFINERS ASSN	200.00	
CHERYL L. JONES, 1875 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP	375.00	32.35
JONES DAY REAVIS & POGUE, 1735 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FRENCH & POLYCLINIC MED. SCHOOL & HEALTH CENTER (TRUSTEES)	4,119.00	3.19
Do	PFIZER, INC.	10,166.00	15.00
Do	WICKLIFFE PARTNERSHIP	720.00	
ERNEST W. JONES, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
GERALD R. JONES, SUITE 810 2000 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SPERRY CORPORATION		
JAMES E. JONES JR , 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ALLIANCE OF AMERICAN INSURERS	275.00	30.00
JAMES E. JONES, 40 FRANKLIN RD., SW P.O. BOX 2021 ROANOKE VA 24022	APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY		
NORVILL JONES, 1620 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	REYNOLDS METALS CO.	250.00	
WILEY N. JONES, SUITE 525 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SOUTHERN PACIFIC CO. & AFFILIATES	1,000.00	500.00
DE SOTO JORDAN, 229 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORPORATION	264.00	252.00
JAMES V. JORDAN III, PO BOX 2563 BIRMINGHAM AL 35202	SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS CO		
MARY LOU JOSEPH, 2025 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO	13,461.57	205.17
ARDON B. JUDD JR , 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20036	DRESSER INDUSTRIES, INC.		
ROBERT E. JULIANO, 1875 I ST., NW, #450 WASHINGTON DC 20006	HOTEL & RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES & BARTENDERS INTL UNION	16,238.64	1,994.79
BYRON E. KABOT, LEGAL DEPARTMENT - 43-33 77 WEST 45TH ST. NEW YORK NY 10036	INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.	2,454.00	843.20
GEZA KADAR, 1750 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HEALTH INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.	6.44	8.00
SUZANNE KALFUS, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FED OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	75.33	
LAUREL B. KAMEN, SUITE 702 1700 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO.		
LINDA HELLER KAMM, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY LARDNER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: INVESTORS MORTGAGE INSURANCE CO).		
Do	FOLEY, LARDNER, HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: LAWYERS TITLE INSURANCE CORP).		
Do	FOLEY, LARDNER, HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: VGS CORPORATION)		
JAMES L. KANE JR., 1315 VINCENT PLACE MCLEAN VA 22101			
DONALD J. KANIEWSKI, 905 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	LABORERS' INTL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, AFL-CIO	6,647.49	58.25
FRED G. KAREM, SHUFFETT, KENTON, CURRY & KAREM 109 NORTH MILL STREET LEXINGTON KY 40507	LINCOLN PROPERTY CO		
Do	NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL		
MARYANN M. KASWELL, SUITE 1200 1300 NORTH 17TH STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209	CONSUMER BANKERS ASSN	2,333.33	1,319.33
HOWARD C. KATZ, 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048	J. ARON & CO. (FOR: COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC.)		
RICHARD S. KAUFMAN, 3471 N. FEDERAL HIGHWAY, #511 FT. LAUDERDALE FL 33306	AMERISERV, INC.		
EVERETT E. KAVANAUGH, SUITE 800 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	COSMETIC, TOILETRY & FRAGRANCE ASSN, INC.		
KAYE SCHOLER FIERMAN HAYS & HANDLER, 1575 I ST., NW SUITE 1150 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE		
Do	AMERICAN PSYCHOANALYTIC ASSOCIATION		
Do	AMERICAN SOCIAL HEALTH ASSN		
Do	BRISTOL-MYERS COMPANY		
Do	CHRIS CRAFT INDUSTRIES, INC.		
Do	DOW CHEMICAL CO		
Do	ELSEVIER SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHERS		
Do	UNITED TELEVISION, INC.	500.00	500.00
RICHARD F. KEATING, SUITE 502 1211 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES, INC.		
ROBERT J. KEEFE, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: AMERICAN FAMILY LIFE ASSURANCE CO)		
Do	THE KEEFE CO. (FOR: CORDAGE INSTITUTE)		
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)		
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)		
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP)		
DAVID A. KEENE, 919 PRINCE ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL TAX LIMITATION COMMITTEE	200.00	10.00
KEITH KEENEY, SUITE 500-D 5775 PEACHTREE-DUNWOODY RD. ATLANTA GA 30342	ROBERT H. KELLEN CO (FOR: CALORIE CONTROL COUNCIL)	100.00	
ROBERT C. KEENEY, 727 N. WASHINGTON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	UNITED FRESH FRUIT & VEGETABLE ASSN.	1,875.00	1,703.08
ROBIN E. KEENEY, 618 WASHINGTON BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COS.	2,000.00	
JEFFERSON D. KEITH, 8100 OAK ST. DUNN LORING VA 22027	NATIONAL PEST CONTROL ASSN		
ROBERT H. KELLEN, 5775 PEACHTREE-DUNWOODY RD., #500-D ATLANTA GA 20342	ROBERT H. KELLEN CO (FOR: CALORIE CONTROL COUNCIL)	90.00	
KELLER & HECKMAN, 1150 17TH STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MERCHANT SHIPPING		
Do	LAND MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS COUNCIL		
Do	SPECIALTY ADVERTISING ASSN. INT'L.	10,650.00	303.00
Do	UTILITIES TELECOMMUNICATIONS COUNCIL		
CANDACE KELLER, 624 9TH ST., NW 7TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20001	GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.	4,444.02	
DONALD W. KELLER, 601 JEFFERSON, #3800 HOUSTON TX 77002	QUINTANA PETROLEUM CORP		
Do	QUINTANA REFINERY COMPANY		
JAY KELLER, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	5,167.50	538.24
DONALD KELLERMANN, SUITE 1110 1875 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TIMES MIRROR COMPANY		12,201.98
JOHN B. KELLEY, 1400 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AVCO CORP	1,500.00	
TY KELLEY, P.O. BOX 1417-D49 ALEXANDRIA VA 22313	NATIONAL ASSN OF CHAIN DRUG STORES, INC	1,500.00	
STEPHEN S. KELLNER, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #1120 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHEMICAL SPECIALTIES MFGRS ASSN		
EARL KELLY, 801 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA	8,505.24	
ERNEST B. KELLY III, 950 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION	1,250.00	235.57
HAROLD V. KELLY, 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.		
JOHN F. KELLY, 1818 L STREET, NW, #906 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MERRILL LYNCH & CO, INC.		
MARK L. KEMMER, 1660 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	2,500.00	1,412.64
KENDALL & ASSOCIATES, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #210 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ANDERSON HIBEY NAUHEIM & BLAIR (FOR MARRIOTT CORP)		
Do	CLADOUHOS & BRASHARES (FOR SMITH BARNEY HARRIS UPHAM & CO)	150.00	
Do	CARL M. FREEMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.		
Do	HELLER, EHRMAN, WHITE & MCAULIFFE	150.00	
Do	MANVILLE CORPORATION	450.00	
Do	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A.	300.00	
Do	WASHINGTON PSYCHIATRIC SOCIETY		
Do	WORLDWIDE INFORMATION RESOURCES, INC		
WILLIAM T. KENDALL, SUITE 210 1750 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIANCE FOR FREE ENTERPRISE		
JOSEPH W. KENNEBECK, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #3210 WASHINGTON DC 20024	VOLKSWAGEN OF AMERICA, INC	300.00	
MICHAEL E. KENNEDY, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
EDWARD E. KENNEY & ASSOCIATES, INC., SUITE 1610 1700 NORTH MOORE STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209	LOCKHEED-GEORGIA CORPORATION		
JEREMIAH J. KENNEY JR , 12TH FL. 1100 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	UNION CARBIDE CORP.		
BRENDAN KENNY, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA	5,500.00	
J. H. KENT, KENT & O'CONNOR 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN DENTAL HYGIENISTS ASSN	3,055.33	1,322.91
Do	AMERICAN SUPPLY ASSOCIATION	4,563.85	1,963.68
Do	AMERICAN WAREHOUSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION		
Do	CFS CONTINENTAL		
Do	GOULD, INC.		
Do	MOTOR CARRIER LAWYERS ASSN.		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	NATIONAL CUSTOMS BROKERS & FORWARDERS ASSN OF AMERICA	1,594.08	682.12
MICHAEL L. KERLEY, 1922 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS	575.00	30.00
PAUL A. KERSCHNER, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS	934.20	
ROBERT M. KETCHEL, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
GILBERT W. KEYES, PO BOX 3999 SEATTLE WA 98124	BOEING COMPANY		
EARLINE A. KEYSER, 1620 I ST., NW, #703 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
KIAWAH ISLAND COMPANY, P.O. BOX 12910 CHARLESTON SC 29142			
BRIAN D. KIDNEY, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #718 WASHINGTON DC 20001	PACIFIC BELL	250.00	
EDWARD J. KIERNAN, 815 16TH STREET, NW, #30 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL UNION OF POLICE ASSOCIATIONS, AFL-CIO		
PETER J. KIERNAN, 2712 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP COMPANY		
ROBERT W. KIERNAN, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	200.00	
WILLIAM S. KIES, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	200.00	
INGOLF N. KILAND JR., 1660 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,000.00	4,729.72
ROBERTA D. KIMBALL, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #802 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	200.00	
RICHARD H. KIMBERLY, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #730 WASHINGTON DC 20004	KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP	4,031.25	912.83
KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP, 401 NORTH LAKE STREET NEENAH WI 54956			13,374.36
GENE KIMMELMAN, 215 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	CONGRESS WATCH	3,312.49	
KING & SPALDING, 1915 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BELLSOUTH CORP		7.00
Do	BETHLEHEM STEEL CORP		154.48
Do	DAMSON OIL CORP		89.70
Do			866.29
Do	LIFE OF GEORGIA		
Do	LINCOLN PROPERTY CO		27.75
Do	MILLER BREWING CO		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS & RELATED INSTITUTIONS	2,100.00	118.25
AUBREY C. KING, 1625 EYE STREET, NW, #609 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL CLUB ASSOCIATION		
CHARLES L. KING, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	375.00	
EDWARD H. KING, 200 WILMOT RD. DEERFIELD IL 60015	WALGREEN CO		
G. JACK KING, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT WASHINGTON DC 20001	U.S. AIR, INC	1,000.00	
W. RUSSELL KING, SUITE 400 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FREEPORT MCMORAN, INC	300.00	72.00
DANIEL T. KINGSLEY, 1730 NORTH LYNN STREET, #400 ARLINGTON VA 22209	NATIONAL VENTURE CAPITAL ASSOCIATION	18,000.00	1,857.80
ROGER P. KINGSLEY, 10801 ROCKVILLE PIKE ROCKVILLE MD 20852	AMERICAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSN		
JANIE A. KINNEY, BLUM & NASH 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FLOATING POINT SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	MERCK & CO., INC		
Do	TWIN COAST NEWSPAPERS, INC		
MARCIA Y. KINTER, 1600 WILSON BOULEVARD, #1000 ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN WATERWAYS OPERATORS, INC		
CECILIA ANNE KIRBY, 1819 L STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN HOTEL & MOTEL ASSN	1,244.49	
KIRBY GILLICK SCHWARTZ & TUOHEY, P.C., SUITE 303 EAST 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	LAKE ONTARIO CEMENT LIMITED	9,475.54	143.82
ALAN G. KIRK II , 1900 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20068	POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO	12.68	
JOHN R. KIRK, BINGHAM, DANA & GOULD 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON		
PAUL G. KIRK JR., SULLIVAN & WORCESTER 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE		
KIRKPATRICK LOCKHART HILL CHRISTOPHER & PHILLIPS, 1900 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CALVERT GROUP, LTD	1,216.00	
Do	INTERNATIONAL GOLD CORPORATION LIMITED	2,380.00	
Do	PAINE WEBBER JACKSON & CURTIS, INC	1,824.00	
Do	SEARCH GROUP, INC		
Do	WHITNEY NATIONAL BANK OF NEW ORLEANS		
SALLY ANN KIRKPATRICK, 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ALLIANCE OF AMERICAN INSURERS	588.00	292.00
KIRLIN CAMPBELL & KEATING, SUITE 800 1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COUNCIL OF EUROPEAN & JAPANESE NATIONAL SHIPOWNERS' ASSN	24,127.50	526.42
ROBERT A. KIRSHNER, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN		
SAUL B. KLAMAN, 1101 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	10,000.00	
RICHARD L. KLASS, 1225 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DGA INTL. INC (FOR: DIR INTL AFF OF THE GEN DEL FOR ARMEMENTS)	150.40	190.43
Do	DGA INTERNATIONAL, INC (FOR: SOCIETE NATIONALE D'ETUDE ET DE CONST DE MOTEURS D'AVIATION).	150.40	5.00
RICHARD P. KLEEMAN, 2005 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PUBLISHERS		
MARK KLEINMAN, BOX 300 4200 WISCONSIN AVE., NW, SUITE 106 WASHINGTON DC 20016			
KLINE KNOPF & WOJDAK, INC, 355 N. 21ST STREET, #105 CAMP HILL PA 17011	GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORPORATION		
RICHARD A. KLINE, 650 INDEPENDENCE AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	COUNCIL OF ACTIVE INDEPENDENT OIL & GAS PRODUCERS	7,629.00	
WILLIAM J. KLINEFELTER, 815 16TH ST., NW SUITE 706 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMER	8,856.39	
KARL R. KLINGELHOFER, 5417 THETFORD PLACE ALEXANDRIA VA 22310	COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL FORUM		
MICHAEL R. KLIPPER, 522 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10036	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA	713.88	25.00
GLENN KNAPP, 773 DARTMOUTH AVE. SAN CARLOS CA 94070			
JEFFREY W. KNIGHT, 1045 SANSOME ST. SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111	FRIENDS OF THE EARTH		
PETER E. KNIGHT, 1101 15TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	4,000.00	96.49
ROBERT L. KNOUS JR., SUITE A-201 1410 GRANT STREET DENVER CO 80203	COLORADO SKI COUNTRY USA		
RUTH E. KOBELL, SUITE 202 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL & CO-OPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA	5,855.77	49.53
THOMAS G. KOBUS, SUITE 350 2000 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL PARKING ASSOCIATION	15,812.42	
BRADLEY R. KOCH, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	133.50	
GEORGE W. KOCH, 1010 WISCONSIN AVE., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20007	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC		
PATRICK C. KOCH, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	800.00	
KOMINERS FORT SCHLEFER & BOYER, 1776 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	APEX MARINE CORP	15,202.00	
Do	COMMITTEE FOR TITLE XI VESSEL FINANCING		
Do	CROWLEY MARITIME CORP AND SUBSIDIARIES	5,425.00	529.73
Do	INGRAM CORPORATION		
NICHOLAS KOMINUS, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS' ASSN	742.50	24.13
STEPHEN KOPLAN, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN FED OF LABOR & CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS	14,441.31	666.54
EUGENE P. KOPP, SUITE 600 SOUTH 1120 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION PACIFIC CORP	1,250.00	
STEVEN KOPPERUD, 1701 N. FT. MYER DRIVE ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN FEED MANUFACTURERS ASSN	3,240.00	
HORACE R. KORNEGAY, 1875 I ST., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE		
KENNETH S. KOVACK, 815 16TH ST., NW, #706 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMER	8,856.39	
JOAN M. KOVALIC, SUITE 600 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: SHERWIN-WILLIAMS COMPANY)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: ZIMPRO CORP)		
CHRIS KOYANAGI, 1702 WOODMAN DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22101	WASHINGTON ALTERNATIVES, INC	3,000.00	36.00
PATRICIA S. KOZIOL, 1719 ROUTE 10 PARSIPPANY NJ 07054	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	600.00	33.40
MYLIO S. KRAJA, 1608 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN LEGION	3,088.02	301.42
THOMAS G. KRAJEWSKI, SUITE 1100 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA	286.50	
AMOS KRAMER, KANSAS PETROLEUM COUNCIL SUITE 1414 MERCHANTS BANK BLDG. 8TH & JACKSON STS. TOPEKA KS 66612.	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JOSEPH H. KRAMER III, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: HTB CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS COALITION)		
STEPHEN W. KRAUS, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
RAYMOND ROGER KRAUSE, SUITE 2700 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,000.00	
JEFFREY KRAUSS, 1350 PICCARD DRIVE, #304 ROCKVILLE MD 20850	M/A-COM, INC	2,500.00	10.50
ALAN G. KRAUT, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	685.00	22.00
DAWN C. KRISTOF, P.O. BOX 17402 DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WASHINGTON DC 20041	WATER & WASTEWATER EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
KRIVIT & KRIVIT, 50 E STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	CITY OF ST PETERSBURG, OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS	2,083.00	
KROGER COMPANY, 1014 VINE ST. CINCINNATI OH 45201			4,176.87
JAMES C. KRONE, 1152 HASLETT ROAD P.O. BOX 99 HASLETT MI 48840	ROSES, INC	1,000.00	340.18
KATHLEEN BONNER KRONMILLER, 600 WATER STREET, SW, #207 WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CORP		
Do	SPACE AMERICA		
THEODORE G. KRONMILLER, ELY RITTS PIETROWSKI & BRICKFIELD WATERGATE 600 BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20037	PEREGRINE CORP	15,000.00	286.36
K. H. KRUKE, 1776 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HIGHWAY USERS FEDERATION FOR SAFETY & MOBILITY	318.18	6.85
LLOYD R. KUHN, 1725 DESALES ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	17,094.00	
JUDITH KUNOFSKY, 530 BUSH STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108	SIERRA CLUB	2,250.00	30.61
ESTER KURZ, SUITE 412 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM	11,433.30	362.62
JEFFREY KURZWEIL, HILL BETTS & NASH 1220 19TH ST., NW, SUITE 302 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MARRIOTT CORPORATION	968.30	
DANIEL M. KUSH, 1615 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	2,000.00	315.32
E. J. KUSHAN, SUITE 500 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GTE SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION		
GARY JAY KUSHNER, P.O. BOX 3556 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE	1,000.00	
JAMES M. KUSZAJ, SUITE 700 SOUTH 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CHEMICAL U.S.A		
KUTAK ROCK & HUIE, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCIES		47.42
Do	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF OMAHA		
Do	HAYES, INC		89.50

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY		163.75
Do	RONALD E. ROBINSON		
PETER KYROS, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #1128 WASHINGTON DC 20036	M/A-COM DEVELOPMENT CORP, ET AL	6,000.00	
LABOR BUREAU, INC., SUITE 501 1346 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC, 100 INDIANA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		16,011.00	10,459.00
LABORERS' INTL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, AFL-CIO, 905 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			21,240.79
JOSEPH L. LACH, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #214 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MANVILLE CORPORATION	625.00	
PHILLIP RAY LACKEY, 823 15TH ST., NW SUITE 1001 WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNATIONAL MASONRY INSTITUTE	1,669.00	
JOHN D. LACOPO, 229 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	EDS CORPORATION	240.00	69.00
ROBERT A. LADIG, SCOTT PLAZA PHILADELPHIA PA 19113	SCOTT PAPER COMPANY	1,550.00	628.18
SANDRA L. LAFEVRE, 2500 RIVA ROAD, SE ANNAPOLIS MD 21401	NATIONWIDE INSURANCE CO & AFFILIATES	1,500.00	
JACK L. LAHR, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY LARDNER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: VGS CORPORATION)		
ROBERT LAMB, 1220 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	5,000.00	153.72
DAVID F. LAMBERT III, 311 FIRST STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL ASSN OF INSURANCE BROKERS		
DAVID M. F. LAMBERT, 1000 POTOMAC STREET, NW, #302 SUITE 900 WASHINGTON DC 20007	FEDERATION EMPLOYMENT & GUIDANCE SERVICE		
DAVID P. LAMBERT, 1800 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
DAVID R. LAMBERT, 1030 15TH ST., NW SUITE 964 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSN	5,000.00	
MARCY LAMBOURNE, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,250.00	30.10
STEPHEN K. LAMBRIGHT, ONE BUSCH PLACE ST. LOUIS MO 63118	ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES, INC		
LAMON ELROD & HARKLEROAD, P.C., 2500 PEACHTREE CENTER - CAIN TOWER 229 PEACHTREE STREET, NE ATLANTA GA 30043.	NATIONAL ASSN OF PENSION CONSULTANTS & ADMINISTRATORS, INC	4,500.00	975.68
VIRGINIA A. LAMPLEY, 1225 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DGA INTERNATIONAL, INC (FOR: DIR INTL AFF OF THE GEN DEL FOR ARMEMENTS)	112.80	75.93
Do	DGA INTERNATIONAL, INC (FOR: SOCIETE NATIONALE D'ETUDE ET DE CONST. DE MOTEURS D'AVIATION).	282.00	131.95
Do	DGA INTERNATIONAL, INC (FOR: SOFREAVIA)		
RAY H. LANCASTER, 1875 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TEXAS GAS TRANSMISSION CORP	3,000.00	148.64
L. CHARLES LANDGRAF, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE		
LANDIS COHEN SINGMAN & RAUH, 1019 19TH STREET, N.W. # 500 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS, AUTHORS & PUBLISHERS	3,500.00	
Do	COUNCIL OF CREATIVE ARTISTS, LIBRARIES & MUSEUMS		
Do	NFL PLAYERS ASSOCIATION	2,000.00	
BROCK R. LANDRY, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #1220 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL WATER WELL ASSN	2,400.00	
Do	WATER SYSTEMS COUNCIL	750.00	
DAVID W. LANDSIDLE, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #730 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PFIZER, INC	650.00	816.52
BRUCE ALAN LANDY, 2700 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	B.A.L CO		
Do	CRYOGENIC VACUUM TECHNOLOGY CO		
Do			
LANE & EDSON, P.C., 2300 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITY OF BALTIMORE	600.00	
Do	COUNCIL FOR RURAL HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT	4,000.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF ENERGY SERVICE COS		
Do	NATIONAL LEASED HOUSING ASSN	600.00	
LANE & MITTENDORF, 1750 K STREET, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GHK COMPANIES		
Do	INDEPENDENT GAS PRODUCERS' COMM		
ALBERT E. LANE, SUITE 537 1377 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MEDCOM-MIC		
Do	PEOPLE OPPOSED TO ENERGY LOBBY - POTEL		
RICHARD F. LANE, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
ROBIN W. LANIER, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSN	160.00	20.00
WAYNE R. LAPIERRE JR., 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER	1,170.00	400.00
CLIFFORD LAPLANTE, 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	1,165.00	
WILLIAM L. LARSEN, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #415 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN		
REED E. LARSON, 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD, #600 SPRINGFIELD VA 22160	NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMM		
JAMES LASALA, 5025 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO		
LATHAM WATKINS & HILLS, SUITE 1200 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSN	250.00	46.80
LOUIS F. LAUN, 260 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10016	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
ROBERT LAUTERBERG, 1707 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL	5,000.00	235.39
DENNIS LAVALLEE, 1016 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF PLUMBING-HEATING-COOLING CONTRACTORS	500.00	129.50
CHARLES B. LAVIN JR., 1016 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF PLUMBING-HEATING-COOLING CONTRACTORS		
JOAN H. LAVOR, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
GEORGE H. LAWRENCE, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	800.00	
ELIZABETH LAWSON, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	2,794.59	82.65
LAXALT CORPORATION, 813 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	BARNESS ORGANIZATION	6,000.00	
Do	CITIZENS FOR AMERICA	9,000.00	
Do	MORGAN STANLEY & COMPANY		
Do	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	15,000.00	
ERNEST M. LE SUEUR, 453 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	BENEFICIAL MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF AMERICA		
LEAD-ZINC PRODUCERS COMMITTEE, SUITE 3415 120 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10271		194.74	10,459.24
LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA MILK PRODUCERS, 1225 8TH STREET, #385 SACRAMENTO CA 95814			1,277.00
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S., 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		39,500.77	39,500.77
LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE TAHOE, 2197 LAKE TAHOE BLVD. P.O. BOX 10110 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE CA 95731			10,057.34
THOMAS B. LEARY, HOGAN & HARTSON 815 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	11,144.08	
RICHARD J. LEASE, 2145 BOISE DRIVE LAS CRUCES NM 88001			
A. MICHAEL LEBECK, P.O. BOX 925 ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103			201.09
LEBOEUF LAMB LEIBY & MACRAE, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE		
Do	SHIPPING CORP. OF INDIA, LTD		
Do	UNDERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S LONDON		
ROBERT F. LEDERER, 1250 I STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ASSN OF NURSERYMEN		
THOMAS J. LEE JR., P.O. BOX 2628 HOUSTON TX 77001	ENTEX, INC		
LEIGHTON LEMOV JACOBS & BUCKLEY, SUITE 800 2033 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ADHESIVE & SEALANT COUNCIL, INC		
Do	AMERICAN ASSN OF NURSE ANESTHETISTS		
Do	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSISTANTS ASSN		
Do	CITY & REGIONAL MAGAZINE ASSN		
Do	CLOROX COMPANY		
Do	EXPRESS FOODS CO., INC		
Do	FEDERATION OF APPAREL MANUFACTURERS	4,341.50	538.40
Do	GA TECHNOLOGIES, INC	9,562.00	516.15
Do	GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION		
Do	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	INTRAOCULAR LENS MFRS ASSN		
Do	MUTUAL SAVINGS CENTRAL FUND, INC	5,000.00	400.00
Do	NATIONAL GLASS DEALERS ASSN		
Do	SALOMON BROTHERS	20,000.00	400.00
Do	SAVINGS BANKS ASSN. OF MASSACHUSETTS	5,000.00	400.00
Do	WHEY PRODUCTS INST		
TERRY L. LEITZELL, ONE THOMAS CIRCLE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SHRIMPBOAT ASSOCIATION	1,000.00	
Do	MARINE CONSTRUCTION & DESIGN CO	750.00	
Do	BOGLE & GATES (FOR: PACIFIC SEAFOOD PROCESSORS ASSN)	1,500.00	
Do	PORT OF SEATTLE	1,000.00	
JOSEPH L. LEITZINGER, 900 4TH AVE. SEATTLE WA 98164	SIMPSON TIMBER CO	520.00	265.00
ELIZABETH LEMOND, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	214.29	801.70
THOMAS J. LENGYEL, 1625 K STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MERCHANT SHIPPING		
BETTY JANE LEONARD, P.O. BOX 19109 GREENSBORO NC 27419	UNIFI, INC		
EARL T. LEONARD JR., P.O. DRAWER 1734 ATLANTA GA 30301	COCA-COLA COMPANY	1,167.00	1,873.74
KAYE CONNIFF LEONARD, SUITE 510 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	POTLATCH CORPORATION	420.00	
LAW OFFICE OF JERRIS LEONARD, 900 17TH STREET, NW, #1020 WASHINGTON DC 20006	KANSAS CORPORATION COMMMISSION		
LLOYD LEONARD, 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	4,846.17	458.50
CHARLES LEPPERT JR., 801 18TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PROCTER & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO	494.25	
LERCH & CO., INC, 1030 15TH STREET, NW, #840 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN		
MARTHA LESTER, 1925 K STREET, NW, #206 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY	148.66	
DALE LESTINA, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,535.00	305.20
LEVA HAWES SYMINGTON & MARTIN, SUITE 1001 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DON LANGENEGGER, ET AL		
Do	FINNIGAN CORPORATION	324.00	3.90
ROBERT JOHN LEVERING, 1730 M ST., NW, #610 WASHINGTON DC 20036	DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION	300.00	42.54
S.R. LEVERING, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, N.E. WASHINGTON DC 20002	U.S. COMMITTEE FOR THE OCEANS		
MORRIS J. LEVIN, 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	2,500.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
BARBARA W. LEVINE, 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSN	634.50	
BERTRAM J. LEVINE, 1667 K STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	JOHNSON & JOHNSON	1,000.00	225.00
KENNETH S. LEVINE, SUITE 220 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	JOSEPH SEAGRAM & SONS, INC	977.50	
LESLIE LEVY, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM	7,029.74	538.74
DAVID A. LEWIS, 530 7TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	FRIENDS OF THE EARTH	175.00	
E. DAVID LEWIS, 1401 WILSON BLVD., #205 ARLINGTON VA 22209	SOCIETY OF AMERICAN WOOD PRESERVERS, INC	300.00	475.00
MICHAEL R. LEWIS, 1133 15TH ST., NW SUITE 640 WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S & WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION	10,364.00	1,216.04
RICHARD LEWIS, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PULPWOOD ASSN		
STUART A. LEWIS, SUITE 300 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MANUFACTURERS HANOVER CORP	500.00	
Do	NATIONAL BANK OF DETROIT	400.00	
JOHN F. LEYDEN, 815 16TH STREET, NW, #308 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO	3,478.76	
WILLIAM J. LHOTA, 215 N. FRONT STREET COLUMBUS OH 43215	COLUMBUS AND SOUTHERN OHIO ELECTRIC CO		
HOWARD S. LIEBENGOOD, 1875 EYE STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE	30,000.00	631.90
HERBERT LIEBENSON, 1604 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSN	5,625.00	
Do	SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL		
WILLIAM C. LIENESCH, 238 10TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION	316.20	35.35
DUKE R. LIGON, 1575 EYE STREET, NW, #510 WASHINGTON DC 20005	CORCORAN HARDESTY WHYTE HEMPHILL & LIGON, P.C. (FOR: NOVA SCOTIA RESOURCES, LTD).		
Do	CORCORAN HARDESTY WHYTE HEMPHILL & LIGON (FOR: PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA).		
ROSS W. LILLARD, 2100 CHARTERBANK CENTER KANSAS CITY MO 64105	STINSON, MAG & FIZZELL (FOR: FARMLAND INDUSTRIES, INC)		
RICHARD A. LILLQUIST, SUITE 500 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FLEXIBLE PACKAGING ASSOCIATION		
DIANE PALMER LILLY, 1200 PEAVEY BUILDING MINNEAPOLIS MN 55479	NORWEST CORPORATION		
EDWARD J. LINCOLN, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTE OF AMERICA		
STEPHEN R. LINDAUER, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20515	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS		
KATHLEEN M. LINEHAN, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GULF OIL CORP	800.00	299.85
ELENA LINTHICUM, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIED CORP		
LINTON MIELDS REISLER & COTTONE, LTD, SUITE 200 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMBASSADOR BRIDGE CO	250.00	
Do	CITY GAS COMPANY	38.00	
Do	COUNCIL OF POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AGENCIES		
Do	IOWA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	4,492.00	
Do	LAKE SUPERIOR DISTRICT POWER CO	570.00	
Do	MADISON GAS & ELECTRIC CO	1,295.00	
Do	METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO	6,075.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF URBAN FLOOD MANAGEMENT AGENCIES		
Do	NORTHERN STATES POWER CO	1,480.00	
Do	OREGON DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION	3,000.00	
Do	STATE OF IL, DEPT OF TRANS, DIV OF WATER RES	3,027.00	105.00
Do	STATE OF IL, DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION	7,092.00	113.00
Do	SUPERIOR WATER, LIGHT & POWER CO	439.00	
Do	WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER CO	3,911.00	
Do	WISCONSIN FUEL AND LIGHT CO	307.00	
Do	WISCONSIN GAS CO	1,789.00	
Do	WISCONSIN NATURAL GAS CO	984.00	
Do	WISCONSIN POWER & LIGHT CO	2,984.00	
Do	WISCONSIN PUBLIC SERVICE CORP	2,333.00	
Do	WISCONSIN SOUTHERN GAS CO	307.00	
RON M. LINTON, SUITE 200 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DENVER TECHNOLOGICAL CENTER	2,371.00	
FRANCES S. LIPSCOMB, 645 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY	250.00	
JANICE C. LIPSEN, 900 17TH ST., NW, #504 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COUNSELORS FOR MANAGEMENT, INC (FOR: IMPRO)	7,500.00	
CRAIG LISKE, P.O. BOX 2120 HOUSTON TX 77252	UNION TEXAS PETROLEUM CORP		
SARA E. LISTER, PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB & TYLER 1730 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #1060 WASHINGTON DC 20006.	F M S CORPORATION		
ROBERT G. LITSCHERT, 1111 19TH ST., NW, 9TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	290.90	88.30
BARBARA A. LITTLE, SUITE 611 1155 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ETHYL CORPORATION	1,000.00	
CHARLES B. LITTLE, SUITE 603 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	UBA, INC	1,000.00	
WILLIAM F. LITTLE, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO	487.00	338.90
ROY LITTLEFIELD, 1250 I STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL TIRE DEALERS & RETREADERS ASSN	6,000.00	220.00
DAVID A. LITVIN, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL COMPANY (OHIO)	587.50	60.50
E.F. LIVAUDAIS JR., 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO		
LIVESTOCK MARKETING ASSOCIATION, 301 E. ARMOUR BLVD. KANSAS CIT Y MO 64111			4,429.19
NEIL C. LIVINGSTONE, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: RAMZI A. DALLOUL).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSN OF JAPAN).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: GOVERNMENT OF HAITI).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF KOREA).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY).	350.00	
LOBEL NOVINS & LAMONT, 1523 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERIC PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY ASSN	4,204.00	296.51
PAUL LOCIGNO, 25 LOUISIANA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS	15,448.11	
ROBERT F. LOCKHART JR., 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	TENNECO, INC		
KAREN LOCKWOOD, 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN	4,572.74	304.71
NILS LOFGREN, 1620 EYE STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC		
LAW OFCS OF SHELDON SUITE 401 1725 DESALES ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN HARDWARE MANUFACTURERS ASSN	1,500.00	
ROBERT S. LONG, 919 18TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DIAMOND SHAMROCK CORP	3,000.00	77.25
THOMAS R. LONG, 299 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10171	WESTVACO CORPORATION		
WILLIAM E. LONG, ONE NATIONWIDE PLAZA COLUMBUS OH 43216	NATIONWIDE INSURANCE COMPANY	4,680.00	1,413.70
LONGNECKER & ASSOC, P.O. BOX 24209 WASHINGTON DC 20024			
JOHN H. LONNQUIST, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW SUITE 214 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MANVILLE CORPORATION	1,500.00	
LAURA LOOMIS, 419 N. NELSON STREET ARLINGTON VA 22203	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION	254.91	17.50
LOOMIS OWEN FELLMAN & HOWE, 2020 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATION OF BITUMINOUS CONTRACTORS		
Do	CLASSROOM PUBLISHERS ASSN		
Do	INDUSTRIAL DIAMOND ASSN		
Do	OPTICAL MFGRS ASSN		
Do	TEXTILE RENTAL SERVICES ASSN OF AMERICA		
SUSAN J. LOOMIS, 1957 E STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA	2,000.00	500.00
LORD DAY & LORD, 1120 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BOWATER NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION	5,537.62	
PHILIP J. LOREE, 50 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10004	FEDERATION OF AMERICAN CONTROLLED SHIPPING	200.00	1.08
ROBERT E. LOSCH, P.C., 1716 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	AMERICAN DREDGING CO., ET AL	17,500.00	3,258.23
Do	PELICAN TERMINAL CORP & PORT OF GALVESTON		
CLAUDIA J. LOUIS, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN		
JAMES F. LOVETT, 1801 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	500.00	200.00
RODNEY W. LOWMAN, SUITE 700 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GULF OIL CORP	800.00	40.00
GERALD M. LOWRIE, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	12,000.00	
DONALD C. LUBICK, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BUFFALO PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA		
MRS. FREDDIE H. LUCAS, 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,000.00	858.94
CHARLES EMMET LUCEY, MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 1850 K STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CATHOLIC PRESS ASSN		
SYLVESTER LUKIS, 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: CANAVERAL PORT AUTHORITY)		
Do	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: CITY OF MIAMI)		
Do	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: DADE COUNTY)		
Do	CRAMER, HABER & LUKIS, P.C. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF GABON)		
LUMBERMENS MUTUAL CASUALTY COMPANY, LONG GROVE IL 60049			3,026.22
MILTON F. LUNCH, 2029 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS	1,000.00	
LUND & O'BRIEN, 1625 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FEDERATION OF AMERICAN CONTROLLED SHIPPING	600.00	56.97
Do	PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT CO	1,617.00	93.03
CHRISTIAN J. LUND, 1825 I STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION	15,750.00	
FRANCIS M. LUNNIE JR., 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS		
JERRY R. LYMAN, 11300 ROCKVILLE PIKE ROCKVILLE MD 20852	RKO GENERAL, INC		
TIMOTHY P. LYNCH, 1501 WILSON BOULEVARD, #910 ARLINGTON VA 22209	ROADWAY EXPRESS, INC	425.00	200.00
WILLIAM T. LYONS, SUITE 700 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CIBA-GEIGY CORP	4,409.00	4,589.00

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
M/A-COM, INC, 1350 PICCARD DRIVE, #304 ROCKVILLE MD 20850			8,442.00
TIMOTHY MACCARTHY, 1620 I STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC	1,260.00	
ANTHONY R. MACCHIA, 127 JOHN STREET NEW YORK NY 10038	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC		
RUSSELL MACCLEERY, 1250 I STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL TIRE DEALERS & RETREADERS ASSN	5,000.00	125.00
JACK A. MACDONALD, 1901 N. FORT MEYER DRIVE, #302 ROSSLYN VA 22209	BEVERLY ENTERPRISES, INC	6,250.00	220.02
MIRIAM A. MACDONALD, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #1010 WASHINGTON DC 20036	METROPOLITAN INSURANCE COS	1,000.00	
JAMES E. MACK, 9005 CONGRESSIONAL COURT POTOMAC MD 20854	NATIONAL ASSN OF MIRROR MFGRS		
Do	PEANUT BUTTER & NUT PROCESSORS ASSN		
JAMES H. MACK, 7901 WESTPARK DR. MCLEAN VA 22102	NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL BUILDERS' ASSN	13,340.80	500.00
THOMAS L. MACK, P.O. BOX 49 PALO VERDE AZ 85343	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
MARK J. MACKEY, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE		
J. LYNN MADDOX, SUITE 1204 1700 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	365.00	
LEIGH U. MADDUX, 3600 NORTH 36TH ROAD ARLINGTON VA 22207	CERTAINTEED CORP		
CLIFF MADISON GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, INC, P.O. BOX 3482 GRANADA HILLS CA 91344	MARK AIR, INC	1,200.00	
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT	1,200.00	
Do	WESTERN AIRLINES	900.00	
MARCIA G. MADSEN, MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TEXAS INDUSTRIES, INC		
SUSAN MAGAW, P.O. BOX 3556 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE	2,000.00	
KATHERINE MAGRAW, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	PEACE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	1,338.08	
FRANCIS E. MAGUIRE JR., 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	2,000.00	
W. TERRY MAGUIRE, BOX 17407 DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WASHINGTON DC 20041	AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSN	1,125.00	
DAVID L. MAHAN, 1225 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DGA INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SOFREAVIA)		
THOMAS D. MAHER, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE		
JOHN F. MAHONEY, 1101 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	5,378.00	191.31
TERENCE P. MAHONY, 1825 K STREET, NW, #807 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO, INC	500.00	
MICHAEL C. MAIBACH, 3065 BOWERS AVENUE SANTA CLARA CA 95051	INTEL CORPORATION	12,000.00	3,550.00
ROBERT L. MAIER, SUITE 1000 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER ALUMINUM & CHEMICAL CORP	350.00	12.00
ANDRE MAISONPIERRE, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1010 WASHINGTON DC 20005	ALLIANCE OF AMERICAN INSURERS	150.00	
MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYERS ASSN, 805 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10022			649.46
DAVID MALLINO, 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPT, AFL-CIO	6,730.33	184.85
J. WILSON MALLOY JR , 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	EASTMAN CHEMICALS DIVISION	700.00	85.00
KURT L. MALMGREN, 1000 16TH STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION	362.00	
MALMGREN, INC, 1120 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BEVERAGE IMPORTERS, INC	11,250.00	11,250.00
MARY JO MALONE, 1735 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INST OF ARCHITECTS	1,900.00	1,715.00
ROBERT H. MALONEY, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	TENNECO, INC		
WILLIAM R. MALONI, 3900 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	17,500.00	1,217.96
MAN-MADE FIBER PRODUCERS ASSN, INC, SUITE 310 1150 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			900.00
CARTER MANASCO, 5932 CHESTERBROOK RD. MCLEAN VA 22101	NATIONAL COAL ASSN	7,812.51	242.29
MANATT PHELPS ROTHENBERG & TUNNEY, SUITE 200 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIED TUBE & CONDUIT CORP		
Do	BKK CORPORATION	1,400.00	
Do	BOEING CO	1,500.00	
Do	KAUFMAN & BROAD, INC	4,100.00	
Do	MANUFACTURERS HANOVER LEASING CORPORATION	1,400.00	
Do	NATIONAL INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	400.00	
Do	NORTHROP CORP	1,100.00	
Do	NORTHWEST ALASKAN PIPELINE CO		
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT	4,400.00	
FRANK MANKIEWICZ, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL INSURANCE COALITION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS COALITION).	102.50	
DONALD W. MANN, 210 THE PLAZA TEANECK NJ 07666	NEGATIVE POPULATION GROWTH, INC	8,700.00	505.19
CYNTHIA MANSFIELD, SUITE 520 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	GPU SERVICE CORPORATION	3,096.03	257.26
ARMAND G MANSON, 1090 VERMONT AVE. N.W. STE 1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BELL AEROSPACE TEXTRON	2,760.00	
MANUFACTURED HOUSING INST, 1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #511 ARLINGTON VA 22202			500.00
JOHN V. MARANEY, 324 EAST CAPITOL ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL STAR ROUTE MAIL CARRIERS' ASSN		
MARCH FOR LIFE, INC, PO BOX 2950 WASHINGTON DC 20013		91,676.10	68,152.81
CHARLES T. MARCK, 1800 M ST., NW, SUITE 700 SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CHEMICAL CO	1,000.00	250.00
R. V. MARIANI, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS		
MARITIME INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, SUITE 600 1133 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005.			11,880.00
RICHARD P. MARKEY, 729 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC		
LAWRENCE D. MARKLEY, PO BOX 3518 ANCHORAGE AK 99501	CHUGACH ELECTRIC ASSN, INC		
NATHAN FRED MARKS, 685 N.W. 8TH STREET GRESHAM OR 97030			
RONALD ANTHONY MARKS, 1121 N. ARLINGTON BLVD., #710 ARLINGTON VA 22209			
LUTHER A. MARKWART, SUITE 1019 1156 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SUGARBEET GROWERS ASSN		
JOHN C. MARLIN, 307 W. NEVADA URBANA IL 61801	CENTRAL STATES RESOURCE CENTER		
HOWARD MARLOWE, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN FED OF LABOR & CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS	12,129.74	766.83
CHALMERS H. MARQUIS, 3430 BLAIR RD., FALLS CHURCH VA 22041	NATIONAL ASSN FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS	600.00	150.00
DEBORAH J. MARQUIS, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	850.00	8.50
JOHN MARSH, 100 OAKVIEW DRIVE TRUMBULL CT 06611	RAYMARK CORPORATION		
C. TRAVIS MARSHALL, 1776 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOROLA, INC	1,500.00	515.44
DANEA KEHOE MARTIN, 1922 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS	185.00	30.00
DAVID F. MARTIN, 2020 14TH STREET, NORTH ARLINGTON VA 22201	TRANE COMPANY	750.00	
DAVID O. MARTIN, NORTH LAKE ST., NEENAH WI 54956	KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP	200.00	128.55
DONALD N. MARTIN, DONALD N. MARTIN & COMPANY, INC. 488 MADISON AVE., NEW YORK NY 10022			
FRED J. MARTIN JR., 1800 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BANKAMERICA CORPORATION	245.22	286.67
JAMES D. MARTIN, 4600 72ND AVENUE LANDOVER HILLS MD 20784	COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION	2,000.00	199.50
JOHN M. MARTIN JR., 6909 FORT HUNT ROAD ALEXANDRIA VA 22307	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	100.00	
Do	JEWELRY INDUSTRY COORDINATING COMMITTEE	100.00	
KATHERINE E. MARTIN, 412 FIRST ST., SE, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20003	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	405.63	228.58
LARRY K. MARTIN, 1150 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MAN-MADE FIBER PRODUCERS ASSN, INC	150.00	
STEPHEN I. MARTIN, HARTFORD PLAZA HARTFORD CT 06115	HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE CO	800.00	
JAMES C. MARTINELLI, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC		
VILMA S. MARTINEZ, 612 S. FLOWER STREET, 5TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES CA 90017	MUNGER, TOLLES & RICKERSHAUSER (FOR: SPANISH INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION CORP).	2,400.00	1,981.07
JUDITH MARTY, 85 RIDGE ST. NORTH SYDNEY, NSW 2060 AUSTRALIA			
JOSEPH J. MARTYAK, 12TH FL. 1100 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	UNION CARBIDE CORP		
MARYLAND SAVINGS-SHARE INSURANCE CORP., 901 NORTH HOWARD STREET BALTIMORE MD 21201			52.35
MIKE M. MASAOKA, SUITE 520, THE FARRAGUT BLDG. 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN JAPANESE TRADE COMM		
Do	JAPAN TELESCOPES MANUFACTURERS ASSN	200.00	
Do	NISEI LOBBY		
Do	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC	750.00	
Do	WEST MEXICO VEGETABLE DISTRIBUTORS ASSN	500.00	
W. A. MASON, P.O. BOX 21106 SHREVEPORT LA 71156	SOUTHWESTERN ELECTRIC POWER CO	139.55	
JON G. MASSEY, 610 POYDRAS STREET, #318 NEW ORLEAN LA 70130	APACHE CORP		
JAMES D. MASSIE, 1015 - 18TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	FERTILIZER INSTITUTE	5,000.00	4,336.34
WILLIAM F. MASSMANN, PO BOX 225086 DALLAS TX 75265	DR PEPPER CO		
COLIN D. MATHEWS, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: METHODIST HOSPITAL)		
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: NORTHVILLE INDUSTRIES)		
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: TRAVELERS INSURANCE COMPANY)		
RICHARD D. MATHIAS, SUITE 901 1660 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC		
CHARLES D. MATTHEWS, SUITE 700 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSN	1,359.60	
ROBERT A. MATTHEWS, 700 NORTH FAIRFAX ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	RAILWAY PROGRESS INST	984.38	
JOANNE E. MATTIACE, 633 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20004	SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO	40.00	2.25

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
WILLIAM C. MATTOX, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #701 WASHINGTON DC 20006	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S.	400.00	55.00
MARSHALL L. MATZ, BARNETT & ALAGIA 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AFFILIATED FOOD PROCESSORS, INC		
Do	AMERICAN BAKERS ASSN		
Do	PLASTICS MANUFACTURING CO	1,377.50	99.76
C.V. & R.V. MAUDLIN, 1511 K STREET, NW, #535 WASHINGTON DC 20005	BRASS AND BRONZE INGOT INSTITUTE		
MAUN GREEN HAYES SIMON JOHANNESON & BREHL, 332 HAMM BUILDING ST. PAUL MN 55102	MURPHY MOTOR FREIGHT LINES, INC		1,368.90
ANTHONY F. MAURIELLO, NEW YORK STATE PETROLEUM COUNCIL 150 STATE STREET ALBANY NY 12207	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	1,508.53	916.79
THOMAS H. MAXEDON, KENTUCKY PETROLEUM COUNCIL 612-A SHELBY STREET FRANKFORT KY 40601	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
ALBERT E. MAY, 1627 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-FLAG SHIP OPERATORS	4,800.00	53.80
JAMES C. MAY, 700 ANDERSON ROAD PURCHASE NY 10577	PEPSICO, INC		
WALTER R. MAY, 7004 PARK TERRACE DRIVE ALEXANDRIA VA 22307	YELLOW FREIGHT SYSTEM, INC	10,500.00	2,536.00
ARNOLD MAYER, 1775 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL WORKERS INTL UNION	18,846.17	596.85
MAYER BROWN & PLATT, 2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #6500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES ASSN OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	COMDISCO, INC		
Do	ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE	149.00	
Do	GATX CORP		
Do	JMB REALTY CORP		
Do	SEARS ROEBUCK & CO		
Do	TRANSCANADA PIPELINES LTD		
JEFFREY G. MAYS, SUITE 400E 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSN		
WILLIAM J. MCAULIFFE JR , 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN LAND TITLE ASSN	570.00	
ANN MCBRIDE, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	12,760.02	575.31
MARTHA MCCABE, 1828 L ST., NW SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA	2,500.00	
JULIE P. MCCAHILL, SUITE 715 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MEAD CORPORATION	275.00	
A. R. MCCAMMON, 501 UNION ST., #506 NASHVILLE TN 37219	TENNESSEE RAILROAD ASSOCIATION		
KATHERINE S. MCCARTER, 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSN	2,566.00	
CAROLYN KIM MCCARTHY, 7901 WESTPARK DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL BUILDERS' ASSN	1,250.00	500.00
JAMES R. MCCARTHY, 1220 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	200.00	
JAMES W MCCARTHY, 1515 WILSON BLVD ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,000.00	2,111.83
MCCARTY NOONE & WILLIAMS, SUITE 3306 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGISTS	855.00	49.16
MICHAEL A. MCCLELLAND, 1200 ONE MAIN PLACE DALLAS TX 75250	STRASBURGER & PRICE (FOR: DALLAS/FT. WORTH REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD)		
ROBERT MCCLORY, BAKER & MCKENZIE 815 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FRANCISCA WEI		
MCCLURE & TROTTER, SUITE 600 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COCA-COLA COMPANY		19.59
Do	ESTATE OF CHARLES G. BLUHDORN		
Do	GULF & WESTERN INDUSTRIES, INC	1,305.00	85.30
Do	MOBIL OIL CORP	258.13	98.77
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COS		
Do	PROVIDENCE CAPITOL CORP		25.00
ROBERT S. MCCONNAUGHEY, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
JOHN L. MCCONNELL, SUITE 1100 1800 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
SALLY MCCONNELL, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	9,010.02	1,120.95
MOLLY MCCORMICK, 2301 MARKET STREET, S24-4 PHILADELPHIA PA 19101	PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY	2,282.30	168.19
ALVIN MCCOY, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FED OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
DENNIS R. MCCOY, 1101 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED GAS PIPE LINE CO		
E. L. MCCULLOCH, 819 RAILWAY LABOR BLDG., 400 1ST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS	284.60	642.78
ROSE MCCULLOUGH, 1219 S. 25TH STREET LINCOLN NB 68502	SIERRA CLUB	2,500.00	1,293.46
ALBERT L. MCDERMOTT, 1819 L STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN HOTEL & MOTEL ASSN	2,291.28	
MARK T. MCDERMOTT, JOSEPH, POWELL, MCDERMOTT & REINER, P.C. 1300 19TH STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036.	CIVIL PILOTS FOR REGULATORY REFORM	351.50	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY, SUITE 500 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AM INTERNATIONAL		
Do	CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO	1,360.00	94.50
Do	FEDERAL KEMPER LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY	1,431.00	15.50
Do	FEDERATION OF JAPAN SALMON FISHERIES COOPERATIVE ASSN		
Do	GUARDIAN AD LITEM, AIR CRASH DISASTER NEAR SAIGON		
Do	KEMPER INVESTORS LIFE INSURANCE CO	689.00	7.50
Do	LUMBERMAN MUTUAL CASUALTY CO		
Do	SPRINGFIELD MARINE BANK (FOR: ESTATE OF GEORGE W. BUNN)		
Do	TIMBER REALIZATION	80.00	
Do	TUNA RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC		
JACK MCDONALD ASSOCIATES, SUITE 610 1120 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE INSURANCE CO	20,000.00	
E. T. MCDONALD, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS	1,300.00	1,500.00
JACK MCDONALD, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #610 WASHINGTON DC 20036	JACK MCDONALD ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE INSURANCE CO)		
MICHAEL D. MCDONALD, MARYLAND PETROLEUM ASSN, 60 WEST ST. ANNAPOLIS MD 21401	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
MCDONOUGH HOLLAND & ALLEN, SUITE 1275 1875 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CARMA-SANDLING GROUP		
Do	COUNTY OF ORANGE		
Do	STEPHEN D. COX		
Do	FRANKLIN REINFORCING STEEL CO, INC		
Do	IRVINE CITY SAVINGS & LOAN ASSN		
Do	ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		
Do	SANTA ANA RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION AGENCY		
PATRICK J. MCDONOUGH, 5999 STEVENSON AVENUE ALEXANDRIA VA 22304	AMERICAN ASSN FOR COUNSELING AND DEVELOPMENT	1,741.50	
DINAH D. MCELFRESH, SUITE 1030N 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HAUCK & ASSOCIATES (FOR: NATIONAL ASSN OF CHILD CARE MANAGEMENT)		
ROBERT H. MCFADDEN, 1620 EYE STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC	120.00	5.50
JOSEPH M. MCGARRY, MUNSON ROAD FARMINGTON CT 06032	HEUBLEIN, INC	16,120.00	2,577.00
PAUL J. MCGEADY, 475 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, #239 NEW YORK NY 10115	MORALITY IN MEDIA, INC	147.67	
DONNA LEE MCGEE, 1800 M STREET, NW, #870-S WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES, INC		
W. CURT MCGEE, 1620 I ST., NW, SUITE 703 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BECHTEL NATIONAL, INC		
P. ANNE MCGHEE, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	450.00	
ROBERT M. MCGLOTTEN, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN FED OF LABOR & CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS	14,537.46	1,153.94
PHYLLIS M. MCGOVERN, 1875 EYE STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE		
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, NEW YORK STATE PETROLEUM COUNCIL 156 WILLIAM ST. NEW YORK NY 10038	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
JEROME J. MCGRATH, 1660 L ST., NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	500.00	
PETER E. MCGUIRE, 400 FIRST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL ASSN OF RETIRED & VETERAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES	4,999.98	101.55
MCHALE COOK & WELCH, P.C., 1122 CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUILDING INDIANAPOLIS IN 46204	ESTATE OF MABEL R. LADD		
MCHENRY & STAFFIER, P.C., SUITE 408 1300 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FOOTHILLS PIPE LINES (YUKON) LTD	5,475.00	
Do	HUSKY OIL LTD		
Do	PAN-ALBERTA GAS LTD		
CLARENCE M. MCINTOSH JR , 400 FIRST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSN	1,307.57	
ROBERT MCINTYRE, ROOM 200 2020 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CITIZENS FOR TAX JUSTICE	7,664.30	
CHRISTINE E. MCKECHNIE, 2550 M ST., NW SUITE 770 WASHINGTON DC 20037	RJR INDUSTRIES, INC	250.00	
MCKENNA CONNER & CUNEO, 3435 WILSHIRE BLVD., 28TH FL. LOS ANGELES CA 90010	AHMANSON FOUNDATION		
Do	CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS		
WILLIAM F. MCKENNA, SUITE 500 2301 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	HOUSLEY, GOLDBERG & KANTARIAN, P.C.		
JAN E. MCKENZIE, 1111 19TH ST., NW SUITE 702 WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	748.00	362.67
ROBERT T. MCKERNAN, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC	500.00	
WILLIAM COLM MCKEVENY, 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK NY 10012	AMERICAN PULPWOOD ASSN		
JAMES D. MCKEVITT, SUITE 695 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS	2,250.00	200.00
C. A. 'MACK' MCKINNEY, 219 NORTH WASHINGTON STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NON COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSN OF THE USA	7,123.14	11,629.28
THOMAS L. MCKNEW JR., 1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #840 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SANTA FE SOUTHERN PACIFIC CORP	1,500.00	
JAMES D. MCLAUGHLIN, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	450.00	51.66
WILLIAM F. MCMANUS, 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	525.00	
JANE PIERSON MCMICHAEL, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	15,137.04	23,819.68
JAMES D. MCMILLAN, 1899 L ST., NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC	EXXON CORPORATION		1,075.68
MCNAIR GLENN KONDUROS CORLEY SINGLETARY PORTER & DIBBLE, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA	1,404.00	
Do	AIRCO, INC		
Do	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
Do	BANKERS TRUST OF SOUTH CAROLINA	5,848.90	
Do	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	528.00	352.27
Do	CBS, INC	6,442.20	248.94
Do	CHARLESTON CENTER #3, LTD		
Do	COLT INDUSTRIES, INC		123.43
Do	DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL		
Do	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	GENERAL MILLS	7,667.21	108.47
Do	GENERAL TELEPHONE & ELECTRONICS	20,671.60	733.90
Do	GEORGIA PACIFIC CORP	2,247.50	157.93
Do	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	HARRIS CORPORATION	22,122.00	777.88
Do	MESA PETROLEUM CO		
Do	METROPOLITAN INSURANCE	678.00	79.87
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	500.00	
Do	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE		
Do	NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORP		
Do	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	3,841.60	
Do	RKO		
Do	SONY CORP OF AMERICA	13,783.60	207.88
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	540.60	427.50
LARAMIE FAITH MCNAMARA, SUITE 2700 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,000.00	
PATRICK H. MCNAMARA, 1800 M STREET, NW, #700 SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CHEMICAL, U.S.A.		
PETER F. MCNEISH, 618 WASHINGTON BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COS	3,000.00	
MICHAEL J. MCSHANE, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #320 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TECHNOLOGY FOR ENERGY CORP		
GEORGE G. MEAD, 430 FIRST ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC	10,000.00	
JOHN K. MEAGHER, 1155 15TH ST.,N.W. SUITE 1004 WASHINGTON DC 20005	LTV CORPORATION	2,500.00	670.00
JOSEPH J. MEDER, SUITE 1100 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERLAKE, INC	9,000.00	415.00
MEDTRONIC, INC, 3055 OLD HIGHWAY 8 P.O. BOX 1453 MINNEAPOLIS MN 55440			2,436.83
WILLIAM H. MEGONNELL, 1111 19TH ST., NW, 9TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	1,223.64	236.65
RICHARD A. MEHLER, 1742 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AUTOMOTIVE PARTS REBUILDERS ASSN		
MENDELSOHN ASSOCIATES, INC., 1826 JEFFERSON PLACE, NW, #101 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES		
Do	WOLF TRAP FOUNDATION FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS		
EDWARD L. MENNING, 1522 K STREET N.W. SUITE 836 WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL VETERINARIANS	32.16	
STEPHANIE MENSH, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF OPHTHALMOLOGY		
ELLIS E. MEREDITH, 1611 NORTH KENT ST. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN APPAREL MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
CHARLES L. MERIN, 1875 I STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE	5,000.00	2,021.11
EDWARD A. MERLIS, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN	5,000.00	
ORREN MERREN, 701 WASHINGTON BUILDING 15TH STREET AND NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PORTFOLIO OF AGRICULTURE AND CAYMAN TURTLE FARM LTD		
EDWARD L. MERRIGAN, 6000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20815	CENTRAL GULF LINES, INC		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF RECYCLING INDUSTRIES, INC	5,000.00	187.92
MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC., SUITE 906 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			4,500.00
THOMAS L. MESKAN, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,250.00	351.79
JEAN L. MESTRES, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CITIES SERVICE OIL & GAS CORP	555.00	178.02
WILLIAM M. METHENITIS, 1200 ONE MAIN PLACE DALLAS TX 75250	STRASBURGER & PRICE (FOR: DALLAS/FT. WORTH REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD)	125.00	
CHRISTOPHER L. MEYER, P.O. BOX 888 ASHLAND KY 41101			
M. BARRY MEYER, 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALUMINUM ASSN		525.00
LARRY D. MEYERS, 1015 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FERTILIZER INSTITUTE	25,000.00	1,711.07
JAMES G. MICHAUX, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #430 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FEDERATED DEPT STORES, INC	500.00	
ANN A. MICHEL, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	200.00	
LAURIE L. MICHEL, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NABISCO BRANDS, INC	4,300.00	1,000.00
THOMAS A. MICHELETTI, 1111 19TH STREET, NW, #303 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO	3,750.00	2,000.00
RONALD A. MICHIELI, SUITE 1032 425 13TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSN	1,000.00	
MID CONTINENT WILDCATTERS ASSN., 200 DOUGLAS BLDG. WICHITA KS 67202		106,973.00	7,729.00
MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSN, 711 ADAMS OFFICE BLDG. TULSA OK 74103		41,140.47	13,010.94
PAUL J. MIGNINI SR., 815 16TH STREET, NW, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMALGAMATED CLOTHING & TEXTILE WORKERS UNION	2,895.00	37.50
SHARON MIHNOVETS, 2809 S. JOYCE ST. ARLINGTON VA 22202			
MILBANK TWEED HADLEY & MCCLOY, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A.		
Do	CLAYMARK CORPORATION		
Do	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S.	10,877.60	
Do	JOHN HANCOCK MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO		
Do	JOINT TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL FINAN. ASSIST. FOR LAW STUDENTS		
Do	MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK		
Do	NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY		
Do	PRUDENTIAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA		
MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, SUITE 500 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BLACK AND DECKER MANUFACTURING COMPANY		75.00
Do	PEPSICO, INC		30.00
Do	PIZZA HUT, INC		170.00
KATHERINE MILLARD, 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ASSN OF PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS	50.00	
ROY H. MILLENSON, 2005 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PUBLISHERS	750.00	153.00
MILLER & CHEVALIER, CHARTERED, METROPOLITAN SQUARE 655 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	HALLMARK CARDS, INC		23.00
Do	WEBSTER, JEPPSON, JONES & AGRAN	10,644.77	13.87
DENNY MILLER ASSOCIATES, 203 MARYLAND AVE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	BOEING COMPANY	333.33	250.00
Do	MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSN	533.33	260.00
Do	PORT OF TACOMA	320.00	250.00
Do	ROCKCOR, INC	666.67	275.00
MILLER ASSOCIATES, INC., 2500 QUE ST.,NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	TOSCO CORPORATION	1,500.00	40.50
MILLER CANFIELD PADDOCK & STONE, SUITE 300 2555 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	FEDERAL HOME LIFE INSURANCE CO		
MILLER CASSIDY LARROCA & LEWIN, SUITE 500 2555 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	47TH STREET PHOTO		1,225.00
DALE MILLER, 4000 RENO ROAD, NW WASHINGTON DC 20008	GULF INTRACOASTAL CANAL ASSN		
Do	TEXASGULF, INC		
DAVID H. MILLER, 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A.	125.00	12.73
DEBORAH IMLE MILLER, 15TH & M STS., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S.		
GRANT MILLER, 1725 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #900 ARLINGTON VA 22202	LTV AEROSPACE & DEFENSE CO	2,500.00	125.00
JAMES C. MILLER, 1616 H ST, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL GRANGE	3,462.50	
JOHN R. MILLER, 1750 MIDLAND BUILDING CLEVELAND OH 44115	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
JOSEPH E. MILLER JR., 1608 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN LEGION	6,507.00	31.85
PAUL J. MILLER, 8000 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO IL 60606	INVESTMENT COUNSEL ASSN OF AMERICA, INC		
RICHARD G. MILLER, 1101 14TH STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN NURSES' ASSN	3,836.64	562.96
ROBERT H. MILLER, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST, SW, #2202 WASHINGTON DC 20024	TENNECO INC		50.00
ROBIN MILLER, 1925 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY	1,535.81	
STEVEN T. MILLER, 1607 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	AMERICAN METAL DETECTORS MANUFACTURERS, INC		
Do	AUTO INTERNACIONAL ASSN		
Do	COALITION OF AUTOMOTIVE ASSNS		
Do	SPECIALTY EQUIPMENT MARKET ASSN	1,500.00	702.48
C.G. PETE MILLIGAN, 4360 N.E. JOE'S POINT STUART FL 33494	AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO	2,900.00	129.80
CHRISTINE TOPPING MILLIKEN, 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., #503 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES	6,314.00	361.00
JOHN C. MILLINER P.O. BOX 1788 FOREST PARK GA 30051	SOUTHEASTERN LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSN	257.68	
JOHN F. MILLS, 1875 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE		
ROBERT G. MILLS, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031	U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE	600.00	
RICHARD V. MINCK, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	1,040.00	
MINERAL EXPLORATION COALITION, INC, P.O. BOX 15638 LAKEWOOD CO 80215		2,995.20	191.88
MINING & RECLAMATION COUNCIL OF AMERICA, 1575 I STREET, NW, #525 WASHINGTON DC 20005			
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C., 1825 I STREET, NW, #1025 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GENERAL TELEPHONE & ELECTRONICS	1,000.00	
Do	HOME RECORDING RIGHTS COALITION	17,200.00	
Do	HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY	2,500.00	
Do	TURNER BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC	2,000.00	
JOANNE MITCHELL, 2020 K STREET, NW, #435 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COMMODITY EXCHANGE, INC	500.00	630.00
STACEY J. MOBLEY, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO	58.00	
TERRENCE W. MODGLIN, 2001 S ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20009	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MERCHANT SHIPPING		
Do	TERRENCE W. MODGLIN & ASSOCIATES (FOR: MARITIME INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT)		
DAVID T. MODL 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO		
ROBERT M. MOLITER, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
ROBERT A. MOLOFSKY, 5025 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO	5,000.00	136.43
MICHAEL J. MOLONEY, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	60.00	
C. MANLY MOLPUS, P.O. BOX 3556 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE	1,000.00	
CHRISTOPHER MONEK, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
JOHN M. MONLEY, SUITE 600 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION CORP		
ELIZABETH R. MONRO, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA	5,000.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
MARY MONROE, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL AIRLINE PASSENGERS ASSN, INC	600.00	140.00
MICHAEL MONRONEY, SUITE 2700 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,000.00	
STEVEN M. MOODIE, 910 16TH STREET ROOM 302 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FEDERATION OF AMERICAN CONTROLLED SHIPPING	200.00	
JAMES P. MOONEY, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	5,700.00	
ALAN J. MOORE, SUITE 840, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SANTA FE INDUSTRIES, INC	1,000.00	
FRANCIS B. MOORE, 3003 BUTTERFIELD ROAD OAK BROOK IL 60521	WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC	5,000.00	2,047.00
JANIS E. MOORE, 1776 F ST., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	250.00	
TIMOTHY X. MOORE, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS		
WILLIAM D. MOORE, 10 DORRANCE STREET PROVIDENCE RI 02903	GREATER PROVIDENCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	332.00	
MORALITY IN MEDIA, INC., 475 RIVERSIDE DRIVE SUITE 239 NEW YORK NY 10115		1,425.85	1,425.85
VINCENT L. MORELLI, 2550 M ST., NW SUITE 225 WASHINGTON DC 20037	CONGOLEUM CORPORATION	500.00	257.82
DUDLEY DIGGES MORGAN III, P.O. BOX 52468 NEW ORLEANS LA 70152	SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	8,333.35	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS, SUITE 800 NORTH 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMITTEE FOR CAP FORMATION THROUGH DIVIDEND REINVESTMENT		
Do	CONSOLIDATED NATURAL GAS CO		
Do	KNOLL FINE CHEMICALS, INC		
JEANNE MORIN, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S	2,400.00	170.05
ROBERT E. MORIN, 600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #354 WASHINGTON DC 20037	SOCIETY OF REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS		
JAMES A. MORRILL, SCOTT PLAZA I PHILADELPHIA PA 19113	SCOTT PAPER COMPANY	2,250.00	757.98
MARTIN S. MORRIS, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
W. PATRICK MORRIS, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA	1,000.00	
MORRISON & FOERSTER, 1920 N STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAYS		1,647.45
Do	CROCKER NATIONAL BANK	8,333.32	65.37
Do	EASTDIL EQUITY		2.70
Do	LOCKHEED AIR TERMINALS, INC		384.37
Do	MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL, INC	7,887.50	29.43
Do	ROSENBERG REAL ESTATE EQUITY FUND, INC	25,040.00	118.38
JULIAN K. MORRISON III, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #802 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	750.00	
PHILIP D. MORRISON, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMF, INC		
Do	BLOUNT, INC		
Do	BLUE BELL, INC		
Do	BORG-WARNER CORP		
Do	EATON CORP		
Do	ESTATE OF VIRGINIA S. DU PONT		
Do	ROCHESTER TAX COUNCIL		
WILLIAM C. MORRISON, 2001 NORTH ADAMS ST. ARLINGTON VA 22201	MEAT IMPORTERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC	875.00	
VALERIE T. MORSE, 453 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	BENEFICIAL MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF AMERICA		
FRANK D. MORUZZI, SUITE 500 1235 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON VA 22202	ITALIAN AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES (U.S.A.), INC		
JOHN H. MOSEMAN, 1875 EYE STREET, NW, #1025 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COALITION OF HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS		
JAMES W. MOSES, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031	U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE	150.00	
RUSSELL N. MOSHER, SUITE 160 950 N. GLEBE RD. ARLINGTON VA 22203	AMERICAN BOILER MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
SOL MOSHER, 1660 L ST., NW, #215 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CROWN ZELLERBACH CORPORATION		
MOSS ASSOCIATES, INC, 2440 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	ASSOCIATION OF BANK HOLDING COS	900.00	
LYNN E. MOTE, 1015 15TH ST., NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNORTH	2,000.00	
MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC, 1600 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		16,512.34	16,512.34
JOHN J. MOTLEY, SUITE 695 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS	2,250.00	200.00
MOTOR AND EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, 1120 19TH ST., NW SUITE 333 WASHINGTON DC 20036			3,378.30
MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC., 300 NEW CENTER BLDG. DETROIT MI 48202		2,831.15	2,831.15
MOUNTAIN WEST ASSOCIATES, SUITE 880 2121 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	GREAT NATIONAL CORPORATION		
Do	PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO	10,050.00	52.21
Do	UTAH POWER & LIGHT CO	22,023.00	5,624.79
MUDGE ROSE GUTHRIE ALEXANDER & FERNDON, 2121 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	MERCEDES BENZ OF NORTH AMERICA		2,043.80
Do	BASIN ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE		
JAMES MULAR, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS		
ALBERT E. MULLIN JR , 111 POWDERMILL RD. (B79) MAYNARD MA 01754	DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CORPORATION	6,000.00	
TRACY MULLIN, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSN	160.00	20.00
ROBERT J. MULLINS, SUITE 202-W 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL & CO-OPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA	8,960.00	
MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ASSOCIATION, C/O LIZ ARCURI 1220 19TH ST., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036			6,165.48
C. LEON MURPHY, P.O. BOX 12910 CHARLESTON SC 29412	KIAWAH ISLAND CO, LTD		
MURPHY MOTOR FREIGHT LINES, INC, P.O. BOX 43640 ST. PAUL MN 55164			
RICHARD W. MURPHY, 1401 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL FOOD PROCESSORS ASSN	500.00	117.82
MURRAY & SCHEER, SUITE 695 2550 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE, ST. PAUL & PACIFIC RAILROADS	400.00	
Do	CLEVELAND CLIFFS IRON CO	250.00	
Do	CONNECTICUT MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	500.00	
Do	IRON ORE LESSORS ASSN, INC	250.00	
Do	LTV CORPORATION	450.00	
Do	MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	500.00	
Do	MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE	500.00	
Do	NATIONAL BUSINESS AIRCRAFT ASSN	500.00	
Do	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF COAL LESSORS	300.00	
Do	NEW ENGLAND MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	500.00	
Do	PENN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	100.00	
Do	SWAZILAND SUGAR ASSN	500.00	
DANIEL H. MURRAY, 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GTE SPRINT	16,250.00	
GORDON L. MURRAY, SUITE 1002 1911 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON VA 22202	LEAR SIEGLER, INC./ENERGY PRODUCTS DIV	125.80	125.80
ROSEMARY GRIFFIN MURRAY, SUITE 901 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC		
WILLIAM E. MURRAY, 1800 MASS. AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	179.50	
ROBERT J. MUTH, 120 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10271	ASARCO INC	450.00	
FRED J. MUTZ, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	4,000.00	15.30
PAUL J. MYER, 1150 17TH ST., NW, 11TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO, INC		
GARY D. MYERS, 1015 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FERTILIZER INSTITUTE	4,500.00	
CLIFFORD M. NAEVE, SUITE 503 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSN	2,079.00	17.50
ALAN Y. NAFTALIN, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	KOTEEN & NAFTALIN (FOR: ALASCOM, INC)		
Do	KOTEEN & NAFTALIN (FOR: TELEPHONE & DATA SYSTEMS, INC)		
NANCY A. NAGY, SUITE 209 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC		
LINDA K. NAIDA, 1616 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL GRANGE	937.50	
PETER A. NALEWAIK, 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC		
JULIA NANAY, 2550 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHARTER OIL CO		95.41
JOHN L. NAPIER, GOLDBERG COTTINGHAM EASTERLING & NAPIER P.O. DRAWER 655 BENNETTSVILLE SC 29512	DARE COUNTY OREGON INLET COMMISSION	18,000.00	1,182.87
Do	FLUE CURED TOBACCO STABILIZATION CORPORATION		
Do	GENERAL MILLS CORPORATION		
Do	NATIONAL BEER WHOLESALERS' ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	15,000.00	1,247.29
Do	TURNER BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC		
Do	DON WALLACE ASSOCIATES, INC		
BERNARD NASH, 1015 18TH ST., NW SUITE 408 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
Do	MERCK & CO., INC		
Do	TIME, INC		
FRANCES E NATHAN, 455 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10016	NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY	5,021.00	
HARDY L. NATHAN, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	900.00	
RAYMOND NATHAN, 4242 EAST-WEST HWY CHEVY CHASE MD 20815	AMERICAN ETHICAL UNION	600.00	296.68
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ASSN, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		6,760.23	6,760.23
NATIONAL ASSN FOR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS, INC, P.O. BOX 14887 COLUMBUS OH 43214		2,962.64	1,865.23
NATIONAL ASSN FOR UNIFORMED SERVICES, 5535 HEMPSTEAD WAY SPRINGFIELD VA 22151		2,501.80	2,456.71
NATIONAL ASSN OF AIR TRAFFIC SPECIALISTS, SUITE 415 WHEATON PLAZA NORTH WHEATON MD 20902			6,636.36
NATIONAL ASSN OF AIRCRAFT & COMMUNICATIONS SUPPLIERS, INC, 23871 MADISON TORRANCE CA 90505		15,300.00	13,258.19
NATIONAL ASSN OF BEVERAGE IMPORTERS, 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1205 WASHINGTON DC 20005			
NATIONAL ASSN OF CHAIN DRUG STORES, INC, P.O. BOX 1417-D49 ALEXANDRIA VA 22313			7,635.00
NATIONAL ASSN OF FEDERAL VETERINARIANS, SUITE 836 1522 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			67.96
NATIONAL ASSN OF HOMES FOR CHILDREN, 104 EAST 35TH ST. NEW YORK NY 10016			2,000.00
NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES, SUITE 503 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.		1,219.00	70,793.00
NATIONAL ASSN OF INSURANCE BROKERS, INC, SUITE 700 311 FIRST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001			
NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS, 1776 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		70,646.06	70,646.06
NATIONAL ASSN OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COS., 3707 WOODVIEW TRACE P.O. BOX 68700 INDIANAPOLIS IN 46268			

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
NATIONAL ASSN OF PENSION CONSULTANTS & ADMINISTRATORS, INC, SUITE 300 3 PIEDMONT CENTER ATLANTA GA 30305		5,175.00	5,488.96
NATIONAL ASSN OF PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS, 747 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10017		9,200.00	2,200.00
NATIONAL ASSN OF PLUMBING-HEATING-COOLING CONTRACTORS, 1016 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,354.12	1,354.12
NATIONAL ASSN OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS, INC., 1101 17TH ST., NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON DC 20036		12,000.00	3,400.00
NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		5,000.00	104.85
NATIONAL ASSN OF STEVEDORES, 2011 I STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20006		58,750.00	13,895.00
NATIONAL ASSN OF TRUCK STOP OPERATORS, INC, 1199 N. FAIRFAX STREET, #801 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314			
NATIONAL ASSN OF WHEAT GROWERS, SUITE 300 415 2ND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		5,330.00	7,316.48
NATIONAL AUDIO-VISUAL ASSN, INC, 3150 SPRING ST. FAIRFAX VA 22031		386,018.60	4,819.65
NATIONAL BROILER COUNCIL, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		1,750.00	1,750.00
NATIONAL BUSINESS AIRCRAFT ASSN, ONE FARRAGUT SQUARE SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20006			
NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		20,818.75	23,068.75
NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSN, 5420 S. QUEBEC ST. P.O. BOX 3469 ENGLEWOOD CO 80155			3,000.00
NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS LOBBY, P.O. BOX 1876 IOWA CITY IA 52244			
NATIONAL CLEAN AIR COALITION, INC, 530 7TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003		43,347.38	51,387.61
NATIONAL CLUB ASSOCIATION, 1625 EYE ST., NW, #609 WASHINGTON DC 20006			
NATIONAL COAL ASSN, COAL BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,280,846.00	15,830.00
NATIONAL COALITION FOR MARINE CONSERVATION, INC., P.O. BOX 23298 SAVANNAH GA 31403		18,284.40	19,658.97
NATIONAL COMM AGAINST REPRESSIVE LEGISLATION, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		5,423.04	9,865.38
NATIONAL COMM FOR A HUMAN LIFE AMENDMENT, INC, SUITE 400 1707 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		347,598.00	10,366.00
NATIONAL COMM FOR CITIZENS IN EDUCATION, SUITE 410 WILDE LAKE VILLAGE GREEN COLUMBIA MD 21044			
NATIONAL COMM ON SMALL ISSUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS, BOX 1, 900 SOUTH 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.		13,010.00	13,010.00
NATIONAL COMMERCIAL FINANCE ASSOCIATION, ONE PENN PLAZA NEW YORK NY 10001		2,186.25	4,447.04
NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE, INC, 1522 K STREET, NW, #406 WASHINGTON DC 20005			281.54
NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER, P.O. BOX 12285 MEMPHIS TN 38182		6,314.26	6,314.26
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF HEALTH CENTERS, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20037		7,762.60	4,168.94
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS, SUITE 400 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		1,902,906.39	
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TECHNICAL SERVICE INDUSTRIES, SUITE 1190 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		719.00	719.00
NATIONAL ELECTRICAL MFGRS ASSN, 2101 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037		166.32	166.32
NATIONAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS INST, SUITE 303 2550 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037		4,210.50	594.07
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.		65,929.00	22,213.86
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CREDIT UNIONS, 577 SIXTH STREET BROOKLYN NY 11215			
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		21,818.76	21,861.87
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, 150 W. 20TH AVE. SAN MATEO CA 94403		13,600.00	13,600.00
NATIONAL FERTILIZER SOLUTIONS ASSN, 8823 NORTH INDUSTRIAL ROAD PEORIA IL 61615		6,997.31	6,997.31
NATIONAL FOOD PROCESSORS ASSN., 1401 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005		1,517.32	1,517.32
NATIONAL GRAIN & FEED ASSN, 725 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			41.00
NATIONAL GRANGE, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		12,500.00	10,022.50
NATIONAL GUARD ASSN OF THE U.S., ONE MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		34,550.00	3,004.01
NATIONAL HEALTH CARE FINANCING ASSN, P.O. BOX 946 HOLLY HILL FL 32017		100.00	
NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRANSPORTATION LEAGUE, SUITE 410 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		12,000.00	11,772.00
NATIONAL KNITWEAR & SPORTSWEAR ASSN, 386 PARK AVENUE SOUTH NEW YORK NY 10016			1,000.00
NATIONAL LEAGUE OF POSTMASTERS OF THE U.S., 1023 NORTH ROYAL STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314			27,783.00
NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC, 1840 WILSON BLVD., #203 ARLINGTON VA 22201		22,745.43	22,745.43
NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FED, 1840 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22201		8,645.05	8,645.05
NATIONAL MOTORSPORTS COMM OF ACCUS, SUITE 1204 1701 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		40.19	
NATIONAL OFFICE MACHINE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, 810 LIVELY BLVD., P.O. BOX 707 WOOD DALE IL 60191	NATIONAL OFFICE MACHINE DEALERS ASSN	85.00	4.26
NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL, INC., 1707 H ST., NW 11TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL OIL JOBBERS COUNCIL	189,451.05	13,322.39
NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN, 425 13TH STREET, NW, #723 WASHINGTON DC 20004			1,555.43
NATIONAL PARKING ASSOCIATION, 2000 K ST., NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20036			25,713.69
NATIONAL PEST CONTROL ASSN, 8100 OAK ST. DUNN LORING VA 22027			
NATIONAL PUBLIC AFFAIRS CORP., 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	300.00	
NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSN, 633 S. WASHINGTON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314			4,500.00
NATIONAL RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSN, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			2,300.00
NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMM, SUITE 600 8001 BRADDOCK RD. SPRINGFIELD VA 22160		9,025.52	9,025.52
NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			3,593.15
NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN, SUITE 100 1448 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314		13,753.00	18,675.00
NATIONAL SECURITY TRADERS ASSN, INC, SUITE 4511 ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048			4,375.00
NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSN, 1604 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		5,000.00	468.78
NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, 2029 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		12,500.00	8,850.00
NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			43,670.04
NATIONAL SOLID WASTES MANAGEMENT ASSN, SUITE 930 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
NATIONAL TAX LIMITATION COMMITTEE, SUITE 600 1523 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		4,600.00	4,545.00
NATIONAL TIRE DEALERS & RETREADERS ASSN, 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005		18,125.00	18,125.00
NATIONAL VENTURE CAPITAL ASSOCIATION, SUITE 400 1730 N. LYNN ST. ARLINGTON VA 22209			2,000.00
NATIONAL WATER WELL ASSN, 500 W. WILSON BRIDGE ROAD WORTHINGTON OH 43085		2,400.00	2,400.00
NATIONAL-AMERICAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSN, 201 PARK WASHINGTON COURT FALLS CHURCH VA 22046		6,000.00	6,000.00
SUSAN BINGHAM NEAL, SUITE 695 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS		
KAREN J. NEALE, 2501 M STREET N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC	300.00	
JEFFREY NEDELMAN, 1010 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20007	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC		
ALLEN NEECE JR., 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NEECE, CATOR & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: ASSOCIATION OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS).	1,600.00	1,600.00
Do	NEECE, CATOR & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: NATIONAL VENTURE CAPITAL ASSOCIATION).	1,500.00	1,500.00
Do	NEECE, CATOR & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: SMALL BUSINESS UNITED)	1,700.00	1,700.00
NEECE CATOR & ASSOCIATES, INC, 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS	1,600.00	1,600.00
Do	LATIN AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS ASSN (LAMA)	1,600.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPS	200.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES (NADCO)	250.00	
Do	NATIONAL VENTURE CAPITAL ASSOCIATION	1,500.00	1,500.00
Do	SMALL BUSINESS UNITED	1,700.00	1,700.00
Do	SOUTHEASTERN LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSN (SLMA)	1,800.00	1,800.00
FRANCES E. NEELY, 245 2ND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION	2,580.00	
MARY ELIZABETH NEESE, 1101 15TH ST., NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	1,000.00	52.15
STANLEY NEHMER, 1320 19TH STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAD-ZINC PRODUCERS COMMITTEE	500.00	350.00
NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF AMERICA, 1951 WEBSTER STREET OAKLAND CA 94612			75.30
NEILL & COMPANY, INC, SUITE 410 1100 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT	180,000.00	1,300.00
Do	GOVERNMENT OF EL SALVADOR		
Do	HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN	55,000.00	150.00
Do	KINGDOM OF MOROCCO		
NEILL & MULLENHOLZ, SUITE 410 1100 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GOVERNMENT OF EL SALVADOR	81,000.00	800.00
Do	HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN		200.00
Do	KINGDOM OF MOROCCO		3,000.00
Do	NATIONAL FARM & POWER EQUIPMENT DEALERS ASSN	1,500.00	
Do	SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSN	7,500.00	150.00
E. COLETTE NELSON, SUITE 540 8401 CORPORATE DRIVE LANDOVER MD 20785	AMERICAN SUBCONTRACTORS ASSN		
GIL NETTLETON, 4101 CATHEDRAL AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	CHARLES E. GOODELL (FOR THOMSON-CSF, INC)		59.15
Do	DGA INTERNATIONAL, INC (FOR SNECMA)		
NETWORK, 806 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20018		45,898.77	38,135.06
E. JOHN NEUMANN, SUITE 820 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BALTIMORE GAS & ELECTRIC CO	1,708.28	313.08
NEW YORK COMM OF INTL COMM OF PASSENGER LINES, 74 TRINITY PLACE NEW YORK NY 10006			
NEW YORK SHIPPENG ASSN., INC., 80 BROAD STREET, 12TH FL. NEW YORK NY 10004	NEW YORK SHIPPING ASSN., INC.		
MARY BENNETT NEWBOULD, 122 C STREET, NW, #875 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSN	1,100.00	
LESLIE F. NEWCOMER, 226 W. RITTENHOUSE SQUARE PHILADELPHIA PA 19103	PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL BANK		
NEWMAN & HOLTZINGER, P.C., 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UTILITY NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP		
KATHRYN L. NEWMAN, 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	REPUBLIC STEEL CORP		
THOMAS E. NEWMAN, 1719 ROUTE 10 PARSIPPANY NJ 07054	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	250.00	
JANET G. NEWPORT, 1050 17TH STREET, NW, #320 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FHP, INC	2,187.00	302.19
NICHOLAS JOHN NICHOLS, 1620 EYE ST. NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INST OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS		
THOMAS NICKELS, 1101 14TH STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN NURSES' ASSN	5,143.96	222.54
NICKERSON INGRAM & ASSOCIATES, INC, 923 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSN		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	MASSACHUSETTS BAY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY		
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT		
Do	SYSTEMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY, INC		
WILLIAM W. NICKERSON, BRAND LOWELL NICKERSON & DOLE 923 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSN		
Do	MASSACHUSETTS BAY TRANSIT AUTHORITY		
PATRICK J. NILAN, 817 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO	12,328.20	2,581.22
NISSAN MOTOR CORPORATION IN U.S.A., 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #707 WASHINGTON DC 20006			86.74
ROBERT W. NOLAN, 1303 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FLEET RESERVE ASSN	100.00	
WALKER F. NOLAN, 1111-19TH STREET,N.W. 9TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	2,076.00	726.23
H. CHRISTOPHER NOLDE, 2501 M ST.,NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC	300.00	
NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, 491 BROADWATER ARNOLD MD 21012	TERRENCE W. MODGLIN & ASSOCIATES (FOR: MARITIME INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT)		
CHARLES M. NOONE, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST SUITE 3306 WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL ASSN OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COS	5,400.00	139.40
M. KATHRYN NORDSTROM, SUITE 900 ONE THOMAS CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PACIFIC SEAFOOD PROCESSORS ASSN	3,750.00	104.57
JAMES O. E. NORELL, 733 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	LEGAL SERVICES CORP		
NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION, P.O. BOX 3609 NORFOLK VA 23514			279.34
JULIA J. NORRELL, 1850 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	5,325.00	140.01
NORTH AMERICAN EXPORT GRAIN ASSN., INC., 1800 M ST., NW, SUITE 610-N WASHINGTON DC 20036			
NORTH AMERICAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION, 511 2ND ST.,NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		25,900.00	25,900.00
EVANS W. NORTH, 1216 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
J. HALLOCK NORTHCOTT, 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MINNESOTA MINING & MANUFACTURING CO	1,400.00	200.00
NORTHEAST UTILITIES SERVICE CO, SELDEN ST. BERLIN CT 06037			2,410.51
NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT, 1140 19TH ST., NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURLINGTON NORTHERN, INC		
Do	COOK INLET REGION, INC		
Do	TRUST FOR PUBLIC LANDS		
P. MICHAEL NUGENT, 229 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORPORATION	480.00	461.00
RALPH D. NURNBERGER, SUITE 412 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMM	10,437.50	578.40
FRANKLIN W. NUTTER, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #512 WASHINGTON DC 20036	REINSURANCE ASSN OF AMER		
MARK J. NUZZACO, 7901 WESTPARK DR. MCLEAN VA 22102	NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL BUILDERS' ASSN	5,825.00	500.00
C.D. NYBERG, P.O. BOX 800 AUSTIN MN 55912	GEO. A. HORMEL & CO		
KENNETH E. NYQUIST, 8600 BRYN MAWR AVENUE CHICAGO IL 60631	NATIONAL ROOFING CONTRACTORS ASSN	8,700.00	
GEORGE O'BEA JR., 815 16TH ST., NW, #304 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED PAPERWORKERS INT'L UNION		
COLEMAN C. O'BRIEN, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	6,884.00	85.25
JOHN F. O'BRIEN, CONNECTICUT PETROLEUM COUNCIL 410 ASYLUM ST. HARTFORD CT 06103	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
MARY EILEEN O'BRIEN, 1800 M ST., NW, SUITE 710 SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CORNING CORPORATION		
RAYMOND V. O'BRIEN, 1707 L ST., NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORPORATION	370.00	60.00
ROSEMARY L. O'BRIEN, SUITE 640 2550 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CF INDUSTRIES, INC	500.00	198.65
THOMAS H. O'BRIEN, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20037	HARRIS CORPORATION	2,500.00	4,800.65
DAVID S. O'BRYON, 1916 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22201	AMERICAN CHIROPRACTIC ASSN	450.00	117.90
DANIEL O'CONNELL, ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON MA 02109	GADSBY & HANNAH (FOR: WANG LABORATORIES, INC)		
JAMES J. O'CONNELL, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	CONTROL DATA CORPORATION	1,062.00	471.64
RICHARD T. O'CONNELL, RICHARD T. O'CONNELL & ASSOCIATES, INC 3208 TRAVELER STREET FAIRFAX VA 22030	CHOCOLATE MANUFACTURERS ASSN OF THE USA		
Do	NATIONAL CONFECTIONERS ASSN OF THE U.S.		
TERRENCE M. O'CONNELL II , 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: E. F. HUTTON & CO, INC)	3,000.00	
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)	1,500.00	
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP)	5,000.00	
WILLIAM B. O'CONNELL, 111 EAST WACKER DR. CHICAGO IL 60601	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	17,500.00	3,361.09
O'CONNOR & HANNAN, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIS-CHALMERS CORP	675.00	
Do	AMERICAN CLINICAL LABORATORY ASSN	3,000.00	
Do	AMERICAN FAMILY LIFE ASSURANCE CO	750.00	
Do	AMERICAN INST OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS		
Do	ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT TELEVISION STATIONS, INC		
Do	AUTOMOTIVE PARTS & ACCESSORIES ASSN		
Do	BORDEN, INC	7,540.73	
Do	CAMBRIDGE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY		
Do	CENTURY MEDIA CORP		
Do	CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS	4,500.00	
Do	CKLW RADIO BROADCASTING, LTD		
Do	CNA INSURANCE	8,697.21	
Do	COMMITTEE FOR PRUDENT DEREGULATION	8,739.25	
Do	COMMUNICATIONS COUNSEL		
Do	DESTILERIA SERRALLES, INC		
Do	FAIRCHILD INDUSTRIES, INC		
Do	FIRST NATIONAL MONETARY CORPORATION	2,386.86	
Do	GLASS PACKAGING INSTITUTE	512.00	
Do	GOVERNMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO		
Do	HEALTH CARE FINANCING STUDY GROUP		
Do	HENNEPIN COUNTY	2,200.00	
Do	HULES MEXICANOS, S.A	15,000.00	
Do	INDUSTRIAS NEGROMEX, S.A. DE C.V	15,000.00	
Do	INSURANCE ASSN OF CONNECTICUT	8,772.00	
Do	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE		
Do	INVESTORS DIVERSIFIED SERVICES, INC		
Do	J. C. PENNEY CO, INC	150.00	
Do	JOSEPH E. SEAGRAM & SONS, INC	1,599.15	
Do	KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP	950.00	
Do	LORD, BISSELL & BROOK		
Do	MERCEDES-BENZ OF NORTH AMERICA, INC	1,400.00	
Do	MEXICAN CEMENT CHAMBER	30,000.00	
Do	MILLER & SCHROEDER MUNICIPALS, INC	200.00	
Do	NATIONAL COAL CONSUMERS ALLIANCE		
Do	NATIONAL COMM FOR QUALITY HEALTH CARE	1,500.00	
Do	NEBRASKA HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM, INC	5,000.00	
Do	NEIGHBORHOOD TV COMPANY, INC		
Do	PACIFIC TELESIS GROUP	5,681.75	
Do	PADDOCK PUBLICATIONS, INC		
Do	PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA	11,828.00	
Do	SECURITIES INDUSTRY ASSN	11,948.00	
Do	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY		
Do	U.S. TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUPPLIERS ASSN		
CHARLES ALBERT O'CONNOR JR., 2300 S. 24TH ROAD, #533 ARLINGTON VA 22206			
GEORGE E. O'CONNOR, 600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	5,000.00	1,040.00
LEONARD F. O'CONNOR, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON		
PATRICK C. O'CONNOR, KENT & O'CONNOR, INC 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN DENTAL HYGIENISTS ASSN		
Do	AMERICAN SUPPLY ASSOCIATION	4,563.85	1,735.03
Do	AMERICAN WAREHOUSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION	2,441.60	997.83
Do	ASSOCIATION OF FOOD INDUSTRIES	3,000.00	1,232.59
Do	STEEL TANK INSTITUTE	1,482.53	606.51
Do	TRANSPORTATION LAWYERS ASSOCIATION	2,347.44	958.69
JOHN B. O'DAY, SUITE 590 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006	INSURANCE ECONOMICS SOCIETY OF AMERICA	2,000.00	
THOMAS A. O'DAY, 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ALLIANCE OF AMERICAN INSURERS	1,242.00	44.75
ASHTON J. O'DONNELL, 50 BEALE ST., PO BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL NATIONAL, INC		
JANE O'GRADY, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AFL-CIO	14,441.31	169.17
TERRI O'GRADY, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER	662.50	138.10
KATHLEEN O'LEARY, 1625 EYE ST., N. W. ROOM 301 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COLUMBIA GAS DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES	3,500.00	159.29
O'MELVENY & MYERS, 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA		
Do	AMAX, INC		
Do	SANTA FE INTERNATIONAL CORP		
Do	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC		
JEAN F. O'NEIL, 884 COLLEGE PARKWAY ROCKVILLE MD 20850	TERRENCE W. MODGLIN & ASSOCS (MARITIME INST FOR RESEARCH...)		
SARAH E. O'NEIL, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE		
O'NEILL AND HAASE, P.C., SUITE 1110 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLEGHENY COUNTY COMMISSION		
Do	AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE	6,200.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	ASSOCIATION OF PROGRESIVE RENTAL ORGANIZATIONS	800.00	
Do	AYDIN CORP		
Do	BEER INDUSTRY ALLIANCE	800.00	
Do	BHC, INC	3,100.00	
Do	COMMERICAL UNION INSURANCE COMPANIES		
Do	CRUISE AMERICA LINE, INC	25,000.00	
Do	GLASS PACKAGING INSTITUTE		
Do	HARVARD MEDICAL CENTER		
Do	MARRIOTT CORPORATION		
Do	MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL	550.00	
Do	MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION		
Do	NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL LIFE		
Do	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN		
Do	PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT CO		
Do	TEXAS UTILITIES SERVICES, INC		
Do	U.S. FOOTBALL LEAGUE		
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP		
DONALD K. O'NEILL, SUITE 2600 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,000.00	
J. DENIS O'TOOLE, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	4,500.00	
M. DIANE O'TOOLE, SUITE 2300 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	NORTHROP CORP		455.76
STEPHEN E. O'TOOLE, 1660 L STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,000.00	1,620.95
HARRY R. OBLEY, MELLON SQUARE PITTSBURGH PA 15230	MELLON BANK N.A. AND MELLON NATIONAL CORP	2,000.00	400.45
G. H. OCHENRIDER, 1000 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	GRUMMAN AEROSPACE CORPORATION	2,500.00	625.06
T. J. ODEN, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	4,500.00	
BRADFORD C. OELMAN, 900 17TH STREET, NW, #508 WASHINGTON DC 20006	OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION		
NEIL H. OFFEN, 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION	1,000.00	
R.Q. OLD AND ASSOCIATES, INC., 205 THE STRAND ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	GRUMMAN AEROSPACE CORPORATION	200.00	
Do	SPERRY ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS	100.00	
ALVIN E. OLIVER, 725 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL GRAIN & FEED ASSN		
AUSTIN P. OLNEY, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEBOEUF, LAMB, LEIBY & MACRAE (FOR: SHIPPING CORP OF INDIA, INC)		
DENNIS M. OLSEN, 485 E STREET IDAHO FALLS ID 83402	AETNA INSURANCE CO	12.45	1.13
Do	AMERICAN BANKERS INSURANCE OF FLORIDA	79.12	7.16
Do	CENTENNIAL INSURANCE COMPANY	5.94	.55
Do	CHARTER OAK INSURANCE	6.02	.55
Do	FLORISTS' MUTUAL INSURANCE CO	29.62	2.68
Do	FOREMOST INSURANCE CO	157.82	14.32
Do	GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY	16.91	1.53
Do	MINNEHOMA INSURANCE COMPANY	5.45	.51
Do	MONSANTO CO	19.50	
Do	NATIONAL FARMERS UNION PROPERTY & CASUALTY INSURANCE CO	27.89	2.54
Do	STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY CO	13.69	1.24
Do	STATE FARM INSURANCE COMPANY	113.69	10.32
Do	STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE CO	185.05	16.79
Do	TRAVELER'S INDEMNITY OF RHODE ISLAND	7.34	.65
Do	TRAVELERS	164.01	14.87
VAN R. OLSEN, 1156 15TH ST., NW, #1019 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. BEET SUGAR ASSN		
ROY E. OLSON, 260 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10016	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
ALAN M. OLSZEWSKI, 1608 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN LEGION	6,363.00	73.58
CLARK ONSTAD, SUITE 300 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	TEXAS AIR CORP. AND CONTINENTAL AIR LINES		23,704.00
PHILIP C. ONSTAD, 500 WEST PUTNAM AVE. GREENWICH CT 06830	CONTROL DATA CORPORATION	100.00	150.00
MICHEL ORBAN, 125 BROAD STREET, 39TH FL. NEW YORK NY 10004	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO		
ORGAN. FOR PROTECTION & ADVANCEMENT OF SMALL TELEPHONE COS, 2301 M STREET, NW, #530 WASHINGTON DC 20037.		900.00	600.00
ABRAHAM ORLOFSKY, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	1,145.43	
DAVID S. OSTERHOUT, 1000 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	ALLIED AEROSPACE SECTOR		
HIDEAKI OTAKA, SUITE 600 919 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, USA, INC	160.00	103.81
J. F. OTERO, 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS	1,000.00	100.00
KEVIN D. OTT, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	200.00	
ROLAND A. OUELLETTE, 1660 L ST., NW, #501 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,600.00	2,731.47
CLIFF OUSE, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	100.00	
GENE E. OVERBECK, 1101 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC	2,125.00	
OVERSEAS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,000.00	345.00
JACK W. OWEN, SUITE 500 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN		223.68
ROBERT W. OWEN, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF HAITI).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC (FOR: REPUBLIC OF KOREA).		
THOMAS J. OWENS, P.O. BOX 12266 SEATTLE WA 98102	DOLLAR SAVINGS BANK, ET AL		
WILLIAM H. OWENS JR , SUITE 1002 1101 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN	1,000.00	
WILLIAM J. OWENS, 1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #511 ARLINGTON VA 22202	MANUFACTURED HOUSING INST	900.00	100.00
R. RAY PAABO, SUITE 840 1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SANTA FE INDUSTRIES, INC	1,000.00	
PACIFIC MANAGEMENT DYNAMICS CORP, SUITE 107 910 FLOEIN RD. SACRAMENTO CA 95831			
JOEL PACKER, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	1,629.50	54.75
HENRY H. PAIGE, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO		
GERI PALAST, SUITE 200 2020 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTL UNION, AFL-CIO, CLC	5,000.00	556.91
JOHN M. PALATIELLO, 210 LITTLE FALLS STREET FALLS CHURCH VA 22046	AMERICAN CONG. ON SURVEY. & MAPP./AMER SOC OF PHOTOGRAMMETRY	9,281.14	1,400.00
HENRY S. PALAU, 201 N WASHINGTON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 223L4	RETIRED OFFICERS ASSN	988.00	
MICHAEL S. PALLAK, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN		
BRADLEY D. PALMER, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031	U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE	2,400.00	
PALUMBO & CERRELL, INC, 11 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN SOC OF COMPOSERS, AUTHORS & PUBLISHERS	15,000.00	
Do	DISTILLED SPIRITS COUNCIL OF THE U.S., INC	9,668.75	
Do	NATIONAL SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION ASSN	4,500.00	
Do	R.J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO CO	14,725.00	
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT	9,000.00	
BENJAMIN L. PALUMBO, 11 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	1,227.19	
PETER J. PANTUSO, 7900 WESTPARK DRIVE, #514 MCLEAN VA 22102	NATIONAL CONFECTIONERS ASSN OF THE U.S.	450.00	65.00
FRED PANZER, 1875 EYE ST., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE		
PAPERBOARD PACKAGING COUNCIL, SUITE 411 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			
G. OLIVER PAPPS, N.J. PETROLEUM COUNCIL 170 W. STATE ST. TRENTON NJ 08608	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	40.00	
STEPHEN J. PARADISE, 1800 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
HERSCHELL E. PARENT, 460 TWIN CITY BANK ONE RIVERFRONT PLACE NORTH LITTLE ROCK AR 72114	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	534.75	461.23
JOHN N. PARKER, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW SUITE 620 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOBIL OIL CORP	375.00	
PRUDENCE H. PARKS, 1100 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20080	WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO	260.56	
KEN PARMELEE, 1448 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN	10,625.00	1,092.00
TOM E. PARO, 1735 DESALES ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF MAXIMUM SERVICE TELECASTERS, INC	742.00	
PARRY AND ROMANI ASSOCIATES, INC, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FAMILY LIFE ASSURANCE CO	1,000.00	
Do	CARE ENTERPRISES	750.00	196.58
Do	LOYAL AMERICAN LIFE INSURANCE CO	450.00	
Do	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	1,650.00	110.93
Do	NATIONAL BEER WHOLESALERS ASSN	300.00	5.75
Do	SONY CORPORATION		54.88
Do	STANDARD OIL OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA		246.00
JACK PARTRIDGE, 1014 VINE ST. CINCINNATI OH 45201	KROGER COMPANY	2,500.00	782.87
ROBERT D. PARTRIDGE, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	625.00	
PASKUS GORDON & HYMAN, 2005 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL MUSIC PUBLISHERS ASSN, INC		
DAVID J. PASSAMANECK, 4647 FORBES BOULEVARD LANHAM MD 20706	AMVETS	6,800.00	150.47
RICHARD M. PATTERSON, 1800 M ST., NW, #700 SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CHEMICAL CO	500.00	239.00
KENTON H. PATTIE, 3150 SPRING ST. FAIRFAX VA 22031	NATIONAL AUDIO-VISUAL ASSN, INC	3,531.25	
DAVID J. PATTISON, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HEALTH INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC		
PATTON BOGGS & BLOW, SUITE 800 2550 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AIR PRODUCTS & CHEMICALS, INC	522.81	
Do	AIWA AMERICA, INC	13.75	2.27
Do	AKAI AMERICA, LTD	29.79	4.92
Do	ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA	1,166.66	1,071.69

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO	100.00	
Do	AMERICAN COLLEGE OF MORTGAGE ATTORNEYS		
Do	AMERICAN CONGRESS OF SURVEYING & MAPPING		
Do	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO	400.00	
Do	AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSN		
Do	AMERICAN MARITIME ASSN	1,485.00	109.75
Do	AMERICAN MOVERS CONFERENCE		
Do	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ASSN EXECUTIVES		
Do	ARMCO, INC	1,166.66	1,071.69
Do	ARTPAC		
Do	ASOCIACION DE AZUCAREROS DE GUATEMALA		
Do	ASSOCIATION OF TRIAL LAWYERS OF AMERICA	312.50	198.20
Do	BABCOCK & BROWN		
Do	BASIC INDUSTRIES COALITION, INC		
Do	C. F. BEAN		
Do	BIOGEN		
Do	BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES, INC		
Do	CASTLE & COOKE, INC		
Do	CHICAGO BOARD OPTIONS EXCHANGE	1,735.00	
Do	CHRYSLER CORPORATION	2,375.00	3,215.00
Do	COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE		
Do	DUTY FREE SHOPPERS, LTD		
Do	ENERGY RESEARCH CORPORATION		
Do	FUJI PHOTO FILM U.S.A., INC	50.42	8.33
Do	GEORGIA PACIFIC CORP	522.81	
Do	GREAT LAKES DREDGE & DOCK		
Do	HAYT HAYT & LANDAU	5,287.00	
Do	HITACHI SALES CORP OF AMERICA	199.42	33.00
Do	E.F. HUTTON LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	8,260.00	124.92
Do	INSTITUTE OF SCRAP IRON & STEEL, INC	1,950.00	
Do	INTERMEDICS, INC		
Do	KAISER ALUMINUM & CHEMICAL CORP	522.81	
Do	KENWOOD U.S.A. CORPORATION	13.75	2.27
Do	KONISHIROKU AMPEX CO, LTD		
Do	LASCO SHIPPING CO		
Do	LAUNDRY CLEANING COUNCIL	6,975.00	
Do	LOOP, INC	1,410.00	
Do	LOSS RESERVE DEDUCTION COMMITTEE	125.00	
Do	MARS, INC		
Do	MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC CORP OF AMERICA	683.09	113.04
Do	MAXELL CORP OF AMERICA	85.52	13.65
Do	MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC	10.00	
Do	MEAD CORPORATION	1,166.66	1,071.69
Do	MICHIGAN INSURANCE ASSN	86.25	
Do	MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC SALES OF AMERICA, INC	75.64	12.51
Do	MOCATTA METALS CORP		
Do	NAKAMICHI U.S.A. CORP	13.75	2.27
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF CHAIN DRUG STORES		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS	685.00	
Do	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	3,133.00	
Do	NATIONAL MARINE MFRS ASSN	1,300.00	
Do	NATIONAL MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING FINANCE ASSN		
Do	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN		
Do	NEC ELECTRONICS (USA) INC	59.59	9.86
Do	NEW PROCESS CO		
Do	NORTH AMERICAN VAN LINES		
Do	OCEAN MINERALS CO		
Do	OSG BULK SHIPS, INC		
Do	OVERSEAS MILITARY SALES GROUP	1,312.50	
Do	PENNZOIL CO	15,595.00	705.32
Do	PIONEER ELECTRONICS (U.S.A.) INC	27.50	4.55
Do	PPG INDUSTRIES, INC	522.81	
Do	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COUNCIL	2,357.00	
Do	REDWOOD INDUSTRY PARK COMM		
Do	REPUBLIQUE D'HAITI	3,100.00	20.00
Do	RETAIL TAX COMMITTEE	8,030.00	700.17
Do	RICE MILLERS' ASSN	195.00	
Do	ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORP		
Do	SANSUI ELECTRONICS CORP	11.46	1.88
Do	SANYO ELECTRIC, INC	206.30	34.13
Do	SHARP ELECTRONICS CORP	91.69	15.17
Do	SLURRY TRANSPORT ASSN		
Do	SONY CORPORATION OF AMERICA	364.46	60.31
Do	ST. JOE MINERALS CORP		
Do	STATE OF LA, DEPT OF CONSERVATION		
Do	STEPHENS, INC		
Do	SULTANTATE OF OMAN	1,720.00	
Do	SUMITOMO 3M LTD		
Do	TDK U.S.A. CORP	93.98	15.55
Do	TEAC CORP		
Do	TEKNIKA ELECTRONICS CORP	1.60	.25
Do	TOSHIBA AMERICAN, INC	91.69	15.17
Do	U.S. LIFESAVING MANUFACTURERS ASSN	130.00	
Do	UNITED BRANDS CO	125.00	3,200.00
Do	UNITED PLANT GUARD WORKERS ASSN		
Do	US JVC CORPORATION	171.91	28.45
Do	VICTOR MAGNETAPE CO, LTD		
Do	ZEISS AVIONICS SYSTEMS, INC	705.00	
ANDREW R. PAUL, 1875 EYE STREET, NW, #940 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GULF & WESTERN MANAGEMENT CO	1,000.00	73.34
PAUL HASTINGS JANOFSKY & WALKER, 6TH FLOOR 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO	3,208.50	14.60
Do	CALIFORNIA PORTLAND CEMENT CO		
Do	GAF CORPORATION	2,577.00	160.10
Do	M LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY	20,150.00	347.25
Do	OGLETHORPE POWER CORP		
Do	SECURITY LIFE OF DENVER	16,570.00	585.80
Do	WESTERN FARMERS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE		
PAUL WEISS RIFKIND WHARTON & GARRISON, 345 PARK AVE. NEW YORK NY 10154	NEC ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC	12,616.79	564.75
Do	ORBITAL SCIENCES CORP		4.50
LARRY E. PAULICK, 2111 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL SPA & POOL INSTITUTE		
LOUIS R. PAULICK, 1901 NORTH FORT MYER DRIVE ARLINGTON VA 22209	GAS APPLIANCE MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
RICHARD A. PAYSOR, SUITE 135 1415 ELBRIDGE PAYNE RD. ST. LOUIS MO 63017	FIRST CAPITOL ASSOCIATES - GATEWAY, INC		
PEABODY LAMBERT & MEYERS, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMITTEE OF CORPORATE TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS		5,063.33
PEACE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			
JAMES M. PEIRCE JR., 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	1,673.77	
PELTON RESEARCH CENTER, 1400 S. JOYCE STREET ARLINGTON VA 22202	HELP, INC		
PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT CO, 2 N. 9TH ST. ALLENTOWN PA 18101			1,710.03
DOMINIC V. PENSABENE, 1700 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	1,100.00	
GREGORY M. PENSABENE, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #840 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SANTA FE INDUSTRIES, INC	2,056.00	
PEPPER & CORAZZINI, 1776 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SOUTHERN SATELITE SYSTEMS INC		
Do	TEST MARKETING GROUP, INC		
PEPSICO, INC., 700 ANDERSON HILL RD. PURCHASE NY 10577			
VICTOR J. PERINI JR., 1776 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HIGHWAY USERS FEDERATION FOR SAFETY & MOBILITY		
PERITO DUERK & PINCO, P.C., 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN COLLEGE OF NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY	1,000.00	800.00

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	AMERICAN PROTESTANT HOSPITAL ASSN	1,500.00	100.00
Do	COMBINED HEALTH RESOURCES, INC		
Do	JOHNSON & JOHNSON		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF ALCOHOLISM TREATMENT PROGRAMS, INC	1,500.00	100.00
Do	SAMARITAN HEALTH SERVICE		
Do	SOCIETY OF REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS		
PERKINS COIE STONE OLSEN & WILLIAMS, SUITE 1200 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BURLINGTON NORTHERN, INC	1,500.00	
Do	DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES		
TONY PERKINS, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	50.00	
GARY J. PERKINSON, 453 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	BENEFICIAL MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF AMERICA		
ERNEST MICHAEL PERLEY, 112 ST CLAIR AVENUE, WEST, #504 TORONTO, ONTARIO M4V 2Y3	CANADIAN COALITION ON ACID RAIN	461.55	80.00
JEFFRY L. PERLMAN, 1615 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	2,420.00	374.58
LEONARD PERLMAN, 5999 STEVENSON AVENUE ALEXANDRIA VA 22304	AMERICAN ASSN FOR COUNSELING & DEVELOPMENT	3,900.00	263.23
MARK PERMAR, P.O. BOX 12910 CHARLESTON SC 29142	KIAWAH ISLAND COMPANY, LTD		
EDMUND J. PERRET II , 1400 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSN		
G. STEPHEN PERRY, 950 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP (COMSAT)	2,000.00	100.00
KATE M. PERRY, 1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION	354.78	11.25
JOHN J. PESCH, 3422 STONEYBRAE DRIVE FALLS CHURCH VA 22044	NORTHROP CORP		
PHILLIPS S. PETER, 1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	250.00	
PETERSON ENGBERG & PETERSON, SUITE 907 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FEDERATED RESEARCH CORP	18,000.00	409.96
GEOFFREY G. PETERSON, SUITE 1300 425 13TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	DISTILLED SPIRITS COUNCIL OF THE US, INC	2,000.00	400.00
LARS E. PETERSON, 1750 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	450.00	
MARY B. PETERSON, 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,000.00	2,119.55
SUSAN F. PETNIUNAS, SUITE 214 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MANVILLE CORP	500.00	
MICHAEL J. PETRINA JR., 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20005	COSMETIC, TOILETRY & FRAGRANCE ASSN, INC		
PAUL F. PETRUS, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOBIL OIL CORP		
H. WILLIAM PETRY, P.O. BOX 1927 SPARTANBURG SC 29304	MILLIKEN RESEARCH CORP		
BRIAN T. PETTY, SUITE 702 1901 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF DRILLING CONTRACTORS		
JAMES R. PHALEN, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW SUITE 820 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MAPCO INC	3,250.00	312.20
PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN., 1100 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		19,639.00	19,639.10
MARSHALL A. PHARR, 6103 ADIRONDACK AMARILLO TX 79106	SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE CO	3,091.20	1,586.38
JOHN D. PHILLIPS, SUITE 503 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES	11,624.00	660.00
RICHARD F. PHILLIPS, 1825 K STREET,N.W. SUITE 1107 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY		
WILLIAM G. PHILLIPS, D.C. ASSOCIATES, INC. 402 THIRD STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AIR QUALITY RESEARCH, INC	2,500.00	133.63
Do	ASSOCIATION OF UNIV. PROGRAMS IN OCCUPA HEALTH & SAFETY	4,500.00	337.48
Do	ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CENTERS		
Do	HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH	2,200.00	782.29
Do	METAL TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO	4,175.00	1,195.36
SAM PICKARD, 1101 17TH ST., NW, #604 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MONSANTO CO		
W.D. PICKETT, 400 FIRST ST. WASHINGTON DC 20001	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD SIGNALMEN	350.00	
PAULETTE C. PIDCOCK, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #530 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BALTIMORE GAS & ELECTRIC CO	705.80	1,030.98
ROBERT R. PIERCE, 5719 BEECH AVENUE BETHESDA MD 20817	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSN	72.94	35.80
PIERSON BALL & DOWD, 1200 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS	15,000.00	
Do	COMMUNITY PSYCHIATRIC CENTERS	818.14	
Do	DUN & BRADSTREET CORP		
Do	GENENTECH	7,389.94	
Do	GENERAL TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY	2,500.00	
Do	INFECTIOUS DISEASES SOCIETY OF AMERICA	3,774.36	
Do	INTERNATIONAL FUTURES EXCHANGE (BERMUDA) LTD		
Do	INTEX HOLDINGS (BERMUDA) LTD		
Do	NATIONAL MUSIC PUBLISHERS ASSN, INC	1,759.60	
Do	SATELLITE BUSINESS SYSTEMS	2,500.00	
PIERSON SEMMES CROLIUS & FINLEY, 1054 31ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN LAND TITLE ASSN		
Do	OKLAHOMA NATURAL GAS COMPANY	312.50	6.79
STUART F. PIERSON, VERNER, LIIPFERT, BERNHARD, & MCPHERSON 1660 L ST., NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AM, ET AL		
DANIEL J. PILIERO II , 1750 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR RESPONSIBLE TAX POLICY	4,225.00	2,200.00
Do	AD HOC COMMITTEE OF MUTUAL FUND MANAGERS	1,133.77	
Do	CBS, INC	2,125.00	
Do	NL INDUSTRIES	1,125.00	
Do	PRUDENTIAL LINES, INC	750.00	
PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO, SUITE 900 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	3,314.00	32.00
PILOTS RIGHTS ASSOCIATION, P.O. BOX 7000-367 REDONDO BEACH CA 90277		14,680.00	7,013.06
PINEAPPLE GROWERS ASSN OF HAWAII, P.O. BOX 3829 HONOLULU HI 96813			
LINDA PINEGAR, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA	3,000.00	
VALERIE F. PINSON, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	1,000.00	
LILLIAN M.S. PITCAITHLY, SUITE 209 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC	137.50	25.00
CHARLES C. PIXLEY, 15809 ANAMOSA DRIVE DERWOOD MD 20855			
PLAINS COTTON GROWERS, INC, PO BOX 3640 LUBBOCK TX 79452		1,102.00	1,102.00
PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, INC., 2010 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, 5TH FL WASHINGTON DC 20036.		2,611.00	2,611.00
PHYLLIS R. PLEASANTS, 1725 K STREET, NW, #1405 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MORTGAGE INSURANCE COS OF AMERICA	2,000.00	333.65
WYLL W. PLEGER, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. # 213 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BROWN & ROOT, INC		
RONALD L. PLESSER, BLUM & NASH 1015 18TH ST., NW, #408 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSN		
Do	TWIN COASTS NEWSPAPER, INC		
SHERMAN S. POLAND, ROSS, MARSH & FOSTER 888 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DORCHESTER GAS PRODUCING CO	315.00	14.72
POLAROID CORPORATION, 549 TECHNOLOGY SQUARE CAMBRIDGE MA 02139			
RICHARD J. POLLACK, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN	2,427.35	557.96
FRANCES A. POLLAK, SUITE 390 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNION CAMP CORPORATION		
ALFRED M. POLLARD, 1819 L STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SECURITY PACIFIC NATIONAL BANK		
KAREN POLLITZ, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	3,797.57	
RAYMOND K. POPE, 2000 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMFAC, INC	3,437.49	782.05
PAULA D. PORPILIA, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SEVENTH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	1,050.00	59.20
PORT OF SEATTLE, P.O. BOX 1209 SEATTLE WA 98111			2,506.22
PHILLIP PORTE & ASSOCS., INC., SUITE 208 1301 ARLINGTON RIDGE RD. ARLINGTON VA 22202	AMERICAN ASSN FOR RESPIRATORY THERAPY	7,000.00	
Do	AMERICAN MEDICAL RECORDS ASSN	1,500.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF MEDICAL DIRECTORS OF RESPIRATORY CARE	4,000.00	
CAROL ALICE PORTER, SUITE 1101 1612 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	WILDLIFE LEGISLATIVE FUND OF AMERICA	3,421.00	
PORTER WRIGHT MORRIS & ARTHUR, 37 WEST BROAD STREET COLUMBUS OH 43215	COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL-ENERGY BALANCE		2,338.02
SHARON T. PORTNOY, ONE PENN PLAZA NEW YORK NY 10001	NATIONAL COMMERCIAL FINANCE ASSN	3,300.00	277.08
WILLIAM J. POTTS JR., HALEY, BADER & POTTS 2000 M STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BORDER BROADCASTERS FREE SPEECH COMMITTEE, INC	1,137.18	
Do	ASSOCIATION FOR BROADCASTING ENGINEERING STANDARDS, INC		
JOHN MICHAEL POWDERLY, 815 16TH ST., NW, #706 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMER	8,856.39	
CATHERINE POWELL, 880 S. PICKETT STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22304	BOAT OWNERS OF THE U.S.	4,000.00	
POWELL GOLDSTEIN FRAZER & MURPHY, SUITE 1050 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF EXECUTIVE SEARCH CONSULTANTS, INC		
Do	BEAR STEARNS & CO		
Do	COALITION FOR COMPETITION	7,111.60	1,231.19
Do	COALITION FOR EMPLOYMENT THROUGH EXPORTS		
Do	CORNING ASSOCIATES	2,000.00	
Do	COUNCIL OF STATE HOUSING AGENCIES	400.00	
Do	CRUM & FORSTER INSURANCE COS	2,500.00	
Do	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	1,715.00	
Do	FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY COMMITTEE		
Do	GOVERNMENT OF NICARAGUA		
Do	HAYES MICROCOMPUTER PRODUCT, INC	500.00	
Do	JACQUES BOREL ENTERPRISES, INC	1,000.00	40.00
Do	MARYLAND SAVINGS-SHARE INSURANCE CORP		
Do	MID-AMERICA ASSOCIATES	20,000.00	
Do	NATIONAL INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT CORP		
Do	NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL	2,475.00	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION	3,653.00	194.25
RICHARD M. POWELL, 7315 WISCONSIN AVE. WASHINGTON DC 20014	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF REFRIGERATED WAREHOUSES		
ROBERT D. POWELL, SUITE 400 1300 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL BUSINESS AIRCRAFT ASSN		
JANET POWER, 1620 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	VISA USA, INC		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
JOHN J. POWER, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AFL-CIO	14,028.69	758.09
GRAYDON R. POWERS JR , 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SCIENTIFIC APPARATUS MAKERS ASSN		
KATHY S. PRAGER, 2029 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS	1,250.00	
ROBERT L. PRATT, 9 BROOKTRAIL ROAD WAYLAND MA 01778	THERMO ELECTRON CORPORATION	3,990.00	1,429.00
WILLIAM B. PRENDERGAST, 6215 KELLOGG DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22101	TOBACCO INSTITUTE	6,000.00	3,124.20
LLOYD T. PRESLAR, 1225 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DGA INTERNATIONAL INC (FOR: SOCIETE NATIONALE D'ETUDE ET DE CONST DE MOTEURS D'AVIATION).		
Do	DGA INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SOFREAVIA)		
PRESTON THORGRIMSON ELLIS & HOLMAN, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AETNA LIFE & CASUALTY		
Do	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP CO./LOUISIANA PACIFIC OF KETCHIKAN		
Do	AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN		
Do	AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES	4,275.00	111.96
Do	AMERICAN WATERWAYS SHIPYARD CONFERENCE		
Do	BELLINGHAM COLD STORAGE		
Do	CALISTA CORP		
Do	CHUGACH NATIVES, INC		
Do	CITIES & COUNTIES FOR CABLE	9,780.00	
Do	CITY OF CINCINNATI		
Do	CITY OF LAKEWOOD		
Do	CITY OF SCOTTSDALE		
Do	CITY OF ST. LOUIS		
Do	COASTAL TRADING CO		
Do	CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING	4,272.00	
Do	COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-FLAG SHIP OPERATORS	3,724.20	
Do	EMPLOYERS REINSURANCE CORP.		
Do	HUDSON WATERWAYS	13,692.00	62.60
Do	INTERGOVERNMENTAL CABLE COMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY		
Do	LUMMI INDIAN BUSINESS COUNCIL		
Do	MOORE MCCORMACK RESOURCES, INC	575.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF STATE DIRECTORS OF COMMUN & JUNIOR COLLEGES		
Do	NORTH WEST TIMBER ASSN	1,443.75	
Do	PORT OF SEATTLE		
Do	STATE OF ALASKA	6,520.00	176.84
Do	SUNMAR SHIPPING, INC		
Do	TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE CO		
Do	TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE		
Do	WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSN	1,443.75	
BARBARA J. PRICE, SUITE 1107 1825 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	WOMETCO ENTERPRISES, INC	1,777.50	118.75
JAMES M. PRICE, P.O. BOX 11248 KNOXVILLE TN 37919	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY	950.00	150.00
LEE PRICE, 1757 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SIERRA CLUB	6,801.00	2,968.94
WOODRUFF M. PRICE, 840 WASHINGTON BLDG. 15TH ST. & NEW YORK AVE. WASHINGTON DC 20005	INT'L UNION, UNITED AUTO AEROSPACE & AGRIC IMPLEMENT WORKERS	1,689.66	37.00
PATRICIA PRIDE, 1129 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CSX CORPORATION	3,000.00	652.23
GWENYTH PRITCHARD, SUITE 695 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS BOARD	32.93	5.50
JERRY C. PRITCHETT, SUITE 750 5530 WISCONSIN AVE., NW CHEVY CHASE MD 20815	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS	2,250.00	200.00
PRO-LIFE CDAC 12, P.O. BOX 7145 MENLO PARK CA 94025	MECHANICAL CONTRACTORS ASSN OF AMER, INC	1,056.00	434.48
PRO-LIFE CONGRESSIONAL DIST ACTION COMM, IN/2, 208 TINKLER LAFAYETTE IN 47901			
PRO/LIFE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 11, P.O. BOX 727 SAN CARLOS CA 94070		1,419.12	1,188.84
SYDNEY PROBST, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC	2,500.00	
EARL PROCTOR, 561-2 SHELBY AVENUE PAINESVILLE OH 44077	LAKE COUNTY VETERANS SERVICES		
STUART PROCTOR, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	5,500.00	180.69
PROFIT SHARING COUNCIL OF AMER, 20 N. WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO IL 60606			
PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP, 1029 VERMONT AVE., NW SUITE 860 WASHINGTON DC 20005			482.19
PROJECT CURE, INC, 2020 K STREET, NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20006			
PROPRIETARY ASSN, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			3,025.00
DAVID P. PROSPERI, 1725 K STREET, NW, #909 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SUPERIOR OIL COMPANY & SUPERIOR FARMING COMPANY		
PRUDENTIAL-BACHE SECURITIES INC., 100 GOLD ST. NEW YORK NY 10272			750.00
JAMES C. PRUITT, SUITE 500 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TEXACO, INC	92.00	
STEVEN L. PRUITT, SUITE 308 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO	9,773.06	141.00
PSC ASSOCIATES, 1609 BARNSTEAD DRIVE RESTON VA 22094			
PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		31,711.51	22,403.19
DAVID E. PULLEN, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #214 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MANVILLE CORP	1,000.00	
WILLIAM E. PURSLEY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHELL OIL COMPANY	500.00	
EARLE W. PUTNAM, 5025 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO		
HOWARD PYLE III, 4930 QUEBEC ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY	3,600.00	
ROBERT N. PYLE, P.O. BOX 3731 WASHINGTON DC 20007	ELKEM METALS COMPANY	3,100.00	
Do	INDEPENDENT BAKERS ASSN	3,000.00	
JOHN R. QUARLES JR , MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSN CLEAN AIR ACT PROJ.	1,000.00	25.00
JAMES M. QUIGLEY, SUITE 540 1875 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION		
WILLIAM A. QUINLAN, 3045 RIVA RD. RIVA MD 21140	NATIONAL CANDY WHOLESALERS ASSN, INC		
Do	RETAIL BAKERS OF AMERICA		
ARTHUR LEE QUINN, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	COOPER LABORATORIES, INC	32,000.00	2,030.22
Do	GOVERNMENT OF BELIZE	4,500.00	112.28
Do	GOVERNMENT OF REPUBLIC OF PANAMA	5,000.00	22.25
Do	SUGAR ASSN OF THE CARIBBEAN	7,500.00	802.91
QUINN RACUSIN YOUNG & DELANEY, CHTD, 1730 K STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES INSURANCE COMPANY	31,028.50	777.29
Do	MARYLAND-SAVINGS SHARE INSURANCE CORP	7,195.00	32.54
QUINTANA REFINERY COMPANY, P.O. BOX 3331 HOUSTON TX 77001			
CLIFFORD RABER, ONE MCDONALD'S PLAZA OAK BROOK IL 60521	MCDONALD'S CORP	168.75	104.33
ALEX RADIN, 2301 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN	478.40	
TESS A. RAE, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
JOHN D. RAFFAELLI, 1317 F STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20004	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: BALCOR/AMERICAN EXPRESS, INC)		
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: DEAN WITTER REALTY, INC)	50.00	
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: FREEPORT-MCMORAN, INC)	200.00	
Do	GULF COAST WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY		
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: JMB REALTY CORP)	200.00	
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: LIFE OF VIRGINIA, ET AL.)	200.00	
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: MONARCH RESOURCES, INC)	100.00	
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: SCHULMAN MANAGEMENT CO)		
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: UNITED SERVICES LIFE COS)	200.00	
Do	R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: VOLUME FOOTWEAR RETAILERS OF AMERICA).	200.00	
ROBERT A. RAGLAND, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	75.00	75.00
RICHARD W. RAHN, 1615 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	1,888.00	95.18
RAILROAD RETIREMENT ASSN, 236 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #510 WASHINGTON DC 20002		6,504.58	4,700.39
RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSN, 400 FIRST ST., NW SUITE 804 WASHINGTON DC 20001		4,800.00	61,661.07
RAILWAY PROGRESS INST, 700 NORTH FAIRFAX ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314			
RANDALL BANGERT & PRICE, 1625 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	750.00	
Do	NATIONAL INDEPENDENT DAIRY-FOODS ASSN	350.00	
Do	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN		
DONALD A. RANDALL, SUITE 1205 1625 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE COUNCILS, INC	1,750.00	
JEANNETTE H. RANDALL, 3471 N. FEDERAL HIGHWAY, #511 FORT LAUDERDALE FL 33306	AMERISERV, INC	1,100.00	1,191.99
CAROL RANDLES, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN. OF BROADCASTERS		
R. RAY RANDLETT, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIED CORPORATION	305.00	18.00
JAMES D. RANGE, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #607 WASHINGTON DC 20024	WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC	5,000.00	
D. MICHAEL RAPPOPORT, P.O. BOX 1980 PHOENIX AZ 85001	SALT RIVER PROJECT	1,680.00	5,599.60
RARE, INC., 1601 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20009			
CARL L. RASAK, 8301 FORT HUNT ROAD ALEXANDRIA VA 22308			
CAROL L. RAULSTON, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC	3,100.00	85.00
G. DAVID RAVENCRAFT, SUITE 507 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASHLAND OIL, INC	2,000.00	
W. RANDALL RAWSON, 1840 WILSON BLVD., #203 ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL LIMESTONE INST, INC	7,700.00	
RAYMARK CORPORATION, 100 OAKVIEW DRIVE TRUMBULL CT 06611			
RBC ASSOCIATES, 324 FOURTH STREET, NE WASHINGTON DC 20003	BANGOR & AROOSTOOK RAILROAD	3,750.00	1,434.55

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	BOSTON & MAINE RAILROAD	7,771.69	1,434.55
Do	CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN TRANSPORTATION CORP	19,000.00	1,612.83
Do	DELAWARE OTSEGO SYSTEM	8,000.00	2,033.45
Do	GENESEE & WYOMING CORP	750.00	1,434.55
Do	PANDROL	1,000.00	1,434.55
Do	PITTSBURG & SHAWMUT RAILROAD	2,100.00	1,464.25
Do	SPENO RAIL SERVICES	3,000.00	1,434.55
SYDNEY C. REAGAN, NO. 10 DUNCANNON CT. DALLAS TX 75225	SOUTHWESTERN PEANUT SHELLERS ASSN		
JOHN DANIEL REAVES, 910 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	687.50	
JOHN M. RECTOR, 205 DAINGERFIELD RD. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL ASSN OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS	700.00	150.00
ROBERT E REDDING, 425 13TH STREET N.W. SUITE 915 WASHINGTON DC 20004	SHIPPERS NATIONAL FREIGHT CLAIM	150.00	
TIMOTHY J. REDMON, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW SUITE 400 WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSN		
DWIGHT C. REED, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN		
JO REED, 1909 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS	373.85	
CHARLES C. REELY, SUITE 203 1840 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL LIMESTONE INST, INC	3,240.00	
PAULINE B. REEPING, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK SHIPPING ASSN., INC		
JOSEPH M. REES, SUITE 711 444 N. CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: CORDAGE INSTITUTE)		
Do	DELTA DENTAL PLANS ASSOCIATION	1,000.00	61.00
MARTHA L. REES, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW SUITE 1120 WASHINGTON DC 20006	E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO	11.00	
ROBERT S. REESE JR , 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC	9,000.00	417.71
J. RONALD REEVES, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT WASHINGTON DC 20001	U.S. AIR, INC	2,000.00	193.75
REID & PRIEST, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	1,231.00	2.00
Do	HILATURAS LERMA, S.A., DE C.V. AND AMYTEX CORP	1,000.00	
Do	MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	3,355.00	347.01
Do	NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	3,355.00	347.02
Do	TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER CO		
Do	UTILITY GROUP		6,502.00
REID & RIEGE, P.C., ONE STATE STREET HARTFORD CT 06103	WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY	300.00	
CHARLOTTE REID, 2466 CHATHAM ROAD AURORA IL 60506	MOTOROLA, INC	3,000.00	
MICHAEL W. REID, SUITE 507 1925 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY		
JERRY E. REIDER, 1235 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY., #305 ARLINGTON VA 22202	EMERSON ELECTRIC CO		
MARY LYNN REILLY, 3805 ALTON PLACE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF AMERICA	58.75	16.55
RONALD H. REIMANN, 176 E. FIFTH STREET ST. PAUL MN 55101	BURLINGTON NORTHERN RAILROAD	16,000.00	1,500.00
NOOLEY REINHEARDT, NOOLEY REINHEARDT & ASSOC. P.O. BOX 23190 WASHINGTON DC 20024	RURAL BUILDERS COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA		
HARRY O. REINSCH, 50 BEALE ST. P.O. BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
MURRAY P. REISER, 4 LONGFELLOW PLACE BOSTON MA 02114	EDWARD BLANKSTEIN, INC		
JACK REITER, 1800 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FLYING TIGER LINE	2,100.00	165.22
RELIGIOUS COALITION FOR ABORTION RIGHTS, INC., 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, N.E. WASHINGTON DC 20002		125,603.46	10,675.89
GEORGE E. RENAULT, 1800 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20035	AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTS, INC		
RENEWABLE FUELS ASSOCIATION, 499 S. CAPITOL STREET, S.W. # 420 WASHINGTON DC 20003		52,709.82	9,370.36
W. W. RENFROE, 69 FOUNTAIN PL. - P.O. BOX 417 FRANKFORT KY 40602	KENTUCKY RAILROAD ASSN		
DIANE RENNERT, 2005 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PUBLISHERS	4,300.00	306.71
RESOURCES FUND, INC, 810 18TH ST., NW, #804 WASHINGTON DC 20006			25,000.00
RETIRED OFFICERS ASSN, 201 N. WASHINGTON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314		8,304.00	
JOHN H. REURS, 74 TRINITY PLACE NEW YORK NY 10006	NEW YORK COMM OF INTL COMM OF PASSENGER LINES		
VINCENT P. REUSING, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #1010 WASHINGTON DC 20036	METROPOLITAN INSURANCE COS	1,000.00	
ALAN V. REUTHER, 1757 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED AUTO, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS	10,470.52	160.30
JOHN REUTHER, SUITE 810 1050 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SATRA CORP		
ALLAN R. REXINGER, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PROPRIETARY ASSN	2,875.00	150.00
MARK E. REY, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	800.00	
MARY ANNE REYNOLDS, 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
JOHN J. RHODES, CUMMINGS & LOCKWOOD 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #650 WASHINGTON DC 20005	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S		
Do	ESTATE OF HELEN W. HALBACH		
EDMUND B. RICE, 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN	5,653.84	105.74
RICE GENOCIDE RESEARCH, 3046 ROOSEVELT STREET DETROIT MI 48216			211.73
GRACE ELLEN RICE, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	5,138.00	38.78
LOIS D. RICE, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVNEUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	CONTROL DATA CORPORATION	531.00	73.21
M. LEE RICE, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA	2,950.00	
THERON J. RICE, SUITE 900 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONOCO, INC		
JAMES E. RICH JR., SUITE 200 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHELL OIL COMPANY	500.00	
RICHARD RICHARDS, BLISS, CRAFT & RICHARDS 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW, 6TH FL WASHINGTON DC 20007	SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT	2,066.66	14.45
STACY RICHARDS, SUITE 802 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	375.00	
ALAN H. RICHARDSON, 2301 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSN	3,000.00	
DOUGLAS B. RICHARDSON, 2001 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW, #100 WASHINGTON DC 20007	GEORESEARCH, INC	110.00	14.60
DOUGLAS C. RICHARDSON, 1957 E STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
K. O. RICHARDSON, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS	5,400.00	5,000.00
LOIS RICHERSON, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	1,000.00	
LARRY D. RICKARDS, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	1,006.43	
JUDY NOEL RIDDLE, P.O. BOX 27567 RICHMOND VA 23261	LAWYERS TITLE INSURANCE CORP		
LOWELL J. RIDGEWAY, NORTH DAKOTA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 418 EAST ROSSER, P.O. BOX 1395 BISMARCK ND 58502	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	598.00	
E. GEORGE RIEDEL, SUITE 200 1707 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORPORATION	1,800.00	150.00
MARK J. RIEDY, 1125 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		
E. PHILIP RIGGIN, 1608 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN LEGION	10,560.00	516.24
PAT RILEY, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FED OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	111.72	
SUSAN RILEY, 1150 17TH STREET, NW, #306 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL	5,800.00	
MARK ALAN RILLING, 110 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE, #409 WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY CAMPAIGN	4,750.02	
R. SCOTT RINN, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC		
DALE P. RIORDAN, 3900 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	23,750.00	604.38
KEVIN J. RIORDAN, SUITE 700 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GULF OIL CORP	800.00	432.00
JOHN S. RIPPEY, 730 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF BANK HOLDING COS	1,000.00	31.00
CAROL A. RISHER, 2005 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PUBLISHERS	2,000.00	
ROBIN RISSO, 511 C STREET, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	CONTINENTAL ASSN OF RESOLUTE EMPLOYERS (C.A.R.E.)		
JAMES E. RITCHIE & ASSOCIATES, SUITE 400 499 S. CAPITOL ST., SW WASHINGTON DC 20003	GAMING INDUSTRY ASSN OF NEVADA, INC	3,200.00	4,564.13
Do	GOLDEN NUGGET, INC		4,798.84
Do	LIBERTY FINANCIAL	1,400.00	2,988.93
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF OFF-TRACK BETTING	2,000.00	5,288.85
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF OPTOMETRISTS & OPTICIANS, INC		5,260.24
Do	NEVADA RESORT ASSN	4,800.00	6,846.22
STARK RITCHIE, 2101 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
RJR INDUSTRIES, INC, 1100 REYNOLDS BLVD. WINSTON-SALEM NC 27106			11,366.11
RAY ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, 2224 PEMBROOKE DENTON TX 76201	J. W. BATESON & CO.,INC	3,000.00	1,371.00
PATRICIA L. ROBERTS, SUITE 1107 1825 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY	1,250.00	165.00
PERRY A. ROBERTS, 8000 FLORISSANT ST. LOUIS MO 63136	EMERSON ELECTRIC CO		
RICHARD R. ROBERTS, SUITE 403 1899 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC	422.00	2,310.00
RICHARD Y. ROBERTS, PAPPANASTOS SAMFORD ROBERTS & BLANCHARD P.O. BOX 1402 MONTGOMERY AL 36102	ALABAMA POWER CO	13,317.50	1,697.62
Do	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN	5,000.00	
MARK ROBERTSON, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO)		
BETTY S. ROBINSON, 1757 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED AUTO, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS	10,009.00	142.70
CHARLES A. ROBINSON JR , 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	127.43	
KENNETH L. ROBINSON, 1111 N. 19TH STREET, #700 ARLINGTON VA 22209	NATIONAL ASSN OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS	1,400.00	
ROBINSON SILVERMAN PEARCE ARONSOHN & BERMAN, 230 PARK AVE. NEW YORK NY 10169	NATIONAL REALTY COMMITTEE		
THOMAS E. ROBINSON, SUITE 700 1101 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS, INC	1,900.00	
BOB JOHN ROBISON, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20004	HILL & KNOWLTON, INC	1,250.00	121.80
ANTOINETTE K. ROCHE, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GA TECHNOLOGIES, INC	1,500.00	250.00
JAMES ANTHONY ROCK, 1730 M STREET, NW, #607 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MONTANA POWER CO AND WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO	300.00	
DAVID W. RODERER, 3900 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	18,000.00	112.16
RODEY DICKASON SLOAN AKIN & ROBB, P.O. BOX 1888 ALBURQERQUE NM 87103	NAVAJO TRIBE		1,351.92
WILLI ROELLI, VOLKART BROTHERS, INC. 120 WALL ST. NEW YORK NY 10005	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC		
ROGERS & WELLS, 1737 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CAMPAGNIE FINANCIERE DE PARIS ET DES PAYS-BAS	565.00	
Do	DESERT PALACE, INC		
Do	WILLIAM ANTHONY HOGAN		
Do	MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	MERRILL LYNCH COMMODITIES, INC		
Do	MERRILL LYNCH LEASING, INC		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF BEDDING MANUFACTURERS		
Do	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC		
Do	SQUIBB CORP		
Do	TEACHERS INSURANCE & ANNUITY ASSN/COLLEGE RET. EQUITIES FUND		
BRUCE N. ROGERS, 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	2,500.00	2,299.71
DONALD L. ROGERS, 730 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF BANK HOLDING COS	2,083.40	
KEITH ROGERS, 47 LAFAYETTE PLACE, APT. 6D GREENWICH CT 06830	U.S. TOBACCO COMPANY	2,475.00	2,617.00
MARGARET ROGERS, 1730 NORTH LYNN ST. ARLINGTON VA 22209	PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMER, INC	1,000.00	
TERRENCE L. ROGERS, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	8,180.70	76.00
ROGOVIN HUGE & LENZNER, P.C., 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CKLW RADIO BROADCASTING, LTD	5,072.50	601.98
RICHARD A. ROHRBACH, 1625 I ST., NW SUITE 809 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BOISE CASCADE CORP	22,250.00	
JACK ROLLINS, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OVERSEAS EDUCATION ASSN & NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
JOHN F. ROLPH III, SUITE 350 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITIBANK, N.A		
KENNETH S. ROLSTON JR , 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PULPWOOD ASSN		
EMIL A. ROMAGNOLI, 120 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10271	ASARCO INC	300.00	
FRED B. ROONEY, 6TH FL. 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE	150.00	
Do	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	375.00	
Do	CALIFORNIA PORTLAND CEMENT COMPANY	125.00	
Do	CONRAIL		
Do	CRAWFORD FITTING CO	125.00	
Do	LONE STAR INDUSTRIES, INC	350.00	
Do	M LIFE INSURANCE CO	300.00	
Do	PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER (FOR: SECURITY LIFE OF DENVER)	300.00	
JOHN C. ROOTS, SUITE 1001 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO	132.04	
ROSE SCHMIDT DIXON & HASLEY, 1575 EYE STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	CIGAR ASSN OF AMERICA		
BURT ROSEN, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PFIZER, INC	1,000.00	1,824.71
LESTER L. ROSEN, 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MILES LABORATORIES, INC		
ALBERT B. ROSENBAUM III, 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TANK TRUCK CARRIERS, INC		
SARA ROSENBAUM, 122 C STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND	2,345.00	
MIRIAM A. ROSENBERG, 5999 STEVENSON AVENUE ALEXANDRIA VA 22304	AMERICAN ASSN FOR COUNSELING & DEVELOPEMENT	4,906.00	
FRANCIS C. ROSENBERGER, 6809 MELROSE DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22101	NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES	3,750.00	
PETER ROSENSTEIN, 1117 NORTH 19TH STREET, #300 ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS	775.39	
ROGER C. ROSENTHAL, SUITE 600 806 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MIGRANT LEGAL ACTION PROGRAN, INC		
ROSES, INC., 1152 HASLETT ROAD P.O. BOX 99 HASLETT MI 48840		2,557.71	2,656.28
JEREMY D. ROSNER, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	549.08	
WILLIAM F. ROSS, SOUTH CAROLINA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 716 KEENAN BLDG. COLUMBIA SC 29201	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	535.00	1,646.73
ALAN J. ROTH, SPIEGEL & MCDIARMID 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	FT. PIERCE UTILITIES AUTH OF THE CITY OF FT. PIERCE, ET AL		
BARRY N. ROTH, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	WILLIAMS COMPANIES	100.00	
SAMUEL A. ROTH, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S	2,000.00	85.00
EDWIN ROTHSCHILD, 2000 P ST., NW, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITIZEN/LABOR ENERGY COALITION	4,000.00	88.00
DONALD D. ROUNDS, SOUTH DAKOTA PETROLEUM COUNCIL P.O. BOX 669 PIERRE SD 57501	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
WILLIAM C. ROUNTREE, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
MICHAEL O. ROUSH, CAPITAL GALLERY EAST, #695 600 MARYLAND AVE. WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS	2,250.00	200.00
MARK ROVNER, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	4,167.22	
EUGENE F. ROWAN, 1156 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	J. C. PENNEY CO, INC		
JOHN W. ROWLAND, 5025 WISCONSIN AVE.,NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO		
ROXTON, INC, 2000 S. EADS STREET, #1003 ARLINGTON VA 22202	GLOBAL IDENTIFICATION CORP		
TOBI Z. ROZEN, 888 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF ICE CREAM MFRS & MILK IND. FOUNDATION		
RUBENSTEIN WOLFSON & COMPANY, INC, 220 EAST 42ND STREET NEW YORK NY 10017	INTERNATIONAL GOLD CORPORATION LIMITED		
ERIC M. RUBIN, RUBIN WINSTON & DIERCKS 1730 M ST., NW, #708 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMISSONER OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR STATE OF NEW MEXICO		
Do	OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC		
JAMES S. RUBIN, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIED CORP	216.00	
PAUL M. RUDEN, WILNER & SCHEINER 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS		
HENRY C. RUEMPLER, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITIBANK, N.A		
NICHOLAS L. RUGGIERE, 1667 K STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	JOHNSON & JOHNSON	1,000.00	25.00
JOHN RUNYAN, 1730 NORTH LYNN STREET SUITE 409 ARLINGTON VA 22209	PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMER, INC	300.00	
MORGAN S. RUPH, 4647 FORBES BOULEVARD LANHAM MD 20706	AMVETS	6,800.00	150.47
LEONARD H. RUPPERT, NEW JERSEY PETROLEUM COUNCIL 170 W. STATE ST. TRENTON NJ 08608	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
ROBERT C. RUPPERT, 1660 L STREET, NW, #901 WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC		
CHARLOTTE RUSH, SUITE 700 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GULF OIL CORP	950.00	
BARRY RUSSELL, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		42.00
NANCY RUSSELL, 4921 SW HEWETT BLVD. PORTLAND OR 97221	FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE		
WALLY RUSTAD, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	100.00	
J. T. RUTHERFORD & ASSOCIATES, INC., SUITE 514 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN ASSN OF BIOANALYSTS/INTL SOC OF CLINICAL LAB TECHS		130.05
Do	AMERICAN COLLEGE OF RADIOLOGY		148.50
Do	AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSN		215.30
ELLA MARICE RYAN, 1156 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	J. C. PENNEY CO, INC	100.00	
FRANK T. RYAN, 1400 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	RUBBER MFGRS ASSN	2,500.00	
GEORGE J. RYAN, 915 ROCKEFELLER BUILDING CLEVELAND OH 44113	LAKE CARRIERS' ASSN		568.88
JOHN F. RYAN, 1707 L ST., NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORPORATION		
JOHN G. RYAN, 1700 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SQUIBB CORP		
PAUL R. SACIA, SUITE 202, WEST WING 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL & CO-OPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA	4,523.06	
THOMAS L. SAGER, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW SUITE 1120 WASHINGTON DC 20006	E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO	44.00	
SAMMONS ENTERPRISES, INC., 403 SOUTH AKARD DALLAS TX 75202			
JAMES H. SAMMONS, 535 NORTH DEARBORN STREET CHICAGO IL 60610	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	900.00	
MARK B. SANDGROUND, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #405 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ARTERY ORGANIZATION, INC		
COLIN D. SANDISON, 1899 L STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	EXXON CORPORATION		466.93
CHARLES E. SANDLER, 1220 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	6,000.00	
PETER G. SANDLUND, 1725 EYE ST., NW, #315 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COUNCIL OF EUROPEAN & JAPANESE NATIONAL SHIPOWNERS' ASSN	300.00	
BRUCE W. SANFORD, BAKER & HOSTETLER 818 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS, SIGMA DELTA CHI	1,500.00	173.45
RONALD A. SARASIN, 311 FIRST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSN		3,750.00
JOHN S. SATAGAJ, 1250 I STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ASSN OF NURSERYMEN		
ALBERT C. SAUNDERS, 1100 15TH ST., NW #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	4,000.00	18.00
SAVE OUR SECURITY, SUITE 222 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		27,856.80	16,263.05
THOMAS C. SAWYER, 1825 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO	500.00	1,538.10
ROBERT WAYNE SAYER, 4545 42ND STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	GCA CORP	1,800.00	290.00
VICTORIA V. SCHAFF, SUITE 1014 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENSERCH CORPORATION	2,289.00	1,073.00
JEROME D. SCHALLER, 1101 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MINNESOTA MINING & MANUFACTURING CO	10,000.00	155.90
WILLIAM T. SCHAPAUGH, 1030 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSN	4,000.00	
C. M. SCHAUERTE, P.O. BOX 3247 HOUSTON TX 77253	AMERICAN GENERAL CORP	13,000.00	2,352.92
RONALD A. SCHECHTER, GOLDFARB, SINGER & AUSTERN 918 16TH STREET, NW, #503 WASHINGTON DC 20006	WASHINGTON INDEPENDENT WRITERS, INC	462.00	
JAY T. SCHECK JR., RT. 202-206 NORTH SOMERVILLE NJ 08876	AMERICAN HOECHST CORPORATION		
JOHN M. SCHEER, P.O. BOX 17402 DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WASHINGTON DC 20041	WATER & WASTEWATER EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
DALE E. SCHELL, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GATX CORP		
JANE N. SCHERER, SUITE 1204 1700 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHEVRON USA, INC	100.00	
JOSEPH SCHERER, 1801 NORTH MOORE ST. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN ASSN OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS		
SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHICAGO BOARD OPTIONS EXCHANGE		
JONATHAN D. SCHILLER, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ROGOVIN, HUGE & LENZNER (FOR: CKLW RADIO BROADCASTING, LTD)	1,000.00	26.00
JACQUES T. SCHLENGER, 1800 MERCANTILE BANK & TRUST BLDG. THE HOPKINS PLAZA BALTIMORE MD 21201	MARYLAND SAVINGS-SHARE INSURANCE CORP		52.35
Do			15.00
JAMES P. SCHLICHT, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC	2,500.00	
KENNETH D. SCHLOMAN, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	915.00	63.93
SCHLOSSBERG-CASSIDY & ASSOCIATES, INC, 955 L'ENFANT PLAZA, S.W. SUITE 1401 WASHINGTON DC 20024	ATLANTA UNIVERSITY	350.00	27.00
Do	BARRY UNIVERSITY		
Do	BOARD OF TRUSTEES	300.00	28.75
Do	BOSTON COLLEGE	250.00	27.00
Do	BOSTON UNIVERSITY	1,000.00	124.75
Do	CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	550.00	90.25
Do	COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	950.00	73.25
Do	COMMUNITY CARE SYSTEMS, INC	100.00	5.00
Do	ELECTRONICS CORPORATION OF AMERICA	400.00	53.50

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	INDEPENDENT RADIO COMMON CARRIERS ASSN	1,000.00	77.00
Do	INDIANA UNIVERSITY	200.00	54.25
Do	LESLEY COLLEGE		
Do	NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY		
Do	OCEAN SPRAY CRANBERRIES, INC	300.00	109.00
Do	PIRELLI CABLE CORPORATION	1,050.00	74.80
Do	PRATT INSTITUTE		
Do	TUFTS UNIVERSITY	600.00	17.00
FOREST S. SCHMELING, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	1,100.00	354.45
RICHARD M. SCHMIDT JR , SUITE 600 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PUBLISHERS	500.00	
ROBERT RICHARD SCHMITT, 11304-047 UNIT C P.O. BOX 888 ASHLAND KY 41101			
SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS, 900 17TH STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SAVIN CORPORATION	634.50	10.75
Do	TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION	1,269.00	108.50
MARK L. SCHNEIDER, 1001 22ND STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
FRANK SCHNELLER, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
JACK J. SCHRAMM, SUITE 607 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC	5,000.00	51.95
ROBERT I. SCHRAMM, 1725 K ST., NW, #909 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SUPERIOR OIL CO & SUPERIOR FARMING CO		
A. KOLBET SCHRICHTE, SUITE 500 1133 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN LOGISTICS ASSOCIATION		
N. DONALD SCHROEDER, MARYLAND PETROLEUM COUNCIL 60 WEST ST., #403 ANNAPOLIS MD 21401	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
STANLEY W. SCHROEDER, 1901 N. FT. MYER DRIVE ARLINGTON VA 22209	GAS APPLIANCE MFGRS ASSN, INC		
MARK SCHULTZ, 1615 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	5,000.00	82.29
WILLIAM B. SCHULTZ, SUITE 700 2000 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PUBLIC CITIZEN, INC	1,000.00	10.00
ROBERT L. SCHULZ, C/O IOWA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 1012 FLEMING BLDG. DES MOINES IA 50309	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	638.75	847.58
WALTER A. SCHUMANN III, 1511 NATALIE JOY LN. MCLEAN VA 22101	POTOMAC OVERLOOK ASSOCIATES		
JAMES H SCHUYLER, 15TH & M STS., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S.		
DONALD H. SCHWAB, 200 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE U.S.	8,750.00	278.80
SCHWABE WILLIAMSON WYATT MOORE & ROBERTS, SUITE 302 1000 POTOMAC ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	HELICOPTER LOGGERS ASSN		
Do	LITCHSTREET COMPANY		17.03
Do	MOUNTAIN STATES ENERGY, INC	1,677.38	1,205.68
Do	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN		
Do	OTIS ELEVATOR CO	2,101.86	1,510.99
Do	PIASECKI AIRCRAFT CORPORATION	993.48	704.73
Do	STATE OF OREGON, CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON METRO	5,607.90	4,031.58
ELINOR SCHWARTZ, 318 S. ABINGDON STREET ARLINGTON VA 22204	CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION	8,700.00	611.28
HARRY K. SCHWARTZ, 2300 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	TOSCO CORPORATION		
RICHARD SCHWARTZ, 880 S. PICKETT ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22304	BOAT OWNERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S.	4,000.00	
STEVE AARON SCHWARTZ, 818 ROEDER ROAD SUITE 702 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	3,725.00	267.25
RICHARD P. SCHWEITZER, 2022 P STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PRIVATE TRUCK COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC		40.00
CARL F. SCHWENSEN, 415 2ND ST., NE SUITE 300 WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL ASSN OF WHEAT GROWERS	4,104.08	
SALLY SCIACCA, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,062.50	
SCIENTIFIC APPARATUS MAKERS ASSN, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		6,989.57	8,561.31
MICHAEL SCIULLA, 880 S. PICKETT ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22304	BOAT OWNERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S.	6,000.00	
HAROLD B. SCOGGINS, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		3.13
SCOTT COMPANY, INC., 66 SURFWATCH DRIVE JOHNS ISLAND SC 29455	COASTAL PROPERTIES INSTITUTE, INC		
JAMES M. SCOTT, 66 SURFWATCH DRIVE JOHNS ISLAND SC 29455	SCOTT COMPANY		
JOHN N. SCOTT, 1825 K STREET, NW, #1107 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY	222.00	788.12
SCRIBNER HALL & THOMPSON, SUITE 700 1875 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONTINENTAL AMERICAN LIFE INSURANCE CO		18.00
Do	JEFFERSON-PILOT CORP. AND SUBSIDIARIES	10,000.00	
Do	OCCIDENTAL LIFE INSURANCE CO OF CALIFORNIA	15,000.00	12.00
Do	PROVIDENT LIFE & ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO	15,000.00	7,588.97
TIMOTHY SCULLY, 25 LOUISIANA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS	8,749.98	
EARL W. SEARS, P.O. BOX 12285 MEMPHIS TN 38112	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER	566.10	1.88
SANDY SEDACCA, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	3,210.00	
CHARLES M. SEEGER III, SUITE 802 2000 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	POPHAM, HAIK ET AL.(FOR: CHICAGO MERCANTILE EXCHANGE)		
H. RICHARD SEIBERT JR , 1776 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	720.00	
PAUL J. SEIDMAN, FEDERAL BAR BUILDING, #1000 1815 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL TOOLING & MACHINING ASSN	11,170.00	327.23
PEGGY SEIPEL, 4647 FORBES BOULEVARD LANHAM MD 20706	AMVETS	6,800.00	150.47
GEORGE M. SEITTS, SUITE 900 1015 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	INTERNORTH	2,000.00	
ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, SUITE 4400 475 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW WASHINGTON, DC 20024	AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR EXPORTS & SECURITY ASSISTANCE	7,500.00	27.00
M. FRANK SELLERS, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE (FOR: BUSINESS ALLIANCE ON GOVERNMENT COMPETITION).	5,000.00	262.60
STANTON P. SENDER, 1211 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO	2,400.00	329.29
STUART D. SERKIN, 1800 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	SLURRY TRANSPORT ASSN		
SERVICE MASTER INDUSTRIES, INC, 2300 WARRENVILLE ROAD DOWNERS GROVE IL 60515			850.00
SARAH SETTON, 1511 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SUGAR ASSOCIATION, INC	150.00	8.00
SEVEN MONTHS SESSION FOR CONGRESS, 3306 YELLOWPINE TERRACE AUSTIN TX 78757			601.00
SEWARD & KISSEL, 919 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	A. I. LEASING CORP		
Do	HALLAC ASSOCIATES, INC		
Do	MERRILL LYNCH MONEY MARKETS, INC		25.80
Do			
J. RICHARD SEWELL, 1111 19TH ST., NW, #1102 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT CO	2,100.00	377.90
SEYFARTH SHAW FAIRWEATHER & GERALDSON, 1111 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS	5,625.96	
WILLIAM H. SHAKER, SUITE 600 1523 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL TAX LIMITATION COMMITTEE	1,500.00	35.00
JAMES M. SHAMBERGER, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #512 WASHINGTON DC 20036	REINSURANCE ASSN OF AMER		
SHAMROCK FOODS CO., 2228 N. BLACK CANYON PHOENIX AZ 85009			
DEBBIE SHANNON, 5TH FLOOR 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	2,500.00	350.90
DAVID L. SHAPIRO, 729 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATED BUILDERS & CONTRACTORS, INC		
HARRY D. SHAPIRO, 1800 MERCANTILE BANK & TRUST BLDG. TWO HOPKINS PLAZA BALTIMORE MD 21201	MARYLAND SAVINGS-SHARE INSURANCE CORP		52.35
NORMAN F. SHARP, 1100 17TH STREET, NW, #1201 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CIGAR ASSN OF AMERICA, INC		
KAREN DOLMATCH SHAW, SUITE 920 1800 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BANKAMERICA CORPORATION	331.92	519.84
LUTHER W. SHAW, SUITE 514 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ASSN	5,625.00	6.75
SHAW PITTMAN POTTS & TROWBRIDGE, 1800 M ST., NW, #900-S WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER	591.00	
Do	ATLAS MINERALS DIVISION	934.00	
Do	COMMITTEE FOR PRIVATE EDUCATION		
Do	EMERSON ELECTRIC CO		
Do	FARMERS FOR FAIRNESS	2,500.00	
Do	INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN BANKERS		
Do	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE	1,200.00	
Do	INVESTMENT COUNSEL ASSN OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	NATIONAL COMM ON SMALL ISSUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS	13,010.00	13.50
Do	RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP		
RUSSELL H. SHAY, 6014 COLLEGE AVE. OAKLAND CA 94618	UTILITY NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP	711.12	35.85
SHEA & GOULD, 330 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10017	SIERRA CLUB	2,227.50	1,107.82
Do	CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL CORP		
Do	CINCINNATI MILACRON		
Do	ELEANOR A. CLARK		378.30
Do	HOSPITAL CORP OF AMERICA	21,125.00	
JOHN J. SHEEHAN, 815 16TH ST., NW, #706 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NABISCO, INC		
PATRICIA Q. SHEEHAN, 1667 K STREET, NW, #410 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMER	11,565.39	
KATHLEEN SHEEKEY, 3RD FLOOR 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	JOHNSON & JOHNSON	1,000.00	225.00
JOHN P. SHEFFEY, 5535 HEMPSTEAD WAY SPRINGFIELD VA 22151	COMMON CAUSE	9,868.00	171.75
DEBORAH SHEIMAN, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN FOR UNIFORMED SERVICES	765.40	
JOHN J. SHEPPARD, 267 WESTERVELT PLACE ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS NJ 07632	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	427.74	2.75
SEYMOUR SHERIFF, 1126 WOODWARD BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20005	C. A. SHEA & COMPANY, INC		
RUSSELL L. SHIPLEY JR , 1120 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1120 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MAN-MADE FIBER PRODUCERS ASSN, INC		
HARVEY A. SHIPMAN, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #830 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL CANDY WHOLESALERS ASSN, INC		
FRED B. SHIPPEE, 1611 N. KENT ST., #800 ARLINGTON VA 22209	PENN CENTRAL CORPORATION		
SHIPPERS NATIONAL FREIGHT CLAIM COUNCIL, INC, 120 MAIN STREET HUNTINGTON NY 11743	AMERICAN APPAREL MANUFACTURERS ASSN, INC		
MARY FRANCES SHLAGEL, SUITE 760 1050 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			150.00
W. RAY SHOCKLEY, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA		
THOMAS K. SHOEMAKER, 1899 L STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TEXTILE MFRS INST	2,550.00	12.00
	TRAVEL INDUSTRY ASSN OF AMERICA		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
SHOOSHAN & JACKSON, INC., 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ROGERS U.S. CABLESYSTEMS, INC		
HARRY M. SHOOSHAN III, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHOOSHAN & JACKSON, INC (FOR: ROGERS U.S. CABLESYSTEMS, INC)		
SCOTT SHOTWELL, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	2,475.00	
A. Z. SHOWS, RM 203 1801 COLUMBIA RD., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009		4,633.64	2,480.58
JOHN SHUEY, P.O. BOX 3151 HOUSTON TX 77253	BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC	7,200.00	638.44
CANDICE J. SHY, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #1014 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENSERCH CORPORATION	4,813.00	1,094.00
MARK SILBERGELD, 2001 S STREET, SW, #520 WASHINGTON DC 20009	CONSUMERS UNION OF U.S., INC	3,200.00	10.00
RONALD G. SILLS, C/O 38832-066, A-1 F.C.I. BOX 7000 TEXARKANA TX 75501		77.00	77.00
DAVID SILVER, 1775 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE	102.20	7.00
STEVEN W. SILVER, ROBERTSON, MONAGLE, EASTAUGH & BRADLEY 210 FERRY WAY JUNEAU AK 99801	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP		
SILVER USERS ASSN, INC, 1717 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		4,313.93	3,495.23
SILVERSTEIN & MULLENS, 1776 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATION FOR ADVANCED LIFE UNDERWRITING	5,000.00	
Do	BRISTOL-MYERS CO		
Do	F.W. WOOLWORTH CO		
Do	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN		
Do	GATX CORP		
Do	MUSIC CORPORATION OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S		
Do	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS		
SIMON DEITCH SIEFMAN TUCKER & FRIEDMAN, P.C., SUITE 1500 4000 TOWN CENTER SOUTHFIELD MI 48075	FIRST NATIONAL MONETARY CORPORATION		
STANLEY C. SIMON, 17130 DALLAS NORTH PARKWAY, #160 DALLAS TX 75248	SIMON, TWOMBLY, & TERRY (FOR: SOUTHLAND CORP)		3,781.67
TALMAGE E. SIMPKINS, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AFL-CIO MARITIME COMMITTEE	300.00	540.99
Do	LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC	1,368.00	172.04
WILLIAM G. SIMPSON, SUITE 424 1155 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FIRST MISSISSIPPI CORPORATION	2,000.00	
Do	MISSISSIPPI POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	2,000.00	
Do	J.R. SCRIBNER ENTERPRISES	2,000.00	
Do	STATE OF MISSISSIPPI	4,000.00	
MARGARET SIMS, 2025 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO		
JEAN SINDAB, 2480 16TH ST., NW, #610 WASHINGTON DC 20009	WASHINGTON OFFICE ON AFRICA	6,319.12	
ROBERT C. SINGER, 475 PARK AVE., SO. AT 32ND ST. NEW YORK NY 10016	SOAP & DETERGENT ASSN		
JAMES C. SIVON, 730 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF BANK HOLDING COS	1,125.00	56.00
SKADDEN ARPS SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM, 919 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CATHEDRAL CORPORATION	750.00	
Do	CITIES SERVICE OIL & GAS CORP	6,000.00	
Do	TEXACO, INC	25,000.00	
Do	TRANSCO ENERGY COMPANY	6,000.00	
Do	TRICENTROL U.S., INC	1,000.00	
WILLIAM J. SKINNER, 815 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	U.S. PHARMACOPEIAL CONVENTION, INC	765.12	11.20
BARNEY J. SKLADANY JR , 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MOBIL OIL CORP	1,125.00	
WILLIAM E. SKLAR, SKLAR, IDELSON 800 18TH STREET, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CITIZENS AGAINST PACS	2,500.00	2,763.00
RUTH L. SKY, 2211 CONGRESS ST. PORTLAND ME 04122	UNION MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	90.00	516.12
F. SLATINSHEK & ASSOCIATES, INC., 1102 BELLE VISTA DR. ALEXANDRIA VA 20007	GRUMMAN AERO CORP; D.L. LYNCH & ASSOCS	200.00	
MATTHEW B. SLEPIN, SUITE 1100 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA	442.00	14.92
SCOTT L. SLESINGER, SUITE 804 1101 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL APARTMENT ASSN		
RONALD J. SLINN, 260 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10016	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
CATHERINE REISS SLOAN, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHOOSHAN & JACKSON, INC (FOR: ROGERS U.S. CABLESYSTEMS, INC)		
JOHN E. SLOAN JR., CAPITAL GALLERY EAST, #695 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	NATIONAL FED OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS	1,150.00	200.00
SLURRY TRANSPORT ASSN, 1800 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009			
SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, 1604 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		3,000.00	124.30
PETER SMALL, 400 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10017	PETER SMALL & ASSOCIATES, INC. (FOR: WILLIAM M. MERCER, INC.)		
SMATHERS SYMINGTON & HERLONG, SUITE 400 1700 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN HORSE COUNCIL	3,666.00	
Do	COALITION OF COMMUNITY BANKS OF FLORIDA		
Do	FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILWAY CO	750.00	
Do	GOLDMAN SACHS & CO		
Do	NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE	1,500.00	
Do	PENNZOIL CO	6,000.00	
Do	REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA	7,500.00	
ELEANOR SMEAL & ASSOCIATES, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #606 WASHINGTON DC 20037	NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN	1,200.00	11.28
DONALD E. SMILEY, 1899 L ST., NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	EXXON CORPORATION		
JAMES R. SMIRCINA, P.O. BOX 5000 CLEVELAND OH 44101	CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING CO	723.00	502.00
CATHERINE S. SMITH, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 209 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC	134.88	25.00
DAVID S. SMITH, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #1102 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MARTIN, BECK & SMITH		
SMITH DAWSON ASSOCIATES, INC, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #304 WASHINGTON DC 20036	N.Y. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	5,625.00	5,838.60
Do	SAN FRANCISCO P.V.C.	9,000.00	9,000.00
DOUGLAS S. SMITH, 3219 MAGNOLIA AVENUE FALLS CHURCH VA 22041	NATIONAL INHOLDERS ASSN		
ELIZABETH M. SMITH, 815 16TH ST., NW, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMALGAMATED CLOTHING & TEXTILE WORKERS UNION	4,939.48	292.71
GARY K. SMITH, 600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20003	GREETING CARD ASSN		
GORDON L. SMITH, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20004	HILL & KNOWLTON, INC (FOR: FLORISTS' TRANSWORLD DELIVERY ASSN)	2,062.50	
GRACE H. SMITH, 2000 M STREET, NW, #230 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TELOCATOR NETWORK OF AMERICA	8,942.00	166.94
JAMES P. SMITH, 2000 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	HOSPITAL CORP OF AMERICA	180.00	
JEFFREY A. SMITH, 919 18TH STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, USA, INC	180.00	124.66
JENNIFER L. SMITH, 900 17TH STREET, NW, #520 WASHINGTON DC 20006	WEST MEXICO VEGETABLE DISTRIBUTORS ASSN	300.00	
JULIAN H. SMITH JR., 600 NORTH 18TH STREET BIRMINGHAM AL 35291	ALABAMA POWER CO	11,712.00	12,380.19
MICHAEL E. SMITH, P.O. BOX 5000 CLEVELAND OH 44101	CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING CO		351.00
MICHAEL P. SMITH, 485 LEXINGTON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10017	NEW YORK STATE BANKERS ASSN	272.00	162.00
ROBERT BLAND SMITH JR , 1100 15TH STREET, WN, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	4,000.00	88.00
RONALD E. SMITH, 2501 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	300.00	
SHALAH SMITH, 1130 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COAL ASSN	2,250.00	333.38
SUSAN SNYDER SMITH, 7900 WESTPARK DRIVE, #514 MCLEAN VA 22102	CHOCOLATE MANUFACTURERS ASSN OF THE USA	500.00	6.25
WILLIAM C. SMITH, 1850 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BALLARD, SPAHR, ANDREWS & INGERSOLL		
WAYNE H. SMITHEY, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FORD MOTOR CO	9,187.50	423.80
FRANK B. SNODGRASS, 1100 17TH ST., NW, #306 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURLEY & DARK LEAF TOBACCO EXPORT ASSN	1,103.02	46.80
LARRY S. SNOWHITE, 1825 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ENVIRITE CORPORATION	1,150.00	22.57
Do	LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE CO	725.00	
Do	MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO (FOR: LION LINES, LTD.)		
Do	MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY & POPEO (FOR: MAINE EDUCATIONAL LOAN MARKETING CORP)		
Do	MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY & POPEO (FOR: MASS. CONSTRUCTION INDUS. COUNCIL TRUCK WEIGHT COMM)		
Do	MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE STUDENT LOAN AUTHORITY	580.00	
Do	NEW ENGLAND EDUCATION LOAN MARKETING CORP	1,450.00	282.84
Do	MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, GLOVSKY AND POPEO (FOR: SCA SERVICES)	2,320.00	46.53
Do	MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY & POPEO (FOR: SECURITIES INDUSTRY ASSN)		
EDWARD F. SNYDER, 245 2ND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION	4,522.74	
J. R. SNYDER, 400 1ST ST., NW, #704 WASHINGTON DC 20001	UNITED TRANSPORTATION UNION		1,500.00
JOHN M. SNYDER, 600 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., S.E. SUITE 205 WASHINGTON DC 20003	CITIZENS COMM FOR THE RIGHT TO KEEP & BEAR ARMS	6,000.00	
SOCIETY FOR ANIMAL PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION, P.O. BOX 3719 GEORGETOWN STATION WASHINGTON DC 20007		44,572.24	40,776.82
FREDERICK P. SOMERS, 1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSN	3,500.00	406.40
SL SOMMER & ASSOCIATES, INC., 3129 WORTHINGTON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20015	NORTHROP CORP	1,200.00	369.50
EDMUND T. SOMMER JR , 1627 K STREET, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-FLAG SHIP OPERATORS	500.00	8.00
KURT A. SOMMER, P.O. BOX 925 ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103			50.00
CHARLES B. SONNEBORN, 1750 K ST. NW SUITE 370 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF OPTHALMOLOGY		
SONOSKY CHAMBERS SACHSE & GUIDO, 1050 31ST ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	ASSINIBOINE AND SIOUX TRIBES		
Do	MACKENZIE TURNIPSEED		
Do	MULTI-HOUSING LAUNDRY ASSOCIATION, INC		
Do	SHOSHONE INDIAN TRIBE		
Do	STANDING ROCK SIOUX TRIBE		
SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN, P.O. BOX 52468 NEW ORLEANS LA 70152		31,143.69	31,143.69
SOUTHWESTERN PEANUT SHELLERS ASSN, 10 DUNCANNON CT. DALLAS TX 75225			
CHARLES E. SOUTHWICK, 1627 K STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FLUOR CORPORATION	15,000.00	731.51
SPACE AMERICA, 600 WATER STREET, SW, #207 WASHINGTON DC 20024			
IAN D. SPATZ, 1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION	847.53	17.60
SPECIALIZED CARRIERS & RIGGING ASSOCIATION, 733 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			
JOHN F. SPEER JR , 888 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF ICE CREAM MFRS & MILK IND. FOUNDATION		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
WILLIAM C. SPENCE, P.O. BOX 683 HOUSTON TX 77001	COLUMBIA GULF TRANSMISSION CO		
JOANN SPEVACEK, 1500 PLANNING RESEARCH DRIVE MCLEAN VA 22102	PLANNING RESEARCH CORP		166.00
SPIEGEL & MCDIARMID, 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY, ET AL		
GEORGE SPIEGEL, SPIEGEL & MCDIARMID 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY		
NICHOLAS J. SPIEZIO, 1709 NEW YORK AVNEUE, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN		
LARRY N. SPILLER, 1015 15TH ST., NW, #802 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL	900.00	
JOSEPH L. SPILMAN JR , 1220 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	200.00	
EARL C. SPURRIER, THE MADISON BUILDING, #514 1155 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ASSN	30.00	
ELISABETH A. SQUEGLIA, BRICKER & ECKLER 888 11TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN SMALL AND RURAL HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, OHIO CHAPTER		
SQUIRE SANDERS & DEMPSEY, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	ALAMO CEMENT COMPANY, ET AL		10.00
Do	AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN EUROPE & THE MEDITERRANEAN		
Do	AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN ITALY, INC		
Do	AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN SPAIN, INC		
Do	AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN GERMANY		
Do	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ANESTHESIOLOGISTS	2,400.00	134.00
Do	ASSOCIATION OF DATA PROCESSING SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	300.00	4.00
Do	CAN-AM CORPORATION		7.25
Do	INDEPENDENT DATA COMMUNICATIONS MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION	700.00	20.00
Do	MICROBAND CORP OF AMERICA		3.00
Do	NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSN		
Do	TYMNET, INC		3.00
JOHN W. SROKA, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
CARL F. ST. CIN, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #604 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MONSANTO CO		
ROBERT P. ST. LOUIS, 2550 M ST., NW, #225 WASHINGTON DC 20037	CONGOLEUM CORPORATION	1,000.00	405.42
COURTNEY A. STADD, 199 S. CAPITOL STREET, SW, #102 WASHINGTON DC 20003	STARSTRUCK, INC		
CONNELL STAFFORD, P.O. DRAWER 1734 ATLANTA GA 30301	COCA-COLA COMPANY	283.00	1,269.00
DAVID E. STAHL, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	3,500.00	
MELVIN R. STAHL, SUITE 1410 1235 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY. ARLINGTON VA 22202	MOTORCYCLE INDUSTRY COUNCIL, INC		
LYNN E. STALBAUM, 1840 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FED	2,610.00	51.30
TYRONE STALLWORTH, 220 NORTH DEVILLERS STREET PENSACOLA FL 32501			
STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO), MIDLAND BLDG. CLEVELAND OH 44115			21,906.31
MITCHEL STANFIELD, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COASTAL CORPORATION	400.00	27.00
DAVID P. STANG, P.C., SUITE 601 1629 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INCOME LIFE INSURANCE CO		
Do	AMERICAN TRUCK DEALERS	16.75	
Do	COMMITTEE FOR AD VALOREM EQUITY	104.34	
Do	EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP ASSN	35.16	
Do	MCDERMOTT INTERNATIONAL		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF ROYALTY OWNERS, INC	30.60	
Do	OCEAN MINERALS CO	47.77	
Do	OFFSHORE INDUSTRY COMMITTEE	343.92	
Do	OFFSHORE MARINE SERVICE ASSN	128.94	
Do	STANDARD OIL OF INDIANA	18.86	
Do	SUN COMPANY, INC	32.77	
MICHAEL J. STANTON, 1620 EYE STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC	880.00	
MELVIN L. STARK, SUITE 321 1707 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE CO	6,000.00	
WALTER M. STARKE, P.O. BOX 2563 BIRMINGHAM AL 35202	SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS CO		
LOIS STARKEY, SUITE 511 1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY. ARLINGTON VA 22202	MANUFACTURED HOUSING INST	700.00	100.00
FRANK M. STASZESKY JR., 1535 SENECA LANE SAN MATEO CA 94402	BECHTEL POWER CORP		
CHARLES D. STATTON, P.O. BOX 3965 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94119	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
SAMUEL E. STAVISKY & ASSOCIATES, INC, 1725 DESALES STREET, NW, #804 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BROADCAST MUSIC, INC	200.00	50.00
SAMUEL E. STAVISKY, 1725 DESALES STREET, NW, #804 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SAMUEL E. STAVISKY ASSOCIATES INC. (FOR: BROADCAST MUSIC INC. (BMI))		30.00
RANDOLPH J. STAYIN, SUITE 600 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: MACHINERY DEALERS NATIONAL ASSOCIATION).	1,380.00	
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: SHERWIN-WILLIAMS CO)	600.00	
Do	TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: SPECIAL COMM FOR WORKPLACE PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM).		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: WALD MANUFACTURING CO, INC)	5,610.00	250.64
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: ZIMPRO CORP)		
JOHN HOWARD STECKER, 2020 LIVE OAK DALLAS TX 75221	GREAT AMERICAN RESERVE INSURANCE CO	3,500.00	887.93
J. C. STEEN, 412 FIRST STREET, SE, #301 WASHINGTON DC 20003	FORD AEROSPACE & COMMUNICATIONS CORP	300.00	108.21
Do	MCDONNELL DOUGLAS CORP	200.00	140.78
Do	NORTHROP CORP		133.91
JACK L. STEMPLER, 1725 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY, #900 ARLINGTON VA 22202	LTV AEROSPACE DEFENSE CO	2,500.00	75.00
STEPHENS OVERSEAS SERVICES, INC., 2121 K STREET, NW, #830 WASHINGTON DC 20037	NATIONAL OFFICE MACHINE DEALERS ASSN	149.98	4.06
Do		174.47	195.28
MICHAEL K. STEPHENSON, SUITE 703 1620 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
STEPTOE & JOHNSON, CHTD, 1250 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COALITION FOR UNIFORM PRODUCT LIABILITY LAW		318.01
Do	COMMITTEE FOR EFFECTIVE CAPITAL RECOVERY		300.00
Do	FOREST INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE ON TIMBER VALUATION & TAXATION		366.01
Do	MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO., ET AL	2,500.00	50.00
Do	RULE OF LAW COMMITTE	107.50	4.00
Do	TRAILWAYS, IANC		
RICHARD W. STERNBERG, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	110.00	
MICHAEL E. STEWARD, 7957 REVENNA LANE SPRINGFIELD VA 22153	PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT CO	5,024.00	439.25
EUGENE L. STEWART, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #910 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ROSES, INC	900.00	6,719.09
ROBERT I. STEWART, 2001 THIRD AVENUE, SOUTH BIRMINGHAM AL 35233	TORCHMARK CORPORATION	5,000.00	3,000.00
TRAVIS B. STEWART, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20036	HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC		
WALTER J. STEWART, SUITE 700 1100 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SONAT, INC		
WARREN E. STICKLE, SUITE 1120 1001 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHEMICAL SPECIALTIES MFGRS ASSN	242.00	57.59
LAVERNE STILL, 1030 15TH ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMER	405.00	21.64
STEPHEN W. STILL, 1100 15TH STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20005	SONAT, INC		
DON STILLMAN, 1757 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INT'L UNION, UNITED AUTO AEROSPACE & AGRIC IMPLEMENT WORKERS	410.35	
EDWARD W. STIMPSON, SUITE 801 1400 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL AVIATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION	1,438.72	
KENNETH F. STINGER, 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC	9,000.00	567.63
BARBARA STINSON, 1901 N. FORT MEYER DRIVE, #302 ROSSLYN VA 22209	BEVERLY ENTERPRISES	4,500.00	356.82
JOHN J. STOCKER, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA	16,000.00	
STOCKHOLDERS OF AMERICA, INC., 1625 EYE ST., N.W. # 724A WASHINGTON DC 20006		7,004.00	492.55
STEVEN F. STOCKMEYER, 1120 20TH STREET, NW SUITE 610, ONE LAFAYETTE CENTRE SOUTH WASHINGTON DC 20036	MANVILLE CORP	2,250.00	39.00
DENNIS C. STOLTE, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION	4,562.00	119.35
GEORGE W. STONE, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW, #202W WASHINGTON DC 20024	FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL & CO-OPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA	4,375.00	338.00
JAY STONE, JAY STONE AND ASSOCIATES, INC 412 FIRST STREET, SE, #50 WASHINGTON DC 20003	LOUISIANA WORLD EXPOSITION, INC		
Do	MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	1,625.00	
Do	MELAMINE CHEMICALS, INC	2,000.00	1,600.00
Do	STATE OF LOUISIANA	14,500.00	4,950.00
STEPHEN STORCH, 1800 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
STOVALL SPRADLIN ARMSTRONG & ISRAEL, 1819 H STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	COMMISSION ON FUTURE POLITICAL STATUS & TRANSITION	2,500.00	67.00
ALAN STOVER, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE,NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INST OF ARCHITECTS	2,500.00	
WILLIAM M. STOVER, 2501 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC	1,000.00	
STRASBURGER & PRICE, 1200 ONE MAIN PLACE DALLAS TX 75250	DALLAS/FT. WORTH REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD		200.88
TERRENCE D. STRAUB, 818 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. STEEL CORPORATION	250.00	663.21
JAMES R. STREETER, 733 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	LEGAL SERVICES CORP	85.20	21.00
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN, 1150 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN RED CROSS RETIREMENT SYSTEM	675.00	
Do	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC	900.00	
Do	CITY OF TUCSON	2,000.00	12.00
Do	DREYFUS CORPORATION		
Do	DREYFUS DOLLAR FUND	5,250.00	115.00
Do	FIFTH AVENUE & 59TH CORP	385.00	4.00
Do	INGERSOLL & BLOCH		
Do	J. ARON & CO, INC	125.00	
Do	PACIFIC EXPRESS, INC		
Do	PLAZA 400 OWNERS CORP	385.00	4.00
Do	PUERTO RICO FEDERAL AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATION		
Do	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
WALTER B. STULTS, 618 WASHINGTON BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COS	4,000.00	
EUGENE F. STURGEON, 182 CRATER LANE KENSINGTON CT 06037	NORTHEAST UTILITIES SERVICE CO	1,555.08	855.43
SULLIVAN & CROMWELL, 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP, INC		
Do	GOLDMAN SACHS & CO		
SULLIVAN & WORCESTER, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MARION LABORATORIES, INC	1,500.00	
AUSTIN P. SULLIVAN JR., P.O. BOX 1113 MINNEAPOLIS MN 55440	GENERAL MILLS, INC		
BONNIE A. SULLIVAN, 725 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL GRAIN & FEED ASSN	27.00	
GAEL M. SULLIVAN, SUITE 1004 1155 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	LTV CORPORATION	2,344.00	640.00
HAROLD R. SULLIVAN, 1750 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	900.00	
JUDY M. SULLIVAN, SUITE S-700 1120 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NORTHWEST ENERGY		
MARCIA Z. SULLIVAN, SUITE 1200 1300 N. 17TH STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209	CONSUMER BANKERS ASSN	2,000.00	1,298.46
MARGARET COX SULLIVAN, 1625 EYE ST., N.W. # 724A WASHINGTON DC 20006	STOCKHOLDERS OF AMERICA, INC		
PATRICK J. SULLIVAN, 815 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO	8,132.44	614.52
RICHARD C. SULLIVAN JR., SUITE 409 110 MARYLAND AVE., N.E. WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY CAMPAIGN	6,925.02	57.50
GARY R. SUMMERS, SUITE 1014 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC	11,000.00	86.00
J. MITCHELL SUMMERS, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ARMCO, INC	1,287.00	276.56
IRIS SUNSHINE, 1710 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10019	INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS UNION	4,730.72	119.33
SURREY & MORSE, 1250 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CAVALIER CLOTHING	18.00	
Do	DALE FASHIONS	18.00	
Do	DEROSSI & SON CO	18.00	
Do	LONDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY		
Do	MAJOR CLOTHING CO	18.00	
Do	PATHFINDER FUND		
Do	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN		
Do	PIETRO BERETTA, S.P.A		
Do	SOUTH JERSEY CLOTHING	18.00	
Do	UNITED NATIONS STAFF UNION		
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP		
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN, 1666 K STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AD HOC COMM FOR EQUITABLE TRANSPORTATION		
Do	ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESSES ADVOCATING TARIFF EQUITY		
Do	BLANCHARD VALLEY HOSPITAL		
Do	CONSUMER CREDIT INSURANCE ASSOCIATION	794.50	
Do	COUNCIL OF INDUSTRIAL BOILER OWNERS		
Do	CREDIT UNION NATL ASSN, INC		33.00
Do	DIRECT MARKETING INSURANCE GROUP	3,954.00	
Do	INDUSTRIAL OIL CONSUMERS GROUP		
Do	LIFETIME COMMUNITIES, INC		
Do	LOYAL TRUST	2,000.00	20.00
Do	MUTUAL OF OMAHA INSURANCE CO		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE COS	3,000.00	19.20
Do	NATIONAL HOME LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY	1,862.00	46.20
Do	WOODSTREAM CORPORATION	387.45	
WILLIAM F. SUTHERLAND, 1750 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	300.00	
WILLIAM W. SUTTLE, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW SUITE 415 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN	465.00	11.50
IRVING W. SWANSON, 11212 FARMLAND DRIVE ROCKVILLE MD 20852	HARRIS CORPORATION	16,000.00	1,476.57
DAVID A. SWEENEY, 25 LOUISIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS	17,278.29	
ROSEMARIE SWEENEY, SUITE 770 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FAMILY PHYSICIANS	2,218.74	889.71
TRICIA L. SWIFT, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	1,200.00	
DAVID A. SYKUTA, ILLINOIS PETROLEUM COUNCIL P.O. BOX 5034 SPRINGFIELD IL 62705	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE	333.00	773.04
CHRISTOPHER U. SYLVESTER, 1831 BRIAR RIDGE COURT MCLEAN VA 22101	GARRISON DIVERSION CONSERVANCY DISTRICT	6,000.00	341.21
MERRIBEL SYMINGTON, SUITE 540 1875 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION		
SYRDAL DANELO KLEIN & MYRE, P.C., 24TH FLOOR FOURTH & BLANCHARD BLDG. SEATTLE WA 98121	WASHINGTON STATE CHARTERBOAT ASSN		
ROBERT TAFT JR., 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: DOSIMETER CORP OF NORTH AMERICA)	3,000.00	
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC.)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: MACHINERY DEALERS NATIONAL ASSOCIATION)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: MIAMI CONSERVANCY DISTRICT)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: PIPER, JAFFRAY & HOPWOOD)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: RCA GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS, INC)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: SHERWIN-WILLIAMS CO)	600.00	
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: SPECIAL COMM FOR WORKPLACE PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: TAFT BROADCASTING COMPANY)	450.00	
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: TELEPHONE & DATA SYSTEMS, INC.)	1,810.00	
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: WALD MANUFACTURING CO, INC)		
Do	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER (FOR: ZIMPRO CORP)	2,222.50	
TAGGART & ASSOCIATES, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MARION LABORATORIES, INC		
Do	TELEPHONE & DATA SYSTEMS, INC		
RUBY TAKANISHI, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	850.00	
WALTER G. TALAREK, SUITE 405 1945 GALLOWS RD. VIENNA VA 22180	AMERICAN WOOD PRESERVERS INSTITUTE		
TALCOTT MCCABE & ASSOCIATES, SUITE 302, WEST WING 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	HOLIDAY INNS, INC	2,500.00	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF HOMES FOR CHILDREN	2,000.00	
Do	SERVICEMASTER INDUSTRIES, INC	850.00	
JULIE TANG, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	PEACE POLITICAL ACTION COMM	837.79	
SUSAN TANNENBAUM, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	5,028.78	103.10
KEITH TARR-WHELAN, 1201 16TH STREET, NW, #222 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SAVE OUR SECURITY	5,250.00	26.00
LINDA TARR-WHELAN, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	1,375.00	39.00
JOHN F. TATE, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031	U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE	1,200.00	
M. LOUISE TATE, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031	U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE	900.00	
GRACA DA SILVA TAVARES, 17 PERKINS STREET WEST NEWTON MA 02165			
CHARLES A. TAYLOR III, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL ST., SW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT INSURERS	1,000.00	
DENNIS J. TAYLOR, SUITE 650 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S	22,972.00	
Do	U.S. SURGICAL CORPORATION	8,750.00	
FRANK A. TAYLOR, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	326.08	
MARGIE A. TAYLOR, P.O. BOX 21 MONTGOMERY AL 36101	ALABAMA RAILROAD ASSN		
PEGGY TAYLOR, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN FED OF LABOR & CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS	14,441.31	427.32
TEAMSTERS FOR A DEMOCRATIC UNION, 2000 P ST., NW, #612 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
STEPHANIE TEFF, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S	3,327.70	47.70
ELAYNE L. TEMPEL, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
PAUL M. TENDLER, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #840 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PAUL TENDLER ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: BASCOM, INC.)		
Do	PAUL TENDLER ASSOCITES, INC (FOR: NATIONAL FEDERATION OF LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES)	1,500.00	150.00
Do	PAUL TENDLER ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TENANTS)		
Do	PAUL TENDLER ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: RASCH ELEKTRONIK)		
Do	PAUL TENDLER ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: SCHOENEMAN, INC)		
Do	PAUL TENDLER ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: SOUTHEASTERN EXPORTERS)		
TENNESSEE HOME MEDICAL PROVIDERS ASSOCIATION,INC., P.O. BOX 23130 KNOXVILLE TN 37933			
BETTY-GRACE TERPSTRA, 918 16TH ST., NW, #402 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN FURNITURE MANUFACTURERS ASSN	750.00	511.67
TEST MARKETING GROUP, INC, 140 S. DEARBORN STREET, #910 CHICAGO IL 60603			
TEXTRON, INC., 40 WESTMINSTER ST. PROVIDENCE RI 02903			11,338.00
THACHER PROFFITT & WOOD, SUITE 512 1140 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GRINDLAYS BANK LIMITED		
Do	SALOMON BROTHERS, INC		287.48
MARY KAY THATCHER, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	3,750.00	105.60
BRUCE D. THEVENOT, 1155 15TH ST., NW, #424 WASHINGTON DC 20005	CASSON CALLIGARO & MUTRYN (FOR HUMANA, INC)	1,233.00	
Do	OKLAHOMA STATE NURSING HOME ASSN	4,740.00	
ALAN J. THIEMANN, 1199 N. FAIRFAX STREET, #801 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL ASSN OF TRUCK STOP OPERATORS		
BARBARA BRENDES THIES, RM. 330W 1500 PLANNING RESEARCH DR. MCLEAN VA 22102	PLANNING RESEARCH CORPORATION		104.01
EDLU J. THOM, 605 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	SOCIETY OF THE PLASTICS INDUSTRY, INC		
DIANE KAY THOMAS, 6962 HANOVER PARKWAY, #301 GREENBELT MD 20770	AMERICAN ASSN OF MINORITY ENTERPRISE SMALL BUS. INVEST COS	4,046.00	
JAMES M. THOMAS JR., 100 INDIANA AVENUE, NW, #403 WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, NATL CAP LOCAL 689		
JOHN W. THOMAS, SUITE 828 1522 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSN	60.00	
Do	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL COLLEGES	20.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
PATRICIA THOMAS, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	6,588.66	
RANDI PARKS THOMAS, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #603 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TUNA RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC	779.13	
ROBERT L. THOMAS, 1319 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ASSN OF PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS	40.00	
THOMAS E. THOMASON, 1620 EYE STREET, NW, #703 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BECHTEL POWER CORP		
THOMPSON & MITCHELL, 1120 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN INLAND WATERWAYS COMMITTEE	316.00	
Do	CONTACT LENS MANUFACTURERS ASSN		
Do	CROWN LIFE INSURANCE CO	9,000.00	2,069.35
Do	MIDLAND ENTERPRISES, INC		
Do	VALLEY LINE COMPANY		
BOYD THOMPSON, SUITE 210 5410 GROSVENOR LANE BETHESDA MD 20814	AMERICAN MEDICAL CARE & REVIEW ASSN		
GARY C. THOMPSON, 1126-16TH ST., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	OIL, CHEMICAL & ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION	4,625.00	
THOMPSON HINE & FLORY, 1920 N ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLTEL CORPORATION	3,726.00	
JAMES F. THOMPSON JR., 1957 E STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA		
KENNETH W. THOMPSON, 1660 L ST., NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	300.00	
LAW OFFICES OF FRED 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #850 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CENTRAL STATES SE & SW AREAS HEALTH, WELFARE & PENSION FUNDS	8,334.00	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	6,042.00	
NANCY THOMPSON, 1600 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC		
RICHARD L THOMPSON, 1700 K STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SQUIBB CORPORATION		
ROGER G. THOMPSON, 117 BELLEFONTE DRIVE ASHLAND KY 41101	KENTUCKY POWER CO	7,500.00	2,280.74
SAMUEL C. THOMPSON JR., SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHIAGO BOARD OPTIONS EXCHANGE, INC		
W. REID THOMPSON, 1900 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20068	POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO		
TERENCE H. THORN, SUITE 919 1700 NORTH MOORE STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209	HOUSTON NATURAL GAS CORP	163.45	
JOHN A. THORNER, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN		
WILLIAM R. THORNHILL, P.O. BOX 2511 HOUSTON TX 77001	TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE CO		
MARGO THORNING, 1850 K ST., NW, #520 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR CAPITAL FORMATION	92.00	
WALTER L. THREADGILL, 1220 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	STORER COMMUNICATIONS, INC	250.00	
SAMUEL THURM, 1725 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATION OF NATL ADVERTISERS		
CYRUS C. TICHENOR III, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #405 WASHINGTON DC 20005	A. H. ROBINS CO, INC	785.00	72.00
DREW V. TIDWELL, SUITE 1200 1300 N. 17TH ST. ARLINGTON VA 22209	CONSUMER BANKERS ASSN	4,012.50	34,877.60
WALLACE TILLMAN, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	150.00	
MARTIN R. TILSON JR , PO BOX 2563 BIRMINGHAM AL 35202	SOUTHERN NATURAL GAS CO	168.24	286.99
PATTI A. TILSON, SUITE 520 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC	500.00	
C. H. TIMBERLAKE, 1825 K ST., NW, #1107 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY	975.00	355.65
TIMMONS & CO, INC, 1850 K ST., NW, #850 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO, INC	1,350.00	
Do	AMERICAN INLAND WATERWAYS COMMITTEE	760.00	
Do	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	285.00	
Do	ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES, INC	315.00	
Do	ASSOCIATION OF TRIAL LAWYERS OF AMERICA		
Do	BOEING COMPANY	855.00	
Do	BROWN GROUP, INC		
Do	CHRYSLER CORPORATION	675.00	
Do	EASTERN AIR LINES, INC	1,045.00	
Do	G. D. SEARLE & CO	475.00	
Do	H. J. HEINZ CO	380.00	
Do	MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL	765.00	
Do	MIDDLE SOUTH SERVICES, INC	950.00	
Do	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER	380.00	
Do	NORTHROP CORP	1,225.00	
Do	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)	380.00	
MICHAEL L. TINER, 1775 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL WORKERS INTL UNION	11,038.44	710.18
CONSTANCE D. TIPTON, 888 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF ICE CREAM MFRS & MILK IND. FOUNDATION		
E. LINWOOD TIPTON, 888 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF ICE CREAM MFRS & MILK IND. FOUNDATION		
EBEN S. TISDALE, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SCIENTIFIC APPARATUS MAKERS ASSN	1,650.00	78.93
TITLE ASSOCIATES, INC., RT.2, BOX 89 COLUMBIA TN 38401			
TOBACCO ASSOCIATES, INC, SUITE 912 1101 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			3,761.46
JAMES R. TOBIN, MACK CENTRE DR. PARAMUS NJ 07652	BECTON, DICKINSON & CO	2,000.00	
WILLIAM J. TOBIN, SUITE 600 1523 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL TAX LIMITATION COMMITTEE	1,000.00	25.00
DAVID G. TODD, P.O. BOX 6300 HUNTINGTON WV 25771	ASHLAND COAL, INC		
M. DOUGLAS TODD, SUITE 2300 1000 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	NORTHROP CORP		
DAVID R. TOLL, SUITE 1100 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	WESTERN UTILITIES CLEAN AIR GROUP		
WILLIAM R. TOLLEY JR , PO BOX 37 MELBOURNE FL 32919	HARRIS CORPORATION		345.59
SALLY AUSTEN TOM, SUITE 1120 1522 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN COLLEGE OF NURSE-MIDWIVES		
EDWARD TONAT, 6723 BRIGADOON DRIVE BETHESDA MD 20817	ROBERT GOFF & ASSOCIATES, INC		
ANN TONJES, 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS	600.00	115.00
WILLIAM D. TOOHEY, 1899 L ST., NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	TRAVEL INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		
TOTAL PETROLEUM, INC, 999 18TH STREET, SUITE 2201 DENVER CO 80202			
WANDA TOWNSEND, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	318.75	
BURKE A. TRACEY, 2111 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY #1009-S ARLINGTON VA 22202	COALITION OF HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS		
JOHN P. TRACEY, 1801 K ST., NW, #1201 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. TELEPHONE ASSN	1,000.00	
JOSEPH P. TRAINOR, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS	3,000.00	260.06
JEFFREY B. TRAMMELL, 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BROWNING-FERRIS INDUSTRIES, INC.).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: BUDD COMPANY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: CANADIAN ASBESTOS INFORMATION CENTRE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: FINANCIAL INVESTMENT ASSOCIATES, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: HEALTH INSURANCE ASSN OF AMERICA).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MOTOROLA, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL INSURANCE COALITION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: MUTUAL OF OMAHA).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NIU, INC)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SANTA FE CORP).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SHAKLEE CORPORATION).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: TOBACCO INSTITUTE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC).	160.00	
HUBERT TRAVAILLE, SUITE 510 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	POTLATCH CORPORATION	2,000.00	192.77
TRAVEL & TOURISM GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS POLICY COUNCIL, SUITE 607 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,760.00	1,760.00
TRAVEL INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, 1899 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
ERNEST B. TREMMEL, INC., 5908 ROSSMORE DRIVE BETHESDA MD 20014	BURNS & ROE, INC	315.00	84.61
R. S. TRIBBE, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TRANS WORLD CORP		
LAURENCE H. TRIBE, 1525 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA		
SALLY A. TRIPLETT, 1725 DESALES STREET, NW, #804 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SAMUEL E. STAVISKY & ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: BROADCAST MUSIC INC. (BMI))		20.00
MICHAEL G. TROOP, 1709 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS	1,105.00	18.00

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
GEORGE G. TROUTMAN, SUITE 1100 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BELL HELICOPTER, INC	150.00	
ALEXANDER B. TROWBRIDGE, 1776 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	2,125.00	
THOMAS L. TRUEBLOOD, 401 NORTH MICHIGAN AVE. CHICAGO IL 60611	INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO	1,000.00	1,660.80
TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND, 82 SECOND ST. SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105			6,302.00
ANH TU, SUITE 860 1029 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP	91.54	
TUNA RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC, 1101 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,468.70	2,393.59
B. ELIZABETH TUNNEY, 124 SALEM CHURCH ROAD MECHANICSBURG PA 17055	RETAIL, WHOLESALE & DEPT STORE UNION (INT'L), ET AL	7,995.00	1,012.77
FRANCES M. TURK, 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION CORP		178.38
RITA M. TURKIEWICZ, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, #711 WASHINGTON DC 20001	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: CORDAGE INSTITUTE)	1,300.00	
Do	KEEFE COMPANY (FOR: NATIONAL REVENUE CORP)		
BRIAN TURNER, 815 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO	6,942.00	
RICHARD F. TURNEY, 1725 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COURTNEY, MCCAMANT & TURNEY	300.00	
W. GLENN TUSSEY, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	7,225.00	
ST. CLAIR J. TWEEDIE, SUITE 220 1575 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CYANAMID CO	15,000.00	269.37
U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS' ASSN, 1001 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		2,182.81	1,432.42
U.S. COMMITTEE FOR THE OCEANS, 100 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			
U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031		9,605.66	9,605.66
U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS, 111 E. WACKER DR. CHICAGO IL 60601			142,813.54
U.S. RECREATIONAL SKI ASSOCIATION, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
JERRY G. UDELL, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN RETAIL FEDERATION	300.00	150.00
PHILIP J. UFHOLZ, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #1010 WASHINGTON DC 20036	METROPOLITAN INSURANCE COS	1,000.00	
MARK J. UGORETZ, 1726 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE		
LEWIS K. UHLER, SUITE 600 1523 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL TAX LIMITATION COMMITTEE	1,000.00	25.00
ULLMAN CONSULTANTS, INC., 1000 POTOMAC ST., N.W. SUITE 302 WASHINGTON DC 20007	CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE WARM SPRINGS RESERVATION	1,500.00	
Do	INTERNATIONAL TITANIUM, INC		
Do	MERCK & CO., INC	7,500.00	
Do	U.S. LEAGUE OF SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS	7,500.00	
Do	WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION	700.00	
Do	PACIFIC LUMBER SALES CO	2,500.00	
MANYA S. UNGAR, 10 BRANDYWINE COURT SCOTCH PLAINS NJ 07076	NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS & TEACHERS		2,184.46
CHARLES K. UNGER, 1600 PRINCE STREET, #212 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL ASSN OF STEVEDORES	3,000.00	166.61
UNIFI, INC., P.O. BOX 19109 GREENSBORO NC 27419			
UNION MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO, 2211 CONGRESS ST. PORTLAND ME 04122			606.12
THOMAS C. UNIS, 1200 ONE MAIN PLACE DALLAS TX 75250	STRASBURGER & PRICE (FOR: DALLAS/FT. WORTH REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD)		
THOMAS C. UNIS, P.C., 1200 ONE MAIN PLACE DALLAS TX 75250	STRASBURGER & PRICE (FOR: DALLAS/FT. WORTH REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD)		
UNITED AUTO, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS, WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW) 8000 E. JEFFERSON DETROIT MI 48214.		95,567.98	95,567.98
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS & JOINERS OF AMERICA, 101 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001			11,731.88
UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL WORKERS INTL UNION, 1775 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		47,666.64	47,666.64
UNITED FRESH FRUIT & VEGETABLE ASSN, 727 N. WASHINGTON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314		1,875.00	1,703.08
UNITED GAS PIPE LINE CO, PO BOX 1478 HOUSTON TX 77001			500.44
UNITED IRISH & AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ILLINOIS, BOX 219 3400 W. 111TH STREET CHICAGO IL 60655			
UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, 9800 FREDERICKSBURG ROAD SAN ANTONIO TX 78288			
LLOYD N. UNSELL, 1101 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA		30.00
A. RUSSELL UPSHAW JR., 1030 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	EASTERN AIRLINES		200.00
DREW A. UPTON, 1100 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SCIENTIFIC APPARATUS MAKERS ASSN		
MARIAN S. URNIKIS, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN		
YOSHINORI USUI, SUITE 600 919 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, USA, INC	60.00	67.56
UTILITY NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP, C/O EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE 1111 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.			
RONALD D. UTT, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.	578.00	23.41
MARY UYEDA, 1200 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSN	798.00	22.78
ANTHONY VALANZANO, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC	600.00	50.00
JACK J. VALENTI, 1600 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	375.00	
DAVID T. VAN CAMP, 225 BUSH STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA		
RICHARD VAN DEUREN, 111 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW, #1800 MILWAUKEE WI 53202	NATIONAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS INST	2,000.00	
JULIANE H. VAN EGMOND, SUITE 220 1575 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN CYANAMID CO	262.67	13.50
LAURA VAN ETTEN, 311 FIRST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSN		
VAN FLEET ASSOCIATES, INC, SUITE 102 499 SOUTH CAPITOL ST., SW WASHINGTON DC 20003	CADILLAC GAGE	11,250.00	
Do	FORD AEROSPACE & COMMUNICATIONS CORP	3,000.00	
Do	MARCONI ELECTRONICS	3,000.00	
NICK L. VAN NELSON, SUITE 540 1875 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION		
VAN NESS FELDMAN SUTCLIFFE CURTIS & LEVENBERG, P.C., 7TH FLOOR 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007.	AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ALTERNATIVE ENERGY TAX CREDITS	6,585.00	
Do	ALLIED-GENERAL NUCLEAR SERVICES		
Do	AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER CO., INC., ET AL		
Do	AMERICAN INST OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS		
Do	AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES		
Do	ARCTIC SLOPE REGIONAL CORP	150.00	
Do	BRAE CORPORATION	600.00	8.00
Do	CHELAN #1, DOUGLAS #1 & GRANT #2	420.00	
Do	COLUMBIA GAS SYSTEM SERVICE CORP	3,180.00	6.00
Do	FLORIDA AGRICULTURE COALITION, INC		
Do	HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC	150.00	6.25
Do	JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC		
Do	MCDONNELL DOUGLAS ASTRONAUTICS CORP		
Do	NATOMAS CO		
Do	PEABODY HOLDING CO, INC	450.00	10.00
Do	REPUBLIC GEOTHERMAL, INC		
Do	REPUBLIC OF KENYA		
Do	REPUBLIC OF PALAU		
Do	JOSEPH SEAGRAM & SONS, INC		
Do	SLURRY TRANSPORT ASSN		
Do	STANDARD OIL CO OF CALIFORNIA	855.00	
Do	STATE OF ALASKA		
Do	TEXAS AIR CORP	2,190.00	18.00
Do	UNION CARBIDE CORP		
JAY N. VARON, SUITE 1000 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOLEY LARDINER HOLLABAUGH & JACOBS (FOR: LAWYERS TITLE INSURANCE CORP)		
JENNIFER VASILOFF, 2030 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	5,300.04	1,004.17
DONALD R. VAUGHAN, P.O. BOX 1288 ASHEBORO NC 27204	STEDMAN CORP		
ROBYN E. VAUGHAN, 1775 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE		
A. RANDALL VEHAR, 900 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA		
VELSICOL CHEMICAL CORP, 341 EAST OHIO ST. CHICAGO IL 60611			
JOSPEH T. VENTURA ENTERPRISES, INC, 1725 K STREET, NW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE		
VENTURE ENTREPRENEURS, INC., SUITE 206 1201 SAN MARCO BLVD. JACKSONVILLE FL 32207			
JERRY T. VERKLER, 1660 L STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	6,250.00	196.73
VERNER LIIPFERT BERNHARD & MCPHERSON, 1660 L STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20036	LABOR-INDUSTRY COALITION FOR INTL TRADE	1,525.00	
FRANK VERRASTRO, 1155 15TH STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PENNZOIL COMPANY	937.50	
LINDA VICKERS, 1706 23RD ST., SOUTH ARLINGTON VA 22202	COMMUNICATING FOR AGRICULTURE, INC	4,999.99	
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF CROP INUSRANCE AGENTS	13,499.99	
R. ERIC VIGE, SUITE 300 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CITIES SERVICE OIL & GAS CORP	525.00	248.95
MICHAEL F. VIGIL JR., 900 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10022	INTERNATIONAL GOLD CORPORATION LIMITED		
HOWARD A. VINE, 1776 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF MANUFACTURERS	600.00	
RALPH VINOVICH, 1875 EYE STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE	23,000.00	980.73
WALTER D. VINYARD JR., ALSTON & BIRD 1800 M STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONTINENTAL INSURANCE COMPANIES	5,000.00	
Do	HARTFORD INSURANCE GROUP	6,000.00	
Do	ITT CORP		
VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF RAILWAY PATRONS, P.O.BOX 867 RICHMOND VA 23207		50.50	68.82
GEORGE A. VIVERETTE JR., 8111 GATEHOUSE ROAD FALLS CHURCH VA 22047	AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSN		
NICK J. VOLCHEFF, 2509 E. SAN MIGUEL PHOENIX AZ 85016	AT&T	700.00	140.00
VOLKSWAGEN OF AMERICA, INC, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #3210 WASHINGTON DC 20024			610.00
DOUGLAS K. VOLLMER, 801 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA	9,644.76	
VOLPE BOSKEY & LYONS, SUITE 602 918 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ASSN OF EQUIPMENT LESSORS		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
INGRID A. VOORHEES, 1957 E ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA	2,000.00	500.00
VORYS SATER SEYMOUR & PEASE, SUITE 1111 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CABOT CORPORATION	7,667.00	479.73
Do	COMMITTEE OF PUBLICLY OWNED COMPANIES		
Do	GROCERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	MOWSAFE PRODUCTS, INC		
Do	NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO	100.00	
Do	OHIO DEPOSIT GUARANTY FUND	4,530.00	3.30
Do	OHIO MFRS ASSN	1,875.00	284.19
Do	SEAGATE COMMUNITY DEVELOMENT CORP	1,147.50	
Do	SIMPLEX TIME RECORDER CO	245.00	8.10
Do	SOUTHERN HOTEL DEVELOPMENT CO		2.32
Do	TOLEDO TRUSTCORP	15,600.00	1,945.31
Do	YANKEE RESOURCES, INC	9,324.00	83.32
CATHERINE WAELDER, 1016 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	58.45	
ROBERT J. WAGER, 2020 K ST., NW, #850 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN BAKERS ASSN	1,337.49	6.50
KERRI WAGNER, 1155 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL BROILER CJUNCIL	750.00	
HOWARD W. WAHL, P.O. BOX 1000 ANN ARBOR MI 48106	BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION		
CHRISTINE M. WAISANEN, NEW MURPHY ROAD & CONCORD PIKE WILMINGTON DE 19897	ICI AMERICAS, INC		
HERBERT R. WAITE, 100 FEDERAL ST. BOSTON MA 02110	BANK OF BOSTON CORPORATION		
Do	FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BOSTON	4,000.00	4,507.00
WALD HARKRADER & ROSS, 1300 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
Do	BANCO DO BRASIL, S.A		
Do	HARTFORD STEAM BOILER INSPECTION & INSURANCE CO		
Do	JAPAN IRON & STEEL EXPORTERS' ASSN		
Do	MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO, LTD		
ANGELA S. WALDORF, N.C. PETROLEUM COUNCIL P.O. BOX 167 RALEIGH NC 27602	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
ROBERT E. WALDRON, ASSOCIATED PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES OF MICHI 930 MICHIGAN NATL TOWER, PO BOX 10070 LANSING MI 48901.	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	805.00	794.14
CHARLS E. WALKER ASSOCIATES, INC, 1730 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AGRICO CHEMICAL COMPANY, ET AL	20,000.00	
Do	AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA		
Do	ALUMINUM CO OF AMER	625.00	
Do	AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO	15,850.00	
Do	AMERICUS SHAREOWNER SERVICE CORP		
Do	ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES, INC	6,000.00	
Do	BECHTEL CIVIL & MINERALS, INC	625.00	
Do	BETHLEHEM STEEL CORP	1,500.00	
Do	CBS, INC	2,500.00	
Do	CHEVRON U.S.A., INC		
Do	COPIAT	2,500.00	
Do	DEALER BANK ASSN	3,333.33	
Do	DIMENSION FINANCIAL CORPORATION, INC		
Do	DRESSER INDUSTRIES, INC	625.00	
Do	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	1,250.00	
Do	FORD MOTOR CO	625.00	
Do	GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER CO	625.00	
Do	GTE CORPORATION		
Do	IBM	625.00	
Do	LONE STAR STEEL CO	1,875.00	
Do	NATIONAL PAYMENT SYSTEMS COALITION	4,900.00	
Do	NETHERLANDS ANTILLES	10,000.00	
Do	NORTHVILLE INDUSTRIES CORP	6,000.00	
Do	NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	6,250.00	
Do	OWENS-ILLINOIS	625.00	
Do	PROCTER & GAMBLE MANUFACTURING CO	625.00	
Do	SCOTT PAPER CO	1,500.00	
Do	SEACO, INC		
Do	SONGWRITERS GUILD		
Do	UNION CARBIDE CORP	625.00	
Do	WEYERHAEUSER CO	625.00	
DOUGLAS K. WALKER, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.		
R. DUFFY WALL & ASSOCIATES, INC, 1317 F STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20004	BALCOR/AMERICAN EXPRESS, INC		
Do	DEAN WITTER REALTY, INC	250.00	50.00
Do	FREEPORT MCMORAN, INC	1,000.00	450.00
Do	JMB REALTY CORP	666.00	200.00
Do	LIFE OF VIRGINIA, ET AL	1,500.00	450.00
Do	LYKES BROTHERS STEAMSHIP CO		
Do	MONARCH RESOURCES, INC	500.00	100.00
Do	SCHULMAN MANAGEMENT COMPANY		
Do	UNITED SERVICES LIFE COS	500.00	200.00
Do	VOLUME FOOTWEAR RETAILERS OF AMERICA	1,000.00	450.00
MARTIN A. WALL, 1025 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC HOSPITAL ASSN	1,075.00	500.00
DON WALLACE ASSOCIATES, INC., 232 E. CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20003	ALABAMA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION	6,000.00	2,398.58
Do	AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE OF THE USA, INC	6,000.00	2,396.17
Do	ARROW TRANSPORTATION CO		
Do	COTTON WAREHOUSE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	11,000.00	2,348.22
Do	SERVICE CORPORATION INTERNATIONAL	6,000.00	191.47
DONALD L. WALLACE JR., 232 E. CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20003	MERCHANTS GRAIN & TRANSPORTATION, INC		
Do	OREGON INLET COMMISSION	12,000.00	12,000.00
RAYMOND C. WALLACE, 5025 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION, AFL-CIO		
LIONEL L. WALLENROD, 260 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10016	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
R. DOUGLAS WALLIN JR , 1235 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY. ARLINGTON VA 22202	EMERSON ELECTRIC CO		155.32
JAMES P. WALSH, DAVIS WRIGHT TODD RIESE & JONES 1752 N ST., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSN	2,500.00	
MAVIS A. WALTERS, 900 17TH STREET, NW, #1010 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INSURANCE SERVICES OFFICE		
HENRY L. WALTHER, 3238 WYNFORD DRIVE FAIRFAX VA 22031	U.S. DEFENSE COMMITTEE	3,000.00	
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, 412 FIRST STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE		
Do	AMERICAN PEANUT PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS, INC	9,000.00	
HERBERT C. WAMSLEY, 1800 M STREET, NW, #1030N WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS, INC	16,250.00	
BONNIE B. WAN, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, #730 WASHINGTON DC 20004	KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP	375.00	125.00
JOHN F. WANAMAKER, 201 N. WASHINGTON, ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	RETIRED OFFICERS ASSN	1,900.00	
BARBARA F. WARDEN, 1522 K ST., NW #406 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE		
RICHARD D. WARDEN, 1757 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED AUTO, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS	15,157.36	254.00
JACK WARE, 1220 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	6,102.00	163.20
MICHAEL O. WARE, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONOCO, INC	1,200.00	
WILLIAM L. WARFIELD, 3900 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN		
PETER F. WARNER, SUITE 2700 1000 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,250.00	
WILLIAM H. WARNER, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	CONTROL DATA CORP	50.00	56.79
CHRISTINE M. WARNKE, SUITE 300 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE	400.00	277.80
B. JACK WARREN, P.O. BOX 95385 ATLANTA GA 30347	FOREST FARMERS ASSN	229.17	434.80
MARJORIE A. WARREN, GNAU, CARTER, JACOBSEN & ASSOC., INC 1777 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BI-COUNTY CONSORTIUM		
Do	INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN, INC		
BARBARA J. WASHBURN, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #370 WASHINGTON DC 20004	CONTROL DATA CORPORATION	660.00	194.83
WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO, 1100 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20080			260.56
WASHINGTON INDEPENDENT WRITERS, INC., 525 NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20045			122.94
WASHINGTON INDUSTRIAL TEAM, INC., 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20003	BOEING COMPANY	900.00	770.43
Do	GRUMMAN AEROSPACE CORPORATION	900.00	770.43
Do	HUGHES AIRCRAFT COMPANY	1,500.00	1,284.05
Do	ROCKWELL INTL		
Do	UNITED TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION		
WATER SYSTEMS COUNCIL, 221 N. LASALLE STREET, #2026 CHICAGO IL 60601		750.00	750.00
CLARKE R. WATSON, 769 DETROIT DENVER CO 80206	WESTLAND COMPANIES, INC		
KENNETH W. WATSON, 645 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10022	INTERNATIONAL GOLD CORPORATION LIMITED		
STEPHEN L. WATSON, 1343 SOUTHVIEW DRIVE INDIANAPOLIS IN 46227	INDIANA RAILROAD ASSN	600.00	510.22
CAROLYN HERR WATTS, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	80.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
DOUGLAS R. WATTS, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC.	1,000.00	
GEORGE B. WATTS, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL BROILER COUNCIL	1,000.00	
BRUCE H. WATZMAN, 1130 17TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COAL ASSN.	5,440.00	474.27
WILLIAM J. WAY, 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	2,500.00	3,254.56
RAYMOND J. WEATHERLY, SUITE 511 1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY. ARLINGTON VA 22202	MANUFACTURED HOUSING INST	900.00	100.00
WILLIAM H. WEATHERSPOON, NORTH CAROLINA PETROLEUM COUNCIL PO BOX 167 RALEIGH NC 27602	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	1,500.00	2,287.80
A. VERNON WEAVER, 2121 K STREET, NW, #830 WASHINGTON DC 20037	STEPHENS OVERSEAS SERVICES, INC.	174.47	
HORACE S. WEBB, P.O. BOX 351 CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52406	IOWA ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY		
FREDERICK L. WEBBER, 1111 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	4,445.00	54.24
LANA N. WEBER, SUITE 205B 5455 BUFORD HWY. ATLANTA GA 30340	DENTAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC		
WEBSTER & SHEFFIELD, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW, #350 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ADAMS COUNTY, COLORADO		4,599.07
Do	CITIBANK N.A.		
WEBSTER CHAMBERLAIN & BEAN, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN PARATRANSIT INSTITUTE	1,000.00	
Do	BEER INDUSTRY ALLIANCE		
Do	MILLER BREWING COMPANY	475.00	24.00
Do	NATIONAL GUARD ASSN OF THE U.S.		
PAUL WECKSTEIN, SUITE 504 236 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	CENTER FOR LAW AND EDUCATION, INC.	763.00	10.00
CHARLES W. WEGNER JR., 600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE, #203 WASHINGTON DC 20003	PROFESSIONAL INSURANCE AGENTS	500.00	7,760.00
JACK R. WEHRLY, SUITE 790 SOUTH 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DOW CORNING CORPORATION		
STEVEN A. WEIN, 1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXTRON, INC.	600.00	150.00
NANCY WEINBERG, 1434 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, #743 WASHINGTON DC 20005	ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY	500.00	211.59
DONALD G. WEINERT, 2029 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS	1,500.00	
JOEL A. WEISS, 1655 N. FT. MYER DRIVE, #700 ROSSLYN VA 22209	ACUREX CORPORATION	6,360.00	668.00
MICHAEL A. WEISS, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	TENNECO INC		125.00
MORTON N. WEISS, SUITE 4511 ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048	NATIONAL SECURITY TRADERS ASSN, INC.	4,375.00	
STANLEY A. WEISS, SUITE 401 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY		
JUDITH H. WEITZ, 122 C ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND		
DON WELCH, P.O. BOX 841 ABILENE TX 79604	WEST TEXAS UTILITIES CO	1,208.00	2,323.92
WELLFORD WEGMAN KRULWICH GOLD & HOFF, SUITE 450 1775 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CANADIAN EMBASSY	800.00	
Do	DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, PROVINCE OF MANITOBA	2,000.00	
Do	GRANTS & CONTRACTS PROJECTS, UNITED WAY OF AMERICA	450.00	
Do	JOHNS-MANVILLE	3,625.00	
Do	MITEX	3,750.00	
Do	PETRO-LEWIS CORPORATION		
L. H. WELLS, SUITE 200 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SHELL OIL CO.	500.00	
THOMAS F. WENNING, 1910 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL GROCERS ASSN		
FRED WERTHEIMER, 2030 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMON CAUSE	15,285.00	2,400.28
WEST MEXICO VEGETABLE DISTRIBUTORS ASSN, PO BOX 848 NOGALES AZ 85621			1,000.00
W. P. WEST 1629 K ST., NW ROOM 204 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DELTA AIR LINES, INC.	273.00	166.60
HARRY H. WESTBAY III, SUITE 805 1625 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ST. REGIS CORP	1,600.00	1,000.00
WESTERN FUELS ASSOCIATION, INC, 700 JEFFERSON BUILDING 1225 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		16,000.00	16,103.84
JOSEPH J. WESTWATER, 10140 LINN STATION ROAD LOUISVILLE KY 40223	DAIRYMEN, INC.	9,000.00	4,071.07
JOHN F. WETZEL JR., 412 FIRST ST., SE, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20003	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	137.50	68.80
WEXLER REYNOLDS HARRISON & SCHULE, INC, SUITE 600 1317 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	AETNA LIFE & CASUALTY		
Do	ALLIED CORPORATION		
Do	AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE	4,500.00	201.34
Do	AMERICAN LOW POWER TELEVISION ASSN		
Do	ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO.	4,600.00	
Do	COMMITTEE FOR PRUDENT DEREGULATION	7,200.00	156.50
Do	CONSORTIUM OF PUBLIC TV STATIONS	10,346.32	303.09
Do	DYCO PETROLEUM CO.	4,000.00	7.50
Do	FOOTHILLS PIPE LINES (YUKON) LTD.	2,912.50	95.50
Do	HOECHST-ROUSSEL PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.	125.00	
Do	INEXCO OIL CO	4,000.00	7.50
Do	MANVILLE CORPORATION	3,750.00	12.75
Do	MOTION PICTURE ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	1,375.00	35.00
Do	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC.	2,400.00	95.20
Do	NATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION	2,580.00	32.00
Do	NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY	2,073.50	618.08
Do	WARNER COMMUNICATIONS, INC	1,245.00	55.50
ROBERT G. WEYMUELLER, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #402 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN LUNG ASSN.	3,350.00	3,940.00
BRIAN B. WHALEN JR., 401 N. MICHIGAN AVE. CHICAGO IL 60611	INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.	1,250.00	53.82
CURTIS E. WHALEN, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #3202 WASHINGTON DC 20024	TRANSCO ENERGY COMPANY		
LEONARD P. WHEAT, 1101 17TH STREET, NW, #1002 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN.		
CHARLES W. WHEELER, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	1,500.00	384.00
CLYDE A. WHEELER JR., SUITE 820 1800 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SUN CO, INC.	15,000.00	279.19
EDWIN M. WHEELER, 1815 H STREET, NW, #100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN PETROCHEMICAL CONSUMERS	75,000.00	1,700.00
THOMAS E. WHEELER, 1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC.	1,375.00	
JUNE M. WHELAN, SUITE 600 S 1120 20TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNION PACIFIC CORPORATION	1,250.00	
WHITE & CASE, 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA		
DONALD F. WHITE, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN RETAIL FEDERATION	1,500.00	125.00
JOHN C. WHITE, 30 SOUTH WACKER CHICAGO IL 60606	COASTAL CORP & CHICAGO MERCANTILE EXCHANGE		
JOHN S. WHITE, 1800 M ST., NW, #975 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MARATHON OIL CO		
JOHN THOMAS WHITE II, SUITE 2202 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA EAST, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	TENNECO INC		
SAM WHITE, 412 FIRST STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	INDEPENDENT CATTLEMEN'S ASSN	4,500.00	
Do	NATIONAL PEANUT GROWERS GROUP	4,834.00	
Do	SAM KANE PACKING		
BRYAN K. WHITEHEAD, 815 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE & STEAMSHIP CLERKS		
ALTON W. WHITEHOUSE JR., 1750 MIDLAND BLDG. CLEVELAND OH 44115	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
MARSHALL E. WHITENTON, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)	95.00	44.31
RICHARD M. WHITING, 730 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ASSOCIATION OF BANK HOLDING COS.	583.33	
BENNETT C. WHITLOCK JR., 1616 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSNS, INC.	7,500.00	
WHITMAN & RANSOM, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW, #650 WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPAN EXTERNAL TRADE ORGANIZATION (JETRO)		239.59
JAMES A. WHITMAN, P.O. BOX 1417-D49 ALEXANDRIA VA 22313	NATIONAL ASSN OF CHAIN DRUG STORES, INC	500.00	
WILLIAM F. WHITSITT, 1800 K ST., NW SUITE 820 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SUN CO, INC	2,088.00	935.21
WILLIAM E. WICKERT JR., 1000 16TH STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION	320.00	
WICKWIRE LEWIS GOLDMARK & SCHOOR, 500 MAYNARD BLDG. SEATTLE WA 98104	ARCTIC SLOPE REGIONAL CORP, ET AL	559.00	782.50
Do	PUBLIC HEALTH HOSPITAL PRESERVATION & DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY		
Do	STATE OF ALASKA, TRANSPORTATION SECTION		
RICHARD J. WIECHMANN, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC		
ANN R. WIESENECK, 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER ALUMINUM & CHEMICAL CORP		
W. SCOTT WILBER, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	3,975.00	200.12
THOMAS D. WILCOX, P.C., 2011 EYE STREET, NW, #705 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF STEVEDORES	6,600.00	785.00
HARRY G. WILES II, 499 S. CAPITOL STREET, SW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL ASSN OF INDEPENDENT INSURERS		165.00
WILEY JOHNSON & REIN, 1776 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CBS, INC		
Do	CLEAR CHANNEL BROADCASTING SERVICE		
WILEY, JOHNSON & REIN, 1776 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	U.S. TELEPHONE, INC.		
GUENTHER O. WILHELM, SUITE 1100 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EXXON CORPORATION		
CARL B. WILKERSON, 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE, INC.		
JERRY C. WILKERSON, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #707 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL FRANCHISE ASSN	650.00	200.00
WILKINSON BARKER KNAUER & QUINN, 1735 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BONNEVILLE INTERNATIONAL CORP		
Do	MANVILLE CORPORATION		
Do	MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE CO.	44,354.50	1,053.71
Do	NORTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE CO	36,290.44	787.56
Do	PACIFIC NORTHWEST BELL TELEPHONE CO	27,486.00	644.99
Do	U.S. WEST, INC.		
PAUL R. WILLGING, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20037	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF HEALTH CENTERS	1,125.00	24.00
RALPH E. WILLHAM, 1750 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SHEET METAL WORKERS' INTL ASSN	10,773.00	
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY, 839 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	GADSDEN TIMES, INC.	1,187.50	
Do	PUBLIC WELFARE FOUNDATION, INC.	4,750.00	
Do	SPARTANBURG HERALD & JOURNAL, INC.	2,375.00	
Do	TUSCALOOSA NEWS, INC.	1,187.50	
F. LEE WILLIAMS, 1616 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN RETAIL FEDERATION	1,600.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
JAMES H. WILLIAMS, 1840 WILSON BLVD., #203 ARLINGTON VA 22201	NATIONAL LIMESTONE INST, INC	4,254.00	
KAREN WILLIAMS, 1750 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HEALTH INSURANCE ASSN OF AMERICA		
LAWRENCE F. WILLIAMS, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	8,280.00	
LEONARD B. WILLIAMS, 1000 16TH STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BETHLEHEM STEEL CORPORATION	120.00	
LUCINDA L. WILLIAMS, 1111 19TH ST., NW, #402 ARLINGTON VA 20036	FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HOSPITALS	5,500.00	
MARGIE R. WILLIAMS, 415 2ND ST., NE SUITE 300 WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL ASSN OF WHEAT GROWERS	1,328.32	
ROBERT E. WILLIAMS, 1825 K ST., NW, #607 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNITED AIRLINES	1,500.00	
W.G. WILLIAMS, 1100 17TH STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
JOHN C. WILLIAMSON, 1725 K STREET, NW, #1405 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MORTGAGE INSURANCE COMPANIES OF AMERICA		
DAVID K. WILLIS, 1620 EYE STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC.		
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, 818 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	RELIANCE GROUP, INC		
CHARLOTTE M. WILMER, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSN	100.00	
WILMER CUTLER & PICKERING, 1666 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS, AUTHORS & PUBLISHERS		83.00
Do	APACHE CORPORATION	465.00	
Do	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE		20.00
Do	CBS, INC	1,061.25	339.23
Do	CITICORP		
Do	DEALER BANK ASSN		
Do	FORD MOTOR CO		
Do	G-4 CHILDREN'S COALITION	752.53	3.25
Do	HANDGUN CONTROL, INC		103.97
Do	MORGAN GUARANTY TRUST CO		
Do	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC.		
Do	NATIONAL CORPORATION FOR HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS		
Do	OWENS-ILLINOIS		
CHARLES D. WILSON, 1850 K ST., NW, #390 WASHINGTON DC 20006	UNION CAMP CORP	745.18	169.20
DENA L. WILSON, SUITE 1000 1600 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN WATERWAYS OPERATORS, INC	2,800.00	181.81
DONNIE E. WILSON, 7374 ELDORADO STREET MCLEAN VA 22102	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC		
ROBERT C. WILSON, RM 400 499 S. CAPITOL ST., SW WASHINGTON DC 20003	RMI, INC	380.00	
Do	SOUTHWEST MARINE, INC	120.00	
Do	WASHINGTON INDUSTRIAL TEAM, INC	600.00	
ROSEMARY L. WILSON, MINNESOTA PETROLEUM COUNCIL 1025 NORTHERN FEDERAL BLDG. ST. PAUL MN 55102	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
WILLIAM A. WILSON III, 8001 BRADDOCK ROAD SPRINGFIELD VA 22160	NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMM	750.00	
JUDY WINCHESTER, 3900 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	4,000.00	280.95
WINDELS MARX DAVIES & IVES, 1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #940 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SOLITRON DEVICES, INC		
JOSEPH B. WINKELMANN, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	2,500.00	87.81
KATHLEEN J. WINN, 1155 15TH ST., NW SUITE 602 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PENNZOIL CO	475.00	
MARIE WINSLOW, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FED OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
WINSTON & STRAWN, #500 2550 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN ASSN OF MUSEUMS	6.00	
Do	BEATRICE FOODS CO	335.00	
Do	BUILDING OWNERS & MANAGERS ASSN INTL		38.19
Do	CUMMINS ENGINE CO, INC		
Do	FFV		
Do	GIC FINANCIAL SERVICES CORP		
Do	GOULD, INC		
Do	INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SHOPPING CENTERS	2,330.00	56.99
Do	LEASE MANAGEMENT CORP		
Do	NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY		
Do	TERSON COMPANY, INC		
DAVID A. WINSTON, 1922 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS	291.00	24.00
JAMES L. WINSTON, 1730 M STREET, NW, #708 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BLACK OWNED BROADCASTERS		
MARK E. WINTER, 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN LAND TITLE ASSN	3,223.00	
WINTHROP WEINSTEIN & SEXTON, 1800 CONWED TOWER, 444 CEDAR STREET ST. PAUL MN 55101	OTTO BREMER FOUNDATION		
RONALD S. WISHART JR., 1100 15TH STREET, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	UNION CARBIDE CORP		
WISNER & SCHWARZ, 1762 CHURCH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ENERGY RECOVERY SYSTEMS, INC		11.23
ROBERT V. WITECK, THE POWER HOUSE 3255 GRACE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ALLIANCE FOR TELEPHONE PROGRESS).	1,900.00	
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ANEUTRONIX, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: CANADIAN ASBESTOS INFORMATION CENTRE).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS).	1,050.00	
Do	GRAY AND COMPANY (FOR: MUTUAL OF OMAHA)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NATIONAL MULTI HOUSING COUNCIL).	100.00	
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: NIU, INC)		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF TURKEY).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALEN DRY CARGO, INC).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: SALOMON BROTHERS, INC).		
RICHARD F. WITHERALL, 236 DENVER CLUB BLDG. DENVER CO 80202	COLORADO RAILROAD ASSN		
WITKOWSKI WEINER MCCAFFREY & BRODSKY, SUITE 350 1575 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	COMMERCIAL CREDIT CORP	144.00	40.33
Do	COORDINATING COUNCIL ON MANUFACTURED HOUSING FINANCE	1,219.95	113.65
Do	FOREMOST INSURANCE CO	2,814.00	61.62
Do	MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC.; COMMERCIAL CREDIT CORP	16,054.00	5,250.00
Do	NATIONAL MANUFACTURED HOUSING FINANCE ASSN	1,025.50	27.78
Do	SHORT LINE LEGISLATIVE COALITION		
GLENN P. WITTE, 888 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF ICE CREAM MFRS & MILK IND. FOUNDATION		
HERMAN C. WITTHAUS, 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL MOTORS CORP	3,000.00	2,633.04
S.R. WOJDAK AND ASSOCIATES, INC, 8 PENN CENTER PLAZA, #1000 PHILADELPHIA PA 19103	BASIX CONTROLS SYSTEMS CORP		
Do	MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA	1,600.00	622.46
Do	READING COMPANY	6,150.00	124.00
Do	ST. CHRISTOPHER'S HOSPITAL FOR CHILDREN	6,000.00	627.79
CLINTON WOLCOTT, 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FED OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES		
JAMES E. WOLF, 2020 14TH ST., NORTH ARLINGTON VA 22201	TRANE COMPANY	1,000.00	
JAMES WOLF, 1925 K ST., NW, #507 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY	174.01	
SIDNEY M. WOLFE, 2000 P ST., NW, #708 WASHINGTON DC 20036	HEALTH RESEARCH GROUP	10.00	
THOMAS F. WOLFE, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.		
DON WOMACK, SUITE 303 1825 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TEXAS UTILITIES SERVICES, INC	2,575.00	237.56
BURTON C. WOOD, 1125 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	12,650.00	3,627.00
CHARLES A. WOOD, 10 LAFAYETTE SQUARE BUFFALO NY 14203	NATIONAL FUEL GAS DISTRIBUTION CORP., ET AL	270.00	494.56
JOHN L. WOOD, 2121 SAN JACINTO ST. P.O. BOX 660164 DALLAS TX 75266	CENTRAL AND SOUTH WEST CORP		
W. ALAN WOODFORD, 2501 M ST.,NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC	300.00	
DIANE WOODRUFF, SUITE 228 1346 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES	3,160.40	
RICHARD P. WOODS, 2501 M ST., N.W. SUITE 540 WASHINGTON DC 20037	PACIFIC RESOURCES, INC	500.00	
WILLIAM E. WOODS, 205 DAINGERFIELD RD. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL ASSN OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS	1,500.00	300.00
PERRY W. WOOFTER, SUITE 530 1800 K ST. NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TESORO PETROLEUM CORP	2,500.00	
LINDA ANZALONE WOOLLEY, 1707 L STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORPORATION		
NOEL C. WOOSLEY, 4647 FORBES BOULEVARD LANHAM MD 20706	AMVETS	6,800.00	150.47
GEORGE M. WORDEN, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HILL & KNOWLTON, INC		
DEE WORKMAN, 405 LEXINGTON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10017	MOBIL OIL CORP	18,750.00	1,600.00
ROSS WORKMAN, P.O. BOX 1396 HOUSTON TX 77251	TRANSCO ENERGY COMPANY	8,333.00	1,836.31
WORLDWIDE INFORMATION RESOURCES, LTD, 1717 K STREET, NW, #706 WASHINGTON DC 20006	EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE U.S.		
Do	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC		
Do	STATE OF MONTANA		
Do	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES U.S.A., INC		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
W. ROBERT WORLEY, 1736 CREEK CROSSING ROAD VIENNA VA 22180	SOUTHERN COMPANY SERVICES, INC	88.00	809.07
STEVEN M. WORTH, 3255 GRACE ST., NW THE POWER HOUSE WASHINGTON DC 20007	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSN OF JAPAN).		
Do	GRAY & CO. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FOR: REPUBLIC OF KOREA).		
SAMUEL H. WRIGHT, 11333 MCCORMICK ROAD HUNT VALLEY MD 21031	PHH GROUP, INC	2,000.00	722.94
RICHARD E. WYCKOFF, 1771 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS		
FREDERICK S. WYLE, 3 GREENWOOD COMMON BERKELEY CA 94708	FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA		
THOMAS L. WYLIE, 1800 K STREET, NW, #820 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SUN COMPANY, INC	9,000.00	155.55
WYMAN BAUTZER ROTHMAN KUCHEL & SILBERT, SUITE 580 600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AUTOMOTIVE DISMANTLERS & RECYCLERS ASSN		
Do	BRISTOL BAY NATIVE CORP		
Do	EKLUTNA, INC		
Do	FILMWAYS, INC		
MARC D. YACKER, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN PAPER INST, INC	375.00	
DAVID V. YADEN, 1730 M STREET, NW, #904 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NERCO, INC	500.00	323.79
T. ALBERT YAMADA, SUITE 520 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOYOTA MOTOR SALES, U.S.A., INC	500.00	
Do	WEST MEXICO VEGETABLE DISTRIBUTORS ASSN	500.00	
NANCY FOSTER YANISH, 1750 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE	200.00	
ANDREA J. YANK, 1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION	1,142.35	24.87
EDWARD R. YAWN, 1111 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE	328.57	347.60
KIM YELTON, 8120 FENTON ST. SILVER SPRING MD 20910	AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE	6,410.56	164.06
JACK YELVERTON, 1303 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	FLEET RESERVE ASSN		
D. SCOTT YOHE, 1629 K ST., NW, #204 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DELTA AIR LINES, INC	390.00	127.40
ANDREW YOOD, 1220 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	200.00	
G. REYNOLDS YOUNG, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	1,000.00	
HUGH F. YOUNG JR , 1500 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL PAINT & COATINGS ASSN, INC	3,000.00	
JOHN ANDREW YOUNG, 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW, #207 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COASTAL CORPORATION		
JUDITH A. YOUNG, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,500.00	33.60
KATHRYN ELEANOR YOUNG, 1615 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20062	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE U.S.		
THANE YOUNG, 777 14TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS	1,500.00	279.78
BETSY YOUNKINS, 1220 L STREET, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST	6,000.00	435.55
EUGENE A. YOURCH, 50 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10004	FEDERATION OF AMERICAN CONTROLLED SHIPPING	200.00	
RALPH ZAAYENGA, 1800 K STREET, NW, #820 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SUN COMPANY, INC	709.80	47.95
HARRY M ZACHEM, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., #507 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASHLAND OIL, INC	2,000.00	
LYNN ZAKUPOWSKY, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	1,000.00	
STEVEN S. ZALEZNICK, 1909 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20049	AMERICAN ASSN OF RETIRED PERSONS	467.31	
BARNABY W. ZALL, 1424 16TH STREET, NW, #707 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FEDERATION FOR AMERICAN IMMIGRATION REFORM	640.00	18.00
JOHN S. ZAPP, 1101 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSN	4,900.00	94.13
JANICE ZARRO, SUITE 715-16 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AVON PRODUCTS, INC		
THOMAS K. ZAUCHA, 1825 SAMUEL MORSE DRIVE RESTON VA 22090	NATIONAL GROCERS ASSN		
L. ANDREW ZAUSNER, 1155 15TH ST., NW, #602 WASHINGTON DC 20005	PENNZOIL CO	1,000.00	7.50
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, 9912 FORT HAMILTON PARKWAY BROOKLYN NY 11209	BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPT., AFL-CIO		
Do	FAIRCHILD INDUSTRIES		
Do	GRUMMAN AEROSPACE CORPORATION		
Do	NEW YORK TELEPHONE		
Do	TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE		
DENIS R. ZEGAR, 201 PARK WASHINGTON COURT FALLS CHURCH VA 22046	NATIONAL-AMERICAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSN	3,000.00	
PHILIP F. ZEIDMAN, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS CONFERENCE, INC		
DON J. ZELLER, SUITE 503 1000 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)	1,850.00	234.52
ZERO POPULATION GROWTH, INC, 1346 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		921.00	1,337.00
RONALD L. ZIEGLER, 1199 N. FAIRFAX STREET, #801 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL ASSN OF TRUCK STOP OPERATORS, INC		
ZIMMER & CARNAVOS, 2501 M STREET, NW, #370 WASHINGTON DC 20037	COLORTYME, INC		
MICHAEL J. ZIMMER, WICKWIRE, GAVIN & GIBBS 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CLEAN COAL COALITION, INC		
Do	COGENERATION COALITION, INC		
KENNETH ZINN, 1837 WYOMING AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	WASHINGTON OFFICE ON AFRICA	3,000.01	
ZUCKERT SCOUTT RASENBERGER & JOHNSON, 888 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	6,000.00	1,464.25
Do	DREYFUS CORPORATION	4,292.00	1,182.86
Do	HARCOURT BRACE JOVANOVICH	3,275.00	292.01
LEIGH ANN ZUNKE, SUITE 400 1401 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL FOOD PROCESSORS ASSN	375.00	
CHARLES O. ZUVER, 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSN	5,000.00	
CARL E. ZWISLER III, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #1005 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL FRANCHISE ASSN		
31ST PRO LIFE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ACTION COMM, 8654 BONVIEW TERRACE WILLIAMSVILLE NY 14221			
34TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ACTION COMM (NY), RD 2 ALLEGANY NY 14706			

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1983 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective headings.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19.....

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§302(e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $.....Dues and assessments
2. $.....Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $.....Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $.....Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $.....Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $.....Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $.....TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $.....TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $.....Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $.....Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $.....''Expense money'' and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": .....

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through....., 19.....)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $.....Public relations and advertising services
2. $.....Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $.....Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $.....Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $.....Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $.....Telephone and telegraph
7. $.....Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $.....All other expenditures
9. $.....TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $.....Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $.....TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $.....TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $.....Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $.....Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
A & S TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, 75 JACOBUS AVENUE SOUTH KEARNY NJ 07032			3,528.71
LEANNE J. ABDNOR, SUITE 1250 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	VENNERS AND CO., LTD. (FOR: KOCH INDUSTRIES)		
ALBERT E. ABRAHAMS, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	8,000.00	641.43
ACACIA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO, 51 LOUISIANA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001			5,000.00
ACTION, INC., 2025 EYE STREET, NW, #1022 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM		
Do	NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIAN, INC		
CHARLES F. ADAMS, SUITE 700 1899 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN ASSN OF ADVERTISING AGENCIES	2,500.00	750.00
ADDISON KETCHEY HORAN & PARIS, FOUNDERS LIFE BUILDING 100 TWIGGS STREET, #300 TAMPA FL 33602	PHH GROUP, INC.	10,800.00	1,912.98
V. J. ADDUCI, 1620 EYE ST., NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOR VEHICLE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S., INC.	10.00	
ELIZABETH AGLE, 530 7TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL CLEAN AIR COALITION, INC.	7,531.22	123.34
ROBERT S. AGMAN, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC	1,368.00	92.27
AIR TRANSPORT ASSN OF AMERICA, 1709 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		34,573.84	34,573.84
ALLIANCE FOR CANNABIS THERAPEUTICS, P.O. BOX 23691 L'ENFANT PLAZA STATION WASHINGTON DC 20024			
SUSAN E. ALVARADO, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS	1,500.00	569.75
ROBERT ALVAREZ, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	261.93	
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF OPHTHALMOLOGY, SUITE 300 1101 VERMONT AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20005			
AMERICAN ASSN OF CROP INSURERS, 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007			
AMERICAN ASSN OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, 2401 VIRGINIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037			373.62
AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, 777 THIRD AVE. NEW YORK NY 10017			24,100.00
AMERICAN CLEAN WATER ASSN, SUITE 519 2025 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		15,256.01	15,622.98
AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS, 415 SECOND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		11,746.17	11,746.17
AMERICAN DENTAL ASSN, 211 E. CHICAGO AVE. CHICAGO IL 60611		14,505.90	14,505.90
AMERICAN FED OF STATE, COUNTY & MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, 1625 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			69,096.68
AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES ASSN, 1101 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			5,500.00
AMERICAN GAS ASSN, 1515 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209		25,636.00	25,636.00
AMERICAN HEALTH PLANNING ASSN, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #950 WASHINGTON DC 20005		24,592.09	5,200.00
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSN, 50 E. HURON ST. CHICAGO IL 60611		4,662.46	7,079.90
AMERICAN MARITIME ASSN, 485 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK NY 10022			
AMERICAN ORTHOTIC AND PROSTHETIC ASSN, 717 PENDLETON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314			
AMERICAN PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSN, 1111 N. FAIRFAX ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314		4,644.77	4,644.77
AMERICAN RIVERS CONSERVATION COUNCIL, 323 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003		44,056.00	46,305.00
AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSN, SUITE 964 1030 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			11,350.00
AMERICAN SUBCONTRACTORS ASSN, SUITE 540 8401 CORPORATE DR. LANDOVER MD 20785			1,200.00
NANCY AMIDEI, SUITE 500 1319 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	FOOD RESEARCH & ACTION CENTER		
ANDERSON & PENDLETON, SUITE 707 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CANNED & COOKED MEAT IMPORTERS' ASSN	2,840.00	3,129.02
ARNE ANDERSON, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	3,579.89	
JAMES A. ANDERSON JR., 1725 K STREET, NW, #710 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL ASSN OF WHOLESALER-DISTRIBUTORS		
LINDA D. ANDERSON, 1411 K STREET, NW, #1110 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS	1,875.00	10.50
SCOTT G. ANDERSON, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	BURLINGTON NORTHERN, INC.	1,900.00	2,296.82
L. J. ANDOLSEK, 1533 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	519.00	22.50
AMY APPERSON, 810 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HANDGUN CONTROL, INC.	2,540.00	
ROBERT J. ARAUJO, 1001 22ND STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)	300.00	30.00
R. G. ARMISTEAD, 8613 JANET LANE VIENNA VA 22180			
ARNOLD & PORTER, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPT., AFL-CIO	220.00	1.50
Do	CENTRAL SERVICES ORGANIZATION		
Do	CITY OF MIAMI	342.00	6.00
Do	CITY OF NEW YORK	437.61	
Do	LONE STAR INDUSTRIES, INC.		
Do	NATIONAL COORDINATING COMM FOR MULTIEMPLOYER PLANS	2,200.00	45.00
Do	RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSN OF AMER, INC	2,600.00	21.00
Do	SACRAMENTO PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT, ET AL		674.55
NAN ARON, 600 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE		
ASIAN PACIFIC ECONOMIC EDUCATIONAL CULTURAL ORGANIZATION, P.O. BOX 891 MANILA, PHILIPPINE			
ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE PENSION & WELFARE PLANS, INC, SUITE 340 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004.		16,412.17	16,412.17
JOHN MCELROY ATKISSON, 1717 K STREET, NW, #502 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSOLIDATED EDISON CO OF NEW YORK, INC.	712.50	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE	20,531.25	1,145.76
CLAUDIA MANSFIELD AUSTIN, 1801 N. MOORE STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN ASSN OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS		52.07
RONALD R. AUSTIN, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OVERSEAS EDUCATION ASSN	1,000.00	
HOPE M. BABCOCK, 645 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY	6,125.00	388.21
DAVID BAKER, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CLEAN AIR COALITION, INC.	3,202.87	86.00
DONALD BALDWIN, SUITE 804 1140 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT COUNCIL		
BALLARD SPAHR ANDREWS & INGERSOLL, SUITE 1100 1850 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY		
Do	ENERGY TERMINALS, INC.		
Do	PENNSYLVANIA ASSN OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES		
Do	PHILADELPHIA PORT CORPORATION		
Do	PORT OF WILMINGTON, DELAWARE		
Do	SOUTH JERSEY PORT CORPORATION		
Do	U.S. COMMITTEE FOR UNICEF		
Do	WEST VIRGINIA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSN		
MICHAEL BALY III, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	4,000.00	358.28
MICHAEL P. BALZANO JR., 444 NORTH CAPITOL ST., NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20001	JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS		
DELMAR K. BANNER, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, #604 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FARM CREDIT COUNCIL	108.00	
BARAFF KOERNER OLENDER & HOCHBERG, P.C., SUITE 203 2033 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COLLEGE FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION		
Do	NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSN		
Do	NORTH AMERICAN SOCCER LEAGUE		
BARBARA BARCHARD, 810 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HANDGUN CONTROL, INC.	3,979.00	
NEIL D. BARON, BOOTH & BARON 122 EAST 42ND ST. NEW YORK NY 10168	STANDARD & POOR'S CORPORATION		
RICHARD L. BARR, P.O. BOX 834 DES MOINES IA 50304	IOWA RAILWAY ASSN		667.09
BARRETT SMITH SCHAPIRO SIMON & ARMSTRONG, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #821 WASHINGTON DC 20004	BEAR STEARNS & CO		702.88
Do	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC.		83.00
Do	MERRILL LYNCH PIERCE FENNER & SMITH, INC	1,207.50	702.88
T. MICHAEL BARRY, 2626 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20037	NATIONAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSN	3,500.00	420.18
ROGER V. BARTH, 2555 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN ASSN FOR CLINICAL CHEMISTRY		
RICHARD A. BARTON, 1730 K ST., NW, #905 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DIRECT MARKETING ASSN	1,400.00	
BASKINS AND SEARS, P.C., 818 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA		
CATHARINE R. BATKY, 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURLINGTON NORTHERN, INC.	750.00	310.66
ROBERT J. BAUGHMAN, 717 PENDLETON ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	AMERICAN ORTHOTIC AND PROSTHETIC ASSN		
MICHAEL K. BEARD, 100 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL COALITION TO BAN HANDGUNS		
GEORGE W. BEATTY, 1200 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BAILARD BIEHL & KAISER, INC.	10,225.00	200.00
ORREN BEATY JR., 700 JEFFERSON BUILDING 1225 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	WESTERN FUELS ASSOCIATION, INC.	2,720.00	2,685.67
MARK BELANGER, 805 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10022	MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYERS ASSN		
BELL BOYD & LLOYD, THREE FIRST NATIONAL PLAZA 70 WEST MADISON STREET CHICAGO IL 60602	BOISE CASCADE CORP		
CATHERINE BENNETT, SUITE 730 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PFIZER, INC.	650.00	682.42
TRISHA BENNETT, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	BURLINGTON NORTHERN, INC.	1,750.00	1,039.72
GEORGE L. BERG JR., 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	5,526.00	87.00
EDWIN M. BERGSMARK, THREE SEAGATE TOLEDO OH 43603	TOLEDO TRUST COMPANY		
JANE W. BERGWIN, 1050 17TH STREET, NW, #490 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSUMERS POWER CO	200.00	
ELLEN BERMAN, SUITE 320 2000 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSUMER ENERGY COUNCIL OF AMERICA		
RICHARD B. BERMAN, 6606 LBJ FREEWAY DALLAS TX 75230	STEAK & ALE RESTAURANTS OF AMERICA, INC		
GEORGE K. BERNSTEIN, 1730 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN	2,000.00	
ROBERT BETZ, 1101 14TH STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20005	ROBERT BETZ ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: ALABAMA HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION)	3,000.00	67.81
MOE BILLER, 817 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO	10,215.48	
ROBERT J. BIRD, 888 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ZACHRY, INC		
BISHOP LIBERMAN COOK PURCELL & REYNOLDS, 1200 17TH STREET, NW, 7TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN MOTORCYCLIST ASSN		
Do	B.A.T. INDUSTRIES, LTD	86,118.75	
Do	HARLEY-DAVIDSON MOTOR CO, INC.		
BRENT BLACKWELDER, 317 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	1,094.98	
NEAL B. BLAIR, 236 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #603 WASHINGTON DC 20002	FREE THE EAGLE & TARGET, INC	12,000.00	
GERRY BLANCHARD, GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMURCON CORPORATION		
Do	BEZTAK COMPANY		
Do	BI-COUNTY CONSORTIUM		
Do	CAC ASSOCIATES		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	DETROIT & MACKINAC RAILWAY COMPANY		
Do	GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS		
Do	GRAND TRAVERSE DEVELOPMENT, INC.		
Do	INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN, INC		
Do	LINEAR AIR MOTORS		
Do	MOVE DETROIT FORWARD FUND		
Do	NETCO		
Do	POTTER INSTRUMENT CO, INC		
Do	PRIMARK CORPORATION		
Do	RJK CONSTRUCTION COMPANY		
Do	SAFEKEEPER SYSTEMS, INC.		
Do	SAFLOK/COMPUTERIZED SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	SANDERS CORPORATION		
Do	U.S. MANUFACTURING COMPANY		
Do	URBAN REVITALIZATION, INC		
KENNETH T. BLAYLOCK, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	18,729.06	3,374.85
SAMUEL A. BLEICHER, BLANK, ROME, COMISKY & MCCAULEY 1700 K STREET, NW, #404 WASHINGTON DC 20006	A & S TRANSPORTATION COMPANY	3,403.75	124.96
JACK A. BLUM, 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INDEPENDENT GASOLINE MARKETERS COUNCIL	25,000.00	732.00
BLUM NASH & RAILSBACK, SUITE 408 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSN		
Do	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
Do	MERCK & CO, INC		
Do	TIME, INC		
Do	TWIN COAST NEWSPAPERS, INC		
Do	VIDEOTEX INDUSTRY ASSN		
BONNEVILLE ASSOCIATES, SUITE 300 200 E. SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111	WESTERN REGIONAL COUNCIL		
BRIAN T. BORDERS, ROYER & SHACKNAI 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BABCOCK & BROWN	10,363.38	1,542.25
WAYNE A. BOUTWELL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	305.00	
JAMES J. BOWE, 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC	1,110.00	1,395.71
RODNEY A. BOWER, SUITE 702 818 ROEDER RD. SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		1,004.12
BOWERY SAVINGS BANK, 110 EAST 42ND STREET NEW YORK NY 10017	AMERICAN PETROFINA, INC	5,002.50	2,455.00
BOWMAN CONNER TOUHEY & PETRILLO, 2828 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #203 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,500.00	
ROBERT K. BOYD, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AGRISTORE SYSTEMS COMPANY		
THURMAN L. BOYKIN, SUITE 702 1911 N. FT. MYER DR. ARLINGTON VA 22209	ARKANSAS 2000, INC		
Do	JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS	833.20	
THERESA M. BRADY, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW, #801 WASHINGTON DC 20001	FOOD RESEARCH & ACTION CENTER	757.78	84.95
CAROLYN BRICKEY, SUITE 500 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS	1,500.00	354.93
BELVA B. BRISSETT, 1771 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	3,080.48	110.35
MARY E. BROOKS, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SATELLITE TELEVISION INDUSTRY ASSN/S.P.A.C.E	4,805.00	
BROWN & FINN, SUITE 510 1920 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	SATELLITE TV VIEWING RIGHTS SUPERFUND, INC	3,325.00	
Do	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,000.00	465.81
DIANE R. BROWN, 1515 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	CROWLEY MARITIME CORPORATION		
DONALD K. BROWN, 1127 11TH ST., #544 SACRAMENTO CA 95814	SUMMA CORPORATION		
Do	INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS	8,500.00	625.00
JOHN J. BROWN, 1125 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF STATE, COUNTY & MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES	8,983.56	99.90
MARGUERITE BRACY BROWN, 1625 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CITIZENS FOR GAULEY RIVER		
BROWN ROADY BONVILLIAN & GOLD, 1300 19TH STREET, NW, #300 WASHINGTON DC 20036	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Do	KANSAS CITY SOUTHERN RAILWAY	14,480.00	1,970.24
Do	METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY	3,750.00	234.98
Do	NORTHEASTERN INTERNATIONAL AIRWAYS, INC	3,512.50	1,331.76
Do	SMITH DAWSON ASSOCS (FOR SAN FRAN. PUBLIC UTIL. COMMISSION)	3,900.22	99.78
Do	WESTERN RIVER GUIDES ASSN		
SHIRLE L. BROWN, P.O. BOX 663, GPO NEW YORK NY 10016	SLB ENTERPRISES		
THOMAS N. BROWNELL, 1700 NORTH MOORE STREET, 20TH FL. ROSSLYN VA 22209	BOEING COMPANY		
WALTER W. BRUDNO, 1800 FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. DALLAS TX 75202	DEMINEX U.S. OIL CO	12,499.98	
Do	TEXASGULF, INC	12,499.98	
GARY W. BRUNER, P.O. BOX 2159 DALLAS TX 75221	AMERICAN PETROFINA, INC		
BRYAN CAVE MCPHEETERS & MCROBERTS, 1015 15TH STREET, NW, #1000 WASHINGTON DC 20005	MICROELECTRONICS & COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY CORP		
MARGARET H. BRYANT, 1899 L ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN NATURAL RESOURCES CO	994.00	52.50
SUSAN BUCK, 108 S. AKARD STREET DALLAS TX 75202	U.S. TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS, INC	12,938.00	189.00
SUSAN M. BUFFONE, 3604 34TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION		
DAVID A. BUNN, SUITE 406 1211 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HEARST CORPORATION		
Do	MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS ASSN, INC		
Do	PARCEL SHIPPERS ASSN		
CHRISTINE CAPITO BURCH, 1625 L STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF STATE, COUNTY & MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES	9,443.70	166.98
DAVID G. BURDEN, 200 E. RANDOLPH DR. CHICAGO IL 60601	STANDARD OIL CO		
SALLY J. BURKE, BARNETT & ALAGIA 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	AMERICAN ASSN OF CROP INSURERS		
DAVID G. BURNEY, 2040 HARBOR ISLAND DR., #208 SAN DIEGO CA 92101	U.S. TUNA FOUNDATION	6,000.00	3,000.00
E. PHILIP BUSH, 2700 REPUBLIC BANK TOWER DALLAS TX 75201	TAYLOR & MIZELL		
NICHOLAS J. BUSH, SUITE 200 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN	7,447.90	8,448.63
WILLIAM A. BUTLER, 645 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY	5,000.00	150.00
JOHN D. CAHILL, 444 N. CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY	8,625.00	
CALIFORNIA HOUSING COUNCIL, 1225 8TH STREET, #325 SACRAMENTO CA 95814			33,298.28
PETER E. CALLANAN, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	HONEYWELL, INC	100.00	225.00
GORDON L. CALVERT, BOX 34-531 BETHESDA MD 20817	COMMERICIAL LAW LEAGUE OF AMER, COMM COLL. AGENCY SECTION		
DONALD L. CALVIN, 11 WALL ST. NEW YORK NY 10005	NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE, INC		
ROBERT P. CANAVAN, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,535.00	115.50
CAPITOL ADVOCATES, 1127 11TH STREET, #950 SACRAMENTO CA 95814	CROWLEY MARITIME CORP	12,600.00	6,859.54
Do	DISTILLED SPIRITS COUNCIL OF THE US, INC		
PETER CARLSON, 317 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	567.82	
CHAPIN CARPENTER JR., 1211 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #406 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS ASSN, INC	1,500.00	
JOHN BENJAMIN CARROLL, SUITE 206 100 E. WASHINGTON ST. SYRACUSE NY 13202	DAIRY FARMER DISTRIBUTORS OF AMERICA, INC	22,000.00	16,433.58
JOHN R. CARTER, 1000 WILSON BOULEVARD SUITE 2600 ARLINGTON VA 22209	TRW, INC	1,000.00	
CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, INC, SUITE 500 624 9TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		488,021.00	630.00
CHADBOURNE PARKE WHITESIDE & WOLFF, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS	1,965.00	51.53
DEBORAH M. CHALFIE, 600 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC REPRESENTATION	82.50	
WILLIAM J. CHANDLER, SUITE 1100 1511 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CHELONIA INSTITUTE		
Do	WEST INDIES INVESTMENT COMPANY		
BLAIR G. CHILDS, P.O. BOX 7610, BF STATION WASHINGTON DC 20044	SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSN	1,040.00	650.00
CLADOUHOS & BRASHARES, 1750 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ASHLAND OIL, INC		
Do	CROWN CENTRAL PETROLEUM CORP		
Do	INTERNATIONAL PROCESSORS		
Do	SEAVIEW PETROLEUM CO		
Do	SECURITIES GROUP		
RUDY I. CLARK, 5342 WOODBURY WOODS LANE FAIRFAX VA 22032	AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSN		135.00
CLAYMARK CORPORATION, INC, C/O MILBANK TWEED HADLEY & MCCLOY 1825 EYE ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			1,747.50
CLIFFORD & WARNKE, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL TOUR ASSOCIATION, INC		
COALITION FOR FULL NUCLEAR ACCOUNTABILITY, 317 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003			
COFFEE SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC, 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER, 8TH FL. NEW YORK NY 10048			
COHEN & URETZ, 1775 K STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CONTRACT STAFFING OF AMERICA, INC		
Do	ESTATE OF SYLVIA S. BURING		805.76
Do	WHEELS, INC		13.25
COHEN & WHITE, 2934 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	COMPUTER & COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION	200.00	6.00
LOIS D. COHEN ASSOCIATES, 360 EAST 65TH STREET NEW YORK NY 10021	NORTHEASTERN INTERNATIONAL AIRWAYS, INC		
ROBERT E. COLE, 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER ALUMINUM & CHEMICAL CORP	600.00	
JOHN M. COLLIER, 4436 PERRIER ST. NEW ORLEANS LA 70115	SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	12,390.89	
COMMITTEE FOR PRIVATE EDUCATION, 1025 MICHIGAN AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20036			
COMMITTEE FOR 806.30 AND 807, INC, SUITE 800 1611 NORTH KENT ST. ARLINGTON VA 22209		35,671.51	21,816.57
STEPHEN R. CONAFAY, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PFIZER, INC	2,000.00	3,828.78
JEFFREY B. CONLEY, 605 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	E. BRUCE HARRISON COMPANY, INC (FOR: NEDA/CAAP)		
JOHN J. CONNOLLY, 499 S. CAPITOL STREET, #501 WASHINGTON DC 20003	BILL HECHT AND ASSOCIATES, INC	2,500.00	
PAULA J. CONNOLLY, 1700 K STREET, NW, #702 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO		
DAVID CONRAD, 530 7TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	FRIENDS OF THE EARTH	1,439.37	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
CONSUMER ENERGY COUNCIL OF AMERICA, SUITE 320 2000 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			1,608.00
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA, 1012 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		32,852.00	28,091.00
JOHN A. CONWAY, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
EILEEN D. COOKE, 110 MARYLAND AVE., NE, SUITE 101, BOX 54 WASHINGTON DC 20002	AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSN	1,200.00	
EDWARD COONEY, SUITE 500 1319 F ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	FOOD RESEARCH & ACTION CENTER	3,263.80	
C. WILLIAM COOPER, 603 BROAD ST. SEWICKLEY PA 15143	UNITED DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES	4,125.00	1,380.00
MARK N. COOPER, 2000 L STREET, N.W. SUITE 320 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSUMER ENERGY COUNCIL OF AMERICA	1,608.00	
COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA, SUITE 1100 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		37,192.83	4,407.16
CORCORAN HARDESTY WHYTE HEMPHILL & LIGON, P.C., SUITE 510 1575 EYE STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION CORP	55,844.00	5,082.66
BENNETT J. CORN, FOUR WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048	COFFEE, SUGAR & COCOA EXCHANGE, INC		
WILLIAM R. CORSON, 1707 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	PENTHOUSE INTL LTD	10,500.00	7,450.00
PETER J. COTCH, WALTER H. WHEELER JR. DRIVE STAMFORD CT 06926	PITNEY BOWES, INC		
COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD, 11 BEACON ST. BOSTON MA 02108			20,909.04
COUNCIL OF ENERGY RESOURCE TRIBES, 5660 S. SYRACUSE CIRCLE PLAZA NORTH, #206 ENGLEWOOD CO 80111			
COUNCIL OF INDUSTRIAL BOILER OWNERS, 11222 SILVERLEAF DR. FAIRFAX STATION VA 22039			857.36
ERIC COX, SUITE W-219 1011 ARLINGTON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	CAMPAIGN FOR U.N. REFORM-POLITICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE	444.48	
AARON W. CROSS, 1801 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP		
CROWELL & MORING, 1100 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	TRW, INC		
BARRY M. CULLEN, 1620 EYE ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO		
DIANE BROWN CUNNINGHAM, 1620 EYE ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO	2,000.00	550.00
MARTIN J. CURRY, 52 HILMA STREET N. QUINCY MA 02171	THORNTON AND EARLY	6,000.00	713.99
CURTIS THAXTER LIPEZ STEVENS BRODER & MICOLEAU, 1 CANAL PLAZA P.O. BOX 7326 PORTLAND ME 04112	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO		
Do	NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY		
Do	NATIONAL BEER WHOLESALERS' ASSOCIATION		
JAY B. CUTLER, 1400 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSN	5,254.48	762.96
DAIRY-FARMER DISTRIBUTORS OF AMERICA, INC, * CHITTENANGO NY 13037		22,452.50	34,830.77
DALEY AND GEORGE, 111 W. WASHINGTON STREET, #2035 CHICAGO IL 60602	COMBINED INSURANCE CO	11,400.00	4,314.89
TRACY DANESE, P.O. BOX 14000 JUNO BEACH FL 33408	FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT CO		4,349.97
DAN DANNER, 1747 PENNYSLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ARMCO, INC	300.00	268.70
COLLEEN A. DARLING, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW, #204 WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE	4,700.00	121.00
JOHN C. DATT, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	4,927.00	
EDWARD J. DAVEY, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #340 WASHINGTON DC 20004	ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE PENSION & WELFARE PLANS, INC	4,050.00	
CHRISTOPHER L. DAVIS, 2501 M STREET, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20037	ALLNET COMMUNICATION SERVICES, INC	20,823.75	2,003.24
Do	COMMITTEE FOR CELLULAR FAIRNESS	19,271.25	1,853.88
EDWIN I. DAVIS, 1510 FIRST CITY EAST BUILDING HOUSTON TX 77002	COASTAL CORP		
KENNETH E. DAVIS, SUITE 743 1434 NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ROHM & HAAS CO	500.00	
WILLIAM LEE DAVIS, 299 PARK AVE. NEW YORK NY 10171	WESTVACO CORP		
DONALD S. DAWSON, 723 WASHINGTON BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20005	OPTICIANS ASSN OF AMER	10,000.00	
Do	VIRGIN ISLANDS GIFT & FASHION SHOP ASSN		
Do	VIRGIN ISLANDS MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION	14,500.00	
JEFF DEBOER, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,750.00	155.42
JOHN J. DEGNAN, SHANLEY & FISHER, P.C. 550 BROAD STREET NEWARK NJ 07102	SHARP ELECTRONICS CORP		
DELOITTE HASKINS & SELLS, 655 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	ARKANSAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORP	7,600.00	
Do	HALLMARK CARDS, INC	7,800.00	48.00
Do	INDEPENDENT LIFE & ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO	6,400.00	19.00
Do	UNION PACIFIC CORP	2,300.00	3.00
DEMINEX U.S. OIL COMPANY, SUITE 840, LOCK BOX 340 PLAZA OF THE AMERICAS, NORTH TOWER DALLAS TX 75201			192.60
GEORGE DILLARD, 5128 SAUER, SUITE A HOUSTON TX 77004	KALEIDOSCOPE RESEARCH & MARKETING GROUP		
RICHARD B. DINGMAN, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SW, #101 WASHINGTON DC 20003	MORAL MAJORITY	900.00	
DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION, 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			2,169.59
PATSY B. DIX, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,021.00	44.00
WILLIAM BARROWS DOGGETT, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)	212.50	25.82
JAMES F. DOHERTY, 624 9TH ST., NW 7TH FL. WASHINGTON DC 20001	GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC	223.92	
JOHN D. DOHERTY JR., 900 17TH STREET, NW, #706 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A		
ROLAND DOLLY, 1899 L STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN NATURAL RESOURCES CO	385.00	24.50
RICHARD M. DONALDSON, 1738 GUILDHALL BLDG. CLEVELAND OH 44115	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
RICHARD MORGAN DOWNEY, 10801 ROCKVILLE PIKE ROCKVILLE MD 20852	AMERICAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSN		
JOHN C. DOYLE JR , 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE		
LOUISE C. DUNLAP, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	58.69	
JOHN H. DUNNE, 818 ROEDER ROAD SUITE 702 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
MICHAEL V. DURANDO, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	2,800.00	97.00
EDITH W. DYLAN, SUITE 906 1818 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC		
A. BLAKEMAN EARLY, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	4,395.00	213.65
CATHERINE EAST, 1411 K STREET, NW, #1110 WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS	1,954.52	
EDWARDS ASSOCIATES, 507 SECOND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF WARM SPRINGS		
MICHAEL D. EDWARDS, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,272.00	195.00
C. M. ELKINS ASSOCIATES, SUITE 310 1100 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DELAWARE & HUDSON RAILWAY CO		
Do	MISSOURI KANSAS TEXAS RAILROAD		
Do	PITTSBURGH & LAKE ERIE RAILROAD		
STEPHEN ENDEAN, 750 7TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	GAY RIGHTS NATIONAL LOBBY, INC	4,410.27	595.22
J. BARRY EPPERSON, P.O. BOX 42464 HOUSTON TX 77242	ASSOCIATED WIRE ROPE FABRICATORS		
JOHN M. ERSKINE JR , 1108 LAVACA, SUITE 400 AUSTIN TX 78701	STANDARD OIL CO (INDIANA)		
O. KEISTER EVANS, P.O. BOX 1308 ALEXANDRIA VA 22313	INTERNATIONAL HARDWOOD PRODUCTS ASSN		
WILLIAM J. EVANS JR., SUITE 901 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AMERICAN WORLD SERVICES, INC	225.00	142.77
THOMAS L. FAGAN, 777 - 14TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20003	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
FARM CREDIT COUNCIL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		169.69	337.85
FARMERS FOR FAIRNESS, ROUTE 1 BACANTON GA 31716		3,500.00	3,500.00
CHRISTOPHER G. FARRAND, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #720 WASHINGTON DC 20036	PEABODY HOLDING COMPANY, INC		231.10
STEPHANIE T. FARRIOR, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL COMM AGAINST REPRESSIVE LEGISLATION	3,750.00	
FREDERICK FEDELI, 1400 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSN	1,711.75	965.02
FEDERAL EXPRESS CORP, BOX 727 MEMPHIS TN 38194			38,139.23
DONALD M. FEHR, 805 THIRD AVE. NEW YORK NY 10022	MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYERS ASSN		
JAMES H. FERGUSON, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #609 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	7,500.00	4,483.00
C. H. FIELDS, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	4,833.00	40.00
THEODORA FINE, 1400 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSN	2,377.10	1,178.67
CHARLES L. FISHMAN, P.C., 1717 K STREET, NW, #502 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSOLIDATED EDISON CO OF NEW YORK	18,600.00	
Do	STONE & WEBSTER ENGINEERING CORP	7,500.00	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	21,600.00	1,447.67
DAVID M. FITZGERALD, 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	GOODYEAR AEROSPACE CORPORATION	1,100.00	
Do	LITTON DATA SYSTEMS	1,200.00	26.00
REV. MSGR. JAMES H. 15 COMPUTER DRIVE WEST ALBANY NY 12205	HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK STATE	551.00	335.00
ALAN M. FITZWATER, 176 E. FIFTH STREET ST. PAUL MN 55101	BURLINGTON NORTHERN RAILROAD	20,000.00	1,240.00
JOHN J. FLYNN, 1125 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS	7,500.00	347.00
DAVID H. FOERSTER, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
FOOD RESEARCH & ACTION CENTER, 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004		5,000.00	11,877.19
FOODSERVICE & LODGING INST, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
MARTI FORMAN, 3471 N. FEDERAL HIGHWAY, #511 FT. LAUDERDALE FL 33306	AMERISERV, INC	5,000.00	900.00
JAMES F. FORT, 316 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE, #304 WASHINGTON DC 20003	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE	1,600.00	261.48
NANCY E. FOSTER, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	850.00	
ALBERT A. FOX JR , 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIED CORP	210.00	26.00
DONALD FRAHER, 810 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HANDGUN CONTROL, INC	5,547.00	250.00
GREGORY W. FRAZIER, P.O. BOX 427 ENGLEWOOD CO 80151	INTERNATIONAL ENERGY BROKERS, INC		
FREE THE EAGLE NATIONAL CITIZEN'S LOBBY, P.O. BOX 881 CENTERVILLE VA 22020		265,143.84	42,493.59
DAVID W. FREER, 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	WESTERN OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION	2,500.00	
FRIED FRANK HARRIS SHRIVER & KAMPELMAN, SUITE 1000 600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	DIAMOND DEALERS CLUB, INC		
ALLYN M. FRITTS, 5006 N. 34TH ROAD ARLINGTON VA 22207	NEW BEDFORD SEAFOOD COUNCIL, INC	3,334.00	279.03
RICH FRUCHTERMAN, 115 D STREET, SE, #G8 WASHINGTON DC 20002	U.S. TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS, INC	2,500.00	
G-4 CHILDREN'S COALITION, ROOM 1100 1666 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		702.86	3,041.91
KIMBERLY A. GAMBLE, 110 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	U.S. COMMITTEE FOR UNICEF	4,996.80	
WILLIAM R. GANSER JR , 4804 FOLSE DR. METAIRIE LA 70002	SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	2,702.58	
DAVID MCLANE GARDINER, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVE.,SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	7,316.88	40.00
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS, 1875 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	EDWARD HINES LUMBER CO		
GARVEY SCHUBERT ADAMS & BARER, 1000 POTOMAC ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	COMINCO AMERICAN, INC	1,040.00	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	ENERGY RESOURCES OF AUSTRALIA AND COUNSELORS FOR MANAGEMENT		
Do	GTE SERVICE CORP	4,125.00	
Do	JAPAN FISHERIES ASSOCIATION	4,025.00	
Do	NORANDA MINING INC	6,540.00	
Do	NORTHWEST MARINE IRON WORKS		
Do	PACCAR, INC	402.50	
Do	PACIFIC RIM TRADE ASSN		
Do	TOTEM OCEAN TRAILER EXPRESS, INC	4,235.00	
Do	WASHINGTON CITIZENS FOR WORLD TRADE	175.00	
GAY RIGHTS NATIONAL LOBBY, INC, 750 7TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003		89,075.76	89,261.74
GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION, 1775 BROADWAY NEW YORK NY 10019		600.00	96.85
CLAIRE M. GEOGHEGAN, 415 2ND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS	4,684.82	
GERARD BYLER & ASSOCIATES, INC, 1100 17TH ST., NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AK CHIN INDIAN COMMUNITY		
Do	COLVILLE BUSINESS COUNCIL		
Do	COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSN OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE		
Do	MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE		
Do	PAPAGO TRIBE OF ARIZONA		
Do	SANTA CLARA PUEBLO		
Do	TULALIP TRIBES		
WILLIAM C. GIBB, 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #201 WASHINGTON DC 20036		5,000.00	
WILLIAM G. GIERY, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FOODSERVICE & LODGING INST		
JAMES T. GLENN, 840 WASHINGTON BUIDING 15TH STREET & NEW YORK AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CSX CORPORATION	3,000.00	576.74
GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC, 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMURCON CORPORATION		
Do	BEZTAK COMPANY		
Do	BI-COUNTY CONSORTIUM		
Do	CAC ASSOCIATES		
Do	DETROIT & MACKINAC RAILWAY COMPANY		
Do	GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS		
Do	GRAND TRAVERSE DEVELOPMENT, INC		
Do	INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN, INC		
Do	JOHN COOLEY CONSTRUCTION CO		
Do	LINEAR AIR MOTORS		
Do	MOVE DETROIT FORWARD FUND		
Do	NETCO		
Do	POTTER INSTRUMENT CO., INC		
DONNA GOLD, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,141.00	32.20
ALFONSO J. GONZALEZ, 7981 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	NATIONAL ASSN OF SOCIAL WORKERS	11,000.00	465.00
ROBERT D. GORDON, 117 C STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	UNITED FEDERATION POLICE		
GEORGE B. GOULD III, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL ASSN OF LETTER CARRIERS	11,258.71	4,773.98
LUIS L. GRANADOS, SUITE 400 1725 DESALES ST., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036	ESOP ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	6,750.00	8,873.88
JAMES W. GREEN, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
DAVID I. GREENBERG, 1314 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA		
PHYLLIS GREENBERGER, 1400 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSN	1,711.75	1,563.12
RANDALL GRIFFIN, 1515 WILSON BOULEVARD ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,000.00	662.75
TOM W. GRIFFITH, SUITE 100 1448 DUKE ST. ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN	4,889.00	
MARYBETH GRISWOLD, 1828 L STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GTE SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CORP	3,100.00	224.79
RICHARD A. GROSS, WALD, HARKRADER & ROSS 1300 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BLACK MAYORS		
JEROME GROSSMAN, 11 BEACON ST. BOSTON MA 02108	COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD	3,421.92	
JOHN T. GRUPENHOFF, SUITE 306 10,000 FALLS ROAD POTOMAC MD 20854	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DERMATOLOGY	1,600.00	121.20
Do	AMERICAN GASTROENTEROLOGICAL ASSN	2,750.00	392.86
Do	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR GASTROINTESTINAL ENDOSCOPY	2,750.00	392.86
Do	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN CANCER INSTITUTES	520.00	141.80
Do	COOLEY'S ANEMIA FOUNDATION		
HALE FOUNDATION, 422 FIRST STREET, SE, #208 WASHINGTON DC 20003		17,585.00	4,458.00
REBECCA L. HALKIAS, 1850 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BALLARD, SPAHR, ANDREWS & INGERSOLL	25.00	3.26
SEYMOUR HALPERN, 540 MADISON AVENUE, 23RD FL. NEW YORK NY 10022	BARON/CANNING & CO., INC. (FOR: AMERICAN CAN CO)		
Do	BARON/CANNING & CO., INC. (FOR: COORDINATION COUNCIL FOR NORTH AMERICAN AFFAIRS)		
Do	BARON/CANNING & CO., INC. (FOR: ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSN OF JAPAN)	1,000.00	67.50
Do	BARON/CANNING AND COMPANY, INC (FOR: EMBASSY OF INDIA)		
Do	BARON/CANNING AND COMPANY, INC (FOR: REPUBLIC OF KOREA)		
ROBERT N. HAMPTON, 7010 GIRARD STREET MCLEAN VA 22101	AUTOMOBILE IMPORTERS OF AMERICA, INC	1,575.00	100.00
NOLAN W. HANCOCK, 1126 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OIL, CHEMICAL & ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION	5,387.00	
HANDGUN CONTROL, INC, 810 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006		492,378.00	147,701.00
DONALD K. HANES, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	83.75	
HANSEN ENGINE CORP, 14920 MINNETONKA INDUSTRIAL ROAD MINNETONKA MN 55343			9,000.00
HELEN S. HARGADON, 1100 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSN	4,000.00	40.00
MICHAEL T. HARRIGAN, 421 KING STREET, #214 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE		10.00
LEWIS B. HASTINGS, 1776 K ST., NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	MOTOROLA, INC	3,000.00	
GARY R. HATTAL, 818 ROEDER ROAD SUITE 702 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
BOB HATTOY, 2410 BEVERLY BOULEVARD, #3 LOS ANGELES CA 90057	SIERRA CLUB	2,875.00	1,422.50
KATHRYN JOANN HAWES, SUITE 702 818 ROEDER RD. SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
JOHN H. HAWKINS JR , 600 N. 18TH ST. BIRMINGHAM AL 35291	ALABAMA POWER CO	13,515.00	
BRUCE R. HAWLEY, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	7,500.00	27.00
BILL HECHT, 499 SOUTH CAPITOL STREET, SE, #501 WASHINGTON DC 20003	BKK CORP	3,000.00	
Do	BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOBACCO CORP	3,000.00	
Do	CONGER LIFE INSURANCE CO	1,000.00	
Do	LOS ANGELES RAIDERS	10,000.00	
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT	2,000.00	
Do	U.S. TOBACCO CO	2,000.00	
M. L. HEFTI, 1700 NORTH MOORE STREET, 20TH FL. ROSSLYN VA 22209	BOEING COMPANY	474.14	1,364.22
STEVEN B. HELLEM, 605 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	E. BRUCE HARRISON CO., INC (FOR: NEDA/CAAP)		
THOMAS R. HENDERSHOT, SUITE200 8181 PROFESSIONAL PL. LANDOVER MD 20785	PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS	17,610.00	
CAROL C. HENDERSON, 110 MARYLAND AVE., NE, #101, BOX 54 WASHINGTON DC 20002	AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSN	837.00	
JOHN B. HENDERSON, SUITE 1100 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	TEXTRON, INC		
HERRICK & SMITH, 100 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON MA 02110	SMITH COLLEGE		285.50
HILL BETTS & NASH, 1220 19TH STREET, NW, #302 WASHINGTON DC 20036	LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO, INC		86.52
J.D. HITTLE, 3137 S. 14TH ST. ARLINGTON VA	VOUGHT CORP	2,500.00	450.00
HOBBS STRAUS DEAN & WILDER, 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE		
Do	METLAKATLA INDIAN COMMUNITY	636.50	
Do	MICCOSUKEE TRIBE OF INDIANS OF FLORIDA		
Do	NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS, INC		
Do	OGLALA SIOUX TRIBE	162.00	6.00
Do	PUEBLO DE COCHITI	2,892.50	181.85
Do	THREE AFFILIATES TRIBES OF THE FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION	250.00	6.00
GLEN D. HOFER, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	888.10	
JOHN S. HOFF, 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	SWIDLER BERLIN & STRELOW (FOR: HOLY CROSS HOSPITAL)		
LAWRENCE S. HOFFHEIMER, SUITE 100 2555 M ST. NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	BRAZOS RIVER HARBOR NAVIGATION DISTRICT	6,000.00	
HOGAN & HARTSON, 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ELECTRONICS ASSN	1,996.40	117.75
Do	COMPUTER & BUSINESS EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSN	1,483.75	45.58
Do	INTEL CORPORATION		
HOLLAND & KNIGHT, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	WACKENHUT CORPORATION	2,936.00	8.00
KAREN S. HOLLWEG, 444 BARKER ROAD MICHIGAN CITY IN 46360	NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY	344.00	22.00
MOSES D. HOLMES JR , 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,535.00	104.50
ALISON HORTON, 645 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY		
HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK STATE, 15 COMPUTER DRIVE WEST ALBANY NY 12205		1,355.00	1,355.00
ANNE L. HOWARD, ANNE L. HOWARD AND ASSOCIATES 888 17TH STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	LITTLE SIX BINGO	9,000.00	2,517.14
Do	PAN AMERICAN MANAGEMENT CO		
Do	PASCUA PUEBLO BINGO		
Do	PASCUA-YAQUI TRIBE		
Do	PUEBLO OF SANDIA TRIBE		
Do	SHAKOPEE MDEUAKAUTON SIOUX COMMUNITY		
Do	STEVEN H. WHILDEN, P.A	1,725.00	88.27

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
GERALD M. HOWARD, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS	1,750.00	51.14
JAMES P. HOWELL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	1,029.88	
TONY R. HUERTA, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL ASSN OF LETTER CARRIERS	4,856.18	
STEVEN D. HUFF, 111 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, #1800 MILWAUKEE WI 53202	NATIONAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS INST	2,000.00	
ROBERT R. HUMPHREYS, 1915 EYE ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION	1,350.00	575.00
Do	HELEN KELLER NATIONAL CENTER	175.00	60.00
HARRIET HUNT-BURGESS, 82 2ND ST. SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105	TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND	1,710.00	2,196.00
ROBERT BRUCE HUNTER, 1801 N. MOORE STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN ASSN OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS		4,800.00
RONALD K. IKEJIRI, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW, #204 WASHINGTON DC 20036	JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE	33,725.00	16,260.94
JOHN H. INGRAM, NICKERSON-INGRAM & ASSOCIATES, INC 1150 17TH STREET, NW, #607 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MASSACHUSETTS BAY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY		
INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN BANKERS, SUITE 303 EAST, RM. 23 200 PARK AVE. NEW YORK NY 10017		2,400.00	2,400.00
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL CONTAINER LESSORS, BEDFORD CONSULTANTS BUILDING BOX 605 BEDFORD NY 10506		7,500.00	7,500.00
INSURANCE ECONOMICS SOCIETY OF AMERICA, SUITE 590 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006		23,248.50	7,237.61
INTERLAKE, INC, 2015 SPRING RD. OAK BROOK IL 60521			15,120.68
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS, 1125 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		16,000.00	972.00
JOHN ISAACS, 100 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD	9,171.60	
ROY T. JACOBSEN, GNAU CARTER JACOBSEN & ASSOC, INC 1250 EYE STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMURCON CORPORATOIN		
Do	BEZTAK COMPANY		
Do	CAC ASSOCIATES		
Do	DETROIT & MACKINAC RAILWAY COMPANY		
Do	GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS		
Do	GRAND TRAVERSE DEVELOPMENT, INC.		
Do	LINEAR AIR MOTORS		
Do	MOVE DETROIT FORWARD FUND		
Do	NETCO		
Do	POTTER INSTRUMENT CO., INC.		
Do	PRIMARK CORPORATION		
Do	RJK CONSTRUCTION COMPANY		
Do	SAFEKEEPER SYSTEMS, INC.		
Do	SAFLOK/COMPUTORIZED SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	SANDERS CORPORATION		
Do	U.S. MANUFACTURING COMPANY		
Do	URBAN REVITALIZATION, INC.		
E. A. JAENKE & ASSOCIATES, INC, 1575 EYE ST., NW, SUITE 230 WASHINGTON DC 20005	FARMLAND INDUSTRIES	500.00	
Do	UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	250.00	
MARGO L. JAMES, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	1,500.00	47.45
JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE, 1765 SUTTER STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118			
T. DESTRY JARVIS, 529 TENNESSEE AVE. ALEXANDRIA VA 22305	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION	791.04	134.50
HERBERT N. JASPER, 415 2ND ST., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS	7,061.53	
PHILIP F. JEHLE, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SMITHKLINE BECKMAN CORP	1,000.00	
KEMPTON B. JENKINS, SUITE 702 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ARMCO, INC	600.00	252.09
CALVIN P. JOHNSON, HOFFHEIMER & JOHNSON 2555 M ST., NW, #100 WASHINGTON DC 20037	COMPUTER SCIENCES CORP	6,000.00	
JOHN D. JOHNSON, SUITE 1014 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP	15,500.00	55.00
L. WAYNE JOHNSON, P.O. BOX 7000-C TEXARKANA TX 75501			
NICHOLAS JOHNSON, BOX 1876 IOWA CITY IA 52244	NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS LOBBY		
THOMAS G. JOHNSON, ONE SHELL PLAZA, #4868 P.O. BOX 2463 HOUSTON TX 77001	SHELL OIL COMPANY	500.00	
JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS, 444 N. CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20001		24,106.90	24,106.90
JONES & WINBURN, SUITE 1040 1101 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ASSN OF EQUIPMENT LESSORS	12,000.00	9,972.42
BEVERLY E. JONES, 114 3RD STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN INDEPENDENT REFINERS ASSN	100.00	
Do	ASHLAND OIL, INC		
RANDALL T. JONES, 1030 15TH ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	1,750.00	
THEODORE L. JONES, 3081 TEDDY DR. BATON ROUGE LA 70896	HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE CO	3,093.75	1,948.66
Do	INSURANCE ASSN OF CONNECTICUT		
JACK C. JORGENSEN, 6534 SPRING VALLEY DRIVE ALEXANDRIA VA 22312	CITY OF ROSEWELL, NM; TOWN OF WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	4,050.00	135.00
CONNIE KAGAN, 2622 N. MILITARY ROAD ARLINGTON VA 22207	NEAVS	1,800.00	15.00
LAUREL B. KAMEN, SUITE 702 1700 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO		
KEIKI KEHOE, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	401.28	
CANDACE KELLER, 624 9TH ST., NW 7TH FLOOR WASHINGTON DC 20001	GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.	3,299.99	
DONALD W. KELLER, 601 JEFFERSON, #3800 HOUSTON TX 77002	QUINTANA REFINERY COMPANY		
PAUL J. KELLEY, 2727 NORTH CENTRAL AVE. PHOENIX AZ 85004	U-HAUL INTL, INC	5,000.00	
BRIAN F. KELLY, 1211 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 802 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO		
KEMPER INVESTORS LIFE INSURANCE CO, 120 SOUTH LASALLE STREET CHICAGO IL 60603			1,218.29
KILGORE & KILGORE, INC, 1800 FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. DALLAS TX 75202	DEMINEX U.S. OIL CO	23.00	21,499.98
Do	TEXASGULF, INC		21,499.98
JANIE A. KINNEY, BLUM & NASH 1015 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MERCK & CO., INC.		
Do	TWIN COAST NEWSPAPERS, INC		
RALPH W. KITTLE, 1620 EYE ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO	1,750.00	531.00
MARK KLEINMAN, BOX 300 4200 WISCONSIN AVE., NW, SUITE 106 WASHINGTON DC 20016			
DIANE E. KOOKEN, 1800 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BANKAMERICA CORPORATION		
THOMAS G. KRAJEWSKI, SUITE 1100 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COOPERATIVE LEGAUE OF THE USA	340.00	
KRIVIT & KRIVIT, 50 E STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	CITY OF ST PETERSBURG, OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS	3,244.50	
JAMES S. KRZYMINSKI, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	937.50	
PHILIP KUGLER, 11 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF TEACHERS		
JEFFREY KURZWEIL, HILL BETTS & NASH 1220 19TH ST., NW, SUITE 302 WASHINGTON DC 20036	MARRIOTT CORPORATION	968.30	
LABOR BUREAU, INC., SUITE 501 1346 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC, 100 INDIANA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		9,643.00	6,938.00
ERIC T. LAITY, 1800 FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. DALLAS TX 75202	DEMINEX U.S. OIL CO	9,000.00	
Do	TEXASGULF, INC	9,000.00	
DAVID R. LAMBERT, 1030 15TH ST., NW SUITE 964 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSN	5,000.00	
STEPHEN L. LANDE, MANCHESTER ASSOCIATES, LTD. 1155 15TH STREET, NW, #811 WASHINGTON DC 20005	INVESTMENT COUNCIL OF PANAMA		
DAVID W. LANDSIDLE, 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW, #730 WASHINGTON DC 20006	PFIZER, INC	650.00	337.13
LANE & EDSON, P.C., 2300 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF ENERGY SERVICE COS	450.00	
LANE & MITTENDORF, 1750 K STREET, NW, #1200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS GROUP		338.51
LARKIN MCCARTHY NOEL & FALK, 1301 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	AMERICAN SHIP BUILDING CO	23,470.40	23,470.40
WILLIAM L. LARSEN, 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #415 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSN		
JOHN LASTER, 1900 M STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20036	SAVE OUR CHILDREN'S SECURITY		
DENNIS LAVALLEE, 1016 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF PLUMBING-HEATING-COOLING CONTRACTORS	500.00	53.50
GEORGE H. LAWRENCE, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	800.00	
ELIZABETH LAWSON, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	2,395.36	73.00
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S., 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		31,371.13	31,371.13
ROBERT F. LEDERER, 1250 I STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ASSN OF NURSERYMEN		
DAVID A. LEFF, 444 NORTH CAPITOL WASHINGTON DC 20001	JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS	2,343.60	
KAYE CONNIFF LEONARD, SUITE 510 1090 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	POTLATCH CORPORATION	90.00	
LLOYD LEONARD, 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	3,981.66	55.85
DALE LESTINA, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	2,535.00	196.00
LEVA HAWES SYMINGTON & MARTIN, SUITE 1001 815 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	DON LANGENEGGER, ET AL		
MORRIS J. LEVIN, 1050 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS	2,500.00	
JAMES F. LEVY, 5301 TRENHOLM ROAD COLUMBIA SC 29260	DENTAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC		
LEWIS & RICE, SUITE 1400 611 OLIVE ST. ST. LOUIS MO 63101	ST. LOUIS MERCANTILE LIBRARY ASSN	1,207.65	70.35
JOHN F. LEWIS, BOX 10023 1665 N. 4TH STREET, #6 COLS OH 43201	ASR INC./LMMCA		
LIPSEN HAMBERGER WHITTEN & HAMBERGER, SUITE 800 1725 DESALES STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GPU SERVICES CORPORATION		
DAVID A. LITVIN, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL COMPANY (OHIO)	262.50	107.31
WILLIAM E. LONG, ONE NATIONWIDE PLAZA COLUMBUS OH 43216	NATIONWIDE INSURANCE COMPANY	9,360.00	1,481.57
CHARLES M. LOVELESS, 1625 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF STATE, COUNTY & MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES	9,205.38	346.21
CHARLES EMMET LUCEY, MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 1850 K STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CATHOLIC PRESS ASSN		
LUMAN & SCHOOR, 1030 15TH ST., NW, #720 WASHINGTON DC 20005	BURNS & ROE, INC		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF PERSONNEL CONSULTANTS		
JERRY R. LYMAN, 11300 ROCKVILLE PIKE ROCKVILLE MD 20852	RKO GENERAL, INC		
JAMES LYON, 317 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE		
WILLIAM T. LYONS, SUITE 700 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CIBA-GEIGY CORP	4,409.00	3,254.00
KATHERINE MAGRAW, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	PEACE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	2,877.78	
MICHAEL MAHDESIAN, 1514 17TH STREET, NW, #306 WASHINGTON DC 20009	ARMENIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE	4,160.00	769.77
JAMES TIMOTHY MAHONEY, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	8,351.25	

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYERS ASSN, 805 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10022			3,213.83
PETER T. MANGIONE, 1319 F STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20004	VOLUME FOOTWEAR RETAILERS OF AMERICA	325.00	
DONALD W. MANN, 210 THE PLAZA TEANECK NJ 07666	NEGATIVE POPULATION GROWTH, INC		
MILTON C. MAPES, SUITE 409 110 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002	NATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY CAMPAIGN	8,250.00	196.53
PATRICIA MARKEY, SUITE 505 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	UNITED DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES	1,593.00	100.25
DONALD R. MARKLEY, 10880 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES CA 90024	WHITTAKER CORPORATION		
RONALD ANTHONY MARKS, 1121 N. ARLINGTON BLVD., #710 ARLINGTON VA 22209			
PEGGY L. MARTIN, 777 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS		
STEVEN A. MARTINDALE, 5053 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ICELANDAIR		
JIM MATHESON, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	65.41	
COLIN D. MATHEWS, 1101 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: METHODIST HOSPITAL)		
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: NORTHVILLE INDUSTRIES)		
Do	VINSON & ELKINS (FOR: TRAVELERS INSURANCE COMPANY)		
MAUN GREEN HAYES SIMON JOHANNESON & BREHL, 332 HAMM BUILDING ST. PAUL MN 55102	MURPHY MOTOR FREIGHT LINES, INC		9,405.77
SAMUEL L. MAURY, SUITE 402 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	100.00	
H. WESLEY MCADEN, SUITE 424 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	J. G. BOSWELL CO		
CHARLIE MCBRIDE ASSOCIATES, INC, 1717 K STREET, NW, #502 WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSOLIDATED EDISON CO OF NEW YORK	16,800.00	
Do	STONE & WEBSTER ENGINEERING CORP	4,300.00	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP	17,400.00	3,069.90
MARTHA MCCABE, 1828 L ST., N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA	2,500.00	
JULIE P. MCCAHILL, SUITE 715 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MEAD CORPORATION	275.00	
A. R. MCCAMMON, 501 UNION ST., #506 NASHVILLE TN 37219	TENNESSEE RAILROAD ASSOCIATION		
LAW OFFICES OF R. C. MCCANDLESS, 1707 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	MILLER & SCHROEDER MUNICIPALS, INC	3,000.00	1,000.00
Do	TRANSAMERICA CORPORATION		
Do	TRANSAMERICA INTERWAY CORP	7,500.00	
JAMES W MCCARTHY, 1515 WILSON BLVD ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	3,000.00	1,556.51
CATHY MCCHAREN, SUITE 610 1200 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	UNITED EGG PRODUCERS		
JOHN A. MCCOMB, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	4,845.00	1,518.40
JOHN L. MCCORMICK, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	642.47	
JACK MCDONALD ASSOCIATES, SUITE 610 1120 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE INSURANCE CO	20,000.00	170.00
JACK MCDONALD, 1120 20TH STREET, NW, #610 WASHINGTON DC 20036	JACK MCDONALD ASSOCIATES, INC (FOR: MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE INSURANCE CO)		
NORRIS MCDONALD, 317 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	227.48	
ROBERT MCINTYRE, ROOM 200 2020 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CITIZENS FOR TAX JUSTICE	6,318.47	
MICHAEL R. MCLEOD, BARNETT & ALAGIA 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE		
Do	DAIRYMEN, INC	2,062.50	
Do	LEAF TOBACCO EXPORTERS ASSN	1,362.50	
Do	UNITED EGG PRODUCERS	250.00	
JANE PIERSON MCMICHAEL, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	11,296.32	2,851.61
MCNAIR GLENN KONDUROS CORLEY SINGLETARY PORTER & DIBBLE, 1155 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	BRISTOL-MYERS CO	1,431.00	
JAMES A. MCPHERSON, 1600 GENESSEE, #710 KANSAS CITY KS 66117	MISSOURI-ARKANSAS BASINS FLOOD CONTROL & CONSERVATION ASSN		
JOSEPH F. MEADOW, 7100 BALTIMORE AVENUE COLLEGE PARK MD 20740	UNITED ACTION FOR ANIMALS, INC	1,150.00	
NANINE MEIKLEJOHN, 1625 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF STATE, COUNTY & MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES	10,300.74	52.75
CHARLES J. MICOLEAU, ONE CANAL PLAZA PORTLAND ME 04112	ANDREW L. LUI AND ASPEN TECHNOLOGY, INC	1,050.00	
MILBANK TWEED HADLEY & MCCLOY, 1825 EYE STREET, NW, #900 WASHINGTON DC 20006	CLAYMARK CORPORATION	1,747.50	
FRED MILLAR, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	283.84	
CLINTON R. MILLER, 5001 SEMINARY ROAD, #1330 ALEXANDRIA VA 22311	NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION	1,800.00	2,387.00
JOHN R. MILLER, 1750 MIDLAND BUILDING CLEVELAND OH 44115	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
TERRENCE W. MODGLIN, 2001 S ST., NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20009	AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MERCHANT SHIPPING		
FRANCIS B. MOORE, 3003 BUTTERFIELD ROAD OAK BROOK IL 60521	WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC	4,000.00	1,540.00
POWELL A. MOORE, 8637 WINTHROP DRIVE ALEXANDRIA VA 22307	LOCKHEED CORP	1,000.00	174.42
TIMOTHY X. MOORE, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS	1,500.00	698.35
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS, SUITE 800 NORTH 1800 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CONSOLIDATED NATURAL GAS CO		
ROBERT E. MOSS, SUITE 500 1899 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN NATURAL RESOURCES CO	2,596.00	59.50
MOSS, MCGEE & BELLMON, 122 C ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL BANKERS ASSN	7,893.03	
Do	NATIONAL COMMUNITY ACTION FOUNDATION, INC	30,000.00	
Do	NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE CORP	5,550.00	
THOMAS MOSTOWY, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NE, #319 WASHINGTON DC 20002	HALT, INC	16,000.00	7,547.45
MOTORCYCLE INDUSTRY COUNCIL, INC, 1235 JEFF DAVIS HWY. ARLINGTON VA 22202			
MUDGE ROSE GUTHRIE ALEXANDER & FERNDON, 2121 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	BASIN ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE		
DANIEL J. MUNDY, 815 16TH ST., NW, #603 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BUILDING & CONSTRUSTION TRADES DEPT., AFL-CIO	6,666.66	6,296.79
PATRICIA MUNOZ, 323 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	AMERICAN RIVERS CONSERVATION COUNCIL		
MURPHY MOTOR FREIGHT LINES, INC, P.O. BOX 43640 ST. PAUL MN 55164			
RICHARD E. MURPHY, 2020 K ST., NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20006	SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTL UNION, AFL-CIO	1,000.00	1,059.57
ROSEMARY GRIFFIN MURRAY, SUITE 901 1660 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC		
BERNARD NASH, 1015 18TH ST., NW SUITE 408 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO		
Do	MERCK & CO., INC		
Do	TIME, INC		
NATA, SUITE 1200 1000 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006			
NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR ANIMAL LEGISLATION, P.O. BOX 77012 WASHINGTON DC 20013		202.50	107.94
NATIONAL ASSN OF ENERGY SERVICE COMPANIES, 2330 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037		450.00	450.00
NATIONAL ASSN OF HOME BUILDERS OF THE U.S., 15TH & M STS., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005		27,724.45	70,357.35
NATIONAL ASSN OF LETTER CARRIERS, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001		360,403.35	196,819.84
NATIONAL ASSN OF PLUMBING-HEATING-COOLING CONTRACTORS, 1016 20TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,908.32	1,908.32
NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005			124,370.53
NATIONAL ASSN OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, 1533 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		2,347.00	3,572.00
NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS LOBBY, P.O. BOX 1876 IOWA CITY IA 52244			
NATIONAL CLEAN AIR COALITION, INC, 530 7TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003		7,248.94	26,717.92
NATIONAL COALITION TO BAN HANDGUNS, 100 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			
NATIONAL COMM AGAINST REPRESSIVE LEGISLATION, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		1,883.50	10,196.51
NATIONAL COMMUNITY ACTION FOUNDATION, INC., 2101 L STREET, N.W. SUITE 906 WASHINGTON DC 20037		31,227.00	34,424.00
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		26,803.49	9,304.10
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		46,173.34	46,173.34
NATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING & REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH ASSN, INC, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #1210 WASHINGTON DC 20005.		313,271.00	799.00
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, 2012 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036.		172,135.00	22,379.97
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CREDIT UNIONS, 577 SIXTH STREET BROOKLYN NY 11215			
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES, P.O. BOX 11038 DURHAM NC 27703		2,000.00	2,000.00
NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN, 1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		13,275.00	13,275.00
NATIONAL HEALTH CARE FINANCING ASSN, P.O. BOX 946 HOLLY HILL FL 32017		100.00	
NATIONAL LOTTERY ASSOCIATION, P.O. BOX 13365 LAS VEGAS NV 89112			
NATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY CAMPAIGN, SUITE 409 110 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		69,644.03	98,203.22
NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		110,864.14	92,955.09
NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION, 1016 16TH STREET, NW, #8G WASHINGTON DC 20036		26,767.85	11,227.62
NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN, SUITE 100 1448 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314		15,435.00	15,055.00
NATIONAL SOLID WASTES MANAGEMENT ASSN, SUITE 930 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			
NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION, 325 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003		14,384.15	16,829.92
NATIONAL TOUR ASSOCIATION, INC., 120 KENTUCKY AVE. LEXINGTON KY 40502		25,306.00	25,306.00
NATIONAL TURKEY FEDERATION, 11319 SUNSET HILLS RD. RESTON VA 22090			
NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES ASSN, SUITE 1202 955 L'ENFANT PLAZA NORTH, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024		25,372.00	17,711.00
NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN, 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		4,957,173.00	1,171,767.75
E. COLETTE NELSON, SUITE 540 8401 CORPORATE DRIVE LANDOVER MD 20785	AMERICAN SUBCONTRACTORS ASSN	1,200.00	
A. S. NEMIR ASSOCIATES, SUITE 1230 PENNSYLVANIA BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20004	BRAZILIAN SUGAR & ALCOHOL INSTITUTE	64,500.00	1,482.46
FREDERICK H. NESBITT, 100 INDIANA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL ASSN OF LETTER CARRIERS	7,851.51	2,439.60
NEW YORK SHIPPENG ASSN., INC., 80 BROAD STREET, 12TH FL. NEW YORK NY 10004	NEW YORK SHIPPING ASSN., INC		
W. F. NICHOLAS, 69 CANNON STREET LONDON E C4 ENGLAND	LONDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY	11,866.68	
NICKERSON INGRAM & ASSOCIATES, INC, 923 15TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSN		
Do	MASSACHUSETTS BAY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY		
Do	ORANGE COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT	9,975.00	
Do	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT		
Do	SYSTEMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY, INC		
WILLIAM W. NICKERSON, BRAND LOWELL NICKERSON & DOLE 923 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSN		376.26
GLENN NISHIMURA, 1314 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
NORTH AMERICAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION, 511 2ND ST.,NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		30,300.00	30,300.00
NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT, 1140 19TH ST., NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	2,152.50	
Do	LOU ZANARDI		
O'CONNOR & HANNAN, 1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	DOUGHERTY, DAWKINS, STRAND & YOST		
Do	MILLER & SCHROEDER MUNICIPALS, INC		
JOHN B. O'DAY, SUITE 590 1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006	INSURANCE ECONOMICS SOCIETY OF AMERICA	2,000.00	
JAMES W. O'DONNELL, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #950 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN HEALTH PLANNING ASSOCIATION	2,000.00	115.00
TERRI O'GRADY, 1600 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN OF AMER	562.50	188.30
BARTLEY O'HARA, 25 LOUISIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS		
PATRICIA M. O'TOOLE, 461 S. BOYLSTON ST. LOS ANGELES CA 90017	UNION OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA		
NEIL H. OFFEN, 1730 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION	1,000.00	
CHARLES J. ORASIN, 810 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HANDGUN CONTROL, INC	3,213.00	
MICHEL ORBAN, 125 BROAD STREET, 39TH FL. NEW YORK NY 10004	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO		
LAW OFFICES OF JOSE SUITE 610 1101 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PUERTO RICO MAYORS ASSN		
OVERSEAS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036		1,000.00	
RONALD C. PADDOCK & COMPANY, 4655 N. ORACLE ROAD, #106 TUCSON AZ 85105	I.T.T. MEDTRONICS		
GERI PALAST, SUITE 200 2020 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTL UNION, AFL-CIO, CLC	5,000.00	397.62
ANDREW PALMER, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	485.88	
GERARD PAUL PANARO, WEBSTER & CHAMBERLAIN 1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	RETAIL BAKERS ASSN	374.00	
FRED PANZER, 1875 EYE ST., NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	TOBACCO INSTITUTE	100.00	50.00
HARRIET PARCELLS, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE		
JUDY E. PARK, 1533 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	9,800.00	37.50
KIMBERLY C. PARKER, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	3,757.42	31.00
SARA LYNN PARKER, 1319 F. ST.,NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON DC 20004	FOOD RESEARCH & ACTION CENTER		
PRUDENCE H. PARKS, 1100 H STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20080	WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO	299.15	
KEN PARMELEE, 1448 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSN	8,884.00	519.00
PATTON BOGGS & BLOW, SUITE 800 2550 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	SULTANTATE OF OMAN	1,205.00	
CARL F. PAUL, 1320 19TH STREET, NW, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20036	BURCH & ASSOCIATES, P.C. (FOR: M.A.N. TRUCK & BUS CORP)		
PAUL HASTINGS JANOFSKY & WALKER, 6TH FLOOR 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	OGLETHORPE POWER CORP		
Do	WESTERN FARMERS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE		
PEABODY LAMBERT & MEYERS, 1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BROADCAST MUSIC, INC	360.00	157.00
Do	COMMITTEE OF CORPORATE TELECOMMUNICATIONS USERS	3,941.00	36.00
Do	NATIONAL MASS RETAILING INSTITUTE	360.00	7.00
PEACE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, 100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NE WASHINGTON DC 20002			3,349.53
ELIN PELTZ, 1511 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSN	300.00	
PENSION RIGHTS CENTER, 1346 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036			813.45
PERITO DUERK & PINCO, P.C., 1140 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #400 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN COLLEGE OF NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY	750.00	25.00
EDMUND J. PERRET II , 1400 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSN	1,783.89	746.09
DEBORAH M. PHILLIPS, SUITE 320 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION		
ROBERT R. PIERCE, 5719 BEECH AVENUE BETHESDA MD 20817	NATIONAL PARKS & CONSERVATION ASSN	33.15	10.20
PIERSON BALL & DOWD, 1200 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS	15,000.00	
Do	ASPEN SYSTEMS CORPORATION	3,000.00	
Do	COMMUNITY PSYCHIATRIC CENTERS	99.00	
Do	DAY TRUST	9,512.23	
Do	GENENTECH	10,844.40	
Do	GENERAL TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY		
Do	INFECTIOUS DISEASES SOCIETY OF AMERICA	6,765.89	
PIERSON SEMMES CROLIUS & FINLEY, 1054 31ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	OKLAHOMA NATURAL GAS COMPANY	825.00	24.70
STUART F. PIERSON, VERNER, LIIPFERT, BERNHARD, & MCPHERSON 1660 L ST., NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AM, ET AL		
PINEAPPLE GROWERS ASSN OF HAWAII, P.O. BOX 3829 HONOLULU HI 96813			
RONALD L. PLESSER, BLUM & NASH 1015 18TH ST., NW, #408 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSN		
Do	TWIN COASTS NEWSPAPER, INC		
Do	VIDEOTEX INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION		
RICHARD J. POLLACK, 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSN	4,347.28	621.64
RAFE POMERANCE, 530 7TH ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	FRIENDS OF THE EARTH		
POPULATION RESOURCE CENTER, INC, 622 THIRD AVE. NEW YORK NY 10017			
PORT OF SEATTLE, P.O. BOX 1209 SEATTLE WA 98111			
POWELL GOLDSTEIN FRAZER & MURPHY, SUITE 1050 1110 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	COALITION FOR COMPETITION	8,434.00	
Do	COALITION FOR EMPLOYMENT THROUGH EXPORTS		
Do	HAYES MICROCOMPUTER PRODUCT, INC	500.00	
Do	WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION	1,858.00	8.10
WOODRUFF M. PRICE, 840 WASHINGTON BLDG. 15TH ST. & NEW YORK AVE. WASHINGTON DC 20005	CSX CORPORATION	3,000.00	575.77
PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP, 1029 VERMONT AVE., NW SUITE 860 WASHINGTON DC 20005			186.00
PROTECT THE INNOCENT, INC., 451 SOUTH INDIANA STREET MOORESVILLE IN 46158			281.92
PUBLIC SECURITIES ASSN, ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER NEW YORK NY 10048		866,261.00	133,151.00
QUINTANA REFINERY COMPANY, P.O. BOX 3331 HOUSTON TX 77001			
RAGAN & MASON, 900 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN SHIP BUILDING CO	1,000.00	
Do	BECHTEL CORP	22,499.99	
Do	CURTISS-WRIGHT CORP		
Do	GOVERNMENT OF BERMUDA	3,000.00	
Do	GULF OIL CORP	4,000.00	
Do	NATIONAL BULK CARRIERS, INC	4,500.00	
Do	R.J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO COMPANY		
Do	RJ REYNOLDS INDUSTRIES, INC		
Do	SEA-LAND INDUSTRIES, INC	20,000.00	20.25
Do	SECURITY PACIFIC LEASING CORPORATION		
Do	SECURITY PACIFIC NATL BANK		
Do	STIMSON LUMBER CO & MILLER REDWOOD CO	3,000.00	
CRAIG J. RANCOURT, SUITE 503 1825 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMERICAN ASSN OF CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES	9,600.72	9,600.72
ROBERT RANDALL, P.O. BOX 23691 WASHINGTON DC 20024	ALLIANCE FOR CANNABIS THERAPEUTICS		
CAROL RANDLES, 1771 N STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN. OF BROADCASTERS	1,500.00	130.43
ROBERT A. RAPOZA, SUITE 8G 1016 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION	8,589.35	
EILER C. RAVNHOLT, 723 INVESTMENT BLDG. WASHINGTON DC 20005	HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSN	500.00	244.00
REASONER DAVIS & VINSON, 888 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	ACACIA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO	5,000.00	
RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSN OF AMER, INC, 888 SEVENTH AVENUE, 9TH FL. NEW YORK NY 10106		7,200.00	7,200.00
PAULINE B. REEPING, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NEW YORK SHIPPING ASSN., INC		
REID & PRIEST, 1111 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	B. ALTMAN & CO	6,350.00	773.46
Do	AMERICAN EXPRESS CO	2,750.00	561.68
Do	FRED T. FRANZIA, JOHN G. FRANZIA & JOSEPH S. FRANZIA		
Do	KAMEHAMEH SCHOOLS/BERNICE P. BISHOP ESTATE	3,000.00	483.41
Do	VELO-BIND, INC		
NOOLEY REINHEARDT, NOOLEY REINHEARDT & ASSOC. P.O. BOX 23190 WASHINGTON DC 20024	RURAL BUILDERS COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA		
ROBIN ALAN RHODES, SUITE 350 2000 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL PARKING ASSOCIATION		
GRACE ELLEN RICE, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	4,929.00	95.00
DOUGLAS B. RICHARDSON, 2001 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW, #100 WASHINGTON DC 20007	GEORESEARCH, INC	82.50	9.00
STARK RITCHIE, 2101 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
ROBERT ROACH, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	222.86	
QUINCY RODGERS, 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW SUITE 320 WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION	600.00	96.85
JAMES A. ROGERS, 316 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE	1,600.00	
JAMES T. ROGERS, 311 FIRST STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSN		
TERRENCE L. ROGERS, 1325 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	4,332.30	64.00
JACK ROLLINS, 1201 16TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	OVERSEAS EDUCATION ASSN & NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN		
ROPES & GRAY, SUITE 700 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	AMHERST COLLEGE; WELLESLEY COLLEGE		
Do	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & INDUSTRIAL CORP OF BOSTON		
Do	GENERAL MILLS, INC	57.50	
MARK ROTH, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL ASSN OF LETTER CARRIERS	5,278.68	
WILLIAM C. ROUNTREE, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
ERIC M. RUBIN, RUBIN WINSTON & DIERCKS 1730 M ST., NW, #708 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMISSONER OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR STATE OF NEW MEXICO		
Do	OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC	4,000.00	
GLORIA CATANEO RUDMAN, SUITE 801 444 N. CAPITOL ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	JOINT MARITIME CONGRESS	6,186.40	
ROBERT C. RUPPERT, 1660 L STREET, NW, #901 WASHINGTON DC 20036	PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC		
RANDALL M. RUSSELL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	937.50	
JOSEPH RYAN, SUITE 320 1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
WILLIAM SAMUEL, 1730 K ST., NW SUITE 1101 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL TREASURY EMPLOYEES UNION	8,732.00	
BRUCE W. SANFORD, BAKER & HOSTETLER 818 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS, SIGMA DELTA CHI	1,500.00	350.19
DONALD E. SANTARELLI, SUITE 700 2033 M ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	EMPRESA BRASILEIRA DE AERONAUTICA, S.A.	500.00	165.00
Do	PACIFIC AGRICULTURAL SERVICES, INC	300.00	70.00
Do	SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL	1,000.00	225.00
Do	STURM, RUGER COMPANY, INC.	500.00	145.00
JOHN S. SATAGAJ, 1250 I STREET, NW, #500 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN ASSN OF NURSERYMEN		
THOMAS J. SCANLON, 3248 PROSPECT STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	J. ARMANDO BERMUDEZ		
MARK L. SCHAFFER, ASHCRAFT & GEREL 2000 L STREET, NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF LABOR & CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS	5,928.00	10.00
HAROLD A. SCHAITBERGER, 1750 NEW YORK AVE. WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF FIRE FIGHTERS	11,657.88	
WILLIAM T. SCHAPAUGH, 1030 15TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSN	4,000.00	
FOREST S. SCHMELING, 1515 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON VA 22209	AMERICAN GAS ASSN	1,100.00	422.00
MARK L. SCHNEIDER, 1001 22ND STREET, NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
WILLIAM B. SCHULTZ, SUITE 700 2000 P ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	PUBLIC CITIZEN, INC.	1,000.00	15.00
SCHWABE WILLIAMSON WYATT MOORE & ROBERTS, SUITE 302 1000 POTOMAC ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	HELICOPTER LOGGERS ASSN.		
Do	LITCHSTREET COMPANY		11.21
Do	MOUNTAIN STATES ENERGY, INC	782.40	181.77
Do	NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN	15,448.49	8.35
Do	NORTHWEST INLAND WATERWAYS COMMITTEE		
Do	OTIS ELEVATOR CO	1,223.40	284.22
Do	PIASECKI AIRCRAFT CORPORATION	1,998.00	464.17
Do	STATE OF OREGON, CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON METRO	3,235.01	751.40
STEVE AARON SCHWARTZ, 818 ROEDER ROAD SUITE 702 SILVER SPRING MD 20910	INTERNATIONAL FED OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS		
DOUGLAS W. SCOTT, 530 BUSH ST. SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108	SIERRA CLUB	9,300.00	231.86
DEBBIE SEASE, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	4,020.00	133.15
SEWARD & KISSEL, 919 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	A. I. LEASING CORP		41.00
Do	HALLAC ASSOCIATES, INC.		
Do	MERRILL LYNCH MONEY MARKETS, INC		
Do			
CLIVE SEYMOUR, P.O. BOX 2511 1010 MILAM, RM. 1657-B HOUSTON TX 77001	TENNECO INC		
BARBARA J. SHAILOR, 1300 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS		
RICHARD N. SHAROOD, 8TH FL. 1752 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	CHEMICAL WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.	437.50	
RUSSELL H. SHAY, 6014 COLLEGE AVE. OAKLAND CA 94618	SIERRA CLUB	1,793.76	953.46
SHEA PRODUCTS, INC, P.O. BOX 184 CLAWSON MI 48017			
SHEARMAN & STERLING, 153 EAST 53RD ST. NEW YORK NY 10005	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	20,000.00	361.32
DEBORAH SHEIMAN, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	1,887.29	27.05
JOHN J. SHEPPARD, 267 WESTERVELT PLACE ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS NJ 07632	C. A. SHEA & COMPANY, INC.		
DALE SHERWIN, 1735 I ST., NW, #717 WASHINGTON DC 20006	A.E. STALEY MFGR CO	9,000.00	660.00
NELSON T. SHIELDS, 810 18TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	HANDGUN CONTROL, INC	1,890.00	
BERNARD H. SIERACKI, ILLINOIS PETROLEUM COUNCIL 79 W. MONROE ST., #514 CHICAGO IL 60603	AMERICAN PETROLEUM INST		
SIERRA CLUB, 50 BUSH ST. SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108		178,782.98	178,782.98
STEPHEN SILBIGER, 1625 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF STATE, COUNTY & MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES	12,508.14	234.13
STEVEN W. SILVER, ROBERTSON, MONAGLE, EASTAUGH & BRADLEY 210 FERRY WAY JUNEAU AK 99801	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP		
SILVERSTEIN & MULLENS, 1776 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN		
SIMON DEITCH SIEFMAN TUCKER & FRIEDMAN, P.C., SUITE 1500 4000 TOWN CENTER SOUTHFIELD MI 48075	FIRST NATIONAL MONETARY CORPORATION		
TALMAGE E. SIMPKINS, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	LABOR MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE, INC	1,368.00	186.00
JEAN SINDAB, 2480 16TH ST., NW, #610 WASHINGTON DC 20009	WASHINGTON OFFICE ON AFRICA	3,916.20	
SISK FOLEY HULTIN & DRIVER, 2501 M ST., NW SUITE 380 WASHINGTON DC 20037	ASHLAND OIL, INC, ET AL		
Do	MAY CO		
Do	TOSCO CORPORATION	2,520.00	
ROBERT SLAUGHTER, SUITE 200 1730 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATURAL GAS SUPPLY ASSN	9,996.95	1,485.89
MATTHEW B. SLEPIN, SUITE 1100 1828 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA	455.00	32.30
SCOTT L. SLESINGER, SUITE 804 1101 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL APARTMENT ASSN		
SMALL BUSINESS COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC, P.O. BOX 4299 COLUMBUS GA 31904		9,900.00	42,073.57
ELEANOR SMEAL & ASSOCIATES, 2600 VIRGINIA AVENUE, NW, #606 WASHINGTON DC 20037	NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN	4,200.00	42.72
SMITH DAWSON ASSOCIATES, INC, 1000 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW, #304 WASHINGTON DC 20036	N.Y. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	5,625.00	5,809.95
Do	SAN FRANCISCO P.V.C.	9,000.00	9,000.00
ELIZABETH M. SMITH, 815 16TH ST., NW, #310 WASHINGTON DC 20006	AMALGAMATED CLOTHING & TEXTILE WORKERS UNION	4,939.48	240.23
PATRICK F. SMITH JR., SUITE 1101 1730 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL TREASURY EMPLOYEES UNION	8,732.00	
WILLIAM C. SMITH, 1850 K STREET, NW, #1100 WASHINGTON DC 20006	BALLARD, SPAHR, ANDREWS & INGERSOLL		
ARTHUR V. SMYTH, 1625 EYE ST., NW, #902 WASHINGTON DC 20006	WEYERHAEUSER CO		
SOCIETY FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION, 1736 FRANKLIN STREET OAKLAND CA 94612		10.08	130.03
VINCENT R. SOMBROTTO, 100 INDIANA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	NATIONAL ASSN OF LETTER CARRIERS	3,236.59	
SOUTHERN FOREST PRODUCTS ASSN, P.O. BOX 52468 NEW ORLEANS LA 70152		20,487.49	20,487.49
SOUTHERN SATELLITE SYSTEMS, INC., P. O. BOX 45684 TULSA OK 74147			
MARK SQUILLACE, 218 D ST., SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE		
STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO), MIDLAND BLDG. CLEVELAND OH 44115			22,422.50
ROBERT H. STEEL, 8401 ARLINGTON BOULEVARD FAIRFAX VA 22031	NATIONAL COMPUTER GRAPHICS ASSN.		
WILLIAM N. STEELE, 1700 NORTH MOORE ST. ROSSLYN VA 22209	BOEING COMPANY	873.68	1,631.05
WILLIAM STEINBERG, 217 MGC - AMERICAN UNIVERSITY S.C. NEBRASKA & MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20016.	AMERICAN UNIVERSITY STUDENT CONFEDERATION		
STEPTOE & JOHNSON, CHTD, 1250 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALLIANCE FOR CANNABIS THERAPEUTICS		683.71
Do	ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE PENSION & WELFARE PLANS, INC.	10,227.50	610.59
Do	RULE OF LAW COMMITTE		
Do	TRAILWAYS, IANC.		
IMAGENE STEWART, 214 P STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20001	AMERICAN WOMEN'S CLERGY ASSN		
JACK MARK STOLIER, SUITE 500 1319 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	FOOD RESEARCH & ACTION CENTER		
DENNIS C. STOLTE, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION	4,437.00	103.00
RICHARD BOYLE STOREY, 455-B CARLISLE DR. HERNDON VA 22070	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY CLUB EXECUTIVES' ASSN		
RONALD J. STRECK, P.O. BOX 238 ALEXANDRIA VA 22313	NATIONAL WHOLESALE DRUGGISTS' ASSN		1,815.75
GEORGE W. STRONG, 2242 BARTLETT HOUSTON TX 77098	HOUSTON NATURAL GAS CORP		
SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION ASSN, 1910 S ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009			
GARY R. SUMMERS, SUITE 1014 900 17TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC.	10,750.00	33.00
THOMAS M. SUSMAN, ROPES & GRAY 1001 22ND STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & INDUSTRIAL CORP OF BOSTON		
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN, 1666 K STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20006	FLATHEAD JOINT BOARD OF CONTROL		
Do	LOYAL TRUST		
Do	PROCESS GAS CONSUMERS GROUP	700.00	
SWIDLER BERLIN & STRELOW, CHTD, 1000 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW #500 WASHINGTON DC 20007	AIRCO, INC.		
Do	GENERAL MILLS, INC	675.00	
Do	INTERNATIONAL ANTICOUNTERFEITING COALITION	4,200.00	
Do	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY HOSPITALS	3,258.75	
Do	NATIONAL SHORTHAND REPORTERS ASSN	1,050.00	
Do	TWENTIETH CENTURY-FOX FILM CORP	13,725.00	
SCOTT R. SWIRLING, SUITE 950 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING & REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH ASSN, INC	543.00	66.00
Z. MICHAEL SZAZ, 6415 FRANCONIA COURT SPRINGFIELD VA 22150	EMBASSY OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA	3,550.00	
TARGET, INC., 6612 OWENS DR. PLEASANTON CA 94566			15,000.00
LINDA TARR-WHELAN, 1201 16TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN	1,375.00	52.00
TAYLOR & MIZELL, 2700 REPUBLICBANK TOWER DALLAS TX 75201		1,000.00	2,287.69
ROBERT C. TAYLOR, 2700 REPUBLICBANK TOWER DALLAS TX 75201	TAYLOR & MIZELL		
TEAMSTERS FOR A DEMOCRATIC UNION, 2000 P ST., NW, #612 WASHINGTON DC 20036			
STEPHANIE TEFF, 1730 M STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.	2,852.31	191.05
JOSEPH L. S. TERRELL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, #604 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FARM CREDIT COUNCIL		
TEXASGULF, INC., HIGH RIDGE PARK STAMFORD CT 06904			136.27
TEXTRON, INC., 40 WESTMINSTER ST. PROVIDENCE RI 02903			10,457.14
MARY KAY THATCHER, 600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	5,250.00	57.00
GARY C. THOMPSON, 1126-16TH ST., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20036	OIL, CHEMICAL & ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION	4,374.99	
THOMPSON HINE & FLORY, 1920 N ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20036	COMMITTEE ON PIPE & TUBE IMPORTS	9,000.00	200.00
Do	GREAT WESTERN SUGAR CO.		
RICHARD L THOMPSON, 1700 K STREET, NW, #601 WASHINGTON DC 20006	ABBOTT LABORATORIES		
ROBERT J. THOMPSON, UTICA TOWER, SUITE 912 1924 SOUTH UTICA TULSA OK 74104	THOMPSON & CO	52,232.50	19,892.24
HAROLD A. THORNTON & ASSOCIATES, 1301 15TH STREET, NW, #818 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN FED OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 2677		
Do	COMMITTEE TO IMPROVE PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARIES		
GIL THURM, 777 14TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL ASSN OF REALTORS		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
JOHN G. TOTH, 2408 WANDA WAY RESTON VA 22091	RESTON ADVISER COMMITTEE		
THOMAS J. TRABUCCO, 1533 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES	8,325.00	34.00
TRANSAFRICA, 545 8TH STREET, SE, #200 WASHINGTON DC 20003		36,711.95	43,281.08
TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND, 82 SECOND ST. SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105			4,259.00
ANH TU, SUITE 860 1029 VERMONT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP	96.00	
WILLIAM J. TURENNE, 1901 L STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ELI LILLY AND COMPANY	3,000.00	166.78
W. GLENN TUSSEY, 600 MARYLAND AVE., SW WASHINGTON DC 20024	AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FED	6,975.00	41.00
GILMAN UDELL, 1750 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	INTERNATIONAL ASSN OF FIRE FIGHTERS	3,000.00	
MATHEW VALENCIC, 201 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NE SUITE 319 WASHINGTON DC 20002	HALT, INC		
R. THOMAS VAN ARSDALL, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	517.50	
RICHARD VAN DEUREN, 111 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW, #1800 MILWAUKEE WI 53202	NATIONAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS INST	2,000.00	
H. B. VAN GIESON, 1700 NORTH MOORE STREET ROSSLYN VA 22209	BOEING COMPANY		
JOHN P. VENNERS, 1899 L ST., NW, #1250 WASHINGTON DC 20036	VENNERS & CO (FOR: KOCH INDUSTRIES)		
JOSPEH T. VENTURA ENTERPRISES, INC, 1725 K STREET, NW, #401 WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE		
VENTURE ENTREPRENEURS, INC., SUITE 206 1201 SAN MARCO BLVD. JACKSONVILLE FL 32207			
VOLUME FOOTWEAR RETAILERS OF AMERICA, 1319 F ST., NW, #700 WASHINGTON DC 20004			725.00
MARCOS VON GOHMAN, 1835 K ST., NW, #600 WASHINGTON DC 20006	GUYANA AIRWAYS CORP		
ABE J. VORON, 6204 WHITE OAK LANE TAMARAC FL 33319	NATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION	1,200.00	800.00
WAGNER & BARODDY, INC, 1100 17TH STREET, NW, #804 WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUS ASSN		
Do	BURNS & ROE, INC	5,925.00	1,870.99
Do	CHICAGO AND NORTHWESTERN RAILROAD	2,275.00	1,059.42
Do	E-SYSTEMS		
Do	JARTRAN, INC	2,050.00	700.56
Do	LANIHAU CORPORATIONS	700.00	207.31
Do	LONG ISLAND TRUST COMPANY		
Do	NATIONAL BEER WHOLESALERS OF AMERICA	9,950.00	3,033.40
SARAH L. WAGONER, 6TH FLOOR 1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20007	ST. JOE MINERALS CORP		
Do	MARLINE OIL CORP		
WALD HARKRADER & ROSS, 1300 19TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	LIFELINE SYSTEMS, INC		
Do	MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO, LTD		
DON WALLACE ASSOCIATES, INC., 232 E. CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20003	ALABAMA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION	6,000.00	2,406.57
Do	AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE OF THE USA, INC	6,000.00	2,439.62
Do	COTTON WAREHOUSE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	11,000.00	2,314.36
DONALD L. WALLACE JR., 232 E. CAPITOL ST. WASHINGTON DC 20003	MERCHANTS GRAIN & TRANSPORTATION, INC		
Do	NATIONAL BEER WHOLESALERS' ASSN OF AMERICA, INC	4,000.00	
Do	OREGON INLET COMMISSION	8,723.88	
ALAN S. WARD, 818 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BAKER & HOSTETLER (FOR: SOAP & DETERGENT ASSN)		
JAMES C. WARNER, 1200 18TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BAILARD BIEHL & KAISER, INC	10,000.00	300.00
MARJORIE A. WARREN, GNAU, CARTER, JACOBSEN & ASSOC., INC 1777 F STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BI-COUNTY CONSORTIUM		
Do	INTER-TRIBAL COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN, INC		
WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO, 1100 H ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20080			2,126.15
WASHINGTON INDEPENDENT WRITERS, INC., 525 NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING WASHINGTON DC 20045			174.16
WASHINGTON OFFICE ON AFRICA, 110 MARYLAND AVE., NE WASHINGTON DC 20002		30,834.27	24,872.47
GEOFFREY WEBB, 530 7TH STREET, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	FRIENDS OF THE EARTH	1,123.54	
LEE J. WEDDIG, SUITE 700 1101 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL FISHERIES INST	4,000.00	30.00
THEODORE F. WEIHE, 1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ADVISORY COMM ON OVERSEAS COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT	2,812.00	
JON F. WEINSTEIN, 9 WILDWOOD GARDENS, #A2 P. WASHINGTON NY 11050			
STANLEY A. WEISS, SUITE 401 21 DUPONT CIRCLE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY		
WILLIAM B. WELSH, 1625 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN FED OF STATE, COUNTY & MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES	16,186.74	71.36
THOMAS F. WENNING, 1910 K ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	NATIONAL GROCERS ASSN		
WEST TEXAS LAND & ROYALTY OWNERS ASSN., 4302 AIRPORT BLVD. AUSTIN TX 78722		47.00	125.00
SHIRLEY H. WESTER, 1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, #950 WASHINGTON DC 20005	AMERICAN HEALTH PLANNING ASSOCIATION	1,500.00	85.00
WESTERN RESOURCE ALLIANCE, 2565 W. 23RD ST. EUGENE OR 97401			405.00
WILLIAM WEWER, 1910 S ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION ASSN		
CURTIS E. WHALEN, 490 L'ENFANT PLAZA, SW, #3202 WASHINGTON DC 20024	TRANSCO ENERGY COMPANY		
ALTON W. WHITEHOUSE JR., 1750 MIDLAND BLDG. CLEVELAND OH 44115	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)		
MARSHALL E. WHITENTON, SUITE 600 1001 22ND ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20037	STANDARD OIL CO (OHIO)	329.00	36.07
ROBERT E. WILBUR, 2700 REPUBLICBANK TOWER DALLAS TX 75201	TAYLOR & MIZELL		
WILLIAMS & JENSEN, P.C., 1101 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	ALAMO CEMENT COMPANY	102.50	6.78
Do	ALASKA LUMBER & PULP, INC		
Do	AMERICAN PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSN		
Do	BRAUM ICE CREAM STORES, INC		
Do	CENTURY 21 REAL ESTATE CORP		
Do	CIGNA	3,577.50	189.59
Do	COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES		
Do	COMMITTEE FOR PRUDENT DEREGULATION		2.71
Do	CONSOLIDATED FOODS CORP		4.06
Do	DESIGN PROFESSIONALS COALITION	1,900.00	135.42
Do	ESTEE LAUDER, INC		
Do	FEDERATION FOR AMERICAN IMMIGRATION REFORM	750.00	54.17
Do	FIRST BOSTON CORP	570.00	56.17
Do	FREIGHT FORWARDERS INSTITUTE		
Do	GENERAL ELECTRIC CO	1,200.00	108.34
Do	GENERAL PORTLAND, INC	102.50	6.78
Do	GIFFORD-HILL & COMPANY, INC	102.50	6.78
Do	HIGHER EDUATION ASSISTANCE FOUNDATION	200.00	13.54
Do	HOUSTON ENDOWMENT, INC		40.63
Do	IU INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT CORP	525.00	54.17
Do	KAISER CEMENT CORPORATION	102.50	6.78
Do	KELLOGG COMPANY	200.00	13.54
Do	KELLY, APPLEMAN, HART & HALLMAN		40.63
Do	KRAUSE MILLING CO	17.00	4.06
Do	MONOLITH PORTLAND CEMENT COMPANY		6.78
Do	MUSTANG FUEL CORPORATION		
Do	NATIONAL ASSN OF WATER COS	742.50	81.26
Do	NATIONAL CABLE TELEVISION ASSN, INC	1,409.50	135.42
Do	NATIONAL OFFICE MACHINE DEALERS ASSN	1,697.50	148.96
Do	NATIONAL SOFT DRINK ASSN		
Do	NATIONWIDE INSURANCE COMPANIES		27.08
Do	OLYMPIA & YORK DEVELOPMENTS LTD		
Do	OLYMPIA & YORK EQUITY CORP		
Do	PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA		
Do	PFIZER, INC		
Do	PROTECTIVE CORPORATION		
Do	RECORDING INDUSTRY OF AMERICA, INC	400.00	40.63
Do	SOUTHLAND ROYALTY CO		
Do	SOUTHWESTERN PORTLAND CEMENT COMPANY	102.50	6.78
Do	STUDENT LOAN MARKETING ASSN	2,050.00	135.42
Do	U.S. TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS, INC		13.54
Do	UNIVERSAL FOODS , INC		
LAWRENCE F. WILLIAMS, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	5,520.00	73.54
WILLIAMS MYERS & QUIGGLE, 888 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	CHURCH ALLIANCE FOR CLARIFICATION OF ERISA		
JAMES L. WINSTON, 1730 M STREET, NW, #708 WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BLACK OWNED BROADCASTERS		
WITKOWSKI WEINER MCCAFFREY & BRODSKY, SUITE 350 1575 I ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC.; COMMERCIAL CREDIT CORP	5,250.00	16,054.15
GEORGE M. WORDEN, 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004	HILL & KNOWLTON, INC		
WYATT & SALTZSTEIN, SUITE 802 1725 DESALES STREET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	AMERICAN BUSINESS PRESS, INC		
RICHARD E. WYCKOFF, 1771 N ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	NATIONAL ASSN OF BROADCASTERS		
BROOKS B. YEAGER, 330 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, SE WASHINGTON DC 20003	SIERRA CLUB	626.00	222.54
ROBERTA LYNN YOUMANS, 1016 16TH STREET, NW, #800 WASHINGTON DC 20036	ROISMAN, RENO & CAVANAUGH	1,557.68	
HUGH F. YOUNG JR., 1500 RHODE ISLAND AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20005	NATIONAL PAINT & COATINGS ASSN, INC	3,000.00	
BARNABY W. ZALL, 1424 16TH STREET, NW, #707 WASHINGTON DC 20036	FEDERATION FOR AMERICAN IMMIGRATION REFORM	6,000.00	50.49
THOMAS K. ZAUCHA, 1825 SAMUEL MORSE DRIVE RESTON VA 22090	NATIONAL GROCERS ASSN		
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, 9912 FORT HAMILTON PARKWAY BROOKLYN NY 11209	BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPT., AFL-CIO		

Organization or Individual Filing	Employer/Client	Receipts	Expenditures
Do	GRUMMAN AEROSPACE CORPORATION		
Do	TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE		
MICHAEL J. ZIMMER, WICKWIRE, GAVIN & GIBBS 1828 L ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20036	COGENERATION COALITION, INC.		
KENNETH ZINN, 1837 WYOMING AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON DC 20009	WASHINGTON OFFICE ON AFRICA	4,500.00	
ZIONTZ PIRTLE MORRISSET ERNSTOFF & CHESTNUT, METROPOLITAN PARK, 16TH FLOOR 1100 OLIVE WAY SEATTLE WA 98101.	MAKAH INDIAN TRIBE		
Do	UKPEAGVIK INUPIAT CORPORATION		
ZUCKERT SCOUTT RASENBERGER & JOHNSON, 888 17TH ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20006	BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE	3,692.00	804.50
Do	DREYFUS CORPORATION	8,883.26	1,383.75
Do	HARCOURT BRACE JOVANOVICH		
13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ACTION COMM, 986 VICAR LANE SAN JOSE CA 95117			9.08
31ST PRO LIFE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ACTION COMM, 8654 BONVIEW TERRACE WILLIAMSVILLE NY 14221			
32ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ACTION COMMITTEE/NY, 129 BELMONT AVE. BUFFALO NY 14223			
9TH PRO-LIFE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ACTION COMMITTEE, 1120 MICHIGAN BOULEVARD DUNEDIN FL 33528		852.00	917.27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

A SALUTE TO GLOVER WILKINS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, Glover Wilkins, Administrator of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Authority, is retiring. I would like to share with those who know him, and particularly those who do not, the accomplishments achieved by this man over the last 37 years or so through his spirit and dedication. I submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reprint his biography, which I found best describes the man I know.

Glover Wilkins, Administrator of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Authority, and the Huck Finn of the Tombigbee, grew up around the river—near his native Brooksville, MS.

Unlike Huck Finn, however, Glover Wilkins has much more vision and ambition for his river than Twain's legendary character had for his.

Glover Wilkins has been associated with the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Authority since its inception, but his dreams for the waterway dates back to 1947 when he was manager of the Columbus, Mississippi Chamber of Commerce. Up until 1958, when Wilkins became Assistant Administrator of the newly formed Tenn-Tom Authority, the chamber with Wilkins at the helm, kept alive the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. From the beginning of his association with Tenn-Tom, Glover Wilkins has been active in maintaining liaison with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, builder of the waterway, and elected Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

His friends and associates know that Glover Wilkins' dedication to the Tenn-Tom project is all consuming. His interest in water resources of this Nation is evidenced by his active association with many regional and national water resource organizations.

He is regional trustee of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association and a past president of the Water Resources Associates, a national group of professional water resource people.

Immediate past chairman of the National Waterways Conference, Inc., he is also a member and past vice president of the Water Resource Congress and served on President Kennedy's Waterway Resource Policy Committee.

He is a member of the Tennessee River Valley Association Board of Directors, and has also served on the Small Business Advisory Council for the State of Mississippi.

In November 1962, he was named Administrator of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority, his present position.

Mr. Speaker, Glover Wilkins is a man we will be sorry to see leave the helm of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority. It gives me great pleasure to extend to him best wishes for a happy, healthy retirement. It is time now for him to enjoy all the things he helped make possible. He has certainly dedicated a lifetime toward preserving our water resources, and we all thank him for his efforts and commitment.●

CUFFING THE CONSTITUTION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the major omissions of this House, under the strong political control of the Democratic Party, is its refusal to advance legislation dealing with criminal law reform.

Curiously, the Los Angeles Times supports this unfortunate failure to act in a recent editorial. The Attorney General, William French Smith, has answered the editorial in an interesting letter to the editor which appeared on April 23, 1984, and which deserves the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 23, 1984]

CUFFING THE CONSTITUTION

In urging the House of Representatives to pass the Administration's anti-crime legislation, President Reagan declared that "it is about time we take the handcuffs off law enforcement and put them on thugs and murderers." This led the editors of The Times to suggest in its editorial (April 13), "Cuffing the Constitution," that the legislation "would put handcuffs on the Constitution." In fact, these anti-crime measures have been written with careful consideration for individual civil liberties and constitutional rights. They have been recognized by the Department of Justice and an overwhelming majority of the Senate—where the bulk of the legislation passed by a vote of 91-1—as critically needed to protect our citizens. The legislation is both prudent and essential, and it should be passed by the House immediately.

The Times criticizes three provisions in the crime package. First, it attacks the modification of the so-called exclusionary rule. The bill would allow courts to hear evidence collected by law enforcement officers who reasonably and in good faith thought they were acting lawfully. It reflects a growing concern in the country that the exclusionary rule's unjustified ill effects need to be curbed.

In California, for instance, a study conducted by the National Institute of Justice found that between 1976 and 1979 more than 4,000 state felony cases were dropped because of the exclusionary rule. The study also showed that half of those not prosecuted in 1976 and 1977 because of the exclusionary rule were re-arrested during the next two years—on an average of three times apiece.

The Times editorial erroneously concludes that the crime package will somehow reward police ignorance. This is simply not, the case. The Senate made clear that the belief the search was lawful must be grounded in objective reasonableness. It must be based on articulable grounds sufficient to cause a reasonable and reasonably trained police officer to conclude that his actions were justified.

The Times' second criticism involves the insanity defense. While The Times embraced one part of the Administration's efforts to improve the insanity defense as "a sensible reform long advocated,"; it challenged the companion effort to restrict the defense to those defendants who are genuinely mentally ill.

The crime package would eliminate the unworkable portion of the current two-part test for insanity. That test now permits the acquittal of a mentally ill defendant if (1) he did not realize that his conduct was wrong, or (2) if knowing it was wrong, he was unable to control it. The latter, "control" part of the test confronts courts and juries with the nearly impossible task of distinguishing between persons who are unable to control their conduct and those who are merely unwilling to do so. As the American Psychiatric Assn. noted recently, the "line between an irresistible impluse and an impulse not resisted is probably no sharper than that between twilight and dusk." Since there is no objective basis for making the distinction, the test invites fabricated claims and produces moral guesses masked as factual determinations.

Finally, The Times editorial states that the bail reforms advocated by the Senate would require a defendant awaiting trial to "prove" he wouldn't commit a crime while out on bail in order to secure pretrial release.

Here again, this is simply not what the anti-crime legislation does. Instead, it would create a limited, but important, authorization for detaining a defendant prior to trial where the government proves that the safety of the community or the appearance of the defendant at trial cannot be reasonably assured if the defendant is released.

These bail reforms have been endorsed by the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime, the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime, and the National District Attorneys Assn. Consideration of a defendant's dangerousness for pretrial release has also been supported by the National Gover-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

31-059 O-87-37 (Pt. 8)

nors' Assn., the National Assn. of Attorneys General, and the American Bar Assn.

The broad support for all three of these improvements in the criminal justice system reflects a growing concern by Americans about the terrible toll of violent crime. The good faith exception to the exclusionary rule passed the Senate by a 63-to-24 vote, and the improvements in the insanity defense and bail laws were passed with the rest of the Administration's Comprehensive Crime Control Act by the overwhelming vote of 91-1 that I mentioned earlier. These proposals—and the others in the anti-crime package—enjoy bipartisan support and are constitutionally sound. They are also critically necessary. The House should pass them without delay. It has no excuse not to.

WILLIAM FRENCH SMITH,
Attorney General, Washington, D.C.●

RAPE PREVENTION MONTH 1984

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, since 1973, Women Against Rape (WAR) has been helping rape victims and their families cope with the realities of this intolerable offense.

Through volunteer escort and counseling services, this private, nonprofit organization has become an invaluable part of our public safety enforcement system throughout this country. Over the past 10 years, WAR has developed crime prevention programs specifically targeted toward rape prevention techniques. In addition, this organization has faithfully disseminated information regarding these programs and guidelines for rape victims to schools, church, and community organizations.

In an effort to aid its campaign to better educate the American public in the prevention and treatment of rape cases, the Collingwood, NJ, chapter of WAR, in conjunction with the Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders, has declared May 1984 as "Rape Prevention Month." During this month, as in the past 4 years, this group will be making film and slide presentations on rape prevention available to interested groups, as well as conducting a high school essay contest on violence and its effects.

At this time, I would like to applaud this particular WAR chapter for its continued dedication in the fight against the rising tide of rape and its side effects. I urge all citizens, educational institutions, and public and private organizations in New Jersey and across this country to fully participate in the observance of this month as Rape Prevention Month.

The war against rape is one we cannot afford to lose.●

GEORGE FRAMPTON'S PROPHECY

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the prescient comments of George Frampton 10 years ago. George Frampton, an extraordinarily talented lawyer, whom I have the privilege to call my friend, warned his then boss, Leon Jaworski, of the consequences of not prosecuting former President Nixon for his Watergate crimes. Lloyd Shearer brought George Frampton's prophecy to light in an illuminating article in yesterday's Parade magazine. I ask unanimous consent to insert that article at this point, and I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

GEORGE FRAMPTON'S PROPHECY

(By Lloyd Shearer)

The more that former President Richard Nixon comes in out of the cold trying to "reimage" himself as an elder statesman, the more accurate becomes the prophecy of George Frampton, an attorney now in the office of Rogovin, Huge and Lenzner in Washington, D.C.

Ten years ago, George Frampton (Yale '64, London School of Economics '66, Harvard Law School '69 and law clerk to Justice Harry Blackmun of the U.S. Supreme Court 1971-72) was one of the brilliant young lawyers on the Watergate Special Prosecuting Force, headed by the late Leon Jaworski. It was this task force that unearthed the criminal secrets of Watergate—the tapes, lies, evasions, conspiracies and stonewallings—which compelled Nixon's resignation on Aug. 9, 1974, without any apology to the nation or admission of guilt.

The closest Nixon came to an apology in his resignation speech was: "I regret deeply any injuries that may have been done in the course of events that led to this decision. I would say only that if some of my judgments were wrong, and some were wrong, they were made in what I believed at the time to be in the best interest of the nation."

Nixon's reluctance to admit his transgressions rankled Jaworski, who held him in contempt for obstructing justice, abusing the power of his position and turning the office of the Presidency "into a mean den where perjury and low scheming became a way of life." Jaworski asked his staff whether he should move to have Nixon indicted on half a dozen charges by the grand jury (which was eager to do so) and then tried in a court of law. Practically the entire staff recommended indictment of the President.

George Frampton, then only 29, put his recommendation down on paper. "I wonder if 10 years from now," he wrote late in August 1974, "history will endorse the notion that Mr. Nixon has 'suffered enough.' The powerful men around him have also lost their jobs and been disgraced, but many of them will have lost their liberty and livelihood. Mr. Nixon, on the other hand, will continue to be supported in lavish style with a pension and subsidies at taxpayers' expense until his death. He may reenter public life, however morally crippled."

"The prospect of Mr. Nixon publishing his memoirs (and thereby adding several million dollars to his net worth)," Frampton continued, "should remind us that, unlike his aides who are convicted of crime, Mr. Nixon will have the 'last say' about his own role in Watergate if he is not prosecuted. This is why, in my view, it is important (absent of a full admission of guilt) to have some definitive resolution of Mr. Nixon's Watergate actions.

"What is certain is that if he is not prosecuted . . . and after there is no more Special Prosecutor, Mr. Nixon in his writing and speaking will have the final opportunity to defend and justify his own role in Watergate as proper, constitutional and in the national interest . . . and to argue that only the political hysteria of the times brought about his downfall."

Thirty days after he became President, Gerald Ford pardoned Richard Nixon for all offenses, and the question of trying Nixon became moot.

This March, CBS paid $500,000 for 90 minutes of interviews with Nixon, now 71, by his former staff assistant, Frank Gannon. And on March 14, the Washington Post Service ran a report by Margot Hornblower that read: "The cream of America's business and industrial establishment welcomed Richard Nixon back into the fold. A sellout crowd of 1600 at the Economic Club of New York . . . gave him three standing ovations . . . Nobody mentioned Watergate."●

A TRIBUTE TO MARY LABYAK AND HOSPICE CARE, INC.

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, Mary Labyak, administrator of Hospice Care, Inc., on whose board of directors I proudly serve, was recently appointed to the American Academy of Medical Administrators. In the most recent publication of Hospice, Inc., "Let's Keep In Touch," a feature article was carried on her that I would like to share with this Congress:

Congratulations to Mary Labyak, Administrator, on her recent appointment to the American Academy of Medical Administrators. Mary was elected as an affiliate of the academy which confers this honor upon those who show special qualifications in medical administration and merit such recognition.

The purpose of the academy is to provide a professional organization dedicated to developing innovative concepts in the field of health care administration and to the promotion and advancement of its members in knowledge, professional standing and personal endeavors, through education and research in management, administration and the philosophy of health care.

The academy is an international professional society which encourages and fosters a scientific approach to the practice of medical administration; provides a means of intercommunications; promotes conducts and institutes educational courses in this

speciality, establishes and maintains a criterion for those engaged in this profession, and to provide for recognition by means of fellowships, grants, and scholarships to those performing noteworthy service in health care leadership.

This is truly an honor for Mary and Hospice Care is very proud of our own administrator. Congratulations.

I want to personally congratulate her and all those connected with the hospice and wish them continued success in their efforts of sharing love and understanding.●

STATESMANSHIP AT GROUP W BROADCASTING

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Lawrence Fraiberg, president of the Group W Television Station Group gave an excellent speech to the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. Among the topics he discussed on that occasion was the use by broadcasters of exit poll data to make election projections while people are still voting: He made a strong plea for voluntary restraint by the broadcast media.

Previously, I included here a copy of the article from Broadcasting magazine about the speech, and Mrs. BOXER, of California, has included the speech in its entirety.

I believe Mr. Fraiberg's statements contributed so much to the dialog that has been conducted between representatives of the broadcast media and some of us in Congress on this issue, however, that today I would ask the indulgence of my colleagues to allow me to specifically highlight and comment on some of what Mr. Fraiberg had to say.

First, along with urging broadcasters to voluntarily refrain from using exit poll data to make election projections, Mr. Fraiberg called for a national uniform 24-hour election day. I am among those who have been reluctant to support this idea for two reasons. The first is that the evidence from the hearings held by the task force on elections of the House Administration Committee is that a 24-hour period for voting would be quite disruptive of the surprisingly fragile process by which we conduct elections in this country.

And second, any attempt to establish a uniform poll closing time in order to prevent election projections could very easily be short-circuited by broadcasters. Since the advent of the idea of using exit poll data to make election projections, broadcasters no longer need any actual vote totals to make their projections. Without voluntary restraint by the broadcasters—which is exactly what most of them have been resisting so strenuously—a uniform poll closing time would do nothing to prevent early projections.

However, I would like to state for the record that if thoughtful, concerned journalists like Mr. Fraiberg can initiate a process leading to firm guidelines in the broadcasting industry about waiting for the polls to close before making election projections, I for one am certainly willing to discuss potential complementary changes in the electoral process.

The second portion of Mr. Fraiberg's speech I would like to highlight is the following:

I can envision an election in which the Presidency itself could turn on a few percentage points in the West. In such a situation, exit polls could actually elect the President.

If anyone here thinks I'm exaggerating the problem, just listen to the words of ABC's Ted Koppel. On election night, 1980, at 10:15 p.m., Koppel said: "It's inevitable now that as this night continues, that Democrats are simply not going to bother to vote where the polls are still open. Why should they? It's all over as far as they're concerned."

Ten minutes later—probably after some heated discussion at ABC—Koppel changed his mind. He said: "Voters on the West Coast: There's more than just a Presidential race. Please do vote!"

But in a very real, very ominous way, Ted Koppel was right the first time. Television had made millions of American voters feel helpless—superfluous.

My comment on this, Mr. Speaker, is simply to point out that every time we get together with broadcasters to discuss the problem of early projections, we get a civics lecture. The broadcasters all piously argue that voters should know their votes count despite the projections; that they should be more mature and go vote on other races even though they have been told the Presidential race is over; that they should know projections are only projections, so they should vote despite having been assured by television news that their votes are irrelevant, and so forth.

And yet, even a network news person—a mature, knowledgeable individual who knew exactly the difference between projections and actual vote totals—had precisely the same reaction—"It's all over and Western votes don't count"—that most Western voters had. I have argued, and I think this bears out, that New York network news people are trying to impose a rather unreasonable standard of civic duty—that people should be expected to go cast their ballots after the election is over—on Western voters.

The third statement of Mr. Fraiberg's that I would like to highlight is:

I dislike the entire idea of legislatures meddling in the area of free speech and journalistic integrity.

I would argue that it is up to us to "head them off at the pass": to show that we can keep our own house in order.

What more can I say to that than: "Hear, hear." This is just exactly the sentiment of those of us in the Congress who have been working on this issue. It is just exactly what we have been asking for, and it is all we are asking for.

The fourth and final comment by Mr. Fraiberg that is particularly worthy of note was when he concluded:

That is why I am announcing today that the news directors of Group W broadcast stations have agreed not to release any of their own exit-poll projections until all polls for that office are closed. If this puts us in an inferior position competitively—then, so be it."

If other members of the broadcast media would demonstrate that kind of statesmanship, this whole problem would immediately be solved.●

PEERLESS INSTRUMENTS, INC., AWARDED "SUBCONTRACTOR OF THE YEAR" FOR REGION II BY U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that a firm in my district, Peerless Instruments Co., Inc., of Elmhurst, Queens, has been named the "Regional Subcontractor of the Year" by the U.S. Small Business Administration for region II, which encompasses New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Each year, judges representing prime contractors in each region select one firm to receive this honor. The Peerless Instruments Co., a leading supplier of precision parts, complex electromechanical assemblies, and advanced electronic control equipment, has won this prestigious award for its fine performance.

Peerless designs, manufactures, and tests critical assemblies and systems of the U.S. aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the nuclear submarine *Nautilus*, trident submarines, and the F-14 and F-16 fighter jets. In addition, Peerless Instruments has earned a nationwide reputation for quality and reliability, and has been designated major supplier for the nuclear Navy by the Naval Sea Systems Command.

As the regional award winner, the company is now eligible to be considered for the coveted National "Small Business Subcontractor of the Year" award. The national winner will be announced at the 17th Annual Small Business Procurement Conference and Awards Banquet, which will be held May 8, 1984.

I congratulate the company's president, Thomas W. Considine, and all of the employees at Peerless Instruments, Inc., who share this award through their dedication.●

LOUISVILLE DEBATE TEAM RANKS HIGH NATIONALLY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the University of Louisville debate team on another outstanding season of tournament competition. The team was runnerup in the national tournament which took place at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville.

This is the second time in 3 years that the University of Louisville debators have reached the final round, and the third time in 4 years that they have reached the final four.

I commend the efforts of Cindy Leiferman (senior) and Mark Whitehead (junior) who constituted the University of Louisville debate squad.

The success of the University of Louisville debate team in recent years attests to the talents of the students, the quality of the program, and the coaching skills of Dr. Thomas J. Hynes, Jr.

I applaud the accomplishments of the 1984 University of Louisville debate team and wish them much continued success.●

A TRIBUTE TO MSGR. DANIEL J. BOURKE

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, this summer one of the leading religious figures in Georgia will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. Msgr. Daniel J. Bourke has devoted long years of service to his parishioners in my hometown of Augusta, GA, and in numerous other cities as well. Even after retirement, he continues to be active in parish affairs and frequently assists in pastoral responsibilities in Savannah.

It is no surprise that Monsignor Bourke's energy and enthusiasm and devotion continue unabated, because he has shown these traits since he was a young man growing up in Ireland.

A native of Birr, County Offaly, Monsignor Bourke prepared for the priesthood in Dublin. He was ordained June 24, 1934, at All Hallows Seminary. That fall he arrived in Savannah, GA, and began a lifetime of service by working in Albany, Douglas, and Savannah parishes.

I came to know this jovial Irishman while he served as pastor of St. Mary's on the Hill Parish, Augusta, from 1957 to 1970.

While carrying out his parish assignments, Monsignor Bourke held a number of diocesan appointments. From 1970 to 1976, he was vicar for special administative services and diocesan comptroller. He also was president of Aquinas High School, Augusta, from 1957 to 1970. He has been a member of the Knights of Columbus since 1935.

Since his retirement, Monsignor Bourke has been living in Savannah, where a golden jubilee celebration is planned for him May 17. Likewise, St. Mary's on the Hill Parish in Augusta plans to honor this gifted man with a celebration on May 11.

I am happy to join his many friends and admirers in paying tribute to one who has contributed so much to his community and to his church.●

ANDROPOV'S DEATH AND THE PROSPECTS OF A NEW REALISM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Ray Cline, entitled "Andropov's Death and the Prospects of a New Realism," appeared in the Washington Times in mid-February. As you may recall, in the wake of Andropov's death, many Americans accepted the false premise that a new Soviet leader would bring about monumental changes in Soviet-American relations.

In retrospect, Mr. Cline, a senior associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University, and a former Deputy Director for Intelligence at CIA, correctly warned that Andropov's death would mean nothing to the Soviet decisionmaking structure. Regardless of the man in charge, every leader in the Politburo is cut from the same Leninist-Stalinist indoctrinated mold. As Mr. Cline explains, the Soviet Hierarchy produces continuity and stability, not sudden changes of course, even in the event of the death of its leader.

Mr. Chernenko's continued refusal to return to the nuclear arms negotiating table, his outright objection to on-site verification, and his renewed campaign against the freedom fighters in Afghanistan are but a few examples of how this "new realism" has fared in just the last few months. I urge my colleagues to take a look at Mr. Cline's article and to heed his warnings.

ANDROPOV'S DEATH AND THE PROSPECTS OF A NEW REALISM

(By Ray Cline)

Honest Americans ought to send their representatives decently and politely to Moscow, not to praise Yuri Andropov, but to bury him. His career rise through the Communist Party bureaucracy and the KGB secret police to the top of the Politburo marked one of the most violent and deceitful periods in Soviet policy toward the United States. It is naive and dangerous to forget and forgive at the grave and speak as if Andropov was a friend and Moscow means us well.

Yuri Andropov's career came to its first revealing climax in the bloody betrayal and butchery of national communist reformers in Hungary in 1956. He saw massive Soviet arming and coaching of Hanoi's military forces to inflict a humiliating defeat on 500,000 American soldiers, sailors, and airmen and then to crush independence and freedom oriented South Vietnamese and Cambodians like bugs. He promoted the replacement of many billions of dollars worth of weapons in Arab hands to spark repeated Arab-Israeli wars and dislocate the whole world's oil supply from the Persian Gulf.

Observing such a payoff for deploying proxy forces against Americans and their allies, Moscow in Andropov's heyday in the KGB and the Politburo exploited a thousand regional grievances around the globe to create lavishly equipped armies in client states like North Korea, North Vietnam, Syria, and Cuba. It encouraged and assisted each to recruit, train, arm, and fund local fighting units dedicated to undermining and destabilizing neighboring states.

A covert war has been going on in the 1970s and 1980s sponsored by the Soviet Union through proxies of proxies to commit acts of cold-blooded terrorist violence, wage destructive ethnic and religious wars against Christians, Jews, and "Yankees," and secretly coordinate revolutionary political warfare in a dozen nations aimed at multiplying Soviet clout and diminishing American influence and prestige.

The mischievous blather from many congressional, academic, and media pundits favoring a friendly gesture by President Reagan of attending Andropov's funeral seemed to suggest that all this international violence is America's fault. Moreover, in typical American pollyanna style they hoped that a kindly personal move made in a "bygones are bygones" manner could magically set Soviet-American relations on a cordial new path. The occupation of Afghanistan and the rape of Lebanon are not so easily repaired.

This kind of gesture by Reagan might have been good domestic politics. It would have been disastrous international policy. In most parts of the world it would be interpreted as reflecting a sense of guilt in Washington, a Vietnam-like weakness in American policy toward Lebanon, and an obsequious American haste to persuade the next head man in Moscow, whoever he turns out to be, to ease the strategic pressure on the American people.

Perhaps many citizens in our rich and tolerant society might think President Reagan was demonstrating the generosity of the strong, but in Soviet, Arab, Latin, and most other cultures such behavior would certainly be read as revealing the deep, hidden anxiety of the weak. Such a signal is wrong and dangerous to send today if the United States intends to have any role defending its

own cultural values and economic interests in international conflicts swirling about us in every quarter.

President Reagan fortunately understood these matters. He understands, though he has failed to persuade the Democrats in Congress and most media moguls, that Andropov's death probably means nothing at all for Soviet decisionmaking. Another personality will take his place, cut from the same cloth, dedicated to the same Leninist-Stalinist ideology and the same KGB-armed forces strategy.

After all, the "young men" in the ruling system in the Soviet Union are in their fifties and sixties and were closely vetted by their senior colleagues in their seventies when they were coopted into the top leadership by Breshnev and recently by Andropov. This one-party dictatorship structure of government is not like ours. It produces continuity and stability, not constant trimming or sudden changes of course.

Every leader in the Politburo learned the basic philosphy of communist states as enunciated by Lenin (war is politics by other means, or politics is war by other means) and Mao Tse-tung (political power grows from the barrel of a gun). Whoever emerges on top of the heap must have the triple support system behind him—the enormous Communist Party bureaucracy, the secret police, and the military forces. Everyone has been taught since he was a child that his society is in an irreconcilable systemic war with the pluralist democracies. He will toe the party line because he has to. Changes in direction in the near term will be tactical and propagandistic, not strategic. Real Soviet policy shifts in search of a modus vivendi enabling the two superpowers to live together without constant and costly conflict will come slowly. They will come at all only if Americans get a clearer picture in their heads of the kind of turbulent world we live in and show some dignity in a prudent determination to protect ourselves, our friends, and our strategic interest. The next phase of the nasty, destructive war in Lebanon probably will be the best litmus test both for Soviet intentions and American firmness.

If thinking about Andropov's death leads to greater realism on the part of Americans rather than fantasies of instant, friendly solutions of bitter differences at improvised summits, Yuri Andropov will in the long run have made a contribution to world peace. Otherwise things will go on much in the same sorry vein as during his active political lifetime. Let us hope that at least a modest learning process may get under way both in Washington and Moscow.

(Ray S. Cline, a senior associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University, is a former deputy director for intelligence, the CIA.)●

TRIBUTE TO MOUNT ANTHONY HIGH SCHOOL'S CLOSE-UP PROGRAM

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, in 1979 schools from Vermont began participating in the Close-up program. Since then nearly 1,500 students and teachers from the State have experienced firsthand a week-long government studies program in Washington. I wish to recognize and give special welcome to students from Mount Anthony Union High in Bennington, who with their teacher Alan George, represent the single largest group ever to participate from the State of Vermont. These 38 enthusiastic participants have arrived in Washington to explore and experience the workings of our Government through seminars, workshops, and study tours.

The entire Bennington community is to be commended for the outstanding support it has provided to the program. Without the generous contributions of many people throughout Bennington, this trip would not have been possible for many of the students. It is in keeping with Vermont spirit of working together to achieve common goals, that this remarkable accomplishment has been realized.

The key to the Close-up program is involvement. I am very pleased to see that Mr. George and the students from Mount Anthony have set such an outstanding example of involvement in the democratic process for others to follow. To them and everyone who helped make it possible my sincere congratulations.●

DEREK SHEARER AWARDED GUGGENHEIM FELLOWSHIP

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my friend and constituent, Prof. Derek Shearer, who was recently awarded a prestigious Guggenheim Fellowship for 1984–85.

Professor Shearer, the director of urban studies at Occidental College, was 1 of 283 scholars, artists, and scientists who were chosen from among 3,542 applicants in the 60th annual Guggenheim competition. The fellows are selected by a committee of seven experts who meet each February to consider applications. The fellowships are awarded on the basis of past accomplishments in a given field, and a strong promise for the future.

The grants, averaging $19,500, are intended to provide 1 year's free time to engage in study, research, or creative activity.

Professor Shearer—an expert on urban policy and vice chair of the Santa Monica Planning Commission—will use his grant to complete a book on the implementation of innovative urban planning practices in American cities.

Professor Shearer teaches courses at Occidental in urban planning, urban economics, management, and urban politics, and directs the schools urban internship program. He is coauthor of two previous books on public policy, "Economic Democracy," and "A New Social Contract." His articles have appeared in the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, the New Republic, the Nation, and many other publications. He is considered one of the leading under-40 thinkers on city planning and urban policy in the United States. His wife, Ruth Goldway, is the former mayor of Santa Monica.

It gives me great pleasure to share Professor Shearer's accomplishment with my colleagues, and I wish him much success on his book.●

SMALL BUSINESS ENVELOPE CEREMONY

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the priviledge of holding a press conference with William F. Bolger, the Postmaster General of the United States.

At this ceremony the Postal Service formally issued a commemorative envelope honoring small business. I would like to include for the RECORD a copy of the remarks I made this morning.

The remarks follow:

COMMEMORATIVE ENVELOPE CEREMONY

Good Morning. I am pleased so many of you could be here this morning with Postmaster General Bolger and me. As you know, this is Small Business Week, and I am excited we can kick off the week with this special ceremony.

Today Postal Service is formally issuing a commemorative envelope in honor of America's small businesses. I would also like to point out that in this week's issue of Time magazine there is a special section devoted to Small Business Week called a salute to small business. I am pleased to say that the U.S. Postal Service is one of the sponsors of this section. I think the Postal Service should be commended for doing so much to recognize our small business community at this time.

This envelope has been long awaited. One of the recommendations to come out of the 1980 White House Conference of Small Business was for the Postal Service to issue a commemorative stamp honoring small business. This recommendation was endorsed by the members of the Small Business Committee, and a formal request was made to the Postmaster General. After a lot of hard work, the Postal Service announced they would issue a commemorative envelope honoring small business. This announcement was formally made 2 years ago at a press conference with the Postmaster General. Last year the design of the envelope was unveiled at a special ceremony. And—at long last—the envelope is being issued today.

It is significant that the envelope is being issued during Small Business Week since this is a time that has been set aside to rec-

ognize the Nation's small business men and women. Small business is the cutting edge of competition; small business is the Nation's job creator; small business is the vanguard of innovation and invention; and small business is the source of the free enterprise leadership. It is the responsibility of all of us in public service to recognize these attributes, and today I feel we have done just that.

I would like to recognize just a few people now. First I want to thank the students from Mrs. Doris Glover's third grade class for coming here today. They are from Jackson Road School in Silver Spring. Perhaps we have some of our future small business men and women among us!

Next, I would like to introduce Pat Taylor. Mr. Taylor is one of the designers of the envelope and will be on hand after we complete our remarks to autograph your program and envelope.

And finally, I would like to recognize two more people: My colleague, Congressman ANDY IRELAND from Florida's 10th District. ANDY initiated the drive to get the Postal Service to issue this envelope; and Patricia Reese of his staff who has worked with ANDY on this over the last 2½ years.

In closing, I want to encourage all of you here to purchase at least one of these envelopes which will be on sale in the back of the room as soon as we finish our remarks. Let us all do our part to make recordbreaking sales of this special envelope.

Again, I want to thank all of you for being here today as we honor our small business community in this special way—the issuance of this commemorative envelope.●

IS THERE ANY FUTURE FOR RELIGION IN NICARAGUA?

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that an insight into the basic orientation of the Government of Nicaragua can be gained by examining the Sandinistas' attitude toward religion. Religion is being pushed out of Nicaragua. Even though Nicaraguans are protesting against the Communist government's actions, as the following article explains, the Sandinistas are determined to put an end to the Catholic Church in that country.

The New York Times reported on August 18, 1982, that Catholic students in Masaya, Nicaragua, protested against the Government's treatment of a young priest, Father Bismarck Carballo. As spokesman for the church in Managua, Father Carballo came to the attention of the Sandinistas. While having lunch with a female friend, he was attacked. Both he and his friend were forced to strip before being taken to jail. The Sandinista television station was on the scene and treated Nicaraguans to news coverage and pictures of the nude priest.

In response to this show of slander, Catholic students staged protests in various cities around the country. Some protesters also seized a military post and the local headquarters of the Sandinista Neighborhood Defense Committee, the civilian groups that police their neighborhoods and denouce suspected "counterrevolutionaries" to the authorities. Well-organized "mobs" from these committees have been known to paint, stone, and even burn down the homes of Nicaraguans who support the church, or question the Government's policies.

The Department of State advises that the Nicaraguan Government has established and fostered the spread of the "People' Church" in opposition to the existing Catholic Church in that country. As part of the Sandinista attack on the church, the Nicaraguan Bishop, Father Obando y Bravo is followed, harassed, and often threatened. As a frequent critic of the Government there, he is considered as an enemy of the state.

Time magazine reported that during his visit to Nicaragua, the Pope was mocked and jeered by groups of Nicaraguans intentionally infiltrated into a public outdoor mass in Managua.

The following article clearly shows that there are many Nicaraguans who love their religion. They resent having it taken from them. They recently voiced their deep concern by gathering at the National Cathedral in Managua. They eagerly offered their support for the church and their opposition to the Sandinista regime. I strongly believe that all Americans should be told of events of this nature so that they can see the true face of Commandante Ortega and company.

I salute the 100,000 God-fearing Nicaraguans and Father Obando y Bravo who bravely defied the atheistic Sandinistas to voice their support for their faith and their freedom. May these dauntless souls live to see the day when Nicaragua is again free.

With these observations in mind, I recommend this informative article to my colleagues in the Congress. (Article from the Washington Times attached.)

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 26, 1984]

U.S. OFFICIALS BLACK OUT ANTI-SANDINISTA RALLY

(By Phil Nicolaides)

On Good Friday, a crowd of some 100,000 Nicaraguans thronged the plaza in front of Managua's National Cathedral for three hours to express, in the words of ABC's Peter Collins, "their passionate solidarity with the Catholic Church and opposition to the Sandinista regime." Some 8¼ million Americans watching the ABC-TV Evening News last Friday witnessed the event and heard the veteran network correspondent report it.

But if Americans had to rely on all other news sources singly or combined, they would never know it happened.

And if Americans had to rely on the State Department, they would be told it didn't happen.

None of the wire services carried the story or transmitted a single photograph to their hundreds of subscribers. None of America's newpapers reported it. Neither did NBC or CBS.

When the Washington Times asked State Department spokesman Joseph Becelia for information about the demonstration, he said he had not heard of it and would have to telephone the U.S. Embassy in Managua for a report. U.S. diplomats in Managua had apparently not cabled to Washington anything about the huge demonstration.

Quoting Roger Gamble, the deputy chief of the U.S. mission, Mr. Becelia sharply challenged the accuracy of the ABC report. "This was not an anti-Sandinista demonstration," he said. "By no means—neither in its origin nor in its nature."

When pressed to explain the loud chants from the crowd and the placards clearly visible on the television screen in the Collins report, Mr. Becelia replied that "any anti-Sandinista character or manifestations were peripheral to the religious nature of the gathering—although there may have been scattered anti-government shouts and a few placards."

He also said the crowd numbered "only 50,000, not 100,000." The larger figure, he said, "was a church estimate."

An ABC spokesman said, "Our crowd estimates were based on a careful review of the capacity of the plaza—the size of two football fields—and the density." In fact, he said, "some church officials were saying the crowd numbered 200,000. That 50,000 figure you got from the embassy is a Sandinista estimate. I don't know why anyone would take it as reliable."

A top administration official said the handling of this affair by the American embassy in Managua "unfortunately confirms the view of some of us that our 'experts' are not expert enough. It casts new light," the source continued, "on the reasons the Kissinger Commission was so dissatisfied with the attitudes and the abilities of our people down there."

A highly placed White House source, told of the State Department explanation, called it "absolutely incredible—those embassy people must be asleep at the switch."

"A disgusting performance," was the reaction of a former high government official closely involved in Latin American policy matters. "But the problem goes beyond embassy ineptitude," he said.

"The real question is why is State's Bureau of Inter-American Affairs putting this curious negative spin on events in Nicaragua which should be playing into our hands and supporting our position?

"It took great courage for those people to join in such a tremendous popular manifestation," he said. "They risked being physically attacked by the turbas divinas [divine mobs]—Marxist goon squads who frequently assault people, even in church buildings, when there is any complaining about the regime."

ABC News officials stood by their story. One reporter on the scene said the State Department's "attempt to downplay the political significance of this event—the people of Nicaragua rallying around their church and their bishop in defiance of the Sandinista regime—must be because they don't know what's going on, or don't want to know.

"Anyone who saw what we saw and heard what we heard would have grasped the fact that this was an outpouring of religious fervor, but also that feeling was directed against the regime, which has been fighting the church. The leaders of the demonstra-

tion, Bishop Obando y Bravo and Father Bismarck Carballo, are symbols of resistance and frequent targets of the Sandinistas," the network reporter said.

One of the frequent chants, ABC said, was, "'We are Christians, not Marxists.' That ought to tell you something."

A high administration official confirmed this account and agreed that the State Department's view was "way off base." He recalled how American embassy staffers in Moscow "showed the same kind of blindness when they failed to read the unmistakable signs that Yuri Andropov had died. Dusko Doder [of the Washington Post] filed the story, and eight hours later our embassy there was still denying it," he recalled.

Some highlights of the original ABC report:

"The crowd of 100,000 . . . led by Archbishop Obando y Bravo, in an exquisite rebuff to Sandinista leaders who had said he was out of touch with the people . . . shouted, 'Free Nicaragua!' and 'Christ Forever!'

"None of the Sandinista leaders was present. Most are declared atheists. In a defiant gesture, the march was organized by Father Bismark Carballo, the director of communications, a priest the regime tried to discredit last year . . . The church has begun to take on the role of the church in Poland. It is becoming the focus of opposition to the Sandinista regime.

"No police were present, because the Sandinistas know the church is the one force that can rally the people against the government. For their part, the church leaders said nothing against the regime, but emphasized the need for Catholic faith which here, as in Poland, means 'No' to Marxism."

Two days after the demonstration, the bishops of Nicaragua issued an Easter pastoral letter sharply critical of the regime. The letter was bitterly attacked in the government-controlled newspaper Barricada for failing to condemn "North American imperialism," and for urging the regime "to enter a dialogue with the murderers of our people."

The bishops' letter was one of the strongest ever issued by the church against the Sandinista regime. It condemned press censorship, the detention of political prisioners, violence against the Indian minority, restrictions on religious freedom, and the collapsing economy which has caused acute shortages and rationing.●

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM BYWATER

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in June 1983 the House Subcommittee on Labor Standards conducted hearings on (H.R. 3175) my bill to provide compensation to victims of asbestos and other occupational diseases. The proceedings of those hearings were published in November 1983. During the hearings on June 13, 1983, the committee was pleased to receive testimony from the AFL-CIO, Industrial Union Department and Building and Construction Trades Department. Testifying on behalf of the Industrial Union Department was William Bywater, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, who focused among other things on the problems of occupational disease other than asbestos-related diseases, and the ways in which such diseases could be properly identified for purposes of compensation. Mr. Bywater attached an extension of testimony to his statement relating to presumptions for asbestos related diseases as well as trigger mechanisms for other toxic substances and processes which he asked to be included in the RECORD and which was accepted by the subcommittee for that purpose.

Inadvertently, that extension of testimony was not included in the published hearing record. Accordingly, I am including Mr. Bywater's additional testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will be accepted and considered part of the hearing record on H.R. 3175.

EXTENSION OF THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM BYWATER

The existing state workers' compensation system has failed to fairly compensate, usually to compensate at all, victims of occupational disease. It is important to know why this is the case.

One reason the compensation system has failed is because two fundamental concepts essential to understanding disease have not been adequately reflected in law.

The first concept is that disease cannot be explained in terms of simple, single causes and simple, single effects. The causes of disease are many and complex. So are the associated effects. Because most of us have this simplistic idea in mind when we use the term "cause," there is a growing consensus among scientists that the term should no longer be used either in scientific or lay publications. They suggest the term "risk factor" instead.

The second concept has been called "population thinking." This is a way of understanding each of us by looking at populations, that is groups to which we each belong because of some shared characteristic (such as our job or exposure to a toxic substance). This kind of thinking has shaped the information we have received from the scientist in modern times. Statistical methods have become very important in gathering and analyzing the information as it comes to us, but few laws or proposed laws have been written with this reality in mind.

Whether we are struggling with the problems of causation or trying to understand what occurs in a population, we have to deal with information as the scientist gives it to us. We must not ask that it be twisted to fit obsolescent language in our laws. Instead, we must change the law to fit the current state of science.

Compensation law has not been totally insensitive to these understandings. Thus the term "due to," "arose out of," "but for," and "the cause" usually found in compensation law should be retained only if they have been clearly qualified. One way this has been done traditionally is by the use of "presumptions."

Used fairly and consistently, presumptions defined and utilized within a compensation system will reduce reliance on the tort system. They bridge the gap created by unresolved scientific uncertainty and the ethical certainty that just claims must be paid.

The bill before us correctly makes an irrebutable presumption that asbestosis is caused by breathing asbestos because the scarring of the lung and calcification observed by the physician is typically found among exposed workers. The chance is very small that the same conditions can be found in the absence of asbestos exposure.

The bill makes the same kind of presumption for mesothelioma. Mesothelioma has in fact been associated with other fibers and, in animals, with some chemicals. But more than 95 percent of the cases studied have been associated with asbestos exposure at work or among the families of asbestos workers and other bystanders. The irrebutable presumption is justified.

In the case of asbestosis and mesothelioma, while most in the exposed population do not develop the disease, a burden of risk of disease was added by the asbestos exposure for each and every worker in the population. The size of the added burden varies, for example, with duration, extent and onset of the exposure, plus other environmental risk factors. Where the environmental factors are the same, the added burden of risk attributable to asbestos is the same and distributed uniformly throughout the entire group of workers.

The principle of Added Burden of Risk (and the irrebuttable presumption which in this case it justifies) must be applied consistently. There are no special rules of nature that set mesothelioma, for example, apart from cancers found at other sites.

Among asbestos insulation workers, regardless of personal differences such as whether they smoked or not, the risk of lung cancer associated with the exposure was more than five times the risk of lung cancer found among workers not exposed to asbestos. The added burden of risk is the same for the entire exposed population—even though the entire population will not contract lung cancer—and, therefore, an irrebuttable presumption is justified for those that do contract lung cancer.

The same case can be made for asbestos-exposed insulation workers who suffer from cancer at other sites (oropharynx, larynx, gastrointestinal tract, ovary, or kidney).

In other populations—even those involving asbestos and lung cancer—the outcome may be less certain. A presumption must be made requiring a higher level of evidence, i.e., a rebuttable presumption may be justified. The decision to apply a rebuttable rather than an irrebuttable presumption is a matter of judgement.

There are no special rules of nature reserved for the effects of asbestos. The principle of the Added Burden of Risk applies to other toxic substances and processes.

The labor movement has a moral commitment to all workers afflicted with occupational disease. We will not compromise this commitment.

A systematic way must be required to assess risk for all populations of workers, a generic approach to trigger all identified populations with a high risk of occupational disease.

We believe that the "trigger" has these elements:

1. An agent, process, or job found toxic from (a) observation of human populations or (b) experimental systems.

2. A site-specific estimate of significant risk of death or disease in a specific population exposed to the agent, process or job.

3. A presumption that a worker must be compensated when a significant, elevated risk has been found in a population, membership of the worker in the exposed population has been established, and the disease has appeared.

4. Coverage can be initiated on a case-by-case basis for reasons such as (a) incidence is unknown, (b) the uncertainties in the data for a population preclude a judgement for an entire population, and (c) when a population has not been defined or disease has appeared only in a few cases.

Neither compensation nor preventive intervention will effectively aid workers at high risk without requirement of these additional steps:

A. A survey of populations known through past studies.

B. An organized program of research to discover additional populations.

C. Maintenance of a registry of such populations.

D. Identification and notification of workers or their families who are members of registered populations.●

NUCLEAR ARMS TALKS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, if asked what they would like to see most in the arena of world affairs, a majority of Americans would undoubtedly indicate their desire for an agreement with the Soviet Union reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world. Seeking to limit the number of these devastating weapons and thereby enhancing world stability is neither a Democrat nor a Republican issue, but rather a bipartisan issue. Since the early 1960's, both Republican and Democrat administrations have pursued negotiations with the Soviets to stabilize our relationship by limiting nuclear weapons testing and by limiting strategic forces. There has been some measure of success in these negotiations. Clearly, there is much left to accomplish. The talks must continue.

Yet, we should not delude ourselves by thinking that future agreements will come easily. For one, the START and INF talks can hit snags on any number of technicalities including the question of verifiability, the definition of throw weight, and the differences in force structure. The talks are further complicated by the nature of the Soviet regime itself. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher once said that we must deal with the Soviet Union "not as we would like it to be but as it is." The differences between the Western democracies and the Soviets are both numerous and profound. Mrs. Thatcher continued: "We must not fall in the trap of projecting our morality on to the Soviet leaders. They do not share our aspirations, they are not constrained by our ethics, they have always considered themselves exempt from the rules that bind other states. Presenting themselves to the world as the fount of progress and revolution, they preside over a modern version of the early tyrannies of history. A structure so rigid that it totally precludes the normal processes of questioning, discussion, and change. They have little contact with their own people, still less with the free world."

For me, the Soviet destruction of the Korean airliner last September and particularly their subsequent rationalizations—even praise—of the attack highlight the extreme differences between our systems. There were indications prior to the KAL atrocity that progress could be made toward achieving an arms control agreement. That event, more than anything else in my opinion, dashed the hopes of those desiring such an accord.

We have now put some distance between us and that event. The harsh rhetoric on both sides has diminished somewhat. It is time for the talks to continue. As the talks resume, we must maintain a realistic appraisal of our adversary and deal with them as they are at the bargaining table. The once ardent cold warrior, Richard Nixon, was able to do so and concluded the SALT I agreement with the Soviets. If the Soviets will return to the talks in Geneva, we can with time and by focusing on areas of mutual concern, continue the march toward a lessening of world tension. The challenge before us is formidable and it demands our most serious efforts.●

ONE PERSON TOO MANY?

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, as you know rapid population growth is an issue that we often overlook. Yet, the fact is that global population is expected to increase by approximately 1.5 billion between now and the end of this century. More than 90 percent of this growth is expected to take place in the poorest nations of the world, and that could have potentially serious consequences for the availability of food, shelter, jobs and basic services, the environment, and peace and stability.

In this connection, I would like to call the attention of our colleagues to a thoughtful article by Tad Szulc that appeared in the April 29, 1984, edition of Parade magazine. With the foreign aid authorization bill scheduled for consideration this week, I hope that our colleagues will give serious thought to the implications of what is potentially an international demographic disaster, a disaster that we may be able to avert through the implementation of effective and efficient population and family planning programs.

The article follows:

ONE PERSON TOO MANY?

(By Tad Szulc)

Short of nuclear annihilation, the greatest threat to humanity is, ironically its own sheer mass. Global population grows inexorably and at a rate so prodigious that by the year 2000—only 16 years from now—the world, with its added billions, will be unable to provide adequate food and energy, let alone jobs, housing, education and health care. And what could happen by the mid-21st century (when babies born in this decade approach old age) defies imagination—unless acceptable ways are found of curtailing population growth. This is as true in a special way for the United States as it is generally for the developing Third World, which accounts for 75 percent of the world's population.

Overpopulation on the scale currently taking shape will result in new and greater famines, perhaps wars, civil strife and deep social distortions as well as massive malnutrition and disease, vast migrations and a sharp drop in living standards almost everywhere, including this country. Yet no high-priority international strategy exists to cope with these problems. Emergency assistance is essentially all that is being done by the world community.

To the U.S., where the population growth rate has leveled off, the world population explosion represents an enormous pressure on its southern borders, as tens of millions of destitute migrants from Latin American are pushed north in search of a livelihood. It adds up to one of the most serious challenges to American society.

The latest famine in Africa, the result of one of the worst and longest droughts in history, illustrates dramatically the collapse of the delicate balance between population growth and food supply. The drought, which began three years ago, was *directly* responsible for the famine, of course, but uncontrollable population increases also contribute to mass starvation.

According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, of the 150 million people who live in the 24 African countries hit by the drought, an estimated 100 million face hunger and as many as 4 million, mainly children, may die this year and next from starvation, malnutrition and related causes. In Mozambique alone, 200,000 may have died in 1983 and at least 100,000 more this year.

Demographers have long warned that massive overpopulation is a time bomb, but in 1983 the point was finally reached when the threat began to become a reality. Recent discussions with population specialists at the UN, World Bank, U.S. Bureau of the Census and Washington think-tanks reveal this gloomy picture:

The world population rose by 82 million between mid-1982 and mid-1983—an all-time record, making 1983 a demographic turning point—reaching 4.7 billion last September. This is more than twice the global population of 20 years ago. The Census Bureau projects an increase of 82.8 million in 1983/84 and 84 million in 1984/85. At this rate, world population will hit 5 billion by 1986 and 6.2 billion by 2000. Try to visualize a new China and a new India—more than six

times the population of the U.S.—swelling the ranks of humanity.

The World Bank estimates that only 23 of the 98 Third World nations will reach stationary population—no more absolute growth—toward the middle or end of the *next* century; the rest will quit growing only sometime during the *22nd* century. China, now with 1.06 billion inhabitants and already the most populated nation in the world, should attain the stationary level in 2040, with 1.43 billion. India will have 1.8 billion when it stabilizes in 2140. The U.S., its growth rates slowing down, is expected to move from its present 234 million to 289 million when we reach stationary population in 2040.

Though average annual rates of growth are decreasing in the world, the actual *numbers* are racing out of hand (because each year the base is larger for figuring percentage increase).

Already, more than half the world's people live in cities that cannot house, feed or support them. Older cities—such as Calcutta, Delhi, Mexico, São Paulo and Jakarta—are turning into urban nightmares. Since 1960, there have been 245 additional cities with populations exceeding 500,000. And rural inhabitants keep migrating to cities, where at the same time babies are being born to earlier immigrants.

This worldwide population emergency is tragic where the availability of food, shelter, health services and jobs is concerned.

Lester R. Brown, president of the Washington-based Worldwatch Institute and a leading authority on food economics, says that "the way things are going, it's quite possible that per capita food production at the end of the century will be less than today." World food production, in fact, is already declining in many key sectors compared with annual population growth. Although overall world grain production doubled between 1950 and 1973, since then, Brown points out, the output *per person* "has barely kept pace with world population growth."

In Africa, for example, per capita food production in 30 countries actually fell in 1979 and 1980, aggravating the famine. When there is starvation on a vast scale, there are no resources, including human energy, to stimulate greater food production. And as births multiply, so does the overall survival problem. Most African nations lack workable systems of food production, distribution and marketing. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization warns that unless 4 million tons of grain are rapidly supplied to 22 African countries with 145 million people, mass starvation may be inevitable.

By the end of the century, the demand for grain in the developing nations will be twice the 437 million tons required in 1980. But experts note that excessive dependence on foreign assistance discourages local food production.

And problems beget other problems. Grain and cattle production, for example, have been hurt by the huge rise in petroleum prices since 1973. Petroleum is used in the production of fertilizers, which fewer and fewer Third World farmers can afford at today's prices. Compounding the problem is worldwide soil erosion, and farmers everywhere are doing little to protect the topsoil.

In terms of nutrition, the situation is appalling throughout most of the Third World. Although physicians offer no standard measurement for required daily caloric intake, it is well below generally accepted levels in the Third World, according to the World Bank.

In addition, medical care is declining. In Ethiopia, there is one doctor per 58,490 inhabitants; in Indonesia, one per 11,530 (in the U.S., it's one for every 520).

Whereas starving Africans have no place to go to find survival, in Latin America and Asia massive migrations are increasingly the solution for the destitute. Illegal migrants from Mexico are entering the U.S. in uncontrollable numbers. During the year ending last Sept. 30, the Immigration and Naturalization Service apprehended 1.03 million illegals crossing the border from Mexico (most were Mexicans, but there were also thousands of Central Americans). And the Service, short-handed along the frontier, doesn't know how many illegal migrants elude its surveillance.

Between 2 million and 3 million illegal immigrants a year remain in the United States, more than the annual natural increase in U.S. population. Approximately 4 million crossed (or attempted to cross) the U.S. border in 1982/1983. But assuming that Mexico's economic situation will not improve markedly, it is possible that nearly 6 million will be crossing the border 15 years from now.

And between 30 million and 40 million Mexicans and Central Americans are likely to enter the U.S. illegally between now and the end of the century. Hispanics now represent an estimated 10 percent of the U.S. population; this percentage may double by the year 2000.

UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar commented recently that "if the rapid population growth in developing nations is left unchecked, it will evidently undermine all efforts for economic and social development and could easily lead to widespread depletion of each nation's basic resources."

An expert at the Center for International Research of the U.S. Census Bureau put it even more starkly: "Unless international action is undertaken rapidly to control population, I can see systems of governments breaking down."

What is being done? In August in Mexico City, the United Nations will hold its periodic World Population Conference to consider new international measures to keep population down. That the world population jumped by 700 million since the last UN population conference, in 1974, suggests the inadequacy of present world programs.

The opposition of the Roman Catholic Church to most forms of birth control and family planning is a major factor inhibiting population control, especially in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Pope John Paul II has made it clear that he will not depart from this stance, but experts say that increasingly Church views are being ignored, particularly in families suffering less poverty and having more education.

China, using draconian methods to limit families to one child, brought its annual growth rate to 1.06 percent in 1983, one of the lowest in the world. India, with 715 million, has birth-control programs, including voluntary sterilization. There are birth-control clinics in many third world countries, and contraceptives are sold by street vendors in many Asian cities.

However, the international community—and especially the U.S.—has not faced the urgent need for a coordinated world program that would bring together all aspects of the great population crisis: birth control, food and energy production, health and education.

The UN has a population division with a relatively low priority. The World Bank's efforts are confined to studies and recommendations. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization lacks adequate resources. The Reagan Administration has a Coordinator of Population Affairs—a scarcely visible operation—in the State Department's Bureaus of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs. Also buried in the State Department is a small Directorate for Health and Population in the Agency for International Development.

Lester Brown of the Worldwatch Institute charges that "there is a vacuum of leadership created by the U.S. in the population area." He adds, "There is no intellectual leadership. This administration has no people with vision to see the future if the United States were to commit itself to these problems."

Meanwhile the population time bomb is ticking. When the explosion comes at the end of this century, the United States will not escape the fallout unless we assume leadership to help our species save itself from its own blindness.●

PROFILING ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCY SERVICES CO.

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents in Orgeon who prize our State's unique heritage of natural beauty, abundant wildlife, clean air and clean water, I want to commend a company in my congressional district which has made protecting the environment literally its business—not only the company, but its president, Art Riedel.

The company is Riedel International's Environmental Emergency Services Co., and its specialty is cleaning up after other people's messes. Whether it is dioxin-contaminated soil, a toxic chemical spill, or an oil platform blowout at sea, the company's emergency units are ready to go anywhere, any time, to clean up practically anything.

Oregon was particularly fortunate to have EES to call on for help in an emergency last month, when an oil tanker in the Columbia River lost control of its steering and ran aground, puncturing its hull and spilling hundreds of gallons of oil into the river.

Thanks to the timely work of EES in containing and cleaning up the spill, an environmental catastrophe was averted. In appreciation for a job well done, and for the enlightenment of my colleagues who are concerned with protecting the environment, I ask that a recent article profiling Environmental Emergency Services Co. be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article by reporter, Steve Jenning was published April 6, in the Portland, Oreg., Oregonian.

The article follows:

RIEDEL HAZARD UNIT, EARNS REPUTATION

(By Steve Jenning)

By late last week, John R. Spencer and his crews had the huge Columbia River oil spill down for the count.

After 18 days, leakage from the Mobil Oil Corp. oil tanker that had punctured its hull on a rocky shoal just north of Portland had been confined to an area surrounding the Longview, Wash., docks. Most of the cleanup work had been done by Riedel International Inc.'s environmental hazard unit, headed by Spencer, a senior vice president.

"By the time this is read," the lanky, dark-haired Texas native said Thursday, "we'll probably have this one licked."

But as he talked, at least 37 other cleanup projects, some of them involving hazardous, toxic chemicals, in one part of North America or another, were being handled by crews from Riedel's Environmental Emergency Services Co.

Spencer said at least six of those 37 were "major jobs," ranging from the cleanup of dioxin-contaminated soils in and around Times Beach, Mo., to the removal of an industrial waste dump in Colorado.

In its 11 years as a formal entity within the $200 million per year, Portland-based, Riedel corporation, the EES unit has become a strong money-maker in a family of highly successful businesses. It also has gained a reputation as an operator that will go almost anywhere to clean up almost anything, from an ocean-borne oil slick sprung from a drilling rig blowout in the Gulf of Mexico, to the reclamation of a small Montana town virtually blown apart in the explosion of a trainload of toxic chemicals.

Estimates of the hazardous and non-hazardous materials cleanup business in North America vary from several hundred millions of dollars to over $1 billion per year. Businesses that must eradicate dangerous waste strewn in their own backyards often keep the full scope of the problem—and the cost of solving it—secret from competitors and customers.

AMONG TOP COMPANIES

But whatever the size of the market, most agree that Riedel's unit is among the top two or three such companies in the world. Riedel spokesman Daniel C. Bell, a senior vice president and generally considered company President Arthur A. Riedel's alter ego, is categorical.

"We are the leader in this industry," Bell says.

It started quite informally, about 20 years ago when Riedel tugs were called in to handle spillage problems in and around the Port of Portland. A major marine construction and general construction company, Riedel had little technical expertise in such work—just about no one had in those days. But because they were first on the scene at many spills, and because of the increasing concern about environmental damage from industrial accidents, Riedel began to hone its skills, inventing new techniques and equipment along the way.

EES was commissioned as a corporate subdivision in 1973. At the time the company managers made a risky, major investment in the fledgling unit. Almost $9 million was spent to purchase trucks, trailers and state-of-the-art cleanup equipment, and more dollars were spent to set up emergency centers throughout the United States.

The idea was to put Riedel's EES units within six hours of any potential major spill, anywhere in the country, involving port accidents, highway crashes or train wrecks.

Bell called it "something that was unique, nobody has ever tried it before." Riedel was breaking new ground, and establishing new techniques and inventing new processes and equipment along the way.

"It was magnum leap," Spencer said.

Why the move?

PRESSURE INCREASED

By the early 1970s, the environmental movement was well established, and along with it increased government funding. Government also put pressure on private business investment aimed at cleaning up industrial waste and accidents.

Riedel, by acting early, had positioned itself at the forefront of a brand-new, nationwide, growth industry. And by the end of the decade the EES division had begun to realize substantial rewards.

"A few years ago, our emphasis changed from dealing with oil spills to hazardous wastes," Bell said.

Riedel is a private company and therefore keeps confidential most of its financial profile. However, company officials noted that the EES unit's contribution to Riedel's overall revenue rose from 2 percent of the total in 1977 to 10 percent this year. Given Riedel's strong overall growth, the dollar figures are even more impressive, Bell said.

With the company now handling about 200 jobs per year, the percentage contribution may keep growing.

But Riedel is not without competitors and according to industry executives, the bidding wars for some jobs, whether privately or publicly financed, can be fierce.

"This business that we're in is going to grow faster than any other business in the United States," Spencer predicted.●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFGHANISTAN

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us can agree that human rights is an important global issue today. On a daily basis, we in Congress hear about the tragic violations of human rights in some of the countries of Central America. I deplore these violations of human liberties whenever and wherever they occur. Let us shift our focus for a moment from this hemisphere to another region of the world, and talk about human rights violations there.

The continued illegal occupation of Afghanistan, a lovely peace-loving land, and the suppression of the Afghani people is one of the great tradegies of this century. Using the pretense of having been invited into the country, the Soviets invaded. The Kremlin set up the puppet Karmal regime and occupied the country with 105,000 well-armed combat troops. The world press has carried horrible stories of Soviet forces poisoning village wells, using poison gas, and strafing innocent Afghanis with the intimidating firepower of their helicopters and armored columns. More than 1 million Afghanis have been killed.

I am particularly worried about the recent escalation of Soviet aggressiveness in the war there. Now, the Soviets are using heavy bombers and high-altitude bombing to destroy population centers and the base camps of the Mujaheddin, the Afghani freedom fighters. In order to bring that poor country to its knees, the Kremlin is willing to use any trick in the book. I believe that the Soviets are willing to kill millions more Afghani peasants in order to subdue the countryside. What can we say about the human rights abuses in that country? The world quickly found out that the Soviets do not play by the rules. They have no peace groups back home protesting their illegal activities in that once free country. Human rights is not an issue in a totalitarian state.

I praise the Afghani resistance fighters for their bravery, dedication, and perseverance. I know that they are fighting against a formidable military force with modern equipment. These Afghani freedom fighters have been forced to fight to free their people and their land from the vicelike grip to the illegal occupiers. These poorly armed freedom fighters are on the leading edge of the fight for human rights.

While all of this bloodletting goes on, the Soviet Government insists that it is a peace-loving nation which respects human rights. The Kremlin actively supports Cuban and Nicaraguan attempts to liberate the so-called oppressed people in Central America. It encourages the Sandinistas in Nicaragua to export their revolution. We should all spend some time in Afghanistan and ask the Afghani people what they think about being liberated by the Soviet Army and what the Soviet Union thinks of the human rights of the Afghani people.

With these thoughts in mind, I recommend this fine article on Soviet military involvement in Afghanistan to all of my friends.

SOVIETS USE BOMBERS IN AFGHANISTAN

The Soviet Union has launched a major new offensive in Afghanistan, for the first time using heavy bombers against the rebels in an effort to take a stronghold that has resisted six previous Soviet campaigns, administration officials said yesterday.

The pounding by Soviet Tu16 Badger bombers began Saturday morning and continued through the weekend, officials said. A column of 20,000 Soviet and Afghan army troops with 600 to 800 vehicles is now moving north through the Panjshir Valley, an area that has continued to resist communist control.

U.S. officials said the latest offensive in the Soviets' four-year effort to control Afghanistan is likely to result in high casualties on both sides, with civilians suffering most from the high-altitude bombing.

The new tactics appear to escalate a trend in which the Soviets, frustrated by the stalemated war, have resorted to heavier at-

tacks on population centers from helicopters, ground attack planes and now bombers.

In attacking the Panjshir, the Soviet Union is going after one of the prime rebel strongholds and the most renowned guerrilla commander, Ahmed Shah Massoud. Massoud, who has been called the Che Guevara of Afghanistan, may have provoked the offensive when his men recently blew up two bridges north of Kabul, the capital, officials said.

But if Massoud's action dictated the timing of the offensive, the Soviet Union had been building up to it. During the past several weeks, the Soviets increased their troop contingent in Kabul and deployed about 100 bombers on their border with Afghanistan.

The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December, 1979, and installed a friendly government in Kabul. But much of the countryside has remained hostile to the Soviet occupiers and the Afghan army that supports them, with the Mujaheddin—as the Afghan rebels are called—waging a war of attrition that seems to have grown more effective during the last four years.

The Soviets have stationed more than 100,000 troops in the country and 30,000 more along the border. They have used Mi24 Hind helicopter gunships extensively, but until this weekend had refrained from the kind of high-altitude, widespread bombing that the United States used in Vietnam in an attempt to demoralize enemy forces.

On Saturday, however, the Soviets sent about three dozen medium-range Badger bombers and a probably larger number of Su24 Fencer fighter-bombers from bases along the border to attack the Panjshir Valley. The bombardment was followed by close-in attacks from ground attack planes and helicopters, plus heavy artillery shelling, officials said.

Massoud has established a primitive resistance government in the Panjshir, and about 10,000 rebels, are said to be ensconced there, many in caves along the valley's sides.

Massoud's rebels took advantage of a semi-official truce with the Soviets last year to fortify gun positions and ammunition stores deep in the mountains, which is why U.S. officials predicted that the Badger bombing would harm villages more than Mujaheddin positions.

By early yesterday, a column of Soviet and Afghan troops reportedly had advanced as far north as Rokheh, which the Soviets had occupied for about 10 months two years ago but had abandoned under pressure from the Mujaheddin. Officials were making no predictions about how long this offensive would last.

"This is the largest attempt to go in there," one official said. "But they'll have a hard time getting them [the Mujaheddin] out of this valley."

"The Soviets as of now, after six tries, don't control the valley," another official said. "But we can't say what their goals are—whether they want to burn crops, or kill Massoud, or control the valley."

Officials also did not say how many of the attacking troops are Soviet. The Soviet Union has tended to let the Afghan army do much of the ground fighting, while the Soviets fly some aircraft and operate some of the tanks and other heavy vehicles further to the rear.●

ELI BOYER IS HONORED

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of this legislative body and the American people the outstanding contributions of Eli Boyer. I speak not only as a Member of Congress from southern California and a member of the Jewish community of Los Angeles, but also as a personal friend of Eli Boyer.

Los Angeles is proud to have Eli Boyer as a native son. After graduating from the University of California, Los Angeles, with a degree in accounting, he rapidly became an outstanding member of his profession and a leader of the community.

Eli Boyer has shared his talents and time to benefit numerous charitable and civic activities. His affiliations include membership in the national executive committee of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, acting as a national vice chairman of the Large City Budgeting Conference of the Council of Jewish Welfare Divisions, membership on key committees and the board of directors of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles and he is a member of the board of the Nathan Adelson Hospice. He has also served as vice president of the Brandeis-Bardin Institute and vice president of Temple Israel of Hollywood. His other affiliations include the boards of directors of the Los Angeles Club and French-American Chamber of Commerce as well as serving on the advisory council to the mayor for the Department of Water and Power. In the academic field, Eli Boyer serves professionally on the advisory board of the School of Business, University of California, Riverside.

On May 17, 1984, the City of Hope board of trustees will honor Eli Boyer with the Spirit of Life Award. I ask the Members to join with me in congratulating Mr. Boyer on this special occasion and in extending our good wishes to the Boyer family—his wife, Michele, and their three children. May they continue to grow together, achieve and share the joy of dedication.●

CONGRESS: BEST LITTLE SOAP OPERA ON CABLE

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article that appeared in the April 29 Outlook section of the Washington Post. The article details C-SPAN's coverage of the activities of the House of Representatives. Apparently, there is an avid, and growing, audience of Americans virtually hooked on live or tape-delayed broadcasts of our proceedings. I ask that the article, "Congress, Best Little Soap Opera on Cable," be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1984]

CONGRESS: BEST LITTLE SOAP OPERA ON CABLE

(By T. R. Reid)

Night has descended over the land of the free, and in homes from coast to coast the American people are starting their noctural tour of the dial.

"And now, heeeeeeere's. . . ."

CLICK.

". . . presents John Wayne, Lillian Gish, and Rin-Tin-Tin starring in. . . ."

CLICK.

". . . the Smashers downed the Maulers 121-97, and the Savages upset. . . ."

CLICK.

". . . presents Diana Lynn, Ronald Reagan, and Bonzo starring in. . . ."

CLICK.

". . . to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend. . . ."

CLICK.

No—wait a minute. What was that last show? Who's that big guy with the white hair and a gravel in his hand? This is Congress? On TV! And hey—this stuff is pretty interesting.

The preceding was, as they say in television, a dramatization, but it reflects a real and political potent phenomenon: More and more people every day are tuning in to the country's most unusual—and in many ways most daring—broadcasting venture, the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Networks, or "C-SPAN."

There were all sorts of dire predictions (few of which came true) five years ago when the House of Representatives first authorized C-SPAN to televise its sessions. The development nobody predicted, though, has been the emergence of a devout national cult of Congress-watchers who have simply become transfixed with the daily look at their government in action.

The cable network's regular gavel-to-gavel coverage has spawned a whole nation of "C-SPAN junkies"—ordinary Americans who spend hours every day watching their congressmen at work, either live or by late-night taped replay. Watching Congress, these viewers say, educates and elucidates. But most of all, it captivates.

"It's the most fascinating thing that's ever been on TV," says Jackie Rosenfeld, a housewife in Southfield, Mich., who found C-SPAN "by accident" one day "when we were just flipping the old dial, you know, and all of a sudden there was Tip O'Neill with his gavel."

Since then, Congress has replaced the soaps and sitcoms in her household, Rosenfeld says "We just keep it on all day. The guys [in Congress] have just become like members of the family. Even that guy whose dentures don't fit right."

Rosenfeld can't recall the name of the denture-wearer, but no matter. "We like him anyway," she says.

"It's about half a generation ahead of everything else in the media," says Marty Stiegenthaler, a devotee in Weathersfield, Conn., who moved his computer business to his home in part so that he could watch the

House while at work. "It shows you what technology can do for democracy because it brings you in direct communication with the government."

Among the 17 million homes wired for this technology is the big white one at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave.—a fact that offers at least a partial answer to the political types who have wondered aloud what President Reagan does all day.

The president evidently spends part of some days watching Congress on C-SPAN, which comes in over Channel 10 on the White House TV sets. "He's an avid viewer," says Rep. Robert S. Walker (R-Pa), himself an avid defender of Reagan's policies in Congress. "A lot of times he's said to me, 'Bob, I saw your speech on Channel 10.'"

Viewer Reagan has queued up a few time with other C-SPAN fans to telephone the studio during the network's regular call-in shows, when listeners can have live exchanges with a guest speaker. With a mixture of pride and chagrin, the network's managers recall a day last year when the President couldn't get through because too many other callers were lined up ahead of him.

While daily House coverage remains C-SPAN's main course, the network offers a number of appetizing side dishes that draw equally rapturous reviews from the audience.

C-SPAN's total budget for election coverage this year is less than CBS News will pay a single anchor man, yet the cable network has produced the most compelling and original hour of political television so far this year.

On caucus night in Iowa, C-SPAN went to one Des Moines caucus, pinned small microphones on every participant and broadcast live democracy at work—no reporter, no back-to-Dan-in-New-York, just real Americans electing their government. It was fascinating. It was inspiring. If it has been broadcast in Russia, it might have sparked a revolution. That one show conveyed the actuality of politics, and the wonder of government by the people, better than any anchor or analyst can ever hope to.

The principle C-SPAN followed that night—"let the story tell itself"—is at the core of all its coverage, and it's this that sets the network apart from the rest of TV news. The big commercial networks jump frenetically from news item to news item in constant fear that viewers will tune out by the millions if things slow down for the briefest moment. C-SPAN trusts the viewer to stay with the story; as the trade journal On Cable put it, C-SPAN "dares to be boring."

The network news shows, for example, might spend 3-4 minutes on a profile of an important congressman. PBS might give it an hour. When C-SPAN broadcast "A Day in the Life of Rep. Robert H. Michel (R-Ill.)," it gave the show a full 8½-hour day. "One interesting thing I learned was how much time he has to spend walking over from his office to vote," recalls Frances Flynn, a regular viewer in San Juan, P.R.

When Congress is not in session, C-SPAN does things like run the cameras all day in a big-city newsroom as the paper is put together or broadcast the White House News Photographers annual dinner. A few times C-SPAN has provided live coverage of the daily meeting where the C-SPAN brass decides what to televise the next day.

The non-profit public-affairs network was set up by the cable industry five years ago last month, when the House first agreed to live TV coverage of its daily sessions.

At that time, opponents predicted that TV would turn the floor debates into an irresistible stage for political showboats and gasbags. These arguments are still made in the Senate when anybody suggests that it, too, should let the American people look in on floor sessions.

So far, the effects in the House seem to have been mainly tangential. There are showboats and gasbags, but they mainly take advantage of the traditional open forums for speech-making at the beginning and end of each legislative day. Debates on actual legislation have not changed noticeably since pre-TV days.

Some House members say that they cast more informed votes now because they can follow the floor debate on TV while working in the office.

The people who have really become better informed, though, are the C-SPAN regulars all over the country who tune in to watch Congress every day.

I recently appeared on a C-SPAN call-in show and asked the regular audience about their viewing habits. They responded with a blizzard of phone calls and letters; the general message was crystallized by Shirley Baas, a retiree in Wallingford, Iowa, who wrote "it has been an ever snowballing passion in my life."

I heard from the "Watchdogs of Congress," a group of women in Sioux City, Iowa, who gather daily to watch the House do its work, and from a club called the "Older Citizens of Moore" in Moore, Okla., whose meetings center on C-SPAN. I learned of a viewer in Lubbock, Tex., who was so upset when her cable service dropped C-SPAN that she bought a $2,000 earth-station antenna to pull in the network without cable. (Other C-SPAN fans in Lubbock eventually raised such a stink that the city council ordered the cable firm to put Congress back on the schedule.)

The people at C-SPAN can't say how many such "junkies" there are. "We intentionally don't deal in numbers," says Brian Lamb, C-SPAN's president, a friendly, dapper, gray-haired, sort who could easily pass for a big-network anchor man. "We're trying to narrowcast; we're not looking for the most popular programming."

The C-SPAN people will say that the audience is growing steadily. And the growth is almost certain to continue, if for no other reason because more and more communities are getting cable television.

Representative Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), who was one of the first congressmen to discover that the House had a loyal TV following, says estimates based on Arbitron surveys indicate that about a quarter-million people watch C-SPAN every day, with millions more tuning in off and on.

In television terms, this is small potatoes. Even the lowest-rated major network shows regularly attract about 6.5 million intense and devoted people distributed in hundreds of congressional districts from Key West to Kodiac are not something to be ignored. "Most House members will travel pretty far to talk to 200 people," Gingrich says. "When I stand up on the floor, the audience might be 1,000 times that.

Accordingly, some House members have made a conscious and successful effort to appeal to the C-SPAN audience. The result has been that some congressmen who rarely penetrate the consciousness of political Washington are developing a loyal national following.

Several representatives give credit to Representative Bill Alexander (D-Ark.), a comer in the Democratic leadership ranks, for blazing this trail. About a year ago Alexander began scheduling "special orders"—long speeches that come at the end of the legislative day, when the House floor is all but empty—and alerting TV viewers ahead of time that a major speech was coming.

Alexander, though, was mainly a one-man band. This year, a group of conservative Republicans turned the Alexander solo performance into a highly orchestrated symphony. They have put together a detailed schedule of "special order" speeches on designated subjects—one of their chief topics is how Speaker O'Neill mistreats the minority Republicans—and taken their case, day after day, to the people.

The talkative Republican insurgents include Gingrich of Georgia, Walker of Pennsylvania, Daniel E. Lungren (Cal.), Connie Mack (Fla.) and Barbara Vucanovich (Nev.). The C-SPAN viewers I talked to were familiar with whole group.

"That Walker—I could listen to him all day," said Jackie Rosenfeld, the Southfield, Mich., housewife. "I have to turn the set down when Walker and those guys get up," counters Shirley Rossi, a self-described "C-SPAN junkie" in Pueblo, Colo. To the politicians, of course, the important thing is not whether a particular viewer likes or dislikes Walker, it is that this junior Republican congressman from Lancaster, Pa., is instantly recognized in Southfield, and Pueblo.

O'Neill himself made the point one day last month when he was presiding over the House. He pointed his gavel around the floor, recognizing "the gentleman from Kansas" and "the gentlelady from New York" for speeches. But when he came to Walker, O'Neill said "the chair recognizes the media star from Pennsylvania."

Some Democrats are so disturbed by the emergence of Republican "media stars" that they are talking about terminating each day's TV coverage of the House when the legislative business is finished. That would mean the "special order" speeches would no longer be televised.

O'Neill, though, wouldn't even propose such a thing. "Television is here to stay permanently now," the speaker said last month. "I think there'd be a hue and cry if you were to shut it off * * * among the senior citizens, those who are not addicted to those soap operas. They watch the Congress and they love it. It's unbelievable."

Unbelievable, perhaps, in metropolitan Washington, D.C., where only a small fraction of the population has a cable connection to bring in C-SPAN. But the daily House sessions are no longer a novelty to the C-SPAN devotees across the nation. For a growing number of people, watching Congress in session is an essential element of the daily routine.

And to these loyal viewers, C-SPAN has become an essential part of the interchange between the people of this vast democracy and their government in Washington.

"That term 'legislative junkies' is funny, but I think it underestimates the audience of C-SPAN," says Aileen Weber, a regular viewer in Colonial Heights, Va. "The people who are watching are people who have discovered how interesting and how important it is to keep track of our representatives when they make our laws. I think more people are going to learn about this, and that is going to make a big difference in our democracy. I think we'll find out that C-SPAN is the most important thing that's happened to democracy since the invention of moveable type."●

IN COMMEMORATION OF HENRY DAVID PALEY

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1984, Henry David Paley, president of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities in the State of New York passed away.

I know my colleagues from New York share my grief and sense of loss at his untimely death. Hank Paley was a warm, intelligent, fair, and decent man. He was dedicated to New York and its citizens; to bettering the educational system, and increasing the students' opportunities to advance their studies. He will be sorely missed by coworkers and friends alike.

The New York State Legislature passed a resolution which I would like to quote in part. It states:

Whereas, serving as President of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities in New York State since 1975, Henry David Paley personally directed and orchestrated a united effort aimed at assuring affordable choice among high quality postsecondary institutions; and

Whereas, today, the prosperous definition of the independent colleges and universities of this Empire State mirrors the commitment of Henry David Paley; and

Whereas, through his unswerving commitment to the aspirations and ideals of the independent colleges and universities of this Empire State, Henry David Paley did so singularly contribute to the efflorescence of educational endeavor; . . . and

Whereas this legislative body is greatly moved to join with the people of this Empire State in expressing its profoundest sorrow upon the passing of this extraordinary American, Henry David Paley . . . .

I, too, would like to express my profoundest sorrow at the passing of Hank Paley, a man we all loved and respected. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 the House voted on a procedural motion offered by Mr. CONTE to instruct the conferees appointed for House Joint Resolution 492 to simply go to conference. Certain news accounts the next day inaccurately portrayed this action as a vote on aid to El Salvador and covert aid to the Contras of Nicaragua. In fact, the vote in question was simply an attempt to get the House conferees, appointed some 20 days ago, to meet with their Senate counterparts in order to reconcile differences between the two Chambers' versions of the urgent supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture.

On March 6, the House passed House Joint Resolution 492, which appropriated $150 million for emergency food assistance for Africa through the food for peace program—Public Law 480. On April 5, the Senate passed this measure with 36 amendments and requested a conference with the House. There are many worthwhile programs—such as the women, infants, and children, WIC, feeding program and other child nutrition programs—that are affected by the House Appropriations Committee chairman's refusal to go to conference with the Senate.

The Senate added numerous amendments to House Joint Resolution 492, many of which are unrelated to the USDA program and were not included in the House version. For example, the Senate added funding for aid to El Salvador and the Contras in Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that my vote on this procedural motion is not construed as a vote for or against aid to El Salvador and Nicaragua. The aid questions were not part of the House-passed bill, nor should this vote in anyway be construed as a vote on the level of aid to the Central American countries. Indeed, the aid levels will be the subject of aid packages soon to come before the House as reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee.●

COACH CLARENCE TURNER TOPS IN NEW JERSEY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding educator and a fine man, Clarence Turner.

As the basketball coach of Camden High School, Coach Turner led his Panther squad to a record of 31–0 this past season, the best in the school's illustrious basketball history. In capping that season with a 69 to 49 victory over Kennedy High School of Paterson, Coach Turner and his team captured a State Group 4 championship. It was Turner's fifth State championship since becoming coach in 1971.

Perhaps more important than his outstanding career as a basketball coach, Clarence Turner is highly respected as an educator and friend by colleagues and students alike. In a day when educators are falsely maligned as inadequate, Clarence has served to dispel that accusation. Not only does he take great pride in turning out fine athletes, but he takes even greater pride in turning out fine men and women. We are truly grateful for his presence in Camden County.

As a fitting tribute to this fine man, the Camden High School Booster Club, along with his many friends, students and associates, will honor Clarence Turner on the evening of Wednesday, May 9 at Nero's Woodbine Inn in Pennsauken.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Clarence Turner on his success this past season, and in wishing him the best of luck in the future.●

FBI UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS NEED GREATER CONTROL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary issued its report on FBI undercover operations. The importance of this study and the validity of its findings, were underscored by the New York Times in its lead editorial of May 5, 1984, which follows. As the Times notes, there is more congressional agreement than disagreement on the problems and benefits of this technique, and "enough agreement to write some constructive legislation."

STRINGS ON FBI STINGS

Beneath the bicker of their majority and dissenting reports, Democrats and Republicans on the House Civil Rights subcommittee reach an important consensus about Government "sting" enterprises: They can be useful tools in fighting crime but need much closer supervision.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, having shunned undercover work during J. Edgar Hoover's 48-year reign, has become much more willing to launch enterprises that masquerade as rackets in order to catch criminals. The well-known Abscam snared seven former members of Congress but it was faulted by a special Senate committee last year for loose management and excessive reliance on cooperating criminals. Other stings were less successful and raised still more questions.

One glaring example is Operation Corkscrew, in which agents tried for five years to demonstrate corruption on Cleveland's municipal bench. While a joint F.B.I.-Justice Department review committee nodded, a crooked bailiff hoodwinked agents into thinking he was bribing judges to fix cases; in fact, he was pocketing the F.B.I. bribe money. That debacle occurred because the bureau ignored its own rules requiring a basis for going after the judges and tests to see that the investigation was proceeding as planned.

In Operation Colcor, agents lost all perspective in pursuing political corruption in North Carolina's Columbus County. They posed as promoters of a new restaurant, proposed a referendum to sell liquor by the drink in that dry county and passed cash to the local political boss. The referendum passed but was set aside when state officials discovered it was an F.B.I. initiative. A few

convictions were obtained, but at a great price.

How can such excesses be curbed? Democrats on the House committee want Congress to require a court order, akin to a search warrant, before anyone is targeted for a sting operation. But Republicans agreed with a unanimous Senate committee's judgment last year that truly rigorous monitoring by the Justice Department could be much more effective than a cursory judicial review of these complex undertakings.

That idea is worth testing. House Republicans would make the internal review mandatory and require Civil Rights and Civil Division attorneys among the monitors. They also want Congress to monitor this undercover work, especially the performance of the review committee. If that fails, there will be time enough to re-examine the warrant idea. Meanwhile, there's enough agreement to write some constructive legislation.●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues in this year's call to conscience vigil to bring attention to the plight of Soviet Jews seeking freedom of religion and the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

I share the concerns of all freedom loving people over the plight of Soviet Jews. I have expressed this concern by urging the Soviet authorities to adopt a more flexible policy on emigration and to live up to those basic international standards of human rights spelled out in the Helsinki accords and other documents to which the Soviet Union is a signatory. Time and again, I have written Soviet officials to urge reconsideration of individual cases of refuseniks, from various cultural backgrounds, who were imprisoned for their religious or political convictions.

Furthermore, I am concerned about recent unwelcome developments in the Soviet bloc such as increasing manifestations of officially sanctioned anti-Semitism, persecution of both prominent and less well-known refuseniks, and the continued downward trend in Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union. We must continue to raise human rights issues with the Soviets at every level and in many forums. I pledge my continued support of the U.S. Government in its efforts on behalf of Soviet Jews, and in pursuit of progress on this human rights question.●

STAR WARS LOST IN SPACE

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Richard Strout, writing in the May 4, 1984 Christian Science Monitor raises questions about the practicality of President Reagan's Star Wars strategic defense program.

I believe that Mr. Strout's brief column is worthy of attention, and I urge my colleagues to read it. His hope that discussions with the Soviets take place is one which must be pursued. After all, we are not going to make ourselves any safer here on Earth through the militarization of space.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1984]

"STAR WARS": IS THIS DEFENSE PRACTICAL?

(By Richard L. Strout)

Does President Reagan really believe in "Star Wars"? You find yourself asking that question while listening to Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger explain it at the National Press Club. It was a sophisticated audience of about 250. The questions were mostly or all doubtful. We came away wondering.

President Reagan introduced "Star Wars" unexpectedly in a nationwide TV speech March 23, 1983, in which he made the extraordinary announcement, "I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century. . . . This subject involves the most basic duty that any president and any people share, the duty to protect and strengthen the peace."

The technical name for it is "Strategic Defense Program." The irreverent immediately dubbed it "Star Wars." Up till now, Mr. Reagan said, we had depended for peace on the threat of retaliation if attacked. But what if we created a kind of permanent protective system or shield over us—the knowledge "that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies"?

Mr. Reagan was cautious about this "new hope for our children": He said, "I know this is a formidable technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century." The public found it hard to visualize. Mr. Reagan seemed to be proposing a kind of shield overhead, an astrodome of defense. People looked at each other. Said the dubious Union of Concerned Scientists, one has to believe "in a defense of stupefying complexity under the total control of a computer program whose proportions defy description, and whose performance will remain a deep mystery." It could never be tested, they noted, until the moment of actual use.

It should be remembered that nuclear defense can't be just partly or even 99 percent effective; if it is not absolute, it loses its meaning. Mr. Reagan was challenged on the subject by reporters at a press conference March 25, 1983. Rival leaders, he said, sit across a table with cocked guns. "Now," he said he would ask "the same scientists who gave us this kind of destructive power to turn their talent to neutralizing them."

Critics of Mr. Reagan ask if he is using "Star Wars" to counter the nuclear freeze groups who want less money spent on defense. Richard Halloran, a defense correspondent of the New York Times, noted in January:

"Over the last 18 months President Reagan has clearly stepped into the front ranks of those American Presidents who, since World War II, have been willing to employ military forces as an instrument of national policy." The reporter says, "He has put marines in Lebanon, mounted a show of force against Libya, ordered the invasion of Grenada, sent ships and soldiers to Central America and authorized covert use of mines off Nicaragua." In contrast to Presidents Ford and Carter, Halloran thinks Mr. Reagan "represents a return to a reliance on military power to achieve political objectives." He thinks Reagan has shown himself to be "bolder than his generals."

I looked down from the Press Club gallery trying to weigh the words of the earnest, fast-talking defense secretary who knows the President so well. Did he believe that a successful Strategic Defense Program could be developed? Mr. Weinberger said, "It must be tried." "Perhaps it won't work," he said; but remember, learned technicians said a strategic missile that could cross the Atlantic and hit a target in Europe was "impossible." How can we know what can be done?

Questions from the audience were handed up to the head table. They all spelled doubt. Mr. Weinberger remained earnest, but courteous. He criticized presidential aspirant Walter F. Mondale by name, for pooh-poohing "Star Wars" as something that would "open the heavens for warfare." Didn't he know the Russians had been trying that since 1967?

We came away wondering. President Reagan argues that his "Strategic Defense Program" shows him as peace-loving. But is it practical? An indirect commentary came on the Weinberger speech itself, which was carefully prepared and presented in the blaze of TV camera crews. But it received little press attention. Everybody yearns for the goal, but what is the next step? One comes away hoping that when the U.S. elections are over, President Reagan, a new Democratic leader, or both will meet General Secretary Konstantin Chernenko, either here or in Moscow, to talk things over.●

KEEP PURPOSE HERE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Michigan Credit Union League for 50 years of dedicated service to the people of Michigan and the credit union movement in the State.

The motto that has guided the Michigan Credit Union League since its inception on October 5, 1934, is "Keep purpose here." With this motto as its banner for half a century now, the Michigan Credit Union League has assisted its member credit unions in their continuing efforts to maintain and improve their effectiveness in providing financial services.

Today, the credit union movement is very strong throughout Michigan with

a third of the State's population on its membership rolls. There are some 800 credit unions in Michigan with combined assets of more than $5 billion, offering their members not only the ability to save and borrow at reasonable rates but a wide range of financial services as well.

However, it was not always so. When the league was organized in 1934, it was a time of severe economic dislocation in this country. There were fewer than 50 credit unions operating in the State, and the combined assets of the various organizations amounted to less than a million dollars.

The Michigan Credit Union League has been a key factor in this impressive record of growth and service, enabling Michigan credit unions to achieve by their united efforts what they could not achieve on an individual basis.

Responding to the needs of its credit union members, the league was the prime mover in all aspects of the growth process. In previous years, the league emphasized the organizing of new credit unions and the development of credit union leadership by providing people with the training and tools to carry out their tasks more effectively.

For the past two decades, the league has taken the lead in the effort to enable credit unions to serve their members as full service financial institutions. For instance, 10 years ago Michigan credit unions with the aid and support of the league led the way in the introduction of the share draft—a check-like instrument enabling credit union members to reach into their accounts without visiting the credit union office. This innovation was a major step in credit unions' efforts toward achieving parity of power with other types of financial institutions as a full service financial organization.

Over the past 50 years as the Michigan league worked to meet the needs of its members, it also developed a national reputation for leadership and innovation. The Nation's other credit union leagues have long looked to Michigan for pioneering efforts in new service concepts.

Today, the Michigan Credit Union League and its member credit unions—as are all credit unions across the country—are faced with new challenges in the areas of deregulation and computerization. But Michigan's credit union people face the uncertain future with confidence—a confidence based to a great degree on the evidence provided by their past achievements. I, too, share that confidence in their ability and I know the Michigan league and its member will again lead our Nation's credit unions in meeting these new challenges.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 50 years, the Michigan Credit Union League has developed a record of service, innovation, and leadership of which to be justly proud. I trust my colleagues will join me in congratulating the league on its golden anniversary and wish it well for the years to come.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 8, 1984, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 9

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Rosemary M. Collyer, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.
SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the environmental restoration program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections
SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold hearings on penalties involving the transportation of hazardous materials.
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposals providing certain health care benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, including S. 2514, S. 2269, S. 2210, S. 2278, and amendment No. 2850 to S. 2269, and other pending committee business.
SR-418

11:00 a.m.
*Judiciary
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 233, to grant the President's Commission on Organized Crime subpena power to require attendance and testimony of witnesses before the Commission or to require the production of information relating to a matter under investigation.
SD-226

1:30 p.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2614, to authorize funds for programs of the Indian Financing Act. S. 2619, to authorize funds for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the Indian Education Act; to be followed by a business meeting, to markup S. 1735, to provide a settlement of a conflict between the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe and owners of private property within the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation, S. 1999, to provide for the statutory designation of the position of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs and to eliminate the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and S. 2166, to authorize funds through fiscal year 1988 for Indian health care programs.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

2:30 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Leslie Lenkowsky, of New York, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency.
SD-419

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1935, proposed Cigarette Safety Study Act.
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-124

Small Business
Export Promotion and Market Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Export-Import Bank administration of SBA set-aside provisions contained in Public Law 98-181.
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

Foreign Relations
Closed briefing on space arms control issues, focusing on Soviet compliance and verification requirements.
S-116, Capitol

Judiciary
Business meeting, on pending calendar business.
SD-226

Joint Economic
To hold hearings to review how recent tax changes have affected the agriculture community, focusing on tax shelters and alternative structures.
SD-538

10:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the impact of drugs on crime.
SR-385

1:30 p.m.
* Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

MAY 14

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act (P.L. 95-190), with respect to public water supply systems and standards, and underground injection.
SD-406

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1300 and H.R. 3050, bills to revise the liabilities and uses of the Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund.
SR-328A

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the joint weapons program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant workers' union (HEREIU).
SD-342

Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on child sexual abuse issues.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Title IX of the Higher Education Act relating to educational equity
SD-430

MAY 16

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1913, S. 1994, S. 2545, and S. 2599, bills to authorize funds for and to reform certain child nutrition programs.
SD-328A

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposals to extend and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund).
SD-406

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for space programs of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the nomination of Jacqueline E. Schafer, of New York, to be a member of the Council on Environmental Quality.
SD-406

MAY 18

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1069, H.R. 555, and S. 817, bills to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve the inclusion in the rate base of a public utility of the costs of construction work in progress.
SD-366

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2157, to clarify the treatment of mineral materials on public lands.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on alleged corruption by officials of the Boilermaker's Union.
SD-430

3:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on travel for the handicapped.
SR-253

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S.J. Res. 10, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women and men.
SD-562

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

11:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1405, proposed Federal Neutrality Act of 1983.
SD-226

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Soil and Water Conservation, Forestry and Environment Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation relating to certain wilderness areas.
SR-328A

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on cost estimating and cost accounting in the Department of Defense weapons program.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for defense programs.
SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 286, to approve the "Compact of Free Association."
SD-366

JUNE 5

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review the transfer of information by the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration to other Federal and State government agencies and the examination of the collection of data by the Internal Revenue Service from private sector sources to identify cases of nonfiling or underreporting of income.
SD-342

Small Business
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of Government competition on small business
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Inspector General and Medical Inspector of the Veterans Administration.
SR-418

JUNE 7

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 138, to establish a National Commission on Teacher Education.
SD-430

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of drugs on women.
SR-325

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review the sharing agreement between the Veterans Administration and the Department of Defense, and to discuss the Veterans Administration's supply and procurement policy.
SR-418

JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation relating to veterans' compensation.
SR-418

JUNE 26

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the status of college athletic programs.
SD-430

SEPTEMBER 18

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.
SR-325

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on pornography issues.
SD-226

SENATE—*Tuesday, May 8, 1984*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 30, 1984)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious Father in Heaven, today we celebrate the centennial of the birth of Harry S. Truman, former Senator and President. We thank Thee for the memory of this very uncommon common man, remembering the international trauma under which he took office and his calm, reassuring, homespun integrity which carried us through and out of national mourning. We thank Thee for his honesty—his fearlessness—his down-to-earthness—his instinctive touch with all the people—and his deep and practical faith in God.

We thank Thee, also, our Father, for his influence as a Senator and for the influence of the Senate upon his subsequent life and service. We celebrate the significant impact which colleagues and peers in this body as well as the Senate as a whole had in equipping him for the Vice Presidency and his unique Presidency. Grant, dear God, that the Senate may continue to produce leadership of such excellence and relevance. In the name of Him by whose divine appointment each of us serves. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order and one special order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

The Senate will then resume consideration of H.R. 2163, the Boat Safety Act.

Pending is the Chiles amendment, No. 3044, to the Baker amendment, which is No. 3027. Under the previous order, at 3 p.m. today, there will be a rollcall vote on the Chiles amendment.

Rollcall votes may be expected today and throughout the week. Senators should be on notice to expect late nights this week, in an effort to complete consideration of this measure.

There are a number of other matters that require the attention of the Senate, including the budget resolution, the reciprocity bill, the FTC bill, and the Resource Conservation Recovery Act.

At some point in the near future, the Senate must deal with the debt limit. We obviously have our work cut our for us in the coming weeks.

I remind Senators that at 10 a.m. today there is a joint meeting of Congress, to commemorate the 100th birthday of President Harry S. Truman. I am sure that all join in honoring this great American President.

The majority leader will have a further announcement regarding the schedule of the Senate.

DEATH OF WILLIAM EGAN, ALASKA'S FIRST GOVERNOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, an era has passed for my State. Alaska has lost a great leader, and I have lost a long time personal friend. Gov. William Egan passed away Sunday night, a quarter of a century after he became the first Governor of Alaska.

Bill Egan was in office as we reached many of the milestones in our State's brief history. One of the principal forces in achieving statehood for Alaska, Bill served as a territorial legislator, as president of Alaska's Constitutional Convention, and was elected as a member of what we called the Tennessee plan and came to Washington as a person who might become a Member of the Senate if Alaska were admitted as a State. At that time he was called a Tennessee plan Senator.

An outspoken proponent of statehood, once Alaska was admitted to the Union Bill Egan continued his public service and in 1959 became the State's first Governor.

He served three terms as Governor. During the first period, he served two terms, which is the limitation under Alaska's constitution. He gave Alaskans the hope that statehood would work and the vigor to rebuild our territory, expand our road systems, and improve our communities. He was very much a leader during the period following the Good Friday earthquake, during which Alaska suffered great devastation.

He was elected once again to serve as Governor in 1970, and during that third term he worked for the passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act, and he helped to draw the plans for the Alaska oil pipeline.

Governor Egan will be remembered as much for those milestones in our history as he will for his always gentle and humble approach to his life and to public office. As Governor, Bill Egan was known to walk from his mansion to work every morning; and on those occasions when he needed a car, he drove it himself. Many residents of Juneau, AK's capital remember the Governor's morning strolls, when he would walk to the waterfront, sit at a local cafe, and drink coffee with the fishermen and with the visitors who arrived on the ferries. They will recall his great memory for details and names. There is not a politician who did not envy his great memory for names.

I particularly remember Bill Egan for his continuous effort to show an interest in and make time for others. He always had time to discuss the problem we were working on together when he was Governor and I served here in the U.S. Senate, as well as when I served in the State legislature.

I want to express my sadness at the passing of Alaska's first Governor, William Egan, and to send the Senate's regrets to his lovely wife, Neva.

Mr. President, at the time the statehood bill passed the Senate, there were many Alaskans in the gallery. No one gave us any signal; no one told us where to go; but at that time, the chapel of the Senate was a very popular place. All Alaskans went to the chapel, and it was there that Mrs. Egan led us in singing the Alaska flag song and the Star Spangled Banner. She has been a real companion to my lost good friend.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if any time remains, I reserve it and ask unanimous consent that if the majority leader has a statement, it appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the acting Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may re-

serve the time that is allotted to the minority leader, for his later use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS AND INCOME TAX RETURN OF SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1963, 1965, 1967, and 1970, and yearly since 1972, I have submitted for the RECORD a history of my financial holdings from the time I was first elected to the Senate in 1957 until May 1983. In order to bring the full record up to date, I submit herewith the history of my financial holdings since May 1983.

My assets include ownership of a home in Madison, WI, on which I owe a mortgage to the former owners; ownership of my home and furnishings in Washington, DC, on which I owe a mortgage to the Perpetual American Federal Savings of Washington, DC; ownership of a 1980 automobile; ownership of two checking accounts in Washington, DC, banks, one checking account in a Madison, WI, bank, and one savings account in a Madison, WI, bank. I hold State and municipal bonds totaling $70,000.

I estimate my net worth to be about $490,000.

To the best of my knowledge, this is an accurate record of my financial holdings and obligations.

I herewith submit a balance sheet showing my net worth and how it was arrived at and a copy of my 1983 Federal income tax return.

I paid $46,143 to the Federal Government in taxes on my 1983 income. In addition, I paid $14,681 to the State of Wisconsin on 1983 income.

I ask unanimous consent that the balance sheet and copy of my 1983 Federal tax return be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Net worth of Senator William Proxmire as of May 8, 1984

	Amount
Municipal and State bonds	$70,000
Three checking and one savings account:	
Washington NS&T checking	3,703
Washington Riggs checking	2,540
Madison, Wis., checking	2,000
Madison, Wis., savings	45,507
Certificate of deposit, Chevy Chase S&L	4,820
1980 Buick Regal (blue book retail value)	6,000
Personal loan, family member	9,993
3097 Ordway Street NW., Washington, D.C.:	
Assessed value	365,545
Mortgage value	(54,812)
Furnishings	20,000
118 Bradford Lane, Madison, Wis.:	
Assessed value	47,200
Mortgage value	(33,175)
Total	$489,321

1040 U.S. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURN, 1983

William & Ellen H. Proxmire, 118 Bradford Lane, Madison, Wis.

My social security number, [redacted]; spouse's social security number, [redacted]

My occupation, U.S. Senator; spouse's occupation, Coordinator.

FILING STATUS

Married filing joint return (even if only one had income).

EXEMPTIONS

Myself, 65 or over and spouse.

First names of my dependent children who lived with me: Douglas.

INCOME

7. Wages, salaries tips, etc., $118,267.

8. Interest income (also attach Schedule B if over $400 or you have any All-Savers interest), $5,939.

9a. Dividends, $107.

10. Refunds of State and local income taxes, from worksheet on page 10 of Instructions, $34.

12. Business income or (loss) (attach Schedule C), $19,096.

13. Capital gain or (loss) (attach Schedule D), $19,250.

18. Rents, royalties, partnerships, estates, trusts, etc. (attach Schedule E), $3,392.

22. Total income. Add amounts in column for lines 7 through 21, $159,301.

ADJUSTMENTS TO INCOME

24. Employee business expenses, $7,556.

25a. IRA deduction, from the worksheet on page 12, $2,000.

29. Deduction for a married couple when both work, $3,000.

31. Total adjustments, $12,556.

ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME

32. Adjusted gross income. Subtract 31 from line 22. If this line is less than $10,000, see "Earned Income Credit" (line 59) on page 16 of Instructions. If you want IRS to figure your tax, see page 3 of Instructions, $146,745.

TAX COMPUTATION

33. Amount from line 32 (adjusted gross income) $146,745.

34a. If you itemize, complete Schedule A (Form 1040) and enter the amount from Schedule A, line 28, $21,913.

35. Subtract line 34a or 34b, whichever applies, from line 33, $124,832.

36. Multiply $1,000 by the total number of exemptions claimed on Form 1040, line 6e, $4,000.

37. Taxable income. Subtract line 36 from line 35, $120,832.

38. Tax Rate Schedule X, Y, or Z, $44,418.

40. Total, Add lines 38 and 39, $44,418.

CREDITS

44. Partial credit for political contribution, $60.

48. Total credits, $60.

49. Balance. Subtract line 48 from line 40 and enter difference (but not less than zero), $44,358.

OTHER TAXES

50. Self-employment tax, $1,785.

56. Total tax, $46,143.

PAYMENTS

57. Federal income tax withheld, $34,835.

58. 1983 estimated tax payments and amount applied from 1982 return, $5,300.

63. Regulated Investment Company credit, $248.

64. Total payments, $40,383.

REFUND OR AMOUNT YOU OWE

67. Amount of line 65 to be applied to your 1984 estimated tax, $67.

68. If line 56 is larger than line 64, enter amount you owe. Attach check or money order for full amount payable to "Internal Revenue Service." Write your social security number and "1983 Form 1040" on it, $5,760

PAID PREPARER

Naron & Wagner, Chartered, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

SCHEDULE A—ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

Medical and dental expenses (Do not include expenses reimbursed or paid by others.)

4a. Doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, insurance premiums you paid for medical and dental care, etc., $1,249.

4c. Other (list—include hearing aids, dentures, eyeglasses, etc.) eyeglasses, $200.

5. Add lines 3 through 4c, $1,449.

6. Multiply amount on Form 1040, line 33, by 5% (.05), $7,337.

7. Subtract line 6 from line 5. If line 6 is more than line 5, write zero, 0.

Taxes

8. State and local income, $9,350.

9. Real estate, $4,419.

10a. General sales (see sales tax tables), $960.

12. Add lines 8 through 11. Write your answer here, $14,729.

Interest expense

13a. Home mortgage interest paid to financial institutions, $4,635.

15. Other, New & 1st Wiltn, $2,168, and DC Nat., $141, subtotal $2,309.

16. Add lines 13a through 15. Write your answer here, $6,944.

Contributions

17a. Cash contributions. (If you gave $3,000 or more to any one organization, report those contributions on line 17b.), $1,674.

20. Add lines 17a through 19. Write your answer here, $1,674.

Miscellaneous deductions

23. Tax return preparation fee $1,100.

24. Other, Prof license, $105, Bus publications, $160, and see attached, 601, Total $866.

25. Add lines 22 through 24. Write your answer here, $1,966.

Summary of itemized deductions

26. Add lines 7, 12, 16, 20, 21, and 25, $25,313.

27. If you checked Form 1040: Filing Status box 2 or 5, write $3,400, $3,400.

28. Subtract line 27 from line 26. Write your answer here and on Form 1040, line 34a. (If line 27 is more than line 26, see the Instructions for line 28 on page 21.), $21,913.

SCHEDULE B—INTEREST AND DIVIDEND INCOME

Part I—Interest income

Interest Income Other Than Interest From All-Savers Certificates

2. Other interest income (list name of payer), Lowy note, J, $117; O'Brien, J, $1,715; United Bank & Tr, J, $478; Chevy Chase S&L, H, $412; D.C. Natl Bk, J, $320; United Bk 271-601 H, $2,089; United 176-014, H, $808.

3. Add lines 1 and 2, $5,939,

Interest From All-Savers Certificates (ASCs)

8. Add lines 3 and 7. Write your answer here and on Form 1040, line 8, $5,939.

Part II—Dividend income

9. Govt. Investors, W, $107.

10. Add amounts on line 9, $107.

15. Subtract line 14 from line 10. Write your answer here and on Form 1040, line 9a, $107.

Part III—Foreign accounts and foreign trusts

16. At any time during the tax year, did you have an interest in or a signature or other authority over a bank account, securities account, or other financial account in a foreign country? No.

17. Were you the grantor of, or transferor to, a foreign trust which existed during the current tax year, whether or not you have any beneficial interest in it? No.

SCHEDULE C—PROFIT OR (LOSS) FROM BUSINESS OR PROFESSION

Name of proprietor: William Proxmire.

A. Main business activity (see Instructions), speaker; product services.

E. Accounting method: (1) Cash.

Part I.—Income

1 a. Gross receipts or sales, $18,946.

c. Subtract line 1b from line 1a and enter the balance here, $18,946.

3. Subtract line 2 from line 1c and enter the gross profit here, $18,946.

5. Add lines 3, 4a, and 4b. This is the gross income, $18,946.

Part II.—Deductions

32. Net profit or (loss). Subtract line 31 from line 5 and enter the result. If a profit, enter on Form 1040, line 12, and on Schedule SE, Part I, line 2 (or Form 1041, line 6). If a loss, go on to line 33, $18,946.

SCHEDULE C—(FORM 1040)

Name of proprietor: William Proxmire.

A. Main business activity (see Instructions), writer; product, literature.

E. Accounting method: Cash.

Part I.—Income

1a. Gross receipts or sales, $150.

c. Subtract line 1b from line 1a and enter the balance here, $150.

3. Subtract line 2 from line 1c and enter the gross profit here, $150.

5. Add lines 3, 4a, and 4b. This is the gross income, $150.

Part II.—Deductions

32. Net profit or (loss). Subtract line 31 from line 5 and enter the result. If a profit, enter on Form 1040, line 12, and on Schedule SE, Part I, line 2 (or Form 1041, line 6). If a loss, go on the line 33, $150.

SCHEDULED (FORM 1040)—CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES

Part I.—Short-term capital gains and losses—assets held one year or less

7. Short-term capital loss carryover from years beginning after 1969, $3,917.

8. Net short-term gain or (loss), combine lines 6 and 7, $3,917.

Part II.—Long-term capital gains and losses—assets held more than one year

16. Enter gain from Form 4797, line 6(a)(1), $52,041.

17. Combine lines 14 through 16, $52,041.

19. Net long-term gain or (loss), combine lines 17 and 18, $52,041.

Part III.—Summary of Parts I and II

20. Combine lines 8 and 19, and enter the net gain or (loss) here, $48,124.

21. If line 20 shows a gain, enter the smaller of line 19 or line 20. Enter zero if there is a loss or no entry on line 19, $48,124

22. Enter 60% of line 21, $28,874.

If line 22 is more than zero, you may be liable for the alternative minimum tax. See Form 6251.

23. Subtract line 22 from line 20. Enter here and on Form 1040, line 13, $19,250.

SCHEDULE E—SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME SCHEDULE

Part I.—Rent and royalty income or loss

1. Are any of the expenses listed below for a vacation home or other recreational unit (see instructions)? No.

Description of Properties (Show kind and location for each), Property A Mad Wisc-118 Brad.

3. a Rents received and Royalties received $4,680.

8. Insurance, $179.

9. Interest, $4,982.

10. Legal and other professional fees, $168.

13. Taxes (Do not include Windfall Profit Tax here. See Part III, line 37.), $1,153.

17. Total expenses other than depreciation and depletion. Add lines 4 through 16, $6,482.

18. Depreciation expense (see Instructions), or depletion, $1,590.

19. Total. Add lines 17 and 18, $8,072.

20. Income or (loss) from rental or royalty properties. Subtract line 19 from line 3a (rents) or 3b (royalties), $3,392.

22. Add properties with losses on line 20, and write the total (losses) here, −$3,392.

23. Combine amounts on lines 21 and 22, and write the net profit or (loss) here, −$3,392.

25. Total rental or royalty income or (loss). Combine amounts on lines 23 and 24, and write the total here. If Parts II, III, and IV on page 2 do not apply to you, write the amount from line 25 on Form 1040, line 18. Otherwise, include the amount in line 39 on page 2 of Schedule E, −$3,392.

Part IV.—Summary

39. TOTAL income or (loss). Combine lines 25, 29, 31, 35, and 38. Write total here and on Form 1040, line 18, −$3,392.

SCHEDULE SE—COMPUTATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAX

Part I.—Regular computation of net earnings from self-employment

2. Net profit or (loss) from Schedule C (Form 1040), line 32, and Schedule K-1 (Form 1065), line 18b (other than farming). See instructions for kinds of income to report, $19,096.

Part II.— Optional computation of net earnings from self-employment

3. Maximum income for optional methods, $1,600.

Part III.—Computation of social security self-employment tax

8. Enter the amount from Part I, line 2, or, if you elected the nonfarm optional method, Part II, line 6, $19,096.

9. Add lines 7 and 8. If less than $400, you are not subject to self-employment tax. Do not fill in the rest of the schedule, $19,096.

10. The largest amount of combined wages and self-employment earnings subject to social security or railroad retirement tax (Tier 1) for 1983 is, $35,700.

12. Subtract line 11c from line 10, $35,700.

13. Enter the smaller of line 9 or line 12, $19,096.

If line 13 is $35,700 or more, fill in $3,337.95 on line 14. Otherwise, multiply line 13 by .0935 and enter the result on line 14, .0935.

14. Self-employment tax. Enter this amount on Form 1040, line 50, $1,785.

SCHEDULE W—DEDUCTION FOR A MARRIED COUPLE WHEN BOTH WORK

	You	Your spouse
Earned income:		
1. Wages, salaries, tips, etc., from Form 1040, line 7. (Do not include any amount your spouse paid you.)	65,231	53,036
2. Net profit or (loss) from self-employment (from Schedules C and F (Form 1040), Schedule K-1 (Form 1065), and any other taxable self-employment or earned income)	19,096	
3. Add lines 1 and 2. This is your total earned income	84,327	53,036
Qualified earned income:		
4. Adjustments from Form 1040, lines 24, 25a, 26, 30, and any repayment of sub-pay included on line 31. (See instructions below.)	3,000	6,556
5. Subtract line 4 from line 3. This is your qualified earned income. (if the amount in column (a) or (b) is zero (-0-) or less, stop here. You may not claim this deduction.)	81,327	46,480
Deductions:		
6. Compare the amounts on line 5(a) and line 5(b) and write the smaller amount here. (Write either amount if 5(a) and 5(b) are exactly the same.) Do not write more than $30,000	30,000	
7. Percentage used to figure the deduction (10%)	×.10	
8. Multiply the amount on line 6 by the percentage on line 7. This is the amount of your deduction. Write the answer here and on Form 1040, line 29	3,000	

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE OF GAINS AND LOSSES

Part I.—Sales or exchanges of property used in a trade or business, and involuntary conversions from other than casualty and theft—property held more than 1 year (except for certain livestock)

3. Section 1231 gain from installment sales from Form 6252, line 21 or 29, $52,041.

5. Add lines 1 through 4 in column g and column h, $52,041.

6. Combine columns g and h of line 5. Enter gain or (loss) here, and on the appropriate line as follows:

(a) For all except partnership returns: $52,041.

ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX COMPUTATION

1. Adjusted gross income from Form 1040, or Form 1040NR, line 33 (estates and trusts, see instructions), $146,745.

2. Deductions (estates and trusts. see instructions):

b. Contributions from Schedule A, line 20, $1,674.

d. Interest expense on property used as a residence from Schedule A, line 13, $4,635.

e. (1) Interest, other than line 2d above, from Schedule A, line 16, $2,309.

(2) Net investment income, $7,636.

(3) Enter the smaller of line 2e(1) or line 2e(2), $2,309.

h. Add lines 2a(3), b, c, d, e(3), f, and g, $8,618.

3. Subtract line 2h from line 1, $138,127.

4. Tax preference items:

b. 60% capital gain deduction, $28,874.

l. Add lines 4a through 4k, $28,874.

5. Alternative minimum taxable income (add lines 3 and 4(l)) (short period returns, see instructions), $167,001.

6. Enter: $40,000, if married filing joint return of surviving spouse, $40,000.

7. Subtract line 6 from line 5. If zero or less, do not complete the rest of this form, $127,001.

8. Enter 20% of line 7, $25,400.

9. Amount from Form 1040, line 49 or Form 1040NR, line 51 (Do not include Form 1040, line 39 or 1040NR, line 42.) (estates and trusts, see instructions), $44,358.

EMPLOYEE BUSINESS EXPENSES

Part I.—Employee business expenses deductible in figuring adjusted gross income on form 1040, line 32

2. Reimbursed and unreimbursed meal, lodging, and other expenses while away from your tax home, $3,000.

6. Add lines 1 through 5, $3,000.

8. If line 6 is more than line 7, subtract line 7 from line 6. Enter here and on Form 1040, line 24, $3,000.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that I was in travel status in the Washington, D.C., area, away from my home in my home state of Wisconsin, in the performance of my official duties as a Member of Congress for ——— days during the year 1983 and that my deductible living expenses while in such travel status amounted to $3000.

Note.—(If such living expenses exceeded $3,000, the deduction is limited under section 162(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to $3,000).

EMPLOYEE BUSINESS EXPENSES

Ellen H. Proxmire.

Social security number, [redacted].

Occupation in which expenses were incurred coordinator.

Employer's name, Wash Whirl-Around.

Part I.—Employee business expenses deductible in figuring adjusted gross income on form 1040, line 32

3. Reimbursed and unreimbursed car expenses from Part II, $4,556.

6. Add line 1 through 5, $4,556.

8. If line 6 is more than line 7, subtract line 7 from line 6. Enter here and on Form 1040, line 24, $4,556.

Part II.—Car expenses (use either your actual expenses or the mileage rate).

A. Number of months you used car for business during 1983, 12 months.

B. Total mileage for months on line A, 7,000 miles.

C. Business part of line B mileage, 4,900 miles.

1. Gasoline, oil, lubrication, etc, $850.

2. Other, $5,373.

3. Total (add lines 1 and 2), $6,223.

4. Divide line C by line B, above, 70.0%.

5. Multiply line 3 by line 4, $4,356.

8. Business parking fees and tolls, $200.

9. Total (add lines 5 through 8). Enter here and in Part I, line 3, $4,556.

COMPUTATION OF EXCESS HOSPITAL INSURANCE BENEFITS TAX CREDIT

1. Total taxable Railroad Retirement Tax Act compensation for services rendered as an employee representative and total taxable compensation received as a "qualified" U.S. Government employee during the year; or $35,700, whichever is smaller (See Purpose of Form), $35,700.

2. Self-employment income reported on Schedule SE (Form 1040), Computation of Social Security Self-Employment Tax, line 13, $19,096.

5. total (add lines 1, 2, 3, and 4), $54,796.

6. Multiply amount on line 5 by .013, $712.35.

7. Maximum employee's hospital insurance benefits tax, $464.10.

8. Difference (subtract line 7 from line 6). Enter here. Also include on Form 1040, line 63, and in the margin to left of line 63, write "Form 4469", $248.25.

DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION

SECTION C.—DEPRECIATION OF NONRECOVERY PROPERTY

A. Description of property	B. Date acquired	C. Cost or other basis	D. Depreciation allowed or allowable in earlier years	E. Method of figuring depreciation	F. Life or rate	G. Deduction for this year
6. Other depreciation:						
118 Land	11/22/80	11,500				
118 Bradford	11/22/80	31,800	3,445	SL	20/00	1,590
7. Total column G, Section C						1,590
10. Total—Add lines 7, 8, and 9. Enter here and on the Depreciation line of your return						1,590

COMPUTATION OF INSTALLMENT SALE INCOME

D. Was property sold to a related party after May 14, 1980? (See instruction C), No.

Part II.—Computation of taxable part of installment sale

14. Gross profit ratio (divide line 11 by line 13) (for years after the year of sale, see instructions), .6827.

16. Payments received during year (Do not include interest whether stated or unstated), $76,228.

17. Add lines 15 and 16, $76,228.

18. Payments received in prior years (Do not include interest whether stated or unstated), $13,772.

19. Taxable part of installment sale (multiply line 17 by line 14), $52,041.

21. Subtract line 20 from line 19. Enter on Schedule D or Form 4797, $52,041.

SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE OF EMPLOYEE BUSINESS EXPENSES, WASH WHIRL-AROUND

Other auto expenses, car 1, $5,373.

Total to part II, 2106, $5,373.

EARNINGS

	Gross	Fed. WT	FICA	St. WT	City WT
U.S. Senate (H)	$65,231	$24,853		$5,624	
Wash Whirl-Around (W)	53,036	9,982	$2,392		
Totals	118,267	34,835	2,392	5,624	

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

Contributions	50 percent	30 percent	20 percent	Non-cash	Total
By check (H)	$1,255				
By check (W)	419				
Total	1,674				$1,674
Carryover	0				
Allowable	1,674				
Allowable contributions to schedule A, line 20					1,674
Other miscellaneous deductions:					
Senate office expenditures	81				
Emp. bus. expenses—wife	405				
Deed of trust	115				
Total to schedule A, line 24	601				

CAN WE REDUCE THE PROSPECTS OF NUCLEAR WAR THROUGH BUILD-DOWN?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the single vote the U.S. Senators have cast on the nuclear freeze came late last year when we voted on an amendment that put the Senate on record as preferring a so-called build-down policy for nuclear arms instead of a nuclear freeze. That vote put the two bodies of Congress in opposition to each other on arms control policy. Earlier in 1983 the House had voted by a nearly 2 to 1 margin in favor of a resolution calling on the President to negotiate a mutual, verifiable freeze on the testing, production or deployment of nuclear arms. Now the President has called on the Congress to begin the process of authorizing the appropriation of some $450 billion over the next 6 years to modernize and improve our nuclear arsenal. Where are nuclear arms control negotiations in all of this? Nuclear arms negotiations with the Soviet Union are suspended with little prospect that they will make any progress in the near future.

So here we have this great democracy of ours with the overwhelming majority of the people on record in poll after poll and in statewide referenda in all parts of the country in favor of U.S. negotiations with the Soviet Union to stop the arms race. We have the House of Representatives endorsing that sentiment by a smashing 2 to 1 margin. We have the Senate expressing preference for a build-down of strategic weapons. And yet this same Congress is called on to pass spending measures that would pour hundreds of billions of additional dollars into expanding our already massive nuclear arsenal. Can this be possible? Can the Congress actually pour these vast sums into nuclear arms and still favor a freeze on nuclear weapons? Can the Government justify spending hundreds of billions of dollars more on nuclear weapons while actually following a policy of building down our nuclear arsenal? Should not a build-down on the basis of any kind of commonsense interpretation mean that we would spend less on nuclear arms? What kind of a nuclear weapons build-down policy is it that calls for such a colossal increase in spending money for additional nuclear weapons?

The irony of this situation in this great democracy is that: There are no two great issues on which the American people are today more decisively committed than these: First, support for efforts to end the arms race and second, support of policies to reduce the immense series of deficits that confronts our Federal Government at this very moment. And yet we are engaged in a hugely expensive, deficit-exploding policy of pouring billions into increasing the sure-kill power of

our already immense nuclear arsenal. Oh yes, we cannot and should not stop strengthening our nuclear capability unilaterally. We must negotiate with the Soviet Union to make any arms control policy more than a naive exercise in unilateral disarmament.

But Mr. President, there is not the slightest indication that the administration has any intention of negotiating an agreement with the Soviet Union that would either freeze our spending on nuclear weapons or result in a significant build-down in the power to deliver a nuclear payload on the adversary. Here is why the build-down constitutes such a cruel deception. For the past 25 years we have poured hundreds of billions of dollars into our nuclear armed power.

Meanwhile, the megatonnage of that nuclear arsenal has steadily declined. The number of warheads has also fallen. We have been engaged in a build-down by the numbers. How in the world can this be? Have we been spending billions of dollars to achieve some kind of a unilateral reduction in the capability of our nuclear arsenal? No, indeed—this build-down by the numbers has given us a far more devastating nuclear force. We have made our nuclear weapons far less vulnerable to any attack by the Soviet Union and we have so improved the accuracy and reliability of our nuclear weapons that we have sharply increased our ability to take out every conceivable Soviet target. We can today take those Soviet targets out more surely and swiftly than ever. So after more than 20 years of a numbers build-down, we have massively built up the capability of our nuclear arsenal to destroy every target in the U.S.S.R. And this is precisely the kind of build-down—costing more hundreds of billions—and giving us ever greater assurance that we can destroy everything in the Soviet Union several times over—that we will buy with the half a trillion dollars we will spend on nuclear weapons over the next 6 years.

Mr. President can we doubt that the Soviet Union will follow the same course? Of course, we cannot. The arms race rushes on. As the nuclear technology competition speeds ahead we may lull ourselves to sleep with those reassuring words: build-down. We may fall for the illusion that we have found a magical system of arms control that will both permit us to pour billions of dollars into building ever bigger nuclear arsenals while at the same building down to a happy future where the nuclear arms on which we are lavishing billions will somehow dwindle and disappear.

What a self-delusion, Mr. President. This multibillion dollar program of building up nuclear weapons will not bring us arms control. It will bring us a continued nuclear arms race that will end in nuclear war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that appeared in the National Journal on March 31, 1984, entitled Watered-Down Build-Down and written by Michael R. Gordon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERED-DOWN BUILD-DOWN

For most people, the nuclear build-down is just a nice-sounding arms control concept. But it recently emerged as a hot campaign issue when Walter F. Mondale attacked Gary Hart for supporting the idea and thus legitimizing the Reagan Administration's strategic buildup.

Mondale's charge is a misleading oversimplification of Hart's record. Hart was an early supporter of the build-down, which calls for retirement of existing warheads as new ones are deployed by the United States or the Soviet Union in modernizing their arsenals. But last fall, Hart opposed the deal by which elements of the build-down were incorporated into the Administration's position at the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) in return for congressional support of the MX missile. Lately, Hart has attempted to fend off Mondale's attack with an oversimplification of his own. Hart's advertisements omit his initial support and state only his opposition to the compromise.

Behind this campaign rhetoric is a complex arms control debate. Unlike many classic disputes between "hard-liners" and "soft-liners," the build-down dispute pits moderates within the Administration against moderates on Capitol Hill.

In this debate, two tough questions confront build-down proponents. Does the treaty proposal's compromise version of build-down do too little? Would a stricter proposal be less palatable to the Soviets than the new frameworks being worked on by the State Department and Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Getting a handle on the build-down is not easy. As proposed by Alton Frye of the Council of Foreign Relations and Sen. William S. Cohen, R-Maine, the original incarnation advanced the simple proposition that two warheads be retired for evey new one deployed. It was to be implemented on an interim basis while the START talks were in progress.

The plan grew more complex as supporters tried to take into account the criticism that "stabilizing" weapons, such as slow-moving bombers, should not be reduced at the same rate as "destabilizing" nuclear systems, such as land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) with multiple warheads. Because of their quick flight time, such missiles are generally thought to have more utility as first-strike weapons—and would, conversely, be lucrative targets for a Soviet first strike.

Accordingly, build-down supporters devised a range of penalties aimed at deterring deployment of first-strike weapons in favor of stabilizing weapons. Under the revised plan, for example, deployment of a new warhead on a multiple-warhead ICBM would require retirement of two existing warheads. But less punitive ratios would be established for submarine-based warheads and those on bombers and single-warhead ICBMs. The planners would also establish contingency provisions in the event the Soviets were to halt deployment of new warheads.

Build-down proponents in the Senate—particularly, Cohen and Sam Nunn, D-Ga.—traded their support of the MX missile for the Administration's adoption of parts of the build-down concept in its START proposal. Features adopted by the Administration included the build-down penalty ratios and a generalized presidential pledge to support a "tradeoff" of restrictions on U.S. bomber weapons for restrictions on Soviet land-based missiles. But a funny thing happened to the build-down on the way to Geneva.

First, the interim implementation plan was dropped. More significantly, the penalty ratios were rendered virtually inoperative in the treaty proposal. The proposal, which aims at an ultimate reduction to 5,000 land and sea-based warheads for each superpower, calls for yearly reductions to be governed by one of two mechanisms: the penalty ratios or an over-all rate of 5 percent of each power's warhead arsenal—whichever is greater. Thus, the build-down's weighted penalty ratios, which work against destabilizing weapons, would be triggered only in the unlikely event that in a given year the ratios required retiring more than 5 percent of the U.S. warhead arsenal.

Barring an unforseen step-up in the U.S. strategic program, there would be no disadvantage in deploying destabilizing weapons such as the MX missile. The current proposal "permits both sides to pursue their modernization plans fully without great penalty," concluded a March 26 Congressional Budget Office report written by Lawrence J. Cavaiola and Bonita J. Dombey. Said an Administration official: "The Administration defanged the build-down and turned it into a traditional reduction formula."

Build-down proponent Frye argued in a recent article in Foreign Affairs that destabilization weapons would still be discouraged because "it would be foolish" for the United States to concentrate a significant number of MX warheads in silos deemed vulnerable to attack if it only had 5,000 warheads over all. That may be. But the Administration's decision to place MX missiles in existing silos testifies to its capacity to take action that its own officials and supporters have deemed wrongheaded. At any rate, the pressure to do otherwise stems from the 5,000-warhead limit in the original START proposal—not from the build-down.

Faced with these arguments, build-down proponents sometimes maintain that if the Administration adopts a more modest objective of reducing ballistic warhead levels to, say, 7,000, or if it toughens the build-down ratios, the modernization penalties might apply.

But Administration moderates foresee intense Soviet resistance to any plan that explicitly tries to seek a stiff penalty for modernizing multi-warhead land-based missiles—where the Soviets are strong—and lesser penalties on bombers and submarine weapons, in which the United States has the technological lead. The State Department would prefer to limit Soviet land-based missiles in a more indirect fashion.

None of this is to say that build-down proponents have not had a measure of success. Faced with pressure from them, from the President's Commission on Strategic Forces and from moderate forces inside the bureaucracy, President Reagan made his "trade-off" pledge, though the bureaucracy has yet to settle on exactly how such trade-off would work.

But that may be another way of saying that the best days of the build-down proponents may be behind them.

THE HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at the Kennedy Center's recent Evening of Commemoration Through the Performing Arts which recalled the Holocaust tragedy, Sigmund Strochlitz, Chairman of the Holocaust Days of Remembrance Committee, detailed plans for the creation of a Holocaust Memorial Museum in the Mall area of Washington, DC.

Elie Wiesel, Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, commented on the uniqueness and significance of such a museum:

Our museum will be a place to remember. To learn. To share. By bearing witness to the tragedy, unprecedented in the annals of history, by collecting names and memories, by studying the chronicles and messages that survived, we will try to tell the story. And in doing so, we will teach our children, and theirs, that what happened once—and because it happened once to one people—must not happen again to any people.

The erection of the Holocaust Museum is one of the many important steps we can take to educate and protect against a Holocaust recurrence. The Senate has another opportunity to help in this fight.

The Genocide Convention was written in response to the Holocaust. All of the world's major powers except for the United States have now demonstrated their approval for the treaty's basic, fundamental principle of international law; 92 nations have signed this landmark agreement.

The Genocide Convention simply condemns the destruction of an entire people and establishes procedures for trying and punishing violators.

Mr. President, the United States takes pride in its exemplary commitment to human rights and justice. In the memory of the Holocaust victims, let us further our commitment to human rights and support ratification of the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

THE FIRST OLYMPICS—ATHENS, 1896

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, with the 1984 summer Olympics just around the corner, I would like to make special mention of a very worthwhile new television miniseries, "The First Olympics—Athens, 1896." It was produced by Columbia Pictures television and will be aired on Sunday and Monday, May 20 and 21.

This is the true story of the 13 unheralded American athletes who competed in the first modern Olympic games in Athens, Greece, in 1896. It is the story of classics Prof. Dr. William Milligan Sloane who assembled the team with the most meager equipment. With Greek history books their only reference to the events, they took the 1896 Olympics by storm. The story takes place in a time when track and field events were virtually unknown in America. It traces the ragtag group of young men through their backgrounds, their pre-Olympic training, through the many nearly disabling obstacles they had to overcome and sees them to their day of reckoning in Athens, where they would bring home 9 of 12 gold medals.

"The First Olympics—Athens, 1896" was cowritten by Gary Allison and William Bast. The guest cast is headed by Louis Jourdan, who stars as the Baron Pierre de Coubertin, the visionary whose dream it is to organize an international festival of athletes and recreate the ancient games after 15 centuries. Other guest stars include Angela Lansbury and Honor Blackman and two young actors, Hunt Block and David Caruso, who portray key members of the first U.S. team. Tom McNab, athletic trainer for the 1984 British track and field team, was the trainer for the miniseries. It is interesting to compare the training methods and track and field scores of the 1896 team with present Olympic records. In 1896, Robert Garrett brought the gold home in the discus event with a hurl of 95 ft., 7½ in. During the 1976 games in Montreal, Mack Wilkins of the United States set the present record with a throw of 221 ft., 5 in.

Mr. President, in anticipation of the upcoming summer Olympics, I would like to join with our fine athletes, the people of Los Angeles, and Columbia Pictures television and commend to you "The First Olympics—Athens, 1896" on May 20 and 21.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE ATTAR

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to make my colleagues aware of the passing of a very special Rhode Islander. A man not born in America but born with the "stuff" Americans are made of.

George Attar died at the age of 42. Born in Syria, he was a man who never forgot his native culture but was tremendously proud of his American citizenship.

He looked forward to sharing the opportunities that would have laid ahead for his family in America. An untimely death stopped him from pursuing his American dream, but I am sure his family will carry his dream as they pursue theirs.

George Attar earned for himself a special place in the Armenian community in Rhode Island, and in the hearts of the many friends he had made in Pawtucket, RI, the city he loved and had chosen as his home.

George Attar in his life exemplified many of the values cherished by all Americans—love of family, willingness to work hard to realize his dreams, and a love of his community and his country.

I ask unanimous consent that a story from the Evening Times of Pawtucket, RI, of Friday, April 27, 1984, on the life of George Attar be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS DREAM RESTS NOW IN HANDS OF FAMILY

(By Karen Hupp)

PAWTUCKET.—Born in Syria and Armenian by descent, George Attar never forgot the traditions of his culture and his country.

But he loved America, treasured his citizenship and struggled for success in his adopted nation.

"George knew everything about America," his sister, Anahid, recalled last week. "And he loved Rhode Island, especially Pawtucket."

"It was his dream to live here and to bring his family here," she continued "He had chances to go where there were more job opportunities. But he wouldn't leave. He would say 'I have established my life in Rhode Island, and I want to finish it here.'"

George Attar died two weeks ago from heart failure. He was 42. The father of two small children, he had owned and operated the Hi Market on Central Avenue for the past 18 months.

His death leaves void in his close-knit family, in the Armenian community which patronized his store and among the many friends he'd made since coming to America in 1968.

And his family is convinced that George died because he worked so hard to make a place for them in their adopted country.

"He didn't think of himself, he thought of his family and others," said Anahid, interviewed in the family home at 124 Sweet Ave. Floral arrangements from George's funeral sat around the room.

"There was always a smile on his face," she continued in her lilting, accented voice. "He was a happy person. He was cruel only to his health."

George was 27, when he left Syria. Sponsored and assisted by several friends living in Pawtucket, he got a job in a pizza parlor and found a small apartment.

"George had always wanted to come to America," said Anahid, who works in Fleet National Bank's international commercial department. "America is a wonderful country, the mother of the whole world," she said. "There is more opportunity here, more freedom."

But George's American dream did not come easily.

Although he had graduated from and subsequently taught at an engineering college in Syria, he enrolled in Pawtucket's high

school equivalency program and received another high school degree.

Already fluent in Armenian, Arabic and French, he painstakingly mastered English and found a new job as a draftsman.

He eventually earned enough money to send for his mother, Satenig, his two sisters, Anahid and Lucy, and younger brother, Paul. He bought furniture and rented a large apartment in Central Falls so they could all live together.

"Family was very important to George," said Anahid. "He would look at all of us and say 'This table we cannot divide'."

Religion was also important to the young Armenian. A regular member of St. Basil's Church where he was a lay reader and chanter, George would often drop in for morning mass at St. Leo's Church on his way to work.

In 1978, George married Sylvia, a Syrian girl living in Venezuela. They'd met when she was visiting mutual friends in Pawtucket. There was no question that the couple would remain with the Attar family, so they all pooled their resources and bought the sprawling two-decker on Sweet Avenue.

"George wouldn't look anywhere else for a house but in Pawtucket," said Anahid.

But in 1982, George was laid off from C.I. Hayes in Cranston, where he'd been employed for 13 years. Now the father of two children, Leon, and Cynthia, he desperately needed work. But there were no openings in his field.

"He took it hard", said Anahid. "His wife told me he was having pain in his body; he was very, very sad. But he would not leave Rhode Island."

After four long months of job-hunting, George saw the tiny, vacant market on Central Avenue.

"We told him it would be a big adjustment, that he would not be working in his field," Anahid said. "But he said it was worse not providing for his wife and children."

So the family helped him purchase the store, which George stocked with convenience items and Armenian foods. Most days he worked from 7 to 7, although often he started earlier to purchase fresh vegetables.

The market didn't make much money. But George loved his customers, Armenians who bought the specialized foods, children who stopped in for candy, neighbors who ran in for a quart of milk.

Tragically, 1984 was the year George had been working 16 years to see.

Business was finally picking up. His son had been accepted in St. Cecilia's School, a source of great pride for the family. Best of all, George's older brother, John, the last member of the family still in Syria, was planning to come to America.

But George wasn't feeling well. He was pale and often complained of chest pains. The family tried to take over some of the heavy work at the store. But one dreary April day he collapsed and later suffered a heart attack at the hospital. He died a few days later.

"He was our backbone," said Anahid, her eyes misting. "We were blind and he gave us eyes. We were deaf, he gave us ears. He gave us the tongue to talk. We needed him to live in this country."

The Attars still aren't sure what will happen to the Hi Market. All have their own careers and though they will now take care of George's wife and children, none has the experience to run a store.

For the time being, however, Paul has taken a leave of absence from his job as a chemist to keep the store open. "George worked so very, very hard," said Anahid. "We don't want his dream to die."

REHABILITATION OF OLD AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I wish to address briefly today the effect of one provision in the tax bill passed by the Senate last month: The changes we made with respect to tax credits and depreciation for rehabilitation of older buildings and historic properties.

As one who strongly supported the original legislation in the late 1970's to grant special tax treatment to those who agree to rehabilitate historic properties, and as a supporter of the provisions in the tax bill of 1981 which greatly extended those credits and added new provisions to encourage rehabilitation of older buildings, I believe the provision we approved last month is a step backward.

I am concerned about the Senate provision for two reasons: First, the way it was done, and second, the adverse effect the Senate provisions will have upon rehabilitation if they are allowed to become law.

The Senate Finance Committee spent a great deal of time arriving at a bill which we felt was fair. After long deliberation and several votes, we agreed that raising the period over which real property can be depreciated from 15 to 20 years was an equitable provision. The real estate industry, while hardly enthusiastic about the change, generally agreed that changing the law to 20 years was preferable to other revenue-raising plans which had been put forth.

When this provision was debated on the floor—in the early morning hours of April 13—we were suddenly presented with a compromise which was billed as acceptable to all segments of the real estate industry. That, it turns out, was certainly not the case. In short, that segment of the real estate industry that specializes in rehabilitation of older buildings and historic property had been sacrificed to the interests of commercial real estate developers.

The Senate provision we passed on April 13 raises the period of depreciation for real property from 15 to 20 years for the period through December 31 of this year. The period then falls to 19 years for property placed in service in calendar year 1985 and to 18 years in calendar year 1986 and thereafter.

As part of the compromise we enacted, the revenue lost as a result of this future liberalization of depreciation is to be made up by decreasing the tax credit for rehabilitation of older buildings and by changing the accounting method used by those who rehabilitate certified historic properties. Under the Senate provisions, the tax credit for buildings over 30 years will be cut from 15 percent to 10 percent, and the credit for buildings over 40 years old will be cut from 20 to 15 percent. The tax credit for rehabilitation of certified historic properties will remain at 25 percent, but those who do the rehabilitation will be required to use a full basis adjustment when computing depreciation, rather than the half-basis adjustment enacted by Congress in 1981.

As I indicated earlier, the notion that this compromise had been agreed to by all sectors of the real estate industry is just plain wrong. Perhaps the best way to characterize what really happened is to quote a legislative spokeswoman for the National Trust for Historic Preservation who told the Washington Post that those in the industry who promoted this scheme are:

> Absolutely unscrupulous people who are content to offer up the Nation's older buildings and central cities as sacrificial lambs so that they could save a few tax dollars.

I could not agree more.

Those who instigated the compromise are among the most vocal opponents of high deficit spending—except, apparently, when it comes to their own interests, namely the tax write-offs they seek for the development of commercial property.

It should be noted that any change in the period of depreciation for real property will not affect the average homeowner in the slightest. The only ones who are affected are those who develop commercial property, including office buildings, apartment houses and shopping malls. All we have asked of these developers is that they accept a modest change in depreciation schedules; after all, until the tax bill of 1981, the period allowed for depreciation was 30 years or longer. A 20-year period is hardly a major hardship in light of the historic period allowed for the depreciation of real property.

This leads me, Mr. President, to my second point of concern over the changes resulting from the Senate compromise.

If these changes become law, they will make it that much harder for those who have been actively involved in the revitalization and rehabilitation of our older central cities and historic property.

Congress approved generous tax credits for rehabilitation of older buildings for a specific purpose: To encourage people to gamble that we can once again make older central cities viable places in which to live.

The existing tax credits for rehabilitating older property are an equalizer: They make it possible for a business to find it just as economically attractive to locate or remain in an older area as to relocate in newer facilities elsewhere. The 15- and 20-percent tax credits for rehabilitation of 30- and 40-year-old buildings are a driving force in making it possible to keep shops

and factories in our older cities, to provide jobs that are essential to areas like my part of the country. According to the Treasury Department, taxpayers claimed $250 million in tax credits for the rehabilitation of older buildings in fiscal year 1982 and $335 million in credits in fiscal year 1983. It is clear that these credits are working to encourage renewal of older buildings in many cities across the country.

The same argument can be made when it comes to historic preservation.

Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Congress has made the preservation of historic properties a national commitment. We have successively liberalized the tax laws over the years to make this possible—most notably the 25-percent tax credit approved in 1981 for rehabilitation of buildings that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Even though the 25-percent tax credit for rehabilitation of historic buildings will remain in effect if the Senate provisions approved last month become law, the accounting changes contained in the compromise proposal are counterproductive in that they will make rehabilitation of historic property somewhat less attractive.

It should be stressed, Mr. President, that it is not easy to rehabilitate an historic property. First, the property must be designated by the National Park Service as a "certified historic structure" which, in itself, can prove a time-consuming experience. Second, the rehabilitation itself must conform to the Secretary of Interior's standards for rehabilitation, to assure that the historic character of the property is not jeopardized.

Whatever the drawbacks, however, the 25-percent tax credit for rehabilitation of historic properties is working. Let me just cite a few statistics from my own State. In 1982 and 1983 alone, some 117 projects were undertaken in Rhode Island, spending a total of $46.5 million to historic rehabilitation. This is more than the total number of historic preservation projects that were undertaken in 5 years between 1977 and 1981, before the 25 percent credit was approved. Nationally, according to a recent report of the U.S. General Accounting Office on the historic credits, the estimated dollar value of investments in historic rehabilitation work has increased from a combined total of $140 million for fiscal years 1977 and 1978 to over $2.1 billion in fiscal year 1983 alone.

Clearly, it is in the national interest to continue to encourage both the preservation and rehabilitation of both historic properties and those which are merely old. Not only does such rehabilitation protect a valuable national resource—the heritage of our own history—it also gives those who want to see the rebirth of our older cities a fighting chance of success.

The Senate made a mistake on April 13. It is my hope, Mr. President, that the conference committee will undo the damage that was inflicted.

THE PRESIDENCY OF HARRY S. TRUMAN—SOME LESSONS FOR TODAY

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, today, May 8, 1984, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of America's greatest Presidents, Harry S. Truman.

Recently, I made note of the many events taking place throughout Missouri and the Nation commemorating the Truman centennial, including today's joint session of Congress.

It is important that we remember and honor Harry Truman. But it is equally important that we also take a moment to reflect upon the lessons that Harry Truman's life in general and Presidency in particular hold for us today.

President Truman often remarked that had he not entered politics, he might very well have become a teacher. In my view, Harry Truman was a teacher, in the sense that the lessons the Truman Presidency provides us are lessons that we would be wise to heed.

From the very moment he was sworn into office upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman taught us the importance of having a President who is willing to take charge and make the tough decisions. Monumental tasks greeted the new President. Abroad, a world war continued to rage. At home, social and economic changes posed challenges which President Truman would have to face.

When F.D.R. died, many people wondered aloud whether the plain-speaking man from Missouri would be able to fill his shoes. Wrote Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan in his diary, "The gravest question mark in every American heart is Truman. Can he swing the job?" More than a few Americans feared that the Presidency would overwhelm him.

But in Missouri, the President's 92-year-old mother knew better. "Harry," she said, "will get along all right."

Harry Truman quickly proved his mother correct.

Speaking to an apprehensive Nation just 4 days after F.D.R.'s death, President Truman assured the American people that the country was in safe hands. Americans, their confidence restored by the President's strong, determined voice, warmed quickly to their new leader.

And those who would work most closely with Harry Truman soon came to recognize one of his greatest traits: His ability to make a decision and stand by it. Wrote one Cabinet member, "It was a wonderful relief to see the promptness with which Truman took up each matter and decided it." Another administration official marveled at how President Truman, in just 15 minutes, had given him a "clear directive" on each of 14 different problems.

Harry Truman did not regard one of his favorite phrases, "The Buck Stops Here," as an empty cliche. Through his firmness and his decisiveness, he taught us that waffling and vacillation have no place in the Oval Office.

Within only a few months after taking office, President Truman taught us another lesson: The importance of bringing to a halt a bloody and costly world war.

Shortly after his swearing-in, the military Chiefs of Staff informed Mr. Truman that the war in Europe would last another 6 months. President Truman refused to accept this gloomy prognosis. Instead, he worked with characteristic determination for a swifter end to the fighting; 25 days after his conference with the Chiefs of Staff, Germany surrendered unconditionally.

Against Japan, the prospects for a quick conclusion to the war seemed much bleaker. But in July, the President received news of the successful explosion of an atomic bomb in the New Mexico desert. Harry Truman knew that he now shouldered an awesome burden.

"Leonard," he confided to a friend, "I am going to have to make a decision which no man in history has ever had to make. I'll make the decision, but it's terrifying to think about what I will have to decide."

True to his word, Harry Truman did not run from the decision which events had forced him to make. He knew that if he did not use the new weapon, the war in the Pacific could drag on for another year and a half, at a cost of tens of thousands of lives on both sides. And so President Truman authorized the dropping of the atomic bomb.

He had given Japan the chance to surrender first. And he had made it unmistakably clear to his advisers that only military centers were to be the targets. As he told a Senator who urged him to drop even more atomic bombs on Japan: "My object is to save as many American lives as possible but I also have a humane feeling for the women and children in Japan."

Harry Truman made the decision to use atomic weapons not out of a spirit of vengeance, but rather out of the simple desire to, in the words of his biographer Robert Donovan, "end the war quickly and save lives."

Mr. Truman did not only lead us in war. He also gave us some valuable lessons about how to conduct a peace. President Truman passionately be-

lieved that nations should settle their differences at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. Speaking in Kansas City in April of 1945, he pointed out:

> When Kansas and Colorado have a quarrel over the water in the Arkansas River they don't call out the National Guard in each state and go to war over it. They bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and abide by the decision. There isn't a reason in the world why we cannot do that internationally.

Accordingly, the concept of the United Nations had few stronger advocates than Harry Truman. In fact, Mr. Truman's first decision as President was that the conference to establish the United Nations would convene as scheduled in San Francisco despite Franklin Roosevelt's death.

After the United Nations was founded in October of President Truman's first year in office, his commitment to the organization never wavered. As he wrote to Eleanor Roosevelt in 1948, "The Charter of the United Nations is a document under which we could work and have peace * * * I am still hopeful and still working with everything I have to make the United Nations work."

Harry Truman's example teaches us that world peace is the noblest goal a nation can aspire to.

Another lesson that emerged from the Truman Presidency involves our relationship with the Soviet Union. None of Harry Truman's predecessors had to deal as extensively with the Soviets in peacetime as did President Truman.

He harbored no illusions about the Soviet system of government. He knew it was undemocratic; he knew it was repressive. "Russian communism," he wrote, "isn't communist at all but just police government pure and simple. A few top hands just take clubs, pistols and concentration camps and rule the people on the lower levels." Harry Truman knew with whom he was dealing.

President Truman also knew that agreement with the Soviets would not come easily, that he would have to show strength and resolve when going face-to-face with Joseph Stalin. He was determined, he told a friend, not to let Stalin beat him at a poker game. He recognized the difference between negotiation and appeasement. In a famous confrontation with Soviet foreign Minister Molotov, the President, as he himself put it, "explained to him in words of one syllable and in language he could understand that cooperation required agreement and concessions on both sides and that cooperation is not a one-way street."

But while Harry Truman understood the difficulties inherent in negotiating with the Soviets, he also knew something else, something that some of today's leaders often seem to forget: The future of world peace hinges upon the maintenance of a dialog between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Truman never forgot that and never failed to demonstrate a desire to pursue such a dialog. "The door is always open for honest negotiations looking toward genuine settlement," he declared to a California crowd in 1948. Privately, President Truman expressed the same sentiment. He noted in a diary entry that "I have always been willing to talk to Russia on any subject." These words held great wisdom when President Truman first wrote them; how much more meaningful they are for us today.

President Truman also taught us another lesson that has particular relevance for us here and now: How to resist successfully the spread of communism without going to war.

When World War II ended, the Soviet Union refused to withdraw its occupying army from Iran and attempted to install a puppet regime there. Some Presidents might have used force to dislodge the Russians. Harry Truman instead opted for quiet but firm diplomatic pressure. In early 1946, the Soviet Army pulled out.

The next year, 1947, found Greece and Turkey in imminent danger of falling into Communist hands. Again, Harry Truman refused to stand idly by. Appearing before Congress, President Truman asked for extensive aid to those nations. In that same speech, the President enunciated what has become known as the Truman Doctrine. He said:

> I believe it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

But, determined though he was to halt the spread of communism, Harry Truman was equally determined not to get the United States into another war. As Mr. Truman's biographer, Robert Donovan, puts it, "Truman clearly was not planning military action to contain the Soviet Union or communism. * * * The main vehicle of American influence abroad was not military but economic."

President Truman's anti-Communist actions testify to his desire to avert bloodshed. His administration's Marshall plan forestalled Communist gains in Western Europe by sending food, not guns, to the devastated nations of that region. His Berlin airlift represented a strong yet restrained measure that preserved freedom in West Berlin while minimizing the risk of war with the Soviet Union.

Harry Truman taught us that deploying troops and mining harbors need not be our only means of combatting communism.

President Truman also reminded us of the need to bolster our ties with our allies. In 1948, he took an unprecedented step when he asked the Senate to adopt a resolution declaring that U.S. policy should favor regional and collective arrangements as provided for in the United Nations Charter. Just 1 year later, representatives of 12 nations gathered in Washington to sign the North Atlantic Treaty.

"It is a simple document," President Truman said of the treaty that established NATO, "but if it had existed in 1914 and 1939, supported by the nations who are represented here today, I believe it would have prevented the acts of aggression which led to two world wars."

Mr. Truman recognized the force for good which NATO could exert upon world affairs. And NATO has indeed served us well since he helped bring about its creation nearly 35 years ago.

Harry Truman brought commonsense and pragmatism to the conduct of American foreign policy. But he also believed that foreign policy should be founded upon more than pragmatic self-interest. Harry Truman based his foreign policy upon the principles of compassion, justice, and mercy.

When he took office, he told Congress that "the responsibility of the great states is to serve and not to dominate the world." As President, Harry Truman set out to serve the world.

At the end of World War II, the nations of Europe faced severe food shortages. Mr. Truman did not turn his back on the suffering Europeans. He set up a Famine Emergency Committee, with Herbert Hoover as its honorary chairman, and asked it to find ways to reduce food consumption in this country so that we could send more food abroad. He appealed to Americans to tighten their belts, telling them that "millions will surely die unless we eat less." And he instituted measures that resulted in unprecedented amounts of food being shipped overseas to alleviate the crisis.

Nor did Harry Truman allow criticism of his relief program to deter him from doing what was right. Of one detractor, a flour manufacturer who balked at stepping up his production, the President wrote, "It is too bad that he couldn't be taken to Poland and be allowed to spend the rest of the winter and spring in a Polish village on the rations they have to eat. Maybe he would be willing to get a little more flour out of the wheat in order that he could have a slice of bread, which would look exceedingly good to him."

In the end, Europe finally recovered and began producing food once again. But the Europeans probably would not have made it through the crisis without U.S. help. According to one historian, "It is no exaggeration to say that American relief shipments in 1945-46 were the salvation of Europe." And it was Harry Truman who helped

clear the way for those shipments to take place.

The famous Marshall plan—which Winston Churchill called "the most unsordid act in history"—represents another achievement stemming from President Truman's desire to inject mercy and compassion into the realm of foreign affairs. We here in the United States perhaps have some difficulty grasping the extent of the devastation that characterized post-war Europe. Harry Truman had no such difficulty. He had visited Europe after the war. He had witnessed first-hand the bombed-out factories, the ravaged countryside, the cold and homeless people.

Mr. Truman was determined to do something about it.

In a 1947 speech at Harvard University, Secretary of State George Marshall outlined the administration's plan. The United States, he said, would take the lead in rebuilding war-torn Europe.

Some historians have portrayed the Marshall plan as some sort of intricate and complex concept. But to Harry Truman, the rationale behind the plan was simple:

> It was a plan after the Second World War to prevent the kind of thing we had happen in this part of the country after the War Between the States. . . . After the Second World War, Europe had suffered the same way we had, and that made me think that we had to help rehabilitate Europe. It had to be rehabilitated by the people who had helped destroy it. . . . People were starving, and they were cold because there wasn't enough coal, and tuberculosis was breaking out. There had been food riots in France and Italy, everywhere. And as if that wasn't bad enough, that winter turned out to have been the coldest in history almost. And something had to be done. . . . The United States had to do it, had to do it all, and the people and the Congress had to be persuaded that it was necessary.

Four years and billions of dollars later, the Marshall plan had succeeded in getting Europe back on its feet.

In his 1949 inaugural address, President Truman set forth another proposal motivated by compassion for less-fortunate people around the globe, the point 4 program. The President described point 4 as a plan to help, as he put it, "the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."

Never before in American history had such concern about the plight of the rest of the world characterized our nation's foreign policy. "Not the discovery of atomic energy," wrote the historian Arnold Toynbee, "but the solicitude of the world's most privileged people for its less privileged as vested in Truman's Point Four and the Marshall Plan . . . . this will be remembered as the single achievement of our age."

Harry Truman's actions surrounding the creation of the state of Israel also demonstrate the quest for justice which underlay his conduct of foreign policy. The atrocities of Adolf Hitler and the Nazis had uprooted thousands of European Jews, leaving them homeless. To many Jewish leaders, the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine seemed to offer a solution to the refugee problem.

Such a proposal did not meet with unanimous approval. One Senator wrote to the President expressing reservations about the idea.

Replied Harry Truman, "I sincerely wish that every Member of Congress could visit the displaced persons camps in Germany and Austria and see just what is happening to 500,000 human beings through no fault of their own."

Several of the President's own advisers also argued against the idea, claiming that America's need for Arab oil precluded United States support for a Jewish state in Palestine.

Harry Truman replied that he wanted to make his decision in the light of justice, not in the light of oil.

And Harry Truman did let justice guide his decision. He decided to endorse the creation of the Jewish state. Only 11 minutes after Israel's leaders proclaimed the independent existence of the new nation, President Truman granted it official diplomatic recognition. "Truman did not bring Israel into being," writes his biographer, Donovan. "But his decisions then and later began what eventually became a special relationship between the two countries."

In his conduct of foreign policy, then, Harry Truman had much to teach us. Hubert Humphrey put it best at a 1965 Truman award banquet in Kansas City:

> You ended World War II and brought peace to a weary and shattered world. You transformed President Franklin Roosevelt's vision of a United Nations into reality. You took the historic decision to aid Greece and Turkey when the flames of freedom had almost flickered out in that part of the world. You launched and saw through the sensational success the Marshall Plan of aid to the war-torn nations of Europe. In the best American tradition, you aided friend and former foe alike. Mr. President, you were a great builder in your years of high responsibility—a builder of peace, of a new Europe, of Israel-American friendship, and of many other things.

But the lessons of the Truman Presidency are by no means confined to foreign affairs. Harry Truman also left his mark upon domestic matters as well.

Upon taking office, President Truman pledged to continue vigorously the efforts of F.D.R. and the New Deal "to improve the lot of the common people."

Harry Truman made good on this pledge.

He fought to give a fair shake to America's working men and working women.

He fought for an agriculture program that would benefit farmers and consumers alike.

He fought for increased Federal aid to eduction, for he recognized that the quality of America's future depended upon the quality of American education.

He fought to strengthen and extend the social security system.

He fought successfully for passage of the National Housing Act of 1949, a measure designed to provide "decent homes in wholesome surroundings for low-income families now living in the squalor of the slums."

Harry Truman often ran into opposition from a stubborn and recalcitrant Congress. He did not always win his legislative battles. But he never quit fighting for what he believed in. As he told President John F. Kennedy in 1962, "You know my program was always 'Give 'em Hell' and if they don't like it give 'em more hell.'"

Perhaps no aspect of domestic policy demonstrates Harry Truman's commitment to fairness and justice more convincingly than does the issue of civil rights.

As a county judge in western Missouri, he had stood up to the Ku Klux Klan.

As a U.S. Senator, he had supported efforts to end racial discrimination.

And as President, Harry Truman launched an all-out war against inequality and injustice.

In late 1946, disturbed by the lack of progress on race relations, he appointed the President's Commission on Civil Rights to study the problem and recommend ways to tackle it. Just 1 year later, President Truman acted on the Commission's suggestions. In his "Special Message to Congress on Civil Rights"—the first such message ever given to Congress by any President—Harry Truman outlined an ambitious program designed to translate the Constitution's rhetoric into reality. He asked Congress to enact an anti-lynching law, an anti-poll tax law, a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission, a permanent Commission on Civil Rights, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. He asked for laws prohibiting discrimination and segregation on interstate trains, planes, and buses. And he informed Congress that he planned to issue an order ending discrimination in the Armed Forces.

Harry Truman's civil rights message came in 1948, right in the midst of an election year. It infuriated the South. It shattered the Democratic Party. It threatened to cost the President his job in November.

But Harry Truman refused to play politics with civil rights. In a letter to

an old Army buddy who had urged him to go easy on the civil rights issue, the President responded:

> When the mob gangs take four people out and shoot them in the back, and everybody in the country is acquainted with who did the shooting and nothing is done about it, that country is in a pretty bad fix from a law enforcement standpoint.
>
> When a Mayor and a City Marshall can take a negro Sergeant off a bus in South Carolina, beat him up and put out one of his eyes, and nothing is done about it by the State Authorities, something is radically wrong with the system.
>
> * * * I can't approve of such goings on and I shall never approve it, as long as I am here, as I told you before. I am going to try to remedy it and if that ends up in my failure to be reelected, that failure will be in good cause.

His deeply rooted sense of compassion led to his strong convictions on civil rights.

Even in the White House, Harry Truman never lost sight of who he was or where he came from. He never lost touch with the feelings, fears, and aspirations of the common people.

"It is the habit of men in high office to kowtow to the so-called big shots and to neglect the little people with no pull," he once wrote in a letter to a cousin in 1952. "When a guy comes to me with endorsements from Senators and House Members, and letters and calls from Governors and Wall Streeters, it leaves me rather cold. But when some old lady or a boy in the Army tells me what's troubling them, I go to work."

The greatness of Harry Truman lies in a large measure in this empathy for the common man.

Mr. President, I have given these speeches on the life and times of Harry Truman to pay tribute to him in his centennial year. The Economist, a British publication which I greatly admire, published an excellent retrospective on President Truman's achievements in its April 28 edition.

The article said, in part:

> The contrast between the slight opinion in which he was generally held when he took up the presidency and the towering achievements which he left behind when he departed gave rise to the unfortunate notion that the office of president of the United States has some magical quality about it that enables a small man to grow into it and become big, or an ignoble man to become noble. As has since been amply demonstrated, nothing of the kind can be expected. Truman could not have done what he did had he not, to begin with, had the right stuff in him.
>
> In my view, there is no doubt he had "the right stuff."

HARRY S. TRUMAN: A CENTENNIAL SALUTE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, it is instructive for all of us to recall the life of our 33d President on this, the centennial of his birth. Harry S. Truman failed as a haberdasher in Kansas City, MO; he succeeded brilliantly, however, as a world leader in this town against all political odds. After he left the White House we realized how long a shadow he had cast.

Winston Churchill saluted him as being responsible, more than any other man, for saving Western civilization. He had set the course of rebuilding Europe and containing Soviet aggression after World War II; his was the deciding authority that ushered in the nuclear epoch. Had we as a people heeded his counsel and example in civil rights nearly 40 years ago we might have been spared much of our national strife of a more recent period.

Yet he was a most unlikely figure for these roles. The credentials he brought to the Oval Office scarcely impressed the media of his day. Indeed, the public's regard for him was achieved in the flesh from the rear of cross-country trains that bypassed a hostile press and overrode polls and doubting punditry. His was an election victory before the dawn of our video age: Before imagery assumed dominance in the selection of national leaders. Only in retrospect was his greatness recognized by the communications channels and opinion molders of the time.

Certainly he was a late bloomer. Limited to a high school education, he worked as a railroad timekeeper and bank clerk before returning to his parents' farm; he gained his first leadership experience in his midthirties as an artillery officer in World War I. After that war he and an Army buddy borrowed money to open a clothing store but were unsuccessful. He then entered politics, but after a single 2-year term the voters turned him out of office at the age of 40. Undaunted, he ran again 2 years later for an even higher county office; under the tutelage of a dubious patron, he won. At 50, he came to Washington as a Member of this body.

In his second term he gained national prominence as a president, effective chairman of an Oversight Committee for the massive national defense program on the eve of our entry into World War II. This exposure helped to propel him into the Office of Vice President in 1944. Three months after being sworn into that Office, as he himself described it, "the Moon, the Stars, and all the planets" fell upon him, and he became President of the United States on the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The enormity of the position gave him pause but he took charge in short order. Behind a modest demeanor was an innate ability for statecraft which soon surfaced. It has often been said that he grew into the post, and this may be true to some extent. It is probably more accurate to say, however, that at age 60 Harry Truman brought to the Presidency abilities and strengths his contemporaries had not fully appreciated before. His was only a high school education in a formal sense, but he was nonetheless the most widely read person to occupy the Oval Office in recent times, with the possible exception of John F. Kennedy. He was steeped in knowledge of history and this was reflected in his wise and forceful decisions. He also brought administrative depth to the Office, fashioning modern management techniques for the White House and Cabinet that brought discipline and organization to the entire executive branch. This was a legacy to all those who followed him in that Office.

His decision to employ the atomic bomb in World War II was a fateful one that remains controversial to this day. But it was his judgment that it would save more lives for both sides than it would claim by bringing the war in the Pacific to an end. He forged a bold postwar foreign policy highlighted by the Truman doctrine; he is credited with saving Greece and Turkey from Soviet domination; he implemented the Marshall plan, which revived Europe's economy, and the Berlin airlift, so critical to all Western Europe in that period.

At home he was no less bold, if less successful. He abolished segregation in the armed services and proposed strong civil rights legislation that the country was not then prepared to accept. Nevertheless, he laid down stepping stones to end racism in our society by establishing a Federal Civil Rights Commission and appointing Supreme Court Justices who helped dismantle racism's trappings. He stood for fair play for everyone and called for statehood for Alaska and my own State of Hawaii, as early as 1946.

On a more personal note, this sense of fair play regardless of skin color or racial ancestry, I recalled only yesterday in a speech saluting Asian-Pacific American Heritage Week. Upon presenting the all-Nisei 442d regimental combat team, of which I was a proud officer, with its 7th Presidential Unit Citation and greeting the Nisei veterans at the White House, President Truman said to them:

> You fought not only the enemy, but you fought prejudice—and you won. Keep up that fight, and we will continue to win—to make this great republic stand for what the Constitution says it stands for: "The welfare of all the people all the time."

These words have inspired many veterans of that most highly decorated "go-for-broke" combat unit to become better Americans for a greater America.

The man from Missouri was a bold innovator in other fields of social legislation as well, notably health and education. But the record shows that he also recognized the limits of what was doable, both in foreign policy and in

the domestic economy; not all his successors were as gifted in this regard. Above all, he recognized his own limitations yet never allowed his self-knowledge to deter him from doing his damndest and doing what was right.

His humor and humility tempered a brusque, blunt-spoken personality. Whether one agreed with him or not, he inspired confidence among voters as a leader whose image was a valid reflection of his true character. When his term of office ended he was more than content to become once again, a plain citizen of Independence, Mo. He may not have been a charismatic leader, Mr. President, but he did give us confidence in our own greatness as a people by his own example. We could identify with him no matter what our walk of life.

It is well for all Americans to reflect on the qualities Harry S. Truman brought to the Presidency of this great country of ours during this centennial anniversary of his birth, especially in this Presidential election year. Ours is a greater country because Harry S. Truman served as its President.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my able colleague yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, what our friend from Hawaii is saying is entirely appropriate and fully deserved by Harry Truman, who was, of course, a Member of the Senate, being sworn in 1935. It is not important except to say that I had been sworn in on Capitol Hill in the House of Representatives 2 years earlier, and I came to know the man who was not only from Missouri but the man who was from the people during the years that we were in the Senate.

In the period of his service in the Senate and then when he took over the reins of the Presidency on the death of Franklin Roosevelt and then later when in his own right he was elected President of the United States in 1948, he was a man from Missouri who had grown up in the responsibilities to which he was committed. And in that election of 1948 I am glad that the citizenry of West Virginia voted for him in the majority rather than in the minority.

I believe that today's programs, the breakfast, the joint meeting of Congress, and then the graciousness of President Reagan at the White House in a later luncheon were essential to the official Truman Centennial observance. These events took place under the Truman Centennial Commission. Many Members of the Senate and House worked together on the program. Former colleagues like the Senator from Missouri, Stuart Symington, came back today to talk of Harry Truman at the joint congressional meeting.

I am privileged to join my colleague from Hawaii in this timely tribute.

Harry Truman was truly not just a man from Missouri; he was a man for the people, and that is certainly the hallmark of the years of public service that he gave. I shall always remember him, as will those who have served in the Senate and in positions within our Federal Government.

It is not enough to say he was either a great man; that might have a differing connotation in the minds of some, or that he was a good man, and yet to speak of him we must remember he was a man of character, a man of courage, a man committed to the country which he led during a most difficult period in a shrinking world.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the senior Senator from West Virginia for his contribution to this day of celebration. Being the only Senator who served with Harry Truman when he was a U.S. Senator, the word of the Senator from West Virginia carries certainly more weight than any other Member of this body, and I again join with him in the praises of that great man from Missouri.

EL SALVADOR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, today's Washington Post contains an editorial which I feel sets a very positive tone on the relationship between the United States and El Salvador.

For several weeks, we have been awaiting the outcome of the Presidential election in El Salvador. This election process has been the demonstration of democracy at work—a free and open election of the top Government officials for this Central American country. But more importantly, it signals a clear choice and a clear mandate to bring together the extreme elements in El Salvador and mold them into a cohensive, working Government unit.

I hope now that we in Congress are prepared to move forward and grant the President's request for additional aid in El Salvador.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRESIDENT TO BET ON

In Jose Napoleon Duarte, the United States has a Central American leader worth betting on. It is not just that he is El Salvador's first president with an authentic democratic mandate, and a man of high personal courage and integrity. He is committed to social reform, the eradication of human rights violations and the reconciliation of all Salvadorans interested in a peaceful and productive society—all goals of American policy.

The tasks before Mr. Duarte are formidable. To offset the continuing threat of the extreme right, he must settle down the moderate conservatives, who are important in the Salvadoran economy—without alienating his labor and peasant support. To counter the continuing war of the extreme left, he must start up his promised "dialogue" and draw in opposition elements open to democratic persuasion—without bringing on a coup. To reassure a champing American Congress, he must not only see that death squad activities keep diminishing, he must also bring to early justice those who killed the American nuns and land reform consultants.

In recent months, Congress has frozen American aid. It was waiting to see whether Mr. Duarte would beat Roberto d'Aubuisson, of the far right, and it was distracted by the furor over the mining in Nicaragua. On Nicaragua, difficult questions must still be resolved. but on El Salvador, there is no further reason for delay or, for that matter, for nickel-and-diming. A good man has won as valid an election as a realistic person can imagine in a country torn by war and social revolution. Now American policy should focus on what will help Mr. Duarte hold off the guerrillas' expected "final offensive," control his military and move toward dialogue.

Meanwhile, there is Costa Rica—democratic, poor, neutral, and lacking an army. For some time it has been the unoffending victim of Nicaraguan-sponsored subversion. Last month San Jose protested Nicaragua's "serious military attacks," conducted apparently to force the Costa Ricans to stop giving the same sanctuary to the Sandinistas' guerrilla challengers as they gave Sandinistas in their day. Now the Costa Ricans, unable politically to kick out the Contras, unable militarily to protect themselves from the Sandinistas, seek emergency aid in Washington for their border guard. they deserve it. But their appeal should also be met by an intensified diplomatic effort to keep the Central America war from getting wider.

BARBARA BUSH

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, April 6 about the very active life of Barbara Bush, the wife of the Vice President. Barbara Bush is a very special woman and many of us are honored to call her a close friend.

In spite of the many responsibilities she faces as the wife of the Vice President, Barbara Bush has dedicated much of her time and energy to the fight against illiteracy, a fight which she has taken up with tireless devotion. Barbara Bush has done much to bring to national attention the problem of illiteracy in America. And through her work with outstanding organizations such as the Literary Volunteers and Reading Is Fundamental, she is working to develop solutions to this multifaceted problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "The Active Life of Barbara Bush" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1984]

THE ACTIVE LIFE OF BARBARA BUSH

(By Enid Nemy)

WASHINGTON.—Barbara Bush is almost convinced that if not for the Secret Service men who accompany her, she would be just another face in the crowd. But when she is recognized as the wife of the Vice President, which is more often than she cares to admit, people are, she said, "very nice to me."

"I'm not a threat to them," she said, her blue eyes twinkling. "I'm not going to steal their husbands."

Mrs. Bush was working on her needlepoint in a sunny alcove in the Vice Presidential residence, on the grounds of the Naval Observatory here, when she made the remark, and both the needlepoint and the statement are typical of her style. At the age of 58 she is relaxed, humorous and direct, and when she prefers not to discuss a subject she is likely to say, "I'm not going to answer that," rather than skirt the issue.

She is also a practiced diplomat. The interview had been delayed because of backed-up airline flights, but she brushed aside apologies. She was, she said, grateful for the postponement because it had given her a morning off.

Although her activities are not widely publicized, Mrs. Bush is probably one of the busiest spouses in the Administration. Her schedule since her husband was sworn in has taken her to 53 countries and the equivalent of 16 times around the world.

HER WORK AS EDITOR OF A DOG'S LIFE

Occasionally, her travels are of a more personal nature. Her visit to New York last week, for example, was to attend a reception at the Public Library at Lincoln Center. The party celebrated the publication of "C. Fred's Story, a Dog's Life" (Doubleday & Company), a book that was supposedly written by C. Fred Bush, the family's golden cocker spaniel. Mrs. Bush is given credit for editing "slightly."

Now, with an election coming up, she is prepared to do her share of campaigning, both with her husband and on her own. "I would rather talk about a cause," she said. "But I have total faith in the President so I feel very good about campaigning for him."

She did not agree with every position taken by the President, she said, but the differences were minor. "I don't agree with George Bush about everything, but I don't talk about it," she said.

One of the issues on which she was known to differ with the President in the past was the proposed Federal equal rights amendment, which both she and her husband supported. She is still in favor of it, she said, "but I'm not as excited about it as I once was."

"I'm mature enough to back off and look at it," she said, as she added that women's struggle for equality "had done wonderful things" but had also, in some cases, been divisive.

"I don't think men and women should have children and not take responsibility," she said. "Men are going to have to take a lot more responsibility. They will have to do more as their share. But women are also going to have to learn that they have to have priorities, that they have to make choices and that they can't have everything. You can't, in my opinion, be a bank president and a full-time mother."

She realized that there were women who could not afford to stay home, she said, but she was "getting to be more conservative." She said home was so important that sacrifices should be made, perhaps for the first four or five years of a child's life. "We can't turn our backs on children," she said.

On the other hand, she added, "I thoroughly expect to vote for a woman President in my lifetime."

Did she think that her husband would be a candidate for President in 1988? Her immediate reaction was, "No, he's done that, I don't see it," but the answer was modified rather quickly to, "He'd never lose in the fall and run in 1988, but if we win, I don't know."

"It's been a very satisfying job," she said, describing her husband's term as Vice President. "This President has surprised me. We've been around Washington a long time but no President has ever carried the Vice Presidency to such a fascinating level, in my opinion. George sees the President two and three times a day and he has lots of responsibility."

Her own responsibilities have included acting as host at more than 590 events at the Vice Presidential residence and attending at least 715 others, a good many of them at the White House.

On the subject of clothes, she said that although she was interested in them, they were not a major concern. "I spend time and effort but no one thinks of me as well-dressed," she said. "It takes a lot of strain off you."

The Bushes spend perhaps two nights a week at home, when they are not traveling, and both take work upstairs with them after dinner. She works on the third floor, he on the second and, she said, "We leave the doors open and yell."

Her morning routine includes an hour of exercise. She later goes over her letters (many of which ask for recipes), plans and schedules and keeps abreast of her principal interest, wiping out illiteracy.

"Really the worst problem we have in this country is illiteracy," she said. "It's not only humiliating but costly."

She was a "cheerleader," rather than an expert, she said. She said she believed that teachers were overworked, underpaid and underpraised and she agreed with the President that criteria should be set by local boards rather than the Federal Government.

She believed, too, she said, that "every single American citizen should have to speak and understand English—otherwise they will become second-class citizens." This did not, she hastened to add, preclude learning Spanish.

What would she do upon returning to private life? Her dream, she said, is to spend six months in Texas and six at their home in Maine, where her five children and four grandchildren could visit. "It will take me about a day and a half to get used to it," she said with a laugh.

UNDERWRITERS LABORATORIES CELEBRATE 90TH YEAR

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I join with all Illinoisans in saluting Underwriters Laboratories Inc., on the occasion of its 90th anniversary.

A pioneer in product testing, the UL label on a product has become the definitive symbol of safety for the American public. UL testing of products used in the home, as well as in business and industry, has protected the lives of millions of Americans.

A world leader in product safety, UL was established in 1894 to help reduce or prevent bodily injury, loss of life and property damage. This independent, not-for-profit corporation has maintained these goals through wars, recessions, changing Government administrations and consumer needs, and rapid technological advances.

If UL's founder and first president, William H. Merrill, had not had the foresight to create UL in 1884, it would be necessary for us to do so now.

DAVID P. RANSBURG—ILLINOIS SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, 2 weeks from today the friends, colleagues, and associates of Mr. David P. Ransburg are going to gather at the Hotel Pere Marquette in Peoria, IL, to honor his designation as the "Illinois Small Business Person of the Year." Unfortunately, a commitment I have in Chicago that same evening will preclude my being able to attend. However, I did want to join with those who are able to be in Peoria that evening in paying tribute to a remarkably able, professional, and intelligent businessman. This is a great honor, not only for Dave and his family, but for the entire Peoria business community, as well.

I first came to know Dave Ransburg shortly after his move to Illinois in the early 1970's. He struck me almost immediately as a man of tremendous entrepreneurial ability. Dave is willing to get involved, he is willing to share ideas and opinions, and he is obviously concerned about his community, his State, and his Nation. In addition to being a successful and capable businessman and community leader, Dave is also a fine husband and father. It has been my pleasure to spend time with Zan Ransburg and to see young David, Jr., and Emily grow. They share in the tribute being held in Peoria.

Dave Ransburg is a great believer in the free enterprise system. He believes, as I do, that we have built a worthy and often noble society and that we must sustain it. It is a cause worthy enough to warrant the expenditure of all of our energies. Dave Ransburg is doing more than his share and is justly being recognized for his endeavors.

Dave Ransburg's life and reputation are testimonies to this vision and his ability to make things happen. He believes that the future is a place we can create—that plans are our path and actions are our vehicle. Dave's mission

is and has been to move his company, his Nation, and his world into a better future.

Dave is the president and chief executive officer of L. R. Nelson Corp., of Peoria, IL. He purchased the company in 1972 and has built it into one of the world's leading manufacturers of quality lawn and garden sprinklers, nozzles, couplings, and accessories. Nelson also sells a complete line of underground sprinkling equipment for residential and commercial applications. Nelson has manufacturing facilities in Princeville, Ill., and distribution facilities in Peoria, IL, Gainesville, FL, and Garden Grove, CA.

Dave serves as chairman of the Governor's Small Business Advisory Commission (Illinois), was founder and first president of the Independent Business Association of Illinois, and member of the Executive Committee of Illinois State Chamber of Commerce Small Business Council. He has served on seven boards of directors for community service organizations and works actively for State and national political candidates and causes.

He has a BS in engineering science from Purdue University and an MBA from Harvard University.

THE COMPANY HISTORY

The history of L.R. Nelson describes how Dave took a low growth, highly leveraged commodity business and led it in new directions. In his 11 years as the owner and chief executive officer he has achieved above average growth in the firm's basic industry—lawn and garden. He has successfully established it in a new area of that industry—landscape and turf—and he has built a strong export business. Through Dave's leadership Nelson has focused primarily on productivity of the organization using state-of-the-art technology in product development, manufacturing, systems, and marketing. This productivity has been made possible by Dave's strong regard for and belief in the people who work for him.

INVESTMENT PHILOSOPHY

Nelson actively invests in projects which will strengthen its product offerings and improve productivity.

This philosophy has served the company well. Under Dave's leadership Nelson has more than doubled its sales per dollar of invested capital. He has provided the leadership and resources required to introduce more than 60 significant new products or product enhancements in 10 major product categories.

MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION

Nelson sales department is organized into three divisions—lawn and garden, landscape and turf, and export. The U.S. divisions utilize 73 salesmen located nationally to serve all key market areas.

The lawn and garden division has almost tripled in volume and profits in the past 10 years and continues to be the largest segment of Nelson's business. Its compound growth rate of 18 percent far exceeds the industry average rate of approximately 4 percent.

A period of investment in the landscape and turf division was started by Dave soon after he purchased the company. Sales have grown approximately 30 percent each year while the industry CGR is only 10 percent.

The export division serves the Middle East, Europe, Australia, South Africa, and South America through commissioned representatives and headquarters staff.

Export sales began in 1977 and reached 6 percent of total sales in 1981. This market has remained relatively strong through the years.

PRODUCTS

Nelson markets products which provide convenient and controlled distribution of water. It works to provide customers with proprietary, high value, reliable products with unique features.

Products introduced since 1972, the year Dave purchased the company, now account for 72 percent of total sales. Dave has worked to create an environment that encourages creativity by expecting success but recognizing the right to fail.

When Dave acquired the company there were 10 active patents—all but 1 due to expire by 1980. To date, the corporation holds 18 patents and has 7 pending to issue by 1984.

TECHNOLOGY

New technology in product design has been coupled with new technology in manufacturing equipment, processes and systems.

The result has been more consistent quality, a greater capacity to respond to seasonal pressures, lower costs, lower inventory, and higher ROI.

In spite of major inventory reductions, Nelson has managed to increase its service level. At the end of fiscal 1983, the company had a 92-percent service level exceeding its own objective of 90 percent. Sales per employee, has increased more than 300 percent since Dave took over in 1972 while sales per employee in similar U.S. industries increased only 30 percent.

CUSTOMER SERVICE

Nelson is proud of its reputation for excellent customer service and reads with pride the approximately 400 "love letters" received each year from satisfied customers.

Nelson is also regarded by its suppliers as a firm committed to ethical business practices and a leader in establishing partnerships and long-term relationships. It hosts vendor seminars each year to improve communications and cooperation.

EMPLOYEES

L. R. Nelson's success can be attributed largerly to Dave's concern not only for the company, but for its people. He believes that a positive future can be created by productive, cooperative employees who plan, act, and grow together. He plays an active role in employee training and development; 70 percent of Nelson managers, supervisors, and technicians have been promoted to their current positions.

During the peak manufacturing months of January through March, Nelson employs approximately 310 people. These include 210 full-time employees, 80 salaried, and 130 hourly, plus 100 part-time workers.

PHILOSOPHY

Dave and his company have been successful over the years because they have built strong long-term relationships with employees, customers, and suppliers. Their philosophy simply stated is "Nelson People Care."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a résumé of David P. Ransburg be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF DAVID P. RANSBURG

Mr. Ransburg is the President and Chief Executive Officer of L. R. Nelson Corporation of Peoria, Illinois. Nelson is one of the world's leading manufacturers of quality lawn and garden sprinklers, nozzles, couplings and accessories. Nelson also sells a complete line of underground sprinkling equipment for residential and commercial applications. Nelson has manufacturing facilities in Princeville, Illinois and distribution facilities in Peoria, Illinois, Gainesville, Florida and Garden Grove, California.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

Selected as 1984 Illinois Small Business Person of The Year (by the SBA).

Chairman of Governor's Small Business Advisory Commission.

Chairman of Illini Chapter of Young Presidents' Organization (YPO).

Chairman of Peoria County Reelection Campaign for Senator Percy.

Board of Directors, Illinois Manufacturers Association (IMA).

Board of Directors, Associated Employers of Illinois (AEI).

Board of Directors, Independent Business Association of Illinois (IBAIL).

Board of Directors, Methodist Medical Center of Illinois Foundation.

Board of Directors, Lakeview Museum.

Republican National Committee's Small Business Advisory Council.

National Small Business Advisory Council (SBA).

Executive Committee of Illinois State Chamber of Commerce Small Business Council.

IMA's Small Manufacturers Action Council (SMAC).

Member Young Presidents' Organization (YPO).

Member Indiana Society of Chicago.

Member First Federated Church.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Founder & First President of the Independent Business Association of Illinois (IBAIL).

Chairman, Public Affairs Council, Irrigation Association.

Chairman, 1980 American Cancer Society District 2 Crusade (12 counties).

Vice Chairman, Finance Committee of Carver for Senator Committee Board of Directors, Central Illinois Industrial Association.

Board of Directors, American Cancer Society, Peoria County.

Board of Directors, W. D. Boyce Council Boy Scouts of America.

Board of Directors, Peoria Y.M.C.A.

Board & Vice President, Peoria Symphony Orchestra.

Board of Directors, Sun Foundation.

Steering Committee for the Illinois Business Regulation Project of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR).

Delegate to the 1980 House Conference on Small Business.

Member Rotary Club.

CAREER SUMMARY

International Business Machines Systems Engineer & Management Sciences Representative, 1961-1963.

United Technical Industries (aircraft R&D) Vice President, 1964-1967.

Keene Corporation (New York based diversified manufacturer) Assistant to Financial Vice President; Vice President of Administrative—Smithcraft Division, 1969-1972.

L. R. Nelson Corporation, President & Chief Executive Officer, 1972 to present.

HARVARD WINS NATIONAL RUGBY TITLE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this past Sunday the Harvard College Men's Rugby Club won the National Collegiate Championship by defeating the University of Colorado by a score of 12 to 4 in the finals at Monterey, CA. On Saturday they had defeated the Pacific Coast Champions, California State University at Long Beach, 15 to 11. I am proud of Harvard's team, especially since my oldest brother Joe and I were both members of the Harvard Rugby Club.

This marks the first time Harvard has ever won the national championship and it has been a long time coming. Harvard Rugby, founded in 1872, is the oldest rugby club in America. It also is the first time in modern history that an eastern club has won the championship, and the Harvard victory breaks a string of four championships by the University of California at Berkeley.

I am proud to take this opportunity to commend these outstanding athletes for their achievement and I join with rugby fans from Cambridge, New England, and the entire United States in saluting them for their victory.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, because of the memorial ceremony for former President Harry Truman, neither the managers nor a number of other Senators are available to proceed with the pending business at this time. I would not wish to proceed without them, obviously. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the transaction of routine morning business be extended until 11 a.m. under the same terms and conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCANDAL AND THE SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on April 27, it was announced that Victor M. Thompson, Jr., resigned his position as a member of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation. Mr. Thompson's resignation from the SFC Board of Directors came only 1 day after he resigned as SFC President, and left the Board without an operating quorum. According to press accounts, Mr. Thompson's resignation was prompted by a report by the SFC's ethics officer, which found that Mr. Thompson had violated SFC ethics policy.

When he was appointed to the SFC Board in 1981 by the President, Mr. Thompson was the chairman and chief executive officer of Utica Bankshares Corp. When the SFC Board elected Mr. Thompson as SFC president in early 1984, it had not been disclosed by Mr. Thompson that Utica Bankshares had been under investigation by the Securities and Exchange Commission since mid-1983 for allegedly overstating its profits and failing to report sizable loan losses.

It is also alleged that Mr. Thompson attempted to sell Utica bank stock to an investor who was also one of the sponsors of the Chaparrosa Ranch tar sands project, which had applied to the SFC for $400 million in loan and price guarantees. Despite this relationship, Mr. Thompson did not recuse himself from participation in SFC Board actions to advance that project through the Corporation's evaluation process.

Unfortunately, there is a postscript to this sordid story. Even though the Chairman of the SFC Board of Directors had been apprised of the allegation against Mr. Thompson, he went ahead and held a Board meeting on April 26. At that meeting it appears that Mr. Thompson participated in Board actions on projects before it.

This is only the latest in a series of scandalous revelations for which this administration has become renowned. It is not the first time that an important program has been crippled under this administration. This is not the first time an agency's credibility has been seriously undermined in this administration by the actions of high-level officials.

I am sure that many of my colleagues share my deep distress at the damage done to the Nation's synthetic fuels program by this latest scandal. I feel sure that many of my colleagues share my conviction that the Synthetic Fuels Corporation is as important today as when it was established by the Congress in 1980. Despite the short-term world oil situation, establishing a domestic synthetic fuels industry is still a key to the Nation's long-term energy security. The Synthetic Fuels Corporation should play a leading role in achieving that goal.

Decisive and immediate action is required by the President to clean up the mess at the SFC. The agency and its program are far too important to the future of this Nation to allow the current situation to continue. The President should act as quickly as possible to reestablish public confidence in the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. This can only be accomplished through new leadership on the Board of Directors. Therefore, the President should nominate a new Chairman of the Board as quickly as possible. The nominee should be of impeccable integrity, and should have broad experience and credentials in the energy industry. The President should make it clear that the new Chairman's first priority is to get the Nation's synthetic fuels program back on track.

We cannot allow another important agency to be crippled by scandal. We must not allow the legitimate and vital mission of the SFC to be jeopardized by individuals whose actions do not meet the highest standards of professionalism and integrity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials relating to this matter.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1984]

THE SYNFUELS FIASCO

The affairs of the unfortunate Synthetic Fuels Corporation have gone from bad to lu-

dicrous. Now its president, Victor M. Thompson, Jr., has resigned in response to allegations of improprieties. That leaves it once again in a state of paralysis, since its board of directors no longer has a quorum. It lacked a quorum through most of the Reagan administration's first year in office and, to no one's surprise, has never picked up much momentum.

Shortly before Mr. Thompson's resignation, the board voted on two major projects with the bare minimum of four votes legally required. Another of those votes was cast by Mr. Thompson's predecessor, Victor A. Schroeder, who had resigned last summer as president—although not a director—in an earlier dispute over ethics. A third vote was that of the board's chairman, Edward E. Noble, an associate of both Mr. Thompson and Mr. Schroeder for some years, who had helped pick first one and then the other for the corporation's presidency. The most useful service that Mr. Noble and Mr. Schroeder can offer the Synfuels Corp. at this point is to follow Mr. Thompson's example and resign, allowing the White House a free hand in reconstituting the board.

The ultimate responsibility for the state of the Synfuels Corp. belongs, inevitably, to the White House. All of these people were appointed by Mr. Reagan and it is up to Mr. Reagan to bring a different kind of direction to the agency.

The Synfuels Corp. was established after the 1979 oil crisis to develop systems for producing synthetics on an industrial scale as insurance against further disruptions in foreign oil supplies. So far it has accomplished very little. But its purpose remains as valid today, and as relevant to national security, as it was five years ago.

The Reagan administration is spending very large amounts of money to provide arms for the military forces, but it has never shown much interest in the closely related question of energy security. The administration is currently cutting the rate of filling the strategic petroleum reserve, although slack oil markets and last year's drop in oil prices make it a highly opportune time to proceed rapidly. Similarly, the administration has given very little attention to synthetic fuels or to the agency that is supposed to be developing a national capacity to produce them. There is a pattern here that reaches well beyond the internal troubles of one obscure agency and its successive president's conduct.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 7, 1984]

SYNFUELS' SYNTHETIC LEADERS

Twice now within a year the Synthetic Fuels Corp., created by Congress in 1980 to build a base for lessening U.S. dependence on foreign oil, has been thrown for a loop by a cloudy resignation of its president.

With only two months on the job, Victor M. Thompson, Jr. quit April 26 after an internal report found that he had violated ethical standards by failing to disclose that an Oklahoma bank he formerly headed was being investigated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Mr. Thompson said he would remain on the corporation's board of directors, but the following day had the good sense to resign from the board, too. His predecessor in the $135,000-a-year post, Victor A. Schroeder, a former Atlanta real estate developer, resigned last August amid charges that he mismanaged the agency, but he has remained on the board of directors.

Thus the Synfuels Corp.'s condition goes from bad to worse. In three years of management by Reagan administration appointees it has made little progress toward its original goal, which was to spur commercial production of substitutes for natural gas or oil from oil shale, coal and tar sands.

Entrepreneurial interest in synthetic fuel has fallen in recent years because development involves risky, high-cost technologies, because oil prices have plummeted, and for other complex reasons. But the allegations of improprieties and mismanagement have unduly hobbled the agency. Board chairman Edward E. Noble, who was instrumental in selecting Mr. Thompson and Mr. Schroeder, served on President Reagan's transition team and in that capacity had urged that Synfuels Corp. be terminated.

Congress has become impatient with the agency's performance to the point that bills to suspend its authority to commit federal funds are gaining support in both the House and the Senate. Nevertheless, Synfuel Corp.'s mission is an important part of the nation's effort to achieve energy independence and remains as vital today as it was when the agency was created in response to the 1979 nationwide shortage of gasoline.

Mr. Noble and Mr. Schroeder would do the nation a distinct favor by quitting the board, and President Reagan has a clear responsibility to nominate new directors who are sound on ethics, strong on effective management and committed to furthering development of synthetic fuel.

HARRY E. DUGAN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Harry E. Dugan has been chosen as the West Virginia Small Business Person of the Year. Mr. Dugan is the founder of Dugan Enterprises, Inc., which now includes three retail grocery stores in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia. I take particular pleasure in Mr. Dugan's selection because of my own experiences in the same line of business. I know, firsthand, the long hours and hard work that a retail grocery business requires if it is to be successful.

We in the Senate are often reminded of the importance of small business to our economic progress. Small business has created almost all of the additional employment that we have achieved over the last 3 years, and Mr. Dugan has played his part. He opened his first store in Berkeley Springs, WV, in 1970. Since then, Dugan Enterprises has opened two other stores, one in Romney and another in Hedgesville, WV. Last year, the business grossed $5 million and employed 60 people. I congratulate Mr. Dugan on his success and the recognition he has deservedly received.

Despite the significance of small businesses to our overall economy—they represent 98 percent of 11 million businesses in the United States and produce over 40 percent of our gross national product—despite the importance of small business to our Nation's employment problems—small business accounts for over one-half of the country's business employment—despite these things, the current administration has generally ignored small business problems. During the recent recession many of them went bankrupt and many of those that survived still face problems.

A year ago, the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) received almost 5,000 responses to a questionnaire sent to the membership asking owners of small businesses to rank the seriousness of the problems facing them. Interest rates were judged the most severe of 72 possible problems. Over 26 percent of all respondents termed interest rates a critical problem, the most extreme rating in the questionnaire. What has this administration done about this problem most critical to small business? It has set in place a combination of fiscal and monetary policies that have given us the highest real rate of interest in memory. No. 3 on the list of small business problems is the cost of natural gas, gasoline, and fuel oil. What has the administration done? It has asked for deregulation of natural gas. No. 4 is the cost of telephone service, and this administration's FCC sought a plan that would have added surcharges to already high telephone costs.

In "Jobs for the Future," a program Senate Democrats proposed last fall and upon which we will soon submit enabling legislation, we proposed a number of aids to small business. Part of our program would support the transfer of training technology from the Department of Defense to the small business sector, thereby addressing a serious problem of small manufacturing concerns. We would also fund State development agencies that typically finance new small business firms. Our programs for innovation, education, and training would also be supportive of small business.

Last year, I said that Democrats had begun a serious effort to review and reform our small business programs. We are continuing that effort.

ISRAEL'S 36TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on May 7, the State of Israel celebrated its 36th anniversary as a modern-day, sovereign nation. I want to take this opportunity to extend to the people of Israel my congratulations for achieving this milestone as the only democratic state in the Middle East.

With the exception of NATO, there has not been a more enduring relationship in the post-World War II era. than the one between the United States and Israel. For 36 years, the maintenance of the security, territorial integrity, and independence of Israel has been one of the pillars of U.S. foreign policy. It must continue to be so.

Why do I say this? The desire of Jews to return to what is to them their rightful homeland was first expressed during the Babylonian exile and became a universal Jewish theme after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D., and the diaspora that followed.

The establishment of the modern-day State of Israel was facilitated by the horrors of the Holocaust perpetrated upon the Jewish people by Nazi Germany. That was reason enough to allow the Jews of the world to reestablish their own homeland. But that is only part of the reason for insuring the security of that homeland.

Israel is a functioning, robust democracy in a world plagued by totalitarian and authoritarian dictatorships.

Israel, through the amazing creativity and energy of her people, has turned deserts into gardens.

Israel, through the entrepreneurial and technical innovativeness of her people, is a land of impressive technological and industrial achievement.

Israel, through the toughness, ingenuity, and perseverance of her people, has built one of the most effective defense capabilities in the world.

Israel, a stable and vibrant democracy, is the one reliable ally we have in the Middle East.

Yes; modern-day Israel is a nation of remarkable attributes, strengths, and accomplishments. We share so many common values and concerns. That is why the relationship between our two countries has been strong and unwavering for the past 36 years, and will continue to be so in the future.

As the people of Israel celebrate their 36th anniversary, I want to salute them for the impressive achievements they have attained in such a short period of time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATTINGLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is clear, I think, that we are not going to be able to get anything done on the pending question, which is the Chiles amendment, until after the regular Tuesday recess, which begins at 12 o'clock noon.

The reason for that is, of course, that the memorial for former President Harry Truman was conducted this morning in the Hall of the House of Representatives, which took away some of our Members. Another reason, I suppose, is that we already have a unanimous-consent agreement that we will vote on the Chiles amendment at 3 p.m.

I have done my best to check around and see if anyone wishes to talk about the Chiles amendment or anything else. I extended morning business until 11 a.m. It is now past that.

It seems to me the best thing to do is to face reality and to simply acknowledge that nothing is going to happen until 2 p.m., which is understandable. And may I say that the minority leader is aware of this and has no objection, I believe.

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in view of these circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that instead of recessing at 12 noon today, as we usually do on Tuesday, the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:29 a.m., recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. EAST).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is closed.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOMS MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the unfinished business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Baker amendment No. 3027, to further reduce deficits by including reconciliations and appropriations caps for defense and nondefense discretionary spending for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

(2) Chiles amendment No. 3044 (to Baker amendment No. 3027) to reduce deficit reduction for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and to provide for a delay for 2 years of cost-of-living adjustments to tax tables.

AMENDMENT NO. 3044

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is there any time allotted between the proponents and opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is not divided, no.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not desire to take a lot of time, Mr. President, but so that I will be able to properly account for the time, let me yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is yielded 5 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment the distinguished Senator from Florida has pending. I think it is fair and proper to call it a Democratic amendment. If it is not that, my good friend from Florida can tell us that it is not.

I think it has been the subject of a number of discussions on that side of the aisle, and I also think that a number of Senators, who heretofore have never voted to do away with indexing of the Tax Code, are apparently prepared to do so, now in a party line vote.

I do not make this statement because I wonder why these Senators have changed their minds, or whether they were right the first time or the second time, but it does appear to me that everyone should know that that seems to be the situation.

Basically, this proposal by my good friend from Florida would, indeed, change the tax indexation for the people of this country. It would do so by modifying tax indexation for calendar years 1985 and 1986, modifying it in a substantial manner, a significant manner. The distinguished Senator can explain in more detail what exemptions or exceptions he has in mind with reference to tax indexation, but I remind the Senate that basically this or something similar to it has been voted on a number of times now as part of various packages.

Second, we worked very hard together to come up with some language on the appropriated accounts of our country which would send the message that we are serious about budget restraint. In principle we have used caps in budget resolutions. We have also used the concept of caps in the reconciliation process and we have from time to time used the enforcement mechanisms in the Budget Act itself for aggregate spending levels.

But basically the Senator from New Mexico believes that the proposal submitted by Senator BAKER in behalf of the leadership and supported by the President for the first time has a very significant enforcement mechanism that should send the message that we are rather serious about trying to keep our fiscal house in order with respect to the appropriated accounts. The cap language includes an actual budget authority cap, setting for each of the next 3 years a cumulative amount we can spend as a nation for appropriated nonentitlement accounts. This is a dollar number. The Baker amendment language includes enforcement that clearly says if and when we breach that cumulative total a point of order will lie against the bill on the floor of the Senate. Hopefully, if it becomes law, this language would apply in both bodies.

The cap in the current amendment is a key provision. It says that there will be no growth this year in the appropriated domestic accounts except appropriated entitlement. However, everyone should know that these programs are not frozen at the lowest possible level. We are assuming supplementals that should be passed are going to be passed before we put that cap on.

Do not forget that all the appropriated discretionary accounts are within the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee so that, for example, if they save money in housing, they could increase spending in another area and still remain within the aggregate cap. But if the total is breached, a point of order would lie and every Member of this institution will know that they are going to vote to set aside a point of order in order to spend more money than was agreed to in a substantive law of the land. A rather good approach, in this Senator's opinion, to making some sense out of where we are going in 1985 and for 2 years thereafter.

The reason I took some time to explain this is that, I do not believe it has been explained in any detail, and because I have not had to do so until this point.

One might say, let us do away with the caps because they are not going to become law this year. I do not know about that. They might. But the point is that this amendment would say that we do not want to establish a sense of discipline on ourselves and we do not want to interfere with the Appropriations Committee. We are just going to make it nice and easy and say it is the sense of the Senate that we should not breach an aggregate cap figure. I do not say this because I do not think the sense-of-the-Senate language is any good at all. It has some merit.

I say it only in comparison with an enforceable situation that is in the amendment that the Senator from Florida wishes to amend. I really think they are as different as night and day. The kinds of problems we have in trying to keep things under control surely are not going to be met by setting some caps and then saying it is the sense of this institution that that is what we should do.

So, I think everybody should know that there is a patent difference between the two proposals. They are the same on all appropriated accounts for domestic as they are for the military expenditures of the country, albeit the caps on the defense are growing and the caps on domestic are frozen next fiscal year and grow at 5 percent in each of the two following years. All Senators can find the numbers in the amendment, and we can attempt to describe some of the assumptions for the various accounts assumed within the aggregate caps.

The distinguished Senator from Florida does something on the appropriated accounts that I should mention. The amendment that is pending will add about 2-percent growth for the year 1985 to the appropriated accounts.

Remember, the leadership uses a freeze next year. Interestingly enough, the leadership amendment then says 5 percent increase in 1986 and 5 percent increase in 1987. But do not forget that it also makes them binding—the freeze, 5, 5, and the point of order I have just described.

The amendment we are going to vote on says let us add 2 percent this year and that will take care of some of the concerns people have, and maybe we will get more money in some of these programs. But in the outyears, it is 2 and 2, which is less than the leadership wants—less, but not enforceably less.

So, it seems to me that with this amendment we are talking about save now and spend later on the appropriated accounts. It might be said here—or a "Dear Colleague" letter might say—that on appropriated accounts, this is a pretty tight budget, too, because we only grow at 2 percent in the outyears, 1986 and 1987. But do not forget, that is a nice target with the sense of the Senate that we will do it. The leadership amendment, if it is adopted and becomes law, will have some binding language to make it subject to a point of order, if and when it is breached.

I could talk about some other changes. There clearly are some significant reductions in the leadership proposal with reference to defense. I should like to address those, if the distinguished Senator from Texas does not care to do so; and if he is not here, I will do that.

For now, let me say that the defense for 1985 in budget authority in the Chiles substitute is reduced by about $8.2 billion, and nondefense is added to by $2.7 billion, for a net saving, all of which is attributable to defense cuts, of $5.5 billion in the first year. I have done the same for all 3 years, and there is a $46.5 billion savings that would come about.

Again, there is no cap.

The changes are basically getting rid of the mandatory caps and adding 2 years of indexation deferral on the tax side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, my good friend from New Mexico has spoken about some of the distinguished features between the leadership plan and the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Florida. He has identified the amendment of the Senator from Florida as the "Democratic plan."

I say to the Senator from New Mexico that I hope it is. It is hard to say whether we will get everybody on this side to vote for it, but I am certainly trying. I hope that before the vote is over, it will be identified as the "Senate's plan," because I find a lot of people on the side of the Senator from New Mexico want to vote for it. I hope that today their consciences will allow them to vote for it, and overcome the frustration triggered by the strong partisan loyalties pulling them to not vote for it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHILES. I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. If it is not yet your plan, I surely do not want to be a party to making it such. So, I should like the Senator to know that I am certainly unsure about that.

Mr. CHILES. I say it is my plan. I hope it is the plan of all the others. I have no objection to being the parent of this plan. I am not ashamed of it at all.

The Senator from New Mexico has talked about indexing as something repudiated many times before in the Senate.

We had a vote earlier on an indexing plan that originated on the Senator's side of the aisle, and some seven or so Republicans voted for that plan. I did not know that they were to be totally repudiated because they voted for that plan. A number of Democrats supported the plan for indexing, but I know of no vote that has ever been taken on an indexing plan similar to the one proposed by the Senator from Florida.

We are saying that two-thirds of the indexing would be allowed to stand, including one-third that covers those at the zero bracket, those people at the very bottom end of the economic ladder, so that they would not have to pay higher taxes simply by virtue of inflation.

Also, that portion of indexing that deals with personal exemptions would be allowed to go into effect.

So, we are talking about affecting one-third of indexing and affecting that part for 2 years. The reason is simply that I do not know how much of a favor we are doing people in granting them indexing, because we are doing it all out of borrowed money. We seem to have been saying to people, "We are going to give you this great indexing, but we are going to borrow money from the Treasury to do it."

Well, my plan would modify that, and, I think, allow us to get the deficit down.

The most interesting argument that I heard from the Senator from New Mexico, though, was that his plan has these binding caps and that they are historic. They are supposedly intended to prevent the "runaway Appropriation Committee" that cannot be trusted from violating the budget resolution. Consequently, the argument is that we have to make these caps binding.

Mr. President, if we survey the Appropriation Committee over the last several years, I think we find that it has been responsible. If we look at the spending for last year, we see that the Appropriation Committee stayed under the amount in the budget resolution for defense and under the amount proposed in the budget resolution for the domestic accounts.

So what is the fuss about some alleged necessity for binding caps? Well, I find it interesting, Mr. President, that the leadership program calls for defense at 7 percent while the Appropriation Committee last year had defense growing at a rate of 3½ percent. Talk about a difference. It is a considerable difference. The leadership plan is raising defense. But, at the same time, the leadership plan says we are capping defense because we want to protect it from the Appropriations Committee.

Now who needs to be protected, Mr. President? It seems to me these caps have to be there, in part, because of the rose garden deal. To get the blessings of the President, to get the blessings of Mr. Weinberger, and to get the blessings of others who want the higher number for defense, we had to raise the defense number very high—7 percent. But at the same time we consoled ourselves by saying:

> The Appropriations Committee will save us. They will not spend all of that money on defense. But, wait a moment, we have to make sure they do not spend it somewhere else.

So, Mr. President, I would say to you, I think those caps had to be there. I think the conscience of the Senator from New Mexico and others worked on them. We cannot put all this money in defense only to risk spending it somewhere else. We can be a little irresponsible, but not that irresponsible. So we better cap defense and we will cap the other programs, too, and then at least the money cannot be transferred. So then if we put more than we think we should put in defense—and it is certainly more at 7 percent than the distinguished Senator from New Mexico felt was necessary when we talk about what his plan was going to be for defense—well, we will protect ourselves and put in the cap.

Mr. President, if somebody is going to vote against my plan because of the nonbinding caps, I believe that argument is a Trojan horse. The Appropriation Committees have not spent more. If you want to worry about not having the caps, look at the plan of the Senator from Florida, because we reduce the numbers.

Mr. President, finally, there is an interesting difference we have not talked about. Really, what are we about here? I think the bottom line is how we are going to reduce the deficit. And I think the difference between the leadership plan or the Rose Garden plan and the plan of the Senator from Florida comes clear on the bottom line. One, the Rose Garden leadership plan, reduces the deficits about $89 billion. The other one, the Chiles alternative, reduces the deficits $150 billion. If Senators are searching for the best reason on which to base their vote, I think they better look at the bottom line, Mr. President. Do you want to vote for something that will reduce the deficits $89 billion and that is all? Then vote against the Chiles plan, because it goes further than that. It reduces the deficits $150 billion.

Do you want to vote for a plan that has deficits going from $180 billion to $204 billion in 1987, growing every year? Then vote against the Chiles plan, because it has deficits going the other way. It has deficits actually declining to $168 billion. That kind of comparison gives you a good guideline to make up your mind.

If you want to vote for a 7-percent defense number, vote against the Chiles plan, because it contends that defense is too high at 7 percent. It says 4-percent real growth on top of inflation, on top of the growth we have already had, is sufficient.

The domestic discretionary numbers come out about equal. They are a wash. You can decide if you want to have a total freeze, if you think a total freeze is realistic. If you think you can freeze all the domestic accounts 1 year, then vote against the Chiles plan. If you think the Appropriation Committees are not going to be able to do that, and are not going to freeze veterans disability payments, are not going to freeze WIC and childhood nutrition programs, but that we should still impose the same restraint, then you might want to look at the Chiles plan. What we have determined is that it is unrealistic to think that you are going to freeze everything in 1 year. So over 3 years my plan makes the restraint. It comes up with the same amount of dollars, but does it over a 3-year timespan.

Mr. President, I think those are some of the basic differences between the plans.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I first say to my friend from Florida—I think he already knows this without my saying it here in the RECORD publicly—that I have the greatest respect for him. I did not intend, in anything I said, to cast aspersions on his fiscal policy or his approach to what is best, nor did I intentionally misstate anything.

Let me summarize the choice as I see it. I think it is a very simple proposition. The Senator is correct that if the entire package, as he suggested, became law and if the economic assumptions were as he suggests during the next 3 years, the deficits would decline as he has indicated.

But I think it is also obvious that there are only two policies that go beyond the leadership amendment to achieve this result larger defense cuts and bigger tax increases. And I do not raise this issue because I am trying to detract from the Senator's plan nor would I say that under no circumstance, at no time, should we ever look at anything like this. I am merely trying to summarize the difference. The difference, in essence, is cutting defense more than the leadership plan and increasing taxes substantially more than the $48 billion already as contained in the leadership plan.

Having said that, let me suggest that the language pertaining to the caps was intended to be understandable, and enforceable and was also intended to make sure that the appropriated levels for defense and for nondefense were clean and separable. This language is not intended to imply that the domestic appropriated accounts have not done their share, but rather to try to put a package together that was clearly balanced. Even with this language, we still have deficits that are too large. This language assures that the package shares the burden: a third taxes and about a third defense and about a third of all of the other programs of Government.

There is not much debate here in this body that we could get more out of entitlements this year. If that is not a possibility, then you have to reduce other nondefense Government programs. The cap language in the leadership amendment is an attempt to do just that, to get just a little bit more out of the nondefense appropriated accounts—about $13 billion over 3 years.

That seems realistic to this Senator. Even the plan that the good Senator from Florida proposes does not attempt to reduce entitlements beyond the levels in the leadership package. This is why the cap language, essentially freezing the level of appropriated programs, is when you take the entitlement savings and the cap on nondefense appropriated programs together, you get about one-third of the savings in the total package. Then the other part of the cap language achieves the savings in the appropriated defense programs. And this is another third of the savings.

That is the reasoning behind the caps. That is why they are important because the symmetry is based both on size and on certainty. Entitlements that are changed save money over the years. The cap, if enforced each year, will also save money over several years, and we will not have the uncertainty in the outyears that is normally attendant to appropriated accounts.

Having said that, I want to take a moment to talk about what the deficit might look like in 1987. Frankly, it is pretty tough to say. I do not want to imply that things are rosy. No. Only that it is just pretty tough to predict what the 1987 and 1988 deficits are going to be.

Frankly, had there been more time to have the Budget Committee consider the current economic situation, I think we would have voted to change the economic assumptions significantly—not because the early CBO and OMB ones are wrong, but because we now have better information. The economic assumptions that yield a deficit trend line going up instead of down after the leadership package is adopted, are based on economic information that is 3½ to 4 months out of date.

I refer the Members of the Senate to the views that the Senator from New Mexico has put in the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1985. They are not directly relevant to this bill because the resolution will follow this bill. However, on pages 117, 118, 119, and 120 of the first concurrent resolution report, Calendar No. 779, is a discussion of this Senator's views on the economy and the effects that this changed economic outlook would have on the budget. This discussion in no way reflects committee decision, but just what the chairman of the committee, the Senator now speaking to the Senate, would have asked the committee to do by way of changing the economic assumptions. If these alternative economics had been used to estimate the budget effects at the leadership amendment this deficit in the leadership package including the interest savings is on a trend line downward.

The deficit in the leadership plan would decline to about $164 billion in the year 1987.

I ask unanimous consent that pages 117, 118, 119, and 120 and the tables that are spread thereon be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the additional views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CHAIRMAN PETE V. DOMENICI

I support the Committee's recommended budget resolution as a pragmatic and reassuring first step toward attacking looming Federal deficits. The Committee's ability to report a budget resolution with a deficit downpayment of $144 billion during the fiscal year 1984–87 period is a responsible act. It is even more courageous given this is an election year.

In retrospect, the budget resolutions of the past 3 years were developed using optimistic economic assumptions. This year, the reverse seems true. The underlying economic assumptions used to develop the budget are too pessimistic in my view. This was confirmed by the administration's new economic forecast released on the second day of the Committee's markup, and other recent economic indicators reflecting increased economic growth and lower unemployment.

If the Committee had up-dated the economic forecast upon which it based its numbers for the reality of higher growth and lower unemployment, the deficits remaining after the Committee's deficit reduction efforts would be: $183.1 billion in FY 1984, $166.2 billion in FY 1985, $163.0 billion in FY 1986, and $164.0 billion in FY 1987. I believe that the latter set of numbers more accurately reflects reality and that either during Senate floor action or during conference with the House of Representatives an appropriate update for economic reality should take place. The following table 1 shows Senate Budget Committee staff calculations of a more realistic economic forecast and compares it to the CBO's January estimates. Table 2 shows an alternative baseline deficit using the more current economic assumptions. Table 3 shows the deficit numbers resulting from these economic assumptions and the interest rate reductions resulting from the resolution's budget recommendations.

Finally, I believe that we must make budget recommendations this year recognizing three important facts: (1) that any budget must be one that Congress will enforce and implement; (2) that much of the action that Congress will take to reduce deficits is underway in the House and Senate; and (3) that more fundamental changes may have to occur during the rest of the 1980s in the spending and revenue policies of the Nation. Each of these three factors deserve further amplification.

First, I am acutely aware of the problem of passing a budget resolution that simply is out of touch with congressional intent. The Committee's FY 1984 budget recommendations were eventually rejected by the Senate and replaced with a budget recommendation that proved unrealistic and unenforceable. Indeed, even with action now underway in the House and Senate, the reconciliation instructions and spending and tax policies contained in that budget will not be met. Such lack of realism in the budget this year, I believe, would corrode the budget process. So, above all, the Committee's recommended budget attempts to be pragmatic and realistic. The recommendations are not perfect, but they are good.

Second, the Committee's deliberations were conducted as the House of Representatives passed a major revenue-raising measure, its own budget recommendations, and a reconciliation instruction on spending. In addition, the full Senate began consideration of a revenue-raising measure that almost exactly parallels the Committee's recommendations, after rejecting by large margins efforts to increase the amount of new revenues.

Third, I believe that more needs to be done in reforming the tax and spending policies of the Nation. A large number of the members of the Committee also strongly believe that even larger deficit-reduction actions must be taken by Congress soon. Many of the members wanted such action this year, but recognized that such action seems unlikely given congressional activity to date. I fully believe that further deficit-reduction measures must be part of any congressional agenda starting early next year.

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

[Calendar year]

	1984	1985	1986	1987
Nominal GNP (percent change, annual):				
CBO January	10.3	9.4	8.6	8.4
Administration April update	10.6	9.1	8.7	8.4
Possible forecast revision	11.0	9.4	8.6	8.4
Real GNP (percent change, annual):				
CBO January	5.4	4.1	3.5	3.5
Administration April update	5.9	4.1	4.0	4.0
Possible forecast revision	6.0	4.1	3.5	3.5
CPI (percent change, annual):				
CBO January	4.5	5.0	4.9	4.7
Administration April update	4.1	4.6	4.5	4.2
Possible forecast revision	4.5	5.0	4.9	4.7
Unemployment rate (annual average):				
CBO January	7.8	7.3	7.0	6.1
Administration April update	7.6	7.4	7.0	6.9
Possible forecast revision	7.6	7.0	6.7	6.5
91-day Treasury bill rate (annual average):				
CBO January	8.9	8.6	8.4	8.2
Administration April update	8.9	8.0	7.1	8.2
Possible forecast revision:				
Baseline	9.3	9.2	9.0	8.9
Post-policy	9.1	8.6	8.0	7.6

TABLE 2.—BUDGET EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1984	1985	1986	1987
CBO baseline revenues	663.0	733.0	794.9	863.5
Technical estimates[1]	−3.6	−2.1	+0.8	+10.4
Alternative economic forecast	+10.3	+15.8	+17.3	+19.0
Alternative baseline reveues	669.7	746.7	813.0	892.9
CBO baseline outlays	852.4	930.3	1,011.8	1,108.7
Shift to President's defense request	+3.2	+8.6	+16.0	+19.6
Alternative economic forecast (UI, GSL)	−0.5	−0.7	−0.2	−0.4
Interest adjustment based on alternative economic forecast and other changes above	+0.5	+2.4	+5.1	+8.0
Alternative baseline outlays	855.6	940.6	1,032.6	1,136.0
CBO baseline deficit	189.4	197.3	216.9	245.2
Revenue and outlay changes	−3.5	−3.3	+2.7	−2.2
Alternative baseline deficit	185.9	193.9	219.6	243.1

[1] Treasury technical re-estimates.

TABLE 3.—FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION USING ALTERNATIVE ECONOMIC FORECAST

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1984	1985	1986	1987	Total, 1984–87
Alternative baseline deficit [1]	185.9	193.9	219.6	243.1	
Revenues	−2.4	−10.7	−16.1	−19.1	−48.3
Defense		−6.0	−16.0	−18.2	−40.2
Nondefense	−0.2	−7.6	−12.2	−17.4	−37.4
Net interest savings due to above changes	−0.1	−1.7	−5.7	−11.6	−19.1
Total policy change	−2.7	−26.0	−49.9	−66.3	−145.0
Interest rate reduction caused by plan		−1.7	−6.7	−12.8	−21.2
Total policy change and interest rate reduction	−2.7	−27.7	−56.6	−79.1	−166.2
Alternative First Budget Resolution deficit	183.1	166.2	163.0	164.0	

[1] Reflects President's defense request, alternative economic forecast, and related technical re-estimates.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished chairman and friend from New Mexico for being solicitous about my concern for the plan. He is right. We are very good friends. We will fight a lot here today. But we always remind each other of our friendship, and never forget it. I think highly of him and the work that he has done on the Budget Committee.

I hestitate to make any remarks against his plan. He has, afterall, just had a birthday. I know that is going to make him not older, but wiser, and I trust it will help him see the light. But having said that, I do have a few remarks.

I listened to the symmetry argument of one-third, one-third, one-third. It is interesting because I think it brings to mind the symmetry of a three-legged stool. The distinguished President is aware that milk stools often had three legs, and those legs gave a person a certain amount of balance.

But I hope nobody tries to do the milking from the stool in the leadership plan. I think they would find that, unless they sit forward, they might have a problem because there are only two legs on that particular stool, not three. One leg comes from raising some revenue, and they do that. Another leg comes from making some cuts in the domestic spending program, and they do that. The third leg of that stool is supposed to be defense. That, I am afraid, is the imaginary leg.

If you look at what this Appropriations Committee—maligned to some extent by binding caps in the leadership plan—did last year on defense, you will see they allowed it to grow 3.5 percent. If you look at what the Budget Committee did which was 5 percent, that is the baseline that we use in every other program. But in defense the leadership decided to use the President's wish list, which is what he would like to have. So that third leg is a wish. If you want to sit on a wish, that is fine with me. Then you can try to construct a complete stool out of a wish. But when you are talking about the budget, wishes are not enough.

Mr. President, neither of the pending plans reduces the deficits enough. I do not think anybody can say they do. I do not say getting our deficits down to $168 billion in 1987 is enough. It is not. It is hard work. It is terrible. The only thing that is worse is deficits of $204 billion, and the direction in which those deficits are going. They are going higher, rather than lower under the leadership plan. If you change the economics, if the leadership plan gets a little better, and ours gets better still, we would be getting the deficits down more. If you want to compare the plans under those circumstances, the deficits do not matter.

But, Mr. President, we have all talked about why we needed to make this down payment, and why we needed to do something this year. We said the reason we need to do it this year is because we are afraid, if we do not do it, interest rates would go up.

Mr. President, we do not have to worry anymore about whether interest rates are going up. They have already gone up. If you look at the business and finance section of today's paper, Treasury bills have risen for the second week in a row. The next thing you will see is the VA raising the loan limit ceiling to 13.5 percent. Mr. President, the VA is controlled by this administration. They do not have to raise that rate unless they decide it is necessary. Mr. President, they knew they had to raise that rate.

We are talking about guaranteeing Federal rates. The Federal Government guarantees that mortgage. Yet, it has gone up to 13.5 percent. What is the long-term loan rate? We have a figure on that, or the fixed rate of interest; 14.11 percent, Mr. President, up from 13.8 in the last 6 months. Within 6 months we have gone from 13.8 to 14.11 How long can the housing industry go on? Mr. President, there is your new economic forecast. It is better evidence than the predictions of any economic. The market is saying it is frightened by the evidence.

Look a little further in today's paper, and you find this: "Trade Deficit Hits a Record $25.8 Billion in One Quarter."

So, Mr. President, we have now gone over $100 billion a year in trade deficits. Why? Because our interest rates are so high. We have priced ourselves out of the international market. It means a 30-percent premium for someone trying to buy American goods. Mr. President, to top that off, the prime interest rate went from 12 to 12.5 percent. This is all today. All that happened just when we are getting ready to vote on the garden plan. Just when we are worried about whether interest rates will climb, we find they are already several steps up the ladder.

What the Members of this body have to concern themselves about in around 10 minutes is whether they want to vote for deficits that are causing these rates to go up. Henry Kaufman said interest rates are going to go up appreciably by the end of this year. The market fell off 11 points after his statement. This already happened.

Henry Kaufman usually forecasts something in the future. What he ended up doing was telling us today's headlines.

Mr. President, in a way what we are going to be voting on shortly is how well we can read the paper. Do we want to break off this recovery, or will we make a statement about the rose garden plan? It has been described by some economists as chicken feed. Are we going to have a little more chicken feed? Or are we going to do something more effective about these deficits.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Florida, raised an issue here that I will take a couple of minutes to talk about.

He says interest rates have been going up and they went up a little bit again today. I guess by implication he is saying if we pass the Chiles plan they will stop going up, but if we pass the leadership plan they will keep going up.

Frankly, in all honesty, I do not think anybody knows that. I have been through this so many times I just do not believe that to be the case.

Let me give you a number. If you believe that to reduce the deficit of the United States by $33 billion in 1985—$33 billion in 1985—instead of reducing it by $26 billion in 1985, if you believe that such a small difference is going to cause dramatic change and alleviate the interest problem we face, then vote for that plan.

This is not the total picture because the Senator will say, "Well, what about 1987?"

I remind everyone here that the principal plans that have been offered on the floor of the Senate to date are a response to the leading economists of the country and the Federal Reserve Chairman, and the others who have said that what we need is very large budget savings in the first year. Several of these plans have almost twice the fiscal year 1985 savings as the leadership plan and, yet, they were soundly defeated.

By comparison we have very, very insignificant difference between $33 billion in savings in the Chiles plan

compared to $26 billion in the leadership plan.

I just do not think that in an economy approaching $3.6 trillion this is a meaningful difference. This economy grew 8.3 percent in real terms in the last quarter. We have just experienced a quarter with one of the highest number of housing starts in any quarter in the last decade. Inflation is supposed to be going through the roof, but it has not even broken the 5-percent mark of late. I just do not think we are going to fix the interest rate problem with $7 billion extra deficit cut in 1985.

On the other hand, one might say, "Look out there in 1987. The leadership plan is $66 billion and the plan of the Senator from Florida is $100 billion. That is pretty good."

Most of it is indexing on the Tax Code. I really do not believe elimination of indexing is going to fix the interest rate problem. As a matter of fact, it appears to me that we have to ask ourselves the question, is eliminating the only insurance that the average American has against higher taxes really going to solve the problem? I do not think so.

Defense? Defense is part of it. I submit we have not heard the last word on that. We will try to establish our budget position here on the floor of the Senate and then again in the next 5 or 6 months.

But, frankly, I do not believe this is going to have that much impact on the financial marketplace. In fact, I am beginning to wonder whether those who control the money supply in this country really know what kind of a budget package will have an effect. Frankly, I am willing to take the risk that a $150 billion deficit reduction package that is doable and achievable is far preferable to a larger package which cannot be enacted into law.

I will say more on that subject as we move through the debate on the leadership package.

For now, let me close by by saying what I said a while ago.

If the Senate feels comfortable in getting rid of 80 percent of benefits of tax indexing, if my colleagues really feel that is really going to help the economy solve the problems that are discussed here, in spite of this buoyant and growing economy then vote to get rid of indexing.

If you want to get all the rest of the money you are attempting to save out of the defense of the country, then vote for this plan and reduce the defense budget yet further. I assume you would do that for one of two reasons: that you think defense is spending too much or that you think that further reduction will have some kind of a noble, dramatic effect on interest rates and thus keep the American economy going.

Frankly, I do not think either cause is a just cause. Therefore, I will choose not to vote for this when it come to a vote shortly in about 2 minutes.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, huge Federal Government budget deficits—by far the largest in the history of our Nation—pose a serious threat to the economy of the United States and to the well-being and prosperity of all Americans.

It is essential that we in the Congress act to reduce significantly the size of the budget deficits, and to get our fiscal policy on a path leading to a balanced budget.

I was seriously concerned in 1979 and 1980 when the budget deficits rose to a level of $60 billion. But the budget deficits now of nearly $200 billion, and increasing as far into the future as economists can see, are nothing short of alarming.

In my view these burgeoning deficits are the direct and predictable result of faulty economic policies followed during the past 3 years. In keeping with administration policies, military spending has been vastly increased, while Government revenues have been slashed by excessive tax cuts that have benefited primarily the well off. The combination of the defense spending increases and the tax cuts has more than offset the very significant cuts that have been made in nondefense Federal Government spending, resulting in growing deficits.

We must reduce the deficits as quickly and as effectively as possible. In reducing the deficits, we cannot ignore the policy mistakes that have produced the deficits. In my view, to reduce deficits we must—

Slow significantly the runaway increases in defense spending;

Begin to restore some of the revenue lost through excessive tax cuts;

Restrain nondefense spending, but avoid placing an unfair burden on programs that already have suffered deep reductions;

Reduce extravagantly expensive agriculture support programs; and

In restoring revenues, try to improve the fairness of our tax system.

For all of these reasons I am supporting the Chiles-Democratic Caucus deficit-reduction proposal. This proposal will:

Reduce the deficits by $150 billion over 3 years, instead of the $89 billion reduction proposed by the administration.

Provide for 4-percent real growth in defense spending, instead of the 7-percent increase proposed by the administration.

Allow an inflation-adjustment increase in nondefense spending in each of the next 3 years, instead of allowing zero growth in 1985 as proposed by the administration.

Increase revenues by $81 billion over the next 3 years instead of the $48 billion proposed by the administration.

Provide for a fairer tax system by deferring indexing of income taxes for 2 years, while preserving inflation adjustments for the individual personal exemption and for the zero bracket amount.

In my view, this proposal makes a bigger, and fairer, reduction in the deficit than would the administration proposal and for that reason I support it.

Mr. President, the Senate this week has also considered other deficit-reduction proposals, including the proposal to simply freeze all spending at the 1984 levels for 1 year. Although that proposal was appealing in its simplicity, I voted against it because of two basic and serious flaws.

The freeze plan would have unfairly penalized social security recipients by eliminating their cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) scheduled for January 1, 1985. Only last year we restructured that social security program to make it solvent and self-supporting.

Cutting social security benefits now does nothing to cut the real budget deficit—it merely increases the surplus in the social security trust fund, and hides the real deficit in other Government accounts. And it is unfair.

In addition, the freeze proposal did nothing significant to restore Federal Government revenues, and that must be a major part of any fair and effective deficit-reduction proposal. In short, the freeze would have frozen in place many of the inequities that exist in our fiscal and spending policies.

With some reluctance, I also voted against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, primarily because it, too, would have eliminated the social security COLA through a 1-year freeze.

The amendment before us—the Chiles-Democratic Caucus proposal—is the most effective and fairest deficit reduction proposal presented to the Senate.

It will reduce the deficit by $150 billion over 3 years, slow the increase in military spending, avoid additional punishing reductions in essential nondefense spending, and preserve the rightful benefits of retirees.

Reducing the awesome Federal deficits is essential. Doing it the right way is important. I believe this amendment provides the most effective, and the fairest, deficit reduction.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief description of the Chiles deficit-reduction plan. I also ask unanimous consent that tabular material and a brief explanation of the tax-indexing adjustment included

in that plan also appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE

In sharp contrast to the White House plan, the Democratic alternative looks at the budget to see what is really there, and determines it will simply have to be less.

It begins with an accurate financial statement, the estimates of CBO. Like anyone who's ever sat down to balance a check book, we know you've got to use official numbers. If you don't, if you use your own wishful-thinking numbers, you can fool yourself into thinking you're better off than you really are.

This plan levels with the Nation about what must be done about the deficits.

Over the next four years, the plan, according to CBO estimates, will actually cut the deficit by a true $150 billion as opposed to the net $89 billion CBO says is the best to be expected from the White House plan. In fact, using accounting of the White House, the Democratic plan would slice the deficit by $200 billion.

Under the Democratic plan, the deficits would decline to $174 billion in 1985, and to $169 billion by 1987. As a percentage of the gross national product, the deficit would decline from 5.2 percent of GNP to 3.6 percent. Those figures are still too high. But they are real steps in the right direction, not steps backward prescribed under the White House package.

The Democratic defense plan permits a 4 percent real growth per year. That amounts to a $27 billion increase over the 1984 appropriations level. It will protect combat readiness accounts and require savings on weapons procurement. This is a far more sensible approach, and just the reverse of the White House plan. The average real growth for defense spending could amount to 6.8 percent a year, measured from 1981 through 1987.

The Democratic plan allows partial inflation adjustment in each year from domestic discretionary appropriations. It also protects programs like WIC, education of the disadvantaged, and job training where a flat freeze would reduce the number of persons served, while protecting actual program operations where a freeze would mean cutting the number of people required to provide the services in programs like veteran hospitals, law enforcement and scientific research.

It would require some restraint in lower priority programs to live within the aggregate appropriations cap. Yet the three-year total outlay savings is roughly the same as provided in the White House package. If some programs can be reduced from current levels, even more than the $2.7 billion we add would be available to cover increases for essential programs if that becomes necessary.

On revenues, the Democratic plan would cut spending $119 billion to raise $81 billion in revenues. That's about $3 in spending for every $2 in revenues. The Democratic plan would leave the tax burden as a percent of income well below the level the President said was acceptable last year when he set it at 20.3 percent of GNP. Under the Democratic plan the level would be 19.4 percent. It would delay indexing for two years, while protecting low and moderate income families from a higher tax burden.

In summary, the Democratic plan is based on the kind of realistic estimates designed to win credibility in the financial markets. Under the Democratic plan, the deficits actually fall, rather than measurably rise after the fashion of the White House plan.

The Democratic plan makes some clear policy changes on military spending, it would require some procurement decisions. But if those decisions are not made—and the White House plan makes none of them—the General Accounting Office tells us we would have to increase spending by 31 percent to pay the real bill implicit in the current buildup.

On revenues, delaying indexing will make it very clear that Congress is serious enough and determined enough to cut the deficit in a way that would win the confidence of the financial markets and on domestic programs the Democratic plan makes no promises that cannot be kept. There is no sleight of hand here. Rather it would protect the needy, and pay for that protection.

CHILES ALTERNATIVE DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				Total, fiscal years 1984–87
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Revenues:					
Baseline	663.0	733.0	794.9	863.5	
Proposed increases	2.4	15.7	26.1	37.1	81.3
Total revenues	665.4	748.7	821.0	900.6	
Outlays:					
Baseline: CBO accounting	852.4	930.3	1,011.8	1,108.7	
Total outlay savings:					
CBO accounting	−.5	−7.8	−20.0	−39.2	−67.5
(Administration accounting)	(−3.8)	(−17.2)	(−38.2)	(−63.2)	(−122.4)
Total outlays (CBO)	851.9	922.5	991.8	1069.5	
National defense:					
CBO accounting	−.2	−.1	−3.3	−7.5	−11.1
(Administration accounting)	(−3.4)	(−8.7)	(−19.3)	(−27.1)	(−58.5)
Entitlements and other mandatories	−.1	−4.6	−5.6	−9.4	−19.6
Non-defense discretionary programs and Federal pay	−.1	−1.6	−5.2	−10.5	−17.4
Net interest:					
CBO accounting	−.1	−1.5	−4.9	−10.7	−17.3
(Administration accounting)	(−.2)	(−2.3)	(−7.1)	(−15.1)	(−24.7)
Offsetting receipts	.0	(1)	−1.0	−1.1	−2.1
Deficits:					
Baseline (CBO)	189.4	197.3	216.9	245.2	
Deficit reduction:					
CBO accounting	−2.9	−23.5	−46.1	−76.2	−148.7
(Administration accounting)	(−6.2)	(−32.9)	(−64.3)	(−100.2)	(−203.6)
Remaining deficit	186.4	173.8	170.7	169.0	

[1] Less than $50 million.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.
Source: Minority staff, Senate Budget Committee, Apr. 26, 1984.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1984	1985	1986	1987	1984–87
Revenues:					
Baseline	663.0	733.0	794.9	863.5	
Proposed increases	+2.4	+10.7	+16.1	+19.1	+48.3
Reported resolution	665.4	743.7	811.0	882.6	
Outlays: Baseline: CBO accounting	852.4	930.3	1,011.8	1,108.7	

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1984	1985	1986	1987	1984–87
Total outlay savings:					
CBO accounting	+2.9	−5.9	−15.4	−22.6	−41.0
(Administration accounting)	(−.3)	(−15.3)	(−33.5)	(−46.4)	(−95.4)
Total outlays (CBO)	855.3	924.4	996.6	1,086.1	
National Defense:					
CBO accounting	+3.2	+2.6	0	+1.4	+7.2
(Administration accounting)	(0)	(−6.0)	(−16.0)	(−18.2)	(−40.2)
Entitlements and other mandatories	−.1	−4.6	−5.6	−9.2	−19.4
Non-defense discretionary programs and Federal pay	−.1	−3.1	−5.6	−7.1	−15.9
Net interest:					
CBO accounting	0	−.8	−3.2	−6.6	−10.6
(Administration accounting)	(−.1)	(−1.6)	(−5.3)	(−10.8)	(−17.8)
Offsetting receipts	0	+(1)	−1.0	−1.1	−2.1
Deficits:					
Baseline (CBO)	189.4	197.3	216.9	245.2	
Deficit reduction:					
CBO accounting	+.6	−16.5	−31.5	−41.7	−89.1
(Administration accounting)	(−2.7)	(−25.9)	(−49.6)	(−65.5)	(−143.7)
Remaining deficit	189.9	180.7	185.6	203.5	

[1] Less than $50 million.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.
Source: Minority staff, Senate Budget Committee, Apr. 26, 1984.

DEFICIT REDUCTION PLANS COMPARED, FISCAL YEAR 1984–87—USING CBO ESTIMATES [1]

[In billions of dollars]

	Republican leadership plan	Chiles alternative plan	House Democratic plan [2]	Hollings, Exon, Andrews	Kassebaum, Grassley, Biden
Total deficit reductions (total outlay savings plus revenue increases)	89	149	130	271	187
Defense reductions	+7	−11	−52	−22	−73
Total domestic reductions	−37	−39	−13	−81	−61
Interest savings	−11	−17	−16	−31	−23
Total outlays savings (defense plus domestic plus interest)	−41	−68	−80	−134	−157
Revenue increases	+48	+81	+50	+137	+30
1987 deficit	204	169	182	104	162

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding.
[2] Figures do not include fiscal year 1984 savings.
Source: Minority staff, Senate Budget Committee, Apr. 26, 1984.

DEFICIT REDUCTION PLANS COMPARED, FISCAL YEAR 1984–87— USING ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTING [1]

[In billions]

	Republican leadership plan	Chiles alternative plan	House Democratic plan	Hollings, Exon, Andrews	Kassebaum, Grassley, Biden
Total deficit reductions (total outlay savings plus Revenue Increases)	144	204	182	325	242
Defense reductions	−40	−59	−96	−70	−121
Total domestic reductions	−37	−39	−15	−81	−61
Interest savings	−18	−25	−22	−37	−30
Total outlay savings (Defense plus domestic plus interest)	−95	−122	−133	−188	−212
Revenue increases	+48	+81	+50	+137	+30
1987 Deficit	204	169	182	104	162

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding.
[2] Figures do not include fiscal year 84 savings.
Source: Minority staff, Senate Budget Committee, Apr. 26, 1984.

EXPLANATION OF PARTIAL DELAY OF INDEXING PROPOSAL IN THE CHILES ALTERNATIVE DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 provided for the indexing of income brackets, including the zero bracket amount, and the personal exemptions. Current tax law allows each individual taxpayer a flat deduction amount called the zero-bracket amount (ZBA). This amount replaces the "standard deduction", for each taxpayer status, which was in effect up to 1976. It is the maximum deduction allowable for taxpayers who do not itemize deductions, and is built into the tax rate schedules issued to the public by the IRS.

The personal exemption is the amount deducted from adjusted gross income, for each dependent. This amount is $100 per dependent, and is deductible whether or not one itemizes deductions.

For low income persons who do not itemize deductions the sum of the zero-bracket amount and the allowable personal exemptions determine the maximum amount of income for which there is zero tax liability.

For example, the ZBA is $2,300 for a single return and $3,400 for a joint return. A single individual under age 65 can have income of $3,300 ($2,300 plus $1,000) without paying taxes while a family of four can have income of $7,400 ($3,400 plus $4,000) without paying taxes.

The current proposal guarantees that these individuals will continue to pay no taxes as long as their income grows by less than the inflation adjustment allowed under indexing. The current proposal delays indexing for two years on all income tax brackets except for the zero-bracket amount, and retains indexing of personal exemption.

All taxpayers benefit from indexing of the zero-bracket amount and the personal exemption. But 95 percent of the benefit from indexing of zero-bracket amount is received by income groups below $40,000. For those with itemized deductions, indexing the ZBA reduces effective tax rates at any given income level by shifting tax brackets upward.

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote in support of the Chiles budget alternative, not because I agree with every element in it, but because it is clearly better than the budget plan put forth by the Republican leadership with the support of the President. First and foremost, the Chiles plan will result in a deficit that is $30 billion lower in fiscal year 1987 than the Republican leadership plan. But beyond mere numbers is the fact that the Republican leadership plan will result in a deficit which is larger in fiscal year 1987 than the deficit in 1985. So, although the Chiles plan may not make enough progress in deficit reduction, it does make some progress. It does offer some hope that we will be able to reverse the rising tide in interest rates and prevent the economic recovery from stalling out.

I am concerned that the Chiles plan contains a 2-year partial delay in indexing the Tax Code. Although it would allow indexing of the personal exemption and the zero bracket amount to go into effect on schedule, the Chiles plan would defer the indexing of the tax brackets for 2 years. This is difficult for me to accept in light of my belief that indexing represents wise and honest tax policy. Only because the partial deferral of indexing is part of a budget reduction program which cuts spending as much as it increases revenues, and only because the Republican alternative is a budget plan which increases the deficit and increases defense spending, can I vote for the Chiles package with its partial indexing provision. The Chiles package would be much more acceptable if it allowed for an effective minimum tax so that we would not have the situation which we have now that thousands of people are making hundreds of thousands of dollars and not paying any taxes. And tens of thousands of profitable corporations pay no taxes because of legal use of tax loopholes and tax shelters.●

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, there was a soap opera entitled "As the World Turns." I am reminded of that today on the floor, "As the world turns." Is it not strange, Mr. President, that here we find the leadership plan, a plan endorsed by the majority party—the Rose Garden plan—proposing less deficit reduction while the "old-spending-Democrats" are opposed, and want more deficit reduction? The Democrats are not supposed

to be concerned about the economy, but here we are, fighting for lower deficits than those on the opposite side of the aisle.

We cannot say for sure that either one of these plans would help keep interest rates from going up. But I think we understand that the one that makes the deficits lower certainly has the better chance to restrain interest rates.

We are talking about differences in the deficits of between $89 billion on one hand and $150 billion on the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the distinguished Senator that the time has expired. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida and I each have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I certainly commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for the intent of this amendment, deficit reduction.

The prime interest rate went up to 12.5 percent today. We should have passed this package 2 weeks ago. But all this amendment does is defer indexing, raise taxes for the working people in this country, and cut defense spending. There are not any other cuts in this package, to my knowledge, no effort to further reduce nondefense spending.

It does not take any imagination to raise taxes on the working people and cut more out of defense. We are talking about all these courageous actions. I hope we can defeat all these amendments that are going to be coming up; and pass the leadership package, whatever we finally end up with. We should go to conference and try to complete action by the Memorial Day recess, which starts on May 24.

I know everyone wants to reduce the deficit, and they all have some painless way to do it. But it is not painless if you want to raise taxes on the working people. All the Chiles amendment does is defer indexing for 2 years, giving the people who make between $30,000 and $50,000 a big tax increase. I do not really believe that is the way to reduce deficit.

In my view we ought to cut spending. We do that to some extent in the leadership package and so does this proposal, but in the final analysis it is going to take a bipartisan effort to get meaningful spending restraint. Certainly the Senator from Florida should be commended for his willingness to try to bring something together. When it is all over, I hope we are in agreement, Democrats and Republicans, that we ought to act and act quickly. I thank my colleagues. They have a tough job on the Budget Committee.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his kind remarks. If you look at the overall plan on which we are about to vote, it will reduce spending for defense and domestic appropriations $20 billion more than the leadership plan.

Mr. President, the historian Livy wrote a history about a Spanish town threatened with invasion by Hannibal. He said:

> The crowds had been gathering outside of the town Senate until it had become something like a general assembly of the population. The leaders of the Senate left their places, collected all the precious metal from the public buildings and private houses that they could find, flung it all into the fire and then they lept in behind it.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate, in trying to do something about the deficit, is not going to collect all of the precious metal and jewels of the city and throw it into the fire. We will not have to leap in behind it if we do not do something about these deficits, Mr. President. I think the people will throw us into that fire. So I hope we will take a step now to appreciably reduce these deficits and give us a better chance to sustain the recovery.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DENTON). Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Andrews	Exon	Mitchell
Baucus	Ford	Moynihan
Bentsen	Hart	Nunn
Biden	Heflin	Pell
Bingaman	Heinz	Pressler
Boren	Huddleston	Proxmire
Bradley	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Randolph
Burdick	Kennedy	Riegle
Byrd	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Chafee	Leahy	Sasser
Chiles	Levin	Stennis
Cranston	Long	Tsongas
DeConcini	Mathias	Weicker
Dixon	Matsunaga	Zorinsky
Dodd	Melcher	
Eagleton	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—49

Abdnor	Cochran	Denton
Armstrong	Cohen	Dole
Baker	D'Amato	Domenici
Boschwitz	Danforth	Durenberger
East	Kassebaum	Simpson
Evans	Kasten	Specter
Garn	Laxalt	Stafford
Goldwater	Lugar	Stevens
Gorton	Mattingly	Symms
Grassley	McClure	Thurmond
Hatch	Murkowski	Tower
Hatfield	Nickles	Trible
Hawkins	Packwood	Wallop
Hecht	Percy	Warner
Helms	Quayle	Wilson
Humphrey	Roth	
Jepsen	Rudman	

NOT VOTING—2

Glenn	Hollings

So Mr. CHILES' amendment (No. 3044) was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous amendment failed.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand that, consistent with some previous negotiations, the Senator from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY, is prepared to offer an amendment but also is prepared to enter into a time agreement of 1 hour, equally divided. Am I correct?

Mr. BRADLEY. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not know if there is any objection to that. The distinguished Senator from Florida has no objection and the Senator from New Mexico has none.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I say that we would have to run a line on this side.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand then there will be no time agreement but, in short order, we may discuss it again. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 3048

(Purpose: To modify certain Medicare provisions, and to adjust the appropriations caps)

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) proposes an amendment numbered 3048.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, add the following:

PART B PREMIUM

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 901 of this Act, the amendments made by such section 901 shall not become effective, and the provisions of the Social Security Act shall remain as though such section 901 had not been enacted.

(b) Section 1839(e) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the monthly premium for each individual enrolled under this part for each month after December 1983 and prior to January 1987 shall be an amount equal to 50 percent of the monthly actuarial rate for enrollees age 65 and over, as determined under subsection (a)(1) and applicable to such month.

"(2) Any increases in premium amounts taking effect prior to January 1987 by reason of paragraph (1) shall be taken into account for purposes of determining increases thereafter under subsection (a)(3).".

(c) Section 1839 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) If no cost-of-living increase becomes effective under section 215(i) in December of any year, the monthly premium of each individual enrolled under this part for the succeeding year shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)) be the same as the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) of the individual for such December.

"(2) If paragraph (1) does not apply to the monthly premiums for a year, if an individual is entitled to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for November and for December in that preceding year, and if the monthly premium for that December and for the following January is deducted from those benefits under section 1840(a)(1), the monthly premium for that individual for that January and for each of the succeeding 11 months for which he is entitled to benefits under section 202 or 223 shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)) be the greater of—

"(A) the monthly premium amount determined under subsection (a)(2) or (e) for that January reduced by the amount (if any) necessary to make the monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for the January after the deduction of the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that January at least equal to the monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for the preceding November after the deduction of the premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that individual for that November, or

"(B) the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that individual for that December.

For purposes of this subsection, retroactive adjustments or payments and deductions on account of work shall not be taken into account in determining the monthly benefits to which an individual is entitled under section 202 or 223.".

PHYSICIAN FEES

SEC. . (a) Section 1842(b) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 904 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(13)(A) During the 24-month period beginning July 1, 1984, the Secretary shall monitor physicians in order to determine—

"(i) The proportion of physicians, by specialty and geographic area of practice, whose claims under this part are not pursuant to an assignment under paragraph (3)(ii), grouped as follows: fewer than 25 percent, 25 percent to 49 percent, 50 percent to 74 percent, 75 percent to 89 percent, 90 percent to 99 percent, and 100 percent, of the claims submitted by such physicians. or for such classifications of physicians as the Secretary may deem to be more informative;

"(ii) the average difference between the actual charges and the reasonable charges recognized for purposes of this part, for each classification of physicians referred to in clause (i); and

"(iii) any changes in the per capita volume and mix of services provided to beneficiaries under this part by each classification of physician referred to in clause (i).

"(B) Information on changes in the elements monitored pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be provided to Congress every sixth month beginning with January 1985 and ending with January 1987.".

(b)(1) The report which the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress on January 1, 1987, shall include recommendations in sufficient detail to serve as the basis for legislative action which Congress can take to assure that any burden of effectively constraining the growth of costs in the medicare part B program, which Congress intends to be borne by providers and physicians, is not transferred (in whole or in part) so as to become an additional burden on part B beneficiaries in the form of increased out-of-pocket costs, reduced services, or reduced access to needed physician care.

(2) Such report shall also include analyses of other methods of payment which might be utilized under part B to constrain the costs of the part B program, including prospective payment systems such as fee schedules (both global and per service), capitation payments, case management, and the use of preferred provider organizations.

(c) In addition to any funds otherwise provided for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for payments to carriers under agreements entered into under section 1842 of the Social Security Act, there are transferred from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Fund such additional amounts for payments to such carriers under such agreements as may be necessary to conduct monitoring of physicians under section 1842(b)(13) of the Social Security Act.

PART B DEDUCTIBLE

SEC. . Notwithstanding the provisions of section 916 of this Act, the amendments made by such section 916 shall not become effective, and the provisions of the Social Security Act shall remain as though such section 916 had not been enacted.

In section ——, relating to limitation of the aggregate total budget authority for national defense and non-defense discretionary activities for the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(f)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), or any other provision of this Act or of any of the amendments made by this Act, it shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or the House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $293,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $327,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $365,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (b), or any other provision of this Act or of any of the amendments made by this Act, it shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or the House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for non-defense discretionary activities to exceed $141,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $148,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $155,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to this deficit reduction package that will restore some balance between defense and nondefense spending. My amendment differs from the proposal offered by the majority leader in at least four respects——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct. The Senator from New Jersey is entitled to be heard. Please remove conversations from the floor.

The Chair recognizes, again, the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, as I said, my amendment differs from the proposal offered by the majority leader in four respects. First, defense spending is reduced from 7 percent real growth to 5 percent real growth, a reduction in budget authority of $5.4 billion in 1985.

Second, two-thirds of the $5.4 billion to be cut from defense is added to the budget freeze for high priority nondefense discretionary spending, including education, medical research, and environment programs. This $3.6 billion restoration represents overall roughly a 3-percent nominal increase for nondefense discretionary programs.

Third, a restoration of $600 million of the $9 billion in medicare changes that are included in this deficit reduction package.

Fourth, the amendment reduces the Federal deficit by nearly $3 billion more than the proposal offered by the majority leader and the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table be printed in the RECORD at this point comparing my amendment to the proposal offered by the majority leader.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRADLEY AMENDMENT COMPARED TO LEADERSHIP PLAN

[In billions of dollars]

	1985		1986		1987	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Reduction in defense spending	−5.4	−2.2	−6.0	−4.1	−6.2	−5.2
Increase in nondefense by approximately 3 percent (⅔ of defense reduction)	+3.6	+1.7	+3.8	+3.0	+4.2	+3.5

BRADLEY AMENDMENT COMPARED TO LEADERSHIP PLAN—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	1985		1986		1987	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Restoration of about 7 percent of the medicare proposals	+.05	+.04	+.1	+.1	+.5	+.5
Further reduction in deficit	−1.7	−.5	−2.1	−1.0	−1.5	−1.2

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, as I stated, the first element of my package is a reduction in the defense buildup from 7 percent real growth to 5 percent. Previous votes this week have demonstrated that Members of the Senate known to be among the strongest supporters of defense spending can support levels of expenditures below that of the Domenici-Baker budget. Indeed, many have supported budget packages that constrain growth in defense spending to rates below what I am now proposing.

The rationale for a 5-percent real increase in defense spending rests on two important points: efficiency in military planning and public support.

Like any organization attempting to plan capital expenditures for years into the future, the Defense Department could make best use of its resources if it can count on a steady, relatively predictable flow of funds. Battleships, tanks, and planes must be modified and eventually replaced. The schedules for this refurbishment may not coincide with the feast or famine moods of the President and Congress. In the post-Vietnam era, our investment in weapons, military construction, and defense research fell dramatically. This was not because tanks did not need replacement or bases did not need refurbishing. No, it was because the mood of the budgetmakers was unsympathetic to the needs of national defense.

The backlog of maintenance, the aging of weapons, the pause in research and—most damaging to our national security—the drop in morale of our soldiers and sailors due to declines in pay and support were the result of these years of famine for defense. Indeed, these years of declining military investment increased the need for and size of the subsequent buildup that began in 1977.

But by the same token, Mr. President, the 13-percent real increase proposed by this administration is just as unhealthy. Years of feast inevitably lead to less well-thought-out strategies and expenditures. Given sudden large budget increases, service secretaries have proposed their own pet programs that, with more deliberate planning horizons, could have been more carefully thought-out and estimated.

What is needed, Mr. President, in contrast to feast or famine, is a sustained and sustainable defense budget, a budget that military planners can have some confidence in, that will allow them to rationally and carefully plan for our national defense. In last year's budget resolution we adopted a 5-percent increase for fiscal year 1985. By actually providing that increase this year we add credibility to our attempts at consistency. A stronger defense will result at a lower long-term cost.

The second reason that 5 percent is important is that the American people are likely to support it. The importance of this support cannot be over emphasized. The generals and admirals know this lesson well: Public support is the single most important component of our national defense. I have been concerned, however, that this administration is undermining this resolve. Support for the necessary rebuilding of our defenses was strong when this administration took office; but 3 years of inordinate high requests and rigidly clung to demands has begun to erode that support. A steady, determined rebuilding of our national defense is required to maintain our defense capability and resolve. The risk for the military and thus for the Nation is that more years of famine could follow these years of plenty.

So, Mr. President, a 5-percent increase in defense spending will encourage a more efficient and a more careful thoughtout defense buildup and at the same time, maintain the support of the American people for a strong national defense. The Reagan defense budget jeopardizes the single most important national security asset that this country possesses: The resolve of American people.

Mr. President, the second component of this plan is to increase spending by $3.6 billion in 1985 for high priority nondefense discretionary spending, including education, health research and environment programs. This represents an increase roughly of 3 percent for overall nondefense discretionary spending over the freeze level in the Baker proposal. A freeze on all nondefense discretionary spending will undermine our efforts to meet pressing national priorities.

Why do we need additional funds for high priority social programs? Because some programs have simply been cut back too deeply. Total outlays for human resource programs relative to prior law have been reduced by about $100 billion over the fiscal year 1982–85 period. In percentage terms, the largest cuts are in employment and training programs, which have been reduced by almost 60 percent. In just the past 3 years, outlays have been reduced over 20 percent for education and social service programs, and needs-based income security programs have been cut about 10 percent. Many of the budget cuts made since 1981 affect lower income families. About 40 percent of the budget cuts affect families with incomes under $10,000 and another 30 percent are from households with incomes between $10,000 and $20,000. We need to make some targeted restorations.

My amendment assumes an increase of $1.3 billion for education. The need for more education aid is compelling. According to recent statistics, the Federal share of funding for elementary and secondary education this year dropped to 6.4 percent, a 20-year low. Federal funding for elementary and secondary education programs in 1980 was $200 million higher than it will be in 1985 if a freeze is adopted. The recent reports on education have emphasized that education is indeed a critical national priority. We need to provide additional funding to strengthen the ongoing programs and we need to provide aid for new education initiatives including aid to help the talented and gifted, aid to help high school students in need of upgrading their basic skills and initial funding for the science and math bill to improve the teaching of science and math in our schools.

According to a recent College Board study, the amount of financial aid available to college students, after two decades of growth, has dropped by $2 billion in the 1980's. During this same time period, the median undergraduate tuition has increased by about a third. A freeze in funding for student aid simply provides too little aid; it robs too many young people of a chance to succeed. We need a modest increase to reverse this erosion in funding.

In the area of environmental protection, I believe it imperative to restore the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the public health and natural resources of this Nation. My proposal would enable us to fund EPA at the level requested by Mr. Ruckelshaus, the EPA Administrator, and the level recommended by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. This is approximately $0.6 billion over the freeze level. My proposal would enable us to fund the Superfund at its fully authorized level next year. Without such funding Superfund sites across the country that are now scheduled for cleanup next year will not be cleaned up. One hundred sites in New Jersey await Superfund action; hundreds more have not even been designated. We must clean those sites up without further delay.

Mr. President, the environmental protection—and hazardous waste cleanup in particular—must be placed in the highest category of domestic spending priorities.

We also need increases in health research. The Nation's expenditure for health care tripled in one decade. In

1975, the burden of illness claimed 12 percent of the national GNP. That percentage may double by the year 2000 unless substantial gains are made in our ability to prevent and control diseases. We are on the edge of major developments in understanding of brain function, immunity, transplantation, gene mapping, infectious diseases, and yes, even cancer. Discoveries in these areas can save millions of dollars in costs of treatment and lost productivity, not to mention offering our citizens a better quality of life. We need to increase funding for these activities. A freeze of the NIH budget when we are clearly on the edge of major developments might save us money this year, but will cost us money in the future.

Mr. President, the third part of this amendment relates to medicare. In the past 5 years the medicare part A deductible has risen 123 percent. The part B coinsurance has increased 100 percent. Charge reductions from unassigned claims passed on to beneficiaries have increased 198 percent. Since medicare covers only 45 percent of the elderly's health care bill, even these reductions understate the elderly's rising health costs. The average elderly person is paying out of pocket as much for health today as when medicare began, about 15 percent of their income. Under current policy and trends, the average elderly person will be spending 19 percent of their income for health care by the year 2000.

Mr. President, I am firmly committed to reducing this intolerable deficit and have so voted. But we cannot ask the elderly to shoulder an unfair burden of the savings. This package contains almost $9 billion in modifications to medicare. Of this $9 billion, elderly beneficiaries are required to contribute a significant share of the savings. The medicare portion of this amendment is identical to an amendment I am cosponsoring with Senator BAUCUS that reduces the elderly's share of the burden by restoring $0.6 billion of the savings in the bill by, first, striking the proposed increase in the part B deductible; second, reducing the proposed part B premium increase in 1987, so the premium will only increase that year by the rate of general inflation instead of the higher rate of medical cost inflation; and third, requiring the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to monitor physician behavior and report periodically to Congress during the 2-year physician fee freeze period so we can examine whether additional costs are being shifted onto medicare beneficiaries.

This is a modest proposal that restores some balance to the medicare package.

In summary Mr. President, I believe that my budget package restores some balance between defense and nondefense spending. Further, this budget plan assumes nearly $3 billion in lower deficits than the majority leader's proposal. But I need to point out that neither this budget plan nor the budget plan proposed by the President and the majority leader is truly sufficient to restore stability to Federal budget policy. But my proposal is a step—a first step—toward a more rational policy.

The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that Federal budget deficits are projected to climb from $200 billion a year to roughly $300 billion a year by the end of the decade. CBO projects that unless changes are made, by 1990 the interest payments that we make on the national debt may be larger than last year's entire defense budget.

If the same policies persist into the future, the Government will be competing with the private sector for limited quantities of capital and credit. In the 1970's the Government deficits consumed a little over a quarter of savings; if deficits continue without abatement, deficits will consume over three-quarters of savings over the 1983–86 period. This may very well be a recipe for rising interest rates, a strengthening dollar, decreased exports, and increased imports. We clearly cannot follow this course. Changes need to be made in Federal budget policy. Using the administration's estimates, my proposal reduces the deficits by $147 billion over the fiscal year 1985–87 period.

This amendment is, therefore, a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPECTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this amendment is, in many ways, just another repeat of something we have voted on around here two or three times.

I am beginning to wonder how long it takes to put together a deficit reduction package. I am beginning to think that maybe some do not want a deficit reduction package unless it can be tailored to their own specific desires.

It would seem to me, with the prime increasing today to 12½ percent, and with a lot of concern about interest rates and what Congress is not doing, that we would try to move very quickly to put this package together and go to conference. We could send a signal to the American people that we do not suffer total paralysis—maybe 90 percent paralysis, but not total paralysis.

I sympathize with the managers of this bill, the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee. It may be that two or three all night sessions is one way to bring this thing to a close. Otherwise, as long as the staffs are awake we are going to have more amendments. The best way is to stay up all night, let the staffs go to sleep, and suddenly you find a reduction in the number of amendments. Everybody wants to put out another press release and make just one more shot at saving America. But since we have started, our record is not too good.

We completed about half the package 3 weeks ago. We have been voting on numbers ever since that time. Everybody has a new package to bring down the deficit and interest rates. That is commendable.

But there are certain parameters that I think we must deal with. Of course, if it is the will of the Senate to do otherwise, then, obviously, we will do otherwise. But it is one thing to talk about reducing spending, reduce it in the committee, and then come right back to the floor and take it away.

Now, we passed in our committee, by a vote of 20 to 0, a deficit reduction package of about $72 billion. That same package passed the Senate by a vote of 76 to 5. But now we are here faced with an amendment that contains a portion that deals with very minor changes in medicare. Yet we are told by the experts that if we do not deal with medicare we are going to have real problems in the late 1980's.

All we are trying to do amounts to just a little band-aid. Maybe someone will say, "You are not doing enough," but you have not seen anybody suggesting specific ways that we can do more.

This is an effort to pick away at what little we have done in the committee, even though it was approved unanimously in the committee.

This amendment would strike the provision which calls for indexing of the part B deductible; it would hold the part B premium at 25 percent of program costs for only 1 additional year; and finally, it would call for a monitoring of the reaction of physicians to the freeze on their fees.

I suggest to my colleagues, who insist on chipping away at all the savings on the Senate side, that there are no savings on the House side. If we are going to have any savings at all, you have to give us some flexibility when we go to conference. But if you keep pushing, pushing, and stripping out the savings on the Senate side, we can forget about any real savings. If we are going to end up with only taxes and defense spending cuts, I doubt

that the President would swallow that package—and I would not suggest that he do so. I would suggest that I think the American people deserve more.

Maybe we have reached the point where it is too near the Democratic and Republican Conventions. Maybe we ought to adjourn, come back and deal with these sticky problems after the election; or after the conventions. Everybody is trying to prove they have a better idea than someone else and a better idea than the leadership. But it is important to note that the part B premiums have increased by less than 270 percent since 1970, while there has been an increase of 1,720 percent in the Government's share of the cost of the part B program, and an increase in overall part B program costs which exceeds 960 percent. The committee proposal was drafted very carefully. We had one proposal that was going to raise the part B premiums to 35 percent over the next 3 or 4 years. It passed our committee by a vote of 17 to 3. It was a bipartisan vote because a clear majority understands that we cannot help fooling the American people. We are not going to have a medicare program, if we listen to some people who want to take it away and not do anything. It seems to me that we are chipping away, trying to get another $500 to $600 million in what I call minimal spending reductions compared to some of the freeze amendments that have been offered. This is miniscule when it comes to affecting senior citizens, and an impact on senior citizens.

The amendment which we adopted in committee allows a balance between the general revenue and premium financing to continue to tilt toward increased Federal financing after 1986. Rather than a year-to-year fix, as happened before and is being proposed again, we should stand by the committee's proposal, which holds the Government subsidy of this program at the 75 percent forever. It used to be 50 percent. Then it went up to 82 percent. Now we are saying we ought to get it back to 75 percent.

We are not asking anybody to bear a lion's share of the program costs. We are looking at physicians, we are looking at hospital costs, and we are also looking at more costsharing.

The original Finance Committee proposal would be for 3 years only. The 1981 Reconciliation Act increased the part B deductible by 25 percent from $60 to $75. Prior to this amendment, the deductible remained at $60 since 1972 despite a more than 430-percent increase in total program benefit payments between 1972 and 1981. I suggest we are not doing anything that cannot be justified.

With respect to the provision which calls for monitoring of the reaction of the freeze on physicians fees, the Senator from Kansas has no objection to that proposal. If you want to offer that proposal, we will take that proposal, although we would want the opportunity to make some suggestions for changes in the language. The medicare amendments which are contained in the Finance Committee provisions represent an attempt on our part to spread the burden of deficit reduction over the largest possible population.

I am not going to address the other portions except to indicate that I hope the Senator from New Jersey might at least eliminate this portion of the amendment. We are willing to accept an amendment on the monitoring. That makes a great deal of sense. But let us not take away any power we have in conference to bargain with the House because they do not have any spending reduction to speak of in the House Ways and Means Committee. By trying to chip away, take away $588 million, you are in effect saying go ahead and give up another $200–$300 million in conference, and we end up with virtually no savings. If that is the will of the Senate, obviously we will abide by that. Again, I hope—and I am in total sympathy with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Florida—if there is any real desire to complete this bill, that we do it.

Finally, I say we have to pass a debt ceiling extension before the 24th of May. I hope we figure out some way that the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee can go to conference. It is obvious to this Senator that, with all the amendments pending, we could be on this bill this week, and maybe next week. If there is some way we can separate the Senate Finance Committee package, and add a debt ceiling increase which would take us up to next July 1, and permit us to go to conference starting next Monday, then I think we could accommodate the desires of the Budget Committee, the leadership, and the Appropriations Committee. We could probably report back to the Senate a completed conference action on the tax portion and the debt ceiling by the 20th or the 21st of May, and maybe complete action on that part of the package before the Memorial Day recess. That would take care of the revenues, and the Finance Committee savings. The President has already signed one bill for $7 billion in savings. He signed an agriculture bill for $3 million in savings.

That would total up to $10 billion and maybe $14 billion in the Finance Committee package, $24 billion in savings, $46 billion in revenue changes plus whatever you get from debt service, which would indicate before we leave for a week that we are on the road to $150 billion or more in deficit reduction.

I suggest to my colleagues from Florida and New Mexico, that if somehow you can work that out, it would be appreciated by members of the Senate Finance Committee and by members of the House Ways and Means Committee. It is our understanding that it may be a long time before—even if the leadership amendment were adopted—there would be agreement with the House Appropriations Committee on caps and how they might respond to caps. But in the meantime, I think the best thing to do would be to defeat all of these amendments hanging around here and go to conference that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. First, Mr. President, let me say to my good friend, the chairman of the Finance Committee, that I have no disagreement with what he said. I hope in a couple of days we would be in the position to see our way clear for you to be able to go to conference with a package most of which would be in your jurisdiction. In any event, there are a number of committees involved in this package, and it certainly is partially budget, partially appropriations, partially armed services, and certainly substantially finance.

I wish the Senate could find its way clear to do this kind of package. If we put debt service on it, we would have accomplished a major feat for the entire year.

Having said that, I was absent unavoidably, and I did not get a chance to ask the Senator from New Jersey. Could we agree on a time certain in 5 or 6 minutes, if the Senator from New Mexico only has 2 minutes?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on the Bradley amendment at 5 minutes until 5.

Mr. BRADLEY. If the Senator will yield, I have no objection to your request. The last time you proposed that, I had no objection to it. I was told the minority leader was willing. We could have a vote without the need for a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let us not request a unanimous consent.

Mr. President, let me make two points. The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has given us adequate reason not to vote for this amendment because of the medicare provisions. We ought to certainly vote against it in terms of the medicare provisions. There will be many other medicare amendments offered here today, tomorrow, and the following day. But in any event, that is not the principal reason to be for or against this. It is obvious to the Senator from New Mexico. If that is not, let me say the rest is very simple. In my opinion, there is no justification to vote for it. Defense is reduced by $5.4 billion. We turn around, and add $3.6 billion to

the domestic programs. It seems to me that even those in the U.S. Senate on both sides of the aisle who think defense is too high, that even though they feel that way, the compelling majority would not want to take $5.5 billion out of defense, then turn around, and put almost $4 billion back into domestic. That is not saving an awful lot. Obviously it is reducing defense, and obviously it is increasing domestic expenditures.

I do not think that is what the Senate wants to do. I could be wrong. We seem to be voting in all different patterns in the last 5 or 6 days. So, frankly, I am not sure what anybody wants to do. But this amendment does not seem to me to be the approach that moves us in the direction of significantly less deficits, which some want; less for defense, which some want; slightly more for domestic programs, which some want. It does not seem to be any of these things. Because of that, I would hope the Senate would not adopt it.

I move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the Senator yield first?

Mr. DOMENICI. I withhold on my motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, this amendment is an attempt to find a balance—something that we can agree on so that we can enact a deficit reduction package. It is true that my amendment reduces the defense appropriation from 7 to 5 percent real growth. The question is, does the Senate want to increase the defense budget by roughly 5 percent, rather than 7 percent? The amendment does take some of these savings and spends them on high priority non-defense programs, such as $1.3 billion for education, $600 million for environment programs and $600 million from what would otherwise be increased costs to senior citizens in medicare. And then to take a small but nonetheless significant step by reducing the deficit by an amount larger than the current pending budget plan offered by the majority leader and the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment is this Senator's attempt to try to find some balance—to try to find some common ground upon which the Senate can agree. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

If the Senator from New Mexico is prepared to make his motion to table, I am prepared to vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BAKER. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) would each vote "Yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HECHT). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 89 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abdnor	Goldwater	Murkowski
Andrews	Gorton	Nickles
Armstrong	Grassley	Nunn
Baker	Hatch	Packwood
Boschwitz	Hatfield	Quayle
Chafee	Hecht	Roth
Cochran	Heinz	Rudman
D'Amato	Helms	Simpson
Danforth	Humphrey	Stafford
Denton	Jepsen	Stennis
Dixon	Kassebaum	Symms
Dole	Kasten	Thurmond
Domenici	Long	Tower
Durenberger	Lugar	Trible
East	Mathias	Wallop
Evans	Mattingly	Wilson
Garn	McClure	Zorinsky

NAYS—43

Baucus	Exon	Moynihan
Bentsen	Ford	Pell
Biden	Hart	Percy
Bingaman	Heflin	Pressler
Boren	Huddleston	Proxmire
Bradley	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Randolph
Burdick	Kennedy	Riegle
Byrd	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Chiles	Leahy	Sasser
Cohen	Levin	Specter
Cranston	Matsunaga	Tsongas
DeConcini	Melcher	Weicker
Dodd	Metzenbaum	
Eagleton	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—6

Glenn	Hollings	Stevens
Hawkins	Laxalt	Warner

So the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 3048 was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, according to the informal understanding between the managers of the bill, I believe that the next amendment is the Gorton amendment. It is my understanding, from conversations with Senator GORTON, that it may take 1½ hours or thereabout to complete the debate and reach a vote on this measure. I do anticipate that we will have a record vote on this measure tonight. Therefore, 7 or 7:30 p.m. would be my best estimate of the next and perhaps the last vote. Members should not depend on that. That is the best estimate I can make at this time.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I inquire of the minority leader if he thinks there is some possibility that in order to put this thing in final form, we might be able—either tonight or tomorrow or at some other point—to get a list of amendments that might be offered on this subject and a unanimous-consent order that no other amendments will be in order. That is the same procedure we followed on the Finance Committee side, and it produced a result, even though it took until 5 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we on our side can run a line to see if we can learn what amendments remain, but I am sure we will have a problem so far as today is concerned, and I do not think I can speak optimistically with reference to tomorrow, but we will continue to check.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I appreciate the minority leader's remarks. I am doing the same on this side. I am compiling a list of amendments of which we know.

If the minority leader and I could meet sometime tomorrow, perhaps on the floor or elsewhere, we can compare notes.

It is the hope of the leadership on this side that we can identify the amendments and get an order that no other amendments would be in order. That would not set a time certain for disposition of this section of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. We will look at the matter on this side. As of now, I have my doubts that we could reach an agreement on the Baker amendment, which is reconciliation. We are talking about a reconciliation shell here. There are caps and various other things about it that concern us. Nevertheless, we will continue to study the situation, and I will talk with the majority leader whenever he wishes.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, is the Senator from Washington ready to proceed?

Mr. GORTON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 3049

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) proposes an amendment numbered 3049.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 19, line 1, strike all through the end of amendment 3027 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $297,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $328,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $366,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

"(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for non-defense discretionary activites to exceed $140,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $144,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $151,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

"(d) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

"(e) It is the sense of Congress that the unprecedented magnitude and persistence of current and projected Federal budget deficits must be addressed in a comprehensive strategy to moderate increases in defense spending while continuing the effective constraints on non-defense discretionary programs. To assure the success of such an initiative, the foregoing procedural restraints, in addition to the total aggregate spending limitations pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are necessary on budget authority both for defense and for non-defense discretionary programs for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987."

COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT LIMITATIONS

SEC. . (a) Paragraph (3) of section (1)(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (2) the cost-of-living adjustment for any calendar year is—

"(A) for calendar years 1985 through 1987, the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, reduced by three percentage points, exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for the calendar year 1983, and

"(B) for calendar years after 1987, the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for the calendar year 1983."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be effective as of the date of enactment.

SEC. . (a)(1) Any increase in benefits which would occur by law under any of the provisions of law described in subsection (b) during the period beginning on October 1, 1984, and ending on September 30, 1987, on the basis of any increase in Consumer Price Index, shall be limited as though the relevant increase in Consumer Price Index was equal to the actual increase in such index minus three percentage points.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply only to the increases in benefit amounts, and shall not be applied in determining whether a threshold CPI increase has been met or in determining increases in amounts under other provisions of law which operate by reference to increases in such benefit amounts.

(3) Any increase in benefit amounts which would have occurred but for the provisions of paragraph (1) shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining benefit increases occurring after September 30, 1987.

(b) For purposes of this section the applicable provisions of law are the cost-of-living adjustments for—

(1) old age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits under section 215(i) of the Social Security Act (but the limitation under subsection (a) shall not apply to supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of such Act);

(2) armed services retirement and retainer pay under section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the Coast Guard, and retired pay of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the Public Health Service;

(3) civil service retirement benefits under section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, foreign service retirement benefits under section 826 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, and Central Intelligence Agency retirement benefits under part J of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for certain employees;

(4) Federal workers' compensation under section 8146a of title 5, United States Code;

(5) Comptroller General Annuities under section 777 of title 31, United States Code; and

(6) Cash Relief Payments under section 1245 (c) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979.

(c) Section 1817 of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 918 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Within 60 days after the end of calendar year 1987, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, into the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, an amount equal to the amount which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be the amount by which the total amount of benefit payments made from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund were reduced by reason of the limitation on cost-of-living increases required by subsection (b) of the section which enacted this subsection.".

SEC. . In the case of any cost-of-living adjustment which is subject to the provisions of section 301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982, the percentage by which the annuity or retired or retainer pay is increased with respect to any increase occurring by law during the period beginning on January 1, 1985, and ending on December 31, 1988, shall be the percentage increase as determined after the application of such section 301, minus three percentage points.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of the amendment: My distinguished colleague from Washington, (Mr. EVANS); both distinguished Senators from Oklahoma; the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI); and the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. DANFORTH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are now engaged in the 5th week of debate of reduction of the huge budget deficits approaching or exceeding $200 billion a year for as far as the eye can see. A number of Members have become impatient over the length of this debate, but I should like to observe that I do not think it has been too expansive or too detailed, when compared with the importance of the issue with which we are dealing.

This opportunity, even in the face of a Presidential election less than 6 months away, is absolutely critical to the economic strength and vitality of the United States and of the American economy.

As a consequence, I think every Member of this body is deserving of congratulations for recognizing that the debate during this year, 1984, has not been over whether or not we need to take decisive steps to reduce budget deficits; not over whether or not there should be a downpayment; but simply over how great, how significant, that downpayment should be; and, of course, at the same time, over the pattern——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order? The speaker is entitled to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GORTON. I thank my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi for his help in bringing the Senate to order.

Mr. President, I should like to go to say that, in addition to the debate over how much the downpayment for the next 3 years and this year should be, it is also over its distribution—its distribution among the defense budget, the expenses for entitlement programs, nondefense discretionary programs, and of course changes in our laws relating to revenues.

I regret to say, however, that the Nation and the Nation's money markets have already judged the effectiveness of the leadership proposal and have found it wanting. Since the leadership proposal was made as a result of an agreement between the Presi-

dent of the United States and the majority leadership of this body, we have seen several increases in rates of interest, both the prime rates and mortgage rates, that clearly indicate that what we have before us in this amendment is too little and too late to have the positive effects on the economy, on economic growth, on interest rates, and on jobs which is the desire of all of us in this body.

The reason for that failure is not difficult to determine. In the first place, the leadership proposal does not, in fact, by all of the economic theories on which we are operating, result in a decline in deficits in 3 fiscal years beginning in 1985 and ending in 1987. In fact, even assuming the passage of that leadership proposal in toto, 1987 deficits would still exceed those for 1985.

Second, it has been the message of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, consistently delivered to numerous committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives and the numerous individual Members, that in order to have a positive impact on interest rates we needed a downpayment which included an up-front reduction in the budget deficit, that is to say, a reduction in fiscal year 1985 of approximately $50 billion. The leadership proposal provides for barely half that.

Other leading and distinguished economists have joined in with a similar message, the message that to do nothing at all will be absolutely disastrous for the economy, the message at the same time that to do only so much as is proposed in the leadership package is to be inadequate in dealing with the demands for credits which are facing a relatively healthy economy here today.

Even though the leadership package is larger than many expected had any chance of passage at the beginning of this calendar year, I should emphasize, Mr. President, that it is not enough. It has been judged by the country to be not enough. It provides insufficient discipline in at least three of the four major areas which it covers.

It is with that background, Mr. President, that I introduced the amendment which is before you at the present time.

This amendment does not undercut the leadership proposal. It does not step backward significantly with respect to any of the value judgments which are included within that proposal. It does, on the other hand, build on it. It builds on it an additonal $85 billion in deficit reductions over the next 3 years, which makes the difference between increasing budget deficits during that period of time or decreasing budget deficits during that period of time.

It does so, I submit, Mr. President, in a way which is fair to all elements of the American population.

The first difference or change between the leadership proposal and this one is that this proposal caps cost-of-living adjustments in nonmeans-tested entitlement programs at 3 percent less than the increase in the Consumer Price Index for each of the next 3 years. Those programs are social security, railroad retirement, civil service and military retirement, including several small miscellaneous Federal retirement programs, such as those for the Foreign Service and the Central Intelligence Agency, together with Federal workers' compensation. No other programs would be affected by this cap. Specifically, veterans compensation programs, which are voted on each year, are not affected, nor is either supplemental security income or food stamps, the programs for which eligibility is created by poverty, by a means test.

Second, in order precisely to balance the proposal which will cut benefits for many millions of recipients of Federal benefits, not below their present level, but below what they will be if they are uncontrolled, this amendment caps personal income tax indexing at a level of 3 percent below the Consumer Price Index for the same 3 years.

I must hasten, Mr. President, to say in the presence of my distinguished colleague from Missouri that this is far from an original provision. This well-balanced proposal has been known for the course of the last year as the Danforth-Boren proposal, one which I found appealing a year ago and find at least equally appealing today, for two reasons: First, its effectiveness in lowering budget deficits and, second, its inherent fairness.

Third, this amendment also requires the Secretary of the Treasury, at the end of the 3-year period, to estimate the amount of savings which have accrued to the Old Age and Survivors Trust Fund as a result of the social security COLA cap and to transfer those savings into the medicare hospital insurance trust fund.

Fourth, this amendment reduces the defense function appropriations caps from the figures contained in the leadership proposal to figures representing the CBO baseline budget authority estimate.

This is particularly important, Mr. President. One of the frustrations of this Nation with the actions of this body is our apparent inability to make decisions for more than 1 year in advance.

This precise subject was debated last year, and after extensive debate both the budget resolution and the ultimate defense authorizations bills and defense appropriations bills, we charted a course of action at an increase in the budget for national defense of approximately 5 percent more than inflation over a 3-year period.

This amendment simply incorporates the agreement which this body and the House of Representatives and, for that matter, the President, by signing those bills, made last year. It increases and enhances the ability of the Department of Defense to plan for the future, rather than lurching from the extreme of a 13 or 14 percent increase 1 year to a freeze the next year, to something in between the year after.

A comparison between this proposal and some on which we have already voted is best illustrated by the fact that the leadership proposal reduces by some $40 billion over the next 3 years the President's original request for national defense. The Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden proposal for a 1-year freeze reduced that number by $121 billion, some three times as much. This proposal shifts the $40 billion reduction over the next 3 years to some $49 billion. That is to say, it is much closer to the leadership proposal than it is to the freeze which was voted on last week but is, I think, a responsible attempt to see to it that our planning for national defense is long range in nature.

Finally, this amendment increases nondefense discretionary appropriations caps for fiscal year 1985 by $2.7 billion over the leadership figure.

You will remember, Mr. President, that the proposal of the leadership is for a zero-percent increase in such programs for 1985, followed by 5-percent increases for 1986 and 1987. This shifts that only to be a 2-percent increase for 1985, with the same budget authority increases for 1986 and 1987 which are included in the leadership proposal.

If this amendment should be adopted, Mr. President, the deficit will decline to approximately $158 billion in fiscal year 1987, compared to almost $204 billion under the leadership plan. Cumulatively, over that 3-year period, this will reduce budget deficits by almost $230 billion, some $85 billion more in deficit reductions than the leadership proposal.

Mr. President, I must say that when I was elected to this body and first spoke here in 1981 or, for that matter, in 1982 and 1983, I did not believe that I would have had the gall to stand before the distinguished President and other Members of this body and claim great credit for a budget proposal which, 3 years out into the future still retained a deficit of over $150 billion.

This is a a shocking number. It is something which was intended by no one from the President through Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate to the people of the United States as a whole.

It is a mark of the hole which we have dug for ourselves, however, that my proposal is a more realistic and more balanced and more successful attack on the budget deficit than almost everything with which we have dealt heretofore in this body and certainly more successful and more decisive than that proposed by the leadership.

I must emphasize, however, that no matter what proposal is adopted in 1984, we are at best dealing with what can be described as a downpayment. This proposal, as difficult as it is to accept, is not a solution to the problem created by budget deficits to the economy of the United States. It is not a solution. It is only a beginning. And we will hear significant criticism of this proposal, because of its allegedly draconian nature, during the course of this debate.

We cannot hide from the fact, however, Mr. President, that it is mild in comparison with the proposals with which we are going to be faced 1 year from right now. It is, however, so much more significant than any other proposal which has had a chance at passage that I am convinced that Chairman Volcker is right, that its acceptance by the Congress and by the President would in fact result in a reduction in interest rates of approximately 2 percent over the balance of the year, even though, I must emphasize once again, it is only a beginning and must be followed by even more significant changes during the course of next year.

Mr. President, I have a table describing the fiscal impact of this proposal and comparing it both to the so-called hybrid baseline estimates and to the CBO baseline estimates. I ask unanimous consent that that table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GORTON'S PROPOSAL COMPARED TO "HYBRID" AND CBO BASELINES

[All figures in billions of dollars, by fiscal years]

	1984	1985	1986	1987	Total, 1984–87
Baseline deficit [1]	192.7	206.7	235.0	269.0	
Revenues:					
GOP leadership	−2.4	−10.7	−16.1	−19.1	−48.3
CIP–3 percent		−3.9	−10.8	−19.0	−33.7
Defense	−3.4	−8.8	−16.3	−20.0	−48.5
Nondefense:					
Modified-leadership [2]	−.2	−6.3	−12.2	−17.4	−36.1
CPI–3 percent		−4.8	−11.5	−18.5	−34.8
Subtotal, change	−6.0	−34.5	−66.9	−94.0	−201.4
Net interest [3]	−.2	−2.5	−8.0	−17.1	−27.8
Total change	−6.2	−37.0	−74.9	−111	−229.2
Total change from CBO baseline	−2.9	−27.6	−56.8	−87.3	−174.6
Plan deficit	186.5	169.7	160.1	157.9	

[1] Assumes CBO baseline for nondefense and President's budet request (not reestimated by CBO) for defense, plus interest adjustment to take account of the defense change. This is the baseline used in the leadership discusssions and used by the House Budget Committee to describe their deficit reduction proposals.

[2] GOP leadership except that 1985 discretionary nondefense appropriation cap increased by $2,700,000,000.

[3] Using CBO economic forecast.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. GORTON. For the record, Mr. President, I should like to point out that figures for this table are slightly different from those in the table included in my "Dear Colleague" letter of last week. The differences are due to the correction of a mistaken accounting for the effects of COLA delay which we adopted before the recess. The total deficit reduction in my plan is approximately $229 billion-plus, whereas in the earlier table I had described it as being $234 billion. I point this out simply because I wish that there be no misunderstanding, and to indicate that these budget estimates have been prepared by the Congressional Budget Office.

As I have already pointed out, Mr. President, the significant difference between this and the leadership proposal is that pursuant to this proposal the deficit will decline, though modestly, during each of the next 3 years. Under the leadership proposal, it will increase over the next 3 years, though obviously at a far lower rate than would be the case should we take no action at all.

This plan includes a deficit reduction of $46 billion more than that of the leadership plan for fiscal year 1987, but even more important, $43 billion of the deficit reduction will take place before the end of fiscal year 1985; 50 percent more than is the case with the leadership proposal.

I think a second point which it is important to make is that this proposal is a fair one. The burden of this deficit reduction idea is spread across virtually the entire population, except for programs affecting those who are poverty stricken, which are exempted from the COLA cap. With that exception, no area of the budget is exempt from budgetary restraint.

Third, this proposal is consistent with a prudent and responsible Federal fiscal policy in general. Most particularly, it does not ignore the crucial entitlement programs, the largest and most rapidly growing parts of our budget. We deceive ourselves if we believe that serious deficit reduction can be accomplished without some discipline on these programs.

Next, by adopting the same defense spending figures we adopted last year, we are avoiding unpredictability in defense spending in outyears, which as I have already discussed, not only impairs our national defense but also contributes to unnecessary increases in defense costs by requiring uneconomical procurement schedules and contracting procedures.

Finally, the modest fiscal 1985 increase in nondefense discretionary programs will provide a measure of much needed breathing room to the Appropriations Committee in dealing with what is obviously a difficult situation.

I know that this proposal has unattractive features in the eyes of many Members of this body. Capping COLA's on retirement programs is not popular. Nevertheless, I am convinced that it is not an unreasonable or unfair request to put to those who benefit from those programs. They, as much as anyone else in our society, are adversely affected by inflation, high interest rates, and a lack of increased productivity in our economy. Furthermore, I should emphasize once again that any social security savings which occurs as a result of this proposal will not be treated like general revenues. Instead, they will be specifically earmarked for the medicare hospital insurance trust fund, where they will continue to finance the social security program for the beneficiaries of OASI and medicare as well.

I would remind my colleagues that the medicare hospital insurance trust fund is projected to be in serious financial trouble within the next few years. We are going to have to come up with a rescue package somewhat akin to that which was created for the retirement program last year. And anything we can set aside against that inevitable rainy day will make that task easier.

For other Senators, the least attractive part of this proposal will be the cap on income tax indexing. I must say, Mr. President, that I include myself in this group. I have voted to this point against every attempt to change or to modify tax indexing. It was the central feature of my own campaign for the Senate in 1980.

And yet, Mr. President, I know that you share with me an experience during the course of the last year. A year ago almost every Member of the U.S. Senate was talking about budget deficits. Almost every Member felt that they were unattractive; that they would have an adverse effect on our economy. But I noted, Mr. President, a large degree of political cynicism running through those arguments.

I must say, Mr. President, that many Members of my party were delighted to reduce budget deficits but they wanted to do so basically by reducing social programs for Democrats. And I must say, Mr. President, that very many Members of the party across the aisle were happy to reduce budget deficits only by taxing Republicans. That is not a formula for success in dealing with the most serious problem with which this Nation is faced today. We can only do it by meeting on some middle ground which treats everyone with equity and with fairness.

As a consequence, the token of what I consider to be my good faith in producing this amendment, is that while it calls for very significant and very

decisive cuts in the growth rate of many spending programs, it also deals with the single tax reform of 1981 which I felt to be most important and most vital. And I commend that kind of approach to all Members of this body on both sides of the aisle because I believe it to be the only way in which we are likely to succeed in this vitally important task.

As a consequence, there is certainly a reason, or more than one reason, in this proposal for opposition on the part of every Member of this body. I cannot claim that I regard it as perfect, even from the point of view of carrying out my own political philosophies, much less those of other Members. I can claim, however, that it will be effective. I can claim that it decisively changes and reforms a number of our spending programs; that, in fact, the ratio of spending cuts to tax increases in this proposal is greater than that in the leadership package.

I can claim that this, more successfully than the leadership package, will actually have a positive effect on the economy of the United States, pushing off the day of increased inflation, not only slowing down, but arresting and reversing, the disturbing increase in interest rates with which we have been inflicted for the last 2 years; providing for more and better employment for the people of the United States, and a more rapid growth in our gross national product. It is after all, Mr. President, exactly those goods, those favorable responses for which we seek through reduction of budget deficits.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in what I am convinced will be a more successful, a more daring, a better and a more complete down payment on these budget deficits through the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington, as a member of the Budget Committee with the least seniority has certainly grasped the concepts and understands the makeup of the Federal budget. I have a lot to say about this proposal from the distinguished Senator from Washington, but I want to make a couple of points now.

First, I have never seen a voting pattern go on in this Chamber as I have seen the last 10 or 12 days. I tend to think there will be a lot of people voting for this proposal who are going to vote, cross their fingers and say, "I voted for it. I sure hope it does not pass." I do not think they really want to have a social security package passed with their vote, that will reduce the expectation and entitlement of social security recipients by $30 billion in 3 years, especially following the social security reform package just adopted in 1982.

I am not going to talk an awful lot about cutting. I am going to make it clear that this is a significant cut in social security, everything from the ordinary social security to disability recipients. Later on when we have more time we will talk a bit about how much. I want to talk in some gross figures: $28.5 billion, to be exact, in social security reduction. The Senator from Washington is correct. He found a way to make sure that the Senator from New Mexico was not saying you are going to balance the budget on the backs of social security. So he says no, we are going to take it from them.

We are going to put it in medicare. So it is not really balancing the budget. It is just taking it from their checks, saying we are going to put it in medicare because that program by 1992 has some problems, and this seems like a nice way to fix it. Take away your cost of living, and put it in the other one. For military retirees, it is only $2.8 billion; for civil servants, it is $3.5 billion. I am not telling the Senate these things because I am trying to make the program harsh that the distinguished Senator from Washington and others propose. I am not saying this because this Senator, the Senator from New Mexico, is not worried about deficits—I am. But I am saying it because somehow or another the people who are voting in the U.S. Senate, and our constituents who are out there listening to what we are doing, seem to apply different standards for some reason. They do not understand yet that this is $28.5 billion reduction in social security, $2.8 billion in reduction in military retirees, $3.5 billion in civil servants.

Sunday somebody that works for the President talked about maybe fixing up social security in 1990, if I read the story right. He did not say how. He said maybe we will have to means test it. Did you see what happened? Every leading media in the country had him on last night already cutting social security. I did not see any lead person in the other party, including the distinguished leader of the minority here, let even 10 hours escape without saying the Secretary of the Treasury is talking about cutting social security. I would almost bet that $30 billion cut out of social security by this plan is more than anybody has ever put down on a piece of paper regarding direct cuts that might result from something like means testing of social security which is what I understand the Secretary of the Treasury was talking about.

The other day we had another vote here on social security. It got 38 votes. I read most of the accounts. I say to my good friend from Washington, as far as social security is concerned, that he did not cut it quite as much. His is only $28 billion—over 3 years. The one over 5 years was $78 billion to my recollection. You are doing one better. You are putting the savings in medicare. The cuts you are taking from their checks, would be placed in medicare. I did not hear anybody talk about the $78 billion much, other than it was a good reduction package.

I repeat to my friends in the Senate, I am one who has been through this battle. The Budget Committee 3 years ago said social security was $40 billion in the red. We put out a resolution saying fix it. We did not say how. Taxes? Benefit changes or what? It barely hit the exterior door of that committee room, and it was all over the country that we were proposing cutting social security. We were pretty much right, the $40 billion assumption turned out to be $38.8 billion in the reform package in order to make it solvent.

Why do I say all of this? I say this because the Senator from New Mexico wants to pass a deficit reduction package in the next couple of days. I would like to get it finished, let it go to the House, and pass something.

Let the American people and those who do not believe we are going to do anything of any significance in an election year find out that we are. That we are going to raise taxes about $47 to $48 billion by loophole closures, and no significant substantive changes in the Tax Code until we look through the rest of this year, but take $47 to $49 billion in taxes out of loophole closures. That will reduce defense substantially, get about $40 to $44 billion in entitlement savings, and have roughly a $150 billion deficit reduction package.

A number of Senators think we ought to do better. We ought to do better. But I submit we are not going to do better by attempting to reform social security again, and take roughly $30 billion out of that program in the name of a package that does more than the $150 billion suggested by the leadership.

I do not believe it is going to happen. Some Senators do not like the Senator from New Mexico to argue against this kind of amendment on the basis that it is not going to happen. I am sorry. I think it is terribly relevant for every Senator in here to understand when you are voting to modify a major program affecting 36 million Americans, that you ought to have some hope that your vote will be meaningful. I repeat that what I heard today within 24 hours after a mild statement about social security in the 1990's leads me to believe that there will be no major changes in social security this year, be it in the name of reform, solvency, deficit reduction, or whatever name you want to put on it. It is not going to happen.

I am opening myself up to my friend's getting up and saying, Are you

interested in deficit reduction or not? Why should we not vote for something that will help, whether or not it is going to pass this year?

I leave that clearly in their hands. They can all look at it as they see fit. They can decide if they want to do this or want to get on with defeating this amendment, passing a deficit package that has a real chance of becoming reality within the next 2 or 3 months, and of sending a message that we are significantly reducing the deficit. We can also decide not to do things like for all practical purposes, passing a 3-year freeze on all of the entitlement programs, including social security, military pensions, civil service pensions, and some others.

I said practically, because I understand the CPI minus 3 is not a freeze. But I submit if we are as successful on inflation as we have been, it is practically a freeze. With inflation at 4, the CPI minus 3, means you get 1 percent in all of those programs.

The Senator from New Mexico does not think this is the best approach to deficit reduction if we have to do a bigger package at some point in time. I will quickly tell you that is absolutely true. I do not believe an approach to the entitlement programs of this country based upon treating them all the same and some kind of partial freeze for anything like 3 years is anything close to the best package you can come up with. If you have to do something next year as part of a major 5-, 6-, or 7-year plan, I submit that to say a 3-year freeze is to acknowledge that you just do not want to work on the programs in a meaningful way and you found some easy way to do it that you assume is equitable.

I used to think freezes on cost of living did not amount to much until I started looking at what 3-year freezes do to a lot of people who are hurting in this country. I have the numbers on what it is going to do to the average person in terms of checks they are expecting, many of them living on that and nothing else. I am just not sure that is what we ought to be doing as party of a deficit reduction package.

I am not critical of the Senator from Washington because for all practical purposes when you get to this point, where the committees have already debated it, they are not going to do it, the Finance Committee said, "We are not doing any more on entitlement savings," it is pretty difficult to do any more than some kind of formula adjustment to the programs.

For that reason, I am not suggesting that a Senator offering a package should do it by some kind of major reform, but, nonetheless, I do believe it is serious business to be taking this kind of action on civil service pensions, on military retirees, on social security recipients.

Having said that, let me suggest that there are many other things to talk about with reference to this amendment. I am not sure that I am going to address each and every one of them today, but, frankly, I hope every Senator understands that it could be their vote that says we are going to do this to these programs, and that each one who votes for it clearly ought to understand that that is precisely what they have in mind. I do not know how we can all think it is not going to amount to anything, that we are going to vote for it but we are really not doing it. I hope nobody is suggesting that. I am not suggesting that my friend from Washington is approaching his amendment in that manner.

I would like to make just one further observation. I really do not believe that the economists, the people working with Paul Volcker at the Federal Reserve, really can tell us what we ought to pass this year that is enough. I do not think they can tell us what it is that we pass up here that will not be enough. But I can tell you that $150 billion off of current policy trend lines in our budget, made up basically of about one-third from defense, nondefense, and revenues with some kind of an assurance that the appropriated part will also come through, which is the so-called leadership package, is not a trivial deficit reduction package.

For those who insist that it is trivial so long as it does not bring the bottom line down to their figure in 3 or 4 years from now, I submit that in our society there are certain realities of the marketplace. Those who study us look at those realities. I think on the one hand they are wondering whether we are going to do anything very significant. On the other hand, I truly believe that if they could imagine that 2 or 3 months from now we would truly put that $150 billion to bed and have it before the President for signature on various bills and say it is done, I think most of them would say we probably did not even think that could happen in this year and it is good. It is effective. It gives us renewed hope that the problems will be addressed.

Having said that, I also want to take 1 minute to tell you that I think the American economy is in pretty good shape today, and I am not one who thinks it is going to stop being in good shape next week or next month. I think clearly we are going to have to fix the deficits, but I think we have learned a number of lessons. Deficits are vitally important, but we have learned that a $3.6 trillion economy can stand more deficits than we thought. We have learned that the American people live with slightly higher interest rates than we thought. We have learned that an 8.3 percent growth in the American economy is possible without rekindling inflation. We have learned that we can put more people to work without any Government program putting them to work, like CETA, in an 11-month period than almost any other period since the Second World War.

We have learned that inflation is down and it might stay down; that optimism is up, and that there is a chance it will stay up. We have one thing left that is pretty tough, with all those goods, all those pluses, and that is the deficit. We do not have to address it all this year. If we take one big step, that is going to be enough and people are going to believe it. I think that step is the credible one that is found in the leadership package. I do not believe we are going to have major surgery on social security; I do not think we are going to have a major reform package for Federal or military retirees; I do not think we are going to de-index the indexed tax code this year. So you can understand why I do not think this package is going to have a dramatic effect on reducing interest rates, because I do not think any of those items that I just ticked off are going to happen. If they are not going to happen, I do not see how they are going to have an impact.

I am saying it as plain as I can. I do not believe there is a chance that kind of package is going anywhere, even if it passes here by a couple of votes. So how can it have such an impact on the deficit?

I know some will say if it passes why do we not make it law? I am just trying to read what I see out there. I regret to say, as strong and as powerful as we think we are, we do not yet run the country here in the Senate. We have a House of Representatives, and we have a President. I do not see all these things that I have just described as being in the cards. I would rather pass what I think is in the cards and can be signed into law and can make a dent.

I will close by saying for anyone who wonders where the deficit will be in 1987, I would submit that if you believe my economics, the deficit under the leadership package will be just about the same place it will be under the amendment of the Senator from Washington. It is just that I am more optimistic for the next 6, 8, 9, or 10 months. In any event, we ought to lower the deficit under his or my optimistic 3-year assessment. I give you that because it has some relevance. If you are voting because you think you know precisely what this is going to do for the deficit in 3 years, I would submit you can look at the proposal that the leadership made and assume that set of economics and you would be very close to where this proposal will get you. Obviously, you would be in better shape if everything worked right under the proposal of the Sena-

tor from Washington on the single issue of deficit reduction.

Having said as much as I want to say on this amendment, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DANFORTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICKLES). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee used the word credibility in his criticism of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington. I think the word credibility is a very good one on which to focus as we debate this matter.

I think that what is at stake here is whether or not we in Congress, we in Washington, have any credibility in dealing with the problem of deficits of $150 billion or $200 billion a year. I submit, Mr. President, that we do not have credibility in the Congress of the United States, and any Senator who has been back to his State in the last month or so knows that we do not have any credibility with our people. The American people do not believe that we have the will to deal with large deficits. The American people are certain that deficits of $150 billion or $200 billion a year, year after year, representing a tripling of the national debt in one decade, have a profound effect on the future of this country.

The American people know it. Urban people, rural people, old people, young people—all of them know that deficits of this size are bad for America; not just bad for the next year or so; not just bad for economic conditions in 1984 and 1985, but bad for our children and bad for our grandchildren. It is not responsible to run up deficits of this size and the American people know it.

Where does the question of credibility come in, Mr. President? The question of credibility arises when the Congress of the United States suggests to the American people that deficits of this size can be solved in a painless fashion, that all we have to do is award a few "golden fleeces," close a loophole here and there in the Tax Code, do a better job of collecting some debts, pay a lower price for Allen wrenches that are acquired by the Defense Department, and, painlessly, we shall solve our problems. People would like to believe that, but there is no credibility whatever in that position.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget used the argument which has been used repeatedly for the past 3 or 4 years whenever we have debated anything on the budget—the magic words, "social security."

Do not do anything to social security; do not do anything to the entitlements. Any time the entitlements are mentioned, press releases will be turned out by our political foes. It is poison to talk about the entitlement programs.

"We are not going to do it," we tell ourselves. This is May 1984, and we say, "We are not going to touch the entitlement programs in 1984," and we have heard the same thing every year in the past and I am sure we shall continue to hear the same argument in the future. Politically, it is said that we cannot touch the entitlement programs.

Mr. President, I have great respect for the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. He is a great Senator and a great chairman of this committee. But he is not a magician. I submit to the Senate that the notion that we can get the deficit under reasonable control absent a balanced program is magic. That is magic, it is not reality, and it is not credible. If we are going to get the deficit at a reasonably low level, we are going to have to do precisely what the Senator from Washington suggests we are going to have to do: We are going to have to trim the defense budget. Not hack away at it; but we are going to have to trim it a little more than we would like to. We are going to have to raise taxes a little more than we would like to raise them.

I have to raise taxes. Ever since I have been in the Senate, I have been for cutting taxes. The first fight I ever got into on the floor of the Senate was on a tax reduction proposal.

Senator GORTON has proposed raising taxes over what they otherwise would have been because that is what changing the indexing formula minus 3 percent does. So we are going to have to raise a little revenue. And, yes, Mr. President, hold on to your hat, but it is absolutely true, we are going to have to address the entitlements.

I suggest to the Senate that the argument that we are not going to touch these programs and cannot touch these programs and still we are going to deal responsibly with the deficit—that is a magical argument. It is not a credible argument.

Mr. President, the non-means-based entitlement programs consist of something like 35 to 40 percent of the Federal budget. I ask anyone who cares to explain to come forward and let us know how we can simply rule out any consideration of 35 to 40 percent of the budget and say we are going to get a $200 billion a year deficit under control. It cannot be done; it is magic.

Mr. President, I do not know; maybe I am done for politically. I almost was in 1982, that is for sure. Maybe I have had it. But I know that for the last year or so, I have traveled all over the State of Missouri talking about CPI minus 3. I am told that in our State, we have the fourth most elderly population in the country. I have traveled all over the State talking about CPI minus 3.

I have talked to audiences of predominantly retired people, and I have explained to them exactly what CPI minus 3 is. I have told them that the concept of CPI minus 3 means that, for a limited period of time, entitlement programs, COLA adjustments, will be less than the cost of living by 3 percent and the same is going to be true with tax indexing.

I can tell the Senate that when this concept is explained, the response of my constituents, including elderly constituents, is overwhelmingly supportive. I ask for shows of hands in the audience, "How many of you would be willing to go along with a program like this?" The overwhelming majority of the hands in the audience go up. Why? Because it is fair. Because it says to taxpayers and the recipients of benefits alike, "You have a role to play in solving this terrible problem of the country. We are going to pass the hat to everybody and you are going to be called on to chip in. Are you willing to do it?"

The answer to the question is, "Yes, we are."

Mr. President, it is conventional wisdom in politics for us to go from one interest group to another and tell them what they want to hear: "We are going to do things to help your group; we will not do anything to affect your group in a negative fashion." So we go to working people or we go to retired people or we go to civil servants or one group or another, and we tell them absolutely everything they want to hear: "You do not have any sacrifice to make in your group," we tell them. "We do not want your group to sacrifice. Why, you have no role to play in saving your country. You have already done enough. We are not going to call on you for anything at all."

Mr. President, I believe that we have gone too far in treating the people of this country as though they are retired Americans or working Americans or black Americans or white Americans or Hispanic Americans or any other kind of Americans. They want to think of themselves as Americans. They are still patriotic. They still believe in their country. They still believe that they have a contribution to make to their country. People 65 and over have children and grandchildren. They have not written off the future of America. They have not resigned from the country. They are still contributing people in America and they want to contribute to the answer. If we present to them a program which is fair, which treats everybody the same, recipient and taxpayer, the overwhelming majority of people will say, "Count me in; I'm proud to be part of the answer."

That is precisely what the Senator from Washington has suggested—some trimming of defense spending—not

hacking, but trimming—and an adjustment of the cost-of-living formulas for both tax purposes and spending purposes—equity, fairness, even-handedness; everybody contributes to the welfare of the country.

Mr. President, I am absolutely convinced that something very like what the Senator from Washington has proposed will have to be addressed by the Congress of the United States after the election if we are going to solve this terrible deficit problem. There is no doubt in my mind that we cannot put together a balanced program while leaving out either entitlements or the revenue side or leaving out the defense side. It cannot be done. And if we are going to address this issue sometime after the election, why not now? The prime rate went up half a percent today. Why not now? Why delude ourselves any longer? Why delude ourselves and delude the country that our problems can be solved by magic? This is the time for credibility, not magic. The Senator from Washington has offered a credible answer.

Mr. DECONCINI and Mr. EVANS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, for the past couple of weeks now I have listened with great interest to many of my distinguished colleagues on the Senate floor discussing the details of the various deficit reduction proposals that are being offered to the pending budget measure. During those same 2 weeks or so I have struggled with my staff, myself, and my own voting record. As the Senator from Missouri points out, we always want to please everybody, and I am no exception. All of the deficit reduction plans call for some very tough, unpleasant fiscal medicine over the next several years. But there appears to be one particular plan. That is the plan that has been offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I want to explain why I am doing so. Mr. President, before I go to the merits of the proposal of the Senator from Washington, I want to say at the outset it was with some heartburn that I reached my conclusion on this plan. So sensitive is a discussion of the cost of living that it sends reverberations through many of my good Arizona citizens who are willing to bear their share of the cost but feel like they have been picked on. Indeed, they have. We saw early in this administration an effort to reduce those COLA's and outright benefits. I do not like to see veterans' compensation and other benefits held back. Quite the contrary. Serving on that Veterans' Committee I have worked hard to keep them and to replace the cuts that were made in 1981 and 1982 by this administration. But the taste of this bitter pill is tempered somewhat by the specter of $200 billion deficits next year and a projected $308 billion deficit in 1989 if we do nothing to curb the freight train of red ink that is rolling down the track at an immense speed headed right for us.

Mr. President, why are we now faced with this dilemma? Why are we now faced with this unsavory task of having to vote for an emergency reduction package that goes against the grain of programs, activities, and people that we fought so long and so hard for? Many of our political careers rest on the support of these people. But as the Senator from Missouri said, if you explain a program that is fairly balanced, that is equitable, they will accept it, if they really believe everyone is going to participate. But someone always escapes. We know that from our hard work. The answer to the problem is that we no longer can stay the course through the stormiest economic squall since the Great Depression.

The combination of the largest defense buildup in our history, the largest tax reduction package of the President's, and the increase in interest payments needed to pay for the money borrowed by Uncle Sam to cover the cost of the President's defense buildup has triggered a 4-year deficit that exceeds the budget deficits of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Nixon, Ford, and Carter administrations combined. That is why we are on the verge of adopting emergency legislation to roll back the damage. Can we wait until the election? Oh, sure. And perhaps we will. Can we wait another 10 years? I guess we could wait until hell freezes over if we had to. But the time to do something is now. Therefore, after searching my soul and reviewing all of these programs as carefully as I can, I am convinced the Gorton deficit reduction plan offers a balanced, reasonable, and equitable approach toward putting our fiscal house in order over the next 3 years. First, with the exception of the Hollings-Exon-Andrews plan, which I voted against, the Gorton deficit reduction plan reduces the deficit to a lower level by fiscal year 1987 than any of the plans that are currently on the table. Through a combination of spending cuts in defense, income tax indexing modifications, and cost-of-living reductions the Gorton plan reduces that deficit to $156.5 billion, if my observations are correct, by the year 1987, a $47.5 billion reduction below the projected Republican leadership deficit the same year, which is $204 billion. It would reduce the deficit to a level that is $5.5 billion below the much heralded Biden-Kassebaum deficit plan as calculated through 1987. So this plan accomplishes what every one of our colleagues has been saying we should accomplish with respect to budget reduction plans. We have one.

The Gorton plan also brings defense spending down to a realistic growth level that will allow us to strengthen our military forces without resorting to the inflated budget-busting defense numbers recommended by President Reagan on February 1.

Imagine, a budget that called for real growth of over 13 percent next year. Fortunately, the President has finally seen the light and on May 3 sent us a revised defense budget. I compliment him for doing that. I wish it had been sooner. But at least he is willing to bear some of the burden of these huge deficits that he certainly has helped create. The Gorton package will force our military to achieve economies in low priority activities without touching the major procurement and conventional force improvement initiatives which are needed in order to maintain our overall defense strength. Forcing the Defense Department to live with a budget of $297.1 billion, an increase of $31.8 billion over last year, is hardly going to set back our efforts to rebuild our defense posture in any of our armed services.

Furthermore, the 3-year total for defense spending contained in this plan is virtually identical to the 3-year defense spending plan adopted by Congress last year in the budget resolution of 1984.

Furthermore, the Gorton plan provides a small amount of relief in the nondefense discretionary spending program by raising the nondefense spending cap, I believe, by a modest $2.7 billion, or 1.9 percent over the pending Republican leadership plan for fiscal year 1985. The caps contained in that leadership plan for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 would not be changed. By making a small adjustment in the nondefense discretionary accounts next year, this plan would allow our law enforcement agencies, our small, personnel-intensive commissions and agencies, our health and science agencies, and our important domestic programs to prepare for the rigid restrictions that are coming down the road in fiscal years 1986 and 1987. Surely, a 2-percent increase over current baselines for nondefense discretionary programs is a bargain.

I compliment the Senator from Washington for realizing that there is need for a small, modest increase in some of these vital services, notwithstanding how everybody likes to condemn "social programs."

Fourth, the Gorton plan would cap personal income tax indexing at the Consumer Price Index less 3 percent for the next 3 years. This is very difficult for me to support. I have been one who has joined the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) for a number of

years, along with others; and when the President finally put his tax package together with indexing, I raved and chanted, "Hooray! Hooray!" But the time has come to realize that if we want to be fair, as the Senator from Missouri just said, everybody has to participate. Some cuts, some reductions, everyplace. Some increase in revenues without overtaxing our people.

I recommended a similar proposal in my recent newsletter. Yes, I have had some letters and some calls objecting to it. But I also had a flood of support realizing that it calls for a balanced program such as offered here.

This brings me to perhaps the most troublesome piece of the Gorton package, but a piece I am willing to support as part of an overall deficit reduction strategy. I am referring to the provision which calls for capping cost-of-living adjustments—I say it again, capping cost-of-living adjustments—in non-means-tested entitlement programs at CPI minus 3 percent for the next 3 years. That is a tough one in Arizona, because the people who receive these cost-of-living increases have already given plenty, and they have paid for it many, many times. It is tough to ask them to give any more.

This controversial portion of the Gorton plan would save $40.6 billion. I believe that with that figure, you can propose to anyone, if you have a balanced budget, that, yes, I will give more, even though I have already given once or twice at the office and once or twice at home. I will do it again as long as everybody is going to give.

Let me say up front that any reduction in COLA's next year is not going to set well in Arizona, but it is time we do not just think about what is going to go well at home or on the front pages of the newspapers. Frankly, it is not popular with the junior Senator from Arizona. I have fought long and hard for Arizona's senior citizens, Federal workers, and civilian, postal, and military retirees. I have a lot of them living in Arizona. I think some of them depend on us to be sure that they do not receive unfair treatment in any budget, tax program, or other Government entitlement programs. But if we are to really come to grips with the deficit, we must begin to look at ways to bring the non-means-tested entitlement programs into the battle of fighting the budget. The approach recommended by the Senator from Washington is a fair way to address the issue of non-means-tested entitlements, without taking the draconian steps of eliminating COLA's as contained in other amendments that have been offered, or freezing at the 1984 level, which is the leadership amendment as I read it.

Although no one can accurately predict what the 1985 CPI will be, assuming that it stays relatively flat, beneficiaries still would be receiving a small cost-of-living adjustment under this plan. If it increases substantially, which many economists predict, the Gorton plan will allow additional relief for those non-means-tested recipients.

I have no doubt that we will be hearing from good people who say, "Why me?" The explanation has been put out here by a number of distinguished Members of this body who feel as I do, that it is time to offer a plan, to put up or shut up, to say what we are going to do and to support it clearly, to realize that we must act now.

Finally, this Gorton package will take savings derived in the old age and survivors' trust fund in the social security program which result from the COLA adjustments and direct them into the medicare hospital insurance trust fund, where the need for an additional infusion of cash is most acute. This approach makes sense when viewed in the context of the goals of the Senator's amendment and the tremendous needs to make the medicare fund solvent.

Mr. President, this has not been a comfortable couple of weeks for this Senator or for any other Senator. These are tough times, and they are becoming tougher. We have seen the worst recession since the Depression, and we are on the brink of getting out of that, some people say, but some people are suffering.

In all candor, there is much Congress could and should have done over the last 3 years to rein in the President's program. We could have and we should have done something about the third year of that tax program when we realized it was not going to work. I was one of the Senators who voted for it, believing that the President was entitled to his opportunity, to his economic program. We tried it, and we know what it has brought us. It has brought us the worst deficits ever.

There is no escaping the raw data on the deficit which shows, without a shadow of a doubt, that the unprecedented deficit built up in the last 4 years can be laid at the feet of the present administration. Congress has to take the blame, too. We have the final authority. We can stop it. But it takes a leader in the White House who is prepared to offer a balanced budget, not just at election time.

The American people demand that we act on the deficit and do it now. If the mail flowing into my office is any indication of a national trend, I believe that the American people are willing to hunker down and share in the sacrifice, as long as Congress shows the courage and the will to develop a permanent, long-range solution to the budget problem which does not single out any one group to absorb all the cuts. We owe it to our senior citizens, our veterans, our blue-collar workers, our men and women of the armed services, our businessmen and women, and to ourselves to attack the deficit problem head on this year, not next year. The program of the Senator from Washington for deficit reduction does just that. It is an honest first step for doing just what I have urged, and I urge the adoption of this plan.

I thank the Senator for the work he has put in on this matter.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I join my colleague the senior Senator from Washington in endorsing the amendment he has proposed.

We have heard a lot of words during the last couple of weeks regarding deficit reduction packages, but I think they all can be capsulized in just a few words. We have heard constant reference to fairness. We have certainly heard a lot of talk about credibility.

Of course, there has been a good deal of discussion about adequacy. That really capsulizes what this debate is all about. Are we or are we not going to have the courage to provide a program which is credible to the American people, fair to all those affected, and adequate to do the important job these proposals are set out to do?

Unfortunately, in listening to the comments of the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of our Budget Committee, it almost sounds like the real question is: In a political year can we include any entitlement changes at all in the budget deficit reduction package? Or are we simply going to ignore that portion of the budget and quietly say to ourselves we will wait until after the election is over and take it up in 1985?

I do not think that is the real question. I think the real question is the one I posed earlier and others have posed, and that is: We need a program which is adequate, fair, and credible.

It seems difficult for me to understand how 45 percent of the budget, all of the entitlement programs, and the 36-plus percent of the budget which are the non-means-tested entitlement programs can be ignored and still develop a program which is adequate, fair, and credible.

I have had the privilege, or the experience, at least, of having run a race for the Senate more recently than anyone else in this body. We had a hotly contested Senate race in the State of Washington in the fall of 1983. And much of the debate during that Senate race revolved around the question of deficits, how to correct deficits, and more particularly what were the elements of a successful budget deficit reduction package.

It was an intense campaign and I spoke as often as I could; in as many places in the State as I could; and as clearly as I could that an adequate,

fair, and credible package simply would have to include the entitlement programs. You could not get it all out of defense. You certainly could not get it all out of discretionary domestic spending. And you obviously cannot get it out of the 12 or 13 percent of our budget which already goes to the interest payments on our national debt.

I do not know whether that resulted as a plus or a minus in the campaign. But certainly speaking out clearly and advocating to audiences, both young and old, that entitlement programs had to share in a budget deficit reduction package was not politically fatal in 1983, and I do not think it has to be politically fatal in 1984.

People are simply smarter than that. If they feel that this Congress and this Senate has done a fair job, and their participation in that fair job makes it adequate and the adequacy makes it credible, then all will benefit.

No one else yet in this debate has mentioned two other facts which I think are important to bring forward.

Since 1970, the entitlement programs—social security, civil service pensions, and/or similar programs—have increased 70 percent faster than the increase in the cost of living. There have been substantial gains, and I suggest that they were warranted gains. This is one small share of slowdown in order to achieve some other important benefits, which again, no one has mentioned during this recent debate.

There are other insidious taxes on the elderly, on those retired, and those receiving disability benefits and everyone else in our society. Those are the taxes which are not levied directly by this body or by any political body in this country, but are certainly levied indirectly. They are, of course, the taxes of inflation and of interest rates, which affect directly or indirectly every citizen in this Nation. They affect directly or indirectly the purchasing power of a recipient of social security and the purchasing power of the American defense establishment.

We sometimes forget that if we were to come forward with a program which is sufficient, we get the benefit of reduced interest rates and the benefit of a continued slowdown in the rate of inflation. If our program is inadequate, I am as certain as I can be, that we will be facing in a year or 2 years, or sometime in the not too distant future, rising interest rates, rising rates of inflation, and we will be wondering what to do to support our people who are facing additional costs.

The chairman of the Budget Committee has emphasized most strongly the effect on social security. He has suggested that this is a 3-year program and we cannot afford to hurt social security recipients for 3 years. We all know that while this is a 3-year program, 3-year programs are subject to change. They are subject to modification. They are always subject to a better idea which comes along later.

I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to the Budget Committee and to the chairman of that committee for having brought us to this point—for having made the debate one of what kind of program we will adopt, instead of whether we will adopt a program.

He has suggested that no one can tell us what will happen with a certain level of deficit reduction, but I reiterate what others have said. If there is one person in this Nation who has some responsibility for the level of interest rates, that person is certainly the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. When he says that a $50 billion deficit reduction package in 1985 will lead to a 2 full percentage point reduction in interest rates, that is worth listening to.

My concern is that we will have debated for 5 weeks and we will have done something if we adopt the leadership package. We will have done something, but the real question is whether it will be sufficient to do the job.

With the best estimates of the future, the deficits 3 years from now under the leadership package will be every bit as high, if not higher, than they are today. And I suggest it will not take long for someone to typify this as a deficit maintenance program rather than a deficit reduction program.

And if so, and if that is the view of the financial markets and the view of the people of the United States, then the debate of the last 5 weeks will have been primarily in vain.

It has been suggested that this Senate does not run the country and that we cannot be sure that the actions we take will ultimately succeed. Of course, that is true. But we can absolutely be sure, that if we do not take action, then we cannot succeed.

I suggest we not try to run the country, but we try to act in the most responsible fashion we can in the Senate. We can make this first step, and I strongly believe that my colleague from the State of Washington has, in fact, produced for this body a program which meets a three-way test of adequacy, fairness, and credibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will be brief, but I wish to congratulate the Senator from Washington for the introduction of his amendment. I know there are a lot of people who would like to see this amendment go away, but, Mr. President, I think it is time that we have the courage in Congress to step forward and make some difficult decisions. When you are talking about CPI-3 on entitlement programs, that is a difficult decision. Certainly in this Senator's case, and I would imagine a lot of Senators, when you talk about CPI-3 on indexing, that is a difficult decision that needs to be made.

I am interested when we hear people talk about the Federal deficit, well, Paul Volcker thinks we need to do more. Regardless of what Paul Volcker seems to think, I think the American people tell us we need to do more. The deficits under the proposal that either passed the House of Representatives or the one that we are considering today, the so-called leadership package, are too high. I think most everyone would agree if you go back to your constituents and you tell them what those deficits are that we are looking at, in the $180 billion or $200 billion range, they will say they are far too high.

I congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, for his comments. I think he made some outstanding comments. The economy is better. Inflation in 1979 was 13.3 percent. In 1980 it was 12.4 percent.

Last year, 1983, it was 3.2 percent. That is a lot better. That certainly saves senior citizens and everybody else a lot of money.

Interest rates are certainly too high. But if you look at the interest rate of December 1980, it was 21.5 percent prime interest rate, and a lot of people have to pay prime plus 2 percent. Today, the prime interest rate is 12.5 percent. Certainly, that is too high, but it is a lot better than 21.5 percent.

If you look back to 1980, everyone was concerned about what? Inflation rates and interest rates. Both of those are down substantially.

But if you go back, at least to my State of Oklahoma, you will find out the one thing that people are still upset about are these enormous deficits. They want us to do something about these deficits, and they want us to do something about these deficits today.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator for his comments. I would say, Mr. President, I failed to mention another item when I said things are better. This one is controversial, more so than the ones we have just discussed.

But we build back our defense in that 3½ years in the middle of a recession. And that is better, too. For those that think you get that for free, they just have to understand that the decade of the 1970's is probably the last free decade for military preparedness for the world's great free superpower. So we have had to spend some money.

I add that because the others are all pluses of another type, that were risks of another type and have been re-

solved. High inflation, which had a big risk, it is down. One risk in better shape. Interest rates, way too high, superhigh risk for America, no growth. Productivity down, terrible risk; everything we stand for, now up.

But also defense neeeded a lot of money, needed modernization, had to pay the people that served and defended this Nation. We did that, too. And so we got rid of a lot of risks. I kind of call it my four-for-one. We had four risks and they have been alleviated dramatically. Now we have one left, the deficit.

All I am suggesting is you are not going to solve that one very quickly. It is going to take a while.

I thank the Senator for his statement. I agree with him that the deficits are too high. No question about it.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I appreciate the chairman's comments. I might add to that, if we are going to talk about it, unemployment. We have 5 million more people working today than we had a couple of years ago. So the economy has rebounded.

But the No. 1 problem remains. We agree the deficits are too large.

In particular, when I mentioned the inflation rate, I mentioned the fact that the inflation rate was 3.2 percent for last year, and yet, you still see a prime interest rate of 12.5 percent. That is too great a difference. That is a 9-percentage point difference.

Why? I would say two things. One, the Federal Reserve—and I think too many people have not been watching what has happened to the money supply—the Federal Reserve expanded greatly the money supply. Basically, if you look at the charts, from about October 1982 all the way through August of 1983, you will see double-digit expansion in the money supply. They have contracted substantially in the last couple of quarters in the growth range of about 4 or 5 percent, about a third of what is was during most of the 1982 and 1983 period which I mentioned.

So, as a result, I think that is what is really pushing the interest rates up today. Most people have ignored that. But we do not control the money supply—that is the Federal Reserve—unless we change the legislation governing the Federal Reserve. We cannot do anything on that today. But we can control Congress and it is responsible for fiscal policy. And Congress has been doing, in this Senator's opinion, a very poor job in fiscal policy. We have not gotten Federal spending under control. One of the reasons why we have not gotten Federal spending under control is because we have not had the courage or the conviction to touch entitlement programs. And the time is now.

The deficits that we are looking at, $200 billion, even under the leadership proposal—and I compliment the leadership because they did come up with a balanced proposal, about a third in tax increases, about a third in defense, and a third from nondefense. I think that is equitable.

But it does not do enough. In this Senator's opinion, I think we need to do more. If you go back and talk to your constituents and say, "We have come up with this package but we are still looking at the deficits that are going to be around $189 billion or $190 billion for the next several years," they will say, "That is not enough." They will say, "Go back to the drawing board and come up with something more."

The proposal that we have, the Gorton proposal of which I am a cosponsor, does more. It takes the leadership savings of $144 billion in deficit reductions and increases that are over 50 percent. It adds another $85 billion in savings over and above that called for by the leadership package. And it does not hurt any one individual that much.

Sure, there are some sacrifices that are involved. Sure, there are some things I do not want to lose like the tax index, 3 percent per year. I think that is something I would like to have.

But we are going to have to start making some sacrifices. I have heard time and time again, "Well, not this year. This is an election year. We have to reelect Ronald Reagan."

Sure, I want to reelect Ronald Reagan. I want to elect a majority of Republicans to control the Senate. I like being in the majority. But I also think we need to be responsible. And the time for being responsible is now. Every other year is an election year. If we are not going to wrestle with difficult problems in an election year, maybe we should not meet but every odd-numbered year.

This is a serious problem and the time is now. We need to address it.

I compliment the Senator from Washington for bringing up his proposal. We are going to be asked to vote to increase the debt limit within the next couple of weeks probably another $200 billion. That means we are going to be borrowing. We are going to go back to the American people and say, "No, we couldn't quite get a package together very good this year, so we are going to have to go into debt another $200 billion."

The national debt today is approximating $1.5 trillion. That is $6,500 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. We are saying that is not enough, that we have to borrow another $200 billion to make sure that we can finance our excess expenditures. We need to make responsible decisions.

This Gorton amendment is not a panacea. It is not a cure-all. It is not going to solve all the problems. But it is significantly better than the $144 billion package. It would take the figures up to $229 billion. So now we are moving up into at least 40-some percent of the forecasted deficit. That is a lot better than 25 percent.

Again, I congratulate my colleagues. I hope the Senate will give serious consideration to this amendment. I hope that we will adopt it today.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICKLES). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. KASSEBAUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, the unanimous-consent request I am about to propound has been submitted to the principals involved in the debate and to the minority leader and the two managers. I believe it is agreeable on both sides. I hope so.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate temporarily lay aside the pending question, which is the Gorton amendment, and proceed to the consideration of a Kennedy amendment to the Finance Committee portion of this bill dealing with medicare, which was permitted by a previous unanimous-consent order, which amendment will be sent to the desk.

I further ask unanimous consent that, at the hour of 4:30 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate return to the consideration of the Gorton amendment, at which time there will be 30 minutes of debate, to be equally divided and under the control of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and that, at the hour of 5 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate vote on or in relation to the Gorton amendment.

ORDER FOR PERIOD OF TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS AND FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. I further ask unanimous consent that if this agreement is entered into, the Senate then go into a period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend not past the hour of 7:30 p.m., in which Senators may speak; and that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow.

That is the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, may I ask the leader, in terms of the Kennedy amendment, it will be laid down to-

night, but with no time understanding with reference either to debate of it or vote upon it?

Mr. BAKER. That is my understanding, Madam President.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3050

(Purpose: To delete sections 901, 916, which raise costs for median beneficiaries by increasing the Part B premium, and indexing the Part B deductible)

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, on behalf of Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. CRANSTON, I send the amendment to the desk to which the distinguished majority leader has referred, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), for himself, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. CRANSTON, proposes an amendment numbered 3050.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike increase in part B premium (sec. 901): On page 1199, beginning with line 4, strike all through line 17 on page 1201.

Strike indexing in part B deductible (sec. 916): On page 1226, beginning with line 21, strike all through line 4 on page 1228.

In the section of the Baker amendment dealing with budget authority for Defense, delete "to exceed $299,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $333,700,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $372,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987" and "substitute" to exceed $298,965,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $333,226,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 and $370,507,000,000 in fiscal year 1987."

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, has the request been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. BAKER. That request also provided automatically for a period for the transaction of routine morning business, did it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam President, the Senate is finally sailing in the right direction with the budget amendments to this bill. Only 4 months ago we were talking about appointing a committee to consider what we ought to do, and now we are taking action. We are trying to put our fiscal House in order. In so doing, we are sending a clear signal to foreign and domestic financial markets that will help restore their confidence in the United States. Perhaps, even some of the damage done to our export markets can be reversed if we act decisively.

The path we have chosen is not easy. It will require sacrifice from every quarter and make demands on the personal integrity of each of us that will be especially heavy in an election year. But we have finally come to recognize that a growing economy alone cannot overcome these mounting deficits. Left untended, these deficits, like weeds, will choke off the economic growth we seek to cultivate.

Clearly, there is a tradeoff between the important programs we want to promote through budget expenditures and the consequences of these huge deficits. It is worth our time to pause and reflect on some of the consequences that we will avert by taking deficit reduction seriously.

A few years ago we were alarmed by deficits of $28 billion, but a few years from now our country could easily face deficits 10 times that size. One is reminded of the dire predictions of the 18th century economist Thomas Malthus, except that it is our own deficits whose geometric rate of growth will consume all our productive economic opportunities.

Although much of the domestic impact of the current deficits is yet to be felt, our buying on borrowed money is having drastic international consequences. The large deficits cause high interest rates and the interest rates artificially increase the value of our dollar. Foreign capital is attracted to our country, away from where it is desperately needed by debtor developing nations, oil importing nations, and our European allies. With a $100 billion trade deficit our exports have greatly suffered due to the exorbitantly priced dollar. However, should foreign capital dry up, not only will our exports suffer but everything—food, clothing, and shelter—will cost more. In short, continued long-term deficits will send interest rates soaring, rekindle inflation, depress investment, limit job opportunities, and increase our trade deficit.

These are economic consequences we are attempting to avoid with our deficit reduction packages. It is these consequences that we must weigh against what we are trying to achieve as a nation. This is why I join with Senators CHAFEE, STAFFORD, WEICKER, and ANDREWS in offering an amendment to the leadership plan. Our amendment will provide a single cap on all appropriations for each of the next 3 fiscal years. The total appropriations permitted by this amendment would be $16.7 billion less than the 3-year total of the leadership plan. In making our calculations, we allow for a real growth rate in defense of 4 percent based on economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office, or 5.5 percent based on the assumptions of the Office of Management and Budget.

For nondefense appropriations, our amendment adopts the CBO baseline, rather than a 1-year freeze. Our amendment's defense figure is $37 billion less than the leadership plan, while our nondefense budget appropriations are $20.3 billion more than the leadership figure over a 3-year period. We consider an absolute freeze on the nondefense appropriated programs inappropriate because these programs have borne the major burden of the deficit reduction effort over the last 4 years.

We also believe that one cap on all appropriations is absolutely necessary in order to properly evaluate each spending program on its own merits. It is a case of commonsense making economic sense. Economics is the dismal science that teaches us to deal rationally with scarcity. Every decision involves a tradeoff. More of one item means less of another. Indeed, serious efforts toward deficit reduction are themselves a tradeoff—the tradeoff between the consequences of huge deficits and the national priorities reflected in our budget expenditures. Exempting defense from this reasoning process, by placing it under a separate appropriations cap, skews our budget priorities and violates sound economic decisionmaking practices.

Congress and the Nation are weighing the tradeoff between deficit reductions and Government programs; now it is time to set up priorities within the budget itself. Defense constitutes over one-half of what is within our budget power to control. Payments for many items such as social security, interest on the debt, Federal retirement, medicare and medicaid are already fixed. Under our proposal, defense expenditures, education, research, and health programs will all face the same scrutiny. Under the leadership proposal, instead of analyzing dollar for dollar the value of each program to the general welfare, defense programs will only be compared with other defense needs and not with education, science, research, or other vital nondefense needs.

We face many challenges in the coming years—educating our children, keeping the peace and maintaining a strong economy. We cannot do any of these unless they are all done together. If two appropriations caps are allowed, funds for educating our children will have to compete with funds for keeping them healthy. The two appropriations caps change the traditional economic analogy from a choice between guns and butter to a choice between guns and more guns, and a choice between butter and education or health or crime control. Guns and butter are both important to our national security, but developing our human capital is the bedrock of our national security. I support an adequate military budget. But I am occasionally troubled by the thought that someday, unless we reorder our priorities, we could end up with a lot of

complicated military hardware and no one literate enough to operate it.

In a time of scarce resources, in a time when the deficits drastically affect the rest of our domestic and international economy, we must make sure that every dollar spent yields a maximum benefit to the general welfare. This can only be done with one appropriations cap, where all programs are evaluated on their merits against one another and against the economic consequences of uncontrolled deficits.

Mr. BAKER. I wish to announce there will be no more rollcall votes tonight.

THE ELECTION RESULTS IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, last week I called upon President Reagan to recall Ambassador Thomas Pickering for consultations on the role which he and his Embassy officials have played in rigging the election in El Salvador.

Now there is evidence that Mr. Pickering was but a key role player in a behind-the-scenes drama much wider than I could have imagined last week. When I asked the President to recall Mr. Pickering, I based the request on the overt actions which the Ambassador had been taking to enhance the candidacy of the socialist nominee, Jose Napoleon Duarte. Now the evidence is that Mr. Pickering was presiding over a covert plan to funnel U.S. Government funds and other assistance directly into Duarte's campaign.

This covert funding has been going on for 2 years. In other words, the State Department and the CIA bought the election for Duarte. Mr. Pickering was merely the purchasing agent. If Mr. Pickering did not approve of the scheme, he should have resigned.

It has been my understanding that President Reagan's policy is to build democracy in El Salvador. However, the covert funding of Duarte does just the opposite. It is, in fact, a misuse of the democratic process that ultimately will subvert the President's policy as defined by Mr. Reagan. The fact appears to be that President Reagan never himself approved the funding of Duarte. It was the decision of the third-level interagency group on Central America that is supposed to coordinate policy in the executive branch. In 1981, President Reagan reportedly authorized the use of covert action to support parties being threatened by Marxist-Leninist insurgency, a step I consider quite proper. But at no time, according to my information, did the President authorize covert action on behalf of one democratic party to the detriment of other democratic parties. The bureaucrats evidently decided, in effect, to classify Roberto D'Aubuisson, Duarte's chief opponent, in the same category as the Communists.

Madam President, the bias of the bureaucrats in favor of the socialist candidate, Mr. Duarte, was plain for all to see, as was their actual malice toward Mr. D'Aubuisson, who openly espoused the principles of the Republican Party in the United States. Mr. D'Aubuisson was forever being linked—in the jargon of the media—to the so-called right-wing death squads. The cue was taken from slanderous accusations of President Carter's Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Robert White.

Yet Mr. White's accusations proved to be flimsy indeed; and when confronted by the attorney for one of his victims before the Western Hemisphere Affairs Subcommittee, he was forced to retract. Lawsuits against Mr. White are pending.

Mr. D'Aubuisson was never given the opportunity by the State Department or the media to confront his accusers. I personally made inquiries of every agency and every high official in the U.S. Government that I judged to be in a position to know the truth. In almost every case, I was told, in effect, that there was no credible evidence, but that it would be impolitic to say so. There were, however, one or two who said that yes, there was evidence linking Mr. D'Aubuisson to the death squads; but when pressed for specifics, they backed down, saying there was nothing that would hold up in court. I am still waiting for any specific evidence, whether it would hold up in court or not. I invite any official of the administration to put it forward.

Nevertheless, the State Department continued an underground campaign of malicious accusations against one of the chief candidates in the Salvadoran elections. Hardly a day failed to go by without unnamed Embassy spokesmen or their similarly anonymous colleagues here in Washington repeating their accusations, or indicating that things would go hard for El Salvador if the voters chose Mr. D'Aubuisson. The faceless spokesmen never failed to point out the symbolic act of refusing a visa to Mr. D'Aubuisson.

We see now that all of this was not just mere bias. The State Department and the CIA were protecting their investment. They had bought Mr. Duarte lock, stock, and barrel, and they did not want the invested capital to be wasted by the Salvadoran voters rejecting the merchandise. They wanted the trappings of democracy to enhance the product, but they did not want to risk a real commitment to freedom.

This was not the policy of President Reagan. I have known the President too long to believe that he would ever support a phony democracy or a crooked election. This was the policy of a small coterie of bureaucrats with their own agenda and their own policies—the permanent government pursuing its own aims in defiance of the President's wishes.

Insofar as the President is responsible, he is responsible, by hindsight for not having been more exacting in insuring that the policymaking slots at the State Department are filled with persons loyal to his principles. Many good friends of the President have tried to warn him that the bureaucracy is out of control; but other advisers of the President have chosen to ignore those warnings. Yet we still see nominations coming forward for key State Department policy slots who represent the views of previous administrations and the bureaucratic establishment. Policy is created by persons; and the President will have to see to it that the persons he chooses are representatives of his aims.

The practical result is that we have the potential for a first-class debacle on our hands, with the prestige of the United States invested in a socialist who is pledged to an economic policy that will bring the country to a halt, and a diplomatic policy that will result in a coalition with the Marxist-Leninists. Mr. Duarte has already intimated that key Marxists will be in his government; and if these Marxists are invited, will the Marxist-Leninists be far behind? Mr. Duarte is without a mandate to rule or the arguments to produce national unity. In assuming power through a rigged election, Mr. Duarte runs the real risk of touching off another conflagration in a war-torn land.

It is a real question just who has been told about the covert funding of Duarte. I have today talked to high members of the administration who were just as shocked as I was to discover what had happened. I have talked to other Senators who were similarly in the dark. I hope that the President is fully briefed on the exact nature of U.S. support for Duarte before he makes his television speech tomorrow.

It is my understanding that not even the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence was informed of the funding of Duarte until last Thursday—the day after particulars I revealed in a speech on the Senate floor were made public. I do not know what went on at that meeting, but I have been given to understand that Senators who heard the news declined to go to El Salvador as election observers because they did not want to be in the position of appearing to approve what has transpired.

All the details of this operation should now be revealed. The whole truth should be told. The only way to make amends is to tell the truth. Those responsible for formulating, approving, and executing the policy should carefully consider whether

they can continue to serve our Government with honor.

The whole purpose of our policy in El Salvador was to build democracy in that country, a country where the citizens were obviously yearning to participate in a free and open democratic process. This is a goal which I have strongly supported, and continue to support.

The essence of democracy is to allow the people to make their own choices within a constitutional system. The essence of democracy is to prevent undue pressures which block the free workings of the political system, and which give unfair advantages to one side or the other. This is what I believe in. This is what the American people believe in.

In our electoral system, we believe that democracy cannot flourish if any political candidate is funded from a single, overwhelming source. At the same time, we believe that a broad base of funding, coming in small donations from the people themselves, is an important sign of healthy democracy, and in itself a partial test of fitness to serve.

Instead, what we had in El Salvador was a calculated plan to defeat the working of democracy in El Salvador. It implies a fear that the people in El Salvador do not know what is good for them, and cannot be trusted to make a proper decision. When we see the narrowness of the apparent margin despite the unfair odds, we see that the fears of the opponents of democracy were justified.

The support reportedly given to Mr. Duarte was not just direct funding, but also comprehensive, across-the-board services. The United States provided funds for 400 precinct organizers for Mr. Duarte, set up a model press operation, provided radio and TV studios, gave technical advice and paid for the computer voter registration system that disenfranchise 20 percent of the voters the first time around. If the CIA programed the computers, how can anyone trust the numbers?

It is not my contention that Mr. D'Aubuisson should have won. My contention is that the Salvadoran people should have had the right to choose without undue pressure from the U.S. Government. It is alleged that I am defending Mr. D'Aubuisson; I have met him only once, on a brief occasion when we both happened to attend a dinner several months ago. On the other hand, I have met Mr. Duarte many times; my staff has spent hours with him discussing his political philosophy. We are under no illusions as to his aims and ideas. Only a total perversion of the terms of political dialog can establish Mr. Duarte as a moderate. If Duarte is a centrist, then our former colleague, George McGovern, is an extreme right winger.

However, my reactions to the El Salvadorans candidates are of no consequence. It is not our choice, but the choice of the people of El Salvador that matters. Unfortunately, the people of El Salvador were not allowed to make a free choice.

It is necessary, therefore, to clear the air. The whole truth should come out, so that the people of El Salvador can take whatever steps they deem necessary in the light of the facts.

I would not presume to dictate, or even suggest, what they should now do, if anything—but neither should anyone else connected with the U.S. Government.

SEA-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam President, the nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missile [SLCM] countdown has begun. Some time between now and June 30, the United States will begin deployment of the nuclear SLCM. Unless something is done soon, some time within the next 53 days the United States will begin the slide down the slippery slope of instability, landing on a heap of broken arms control promises.

Current American arms control efforts are limited to sporadic multilateral activity in the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. These efforts, such as they are, represent steps in the right direction, but they are not enough. We must return to the START and INF negotiations and tackle all the hard issues, including nuclear SLCM's, while there is still time.

Given the current state of world affairs, the United States should be doing everything in its power to bring the Soviet Union back to the negotiating table. But I am not persuaded that the United States is doing all that it could.

The most glaring evidence to suggest that we are not trying our hardest is found in our stated intention to deploy the nuclear SLCM. If we were really pursuing all avenues to achieve arms control, we would think twice before deploying a missile that will undercut all existing American arms control proposals. Once deployed, the nuclear SLCM could make START, or any other accord, obsolete before it is signed. The time to halt nuclear SLCM deployments and get arms control back on track is now, before major deployments occur, and not after the fact. And the best way to achieve these goals is to impose a bilateral moratorium on American and Soviet nuclear SLCM deployments. Senator DAVE DURENBERGER and I proposed just that on May 3, and we invite all interested colleagues to consider our proposed moratorium as a way to bring the U.S.S.R. back to the Geneva talks. It is in our mutual interest to have those talks succeed.

As I mentioned before, time is running out. There are just 54 days before we reach the point of no return signaled by the first nuclear SLCM deployment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam President, pursuant to the provisions of rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask leave of the Senate to be absent on May 9, 10, and 11 for the purpose of attending a conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 111

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 be star printed to correct a printing error on page 3, line 1, of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, there are a number of items, seven items, on today's Calendar of Business which appear to be cleared on this side for action by unanimous consent. I refer to Calendar Orders Nos. 794, 836, 837, 839, 840, and 841. May I inquire of the minority leader if he is in a position to clear all or any portion of those measures for action by unanimous consent at this time?

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, there is no objection on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I may also say to the minority leader that one other item is cleared on this side. That is Calendar Order No. 707, H.R. 3240. However, I am advised that the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) wishes to be present when that measure is taken up.

What I propose to do now, and indeed I will make this request for the consideration of the minority leader and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Orders 794, 836, 837, 839, 840, and 841 be considered en bloc.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I have no objection to that request. The distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is present. Since he had indicated his desire to be present at the time Calendar Order 707 is taken up, the majority leader may want to proceed with that immediately or following the six calendar orders to which he alluded with reference to voting en bloc.

Mr. BAKER. Very well. Since it would be dealt with en bloc and the

Senator from New York is on the floor, I wonder if he has any objection if we take the 15 seconds necessary to dispose of the other items?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. No objection.

Mr. BAKER. Then I put the request, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

SALE OF AMMUNITION FOR AVALANCHE CONTROL PURPOSES

The bill (S. 2100) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell ammunition for use for avalanche-control purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2100

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to the needs of the Army, the Secretary of the Army may sell ammunition for military weapons which are used for avalanche-control purposes to any State (or entity of a State) or to any other non-Federal entity that has been authorized by a State to use those weapons in that State for avalanche-control purposes. Sales of ammunition under this Act shall be on a reimbursable basis and shall be subject to the condition that the ammunition be used only for avalanche-control purposes.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL SAFETY IN THE WORKPLACE WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 258) to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 258

Whereas the National Safety Council statistics indicate that workplace accidents accounted for eleven thousand employee deaths and one million nine hundred thousand employee injuries during 1982;

Whereas such accidents caused immeasurable pain and suffering to victims and their families;

Whereas the cost of occupational accidents amounted to over $31,000,000 in losses to American industry during 1982;

Whereas the American Society of Safety Engineers and other safety and health organizations continue to promote occupational safety in all industries; and

Whereas this endeavor is worthy of support and cooperation so that the toll of workplace injuries and deaths will be reduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984, is designated as "National Safety in the Workplace Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation commemorating the efforts of organizations which promote safety and health for the American worker and calling upon all government agencies and the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL BLOOD PRESSURE AWARENESS WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 260) designating the week beginning on November 11, 1984, as "National Blood Pressure Awareness Week," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 260

Whereas diseases resulting from hypertension cause needless mortality and morbidity which can be reduced if hypertension is discovered through blood pressure screening;

Whereas sixty million Americans are hypertensive;

Whereas hypertension is a major factor in five hundred thousand strokes and one hundred and seventy-five thousand stroke-related deaths annually as well as more than one million five hundred thousand heart attacks and five hundred and sixty-seven thousand heart attack-related deaths annually;

Whereas twenty-nine million workdays, representing $2,000,000,000 in earnings, are lost each year because of cardiovascular diseases;

Whereas the risk of the major cardiovascular diseases is directly related to hypertension and even mild elevation in blood pressure may result in substantial risk of illness;

Whereas much of the 30 per centum reduction in mortality between 1970 and 1980 for stroke, hypertension heart disease and other cardiovascular system disease can be partially attributed to increased awareness and better control of blood pressure; and

Whereas increased blood pressure screening will identify greater numbers of Americans at risk for hypertension-related cardiovascular disease and encourage these Americans to seek treatment to control their blood pressure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning on November 11, 1984, is hereby designated as "National Blood Pressure Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL NURSE RECOGNITION DAY

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 274) to authorize and request the President to designate May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 274

Whereas nurses constitute the largest single health care group in the country;

Whereas nurses are the ones who are always there—providing care in our Nation's hospitals twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week—and in community clinics, schools, nursing homes, industry, physicians' offices, and patients' homes;

Whereas nurses play a crucial role in health education and disease and injury prevention;

Whereas nurses support of patients and families is essential to rehabilitation and restoration of health;

Whereas nurses require a high level of scientific knowledge, specialized skill, empathy and compassion; and

Whereas nurses provide cost-effective, quality and underutilized services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 279) to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 279

Whereas farm women contribute substantially to the stabilization of family farms in the United States;

Whereas more than one million women are engaged, either solely or jointly, in the operation of farms in the United States;

Whereas farm women are involved in all aspects of farming operations either as accountants, machine operators, veterinarians, crop specialists, businesswomen, mothers, or other occupations;

Whereas farm women also make significant contributions to agriculture, the leading employer in the United States, by virtue of their motivation and pride;

Whereas farm women are committed to the preservation of their families and farming operations and to the prosperity of our nation's agricultural economy; and

Whereas the appropriate recognition of the contributions made by our nation's farm women is long overdue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, is designated as "Women in Agriculture Week" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL ARSON AWARENESS WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 283) to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 283

Whereas one of every four fires is of suspicious origin, according to statistics of the U.S. Fire Administration;

Whereas death caused by arson has increased dramatically over the last ten years;

Whereas no other fire cause has exceeded arson in total dollar loss;

Whereas the crime of arson is associated with high profits and a low risk of apprehension and imprisonment;

Whereas the complexity of arson makes it a difficult crime to recognize and prevent; and

Whereas we need to create an awareness of arson, its impact on each of us, and the community resources available to us in the event that we are victims of arson: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 7, 1984, as "National Arson Awareness Week," and to call upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SPECIALLY STRUCK MEDAL IN HONOR OF ROY WILKENS

Mr. BAKER. Now, Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar Order 707, H.R. 3240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3240) to authorize the President of the United States to present on behalf of Congress a specially struck medal to the widow of Roy Wilkens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, we have before us a proposal first presented to the Senate several years ago, and passed by the Senate in combination with several other measures in S. 1729. My distinguished associate in the House of Representatives, Mr. RANGEL, introduced the companion bill, H.R. 3240. Congressman RANGEL's measure is the bill now before us.

Madam President, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 3240, legislation advanced by myself and my good friend from New York, Congressman RANGEL, to mint a gold medal in honor of one of America's heroes, Roy Wilkins, and present it to his widow, Aminda Badeau Wilkins.

Permit me to remind my colleagues in this body that the Senate already has passed my companion measure to this legislation, S. 1348, as section 1 of S. 1729 on September 13, 1983. The House of Representatives followed this body's lead by approving Congressman RANGEL's bill, H.R. 3240, on March 13, 1984.

This gold medal will not be the first national honor for Roy Wilkins. He received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our highest civil honor, from President Lyndon B. Johnson in January 1969. Nor is it likely to be the last honor for this great American.

These tributes are our opportunity to recognize Roy Wilkins' contributions to this country. In remembering his life and the role he played in history, we have a chance to deepen our understanding of ourselves and of our cohesiveness as one people. Indeed, the effort to make of us one people dominated Roy Wilkins' life. We are the benefactors of his struggle and his success.

Roy Wilkins was born at the start of the 20th century. His life reflected the main currents of this century, just as our present society reflects his visions and achievements.

We honor the grandson of a slave. I ask you to reflect on that for a moment, the social change which is a hallmark of American history. When we speak of the transition from slavery to national hero in but three generations, we realize how truly dynamic this society can be—and ought to be.

Several States will claim Roy Wilkins as their own. He was born in St. Louis, MO; he was educated and began his career in Minnesota. But it was in our State of New York that Roy Wilkins lived for more than 45 years.

He began his career in journalism, but, as with W.E.B. DuBois, whom Roy Wilkins succeeded as editor of the Crisis, journalism was for Roy Wilkins primarily a means of political action.

In retrospect, Roy Wilkins' succession to Dr. DuBois as the editor of the Crisis signified the importance of the role which Wilkins would play in our history. The Crisis magazine and the NAACP, for which it spoke, have been and remain leading institutions of social progress. The growth of the NAACP during Roy Wilkins' time, from 25,000 members in the 1930's to 400,000 in the 1970's, is well know. But this organizational achievement is only part of his story, only part of the reason Congress should honor him. The key part is the tenacity with which Roy Wilkins held to two goals: racial equality and nonviolence.

Looking back, it is remarkable—a sign of his idealism—that Roy Wilkins was able to retain these goals. In 1934, he was arrested in Washington for leading a march on the Office of the Attorney General, Homer S. Cummings—President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Attorney General, one might add. Lynchings of black Americans then occurred at a rate of some 35 per year; yet Cummings had failed to include lynching on the agenda of the National Conference on Crime. Wilkins' response to lynchings in 1934 characterized the method and determination of the civil rights movement which would follow for three decades, namely, organized acts of peaceful resistance to injustice.

I imagine that the strength and reserve required to face peacefully the violence against black Americans in the 1930's enabled Roy Wilkins to resist a more subtle and potentially more destructive challenge from within the civil rights movement in the 1960's. I refer to calls for black separatism which grew out of the civil rights movement of later days. Were it not for the strength and commitment of Roy Wilkins and others, the civil rights movement in the 1960's might have torn this country apart, doing

damage which one shudders to imagine.

Roy Wilkins' character mirrored the values of strength and restraint which dominated his political action. Arnold Aronson, a long time colleague of Roy Wilkins, reminded those at Wilkins' funeral of an incident which expressed the perfect mix of Wilkins' personality and his politics. When a Washington, DC, hotel refused a room to Roy Wilkins, he protested vigorously to the manager, without pounding, without threatening, without yelling. When he finished, the hotel manager said, "Mr. Wilkins, I hope you succeed in getting a law passed that will make us all do what is right." Roy Wilkins did just that, and he did so more than once.

Aronson reminded us that the first such victory, the Civil Rights Act of 1957, was not perfect, measured by the legitimate demands of its advocates. But Wilkins' strength as a negotiator brought passage of this bill despite the dissatisfaction, and this set an example for civil rights legislation which marked some of the great moments in the history of the U.S. Congress.

In his autobiography, standing fast, Roy Wilkins describes just one of these great acts, passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act:

> The Civil Rights Act was a measure for the people by the people. If Congress had not passed it, I don't think Negro Americans would ever have recovered from the injustice. Their faith in the Constitution and in orderly democratic processes had already been tested almost beyond endurance . . . The Civil Rights Act became a Magna Carta for the race, a splendid monument for the cause of human rights.

That was precisely what Roy Wilkins' life was about: the struggle for human rights, for dignity in a sometimes cruel world. His life was also about America, the notions of equality and freedom that this Nation should and can embody.

It is only fitting to close with Roy Wilkins' own words:

> We are proud of our race, of our color, of our history as Americans. We are so proud of it that we demand that it be accepted on an equality with every other minority or majority in this nation. We want to stand on an equal footing with our fellow Americans and help make our country what it was supposed to be

Madam President, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure. It is only fitting that the Congress recognize Roy Wilkins' many and lasting contributions to the Nation by passing legislation to mint a gold medal in his honor.

Since we are voting on a House bill, it is not possible to have Senate sponsors of the measure. But I know that my good friend, the junior Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO), would wish to be associated with passage of this bill, as would the Senators from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ and Mr. DURENBERGER), Mr. Wilkens having grown up in Minnesota, and later moving to New York, where his widow, Mrs. Wilkens, now resides.

I thank the majority leader and minority leader for their courtesy in helping to bring this bill to a vote.

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I commend the Senator from New York for his urging consideration of this matter. May I say that for several days the Senator from New York has brought this matter to my attention. I am happy to say that his perseverance and the good will of a number of other Senators finally permitted us to clear this matter and bring it to the attention of the Senator at this time.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, I am pleased that passage of this measure has been taken on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of which Mr. Wilkins was so long a distinguished leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RULES COMMITTEE DISCHARGED FROM CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 295

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 295, to permit the 1984 "Olympic Torch Relay" to be run through the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and that the measure be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMOKEY BEAR WEEK

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, if the minority leader does not object, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 838, Senate Joint Resolution 273.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 273) to designate the week of May 13, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 3051

(Purpose: To change the date of "Smokey Bear Week")

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of Mr. HEFLIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), for the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), proposes an amendment numbered 3051.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, strike out line 3 and insert in lieu thereof "That the week of August 5, 1984, through August 11, 1984, is".

Amend the title so as to read: Joint resolution to designate the week of August 5, 1984, through August 11, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week."

Mr. HEFLIN. Madam President, we have had overwhelming support for our week in commemoration of Smokey Bear. Over 40 Senators have cosponsored this legislation, and I am hopeful that our resolution will pass the Senate. Due to the shortness of time for this resolution's consideration by the House of Representatives, I am offering an amendment to change the date of the commemoration from the week of May 13 to 19 to the week of August 5 to 11. August 9 marks the 40th birthday of the introduction of Smokey Bear into the cooperative forest fire protection campaign and, accordingly, I believe that will be an appropriate time for this celebration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3051) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as amended.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 273

Whereas August 9, 1984, marks the fortieth anniversary of the introduction of Smokey Bear into the Cooperative Forest Fire Protection campaign through the efforts of the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, The Advertising Council, and the National Association of State Foresters;

Whereas May 23, 1984, marks the thirty-second anniversary of President Harry S Truman signing the Act to enact section 711 of title 18, United States Code, protecting the use of the character Smokey Bear;

Whereas The Smokey Bear program has demonstrated the success of the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, The Advertising Council, and the National Association of State Foresters in producing a unique public service campaign to create and maintain public awareness for the prevention of forest fires;

Whereas The Smokey Bear program has encouraged children across the Nation to prevent wildfires by becoming junior forest rangers;

Whereas several generations of children have been taught about Smokey Bear and have become responsible adults who are careful with fire;

Whereas since the establishment of the Smokey Bear program in 1944, the damage caused by forest fires has been reduced from ten million acres to three million acres in 1981, saving over $20,000,000,000 for United States taxpayers; and

Whereas the Smokey Bear program on August 9, 1984 enters the forty-first year of successful stewardship of forests in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 13, 1984, through May 19, 1984, is designated "Smokey Bear Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation recognizing the successful efforts of the organizations and people involved in the Smokey Bear program and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

TVA HELPS CONTROL THE TENNESSEE FLOOD

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, Smokey Bear will have no problems today. I may say, parenthetically, that I am told that in my native State of Tennessee, for the first time in the 50-year history of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the theoretical and mythical 100-year flood occurred, and it was an extraordinary event.

Fortunately, there was no loss of life from the flood directly, and there was no great property damage, which is a great tribute to that agency and their ability to control that flood. Other States, I believe, have not been as fortunate.

Madam President, too often we in government are quick to criticize public institutions as being ineffective, burdensome, and never accomplishing what they were set up to do.

This has not been the case with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Just the past several days, those of us from Tennessee have witnessed the benefits the flood-control program that was ushered in with the advent of TVA has meant to our region of the country. Over 6 inches of rain fell in Tennessee during the last 72 hours, which could have meant high loss of property and possibly the loss of lives. I am happy to report that TVA, with its system of dams, was able to keep the water levels within reasonable limits resulting in a minimum of damage to property and no loss of lives.

Witnessing the largest May flood in its 50-plus-year history, TVA has worked around the clock to lower the water levels in its reservoirs. It has been estimated that without the TVA system of dams, water levels in Chattanooga, TN, could have reached a crest level of 50 feet instead of the estimated 35-foot mark.

With clearing weather expected, most of those families that have been evacuated from their homes in Tennessee will be able to return.

I, along with my colleague, Senator SASSER, stand ready to work with Tennessee's Governor, Lamar Alexander, in supporting any request that he may make for emergency assistance for those areas affected by these weather conditions.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I have one final matter. I inquire of the minority leader if he is prepared to clear this one item as if in executive session.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons (Treaty Document No. 98-23), transmitted to the Senate by the President on May 7, 1984; and ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons drawn up within the Council of Europe by a committee of experts from member States and observers from the United States and Canada, as adopted by the Council of Ministers, and signed on behalf of the United States at Strasbourg on March 21, 1983.

The provisions of the Convention are explained in a report of the acting Secretary of State which accompanies this letter. The major advantages of a multilateral treaty on this subject are that it provides uniform procedures for transfer of sentenced persons and saves the resources that would be required to negotiate and bring into force bilateral treaties with a substantial number of member States of the Council of Europe in whose jails approximately one fourth of our citizens imprisoned abroad are serving sentences.

I recommend that the Senate give favorable consideration to this treaty at an early date.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 1984.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate on May 7, 1984, during the recess of the Senate, received messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and a treaty; which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations and treaty received on May 7, 1984, are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

FISHERY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND POLAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS—PM 135

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 7, 1984, during the recess of the Senate received the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which pursuant to Public Law 94-265 was referred jointly to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-265; 16 USC 1801), I transmit herewith an exchange of Diplomatic Notes, together with the present agreement, extending the Governing International Fishery Agreement between the United States and Poland, signed at Washington on August 2, 1976, until December 31, 1985. The exchange of notes together with the present agreement constitute a Governing International Fishery Agreement within the requirements of Section 201(c) of the Act.

Several U.S. fishing interests have urged prompt consideration of this agreement. In view of the July 1 expiration date of the current agreement, I urge that the Congress give favor-

able consideration to this extension at an early date.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1984.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON AGING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS—PM 136

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate on May 7, 1984, during the recess of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 204(f) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, I hereby transmit the Annual Report for 1983 of the Federal Council on Aging. The report reflects the Council's views in its role of examining programs serving older Americans.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1984.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

DEFERRAL OF CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 137

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, was referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one new deferral of budget authority totaling $101,999,550 and one revision to a previously reported deferral increasing the amount deferred by $778,000. The total for the previously deferred deferral is now $55,850,019.

The deferrals affect Funds Appropriated to the President and the Department of Agriculture.

The details of the deferrals are contained in the attached reports.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 1984.*

FISHERY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 138

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which, pursuant to Public Law 94-265, was referred jointly to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-265; 16 USC 1801), I transmit herewith an exchange of Diplomatic Notes, together with the present agreement, extending the Governing International Fishery Agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, signed at Washington on November 26, 1976, until December 31, 1985. The exchange of notes together with the present agreement constitute a Governing International Fishery Agreement within the requirements of Section 201(c) of the Act.

Several U.S. fishing interests have urged prompt consideration of this agreement. In view of the July 1 expiration date of the current agreement, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this extension at an early date.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 1984.*

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from the further consideration of the following concurrent resolution; and the concurrent resolution was placed on the calendar:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution to permit the Olympic torch relay to be run through the U.S. Capitol Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. 2418. A bill to authorize and direct the Librarian of Congress, subject to the supervision and authority of a Federal civilian or military agency, to proceed with the construction of the Library of Congress mass book deacidification facility, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-429).

By Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 2640. An original bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1985 (Rept. No. 98-430).

By Mr. PACKOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1286. A bill to establish a program to conduct research and development for improved manufacturing technologies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-431).

S. 2436. A bill to authorize appropriations of funds for activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-432).

By Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. 2556. A bill to authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center for fiscal years 1985 through 1989 (Rept. No. 98-433).

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2371. A bill to provide for the distribution within the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Peace, Friendship, and Freedom."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING THE RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1984, the following executive reports of committees were filed on May 7, 1984, during the recess of the Senate:

By Mr. DOLE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joel Gerber, of Virginia, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term expiring 15 years after he takes office.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

Ruth O. Peters, of Virginia, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service for the remainder of the term expiring December 8, 1987.

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert Thomas Hennemeyer, of Illinois, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Gambia.

Contributions are to be reported for the period beginning on the first day of the fourth calendar year preceding the calendar year of the nomination and ending on the date of the nomination.

Nominee: Robert Thomas Hennemeyer.

Post: The Gambia.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee

1. Self, none.
2. Spouse, none.

3. Children and Spouses, names: Christian, Paul, and Robin, all none.
4. Parents, all deceased.
5. Grandparents all deceased.
6. Brothers, no brothers.
7. Sisters and Spouses, names:
Mrs. Ruth Liston, none.
Mr. Thomas Liston, $100, 1983, Ill. Republican Party.
Mrs. Mary Ann Shinners, none, Mr. James Shinners, none.

S. L. Abbott, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Kingdom of Lesotho.

Contributions are to be reported for the period beginning on the first day of the fourth calendar year preceding the calendar year of the nomination and ending on the date of the nomination.

Nominee: S. L. Abbott
Post: U.S. Ambassador to Lesotho

Contributions, amount, date, and donee

1. Self, $1,000 May 1980, Reagan for President Committee; $1,638 July 1981, newspaper ad for the President; $1,000 February 1983, John Tower Senate Club; $200 April 1983, Tower Dinner Committee; and $500 August 1983, Senator Helms Dinner Committee.
2. Spouse, same as husband.
3. Children and spouses, none.
4. Parents, none.
5. Grandparents, none.
6. Brothers and spouses, none.
7. Sisters and spouses, none.

CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY S.L. ABBOTT AND SPOUSE (ARLINE ABBOTT)

April 1979, $250, El Paso County Republican Party.
January 1980, $100, Governor Clements Committee.
March 1980, $25 El Paso County Republican Party.
March 1980, $1,000, S. L. Abbott for State Republican/Committee.
May 1980, $1,000, Reagan for President Committee.
January 1981, $200, Governor Clements Committee.
April 1981, $50, El Paso County Republican Party.
July 1981, $1,638, newspaper ad supporting President Reagan.
November 1981, $100, Ward Koehler for District Judge Committee.
November 1981, $1,000, Heritage Foundation.
March 1982, $100, El Paso County Republican Party.
March 1982, $25, U.S. Defense Committee.
June 1982, $250, George Strake for Lieutenant Governor Committee.
October 1982, $500, Ralph Scoggins for District Judge Committee.
October 1982, $100, Ernest Angelo for State Senate Committee.
November 1982, $1,000, Council for National Policy.
February 1983, $1,000, John Tower Senate Club.
April 1983, $25, Republican National Committee.
April 1983, $200, John Tower Dinner Committee.
April 1983, $20, American Security Council.
May 1983, $125, American Legal Foundation.
July 1983, $100, National Defense Task Force.
August 1983, $500, Senator Jesse Helms Dinner Committee.

This is the total list of contributions. The list was then reduced for the reporting form to include only those contributions to Federal offices or Presidential candidates.

(The above nominations were reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with the recommendation that they be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly appointed committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. RIEGLE):

S. 2638. A bill to provide for research relating to the control of gypsy moths, to assist States and local communities in controlling gypsy moth infestations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOSCHWITZ:

S. 2639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of employee awards; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MATHIAS (from the Committee on Rules and Administration):

S. 2640. An original bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1985; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON):

S. 2641. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated as the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2642. A bill to suspend until July 1, 1989, the duty on yttrium-bearing ores, materials, and compounds containing by weight more than 19 percent but less than 85-percent yttium-oxide equivalent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

S. 2643. A bill to extend the service area for the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JEPSEN:

S. 2644. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to protect the benefit levels of individuals becoming eligible for benefits in or after 1979 by eliminating the disparity (resulting from changes made in 1977 in the benefit computation formula) between those levels and the benefit levels of persons who became eligible for benefits before 1979; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. 2645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for airline passenger consumer protection; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 2646. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to insure the continued financial integrity of the rural electrification and telephone revolving fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

S. 2647. A bill to revise and extend titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act, relating to health professions educational assistance and nursing educational assistance; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 2648. A bill to amend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act to ban ocean dumping at the 12-mile site, to develop a plan for the revitalization of the New York Bight Apex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2649. A bill to amend the Safe Water Drinking Act (title XIV of the Public Health Service Act) to authorize funds for fiscal years 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987, 1988, 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GLENN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DIXON, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. FORD, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TOWER, Mr. DODD, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HELMS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JEPSEN, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

S.J. Res. 288. A joint resolution to designate the week of September 16 through September 22, 1984, as "Emergency Medicine Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAWKINS (for herself, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. DODD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PELL, Mr. HECHT, Mr. NUNN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GARN, and Mr. LAXALT):

S.J. Res. 289. A joint resolution to designate June 18, 1984, as "National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGLETON (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHILES, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EXON, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. WALLOP):

S.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution designating the month of November 1984 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to consent to an amendment enacted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to call on pertinent member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and on Japan to meet their respective commitments to increase defense spending in 1983 and 1984; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. RIEGLE):

S. 2638. A bill to provide for research relating to the control of gypsy moths, to assist States and local communities in controlling gypsy moth infestations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

GYPSY MOTH CONTROL ACT OF 1984

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Gypsy Moth Control Act of 1984, a bill to establish a 5-year gypsy moth research program and a 10-year suppression program. I am pleased to have as cosponsors of this measure Senators BRADLEY, D'AMATO, HATFIELD, HEINZ, JEPSEN, LEVIN, MELCHER, and RIEGLE.

Those of us from the Northeast are all too familiar with the voracious appetite of the gypsy moth. Very soon, gypsy moth larvae will emerge from egg masses and, in response to light, climb into the crowns of trees. Then, suspended from silken threads, the newly hatched larvae will disperse and migrate, and begin to feed in earnest. During their 2-month maturation through a series of instars, gypsy moth caterpillars will devour up to 40 inches of foliage daily, feeding on oak, hickory, poplar, birch, beech, and maple leaves, as well as pine needles and hemlocks. Gypsy moth caterpillars in the West have eaten California oak, coastal manzanita, and low shrubbery. Because the insect is able to feed successfully on both hardwoods and conifers, there are literally hundreds of host plants throughout the United States.

Gypsy moths first appeared in this country in 1869 when Dr. Leopold Trouvelot, a French scientist, brought some to Massachusetts in an attempt to crossbreed them with silkworms. He hoped to produce a disease-resistant silkworm, but he failed. Several of the caterpillars escaped.

Mr. President, the gypsy moth was introduced into the United States absent its natural parasites and predators. Consequently, it could breed rapidly, and did—the first significant defoliation occurred in 1889. The insect has many attributes that have increased its viability: high reproductive potential; the ability to feed on a wide variety of trees and shrubs; and various behavioral and morphological traits that enhance survivial. Additionally, human influences such as land clearing, heavy cutting and burning, and urban sprawl seem to have benefitted the pest.

Today, the gypsy moth is well established in the Northeast as a serious defoliator of forest, fruit, and shade trees and ornamentals. Moreover, the insect is expanding its range. It is now distributed in western New York and Pennsylvania, and as far South as Maryland. Virginia, West Virginia, and Michigan are considered to be generally infested. Last year, isolated infestations occured in California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin. Prior to last year, isolated infestations were discovered in Alabama, Arkansas, and Nebraska.

In the Northeast, the gypsy moth's biggest impact has been on backyards—denuding shale and ornamental trees, littering pools and lawn furniture, and irritating people's skin. But beyond these nuisances, the gypsy moth poses a grave threat to urban, State, and commercial forests. Infestations in the South and Midwest threaten the commercial oak and hickory stands that produce the raw materials for hardwood furniture. One shudders to think what would happen if the insect were to become as firmly entrenched in California and the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, Congress first appropriated funds to combat gypsy moths in 1906. Since then, the Federal commitment has been sporadic, and usually responsive only to the immediate problem, at best. Clearly, such a haphazard approach has been inadequate: 52 million acres have been defoliated since national records were first compiled in 1924; 28.4 million acres have been defoliated in the last 4 years alone.

The legislation I introduce today with my distinguished colleagues is designed to insure that the Federal commitment to research and combat the gypsy moth will be a sustained one, funded at adequate levels.

U.S. Forest Service gypsy moth research is funded at $2.8 million for fiscal year 1984. The Gypsy Moth Control Act would amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978—Public Law 95-307—to authorize the current program through fiscal year 1989 at $3 million annually.

Federal research has proven to be a good investment, with applications far beyond gypsy moth control. Pioneering work concerning the occurrence and behavior of vertebrate and invertebrate parasites and predators was conducted early in this century. So, too, was research into silvicultural control methods and the proper management of infested woodlots. Initial research into population dynamics was undertaken prior to 1920, as well.

More recently, extensive research has led to the development of techniques to establish sterile males into gypsy moth populations. And tremendous progress has been made in the manufacture of synthetic pheromones—sex attractants—and microbial pathogens. The use of these techniques and agents could revolutionize pest control, reducing our dependence upon chemical pesticides.

The Gypsy Moth Control Act would promote further development and refinement of these environmentally benign biological controls. Emphasis would be placed on solving technology transfer problems that hinder greater use of bacterial and viral agents.

The effort to eradicate or contain the gypsy moth has been as unprecedented as the associated research, and oftimes as important. The widespread use—and subsequent ban—of Paris green, lead arsenate, and DDT were all precipitated by significant explosions in gypsy moth populations. A Federal domestic quarantine was imposed in 1912 to prevent the gypsy moth's Southern and Western migration, and was successful for many years. More importantly, most significant breakthroughs in aerial spray technology have been associated with efforts to suppress the pest.

The Gypsy Moth Control Act would amend the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978—Public Law 95-313—to authorize a 10-year suppression program through fiscal year 1994, funded at $10 million annually. At present, roughly $4 million in Federal funds is earmarked for the Forest Service/State cooperative gypsy moth suppression program. This is not enough. States today are expected to assume 75 percent of the costs of suppression programs carried out on non-Federal public lands. Unfortunately, such a requirement discourages many financially strapped States from participating in the program.

Under the proposed legislation, the State share of the costs would be reduced 25 to 50 percent. This increase in Federal assistance is necessary if the States are to embark on expanded, effective programs. Private landowners would continue to be responsible

for one-half of the costs of programs carried out on their lands.

Mr. President, the gypsy moth is perhaps the Nation's most destructive forest pest. The annual environmental, economic, and aesthetic damage is enormous. The isolated infestations that have occurred over the past few years indicate that the gypsy moth problem is no longer confined to the Northeast; it is rapidly becoming national in scope. A sustained Federal effort to research and suppress the pest is not only desirable; it is imperative. The Gypsy Moth Control Act will initiate this effort. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Gypsy Moth Control Act of 1984".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) since its accidental introduction into the United States in 1869, the gypsy moth has caused significant environmental damage at tremendous economic cost;

(2) gypsy moths defoliated approximately 2.4 million acres of forest land in the United States during 1983, severely damaging or threatening urban, State, and commercial hardwood forests;

(3) many important technological developments and precedents have been associated with efforts to eradicate or contain gypsy moths, particularly in regard to aerial spray technology and methods of biological control; and

(4) sustained funding and commitment of resources is necessary for effective gypsy moth research and the development of sound pest management programs relating to the gypsy moth.

(b) The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) provide for an expanded and accelerated program of research into the nature, effect, and control of gypsy moth infestations, with particular attention to methods that use biological controls;

(2) assist State and local efforts to identify new gypsy moth populations and assess the size of current populations; and

(3) assist State and local efforts to develop and carry out programs to eradicate or contain gypsy moth populations, particularly those programs that use biological controls.

GYPSY MOTH RESEARCH

SEC. 3. The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 is amended by—

(1) inserting immediately after section 6 (16 U.S.C. 1645) a new section 6A as follows:

"SPECIAL GYPSY MOTH RESEARCH PROGRAM

"SEC. 6A. (a) The Secretary shall establish and implement a special five-year program of research under this Act into the nature, effect, and control of gypsy moth infestations. Research conducted under the special program shall be directed toward developing appropriate technology for more effective and cost-efficient eradication or control of gypsy moth populations. Special emphasis shall be given to the development of (1) gypsy moth suppression methods that use biological controls and (2) technology that is appropriate for applications on non-Federal public and private forest land, including small nonindustrial parcels of forest land.

"(b) In implementing the special research program provided for under this section, the Secretary shall combine ongoing research projects with additional research projects, as appropriate to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the special research program.

"(c) At the completion of the special research program provided for under this section, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress (1) on the operation of the program and the results of the research projects conducted under the program, and (2) stating the Secretary's recommendations with respect to additional research efforts necessary to improve gypsy moth suppression efforts.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years during the period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1989, to carry out the provisions of this section."; and

(2) in section 7 (16 U.S.C. 1646), striking out "There are" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in section 6A of this Act, there are".

GYPSY MOTH CONTROL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. The Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 is amended by inserting immediately after section 5 (16 U.S.C. 2104) a new section 5A as follows:

"GYPSY MOTH CONTROL

"SEC. 5A. (a) The Secretary shall develop and implement a special gypsy moth control assistance program under this Act, to be in effect during the ten-year period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1994, to encourage managers of non-Federal public and private forest land to develop and carry out efforts to eradicate or control gypsy moth populations on such lands.

"(b) In implementing the special assistance program under this section, the Secretary shall, in cooperation with State foresters or equivalent State officials, subdivisions of States, agencies, institutions, organizations, or individuals managing non-Federal forest land—

"(1) conduct surveys to detect and appraise gypsy moth populations affecting non-Federal forest land, or share in the cost of the conduct of such surveys by State foresters or equivalent State officials, as provided in subsection (c) of this section;

"(2) determine the biological, chemical, and mechanical measures necessary to eradicate or control such gypsy moth populations on non-Federal forest land, giving special emphasis, as appropriate, to gypsy moth suppression methods that use biological controls and the application of appropriate technology for more effective and cost-efficient eradication or control of gypsy moth populations on such forest land developed under the special research program established under section 6A of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978; and

"(3) assist States, subdivisions of States, agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals managing non-Federal forest land in developing and carrying out programs to eradicate or control gypsy moth populations by sharing in the cost of implementing such programs, as provided in subsection (d) of this section, and providing technical information, advice, and related assistance to such entities.

"(c) The Secretary shall make available to State foresters or equivalent State officials cost share assistance to facilitate the conduct by such officials of surveys to identify new gypsy moth populations and assess the size of existing populations affecting non-Federal public and private forest land. Such cost share assistance shall be made available to each State on an annual basis, through the end of the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and shall be used to cover a portion of the cost of State technical forest insect survey staffs and associated operating costs involved in the conduct of gypsy moth identification and assessment surveys and evaluations and the reporting on gypsy moth infestations, and the making of recommendations on the control thereof, to managers of non-Federal forest land. The percentage of such annual costs to be shared shall be that percentage, not to exceed 50 percent, of the costs that the Secretary determines necessary and appropriate to facilitate the conduct of such surveys and related activities.

"(d) The Secretary shall make available, to States, subdivisions of States, agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals managing non-Federal public or private forest land, cost share assistance in developing and carrying out programs to eradicate or contain gypsy moth populations. Such cost share assistance shall be made available to such entities, under agreements, through the end of the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and shall be used to cover a portion of the cost of such programs as set forth in the agreements. The percentage of the costs to be shared under an agreement shall be that percentage (not less than 50 percent nor more than 75 percent with respect to any program carried out on non-Federal public forest land and not to exceed 50 percent of such costs with respect to any program carried out on private forest land) that the Secretary determines necessary and appropriate to facilitate the development and conduct of such programs.

"(e) The Secretary may issue such regulations as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years during the period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1994, to carry out the provisions of this section.".●

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor legislation offered by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York. This legislation, which would extend through 1989 the gypsy moth research program and provide $10 million per annum to fund specific eradication efforts is a much needed measure.

As many of my colleagues are aware, this pest threatens the forests of the Northeastern United States to a degree only exceeded by acid rain. I am personally committed to seeing the Federal Government maintain its proper role in the control, and eventual eradication, of this problem.

In this decade alone, millions of acres of trees have been defoliated by the gypsy moth. This pest destroys the natural beauty of the Adirondacks, leaving trees that look like stubble on the landscape. The Federal

Government has an obligation to assist in the control of this menace.

I urge my colleagues to swiftly pass this vital legislation in order to prevent further damage to one of the most beautiful areas of this country.●

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with my colleague from New York today in sponsoring the Gypsy Moth Control Act of 1984. Until 1982, outbreaks of gypsy moths in my State were unheard of. The moth has been a great problem in Eastern States for many years, and great damage has been inflicted on forests, nurseries, and homeowners' trees and bushes in those States.

That situation unfortunately has changed. In 1982, small infestations of gypsy moths were discovered in Marion County by the Oregon State Department of Agriculture. Isolated eradication attempts were made, and the problem was thought to be under control. It appears that the egg masses were brought into Oregon by persons moving there from the Eastern part of the country. However, it was apparent in 1983 that the moth was spreading rapidly, and the city of Salem was sprayed for the pest. Control efforts are still not having a great impact, and outbreaks this year have occurred in the Portland and Corvallis areas, and again in the Salem area.

I am very concerned about this new pest and have worked to secure funding, on a cost-sharing basis with my State, to undertake eradication programs. This year, $250,000 has been allocated to Oregon for control methods, primarily the spraying of bacillus thuringiensis, a biological control agent. Although the gypsy moth prefers deciduous trees and plants as its food source, it has been known to attack conifers, which could prove deadly to my State's economy, because much of it is forested with these types of trees.

This legislation authorizes both a research and eradication program through the Department of Agriculture at funding levels that should begin to control the pest. The cost-sharing aspect of the bill for control efforts is especially appealing, as Oregon already has made sound commitments to help in gypsy moth control programs.

One last key element of this bill is the research aspect. It has become abundantly clear to me that the public is very concerned about the use of chemical sprays to control pests of all kinds. Citizens in my State are very concerned about the short- and long-term effects of chemical sprays on human health, and every effort must be made to find alternative nontoxic pest control methods. This bill certainly is a step in the right direction.

I encourage my colleagues on the Senate Agriculture Committee to move expeditiously on this proposal.●

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the Gypsy Moth Control Act of 1984, which is being introduced today.

Although the gypsy moth destruction has been the greatest in the Northeastern part of the United States, the State of Michigan faces the threat of the spread of gypsy moths.

In 1980, gypsy moths defoliated only 19 acres in Michigan. The damage spread to 452 acres in 1983. The State of Michigan stands to lose many valuable acres of oak to gypsy moth infestations. Two commodities in the State are already subject to quarantines by other States and Canada—timber and Christmas trees. While only 2 counties are currently subject to defoliation, 12 counties in Michigan are under a low-risk quarantine and these counties are being closely watched for the infestation of gypsy moths.

This legislation would expand the Federal funding for gypsy moth research from its current level of $2.8 million in fiscal year 1984 to $3 million annually through fiscal year 1989. The State of Michigan was involved in the testing program implemented by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, which introduced sterile male techniques. According to the State Department of Agriculture, the testing in Michigan proved to be a very effective way of reducing the spreading of gypsy moths.

The Gypsy Moth Control Act also increases funding for the gypsy moth suppression program, which would be funded at $10 million annually through fiscal year 1994. The State share of the suppression program is now 75 percent. This legislation brings the State share to 25 to 50 percent. If we want our States to participate and expand their current programs, I believe we must reduce the State share to a reasonable level.

The gypsy moth destruction has been well documented in the Northeast and threatens many other States. The economic and environmental consequences from the destruction of these pests demand a strong Federal program.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.●

By Mr. BOSCHWITZ:

S. 2639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of employee awards; to the Committee on Finance.

TAXATION OF EMPLOYEE AWARDS

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I am introducing today legislation to amend to Internal Revenue Code with respect to the taxation of employee awards. The bill offers a simple, straightforward, nondiscriminatory solution to the problem of the taxability of employee awards and is supported by a wide array of hundreds of companies around the country in the incentive industry.

Present law (section 274 (b)(1)(C) and (b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (as amended by ERTA), allows an employer to deduct up to $400, and in the case of qualified plan awards, up to $1,600, of the cost of employee achievement awards; that is, items of tangible personal property awarded by reason of an employee's length of service, productivity or safety achievement. It seems clear that the intent of the sponsors of the ERTA amendments to section 274(b) of the Code was that eligible gifts should be excluded from an employee's income. Absent such an exclusion from the income of an employee recipient, the ERTA amendments will have little, if any, practical effect.

The ERTA provision, however, did not provide for any exclusion of the value of employee awards from the recipient's gross income, and the Internal Revenue Service has taken the position that an award, other than one of nominal value, such as a Christmas turkey or ham, is taxable to the employee. The potential taxation to employees of achievement awards brings into question the viability of these award programs by making the awards far less attractive to the recipient.

Section 828 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, Tax Treatment of Employee Awards, would create a statutory exclusion from income for so-called traditional employee gifts such as watches and emblematic jewelry. This proposal would result in all other types of employee awards being taxable to the employee recipient.

This restrictive proposal clearly favors one segment of the incentive industry over all others. This inequality of treatment has no foundation in the original section 274(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, nor the ERTA amendments to that section. There is simply no justification for restricting an employer's ability to make a meaningful noncash award to its employees or for favoring one type of property over another. Indeed, the absence of adequate choices could have the effect of not motivating employees, whose personal tastes would not be satisfied by the restricted items offered, to achieve the accomplishments the employer wishes to award.

Furthermore, characterizing gifts such as watches and emblematic jewelry as traditional and all other gifts as nontraditional ignores the realities of the incentive industry. Award programs, which make use of a wide range of consumer products, have been in existence for well over 50 years.

Employee incentive awards should be promoted because such awards produce an important national benefit. There is little doubt that the recognition of employee achievement

serves to strengthen the morale of the work force, fosters pride on the part of individual employees, and enhances employer-employee relationships. The Finance Committee proposal, however, is not the solution to the problem of the taxability of employee awards. In addition to its arbitrary restrictions on types of awards, it is estimated the proposal would result in a loss of $300,000,000 in revenue.

My bill offers a simple, straightforward, nondiscriminatory solution to the problem of the taxability of employee awards. The proposal draws on the language of section 274(b)(1)(C) of the code, and would exclude from an employee-recipient's income up to $250, and, in the case of qualified plan awards, up to $400 of the value of all awards deductible to an employer under that section. These dollar limits are substantially lower than those provided for in the Finance Committee proposal. My bill may even raise revenue because it will tax all award items above the $250 and $400 limits for the first time.●

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2642. A bill to suspend until July 1, 1989, the duty on yttrium bearing ores, materials, and compounds containing by weight more than 19 percent but less than 85 percent yttrium oxide equivalent; to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON YTTRIUM

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill which would suspend for 5 years the duty on yttrium bearing ores and materials and enable domestic companies to fairly compete with foreign competitors.

At the present time, there are no significant domestic sources in the United States of yttrium concentrates, which are used in the production of high-purity yttrium aluminum garnets and yttrium oxide. Yttrium oxide is used to make yttrium aluminum garnets and yttrium iron garnets—products vital in the manufacture of certain items for our national defense. Among these products are defense warning system receivers and alloys for jet engines. Other applications include lasers, refractory insulating materials, strategic superalloys, energy-saving fluorescent lights, and all color televisions.

Under U.S. tariff classification, U.S. refiners import yttrium oxide concentrates for refining at a duty of 6.6 percent, which is 2.1 percent above what foreign refiners pay to import refined high-purity yttrium oxide.

The yttrium oxide market is very competitive and U.S. refiners compete domestically and in foreign markets with foreign companies which have access to duty-free feedstock and which can import high-purity yttrium oxide this country at a current duty of 4.5 percent. Major foreign companies offering high-purity yttrium oxide in the United States include the large French Goverment-owned company, Rhone-Poulenc, China Rare Earths of the People's Republic of China, the Norwegian Co., Magon, partly owned by the Norwegian Government and Mitsubishi Chemical, and several Japanese processors.

The low profit margin and highly competitive nature of the business if forcing U.S. refiners and producers out of business. During the past decade, two U.S. refiners have permanently closed, and now only two refiners which produce high-purity yttrium oxide remain in business in the country: the Research Chemicals Division of the Nucor Corp. in Phoenix, AZ, and Molycorp, Inc., in Louviers, CO.

My bill is very simple. It would suspend until July 1, 1989, the duty on yttrium bearing ores, materials, and compounds containing by weight more than 19 percent, but less than 85 percent yttrium oxide equivalent. This legislation is necessary to preserve our domestic industry. I wish to emphasize at this point that the legislation does not propose any increased duty to protect our domestic industry, but simply suspends one so that our domestic yttrium refining industry can be competitive with foreign companies both here and abroad.

The Subcommittee on Trade of the House Ways and Means Committee has held hearings on a similar bill, H.R. 2667, and the administration supports this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the enactment of this legislation and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2642

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedule of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new item:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the fifteenth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

S. 2643. A bill to extend the service area for the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXTENSION OF SERVICE AREA OF THE SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the service area for the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project in California. Specifically, the bill includes the Pleasant Valley Water District lands in Fresno County in the San Luis unit service area. It also makes clear that the Pleasant Valley Water District has the right to apply for a loan under Public Law 84-130 if funds are available under that program. I am pleased that my colleague from California, Senator PETE WILSON, is joining me as a cosponsor of this legislation.

Last November, I introduced S. 2068 to include the Pleasant Valley Water District within the boundaries of the San Luis unit and to authorize funds for the construction of irrigation facilities in the district. Since then, I have received comments on the bill from various California water interests. The legislation being introduced today reflects those comments and suggested amendments. As a result, I believe it now enjoys broad support from the California water community.

The Pleasant Valley Water District comprises approximately 38,000 acres in the agriculturally rich San Joaquin Valley near Coalinga. The land has been farmed since the early 1900's using ground water for irrigation. The ground water, however, has been dropping and losing quality at such a rate that the area could return to desert within another generation. This situation combined with the devastating earthquake in Coalinga in May 1983 which damaged the district's pipes and wells raises a serious question as to whether the area can survive. But if Pleasant Valley can proceed to construct a water distribution system, the opportunity and stimulus for Coalinga's rebirth as a productive area should be at hand.

In the past it has not been feasible for Pleasant Valley Water District to build the needed distribution system because of the lack of participation by Standard Oil of California. The company owns almost half of the land in the district—17,000 acres—far exceeding the acreage limitation under Federal reclamation law. In October 1983, however, Standard agreed to sell its excess lands under recordable contracts—contingent upon its being able to retain its mineral rights—thereby enabling the district to seek Federal irrigation water.

Water for Pleasant Valley would come from facilities of the Central Valley project in northern California through the delta down the California aqueduct to the San Luis Reservoir. For a number of years the Department of the Interior and the State of California have been in disagreement about how much of this water is needed to insure delta water quality. Only when agreement is reached on the delta water needs will Pleasant Valley and other districts be able to

request a firm supply of any available water. But without being in the service area of the San Luis unit, the district cannot even do the preliminary work with the Bureau of Reclamation to begin the distribution system program. This legislation will permit the Pleasant Valley Water District to do this necessary planning to enter into an agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation for a permanent water supply when it is available. It does not give Pleasant Valley any priority for that water or any advantage over other districts within the service area of the San Luis unit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2643

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(a) of the Act of June 3, 1960 (Public Law 86-488; 74 Stat. 156) is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof after the word "California," the phrase "and the area within the boundaries of the Pleasant Valley Water District in Fresno County, California, as such boundaries now exist or as they may be changed from time to time in accordance with applicable State law and as approved by the Secretary of the Interior.".

SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Act of June 3, 1960 (Public Law 86-488; 74 Stat. 160) is amended by inserting after the last sentence thereof the phrase "Provided further that the work to be undertaken pursuant to the first section of this Act in the Pleasant Valley Water District may be financed in accordance with the Act of July 4, 1955 (Public Law 84-130; 69 Stat. 245), as amended.".

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. 2645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for airline consumer protection; to the Committee on Finance.

AIRLINE PASSENGER CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today addressing an issue of great concern to hundreds of thousands of American air traveling consumers.

Since airline deregulation legislation was passed in 1978, there has been a great deal of change in that industry—some good and some bad. I opposed airline deregulation then—and continue to oppose it—for a number of reasons. In my home State of South Dakota, for example, we have suffered a great loss in air service and rates have skyrocketed. I am currently working on a number of fronts to address those problems. But, the focus of the legislation I am introducing today, is of such timely importance that literally thousands of air passengers are in risk of losing hundreds of dollars each. This issue is the problem of airline bankruptcy.

Recently, we have seen a growing number of bankruptcies by air carriers, including Braniff, Continental, Pacific Express, Air Vermont, and many other smaller carriers. Just last month a small carrier in my home State of South Dakota filed for bankruptcy. Several air carriers still flying are experiencing financial difficulties caused by the economy and by operating in a highly competitive, deregulated environment. Some of these carriers could also wind up in bankruptcy in the months ahead. Indeed, I would predict, Mr. President, that before a year is up, we will experience another bankruptcy by a major air carrier, resulting in a great financial loss to hundreds or even thousands of consumers in a single day.

Now proponents of deregulation say that this is simply how the free market system works. If a company is not being managed well enough, it should go bankrupt. Well, Mr. President, I agree with part of that reasoning, but the one big problem is that, oftentimes, many innocent consumers are greatly harmed in the process.

Let me stress at this point that this is not an industry bailout bill. The defaulting carrier would not receive 1 penny as a result of this bill. It is aimed at the consumer. These are business people, tourists, traveling families, and others for whom an airplane trip is a very substantial investment. We are talking about hundreds—in some cases thousands—of dollars per person. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Business, Trade, and Tourism, I know what a drastic impact this could have not only on the individual consumer, but also on the many travel- and tourism-related small businesses across the country.

These are people who, in good faith, purchase tickets, but are unable to use them because of the subsequent bankruptcy of the airline. Under current bankruptcy law, the best they can expect is to occupy last place on the list of unsecured creditors.

In the past, the airlines themselves addressed this problem through the default protection program (DPP). The Air Traffic Conference of America had established the DPP to protect consumers in the event of situations such as bankruptcy filing, where the airline's service has been discontinued. However, this plan proved ineffective in dealing with the bankruptcy filing by Continental Airlines last September. Since then, all major carriers have withdrawn from the DPP, leaving the consumer without any recourse. Additionally, travel agents had previously been able to buy default protection insurance to protect themselves and their customers in the event of an airline failure. Now, however, I understand that such insurance is no longer available since the collapse of the default protection plan.

I have discussed this problem at great length with one of my State's most respected travel experts, Mrs. Melva (Mel) Pederson, of Watertown, SD. Mel is president of Pederson Travel Service, a 25-year-plus member of the American Society of Travel Agents, and chairman of my South Dakota Travel and Tourism Advisory Board. Her keen insight and experience in the travel industry have been invaluable to me as chairman of the Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from recent correspondence I received from Mrs. Pederson and an article from Travel Weekly be inserted following my remarks. The experiences Mel has relayed to me confirm my suspicion that the traveling public is headed for a real economic catastrophe unless we act now.

I urge the Air Traffic Conference to examine ways to voluntarily protect the airline passenger consumer. Indeed, I would hope that we do not need any long-term Federal plan to resolve this problem. I understand that the airline industry is currently considering several voluntary industry proposals to adequately address this problem. I encourage them to step up efforts to work out this problem in the private sector. In the meantime, however, something must be done to bring stability to this situation and to protect the consumer from events over which they have no control.

My legislation will protect the interests of passengers left stranded and out-of-pocket because of an airline bankruptcy. The interests of these passengers clearly need some form of protection. Under present law, customers are left holding a ticket that other air carriers will not honor because they are unlikely to be reimbursed as unsecured creditors. The passenger today has no remedy. They may be stranded and penniless thousands of miles away from home. In some cases, where the carrier has been reorganized, the passenger may be offered the right to trade in the ticket for a new ticket. But, in many cases, the reorganized carrier has reduced operations and may no longer serve the passenger's intended destination. In the meantime, the consumer remains without remedy.

EXPLANATION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is quite simple. It assures that members of the traveling public holding tickets on a bankrupt scheduled air carrier can have those tickets honored by other air carriers who continue to serve the intended destination. In return, these airlines would simply take a credit against the tax they pay into the airport and airway trust fund. As you know, we currently have billions of dollars in the trust fund. No

additional taxes would have to be raised and no programs would have to be cut as a result of this proposal. In addition, this legislation allows for repayment of these funds into the trust fund, assuming the airline would subsequently settle its claims. The Secretary of the Treasury would, in effect, become a creditor of the bankrupt airline by acquiring the claim of the passenger against the bankrupt airline. The Secretary would then seek settlement of the claim in the regular bankruptcy proceeding. Any settlement achieved would be paid back into the trust fund.

This legislation has compelling logic. It provides a simple and direct remedy for thousands of consumers who would otherwise be stranded, inconvenienced, or lose the price of their ticket or tickets. It continues the present policy of providing substitute transportation first and ironing out reimbursement details later, to assure a smoothly functioning air travel system. It consolidates these individuals' claims against the bankrupt airline in an efficient manner to be pursued in accordance with bankruptcy law and procedure by the Secretary of the Treasury. No additional taxes would be raised and no programs or spending priorities would be adversely affected.

Other airlines who provide service to the consumer are reimbursed for the price of their equivalent service from the trust fund which is largely funded by the existing tax on tickets paid by the same airline passengers we are seeking to protect. The ticket purchaser may transfer the ticket to another person if, because of the passage of time, there is no reason for making the planned trip. The amendment provides a form of consumer insurance paid for by consumers who are the passengers on our Nation's airlines.

Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation, and ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill appear following my correspondence from Mrs. Pederson.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEDERSON TRAVEL SERVICE,
Watertown, SD, April 24, 1984.

Hon. LARRY PRESSLER,
407A Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR LARRY: To briefly go over our telephone visit today regarding airline bankruptcies:

Not only the travel agents, but most of all the consumers, are in peril, paying for airline tickets, and then not being able to use them because of the default of an airline. The customer does not get his money back, nor does he have recourse to use the ticket on another airline, as was once possible before most airlines withdrew from the Default Protection Plan.

Today we received notice that Air Illinois, a small carrier based in Carbondale, Ill., has discontinued all scheduled passenger air service.

Each week we receive notice that certain airlines have withdrawn from ASP (Area Settlement Plan).

January 1, 1984.—National Commuter Airlines of Miami.

January 15, 1984.—Pocono Airlines of Avaco, PA.

December 27, 1983.—Devoe Airlines of Melbourne, FL.

January 1, 1984.—Pacific Cal Air of Oakland, CA.

January 29, 1984.—Air Vermont of Burlington, VT.

April 1, 1984.—Air Niugini of Honolulu.

And so on.

We in South Dakota were terribly concerned the last days of March 1984, when Republic Airlines threatened to shut down, following Continental's footsteps if the union did not come to terms with them.

When Continental defaulted we had several clients who lost their money because other airlines were not substituting for Continental in their city-pairs.

We need immediate emergency relief for everyone's sake—not only the travel agents, but especially the consumers.

Sincerely,

MELVA PEDERSON,
CTC, President.

HALLISSEY ASKS ATC TO APPROVE DPP REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

ASTA Senior Vice Chairman Joe Hallissey, CTC, this week called on the Air Traffic Conference to immediately approve an ATC bankruptcy protection system developed by the Special Task Force on Default Protection, a travel agency/airline group set up to find a replacement for the Default Protection Plan (DPP).

The task force, which ASTA initiated, has recommended a bankruptcy protection system funded from small contributions from both travel agents and airlines to reimburse passengers who are holding tickets on a bankrupt airline.

Although it would be more logical to have the system funded from a small ticket surcharge to be paid by consumers, Hallissey said it would be impossible to set up such a system quickly because Congress would have to adopt legislation.

"ASTA is so convinced of the pressing need for this type of protection that we are willing to support the proposal calling for travel agents to pay part of the cost for this protection, even though agents, unlike airlines, cannot pass this cost on to consumers," Hallissey said to the ATC.

According to Hallissey, "The important point for all ATC members to keep in mind is that we are all now living in a very dangerous situation. If any airline files for bankruptcy now, a great many passengers will be inconvenienced and they will turn in anger against all airlines and travel agents for failing to provide protection. ASTA feels this is the most serious problem hanging over the entire industry, and it is critical that action must be taken immediately to alleviate the danger."

Therefore, Hallissey asked ATC to call a special meeting as soon as possible to consider the report of the Special Task Force. "Once the plan is in effect, we could work together on refinements to improve it. The important thing now is to implement this plan as soon as possible," he said.

The DPP is virtually non-existent because most airlines have withdrawn their participation in the Plan. Recognizing the need to protect the public in the event of an airline bankruptcy, ASTA has been in the forefront of initiatives to develop an alternative to the DPP.

S. 2645

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 4263 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 4263) is amended by adding a new paragraph (g) at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(g) Every carrier providing taxable transportation as defined by section 4262 may take as a credit against the tax imposed by section 4261, an amount necessary to reimburse it for honoring tickets (other than free travel passes) previously issued to passengers for travel on any scheduled air carrier that later petitions for bankruptcy and is unable to provide the transportation purchased by the passenger. The amount of the credit shall not exceed the amount that the carrier would have received if it had charged that passenger for transporting on a stand-by or space-available basis. The United States shall succeed to all rights of the original ticket purchaser and shall become a creditor of the bankrupt air carrier for an amount equal to the credit that was taken for honoring the ticket of the bankrupt air carrier."

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 2646. A bill to amend the Rural Electricification Act of 1936 to insure the continued financial integrity of the Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act. I believe this bill, at long last, provide a workable and permanent solution to the problems of the Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund, a solution which does not burden the taxpayers with yet another layer of deficits.

For some time now, this body has been considering legislation offered by our colleagues and strongly supported by the associations representing the rural electric and telephone borrowers. I salute those members for their efforts on behalf of the REA programs, because those programs have proven to be among the most successful ever created by this Government.

But I have been deeply concerned over the developing information which identifies the costs which would accompany this legislation, costs which have been pegged by competent authority at somewhere between $10 and $20 billion. Even more distracting has been the conclusion that even with these great costs, the fund will probably still go broke.

Various attempts have been made to correct the association-sponsored legislation, but with every new repair attempt, some new flaw arises. Now we have been told by knowledgeable sources that this legislation will actu-

ally result in erratic interest rates which could severely hamper the ability of REA borrowers to plan for their financing needs and which could indeed threaten the solvency of the REA Revolving Fund.

My bill offers us one way out of the maze caused by the original legislation. It creates a formula for determining the REA Revolving Fund rates which is stable, workable, and certainly fair and reasonable. It provides for a significant discretionary or hardship loan program. It does not rely on bold guesses about economic conditions 2, 3 or 4 years from now. And most appropriately of all, from any standpoint, it places the cost of the REA programs on the REA borrowers, where it belongs and where the REA borrowers have many times said that they want it.

The other great advantage of the bill is that it guarantees the availability of adequate funding for REA borrowers without pricing that money out of reach. With this measure in effect under current program size and cost of money conditions, the REA Revolving Fund would be fully self-sustaining with interest rates averaging about 2 percent below the Government's own cost of borrowing.

I feel this bill provides for a reasonable middle ground between the awesome costs which the previously introduced legislation would have entailed and the heavily reduced program size which the administration has proposed to submit as a solution to the REA Revolving Fund problem.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my "Dear Colleague" letter and a section-by-section summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the materila was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, May 3, 1984.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Having been previously toasted lightly on the legislative fires of immigration reform, nuclear regulation and chairing of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I don't know why I should choose to tie myself to the stake for one last try—but hear me out on this one.

Next week several of your constituents (and mine!) will be in Washington, D.C. urging the very prompt and immediate passage of S. 1300, a bill which purports to assure the "self-sufficiency" of the Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund (RETRF). As that crew rides in from the west—and indeed that's from where many will be making the journey—you will be bombarded with information—and misinformation—that the various trade associations have been spreading diligently over the landscape about S. 1300 and its "enemies" who would destroy it.

I come from a state that has been magificently served by the REA over the years. One of the first national directors of that organization was one J.C. "Kid" Nichols, a Wyoming businessman, who was a dear and lifelong friend of mine. When this remarkable agency first embarked upon its mission in this country it was a stunning thing to observe. It literally changed the face of America. But after the extraordinary effort had been largely completed—when over 99 percent of rural America then received electrical energy—then some very creative financiers, accountants, lawyers and businessmen entered the fray. The complexity of the financing schemes and revolving fund capers of the REA would make an atomic scientist blanch. For they will have your eyes whirling like slot machine wheels as they patiently describe the remarkable and complex financing procedures of REA. Why shouldn't it be good—for few can really understand it.

CBOs (Certificates of Beneficial Ownership), borrowings, low-percent interest loans, financing commitments, off-budget borrowing and an extraordinary array of the most electrifying fiscal and credit crunching ways to electrify rural America. However, what will really electrify you is the real cost. I think you need to know that this "self-sufficiency" bill really does not compare in any way to what your constituents may have been informed. Bear with me for a moment. Let me relate some of the tales of woe that have been used to increase your fervor and your favor. Let's review the bidding. Here is the pitch presented by the trade associations who really have juiced up the citizens in America (if you will pardon that allusion!). Let's sort them out as "the pitch" and "the fact".

1. The Pitch: "Immediate action is needed right now to avert Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund bankruptcy."

The Fact: Indeed RETRF operations must be altered in order to assure the fund's long term solvency—but remember, we were always told that the ever generous "revolving fund" would "take care of everything" and that "everything" was in good order. We surely didn't get to this point of distress overnight and there is aboslutely no cogent reason to be rammed into action at this particular moment of the legislative year. Congress has already been mighty generous by delaying the RETRF deterioration for yet another year by appropriating $197.8 million to the fund in 1984. Those who are zealously fanning the flames and telling us to "act immediately" don't really want you to slow up long enough to consider any other solutions, or to really understand what S. 1300 is going to cost this country.

2. The Pitch: "This legislation was prepared by a 'blue-ribbon' committee including past REA administrators and the 'best minds' in the industry."

The Fact: This bill was not drafted by objective parties. It was certainly prepared by the craftiest and wiliest minds in or out of the industry, but it is proposed to really serve the special interest groups that will benefit most from it. Furthermore, while the "blue ribbon" committee may have agreed on the concept of it—the specific language of the bill was drafted by trade association technicians who see the present financing system in total disarray. Ah, and they always said it "wouldn't cost a nickel!"

3. The Pitch: "The $7.9 billion 'equity transfer' is not a 'forgiveness', and it really won't cost the Treasury or the taxpayer a cent."

The Fact: Try not to chuckle at that one. Even the Congressional Budget Office calls it a "forgiveness". So do the Congressional Research Service, the Government Accounting Office, the Office of Management and Budget, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Treasury. And each and every one of them also say that this "forgiveness" will cost the taxpayers literally billions of dollars. You might wish to ask your banker for this kind of an "equity transfer" on your home mortgage.

4. The Pitch: "The bill shows the borrowers' 'willingness' to pay a higher RETRF rate."

The Fact: Such "willingness" to pay higher RETRF rates is commendable. The real fact is that the technicians who sliced this rate-setting formula together would have pleased Rube Goldberg, for the rates under this bill will be too low to prevent the RETRF insolvency. Thus the bill really perverts the honest willingness of reliable borrowers to pay rates that are actually high enough to preserve the RETRF.

5. The Pitch: "Technical problems with the rate-setting formula have now been 'corrected' or 'fixed' in the amended House version".

The Fact: Borrowers have no idea whatsoever what is in store for them under the amended rate-setting formula. Extensive computer modeling of the House formula amendment shows that rates will be erratic, unpredictable, and quite subject to manipulation. The amended formula might have the possibility to work in theory, but it is more unlikely to work in actual practice. But the trade associations won't be too concerned about that because if it fails they'll simply bash our doors down again at some future time for some additional subsidies.

6. The Pitch: "This bill does not 'forgive' any borrower's current debt."

The Fact: That is right down the pike—an absolutely true statement and one that has never really been at issue. But the trade associations have used this plump "straw man" to divert our attention from just how this legislation reduces interest rates on future loans by only about 2 percent—compared with the rates which would be required without all of this new spirit of "forgiveness" and subsidy. Hear that once again please. All of these "forgivenesses" only reduce RETRF rates by 2 percent or less.

7. The Pitch: "Refinancing of the loan guarantees and REA borrowings from the Treasury is very 'fair' and 'won't cost the Treasury a penny.'"

The Fact: How a "downward-only", penalty free refinancing can be called "fair" is beyond my pale of comprehension. We do have a word for that out in Wyoming. A really "fair" proposal would have interest rates floating down and up with the government's cost of borrowing. The potential cost of this "one way" refinancing is staggering—easily in the billions of dollars. But the supporters of the measure say that these refinancings won't cost anything because Treasury won't permit them. Well if they won't be used, why not let's toss them out now?

8. The Pitch: "Even if this bill does 'cost a little', it's 'fair' (again that word) since cooperatives only get a fraction of the subsidies provided to other utilities."

The Fact: Here is an absolute flight from truth. Comparative subsidies have been studied by many organizations including the GAO and CRS. Only the trade associations continue to suggest that co-op subsidies are somehow less than those to the investor owned utilities—by use of a dazzling complex and analytical procedure. The trade associations would hope that certainly if they are to repeat this fiction enough, it will be accepted because it "sounds familiar."

And now the real capper:

The Pitch: "People who oppose this bill or would want to change it in any way are trying to 'turn off the lights' in rural America.

The Fact: This is the one that gets me. In a recent report by the Inspector General of the U.S.D.A. it was found that there were 54 co-ops which had 50 percent or more of their consumers living in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. They are telling you or me that we dare not oppose any part of this legislation or question it or try to improve it because we will then be branded as an "enemy" of rural America—and that the ranchers and farmers will be there to meet us with a phalanx of pitchforks and shovels when we get back to the old home ground. Certainly there may still be rural citizens in the United States of America who require the extraordinary boons and benefits of electrical power—if so, then let us serve those people.

Let us create those long lines of power that serve only very few people and let us fully subsidize those and get that power out there to those less fortunate persons. But those persons are now very few and the cost of serving all of those people is really peanuts compared to this legislative package we are asked to swallow. I do only urge that the trade associations will spare me the imagery of the leather-faced lady in the tattered calico dress—with tangled and matted hair like Marjorie Main—mashing away on a wooden washboard using grandma's lye soap while the nearest light bulb glimmers some 50 miles away over the mountain. I will honestly want to take care of each and every one of those persons that the trade associations can produce, and will use taxpayer's money to do it. That I commit to—but I really balk when I see REA's peddling power to substantial corporations. One co-op in my own home state had 1982 power sales of 386,000 megawatt hours—and 354,000 of those hours (91.7 percent!) were sold to large industrial and commercial users and yet that co-op still qualifies for 2 percent REA loans.

That is not right or "fair" (an often used term in this debate and those usable by both sides!). It is a very real example of awesome and even arrogant special interest steam rolling—for now we are being "advised" that we have to think and vote the way the paymasters of an extraordinarily generous P.A.C. fund will tell us. And please know that I am the beneficiary of some of those P.A.C. funds—and I have also picked up an honorarium or two. But as thoughtful legislators—Democrats and Republicans alike—we should all be offended at the assertion that by our actions in question this bill, it is akin to ripping the old wires and insulators out of the chickenhouse.

I guess I must be a perverse rascal. I oppose this bill precisely because of what I am being told—that I dare not oppose it—that it would indeed be "political suicide" to get involved. And this is an election year for me! But I have been fed a long string of misrepresentations on this baby—about what this bill really does and how much it will really cost the taxpayers. Annie Landers had it right when she said, "Wake up and smell the coffee."

I know personally those fine gentlemen and gentlewomen who serve on the various boards of directors of REAs in my own State of Wyoming and there are a remarkable and dedicated lot of them. I also feel that many of them honestly don't have any concept of what this extraordinary "bailout" bill really is. For those persons are the "salt of the earth" types—the farmer, the rancher, or the small businessman, the guy that really makes America hum—and these are the same people that write us those wrenching, serious and searching letters saying, "Al, what are you going to do about that $200 billion deficit?" They just have to be searching their souls when they come out to Washington next week to visit with us on this measure.

I deeply believe that the trade associations have consciously or unconsciously misled the public about what this bill really does. And maybe they have been doing that for years. I would not like to think so. Ask your constituents when they hit town if they have been told that the Congressional Budget Office has found that this bill will cost their government over $10 billion bucks by the year 2010.

One of the reasons why we are up to our fannies in deficits (and for me that is a long way off the ground!) is because past Congresses have made some dazzling previous political decisions for us—"built in" this and "built in" that—like this commitment of 1984 dollars in legislation crafted many years ago. Take a look at those CBOs (Certificates of Beneficial Ownership) and where we go from here on them. In the year 2006 a first balloon payment of $353.6 million will become due. But nowhere in the proposed legislation is there any money provided for repayment of that principal amount. In fact, the House formula amendment specifically states that interest expense is to meet interest income—but how about the principal? When that first CBO comes due I hunch we will be asked for another simple conversion of "debt" into "equity". The total CBO amount now outstanding is approximately $3.5 billion.

We all ceremoniously wring our hands (and I do too, and I don't leave myself out) about the deficit and try and search, and grapple to figure out honestly how to make a "down payment" on it. And yet the trade associations that press for S. 1300 would have us decide in this year of 1984 to give away billions of 1985-2016 tax dollars to bail out an industry that doesn't even need to be bailed out. I have only labored in this vineyard for a bit over five years, but I have never seen one quite like this. This bill is a classic case study of how special interest groups—using a magnificent blend of emotion, hype, high drama, guilt, political retribution and wretched distortion—all with a rich background of violin music from "the days of yore" in an attempt to unload today's problems on tomorrow's taxpayers by mobilizing and manipulating some very fine citizen constituents. We still have a crack at changing the ending of this story and we might just make it a case study of how an informed and alert Congress decided to educate itself and refused to blindly and blandly just add billions of dollars to the indebtedness of future generations of rural Americans and all other taxpayers.

I am looking at some alternatives. I would hope that you might resist the pressure to "sign on" to S. 1300 or maybe even withdraw your present support of it. I would urge you to counsel with your good constituents and inform them on some of the facts that the trade associations have withheld from them. I will be furnishing the stack to you. Finally, I would sincerely urge you to work with me to develop a reasonable, honest and fair alternative to S. 1300 that will keep those rural lights burning without searing the taxpayers' pockets for a long time to come.

I would hope you might lay back on this one and take a very close look at it. If you mull around in it long enough you might see how an extremely sophisticated special interest lobby has taken a most magnificent program and through use of a remarkable array of scalpels, wrenches and sledge hammers has fashioned a bizarre blend of on-budget/off-budget financing and subsidy packages through use of the Federal Financing Bank and other methods over these many years that would greatly and deeply disappoint, sadden and distress the creators of rural electrification in this country. This session would be a good time to address the issue as to where it all went awry. Just be assured that it did. So I am ready to dig in for the long haul on this one. I get lots of dazzling flack from the trade associations—but no answers. Will you join me in seeking and getting some?

I thank you for your attentiveness.

With best personal regards to you.

Sincerely,

ALAN R. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

SECTION 1

Separates the RETRF into two separate and distinct accounts, one for Telephone borrowers and the other for Electric borrowers. Substantively the same as the split contemplated in S. 1300.

SECTION 2

Provides for amortization of CBO's, with level annual debt service. This change will assure that CBO principal begins to be repaid, thus reducing temptation to provide "forgiveness" in some future years. Use of amortized CBO's results in substantial interest savings to the RETRF vis-a-vis existing simple interest payment schedule, and is thus a prudent financial step not withstanding any other legislative actions.

SECTION 3

Requires that 'standard rate' be established periodically for each account of the RETRF. Such rates shall be calculated using the formula:

CBO interest plus CBO principal divided by interest receipts times CBO rate.

Sets 5 percent minimum for such standard rate, and permits Administrator to make discretionary loans at lesser rates, but not less than one-half of the standard rate.

The proposal also envisions phasing in the new standard rate by setting the first year's interest rate at 80 percent of the formula-derived amount, then increasing that percentage by 2 percent per year until the tenth year, at which time the standard rate will be 100 percent of the formula-derived rate.

The structure of this formula will accommodate lower interest discretionary loans by the Administration for extreme hardship losses. The reduced interest receipts of such loans will be reflected within the formula and will result in marginally higher standard rates. The formula will retain RETRF solvency under any set of plausible CBO rate conditions.

SECTION 4

Reaffirms the policy of encouraging and assisting borrowers to develop their own resources and independence.

Places $850/$250 million caps on electric and telephone programs respectively. All other financing needs must be met through supplemental sources.

SECTION 5

Deletes automatic RETRF access for telephone borrowers with three or fewer density per mile. Eliminates restrictive language requiring TIER of 1.5 or higher for access to RTB financing.

SECTIONS 6 AND 7

Taken together, these sections assure that monies received by the Administrator as a result of class A stock redemption will be returned to Treasury rather than be converted to permanent equity of the RETRF.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

S. 2647. A bill to revise and extend titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act, relating to health professions educational assistance and nursing educational assistance; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND NURSING EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today I am introducing for myself and Senators RANDOLPH and MATSUNAGA S. 2647 a bill which will revise and extend titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act, relating to health professions educational assistance and nursing educational assistance, the "Health Professions and Nursing Educational Assistance Amendments of 1984."

For more than two decades, we have had a partnership with our Nation's health professions schools and students to meet our needs for qualified health professionals. Working together, we have dramatically increased our Nation's capacity to train health professionals, we have encouraged a renewed interest in primary care, and we have established a national health service corps that has the potential for fielding almost 3,600 physicians and other health professionals in 1985 to meet the needs of the underserved.

Despite the fact that we have made substantial progress in solving the problems that were first identified years ago, much remains to be done. Many low- and middle-income students may no longer be able to afford the price of education in our health professions schools. Four years ago, I noted that high levels of student indebtedness will frustrate our efforts to continue to improve appropriate specialty and geographic distribution among our health professionals. This warning is still true today. We must be doubly concerned about the reality that under our current system of payment for health services these high levels of indebtedness will surely be passed along in higher costs to those seeking health care.

A student's ability to pay for education must not become an implicit or explicit admission criterion. We must have health care professionals who come from all areas of our society: women, minorities, low-income whites, and the physically handicapped.

Our Nation's nurses are essential to our ability to provide health services and are critical members of the health care team. Without them, our ability to meet the health needs of our citizens is jeopardized.

A recent study of nursing and nursing education completed by the Institute of Medicine concluded that as of the fall of 1982, there was no longer a generalized national shortage of RN's or of LPN's. However, there are identified shortages that occur unevenly thoughout the Nation in different geographic areas, in different health care settings, especially those that serve the economically disadvantaged and in specialty distribution or continues to be a need for Federal support for nursing programs.

The problems of geographic and specialty distribution of our health professionals are persistent. Nine years ago, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I conducted hearings on Geographic and Specialty Maldistribution. I am pleased that progress has been made in reducing the magnitude of the problems, but I believe that we must not relax our concerns about these issues. I am not prepared to deny the poor of rural America and inner-city neighborhoods access to primary health care on the basis of their needs.

The Reagan administration has proposed some $80 million in reduced funding for health professions training, including reduced funding for physicians, nursing, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and public health training. Mr. Reagan's premise seems to be that the market and free enterprise will take care of our future needs, so a fiscal year 1985 budget that is less than one-third of fiscal year 1981 is justified. Mr. Reagan's view on health professions is unacceptable:

It is clear that this body should act on authorizing legislation that rejects the premises found in the President's fiscal year 1985 budget proposal for health professions education.

The proposed $38 million reduction in nursing training from fiscal year 1984 levels is unacceptable. The proposed $30 million reduction in primary care/family medicine program support is unacceptable. The proposed $8 million reduction in area health education centers is unacceptable. And the proposed $7 million reduction in public health program support is unacceptable.

I believe that my bill, the Health Professions and Nursing Educational Assistance Amendments of 1984, is legislation responsive to the current needs of our society for qualified trained health professionals.

It includes provisions for appropriate authorization levels for existing health professions programs, makes provisions for a modest increase in the health professions student loan program, and creates a modest service contingent loan forgiveness program.

I believe that the loan-in-kind provision proposed by my bill is an idea whose time has come. It is not a new idea, in fact, a version of it exists in current legislation. My bill simply expands and elaborates on the principle that the Secretary should have the discretion to complement the National Health Service Corps by reducing the debts of graduates of health profession schools for the performance of service in academic, nonprofit research, or community or public service employment. The $10 million authorized for fiscal year 1985 cannot be said to be excessive.

Mr. President, my bill places appropriate emphasis of advanced nurse training, shifting to a direction suggested by the Institute of Medicine. The traineeships, fellowships and demonstration projects proposed by my bill will assist nurses, nursing institutions, and America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill summary and the Health Professions and Nursing Educational Assistance Amendments of 1984 be printed in the RECORD. I further ask the support of my colleagues on this measure.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be reprinted in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND NURSING EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1984

TITLE I—HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Part A: Authorization of appropriations

Grants for Construction and Acquisition of Equipment—Reauthorizes $5,000,000 for grants for construction of teaching facilities and the acquisition of equipment for training.

Health Education Assistance Loans (HEAL)—Reauthorizes the federal loan insurance program to a total principal amount to a line of credit not exceeding $275,000,000 for FY85, $290,000,000 for FY86, $305,000,000 for FY87 and FY88.

Health Professions Student Loan (HPSL)—Authorizes federal capital contribution into student loan funds into three categories: (1) authorizes $3,000,000 for FY85-88 to schools that have established student loan funds before July 1, 1972, (2) authorizes $5,000,000 for FY85-88 to schools that have established student loan funds after July 1, 1982, and (3) authorizes $2,000,000 to schools of public health to establish student loan funds.

Scholarships for Students of Exceptional Financial Need—Reauthorizes grants to provide scholarships to first year, full time MOD/VOP students who are of exceptional financial need at $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 1985, $9,000,000 for FY86, $10,000,000 for FY87, and $11,000,000 for FY88.

Departments of Family Medicine—Reauthorizes grant to schools of medicine and os-

teopathy to establish, maintain, or improve academic administrative units to provide clinical instruction in family medicine at $11,000,000 for FY85, $11,500,000 for FY86, and $12,000,000 for FY87 and FY88.

Area Health Education Centers (AHEC)—Reauthorizes contracts with schools of medicine and osteopathy for the planning, development and operation of area health education center programs at $20,000,000 for FY85, $24,000,000 for FY86, $26,000,000 for FY87, and $28,000,000 for FY88.

Physicians Assistance—Reauthorizes grants to schools of medicine, osteopathy, and other public or non-profit private entities to meet the costs of projects to plan, develop, operate or maintain programs for the training of physicians assistants at $5,600,000 for FY85, $6,600,000 for FY86, and $7,000,000 for FY87 and FY88.

General Internal Medicine and General Pediatrics—Reauthorizes grants and contracts to schools of medicine and osteopathy, and public or non-profit private hospitals to plan, develop and operate approved residency training programs in general internal medicine or general pediatrics at $21,000,000 for FY85, $22,000,000 for FY86 and $23,000,000 for FY87 and FY88.

Family Medicine and General Practice of Dentistry—Reauthorizes grants and contracts to any public or nonprofit private hospitals, schools of medicine or osteopathy to plan, develop, operate, or participate in professional training programs in the field of family medicine, or public or nonprofit private schools of dentistry or accredited postgraduate dental training institutions to plan, develop and operate an approved residency program in the general practice of dentistry, at $37,000,000 for FY85, $39,700,000 for FY86, and $41,700,000 for FY87 and FY88.

Educational Assistance to Individuals from Disadvantaged Backgrounds—Reauthorizes grants and contracts to schools of medicine, osteopathy, public health, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, allied health and podiatry and other health education entities to assist individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds to undertake education to enter a health profession, at $24,000,000 for FY85, $25,000,000 for FY86, and $26,000,000 for FY87 and FY88.

Curriculum Development Grants—Reauthorize grants to and contracts with any health profession, allied health profession or nurse training institution health manpower projects and programs such as, but not limited to: health promotion/disease prevention, training in geriatrics and long term care, promoting economics in health professions, teaching and practice, faculty development for health professional schools, and nutrition, at $8,000,000 for FY85-88.

Advanced Financial Distress Assistance—Reauthorizes contracts to schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry or pharmacy to provide financial assistance to meet incurred or prospective costs of operation if the Secretary determines that payment of such costs is essential to remove a school from serious and longstanding financial instability (only for schools who have previously received support under section 788(A) or 788(B)), at $5,600,000 for FY85-88.

Graduate Programs in Health Administration—Reauthorizes grants to public or nonprofit private educational entities to support graduate educational programs in health administration, hospital administration, and health planning at $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1986 and $3,500,000 for fiscal year 1987, and $4,000,000 for fiscal year 1988.

Traineeships for Students in Other Graduate Programs—Reauthorizes grants to public, nonprofit private educational entities which offer a program in health administration, hospital administration or health policy analysis and planning, to train students enrolled in such a program, at $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1986, $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Public Health Traineeships—Reauthorizes grants to accredited schools of public health and other public or nonprofit institutions which provide training in public health to provide traineeships, at $4,500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $5,500,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $6,000,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Training in Preventive Medicine—Reauthorizes grants to and contracts with schools of medicine, osteopathy and public health to plan, develop, maintain or improve residency training programs in preventive medicine, at $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $3,500,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Project Grants and Contracts in Allied Health—Authorizes the Secretary of HHS to make grants and contracts for planning, developing, demonstrating, operating, and evaluating projects in allied health, at $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1985, $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1987, and $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1988.

Part B: Program revisions

Training of Physician Assistants—The definition of program for the training of physician assistants is amended to focus on training individuals qualified to primary health care under the supervision of a physician, and emphasize training in disease prevention, health promotion, geriatric medicine and home health care. (Sec. 701)

Schools of Allied Health

a. For purposes of Title VII of the Public Health Service Act the definition of school of allied health is amended to include college, and institutions providing additional training for allied health professionals. (Sec. 701(10)(A)).

b. A new paragraph is added providing a definition of allied health professional which includes individuals with post baccalaureate training in a science related to health care.

c. An individuals representing one of the allied health professional educational programs is included in the National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education. (Sec. 702)

Graduate Programs in Clinical Psychology

a. For purposes of Title VII of the Public Health Service Act, graduate programs in clinical psychology are included in the definitions under General Provisions (Sec. 701 (5))

b. Graduate programs in clinical psychology are included in statute as eligible to participate in programs authorized under Educational Assistance to Individuals from Disadvantaged Backgrounds. (Sec. 787)

Acquisition of Equipment and Instrumentation for Teaching Facilities—Grant authority for assistance in the construction of teaching facilities for health professional schools is amended to include the acquisition of equipment. (Sec. 720) "Equipment" is defined as any equipment, device, tool, or other medical or scientific instrumentation to be used by students, faculty or personnel.

Health Professions Student Loan Program (HPSL Program)—The Secretary is provided with guidance on termination procedures that would have to be followed before a school could be terminated from participating in the HPSL program for reasons of having a high default rate on HPSL loans by its graduates. The purpose is to avoid unfair and inequitable terminations.

The participating institutions would be required to provide thorough and adequate loan information on HPSL's made to students. The purpose is to guarantee that students are given every opportunity to understand the nature of the financial obligations required of them as participants in the HPSL program.

Provides for the assumption of collection effort by the Federal government once an institution has exercised due diligence in attempting to collect a delinquent loan. Provides for loans collected by the Secretary to be redistributed to the participating institutions in a manner prescribed by the federal government.

Loan-in-Kind Repayment Program—Creates and authorizes a loan-in-kind repayment program (LIKRP) to permit the Secretary to reduce the debts of graduates of health profession schools for the performance of service in academic, nonprofit research, or community or public service employment. Provides for a year by year schedule so that both the Secretary and the individual have the greatest amount of freedom of discretion possible under such a contractual arrangement.

Exceptional Financial Need Scholarship Program—modifies this program to restrict the total scholarship award to a student from exceeding the cost of attendance at a given educational institution attended by the student in a given year. Eliminates requirement that such students participate in the National Health Service Corps, since this scholarship program is but a one year program, and restricted to the first year of training.

Capitation Grants for Schools of Public Health—annual grants to schools of public health for the support of the education programs of such schools are permitted according to a formula that considers the number of full-time equivalents and part-time students. Specifies eligibility and application requirements for schools of public health for capitation grants.

Area Health Education Centers—Authority for the AHEC program is amended to permit greater flexibility in awarding special projects grants. Changes special projects funding from up to 10 percent of funds to simple 10 percent of funds.

Dentistry—authority for the program is amended to include approved advanced educational programs in the general practice of dentistry. Also, requires a 10 percent set aside of funds authorized for family medicine and general dentistry programs.

Special Projects—amends existing authority to create pilot projects in the health professions and special projects in the health professions. Grants and contracts are permitted for faculty development and curricula development.

Graduate Programs in Health Administration—amends existing authority to permit funding of programs with at least 20 students and a high minority enrollment.

Special Projects for Schools of Public Health—authorizes grants to schools of public health to develop programs in an

array of public health areas, e.g., biostatistics or epidemiology, environmental health sciences, nutrition, geriatrics, health promotion and disease prevention, alcoholism and medical care cost containment. Authorizes $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1986, $4,000,000 for fiscal year 1987, and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1988.

Project Grants and Contracts in Allied Health—amends the existing authority to permit grants and contracts for the planning, developing, demonstrating, operating, and evaluating projects related to the use of allied health personnel in the health care delivery system, the retraining of allied health personnel who have been out of the job market, to provide training and education to improve the skills of allied health assistants and other subprofessional allied health personnel who are employed in acute, chronic, and long-term care institutions, and other projects.

Educational Assistance to Disadvantaged Individuals in Allied Health Training—amends existing authority to permit grants and contracts with schools of allied health, state and local educational agencies, and other public or private nonprofit entities to assist in meeting the costs of assisting individuals who, due to socio-economic factors, are financially or otherwise disadvantaged to undertake education to enter the allied health professions. Authorizes $1.5 million for fiscal year 1985 and slight increases for the next three fiscal years.

NURSING

A. Authorization: Special Projects—authorizes for appropriation $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $16,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, $17,000,000 for fiscal year 1987, and $17,000,000 for fiscal year 1988.

Advanced Nurse Training Programs—authorizes for appropriation $22,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $22,300,000 for fiscal year 1986, $24,700,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Nurse Practitioner—authorizes for appropriation $17,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $17,300,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $17,800,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Demonstration Projects—authorizes for appropriation $11,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $11,500,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Traineeships for Advanced Training of Professional Nurses—authorizes for appropriation $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $17,000,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Fellowships—authorizes for appropriation $4,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $4,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

Nurse Anesthetists—authorizes for appropriation $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $1,200,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1988.

B. Program Revisions: Nurse Practitioner Program—amends existing authority to permit the Secretary to make grants to and enter into contracts with public or nonprofit private schools of nursing and medicine, public or nonprofit private hospitals, and other entities to plan, expand, or maintain nurse practitioner programs. Requires such programs to award a Master's degree or doctoral degree. Permits nurse midwifery program to grant certificates in addition to Master's and doctoral degrees.

Demonstration Projects—creates the authority for the Secretary to make grants to public and private nonprofit schools of nursing to support demonstration projects to demonstrate nurse practice and nurse education collaboration, nursing cost-effectiveness in long term care, pediatrics, community health nursing and other areas.

Fellowships—creates the authority for the Secretary to make grants for fellowships for nursing faculty to acquire increased skills so that they may participate in the training of advanced level nurses, may investigate alternatives to traditional health care modalities that are cost-effective, with special emphasis on at-risk populations such as the elderly, premature newborns, the handicapped, and ethnic minorities, and may examine nursing interventions that result in positive outcomes in health status.

S. 2647

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Health Professions and Nursing Educational Assistance Amendments of 1984".

REFERENCE

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act.

TITLE I—HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

PART A—AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

GRANTS FOR—CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT

SEC. 101. Section 720 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For grants under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.".

SCOPE AND DURATION OF FEDERAL LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 102. (a) The first sentence of section 728 (a) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983;" and by inserting before the period a semicolon and "$275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985; $290,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986; $305,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987; and $305,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

(b) The second sentence of such section is amended by striking out "1987," and inserting in lieu thereof "1991,".

STUDENT LOANS

SEC. 103. (a) Section 742 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) For the purpose of making Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, podiatry, optometry, or veterinary medicine which have established such funds under section 740 after July 1, 1972, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

"(2) For the purpose of making Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, podiatry, optometry, or veterinary medicine which have established such funds under section 740 on or before July 1, 1972, there are authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

"(3) For the purpose of making Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of schools of public health which have established such funds under section 740, there are authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988.".

(b) Section 743 is amended by striking out "1987" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1991".

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR STUDENTS OF EXCEPTIONAL FINANCIAL NEED

SEC. 104. Section 758(d) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

DEPARTMENTS OF FAMILY MEDICINE

SEC. 105. Section 780(c) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting a comma and "$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $11,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988" after "1984".

AREA HEALTH EDUCATION CENTERS

SEC. 106. The first sentence of section 781(g) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $28,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS

SEC. 107. Section 783(d) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $6,600,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

GENERAL INTERNAL MEDICINE AND GENERAL PEDIATRICS

SEC. 108. Section 784(b) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$21,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

FAMILY MEDICINE AND GENERAL PRACTICE OF DENTISTRY

SEC. 109. (a) The first sentence of section 786(c) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$37,800,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985,

$39,700,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $41,700,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $41,700,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

(b) The second sentence of such section is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting "September 30, 1985, September 30, 1986, September 30, 1987, and September 30, 1988," after "1984,".

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS FROM DISADVANTAGED BACKGROUNDS

SEC. 110. The first sentence of section 787(b) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

CONVERSION AND CURRICULUM GRANTS

SEC. 111. Section 788(f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.".

ADVANCED FINANCIAL DISTRESS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 112. The first sentence of section 788B(h) is amended by inserting before the period a comma and "and $5,600,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years".

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 113. Section 791(d) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

TRAINEESHIPS FOR STUDENTS IN OTHER GRADUATE PROGRAMS

SEC. 114. Section 791(A)(c) is amended by striking out "and" after "1980;" and by inserting before the period a semicolon and "$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985; $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986; $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987; and $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINEESHIPS

SEC. 115. Section 792(c) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983;" and by inserting before the period a semicolon and "$4,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985; $5,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986; $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987; and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

TRAINING IN PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

SEC. 116. Section 793(c) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS IN ALLIED HEALTH

SEC. 117. Section 796(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) For payments under grants and contracts under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988.".

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS IN ALLIED HEALTH TRAINING

SEC. 118. Section 798(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) For payments under grants and contracts under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.".

PART B—PROGRAM REVISIONS

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

SEC. 121. (a) Section 701 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(13) The term 'graduate program in clinical psychology' means a graduate program in a public or nonprofit private institution in a State which provides training leading to a doctoral degree in clinical psychology or an equivalent degree.".

(b) Section 701(5) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" after "pharmacy,"; and

(2) by inserting "or a graduate program in clinical psychology," after "health administration,".

(c) Section 737 is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(d) Section 787(a)(1) is amended by inserting a comma and "graduate programs in clinical psychology," after "podiatry".

SCHOOLS OF ALLIED HEALTH

SEC. 122. (a) Section 701(10) is amended by inserting "college," before "junior college,".

(b) Section 701 (as amended by section 121 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) The term 'allied health professional' means an individual—

"(A) who has received a certificate, an associate's degree, a bachelor's degree, a masters' degree, a doctoral degree, or postbaccalaureate training, in a science relating to health care;

"(B) who has responsibility for the delivery of health care services or related services, including—

"(i) services relating to the identification, evaluation, and prevention of diseases and disorders;

"(ii) dietary and nutrition services;

"(iii) health promotion services;

"(iv) rehabilitation services; or

"(v) health systems management services; and

"(C) who is not a graduate of a school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, public health, or chiropractic, or a graduate program in health administration or clinical psychology.".

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION

SEC. 123. Section 702(a) is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Of the appointed members of the Council (1) twelve shall be representatives of the health professions schools assisted under programs authorized by this title, including at least one representative each from schools of veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, allied health, and public health and at least one representative of graduate programs in health administration, (2) three shall be full-time students enrolled in health professions schools, including schools of allied health, and five shall be members of the general public.".

PROCEDURES FOR THE PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS

SEC. 124. Part A of title VII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROCEDURES FOR THE PROMULGATION OF REGULATION

"SEC. 711. The Secretary shall promulgate any rule or regulation to carry out part C in accordance with the provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code. In promulgating any such rule or regulation, the Secretary shall give interested persons at least 60 days to participate in the rule making under subsection (c) of such section.".

ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT FOR TEACHING FACILITIES

SEC. 125. (a) section 720(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The Secretary may make grants to assist in the construction of teaching facilities or the acquisition of equipment for the training of physicians, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, veterinarians, and professional public health personnel.".

(b)(1) Section 721(b)(1) is amended—

(A) by inserting "or the acquisition of equipment" after "construction of any facility" in the second sentence;

(B) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(C) by inserting "or acquire equipment" after "construct a facility" in such sentence.

(2) Section 721(c)(2) is amended—

(A) by inserting "or equipment" after "the facility" in clause (A);

(B) by inserting "or acquiring the equipment" after "the facility" in clause (B); and

(C) by striking out clause (C) and inserting in lieu thereof: "(C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction of the facility or acquisition of the equipment is completed, for effective use of such facility or equipment to provide the training for which such facility is being constructed or such equipment is being acquired;".

(3) Section 721(c)(7) is amended by inserting "in the case of an applicaiton for a grant to assist in the construction of a teaching facility," before "the application".

(c) Section 721(d) is amended by inserting "to assist in the construction of teaching facilities" after "applications for grants" in the matter preceding paragraph (1).

(d) Section 721 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) The Secretary shall by regulation provide for the proper review of grants for the acquisition of equipment under section 720(a)(1) by utilizing, to the maximum extent possible, appropriate peer review groups composed principally of non-Federal experts.".

(e)(1) Section 722(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The amount of any grant under section 720(a)(1) for construction of a project or the acquisition of equipment shall be such amount as the Secretary determines to be appropriate after obtaining advice from the Council, except that no grant may exceed 80 percent of the necessary costs of construction of a project, as determined by the Secretary, or 80 percent of the necessary cost of acquisition of equipment, as determined by the Secretary.".

(2) The last sentence of section 722(b) is amended by inserting "or acquisition of the equipment, as the case may be" before the period.

(3) Section 722(c) is amended—

(A) by inserting "of a project or the acquisition of equipment" after "cost of construction"; and

(B) by inserting "or acquisition" before "which is to be financed".

(f) Clause (1) of section 725 is amended by inserting "or the acquisition of any equipment" after "any facility".

(g) Part B of title VII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 726A. For purposes of this part, the term 'equipment' means any equipment, device, tool, or other medical or scientific instrumentation to be used by students, faculty, or administrative or maintenance personnel for clinical purposes, research activities, libraries, classrooms, offices, auditoriums, or other related purposes necessary for, and appropriate to, the conduct of programs of education.".

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOAN PROGRAM

SEC. 126. (a) Section 729 is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)" before "The";

(2) by striking out "and" after "podiatry," in the first sentence;

(3) by inserting a comma and "and $5,000 for a student enrolled in a school of allied health" before the period in the first sentence;

(4) by striking out "and" after "podiatry," in the second sentence; and

(5) by inserting a comma and "and $20,000 in the case of a borrower who is or was a student enrolled in a school of allied health" before the period in the second sentence.

(b) Section 737(1) is amended by inserting a comma and "allied health," after "public health".

(c) Section 737 (as amended by section 121(c) of this Act) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) The term 'school of allied health' means a program in a school of allied health (as defined in section 701(10)) which leads to a masters' degree or a doctoral degree.".

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

SEC. 127. (a)(1) Section 740(a) is amended by inserting "public health," after "optometry,".

(2) Section 740(b)(4) is amended—

(A) by inserting "doctor of pharmacy or an equivalent degree," before "doctor of podiatry";

(B) by striking out "or" before "doctor of veterinary medicine"; and

(C) by inserting a comma and "or a graduate degree in public health or an equivalent degree" before the semicolon.

(3) Section 741(b) is amended—

(A) by inserting "doctor of pharmacy or an equivalent degree," before "doctor of podiatry";

(B) by striking out "or" before "doctor of veterinary medicine"; and

(C) by inserting a comma and "or a graduate degree in public health or an equivalent degree" before the period.

(4) Section 741 (c) is amended by inserting "public health," after "optometry,".

(5) Subpart II of part C of title VII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 745. For purposes of this subpart, the term 'school of pharmacy' means a public or nonprofit private school in a State which provides training leading to a degree of bachelor of science in pharmacy or an equivalent degree or a degree of doctor of pharmacy or an equivalent degree and which is accredited in the manner described in section 701(5).".

(b) Section 741(j) is amended—

(1) by inserting "and in accordance with this section" after "Secretary" in the first sentence; and

(2) by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No such charge may be made if the payment of such installment or the filing of such evidence is made within 60 days after the date on which such installment or filing is due. The amount of any such charge may not exceed an amount equal to the product of the amount of such installment and 6 percent.".

(c) Section 742(b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Any funds from a student loan fund established under this subpart which are returned to the Secretary in any fiscal year shall be available for allotment under this subpart in such fiscal year and the fiscal year succeeding such fiscal year.".

(d)(1) Subpart II of part C of title VII (as amended by subsection (a)(5) of this section) is further amended—

(A) by redesignating section 745 (as added by subsection (a)(5) of this section) as section 746; and

(B) by inserting after section 744 the following new section:

"STUDENT LOAN INFORMATION BY INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 745. (a) With respect to loans made by a school under this subpart after June 30, 1985, each school, in order to carry out the provisions of sections 740 and 741, shall, at any time such school makes a loan to a student under this subpart, provide thorough and adequate loan information on loans made under this subpart to the student. The loan information required to be provided to the student by this subsection shall include—

"(1) the yearly and cumulative maximum amounts that may be borrowed by the student;

"(2) the terms under which repayment of the loan will begin;

"(3) the maximum number of years in which the loan must be repaid;

"(4) the interest rate that will be paid by the borrower and the minimum amount of the required monthly payment;

"(5) the amount of any other fees charged to the borrower by the lender;

"(6) any options the borrower may have for deferral, cancellation, prepayment, consolidation, or other refinancing of the loan;

"(7) a definition of default on the loan and a specification of the consequences which will result to the borrower if the borrower defaults, including a description of any arrangements which may be made with credit bureau organizations; and

"(8) to the extent practicable, the effect of accepting the loan on the eligibility of the borrower for other forms of student assistance.

"(b) With respect to loans made under this subpart after June 30, 1985, each school, in order to carry out the provisions of sections 740 and 741, shall, immediately prior to the graduation from such school of a student who has received a loan under this subpart, disclose to the student the information required by this subsection. Such information shall include—

"(1) a specification of—

"(A) each amount borrowed under this subpart; and

"(B) the total amount financed under this subpart, which shall equal the difference between—

"(i) the sum of all amounts borrowed by the borrower under this subpart, minus

"(ii) the sum of all charges paid by the borrower with respect to such amounts;

"(2) the dollar cost to the borrower of the total amount borrowed under this subpart;

"(3) the dollar amount of total scheduled payments, calculated by adding the amounts described in paragraphs (1)(B) and (2); and

"(4) a schedule for repayment of the loan by the borrower, including the number, amounts, and frequency of payments to be made.

"(c) The loan information required by subsections (a) and (b) shall be made available in a conspicuous form either in the note or other written evidence of the loan or in another written form signed by the borrower.

"(d) Each school, in order to carry out the provisions of sections 740 and 741, shall maintain contact with any borrower who received a loan under this subpart during any period beginning after June 30, 1985, in which such borrower defers payment of such loan (as permitted by section 741(c)) following the borrower's graduation from such school. Such required contact with the borrower shall consist of letters to the borrower which summarize the information described in subsection (b)(4). Such letters shall be sent by the school to the borrower approximately 90 days after the borrower's graduation, approximately 180 days after such graduation, and at approximately 30 days prior to the date on which the first payment by the borrower on a loan under this subpart is due.

"(e)(1) With respect to loans made under this subpart which are not delinquent on June 30, 1985, and with respect to any loans made pursuant to this subpart after such date, a school, in order to carry out the provisions of sections 740 and 741, shall take the actions described in paragraphs (2) and (3) whenever a student who received a loan under this subpart fails to make one or more loan payments in accordance with the repayment schedule contained in the loan agreement between the borrower and the school.

"(2) A school shall notify a delinquent borrower of the status of the borrower's loan account and the consequences of default on the loan—

"(A) approximately 15 days after the due date of any delinquent loan payment;

"(B) approximately 45 days after such date;

"(C) approximately 60 days after such date;

"(D) approximately 75 days after such date; and

"(E) approximately 120 days after such date.

"(3)(A) If, after sending all the notices required by paragraph (2) with respect to a delinquent loan, such loan remains delinquent, a school shall take the actions described in subparagraphs (B) through (D) unless the costs that will be incurred by the school in taking such actions will exceed the total amount of the delinquent loan.

"(B) The school shall notify any credit bureau organization to which the school subscribes of the delinquent loan.

"(C) The school shall use collection agents to collect the loan, and may use an internal collection agent.

"(D) The school shall institute any appropriate legal proceedings against the borrower after all other attempts to collect the loan have failed.

"(f)(1) With respect to any loan under this subpart which is delinquent on June 30, 1985, a school shall take the actions described in paragraphs (2) through (5) unless the costs that will be incurred by the school in taking such actions will exceed the total amount of the delinquent loan.

"(2) A school shall pursue all reasonable methods available for locating the borrower of such a loan.

"(3) If such a borrower is located, the school shall send the borrower a registered letter, stating the borrower's obligation to repay the loan and the consequences resulting to the borrower from default. The school shall provide the borrower with a period of 30 days to respond to the letter before taking any further action with respect to the loan.

"(4) If a borrower does not respond to a letter sent pursuant to paragraph (3) within the 30-day period prescribed by such paragraph, a school shall send such borrower two additional registered letters which specify the actions the school will take to collect the loan.

"(5) If a borrower has not begun to repay a loan within 120 days after receipt of the letter described in paragraph (3), a school shall use the collection procedures described in subsection (e)(3) to collect such loan.

"(g) If a school has complied with all the requirements of this section with respect to a loan and is still unable to collect the loan, the Secretary shall accept referral of such loan for collection by such means as may be at the disposal of the Federal Government. Any amounts collected on a loan referred to the Secretary shall be returned to the Secretary for allotment under this subpart in the fiscal year in which such amounts are returned and the fiscal year succeeding such fiscal year.".

(2) Section 740 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c)(1) An agreement with a school under subsection (a) may only be terminated by the Secretary, in accordance with the procedures established by this subsection, if the Secretary finds that the school has failed to comply substantially with section 745. The procedures that the Secretary shall follow in terminating such an agreement shall include at least the procedures described in paragraphs (2) through (6) of this subsection.

"(2) The Secretary shall provide a school with which the Secretary has an agreement under subsection (a) with written notice of an allegation that the school is not in substantial compliance with section 745. Such notice shall include a written statement of reasonable and achievable steps which the school may take to demonstrate progress toward achieving substantial compliance with such section.

"(3) The Secretary shall provide a school which has received a notice described in paragraph (2) with a reasonable period of at least 30 business days to demonstrate that the school is in substantial compliance with section 745 or has taken reasonable actions to demonstrate significant progress toward achieving substantial compliance with such section.

"(4) If the Secretary determines that the response of a school under paragraph (3) is not adequate, the Secretary shall notify the school in writing that the Secretary intends to terminate the agreement under subsection (a) with the school and that the school may request a formal hearing with respect to such termination. If the school requests such a hearing within 30 days after the receipt of such notice, the Secretary shall provide such school with a hearing conducted by an administrative law judge. The administrative law judge shall consider all evidence offered at the hearing and issue a decision containing findings of fact and a determination whether a school is in substantial compliance with section 745. In making such determination, the administrative law judge shall give appropriate consideration to extenuating factors, which may include—

"(A) the appropriateness of a rigid delinquency standard in the case of a school which has relatively few borrowers repaying loans under this subpart;

"(B) the relative number of borrowers who did not graduate from such school;

"(C) the relative number of borrowers who attended the school and who are repaying loans under this subpart;

"(D) the progress the school is making in collecting loan installments on which payments are past due;

"(E) the economic conditions of the areas in which graduates of the school are residing;

"(F) administrative problems beyond the control of the current officials of the school responsible for loan collection; and

"(G) the legal enforceability of any delinquent loans.

"(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the decision of an administrative law judge under this subsection shall be binding on the parties and shall become effective 30 days after issuance of the administrative law judge's decision under paragraph (4).

"(B) Any school may, within 30 days after the date on which the administrative law judge issues a decision under this subsection, request a review of such decision by the Secretary. If a request for such a review is made, the Secretary shall conduct such review and make a determination based on consideration of all information submitted to the administrative law judge and any other information submitted by the parties. In conducting such review and making such determination, the Secretary shall affirm the findings and determination of the administrative law judge, unless such findings and determination are unsupported by substantial evidence based on the record taken as a whole.

"(6) A school which has requested a hearing pursuant to paragraph (4) and has requested a review of the decision of an administrative law judge by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (5), shall be considered to have exhausted its administrative remedies and shall be entitled to judicial review in a United States district court.

"(d) Until an agreement with a school under subsection (a) has been formally terminated by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (c), the school shall continue to have access to all funds available in the student loan fund of such school under this section to make student loans.".

(e) Section 6103(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended—

(1) by inserting "administered by the Department of Education" before the period in the paragraph heading of paragraph (4); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Individuals who have defaulted on student loans administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon written request by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary may disclose the mailing address of any taxpayer who has defaulted on a loan under subpart II of part C of title VII of the Public Health Service Act or under subpart II of part C of title VIII of such Act, for use only by officers, employees, or agents of the Department of Health and Human Services for the purposes of locating such taxpayer for purposes of collecting such loan.

"(B) DISCLOSURE TO SCHOOLS.—Any mailing address disclosed under subparagraph (A) may be disclosed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to any shcool with which the Secretary of Health and Human Services has an agreement under subpart II of part C of title VII of the Public Health Service Act or Subpart II of part C of title VIII of such Act, for use only by officers, employees, or agents of such school whose duties relate to the collection of student loans for purposes of locating individuals who have defaulted on student loans made under such subparts for the purposes of collecting such loans.".

LOAN-IN-KIND REPAYMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 128. (a) Part C of title VII is amended—

(1) by striking out the subpart heading for subpart IV; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"SUBPART III—LOAN-IN-KIND REPAYMENT PROGRAM

"ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 751. (a) The Secretary shall establish the Loan-In-Kind Repayment Program (hereinafter in this subpart referred to as the 'Repayment Program') to assure an adequate distribution of trained health professionals and to provide a program through which an eligible individual may reduce the debts incurred by such individual in obtaining education by performing service in academic, nonprofit research, or community or public service employment.

"(b) To participate in the Repayment Program, an eligible individual must—

"(1) be within—

"(A) one year of graduation from—

"(i) a school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy in a State, or

"(ii) a graduate program in health administration or clinical psychology; or

"(B) one year of completing an approved internship, residency or other advanced clinical training;

"(2) submit an application to the Secretary for participation in the Repayment Program;

"(3) sign and submit to the Secretary, with such application, a written contract (described in subsection (e)) to accept payment of designated loan amounts on behalf of the eligible individual (contingent on finding and securing eligible employment under this subpart) and to undertake full-time eligible employment for a designated employment period; and

"(4) have obtained an eligible loan in support of the health professions education of such eligible individual.

"(c)(1) In disseminating application forms and contract forms to eligible individuals desiring to participate in the Repayment Program, the Secretary shall include with such forms—

"(A) a fair summary of the rights and liabilities of an eligible individual whose application is approved (and whose contract is accepted) by the Secretary, including in the summary a clear explanation of the damages to which the United States is entitled under section 752 in the case of the eligible individual's breach of the contract;

"(B) information respecting the employment obligation of an eligible individual under a contract under this subpart and such other information as may be necessary for the eligible individual to understand the eligible individual's prospective participation in the Repayment Program and in eligible employment.

"(2) The application form, contract form, and all other information furnished by the Secretary under this subpart shall be written in a manner designed for understanding by the average eligible individual applying to participate in the Repayment Program. The Secretary shall make such application forms, contract forms, and other information available to eligible individuals desiring to participate in the Repayment Program at a time sufficiently early in the application process to insure that such eligible individuals have adequate time to carefully review and evaluate such forms and information.

"(d)(1) An eligible individual becomes a participant in the Repayment Program only upon the Secretary's approval of the eligible individual's application submitted under subsection (b) and the Secretary's acceptance of the contract submitted by the eligible individual under such subsection.

"(2) The Secretary shall provide written notice to an eligible individual promptly upon the Secretary's approval under paragraph (1) of the eligible individual's participation in the Repayment Program.

"(e) The written contract (referred to in this subpart) between the secretary and a participant shall contain—

"(1) and agreement that—

"(A) subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary agrees to provide the participant with repayment (described in subsection (f)) for a designated employment period determined by the participant which is not less than two years, during which period the participant is engaged in full-time eligible employment; and

"(B) subject to paragraph (2), the participant agrees to engage in full-time eligible employment for a designated employment period of not less than two years;

"(2) a provision that any financial obligation of the United States arising out of a contract entered into under this subpart and any obligation of the participant which is conditioned thereon, is contingent upon the appropriation by the Congress of amounts for loan repayment under this subpart;

"(3) a statement of the damages to which the United States is entitled under section 752 for breach of the contract by the participant; and

"(4) such other statements of the rights and liabilities of the Secretary and of the participant, which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this subpart.

"(f)(1)(A) Repayment under a written contract under this subpart shall consist of payment to, or (in accordance with paragraph (2)) on behalf of, the participant an amount, for each year of employment by the participant in eligible employment, equal to—

"(i) 20 percent of the total amount of the principal of the participant's eligible loans; or

"(ii) $20,000,

whichever is less.

"(B) The Secretary may prepay all or part of the total amont of the principal of the eligible loans of participant in the Repayment Program.

"(2) The Secretary may enter into a contract with a lender which made an eligible loan to a participant in the Repayment Program in order to pay such lender, on behalf of such participant, amounts of the principal of such eligible loan. Payment to such lender may be made without regard to section 3324 of title 31, United States Code.

"(g) The Secretary shall report to Congress on March 1 of each year—

"(1) the number and types of eligible employment that participants undertake under the Repayment Program;

"(2) the total amount of loan principal paid under the program in each fiscal year; and

"(3) the number of applications filed for participation in the Repayment Program.

"RECOVERY

"SEC. 752. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, if a participant breaches a written contract under this subpart by failing either to begin such participant's eligible employment or to complete such employment, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the participant an amount determined in accordance with the formula

$$A=3o(t-s/t)$$

in which 'A' is the amount the United States is entitled to recover, 'o' is the sum of the amounts paid under this subpart to or on behalf of the participant; 't' is the total number of months in the participant's period of eligible employment; and 's' is the number of months of such period served by such participant in accordance with a written contract under section 751(e). Any amount of damages which the United States is entitled to recover under this subsection shall, within the one-year period beginning on the date of the breach of the written contract (or such longer period beginning on such date as specified by the Secretary for good cause shown), be paid to the United States.

"(b)((1) Any obligation of a participant under the Repayment Program (or a contact thereunder) for service or payment of damages shall be canceled upon the death of the participant.

"(2) The Secretary shall by regulation permit a participant to remain in good standing in the Repayment Program if such participant does not retain eligible employment under the program and is seeking new eligible employment.

"(3) The Secretary shall by regulation provide for the partial or total waiver or suspension of any designated repayment penalty by a participant under the Repayment Program (or a contract thereunder) whenever compliance by the participant is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to the participant and if enforcement of such obligation with respect to any participant would be unconscionable.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 753. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time prescribe regulations designating the types of eligible employment which are in greatest need of health professionals and the types of health professionals needed in such types of employment.

"(b) The Secretary shall publicize the Repayment Program, the types of eligible employment designated pursuant to subsection (a), and the employment verification procedure prescribed under subsection (c). The Secretary shall distribute such information so that it is available to students in health professions schools, faculty and administrators of such schools, State governors, and administrators of Federal, State, and local departments and agencies.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to implement this subpart, including regulations establishing a procedure whereby a particular position is determined to be eligible employment for purposes of this subpart and a monitoring system whereby the Secretary verifies that each participant is complying with the terms and conditions of the contract with the Secretary.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 754. For purposes of this subpart:

"(1) The term 'designated employment period' means a period in which a participant engages in eligible employment under this subpart, as determined by such participant, but which is not less than two years.

"(2) The term 'eligible employment' means—

"(A) teaching or research in health professions schools;

"(B) employment in State or local public health or environmental protection agencies;

"(C) employment in hospitals, clinics, and prisons owned and operated by State or local governments;

"(D) employment in nonprofit nursing homes and other long-term care facilities;

"(E) employment in Federal agencies (other than the Department of Defense) which conduct or support biomedical research, including the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Environmental Protection Agency;

"(F) employment in Federal and State programs for the inspection of meat, poultry, and other animal-derived food products (other than programs carried out by the Department of Defense); and

"(G) employment in a health manpower shortage area designated under section 332.

"(3) The term 'eligible individual' means an individual—

"(A) who is a graduate of a school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, or public health, or a graduate program in

health administration or clinical psychology, and

"(B) who has received an eligible loan.

"(4) The term 'eligible loan' means a loan obtained by an individual under—

"(A) this part;

"(B) part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; or

"(C) part D of such title.

"(5) The term 'participant' means an eligible participant whose application submitted under this subpart has been approved by the Secretary and whose contract submitted under this subpart has been accepted by the Secretary.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS OF EXCEPTIONAL FINANCIAL NEED

SEC. 129. (a) Section 758(d) is amended by striking out paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) A scholarship provided to a student for a school year under a grant under subsection (a) shall consist of—

"(A) payment to, or (in accordance with paragraph (4)) on behalf of, the student of the amount (except as provided in section 710) of—

"(i) the tuition of the student in such school year; and

"(ii) all other reasonable educational expenses, including fees, books, and laboratory expenses, incurred by the student in such school year; and

"(B) payment to the student of a stipend of $400 per month (adjusted in accordance with paragraph (5)) for each of the 12 consecutive months beginning with the first month of such school year.

"(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the total scholarship award to a student for each year shall exceed the cost of attendance for that year at the educational institution attended by the student (as determined by such educational institution).

"(4) The Secretary may contract with an educational institution, in which is enrolled a student who received a scholarship with a grant under subsection (a), for the payment to the educational institution of the amounts of tuition and other reasonable educational expenses described in paragraph (2)(A). Payment to such an educational institution may be made without regard to section 3324 of title 31, United States Code.

"(5) The amount of the monthly stipend, specified in paragraph (2)(B) and as previously adjusted (if at all) in accordance with this paragraph, shall be increased by the Secretary for each school year ending in a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1978, by an amount (rounded to the next highest multiple of $1) equal to the amount of such stipend multiplied by the overall percentage (as set forth in the report transmitted to the Congress under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code) of the adjustment (if such adjustment is an increase) in the rates of pay under the General Schedule made effective in the fiscal year in which such school year ends.".

(b) Section 338A(g)(1) is amended by striking out "or under section 758 (relating to scholarships for first-year students of exceptional financial need),".

CAPITATION GRANTS FOR SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

SEC. 130. (a) Section 770 is amended to read as follows:

"CAPITATION GRANTS FOR SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

"SEC. 770. (a)(1) The Secretary shall make annual grants to schools of public health for the support of the education programs of such schools. The amount of the annual grant to each such school with an approved application shall be computed for each fiscal year in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3).

"(2) Each school of public health shall receive for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for each of the next three fiscal years, an amount equal to the product of—

"(A) $1,400, and

"(B) the sum of (i) the number of full-time students enrolled in such school in the school year beginning in such fiscal year, and (ii) the number of full-time equivalents of part-time students, determined pursuant to paragraph (3), for such school for such school year.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (2), the number of full-time equivalents of part-time students for a school of public health for any school year is a number equal to—

"(A) the total number of credit hours of instruction in such year for which part-time students of such school, who are pursuing a course of study leading to a graduate degree in public health or an equivalent degree, have enrolled, divided by

"(B) the greater of (i) the number of credit hours of instruction which a full-time student of such school was required to take in such year, or (ii) 9, rounded to the next highest whole number.

"(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if the aggregate of the amounts of the grants to be made in accordance with such subsection for any fiscal year to schools of public health with approved applications exceeds the total of the amounts appropriates for such grants for such schools under subsection (e), the amount of a school's grant with respect to which such excess exists shall for such fiscal year be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined for the school under subsection (a) as the total of the amounts appropriated for that year under subsection (e) bears to the amount required to make grants in accordance with subsection (a) to each of the schools of public health with approved applications.

"(c)(1) For purposes of this section, regulations of the Secretary shall include provisions relating to the determination of the number of students enrolled in a school or in a particular year-class in a school on the basis of estimates, on the basis of the number of students who in an earlier year were enrolled in a school or in a particular year-class, or on such other basis as the Secretary deems appropriate for making such determination, and shall include methods of making such determination when a school or a year-class was not in existence in an earlier year at a school.

"(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'full-time students' (whether such term is used by itself or in connection with a particular year-class) means students pursuing a full-time course of study leading to a graduate degree in public health or equivalent degree.

"(d) In the case of a new school of public health which applies for a grant under this section in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which it will admit its first class, the enrollment for purposes of subsection (a) shall be the number of full-time students which the Secretary determines, on the basis of assurances provided by the school, will be enrolled in the school, in the fiscal year after the fiscal year in which the grant is made.

"(e) For payments under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.".

(b) Section 771 is amended to read as follows:

"ELIGIBILITY FOR CAPITATION GRANTS

"SEC. 771. (a) The Secretary shall not make a grant under section 770 to any school of public health in a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1977, unless the application for the grant contains, or is supported by, assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the applicant will expend in carrying out its functions as a school of public health during the fiscal year for which such grant is sought, an amount of funds (other than funds for construction as determined by the Secretary) from non-Federal sources which is at least as great as the amount of funds expended by such applicant for such purpose (excluding expenditures of a nonrecurring nature) in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which such grant is sought.

"(b)(1) To be eligible for a grant under section 770 for a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1984, a school of public health shall maintain an enrollment of full-time, first-year students, for the school year beginning in the fiscal year for which a grant under section 770 is applied for, which is not less than the number of full-time, first year students enrolled in such school in the school year beginning in the fiscal year ending September 30, 1976.

"(2) The Secretary may waive (in whole or in part) application to a school of public health of the requirement of paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines, after receiving the written recommendation of the appropriate accreditation body or bodies (approved for such purpose by the Secretary of Education) that compliance by such school with such requirement will prevent it from maintaining its accreditation.".

(c)(1) Section 772(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or subsection (a) or (b) of section 788";

(B) by striking out "of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, or podiatry," and inserting in lieu thereof "public health,";

(C) by striking out "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Health and Human Services";

(D) by striking out "Commissioner of Education" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Education"; and

(E) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Education".

(2) The section heading for section 772 is amended to read as follows:

"APPLICATION FOR CAPITATION GRANTS"

(3) Section 788 is amended by redesignating subsection (f) (as amended by section 111 of this Act) as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) To be eligible for a grant under subsection (a) or (b), the applicant must (1) be a public or other nonprofit school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, or podiatry, and (2) be accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Secretary of Education, except that the requirement of this clause shall be deemed to be satisfied if (A) in the case of a school which by reason of no, or an

insufficient, period of operation is not, at the time of application for a grant under this part, eligible for such accreditation, the Secretary of Education finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school will meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies prior to the beginning of the academic year following the normal graduation date of students who are in their first year of instruction at such school during the fiscal year in which the Secretary of Health and Human Services makes a final determination as to approval of the application, or (B) in the case of any other school, the Secretary of Education finds after such consultation and after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services that there is reasonable ground to expect that, with the aid of a grant (or grants) under those sections, having regard for the purposes of the grant for which application is made, such school will meet such accreditation standards within a reasonable time.".

(d) The heading for part E of title VII is amended to read as follows:

"PART E—GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH"

AREA HEALTH EDUCATION CENTERS

SEC. 131. Section 781 is amended—

(1) by inserting a comma and "and with public or private nonprofit entities which have served as regional area health education centers and which have previously received such assistance," after "this section" in subsection (a)(2);

(2) by striking out "section 822" in subsection (c)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 803"; and

(3) by striking out "may obligate not more than" in the second sentence of subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "shall obligate".

FAMILY MEDICINE AND GENERAL PRACTICE OF DENTISTRY

SEC. 131. (a) Section 786(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may make grants and enter into contracts with any public or nonprofit private school of dentistry, any accredited postgraduate dental training institution, or any other public or private nonprofit entity which the Secretary determines is capable of carrying out a grant or contract under this subsection—

"(1) to plan, develop, and operate an approved residency program in the general practice of dentistry or an approved advanced educational program in the general practice of dentistry; and

"(2) to provide financial assistance (in the form of traineeships and fellowships) to participants in such a program who are in need of financial assistance and who plan to specialize in the practice of general dentistry.".

(b) Section 786(c) (as amended by section 109 of this Act) is further amended—

(1) by inserting "and contracts" after "grants" in the first sentence; and

(2) by inserting before the period in the second sentence a comma and "and shall obligate not less than 10 percent of such amounts in each fiscal year for grants and contracts under subsection (b)".

CONVERSION AND CURRICULUM ASSISTANCE

SEC. 133. (a) Section 788(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The Secretary may make grants to and enter into contracts with schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, and allied health, graduate programs in health administration, and other appropriate public or nonprofit private entities, for—

"(A) pilot projects in the health professions; and

"(B) special projects in the health professions.

"(2) Grants made and contracts entered into under paragraph (1) shall include grants and contracts for projects to—

"(A) provide faculty development, including—

"(i) the enhancement and improvement of the teaching skills and educational methods of faculty of schools which receive a grant or contract under such paragraph;

"(ii) the training of faculty of schools which receive a grant or contract under such paragraph in computer technology, research methods, communications skills, administration, management, and ethics; and

"(iii) the training of faculty of schools which receive a grant or contract under such paragraph in areas such as toxicology, environmental health, nutrition, and gerontology;

"(B) plan, develop, and establish innovative curricula, including—

"(i) course materials in health education and promotion, disease prevention, self-care, the special needs of the elderly, and communications skills for health professionals; and

"(ii) multidisciplinary approaches to educational programs;

"(C) establish new clinical training sites and methods to provide clinical training consistent with changes in the patient population, the importance of health prevention activities, and reduced financial resources, including community based training sites and training by simulation of clinical encounters.

"(3) The Secretary shall prescribe general national health professions education priority guidelines in order to establish priorities for each type of project described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2). In prescribing such guidelines, the Secretary shall consult with the types of schools and programs described in paragraph (1).

"(4) In awarding grants and entering into contracts under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall evaluate a proposal from a school providing education in a particular health profession by comparing such proposal with proposals from other schools providing education in the same health profession.

"(5)(A) The Secretary shall by regulation provide for proper peer review of all grants and contracts under paragraph (1) by utilizing, to the maximum extent possible, appropriate peer review groups composed principally of non-Federal experts.

"(B) The Secretary shall submit each proposal for a grant or contract under paragraph (1) for peer review in accordance with subparagraph (A). The Secretary may not make a grant or enter into a contract under paragraph (1) until the Secretary has received the recommendations of the appropriate peer review committee and the National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education with respect to the proposal for such grant or contract.".

(b) Section 788 (as amended by section 111, section 130(c)(3), and subsection (a) of this section) is further amended by striking out subsection (a) and redesignating subsections (b) through (g) as subsections (a) through (f), respectively.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 134. Section 791(c)(2)(A)(1) is amended by inserting before the semicolon a comma and "except that in any case in which the number of minority students enrolled in the graduate educational programs of such entity exceeds an amount equal to 45 percent of all students enrolled in such programs, such application shall only be required to contain assurances that at least 20 individuals will complete such programs in such school year".

SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

SEC. 135. Subpart I of part G of title VII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

"SEC. 794A. (a) The Secretary may make grants to assist schools of public health in meeting the costs of special projects to develop new programs or to expand existing programs in—

"(1) biostatistics or epidemiology;

"(2) health administration, health planning, or health policy analysis;

"(3) environmental health sciences;

"(4) dietetics and nutrition;

"(5) behavioral sciences;

"(6) geriatrics;

"(7) health promotion and disease prevention;

"(8) alcoholism;

"(9) the epidemiology of sexually transmitted diseases;

"(10) medical care cost containment; and

"(11) injury due to accidents within and outside the workplace.

"(b) To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988.".

PROJECTS GRANTS AND CONTRACTS IN ALLIED HEALTH

SEC. 136. (a) Subsection (a) of section 796 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary shall make grants to and enter into contracts with eligible entities to assist them in meeting the costs of planning, developing, demonstrating, operating, and evaluating projects relating to the establishment of programs to—

"(1) develop methods for increasing the efficiency and reducing the costs of health care delivery through more effective use of allied health personnel;

"(2) provide continuing education for allied health professionals, including competency improvement, faculty development, and advanced training;

"(3) provide appropriate retraining opportunities for allied health personnel who, after periods of professional inactivity, desire again actively to engage in the practice or teaching of their allied health profession;

"(4) improve the distribution and availability by geographic area or by specialty group of adequately trained allied health personnel needed to meet the health needs of the Nation, including the need to increase the availability of primary care services, services to the elderly, and services to bilingual groups and the need to promote preventive health care;

"(5) provide training and education to improve the skills of allied health assistants and other subprofessional allied health personnel (as defined by the Secretary) who are employed in acute, chronic, and long-term care institutions;

"(6) provide education and training to permit individuals to become proficient in a related specialty; and

"(7) develop ways to meet changing needs in health care delivery without creating new allied health occupations or specialities.".

(b) Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such an application shall provide for such fiscal control and accounting procedures and reports, and access to the records of the applicant, as the Secretary may require to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section.".

(c) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsection (d) (as amended by section 117 of this Act) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary may, with the advice of the National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education, provide assistance to the heads of other Federal agencies to encourage and assist in the utilization of medical facilities under the jurisdiction of such agencies for allied health training programs.".

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS IN ALLIED HEALTH TRAINING

SEC. 137. Section 798 is amended to read as follows:

"EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS IN ALLIED HEALTH TRAINING

"SEC. 798. (a)(1) for the purpose of assisting individuals who, due to socioeconomic factors, are financially or otherwise disadvantaged (including individuals who are veterans of the Armed Forces with military training or experience in the health field) to undertake education to enter the allied health professions, the Secretary shall make grants to and enter into contracts with schools of allied health, State and local educational agencies, and other public or private nonprofit entities to assist in meeting the costs described in paragraph (2).

"(2) A grant or contract under paragraph (1) may be used by the school, agency, or entity to meet the costs of—

"(A) identifying, recruiting, selecting, and retaining such disadvantaged individuals;

"(B) facilitating the entry of such individuals into schools of allied health;

"(C) providing counseling, education, or other services designed to assist such individuals to complete successfully their education at a school of allied health; and

"(D) providing, for a period prior to the entry of such individuals into the program of education of a school of allied health, preliminary education designed to assist such individuals to complete successfully such program of education.

"(b)(1) No grant may be made or contract entered into under subsection (a) unless an application therefor has been submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary. Such application shall be in such form, submitted in such manner, and contain such information, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

"(2) The amount of any grant under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Secretary.

"(c) For payments under grants and contracts under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $2,000,000 for fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $2,500,000 for fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $3,000,000 for fiscal year ending September 30, 1988.".

PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS

SEC. 138. (a) Section 759 is repealed.

(b) Part D of title VII is repealed.

(c) Section 782 is repealed.

(d) Section 785 is repealed.

(e) Section 797 is repealed. Section 798 (as amended by section 136 of this Act) is redesignated as section 797.

TITLE II—NURSE TRAINING

REPEALS

SEC. 201. (a) Sections 801, 802, 803, 805, 810, 811, and 815 are repealed.

(b) Part A of title VIII is amended—

(1) by striking out the headings for subparts I, II, III, and IV; and

(2) by striking out the heading for part A and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Part A—Special Projects".

(c) Section 804 is redesignated as section 858, and is amended—

(1) by striking out "this subpart" in the matter preceding clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "subpart I of part A (as such subpart was in effect prior to September 30, 1984);

(2) by inserting "under subpart I of part A (as such subpart was in effect prior to September 30, 1984) after "Federal participation" in the matter following clause (3); and

(3) by adding "FOR CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE" at the end of section heading.

(d) Section 851 (b) is amended by striking out ", and in the review of applications for construction projects under subpart I or part A, of applications under section 805, and of applications under subpart III of part A".

(e) Section 853(1) is amended by striking out "the Canal Zone,".

(f) Section 853(6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) The term 'accredited' when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies, or by a State agency, approved for such purpose by the Secretary of Education and when applied to a hospital, school, college, or university (or a unit thereof) means a hospital, school, college, or university (or a unit thereof) which is accredited by a recognized body or bodies, or by a State agency, approved for such purpose by the Secretary of Education, except that a school of nursing seeking an agreement under subpart II of part C for the establishment of a student loan fund, which is not, at the time of the application under such subpart, eligible for accreditation by such a recognized body or bodies or State agency, shall be deemed accredited for purposes of such subpart if the Secretary of Education finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school will meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies prior to the beginning of the academic year following the normal graduation date of students who are in their first year of instruction at such school during the fiscal year in which the agreement with such school is made under such subpart; except that the provisions of this clause shall not apply for purposes of section 838. For the purpose of this paragraph, the Secretary of Education shall publish a list of recognized accrediting bodies, and of State agencies, which he determines to the Secretary of Education reliable authority as to the quality of education offered.".

SPECIAL PROJECTS

SEC. 202. The first sentence of section 820(d) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983,", and by inserting before the period a comma and "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $17,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $17,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

ADVANCED NURSE TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 203. Section 821(b) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $22,300,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $24,700,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $24,700,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

NURSE PRACTITIONER PROGRAMS

SEC. 204. Section 822 is amended to read as follows:

"NURSE PRACTITIONER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 822. (a)(1)(A) The Secretary may make grants to and enter into contracts with public or nonprofit private schools of nursing and medicine, public or nonprofit private hospitals, and other public or nonprofit private entities to meet the cost of projects to—

"(i) plan, develop, and operate,

"(ii) significantly expand, or

"(iii) maintain existing,

programs for the training of nurse practitioners or programs for the training of nurse midwives.

"(B) The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications for grants or contracts under subparagraph (A) for—

"(i) programs for the training of nurse practitioners who will practice in health manpower shortage areas (designated under section 332);

"(ii) programs for the training of nurse practitioners which emphasize training respecting the special problems of geriatric patients and training to meet the particular needs of nursing home patients; and

"(iii) programs for the training of nurse midwives.

"(2)(A) For purposes of this section—

"(i) the term 'programs for the training of nurse practitioners' means educational programs for registered nurses (irrespective of the type of school of nursing in which the nurses received their training) which meet guidelines prescribed by the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (B) and which have as their objective the education of nurses (including pediatric and geriatric nurses) who will, upon completion of their studies in such programs, receive a masters' degree or a doctoral degree and will be qualified to effectively provide primary health care, including primary health care in homes and in ambulatory car facilities, long-term care facilities, and other health care institutions; and

"(ii) the term 'programs for the training of nurse midwives' means educational programs for registered nurses (irrespective of the type of school of nursing in which the nurses received their training) which grant a certificate, a masters' degree, or a doctoral degree, which meet guidelines prescribed by the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (B), and which have as their objective

the education of nurses for clinical nurse midwifery practice.

"(B) After consultation with appropriate educational organizations and professional nursing and medical organizations, the Secretary shall prescribe guidelines for programs for the training of nurse practitioners and programs for the training of nurse midwives. Such guidelines shall, as a minimum, require that any such program—

"(i) extend for at least one academic year and consist of—

"(I) supervised clinical practice, and

"(II) at least four months (in the aggregate) of classroom instruction,

directed toward preparing nurses to deliver primary health care (in the case of programs for the training of nurse practitioners) or to engage in clinical nurse midwifery practice (in the case of programs for the training of nurse midwives); and

"(ii) have an enrollment of not less than eight students.

"(b)(1) The Secretary may make grants to and enter into contracts with schools of nursing and public health, public or nonprofit private hospitals, and other nonprofit entities to establish and operate traineeship programs to train nurse practitioners or nurse midwives. In considering applications for a grant or contract under this subsection, the Secretary shall give special consideration to applications for traineeships to train individuals who are residents of health manpower shortage areas designated under section 332.

"(2) Traineeships funded under this subsection shall include 100 percent of the costs of tuition, reasonable living and moving expenses (including stipends), books, fees, and necessary transportation.

"(3) A traineeship funded under this subsection shall not be awarded unless the recipient enters into commitment with the Secretary to practice as a nurse practitioner or as a nurse midwife in a health manpower shortage area (designated under section 332) for a period equal to one month for each month for which the recipient receives such a traineeship.

"(4)(A) If, for any reason, an individual who received a traineeship under paragraph (1) fails to complete a service obligation under paragraph (3), such individual shall be liable for the payment of an amount equal to the cost of tuition and other education expenses and other payments paid under the traineeship, plus interest at the maximum legal prevailing rate.

"(B) When an individual who received a traineeship is academically dismissed or voluntarily terminates academic training, such individual shall be liable for repayment to the Government for an amount equal to the cost of tuition and other educational expenses paid to or for such individual from Federal funds plus any other payments which were received under the traineeship.

"(C) Any amount which the United States is entitled to recover under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall, within the three-year period beginning on the date the United States becomes entitled to recover such amount, be paid to the United States.

"(D) The Secretary shall by regulation provide for the waiver or suspension of any obligation under subparagraph (A) or (B) applicable to any individual whenever compliance by such individual is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to such individual and if enforcement of such obligation with respect to any individual would be against equity and good conscience.

"(c) No grant may be made or contract entered into for a project to plan, develop, and operate a program for the training of nurse practitioners or a program for the training of nurse midwives unless the application for the grant or contract contains assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the program will upon its development meet the guidelines which are in effect under subsection (a)(2)(B). No grant may be made or contract entered into for a project to expand or maintain such a program unless the application for the grant or contract contains assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the program meets the guidelines which are in effect under such subsection.

"(d) The costs for which a grant or contract under this section may be made may include costs of preparation of faculty members in order to conform to the guidelines established under subsection (a)(2)(B).

"(e) For payments under grants and contracts under this section there are authorized to be appropriated $17,000,000 for fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $17,300,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $17,800,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $17,800,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988.".

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 205. Part A of title VIII is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 820, 821, and 822 (as amended by sections 202, 203, and 204 of this Act, respectively) as sections 801, 802, and 803, respectively; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 804. (a) The Secretary may make grants to public and private nonprofit schools of nursing and other public and nonprofit private entities to support demonstration projects to—

"(1) support clinical nurse training programs which combine educational curricula and clinical practice in health care delivery organizations, including acute care facilities, long-term care facilities, and ambulatory care facilities;

"(2) improve access to nursing services in noninstitutional settings through support of independent nursing practice arrangements in communities; and

"(3) encourage nursing graduates to practice in health manpower shortage areas (designated under section 332) to improve the specialty and geographical distribution of nurses in the United States.

"(b) The amount of any grant under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Secretary.

"(c) No grant may be made under subsection (a) unless an application therefor has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary. Such application shall be in such form, submitted in such manner, and contain such information as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

"(d) To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $11,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $11,500,000 for fiscal year 1986, $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1987, and $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1988.".

TRAINEESHIPS FOR ADVANCED TRAINING OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES

SEC. 206. (a) Section 830(a)(1)(C) is amended by inserting "or nurse midwives" before the comma.

(b) Section 830 is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(2) by inserting "(1)" before "There" in such subsection;

(3) by striking out "this section" in the first sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)";

(4) by striking out "and" after "1983," in such sentence;

(5) by inserting a comma and "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $17,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $17,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988" before the period in such sentence;

(6) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(2) To carry out subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988."; and

(7) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary may make grants to public or private nonprofit institutions to cover the costs of post baccalaureate and post doctoral fellowships for faculty in schools of nursing to enable such faculty to—

"(1) expand knowledge with respect to nursing by working with groups of students;

"(2) investigate cost-effective alternatives to traditional health care modalities, with special attention to the needs of at-risk populations, such as the elderly, premature newborns, physically and mentally disabled individuals, and ethnic minority groups;

"(3) examine nursing interventions that result in positive outcomes in health status, with attention to interventions which address family violence, drug and alcohol abuse, the health of women, adolescent care, disease prevention, and ethical concerns; and

"(4) address other areas of nursing practice considered by the Secretary to require additional study.".

TRAINEESHIPS FOR THE TRAINING OF NURSE ANESTHETISTS

SEC. 207. Section 831(b) is amended by striking out "and" after "1983," and by inserting before the period a comma and "$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, $1,200,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988".

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 2648. A bill to amend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act to ban ocean dumping at the 12-mile site, to develop a plan for the revitalization of the New York Bight apex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

OCEAN REVITALIZATION ACT

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to end the degradation of New Jersey's coastal waters and contamination of our fisheries by the ocean dumping of sewage sludge close in to New Jersey's shores. My bill, the Ocean Revitaliza-

tion Act, would permanently ban sewage sludge dumping at the so-called 12-mile site. It would also direct the Environmental Protection Agency to develop an action plan for revitalizing the New York Bight apex.

On April 26, 1984, after years of regulatory delay and litigation, the EPA proposed closing the sludge dump site 12 miles off New Jersey's shores and moving sludge disposal further out to sea, to a 106-mile site. The 106-mile site was proposed for a 5-year period, as an interim measure, until alternatives to ocean dumping can be found. This proposal will now go through a comment and public hearing process. It is likely to be finalized in 6 to 8 months.

EPA's decision to close the 12-mile site is good news for New Jersey and the entire New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. The Ocean Dumping Act was enacted over a decade ago. It was intended by Congress to put an end, once and for all, to continued degradation of our oceans. This intent was reaffirmed in 1977, when the Congress adopted an amendment to the act to halt harmful dumping of sewage sludge.

However, in the last decade, sludge dumping at the 12-mile site has increased from 4.7 million tons per year in 1973 to 8.3 million tons in 1983. Some projections indicate that sludge dumping will double or triple in the coming years, if these practices are not stopped. This is because mammoth, new secondary wastewater treatment plants will come on line in New York City and New Jersey, and other coastal municipalities may consider reentering the ocean with their wastes.

Mr. President, frustration in New Jersey with these practices is running at an all time high. The stress placed on the waters washing our shore by ocean dumping is worsened by the unconscionable dumping of 230 million gallons of raw sewage a day by the city of New York into the Hudson and East Rivers. New Jersey's economy is heavily dependent on keeping our coastal waters healthy. Our tourist industry, along with a more than $1 billion per year commercial and recreational marine fishing industry, cannot tolerate continued degradation of our coastal resources.

In announcing its decision, EPA noted that 40 to 50 years of dumping in shallow waters within 12 miles of New Jersey's beaches has spread the official 6.6-square-mile site for sludge dumping to an area of 20 to 30 square miles. This area is a major commercial fishing zone and concentrations of heavy metals and organic bacteria there have reached levels warranting immediate action. The degradation has moved inland, to about 5 miles off New Jersey's beaches.

EPA has developed a solid basis for its proposal to close the 12-mile site. I believe it will finalize this preliminary decision in a timely manner. The major obstacle, in my judgment, to a halt to sludge dumping at the 12-mile site lies in renewed litigation, on the part of New York City, and perhaps others, to overturn the Agency's decision.

My concern in this regard is only heightened by the fact that a final decision on closing the site is 6 to 8 months away. It will likely be promulgated after the Congress has adjourned for the year. I have been unable to secure assurances from the city of New York that it will not sue while the Congress is in recess. Such litigation would further delay clean up actions in the region and clearly thwart EPA and congressional efforts to halt sewage sludge dumping that degrades the environment or threatens the public health.

I introduce my legislation to send a clear signal to those who would seek to overturn EPA's decision in court, that the Congress will not stand for continued delay. Our nearby ocean waters must not continue to serve as an unregulated waste dump.

Mr. President, closure of the 12-mile site will not be without cost to the six New Jersey sewage authorities which continue to dispose of wastes there. However, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection estimates that when the costs of moving to the 106-mile site are spread out over the large number of people served by these plants, the cost to each household would be $3 to $4 per year. The same modest costs would apply to New York sewage authorities. These costs will be insignificant for the individuals involved, while the benefits to our region will be substantial.

Mr. President, this legislation is consistent with efforts actively underway in New Jersey to develop alternatives to current ocean-dumping practices. The State of New Jersey has an active Ocean Waste Management Committee which is dedicated to improving the quality of our coastal waters. Both Governor Kean, of New Jersey, and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection support moving the sludge dump site out to 106 miles, and ultimately putting an end to all sludge dumping. My State is committed to revitalizing the New York Bight.

I urge my neighbors across the river in New York to turn away from confrontation and litigation, and to join in a regional effort to revitalize our common waters. If we would just all turn our best scientists and engineers to work on solving this problem, I am confident we can find the answers we need.

My President, the resolution of waste disposal issues is not simple. I do not mean to imply that it is. In deciding how to dispose of sludges, the by-product of secondary treatment facilities, we must be mindful that our environment is a fragile system. None of the potential methods of disposal are without problems. Disposal of toxic sludges on land, untreated, can contaminate groundwater and soils. Incineration of toxic sludges can spread dangerous pollutants through the air. But, Mr. President, our nearby ocean waters must not continue to serve as an unregulated waste dump just because the ocean is a cheap place to dump; just because dumpers have resisted alternatives; or just because it has been that way for years. It must change.

Mr. President, last week the Senate approved a resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as the National Week of the Ocean. I was a cosponsor of the Senate version of this resolution. One step we can take to followup on this congressional recognition of the importance of our oceans is to end sludge dumping in the New York Bight and develop an action plan to revitalize these waters. That is what the Ocean Revitalization Act is designed to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2648

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Ocean Revitalization Act".

SEC. 2. Title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act is amended by adding the following new section:

"NEW YORK BIGHT APEX

"SEC. 113. (a) The Congress finds and declares that the New York Bight Apex is not a suitable location for the ocean dumping of municipal sludge.

"(b)(1) The Administrator may not issue, or renew, any permit under this title that authorizes the dumping of, or the transportation for purposes of dumping, municipal sludge at the Apex site or anywhere within the Apex after the day determined by the Administrator to be the first day on which municipal sludge can reasonably be dumped at a site designated under section 102 other than a site within the Apex.

"(c)(1) Not later than three years after the date of enactment of the Ocean Revitalization Act, the Administrator shall prepare, and submit to the Congress a New York Bight Apex Restoration Plan. In preparing such Plan, the Administrator shall hold public hearings in the affected States to obtain the views and comments of interested persons.

"(2) Such Plan shall—

"(A) identify and assess the impact of pollutant inputs, such as treated and untreated sewage discharge, industrial outfalls, agricultural and urban runoff, storm sewer overflow, upstream contaminant sources, and dumping that are affecting the water quality and marine resources of the Apex;

"(B) identify those uses in the Apex or on nearby shore areas that are being inhibited because of those imputs;

"(C) determine the fate of the contaminants from those imputs and their effect on the marine environment;

"(D) identify technologies and management practices, and determine the costs necessary to control those imputs;

"(E) identify impediments to the use of such technologies and management practices and to the cleanup of those inputs;

"(F) devise a schedule of economically feasible projects to implement the controls identified under subparagraph (D) and to remove the impediments identified under subparagraph (E); and

"(G) develop recommendations for funding and coordinating the various Federal, State, and local government programs necessary to implement the projects devised under subparagraph (F).

"(3) Not later than six months after the date of enactment of the Ocean Revitalization Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a detailed schedule (and any associated funding requirements) for completing the restoration plan required by this subsection.

"(4) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, for purposes of preparing the New York Bight Apex Restoration Plan required under this subsection, not to exceed $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1987.

"(d) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'Apex' means the New York Bight Apex consisting of the ocean waters of the Atlantic Ocean westward of 73° 30' W. longitude and northward of 40°10' N. latitude.

"(2) The term 'Apex site' means that site within the Apex at which the dumping of municipal sludge occurred before October 1, 1983.

"(3) The term 'municipal sludge' means solid, semisolid, or liquid waste generated by a wastewater treatment plant of a sewage authority or other unit of State or local government.".●

By Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2649. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act (title XIV of the Public Health Service Act) to authorize funds for fiscal years 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, and 1989 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Safe Drinking Water Amendments of 1984. This legislation will modify the existing drinking water program to help insure the citizens of this country have a water supply that will not be harmful to their health. This should be a fundamental function of Government and I believe that the passage of these amendments will diminish the risks to public health from contaminants now found in surface and underground drinking water sources. Before I discuss the key provisions of my legislation, I would like to touch on the current condition of the Nation's drinking water resources as a reflection of the need for change in existing programs.

Congress enacted the Safe Drinking Water Act in 1974 in response to contamination detected in the water supplies of a number of large cities. The Environmental Protection Agency was directed to issue standards for contaminants found in drinking water, which public systems were required to meet. However, the national mandate for clean drinking water under the act has not been fulfilled. Consequently, many Americans are concerned about the quality of their drinking water supplies.

According to random quality surveys performed by EPA and other Government agencies, surface water supplies are contaminated by over 700 synthetic organic chemicals, heavy metals, pesticides, and other pollutants. Some of these exotic names now unfortunately sound familiar to us—vinyl chloride, carbon tetrachloride, trichloroethylene, chloroform, kepone, PCB's, and benzene. The National Academy of Sciences has identified at least 22 of these chemicals as carcinogens and others as mutagenic or otherwise toxic. The vast majority we know little about as their potential toxicity has not been tested.

Further, the extent of our knowledge seems severely limited when we consider that 700 chemicals represent only a small portion of industrial chemicals produced and possibly present in our water supplies. These chemicals, for the most part, remain in our water since treatment is limited almost exclusively to filtration and disinfection which is ineffective in removing such contaminants.

The condition of our Nation's ground water, which supplies drinking water for about 50 percent of the U.S. population, is even more threatening in some cases. Less than 10 years ago, ground water was regarded as a pristine resource, not subject to the contamination prevalent in surface sources because of natural soil filtration processes. Numerous recent studies and surveys have shown, however, that ground water is subject to severe contamination in many localities by human activities on the overlying surface. One can pick up a newspaper in virtually any part of the country and read of another discovery of a well-rendered unfit for drinking.

Due to the different chemical and physical characteristics of underground supplies, the occurrence of contaminants is often at much higher concentrations than in surface waters. Even more ominous is the fact that ground water can remain contaminated for centuries. There is now serious concern at all levels of government about the long-term availability of our ground water resources to meet the Nation's increasing demands for water for drinking and other purposes.

The sources of organic chemicals and other contaminants in water are numerous. Surface supplies are subject to pollution from industrial discharges, urban and agricultural runoff, municipal sewage effluent, chlorination, and other point and nonpoint sources. Ground water is subject to about 30 different sources of chemical contamination. These include hazardous waste landfills, surface impoundments—EPA has recently reported that 150,000 of the estimated 181,000 impoundments are located within 1 mile of ground or surface water supplies—septic tanks and cesspools, pesticide and nitrate infiltration from agricultural activities, and leaking underground storage tanks.

In fact, much of what we do on the land surface has the potential to contaminate ground water. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight, which has held several hearings on the subject of ground water contamination, I have listened to numerous experts, regulators, and other interested parties discuss the problem, its effects, and limited available remedies. It is clear that we cannot solely rely on cleanup which is often technically or economically infeasible. Prevention of contamination is the only viable, long-term remedy for the problem.

However, in view of the degradation that has already occurred, our first concern must be to identify those supplies which are contaminated and proceed to protect the public health in those communities. The amendments I am introducing today will provide the basis for these vital Government actions.

I would like to briefly describe the major provisions of the bill and the need for constructive change in the existing programs. The legislation may be divided into two major parts: First, public water supply standards and other system requirements; and second, programs for the protection of underground sources of drinking water.

The present public water system program is based on mandatory compliance with uniform standards established by the EPA. The foremost problem in the drinking water area is the lack of sufficient standards to insure adequate protection for consumers. There are currently less than 20 drinking water standards which do not include toxic organic chemicals of greatest concern to the American public. Congress intended drinking water standards to be stringent and comprehensive in order to drive the installation of treatment technology and provide the basis for cleanup operations under the Solid Waste Disposal Act and Superfund. Without adequate

standards we cannot assure the public that their health is being protected from contaminants in drinking water. It is imperative, therefore, that the impossible delays in the current standard-setting process be eliminated.

Standard setting would be expedited by this bill in several ways. First, deadlines are established for the Agency's promulgation of standards for contaminants which they view to be of foremost public health concern. In addition, the time requirements of two-step rulemaking procedures for the issuance of recommended maximum contaminant goals and maximum contaminant standards would be reduced by the simultaneous proposal and promulgation of these levels. The present obstacle to standard setting posed by the indefinable concept of generally available technology would be eliminated by requiring the setting of standards as close to the maximum contaminant goal as feasible with the best available technology.

Mr. President, in changing from the generally available requirement to a standard-setting process that relies on best available technology, we have had to face another issue. That is whether BAT will include cost considerations. The bill, as drafted, does not take cost into account. It simply says that the standard will be set as close to the goal as possible based on the application of best available technology. Although the bill has not been introduced, as yet, I have already received many comments on this provision. It is clear to me that the bill will have to be modified to take costs into consideration in some form. I am not sure at this point what precise language we will use to accomplish this end and look forward to taking comments on that subject next week in hearings on this legislation.

EPA has the authority to issue a required treatment technique in cases where monitoring for a specific contaminant is not feasible. However, the Agency has failed to issue such a standard even though filtration is the only reliable and effective means for removing many viruses, bacteria, and disease-causing protozoa such as giardia from drinking water supplies. The majority of systems throughout the country now filter their water. Where surface water supplies are not filtered, the risk of contracting viral or bacterial disease are considered significantly higher. This legislation would also require system filtration of supplies withdrawn from surface water sources, unless they can make a showing that their water source is such that they do not need it or they are using an effective alternative technology. Disinfection would be required of all surface and ground water systems.

The public notification requirements under the existing statute are widely agreed to be ineffective—a significant portion of the noncompliance statistics are due to notification violations rather than exceedance of standards. These amendments require EPA to promulgate regulations which would insure that the public be notified of continuous violations or the presence of a potential adverse health threat.

Monitoring is the means by which we discover contamination and check on the effectiveness of existing treatment. The act currently requires periodic monitoring of the water supply to test levels of contaminants for which there are standards. Because standards for many potentially harmful organics do not exist, detection of these contaminants has occurred primarily on an accidental basis.

This legislation requires EPA to develop regulations for monitoring of unregulated contaminants for all public systems. These regulations will include a schedule for monitoring based on system size and the likelihood of contamination. However, all systems must monitor at least once within 5 years of enactment of this bill to insure contamination does not exist.

The provisions of the act pertaining to protection of underground sources of drinking water include a program regulating deep well waste injection. Restrictions are imposed on the placement of waste into, above or below underground sources of drinking water through wells. EPA estimates that about 55 percent of the hazardous waste generated annually is disposed of by this means.

The disposal method most likely to contaminate ground water is placement of waste into or above drinking water sources. This legislation would prohibit such practices.

The most common method of subsurface disposal involves injection below an underground source of drinking water. This means of disposal may become increasingly popular because it is generally less expensive than surface disposal or incineration methods.

EPA regulations are intended to limit the possibility of hazardous waste leakage into overlying aquifers. However, the type of leak monitoring required for these wells is insufficient to detect all potential leaks. Total reliance on the integrity of the injection well is shortsighted gambling with an essential resource. This legislation would require operators of these deep injection wells to monitor for contamination in the susceptible drinking water aquifer.

Mr. President, this legislation strikes a sound balance between the flexibility required to regulate the Nation's 69,000 different water systems and the active direction needed to provide consistently high quality drinking water throughout the country. I ask my fellow Senators to join me in this effort to insure a safe water supply for our citizens. It is imperative if we are to protect the health of all individuals from the ubiquitous threat of chemical and other disease-causing contamination. I welcome working with my colleagues to move forward with this bill so that the Nation's waters continue to be the lifegiving resource upon which we all rely.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 2649

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1984."

DECLARATION OF GOALS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. Part A of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding the following new section:

"DECLARATION OF GOALS AND POLICY

"SEC. 1400. (a) The objectives of this Act are to assure that all public water systems provide a safe supply of drinking water to the people of this Nation and to protect the ground water resources of this Nation from contamination. In order to achieve these objectives it is hereby declared that, consistent with the provisions of this Act.

"(1) it is the national goal that all public water systems provide drinking water free of any contamination that may have any adverse effect on the health of persons;

"(2) it is the national goal that all underground sources of drinking water be protected from any contamination that may have any adverse effect on the health of persons;

"(3) it is the national policy to provide adequate controls on activities that threaten to contaminate the ground water resources of this nation in order to prevent any such contamination.

"(b) It is the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the responsibilities and rights of states to assure that public water systems provide a safe supply of drinking water and that underground sources of drinking water are protected from contamination."

NATIONAL PRIMARY DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1412(a) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Effective on the date of the enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1984, each national interim primary drinking water regualtion promulgated under this section before such date of enactment shall be deemed to be a national primary drinking water regulation under subsection (b). No such regulation shall be required to comply with the standards set forth in subsection (b)(2) unless such regulation is amended to establish a different maximum contaminant level after the date of the enactment of such amendments.".

(b) Section 1412(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting:

"(1)(A) Not later than eighteen months after the date of the enactment of the Safe

Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1984, the Administrator shall—

"(i) simultaneously propose maximum contaminant level goals and national primary drinking water regulations, and after opportunity for public comment, simultaneously publish maximum contaminant level goals and promulgate national primary drinking water regulations for the fourteen contaminants listed in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking published in 47 Federal Register 9352; or

"(ii) make and publish a determination in the Federal Register that for a particular contaminant listed in 47 Federal Register 9352, a national primary drinking water regulation is not necessary because the levels of such contaminant currently found in public water systems do not represent a threat of a known or anticipated adverse effect on the health of persons.

"(B) Not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1984, the Administrator shall—

"(i) simultaneously propose maximum contaminant level goals and national primary drinking water regulations, and after opportunity for public comment, simultaneously publish maximum contaminant level goals and promulgate national drinking primary water regulations for each of the contaminants listed in the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking published in 48 Federal Register 45502; or

"(ii) make and publish a determination in the Federal Register that for a particular contaminant listed in 48 Federal Register 45502, a national primary drinking water regulation is not necessary because the levels of such contaminant currently found in public water systems do not represent a threat of a known or anticipated adverse effect on the health of persons.

"(C)(i) The Administrator shall publish maximum contaminant level goals and simultaneously promulgate national primary drinking water regulations for each substance (other than a substance referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B) for which a national primary drinking water regulation was promulgated) which, in the judgment of the Administrator, may have an adverse effect on the health of persons. On January 1, 1988 and at annual intervals thereafter, the Administrator shall publish a list establishing priorities for the review of substances (other than substances referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B)) which may require regulation under this Act in order to prevent known or anticipated adverse effects on the health of persons. Such priorities shall be based upon the extent to which such contaminant occurs in public water systems throughout the United States and on the known or anticipated adverse effects of such substance on the health of persons. In establishing such priorities the Administrator's consideration shall include, but not be limited to, substances regulated as toxic water pollutants under section 307 of the Clean Water Act and substances registered as pesticides under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

"(ii) For each contaminant listed on the priority list, the Administrator shall, within three years of listing, simultaneously publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation or make and publish a determination in the Federal Register for such contaminant that a national primary drinking water regulation is not necessary because the levels of such contaminant found in public water systems do not represent a threat of a known or anticipated adverse effect on the health of persons.

"(2) Each maximum contaminant level goal established under this subsection shall be set at the level at which, in the Administrator's judgment, no known or anticipated adverse effects on the health of persons occur and which allows an adequate margin of safety. Each national primary drinking water regulation for a contaminant for which a maximum contaminant level goal is established under this subsection shall specify a maximum level for such contaminant which is as close to the maximum contaminant level goal as is feasible.

"(3)(A) The Administrator is authorized to promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation that requires the use of a treatment technique in lieu of establishing a maximum contaminant level, if the Administrator makes a finding of overriding economic and technological constraints on monitoring. In such case, the Administrator shall identify those treatment techniques which, in the Administrator's judgment, would prevent known or anticipated adverse effects on the health of persons to the extent feasible. Such regulations shall specify each treatment technique known to the Administrator which meets the requirements of this paragraph, but the Administrator may grant a variance from any such specified treatment technique in accordance with section 1415(a)(3).

"(B) If any contaminant referred to in paragraphs (b)(1) (A) or (B) is listed under this paragraph (and a national primary drinking water regulation requiring the use of treatment techniques is simultaneously promulgated under this paragraph for such contaminant), the listing and promulgation under this paragraph shall be made on the date referred to in paragraphs (b)(1) (A) and (B) for the establishment of primary drinking water regulations.

"(C) The Administrator shall propose and promulgate regulations requiring filtration as a treatment technique for all public water systems supplied by surface raw water sources. The Administrator is authorized to grant variances from this requirement according to the provisions under Sec. 1415(a)(1)(B) and 1415(a)(3).

"(D) The Administrator shall propose and promulgate regulations requiring disinfection as a treatment technique for all public water systems. The Administrator is authorized to grant variances from this requirement according to the provisions under Sec. 1415(a)(1)(B) and 1415(a)(3).

"(4) The Administrator may, after opportunity for public comment, change maximum contaminant level goals, or the list established under paragraph (3), and shall simultaneously with such change, amend the national primary drinking water regulations concerned accordingly.

"(5) For the purpose of this subsection, the term 'feasible' means feasible with the use of technology, treatment techniques, or other means, which the Adminstrator determines to be the best available.".

(c) Sections 1412(b) (4), (5) and (6) of the Safe Drinking Water Act are amended by striking the word "Revised" where it appears and redesignating the paragraphs "(6)", "(7)", and "(8)".

(d) Section 1412(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Administrator shall provide the Science Advisory Board, established under the Environmental Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1978, an opportunity to comment prior to proposal of a maximum contaminant level goal and national primary drinking water regulation.".

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1414(a)(1)(A) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by inserting "and such public water system" after the words "notify the State".

(b) Section 1414(a)(1)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) If beyond the thirtieth day after the Administrator's notification the State has not commenced appropriate enforcement action, the Administration shall issue an order under subsection (g) requiring the public water system to comply with such regulation or requirement or shall commence a civil action under subsection (b).".

(c) Section 1414(a)(2) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the words "he may commence a civil action under subsection (b)" and adding the following: "he shall issue an order under subsection (g) requiring the public water system to comply with such regulation or requirement or shall commence a civil action under subsection (b)".

(d) Section 1414 of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (g):

"(g)(1) In any case in which the Administrator is authorized to bring a civil action under this section with respect to any regulation, schedule, or other requirement, the Administrator also may issue an order to require compliance with such regulation, schedule, or other requirement.

"(2) An order issued under this subsection shall not take effect until after notice and opportunity for public hearing and, in the case of a State having primary enforcement responsibility, until after the Administrator has provided the State with an opportunity to confer with the Administrator regarding the proposed order. A copy of any order proposed to be issued under this subsection shall be sent to the appropriate State agency of the State involved if the State has primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems in that State. Any order issued under this subsection shall state with reasonable specificity the nature of the violation. In any case in which an order under this subsection is issued to a corporation, a copy of such order shall be issued to appropriate corporate officers.

"(3)(A) Any person who violates, or fails or refuses to comply with an order under paragraph (2) shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty of not more than $25,000 per day of violation.

"(B) In the case of any civil penalty under this paragraph which does not exceed a total of $5,000, the penalty shall be assessed by the Administrator after notice and opportunity for a hearing on the record in accordance with section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code. The Administrator shall have the discretion to compromise, modify, or remit, with or without conditions, any civil penalty assessed under this subsection against any person.

"(C) In the case of any civil penalty which exceeds $5,000, the penalty shall be assessed by a civil action brought by the Administrator in the appropriate United States district court (as determined under the provisions of title 28 of the United States Code).

"(D) If any person fails to pay an assessment of a civil penalty after it has become a final and unappealable order, or after the appropriate court of appeals has entered

final judgment in favor of the Administrator, the Attorney General shall recover the amount for which such person is liable in any appropriate district court of the United States. In any such action, the validity and appropriateness of the final order imposing the civil penalty shall not be subject to review."

(e) Section 1414 of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the words "Failure by State to Assure" from the title.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

SEC. 5. (a) Section 1414(c) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking everything after the sentence "The Administrator shall by regulation prescribe the form, manner, and frequency for giving notice under this subsection" to the sentence beginning "The Administrator may also require" and adding the following:

"Within 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1984, the Administrator shall amend such regulations to provide for different types and frequencies of notice based on the differences between violations which are intermittent or infrequent and violations which are continuous or frequent. Such regulations shall also take into account the seriousness of any potential adverse health effects which may be involved. Notice for violations designated by the Administrator as continuous or posing a serious potential adverse health effect shall be given no less frequently than every three months and in no case shall notices be given less frequently than annually. Until such amendments are promulgated, the regulations in effect on the date of the enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1984 shall remain in effect.".

VARIANCES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 1415(a)(1)(A) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the word "despite" and adding the following: ". A variance may only be issued to a system after the system's".

(b) Section 1415(a)(1)(A) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended striking the word "generally" before the word "available" and by adding after "(taking costs into consideration)." the following: "The Administrator shall propose and promulgate his finding of the best available technology, treatment techniques or other means available for each contaminant at the time he proposes and promulgates a maximum contaminant level for each such contaminant. The Administrator's finding of best available technology, treatment techniques or other means may vary depending on the number of persons served by the system or for other physical conditions related to engineering feasibility and costs of compliance with maximum contaminant levels as considered appropriate by the Administrator.".

(c) Section 1415(a)(1)(A) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the words "within one year of the date" and adding "at the time".

(d) Section 1415(a)(1)(A)(ii) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding after the words "water system of such" the word "additional".

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1416(b)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the words "within one year of the date" and adding "at the time".

(b) Section 1416(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the word "interim" and striking the words "not later than January 1, 1984" and adding "not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1984.".

(c) Section 1416(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the word "revised" and the words "not later than seven years after the date such requirement takes effect" and adding "other than a regulation referred to in section 1412(a), 12 months after the date of the issuance of the exemption."

(d) Section 1416 (a)(2)(B) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) The final date for compliance provided in any schedule in the case of any exemption may be extended by the State (in the case of a State which has primary enforcement responsibility) or by the Administrator (in any other case) for a period not to exceed 3 years after the date of the issuance of the exemption if the public water system establishes that—

"(i) the system cannot meet the standard without capital improvements which cannot be completed within the period of such exemption;

"(ii) the system is taking all practicable steps to meet the standard;

"(iii) in the case of a system which needs financial assistance for the necessary improvements, the system has entered into an agreement to obtain such financial assistance; or

"(iv) the system has entered into an enforceable agreement to become a part of a regional public water system.

In the case of a system which does not serve more than 500 service connections and which needs financial assistance for the necessary improvements, an exemption granted under subsection (b)(2)(A) (i) or (ii) may be renewed for one or more additional 2-year periods if the system establishes that it continues to meet the requirements of clause (ii) of this subparagraph.".

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 8. (a) Section 1423(a)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking out all after the first sentence and substituting the following:

"If beyond the thirtieth day after the Administrator's notification the State has not commenced appropriate enforcement action, the Administrator shall issue an order under subsection (d) requiring the person to comply with such requirement or shall commence a civil action under subsection (b)(1).".

(b) Section 1414(a)(2) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the words "he may commence a civil action under subsection (b)(1)" and substituting the following:

"he shall issue an order under subsection (d) requiring the person to comply with such requirement or shall commence a civil action under subsection (b)(1).".

(c) Section 1423(b)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and substituting the following:

"Civil actions referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2), subsection (a) shall be brought in the appropriate United States district court and such court shall have jurisdiction to require compliance with any requirement of an applicable underground injection program.".

(d) Section 1423(d)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking in the last sentence "$5,000" and substituting "$25,000" and by striking "60" and substituting "30."

(e) Section 1423 of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d)(1) In any case in which the Administrator is authorized to bring a civil action under this section with respect to any requirement of an applicable underground injection control program, the Administrator may also issue an order to require compliance with such requirement.

"(2) An order issued under this subsection shall not take effect until after notice and opportunity for public hearing and, in the case of a State having primary enforcement responsibility for underground water sources (within the meaning of section 1422(b)(3) or 1425(c)) until after the Administrator has provided the State with an opportunity to confer with the Administrator regarding the proposed order. A copy of any order proposed to be issued under this subsection shall be sent to the appropriate State agency involved if the State has primary enforcement responsibility. Any other issued under this subsection shall state with reasonable specificity the nature of the violation. In any case in which an order under this subsection is issued to a corporation, a copy of such order shall be issued to appropriate corporate officers.

"(3)(A) Any person who violates, or fails or refuses to comply with an order under paragraph (2) shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty of not more than $25,000 per day of violation.

"(B) In the case of any civil penalty under this paragraph which does not exceed $5,000, the penalty shall be assessed by the Administrator after notice and opportunity for a hearing on the record in accordance with section 554 of of title 5 of the United States Code. The Administrator shall have the discretion to compromise, modify, or remit, with or without conditions, any civil penalty assessed under this subsection against any person.

"(C) In the case of any civil penalty which exceeds $5,000, the penalty shall be assessed by a civil action brought by the Administrator in the appropriate United States district court (as determined under the provisions of title 28 of the United States Code).

"(D) If any person fails to pay an assessment of a civil penalty after it has become a final and unappealable order, or after the appropriate court of appeals has entered final judgment in favor of the Administrator, the Attorney General shall recover the amount for which such person is liable in any appropriate district court of the United States. In any such action, the validity and appropriateness of the final order imposing the civil penalty shall not be subject to review.".

(f) Section 1423 of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking the words "Failure of State to Assure" from the title.

RESTRICTIONS ON UNDERGROUND INJECTION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE AND REGULATION OF STATE PROGRAMS.

SEC. 9. (a) Part C of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding the following new sections:

"RESTRICTIONS ON HAZARDOUS WASTE INJECTION

"SEC. 1426. No hazardous waste may be disposed of by underground injection above or into a formation which contains (within one quarter mile of the injection well bore) a drinking water source. Injection of contaminated water into the acquifer from which it was withdrawn may be allowed if the Administrator determines, pursuant to

procedures approved under this Act or the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act or the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, that such injection is an appropriate and environmentally acceptable aspect of a clean-up, removal or remedial action for the contaminated acquifer. The prohibition established under this subsection shall take effect six months after the enactment of this section except in the case of any State in which identical prohibitions are in effect before such date. The term "hazardous waste" used in this section means any hazardous waste, as defined in the Solid Waste Disposal Act, which is listed or identified under section 3001 of that Act. The prohibition established by this subsection shall be treated for purposes of the Act as a prohibition established pursuant to an applicable underground injection program.

"REGULATION OF STATE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 1427. (a) No later than 18 months after enactment, the Administrator shall revise regulations issued under this Act to require the following:

"(1) restoration of ground water quality after the termination of Class III operations such that underground drinking water sources in the prescribed location will exceed national primary drinking water regulation or any other unregulated contamination which the Administration determines may pose adverse health effects to persons.

"(2) monitoring of underground drinking water sources down gradient from a Class I injection well.

"(b) Section 146.4(c) of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect as of the date of enactment, shall not apply after such date.

"(c) The Administrator, in cooperation with the State, shall compile and, not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of these amendments, submit to the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the United States House of Representatives, an inventory of all wells in the United States which inject hazardous wastes. The inventory shall include the following information:

"(1) the location and depth of each well;

"(2) engineering and construction details of each, including the thickness and composition of its casing, the width and content of the annulus, and pump pressure and capacity;

"(3) the hydrogeological characteristics of the overlying and underlying strata, as well as that into which the waste is injected;

"(4) the location and size of all drinking water aquifers penetrated by the well, or within a one-mile radius of the well or within two hundred feet below the well injection point;

"(5) the location, capacity, and population served by each well providing drinking or irrigation water which is within a five-mile radius of the injection well;

"(6) the nature and volume of the waste injected during the one-year period immediately preceding the date of the report;

"(7) the dates and nature of the inspections of the injection well conducted by independent third parties or agents of State, Federal or local governments;

"(8) the name and address of all owners and operators of the well and any disposal facility associated with it; and

"(9) such other information as the Administrator may, in his discretion, deem necessary to define the scope and nature of hazardous waste disposal in the United States through underground injection.

"(b) In fulfilling the requirements of subsection (a)(3)-(5), the Administrator need only submit such information as can be obtained from currently existing State records and from site visits to at least twenty facilities containing wells which inject hazardous waste.

"(c) The States shall make available to the Administrator such information as he deems necessary to accomplish the objections of this section.".

TAMPERING WITH PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS

SEC. 10. Part D is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"TAMPERING WITH PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS

"SEC. 1432. (a) Any person who tampers with a public water system shall be fined not more than $50,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) Any person who attempts to tamper, or makes a threat to tamper, with a public drinking water system shall be fined not more than $20,000, or imprisoned for not more than 3 years, of both.

"(c) The Administrator may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court (as determined under the provisions of title 28 of the United States Code) against any person who tampers, attempts to tamper, or makes a threat to tamper with a public water system. The court may impose on such person a civil penalty of not more than $50,000 for such tampering or not more than $20,000 for such attempt or threat.

"(d) For purposes of this section, the term 'tamper' means—

"(1) to introduce a contaminant into a public water system with the intention of harming persons; or

"(2) to otherwise interfere with the operation of a public water system with the intention of harming persons.".

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 11. (a) Section 1442 of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(g) The Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to small public water systems to enable such systems to achieve and maintain compliance with national drinking water regulations. Such assistance may include 'circuit-rider' programs, training, and preliminary engineering studies. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection, $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1984 through 1989.".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. (a) Section 1442(f) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by inserting the following at the end thereof: "There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (a)(2)(B), $9,600,000 for the fiscal year 1984, $9,600,000 for the fiscal year 1985, $11,300,000 for the fiscal year 1986, $11,300,000 for the fiscal year 1987, $11,300,000 for the fiscal year 1988, and $11,300,000 for the fiscal year 1989. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section (other than subsection (g), subsection (a)(2)(B), and provisions relating to research), $42,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, $42,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985, $47,000,000 for the fiscal year 1986, $47,000,000 for the fiscal year 1987, $47,000,000 for the fiscal year 1988, and $47,000,000 for the fiscal year 1989.".

(b) Section 1443(a)(7) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "For the purposes of making grants under paragraph (1) there are authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, $40,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985, $45,000,000 for the fiscal year 1986, $45,000,000 for the fiscal year 1987, $45,000,000 for the fiscal year 1988, and $45,000,000 for the fiscal year 1989.".

(c) Section 1443(b)(5) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "For the purpose of making grants under paragraph (1) there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985, $28,000,000 for the fiscal year 1986, $28,000,000 for the fiscal year 1987, $28,000,000 for the fiscal year 1988, and $28,000,000 for the fiscal year 1989.".

(d) Section 1441(f) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by striking out "in effect" and all that follows and substituting "in effect for more than one year.".

MONITORING FOR UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS

SEC. 13. (a) Section 1445(a) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In requiring a public water system to monitor under this subsection, the Administrator may take into consideration the system size and the contaminants likely to be found in the system's drinking water.".

(b) Section 1445(a) of the Safe Drinking Water Act is amended by adding "(1)" after "(a)" and adding the following at the end thereof:

"(a)(2) Not later than 18 months from the date of enactment, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations for every public water system to conduct a monitoring program for unregulated contaminants. The Administrator's regulations shall vary the frequency and schedule of monitoring requirements for systems based on the number of persons served by the system and the contaminants likely to be found but each system must be required to monitor surface sources and representative supply wells at least once and such monitoring must be conducted within five years of the effective date of the Administrator's regulations. The Administrator's regulations shall list unregulated contaminants for which systems may be required to monitor, but the primary enforcement authority in each state shall be given the flexibility to add or delete contaminants, for individual systems, based on an approved assessment of what contaminants may be found in the system. Notification of the availability of the results of such monitoring programs shall be given to the persons served by the system and the Administrator. The Administrator may waive this monitoring requirement for a system which has conducted a monitoring program after January 1, 1983, if the Administrator determines the program to have been consistent with the regulations promulgated under this section.

"(a)(3) The Administrator shall reimburse the monitoring costs incurred under the regulation by systems supplying less than 150 service connections.".●

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GLENN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DIXON, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. FORD, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. SAR-

BANES, Mr. TOWER, Mr. DODD, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HELMS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. PRYOR):

S.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 16 through September 22, 1984, as "Emergency Medicine Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMERGENCY MEDICINE WEEK

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, today, with 28 of my Senate colleagues, I am introducing a joint resolution to designate the week of September 16, 1984, as "Emergency Medicine Week." A companion measure has been introduced by Representative VANDERGRIFF in the House of Representatives.

In the late sixties, a lack of emphasis on emergency medicine led the National Academy of Sciences to report that accidental injuries were the Nation's most important environmental health problem. In response, the American College of Emergency Physicians was founded to increase the emphasis on the specialty of emergency medicine.

Countless lives have been saved in the intervening years due to the efforts of this dedicated group of concerned professionals who established 63 physician residency programs that offer specialized training in emergency medicine. The American College of Emergency Physicians also played a key role in contributing to vast improvements in the training of emergency nurses and prehospital providers.

Mr. President, this resolution recognizes the advances in the training of a special group of health care professionals who have been responsible for dramatically improved care for those of us who fall victim to some form of accidental injury.

Adoption of this resolution will increase public awareness of the importance of life-saving specialists and will provide much needed support for these dedicated professionals.

I urge my colleagues to support swift passage of this measure.●

By Mrs. HAWKINS (for herself, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DOLE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. DODD, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PELL, Mr. HECHT, Mr. NUNN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GARN, and Mr. LAXALT):

S.J. Res. 289. A joint resolution to designate June 18, 1984, as "National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY AWARENESS DAY

● Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution that will authorize June 18, 1984, as "National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Day." Motor vehicle crashes are the No. 1 killer and crippler of children, and the primary traumatic cause of spinal cord injuries, epilepsy, and mental retardation in children between the ages of 6 months and 5 years in the United States. Between 1978 and 1982 nearly 3,400 child passengers under 5 years of age were killed in traffic accidents, while another 250,000 were severely injured. In other words, an average of 629 children are killed and 50,000 are injured annually. Breaking these figures down even further will show that on the average, 56 children are killed and 4,166 are injured monthly. Dividing these disturbingly high numbers by days, minutes, and finally seconds would only illustrate that too many children are unfortunately seriously maimed, injured, or fatally wounded in motor vehicle crashes in the United States.

It is staggering to note that more infants and small children are killed or crippled while riding as passengers in motor vehicles than the total affected by pertussis. tetanus, diptheria, measles, mumps, rubella, and polio, the seven childhood diseases. These injuries do not necessarily occur only when the vehicle is involved in a crash. Death and injury can result from common driving maneuvers, such as sudden stops, turns, swerves, or falling from a moving vehicle. Ejection of an unrestrained child from a vehicle increases the danger of fatal or serious injury from striking the pavement, or other objects, in addition to the danger of injuries resulting from contact with the vehicle interior before and after ejection.

Fortunately, during the past 10 to 15 years, the injury prevention potential of child safety seats provides infants and small children with much more protection than a standard safety belt. Safety seats are manufactured to fit the child while the safety belts are generally more effective for larger children or adults. According to the Surgeon General of the United States, child safety seats, used properly, reduce injuries and deaths 60 to 90 percent.

Tragically, misuse of child safety seats appears to be a significant and widespread problem. The National Transportation safety board estimates that over 70 percent of child restraint devices are used incorrectly. When tests demonstrate that child restraint systems could reduce child motor vehicle crash fatalities by as much as 90 percent and injuries by 70 percent, it seems to me that we have great reason for educating the American public as to the proper manner for installing and utilizing child safety seats.

A popular myth shared by many adults in that holding a child in their arms is the safest way for a child to travel. Surveys show that adults holding children in their arms often increased the severity of the injury of the children instead of protecting them from harm. For example, if a 100-pound adult holding a child is involved in a 30-mile-per-hour crash, that adult will crush the child with the force of 3,000 pounds. Another myth is that accidents only occur on lengthy trips in dangerous conditions. Statistics show that most collisions occur within 25 miles of home, during good weather and on dry pavement. Therefore, short family trips to the grocery store, nursery school, or trips to visit grandparents are potentially the most dangerous.

To date 42 States and the District of Columbia have passed legislation mandating the use of child safety restraint systems. My own State of Florida passed such a law in July 1983. Organizations are working to raise public awareness. For example, LifeSavers of Washington, DC, will hold its National Conference on Alcohol Countermeasures and Occupant Protection May 8 to 10 in Orlando. Along with good legislation and the efforts of such organizations, more is needed to make the public aware of the need for and the proper use of these child passenger safety systems. I believe a national day of awareness for child safety seats could have a nationwide impact on preventing unnecessary deaths and injuries to infants and small children involved in traffic accidents.

This need for better public awareness of the proper use of child safety seats was discussed during the Senate's childrens caucus forum on childhood injury prevention held at the D.C. Children's Hospital on July 26, 1983. The panel of health care professionals stressed that the word accident is a misnomer because many so-called accidents can be prevented through legislation such as seatbelt laws and through public education campaigns. Following the caucus meeting Secretaries Dole and Heckler pledged the assistance of their respective departments in a national campaign to curb the childhood accident epidemic. This initiative is but one of the activities and policies being taken by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Transportation to prevent childhood deaths and injuries.

This initiative has the full support of the National Transportation Safety Board and the following organizations:

Alliance of American Insurers.
American Academy of Pediatrics.
American Association for Automotive Medicine.
American Automobile Association.
American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.
American Insurance Association.
American Red Cross.
American Trauma Society.
American Women in Radio and Television, Inc.
Easter Seal Society.
Epilepsy Foundation of America.
Government Employees Insurance Company.
International Association of Chiefs of Police.
Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association.
National Association of Governors' Highway Safety Representatives.
National Association of Women Highway Safety Leaders.
National Automobile Dealers Association.
National Child Passenger Safety Association.
National Coalition of Emergency Medical Services.
National PTA.
National Safety Council.

Mr. President, I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in cosponsoring and supporting this resolution.●

By Mr. EAGLETON (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHILES, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EXON, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. WALLOP):

S.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution designating the month of November 1984 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE MONTH

● Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, today, 36 of my colleagues and I are introducing a joint resolution declaring the sense of the Congress to be that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of November 1984 as National Alzheimer's Disease Month.

We are all fairly familiar with most of the major diseases from which many older people suffer and die—heart disease, cancer, and stroke. But it is only recently that Americans have even heard the name of the fourth major killer—senile dementia of the Alzheimer's type.

Alzheimer's disease is a dementing disorder that causes loss of memory, followed by confusion, disorientation, loss of intellect, and eventual physical deterioration in an estimated 1.2 million Americans over the age of 65. Another 600,000 persons in their forties and fifties are also affected, and it is estimated that the disease is responsible for $26 billion in lost productivity each year.

The quantifiable dollar impact of what has been called the silent epidemic, as enormous as it is, is but a fraction of the true cost associated with this disease. Added to the cost in lost productivity is an estimated $20 billion in annual health care costs associated with Alzheimer's disease. The emotional and physical stress on the families of Alzheimer's victims and the loss of human dignity are incalculable costs to our society as a whole.

At the present time, the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease is unequivocal only postmortem. Therapy is almost nonexistent. Yet, these grim facts do not mean that we must regard Alzheimer's disease as perpetually inevitable and untreatable. The special challenge of this disease is to coordinate more effectively the resources we already have as well as to build upon what knowledge we are beginning to gain.

Congress has clearly responded to the need for more research into the cause of Alzheimer's disease and the search for a cure. In 1984, Congress increased funding toward research by $15 million over the preceding year for a total of $40 million. It is my expectation that these research efforts through the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health will continue to be strengthened, but we cannot rely solely on our hope for a cure or a treatment for the disease.

We must alter the practice of medicine to sharpen its awareness of the disease.

We must alter the attitudes of our health care institutions which have not traditionally dealt with senility, including Alzheimer's disease.

We must educate our health professionals through the medical, nursing, and allied health schools to teach more effectively geriatric medicine and the specific diseases of older people.

We must educate the public at large that old age is not synonymous with senility.

Finally, we must educate the public of what Alzheimer's disease is and what problems are associated with caring for Alzheimer's victims.

Already the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, in its deliberations on the extension of the Older Americans Act, has included special emphasis on services to families of Alzheimer's disease victims who are too often struggling alone to cope with the day-to-day vigil over the mental and physical deterioration of a loved one.

This joint resolution is designed to further heighten the awareness of the general public of what Alzheimer's disease is and the nature of the problems associated with caring for Alzheimer's victims. This joint resolution alone will not ease the burden on Alzheimer's victims and their families, but it can help assure a high priority by government at all levels, by business, and by individuals to find answers to the problem through research, development of an integrated care continuum for Alzheimer's patients, and an integrated support system for families providing care for Alzheimer's patients.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 290

Whereas more than two million Americans are affected by Alzheimer's disease, which is a surprisingly common disorder that destroys certain vital cells of the brain;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is the fourth leading cause of death among older Americans;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is responsible for 50 per centum of all nursing home admissions, at an annual cost of more than $20,000,000,000;

Whereas in one-third of all American families one parent will succumb to this disease;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is not a normal consequence of aging; and

Whereas an increase in the national awareness of the problem of Alzheimer's disease may stimulate the interest and concern of the American people, which may lead, in turn, to increased research and eventually to the discovery of a cure for Alzheimer's disease: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the month of November 1984 is designated as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this joint resolution to designate the month of November as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

Though we have often euphemistically referred to the time when we grow old as the "Golden Years", for many it is filled with fear and pain. In recent years we have become familiar with the term Alzheimer's disease. We refer to it clinically as a disease that affects one's brain, and eventually one's ability to control memory and activity. For those afflicted with Alzheimer's disease, and for their loved ones, it is a slow and painful journey.

Alzheimer's disease is now considered the fourth or fifth leading cause

of death. Though it has been diagnosed in middle-aged people, the slow progress of the disease usually leads to the severest impairment among the elderly. Approximately 20 percent of all individuals 80 years of age or more will suffer from Alzheimer's disease. In particular, 12 to 15 percent of all nursing home residents are believed to have Alzheimer's disease, accounting for over half of all senility cases in nursing homes.

Perhaps the greatest horror is the fact that no one knows what causes Alzheimer's disease and it is a monster without a cure. Only after death can the proper identification be made. Alzheimer's disease, however, can be managed. With the help of drugs in some cases, and patient and loving caregivers, Alzheimer's disease victims can continue to participate in everyday activities. Only in the final stages of the disease will total care be required.

Last year, in the fiscal 1984 Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bill, Congress earmarked $3.5 million to establish special Alzheimer's disease centers. In addition, some $25 million will be spent on the continued search for the causes and possible cures of the disease. But we must continue to familiarize our professionals with the characteristics of the disease, and we must continue to educate the community so they are aware of the trauma and can better support the families of those who suffer from Alzheimer's disease.

The Senate joint resolution designating November as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month" is one way to focus public attention on the issues surrounding Alzheimer's disease. We need to insure that medical professionals make every effort to properly diagnose Alzheimer's disease. Services must be made available to assist families in their care for victims. And assistance must be provided to the caregivers themselves who must cope with both the physical and emotional demands of the disease. I am pleased that we included an amendment in this year's Older Americans Act reauthorization bill which provides priority training under title IV to persons engaged in the provision of supportive services to victims of Alzheimer's disease and their families.

I encourage my colleagues to support this joint resolution as an acknowledgement of all the individuals who have dedicated themselves to solving the mystery of Alzheimer's disease, as well as the many people who have devoted their time to the care of Alzheimer's disease victims. We must strengthen our effort to combat Alzheimer's disease by determining the cause and finding a cure for this devastating disease.●

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor a joint resolution to designate the month of November 1984, as National Alzheimer's Disease Month. Last year, I cosponsored a similar joint resolution because I felt this Nation was still unaware of the tragic effects of this degenerative disease. That is rapidly changing, however.

Government-sponsored research for Alzheimer's disease was increased by 75 percent this fiscal year. The Older Americans Act will soon include respite services for Alzheimer's disease sufferers and their families. In New York City, an Alzheimer's disease resource center was recently opened. These are all signs that our Nation is finally beginning to become aware of the seriousness of this disease. There is still a long way to go, however. We must keeps the momentum going.

Alzheimer's disease, sometimes called the disease of the 1980's, mostly afflicts the elderly. The sudden prominence of this disease reflects the growing number of elderly citizens in our society. This neurological disorder, which now affects over 5 percent of those over 65 years of age, is estimated to cause 120,000 deaths a year. It is also estimated to cost this Nation $26 billion annually and it accounts for a large portion of nursing home care.

Alzheimer's is not a natural aging process. It can, and should, be cured. The outrageous cost of this disease, both to the sufferers and their families, proves that Government research efforts are a sound investment.

There have been some encouraging results from this research. Years of research, however, lay ahead. In the meantime, help must be given to the sufferers and their families. The immediate cause for worry about an afflicted Alzheimer's disease patient is personal safety. Simple absent-mindedness causes many accidents, but senile dementia can be fatal. In the disease's later stages, precautions must be taken to protect the sufferer from his or her own unwitting actions. The cost of this care is estimated to be $17,000 per year, per patient. Besides being a monumental emotional burden, Alzheimer's disease is also a severe financial burden.

The designation of November 1984 as National Alzheimer's Disease Month is an important part of our effort to promote awareness of this deadly issue. I urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors.●

By Mr. INOUYE:

S.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to consent to an amendment enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENTS

● Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today, I have introduced a measure to give the necessary consent of Congress to amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act which have been recommended and adopted by the State of Hawaii. These amendments reduce the blood quantum requirement for a Hawaiian homestead lessee's spouse or children to assume his unexpired homestead interest upon his death from 50 to 25 percent Hawaiian. They also limit the Hawaiian Homes Commission's authority to designate a successor if a lessee dies without having designated a successor.

In 1920, by the passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, the U.S. Congress dedicated approximately 200,000 acres of Government lands to a homesteading program for persons of at least 50-percent Hawaiian ancestry. Under this program, the Hawaiian Homes Commission was authorized to:

First, lease residential, agricultural, or pastoral lots to eligible Hawaiians for 99-year periods at a rental of $1 per year;

Second, offer financial assistance to individual homesteaders through low-interest loans for agricultural development and home construction; and

Third, provide agricultural and other experts to aid the homesteaders in developing their farms and ranches. Such leases have been, and continue to be, made.

When Hawaii became a State in 1959, Congress required, as a condition of admission, that the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act become a provision of the Hawaii State Constitution. In addition, title to Hawaiian Homes lands, and responsibilities for the administering of the act were transferred to the State. However, the amendment of certain provisions of the act remained subject to the approval of the U.S. Government. Included among these provisions are those sections relating to the qualifications of lessees and their successors. The measure I am introducing today is thus necessary to ratify the State of Hawaii's decision to reduce the blood quantum requirement for a spouse or child to succeed an original lessee's homestead interest.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act presently requires that successors to unexpired terms of Hawaiian home lands leases must be of at least 50-percent Hawaiian ancestry. In many instances, however, original homesteaders have spouses who are nonnative Hawaiians so that neither the homesteader's spouse nor offspring have the minimum blood requirement to qualify as successors. The death of a lessee thus often results in the eviction of his wife and children.

The lawmakers of the State of Hawaii are convinced that this situation threatens family stability and security and frustrates the intent of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

They have concluded that the native Hawaiian lessees should be provided with assurances that his closest family may succeed him in order to encourage stability and the improvement of property as well as to avoid inhumane results. It is to be emphasized, however, that the proposed relaxing of the blood requirement applies only to the surviving spouse and children so that all other successors to homestead leases will have to meet the existing 50-percent criteria.

Another concern reflected in the measure is that if a lessee dies without having designated a successor, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act currently requires that the department select a successor from among the lessee's spouse, children, widow or widowers of children, grandchildren, brothers, and sisters, widows or widowers of brothers and sisters, or nieces and nephews. Should the Department be successful in contacting all qualified relatives, the Hawaiian Homes Commission must, somehow, select the successor. This has not been an easy task because of the problems it has caused within family units. The language hereby submitted for approval therefore limits selection by the Commission of a qualified successor to a spouse, or if none, then the children. If there are neither spouse nor children, the lease will be canceled. This places the onus on the lessee to designate a successor.

Mr. President, this measure represents the first time that the State of Hawaii has sought the consent of Congress for amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. These amendments, passed as act 272 of the 1982 Hawaii State Legislature, have been carefully debated and reviewed on the State level and I believe represents a reasonable means of forwarding the purposes of the original act. A Federal-State Task Force on the Hawaiian Homes Commission, composed of representatives of the Hawaiian community and Federal Department of Interior, after careful examination of the matter, have also recommended Federal consent to these amendments. I therefore urge my colleagues to act favorably on this measure and ask unanimous consent that the full text of the measure be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 291

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as required by section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union", approved March 18, 1959 (73 Stat. 4), the United States hereby consents to the amendment enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii and approved by the Governor of such State on June 18, 1982, to section 209 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 249

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) were added as cosponsors of S. 249, a bill entitled the "Employee Educational Assistance Extension Act."

S. 454

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 454, a bill to provide for an accelerated study of the causes and effects of acidic deposition during a 5-year period, and to provide for grants for mitigation at sites where there are harmful effects on ecosystems resulting from high acidity.

S. 476

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 476, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require a finding of medical improvement when disability benefits are terminated, to provide for a review and right to personal appearance prior to termination of disability benefits, to provide for uniform standards in determining disability, to provide continued payment of disability benefits during the appeals process, and for other purposes.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. HART, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to authorize a national program of improving the quality of education.

S. 764

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 764, a bill to assure the continued protection of the traveling public in the marketing of air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1256

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to authorize special assistance for desegregation activities.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to clarify the application of the Federal antitrust laws to local governments.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1651, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for presumption of service connection to be established by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for certain diseases of certain veterans exposed to dioxin or radiation during service in the Armed Forces; to require the Administrator to develop, through process of public participation and subject to judicial review, regulations specifying standards for the presumptions applicable to the resolution of claims for disability compensation based on such exposures; to require that such regulations address certain specified diseases; and to require that all claimants for Veterans' Administration benefits be given the benefit of every reasonable doubt in claims adjudications, and for other purposes.

S. 1816

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1816, a bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act, the Tariff Act of 1930, and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to improve the labeling of textile fiber and wool products.

S. 2014

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2014, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide for assistance in locating missing children.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2031, a bill relating to the residence of the American Ambassador to Israel.

S. 2131

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2131, a bill to provide for the temporary suspension of deportation for certain aliens who are nationals of El Salvador, and to provide for Presidential and congressional review of conditions in El Salvador and other countries.

S. 2136

At the request of Mr. WILSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2136, a bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the Bureau of Land Management and the city of Los Angeles for purposes of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area.

S. 2358

At the request of Mr. PROXMIRE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2358, a bill to prohibit the U.S.

Synthetic Fuels Corporation from making new awards of financial assistance before the comprehensive strategy (as set forth in the Energy Security Act) is approved.

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to extend the authorization for 5 years for the low income home energy assistance program, for the community services block grant, and for the Head Start program, and for other purposes.

S. 2375

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2375, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration.

S. 2397

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2397, a bill to establish a program to provide part-time school year and full-time summer employment to economically disadvantaged youth who are pursuing further education or training leading to meaningful unsubsidized employment.

S. 2423

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2423, a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for the purpose of compensating and otherwise assisting victims of crime, and to provide funds to the Department of Justice for the purpose of assisting victims of Federal crime.

S. 2436

At the request of Mr. GOLDWATER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HECHT) were added as consponsors of S. 2436, a bill to authorize appropriations of funds for activities of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and for other purposes.

S. 2488

At the request of Mr. BURDICK, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2488, a bill to terminate the effect of provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that require bilingual ballots and election materials.

S. 2505

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2505, a bill to provide a right of first refusal for metropolitan areas before a professional sports team is relocated, and for other purposes.

S. 2569

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to make necessary improvements in the SSI program with the objective of assuring that such program will more realistically and more equitably reflect the needs and circumstances of applicants and recipients thereunder.

S. 2573

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) were added as cosponsors of S. 2573, a bill to revise and extend programs for persons with developmental disabilities.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 129

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 129, a joint resolution calling upon the President to seek a mutual and verifiable ban on weapons in space and on weapons designed to attack objects in space.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 230

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 230, a joint resolution to designate the week of October 7, 1984, through October 13, 1984, as "National Birds of Prey Conservation Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 245

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 245, a joint resolution to designate the week of April 15 through April 21, 1984, as "National Recreational Sports Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 270

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 270, a joint resolution designating the week of July 1 through July 8, 1984, as "National Duck Stamp Week" and 1984 as the "Golden Anniversary Year of the Duck Stamp."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 274

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. QUAYLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 274, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate May 6, 1984, as "National Nurse Recognition Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 279

At the request of Mr. KASTEN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 279, a joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 287

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 287, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate January 27, 1985, as "National Jerome Kern Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 100

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 100, a concurrent resolution concerning the drilling ship *Glomar Java Sea.*

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, a concurrent resolution to commemorate the Ukrainian famine of 1933.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 109, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government take immediate steps to support a national STORM program.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 110

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Res-

olution 110, a concurrent resolution in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Brown against Board of Education.

SENATE RESOLUTION 360

At the request of Mr. TOWER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 360, a resolution to amend rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to provide that no amendment that is not germane or relevant to the subject matter of a bill or resolution shall be in order unless such amendment has been submitted at the desk at least 48 hours prior to consideration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 364

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 364, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that certain recommendations of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control relating to the Veterans' Administration health care system be rejected as a matter of national policy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 372

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 372, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding exposure of members of the Armed Forces to ionizing radiation and to herbicides containing dioxin.

SENATE RESOLUTION 385

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 385, a resolution urging continuation of tax deductibility of residential mortgage interest payments.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 112—RELATING TO DEFENSE SPENDING COMMITMENTS BY NATO MEMBER NATIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 112

Whereas the countries of Belgium, the United Kingdom, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey (North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations), and the country of Japan are recognized as allies of the United States and have entered into formal treaties and security agreements with the United States for the common defense;

Whereas the importance of increased military strength and unity are vital for the defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations and Japan as well as for the maintenance of international peace and stability in spite of economic difficulties;

Whereas Soviet aggression in Afghanistan and in Central America and the continuing threat of intervention in Poland by the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies underscores the importance of military preparedness on the part of all North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations and Japan;

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations voluntarily renewed their mutual commitment to increased strength and unity at the London summit in 1977 and specifically pledged themselves to undertake a 3 per centum annual real increase in defense outlays over the subsequent five years;

Whereas the United States has provided Japan with a defense umbrella in the post-World War II era, thereby relieving Japan of much of its national defense burden, and has contributed enormously to the economic recovery of Japan since World War II;

Whereas Japan has emerged as the world's third greatest economic power in the aftermath of World War II with a gross national product in 1982 of $1,060,000,000,000;

Whereas the United States spend nearly eight times more per person on defense than Japan did in 1982;

Whereas Japan in 1981 entered into a commitment to defend the air and sea lanes of communication out to one thousand miles from its home islands as part of its responsibilities under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between our two countries;

Whereas in 1983 Japanese defense spending decreased by 7.0 per centum from 1980;

Whereas Belgium, Denmark, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and Greece did not achieve a 3 per centum real increase in defense spending in 1982;

Whereas these countries would have contributed $1,612,800,000 more to the common defense if they had achieved a 3 per centum real increase in defense spending in 1982;

Whereas budget austerity in the United States is causing substantial financial hardship for many Americans; and

Whereas alliance initiatives are frequently driven by the largest and the most capable military partner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should call on the pertinent member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations to meet or exceed their pledges for at least a 3 per centum real increase in defense spending in 1983 and in 1984 and call upon Japan to further increase defense spending in 1983 and in 1984 in furtherance of increased unity, equitable sharing of our common defense burden, and international stability.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

BRADLEY AMENDMENT NO. 3048

Mr. BRADLEY proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, add the following:

PART B PREMIUM

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 901 of this Act, the amendments made by such section 901 shall not become effective, and the provisions of the Social Security Act shall remain as though such section 901 had not been enacted.

(b) Section 1839(e) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the monthly premium for each individual enrolled under this part for each month after December 1983 and prior to January 1987 shall be an amount equal to 50 percent of the monthly actuarial rate for enrollees age 65 and over, as determined under subsection (a)(1) and applicable to such month.

"(2) Any increases in premium amounts taking effect prior to January 1987 by reason of paragraph (1) shall be taken into account for purposes of determining increases thereafter under subsection (a)(3).".

(c) Section 1839 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) If no cost-of-living increase becomes effective under section 215(i) in December of any year, the monthly premium of each individual enrolled under this part for the succeeding year shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)) be the same as the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) of the individual for such December.

"(2) If paragraph (1) does not apply to the monthly premiums for a year, if an individual is entitled to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for November and for December in that preceding year, and if the monthly premium for that December and for the following January is deducted from those benefits under section 1840(a)(1), the monthly premium for that individual for that January and for each of the succeeding 11 months for which he is entitled to benefits under section 202 or 223 shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)) be the greater of—

"(A) the monthly premium amount determined under subsection (a)(2) or (e) for that January reduced by the amount (if any) necessary to make the monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for that January after the deduction of the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that January at least equal to the monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for the preceding November after the deduction of the premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that individual for that November, or

"(B) the monthly premium (disregarding subsection (b)) for that individual for that December.

For purposes of this subsection, retroactive adjustments or payments and deductions on account of work shall not be taken into account in determining the monthly benefits to which an individual is entitled under section 202 or 223.".

PHYSICIAN FEES

SEC. . (a) Section 1842(b) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 904 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(13)(A) During the 24-month period beginning July 1, 1984, the Secretary shall monitor physicians in order to determine—

"(i) the proportion of physicians, by specialty and geographic area of practice, whose claims under this part are not pursuant to an assignment under paragraph (3)(ii), grouped as follows: fewer than 25 percent, 25 percent to 49 percent, 50 percent to 74 percent, 75 percent to 89 percent, 90 percent to 99 percent, and 100 percent, of the claims submitted by such physicians, or for such classifications of physicians as the Secretary may deem to be more informative;

"(ii) the average difference between the actual charges and the reasonable charges recognized for purposes of this part, for each classification of physicians referred to in clause (i); and

"(iii) any changes in the per capita volume and mix of services provided to beneficiaries under this part by each classification of physician referred to in clause (i).

"(B) Information on changes in the elements monitored pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be provided to Congress every sixth month beginning with January 1985 and ending with January 1987.".

(b)(1) The report which the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress on January 1, 1987, shall include recommendations in sufficient detail to serve as the basis for legislative action which Congress can take to assure that any burden of effectively constraining the growth of costs in the medicare part B program, which Congress intends to be borne by providers and physicians, is not transferred (in whole or in part) so as to become an additional burden on part B beneficiaries in the form of increased out-of-pocket costs, reduced services, or reduced access to needed physician care.

(2) Such report shall also include analyses of other methods of payment which might be utilized under part B to constrain the costs of the part B program, including prospective payment systems such as fee schedules (both global and per service), capitation payments, case management, and the use of preferred provider organizations.

(c) In addition to any funds otherwise provided for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for payments to carriers under agreements entered into under section 1842 of the Social Security Act, there are transferred from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Fund such additional amounts for payments to such carriers under such agreements as may be necessary to conduct monitoring of physicians under section 1842(b)(13) of the Social Security Act.

PART B DEDUCTIBLE

SEC. . Notwithstanding the provisions of section 916 of this Act, the amendments made by such section 916 shall not become effective, and the provisions of the Social Security Act shall remain as though such section 916 had not been enacted.

In section , relating to limitation of the aggregate total budget authority for national defense and non-defense discretionary activities for the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(f)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), or any other provision of this Act or of any of the amendments made by this Act, it shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or the House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $293,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $327,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $365,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (b), or any other provision of this Act or of any of the amendments made by this Act, it shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or the House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $141,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $148,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $155,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

GORTON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3049

Mr. GORTON (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. DANFORTH) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra, as follows:

Beginning on page 19, line 1, strike all through the end of the amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. . (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $297,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $328,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $366,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for non-defense discretionary activities to exceed $140,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $144,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $151,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(c) For the purposes of this section, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

(d) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

(e) It is the sense of Congress that the unprecedented magnitude and persistence of current and projected Federal budget deficits must be addressed in a comprehensive strategy to moderate increases in defense spending while continuing the effective constraints on non-defense discretionary programs, assure the success of such a initiative, the foregoing procedural restraints, in addition to the total aggregate spending limitations pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are necessary on budget authority both for defense and for non-defense discretionary programs for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT LIMITATIONS

SEC. . (a) Paragraph (3) of section (1)(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the cost-of-living adjustment for any calendar year is—

"(A) for calendar years 1985 through 1987 the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, reduced by three percentage points, exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for the calendar year 1983, and

"(B) for calendar years after 1987, the percentage (if any) by which—

"(i) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, exceeds

"(ii) the CPI for the calendar year 1983."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be effective as of the date of enactment.

SEC. . (a)(1) Any increase in benefits which would occur by law under any of the provisions of law described in subsection (b) during the period beginning on October 1, 1984, and ending on September 30, 1987, on the basis of any increase in the Consumer Price Index, shall be limited as though the relevant increase in the Consumer Price Index was equal to the actual increase in such index minus three percentage points.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply only to the increases in benefit amounts, and shall not be applied in determining whether a threshold CPI increase has been met or in determining increases in amounts under other provisions of law which operate by reference to increases in such benefit amounts.

(3) Any increase in benefit amounts which would have occurred but for the provisions of paragraph (1) shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining benefit increases occurring after September 30, 1987.

(b) For purposes of this section the applicable provisions of law are the cost-of-living adjustments for—

(1) old age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits under section 215(i) of the Social Security Act (but the limitation under subsection (a) shall not apply to supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of such Act);

(2) armed services retirement and retainer pay under section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the Coast Guard, and retired pay of commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the Public Health Service;

(3) civil service retirement benefits under section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, foreign service retirement benefits under section 826 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, and Central Intelligence Agency retirement benefits under part J of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for certain employees;

(4) Federal workers' compensation under section 8146a of title 5, United States Code;

(5) Comptroller General Annuities under section 777 of title 31, United States Code; and

(6) Cash Relief Payments under section 1245(c) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979.

(c) Section 1817 of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 918 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Within 60 days after the end of calendar year 1987, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, into the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, an amount equal to the amount which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be the amount by which the total amount of benefit payments made from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund

and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund were reduced by reason of the limitation on cost-of-living increases required by subsection (b) of the section which enacted this subsection.".

SEC. . In the case of any cost-of-living adjustment which is subject to the provisions of section 301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982, the percentage by which the annuity or retired or retainer pay is increased with respect to any increase occurring by law during the period beginning on January 1, 1985, and ending on December 30, 1988, shall be the percentage increase as determined after the application of such section 301, minus three percentage points.

KENNEDY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3050

Mr. BYRD (for Mr. KENNEDY, for himself, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. CRANSTON) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill H.R. 2163, supra; as follows:

Strike increase in part B premium (Sec. 901): On page 1199, beginning with line 4, strike all through line 17 on page 1201.

Strike indexing of part B deductible (Sec. 916): On page 1226, beginning with line 21, strike all through line 4 on page 1228.

In the section of the Baker amendment dealing with Budget Authority for Defense, delete "to exceed $299,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $333,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or $372,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987," and substitute "to exceed $298,965,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, $333,226,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, and $370,507,000,000 in fiscal year 1987,".

SMOKEY BEAR WEEK

HEFLIN AMENDMENT NO. 3051

Mr. BYRD (for Mr. HEFLIN) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 273) to designate the week of May 13, 1984, through May 19, 1984, as "Smokey Bear Week"; as follows:

On page 2, strike out line 3 and insert in lieu thereof "That the week of August 5, 1984, through August 11, 1984, is".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AND RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I wish to announce that a hearing has been scheduled on legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, May 15, 1984, at 9:30 a.m. in room 328-A Senate Russell Office Building.

For further information please contact the Agriculture Committee staff at 224-0014 or 224-0017.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs will hold a hearing on S. 1935, the Cigarette Study Safety Act on Thursday, May 10, at 9:30 a.m. in SD-342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Margaret Hecht at 224-4751.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND RESERVED WATER

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public the scheduling of a public hearing before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water on Thursday, May 17, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The subcommittee will receive testimony on the following bills: S. 1218 and H.R. 2645, to amend the act of August 15, 1978, regarding the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia; S. 1331, to establish the Mono Lake National Monument in the State of California, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1341, to establish the Mono Lake National Forest Scenic Area in the State of California, and for other purposes.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements for the hearing record should write to the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Because of the number of people expected to testify, witnesses will be arranged in panels and oral testimony will be limited to 5 minutes. Witnesses are requested to supply the subcommittee with 25 copies of their written testimony 24 hours in advance of the hearing, as required by the rules of the committee, and 50 copies the day of the hearing.

For further information regarding this hearing you may wish to contact Mr. Tony Bevinetto of the subcommittee staff at 224-5161.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION AND SUPPLY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Supply, of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, be deemed to have been authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 8, at 1 p.m., to hold an oversight hearing to consider the revised Constitution of American Samoa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL RESOLUTION ON LATIN AMERICA

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Mr. Carlos Andres Perez, former president of Venezuela (1974-79) and a vice president of the Socialist International, last week brought to my attention a resolution on Latin America adopted by the Socialist International at its meeting in Copenhagen, April 26. This resolution endorses the Contadora group initiative as a real and effective path toward a political solution in Central America and urges a negotiated settlement to the conflict in El Salvador. The resolution reaffirms the importance of adhering to the rule of law in international relations and deplores the Reagan administration's decision to withdraw the United States from the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to Central America. The resolution also appeals to the Nicaraguan Government to hold the November elections under conditions of genuine pluralism and the guaranteeing of all freedoms, including freedom of expression. I ask that the full text of this resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON LATIN AMERICA

I

The Socialist International expresses its profound concern at the deterioration of the situation in the region of Central America, in terms of the escalation of armed conflict as well as the violation of the principles of international law.

It is self-evident that it is up to every nation—large or small—to respect the international system of rules. The basis for orderly relations in the world is that every sovereign nation has the right to demand respect for its territorial integrity and that every nation abstains from interfering in another nation's internal affairs.

There are no special rules for great powers. Instead it could be said that these nations have a particular responsibility to respect and to uphold the system of international norms. To break the rules of international law can never be excused, not even with reference to special great power interests or to a certain geographic situation.

The rules of international law cover all states. Responsible politicians in countries concerned must realize that the rest of the world will expect actions that are in agreement with the rules of international law. It is only in this way that respect for the nation's policies can be preserved.

The fact that the United States decided to withdraw, for a certain time, from the jurisdiction of the International Court in The Hague in questions regarding Central America gives cause for great concern. This indicates that the country has decided to enact a policy towards Latin American nations that can result in actions that violate international law.

The position of the International Court should be strengthened. All countries, not least the great powers, have a long-term responsibility to uphold this legal mechanism

for the solution of conflicts. The action by the United States in this specific case can contribute to a continued weakening of the prestige and the position of the International Court. That is something that all nations must deeply deplore.

The rules of international law about respect for territorial integrity and non-intervention in internal affairs apply of course to all Latin American countries. To start a naval blockade against these countries, for example in the form of mining, is wholly against the basic rules of international law, and in the case of Nicaragua is against the spirit of agreement of Contadora. To mine another nation's territorial water in peacetime is an act of aggression, and thereby a grave crime against the rules of international law and against the Charter of the United Nations.

II

The persistence of injustice and the lack of real and effective democracy in Central America has been the main cause of the existence and the intensification of the crisis which now racks this region of the world.

The Socialist International expresses its conviction that it will only be through truly free elections and effective social, economic and political democracy that progress can be made towards a resolution of the conflicts in the region.

The Socialist International welcomes the calling of elections for 4th of November next in Nicaragua as an important step in the process of the institutionalization of democracy of that count.

The Socialist International appeals for these elections to be held in conditions of genuine pluralism and the guaranteeing of all freedoms, including freedom of expression.

The elections in El Salvador, in the current circumstances, without the participation of the MNR or the FDR/FMLN, and without fundamental political liberties, and in the context of a widespread repression, unfortunately do not constitute a solution to the conflict.

In view of the situation in El Salvador the path of negotiations to arrive at a political solution must be followed.

The Socialist International rejects intervention in El Salvador and expresses its willingness to collaborate so that the conflicting sides reach a comprehensive political solution by means of negotiations, which takes account of the real causes of the conflict—injustice and repression.

Regarding the calling of elections for a constitutional assembly in Guatemala, the Socialist International repeats that these could only initiate an effective democratisation of this country if they are held with the free participation of all the political forces and with an end of repression. The Socialist International reiterates its support for the Democratic Socialist Party of Guatemala.

The Socialist International follows with interest the advances in the process of reinforcing the institutions in Panama and is confident that this country, after the next elections to be held on May 6, will continue to actively contribute to the work of the Contadura Group and to consolidate the process or reaffirming its national sovereignty, through the fulfillment of the Torrijos-Carter treaties.

The Socialist International hopes that recent events in Honduras may lead to a reassessment of Honduran policy towards the region, resulting in Honduras adopting a policy of neutrality with regard to the conflicts in the area.

The Socialist International supports the stance of the MLDR and of numerous other personalities of different political tendencies in that country, who are in favor of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Honduran territory, and who demand that the sovereignty of Honduras be fully respected.

The Socialist International reaffirms its position in favour of negotiations and political solutions to the conflicts in Central America. The Contadora initiative, which must continue to recieve the fullest support and collaboration internationally, constitutes a real and effective path toward a political solution to the conflicts in this area of the Latin American continent.

III

The Socialist International expresses its satifaction at the recent triumph of its member party in Venezuela, Democratic Action, AD, and the election of comrade Jamie Lusinchi as president of that country with a decisive majority.

The Socialist International expresses its support for the advances in and consolidation of democracy in Argentina and the efforts of President Raul Alfonsin to overcome the accumulated problems of that country, following the years of dictatorship.

The Socialist International calls on the government of Great Britain to give a positive response to the request—reiterated recently by President Alfonsin—for negotiations with Argentina, within the context of the United Nations, on the Falklands/Malvinas conflict.

The Socialist International declares its full support for the overwhelming demand by the people of Brazil for direct and immediate presidential elections.

The Socialist International looks forward to the success of the presidential candidate, Rodrigo Borja, the representative of its member party in Ecuador, the PID, in the elections to be held on May 6, 1984.

At the same time, the Socialist International expresses its support for its member party in Peru, the Partido Aprista Peruano APRA, which has nominated Alan Garcia as candidate for the presidential elections in that country.

The Socialist International reiterates once again its support for the Chilean people and the demands of all democratic forces in that country, which has been expressed vigorously in recent months, in favour of a quick return to democracy. It also expresses its solidarity with the people of Uruguay, who are making decisive progress in their struggle to reestablish democracy in that country, and with the demand for the legalization of political parties and freedom for individuals of the opposition to stand for elections—unconditional, democratic elections—and full respect of the will of the people.

The Socialist International declares its solidarity with the Revolutionary Febrerista Party in its struggle for democracy and freedom in Paraguay.

In Haiti the oldest and most cruel dictatorship in the Caribbean has submitted the Haitian people for so many years to poverty and social inequality.

The SI denounce this dictatorship and its constant violation of human rights. We call on the democratic forces all over the world to join us in the support of the Haitian people to bring the Duvalier dictatorship to an end and to establish democracy in Haiti.

IV

In light of the worsening economic problems in Latin America and the Caribbean, in particular the problem of external debt, the Socialist International affirms the need of joint efforts to overcome the serious situation affecting this region, as well as other areas of the developing world, and which affects in particular the working class and the poorest groups. In this context, the Socialist International rejects the policies imposed by the IMF, which have worsened social tensions in these countries, and which do not represent a viable economic alternative.●

AGRICULTURAL OPTIONS UNDER THE REAGAN LEADERSHIP

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it is appropriate to bring to the attention of the Senate the efforts of some of the outstanding appointees of the Reagan administration to develop agricultural options, a new marketing tool for farmers.

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission is the regulatory agency for the futures industry, which is within the legislative jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. As vacancies have occurred at the CFTC, President Reagan has appointed outstanding individuals as Commissioners. They worked hard to increase the involvement of the public and the industry, and have actively pursued such innovations as agricultural options trading.

SUSAN PHILLIPS

Dr. Susan Phillips, a former university administrator and professor of finance in Iowa, has been appointed by the President as Chairman of the CFTC. This highly qualified woman had already been appointed by President Reagan as Commissioner prior to her being named Chairman in 1983, and she is performing her duties with distinction.

I might add that Dr. Phillips' appointment as head of this important Federal regulatory agency is another in a series of appointments of women to positions of major responsibility in the Reagan administration. She joins the ranks of a large number of women who serve the administration with great distinction, because of their outstanding qualifications for the positions to which they have been appointed. Those who most readily come to mind are Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Hanford Dole, who is a native of my own State, Health and Human Services Secretary Margaret Heckler, White House assistant Faith Whittlesey, United Nation's Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, and of course, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Mary Jarratt.

KALO HINEMAN

The Nation's futures markets began many years ago as a way to bring together buyers and sellers of agricultural products, but many of us have been

concerned that agriculture itself had not been adequately represented on the Commission. I and other Senators have written to both President Carter and then President Reagan urging that a farmer be appointed to the Commission.

President Reagan has done so in exemplary fashion by selecting Kalo Hineman for the job. Kalo is a farmer and rancher from Dighton, Kans., who has been an agricultural and community leader as well as a State legislator. He was first called to our attention by the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), and we have found that Kalo carries out his duties very capably and responsibly.

AGRICULTURAL OPTIONS

One of the innovative ideas being pursued by Dr. Phillips, Kalo Hineman, and their colleagues is the trading of agricultural options. An option is a contract that gives the purchaser the right, but not the obligation, to buy or sell a commodity (or a futures contract based on that commodity) at a set price on or before a set date in the future. The buyer pays a one-time premium to purchase the option contract.

Agricultural options could allow farmers and processors to protect themselves from unfavorable price movements without forgoing the opportunity to take advantage of favorable price movements. For example, a farmer might acquire an option to sell corn at a certain price next harvest. When harvest arrives, if market prices are below the option price, he can exercise his option and sell the corn as provided in this contract. However, if market prices are higher, he can disregard the option and sell the corn on the cash market. In effect, he can take advantage of whichever price is higher.

In this way options provide greater flexibility than either cash forward contracts or futures contracts. The buyer of the option must pay the premium whether he exercises the option or not, but he—and his lender—are not subject to additional margin calls as they might be in the futures market. Thus options could minimize risk, while still allowing an opportunity for reward.

Agricultural options came to my attention 2 years ago as a possible new, private sector marketing tool for farmers. During consideration of the Futures Trading Act of 1982, I offered the amendment which cleared away the statutory roadblocks to agricultural options trading. The amendment was adopted by the Agriculture Committee and approved by the Senate, and the bill was signed into law by President Reagan.

This new law will allow trading in agricultural options to occur, subject to the approval of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The CFTC has announced a pilot program under which limited trading in agricultural options could occur during 1984.

Two excellent articles on these topics have recently appeared in FarmFutures magazine. One article explains agricultural options trading and the other describes Kalo Hineman's unique role as a CFTC Commissioner with a farm background.

A third article appeared in the April edition of USDA's Farmline magazine, and I believe it will be of interest to those interested in trading in options and in their possible impact on farm policy, as well.

Mr. President, I ask that these three articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The articles follow:

KALO HINEMAN—THE FARMER IN THE CFTC

(By David Pelzer)

Two years ago Kalo Hineman, a wheat and cattle producer from Dighton, Kansas, went to Washington to be a bureaucrat. His job: to watch over commodity futures markets as the first agricultural producer to serve on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission since its creation in 1974.

Within months, Hineman found himself chairing a committee that would set up a pilot program to re-instate agricultural options in the marketplace. He also has found himself in the middle of a continuing dispute between the futures trading community and some outspoken farmers and ranchers who suspect those markets may be doing them in.

Kalo (everyone calls him by his first name) began raising start-up cattle on western Kansas wheat pasture and native grass in 1947. In time he became part owner of a southwestern Kansas feedlot. In the 1970s, he served in the Kansas House of Representatives, where an old friend, Senator Bob Dole approached him with the idea of having a Kansas producer sit on the CFTC. When an opening became available, Dole submitted Kalo's name to President Reagan. He was officially sworn in on January 12, 1982 for a four and a half year term. During his stay in Washington, his oldest son manages the farm in trust.

NEW ERA FOR AGRICULTURE

Kalo said he took the commission job out of concern for the changing nature of modern farming. "My generation was never as market-oriented as we should have been," he said "We lived in an era of flat markets."

Ironically, in the years when Kalo was actively running his operation, he made little use of the futures markets.

Eventually he "gave them a look—but I didn't use them right," he confessed. "My attention was focused on how I could make those steers gain weight a little cheaper and how I could raise a few more bushels per acre of wheat. Back then, most of us didn't have a market plan."

Times have changed, and Kalo changed with them. While he does not consider his role to be a promoter of the futures markets, he maintains that for producers to survive the up-and-down markets of the 1980s, they had better understand the basics of futures markets.

"A lot of the things we cuss 'em for, they were never intended to be," he said, mindful of the days back home when farmers commonly praised the Lord and cursed the CBT in the same breath. "Futures are risk-shifting, price discovery markets. They were never intended to be price forecasters," he maintained.

"We're selling our products and borrowing our money on the world market now, not on a local market as our grandfathers did," Kalo continued. "I'm not telling you we have to like it—I'm telling you what the facts are. In this day instant transmission of information, this world is not that small anymore. We have to understand export markets, and futures markets, so that we don't advocate something counter to our own well being."

To drive home his point, Kalo recalled a visit by an Australian Wheat Board member who, when asked how a government-run marketing agency sets the price for all that nation's wheat, replied: "We price our wheat just like everyone else in the world—based on the U.S. futures price. You have the world's only openly competitive markets."

"Our market remains free in that anybody can get in or out," Kalo said. "Absent the futures, we might have prices set in a phone booth—and with no farmers in that phone booth."

PIT PATROLMEN

To Kalo, the job of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission is to make sure markets stay openly competitive, and to see that they stay free from manipulation and fraud. Up to this point, he is "comfortable" with CFTC's enforcement program.

"It's like crime in the streets," he said. "If I were a cop, I wouldn't tell you there is no crime going on. . . . But I think we have a very effective market surveillance team. So do the exchanges for the most part. Our people are professionals. They can spot patterns, and they know what they are looking for."

Because of the human element in the pits, the need for enforcement is ongoing, Kalo emphasized. But with the development of computer technology, "our ability to reconstruct trading sequences and practices is getting better."

Recently the CFTC's ability to ensure a free and open market has been called into question. State delegations of the National Cattlemen's Association have renewed their longtime push for a national resolution to ban or severely restrict cattle futures trading. (See "Voices of Dissent," page 28.) Grain producers have expressed concern over unusual price volatility in corn and soybean futures last fall, resulting in a congressional hearing. (See "Wild Grain Prices," page M-19.)

When asked to explain the reasons behind the recent furor over futures trading, Kalo replied that in times of turmoil people "lash out at the things they least understand and those easiest to lash out at"—in this case, the futures markets.

"The markets are suspect," Kalo said. "We're suspect, too, because we're the government."

CATTLE PRODUCERS HURTING

He cited mountain-state cow-calf producers specifically as "one of the hardest hit segments of agriculture today," due to the dramatic change in cash cattle markets and a greater amount of interdependence between the livestock industry and world feedgrain prices.

Cattle industry experts confirm that while many cattle producers follow the futures markets at least in passing, very few actively use it to hedge or speculate. Many producers hear futures prices quoted the most at the feedlot, when it comes time to settle on

a cash price. A drop in the futures price for live cattle may force a feedlot operator who is hedging to lower his cash price bid for feeder cattle. Many producers in this situation feel they are bearing the brunt of the feedlot's loss. While cattle producers point to other price pitfalls, including habitual over-production, many view the futures as another burden heaped on their pile of woe.

"I hear producers say 'If I can't use it, and if it's being used against me, I'd rather get rid of it,'" Kalo explained. "And I understand their frustration."

Some state delegations within the National Cattlemen's Association have pointed to a recent congressional study as evidence that cattle futures markets are not working in accordance with supply and demand. John Helmuth, an economist with the House Small Business Committee, concluded that when live cattle futures prices reach a level covering cattle feeder costs in the Corn Belt plus an interior basis adjustment, they will always drop. This is due, Helmuth said, to a relatively large amount of short selling by commercial feedlots, grain companies, meat companies and the officers of these companies, as well as large farmers and speculators.

In comparison, there is a lack of hedgers to take the long (buy) side of the market, Helmuth said.

While Kalo and CFTC economists reject Helmuth's analysis, he does agree with Helmuth that the lack of hedging activity on one side of the market can cause problems.

"I would be more comfortable if there were a larger usage by commercial hedgers," Kalo said. "I would be more comfortable if (more producers used) the feeder cattle contract, (for) I would then have a better feel for the market. I don't like thin markets (those with low volume and open interest, making it more difficult for a potential buyer to find a seller, and vice versa). I like markets that are highly liquid, with easy entry and exit. If the market gets thin, one transaction can make a big wave, whereas in a big, liquid market, it could hardly make a ripple."

This is why speculators are needed in the market, Kalo explained. Without them, there may not be anyone to take an opposite position that allows hedgers those easy entrances and exits.

A recent CFTC study on large hedgers indicated that more commercial hedgers are working the buy side of the live cattle market than a year or two ago. The increased activity is due in part to a new "certificate of delivery" instituted in the December live cattle contract that helped cattle from being physically moved unnecessarily.

Kalo would also like to see a price index developed that hedgers with 400-lb. calves or 900-lb. feeder steers could use to compare to their cash market prices. That proposal, however, is still in its development stages.

IF FUTURES WERE BANNED

Part of the continuing disagreement between the anti-futures crowd and moderates like Kalo stems from the different philosophies about what would happen if cattle (or any other commodity) futures were to be banned. In Helmuth's view, cash price drops would not come as fast or go as deep. Further, the trend toward more forward contracting done electronically in a central auction would accelerate, he claimed.

Kalo disagrees. "If cattle futures were banned today, the plight of the cow-calf producer wouldn't change one bit," he maintained. "In fact, it could hurt him a little. Do away with futures and cattle feeders would incur additional risk, and are likely to bid cheaper for those feeder cattle."

Futures quotes contain a lot of important price information. To ban futures would mean cutting off an important source of information available to farmers. And one thing farmers don't need is less information, he added.

"With or without futures, the well organized agribusiness companies are going to have their information," Kalo argued. "A friend of mine at Union Equity, the chief teller there, makes conference calls all over the world before walking out into the market in the morning. He's going to have his information."

"It isn't going to be easy" for farmers to do the same, Kalo admitted. "Maybe a busy farmer needs to rely someplace down the road on some kind of consulting service interested in his own risk management program, rather than just to sell him a futures contract."

Kalo emphasized that although futures are not necessarily for everyone, producers should have a sound understanding of how they work. He encouraged producers to play an active role in helping to improve the system so that it works for them.

After his tenure ends in 1986, Kalo said he plans to return to Kansas, assuring the folks back home that he doesn't "intend to keep Potomac fever." Whether he will help his son run the farm or become an active partner in a livestock company has yet to be decided. Regardless, Kalo believes his experience watching over the futures markets will make him a much better businessman in his own right.

On his return home, it is likely that Kalo will be remembered as the farmer who went to Washington and still returned a farmer. As one producer friend back home who razzed him good-naturedly about taking his office job said: "The day Kalo becomes a bureaucrat, we'll all be bureaucrats."

POLICING THE PITS

Created by Congress in 1974, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission is an independent federal agency charged with regulating 11 futures trading exchanges and more than 90 actively traded contracts ranging from soybeans to stock indices. Its 1984 budget is about $26 million.

The CFTC tries to preserve a competitive marketplace by monitoring size of open positions, activities of large traders, key price relationships, availability of deliverable supplies and other potential problems. A 23-member team of economists looks out for threats of market manipulation, reviewing "snapshots" of trading patterns that show price relationships and open interest. Every Friday the full commission meets to review expiring contracts and discuss the positions of individual traders capable of moving the market.

When problems are identified, the CFTC has power to review the records of individual traders, to issue warning letters, or directly intervene in the market, such as by ordering liquidation-only trading. CFTC may also ban violators from using the futures market, temporarily or permanently.

In cases of reporting violations by traders, the CFTC has dished out "some pretty strong medicine," according to Commissioner Kalo Hineman. Ray E. Friedman & Co. (REFCO), for example, was fined a total of $525,000 last year for a series of violations in 1980 of speculative position limits in corn, wheat and cotton. Last year the commission dished out penalties of $3.5 million to 49 individuals or firms, and used cease and desist orders 71 times.

Despite this, CFTC has been accused of failing to keep pace with the explosive growth of futures markets. CFTC has tried to rely on the exchanges to regulate themselves better through a newly formed association. But it also has had to reprimand some exchanges for failing to toughen up their rules and for spending money more on promotion instead of more advanced trade monitoring systems.

OPTIONS TRADING: THE NEW PRICE INSURANCE

(By Scott W. Stewart)

Futures options, to be re-introduced this fall, are being hailed by supporters as the ultimate marketing tool for farmers. The fanfare is for good reason, too. No other marketing alternative allows a producer to lock in a minimum price without limiting the maximum possible price. As good as the advantages of options may seem, however, there are some catches you should know about before you charge ahead.

The biggest stumbling blocks will be the cost of buying options—premiums—and the hard reality that options will not offer a profitable price when one would otherwise not be available. You still will have to be a smart marketer when using them. Taking that into account, options still may be the marketing alternative of the century.

Options will be considered in the experimental stage for the next three years. As FarmFutures reported in January of last year, Congress has lifted a 47-year ban on this kind of trading. The pilot project now planned calls for each of the exchanges to pick two commodities on which to trade options. The Chicago Board of Trade, for instance, picked soybeans, because soybean prices are the most volatile and futures trading volume is high enough to ensure the success of the options contract. (The other exchanges have not made their plans public.) If the trial period proves successful, more options will be approved.

HOW OPTIONS WORK

An option gives you the right—but not the obligation—to buy or sell a commodity at a given price during a given period of time. Both the price and the time are directly related to the futures contracts currently being traded in your commodity. But options are different from regular futures contracts in several ways.

There are two types of options, "puts" are "calls". Producers of crops or livestock would purchase a "put." This is an option to sell a given commodity at a fixed price (called the striking price) sometime in the future.

For example, if the July 1984 soybean futures were currently trading at $9, you could buy a put, giving you the option to take possession of a short soybean futures contract for 5,000 bushels at $9 anytime until that option contract expires.

In return for this opportunity, you would have to pay a premium. Initial studies estimate that this premium will be anywhere from 5 percent to 15 percent of the futures price. The premium (price of the option) will be determined by open outcry in the trading pit. The cost will depend on the market's volatility and the length of time until the option expires. Predicting a precise premium on an option for the next three years is like trying to predict soybean prices three years in advance—not too easy.

Paying 40 cents (or more) per bushel ($2,000 per contract) of soybeans for price insurance may seem outrageous or cheap, depending on your perspective. If you multiply 40 cents times every bushel you produce, that's expensive insurance. On the other hand, looking back to last summer, an option on soybeans could have been an attractive marketing alternative. When futures prices were over $9, some forecasts had them going to $12. But any sensible marketer knew that there was always the potential of $3 to $4 declines from such levels. Few marketers want to pass up $12 beans, but there is not a farmer around who wants to watch $9 beans become $6 beans. So giving 40 cents or even 80 cents to ensure an $8 or $9 price while waiting for a $12 price in hindsight would have been a very sound and comforting investment.

Let's say you did buy a put option last summer. After the price fell you could either exercise the option to obtain that $9 soybean futures price, or resell the option and make up the difference between the option price and the current futures price.

If futures prices rise beyond $9, you would have little use for your option, and would let it expire with no further cost. You would then either sell your crop, forward contract it, hedge or even buy another option.

CALL OPTIONS

A purchaser of farm products, such as a feed or livestock buyer, would make use of "call" options. In this case you would pay a premium for the right to buy agricultural goods at a fixed price over a given time period.

Notice that unlike a futures contract, you have no obligation to buy in order to close out your option.

In options trading, puts and calls are not considered the opposite sides of the same contract. Rather, they are two separate contracts.

Another difference between options contracts and regular futures contracts lies in terms of delivery. If you take delivery on a futures contract you receive a commodity. With options, if you take delivery (exercise the option) you receive a futures contract. In both instances the number of deliveries will be very small.

INSURANCE POLICY

From the above soybean examples you can see that dealing in options is like purchasing an insurance policy against unexpected price changes. The fixed premium you pay at the beginning of the transaction is even similar to an insurance premium.

Carrying the analogy further, your choice among various strike prices in options trading is similar to a deductible on your auto insurance. If a premium of 90 cents per bushel for a $9 put is too expensive for you, you could buy an $8.50 put at a lower premium. Your floor price would be 50 cents lower, but your premium would be less, too.

STILL NEED MARKETING

In order to make effective use of options as a profitable marketing tool, you will still have to plan out and execute a sound marketing plan. The most important factor to remember is that your goal is to sell at a profitable price. You can price your beans at $9 by forward contracting, hedging or buying a put. If you use options wisely, you can guarantee that $9 price (minus the premium you pay) in times of higher risk without limiting your opportunity to catch the bullish wave.

On the other hand, options are no panacea to farmers' most basic marketing problems. Since options will be based on futures contracts, they will not offer a more profitable price than what you could get by trading on the board.

What is more, if you are confused by the current set-up on the futures market, just wait till options start trading. You'll have to follow puts and calls at five different striking price levels for every futures contract. Yet this complexity has not scared away traders from options in the bond markets and other commodities, so take heart. If you understand the basic concept, a broker should be able to help you take care of many of the finer details.

Options trading of course will not free you from the most difficult marketing decisions. You will still have to determine what is a good price and when to go for it. A simple marketing plan might include locking in a profitable price by buying put options anytime soybean prices surpass $8 or corn prices top $3. Of course, you will have to subtract the cost of the premium from the option price.

Unfortunately, options do not offer a cure for the uncertainties that cause many producers to delay their marketing decisions and miss out on profitable pricing opportunities. But with proper use, you should be able to guarantee that when you are ready to retire, the farm will still be there for your children.

OPTIONS TRADING: IS IT FOR FARMERS?

Farmers will soon have a new tool available for dealing with price uncertainties: agricultural options.

Trading in agricultural commodity options is expected to begin this fall after nearly a 50-year ban. Options will allow farmers to lock onto a guaranteed price in selling their output or purchasing certain inputs, but without some of the risks of trading in futures contracts.

"If you purchase an option," says David Kenyon, "you know your financial liability in advance, you are not subject to margin calls, and you do not forfeit the opportunity to take advantage of favorable price shifts in the cash market that may occur before your option expires."

The difference between options and futures is one of the subjects covered by Kenyon in his Farmers' Guide to Trading Agricultural Commodity Options. Kenyon, a professor of agricultural economics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, wrote the guide while on a study-research assignment with USDA's Economic Research Service.

According to Kenyon, options may provide an attractive alternative for farmers who have backed off from hedging only because of the risks present in the futures market. He cautions, however, that rules for options trading are still being written, that options can be expensive, and that average returns may not match those available from futures. Farmers should carefully investigate options and get professional advice before making any trading decisions.

Options trading in gold, Treasury bonds, and sugar began in October 1982. Options for several major U.S. farm commodities should be available before the end of this year. Under a 3-year pilot program, the Chicago Board of Trade, Chicago Mercantile Exchange, Kansas City Board of Trade, and other approved exchanges will each be permitted to write option contracts on two commodities. Options may initially be offered on corn, soybeans, wheat, fed cattle, hogs, and possibly some other commodities that already trade on futures markets.

WHAT'S AN OPTION?

An option, says Kenyon, is a contract that gives you the right, but not the obligation, to buy or sell a futures contract at a specified price until the option expires. Once you lock in a price by purchasing an option, you can exercise your option to buy or sell at that price regardless of any later changes in the price of the futures contract.

The right to sell at a fixed price is called a put option; the right to buy at a fixed price is a call option.

If you are a corn farmer, for example, you might purchase a put option to lock in a selling price for your corn crop. If you are a hog farmer, you might buy a call option if you wanted to lock in a purchase price for feed corn.

In either case, you would choose a price from several alternative strike prices available at the exchange offering the option contracts. This is the price you would be locking in—the price at which you could exercise your option to buy or sell futures. It does not have to match the underlying futures contract price at the time you purchase the option.

In fact, the option buyer will be able to choose from strike prices either above or below the then-current futures contract price. So, why wouldn't the corn producer choose the highest available strike price to maximize returns? And why wouldn't the hog producer choose the lowest strike price to minimize feed costs?

The reason is the premium, which might be compared with a premium on an insurance policy. The more price insurance you want, the more you pay. In most cases, premiums will rise enough to offset the additional price guarantees you can obtain by selecting more favorable strike prices.

FIGURING THE PREMIUM

Premiums are calculated from option unit prices. For each strike price available to the buyer of an option contract, there will be an associated transaction price, called the option price or option unit price.

The buyer of a put option—like the corn producer—will find that the unit price rises as the strike price rises. The buyer of a call option—like the hog producer—will find that the unit price rises as the strike price drops.

Option unit prices may fluctuate throughout the trading day as the value of the underlying futures contract changes and as option buyers and sellers adjust their bid and asking prices based on supply and demand.

The premium you pay is the option unit price multiplied by the number of units (bushels or whatever) in the futures contract. Thus, a unit price of 20 cents per bushel of corn translates into a premium of $1,000 for an option on a 5,000-bushel futures contract.

If a 20-cent unit price were attached to a strike price of $3.00 per bushel on a put option, the corn farmer might have to pay somewhere around 30 to 35 cents per bushel—a premium of $1,500 to $1,750—to lock in a strike price of $3.10 per bushel.

HERE'S HOW IT ALL MIGHT WORK

Assume that corn options will be offered by next year, and you're a corn farmer watching the options market as you begin your spring planting. Let's say a $3.00-a-bushel strike price is available at a 20-cent unit price on a put option for December

1985 corn. You see this as an opportunity to lock in a $2.60-a-bushel floor price for your crop—the $3.00 strike price minus the 20-cent unit price minus another 20 cents for the basis (the difference between futures and cash prices in your area).

You're afraid that corn prices might drop below $2.60 in the cash market by the time you harvest your crop in October, and you figure that $2.60 would be enough to cover your production costs and still provide a small profit. You pay your premium, plus a brokerage commission.

After that, you can exercise your right to sell for $3.00 any time up to the expiration date of your options contract. Options contracts will probably expire about 2 weeks before the last delivery day of the futures contract.

Now, suppose that December corn futures are down to around $2.20 per bushel in October, and you decide to exercise your option. You might instruct your broker to assign you a long (buy) position on the futures market near the end of the trading session and to immediately exercise your option. Your broker calls the exchange and, after the end of the trading day, a clearing corporation acts on your "exercise" request by assigning you a short (sell) position in futures. This offsets the long position you took during the trading session. Your option is exercised, and your futures position is simultaneously terminated—all before trading resumes the next morning.

What happened? You bought a futures contract at that day's price of around $2.20 a bushel and you sold the contract by exercising your option at your locked-in strike price of $3.00 a bushel. Your profit: 80 cents a bushel, minus the 20-cent option unit price already paid in the premium. If you can sell your corn in the cash market for around $2.00 a bushel, you've managed to net your $2.60 per bushel floor price—$2.00 in the cash market, plus around 60 cents because of your options transaction.

Your insurance paid off. You did much better than you would have done in the cash market alone, where you would have netted only $2.00 a bushel.

THE OTHER DIRECTION

How would you have fared had corn prices gone up instead of down between spring and fall?

Kenyon uses the example of December corn futures reaching $3.50 a bushel. If you held a futures contract—rather than an option—to sell your corn at around $3.00, you would either have to deliver your corn at that price or, more likely, you would buy out of the contract at $3.50—a 50-cent loss on your futures transaction. That loss would offset your gain in the cash market.

The options contract offers a better alternative. You could simply let the option expire and sell your corn in the cash market for the higher price. You would still lose your premium, which amounts to 20 cents a bushel, but you come out well ahead of where you would have been had you hedged in the futures market. In this instance, the cash market—without options or futures—would have provided the highest returns, although you would have taken the risk that prices might fall.

Notice that with both options and futures, you successfully locked in a floor price. The difference, says Kenyon, is that options allow much higher profits if prices go in your direction.

The same results, in reverse, would apply if you were a hog producer trying to lock in a ceiling on costs for feed corn. A call option could protect you from rising corn prices without locking you into a futures contract if corn prices fell sharply.

COMPARING OPTIONS AND FUTURES

Although the chance to benefit from favorable price movements is a key advantage of options, there are many other considerations in weighing options against futures. Among the most important may be relative earnings.

Kenyon constructed several examples to compare returns. In his examples, he found that returns from future hedging are higher than returns from options under some price scenarios, but much depends on the direction of price movement and the size of the option premium.

The degree to which farmers will use options will be heavily influenced by the premiums, he says. The corn farmer's option in the previous example would took less appealing if the option unit price were 35 cents a bushel instead of 20 cents. A higher premium would set a lower floor price, and it would cut deeper into potential gains if cash prices rose between spring and fall.

Option grantors (those who sell options) demand higher premiums to offset increased risks. Like sellers of insurance, they try to make sure that, overall, their premiums cover their payouts when futures markets provide profits to option buyers. When prices go in their favor, option sellers keep the premiums as payment for providing option buyers with price insurance.

Even as option buyers, he says, farmers may not view premiums as tipping the scales against the options strategy. At least, premiums are known up front, and they constitute the entire financial liability of the option buyer, other than brokerage fees.

Purchasers of options do not have to meet margin calls. Holders of futures contracts, as well as sellers of options, do have to meet margin calls to put up additional cash if futures prices go against them.

OTHER ADVANTAGES, TOO

He also points out that options may offer a more attractive price management tool when yield risk is considered. A farmer hedging in futures usually has to consider the possibility that yields may not match expectations.

If the farmer hedges an entire crop based on normal yields, losses in the futures market can be relatively high if poor weather cuts yields and boosts prices.

With options, on the other hand, the farmer can obtain price protection on the entire crop without the risk of being locked into a futures contract that may, under some circumstances, substantially reduce net returns. If yield is lower than expected and price is higher, the option buyer simply allows the option to expire, losing only the premium.

Options, says Kenyon, can be bought and sold on any business day, so farmers can buy or sell price insurance as they need it. And an option buyer does not even have to exercise the option in the futures market in order to realize a profit. The trader can liquidate the option position by making an offsetting option trade, possibly recapturing part of the premium.

"Selling an option at harvest returns the same or more profit than exercising the option and avoids trading the underlying futures contract. Hence," says Kenyon, "more option buyers will choose to sell rather than exercise their options position."

Kenyon notes that the history of options trading has been tainted by a few unscrupulous brokers and some deceptive trade practices. That's one reason, he says, why the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) is proceeding slowly and carefully in designing the pilot program for agricultural options.

The best policy, however, is still "buyer beware," Kenyon advises. "Farmers should be careful in dealing with those who promise enormous profits." Check out such deals with local brokers who have established reputations or with the CFTC, he says. Also, be aware that commissions charged by brokers may vary both in the manner in which they are charged and in the size of the fee. Ask about the fee structure before choosing a broker.

COMPARING RETURNS: TWO EXAMPLES OF OPTIONS VERSUS FUTURES VERSUS CASH MARKETS

EXAMPLE I.—*Corn prices drop from spring to fall*

Assumptions:	*Bushel*
Futures price at time of hedge	$3.00
Selected strike price	3.00
Option unit price	.20
October futures price	2.20
October cash price	2.00
Corn production on farm	10,000

EXAMPLE II.—*Corn prices rise from spring to fall*

Assumptions:	*Bushel*
Futures price at time of hedge	$3.00
Selected strike price	3.00
Option unit price	.20
October futures price	3.50
October cash price	3.30
Corn production on farm	10,000

STRATEGY A.—*Buy Put Options on December 2 Corn Futures Contracts (10,000 Bushels)*

Return on futures from exercise of put options:	
Sell 2 5,000-bushel contracts at $3 strike price	$30,000
Buy back 2 5,000-bushel contracts at $2.20 October price	−22,000
Earnings on put options	8,000
Premium on 2 put options (10,000 bushels times 20¢ unit price)	−2,000
Net earnings on put options	[1] 6,000
Receipts from sale on cash market: 10,000 bushels times $2 cash price	+20,000
Net earnings: $6,000 in futures times $20,000 in cash market	26,000
Allow options to expire:	
Earnings/losses on put options	0
Premium on put options (10,000 bushels times 20¢ unit price)	−2,000
Net losses on put options	[1] −2,000
Receipts from sale on cash market: 10,000 bushels times $3.30 cash price	+33,000
Net earnings: $33,000 in cash market minus $2,000 loss on put options	31,000

[1] Minus brokerage commissions.

STRATEGY B.—*Sell December 1 Corn Futures Contract (5,000 Bushels) To Hedge Half Your Expected Crop* [1]

Return on futures:	
Sell 5,000-bushel contract at $3 futures hedge price	$15,000
Buy back 5,000-bushel contract at $2.20 October price	−11,000
Net earnings on future hedge	[2] 4,000
Receipts from cash sale on cash market: 10,000 bushels times $2 cash price	+20,000
Net earnings: $4,000 in futures plus $20,000 in cash market	24,000
Return on futures:	
Sell 5,000-bushel contract at $3 futures hedge price	15,000
Buy back 5,000-bushel contract at $3.50 October price	−17,500
Losses on future hedge	[2] 2,500
Receipts from sale on cash market: 10,000 bushels times $3.30 cash price	+33,000
Net earnings: $33,000 in cash market minus $2,500 loss on futures hedge	30,500

[1] Hedging the entire crop through futures would have resulted in net earnings of $28,000 in both the examples. However, this assumes fixed yields. In practice, most farmers would be unlikely to hedge an entire crop before they had some assurance that yields would match expectations.

[2] Minus brokerage commissions.

STRATEGY C.—*Sell Corn in Cash Market (No Futures Hedge on Option)*

Net earnings: 10,000 bushels × $2.00 cash price	20,000
Net earnings: 10,000 bushels × $3.30 cash price	33,000

NOTE.—To keep the comparisions relatively simple, the strategy of offsetting rather than exercising the option is not illustrated here. In many cases, this would increase the returns available through options.●

LETTER FROM NICARAGUA

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, too often in our discussion of events in Central America, we rely on facts and figures that fail to convey the human dimension. I was struck by a recent letter published in the Harvard Magazine written by a Harvard University graduate. The author, Sarah Stookey, has been in Nicaragua since her graduation last year, teaching English to Salvadoran refugees and doing agricultural work. Her letter is filled with her personal impressions of life in Nicaragua and the impact of President Reagan's secret war on the people of Nicaragua. I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

LETTER FROM NICARAGUA

(By Sarah Stookey)

I have been back in Esteli for three weeks now—it feels like much longer. I am living with a family in Barrio Jaime Ubeda. It is a very good home to be in. The mother, Franci, is 34 and a student at the Frente Sandinista College just north of town. It is a school of general education, administrative and military training, and farming work. Eighty students participate in each year-and-a-half program, designed to develop an indigenous group of professionals for government work. The students are, for the most part, middle aged, with "life experience" in the revolution but little formal education. Franci was selected for her work in the underground women's movement of the 60s and 70s, and for her apparent leadership potential.

Franci lives at the school during the year but is home now for a couple of months. Everyone in the house is home now. The annual three-month vacation has just begun—all six Franci's daughters finished their final examinations last week.

Magda, the oldest at 19, is working during the day with the Juventud Sandinista, the youth organization of the FSLN. She spends all day at meetings or in the barrios, managing activities for smaller children.

Another daughter, Karellia, 15, is going to go pick coffee this month. Many brigades have left Esteli for the mountains in the north where the coffee crop is concentrated. Each brigade is made up of the members of a mass organization (for example, AMNLAE, the women's organization) or of a CDS (the barrio community organizations) or of students. The brigades go up for two- to four-week periods to bring in the harvest quickly and to help make up for the many *campesinos* who are fighting or have been forced to abandon their crops because of contra ambushes. The brigades work under army protection and are themselves armed.

We have had news from friends who are working in these brigades, and from others who have visited. It is hard work, the food is very poor, and there are frequent ambush attempts. These are often repelled without casualties, but two students from Esteli have died since I have been here.

Students who do not want to pick coffee and are not otherwise busy, either as sole wage-earner in a family or in government or mass organization work or in vital production, are participating in three weeks of training and seminars on civil defense practices. In case of an invasion, they will be the coordinators in the barrios, supervising first aid, fire fighting, food distribution, child care.

The little girls in the family, ages 6 to 11, spend the day playing in the house, in the street, or running errands. They are eager companions/interpreters on trips to el centro.

This is clearly a time of preparing for an invasion. The territorial militias, those forces that will defend the city, are training all day on the weekends and for two hours every weeknight. The training is in general defense skills and procedes assignment to barrio level battalions, which are coordinated by the CDS in each neighborhood.

Saturdays, people gather in the plaza around noon. We divide up into groups of ten, and each group is instructed by a member of the EPS, Popular Sandinista Army. A group of ten this past Saturday included a seven-year-old boy and his mother, several teen-age girls, a fifty-year-old woman, and a couple of young men. We practiced maneuvers in a field—how to form a line of defense, how to respond to air or chemical attack.

On Sunday there is arms training, instruction in how to take apart and reassemble the gun, and, only afterwards, target practice. Everyone, of all ages, is respectfully attended to and allowed their turn and questions. The sun is very hot but, inevitably, just when it's the worst, a jeep shows up with a tub of ice water and a cup is passed around. Sometimes, instead of arms training, there is work on Sunday. Everyone walks, in two lines on either side of the highway, singing and clapping, to a place where we're given picks and shovels and dig foxholes or refuges.

Always there is sharing of food—tortillas, pineapple, bananas—and much joking and flirting. And always there are the mountains that ring Esteli. The clouds are constantly changing the patterns of light and shade on the meadows and darker woods.

And it is so, always, that the more I see of the community's preparation for its defense, the more sure I feel of their cause and the more desperate about the effect of U.S. power in the region.

I have never seen people caring so much about each other—giving and working when they have so little to give and so much to do. Those who dig the longest, who rest the least, are always the poorest farmers. This house where I am has only one small scholarship to feed and clothe seven people and yet I was told that I needn't worry about contributing money for food, that as long as there was something to eat, it was mine to share.

The difference between these and similar generosities in the States is the context in which they occur. I believe the purpose of government is to nurture and institutionalize the best in human relations. And here I feel that happening. The FSLN has made a commitment to improving the quality of life of the poor. The current administration is making tangible progress—cheaper food, free health care, widespread public education. And it is fervently seeking out ways to involve people in this work. Often there is no alternative. Here there is not the unique "luxury" of being passive, of being able to trust that the coffee will be harvested, sewers will be built, or the cities defended. In the States it seems that we are often debilitatingly dependent on mysteriously complex and distant mechanisms of administration and provision. We have an abundance of technicians and officials who are all too willing to carry out the responsibilities of the community without popular "interference." And an abundance of workers who also produce in a vacuum, without really feeling part of the social-political organism. We do not often acknowledge our dependencies on one another.

Self-government is a logistical necessity here; as Annie Dillard said about China, "it is a country made by hand." But the monumental tasks facing this people could never be accomplished without honest evaluation of the society's resources and needs. The process of popularly determined and effected government requires open recognition of the contribution of each social group and of each individual. Making life better here has also meant developing a highly sensitive awareness to the complexity of social relationships.

Someone at home asked me recently about an impression of surreality she got from reading Gabriel Marquez's "One Hundred Years of Solitude." In that book about Latin America, the men build houses of ice in the tropical jungle and wonder why they melt. What I feel here, what I have tried to describe, is an honesty and understanding that are the very opposite of surreality.

This is why I am very happy here now. It is the basis of my particular attraction to this place, and why I think I have a lot to learn here. And it is very much a result of being able to be in Esteli. But I hope that you will continue to help the people here, to oppose our government's actions against

Nicaragua, even though you may not share all my enthusiasm about this process. It is one thing to be critical or offended by what is happening in this country. It is another to sit back and watch the United States systematically and militarily undermine the popularly supported, internationally recognized government of another country.

And the U.S. is the central power in this war. It is our dollars, our military expertise, our new airbase in Honduras (which dwarfs the "Cuban airstrip" in Grenada), our paramilitary training camps in Florida and New Jersey, and our refusal to seriously consider the FSLN's diplomatic proposals that are feeding the war in this region. Our planes are flying the reconnaissance missions that made possible the attacks on the Managua airport and the port of Corinto last fall. We must take responsibility for those fires in Corinto that forced 25,000 people to flee their homes.

And every week campesinos are found dead near their fields in the mountains near Esteli, often decapitated with their own machetes.

And still U.S. law, the Boland amendment to the FY 1983 Intelligence Authorization Act, prohibits the CIA and the Defense Department from participating in the contra attempt to overthrow the government of Nicaragua. And still, the OAS charter, of which we are a signer, proclaims: "No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic and cultural elements."

As Senator Moynihan wrote of the Boland amendment: "This is the law, American law. It is not a matter of interpretation, it is a law which the Administration must abide by. . . ." And of the OAS treaty: "As we are a government of laws, we would hope to be a government of laws in the hemisphere and thus be bound by our commitments."

Not liking what is happening inside Nicaragua does not justify the destruction of Nicaragua's project of change. That is one point.

There is another: that unless the government of the U.S. obeys the laws promulgated by the representatives of the people and the treaties to which it self-righteously holds other nations, then we surely are building ice houses in the jungle.

Please be angry. To stop this violence against the people here. And to assert *our* right to honest relations with one another. We cannot allow ourselves to do what we are doing.●

FISCAL SANITY

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as we continue to debate what steps we will take this year to reduce current and outyear deficits, I would like to share with my colleagues some valuable insights on the deficit problem contained in an article written by O.B. Butler, chairman of the board of Proctor & Gamble. Mr. Butler's essay, "A Plea for Fiscal Sanity," gets right to the heart of the matter. As he says, "the problem will not be solved easily and it will not be solved by partisanship or demagoguery. It will be solved only be a public willingness to face facts and share the pain." To which I would only add, that sharing of the pain must involve every sector of our society, not just the individual taxpayer or program beneficiary. The business community, various industries that benefit from Federal subsidies—either direct or through the Tax Code—and the entire public sector must bear the burden as well as individuals.

That is the approach we are trying to take in this year's deficit reduction effort, and that is what we will have to keep doing in the years ahead. I commend Mr. Butler for his observations on this subject, and I ask that his article be printed in the RECORD in full at this point for the benefit of Members.

The article follows:

A PLEA FOR FISCAL SANITY

It is high time that we bring common sense and hard facts to our discussion of the federal deficit and the problems it creates.

First of all, we need to get the size of the current deficits in perspective. These are not "deficits as usual." The fact is that the federal deficits for the last two fiscal years, and the projected deficits for the next two fiscal years, are far and away the highest peace time deficits in the history of our country. Even when measured as percentage of gross national product (which rules out the effects of inflation and economic growth), they are substantially larger than the largest deficits we ran during the middle of the Great Depression of the 1930's when we were deliberately trying to spend our way out of economic disaster and were consciously willing to encourage inflation.

Learned economists are debating whether deficits are truly inflationary. At the same time, there seems to be a general acceptance of the discredited theory that federal deficits improve economic growth.

Common sense tells us that no individual, no family, and no corporation can consistently spend beyond its income without eventually facing financial disaster. The same is true of governments except that a government which persistently spends beyond its means can bring economic disaster to the entire country. All of the economic rationalizations in the world will not change the basic laws of human behavior.

A simple study of our post war history confirms what everyone should know; that is, that repeated federal deficits are inflationary. They also tell us, and this may come as a surprise to some, that repeated federal deficits also tend to reduce (rather than stimulate) the rate of economic growth and they tend to increase (rather than reduce) the rate of unemployment. The following table illustrates the point. The various time periods are not grouped on an arbitrary basis but are chosen because they represent extended periods of relatively consistent federal fiscal policy. From 1950 through 1966 the federal budget was generally in balance with six years of small surplus, seven years of small deficits and four years of almost exact balance. The next eight years were a period of almost consistent deficits (seven of the eight years), but deficits consistently in the magnitude of 1 to 2% of GNP. The next seven years were periods of consistent deficits which were generally in the range of 2½% GNP. The last four years are years of consistent deficits in the range of 4 to 5% GNP.

Period	Annual deficit		Percent annual economic growth [1]	Annual inflation rate [2]	Annual unemployment rate	Interest rate—	
	Billions	As percent GNP				Long term [3]	Short term [4]
1950–66	$2.6	0.6	4.0	2.1	4.9	4.0	2.6
1967–74	12.4	1.2	3.4	4.8	4.6	7.6	5.6
1975–81	50.1	2.4	2.5	7.9	7.1	10.4	8.4
1982–83	155.3	4.9	0.2	5.6	9.6	13.9	10.1
1984–85	175.0	4.6					

[1] As measured by Gross National Product adjusted for inflation.
[2] As measured by the GNP deflator.
[3] Yield on new issues of high grade corporate bonds.
[4] Yield on new issues of 91-day Treasury Bills.

Note that in a period of 17 years of generally balanced budgets, the rate of economic growth (measured as Gross National Product adjusted for inflation) was 4 percent. The inflation rate was 2.1 percent and the unemployment rate was under 5 percent. Interest rates on short-term borrowing were 2.6 percent and on long-term borrowing were 4 percent.

In the ensuing periods, as we encountered ever increasing federal deficits, the rate of economic growth declined until it has been essentially nothing during the last two years. The rate of inflation and unemployment increased dramatically and interest rates reached levels which will stifle economic expansion and are destroying millions of U.S. jobs because of the artificial exchange rates which these high interest rates create.

Statistical correlations don't prove cause and effect, but these correlations are remarkably consistent. Some will argue that the decline in economic growth resulted from loss in productivity and poor work practices, but it can be equally argued that these evils were encouraged by the general pattern of government fiscal irresponsibility and the resulting inflation.

It is true that in the last two years we have controlled the money supply sufficiently to achieve some moderation of inflation despite the huge deficits, but we have paid for that with almost 10 percent unemployment and no economic growth.

A simple look at history and at the projected deficit for the next two years suggests very strongly that we must either act to eliminate the deficit or we must be prepared for more years of zero economic growth accompanied by either extreme levels of unemployment or extreme rates of inflation. Who among us would willingly accept either of these alternatives?

BALANCING THE BUDGET

If we are unwilling to accept the almost inevitable economic outcome of these continued deficits, if we would truly like to return the country to the growth rates, inflation rates and unemployment rates which we had for 17 years, then we must be prepared to make some very painful budget decisions.

We must start with the recognition that there is no easy way to balance the budget. Part of our society is demanding that we balance the budget by increasing taxes. Another part is demanding that we balance the budget by cutting spending. Some are demanding that we increase taxes only on the "rich". Others are demanding that we hold Social Security sacred and that we not tamper with either the tax or the benefits. Others are demanding that we cut any expenses except welfare. Others are demanding that we cut any expense except defense. It is time that we face the facts that none of these solutions is possible.

Our current expenditures exceed our income by 27%! To balance the budget entirely by increasing revenues would require the equivalent of a 27% surcharge on every single source of income that the federal government has. For example, it would take a 27% increase in every corporate tax, every personal income tax, Social Security taxes, Medicare payments by individuals, excise taxes, tariffs, contributions by federal employees to their retirement funds—every source of federal revenue. If Social Security taxes were exempt from the increase, every other form of income would have to go up 42% to bring the budget into balance. The deficit is simply too big to be eliminated entirely by tax increases, the brunt of which would have to be borne almost entirely by the hard working, income producing middle class. (Almost 60% of the personal income taxes and over 80% of the personal Social Security tax is paid by families with adjusted gross income of less than $40,000.)

Neither can the budget be balanced simply by cutting expenditures. To do so would require a 21% reduction in every single item of federal expenditure, including Social Security payments, welfare payments, Medicare, defense, farm subsidies, federal pensions, food stamps and even interest on the national debt. If Social Security and Medicare were exempt from the cuts, we would need a 30% cut in all other expenditures. If defense and Social Security were both exempt, the cuts in all other payments and service would have to be about 40%. It simply isn't possible to balance the budget entirely by cutting spending, much less to balance it by cutting some kinds of spending and exempting other kinds.

Does all this mean that the situation is hopeless? Are we, in fact, already condemned to a stagnant economy with 10% or higher unemployment and double digit inflation? Not necessarily, but the problem will not be solved easily and it will not be solved by partisanship or demagoguery. It will be solved only by a public determination to face facts and share the pain. It will require a willingness on the part of individuals, corporations and the public to pay higher taxes and an equal willingness on the part of government beneficiaries to give up some of their income. A budget that is out of balance by more than 25% can still be balanced without confiscatory taxation or disastrous spending cuts. For example, to recover half of the deficit through higher taxes would require about a 12½% increase in every form of government revenue. That would be painful, but not unbearable. To recover half the deficits through spending cuts at the same time would require a 10% cut in every single federal expenditure including Social Security and defense. Those cuts would be painful but they are less severe than the cuts which many hard working Americans have had to make because of unemployment, reduced work weeks and "give-backs." Every citizen of the country would have to make some sacrifice in the short-term. It would be painful for everyone, but it might well be worth it.

Imagine what would happen to our economy if long-term interest rates again dropped to 5%. The yen and mark would return to normal exchange values versus the dollar. Our exports would increase, imports would decline, and more jobs would be created in this country. Young people could afford the mortgages to buy houses and furniture and appliances. Lower interest rates alone would cut the deficit by 20% because of lower interest payments on the federal debt. Lower inflation would cut expenditures and faster economic growth would stimulate revenues. The size of the increase in taxes and the cuts in expenditures could be quickly reduced. History suggests that over a period of a few years, economic growth would return to healthy levels, inflation would virtually disappear and every American who wanted to work would be able to find a job.

Don't we, in fact, owe this to our children?●

INTERNATIONAL LAW

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, in the continuing and complex debate now abroad in the Nation respecting the proper role of international law in the development of American foreign policy, one is heartened and encouraged to find in the work of Richard N. Gardner calming wisdom and precise scholarship.

Richard Gardner is Henry L. Moses professor of international law and international law at Columbia University, and counsel to the law firm of Coudert Bros. He has served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, from 1961 to 1965, and as U.S. Ambassador to Italy, from 1977 to 1981.

He is, therefore, that rare combination of legal scholar and accomplished diplomat. Accordingly, he brings to discussions of the rule of law in world affairs an especial competence borne of practical experience.

In the current number of Trialogue, Ambassador Gardner brings this expertise to bear in an article he has written entitled "Sovereignty and Intervention: A Challenge of Law-Making for the Industrialized Democracies."

The essay addresses recent events in Grenada and Central America in the context of how certain American policies, undertaken without proper consideration of international law, has led to our country's political isolation—even from thse industrialized democracies with whom we have most in common and with whom we most need to act in concert.

I commend Professor Gardner's work to the attention of the Senate, and urge that Senators read this article with the care it warrants.

Mr. President, I ask that Professor Gardner's essay be printed in the RECORD.

The essay follows:

A CHALLENGE OF LAW MAKING FOR THE INDUSTRIALIZED DEMOCRACIES

(By Richard N. Gardner)

The controversy over the U.S. military action in Grenada is of the deepest significance for the trilateral countries of Western Europe, North America and Japan for two reasons. One is obvious; the other has been almost totally ignored.

The obvious reason is the political cost of the unprecedented isolation of the United States from its allies and friends on a military action deemed in the national interest by the American government and overwhelmingly supported by the American people. When the U.N. General Assembly voted by 108 to 27 abstentions on November 2, 1983, to "deplore" the occupation of Grenada as a "flagrant violation of international law," the United States could not muster a negative vote from a single trilateral country. Only Israel, El Salvador and six small Caribbean countries joined the United States in opposition. The United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, Belgium and Japan abstained. France, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Portugal all voted to deplore the U.S. action.

The less obvious significance of Grenada is the confusion it revealed among trilateral governments and leaders of public opinion over a question of central importance to the solidarity and survival of the trilateral countries: Just what legal and moral principles governing the use of armed forces are the trilateral countries prepared to live by and ask others to live by at this point in the nuclear age?

It is not a new question, nor an easy one. It is a question that was raised at the time of U.S. military actions in the Cuban missile crisis, in the Dominican Republic, and in Vietnam; by the Soviet military actions in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan and Soviet interference in Poland; by Soviet and Cuban interventions in Central America; by Israel's raid on Entebbe, its invasion of Lebanon and its attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor; by the Argentine-British conflict in the Falklands; by French military actions in Africa; and by Chinese and Vietnamese attacks upon their neighbors. It arises today in El Salvador and Nicaragua. And it will undoubtedly arise in unforeseen ways in the years ahead.

But let us begin with Grenada. When armed forces of the United States occupied Grenada on October 25, 1983, accompanied by forces from six English-speaking Caribbean countries, the avowed purpose was to protect American citizens, restore order and liberate the country from Soviet-Cuban domination.

The military action of the United States was triggered by the murder on October 19

of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and other elected leaders by a militant communist faction led by Deputy Prime Minister Bernard Coard, an event accompanied by civil strife and the collapse of government authority. The United States declared that it acted in response to two requests for assistance: a formal request on October 23 from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), a regional grouping of seven Caribbean mini-states, and a confidential appeal from the Governor-General of Grenada as the sole remaining source of lawful government authority.[1]

Speaking in the United Nations Security Council on October 27, U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick emphasized that Cuban and Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Grenada was a major factor in the American decision. "Grenada's internal affairs," she said, "had fallen under the permanent intervention of one neighboring and one remote tyranny." Ambassador Kirkpatrick added that the U.S. action was justified by a "unique combination of circumstances" that included "danger to innocent United States nationals, the absence of a minimally responsible government in Grenada and the danger posed to the OECS by the relatively awesome military might that those responsible for the murder of the Bishop Government now had at their disposal."

"The United States response," she concluded, "was fully compatible with relevant international laws and practice." [2]

If this was the American justification for its action in Grenada, on what basis could the U.N. General Assembly find that the same action was a "flagrant violation of international law?" And why did so many leaders of public opinion in the industrialized democracies—quite a few in the United States itself—rush to the judgement expressed by the Times of London: "There is no getting around the fact that the United States and its Caribbean allies have committed an act of aggression against Grenada. They are in breach of international law and of the Charter of the U.N."

Clearly one explanation for these divergent judgements was lack of agreement on the facts. Were American citizens really in danger? Were the "invitations" by the Governor-General of Grenada and the OECS spontaneous—or made under pressure from the U.S.? Were those who overthrew the Bishop government really acting on behalf of the Soviet Union or Cuba to destroy the independence of the country? Did the Soviet-Cuban military build-up in Grenada constitute an imminent danger to the security of Grenada's tiny and defenseless neighbors? Was the purpose of the U.S.-led occupying forces exclusively to restore order and asssure the free exercise of sovereignty by the people of Grenada—or was it to impose a government to the liking of the United States? Finally, would the occupying forces really leave once order was restored and the conditions for free elections assured?

It is not my purpose in this essay to resolve these factual issues. Authoritative judgements on them, in any event, are difficult to make now on the basis of publicly available evidence. I will only note in passing that if the trilateral countries failed to support the United States because they disbelieved the U.S. version of events, this in itself is a commentary on the state of trust and confidence between countries that are supposed to be allies and close friends. The trilateral countries were not prepared, to put it mildly, "to give the U.S. the benefit of the doubt."

It would be even more ominous for their future relations, however, if the trilateral countries were in fundamental disagreement over the principles to be applied in judging the legality and morality of the use of armed force by themselves or other nations. If that should be the case, it would place in doubt one of the premises of the trilateral concept—that there is, in fact, a real community of industrialized democracies capable of common action based on shared concepts not only of national interest, but of fundamental human values.[3]

The rules of international law governing the use of force may be found in treaties and in international customary law, that is the rules nations follow in practice out of a sense of legal obligation. The most authoritative statements of the rules are to be found in the following provisions of the United Nations Charter:

All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered. (Article 2(3)).

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations. (Article 2(4)).

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations . . . (Article 51).

Another source of applicable law is the Charter of the Organization of American States, which declares in Article 15: No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state.

Although the OAS formulation set forth above does not appear in the U.N. Charter, the General Assembly has adopted the identical language in a resolution in 1970 purporting to be an authoritative interpretation of the U.N. Charter, the Declaration of Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The search for principles to govern the use of armed force does not end, however, with the recitation of those broad propositions. International constitutions are not self-interpretating any more than national constitutions—nor are phrases like "armed attack," "self-defense" or "intervention" any more self-explanatory than "cruel and unusual punishments," "interstate commerce" or "due process of law." The process of interpretation requires sophisticated human judgement, which means at a minimum that interpretation of any single provision must take into account other provisions of the same document, the purposes of the international instrument as a whole, the drafting history, subsequent state practice and the applicability of rules of customary international law, possibly co-existing with the international agreement. Moreover, careful judgement must be used in the application of broad constitutional provisions in a variety of unique instances, many of which could not have been foreseen when the international constitution was drafted. As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once put it: "General principles do not decide concrete cases."

The simple truth is that international law on this subject is far from clear, as evidenced by the widespread disagreement between government decision-makers and respected scholars both within and between nations. As everyone knows, international law differs from domestic law in that there is no court of compulsory jurisdiction for its authoritative interpretation, nor is there a legislature to adjust the law to changing circumstances or a police force to secure universal enforcement. This does not necessarily mean that international law does not exist; there are mutual restraints and reciprocal concessions embodied in treaties and customary international law that nations choose to regard as legally binding out of perceived self-interest. Indeed, on a large number of subjects ranging from the Law of the Sea to diplomatic immunity, the rules of international law are observed by almost all nations almost all of the time. But clearly the interpretation of these rules in the decentralized international system is a more difficult matter than in the domestic legal order, particularly when we are dealing with an issue like the use of force which touches vital national interests. What we are really talking about is "word politics"[4] between nations—a struggle to shape norms to govern national behavior in support of certain national interests and values.

The challenge to trilateral countries is one of creative and purposeful international law-making—among themselves as a kind of "law-bloc"—and with other members of the international community. This means, first of all, looking carefully at those various formulations governing the use of armed force that have some basis of support in contemporary international law and deciding which ones should be espoused or rejected in the interest of promoting the values the trilateral countries share—among which are certainly those of peace, justice, national self-determination, and human rights.

A second stage would be a concerted effort—now so notably lacking—to observe these formulations in their own behavior and to press for their wider recognition through bilateral and multilateral diplomacy. What these formulations might be, at least in barest outline, I shall suggest in a moment.

CHALLENGES TO A RULE OF LAW APPROACH

There are, however, a number of very fundamental objections to this "rule of law" approach. The starkest objection comes from those who believe, as the Wall Street Journal suggested in the aftermath of Grenada, that international law simply does not exist. A variant of this view would be that although international law exists in the majority of international situations, it does not exist, or does not apply when armed force is used by nations in what they conceive to be their supreme national interest. No less a figure than Dean Acheson drew that conclusion at the time of the U.S. quarantine of Cuba in 1962:

I must conclude that the propriety of the Cuban quarantine is not a legal issue. The power, position and prestige of the United States had been challenged by another state; and laws simply does not deal with such questions of ultimate power—power that comes close to the sources of sovereignty . . . The survival of states is not a matter of law.[5]

This statement has powerful appeal in an age when the Soviet Union and its allies have violated traditional international law principles with impunity—and when nations

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

like Iran, Libya and Syria have raised terrorism to the level of state practice. But do we really want to take the view that there are no legal rules applicable to judge the actions of the Soviet Union and its allies, or the smaller terrorist nations, which threaten the safety of free nations and the achievement of a decent world order? We would do well to remember the wise observation of one of Britain's greatest international lawyers, J. L. Brierly: "The ultimate explanation of the binding force of all law is that man, whether he is a single individual or whether he is associated with other men in a state, is constrained, so far he is a reasonable being, to believe that order and not chaos is the governing principle of the world in which he has to live." [6]

In the nuclear age, it is precisely in dangerous confrontations of power that some ground rules are needed to preserve "order" and avert "chaos." A conclusion that "no law" is applicable would generally serve the interests of the Soviet Union and other challengers to the peace of free nations; it would create even more uncertainty and instability than we already have. There is no nation that denies the existence of international law, and all feel constrained to find legal justifications for their behavior. It is surely better to have nations arguing over what international law is than to assert that no international law applies at all.

I spoke earlier of "international law and morality." International law often codifies national interest and convenience, as in the Law of the Sea. In the sensitive area of the use of armed force, it seeks to codify morality as well. But it is precisely here that we come to a second fundamental objection to the "rule of law" approach: May there not be exceptional situations where the law may be disregarded if necessary to achieve some greater good? In real life, we all recognize extreme situations where violating the law may be appropriate to achieve some valid purpose—e.g., going through a red light to take an injured person to the hospital for urgent medical treatment.

Moreover, where traditional international law fails to take account of new realities and cannot be changed through negotiation and diplomacy, there may be exceptional situations where "law-making" through new state practice requires some temporary "law-breaking." A successful example of this phenomenon was the Truman Proclamation of 1945 taking jurisdiction over the resources of the continental shelf, a unilateral action that "broke" the old law before the new legal principle was "made" by general acceptance. Nevertheless, if we are to accept violations of traditional rules in exceptional cases, we should carefully consider whether the consequences are beneficial not just for the acting country, but for the majority of mankind as a whole—and whether the value of the objective being served outweighs the damage that the unilateral change in the rules may do to the future conduct of international relations. I do not suggest that this legal-moral calculation is an easy one. But I do reject the notion that in international affairs the end always justifies the means, a proposition that is readily available to totalitarian powers, as well as to free nations.

There is yet another objection to the "rule of law" approach, from those who argue that the rules of international law, particularly those governing the use of armed force, are capable of almost any interpretation, and should simply be manipulated by nations in each case to achieve whatever foreign policy goals seems valid at the moment. But the U.N. Charter and other sources of international law cannot be treated as pieces of India rubber to be stretched one way and then another in light of the short-term political necessities of each situation. There has to be some continuity in our day-to-day interpretation. If we "bend" the principles to fit one case, we must be willing to live with the new configuration in the next. The Soviet Union cannot very well be denied the same freedom to resort to force which the United States claims through "liberal interpretations" of existing norms. As Justice Robert Jackson once put it in a domestic context:

A military order, however unconstitutional, is not apt to last longer than the military emergency . . . But once a judicial opinion rationalizes such an order to show that it conforms to the Constitution, or rather rationalizes the Constitution to show that the Constitution sanctions such an order, the Court for all time has validated the principle . . . The principle then lies about like a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need.[7]

Yet another challenge to the "rule of law" approach comes from the believers in "spheres of influence." According to this view, the United States must be conceded the same freedom to defend its interests in Latin America as the Soviet Union claims in Eastern Europe. In other words, accept the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty for Eastern Europe in return for a "reverse" Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty for Latin America, with perhaps other such doctrines for China, Vietnam, Britain, France, Japan and other countries in areas of historic interest to them.

It scarcely needs emphasis that this approach does violence to the principles of sovereign equality and self-determination embodied in the United Nations Charter and other treaties in force, and that it would never be accepted by the small nations of the world, least of all by those in the "spheres of influence" that are principally at issue. Nor is such a concept likely to appeal to the citizens of the United States and other industrialized democracies, most of whom profess a principled concern for freedom and human rights in all parts of the world, from Poland and Grenada to Tibet and Cambodia.

A similar challenge to the "rule of law" approach might be described as a rough and ready theory of "reciprocity." It is a principle well-recognized in the common law—and perhaps more generally in all legal systems—that when one party violates a material provision in a contract, the other party is relieved of its obligations under the same instrument. It is argued by analogy that as long as the Soviet Union and other totalitarian powers persistently violate the norms laid down in the Charter and other sources of international law, the United States and other free nations must have the right to do so when necessary to defend their interests. To quote Dean Acheson again: "We must never forget that between an opponent who is prepared to use force to gain his end and one who is not prepared to use force to defend his interests—the former is usually the winner." [8]

International law clearly permits the United States to refuse to perform its commitments in a bilateral agreement with the Soviet Union if the Soviet Union has breached a material provision of that same agreement. It may also permit the United States to take broader measures against the Soviet Union—measures that might otherwise be considered illegal—in response to Soviet violations of international law directed against the United States. But it is quite another thing to claim that the United States should be released from its obligations to innocent third countries because the Soviet Union is disobeying the rules.

The concept that we must be free to "fight fire with fire" has undoubted political appeal and certainly would make it easier for the industrialized democracies to defend their security interests in particular situations. But if the trilateral countries accept the Soviet standard of international behavior as their own, do they then forfeit any claim before the rest of the world to stand on a higher plane of morality? Do they abandon all legal restraints on the use of force or only some, and do they cast aside the restraints on forcible intervention everywhere or only in countries where the rules have already been violated by their adversaries? A "tit-for-tat" rejection of legal restraints on the use of force—"you invaded Afghanistan so we can invade anyone we like"—will encounter violent opposition from almost everyone but the superpowers and will quickly bring the standards of international behavior down to the lowest common denominator. As I shall suggest in a moment, most of the benefits of the "reciprocity" approach can be achieved with less cost to the trilateral countries by a judicious use of the concept of "self-defense" consistently with respect for international law.

In this catalogue of challenges to a "rule of law" approach there is one, however, that merits more sympathetic consideration. This is the view that reads as interdependent and correlative the provisions of the U.N. charter restraining the use of force by member states and the provisions of the Charter placing on the United Nations the duty to establish international peace and justice. With the frustration of the Charter system for collective security and the peaceful settlement of disputes, it is argued, the member states must recover their pre-existing freedom of action to protect their interests by means of individual or collective self-help. As Professor Arthur Goodhart of Oxford put it during the Suez crisis of 1956: "The renunciation of the use of force in Article 2(4) is not of an absolute character, but is dependent on the proper enforcement of international order by the United Nations." If a different view were accepted, he argued, U.N. members would be obliged to stand idly by in the face of the most extreme violations of their rights and "membership in the United Nations would be a source of danger and of weakness to the law-abiding nations." [9]

This "frustration of Charter purposes" concept, however, still leaves us with some of the same problems that we found with the other challenges to a "rule of law" approach. If Article 2(4) of the Charter is set aside, what forms are then applicable? To abandon all restraints in the Charter because of the U.N.'s weakness would serve neither peace nor justice, nor would it advance the cause of rebuilding the U.N.'s collective processes. At the same time, there is merit in the view than the Charter restraints on the use of force must be interpreted differently in today's world than they would have been in the world envisaged at San Francisco. How this might be done is the question to which we now turn.

ELEMENTS OF A RULE OF LAW APPROACH

If it is in the interest of the industrialized democracies, subject to the qualifications noted above, to follow a "rule of law" approach to the use of armed force, what should be the applicable legal principles? Volumes of learned scholarship have been written on this enormously difficult and complex subject. What follows is a brief review of five concepts of varying degrees of persuasiveness from which the trilateral countries will need to fashion a common approach:

Self-defense: the United Nations Charter codifies "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations." There is general agreement in the international community that this gives a nation the right to use force when its territory or its armed forces are attacked or when an attack is made on the territory or armed forces of another nation to which it is bound in a collective self-defense arrangement like NATO.

There are some specific questions about the self-defense concept, however, that are more difficult to resolve. For example: Can the concept of self-defense be stretched to legitimize a use of force in anticipation of an "armed attack?" In the Cuban missile crisis, the United States deliberately declined to use "anticipatory self-defense" as a justification for the quarantine of Cuba, and with good reason. If the deployment of Soviet missiles in Cuba could provide a legal basis for a blockade of Cuba in 1962, could not the Soviet Union use "anticipatory self-defense" to justify forcible action to stop the deployment of the Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe in 1984? It would be a dangerous doctrine, particularly in an age of nuclear weapons, to say that the mere deployment and readying of weapons justified the preemptive use of force by others. Yet international law before the U.N. Charter did recognize the right of anticipatory self-defense when the "necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation." [10] It is doubtful that the U.N. Charter was intended to deny a nation the right to defend itself against an armed attack that was already underway. Where to draw the line between permissible response to an imminent attack and impermissible response against the readying of weapons will not always be easy, but the principle seems clear enough and finds support in existing practice. Israel, for example, received no support in the United Nations for its preemptive strike against Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981, but it received widespread support (and no U.N. condemnation) when it began hostilities in 1967 after President Nassar blockaded the Gulf of Aquaba.

Another question concerns self-defense in the face of "indirect aggression." In today's world, an "armed attack" can occur not only through the marching of troops or the launching of weapons across borders, but by the forcible seizure of power within one country by persons acting as agents of another country with the aim of destroying the first country's independence. This would suggest that "collective self-defense" should also embrace military action to defend the freedom and independence of a country that is being subjected to a previous indirect aggression by others. Putting it another way, "counter-intervention" in response to a prior illegal intervention should not be regarded as illegal provided it has as its motive and actual consequence the preservation of the freedom and independence of the people on whose behalf the "counter-intervention" is carried out. John Stuart Mill was an advocate of this principle as far back as 1848 in an eloquent passage that has particular application today:

The doctrine of non-intervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue: that the wrong side may help the wrong but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce non-intervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent.

Since the first Hague conference in 1899, the international community has sought to develop rules of warfare to limit the destructiveness of conflicts and particularly the damage to innocent civilians. When armed force is used in self-defense or under any other legal theory, therefore, there is not only the question of when force may be used, but how it is used. One principle of continued vitality is that of "military necessity"—that is, a use of force in self-defense or on some other basis should be limited so far as possible to military objectives. No doubt this is a difficult principle to apply in the nuclear age; yet in its humane purpose it is a principle that merits support from the community of nations.

Protection of Nationals: The United States and other trilateral countries have long asserted a right to use force on the territory of another nation to protect their nationals from an imminent threat of injury where the territorial sovereign was unable or unwilling to protect them. The U.S.-Belgian rescue effort in the Congo in 1964. Israel's raid on Entebbe, and the initial phase of the American landings in the Dominican Republic in 1965 and in Grenada all relied on this principle. To avoid abuse of the concept, it is generally conceded that the measures taken must be strictly confined to the purpose of protection—thus there would be no justification in occupying a country after endangered citizens had been removed. Most developing countries still challenge this legal concept, even when so strictly limited. Yet it seems evident that the industralized democracies should continue to support it in an age where terrorist acts and the collapse of civil authority are all too frequent occurrences.

Military Assistance Upon Request: Traditional international law has recognized the right of one country to give military assistance to another at the latter's request, including the deployment of armed forces on its territory. It is still a widely held view that it is legal to assist the established government in a civil war situation, but not the insurgent group, at least not until the insurgents have become sufficiently established that other countries may appropriately grant them belligerent status. But this whole question of assistance upon request and intervention in civil wars is one of the most controversial areas of international law, with the Soviet Union, Cuba, and many developing countries challenging the traditional customary law rule and insisting on a right to support "wars of national liberation" against established governments. Here is an area where the U.N. Charter is silent and the practice of states offers no clear guide for judgement, for the evident reason that no clear consensus exists within the international community.

It seems clear that the trilateral countries have a common interest in supporting the traditional international law rule prohibiting outside military support on behalf of revolutionary movements seeking to overthrow existing governments. They also have a common interest in affirming the right to provide military support to established governments defending themselves against a foreign-supported revolution. A closer question for the trilateral countries is whether, in the absence of any foreign intervention whatsoever, they should continue to assert a right to assist established governments to put down indigenous revolutionary movements. One problem with this traditional doctrine is that it provides ready justification for the use of armed force by the United States and other trilateral countries in support of any government, no matter how dictatorial or unpopular, to help it suppress popular forces seeking political and social reform. Moreover, it may help the Soviet Union to justify its uses of force to achieve the permanent incorporation into the Soviet orbit of any country which has once been taken over by a Soviet-supported communist coup. Soviet troops went into Hungary and Afghanistan, after all, in response to "requests" by pro-Soviet leaders falsely purporting to speak for the legitimate government of the country. Had they gone into Poland, they could probably have produced a request from General Jaruzelski.

On the other hand, military assistance upon request aimed merely at the restoration of law and order and not at the suppression of an indigenous revolutionary movement would seem to offer less problems as a legal concept for the trilateral countries and others. Here again, it will not always be easy to draw the line.

Regional Action: Article 52 of the United Nations Charter permits regional organizations to deal with "such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action," provided that their activities "are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations." Article 53 further provides that no "enforcement action" shall be taken by regional organizations without the authorization of the Security Council.

The United States has sought to justify as a legitimate use of regional peace-keeping the OAS-authorized quarantine of Cuba in 1962 and the OAS-authorized peace force which occupied the Dominican Republic in 1965 after the collapse of order in that country. It has also sought to justify the occupation of Grenada as a valid regional peacekeeping effort by the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. In the Dominican and Grenada cases, the United States argued that no "enforcement action" requiring Security Council approval was involved, since force was not being exercised against the will of a state, but only to maintain order after the collapse of government authority. In the Cuban quarantine, the U.S. argued that there was no "enforcement action" because the members of the OAS acted pursuant to a recommendation rather than a mandatory decision—a questionable theory to say the least, since certainly there was "enforcement" of the blockade against the ships of the Soviet Union and other countries.

It is not clear that the concept of regional peacekeeping adds to the uses of force that would otherwise be legally available to individual countries. Article 52 requires that actions by regional agencies must be consistent with United Nations principles. One of those principles is the prohibition in Article 2(4) of the use of force against the "territo-

rial integrity of political independence of any state." Uses of force that would be illegal if undertaken by a single nation are not validated therefore simply because they are undertaken by several states pursuant to recommendations by regional agencies. In the Grenada and Dominican Republic cases, reliance on the concept of regional action would require a demonstration that the "territorial integrity" or "political independence" of those nations was not violated. In short, the prohibition in Article 2(4) could be given a limited interpretation. But in that event, action by the United States alone would have been just as lawful (though less politically attractive) as action by the regional group.

"Humanitarian" or "Democratic" Intervention: Some scholars now argue that international law permits one or more countries to use force in the territory of another to put an end to human rights abuses or vindicate the rights of the people to democratic institutions. Indeed, Ambassador Kirkpatrick has used this argument to justify U.S. military support for the "Contras" seeking to overthrow the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua.[11] The concept of "humanitarian" or "democratic" intervention is undeniably attractive when the world is faced with extreme situations such as Hitler's campaign of genocide against six million Jews or Idi Amin's wanton slaughter of his own countrymen. It is, however, a principle that finds little support in treaty law or the customary rules that derive from consistent state practice. It is also vulnerable to an obvious practical objection. Two thirds of the members of the international community are less than fully functioning democracies and at least one third engage in gross and persistent human rights violations. A legal principle that would authorize unilateral or collective intervention against such a large number of countries would be an invitation to an unrestrained world civil war—too threatening to international peace and stability to command broad support within the international community or by the trilateral countries themselves.

What is the application of the five concepts outlined above to the Grenada situation? If the facts as given by the United States government are accepted, the principle that force may be used to protect endangered citizens clearly justifies the initial Grenada landings. The continued occupation of Grenada once that purpose had been accomplished can be justified on the basis of the invitation by the Governor-General to put an end to foreign intervention and/or maintain domestic order, assuming the constitution of Grenada provides him with the necessary authority to issue such an invitation.

For the reasons given earlier, the concepts of "regional action" and "humanitarian" or "democratic" intervention are not good legal arguments for the Grenada action. But "collective self-defense" is a concept that can apply to Grenada. This is not the "anticipatory self-defense" of Grenada's neighbors, which would stretch the concept too far since no attack upon them was imminent. Rather it would be the murder of Bishop and the seizure of power by persons allegedly acting as agents of the Soviet Union or Cuba for the purpose of subordinating Grenada's sovereignty to one or both of those countries that could be regarded as a "use of force" against the political independence of Grenada, justifying a collective self-defense action by the United States and Grenada's neighbors. To put it another way, and assuming once again that the facts presented by the United States are accepted, the Soviet Union and Cuba "intervened" illegally in Grenada to suppress freedom; the United States lawfully "counter-intervened" with Grenada's neighbors to restore freedom. The use of force observed the requirement of military necessity since a genuine effort was made to avoid harm to innocent civilians.

This brief exposition of applicable legal theories,[12] simplified in the extreme for the purpose of brevity, may well raise more questions than it resolves. Some will challenge the validity of my necessarily abbreviated formulations and subjective judgments. Fair enough. The basic purpose of this essay is not to suggest that the answers to these questions are clear, but rather that the trilateral countries should accord high priority in thinking about them at senior levels of government in an effort to develop a trilateral consensus.

The Soviet Union and its allies in the developing world are actively promoting legal doctrines to serve their interests in international fora like the United Nations, in their bilateral diplomacy and in their unilateral official pronouncements. Their purpose is obvious—to prohibit all "imperialist interventions" by the trilateral countries while legitimizing all Soviet-sponsored uses of armed force in support of "wars of national liberation." If the trilateral countries wish to shape a world order conducive to the promotion of peace and freedom, they will need in their turn to develop a more unified and purposeful approach on these questions than they have thus far.

A trilateral report on the international law of armed force, written by scholars from Western Europe, North America and Japan, on the basis of broad consultation with governmental and private authorities throughout the world could be a useful first step toward achieving some consensus on an issue of central importance to the industrialized democracies and all other free nations.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Grenada, A Preliminary Report*, Released by the Departments of State and Defense, December 1983.

[2] Provisional Verbatim Record of the U.N. Security Council meeting of October 27, 1983, S/PV.2491, pp. 28-43.

[3] The issue raised is when the use of force is legal and moral, not when it serves the national interest. The two issues should be clearly distinguished: There may be cases where the use of armed force by one or more of the trilateral countries would find a clear basis in law and morality but would be politically inexpedient. Conversely, a use of force may be politically expedient but neither legal nor moral.

[4] The phrase is that of Professor Thomas Franck of New York University.

[5] *Proceedings* of the American Society of International Law (1963), p. 14.

[6] J. L. Brierly, *The Law of Nations*, pp. 55-66 (6th edition, 1963).

[7] *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214, 246 (1944).

[8] "Foreign Policy and Presidential Moralism," *The Reporter*, May 2, 1957.

[9] A. L. Goodhart, "Some Legal Aspects of the Suez Situation." *Tensions in the Middle East*. Philip W. Thayer, Ed., Johns Hopkins University Press, 1958.

[10] Daniel Webster's famous communication to the British government in the *Caroline* case, August 6, 1842, cited in 2 Moore, *Digest of International Law* 412 (1906).

[11] *The New York Times*, June 30, 1983.

[12] In the interest of brevity, there has been no discussion of a sixth possible justification for the use of armed force—reprisal by one nation against the illegal action of another. As a practical matter, this justification is not usually invoked in the major uses of armed force with which we have been concerned here. There is much disagreement, in any event, on whether and under what conditions armed reprisals are permitted under the U.N. Charter.●

THE KANSAS CITY STAR TRIBUTE TO FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

● Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, many tributes have been paid to Harry S. Truman in honor of his centennial, which we are celebrating today. Among the finest efforts I have seen is the four-section tribute published by the Kansas City Star this past Sunday, May 6.

Numerous staff members of the Star, as well as scholars and contemporaries of Mr. Truman, including Clark M. Clifford, Dean Rusk, and former Representative Richard W. Bolling, contributed their best efforts to the sections.

There was superb original artwork and graphics and hand-tinted photographs. In all, the sections were an outstanding tribute, and I am sending copies to my House and Senate colleagues. I know they will enjoy reading them as much as I did.

The Star's publisher and chairman of the board, James H. Hale, and Pam Johnson, editor of the sections, are to be congratulated.●

REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD BOLAND'S RECEIPT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION'S DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, Members of this body as well as the other body often receive recognition and awards for a multitude of different reasons, but there is one in particular which I think we should take note of today. On Wednesday, May 9, the distinguished chairman from the other body's Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, Congressman EDWARD BOLAND will be awarded the Distinguished Public Service Award by Dr. Edward Knapp, Director of the National Science Foundation.

As chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, I have been fortunate to work with Congressman BOLAND annually on our subcommittee's appropriations bills. As a result of these opportunities, I have come to admire and respect the Congressman from Massachusetts. He is one of the most knowledgeable and thoughtful Members in either body and is thoroughly deserving of this coveted award.

Mr. BOLAND was elected to the Congress in 1952 and has served continuously since then as the Representative of the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts. He is the ranking member of the House Appropriations

Committee. As chairman of its HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee, he has given unwavering support to basic scientific research and education. "Even before the shock of sputnik," the Foundation's citation says, "he saw the necessity of improving the competence of teachers of science and mathematics, and of insuring the Nation's strength through fellowships for the education of scientists and engineers. For more than three decades, he has remained dedicated to excellence in science education."

A reception given in honor of Mr. BOLAND on May 8 at the National Air and Space Museum and the presentation to him of the Distinguished Public Service Award at the National Science Board dinner on May 9 are part of the National Science Foundation's Science Week activities. It is the intention of the Foundation during Science Week to convey to the public the importance of science in the American way of life.

Mr. President, I am sure that all Members of the Senate will join me in congratulating Mr. BOLAND on the Foundation's recognition of his outstanding contributions to the advancement of American science and education.●

JOHN M. WALSH: TENNESSEE'S SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF 1984

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues know May 6 to 12, 1984, has been proclaimed small business week, a period during which we honor our Nation's entrepreneurial leaders. It is fitting that we honor the men and women who are leaders in our small business community given the tremendous impact small firms continue to have on our economy.

On the national level, small businesses continue to set a sterling example of job creation in the marketplace. Between 1980 and 1982, small business produced 2,650,000 new jobs compared with a loss of 1,664,000 jobs in this same period for larger businesses. Small firms led employment growth during the initial stages of our economic recovery registering a net employment gain of 2.6 percent from September 1982 to September 1983. Larger firms only experienced an employment gain rate of 1.2 percent for this period.

In total, small business employs nearly 48 percent of the nonfarm work force in America. These firms contribute 42 percent of the sales and generate close to 38 percent of our country's gross national product.

This same business strength is evident at the State level. In Tennessee, there are approximately 83,000 business establishments. Of these, about 79,000 employ less than 100 workers. This small business community in Tennessee produces roughly half of our State's goods and services and contributes nearly 45 percent of the State's total payroll. Tennessee's small firms constitute 80 percent of the manufacturing companies in the State, nearly 100 percent of the construction, service, finance, insurance, and real estate firms in the State and over 60 percent of Tennessee's wholesale and retail operations.

Representing Tennessee's small firms as our small business person of the year for 1984 is John M. Walsh, president and owner of Porcelain Industries of Nashville, TN. Mr. Walsh and his firm exemplify many of the positive traits those of us on the small business committee have come to recognize as hallmarks of successful companies.

Porcelain Industries was established in 1956 in a small rented building. The firm got underway with initial capital totaling $4,000. Employment at this early stage included eight people. Over the years, Porcelain Industries has met numerous challenges in the marketplace, faced economic adversity and gone through significant changes in its basic manufacturing process. Yet, Mr. Walsh's company has come through these trials in stronger shape. The company has experienced a compounded annual employment growth rate of over 10 percent. The present work force stands at 110 persons. Firm sales have grown almost every year and stood at $6.2 million at the end of the last fiscal year.

Perhaps the most significant attribute displayed by Mr. Walsh's firm is the innovativeness he has displayed in his product. Procelain Industries manufactures component parts used in such products as barbecue grills, hot water heaters, gas stoves, kerosene heaters, and parts used in chemical and petrochemical industries. A trend setter in this industry, Mr. Walsh's firm introduced porcelain enamel cooking grids to the gas barbecue grill industry. The company was also the first to introduce porcelain-enameled woodburning stove mats. The company is also involved in the design of kerosene heaters.

Further evidence of the innovativeness displayed by Mr. Walsh and his workers can be seen in the installation of a new, highly efficient enamel furnace which cut the company's electrical costs by 30 percent. In addition, while other firms in this industry have experienced waste-water disposal problems, Porcelain Industries initiated a method of reusing water throughout its processing areas. This reduction in water usage has not only lowered operating costs, it has had a positive impact on the environment.

Mr. President, the history of John Walsh and Porcelain Industries serve as a reminder to us all of the many benefits generated by the small business community. I am proud to join in honoring John Walsh as Tennessee's Small Business Person of 1984.●

LAW DAY 1984

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate, and the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a recent address by the attorney general of the State of New York, the Honorable Robert Abrams.

At the New York State Court of Appeals Law Day ceremony on May 1, Attorney General Abrams spoke to the timely subject of the importance of international law in the advancement and protection of human rights around the world.

It is an insightful and thoughtful presentation, and I ask that the complete text of this address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The material follows:

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE RULE OF LAW

(Remarks of Attorney General Robert Abrams, Law Day 1984)

Chief Judge Cook, Honorable Judges of the Court of Appeals, Governor Cuomo, Mr. Fales, ladies and gentlemen, a few weeks ago, in proclaiming May 1, 1984 as Law Day USA, President Reagan stated, "Without law, there can be no freedom, only chaos and disorder . . . [A]nd without freedom, law is but a cynical veneer for injustice and oppression."

This is a fitting observation for Law Day. It echoes a line in the preamble of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "[I]t is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law . . . " Simply put, laws exist to protect basic human rights, and without those rights, the rule of law has no meaning. As lawyers, we have dedicated ourselves to the rule of law and to the fundamental human rights it is meant to uphold, not only in this country, but in all parts of the world.

On Law Day it is also fitting to note just how fragile the rule of law is in the world today. At about the same time the President was issuing his Law Day proclamation, the United States government was notifying the International Court of Justice that it was withdrawing its consent to the Court's compulsory jurisdiction with respect to disputes with any Central American state or disputes arising out of events in Central America.

This event is without precedent in the 38 years since the United States agreed to submit itself to the World Court's jurisdiction, and casts a shadow over our celebrations today. It was precipitated, of course, by U.S. participation in the mining of Nicaraguan harbors and the intention of Nicaragua to bring an action before the Court charging that the United States had violated international law by this and other actions in support of anti-Sandinista insurgents.

This is an interesting legal issue over which reasonable men and women can disagree. For example, Ambassador Kirkpatrick, our government's chief representative before the United Nations and one of the Administration's most effective advocates,

has asserted that the United States and its allies in Central America have a right to act in "individual and collective self-defense" against Nicaraguan aggression. Senator Goldwater, on the other hand, in a characteristically blunt letter to the Director of the CIA, has concluded that mining harbors in Nicaragua "is an act violating international law [and] an act of war."

Without choosing sides on this question one can go to the larger issue, namely: How this dispute ought to be resolved. If we have learned no other lesson in this century after the terrible cost of two world wars and countless smaller wars, it must be that disputes between nations are far better resolved in a court of law. That is precisely why the International Court of Justice was established, and why the United States agreed to accept its authority in 1946.

The recent events involving Central America raise two important questions that we—as lawyers—ought to examine.

They are whether the United States ought to assign any importance to the rule of law and human rights in formulating its foreign policy goals and, if so, what we as a nation are doing to promote these concepts.

There is no question that many countries honor human rights mainly in the breach. Human rights organizations report that more than 60 nations practice torture as an instrument of government power. Political killings are commonplace in many of these countries. The governments of many other nations are less brutal but no less effective in suppressing freedoms of speech, assembly and religious expression; the right to travel or emigrate; the right to work and share equitably in society's benefits; and the freedom to form free political parties and participate fully in government. Many of these governments are our adversaries in the world arena; many others are our friends and allies.

Those who oppose a strong human rights policy argue that it puts us at a competitive disadvantage with other nations—chiefly the Soviet Union and its allies—who play by different rules. They assert that it hinders our ability to meet vital security and economic needs; that it has a purely moral and very little political significance. To them, human rights is an occasionally useful propaganda tool to use against the Soviets, but not to criticize our allies.

In my view, these arguments overlook two important facts. First, our nation's dedication to the protection of basic rights and the rule of law is the one thing that separates us most fundamentally from the Soviet Union. There can be no dispute that the Soviet Union and what it represents present the most serious threat to our national interests. But this threat cannot just be measured in material terms of military power or economic resources; it is equally a threat represented by ideas and ideology. We must be as prepared to meet our adversary on the field of ideas as we are on the field of battle.

I could not articulate this notion as well as it has been stated by a distinguished American lawyer, Dean Thomas—Buergenthal of the Washington College of Law at American University, who sits on the Inter-American Court of Human Rights:

"A sound human rights policy provides the United States with an ideology that distinguishes us most clearly from the Soviet Union and seriously undercuts the ideological appeal of Communism. It is the only ideology, the only dream, if you will, that the people of the U.S. share with the vast majority of the people of the second and third worlds. The quest for human rights and human dignity is a phenomenon of contemporary life of universal dimensions and immense significance in the struggle between East and West. And those who do not grasp its significance do not know much about the world we live in and the forces that shape it."

Nor can we ignore the fact that in our shrinking world, the systematic deprivation of fundamental human rights, wherever it occurs, ultimately touches each of us.

As this State's chief legal officer, my responsibilities are purely domestic. But even in this position I have been confronted with the brutal effects of human rights violations in other parts of the world. Last year, I was asked by the government of El Salvador to certify the results of an autopsy examination performed by a coroner in New York on the remains of a body believed to be that of John Sullivan, an American journalist who was murdered in El Salvador in December, 1980. My agreement to make this certification was a condition imposed by the Salvadoran government to permit Mr. Sullivan's family to remove the body from that country. The autopsy confirmed that the body was that of Mr. Sullivan.

At about this time, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York issued a report of a mission it sent to El Salvador to examine the Salvadoran criminal justice system. The City Bar Association mission reported that there had been over 30,000 unsolved murders over a three year period in El Salvador, and that none was the subject of an investigation, let alone prosecution of those responsible, save a few isolated cases involving American citizens who happened to be among the victims. Having lent the good name and offices of the Attorney General of New York to an important aspect of the investigation of Mr. Sullivan's murder, I felt compelled to convey to the Salvadoran government the growing sense of frustration with which our legal community views events in that country.

Many of us in this room tonight are the sons and daughters or grandchildren of men and women who sought refuge in this country from the brutality of foreign governments. There are in the world today tens of millions of individuals who are victims of racial, religious or political persecution, of social or economic injustice, who aspire to join us in the United States. There is simply not room enough for everyone who wishes to come. Knowing that, how can we ignore their plight by failing to promote the protection of human rights throughout the world?

In short, the United States has both a moral and a pragmatic duty to protect and promote fundamental human rights throughout the world, and this ought to be one of the highest priorities of our foreign policy.

The remaining question is whether we—as a nation—are meeting that duty. What kind of example for the world have we set? What kind of leadership have we exercised?

Fundamental to protection of human rights is the rule of law, and I believe that one measure of our performance as a nation is what the United States has done to promote the rule of law throughout the world.

The basic instrument of human rights is of course the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 10, 1948. This act represented the first important step by the community of nations to articulate the fundamental rights of all individuals and implement the rule of law in all parts of the world. Like the United Nations itself, the Universal Declaration is a product of American leadership. It was borne of the Wilsonian idealism that marked America's entrance onto the world stage in the early part of this century. It is the embodiment of Franklin Roosevelt's "four essential human freedoms"—freedom of speech and expression, freedom to worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear. The purpose of the declaration was to establish "a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations" guaranteeing the full scope of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.

It is a magnificent document, and the United States can rightly claim credit for its inspiration and its adoption. But the Univeral Declaration was never intended to be an end in itself. In the words of the U.S. Representative to the General Assembly when the Declaration was adopted, "It is not and does not purport to be a statement of law or of legal obligation." Rather, the Declaration was simply meant to be a first step towards the implementation of a set of binding legal principles to govern the conduct of nations.

The next essential step toward this goal was articulated in 1948, by John Foster Dulles, the American Delegate to the General Assembly, who stated: "I hope and believe this Assembly will endorse this Declaration [of Human Rights]. But we must not stop there. We must go on with the drafting of a convenant that will seek to translate human rights into law. . . ."

While the community of nations has largely followed this injunction, it is here that the United States record of inspiration and leadership has sadly and ironically broken down. Today, more than three decades after the adoption of the Universal Declaration, five treaties which are vital to the implementation of the rule of law throughout the world have yet to be ratified by the United States. It is an unfortunate record, and one which must be corrected if the United States is to take its rightful place among the nations of the world as the leading proponent of human rights and the rule of law.

I would like to briefly describe each of these treaties.

Two of them, the United Nations Convenant on Civil and Political Rights and the United Nations Convenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, were signed on behalf of the United States by President Carter on October 5, 1977 and transmitted to the Senate for its assent to ratification in 1978. The Civil and Political Rights Convenant establishes a minimum standard of conduct requiring all participating governments to respect fundamental civil rights, including equality, life, liberty and physical integrity, freedom of movement, fair and speedy trial of criminal charges, free expression, peaceful assembly, free association, and participation in public affairs. It forbids, torture, cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment, slavery, arbitrary arrest, double jeopardy, and imprisonment for debts. The Civil and Political Rights Covenant is, in essence, the international embodiment of our own Bill of Rights.

The Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Convenant requires governments to work to the full extent of their available resources to achieve for their inhabitants the rights to gainful employment, safe and healthy working conditions, trade union member-

ship, social security, protection for the family, adequate food, housing and clothing, health care, and primary education. It does not purport to establish present rights, but sets aspirational goals that all nations should seek to realize progressively as their resources permit. It establishes governmental aims that are entirely consistent with social and economic policy goals followed by our country since the 1930's, and articulates international standards which our country ought to be working to achieve.

The two United Nations Convenants entered into force in 1976, have each been ratified by at least 59 countries, including every major Western nation except the United States.

A third unratified treaty is the American Convention on Human Rights, which was signed on behalf of the United States on June 1, 1977. It has been pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee since February 23, 1978. Like the Civil and Political Rights Covenant, it requires governments to respect and ensure the fundamental rights of individuals that are guaranteed by our own Bill of Rights. It also establishes an Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and an Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The court is composed of seven judges elected in an individual capacity with jurisdiction to hear cases submitted by the Commission and states that are parties to the treaty. It is a sad and unacceptable irony that a distinguished American lawyer has already been elected to serve on the Inter-American Court, Thomas Buergenthal, who was nominated by Costa Rica rather than his own country, which has not ratified the Convention.

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination is a fourth treaty unratified by the United States. It was signed on behalf of the United States on September 28, 1966, and has been pending before the Senate since February, 1978. It outlaws discrimination on the basis of race, color, descent or national or ethnic origin. The Convention requires nations to pursue a policy of eliminating such discrimination by refraining from discriminatory practices, guaranteeing equal protection of law, and providing remedies against discriminatory treatment.

The Racial Discrimination Convention is entirely consistent with the law and policy this country has followed over the last one hundred years through the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment and the Civil Rights Acts of the 1960's. Like the two United Nations Covenants, the Racial Discrimination Convention has been ratified by every major Western nation except the United States.

The oldest of the five international human rights treaties not yet ratified by the United States is the most stunningly shameful example of our failure to lead the world toward the rule of law. It is the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which was signed by President Truman on December 11, 1948. It was transmitted to the Senate for its assent to ratification on June 16, 1949, and has been awaiting action for nearly 35 years.

The Genocide Convention was inspired by the Holocaust and the shocking discovery that many of the most horrible acts presented to the Nuremberg Tribunal were not in fact legally prohibited by the law of nations. The Convention affirms that genocide "whether committed in time of peace or in time of war" is a crime under international law. It prohibits specified acts committed "with intent to destroy . . . a national, ethnical, racial or religious group," and provides that no individual guilty of genocide would be immune from punishment.

Eighty-six Nations have ratified the Genocide Convention, including every democratic country in the world except the United States. As Chief Justice Earl Warren stated in 1968, on the twentieth anniversary of the Convention, "We as a nation should have been the first to ratify the Genocide Convention. . . instead, we may be near the last."

No treaty or convention ranks higher than the Genocide Convention as a symbol of the commitment of the world community to the rule of law and civilized behavior by nations. In his 1970 report recommending ratification of the Genocide Convention, Secretary of State William P. Rogers said:

"I am convinced that the American people together with all the peoples of the world will hail United States ratification of this convention as a concrete example of our dedication to safeguarding human rights and basic freedoms."

Today, fourteen years after those words were spoken, the people of the world can only see America's continuing failure to ratify the Genocide Convention as a tragic betrayal of its own ideals.

None of these treaties will change the world overnight. Words alone cannot feed the hungry, clothe or shelter the poor and homeless, end discrimination or stop nations from brutalizing their own citizens. But, these five treaties give some reason to hope that some day these evils will be eliminated from the earth. One thing is certain: Any hope that the rule of law will one day govern the conduct of all nations is futile unless the United States ratifies these five basic treaties.

We, as lawyers, have a duty to help bring this about. None of the treaties should be controversial. They have all been the subject of extensive hearings in the United States Senate. Questions once raised relating to our sovereignty and the integrity of our Constitution and laws have long since been resolved. The American Bar Association, together with a multitude of individuals and organizations throughout the United States, has urged the ratification of all five treaties. Ratification of the Genocide Convention in particular is one of the legislative priorities of the American Bar Association, which has undertaken a special project to accomplish this at the earliest possible time.

As Americans, we have a responsibility to serve the principles of democracy, humanity and justice upon which our nation was established. As lawyers, we have a special responsibility to serve these principles by promoting the rule of law. I can think of no better way to meet this duty than joining together to urge the ratification of the five international human rights treaties now pending before the United States Senate.

The very words inscribed on the Liberty Bell are the words from Leviticus that refer to the teaching that all should have a fair and equal chance for freedom.

"And you shall proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all its inhabitants thereof."

Let us never fail to keep this ancient injunction, never more important that it is today throughout the world.●

PRAISING JUSTICE FRANCIS T. MURPHY AND FEDERATION OF NEW YORK STATE JUDGES CALLING FOR MORE PRISON CONSTRUCTION

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, at some point during the debate on this budget bill, Senator SPECTER and I along with several of our colleagues, intend to raise a revenue neutral amendment to earmark $200 million in 1985 for much needed prison construction. First, however, there are three documents I would very much like my colleagues to review.

The first of these is the formal resolution of the largest judicial organization in the history of New York, the Federation of New York Judges. This resolution, issued on April 23, 1984, calls upon the judges of New York not only to impose severe sentences upon defendants "who, if at liberty, would be a threat to the lives of the men, women, and children" of the State, but also to impose such sentences "regardless of the existence of prisons sufficient in size or number to receive such prisoners."

Accompanying this resolution is the strong, forthright, and very correct statement of the Federation's President, Francis T. Murphy, Presiding Justice, Appellate Division, First Department. Justice Murphy states:

When the safety of the people • • • cannot be assured except by the severe punishment of those who brutalize them, then the prisons to which such defendants should be sent should be built.

Finally, the Justice Department's recent report—Prisoners 1983—tells us that last year 21,420 felons were released from State prisons, not because they were rehabilitated or had completed their sentence, but simply because we had run out of room for them.

Mr. President, I ask that the judges' resolution, Justice Murphy's statement, and tables 9 and 15—profiles of jail and prison crowding—and the "Summary of 1983 Prison Population" from the Justice Department report be printed in their entirety at the conclusion of these remarks.

We should all applaud Justice Murphy and the Federation of New York State Judges for their courageous and absolutely accurate statement and policy resolution. As they so rightly declare, the time to focus and force the crime issue is now.

The material follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE FEDERATION OF NEW YORK STATE JUDGES

The residences of people of this State having become barricaded places in which they live behind chained and bolted doors;

The streets having become the lawless marches of robbers, rapists and felons of every kind who victimize men, women and children;

The night having become the time for retreat by the lawful, and for invasion by the criminal;

And the fear of the law and the courts having been diminished by the true and common perception of a failing criminal justice system;

Now be it resolved by the Federation of New York State Judges, acting in defense of the liberty and safety of the people of this State, that:

The law of New York requires the imprisonment of every convicted defendant who, if at liberty, would be a threat to the lives of the men, women and children of this state.

The moral law, the oath of judicial office, and the Canons of Judicial Ethics require every judge to execute the law by sentencing such defendants to prison terms that will effectively punish them for the crimes that they have committed.

Accordingly, the Federation of New York State Judges calls upon every New York judge to continue to sentence such defendants to terms of imprisonment which, by their severity, will isolate them from the men, women and children they threaten.

Further, the Federation of New York State Judges resolves that such sentences should continue to be imposed regardless of the existence of prisons sufficient in size or number to receive such prisoners. When the safety of the people of this State cannot be assured except by the severe punishment of those who brutalize them, then the prisons to which such defendants should be sent should be built. Swift and severe punishment is the only defense against predators.

Statement of Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy

Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Department, speaking as president of the Federation of New York State Judges, announced today that the Federation by formal resolution has called upon New York judges not only to impose severe sentences upon defendants "who, if at liberty, would be a threat to the lives of the men, women and children of this State", but to impose such sentences "regardless of the existence of prisons sufficient in size or number to receive such prisoners."

Presiding Justice Murphy stated: "When the safety of the people of this State cannot be assured except by the severe punishment of those who brutalize them, then the prisons to which such defendants should be sent should be built."

"No more essential duty of government exists than the protection of the lives of its people. Fail in this, and we fail in everything. Then take down the museums, dismantle the theatres, close the parks and beaches, shut the schools, the subways, and the hospitals, turn out the lights, let every decent person become his own keeper and lock himself in his apartment cell. Such a society is unthinkable, yet the one in which we now live was unthinkable only a generation ago. If then someone had said that in 1984 hundreds of thousands of apartment windows in New York City would be covered with metal gates, and that private security guards would patrol the lobbies, hallways and rooftops of apartment buildings, we would have thought him insane.

"We hear but do not listen to the ordinary man and woman. It is they who are the victims of crime, and they in their anguish have something of value to say.

"They tell us that their lives, burdened by personal problems involved in simply living, must be led in a society in which a brutal attack upon them by a robber would surprise no one. They tell us that they are denied the small pleasures of life—a morning's visit to a church or synagogue, an evening's stroll in summer by a husband and wife, a subway ride with their children to a park. They say that such a half life is not life at all. They tell us that criminals have taken the city, that crime has beaten government to its knees, that the moral passion for justice has been drained out of society and, in its place, there is an overwhelming sense of helplessness. They say that they fear that they have grown too used to crime, and they wonder whether society, for all its pretensions, has become pitiless.

"The ordinary man and woman are right, and everyone knows it because we are that man and woman.

"For at least 200 years the causes of crime and its prevention have been studied, yet prisons have multiplied and crimes have so increased in number and savagery that there is no crime that would shock anyone for longer than the life of the news story that reports it. As for rehabilitation of the criminal, there are no rehabilitative techniques, and no rehabilitative prisons. Looking back over the past two centuries, we see that science, as a new way of knowing, not only promised to augment man's power but dramatically delivered on that promise. The power it delivered, however, proved to be over nature only. It did not increase our power over ourselves to become better people. It has left man unchanged, sitting in the evening of his life in a warehouse filled with his technology.

"Society, therefore, is pressed to its ancient and only defense against the violent criminal, the inculcation in him of the fear of swift and severe punishment by a morally outraged people. No other road is open. Either we take that road now, or we will live in the sickly twilight of a soulless people too weak to drive predators out of their own house."

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORT: PRISONERS IN 1983

TABLE 7.—STATE PRISONERS HELD IN LOCAL JAILS BECAUSE OF OVERCROWDING

State	1983	1982	1981
Total	8,078	8,689	6,900
Alabama	1,001	1,113	1,472
California	1,244	1,090	600
Colorado	211	[1] 244	0
Florida [1]	0	295	287
Illinois [2]	86	0	0
Kentucky	[1] [2] 244	[1] 162	104
Louisiana	2,299	1,499	793
Maine	75	61	24
Maryland	82	67	71
Massachusetts	[1] 2	[1] 8	7
Michigan	0	7	43
Mississippi	1,006	1,020	1,147
Montana	0	0	1
New Jersey [1]	976	1,584	995
New Mexico	0	2	2
Oklahoma	0	0	48
South Carolina	514	498	549
Tennessee	8	186	219
Utah	55	6	29
Vermont [4]	7	11	0
Virginia	246	643	485
Washington	28	28	24
Wisconsin [5]	3	165	0

[1] Not included in this State's official prison count.
[2] Illinois houses 18 of the reported 86 inmates in Nevada facilities.
[3] Kentucky's figures are for Dec. 28, 1983.
[4] Vermont, which has a combined jail/prison system, houses inmates in lockups to alleviate overcrowding.
[5] Wisconsin houses 276 inmates in other State, Federal, and county facilities because of overcrowding.

TABLE 15.—PROFILE OF PRISON CROWDING, 1983

State	Yearend prison population as percent of capacity [1]	Percent of yearend population in local jails because of overcrowding [2]	Number of early releases because of overcrowding
United States	110	[2] 2.2	21,420
Federal institutions	118	0	NA
State institutions	110	NA	21,420
Alabama	114	10.2	0
Alaska	130	NA	33
Arizona	114	0	188
Arkansas	100	0	0
California	124	3.2	NA
Colorado	106	6.1	0
Connecticut	112	NA	0
Delaware	107	NA	245
District of Columbia [3]	123	NA	NA
Florida	110	0	2,418
Georgia	99	NA	1,530
Hawaii	155	NA	0
Idaho	134	0	0
Illinois	115	.6	2,851
Indiana	146	NA	1,101
Iowa	105	NA	0
Kansas	119	0	0
Kentucky	95	4.9	NA
Louisiana	100	17.7	0
Maine	114	7.1	NA
Maryland	123	.7	0
Massachusetts	141	...	0
Michigan	110	0	4,290
Minnesota	90	NA	0
Mississippi	101	18.0	38
Missouri	91	0	0
Montana	130	0	9
Nebraska	122	0	0
Nevada	113	0	0
New Hampshire [3]	107	0	0
New Jersey	111	9.5	0
New Mexico	103	0	0
New York	107	0	0
North Carolina	95	0	NA
North Dakota	87	0	NA
Ohio	108	0	0
Oklahoma	123	0	NA
Oregon	150	0	0
Pennsylvania	124	0	0
Rhode Island	98	NA	0
South Carolina	129	5.4	57
South Dakota	107	0	0
Tennessee	122	.2	259
Texas	91	0	7,118
Utah	105	4.3	139
Vermont	93	1.4	0
Virginia	105	2.4	NA
Washington	129	...	847
West Virginia [3]	105	0	0
Wisconsin	123	...	297
Wyoming	115	0	NA

[1] Average of highest and lowest capacity.
[2] States with combined prison and jail systems not included.
[3] Males only
NA Not available.
... Less than 0.5 percent.

1983 Prison Population: A Summary

While the rate of increase in prison population during 1983 slowed to about half that of 1981 and 1982 (5.9% compared to 12.2% in 1981 and 12.0% in 1982), the number of inmates gained was approximately equal to the average annual growth during the preceding six years. The yearend 1983 population reached a new high of 438,830, nearly 93% of which was under the jurisdiction of State correctional systems. Males accounted for approximately 96% of the overall population.

Prison administrators and staff continued to grapple with a shortage of available housing capacity to accommodate the 1983 population. Correctional systems reported that:

The entire prison system in seven States (and all male penal facilities in one additional State) were operating under court order;

24 jurisdictions were operating one or more facilities under court order or consent decree, and 9 others had litigation pending;

18 States reported a total of nearly 8,100 sentenced prisoners held in local jails because of State prison crowding;

15 States reported 21,420 prisoners who received early release during 1983 because of crowding in State prisons;

State and Federal prison systems reported that, on the average, they were operating at about 110% of capacity; and,

1 in every 10 inmates was estimated to reside in a prison built before 1875; the average inmate resided in a prison nearly 40 years old.

In response to the dual demands to house inmates and to replace outdated facilities, substantial capital expenditures have been undertaken by correctional systems. During FY 82 and FY 83, State correctional systems reported more than $900 million in capital outlays and approximately $2.25 billion in bonds and other revenue-raising mechanisms to support capital improvements. Annual expenditures by State correctional systems during FY 83 were reported to be approaching $6 billion.●

PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of $50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of $14 million. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with my intention to see that such information is available to the full Senate, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the notifications which have been received. Any portion which is classified information has been deleted for publication, but is available to Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

The notifications follow:

DEFENSE SECURITY
ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, April 19, 1984.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding under separate cover Transmittal No. 84-42, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter of Offer to Korea for defense articles and services in excess of $14 million. Since most of the essential elements of this proposed sale are to remain classified, we will not notify the news media.

Sincerely,

GLENN A. RUDD,
Deputy Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 84-42—NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF LETTER OF OFFER PURSUANT TO SECTION 36(b) OF THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

(i)(U) Prospective purchaser: Korea.

(ii) Total estimated value: Total, $29 million.

(iii) Description of articles or services offered: A quantity of air-to-air missiles with spare parts, support equipment, a site survey, contractor technical assistance, missile maintenance training, publications, and documentation.

(iv)(U) Military Department: Navy (SBR).

(v)(U) Sales Commission, fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vi)(U) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Articles or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See attached Annex.

(vii)(U) Section 28 Report: Included in report for quarter ending December 31, 1983.

(viii)(U) Date Report Delivered to Congress: April 19, 1984.

As defined in section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

(U) This sale will contribute to the foreign policy objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country which has been and continues to be an impetus for modernization and progress in Eastern Asia. The sale of this equipment and support will enhance deterrence and contribute to the preservation of peace and stability on the Korean peninsula.

(U) The sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

(U) Implementation of this sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel to Korea; however, one contractor representative will be required in Korea for nine months.

(U) There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.

DEFENSE SECURITY
ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1984.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 84-44 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter of Offer to Canada for defense articles and services estimated to cost $113 million. Shortly after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media of the unclassified portion of this Transmittal.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C. GAST, *Director.*

TRANSMITTAL NO. 84-44.—NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF LETTER OF OFFER PURSUANT TO SECTION 36(b) OF THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

(i) Prospective purchaser: Canada.

(ii) Total Estimated Value: Major Defense Equipment,[1] $100 million; other, $13 million; Total, $113 million.

(iii) Description of Articles or Services Offered: A quantity of 408 AIM-7M SPARROW missiles, related support and training equipment, spares, repair parts, publications, support, and training.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (AIZ)

(v) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Articles or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex under separate cover.

(vii) Section 28 Report: Case not included in Section 28 report.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 2, 1984.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

CANADA—AIM-7M SPARROW MISSILES

The Government of Canada has requested the purchase of a quantity of 408 AIM-7M SPARROW missiles, related support and training equipment, spares, repair parts, publications, support, and training at an estimated cost of $113 million.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the military capabilities of Canada; furthering NATO rationalization, standardization, and interoperability; and enhancing the defenses of the Western Alliance.

The Government of Canada intends to use these AIM-7M SPARROW missiles on its CF-18 fighter aircraft.

The sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors will be the Raytheon Corporation of Lowell, Massachusetts, General Dynamics Corporation of Camden, Arkansas, and Hercules ABL of Cumberland, Maryland.

Implementation of this sale will require the assignment of one additional contractor representative to Canada for one year.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.

DEFENSE SECURITY
ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, May 2, 1984.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 84-43 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter of Offer to Canada for defense articles and services estimated to cost $41 million. Shortly after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media of the unclassified portion of this Transmittal.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C. GAST, *Director.*

TRANSMITTAL NO. 84-43.—NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF LETTER OF OFFER PURSUANT TO SECTION 36(b) OF THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Canada.

(ii) Total Estimated Value: Major Defense Equipment,[1] $37 million; other, $4 million; Total, $41 million.

(iii) Description of Articles or Services Offered: A quantity of 416 AIM-9M SIDEWINDER missiles, 40 AIM-9M-3 training missiles, 16 AIM-9M telemetry missiles, containers, related support and test equipment, spares, repair parts, and support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (AJA).

(v) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

[1] As defined in section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

[1] As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Articles or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex under separate cover.

(vii) Section 28 Report: Case not included in Section 28 report.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 2, 1984.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

CANADA—AIM-9M SIDEWINDER MISSILES

The Government of Canada has requested the purchase of a quantity of 416 AIM-9M SIDEWINDER missiles, 40 AIM-9M-3 training missiles, 16 AIM-9M telemetry missiles, containers, related support and test equipment, spares, repair parts, and support at an estimated cost of $41 million.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the military capabilities of Canada; furthering NATO rationalization, standardization, and interoperability; and enhancing the defenses of the Western Alliance.

The Government of Canada intends to use these AIM-9M SIDEWINDER missiles on its CF-18 fighter aircraft.

The sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractors will be the Raytheon Corporation of Lowell, Massachusetts, and Aeronutronic Ford of Newport Beach, California.

Implementation of this sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel or contractor representatives to Canada.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.●

ANDREW M. GREELEY

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, among the most eminent of American intellectual figures of the 20th century, few indeed have been so consistently impressive for the diversity of the fields of their accomplishment as Father Andrew M. Greeley.

Most widely known at present for his popular success as an author of four best-selling novels, Father Greeley has also established an enviable reputation as theologian, scholar, sociologist, teacher, journalist.

It happens also that the senior Senator from New York counts Father Greeley among his closest and most treasured friends. Having long admired Father Greeley for the breadth of his scholarship, the precision of his insight—and for the pleasure of his conversation when his full schedule permits—I am pleased to be able to share with my colleagues a story about this remarkable man that was published in Sunday's New York Times Magazine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of an article by Mark Harris be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, May 6, 1984]

NOVELIST, JOURNALIST, SOCIOLOGIST, PRIEST—ANDREW GREELEY

(By Mark Harris)

Father Andrew M. Greeley owns three houses—a city house in Chicago, a beach house in Michigan and a winter house in Tucson, Ariz. "Not bad," said an Arizonan, "but why isn't he back in Chicago ministering to the faithful?"

"Yes," says Father Greeley, "People seem to take offense at that. They don't realize how hard it is to have three houses. I say, 'Hey, I work awfully hard, and if you don't believe that, look at my output. If it offends you that I seem to live a life of luxury, at least consider the fact that I don't have much time to enjoy it.' "

Chicagoan in Arizona, a self-described parish priest, Andrew Greeley has not ministered full time to a parish in 20 years. He wishes he could. In Tucson, he is a weekend priest, a sometime celebrant at mass. Around the world, he ministers to a parish of millions of readers. Canonically, he is a priest of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago officially detached to scholarship, teaching and writing.

Father Greeley has chosen to serve the church by communicating through his writings for 30 years, most spectacularly since 1981 through best-selling novels to several million readers, most of them Catholics. A startling characteristic of his novels has been their daring sexual frankness.

Suddenly rich, he has really never changed his style of life. He owned the houses before he wrote the novels. "Correction," says he, "the bank owns them." The summer house in Grand Beach, Mich., is a cottage. The "house" in Chicago is actually an apartment—"three small, perfectly plain rooms" on the 47th floor of the John Hancock Center. But isn't that one of the world's great buildings? "Yes," Father Greeley agrees, "but it's not one of the world's great apartments." He requires a residence in Arizona because he teaches there.

Novelist, priest, reporter, poet, newspaper columnist, Andrew Greeley is also a tenured professor of sociology at the University of Arizona in Tucson. He no longer accepts a salary. If the royalties of his books decline, he will resume taking a salary. "I didn't become a priest to make money," he says, "and I didn't write books to make money."

When he made his first million he gave it away.

Earlier this year, in the name of his mother and father, he pledged $850,000 to the University of Chicago for a chair in Roman Catholic studies. In the same giving mood, he endowed a lectureship of $150,000 to St. Mary of the Lake Seminary in Mundelein, Ill., where he had been ordained. There he had first tried writing, an effort the then-rector had greeted with: "You're not going to publish this, are you?" The seminary, he says, has yet to thank him. He smiles.

Father Greeley recognizes that many people suppose him to be "an embarrassment" to the Roman Catholic Church, but the church has never formally rebuked or punished him for anything he has said or written.

He has been widely accused of washing clerical linen in public over the course of four novels, the most recent of which, "Lord of the Dance," has just appeared. Well, he washes linen in public when he thinks it's dirty.

The example his critics chiefly cite is his 1981 novel "The Cardinal Sins" about a high churchman in deep financial fraud. In spite of Father Greeley's denials, many people have persisted in identifying the fictional churchman as Chicago's own John Cardinal Cody, with whom Father Greeley had often battled on several issues, among them his own role in the Chicago diocese. But Father Greeley contends that his principal opposition to the late Cardinal was substantially based upon the prelate's administrative policies—in particular, his closing of four inner-city schools.

At the time of Cardinal Cody's death in 1982, his financial affairs were under investigation by a Federal grand jury, a story first reported by The Chicago Sun-Times. Certain documents that Father Greeley has claimed in court were stolen from his private archives were reported in an article in The Chicago Lawyer to reveal a plan by him to expose the Cardinal. Father Greeley has described the principal document as being a novelist's "feelings, fantasies . . . late-night, sleepy musings in a hotel in Rome." He asserts the material was stolen by James Winters, managing editor of The Notre Dame Magazine, an alumni publication, who came upon it while researching an as-yet-unpublished article about Father Greeley. Mr. Winters, who claims he reviewed Father Greeley's files with his "full knowledge and consent," has filed a $3 million libel suit charging Father Greeley with damaging his reputation as a writer. The suit is currently pending in Cook County Court in Illinois. Father Greeley has in turn filed a $5.5 million suit against Mr. Winters for "invasion of privacy, alienation of property and constructive fraud."

Until recently, Father Greeley thought it impossible that the Chicago Archdiocese would ever summon him home, but the other day he received a friendly phone call from Joseph Cardinal Bernardin. "Nothing of substance," Father Greeley reports, but it ended a long silence between him and the Chicago hierarchy. "I think I'd easily be welcomed back into the Chicago diocese if I stopped writing novels. The past could be forgiven. The present could not be forgiven. And everybody's anxious about the future.

I visited Father Greeley at his house on a rugged mountainside in Arizona. He was in good health. He swims a mile a day in his private pool. He does not smoke. He was a teetotaller, too during the first 10 years of his priesthood, "but I started going to Rome and got corrupted by wine." His voice is resonant, agreeable—a big voice out of a big chest. Now and again he punctuates a serious point by dipping for a moment into brogue. Sometimes in the same tongue he plays the role of the leprechaun—the tricky old man who knows where the treasure is hidden. And why not? For he resembles the leprechaun, his eyes impishly taking in all they can see. At 56 years of age, his face is lined and weathered, as if perhaps his eyes have seen too much. But in a Mexican restaurant in Tucson, waitresses cluster about him, eager to touch him, evidently perceiving him as handsome.

We sit later facing each other in his sunswept living room. On a wall behind him hangs a serigraph entitled "Chicago's Loop El," by an artist named Hellman. Why wasn't this priest back in Chicago ministering to the faithful?

But what is a priest? Andrew Greeley decided to become a priest when he was a child in second grade on the West Side of Chicago. Nobody ever opposed him. His

father, who earned a modest living as a broker and was a bit of a writer, died when his son was 19. The support of the family fell to Mrs. Greeley, who saw to it that her son's education was never interrrupted. Andrew Greeley has two sisters, with one of whom, the theologian Mary Jule Durkin, he frequently works closely on church-related sociological studies.

Andrew Moran Greeley, ordained in 1954, received his doctoral degree in sociology from the University of Chicago in 1962. He was 34. Efficient, speedy, thorough, highly organized, he had been a graduate student only 20 months. He has published (as well as I can count them) 67 books in 25 years at 26 publishing houses, large and small, secular and Catholic. His books cover a broad variety of subjects, such as community ethnicity, children, politics, education, love, sex, career, theology and religious "myth." His frequent use of the idea of "myth"—"The Mary Myth," "The Jesus Myth," "The Sinai Myth"—should not suggest religious debunking. By "Myth," Father Greeley means the essence of the tales of the Bible, describing God as "implacably passionate." Nothing we can do can cause God to change His/Her mind about us. This is the basis of Father Greeley's disagreement with the church on earth—not that its clergy sometimes creates scandal but that it teaches love too little and mere rule book obedience too much.

One of his books is poetry, some of his books are illustrated with his own skillful photographs and many of them are supported with groaning tables of data gathered by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) in Chicago, of which he is a senior research associate. His writing is sometimes scholarly and happily readable, sometimes peppy and vernacular, as in his syndicated newspaper column. He displays a wide acquaintance with the arts of the ages, and with poetry and literature, such as one does not often associate with the voluntary reading of a sociologist.

Publish or perish. But in 1973, the University of Chicago denied Father Greeley tenure. He had taught there 10 years. He had published 40 books. One would have imagined him qualified.

The first cause of his downfall at the University of Chicago, he believes, was his "blurred identity."

"There's a certain portion of the human race that has a hard time accepting people that blur categories," he says.

It was, according to his biographer, John N. Kotre, "the nadir of his career." Early this year, Father Greeley came back strong by endowing a chair at the school that had denied him tenure. Was this a perverse revenge? "Oh, but that would be extravagant revenge," he says. "No, it's to create a dialogue between church and scholarship. It's dialogue we need, not revenge."

Never has he allowed himself to be diverted from his calling. Cardinal Cody's denying him a Chicago parish pushed Father Greeley to the margins of the church, but never out. "On the margins I may be, but the margins are still inside. My commitment is the same as the day I was ordained. I'm a priest. I'm Catholic. It's the only church I have. At times it may not be very attractive, very efficient, or very intelligent, but I won't leave it until the day after the Pope does."

What was the true work of a priest? "I saw priests helping people. They were men to whom people felt free to go when they needed help. It was uncomplicated. A priest lived in a parish. His ministry was poor people." Years later, after he had begun to see enlarged dimensions to the idea of a priest, he envisioned women as priests, too, and championed their ordination.

At St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Andrew Greeley gathered that American Catholics were without much education and cared little for it, and he assumed that to be true. He was a good student, a serious young man who read many books, classical and modern. Essentially he was happy, and at this time of his life he was obedient. "I kept my mouth shut in the seminary. I was really very docile."

It was at this time of his life, on a summer day when he was 22, standing on the platform of an elevated station, that Andrew Greeley was transformed by a revelation—not precisely a religious revelation, not even a miracle, only a new image of himself. He had formed friendships that summer with young Irish Catholic men attending the University of Chicago, one of the world's notable secular institutions, and had been impressed by their acquaintance with radical ideas never admitted to St. Mary of the Lake. "It was my turning point," he says. "I realized that the Catholic world in which I was going to be a priest in a few years was to be an astonishingly different world from the world I'd grown up in, and I thought I ought to prepare myself for it because they certainly weren't preparing me for it in the seminary."

Thirty years later he recalled the event with undiminished vexation. "What they'd been doing at the seminary was training functionaries for a social institution that had not changed and would not change. Only it did change. We were about to live through one of the most historically interesting and important interludes in the history of the Catholic heritage. For some of us this was enormously exciting."

Andrew Greeley went on to become a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, as he had always meant to be. He also became something else, something he had not quite counted on: a member of the first modern generation of American Catholic intellectuals. "I didn't understand how different the Catholic world was going to be, I didn't understand the directions of the difference. But I knew it was going to be different."

Father Greeley's first parish was his last. He was there for 10 years. Instead of the "cap and sweater" people he had expected to serve, he found himself in the midst of plenty at Christ the King parish in the southwest corner of Chicago. "I knew theoretically that American Catholicism was changing . . . but I was totally unprepared," he later wrote in "Nothing But a Loud-Mouthed Irish Priest," "to find myself dropped into the middle of what quite obviously was the parish of the future. . . . Here it was not only possible for all the young people to go to college, it was unthinkable that they should not. Here the Americanization of the Catholic immigrant groups was entering its last phase. The Irish had arrived."

Vastly significant was the fact that affluence and education did not decrease interest in the Church but instead spurred the growth of the parish church as a center for learning and culture, apart from its place as a house of worship. It was at Christ the King that Father Greeley identified the young Catholics whom he would later call "the new breed." They believe, he wrote in a widely read article in America magazine, that "all issues, minor or major, must be brought into the open and discussed. . . . They are appalled when their honesty is taken as disrespect and their desire to discuss is understood as disobedience. * * * They think that they are being much more open with their superiors than those who comply with an external show of docility." He was describing not only his young parishioners but himself.

Until then, he had been a closet writer, partly because he had never carried in his head the image of a priest as writer. "I really did just stumble into it quite by chance," Father Greeley says. "I discovered that I could do it reasonably well, and I enjoyed it. Once you begin, it's like dope."

His work came to the attention of an editor at Sheed & Ward, who encouraged Father Greeley, then 31 years old, to make a book of his experiences, which was published in 1959 as "The Church and the Suburbs."

His first work carried the imprimatur—"free of doctrinal or moral error"—of Albert G. Meyer, then Archbishop of Chicago and later a cardinal, who was soon to actively enter Father Greeley's life as the first and best intellectual supporter he was to know among the church hierarchy. The Archbishop would later enter Father Greeley's novel, "The Cardinal Sins," as the valuable and admirable mentor to the young priest Kevin, like Father Greeley, one of the new breed of Catholic intellectuals.

Sponsored by Cardinal Meyer, Father Greeley was reassigned to the parish of St. Thomas the Apostle, near the University of Chicago. No longer a parish priest in the sense that he had envisioned as a schoolboy, his duty now consisted of an obligation to extend his intellect, deepen his comprehension and serve his church with everything he could carry to it of knowledge or information.

In order to push forward his work on his doctoral dissertation in sociology, Father Greely formed an association with the Chicago-based National Opinion Research Center. Over the years, through NORC's facilities for data gathering, Father Greeley was to learn many things about life in general, American Catholic life in particular and, finally about himself and his "blurred identity."

His doctoral study began as "an attempt to find out why Catholics weren't going to graduate school and were not choosing academic careers." With questionnaires, he surveyed 33,000 students in 135 colleges and learned, almost instantly, that the assumption with which he had begun was groundless: Catholic students were as ambitious as those in any other religious group, and as deeply involved in academic studies. As the data began to assume shape, Father Greeley received a memorable note from a colleague at NORC: "Looks like Notre Dame beat Southern Methodist this year."

Everything he had suspected at Christ the King parish was apparently manifest all over America. The church of the obedient seminarian had become the "informal, voluntaristic, open-ended" church characterized by youth, intellect, logical skepticism, language, learning and democratic participation.

For personal excitement it was unbeatable. The investigator was also the subject. "I was living in the changes the data were showing," says Father Greeley. "My flesh was already on the statistical skeleton."

Over the years, data gave a basis to vision. By 1979 he could write the bottom line with some satisfaction in The Annual Review of Sociology. Irish Catholics "are actually the

most successful Gentile ethnic group in America," and "second only to Jews in income, occupational prestige and education."

Father Greeley—Dr. Greeley—traveled a little and wrote a lot. His books tumbled into the world. People began to say of him that he had never had an unpublished thought.

He tended not to hold his tongue. He once said of priests and religious educators that they "are presently completely uninterested in theology." He felt that his criticism was amiable and professional. He was frequently startled to hear cries of indignation from the objects of his evaluation.

With a subsidy from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Father Greeley led the staff of NORC in a study in 1969 of attitudes among American priests, from whom the bishops had lately felt themselves at a nervous distance. Fifteen to 20 percent of newly ordained priests had left their callings over the last decade. That much was known.

A 46-page questionnaire was distributed to 7,500 clergy, whose responses overwhelmingly rejected Pope Paul VI's encyclical on artificial birth control, "Humanae Vitae," and supported American parishioners in their rejection to it. In numbers proportionate to their differences on birth control, the priests polled also opposed the bishops on questions of celibacy and divorce.

When Father Greeley carried the results of the NORC survey to a committee meeting of the bishops, his findings were received with hostility by men whose isolation he had statistically verified. "When the presentation was complete," he later wrote, "not a single question was asked, not a single word said. All the faces around the table were grim and stony." He had raised questions the bishops preferred not to discuss.

"I could have done two things," Father Greeley said, according to The National Catholic Reporter. "One was just sit back and let them destroy the study. Or I could have chosen to fight them—which I did. In either case, they were through with me." After he made his final report, Father Greeley declared the impossibility of a scholar's working with the bishops with "any standards of professional self-respect." As a closing salute, he described the "present leadership of the church" as "morally, intellectually and religiously bankrupt." Now he was swept onto the margins of his church.

Personal difficulty pursued him farther. The University of Chicago denied him tenure. When he had begun his graduate work, academic tenure was not a concern. His church was his tenure. But now he began to feel with full force the effect of his blurred identity. "What they'd say they said is that I wasn't a very good sociologist. Or they'd say, 'How can you be serious when you write as much as you do?' I should never have gotten into it. I discovered that academics live up to their principles about as well as priests do."

However, his rejection by the department of sociology had followed a prolonged struggle among its fiercely divided members. More than a decade later, the then-occupant of the chair of sociology, Morris Janowitz declined to discuss the matter, saying, "It's too painful. It would reopen too many wounds."

Some of his former colleagues recently assessed Father Greeley's standing as a sociologist in terms ranging from unequivocal praise to critical skepticism. "Andy puts it to the fact that he was a professed Catholic," says James S. Coleman, a longstanding member of the department and the principal author of the 1966 landmark study of segregated education. "It wasn't quite that way, but if he hadn't been a priest, or if his work had been completely outside Catholic schools or religion, or if his personal style had been a little less cantankerous, he'd have been accepted. There's no question about his present status as a sociologist. He's well-regarded in the discipline. He does quite good data analysis and his empirical work is quite solid." Professor Coleman is currently collaborating with Father Greeley on a study of the effects of Catholic high schools on minority students.

"It was his style," Professor Coleman concludes. "That's what the trouble was. Andy's his own worst enemy in the sense that if something goes wrong he'll fire off an angry letter to someone."

Another former colleague indicated that the department has always felt that it has some kind of collective responsibility for what its members say. "You know, Andy writes so much, it stands against him as well as for him. There was something about him of showmanship and bluster. He always lived the good life. But then, he hadn't taken vows of poverty, had he?"

Turning things over in his memory, the professor says, "He was a good teacher. He showed up. He was prepared. Some of the people at Chicago were piqued by his Catholic advocacy. They'd say, 'We don't push our case, don't push yours,' But everyone to some extent pushes his own case, doesn't he? The closer you come to the Catholic community, the more relevant his work is. He wanted to establish the authenticity of Catholic ethnic culture. He wasn't the New Left, he wasn't the Old Left, he wasn't the Socialist Left, he wasn't a Marxist out of the French, he wasn't a trendy Maoist. He should have been a part of the Jesuits. He was an attractive fellow, an enormously gracious fellow."

Whatever he was, Andrew Greeley failed of perfect identity. He became that rarity, a free-lance priest. He was 45 years old and he had burned big bridges behind him.

Five years after the disappointment of the tenure decision at Chicago, his biographer John Kotre published "The Best of Times, the Worst of Times: Andrew Greeley and American Catholicism, 1950–1975." When Father Greeley read the book, he says, he was "really sleepless for several nights" contemplating those "trajectories" of his life which it revealed to him. He was now, with unfamiliar clarity, where he had been, what he had tried to do and the nature of that fate which, at the worst moments of his depression, he called failure.

In 1978, the year of Kotre's book, Andrew Greeeley was appointed with tenure to a professorship in the department of sociology at the University of Arizona. He acquired the Tucson house, moving in with his memories, grateful, restless and rueful, replaying in this mind scenarios of recent bitter dramas. Here be began what became known as his "stories."

Although he had written a bit of fiction over the years, his essential work had been in other forms. How did one go about it? "If I'd had time I'd have taken some courses in creative writing." But he was 50 years old and didn't have forever. He learned to hypnotize himself, which he says "put me in touch with the imagery of my past. It made the early years of my life far more vivid. It almost compelled me to want to get everything down on paper. It was now or never, and I plunged."

Did he mean that self-hypnotism exposed his subconscious to Him? "No, I'd rather say it permitted things to come to my consciousness that I would not necessarily have adverted to." This is marvelous understatement. A priest is "a man like any other," Father Greeley has contended, "but with special commitments." When a priest, or any man, commits himself to fiction writing he will soon have "adverted to" scenes and events formerly unexplored. He will draw for the scenes of his fictional action upon the experiential capital of his life.

Fiction about priests had tradionally presented them as kind, gentle, sympathetic, sentimental. The model had been Bing Crosby whistling a merry tune. In his novels, however, Father Greeley appears at first glance to have plundered all ecclesiastical privacy, exhibiting priests and prelates possessed of all the passions for powers, riches and sex, whether in the archdiocese of Chicago, where Father Greeley has lived, or at the Vatican, where he has often visited.

The author's listing opposite the title page of Father Greeley's new 401-page novel, "Lord of the Dance," names three earlier "stories" by him: "The Cardinal Sins," "Thy Brother's Wife" and "Ascent Into Hell."

The first of these appeared in 1981 and has sold about three million copies, hardbound and paperback—roughly 12 times the aggregate sales of his first 63 books. These "stories" are not, in fact, his first novels, but the early attempts, in his words, have "vanished."

The immense popular reception for his books amazed him. With sums of money beyond every self-expectation came bruising criticism, deepening the ambiguity of his blurred identity. He was now known as the priest who wrote dirty books. The words most often used to describe his novels have been "steamy" and "trash." A Chicago Sun-Times book reviewer wrote: "The Cardinal Sins' is enough to give trash a bad name." He was accused of exploiting sex for bucks.

The charges dizzied him. "This priest knows nothing about sex," went one. "How does this priest know so much about sex?" went another, paradoxically. He was a figure of curiosity for the media, which badgered him with repetitive questions: "Why did you write that novel? What's your relationship to the bishop? What's the church's reaction to you? What do you do with the money?"

Among discerning readers of literature, Andrew Greeley's name sounded a faintest bell—best-selling authors come and go. And in fact, on my own first reading of an Andrew Greeley novel, I perceived him as a rough-and-ready novelist, light on style. His characters had little depth to them. Their dialogue was unconvincing. Often it seemed that the author stifled the growth of his characters in the interest of an insistent message whether or not the message was consistent with the characters' probable direction. His books had so many plots and subplots I couldn't remember the beginning when I reached the end. The defects of his books were the result, I supposed, of their having been written in haste.

Through his novels moved hero-priests modeled, I supposed, on the author. Unlike clear sinners, they remained true to their vows to celibacy, never stole money, never lusted to be Pope or President. The spotless author employing his novels to justify his

life was an old spectacle, and I blamed his transparency upon Father Greeley's having come so late to the complex craft.

He himself has described literature as "an art where every reader is his own critic." To me, he said, "Who's to say what literature is? I don't know what literature is."

Andrew Greeley does not read his books as either autobiograhical or topical. He does not think of his readers as "market" or his books as "product." He locates his books in ancient religious tradition.

In notes to his novels, he has tried to explain to his readers how a religious experience may arise from seemingly worldly fiction. An early note appeared as an afterword to the paperbound edition of "The Cardinal Sins." For that novel he wrote:

" 'Why would a priest write a novel,?' I am frequently asked. The answer is simple: Stories have always been the best way to talk about religion because stories appeal to the emotions and the whole personality and not just to the mind. Jesus told parables; the authors of the David and Joseph cycles and the Song of Songs in the Jewish scriptures, for example, also told stories. Both Jesus, and the earlier story-tellers did not try to edify with their stories. Rather, their tales were about secular events—kings and generals, women, family feuds, passionate love affairs, farmers, treasure hunters, merchants going on journeys, crooked judges, wedding feasts, gardeners, women taken in adultery."

If Father Greeley's novels have noble purposes they also have intricate designs. He cites their structures, their historical parallels, their classical borrowing and their calculated symbols. Indeed, in his newest book, "Lord of the Dance," the third of his Passover Trilogy, the action replicates the return of Jesus from the dead and the consummation of His marriage to "His spouse, the church." Old poetry and new sprinkled among his pages illuminate his intention.

At first he is astonished that I had not made these connections for myself, but then admits, "It's a somewhat subtle point. I leaned over too far to avoid pointing to the religious." He had been surprised, he says, "how much publishers and editors let me get away with the theological themes," adding with a touch of perplexity, "Maybe they don't catch them, maybe they're not aware they're there."

Each time a new novel is published or new editions of older novels are issued, hundreds of people sit down to write letters to Father Greeley. He replies at least briefly to each reader.

Recently I read about 500 of those letters. They came mostly, not entirely, from Catholics of all ages and stations for whom the Greeley novels are the first expression they have encountered of feelings they secretly harbored about the church in which they were raised, for which they held high hope, which somehow disappointed them and to which those who have fallen away desire to return. One priest humanized restores all religion.

A female convert to Catholicism from Salt Lake City wrote to congratulate Father Greeley on his "writings about priests . . . people like me used to put them up on a pedestal . . . considering them above reproach or temptation. After reading your novels, it has finally come to me that priests are, first and above all—people."

Many of the letters are confessions from readers who, having sinned, seem to receive the novels of Father Greeley as absolution. The schemes of his novels reveal a moral system that makes modern sense to them. They do not view the "good" hero-priest as necessarily good or heroic, nor do they see him, as I did, as merely Father Greeley prettified. They recognize him as sinner-priest, for he is rigid and prideful. He is aloof, hyperresponsible, and therefore, unnatural. He is hidden and remote, intent upon earning God's love.

It is the "bad" priest who is recognized by Father Greeley's readers as most real because he is most like them. He surrenders to fleshly weakness without losing God's love, for God loves everyone. God's love need not be "earned." God is not a moralist but an "implacably passionate" deity. We are all part of God's design. God draws straight with crooked lines.

"Life," according to Father Greeley, "needs more joy, more love, more celebration, and that means more justice. Life might be a wedding feast. We've been given an invitation to a great party and we're crazy not to go."

His readers apparently understand, without literary coaching, how to read his works. One must, for example, read the title "The Cardinal Sins" as a pun. It is not so much a topical book about a sinning cardinal as about the cardinal sins and their sources in human beings. Those actions that are the evil in us, the foreword to "The Cardinal Sins" tells us, emanate from "fundamental goodness running out of control, from human love that is confused and frightened and not trusting enough of love."

Most of Father Greeley's readers had never heard such things from their own parish priests. A woman in Canada wrote: "I have always felt I had to earn God's love & forgiveness & have seen him as Judge rather than Lover. Thank you for new insights."

For these readers, the memory of the church's teachings is only of thou-shalt-nots and punishment: "You made me glad that I decided to remain a Catholic, even though the Church has 10,000 stupid rules. * * * But the criticism is needed. How else could it ever become better and reach its people who are crying out to someone to help us find God in our everyday lives."

From a Catholic theologian: "I never fail to profit from your works and consider you a singular blessing to the church in the United States. * * * You always say what I am thinking."

A nurse, "mother of three, brought up in a poor Irish Catholic Ghetto in the Dorchester section of Boston" writes: "You make these difficult theological premises so easy to understand. * * * You have helped greatly to see God's will for me."

Hour after hour, I read Father Greeley's letters. They dissolved his "blurred identity." He is a parish priest. And there his ministry is. In his mailbox.●

MARTHA GRAHAM: HAPPY BIRTHDAY AND THANKS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, were this Japan, and had we the possibility of naming individuals, "living national treasures," I would petition that such an honor be bestowed on Martha Graham.

Martha Graham choreographed the awakening of dance in the United States. Her work and life have graced our civilization and nurtured and advanced dance as an art form and discipline.

Today is Martha Graham's 90th birthday, and I can think of no more appropriate person to pay her homage than her friend, Agnes de Mille. Accordingly, I ask to have printed in the RECORD her "Tribute."

The tribute follows:

IN TRIBUTE

(By Agnes de Mille)

Martha Graham is the most famous of the Denishawn students. She is probably the greatest American choreographer and stands high among the great performing theater personalities of our time. A teacher of inspirational force as well, and an international cultural influence in fields beyond her immediate profession, she is one of the rare people in dance history who have created new styles and techniques of moving.

Her invention is prodigious; like Picasso's, her art has changed deeply in style and technique many times during her career. For every new work there was not only a new design in steps, but a new concept in technique and dynamics, a restudying of the basis of movement. No other choreographer has attempted this.

She unquestionably was influenced at first by St. Denis' Oriental studies and she ackowledges her debt in point of view. But the heritage goes deeper. The use of the ground, the kneeling, squatting, rising and sinking, which is an essential part of Oriental dancing and found nowhere in any Western form, she incorporated into her style. She also appropriated the oriental use of the foot, the shifting and sliding on the earth, the curling in of the toes to act as a hinge.

But she is no imitator or adaptor. She is an original, a generic force. There was never anything quite like her before, and everyone who comes after will dance a little differently.

In classic ballet, dance movement had hitherto consisted of moving from position to position, raising or lowering the feet, bending smoothly, going from place to place, always serenely, always lightly. The internal workings of the action, the machinery and combustion, were carefully hidden, and only the lovely results were shown. Martha Graham exposed the engineering, the effort. Life, she said, is effort. She realized also that the resolution of movement was as important as the spasm, that movement had a cycle, flowed to a climax, and ebbed away in relaxation.

She threw aside all the traditional steps and techniques of ballet, the straight long leg, the pointed toe, the quiet even hips, the flexed foot, the relaxed hand. She stressed continuous unfolding movement from a central core, as in all Oriental movement, but she added spasms and resistance, which are not characteristic of the East at all.

She incorporated the ground, making the floor a partner of movement in a manner of far greater virtuosity than anything found elsewhere. She invented many beautiful falls and recoveries from the ground. She discovered a whole technique of balancing on bent knees, with her thighs as a hinge and the spine cantilevered and suspended in counter balance. She invented turns with a changing and swinging body axis.

At first it seemed she was speaking in a language we had not inherited and one quite unintelligible to most of us, but in reality her dance was far closer to natural acting than ballet dancing. It was not a realistic imitation of emotion, as in acting, how-

ever, it was an imaginative expansion of acting. Children today who have not been trained in a balletic heritage find her style sympathetic and easy to understand.

She began working like Isadora Duncan on a bare stage with only costumes and lights, striving to break all the old romantic molds. Later, she added scenic and costume effects of great imaginative beauty. Her music was contemporary and much of it was composed to order.

She has always been daring as to subject matter and collaborators, prefiguring many theater vogues and introducing through her works a number of unknowns who became famous, such as composer Aaron Copland and sculptor Isamu Noguchi.

She inaugurated several stage techniques that were taken for granted later: mobile scenery, symbolic props and set pieces, speech with dancing, the chorus of commenting dancers as in the Orient. And she was the first to integrate her group racially, using Asians and Negroes in the regular company.

Her costumes have had a marked influence on dress style, both on and off the stage. The straight, dark, longskirted costume and the leotard, replacing the ballet tutu or folk dress, were her invention. The accepted work uniform today for all dancers, ballet and modern, has become the Graham leotard. The American ballet students wear it with traditional tights and point shoes, and the Europeans are gradually adopting it also. No ballet student anywhere in America works in tutu and bloomers. The leotard has become ubiquitous in civil life.

Historically speaking, Graham has had as forceful an impact on all branches of the contemporary theater as Duncan. Technically, in terms of invented and added steps and style, hers is the greatest single life contribution in the records of dancing. Her dance dramas compare with the work of America's greatest playwrights.

In the words of William Schuman, the composer who was president of New York's Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, at the ninth annual Capezio Dance Award Luncheon honoring Martha Graham:

She has created an original vocabulary of dance movement that has added a new dimension to the expressivity of the choreographic art. She has been gloriously incapable, ever, of being slight, captious or superficial. Her works—whether tragic or comic—always probe, distill, and illuminate. She continues to create with undiminished zeal. Each new work brings the excitement of discovery of previously unexplored facets of her endlessly fertile imagination.

"For these reasons she has achieved a position which is not adequately to be described solely as one of pre-eminence in her field. For whether we speak of the world of Dance, of Music, of Literature, or of the Graphic Arts, Martha Graham is one of the greatest artists America has ever produced."

Nothing stops Graham, age nor change of country nor condition. She no longer dances as she once did, but her stage presence still is oceanic and each year sees new works of originality and invention. Graham seems to live at the fountainhead, and what she expresses foretells our passion and our intent.

Graham maintains a school in New York and teaches master courses. Her annual season on Broadway is the object of pilgrimages from all over the Americas, indeed, from all parts of the world. Her present company, in points of execution, style, and finesse of presentation, places her theater on a par with the great historic companies—with the Diaghilev troupe in its heyday, and with the Grand Kabuki of Japan. It is unquestionably the most stylish theater we in America have evolved and should, hopefully, be taken over by the government and preserved as the basis for an enduring national institution.●

HEALTH CARE COORDINATION ACT OF 1983—S. 1614

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor S. 1614, the Health Care Coordination Act of 1983, introduced by my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Health care costs have risen dramatically in recent years. Yet many legislative proposals designed to arrest this increase have neglected both the beneficiary and the quality of health care. I support S. 1614 because it not only addresses the problem of the high and increasing cost of health care, but it also helps those most adversely affected by these costs, the elderly poor.

The Health Care Coordination Act takes the responsible step of allowing States to implement coordinated programs of acute and long-term care for beneficiaries who quality for both medicaid and medicare. By allowing the combination of medicare and medicaid for the first time, the program will be able to provide more services for those elderly who qualify.

The most common complaint about the medicare program is that it does not cover long-term care. Over $40 billion was spent for long-term care for 1982, $27 billion of which went for nursing home care alone. Medicaid accounts for 90 percent of all public funds for long-term care. The Health Care Coordination Act would combine the advantages of both medicaid and medicare and remove the perverse incentives that shift costs between the two programs. This will be possible because the States will administer the program. The State or a designated health care provider will be able to offer additional services and, if necessary, charge enrollment, fees, cost sharing, or premiums with approval of the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS). Neither the States nor any of the 4 million eligible enrollees would be obligated to join this program.

Most importantly, this program would be, at worst budget neutral. Medicare payments for eligible enrollees would be capped and the States, as administrators, would be required to assure the Secretary of HHS that the Federal Government will not exceed the total costs which would have been incurred by the State and Federal Governments if the program were not in effect. Significant savings will be made by avoiding unnecessary hospitalization. Whereas the average home care or community care stay costs $50 to $60 per day on the average, the average cost for a day in a hospital is well over $200. Billions have been spent on needless hospital stays. S. 1614 is a rational initiative toward correcting such unnecessary spending.

Medicare and medicaid together will cost the Federal Government over $80 billion for this fiscal year. Medicaid will cost State governments about $20 billion. Both programs are growing faster than inflation. In addition, elderly persons comprise the fastest growing segment of the population, In fact, the 85-plus population grew by 165 percent between 1960 to 1982. Health care resources for the elderly are financially strained and deteriorating. A comprehensive restructuring of our health systems seems inevitable. S. 1614 would be an essential step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this legislation and I urged its quick passage.

Thank you, Mr. President.●

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION—S. 430, TSONGAS BILL

● Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor S. 430, introduced by Senator TSONGAS, which would prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

This legislation represents a step forward on this Nation's long march toward equality and justice for all our citizens. The principle behind this legislation is a simple one: Sexual orientation is a purely private matter, which should have no bearing on individual performance in the workplace.

For some time, I have been a supporter of Federal legislation banning employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. I am now persuaded that the Tsongas bill represents the most reasonable, fair, and effective way to bar discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in employment. This bill clearly states that this form of discrimination is offensive to fundamental notions of equity—and that the best way to deter it lies in legislation adopted at the Federal level.

If the personal privacy of employees is to be protected, employers must be given no reason to inquire into the sexual orientation of their employees. For that reason, this bill has a number of provisions that should insure that employers need not inquire into their employee's sexual orientation. Thus, the bill strictly prohibits quotas based on employee's sexual orientation, and bars a finding of discrimination based soley on the fact that an employer employs fewer persons with a particular sexual orientation than are found in the population at large.

I have also expressed some concern, given the present political climate, about opening the Civil Rights Act on the floor of the Senate. Would this lead, for example, to legal restrictions on affirmative action? Or religious liberty? Since 1964, however, the Civil Rights Act has been opened a number of times—without the adverse consequences many fear. Groups representing women and black communities are in firm support of this legislation, in spite of the concern that opening the Civil Rights Act might produce legal restrictions harmful to the interests of blacks or women.

Moreover, even the strongest proponents of this measure recognize that floor action in the Congress is unlikely anytime soon. It may take years before this legislation is enacted into law. Cosponsorship now reflects my support of the principle that employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation should not be countenanced.

Mr. President, when enacted, the Tsongas bill will remove a major legal obstacle to the realization of our national goal of equal opportunity for all.●

AN EMERGENCY CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, last Friday, Dr. John R. Silber, president of Boston University, gave the law day address before a group of Boston University alumni.

As I am sure my colleagues know, in addition to being president of Boston University, Dr. Silber was a very distinguished member of the Kissinger Commission. The address he gave last Friday, entitled "Central America and the War Powers Act: An Emerging Constitutional Crisis," is a very thought-provoking piece, which I should like to share with my colleagues. Therefore, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE WAR POWERS ACT: AN EMERGING CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

(By John R. Silber)

The United States stands alone in the world as a nation in which foreign policy is a matter of constant and often embittered public controversy, not merely between the party in office and its opponents, but within the parties themselves, and even within the party controlling the executive branch. One reason for this is doubtless the lack of party discipline characteristic of presidential government structured by the doctrine of separated powers. In the United Kingdom, if parliamentarians of the ruling party assault its foreign policy, success is likely to mean a general election and a possible loss of the assailant's seat. And so it is only in such moments of supreme crisis as the military and political collapse of France in May 1940 or the 1956 Suez invasion that a British prime minister cannot count on the support of his own party. In this country, by contrast, opposing your own president is as likely to increase as to reduce your chances for re-election.

Moreover, although Americans are notorious for self-criticism, most Americans believe themselves and their country to be basically good, and thus what is most often said in criticism of our foreign policy is not that it is evil, but that it is inept or incoherent; well-meaning, perhaps, but blundering. It is widely believed that with more thoughtfulness, more foresight and consistency, a good President ought to be able to straighten things out. We tend to believe that next time around, or the time after that, we will do better.

The fault is neither in our national character nor in the character of our leaders; nor can we afford to wait until we perfect ourselves. No president—Democratic or Republican—however farsighted and decisive he may be, can formulate or maintain an effective and consistent foreign policy in the present circumstances. These circumstances comprise an increasing external challenge and a series of congressionally mandated restraints on the executive branch. Together they provide a dangerous whipsaw which has rendered American foreign policy ineffective and erratic. The situation in Central America provides a current and critical example.

Dominated by Cuba, following the Cuban example of totalitarian government, military *macho*, economic decline, and clientage of the geopolitical ambitions of the Soviet Union, Nicaragua has embarked on a course of jabbing, at the expense of the freedom and well-being of its people, the giant to the north. Thus the Kissinger Commission concluded that Nicaragua, recipient of more than 15,000 tons of Soviet and Eastern Bloc war materiel in 1983 alone, "serves as a base of subversion through overland infiltration of people and supplies than can affect" all of Central America (p. 93). It provides a safe haven for Salvadoran terrorists and their leaders, provides radio facilities to help them coordinate their attacks, and participates in the Soviet-Cuban spy network that now blankets all of the Caribbean. Nicaragua is training an army five times larger than any other in Central America, an army which threatens peaceful countries such as Costa Rica, a democracy without an army, and Panama, soon to be responsible for the security of the canal. The leadership of both countries are convinced that sooner or later they will be invaded.

Addressing the Kissinger Commission, President Suazo Cordova of Honduras said: "The regime established [in] Nicaragua [poses] a threat to the rest of Central America in two ways: first, because of its constant harassment and sponsorship of violence and terror in the area and second because of the disproportionate size of its military establishment, which has upset the balance of power. This balance must now be restored. Our neighbors have become a serious problem, and for that reason we need a susbtantial increase in our internal defenses to protect our sovereignty and our historical and cultural heritage."

Yet extraordinarily, it is the United States, not Nicaragua, not Cuba, not the Soviet Union, which stands accused before the World Court of violating international law. The Soviets invaded Afghanistan, the Cubans and Nicaraguans supply the FMLN, and it is the United States which must publicly reject the jurisdiction of a court which it has long supported. And we become more and more divided against ourselves in a welter of accusations and counter-accusations. Not just the President, but our country as a whole is being whipsawed. And if half of the impetus for the whipsaw is the increasing strategic and military and propaganda power of our enemies, the other half comes from within, and is traceable to the violation of a fundamental principle of the U.S. Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution wrestled for a long time with the problem of how to restrain power without negating it. Their answer was a system of checks and balances, in which the Constitution assigns the power to conduct foreign policy, and, deriving from this, the role of Commander in Chief, to the Executive Branch of the government. Congress, as a deliberative and legislative body, is to share in the determination of foreign policy, but the President is to be responsible for its conduct. There is no more remarkable example of this in our history than the fact that the Fort Sumter crisis occurred with Congress out of session. President Lincoln conducted the opening stages of the Civil War as a purely executive act, and when, immediately after Fort Sumter, he called Congress into special session, he gave it 80 days to assemble. During the interim, he called up the militia, initiated the blockade of southern ports, raised an army of 300,000 volunteers and authorized the suspension of habeas corpus. It is doubtful that he could have gotten most of these actions through Congress in the form of legislation, although when it met on July 4, 1861, Congress tacitly approved his faits accomplis.

This separation of powers continued essentially unaltered until a decade ago. But beginning with the War Powers Act of 1973, we have arrived at a situaton where separation of powers is no longer in full operation. The provisions of the War Powers Act deprive the President of the power to back his diplomacy with military action short of an all-out, declared war. Confronting challenges of the sort posed by Nicaragua and El Salvador, the President has only three choices, all of them bad: He can do nothing; he can declare war; or he can try to find his way through a thicket of legal restraints that impede his decisions and that almost inevitably give rise to accusations of illegal conduct. President Reagan presumably rejected the first two options when faced with the situation in Nicaragua; and the whipsaw caught him.

To understand why any President—Republican or Democratic—will be ineffective in the conduct of foreign policy, we must examine how the executive's hands have been tied by a group of laws, amendments, and continuing resolutions which place too much responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy, especially the military aspects of it, in the hands of a deliberative, rather than an executive body. The constitutionality of many of these measures has yet to be thoroughly tested, and it is high time that we test them. But it is even more important to understand their effect on our foreign policy, and to look at the ways in which that deliberative body has chosen to use its power.

The War Powers Act of 1973 was a drastic response to the Vietnam war. It was passed over the veto of the President, and to many it seemed like a good idea at the time. President Johnson had tried to conduct a major and protracted was as if it were a minor police action. Congress was complicit in this error, and by the end of the war, the overwhelming majority of Americans were convinced that the conduct of the war had been

a serious mistake, albeit they had diverse and contradictory reasons for their conclusion. However, by limiting the President's ability to deploy U.S. forces, the War Powers Act essentially put control of crucial U.S. military actions into the hands of the Congress. The effects of this, perhaps unforseeable in 1973, are all too clear now. In a world in which subversion, terrorism, and constantly changing geostrategic pressures are the rule, the U.S. Congress must now be consulted, "in every possible instance," in advance, on the deployment of our military forces. Troops may not be introduced any where outside of U.S. without full reports being made to Congress within 48 hours. The President may not have troops for more than 90 days in any area where hostilities are ongoing or imminent without explicit approval from Congress.

This means that, simply by doing nothing, Congress can force the President to withdraw U.S. troops within 90 days. It means that, short of declaring war, Congress must pass a bill announcing exactly how long and on what terms U.S. troops will be allowed to remain somewhere. It means that, in an area of foreign policy in which secrecy is often essential, publicity is mandatory. It means that essentially military considerations have become, unavoidably, political issues. This has its effect both on the President, who must consider, not the efficacy of his actions, but their effect on Congress, and on Congress itself, as a consequence of its having assumed a role in the conduct of foreign policy. Rarely, if ever, in the history of the U.S., has there been more divisiveness, more striking of inconsistent poses, and more downright confusion about foreign policy than there is now. In this election year, not only the determination, but the conduct of foreign policy has become a political football.

The War Powers Act has been joined by a host of perpetual and ad hoc restrictions on the President's power to act effectively. Since 1978, for example, it has been illegal to sell anti-personnel weapons to El Salvador. Thus the Salvadoran army either buys the weapons it needs from elsewhere, or uses U.S. rockets designed to stop a single tank against guerrilla fighters, who are not known for their tendency to stand in groups.

Sections have been added to the Foreign Assistance Act which sharply restrict security assistance to countries whose human rights record does not meet our standards, even if such assistance is in our national interest, and even if the denial of that assistance leads to the abrogation of all human rights as a consequence of a Marxist victory. (Had the FAA been on the books in 1942, it would have ruled out lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union.) This act prevents our helping Costa Rica strengthen its security forces because they are all technically police. The FAA also effectively prohibits our being able to assist with legal reforms in El Salvador.

Perhaps most damaging to an effective foreign policy, however, has been the unwillingness on the part of Congress to recognize that secrecy plays an essential part in the conduct of international affairs. This results in an inescapable contradiction. When the details of our covert support for the Nicaraguan freedom fighters are the subject of editorials in the newspapers, and openly debated in Congress, the question of whether our support should be convert or overt is answered: it must be overt because it cannot be covert. Or rather, we must attempt to operate by oxymoron: We must be either overtly covert, or covertly overt. Either contradiction describes the case, and leaves us open to tendentious and ideologically motivated prosecution under international law. The Nicaraguans, while supporting terrorists in neighboring countries, have the sense to deny that they are doing so.

The Clark Amendment of 1976 was an early milestone in making the covert overt: It forbids the President to provide "assistance of any kind" which would promote, "directly or indirectly," the "capacity of any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual to conduct military or paramilitary operations in Angola" without submitting detailed plans to Congress. The Amendment gave free play to Castro, who was not inhibited by any similar amendment passed by a Cuban Congress.

The Boland amendment followed up on this by further restricting the President's options with regard to a specific country: it specifically forbade either the Department of Defense or the CIA from assisting any group for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Nicaragua. The tangled web of legal and constitutional issues was revealed in its full confusion in 1983 when the House debated the covert/overt issue and made this topic a major item for newspapers and television.

None of this is to argue that Congress should not determine our foreign policy, or that Congressional Committees should not be consulted and informed on the actions taken by the State Department. The determination of foreign policy must be, as the framers of the Constitution intended, a matter for voting and for debate by the peoples' representatives. The goals of our foreign policy must be an expression of our national will. But this requires, first of all, that Congress provide leadership rather than politically-motivated second-guessing, and that the conduct of foreign policy be decisive, flexible, coherent, and resourceful. The current situation is highly deficient in each of these qualities.

These issues involve national survival. To limit the President to a policy choice of either doing nothing or declaring war denies him adequate tools for the conduct of diplomacy. Yet this is precisely the choice now imposed upon him. The result is that there is not a power in the world, from Upper Volta to the Soviet Union, that does not use clandestine force—except the United States. The consequences of this policy may well be national suicide, as we reach the point where we signal to our enemies the message that we cannot draw a line until they land on our beaches and that there is consequently almost no limit to how far they can go.

There is a clear historical parallel in the rise of Nazi Germany, in which Hitler, through a series of small increments, made himself master of Europe. He began by remilitarizing the Rhineland in violation of the Treaty of Versailles. He was in no position to maintain his occupation against military force, but France and Britain did nothing. He next annexed Austria. The allies chose to regard this action as one affecting only Germans. Thus far, Hitler proceeded with their silent acquiescence. When he came to annex the Sudetenland, he acquired their active complicity at the Munich Conference. By the time he occupied the remains of Chechoslovakia, he no longer needed their approval. He cannot be blamed in thinking that he could succeed in taking Poland without opposition, for nothing in the behavior of Britain and France suggested that either country was prepared to draw a line—or rather, that when Hitler stepped up to the line, they would not erase it and draw a new one farther back. He had proceeded step by step, and no one told him to stop. When the allies finally told him to stop, it required six years of war and a score of millions of deaths to enforce their demand.

The Soviets operate in just such a fashion, extending their power wherever they can, probing to see where we draw the line. They have discovered that we will tolerate a Soviet client state in Cuba and a major Soviet offensive capability on that island. We have shown the greatest reluctance to proceed militarily against Soviet proxies in our hemisphere, although the presence of such proxies clearly violates both the Monroe Doctrine and the OAS charter.

If we do not remove the restrictions on the effective management of foreign policy that now hinder the operation of the President of the United States, we may some day face a Soviet Union that is willing and able to wage war on its own terms, in our territory. This is not an inevitable outcome. The Soviet Union, although imperialistic, is cautiously so. Its leadership is composed of realists in the use of power who can recognize clearly drawn lines, especially when there are no erasers in sight. This is true also of their proxies. We should be instructed by the caution with which Castro responded to the liberation of Grenada. By our action, we made patent to the world that Castro cannot protect his clients against determined and rapid action by the United States. The lesson was not lost on the government of Suriname, which immediately expelled its Cuban advisers.

But can anyone doubt that if the administration had filed a bill for the invasion of Grenada, Congress would still be debating it? And it is entirely likely that if we were still dithering about what to do about Grenada, the Cubans with Soviet support would have reinforced their military presence on the island to the point that military action would have been costly in lives—American, Cuban, and Grenadian.

In pursuing a more rational and flexible policy in Central America, we will be making a terrible mistake if we fail to support the revolution for democracy throughout the region, including the betrayed revolution for democracy in Nicaragua. Our commitment to that revolution puts us in support of the rebel forces, most of whom were active opponents of Somoza. One of them, Eden Pastora, was the military leader of the movement which brought Somoza down.

Our commitment to democracy also compels our support of the government of El Salvador. There is nothing inconsistent with American values in supporting Jose Napoleon Duarte and Alvara Magana in El Salvador. These men are genuine, committed democrats. But there is nothing consistent with American values in supporting the Sandinistas. When we made an alliance with Stalin in 1941, we had at least the excuse of trying to defeat Hitler. Forced to choose between two great evils, we made a rational choice and backed the lesser against the greater. There can be no such justification for allying ourselves with Castro and with the Sandinistas to oppress not only the people of Nicaragua but all the people of Central America.

Rather, we should continue to increase the pressure on the Sandinistas to force

them in the direction of democracy; and we should give sufficient support to El Salvador in order to insure its survival as a democratic country. We cannot achieve either of these goals without strong bipartisan support for a rational foreign policy. We cannot develop such support if the Congress continues on its course of breaking down the wall separating itself from the executive, and continues to arrogate to itself not merely the making of foreign policy, but its detailed implementation

Not the least of the bad legacies of the Vietnam war is the extent to which Lyndon Johnson's compromised attempt to defend an imperfect democracy in Saigon against a perfect totalitarianism in Hanoi has come to be regarded as the model of what happens when the executive is free to implement foreign policy. This catastrophic event has purged the national memory of other, better examples, not the least of them the resolute action by which Johnson himself in 1965, in concert with the OAS, restored democracy to the Dominican Republic. The other great examples are Abraham Lincoln's decision to treat secession as the national crisis it was rather than allowing a deeply divided Congress to tie his hands, and Harry S. Truman's prompt and courageous support of South Korea.

Korea, we should remember, was the last time the communists engaged in an overt invasion of one of our allies. Truman forced them into adopting a policy of covert subversion and the use of proxies. As we confront the situation raised by their more recent policy, our options are more complex and the way not so clear. But one thing is clear: the president should be free to be as resolute as Lincoln and Truman. We have, through the War Powers Act and the amendments that have followed in its wake, institutionalized Neville Chamberlain as the preferred model for American presidents. If we remember what Chamberlain's policies led to, we may yet reverse this disastrous trend.

The hour is late.●

THE KID FROM RED BANK

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this country recently lost a truly great man whose music and art enriched the lives of thousands of people, both in America and abroad, William (Count) Basie. People from my State, in particular, were saddened by the passing of Mr. Basie for he was a native son. Born in Red Bank, NJ, Mr. Basie's talent was soon shared with the whole world who came to love his music. His big band sound epitomized the vitality, warmth, honor, and smoothness of the man.

Mr. Basie gained fame and fortune but retained his humility. He asked only to be remembered as a nice guy. Nice he certainly was and a consummate musician whose contribution to our culture will be irreplacable.

Mr. Basie was eloquently remembered in the Newark Star Ledger's lead editorial on May 1, 1984. I ask that the full text of this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE COUNT

He was called The Kid from Red Bank in deference to his New Jersey origins, but later in life, William (Count) Basie was also called by such distinguished titles as a master of modern music, a great innovator and a great performer.

Mr. Basie, who died last week at the age of 79, had his roots in jazz. His early successes were in small bands in Kansas City, one of the nation's leading centers for jazz during the 1930s. But he had the vision to recognize that if his music was to have wide appeal throughout the nation and the world, something else would be needed.

What was needed was a music with the drive and the vivacity of jazz, but with smoothness of the popular big bands of the so-called Swing Era of the 1930s and 1940s. And that was what Mr. Basie provided as he put together one of the greatest of the big bands.

The result was a distinctive contribution to modern music, one that transcended labels and was marked by an extraordinary level of excellence. Such original songs as "One O'Clock Jump" became the talk of the music world, clamored for both by jazz enthusiasts and by the general public.

As a performer, Mr. Basie mirrored the qualities he sought in his band arrangements, a reworking and modernizing of old-fashioned, earthy musical techniques. He took the so-called "stride" piano style that had made such jazz pianists as Fats Waller and James P. Johnson famous, but smoothed it out and gave it his distinguished personal imprint.

Mr. Basie constantly sought the greatest jazz artists to play in his ensemble. The list of those who at one time or another were part of the Count Basie orchestra reads like a jazz Hall of Fame. It includes Lester Young, Buck Clayton, Vic Dickerson, Illinois Jacquet, Don Byas, J. J. Johnson and Clark Terry, to name only a few.

When musical styles changed, Mr. Basie kept up with the times, changing his band format from time to time, moving from a big band to a smaller unit when the big band era ended.

But there always was a Count Basie band, and it looks as if there always will be one. Under the direction of Aaron Woodward, Mr. Basie's adopted son, the band will continue in the familiar musical vein. That's a comforting note.●

LT. GEN. ROBERT M. BOND

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, on April 26, 1984, Lt. Gen. Robert M. Bond was killed in an aircraft accident at Nellis Air Force Base, NV. Facts relating to his death are sketchy since he apparently was doing secret tests for the Air Force. It was first reported by the press that General Bond crashed while testing a new supersecret "Stealth" fighter aircraft. Later reports by the news media indicated that he was not flying the "Stealth" aircraft, but instead he was piloting a Soviet-style Mig-23 fighter. Whatever the circumstances of his death, one thing is sure. General Bond will be sincerely missed and mourned by those of us who knew him as a friend.

General Bond was an Air Force command pilot with more than 5,000 flying hours, primarily in tactical fighter aircraft. His military decorations and awards include the Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Meritorious Service Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Air Medal with 11 oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award ribbon with four oak leaf clusters and several foreign decorations.

General Bond had an outstanding military career. In 1951, he enlisted in the Air Force. After a year in the aviation cadet program, he earned his wings and commission. Upon completing advanced gunnery training at Nellis Air Force Base, he was assigned to the 51st Fighter-Intercepter Wing at K-13 Airfield in South Korea where he flew combat missions in F-86 Saber-jets.

From 1954 to 1959, General Bond was stationed at Alexandria (now England) Air Force Base, La. As a member of the 398th Tactical Fighter Squadron, 366th Tactical Fighter Wing, he participated in several of the early nonstop deployments to Europe, flying F-84's, F-86's, and F-100's. From July to October 1958, he attended the U.S. Air Force Fighter Weapons School at Nellis.

Upon deactivation of the 366th Tactical Fighter Wing in the spring of 1959, General Bond returned to Nellis and served as an instructor pilot in Fighter Weapons School as an F-105 project test pilot.

In 1963, General Bond was assigned to the 6002d Standardization and Evaluation Group at Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, and was chief of the Strike Branch there. While stationed at Kadena he flew combat missions in Southeast Asia.

From 1965 to 1966, General Bond attended the Air Command and Staff College and then joined the Directorate of Safety, Headquarters 1002d Inspector General Group, Norton Air Force Base, CA, as the F-105 and F-111 project officer. In August 1968, he was assigned to Cam Ranh Bay Air Force Base in Vietnam where he flew 213 combat missions in F-4 Phantoms and progressed from flight commander to operations officer.

He was assigned to Luke Air Force Base, AZ, in 1969 as an F-100 instructor pilot. In January 1970, he assumed command of the 310th Tactical Fighter Training Squadron, the first Air Force A-7 unit. While stationed at Luke Air Force Base, he progressed from squadron commander to director of operations for the 58th Tactical Fighter Training Wing. General Bond returned to England Air Force Base in 1972, as vice commander of the newly reorganized 23rd Tactical Fighter Wing. During this assignment, he served on temporary duty in Southeast Asia flying combat missions in A-7's.

In June 1973, General Bond came to Washington, DC, as the deputy director for General Purpose Forces. He

was responsible for establishing and validating operational requirements and system modifications for tactical fighter and airlift aircraft and their associated weaponry and subsystems.

In 1978, General Bond moved to Florida, where I came to know him, when he was assigned to Eglin Air Force Base, as commander of the Armament Division, Air Force Systems Command. In 1981, he was promoted to lieutenant general and assumed the duties as vice commander of Air Force Systems Command at Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland.

General Bond is survived by his wife Betty, four children—Susan B. Hurry; Robert M. Bond, Pamela Bond-Lunger; and Stephen L. Bond, and five grandchildren.

General Bond was a fine family man, an outstanding aviator, a superior leader, and a dedicated American. He dedicated his life and his talents to the defense of his country. We will truly miss him.●

S. 2375—SBA LOANS

● Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, on February 29, 1984, I, along with Senator BUMPERS the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, and others, introduced legislation, S. 2375, to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration and to open up new sources of capital for small businesses.

This bill would permit the pooling of the guaranteed portions of SBA loans for sale in larger lots to investors. In this way, such major institutional investors as pension funds, insurance companies, and mutual funds would be encouraged, and could be attracted for the first time to invest in SBA guaranteed loans, thereby allowing small businesses to tap capital pools previously unavailable, at no additional cost to the Government.

The Small Business Committee has already held a hearing on this bill. At this and other congressional hearings, and in several related studies, brokers, local lending institutions and the General Accounting Office all spoke enthusiastically of the benefits that small business could receive from a vastly improved and expanded secondary market in SBA guaranteed loans. Testimony was highly supportive that this increased market activity would produce market efficiencies that could lower the interest rates for small business.

It is no secret that small businesses have traditionally had the most difficulty in obtaining needed capital through conventional financing channels. The record level of interest rates this country experienced in the last few years has made the economic life of small business one of uncertainty. Not only has capital been expensive, but in many cases that capital has been difficult, or even impossible, to obtain. By encouraging investment in small business through an efficient secondary market operation, this bill would go a long way toward insuring that small business has access to sufficient capital at reasonable terms and affordable rates.

We have already received letters from a number of significant Small Business organizations expressing their support for this legislation and their hope that Congress acts quickly to adopt it. At this time, I would like to share with my colleagues copies of the letters I have received from Small Business United, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Independent Bankers Association, National Small Business Association, Small Business Legislative Council, National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, American Association of Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies, National Association of Business Development Corps., Smaller Business Association of New England, National Council for Urban Economic Development, Utah Council of Small Business, and the Indepedent Business Association of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I ask that these letters be printed in their entirety in the RECORD.

The letters follow:

Hon. LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Small Business United (SBU) a coalition of 14 regional, state and metropolitan trade associations representing more than 60,000 small businesses nationwide supports S. 2375 and urges its quick enactment by the Senate.

The bill, providing for the pooled sale of Small Business Administration (SBA) 7(a) guaranteed loans into a secondary market, could dramatically improve small business' access to capital and increase the efficiency of SBA's loan program at no financial cost to the federal government. As was shown in a recent General Accounting Office report on the 7(a) loan program, loans guaranteed by the SBA are an important source of capital for small business. According to the GAO "approximately 30 to 40 percent of the dollar amount of banks' long-term financing (six years or more) to small businesses may carry an SBA guarantee." By improving the salability of 7(a) loans in secondary markets, S. 2375 enhances bank liquidity allowing banks to make more loans, both 7(a) guaranteed and non-guaranteed loans. Thus small business, as well as other bank borrowers, will have increased access to capital, and market efficiency will be improved.

SBU thanks you for sponsoring this bill and hopes it will soon become law.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. RENNIE,
President, SBU.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 7, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, composed of nearly 200,000 companies of which most are small businesses, I commend you and Senator Bumpers for introducing S. 2375, legislation to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration (SBA).

The U.S. Chamber's Council of Small Business recently voted to endorse this legislation as consistent with the Chamber's policy of insuring the adquate availability of financing to meet the needs of those small businesses without access to private sector sources of funding.

As you and members of your Committee are well aware, obtaining capital through traditional financing channels is expensive and difficult for small companies. In many cases, lack of available capital can thwart the development of growing businesses, and may even threaten the continued viability of smaller firms.

Your proposal to encourage development of the secondary market for SBA loans should increase the funds available to small business borrowers from SBA loans, while reducing the cost of these loans.

We look forward to working with you toward swift passage of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. BREAULT.

INDEPENDENT BANKERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 13, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Small Business, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your invitation, I am writing in regard to your bill S. 2375, to improve the secondary marketing of SBA guaranteed loans, on which you held hearings March 6. The IBAA supports the enactment of S. 2375.

The IBAA's resolutions call for Congress and the Administration "to strengthen guaranteed loan program authorizations wherever guaranteed loans have proven effective, and to make such loan guarantees as workable and reliable as possible for borrowers and lenders." By providing for the pooled sale of SBA guaranteed loans and otherwise encouraging the secondary marketing of guaranteed loans, S. 2375 should strengthen the SBA loan guarantee program.

Guarantees by the Small Business Administration can be useful in channelling funds to small businesses which may have difficulty competing for adequate credit. A government loan guarantee can increase the capacity of independent banks to serve small business borrowers because the guaranteed loan is readily salable in secondary markets, does not generally apply against the legal lending limit of the banks, and may render certain loans less subject to a substandard classification by the bank regulators. The sale of guaranteed loans in the secondary market enables a flow of funds into fund-deficient areas to finance local enterprises. The marketing of guaranteed loans to secondary investors can also enable local institutions to extend longer term credit to businesses.

In the pooling of SBA guaranteed loans as provided in S. 2375, the pooling arrangements should in all cases accommodate individual loans or very small numbers of loans from originating banks, so that smaller banks which originate smaller numbers of SBA loans are not bypassed in this process.

APRIL 30, 1984.

Senator LOWELL WEICKER,
Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Small Business Association (NSB) is pleased to support your legislation, S. 2375, which would improve the operation of secondary markets for SBA guaranteed loans.

This legislation, if enacted, should help the small business sector by way of providing for long-term, low-rate financing for worthy businesses. The fact that banks would be able to "roll over" loans already made under the guaranteed program thereby replenishing their loan portfolios will be beneficial, particularly as the economic recovery increases loan demand. Furthermore, the secondary market should provide a means for tapping into insurance funds and pension funds, an area our association has long pursued.

Once again, please be asssured of our support in your efforts to gain passage of S. 2375.

Sincerely,

JEROME R. GULAN,
Executive Vice President.

SMALL BUSINESS, LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, May 3, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL WEICKER,
Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Small Business Legislative Council (SBLC) I commend your initiative in sponsoring legislation to stimulate the growth of secondary markets for SBA guarantee loans.

SBLC views the secondary market as a source of capital funding for small business which is assuming greater and greater importance in today's economy. We believe that legislation such as S. 2375 is needed, and will prove to be of great value to small business in the years ahead.

It is my pleasure, therefore, to report that the Executive Committee of the Small Business Legislative Council supports S. 2375, and urges your Committee to expedite Senate approval. This legislation would be especially useful if it can be assured that funds generated from the sale of "packaged" SBA guaranteed loans will in fact be used to make new loans to small companies and not for other purposes.

Please be assured that we shall also submit your legislation to the 82 trade and professional associations representing one fourth of the small business community who are members of SBLC for their individual support and approval as well.

Sincerely,

JARED O. BLUM,
Chairman, Vice President, Direct Selling Association.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES,
Washington, DC, April 25, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL WEICKER, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing this letter to express our Association's support for S. 2375, the legislation you have introduced to make the secondary market process more efficient in the Small Business Administration's guaranteed loan program.

Although small business investment companies do not participate directly in the SBA loan program, we strongly back S. 2375, for two reasons.

First, many of the small businesses in which SBICs invest are prime candidates for guaranteed loans under Section 7 of the Small Business Act. We believe that your legislative proposal would enhance the ability of these growth firms to receive loans in a timely fashion.

Our second reason for supporting S. 2375 arises from the nature of the SBIC program itself. As you know, SBICs are privately-capitalized and privately-managed financial institutions providing venture capital and long-term loans to young and growing businesses. SBICs make their own investment decisions without SBA approval or oversight. We believe that this private sector orientation has proven effective and highly successful over the past 25 years. SBA's costs in administering the program are negligible; the Federal Government's losses on its loans to SBICs have also been minimal.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MESBIC'S
Washington, DC, May 1, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL WEICKER,
Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WEICKER: On February 29, 1984, you introduced S. 2375, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration. The American Association of Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies (AAMESBIC) applauds your effort as an efficient example of a government and private sector initiative working toward a common good.

Through our daily exposure to small business entrepreneurs in need of financing, the MESBIC industry is acutely aware of the need for the increased availability of small business investment capital. The establishment of a secondary market for SBA guaranteed loans would attract funds from insurance companies, pension funds, and other traditionally long term investors, permitting the SBA to extend additional loans to the small business community at no additional cost to the government. The increased supply of funds could also be expected to ultimately lower interest rates to the small business borrower.

S. 2375 has the enthusiastic support of the MESBIC industry. We would welcome the opportunity to testify at any future hearings on the bill, and offer any assistance we may be able to provide in furthering its progress.

Sincerely,

JOANN H. PRICE.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS,
Washington, DC, April 18, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

MY DEAR SENATOR WEICKER: I am writing on behalf of the membership of our organization to thank you for your sponsorship of S-2375. The passage of this bill would greatly improve the lending capability of the BDC's throughout the country, all of whom are private sector enterprises.

The use of the 7-A guarantee program by the BDC's has been ongoing for several years and it has become a valuable financing item.

Sincerely yours,

FRED F. STOCKWELL,
President.

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Waltham, MA, April 27, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, 303 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WEICKER: On behalf of SBANE's 2000 members throughout New England, I want to commend your recent efforts in introducing to the Senate a bill that would facilitate a secondary market for the SBA guaranteed loans.

As Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I know you are aware of the many problems facing small businesses. Of particular concern is the difficulty small businesses have in getting capital, both for start-up and expansion efforts.

Your leadership in developing this legislation, S. 2375, is outstanding. Modeled after Ginnie Mae, S. 2375 would allow the pooling of the guaranteed portions of SBA loans for sale in large lots to investors. For the first time, major institutional investors would be attracted to invest in SBA loans through this secondary market.

Small businesses throughout the nation will benefit from this legislation by being able to secure long-term financing at fixed and lower rates. By introducing S. 2375, you have done a great service to the small business sector. With passage of S. 2375, there will be more capital available for small businesses allowing them to continue to lead the nation in productivity, innovation and job creation.

Again, thank you for your leadership. If I can be of service in helping to get this bill enacted, please don't hesitate to call me or SBANE's public affairs director, Carolyn VanSant.

Sincerely,

LEWIS A. SHATTUCK,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR URBAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, May 3, 1984.

Hon. LOWELL P. WEICKER,
Chairman, Small Business Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WEICKER: The National Council for Urban Economic Development supports your efforts to facilitate the flow of capital to small business. The ability of small business to create jobs, investment, and technological innovation is well recognized by our public and private sector economic development practitioners who strive daily to bring about sustained economic growth in over 450 communities around the country.

Specifically, we welcome your Committee's proposal to expand the secondary market for SBA loans as proposed in S. 2375. This bill is unique in that it would increase the amount of capital available to small business without additional federal outlays.

We hope the Congress proceeds expeditiously on this important proposal.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. PETERSON,
Executive Director.

UTAH COUNCIL OF SMALL BUSINESS,
Salt Lake City, UT, April 30, 1984.

Senator LOWELL WEICKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Small Business, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WEICKER. The Utah Council of Small Business is pleased to lend its support to S. 2375, amending the Small Business Act to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration.

Securing capital is still the major problem for small business and this effort to accomodate pooling of SBA guaranteed loans for sale to secondary market investors seems to be an excellent way of assisting small business. It appears to be a way of surmounting the problem individual small businesses have because of relatively low loan volumes.

Please let us know if we can be of assistance in the passage of this bill.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. KENNARD,
Vice President.

INDEPENDENT BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, WI, April 30, 1984.

Senator LOWELL WEICKER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WEICKER: On behalf of the members of the Independent Business Association of Wisconsin, we want to thank you for sponsoring Senate Bill 2375 authorizing current SBA administrative secondary market loan policy.

IBA supports this legislation because it would allow pooling or combining individual SBA loans into larger lots, thereby spreading risks over a larger number of projects and providing a more marketable package to private sector lenders such as pension funds, institutional investors, and large money center banks. These large sources of capital have traditionally been unavailable to small business borrowers.

We also feel that the desire to limit off budget spending, while laudable, does not properly take into account the differences between this program and others that only appear to be similar.

The SBA secondary market program, extensively used by several Wisconsin banks, allows a conduit between small businesses and private investors that, as cited above, are not usually available as small business lenders.

The program has been successful and unlike the "direct" lending programs of SBA is based solely on private sector credit judgements. The programs allows a small firm to obtain credit at fixed rates for long terms thereby placing them on a similar footing with large corporate borrowers.

We laud your efforts on behalf of small business and look forward to passage that we may better fuel the U.S. economy with new products, new jobs and a new place in the international marketplace.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL N. HOPE,
President-Elect.
SAUNDRA HERRE,
Vice President, Federal Programs.●

RETENTION OF THE DEDUCTION FOR MORTGAGE INTEREST

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I want to take a few minutes to address the Senate on the issue of deductibility of mortgage interest, and to express my support for Senate Resolution 385. This sense of the Senate resolution was introduced on May 2, 1984, by the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, and provides that the deduction for mortgage interest should be retained regardless of what we do to reform or simplify the current Tax Code.

The Senator from Texas offered this resolution after the President of the United States recently refused to rule out a limit on the deductibility of mortgage interest as a part of any tax package, currently under review by the Department of the Treasury. In light of this, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will approve this resolution promptly so that we send a strong signal to the home building industry, and also homeowners and potential home buyers.

There is no question about the need to reexamine the existing Tax Code, Mr. President. It has grown entirely too complex and I think we can take some steps to make the tax system more equitable and more understandable. These efforts will improve compliance. However, the deduction of mortgage interest has been one of the cornerstones of our Nation's commitment to housing and homeownership, and it is essential that it be retained. This deduction has been the key to fair, decent, and affordable housing in this country, and with interest rates as high as they are currently—and the projections are for mortgage rates to go higher next year—it is essential that potential home buyers have every assurance that this provision will be retained.

The statistics about the crowding out effect as mortgage rates climb are very distressing, Mr. President. I have seen estimates that show that when mortgage rates hit 15 percent the number of families able to afford homes is reduced to about one in nine. The end result of higher interest rates is that more and more people are putting off buying a home. We have got to do more to get the deficit under control, and we also need to retain the current deduction. These factors will encourage homeownership and promote community stability as new families put down roots. For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I think the Senate needs to reaffirm our commitment to the mortgage interest deduction.

I have asked that my name be added as a cosponsor of the Bentsen resolution.●

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, President Reagan in a proclamation on November 28, 1983, designated 1983 through 1992 as the "National Decade of Disabled Persons" and set as a national goal the increased economic independence of every disabled American. I would like to share with my colleagues some valuable insights contained in the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education's "Position Statement on Vocational Education For Students With Disabilities."

For years, there have been many leaders who have reminded us that there are 36 million Americans out there who provide the strength of a tremendous natural resource—if channeled in a productive way. A handicapped person is only disabled to the extent that he or she is prevented from achievement. It is a myth that disabled people prefer to stay at home and do nothing in order to collect Government or insurance benefits.

I commend the members of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education for their leadership in bringing about progress in the design of vocation programs for disabled students, and I ask that their Position Statement be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of Members.

The statement follows:

POSITION STATEMENT ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

MEMBERS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Edward Miller, Chairman (Maryland).
Caroline Huges, Vice Chairman (Oklahoma).
Dolph Andrews (California).
Betty Breaux (Louisiana).
Vernon Broussard (California).
James Buford (Missouri).
Noland Bushnell (California).
Pedro Diaz, Jr. (Texas).
Joanne Dwyer (Pennsylvania).
Gladys Eddy (Colorado).[1]
James W. Griffith, Executive Director.
George Fellendorf (Maryland).[1]
Reuben Guenthner (North Dakota).
Jean Hanson (Minnesota).
Joan Kenney (Nevada).[1]
Edward LaMontagne (Connecticut).[2]
Esther Levens (Kansas).
William J. McGinnis, Jr. (New Jersey).
Byrl Shoemaker (Ohio).
Kenneth Smith (District of Columbia).
Calvin Stephens (Texas).[1]

[1] Members of Ad Hoc Committee on the Handicapped.
[2] Chairman of the Committee.

POSITION STATEMENT ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education calls upon State and local agencies to provide appropriately designed vocational education programs to disabled students in order to help them become self-sufficient in living and working.

BACKGROUND

History is replete with examples of disabled people working in a full range of occupational areas. We know about mentally re-

tarded individuals working as welders, blind people in farming, deaf persons as automobile mechanics, and people using wheelchairs as draftsmen—the list can go on and on. Disabled people have proven their mettle; they can work. The limiting factors are not their disabilities, but our ability to see their potential and to assist them in their development.

If we look beyond the Federal laws that demand equal rights for handicapped people, we can see an even more compelling reason for undertaking increased efforts to ensure access and equality for handicapped people in employment and in those educational programs which lead to employment. It's the economics of dependence versus independence. Statistics show that for every dollar spent on rehabilitation training, the individual can expect a return of approximately ten more dollars in lifetime earnings. The amount of income tax paid by the working disabled is proportionally increased. For the nation, dependence includes the added costs of public maintenance, institutionalized care, and social security disability payments. It then becomes abundantly clear that we can ill afford NOT to prepare handicapped people for employment.

SERVICES TO STUDENTS WITH HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

Vocational educators must provide learning and occupational opportunities for disabled persons to become independent and cast off the kinds of assistance, although well-intentioned, that leads to dependency. Vocational education for the handicapped necessitates a change of thinking on the part of the employers about hiring disabled people. The disabled student requires a great deal of understanding on the part of the teacher. Different safety rules may be required; more space may be needed in labs to maneuver a wheelchair. More career and vocational guidance centers are needed so that students with a handicapping condition can find the career or vocation in which he or she will be successful. Vocational teachers must be prepared to offer praise frequently. School personnel must administer a series of work evaluations and assessments to accurately assess the students' interests and abilities prior to developing a formalized individual vocational program. Employers must be patient: those that are have found that handicapped employees are more responsible, have fewer absences, and pay more attention to detail work than many other workers.

In view of the employment potential of disabled people and the legal and economic reasons for facilitating their access to employment-related programs, we must continue to explore new mechanisms which will enable the vocational education enterprise to expand and improve its services to this target population. During the 1981 school year, 34.6 percent of the estimated number of disabled students in grades 9 to 12 were served by vocational education. This figure is evidence of a continual increase in the number of disabled students served. Between 1976 and 1981, secondary vocational enrollment increased to about 18 percent. For the same period, secondary enrollment of disabled students in vocational programs changed from 203,647 to 437,397, an increase of 115 percent.

National commitment to the handicapped, during the 1976–1981 time period, was considerable. The Council, while continuing to support the presence and leadership of the Federal Government, however, recognizes that State and local agencies have a decisive role in expanding and improving services.

A recent study was undertaken, in which the Council cooperated, to help answer the question, "To what degree have state level comprehensive cooperative agreements involving special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation influenced the delivery of local level services to handicapped youth enrolled in vocational education?" Analysis of findings shows that state and local comprehensive agreements exerted a significant positive impact on local programs. This impact or influence is in program operations that are not only crucial to the development of appropriate vocational education services for handicapped students; but also, would appear to be difficult to achieve without some form of organized cooperation among different agencies and programs. More specifically, the comprehensive agreement provides a unique and impartial setting through which previously distinctive program operations can provide a more focused approach to service delivery by establishing a common language and set of goals and objectives. Unfortunately, only seventeen states had, according to the study's criteria, a comprehensive cooperative agreement.

Another study found that a majority of states responding have put into place the kinds of support systems needed to expand and improve the quality of services. Indicative of this trend are the documented increases in related state laws, education codes, cooperative agreements and studies on coordination and cooperation between special education and vocational education.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

In order to continue to help disabled students achieve the goal of self-sufficiency in living and working, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education proposes that certain activities be carried out by the responsible agencies. Through the implementation of the following activities, the Council anticipates the expansion of appropriately designed vocational programs for disabled students:

FEDERAL LEVEL

Technical assistance: Help states develop and implement comprehensive cooperative agreements. Disseminate profiles of exemplary secondary and postsecondary vocational programs serving disabled students.

Information: Collect data on the (a) actual number of disabled students in grades 9 through 12 (ages 16 to 21); and (b) the kind of vocational program taken.

STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL

Professional Preparation: Require pre and inservice preparation of vocational education teachers and support personnel that will sustain effective instruction of disabled students.

Commitment: Put into place state provisions that promote the expansion and quality of pre-vocational and vocational programming and services to disabled students.

Prepare a position statement which commits the local secondary or postsecondary education agency to the goal of offering appropriately designed vocational programs.

Linkages: Establish state and local comprehensive cooperative agreements or other mechanisms to improve the delivery of services.

Urge local business people to employ vocationally prepared disabled persons.

Recruitment: Develop a plan of action designed to introduce disabled students into vocational areas where their involvement is low, or perhaps does not exist.●

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

● Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to share with my colleagues an article, "Australian Farmers Despair As Its Sugar Industry Hits Most Depressed Level in Over a Century," which appeared in the April 23 edition of the Australian. I share it with my colleagues because it illustrates the dire situation in the world sugar market and the problem facing sugar producers, even efficient sugar producers with support programs.

I note with interest that the Queensland sugar farmers are seeking an increase in their support level from $480 to $560 a ton. Even with a 93-cent dollar, and a long as opposed to a short ton, it places that support price above the present $350 per ton U.S. support level. While I do not know the details of the Australian sugar program it is clear that present EEC sugar policy, and the current International Sugar Agreement in which the EEC is not a participant, has made it absolutely essential that nations defend even their most efficient producers with a domestic support program. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues as we look to renewal of the sugar program in the 1985 farm bill.

I also wish to share with my colleagues a brief statement which Mr. Robert Hughes, the president of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association presented to Secretary Block at the USDA listening session in Riverside, CA, Saturday, April 28. I hope that it will help my colleagues, who may have questioned the need for and wisdom of the current program, appreciate that program's importance to the welfare and survival of this important domestic industry.

I ask that the material to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT H. HUGHES ON BEHALF OF HAWAIIAN SUGAR PLANTERS' ASSOCIATION

Thank you for the opportunity to present a statement about food and agriculture policy with respect to United States production of sugar.

My name is Robert H. Hughes, and I am President of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, a non-profit organization of sugar growers in Hawaii.

The 9,000,000 tons of sugarcane grown and milled by HSPA members produces about 1,000,000 tons of raw sugar each year. Our sugar is refined by California and Hawaiian Sugar Company (C and H), and agricultural processing and marketing cooperative owned by Hawaiian sugarcane producers. C and H markets refined sugar throughout the west and sells approximately 150,000 tons as raw sugar to Gulf and East Coast refineries.

Despite decline in acreage since 1981, sugar remains the dominant agricultural ac-

tivity in Hawaii, utilizing three-fourths of the state's cultivated acreage and employing 7,800 workers, 8 percent of Hawaii's private employment. Fifteen hundred refinery jobs in California are dependent upon Hawaiian sugar. In addition, there are approximately 20,000 in related employment in Hawaii dependent upon the sugar industry.

Hawaiian production represents 17 percent of total U.S. production, and Hawaii is second only to Florida as a domestic producer of sugar.

Despite Hawaii having the world's highest sugar-per-acre yields and lowest manhour input, our industry lost some $89 million in 1981, a year in which there was no U.S. sugar program. The sugar provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 were adopted just in time to provide the Hawaiian sugar industry with an opportunity for survival.

With the continuing sharp decline in sugar prices on the world "dump" market in early 1982, it became necessary for USDA to employ quotas on sugar imports to avoid acquisition of sugar stocks by the Federal Government. Those quotas have effectively maintained a price in the U.S. market sufficient to keep that market a more attractive destination for domestic sugar than the alternative of forfeiture. Mr. Secretary, your Department is to be congratulated on the exemplary manner in which the sugar program has been administered. It has achieved the goal established by the Congress to operate the program without cost to the government while assuring the survival of a domestic sugar industry and an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices.

From the viewpoint of Hawaii's sugar producers, the sugar program has been absolutely essential to our survival. With aggressive cost-cutting efforts, it has permitted our industry to reduce the $89 million loss suffered in 1981 to about a break-even on sugar in 1983. Profits from by-products, however, allowed a meager 2.7 percent return on invested capital. One-half the Hawaii plantations, producing one-third of the 1983 crop, operated at a loss for the third successive year and are in a fight for survival. Their continuance is in real jeopardy despite the stability provided by the Farm Act.

Our cost-cutting efforts have been painful and are continuing. Fifteen percent of our 1981 sugar acreage has been abandoned and only a fraction of those acres are likely to be used for other crops. Many small independent cane farmers, who mill their crops at plantation facilities, have dropped by the wayside.

In summary, the reaction in Hawaii to rock-bottom sugar prices in 1981 has been shrinkage in farmed acres and production, coupled with stringent cost-cutting. The outcome is uncertain as to the future.

The sugar loan rate is scheduled to increase by a quarter cent each year, about 1.5 percent per year, through fiscal 1986. It is doubtful that we can contain costs of production within the 1.5 percent increase.

The present sugar program is a program that works and works without cost to American taxpayers.

Your administration has every reason to take pride in its implementation. The Hawaiian sugar industry urges you to seek its renewal in the next Farm Act.

Thank you very much.

AUSTRALIAN FARMERS DESPAIR AS ITS SUGAR INDUSTRY HITS MOST DEPRESSED LEVEL IN OVER A CENTURY

The sugar industry has fallen to its most depressed level in over a century, and hundreds of cane farmers face being forced from the land. World sugar prices have dropped by half in the past six months because of large surpluses and declining consumption.

The downturn in the industry—our eighth largest export earner—will severely affect many Queensland coastal towns. It is also expected to affect the national economy, because sugar ranks second behind wheat as the nation's main rural crop.

The sugar industry has been severely affected before, but never in its long history has it been in such trouble. Worst affected are the family cane farmers who have been the backbone of the industry for generations. Many are shattered by the sudden downturn. Their troubles began in the early 1980s when world prices were relatively high and many medium to large producers borrowed heavily to expand. But a price collapse, combined with rising interest rates, drought, rising costs and falling consumption for the first time in 80 years, took their toll. Worse could follow if the world sugar industry cannot agree on a new International Sugar Agreement in Geneva in June.

Subsidized European Economic Community sugar exports are depressing world prices and depriving other countries of export earnings. The only growers making money from sugar are those in the EEC, which has flooded the market, increasing exports between 1977 and 1981 by 340 percent. The EEC's share of world exports has risen from 7.8 percent in 1976 to 25.6 percent in 1982.

The Queensland Cane Growers Council warns a price war could break out among exporting countries if a new ISA is not made. The main exporters have large stockpiles, built up as part of their price-support obligations under the present ISA. Release of these stocks could have a devastating effect on prices.

Despite being the most efficient sugar producers in the world, Australia's 6800 cane farmers will earn an average $5622 in this financial year, after a meagre profit of $4193 in 1982-83. "If we do nothing the industry will sort itself out—people will go bankrupt," the council's general-secretary, Mr. Ron Belcher, says. "But, if structural changes are carefully managed the human suffering will be reduced and people will be able to leave the industry with dignity."

The family farm structure of the industry is under greatest threat. Mr. Belcher says if the industry were starting afresh it would begin with businesses instead of family farms and holdings would be larger. Typical is a Bundaberg grower, Mr. Lindsay Curd. When he left school, aged 14, he dreamed of buying a sugarcane farm. For six years he worked up to 100 hours a week until he bought his farm. Mr. Curd spent the next 10 years working the same long hours on his own farm and for a neighboring cane farmer, Mr. Ned Churchwood, to pay for it. Eventually, he was able to buy a second and then a third farm.

Now he is in danger of losing his farms. Three years ago his 36ha of land was worth $220,000. Today, there are no buyers at any price. Mr. Curd can't get another job because of the sugar depression in the Bundaberg district. Similarly, most cane farmers forced from the land will be battling for new jobs. Sugar is the only business they know. Mr. Alan Lawson, another Bundaberg grower, says after a lifetime in the industry he hopes to just scrape through.

"We live in the hope that prices will eventually improve or that something will happen," Mr. Lawson said. "I don't know how those people with overdrafts and big mortages will survive. Costs and taxes are crippling the industry."

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics agrees that prospects for recovery are poor without an upturn in world prices, but says in the long term Australia has the potential to lift sugar production considerably. Domestically, cane growers have called for an increase of $80 a ton to $560 a ton after the Commonwealth Queensland Sugar Agreement comes into force on June 30.

Mr. Belcher says the industry wants more than $480 a ton for manufacture-type sugar, but there are alternative sweeteners and sugar must stay competitive.

The Bundaberg Sugar Company says there is reason for optimism and believes it is realistic to think the world price can steadily increase later in 1984. About 95 percent of the national crop is produced in Queensland, stretching from Mossman, north of Cairns, through to Bundaberg and as far south as Grafton in northern NSW. Mr. Churchwood, one of the larger farmers growing 9000 tons of can in his 134.8ha each year, is the chairman of the Bundaberg District Canegrowers executive and serves on many other industry boards.

He is weathering the downturn because he has financial reserves. But he is cutting costs and delaying the purchase of new equipment until the industry is profitable. "Because of our resilience we will survive, but the going is very tough for a lot," Mr. Churchwood says. "This is one of the oldest cane-growing areas in Australia and although the Government doesn't owe us a living, it does have the responsibility of containing basic charges such as electricity and water, which are placing export industries in jeopardy. "And something must be done about costs. Only four years ago diesel cost 16¢ a litre, now it is 44¢."

He says the answer is not for cane farmers to become more efficient because the industry has reached its limit for the time being: "We need prices $25 a ton higher. If the sugar industry dies these sugar towns all along the coast will also die."

Nearly 400,000ha of prime agricultural land is used for cane growing. Australia, the fourth largest sugar producer in the world, limits production to about 3.6 million tons (worth $635 million in export earnings) through quotas, but could increase production to 5 million tons in existing mill areas. World production is expected to fall to 95.86 million tons this financial year, compared with 100 million tons in the two previous seasons.

Mr. Belcher says the problem with the existing ISA is that the EEC has not been a part of it: "If we can establish a new ISA which includes the EEC, then we can start to get some price agreement." Changing the image of sugar in diets is the other key problem. Mr. Belcher says sugar is an important energy food and there is no scientific evidence to support statements suggesting sugar is bad.

Australian consumption has fallen from 50kg a person a year—a level it maintained all this century until four years ago—to 46kg a person. The industry is now spending several million dollars on an education program to counter fallacies and misconceptions about sugar.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATIONS BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this notice of a Senate employee who proposes to participate in a program, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. David G. Shoultz, of the staff of Senator HAWKINS to participate in a program sponsored by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in Jerusalem from January 2-13, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Shoultz, in the program in Jerusalem, at the expense of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, to discuss United States-Israeli relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. David S. Sullivan, of the staff of Senators MCCLURE and SYMMS, to participate in a program sponsored by the Confederation of the Associations for the Unity of the Societies of the Americas, in Montevideo, Uruguay, from February 20 through 25, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Sullivan in the program in Montevideo, Uruguay, at the expense of the Confederation of the Associations for the Unity of the Societies of the Americas, to attend a convention, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under Rule 35 which would permit Mr. Earl Eisenhower and Mrs. Judy Eisenhower, of the staff of Senator GOLDWATER, Miss Dorthea Roberson of the staff of the Intelligence Committee, to participate in a program sponsored by Soochow University, in Taipei, Taiwan, from November 20-28, 1983.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Eisenhower, Mrs. Eisenhower, and Miss Roberson in the program in Taipei at the expense of Soochow University, to discuss educational research programs, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Ms. Kathy Stoner of the staff of Senator JESSE HELMS, to participate in a program sponsored by Tunghai University, in Taipei, Taiwan, from August 9-17, 1983.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Stoner in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of Tunghai University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Senator ARLEN SPECTER and Mrs. Specter, and Mr. Paul R. Michel, a member of the Senator's staff, to participate in the following programs from January 3-16, 1984, visits to the Republic of China, sponsored by Soochow University, to Hong Kong, sponsored by the Chinese University of New Asia College and to the Peoples Republic of China, sponsored by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator and Mrs. Specter and Mr. Michel in these programs, for meetings and discussions with government and civilian leaders, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Senator DENNIS DECONCINI, his wife Susan, and Jane Green and Stephen Wilson of his Senate staff, to participate in a program sponsored by Soochow University, in Taipei, Taiwan, from April 13-18, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator DECONCINI, his wife Susan and Jane Green and Stephen Wilson of the Senator's staff, in the program in Taipei, Taiwan, at the expense of Soochow University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit R. Ian Butterfield, a member of Senator ROTH'S staff, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University from April 15-24, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Butterfield in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of the Chinese Culture University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Richard Rolf of the staff of Senator HATFIELD to participate in a program sponsored by Hauss Rissen, in Hamburg and Berlin, West Germany, from April 5-13, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Rolf in the seminar in Hamburg and Berlin, West Germany, at the expense of Hauss Rissen, to discuss United States-German relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Paul Sivley of the staff of Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI, to participate in a program in Jordan, sponsored by the World Affairs Council, from April 13-22, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Sivley in the program in Jordan, at the expense of the World Affairs Council, a private educational and cultural association based in Amman, Jordan, to participate in a factfinding trip, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Senator PAUL S. TRIBLE, JR., to participate in a program sponsored by Tamkang University in Taipei, Taiwan, from October 7-13, 1983.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator TRIBLE in the program in Taipei, at the expense of Tamkang University, to meet with government and civilian leaders is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

CUBAN GOVERNMENT'S INVOLVEMENT IN FACILITATING INTERNATIONAL DRUG TRAFFIC

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article by Stanley Penn and Edward T. Pound that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 30, 1984.

The article describes the protection offered to smugglers by the Cuban Government in exchange for hard currency that it needs for its efforts to foment revolution in Latin America.

The article carefully delineates the extensive evidence now on the record, and credits our colleague from Alabama, Mr. JEREMIAH DENTON, with first uncovering the role of the Cuban Government more than 2 years ago.

Mr. President, the article speaks for itself, but I want to say that Senator DENTON deserves our thanks for first bringing the official role of the Cuban Government to our attention and for continuing to expose the facts through his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism.

Mr. President, I ask that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed in full in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The article follows:

SMUGGLERS OF DRUGS FROM COLOMBIA TO THE UNITED STATES ARE PROTECTED BY CUBA—IN RETURN, IT GETS CURRENCY TO FOMENT REVOLUTION; ADMIRAL'S ODD ACTIVITIES—EAVESDROPPER AT THE HILTON

(By Stanley Penn and Edward T. Pound)

The drug business is helping Cuba foment revolution in Latin America.

While maintaining an outwardly tough posture toward drug smugglers, the Cuban government has secretly singled out a few for special favors. These selected traffickers have been permitted to use Cuban waters as a haven from the U.S. Coast Guard while transshipping narcotics to the U.S. From Colombia.

In return, Cuba gets scarce hard currency—as much as $500,000 per shipment, by some estimates. It uses some of this money to buy arms that are secretly ferried by the drug smugglers to guerrillas in Latin America.

This arrangement, said to be sanctioned by Fidel Castro himself, has been detailed by U.S. drug investigators and intelligence specialists, as well as by drug runners who have given first hand testimony of their activities to lawmen in the U.S. and Mexico.

OFFICIAL CONCERN

"There's evidence of a considerable amount of drug trafficking that transits through Cuba by water and air," says Frank V. Monastero, assistant administrator of the federal Drug Enforcement Administration. Noting that the smugglers sometimes use Cuban government facilities, Mr. Monastero adds: "If the Cuban government wanted to cease that activity, they could put a stop to it."

Drug agents don't think Cuba operates its own drug smuggling network. Rather, they say, Cuba permits certain traffickers safe passage and allows large "mother ships" laden with drugs from Colombia to lay over and refuel in Cuba. This allows the mother ships to transfer their illicit cargo to smaller, faster boats for delivery to Florida.

The Cuban government's ties to drug smuggling were discussed two years ago during hearings by a Senate subcommittee headed by Sen. Jeremiah A. Denton of Alabama. Federal lawmen gave Senate panels additional information last year and in closed session last month.

A criminal trial last year in Miami provided still more evidence. Four Cuban government officials were among those charged with conspiring to permit Cuba to be used as a loading station for U.S.-bound drug vessels during 1980 and 1981. Six people were convicted or pleaded guilty. The Cuban officials, including a former Cuban ambassador to Colombia and a vice admiral who belonged to the Cuban Communist Party's central committee, failed to appear at the trial and are considered fugitives, according to the U.S. Justice Department.

Evidence presented at the trial has convinced Tom Boyatt, a former U.S. ambassador to Colombia, of the Cuban government's complicity. "When you have a Cuban ambassador and a Cuban admiral involved" he says, "you don't need further evidence that it's a matter of national policy."

Indicted with the Cuban officials was Jaime Guillot-Lara, a 38-year-old Colombian charged with using Cuban facilities to help transport large quantities of marijuana and Quaalude tablets into the U.S. The U.S. government has never apprehended Mr. Guillot-Lara, but in November 1981, he was imprisoned in Mexico for using false identity papers.

Mr. Guillot-Lara admitted shipping arms to Colombia's Cuban-backed M-19 terrorist group, according to a State Department official reporting to a Senate subcommittee. Mr. Guillot-Lara said that funds for the arms shipments were furnished by Cuban embassies in Mexico and Colombia. He was freed by Mexico in 1982, but the Mexican government refused a U.S. request for his extradition. His current whereabouts aren't known.

Mr. Guillot-Lara apparently entered the drug business in 1976. By the U.S. government's estimate, his 15-member gang shipped some 2.5 million pounds of marijuana, 80 pounds of cocaine and 25 million Quaaludes to the U.S. between 1977 and 1981.

THE M-19 CONNECTION

In 1980, Mr. Guillot-Lara allegedly arranged to receive Cuban assistance with those shipments and agreed to transport arms to M-19. Mr. Guillot-Lara was known to M-19 through his longtime acquaintance with Jaime Bateman, a Colombian who was an M-19 leader until his death in a plane crash in 1982.

Mr. Guillot-Lara is known to have purchased Uzi submachine guns, pistols and AR-15 rifles from a Miami arms dealer. According to State Department reports, the arms he purchased typically were ferried to Colombia, where his boat picked up drugs for delivery to the U.S.

In October 1981, for example, Mr. Guillot-Lara's boat, Zar De Honduras, received arms from a ship off the coast of Panama. The arms—550 FAL rifles worth at least $500 apiece and 90,000 cartridges—were delivered to a port on Colombia's northeast coast and taken to a clandestine airport nearby. After 5,000 pounds of marijuana bound for the U.S. were stowed on board the ship, the weapons were flown to an M-19 base in Caqueta province, a large cocaine-producing area in southern Colombia.

M-19 and other Colombian insurgents profit from narcotics by taxing drug growers and by guarding traffickers' airstrips and cocaine-processing laboratories. Colombia's defense minister, Gustavo Matamoros, recently attacked the "alliance" between drug runners and guerrillas. He claimed that planes leave Colombia with cocaine and return with weapons originating in Cuba.

Colombia broke ties with Cuba in 1981, following the capture of some M-19 terrorists who admitted they had been trained and outfitted in Cuba. Just last month 100 M-19 insurgents, armed with submachine guns and hand grenades, battled a Colombian army garrison in Florencia. The army drove off the guerrillas, but not before they had seized the local jail and freed 125 prisoners.

Cuba stoutly denies involvement with drug smugglers. "We have been trying to help in control of the drug traffic," says a Cuban government press officer in Washington. "Every plane, every ship or yacht which we catch in our waters or in our air space, we have detained." Terming the charges that Cuba helps drug smugglers "unfounded," he says that at any given time, 15 to 30 American traffickers are in Cuban jails. "We have been freeing some of them at the request of some [U.S.] congressmen as a goodwill gesture," he adds.

By denying its ties to dope runners, diplomats say, Cuba hopes to avoid antagonizing other Hispanic governments. "The Cubans are interested in expanding regular diplomatic relations with Latin America," a U.S. State Department official says, "and they'd like to present at least a plausible denial that they're involved in subverting these governments."

A MIAMI SUSPECT

Jose Alvero-Cruz, a Miami beauty parlor operator, is among those suspected of using Cuba to smuggle drugs to the U.S. According to a secret 1982 Drug Enforcement Administration report, an informant disclosed that Mr. Alvero-Cruz met with Fidel Castro, and during the meeting they arranged for a fishing vessel, the Santa Marta, to use a secluded harbor on Cuba's southern coast.

"The vessel would contain 50 tons of marijuana and a large quantity of cocaine," the report stated. "Arrangements were made from Cuba to have the Santa Marta leave port and meet the offload boats at sea.".

Mr. Alvero-Cruz, who took part in the abortive, U.S. sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961, recently began a 10-year prison sentence for federal income tax evasion. The wealthy 44-year-old had "large" bank deposits in Spain, the Justice Department has said. Mr. Alvero-Cruz's attorney says his client "hates Castro" and hasn't been involved with Cuba in drug smuggling.

Another suspected smuggler with Cuban ties is Osiris Santis. According to the drug-agency report. Mr. Santis told an informant that he had received "large quantities" of marijuana and cocaine from "high Cuban government officials." The drugs assertedly came from Colombia's M-19 guerrillas. The informant said he saw "automatic weapons, grenades and explosives of apparent Russian manufacture," in Cuban-born Mr. Santis's possession.

In 1982, Mr. Santis pleaded guilty in Miami's Dade County circuit court to charges of possession of cocaine and a concealed weapon. He received probation. His attorney says that the 40-year-old Mr. Santis denies any wrongdoing in connection with Cuba.

Fresh information about M-19's links to the drug trade may surface as a result of the federal indictment of Harold J. Rosenthal and 29 others in Atlanta last January.

Mr. Rosenthal fled to Colombia after escaping in 1981 from a Memphis prison, where he had been serving time for a drug conviction. He was captured by Colombian authorities last September and returned to the U.S., where he was charged with operating a ring that had smuggled five tons of cocaine into the U.S. since June 1982. "He was sharing his profits with M-19", says an investigator familiar with the case. "In turn, the M-19 allowed him to conduct his business." Mr. Rosenthal has denied any wrongdoing.

Back in 1979, when Cuba was considering aiding drug smugglers, one high level Cuban official branded the plan "barbarous," according to a Central Intelligence Agency report. But according to the CIA's informant, the prevailing view was that by assisting the narcotics trade, Cuba would obtain hard currency while hastening the "deterioration" of U.S. society.

The major Colombian narcotics smugglers long had been eager for an understanding with Cuba. Cuba's vigilance in seizing narcotics boats and confiscating drugs had added burdensome costs to their business.

TOP-LEVEL MEETING IN SPAIN

One former smuggler, interviewed in his attorney's office in Miami, recalls that the leaders of five major Colombian drug gangs met in Spain in 1979 "to see what could be done to get Cuba not to kidnap boats any more." According to the former smuggler, who says he attended some of the meetings, the smugglers determined to seek help from Jaime Guillot-Lara, in the belief that he "had contacts with the Cubans."

Whether Mr. Guillot-Lara aided the traffickers at that time isn't clear. But his Cuban connection was a Colombian lawyer

and an admitted drug dealer, Juan (Johnny) Crump, who was a close friend of Cuba's ambassador to Colombia at the time, Fernando Ravelo.

The 43-year-old Mr. Crump, who was briefly jailed in the U.S. after a guilty plea for a drug violation, testified for the government at the Miami drug trial that stemmed from the indictment of the four Cuban officials.

Interviewed in New York, Mr. Crump, currently a U.S. resident, recalls his association with the former Cuban ambassador to Colombia: "We talked to each other almost daily during the last two or three years I was in Colombia," he says. "We called each other *compadre*." The tall, lanky Mr. Crump displays a snapshot of his youngest daughter, Viviana, with Ambassador Ravelo at the child's baptism in Bogota in November 1980. "Ambassador Ravelo was the godfather," Mr. Crump says.

GATHERING IN BOGOTA

Mr. Crump figured prominently in the negotiations that led to an agreement between the smugglers and Cuba, according to the interview and trial testimony. The deal was struck at a series of meetings held during 1979 and 1980 at the Bogota Hilton Hotel, Mr. Crump says. In attendance were Mr. Crump, Mr. Guillot-Lara, Ambassador Ravelo and Cuba's minister-counselor to Colombia, Gonzalo Bassols. They agreed that Mr. Guillot-Lara's drug boats, flying the Panamanian flag, and bearing the code name Viviana, would be given passage through Cuban waters.

Also privy to those meetings was Mr. Guillot-Lara's girlfriend at the time, Carmen Blanco, whose room at the Bogota Hilton adjoined the conference room. Miss Blanco later told the Miami grand jury that indicted the four Cuban officials what she had overheard. At one point, she said, Mr. Guillot-Lara told the Cubans that "he had enough money to do any type of business with them."

She also testified that Mr. Bassols, the Cuban minister-counselor, told Guillot-Lara that the drug scheme had been cleared by a high Cuban official. "Did he mention that man's name?" the prosecutor asked. "Fidel Castro," replied Miss Blanco, who wasn't accused of any wrongdoing.

A self-described former Cuban intelligence agent, Mario Estevez, was a government witness at the Miami trial. Mr. Estevez said he served on the crew of the Lazy Lady, a fishing boat that sailed from Florida to Cuba in late 1980 to rendezvous with the Viviana, a mother ship laden with 10 million Quaaludes from Colombia. Guillot-Lara, who had purchased the pills for 10 cents each, intended to smuggle them into the U.S., where they would fetch 70 cents apiece, according to information at the trial in Miami.

Mr. Estevez testified that when the Lazy Lady pulled into port on Cuba's north coast it was greeted by Aldo Santamaria Cuadrado, a Cuban vice admiral. The vice admiral allegedly said to the crew: "We are going to fill Miami completely with the drugs." Imprisoned for a drug conviction in 1982, Mr. Estevez has since been released.

Since that incident, U.S. drug agents have seized a number of Mr. Guillot-Lara's ships, thus sharply reducing his drug income and hampering his ability to pay Cuba the required fees. He owed the Cuban government an estimated $8 million as of October 1981, an official of the U.S. drug agency says.

One trawler, seized off North Carolina in 1981, contained 40,000 pounds of marijuana, worth $16 million wholesale. U.S. Coast Guard officials say it bore the name Viviana and flew a Panamanian flag.

Since 1982, the U.S. Coast Guard has intensified its effort to choke off the flow of drugs by placing its cutters along two major trade routes: the Yucatan Straits between Cuba and Mexico and the Windward Passage between Cuba and Haiti. But the Cubans apparently have devised a plan to undercut the U.S. strategy.

According to a Defense Department intelligence report, Cuba has rented a cargo ship for $24,000 a month from a Panamanian shipowner. The scheme calls for the ship to move narcotics north from Colombia to a small island off Cuba's southern coast. The drugs would then be flown over the Cuban mainland to an island off the northern coast and from there shipped to Florida. This route would neatly avoid the Yucatan Straits and the Windward Passage. Whether the plan has yet been employed isn't known.●

DEATH OF FORMER GOV. BILL EGAN OF ALASKA

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to a great Alaskan who played a major role in Alaska's history.

Former Gov. William Egan, 69 years old, died Sunday of cancer. During his lifetime, Bill, as the first Governor of Alaska, was in large part responsible for charting Alaska's future as a State; surely one of the toughest jobs ever faced by an Alaskan.

Bill was one of Alaska's most effective champions of statehood and chaired the convention which carefully crafted Alaska's State constitution.

A firm believer that Alaska's natural resources could be developed rationally for the benefit of the people of Alaska—and the people of the Nation as well—Bill never stopped promoting sound use of the State's natural resources. He was a founding member and cochairman of Commonwealth North, a civic organization dedicated to the orderly economic growth and prosperity of Alaska.

Bill was loved and respected by all Alaskans, as evidenced by his serving three terms as Governor.

One of his most memorable traits was his uncanny ability to remember names and faces. It was commonplace for Bill to meet someone he had met years before and, without hesitation, call him by name. This ability may have seemed to be a small thing, but it was important to everyone who had the privilege of meeting him, and in the three terms he served as Governor, everyone was almost every Alaskan.

I should also like to express my condolences to Bill's longtime companion and ardent supporter, his wife, Neva, as well as his son, Dennis; his sister, Alice Horton; his brother, Clinton, and two granddaughters.

He will be missed.●

COSPONSORSHIP OF NATIONAL ICE CREAM MONTH

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I today cosponsor a joint resolution introduced by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON). This joint resolution would designate the month of July as National Ice Cream Month and July 15, 1984, as National Ice Cream Day.

Mr. President, in my home State of New York, dairy farming is one of our most lucrative and productive industries. Ice cream production uses nearly 10 percent of the milk produced by dairy farmers. The ice cream industry employs thousands and its sales total over $3½ billion.

Not only is ice cream loved by 90 percent of all Americans, but also it is typically American. It symbolizes the United States.

Therefore, in honor of the ice cream industry's sparkling economic performance and its nationwide appeal, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the role that this nutritious and wholesome food has played in America's life by adopting this resolution without delay.

Thank you, Mr. President.●

SECRETARY REGAN DISCUSSES THE ECONOMY

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury, Donald Regan, recently spoke in St. Louis to the National Conference of Black Mayors. His remarks covered a broad range of topics relating to the economy. I believe it is noteworthy that the Secretary emphasized the administration's commitment to the enterprise zone legislation to which the Senate agreed last month. These remarks show that the proposal is one of the high priorities of the administration.

I ask that the text of the Secretary's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY DONALD T. REGAN

It's a pleasure to be in St. Louis, not the least of the reasons being it's a pleasure to get out of Washington. Although I will admit it's a nice time of the year to be in our nation's capital.

Lately, the sun has been shining, the cherry blossoms are blooming and the squirrels are scurring around searching for nuts. Which has a lot of Washingtonians nervous.

A month ago I met with a few members of your group and we had a frank and honest discussion. They felt that it would be a good idea to continue here today before your entire organization what we began discussing last month.

I speak to you as one public servant to another.

Our administration is now embarked upon a program which we believe captures a sensible mixture of idealism and pragmatism. It is a program which holds the promise of progress to all Americans, and, I believe it's

a program which is pragmatic, that is, a program which will bring results.

And yet admittedly there are many who yet don't share in the fruits of this prosperity.

And this fact creates a dilemma for all of us in government—for you in your cities, and for us in Washington.

For our part, we are consistently urged to try one of three paths.

There are those who say to us, "Do nothing." But no American can ignore the plight of less fortunate Americans. Out of compassion and humanity, we have an obligation to act.

Then, there are those who say "Try more government aid programs. Spend more money." Well, that has a certain appeal. It sounds good. It is well-intentioned. It satisfies our sense of duty.

There's just one problem. It doesn't work. For half a century we tried these programs. The problems got worse. Then we tried even newer, bigger programs. Again, they didn't work.

Layers of bureaucracy were added. Money was squandered. Much of it staying in Washington. Too little of it ever reaching the people for whom the benefits were intended. They suffered all the more.

Clearly, all we did by throwing good money after bad was to prove a very sound economic theorem: the law of diminishing returns. We kept speeding up the train even though we were heading down the wrong track.

After a half century, not only didn't we help those we intended to help, but we endangered everyone else with destructive inflation and an economy that seemingly had lost its ability to ever boom again. It was time for something new.

The third approach is the one we are now embarked on.

At its core is the belief that if the whole economy could advance, if the whole economy could grow without inflation, then, through that growth, we could also outgrow many of our problems.

It is predicated on the belief that people want to help themselves. We believe they are ready to take advantage of economic opportunity if is is presented to them. We believe they want to do it themselves—and be masters of their own destinies, their own lives.

Can all this happen all at once? Can it happen everywhere at once? No, of course not. Like everything worthwhile, it takes time to build. And therein lies the problem for you and me—and all government officials.

Voters have little, indeed very little patience. But that shouldn't move us from our course.

Our answer is to stimulate the economy. We are doing that, and it obviously has begun to work. But because it hasn't worked on the instant, for everyone everywhere, should we abandon this approach?

I don't think so. Because in the last analysis we must ask and anwer the question: what approach will do the most, for the most, on a permanent basis.

One case in point sums up the difference between the old politics of government pump priming and our approach.

Last year there were demands for us to support an old-style, $3.5 billion training program that was meant to place 300,000 people in make-work jobs over a one year period. We turned it down believing firmly that economic recovery could do that job.

Well, it did the job. We have added over 300,000 permanent jobs every single month for the past 16 months. That's more than 5 million new workers on the job and paying taxes.

Put simply, the recovery put as many people back to work each month as that job program would have done in a year.

I believe this is the kind of program we should pursue—a program that puts people to work, money in their pockets and, incidentally, money in your cash box and mine.

Now I'm not unmindful of the interim pressures. Each of you is a CEO of a municipal community. No matter what the size of your city, you have all experienced the same problems of any mayor in any town. For many of you, your tax base has shifted. To cope, you know that you have to pursue that economic ideal, the net taxpayer—that man, woman, family or business that pays more in taxes than he demands in services.

By the way when you get back home, I wouldn't put it exactly that way. Believe me those net taxpayers will unnet themselves pretty quickly when they find out that's what they are.

So what can you do? There are many who demand and need services but are in less of a position to pay for them. Do you raise taxes for them? Of course not. The answer is not higher tax rates. It doesn't make any sense to raise taxes when others are already taxed about as much as they can bear.

The answer is to increase your tax base, rather than the tax rate. And I find there is a grudging, but growing recognition that high marginal tax rates work against efforts to increase that base.

Bearing that in mind we at the federal level cut marginal tax rates. And we're seeing results. Our tax cuts are fueling an entrepreneurial explosion. New incorporations have doubled since 1977 and may have hit a record 600,000 in 1983. Minorities and women, according to the Small Business Administration, are starting new firms even faster than average. These are the risk takers who generate the most new products and these new ventures produce the jobs that are so important to your cities.

It is this we are trying to encourage. This will be the engine that will pull your economies down the right track. And to this end we designed specific programs.

One is our program of enterprise zones—a program unanimously endorsed by the National League of Cities last December.

This program combines tax cuts and advantages for businesses, jobs for the unemployed, and renewal and restoration of our hardest hit inner cities.

It is a program already passed by the Senate of the United States. In fact, it is a program widely endorsed by members of both parties. Yet it is a program in limbo.

For two years that legislation has sat on Capitol Hill. The House continues to bottle it up.

As the President asked one month ago "How in the world can some people give speeches about creating jobs and hope when they refuse to take action on a bill that is designed to provide just that?"

It's a good question. I have a theory. The Congress knows the program will work. But instead there are those with vested interests—those who would perpetuate old failed programs which they sponsored rather than allowing us to try new ones.

Enterprise zones encourage growth where we need it most—in areas of high youth and minority unemployment, in urban areas where the tax base has been hit the hardest.

Our legislation will give cities the chance and flexibility to make this innovative idea work.

Twenty one states have passed their own enterprise zone programs—and the results are encouraging.

We need your partnership. And we need you to convince the House to pass this legislation. As the President said, "They don't have to see the light. They have to feel the heat."

On another front we have had some legislative success. Last November the President reconfirmed our commitment to the revenue sharing program which recently sent $4.6 billion from Washington back to our cities, counties and towns.

Historically, the federal government has collected revenue efficiently. But it has never been as efficient in allocating that revenue back to the local level.

The revenue sharing program we administer at the Treasury Department is a successful no-strings program enabling us to spend money not as Washington dictates, but as local officials choose. And I'm thankful for that since history proves that the federal government is almost inept in allocating that revenue back to the local level. I'll never believe that some bureaucrat hundreds or even thousands of miles from your city can ever know better than you where available funds should be spent.

Furthermore, Revenue Sharing is one of our most cost-effective programs at Treasury, spending a little more than one-tenth of one percent on administration. As a result our general revenue sharing program will set a superb example of government efficiency for other federal programs.

As the President said as he signed the bill on November 30 "The federal government never spent more money wisely than by devoting it to general revenue sharing."

The specific legislation of enterprise zones and revenue sharing are only steps in the general economic program of growth and revitalization which are essential to economic recovery and victory.

You are mayors of cities from across this land. Many of you represent small cities. Some of you represent our largest cities. As I look across the country, from my vantage point as Treasury Secretary, and consider our overall national financial position, I cannot separate the federal from the state and local.

And as I look, I am heartened and relieved. We have made some significant steps forward. Remember for just a moment where we were four years ago. Political memories are often short. But we can't afford to forget.

Four years ago economic activity was grinding to a standstill. Industrial production was down. Actual wages and earnings were down. Productivity was down. And small businesses, which account for nearly two thirds of new jobs and employ so many minority and disadvantaged youths, were stifled.

Four years ago inflation was at the highest level in our history.

Who does that hurt? The rich? Well, yes, but the poor and middle class even more.

The prices of necessities—take food for example, were rising so quickly that a poor family's monthly grocery bill jumped from $165 to $240.

If the inflation rate of four years ago continued, the poor family would now be paying $300 a month for food, the same is true for energy and housing.

Today we believe the backbone of inflation has been broken. In 1983 the rate was only 3.8 percent, down from highs of 12 and 13 percent, and reaching 15 percent in some months.

That figure alone is a fact of economic transfiguration.

But that's not all we've done. Our program of fiscal reform ended a five year period in which tax revenues actually doubled. Today your taxes are significantly lower because of our war on inflation and our historic tax cuts.

And our tax program isn't finished either. It is estimated that more than three quarters of the benefits of tax indexing will go to lower and middle income taxpayers. Without that tax indexing, those in the lowest tax bracket would face a tax hike of up to 10 percent by 1988.

Combining these tax breaks with the sharp drop in inflation, the average family will enjoy $4,000 in additional purchasing power this year.

Those figures are certainly an improvement over four years ago. And yet to look at the newspapers and television, one would never know that. I think some of this comes from the fact that it's an election year. As a result, politicians and journalists have to sell something to someone. The party in power is often attacked for make-believe actions it never sponsored. This year, this time around the party in power is being called "unfair."

What do they mean by that? Unfairness to whom? Our programs benefit all Americans. These figures of economic growth, lower inflation, and less taxes hold the promise of lasting economic independence and growth benefiting all Americans.

What our opponents really have in mind is our unfairness to their vested programs. We are not willing to go down the road of high taxation, high inflation, low growth and economic stagnation.

Our programs do something their so called fair programs don't. Our programs work. The 3.8 percent rise in consumer prices in 1983 was the lowest rise in more than a decade and the 0.6 percent rise in producer prices was the lowest in nearly two decades.

Our GNP growth this year will be strong and steady. We are estimating about 5 percent for 1984.

The leading economic indicators are up. Industrial production is rising. Productivity rose at a 1 percent annual rate in the fourth quarter of 1983 and was up 3.5 percent from a year earlier.

These are the facts of success. These are the facts of economic recovery. These are the facts which mean benefits for all Americans.

But I recognize, and you recognize that the full effect of economic reform takes time. A wise predecessor of mine once said "the economist's lag is the politician's nightmare."

It's true. Those of us in government are on the line—on the line to produce results. But we can't provide instant miracles unless we resort to sham, and are willing to pay a higher price later. We won't do this.

Instead, we must stick with our program. It has just begun. The progress we have made to date is undeniable, our faith in the future is unshakeable.

Of special significance to you and all Americans is our directive from the President to develop a proposal for fundamental change in the tax code. What we have now is best described as a quagmire. It's complexity and inefficiency has reached the point of being disgraceful.

Our task is to develop a proposal for a system that is fair, simple and economically efficient. And it's quite possible that a simpler system, with a broader tax base would allow tax rates to drop.

On deficits, I'm very confident that we will soon have an acceptable downpayment. We are very serious about this problem and cognizant of the impact large deficits could have in later years.

I find the word "downpayment" to be very appropriate in this case. It implies future action and I can assure you we have no intention of stopping here. We are committed to removing the current deficit and to controlling the overspending that drains resources from the economy.

Now, I won't kid you or myself. There are special interest groups everywhere for everything who will attempt to protect their particular program and even push for larger funding. They'll call us unfair. But what's really unfair is to run up larger and larger deficits with more and more spending—and running the risk of putting this economy back to where it was three and four years ago.

If we can continue our course, I am confident that growth will continue. As the economy expands, the opportunities for all Americans will grow as well.

With lower inflation, more jobs, less taxes, and overall economic growth, the closing years of the twentieth century will be a time of exhiliration and expansion—a time which will prove, once and for all, that there is no limit to the progress of free men in a free market. And a time which will rid us once and for all of the stagnation and lessoning opportunity of the late 1960s and 1970s.

I can't think of a better economic prescription for the mayors of any city, nor for any American.

Thank you.●

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE AND FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, on tomorrow, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be recognized under a special order for not to exceed 15 minutes; and that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 12 noon, in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, that is all I have, and I see no other Senator seeking recognition.

Having consulted with the minority leader in advance, I now move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 7:34 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, May 9, 1984, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate May 7, 1984, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1984:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Weston Adams, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malawi.

Edward E. Wolfe, of Virginia, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries Affairs, for the rank of ambassador.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Ben C. Rusche, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. (New position—Public Law 97-425 of January 7, 1983.)

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1984:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Air Force, under the provisions of section 628, title 10, United States Code, as amended, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Kempi, David J., Jr., [redacted]
Lyons, Edward K., [redacted]
Menke, Norman T., [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonel

Alenduff, Joseph R., [redacted]
Baker, Charles W., Jr., [redacted]
Bennett, Richard J., [redacted]
Bush, Howard J., [redacted]
Douglass, Bruce S., [redacted]
Eden, James L., [redacted]
Ferebee, George W., [redacted]
Haeusser, Horst G., [redacted]
Hauger, Jon D., [redacted]
Lau, Earl S. C., [redacted]
Liebchen, Peter A. W., [redacted]
Payne, Charles W., Jr., [redacted]
Perry, Glenn M., II, [redacted]
Schaffner, James L., [redacted]
Schroeder, Leonard T., III, [redacted]
Thompson, Thomas N., [redacted]
Weisert, Donald H., [redacted]
Witt, Merlyn J., [redacted]

To be major

Bertoldo, Donald R., [redacted]
Kobernik, Ronald K., [redacted]
Ruppelius, David E., [redacted]

MEDICAL SCIENCE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Mitchell, Robert B., [redacted]

To be major

Csercsevits, Martin B., [redacted]
Storey, Richard C., Jr., [redacted]

CHAPLAIN

To be major

Supa, Joseph, [redacted]

NURSE CORPS

To be major

Currystradleigh, Patricia M., [redacted]

The following-named officers for promotion to the grade indicated in the Reserve of the Air Force, under the provisions of sec-

tion 307, title 32, United States Code, and Sections 8363 and 593, title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Bailey, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnhart, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boab, Patrick S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buchanan, Gordon J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Butler, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cabrinha, Lawrence C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chapman, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christgen, Kenneth H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cosgrave, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowder, Dean W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dodge, Dexter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evanoff, Boris G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Marvin J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gallagher, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gruenhagen, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haack, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hague, Dennis B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kalka, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Killey, Philip G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindemuth, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Linz, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lowe, Theodore F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Machemehl, Charles A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
May, Stanley P., xxx-xx-xxxx
McCutchin, Emmett L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Meshell, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Messner, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nelson, Gary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nelson, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Neville, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Donnell, Paul H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quarelli, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Francis D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryan, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simpson, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Slauson, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Troyer, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tyus, Ted D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Udell, Maurice H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walston, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Westerberg, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wheeler, Lewis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Whitehead, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Womack, Fred D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wooding, Judson E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woodward, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN CORPS

McCarty, Harvey D., xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDGE ADVOCATE

Carpenter, Howard G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paschon, Robert V., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

Davis, Henry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Meade O., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lojko, Albert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reed, Samuel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rosenthal, Morris W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryckman, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Syribeys, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zongker, Philip E., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Air Force under the provisions of section 593(a) title 10 of the United States Code, as amended:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Will T. Abernathy Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Dudley S. Bynum, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Ernest S. Clark, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Henry B. Foster III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. David E. Friestad, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Thomas J. Gresch, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Roy A. Lefever, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Donald J. McCurnin, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. David E. McCutchin, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Michael D. McIlhon, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Edward J. Mechenbier, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Dean L. Monteith, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. C. D. Payne, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Louis J. Pellegrine, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Douglas M. Pierce, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. William A. Prosise Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Robert T. Radochia, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Robert E. Ramsburg, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Aubrey V. Renfroe, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Gary L. Senseney, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Daniel R. Stringfellow, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Philip E. Thornton, xxx-xx-xxxx

LEGAL

Maj. Harry C. Dees Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN

Maj. William J. Hower, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Maj. Clayton J. Arnold Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

Maj. Arthur W. Spiro, xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 531, title 10, United States Code, with grades and dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force provided that in no case shall the officers be appointed in a grade higher than that indicated.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be captain

Loffland, John, E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marr, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 624:

Abblitt, Donald L., xxxx
Addison, Jesse W., xx...
Akstin, Anthony C., xx...
Allen, Thomas E., xx...
Arbacas, William V., Jr., xx...
Armbrister, Anthony P., xx...
Aslaken, Michael L., xx...
Bailey, Ronnie J., xxxx
Baker, Harold L., xx...
Banta, Robert W., Jr., xx...
Barber, Richard E., xx...
Barnes, Harry K., xx...
Baron, Peter T., xx...
Barrows, Thomas L., xx...
Bauernfeind, Edmund, xx...
Beaver, Donald B., xx...
Beavers, Jennings B. II, xx...
Beitz, John C. II, xx...
Bekeris, Joseph A. III, xx...
Bender, Robert G., Jr., xx...
Benes, Edward A., xx...
Benson, James H., xx...
Berndt, Martin R., xx...
Berry, William D., xx...
Bice, David F., xx...
Bishoff, Willie R., Jr., xxxx
Bockman, Larry J., xx...
Boehm, Harold C., Jr., xx...
Boese, William J., xx...
Bonham, Alan R., xx...
Boulden, David F., xx...
Boulware, John C., Jr., xx...
Boyle, Joseph M., xx...
Brannon, Daniel M., xx...
Brewer, Frank L., xx...
Brewer, Slade A., xx...
Broadaway, William W., xx...
Brown, George B., III, xx...
Brown, Kenneth J., xx...
Bucko, Leonard J., xx...
Burgess, Laurence K., xx...
Burroughs, Ervin W., xx...
Busam, Francis J., xx...
Bushnell, William D., xx...
Butler, James Q., Jr., xxxx
Campbell, Rodney L., xx...
Carlson, George A., xx...
Carras, Thomas P., xx...
Caspersen, Mark H., xx...
Cero, Benjamin A., xx...
Chambliss, Richard W., xx...
Chetkovich, Mary K., xx...
Christopher, Ronald R., Jr., xx...
Ciampa, Joseph F., xxxx
Cicerrella, Warren J., xx...
Cieslak, James L., xx...
Clancey, Dennis E., xx...
Clark, William A., III, xx...
Clarke, Larry G., xxxx
Clinton, John T., xx...
Collins, Clarence M., III, xx...
Collins, William R., xx...
Conner, Paul R., xx...
Consagra, Louis C., xx...
Cooley, Joel L., xx...
Cooper, Gerald J., xx...
Craig, Larry A., xx...
Critchfield, Daniel D., xx...
Crooker, Carol S., xx...
Cross, Charles D., xx...
Cross, Michael J., xx...
Crow, Michael J., xx...
Cucina, Anthony H., Jr., xxxx
Culp, Ronald K., xx...
Cushman, Larry J., xxxx
Dallaire, Richard J., xx...
Daugherty, Sharon F., xx...
Defreytas, John R., xxxx
Dehoust, Walter F., xx...
Demahy, Bernard M., Jr., xx...
Deubler, William F., xx...
Dineen, Michael J., xx...
Donnelly, Thomas P., Jr., xx...
Dougherty, Roger H., xx...
Dubrachek, Cyril P., xx...
Duff, Richard H., xx...
Duhe, Keith M., xx...
Dunn, Perry R., xx...
Edwards, Linda E., xx...
Eisenbrey, David R., xx...
Emery, Harvey W., Jr., xx...
English, Joe R., xx...
Enke, Russell J., xx...
Estes, Kenneth W., xx...
Farmer, Paul C., xx...
Faucher, Ronald R., xx...
Fawcett, Robert J., xx...
Feigel, David E., xx...
Fisher, Charles S., xx...
Florence, Howard C., xxxx
Ford, Walter G., xx...
Fowler, Frederick T., xx...
Frantz, Kenneth D., xx...
Frommelt, Warren T., Jr., xx...
Fulks, James A., xx...
Gangloff, Jon A., xx...
Ganier, Milton J., xx...
Garbett, Cheryl A., xx...
Garbrous, Joseph C., xx...
Garner, Robert J., xx...
Garrett, Donald R., xx...
Garrett, John C., xx...
Gearhart, Lyle D., xx...
Geary, Robert W., xx...
Geren, Henry C., II, xx...
Goral, Frank L., xx...
Goza, Joel L., xx...
Green, Richard H., xx...
Green, William W., xxxx
Greene, Michael R., xx...
Greska, Thomas J., xx...
Guerin, James M., xx...
Hackert, Nancy J., xx...

Hagel, Lawrence B., XX...
Hagerman, Richard A., XX...
Hagerty, Robert M., XX...
Hailston, Earl B., XX...
Hall, Thomas H., Jr., XX...
Hamilton, Paul S., XX...
Hampton, Thomas E., XX...
Hance, George W., Jr., XX...
Harder, Bruce R., XX...
Harley, William, XX...
Harvey, Ralph E., XX...
Hatch, James E., XX...
Hay, Edward P., Jr., XX...
Heck, Matthew J., XX...
Heffernan, John B., XX...
Henderson, Michael B., XX...
Henderson, Michael M., XX...
Hensley, Robert W., XX...
Hess, Theodore G., XX...
Hicks, Thomas H., XX...
Hieb, Ross J., XX...
Hodges, James W., XX...
Holloway, Ronnie, XX...
Horne, William J., XX...
Hough, Michael A., XX...
Houston, Dan P., XX...
Hover, Carl T., XX...
Hudson, Richard B., XX...
Hughes, Daniel L., XX...
Hurst, Stephen F., XX...
Ingersoll, Jonathan E., XX...
Jacobs, David H., XX...
Jacobs, Roger A., XXXX
James, Samuel E., XX...
Jensen, Harry, Jr., XX...
Johnson, Allan W., XX...
Johnson, Charles C., XX...
Jones, Robert D., XX...
Jordan, Larry J., XX...
Juve, Martin O., XX...
Kaba, Ronald L., XX...
Kayser, Richard H., XX...
Keene, Thomas A., XX...
Kelley, Kevin P., XXXX
Kelley, Terrell T., XX...
Kelly, Paul V., XX...
Kennedy, Kevin M., XX...
Kerrigan, Dennis W., XX...
King, Pierce R., XX...
Kline, Richard L., Jr., XX...
Knutson, Bruce B., Jr., XX...
Kolb, Bernard F., XX...
Kollay, Daniel P., XX...
Korneder, John H., XX...
Kostin, Bazil, XX...
Kratz, Jon J., XX...
Krupp, Dennis T., XX...
Kuck, George V., Jr., XX...
Kunkel, Richard H., Jr., XX...
Larose, Arlen L., XX...
Larson, Robert G., XX...
Lavoy, Donald J., XX...
Leonard, Edward M., XX...
Leonard, John E. XXXX
Leonard, John P., III, XX...
Lippold, Roger H., XX...
Lockett, Clifford B., Jr., XX...
Long, Everett, III, XX...
Loomis, Gary L., XX...
Lovingood, Howard, XX...
Luby, Bernard F., Jr., XX...
Lucas, William J., XXXX
Lutz, David A., XX...
Lyman, Charles H., XX...
Lyon, Bruce C., XX...
Mack, John M., XX...
Maddocks, Robert A., Jr., XX...
Magnus, Robert, XX...
Majchrzak, James D., XX...
Marlow, Roger D., XX...
Martello, Frank J., Jr., XX...
Martin, John P., XX...
Massimini, Sebastian V., XX...
Maxon, Warren D., XX...
McAtee, Willard J., XX...
McCarty, Michael R., XX...
McElraft, Roger C., XX...
McElyea, William P., XX...
McGinnis, Harold S., Jr., XX...
McKiernan, Robert F., XX...
McKittrick, Robert B., XX...
McLaughlin, Sidney E., XX...
McMinn, Vernon L., XX...
McMullen, William C., III, XX...
McNutt, Kenneth E., Jr., XX...
Medinger, Vernon G., XX...
Merritt, Jerry A., XXXX
Messer, James M., XX...
Miller, Benjamin P., III, XX...
Miller, Paul W., XX...
Miller, Wallace B., XX...
Mize, David M., XX...
Molon, Thomas J., XX...
Monahan, Mark C., XX...
Morris, Wayne V., XX...
Moseler, Daniel J., XX...
Murray, James M., Jr., XX...
Murray, John T., XX...
Myers, Richard H., XX...
Niewenhous, Siebrand H., III, XX...
Norton, Harvey R., XX...
Oldfield, William B., Jr., XX...
Oler, Willie J., XX...
O'Neill, Hugh J., XX...
Orth, Thomas M., XX...
Osborne, James M., XX...
Palermo, Anthony M., XX...
Parker, Robert D., XX...
Parks, Garry L., XX...
Parsons, Larry F., XX...
Penne, John A., XX...
Perry, Henry C., XX...
Peterson, Harry W., III., XX...
Petty, Leslie B., XX...
Pfeiffer, Samuel F., Jr., XX...
Pilcher, Russell D., XX...
Pitterle, Peter T., XX...
Plantz, James G., XX...
Powell, Michael L., XX...
Powers, David R., XX...
Priest, Richard H., XX...
Quinter, Theodore L., XX...
Quist, Burton C., XX...
Rannals, Larry D., XX...
Ransbottom, William E., XX...
Rathbun, James P., Jr., XX...
Rayburn, Ross., XX...
Reardon, Michael J., Jr., XX...
Reed, Bruce J., XX...
Reeke, John D., XX...
Reilly, Charles T., Jr., XX...
Reiten, Robert P., XX...
Restivo, Johnny D., XX...
Rice, John E., XX...
Ricker, Larry M., XX...
Riddick, Walter H., XX...
Riersgard, Daryl D., XX...
Rigoulot, James P., XX...
Rivers, Robert W., XX...
Roach, Alan J., XX...
Roake, John M., XX...
Roberson, Larry E., XXXX
Roberts, Billy J., XX...
Roberts, Collin C., XX...
Robertus, John H., XX...
Robnick, Sands A., XX...
Rodriguez, Humberto W., XX...
Rogers, Steven G., XX...
Ronald, Jeffrey T., XXXX
Roth, Lester D., Jr., XX...
Rudge, Harry G., XX...
Rupp, William R., XX...
Sakowicz, Charles A., XX...
Scott, William F., XX...
Seeley, David J., XX...
Sefton, Keith T., XX...
Sevon, Walter W., Jr., XX...
Sexton, James P., XX...
Shallcross, Walter W., III, XX...
Shotwell, John M., XX...
Sloan, William S., XX...
Smith, Rodney N., XX...
Smith, Terrance L., XX...
Smith, William A., XX...
Snakenberg, John D., XX...
Solhan, George XX...
Somers, Myles P., XX...
Soniak, Michael J., XX...
Southwick, Curtis B., XX...
Sprietsma, Charles F., XX...
Stearns, Richard D., XX...
Steinbaugh, Eric N., XX...
Stelma, John T., XX...
Stewart, Charles E., XX...
Stivers, Keith H., XX...
Stromberg, Russel M., XX...
Stuckey, Thomas L., Jr., XX...
Sullivan, Patrick, XX...
Swihart, Thomas W., XX...
Talty, Thomas M., XX...
Taylor, Ronald L., XX...
Teixeira, Milton J., XX...
Theune, Donald W., XX...
Todd, John R., XX...
Tomsky, David F., XX...
Traasdahl, Edward C., XX...
Trathowen, Clyde R., XX...
Tyler, Robert R., XX...
Waddill, Durward C., XX...
Walke, Edwin C., XX...
Waniata, Roger P., XX...
Weber, David L., XX...
Wellington, Joseph A., XX...
Wellman, David A., XX...
Whitlow, James L., XX...
Williams, Frederick C., Jr., XX...
Wills, John M., XX...
Wilson, James W., II, XX...
Wilson, Marvin L., Jr., XX...
Winslow, John H., XX...
Winterheimer, Jack W., XX...
Yahner, Frank A., III XX...
Young, Billy L., XX...
Young, Charles F., XX...
Ziehmn, Michael V., XX...

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, May 8, 1984*

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O righteous God, as Your blessings have given comfort and assurance in days past, so may Your love surround us this day. May Your spirit give peace and hope to all who need support, and may Your benediction follow us throughout our lives. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of April 26, 1984, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10:05 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10:05 a.m.

□ 1000

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 126 IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding.

The U.S. Army Band and Chorus (Pershing's Own), under the direction of Col. Eugene W. Allen, leader and commander, entered the door to the left of the Speaker, took the positions assigned to them, and presented a prelude concert.

The honored guests, Margaret Truman Daniel, E. Clifton Daniel, and their four sons, Clifton, William, Harrison, and Thomas entered the door to the right of the Speaker, and took the positions assigned to them.

The Doorkeeper, the Honorable James T. Malloy, announced the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND) and the Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 126, the joint meeting to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman will come to order.

The Doorkeeper will announce the colors.

The Doorkeeper announced the colors of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Members will rise.

The Members rose, and the colors were carried into the Chamber by the Joint Armed Forces Color Guard.

The National Anthem was presented by the U.S. Army Band and Chorus.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House.

The SPEAKER. The invocation will be given by the Reverend James David Ford, Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following invocation:

Almighty God, as we gather this day for remembrance and celebration, we ask Your blessing upon us. We recall with appreciation the life and work of Harry S. Truman for the values of family and faith that he treasured and for his dedication to the welfare of our country. May his efforts for justice in our society and understanding among the nations of the world inspire us to uphold those ideas and ideals which were exemplified by his life.

We thank You, O God, that at the decisive moments in life You raise up leaders for the needs of the day. Help us, O gracious God, to honor his memory that we may also seek justice, love, mercy, and ever walk humbly with You.

This we pray. Amen.

The colors were posted, and the Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Fourth District of Missouri, the Honorable IKE SKELTON, chairman of the Joint Committee of Arrangements.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the 98th Congress, distinguished guests:

I welcome you and the American people to this ceremony commemorating the 100th birthday of the man from Missouri, Harry S. Truman.

One hundred years ago today a son was born to John Anderson Truman and Martha Ellen Young Truman in Lamar, Mo. That event marked the beginning of the life of a great captain who for a critical period in our Nation's history guided our ship of state. He steered it on a straight course through troubled times.

This is a historic event. Joint meetings of Congress such as this rarely occur, and it is fitting that such an event should be held to honor a President who had such a great sense of history. "Reading history," Truman wrote of his childhood, "was far more than a romantic adventure. It was solid instruction and wise teaching which I felt somehow that I wanted and needed. I could see that history had some extremely valuable lessons to teach."

His knowledge of the past directed President Truman's aspirations for our Nation's future. Because he knew that time was the final arbiter, he was able to lead our country through some of the most difficult days without wearing the shackles of fleeting public opinion.

Harry Truman was more concerned about the judgment of history than what contemporary political pollsters said. He was more concerned about what was right or wrong.

Harry Truman throughout his life set an example for Americans for succeeding generations. He was the epitome of the citizen soldier. He was a loving and caring father and husband. He was a warm and true friend. He was possessed of the highest integrity, and he was a devoted public servant.

My father, being a longtime Missouri friend of Harry Truman, brought me to Washington when I was a 17-year-old high school senior to witness the inaugural ceremony on January 20, 1949. I well remember, as I stood on the Capitol Grounds on that wintry day, President Truman taking the oath of office and his saying, "I accept with great humility the honor which the American people have conferred upon me. I accept it with the resolve to do all that I can for the welfare of this Nation and for the peace of the world."

Harry Truman's whole life was a reflection of doing all that he could. He believed in doing his best. He once wrote to his daughter, "Your dad will never be reckoned among the great, but you can be sure he did his level

best and he gave all he had to his country."

President Truman offered his best, and the people of our Nation are the beneficiaries of his doing his best.

Harry Truman was right about many things, but his modesty led him to underestimate how history would remember him. Today when historians rank the Presidents of the United States, Harry S. Truman is always near the top of any such list, along with men like George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Jefferson. Harry Truman was one of our great Presidents because he took with him to the White House the character traits he had developed on the farm and in a small town in Missouri.

Truman's grandmother once said of him that he could plow the straightest furrow in the county. This was true about Harry Truman, both literally and figuratively, both as a young man on the farm and later as President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, because of what he brought to public service, he is not only an example for our time but a model for succeeding generations. Harry Truman had a special role in history, and I am sure that his stature will continue to rise in the years ahead. Thus it is fitting and proper that we pay tribute to the memory of that man born 100 years ago this day, this remarkable man from Missouri, Harry S. Truman.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. We are honored to have with us today the Truman family: In addition to Margaret Truman Daniel, E. Clifton Daniel, and their four sons, Clifton, William, Harrison, and Thomas.

Will they kindly rise and be acknowledged?

[Applause.]

□ 1020

The SPEAKER. We are also honored to have with us today many associates and Cabinet members of the late President; the Honorable John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury; Mrs. Oscar Chapman, widow of the Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture; Gov. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce and Ambassador to Russia and Great Britain; the Honorable Elmer Staats, Deputy Director of the Budget and Comptroller General.

We also have many members of the late President's personal staff: The Honorable David Stow; Gen. Donald Dawson; the Honorable George Elsey; the Honorable Roger Tubby; and the Honorable Philip Nash.

Will all of them please rise. [Applause.]

America had called upon Harry Truman's leadership as early as 1918 when he commanded Battery D of the 129th Field Artillery in France during the First World War.

The U.S. Army Band and Chorus will pay tribute to Captain Truman's military service with a medley of World War I songs, the "Over There Fantasie."

(The "Over There Fantasie" was presented by the U.S. Army Band and Chorus.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the Fifth District of Missouri, the Honorable ALAN WHEAT, who currently represents the hometown of the late President Truman.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the other body, distinguished guests, members of the Truman family: Today marks the 100th anniversary of the birth date of Harry S. Truman. I am proud to represent in the Congress of the United States the hometown of Harry Truman, Independence, Mo. This week I will be in Independence as we dedicate the Truman home to the national park system and honor Margaret Truman Daniel with the Harry S. Truman Public Service Award.

This last weekend I was in Independence for a parade honoring Harry Truman and in Grandview, Mo., for another parade honoring Mr. Truman, as well as the dedication of the Truman farm home. All of Independence, Grandview, and Kansas City turned out to honor Mr. Truman, but I am most proud to be here today on this historical occasion as our Nation honors the memory of Harry S. Truman, one of American's greatest Presidents. But we do not honor Mr. Truman merely because he was President. We honor him because he was a man of the people, a working man, a bank bookkeeper, a railroad timekeeper, a soldier, a haberdasher, a farmer, a county judge, and a U.S. Senator, and nowhere during his entire public nor private life did he ever lose his ability to stay in touch with the common man.

Harry Truman is remembered for many great attributes, but perhaps common people remember him more for his courage, his integrity, and his compassion than any other reason.

The year 1948 was an election year for Harry Truman. It was a very difficult election year and he had many advisers who told him that to push the Civil Rights Commission was an act of political suicide, but Harry Truman looked beyond political expediency to the greater goals that he had set for himself and for the Nation. He demanded of the Congress new civil rights laws protecting fair housing in this country, guaranteeing an end to discrimination in transportation and protecting America's greatest liberty, the right to vote, and then to prove that he himself would do what he had asked the Congress to do, he desegregated the Armed Forces by Executive order.

In 1984 we take these actions for granted, but in 1948 they created an uproar. Called upon to defend his actions at the Democratic Convention, he responded this way to a delegate from Alabama: "The bill of Rights applies to everyone in this country and don't you ever forget it," and he went on to say that, "It would be a good idea to read those 10 amendments every once in a while; not enough people do and that is one reason we are in the trouble we are in."

His courage was amplified by his integrity. In 1940, as today, it would be easy to give the Defense Department a blank check, but Harry Truman saw things differently in 1940. He said, "It is an amazing thing. Every 10 cents spent on a work relief project like the WPA or the PWA, every dime is looked into and somebody is always against spending a nickel to help the poor or to give a man a job who doesn't have any, but when it comes to the Defense Department, the sky is the limit and no questions asked and the economy boys never open their mouths about that." That was the integrity of Harry Truman. He did not believe in wasting Government money for any program, not even when it came to himself, because when he retired from the Presidency he did not retire with a great personal staff. He did not go back to a resort. He went to a modest home in Independence, a return to the private life he knew so well.

His courage, his integrity were tempered by his compassion; his love of all men, rich and poor, black and white, friend, and foe, was well known in Independence, Mo., and perhaps can be described best by the situation that he faced after World War II. There were many that urged Truman to take actions to keep the Soviet Union from taking advantage of a war-ravaged Europe and, in fact, he did recommend the Marshall plan, but he did not recommend it for political expediency. This is the way he put it to Sam Rayburn, one of the toughest Speakers of the House of Representatives ever to serve: "Sam, if we don't do it, Europe is going to have its greatest depression ever and I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of people are going to starve to death, and that is not something that we want to have on our conscience, not if we can help it, we don't."

That was Harry Truman. Perhaps today as we look at our foreign policy we should ask not only what Harry Truman would have done, but why he would have done it.

Ladies and gentlemen, he was one of the most powerful men of his century and yet at the same time remained firmly rooted in humble Missouri soil.

Courage, integrity, and compassion, those were all his, but perhaps his humility was his greatest gift. He put it best when he said, "I have tried my best to give the Nation everything I have. There are probably 1 million people who could have done the job better than I did it, but I had the job," and then he quoted an epitaph that he had read on a tombstone in a cemetery that said, "Here lies Jack Williams. He done his damndest."

Well, Harry Truman said he wanted to be remembered that way and, ladies and gentlemen, Harry Truman done his damndest, too. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Robert J. Donovan, who covered the White House as a member of the press during the Truman years and has written extensively about the late President. Mr. Robert J. Donovan.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, no one is in a better position than you ladies and gentlemen of the Congress to comprehend the drama and dimension of the Presidency of Harry S. Truman. Mr. Truman was a Member of the Senate for 10 years beginning in 1935. He served on Appropriations and other major committees. Starting from a rather friendless environment, he worked his way up through hard work, amiability, and political acumen to a position of influence and respect. He became one of the best liked Members of the Senate.

After Pearl Harbor, he had an idea that led to his becoming a national figure. The idea was to conduct an ongoing investigation of the costly national defense program. The need for congressional oversight was accepted at his suggestion and the highly publicized investigation proceeded under his chairmanship of what was called the Truman committee.

One of the many ironies of his life was that the Truman committee made him so prominent that it resulted in depriving him of the career he most coveted, that of remaining a Senator, for a situation had developed in the Democratic Party in 1944 that necessitated the choice of a compromise candidate to run with President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his quest for a fourth term. Circumstances combined to cast Senator Truman in that role. He yielded to the demands of party loyalty and was inaugurated as Vice President on January 20, 1945.

On April 12, 1945, his 83d day in that office, Vice President Truman was presiding over a work-a-day session of the Senate. His friend, Sam Rayburn, had invited him to the Speaker's hideaway off the House floor after the adjournment of the Senate. When Mr. Truman arrived, he was given a message to call Stephen Early at the White House. Early was a principal assistant to President Roosevelt who had gone to Warm Springs, Ga., for a rest. Mr. Truman returned the call and was startled by the strained tone of Early's voice bidding him, without explanation, to come to the White House immediately. Mr. Truman's limousine was at the Senate side. From the Speaker's hideaway, he darted down the stairs to the basement and ran the entire length of this building to get to it. What an arresting sight it would have been to see the Vice President running along through that dim and largely deserted passageway on that afternoon.

Four days later he was escorted down this center aisle as the 33d President of the United States for the purpose of addressing a joint session. The joint sessions then were broadcast by radio. Almost numbed by his new burdens, Mr. Truman strode up these steps, faced the audience, and began, "Mr. Speaker, Mr. President"——

"Just a minute," Speaker Rayburn interrupted in a Texas sized whisper, heard by millions of radio listeners, "let me present you, will you, Harry?"

The nearly 8 years that followed were a momentous time, as you ladies and gentlemen are being constantly reminded. Time and again, 40 years later, you are compelled to deal with policies, alliances, governmental institutions, weapons, and problems like the cold war that had their origins in the Truman administration. Who better than you can imagine the experience toward which the recent Senator Truman headed when he ran through the basement that afternoon.

The Second World War was at its climax. The Allied Nations in Europe were exhausted. Germany and Japan were toppling. Old empires were collapsing. Civil war loomed in China and in Vietnam. In the Middle East was approaching the hostilities in which Israel was soon to be born. Although devastated by war, the Soviet Union under Stalin was rising as one of two superpowers and in Los Alamos, N. Mex., plans were being made to test an atomic bomb.

The historical importance of Mr. Truman rests strongly on the fact that he was the President at the time when those enormous events had to be dealt with. In many cases, therefore, his decision was a matrix of American policy in the whole period following the Second World War and he could not go from Sam Rayburn's hideaway to the Oval Office and put his feet up on the desk and wait for a convenient time to make those decisions after ample reflection. The tide of events moved swiftly. Almost immediately the new President had to decide how to respond to Stalin's intrusions in Poland and Eastern Europe and what stand to take on troublesome disputes that arose that spring at the U.N. Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. Just beyond lay other extremely difficult decisions; the decision for example, on using the atomic bomb and the decision taken in pursuance of a policy inherited from the Roosevelt administration of sending occupying forces into southern Korea in the summer of 1945, the consequences of which could scarcely have been imagined.

Other great decisions affecting America's relations with Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, were rapidly forced upon President Truman. The symbols of those decisions are the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, NATO, point 4, the special relationship with Israel, the Korean war, and the building of friendly ties with America's erstwhile enemies, Japan and West Germany.

A critical fact about President Truman was that he believed that the United States should exert strong international leadership, rather than revert to isolationism. Such a viewpoint alined him with powerful elements in the Congress, in the press, in the universities, in the professions, in business and industry, in banks and investment houses, in labor and in the armed services.

His advocacy of a strong international policy put him in accord not only with Rooseveltian Democrats, but with Republicans, like Thomas E. Dewey, John Foster Dulles, and Henry L. Stimson. Despite differences in detail, Truman stood at the head of a potent consensus favoring a dominant American role, moral leadership, support of capitalist interests, and prevention of Communist expansionism. That consensus determined the direction of postwar American foreign policy.

Generally, President Truman's foreign policy initiatives required legislation, often at the time when the Republicans controlled the 80th Congress. When it came to European affairs, in contrast to China, on which bitter partisan differences arose, there was in truth a bipartisan foreign policy then. For that, many shared the credit with Mr. Truman. President Roosevelt had wisely laid the foundation. Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan, the chief Republican spokesman on foreign policy in the Senate then, was a towering figure in support. Other Republicans who come to mind were Senators Lodge and Saltonstall of Massachusetts, Cooper of Kentucky, and Smith of New Jersey; also, Representatives Eaton of New Jersey, Herter of Massachusetts, and Javits of New York.

□ 1040

It was President Truman's destiny to manage America's relations with a new order that emerged from the Second World War. In the process, significant historical landmarks were erected. It was a task stoutly undertaken by a very decent man.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. To a President who loved music, a tribute in words and music. The U.S. Army Band will now present a musical narrative dedicated to a great leader, citizen, and hero. Ladies and gentlemen, the premiere performance of "Nomination Into History":

The U.S. Army Band presented the musical narrative, "Nomination Into History."

The U.S. Army Chorus retired from the Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the first Secretary of the Air Force and former Senator from Missouri, the Honorable Stuart Symington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen: Just half a century ago, Harry S. Truman, of Independence, Mo., was elected to serve in the U.S. Senate. In the years following he added both his voice and his vote to the watershed legislation which gave our people new hope and our country new strength. He arrived here, as the leader said, as timid as a country boy on the campus of a great university. For Harry Truman was never timid. It was a secret world kept from his colleagues, his constituents, his subordinates, and his adversaries.

One can only wonder how many like Truman read "Plutarch's Lives," and also the histories of Greece and Rome and Egypt and the Orient, those civilizations of the past, which were but prolog to the world in which he was born, and born to lead.

As he later observed, he could not see well enough to bat, but wound up by the age of 14 to have read the books in the Independence Public Library, and our big, old Bible three times through.

It is said a President should have a sense of history. No President ever had more of that sense or more justly found his judgments to be fortified by that sense than Harry Truman.

What else contributed to his brilliant and enduring confidence? Missouri. The soil which he walked as a boy, his first paying job, coming up and mopping the floors of a neighborhood drugstore at 6:30 in the morning, his first week's wages, the three silver dollars which he thereupon tried to give his father, the responsibility of command of Battery D under fire near Verdun. Very possibly it was in France, with his own and many other lives at stake, plus his innate sense of order, that he learned in actual crisis to be a truly effective executive, manned with a capacity to delegate authority, along with the wisdom of giving such delegation to the right person.

In Government, where there is no profit, no profit motive, such delegation is vital for efficiency.

The one who would have the most influence on his life was the new acquaintance that he met in Sunday school, and described as having golden curls and the most beautiful blue eyes, the lady we were all to know and love one day as Bess Wallace Truman.

Let us also note the devotion that both parents had for their daughter, Margaret, a gracious wife and mother, who over the years has brought additional honor to the Truman name. The ingredients of a simple and virtuous family life, a correct bearing, a loving nature, and thirst for knowledge and service, these made up the man who one day was to stand at the helm of his country against neglect and indifference at home and tyranny abroad. Like the number of votes he received in 1948, those ingredients were more than sufficient.

I was honored to serve President Truman, and may I say to you all, including my former colleagues, that today I am doubly grateful and honored to serve his undying memory.

Bless you all.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the former Secretary of Defense, the former Special Counsel to the late President Truman, the Honorable Clark Clifford, who is the chairman of the Harry S. Truman Centennial. Clark Clifford.

Mr. CLIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, the Truman Centennial Committee wishes to present its deepest appreciation to the Congress for this magnificient ceremony honoring one of our most illustrious Presidents.

As I listened to the other speeches I found myself simultaneously pointing with pride and viewing with alarm, pointing with pride at the excellence of the speeches but viewing with alarm as all of the points that I was going to make were being made by the others. And as paragraph after paragraph slipped away from me, all I could think of was an incident that occurred years ago here in Washington at a dinner party.

A gentleman guest talked first to a dinner partner on his left; then he turned to the lady on his right and said, "Did I get your name correctly? Is your name Post?" She said, "Yes."

He said, "Is it Emily Post?" She said, "Yes."

He said, "Are you the world renowned authority on manners?"

She said, "Yes." Then she said, "Why do you ask?"

"Because," he said, "you have just eaten my salad." [Applause.]

Many times through the years people will ask what do you think was the most difficult decision the President made or the most far reaching. I am sure there is no ready answer for those questions but in my limited time I thought I would take one problem and show you the manner in which this man handled it. It might be called the anatomy of decision.

President Truman inherited from Franklin Roosevelt a deeply troubled Middle East and one of the major problems there was the question of whether or not there should be a homeland for the Jews. The President read a great deal, he consulted all of the available experts, and he reached the conclusion in his own mind that it should be the policy of our country to support a homeland for these people.

When he made that decision he brought upon himself the bitterest, the most venemous, unrelenting struggle that he had, I believe, during the entire time he was in the White House. There were powerful forces that were determined to see that this policy should not be carried out, and the most distressing one element of the entire controversy was the fact that most of the opposition came from within his own administration.

The State Department was absolutely determined that he should not succeed in carrying out his aim. The Defense Department at the same time felt that the decision was wrong because he was picking the incorrect side.

I remember one time having a conversation with James Forrestal, the first Secretary of Defense, and he said, "You fellows in the White House just don't understand what is going on." he said, "Soon 350,000 Jews will be pushed into the Mediterranean by 35 million Arabs."

I reported that to the President and the President said, "This is not a question of numbers. This is a question of basic human policy."

The contest went on. Over and over again he would start one move and it would be frustrated by those that worked against him in the State Department.

The great issue of the day was whether there should be trusteeship or whether there should be partition. If you favored trusteeship, you favored a plan that would postpone indefinitely and perhaps forever the establishment of a Jewish homeland. If you favored partition, then you were for the carving out of an area in Palestine and delivering it to those whom President Truman felt so richly deserved it.

Finally, this 3½-year-old conflict, growing always and in bitterness as it developed, came to a climax because on the 14th day of May the leaders in Palestine were to announce that was that day that the new Jewish state would come into existence. The President called me in maybe 2 weeks prior to that and he said, "Now, I am going to have a meeting on the 11th of May." And he said, "General Marshall will come over and Bob Lovett will come with him and they are experts."

And he said, "General Marshall is unalterably opposed to this policy."

□ 1100

And he said, "I wish that you would start in and prepare. I would like you to present my views to these men," and I remember his words; he said, "Accept it as though you were going to make an argument before the Supreme Court of the United States." And I went to work on it.

What I did was go back over my notes, go back over his speeches to find out the positions that he had taken on previous occasions. Then I organized that, so that I could present to General Marshall what I knew to be the President's own views.

The first point I made was the question of intolerance. The President said, "All my life I cannot bear intolerance. There is no more un-American attitude that exists. Why do some people feel that they are superior to others? And why must we have intolerance in our country?"

And he said, "In this effort to create a homeland for these people," he said, "this will be a blow against intolerance."

And second, he had talked many times about persecution. He said, "Why, over the centuries, must these people be persecuted? Why do others feel superior? What right do they have to segregate, to build ghettoes and see that these people do not have the opportunity of others, the opportunity of right, of work, of religion, the freedoms that we appreciate so much?"

He said, "I think that this step on our part will be an opportunity to demonstrate our attitude toward persecution."

And then he said, "Every individual in the world must feel some sense of personal guilt at the most bestial, the most unforgiveable, the most unbelievable crime in the world, and that was the extermination of 6 million Jews." And he said, "maybe we can, by urging this policy, make some feeble restitution at the agony that this has caused the world today."

And then one of the other main points he made was that in all the world, after the close of the Second World War, there were hundreds of thousands and even millions of displaced persons and every one of them had a place to return to except the Jews.

And he said, "How unfair can history be? How unfair that even after the close of the great war that no provision is being made and these people must shift from country to country looking for someplace where ultimately they can develop a life?"

President Truman was a great Bible student. Interestingly enough, he loved the Old Testament. He contended that the Old Testament had made a commitment to these people that some day they would come into their right and some day they would have a homeland of their own. He would refer from time to time to Isaiah, and he would refer to other prophets and their views and their commitments.

And finally he said the British must be held to account. He said, "In 1917 the Balfour Declaration was issued and the Balfour Declaration carried a promise to these people, if I ever read it."

This was the substance of the argument, then, that I was prepared with when the meeting came with General Marshall, Mr. Lovett, very estimable gentlemen and their assistants.

General Marshall made his first presentation and he told of the reasons why we should not even be considering recognizing the new state. Lovett backed him up and there were some additional matters.

Then the President said "Clifford will make his presentation" and I made it. And as I made it, General Marshall's face got redder and redder and redder, and finally at the end he exploded. He said, "I don't understand what is going on here." He said, "We didn't come over to have an emotional experience of these various elements; we came over to consider a complicated foreign policy problem and to consider certain international laws that are applicable to this issue."

The President made a few comments and then dismissed the meeting. And I said, "Mr. President, I am afraid that my effort didn't do very much." Well, he said, "Let us not be too hasty, let us let the dust settle just a little."

His prescience was interesting, because that afternoon Bob Lovett called and said, "I am deeply disturbed at the meeting we had this morning." And he said, "I wonder if you would drop by my house on your way home," and I said "Of course." And we talked late into the evening.

He said, "What possibility is there in getting the President to change his mind?" I said, "Utterly none." He said, "We will have to go to work on General Marshall." He said, "It would be a tragedy for these two men at this time to break."

The reason it was so serious was because General Marshall felt so strongly about it. When General Marshall finished his second presentation to President Truman he said, "Mr. President, I feel obliged to tell you that if you go ahead with this act of recognition, I will be unable to vote for you this coming November."

So that not only was it based on policy, but it was based upon a deep personal feeling that General Marshall had.

Mr. Lovett went to work in the State Department and I will go over the next 2 days very quickly; but on the morning of the 14th, the day the announcement was to be made, General Marshall called President Truman and said, "Mr. President, I cannot support your action in recognition but I will not oppose it. I will say nothing at all." The President said, "Thank you, General Marshall. That is all that I need."

Mr. Lovett came over. We prepared the statement.

At 4 o'clock the new nation of Israel was declared and 11 minutes after 4, the United States became the first nation in the world to recognize Israel.

Now some time later came a fascinating development. I will refer to it here briefly.

The Israeli Prime Minister was in the United States and he had a meeting with President Truman. It was Prime Minister Ben Gurion. And later, he wrote his book and his memoirs and this paragraph appears. He said: "At that time I had a meeting with President Truman. I told him that as a foreigner, I could not judge what would be his place in American history. But his helpfulness to us, his constant sympathy with our aims in Israel, his courageous decision to recognize our new state so quickly, and his steadfast support since then had given him an immortal place in Jewish history.

"As I said that, tears suddenly sprang to his eyes. And his eyes were still wet when he bade me goodbye. I had rarely seen anyone so moved. He left. A little while later, I, too, had to go out and a correspondent came up to me and asked, 'Why was President Truman in tears when he left you?' "

"I believe I know. He was in tears because he had fought for 3½ years for a deep principle that touched every humanitarian nature in his being. I think he was in tears also because his God had seen fit to answer his prayer and grant him his wishes."

Perhaps you will understand better now why we loved him so. Thank you.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. We have indeed been reliving history with those who worked beside President Truman.

The Chair recognizes the widely acclaimed pianist, Mr. Daniel Pollack, whose early talent was recognized by the late President Truman and who has since captivated audiences around the world.

Mr. Pollack will play Etude Opus 25 No. 11 in A minor "The Winter Wind," and Polonaise in A^b major Opus 53, both by Frederic Chopin.

Mr. Daniel Pollack played a musical tribute consisting of: Etude Opus 25 No. 11 in A minor "The Winter Wind," and Polonaise in A^b major Opus 53, by Frederic Chopin.

□ 1120

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the daughter of the late Presi-

dent Truman, Margaret Truman Daniel.

[Applause.]

Mrs. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, first I would like to say that Dad would have loved all of the music, as I am sure we all did.

You cannot imagine what a delight and honor it is for me to find myself once again in this place. It is both exhilarating and humbling to be standing in the same spot where my father stood when he delivered his annual State of the Union Message.

This monumental building and its majestic site, towering over the Capital of our Republic, was once my playground. I skipped through its long corridors with my schoolbooks, I became familiar with the great men and great events memoralized here, I wandered casually into the family gallery of the Senate and listened to the Nation's business being transacted.

It was a simpler, easier time, with no passes required for a daughter of the Senate, the guards all knew me and no electronic surveillance of visitors.

Most delightful of all, I rode the subway back and forth between the Senate Office Building and the Capitol to my heart's content.

And while my father labored in room 240 of the Old Senate Office Building, I did my homework until it was time for him to drive me home in his spiffy Chrysler.

When as a child you walk beside a good man, a warmhearted man, and find comfort, love and protection in his embrace, you never think of him as a great man. He is just your Dad and you love him. It is only when you grow up and step back from him or leave him for your own career and your own home, it is only then that you can measure his greatness and fully appreciate it. Pride reinforces love.

My father was a great man and his greatness grows with time. I am given evidence of that in some way every day. Wherever I go, even in the hinterlands of China, where I was last fall, people came up to me and said, "I just want to tell you how much I admired your father." That is all, but they had a compulsion to say it.

Now on his 100th birthday the attention of the whole Nation and much of the world beyond is focused on his accomplishments and his character. Without the character there would have been no accomplishments.

What was his character as it was revealed to his daughter, his only child? First of all, there was never a man more devoted to his family. You can see that in the letters he wrote to his wife, his mother, his sister, and to me. Even though with youthful carelessness I rarely replied, his letters kept coming.

It is extraordinary in this electronic age, an age of instant contact and communications, to recall that he wrote every word laborious by hand. And even when he was President, he licked a 3-cent stamp and pasted it on my personal letter.

Actually, for those of you who are so young here, there really was once a 3-cent stamp.

How in the midst of one of the most difficult and dangerous periods of American history did he as President and Commander in Chief, find time to write those letters every day? They were expressed in the homely idiom of Missouri and with the affection and longing of a man often separated from his family by his compelling sense of duty. They reflected his simplicity, directness, wisdom, and resolve. Qualities that he demonstrated in his public behavior, as well as his private life.

There was at the core of the man a gentleness that was often obscured by the brusqueness he sometimes displayed as a partisan politician and the firmness he showed as a statesman. Giving them hell was a rhetoric advice, permissible in a political context, but he really loved people. He was supremely confident of the people's ability to govern themselves, if properly led.

Above all, he loved the United States of America next to his family and he served it devotedly in war and peace.

His forthrightness was not an expression of irritation, but a sign of strong will and high purpose. And he was a great teaser. He liked to get your goat and then grin about it. His grin was as wide as his hat brim and as quick as his temper. Of course, he was capable of occasional expressions of anger. That is to say he could get fighting mad. But if you were the beloved beneficiary of his anger, as I was, and not its target, you kind of enjoyed it.

Every girl has a white knight in her dreams and he was mine. Now I have five white knights. My husband, Clifton Daniel, my sons, Clifton Truman Daniel, William Wallace Daniel, Harrison Gates Daniel, and Thomas Washington Daniel. At least I hope they are my white knights.

So it is with great pride that I have sat here today and seen Dad honored, revered and eulogized. This august convocation would have delighted him. He would also have felt right at home in the midst of it. He jokingly called the Presidential mansion the Great White Jail, but he felt a sense of liberation, a certain expansiveness in the Halls of Congress.

He loved the work and reveled in the comradeship he found here. Being one of the boys was his greatest pleasure. And he took pride in belonging to the world's most exclusive club, the U.S. Senate.

He was prouder still to be a member of that even more restricted group, Uncle Sam Rayburn's Board of Education, the bourbon and branch water college of congressional knowledge.

He loved politicians, even Republicans. True.

I hope that somewhere, somehow, he is watching these impressive proceedings and listening in. If he is, he probably thinks we are making too much of the occasion, but he is nevertheless enjoying it.

He was a modest man, but not fanatically so.

On his behalf, I conclude with heartfelt thanks to all those who have made possible this great celebration and are contributing to all the other events marking the Truman centennial. You have worked long, hard, and successfully. My father would be grateful, and my mother. I am grateful. My family, every branch of it, is honored. And we thank all of you.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the Honorable MARK HATFIELD, a Senator from Oregon, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Arrangements.

[Applause.]

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Margaret Truman Daniel, ladies and gentlemen, a thousand thanks for all who have shared today in those splendid memories and flashbacks in history. What a pleasant experience it has been.

Yet I believe that these reflections on President Truman's life can be more than just historical reminiscences. In reality, they are lessons for a contemporary world. I have found inspiration in President Truman's unique ability to reach out in a commitment of friendship, frequently transcending political differences and personality characteristics.

He was well aware that in public life we have the experience of a life that is full of passion and pretension. It is a life in which personal relationships may become exploitive contacts and political opponents may become enemies.

For too many there is no distinction between one's self, one's politics, one's party and one's ambition. In the process friendships become elusive by believing the worst, ascribing the wrong motives, and allowing bad feelings to fester. Our differences grow into irreconcilable hatred where communication is impossible.

President Truman's life in politics illustrates a rare exception to this state of affairs. A historic example is his invitation to Herbert Hoover, who many considered to be a political leper, to visit the White House for the first time since the former President had left over a decade ago.

I have learned from this amazing friendship that grew between this political odd couple. For both of these statesmen differed in so many facets

of their personal lives, maintained their unique personalities, their political philosophies, even their puckishness, and still they had respect for one another.

Harry Truman has left us a legacy of reconciliation, between people, between nations. Rather than emulate the extremes of rigid singlemindedness or ruthless ambivalence, we should heed the example in the life of Harry Truman.

Understanding one another requires taking the initiative as Truman did. Taking the initiative to assume the best motives, taking the initiative to repair ruptured relationships, taking the initiative to understanding each other, for with understanding comes communication, the gateway to the path of tending to our neighbor's needs, our Nation's needs, our world's needs. The path trod by Harry Truman.

[Applause.]

The U.S. Army Chorus reentered the Chamber, and the colors were brought to the well of the House.

The SPEAKER. The benediction will be given by Rev. Richard C. Halverson, Chaplain of the Senate.

The Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., LL.D., offered the following benediction:

Sovereign Lord of history, we thank Thee for the memory of Harry S. Truman, a very uncommon common man. God fearing, Bible loving, strong, courageous, honest, plain-speaking, noble, gutsy, humble. He embodied all the virtues and values precious to our Republic.

Gracious Father, we thank Thee for this very uncommon common citizen President.

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift up His countenance upon you and give you His peace. Amen.

□ 1138

The U.S. Army Chorus, accompanied by the Members and guests, rendered "God Bless America," and the colors were retired by the Joint Armed Forces Color Guard.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the Congress, the Chair would like to particularly thank, and the Congress appreciates, the chairman, IKE SKELTON, for the beautiful job he has done, and MARK HATFIELD, the Senator from Oregon, for the beautiful job that he has done, and the Chair thanks all who have participated.

The Chair declares the joint meeting dissolved.

The House will continue in recess until the hour of 1 o'clock.

The honored guests, the Members of the U.S. Senate, and the members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Chamber.

At 11 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m., the proceedings in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman were concluded.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) at 1 p.m.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN SAID WE NEED TO LOOK AFTER MILITARY SPENDING

(Mr. BEDELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, like many of our Members at the Truman memorial this morning, I was extremely impressed by the speech by our collegue, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. WHEAT). One of the things that Mr. WHEAT said was that President Truman had said that we need to look at military spending just as we look at social spending.

My Small Business Subcommittee recently had before it legislation that would do something about the expenditures of the miltary and what they are paying. We were shocked to find out that $435 for a hammer was not an exception, but this was what was happening commonly in the military.

Next week we will bring a bill to the floor to give ourselves an opportunity to do exactly what Mr. Truman said should be done, for Congress to do something about that problem. Many people do not want to see anything done about that problem, and it is understandable.

I am here to plead with my colleagues in the House to have the courage to stand up for the taxpayers when that legislation comes forward, to resist those opportunities to cut down on this effort and dilute the effort that we are making. Stand up and demand that correction is taken. Support that bill and not accept weakening amendments that would enable us to continue to pay those outrageous prices for such items.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL TRIP TO EL SALVADOR

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the opportunity to serve as cochairman of the official American delegation sent to El Salvador to observe the Presidential elections.

Ten Members of Congress made the trip, and 8 of the 10 were House Members. There were 13 private citizens making up the delegation. We are in total agreement on our findings: The elections were free, open, and honest.

Despite guerrilla efforts to disrupt the process, the Salvadoran people went to the polls in tremendous numbers. It appears the turnout will be well above the 80-percent mark, which is greater than the 78-percent rate for the March 25 elections.

The Salavadoran people have spoken and their message is clear: They want democracy. Their strong vote is also a forceful repudiation of the guerrillas.

Democracy has a strong beginning in El Salvador. I hope with our help, and the will and determination of the people in El Salvador should be respected by this Nation.

I also would like to tell the Members that each Member of the House is being sent this brief report, very brief, about two pages long. I hope the Members will look at the report.

WE DO NOT NEED THE MX MISSILE

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by what was said today in the testimonial to President Truman and what was said about it just a moment ago on the floor, about the cautionary thing of seeing to it that any money we spend for defense really goes for defense. A difficult thing to achieve is to find a whole project or a whole weapons system that we really do not need. Such a vote will come up next week on the MX system.

In my opinion, the MX system is extremely expensive. We do not need it. The money for it is needed for conventional warfare in Europe or other strategic warfare, but it is not needed for that particular weapon, which is so highly vulnerable.

I hope many Members will look at their consciences and try to come up with an affirmative vote to knock out the MX missile.

THE CRISIS IN INTERNATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the International Trade Subcommittee just met with economic ministers and government representatives of Latin American countries, including Brazil, Peru, Mexico, Argentina, and others. They said to us, among other things, "We are restructuring the international debt to create an appearance of normality." "The debt as it exists today cannot be repaid." "The U.S. protectionist policies are unacceptable," and perhaps most disturbing of all, "The preservation of democracy in most of the countries of the area may be perilously jeopardized if a negotiated solution is not provided."

Mr. Speaker, the accumulated international debt of Latin America exceeds $400 billion. In the last decade we have been on a huge economic drunk and even the person paying the borrower bill, which is us, refuses now to sober up. This situation is the greatest threat to world stability and world peace that exists on the planet today and this Congress must concentrate in the near future on the problem before it is too late.

A CLEAR CHOICE IN EL SALVADOR

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mississippi has already pointed out, there was an election in El Salvador on Sunday, and as reported in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post, the Communist guerrillas in El Salvador showed their true colors in the face of the vote.

While voters were marking their ballots, the Communist terrorists were firing upon helicopters carrying election observers, including the gentleman from Mississippi, and journalists, burning ballots in several towns of the Chalatenago Province, blowing up a major electrical company, bombarding the town of San Sebastian, and attacking Government barracks in San Miguel. These election day efforts by the Communists killed nine civilians, as well as two policemen who tried to disarm one of the terrorist bombs found in San Miguel. Another national policeman was wounded in the attack on the San Miguel barracks.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see how the two sides in El Salvador look upon democracy. The good guys—thousands of Salvadorans who believe in democracy—went to the polls and cast their ballots freely and fairly. The bad guys—a tiny minority of Cuban-backed, Communist terrorists who detest democracy—tried to disrupt the election by violent means.

Mr. Speaker, which side will the Members of this House support when we vote this week?

THE AMERICAN PASSBOOK SAVINGS ACT

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, it is high time for Congress to do something positive to lower those high and rising interest rates in America. High interest rates threaten not only to deny many young Americans their chance at the American dream of private homeownership but also threaten the continuation of the current economic recovery.

Next week I will be offering a bill, cosponsored by members of liberal and conservative persuasions and everything in between. This bill, the American Passbook Savings Act, will allow every American the opportunity to earn substantial tax-free income, in the form of interest earned on traditional passbook savings yielding 6 percent or less. If Americans are thus encouraged to take their savings out of high yield but taxable certificates of deposit, placing those savings instead into tax-free passbook accounts, several most desirable results can be achieved:

Among them; the cost of money to American savings institutions, now generally at 10 percent, could be dramatically reduced, producing lower mortgage rates for Americans. And tax-free passbook savings would go a long way toward encouraging Americans to save more, thus expanding the private credit markets.

Mr. Speaker, getting interest rates down and keeping them down must become one of our highest priorities.

DAY CARE FOR CHILDREN—A MOTHER'S DAY GIFT

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. PERKINS and all the committee members today for doing something for the parents of this country in the week when we are moving toward celebrating Mother's Day. The committee acted very rapidly on a very, very important piece of legislation. It is H.R. 4913. What the bill will do is allow people and communities to put together after school day care for children before their parents come home from work. It really will make a tremendous difference for people worrying so much about missing children and what happens to children after school. Still parents have to work and in that very critical age from 6 to 12 years this bill will give some direction and guidance. It is incredibly cost effective allowing communities to use schools for after school care. The bill hardly costs as much as the tail section of one of our fighter aircraft.

So I am very pleased that the committee acted on this latchkey day care bill and acted on it very rapidly. I must say for the mothers of the country, it certainly means much more that this Congress moves this bill for Mother's Day than cards and flowers, because the care and the stress this bill will relieve is very significant.

I encourage other Members to join in this bill and I hope we can move it out on the House floor as rapidly as possible.

□ 1310

THOUGHTS OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, today as we address this centennial of the birth of Harry S. Truman we might want to think about some of the things that President Truman had to say in the area of world affairs.

On December 15 of 1950 in a radio and television report Harry Truman said: "* * * we are willing to negotiate differences, but we will not yield to aggression. Appeasement of evil is not the road to peace."

In a St. Patrick's Day address on March 17, 1948, he said:

* * * Communism masquerades as a doctrine of progress. It is nothing of the kind. It is, on the contrary, a movement of reaction. It denies that man is master of his fate, and consequently denies man's right to govern himself.

In an address in Alexandria, VA, on February 22, 1951, Harry Truman said:

* * * Communism seeks to induce men to surrender their freedom by false promises of a better life. But the great danger of communism does not lie in its false promises. It lies in the fact that it is an instrument of an armed imperialism which seeks to extend its influence by force.

In a commencement address at Princeton University on June 17, 1947, Harry Truman said, and I quote:

* * * Weakness on our part would stir fear among the small or weakened nations that we were giving up our world leadership. It would seem to them that we lacked the will

to fulfill our pledge to aid free and independent nations to maintain their freedoms, or our commitments to aid in restoring war-torn economies. In such an atmosphere of uncertainty, these nations might not be able to resist the encroachments of totalitarian pressures. We must not let friendly nations go by default.

By saying these kinds of things one wonders if Harry Truman would find any affinity whatsoever with the modern-day Democratic Party.

THOUGHTS OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, following along on the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), I thought some other words of President Harry S. Truman would be instructive for us today. He said in addressing a joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947, these words:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

He further went on to say in an address at a Jefferson Day dinner on April 5, 1947, these words:

. . . Our foreign policy must not be wrecked on the rocks of partisanship. United support of a policy that serves the interests of the Nation as a whole must be our aim.

One must wonder, Mr. Speaker, how he would react to the "Dear Commandante" letter we have heard so much about here on the floor in recent weeks.

He said in a special message to Congress these words:

. . . We have learned, by the costly lesson of two world wars, that what happens beyond our shores determines how we live our own lives. We have learned that, if we want to live in freedom and security, we must work with all the world for freedom and security.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, he said in an address in Mexico City on March 3, 1947:

. . . Nonintervention does not and cannot mean indifference to what goes on beyond our own borders. Events in one country may have a profound effect on other countries. The community of nations feels concern at the violation of accepted principles of national behavior by any one of its members. The lawlessness of one nation may threaten the very existence of the law on which all nations depend.

As we celebrate the centennial of the birth of Harry S. Truman it might be instructive for both Democrats and Republicans in this House, Mr. Speaker, to pay heed to those words.

PAST AND PRESENT DEMOCRATIC PARTY VIEWS ON FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, we have been doing some historical research on the difference between the traditional Democratic Party of Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy and the more radical world view of George McGovern and his followers.

I think one of the best statements of the Truman-Kennedy world view is to be found on September 6, 1962, by the now chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee who was then a member of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee. It is a worthwhile statement and I urge every Member to read it. It runs for two pages, but I want to mention four specific paragraphs.

He said, and this is the current chairman offering an amendment this week that is radically different.

He said:

If we are to preserve the historical values of the democratic profile of the Americas, we can no longer simply espouse high-sounding principles without taking meaningful action.

We have declared the inter-American system to be incompatible with any form of totalitarianism.

We must not permit the inter-American policy of nonintervention to become a policy of nonaction which will end in nonexistence of the free world.

I say that the very existence of the Soviets in Cuba is an act of aggression.

The member nations of this hemisphere—as well as our friends and allies around the world—must take positive action now—both economically and militarily—to remove this fester on the face of freedom and to return Cuba to democratic progress.

The gentleman who is now the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee went on to recommend absolute military action even at the risk of Soviet reaction in Berlin or Turkey or anywhere else. That document is a remarkable statement on September 6, 1962, in comparison with the current McGovern radicalism of the Democratic Party.

THOUGHTS OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on the Democratic side of the aisle we often hear a lot of rhetoric opposing the present foreign policy of Ronald Reagan. But, you know, I used to be a Harry Truman Democrat and I was proud of it and I still admire and respect him and think he was one of the greatest Presidents this country ever had.

Let me tell you why I was a Harry Truman Democrat.

Harry Truman before a commencement address at Princeton University said "* * * weakness on our part would stir fear among the small or weakened nations that we were giving up our world leadership."

Then he goes on and in his State of the Union Message on January 6, 1947, he said: "* * * we live in a world in which strength on the part of peace-loving nations is still the greatest deterrent to aggression. World stability can be destroyed when nations with great responsibilities neglect to maintain the means of discharging those responsibilities."

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan and I still believe in the Harry Truman philosophy of peace through strength. That is what kept this Nation free for all of these 200 years, and that is why we have a free world today.

TRADE DEFICIT

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Times carried a headline in the business section that says, "Record 25.8 billion trade gap posted in first quarter of 1984."

If the trade deficit continues at this pace it will translate into the loss of 2½ million American jobs that will be exported overseas. I think clearly this body must act.

Congress must act first in reducing the budget deficit. One of the problems in expanding our exports is the high value of the dollar in relation to other currencies.

Second, Congress must act in trade legislation. We must insure that American industries are functioning in an environment of fair trade as well as free trade. We must stop the practice of dumping products into the American market.

Third, Congress must act in continuing pressure on our allies to take more responsibility for free world security. One of the difficulties that we have is that many American dollars move overseas in supporting the American military forces that guarantee the security of the free world. It is time that our allies take a much greater share of responsibility for their own security.

MISSING CHILDREN CLEARINGHOUSES

(Mr. LEWIS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week I toured the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Missing Children Clearinghouse.

Initiated on a shoestring budget during the past 18 months, Florida's program has become the state of the art in locating missing children. I am proud to have been a part of that initiative.

Today, I am introducing legislation that urges other States to establish their own missing children clearinghouses under the direction of their respective departments of law enforcement.

It is most important that the people on the frontlines in the search for our missing children, the State and local police, have all the tools necessary to find these children.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these State clearinghouses will complement and serve as natural and essential components of the newly established National Missing Children Clearinghouse.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this nonpartisan resolution.

SOVIET BOYCOTT OF OLYMPIC GAMES

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union announced today that it intended to boycott the summer Olympics. The alleged rationale for that preliminary decision on their part was the nonsecurity, the lack of security that would be accorded to their athletes by the U.S. Government and, further, that the rights of their athletes would be trampled somehow by the U.S. Government and the U.S. Olympic Committee.

□ 1320

Nothing, of course, is farther from the truth. The truth of the matter is that they have declared their own program, a program of defector's prevention. That is the real rationale for the Soviet action which we hope will be changed by June 5, the last day this kind of situation can be changed.

Everybody in the world knows that the United States and particularly Members of Congress know that the tightest and most sophisticated security networks are being put into effect for the summer Olympics to protect the athletes of every visiting country, including the Soviet Union.

We will not apologize to the Soviet Union for any alleged lack of security and, furthermore, we invite them to change their mind. We want their athletes here to compete in the Olympics.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

FED'S ACTION IN SECRET

(Mr. KEMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the prime interest rate went from 12 to 12.5 percent this morning. But it just did not happen this morning, Mr. Speaker. It happened about a month ago when the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board met in secret and decided the economy was growing too fast and thus they had to tighten credit and raise interest rates.

At that meeting they made the decision to raise interest rates and tighten up on the growth of credit and the supply of money thus allowing the Federal funds rate to rise to around 11 percent. How do I know? I know from leaks in the Washington Post and Frank Morris, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. According to the Post, Mr. Morris announced that the Fed had secretly decided that the economy was growing faster than they wanted, and they moved to lower the rate of growth in the economy by tightening interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, there are two fundamental things wrong here. Number one, the Fed is doing this in secret and no one knows about it except the constituency of Frank Morris of the Boston Fed and a few inside traders who can sell bonds and/or sell stocks and buy dollars and profit from inside information, while the rest of us are impoverished by the reduced rate of growth.

The second thing wrong with it is the policy itself. Why are they tightening? Mr. Speaker, why is the Federal Reserve worried about too much growth of the economy? We need more jobs and more growth. There is nothing wrong with 8 percent real growth and low inflation. It seems to me that the Fed ought to be held more accountable by those in the Congress who say they represent the American people.

Where are the voices today on the Democratic side of the aisle? Why are they not calling for accountability from the Federal Reserve? And why, Mr. Speaker, is the Fed slowing the economy in the beginning of an economic recovery that is putting people back to work and lowering deficits?

Let us hold the Fed accountable for these actions and demand answers to these hard questions. Let us help give the American people the sound money and low interest rates that once made the dollar the standard and measure for the whole world.

MX A WEAPON OF QUESTIONABLE STRATEGIC VALUE

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to express my opposition to the funding of the MX missile.

One of the major reasons offered by the administration in last year's debate on the MX was that it represented an important bargaining chip in arms control talks with the Soviets. They claimed that our deployment of the MX would offset deployment of similar Soviet missiles, which would give the Soviets an incentive to agree to mutual reductions in our arsenals. Many Members were swayed by that argument and voted to continue funding the MX.

I would ask those Members to reassess that vote in light of the arms control situation we find ourselves in this year. We are now not engaged in any formal arms control talks with the Soviets—a situation that alarms most Americans and leaders of other countries, including the Chinese. The use of the MX as a bargaining chip with the Soviets has clearly been unsuccessful.

Another important issue in this year's debate on the MX issue is the question of where the defense budget can best be cut. There is little dispute in Congress that the administration's recommendation of a 13.5 percent real increase in defense spending is excessive. However, in deciding where to cut the budget, we are forced to make reductions in personnel and readiness-related accounts to fully fund all the weapons systems coming on line. I do not believe Congress should fund the MX, a weapon system of questionable strategic value that would add a further element of instability to our relations with the Soviets, at the expense of the readiness of our military forces.

A TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is a joy today—May 8, 1984—to speak in honor of the beloved, late Harry S. Truman, our 33d President whose 100th birthday is today.

Harry Truman was an extraordinary man. If he had not been born a leader of men, he rapidly demonstrated that circumstances had made him one. The toughest decisions of this century fell to him to make. It was his decision to drop the first atomic bomb on Japan. It was his decision to stand up to the Soviet Empire. It was his decision to launch the Marshall plan, the greatest and most foresighted foreign policy initiative of our age. It was that decision to rebuild Europe around a prosperous West Germany that made possible the peace from world war that we have enjoyed since then.

He had a homespun way of talking about himself. His use of common idioms reinforced the strength of his

character. He could stand the heat in the kitchen. He once revealed that if he could write his own epitaph he would choose an inscription which is in the cemetery at Tombstone, Arizona: "Here lies Jack Williams. He done his damndest."

Some men, even a great soldier like Gen. Douglas MacArthur, misconstrued him entirely and failed to appreciate Truman's grasp of history. President Reagan's recent visit to China may be seen today as a vindication of Truman's words:

The kind of victory MacArthur had in mind—victory by the bombing of Chinese cities, victory by expanding the conflict to all of China—would have been the wrong kind of victory.

Let us hope that there will be more such men to lead the world in the future.

SOVIET OLYMPIC DECISION WITHOUT FOUNDATION

(Mr. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUI. We have just learned that the Soviet Union intends not to participate in the summer Olympics in Los Angeles, CA. As one of 45 members of our California delegation, I would just like to quote the Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley.

He indicated disappointment in the Soviet decision and indicated their charges are without foundation.

I quote him:

Both the Federal Government, LAOOC, and I and the Los Angeles Police Department have repeatedly given assurances to the Soviets and everybody else that their athletes would be welcome, and would be protected, and we have every expectation to be able to supply every aspect of security to all visitors including their athletes.

I would have to say the Soviets are not afraid of their security; they are afraid there will be defections of their athletes, and that would be an international embarrassment to them.

I am very sorry they have to harm California as a way to try to embarrass the United States for their own weakness.

SOIL CONSERVATION INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT ACT

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to coordinate soil conservation efforts presently underway in both Houses of Congress.

This measure will increase the investment tax credit by 10 percent for farmers who undertake certain specific soil and water conservation activities on highly erodible cropland already under cultivation.

While this concept is similar to that embodied in S. 2180 introduced in the other body, I have modified the concept to restrict it to only those acres identified as highly erodible, so as to reduce the measure's impact upon the Federal Treasury, while improving conservation incentives where they are most needed.

In addition, this legislation will complement other proposals before the House, such as the "sodbuster" legislation we are presently considering which prohibits Federal price supports for commodities produced on highly erodible land, by further encouraging the retirement of such fragile lands from cultivation.

Finally, my introduction of this legislation is in conjunction with H.R. 5200, the National Agricultural Soil Protection Act, which I introduced on March 20, 1984. Both measures are based on many months of research and discussion with various members of the agricultural community on how best to address our Nation's soil erosion problems. Your interest and support on this important issue is invited.

CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1984

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3635) to amend chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation of children) of title 18 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Child Protection Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) child pornography has developed into a highly organized, multi-million-dollar industry which operates on a nationwide scale;

(2) thousands of children including large numbers of runaway and homeless youth are exploited in the production and distribution of pornographic materials; and

(3) the use of children as subjects of pornographic materials is harmful to the physiological, emotional, and mental health of the individual child and to society.

SEC. 3. Section 2251 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking out "visual or print medium" each place it appears and inserting "visual depiction" in lieu thereof;

(2) by striking out "depicting" each place it appears and inserting "of" in lieu thereof;

(3) by striking out "person" each place it appears in subsection (c) and inserting "individual" in lieu thereof;

(4) by striking out "$10,000" and inserting "$100,000" in lieu thereof;

(5) by striking out "$15,000" and inserting "$200,000" in lieu thereof; and

(6) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following: "Any organization which violates this section shall be fined not more than $250,000.".

SEC. 4. Section 2252 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking out ", for the purpose of sale or distribution for sale";

(2) by striking out "for the purpose of sale or distribution for sale" the second place it appears;

(3) by striking out "obscene" each place it appears;

(4) by striking out "visual or print medium" each place it appears and inserting "visual depiction" in lieu thereof;

(5) by striking out "depicts" each place it appears and inserting "is of" in lieu thereof;

(6) by striking out "or knowingly sells or distributes for sale" and inserting in lieu thereof "or distributes";

(7) by inserting after "mailed" the following: "or knowingly reproduces any visual depiction for distribution in interstate or foreign commerce or through the mails";

(8) by striking out "person" each place it appears in subsection (b) and inserting "individual" in lieu thereof;

(9) by striking out "$10,000" and inserting "$100,000" in lieu thereof;

(10) by striking out "$15,000" and inserting "$200,000" in lieu thereof; and

(11) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following: "Any organization which violates this section shall be fined not more than $250,000.".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 2253 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out "sixteen" and inserting "eighteen" in lieu thereof;

(2) by striking out "sado-masochistic" and inserting "sadistic or masochistic" in lieu thereof;

(3) by striking out "(for the purpose of sexual stimulation)"; and

(4) by striking out "lewd" and inserting "lascivious" in lieu thereof;

(5) by striking out ", for pecuniary profit"; and

(6) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) 'organization' means a person other than an individual.".

(b) Section 2253 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended by subsection (a) is redesignated as section 2255.

SEC. 6. Chapter 110 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after section 2252 the following:

"§ 2253. Criminal forfeiture

"(a) A person who is convicted of an offense under section 2251 or 2252 of this title shall forfeit to the United States such person's interest in—

"(1) any property constituting or derived from gross profits or other proceeds obtained from such offense; and

"(2) any property used, or intended to be used, to commit such offense.

"(b) In any action under this section, the court may enter such restraining orders or take other appropriate action (including acceptance of performance bonds) in connection with any interest that is subject to forfeiture.

"(c) The court shall order forfeiture of property referred to in subsection (a) if the trier of fact determines, beyond a reasonable doubt, that such property is subject to forfeiture.

"(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, the customs laws relating to disposition of seized or forfeited property shall apply to property under this section, if such laws are not inconsistent with this section.

"(2) In any dispostion of property under this section, a convicted person shall not be permitted to acquire property forfeited by such person.

"(3) The duties of the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to dispositions of property shall be performed under paragraph (1) of this subsection by the Attorney General, unless such duties arise from forfeitures effected under the customs laws.

"§ 2254. Civil forfeiture

"(a) The following property shall be subject to forfeiture by the United States:

"(1) Any material or equipment used, or intended for use, in producing, reproducing, transporting, shipping, or receiving any visual depiction in violation of this chapter.

"(2) Any visual depiction produced, transported, shipped, or received in violation of this chapter, or any material containing such depiction.

"(3) Any property constituting or derived from gross profits or other proceeds obtained from a violation of this chapter, except that no property shall be forfeited under this paragraph, to the extent of the interest of an owner, by reason of any act or omission established by that owner to have been committed or omitted without the knowledge or consent of that owner.

"(b) All provisions of the customs law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of property for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such property or the proceeds from the sale thereof, the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures, and the compromise of claims, shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under this section, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, except that such duties as are imposed upon the customs officer or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of property under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of property under this section by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General, except to the extent that such duties arise from seizures and forfeitures effected by any customs officer.".

SEC. 7. The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 110 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 2252 the following new items:

"2253. Criminal forfeiture.

"2254. Civil forfeiture.";

and

(2) by redesignating the item relating to section 2253 as 2255.

SEC. 8. Section 2516(1)(c) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting "sections 2251 and 2252 (sexual exploitation of children)," after "section 664 (embezzlement from pension and welfare funds),"

SEC. 9. Beginning one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress on prosecutions, convictions, and forfeitures under chapter 110 of title 18 of the United States Code.

□ 1330

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES)?

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I am, in fact, very pleased to work with my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) in bringing this bill to the floor. It would not have been brought here without his cooperation.

It is a response in part to the decision of the Supreme Court in New York against Farber which decided we did not need the obscenity standard to be met in relationship to child pornography because the State's interest in the well-being of our children superseded even some of the nicer requirements of the first amendment when applied to consenting adults. Also, the bill eliminates the existing requirement of the sale or commercial aspect of the pornography in that we learned during hearings that this is a kind of a cult situation where much of the exchange is among those sick people who get pleasure out of trading pictures and obviously, whether it is sold or not, the impact on the child is the same. It also raises the age from 16 to 18 years, because very often we are unable to locate the child and the age must be deduced from the picture itself. This will make it easier to bring it within the protected age groups.

We have also adopted the forfeiture provisions of the bill of the other body and also we have permitted wiretaps, with judicial supervision, to facilitate the interception of this somewhat clandestine cultish group that exchange this pornography.

I also want to say that we are indebted to the junior Senators from Pennsylvania and from Iowa in their cooperation in getting this bill in shape to bring to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) to explain the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has done a very good job of describing what is in the compromise version of the bill. The fact is that the bill does strengthen the law against child pornography, as my colleague from Michigan has indicated. And, most importantly, eliminates the burden of proving that child pornography is obscene under the complex Supreme Court test.

It eliminates the requirement of proving that the production, distribution, and receipt of child pornography was for the purpose of sale, which has been a hinderance to prosecution under the existing law.

It does raise the age, as my colleague has indicated, from 16 to 18. That is going to enable us to do a better job of ferreting out the abuses to younger children in particular in that age group between 13 and 16, where age if often very difficult to discern. It does substantially raise the fine that can be imposed from $10,000 to $100,000 for a first offense, and from $15,000 to $200,000 for a second offense.

It closes the loophole which now limits prosecution for production of child pornography only to those persons who actually induce children to pose in pornographic pictures. Under this bill the producers, regardless of where or how they obtained their negatives, can be prosecuted.

And it does provide extremely important authority to permit the Government to participate in wiretapping in those instances permitted by the courts.

The principal amendments that we took in conference deal with civil and criminal forfeiture which, I think, will provide prosecutors with additional tools and are strengthening amendments.

In addition, we have developed a new definition of sexually explicit conduct.

My colleague from Michigan (Mr. SAWYER), has correctly given a great deal of credit to the Senator from Iowa, who worked very diligently in conference and in the Senate, and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, (Mr. SPECTER), who also worked very hard on this legislation. Indeed, Mr. SPECTER was a principal architect of the bill in the Senate.

On the House side a number of Members worked extremely hard, not the least of which is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HUTTO), who has been very interested in this area of the law for a long time and who, in fact, made substantial contributions during the hearing process and during markup in this legislation. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HUTTO) has been invaluable to us in our endeavors, as has the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN), who has been very, very helpful. Our colleague on the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) has been extremely helpful in both during the hearing process, as well as during markup.

Last, but not least, my colleague from Michigan, who is the prime sponsor of this legislation, has been invaluable in moving this measure through the legislative process. HAL SAWYER worked extremely hard, not just during the hearing process, but in markup, in crafting a strong bill. This legislation will close the loopholes and provide prosecutors with the new tools

they need to strengthen our enforcement efforts against those who produce or traffic in such smut.

I just regret that our colleague from Michigan, the ranking Republican (Mr. SAWYER) is not going to be with us in the next Congress. His contributions to the criminal justice system have been noteworthy and significant.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of concurring in the Senate amendment on the child pornography bill. This bill is long overdue in that it will give our prosecutors tools to better and more easily convict those who are in the process of producing and disseminating child pornography.

The Supreme Court has given us the opening to strengthen the child pornography statutes and I am glad that we are taking advantage of this opening not only in what elements of the crime have to be proven in court, but also in increasing the fines and forfeitures rather dramatically so that it will no longer pay kiddie porn pushers to do this kind of activity, because if they are caught and they are convicted, the forfeiture is going to be high enough so that it really stings them in the pocketbook.

I would like to salute the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SAWYER) for their valiant efforts in this piece of legislation.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan again for yielding.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to objection, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HUTTO).

Mr. HUTTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I too, want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SAWYER) for their fine work on this bill.

I appreciate especially the hospitality that they extended to me and the way they conducted the hearings when I went before the gentleman's subcommittee.

I think that through the gentlemen's efforts we are finally getting to one of the Nation's greatest problems regarding children. It is unbelievable what has been done in the past several years with regard to exploitation of children. Through this legislation I think you are making a giant step in trying to curtail and to stop this heinous practice.

About 1 million youngsters a year are affected, is my understanding. I am glad, too, that through your efforts and through the efforts of the media, particularly the Ladies Home Journal and the Reader's Digest that the American people are learning about this tremendous problem and of course when the people speak, well, then, we get some results. And they are acting through the efforts that you have made.

I believe that this legislation passed this body with only one dissenting vote. It is my hope that we will pass this legislation unanimously and send it to the President.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to echo the words of commendation to the chairman and the ranking member of this subcommittee. They have worked diligently on this bill.

I am only sorry that other crime legislation has not moved as swiftly in other subcommittees. I think they have proven that you can work with this on a bipartisan basis in the House and in the Senate.

I would hope that this would be used as a guide to the full Judiciary Committee to work as expeditiously on other elements of the President's crime package so we might deal with them as we are dealing with this bill today.

□ 1340

The legislation is needed. Without such legislative changes we have been hamstrung in terms of prosecuting those who are the purveyors of this type of pornography.

I might just say that I do not think that we could have had this legislation 10 or 15 years ago, not because of the intent of the Members, but because of the overall public attitude. I think we have recognized that pornography is a harm to society, and the harm goes beyond those people who may be just looking at that pornography. It goes to those people who are caught in the whole web of it. And it certainly goes to those children who are being brought into the web of pornography at earlier and earlier ages.

In my home State of California, we have a terrible situation that is revealing itself now of molestation of children in day care centers. It has caused the entire public consciousness to be raised in this whole area. And child pornography is certainly just one part of that whole problem.

So I again wish to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES), and the ranking minority member (Mr. SAWYER) for the work that they have done. I am sorry that we have not seen this same type of work being done on other parts of the package that are within the jurisdictions of other subcommittees. Again, I would hope that these other subcommittees would use this as a model for the type of work we can do on a bipartisan basis.

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. SAWYER and Mr. HUGHES for their dedicated work on this important piece of legislation. Through their efforts, and those of others, this bill is even stronger than it was when we voted on it in November.

During our work on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, we have heard about many forms of child abuse, the most insidious of which is probably sexual abuse. We have heard that abusers will use child pornography to persuade children that others do certain things, so they must be OK. We know that it is not OK, and this bill is a good way for us to send a message to those who think otherwise.

Thank you.●

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY AND REVISION TO A PREVIOUSLY REPORTED DEFERRAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 98-216)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, May 8, 1984.)

EXTENDING THE GOVERNING INTERNATIONAL FISHERY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 98-217)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Commit-

tee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, May 8, 1984.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today, prior to general debate on H.R. 5119, the foreign aid authorization for fiscal year 1985.

VIRGINIA NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5121) to designate certain national forest system lands in the State of Virginia as wilderness, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5121

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Virginia National Forest Wilderness Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131-1136), the following lands in the State of Virginia are hereby designated as wilderness and, therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System—

(1) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately six thousand three hundred and seventy-five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Beartown Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Beartown Wilderness;

(2) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately five thousand five hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Kimberling Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Kimberling Creek Wilderness;

(3) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately five thousand seven hundred and thirty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Lewis Fork Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Lewis Fork Wilderness;

(4) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately three thousand four hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Little Dry Run Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Little Dry Run Wilderness;

(5) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately three thousand eight hundred and fifty-five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Little Wilson Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Little Wilson Creek Wilderness;

(6) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately eight thousand two hundred and fifty-three acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mountain Lake Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Mountain Lake Wilderness;

(7) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately three thousand three hundred and twenty-six acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Peters Mountain Wilderness—Proposed." dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Peters Mountain Wilderness;

(8) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately two thousand four hundred and fifty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Thunder Ridge Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Thunder Ridge Wilderness;

(9) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately one hundred and sixty acres, as generally depicted on map entitled "James River Face Wilderness Addition—Proposed", dated January 1984, and which are hereby incorporated in, and shall be deemed part of, the James River Face Wilderness as designated by Public Law 93-622;

(10) certain lands in the George Washington National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately six thousand seven hundred and twenty-five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Ramseys Draft Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1984, and which shall be known as the Ramseys Draft Wilderness; and

(11) certain lands in the George Washington National Forest, Virginia, which comprise approximately ten thousand and ninety acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Saint Mary's Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1984, and which shall be known as the Saint Mary's Wilderness.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas designated under this section shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act (or any similar reference) shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated under this section with the Committees on Agriculture and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and with the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. The map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that correction of clerical and typographical errors in the legal description and map may be made. The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act, the Secretary shall review, as to their suitability for preservation as wilderness, the following areas in the State of Virginia—

(1) certain lands in the George Washington National Forest which comprise approximately nine thousand three hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Rough Mountain Wilderness Study Area—Proposed", dated January 1984, and which shall be known as the Rough Mountain Wilderness Study Area;

(2) certain lands in the George Washington National Forest which comprise approximately five thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Rich Hole Wilderness Study Area—Proposed", dated January 1984, and which shall be known as the Rich Hole Wilderness Study Area;

(3) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest which comprise approximately five thousand eight hundred and seventy-five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Barbours Creek Wilderness Study Area—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Barbours Creek Wilderness Study Area; and

(4) certain lands in the Jefferson National Forest which comprise approximately four thousand three hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Shawvers Run Wilderness Study Area—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Shawvers Run Wilderness Study Area.

In conducting his review, the Secretary shall give public notice at least sixty days in advance of any hearing or other public meeting concerning a study area.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, until Congress determines otherwise, the wilderness study areas designated by this section shall be administered by the Secretary so as to maintain their presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 4. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second roadless area review and evaluation program (RARE II);

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of national forest system roadless areas in Virginia and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II final environmental statement (dated January 1979) with respect to national forest system lands in States other than Virginia, such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to national forest system lands in the State of Virginia;

(2) with respect to the national forest system lands in the State of Virginia which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II) and those lands referred to in subsection (d), except those lands remaining in wilderness study upon enactment of this Act, that review and evaluation or reference shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revisions of the plans, but shall

review the wilderness option when the plans are revised, which revisions will ordinarily occur on a ten-year cycle, or at least every fifteen years, unless, prior to such time the Secretary of Agriculture finds that conditions in a unit have significantly changed;

(3) areas in the State of Virginia reviewed in such final environmental statement or referenced in subsection (d) and not designated wilderness or wilderness study upon enactment of this Act shall be managed for multiple use in accordance with land management plans pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976: *Provided*, That such areas need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of the initial land management plans;

(4) in the event that revised land management plans in the State of Virginia are implemented pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law, areas not recommended for wilderness designation need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitabliity for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of such plans, and areas recommend for wilderness designation shall be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation as may be required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law; and

(5) unless expressly authorized by Congress, the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of national forest system lands in the State of Virginia for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(c) As used in this section, and as provided in section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the term "revision" shall not include an "amendment" to a plan.

(d) The provisions of this section shall also apply to national forest system roadless lands in the State of Virginia which are less than 5,000 acres in size.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5121, the Virginia Wilderness Act. H.R. 5121 was introduced by Virginia Congressmen OLIN and BOUCHER, and covers lands located in their congressional districts. As reported by the committee, the bill designates 11 additions to the wilderness system and 4 wilderness study areas. Many of the wilderness proposals, such as Ramsey's Draft, Mountain Lake, Peters Mountain, and St. Mary's are longstanding wilderness proposals on which the Public Lands Subcommittee held hearings in the 95th Congress, 6 years ago. Several are areas which were designated for wilderness study by Congress in 1975. With very few exceptions, the proposals are recommended for wilderness by the Forest Service in recognition of their outstanding recreation potential, and in some cases, significant stands of virgin timber. As Members may be aware, most of the central Appalachians were heavily logged around the turn of the century, and virgin timber stands are a rarity indeed.

Mr. Speaker, Congressmen OLIN and BOUCHER strongly support this bill and have urged it be moved as soon as possible. I am aware that the Westvaco Corp. has expressed concern with the bill, because they fear that some future Congress might designate all wilderness areas class I for the purposes of the Clean Air Act, and that such redesignation might imperil Westvaco's planned expansion of their facility in Covington, VA. To alleviate Westvaco's concerns, Congressmen OLIN and BOUCHER asked us to make the four areas closest to Covington wilderness study areas, even though two of them are proposed for wilderness by the Forest Service. We have accommodated their request, and I would additionally advise Members that the State of Virginia, the two Congressmen, and the major environment groups supporting wilderness have stated for the record that they will not propose class I redesignation. In short we have bent over backwards to accommodate Westvaco and am hopeful that our actions will prompt them to reconsider their previous opposition to the bill. For further information on the wilderness/clean air issue, I would refer Members to the committee report on the bill, which contains an excellent discussion of the matter.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 5121, as amended, is extremely meritorious legislation, and I congratulate Congressmen OLIN and BOUCHER for their prolonged efforts to negotiate this compromise measure. I urge my colleagues' support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and I wish to thank him for the great support he has been giving us on these wilderness bills.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5121 and H.R. 3788, which will be brought up later this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

These bills have been referred both to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bills involve what are referred to as eastern forests and they contain so-called release/sufficiency language which relates to the management of areas in the national forests which are not designated as wilderness. In order to expedite consideration of these bills, the Committee on Agriculture does not object to their being taken up on the floor of the House without consideration by the committee. This position is taken without in any respect waiving jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with regard to these bills or to similar provisions in other bills. If the provisions of H.R. 5121 and H.R. 3788 should become an issue with the Senate—in the event that the bills pass the House—I intend to request that the Committee on Agriculture be represented in any conference which may be held.

I appreciate this opportunity to make clear the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Agriculture in these bills.

I would like to take the occasion also to commend Mr. SEIBERLING, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, Mr. UDALL, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and Senator JIM MCCLURE, chairman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, for their work in reaching a compromise on the release language included in the wilderness bills. The new compromise language is being included by amendment in the two wilderness bills before the House today. The release language governs the management and future review of lands that have been studied for potential wilderness designation by the Forest Service, but not designated as wilderness in the legislation.

For several years this has been an intractable issue between the Senate and House on a series of wilderness bills that have passed the House and has stalled further action on these bills even though all other issues have been resolved. Messrs. SEIBERLING and UDALL have persisted in their efforts to compromise these differences, in consultation with our committee, and I am pleased that they finally have succeeded. We can now expect final congressional action on wilderness bills affecting many areas of the country.

I also would like to commend my dear friend, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), who is handling the bill on the minority side. I am

always appreciative of the work that he does.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5121, the Virginia wilderness bill.

In terms of total acreage, the bill is very close to the RARE II recommendations. In fact, the Forest Service would support wilderness designation for two additional areas—known as Rough Mountain and Rich Hole—instead of the wilderness study proposed in the bill.

The committee and the Virginia delegation left these two areas and two others in a study status due to the concerns of Westvaco. The company owns a large papermill located very close to the study areas and is concerned about possible redesignation of the areas as class I under the Clean Air Act. While redesignation is not likely, the study called for in the bill will allow some additional time to look at this issue and hopefully satisfy the company's concerns.

The bill also contains the new compromise release language worked out between Members of both bodies. While it falls far short of hard release which I would prefer to see, I respect the views of the key Members involved and can appreciate the pressures placed on them to reach an agreement.

Overall, I believe the bill is a reasonable proposal and I intend to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER).

□ 1350

Mr. BOUCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like first to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, Mr. SEIBERLING, and to his very capable staff for their assistance with this legislation. I understand the very busy schedules which the subcommittee and the full committee have been operating under, and I greatly appreciate the expeditious consideration which this legislation has received.

Like many of the wilderness bills which the House considers, H.R. 5121 represents the balance of diverse interests which has been developed through many months of debate and discussion. My colleague from Virginia, Mr. OLIN, and I have worked closely with the Forest Service field representatives who are most familiar with the RARE II study areas, and our recommendations reflect their advice. We have also attempted to work with as many of the forest users as possible. H.R. 5121 was drafted after careful consideration of the interests of those to whom the forest is a means of livelihood, a recreational resource, an avenue of learning and scientific study, or a provider of drinking water. The selection of areas for wilderness protection and the recommendations for the boundaries of each of these areas have evolved from the suggestions of thousands of Virginia citizens.

H.R. 5121 designates as wilderness for hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, and other compatible uses approximately 56,000 acres, comprising somewhat less than 4 percent of Virginia's National Forest lands. It places approximately 25,000 acres in further study, and it releases to multiple use nearly 135,000 acres which have been studied and restudied for possible wilderness designation. The care which we have taken in selecting the areas for wilderness protection has resulted in broad-based and bipartisan support for this legislation.

All of the areas recommended for wilderness designation and for further study lie in the Ninth and Sixth Congressional Districts in the State of Virginia, which Mr. OLIN and I have the privilege of representing. We have worked as partners in developing this measure, and I am pleased to have my distinguished colleague from Virginia's Sixth District as a cosponsor.

I am also pleased that the gentleman from Virginia's Second District, Mr. WHITEHURST, has joined in the cosponsorship of this measure. Mr. WHITEHURST, as many Members know, has been active over the years in efforts to protect the special wilderness resources of Virginia, and I commend him for his foresight and initiative. His cosponsorship of H.R. 5121 reflects well upon the bipartisan nature of our commitment to protect irreplaceable natural resources and to balance these protections with a respect for Virginia's economic development needs.

Within my own district, 7 sites totaling 45,124 acres will be designated as wilderness. Two sites totaling 9,585 acres are recommended for further study.

Each of the areas our legislation would place in the National Wilderness Preservation System has been recommended for wilderness by the U.S. Forest Service. During the past 18 months we have consulted with local citizens and elected officials in the affected counties with regard to each of these areas. With the clear understanding that wilderness areas will remain open to hunting and fishing and that wilderness legislation will not impair the rights of any private property owners or result in any condemnation of land by the Federal Government, a strong consensus has developed in favor of the designation of these areas. Among the many active suporters of H.R. 5121 are the Virginia Wildlife Federation, Trout Unlimited, the Tazewell County Sportsmen's Club, the Craig County Wildlife Association, and the Virginia Wilderness Committee.

In Tazewell County, 5,115 acres of the Beartown RARE II study area will be designated as wilderness, thereby protecting the popular native trout streams, three zones of vegetation types and excellent hunting grounds. The designation of these areas has been strongly promoted by the Tazewell County Sportsmen's Club, and the boundaries we have selected are supported by local users as well as those from neighboring counties.

In the Mount Rogers Recreation Area in the Counties of Smyth and Grayson, two unique areas totaling just over 9,500 acres will be designated as wilderness. Forest users enjoy the scenic areas of Lewis Fork and Little Wilson Creek for day-hiking and horseback riding. The Lewis Fork area is traversed by the Appalachian Trail, and it has been under consideration for possible reintroduction of the golden eagle.

In Wythe County to the east of Lewis Fork and Little Wilson lies the area of Little Dry Run. This roadless and remote area is representative of the Appalachian Forest ecosystem, providing a home for deer, turkey, squirrel, grouse, songbirds, and other nongame animals. The total acreage of Little Dry Run is 3,400.

Kimberling Creek is Bland County is popular for hunting and camping. The stands of mixed hardwoods and white and yellow pines in this 5,580 acre tract offer little commercial development, and recreation is clearly the most appropriate usage for this area.

The largest and perhaps most spectacular proposed wilderness area in my district is the Mountain Lake area in Giles County—part of a highland plateau sitting squarely on the eastern Continental Divide. This area is the home of the University of Virginia's Biological Monitoring Research Station, and its resources are the subject of extensive long-term studies. In addition the area contains superlative stands of virgin spruce and hemlock, a mountain bog of unusually large size, and a mature hardwood forest with a lush fern, rhododendron, and azalea understory.

Just west of Mountain Lake lies Peters Mountain, a 3,300-acre tract which contains a beautiful high mountain bog and a popular trout stream. Yellow poplar, red oak, and hickory occur in the coves of the area, and the crest of Peters Mountain has numerous sandstone outcroppings which afford exceptional views of the surrounding countryside.

The one area which has occasioned considerable disagreement between local citizens and the Forest Service is in Craig County. This disagreement centers on the Forest Service's multiple use recommendations for the Barbours Creek study area. My office worked with the proponents of the Barbours Creek study area to focus on the resources which the local citizens are most interested in conserving. We have redrawn the boundaries of the original study area, removing in this process several traveled roads and other areas which appear to be more suited for multiple use. In so doing we have created two separate areas, Barbours Creek and Shawvers Run, both of which include excellent hunting grounds and native trout streams. Our legislation places both Barbours Creek and Shawvers Run into further study, offering the protection of special management until such time as Congress acts to alter their status. I would have been pleased to place both of these areas in wilderness at this time were it not for a very important southwest Virginia employer, the concerns of which I would also like to address.

The Westvaco Bleached Board Division has expressed concern that the designation of areas as wilderness may at some point in the future be followed by their redesignation by Congress as class 1 regions for purposes of the Clean Air Act. Westvaco has recently announced an important expansion of its Covington, VA, plant and is concerned that such a redesignation might impair its expansion.

Mr. OLIN and I have met and worked with Westvaco officials on numerous occasions in an effort fully to understand their concerns and determine how we might best address them. H.R. 5121 represents a sincere and, we believe, reasonable approach to the concerns Westvaco has raised. Our bill leaves in place the current class II air standards for each of the proposed wilderness areas and wilderness study areas, and I will actively oppose any change of these standards to a more restrictive category. I am of the view that the existing class II standards offer ample protection to both the wilderness resources and the business development opportunities of neighboring communities, and I was pleased to find that members of the Interior Committee share this view. This perspective is carefully and appropriately detailed in the committee report accompanying H.R. 5121.

Moreover, I have discussed Westvaco's concerns with representatives of national environmental organizations which have an interest in the Clean Air Act and in wilderness legislation. I was pleased to learn that neither the Sierra Club nor the Wilderness Society has any plans to recommend new class I Clean Air Act designations in Virginia, and I have received a letter from those organizations so stating.

I am also pleased to report that the leaders in the Virginia conservation community have been willing to document their intentions in this area as well. Representatives of key environmental organizations in the State have stated clearly that these groups will not seek and will not support redesignation of our proposed wilderness areas to class I.

Notwithstanding these significant assurances and the extreme improbability of Congress redesignating these areas as class I, Mr. OLIN and I have taken an additional step to assure Westvaco that their expansion will not be impaired by the passage of our bill. For the four areas which are closest to Westvaco's plant, we have chosen not to make wilderness recommendations at this time. On the other hand, because of strong citizen interest in the preservation of these areas and the value of their wilderness resources, we are not releasing to multiple use Barbours Creek, Shawvers Run, Rich Hole, or Rough Mountain. To balance all interests, we have placed these areas in further study with the stipulation that they be managed to protect their wilderness values until further act of the Congress determines their final status.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe that our wilderness proposal deserves the favorable consideration of the House. It preserves in perpetuity some of the outstanding natural treasures of western and southwestern Virginia. It balances the interests of various groups concerned with the resources of our National Forests, and it is broadly supported by the citizens I have the privilege of representing.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. OLIN).

Mr. OLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5121, the Virginia wilderness bill. As a sponsor of this bill which includes wilderness designations in my district, I can assure my colleagues that this is a carefully balanced bill which protects important and unique areas in Virginia for future generations, as well as protecting jobs. Great care has been taken to insure that both are protected.

H.R. 5121 designates 56,000 acres in Virginia as wilderness. This equals 3.4 percent of the 1,632,307 acres of national forest lands in the Commonwealth. Just as important, this bill releases to multiple use management over 157,000 acres which have been held in a quasi-wilderness limbo for a number of years.

This bill represents the culmination of over a year of careful study by Congressman BOUCHER and myself. The areas contained in H.R. 5121 were part of the U.S. Forest Service's RARE II study. And, I am pleased to add that the administration supports this legislation.

Over the last year I have talked with and heard from thousands of people in Virginia's Sixth Congressional District about wilderness. Elected officials and numerous civic organizations have expressed their opinions. With only a few exceptions, public opinion expressed at meetings and through correspondence has been supportive of wilderness by a wide margin.

On the basis of the recommendations of the Forest Service, the input I have received throughout the Sixth Congressional District, and my own review of these sites and the issues involved, I have proposed wilderness designation for three sites in my district in H.R. 5121. These sites are St. Mary's and Ramsey's Draft in Augusta County, and Thunder Ridge in Rockbridge, Botetourt, and Bedford Counties. I am convinced that the protection offered by wilderness designation makes sense for these special sites.

Mr. Speaker, since promoting economic and industrial development in the Sixth District of Virginia is one of my top priorities, I would like to clarify a few misunderstandings which I have encountered on how wilderness will affect air quality standards as provided under the Clean Air Act.

First, all of the areas designated for wilderness under H.R. 5121 will retain their existing class II air quality standards.

Second, Congressman BOUCHER and I have no desire to see these standards change and will vigorously any effort to redesignate these sites to class I air.

Further, I have found no desire by any group or organization to change the air quality standards from class II to class I.

In its committee report, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee "emphatically states its intention that wilderness areas designated by H.R. 5121 should remain class II." The report goes on to say, "This committee would strongly oppose any attempt to redesignate the wilderness class I."

The major environmental organizations in Virginia have publicly stated: We can foresee no set of circumstances under which we would either initiate or support any effort to reclassify wilderness areas in Virginia to air quality class I. We believe that any such effort would be unnecessary and ill-advised."

Even major national environmental organizations have gone on record stating that they have no plans to seek redesignations for these sites—now or in the future.

Finally, my conversations with the Governor of Virginia make it clear that the Commonwealth of Virginia

has no desire to redesignate any of the wilderness areas from class II to class I.

Third, given the proximity of these and other class II wilderness areas to important industrial activities throughout the country, there is no reason to believe that this Congress—or some future Congress—would seek to redesignate class II wilderness areas to class I.

After a thorough investigation it is abundantly clear to me that H.R. 5121 does not threaten jobs and that these wilderness sites will not be redesignated to class I air quality areas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Interior Committee, and the chairman of the subcommittee involved, Mr. SEIBERLING, for its prompt attention to H.R. 5121 and for bringing it to the floor today. I believe this is a balanced and fair bill which deserves the support of our colleagues, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to describe the recommendations of the U.S. Forest Service under its RARE II study and the areas recommended for wilderness and further study under H.R. 5121.

In all of our analysis, the starting point was the Forest Service recommendations for specific sites. In the Sixth District, six sites were originally recommended for wilderness. They were: First, head of Dry Run in Rockingham County in the George Washington National Forest; second, St. Mary's in Augusta County in the George Washington National Forest; third, Ramsey's Draft in Augusta County in the George Washington National Forest; fourth, Rough Mountain in Bath County in the George Washington National Forest; fifth, Rich Hole in Alleghany and Rockbridge Counties in the George Washington National Forest; and sixth, Thunder Ridge in Rockbridge, Botetourt, and Bedford Counties in the Thomas Jefferson National Forest.

In addition, three sites were recommended for further planning: First, Southern Massanutten in Rockingham and Page Counties in the George Washington National Forest; second, Dolly Anne in Alleghany County in the George Washington National Forest; and third, Ramsey's Draft Addition in Augusta and Highland Counties in the George Washington National Forest.

The proposed St. Mary's Wilderness Area is 10,090 acres in southeastern Augusta County. It is situated mostly within the watershed of the St. Mary's River and its tributaries. The site lies on the western slopes of the Blue Ridge just off the Blue Ridge Parkway. The most outstanding feature of this area is the St. Mary's River itself and its numerous cascades.

The St. Mary's River is classed as a No. 1 native trout stream in its upper reaches and No. 2 in the lower reaches. The stream contains native trout. Because of its rugged terrain, St. Mary's is also prime bear habitat.

Ramsey's Draft is another good wilderness candidate. It is 6,725 acres in northestern Augusta County and located just off Route 250. The boundary of Ramsey's Draft is the ridge of mountains which surround the draft. It is a beautiful area with large stands of virgin timber and is a popular area for hikers and campers. The area also has a good parking area adjacent to it just off Route 250.

The Thunder Ridge Wilderness proposal will complement the existing adjacent James River Face Wilderness Area. This will provide a continuous wilderness area in the Blue Ridge Mountains chain from the James River to Apple Orchard Mountain, and it includes a portion of the Appalachian Trail. The two wilderness areas are separated only by Petites Gap Road. A 2-acre trail-head parking area is provided for. James River face is a permanent class I air quality area.

In addition to these three sites, H.R. 5121 also adds 160 acres to the James River Face Wilderness Area. As I indicated, the Thunder Ridge Wilderness Area would be adjacent to the James River Face Wilderness Area with a road separating the two areas. In several small sections, however, designating Thunder Ridge as a wilderness area would leave small pockets of nonwilderness Forest Service lands surrounded by wilderness areas. The addition of the 160 acres to the James River Face Wilderness Area eliminates these nonwilderness pockets and improves the ability of the Forest Service to manage both wilderness areas more effectively.

At two of the sites recommended for wilderness designation by the U.S. Forest Service—Rough Mountain and Rich Hole—concerns have been raised by some that wilderness designations might restrict economic growth in nearby communities. The possibility of a future redesignation of these sites to class I air under the Clean Air Act, the likelihood of such a redesignation, and the implications of such a redesignation have been the subject of some debate and conflicting opinions. I would like to focus on this debate for a few minutes.

Covington, VA, is the site of a major paper mill operation of the Westvaco Corp. It is a major source of employment to the area and an important source of tax revenues. I am pleased to report that Westvaco has now begun a major new expansion at its Covington facility. This will mean the creation of a number of new jobs for the region. Obviously, Westvaco is anxious to insure that they are able to proceed with this expansion and modernization and that actions not be taken which might impede normal and responsible growth in its work at Covington.

In this context, Westvaco, and others in the area, have expressed concerns that if wilderness areas are established in too close of proximity to their Covington plant they might be constrained in their activities if at some future point in time these new wilderness areas were somehow redesignated as class I areas under the Clean Air Act. Let me hasten to add that no one has suggested that Westvaco would be constrained in its growth if these areas retain their current class II designations. The concerns focus on whether these sites might be redesignated as class I and what that might mean to the Covington facility.

Mr. Speaker, as I have described earlier, the designation of areas as wilderness does not change their air quality standard. The areas reviewed under RARE II are all class II and those which are designated wilderness will remain class II. Further, there is no visible interest on anyone's part to seek a redesignation from class II to class I, and the likelihood that these areas would be redesignated as class I is extremely remote.

Nevertheless, I wanted to better understand what the impact on Westvaco might be if several close sites were somehow redesignated as class I air quality areas. I raised this question with the State Air Pollution Control Board, the agency charged with enforcing the Clean Air Act in Virginia for the Environmental Protection Agency.

For study purposes the State Board looked at a worst-case scenario in which four areas between 10 and 20 miles away from Covington would be designated as wilderness and would have their air quality redesignated to class I. The Air Board then used an EPA approved computer model to see whether Westvaco could expand and increase its emissions without violating class I air quality standards.

In its preliminary report, the regional director of the State Air Pollution Control Board concluded that even in this worst case situation, Westvaco would be violating its existing class II air quality standards around Covington long before class I air at wilderness sites 10 to 20 miles away would impose any restrictions on Westvaco's expansion.

The sites examined in the Air Board Study were Rich Hole, Rough Mountain, Barbours Creek, and Shawvers Run.

Still Westvaco felt that additional scientific data would be necessary before the Air Board's preliminary finding could be verified. Because I am so committed to job creation in the Virginia's Sixth Congressional District, I decided to hold off on any deci-

sion on wilderness designation for Rough Mountain and Rich Hole until meteorological data could be collected and analyzed in a technical and dispassionate manner. My colleague, Mr. BOUCHER from the Ninth Congressional District agreed with this approach and also agreed to hold off on any designation recommendations for Barbours Creek and Shawvers Run until scientific data became available.

Toward this goal, Congressman BOUCHER and I have written to the Environmental Protection Agency requesting that agency to conduct a thorough review of the Clean Air Act issues and questions which have been raised in this debate. Mr. Speaker, for the record I am including a copy of the letter to EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 15, 1984.

Hon. WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. RUCKELSHAUS: In evaluating U.S. Forest Service proposals to designate National Forest System lands in our Congressional Districts as wilderness, we have found considerable disagreement on the question of whether designating areas as wilderness might impose Clean Air Act restrictions which might hamper economic growth in nearby communities.

While all of the areas proposed for wilderness are currently class II, as defined under the Clean Air Act of 1977, concerns exist that these areas might be redesignated to class I sometime in the future. We have been presented with conflicting data on whether class I air quality standards at three specific sites would impose restrictions on possible future expansions of the Westvaco Corporation at its Covington, Virginia facility. These sites are: Rough Mountain, in Bath County; Rich Hole, in Alleghany and Rockbridge Counties; and, Barbours Creek, in Craig County. These are identified on the enclosed map.

We are anxious to maintain a climate which is conducive to future economic growth and job creation in Virginia. Nevertheless, we also support the preservation of wild and primitive areas for future generations.

Since the Environmental Protection Agency is charged with administering the Clean Air Act, and the wilderness debate on the three areas cited above is essentially a technical and scientific one on the impact of the Clean Air Act at these specific sites, we are asking for your help in better understanding the facts. It would be very helpful for us to have your opinion as to the circumstances, or lack thereof, under which a class I designation at each of these sites would impose restrictions on future expansions at Westvaco Corporation's facility in Covington. We would also appreciate some estimates on the likelihood of any scenarios under which restrictions would be placed on Westvaco and the costs of existing technologies for meeting and complying with those restrictions.

We recognize that the answers to these questions will take some analysis by your agency; however, it is important for us to have a sound opinion based on scientific and technical fact, not emotion or idle conjecture. We would very much appreciate your opinion so that we may proceed in a thoughtful way on the wilderness recommendations for the sites referenced above.

Please keep us apprised of your progress in answering these questions. If we can provide you with any information or answer any questions on this for you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

JIM OLIN,
Member of Congress.
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5121 leaves Rich Hole and Rough Mountain in their current study status. The same is true for Barbours Creek and Shawvers Run in Craig County in Mr. BOUCHER's district. Keeping these areas in their current status will protect them from development and maintain their natural charter and integrity. At the same time, it provides us with the time needed to resolve technical, scientific questions on the Clean Air Act without holding hostage the other areas provided for under H.R. 5121.

The remaining site recommended for wilderness designation by the U.S. Forest Service under its RARE II study was head of Dry Run in Rockingham County. In 1980, the Forest Service reassessed this site and changed its recommendation from wilderness to multiple-use. This change was based on the small size of Head of Dry Run—1,300 acres—and the difficulties the Forest Service would encounter in trying to manage a wilderness area of such small size. I have concurred with the Forest Service in this assessment of the site and have not recommended it for wilderness. Instead, under H.R. 5121 it would be released for multiple-use.

Other than the four specific sites held for further planning in the bill, and those designated as wilderness, all other sites in Virginia reviewed under RARE II in both the George Washington and the Thomas Jefferson National Forests are returned to U.S. Forest Service multiple-use management under H.R. 5121.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to misunderstandings about the relationship of the Wilderness Act and the Clean Air Act, I have found some misconceptions about how wilderness areas are managed. For example, some have feared that if a fire starts in a wilderness area, the Forest Service would have to use bucket brigades and hand tools to fight it. The truth is that the Forest Service can take whatever actions are necessary to put out a fire. The Wilderness Act of 1964 is clear on this point; section 4(d)(1) provides:

. . . such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases . . .

Another misconception is that if someone gets hurt in a wilderness area they could only be brought out on foot. Again, the Wilderness Act of 1964 is clear that any steps necessary can be taken, including the construction of roads, or place to land aircraft, the construction of a temporary structure, or anything else that is necessary in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons in a wilderness area.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I believe this is a fair and balanced bill. It is the result of input from many people and reflects a sincere effort to be responsive to concerns that exist over wilderness designations without undermining the basic need to protect unique natural treasures.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5121, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1400

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

TEXAS WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3788) to designate various areas as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the national forests in the State of Texas, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3788

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Texas Wilderness Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890), the following lands are hereby designated as wilderness, and therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) certain lands in the Angelina National Forest, Texas, which comprise approximately five thousand four hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Turkey Hill Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Turkey Hill Wilderness;

(2) certain lands in the Angelina National Forest, Texas, which comprise approximately twelve thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Upland Island Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Upland Island Wilderness;

(3) certain lands in the Davy Crockett National Forest, Texas, which comprise approximately three thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Big Slough Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Big Slough Wilderness;

(4) certain lands in the Sabine National Forest, Texas, which comprise approximately ten thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Indian Mounds Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Indian Mounds Wilderness; and

(5) certain lands in the Sam Houston National Forest, Texas, which comprise approximately four thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Little Lake Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Little Lake Creek Wilderness.

MAPS AND DESCRIPTIONS

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of each wilderness area designated by this Act with the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, and the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, and each such map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made. Each such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS

SEC. 4. (a) Subject to valid existing rights, each wilderness area designated by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that, with respect to any area designated in this Act, any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

(b) The Congress finds that the Indian Mounds and Upland Island Wilderness Areas designated by this Act contain significant amounts of intermingled lands owned by the Temple-Eastex Incorporated and that in order to manage the wilderness in an efficient and effective manner it is in the public interest that these lands be owned by the Federal Government. Accordingly, notwithstanding any other provision of the law, within ninety days of enactment of this Act, the United States through the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to acquire by exchange from Temple-Eastex Incorporated, subject to the concurrence of said corporation, the lands depicted on a map entitled "Indian Mounds Land Exchange", dated March 1984, consisting of tracts 2264, 2265, 1302, and 2289 and the lands depicted on a map entitled "Upland Island Land Exchange", dated March 1984, and consisting of tract 3191. The lands acquired by the United States under the provisions of this section shall become parts of the Sabine and Angelina National Forest respectively and shall be administered in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the national forests and the National Wilderness Preservation System, as appropriate.

(c) Upon acceptance of title by the United States to the lands described in subsection (a) of this section, the United States through the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to Temple-Eastex Incorporated and the national forest system lands depicted on a map entitled "Indian Mounds Land Exchange—Conveyance to Temple-Eastex", dated March 1984, and consisting of tracts K-La-II, K-la-III, K-La-I, K-2r, S-3, S-2r and S-2o and the lands depicted on a map entitled "Upland Island Land Exchange—Conveyance to Temple-Eastex" dated March 1984, and consisting of tracts S-13-J, S-29-I and S-29-II. The exchange of land authorized by this section shall not include mineral interests.

(d) Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, for any existing timber sale contracts or portions of sale contracts within the boundaries of the Indian Mounds, Upland Island and Little Creek Wilderness Areas as designated by this Act, terminate the timber sale contracts without cost to the buyer: *Provided,* That with respect to the portion of the timber sale located in compartment 80 within the proposed Indian Mounds Wilderness and sold to the Saint Regis Paper Company, the Secretary shall upon termination of the contract compensate the buyer by offering to sell the buyer similar timber of approximately equal volumes and values. Such compensatory sale shall be carried out on a negotiated basis.

EFFECT OF RARE II

SEC. 5. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second roadless area review and evaluation program (RARE II);

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of national forest system roadless areas in Texas and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II final environmental statement (dated January 1979) with respect to national forest system lands in States other than Texas, such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to national forest system lands in the State of Texas;

(2) with respect to the national forest system lands in the State of Texas which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II) and those lands referred to in subsection (d), that review and evaluation or reference shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revisions of the plans, but shall review the wilderness option when the plans are revised, which revisions will ordinarily occur on a ten-year cycle, or at least every fifteen years, unless, prior to such time the Secretary of Agriculture finds that conditions in a unit have significantly changed;

(3) areas in the State of Texas reviewed in such final environmental statement or referenced in subsection (d) and not designated wilderness upon enactment of this Act shall be managed for multiple use in accordance with land management plans pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976: *Provided,* That such areas need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of the initial land management plans;

(4) in the event that revised land management plans in the State of Texas are implemented pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law, areas not recommended for wilderness designation need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation prior to or during revision of such plans, and areas recommended for wilderness designation shall be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation as may be required by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and other applicable law; and

(5) unless expressly authorized by Congress, the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of national forest system lands in the State of Texas for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(c) As used in this section, and as provided in section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the term "revision" shall not include an "amendment" to a plan.

(d) The provisions of this section shall also apply to national forest system roadless lands in the State of Texas which are less than 5,000 acres in size.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to bring this consensus legislation before the House today because it rep-

resents a middle ground compromise on an issue that the committee has struggled with since 1979.

When the Forest Service completed its RARE II review of national forest roadless lands in 1979 it recommended that only 8,790 acres of roadless land be designated as wilderness in Texas. Texas conservationists noted that this recommendation amounted to a mere 1.1 percent of the national forest land in a State that currently has no national forest wilderness. They argued for a much larger wilderness package in order to set aside some areas to serve the recreation and wilderness needs of the fast growing Houston and Dallas metropolitan areas. In response to their concerns our former colleague, Bob Eckhardt, introduced legislation to designate some 63,000 acres of wilderness. The Subcommittee on Public Lands held a hearing on that legislation in 1980 and also visited several of the areas proposed for wilderness. However, due to sharp divisions of opinion on the wilderness issue, the legislation never went to markup. The impasse continued in the 97th Congress.

In 1983, Texas conservationists, buoyed by the increasing demand among hunters, other sportsmen's groups, and urban residents to set aside select areas for primitive recreation, initiated a new effort to secure wilderness protection for the 63,000 acres formerly proposed by Congressman Eckhardt. Their new bill, H.R. 3788 was introduced by Congressman JOHN BRYANT and cosponsored by Congressmen STEVE BARTLETT and MARTIN FROST, and hearings were held last November. During those hearings, I believe it became apparent to all concerned that further delay on the wilderness issue would be detrimental to both those proposing wilderness and those who wished to see national forest roadless areas opened for logging and other development. Fortunately, our colleagues, Congressmen CHARLES WILSON and JOHN BRYANT, agreed to participate in a series of negotiations aimed at resolving the issue. At several points in the negotiations, it would have been easy for both Members to adopt unyielding positions, and I am personally grateful for the patience, diligence, and flexibility they demonstrated in arriving at the consensus product before us today.

The compromise proposal will designate 34,000 acres of wilderness in east Texas, 25,000 in Congressman WILSON's district, 5,400 in Congressman SAM HALL's district and 4,000 in Congressman PHIL GRAMM's district, and strikes almost the exact middle ground between the administration's 8,790-acre position and the conservationists' 63,000-acre bill. Having hiked in several of the areas in question in 1980, I also believe we have selected the finest areas for wilderness protection.

For example, the proposed 12,000-acre Upland Island Wilderness is a virtual microcosm of the varying ecosystems of east Texas, ranging from palmetto, oak, cypress flats along the river bottom on the south to spacious and relatively open pine forests on the rolling hills to the north. Further to the east, the proposed 10,000-acre Indian Mounds Wilderness consists of gently rolling terrain with magnificent creek bottoms and several State champion trees. And the 3,000-acre Big Slough Wilderness will afford excellent hunting and canoeing opportunities, including a near circular canoe route and impressive stands of virgin timber along the Neches River. It should additionally be noted that the wilderness proposals lie with a 1½- to 2½-hour drive of Houston and a 4- to 5-hour drive from Dallas, and along with the Big Thicket National Preserve established a decade ago, will provide the only nearby opportunity for residents of those metropolitan areas to enjoy a wilderness type experience. Wilderness designation will also guarantee that hunters and other sportsmen are assured of at least some relatively large areas where they can pursue recreation in an environment undisturbed by roads, clearcuts and the other marks of development.

On the development side of the ledger, the "release" language of H.R. 3788 provides that the east Texas roadless lands not designated as wilderness may be made available for such nonwilderness uses as are determined appropriate through the Forest Service's land management planning process. This is an important concession by conservationists, because absent such "release" language the Forest Service would continue their ongoing RARE III wilderness studies of roadless lands in east Texas, and development activities such as timber harvest might be delayed or thwarted by administrative or judicial appeals.

As a final point, I would note that portions of the wilderness proposals of H.R. 3788 are underlain by privately owned mineral rights. Pursuant to the Wilderness Act, such rights will be honored. However, I believe it is the hope of all concerned that if and when an owner decides to exercise his rights in a wilderness area the Forest Service would work with him to determine if a mineral exchange or some other mutually acceptable arrangement could be made to avoid any undue disruption of wilderness values. I am informed that at any given time, certain national forest lands in east Texas are generally unleased and might be available for such a mineral rights exchange in order to protect wilderness values, and I am confident that the Forest Service will carefully examine this option if and when a problem arises. I also note that the potential for wilderness/mineral conflicts will decrease over time as some of the privately owned rights are due to expire in the near future and others may ultimately be sold to the Government under the willing buyer-willing seller authority of section 5 of the Wilderness Act.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 3788, as amended, is a meritorious proposal which will successfully resolve the longstanding dispute over wilderness in east Texas. Due to the hard work of Congressmen WILSON and BRYANT, we have come up with a proposal that equitably balances the interests concerned, and I, once again, cannot commend the Members enough for their hard work and good faith in reaching this agreement. I also note that our compromise proposal has been introduced and cosponsored by Senators TOWER and BENTSEN in the other body, which is but another indication of the overall consensus nature of this bill. I, therefore, urge my colleagues' strong support of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Texas wilderness bill contains a number of provisions to which the Forest Service strongly object.

While I realize the bill is the end product of lengthy negotiations and debate between those affected, I believe it is essential that all Members know what is involved.

The five areas to be designated as wilderness contain 34,400 acres which exceeds the RARE II recommendation of three areas by 8,790 acres. The Forest Service opposes these additions.

More importantly, the Department objects to the land exchange and timber sale provisions inserted in the bill. The following is the precise wording of their report dated just yesterday, May 7.

Sections 4 (b) and (c) of the Committee bill have been amended to mandate a land exchange between the Forest Service and Temple-Eastex Corporation to acquire private lands lying within two of the areas designated as wilderness. About 2,725 acres of National Forest land would be conveyed for about 2,735 acres of Temple-Eastex Corporation lands. This exchange of nearly equal land areas has several objectionable features. Forest Service estimates of value based on transaction evidence, show the National Forest land to be as much as $1.6 million more valuable than the private lands. The difference in value is attributable to the larger volume and better quality of the timber stands on the National Forest lands. Existing authorities, under which the Forest Service regularly exchanges land with private parties, require an equal value transaction. We strongly recommend, therefore, that the bill be amended to provide that the land exchange be based on equal value.

While I commend my colleague from Texas (Mr. WILSON) for his efforts in reaching a compromise on acreage and the number of wilderness areas, I be-

lieve we need to take a closer look at the other provisions of the bill to make sure we are not "ripping off" the taxpayer.

There are clearly hidden costs to creating wilderness both in terms of opportunities lost to develop the resource of an area and now we are being asked to actually buy the land.

I intend to oppose the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the good gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT), a strong supporter of the legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3788, the Texas wilderness bill, which I cosponsored in its original form and which I also endorse in its current form.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING), and I also commend the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), as well as both my colleagues from Texas who are sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRYANT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILSON).

As you will recall, the original legislation designated 63,700 acres in 10 components of the national wilderness preservation system in the national forests of Texas. This current compromise bill sets aside a more modest 34,000 acres for wilderness designation in only five of these components.

The largest State in the lower 48, composed of 168 million acres, Texas, has only 46,850 acres, or 0.028 percent, designated as wilderness. In contrast, the State of New Mexico, less than half the size of Texas, has more than 32 times as much designated wilderness. Montana, which is a little larger than half the size of Texas, has roughly 73 times the wilderness acreage. California, which is about two-thirds the size of Texas, has about 58 times as much wilderness as Texas does.

Mr. Speaker, a critical need exists for additional wilderness areas to be preserved for future generations in the State of Texas. The only current designated wilderness area in Texas is located in the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in west Texas. West Texas encompasses a vastly different type of ecosystem than that in east Texas. The east Texas parcels under consideration are incredibly unique, and they are worth setting aside.

The east Texas wilderness contains vast stands of longleaf pine, as well as the national champion long leaf pine, the largest Florida basswood, and the largest cherrybark oak in Texas national forests. The Indian Mounds component of this bill contains distinctive plants such as greenvein orchids and yellow lady's slipper, as well as fossil beds, and a permanent spring pool where pioneer wagon trains watered. In preserving these areas, we are protecting not only a unique ecosystem, but we are also preserving a bit of Texas history.

Texas needs more designated wilderness because Guadalupe Mountains National Park in west Texas is far away and inaccessible from the major population centers of the State. The wilderness areas designated in this bill in east Texas are in fact within less than 5 hours' drive from Houston, San Antonio, Austin, and Dallas-Fort Worth.

□ 1410

Ten million people live within a 5-hour drive from the wilderness areas set aside in this bill.

As a result of our recent economic growth and urban expansion, the demand for a variety of outdoor wilderness activities in east Texas in spiraling. Wilderness designation will allow these pristine areas to remain available for nonimpairing recreational uses such as hiking, camping, hunting, horseback riding, and nature study, within the reach, and uniquely so, of urban centers.

Now, that is not to say that all outdoor recreation areas should be designated as wilderness. The whole concept of preservation and recreation require a mix of uses. East Texas already has national forests and national parks and Corps of Engineer lakes. We need designated wilderness areas to be set aside to complement these other uses.

Now, several times I personally visited the areas under consideration for wilderness designation in this bill and in the earlier version. Several weeks ago, I visited this wilderness with my son. From firsthand experience, I can report to my colleagues in the House that nothing compares with the east Texas wilderness in a way to rest the mind and invigorate the body.

Texas wilderness areas are a precious natural resource. They are not infinite. The simple fact is that Texas needs this bill to preserve our wilderness lands. With your help, we can preserve them now, for we cannot do it later. These tracts must be protected as a part of our Texas heritage for our children and grandchildren to enjoy.

Now, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) correctly noted that there has been one question raised about the cost. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to this House that, in fact, the cost estimate of $1,600,000, that is not correct; it is somewhat of a frivolous estimate because there is no out-of-pocket cost to the Treasury. These lands are already owned by the Federal Government, with the exception of some land swaps, so there will be no dollar cost to the Treasury. In fact, the United States will be exchanging private land for public land on a roughly equal basis.

So, Mr. Chairman, to summarize my support and the reason for the support that this House should give to this bill:

First, there are no wilderness areas in east Texas now and this provides a modest 34,000 acres.

Second, there are significant and unique ecosystems to be protected for future generations.

Third, unlike wilderness areas in other States, these 34,000 acres are close to urban populations.

Fourth, having some of the forests designated as official wilderness areas will add to the diversity and to the enjoyment of the outdoors.

So I congratulate my colleagues from Texas (Mr. BRYANT and Mr. WILSON) on their success in developing this compromise measure and I urge my colleagues here in the House to approve it today.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. BRYANT) who was one of the Members who worked out this very commendable compromise.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, this is a proud day for Texas and for the legions of citizens, public interest organizations, and environmental groups throughout my State and the Nation who have struggled so long and so tirelessly to preserve for all time, as wilderness, some of the most unusual and scenic woodlands in the world.

Today, after years of hoping and planning by so many, and months of delicate and occasionally frustrating negotiations spearheaded by Congressman JOHN SEIBERLING, I am pleased to ask this House to approve H.R. 3788, the Texas wilderness bill.

This compromise measure secures for generations to come 34,400 acres—five relatively small, but spectacular tracts in the four national forests of east Texas. Enactment of this legislation, a companion to which has been introduced in the other body by Texas Senators LLOYD BENTSEN, and JOHN TOWER will provide the only wilderness areas within convenient reach of the majority of Texans.

While I initially sought to place a much larger area within the national wilderness preservation system, I am satisfied that Texans today and tomorrow will have the opportunity to visit and enjoy some of the finest examples of our dwindling natural heritage in its most pristine form, if this bill becomes law.

In addition to the natural physical beauty of these areas, which will almost double the amount of wilderness acreage in Texas, they contain an array of champion trees and various species of plants and animals which exist in few, if any, other places in the Nation or the world.

By saving these few acres—less than one-quarter of 1 percent of all the commercial timberland in Texas—we

will protect forever an irreplaceable bit of our natural heritage.

In spite of its vast 171.1 million acres and astounding population growth, Texas has only one small parcel of wilderness—46,850 acres in the remote Guadalupe National Park of far west Texas—as compared with more than 80 million acres designated in other States since 1964. Its distance from the major population centers in the eastern half of the State removes it from general access and significant human enjoyment.

Each of the five areas in this compromise bill is within easy driving distance of Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio, Austin, and the other metropolitan areas where most Texans live and work. Each is composed entirely of public lands. Each is unique. And each—without the essential wilderness designation we seek today—would eventually be clearcut to the bare ground for commercial timber.

The astounding population growth of Texas—due in large measure to vast migration from the Northeast—constitutes a severe threat to Texas' once lavish and numerous natural areas. Enactment of this legislation will help keep a tiny piece of Texas as it is.

Only by giving these prime examples of nature's beauty and abundance wilderness designation will our children and grandchildren know what so much of Texas was like when their ancestors first explored and settled what is now east Texas. Only with wilderness designation will these areas continue to be as desirable as they are today for hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, and nature studies.

I am also grateful to two of my colleagues, without whose diligence, cooperation, and good faith commitment, the Texas wilderness bill would continue to be only the dream that it has been for two decades.

Congressman CHARLES WILSON, my colleague from Texas who well represented the divergent interests of his district during our lengthy negotiations, and Congressman JOHN SEIBERLING, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks who forged the compromise, worked long and hard to write the version of the Texas wilderness bill that is before us today.

They have earned my thanks and deserve the appreciation of the people of Texas.

Although I take pride in being the author of the Texas wilderness bill, today's victory is not that of any one individual. It belongs to literally thousands of Texans who never became tired of this task, who never lost sight of the goal or lost faith that it could and would be achieved.

Today's victory belongs to the members of the Texas Committee on Natural Resources, the Sierra Club, the sportsmen's clubs of Texas, the Houston Sportsmen's Association, the Texas Independent Birdhunters Association, the Texas League of Women Voters, the Audubon Society, and countless other civic, community, and conservation groups. It belongs to everyone who wrote a letter, signed a petition, made a phone call, attended a meeting, or only hoped for the preservation of the Texas wilderness.

Fellow members, today I ask you to vote for H.R. 3788 to preserve for future generations a small part of the Texas natural heritage that we still have today.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.)

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio and also the gentlemen from Texas (Mr. BRYANT) and (Mr. WILSON) and (Mr. BARTLETT) from the Dallas area for their work on this bill.

It pleases me to see these gentlemen, especially the gentleman from Ohio who has praised the virtues of east Texas. We are talking about 34,000 acres in this bill, however, I live down there next to it and you can talk about east Texas in its entirety, as we are talking about this 34,000 acres.

We invite anyone to come down there and visit with us. I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) knows more about wilderness areas than any person in this Congress and we appreciate what he has done in these areas.

I do want to bring up one point with the gentleman if I may. When we were discussing this measure sometime back, the question came to my mind about the mineral interests that are owned by individuals within the confines of the boundaries of this 34,000-acre tract. It is my understanding, and I would like to ask clarification from the gentleman from Ohio, that the mineral interests that are owned by individuals under this acreage designated the Texas wilderness bill, or H.R. 3788, will not be affected. The ownership of those mineral interests will still be owned and subject to use by the people who own the interests.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I am happy to yield.

□ 1420

Mr. SEIBERLING. That is absolutely correct. Under the Wilderness Act such rights will be honored, must be honored. However, if and when an owner decides to exercise his rights in a wilderness area in the national forest, it is our intent the Forest Service would work with him to determine if a mineral exchange or some other mutually acceptable arrangement could be made to avoid any undue disruption of the wilderness values. I am informed that at any given time there are enough national forest lands in east Texas that are normally unleased for mineral purposes that could be available for mineral rights exchange in order to provide that kind of quid pro quo if the owners are interested in engaging in it. And I certainly think it is the intent of the committee that the Forest Service carefully examine this option if and when a question arises of that sort, and the Service tries to minimize wilderness mineral conflicts by recognizing the rights of the owners of the minerals fully, as does the existing law.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. If I may direct another question to the gentleman, and let me make it in the form of a question, suppose that a person owns 200 acres of minerals under this wilderness bill and the lease is for a term of 5 or 10 years. And there is other acreage outside of the Wilderness Act which of course this bill would not cover. But suppose that the operator needed this 200 acres to form a unit, to drill a well for gas which would be a 640-acre unit with a 10-percent tolerance, or a lesser amount for oil, whatever the case may be. Would the mineral interest owner be deprived of the right to place his or her mineral interest into this producing unit or drilling unit under the provisions of this act, of this bill?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I do not know enough about mineral law particularly in Texas to give a definitive answer. But let me simply say this: That this bill would in no way change the rights of the existing mineral leases or mineral ownership from what they would be in the absence of this legislation.

So to the extent that the owner of the mineral interests can now make that kind of grouping he would still be able to do so.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I want to make perfectly clear for the RECORD, if I can follow the gentleman's hypothetical problem, if there is a unit of 600 acres and the individual owners owned the mineral rights in the area which we are setting aside as wilderness, they could use that 200 acres to make the full 600 acres, if there was no disturbance on the surface of the land.

I believe that would be correct. That is No. 1.

No. 2, though, to make sure your position is protected, and those that own those mineral rights, we must make sure that the Forest Service, once we classify this as wilderness, does not write regulations so prohibitive that they would force the individual to exchange even if he would not want to. That is what I think you are seeking.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I agree with my distinguished friend and colleague from Alaska, except that I would say that the Forest Service must allow that mineral owner to develop those rights and make whatever surface disturbance is necessary to do so.

The only control the Forest Service has is to require no more disturbance than is necessary to fully exploit those rights is made.

But that is true of the national forests, even in the absence of wilderness. The Forest Service is supposed to protect the surface to the degree that it can be done, subject to the overriding right of the mineral owner to do whatever is necessary.

So as far as I am concerned, it is the intent of this legislation to make no change whatsoever in the rights of those mineral owners.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. The thing that gave me concern was a paragraph on page 14 of the report which reads:

Lands designated as wilderness are also withdrawn from mineral activity under the terms of the National Wilderness Preservation Act. No significant loss of mineral receipts is expected to result from this bill, however, because mineral resources can be removed under valid existing rights.

As I understand the gentleman from Alaska, and I concur, if this hypothetical 200 acres is made a part of the drilling unit, there is no reason why you could not, I assume, directionally drill under this acreage?

Mr. SEIBERLING. That is correct.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Or to include this within the drilling unit. I assume that you would not have the right, an operator would not have the right to drill a well on this 200-acre tract even though the surface is not owned by the mineral owner? There would be no drilling on that tract; is that correct?

Mr. SEIBERLING. No, that is not correct. To the extent that the mineral owner must use the surface to actually develop his mineral rights, he is entitled to do so, even though it is in a wilderness area.

All this language means that the gentleman read from the committee report is that the area is withdrawn from further mineral leasing by the Forest Service beyond what rights have already been leased or otherwise exist. So what it means is that, if there were adjoining areas under which there was no privately existing mineral right or lease, that the Forest Service would no longer be able to lease adjacent areas within the wilderness area.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again I think what the paragraph the gentleman read or the comment he read from the report refers to is only the Federal lands.

Mr. SEIBERLING. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It does not refer to the privately owned lands that are incorporated in the wilderness area. Their rights are protected. And I go back to the 200 acres, knowing that these units have to be made up because of the size under Texas law, I believe, and this would not affect, this legislation would protect the rights of the private owner. It just affects any other Federal lands that have not been leased. That is my interpretation.

Mr. SEIBERLING. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. If I might direct a question to either of you gentlemen: If this 200 acres that we are talking about, if the lease expired without any development under the existing lease, the mineral owner would still own the mineral rights, of course.

Mr. SEIBERLING. It would depend. If the lease was a lease of the mineral interests then when the lease expired then his rights expired. So if the lease requires timely development within a certain period of time then he will have to do that or else his rights will expire.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I understand, Mr. Chairman. But many times in Texas you will have a 10-year lease or a 3-year lease, and that lease might expire because of nonproduction. And some other company or individual may come along at the time of the expiration of the original lease, or sometime prior thereto, if there is not development, and take a lease on it again for another 5 years.

Will this bill prevent that mineral owner from subsequently leasing his or her land?

Mr. SEIBERLING. The bill would prohibit the Forest Service from subsequently leasing land with respect to which a previous lease had expired.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. The point I am making, sir, is after this lease expires, that does not mean that the mineral interests revert to the Federal Government, does it?

Mr. SEIBERLING. No. If the mineral interests were privately owned.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. I am speaking of privately owned leases, private ownership.

Mr. SEIBERLING. That would continue forever, as long as that owner decided to continue to hold that ownership.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. And could that owner in the future execute another oil or gas or mineral lease on that 200 acres?

Mr. SEIBERLING. The answer is yes.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. In the future?

Mr. SEIBERLING. In the future, definitely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to advise the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that he has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Yes, it does.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I would ask the gentleman from Alaska if he would yield me time to respond to his question.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I would like to respond about the Forest Service evaluation of the land.

On an acre-for-acre basis the Government will get 10.6 acres more than it would give to Temple-Eastex, which is the owner of the land that would be exchanged. And while the Forest Service lands involved might have slightly higher timber values, they are nothing like $1,600,000. In fact, the Temple-Eastex lands have higher land value as land per se, because a significant part of them are adjoining the Toledo Bend Reservoir, which makes them very valuable from the standpoint of development for recreational and subdivision development.

So it is the committee's view that any slight differences in timber values are balanced out by the higher subdivision value of the Temple-Eastex lands. And even to the extent there may be differences in timber values, I would simply like to put a couple of facts in the RECORD here because I think it is very important.

The Forest Service estimates of $1,600,000 would amount to approximately $600 per acre, an unrealistically large difference given the fact that an acre of east Texas forest land is generally selling for only about $1,000 to $1,500.

□ 1430

Temple-Eastex estimates the difference, if any, to be less than $70 per acre. The committee believes Temple-Eastex's estimate is much closer to the actual fact for several reasons.

First, the land involved on both sides of this exchange is simply typical forest land common to east Texas. There is no evidence that the Forest Service lands are better growing sites or otherwise better suited to timber production. The Forest Service has not even got an appraisal. They simply pulled this figure out of the air.

Aerial photos indicate that 408 acres of the Temple-Eastex land versus 550 acres of the Forest Service land to be exchanged have been converted to higher yielding pine plantations. Pine trees are more valuable in east Texas than hardwoods. However, this is only

a 142-acre difference in lands that have been planted.

Finally, I point out that both lands have some clearcuts on them already; of about equal proportions. And that the hardwood that has been left has little value in either case.

I would like to make a couple of other observations that I do think are important to answer some of the points raised in the Forest Service's letter, which, incidentally was received after the committee had already reported this bill.

The Forest Service says the proposed exchange is imprecise in its description of lands to be exchanged. This is difficult to accept because all of the tracts are identified by tract number and by maps referenced in the bill and most of them are surrounded by other ownership, so that they are especially easy to identify.

Furthermore, the Forest Service had already been negotiating with Temple-Eastex on some of these lands. The reason they say it is imprecise is that there is certain land, about 400 acres of Temple-Eastex lands that are part of the tracts to be exchanged, that are outside of the boundaries of the wilderness areas, and they say they are not sure whether those are to be exchanged.

Let me make it absolutely clear: Those lands are to be included in the exchange. One of the reasons is to enable the Forest Service to consolidate its holdings including the holdings outside of the wilderness area and avoid leaving Temple-Eastex with very small tracts of land as in-holdings inside the national forest.

Finally, the Forest Service indicates that cutting and sales are already underway. The only place where cutting is underway is a minor thinning sale which, as far as the committee is concerned, can go right ahead. And two of the three other areas of sales are areas where the purchasers have agreed to the termination of their contracts and the substitution of timber elsewhere, and we think that the third one can probably be worked out.

Finally, the Forest Service says 90 days is not enough to complete that exchange. Since the parcels are already identified and mapped out, we believe that there is no reason to take even 90 days to do it.

However, the Forest Service supervisor, who was the person behind this letter, I am sure, has been fighting this legislation for years, ever since the RARE–II program was first promulgated. I think the letter is simply a part of the same foot dragging we have encountered before.

Now the Congressmen concerned have worked this thing out, and it does seem to me that it is time to push this matter over the dam so that the uncertainty is ended, and the forest products industry, the Forest Service and everybody else has a clear idea of where they stand.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

For clarification and to make sure the RECORD is absolutely clear, it is my understanding in fact there is no acquisition or purchase with Treasury dollars of land but there is merely a swap and that some private land is set aside that is more suitable for wilderness designation is being exchanged almost on an acre-for-acre basis with the existing Forest Service land.

So the $1,600,000 allegation of cost is not an actual dollar check that would be written out of the Treasury. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) does not believe it is a cost at all.

Mr. SEIBERLING. If the gentleman will yield, that is absolutely correct. Furthermore, if the Forest Service went through its normal exchange process, they would be spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in environmental impact statements and all the bureaucratic rigamarole, so by avoiding that we would be saving them some actual cash.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point, because it needed to be.

Mr. SEIBERLING. In any event, no cash outlay is involved.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is no cash involved.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3788, legislation to designate 34,400 acres of east Texas land as wilderness areas. This bill represents an equitable compromise to preserve a significant area of east Texas woodlands for future generations of all Americans, and I commend my fellow Texans for their leadership on this issue.

Currently, the State of Texas has but a single designated wilderness area. Located in Guadalupe National Park, west Texas, this area is vastly different from the wilderness acreage proposed under H.R. 3788. The unique character and environment of the woodland areas of east Texas must be preserved. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3788, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1129, DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1129) to authorize appropriations for programs under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 12, 1984.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are able to bring to the floor for consideration the conference report on S. 1129, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1984. The bill reauthorizes the domestic volunteer programs of the action agency through fiscal year 1986.

These programs include in title I the volunteers in service to America program (VISTA), service learning programs, and special volunteer programs. Title II reauthorizes the Foster Grandparent program, the retired senior volunteer program and the Senior Companion program. Title IV of the act provides authority for the overall administration and management of the ACTION Agency and its programs.

Before discussing the details of the conference report, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my full committee chairman CARL PERKINS of Kentucky for his commitment in guiding this bill through conference and

his invaluable role in bringing the report to the floor today. My colleague IKE ANDREWS of North Carolina, chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, also deserves special thanks for his cooperation in developing this bill and for his support throughout the entire reauthorization process.

There were more than 50 points of difference between the House and Senate bills, and the report before us is the result of months of negotiations and give and take between the House and Senate conferees on both sides of the aisle. The result of these extensive and prolonged negotiations is a bill that enjoys broad bipartisan support by the conferees, as well as strong support from affected constituency groups, senior citizens organizations, private voluntary organizations, and grassroots self-help groups that are most dramatically impacted by this legislation.

Prior to the Easter recess, the Senate approved this conference report by unanimous consent. In October of last year the House overwhelmingly approved its version of the bill by a vote of 312 to 30. I ask for your similar bipartisan support today.

There are a number of specific issues addressed in the conference report that I would like to comment upon.

As chairman of the authorizing subcommittee for title I of the act, I am particularly pleased with provisions that should begin the process of restoring and revitalizing VISTA and reverse the "lingering death" the program has been subjected to over the last 3 years.

Since 1980 VISTA's budget has been slashed from $34 million to under $12 million, the number of VISTA volunteers has dropped from over 5,000 to under 2,000, and the number of VISTA projects has declined from 840 to 450. This has occurred at a time when the Census Bureau has reported the greatest increases in poverty in two decades. Today more than 34 million Americans are living in poverty with another 12 million surviving only marginally above poverty levels.

These poverty figures are the highest since 1965—the first full year of the VISTA program. In the face of these developments, VISTA volunteers and projects have been continuing to make contributions to meeting poor people's most desperate needs all across our Nation. I know, first hand, the kind of irreplaceable role VISTA volunteers are playing in feeding the hungry in Pittsburgh, through the Hunger Action Council's Community Food Bank, and in combating illiteracy throughout the State of Pennsylvania through the Beaver County Federated Library System. Recently I visited, with my colleagues Congressman CORRADA and Congressman BOUCHER, VISTA projects in some of America's poorest neighborhoods. VISTA volunteers there are providing critical assistance in fighting alcohol and drug abuse, increasing educational opportunities for the young and combating the effects of poverty on the elderly. We heard moving pleas for more VISTA volunteers, as well as for support and training for those volunteers.

S. 1129 will begin the road back to restoring VISTA to its full, and desperately needed, potential. The conference report calls for minimum volunteer service year levels of 2,000 volunteers in 1984, 2,200 in 1985, and 2,400 in 1986. These service year levels translate into minimum funding levels of $14.4 million, $15.8 million, and $17.3 million. The bill also provides authorizing levels for fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986 of $17, $20, and $25 million respectively for the VISTA program.

I want to stress that the conferees intend that the VISTA volunteer service year levels be minimum levels, not ceilings. The dollar figures for both the mandatory minimum service year levels and the reauthorization levels are far lower than the VISTA funding floors approved by this body last fall. I intend to work with the Appropriations Committee to insure that the VISTA appropriations is as close as possible to its authorization level in each of the years of this reauthorization.

Further, I will be urging the Appropriations Committee to provide an emergency supplemental appropriation for VISTA in fiscal year 1984. The current continuing resolution level of $11.8 million will have a devastating effect upon the VISTA program by the end of this fiscal year. According to the Congressional Research Service, the number of actual VISTA volunteers will drop from the current 1,950 to 860 by September 1984 if no new funds are appropriated. Parts of the country with some of the greatest need for VISTA, the South and Southwest, will lose nearly all of their VISTA volunteers. In fact, VISTA will require an additional $2 million in fiscal year 1984 just to maintain the 1983 level of volunteers. I hope my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will agree that we should not allow this devastation to occur. In addition to laying the basis for VISTA's revival in 1985 and 1986, we must keep the program alive in 1984.

The conference agreement touches upon several areas of concern to me in regard to the current administration of the VISTA program. These include the failure to recruit volunteers on a national basis, the lack of public promotion of VISTA, and the inadequate level of support services, training, and supervision provided to VISTA volunteers and projects. VISTA sponsoring organizations have repeatedly stressed the importance of preservice training, career development, and the need for other essential support functions such as adequate funds for transportation and supervision of VISTA volunteers. As the conference report states, these services, small in cost, are often critical to a project's success and ability to continue once VISTA assistance is phased out.

The amendments included in S. 1129 should make it clear that Congress intends VISTA to be a national program, providing opportunity for service to all Americans, regardless of geographic location, income level, age, sex, and professional experience. Locally recruited volunteers from the poverty-stricken areas where VISTA projects are located have done exemplary work as VISTA's. But it has not been, and is not now, the intent of Congress to limit volunteer opportunities to only those individuals who reside in communities that have approved VISTA projects and who are fortunate enough to be aware of an available VISTA position at one of those projects.

It is time that VISTA's name reappear on the ACTION agency stationery, that VISTA reinstate its "800" information number and that recruitment and public awareness efforts be made to bring broader attention to the program and increased recognition of the invaluable contribution that over 75,000 VISTA volunteers have made since 1965.

Another area of concern addressed by the conference agreement is in regard to the ACTION agency's use of its noncareer and political hiring authorities. The conference agreement includes a ceiling of 8.5 percent on all personnel who may be in the combined total of certain categories of noncareer employees. Specifically, these include schedule C employees, experts, consultants, and temporaries at the GS-8 level and higher. The House version of the bill included schedule B employees in the list of restricted employees, but these employees were dropped from the restricted list in conference.

Although House conferees were willing to drop schedule B's from the restricted list in an effort to reach a compromise, I am hopeful that the Office of Personnel Management will take some action in regard to the agency's schedule B hiring authority once a final report from the General Accounting Office on ACTION personnel practices is available. The authority is granted for the purpose of employing individuals with highly specialized skills for specific short-term tasks that otherwise could not be attained through normal civil service hiring procedures. A GAO statement of findings provided to the Committee on Education and Labor indicates that ACTION has used the authority inappropriately, and has avoided civil serv-

ice procedures to hire employees who have replaced "riffed" career civil servants.

According to GAO data, the ACTION agency has perhaps the greatest percentage of noncareer employees of any Federal agency. As of September 30, 1983, ACTION's noncareer employees were 18.6 percent of ACTION total staff, about 3 percent higher than in November 1981 when ACTION had twice as many employees. The conference agreement regarding a noncareer personnel ceiling for the agency is in response to these figures. It is also in response to the fact that ACTION has hired many noncareer political employees to replace riffed career employees who were knowledgeable and concerned about the programs in the Agency. Although the 8.5 percent cap in S. 1129 is not likely to have an immediate or drastic impact on ACTION hiring practices, it is evidence of congressional concern and an indication that we fully intend to continue to monitor agency personnel policies in the future.

S. 1129 represents a comprehensive approach to President Reagan's challenge to "restore, in our time, the American spirit of voluntary service, of cooperation, of private and community initiatives; a spirit that flows like a mighty river through the history of our Nation." These programs have been tapping that spirit for many years, to the benefit of millions of disadvantaged Americans who need assistance in their struggle for a better life for themselves, their families and their communities. I urge your support for this conference report so that the vital contributions of volunteers, both young and old, may continue.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF S. 1129, DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

TITLE I, PART A, VISTA

Broadens the opportunities for persons from all walks of life, geographic areas, ages, and economic levels to serve as VISTA volunteers.

Establishes as an objective of the VISTA program the generation of private sector resources and the encouragement of part-time volunteer service at the local level.

Provides that if a VISTA applicant who is locally recruited becomes unavailable for service prior to the commencement of service, the VISTA sponsoring organization may replace the VISTA applicant with another qualified applicant approved by ACTION/VISTA.

Requires that 20% of all VISTA volunteers be 55 years of age or older.

Expands the list of possible VISTA volunteer assignments to include addressing the programs of the homeless, jobless, hungry, illiterate or functionally illiterate youth or other persons, and special needs connected to alcohol and drug abuse. These additions are not intended to restrict activities to these areas or other areas already specified in the Act, nor is it intended to eliminate from eligibility other programs or projects that meet VISTA's anti-poverty criteria and purpose.

Provides for low-income community volunteers as well as nationally-recruited specialist volunteers, in addition to requiring that the Director make national efforts to attract volunteers into the program.

Requires career development and individual plans for job advancement for each low-income volunteer. These efforts are to be coordinated, where appropriate, with local private industry councils (PIC's).

Requires the Director to provide VISTA volunteers with pre-service, and where appropriate, in-service training.

Mandates that ACTION conduct biennial evaluations of the VISTA program and other ACTION programs.

Requires the Director to establish a mechanism for meaningful participation by program beneficiaries in the planning, developing and implementing of VISTA programs.

TITLE I, PART B, SERVICE LEARNING

Amends the Service Learning portion of the Act to require that any project assisted under this Part meet the anti-poverty criteria of the VISTA program and contain a clear educational and service component.

TITLE I, PART C, SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

Mandates the establishment of criteria for the awarding of Part C (Demonstration/Citizen Participation) grants and contracts on the basis of merit and an equitable geographic distribution of programs. All grants in excess of $50,000 are to be selected through a competitive process.

TITLE IV, ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Amends the Act to state that ACTION is to provide a focal point for volunteers at the national, state and local level.

Strikes the authority for the appointment of two Presidential appointees as Associate Directors, two Presidential appointees as Assistant Directors, and provides for the appointment of an Associate Director for Domestic and Anti-Poverty Operations, and three Assistant Directors. One such Assistant Director shall be responsible for VISTA and other anti-poverty programs under Title I, one shall be primarily responsible for the Older American Volunteer Programs, and one for liaison with private voluntary organizations.

Places a cap of 8.5% on certain non-career employees in the following categories: Schedule C's, experts, consultants and temporaries over the GS-8 level.

Repeals the National Volunteer Advisory Council effective January 1, 1986.

Changes the requirement for periodic evaluation of ACTION programs to a biennial requirement and requires reports to Congress to reflect findings and actions taken as a result of final evaluations.

Requires ACTION to provide all grantees denied renewal funding 75-days advance notice as well as the grounds for the denial. In a case where the project is denied refunding for failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant award, the recipient must be afforded an opportunity for an informal hearing at a location convenient to the recipient agency before an impartial hearing examiner mutually agreed to by ACTION and the recipient.

Deletes the Director's ability to waive requirements for 30-days public notice in the Federal Register of all regulations prior to their effective date and the Director's ability to waive the 45-days notice requirement to Congress prior to the implementation of final regulations.

Authorizes for $1.8 million for Service Learning Programs (Part B, Title 1) in FY 84, 85 and 86.

Authorizes for $1.984 for Special Volunteer Programs (Part C, Title 1) for FY 84, 85 and 86.

Prohibits the use of VISTA funds or volunteers for any other ACTION program or project unless the program or project meets VISTA's strict anti-poverty criteria.

Authorizes for the RSVP programs $29.7 million in FY 84, $30.4 million in FY 85 and $31.1 million in FY 86.

Authorizes for the Foster Grandparents Program $54.3 million in FY 84, $56.7 million in FY 85 and $58.7 million in FY 86.

Authorizes for the Senior Companion program $27.8 million in FY 84, $28.3 million in FY 85 and $28.6 million in FY 86.

Authorizes an appropriation for Administration and Coordination of the ACTION Agency and its programs of $25.8 million in FY 84, $27 million in FY 85 and $28 million in FY 86.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Provides for a three-year reauthorization for VISTA of $17 million for FY 84; $20 million for FY 85, and $25 million for FY 86.

Establishes minimum VISTA service year levels—guaranteed VISTA funding levels—that must be funded first, prior to providing funds for Part B (Service Learning) and Part C (Special Volunteer Programs).

Mandates that of the funds appropriated for VISTA, there first must be made available funds adequate to produce a minimum of: 2,000 VISTA service years in FY 84, 2,200 VISTA service years in FY 85, and 2,400 VISTA service years in FY 86.

Specifies that in FY 84 the service year level is contingent upon the receipt of an additional appropriation in excess of the current $15.6 million appropriated for all Title 1 programs under the Continuing Resolution.

Prohibits the use of VISTA funds or volunteers for any other ACTION program or project unless the program or project meets VISTA's strict anti-poverty criteria.

□ 1440

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this bill and this conference report is probably going to pass anyway. But I do rise in opposition to the report as it is reported to S. 1129 as reported to the House floor.

I had hoped during the course of the negotiations in the conference to be able to submit a conference report that I could stand here and support, but I cannot, because the final version of the conference report, in effect, includes a funding floor, so I cannot and will not support it.

I strongly believe in volunteerism. I recognize the vital contribution that volunteers have made to every facet of our society. And thus I am opposed to any Federal venture which competes with, restricts, or channels the development and expansion of locally generated volunteer efforts.

I believe that S. 1129, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1983, as reported by the conference, would do just that.

Now from the beginning of the reauthorization process I have consistently

opposed the extension of VISTA with a funding floor. I have recognized and stated on every occasion the value of other volunteer programs authorized under the act, the volunteer programs for the elderly, the volunteer programs for youth, and the community volunteer demonstration programs. These programs have merit. They represent legitimate forms of Federal support for volunteer activities.

But unfortunately, these very important programs and their continuation continue to be held hostage by those that would attempt to guarantee a funding floor for VISTA.

So I continue to be distressed that this legislation here before us does include a version of the funding floor.

Inclusion of such a funding floor is an example of a serious abuse of the legislative process.

In order to insure reauthorization of volunteer programs for which there was strong support, many conferees, who opposed a funding floor for VISTA, agreed to an assurance that monies first be made available for a specific number of VISTA volunteer service years before funds could be appropriated for other volunteer programs under title I of the act.

Now this agreement, perhaps in different words, represents in effect an endorsement of a funding floor for VISTA.

Such an endorsement is ill-advised. In this time of limited resources that must be stretched, a funding floor for VISTA could jeopardize appropriations for the other vital volunteer programs in title I. Such a funding floor, by whatever name, will reduce the flexibility of the ACTION agency to respond to new and to emerging priorities. The floor constitutes an obvious intrusion into the authority of the Appropriations Committee.

And finally, a guarantee of a specified number of VISTA volunteer service years is an illustration of blatant fiscal protectionism.

This is a time when Congress should begin to carefully select our legislative objectives and to put aside or to challenge all those that would sacrifice some much-needed programs in the interest of just one program, the VISTA program in this case.

For these reasons, the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor and I did not sign the conference report. We urge our colleagues to vote "No" on S. 1129.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on S. 1129 have just recently completed the long and difficult task of coming to an agreement on two very different versions of legislation reauthorizing the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973. I oppose the report of the conferees with some reluctance because I know of the tremendous amount of work which has gone into the production of the agreement. I cannot, however, agree to support the conference report because it contains what I consider to be a fundamental flaw—it continues the so-called funding floor for the VISTA program.

The VISTA funding floor operates by stating that of any appropriation made under title I of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act, a set amount must first be committed to the VISTA program. In so doing, the activities authorized under part B—the service-learning program—and part C—demonstration projects—are effectively held hostage to VISTA funding.

Throughout the consideration of this legislation, I have expressed opposition to VISTA and the VISTA funding floor. I have done so, for two principal reasons:

First, a funding floor denies the appropriations committees of both Houses their prerogative to establish priorities among various authorized activities under the three parts of title I. The Appropriations Committee must, in effect, agree to meet the VISTA funding floor or resign itself to fund no activities under part B on part C; and

Second, the VISTA program itself merits no special consideration in the appropriations process. It is, first of all, not really a volunteer program in that the participants receive stipends for their service. It is also a program which has been subject to criticism and controversy throughout its history.

I firmly believe that if the VISTA program is to be continued, it must be forced to compete on an equal footing with other domestic spending programs. S. 1129 continues the bad practice of protecting VISTA from competition from other volunteer programs at the ACTION agency.

Because the conference report did not address this basic problem, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to further clarify the gentleman's objections to the VISTA floor funding, I would like to say that since the year 1980 VISTA's budget has been slashed in our austerity measures in Congress from $34 million to the present year of under $12 million. The number of VISTA volunteers has dropped from over 5,000 volunteers throughout our Nation to under 2,000. And the number of VISTA projects has declined from 840 projects to 450 projects.

This has occurred at a time when the Census Bureau is reporting to us that we are experiencing a great increase in poverty in our country. Poverty among American families is at its highest level for the past two decades. Today more than 34 million Americans are living in poverty, with another 12 million surviving only on marginally above poverty levels.

The VISTA floor funding, which is perhaps misnamed by the gentleman from Texas, is merely a mandate that the VISTA volunteers could go no less than 2,000 VISTA service years in fiscal year 1984; 2,200 VISTA service years in 1985; and 2,400 VISTA service years in 1986, only to keep the VISTA Program from disappearing totally.

The Senate conferees agreed unanimously to this concept and we believe that it was a good compromise.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference agreement on S. 1129, to revise and extend the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973. This agreement represents a carefully developed compromise between the Senate and the House versions of this important piece of legislation. I wish to commend Mr. MURPHY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education, Mr. ANDREWS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, and Mr. HATCH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, for fashioning what I consider to be a masterful solution for the continuation of these valuable volunteer programs which will continue to address the problems of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modest piece of legislation which will extend the volunteer programs under title I of this act and provide for the maintenance of those volunteers in service to America (VISTA) who are now placed, and to provide for a modest increase in volunteers to serve in already approved projects which serve the poor, providing needed services in programs such as food banks, shelters for the homeless, literacy improvement, youth development, and employment placement and counseling.

This legislation will provide a minimum of 2,000 VISTA volunteer service years in fiscal year 1984 if a supplemental appropriation is provided; a minimum of 2,200 VISTA volunteer service years in fiscal year 1985; and a minimum of 2,400 VISTA volunteer service years in fiscal year 1986 for part A of title I. The authorization provides for the important service learning programs in part B and the demonstration and citizen participation programs in part C to be maintained at current levels.

In addition, this legislation will continue those important programs for older Americans in title II of this act, such as Foster Grandparents and retired senior volunteers. Also, there is a provision to provide a new authorization for the Senior Companion program to address the needs of the homebound elderly. I believe that this is an important addition to these worthwhile efforts to serve the elderly of this country. This additional authorization should provide opportuni-

ties for over 4,000 additional older American volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go through the details of this bill since it has been explained adequately by the chairmen of the two subcommittees, but I do wish to reiterate that these authorization levels are extremely modest, and in some cases, considerably below the amounts provided for these programs in 1981. The continuation of VISTA and the Older American Volunteer programs are vital if our local communities are to continue providing opportunities and services to the 34 million Americans who are now living in poverty.

Unfortunately, these programs have been operating under the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1984, and this fact will have an adverse effect on maintaining the current level of volunteers if we do not act quickly. This action is needed in order for us to request additional funds for 1984 to maintain those projects which are currently operating and to provide additional volunteers for those already approved projects.

Favorable action here today on this reauthorization is imperative, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this conference report to continue the Older Americans Volunteer programs, volunteers in service to America, along with those smaller volunteer programs such as service learning and citizen participation.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker I rise in support of the conference agreement on S. 1129, and particularly title II of the bill, that portion of it that reauthorizes the Older American Volunteer programs.

This title was first introduced separately in the House by Chairman PERKINS and myself as H.R. 1719, was later combined with H.R. 2655, which reauthorizes the VISTA program, and, finally, is part of S. 1129, the bill which is the subject of the conference agreement we are considering today.

We hear so freqently about what we owe to our senior citizens, and what their needs are, and what we should be doing for them. What we do not hear about so often is what they are doing for others. The Older American Volunteer programs are instances of senior citizens contributing to make a better life for all of us—but particularly vulnerable children and other older Americans in need. They include the Foster Grandparents program, the Senior Companion program, and the Retired Senior Volunteer program, better known as RSVP.

The provisions in title II of S. 1129 pertaining to these senior volunteer programs were largely contained in the House-passed version of this bill, H.R. 2655. They were accepted by the Senate conferees, with some minor modifications, and I am convinced they will provide modest but needed fine-tuning.

One substantive provision of which we are proud is a bipartisan proposal to expand the Senior Companion program in order to increase and improve their volunteer service to the homebound elderly. Another provision would put into statute the current practice of maintaining a 30 percent ceiling on required local contributions for RSVP programs. Also, with regard to local match, the ACTION agency's control over local funds raised in excess of the required amount would be limited.

S. 1129 will lessen restrictions now existing regarding Foster Grandparent service to mentally retarded individuals who reach 21 years of age. Finally, the allowable stipend for Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions would be raised from $2 per hour to $2.20 per hour. This increase, dependent upon the availability of adequate appropriations, would in small part provide for inflation during the past 5 years.

The conferees agreed on authorization levels that struck a middle ground between the House figures and the somewhat lower Senate authorizations, with an added provision to permit sufficient appropriations to provide for the increase in the Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions' stipend.

In my judgment, the agreement reached by the conferees on S. 1129 is a very reasonable one, and one that House Members can enthusiastically support. I urge favorable action on this conference agreement.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I would join in the commendation of the chairman of the subcommittee, with whom I worked on this legislation and worked with on many other pieces of legislation over the last year.

I think we are both—even though I continue to oppose the conference report—grateful that we finally do have some legislation that we can get behind us and move on to some other subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I join the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and the chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee in expressing my strong support for the conference report accompanying S. 1129, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1984.

This bill has been a very long time in coming. The Subcommittee on Select Education first began considering this bill in April 1983. In October 1983, the House approved H.R. 2655 by an overwhelming 312 to 20. But from October 1983 until a few weeks ago, those who opposed assurances of funding for VISTA, the Federal Government's only domestic full-time antipoverty volunteer program, used every possible delaying tactic.

As a result, critical and proven cost-effective VISTA projects across the country were placed, and remain today, in great jeopardy. Without the necessary authorization, VISTA has been held to a fiscal year 1984 appropriation, providing only $11.8 million, a 71-percent cut from just 3 years ago. This woefully inadequate budget, according to CRS, will slash the number of VISTA volunteers by over half, from 1,950 to 931, and cut the number of VISTA projects from 418 to 320 by September 1984.

Our success in finally bringing this report to the floor today is largely due to the efforts of our chairmen, Mr. PERKINS and Mr. MURPHY. Their efforts were buttressed by the tenacity of the wide VISTA network, supported by Friends of VISTA and its Executive Director, Mimi Mager. This bill enjoyed strong and continued support from a range of national and grassroots organizations as diverse as the American Association of Retired Persons, Blinded Veterans of America, League of Women Voters, Literacy Volunteers of America, the three National Directors' Associations of the Foster Grandparents, the Retired Senior Volunteer programs, and the Senior Companion program, the National Coalition Against Domesic Violence, Second Harvest, the Steelworkers of America, and Volunteer National Center for Citizen Involvement.

The report we are considering today was approved unanimously by the Senate prior to the Easter recess. Although the VISTA funding levels included in this bill for fiscal years 1984-86 are not as high as those I advocated during the conference, the bill overall is a strong and good one. It makes much-needed improvements in the VISTA and Older American Volunteer programs administered by the ACTION agency.

The VISTA program, the Older American Volunteer programs, and the poor and elderly citizens and communities they serve, have been hurt badly by our delay in approving this legislation. The first step in repairing this damage must be our swift action to pass the conference report.

A necessary next step is an emergency fiscal year 1984 supplemental for VISTA to bring the program up to its authorized level of $17 million. This would begin to reverse the last 3 years of neglect, abuse and misuse of VISTA resources.

Some argue that the funding levels included for VISTA in S. 1129 are excessive and budget busting. I want to point out that the minimum service years of 2000, 2200, and 2400 respectively for fiscal years 1984, 1985, and

1986 required to be funded under this conference agreement are $36 million, or 43 percent, below the earlier House-approved levels. Even the authorization ceilings included in this bill are $21 million, or 23 percent, lower than the earlier House-approved levels.

In fact, VISTA's authorization ceiling in this bill for fiscal years 1986—2 years from now—is identical to VISTA's appropriation in 1969—15 years ago. Since that time, the Consumer Price Index has risen by nearly 200 percent. To return VISTA—2 years from now—to its 1969 funding level is hardly an extravagance. It is an embarrassment.

Despite the claims by VISTA's opponents, the funding guarantees provided for VISTA in this bill are not new. For over 10 years, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act has contained funding floors for VISTA. This has been, and I hope will continue to be, Congress way of insuring that VISTA, the ACTION agency's only full-time antipoverty program, receives first priority funding—prior to the funding of other title I programs deemed to be less essential than the VISTA program.

One thing is clear: VISTA remains ACTION's most unique and effective tool in addressing the most basic problems of the poor of this Nation. There is no more cost-effective or productive way to support the administration's new priorities than through the VISTA program. The funding floors provided for VISTA will in no way set back the ACTION agency's new program initiatives. Indeed, they could only hence these efforts.

I take special pride in having been one of the Members responsible for preserving VISTA funding floors in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981. Had these floors not been maintained in fiscal years 1982 and 1983, it is clear we would not be here today discussing funding for VISTA in fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986. The funding floors provided VISTA with a lifejacket to keep it afloat and enabled the program to hang on despite continued administrative and legislative efforts to undermine and eliminate it.

I also want to make perfectly clear that the VISTA funding floors in no way jeopardize the Older American Volunteer programs. Perhaps the clearest proof of this fact is the action taken by the National Council of Senior Citizens designating defeat of Mr. BARTLETT's amendment last October to eliminate VISTA's funding floor as one of the 10 key congressional votes for senior citizens. Last fall, nearly every major civic organization representing senior citizens joined 40 other national organizations in a letter urging the maintenance and expansion of the VISTA program including the funding floor.

Another point of deep concern not only to Members of Congress but also to the General Accounting Office involves ACTION's abuse and politicization of its noncareer hiring authorities.

The conference report includes an 8.5-percent cap on certain categories of noncareer and political appointees. I regret having to admit to my colleagues that this cap is nothing short of a joke. In real terms, phased in over a 1-year period, the cap will result in reducing few, if any, of the excessive numbers of political employees currently padding the ACTION agency payroll.

Over the past 3 years, ACTION RIF'd over 200 talented career civil servants, many of whom had 10 or more years of experience in administering ACTION programs. No sooner were those career civil servants out the door than ACTION hired new employees—strong in partisan political credentials but weak on programmatic experience—to replace the RIF'd employees.

For 3 years ACTION has served as a dumping ground for Reagan loyalists and their siblings as well as political appointees fired or dismissed from other agencies. Recently, someone joked that ACTION was a classic example of a CETA program for Reaganites.

According to the GAO, as of September 30, 1983, nearly one in every five of ACTION's employees were noncareer and primarily political appointees. This is probably the highest percentage of any Federal agency or department. Since 1981, ACTION has had more political appointees than the much-criticized previous administration which was responsible for over twice the number of career employees. Further, in the last administration, no ACTION career civil servants lost their jobs as a result of a reduction in force.

Information submitted by the ACTION agency to Congress showed that the agency has also developed a bizarre policy of encouraging and paying its top civil servants to work at ACTION's expense at other Federal agencies. Recently, we learned that ACTION's practice of paying employees to work elsewhere is not limited to career civil servants.

The San Francisco Examiner recently disclosed that Susan Borchard, previously the ACTION Regional Director in San Francisco, had been transferred "on paper" from San Francisco to the ACTION Director's office as a Special and Confidential Assistant. Yet it was disclosed that Ms. Borchard had never spent a day working in this capacity, but instead is working full-time in the White House personnel office, clearing political appointments for positions throughout the Reagan administration. I might note that Ms. Borchard's salary of nearly $52,000 would more than support seven full-time VISTA volunteers for a full year of service. This is only one example of the politically motivated hiring practices of the ACTION agency. Unfortunately, this bill does not go far enough in addressing abuses such as this.

Following a 2-year investigation, the GAO found a clear pattern of ACTION's questionable use and mismanagement of noncareer hiring authorities. GAO is scheduled to issue its final report on this matter within the next few weeks. It is my firm hope that GAO, OPM, and the Congress will force ACTION to curb these abuses once and for all.

This bill also includes a provision I authored prohibiting the use of VISTA volunteers or VISTA resources for any other ACTION program or project that does not meet the strict antipoverty criteria of the VISTA program. GAO confirmed that the ACTION Agency illegally diverted VISTA funds and volunteers into new Agency initiatives, unauthorized by the Congress, and clearly lacking the mandated antipoverty purpose and focus of the VISTA program.

By including this prohibition in the authorization of appropriations section of the bill, the conferees clearly intend to prohibit any such diversions of VISTA's limited resources.

Today, more than ever, the VISTA program is desperately needed. Recently the Census Bureau reported that the 1982 poverty rate had risen to 15 percent of the population, the highest since 1965, the first year of the VISTA program, and other War on Poverty programs. Today, more than 1 out of 5 children in this country lives in poverty. One out of two black children lives in poverty. One out of three Hispanic children lives in poverty.

We must insure, through the passage of S. 1129, continuation of VISTA, a critical antipoverty program that has proven its cost-effectiveness. We must insure that dedicated Americans—many of them poor themselves—can continue to volunteer their services full-time to those in this Nation who face the harsh struggles of poverty.

Above all, during these times of massive cutbacks in so many social programs, we must give our wholehearted support to programs that promote self-help, generate private sector resources, and leave low-income neighborhoods and communities more independent and more capable than ever. VISTA has demonstrated its ability to help the poor help themselves, to generate new resources to alleviate poverty, to promote business ventures, and to develop economic programs that make a lasting and tangible difference in low-income communities.

Let us not delay any further the passage of this legislation. We must begin immediately to rebuild the VISTA pro-

gram, to restore VISTA services so desperately needed by poor people throughout America, and to reopen the opportunities for antipoverty volunteer service for all Americans.●

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to add my voice to those who have already spoken in support of swift passage of the conference report on bill S. 1129. I do so because I know firsthand the invaluable aid VISTA volunteers have given to keep antipoverty projects in my district and throughout the country. VISTA has meant substantial new resources, volunteers, and coordination efforts that low-income communities and poor people struggling for a new life for themselves and their families simply cannot do without.

I find it noteworthy that so many of us Texans have been and are deeply involved with VISTA. One Texan, Lyndon B. Johnson, gave VISTA its birth and launched the program on the path it follows today. Since 1965, over 3,500 Volunteers have served the poor and the disadvantaged throughout the State of Texas, and countless Texans have served as VISTA volunteers nationwide.

Another Texan, Mr. Thomas Pauken, has been seeking VISTA's demise for the last 3 years and has succeeded in cutting the program to the bone. Yet another Texan, my colleague, Mr. BARTLETT, has assisted Mr. Pauken in the drive to put VISTA in an early grave through elimination of the program's funding guarantees. As a result of these efforts, I am sorry to report, the number of VISTA volunteers in Texas has dropped from 153 in 1980 to 67 today and the number of projects has been cut from 26 to 6.

But this Texan is here today to support VISTA's resurrection and rebirth. This is particularly the case as I now have the privilege of heading the Select Committee on Hunger. Nowhere is the irreplaceable work of VISTA volunteers clearer than in VISTA's ongoing efforts to reduce hunger and malnutrition in our Nation. The success VISTA volunteers have registered already indicate the vast untapped potential of VISTA to significantly affect the growing danger of hunger in America.

Unfortunately there are no comprehensive and complete statistics on the exact number of the tens of thousands of Americans who are going hungry every day. But objective studies by, among others, the General Accounting Office, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Food Research and Action Center, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture itself, document a vast and accelerating increase in the demand at emergency food distribution centers over the last 2 years. Some of these increases are as high as 400 and 500 percent over the last 2 years.

Low-income individuals and families, hard hit by employment and budget cutbacks, have been joined in poverty by the new poor of formerly stable, self-sufficient families now enduring long-term unemployment, and all of these people are now without enough to eat.

In a particularly ominous development, a new study by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health indicates that as many as 500,000 low-income children under the age of 6 are now suffering from chronic malnutrition. This catastrophe simply cannot be allowed to continue.

In response of this growing national emergency, more than 400 VISTA volunteers, 1 of every 5, are working in 94 projects in 40 States to organize and expand emergency food banks, develop nutrition programs for the elderly and children, and initiate food gleaning projects. The real gains these 400 volunteers have made highlight what could be accomplished by even more VISTA volunteers and efforts.

We in Texas have a bird's-eye view of VISTA's success because of the work of volunteers at the Brownsville Community Food Bank, the San Antonio Food Bank, the Capital Area Food Bank in Austin and the Houston Area Food Bank in my own district.

VISTA's at the Houston Food Bank have, just over the course of 2 years, helped to increase the number of member agencies from 70 to 190, boost food collections from 10,000 pounds per month to 280,000 pounds, expand food distribution from 20,000 to 300,000 pounds a month, and recruit 30 new community volunteers.

The North Texas Food Bank has been highly regarded by many, including President Reagan, who visited last year to demonstrate his admiration for this VISTA-supported organization which is funneling thousands of tons of free food to needy people in 26 counties of the State. Yet, despite the President's words of praise, this project was denied refunding by Mr. Paukan, as was a statewide antihunger network that would have distributed food to dozens of food banks throughout the State.

Texas is not the only State fortunate enough to have VISTA's working at projects addressing hunger and hunger-related problems:

At the Community Food Bank in Newark, N.J., two VISTA's were crucial in expanding distribution from 70,000 pounds a month to 350,000 pounds a month and increasing member agencies from 100 to over 350 during the year ending December 1983.

The work of 20 VISTA's at Oregon Food Share in Portland since 1981 significantly contributed to the April 1983 award to Oregon Food Share of the President's National Volunteer Action Award. The volunteers' key financial, personnel, and logistical coordination prepared the statewide network for a massive increase in food distribution from 1.5 million pounds to just under 8 million pounds, including 2.3 million pounds in surplus government commodities, in 1983. VISTA's helped establish 5 new Community Food Advisory Committees, recruit 50 new statewide corporate food donors, coordinate 5 gleaning projects producing 1 million pounds of food, and extend the network to every county in the state, now service 12,000 people a week.

VISTA efforts have not been limited to just food banks or local soup kitchens and food pantries. Volunteers have also been the key organizers of both rural and urban food gleaning projects. VISTA's have coordinated hot breakfast and lunch programs for children, both in summer months when the schools are closed, and where budget cutbacks have eliminated school food programs altogether. Urban meals-on-wheels programs for the elderly, rural transportation to elderly nutrition centers, nutrition classes, and food buying co-ops have all been developed by VISTA volunteers.

VISTA volunteers are already playing an exemplary role in addressing this growing national emergency. Their current success demonstrates the potential for doing even more with VISTA volunteers to end the crises of hungry children throughout America.

For all reasons I urge my colleagues to swiftly approve S. 1129. The time to act is now. We must assure the beneficiaries of VISTA projects that their voices are heard, and that we care.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have before us today the final conference agreement on legislation to extend the Older American Volunteer programs and the VISTA program for the next 3 years. In adopting this legislation, Congress has once again reaffirmed our commitment to maintaining a Federal volunteer agency that will foster and promote expanded volunteer opportunities for all people across this Nation—of all backgrounds—and of all ages.

As a member of the conference committee which brings this report to the floor of the House today, I am especially glad that we have finalized our work prior to the work on the fiscal year 1985 appropriations bills that will assure that the changes that were made through this reauthorization can be effectively implemented.

This bill authorizes funds for the three Older American Volunteer programs: Foster Grandparents, Senior Companions, and the Retired Senior Volunteer program at the following levels: Foster Grandparents: $58.8 million in fiscal year 1984; $61.4 million in fiscal year 1985 and $63.9 million in fiscal year 1986. For the Senior Com-

panions program, the following amounts are provided: $27.8 million in fiscal year 1984; $28.3 million in fiscal year 1985 and $28.6 million in fiscal year 1986. Finally, the following amounts are provided for the RSVP program: $29.7 million in fiscal year 1984, $30.4 million in fiscal year 1985 and $31.1 million in fiscal year 1986.

I am pleased to note that this bill also increases the hourly stipend for Foster Grandparents and RSVP's from $2 to $2.20 per hour, which is long overdue considering that many of these volunteers offer their services with little compensation in addition to this stipend such as transportation, meals, and health services. We have also retained one other feature of the House bill, H.R. 2655, which limits the local contribution to Senior Volunteer projects to 30 percent of the total cost. Foster Grandparents have proven to be valuable resources in local communities where they work with developmentally disabled children and those in institutionalized settings.

This report also extends authorizations for the VISTA program, as well as our other two Federal antipoverty programs, service learning and special volunteer. For VISTA, we have retained the character of the program by requiring sufficient funds to support at least 2,000 VISTA volunteers in fiscal year 1984, 2,200 in fiscal year 1985 and 2,400 in fiscal year 1986 at the following levels: $25 million in fiscal year 1984, $28 million in fiscal year 1985 and $30 million in fiscal year 1986.

I am pleased that this report also contains a provision I authored in committee which requires at least 20 percent of VISTA volunteers to be 55 years of age or older. With this provision, we have assured an age-integrated volunteer program as well as appropriate participation by older Americans who are valuable resources to local communities. The scope and nature of volunteer opportunities provided through VISTA differ substantially from those provided through the Older American Volunteer programs. They are longer in duration, for at least 1 year, and require a full-time commitment as opposed to senior volunteers in the OAVP who donate somewhere between 8 and 10 hours per week. I believe that both the VISTA program and the Older American Volunteer programs provide important and much-needed volunteer opportunities for senior citizens. In passing this report today, we have reaffirmed that commitment and underscored our overriding concern that volunteer opportunities must continue to exist in communities in order to combat poverty and its byproducts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our subcommittee chairman, AUSTIN MURPHY for his diligence in steering this bill through committee, as well as our full committee chairman, CARL PERKINS, for his continued commitment to all social programs which form a floor of support for those Americans who need assistance in order to achieve self-sufficiency. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this report before us today.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, I want to speak in support of rapid approval of the conference report S. 1129, the Domestic Volunteer Service Act amendments reauthorizing the ACTION agency, VISTA, and the Older American Volunteer programs.

This legislation is essential for the continuation of the Foster Grandparent, Retired Senior Volunteer and Senior Companion programs, which have always enjoyed broad bipartisan support and have been recognized across the Nation for their contributions made to the elderly.

What is not as well recognized is the importance of the VISTA program for senior citizens. VISTA has had a significant and greatly beneficial impact on the lives of the elderly and will do so even more with the provisions of the bill before us expanding the opportunities for the elderly to become VISTA volunteers.

Throughout its history VISTA has had a significant impact upon the lives of this Nation's elderly. VISTA has been essential to leveraging resources in local neighborhoods which benefit elderly residents in developing solutions to problems of the elderly in housing, energy conservation, crime prevention, food and nutrition projects, health care, advocacy projects for the handicapped and disabled, alcohol and medication abuse programs, development of adult day care, and innovative new rural transportation systems for the elderly.

Today approximately 15 percent of all VISTA volunteers in the field are assigned to over 70 projects in 35 States serving the elderly poor. These 200 VISTA's are dedicating a year of their lives working on projects designed to improve the quality of senior citizens' lives and they are providing a resource that the elderly simply cannot do without.

Another significant fact that my colleagues should be aware of is the number of VISTA volunteers who are themselves senior citizens. Currently 17 percent of all VISTA's are over the age of 55 and the bill before us will require that a full 20 percent of volunteers be older Americans. As VISTA volunteers, the elderly receive even more than the renewed sense of purpose and accomplishment VISTA service brings. They receive an income supplement to assist them in retirement and medical benefits as well. Many of these senior VISTA's have gone on to full-time paying jobs, including as the administrators on staffs of the charitable and nonprofit organizations meeting the needs of the elderly.

One of the most significant measures of VISTA's importance to the elderly is the National Council of Senior Citizens' recent listing of the 10 most important votes taken by this body last fall.

NCSC declared that a vote against the Bartlett amendment was a vote for senior citizens and 1 of the 10 most important of the year. I might also point out that VISTA has been strongly supported by all the senior citizens organizations, not just NCSC, who view the program as essential to the welfare and future of elderly Americans.

We are blessed as a Nation to have citizens who are willing to make this commitment to better the lives of the elderly and all poor people. In conclusion, I urge my colleagues, on behalf of senior citizens throughout this nation, to swiftly approve this conference report, not only because of the three Older American Volunteer programs, but also because of VISTA's invaluable contributions.●

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this conference report will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5119, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 497,

and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 497

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5119) to authorize international development and security assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by this resolution, and which shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the bill (H.R. 5421) as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI and clause 5(a) of rule XXI are hereby waived. Said substitute shall be considered for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read, but the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, determine when title X of the substitute shall be considered for amendment. No amendment to the substitute shall be in order which changes, includes, or affects the subject matter of title X, funding and policies specifically relating to Central America or the countries of which it consists (Panama, Belize, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica, and El Salvador), except the following amendments to title X, which shall not be subject to amendment, shall be considered as having been read, and shall be considered only in the following order: (1) the amendment printed in the Congressional Record of May 3, 1984, by, and if offered by, Representative Studds of Massachusetts, said amendment shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in Committee of the Whole, and said amendment shall be debatable for not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Representative Studds and a Member opposed thereto; and (2) the amendment printed in the Congressional Record of May 3, 1984, by, and if offered by, Representative Broomfield of Michigan, all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI and clause 5(a) of rule XXI are hereby waived, and said amendment shall be debatable for not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Representative Broomfield and a Member opposed thereto. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by this resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1450

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as is the custom, I yield 30 minutes, for the purpose of debate only, to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 497 provides for consideration of H.R. 5119, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1984. It is a modified open rule, providing for 2 hours of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 402(a) of the Budget Act, which requires that legislation authorizing new budget authority be reported by May 15 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year in which the new budget authority becomes effective.

This waiver is necessary because the bill authorizes the appropriation of $1,636,000 in fiscal year 1984 for payment to the International Atomic Energy Agency. Since the bill was not reported by May 15, 1983, it would be subject to a point of order under section 402(a) of the Budget Act.

In addition, the rule makes in order the text of H.R. 5421 as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. To facilitate debate, the substitute shall be considered for amendment by title instead of by section, and each title shall be considered as read.

The rule grants a waiver of clause 7 of rule XVI—the germaneness rule—to allow consideration of the substitute. The waiver is necessary because title X of the substitute contains provisions which impose conditions on troops and military advisors in Central America which were not included in the bill as introduced.

The rule also waives points of order against the substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI which prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. This waiver is necessary because various provisions of the bill provide that funds are available for expenditure upon enactment of the bill, provide for new use of previously appropriated funds, or might otherwise constitute appropriations in a legislative bill.

An example of this violation would be a provision in H.R. 5421 which provides for a foreign military exchange educational program which does not limit participation to the amount of funds provided in the appropriations bill. All students who apply would be eligible for participation in educational programs at our military schools upon enactment of the bill, and the bill would require the appropriate expenditure of funds by the Secretary to accomodate their participation.

Because the parliamentary procedure established by the rule is slightly unusual, I would like to spend a few moments to make sure that Members understand how it would operate and why this procedure is necessary.

Subsequent to the committee report, an agreement was reached by the majority and minority leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee to seek a rule that would allow the House to consider a text including provisions establishing congressional policy with respect to Central America. The Chairman of the committee introduced a bill (H.R. 5420) to provide a legislative vehicle that could be properly referenced in the rule as a base text.

That text included provisions limiting aid to El Salvador and providing for joint resolutions which would waive those limitations. The text, however, also included a rule providing expedited procedures for the consideration of such subsequent resolutions, a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules.

During consideration of the rule, serious reservations were raised by members of our committee. Specifically, the committee feels that any changes affecting the rules of the House should not be made in a piecemeal fashion, but should be thoughtfully considered and reviewed. If a case can be made that expedited procedures can, and should, accompany congressional approval procedures, then the rules should be changed to reflect that decision through the appropriate process. Acting separately through individual bills as they move through the House is unwise and does not adequately protect the privileges and policies of the House.

However, in order to act quickly and accommodate the Foreign Affairs Committee request, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) introduced a bill, H.R. 5421. The bill was identical to the Foreign Affairs text except that it deleted a single, two-sentence subsection, which provided the expedited procedure language.

Although this is an unusual procedure, it provides the only manner in which the Rules Committee can retain control over our responsibility for reviewing and recommending changes in the rules of the House, and still pro-

vide timely consideration of a foreign aid bill.

By making in order H.R. 5421 as original text, the Committee on Rules serves notice that, as in the past, it will not entertain efforts by legislative committees to alter the rules piecemeal—bill by bill—and that it will continue to assert its authority in matters affecting the rules of the House in the most effective way possible.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 497 further prohibits consideration of title X of the substitute, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, until the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole so specifies. Under the normal procedures of the House, the bill would be read by title or section. However, during the Rules Committee consideration of this bill, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee requested that flexibility be given to the consideration of this title since it deals with the controversial issue of Central America.

After careful deliberation, the committee approved this rule granting the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the discretion to determine when title X shall be considered. This procedure would allow the consideration of the Central American title at the beginning, or at the end, or at any time during consideration of this bill under the 5-minute rule.

Titles 1 through 9 will be completely open to amendment under the 5-minute rule. However, the rule specifies that until, and after title X is considered for amendment, no amendments which affect the matter in title X relating to Central America may be offered. The resolution makes in order only the following amendments, which must be offered in the following order, and shall themselves not be subject to amendment:

First, the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3 by Representative STUDDS to be debatable for 3 hours with the time equally divided and controlled by Mr. STUDDS and a Member opposed to the amendment. To accomplish his goal of providing a one-step procedure for certification and funding for military and economic assistance, Representative STUDDS must amend three different parts of the bill. Therefore, to allow one vote on the Studds proposal, the rule provides that the amendment shall not be subject to a demand for a division in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Second, the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 3 by Representative BROOMFIELD to be debatable for 3 hours with the time equally divided and controlled by Representative BROOMFIELD and a Member opposed to the amendment. The resolution grants a waiver of clause 5(a) of rule XXI which prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. This waiver is needed because various provisions of the Broomfield amendment provide that funds are available for expenditure upon enactment of the bill or provide for new use of previously appropriated funds or might otherwise constitute appropriations in a legislative bill.

The rule also grants a waiver of clause 7, rule XVI, the germaneness rule, against the Broomfield amendment. This waiver is needed because the trade credit insurance program expands the authority of the Export-Import Bank, which is beyond the scope of the bill as introduced.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5119 authorizes appropriations of $10.5 billion for foreign and economic security assistance programs in fiscal 1985, and $301 million in supplemental authorizations for fiscal 1984.

Approximately $300 million is available for Central American nations in fiscal 1984, and $1 billion is provided for fiscal 1985. Of the latter amount, $233 million is provided for military assistance, while the balance is reserved for economic support and developmental assistance for Central American countries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5119 is a bill of considerable consequence and of considerable urgency. I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule, so that the House can consider this important legislation.

□ 1500

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us is an unusual rule in that it makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment a substitute introduced by a member of the Rules Committee for the bill reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I want to allay the concerns of my colleagues that the Rules Committee has somehow assumed the role of a supercommittee that may override the judgment of other committees at will by superimposing its own bills on theirs.

I can understand that concern—it is one I voiced in the Rules Committee, and I offered an amendment to deal with that problem. I hope we are not setting a precedent by this action today.

But what brought us to this unusual rule was prompted by the Democratic Caucus of the Foreign Affairs Committee when it waited until after the foreign aid bill had been reported to recommend a new title X providing aid for Central America. That title included a provision that infringed on the Rules Committee's jurisdiction by giving privileged status to joint resolutions approving the release of the remainder of El Salvador aid or any presidential waivers.

So the Rules Committee's Democratic Caucus retaliated to the Foreign Affairs Committee's Democratic Caucus mosquito bite with a sledge hammer—it agreed to make in order a Moakley substitute deleting that special rules provision.

I am pleased to report that the mosquito is quite dead, though I fear the lump we raised on our own arm is considerably larger and more painful than anything the mosquito might have caused.

This whole convoluted process of amending a bill in closed committee caucuses brings to mind the line about how laws are like sausages—people should not see how they are made.

But I fear that when it is done, in the smoke-filled caucus sausage machine, the product that emerges is of a far more suspicious aroma and appearance than anything that might emerge from the public, sunshine sausage machine.

I suspect this is the Democrats' way of giving us smoked sausages.

This is a modified open rule, with titles I through IX open to any and all germane amendments following 2 hours of general debate. But title X, relating to Central America aid—the title which was not reported from committee—is closed to all but two amendments: A perfecting amendment by Representative STUDDS, and a substitute title by Representative BROOMFIELD, neither of which is subject to amendment.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that we have had any kind of a closed rule on a foreign aid bill, and again I hope this is not a precedent. But there were no other requests to make in order further amendments to this title, and the minority was thus in agreement with the request.

Both the Studds and Broomfield amendments are subject to 3 hours of debate, divided between proponents and opponents.

I think it is safe to say that the Studds amendment in effect bars all fiscal 1985 funds to El Salvador because it imposes almost impossible conditions on the release of that aid. The Broomfield substitute, on the other hand, places more reasonable conditions on that aid than either the Studds or Fascell-Moakley language. Moreover, the Broomfield substitute is nearly identical to the President's request which is based on the Kissinger Commission's recommendations.

I want to conclude by emphasizing my concern about producing bills from these caucus sausage machines. It does not bode well for either the legislative process or the prospects for enacting this bill. We have not had a foreign aid authorization since 1981, and this

whole process makes a repetition of that trend all the more likely.

I also want to express my reservations about burdening these bills with so many conditions and instructions and directions and strings that we literally tie the President's hands in the day-to-day conduct of foreign policy.

Yes, we have a role in foreign policy; but that role should be to facilitate and promote our national interests, not to impede and hamstring the President to the point of policy paralysis. I hope the amendment process will help to cut away some of these tangling strings, but I do support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ZSCHAU).

Mr. ZSCHAU. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, although I understand that this rule has the approval and support of the leadership of both parties, I plan to oppose it. I would like to explain why.

As the gentleman from Mississippi has just indicated, this is the first time in memory that a foreign aid authorization bill has been brought to the floor not subject to an open rule. I think that history has served us well. Foreign policy issues are complex. They need deliberation, they need debate, they need creative suggestions that Members of this body are able to provide. For that reason I think it is appropriate that foreign aid bills do come to the floor under an open rule.

Second, foreign policy issues need consensus. That means that the ideas of all Members of this body should get a hearing when we debate foreign policy issues. For that reason, I am disturbed that we have a break of tradition now by closing one section of the foreign aid bill under this proposed rule.

This case, as the gentleman from Mississippi has already indicated, is even worse. The very section of the bill—section 10—which is not open to amendment, is the only section that was not marked up in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is the section dealing with Central America. I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I have some ideas regarding our policy in Central America that I thought might have been constructive, but this section dealing with the complex and vexing problems of Central America was not open to debate even in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The very set of issues that are the most difficult, that beg for deliberation and creative proposals, were not open for discussion in the committee. It is for that reason that I think that this rule, which precludes amendments to that section on the House floor too, does not serve this body well.

For example, let us consider one particular part of section 10—the various proposals that we will be considering related to the aid to El Salvador, specifically the procedures for congressional concurrence with the Presidential certification as to whether or not the Government of El Salvador has complied with the conditions that govern further military assistance.

Tomorrow we will be forced to choose between two extremes. In the one extreme, the Moakley language, either House, by a simple majority, can veto the President's certification.

□ 1510

This is governance by one House of Congress. I feel that approach does not create a proper balance of power. It certainly was not the sort of balance that was envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.

On the other hand, the Broomfield-Murtha proposal would require two-thirds of both Houses in order to veto a Presidential certification as to whether or not the Government of El Salvador had complied with the conditions. That approach may not give Congress a loud enough voice in the process.

I had a proposal that fell somewhere in between, under which a simple majority of both Houses of Congress would be required for overturning a Presidential certification. It would have provided that if both Houses pass a concurrent resolution disapproving a Presidential certification, it would not be in order for either the House or the Senate to consider any appropriations measure providing money for El Salvador.

Such a provision avoids the extremes of the two alternatives we are being permitted to consider, that is, either a one-house veto or the necessity of both Houses mustering a two-thirds vote to override a Presidential certification. Instead, my proposal would allow a simple majority in Congress to decide whether El Salvador had met the conditions imposed on aid to that Government.

This is precisely the procedure followed under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. Under that act, neither House may consider any bill that exceeds the budget resolution, a concurrent resolution adopted each year by Congress.

The procedure is fair, it is constitutional, and it makes sense. Following is the text of the amendment which I had hoped to offer to the Central America section of the foreign aid bill:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5421

Amend section 1003(d)(2) of the bill (page 87, lines 9-24) to read as follows:

"(2) Not to exceed an additional $124,500,000 of military assistance and financing, and the remaining amounts of economic support assistance approved by the Congress for El Salvador, may be provided if the President submits a second report pursuant to subsection (b) stating that the President has determined that the Government of El Salvador has achieved the objectives described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) and, since the first report was submitted, has made additional demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (c).

"(3) If within thirty calendar days after receiving the reports required by this section, the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress finds that the objectives described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) have not been met, and since the first report was submitted, the government of El Salvador has not made additional demonstrated progress in achieving the objectives described in paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (c), it shall not be in order for the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any provision of an appropriations measure for fiscal year 1985 which would make funds available for military assistance for El Salvador. If such a resolution is adopted with respect to a report, a new report may be submitted if the President states in such report that it describes new plans, steps or policies by the Government of El Salvador designed to address the objectives described in subsection (b) or that it describes new circumstances or new information showing that the plan, steps or policies address the objectives described in subsection (b). Any such revised report shall be subject to this paragraph.".

Whether or not my proposal is a good idea or not is an open question. But that is not the issue. The point is that under the proposed rule we do not even have the chance to debate it. We do not have the chance to discuss any other ideas relating to the difficult situation in Central America that may have been offered by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee or other Members of this body.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I plan to oppose this rule.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to express my appreciation to him and to the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee for presenting this rule so clearly and concisely.

It is an unusual rule, but these are unusual times, Mr. Speaker. The Committee on Foreign Affairs was anxious to get a bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for foreign assistance programs before the House for consideration. And I want to advise my colleagues that a lot of diligent work went into getting a bill here for consideration under a rule. The rule would perhaps not satisfy every single Member but it is one which will give the Members the opportunity to debate the principal points of view

that seem to be represented in this body.

We did have ample discussion in the committee on all of the issues. We did our best to bring out a bill which reflected the consensus of the committee, but that was impossible on all points despite how much we tried. Therefore, an agreement was reached that we would come to the floor and let the House work its will with respect to the one title on which we could not get a consensus, that dealing with assistance for Central America. We did that in the fashion whereby the principal points of view would get heard and there would be an opportunity for Members not only to express themselves but to vote on those different approaches to a very difficult problem.

I will admit that in the process it was not possible to give every single Member an opportunity to offer amendments with respect to his particular idea or suggestion. I would simply say that I would hope that they would understand, however, that in this case the basic issues will be aired and will be heard, and the House will work its will. In the ultimate process, it is essential to get an authorization bill passed so that we do not depend continually on an appropriation by continuing resolution. In the course of the lengthy deliberations and consideration of the bill, we will make those adjustments that are agreed on during the course of consideration, whether that be in Committee of the Whole or in conference or otherwise.

So I would ask the forbearance of my colleagues, particularly my friend, the gentleman from California, who is such a valued member on the Foreign Affairs Committee. We note his objection. I regret that he feels it is necessary to make that point, but he is right in making the point. I would just hope, however, that he would bear with us, have the House adopt this rule and begin consideration of the bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me thank the Rules Committee for understanding the problem and both sides of the aisle for giving the House an opportunity to work its will on a very important piece of legislation.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and if the gentleman from Louisiana has no further requests, I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule from this point on into the afternoon. We had been advised on this side of the aisle earlier that we would take up the soil conservation bill, H.R. 3457, after the rule, and then we were informed that we would go ahead after the rule on the foreign aid authorization bill and proceed with general debate on the foreign aid authorization bill.

There seems to be now some confusion on that. Apparently we are going to go ahead with the soil conservation bill.

Mr. Speaker, so that we can have the Members on our side of the aisle here that would be involved in the debate on either one of those bills, could we inquire as to what would be next on the agenda?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) for a response.

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that we are going to take up the soil conservation bill, then have the votes on the suspensions and the conference report, and then have the 2 hours of debate.

Mr. LOTT. So the votes on the suspension and the conference report would come after the completion of the Soil Conservation Act legislation?

Mr. WATKINS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Chair, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 493 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3457.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land from wind and water erosion, to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands from cultivation, with Mr. FASCELL (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, May 7, 1984, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JONES) had 19 minutes of general debate remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN) had 6 minutes of general debate remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JONES.

□ 1520

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I believe that on both sides of the aisle today, the ones having the minority side as well as the majority side of the bill, may have some more debate and they are not here yet. If the Chair will permit me, I will give an explanation of the bill until some of them arrive.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3457, known as the Soil Conservation Act of 1984, would provide that any person who after enactment of the bill produces during any crop year an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land on a field on which the highly erodible land is the predominant class, shall be ineligible for farm program benefits on any commodity that person produces during the same crop year. The farm program benefits denied under this provision include price support or commodity program payments, farm storage facility loans, Federal crop insurance, disaster payments, and any Farmers Home Administration insured or guaranteed loan if the Farmers Home Administration loan would be used for a purpose that would contribute to excessive erosion on the field. The bill would also exempt persons who produce a commodity on highly erodible land if the commodity was: First, produced on land cultivated for any of the 1973 or 1984 crops; second, planted before the date of enactment of the bill; third, planted during any crop year beginning before the date of enactment of the bill; or fourth, produced under a conservation system approved by a conservation district. It would also exempt a loan made before the date of enactment of the bill.

The bill also, Mr. Chairman, requires the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a conservation reserve program with owners and operators of erosion-prone cropland under long-term contracts of between 7 and 15 years to assist in conserving and improving the soil and water resources of the farm. Under these contracts, landowners would be required to adopt conservation plans to convert erosion-prone land to less erosive use, such as pasture or trees. In return, landowners

would receive technical and financial assistance to carry out the conservation measures as well as an annual rental fee for the term of the contract. The bill limits signup of conservation reserve contracts to a 3-year period beginning October 1, 1984, and restricts the amount of payments which may be made under contracts entered into during the signup period to $50 million in fiscal year 1985, $75 million in fiscal year 1986, and $100 million in fiscal year 1987.

Mr. Chairman, that fairly well sums up what we did yesterday in general debate and also describes partially what this bill is all about.

I see that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee is here and it may be that he has someone who would like to debate the remaining part of the 6 minutes that he has allotted to him.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time on this side.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, let me just say that yesterday when a number of Members were not here, the gentleman from Tennessee and I both discussed the merits of this proposal. We both support it. I have a few reservations. There might be amendments offered this afternoon. We will talk about those then; but basically this is a bill which we think is important enough subject matter that it not be put into next year's farm bill and that it be highlighted as necessary.

The price tag on it has been reduced through an amendment I offered in committee. The bill passed the committee 38 to 1.

I think it is necessary to preserve the soil in our country. I support the proposition.

Mr. Chairman, at this time since the persons requesting additional time on my side are not present, they can take 5 minutes under the 5-minute rule and I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984. As an original cosponsor of this bill, I am proud to have played a role in the development of this important legislation.

For much too long, the Federal Government has inadvertently sanctioned the practice of "sodbusting" by extending farm program benefits to those who plow up and plant fragile, erosion-prone land. This bill stops that. Likewise, this bill recognizes that farm programs and soil conservation program can no longer be divorced but must increasingly interact with one another to both save soil and protect farm income.

To achieve these goals, H.R. 3457 contains a three-part strategy which includes:

First, a sodbuster provision that prohibits any farm program benefits—price support loans and payments, storage facility loans, Federal crop insurance, disaster payments and FmHA loans—to any farmer who plows and plants any field which is predominantly highly erodible land (class IVe, VIe, VII, or VIII land) unless the land is cultivated under a system approved by the Conservation District;

Second, a conservation reserve program in which the Federal Government will share the cost of making serious long-term reductions in soil erosion through 7- to 15-year contracts with farmers who choose to set aside highly erodible lands on their farms; and

Third, a cropland base protection study on various voluntary set-aside programs to analyse a program under which farmers who set aside cropland to perennial grasses or legumes as part of a crop rotation pattern, first, may qualify under future commodity programs to have lands designated as cropland in rotation for the purpose of establishing a normal acreage base for the farm, or, second, designate cropland as "set-aside or conserving-use acreage" under these programs.

This last provision is aimed at correcting an inequity in farm programs that I have heard expressed over and over again by Iowa farmers. Specifically, farmers who have historically practiced good conservation and crop rotation have been penalized by our farm programs. Particularly hard hit have been livestock producers. This study has the potential of addressing and correcting this longstanding inequity.

Contrary to some of the rhetoric we are likely to hear during the debate today, the "sodbuster" title in this bill does not legislate farming practices. Farmers will still be free to do what they please with their land—even to abuse it. The bill merely says that farmers who plow highly erodible land that has not been cropped since 1973, and who do so without a plan approved by local conservation officials, will not be entitled to important Federal program benefits. That makes sense, particularly when one recognizes that extensive plowing of fragile grasslands in recent years has aggravated soil erosion, added to crop surpluses, and raised the price tag for farm programs.

This bill rectifies several weaknesses identified in sodbuster legislation which passed the Senate in November. Under the amendment I offered during committee consideration, if a farmer plows up a field predominantly composed of highly erodible land, he will be ineligible for price supports and other benefits not just on that land, but on any other land he farms.

The conservation reserve in H.R. 3457 is likewise a much needed improvement of existing production control programs. In 1977, a USDA survey disclosed that just 3 percent of the country's cropland—11 million acres—accounted for 26 percent of all cropland erosion caused by wind and water. Soil erosion is similarly concentrated in Iowa, as it is in most States. Obviously, this small amount of land constitutes a very large part of America's serious soil erosion problem. Soil scientists agree that it would be prohibitively expensive to try to protect this land from erosion while keeping it in intensive cultivation. The only practical solution is to plant the land to long-term cover crops.

With the long-term contracts, farmers could enroll erosion prone cropland in a 7 to 15 year conservation reserve. In return for an annual rental fee, the contract would require the farmer to establish and maintain suitable cover crops. In times of national emergency, the Secretary of Agriculture would be able to temporarily release land under contract for production of needed crops.

Instead of storing surplus grain in bins, where it lasts a few years, the conservation reserve would store the capacity to grow it in the soil, where it will last until we really need it. We would also be preventing hundreds of millions of tons of pesticide and fertilizer rich soil sediment from polluting the Nation's surface waters.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1984 will not solve all of the America's farm income or soil conservation problems. But this bill is a logical, long-overdue step away from the crisis management that now masquerades as agricultural policy, and which on balance degrades one of America's most valuable resources.

In closing, this bill enjoys broad support amongst agricultural, environmental and religious organizations, and I insert for the record a letter I received in support of this bill from a broad coalition of religious groups:

APRIL 19, 1984.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Soil Conservation Act of 1984 (H.R. 3457) is likely to be considered during the week of April 30. We, the undersigned organizations, support H.R. 3457 as an important initiative in the ongoing effort to conserve our nation's food and fiber producing resources.

We believe that stewardship of the land is an urgent concern which we all share. Our food security and our contribution to world food security are dependent on the preservation of our soil. We support a sustainable system of agriculture, based on family farms, in which soil productivity and agricultural diversity are maintained.

Soil loss threatens to undermine the sustainability of our agricultural production. Nearly 6.5 billion tons of U.S. soil are washed or blown away annually. Much of this soil loss is concentrated on a relatively small number of fragile, highly erodible acres where the rate of topsoil loss greatly

exceeds the soil's natural regenerative capacity.

Of the 8 million acres brought into production between 1977 and 1982, nearly one-half are highly erodible. Contrary to popular belief, highly erodible acres are often highly productive and represent a valuable resource when properly managed. Although improved conservation practice could reduce erosion to safe levels on a handful of these acres, retirement from continuous intensive production is usually the best solution. In most cases, highly erodible land can be used for intensive crop production in two of ten years without damage.

Furthermore, highly erodible land contributes disproportionately to the pollution of the nation's waterways through sedimentation and agricultural chemical run-off. These pollutants are a major obstacle to realization of national water quality goals. The U.S. spends approximately $1 billion annually on dredging operations to keep navigable waterways and harbors open to commercial traffic.

The Soil Conservation Act has two major objectives. First, public incentives to plow additional highly erodible land would be eliminated. If passed in its current form, H.R. 3457 would stop all farm program payments to farmers who produce any commodities on highly erodible land in the absence of a Soil Conservation Service-approved on-farm conservation plan. Known as the sodbuster provision, it would apply only to land plowed for crop production after enactment of the bill.

Secondly, the bill would provide incentives for farmers to retire highly erodible land already in production. Known as the conservation reserve, it would offer farmers technical assistance and cost-sharing on initial conversion as well as an annual rental fee for agreeing to place land in conservation (non-erosive) use for a period of from 7 to 15 years. By removing this land from intensive production, its productive capacity can be preserved for future needs. Land placed in the conservation reserve could be brought back into production of grain crops in the event of short supply.

Furthermore, by reducing the number of acres elgible for farm support payments, the conservation reserve would have little or no additional budgetary impact. Long term retirement of highly erodible land would cost less than removing land from production on a short-term basis through land diversion payments. As approved by Committee, the conservation reserve would be a pilot project with total funding of $225 million over three years.

We strongly urge passage of H.R. 3457 as approved by the Agriculture Committee. Farm programs—the public investment in agriculture—should enhance national goals, including conservation of productive resources. The Soil Conservation Act is an important initiative in the effort to preserve our nation's farmlands. Approval of H.R. 3457 would help ensure that topsoil continues to produce food, rather than becoming a pollutant in our waterways.

Sincerely,

American Lutheran Church; Bread for the World; Center for Rural Affairs; Interfaith Action for Economic Justice; Lutheran Church in America; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; National Council of Churches of Christ/Division of Church and Society, Domestic Hunger and Poverty; United Church Board for Homeland Ministries; and United Church of Christ, Office for Church and Society.●

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984. This bill recognizes that farm programs and soil conservation programs can no longer operate in separate worlds, but must interact in order to save soil and protect farm income. H.R. 3457 contains innovative, but practical soil conservation measures that will help to preserve agricultural resources and water quality, reduce farm surpluses, and protect both farmers and consumers from extremes in commodity prices.

H.R. 3457 is comprised of three important programs: the sodbuster program, the conservation reserve program and the cropland base protection program. The sodbuster program insures that Federal farm programs are taken out of the business of subsidizing farm practices which cause soil erosion. By making "sodbusters" ineligible for Federal price supports, crop insurance, farm loans and disaster payments, the bill seeks to discourage sodbusters from beginning new cropping on highly erodible land. The Department of Agriculture (USDA) projects that between 40 and 100 million acres of highly erodible land could be brought under the plow in the future if current farm program incentives and the prospect of rising commodity prices continue. Government farm and loan programs should stop underwriting the risk for plowing up and cropping highly erodible lands.

The conservation reserve program, the second component of H.R. 3457, seeks to protect some of the Nation's most erosive lands through 7-to-10-year contracts with farmers who choose to set aside highly erodible lands on their farms. The program is a fine-tuned and effective approach to soil conservation because it selectively targets highly erodible lands, and is based on local decisionmaking and economic practicality. If 12.5 million of the most erodible acres—an amount of land equivalent to that temporarily set aside under 1982 commodity programs—were set aside in longer term arrangements, about 600 million tons of soil could be saved each year, or roughly one-third of all soil being lost today. Opponents of this legislation who object to the costs of the conservation reserve program are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. The Government will not spend more by paying farmers to take erodible land out of production. Rather, these payments will be made in lieu of Federal crop price supports and other payments which would be made for crops grown on that land. Furthermore, the long-term benefits for our children and grandchildren of protecting these fragile lands are incalculable.

The third provision in the bill is the cropland base protection program. One current disincentive for farmers who practice sound crop rotation and other kinds of conservation practices is that such land is currently not counted as part of their normal cropland acreage, the base formula which is used to compute farm payments in commodity programs. H.R. 3457 authorizes a study of this situation to determine whether such conservation and rotation lands should be included in a farmer's normal cropland acreage. Under the Reagan administration PIK programs, for example, farmers who had previously seeded cropland to alfalfa, either in rotation or as part of a conservation plan to stabilize marginal cropland, could not count those acres as part of their farm's base acreage, nor could such acres qualify as set asides in the wheat or feed grain programs. These farmers practicing conservation, were in effect, penalized by these programs. By incorporating conservation lands into the normal cropland base, more farmers will have an incentive to practice sound conservation farming.

The strong and effective soil conservation measures in H.R. 3457 are needed to slow soil erosion, the consequences of which go far beyond the loss of farmland. As farmland washes into streams and rivers, it carries with it dangerous pesticides which degrade water quality. Farm soil erosion is also a major contributor to sedimentation which clogs our waterways, reservoirs, irrigation ditches and streams, kills fish and increases the costs of treating drinking water.

My home State of Ohio has long understood the importance of soil conservation. Ohio has been an aggressive leader in soil conservation, with more local and State employees than Federal employees focusing on soil and water conservation within the State. Yet officials in Ohio still estimate that Ohio has 5,772,000 acres of highly erodible land. Over the long run, these acres may lose their productive capacity if measures such as H.R. 3457 are not in place to encourage landowners to manage their soil in a responsible fashion.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill, which is a reasonable approach to a serious natural resource problem. The Soil Conservation Act of 1984 is an important step toward reducing the alarming rates of soil erosion in the United States.●

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the approval of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984. As a cosponsor of this measure, I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the passage of this important legislation.

In assessing the importance of soil conservation, President Roosevelt once noted that the history of every nation is eventually written by the way it

cares for its soil. The history being written today by our Nation is not encouraging. According to preliminary national resources inventory data, more than 44 million acres of highly erodible acreas are currently being cultivated in the United States and an additional 247 million acreas of highly erodible land are potential acres for new cultivation in the future. In South Dakota, from 7 to 14 tons of soil are being lost per acre on 8½ million acres of cropland because of wind and water erosion.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1984 now being considered recognizes the importance of conserving our soil resources by providing incentives for the long-term conversion of erosion prone cropland to less intensive uses and by discouraging the future cultivation of erosion prone grasslands for crop production by eliminating incentives for sodbusting. This legislation which has received the strong support of the Conservation, Credit and Rural Development Subcommittee and the Committee on Agriculture provides a needed and balanced approach to conserving our Nation's soil resources and I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the Soil Conservation Act of 1984.●

● Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984 and commend Chairman DE LA GARZA, Subcommittee Chairman JONES and ranking member Mr. COLEMAN for presenting this Congress with a piece of conservation legislation.

As a cosponsor of the original sodbuster bill, I am pleased to note that its provisions have been included as part of H.R. 3457.

Of course, no piece of legislation is perfect and I have some concerns about some of the details of this bill, but on the whole, I think producers are ready for some conservation legislation with teeth.

It is important to keep in mind that no matter how beneficial this bill might be, farmers and ranchers would be doing more of their own conservation work if incomes were better.

Second, we need to look at the Tax Code and price-support programs to see what incentives they are giving nonfarm investors to crop marginal ground.

However, this bill is an important step forward and should raise the national conciousness about the need for conservation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of my testimony before the House Agriculture Committee, Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development regarding H.R. 3457 and urge adoption of the bill:

HON. VIRGINIA SMITH, TESTIMONY BEFORE THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION, CREDIT, AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT, SEPTEMBER 20, 1983

I would like to thank the Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. Jones, the Ranking Minority Member, Mr. Coleman, and the entire Subcommittee for calling this hearing and for allotting this time for me to testify. Your consideration is appreciated.

As most of you, I have just completed an extensive tour of my District, holding 77 meetings and talking with thousands of people. I want this Subcommittee to know that one of the issues of top concern is the conservation issue.

My District is one that contains more cattle than people. So, as you can imagine, it also consists of vast pastureland expanses. The beautiful and unique Sandhill Range provides one of nature's best cattle grassland regions. These rolling dunes covered with a thin layer of topsoil and grass are also blessed with the most mighty underground water aquifers on the continent.

The Ogallala aquifer stretches from Nebraska to Texas and is 600 miles wide. Nebraska is by far the biggest benefactor of this aquifer's fresh water treasure. We stand second only to California in irrigation, with upwards of 8 million acres, practically immune to the present drought that wracks the rest of the Nation's heartland.

The mindless and tragic destruction of this land has people in my District upset. We have seen quarter section after quarter section plowed, drained, leveled, or otherwise defaced and planted to row crops. Some of this development has come at the hands of corporations, who have no interest in farming and only invest as a way to hide from inflation or to gain tax advantages. Some has come at the hands of individuals who live in the area, and who have exploited the resource for their own short term advantage.

For these reasons, I strongly support the efforts of this Committee to formulate legislation aimed at dealing with America's conservation problems. I especially appreciate inclusion of the Sodbuster bill as Title II of H.R. 3457. The Sodbuster bill had wide support and is seen as a response by government to the plowing of fragile grasslands that should never be torn up.

Many producers, agricultural and conservation groups, and farm experts think that farm programs discourage conservation and, in many cases, even encourage bad farming practices. Title III, the Certified Voluntary Set-aside, whereby producers who use grasses or legumes as part of a crop rotation can designate that ground as set-aside for farm program purposes, will certainly go a long way to end the discrimination those producers have endured from most farm programs.

I also support Title IV, the Conservation Reserve program, which would operate much like the old Soil Bank program. This program was very popular with producers as well as people interested in wildlife and hunting. There is certainly a need for some longer-term acreage set-aside as the world economic situation and the export situation do not indicate a need to return to full production.

Despite my overall support for the legislation, I would like to caution the Subcommittee on some well intentioned, but potentially harmful provisions.

Although I am a strong supporter of conservation and fight for conservation funds in the Agricultural Appropriation bill every year, I am also a strong advocate of local control and local decision-making.

Specifically, Section 201(b)(5), which deals with exceptions to the provisions of the Sodbuster bill, states that penalties will not apply to crops produced using a conservation system that has been approved by a conservation district and that is based on technical standards set forth in the Soil Conservation Service technical guide for that conservation district.

I do not question SCS expertise in the technical aspects of conservation, but I do question whether that huge beauracracy can keep up with the ever-changing methods of conservation farming.

I understand the need for uniform standards, but can also see a nightmare whereby certain implements or farming practices are not approved simply because SCS has not had time to evaluate them. The diversity in agriculture, as well as geography and the diversity of producers preference, dictate that there are thousands of ways to farm.

I suggest that if there must be SCS guidelines, they should be as general as possible. Maximum flexibility must be given to the local conservation districts, most of whom have elected officers, so that local conditions and local practices can be approved without interference from Washington. Local people care most about their land and water resources, and they should be the ones to make these decisions.

Also, I would like to call the Subcommittee's attention to Section 103(3), specifying which land classes come under jurisdiction of the Sodbuster bill. In Nebraska, we have 4.6 million acres of class IIIe land and 2.7 million acres of class IVe land under cultivation. Although these lands would be grandfathered by the legislation, there is still 1.9 million acres of IIIe and 2.5 million acres of IVe land that could potentially be farmed.

You may be surprised to hear me concerned about this ground after expressing my support for conservation. I want to note that farming this type of ground in Nebraska and conservation are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Because of our irrigation resources and sandy land, erosion can be controlled and crops can be grown on class IIIe and IVe land. There are definitely problems with the degree of slope and other factors, but with irrigation and the fact that the sandy soil absorbs the water so quickly, erosion and blowing can be controlled with proper management practices.

I certainly hope that the economic opportunity irrigation affords would not be diminished by including these two land classifications. Again, if they must be included it is even more important that local officials make the decisions about who is allowed to have approved conservation practices and who is not.

This concludes my testimony. I hope you will accept my remarks as supportive and constructive, and I would be happy to answer any questions the Subcommittee might have.●

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, soil erosion is a very real problem for farmers in every part of the country. Recent reports of severe wind erosion in the Southwest and excessive rainfall and flooding in other parts of the country dramatically illustrate the damage that erosion can cause.

Mr. Chairman, it is vital in an increasingly competitive world market-

place that we encourage and work with farmers to help protect the productive capabilities of our Nation's cropland. In addition, effective erosion control practices will help preserve and improve the quality of the Nation's lakes, rivers and streams. Excessive runoff of topsoil and agricultural chemicals can result in costly dredging and cleanup efforts and cause severe damage to aquatic life.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today represents a significant first step toward more effective control of soil erosion and the protection of our lakes and streams. Under this legislation, farmers would be encouraged to remove highly erodible land from production, or refrain from breaking out such land for the production of crops. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. JONES, and the ranking minority member, Mr. COLEMAN, as well as the other members of the committee for their hard work on this bill.

With the shadow of large budget deficits hanging over their heads these gentlemen along with the other members of the committee reported a bill that is lean but effective. It will provide us with the type of experience and information needed next year when Congress takes up the 1985 farm bill.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is concern by some Members over certain provisions of this bill. I hope that we can discuss fully those concerns and reach agreement on this bill today.●

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1. The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Soil Conservation Act of 1984".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "agricultural commodity" means any agricultural commodity planted and produced by annual tilling of the soil, or on an annual basis by one-trip planters;

(2) the term "conservation district" means any district or unit of State or local government formed under State or territorial law for the express purpose of developing and carrying out a local soil and water conservation program. Such districts or units of State or local government may be called conservation districts, soil conservation districts, soil and water conservation districts, resource conservation districts, natural resource districts, land conservation committees, or a similar name;

(3) the term "erosion-prone cropland" means land that is classified by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture as class IIIe, IVe, VI, VII, or VIII land under the land capability classification system in effect on the date of enactment of this Act and that has been devoted to the production of an agricultural commodity in three out of the past five years, or any other land in a State that the Soil Conservation Service determines has an erosion rate, in the production of an agricultural commodity, that is equal to or greater than the average erosion rate in the same State on any of the foregoing classes of land;

(4) the term "field" means that term as defined in section 718.2 of title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations, except that any highly erodible land on which an agricultural commodity is produced after the date of enactment of this Act and which is not exempt under section 202 shall be considered as part of the field in which such land was included on such date of enactment;

(5) the term "highly erodible land" means land classified by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture as class IVe, VIe, VII, or VIII land under the land capability classification system in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, or any other land in a State that the Soil Conservation Service determines would have an erosion rate, if that land is used to produce an agricultural commodity, that is equal to or greater than the average erosion rate in the same State on any of the foregoing classes of land; and

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to title I?

The Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II

PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY FOR PRODUCTION ON HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND

SEC. 201. Except as provided in sections 202 and 407(c) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, following the date of enactment of this Act any person who during any crop year produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land on a field on which such highly erodible land is the predominant class shall be ineligible, as to any commodity produced during that crop year by such person, for—

(1) any type of price support or payments made available under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.), the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714 et seq.), or any other Act;

(2) a farm storage facility loan under section 4 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714b(h));

(3) crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.);

(4) a disaster payment under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.); or

(5) a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) or any other provision of law administered by the Farmers Home Administration, if the Secretary determines that such loan will be used for a purpose that will contribute to excessive erosion on such field.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 202. (a) Section 201 shall not apply to any person who, during any crop year, produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land on a field on which such highly erodible land is the predominant class if all the commodities so produced by such person during that crop year where—

(1) produced on any land that was cultivated to produce any of the 1973 through 1984 crops of agricultural commodities;

(2) planted before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) planted during any crop year beginning before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(4) produced (A) in an area within a conservation district under a conservation system that has been approved by a conservation district after it has been determined that the conservation system is in conformity with technical standards set forth in the Soil Conservation Service technical guide for that conservation district, or (B) in an area, not within a conservation district, under a conservation system determined by the Secretary to be adequate for the production of such agricultural commodity on highly erodible land.

(b) Section 201 shall not apply to any loan made before the date of enactment of this Act.

COMPLETION OF LAND CAPABILITY CLASSIFICATION SURVEYS

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, complete soil surveys on those private lands that have not been classified as to land capability, and, insofar as possible, concentrate on those localities where significant amounts of highly erodible land are being converted to the production of agricultural commodities. In addition to other sums authorized to be appropriated by this Act, such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GLICKMAN: Page 6, line 20, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

Page 6, after line 19, insert the following new subsection: (b) Section 201 shall not apply to any highly erodible land during any crop year if such land was planted in reliance on the determination by the Soil Conservation Service that such land was not highly erodible land. The exemption allowed by the subsection shall not apply to any crop which was planted on any land after the Soil Conversation Service determines such land to be highly erodible land.

Mr. GLICKMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill that I think will do as much to Help American agriculture as well as urban interests as any farm bill we will deal with this year.

One of the key aspects of the working of this bill will be the determinations the Soil Conservation Service

makes on land not presently classified according to the official SCS land capability classification system. If a producer has land not classified, he will have to rely on a determination by the SCS that the field will not have an erosion rate equal to or greater than comparable land in the same State; this decison will, obviously, be key to his planting since it will affect whether the crop grown on that land will be eligible for farm program assistance.

I want to be sure that producers who make a good-faith reliance on such a determination are not penalized if the SCS should find at some later date that the original decision was in error. My amendment will provide that safeguard.

The amendment provides that once a determination about the erodible characteristics of the land has been made, the producer can feel confident that the crop grown on that land and elsewhere on his land for that matter will not be declared ineligible for assistance. The safe harbor the amendment creates will remain in effect until SCS makes a decision at some future time and until the producer is notified of the change in the classification. Then, if the SCS reverses its original determination, and the producer is notified, he will have to comply with the new determination for the following crop year.

The amendment will be creating a safe harbor for crops in the ground, but will not create a safe harbor in perpetuity. It simply assures producers that the investment they make on advice from the SCS will not be jeopardized while the crop is in the ground, and it also provides a mechanism by which producers will have to curtail planting on highly erodible ground in the future if the SCS reverses its original decision.

I think this is an important bill and I urge the adoption of this additional safeguard.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague and a member of the subcommittee from the State of Kansas.

This amendment really does strengthen H.R. 3457, because it actually protects farmers who in good faith cultivated highly erodible land after having been misinformed by the Soil Conservation Service.

We have discussed the amendment and we have no objection to it at all on this side.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I would say if anything, this will encourage farmers to go to the SCS to get advisory opinions and maybe will help in compliance.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I further would like to commend the gentleman. He makes a worthy contribution and enhances the legislation and certainly we have no objection to including this amendment in the general bill.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have looked at the gentleman's amendment and I see no reason to oppose it and we would accept it over here.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee are aware of my longstanding interest and concerns about sodbuster legislation. A couple of those concerns were outlined in my minority views to the report on this bill. I will not reiterate those now, but I do have some general observations to make.

Let me call attention to some of the very grievous impacts of this seemingly innocent and well-meaning legislation. The purported objective of this legislation is to stop sodbusting. This legislation does not stop sodbusting. Tax considerations and poor livestock prices have caused sodbusting. The purported objective of this legislation is to stop Federal subsidies to newly broken land. Newly broken land has no crop base, no cropland history. As a consequence, it receives no taxpayer subsidies.

What does this legislation do? This legislation puts into place a vehicle for forcing conservation measures using farm program benefits to blackmail compliance. This legislation takes managerial decisions from the greatest conservationist of all, the farmer, and makes those managerial decisions subject to the judgmental decisions of a bureaucrat. This legislation adds regulations when none existed. This legislation adds more Government employment. This legislation adds cost to the Government. This legislation confiscates property rights.

It adds all the negative impacts that many of us have campaigned against and worked against and yet it does not and will not stop the conversion of grassland to cropland. This legislation is a vehicle to land use regulations. Many a farm operator will rue the day that this legislation was signed into law by a President who vowed to cut regulation, cut Government employment, and cut Government costs. I would urge that you support the managerial ability of our agricultural producers and vote against making him subserviant to local bureaucratic judgmental decisions.

Vote against H.R. 3457.

□ 1530

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I appreciate the opportunity to take a few minutes to make a few comments and observations on our actions with respect to this particular piece of legislation.

Most of us realize that the time has come to recognize that our Federal agricultural programs, however well intended, have had some detrimental side effects. Among them has been the enticement of plowing up and planting fragile land.

While at this time I will not get into a debate on the merits of Federal price and income support programs, it is worth mentioning their negative impact on soil conservations. Sometimes it seems that no matter how well intended Federal action might be, the end result is disastrous.

I am pleased that my colleagues have recognized this conflict in Federal agricultural policy and have moved to elminate it.

I do have reservations, however, about H.R. 3457 in the form in which it has been reported from the committee. In our zeal to correct an environmental problem we must carefully weigh our actions.

The agricultural community is undergoing some difficult times, and I think it is accurate to say that none of us want to bring further hardship on rural America. It can be safely said that many producers who do not implement soil conservation measures where needed would like to do so but simply cannot afford it. Studies have shown that soil conservation measures are often undertaken by those who can devote financial resources necessary to do so, yet a great deal of land has been treated that may not be considered to be high priority.

Given the determination that much soil conservation is left undone due to economic constraints, I have concerns over the severity of H.R. 3457 in its reported form. Our intent here is to reduce soil erosion, not to put farmers out of business.

It is with this concern that I lend my reserved support to H.R. 3457. It is relevant to add at this time that I have done a great deal of work on this issue of soil conservation in recent months and my findings on this legislation have been mixed.

It is for that reason that I introduced legislation of my own, H.R. 5200, the National Agricultural Soil

Protection Act, which would work in conjunction with this bill, H.R. 3457, yet offer a less damaging, more positive approach to the problem. The approach that I have undertaken in H.R. 5200 has been to provide those farmers most in need with the financial assistance to adopt soil conservation measures which they were previously unable to afford.

Additionally, H.R. 5200 proposes structural changes within the Department of Agriculture and on the regional level to allow for greater cooperation between natural resource agencies at USDA and reduced duplication and competition.

Therefore, as I indicated, I am going to support H.R. 3457 with some reservations, and I urge my colleagues to consider the legislation that I previously introduced, H.R. 5200, as we begin work on the 1985 farm bill.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAUB. I am happy to yield.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I would like to commend the gentleman from Nebraska for his statement and for his contribution and constructive innovation in his bill he has introduced. He is certainly working to repair the damage that has been done over the years to our topsoil, and his involvement and his constructive suggestions are going to be heeded, I believe.

I appreciate the gentleman for working with the committee and in the future we look forward to additional leadership from the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DAUB. I want to thank the gentleman for the compliment paid and want to indicate that this morning I introduced another part of that package which I hope will be referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which is a 10-percent tax credit incentive. It alters the way in which we have been inviting people in the watershed and special district areas that are created and better defined in this piece of legislation to get into the program and find a way in which we can stretch those very precious resources that are first within the USDA, and the talent that we have federally to administer these programs, coupled with the precious resource of tax money to implement some of these programs and invite more of our actual growers and producers to participate in a positive way in soil and water conservation.

I thank the gentleman and thank the committee for its time and yield back the balance of the time I may have.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I want to state to my colleagues, and specifically to the two Members who spoke prior to me, that I understand their concerns. I want to reemphasize, though, to both of my two colleagues who preceded me, and I want to make it clear to all the Members and as a part of the legislative history, that nothing in this bill imposes demands on any farmer or rancher concerning what may be or may not be done with his or her land.

Now let me go to the other part. We have had soil conservation legislation by which the farmer, the rancher, and the Government entered into a partnership. We shared the cost. The Government approved the proposal and much land was made productive land. The land was terraced, land was leveled. There was much good done by the Soil Conservation Service in partnership with the individual farmer and the individual rancher.

What we do here, of course, I will have to admit, and all of us would have to admit is not perfect, it is not the end solution, and I assure my colleague from Nebraska that our subcommittee and our committee will take a look at his legislation. It is an ongoing process.

But what we do here, which may seem onerous to some, is not. It is a continuation of that partnership. But what was happening was that one arm working in a partnership was working the land, terracing, leveling, and making it more productive, conserving it.

On the other hand, we were giving assistance in raising certain commodities, certain crops, without any regard to what we were doing over here on the right.

□ 1540

And what land was put in reserve or what land was put in setaside, was left entirely up to the producer without taking into consideration the other aspects of our soil conservation programs.

An attempt is made here now to put them together. You cannot share the benefits of this program here and undo the benefits that the Nation and a region would have gained, what we did with the other program. Not perfect, I agree, but a step in the right direction, I hope.

But never will we yield to any temptation or never will we be oblivious or disregard the concerns which have been mentioned by my two colleagues which are valid concerns. And it is not our intention to do contrary to what they have expressed concerns over.

So what I would say is we need to continue working together. That is a step forward, a modest step; always providing my assurance, and the legislative history always providing the safeguard as we see it; always listening to concerns. But we need to move and I think this is a good first step in this direction.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I have great respect for the chairman and his fairness in presenting legislation and hearing all sides, as I do for the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. JONES.

I do have great concern about the legislation. I do not support the payment of subsidies to newly turned land, especially when those newly turned lands are going on, where the sod busting that is going on at a very rapid rate and with a lot of acres.

But I hope that in correcting or attempting to correct those abuses that we do not heap a great deal of abuse on the ordinary, average producer that we have throughout the United States of America. I have a lot of confidence in that producer.

But if those abuses do arise and they do come to our attention, I hope the chairman will join me in correcting the agency or correcting those abuses as they see, as we see fit and they arise out there. And I am sure there will be some arise because we cannot, we are not all knowing when we write legislation.

But my concern is great enough to oppose the legislation. I am sure this legislation is going to pass. Barring that, I am sure we are going to have to come back and relook at some of this and adjust it.

For instance, Montana has only had 90 percent or 60 percent of its land soil-surveyed. We are going to have to adjust that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Let me assure the gentleman from Montana, my dear distinguished colleague, that we honor and respect his opinion and certainly would not do otherwise.

But our assurance to him of continuous oversight, of continuous specific concern to the areas of concern that have been brought out this afternoon, so that we may not, as our intention is not, prejudice anyone.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAUB. Let me speak for myself when I say that indeed the very positive and constructive work that has been accomplished by the subcommittee and Mr. JONES has worked so very hard on a bill which I can say right now, because of what you said, Mr. Chairman, is one, and your remarks are words which I wish to be associat-

ed with, I too agree, this legislation is a good, positive step forward.

The concern I raise simply is that there can be some refinement of this idea of how we really do finally implement the sod-buster preventions which are so fundamentally addressed by this piece of legislation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. We will continue working with the distinguished gentleman in that respect. Again, I promise and I know that the subcommittee chairman would agree with me, that we will, should this become law; we will have continuous oversight and continuous work to achieve ultimately, hopefully, the perfect solution or as near as we possibly can. Let me thank all the Members who have worked so diligently on this legislation and again assure all my colleagues of our continuous overview of this program.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I will not be long, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to commend the chairman of the Conservation Subcommittee, Mr. ED JONES. His perseverance is largely responsible for bringing this excellent legislation before the House.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, H.R. 3457, is a comprehensive one which will at long last give us the tools to affect the underlying causes of soil erosion. It recognizes that effective soil conservation legislation must pursue two goals simultaneously. First, it establishes a program to take out of production the highly erodible farmland that is responsible for the lion's share of current soil loss. Second, it sets some responsible ground rules regarding the granting of Federal farm program benefits that will discourage the breaking out of highly erodible land not yet under cultivation.

It is a real treat for me to see H.R. 3457 finally before the committee for markup. I have for several years now promoted the need for linkage between Federal conservation programs and commodity support programs. In the 96th Congress, I introduced H.R. 3681, the first bill which would require soil and water conservation plans on farms which wished to be eligible for price support benefits. That bill caused quite a stir at the time. For a while I thought that it might even cause another tractorcade.

Now, it seems that we have come full circle. The bill before the committee today would deny Federal farm program benefits to farmers who persisted in cropping highly erodible soils without an acceptable conservation plan. It has overwhelming support.

I shall start my discussion with comments on the conservation reserve that the bill establishes, then proceed to its sodbuster provisions. I choose this order because I believe that you will see just how important the sodbuster provisions are once you learn why we must establish a conservation reserve if we are to have any real hope of reducing soil erosion.

In the mid 1970's, the Federal Government exhorted farmers to farm as many acres as they had available so that the United States could substantially increase its exports of food and feed grains. Farmers responded not only by removing shelterbelts and other erosion control structures which used land that they felt they could crop, but also by breaking out highly erodible fields previously protected from erosion by perennial grasses and trees.

At the time, the market price for grains was adequate to encourage such actions. Many of these newly cultivated fields, however, were not suited to year in, year out production of annual crops because their shallow topsoil and lack of adequate moisture made consistently profitable yields unreliable. Much of this risk of failure, however, was shifted from the farmer to the Federal Government by virtue of the fact that the crops grown on these marginal soils were eligible for commodity price supports, crop insurance, Farmers Home loans and disaster payments, each of which is federally subsidized. In effect, Government policy encouraged the cropping of fragile soils and Government programs minimized the financial risk of so doing.

According to the Natural Resource Inventory conducted in 1977 by the Soil Conservation Service, much of the fragile land that is today contributing a disproportionate share of our total soil loss was converted to cropland in the expansionary period of 1973 through 1976. Preliminary data from the 1982 N.R.I. indicate that there were 421 million acres of cropland in production in 1982, and that at least one half of the additional 8 million acres which came into production since 1977 is highly erodible. Much of this fragile land would never have been brought into production if federal farm program benefits had not minimized the risk of farming such soils.

The average erosion rate on all cropland in the United States is only about 5 tons per acre. Since soil is generated from parent material at about this rate, 5 tons per acre is considered an acceptable rate of erosion within the agricultural community.

The rate of erosion on what this bill terms highly erodible soils, however, is approximately 20 tons per acre, four times the acceptable rate. The highly erodible soils now under cultivation represent only 5 percent of the Nation's cropland base, yet yield 43 percent of all the soil lost from farmland. Such is the magnitude of the problem on these soils. The attached table No. 1, which I would like included in the RECORD, further describes the situation for certain States.

The fact that so small a portion of our farmland contributes so large a share of all erosion is, ironically, encouraging. It means that with a carefully designed program, a major share of all soil loss can be eliminated.

The conservation reserve of H.R. 3457 is directed toward this highly erodible land. By offering cost-share assistance for necessary conservation practices and annual land rental payments to farmers who will plant such soils to grass or trees and maintain them in such a use for 7 to 15 years, a considerable reduction in soil erosion can be achieved.

Why is it so important to control soil erosion? First, the topsoil that we are losing is the source of our much-envied agricultural productivity. Annual crops use only the top 10 to 12 inches of soil. Over the millennia this fraction has developed unique physical and chemical properties that make abundant crop yields possible. Soil erosion destroys this capacity by stripping away this layer of soil. What remains is a thinner layer of topsoil which forces plant roots to seek sustenance in subsoil which has a far poorer ability to hold the nutrients and water necessary for large yields. The net result is lower productivity and higher costs—What actually destroyed the agricultural base that made Rome and Athens the wealthy city-states that they were was soil erosion. Degradation of their mostly hilly cropland caused the water table to fall to depths which plant roots could not reach.

Soil erosion reduces agricultural productivity. If crop yields per acre are the measure of productivity, it may appear that soil erosion is of no consequence. But if erosion results in a need for ever greater quantities of fertilizer in order to maintain per acre yields, then the productivity of that input actually has declined.

There are, however, other costs that are more quantifiable. Soil, when it is washed from cropland, finds its way into watercourses. To the hydrologist, such soil becomes sediment; to those charged with keeping our waterways open and our water potable, it is a very costly form of pollution.

The Mississippi River drains nearly two-thirds of the Nation. Much of the cropland within the drainage basin is level to only gently sloping and does not suffer a great deal of soil loss. However, the remainder erodes at rates of 5 to over 50 tons of soil per acre per year.

The following chart, not included in the RECORD, demonstrates that, in a single year, the Mississippi's drainage area yields 900 million tons of eroded soil.

Accounting of soil transportation within the Mississippi River Basin [1]

Average annual area yield (annually)	900,000,000
A Soil lost to Gulf of Mexico	255,000,000
B Sediment inflow into dams within subbasins off Mississippi mainstem	341,828,000
C Sediment dredged from river channel (for navigation purposes only)	70,000,000
Total (A+B+C)	666,828,000
Soil moving within basin but not necessarily in river system	233,000,000

[1] From "Characterization of the suspended-sediment regime and bed-material gradation of the Mississippi River Basin" Potamology program (P-1), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experimental Station, Vicksburg, Miss. (August 1981).

As you can see, 74 percent of this soil load finds it way into the Mississippi River or its tributaries and setbacks. Indeed the Mississippi delta is the product of over 255 million tons of that sediment moving all the way to the Gulf of Mexico where it is deposited. Eighty percent of what is dropped at the mouth of the river is silt and other fine particles that are the most valuable fractions of topsoil.

The Army Corps of Engineers reports that some 70 million tons of soil per year are dredged from the lower Mississippi mainstem alone so that it may be kept open to barge and boat traffic. The annual expense of this activity is $170 million. Nationally, $300 million to $350 million is spent each year on dredging water-borne sediment from rivers.

The sediment load in the Mississippi is so great that the Corps has had to build weirs along its length to interrupt the transport of soil before it moves to the lower reaches of the river. Some 341,828,000 tons of such soil per year are caught by 362 dams of greater than 75,000 acre-feet of design capacity. The cost of removing this sediment ranges from $1 to $3 per ton per year.

The above figures do not include the costs of dredging the upstream areas of the Mississippi, its tributaries and associated ports; or of cleaning up commercial fisheries, recreation areas, flood control dams; or of building structures for sediment control.

Finally, there are many communities which must remove sediment from water before they can use it for drinking and other community services. This is a critical activity because the fine particles which are removed carry the chemical elements that are hazardous to human health. The city of St. Louis spends $5 to $6 million annually to precipitate soil sediment from Mississippi River water. Virtually all of this cleanup must be done in the spring when snowmelt and rainfall start to move soil that has been destabilized by agricultural cultivation.

These costs are avoidable. The conservation reserve that we propose will reduce soil erosion on that fast eroding protion of our cropland and thereby make unnecessary much of the recurrent annual expenditure for water cleanup activities. I urge you to approve this section without change so that we may break this vicious cycle of erosion, sedimentation, and cleanup.

The conservation reserve will cost us money, it is true. Its costs, however, will be more than offset by the savings generated by a reduced level of expenditure for the water cleanup activities enumerated above and by a reduction in the rate at which our farmland's productivity is lost.

Let me now turn to the sodbuster provisions of this bill. The term "sodbuster," of course, describes the practice by which farmers break out highly erodible soils that have been previously protected from erosion by their grass or forest cover. Sodbusting is primarily to blame for the fact that only 5 percent of our Nation's cropland today yields 43 percent of our total soil loss. The fact is that most of this 5 percent should never have been plowed up in the first place. Yet it was, largely because Federal farm program benefits encouraged farmers to cultivate this fragile land.

If we are to minimize further sodbusting and the need for costly water cleanup and conservation programs, we must do our utmost to insure that no more highly erodible land is brought into production. To accomplish this, we must reorient our Federal farm programs so that they no longer encourage the annual cultivation of these fragile soils.

The sodbuster provisions of H.R. 3457 will deny to farmers who persist in breaking out highly erodible soils the price supports, crop insurance, FmHA loans and disaster payments that shift much of the financial risk of farming such soils to the Federal Government. The sodbuster provisions will not deny the farmer the right to farm highly erodible soils. It will simply deny him the taxpayers' help in doing so unless he agrees to farm them in such a way that will not create unacceptable soil losses.

There are some who feel that these sodbuster provisions are too tough. By contrast, they would only restrict the denial of farm program benefits to the particular produce grown on the newly broken out, highly erodible land. All other crops grown by that farmer on other lands would continue to be eligible.

This makes no sense. For years we have been passing legislation to control soil erosion. Little of it has reached to the core of the problem as does this bill. If we weaken the sodbuster provisions, we will be saying to those who farm highly erodible land, we only partially want to discourage your unwise actions. Preserving the committee's language firmly says, if in the future you farm highly erodible land carelessly, you will farm without the Government's financial assistance. If you wish to benefit from that assistance, you simply must keep your soil loss to an acceptable level: The choice is yours.

Some would also limit the kinds of land that would be restricted by sodbuster. This makes even less sense than the previous suggestion. Land is classified by USDA according to its capability to grow crops. Classes 1 and 2 are generally considered to be relatively stable and not highly erodible.

Classes 3 through 8, however, have limitations which make farming them problematic. Soil loss is largely a function of slope—anything with greater than a 15 percent slope is highly erodible if not farmed carefully. The SCS designates such soils with a small letter "e" suffix. Classes 3e, 4e, and 6e are thus highly erodible, as are all soils in classes 7 and 8. Four of these classes are enumerated in this bill.

Class 3e, however, is not enumerated in the bill but is otherwise described. It is not enumerated because the Committee felt that a broader description than that which the capability classification system ascribes to 3e land would give the Secretary needed flexibility in classifying these traditional soils. Although this is a class of soils that are too steep to be farmed safely without attention to soil conserving practices, some have suggested eliminating it. Like the earlier proposal to limit the scope of the sodbuster restrictions, one must ask, why? We are trying to prevent further degradation of our soil and water resources without the expenditure of Federal tax dollars. Soil Conservation Service statistics clearly prove that 3e soils are by far the most vulnerable to sodbusting in the future. The following table indicates why.

	Million acres—	
	Now cropped	Not yet cropped
Category:		
3e	83	100
4e	32	89
6e	10	157
7	2.8	270
8	.037	6

From the fact that far more 3e land is now being farmed than all other highly erodible categories combined, one can see that farmers clearly prefer it. Second, farmers now till almost 1 acre of 3e soil for every acre not yet broken out, while they only till about 1 acre of 4e, the "next best," for every 3 acres not yet out tilled. Remember that as you move from 3e through 4e, 6e and 7 to 8, the difficulty and ex-

pense of farming grow considerably. The "best" highly erodible soil, therefore, is 3e, and there are still some 100 million acres that can be broken out. Ease of farming dictates that this land will be broken out first and that, therefore, this class is at greatest risk. We cannot let this land slip through our fingers. If we do, we will pay for its erosion through the costs of controlling it and cleaning up the water that it pollutes, or through the costs of putting it into some future conservation reserve.

I want to remind those who worry that this may inconvenience some farmers that governmental cost sharing money through the A.C.P. program will be available to help those farmers install the necessary conservation practices. The farmer will therefore not be left on his own by this legislation. He will not in any way, shape or form be denied the use of his land or absolute control over it. If he, however, wishes to receive Federal farm program benefits to minimize his own financial risk of farming marginal land, he will have to follow accepted conservation practices in order to control soil erosion. As I noted, the Government will even pay a goodly share of the cost of doing that. Ironically, this bill will even make him a better farmer. By installing these conservation practices, his topsoil will be conserved. The chance of crop loss due to drought and flash flooding will be reduced. The cost of fertilization will also be reduced because soil nutrients will not be washed away.

For years we have struggled with soil erosion. We have spent billions of dollars stabilizing land and purifying water. Most of these actions have been either after the fact or piecemeal. This legislation offers us the first comprehensive attack on the root of the problem—highly erodible soils already being farmed and highly erodible soils in danger of being farmed. I urge you to approve this legislation without change.

CONCENTRATION OF SOIL EROSION IN SELECTED STATES IN 1977 FOR MOST ERODIBLE AGRICULTURAL LANDS [1]

State	Millions of acres	Percent of State total	Millions of tons	Percent of State total	Average rate (tons per acre year)
Illinois	1.7	6	76	41	45
Iowa	3.5	11	148	53	42
Kansas [2]	6.2	13	137	53	22
Missouri	3.1	8	131	53	42
New Mexico [2]	5.0	10	234	60	12
Oklahoma [2]	2.6	6	55	42	21
Oregon [2]	1.4	5	10	26	7
South Carolina	.6	4	8	45	15
South Dakota [2]	2.3	6	49	39	21
Tennessee	1.2	5	55	55	48
Texas [2]	15.1	10	794	68	53
Vermont	.3	5	3	56	9
Washington	1.1	4	25	44	24
Wisconsin	.8	3	25	39	31

[1] Includes cropland, pastureland, rangeland, and forestland.
[2] Includes wind erosion.
Source: Soil Conservation Service/USDA, 1977 National Resoruce Inventory.

I again commend the chairman, ranking member of the subcommittee and the chairman and ranking member of the full committee for this fine piece of legislation.

I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed several typographical errors that occurred in the printing of the bill, H.R. 3457 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

I understand that these errors will be corrected in the printing of the bill as passed by the House. For the information of the Members, I wish to provide a list of the corrections that need to be made.

The list is as follows:

Page 2, line 17, and page 3, line 1-3, insert quotation remarks around the words "conservation districts," "soil conservation districts," "soil and water conservation districts," "resource conservation districts," "natural resource districts," and "land conservation committees,".

Page 3, line 24, strike out the period and insert thereof a semi-colon.

Page 6, line 2, strike out "where" and insert in lieu thereof "were".

Page 11, line 3, strike out "detemines" and insert in lieu thereof "determines".

Page 13, line 23, strike out "of" and insert in lieu thereof "for".

Page 15, line 9, strike out the comma.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation. There is one aspect that I am happy to see now reported in the bill that has been corrected, that was brought up by the gentleman from Iowa, and when the legislation was brought up in the committee.

That is the question where you have highly erodible land and other land not highly erodible contained in the same field. And even though the highly erodible land may be predominant in that one field, yet unless the highly erodible land is broken out, the other land which is not highly erodible will still remain eligible for crop programs and the land that is not highly erodible can be broken out and the crop grown thereon is eligible for crop programs.

As I understand the bill before the House, if I have a 100-acre field and part of it is flat and not highly erodible and a hilly part also, and 60 percent of it is very highly erodible and the other 40 percent is not; that I go in there and break out the 40 percent in that one field which is not highly erodible, yet I can still put a corn crop on it and I will still be eligible for program payments and could sign up on that corn.

I am pleased to see that, because otherwise we would be penalizing persons, requiring them to go in and fence off and divide a field to be able to do the very same thing.

As I understand the legislation now, unless the highly erodible land is actually broken out in a field in which highly erodible land is predominant, then the prohibitions against program participation do not apply and I think that the legislation has been improved by this and I wish to commend the gentleman from Tennessee also and also the gentleman from Missouri for this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1550

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III

CROPLAND BASE PROTECTION STUDY

SEC. 301. On or before February 15, 1985, the Secretary shall submit to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report containing a detailed study and analysis, including legislative recommendations where appropriate, of various voluntary set-aside programs, including those recommended by farm or conservation groups. Such study shall include an analysis of a program under which persons who set aside cropland to approved perennial grasses or legumes as part of a crop rotation pattern to reduce soil erosion or build soil productivity (1) may qualify under future commodity stabilization programs to have such lands designated as cropland in rotation for the purpose of establishing a normal acreage base for the farm, or (2) may designate such cropland as set-aside or conserving-use acreage under such programs. Such study shall also include an analysis of the impact of any voluntary set-aside program on water quality.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STANGELAND

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STANGELAND: Page 8, immediately after line 2, insert the following new section:

ANALYSIS OF USDA CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 302. The Secretary shall conduct an economic study of the costs and benefits of all current soil conservation programs, including research and extension efforts. This study shall be led by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Agencies responsible for administering USDA's soil conservation programs will be responsible for providing necessary data and assistance as required to complete the study.

The study will emphasize an economic analysis of current USDA soil conservation programs. The cost-benefit, both direct and indirect, analyses of these programs should be measured and compared to a situation in which no such programs were in effect. The benefits measured should include, but not necessarily be limited to, increases in, or maintenance of, onsite program benefits,

such as topsoil maintenance and soil productivity, and offsite program benefits, such as improved water quality and reduced dredging. Program costs should include, but not necessarily be limited to, state and local matching funds and direct or indirect costs imposed on those outside federal, state and local governments, who assist with, or take part in, USDA conservation programs.

The Secretary shall submit to the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the results of this study within nine months after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. STANGELAND (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I am introducing an amendment to H.R. 3457 that will require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an economic analysis of all current USDA soil conservation programs, including research and extension efforts. Close to $1 billion is projected to be spent on these programs in fiscal year 1984 on top of the billions of dollars that have already been spent by USDA for soil conservation during the past half-century. Nevertheless, I am yet to see a comprehensive and systematic report that summarizes the costs and benefits of these programs in a straightforward manner. I do not think it is too much to ask for such a study in view of the additional proposed spending for soil conservation in the bill we are now considering. All I want to find out is which of the current programs are the most effective. In other words, to maximize the soil saved from these programs we must have this information.

I am proposing that the Economic Research Service (ERS) of USDA undertake this economic study. The study will be due in 9 months so the results can be made available for deliberations on the 1985 farm bill.

The study will examine such benefits as increased or maintained agricultural productivity as well as offsite benefits, including water quality enhancement and reduced dredging costs on our waterways. Costs addressed will not only include Government program costs (Federal, State and local), but also the costs imposed on farmers and others who assist with or participate in USDA's soil conservation programs. I look forward to seeing the results of such a study. Financial resources are scarce in the Federal Government, and it is only commonsense to evaluate the soil conservation programs already on the books if we are going to add new ones.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANGELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this amendment. I think that both sides here agree that this amendment is worthy and that we should go forward with it. This is appropriately designated in the bill in the proper place because it follows a study that we are going to also conduct.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANGELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly join the chairman in supporting this amendment. I would like to say that the gentleman from Minnnesota is a very hard-working member of our committee and this is an example of his contributions.

I certainly would accept the amendment.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee chairman and I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STANGELAND).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman—

Where soil is lost, civilization often goes with it. Today, soil is as essential for the production of food and fiber as it was during the Neolithic. The decline of our soil is not easily perceived. It is a chronic, slow process without the urgency of an environmental crisis. Yet, soil is the basis for our very existence; it enables us to live off the rocks on their way to the sea.—Dr. Priscilla Grew, Director of the California Department of Conservation.

Today we confront a potential crisis which if unchecked could impact us as dramatically and more severely than the oil crisis of the 1970's.

Just as countries everywhere became dependent on OPEC oil in the 1970's, so they now depend on North America for grain. And just as Middle Eastern oil is being depleted, so too are North American soils. But here the similarity ends, for where substitutes can be developed for oil to run our cars and heat our homes, there is no ready alternative to soil in food production.

Our Nation's most precious natural resource, its once plentiful supply of farmland, is being washed away by rain, blown away by wind and raped by poor farming practices.

Soil erosion may be the most pervasive and persistent environmental problem in the United States and yet it is so gradual, so subtle a process that it has not been viewed as a crisis. Annually erosion is costing the nation about 6.5 billion tons of soil according to USDA estimates.

Annual erosion on Ohio farmland totals more than 68 million tons of soil, about 72 percent of which is on cropland.

Since the Dust Bowl in the 1930's when huge clouds of top soil blew across the country and were washed away in the Atlantic Ocean, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has made reducing erosion a prime objective. Yet, despite over 50 years of Federal technical and financial assistance, soil erosion continues to be a serious national problem.

In 1935 agents of the newly created Soil Conservation Service went across the country teaching farmers how to save their land, millions of dollars were spent building terraces, planting trees as wind breaks, trying new methods of strip-cropping and crop rotation. The experiment worked, erosion slowed and America's farmlands became productive once more.

As we enter the 1980's, however, we face a worldwide shortage of productive cropland and a growing global demand for food products. This demand for increased agricultural production and the opening of giant foreign markets for American grains and beans in the 1970's brought about dramatic changes in agriculture which substantially accelerated the pace of erosion.

In the early 1970's the Department of Agriculture stopped paying farmers to keep land idle and told them to plant fencepost to fencepost to increase production. More than willing to share in the new export boom, farmers began plowing under pasture and grazing lands, some never before touched and previously thought too fragile or not fertile enough. Frequently this was marginal, easily eroded land such as hillsides or sloping fields.

Basic conservation measures were abandoned. In some places, the rows of trees and hedges orginally planted as erosion-controlling windbreaks got in the way of large modern farm equipment and were removed. The availability of cheap nitrogen ferlitizer led farmers to abandon traditional crop rotations for continuous planting of corn and other row crops.

Since the Soviet entry into the U.S. market in 1972, American overseas sales have increased dramatically. About 1 of every 3 acres now produces food for export, bringing home more than $40 billion, and representing one of the few bright spots in our balance of trade picture.

While world food output has more than doubled since 1950, that impressive increase has entailed land abuse so severe that at least one-fifth and up to one-third of the world's cropland is

losing topsoil at a rate that is undermining its long-term productivity. Nearly one-third of Ohio's cropland is eroding at a rate that will hurt long-term productivity and has recently been termed "intolerable" by State conservationists.

In 1981 the Department of Agriculture estimated that the productivity of 34 percent of U.S. cropland was declining because of excessive loss of top soil. It is estimated that the productivity capability of 1 to 1.5 million acres of farm land is lost annually because of erosion. That is an area six times the size of Chicago.

Further, soil erosion is a widespread global phenomenon and a problem which few countries have been able to address effectively. A 1977 U.N. survey reported that almost one-fifth of the world's cropland is now being steadily degraded.

Soil in other countries such as the Soviet Union, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Ethiopia are so badly deteriorated that even more pressure is placed on U.S. soils, as North America is increasingly looked upon as the bread basket of the world. As John Timmons, an economics professor who specializes in natural resources issues at Iowa State University puts it, "in effect, we are exporting our soil and water quality in the form of food and feed grains."

Domestically, food prices are rising, and a 1981 national agricultural lands study reported that consumers could experience a 6- to 8-percent increase in food prices for every million acres of agricultural land lost. While our ability to continue to feed our own people in the forseeable future is not in serious question, our ability to continue to export our agricultural products looms as a large question mark. This comes at a time when forecasts for foreign demand and supply suggest that the 1980's could be a period of near-record growth in demand, slower growth in production and increased world dependence on agricultural commodities from the United States.

Despite the Department of Agriculture's recognition that soil erosion is its highest conservation priority, a recent GAO report found that the problem is becoming more serious and USDA programs are not keeping pace with the problem.

The situation is further exaccerbated by the fact that adopting erosion control practices is, in most cases, not cost-effective for the farmer. Detailed studies on the economics of soil conservation do indicate that short-term costs of conservation measures often exceed short-term benefits.

The alternative, however is to face long-term food scarcity as we consume the productive resource bases itself, engaging in what Lester Brown, head of Worldwatch Institute, terms "the biological equivalent of deficit financing." If the costs are too high today, the price to future generations may be even greater, as the worlds supply of land and food produced on it continue to diminish.

This week we have before us a bill which, though it will not stop erosion, will initiate measures to slow the rate of future conversion of fragile lands.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1984 would make farmers planting on highly erodible land—sodbusters—ineligible for Federal price-support or commodity payments, farm storage loans, Federal crop insurance, disaster payments, and any Farmers Home Administration insured or guaranteed loans.

The bill would also establish a conservation reserve program enabling the Department of Agriculture to contract with owners of erosion-prone cropland to preserve and improve farm soil and water resources.

As I said, this bill will not eliminate erosion, but it is a move to address the critical problem of soil erosion and a step that must be taken.

While both economic and political pressures can foster a short-term approach, pressures to wring too much from the land in the short run can destroy it over the long run.

As Lester Brown said, "We have not inherited the Earth from our fathers, we are borrowing it from our children." We have an obligation to protect their heritage.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

SEC. 401. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall formulate and carry out a program with owners and operators of erosion-prone cropland to assist them in conserving and improving the soil and water resources of their farms or ranches. In any such program, the Secretary shall include other than erosion-prone cropland upon a demonstration by the conservation district that a serious soil erosion problem exists on such land, or in an area not within a conservation district if the Secretary determines that such a serious soil erosion problem exists.

CONTRACTS

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary shall enter into contracts during the period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1987, of not less than seven nor more than fifteen years for the purpose of carrying out this title. In such contract, the owner or operator shall agree to—

(1) effectuate during the agreement period a plan approved by a conservation district (or in an area not within a conservation district, a plan approved by the Secretary) for converting erosion-prone cropland normally devoted to the production of an agricultural commodity on a farm or ranch into a less intensive use, such as pasture, permanent grass or legumes, or trees substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein, except to the extent that any requirements thereof are waived or modified by the Secretary;

(2) forfeit all rights to further payments under the contract and refund to the United States all payments, with interest, received thereunder upon the violation of the contract at any stage during the time the owner or operator has control of the land if the Secretary, after considering the recommendations of the soil conservation district and the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if the Secretary determines that the violation by the owner or operator does not warrant termination of the contract;

(3) upon transfer of the owner or operator's right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period, forfeit all rights to further payments under the contract and refund to the United States all payments received thereunder, or accept such payment adjustments or make such refunds as the Secretary may deem appropriate and consistent with the objectives of this title, unless the transferee of any such land agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations under the contract;

(4) not conduct any harvesting or grazing of otherwise make commercial use of the forage or trees on land that is subject to the contract unless it is expressly permitted in the contract, or adopt any practice specified in the contract by the Secretary as a practice that would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract; and

(5) such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and are included in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration thereof.

(b) The plan, as described in subsection (a)(1), for converting erosion-prone cropland normally devoted to the production of agricultural commodities on a farm or ranch into a less-intensive use shall set forth the conservation measures and practices to be installed by the owner or operator during the agreement period and the commercial use, if any, to be made of the land during such period and may provide for the permanent retirement of cropland base and allotment history for such land.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 403. In return for such agreement by the owner or operator, the Secretary shall agree to (1) provide technical assistance, (2) share the cost of carrying out the conservation measures and practices set forth in the contract for which the Secretary determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest, and (3) pay an annual land rental fee, for a period not in excess of the duration of the contract, on those acres of erosion-prone cropland that are placed in a conservation use and for any cropland base and allotment history that the owner or operator agrees to retire permanently.

COST-SHARING

SEC. 404. The Secretary shall base the amount of cost sharing for conservation measures and practices under this title on that part of the total cost thereof that the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the installation and maintenance of the conservation plantings and practices for the normally expected life of such a planting or practice.

LAND RENTAL

SEC. 405. The Secretary shall determine on the basis of bids received from owners and operators the amount of land rental to be paid for converting erosion-prone cropland to less intensive uses and for any cropland base or allotment history that the owner or operator agrees to retire permanently. In awarding contracts the Secretary shall give priority to those bids that will result in the lowest cost to the Government when calculated on the basis of all relevant factors, including the following—

(1) tons of soil saved on the diverted land, as calculated by the difference between the estimated soil loss on the precontract cropping system employed by the owner or operator and the system that will be installed as a result of the contract;

(2) the acres per year of erosion-prone cropland diverted;

(3) the units of agricultural commodity that would be diverted from production under the terms of the contract;

(4) the number of acres of cropland base and allotment history that the owner or operator agree to retire permanently as a condition of the contract; and

(5) the value of the cost sharing to be provided for installation of conservation measures and practices.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, payments under this title shall be made in cash or in commodities in such amount and on such time schedule as agreed upon and specified in the contract. Such payments may be made in advance of determination of performance.

(b) If a producer who is entitled to any such payment or compensation dies, becomes incompetent, or disappears before receiving such payment or compensation, or is succeeded by another who renders or completes the required performance, the Secretary shall make or provide such payment or compensation, in accordance with regulations and without regard to any other provisions of law, in such manner as the Secretary determines to be fair and reasonable in light of all of the circumstances.

(c) In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary may not enter into contracts with producers that would require payments to producers under this title in excess of $50,000,000 for contracts entered into during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, in excess of $75,000,000 for contracts entered into during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and in excess of $100,000,000 for contracts entered into during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987. The Secretary may enter into contracts in any fiscal year that require payments to producers only to such extent or in such amounts as provided in appropriation Acts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 407. (a) The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision of sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments under the program.

(b) The Secretary may terminate any contract by mutual agreement with the owner or operator if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification or contracts as the Secretary may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this title or facilitate its administration.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of title II of this Act, the Secretary shall provide by appropriate regulations for preservation of cropland base and allotment history, applicable to acreage diverted from the production of crops under this title, for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for participation in such program or for an allotment or other limitation in such program, unless the owner or operator agrees under the contract to retire permanently such cropland base and allotment history.

(d) In carrying out this title, the Secretary may utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, except that the Secretary may not use funds of the Corporation to carry out this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out this title.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 408. Effective during the period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1987, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for the administration of this title, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for its costs to be incurred under this title.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary shall, within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register such regulations, as the Secretary determines desirable to implement this Act. In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall use the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

APPEAL PROCEDURES

SEC. 502. The Secretary shall establish, by regulation, an appeal procedure under which a person who is adversely affected by any determination made under this Act may seek review of such determination.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 503. The authority provided by this Act shall be in addition to and not in place of other authorities available to the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation for carrying out soil and water conservation programs.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984 and commend Chairman DE LA GARZA, Subcommittee Chairman JONES and Ranking Member Mr. COLEMAN for presenting this Congress with a piece of conservation legislation.

As a cosponsor of the original sodbuster bill, I am pleased to note that its provisions have been included as part of H.R. 3457.

Of course, no piece of legislation is perfect and I have some concerns about some of the details of this bill, but on the whole, I think producers are ready for some conservation legislation with teeth.

It is important to keep in mind that no matter how beneficial this bill might be, farmers and ranchers would be doing more of their own conservation work if incomes were better.

Second, we need to look at the Tax Code and price support programs to see what incentives they are giving nonfarm investors to crop marginal ground.

However, this bill is an important step forward and should raise the national, consciousness about the need for conservation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore Mr. SMITH of Iowa having assumed the chair, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land from wind and water erosion, to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands from cultivation, pursuant to House Resolution 493, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote soil conservation in the United States.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the pending business is the question on the motion to suspend the rules and the question on agreeing to the conference report on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5121, by the yeas and nays; and the conference report on S. 1129, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote, if ordered.

VIRGINIA NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5121, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5121, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 20, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—376

Ackerman	Brown (CA)	Dickinson
Addabbo	Brown (CO)	Dicks
Akaka	Broyhill	Dingell
Albosta	Bryant	Dixon
Alexander	Burton (CA)	Donnelly
Anderson	Burton (IN)	Dorgan
Andrews (TX)	Byron	Dowdy
Annunzio	Campbell	Downey
Anthony	Carney	Dreier
Applegate	Carper	Duncan
Archer	Carr	Durbin
Aspin	Chandler	Dwyer
AuCoin	Chappell	Dymally
Badham	Chappie	Dyson
Barnard	Cheney	Early
Barnes	Clarke	Eckart
Bartlett	Clay	Edgar
Bateman	Clinger	Edwards (AL)
Bates	Coats	Edwards (CA)
Bedell	Coelho	Edwards (OK)
Beilenson	Coleman (MO)	English
Bennett	Coleman (TX)	Erdreich
Bereuter	Collins	Evans (IA)
Berman	Conable	Evans (IL)
Bethune	Conte	Fascell
Bevill	Conyers	Fazio
Biaggi	Cooper	Feighan
Bilirakis	Corcoran	Fiedler
Boehlert	Coughlin	Fish
Boggs	Courter	Flippo
Boland	Coyne	Florio
Boner	Craig	Foglietta
Bonior	Crockett	Foley
Bonker	Dannemeyer	Ford (MI)
Borski	Darden	Ford (TN)
Bosco	Daschle	Frank
Boucher	Daub	Franklin
Boxer	Davis	Frenzel
Breaux	de la Garza	Frost
Britt	Dellums	Fuqua
Brooks	Derrick	Gaydos
Broomfield	DeWine	Gejdenson
Gekas	Marriott	Russo
Gephardt	Martin (IL)	Sabo
Gibbons	Martin (NY)	Sawyer
Gilman	Martinez	Schaefer
Gingrich	Matsui	Scheuer
Glickman	Mavroules	Schneider
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Schroeder
Goodling	McCain	Schulze
Gore	McCandless	Schumer
Gradison	McCloskey	Seiberling
Gray	McCollum	Sensenbrenner
Green	McCurdy	Sharp
Gregg	McDade	Shaw
Guarini	McEwen	Shelby
Gunderson	McGrath	Shumway
Hall, Ralph	McHugh	Sikorski
Hall, Sam	McKernan	Siljander
Hamilton	McKinney	Simon
Hammerschmidt	McNulty	Sisisky
Harkin	Mica	Skeen
Hatcher	Michel	Skelton
Hayes	Miller (CA)	Slattery
Hefner	Miller (OH)	Smith (FL)
Heftel	Mineta	Smith (IA)
Hertel	Minish	Smith (NE)
Hightower	Mitchell	Smith (NJ)
Hiler	Moakley	Smith, Robert
Hillis	Molinari	Snowe
Holt	Mollohan	Snyder
Howard	Montgomery	Solarz
Hoyer	Moody	Solomon
Huckaby	Moore	Spence
Hughes	Moorhead	Spratt
Hunter	Morrison (CT)	St Germain
Hutto	Morrison (WA)	Staggers
Hyde	Mrazek	Stangeland
Ireland	Murphy	Stark
Jacobs	Murtha	Stokes
Jeffords	Myers	Stratton
Johnson	Natcher	Sundquist
Jones (OK)	Nelson	Synar
Jones (TN)	Nichols	Tauke
Kasich	Nielson	Tauzin
Kastenmeier	Nowak	Taylor
Kemp	O'Brien	Thomas (CA)
Kennelly	Oakar	Thomas (GA)
Kildee	Oberstar	Torres
Kindness	Obey	Torricelli
Kleczka	Olin	Towns
Kogovsek	Ortiz	Traxler
Kolter	Owens	Udall
Kostmayer	Packard	Vandergriff
LaFalce	Panetta	Vento
Lagomarsino	Pashayan	Volkmer
Lantos	Patterson	Vucanovich
Latta	Pease	Walgren
Leach	Penny	Walker
Lehman (CA)	Pepper	Watkins
Lehman (FL)	Perkins	Waxman
Leland	Petri	Weaver
Lent	Pickle	Weber
Levin	Porter	Weiss
Levine	Price	Wheat
Levitas	Pritchard	Whitehurst
Lewis (CA)	Pursell	Whitley
Lewis (FL)	Quillen	Whittaker
Lipinski	Rangel	Whitten
Livingston	Ratchford	Williams (MT)
Lloyd	Ray	Wilson
Loeffler	Regula	Winn
Long (LA)	Reid	Wirth
Long (MD)	Richardson	Wise
Lott	Ridge	Wolf
Lowery (CA)	Rinaldo	Wolpe
Lowry (WA)	Ritter	Wortley
Lujan	Roberts	Wright
Luken	Rodino	Wyden
Lundine	Roe	Wylie
Lungren	Roemer	Yates
Mack	Rostenkowski	Yatron
MacKay	Roth	Young (MO)
Madigan	Roukema	Zschau
Markey	Rowland	
Marlenee	Roybal	

NAYS—20

Bliley	Hubbard	Shuster
Crane, Daniel	Leath	Smith, Denny
Crane, Philip	Parris	Stenholm
Daniel	Patman	Stump
Emerson	Paul	Tallon
Hartnett	Robinson	Young (AK)
Horton	Rudd	

NOT VOTING—37

Andrews (NC)	Harrison	Rahall
D'Amours	Hawkins	Rogers
Erlenborn	Hopkins	Rose
Ferraro	Jenkins	Savage
Fields	Jones (NC)	Shannon
Fowler	Kaptur	Studds
Garcia	Kazen	Swift
Gramm	Kramer	Valentine
Hall (IN)	Martin (NC)	Vander Jagt
Hall (OH)	Mikulski	Williams (OH)
Hance	Neal	Young (FL)
Hansen (ID)	Ottinger	
Hansen (UT)	Oxley	

□ 1610

Mr. EMERSON and Mr. SHUSTER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1620

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the adoption of the conference report on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1129, DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the Senate bill, S. 1129.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 369, noes 25, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

AYES—369

Ackerman	Aspin	Bethune
Addabbo	Barnard	Bevill
Akaka	Barnes	Biaggi
Albosta	Bateman	Bilirakis
Alexander	Bates	Bliley
Anderson	Bedell	Boehlert
Andrews (TX)	Beilenson	Boggs
Annunzio	Bennett	Boland
Anthony	Bereuter	Boner
Applegate	Berman	Bonior

Bonker	Goodling	Miller (OH)
Borski	Gore	Mineta
Bosco	Gradison	Minish
Boucher	Gray	Mitchell
Boxer	Green	Moakley
Breaux	Gregg	Molinari
Britt	Guarini	Mollohan
Brooks	Gunderson	Montgomery
Broomfield	Hall, Ralph	Moody
Brown (CA)	Hall, Sam	Moore
Brown (CO)	Hamilton	Moorhead
Broyhill	Hammerschmidt	Morrison (CT)
Bryant	Harkin	Morrison (WA)
Burton (CA)	Hatcher	Mrazek
Byron	Hayes	Murphy
Campbell	Hefner	Murtha
Carney	Heftel	Myers
Carper	Hertel	Natcher
Carr	Hightower	Nelson
Chandler	Hiler	Nichols
Chappell	Hillis	Nowak
Chappie	Holt	O'Brien
Clarke	Horton	Oakar
Clay	Howard	Oberstar
Clinger	Hoyer	Obey
Coats	Hubbard	Olin
Coelho	Huckaby	Ortiz
Coleman (MO)	Hughes	Owens
Coleman (TX)	Hunter	Packard
Collins	Hutto	Panetta
Conable	Hyde	Parris
Conte	Ireland	Pashayan
Conyers	Jacobs	Patman
Cooper	Jeffords	Patterson
Corcoran	Johnson	Pease
Coughlin	Jones (OK)	Penny
Courter	Jones (TN)	Pepper
Coyne	Kasich	Perkins
Crockett	Kastenmeier	Petri
Daniel	Kemp	Pickle
Darden	Kennelly	Porter
Daschle	Kildee	Price
Daub	Kindness	Pritchard
Davis	Kleczka	Pursell
de la Garza	Kogovsek	Quillen
Dellums	Kolter	Rangel
Derrick	Kostmayer	Ratchford
DeWine	LaFalce	Ray
Dickinson	Lagomarsino	Regula
Dicks	Lantos	Reid
Dingell	Leach	Richardson
Dixon	Leath	Ridge
Donnelly	Lehman (CA)	Rinaldo
Dorgan	Lehman (FL)	Ritter
Dowdy	Leland	Roberts
Downey	Lent	Robinson
Duncan	Levin	Rodino
Durbin	Levine	Roe
Dwyer	Levitas	Roemer
Dyson	Lewis (CA)	Rostenkowski
Early	Lewis (FL)	Roth
Eckart	Lipinski	Roukema
Edgar	Lloyd	Rowland
Edwards (AL)	Long (LA)	Roybal
Edwards (CA)	Long (MD)	Russo
Edwards (OK)	Lott	Sabo
Emerson	Lowery (CA)	Sawyer
English	Lowry (WA)	Schaefer
Erdreich	Luken	Scheuer
Evans (IA)	Lundine	Schneider
Evans (IL)	Mack	Schroeder
Fascell	MacKay	Schulze
Fazio	Madigan	Schumer
Feighan	Markey	Seiberling
Ferraro	Marlenee	Sensenbrenner
Fiedler	Marriott	Sharp
Fish	Martin (IL)	Shaw
Flippo	Martin (NY)	Shelby
Florio	Martinez	Shuster
Foglietta	Matsui	Sikorski
Foley	Mavroules	Siljander
Ford (MI)	Mazzoli	Simon
Ford (TN)	McCain	Sisisky
Frank	McCandless	Skeen
Franklin	McCloskey	Skelton
Frost	McCollum	Slattery
Fuqua	McCurdy	Smith (FL)
Gaydos	McDade	Smith (IA)
Gejdenson	McEwen	Smith (NE)
Gekas	McGrath	Smith (NJ)
Gephardt	McHugh	Smith, Robert
Gibbons	McKernan	Snowe
Gilman	McKinney	Snyder
Gingrich	McNulty	Solarz
Glickman	Mica	Solomon
Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Spence
Spratt	Towns	Whittaker
St Germain	Traxler	Whitten
Staggers	Udall	Williams (MT)
Stangeland	Vandergriff	Wilson
Stark	Vento	Winn
Stenholm	Volkmer	Wirth
Stokes	Vucanovich	Wise
Stratton	Walgren	Wolf
Sundquist	Walker	Wolpe
Synar	Watkins	Wortley
Tallon	Waxman	Wright
Tauke	Weaver	Wyden
Tauzin	Weber	Wylie
Taylor	Weiss	Yates
Thomas (GA)	Wheat	Yatron
Torres	Whitehurst	Young (AK)
Torricelli	Whitley	Young (MO)

NOES—25

Archer	Dreier	Paul
Badham	Frenzel	Rudd
Bartlett	Hartnett	Shumway
Burton (IN)	Latta	Smith, Denny
Cheney	Livingston	Stump
Craig	Loeffler	Thomas (CA)
Crane, Daniel	Lungren	Zschau
Crane, Philip	Michel	
Dannemeyer	Nielson	

NOT VOTING—39

Andrews (NC)	Hansen (UT)	Ottinger
AuCoin	Harrison	Oxley
D'Amours	Hawkins	Rahall
Dymally	Hopkins	Rogers
Erlenborn	Jenkins	Rose
Fields	Jones (NC)	Savage
Fowler	Kaptur	Shannon
Garcia	Kazen	Studds
Gramm	Kramer	Swift
Hall (IN)	Lujan	Valentine
Hall (OH)	Martin (NC)	Vander Jagt
Hance	Mikulski	Williams (OH)
Hansen (ID)	Neal	Young (FL)

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 663) to make persons who produce agricultural commodities on highly erodible land ineligible for certain agricultural-related programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Highly Erodible Land Conservation Act of 1983".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "agricultural commodity" means any agricultural product planted and produced by annual tilling of the soil, including one-trip planters;

(2) the term "highly erodible land" means land classified by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture as class IVe, VIe, VII, or VIII land under the land capability classification systems in effect on the date of enactment of this Act. The land capability class for a field shall be that determined by the Secretary to be predominant class under regulations issued by the Secretary; and

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY

SEC. 3. Except as provided in section 4 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, following the date of enactment of this Act any person who produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land shall be ineligible, with respect to such commodity produced on such land, for—

(1) any type of price support, income assistance, or production adjustment payments for such commodity made available under the Agricultural Act of 1949, the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, or any other Act;

(2) a loan for the construction or purchase of a facility for the storage of such commodity made under section 4(h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act;

(3) crop insurance for such commodity under the Federal Crop Insurance Act;

(4) a disaster payment for such commodity made under the Agricultural Act of 1949; or

(5) a new loan made, insured, or guaranteed under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, or any other provision of law administered by the Farmers Home Administration, if the Secretary determines that such loan will be used for a purpose that will contribute to excessive erosion of highly erodible land.

EXCEPTIONS

SEC. 4. Section 3 shall not apply to—

(1) any land that was cultivated by a person to produce any of the 1973 through 1983 crops of agricultural commodities;

(2) any crop of an agricultural commodity planted by a person before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) any crop of an agricultural commodity planted by a person during any crop year beginning before the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) any loan described in section 3 made before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(5) any crop of an agricultural commodity produced using a conservation system that has been approved by soil conservation district and that is based on technical standards set forth in the Soil Conservation Service technical guide for that soil conservation district. In areas where no soil conservation district exists, the Secretary shall determine the adequacy of the conservation system to be used in the production of any agricultural commodity on highly erodible land.

USE OF AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEES IN ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. To ensure compliance with the provisions of this Act on the part of those persons particpating in the programs described in section 3, as well as fair and equitable treatment in the application of this Act, the Secretary shall use the county committees established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in the administration of this Act.

APPEAL OF LAND CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall establish, by regulation, an appeal procedure under which a person who produces an agricultural commodity on land classified as class IVe, VIe, VII, or VIII land under the land capability classification systems applicable under this Act may seek review of such classification.

COMPLETION OF SOIL SURVEYS

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, complete soil surveys on those private lands that do not have a soil survey suitable for use in determining the land capability class for purposes of this Act, and, insofar as possible, concentrate on those localities where significant amounts of highly erodible land are being converted to the production of agricultural commodities.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA moves to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 663, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 3457, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Soil Conservation Act of 1984".

TITLE I

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "agricultural commodity" means any agricultural commodity planted and produced by annual tilling of the soil, or on an annual basis by one-trip planters;

(2) the term "conservation district" means any district or unit of State or local government formed under State or territorial law for the express purpose of developing and carrying out a local soil and water conservation program. Such districts or units of State or local government may be called "conservation districts", "soil conservation districts", "soil and water conservation districts", "resource conservation districts", "natural resource districts", "land conservation committees", or a similar name;

(3) the term "erosion-prone cropland" means land that is classified by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture as class IIIe, IVe, VI, VII, or VIII land under the land capability classification system in effect on the date of enactment of this Act and that has been devoted to the production of an agricultural commodity in three out of the past five years, or any other land in a State that the Soil Conservation Service determines has an erosion rate, in the production of an agricultural commodity, that is equal to or greater than the average erosion rate in the same State on any of the foregoing classes of land;

(4) the term "field" means that term as defined in section 718.2 of title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations, except that any highly erodible land on which an agricultural commodity is produced after the date of enactment of this Act and which is not exempt under section 202 shall be considered as part of the field in which such land was included on such date of enactment;

(5) the term "highly erodible land" means land classified by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture as class IVe, VIe, VII, or VIII land under the land capability classification system in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, or any other land in a State that the Soil Conservation Service determines would have an erosion rate, if that land is used to produce an agricultural commodity, that is equal to or greater than the average erosion rate in the same State on any of the foregoing classes of land; and

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE II

PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY FOR PRODUCTION ON HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND

SEC. 201. Except as provided in sections 202 and 407(c) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, following the date of enactment of this Act any person who during any crop year produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land on a field on which such highly erodible land is the predominant class shall be ineligible, as to any commodity produced during that crop year by such person, for—

(1) any type of price support or payments made available under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.), the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714 et seq.), or any other Act;

(2) a farm storage facility loan under section 4 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714b(h));

(3) crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.);

(4) a disaster payment under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.); or

(5) a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) or any other provision of law administered by the Farmers Home Administration, if the Secretary determines that such loan will be used for a purpose that will contribute to excessive erosion on such field.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 202. (a) Section 201 shall not apply to any person who, during any crop year, produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land on a field on which such highly erodible land is the predominant class if all the commodities so produced by such person during that crop year were—

(1) produced on any land that was cultivated to produce any of the 1973 through 1984 crops of agricultural commodities;

(2) planted before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) planted during any crop year beginning before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(4) produced (A) in an area within a conservation district under a conservation system that has been approved by a conservation district after it has been determined that the conservation system is in conformity with technical standards set forth in the Soil Conservation Service technical guide for that conservation district, or (B) in an area, not within a conservation district, under a conservation system determined by the Secretary to be adequate for the production of such agricultural commodity on highly erodible land.

(b) Section 201 shall not apply to any highly erodible land during any crop year if such land was planted in reliance on the determination by the Soil Conservation Service that such land was not highly erodible land. The exemption allowed by the subsection shall not apply to any crop which was planted on any land after the Soil Conservation Service determines such land to be highly erodible land.

(c) Section 201 shall not apply to any loan made before the date of enactment of this Act.

COMPLETION OF LAND CAPABILITY CLASSIFICATION SURVEYS

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, complete soil surveys on those private lands that have not been classified as to land capability, and, insofar as possible, concentrate on those localities where significant amounts of highly erodible land are being converted to the production of agricultural commodities. In addition to other sums authorized to be appropriated by this Act, such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

TITLE III

CROPLAND BASE PROTECTION STUDY

SEC. 301. On or before February 15, 1985, the Secretary shall submit to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report containing a detailed study and analysis, including legislative recommendations where appropriate, of various voluntary set-aside programs, including those recommended by farm or conservation groups. Such study shall include an analysis of a program under which persons who set aside cropland to approved perennial grasses or legumes as part of a crop rotation pattern to reduce soil erosion or build soil productivity (1) may qualify under future commodity stabilization programs to have such lands designated as cropland in rotation for the purpose of establishing a normal acreage base for the farm, or (2) may designate such cropland as set-aside or conserving-use acreage under such programs. Such study shall also include an analysis of the impact of any voluntary set-aside program on water quality.

ANALYSIS OF USDA CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary shall conduct an economic study of the costs and benefits of all current soil conservation programs, including research and extension efforts. This study shall be led by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Agencies responsible for administering USDA's soil conservation programs will be responsible for providing necessary data and assistance as required to complete the study.

(b) The study will emphasize an economic analysis of current USDA soil conservation programs. The cost-benefit, both direct and indirect, analyses of these programs should be measured and compared to a situation in which no such programs were in effect. The benefits measured should include, but not necessarily be limited to, increases in, or maintenance of, onsite program benefits, such as topsoil maintenance and soil productivity, and offsite program benefits, such as improved water quality and reduced dredging. Program costs should include, but not necessarily be limited to, state and local matching funds and direct or indirect costs imposed on those outside federal, state and local governments, who assist with, or take part in, USDA conservation programs.

(c) The Secretary shall submit to the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the results of t..is study within nine months after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV

CONSERVATIVE RESERVE PROGRAM

SEC. 401. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall formulate and carry out a program with owners and operators of erosion-prone cropland to assist them in conserving and improving the soil and water resources of their farms or ranches. In any such program, the Secretary shall include other than erosion-prone cropland upon a demonstration by the conservation district that a serious soil erosion problem exists on such land, or in an area not within a conservation district if the Secretary determines that such a serious soil erosion problem exists.

CONTRACTS

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary shall enter into contracts during the period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1987, of not less than seven nor more than fifteen years for the purpose of carrying out this title. In such contract, the owner or operator shall agree to—

(1) effectuate during the agreement period a plan approved by a conservation district (or in an area not within a conservation district, a plan approved by the Secretary) for converting erosion-prone cropland normally devoted to the production of an agricultural commodity on a farm or ranch into a less intensive use, such as pasture, permanent grass or legumes, or trees substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein, except to the extent that any requirements thereof are waived or modified by the Secretary;

(2) forfeit all rights to further payments under the contract and refund to the United States all payments, with interest, received thereunder upon the violation of the contract at any stage during the time the owner or operator has control of the land if the Secretary, after considering the recommendations of the soil conservation district and the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if the Secretary determines that the violation by the owner or operator does not warrant termination of the contract;

(3) upon transfer of the owner or operator's right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period, forfeit all rights to further payments under the contract and refund to the United States all payments received thereunder, or accept such payment adjustments or make such refunds as the Secretary may deem appropriate and consistent with the objectives of this title, unless the transferee of any such land agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations under the contract;

(4) not conduct any harvesting or grazing or otherwise make commercial use of the forage or trees on land that is subject to the contract unless it is expressly permitted in the contract, or adopt any practice specified in the contract by the Secretary as a practice that would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract; and

(5) such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and are included in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration thereof.

(b) The plan, as described in subsection (a)(1), for converting erosion-prone cropland normally devoted to the production of agricultural commodities on a farm or ranch into a less-intensive use shall set forth the conservation measures and practices to be installed by the owner or operator during the agreement period and the commercial use, if any, to be made of the land during such period and may provide for the permanent retirement of cropland base and allotment history for such land.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 403. In return for such agreement by the owner or operator, the Secretary shall agree to (1) provide technical assistance, (2) share the cost of carrying out the conservation measures and practices set forth in the contract for which the Secretary determines that cost sharing is appropriate and in the public interest, and (3) pay an annual land rental fee, for a period not in excess of the duration of the contract, on those acres of erosion-prone cropland that are placed in a conservation use and for any cropland base and allotment history that the owner or operator agrees to retire permanently.

COST SHARING

SEC. 404. The Secretary shall base the amount of cost sharing for conservation measures and practices under this title on that part of the total cost thereof that the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the installation and maintenance of the conservation plantings and practices for the normally expected life of such a planting or practice.

LAND RENTAL

SEC. 405. The Secretary shall determine on the basis of bids received from owners and operators the amount of land rental to be paid for converting erosion-prone cropland to less intensive uses and for any cropland base or allotment history that the owner or operator agrees to retire permanently. In awarding contracts the Secretary shall give priority to those bids that will result in the lowest cost to the Government when calculated on the basis of all relevant factors, including the following—

(1) tons of soil saved on the diverted land, as calculated by the difference between the estimated soil loss on the precontract cropping system employed by the owner or operator and the system that will be installed as a result of the contract;

(2) the acres per year of erosion-prone cropland diverted;

(3) the units of agricultural commodity that would be diverted from production under the terms of the contract;

(4) the number of acres of cropland base and allotment history that the owner or operator agree to retire permanently as a condition of the contract; and

(5) the value of the cost sharing to be provided for installation of conservation measures and practices.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, payments under this title shall be made in cash or in commodities in such amount and on such time schedule as agreed upon and specified in the contract. Such payments may be made in advance of determination of performance.

(b) If a producer who is entitled to any such payment or compensation dies, becomes incompetent, or disappears before receiving such payment or compensation, or is succeeded by another who renders or completes the required performance, the Secretary shall make or provide such payment or compensation, in accordance with regulations and without regard to any other provisions of law, in such manner as the Secretary determines to be fair and reasonable in light of all of the circumstances.

(c) In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary may not enter into contracts with producers that would require payments to producers under this title in excess of $50,000,000 for contracts entered into during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, in excess of $75,000,000 for contracts entered into during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and in excess of $100,000,000 for contracts entered into during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987. The Secretary may enter into contracts in any fiscal year that require payments to producers only to such extent or in such amounts as provided in appropriation Acts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 407. (a) The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments under the program.

(b) The Secretary may terminate any contract by mutual agreement with the owner or operator if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification or contracts as the Secretary may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this title or facilitate its administration.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of title II of this Act, the Secretary shall provide by appropriate regulations for preservation of cropland base and allotment history, applicable to acreage diverted from the production of crops under this title, for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for participation in such program or for an allotment or other limitation in such program, unless the owner or operator agrees under the contract to retire permanently such cropland base and allotment history.

(d) In carrying out this title, the Secretary may utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, except that the Secretary may not use funds of the Corporation to carry out this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out this title.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 408. Effective during the period beginning October 1, 1984, and ending September 30, 1987, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for the administration of this title, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for its costs to be incurred under this title.

TITLE V

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary shall, within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register such regulations as the Secretary determines desirable to implement this Act. In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall use the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

APPEAL PROCEDURES

SEC. 502. The authority provided by this Act shall be in addition to and not in place of other authorities available to the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation

for carrying out soil and water conservation programs.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote soil conservation in the United States."

A similar House bill, H.R. 3457, was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks either on S. 663, the Senate bill just passed, or on H.R. 3457, the bill as passed earlier today by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1984

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5119.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AUCOIN) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to assume the chair temporarily.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5119) to authorize international development and security assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes, with Mr. KILDEE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

I simply want to rise in strong support of H.R. 5421.

I want to salute our chairman for bringing this bill to the floor. If anybody could bring it here, it was our chairman, and if anybody can pass it, it is our chairman. I will be supporting our chairman throughout the effort to pass this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5421, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1984.

Compared to many of the measures that we consider in this Chamber, this is a very modest bill. It authorizes only $10.5 billion—a suprisingly low amount considering that this is one of the main vehicles by which we invest in a better world. The philosophy behind this bill is that the United States is more secure in a world in which all nations are secure and at peace, and that our own people are better off in a world in which all people have hope that they can meet their basic aspirations for themselves and for their children. Despite our differences, I believe we all share that philosophy. So when all is said and done—when all the amendments have been offered and debated and voted up or down—I hope all the Members will join the chairman and me and the other members of the committee in voting for the bill.

The committee and its subcommittees have worked hard on this bill. We have produced a bill that we think our colleagues can confidently support. My own personal belief is that, while military aid is important, economic aid is more important in building a secure world. Those who believe as I do will be pleased with the results of the committee's work. While fully providing for the military security of our friends and allies, the committee has made modest cuts in the administration's military aid request in order to permit modest increases in economic aid.

We have increased funds for population assistance, in order to provide more effective assistance to those millions of parents throughout the world who want to plan the size of their families so they can live within their means. We have increased funds for education, in recognition of the fact that the future depends on the education of the world's children.

We have increased funds for international organizations and programs, because in that way our money is leveraged by being matched by other contributions in order to achieve a greater impact on the alleviation of poverty throughout the world. We have increased funds for the Peace Corps, so we can begin to build that unique organization back up to what it was in its prouder days.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, I want to inform the House of the provisions of the bill that pertain to that region. The committee has strengthened the limitations and prohibitions on arms sales to some of the hemisphere's most notorious human rights violators: Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay. The committee has also strengthened the conditions on economic and military aid to Haiti in view of that country's human rights situation.

The committee has provided increased economic assistance for three struggling Andean democracies—Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia—that have been severely affected by adverse weather conditions. We have also provided increased assistance for the islands of the eastern Caribbean in order to strengthen the ability of those democracies to resist disorder and meet the needs of their people.

The committee has established a scholarship program for economically disadvantaged students from Latin America and the Caribbean. We decided to take this good idea, which was proposed by the Kissinger Commission, and expand it to include all of Latin America and the Caribbean.

The committee adopted several measures to strengthen the independence and integrity of the Inter-American Foundation, so that that organization will be able to continue its uniquely effective support for self-help development projects in this hemisphere.

And the committee adopted language applauding Argentina for the reestablishment of democracy, and urging the President to do everything to help Argentina restructure its debt.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the committee's recommendations with respect to Central America. The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, which developed most of these recommendations, had before it the recommendations of the Kissinger Commission, on which I was privileged to serve as a senior counselor. It was my intent that the subcommittee recommendations be faithful to the recommendations of the Kissinger Commission. I believe they were, and I believe the committee bill remains faithful to those recommendations.

That is not to say that all the recommendations of the Kissinger Commission were adopted in their entirety by the committee, nor should they have been. It is not the function of Congress simply to translate the recommendations of private commissions into public policy without making any changes. Nor is it to say that the committee bill is identical to the administration's bill. It certainly is not. In fact, I would argue that our bill comes closer to the spirit of the Commission than the administration's bill does.

The Kissinger Commission found that the challenges that we face in Central America are military, econom-

ic, and political. The bill that we bring before the House today meets the challenges on all three of those fronts.

On the military front, the bill provides resources that are completely adequate to the problems that we confront. For fiscal year 1985, the bill authorizes more than a quarter of a billion dollars in military aid for Central America, which is more than twice what Congress has authorized for any preceding fiscal year. For El Salvador, the bill authorizes almost $190 million, which is again more than double what has been provided in previous fiscal years. Honduras is provided a further $41 million in 1985, which is equivalent to the administration's request for the current fiscal year, and surely sufficient for a country that is not at war and faces no viable guerrilla threat. The administration's 1984 and 1985 military aid requests for Costa Rica are fully funded by the bill, and would give that country sufficient resources to meet the threats it faces.

On the economic front, the committee bill fully funds the administration request for Central America for both fiscal years 1984 and 1985. The committee is fully cognizant of the importance of the economic dimension of Central America's problems and, in fact, has been in the forefront in trying to get the administration to pay adequate attention to this dimension. However, there is one important observation of the Kissinger Commission that the administration has chosen to ignore, and that is the impossibility of achieving economic development in the absence of a more peaceful and secure environment. Because that is so crucial, the committee chose to withhold obligation of $250 million of the authorized economic aid pending the achievement of a comprehensive peace agreement and the elaboration of a regional development plan among the countries of the region.

Mr. Chairman, there are many incentives for war in Central America, but there are few incentives for peace. This is an incentive for peace. It is an incentive for the Central American nations to work together to achieve the conditions that will make economic development possible. It is an important part of the bill, and I hope the Members will look favorably on it.

On the political front, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the most important finding of the Kissinger Commission was that violence and terror by government forces and death squads in El Salvador really do threaten our objectives in El Salvador and those of the democratic forces in that country. From that finding stemmed what I believe is the most important recommendation of the Commission, which reads as follows:

> With respect to El Salvador, military aid should, through legislation requiring periodic reports, be made contingent upon demonstrated progress toward free elections; freedom of association; the establishment of the rule of law and an effective judicial system; and the termination of the activities of the so-called death squads, as well as vigorous action against those guilty of crimes and the prosecution to the extent possible of past offenders. These conditions should be seriously enforced.

The administration bill completely ignored this recommendation. The administration's so-called conditionality language was so soft that it would have been laughed at by the Salvadorans. The committee bill contains real conditionality language, of the type envisioned by the Kissinger Commission. Specifically, the committee bill says that military aid for El Salvador can be continued at currently authorized levels of 64.8 million without a certification, but if the Salvadoran Government wants the entire authorization for 1985 then it must achieve, not perfection, but only the following minimally acceptable conditions:

First, ending the involvement of its own forces in indiscriminate violence, secret detentions, abductions, torture, and murder;

Second, compliance with the Geneva Conventions relating to the protection of civilians during combat, which really amounts to nothing more than a requirement that the Salvadoran Air Force stop bombing civilian noncombatants; and

Third, participation by the government in negotiations with the left.

The government must also be making progress on other reforms. In view of the dubious factual basis of previous Presidential certifications, the bill also provides for congressional approval of a certification by joint resolution.

Mr. Chairman, that honorable man and my good friend, Napoleon Duarte, has apparently been elected President of El Salvador. He has pledged to end the death squads and to begin a dialog with the left. To do either, he will have to overcome extremely powerful and dangerous forces who do not want to see either of those things happen. We must back President Duarte up. We must enable him to go to the army and say, "The United States means business. If we don't clean up the death squads and seek a political solution to the conflict, the United States will not back us." The committee bill gives President Duarte that backing. The committee bill makes it clear that U.S. aid depends on action in these areas. It is very important that we send this message to El Salvador.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), for his tireless efforts in putting this package together and bringing it to the floor. It is not easy on our committee, where opinions are diverse and strongly held, to fashion a bill that will be supported by a majority of the committee—and, I believe, a majority of the House. But under DANTE FASCELL's leadership, we have done it. It is not easy to bring a foreign aid bill to the floor in an election year; most people said we would never get this far, but under DANTE FASCELL's leadership, we have done it. So I want to congratulate the chairman, and also the committee staff for their excellent work.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill, that would increase security in our world, foster economic development, and encourage peace in Central America. I again urge all Members to support it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I appreciate his kind remarks and his strong work on behalf of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time I rise in support of the foreign assistance program as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The bill which is before you, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1984, provides for a supplemental authorization for foreign assistance for fiscal year 1984, and the authorization for fiscal year 1985.

Now, as you know, we have not passed a regular foreign aid authorization bill since 1981. I am here to tell you that in my opinion it is time we faced up to what is happening to the legislative process, and that we face up to what has to be done.

I have been around long enough to know that foreign aid is not exactly the most appealing topic in the Congress. I also know it is an election year and aside from the normal strains of nervousness that are common at this time, I know that people have very strong convictions about various issues in this bill. There is not going to be much chance of passing a bill of this nature which has that kind of atmosphere attached to it on many issues, unless you want to preserve the normal processes of this House.

In the past, we have enjoyed the luxury of ducking the issue and I think that is unfortunate, because that has been at the expense of the regular process. The issue is not whether we are going to approve foreign aid in this Congress. We are going to do that. We have been doing it without authorization in continuing resolutions. The only question, therefore, is will we pass authorizing legislation this year or will we duck the issue and rely on a continuing resolution again? Will we follow the normal processes of this House, or will we continue to let the process atrophy and take what amounts to, for some people, the easy way out by letting the Appropriations Committee have the responsibility for the entire legislative and appropriations process.

It seems to me that that is the real issue here today.

Another point also needs to be stressed: Every President of the United States since World War II, and President Reagan is one of those, without exception has recommended and strongly supported and asked for foreign assistance. Now, why is that? We have to ask, why is that?

The answer is that every President has recognized that there are programs in this legislation which are absolutely vital to the national interests of the United States, whether they be economic, military, social, or political. The fact is that if we did not have a tool of this kind, a measure of this kind, we would be in effect really tying the hands of the President in pursuing America's national interests abroad.

□ 1640

Now all of us here, whether you vote for or against this bill, know that these programs are in our best interest. Our friends around the world must have assistance to help themselves, and without their economic development our economic strength will suffer. We cannot trade if they cannot buy.

And they need military security. We know that many of our friends who have committed themselves to our mutual security cannot do that on their own. And it would be a mistake for us to delude the American people that we could walk away from our friends abroad and just let people shift for themselves in the rest of the world, and that the United States thereby would be served, because that is not true. This we all know is a world where it is more and more difficult for any nation to go it alone. And even the United States as rich and as blessed as we are in this country, must realize every single day that what happens anywhere in any corner of the globe may affect every American citizen.

Every President of both parties has recognized that the permanent international interests of the United States are served by the American people making a commitment to provide the assistance necessary to achieve the objectives that we believe in. There is no way to do that by denying the President the tools necessary to do the job by not providing the economic, and security assistance necessary to enable the peoples of the world to help themselves.

This bill does not bail them out, but in some small way it does provide some assistance which helps them help themselves. And that advances the interests of the United States.

We must pass this bill. No bill is perfect. There is going to be something in this bill somebody does not like. There may be some people who, for one reason or another, will never vote for foreign aid because a matter of strong conviction.

I cannot argue with them on that. They are entitled to their opinion. I happen to think they are wrong. They think I am wrong. And we have to rely on the majority of this body and the American people to arrive at some consensus which I hope is more reasonable, forward looking, and progressive.

The principal features of H.R. 5421 are basically that it authorizes $301,174,000 for fiscal year 1984 and $10,537,010,000 for fiscal year 1985.

This total amount is $1.9 billion below the President's budget. I will explain that in a moment.

The principal provisions of the bill include $3.9 billion for foreign military sales credits, grant military assistance, training, and peacekeeping operations. That is to help U.S. friends and allies improve their self-defense capabilities. Their strengthened defenses in turn contribute to the security of the United States.

The bill contains $5 million to strengthen the international antiterrorism effort. Some of you may have heard recently, and I do not know whether it is terrorists or not, or who will take the credit for it, but in the Quebec Provincial Parliament somebody decided to shoot up the Members, and I dare say that we are faced today in this world with a new type of phenomena which seeks to rule the world by terror and violence. This bill has a provision which deals with that problem.

There is $3.7 billion for the economic support fund to support friends in areas of special interest to the United States, particularly in the Middle East.

There is $1.9 billion for the bilateral development assistance to help improve living conditions for poor majorities in the developing countries in the Third World. This includes $75 million for a new economic initiative in the sub-Sahara Africa, and $25 million for a new child survival fund.

Included are substantial amounts in this bill both for security and economic assistance for programs in Israel, Egypt, and other Middle East countries.

The Central American provisions in title X authorize about a billion dollars in fiscal 1985 which is about $200 million below the request from the President, based on the recommendations of the Kissinger Commission. Title X will be discussed in detail during the 6-hour period allotted to the consideration of amendments in the Central American title of the bill.

Most of the reduction in the funding in the bill below the President's request are due to the committee's handling of the foreign military sales account. Whereas the President had recommended a proposal that all FMS credits be placed on the budget as direct credits, the committee left FMS market rate financing off the budget, as it is in the present law.

We did say, however, in the report, and we advised the administration, that we see the wisdom of putting all of that directly on the budget. But we did not see how in this particular time we could add that to the budget deficit, an additional several billion dollars. So we decided to put part of it on budget this year, and advised the administration that the committee would look favorably upon putting the rest of it on budget next year.

□ 1650

We also made other reductions, however, we reduced the FMS guarantee reserve fund by $160 million and the grant military assistance programs were also reduced below the amounts requested.

And in order to achieve a balance in this bill, the committee made some inceases in economic programs and other assistance. Those increases include assistance for Israel, for development assistance programs in agricultural and rural development, health and population, for the United Nations development program, for UNICEF, and for American schools and hospitals and for the Peace Corps.

In the total funding in the bill is below the budget request.

In spite of these selective increases, the total funding in the bill is below the budget request.

The military portion of this bill is less than 2 percent of the U.S. military budget. I want to repeat that: The military portion of this bill is less than 2 percent of the current U.S. defense budget. And what we get in return are important base rights in countries such as Greece, Turkey, and other places around the world; pre-positioning of equipment and material. It also contributes more to the security of the United States in a more cost-effective way than if we had the direct involvement of U.S. forces.

So we not only get better efficiency, more effectiveness, better dollar value, but we help our friends and ourselves in the process. I think we need to remember also that most of this money, about 85 percent of it, is spent in the United States.

Furthermore, it is estimated by the Department of Commerce that it provides several hundred thousand jobs for Americans who are involved in producing goods and services for these aid program.

This is a good bill, I submit, Mr. Chairman. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. There will be amendments, obviously. Some will pass, some will get defeated. And the House is going to work its will.

We did the best we could in the committee to bring a bill to the floor that

would have wide bipartisan support on most issues. I want to compliment my ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and others; the subcommittee chairmen and their ranking members and Members on both sides of the aisle. Everybody worked hard on this legislation and the product is one that we can be proud of.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HAMILTON. I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that it has been a great pleasure for me as a member of the committee to work under the gentleman's leadership. He has taken over responsibility of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I think has impressed all of us with the skill that he has exercised in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise in support of the bill. I think the funds in it promote U.S. political and military interests around the world. I think there is a very careful balance in here between security and economic programs and I strongly support the bill and I commend the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5421, the version of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1984 which the House will be considering today.

This important legislation was passed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in March 1984 and authorizes appropriations of over $10.5 billion which is nearly $2 billion less than requested by the administration for foreign assistance for fiscal year 1985. This bill also authorizes nearly $300 million in fiscal year 1984 supplemental aid. This funding, which includes military assistance, economic support and development and humanitarian assistance, is an essential component of American foreign policy.

These funds help protect and promote U.S. political and military interests around the world as well as help others help themselves. They also help our national economy. Some 70 percent of these funds will be spent in the United States and represent hundreds of thousands of jobs here.

The bill is cost-effective. It facilitates base rights, prepositioning, facilities, enhancement of friendly forces, at far less cost than direct U.S. defense measures.

The interrelationship between our ability to protect key American national interests and the economic and security programs contained in this legislation can be dramatically illustrated by a quick perusal of how H.R. 5421 affects the Middle East and Europe. These two areas are to receive over 60 percent of the funds in this bill.

EUROPE

In Europe, Mr. Chairman, this bill supports the continued vitality of NATO's southern flank and the strengthening of Western security interests in the Mediterranean region.

Four key NATO allies—Portugal, Spain, Greece, and Turkey—are to receive some $270 million in economic support fund money, some $290 million in grant military assistance and $1.46 billion in foreign military sales financing in addition to military training funds.

Together these four nations, along with Italy and France, have responsibilities in NATO's southern region. Today, this region is increasingly vital to Western security. The political instability of the Middle East offers a possible arena for the Soviet Union's expanded interference there and in the Mediterranean, where its navy is already strong. We must help these nations, for they are a bridge linking the United States and the Atlantic to the Middle East and Persian Gulf.

In each of these four countries the United States has important military facilities access agreements. Each access agreement is critical for the United States and the four agreements, taken together, provide the United States a critical link across the northern edge of the Mediterranean Sea. These allies look to the United States for assistance to augment their own contributions to Western security. All of these countries are upgrading their military forces and need American assistance and equipment. Thus, the assistance provided to these countries is among the most efficient forms of national defense expenditures and can make a substantial addition to U.S. national security interests and to world peace.

GREECE

Given Greece's important geopolitical location and our mutual security interests, Greece's continued closed relationship with the United States is of vital importance. Therefore, there is $500 million in security assistance for Greece in this bill. Greece has a socialist government and we have had differences with that governmemt over the last 3 years, but we also have a mutual stake in maintaining a close and trustful dialog with that government and in preserving our security relations. Greece did sign a new base agreement with the U.S. in 1983. Greece and the United States remain deeply intertwined nations. Many of America's leading citizens are of Greek lineage. The essence of our political cultures are the same. America's system of government is descended from Greece—the cradle of democracy.

TURKEY

Turkey is also an important country for the United States and its contribution to NATO is critical. Turkey is NATO's major link with the Middle East. It is the only Islamic member of NATO. We need to help Turkey with its economic and military needs in part because we should support Turkey's own impressive efforts to rebuild its country and economy. We should also encourage the ongoing political changes in Turkey, especially the return of a democratically elected government. The United States does have differences with Turkey on the Cyprus issue and on some human rights matters and these issues affect policy, but it is also true that Turkey, an Islamic nation, is a key pro-West country in a turbulent region with common borders with such states as Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, Iran, and Syria. We neglect Turkey at our own peril. This bill contains $716 million in military credits, $175 million in economic aid and $4 million in military training for Turkey.

CYPRUS

The $15 million economic aid program supported by this bill for Cyprus is another key sign of strong U.S. support for this island nation. Continued U.S. assistance supplements efforts to help facilitate a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus dispute. Amendments will likely be offered during consideration of this bill to address the deteriorating situation on Cyprus as a direct result of the Turkish Cypriot Unilateral Declaration of Independence and subsequent events. The frustrations of many Americans over the lack of progress toward a settlement of the Cyprus dispute is understandable, but I hope by colleagues are aware of the continued importance of U.S. economic assistance for Cyprus to help deal with humanitarian, economic development, and educational needs of the Cypriot people.

SPAIN

Spain is another country in Europe which is key to Western defenses. Even now it seeks to integrate its military more effectively into the Western security system. Democratic Spain will receive both economic and military assistance in this legislation. This assistance, which contains $400 million in FMS credits, $12 million in economic aid and $3 million in military training, 16 pivotal if Spain's membership in NATO is to be solidified and we are to build a constituency for NATO in Spain. It will also help Spain's democratic government define a new and clearer role for its military forces.

PORTUGAL

Portugal is also to receive substantial economic and security assistance in this bill—$128 million in security assistance and $80 million in economic aid. The United States renewed its bilateral base agreement with Portugal in December 1983, which gives the United States continued use of Lajes Air Base in the Azores Islands. U.S. assistance will promote Portugal's secu-

rity, strengthen its democracy, and enhance its contributions to NATO and the defense of Western security as well as help alleviate the financial burdens of Portugal's troubled economy. It is in our interest to help Portugal economically because Portugal is already taking difficult steps to help itself through important austerity programs.

Mr. Chairman, our assistance programs for these four NATO allies buttress vital Western security interests. Without this assistance, American access to key military facilities is compromised and the ability of our allies to strengthen their own defenses is weakened. NATO's southern flank is vital to our interests and we must not let its security be undermined.

MIDDLE EAST

Mr. Chairman, the Middle East will receive over 40 percent of the funds authorized in this bill. These funds are closely related to American efforts to promote and expand the Middle East peace process and to strengthen the moderate forces in the region. With the Middle East peace process stalemated, it is critically important to maintain the security and economic well-being of our friends in the region in the expectation that new opportunities for further progress toward a comprehensive peace will be created and that no party will foreclose those possibilities.

ISRAEL

H.R. 5421 provides for:

An authorization for Israel of $2.5 billion in economic and military assistance to be provided on a grant basis. The United States has a historic commitment to Israel's security and economic well-being and U.S. assistance provides a tangible demonstration of the strength and durability of that commitment. The United States seeks to give Israel the confidence to take the risks necessary to pursue the peace process. It is a continuing principle of U.S. security assistance to enable Israel to maintain a qualitative edge in military technology in the Middle East. This is especially important because of increasing Soviet sales of sophisticated arms to other countries in the region, and especially to Syria. The economic aid for Israel in this bill is particularly important for Israel at this time of economic hardship in that country. U.S. economic aid can supplement Israel's own efforts to reform its economy.

EGYPT

An authorization for Egypt of over $2 billion, including $1.175 billion in military assistance, $750 million in economic assistance, and $225 million in food aid. Egypt remains critical to the success of U.S. regional political and strategic policies and these requests support U.S. policy. The United States and Egypt have a shared strategic interest in the stability of the Middle East and the surrounding region, especially Africa, and a shared strategic commitment to a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Egypt has been an active partner in the Middle East peace process, and continued Egyptian support is crucial to its ultimate success. The Mubarak government publicly supports the President's September 1, 1982, peace initiative.

OTHER

Smaller authorizations for economic and military assistance for other countries in the region: Jordan is to receive $117 million; Oman $60 million; Yemen Arab Republic $45.5 million; and Lebanon $36 million. We have important ties to these countries and a stake in what happens to each despite recent problems with Lebanon and Jordan in particular. Our programs with these countries promote broad U.S. policy objectives in the Middle East and, in the case of Oman, are directly related to a military facilities access agreement for U.S. forces; Oman is located near the entrance to the Persian Gulf and abuts the Staits of Hormuz.

REGIONAL PROGRAMS

An authorization of $15 million for special Middle East programs to promote regional cooperative programs involving both Israelis and Arabs, economic development projects in the critical West Bank and Gaza area where significant proportions of the Palestinian people live, and regional program support and development. These programs are small in amounts but touch the lives of many people and promote the cause of peace.

Mr. Chairman, the United States continues to have a stake in what happens in the Middle East. We cannot walk away from the region because of the stalemated peace process or reverses in Lebanon because we have important and interrelated interests there in the stability and well-being of friends, in access to oil, in reducing the tensions of regional conflict and in preventing the Soviets from obtaining an enhanced position in the area. These funds help us in promoting those interests. Without these programs, efforts to energize the peace process will be hampered.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate my support for H.R. 5421. Many Members may feel it is not a good time for any foreign aid bill and that the mood of the American people is against the legislation. It is true, that given our significant domestic needs and priorities, the amount of resources being provided for assistance overseas is declining. But it is also true that we cannot confront the foreign policy challenges we face and counter aggressive policies of our adversaries without the prudent use of economic and military assistance programs in H.R. 5421. This bill also supports key national interests overseas, promotes trade, and represents some 450,000 jobs for Americans.

Mr. Chairman, let me add one final plea. This bill strikes a careful balance between security and economic programs and contains important policy guidelines. Any effort to move precipitously to change this balance or eliminate policy guidelines could well lead many Members to reconsider their support for H.R. 5421.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H.R. 5421.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman, who is a distinguished chairman of the Subcommitte on the Middle East and who, year after year, handles some of the most difficult issues that confront our committee, and does that with great skill and resolve.

I want to just conclude with an advisory so all my colleagues who are listening in and all who are here will know what our intentions are.

We will start at noon tomorrow, on Wednesday, and we will stay in session as long as possible. The idea is that we will try to finish the first nine titles tomorrow.

□ 1700

There will be a few amendments here and there. We will do the best we can with them.

If everybody cooperates we will finish nine titles by tomorrow night and hopefully at some decent hour.

Then, if the leadership agrees, we would come in at 10 o'clock on Thursday and take up title X, which is the Central American package.

With 6 hours of debate, slippage of time during debate and notes, you are talking about an elapsed time of about 8 hours.

With another hour or so of voting on the motion to recommit you can see that even if we started at 10 o'clock on Thursday on the final title of this bill we would be very fortunate to finish the bill before 10 o'clock Thursday night.

Now, I would like to do that. We are scheduled to have a session on Friday, if necessary. I would do almost anything to keep from a Friday session. But if we have to, we will.

But I want all of my colleagues who are watching and listening to know what we are trying to do, what we expect to do, and that we will try to meet our responsibility the best we can. We can only do it if you help us. If you decide you do not want to do that, of course it will not work.

I think all of my colleagues recognize what is involved here and that we are trying to do a responsible job and that they will cooperate.

31-059 O-87-43 (Pt. 8)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin debate today, I want on this occasion to congratulate Chairman FASCELL for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. Mr. FASCELL has followed the admirable tradition of our former chairman, CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, in working with the minority in a spirit of fairness and bipartisanship.

Mr. Chairman, the world continues to be a dangerous place, a place that challenges the idealism and the realism for which America is proud.

In meeting these challenges, this foreign assistance legislation will play a vital role.

Idealistically, Americans realize that, as President Reagan said, "peace and individual betterment are universal purposes. They are at the heart of the American dream."

As Americans, we instinctively reach out to help the victims of flood and famine around the world. We encourage democracy and human rights. We build dams and roads. We teach farmers to grow more food. In short, we help people to help themselves to a better life.

But Americans are known for realism too. Reality tells us that progress and change take time. That we cannot do it alone, but we can and should help, for their sake and our own.

The realities of the world we live in tell us that the economic and military support which this bill provides is critical to the survival of many of our allies and friends around the globe. America's sense of realism also tells us that the survival of friends and allies on this shrinking planet—in the face of Soviet-sponsored aggression and subversion—is essential to the survival of our own society as we know it today. Without our help, many countries would face violent and bloody periods of instability, which ultimately would threaten our own security.

We face many challenges around the world. Instability continues in the Middle East and the bloody war between Iraq and Iran goes on. Two of our allies in the region, Egypt and Israel, desperately continue to need our economic and military support.

The Soviets continue their tragic occupation of Afghanistan and our allies in the region are concerned that they may become the next victims of Soviet expansionism.

The lack of a solution in Cyprus continues to be of great concern to all of us. I hope we can take action here this week that will bring the parties to the Cyprus problem closer to a solution.

Many of the small nations we assist occupy strategic locations around the globe. Obviously, we extend our help for reasons not only of idealism, but for self-interest as well.

America wants to live in peace and freedom. We can best do that by encouraging free, humane, and open societies in a secure and prosperous world. Some may call this overly idealistic. I say that the security of our Nation demands no less. That is reality.

The Bipartisan Commission on Central America recommended that, "our policy must be based on the principles of democratic self-determination, economic and social improvement that fairly benefits all, and cooperation in meeting threats to the security of the region." I applaud the Commission and regret that the Foreign Affairs Committee, as a committee, was unable to resolve the issue of aid to Central America.

So that we might deal responsibly with this issue, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Congressman MURTHA of Pennsylvania, in a bipartisan approach to Central American aid, an approach combining sufficient flexibility to carry out foreign policy, while retaining responsible congressional oversight and conditions.

Mr. Chairman, Americans of the television age have been said to want instant negotiations, instant progress, and instant solutions. Impatience is an admirable American trait. But so is persistence. Persistence was a quality that our ancestors brought to this country as they survived the hardships of building an new life in a new nation.

As we reach out to deal with the difficult problems we face around the world, we need to recall the persistence of our ancestors. We need to persevere. We need to continue to support this program—because it is right to do so—and because it is in our own best self-interests.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this morning I and other members of the International Trade Subcommittee of the Banking Committee were told in no uncertain terms by Latin American legislators that gigantic debts are threatening the political stability of their countries.

M. V. Pratini de Morales of the Brazilian Congress said:

> The moment has arrived to state clearly that the preservation of democracy in most of the countries of the area may be perilously jeopardized if a negotiated solution is not provided to the long-term problem of the Latin American countries.

Latin American debt already exceeds $400 billion and part of the problem, I am sorry to say, must rest with this Congress as well as with the international banking community that has made these loans.

For the past decade we have been on one huge economic drunk, and even the person paying the bill—us—is unwilling to sober up.

It is time that we take a cold shower, drink some black coffee, and face reality.

U.S. and Latin American economies are inextricably woven together. What affects one affects the other. And this can be seen quite clearly when you look at interest rates.

As our interest rates rise, so do the interest rates that nations such as Argentina, Peru, Mexico, and Brazil must pay for money.

Brazilian Congressman Pratini de Morales said the current recession in Latin America is caused partly by the tremendous amount of money those countries must use just to pay the debt service on their loans from U.S. banks and the banks of other developed nations.

He estimates that 35 percent of the total export revenue of the Latin American countries goes to service their debts.

He told the Foreign Trade Subcommittee that the problems in Latin America have cost the United States a decline of 40 percent in exports to the region and he estimated this has cost the United States some 400,000 jobs.

Representatives from Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, Mexico, the Netherlands Antilles, and the Dominican Republic to the Latin American Parliament are in Washington right now. They have issued a statement urging that the payback periods be extended and that their debts be renegotiated.

And they also contend:

> The high interest rates fixed unilaterally by the United States and the protectionist policies which are hampering our development, are unacceptable.

Section 810 of this foreign aid bill is aimed at restoring democracy in Argentina. This section states that the President should take the necessary steps to restructure Argentina's debt and the debts of other democracies in Latin America by allowing a longer period of amortization and lower interest rates.

The President is also urged to restructure these loan obligations to the United States and work toward reducing the financial pressures on these countries.

What we are asked to do is not popular among some groups.

But we must face the reality that we must have a political as well as an economic approach, because I believe this is the greatest threat to world peace today, and it is right here in our own hemisphere.

We must not just take the same old approach we have taken for a decade.

Congress, the international banking community, including the IMF and the World Bank, and the American

taxpayer, must be willing to consider a new approach.

We must strike a balance somehow between propping up a bankrupt nation and strangling the economy of a nation that is trying to help itself.

To do less would be to abdicate our responsibility, both to our sister nations in Latin America and to our own vital interests at home.

To do less would be to invite the Communist powers to extend their sphere of influence throughout Latin America.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I want to start off by commending the new chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL). He has had a difficult road to hoe. We are not at the end of the road yet, and as the gentleman well knows, we have a lot of activity ahead of us. But I want to commend the way that he has handled his very difficult assignment, well in the tradition of his predecessor, Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. Chairman, the House Foreign Affairs Committee worked in relative harmony on this year's foreign aid bill and supplemental authorization request. And, in my opinion, came to responsible decisions on most issues, with the significant exception of Central America.

The bill, as it now stands, with its language on Central America, is one that I do not think most Members on this side of the aisle can support. We are being asked to approve language restricting aid to Latin America that would be counterproductive in the region, most probably unconstitutional in several respects, and which could never be supported by me, most of my Republican colleagues or, I submit, the President of the United States.

Not only does the title on Central America jeopardize this bill, it also dismisses the hard work of many fine Americans who spent 6 months studying the problems of Central America.

The Bipartisan Commission on Central America found serious needs and proposed a comprehensive solution, the Jackson plan, which addressed all elements of the problems in the region.

The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs tore that proposal apart, ignored many of the basic recommendations and added other provisions which would tie the President's hands and limit his ability to conduct an effective foreign policy.

The Foreign Affairs Committee separated Central America from the rest of the bill during its consideration. This bill, as it now stands, jeopardizes more than the bipartisan spirit of the Jackson plan. It jeopardizes the future of a region vitally important to the national security of this country.

□ 1710

This amendment jeopardizes the future of El Salvador and, I submit, all of Central America. It ignores the tremendous demonstration of democracy made in El Salvador this past weekend in its Presidential elections. I will speak more about this later when we get to the amendment process. But I will say, Mr. Chairman, I was there for the Presidential election on May 6, as I was for the preliminary election on March 25, and there is a tremendous upswelling of democratic feeling and, I think, democratic practices starting to take hold in that country. El Salvador, Honduras, and the other countries in that region are making genuine progress toward acceptable standards of human rights, democracy and freedom. There is a long way to go, but they have come a long way, too.

My problem with title X in the bill is that it ignores that progress and sets standards which cannot be met overnight, no matter how desirable—and it is—that they might be. If this House is serious about achieving the goals that we all seek for Central America, then I hope serious consideration will be given to the Broomfield-Murtha substitute to title X.

So I would urge my colleagues to give very careful consideration to what would be the long-term consequences of rejecting out of hand the Jackson plan's recommendations and instead give their support to the sincere effort represented by Mr. BROOMFIELD and Mr. MURTHA in seeking a workable, responsible compromise.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) move that the Committee do now rise?

Mr. FASCELL. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) on a point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I was just making an inquiry. I have been waiting to speak and to be recognized, and I understood the Committee was about to rise.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection if the gentleman wants to take back some of his time and allow the gentleman to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) withdraws his motion, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD).

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman form New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 6 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to praise our committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL). He has done an outstanding job. Although I am not disposed to vote for the legislation, the gentleman is certainly to be commended.

Mr. Chairman, on this the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry Truman, it is wise for us to remember the purpose for which our foreign aid program was originally established. When President Truman launched the point 4 program in 1946, he declared the importance of providing military and economic assistance to those countries whose political and economic stability was essential to the strategic interests of the United States.

As America's global interests and commitments have gradually increase, so our foreign aid program has increased, gathering a momentum of its own and moving away from the priorities for which it was originally intended. The bipartisan consensus that shaped our foreign aid program in those early years has also dissipated. What we have now is not an orderly program, integrated into our overall security strategy, but a grab bag of contradictory policy initiatives and agendas, reflecting the whims of various congressional subcommittees.

The problems that prompted President Truman to begin a program of foreign military and economic assistance are now much closer to our own shores than they were in the days when he was President. And no one who anticipates the forthcoming debate on this fiscal year 1985 authorization bill will deny that it is those problems, close to our own borders, in Central America, that will be the focus of this year's debate.

Our aid program in Central America must help our friends economically and militarily, because the threat they face comes both ways. And just as our economic aid is aimed at rooting out the sources of poverty and unrest: Witness, for example, the emphasis on land reform in El Salvador, so our military aid must, likewise, be focused on the source of the problem. That source was identified last year by the Democrats on the Select Committee on Intelligence when they wrote in their committee report on the Boland-Zablocki resolution: The armed insurgency in El Salvador—

Depends for its lifeblood—arms, ammunition, financing, logistics, and command-and-

control facilities—upon outside assistance from Nicaragua and Cuba. This Nicaraguan/Cuban contribution to the Salvadoran insurgency is longstanding. It began shortly after the overthrow of Somoza in July 1979. It has provided—by land, sea, and air—the great bulk of the military equipment and support received by the insurgents.

Mr. Chairman the time has come to get serious about Communist insurgency in Central America. Just 2 days ago, the people of El Salvador braved gunfire and every conceivable threat of intimidation to go to the polls and freely elect their own Government. It was the second time in 26 months that they have conducted free elections—and, may I say, that is exactly two more elections that the Sandinistas have held. The people of El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and, yes, Nicaragua, want to be free. And they have not been seduced by the fantasies of "popular revolution" emanating from Managua.

My point is this: There are many members in this House who will not be well disposed toward voting for this foreign aid bill if an understanding is not reached concerning a continuation of support for the Nicaraguan Contras in their efforts to interdict the military supply lines that are feeding the Salvadoran guerrillas. I realize that this bill is not the vehicle for authorizing support for the Contras. But we are seeking assurances and an understanding that Congress is not going to leave the Contras in the lurch, and in effect, making Central America safe for communism.

I need not belabor the point, but we must take the long view. If Nicaragua and its Soviet and Cuban partons continue to act with impunity, destabilizing the rest of Central America, the consequences for each and every one of us—and for all Americans as well—are very serious indeed. We need only ponder the results of the primary election in Texas to realize how the American people are going to react to the tidal wave of people seeking entry, legally or illegally, into our country when Central America goes down the drain.

And even worse, how will they feel when aggressive nuclear missiles aimed at our country are less than 4 minutes away. This foreign aid bill should be geared toward preventing the spread of international communism in Central America and throughout the world. It is not and unless successfully amended to do so, I will have to vote against it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 3 minutes.

There was no objection.

□ 1720

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, some time in the next day or two, when we are in the wee hours of debating the major bill that is before us that the chairman put forward and the committee has worked so hard on, I am going to offer an amendment expressing the sense of the Congress. We may all be tired and may not want to hear all the debate on it, but I would like to outline it briefly, because the sense of the Congress is not necessarily all the business here. We have a lot of other very significant things to do, but I think this is very important and I hope the Members will consider it in that light.

It will be a sense of the Congress that the supplying of chemical and biological weapons is inhumane and pose grave threats to humanity, and that the United States should increase its investigations of suspected instances of chemical and biological warfare, encourage the development of antidotes for chemical and biological weapons, especially for micotoxins, commonly referred to as yellow rain, urge other nations to investigate suspected instances of chemical and biological warfare, help the U.N. investigators gain access to areas where chemical and biological warfare is or has been suspected, and negotiate with the Soviet Union and other nations to strengthen the existing agreements or make other agreements as necessary regarding chemical and biological warfare.

There has been a growing body of evidence for some time that has been accumulated by the United Nations, by the United States, by France, and by other nations of the world that indicates that chemical and biological weapons have been employed in the current war between Iran and Iraq, and in the past and present conflicts in Southeast Asia and in Afghanistan.

Such evidence also indicates that the Soviet Union employs chemical and biological weapons in Afghanistan and supplies such weapons to its allies in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia. Such activities by the Soviet Union and other nations contravene arms control agreements which have been ratified by such nations in the past, and exposure to chemical and biological weapons often causes slow and agonizing death and few antidotes are available to treat exposure to such weapons.

We cannot stand idly by while more and more reports about the use of these gases and micotoxins are coming in from all over the world. The effects of chemical and biological weapons on people are as bad or worse than the effects of nuclear weapons, and countries are a lot more likely to use them because they can be limited geographically and do not destroy the countryside.

For this reason, there may be a greater threat, actually, to mankind from these weapons than from nuclear weapons. Chemical and biological weapons are not only illegal; they are immoral and more inhumane than most can imagine. Yellow rain, which is a deadly fungus for which there is no known antidote, literally causes the entire body to break down and deteriorate and the victim dies a slow and agonizing death.

I hope that, as I said, in the wee hours when we are discussing the final stages of this great bill that is before us, and I am sure that is where this particular amendment fits in, that we can seriously consider the amendment when it is offered, because I think that a sense of the Congress on this important topic at this time in the matter of chemical and biological warfare debate is essential.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope the committee and the Members will consider it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) is recognized for such time as he may consume.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this week the House has its first opportunity in several years to change the direction of U.S. foreign assistance programs. Not since 1981 have we passed a foreign aid bill.

In that time the administration has altered this Nation's traditional foreign assistance priorities. Increasingly, it funds the weapons of war rather than the tools for peace. In real dollars, development and food aid would increase only 2.3 percent from fiscal year 1981 to fiscal year 1985, if the administration has its way. Military aid would increase 43 percent.

This legislation reverses that trend. It cuts the administration request by $1.6 billion. Most of that comes from reductions in military sales and grant assistance. The bill also emphasizes the committee's concern about getting aid for basic human needs to the poorest members of other societies.

Like many Members in this Chamber, I favor the bill's support for Israel's security and for peace in the Middle East. It provides grants for economic support funds necessary to develop the peacekeeping process and assist Israel's troubled economy.

Foreign assistance is the fundamental vehicle for the United States to promote peace and stability in the world through nonmilitary means. And it is not a tremendous expense. This legislation represents less than 1½ percent of total budget authority.

Conflict in the Third World dominates much of our debate in this Chamber. Much of the unrest results from poverty and a lack of economic opportunity. The most effective way to address these problems is through the kinds of economic and development assistance provided in this legislation.

What we spend in this bill will be far less than what it may cost in the future to support another nation's military when its internal situation has dissolved and the people of that country are polarized by gross economic inequality.

The committee has taken steps to focus U.S. assistance on the poor majority in Third World nations. It recognizes the importance of health, nutrition, and population programs and their crucial interrelationship.

The committee believed that aid must also be directed to encourage grassroots development and initiatives at the local level. By aiding the small businessman, the subsistence farmer, U.S. programs build the strong base for peaceful, democratic development.

We have heard from the President and from many others about the growing Soviet threat in the Third World. The United States can best protect its interests by building strong economic ties to those lesser developed nations. The Soviet Union can only try to project its influence so long as military arms are needed. Weapons do not build irrigation systems, they do not provide scholarships for higher education, they do not promote trade.

A prudent America can help build peace and stability at the foundations of other societies I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5421.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a couple of things, first to my Republican colleagues, about foreign aid. Foreign aid has never been one of the most popular programs among committed Republicans, and I think that has been a mistake.

I think the fact that we are not only the leader of the free world, but we are the most powerful country in the world imposes responsibilities, and our responsibilities do not cease at the borders of our country. There are other countries in the world that look to us for not only example in the operation of democracy, but for support, for aid.

It is important to us that we have other countries that look to us because we certainly look to them. A glance at a list of resources that we do not have, that are not indigenous to this country but are only available from countries overseas, indicates in our self-interest that we had best have allies and countries with whom we can trade. Not only that, but we need overseas markets, and if the rest of the world is in chaos, we cannot immunize ourselves from that chaos.

So an enlightened program of economic assistance to countries overseas is indispensable to an enlightened foreign policy. So looking at this bill, there are many parts of it that I do not like. There are many parts of it that are unacceptable, really, but in a package of foreign aid that includes economic assistance as well as military assistance, there are always compromises and one has to take the parts that one does not like to get the parts that one does like. The perfect is the enemy of the good, and if we wait for a perfect piece of legislation, we will never get any at all.

That said, I would like to address a few remarks to my Democratic colleagues, and that is that it seems to me there is an emphasis on the Democratic side on the economic aid, with a downgrading or a failure to appreciate the need for appropriate military aid.

I can think of no better example than El Salvador, where economic aid, of course, is indispensable to bringing that country up to par, to economic growth, to alleviating the 30 percent unemployed, to alleviating the crushing poverty, to give those people hope. If anybody deserves hope on this globe, it is the people of El Salvador, who have had three elections in 2 years. What a showcase of democracy. How much we can learn from people to whom the right to vote, the privilege to vote, is such an honor that they endure physical harm, even jeopardize their lives, wait in the broiling sun hours just to get to cast their vote.

But I suggest to my Democratic friends that we cannot isolate economic aid from military aid, because the aim of the Leninist gestapo of the left, and you can call them anything you want, you can throw after shave lotion on them if you want to, but they are murderous guerrillas who are the enemies of democracy and whose sworn aim and goal is to destroy and disrupt democracy. So they have to be neutralized. They destroy. They have destroyed over $800 million worth of infrastructure and worth of the economy of El Salvador, far more than we have given El Salvador in aid.

So to protect our investment in economic aid, there must be appropriate military aid. The time is now. Examine your consciences and say, "Why do we demand a standard of perfection for El Salvador that we do not demand of any other country in the world?"

It is not right. If fairness is the hallmark of this year's campaign for both sides, I suggest it is not being fair to the entire area much less El Salvador, to demand a standard of achievement or of attainment as long as they are trying, as long as they are making the best effort possible. That effort should be recognized, and not rewarded, but supported by economic aid and military aid so that the military can protect the investment in economic aid.

I would suggest to my colleagues that the military of El Salvador has earned great plaudits by protecting the election, by seeing to it that 1,400,000 people could come out and vote in the election that just passed this Sunday.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CORRADA. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1984 is a major piece of legislation and it deserves our approval. I am particularly interested in title VIII which deals with Latin America and the Caribbean.

I believe that the United States has a responsibility and a moral obligation to support and encourage the democratic process in the region. We should be particularly supportive of countries such as the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, and others which traditionally have been alined with the United States. At a time when those countries are facing serious economic troubles at home, we should stand ready to assist them with economic support funds (ESF) as a means of preventing economic instability that could trigger political unrest.

One of the recommendations of the Kissinger Commission was the increase of scholarships for students from the Caribbean and Latin America to study in the United States. I fully endorse that recommendation and think it is an excellent way to provide the educational preparation that will improve each country's ability to enhance its economic development. At the same time, we would be establishing friendship and ties with our neighbors to the south which will increase our mutual understanding and strengthen our commonality of purpose.

In this regard, I am very pleased by the language in subsection (f) of section 805, to encourage the use of educational institutions in Puerto Rico as a way of helping participants in the program to acquire English language skills. As the only Spanish-speaking U.S. presence in the region, Puerto Rico is in an excellent position to serve as a bridge between the United States and the Caribbean and Central

American countries. We share both language and culture and this enables us to be more effective in meeting the educational needs of students participating in the scholarship program.

In addition, subsection (i) requires a report from the President on the role that educational and technical institutions in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands could play in the development of the Caribbean and Central American region. The educational institutions in Puerto Rico have already begun to work to determine the areas in which they can be most effective. Dr. Ismael Almodóvar, president of the University of Puerto Rico, has met with officials of the U.S. Department of Education and they are preparing a capability statement for educational programs at the university. In Puerto Rico, we already have a tradition of helping our neighbors in the Caribbean and of educating many students from those countries. I look forward to an active role by public and private educational institutions in Puerto Rico on this very worthwhile effort.

Title VII of the bill appropriates $125.5 million for the Peace Corps and I am encouraged by our continued commitment to the Peace Corps volunteers as goodwill ambassadors for the United States throughout the world. The establishment of a policy designed to increase by 10,000 the number of volunteers by the end of fiscal year 1988 is a welcomed sign in the direction of expanding the role of the Peace Corps. I am hopeful that in recruiting volunteers the Peace Corps will take advantage of the extensive pool of talent available in Puerto Rico. The excellent work done by the Peace Corps is to be emulated and encouraged.

I urge my colleagues to approve this bill.

□ 1730

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, for the skill he has demonstrated in bringing this bill to the floor. He has found avenues for consensus and cooperation where lesser legislators would only see confusion. Without his hard work and determined leadership, we would not be debating this bill today.

And that would be a mistake. President Reagan has called for a bipartisan foreign policy, and this bill offers the perfect place to start. This legislation will serve U.S. interests by helping our friends and allies around the world defend themselves and develop their economies. It is not a handout, $7 out of every $10 authorized for foreign aid will be spent for goods and services made in the United States. This bill is a downpayment on a more prosperous future; it merits speedy passage.

As we know, there is no consensus for passage yet. Objections will be raised to the restrictions and conditions the committee has placed on aid to specific countries—especially the funds earmarked for El Salvador and the other nations of Central America. In other cases, Members will no doubt move to place even tighter restrictions on our assistance. But I hope that in the end most of us can agree that this bill presents constructive proposals to the complex problems that divide our world. It is a necessary and viable vehicle to bolster U.S. interests across the globe.

In the Middle East, our aid is designed to enhance the prospects for peace created by the Camp David accords. Israel will receive $2.5 billion in economic and military assistance. This assistance is tangible evidence of our historical support for the State of Israel—our closest friend and the most dependable democracy in the region—and it supports U.S. strategic interests in the Middle East.

At the same time, the $2 billion provided to Egypt will help that country fend off pressures from parties opposed to the peace process. And it demonstrates our determination to stand by any Arab nation willing to step forward and negotiate peace with Israel. Finally, funds under the peacekeeping section of the bill will directly support the multinational force that oversees the implementation of the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty.

In the world's poorer countries, over $1 billion in U.S. development assistance will pay for programs to promote agriculture, rural development, private enterprise and sound nutrition. Almost half of those funds will go to the poorest of the poor—the 20 percent of the world's population whose daily life is a struggle for survival, and over $300 million is dedicated to defusing the slowly ticking time bomb of population growth. This program is especially important. By the year 2000, 2 billion more people will inhabit the globe. Every acre of usable farmland will have to feed twice as many people as it did in 1975. Skimping on population assistance now can only lead to far greater financial and human costs in the future.

Finally, this bill begins to balance the economic and military portions of our overall foreign aid budget. Increases for international narcotics control, UNICEF, the U.N. development program, the children's survival fund, and the Peace Corps will offer real help to people who have known only hardship.

But we still have a long way to go. In the last 20 years, military spending has outstripped development aid by a 16 to 1 count. Under this administration, the inequity has only deepened. Since 1980, military aid has increased 100 percent. Development assistance has lagged far behind with a 6-percent increase. As a result, most of the world is dangerous and destitute—a place where poverty and injustice breeds hatred and buries hope. In the end, some stark facts speak for themselves: 450 million people suffer from hunger and malnutrition; 600 million people have no jobs or are less than fully employed; 2 billion people—half of the world—cannot find clean water to drink; 11 million babies die before their first birthday; and 8 million refugees—the inevitable byproducts of 14 ongoing wars—have been forced to flee their homes in order to save their lives.

In the 5 minutes it has taken me to give this speech, 150 children have died for want of food or a simple vaccination. At the same time, $7.5 million has been spent for military purposes. That is a crime. This foreign aid bill, through far from perfect takes a first step toward redressing that injustice. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DYMALLY).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. DYMALLY) is recognized for 2 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for giving me this opportunity to speak in support of this bill.

I suspect that the easiest no vote one could cast in an election year is a no vote against a foreign aid bill, so it takes some courage, some deliberation, and some careful thinking to vote on a package such as this.

This bill is a compromise, a moderate compromise, in my judgment, that brings a measure of aid to a number of countries in need of aid. I cite one particular area, and that is the Caribbean. Under the Kissinger recommendations most of the funds were earmarked for Central America. In this piece of legislation the funds are spread not only through Central America but in the Caribbean, that portion that we historically know as the English-speaking islands.

For Belize, the so-called "Pot of Gold" for Central America, Belize has been included in the "Pot of Gold."

So I think this is a good bill. I intend to cast an aye vote for the bill. The controversial part of the bill will be debated, and each Member will have an opportunity about three times to

pass judgment on that portion which is controversial, that is, El Salvador.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good bill. It deserves the support of every Member of Congress. I ask for an "aye" vote when it comes up.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS) is recognized for 4 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding this time to me and to commend him for bringing this foreign affairs assistance bill before the House.

I particularly want to commend him for arranging to have a full debate on U.S. policy in Central America. If recent history proves anything, it is that the United States gets itself into trouble internationally when the executive branch is allowed to act in a unitary manner and on a solitary basis without the involvement and approval of Congress.

So as we begin the debate on the future course of U.S. policy in Central America, we know we will be debating not just aid levels for the region, we will be debating whether this administration's policy of sending more troops and more military aid can bring peace, and I believe that we will determine whether the United States will be drawn into a prolonged war in Central America with a great possibility, or even likelihood, of direct American military involvement in that conflict.

□ 1740

Since coming to office, this administration has sent massive amounts of military aid to El Salvador; yet the death tallies and the death squads continue. Despite massive U.S. aid, the Salvadoran Government has yet to bring to justice the murderers not only of its own people, but of eight American citizens.

Now, U.S. advisers accompany Salvadoran pilots on bombing missions. U.S. manned OV-1 Mohawks fly combat missions over combat zones. U.S. naval vessels accompany Honduran and Salvadoran and perhaps Contra naval vessels in surveillance and attack missions against Nicaraguan shipping.

In Honduras, this administration has built a sophisticated military infrastructure complete with runways and hospitals, all equipped for use by U.S. forces in the event of an all-out war in Central America.

Mr. Chairman, we may at this particular moment be at the last best chance for using American persuasion, power and leverage to bring the contending sides to a negotiated settlement in El Salvador and in the rest of Central America.

In particular in El Salvador, it is quite clear that the guerrillas and the Government's military forces are at somewhat of a stalemate. Neither side knows what America's future military involvement will be there and so it seems to me that right now we have the basis for trying to bring about a negotiated settlement. If we wait, either one side or the other will feel that the better part of wisdom for them is to continue the war.

It is I think absolutely clear that the American people have demonstrated in poll after poll that they do not want American military involvement in Central America and this administration proceeds at its won risk, and of course at America's risk, if it continues to take the United States in that direction.

The nations in the region have demonstrated that they want our help toward a negotiated resolution. The Contadora process is something that we ought to be supporting full force rather than undercutting.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Let me just say as I conclude here that I appreciate the comments of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this general debate as we conclude it today. The discussion has been very sensible and at a very fine level.

I would hope that tomorrow as we enter the amending process where obvious differences of opinion will flourish and come to the floor, that we can continue the same kind of intellectual, intelligent, balanced debate that we have had here today. After all, it is not just for our colleagues. The American people themselves are entitled to that. I believe it will help the entire process. With that kind of help from my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, we might have a chance of doing the first nine titles of this bill sometime tomorrow before 2 o'clock in the morning and then get to title X on Thursday morning and finish that.

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5119, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1984. While supporting this legislation, I share a number of the "Additional Views" presented in the committee report by my distinguished colleague, Congressman GEORGE W. CROCKETT, JR. This bill is very complex and reflects a multitude of diverse and conflicting views of the world, and as a result contains a hodgepodge of programs and policies. It does not present us with a set of coherent policies based upon a theoretical framework that would hold it together. In some sections, H.R. 5119 seeks to channel our foreign relations in a manner that emphasizes assertive diplomacy and the politics of reconciliation. In other areas, such as the Middle East, this legislation restricts diplomacy and takes an overtly one-sided view, making it more difficult for the United States to be a credible force for moderation and reconciliation.

Congressman CROCKETT has also raised the issue of an overemphasis on military assistance as opposed to economic assistance. The balance in this legislation is clearly unsatisfactory given the problems in the world which are primarily political, economic, and social in nature and not resolvable through military assistance. Given the need in the world, particularly in the Caribbean, Africa, Central America, and Asia for food, clothing, and housing, this bill which provides $4 billion in military aid, and only $5.6 billion in economic assistance, and $960.9 million in other types of assistance, presents at best a workable legislative compromise. It also presents an unfulfilled moral agenda given the imbalances between military and economic assistance and between regions of the world in terms of need and human suffering.

However, this legislation has a number of very positive features, particularly as it seeks to address human rights and economic development in many areas of the world. Because of these features and because I believe it is in our national interest to pass a foreign assistance bill which provides at least some policy framework for our assistance programs, I have decided to support H.R. 5119. I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for his leadership and for his acumen in structuring H.R. 5119, which represents, "the art of the possible."

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on Haitian Refugees, I am especially appreciative of section 803 contained in title VIII, which concerns itself with, "Promoting the development of the Haitian people and providing for orderly emigration from Haiti." In this section, the Committee on Foreign Affairs expresses its concern for the promotion and protection of human rights in Haiti by conditioning assistance on the certification by the President that the Government of Haiti "is making a concerted and significant effort to improve the human rights situation in Haiti by implementing the political reforms which are essential to the development of democracy in Haiti, including the establishment of political parties, free elections, and freedom of the press." Section 803 also states that—

If the President cannot make such a determination, fiscal year 1985 economic and military training assistance to the Government of Haiti cannot be obligated; however, under section 123(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act economic assistance can continue to be provided through PVO's, and Public

Law 480 food assistance programs can continue.

I very much appreciated the committee's cooperation in structuring this section which reflects a shared concern with equitable, bottom up development, and human rights. Section 803 provides a narrative on recent developments in the human rights area which are not reflective of forward movement in this area. More recent events reflect some indication of a change in a more positive direction, one that I hope will continue and enable our relations with the Government of Haiti to improve, particularly in the vital arenas of trade and aid.

Sections 804, 805, and 806 also contain provisions which will be helpful to our relations with the Caribbean. Section 804 expands economic support funds for the eastern Caribbean by earmarking $44 million for the countries of this neglected region. This is $25 million more than proposed by the administration. This is vitally necessary if these nations are to be able to improve their infrastructure and to take advantage of the trade provisions of the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

I also want to congratulate the committee for its recognition that regional integration is crucial to the development of the Caribbean. Its strong recommendation to the administration to work with representatives of the Caribbean Development Bank, the Caribbean Common Market, and the Carribean Free Trade Association in order to enhance the development and implementation of a plan for regional integration and development is well taken. Section 805 which would establish a program of scholarships for economically disadvantaged students from Latin America and the Caribbean is very much needed and is definitely in our national interest.

Section 806, which seeks to maintain the bipartisan support and independence of the Inter-American Foundation, is very much in order given recent developments which appear to have involved an attempt to politicize and impose an ideological straightjacket on this respected and valuable institution. Having a familiarity with the work of the Inter-American Foundation in Haiti where it functions in a most productive and useful manner, providing an opportunity for the poor to identify their needs and to work to meet these needs, I am most pleased that subsection (a) of section 806 reaffirms and clarifies this most important development ethic.

With reference to Africa, the continent with the greatest need for development and economic assistance, the only new initiative is contained in title IV, entitled "Economic Policy Initiative for Africa." This initiative, which proposes $75 million in fiscal year 1985 to promote policy reforms for the purpose of promoting policy reforms and economic growth, raises a number of concerns quantitative and qualitative. Seventy-five million dollars to address the poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease is woefully inadequate when measured against the need of sub-Saharan Africa and the dollar amounts provided to other regions of the world. I am encouraged that the committee has raised and addressed an additional concern that the initiative be targeted not only to promote economic growth but also to encourage equitable distribution of resources in order to meet the basic human needs of the poor in sub-Saharan Africa. There has also been concern that without careful attention this additional economic assistance could be used to impose East-West criteria in an area of the world which cries out for development and humanitarian aid. For example, in our relations with Zimbabwe the administration has demonstrated a penchant of utilizing short-term political criteria in its decisonmaking on the allocation of economic assistance. I am pleased that the committee has added a provision requiring prior congressional consultation regarding potential recipients. In short, while I welcome increased attention to the pressing economic situation of sub-Saharan Africa, the low level of assistance provided and the opportunity for ideological bullying is troubling and not unlike the reservations a number of Members had in the debate over the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

As stated in my opening remarks, with reference to the Middle East, I share Congressman GEORGE CROCKETT'S objections to a number of the provisions that deal with this troubled region. Section 909, which codifies a U.S. policy against any and all contacts designed to moderate the position of the Palestine Liberation Organization toward a diplomatic solution to the terrible conflict in the Middle East based on mutual recognition and justice for all the peoples of the region, is in my judgment an unwarranted restriction on our Nation's ability to play a moderating and constructive role. Section 911 presents a distorted and one-sided picture of Egyptian-Israeli relations, and is gratuitously provocative. It puts the onus on progress in fulfilling the Camp David accords solely on the Egyptians. It states that "U.S. assistance to Egypt is provided in the expectation that Egypt will support and fulfill the provisions of the Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty." This ignores the responsibility, both moral and political, that both parties have in the peace process. I share Congressman CROCKETT'S view that the Israeli Government as well as the Arab Republic of Egypt "has the same obligation to demonstrate its good faith in a generalized Middle East peace settlement * * *." Support for Congressman CROCKETT'S amendment, that would seek to clarify that U.S. assistance to Israel and Egypt is provided with the expectation that both countries will support the provisions of the Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty, is imperative if we are to be fair and effective in our diplomatic efforts to build on the Camp David accords.

I also urge my colleagues to support the very reasonable amendment that will be offered by our colleague Congressman GERRY E. STUDDS. This amendment would prohibit any U.S. military aid to El Salvador unless the Congress, by passage of a joint resolution, approves a Presidential certification that the Salvadoran Government has met the following conditions: removal of those responsible for or associated with the death squads from military, security, and police forces, and establishment of effective control over those forces responsible for death squad activities. The amendment would require compliance with the Geneva Convention and negotiation among all parties to the conflict, unless the guerrillas refuse to participate. The amendment also requires the release of political prisoners, progress toward an effective judicial system and a free press, and progress on land reform. Unless we insist on the removal of those within the security apparatus, who are wedded to murderous violence, there is little hope of genuine economic and political reform in El Salvador.

In conclusion and on balance, this legislation imposes a necessary, if imperfect, framework for the carrying out of our foreign assistance program and clarifies congressional priorities and areas of concern. Our foreign policy needs such a framework and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5119.●

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, there are a vast number of issues in this bill, not only because it is a bill that deals with global problems, and not only because it authorizes a vast sum of money, but because this bill represents foreign policy. When we enact this bill, we are either approving or disapproving an enormous range of foreign policy decisions. But because the scope of debate is limited, and because no one of us can equal the resources of the foreign policy establishment, we can only focus on a few items. I want to address myself to Central America.

If we accept the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), we will in effect be embracing the policy of the administration in Central America. In its essence, this is the same policy that has been followed in that area for the past 70 years or so, and which led directly to the problems that we see today. This

is a policy that embraced stability over justice, a policy that favored exploitation over legitimate enterprise, a policy that encouraged repression over reform, a policy that stood against, rather than with, the needs of the poor, the landless, the helpless. The consequence is that we are not now seen as a government that stands for hope and justice, a government that stands with the people against their oppressors. The consequence is that the region is left with little or no hope for reform without resort to violence—and so there is revolution and rebellion.

Oh, we are told that the El Salvador election makes it all better. But one election does not a government make, any more than a single swallow brings about spring. The election of Mr. Duarte might mean a great deal, or it might mean nothing. He has, after all, been elected twice before, and frustrated twice before. The question is not whether he can be elected, but whether he will be permitted to govern—and if he is, whether he can forge a government that his people can see as legitimate, that they can trust, that they can have some hope in. And of course, all that remains to be demonstrated. As I have said, he has been twice elected and twice not permitted to govern before—not a very encouraging history.

What we need, then, is a bill that recognizes the dismal past and that insists that the Government of El Salvador earn the aid that we might authorize. The bill offered by the committee imposes some minimal conditions to encourage a government of reform and legitimacy—but the administration substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan is sadly lacking in those conditions.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. STUDDS) would strengthen the conditions recommended by the committee—so I think we can see that the committee bill is moderate and does not go quite as far as some would wish, while it does beyond anything that the administration wants.

The issue is how do we forge a policy that stands for what this country stands for. This country stands for decency. Does this bill set conditions that would encourage the growth of a decent government in El Salvador? Does it discourage actions that have been undermining legitimate government in Honduras? Does it try to do anything about outrages in Guatemala? Does this bill reward governments that work toward the kinds of things that we stand for? Things like elections that have meaning; things like land reform, like reasonable opportunity, like elementary justice, like basic schooling, like roads and some kind of help for economic advancement? For we cannot forever prop up the corrupt, the unjust and the ineffective.

If we cannot stand for a bill that helps governments that earn and deserve the support of their people, we are fooling ourselves. The Government of Vietnam did not earn the support of its people, and it failed—and no one can say today that the people of Vietnam live in a happy state. But we could not save it even with unlimited treasure and unlimited blood, because it would not be saved. Nor can we save any other government from itself. This bill must impose reasonable conditions for aid, because it must embrace a policy that will work. The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan does not represent that kind of policy and it ought to be rejected.

If the Government of El Salvador has been transformed by an election. I will be mightily surprised. I suggest that it takes more than one election to make a government—it takes a government that works. An election victory means only one thing: a license to try and do a given job. The task does not end with an election success—it only begins at that point. The Government of El Salvador has yet to do its job. It has only gained a license to try. Until it tries, and unless we can be satisfied that this is a government worthy of our support, worthy of the confidence of its own people, there is no way that we could say that aid would be of any benefit.●

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, today we have before the House a very important bill, the foreign assistance reauthorization for fiscal year 1985. This bill provides a 1-year authorization for various U.S. foreign assistance programs including, of special interest to me, the international family planning program within the Agency for International Development (AID).

H.R. 5119 includes $320 million in foreign assistance for international voluntary family planning efforts; $15 million of that amount is for the very important region of Central America, as recommended by the Kissinger Commission report on the region.

There is some controversy surrounding this program, and I wanted to take this opportunity to discuss why, in my view, these voluntary family planning programs are so crucial and may be the most important of all our foreign assistance activities.

U.S. population growth has stabilized. The United States is not facing social and political problems as a result of population growth. The population problem in this country is due to immigration rather than population growth—a fact that we will soon grapple with when the House considers the immigration bill later this spring.

Unfortunately, most countries of the world, and especially the developing nations, are in a very different and much more difficult position. The world will grow by 84 million people this year. Growth rates are high because death rates have declined faster than birth rates. Some success has been achieved in international voluntary family planning efforts because world growth has declined slightly over the past decade from 2 percent to 1.8 percent. However, this is still not enough. One indication—it took a hundred years for the world's population to increase from 1 billion in 1830 to 2 billion in 1930. The world now increases by 1 billion people in less than 15 years.

What does this mean in real terms? Ninety percent of the world's growth is in the less developed countries. These are the very same countries that are experiencing the most difficulty in providing the essentials of food, water, clothing, and shelter to their citizens. Unemployment is as high as 40 percent in many developed nations and a significant number of children do not have access to education. In addition, the developing nations have been unable to increase food output at the same pace as the population is growing.

World leaders in the developing nations have taken note of this situation and have instituted programs in their countries to provide voluntary family planning services to their citizens. Contrary to what opponents of the U.S. international voluntary family planning program may argue, the United States does not force family planning services on any nation. Rather, for AID to provide assistance, a request must be made for those services by the host government.

And how are these world leaders concerned? I will give you some examples. On April 28, 1983, Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado, the President of Mexico, spoke to the Mexican National Population Council. He said some very significant things worth repeating:

> Policies for quantitative population control are justified insofar as they translate into qualitative improvements for people of all ages, not only the human beings now being born but for those already living. . . . It is important to point out that in population policy, as in planning in general, consensus has a profound and far-reaching impact on national life. It has been rightly said that population is our most precious heritage. The people are the protagonists of our history and the subject of our destiny. . . . In our constitution, man is the object of our democracy. That is why, in the recent popular referendum, great emphasis is placed on population policy as a social right which permits greater individual freedom, especially for couples. . . . A far reaching population policy would add dignity, strength and clarity to our institutions.

Also of interest are additional comments by Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, at the United Nations Population Award ceremony:

Long before our independence we realized that povery could not be effectively combated unless the size of the family was limited to enable each child to have a better share of resources and opportunities. . . . The Government can act only with the consent and cooperation of the people. Our family planning program is entirely voluntary and we recognize the importance of involving voluntary organizations in its implementation.

It is said that prosperity is a good contraceptive. But the effects of development are submerged unless we bring about a low birth rate. Family planning is an input for development, an indispensable exercise in human capital formation. Education, better capacity for producing and earning a higher rise in per capita income are possible only when population is curbed. * * * We are pursuing our objective with undeviating steadfastness. But we have not and shall not use coercion.

Child bearing should be a joy, not a burden, and since it is the mother who bears and rears the child, we are concerned not only with her health but with her will. Family planning is proof of our love for our children and a test of our claim to be good mothers, good fathers, and a good society.

Both of these statements are indications of the interest and commitment of the developing world to voluntary family planning efforts.

There have been many allegations about how voluntary family planning services are delivered in other parts of the world and the U.S. role in coercion and abortion. The United States has long played an important role as a leader in the effort to provide safe and effective voluntary family planning services to all individuals. Never has this effort included the promotion of coercion or abortion. All AID funded projects have been and are subjected to compliance procedures. Not one penny of U.S. AID funds goes to finance abortions, abortion related activities or coercive family planning practices.

For the United States to reverse our commitment in this vital area, as we are approaching the United Nations World Population Conference in Mexico City this August, would be a serious mistake. Accordingly, I would urge all of the Members of this body to reject the Smith amendment and retain the commitment to international family planning efforts.●

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEISS) having assumed the chair, Mr. AUCOIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5119) to authorize international development and security assistance programs and Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR ROBBERY OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharge from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 422) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide a criminal penalty for robbery of a controlled substance, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HYDE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for an explanation.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I might say that I have an amendment at the desk which would, indeed, incorporate the compromises that have been effected between the other body and we in the House in consideration of the Controlled Substances Registrant Act which passed the House on April 2 of this year.

Basically, the parties in the other body and those in the House dealing with this legislation have agreed upon the House bill with I think four relatively minor changes.

First, we are adding a sentence enhancement, if the offense is committed with a dangerous weapon or device. This would carry a maximum sentence of 25 years imprisonment and a fine of up to $35,000.

Second, we have changed the level of bodily injury required to trigger one of the jurisdictional elements of the offense.

We have reduced the injuries from serious bodily injury to significant bodily injury.

We have also required that the Attorney General report to Congress for 3 years on his enforcement of this act.

Fourth, we have changed the term "registrant" which is not strictly defined in the statute to a person registered with the Drug Enforcement Administration under section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 822.

It is a good bill. We think it has a good threshold. As the gentleman from Illinois well knows, who has been one of the leaders in attempting to pass pharmacy robbery I know for at least the past two Congresses, I think that we have addressed the problem. We have taken into account I think the concerns of the State prosecutors who feel that we are expending unreasonably Federal jurisdiction. This recognizes that the State authorities still are the primary focus of the street crime, including robberies of all kinds, but there is a definite Federal interest, a Federal need to involve itself in the prosecution of pharmacy robberies and burglaries and we think it is a well balanced, reasonable piece of legislation.

Mr. HYDE. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this amendment which the gentleman from New Jersey is going to offer is the result of a compromise based on S. 422 and H.R. 5222, both of which have passed the respective bodies of the Congress. I am informed that DEA statistics indicate that 342 armed robberies of controlled substances from pharmacies occurred during the first 3 months of 1983 alone. There is a tremendous profit potential in pharmacy crime.

This amendment that will be offered, I am informed, to S. 422 allows Federal law enforcement involvement where DEA and FBI agents can make a contribution to the case.

I do want to say that this legislation is based in large part on the hard work of Chairman HUGHES and Congressman HAROLD SAWYER, minority member of the subcommittee, and Senator JEPSEN in support of pharmacy crime legislation and I commend their efforts in moving this legislation in the House.

Last, may I say that pharmacy crime legislation in this Congress would not be possible without the work of the National Association of Chain Drug Stores and the National Wholesale Druggists Association.

I want to commend the chairman for expediting this very important legislation.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES. I just want to echo the sentiments of the gentleman. I think the industry has been extremely supportive. They have been very helpful in attempting to craft legislation that maintains the balance that both the gentleman from Illinois and I seek and the gentleman is very modest. The gentleman himself really has been a leader in this body in endeavoring to pass pharmacy, robbery, and burglary legislation and I commend him for those efforts.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 422

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)

chapter 103 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 2118. Robbery of persons registered under the Controlled Substances Act

"(a) Whoever takes or attempts to take from the person or presence of another, any material, compound, or prescription containing any quantity of a controlled substance belonging to or in the care, custody, or control, management or possession of a pharmacy or a person registered with the Drug Enforcement Administration under section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) by force or violence, or by intimidation, shall be imprisoned for not more than twenty years, or fined not more than $25,000, or both.

"(b) Whoever enters or attempts to enter the business premises or property of a pharmacy or a person registered with the Drug Enforcement Administration under section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) with the intent to steal any quantity of a controlled substance shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

"(c) Whoever, in committing any offense under subsection (a) or (b), assaults any person, or puts in jeopardy the life of any person by the use of a dangerous weapon or device, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for not more than twenty-five years.

"(d) Whoever in committing any offense under section (a) or (b), kills any person, shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

"(e) If two or more persons conspire to violate this section and one or more of such persons do any overt act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both, which may not exceed the maximum punishment prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy.

"(f) For the purposes of this section, the term 'controlled substance' has the meaning set forth in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

"(g) For the purposes of subsection (b), the term 'business premises or property' includes storage facilities, vehicles, aircraft, trucks, or other means of transport or delivery.

"(h) Violations of this section may be prosecuted only upon approval by the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or a designated Assistant Attorney General, unless assistance is requested by a State or local law enforcement official.".

SEC. 2. The table of sections for chapter 103 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2118. Robbery of persons registered under the Controlled Substances Act.".

SEC. 3. For each of the first three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General of the United States, shall submit an annual report to the Congress with respect to its enforcement activities relating to the offense described in the amendment made by the first section of this Act.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HUGHES

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. HUGHES: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Controlled Substance Registrant Protection Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. Chapter 103 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"2118. Robberies and burglaries involving controlled substances

"(a) Whoever takes or attempts to take from the person or presence of another by force or violence or by intimidation any material or compound containing any quantity of a controlled substance belonging to or in the care, custody, control, or possession of a person registered with the Drug Enforcement Administration under section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) shall, except as provided in subsection (c), be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both, if (1) the replacement cost of the material or compound to the registrant was not less than $500, (2) the person who engaged in such taking or attempted such taking traveled in interstate or foreign commerce or used any facility in interstate or foreign commerce to facilitate such taking or attempt, or (3) another person was killed or suffered significant bodily injury as a result of such taking or attempt.

"(b) Whoever, without authority, enters or attempts to enter, or remains in, the business premises or property of a person registered with the Drug Enforcement Administration under section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) with the intent to steal any material or compound containing any quantity of a controlled substance shall, except as provided in subsection (c), be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both, if (1) the replacement cost of the controlled substance to the registrant was not less than $500, (2) the person who engaged in such entry or attempted such entry or who remained in such premises or property traveled in interstate or foreign commerce or used any facility in interstate or foreign commerce to facilitate such entry or attempt or to facilitate remaining in such premises or property, or (3) another person was killed or suffered significant bodily injury as a result of such entry or attempt.

"(c)(1) Whoever in committing any offense under subsection (a) or (b) assaults any person, or puts in jeopadry the life of any person, by the use of a dangerous weapon or device shall be fined not more than $35,000 and imprisoned for not more than twenty-five years.

"(2) Whoever in committing any offense under subsection (a) or (b) kills any person shall be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both.

"(d) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) or (b) of this section and one or more of such persons do any overt act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years or both.

"(e) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'controlled substance' has the meaning prescribed for that term by section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act.

"(2) the term 'business premises or property' includes conveyances and storage facilities.

"(3) the term 'significant bodily injury' means bodily injury which involves a risk of death, significant physical pain, protracted and obvious disfigurement, or a protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental or sensory faculty.".

SEC. 3. The table of sections for chapter 103 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"2118. Robberies and burglaries involving controlled substances.".

SEC. 4. For each of the first three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General of the United States shall submit an annual report to the Congress with respect to the enforcement activities of the Attorney General relating to the offenses created by the amendment made by section 2 of this Act.

Mr. HUGHES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO AMENDMENT ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

(Mr. AKAKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I will introduce a bill today which seeks to require the consent of Congress to an amendment enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii.

In 1920, the Congress of the United States passed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. This act was enacted to "rehabilitate" Native Hawaiians through a government-sponsored homesteading program. Native Hawaiians, descendants of not less than one-half part blood of inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778, were able to recapture possession and control of the public lands of the Territory of Hawaii as homesteads, a total of approximately 200,000 acres. Qualifying Native Hawaiians were thus able to lease a tract of Hawaiian home lands at the nominal cost of $1 a year to use as a means to achieve social and economic well-being.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act also required that successorship of a tract be designated to any relative of

the lessee, provided that he or she qualified as a Native Hawaiian as defined in the act.

In 1959, the Hawaii Admission Act provided that ownership of the Hawaiian home lands be transferred from the United States to the State of Hawaii. These lands were to be held by the State in trust for Native Hawaiians and administered in accordance with the act. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was adopted as a part of the constitution of the State of Hawaii, and the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands was created to administer the Hawaiian home lands under the commission.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today is presented to the Congress in accordance with section 4, subsection (2) of the Admission Act. This bill seeks the required consent of Congress to an amendment enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 was adopted as a provision of the constitution of the State of Hawaii as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands.

Under the provisions of the Admission Act, "An Act to Provide for the Admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union" (March 18, 1959), Congress transferred the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands to the State of Hawaii.

Subsection (2) of section 4 of the Admission Act states "that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the constitution, or in the manner required for State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States."

On June 18, 1982, act 272 was signed by Governor Ariyoshi. Act 272, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1982, seeks to amend section 209, in relation to successors to lessees, of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act. Under section 209, upon the death of the lessee, his or her interest in the tract or tracts and the improvements thereon, shall vest in the relatives of the decedent provided that such persons qualify to be a lessee of Hawaiian home lands. Persons are qualified to be a lessee of Hawaiian home lands if they are Native Hawaiian. The term Native Hawaiian means any descendant of not less than one-half part of the blood of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778.

Act 272, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1982, seeks to amend section 209 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act to allow for successorship of lessee's interest in the tract to the following relatives to the lessee:

(1) husband [and], wife, or children, who are at least one-quarter Hawaiian, or

(2) Native Hawaiian, widows or widowers of the children, grandchildren, brothers and sisters, widows or widowers of the brothers and sisters, or nieces and nephews.

During the month of April, I was fortunate to have had the opportunity to participate in hearings in Hawaii on the Report of the Native Hawaiians Study Commission. Throughout the course of the week-long hearings, witnesses testified regarding a change in the blood quantum, the definition of the amount of blood required to qualify as a Native Hawaiian, as used in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. Advocates for a change in the blood quantum claimed that the quantum currently serves as a divisive mechanism in Hawaiian families. Opponents felt that the change would deny those beneficiaries currently waiting for Hawaiian home lands tracts expeditious and fair treatment.

However, I must indicate for the RECORD that although some consideration has been given to a broader change in the definition of the term Native Hawaiian, the bill which I am proposing today amends the section only as to successorship to allow those descendants of Native Hawaiian lessees to be designated interest in the tract or tracts upon death of said lessees if they have 25 percent Hawaiian blood. In introducing this legislation, I am simply requesting that Congress consent to the amendment of the Hawaii State Legislature to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920.

In order to explain simply the intent of this amendment, I would like to explain the circumstances leading to its creation. The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, the body which acts as trustee for beneficiaries of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, found that current lessees face a grave problem. Under the terms of the Admission Act, if the lessee is a Native Hawaiian—at least 50 percent Hawaiian—and that lessee is the only person in his immediate family who is a Native Hawaiian, then his spouse and children will be able to live on, use, and occupy Hawaiian homelands only as long as said lessee is alive. When said lessee dies, his spouse and children will not be able to continue to live on, use, or occupy Hawaiian homelands.

I would like to submit for the RECORD an article from the Garden Island of April 16, 1984, which illustrates the problems of Native Hawaiians' successors today. You will see from the article that the present law has a divisive effect on Hawaiian families. The implementation of Act 272, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1982, will have an obvious positive impact on the plight of Native Hawaiians. The article follows:

[From the Garden Island, Monday, Apr. 16, 1984]

A FAMILY SPLIT ILLUSTRATES PLIGHT OF HAWAIIANS

(By William LeGro)

An Anahola family dispute over a Hawaiian Homes lease is the latest incident displaying the problems facing the program and the people it's supposed to be serving.

While the immediate issue is whether one member of the family is entitled to the lease, underlying the fight is the desperation many Hawaiians feel about their chances of ever getting a piece of the 200,000 acres the Department of Hawaiian Homes Lands owns.

In Anahola, the story goes like this (names are being withheld to protect the family's privacy):

Mr. K had a lease on an Anahola houselot, and built his house there, raised his family, and died. On an official notarized form, signed by Mr. K and then—Hawaiian Homes Commission Chairman Billie Beamer, dated Oct. 15, 1975, Mr. K stated the terms of successorship under the law had been "fully explained to me. I do not wish to consider any relatives."

Mr. K didn't want any of his relatives to succeed to his lease. Instead, he wanted the DHHL to appraise his house and pay his widow for it. Not having enough Hawaiian ancestry, neither she nor the couple's children could succeed to the lease. The children told The Garden Island their father didn't want to split the family by choosing one of the many cousins to succeed him. Instead, he wanted the lease to go back on the list of available properties and be awarded to the next qualified person on the waiting list, which now has more than 7,000 people on it.

In a letter dated Oct. 25, 1978, then-Chairman Merwyn Jones expressed condolences to the now-widowed Mrs. K. Jones said the lease would be terminated in accordance with her husband's wishes, the net proceeds of the improvements (mainly the house) would be sent to her, and the property "would then resume its status on unleased Hawaiian Home Lands, and the Department will lease this homestead to the next applicant on the list."

In that letter Jones also noted the family had expressed interest in renouncing Mr. K.'s will and having a qualified relative succeed to the lease. Although the department had earlier approved the will, Jones said the DHHL, would consider renouncement of the will and allowing a relative to succeed.

But it would be a long and time-consuming process Jones said. And until a successor was found, Mr. K.'s wife and children—ineligible to succeed—could continue to live in the house.

And so they did. They're still there, but have been told they will soon have to move to let a cousin who has been awarded the lease move in.

But everything had changed in the intervening years, the children say. They changed their minds about renouncing their father's will—strains had already developed as the search for a successor had begun. They say a cousin qualified by ancestry to succeed had first promised she would share their family home with them when she succeeded to the lease—and had then backed out of the promise.

Seeing the battle developing, the children say they went to see DHHL Kauai's representative Juliet Aiu to call off the renouncement of the will and the search for a succes-

sor. They say they realize their father's wishes had solid foundation in reality.

The children say Mrs. Aiu called Honolulu for them and had the daughter speak to a DHHL official, who said he would see what he could do about stopping the successor search. He said he would send them a letter, the children say, but no letter arrived.

And the search went on. DHHL Ombudsman Ken Toguchi told The Garden Island the department placed four legal ads for a relative-successor, and the cousin who eventually got the lease was the only one to answer.

Toguchi said Mr. K's will make the property revert back to the control of the DHHL, which went looking for a successor. The decision, he said, was the Commission's to make, and the Commission decided to let the cousin succeed.

Toguchi said the department should have the check ready for Mrs. K this week (actually, the money will be loaned to the cousin, who will pay Mrs. K). If Mrs. K accepts the money, he said, "It's all over."

The children vow they won't leave their family home until the Hawaiian Homes Commission revokes the successorship and awards the property to the next applicant on the waiting list, as their father wanted and as the department previously said it would do.

They say their cousin's father—their own father's brother—is the one who got the successorship for his daughter. They claim there are seven people who will sign affidavits saying the uncle boasted he got the award for her by knowing the right people in the right places in government.

When the cousin was contacted by The Garden Island to get her side of the story, her father came on the line and said that "There was no will," that the award was made "by the books" and was "all legal."

The children say they won't leave their home under these circumstances. They are prepared to face the police and the courts. With the money coming from the DHHL very soon, the showdown may be just around the corner.

More than 7,000 Hawaiians have waited up to 30 years for a lease, and those are the ones who qualify under the 50 percent or more Hawaiian ancestry rule. Mr. K's children—and there are more than 100,000 such part-Hawaiian people without the minimum 50 percent Hawaiian ancestry—are the targets of a Congressional bill to open up the lands to those of less than one-half Hawaiian blood. That change is probably far down the road.

The federal government is investigating the operations of the Hawaiian Homes program following a lawsuit by native Hawaiian groups. The department has been criticized for not getting proper compensation for its commercial leases and for "losing" thousands of acres of land through faulty record-keeping.

The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act has been in effect more than 60 years, and governs more than 200,000 acres of land expressly for the benefit of Hawaiians. Yet in Anahola land is so precious a family is split over a few thousand square feet. This is not the first article The Garden Island has carried about bitter divisions among Hawaiians over Hawaiian Homes, and it's likely not to be the last.

To remedy this problem, this bill reduces the Hawaiian blood requirements for a spouse or offspring of a Hawaiian homestead lessee to qualify as a successor to a homestead lease.

In addition to lowering the blood quantum to 25 percent, the bill will eliminate the requirement of the lessee to designate a successor at the time the homestead award is granted. The bill will also allow the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands to select a successor to a lease in the event the lessee fails to designate a successor upon his death.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that you understand the importance of this issue to the people of my State. It is recognized that self-determination is a desirable goal of Hawaiians; the goal of self-determination would be furthered by passage of this bill. Let us now work to fulfill our responsibility in offering our consent to Act 272, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1982, to relieve current lessees, and their families, of their frustrations and despair.

□ 1750

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to precede the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) in special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT AMERICAN—EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker it is with a great sense of sorrow that we come together today for this special order to eulogize a dear friend and a distinguished public servant, our late colleague, ED FORSYTHE.

ED's passing is a tremendous loss to this body and to the people of New Jersey, particularly his constituents in the 13th district whom he served with great dedication. We will miss him not only as a colleague and friend but also his independent spirit, as much as we will miss the trademark bowtie that became such a familiar fixture in this Chamber.

Since he came to Congress in 1971, ED became known as a "workhorse"—and the phrase most often used to describe him was "quiet but effective." ED never sought the limelight, but was instead content to work hard for his constituents and for his beliefs behind the scenes.

He played a crucial role in fashioning a number of legislative compromises. In his role as ranking minority member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, ED had the difficult task of balancing the interests of environmental protection with those of resources development. As a leader in the fight to preserve the Endangered Species Act, ED was instrumental in fending off numerous attempts to weaken that law. His commitment to national wildlife refuges was demonstrated by his authorship of the Non-Game Fish and Wildlife Act, and his important role in the success of the National Environmental Protection Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

ED began his government career in 1948 as secretary of the Moorestown Board of Adjustment. He was elected to the township committee in 1953 and served as mayor from 1957 until 1962, when he became chairman of the township planning board, a post he held through 1963.

From 1963 until his election to Congress in 1971, ED served in the New Jersey State Senate, moving up the ranks as assistant majority leader, minority leader, senate president and then served as Acting Governor in 1968. While serving in the senate, ED was responsible for legislation to create a statewide grand jury which gave New Jersey law enforcement officials the necessary tools to pursue and prosecute organized crime and corruption.

ED was a fiercely independent legislator, who put his principles above politics. His Quaker background gave him a strong commitment for world peace and this was apparent when dealing with military appropriations and foreign policy. His strongly held moral beliefs in this area earned him widespread respect from his colleagues.

In the years that ED and I served together, he could always be counted on to put partisan considerations aside whenever it came to the best interests of the people of New Jersey. On many an occasion, ED was the one who would pull us all together as a delegation, in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation, to work on matters affecting our State.

At this time, I want to take a moment to commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), who has introduced a joint resolution that will rename the Barnegat and Brigantine Wildlife Refuges in New Jersey for ED FORSYTHE. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am pleased that we passed this legislation to commemorate ED's work in this area, and I can think of no better way to pay tribute to his dedication to preserving the wildlife of our Nation.

I extend my deepest sympathies to ED's wife Mary, his daughter Susan, and the rest of his family. We will miss ED FORSYTHE a great deal.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman form New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. I thank the gentleman for yielding, the distinguished

chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the dean of the New Jersey delegation, and I commend him for taking out this particular special order.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago, when ED FORSYTHE announced that he would not seek another term in office, I knew I was losing a close and valued colleague in the House. Now I have lost a good friend as well. ED's unfortunate death last month has taken from us a great legislator and a fine individual.

ED FORSYTHE was always a special friend and trusted advisor to me. When I first came to the Congress, ED went out of his way to work with me on a number of issues, sharing with me his valuable years of experience in Congress. Though we served on opposite sides of the aisle, I can honestly say that partisanship never stood in the way of our mutual efforts, detract from the work that needed to be done, or affect our close relationship.

Throughout the years, I had the privilege of working closely with ED on many issues affecting our adjoining districts in southern New Jersey. I also served with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, where we joined forces on a number of proposals aimed at protecting our New Jersey shore. In the fields of environmental protection and conservation, ED clearly left his greatest marks as a leader.

ED's rarest quality, which I deeply admired, was his conviction to follow his conscience. ED legislated with honesty and integrity. By doing so, he always stood out as an example of what is right about our Government, and what public service truly means.

Over the years, ED worked diligently and steadily, maintaining the highest standards in his efforts. He was a conscientious and thorough lawmaker who concentrated on substance, rather than style. He never sought the limelight.

ED FORSYTHE was active in public service from 1948 until this year, starting out on his local governing body and continuing his involvenment up through his election to the 91st Congress, and his reelection to each Congress since. But even after years of service in Washington, ED maintained close contact with his constituency at home. His work and his family were his life—a life that has been full, meaningful and productive.

I know I am not alone when I say that ED will be greatly missed, for we have been enriched by his presence among us.

□ 1800

But he had, even after years of service in Washington, maintained close contact with his constituency at home. His work and his family were his life, a life that has been full, meaningful and productive. I know that I am not alone when I way that ED will be sadly missed for we have all been enriched by his presence here in the Congress.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to pay tribute to our good friend and colleague, the late Congressman ED FORSYTHE. Our Nation and State of New Jersey sustained a great loss with the passing of the distinguished and dedicated gentleman. He was a man of integrity—a man of principle.

He represented the best that this Nation has to offer. He served quietly but tirelessly and effectively for the people of his district. There was not an ounce of pomposity or pretention in ED FORSYTHE. He was a warm, down-to-earth man, very much at home with the people of his Pine Barrens district.

In these few short weeks since his passing, we have become painfully aware of the tremendous work he shouldered every day. We also are aware of the emptiness and void left by his passing, as we endeavor to continue without his guidance, without his patience, and without his foresight. As senior Republican in the New Jersey delegation, he provided the anchor for us in the political storms.

ED FORSYTHE spent most of his adult life working for the public good. He entered public service in 1948 to work in the government of his hometown of Morrestown. By 1963, ED found himself in the New Jersey State Senate and, by 1968, president of that distinguished body. In 1968, he served a brief tenure as Acting Governor of the State of New Jersey.

ED FORSYTHE came to Washington in 1970. Here he distinguished himself as a friend of the environment and a foe of Government waste and excess.

His legislative accomplishments are many. He held the post of ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. ED FORSYTHE was a major legislative leader in fashioning the Fisheries Conservation and Management Act. This 1976 legislation came from the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee, on which he was the ranking minority member at the time. This crucial bill recognized the need for rational and prudent management of fish resources. The act resulted in the creation of regional commissions which manage the taking of fish and promote the development of fish. Successful passage of this landmark legislation was but one example of his expertise and parliamentary skill.

He was also a leader on many other important bills, including many changes we have seen with the respect to the Coastal Zone Management Act; natural wildlife refuge bills; and Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, the so-called ocean dumping bill.

The National Wildlife Federation recognized his considerable legislative accomplishments in 1980 by naming ED FORSYTHE its Legislator of the Year.

Long before I met ED FORSYTHE, his reputation was well-known to me. Having been elected in 1980, many people preferred advice that proved useful. Among the best bits of advice I received was from those who had known ED FORSYTHE and his distinguished leadership in the New Jersey Senate. Their advice was simple, "when you get to Washington, you will find it necessary to know whose word you can trust and whose advice is sound and not self-serving. ED FORSYTHE is one whose word is good. You can trust him."

That proved to be one of the best political and professional counsels a freshman legislator could have received.

There will be simply no way to replace ED FORSYTHE. His breadth of experience and willingness to serve so completely are indeed rare.

ED FORSYTHE was a man of high principle. When he spoke, this Congress listened. His voice is now quiet but he will be long remembered.

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in joining Representative RODINO in this special order in memory of our late colleague, EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.

Congressman FORSYTHE was a man dedicated to many great causes and was respected by all who know him. He served as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Congressman FORSYTHE was a legislator for 13 years and became a strong and effective voice for natural resource legislation, and legislation protecting our wildlife refuges.

EDWIN was a humanitarian. A sensitive, caring person who made valuable contributions toward making this world a better place to live.

Let history recall Congressman EDWIN B. FORSYTHE for the great American and legislator that he was.●

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, ED FORSYTHE was a decent, honorable man.

The House has lost a conscientious, thoughtful, hardworking Member.

I had the pleasure of serving with ED for nearly 10 years on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He made enormous contributions to the protection of our natural resources—bringing to the legislative deliberations of the committee the spirit of bipartisanship so important to conservation initiatives.

ED demonstrated the cooperative spirit essential to the functioning of this House as a legislative body. He represented his constituents and the principles of his party without acrimony and without unnecessary divisiveness and confrontation.

Rather, in a firm, honest direct manner, he acted in accordance with those principles which he held deeply.

I shall miss ED in the House and, particularly in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

I feel very sorry that ED will not enjoy the years of a fulfilled retirement which he has earned.●

● Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my House colleagues today in paying tribute to a man who was more than a neighbor or fellow Member of this body. EDWIN FORSYTHE was a friend.

Because his office was but a few doors down the hall from mine in the Rayburn Building, we oftentimes crossed paths or walked to the House floor for votes or debate together. It was on those occasions, perhaps more than at any other time, that I fully appreciated the depth of his knowledge about this House and the legislation we consider here daily. I admired his even, balanced approach to the most difficult of issues and I sought his input on issues that affected his congressional district in New Jersey and mine in Ohio. He impressed me with his concern for his constituents and with his understanding of issues that were complex and detailed.

The House will miss ED greatly, just as the people of his congressional district will miss his dedication to their needs and concerns. If we continue to adhere to the principles ED upheld and remain true to the example he set in this Chamber, then it will be that he is gone, but certainly not forgotten. I considered him a good friend and I extend to his fine family my deepest sympathy at this time of their loss.●

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a trusted colleague and friend. When one mentions ED FORSYTHE, the words trust, respect, and integrity come to mind; a patriot who served his State and Nation with dignity.

Sincerity proved to be ED's greatest asset during his more than 30 years of public service. He maintained a low profile in office, yet worked intently on the issues of concern to his constituency.

The people of New Jersey's 13th District expressed a deep concern for their environment—Congressman FORSYTHE represented their interests as ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He was an effective advocate for wetlands preservation, a prime sponsor of the 1976 law that created a 200-mile fishing limit, and a strong supporter of the Endangered Species Act. He worked for what he believed in and got results.

As a leader of the New Jersey Delegation, ED could always be counted on as a team player, choosing always to share rather than monopolize, give rather than take. He brought a sense of decency and integrity to public office at a difficult time.

A man of wisdom, a private man, a man who touched the lives of so many—Congress and the nation will sadly miss this fine American.●

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for allowing me to participate in this special order to honor a colleague all of us greatly admired.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1977, my first assignments were the Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees. I was most privileged and fortunate to have ED FORSYTHE as one of my first ranking minority leaders.

The qualities I admired most in ED were his dedication to the nonglamourous, but important, committee work, his attention to individual Members' concerns, and the fairness and decency he displayed in addressing those concerns.

As many have said today, ED's decency, fairness, and hard work characterized his 35 years of public service. These qualities were exemplified when ED began his public career tackling the burdensome but important job of secretary of the Moorestown Board of Adjustment. ED's emphasis on getting the job done quitely and effectively continued through his service as a township committeeman, mayor, State senator, and U.S. Congressman.

ED's efforts did not go unnoticed by his colleagues. At every level of government service he achieved a leadership position among his peers. I believe this recognition by his peers is a lasting tribute to ED.

ED's leadership and work in Congress will always leave a profound and positive impact on our Nation and particularly Louisiana, where our natural resources are the key to the State's welfare.

ED played a critical role in the passage and shaping of vital natural resource legislation. These landmarks acts included the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

Most importantly, ED was instrumental in forging the landmark 1978 Outer Continental Shelf Land Act amendments. Since its passage ED worked diligently to assure that the OCS Act was properly implemented. He always realized the importance of the OCS program to the Nation and our energy security needs.

It was a real pleasure to serve with ED on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as well as the Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf.

We will miss ED greatly.●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of the Honorable ED FORSYTHE, the State of New Jersey has lost one of its ablest public servants, America has lost an outstanding legislator, and I have lost a good friend.

ED's experiences prior to serving in Congress prepared him well: his 8 years in the New Jersey State senate enabled him to serve as assistant majority leader, minority leader, and senate president. In 1968, he also served as Acting Governor of New Jersey.

ED's 14 years in the House of Representatives were characterized by significant accomplishments. As senior Republican in New Jersey's congressional delegation, ED distinguished himself as a principled, hard-working leader, whose battle with cancer in no way diminished his vigorous pursuit of the goals he had for his constituents and for the country at large.

ED's family deserves our deepest sympathy. They may take comfort, however, in the fact that ED's contributions to our Nation long will be remembered.●

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today I join the distinguished dean of the New Jersey delegation in honoring the memory of EDWIN B. FORSYTHE with whom we served for many years. ED was an exceptional legislator and a fine human being. He did not shout to make his point heard because he did not need to. When he spoke on the issue that concerned him most—the preservation of our environment—he spoke from the heart and with conviction. He cared about his constituency and his State. Before, and up until his death, he actively sought to eliminate ocean pollution—a problem that has threatened New Jersey's beaches and plagued its citizens for far too long.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and, in the last 3 years, its ranking minority member, he was instrumental in the passage of important environmental legislation such as the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Protection Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

ED FORSYTHE was a man of conviction. Even though he disagreed with his own party at times, he did not compromise his beliefs, but always voted his conscience. As a Quaker, he was a man of peace. His votes on defense issues demonstrated this. We shall all remember EDWIN B. FORSYTHE for the man he was and the beliefs for which he stood.●

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, of this year we lost a good friend and colleague in ED FORSYTHE of New Jersey. ED served in the House

of Representatives for 13 years and established a reputation as an effective legislator and real leader in this institution. He was a kind and decent human being and we all miss him very much.

ED began his outstanding record of public service in 1948 as secretary of the Morristown, NJ, Board of Adjustments. Following these humble beginnings ED served as mayor of Morristown and then went on to be elected to the State senate. He rose quickly in the leadership ranks in the senate, holding positions of assistant minority leader, minority leader, senate president, and president pro tempore.

ED was first elected to Congress in 1970 to fill the unexpired term of the Honorable William Cahill in the 91st Congress and was then reelected to his first full 2 year term in 1972.

In his career in Congress, ED served with distinction on the Standards of Official Conduct Committee, the Science and Technology Committee, and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, where he most recently held the position of ranking minority member. For the past 3 years, Mr. Speaker, I have had the distinct pleasure of serving with ED on the Merchant Marine Committee where I admired and respected his valuable leadership. ED was an outstanding legislator who was able to forge consensus and compromise on nearly every issue in which he was involved. Through his work on the Merchant Marine Committee, ED developed a reputation as a protector and defender of our Nation's fish and wildlife resources. He played a critical role in the passage of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Additionally, he was the prime author of the Nongame Act which has increased the attention given to the many wildlife in this country that are not hunted.

In addition to wildlife issues, ED was a leading spokesman for the development of our Nation's energy sources. As a member of the ad hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf, which developed the 1978 amendments to the OCS Lands Act, ED was an early proponent of accelerating the development of our offshore resources in a timely and safe manner. His commitment to developing energy resources domestically was coupled with his strong devotion to environmental safeguards. He was a champion of environmental concerns and worked to maintain a delicate balance between the protection of our Nation's environment and the orderly development of our natural resources.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, will sorely miss ED FORSYTHE and I am proud to have had the opportunity to serve with him in Congress. His tremendous contribution to the legislative process will long be remembered in this august body. In the truest sense of the term he was a gentleman and a scholar and we are all better off for having had the privelege to know him.●

● Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, Adlai Stevenson said:

What do we mean by patriotism in the context of our times? * * * A patriotism that puts country ahead of self; a patriotism which is not short frenzied outbursts of emotion, but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime. There are words that are easy to utter, but this is a mighty assignment. For it is often easier to fight for principles than to live up to them.

EDWIN FORSYTHE both fought for and lived up to the principles he espoused.

ED transcended both politics and party. He was not afraid to go up against the mainstream. A careful and thoughtful legislator ED FORSYTHE built a strong environmental record which was at the same time sympathetic to the inevitably accompanying issue of development.

With his passing we are losing not only a friend, but an able and knowledgeable Member of Congress. He will be sorely missed in this body, as well as in the 13th District of New Jersey which loses an experienced and dedicated Representative.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife Mary and their child.●

● Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, a deep sadness came over this Chamber on the 29th of March, when it was announced that our esteemed colleague from the 13th District of New Jersey, ED FORSYTHE, had died. This sadness will fade, but slowly, for ED, although a quiet man, was an effective and hard working part of this body for almost 14 years. Many suspension days will pass before we will realize that we cannot look for ED's counsel on the many bills that come from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee where he was for so long the able ranking Republican member.

ED's passing is a loss not only to this Chamber, to his wife Mary, whom he affectionately called "Mickey," and to his daughter, Susan. The people of New Jersey have lost a faithful public servant, his staff has lost a good boss, I have lost a good office neighbor, and all of us have lost a friend.

I am proud to have worked with ED for several years on the Education and Labor Committee and to have served in the House with him. I hope the tributes paid to him today will somehow comfort his wife, his family, and his fine staff.●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give tribute to our late colleague and very dear friend, EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.

ED was a man committed to public service in the New Jersey Senate and this House. He served as a State senator from 1963 to 1969, rising to become president of the New Jersey Senate, and acting Governor in 1968. His dedication to his party was respected by all who knew him, and ED was elected to the Republican National Convention in 1968 and 1976. Let there be no doubt about it, ED FORSYTHE made his mark on the representative bodies of his home State and here in Washington.

We have indeed lost a good and resourceful leader, a man dedicated to public service and commitment. I shall remember him as a fine colleague who very much deserves to be honored today.●

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have this opportunity to pay tribute to our late friend and colleague, ED FORSYTHE, and to say how much I will miss working with him here in the Congress.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I came to know ED well in his capacity as ranking minority member. He was an able legislator, a sound leader, and a true gentleman. His presence will surely be sorely missed.

ED was respected and recognized for his conservation efforts, and for his balanced thinking in the realm of environmental affairs—the awards and tributes he has received through the years attest to that. His tenure in the House was marked by consistency, thoughtfulness, and a sound sense of the need to represent the people. He will be missed by his constituents, his colleagues, and the political community at large.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest condolences to ED FORSYTHE's family, and to reiterate to them that he has left a very deep and positive mark.●

● Mr. LOEFFLER. Mr. Speaker, ED FORSYTHE devoted over 20 years of outstanding public service to the people of New Jersey and to our Nation—first as a member of the New Jersey senate where he served as assistant majority leader, minority leader, senate president, and acting Governor—then as a Member of this body, where he served with great distinction as ranking Republican on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and on the Science and Technology Committee.

I had the opportunity to work closely with ED on the Republican Committee on Committees, where I was impressed by his dedication and sense of fairness.

ED FORSYTHE devoted his 13 years of service in the House to bettering the lives of all Americans. He worked diligently to fashion legislation in the area of fisheries development and wildlife management. He also contributed his special expertise on issues relating to maritime policy, our Nation's Coast Guard, and the Panama Canal, and for this we are all most appreciative and grateful.

Finally, ED stood firmly by his principles that hard-working Americans should not be overburdened by Government regulation and taxes and that our free enterprise system is the greatest hope for the development of human potential.

My wife Kathy joins me in remembering ED today and in extending our condolences to ED's wife, Mary, and daughter Susan.●

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sadness that we learned of the death of our colleague and friend from the State of New Jersey, ED FORSYTHE.

Congressman FORSYTHE had a long and distinguished career in New Jersey politics—locally, in the State senate and, finally, in the House of Representatives. He served the people of New Jersey the only way he knew how—honestly and with great dedication.

For those of us in the New Jersey delegation, we were privileged to work closely with ED on a great many issues. We benefited from his vast knowledge and expertise on a daily basis.

It is well known that ED FORSYTHE was a major influence on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the prime mover of the legislation to set a 200-mile fishing limit. But, he was much more than that.

ED FORSYTHE was a decent and honorable man, strong in his convictions, dedicated to his family and friends. He often shunned the attention offered to Congressmen, preferring to live a humble and quiet life.

With ED FORSYTHE's passing, all of us are a little poorer, for we have lost a good friend and conscientious colleague. But having known and worked with ED over the years, all of us can be grateful that we are richer for the experience.●

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a dear and respected colleague, ED FORSYTHE. I share the sadness of his family and friends in his recent passing. ED will be long remembered as one of the most honorable and respected Members of Congress.

Since he was first elected in 1970, ED was a quiet, stable, reasonable voice in committee and in debate on the floor. Of his many legislative accomplishments, I know ED was probably most proud of his strong support for the Endangered Species Act and other environmental preservation issues. A deeply religious man of the Quaker faith, ED was committed to expressing that denomination's beliefs in nonviolence and passivism. Each year when the defense appropriations bill would come to a vote, ED would offer the motion to recommit the bill to committee. Although I rarely supported his motion, I admired his integrity and strength of conviction expressed in this way.

ED served well the citizens of New Jersey, even before he was elected to the House. The senior Republican on the New Jersey delegation, ED also served his State in the State senate and as acting Governor. The State can well be proud of his fine service on its behalf.

In closing, I would like to extend my personal sympathy to ED's family and friends. He was a man of distinction, and one I am grateful and proud to have known.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the Nation recently lost a very valuable public servant, ED FORSYTHE. During two Congresses in the early 1970's, I had the privilege of serving with ED on the Education and Labor Committee and particularly on its subcommittee dealing with elementary, secondary, and vocational education. I developed the greatest respect for ED's contributions as a legislator during our service together on the committee and our more than 13 years of service together in the House. He was always a voice for reason, moderation, and commonsense.

Beyond his contributions as a legislator, ED was one of the most thoughtful and conscientious Members with whom it has been my privilege to serve in the House.

I would like to extend my personal condolences to ED's widow, his family, and his many friends. His wise counsel will be missed by all of us.●

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a personal tribute to my friend and colleague, ED FORSYTHE.

ED was a seasoned legislator by the time I came to serve in the House of Representatives, having chosen a career in public service more than 35 years ago, and I was to learn a great deal from observing him in my first term as a U.S. Congressman. He came from the Pennsylvania Fifth District town of Westtown and graduated from public school there. It was common ground that created between us a relationship that transcended our common professions of small businessmen and legislators.

ED did not speak harshly or loudly; he did not strong-arm or pressure his peers. What he did do was work painstakingly and constantly, choosing a low-key, low-profile approach to produce results for the benefit of the people of the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey and for the country he loved.

He lived his life, publicly, and privately, day in and day out, in a way that he could be satisfied with his efforts and that his family, friends, and constituents could point to with pride. His style was that of a soft-spoken, fair, and discerning man. Never more apparent than in the last 5 years, but certainly throughout his career as well, ED was a man of spirit and courage. His resolve to do what he thought was right never dimmed.

My memory of ED's quiet effectiveness and his faith in his fellow man and his God will always be inspirational to me. I feel fortunate in having known him as a friend and colleague.

His wife, Mickey, and his daughter, Susan, have my deepest sympathies.●

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues I am saddened at the recent death of our dear friend and colleague, ED FORSYTHE. His passing on March 29 leaves a great void in this Chamber. Certainly I have lost an irreplaceable colleague.

ED FORSYTHE was an outstanding Member—one who worked hard for his district and for the State of New Jersey. Because of his committee responsibility as ranking minority member on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee he was also a national figure.

Among his major achievements were the creation of the 1976, 200-mile fishing limit off the U.S. coast, the passage of the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the National Environmental Protection Act. All are pieces of legislation which could not have been realized without his superb guidance.

ED FORSYTHE possessed those qualities essential for leadership—sound judgment, patience, perseverance and unyielding adherence to the principles and policies advocated by his party for the welfare of our Nation. His character, achievements, and faithful service will be an inspiration to generations yet to come.

We have lost a true friend and this country has lost a great statesman. I extend my condolences to his family and friends, and my deep appreciation for all the work he did for all of us.●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with much sadness in my heart that I rise today to join my colleagues in this much deserved tribute to our good friend ED FORSYTHE.

ED FORSYTHE was a man who devoted his life to caring for others. This gentle man never learned to say "no" when it came to meeting the needs of the people he served during his long distinguished career in public office.

Mr. Speaker, ED was a man who did it all. Like myself he began his political career on the local level, serving on the Moorestown Township Committee and later as mayor of his beloved home community. ED later moved on to the New Jersey State Senate, where he served honorably for 7 years, holding the posts of both minority leader and senate president before being elected to Congress in 1970 to fill the expired term of Bill Cahill, who had been elected Governor.

During the nearly 14 years that ED FORSYTHE served in the House, he became known as one of its most effec-

tive Members. His success story here was not based on flamboyant showmanship, but rather on a low-key gentle approach that rapidly won over many Members to his points of view.

As the ranking minority member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, ED FORSYTHE became instrumental in the development of legislation that will determine the direction of our Nation's environmental policies in the years ahead. He was the prime sponsor of the landmark 200-mile-limit offshore fishing law that was enacted in 1976, and played a key role in the formulation of such critical legislation as the National Environmental Protection Act, the Non-Game Fish and Wildlife Act, the Alaskan Land Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

Even though he became an acknowledged national and international leader in the field of environmental protection, ED FORSYTHE's heart was never too far from his home State of New Jersey, which he dearly loved. When the controversial pinelands preservation plan was being considered by Congress, ED dove head first into the battle. And while his plan to preserve those wetlands was not greeted with unanimous approval by all members of the New Jersey congressional delegation, his genuine concern for our State most certainly was.

And just prior to his most untimely death, ED FORSYTHE was deeply involved in many important legislative areas including the fish and wildlife conservation fund and the efforts to phase out the dumping of sewage sludge into our oceans.

ED FORSYTHE is a man we will deeply miss in the months and years ahead as we here attempt to deal with the environmental problems facing our Nation. To acknowledge his accomplishments, I am proud to have sponsored legislation which designated the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the national wildlife refuge system as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

My prayers go out to ED's wife Mary, his daughter Susan and other members of the Forsythe family at this time of great sadness. But they can rest assured that the legacy that ED FORSYTHE left behind will serve as an example for us all to follow. I was most proud to have called him my friend.●

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I join my colleagues today to express my sorrow over the death of my friend and longtime colleague EDWIN FORSYTHE. ED was a Burlington County resident who had represented his south Jersey district in Congress for 14 years until his death in March.

I first met ED FORSYTHE in 1967 when I was elected to the New Jersey State Senate. ED subsequently became president of the Senate and served with distinction. We were both later elected to the House of Representatives, and had served together in Washington since 1973. All of us who knew ED would agree that he truly was a dedicated and outstanding public servant who worked hard and did an effective job in representing the interests of his constituents.

He was the ranking Republican on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and as such had a hand in drafting legislation of great importance to the country, especially to New Jersey and the other coastal States. His activities in this area resulted in his receiving numerous awards and public recognition for his leadership in the conservation of our coastal resources. When we look at his record of accomplishments, it is obvious that ED FORSYTHE had an opportunity to contribute creatively and constructively to the welfare of this Nation, and I can say without hestitation that he was equal to the task.

Mr. Speaker, I close my remarks by citing an editorial from the Newark, N.J., Star-Ledger which said in tribute to Mr. FORSYTHE:

His district, his state and his country have lost an effective legislator with attributes that are, unfortunately, rare. To say that he will be missed may seem trite and inadequate—but it is nonetheless true.●

● Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of our colleague, Representative EDWIN B. FORSYTHE of New Jersey, is an occasion of great sadness for those of us who knew and served with him in the House.

I made the acquaintance of Mr. FORSYTHE when he first came to Congress in 1971 and was assigned to membership on the Committee on Education and Labor. He was a kind and gentle man, a reasonable man and searched diligently for the legislative answers as to what was best for the country. I was truly sorry when he transferred from the Education and Labor Committee to another assignment.

His 13th New Jersey District has lost an outstanding public servant and the colleagues in this House have lost a friend.●

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise to pay tribute to a close friend and a very capable and committed colleague, ED FORSYTHE.

Yet my sadness today is tempered by a deep pride in having known and served with this dedicated and outstanding individual. ED worked very hard on behalf of the citizens of New Jersey's 13th Congressional District, and he worked very hard on behalf of the citizens of the United States.

As ranking minority member of the important Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee ED worked on a number of issues affecting our merchant marine fleet, our foreign policy and our environment.

ED was never afraid to make the tough decision, and to stand firm for legislative priorities he set and which were obviously supported by the citizens of his district and many others across the country. ED's deep love for an commitment to our Nation's environment and natural resources were often reflected in his voting, both in committee and on the floor of the House.

I have a tremendous amount of respect for ED's work in Congress. He was an outstanding legislator. But he was far more than that. For me, ED was a close personal friend. I will miss our conversations and his trademarked crew cut and bow tie. This House will miss his leadership and ability.

To ED's wife and family I extend my sympathies. You can be very proud of ED; his work, dedication and personality have left their indelible mark on this House and on the hearts of many of us who serve here.●

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our late colleague, EDWIN B. FORSYTHE. News of his death was not softened by the knowledge that ED's passing came finally, with mercy, after a long and tiring illness. He will be missed here in the Congress he served well for so long.

Over his 14-year career in Congress, ED distinguished himself as a man of integrity and personal strength. He did not easily wear the cloak of assumptions which frequently accompany affiliation with one or the other parties in this body. The votes he cast—"conservative" on economic issues; "liberal" or matters affecting foreign affairs—reflect the basic responsibility ED felt to develop his own views, and to fairly represent those who entrusted him with their vote. That the people of New Jersey returned ED FORSYTHE to seven successive Congresses testifies to the respect and admiration he won in fulfillment of that responsibility.

ED won that admiration and respect here in Congress as well. As ranking member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee, ED was a vital force in the development of landmark legislation approved in this body. It is fair to say that without his reasoned, responsible and tempered influence, some of this legislation would not have been so finely drafted or so responsive as it is in statute today. Through his work with the subcommittee, ED played a pivotal role in the development of the Endangered Species Act and subsequent reauthorization, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and—in this Congress—the Wetlands Loan Act extension. ED has earned well his reputation and our respect for his sen-

sitive, reasoned approach to conservation and wildlife preservation.

Clearly, ED's achievements through years of conscientious work here in Congress deserve our praise today. His unbroken series of reelection and the numerous national and local awards recognizing his achievements evidence the respect outside of Congress in the communities and constituencies he represented. But I think the most fitting tribute to ED's work and life lies not in our words today, and not in the honors he has so well earned, but in the impact he made upon this institution and the laws he helped form. The legislation he helped fashion stands by itself in tribute to ED's work and life here with us.

I regret his passage, and join my colleagues in paying him tribute he so richly deserves.●

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation suffered a great loss when our late colleague, EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, passed away on March 29. My wife, Lee, joins in extending our condolences to his wife, Mary, and their daughter, Susan.

During his 14 years in the Congress, ED FORSYTHE was a tireless worker for the protection of our environment, while at the same time, realizing that our Nation also needed economic development. He sought to balance these competing interests in a way that ultimately benefited the Nation as a whole.

ED was not a flamboyant legislator, but he was a very effective one. He was a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and during his tenure I had the pleasure of working with him to enact into law some of the most important environmental protective legislation ever passed by the Congress. I refer to the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the National Environmental Protection Act.

When efforts were made to weaken the Endangered Species Act a few years ago, ED was one of the most outspoken opponents to such a move and was successful in adding plants and additional species of fish and wildlife to a bill strengthening penalties for selling endangered species abroad. In 1976, he was the primary sponsor of the bill that created the 200-mile fishing zone.

In addition to his environmental concerns, ED was also tireless in his desire to see that our U.S. merchant marine and shipbuilding base would return to its former position of preeminence.

I consider it good fortune that I had the opportunity to know him, to work with him, and to have him as my friend. We will all sorely miss ED's warmth and dedication in the House of Representatives.●

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my other colleagues here today in honoring Congressman EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.

ED was a decent and compassionate individual. Through our work on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I came to value his friendship and respect his reasoned approach to the many issues and problems before Congress.

This institution certainly needs more individuals with ED's philosophy and balance. We will all miss ED FORSYTHE greatly, and I would like to extend my sympathies to his family and friends.●

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, because ED FORSYTHE and I came to the House together in 1970, it is especially hard to realize he has departed our ranks.

He was a quiet, industrious worker and an effective Member of Congress.

ED was always interested in natural resource legislation and took an active role in promoting this interest. ED was a diligent Representative who served his constituency well, and we will miss him.

I join my colleagues in expressing my sympathies to his family and loved ones.●

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in this tribute today to our colleague, Representative ED FORSYTHE. It was a privilege to serve with him in this Chamber for 13 years. I will remember him as a very thoughtful and quiet man, who was dedicated to a strong set of principles.

I know the people of New Jersey feel a great sense of loss over his death, just as we do here in Congress. He served with distinction in the New Jersey Senate before coming to Washington in 1971 and was most able representative of the State's 13th District.

He was a hard working and knowledgeable member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and was very effective in his role as ranking Republican on the committee. He also was a strong member of the Committee on Standards and Official Conduct.

We will miss his quiet manner and bow tie here in the Congress.●

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of ED FORSYTHE is a major loss for this institution and for the Nation.

I had the privilege of serving for 5 years with ED on the Merchant Marine Committee and the subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife.

He was a quiet man, but when he spoke he was listened to.

And when he spoke, chances are he spoke on behalf of the environment, on behalf of wildlife conservation, on behalf of protecting America's abundant fisheries, on behalf of saving our precious coastline from pollution and plunder.

The legacy of this soft spoken, gentle, and hard-working man is written in our Nation's lawbooks: The National Environmental Protection Act, the Non-Game Fish and Wildlife Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the 200-mile offshore fishing limit.

His accomplishments are as important for Massachusetts and for every other coastal State as they are for his beloved New Jersey.

Above all else, ED FORSYTHE was a gentleman. I am saddened by his passing.●

● Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity, along with my colleagues, to pay tribute to Congressman EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, who recently passed away.

The tremendous work he did in serving his constituents and our Nation is a shining example for others to follow, and his efforts will be long remembered. His record of accomplishments shows a great deal of dedication and ability, as well as personal integrity.

ED's knowledge and expertise on environmental matters made him an effective member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and he made many important contributions to this country.

My sincere condolences to Mrs. Forsythe, his family and friends in their hour of sorrow. Their loss is shared by those who knew ED, and his high level of service is etched in their memories.

I admired his work and the principles for which he stood, and it is a privilege for me to join with the distinguished Members of this body as we acknowledge the passing of this hard-working legislator.●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable EDWIN B. FORSYTHE of New Jersey.

Since his election in 1970, ED FORSYTHE ably and conscientiously represented his constituents in New Jersey. His entire life was dedicated to the public service starting with a position in the municipal government in 1948. He was elected to the New Jersey Senate in 1963 where he culminated his service as minority leader in 1967 and president in 1968.

During his many years of service in the House of Representatives, ED earned a reputation for hard work and thoroughness in carrying out his duties. He was particularly active in his work in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee where he became ranking member. ED was very instrumental in the enactment of the 200-mile fishing jurisdiction and was a key participant in the compromise worked out on the Endangered Species Act. For his work in that act, he received the Legislator of the Year Award in 1980 from the National Wildlife Federation.

ED had the ability to identify the issues and concerns in a way that pro-

moted compromises and satisfactory results. During the past year, ED had become increasingly interested and involved in the problems and concerns of the U.S. Merchant Marine. His efforts had been directed to studying and analyzing the situation with the hope of coming up with alternatives and solutions that would result in a stronger and more competitive U.S. merchant fleet. It is particularly sad that he was not able to complete this effort.

His wisdom and counsel will be sorely missed by all of us. My prayers and condolences are with Mary his widow and the rest of the family.●

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, he walked quietly among us in the House of Representatives, but ED FORSYTHE made his mark here as he had previously done in the New Jersey State Senate.

I had the pleasure of serving with ED both in the State Senate in the 1960's and since 1979 when I came to Congress. He was a man of calm and reason who did not let the passion of his advocacy prevent him from hearing and carefully considering opposing opinions.

Though we differed on most issues, I admired him for many reasons including his strong support for cuts in the military budget even though Fort Dix was located in his district. He strongly upheld the Quaker's belief in a peaceful approach to conflicts.

ED FORSYTHE never forgot where he came from or why he was sent here seven times by the voters of central Jersey. He was an effective representative for the concerns of his constituents and he always remembered that the 13th District was only part of the whole, albeit a very significant part.

His work on the environment drew national recognition and was particularly important to his district and to New Jersey. ED knew the importance of focusing one's attention in order to be effective in this body. And he worked at it as a master craftsman.

For 27 years ED served in public office: First as mayor of Moorestown beginning in 1957 before elected to the State legislature and subsequently to the House of Representatives.

He was a very private man who preferred home and family to the glitter of Washington night life and he returned home to New Jersey at every opportunity.

ED's legacy to us is that he proved that one person can make a difference in public life. We are better because he walked among us.

I join my colleagues in extending to his wife, Mickie, his daughter, Susan, and the other members of the FORSYTHE family, my sincere sympathy.●

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity arranged by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) to pay tribute to an outstanding Member of this body and a brave individual, our late colleague ED FORSYTHE.

He served his constituents in the 13th District of New Jersey since 1970 and he served them ably and well. He was an honest and honorable man who was liked by all who had the opportunity to get to know him.

I remember our service together on the Science and Technology Committee. He was always well prepared for debate and we all respected his views, ideas, and ambitions for America. We will miss him.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family. We, in this body, have lost a friend and a colleague and we are the lesser for it.●

● Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, a deep sadness came over this Chamber on the 29th of March, when it was announced that our esteemed colleague from the 13th District of New Jersey, ED FORSYTHE, had died. This sadness will fade, but slowly, for ED, although a quiet man, was an effective and hard working part of this body for almost 14 years. Many suspension days will pass before we will realize that we cannot look for ED's counsel on the many bills that come from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee where he was for so long the able ranking Republican member.

ED's passing is a loss not only to this Chamber, to his wife Mary, whom he affectionately called Mickey, and to his daughter, Susan. The people of New Jersey have lost a faithful public servant, his staff have lost a good boss, I have lost a good office neighbor, and all of us have lost a friend.

I am proud to have worked with ED for several years on the Education and Labor Committee and to have served in the House with him. I hope the tributes paid to him today will somehow comfort his wife, his family, and his fine staff.●

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. RODINO, for reserving this time for Members to pay tribute to the late Congressman EDWIN B. FORSYTHE. I join with my colleagues in mourning the loss of an individual, who in my mind, personified the word "gentleman."

Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune of serving with the late EDWIN FORSYTHE on the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct which I chair. Mr. FORSYTHE and I served together on the committee since his appointment in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, that was the first time I had the opportunity to work with Congressman FORSYTHE. We developed an excellent working relationship and friendship. I grew to admire his courage and dedication to the work of the committee particularly as we investigated and deliberated on some very difficult matters during the last 18 months.

Even at the most difficult and trying times, Congressman FORSYTHE never lost sight of the important and sensitive nature of the committee's work. He never missed a meeting. During the course of the investigations, EDWIN FORSYTHE consistently stressed that we seek the most equitable and fair solutions in an expeditious manner.

That simply was the manner of Congressman FORSYTHE, Mr. Speaker. He was a just and peace-loving human being. He also was a conscientious and hard working committee member. He never yearned for the limelight but rather was committed to working diligently behind the scenes. Those characteristics were displayed not only in his work on the House Ethics Committee but also during his entire 14-year career in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as the senior Republican member of the New Jersey Congressional Delegation, Congressman FORSYTHE worked tirelessly to insure the cohesiveness of the delegation. His primary interest was the welfare of the residents of the State of New Jersey.

He also rose to a place of prominence amongst the Republican Members of the House. As the ranking Republican on the House Merchant Marines and Fisheries Committee, Congressman FORSYTHE was involved in the formation of U.S. maritime policy and the Congress efforts to preserve the Nation's wildlife.

He was credited with winning passage of the 200-mile limit, off-shore fishing law in 1976 and also played a critical role in such important national legislation as the National Environment Protection Act and the Alaskan Lands Act.

Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle shall miss this dedicated human being. He was a friend and colleague to me on the House Ethics Committee. I know that residents of New Jersey's 13th Congressional District will mourn the loss of Congressman EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.

I take this time to extend my condolences to the late Congressman FORSYTHE's wife, Mary, and his daughter, Susan. All of us will miss this outstanding public servant.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of regret and personal loss that I pay tribute to one of this body's truly respected Members, Congressman ED FORSYTHE.

From his first term in Congress in 1970, to his death on March 29, ED worked tirelessly for this Nation and his constituents whom he knew so well.

ED's extensive knowledge and great skill were honed from a long and distinguished career in public service which stretched from the Moorestown,

NJ, Township Council to the State Senate, and finally to this body.

During his years in the Congress, ED was a good friend and it was truly an honor and a pleasure to serve with him. Because of his position as the ranking Republican of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and on the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, ED commanded great respect for his views on maritime issues as well as on environmental and wildlife preservation. There are many landmark laws in these areas that are the better because of ED.

Mr. Speaker, ED FORSYTHE was truly a servant of the people in the highest sense of the term, and he deserves to be remembered as such.

I wish to convey my heartfelt condolences to his family, and I share their grief for their loss. I know I speak for many when I say that he will be sorely missed.●

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ED FORSYTHE was a man of high principles and deeply held convictions which together guided his actions as a Member of this House and in his personal life.

Although we had served together since 1970, it has been my distinct privilege to have him as my counterpart on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee where he has been the ranking minority member since the beginning of the 98th Congress. ED was a very fine leader of the minority and indeed set an example for all our Members. His unfailing forthright and reasonable approach contributed greatly to the enactment of much of the major legislation that has come out of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. The committee's record in fisheries, wildlife, and other environmental areas is due in large part to the commitment, vision, and efforts of ED FORSYTHE.

As chairman of the committee, and especially as his long time friend, I shall certainly miss him in the days ahead.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sorrow at the passing of a good freind and colleague, ED FORSYTHE. He was a highly dedicated and most distinguished Member of this body.

ED and I were both elected to the House of Representatives for our first term in 1970. I had the distinct honor of serving with ED for many years on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of which he was ranking minority member.

As one who worked closely with him on that committee, I can personally attest to the effective work and active leadership ED provided on matters considered by our committee. His contribution to legislation protecting our precious coastal environment, our fisheries resources and marine mammals was outstanding and benefited our entire Nation. With all of his legislative efforts, ED FORSYTHE always was alert to the interests and concerns of his constituents in the 13th District of New Jersey, working tirelessly on their behalf.

ED FORSYTHE's outstanding career in the Congress demonstrated the best characteristics of a true public servant: integrity, leadership, hard work, and devotion to meeting the needs of his constituency.

He was a man we all admired and respected. I extend my deepest sympathies to his lovely wife, Mary, and family. We will miss him greatly. Thank you.●

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 29, 1984, U.S. Representative EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, of New Jersey, died.

I am one of those Members of Congress who had the privilege of knowing and working closely with ED FORSYTHE on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, where he served with distinction as ranking minority member.

ED FORSYTHE had the ability to examine both sides of an issue and make the wisest decision. He was known for his support of both environmentalists and developers. He worked hard to create a 200-mile fishing limit and played an important role in the passage of the Endangered Species Act and other similar measures. At the same time, ED recognized the need for America to gain independence in our energy resources, and favored exploration and production of oil and gas on our Outer Continental Shelf. This was not a contradictory policy.

Indeed, ED FORSYTHE was always thoughtful and judicious in his insights, displayed the greatest integrity, and gained the respect of his colleagues on the majority side as well as on the minority.

I join with others in extending my condolences to the FORSYTHE family.●

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today I join the distinguished dean of the New Jersey delegation in honoring the memory of EDWIN B. FORSYTHE with whom we served for many years. ED was an exceptional legislator and a fine human being. He did not shout to make his point heard because he did not need to. When he spoke on the issue that concerned him most—the preservation of our environment—he spoke from the heart and with conviction. He cared about his constituency and his State. Before, and up until his death, he actively sought to eliminate pollution—a problem that has threatened New Jersey's beaches and plagued its citizens for far too long.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and, in the last 3 years, its ranking minority member, he was instrumental in the passage of important environmental legislation such as the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Protection Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

ED B. FORSYTHE was a man of conviction. Even though he disagreed with his own party at times, he did not compromise his beliefs, but always voted his conscience. As a Quaker, he was a man of peace. His votes on defense issues demonstrated this. We shall all remember EDWIN B. FORSYTHE for the man he was and the beliefs for which he stood.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend and revise their remarks, and include extraneous material, on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to join with my colleagues in honoring former President Harry S. Truman on this the 100th anniversary of his birth.

At the outset, let me congratulate our distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for arranging this special order. Also, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not commend the entire Missouri delegation in helping make today's commemorative activities, including a joint meeting of the Congress, such a big success.

In April 1945 Harry S. Truman became the seventh Vice President in our Nation's history to assume the highest office in the land upon the death of a President. As we all know, he was thrust into the spotlight in a most difficult and critical period of time. Upon learning of Franklin Roosevelt's death, he said he felt as if, "the Moon, the stars and all the planets had fallen on me."

Instead of floundering about at this decisive time, Mr. Truman rose to the occasion and met the many difficult and complicated challenges with courageous and inspired leadership.

In the foreign arena, he will always be remembered and admired for the historic role he played in the restoration and reconstruction of war-shattered Europe, the creation and development of the Marshall plan and

NATO, and what we now refer to as the Truman doctrine—to aid nations threatened by Communist takeover. He was also responsible for breaking the Russian blockade of West Berlin in 1948-49 with the now famous "Berlin airlift," and for strongly supporting the United Nations during its formative years.

In addition, President Truman's great sense of justice led to his momentous decision on May 14, 1948, to announce de facto recognition of the provisional government of Israel.

Later, in January 1949, after Israel repelled the attacks of the Arab States and had elected Dr. Chaim Weizmann president, President Truman recognized the Israeli nation de jure.

On the domestic front, President Truman was responsible for a higher minimum wage, increased social security, and aid-for-housing laws—including the National Housing Act of 1949.

Frankly, I feel that one of Harry Truman's greatest achievements as President centered around his commitment to civil rights. In his "Memoirs" he wrote:

> All my life I have fought against prejudice and intolerance. As a young man I was disturbed by the attitude of some people toward other races and religions. As I grew older, I could never understand how people could forget the origins and blessings of their own freedom.
>
> I have little patience with people who take the Bill of Rights for granted. The Bill of Rights, contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, is every American's guarantee of freedom.
>
> Equality of opportunity and equal justice under the law are not mere phrases of fine words. These are the living achievements of a people who had rebelled against despotism. Many generations have fled to this country to get away from oppression by their own governments. And it has always troubled me how some who called themselves Americans could themselves be oppressors.
>
> As Americans, we believe that every man should be free to live his life as he wishes. He should be limited only by his responsibility to his fellow countrymen. If this freedom is to be more than a dream, each man must be guaranteed equality of opportunity. The only limit to an American's achievement should be his ability, his industry and his character.

To this end, he submitted the first Presidential message on civil rights and signed an Executive order in July 1948 which declared that the Armed Forces would be integrated without regard to race or religion.

I first got to know President Truman during the 1948 Presidential campaign. Being Democratic chairman of Los Angeles County that year, I was automatically made chairman of the Truman campaign.

I raised the finances for a million-piece mailout, and was later told it was the largest single Truman-Barkley mailing piece west of the Mississippi River.

Whenever President Truman would visit the west coast, he would try to see as many of the grassroots people as his schedule would allow.

I can well remember one particular instance when we met at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco. For close to an hour we sat and discussed the pertinent issues of the day. He did not hesitate to ask questions and, he seemed most responsive to new ideas. I went away from that meeting with the feeling that here was a man who had the world's problems on his shoulders as President, yet was very attentive to my suggestions and genuinely concerned in helping the less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, Harry S. Truman will long be remembered as a man of forthrightness and integrity—a man of vision and action. He had great commonsense and with all the power of high office, Harry Truman never forgot his roots.

My wife, Lee, joins me in paying homage to President Truman. We know he will continue to be simply remembered as a good man who became a great President.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to thank our friend from California for his very kind remarks about our session today and all those who made it possible to be such a memorable event.

Today marks the 100th birthday of Harry S. Truman. To those of us in Missouri, it is a special day. As you know, a number of months ago I offered a joint resolution which was passed in this House and also passed in the Senate which established a joint session of Congress and of course that session was the ceremony that we had this morning.

Throughout the entire time of working with the committee, I might say they were very, very helpful and filled with encouragement throughout the weeks and months working on this. But I learned that the special feeling about the late President Harry Truman is not confined to Missouri; that it is a universal feeling of respect and warmth and that President Truman, who was so keenly interested in history, would have felt, I feel, pleasantly surprised that he was being studied as closely as a positive object and lesson in history.

Mr. Speaker, a number of Governors and legislators and friends and associates of the late President Truman have sent me resolutions and letters and comments, which I will include in the RECORD.

At this point, I yield to my friend and colleague from the other side of the State of Missouri, Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to add my voice to those of the gentleman from California and others in commending the gentleman in the well for the work done putting together the joint session today and putting together the entire commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman.

Every member of the Missouri delegation and I dare say every Missourian today is proud to remember, with the rest of the citizens of the United States, the contribution made by President Harry Truman and to this country and free men who live everywhere.

I was thrilled today by the speeches that were made in the joint session and by the words of the President in the luncheon which was held in the White House.

I feel that it is important for us as Americans to remember our Presidents; it is also important to remember the values and the character and the things of importance that our President stood for. Obviously President Truman stood for many, many important values; honesty, candor, a feeling of patriotism about his country, a willingness to put human values above other considerations, which was all told to us today in anecdote and in the speeches that were so well given.

So I was thrilled to be here today to be a part of this commemoration ceremony and I simply wanted to rise at this point to commend the gentleman in the well and others who served on the committee so that the American people could have a lasting reminder of the meaning of the life of President Harry Truman.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his very kind and warm remarks about President Truman.

Mr. Speaker, everyone has his or her favorite Harry Truman story. It is interesting, working through the months to actually be told or have them sent to me by various people, some who served with him in World War I, those who knew him as a county court judge and Jackson County politician, those who knew him in the Senate, those who worked with him when he was President of the United States.

Many things can be said about President Truman. I would like to share just a thought or two of mine at this time because he was a great inspiration to me at a young part of my life. I was known to him as "Ike's boy" because he and my father, whose name was also the same as mine, were friends through the years.

This morning at a breakfast in the Library of Congress there was a film clip showing the then-Senator Truman with a small statuette of the Madonna on the Trail. This is a replica of various statutes of the pioneer mother that are along various important early routes moving west across our Nation.

We have one in my hometown of Lexington, MO. And it was in 1928

that Judge Harry Truman came to Lexington and made the dedicatory speech for that Madonna of the Trail statute.

I might also say that my father gave another speech that day as he was the young prosecuting attorney of Lafayette County in Lexington at that time.

Also, I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, being brought to Washington by my father for the inauguration of President Truman and which took place on January 20, 1949.

Many people, political leaders, pollsters alike, felt that President Truman could not win the election in his own right in that 1948 campaign. Of course, it is history that he won and he won substantially.

I remember being brought to Washington and I was fortunate enough to be at the electors dinner, the electors who voted for him in the election system under our electoral process, where he made his very interesting and very accurate immitation of the radio commentator H.V. Kaltenborn.

□ 1810

It was quite a memorable event and as I recall the following day he was sworn into office as the President of the United States, which I witnessed as a 17-year-old high school student.

The President has meant a great deal to those who knew him. He has meant a great deal to those who did not know him. Integrity, determination, clear thinking, leadership, decisiveness. He was a good friend, a true friend to those who knew him. He was a warm and caring husband and father. He was a devoted public servant, the very epitome of a citizen soldier and we could go on and on about President Truman.

Let me tell two short incidents that reflect the inner side of Harry Truman. The first was related to me when I was 13 years old. I happened to be in the Kansas City Hospital. My roommate in that hospital was an elderly gentleman who was having an operation on his eyes for cataracts. In talking with this gentleman—this being 1945, August 1945—he came from the Kansas City area, he and I began speaking. He spoke of President Truman of whom he was very fond.

He told me that not too long before that he was at his job and his job was that of being a custodian at a Kansas City high school. He related to me that one day the President came to speak to the students at the school. The day President Truman came, he got out of his car and walked through the door and he saw this man, whose name was Tom, that is all I can remember, this elderly gentleman. President Truman shook hands with him and asked him if he was going to come in to hear him speak to the students of that high school.

This gentleman, Tom, told him that no, he could not because his job required him to stay there at the door. This gentleman took great pride in telling me that about 5 minutes later, before President Truman spoke, someone came to him and said, "President Truman has asked me to take your place so that you can come in and hear him speak," which of course elated this custodian greatly.

I also remember an incident in 1952 during the waning days of President Truman's term in office. He of course was campaigning, campaigning much as he did in 1948, but he was campaigning through Missouri on a train, on the back of this train. He, of course, gave one of his famous speeches to the crowd at Jefferson City, MO. And being a student at the University of Missouri, a friend of mine, young Rufus Burrus and I went over to see the President and there we did see him, heard his speech, were allowed on the train and shook hands with the various dignitaries there.

I do remember though immediately after his speech there was a gentleman who rolled himself up to the train, who, evidently through an accident or some other reason, had no legs, and he rolled himself up on what looked like a homemade skateboard. I will never forget the President seeing him down there, rather than waving at him, walked completely off the train and went down to shake his hand and to speak with him.

As I witnessed this I witnessed not just a perfunctory hello, but a very warm and kind appreciation that the President had for this man who, with great difficulty, had come down to hear the President speak that night.

I will never forget that. You really cannot describe it. But that incident portrayed to me as well as the incident that was related by my friend, Tom, about the warmth and the kindness and personal character of Harry Truman. He was truly a man who cared and was considerate of other people. I recall those instances and I hope that those who read this RECORD in the future years will know that he was far more than an outstanding President, far more than a determined and great leader, but he was a very warm and kind and caring human being.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to my friend from Kansas (Mr. SLATTERY).

Mr. SLATTERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to pay a special thank you for the work the gentleman has done and my colleagues from the great State of Missouri who have done just a fantastic job. And the gentleman's work was evident today in the ceremony which we held here which was a great inspiration to me as I listened to all the speeches given and saw people like Clark Clifford and others that were actively involved in President Truman's administration share with us their reflections. It was really inspiring to me.

I thank the gentleman for all the work that he has done.

I would like to share with the gentleman some recollections of a very special friend of mine who lives in northeast Kansas and who had a special friendship with the late President Truman and Mrs. Truman. She was the first woman to serve as Treasurer of the United States. She held that post from 1949 until 1953. Her name is Georgia Neese Clark Gray.

It is a special pleasure for me to just spend a couple of minutes, if I could, sharing with the gentleman some of her recent recollections.

Mr. SKELTON. Please do, because I had the pleasure of having a very nice visit with the lady of whom the gentleman speaks in the Truman Library not too many years ago. She is a lovely person and a very fine public servant.

Mr. SLATTERY. A great woman who made a tremendous contribution to our Nation and is continuing to do that.

HARRY S. TRUMAN MEMORIAL, MAY 8, 1984, IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Georgia Neese Clark Gray, Treasurer of the United States, 1949–53)

Nothing in my lifetime is treasured and revered more than the memory of Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States, and that of his beloved Bess Wallace Truman. The celebration of the 100th anniversary of his birth evokes, for me, poignant and loving thoughts.

I shall never forget his almost fatherly concern when, in the Oval Office, President Truman offered me the position of Treasurer of the United States. "Can you afford it?" was his question. He then pointed out that the cost of living and working in Washington would exceed by far the salary. Cognizant that I would be the first woman nominated to such a post, I replied "Mr. President, I cannot afford to decline." He then closed the matter with the rather laconic comment: "No, you cannot."

Over the years prior to the appointment, I had known the President only casually as the Senator from Missouri. During his administration he was my boss. It was after returning to the family home in Independence that we, my husband Andy and I, developed a warm and devoted friendship. We were always welcomed at visits to the Truman's home on Delaware Street. We entertained the distinguished couple at our Home in Richland, Kansas.

We delight in the presentation of the City of Independence Public Service Award to be made to the Truman's Daughter Margaret Truman Daniel, next Friday night at the Truman Library. We'll be there, as we were present at the ground-breaking and dedication of the building. President Truman took great pride, as stone and steel were assembled, in the construction. To him, it symbolized an enduring record of his career for generations to come. Its imposing simplicity proclaims the man. It also served as a workplace for Mr. Truman, and work he did. He always delighted in leaving his office to

stroll through the building and greet families, especially the youngsters. The prominent of the world also made a national mecca of his office and museum.

When the Truman Library Board of Trustees meets this Saturday, it will mark the 100th year of Harry S. Truman. We'll remember, somewhat personally and silently, the comforting memories. And en route to the library, we'll go past 219 North Delaware Street, recalling the "click" opening of the electronically-operated lock on the iron gate. And we'll march in memory of the walk to the open door and once again greet the indestructible Harry and Bess Truman.

May God bless them.

Mr. SKELTON. It was certainly very kind of the gentleman and very kind of Mrs. Gray to send those comments and we do appreciate them and we hope that they will be reflected in the RECORD as she said them.

We have so many comments that we could make about Harry Truman. I think one of the important lessons that we learned today from all that has gone on in this Chamber concerning the late President, the 33d President, is that we can learn something from his life and we can learn something from the way he did his work. As you know he did his best wherever it was at the time.

□ 1820

President Truman was very keenly interested in history. He let the light of history guide his work. And from our ceremony today, I certainly hope that we can take information, that we can take our judgment and we can take the knowledge not only of the type of person and the character of Harry Truman with us, but we can take those difficult decisions and the reasons he made them to heart as we make decisions in the days and years ahead for our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to have this special order. Again I thank all of my colleagues who helped me so very much in this ceremony that we had today, with special recognition to Senator MARK HATFIELD, who served as the vice chairman of the committee for the joint meeting, Antoinette Arnett, the executive director who put untold hours into it, and all of those on the staffs of our colleagues who made it possible.

Harry Truman will be long remembered. I hope that what we did today will cause his memory to be all the brighter in the decades ahead, for he was a true and fine and great American.

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the centennial of the birth of President Harry S. Truman is an appropriate time to pay tribute to a truly remarkable man.

Few Presidents have taken office under more difficult circumstances than Harry Truman. With the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt—a President of considerable popularity and substantial achievement—and with the Nation still at war, Harry Truman assumed the Presidency in a tumultuous time. While many of his countrymen wondered about his ability to guide the Nation in the uncertain days that lay ahead, those who knew him best were confident that the country would be well served by his service as Chief Executive. History has recognized that that confidence was well placed.

A list of Harry Truman's accomplishments as President include some of the most important initiatives this country has undertaken in the 20th century. In the area of foreign affairs, the successful conclusion of World War II, the implementation of the Marshall Plan, the advent of the Truman doctrine, and the Berlin airlift, marked the United States as a world power with the means and the inclination to assist other nations whose freedom was threatened.

On the domestic front, Harry Truman's successful redirection of our economy from a war footing to one of peace ushered in a period of prosperity that made this Nation the envy of the world. He set the tone for the great national debate of the 1960's when he became the first President to address Congress on the subject of civil rights. His commitment to equality was perhaps best stated in his book, Memoirs when he wrote.

As Americans, we believe that every man should be free to live his life as he wishes. He should be limited only by his responsibility to his fellow countrymen . . . the only limit to an American's achievement should be his ability, his industry, and his character.

Harry Truman was a man of courage, commonsense, and good judgment. The respect and affection with which he has come to be regarded by the American people is a tribute to both the things he accomplished while in Office, and the manner in which he conducted his Presidency. His words are quoted with approval by politicians of all persuasions, and his willingness to tackle problems head-on and accept responsibility for the decisions necessary to resolve them, are traits by which succeeding occupants of the Oval Office have striven to be known.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidency provides as stern a test as can be made of the character of those who hold it. Harry Truman emerged from Office much as he entered: a man of integrity and candor whose love of family and deep sense of patriotism reflected the basic values of the American people. His character had surely been tested but had not been found wanting. He was able to return to Independence, to the house he loved, without a sense of longing because he had never lost sight of who he was and what things were important to his life. The special place which he holds in American history and in the hearts of his countrymen is due in no small measure to not only his achievements in Office but the constancy of his values as well. While he did not regard himself as extraordinary, I believe that that characterization is not inappropriate in light of the manner in which he discharged his duties and the manner in which he lived his life.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay homage to our late President, Harry Truman. As a legendary figure, stories of Harry's heroism, congeniality, and dedication to maintaining his high principles are often recited. Today we reflect with great admiration the courage he displayed when making those monumental decisions as President.

As some may remember, Harry was a decisive and conscientious wartime leader. However, his heart and his true skill lay in maintaining peace abroad and at home. He was a staunch supporter of the promotion of democracy overseas. He vowed to protect all free peoples who were unwillingly subjected to subordination by aggressive forces. In 1948, he instigated the Marshall plan which provided financial assistance for beleaguered Asian and European countries.

At home, President Truman also displayed adept decisiveness in his domestic policy. He attempted to reinstate Roosevelt's welfare ideals in his program the Fair Deal. But, perhaps his most notable contribution was his foundation work in the area of civil rights. Even one of his Executive orders included the abolishment of segregation in the armed services.

President Truman was not only a productive provider for the American people, but also an important symbol of success. His ascension from a farmer-haberdasher to a powerful world leader was proof that hard work and motivation pay off. For many Americans Harry's achievements have inspired them to strive for our highest goals. We have certainly missed this great man's humble candidness, as well as his ability to nobly assume the difficult responsibilities of President with confidence and laudable competence.●

● Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have met Mr. Truman and to be in meetings with him a few times both during and after his Presidency. I was very impressed with his directness and his ability to make people believe that he was in charge and to really want to carry out his decisions. Here was a man incapable of pretense. Some Presidents overrate their own accomplishments and try to create a Presidential image in an effort to live up to the public hero worship. But, Harry Truman knew exactly what he wanted to do and did not overrate or underrate his own capabilities. He was as plain as your next

door neighbor, amiable but very firm, and always compassionate.

Some people have forgotten how he was ridiculed by opponents who are now long gone and little remembered, but I never had any doubt that Harry S. Truman would one day be revered. A review of his accomplishments through the years as artillery captain, county judge, crusading Senator, and activist in the White House—even as the failed haberdasher who honored and paid his debts—reflect his ability and integrity. At each stage of his life, he rose to his responsibilities, whatever they were. He became an enthusiastic and outstanding student of American history and what is more important, he showed the ability to use the historical knowledge he had acquired the hard way in his career as a national leader. This unassuming Missourian who was unafraid to speak his mind and to make the great decisions without looking back occupies a unique place in American history and his stature can only grow in the years to come.

As a final affectionate postscript, let it be said that President Truman's devotion to his beloved Bess and daughter, Margaret and family, was an inspiration that will always be remembered by those of us who first became active in politics when he was our President and leader.●

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate for the House to take time today for reflection on the memory of Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States. Harry Truman's wit, his courage, and his indefatigable determination made him a legend in his own time. In the eyes of his country men and women, he will always be loved, admired and respected.

On the evening of April 12, 1945, Harry Truman sat only a few yards from where I now speak. He had joined his old friend Sam Rayburn, the Speaker of the House, for a slight libation in the Speaker's office. An unexpected and urgent call came from the White House. Truman immediately left the Hill for 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, where he was taken upstairs to the study of Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt. "Harry," she said, "the President is dead." Truman, who had not anticipated that this was the cause of his trip to the White House, asked if there was anything he could do for the widow and her family. Eleanor Roosevelt replied, "Is there anything we can do for you? For you are the one in trouble now."

Eleanor Roosevelt's remark was prescient, for Harry Truman's years at the helm of the "Ship of State" were filled with controversy, challenges and change. He led his country and the free world during years of maximum danger, when the future was by no means assured, and the nature of governments throughout the world was in a state of flux.

But through the great crises of the day, Harry Truman never doubted his ability to do what was best, and history will judge him kindly. His outward manner, the quick wit and the profane talk, disguised a learned intellect. Truman is said to have read every book in the library of his hometown and his memory was encyclopedic. He was especially fond of the classical figures of antiquity, and he felt a close affinity to the Founding Fathers of the United States. His love of history gave him a guidepost for his own involvement in public life, from his years as a county judge to his days in the Oval Office. Truman kept a copy of Marcus Aurelius' "Meditations," and often in his letters and conversations would quote from it. "If it is not right, do not do it; if it is not so, do not say it," Aurelius wrote in the second century. Harry Truman had it underlined.

Harry Truman brought the simple values of the American heartland to the White House and the world. He was honest and humane. His love for his wife and daughter was obvious to all Americans. His pride in our country, and his determination to insure a fairer deal for all its citizens, earned him the respect of the world.

Truman's record grows with the passing of every year. He led the Nation during the final months of the most destructive war in the history of human kind, and he worked tirelessly to insure that the peace would be a lasting and final one. He instituted the Truman doctrine to insure that freedom was defended and allowed to flourish. He proposed the Marshall plan, the greatest single gesture of generosity and responsibility in the 208 years of this Republic. He fought for increased aid for the elderly, education for the young, justice for the poor and equal rights for those in our society who were not white. He was a fighter for the causes he believed in, and a champion of freedom when it was threatened.

Few men have left such a lasting mark on the shape of the world. The faces of contemporary Japan and Western Europe owe as much to him as to the energy of their own people. The citizens of the United States have taken Harry Truman into their hearts as a gutsy, courageous folkhero. Somehow that seems appropriate for a politician who promised to "give 'em hell." He may well have done that sometimes. But, more often than not, he was giving the world hope. I am honored to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American statesman, Harry S. Truman, on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to rise in observance of the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of our greatest Presidents, Harry S. Truman. Truman was an extraordinary man whose fortitude and bravery during the gravest of crises guided the United States and Europe through perhaps the most complex and turbulent of times.

Thrust into the role of the leader of the free world after the sudden death of Franklin Roosevelt, Truman led the allies to the successful completion of World War II, a victory over the Axis forces which were attempting to overrun two continents.

Truman then guided Western Europe back to freedom and prosperity with the Marshall plan and Truman doctrine. Harry Truman maintained that the United States would remain the friend of the oppressed and would not tolerate the spread of totalitarian governments.

It has been said that the mark of a great man is his ability to rise to great challenges. Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States, rose to and overcame some of the greatest challenges ever to face a world leader. His special place in history is assured and it is particularly fitting that we honor his memory on his 100th birthday.●

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today in tribute to the 33d President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. President Truman will be always remembered as a world leader in war and the architect of reconstruction of Europe and Japan after World War II.

Truman rose from sturdy American stock in Missouri to be a judge, a U.S. Senator, Vice President and, upon the death of President Roosevelt, President of the United States. In all he did he brought candor and honesty.

Growing up in north Florida, Harry Truman was one of my idols. He was a plain spoken man who said exactly what he thought and did exactly what he said he would do. Some might accuse him of being salty for the earthy way he phrased his remarks but I believe the American people responded to the genuine feelings of the man.

Truman is revered throughout America and has been the subject of books, a broadway play and the board game "Trivial Pursuit". Statues have been erected in his honor and schools and streets have been named after him.

His memory is still strong in a nation that is a better place to live because he served his Nation. As we celebrate the 100th anniversary of his birth, we should pause to remember how much this man gave to our way of life.●

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry S. Truman on the 100th anni-

versary of his birth. Harry Truman, the 33d President of the United States, has been described as a compassionate and humble man. He was a President with both character and commonsense and his integrity and leadership ability will be admired for generations to come. Although Truman was not initially voted into the Office, he responded to the duties and responsibilities of the Presidency by faithfully guiding the country through one of the most difficult and devastating experiences facing our great Nation.

President Truman's extensive efforts to help secure world peace through the Truman doctrine and Marshall plan have been acclaimed by all free nations. His endeavors to combat the spread of communism led to the creation of NATO. While Harry Truman made concerted attempts to help the underprivileged peoples of other nations he did not forget the people of this land. He was the first President to recognize the pressing need for civil rights legislation.

I admire this great President for his skill as a world leader as well as the ability he possessed to maintain his honor and dignity. I admire a man who never grew pretentious or self-righteous. He was raised on a farm in Missouri and by remaining solidly rooted in what is basic and good about rural and small town America, he was able—even holding the most powerful position in the world—to govern with perspective and commonsense. And after he had finished his job, he went back to Missouri, of course.

It is a good time in our history to take note and recall the valuable lessons we learned from this man of the people, and I am proud to be a part of paying tribute to one of our great Presidents.●

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the special order honoring President Harry S. Truman. As we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of this great American, we remember him as a man of innovative ideas, and one of this century's most influential statesmen.

Thrust into the Presidency by the sudden death of Roosevelt, Truman entered office at an extraordinary time: the complex and turbulent era ushered in by the conclusion of World War II.

His decision to end the war by dropping the atomic bomb on Japan was a difficult decision that he stood by, and in later years was praised for it. In addition, as the war concluded, Truman helped guide the Nation's economy back into peacetime channels.

President Truman was a strong, decisive man, who worked hard for what he believed in. He was ultimately responsible for the Truman doctrine which declared the United States would support all free peoples who were resisting attempted subjugations either by armed minorities at home or aggressors outside their borders. Truman also made it possible for George Marshall to carry through Congress the Marshall plan calling for the transfer of massive economic aid from the free nations of the West to the beleaguered countries in Europe and Asia.

The other side to the President possessed a quick wit to counter his quick temper, and he is known to be one of the great patriots of our country—believing that every person is responsible for the enforcement of the Constitution. During his tenure, President Truman, in an effort to shed light on his responsibilities, kept a diary. Published later as a book, President Truman felt it would help people understand the Presidency as he experienced it, and come to know him as he really was.

In an excerpt from that book he wrote a statement that truly reflects his candor and pride in being President. He wrote:

> It is a pity that some people have a contemptuous idea of politics—because politics under our system is government, and a man who is not interested in politics is not doing his patriotic duty toward maintaining the constitution of the United States. I am proud to be a politician and to work politically for the happiness and the welfare of the country.

Harry S. Truman will not only be remembered in history for his Presidency, but for the effectiveness and spirit he lent it.●

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 100-year anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman—a man who assumed the reigns of leadership in our Nation during difficult times, but with confidence and vision guided the United States through several tumultuous years.

Harry Truman's career symbolizes the essence of American traditional values—a man of modest upbringing who faced difficult challenges throughout his early life but never lost faith in his eventual success or abilities. As historian David McCullough recently said:

> Again and again he had turned setbacks into positive accomplishments. The boy who couldn't go to college became a life long student of history. The boy who was turned down by West Point became a model battlefield officer. The failed businessman met his debts so honorably that it is still talked about in and around Kansas City. The man who was first dismissed in Washington as the "Senator from Pendergast" became one of the prominent figures in the wartime Senate and in the Democratic Party. All in all, it had been no little man's career.

Mr. Truman faced many problems and crucial decisions during his Presidency. But he faced each crisis with a sense of confidence and a keen awareness of history. Indeed, his accomplishments became a part of history-shaping events which still have far-reaching consequences in our world today. The extent of Mr. Truman's achievements were aptly summed up in an editorial after his death in 1972: "It grows increasingly hard to remember what Harry Truman did wrong, and increasingly hard to dispute that he did most of the things right."

Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate 100 years since the birth of Harry S. Truman—a man of greatness and vision.

Although during his career few perceived his greatness, in retrospect Harry Truman distinguished himself in world affairs and earned an endearing place in history. The life and times of Harry Truman bring to mind the words of Sophocles: "One must wait until the evening to see how splendid the day has been."●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved to rise in honor of the 100-year birthday of our late President, Harry S. Truman.

Harry Truman—the man from Independence—is a symbol of how high a common citizen can rise in this country. He was a workingman, an entrepreneur, and an elected official who was well liked by all who knew him.

He rose through the ranks in the Missouri National Guard, eventually commanding a battery of field artillery during World War I. He ran a haberdashery after the war, and, although it failed, Harry Truman in his own hard-working way paid off the firm's debts without filing for bankruptcy.

The future President entered public life as an elected judge in 1922, and served in the U.S. Senate for two terms before becoming Vice President in 1944. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman became our 33d President after the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Despite the predictions of many people that a Truman Presidency would be weak and indecisive, he proved to be a strong and resourceful leader. He was a champion of civil rights, low-cost housing, Federal aid to education, and increased social security benefits.

Most notably, Harry Truman ordered the desegregation of the Armed Forces, oversaw a successful Berlin airlift, established the Commission on Civil Rights, and in an age of overt Communist aggression, began a policy of containment now known as the Truman doctrine. The Marshall plan, point four program, medicare, and the Fair Deal were all his brainchildren.

Harry Truman was a feisty leader who genuinely cared about the common man in this country and abroad. He probably would not have wanted this big fuss we are making over him today, but that is all right,

because he certainly deserves it. God bless him.●

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, The adjective most often used to describe President Truman is feisty. And he was, indeed, that.

He was the beleaguered underdog who won the Presidency in 1948 against all odds in a campaign against the do-nothing 80th Congress. I note in passing that I joined this body in the 81st Congress.

With little enthusiastic support from his party, he confounded all the political experts and won almost single-handedly by doggedly taking his campaign to the people. His opponent was a candidate who was so sure of victory that, in Harry Truman's words:

> He has been following me up and down this country making speeches about home, mother, unity and efficiency. * * * He won't talk about the issues. * * *"

No two-dollar words for Harry Truman.

Most remarkable of all, he won the Presidency despite a splintering of his party that say two Members run for that office on third-and fourth-party tickets.

In a victory that showed he was no accidental President, Harry Truman was both humorous and humble. His mimicking of the radio commentator who kept insisting during the long election night count—there were no exit polls or early projections back then—that President Truman would lose, despite his lead, will not soon be forgotten. At a victory celebration in his native Independence, MO, the President said: "I thank you very much indeed for this celebration, which is not for me. It is for the whole country. It is for the whole world."

Little was known of this man when he had the awesome Presidential mantle thrust upon him in the midst of World War II. Little was expected of him. Few knew of the depths of his courage and convictions, his vision, and his creativity.

In civil rights, Harry Truman was a pioneer. He abolished segregation in the Armed Forces. He banned discrimination by contractors working for the Federal Government. His administration challenged racial discrimination in education, arguing in court that segregation was an easy mark for communist propaganda and raised questions among our friends about the depth of our devotion to the democratic way of life.

It was a sad moment in our history when the enemies of President Truman reviled him as a tool of communism. Here was the man who created the Truman doctrine to support Greece and Turkey in their fight against subjugation by Communisits; the man who presided over the Marshall plan and the policy of containment of Soviet Russia; the President who, working tirelessly with Republican leaders of Congress, won bipartisan support for NATO—our Nation's first peacetime military alliance; the President who committed American troops to the defense of a nation under Communist invasion, an action that became so unpopular that he decided not to seek reelection. Soft on communism?

Whatever their internal problems and imperfections, Greece and Turkey, the nations of NATO, South Korea—none are under the domination of communism, thanks in no small measure to the haberdasher from Independence.

No other man in history has had to make the dread, soul-searing decision to use the atomic bomb, and we pray to God that no other one ever will. And what other President has had to endure the vilification President Truman suffered for carrying out his constitutional responsibilities—for firing an insubordinate hero general who had forgotten who was the Commander in Chief?—an action that history has vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman was a great President, but he always said he was two persons: the President of the United States and Harry S. Truman, father of Margaret, husband of Bess. It was Harry Truman the human being—the loving and feisty father—who wrote the scathing note to the music critic of the Washington Post for a review of his daughter's concert in which he attacked everything but "the varnish on the piano." Father Harry told the critic that he sounded like a "frustrated man that never made a success, an eight-ulcer man on a four-ulcer job and all four ulcers working."

Today, we honor Harry Truman on his 100th birthday anniversary. He will be just as greatly honored a century hence.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to participate in this occasion honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Harry S. Truman.

In retrospect, the Presidency of Harry Truman compels great respect—especially in foreign policy—but it is unfortunate that our 33d President was widely underestimated by his contemporaries and burdened by the enormous popularity of his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Truman, when he assumed the Presidency, was at best considered to be good natured but ordinary; at worst provincial and inept. Fortunately, he was usually indifferent to criticism.

Truman was further hampered by the fact that he was one of the worst prepared Presidents in history. As Vice President, he had been nowhere near the White House war room, had never heard of the atomic bomb, and had not even met the Secretary of State. Yet Truman surmounted these many disadvantages to be ranked as one of the greatest of all our Presidents.

It was gradually recognized that the country was extraordinarily lucky to have had Truman's leadership. His straightforward, decisive, simple, and honest style eventually inspired the confidence of even his toughest critics. Members of the Roosevelt circle who initially had been the most skeptical later rallied to Truman's defense. As David Lillienthal, whom Truman had appointed Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, wrote in the President's defense:

> The way he took on the aggressions of Russia; the courage in calling a special session of an antagonistic Congress controlled by the opposition to put through an extensive program for the restoration of Europe; his civil rights program, upon which he has not welched or trimmed—my God! What do these people want?

Truman was aided in his efforts to lead postwar America through a confusing and troubled time by a deep understanding of world history that surpassed that of most Presidents. As Truman often repeated in later years: "The only thing new in the world is the history we don't know." He had a strong sense of being part of history in the making and a humility regarding his role as President.

Today, we remember Harry Truman as one of our most beloved Presidents. We miss his unpretentiousness and his feisty rhetoric in an era of media-dominated politics in which an unimposing ex-haberdasher with a flat midwester accent might not be able to compete. But more than that we appreciate the scope of his knowledge, the depth of his character, his confidence in and understanding of his own abilities. He believed in the importance of trusting in his fellow man—"If you don't, how can you expect him to have trust in you?" Truman asked, "What's the use of living?"—and thought that the fact that many did not share such values constituted what was wrong with the modern world. He drew on the great literary works of the past for guidance and solace—from the Bible, to Plutarch, to Lord Byron—and believed firmly that the basic source of our strength as a country was a spiritual one.

But what finally distinguished him was his profound sense of his roots and his respect for the dignity of the common citizen. He liked to quote Benjamin Franklin who said:

> In free governments, the rulers are the servants and the people their superiors and sovereigns. For the former therefore to return among the latter is not to degrade them but to promote them.

"I kept that in mind when I was in the White House," Truman said in his retirement, "and I've had it in mind since I got my promotion."●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, IKE

SKELTON, for organizing this special order to honor one of our greatest Presidents, Harry S. Truman.

Many refer to Harry Truman as the common man who made good. Yet, there was nothing common about Harry Truman. From his humble early life in Missouri, Harry Truman rose to greatness because he strove for greatness.

His political life began in county government, when in 1922 he was elected as a judge in Jackson County. He then served in the U.S. Senate before becoming Vice President under Franklin Roosevelt. He gained national prominence as a Senator when he led an investigation of military procurement practices, which uncovered numerous questionable practices. In 1944, after serving less than 100 days as the Vice President, he became our 33d President upon the death of Franklin Roosevelt.

Few administrations can rival that of President Truman's. Domestically, he guided the United States in its difficult transition from a war-time economy to a peace-time economy. He laid the groundwork for medicare, and placed great emphasis on low-cost housing for the poor. Perhaps, most notably, it was President Truman who elevated civil rights onto the national stage. During the 1940 campaign, Truman asserted his commitment to civil rights in front of a group of farmers, many of whom were suspected Ku Klux Klansmen. He said:

I believe in the brotherhood of man, not merely the brotherhood of white men but the brotherhood of all men before the law.

In foreign affairs, we are all aware of the importance of the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and NATO which successfully allowed free people all over the world to resist the tide of totalitarian aggression.

As the most powerful man in the world, President Truman never forgot his past or our Nation's past. He was an avid historian and believed in the value of lessons learned from the past. Moreover, Harry Truman, even after he had achieved international prominence, never forgot America's common men and women. Truman understood that it was the basic dignity and humanity of these people which made America strong.

We could marvel at the accomplishments of Truman's administration, for many hours, yet, I don't believe that is what Harry Truman would want. As we celebrate his 100 birthday let us keep in mind his ideals of leadership by example, courage, honesty, and plain speech. Perhaps he said it best when he remarked:

If politics ever gets away from the people, our country will be in big trouble. Politics is people. People count. People matter.●

● Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the idea that Harry S. Truman was born 100 years ago on May 8 is one to which I have a hard time accommodating.

The picture of Harry Truman that comes to mind is always one of a brisk, vigorous, decisive man of action—nothing at all about him suggested age or infirmity.

It was one of the great privileges of my life to be on the Democratic ticket with him in November 1948, when he so stirred the people of this country that he snatched victory away from Gov. Thomas E. Dewey who was considered by practically everybody to be the certain winner.

And I was proud to be his active supporter during the final 4 years of his Presidency.

The respect accorded to this man from Missouri today is almost universal. Prominent American leaders of both parties vie with each other in paying him homage. Polls of historians and political scientists place him among the great Presidents. Books written about him enjoy enormously successful sales, both at home and abroad.

Almost no one wants to remember the tremendous vilification that was visited upon him during the years he sat in the White House. Politicians all over the country lambasted him for his stands on civil rights. Labor leaders damned him at the highest decibel levels for his refusal to accept strikes in the coal and railroad industries which he said damaged the Nation's security. Opponents said his administration was riddled with scandal. Editorial cartoonists vied with each other in producing the most outrageously scurrilous images of him. But time has rubbed them out.

Now that he and his administration have receded into the past, the lens of history can show him as he really was: An extraordinary President who met unprecedented challenges, and acquitted himself and his country in a manner that reflected courage and honor upon us all.

Harry Truman emerged upon the national scene almost as a stranger on that April day in 1945 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt died. Roosevelt was such a commanding figure and such a dramatic one that the national spotlight was on him for the preceding 12 years. The President so dazzled the country that those around him went virtually unnoticed, even though many, like Truman, had had distinguished public careers of their own before the Roosevelt era.

As Roosevelt personified the extraordinary American, urbane and charismatic, Harry Truman came to be seen as the ordinary American. He seemed to be the man people would meet at the grocery store or the barbershop. He would not have been out of place as anyones next door neighbor.

He came unexpectedly to the Presidency and was immediately faced with absolutely stupendous decisions of which he had had no prior inkling. As Roosevelt's Vice President, Truman had never been an F.D.R. insider. The modern notion of a Vice President as a Presidential assistant had not even been considered 40 years ago.

But the modest, unassuming man who had been a farmer, a haberdasher, a country judge, and a U.S. Senator walked into the Oval Office and told his friends that he was going to do his "dead level best" and went to work.

His country was nearing the climax of a devastating world war and almost immediately he had to face the reality of the atomic bomb about which he had not been told before. He had to decide whether to loose a dreadful new weapon upon the Japanese or to face the loss of a million American lives in a final onslaught against the Japanese homeland. He opted for the bomb and thus forced an early end to the war.

Even before final victory was won in World War II, President Truman had to face the breakup of the wartime alliance, and the reality of the Soviet Union's threat to the peace and security of the ravaged and war-weakened West.

The steps he took to counter that threat set the policy of this country in the succeeding three decades, and there is no responsible authority to deny its correctness.

The momentous policy initiatives of the Nation under Harry Truman in those years from 1945 to 1953 are too well known to be repeated here.

But it is proper that, today, we pause to pay tribute to this remarkable man who could indeed walk with kings without losing the common touch.

The country owes Harry Truman a great debt, and as the years go by, there can be no doubt that his splendor as a great American will increase.●

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to hear the many words of praise for the late President Harry Truman. President Truman was elected in a bitterly contested campaign in 1948, with a razor-thin victory that almost no one expected to happen. So the bipartisan praise suggests, I suppose, a certain progress in the recognition of his statesmanship.

But for a political leader to be great, he must have done great deeds, he must have acted out of the ordinary. To praise Harry Truman's greatness means to praise the actions he took—otherwise greatness has no meaning.

Here, then, is a list, by no means exhaustive, of some of Mr. Truman's acts and deeds in office:

His recognition of the State of Israel within 11 minutes of Israel's declaration of independence.

The development of the Truman doctrine according to which "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

The airlift to Berlin in order to break the Soviet Union's blockade of that city.

Creating the Marshall plan for massive economic recovery assistance to the war-torn states of Europe, in order to overcome Europe's weakness and vulnerability to Soviet aggression.

The development of a nuclear deterrant because "American's security and the security of the free world depend to a large degree on our leadership in the field of nuclear energy."

Establishing a worldwide strategy of mutual defense alliances from NATO in Europe to ANZUS in the South Pacific, to resist Communist aggression anywhere around the globe.

His magnanimous invitation to former President Hoover to head the Famine Emergency Committee, an act which helped restore Hoover's reputation.

President Truman followed the course of commonsense in dealing with the Soviet threat. He did all he could to help develop the economies of the free world nations so that they could resist Soviet aggression. And he did not hesitate to oppose force with force, when the Soviet imperial leaders left him no choice. He always understood that military aggression requires a military solution.

Dean Acheson described Harry Truman as "the captain with the mighty heart." Mr. Truman's plain speech made him a successful communicator in office. He shared in some of the finest qualities of the American people, and they recognized him as one of their own.

Mr. Speaker, we owe Harry Truman a great debt for his leadership and efforts on behalf of a strong America.●

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the 33d President of the United States.

While Harry—"Give 'em Hell, Harry"—was not felt capable nor sufficiently trained to lead a great Nation such as ours, he has become rated as one of the more effective and able Presidents of our time.

President Truman believed in helping those who could not help themselves and during his administration he instituted programs to help the poor and the underprivileged. He showed great leadership and compassion—as well as good old Missouri horsesense—in rebuilding Europe and Japan following the cataclysm of World War II.

As one who dedicated his life to his country, it is appropriate and fitting that we honor Harry S. Truman on the centennial anniversary of his birth.●

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor to have this opportunity to laud one of America's finest Presidents, Harry S. Truman. On this day, the 100th anniversary of his birth, we may all feel proud as we reflect upon the courageous leadership President Truman provided during a trying time in our Nation's history.

In 1945, President Truman inherited the colossal task of trying to fill the shoes of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He responded with a display of decisiveness, innovation, and dedication that today remains an example worthy of us all. His strong leadership guided the Nation through the conclusion of World War II and into a peacetime economy. In the area of foreign policy, he established the Truman doctrine, declaring that the United States would support all free people who resisted attempted subjugation either by armed minorities within their country or from outside aggressors. The Truman doctrine was also vital for it helped pave the way for the adoption of the Marshall plan.

At home, President Truman fought for social welfare programs by supporting low-cost housing and the introduction of a health insurance program which would eventually evolve into medicare. As one of the first Presidents to address the importance of civil rights, President Truman ardently supported the wartime Fair Employment Act, designed to prevent discrimination against minority groups. It did not take long for President Truman to move out of FDR's shadow and establish himself as a firm and decisive leader.

Mr. Speaker, on this day, I am proud to join our colleagues in honoring a dedicated man, a strong leader, and a fine President, Harry S. Truman.●

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in a fitting tribute to one of this country's gtreatest Presidents. I have admired Harry Truman for many years. It is appropriate, on the 100th anniversary of his birth, that we honor this great American.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton) for taking this Special Order so that those of us who admire and appreciate the tremendous contributions of Harry Truman may show our esteem.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a fine article on President Truman that appeared in April 28, 1984, issue of the Economist.

HARRY TRUMAN: FOREIGN POLICY MASTERBUILDER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—History has so far dealt kindly with President Harry Truman, who would have been 100 years old on May 8th had he fulfilled his intention of living to that age. The contrast between the slight opinion in which he was generally held when he took up the presidency and the towering achievements which he left behind when he departed gave rise to the unfortunate notion that the office of president of the United States has some magical quality about it that enables a small man to grow into it and become big, or an ignoble man to become noble. As has since been amply demonstrated, nothing of the kind can be expected. Truman could not have done what he did had he not, to begin with, had the right stuff in him.

His first period of office coincided with a sharp turn of the road in world politics and with the sudden emergence of a global power structure previously unseen, which called for a revolutionary change in American foreign policy. The high excitement of the Truman presidency came from the opening of the cold war and the accompanying transformation in American diplomacy, which Truman presided over. He had with him in this tenuous and alarming passage a group of public servants of exceptional quality. Without them it could not have been done, no doubt. But it was he himself, the little man with the thick eyeglasses from rural Missouri, who led the team, directed the fateful change and set the new course.

One of Mr. Truman's precepts was that you must always keep in mind who you are and where you come from. He was decidedly from Jackson County, Missouri. He was a small farmer, a wartime captain of artillery, an unsuccessful haberdasher, the elective administrator (judge) of his county and a senator from Missouri.

In 1944 he was picked somewhat indifferently for the vice-presidency by Franklin Roosevelt, to whom he was not at all close, as the one who would do least damage to the president's prospects of reelection to a fourth term. They won the election. But Roosevelt died on the 83rd day of his new term, leaving Truman high and dry. "That Throttlebottom!" exclaimed one eminent public servant with incredulity.

Truman was incomparably more simple, more direct and more limited than his predecessor. He was the last American president not to have been to college, though probably one of the three or four best-read; the last to cross Pennsylvania Avenue habitually on foot (usually with an armful of briefcases); in the words of his interviewer and biographer Merle Miller, "the last human being to occupy the White House". As president he kept on writing home to his mother and sister in Independence, Missouri, telling them what was going on in the White House and providing the 3 cent stamp himself, since this was not official business.

Of all American presidents he was the one with the least resemblance to Hamlet. It was not unknown for him to make a mess of something (in fact as an administrator he was no great shakes), but it was unknown for him to go on worrying about a decision once he had made it. He mishandled Henry Wallace in 1946, when Wallace as secretary of commerce was promoting his own foreign policy in conflict with that of the secretary of state, James Byrnes. When he realized that he had to dismiss Wallace he did it in a handwritten note so intemperate that it had to be fished back and destroyed with the magnanimous complicity of the victim. Afterwards Truman summed it all up for his mother in a few breezy words: "I had to fire Henry today . . . Well, now he's out and the crackpots are having conniption fits."

Until he became president Truman was told nothing whatever about the Manhattan

Engineering District, as the atom bomb project was called. Once he knew, he was quite able to appreciate how momentous it was. He set up the prodigiously authoritative Interim Committee to consider the future control of the new force as well as its immediate use. Later he backed the legislation that put the control of atomic energy in the civilian hands of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The immediate decision called for in July, 1945, was whether to use the bomb against Japan. This gave him no difficulty. The bomb has been developed for use in war. It offered the most efficient means of finishing the Japanese war. The chain of decisions had been long at work that led to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Truman saw no reason to back away from the ghastly, conclusive deed, and once it was done he lost literally not a moment's sleep over it. Regrets to him were a form of self-indulgence.

FROM CHARM TO CURTNESS

Truman's presidency saw the start of the cold war, but it is necessary to be clear that the swift disintegration of the grand wartime alliance was already under way before Roosevelt's death in April, 1945, thurst Truman into the presidency. Signs of a hardening of the Soviet attitude to east-west co-operation in the postwar settlement started to appear soon after Stalin got back to Moscow from the summit conference at Yalta in February. The signs concerned Germany, Rumania and most immediately Poland; in addition, Stalin picked an unpleasant quarrel with Roosevelt about the start of negotiations for a German surrender in Italy. Truman took over an administration that was already disappointed and perturbed.

The Soviet rulers may, nevertheless, have thought that the change from Roosevelt to Truman was a change for the worse for them. If they did, the difference of Truman's style from Roosevelt's may have enhanced the impression. He was not subtle or particularly patient, he did not (indeed, could not) drench a person in charm as Roosevelt did, or use an apparently pointless digression to relax a moment of tension. When Molotov came to see him 11 days after Roosevelt's death, his staff briefed him to be firm, but he was so curt that Molotov went away in dudgeon. Mr. Averell Harriman, who was there, thought Truman's hard treatment of Molotov a mistake because it "gave Molotov an excuse to tell Stalin that the Roosevelt policy was being abandoned". He did not think it a decisive mistake. Molotov at the time was on his way to the charter conference of the United Nations at San Francisco. There the rift continued to widen without any personal help from Truman.

In May, with the war over in Europe, the president had to turn his attention to winding up Lend-Lease. This was a case in which a foreign-policy action was not merely influenced, but dictated, by domestic politics. Congress had been nagging at Roosevelt about Lend-Lease, suspicious that he might be planning to use it for some kind of global New Deal at the expense of the American taxpayer (something not unlike that did happen some years later). Truman probably had no choice but to end it, but he signed the order without reading the fine print, and the abrupt way it was done created an uproar. The Russians in particular thought themselves victims of a hostile act.

It was at Potsdam, in July, that Truman got word of the successful atomic test at Alamogordo, New Mexico, and casually mentioned to Stalin that the United States had perfected "a very powerful explosive". Stalin, who had probably heard about the Manhattan project long before Truman did, did not appear particularly impressed. Yet it does seem possible that, while the American atomic monopoly lasted, the knowledge of it affected both Americans and Russians in a way not helpful to diplomatic understanding. As for the Potsdam conference, Truman wrote to his mother about it: "You never saw such pig-headed people as are the Russians".

A PLAN AND A DOCTRINE

In the downhill slide of world affairs from the Yalta summit to the Korean war, the 15 weeks in 1947 from February 21st to June 5th have been singled out as the period in which American policy took its great leap forward. February 21st was the day on which the British embassy in Washington told the state department of the British government's decision to end its aid to Greece and Turkey. June 5th was the date of General George Marshall's commencement address at Harvard, offering Europe the Marshall plan. A participant, Joseph Jones, reconstructing the events some years later in a book, "The Fifteen Weeks", called them the most revolutionary advances in United States' foreign policy since the year of the Monroe doctrine, 1823.

Central to the change was the enunciation by the president, in his address to congress on March 12th, of what came to be known as the Truman doctrine. "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

What the president was actually doing was asking for money, and for authority to step in with economic and military aid to Greece and technical military assistance to Turkey to fill the gap which had opened up with the sudden decline of British power.

On the face of it this did not require any statement so general or far-reaching. What had happened was that when General Marshall, in his terse, matter-of-fact way, explained to the congressional leaders what was needed, the congressional leaders fidgeted and muttered. The proposition sounded fishy to them. They did not feel the need to rescue the crumbling British empire or the unpopular Greek monarchy. Dean Acheson, who was present as undersecretary of state, intervened, with his chief's permission, with a rousing statement of the global danger in a situation more menacing than the world had seen since Rome faced Carthage.

The Democratic party at the time had recently lost control of congress to the Republicans, and Mr. Truman could get nothing important through the senate without bipartisan support. In foreign-policy matters this meant the support of Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan. Vandenberg had spoken early, even before Germany was beaten, of his misgivings about the course of Soviet conduct. Now he declared himself "impressed, even shaken" by Acheson's sounding of the global alarm. He insisted that the request for the money and the narrow authority which the administration needed be accompanied by a message to congress, and an explanation to the American people, in which the grim facts of the larger situation should be set out.

Acheson incorporated the "Vandenberg condition", as he called it at the time, in his instructions to the briefing team. The result was a doctrine of such general application that men like Walter Lippmann and George Kennan, whose writings and pleadings had charged the intellectual climate with much of its urgency, were startled and alarmed and devoted many months to arguing about what had gone wrong.

If the Truman doctrine was sown by political accident, it took root fast because of a convergence of challenges to the American consciousness which called for a bigger response than limited promises of aid. Mr. Kennan, startled as he was by the alarming scope of Truman's promise to the free world, nevertheless lost no time in spelling it out in the celebrated article by "X" in the summer issue of Foreign Affairs. This called for Soviet expansionism to be "contained by the adroit and vigilant application of counterforce at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points".

This was attacked by Walter Lippmann as a recipe for over-expansion and for the recruitment and subsidizing of "a heterogeneous array of satellites, clients, dependants and puppets"—an accurate description of one part, though one part only, of what eventually happened. While later presidents have tried to elaborate or qualify, their efforts have been mostly transitory and the Truman doctrine, with Kennan's "containment" elaboration of it, substantially represents American global policy at the present day.

More important at the time, however, was the general state of collapse in Europe, of which Britain's decision to dump its Greek and Turkish responsibilities in the American lap was a mere side-effect. The team that stitched the doctrine together in a such a hurry was already at work on the outlines of the Marshall plan. Acheson delivered the first official exposition of the principles of foreign aid at a small college at Cleveland, Mississippi, on May 8, 1947. Marshall, in his customary modest language, made the offer to Europe, at Harvard four weeks later, of massive American support for a programme of European recovery; it was Truman who later insisted that this project be known as the Marshall plan. As Mr. Arthur Schlesinger was to describe it in "The Vital Centre" two years later, "Our present policy for world peace has thus settled into the formula of reconstruction plus containment".

Some interaction inevitably took place between the two. The recovery programme required an effort to organize Germany or at least its western zones; the Russians replied to that with the blockade of Berlin, to which Truman replied with the Berlin airlift and the reinforcement of the American air force in Europe—another fateful step requiring bipartisan support. Preparatory work started that summer on the North Atlantic treaty, although the treaty was not completed and signed until after Truman had confounded everybody by winning the presidential election of 1948, and had been inaugurated for his unexpected second term. It was in his inaugural address in January, 1949, that he broached the extension of the philosophy of foreign assistance to the under-developed world. The ratification by the senate of the North Atlantic treaty in the spring of 1949 was practically the last gasp of bipartisanship.

SOUR GRAPESHOT

As it turned out, much of the co-operation that Truman got from the Republicans in his first term was based on the general belief that the election of 1948 would see the end of him and that the Republicans, excluded from the White House for 16 years, would get their turn. Truman's rout

of Thomas Dewey left them in a condition of frustration and impotent rage from which in some ways the party has still not altogether recovered.

One form it took was the welling up of the already powerful anti-communist stream in the nation's feelings into paranoia: the point about Joseph McCarthy was not anything original in him, it was the hearing he got in the country. Another feature was the mythology built up around Chiang Kai-shek (who was losing China at the moment Truman was elected) and concurrently, by a curious syllogism, around the Napoleonic commander-in-chief in the Far East, General Douglas MacArthur.

More subtle was the reinterpretation of the Yalta agreement to show Roosevelt, and by extension his successor Truman, as having wantonly sacrificed the national lives of free peoples to Stalin's greed for territory. Both the China lobby and the eastern European émigré groups joined in the attack on what most people believed, at the time it was done, to be the best postwar settlement that could be got in the circumstances.

Truman, with Marshall back at work to support him engaged in the Korean war against this unpromising political background. At the height of it, since MacArthur persisted in threatening to carry the war into China, he was obliged to dismiss MacArthur; he did it in his accustomed brisk, prosaic manner, to all appearances impervious to the uproar and fury that broke upon his head. "We're in for a run of hysteria in this country", he said.

From that period Truman still holds the statistical record, unbroken even by Mr Jimmy Carter, for public unpopularity as reflected in the opinion polls. While a good part of the trouble come from the national political paranoia that prevailed in the last years of his administration and the first years of Eisenhower's, that was not all.

Not only had the Republicans been out too long, the Democrats has been in too long; patronage was overdone, too many comfortable self-serving practices had been established; there were congressional investigations which revealed wrongful allocation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation grants of money and political manipulation of the tax collections. As scandals they have been exceeded before and since; still, Truman lacked the administrative sense to put them right or the political showmanship that might have restored appearances. In domestic goverment he made many innovations that the postwar era required and that have endured; yet it is as the layer of foreign-policy foundations that he is most remembered.●

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the various proclamations, tributes, and statements relating to Harry Truman to which I referred earlier are as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 8, 1984 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States, and is one of this nation's most respected statesmen; and

Whereas, in November of 1944 the voters of this country elected Harry Truman Vice President where he served only 83 days and succeeded to the Presidency in April, 1945 upon the death of President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, in his first months in office, President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II and made the difficult decisions that ushered in the nuclear age and in the postwar years he oversaw America's transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and began an era of growth and stability; and

Whereas, in foreign affairs President Truman established the cornerstones of the policy of containment in dealing with the communist threat to Europe and through the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan he assisted free peoples in their efforts to stem the tide of totalitarianism; and

Whereas, in 1948 Harry Truman was elected to the Presidency, battling from behind to overcome Thomas Dewey and President Truman responded to the invasion of South Korea by utilizing United Nations as well as American forces in dealing with that crisis;

Now, therefore, I, Anthony S. Earl, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman" in the State of Wisconsin.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, on May 8, 1984, the nation marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, our 33rd President and one of this century's most influential statesmen. President Truman's vision and leadership contributed greatly toward shaping the course of history in the post-World War II era; and

Whereas, Harry Truman first gained national prominence as a United States Senator from the State of Missouri; and

Whereas, in 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt chose Mr. Truman to be his vice presidential running mate. After serving only a brief tenure as Vice President, Harry Truman ascended to the Presidency upon the death of President Roosevelt in April 1945. In his first few months in office, President Truman guided the country to the successful completion of a devastating war and oversaw the transition to a peacetime economy; and

Whereas, President Truman's domestic policies clearly illustrated his compassionate nature. He prevailed upon Congress to pass legislation pledging the federal government to use all means at its disposal to assure maximum employment. He made it possible for millions of Americans to obtain low-cost housing by securing passage of the National Housing Act of 1949. And, he became the first President to submit a message to Congress on civil rights; and

Whereas, above all, the world remembers Harry S. Truman as a man of courage, decisiveness, humanity, and wit; now

Therefore, I, James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor of the State of North Carolina, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, as "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman Day" in North Carolina and commend this observance to our citizens.

STATE OF TENNESSEE—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 8, 1984, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States, and a man who skillfully led the world through one of the most critical periods in modern history; and

Whereas, the Truman Centennial will be marked with ceremonies and activities which will draw considerable attention to the many great accomplishments of Harry S. Truman before, during, and after his Presidency; and

Whereas, in honor of President Truman, President Reagan has officially proclaimed May 8, 1984, the "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman", and has called on all Americans to "observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in remembrance of his many accomplishments and dedication to freedom and democracy;

Now, therefore, I, Lamar Alexander, as Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, as "Harry S. Truman Day" in Tennessee and do urge all our citizens to join me in this observance.

STATE OF WYOMING—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 8 1984, will mark the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States, and a man who skillfully led the world through one of the most critical periods in modern history; and

Whereas, the Truman Centennial will be marked with ceremonies and activities which will draw considerable attention to the many great accomplishments of Harry S. Truman before, during, and after his Presidency; and

Whereas, in honor of President Truman, President Reagan has officially proclaimed May 8, 1984, the "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman," and has called upon all Americans to "observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in remembrance of his many accomplishments and dedication to freedom and democracy;"

Now, therefore, I, Ed Herschler, Governor of the State of Wyoming, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, as "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman" in Wyoming, and call upon the citizens of Wyoming to mark this occasion with fitting tribute to President Truman.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wyoming to be affixed this thirteenth day of April, 1984.

STATE OF COLORADO—PROCLAMATION—THE CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S. TRUMAN, MAY 8, 1984

Whereas, May 8, 1984, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States and one of this nation's most respected statesman; and

Whereas, elected to the U.S. Senate from Missouri in 1934, Mr. Truman gained national recognition during World War II, when his investigating committee saved the taxpayers large amounts of money by exposing waste and extravagance in the procurement process; and

Whereas, in 1944 he was elected vice president and succeeded to the presidency in April 1945, upon the death of President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II and in postwar years oversaw America's transition to a peacetime economy and began an era of growth and stability; and

Whereas, in foreign affairs President Truman established the cornerstones of the policy of containment in dealing with the communist threat to Europe and implemented the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan; and

Whereas, President Truman assisted in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas, Mr. Truman was elected to the presidency in 1948 and he responded to the invasion of South Korea by utilizing the United Nations as well as American forces in dealing with that crisis; and

Whereas, although confronted with a series of major challenges throughout his tenure, President Truman responded with courage, humanity, decisiveness and a wit which have secured his place in the nation's history as one of our most respected presidents;

Now, therefore, I, Richard D. Lamm, Governor of the State of Colorado, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984 as "The Centennial of the Birth of Harry Truman" in the State of Colorado.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT—OFFICIAL STATEMENT

America has been the birthplace of many individuals whose leadership skills and abilities serve as an inspiration to people everywhere and whose visions and policies have had significant effect in determining the course of history.

The life and leadership of Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States and a most respected statesman, stand as a magnificent example of these outstanding Americans.

Mr. Truman was first elected to the United States Senate in 1934. He distinguished himself in that body and gained national recognition as Chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program (Truman Committee). The Committee saved an estimated $15 million by eliminating waste and extravagance in defense spending.

In 1944, he was elected Vice President and he succeeded to the Presidency in April 1945 upon the death of Franklin Roosevelt.

President Truman guided our country through the waning days of World War II and made the difficult decision to deploy the A-bomb. He directed America's transition to a peacetime economy at the conclusion of the war and ushered in a new era of growth and prosperity.

President Truman's contributions to the field of foreign policy were the most far reaching. He firmly believed that nations should be free to work out their own destiny and that those who chose to be free but were threatened by outside forces were deserving of our assistance. The implementation of the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, the Berlin airlift, and the Point Four program are all indicative of his unwavering belief in and support of the right of self determination and the containment of subversive forces.

May 8, 1984 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman. He is remembered as a man of compassion, great courage, decisiveness and wit. Ceremonies and activities will be held throughout the country to commemorate his life and his dedication to the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Therefore, in conjunction with the national observance and in tribute to a great American leader, I am proud to designate May 8, 1984 as centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman Day in Connecticut, in recognition of his many accomplishments and contributions to the progress of our nation.

STATE OF DELAWARE—STATEMENT IN RECOGNITION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

Whereas, May 8, 1984, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States and one of this nation's most respected statesmen; and

Whereas, while in the United States Senate, Mr. Truman gained national recognition during World War II when his investigating committee saved the taxpayers large amounts of money by exposing waste and extravagance in the procurement process; and

Whereas, Mr. Truman succeeded to the Presidency in April, 1945, upon the death of President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II, oversaw America's transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and began an era of growth and stability; and

Whereas, although confronted with a series of challenges throughout his tenure, President Truman responded with courage, humanity, and a wit which have secured his place as one of our most respected Presidents.

Now, therefore, we, Pierre S. du Pont, Governor, and Michael N. Castle, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, do hereby declare May 8, 1984, as an observance of the Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman, and urge all citizens to recognize his many accomplishments on behalf of all people.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 8, 1984, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States and one of this Nation's most respected statesmen; and

Whereas, First elected to the United States Senate from Missouri in 1934; and

Whereas, In November 1944, the voters elected Mr. Truman Vice President. He served only 83 days in that office and succeeded to the Presidency in April 1945, upon the death of President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, In his first months in office, President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II and made the difficult decisions that ushered in the nuclear age; and

Whereas, Through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan he stalwartly assisted free peoples in their efforts to stem the tide of totalitarian subversion; and

Whereas, In 1948, Mr. Truman was elected the Presidency; and

Whereas, Although confronted with a series of major challenges throughout his tenure, President Truman responded with courage, humanity, decisiveness, and a wit which have secured his place in the Nation's history as one of our most respected Presidents.

Now, therefore, I, Allen I. Olson, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984 to be the "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman" and call upon the people of North Dakota to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in rememberance of his many accomplishments and dedication to freedom and democracy.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of North Dakota to be affixed this twelfth day of April, 1984.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Harry S. Truman gained national recognition during World War II for his efforts in saving the taxpayers thousands of dollars by exposing waste and extravagance in the federal government's procurement process, and;

Whereas, as the thirty-third president, Mr. Truman guided this country through the end of World War II and made the difficult decisions that saw Americans make the transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy which began an era of prosperity and stability, and;

Whereas, through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, this nation has assisted free countries in their efforts to contain the threat of Communism. And, in applying the principles of collective security, President Truman assisted in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to aid European nations in responding to outside threats, and;

Whereas, no matter what confronted him President Truman responded to the series of challenges with courage, decisiveness, intelligence, and the sensitivity to humanity which have made him one of America's most respected leaders.

Now, therefore, I, John D. Rockefeller IV, Governor of the State of West Virginia, do hereby proclaim the day of May 8, 1984, as the "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman" in West Virginia, and call upon the people of this state to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in remembrance of the many contributions he has made to this nation's freedom and democracy.

STATE OF WASHINGTON—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 8, 1984, will mark the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States, and a man who skillfully led the world through one of the most critical periods in modern history; and

Whereas, first elected to the United States Senate from Missouri in 1934, Mr. Truman gained national recognition during World War II, when his investigating committee saved the taxpayers large amounts of money by exposing waste and extravagance in the procurement process; and

Whereas, in November, 1944, the voters elected Mr. Truman Vice President of the United States; and

Whereas, Mr. Truman served only 83 days as Vice President and succeeded to the Presidency in April, 1945, upon the death of President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, in his first months in office President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II and made the difficult decisions that ushered in the nuclear age; and

Whereas, in the postwar years, he oversaw America's transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and began an era of growth and stability; and

Whereas, in 1948, Mr. Truman was elected to the Presidency; and

Whereas, although confronted with a series of major challenges throughout his tenure, President Truman responded with courage, humanity, decisiveness, and wit, all of which secured his place in the nation's history as one of our most respected Presidents;

Now, therefore, I, John Spellman, Governor of the State of Washington, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, as "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman" in Washington State.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 8, 1984 marks the one hundreth anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States and one of this nation's most respected statesman; and

Whereas, President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II

and made the difficult decisions that ushered in the nuclear age; and

Whereas, President Truman oversaw America's transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and began an era of growth and stability; and

Whereas, President Truman established the cornerstones of the policy of containment in dealing with the communist threat to Europe;

Now, therefore, I, Toney Anaya, Governor of the State of New Mexico, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 8, 1984, as: "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman" in New Mexico, and I call upon the citizens of the state to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in remembrance of his many accomplishments and dedication to freedom and democracy.

STATE OF NEVADA—A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas, May 8, 1984, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States and one of this Nation's most respected statesmen; and

Whereas, first elected to the United States Senate from Missouri in 1934, Mr. Truman gained national recognition during World War II, when his investigating committee saved the taxpayers large amounts of money by exposing waste and extravagance in the procurement process. In November 1944, the voters elected Mr. Truman Vice President. He served only 83 days in that office and succeeded to the Presidency in April 1945, upon the death of President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, in his first months in office, President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II and made the difficult decisions that ushered in the nuclear age. In the postwar years, he oversaw America's transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and began an era of growth and stability. In foreign affairs, President Truman established the cornerstones of the policy of containment in dealing with the communist threat to Europe. Through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan he stalwartly assisted free peoples in their efforts to stem the tide of totalitarian subversion. In applying the principles of collective security, President Truman assisted in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to help European nations respond to this threat; and

Whereas, in 1948, Mr. Truman was elected to the Presidency, battling from behind to overtake Governor Thomas Dewey. President Truman responded to the invasion of South Korea by utilizing United Nations as well as American forces in dealing with that crisis; and

Whereas, although confronted with a series of major challenges throughout his tenure, President Truman responded with courage, humanity, decisiveness, and a wit which have secured his place in the Nation's history as one of our most respected Presidents;

Now, therefore, I, Richard H. Bryan, Governor of the State of Nevada, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, to be the "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman" and call upon the people of the state of Nevada to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in remembrance of his many accomplishments and dedication to freedom and democracy.

STATE OF HAWAII—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States, was born on May 8, 1884, in Lamar, Missouri; and

Whereas, the life of Harry S. Truman was one of extraordinary accomplishment and dedication to American ideals; and

Whereas, Harry S. Truman began service in the Missouri National Guard in 1905; served in World War I in France; became a businessman; entered the field of politics as a Democrat; served with distinction in the United States Senate before and during World War II; and was elected Vice President of the United States in 1944, a position he held only 82 days, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt died in office and Mr. Truman became the 33rd President; and

Whereas, the period of Harry S. Truman's public service was one of immense distress for our nation and the world, including the Depression years and the years of World War II and the Korean conflict; and

Whereas, both before and after assuming the office of President, Mr. Truman proved to be a citizen of great courage, unquestioned integrity, exceptional decisiveness, and total dedication to American principles and ideals; and

Whereas, in making decisions awesome in their implications for the world, President Truman sought the counsel of many and then acted decisively, meriting admiration for his keen logic, sound judgment, and willingness to bear the burden of crisis management; and

Whereas, Hawaii in 1953 was privileged to welcome President and Mrs. Truman as honored guests in the islands; and

Whereas, it is eminently fitting that all in Hawaii be reminded of the centennial of the birth of this great American President;

Now, therefore, I, George R. Ariyoshi, Governor of Hawaii, mindful of the extraordinary contributions of President Truman to our nation and the world, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, to be "President Harry S. Truman Centennial Day in Hawaii" and invite all in our islands to observe this day with activities appropriate to its importance.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Harry S. Truman served America in World War I, helping to organize a Missouri regiment and later commanding a battery of that regiment in France; and

Whereas, Harry S. Truman began a career in local politics in Jackson County, Missouri in 1922 and was elected to the United States Senate in 1934; and

Whereas, as a Senator, Harry S. Truman was instrumental in drafting significant legislation and also helped save taxpayers an estimated $15 million in World War II defense costs; and

Whereas, after serving as Vice President for less than three months, Harry S. Truman became President upon the death of Franklin Roosevelt on April 12, 1945; and

Whereas, Harry S. Truman presided over the successful conclusion of World War II, then developed the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine to aid and protect our war-ravaged Europen allies; and

Whereas, Harry S. Truman was elected President in his own right 1948, and continued to show resolve in the face of communist aggression, while proposing social legislation embodied in the Fair Deal; and

Whereas, after his Presidency, in the final two decades of his life, Harry S. Truman remained a popular public figure, admired for the plain in speaking, the wit, and the decisiveness he displayed as President; and

Whereas, May 8, 1984 marks the centennial of the birth of Harry S. Truman;

Now, therefore, I George Deukmejian, Governor of the State of California, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984 as Harry S. Truman Day in California and do urge Californians to honor the memory of this great American on this occasion.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN

(By Missouri Secretary of State James C. Kirkpatrick)

In the time span of a little over a half of a century, I was deeply honored to meet the greatest President of the United States when he first campaigned for the United States Senate in 1933 and finally to receive one of my most cherished awards, the Harry S. Truman Award for Public Service in 1983.

As the publisher of the Daily Democrat in Lamar, the birthplace of Harry S. Truman, I learned much about his early childhood and talked to many about his character traits. He stood for honesty, integrity, strength and freedom throughout his exemplary life.

He earned the respect of our nation by striving to do what he felt was right. His statement, "I don't give a damn what history thinks of me. I know what I did, and that's enough for me," summarizes the leadership of Harry S. Truman, when our nation desperately sought a strong leader.

Our country needs a Truman today—for his courage and for his dedication to truth, fair play and social justice.

As a greatful Irishman for the accomplishments of our greatest President, may I close this tribute with my own form of an old Irish Blessing:

May the many moral attributes of President Harry S. Truman be continually idealized by dedicated people.

May our nation continue to respect and follow the principles set forth by this great man,

As we constantly strive for better government, after the example set for us by a great President from Missouri.

CITY OF KANSAS CITY, KANS.—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 9, 1984 marks the centennial of the birth of Harry S. Truman, 33rd President of the United States; and

Whereas, Harry S. Truman as President guided the United States through one of the most difficult periods in its history; and

Whereas, The Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and NATO serve to remind us of the contributions he made to the rebuilding and stability of Europe and thus to free peoples everywhere; and

Whereas, Candidate Truman became the architect in 1948 of the greatest political upset in the history of American politics; and

Whereas, Historians have accorded to President Truman the status of one of our most respected Presidents; and

Whereas, Harry S. Truman represented one of America's greatest national assets, nurtured here in greater Kansas City and inbred with midwestern common sense and decency; and

Whereas, everyone in the greater Kansas City metroplex should be proud to have called Mr. Truman, "neighbor":

Now, therefore, I, John E. Reardon, Mayor of the City of Kansas City, Kansas, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 8, 1984, to be "the centennial of the Birth of Harry S.

Truman" in Kansas City, Kansas and urge all citizens to observe this day.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—HARRY S. TRUMAN DAY, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, May 8, 1984 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States and one of this Nation's most respected statesmen; and

Whereas, Harry Truman was elected to the United States Senate from Missouri in 1934 gaining national recognition during World War II, when his investigating committee saved the taxpayers large amounts of money by exposing waste and extravagance in the procurement process; and

Whereas, in November 1944, the voters elected Mr. Truman Vice President where he served only 83 days in that office and succeeded to the Presidency in April 1945, upon the death of President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, President Truman guided the country through the end of World War II overseeing America's transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy, beginning an era of growth and stability; and

Whereas, President Truman was confronted with a series of major challenges throughout his tenure; he responded with courage, humanity, decisiveness, and wit securing his place in our Nation's history and in the hearts of his fellow countrymen as one of our most respected Presidents:

Now, therefore, I, the Mayor of the District of Columbia do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 8 1984 as "Harry S. Truman Day" in Washington, D.C. and call upon the residents of the District of Columbia to join me in observing the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of our thirty-third President.

CITY OF LAMAR, MO.—A PROCLAMATION

May 8, 1984, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the thirty-third President of the United States and one of this Nation's most respected statesmen.

Born in Lamar, Missouri, on May 8, 1884, Truman's birthplace was officially dedicated and opened to the public in Lamar in 1959. Lamar is very proud of this birthplace shrine which is officially listed on the National Register of Historic Places, in recognition of the outstanding significance of the property and to encourage its preservation. It serves as a symbol for Harry S. Truman, whose personal sacrifices for his God, his nation and his people merited him the highest honor the United States can bestow—The Office of the President of the United States.

Truman was elected to the United States Senate in 1934, and in July 1944, he was nominated as the vice-presidential candidate to run with Franklin Roosevelt. Mr. Truman drew the largest crowd in Barton County history when he returned to Lamar on August 31, 1944, to deliver his vice presidential nomination acceptance speech. Elected in November, he served as Vice President only 82 days succeeding to the Presidency April 12, 1945, on Roosevelt's death. His first year as President was marked by the dropping of the first atomic bomb and the end of World War II.

Although confronted with a series of major challenges throughout his tenure, President Truman responded with courage, humanity, decisiveness and a wit which has secured his place in the Nation's history as one of our most respected Presidents. Truman was a Missourian of candor and wit. He was not afraid to tell it exactly like it was. A trait which made him a controversial President, but gain him many admirers, both Republicans and Democrats.

On April 19, 1959, Mr. Truman returned to Lamar, for the last time, for the dedication of his Lamar Birthplace. Over 6,000 persons attended the ceremonies.

Now, therefore, I, Gerald W. Gilkey, Mayor of the City of Lamar, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984 to be the "Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman". I call upon the people of Lamar to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities in remembrance of his many accomplishments and dedication to freedom and democracy.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 16th day of April, 1984.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN BY WALTER E. WASHINGTON, FORMER MAYOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I am pleased to participate in the commemoration of the Centennial of President Harry S. Truman. President Truman was a strong voice in support of civil rights in the Nation. He played an important role in the transformation of the United States from a closed segregated to an open integrated society. He will be remembered for having integrated the armed forces by Executive Order. He will also be remembered for his forthright advocacy of civil rights, even though he knew he was taking a great political risk. Those of us in Washington, D.C. recall him as an early advocate of local self government for the citizens of this city and for a vote in presidential elections. He believed in the many citizens who lived behind the monuments and he acted to assure their equality and human dignity.

In his address to the Annual Convention of the NAACP on June 29, 1947, President Truman asserted:

"As Americans, we believe that every man should be free to live his life as he wishes. He should be limited only by his responsibility to his fellow countryman. If freedom is to be more than a dream, each man must be guaranteed equality of opportunity. The only limit to an American achievement should be his ability, his industry and his character."

Harry S. Truman was an inspiration for our times.

STATEMENT BY W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

When he first became President, people assumed that Harry Truman was an ordinary man—but he became one of the most extraordinary leaders in our nation's history. I came home from my post as Ambassador in Moscow to brief the new President. I discovered that he had read every cable, was thoroughly informed, and already completely in command. He had a gift for decision making; he never looked back and agonized once an issue was settled.

In any crisis, he was a center of calm. The politicians said he had no chance in 1948; he went ahead and fought his fight and won his stunning victory. When his ratings in the polls fell in the early 1950's, especially after he dismissed General MacArthur, he held to his course and was content to wait for history's more favorable judgment. His enemies were the pompous and the irrational apostles of the extreme right and the extreme left, who both seemed to think that the only choice was a nuclear war or appeasement.

Harry Truman resisted the worst excesses of McCarthyism; he stood for civil liberties and civil rights. And abroad, it was President Truman who was responsible for the Truman Doctrine in Greece and Turkey, and for the Marshall Plan in Western Europe.

At one point someone derisively called him an accidental President. If that is what he was, he was one of the happiest accidents in this nation's history.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 24, 1984.*

It was my privilege to be assigned to a succession of top commands—Commanding General, U.S. Eighth Army and Republic of Korea Army in combat; Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers and Commander-in-Chief United Nations Forces in the Far East; and Supreme Allied Commander Europe—all during President Truman's Presidency.

By the nature of these assignments, I feel that each of them required his personal approval.

In every one of them, no Field Commander or Theater Commander could have had finer support, nor more considerate personal courtesies from his Commander-in-Chief than he accorded me.

I early formed great admiration for President Truman's personal integrity, courage, and leadership, and his wide knowledge of military history. That admiration has steadily grown through the years.

M.B. RIDGWAY,
General, U.S. Army, Retired.

STATEMENT OF J. J. MCCLOY, THE FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR DURING WORLD WAR II IN REGARD TO THE STATURE OF HARRY S. TRUMAN AS ONE OF OUR LEADING PRESIDENTS

I came to know President Truman when he was a Senator and Chairman of the Truman Committee dealing with the adjustment of munitions contracts during the course of World War II.

My chief connection with him, however, was following the death of President Roosevelt when I had a number of important discussions with him relating to the terms on which the war with Japan could be brought to an end in order to preserve peace in the Pacific and in the best interests of the United States and its Allies.

President Truman will rank, in my judgment, as one of our finest national leaders. He quickly absorbed the profound consequences of the atom bomb and its potential use. He was a student of history and a great patriot, sensitive to the vital interests of the country in a critical period of its history. He dealt sensibly with challenging international problems as well as with problems induced by far reaching postwar changes. He did much to help preserve the peace in a new world charged with the release of nuclear power and with major political readjustments.

STATEMENT OF ELMER B. STAATS, PRESIDENT, HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

President Truman had a great personal interest in the Federal Budget, possibly stemming from having served on the Senate Appropriations Committee. But he also simply liked to work with the budget. He had a prodigious memory. He startled us, for example, in budget briefings by recalling what we had requested for some specific program in the prior year. He worked at the budget in detail.

He was the only President to hold his own press conference on the budget. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the

Budget, who sat at his side during these conferences, had little to do. And, when appropriation bills were enacted, he was interested in following up as the agency programs were being carried out. A briefing book, prepared at his request, called "The Budget in Operation," showing such details as trends in government employment, workload, grants-in-aid, procurement, unemployment compensation, and so forth, was in the upper left drawer of his desk and he referred to it in most of our meetings with him about the budget.

Overall, of the eight budgets prepared by President Truman, four were in surplus and four were in deficit. Three of these deficit years reflected the defense buildup during the Korean War. Even so, the surplus exceeded the deficits—$22.5 billion to $12.1 billion, a ratio of nearly 2 to 1.

After President Johnson prepared his first budget for fiscal year 1965, knowing of President Truman's interest in the budget, he asked Charles Murphy, President Truman's former Counsel, and myself to brief President Truman in Independence on the new budget. Visiting the President's former office in Independence not long ago, I discovered that President Johnson's 1965 budget was on top of the reading stack which he left at the time he died.

President Truman understood budgeting as an important tool in managing the executive branch and in gaining acceptance of his programs in Congress. He set an example for any President of the need for personal involvement and understanding of what goes into the budget and the need for working closely with Congress in its enactment.

STATEMENT OF BENEDICT K. ZOBRIST, DIRECTOR, HARRY S. TRUMAN LIBRARY

As Director of the Harry S. Truman Library and as a professional historian and archivist, I am grateful for this opportunity to pay tribute to Harry S. Truman on the occasion of the celebration of the centennial of his birth. While the final verdict is not in, most historians now rank President Truman high among our Chief Executives in terms of leadership, strength of character, high courage and devotion to principle. From the beginning of his administration to its end, President Truman was called on to make many tough decisions. In making these decisions history always served as a constant guide. From his earliest schooldays Mr. Truman was an omnivorous reader of history and biography. "My debt to history," he once wrote, "cannot be calculated."

By the time of his death, President Truman had repaid this debt in full, I believe, by his gift to the Nation of his Presidential papers together with the thousands of gifts which had been given to him while he was in the White House by heads of state and common people alike. Housed in the beautiful Harry S. Truman Library, dedicated in 1957, which is located in President Truman's hometown of Independence, Missouri, the Truman Presidential papers along with papers of many of Mr. Truman's associates also deposited in the Library have been used since 1959 by more than 3,600 scholars from every state in the Union and from many foreign countries. In the museum area of the building, exhibits which reflect President Truman's interest in the history and nature of the Presidency have been viewed by more than five million visitors. Administered by the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration, the Library stands as a permanent symbol of Mr. Truman's lifelong dedication to the study of history and his deep appreciation of its significance to decisionmakers in a free society.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. SNYDER, CHAIRMAN, HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

Gentleman: At noon on April 12, 1945, I was in Mexico City. A joint group of United States-Mexican bankers had just concluded a successful conference on exchange rates concerning our export-import business.

Floyd Ransom, a prominent American businessman in Mexico City, had invited a number of the conference participants to his home for a luncheon to celebrate our significant accomplishment. It turned out to be a typical Mexican luncheon that lasted the remainder of the afternoon.

We were still at the table when the butler announced that the radio had just flashed the story of President Roosevelt's death.

A. P. Giannini, the founder of the Bank of America, was sitting next to me, and had been inquiring about the background of Vice President Truman, as there had been numerous rumors on the West Coast regarding Roosevelt's health.

The announcement had the effect of a startling explosion, which started everyone to talking at once. There was great speculation as to what sort of President Mr. Truman would make and because of my long friendship with him I was plied with many questions.

Due to my close observation of his activities as a military leader, County Court official, Senator, and Chairman of the Truman Committee, I talked particularly about his great skill in choosing men of experience in connection with the individual task that he was working on at any given time. This facet of Mr. Truman's markup greatly impressed Giannini. He made one remark, "I really feel better."

Later in the evening at the Reforma Hotel, President Truman telephoned me. I told him how greatly shocked we all were to learn of Roosevelt's death. "Yes, he said. "I feel like I have been struck by a bolt of lightning." I went on to assure him of my deepest sympathy in the trying hours he was experiencing. He broke in to ask how soon I could get to Washington. I said that I would be there at the earliest possible moment. The conversation ended with his telling me, "Come to see me as soon as you get here."

I finally arrived in Washington at 10:00 p.m. the night of April 13th. In those days we travelled by DC3's which required many stops for refueling. It had been a sad, depressing trip across the country. At each stop we made, the terminal was filled with dazed, apprehensive mourners lamenting the death of a great leader.

The next morning, April 14, I was on the way for my first visit with President Truman. I can assure you that it was in a prayerful mood that I approached my appointment with a man who so richly deserved the fullest and the most earnest support of every citizen of our country, and for that matter, of the world.

In spite of the problems that had been prepiling in on him, I was pleased to see the President appeared to have had a good night's rest and was confidently taking up his myriad tasks.

He spent about fifteen minutes bringing me up to date. The first official act had been to declare a National mourning period and in making arrangements for the White House funeral rites of President Roosevelt. He had talked with his Cabinet, with leaders of Congress, advised foreign Heads of State, conferred with the Secretary of State to receive information reports on foreign matters, including the war posture. He had met with Admiral Leahy and the military leaders, including the Secretaries of War and Navy, he had arranged to address a Joint Session of Congress on April 16. Throughout the day he had received messages from all over the world and had had a visit with Jimmy Byrnes. He was learning that he had not been kept informed on critical matters by his predecessor. He also had learned the day before for the first time that Stalin was not living up to the agreements that he had made with Churchill and Roosevelt. A matter that greatly distressed President Truman was the unhappy complications which were developing in the Polish situation. He said that he had spent some hours the evening before reading the position papers on this development, which revealed that the Soviets had deliberately shot down hundreds of Polish officers and had buried them in an open ditch.

That morning before I arrived he had already talked to Steve Early and Sam Rosenman about his forthcoming speech before Congress. Another matter that he must decide that day was about the final arrangements for the United Nations Conference which had been scheduled in San Francisco for that month.

Frankly, I was appalled at the volume of matters that he had acted on in the few hours since he had been sworn in.

He then told me that he wanted me to be in Washington with him. The day before he had checked for a suitable assignment and had learned that the job of Federal Loan Administrator was vacant. It was an operation with which I was thoroughly familiar. So he wanted me to take that one immediately. Personally, I felt that I could be of far greater help as the President of the First National Bank in St. Louis, a position to which I had already been elected. We were still discussing the matter when Jim Byrnes came in. He told Jim that I was holding out on the appointment. Jimmy spoke up and said, "Harry, don't forget who you are now. Order him' to do it." That ended the discussion. Three days later, on April 17, the President sent my nomination as Federal Loan Administrator to the Senate as his first major appointment.

As I was leaving, Secretary Morgenthau came in for a very short call. Another day's heavy schedule was ahead for the new President.

At 4 p.m., James Byrnes and I proceeded to the East Room of the White House to attend the simple funeral rites for a great President. The service was conducted by Bishop Angus Dunn of the Episcopal National Cathedral. A few words by the Bishop, some of President Roosevelt's favorite hymns were sung, and the service was over. The brevity was at the request of Mrs. Roosevelt.

President Truman, Mrs. Truman and Margaret went to Hyde Park for the services there. I met the train upon their return Sunday evening and rode with the Trumans to their Connecticut Avenue apartment. En route we discussed the speech which he was to deliver before the Joint Session of Congress the next day. I was pleased with what he planned to say. We changed one or two parts and decided to add a couple of thoughts to emphasize that the war was not yet over and to touch on the U.S. role after the war.

I had left him at the apartment with the understanding that I would be at the White House early the next morning.

On Monday morning I had an opportunity to go over the full draft of the speech and later went with the President to the Capitol to hear him deliver it. It was well received—at one point with a standing ovation when he reasserted the demand for an unconditional surrender.

I saw President Truman two or three times a day during the week. I had lunch with him, Vaughan and Ed McKim at the Blair House. This was quite a reunion from Old Fort Riley days during the Twenties and Thirties when as Colonels, Truman commanded the 379th F.A. Reserve Regiment, Vaughan the 380th and I the 381st, for two weeks each summer. I recall this military phase as it was in those days that Colonel Truman and I began to apply the Five Paragraph Military Order to problems in our civilian life. To refresh your memory, the Five Paragraph Order requires:

1. Situation: a. Enemy Forces (Elements working against us); and b. Own Forces (Resources we have available).
2. Mission: (What we are trying to do).
3. Solution: (How can we handle problems).
4. Administration and Logistics: (Implementation of our resources).
5. Order and Communication: (Retained direction); (Delegated direction); and (Line of authority).

I know that formula was of great value to Our President in the critical first months, as it was throughout his entire administration.

A delightful incident occurred as we were returning from lunch to the White House. As we reached the center of Pennsylvania Avenue, the President suddenly stopped and said, "Oh, Hell! I left my White House pass on the dresser."

Tuesday morning, the 16th, among other matters we discussed the world's critical food situation. I took the occasion to mention former President Hoover's experience after W.W. I. I had met him in Paris in 1919. Others thought well of the idea, and some time later Mr. Truman called him to the White House to discuss Europe. This led to his appointment by the President, as Honorary Chairman, Famine Emergency Committee. They became warm friends. Years later, when I was talking with President Hoover, he said that the appointment added ten years to his life.

The President spent some minutes in discussing the problems that would follow the fall of Hitler. He felt, from reports, that victory was imminent in Europe. There were many matters that would require conferences with Churchill and with Stalin. He was most interested in meeting Churchill, though he did not wish to offend Stalin by a premature talk with the British. It was a delicate situation about which he was seeking diplomatic advice. He was considerably concerned about the organization of the Occupation of Germany, the logistics of some withdrawal of troops, and the reenforcement of the forces in the Pacific. He told me that he had learned something that might materially affect the Pacific situation but was not in position to discuss it yet. (It was his first knowledge of the atom bomb.)

Later that morning, I attended the President's first press and radio conference at 10:30 a.m. After a few announcements covering White House staff, a letter from Mrs. Roosevelt, and one or two other matters, he said he was ready for questions. Everything went well, although the President passed up a few questions that he preferred to discuss at a more appropriate time.

The Trumans moved to the Blair House that day.

The night of the 17th, the President made a world-wide broadcast to the U.S. Armed Forces in foreign service.

The warmth, understanding and courage conveyed by this message was reassuring to the troops around the world that they were under the continued leadership of a dedicated commander.

The remainder of the week I spent considerable time on the Hill and at the R.F.C. The hearing on Friday was relatively short as most of the Committee had had me before them numerous times during the Defense Plant days and already knew my policies.

The President told me that he was particularly pleased with his talk with Harriman, who had flown back from Moscow for the converence. "Harriman knows what he is talking about," he remarked. "He is well informed on the Polish situation. His views on Stalin were most revealing. His dispatches, which I have carefully read are frank and to the point." He grinned when he told me that Harriman had been fearful that he had not read his reports and would not, therefore, fully understand the situation. "I told him," the President said, "that if he sent in good reports, I would always read them carefully."

Incidentally, the attitude of Molotov had completely toughened since the first friendly, cooperative talk President Truman had with him during the first week in office. In the later talk, the President forcefully insisted that the Polish agreements arrived at in Yalta should be carried out. I was told by Ambassador Harriman later that the President was very firm in his talk with Molotov, insisting that Russia live up to her agreements.

I would like to inject here that it was Ambassador Harriman who advised Jesse Jones and me on one of his visits to Washington in 1943 that Stalin was not trustworthy about all of his agreements.

During one of our talks, the President said that he thought that he would take his time about making major changes in personnel. He strongly felt that as President Roosevelt had been elected to the Presidency by a substantial majority only five months before, he, Truman, should carry out, to the best of his ability, the policies on which Roosevelt had been elected. He believed that Cabinet members and staff who were close to the former President could help him materially in learning about those commitments. He had asked all Cabinet members to stay on. He said, however, that he had already asked Jim Byrnes, off the record, to be Secretary of State, after the United Nations meeting. He worried about Presidential succession. He considered that Byrnes would be highly qualified. He said that he also wanted to talk with me about the Treasury, as he was not pleased with some of Morgenthau's positions. I promptly brought up Fred Vinson's name, as I immediately thought of the tax problems that would confront the Administration. When asked how well I knew him, I had to confess that my acquaintance was largely by reputation, but that he appeared to have considerable political charisma. Frankly, I don't use that word as it hadn't been liberated at the time.

Mr. Truman said he had thought of him—and one or two others. We were interrupted about that time and further discussions had to be postponed.

I left early the next day for St. Louis to terminate my First National Bank connection, and make peace with my family. During my absence from Washington, the Senate unanimously approved my appointment as Federal Loan Administrator, on Tuesday April 24th.

I remained in St. Louis four days in closing matters at the bank and in arranging to bring my family to Washington. Walter Smith, then President of the St. Louis bank, said he would not hurry in replacing me in the hope that I might be able to get back soon. With that same hope in mind, we stored our furniture and planned to take only a few things to Washington. It turned out that the few months stretched out to eight years, and I never got back to St. Louis.

I arrived back in Washington at 10:30 a.m. on April 30th and was sworn in at the White House at two-thirty that afternoon. And there I was, back in government service again. My face was really quite reddened when I received a telegram from Giannini saying, "I see that Truman is following his old policy in selecting men."

President Truman was present at the swearing-in. He called me into his office and told me not to get so tied up at the RFC that I couldn't show up regularly for informal talks. He said, "I want you around where I can talk with you, or I wouldn't have brought you back here."

It was at that time that we made an agreement that we kept throughout three jobs and nearly eight years of time. We would keep my name off of the calendar when I came to see him. As a result our visits were mostly off-the-record except on rare occasions.

Upon taking charge as Federal Loan Administrator, I immediately began work on two important projects to which I had devoted much study. The first, because of the imminent ending of the war, was to take steps to get Congressional authority to merge all of the wartime subsidiary corporations into the parent corporation, and second, to begin planning for the reconversion of war plants of the Defense Plant Corporation into peacetime production and to start studies for providing financing to business for postwar developments. These were ideas that the President and I had started discussing when he was Chairman of the Truman Committee and I, at the DPC. We both felt that these two steps would greatly accelerate the return of our economy from a total war status to a private enterprise basis.

It was my opinion, which was confirmed some months later, that banks and the RFC working together could speed up the solution of the financial problems that would confront business, both large and small, in the post-war period. Congress promptly authorized the mergers.

On July 1, 1945, the first Cabinet changes were made: Tom Clark (Attorney General), Clint Anderson (Agriculture), Bob Hannegan (Postmaster General), and Lou Schwellenbach (Labor), were sworn in. On July 3, James Byrnes became Secretary of State. On July 23, Fred Vinson became Secretary of the Treasury, and I became Director of Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Within a few months Fred Vinson was appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and I succeeded him as Secretary of the Treasury.

In those early days, when pressures were greatest, President Truman came in contact intimately with a number of able, effective leaders with whom he had had only casual

acquaintances before. The foundations were laid then for friendship that lasted through good days and bad, for many years.

In his splendid book on the Truman Administration, "Present At the Creation," Dean Acheson ventured that Mr. Truman learned fast. This was really quite an understatement when you consider that on April 12, 1945, Harry S. Truman was suddenly catapulted from the relatively peaceful atmosphere of the Senate into the seething caldron of exploding events in the midst of a war about which he had not been fully briefed.

To this day I am still filled with pride and admiration at the amazing speed with which President Truman assimulated the huge piles of information, hitherto unknown to him, about facts, situations, figures and personalities, and came through promptly with scores of sound decisions.

Consider for a moment of suddenly being made aware:

(1) That you were the President of the United States,

(2) The necessity to assure continuity of the functions of the entire U.S. responsibilities; orient with his Cabinet—with Staff—with Congress—with Foreign Powers,

(3) Communicate with troops in the field all over the world,

(4) Take up share of direction of a World War,

(5) Assimilate the vast amount of information covering diplomatic arrangements, including briefings on Heads of State, Foreign Ambassadors here and ours abroad,

(6) Consider changes in Cabinet, and other posts,

(7) Carry on discussions and plans for the war with people you had never met or communicated with before,

(8) Arrange to quietly learn if any unrecorded commitments had been made to the British or to the Russians,

(9) Address the United Nations Conference (June 26, 1945),

(10) In three weeks face the countless problems of the surrender of the Germans (May 8, 1946),

(11) Arrange and attend the Potsdam Conference,

(12) The change of British Prime Ministers in the midst of the Potsdam Conference,

(13) The decision to drop the atom bomb,

(14) And square off for the holocaust brought on by V-J Day: Decision to have MacArthur take the Japanese Surrender; Demobilization; Reconstruction; Economic adjustments; Occupation of defeated enemy countries; Russia's threat; Interim Aid; Foreign Aid; and, importantly state of our domestic economy.

Yes, gentlemen, those four months were busy days for the President. It was fortunate, as I have said, that he was able to quickly recruit able talent to help him bear the burden of those and later days.

In closing I want to give you a few of my impressions of the strengths of Mr. Truman that stood him in good stead in meeting the tremendous demands on his courage, strength, faith and character in that testing period of heart and mind.

There were many facets to Mr. Truman's make-up that enabled him to make decisions promptly:

(1) His capacity to quickly classify, weigh and make use of facts presented to him.

(2) His choice of counsellors on specific matters.

(3) His instinctive ability to sort out essentials.

The President was once asked if he had ever regretted having made a major decision. His reply was revealing, "Events followed events so closely that there were many things that had to be done almost instantly as a delay might have been disastrous. Had I had more time to contemplate some of the matters, they might have been handled in some other way. But considering the information available at the time and the circumstances prevailing when the decisions had to be made, I do not see how I could have acted very differently."

He told me that when he was preparing for bed at night, he would searchingly ask himself whether or not he had acted on matters of the day to the best of his abilities. If the answer was in the affirmative, he went soundly to sleep and awakened the next morning refreshed, and ready for another day's trials.

Dean Acheson in speaking of Truman some years after the close of the Truman Administration, said, "If a President will make decisions, you're in luck. That is the essential quality. And if he has a high batting average in the correctness of his decisions, then you're in clover."

As to the quality of President Truman's decisions there was never any doubt.

Eric Sevareid summed up my remarks for me when he wrote:

"Chance, in good part, took Harry Truman to the Presidency, but it was his character, his simplicity, his honesty and his self-discipline that kept him there and determined his historical fate. He is, without any doubt, destined to live in the books as one of the strongest and most decisive of the American Presidents."

A COMMEMORATIVE STATEMENT ON THE CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S. TRUMAN FROM THE HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, AS WRITTEN BY DANE A. JOHNSON, TRUMAN SCHOLAR

As Truman Scholars, we are perhaps more indebted to Harry S. Truman than most. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that on the centennial of his birth we should recount in a specific manner the debts all of us owe to this great American. We do not intend, however, to detail all of Mr. Truman's accomplishments. That can be left to the more eloquent, left to those who lived and worked with the honorable former President. Instead, we will try to capture a bit of his spirit, for it is this spirit we hope to employ as Truman Scholars—young men and women dedicated to public service.

We have been lucky enough to further our education via the Truman Scholarship, but all Americans would do well to recognize Mr. Truman's belief in the value of learning. In fact, he was a legendary self-educator. It has been said that no other U.S. Senator before or since ever checked out and read as many books from the Library of Congress as the politician from Missouri. In this spirit, Mr. Truman stated, "Free and inquiring minds with unlimited access to the sources of knowledge can be the architects of a peaceful and prosperous world."

Nevertheless, education alone will not serve as a panacea for facing today's myriad governmental problems. Mr. Truman knew that one also needs a certain spirit, the desire to solve problems by getting right to the heart of things. It was this indefatigable spirit and a wry sense of humor which led then President Truman to remark about some dilly-dallying "experts": "If you lay those economists end to end, they'd probably point in all directions." He preferred practical solutions rather than high-flying theories for meeting the most difficult challenges.

And Mr. Truman certainly never shirked a challenge, whether it was commanding a tough artillery unit in World War I or facing a mother-in-law who did not believe that he measured up to her daughter. It was with this sense of facing a challenge that he stood up to the problems of the Presidency that were thrust upon him so suddenly, and still claimed in his self-deprecating style that "lots of folks could do this job better than me, but it's my job to do it."

He was a man who disliked phonies, distrusted the power hungry, and despised bureaucratic bunglers. He believed in standing up for one's beliefs, working hard, and listening to the people. He was proud to be called a politican and never shrunk from making the tough decisions. Clearly, these are attributes all citizens should honor, things that circumscribe the spirit of an American.

An army officer, county judge, Senator, and our 33rd President, Harry S. Truman always insisted that he was a public servant first and foremost; "President" just happened to be his final title. Again, it is this spirit, rather than any specific actions, that we strive to memorialize as Truman Scholars. Mr. Truman's spirit supplies both direction and inspiration to our studies and our careers. On this day of commemoration, we hope all Americans share in our feeling.

APRIL 30, 1984.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,

Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Truman Centennial, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR IKE: President Harry Truman had one of the keenest sense of humor and every once in a while, it came out with a bang.

I recall going down to The White House to visit one day and found him laughing his head off. He said "Those Vermont Democrats were so sure I was going to lose the election that they didn't lift a finger to help me."—So he appointed Ernest Gibson, a Republican, District Judge for the State of Vermont. He thought that was pretty funny.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

[Essay of Jennifer Bertz, Elementary Level Winner, Truman Essay Contest]

HARRY S. TRUMAN—REMEMBERED ALWAYS!

Harry S. Truman will be remembered as a great President because of his courageous decisions in office. Truman was a trustworthy and intelligent man who had a short vice-presidential term due to the death of Franklin Roosevelt. Mr. Truman believed the greatest duty of the presidential office was to lead and inspire the public's opinion.

After Truman dropped the atom bomb ending World War II, he thought that he should develop ways to keep peace and give aid to the suffering countries. He helped frame the United Nations, an organization to bring peace to nations. George C. Marshall outlined the Marshall plan which extended into the Truman Doctrine. It is a plan to help economic recovery for war-torn countries.

Truman announced a doctrine of international resistance to communistic aggression and it was called the Truman Doctrine. This doctrine guaranteed American aid to free

nations. He set up NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for protection against aggression.

The "Fair Deal" was a slogan that Truman used during his compaign. He said it offered the American people "the promise of equal rights and equal opportunities" for both the rich and the poor.

Being very outspoken and very forward, he won the loyalty of many people. No American President revered his office so highly as did Harry S. Truman—a truly great President!

[Essay of Christopher P. Hyde, Intermediate Level Winner, Truman Essay Contest]

HARRY S. TRUMAN—A GREAT PRESIDENT

Harry S. Truman is remembered by the people today as the president who dropped the atomic bomb. But I think this is only because our generation is so concerned with nuclear issues. I think history will show that Truman's accomplishments will rank him among the most outstanding president in our country.

Truman's great understanding of the common people, his responsibility, his proposals for Social Security, his stand against Congress, the establishment of military training, government health insurance programs, and the approval of the Marshall Plan are only a few of his outstanding achievements while in office.

On April 12, 1945, at 7:09 p.m. Harry S. Truman became the 33rd President of the United States, after President Franklin D. Roosevelt died of a hemorrhage. About thirteen days after Truman took office the first United Nations Conference took place. On May 7, Germany surrendered. On August 6, the first atomic bomb was dropped an Hiroshima. Three days later the second bomb was dropped on Nagasaki. As a result on August 14th the war ended.

Many people might say in looking back that Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb on Japan was a mistake. However, Truman gave the order to save thousands of Americans' lives and to end the war. Interviews and investigations have been conducted with much evidence proving that Japan would never have surrendered, but would have carried on the war with the loss of many American lives.

Truman not only made important decisions but took responsibility for any decision made. He had a sign made for his desk, "The Buck Stops Here." This policy of responsibility, set a standard that American Presidents have since followed. Presidents are elected to a high office with much glory and honor, but they must remember Truman's ideal. In the end the decisions and responsibilities are the president's.

Truman also understood world economics as shown by the fact that under his administration the Marshall Plan was created to re-establish war damaged Europe.

In my opinion, history will show that Truman was one of our truly great presidents, and many other Americans think so too.

[Essay of Beverly Davis, Secondary Level Winner, Truman Essay Contest]

"WHY HARRY S. TRUMAN WILL BE REMEMBERED AS A GREAT AMERICAN PRESIDENT"

HARRY S. TRUMAN: A MAN OF COURAGE

Throughout his life he showed promise and courage. He was proud of his state and retained respect for all the offices he held. This man, Harry S. Truman, was a leader in all phases of his political career but will be most remembered for his courageous term as the thirty-third President of the United States.

After serving as Vice-President only eighty-three days, Truman upon Franklin D. Roosevelt's death, took office as President, becoming the first to enter the office during a war. He immediately turned his concern to foreign affairs.

Truman's first major decision was to call a meeting of world leaders which would result in the formation of the United Nations. This was soon followed by his meeting in Potsdam, Germany, with Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin to adopt a policy for dealing with wartime foes. Many of the countries participating in these meetings, including the United States, were involved in World War II. After six years of fighting with death tolls and expenses soaring, Truman made the memorable order to drop two atomic bombs on Japan. The resulting historic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki brought the atomic age to life, but Truman in the world's interest ended the war.

Following his reelection, Truman was again involved in wartime as the Korean War broke out in 1950. Truman, after meeting with the United Nations, recommended the country support South Korea from the North's invasion. His major reason was to demonstrate the United States' ability to stop the expansion of communism.

Other alliances overseas were formed during the Truman Presidency besides war. These included the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a peacetime military alliance with twelve countries and the Truman Doctrine, a policy supporting the cause of freedom wherever it was threatened. After the wars, Truman pushed for the passage of the Marshall Plan which helped the countries of Western Europe rebuild. He also showed interest in underdeveloped nations by offering them American funds and knowledge with his enactment of the Point Four Program.

While he was occupied with foreign affairs, Truman never forgot about domestic issues. His Fair Deal program, a continuation of FDR's New Deal, lowered housing costs and raised minimum wages.

Harry S. Truman will be remembered as a president of courage. The devotion and respect he had for the office allowed him to proudly lead the country with consideration for her citizens. His popularity enhanced the country's leadership abroad and advanced the welfare of the citizens at home. His creativity and aggression gave him the will to face tough decisions and the courage not to falter in his responsibilities. His term in office clearly demonstrated his following of a Biblical prescription taught him by his mother, "whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might."

CITY OF DETROIT—PROCLAMATION

May 8, 1984 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States and one of our nation's best respected statesmen.

After succeeding the presidency in April 1945 upon the death of president Franklin Roosevelt, Truman steadily and strongly guided this nation into the beginning of a new era—the nuclear age—and helped rebuild the economies of war torn nations. At the same time, he established the cornerstones and implemented the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan to assist those threatened by totalitarian aggression.

Mr. Truman was repeatedly confronted with a series of major challenges throughout his tenure including the Berlin Airlift, the Korean War and desegregating the U.S. Armed Forces. For each issue he acted and responded in the manner of a great leader—with courage, honesty, decisiveness and wisdom. Harry Truman earned his place in U.S. history as one of our most respected presidents.

Therefore, I, Coleman A. Young, Mayor of the City of Detroit, issue this Proclamation in recognition of the 100th anniversary of Harry S. Truman's birth and urge Detroit residents to take cognizance of the impact he had upon the history of the United States and the world.

PROCLAMATION: OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR, STATE OF MISSOURI

Whereas, Harry S. Truman was a native Missourian, born May 8, 1884, in Lamar, Missouri; and

Whereas, Mr. Truman farmed 600 acres in Grandview from 1906-1917 and later made his permanent home in Independence, Missouri; and

Whereas, Harry S. Truman was sworn in as the thirty-third President of the United States on April 12, 1945; and

Whereas, we in Missouri are proud to claim our famous native son, the only Missourian to serve his country in the highest office in the land; and

Whereas, we recognize and compliment Mr. Truman for his determination, leadership and firm resolve in carrying out his responsibilities as President of the most powerful nation on earth; and

Whereas, we particularly remember Mr. Truman for his wit, his wry humor and his resolve by the sign he had placed on his desk in the White House, which read: "The Buck Stops Here"; and

Whereas, we set aside a special day in Missouri each year to salute Missouri's first citizen; and

Whereas, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of our thirty-third President:

Now, therefore, I, Christopher S. Bond, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, as "Harry S. Truman Day" in Missouri, in honor of this great Missourian and do call upon all citizens of the State of Missouri to pay tribute to the memory of Mr. Truman and his many accomplishments and contributions to the benefit of the world, the United States and his native State of Missouri.

PROCLAMATION

Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States, continues to gain in stature as historians and political scientists evaluate the significance of the momentous decisions made by the man whose motto was "The Buck Stops Here."

Assuming the Presidency after only 83 days as Vice President, Mr. Truman directed the country through the final stages of World War II. He never vacillated in making judgments calculated to change the course of world history. In the post-war years he supervised the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and guided the United States into an era of development and vitality.

President Truman's greatest achievements were in foreign affairs. Through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, he provided the wherewithal to enable free peoples to resist encroachment by totalitar-

ian forces. His theory of collective defense gave birth to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and constructed a cohesive force capable of responding to any act of aggression.

No reminiscence of the Truman years would be complete without mention of the 1948 Presidential campaign. Political pundits and the polls predicted certain defeat—but Mr. Truman undaunted by the odds—went directly to the people and scored the greatest come-from-behind victory in the annals of American politics.

Facing a number of major problems following his reelection, President Truman utilized United Nations' and American troops in response to the invasion of South Korea. On the homefront, he was a staunch proponent of civil rights and moved with dispatch to desegregate the Armed Forces.

A great humanitarian, astute statesman and political leader par excellence, President Truman's service to this Nation and the entire world will be recounted for centuries by the chroniclers of important events. It is fitting that all New Yorkers join in paying tribute to this noble leader who was blessed with the common touch.

Now, therefore, I, Mario M. Cuomo, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1984, as the Centennial of the Birth of Harry S. Truman Day in New York State.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO

DAY OF RECOGNITION

Whereas Harry S. Truman served our nation with valor, integrity, and distinction as a soldier, Senator, Vice-President, and President;

Whereas Mr. Truman retained throughout his life a profound faith in his fellow citizens, a faith that served him especially well in the Presidency, when he was obliged to endure the contemptuous scorn of numerous journalists and prominent public figures, even though historians acknowledge today that he was among the very best of American chief executives;

Whereas Mr. Truman did more than any other President has done to pave the way for political equality for the United States citizens of Puerto Rico, by signing into law the bills that authorized Puerto Ricans to elect our own Governor and to adopt a local Constitution;

Now, therefore: I, Carlos Romero-Barcelo, Governor of Puerto Rico, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 8, 1984, as a day of recognition throughout Puerto Rico, in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S. Truman, 33rd President of the United States. I urge that this day of recognition be observed by all Puerto Ricans, in respectful and affectionate appreciation of the democratic and humane values embodied by Mr. Truman.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order precede that of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, recently Frank Gregorsky, from the Republican Study Committee, prepared a paper entitled "What's the Matter with Democratic Foreign Policy?" It would be the intention of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) and myself this evening to present this paper in detail as Mr. Gregorsky has written it, because we feel strongly that the outline that has been presented here in fact is a very cogent presentation of how the radical wing of the Democratic Party has taken over the foreign policy of that party and is leading the party, and insofar as it leads part of the country, is leading that part of the country, into a foreign policy which does not serve our best long-term interests. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am going to begin presenting this paper as Mr. Gregorsky has written it.

PART 1: A WORLDVIEW IN SEARCH OF A WORLD

INTRODUCTION

The French Socialist Jean-Francois Revel wrote in 1976:

> The historical memory of the Left is like that of a pillow; it changes shape when pounded by a fist, but it doesn't know how to avoid the blow, and it always peacefully regains its original shape, ready for the next pounding.[1]

He was talking about the European Left and its refusal to see that Marxism-Leninism was inherently totalitarian, and that Communist movements and governments inevitably threaten and often kill democracy. But Revel's contempt might just as well be directed at half or more of House and Senate Democrats in the U.S.A. in 1984.

That's what this monograph is about: the growing impact on America's oldest political party of a worldview that is defeatist, drenched in pessimism and incompetent when applied to a world having little to do with its assumptions.

The American Democratic Party today, almost everywhere outside the South, is led by people profoundly affected by the Vietnam sequence as seen from stateside America. Some are veteran politicians (WALTER MONDALE, ALAN CRANSTON, CLAIBORNE PELL) once comfortable with the Truman-JFK-Johnson "containment" approach to Communism. Others (TOM DOWNEY, CHRIS DODD, and a flood of people whose thinking this monograph samples) became politically aware during the Vietnam controversy, and began political careers that would sharply alter their party.

[1] Footnotes appear later in RECORD.

When Senator Henry Jackson died the day after the KAL 007 atrocity, official Washington justifiably praised him as a tough centrist, one who mixed liberal idealism with a firm view of Soviet power. It didn't ask the logical follow-up: who's left to live out that legacy in the Democratic Party?

Indeed, what prominent Democrat comes to mind, other than Senator SAM NUNN of Georgia?

There really isn't anyone else. Democratic Senators like LLOYD BENTSEN and DAVID BOREN may now and then risk a speech in favor of Ronald Reagan's Central America policies, but they count for little when it comes to guiding Democratic thought-processes. One shouldn't expect SAM NUNN, with or without their help, to be any more successful in toughening up Democratic foreign policy in the next five years than Scoop Jackson was in the last five.

Containment—the willingness to use or finance force to bolster friendly governments under Communist attack—is dead in the Democratic Party. Not only conservatives realize this.

Alan Ehrenhalt of Congressional Quarterly noted that the congressional Democratic Party used to have three roughly-equal factions: southern conservatives, ethnic machine loyalists from the big cities, and issue-oriented liberals. As late as the early 1970s, you could find the first two groups supporting a strong defense and, for the most part, the efforts of a centrist Republican President to end the Vietnam war in a way that preserved South Vietnam's independence.[2]

These two groups had the congressional power and experience; they included moderate Democratic Representatives like Hale Boggs, Carl Albert, John McCormack and Martha Griffiths, and Senate hawks such as Gale McGee, Harry Byrd, James Eastland and Jackson himself.

The third group in Ehrenhalt's trio was busy learning, or at least reciting, the "lessons of Vietnam" and growing in number.

The 75-strong Democratic freshman class of 1974 signalled the beginning of the end for Ehrenhalt's "big city ethnics," and for the whole tradition and structure of the Rayburn-era House. Writing in 1983, he noted that Rep. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI (D-Ill.) "used to command an eight-member Chicago Democratic delegation . . . but this year, when he voted for the defense authorization bill, only two of his troops joined him." Ehrenhalt illustrated in one district the steady 1970's wave of change that swamped the party of John Kennedy:

> A decade ago, the working-class neighborhoods of western Queens in New York City were represented by Rep. James J. Delaney, a cranky old Democrat who voiced Archie Bunker-style sentiments in a district that

contained Bunker's fictional home. Delaney was never heard to question the Vietnam War, the Pentagon or military spending. When Delaney retired in 1978, his district went to Geraldine Ferraro, an outspoken feminist who is independent of any machine.[3]

This was happening in dozens of districts, a trend underlying even the generally conservative elections of 1980. By the time President Reagan took the oath of office, JFK-Jackson Democrats had been superseded by McGovern-Mondale Democrats, especially in the House. In 1982 57 new Democrats solidified dominance of the House Democratic Caucus by the Vietnam generation.

Freshman Rep. JIM BATES (Calif.) called a special party caucus to question Majority Leader WRIGHT's mild support (since ended) of the Reagan Administration of El Salvador and the MX missile. Class of '74 Reps. GEORGE MILLER (Calif.) and TOM DOWNEY (N.Y.) complained that WRIGHT and whip TOM FOLEY weren't reflecting the majority of House Democrats; they were right. WRIGHT recognized his political wrong and changed on MX.

Ehrenhalt drew the conclusion:

A decade ago, candidates for House Democratic leadership had to be careful not to sound too liberal. Today, they cannot afford to sound too conservative. Otherwise, they risk alienating the generation that will be crucial in party leadership contests in the years ahead. In the climate, Wright's decision this summer to change his mind and oppose the MX was a prudent one.[4]

□ 1830

Prudent in what sense? If not for U.S. foreign policy, then for Mr. WRIGHT, and his ambitions to succeed Speaker TIP O'NEILL. JIM WRIGHT has to speak softly about the declared enemies of the U.S., and carry a big stick against the exertion of American power, if he's to be the next Speaker. But campaign produces schizophrenic behavior.

In January 1984 he endorsed the Kissinger Commission's Report on Central America, which said that "history offers no basis" for the notion that America could sweetly nudge Nicaragua's Marxist government into becoming a pluralist democracy. But force might do the trick, so the Commission called for continued help for anti-Marxist forces fighting to break the power monopoly in Nicaragua.

Three months later WRIGHT, with Democratic colleagues MIKE BARNES (Md.), BILL ALEXANDER (Ark.), MATT MCHUGH (N.Y), ROBERT TORRICELLI (N.J.), EDWARD BOLAND (Mass.), STEPHEN SOLARZ (N.Y.), DAVE OBEY (Wis.), BOB GARCIA (N.Y.), and LEE HAMILTON (Ind.), sent a letter to Nicaraguan strongman Daniel Ortega.

The letter condemns U.S. pressures against his government, praises Ortega's "decision . . . to reduce press censorship and allow greater freedom of assembly for political parties," and expresses pleasure that this progress could be made "in the midst of ongoing military hostilities on the borders of Nicaragua."

The second paragraph stresses, "We have been, and remain, opposed to U.S. support for military action directed against the people or government of Nicaragua," and the closing salutation reads, "Very sincerely yours." [5]

JIM WRIGHT has served his home State of Texas in the U.S. House for nearly 30 years. While his flip-flop on the MX from 1982 to 1983 surprised many, his weakening on Central America from 1983 to 1984 was less newsworthy. You'd think an experienced man aspiring to be the most powerful Congressman in the land would know better. Maybe he does, in a manner of speaking: the House Democratic Caucus is probably turning its formal leadership into followers.

The newer members of WRIGHT's team are making sure there's no backsliding on MX. Rep. LES AUCOIN (D-Oreg.) wrote to party colleagues TOM FOLEY and BILL ALEXANDER (majority whip and assistant majority whip, respectively), urging a "no" vote on MX. This letter, as characterized by the pro-MX Nuclear Times, "implies that liberal Democrats will not back MX supporters for House leadership positions . . . Anti-MX lobbyists are pressing O'NEILL to put out the message to Democratic members: If you're not with us, then take a walk and don't be in town the day of the vote."[6]

Majority leader WRIGHT's personal convictions on weapons systems and Central America may be irrelevant. Even if he chose to stand fast for whatever his beliefs are, it's doubtful it would make a difference. WRIGHT's dealing with a force wilder than any he's ever known. The ousting of President Carter removed all restraints from the Caucus's Vietnam-scarred activists. The notion that on Central America they were reacting to Reagan's "belligerence" isn't borne out by the sequence of events; they had an agenda, but not a Democratic President to worry about constraining if they pushed to the hilt.

Less than two weeks after Ronald Reagan was sworn in, moderate Democrats were purged from Foreign Affairs subcommittees by secret ballot. On February 3, 1981, Rep. GUS YATRON of Pennsylvania was deposed as chairman of what later came to be called the western hemisphere subcommittee, in favor of Rep. BARNES of Maryland. Tho he had the seniority for it, Rep. DAN MICA of Florida then lost to Rep. HOWARD WOLPE of Michigan for chairman of the Africa subcommittee.

Before that MICA moved to take the Yatron vacancy and was voted down. Afterwards he said, "It was obviously part of a deal . . . BARNES and WOLPE and I came in the same class, so they used that as an argument that there really was no seniority there. I thought it was just an excuse to pull a radical-liberal revolt." MICA guessed, wrongly, that it was "a last flicker in this House of extremist attitudes."[7]

The Foreign Affairs Committee wages covert war on America's Central American policy from that day on. In April 1981 the Inter-American subcommittee nearly accepted an amendment by Rep. JERRY STUDDS (D-Mass.) to continue a military and economic aid ban on Argentina. STUDDS then tried to ban military aid to El Salvador and BARNES tried to do the same thing via human rights conditions that Congressional Quarterly called "difficult." Both amendments failed on 4-4 votes [8], a division not at all representative of the full House in that early period of the Reagan Presidency. It was a harbinger.

By 1984 Foreign Affairs Democrats were more effective. On March 1 the Barnes subcommittee voted down the President's entire request ($218 million) for FY 1984 military aid to Honduras and El Salvador. This was described by the Washington Times as "largely the legislative vehicle to implement the recommendations of the Kissinger Commission on Central America." [9]

Then 22 committee Democrats, including chairman DANTE FASCELL of Florida, wrote the Administration demanding Congress vote on emergency military aid heading for El Salvador.

BARNES' subcommittee also voted to pull nearly all U.S. troops out of Honduras, where U.S. servicemen engage in joint maneuvers with the Honduran army. Congressman STUDDS introduced H.R. 4745 to prohibit those exercises, and hold to 200 the number of U.S. military personnel allowed in Honduras.[10]

The Studds bill wasn't going to win acceptance by the full House, and there was always the Senate to offset the harsh treatment by Foreign Affairs Democrats of U.S. allies in Central America. But the defeatists have raw numbers and a disproportionate share of committee muscle. So House Foreign Affairs and its subcommittees show no bipartisanship or moderation. House Democrats use these institutional platforms to stress certain themes; they send messages to the President and keep their own skittish leadership in line.

There has to be more pressure on the leadership than meets the eye. Individual GOP and Southern Democratic Representatives recall incidents of broken commitments and unexplained tradeoffs, but haven't really built a mosaic out of the pieces of glass. Occasionally enough background data ignites to light up the path of a pivotal Member. Evans and

Novak charged in their July 22, 1983, column that U.S. policy in Central America was being strained by one internal ideology-for-position arrangement:

For four years under the chairmanship of Rep. Edward Boland, the Intelligence Committee had shown commendable ability to overcome partisan wrangling that destroyed its predecessor committee under Otis Pike. But that admirable record has crumbled under political pressures of the Central American crisis and a runaway staff.

As a result, what is supposed to be a bipartisan watchdog over the intelligence community [now attacks] President Reagan's Latin American policy in behalf of the Democratic Party's left wing.

Boland . . . is under relentless political pressure from Democratic liberals. He will need their support to achieve his dream of becoming chairman of the House Appropriations Committee some day.

If not for the more realistic Senate, the U.S. would have virtually no leverage in Central America.

REFLEXIVE DEFEATISM

Since President Richard Nixon's April 1970 move into Cambodia, a pattern has come to rule public discussion of U.S. foreign policy options:

(1) News comes out that a U.S. President has aided, is aiding, or proposes to aid, with military means a group somewhere in the world opposing a rival Communist group—sometimes by direct help to friends, other times by military pressure against adversaries.

(2) Alarmed Representatives and jittery Senators schedule hearings and rush to microphones to brand America a force for ill while finding little fault with the Communist group.

(3) The President gets only part of the support he wants and the situation in (fill in region), if not ended decisively that very month, is stalemated or goes against the West, while defeatists allege the U.S. is risking war or promoting hostilities for no good reason.

For at least 14 years this 1-2-3 has happened like clockwork.

The pattern was there in varying degrees during the Cambodia incursion in 1970, Laos in 1971, the Haiphong Harbor mining of 1972, the U.S. nuclear alert that kept the Soviets out of the Middle East in October 1973, the Mayaguez retrieval in May 1975, the Angola contest in late 1975, the decision to resume substantial aid to El Salvador in early 1981, U.S. naval maneuvers in the Caribbean during July 1983, and the Grenada rescue operation three months later.

To see how the congressional Democratic Party has changed during that period, it is worth looking at two of those incidents 12 years apart. The first is President Nixon's decision to mine North Vietnam's main harbor in 1972 to choke off the spring offensive against South Vietnam. The second is the mid-April 1984 fracas about U.S. mines in Nicaraguan harbors. Both initiatives came from Republican Presidents and were aimed at Communist states friendly to the U.S.S.R. who were arming insurrections against U.S. allies.

Here is what key House Democrats said in Congress the two days after Nixon's May 8 announcement:

Congressman JAMES SCHEUER (N.Y.) on the House floor:

Up until a short time ago, he was telling us how successful his policy was . . . Now he suddenly escalates the war, not only within Vietnam but in such a way that risks a confrontation with the Soviet Union that could push us into a nuclear world holocaust . . . President Nixon is more interested in his own reelection than in the maintenance of world peace.[11]

Congressman SIDNEY YATES (Ill.):

The decision is provocative, unnecessarily risky, and in great measure useless. Why indulge in such a futile gesture at this time? . . . North Vietnam will have enough arms and war material to carry on their operations for months without additional supplies from the outside . . . It is particularly difficult to understand an action that may jeopardize the work of years of peace in the signing of the nuclear arms limitation agreement.[12]

□ 1840

Congressman RON DELLUMS (Calif.):

Those of us in Congress must have a great sense . . . of responsibility both to the Americans who are pawns in Mr. Nixon's games, and to the Vietnamese whose society we are turning into a smoking ruin . . . In the last year of the Second World War, after the Germans knew they were defeated, they went on an orgy of killing that exceeded the horrors of the earlier part of the war, haunting the conscience of mankind ever since. No longer able to impose our will in Southeast Asia, will our removal be in the same frenzied manner?[13]

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND (Mass.):

[This] risks a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union. Nixon, in effect, has thrown down the gauntlet, defying the Soviet Union to challenge his will. It is an exercise in brinksmanship wholly unparalleled in the history of the Vietnam War. It could conceivably lead to nuclear war, even more conceivably to the introduction of Chinese or Soviet "volunteers" into the conflict. And all the minor triumphs of American diplomacy over the past decade—the SALT talks, the European detente, the rapprochement with China, the summit conference still gamely scheduled for later this month—could vanish before our eyes.[14]

Congressman JOHN CONYERS (Mich.):

Mr. Speaker, today a resolution of impeachment of the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, was introduced for myself and Representatives Bella Abzug, Shirley Chisholm, Ronald Dellums, and William Ryan.[15]

George McGovern called the mining "a flirtation with World War III." Senator Ed Muskie (D-Maine) said Nixon "is risking a major confrontation with the Soviet Union and with China and is jeopardizing the major security interests of the United States." Congressman TIP O'NEILL denounced Nixon's "get tough" attitude and said it "presents the calculated risk of a confrontation with the Soviet Union. The White House will have to show tremendous diplomatic skills in the next three days or we could be in World War III."[16]

The scheduled summit in Moscow came off as planned. The North's offensive against the South petered out and was not renewed until 1975. The Russians and Chinese didn't order their volunteers into Vietnam. A SALT pact between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. was initialed that month and passed by the Senate in September. North Vietnam changed negotiating tactics and became more flexible. A Harris Survey taken May 9-10, 1972, showed 59-24% endorsement of Nixon's move. There was no World War III. None of the above Democrats admitted later to being inept analysts of how power and diplomacy work; none showed any sign that they learned anything from their forecasting mistakes.

One month short of a dozen years later, the congressional rank-and-file heard about another mining of Communist ports. For a few months in early 1984 the CIA had, from a ship just outside Nicaragua's 12-mile boundary, been supervising minelaying by insurrectionists.

Legislators of many ideological stripes were offended. Some Republicans opposed the mining for practical reasons (fear of sinking ships of allies like France); some were insulted at being encouraged by Administration personnel to deceive Congress (BARRY GOLDWATER, JAKE GARN, BILL ARMSTRONG). White House Chief-of-Staff Jim Baker and CIA Director Bill Casey even gave Senate Republicans the okay to vote against an anti-mining resolution, which passed by 84-12.

So it can't be true that to oppose the way the mining was handled, or even to oppose the mining itself, was a sign of defeatism and alarmism. To find the latter you have to listen carefully to the angry Democrats; they focused only somewhat on practicality and little on institutional honesty. They mainly seemed offended by the very thought of yet another U.S. move against a Communist nation.

If the U.S. had violatd international law with the mining, it was in response to Nicaragua's violation of national law by arming El Salvador's Marxists. This was a point most Democrats ignored. Instead, in the name of holding it to pristinely aloof standards, they trashed their own country.

This is a sample of what they said during April 10-15, 1984:

Senator TED KENNEDY (D-Mass.): "This is a dark moment in the history of our nation. . ."[17]

Senator GARY HART (D-Colo.): The mining "comes very close to an act of war, a return to the cowboy days of the CIA." [18]

Jesse Jackson: "We must support the government of Nicaragua. We have no right to mine the harbors there." [19]

Senate Minority Leader ROBERT BYRD (D-W.V.): "It is an act of terrorism." [20] (One week earlier BYRD had voted moneys for the anti-Sandinista forces, who have done more property and human damage than any collection of CIA mines.)

Congressman TIM WIRTH (D-Colo.): "After fighting throughout this century for the rule of law in international affairs, we have decided to become international outlaws . . ." [21]

Congressman MATTHEW MARTINEZ (D-Calif.): "This CIA-sponsored terrorism must be stopped. It is the responsibility of Congress to put a halt to this militant aggression and provocation . . . . We all but guarantee a continuation of the political confusion in Nicaragua by economically crippling the country." [22]

Congressman ED MARKEY (D-Mass.): "Is Ronald Reagan going to give America a new role in the world? Instead of being the world's policeman, are we now going to become the world's outlaw? . . . (I)t is time for us in Congress to stop President Reagan's reckless, irresponsible war against Nicaragua." [23]

Congresswoman CARDIS COLLINS (D-Ill.): "We must stop attacking a sovereign country, an impoverished nation left bankrupt by a despotic family we helped put and keep in power for so long. If we do not say no now, I am afraid that we will find out why Reagan wants to exempt himself from international law . . ." [24]

Congressman DAVID BONIOR (D-Mich.): "I am proud that a majority of this body has voted twice to stop funding the CIA-sponsored war against Nicaragua. And I urge the House to stand by its convictions, and reject any funds for a policy that is branding this nation as an international outlaw." [25]

TED KENNEDY again: "Give diplomacy a chance, give peace a chance, give negotiations a chance." [26]

Congresswoman BARBARA BOXER (D-Calif.): "I am appalled and ashamed of our cowardly behavior, waging a secret war, endangering lives at sea and refusing to stand up to world scrutiny. The President blames the Congress for interfering with his military exploits. I say thank God we do." [27]

"Ashamed" is a key word. Many Democrats, and not just those elected ones who like microphones, are ashamed, horrified, livid and traumatized every time the U.S. comes anywhere near using or supporting force against a Communist government or insurrectionist force. They use words like "impractical" and "ineffective" from time to time, but the emphasis is on the vileness of the intent and the unworthiness of the goal.

The comparison between 1972 and 1984 says two things. In one respect, there is continuity. Lots of Democrats enjoy doubting the wisdom and intent of their nation's President when he moves against Communist elements; those same Democrats almost never come back and say, "We called that one wrong; we'll be a bit more realistic next time."

In another respect, there's a big difference.

In May 1972, during the first week of the Haiphong mining, Richard Nixon actually got more vocal support from House Democrats than he got opposition. A majority of the House Democrats taking a strong position adhered to the JFK tradition and trusted presidential leadership. In April 1984, tho, House (or Senate) Democrats willing to give a Republican President the benefit of the doubt on the Nicaragua mining were hard to find.

THE 1974 REPUDIATION

It's an old story that the student protesters of the late 1960s donned business suits, adopted a middle-class outlook when the children came, and starting voting for property tax relief. A lot of them did. But some changed packaging more than substance. They bought suits and dropped the anti-establishment rhetoric only to make their politicking more effective, and they carried their anti-military, defeatist outlook to Congress.

By 1984 fully 191 of the 267 House Democrats, or almost 72% had come to Congress in 1974 or later. Colorado Rep. TIM WIRTH, Class of '74, was correct to observe, "We were the children of Vietnam, not children of World War II. We were products of television, not of print. We were products of computer politics, not courthouse politics. And we were reflections of JFK as president, not FDR. We were the first class that was like that, and now the whole place is." [28]

WIRTH is accurate, with one major exception. The Class of '74 House Democrats are not reflections of JFK in their thinking about the U.S. role in the world. JFK was an optimist; he was of the generation that had won a war against tyranny and helped rebuild (and then manage) the free world. He looked around him as he matured and saw things that largely worked.

The Class of '74, by contrast, was birthed in a period of extreme skepticism. JFK liked to say "We can do better," but the 1974 campaigns of Democratic challengers were enshrouded by feelings of "We can't do anything right, so let's quit." It's true that some could sound upbeat, but this was probably more a reflection of hope about their own individual, political futures. The Class of '74 personified a decade whose travellers routinely told pollsters, "I'm gonna do fine, but the country's a mess and the world is even worse." They looked around them and all the signs said, "Be skeptical. Question. Doubt. Shatter illusions before they shatter you."

This was understandable. The U.S.A. in 1973-74 was a land of gas shortages, a 27% hike in food prices and a 35% hike in energy costs, and a doubling of the prime rate. Actions to combat pollution hadn't yet brought real results and an energy crisis looked to abort the struggle. There was isolationism, scandal, impeachment, deep cracks in NATO, and a bipartisan feeling that the Soviets and Red Chinese were, one way or another, supposed to cooperate with America.

All the certainties of the postwar era, from cheap energy to who America's enemies were, were being bludgeoned. None of the Vietnam POWs running for Congress that year made it.

In this environment one of the greatest political warps in American history occurred, as the voters repudiated the visible symbol of incompetence, venality and collapsing certitude: the congressional Republican Party. The dimensions of the 1974 warp are clear when one looks at where key Members of the Class of '74 won, and how those districts voted only two years prior.

In 1974,

□ 1850

WIRTH won 52-48% in a district (Colorado 2) that had voted 65% for President Nixon.

MATT MCHUGH won 53-43% in a district (New York 27) that had gone 64% for Nixon.

BOB CARR won 60-50% (647 votes) in a district (Michigan 6) that had gone 59% for Nixon.

CHRIS DODD won 60-40% in a district (Connecticut 2) that had gone 60% for Nixon.

DON BONKER won 62-38% in a district (Washington 3) that had gone 58% for Nixon.

LES AUCOIN won 56-44% in a district (Oregon 1) that had gone 56% for Nixon.

JAMES WEAVER won 53-47% in a district (Oregon 4) that had gone 56% for Nixon.

HAROLD FORD won 50-50% (744 votes) in a district (Tennessee 8) that had gone 57% for Nixon.

NORMAN MINETA won 53-42% in a district (California 13) that had gone 58% for Nixon.

JERRY PATTERSON won 55-42 percent in a district (California 38) that had gone 68 percent for Nixon.

STEVE NEAL won 52-48 percent in a district (North Carolina 5) that had gone 71 percent for Nixon.

MARTY RUSSO won 53-47 percent in a district (Illinois 3) that had gone 70 percent for Nixon.

PHIL SHARP won 54-46 percent in a district (Indiana 10) that had gone 69 percent for Nixon.

TOM HARKIN won 51-49 percent in a district (Iowa 5) that had gone 63 percent for Nixon.

TOM DOWNEY won 49-45 percent in a district (New York 2) that had gone 72 percent for Nixon.[29]

(Downey's Long Island district had been Nixon's best in all of New York. Noted the 1976 Almanac of American Politics, "How a district that gave 72 percent of its vote for Richard Nixon and 66 percent for Republican Congressman James Grover two years before could switch so massively is a question worthy of a sophisticated piece of survey research.") [30]

All managed to hang on. They survived the GOP mini-wave of 1978 and the Reagan tidal wave of two years later. All except (perhaps) Neal, Mineta and Russo tend to work from a Vietnam-scarred perspective.

Because of that 1974 warp, and because foreign policy hasn't been a salient issue in any election since the early 1970s, dozens of traditionalist districts have Democratic Representatives with pessimistic attitudes about the U.S. mission in the world. That, along with Ehrenhalt's phenomenon of defeatist Democrats taking over from JFK or conserative Democrats in districts never Republican, changed the composition of the congressional Democratic Party.

Most congressional Democrats elected in 1974 and after may like JFK's modernist style but they repudiate his optimistic essence. They are competent professionals with no positive political vision to believe in. They inherited a domestic liberal tradition in ruins. They survive by shrewd media-management, effective constituent service, and whatever compromises are necessary on domestic issues. On foreign policy they're able to stick to their principles.

The Class of '74 has become what WIRTH called the House's "middle managers." Six of 20 Budget Committee Democrats were first elected in 1974. Said Congressional Quarterly: "Virtually every one of the 37 remaining class members is in a power position in the House: 30 chair subcommittees and all the others serve on either the Appropriations, Rules, or Ways and Means Committees, the most prestigious panels in the House." A 1983 CQ study found the class of '74 voting alike 82 percent of the time "on selected key votes." [31]

When observers like Ehrenhalt can write that "it is no longer considered radical or even adventurous for rank-and-file Democrats from Eastern and Midwestern districts to vote against authorizing money for defense. It is standard practice," one sees a Vietnam generation that stuck to its banners, in effect if not literally.[32]

With the disappearance of the big-city ethnics, and the taming of the Southern conservative contingent to where it controls no committee, the House Democratic caucus, and often the House (which is set up to follow majorities of majorities even if they're minorities), defeatist Democrats have the power, or most of it. Not every House Democrat elected in 1974 or later is a defeatist but the great majority are. No leadership decision they firmly oppose can last.

THE RADICAL WORLD VIEW

You can analyze defeatism in the House and Senate two ways. One is by post-1974 rollcall votes and speeches of Democrats on individual issues, a partial list of which runs: Opposition to Trident, MX, and the B-1 bomber. Successful stoppage of Ford-Kissinger plan to help pro-Western forces in Angola. Belief in the promises of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua in 1979-80. Stress on arms control process over actual state of U.S. defenses. A dovish stance, stressing retreat or negotiation over confrontation, in every world hotspot except (sometimes) the Middle East. And, after 1980, attempts to cut or end U.S. aid to El Salvador's government and Nicaraguan rebels.

Most studies of the philosophical make up of Congress use that approach, which starts with vote analysis and draws conclusions, cautiously, about policy formulation.

This monograph takes another tack. It surveys the character of Democratic foreign policy commentary and actions, and derives a radical world view; then it measures that world view against the world. The world view is implied by lists of defense and foreign policy votes but clarified by themes and phrases repeated in floor statements, on national TV, and elsewhere.

As a result, the sketch is more impressionistic than statistical. It isn't the kind of thing people used to thinking of Congress in CQ terms would come to easily.

Everyone knows that Senator TED KENNEDY has a "dovish" voting record on defense and foreign policy matters. It would be no news to list those votes and say they imply X or Y. What's a lot more useful is to look at the arguments and underlying assumptions KENNEDY and others make. Why do their minds work that way?

KENNEDY chose to write in Rolling Stone on March 15, 1984:

> Reagan is the best pretender as president that we have had in modern history. Some White House aides talk of "the peace issue" as if it were mostly a political problem for Ronald Reagan. Others imply that they only need to play for time before launching a wider war in Central America in 1985, which would be a tragic replay of the fateful mistake of two decades ago in Indochina. Administration officials are talking peace in 1984 as a prelude to making war in 1985.[33]

That definitive prose is worth more for insight than a printout of KENNEDY's 21+ years of Senate votes; there's a comprehensive way of viewing America and the world behind it. And KENNEDY's emphatic, motivation-judging and mind-reading rhetoric is not a unique product of his revolving-door, ever-bright team of writers hoping to be the next Ted Sorensen. The same violent assumptions, the same pining for 1968 and looking under every bed for Tonkin Gulf conspiracies, grace the words of people you never heard of, like freshman Rep. EDWARD FEIGHAN (D-Ohio), who told the House in a March 28 statement:

> President Reagan is preparing for war. And by perpetuating a policy of military intervention that has failed nearly every American President since Monroe, he is sentencing the people of Central America to another endless cycle of violence and poverty and despair.[34]

Taken together, the votes, the speeches, the choice of villains, the terms stressed or ignored, show this view of the world:

(1) There are no evil ideologies or governing systems in the world except for South Africa. Communists are at heart reformers who are too rough in their means. They're not inherently bad, but the U.S. is so clumsy and paranoid in its dealings with Communists that we facilitate or give them excuses for their excesses.

(2) Leftwing totalitarianism is caused by rightwing authoritarianism, and the U.S. makes both worse. We finance the rightists, and make the leftists worse by not competing with the Soviets to finance them. There's always hope that Nicaragua, Vietnam, the U.S.S.R., Cuba, Angola, et al. will behave, if we only treat them as sincere and respectable nations run by people not that different from Americans.

(3) Foreign policy conflicts are worse off when America plays world policemen. The lesson of Vietnam is that we can't impose our will anywhere; neither can the Soviets, in the long term. What Presidents sometimes say are "vital interests" are not worth fighting for in any event. To ease world tension the U.S. should maintain a low profile in whatever area it wants to keep influence in.

(4) American military force is only proper to defend the U.S. and (perhaps) a few of its democratic allies from an attack that has already commenced. Threatening force to prevent a feared attack is too risky in almost all circumstances. Force never really settles anything, and if it does, it should not. Even when a victory for freedom is quick and relatively cheap, as in Grenada, it's still wrong, evil, a violation of some principle (usually labeled "noninterventionism").

□ 1900

(5) Political negotiations and military force have nothing to do with each other; Clausewitz, U.S. Grant, and Henry Kissinger were wrong. In fact negotiating and force are mutually exclusive. Presidents who subsidize or threaten force prove that they don't want to negotiate. Members of Congress and peace activities who forswear force make the best negotiators because the other side knows no harm will come to them from the U.S.

(This world view is called "Radical" because it's thoroughgoing, comprehensive, fixated on 10% of recent history to the permanent exclusion of the other 90%, and different from anything elective U.S. politics has known in the postwar era. It's not a perfect word but seems more accurate, or at least more neutral than "leftists" or "isolationist." After all, Democrats entering national politics in the 1970's tend not to be statist on price controls, nationalization or starting new programs. And they favor foreign aid and the alliance with Israel.)

Attempts by Democrats at sketching a comprehensive foreign policy ought to be measured by those five postulates. Try it with George McGovern's 1972 convention acceptence speech, or President Jimmy Carter's Notre Dame speech in May 1977. Or look at New York Congressman STEPHEN SOLARZ' April 1984 statement to the Democratic Platform Committee.

In his statement, SOLARZ condemns South Africa's apartheid. He blames NATO's problems on Reagan's rhetoric. He eschews "military solutions to what are essentially political problems." He wants a quick end to covert action against Nicaragua. He wants the elected leaders of El Salvador to "enter into a good faith and unconditional dialogue with the opposition," and an end to U.S. military exercises in Honduras. He mocks the phrase "evil empire" and blames the Russians for nothing except, mildy, keeping troops in Afghanistan and keeping Jews in the Soviet Union. He says annual summits and the nuclear freeze will meet the "high priority" of "repairing our relations with the Soviet Union."

SOLARZ calls for a human rights crusade against governments "right or left." But he only mentions right-wing violators, condemning U.S. allies in Pakistan, South Korea, the Philippines and Taiwan. He says nothing about Quaddafi's terrorism, nothing about Vietnam's regional aggression, nothing about Cuba, nothing about Soviet use of chemical weapons, nothing about the Soviet military build-up, and nothing that contradicts the five radical postulates just listed. (See Appendix A.)

One can't be sure how many national Democrats consciously make policy based on a radical world view. The problem for the party is that so many of them now speak and vote as if they accept most of all of the world view.

The first problem is the world view doesn't work in this particular world. The second is that those who hold it don't seem to care.

M'CARTHYISM LOSES

Tho linking today's Democrats to an ineffective way of thinking, this monograph shouldn't be taken as a narrow endorsement of Ronald Reagan's administration. The ideal approach in the broadest sense is how the U.S. handled itself in a troubled world from Truman's time to now except for Jimmy Carter's term.

The hallmarks of that approach are pragmatism, internationalism, a feeling that the U.S. is a force for good, a bulwark against Soviet expansionism, and able to learn from its mistakes. That tradition encompasses the work and mindset of Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and Ronald Reagan.

The post-1945 tradition includes a series of foreign policy successes that saved Greece and Turkey for NATO in the late 1940's; Lebanon for the West in 1958 and 1970; Western Europe from famine and Stalin's threats up to 1948 and, thru NATO from 1949, from Warsaw Pact invasion since; South Korea in the early fifties; Guatemala in 1954; Indonesia and the Dominican Republic in 1965; Israel in 1973; and Grenada in 1983.

Thru wise diplomacy it kept Taiwan from mainland domination, engineered a neutral and relatively free Austria, reconstructed Japan into a Pacific showcase for freedom and meant military pacts between the U.S. and its sister democracies everywhere.

It was not all roses. There were failures in Cuba, in Iran, and, in huge dimension, Southeast Asia. There was serious bickering between the two parties about foreign policy in the 1952 and 1964 presidential elections. There was high defense spending and many soldiers were killed. There were official lies by Johnson and Nixon and DEF-CON alerts that terrified the nation.

Running foreign policy as the world's leading free nation after 1945 was not easy. Both parties had shared assumptions, even if they didn't always think so at the time. During the time of Cold War consensus (1946–68), the centers of both parties governed within a framework of shared values—freedom's importance and Soviet threat. The left-wing of the Democrats and the right-wing of the GOP made the noise but the centrists of both parties made the history; they became instructors of reality to the rest of the political culture.

The modern Democratic Party, led now by two generations traumatized by Vietnam, can't govern in that framework of realism. It's a framework that includes bombs, deals, threats, an activist CIA, and cold calculation, as well as economic aid, peace pacts, diplomatic protests, and summits at which goodwill is displayed. Today's Democrats seem only like the last four. Without more than that, they can't defend U.S. interests in a hostile world.

Anti-Communist Republicans for a long time tried to make a similar case, starting with the second Truman Administration. Their efforts were inelegant, the political side-effects and intellectual fallout ghastly. They made the moral and strategic error of presuming motivation. They were given to doubting Democratic patriotism—even before Vietnam, when that party was led by strong, anti-communist liberals.

The attackees (everyone from left-wing Hollywood activists to Dean Acheson, one of the most effective Secretaries of State ever) then fought back with the tarbrush "McCarthyism." The isolationist remnant in the GOP under both Truman and Eisenhower managed to separate itself from responsible analysis and unite the Republican center with responsible majority of Democrats. So clumsy was the right-wing attack, and so powerful the Democratic response, that "McCarthyism" can still silence debates about foreign policy—30 years after the Wisconsin Senator was censured by his colleagues.

The necessary question still gets lost in the rhetorical mud. It's a question national Democrats could answer convincingly in 1955 or 1965, but can't now. That question has nothing to do with motivation or patriotism, and everything to do with results and reality. Conservatives, Republicans and traditional Democrats ought to ask it the right way:

"Can the Democrats manage U.S. foreign affairs based on their view of the world? Based on the record of the recent past, will their policies work?"

Effectiveness and competence is the standard for judging, not motivation. Any fair-minded (or merely cautious) critic should take as a given the patriotism of any Democrat. Republicans eager to save Central America from Radical blunders must make it a point to endorse the patriotism and sincerity of every Democrat they take to task for being, objectively speaking, blind to reality.

Radicalized Democrats would prefer Joe McCarthy launch every debate. Their opponents must instead make Al Smith the keynote: "Let's look at the record, my friend." They should downplay words like "appeasement" and emphasize words like pessimism, defeatism, reality, and results.

Conservatives, Republicans and traditional Democrats must be instruc-

tors in reality, not evaluators of motivation.

What they are, and what they aren't, must be made painfully, redundantly and emphatically clear. If it's not, today's Democrats will successfully dodge responsibility for the results of their Radical worldview, and Republicans eager to unite political justice and recent history will only unite Radical delusions and U.S. policy dominance.

Hardliners tempted to smear Democrats should remember what freshman Rep. BILL RICHARDSON (D-N.M.) said in the House April 27, 1983:

> This Administration, in a disturbing echo from the past, is . . . attempting to equate support for official policy [in Central America] with patriotism . . . This foot-stomping is not only unfair but dangerous. I would remind this Administration that remaining silent in the face of policies that hurt the nation is not patriotism, but moral cowardice.[36]

Republicans need never resort to the motivation-assumptions inherent in "McCarthyism." Neither should they be guilty of "moral cowardice" as Rep. RICHARDSON defined it. Grant the mobility of the intent while objectively measuring the effect of the results. There are enough results to make a sound case against the Radical worldview.

M'GOVERNISM WINS

1972 Democratic standard-bearer George McGovern used to be remembered for losing big to Richard Nixon and picking a running-mate who quit after 2½ weeks. Now, after his 1984 race, he's seen as a decent, friendly sort who appealed to his party's conscience and made good showings in the Iowa Caucus and Massachusetts Primary.

In the party's history books, he deserves to be remembered for clarifying a new approach to foreign policy, one ahead of its time.

McGovern's 1972 slogan was "Come Home America," his main issue Vietnam. In early July of that year he said he'd go on his knees begging Hanoi to release American POWs if he thought that would make the difference. On national TV 4 weeks before the general election he called the Vietcong "a small band of peasant guerrillas" who only wanted independence from American aggression. He promised to cut off all ties to allied governments in Southeast Asia and called for a 33% cut in the defense budget by fiscal year 1975.

□ 1910

Some of McGovern's advice was taken and some wasn't. He stuck to his principles. In 1972, he embodied every part of the Radical worldview just outlined, and still does.

McGovern's 1977 autobiography "Grassroots" has photos of the South Dakota Senator with Fidel Castro in a jeep, and with Vietnam's Premier Pham Van Dong, as Ho Chi Minh looks down benignly from the wall. It ends with a chapter revealing to the point of embarrassment: in "Looking Outward," every part of the Radical worldview is there. U.S. diplomacy after the Marshall Plan is called an unmitigated failure, and a "mature," friendly approach to Communist elements is called for.

From his time in Cuba in 1977, McGovern concludes:

> Castro does not seem to be a dictator for his own sake, but a convinced revolutionary who is popular among his own people. Tho we may wish that he would see the world our way, his own scale of values weighs social and economical equality far more than civil liberties. He will never, it is clear, trade his conceptions for American tourism and trade. (p. 284)

Translation: American talk about democracy is a cover for business propositions, which the uncorruptible and unselfish dictator won't fall for in any event. Castro is wise to America's retrograde commercialism, and we have some nerve applying standards of civil liberties to him. Seven years later—after the evidence of Castro's support of Puerto Rican terrorists in the U.S., after his 1980 Vietnam-like pushing of Cubans (criminals and political victims alike) into the sea on rafts, after endorsing Brezhnev's invasion of Afghanistan—George McGovern could still say of Cuba's dictator:

> We could have him in a cooperative relationship with the United States if we'd go after him. I would begin conversations looking to the exchange of ambassadors . . . and lifting the trade embargo . . . so that instead of fighting at every turn in Central America, we'd at least have a working relationship of some kind with him.[37]

McGovern wants to be friends with and make amends to Communists everywhere. His autobiography says of five days in Vietnam in January 1976:

> The visit to Vietnam moved me as has no other experience abroad. Walking thru the streets of Hanoi where American bombs had fallen, seeing the devastation of the countryside from an airplane window, listening to Vietnamese expressions, despite all this, of friendship for the American people redoubled my determination to work for reason and fairness in our postwar Vietnam policy. (p. 129)

That meant attacking the Carter Administration for not supporting Vietnam's loan applications to international development banks. Sen. McGovern wanted the U.S. trade embargo lifted, too, plus billions in U.S.-to-Vietnam aid. The McGovern tendency to excuse Vietnam's Communists for everything and put the blame for that region's troubles on America is almost pathological. Asked by the Washington Times in July 1983 if the Vietnamese were "better off" under Communist rule than under an authoritarian regime supported by the U.S., he wouldn't say no:

> That's a hard question to answer, because we virtually devastated that country in some 20 years of war, first with the French and then with the Americans. After a quarter of a century of devastating warfare they have been left to fend for themselves, and under those circumstances you're bound to have enormous suffering and disorder.[38]

It's still our fault. Everything Communists do is somehow America's fault. McGovern told the Washington Post a few days before the Soviets shot down Korean Flight 007 on September 1:

> I think we ought to be very thankful that this man Andropov seems to be a reasonable guy and somewhat restrained. Because certainly the Reagan-Weinberger approach is one of intense confrontation. It's almost as though they were spoiling for a military showdown.[39]

Two weeks later he declared for the 1984 nomination calling for a 25 percent cut in the defense budget and, as he put it 6½ weeks before the New Hampshire Primary, "no more American military involvement anywhere in Central America, period." At about the same time he told the Washington Post: "The most serious single mistake Reagan has made is to permit Soviet-American relations to collapse."[40]

Right after Andropov's death became known, McGovern said, "It is a modern tragedy that one of the Soviet Union's most intelligent and realistic leaders has served and died, during the administration of the most ill-informed and dangerous man ever to occupy the White House."[41]

President McGovern would stop more Cruises and Pershings from entering Western Europe, because a bolstered NATO makes the Soviets "even more trigger-happy and paranoid. * * * If they shot down a Korean jetliner thinking that their airspace was threatened, my God, what are they going to do if they think that we have surrounded them with intermediate-range missiles?" This logic has the U.S.S.R. being eminently logical and paranoid simultaneously, and it is America's fault for appreciating neither.[42]

George McGovern may be an oddity—a politician who says what he thinks about world events and never deviates from his underlying assumptions—but McGovernism is no longer an oddity. He was as much founder of as spokesman for the orthodoxy that supplanted his party's JFK-era realism. Ben Wattenberg said on CBS radio in January 1984, "McGovern has grandfather rights on hyper-dovish Democrats." The former Senator's legacy is a generation that thinks like he does, even if it talks less fulsomely.

An October 16, 1983, Washington Post piece called him "the brood hen of American politics," and pointed out that "every Democrat running for President owes George McGovern," because he "gave his opponents the brainpower without which they could not run their campaigns." GARY HART

said as much in a campaign memoir published 10 years earlier.

His candidacy brought new hope to millions. It was the first step in forging a new political "center," a movement consecrated to change and progress. It was the occasion for the emergence of new activists. Unlike those who have gotten into politics for an individual candidate and then disappeared after the defeat, the thousands of people who came into the McGovern campaign will stay active in party affairs all across the nation. They are joining the staffs of Senators, Governors, and Congressmen. They are seeking party positions at the state and local level. Some will undoubtedly seek office themselves.[43]

Walter Mondale's campaign director (Jim Johnson) and political director (Paul Tully) are important McGovern operatives. ALAN CRANSTON'S campaign manager ran McGovern's Dade County effort in 1972. ERNEST HOLLINGS' campaign manager was the South Carolina coordinator. The architect of McGovern's stunning 2nd-place showing in the 1972 New Hampshire primary was Joe Grandmaison, thru late 1983 high in the JOHN GLENN organization. McGovern veterans comprise "two full pages" of GARY HART'S campaign staff list. And GARY HART, tho he now disassociates himself from McGovern's big spending tendencies, remains true to McGovern's foreign policy.

Post writer Bill Peterson explains:

Their idealism has been tempered by time, and political defeat. They are no longer the political bomb-throwers they were portrayed as in 1972. Actually, few ever were. They were simply some of the most ambitious young people of their generation, deeply committed to a cause. They were liberal activists during a year when the McGovern campaign was The-Place-To-Be. They are now at an age, and have accumulated the experience, that they feel entitles them to a shot at running the country.

McGovern and his minions directly altered the presidential nominating process, and they legitimized running a national campaign on anti-Cold War principles. The party's three 1980 presidential candidates (Carter, Brown and KENNEDY) espoused world views not that different from the McGovern ones of 1972. Some of the 1972 veterans ran for Congress, and implanted McGovernism there.

If America's participation in the Vietnam War had as one of its legacies the McGovern 1972 crusade, then a legacy of both has to be the shape of the Democratic Party in 1984. In the 1970s it was never an equal match between Jacksonism and McGovernism. Jackson lost two nomination fights; McGovern beat him for one and then McGovernism dominated the policies of the man (Jimmy Carter) that beat him for the other. Scoop Jackson can best be seen in the 1970s as JFK holdover, with fewer and fewer allies as the decade wore on.

McGovern's 1972 campaign built the coffin for John Kennedy's tough-minded internationalism. What McGovernism did to the Democratic Party in subsequent elections nailed the coffin shut.

HISTORY LESSON

To be a rising Democrat today requires a certain view of what shaped the present. It was stated with a flourish by a man elected to the House in 1974 and the Senate in 1978, PAUL TSONGAS of Massachusetts, in a floor speech January 29, 1980:

Twenty years ago, Mr. President, people stood up on the floor of this Chamber and said, "Well, maybe Batista was not such a great soul after all," but they never said anything about him when he was in power. "And this fellow, Fidel Castro, we do not like the way he combs his beard."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman pause just a moment. The Chair does request the gentleman to omit those portions of the paper which he is reading which refer to specific sitting Members of the other body and to their actions in that body.

As you know, there is a rule against it, and the Chair is required to take the initiative to enforce that rule.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, the gentleman to whom I am referring was a Member of the House during the period of the time that this speech was made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As long as it is not a reference to his actions in the other body, in the Senate, or critical of him as a Senator.

There are a couple of other references a bit earlier that the Chair would respectfully request the gentleman to omit when he has finished his reading today.

Mr. WALKER. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have referred to any direct speeches in the Senate. And I am fairly certain that the Member from Massachusetts to whom I am referring here in 1980 when the speech was made was a Member of the House and not of the Senate.

And this fellow, Fidel Castro, we do not like the way he combs his beard, and we have to get rid of him; he is a threat. So the way we are going to get rid of him is to isolate him.

□ 1920

And they raised the spectre of Communism and everybody rallied around the flag and we isolated Castro, all right. He is still in power and most of those who were here and argued that case have long since passed on to the boards of directors of various U.S. firms.

Castro is in power today because we isolated him and gave him no choice but to turn to the Soviets. The people whose arguments resulted in that policy are the same ones who have continued for 20 years to argue for more isolation. . . .

If you want to understand Castro, go back and look at Batista. If you want to understand what happened in the Dominican Republic, go back and look at Trujillo. If you want to see what happened in Nicaragua, look at Somoza. If you want to find out what happened in Vietnam, look at Diem. If you want to find out what happened in Cambodia, look at Lon Nol. Look at the Shah of Iran.[44]

In this panoramic sweep, two things are missing. The first is an ideology called communism that facilitates (or requires) totalitarianism if given any opening. The second is any redeeming international value for Uncle Sam, a hapless sort fumbling around the world indirectly creating Communist regimes and making them worse by avoiding friendship.

A similar overarching perspective comes from the late Frank Church, who served Idaho in the Senate 1956-80. By the mid-1960s he'd blended the "lessons of Vietnam" with the traditional isolationism of his home turf. In January 1984, he told columnist David Broder:

Remember how many years we pursued stupid policies in Asia, based on ignorance and an irrelevant ideological view of the world. The stupidity of it! All those years of trying to "contain" China, a pygmy nation beset by problems of its own. . . .

Yet we seem to be unable to learn from the failure of our Vietnam policy, or the equally evident failure of our hard-line policy toward Castro in Cuba. It is this idea that the communist threat is everywhere that has made our government its captive and its victim.

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKELTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to pick up where the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) left off in the document entitled, "What is the Matter With the Democratic Foreign Policy," by Mr. Frank Gregorsky, who was quoting at this point Senator Frank Church talking to David Broder in January 1984:

Somehow, some day, this country has got to learn to live with revolution in the Third World. It's endemic. It's relatively easy to suppress revolution in Grenada, so we congratulate ourselves. It's more difficult to suppress it in Nicaragua or Central America, so we fret about that. But it will be impossible when it comes to Brazil or Argentina.

This country has become so conservative—so fearful—that we have come to see revolution anywhere in the world as a threat to the United States. It's nonsense. And yet that policy we have followed has cost us so many lives, so much treasure, such setbacks to our vital interests, as a great power ought not to endure.

Until we learn to live with revolution, we will continue to blunder, and it will work to the Soviets' advantage. It will put them on the winning side, while we put ourselves on

the side of rotten, corrupt regimes that end up losing.[45]

Tsongas and Church were never found singing the praises of Stalinism. They were not necessarily static as political thinkers: on domestic issues, they challenged the big-government orthodoxy of their party's leadership (as have GARY HART and TIM WIRTH).

But their comments taken together show a view of the modern world that is rigid, unyielding, and skewed. It's a world where America does nothing right and Communism is just sort of out there, not as a proactive, sinister force, but as a bland atmospheric particulate that rushes into vacuums caused by "stupid" America and its "rotten, corrupt" allies.

McGovern, Tsongas, Church and other Democrats perfected the technique of not holding left-wing governments accountable for their actions. Those governments, quoting Lenin and justifying brutality in the name of Communism, are history's fault. Or maybe America's fault for being on the wrong side of that history, and supporting Batista, Trujillo, Somoza, and Thieu.

Some Democrats are eager to help write that history:

When a Communist regime seems likely, McGovern Democrats are willing to bet on its neutrality. Even though there is only one Yugoslavia, they treat it as the rule not the exception. Once a Communist regime is in, these Democrats give it unlimited sway to get even with history. At some distant point, they say, it may become an independent Communist state we can do business with, and that day can come sooner if we make a generous offer now.

Revel wrote that some people on Left think there's "some variety of communism other than Stalinism. But Stalinism is the very essence of communism. What varies is not the Stalinist system but the harshness with which it is applied. You cannot shoot or imprison all of the people all of the time. Nor is it necessary every day of the week to send tanks to reestablish Stalinist order in a friendly country. At times when pressure from above plus a rising standard of living are enough to forestall rebellion, repression need not be spectacular: it is part of the daily routine. But it is nonetheless Stalinist."[47]

The people making Democratic foreign policy today, from veterans KENNEDY, PELL, CRANSTON, and Mondale, to rookies FEIGHAN, BOXER, RICHARDSON, and MARTINEZ, implicitly reject that statement. (Just ask a Democrat to tell you what's wrong with it.) They appear to believe Stalinism exists only as a historical relic (Khrushchev got rid of it) or, if here now, is a byproduct of the change from a right-wing government to a left-wing one—a change the United States didn't get on the right side of early on.

Since Communism doesn't strike them as an independent, inexorable force feeding on totalitarian personalities and concepts, McGovern Democrats don't fear it. It's an animal their worldview didn't equip them to tame.

Every time a Communist movement battles an authoritarian U.S. ally, Democrats with Radical views believe the promises of the movement.

Every time a Communist movement takes power, Democratic Congressmen say it will be fair, progressive, enlightened.

Every time it's not, the blame goes to the United States or the particular country's history. Every time a Communist government declares for the export of its system, we're not supposed to pay attention to what's being promised.

Every time a Communist government commits an atrocity, Western memories are to be short and tempers long.

Rep. TOM HARKIN had high hopes for the Sandinistas in July 1979:

Nicaragua is a very small country. Thus, the members of the Broad Opposition front are quite familiar with the members of the provisional government and would know, much better than we would, if there was reason to be wary of it. The fact that the Broad Opposition Front, whose members would have the most to lose by a Communist takeover, would endorse the new plan, should assuage fears in this country that the junta is dominated by Communists. . . . The chances that General Somoza will be replaced by a truly democratic and representative government can only be enhanced by this most recent show of unity.[48]

Another Congressman elected in 1974, DON BONKER of Washington state, made excuses in advance for a Marxist force about to take Angola's capital in December 1975, remaking its leader into a reassuring Western presence:

Perhaps (an MPLA) government is inclined to nationalize American oil holdings, but it would not necessarily do so without compensation. In any case, such an action is understandable for a fledgling country which wants to reverse a humiliating legacy of dependence. If, as we claim, capital investment and trade are mutually beneficial, a new government, whatever it politics, will be tempted to establish relations. . . The leader of MPLA is Agostinho Neto, a medical doctor who seems to have acquired the enlightened and diplomatic style of the Europeans with whom he has long had admiring contact. . .[49]

BONKER thinks it was terrible for Angola to be dependent on the Portuguese; today it, or its besieged government, is every bit as dependent on the Soviets. But BONKER says nothing; when a Marxist group does take over, most Democrats have a hard time speaking ill of it and blame America for the rest of it.

□ 1930

AND BLAME AMERICA FOR THE REST

The other half of the Radical syndrome of looking for the best in Communists (and rationalizing the worst) is the assumption that America can do no right. The Marshall plan and the Peace Corps are the only postwar foreign policy initiatives today's Democrats point to with pride; they ignore or are ashamed of almost all else.

More than anything, this belief stems from Vietnam. In the late 60s and early 70s, it became a truism with the entire American left, from bombthrowers in Chicago to Eastern writers to progressive, pinstriped supporters of Eugene McCarthy and McGovern, that Southeast Asia would be fine once the U.S. left.

"Give Peace a Chance," American policy-makers were told, the implication being that it was only the U.S. or its ally South Vietnam getting in the way. Some Democrats went beyond mere implication.

Rep. DAVE OBEY (D-Wis.), June 2, 1970:

And we further believe that when it becomes unmistakably clear that America intends to end its involvement in Vietnam, all contending political factions in South Vietnam will have incentive to make the accommodations necessary for negotiating a political compromise.[51]

Senator Walter Mondale (D-Minn.), February 10, 1971:

The million-man South Vietnamese Army is the basis of our policy—to withdraw and yet to preserve the Saigon regime at the same time. In the end, this policy is built on sand. That is why we bomb and invade. We have seen this logic before. If only we "hurt" the other side, if only we show ourselves manly, or ferocious, or unpredictable, the truth will somehow be postponed or go away. . . The (Nixon) Administration is so committed to the Theiu-Ky regime, and so doubtful of its strength, that they refuse a compromise settlement and launch a wider war. . .

History has given us words for what we are doing in Indochina. We are making a wilderness of devastation in three countries, a wilderness of our own schools and cities and farms starved by war spending. We are making a wilderness, and call it peace.[52]

Rep. BOB CARR, March 12, 1975:

If we really want to help the *people* of Cambodia and the *people* of South Vietnam, is it not wiser to end the killing? Since most credited analysts of foreign policy admit that the Lon No I regime cannot survive, won't the granting of further aid only prolong the fighting and, with it, the killing?[53]

Rep. ED BOLAND, June 17, 1971:

Draining our resources and dividing our people, the war is now little more than an exercise in futility. A negotiated political, settlement is the only way—quite literally, the only way—to stop the bloodshed. The concept of victory, always suspect, is now absurd . . . How much more can we endure? How many planeloads of coffins, how many

mutilated and lamed soldiers, how many more Mylais, how many more plundered cities and burned villages?[54]

The questions of Congressmen CARR and BOLAND ought better to have been put to the North Vietnamese. The pattern for 1984 rhetoric was locked in long ago: give the benefit of every doubt to the Communists and doubt every benefit of your own nation. Make mincemeat of any ally dumb enough, or imperfect enough, to fight on the side of the U.S. Trash America, indict the President, and give the benefit of every doubt to Marxist regimes. That's the standard formula.

One radical Democrat went so far as to blame the U.S. military for part of the 1968 Hue massacre, a crime of particular viciousness usually ascribed to Communist forces even by antiwar historians:

There is some question as to how many people actually suffer if South Vietnam came under Communist administration. The example is often cited of Hue, which after having been occupied by the North Vietnamese was found to have mass graves with many bodies in them. We had assumed these people had been shot by the North Vietnamese, although a story has surfaced to the effect that our bombing and razing of a great portion of Hue resulted in many deaths and that these victims, too, were buried in the same open trenches.[55]

There is no absolute certainty that there would be a bloodbath. As I have noted, it appears there is a possibility that some of the people buried in the trenches at Hue may well have been killed by American bombs, so many deaths may not be clear evidence in themselves that a bloodbath would ensue.[56]

Perhaps the programmed drownings of boat people later in the decade would meet that radical Democrat's legal definition of bloodbath. It's a fair question for the institutional leader of radical Democrats on foreign policy.

In the Radical worldview, there is no crime by a Communist army or government that can't either be trivialized or blamed on America. There can be no "absolute certainty" that the next Communist regime will do whatever all the others have done in varying degrees.

Congressman HARKIN, on June 26, 1979, told the House that the Sandinistas knew more about nurturing democracy that America did:

Should the United States feel impelled to meddle once again in Nicaragua, the result will certainly be self-defeating . . . The process of developing a unified democracy in Nicaragua will be a slow one. However, if we attempt to artifically speed it up, we will only end up killing democracy once again, as we did four decades ago.[57]

Rep. BILL RICHARDSON, on April 27, 1983, said the best way to teach the Sandinistas a lesson was to cut off aid to those fighting them:

All of us in the Congress oppose Marxist power in Central America. But our current policies cannot and will not save that region. They will only prevent us from resolving the fighting and restoring the peace . . . In the past two years, we have secretly shipped over $60 million worth of weapons, helicopters, and supplies to the anti-Sandinista forces operating in Nicaragua. Our actions will only serve to drive that regime into the arms of the Soviets and to strengthen their grip on that country.[58]

In September 1983 a few Democratic Congressmen even showed more anger at the U.S. for the KAL 007 atrocity than at the Soviets. Said Rep. TED WEISS (D-N.Y.):

(W)e should learn that the Russians are not barbaric, subhuman, agents of aggression and deceit upon whom we suddenly can no longer trust or work with in . . . negotiations. Rather, the Soviets' response to a commercial airliner overflying its territory reflected the defensiveness and paranoia of a nation desperately afraid that the world might perceive it as a second-rate power. The harsh rhetoric [by the U.S.] can only heighten the Soviets' state of paranoia and isolation, and reduce ever further the already slim chances for arms reduction.[59]

One week earlier, Rep. GEORGE CROCKETT (D-Mich.) addressed students at Anderson College in Indiana:

The easy temptation . . . is to put the incident into our old Cold War framework and capitalize on it as simply another illustration of the inhumanity or brutality of the Soviet people—and then answer the attack by voting more money for missiles and bombers and other weapons. But, let us acknowledge for a moment that maybe our own preoccupation with defense and military solutions contributed to the climate that allowed the mistake to be made.[60]

How do you reason with people who think like that?

THE ANGOLA DEPARTURE

When both houses of Congress ended U.S. covert aid to pro-West forces in Angola, the Class of 1974 showed its policies could be implemented against the wishes of a traditionalist President. It exploited the Vietnam weariness of the population and national press to put the forces of realism thoroughly on the defensive. Angola was McGovern Radicalism's first clear "win." A lot of other causes and interests lost.

When Portugal granted the Southwest African state of Angola its formal independence on November 11, 1975, the three-way civil war heated up. The Soviet Union supported the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). South Africa and the U.S. backed the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA). Zaire and Red China backed Holden Roberto's National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA).

In the December 6, 1975, New Republic, Tad Szulc spelled out the Soviet investment in Angola:

Quite aside from its wealth—oil, diamonds, sugar and coffee—Angola is strategically located on Africa's west coast. Control would give Moscow a military presence on the South Atlantic. The Soviets have a foothold in Cuba in the Caribbean and a foothold in Somalia right below the entrance to the Persian Gulf. Bases in Angola, if they were to be obtained, would be crucial in supporting the Soviet fleet both in the South Atlantic and the Indian Ocean, thus faciliating operations along the oil tanker routes around Cape Horn.[61]

But the Administration of Gerald Ford was in hot water when previous CIA aid to UNITA was revealed and more asked of Congress. At about the same time Fidel Castro sent in 15,000 Cuban soldiers to fight on the side of the MPLA. At the end of 1975, the younger Democrats saw a chance to teach the foreign policy establishment the "lessons of Vietnam."

On December 12, 1975, freshman DON BONKER called for strict objectivity between the forces of the West and the forces favored by Russia and Red China:

□ 1940

(It) is an effete chessboard mentality, the 1950ish notion that we have to counter every Soviet move, however many innocent pawns we lose in the process, or that in the end we will be blackmailed. The only genuine parallel I detect between chess and the tragically real Angolan situation is that both superpowers are indeed treating it as a game. I thought by now we had learned that the United States cannot be the policeman of the world, let alone the king. . . . Why not remain above the fray and let them [the contending factions] fight it out?[62]

Rep. BONKER that day vowed to amend security assistance legislation before the House International Relations Committee to "enjoin direct or indirect American military aid to Angola." The Senate voted such a ban one week before Christmas 1975. Dozens of House Democrats made similar moves when the second session of the 96th Congress opened in January 1976; any help for UNITA was out of the question after that month, an aid ban known as the Clark amendment having been legislated over President Ford's veto.

The Class of 1974 was joining with veteran Democrats radicalized by Vietnam to make policy out of world view: American involvement in an East-West conflict, apart from aid to Marxist forces once they won, is wrong.

Castro's troops tipped the scales. By April, MPLA forces led by Agostinho Neto had the capital of Luanda and nominal control of the country. The Cubans stayed, acting less as soldiers and more as technicians and doctors. Neto flew to Cuba in the summer of 1976 and signed a flock of agreements. Within 5 years, there would be 30,000 Cubans in Angola, and their fighting would again reach high levels.[63]

Most Democrats stood firmly by the Clark Amendment. President Reagan tried to repeal it in spring 1981. The WOLPE-led Africa subcommittee on House Foreign Affairs voted 7–0 against repeal, and the full committee agreed 19–5 in a show of hands. Rep. WOLPE worried that repeal would make Angola's Marxist leaders fear re-

newed U.S. aid to Savimbi's insurgents, and so make the government more reliant on Cuban troops. Under WOLPE's formulation, banning aid to the insurgents was a way to lessen Castro's influence.[64]

Other Democrats were more direct in their sympathies. George McGovern flew to Luanda in December 1978 to meet with the governing Marxists. He said, "I wouldn't be here today if I didn't believe it were possible for us to improve our relations with Angola." But the U.S. refused to do diplomatic business there unless the Cubans left, a stance enduring thru three presidencies.[65]

What happened to the Angolans? Good question, and it can't be answered easily. There seems to have been no bloodbath, if only because a sub-tropical, bush-covered African state is not given to totalitarian micromanagement. All we know is that Neto and his successor Eduardo dos Santos made attempts to communize Angolan society, never held real elections, and tied Angola to Cuba, the Soviet Union, and certain Eastern Bloc countries.

It's also the case that Angola encouraged the Katanga province of the old Belgian Congo to rebel against Zaire, a sometime U.S. ally (and persistent foe of Libya's Colonel Qadhafi). There were border skirmishes in 1977 and 1978. The Carter Administration felt compelled to ship $2 million in medical supplies, combat rations, backpacks, and radio gear to Zaire's President Mobutu. Even that unnerved Congressman BONKER, whose committee assignments encouraged him to apply the Radical worldview to Africa:

(P)lummeting copper prices and general mismanagement have put Zaire's economy in political straits; and its political situation, depending more on military power than on popular support is, in the long run, tenuous. Supporting narrowly-based regimes—as we did in Portugal, Greece, and Vietnam—can be good policy one day but bad policy the next. In the case of Zaire, even tho "our boy" is still in power, it is not evident what influence we have achieved for all the hundreds of millions of dollars in economic and military aid we have put in. President Mobutu is not known for his ringing support of America's policies and principles.[66]

That quote is marvelous. It and the March 1977 op-ed piece it's from make excuses for Angola's Marxist leaders and take gratuitous shots at "our boy" (read: our ally) in Zaire, who probably doesn't deserve, implied BONKER, even non-military aid. America's friends are always worse than its enemies; help the latter and get tough with the former. This could be made in a Radical mantra if their arguments didn't require such long sentences.

One wishes Mr. BONKER would find a Marxist regime "depending more on military power than popular support" and denounce it; there are a lot of them around. "Narrowly-based" governments for the Left are rarely called that by today's Democrats. If they were, Mr. BONKER would be writing op-eds against present-day Angola.

By early 1984, Neto's heirs controlled less than one-third the country. FNLA's leaders were exiled in Paris, but UNITA forces led by Jonas Savimbi controlled the southeastern third of Angola and most of the provincial capitals. With help of various kinds from Zaire, Zambia, South Africa, Saudi Arabia, and Morocco, Savimbi aimed to force President dos Santos into a coalition government.

Savimbi was quoted in the Washington Post May 29, 1983:

My critics in the West are hypocrites. Do they believe that black men like us want to import apartheid to Angola? It is unthinkable. Against whom would we apply it? Ourselves? These Westerners say we should not take aid from South Africa for our struggle. But they will never give us aid themselves. They seem to be asking us to commit suicide, to accept being crushed by the Cubans and the Russians in our own country. We do not want to be an African Hungary. To avoid it, we have to take help from wherever it is on offer.[67]

It won't come from a Democratic House. It won't come from Democrats like CHRIS DODD, who is more entranced than Jonas Savimbi by the thought of another Hungary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is sure the gentleman is aware of the rule that he cannot make reference to sitting Members of the other body or to the activities or proceedings in that body.

Mr. GINGRICH. In the body. All right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. Over eight years later Democrats stand guard over the 1976 Angolan aid ban and the Clark amendment. They don't know what to make of Savimbi and his broadly-based, anti-Communist army, against which no civilian atrocities have been effectively held. Pro-western guerrillas who tend to avoid terrorism don't fit into the Radical worldview, so Democrats don't think about Angola until some American conservative suggests sending weapons to UNITA. At that point reflexes are triggered, and ineffective doctrines spill forth.

It gets harder and harder to believe that the MPLA regime is the true voice of the Angolan people. But some people; they have to.

The themes of the worldview should be familiar by now:

Communism is not necessarily wrong, but America nearly always is. Our allies are bigger threats to freedom than our declared enemies. Anytime a Communist government sins, it originates in something we or the previous rightist regime in that nation did. America must strive to show goodwill to the forces of history, by disengagement, desertion of its allies, cutting its defense budget, and generous aid and credit. America can't be the world's policeman, but that's fine because the neighborhood isn't in much, if any, danger from Communists to begin with. Force is never a part of effective negotiation but always an obstacle to it.

Some Democrats have been astonishing in their consistency.

Let me ask the chair for just a moment, to insure the chair understands what I am now doing, I have a series of quotations from a gentleman who is currently in the other body, but the quotations are from the floor of the House when he was in this body. I presume they are, therefore, legitimate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If they are not references to or critical of him as a Senator.

Mr. GINGRICH. All right.

Messrs. DODD and DOWNEY are two who've been saying the same thing since they got to Washington over nine years ago.

CHRIS DODD on Cambodia, March 12, 1975:

President Ford has tried to make this an issue by charging Congress with abandoning an ally. I say that calling the Lon Nol regime an ally is to debase the meaning of the word as it applies to our true allies. We have no defense commitment to Cambodia, and none is claimed by the President . . . The greatest gift our country can give to the Cambodian people is not guns but peace. And the best way to accomplish that goal is by ending military aid now.[68]

CHRIS DODD on Angola, December 19, 1975:

Mr. Speaker, I am urging my colleagues . . . to denounce equivocally the blatant intrusion on the part of the Ford Administration, the Soviet Union, and the South African and Cuban regimes in the domestic affairs of a newly independent African nation. Sadly, Angola has become the most recent staging ground for a familiar game of power politics whose players are failing to keep at heart the best interests of the Angolan people.[69]

CHRIS DODD on Nicaragua, August 21, 1983, questioned by Morton Kondracke on "Meet the Press:"

Q: The Nicaraguan government says that it's promoting a revolution without frontiers in the Central American region. Doesn't that seem to mean to you that they have it in mind to overthrow the neighboring governments, and shouldn't the United States be able to use military assistance and perhaps the threat of force to prevent that from happening?

A: That's rhetoric—"revolution without frontiers"—there's an awful lot of rhetoric being thrown about Central America these days. I don't necessarily believe because they use that kind of rhetoric that they're determined to overthrow every neighboring government in the Central American region. And I certainly don't think it warrants the kind of support of a covert activity which could clearly enflame the entire region in a military situation which would not serve our interests or the interests of our neighboring allies in the region well.[70]

CHRIS DODD after President Reagan's Grenada speech, October 27, 1983, questioned by John Dancy of NBC-TV:

Q: What about the President's contention that this was about to become a major Cuban base? Was that the reason for going in?

A: Not in and of itself. I think you'd like to try and exhaust other possibilities. . . The question of whether or not we needed to do what we did militarily, in order to deal with the potential Cuban threat, I think is something we should have sought the advice and counsel of other people [on]—particularly the Organization of American States, where as many as 15 countries today, not to mention our European allies, have all condemned our action. I'm not opposed to the use of military force; it just seems to me that ought to be your last option, not your first option. And my sense of the Reagan Administration is, they've jumped too quickly to this option without exhausting those other ones.[71]

Congressman DOWNEY minces fewer words. From Grenada back thru Vietnam he's been harshly loyal to the Radical worldview. On October 25, 1983, within hours of the Grenada operation's start, DOWNEY was on the House floor accusing President Reagan of shooting first and asking questions later:

First of all, you say that we are there to protect American lives . . . Then, five minutes later, the chancellor of the medical school comes on to say that no lives were in danger in Grenada. Second, you say to us that we have a treaty commitment that the eastern Caribbean countries can ask for help if they feel threatened? What if they feel threatened by Cuba and Nicaragua, Mr. President? [72]

TOM DOWNEY on anti-Communist forces in and around Nicaragua, July 28, 1983:

It appears as though some of my colleagues have transited the last 30 years without learning very much about American diplomatic history or the history of Central America . . . Some of the blackest pages of American history have been written in that portion of the world. American troops have been [in Nicaragua] twice in this century. The only thing that is different is that no longer are we interested in directly sending in American troops . . . We are not prepared to do a land version of the Bay of Pigs, with the 10,000 thugs, brigands and thieves.[73]

(In DOWNEY's entire 500-word House statement, there's not one critical mention of the Sandinistas, Fidel Castro or the Soviets. He doesn't even make the pretense of objectivity between the allies of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. that others did.)

To those of my colleagues whose myopia on viewing the Red menace obscures the enormous suffering of the people in this region, I say this to them: Is our arrogance so infinite that we can suggest that these countries are ours to lose? The presupposes they are ours to begin with.[74]

It is the millions of poor, innocent people who would like to live in peace, have something for their families, that should concern us first—not whether we lose or win in Nicaragua, but whether or not these people can live a life of hope and opportunity. They can live a life of hope and opportunity, Mr. Chairman, if we stop the killing.

□ 1950

TOM DOWNEY urging President Carter to get U.S. troops out of South Korea no matter what, May 23, 1977:

The central question is not whether South Korea can or cannot survive without our ground forces. The central question is this: Are the people of the United States willing to send more American men to die in another land war in Asia in defense of another corrupt and repressive dictatorship? . . .

If we are not, and I am not, we must pull our ground forces out as quickly as possible. If we fail to do this, we may find ourselves trapped into a war we do not want . . .

Do we want another Vietnam or do we not? This, not the military balance in Korea, is the question we must face.[75]

(In DOWNEY's entire 250-word House statement, there's no mention of the government to the North, and no recognition that the cause of another Korean War could be other than assumed provocation by the U.S.)

TOM DOWNEY on the last non-communist government of South Vietnam, March 25, 1975:

I come before this committee today [and ask]: My God, why are we still financing the almost inconceivable suffering that the people of Vietnam have endured . . . In addition to the military situation, we now see the final degradation of the society in Vietnam. The people of South Vietnam suffer as much from cruelty, stupidity and greed of their own government as they do from the war. President Thieu is a dying man surviving on the oxygen of the American dollars . . . Our military aid is not saving these people, it is murdering them.[76]

(In DOWNEY's entire 1,200-word statement to the House Appropriations Committee, there's not one critical mention of North Vietnam, the Vietcong or the Soviet Union.)

TOM DOWNEY, March 12, 1975, on Cambodia just before the Khymer Rouge launched a program that caused the deaths of one-fifth of the population:

In recent weeks the Lon Nol regime has proven itself to be corrupt and incompetent. Cambodian army officers can be seen relaxing around plush hotels while rebels storm the countryside. The wealthy of Phnom Penh continue to give lavish dinner parties while in the poorer quarters of the city parents and children beg for food. The government has shown favoritism in the distribution of rice, while prices in the marketplace have risen 20% . . .

We must not prolong the agony which $1.75 billion of U.S. funds has aided over the past 5 years. It is time that we allow the peaceful people of Cambodia to rebuild their nation . . . (T)he Administration has warned that if we leave there will be a "bloodbath." But to warn of a new bloodbath is no justification for extending the current bloodbath.[77]

(In DOWNEY's entire 1,000-word statement there's not one critical mention of the Khymer Rouge insurgents.)

The radical Democrats are consistent; one could predict down to the phrase what they'd say if Guatemala, the Philippines, Mexico or Malaysia were approaching civil strife with one of the sides Marxist. The radical Democrats' view of the world seems clear enough. They apply it every place U.S. interests are at stake, and they make predictions, as do other Democrats.

Their assumptions and predictions were tested in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Angola and Nicaragua, but not in El Salvador or Grenada.

FOOTNOTES TO PART ONE

[1] Jean-Francois Revel, *The Totalitarian Temptation* (New York: Penguin Books, 1976), p. 53.

[2] Alan Ehrenhalt, "House Democrats: A New Center of Gravity," *Congressional Quarterly:* October 1, 1983, p. 2059.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] "Ten Congressmen Send A Message to Managua," *Wall Street Journal:* April 17, 1984, p. 34. Also see editorial on same page.

[6] "Showdown On MX," *Nuclear Times:* April 1984, pp. 7-8. Also see, "The MX: One Step Closer," *Newsweek:* August 1, 1983, p. 25.

[7] "House Liberals Retain Clout On Foreign Affairs Panel," *Congressional Quarterly:* February 7, 1981, p. 263.

[8] "Reagan Foreign Policy Requests Challenged," *Congressional Quarterly:* April 18, 1981, pp. 687-88.

[9] "House Unit Makes Major Cuts In Central American Aid Plan," *Washington Times:* March 2, 1984.

[10] Ibid.

[11] *Congressional Record:* May 9, 1972, p. 16282.

[12] *Congressional Record:* May 9, 1972, p. 16288.

[13] *Congressional Record:* May 10, 1972, p. 16748.

[14] *Congressional Record:* May 9, 1972, p. 16465.

[15] "Impeachment Proceedings Instituted Against The President," *Congressional Record:* May 10, 1972, p. 16692.

[16] Lost in all the fuss was the fact that Nixon had softened his withdrawal terms with hardening his short-run military pressure. The McGovern and Muskie quotes are from Theodore White, The Making Of The President 1972 (New York: Atheneum, 1973), p. 236. The O'Neill quote is from *Congressional Record:* May 9, 1972, p. 16282. Under Nixon, Democrats got acclimated to divorcing military pressure from negotiating strength.

[17] As quoted in *Washington Post,* April 10, 1984.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] *Congressional Record:* April 11, 1984, p. H-2778.

[22] *Congressional Record:* April 12, 1984, p. E-1642.

[23] *Congressional Record:* April 10, 1984, p. 2516.

[24] Ibid.

[25] *Congressional Record:* April, 10, 1984, p. H-2515.

[26] Film clip from *This Week With David Brinkley,* April 15, 1984.

[27] *Congressional Record:* April 10, 1984, p. H-2515.

[28] Diane Granat, "Whatever Happened To The Watergate Babies?", *Congressional Quarterly:* April 3, 1984, p. 499.

[29] All election numbers come from Barone, Ujifusa and Matthews, *The Almanac Of American Politics* 1976 (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1975).

[30] Ibid., p. 558. The proposed research project looks even more appealing in 1984.

[31] Granat.

[32] Ehrenhalt.

[33] Kennedy's article was put in the Congressional Record by Rep. John Bryant (D-Texas) on March 15, 1984, pp. E-1027-28.

[34] Rep. Edward Feighan, "Reagan Administration's Militaristic Policy In Central America," *Congressional Record:* March 28, 1984, pp. E-1292-94.

[35] Rep. Barney Frank, "Statement of Congressman Stephen J. Solarz, *Congressional Record:* April 24, 1984, pp E. 1693-94.

[36] *Congressional Record:* April 27, 1983, p. H-2424.

[37] As quoted in *Washington Post,* January 14, 1984.

[38] As quoted in *Washington Times,* July 27, 1983.

[39] As quoted in *Washington Post,* September 4, 1983. The interview occurred before the KAL 007 atrocity.

[40] As quoted in *Washington Post*, January 14, 1984.
[41] As quoted by CBS Radio commentator Joe Sobran, February 21, 1984. Sobran has tracked closely the McGovernization of the Democratic Party on defense and social issues.
[42] As quoted in *Washington Post*, January 14, 1984.
[43] Gary Hart, *Right From The Start* (New York: Quadrangle, 1973), p. 330.
[44] *Congressional Record:* January 29, 1980, P. S-529.
[45] David S. Broder, "Frank Church's Challenge," *Washington Post*, January 22, 1984.
[46] *Congressional Record:* June 29, 1970, p. 21907.
[47] Revel, p. 29.
[48] Rep. Tom Harkin, "Moderates Back Sandinista Plan," *Congressional Record:* June 26, 1979, p. E-3269.
[49] Rep. Don Bonker, "What Price Angola?", *Congressional Record:* December 12, 1975, p. 40426.
[50] Sen. Chris Dodd on NBC-TV's *Meet The Press.* Author's tape.
[51] *Congressional Record:* June 2, 1970, p. 17890.
[52] *Congressional Record:* February 10, 1971, p. 25056.
[53] Rep. Ron Dellums, "Statement of Congressman Bob Carr on the floor of the House Democratic Caucus," *Congressional Record:* March 13, 1975, p. 6612.
[54] *Congressional Record:* June 17, 1971, p. 20545.
[55] *Congressional Record:* June 29, 1970, p. 21908.
[56] Ibid., p. 21909.
[57] Harkin.
[58] *Congressional Record:* April 27, 1983, p. H-2424.
[59] *Congressional Record:* September 14, 1983, p. H-6869.
[60] Crockett inserted his own September 8 speech in *Congressional Record:* September 14, 1983, pp. H-6881-82.
[61] Tad Szulc, "Angola Up For Grabs," *The New Republic:* December 6, 1975, p. 11.
[62] Bonker.
[63] "Castro, Neto Agree On Troops, Cooperation," *Washington Post:* August 4, 1976, p. 7.
[64] Discussion of Clark Amendment in *Congressional Quarterly:* May 16, 1981, p. 850. On the Senate side, Paul Tsongas "said getting the Cuban troops out of Angola could be achieved by 'delicate negotiation,' but only if the Angolans felt the security of the ban on U.S. intervention in their nation." Once again, diplomatic leverage is to be improved by disavowing military pressure.
[65] "Neto Sees, McGovern, Says Angola Wants Ties With the U.S.," *Washington Post:* December 14, 1978, p. A26.
[66] Rep. Don Bonker, "Zaire-Angola Warnings, "*Washington Post:* April 20, 1977.
[67] Fred Bridgland, "What If The Angolian Rebels Win?", *Washington Post:* May 29, 1983, p. C2. On December 19, 1975, Sen. Alan Cranston said of the just-voted ban on aid to Savimbi's forces: "(W)e will now have no new 'Gulf of Tonkin Resolution' opening the way to a Vietnam-type disaster in Angola." (*Congressional Record:* December 19, 1975, p. 42219.) In straining so hard to avoid that unlikely disaster, Cranston and his allies produced others they do not understand.
[68] *Congressional Record:* March 12, 1975, p. 6403.
[69] *Congressional Record:* December 19, 1975, p. 42375.
[70] Dodd on *Meet The Press.*
[71] NBC-TV coverage of President Reagan's speech on Grenada and Lebanon, October 27, 1983. Author's tape.
[72] *Congressional Record:* October 25, 1983, p. H-8580.
[73] *Congressional Record:* July 28, 1983, pp. H. 5850-51.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Rep. Tom Downey, "Korea: We Must Face Reality Now," *Congressional Record:* May 23, 1977, pp. 16157-58.
[76] Rep. Tom Downey, "Vietnam, "*Congressional Record:* March 25, 1975, pp. 8571-72. This is an incredible statement. Downey analyzes events in Vietnam since 1949 from a totally anti-U.S. viewpoint, tying each of them to how old he was.
[77] *Congressional Record:* March 13, 1975, p. 6648.

PART TWO: THE WORLD AS IT IS

VIETNAM

Tho it might seem otherwise, this monograph doesn't aim to refight the Indochina War or blame anyone but the Communists themselves for the things that happened when the U.S. called it quits in 1975. The Vietnam experience, broadly defined, was the most destructive thing to affect the U.S. since the Civil War. The pro-war elements in the U.S., both military and political, made mistakes and miscalculations that can't be written off just because their hearts were in the right place.[1]

I also don't seek to give a skewed version of what happened in Congress 1973-75. Radicalized Democrats weren't then strong enough to force a bombing and funds cutoff for Indochina on President Ford. They did it only with the help of moderate Democrats and a large chunk of House and Senate Republicans.

America by spring 1975 was fed up with the U.S. effort in Indochina. No argument by Gerald Ford or Henry Kissinger could've surmounted that attitude. Class of '74 Democrats were, at that time, in policy terms, squarely on the side of the majority.

But, nine years later, the assumptions and predictions of those rising Democrats can be looked at again. They are fair game, especially with the rethinking of the Vietnam experience that began around 1979. Academics, military strategists, and others not at the time obsessed with endorsing or destroying the policies of the moment now calmly study what America did right and what it did wrong.

Here's a composite sketch of America in Vietnam and Vietnam in American politics and society:

(1) The U.S. government never had clear objectives in Southeast Asia. John Kennedy wanted to stop Red Chinese expansion, Lyndon Johnson wanted to democratize the place and build TVAs on the Mekong, and Richard Nixon focused on "peace with honor" to maintain U.S. credibility around the world. All three Presidents acted as if the job could be done on the cheap. As a result, $130 billion was spent foolishly, if not wasted, the U.S. economy was dislocated, and 50,000 Americans lost their lives for little if any gain.

(2) American politics polarized, and containment was ruptured. The Cold War consensus that began eroding in 1965 was dead by 1969. With the start of the Nixon Administration, two opposing forces sought, and failed, to dominate U.S. foreign policy.

One was a retreating Cold War establishment, nominally led by Republicans because Nixon was perceived as in charge; it also included Democrats still loyal to Truman-Kennedy-Johnson realism. This group usually had the "silent" majority, which backed Nixon's aggressive withdrawal approach in Vietnam by majorities of up to 65%. Teddy White wrote: "If it was kill or surrender, the American people would back their president on the kill side."[2]

The other force was the disillusioned segment of the post-World War II establishment personified by Clark Clifford, Robert MacNamara and Cyrus Vance. These erstwhile hawks came to think America made fatal mistakes, not just about Vietnam but about the way the world worked. Their change-of-mind as the Johnson administration waned helped a majority of elected Democrats stake out anti-Vietnam stances after Nixon came in.

In so doing, Democrats made common cause with millions of Americans in universities and upper-income "New Class" professions (we didn't have the term "Yumpies" then), who would man the ramparts in Congress and the media after Nixon's mistakes produced the 1974 repudiation.

The first group wanted to end direct U.S. involvement in Indochina in a way that would keep the region non-Communist. The second group wanted out, either immediately or by a "date certain," as the phrase went. They believed the entire Vietnam experience a lost cause; some lacerated their country for "immoral" actions.

The 1972 presidential election was a textbook clash of these two forces, Richard Nixon for the retreating Cold War establishment and George McGovern for a growing anti-Vietnam, New Class, deeply skeptical coalition nominally headed by a band of traumatized elder statesmen.

(3) The clash of these two political forces plus Nixon's self-inflicted wounds produced a hybrid foreign policy during 1969-76 that everyone could disclaim parentage of. The policy that resulted kept the world guessing about the nature of America's commitment to "freedom" (meaning national independence under non-Communist regimes) in Southeast Asia. That's how a democracy handles issues that split the national will.

(4) Some progress was made in South Vietnam "nation-building" after the Vietcong's 1968 setback, tho the Thieu regime could not by any stretch of the imagination be called democratic. The country's military was in good shape by the end of 1972, just before the U.S.-North Vietnam peace accords were signed. Laos was making progress toward stable, non-Communist government. Cambodia was not; the Lon Nol regime was the weakest, most inept of America's regional allies. Congress forced President Nixon to stop bombing in support of Lon Nol in the summer of 1973, a move backed by public opinion.

(5) After getting most of its POWs back in March 1973, the U.S. lost interest in Indochina, and was encouraged by the media to focus on the burgeoning Watergate scandal. The 93rd Congress was reasserting prerogatives,

[1] Footnotes appear later in the RECORD.

investigating the scandal, reclaiming war powers, cutting defense and foreign aid to sustain new social welfare add-ons. Fox Butterworth writes:

American military aid to South Vietnam and Laos dropped from about $2.5 billion in 1973 to $1.6 billion in 1974 and then plunged further to a projected $700 million in 1975, half of it covering shipping costs. When Hanoi's attacks came [in March 1975, the first Northern offensive since April 1972], South Vietnam's armed forces were receiving only 2 percent of the funds and supplies American soldiers had gotten in 1968 or 1969, according to Maj. Gen. John E. Murray, the chief military administrator in Saigon in 1974 . . . .[3]

(6) In any case, the South's military was never a safe bet against the totalitarian elan of its opposite number in North, and the pro-West elements in Cambodia were even worse off. For many reasons, both American allies succumbed to Communist forces in spring 1975, while Laos was doing the same thing in a much less dramatic way.

(7) North Vietnam treated the Vietcong survivors as pesky office-seekers and unified North and South by fiat in 1976. Cambodia fell under the terror of Pol Pot and Khymer Rouge, losing perhaps two million of its population and being "rescued," in a relative sense, by Vietnam's 1979 invasion. Vietnam now had the world's third largest army (in per capita manpower) and felt strong enough, despite a collapsing economy, to taunt Red China in border skirmishes.

There was no democracy or prosperity in Laos, Cambodia or Vietnam with Americans gone. But out of sight was out of mind. The travails of America's Vietnam experience were, surprisingly, not an issue in the 1976 or 1980 elections.

Most objective students of America and its 1961-1975 Southeast Asia doings shouldn't find too much fault with the preceding sketch. No one comes out looking good, but some groups and forecasts look worse than others. It is here because this monograph needs a Vietnam framework to analyze what happened to the Democrats on the way from Truman and Kennedy to McGovern and Mondale.

□ 2000

It's also here in response to a 1982 observation by Kevin Phillips:

American public opinion toward the war was two-edged from the beginning: "Win or get out" probably summed up the feelings of the majority in 1965 and 1966. By the early 1970s, when victory no longer seemed possible, majority preference swung to a respectable egress, as represented in 1972 by Richard Nixon.

Only well after the negotiated U.S. withdrawal in January 1973, as the debris of Watergate began to accumulate, can it be said that public opinion swung (briefly, I think) and blamed Nixon, the military and conservatives for the debacle.

Here Richard Whalen and others were percipient in calling Watergate a disguised political civil war to allocate blame for the failure in Southeast Asia. It was, and from 1974 to 1976, Watergate did.

But the preliminary allocation was not permanent, and the question now is whether we can expect a reassessment . . . (O)ur political history suggests that our country's wars do not end—not their final national impact—until they've been refought in the political arena, and the refighting can go on for more than a decade.[4]

It's been ten years since those 75 Democrats entered the House thru the post-Vietnam 1974 political warp. The military debate over what worked and didn't work in Vietnam started years ago. Where's the political debate Phillips says American historical trends call for? How kind has history been to the early- and mid-70s notions of the forces that began with Nixon's collapse to take over the Democratic Party?

THEY WERE WRONG

Early adherents of the Radical worldview did make the Cold War establishment better explain what it was doing in Southeast Asia; the explanations changed all the time but at least more thought was given to them. Radicalized Democrats were asking some of what Peter Drucker calls "the right questions," because they weren't concerned with defending existing foreign policy.

But their basic assumptions were that:

Indochina would be prosperous and peaceful once the United States got out;

The situation in South Vietnam was a genuine civil war dominated by the popular and indigenous Vietcong, with only marginal aid from the North;

Area Communists were social reformers who wouldn't persecute the Buddhists and others that balked at American-backed governments there;

There would be no "bloodbath" in Cambodia or South Vietnam;

The Soviets would ultimately ditch their Vietnamese clients because they'd be too poor or strategically insignificant to sustain with foreign aid;

Hanoi would come clean about U.S. MIA's once hostilities were over.

All of these look astonishing in hindsight.

And it was to be stressed that most "hawks," from President Johnson rightward, predicted from 1965 on that these assumptions would be shredded if Communist elements ever gained absolute power.[5] In that sense the centrist establishment's worldview was vindicated by what happened in Southeast Asia, even as its bungling operations obscured its intellectual victory.[6]

But the basic assumptions of anti-Vietnam Democrats wither under the historian's microscope.

It was supposed to be different. In the spring of 1975, just as 75 Democrats were learning to work the House and the U.S. position in Southeast Asia crumbled, a piece called "Apes on a Treadmill" appeared in the New York quarterly Foreign Policy. Written by Paul Warnke, "Apes" was a paint-by-the-numbers portrait of what Vietnam should teach the U.S. about—well, about everything. Warnke's piece dispassionately sought to mummify every element of the already-gangrenous Cold War consensus.

His 1975 work sounds like a sourcebook for Democratic speeches in 1984:

I think we are spending too much on military arms and manpower and that to continue to do so worsens our economic position and jeopardizes our true national security.

Realistic recognition that we need not and cannot be the world's policeman is now quite general. But this discredited notion still has major impact on our defense policy.

Our armed forces still are tailored for use in wars of all varieties in any and all places. . . . Contemporary experience should indicate that most of the world wants none of our military intervention.

Neither we nor any other outsiders are wise enough to decide for another people the course to which their aspirations should lead them. The continuing penumbra of the illusion that somehow we know best can only blur a sound perception of our true foreign policy interests.

Today's electorate should be sophisticated enough to understand that no foreign country is ours to win or lose.

(T)he injection of American firepower into a local conflict is rarely compatible with our foreign policy interests. At a minimum, it will exponentially increase the devastation. A matching imprudence on the part of the other military superpower could engulf the world.

Vaunting rhetoric about our peacekeeping role, our worldwide commitments, the morale of our allies, control of the seas, and our indispensable leadership of the free world now awakens as much derision as respect.[7]

Maybe, but Warnke was one of the chief deriders. He spoke in 1975 as an ex-Cold Warrior anxious to launch a new consensus. He did, for the Democrats. It was based on limited involvement in the world, guilt, disarmament, contempt for imperfect allies, the hoarding of blame and the endlessly repeated notion that the U.S. is its own worst enemy.

The "apes" on the Warnke "treadmill" were the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. As in British Labor Party analyses of Britain and Germany in the mid-1930's, there was no difference between them; they were obsessed with weapons and security and the U.S. (or Britain) as the most mature of the apes could leap off the treadmill and set a positive example for the Soviets (or German Nazis).

In all other ways Warnke's expectations were quite low.

Did the American Left, broadly defined, learn anything from post-1975 events in and around Vietnam? By mid-1979 painful second thoughts were running thru parts of it.

The New Republic featured a symposium on "Vietnam—Were We Wrong?" (The contributors tended to doubt it, but at least the right question was heard.) More significantly, antiwar activist Joan Baez and 83 others ran a

full-page ad in major newspapers in May 1979 that said:

People disappear and never return. People are shipped to "reeducation centers," fed a starvation diet of stale rice, forced to squat bound wrist to ankle suffocated in connex boxes. People are used as human mine detectors, clearing live mine fields with their hands and feet. For many, life is hell and death is prayed for . . .

Baez said that fall:

I've remained totally consistent in what I've said and done—and done—loudly—for over 20 years. I opposed human-rights violations in Vietnam when the United States was there, and I oppose it now under a communist Vietnamese government. I don't have any stock in the government of Vietnam, and never did—and that's very hard for people to understand . . .

The Vietnamese government is extremely clever and has done brilliant public-relations work—even getting people from our Congress to go in and come back saying, "Hanoi's doing everything it can to stop the flow of refugees." That's very, very clever. But I hate to think what happens to the people still in Vietnam who would like to have been refugees . . .

Many Vietnamese are undergoing torture, for example. We're learning more about it from the boat people who have managed to escape from Vietnam. It gets harder and harder for people in this country to deny what's happening, but some still try to deny it . . .

The left wing doesn't want to think about it, the right wing is not human-rights oriented, and lots of people have just really had it with the word Vietnam.[8]

The year 1979 was critical in the deidealization of the Vietnamese Communists. The (precarious) existence of the boat people clouded certain fantasies. There seemed no defense for a government that would force "ethnically impure" nationals out into the South China seas to face death on rickety boats. The small portion that were saved came to the U.S. and began to tell of life under the cohorts and proteges of Ho Chi Minh.

Some of these new Americans have been Vietcong partisans, like Mrs. Hue-Tam Ho Tai. Her father founded a Trotskyite party in Vietnam and, in 1977, was put by the government in a camp to starve to death. Her aunt was a senior official in the Vietcong's makeshift government when such a front was still useful to the planners in the North. Now a history teacher at Harvard, Mrs. Ho Tai told Fox Butterfield two years ago:

During the war, people looked at the Communists and said they were dedicated, driven and omnicompetent. Now we see them as corrupt and incompetent. It was fashionable to think that a guerrilla movement needed popular support to succeed, and that if the Vietcong survived, therefore they must have popular support. You can see how wrong it was now, because the Communist certainly aren't popular in the South.[9]

Not everyone saw how wrong it was. Most elected Democrats didn't do any public rethinking.

With the uncharacteristic exception of George McGovern's 1978 call for a U.N. force to overthrow Pol Pot in Cambodia, there was little comment by prominent Democrats on the hellishness of Communist Indochina. No one apologized for being wrong. The elect Paul Warnke and his elected admirers kept drawing conclusions from Vietnam, but not from anything that happened there after the spring of 1975.

There were exceptions. TOM DOWNEY, in a House statement April 11, 1978, blamed Communist atrocities on America:

No one can deny that our involvement in Southeast Asia is a blot on our history. This is a direct result of a series of bad judgements. Bad judgement from those who got us involved. Bad judgement from those who misconceived exactly what our mission was and how to complete it once we were involved. Finally, bad judgement from those who engineered the evacuation.

(No bad judgments were attributed to anyone besides Americans.)

We are all familiar . . . with the atrocities taking place in Cambodia. Reports from refugees are continually pouring out of that country. . . . The media is reluctant to cover these reports and, despite its stance, the administration virtually ignores the horrors of Cambodia.

There seems to be a concerted effort to keep the collective American conscience guilt free. . . . (T)he United States is at least indirectly responsible for the situation of the Indochinese people. [emphasis added][10]

DOWNEY's daily labors would keep America guilt-ridden. How the U.S. is guilty for what Pol Pot's Marxists did isn't explained. DOWNEY says the U.S. must take steps to end the carnage in Cambodia. These steps turn out to be urging Red China to pressure the Khymer Rouge and having President Carter urge them to abide by the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights. This kind of thing has become Democratic diplomacy at its toughest.

The skeptical Democrats who came to Congress in 1974 or later, and had post-1974 Southeast Asia to draw conclusions from, don't appear to be skeptics about the orthodoxy of a decade ago. They do not have the intellectual consistency of Joan Baez.

The Bonkers and the Dodds spent the late 1970's inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD condemnations of Soviet persecution of individual dissidents. In this they were diligent, but Southeast Asia was off limits. They either fit Pol Pot's terror and Vietnam's poverty into their anti-U.S. framework—things wouldn't be that bad if only the U.S. has stayed out—or else they ignored it.

To reexamine what happened after the U.S. left was to question the very foundation of their worldview and purpose in political life. That was too risky.

□ 2010

In fact, the radical Democrats have taken the same arguments and moved them from Southeast Asia to Central America. They warn that America is a bumbling, evil-prone force there. They assert with conviction that the people of the region will work things out nicely if America withdraws support from its allied military forces (in and around Nicaragua, the insurrectionaries; in El Salvador, the democratically elected government). They don't see Daniel Ortega or Fidel Castro as agents of totalitarianism or of Soviet expansion (indeed, they try not to see them at all). They believe America's allies in the region are the real threat to peace and freedom.

As politicians get older, as statesmen get more seasoned, they learn from their inevitable mistakes. Too many Democrats aren't learning anything from their foreign policy mistakes; they don't seem to think they made any.

Someone asked Winston Churchill in 1940 why the British were fighting so hard against the Nazis. He said, "If we stop, you'll find out." Today's Democrats have found out little but what they don't know isn't hurting them.

NICARAGUA

In a June 1979 piece entitled "Echoes of Cuba In Nicaragua," writer Constantine Menges said:

Last August when the Sandinistas began open war against the Somoza government, an American journalist reported that the guerrillas were busy removing all the Communist literature and insignia from their hideouts . . . (T)he defeat of the Somoza army by the Sandinistas will be followed by a Cuban-type process from which the pro-Castro guerrilla leaders will emerge as the only group with real power. At present, they alone have the guns, unity and experience.[11]

This was a minority view in press and government circles. The Carter administration figured anything would be preferable to continued embarrassment by Anastasio Somoza's regime. A few weeks after the Sandinistas took power. Stephen Kinzer in the New Republic expressed the standard hopes of most liberals and Democrats have for nascent communist regimes:

The Nicaraguan movement that overthrew the government of General Anastasio Somoza was as broad a coalition as can be imagined . . . In mid-June, still in exile outside of Nicaragua, the junta issued a document promising . . . a "regime of genuine democracy, justice, and social progress that fully guarantees the rights of all Nicaraguans to political participation . . ." [The junta will probably rule from 2-4 years, then] there are supposed to be elections for a constituent assembly. That assembly will write a new constitution that probably will be based on a presidential system similar to that used in the United States . . . In foreign affairs, the junta has pledged to follow "an independent and non-aligned" policy . . .[12]

It would be almost cruel to go on quoting from the Kinzer piece, which contained not one mention of the Soviets or of Fidel Castro. There are not that many quotable comments by

elected Democrats from this period. Unlike the Southeast Asia and Angolan situations, a conservative President was not in power; it was not as easy to blame America for what was happening. Dozens of Democrats put anti-Somoza statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD thru 1978 and the first half of 1979, but they were largely satisfied with the diplomacy of Jimmy Carter, Andrew Young and Cyrus Vance, who came to see the Sandinistas as inevitable and better than what they would replace.

Kinzer in the New Republic probably spoke for the (quiet) expectations of many elected Democrats, and of President Carter. This time, they thought, a right-to-left and wrong-to-right transition had occurred and the American government was not on the losing side of progressive, historical forces.

Still, there were perfectionists. On November 1, 1979, then-Congressman CHRIS DODD put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an amazing piece by Max Holland. Holland said the Sandinistas didn't have enough sympathizers in the American press and called comparisons by the Time reporter of Nicaragua in 1979 to Cuba in 1959 ridiculous. He even chided the Washington Post for using "pejorative buzzwords" Like "Marxist government" to describe Sandinista goals. Representative DODD called Holland's analysis "enlightening and useful."[13]

Like DODD, the Carter-Mondale Administration was sympathetic to the Nicaraguan Communists their first 18 months in power. President Carter used up dwindling political capital to get an aid package thru Congress.

In the first ten weeks of the regime, the U.S. gave Nicaragua $26.5 million in emergency food and financial help. By January 1981 the figure grew to $118 million in direct bilateral aid plus a lot more thru multilateral institutions. Carter Administration statements about Nicaragua were reassuring and non-threatening.

In 1979 Representative OBEY set the standard for Radical analysis when he attacked a House minority willing to restrict Jimmy Carter's ability to get aid to Nicaragua: "The best friends the Communists and Marxists in Nicaragua have are the people in this country who are trying systematically to dismantle the President's authority to deal with that issue in a rational way." No Democrat said OBEY might be practicing a bit of McCarthyism.[14]

Reassurance also came from the House Democratic leadership. Under extreme pressure from President Carter and Majority Leader WRIGHT, the House voted 243-144 against an amendment deleting $25 million in economic aid for Nicaragua from H.R. 6942 (the FY 1981 foreign aid authorization bill). Democrats split 212-to-28 for this aid. The vote was June 5, 1980.[15]

Nicaraguan junta member Arturo Cruz Porras visited Washington the day before and made a deep impression on WRIGHT and Speaker O'NEILL. O'NEILL told the House, "Dr. Cruz was truly eloquent and convincing that the United States should not fear that Nicaragua wishes to align itself with the Soviet Union or Cuba." [16]

WRIGHT, leaving for Nicaragua in a few days, told the House June 5:

I believe that nation is capable of being saved. Let me, I appeal to you, have the tools by which I can help salvage their friendship . . .[17]

WRIGHT got his favorable vote and went to Nicaragua; Mr. OBEY had triumphed against Communism's "best friends" among the House GOP. Would the Radical world view be redeemed this time around?

THEY WERE WRONG

It didn't seem so. In 1982-83 it became fashionable for anti-Reagan Democrats to blame U.S. toughness for communizing Sandinista aspirations. They forget the Carter interlude, the U.S. aid package, and the fact that the Reagan Administration kept it going into 1982.[18] They forget what the new rulers of Nicaragua did before 1981.

It was in 1977, before they even came to power, that Sandinistas with PLO help defaced the Managua synagogue with anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli slogans.[19]

It was in summer 1979, before Reagan, that, according to one of their former intelligence agents, the Sandinistas killed 5,000 of their countrymen and forced Jews to leave the country.[20]

It was in 1979, before Reagan, that Nicaragua started conscription and began a 4-year increase in military manpower that would total 700%.

It was in late 1979, before Reagan, that Nicaragua was playing host to 200 Cuban military and security personnel.

It was in late 1979, following the traditional Marxist-Leninist pattern, that the Sandinistas made themselves more Communist than Sandinista by systematically driving the moderate, pro-West and accommodationist forces out of the coalition that had ousted Somoza.[21]

It was in summer 1980, before Reagan, that a government spokesmen said elections would have to wait until 1985, and that they'd be only to "ratify the revolution."

It's true the Reagan people came into power without high hopes for any Communist regime. What's more relevant here is that Nicaragua was giving them little hope even if they'd been of a mind to have some.

Some 15,000 Miskito Indians have been forcibly relocated, 39 of their villages destroyed by the government. Stories intended for LA PRENSA, the only open opposition paper during Somoza's last days, must go thru Sandinista censors seven hours before printing. Managua prisons are run with KGB methods, interrogators trained by Cubans with at least five years experience in the U.S.S.R. Captured counter-revolutionaries are taken to their nearest village and "vest-cut"—their arms and legs severed, causing them to bleed to death as an example to terrified townspeople. The Foreign Secretary's office in Honduras released documentation in August 1982 of over 30 attacks by Nicaraguan military personnel and agents against Honduran nationals and property in less than seven months.[22]

U.S. refugee officials talked to Nicaraguans who fled to Tilaran in Costa Rica. These refugees said this about the Nicaraguan Communist:

GARBIEL: In San Miguelito a woman, mother of two children, who attended Catholic masses, was taken from her house at midnight. They shaved her hair and cut her. All the soldiers raped her and then they cut her throat. Everyone who attends Mass is persecuted.

FIDELINA: They put my brother in his house and killed him in his own house. They left him buried in the patio of the house.

ROFINA: They killed my two sons and cut off their fingers and toes. Then they pulled their bodies behind a horse.

CECILIO: Anyone who makes an accusation is tortured and disappears together with his family. I am frightened because of this information I am giving.

EMILIA: When they arrived at my house, they made zanganadas (rude remarks). They robbed, everything, hit people, tortured. The children 12 to 15 years old were taken away, forced to join them. Those that refused had their hands destroyed one by one so that they would tell where their parents were. Then they cut their throats; they don't waste bullets on children.[23]

On July 28, 1983, four years and 29 days after his floor statement predicting "a truly democratic and representative government" after Somoza, Representative TOM HARKIN was blasting as unworthy allies the 10,000-strong "Contras," backed by the U.S. and raiding Nicaragua from outlying areas. TOM DOWNEY dubbed them "thugs, brigands, and thieves."

□ 2020

HARKIN, who by 1984 would seem the Nicaraguan Communists' firmest supporter in the House, preferred to recall the atrocities of Somoza—it's his rote response to criticism of today's Nicaragua. In his 1,000-word statement there wasn't one harsh word for the Sandinistas; Cuba and the Soviet Union weren't mentioned.

And Congressman HARKIN said this: "Now, those who say the Sandinistas are not Boy Scouts, I agree, they are not Boy Scouts. But compared to the Contras, whom we are supporting, they are Eagle Scouts." [24]

This comment came in the heat of an effort by House Democrats to cut off direct U.S. aid to insurgent Nicaraguans. An amendment to that effect by Majority Leader JIM WRIGHT was attached by voice vote (an immediate motion to recommit failing by 234–189) to the FY 1983 intelligence Authorization Act. Tho not sustained by the Senate, passing this amendment was a milestone for the Radical worldview. Samples from the Democratic side of the debate:

Representative BILL ALEXANDER:

I have heard [Republican] Members . . . defend Mr. Reagan's war in Central America. I could not help but be impressed by the perception that the ghost of Somoza walks very heavily in this Chamber. Today we are paying the price for [supporting him] and today we are trying to repeat a similar policy of militarism that would impress upon a people the will of the United States.[25]

Representative ROBERT GARCIA:

I just wonder who gives us the right to tell the people of Central America what to do and what not to do. It is not ours to win or lose. Central America belongs to the Central Americans. . . . (I)t is important that we do debate this issue, because today we may just be starting the next world war.[26]

Representative HOWARD WOLPE:

(W)e have supported time and time again rightwing dictatorships that have been violative of the rights of the people, that have been protective of a few land-owning families maintained in power with the support of rightwing military groups. In Chile, in Guatemala, in El Salvador, that has been the pattern of American response. . . .[27]

Representative RON DELLUMS:

The Reagan Administration's covert war against the government of Nicaragua is clearly illegal. It is yet another example of the cowboy mentality of the President and the CIA.[28]

Representative DON BONKER:

Twenty-five years ago, we Americans experienced considerable discomfort with Castro coming to power and the installation of a Communist government next to our borders. Did that in itself threaten our security? Castro has failed miserably in seeking to export his revolution in the intervening years.[29]

Representative NORM MINETA (D-Calif.):

How did we get so enmeshed in the Vietnam War? The answer is that the political leadership of both parties failed this country. Let us not fail the American people again. If Congress fails to stop the President, we will share responsibility for this new, open-ended, and unnecessary war. Let us avoid deceiving ourselves again.[30]

Representative JAMES OBERSTAR (D-Minn.) recounted human rights violations by El Salvador's government, ignoring the free elections that produced it and calling it one of "colonels." Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR (D-Ohio) hinted that her son, soon to turn 18, would not serve in the much-feared, oft-predicted and perpetually-unlikely U.S. invasion of Nicaragua. Representative BILL RATCHFORD (D-Conn.) of Connecticut blamed U.S. policies for everything wrong in the region.[31]

With the exception of chief deputy majority whip ALEXANDER, elected in 1968, all these Congressman came to Washington in 1974 or later. In foreign policy debates, they lead the Democratic advance against policies of the realistic center. The tone differed but the key themes were all there on July 28, 1983:

The U.S. is to blame for the sins of both right-wing and left-wing governments. This is another Vietnam we're getting into. Existing Communist governments in the region pose no effective threat to us. We are playing God with peaceful people who'd work things out harmoniously if we would only leave. Our allies in El Salvador are horrible people who don't deserve our support, and the Communists in Nicaragua are trying to do some good things.

FOOTNOTES TO PART TWO

[1] Kevin Phillips wrote two years ago: "Today, as ten years ago, the left-liberal case against the war derived no small validity from the lies and misrepresentations of both the Johnson and the Nixon Administrations, to say nothing of inept military tactics (like defoliation). Moreover, many military officers came to regard Vietnam as a tour of duty to be milked in every way for current and future promotion." (*Post-Conservative America*, p. 171.)

[2] White, p. 236.

[3] Fox Butterfield, "The New Vietnam Scholarship," *The New York Times Magazine:* February 13, 1983, p. 57.

[4] Kevin Phillips, *Post-Conservative* America (New York: Vintage Books, 1982), p. 167.

[5] One of the few Western authorities on North Vietnam, Prof. P.J. Honey, wrote in the *London Telegraph* April 16, 1975:

"The Vietnamese Communists are not a group of idealistic bare-foot peasants fighting with rudimentary home-made weapons to free Vietnam from foreign domination, or lovers of peace reluctantly forced into using violence against corrupt compatriots, sustained by American dollars, who are oppressing the Vietnamese nation . . .

"They are an aggressive expansionist movement who already control North Vietnam and the greater portion of the three neighboring states of Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam. They are the Prussians of the Southeast Asia who, despite their strictures on the South Vietnamese for accepting American aid, themselves depend wholly on Russia, China and the rest of the Communist bloc for military and economic supplies.

"They subject the North Vietnamese people to one of the lowest living standards in the world so that their armies may engage in military conquest abroad . . ."

[6] Phillips again: "Centrist liberals gave the war its essential shape—a computerized, politically restrained attempt to apply limited military power. If the conflict in Indochina was the first American war to be fully condemned by the university community and the intelligentsia, it was also the first to be largely blueprinted by people within these same circles" (p. 169).

[7] Paul Warnke, "Apes On A Treadmill," *Foreign Policy:* Spring 1975, pp. 12-29.

[8] "Joan Baez On Why Performers Should Speak Out," *U.S. News & World Report:* October 1, 1979, p. 36.

[9] Butterfield, p. 29.

[10] Rep. Tom Downey, "Southeast Asia—Which Way To A Clear Conscience?" *Congressional Record:* April 11, 1978, p. 9714

[11] Constantine C. Menges, "Echoes Of Cuba In Nicaragua," *Chicago Tribune:* June 29, 1979. He also said:

"In 1957, as Castro's guerrilla band of several hundred seemed to be succeeding and gained favorable press attention, Castro issued the Manifesto of the Sierra Maestra which proclaimed the goal of 'truly free, democratic, impartial elections.'

"It also proposed a Civilian Revolutionary Front consisting of all opposition parties and groups. Their task would be to 'hold general elections at the end of one year according to the Constitution of 1940.'

"It worked. Batista was isolated politically, there was no separate, independent organization of democratic, reformist groups, and Castro kept tight control over the military force within his 'coalition.'

"After his victory, Castro established a totalitarian regime far more repressive than the one he had overthrown and became a bridgehead for political warfare against both the democracies and dictatorships of Latin America."

[12] Stephen Kinzer, "Meet The Junta," *The New Republic:* August 4 & 11, 1979, pp. 16-17.

[13] Rep. Chris Dodd, "Analyzing the Sandinista Revolution In Nicaragua," *Congressional Record:* November 1, 1979, pp. E-5420-21.

[14] As quoted in the 1979 *Congressional Quarterly Almanac*, p. 263.

[15] *Congressional Quarterly:* June 7, 1980, p. 1604.

[16] *Congressional Record:* June 5, 1980, p. H-4572.

[17] *Congressional Record:* June 5, 1980, p. H-4564.

[18] The U.S. gave $59.8 million in total economic assistance to Nicaragua in 1981, and $6.3 million in 1982. State Dept. report to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, February 1984, p. 649.

[19] Richard Araujo, *"The Sandinista War On Human Rights,"* Heritage Backgrounder, p. 5.

[20] Ibid., p. 2.

[21] Araujo, pp. 4-5.

[22] "News From Honduras: Account of Sandinista Aggressions In Honduran Territory," Directorate of Information And Press: August 23, 1982.

[23] "Refugees Flee Nicaragua, Tell Of Sandinista Atrocities," *Washington Times:* January 26, 1984.

[24] *Congressional Record:* July 28, 1983, p. H-5857.

[25] Ibid., p. H-5831.

[26] Ibid., p. H-5855.

[27] Ibid., p. H-5855.

[28] Ibid., p. H-5819.

[29] Ibid., p. H-5871.

[30] Ibid., p. H-5871.

[31] Oberstar, p. H-5859. Oakar, pp. H-5860-61. Ratchford, pp. H-5872-73.

ISSUES INVOLVED IN FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is useful before I begin to explain to those who might be watching at this point on C-SPAN that what happens from time to time in this House is that Members who are perhaps more interested in making a political point than speaking truth decide to follow an approach which brings into question not only Members' judgment but their patriotism.

I think the oldest of philosophies in the world, the oldest of political philosophies and the sickest, is that the end justifies the means. And I suppose that today's modern descendants of Joe McCarthy may be a little bit prettier and a little bit more skilled in the use of television; they are certainly no less comfortable in the use of innuendo than was the late Senator from my own State.

I think the most constructive thing that can be done of the night before we get into consideration in earnest of the foreign aid bill which will determine what the policy of this country ought to be toward Central America and Nicaragua, is to simply discuss what kind of issues we are going to be dealing with this week, trying to do so

not in a partisan fashion with a bloodlust aimed at the next election, but simply aimed at what I hope will be a thoughtful analysis of how we defend the interests of this country in Central America.

There are two issues that we will deal with this week. One is what is the validity of their country's policy toward Central America and especially toward El Salvador and Nicaragua? And, second, what is the best and most constructive manner in which Congress can affect the conduct and the content of that policy?

The issue is not as some perpetual sophomores in this House would have you believe, not as some fervent ideologues would have you believe; the issue is not whether the United States should be defending our interests in Central America; the issue is how we best and most skillfully defend those interests.

Do we do it in ways that will be effective or do we do it in ways that will backfire and make it easier for Marxists to take over and expand their influence in the region?

I, for one, recognize that there can be only one foreign policy at a time and that is the policy which is enunciated by the administration, whichever administration happens to be in power, under the laws enacted by the Congress.

And that is the key phrase, "Under the laws enacted by the Congress," because we elect Presidents not to be kings; we elect Presidents to faithfully follow the laws that are passed by the U.S. Congress.

Some in the administration feel that the proper role of Congress is simply to speak out if you support the administration's policy and be silent if you do not. That will never happen in this country and I would suggest that it never has.

Members of Congress have a right and a duty to discuss their views openly; not only about domestic questions but about foreign policy questions as well.

George Washington stated it best when he stated as follows:

> If men are to be precluded from offering their sentiments on a matter which may involve the most alarming and serious consequences that can invite the consideration of mankind, reason is then of no use to us; then freedom of speech may be taken away and dark and silent we may be led like sheep to the slaughter.

We will be asked this week to authorize for further appropriations $1.04 billion for economic and military assistance to Central America, more than $420 million of this is for military and economic aid to El Salvador.

There will be essentially three options before us on the issue of aid to Central America. A number of us who have opposed the administration's policy on Central America have made it quite clear that money, itself, is not the issue. We of course do not want to waste money on anything. But if we thought that the funds were going to support a policy which had a reasonable chance of success, reasonable chance of working, we would be foolish not to support it.

There are a number of problems, however, in working your way toward support for the administration's present policy.

□ 2030

No. 1 is that you have to be a double genius to figure out what that administration policy really is.

The administration implies, for instance, that change in reform have continued in El Salvador since the coup of 1979. The recent election is evidently the high point in this continuous strain of progress. But those who have been following El Salvador for a number of years—and I have for the over 10 years that I have served on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee—seen a somewhat different situation.

Many of the original reformers in the El Salvadoran Government are gone. The reform officers are no longer in power. People like Viera, who headed the land reform program, are now dead and there is little chance that his killers, who also killed two U.S. labor advisers, will be brought to justice, despite Mr. Duarte's victory.

I want to say that I have tremendous respect for Mr. Duarte. I think he does have guts and courage and I think he does have the right instinct. But despite his victory, it is the army and the security forces who up until now are the ones who have held real power, regardless of who has occupied various political offices in El Salvador.

Military officers like Mr. Carranza, head of the Treasury police. His removal some years ago was regarded as a sign of progress. He is now back in a higher position than before and yet we are told that the continuum of progress continues.

The real question that has to be asked is this: Can we expect change and reform from the very people in El Salvador who made change and reform necessary in the first place and who are most influential in opposing the kind of constructive change that would give democratic forces in El Salvador a real opportunity to survive?

The administration says it is serious about putting an end to the death squads. And yet at the end of last year, Vice President Bush gave a proper and I thought very useful speech on that subject in El Salvador. And Ambassador Pickering carried the same message to El Salvadoran authorities.

Yet, the same time, President Reagan publicly expressed doubt that the death squads were related to the rightwing and speculated that they in fact were connected elsewhere, despite significant testimony given to the countrary to our committee and others.

You cannot speak with one voice in El Salvador and another voice here and expect to be believed if you are running the foreign policy of the United States. And yet that has been the case with this administration in the case of that issue.

On the subject of negotiations. The administration claims it supports the efforts of the Contadora countries who are seeking diplomatic solutions to the crises in Central America.

But veteran observers, including Mr. Sol Linowitz, whose patriotism, I trust, is without question, who has represented this district in a number of forums with great expertise and great distinction over the years in both the Middle East and Central America, Mr. Linowitz told our subcommittee 2 weeks ago that:

> Leaders in Central America believe we are only giving Contadora lip service. That we are saying the right things, but not undertaking the right actions.

The second problem we have in trying to weave our way toward support of administration policy is that we believe that the administration is relying on the most optimistic assumptions possible about our ability to influence the outcome of that problem through military means without a concurrent effective and equally strong and equally strongly pursued policy on the negotiation side. I have no idea whether the rebels in El Salvador would negotiate. I suspect that many, perhaps even most of them, would not. I suspect some of them would if they had their druthers.

But the important thing for our national interests is that we put them to the test. If negotiations lead nowhere, if negotiations prove impossible to pursue, I want history's record to show that it was not the United States who was responsible in any way for the failure of those negotiations. I want the responsibility to be squarely on the back of the rebels.

Unless we actively pursue a policy of negotiations, history will not show that fact.

People raise human rights issues. They raise the nuns' case. They raise land reform. I am concerned about all of those. But, very frankly, in the last analysis in terms of our ability to defend this nation's interests, none of those are as important as making clear to the world that the United States is not just mouthing, but is also actively seeking efforts to achieve a negotiation with whomever would negotiate on the subject.

We are strongly handicapped by 80 years of bad history and bad policy in that part of the world. And if our policy appears to be a continuation of

that history where we continue to simply prop up governments, no matter how ineffectual they prove to be, or no matter how oppressive they prove to be, simply because they are friendly to us in the short term, we will lose in the long term. And that means that we have to avoid putting ourselves in the position where we can be pictured as opponents of negotiation.

We also have a problem when we are told that our commitment to a diplomatic solution is in doubt. As Mr. Linowitz again told the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, leaders in Latin America and Central America do not believe that the United States is committed to the Contadora countries. They will say publicly because they are polite people, Mr. Linowitz said, that we are pursuing that policy, but privately they will indicate their strong concerns otherwise.

No realistic person believes, at least I hope not, that a policy of negotiations alone has a chance of working. We need both a military strategy, an economic strategy, and concurrently a political and negotiations strategy to go along with it. But a policy of reliance, first and foremost, on military and economic aid and only second on negotiations will not work either.

So the question arises: What is the proper way for Members of Congress who disagree with the administration policy to deal with this issue?

I personally believe it is a bad idea for Congress to try to administer foreign policy from Capitol Hill. I simply do not think it can be done.

I know too many Members in this Chamber well enough to believe that they would make intelligent Secretaries of State. But the fact is that no President can run foreign policy on a controversial issue for any significant length of time without having the assent and the active support of a broad-based philosophical coalition among both the American people and the Congress itself.

What we need to do is try to find a way to achieve that coalition through definition of policy which will make it easier for that coalition to form so that whatever policy is followed by any administration it is sustainable not through just one administration, but through a number of administrations, be they Republican or Democrat.

I hate the idea of Congress trying to establish conditions under which the President will be allowed to grant aid. But if there are basic differences between the branches of Government, the Congress has no choice but to try and impose those conditions.

And the test of an administration is how skillfully it can create a coalition before bills like this are voted on so that the need to establish those conditions is eliminated or reduced.

□ 2040

If Congress does object or does have great misgivings about where the administration's policy will lead in terms of security and good fortune of this country, the question is how we express that in the most constructive way.

What this country needs is for the administration—any administration—to put together that broad-based coalition before the fact. Leaders of various factions of the Congress need to be brought together with the administration to work out a strategy which can be sustained long term. It is not possible and it is not smart for an administration to simply think they can get by by appointing mostly like-minded—not all, but mostly like-minded—people to a commission which you know would give you the results which you were looking for in the first place. You have to do more than simply find enough ideological soulmates on the opposite side of the aisle who will go along with your policy. What you have to do is try to work out a more broad-based policy than that. That is what is missing, and that is why Congress is stuck with the miserable and regrettable job of trying to decide under what conditions it will provide money that the President may send to Central America.

I intend to support the committee's version of aid to Central America and their conditions for Central America, but I am frankly very uncomfortable with the committee approach. It is appropriate, although regrettable, for the committee to set out conditions which Congress feels would define the elements of a successful policy and upon which future appropriations would be based. However, I must say that I have grave doubts about the long-term wisdom of going one step further and saying that after the administration has certified that those conditions exist that the Congress must pass another resolution verifying that the President has been honest.

I understand why that has come into being, I understand why the committee has produced those conditions. The Congress has no choice but to require conditions when they have lost trust in the willingness of the administration to carry out policy which is broadly understood and broadly supported.

So I understand why the committee has produced those conditions. But I nonetheless think that it may cause problems down the line. I frankly think it would be preferable to deal with the issue through the power of the purse. Rather than spelling out conditions, I would personally prefer that the Congress would simply make a collective judgment about whether or not the administration's policy contains the required elements for success. If it does not, in my judgment Congress ought to deny all funds for that policy until it changes so that it does have a reasonable opportunity for success. That is a drastic last step that should only be taken if you are convinced that the administration's policy is disastrous for this country and ill-serves our interest over the long term, and I believe we are at that point today.

But the committee has acted in a different way, and so we have these three choices before us this week.

The major alternative to the committee choice is the Broomfield amendment which, in my judgment, presents worse problems even than the committee proposal because what that proposal really says is that there will be no effective direction at all from this Congress and no effective limits at all on administration or Presidential policy in Central America.

We would be giving almost all of the money based on mere certification, even though it has been demonstrated that the certification process itself has been virtually ineffective.

So given what a number of us feel is the absolute certainty of the failure of American policy to effectively defend our national interests, we feel that we cannot in good conscience provide the administration's request, which is what the Broomfield amendment does.

So in my judgment the best thing for us to do at this point would be to pass the committee bill and then use the language in the committee bill as a lever to try to persuade the administration before it is too late to try to work out a truly bipartisan and truly cross philosophy support for its policy in that region of the world. If we do not reach that point, then it seems to me that Congress ought to deal with the issue on the appropriation vehicle which comes before us and refuse all further appropriations beyond the authorized committee amount until such a bipartisan agreement is worked out.

It seems to me that that would be far preferable to giving the administration carte blanche, given the miserable record of success in that part of the world.

I think it is useful to note that in January 1981, shortly before this administration took office, the El Salvadoran rebels began what they referred to as their final offensive. At that time we had provided virtually nothing by way of military aid to the El Salvadoran Government. Today, after we have provided more than a quarter of a billion dollars in military assistance to El Salvador, the rebels are stronger than before, and our chances of success in El Salvador are less than they were at the time that this administration took office.

It seems to me that we ought to follow the committee recommendations on administration policy for the

moment, to give us more time to try to work out that bipartisan coalition which the administration says it wants.

I do think it is also useful to take just a moment to analyze the request that has been made by the President and some of his allies for a bipartisan support for the administration's existing policy.

I listened to the words of these new bipartisanites, and I wonder where they were when the previous administration was negotiating a Panama Canal Treaty which was supported by every previous administration before the Carter administration, going back some 20 years. I wonder what those new-born bipartisanites were thinking in the days when they were supporting amendments on the floor of this House which would have prevented, if passed, the administration from negotiating a Panama Canal Treaty.

I note, for instance, that on September 24, 1975, on a motion to recommit the conference report on the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill, that we had an amendment prohibiting funds for the State Department even negotiating on the Panama Canal. Some of the same forces who suggest today that the administration's and only the administration's position on negotiations ought to be supported are some of the same forces who were trying to preclude by legislative action any ability of the administration to negotiate the question of the Panama Canal. There were 68 percent of the Republicans who voted against even giving the administration the right to negotiate.

I question whether their new-found bipartisan desires are in fact bipartisan or whether they are underlaid by something else.

□ 2050

I notice a series of other amendments on Zimbabwe on June 28, 1979. There was an amendment to terminate the administration's policy of existing sanctions on Rhodesia and again we had a majority of Republicans supporting that amendment.

President Reagan just visited Communist China, now known politely as the People's Republic of China, I guess. This new-found interest in the People's Republc of China on the part of the President was certainly not in evidence on the Republican side of the aisle when, on March 13, 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act which made it possible for relations to open up with the Mainland Chinese and which, in turn, made it possible for President Reagan to visit that country in the first place, that bill when before us found 98 Republicans opposing it versus 51 on a motion to strike the enacting clause, which guts the bill, including a number of persons who often take special orders to talk at great length about the need for Congress to support the President's policy.

It seems to me that it is important for us to support the President's policy only if it is a conservative President's policy, or only if it is a Republican President's policy.

I do want to say something else. The Broomfield amendment will be before the House tomorrow, and undoubtedly that will receive a good deal of support from the Republican side of the aisle. It seems to me that if that amendment passes, then the Members on this side of the aisle have an obligation to do what they have so rarely done in the past, which is to provide a majority in support of the foreign assistance bill.

It seems to me that if the Broomfield amendment passes, which lays out the priorities as seem on that side of the aisle, then that side of the aisle has the obligation to provide a majority of votes for passage.

I can recall being on this floor time and time again, given my responsibilities as ranking Democrat on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, trying to achieve passage of foreign assistance bills under both the Ford and the Carter administration. I remember how difficult it was to get some, in fact most, of the Members on the minority side of the aisle to support those initiatives at that time. Today we are told that the foreign aid bill takes only 1½ percent of the Federal budget, and even less of the gross national product, so we ought to support it without question. But when we had a different administration, under different circumstances, I did not see a flock of votes from that side of the aisle to support the administration's foreign aid bill.

If it is true that foreign assistance is just another technique to defend the national interest of the United States, then regardless of how unpopular it is domestically, it seems to me that people have an obligation to support that legislation be there a Republican President or a Democratic President.

So I urge everyone who is considering voting for the Broomfield amendment tomorrow to face the fact that if that passes, they have a leadpipe cinch obligation to then vote to support on final passage the entire bill, because it will mean that their priorities, not the priorities on this side of the aisle, are in fact the priorities spelled out in that bill, and that will require a higher sense of obligation than I have seen evidenced on that side of the aisle, by the majority at least on that side of the aisle, on most occasions on which we have had a foreign aid bill on the floor.

We have had marvelous bipartisan support from some Republicans in this House, but that cannot be said of a majority, and I think that Members ought to remember that before they cast their votes on the Broomfield amendment tomorrow.

CONCERN NOT FOR SELF, BUT FOR OTHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 28, 1984, at the annual dinner of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, Southern Association, held at the Hall of the Americas in Washington, DC, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. James D. Watkins, delivered the principal address. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the timely and cogent remarks of Admiral Watkins, which follow:

CONCERN NOT FOR SELF, BUT FOR OTHERS

Let me take you back to a moment in recent history which I shall not soon forget. I want to share with you my feelings about the tragedy which occurred only last fall in Beirut, Lebanon, on Sunday morning, October 23rd—feelings which will continue to guide my life as I attempt to serve both God and world community.

It was on this morning that a terrorist, in a bomb-laden truck, took the lives of two hundred and forty-one brave young Americans, and in so doing reawakened this Nation to the terrible crime of international terrorism; its cost in individual lives, its toll in national suffering.

Events of this tragic day were best summarized, not by official report or investigatory commission, but by one of our rabbi chaplains, Lieutenant Commander Resnicoff, who witnessed not only the darkness and pain of Beirut, but the love and spirit of those sailors and marines to whom he administered there.

Rabbi Resnicoff wrote about a friend of his, a Protestant chaplain, who was pulled from the ruin that was once a concrete-reinforced headquarters building.

And as this young chaplain was pulled from the carnage—after being trapped beneath tons of concrete for over four hours—his body wracked with pain and still unsure of his own condition, his first words were to ask how his clerk was. Like so many of the men saved that day, Rabbi Resnicoff wrote, this survivor asked first about others.

This is the same spirit of love we Knights of Malta have pledged to promote, live and share—the heritage of love and brotherhood we celebrate tonight. This is a legacy of service and devotion rendered by the Sovereign Military Order of Malta for the past nine centuries. This is the hope for our Nation and the free world.

So the Beirut tragedy is not only about fear, or frustration, or death, but can be a symbol of loving spirit and strength; a living testimony to our great potential as Americans with special God-given gifts which can make a difference in a grief-stricken world.

Still, we are constantly asked by others—how can we make a difference? What can we do to influence a world so beset by problems, plagued by fear and hunger and pain and a thousand other maladies of our times?

The answer is already within each of us, as laborers working to extend God's love to

those in need. Now we must show the same moral courage and strength as those young men who asked not about themselves, but about the condition of others—we must perform the same work as our order's founder who cared for sick and needy pilgrims reaching the Holy Land. It is this same spirit of love, care and concern which we must apply to difficult problems we face today.

And this will not be easy, for our road is strewn with thorns and pitfalls and barricades—the social litter left by those who espouse evil and treachery.

In the face of such litter, we must display courage—we must act in accordance with our moral convictions. We must not be fashioned by events, but rather shape them for the future good of civilization. We can do this through helping freedom-loving and God-fearing people—who are like those pilgrims struggling toward the Holy Land—whenever and wherever we find them. This is our destiny.

In this regard, we can take comfort in, and are also challenged by, words of our Pontiff, who recently told our new envoy to Rome, "I cannot fail to express my conviction that the condition of today's world depends in great measure on the way the United States exercises her global mission of service to humanity."

In this task, in our exercise of our global mission to humanity, each of us is asked to contribute in our own special way. Yet each of our individual efforts will unite, through our common beliefs, to form a singleness of purpose and spirit. We all share a common goal of doing Christ's work by generously giving of ourselves, our prayers and our toils.

One of my recent contributions was forged out of Lebanon's tragedy. Six days after the bombing in Beirut, I participated in a ceremony at Dover Air Force Base in Delaware which inspired a course change in my life. At barely 7 a.m. on a Saturday morning, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Kelley and I stood with families of some of the Beirut fallen. On this sad day we witnessed arrival of the first fifteen bodies of those who had died in Beirut. As I stood before those flag draped coffins, I told those present:

"For anyone to die as the result of a cowardly act of faceless terrorism leaves each of us outraged and diminished. For so many to lose their lives both saddens us and makes us determined to ensure that those brave men did not die in vain. Now I would hope that Americans would strive, on an urgent basis, to build a new and enlightened national strategy, to deal with the insidious * * * practices of individuals, and their supporting governments, that would condone such acts of violence as their principal tool of political persuasion. For the sake of those who died, and those who continue to serve, we must do this."

Later, on a somber helicopter flight back to Washington, I talked with military chaplains who had shared this sad homecoming with me. We talked not only of past events, but of the future of our Nation. We talked about morality, and discussed ways to deal with terrorism within our Christian tradition. We talked about dealing with evil without succumbing to evil ways.

Since then, I have discussed the topic of terrorism with many people—military leaders and civilians, chaplains and lawyers, ethicists and philosophers. I knew I had to come to grips personally with this threat to humanity, so that I could better perform my duties both as a military leader sworn to defend this great nation, and as a man concerned with the proper, moral response to evil. I felt I also had this responsibility, as a fellow knight, and laborer in the name of Christian Ethics.

Again I was reminded of this responsibility, when on Easter Sunday Pope John Paul II, addressing one of the largest crowds ever to fill St. Peter's Square, said that the "universal desire for the dignity of man and for his rights" struggles against "brutal force of arrogance and violence, of oppression of consciences, of torture and terrorism."

But talking about my responsibilities, on this podium, detached from real-world considerations, is easy and doesn't get me any closer to correctly answering my challenge to serve Christ by serving others. I must take my ideals into a world where terrorism flourishes, a world where there are foreign powers who do not share our Nation's zeal to protect as sacred the worth, freedom and dignity of each human being.

So I have found it not to be an easy task; for terrorism—like so many other modern problems—does not lend itself to simplistic "either/or" decisions. It is a complex subject and decisions in the making are less between absolutes of entirely good or dead wrong, than they are between subtle nuances which make up the best possible course of action considering world realities.

In my search for answers to difficult questions, I selected as a starting point the majority's acceptance of the basic right to defend against unjust aggression. I believe as long as evil and danger persists, a people shouldn't be denied the right of lawful self-defense, once all peace efforts have failed. This is a lawful obligation of peace-loving nations.

But lawful rights constitute only one side of the question. For a legal action, even in our society, is not necessarily a moral action. And, what constitutes a proper legal defense against terrorism, is not necessarily a moral response to terrorism. Then these questions are multiplied a hundred fold when we take the terrorism question outside of our own national experience, and put it into an international setting.

The resultant solution is further complicated by the fact that it is difficult, almost impossible, to develop a universal definition of terrorism upon which all can agree. Whereas an American might see terrorism as random acts of violence, or threats of violence, usually committed against innocent victims to evoke fear, and usually undertaken to effect political objectives, a radical Shiite extremist might see terrorism as a justifiable extension of the "war of liberation."

At this point, as a United States military leader, I too, like you, put myself before God and pray for His help and guidance. I then do the best I can with choices at hand.

But I am not without answers; for I believe a Christian upbringing from which my moral conviction springs can help guide the way. In this, I am further guided by words of a great man of our time, newly installed Archbishop of New York John J. O'Conner, who writes that terrorism is one of the offenses against life which is fast becoming accepted as moral behavior.

In his classic work, In Defense of Life, the Archbishop said—"it is impossible for peace to flourish where the safety of life is compromised in this way. Where violence rages, true peace ends."

So it is this compromise of the safety of life, which I consider to be at the core of the most heinous acts of terrorism.

And what then should be our response? Can we attack bases where terrorists' bombs are made? Can we attack the base or country supplying materials and money to the terrorists? What is the moral response to such criminal actions?

From my studies, I believe that in particular circumstances, provided very specific conditions are met, it can be moral to preempt a probable terrorist attack. I say this with all the caveats that must be followed, such as:

We must have just cause to believe we are threatened.

We must base our decision upon competent authority.

If military action is deemed necessary, then it must be one of last resort—we must try all other alternatives to stop the terrorist's act before we revert to a preemptive move.

We must have reasonable hope of success before we take preemptive actions. Otherwise, risk of life involved would not be acceptable.

And we must foresee more good than evil in all our actions.

I believe these principles must be followed in forming a moral response to terrorism. I believe we must take counteraction when threatened and, by so doing, exercise our global mission of service to humanity. We cannot afford to speak in grand terms about morality and Western World leadership if we lack conviction to stand by those words with firm and responsible action. To quote Shakespeare, we cannot "speak in a monstrous little voice," which can only be viewed as a legal course of action, surely not a moral course of action for America.

Put another way, we should work to make terrorist acts so counter-productive and costly, or seem so costly, that potential perpetrators will think twice before conducting, or threatening to conduct, terrorist acts. In fact, a retaliatory act carried out for its deterrent effect may, under carefully controlled circumstances, be moral.

Does that mean we should always take a military response? No! Fight fire with fire if you will? Not at all. We could and should link with our allies and friends to deal with this emerging form of unconventional warfare using diplomatic moves, political pressures, trade barriers and isolation of nations who use, sponsor or condone terrorism. And this is just the beginning.

I say this with great determination—a determination that American force should never be used haphazardly; should never be used without first thinking through and exhausting every other possible action available. In my opinion, we should never adopt principles expounded by those we seek to thwart, that is, to return action to kind for kind. I know our course is sound, for we do not seek to destroy our enemies, but to protect rights and freedoms of peaceful people.

This is the basis for my moral and ethical thoughts about terrorism. I believe I can and must face these difficult questions both as a Knight of Malta, entrusted with the emblem of the cross to prevent spread of man's inhumanity to man; and as a responsible citizen of a nation which has the capability to defend others less fortunate than ourselves.

This is what my oath of office is all about. This is my responsibility to the moral, freedom-loving peoples of the world. This is my responsibility to those brave men who died in Beirut on October 23rd.

So this is the vocation I have chosen for myself to best answer the call we all receive,

the call to serve God by serving others. In so doing, perhaps I, too, can be more like those brave young men in Beirut, whose first concern was not for self, but for others.

Again, it was Rabbi Resnicoff who best described this brotherhood of love and devotion when he wrote—"(While) working with the wounded—sometimes comforting, and simply letting them know help was on the way * * *—my kippa was lost. The last I remember it, I had used it to mop someone's brow. Father Pucciarelli, the Catholic chaplain, cut a circle of camouflage cloth out of his only cap, a piece of material which would become my temporary head-covering * * * somehow, we both wanted to shout * * * in a land where people were killing * * * at least partially based on differences in religions * * * that we—we Americans—still believed we could be proud of our particular religions, and yet work side by side when the time came to help others, to comfort, to ease pain."

This is the courage and selfless love which comes naturally to so many, like my brothers in arms, and you in this special fraternity of caring knights.

So, I would hope you can accept me, a military man, as one equally committed to our sovereign order's special mission of service to all mankind, providing comfort to the sick and solace to those suffering the world's pain.

Thank you and God bless.●

LEGISLATION AMENDING THE INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would amend the Indian Self-Determination Act, originally enacted in 1973. This act was passed in order to help Indian tribes achieve self-determination by allowing the tribes to enter into contracts with the United States in order to assume the administration of governmental programs previously administered by the Federal Government for the benefit of Indians.

The successful administration of these programs, however, demands that an adequate amount of funds be spent on indirect or overhead costs. The Indian tribes, lacking adequate means of raising revenues through taxation, have been looking to the United States in order to find the necessary funds to cover these indirect costs.

The act currently states that the amount of funds provided under a contract shall be not less than what would have been provided for the direct operation of the program by the United States. It has become obvious however since the act was passed that a tribe's indirect costs for the operation of a program tend to be generally higher than what the Federal Government's costs would have been in administering the same program.

Because the current language is unclear and somewhat vague, some tribes are afraid that if not enough funds are provided in order to cover these indirect costs, they will have to use direct program moneys in order to do so. In the alternative, tribes in order to not sacrifice much needed program funds may have to cancel the contracts and allow the Federal Government to reassume the administration of these programs. This, of course, would be contrary to the very spirit and intent of the Indian Self-Determination Act.

The legislation I am introducing today will clarify the law and make sure that the tribes are given an adequate and reasonable amount of funds in order to cover the indirect costs associated with these self-determination contracts.●

THE NEED FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, congressional action on the problem of undocumented aliens is clearly in the public interest and H.R. 1510, the Immigration Reform and Control Act, is an effort to carry out this Nation's constitutional responsibility to control its borders.

All public opinion polls clearly demonstrate that the American people are overwhelmingly in support of immigration reform and most polls indicate that employer sanctions are supported by a significant majority of the Hispanic community.

There has been a definite consensus for some time on the part of all policy makers who have closely studied this problem that employer sanctions, coupled with stronger border enforcement, are the most humane and effective way to stem the influx of undocumented aliens.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post suggests that employer sanctions "provide an effective, orderly and dignified alternative to large-scale raids and roundups." In fact, the Supreme Court, which for almost a decade has wrestled with the various civil liberty issues associated with interior apprehension efforts, has on several occasions called on Congress to enact employer sanctions.

While I clearly recognize that H.R. 1510 does not fully satisfy all people, there comes a time when the national interest must outweigh geographical concerns and the parochial, special interests of the various groups lobbying against this legislation.

I wish to insert into the Record following my remarks, a New York Times editorial discussing the Hispanic perspective on this legislation and the Washington Post editorial to which I referred earlier.

[The New York Times, Friday, Apr. 20, 1984]

HISPANIC VOTES VS. PUBLIC INTEREST

Citing their painfully won knowledge of discrimination, Hispanic groups have mobilized against the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration reform bill and the Democratic Presidential candidates have rushed thirstily to their side. What a sad mistake for all concerned.

For one thing, the effort will not help all Hispanics but might well cost a million or more of them something priceless: legal status.

Worse, the effort pits parochial special interest against the general interest—and against fairness. It's fairness, most of all, that's offered by the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, which has twice passed the Senate resoundingly and is almost all the way home in the House. And fairness is the best reason for Congress now to finish the job.

Simpson-Mazzoli represents a carefully balanced political bargain. It would legalize illegal aliens already in this country, freeing them from a cloud of exploitation and fear of discovery, fear so strong some won't call the police even after robbery or rape.

At the same time, Simpson-Mazzoli would finally make it illegal for an employer to hire illegal workers. Thus turning off the economic magnets would probably be the most effective thing America can do to regain control of its borders. Closing the back door would relieve mounting pressure to close the front door to legal immigration. The pressure is so strong that there are now urgent calls in Congress to halve the number of legal immigrants from around the world.

Legalization and employer sanctions can probably only be enacted as a package. Hispanic groups, however, embrace the sweet and scorn the sour. They call for even more generous legalization while denouncing employer sanctions, arguing that these would make employers reluctant to hire anyone who looks Hispanic, legal or not. It's a hard argument to follow. Employers already face labor shortages. Under Simpson-Mazzoli, they'd find it harder, if anything, to locate workers; they'd have every reason not to discriminate.

In place of employer sanctions, the Hispanic groups endorse a bill sponsored by Representative Edward Roybal of California. It calls for hiring many more Border Patrolmen. But that would have pallid enforcement effect compared with employer sanctions, and it's something the Administration proposes doing anyway. The Hispanic alternative is no alternative at all.

More understandable than the public arguments against Simpson-Mazzoli is the not-so-public belief among Hispanics who have made it to the Promised Land that they must not betray those yet to come—indeed, must protect the illegal path. It's a humane, even admirable feeling. Yet it collides with something else humane: equity.

There are millions, all over the world, who also want to enter the Promised Land. Hispanic groups speak passionately for "undocumented workers" yet to come from Mexico. But who speaks for the millions waiting patiently elsewhere? To tolerate a continued illegal tide sorely tries American patience with all foreign migrants.

By any standard of decency, it's wrong to favor migrants from one country at the expense of all others. It's wrong to favor illegal at the expense of legal entrants. Simpson-Mazzoli, this generation's immigration

reform bill, would right those wrongs. It serves the general interest, and the Democratic Presidential candidates know it. If they're serious about showing their independence of special interests, here's a gleaming chance for them to do it.

[The Washington Post, Friday, Apr. 20, 1984]

FINDING UNDOCUMENTED WORKERS

This week the Supreme Court validated a method used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to apprehend illegal aliens working in American factories. In a 7-2 decision in the case of INS v Delgado, the justices upheld the right of government agents to enter a factory with a warrant or the consent of the owner and question all workers who might be in the country illegally. Sixty percent of all illegal aliens apprehended in non-border locations are found in these work-place surveys.

While factory sweeps of this kind may be legal and effective, they are troubling to anyone concerned about the civil liberties of citizens and lawfully admitted aliens who are the repeated, if unintended target of these actions. Four such persons—two native-born Americans and two resident aliens—brought the suit that the court decided this week. All were of Hispanic background and were apparently questioned simply because of their appearance and ethnic origin and their presence in a factory with a history of hiring illegal aliens. These sweeps are, by their nature, directed at one identifiable element in the American population and require those questioned to produce answers and identification of a sort for which other Americans are highly unlikely ever to be asked.

There is a better way, of course, to enforce immigration controls, and it wouldn't involve mass interrogation of an entire factory work force. It is to apply sanctions against employers who hire undocumented workers. That way, the immigration status of every job applicant—not just the ones who appear to be Hispanic—would be checked before hiring, and the boss's records, instead of the employees' appearance, clothes and accent, could be checked. Justices both sides in Delgado said as much. In a footnote to his concurring opinion, Justice Powell points out that "Despite the vast expenditures by the INS and other agencies to prevent illegal immigration and apprehend aliens illegally in the United States, and despite laws making it a crime for them to be here, our law irrationally continues to permit United States employers to hire them." Justice Brennan, who dissented, deplores the fact that "the Immigration Act expressly exempts American businesses that employ undocumented aliens from all criminal sanctions . . . thereby adding to the already powerful incentives for aliens to cross our borders illegally in search of employment".

The solution is at hand. The Simpson-Mazzoli immigration reform bill, which has twice been passed by the Senate, will finally reach the House floor next month. The employer sanctions it would impose provide an effective, orderly and dignified alternative to large-scale raids and roundups. The bill should be passed.●

OPEN LETTER ON GRENADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, on October 25, 1983, the President of the United States ordered American Armed Forces to invade the small but sovereign Caribbean nation of Grenada. This was done without legal or moral justification and without prior notification of the Congress. By once again resorting to the use of military force before other options were fully explored, the Reagan administration demonstrated the low regard that it holds for established procedures for resolving international disputes and threats to peace and security as well as an arrogant view of political processes in the Third World.

I commend my colleagues in this House and to people throughout the United States a letter which was written by the Hon. Dessima M. Williams, former Ambassador from Grenada to the Organization of American States and Deputy Governor to the World Bank during the administration of the late Prime Minister Maurice Bishop. We would do well to read this open letter, and to learn of the dreams and aspirations of the people of Grenada, then as now, for independence, self-determination, and economic prosperity.

Over the last 6 months, events in Central America, the Middle East, Asia, and southern Africa have captured our attention, reminding us of the awesome responsibilities that we, as a great power, have throughout the world.

Often, our great power is projected into areas where our national interests are not directly at stake and we maliciously interfere in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations who have different political ideologies and economic systems. To continue this policy of military confrontation and disregard for international law will only jeopardize this country's longrun economic, political, and security interests and erode America's standing in the world community.

I commend to my colleagues the open letter of Ambassador Williams:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS AND TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

(By the Honorable Dessima Williams)

On February 7, 1984, Grenada marked ten years of independence from British rule. On July 4, 1984, the United States of America will mark its 208th year from the same colonial power. Your nation will be celebrating more than two centuries of the nation-building experience. For Grenada, whose short decade of "independence" was marred first by the five year dictatorship of Eric Gairy, and then by an invasion and foreign military occupation, the tenth anniversary of "independence" was hollow and ironic indeed.

Like Algeria, the United States of Mexico or Grenada, the United States of America was etched out of the colonial experience, which ended with a national revolutionary struggle, of which 1776 is a milestone date. The Grenada Revolution of 1979, though significantly different in class character than that of the United States, began our own struggle for sovereignty, development and freedom, aimed at national objectives similar to that of the United States Revolution: full sovereign control over all resources and decisions of the nation, and the full and peaceful development of all its people. For Grenada, this objective was even more pressing because in its 475 years of colonial rule by Spain, France and Britian respectively, social inequality, economic underdevelopment, dependency and backwardness was what predominated national life.

At the end of this era, in 1974, Grenada was left with one Government-built secondary school, one early twentieth-century relic of an airport with incredible limitations; an open, fragile and dependent economy based on cash crops for export and on tourism; a population that was fifty five percent functionally illiterate, and some thirty percent unemployed. Eric Williams' "Capitalism and Slavery" had visited Grenada.

But formal separation from Britain in 1974 did not bring a break with the path and policies of the past. From 1974 to 1979, the situation worsened: unemployment climbed from thirty to fifty percent; the food import bill, inflation and budget deficits all soared; the level and intensity of exploitation, social discontent and alienation rose rapidly; malnutrition and gastroenteritis became epidemic; Argentina-styled disappearances emerged. All of this was kept together by a repressive police machinery prepared and secured for Gairy by Chile's Pinochet. Sovereignty for Grenada was a farce.

It was in the second five years of our nationhood, led by Prime Minister Maurice Bishop that Grenada made the greatest social advances and began to secure the nation's sovereignty. The masses of the population rallied together for economic justice, social progress and political power, determining for the first time, that unique path to our development and independence. To the people of this small island state, sovereignty began to have meaning: the right to popular participation, the right to jobs and improved consumer conditions and the right to fashion a revolutionary foreign policy. Patriotism, pride, dignity and justice marked this fruitful struggle of building real independence and real democracy.

Unemployment fell to 13% in four years; and similar to that as envisioned in the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Bill, unemployment was to be completely wiped out by 1987. Grenada's economic development policies received a rare "clean bill of health" from the World Bank in 1982. She was warmly received and supported by all sober, forward-thinking and democratic Governments. The development strategy, employing a democratic thrust, brought equal pay for equal work for men and women alike; free education, health and dental care were attained as well as profit-sharing for Government-owned plantation workers. In symbolic and real terms, the construction of a new international airport, 75% completed at the time of the invasion, was an unprecedented achievement.

Grenada. They represented a most blatantly anti-democratic force, and demonstrated contempt for and ignorance about people and society. Yet the tragic and monumental error and folly of these men can never be the justification for foreign intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign and independent nation, such as Grenada was in October 1983. As one Grenadian woman told me:

"We dealt with Gairy and his Mongoose Gang, and we would have dealt with this RMC gang. What America come for?"

She is a farm worker who has not studied the international political meaning of sovereignty, but she understands its very essence and is prepared to defend it.

There is a return to democracy now, we are told. In reality we know differently, the experience is different. Democracy cannot be purchased in the United States and imported into Grenada. "Made in U.S.A." democracy is, at a minimum, neo-colonialism for Grenada which has now been accepted as a participant-recipient in the Caribbean Basin Initiative. As one small businessman told me in December:

"Dey preparing Grenada for the full penetration of American big corporation. Wha' will happen to me? Ah really can't take wha' Seaga givin' Jamaica."

It is encouraging to observe that there is a sizeable cross-section of public opinion in this country which believes that the United States invasion of Grenada is wrong, illegal and harmful to the national interest. (One hundred and six nations voted against the U.S. invasion in the United Nations.) Just as you, 208 years later are still conducting your national search for your system of democracy, so we too, only ten years old, were building our system, creatively combining old and new to fashion a unique Grenadian democracy. Your search goes on, punctuated with difficulty, but making progress. Ours was pounced upon and aborted by your government at one of the most vulnerable moments in our nation's history.

The people of the United States should have no difficulty understanding the problems of nation-building. Over these two hundred years your own history has been one of a persistent struggle to attain the full promise of your democracy, and to maintain law and order amid domestic conflict. Rifts within your nation have been deep and fierce, threatening at times to wrench your domestic order apart. The murders of President Lincoln, Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and President John F. Kennedy were indeed occasions of deep national stress and disorientation comparable to the period in Grenada immediately following the assassination of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and others in October 1983. As an independent and sovereign nation you would not be expected to want or to welcome any invasion by a foreign military power, especially one of incomparable superior might. So why should we in Grenada? Sovereignty is not negotiable; indeed it carries its own risks. The process of nation-building has its hard and difficult periods. But invasions are never part of the legitimate growing pains of any nation.

The invasion of Grenada by the United States armed forces was an assault on and has resulted in the loss of Grenada's sovereignty. Essentially, the United States has created a colony out of Grenada. I assert this based on international legal opinion and on long-standing and well-recognized international and diplomatic fact and practices. Further, the conduct of the United States Government in Grenada since the invasion has made this very clear. In real terms, the invasion of Grenada and the continuing occupation remains a fundamental negation of Grenada's sovereignty. In defense of your nation's proud history, you cannot allow this unjustified and illegal invasion of a nation of 110,000 people and 133 sq. miles to pass as a "victory for democracy". Any patriot, Grenadian or American, cannot accept military occupation in exchange for freedom.

The reasons given by President Reagan to justify the invasion are completely invalid and unacceptable. (To rescue U.S. citizens, restore 'law and order' and honor a Caribbean Treaty request.) The invasion plans were in the making and were rehearsed long before the three now infamous reasons were found. The group of "militarists and anarchists", as Maurice Bishop branded Coard and company hours before his callous and cowardly assassination, opened the door for the U.S. military adventure into Grenada.

As a citizen of Grenada who favours democracy and sovereignty, I am reflecting on this situation and invite you to do so with me. All Grenadians will have to analyze the assault on our sovereignty and find a way to end the occupation and restore the territorial and intrinsic integrity of our homeland. The United States Congress and people must realize that a wrong has been done to a people and their infant democracy. Responsibility must be taken for this act as well as for its future implications. Any and every new policy towards Grenada must reckon with one basic reality: that Grenada's right of self-determination, independence and sovereignty are indisputable.●

INTRODUCTION OF SOIL CONSERVATION INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT BILL

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been demonstrating its concern over soil erosion in the country by undertaking action to prohibit Federal payments for those who plow up fragile soil. Action in this direction is important, however it will not solve the whole problem.

Today, I am introducing legislation which would complement these efforts to provide a more comprehensive approach, and I take this opportunity to share with you some information about this proposal.

The measure I am introducing is similar to S. 2180 introduced in the other body, with one major difference. S. 2180 increases the investment tax credit by 10 percent—for a total of 20 percent—for certain soil and water conservation practices and equipment expenditures. During hearings in the other body on S. 2180, several agricultural organizations testified in favor of the creation of investment tax credits for farmers who are willing to make soil and water conservation expenditures because such expenditures are regarded as expenses which do not increase output and which can not be passed along in the marketing chain. As well, the point was raised that the tax credit, as opposed to a tax deduction, is far more beneficial to individuals in the lower income brackets—those less able to employ conservation practices due to cost considerations.

However, these same organizations also testified that the unrestricted investment tax credit has proven attractive to investors seeking tax shelters and that it contributes to the "sodbusting" of fragile lands, not to mention its expense to the Treasury.

It was therefore recommended that the investment tax credit for soil and water conservation expenditures be targeted to those most in need, and those likely to employ it in the most beneficial manner. Thus, the legislation I am introducing today will allow an investment tax credit for soil and water conservation practices and equipment expenditures for those highly erodible acres—classes IVe-VIII—currently under cultivation, and the measure will be limited to only those practices which are conducive to good land management practices for such fragile acres.

This legislation specifically lists those practices and types of equipment which will assist in diverting fragile acres from row-cropping and into cover crops, for example.

Testimony before Congress has suggested that tax incentives can play a sound and legitimate role in a comprehensive program for the reduction of soil erosion if they are conditioned in ways that assure they will induce corrective action where it is most needed. Also suggested was the tying of this kind of legislation to the "sodbuster" proposal.

This is exactly what we have done in introducing this legislation today. The sodbuster legislation which we are now contemplating will address those new fragile acres brought under production, by removing the incentive of Government payments. My proposal will further encourage producers to retire from production and treat those fragile acres already under cultivation by allowing producers an additional 10 percent investment tax credit to help them foot the cost.

This concept, in its original form, enjoyed broad support, and refining the proposal, as I have done in this measure, should receive even broader support. Not only does it make sense from an environmental—and business—standpoint, but it makes much more sense from the standpoint of its impact upon the Federal Treasury.

Finally, my introduction of this legislation is in conjunction with H.R. 5200. The National Agricultural Soil Protection Act, which I introduced on March 20, 1984. Both measures are based on many months of research and discussion with various members of the agricultural community on how best to address our Nation's soil erosion problems, and both measures will complement the legislation referred to as the "sodbuster" proposal currently under consideration in the House. Your interest and support on this important matter are most welcome.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MIKULSKI (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SILJANDER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MCEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CROCKETT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HUTTO, for 30 minutes, on May 9.

Mr. REID, for 15 minutes, on May 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SKELTON, and to include extraneous material in the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $3,759.

Mrs. ROUKEMA, to revise and extend her remarks in the tribute to the Honorable EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WINN in three instances.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mrs. JOHNSON.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. MCGRATH in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. WHEAT.

Mrs. BURTON of California.

Mr. WIRTH.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. FORD of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. BEDELL.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. TAUZIN.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. TORRES.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. VANDERGRIFF.

Mr. BOUCHER.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. BORSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 9, 1984, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3296. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting notification that during the month of April the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) made payments to the U.S. creditors on credits guaranteed by the CCC for which payments had not been received from the Polish People's Republic, pursuant to Public Law 97-257, section 306; Public Law 98-151, section 101(d); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3297. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1984 and amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1985, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 98-218); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3298. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a supplemental listing of contract award dates for the period May 1, 1984 to June 30, 1984, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 139(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3299. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's statement on the concept of Federal legislation to require a system of rotational health warnings in cigarette advertisements and on packages, pursuant to the act of September 26, 1914, chapter 311, section 6(f); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3300. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the 1983 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529 (92 Stat. 1871); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3301. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Maternal and Child Health Block Grant: Program Changes Emerging under State Administration" (GAO/HRD-84-35, May 7, 1984); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4810. A bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 to direct the Secretary of Transportation to study the feasibility of constructing a rail rapid transit line between the West Falls Church, Va., station of the Washington, District of Columbia, metrorail system and Dulles International Airport (Rept. No. 98-735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5308. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated as the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 98-736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to promote competition and efficiency in the transmission of electric energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5609. A bill to authorize a national program of improving the quality of education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5610. A bill to amend chapter 215 of title 18 of the United States Code with regard to the grand jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYSON (for himself and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 5611. A bill to authorize the 11th Airborne Division Association to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD) (by request):

H.R. 5612. A bill to permit the payment of rewards for information concerning terrorist acts; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

H.R. 5613. A bill to prohibit the training, supporting, or inducing of terrorism, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii (for himself, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. BATES):

H.R. 5614. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to provide criminal penalties for manufacturers who fail to notify owners or purchasers of motor vehicle safety defects or failures to comply with motor vehicle safety standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAUB:

H.R. 5615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an investment tax credit of up to 20 percent of certain expenditures by the taxpayer for soil or water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By HUGHES (for himself, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 5616. A bill to amend chapter 47 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for fraud and related activities in connection with access devices and computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. MICA, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mrs. JOHNSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. BONER of Tennessee):

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain dollar limitations under Veterans' Administration housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. HILLIS, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MICA, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. SIMON):

H.R. 5618. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve Veterans' Administration health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MRAZEK:

H.R. 5619. A bill to designate Hauppauge, N.Y., as an additional place where court may be held in the eastern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 5620. A bill to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1985 through 1989, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. DOWNEY of New York):

H.R. 5621. A bill to declare null and void the administration's attempt to withdraw for 2 years U.S. acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes relating to Central America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5622. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDERGRIFF (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, and Mr. LOEFFLER):

H.R. 5623. A bill to encourage the use of native wildflowers in highway landscaping; to the Commitee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 5624. A bill to require 70 percent of the shareholders of certain corporations to approve compensation paid in excess of certain limitations to employees of such corporations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BONKER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, and Mr. CRAIG):

H.R. 5625. A bill requiring the Commissioner of Customs to establish a customs district known as the Columbia-Snake Customs District; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AKAKA:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to consent to an amendment enacted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARNES (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRITT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MICHEL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SABO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YATES, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. SABO):

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution to designate June 18, 1984, as "National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution designating May 11, 1984, as "Colonel Commandant Mi-

chael Kovats Memorial Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MICA, and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 301. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that States should establish clearinghouses to provide information on missing children; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HILER introduced a bill (H.R. 5626) for the relief of Dewey J. Hassler; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 750: Mr. GORE.

H.R. 881: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1918: Mr. BADHAM and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 2099: Mr. CROCKETT and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 2125: Mr. DAUB, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 2729: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2837: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2847: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 2889: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 3277: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 3642: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 4111: Mr. BIAGGI and Mr. MINISH.

H.R. 4193: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MCKERNAN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana.

H.R. 4320: Mr. BROYHILL.

H.R. 4360: Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WILSON of Texas, Mr. ROSE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 4472: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 4501: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 4731: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LUKEN, Mrs. BOGGS, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 4760: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 4772: Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GORE, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 4785: Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MINISH, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WISE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 4786: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STOKES, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 4857: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 4895: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BRITT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 4916: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SABO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. HOPKINS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RAY, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 4966: Mr. GORE.

H.R. 4971: Mr. CORRADA, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. BRITT, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. YATES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MARRIOTT, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 5039: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. SIMON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BARNES, Mr. DYSON, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 5145: Mr. MINISH, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MAZZOLI and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 5223: Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 5237: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 5238: Mr. GORE.

H.R. 5243: Mr. PORTER, Mr. REID, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 5269: Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 5370: Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MARRIOTT, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 5381: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. COLLINS, Ms. BOXER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 5432: Mr. WEBER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 5452: Mr. GORE and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5457: Mr. FROST and Mr. WON PAT.

H.R. 5459: Mr. PATMAN.

H.R. 5490: Mr. GRADISON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. DEWINE.

H.R. 5525: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 5575: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 5598: Mr. FASCELL and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 5603: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.J. Res. 169: Mr. HYDE and Mr. PACKARD.

H.J. Res. 272: Mr. COOPER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 389: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.J. Res. 473: Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WISE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.J. Res. 488: Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GORE, and Mr. BOSCO.

H.J. Res. 500: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Ms. FERRARO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HILER, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MICHEL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BATES, Mr. LELAND, Mr. VENTO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 522: Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. STUMP.

H.J. Res. 527: Mr. STUMP.

H.J. Res. 528: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

H.J. Res. 545: Mr. WON PAT, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ROE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr.

LEATH of Texas, Mr. GORE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. HANCE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARNES, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WINN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MINETA, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mrs. HOLT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. FISH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 546: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. SIMON.

H.J. Res. 550: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. WINN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. YATRON.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. BADHAM.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. BADHAM.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5119

By Mr. BEREUTER:

(Amendment to title IX of H.R. 5421 (Amendment in the nature of a substitute).) —Insert the following new section and renumber accordingly

FACILITATING INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE THROUGH MEXICO

SEC. 914. Recognizing that increased levels of balanced international trade are an essential component in an economic development program for the region and that the United States has traditionally been the most important trading partner for each of the nations of Latin America, it is the sense of Congress that current procedures and laws of the Government of Mexico, and practices of its officials constitute a significant impediment to the transit of vehicles carrying the commodities of international trade through Mexican territory. As the Government of Mexico has played a valuable role in assisting and encouraging the economic and political development of the region, and in offering advice to the United States as to constructive policies this nation might pursue with respect to peace and prosperity in the Secretary of State, acting independently or with representatives of other Latin America nations, shall initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico aimed at eliminating or reducing those impediments to international trade. The agenda for such negotiations should include discussions to encourage the Government of Mexico to accede to existing international custom conventions on international in-transit shipments. Such actions are to be taken in concert with the institution by the United States and the nations of the region where the transiting shipments originate, of appropriate and cooperative steps to make sealed-truck, no-inspection transit administratively acceptable to the Government of Mexico and other transited countries. Similar unilateral or multilateral negotiations by the Secretary of State with nations respecting the same international customs conventions is also encouraged. The Secretary of State shall report the status of these negotiations to Congress by January 1, 1985.

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado:

Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 3, line 4, immediately after the first "Egypt" add "subject to the condition that Egypt conform to the Camp David Accords, including the exchange of ambassadors with Israel".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 3, line 4, immediately after "and" add ", subject to the condition that Egypt conform to the Camp David Accords, including the exchange of ambassadors with Israel,".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 19, line 22, strike "$3,231,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,219,500,000";

On page 25, line 3, strike "15,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000" and on line 6, strike "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 24, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Any funds allocated under this chapter for Dijbouti, Jordan, Kenya, Mauritius, Oman, Senegal, Seychelles, Zambia, Zaire, Zimbabwe, and Tunisia for fiscal year 1985 shall not exceed $5,000,000 for each country and shall be used only for the direct delivery of services to the needy by private and voluntary organizations.".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 24, after line 25, add the following new subsection:

"(g) Any funds allocated under this chapter for Dijbouti, Jordan, Kenya, Mauritius, Oman, Senegal, Seychelles, Zambia, and Zimbabwe for fiscal year 1985 shall not exceed $5,000,000 for each country and shall be used only for the direct delivery of services to the needy by private and voluntary organizations.".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 24, after line 25, add the following new subsection:

"(g) None of the funds available to carry out this chapter for the fiscal year 1985 shall be allocated to any country whose votes in the 38th United Nations General Assembly Plenary differed from the United States' position by twenty percent or more, as recorded in the Department of State's Report to the Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations, dated February 24, 1984.".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 26, line 13, strike "$698,758,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$682,751,000".

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —On page 71, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 19.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

ACCOUNTABILITY OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUNDS

SEC. . Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting the following new section 618 immediately after section 617:

SEC. 618. ACCOUNTABILITY OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUNDS.—The President shall establish appropriate accountability procedures to ensure that all funds made available to carry out this Act are used for the purposes intended.".

By Mr. DYMALLY:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).) —Page 48, after line 13, insert the following:

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

SEC. 513. (a) The Congress finds that the American University of Beirut, which for more than a century has represented the highest American ideals of free inquiry and service to mankind, as been and will continue to be a valuable contributor to understanding and cooperation between the people of the United States and the people of the Middle East and an important asset in enhancing prospects for peace in the area.

(b) Accordingly, $15,000,000 of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under sections 201 and 501 of this Act shall be provided to the American University of Beirut in the fiscal year 1985.

(c) The Secretary of State shall conduct a study of what means would be most appropriate to continue such a level of financial assistance to the American University of Beirut in future years in view of the university's value to United States interests in the area, including the possibility of establishing a trust fund. The results of this study shall be provided to the chairman of the committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate no later than January 1, 1985.

By Mr. GOODLING:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute Text of H.R. 5421).) —Page 38, line 17, strike out "$279,114,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$275,300,000".

Page 39, line 14, insert "and" after the semicolon; strike out line 15 and all that follows through line 6 on page 40; and on page 40, line 7, strike out "(Q)" and insert in lieu thereof "(K)".

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute Text of H.R. 5421).) —Page 79, line 4, insert "(a)" after "SEC. 913."; line 13, insert "and" after the semicolon; line 19, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period; and strike out lines 20 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The United States shall not terminate its membership in, or otherwise suspend its participation in and contributions to UNESCO unless such action is required by section 115 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (relating to suspension of United States participation in the United Nations if Israel is illegally expelled) or by section 109 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1982 and 1983 (relating to the imposition of restrictions by UNESCO on freedom of the press and the free flow of information), or unless such action is otherwise specifically authorized or required by an Act of Congress.

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute Text of H.R. 5421).) —Page 79, line 4, insert "(a)" after "SEC. 913."; line 13, insert "and" after the semicolon; line 19, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period; and strike out lines 20 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Unless such action is hereafter specifically authorized by an Act of Congress, the United States shall not implement its notice of intent to withdraw from UNESCO prior to December 31, 1985. The executive branch shall not make any decision concerning United States withdrawal from UNESCO without full consultation with the appropriate committees of the Congress.

By Mr. McCOLLUM:

(Amendment to the amendment-in-the-nature-of-a-substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).)

—Page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SEC. 914. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) evidence accumulated by the United States, France, Canada, and other nations, and by the United Nations and other international organizations, indicates that chemical and biological weapons have been employed in the current war between Iran and Iraq and in past and present conflicts in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan;

(2) such evidence also indicates that the Soviet Union employs chemical and biological weapons in Afghanistan and supplies such weapons to its allies in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia;

(3) such activities by the Soviet Union and other nations contravene arms control agreements which have been ratified by such nations; and

(4) exposure to chemical and biological weapons often causes slow and agonizing death, and few antidotes are available to treat exposure to such weapons.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of Congress that the use and the supplying of chemical and biological weapons are inhumane and pose grave theats to humanity and that the United States should (1) increase its investigations of suspected instances of chemical and biological warfare, (2) encourage the development of antidotes for chemical and biological weapons, especially for the mycotoxin commonly referred to as "yellow rain", (3) urge other nations to investigate suspected instances of chemical and biological warfare, (4) help United Nations investigators gain access to areas where chemical and biological warfare is or has been suspected, and (5) negotiate with the Soviet Union and other nations to strengthen existing agreements and treaties regarding chemical and biological warfare by establishing effective means to ensure compliance with such agreements and treaties.

By Mr. REGULA:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).)

—Page 51, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SALES OF SURPLUS DAIRY PRODUCTS TO THE PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 606. Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 116. For purposes of sales under this title of dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, the Peoples' Republic of China shall be considered to be a friendly country".

By Mr. WEISS:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).)

—Page 44, line 14, after the semicolon, insert "and"; line 20, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period; and strike out line 21 and all that follows through line 2 on page 45.

By Mr. WOLF:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).)

—Page 71, after line 19, insert the following new section 811 and redesignate existing section 811 as section 812:

HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR LATIN AMERICA

SEC. 811. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 $1,000,000 to be used by the Agency for International Development to provide education in human rights for the countries of Latin America, at the discretion of the Secretary of State. Assistance may be provided under this section to educate the military, security, and police forces and general public in these countries, without regard to the limitation in section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The amount authorized by this section is in addition to any amounts otherwise available for the purpose specified in this section, and is authorized to remain available until expended.

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute (Text of H.R. 5421).)

—Page 105, after line 18, insert the following new section 1015 and redesignate existing section 1015 as section 1016:

HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR EL SALVADOR

SEC. 1015. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 $1 million to be used by the Agency for International Development to provide education in human rights to the military, security, and police forces and the public of El Salvador. Assistance may be provided under this section without regard to the limitation in section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The amount authorized by this section is in addition to any amounts otherwise available for the purpose specified in this section, and is authorized to remain available until expended.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

HON. PETE WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to join with the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of California in recognizing the 100th anniversary of Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States and a Freemason who cherished his Masonic affiliation.

The Masons of California are justifiably proud of the Masonic heritage left by President Truman. His life stands in tribute to the Masonic principles of fellowship and brotherly love which guided his Presidency and his work.

Today, as all Americans celebrate the 100th birthday of our former President, let it not be forgotten that there are none more proud to recognize President Truman's Masonic background and his contributions to the United States and humanity than the membership of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of California.●

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, we have some unfinished business in the arena of auto safety. When Congress enacted the National Traffic Motor Vehicle Safety Act 18 years ago there was a critical omission from that legislation—there was no effective penalty to deter automobile manufacturers from withholding information about dangerous defects in their products.

At that time Members of both the House and Senate introduced amendments establishing criminal sanctions against officers, directors, and agents of auto manufacturers who knowingly and willfully withheld information about hazards in the vehicles.

Spokesmen from the auto industry assured Congress that these criminal penalties were unnecessary to gain their compliance with the law, and as the issue was debated, it became a question of their honor. Congress was persuaded that the Motor Vehicle Safety Act should contain only civil penalties, levied only against the corporation, at $1,000 per violation or $400,000 for any related series of violations—a limit raised to $800,000 in 1974.

This is scarcely a slap on the wrist in an industry where, in good years, a firm may profit in the billions. General Motors, for instance, had profits of $3.7 billion in 1983, the same year that the U.S. Justice Department filed a $4 million lawsuit, charging GM with giving false information and obstructing the Government's investigation of the 1980 X-car braking system.

Since the Government agency charged with enforcing the Motor Vehicle Safety Act is largely dependent on information provided by automakers, giving false information is an infraction of major significance. Yet the penalty in this instance would be hardly more than 1/1,000th of a year's profits, the net proceeds from about 2 hours' production for this industrial giant.

The X-car case is in trial right now, and it will likely be several years before we get a final determination from the courts. But we should not wait for a judicial decision to enact legislation to prevent such a situation from arising in the future.

Today I am introducing a bill to provide what the Congress was dissuaded from in 1966—criminal sanctions for deliberately withholding information on potentially dangerous defects in motor vehicles. The bill would not levy a special penalty on the auto industry. The legislation I am proposing would only put automakers on a parity with the other producers and distributors of potentially dangerous consumer products.

The penalties provided by this bill are a $50,000 fine and/or 1 year's imprisonment—the same penalties outlined for knowing and willful violation of the Consumer Product Safety Act and essentially the same penalties provided in the Flammable Fabrics Act, the Refrigerator Safety Act, the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, and the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, which are all defined as criminal misdemeanors.

In environmental protection, another regulatory area that affects businesses, there are no fewer than 23 Federal statutes with criminal provisions for knowing violations. Such laws as the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Deepwater Port Act, the Rivers and Harbors Act, all address corporate malfeasance, at least in part, by holding the agents accountable for noncompliance.

Given the devastating impact of defective automobiles on human life and well-being, it is time that we bring the Auto Safety Code in line with the rest of our regulatory laws.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington, DC, on May 2 and 3 due to official business. During this time I was unable to vote on rollcalls Nos. 125 through 130. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 125, approval of the Journal, "yea."

Rollcall No. 126, motion to instruct House managers of House Joint Resolution 492, "yea."

Rollcall No. 127, on agreeing to conference report on S. 64, Irish Wilderness Act of 1984, "no."

Rollcall No. 128, approval of the Journal, "yea."

Rollcall No. 129, amendment to auction off Hoover Dam electricity at market rates, "yea."

Rollcall No. 130, final passage of H.R. 4275, "no."●

CONGREGATION SHA'AR ZAHAV OF SAN FRANCISCO

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 20, 1984, Congregation Sha'ar Zahav of San Francisco will have a very special celebration.

The celebration will mark the conclusion of a weekend of dedication of the congregation's first permanent synagogue. It represents a great triumph for the young congregation as well as an appropriate moment to reflect on its many services and accomplishments.

Congregation Sha'ar Zahav was founded in 1977 and has grown to more than 200 members. It was established for a very special reason—to respond to the needs of San Francisco's

large lesbian and gay Jewish population.

Congregation Sha'ar Zahav became a member of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1982. Its High Holy Day services are attended by over 1,000 people, and it is actively involved not only in the gay community but also with senior citizens, the Jewish Welfare Federation, Israel Independence Day, and on behalf of oppressed Ethiopian and Soviet Jewry.

Congregation Sha'ar Zahav reflects the pride and sense of accomplishment of its members, and it continues and reaffirms a long tradition of social concern.

We in San Francisco are proud of Sha'ar Zahav.

Last year I had the privilege of joining hundreds of others at the congregation's high holy day services. I was very deeply moved at the beauty and sincerity of the service, which members of the congregation had developed as a blend of traditional Jewish liturgy with new material designed to reflect the realities of their lives.

My experience at this service crystallized my belief that Congregation Sh'ar Zahav represents more than a welcome and needed center for gay and lesbian Jews; it represents the finest traditions of community pride in diversity, of caring and social concern, and of building on what is best in the old to create something new—of the city which I am proud to represent in this Congress.

On behalf of all San Franciscans, I offer my heartfelt congratulations and my best wishes to Congregation Sha'ar Zahav on the occasion of dedicating a home of its own.●

TRIO TAKES ICY POTOMAC PLUNGE

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that young people today do not have enough role models—that there just are not any heroes after which they can pattern their lives. While this may be true, perhaps the problem is not that there are not any good people in this world, but rather, that we do not often hear about them. Most of the time the heroic deeds of good people go unnoticed as they selflessly live their lives with high regard for the needs of others.

The Alexandria Gazette took the opportunity during April to bring to light the heroic deeds of four county firefighters who selflessly, and skillfully, braved the chilly waters of the Potomac River to rescue three drowning victims.

Today I submit that article to your attention—so that both young and old may be inspired by the courageous acts of these four men on behalf of others.

The article follows:

TRIO TAKES ICY POTOMAC PLUNGE

(By Mark Bergin)

Three people were saved from drowning in the Potomac River by county firefighters who dived into the chilling water and pushed a rescue boat out to save them.

The firemen's first rescue attempt failed when they were unable to propel their canoe with a shovel, the only paddle at hand.

The three victims, a Smithsonian Institution archaeologist and his two Mexican house guests, were canoeing Tuesday morning near Herbert Springs, south of Alexandria, when their canoe capsized in wind and rough water about 150 feet from shore.

They were not wearing life vests and were unable to grab flotation cushions, firemen said, but clung for life to the half-submerged canoe until their cries for help were heard by a carpenter working in a nearby house.

When firemen arrived about 11:20 a.m., 30 minutes after the victims entered the water, the three "were nearly gone, they were cold and hanging on," said Capt. R. C. Bragg, Jr.

Firemen said the swamped canoe was barely able to keep all three above water and that two of the men were unable to swim.

The men were identified as archaeologist Robert Laughlin, 49, of Mount Vernon and Laughlin's house guests, Mariano Lopez Mendez, 33, and Sebastian Ramirez Intzin, 20, both Mexican nationals unable to speak English.

All three were treated for hypothermia and exposure at Mount Vernon Hospital and released. Firemen estimated the water temperature at less than 40 degrees.

When rescuers arrived and saw how far the victims were from shore, four Mount Vernon firemen commandeered a canoe from a nearby home. With only a fire shovel for a paddle, they were unable to make headway against a stiff northerly wind.

Two firemen jumped into the river and swam next to the canoe to push it out to the victims.

"It was a do-or-die type situation. We had to just get out there," said Capt. Hugh Wood. He said they "didn't think about" the danger of succumbing to the cold water.

Wood and Firefighter David Ludeker pushed the canoe approximately 600 feet along the shore line and out to the foundering canoe. Firefighter Walter Brown was aboard the canoe.

When they reached the capsized canoe, the firemen pulled the victims to the side of their canoe and held them alongside, unable to pull them aboard for fear of capsizing their own boat. One of the victims, apparently gripped with fear and cold, almost had to be dragged from the capsized canoe, Brown said.

"Fear, cold and a communications gap," said Brown of the problems in rescuing this victim.

Firefighter Buddy Cronk stood at the shoreline holding a 150-foot safety line with one end tied to the rescue canoe. Cronk said by the time the canoe reached the stricken three, the rope was completely played out. Once all three victims were safely against the canoe, Cronk and a nearby resident pulled them to shore.

Once ashore, they were covered with blankets and firemen's coats until rescue personnel decided they were warm enough to be moved.

Saving three stricken men from drowning in the chilling Potomac River was a feat that four Mount Vernon firemen took in stride.

"Do you think what we did was all that special? No, seriously, it's just what we do. We just did it," said Firefighter Buddy Cronk, 34, a 12-year veteran of the Fairfax County Fire Department.

Cronk held a lifeline for Capt. Hugh Woods and Firefighter David Ludeker, 29, who kicked their legs to push a rescue canoe into the river Tuesday morning, risking death in the chilling river.

Woods, a 14-year member of the department, said the decision to dive in was a simple one, despite the danger.

"It was pretty much a quick decision and it had to be made," Woods said. Warm and dry back at Company 9, the Mount Vernon fire station, Woods looked around at his men and said, "There was no hesitancy on these guys' parts. They knew they were being 'jeopardized,' they knew the water was cold."

Woods seemed to emphasize the word "jeopardized" to down play the stunning impact the cold water had on him and the others—it was the kind of paralyzing cold that could easily have made the men weaken, cramp or faint in the water and drown.

Ludeker said Woods has a swimming pool and had just measured its water temperature at 42 degrees. The Potomac, Woods said, was colder.

Ludeker a nine-year veteran who has served seven years at Mount Vernon, and Firefighter Walter Brown, 28, in his fourth year with the department, had already attempted to save the men by paddling their canoe and had themselves capsized once near shore. Their only paddle was a fire shovel, and they could make no headway against a strong wind and current.

"When the shovel didn't work, we had to try it (swimming). It was a last-ditch effort," said Ludeker. Brown rode in the canoe to help hold the victims against the side when the canoe was pulled ashore.

Later Tuesday, the four extinguished several bush fires believed started by children.

They took that is stride, too.

"Pretty exciting stuff, huh?" Brown said as he sprayed water from a metal tank strapped to his back on spreading flames in a field full of smoke.

Ludeker batted the flames down using the same shovel he had paddled the canoe with that morning.●

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Volunteer Week, set aside to honor the thousands of men and women who serve the needs of others throughout the world. In conjunction with that, the Peace Corps is honoring James B. Quinn at a luncheon today. Mr. Quinn, a resident of Kansas City, MO, along with five

other volunteers is being named as Outstanding Peace Corps Volunteer of 1984.

The spirit of Peace Corps volunteers—unique and dedicated Americans working in countries around the globe in many distinctive kinds of programs—is exemplified by Mr. Quinn and the other recipients of the award. These are outstanding disabled volunteers and volunteers working in special education projects.

Mr. Quinn, who is deaf, has done a magnificent job in the Philippines where he has served these past 3½ years. He has been a deaf education instructor at a school for the deaf. He has also begun a program of community outreach teaching deaf awareness and signing to members of his community. Quinn has also worked with the deaf community by creating a drama program for his students.

He has been a role model for his deaf Filipino students by fully participating in the adult, hearing world. Through his work he hopes to provide his students with the incentive to develop their skills and function within the hearing world.

As one of 5,000 volunteers in the Peace Corps, Mr. Quinn's accomplishments stand out as a tribute to his abilities and his drive. I am honored to be able to share in his achievements today.●

HOME COMPUTERS: "TIME HAS COME"

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced H.R. 2531, a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Service Tax Code to provide a credit against income tax for people who purchase a home computer for educational, professional, or other essentially nonrecreational use.

Even today, computers are still too expensive for many people. Because they cannot afford a computer, they are being denied the advantages that their use could bring. By providing a $100 tax credit each year for each family member when that family buys a computer, we can help families who want to learn and work at home.

The opportunities of the information age we are entering should not be just for the well-to-do. H.R. 2531 would allow the average family to learn the skills they will need as America moves into the 21st century. The following editorial from the Clayton News Daily sums up the need for H.R. 2531 to be made into law.

[From the Clayton News Daily, Mar. 30, 1984]

TIME HAS COME

Several years ago, Sixth District Congressman Newt Gingrich (R-Jonesboro) introduced legislation which would have given a credit on a person's income taxes for the purchase of home computer systems.

At the time he introduced the legislation, many people made negative comments about his priorities of talking about giving tax credits to people on their income tax forms for the purchase of such "luxury" items when the real issue that needed addressing was creating jobs for the many persons who were out of work.

And, we concurred with those critics of Congressman Gingrich. After all, home computers were not that common in Sixth District homes at the time and we were far more concerned with high unemployment than we were with giving tax credits to the relatively affluent.

However, over the past few years, home computers have become more and more common in homes throughout the Sixth District and throughout this nation.

But, the fact that home computers have become popular is not a good enough reason to consider giving tax credits to people who buy them.

The fact of the matter is that home computers have proven their value to the average American family in many ways—helping children with their homework, assisting Mom and Dad make ends meet, and providing a recreational outlet for the entire family.

Most people do not purchase home computers because they are just another expensive toy: they do so because these machines can help make life easier for all of us.

We think Congressman Gingrich's idea which many laughed at when he first introduced it, is making more and more sense.

Giving tax credits for the purchase of home computers is an idea whose time has come, we now believe.●

RECENT RESEARCH ON PLANT CLOSINGS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention some recent research on an issue of growing concern to millions of Americans—plant closings and economic dislocation. Because the Federal Government does not keep track of how many factories and other workplaces are permanently shut down each year, nor of what the consequences are for the millions of Americans who lose their jobs, we are indebted to the small group of scholars and researchers who have been investigating these problems.

In December 1983, the Brookings Institution reported research by Candee S. Harris which reveals truly alarming statistics about the wave of plant closings that has smashed through our communities in recent years. According to Ms. Harris' report, over 900,000 manufacturing jobs were lost each year from 1978 to 1982 due to plant closings in firms with 100 or more employees. Over 900,000 jobs a year just in the largest firms and just in manufacturing.

The total number of jobs lost—permanently—because of establishment closings in all industries and in firms of all sizes from 1980 to 1982 was over 7 million.

From 1980 to 1982, 1 of every 14 people in the U.S. work force lost his or her job in an establishment closing.

Ms. Harris' research indicates that no region has been spared the disruptions and trauma caused by plant closings. The rates of manufacturing job loss in every region of the country exceeded 10 percent during the years 1980 to 1982. Moreover, the Nation as a whole replaced only 9 manufacturing jobs for each 10 lost in plant closings at large manufacturing firms between 1976 and 1982.

Among many other important findings, Ms. Harris' work for Brookings reveals that subsidiary or branch manufacturing plants are far more likely to close than independent plants. "Within the same firm size classes, closing rates range from two to five times higher for the subordinate establishments." This finding confirms the conclusion reached by Representative BERKLEY BEDELL's Small Business Subcommittee on Antitrust in its 1980 report on conglomerates and their effects on small business and local communities: Absentee corporate ownership of resources important to a community, and especially conglomerate ownership of mature local subsidiaries, can have serious adverse impacts on the community and tends to inhibit the long-term growth of the local economy.

A second research effort I want to share with my colleagues was undertaken by Prof. Charles Craypo of Cornell University. Professor Craypo studied 27 facility closings between 1954 and 1983 in the Indiana factory towns of South Bend and Mishawaka. During the period he studied, the South Bend area lost 12 percent of its manufacturing employment. The closings studied resulted in the loss of nearly 40,000 jobs.

Absentee owners closed 23 of the 27 plants; 19 of the plants were relocated elsewhere, and some of the plants were closed for anticompetitive reasons. Locally owned, healthy businesses were acquired by multiplant, absentee owners which shut them down in order to concentrate available market share among fewer producers.

Most Americans believe that plant closings result from business failures and are unavoidable. Professor Craypo's work shows that this is not true. Business failures or bankruptcy were not a factor in 24 of the 27 cases he

studied. According to Professor Craypo, the key determinant in the incidence of closings and phasedowns is whether absentee owners continue to invest in local plants.

I would like to quote from Professor Craypo's "Summary and Conclusion:"

These shutdown decisions were for reasons internal to the needs of the companies, but they produced substantial social costs to labor, small businesses, and the community. Those who suffered the consequences, however, had little say in the matter and virtually no influence over either the process or its outcome. Most of the closings had tactical significance relevant to product market shares or labor market costs, or both. Without exception, the reasons were only vaguely communicated to local area residents and organizations.

Divergent objectives and interests leave little room for cooperation in this kind of dislocation. Productive capital was taken from the community in these closings, but the workers stayed behind. They and their factory towns had to make the adjustments, not the people and the organizations that made the decisions. It became a matter of relative control over the economic environment, not a situation in which workers, owners, and community are hapless objects or inexorable market forces and therefore in common predicament and inclined to cooperate. Unions and communities have no control over the plant closing environment when they are of no further use in the production process.

Absentee owners have a great deal more discretion. They alone make the investment choices. Diversified concerns, they do business in a variety of industries, or have the capacity to do so if they choose. Mobility allows them to take advantage of a global situation in which some industries are declining while others are expanding, and some geographic regions are at a stage of industrial development where labor earnings and social wage costs are high while others are in a low-cost stage. The result is that corporations can pick and choose strategically among industries and locations, while workers and communities cannot.

Another research project Professor Craypo reported on recently helps show the urgency of governmental regulation of the process by which corporations shut down major facilities. He studied the effects of the closing of a Drewry's brewery in South Bend on the workers who lost their jobs. His most significant findings: The displaced workers' mortality rate following the closing was 16 times higher than normal for people of their age. Many earlier studies have shown that plant closings have significant adverse health effects on the displaced workers, but Professor Craypo's findings are among the most dramatic.

Researchers in California have shown that the development of an increasingly high-tech economy will not mean the end of plant closings and their adverse consequences. Philip Shapira and Jean Ross at the University of California, Berkeley, have studied the growing high-tech industry in California. They report that between January 1980 and January 1984, at least 47,000 workers in high-technology industries lost their jobs in 147 closures and layoffs. Shapira and Ross emphasize that these are minimum figures, because many closures go unreported. Their report concludes with a warning to communities that intend to tie their future to particular high-technology firms:

In overall terms, it is likely that high technology sectors will grow in California in the future, although some individual sectors may experience absolute decline. But, as important, the high technology sector will be subject to much restructuring and flux, as this study suggests. Research has already demonstrated that much of the high technology sector is already very polarized, with many low-paid, low skill jobs and a dearth of middle-range employment. But all jobs in the industry are increasingly vulnerable to restructuring. Communities looking to increase their high technology employment would be advised to look with a critical eye at the long term prospects for high tech employment to make sure that jobs that are here today are not gone tomorrow.

Shapira and Ross' concerns are echoed by two Stanford University researchers, Russel Rumberger and Henry Levin, who believe that the Federal Government's predictions about high-technology job growth may be overstated. They argue that the increased use of robots and the movement overseas of production jobs—as in the case of Atari's relocation of 1,825 jobs from California to Southeast Asia—threaten job expansion. According to Rumberger and Levin, "Some evidence suggests that more jobs will be destroyed than created by technology change. A recent study of robotics suggests that robots will eliminate 100,000 to 200,000 jobs by 1990, while creating only 32,000 to 64,000 jobs."

Finally, I would like to bring a research project from the other side of the country to the Members' attention. The research was conducted in Maine with the financial support of Bowdoin College by Nancy Folbre, Julia Leighton, and Melissa Roderick. They studied the closing of 107 Maine plants that employed 75 or more workers. The plant closings occurred between January 1971 and June 1981, and resulted in a total direct and indirect loss of nearly 50,000 jobs.

Among the most interesting research findings are the following:

First, bankruptcy was a minor factor in the closings. Only 13 percent were caused by bankruptcy.

Second, nonunion work forces were affected disproportionately. Although 33 percent of Maine's manufacturing labor force was unionized, only 16 percent of the plants closed were unionized.

Third, closings were concentrated in low-wage industries with a disproportionately high percentage of female workers.

Fourth, when companies give advance notice of the plant closing, the resulting unemployment is significantly less severe. If as little as 1 month of advance notice were given the overall unemployment resulting from the closure—both direct and indirect—would decline from 5 worker-months of unemployment to 4, a 20-percent decline.

The last finding seems to me to be the most significant. For many years, I have argued that large firms should be required to give their employees advance notice of plant closings and permanent layoffs. As this new research from Maine confirms, such a requirement would ease the displaced workers' transition from one job to another, reduce the resulting level of unemployment, and reduce the social costs of plant closings, which private corporations now freely transfer onto the backs of the taxpaying public.

I am encouraged by the excellent research that has been undertaken in universities, colleges, and research institutions across the land. With more Federal support, these research efforts could do even more to point the way to a solution to some of the persistent problems of economic dislocation and job loss.

If any of my colleagues would like copies of any of the reports I have described, I would be happy to provide them.●

TRIBUTE TO WALTER FLOWERS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1984

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a good friend and former colleague, Walter Flowers, whose untimely death at the age of 51 comes as shocking and sorrowful news to those of us who knew him well.

Walter was one of the most widely respected and well liked Members of this body. He was an extremely intelligent person—a Phi Beta Kappa graduate and an astute scholar of the law. I had the great privilege of serving with Walter on the Science and Technology Committee, where he chaired the Fossil, Nuclear Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Subcommittee. He was always knowledgeable, well-prepared, and fair in his approach to the often controversial matters over which the committee presided.

Walter also served on the Judiciary Committee during that Committee's investigation of the Watergate affair. His leadership and courage during that difficult period should still serve as a model for us all.

More important to me, Walter was a good and close friend, as he was to many Members during his time of public service. But even after his return to private life he maintained those friendships. He was always will-

ing to sit down and talk about anything, from legislation, about which he had great knowledge, to sports, about which he had great interest.

Walt was a wonderful person and a true friend. I join with my colleagues in offering my condolences to his dear wife Beverly, and to his family. He will be sorely missed by them and by his friends, both in Congress and out.●

ELECTRIC UTILITY TRANSMISSION REFORM ACT OF 1984

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill designed to increase efficiency in the distribution of surplus electric generating capacity and to promote competition in the bulk power supply market. My bill, the Electric Utility Transmission Reform Act of 1984, would amend the Federal Power Act to remove impediments in the existing law and specifically authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to order wheeling—that is, an arrangement whereby one utility is paid to transmit electric energy between two other utilities—on fair and nondiscriminatory terms to all sectors of the industry. This bill would provide lower electric rates for consumers by facilitating the regional distribution of surplus, low-cost power.

This proposal has earlier received support in this Chamber. In 1977, the administration proposed similar amendments to the Federal Power Act as part of a comprehensive National Energy Act. The House passed such legislation, but, in the face of overwhelming opposition by investor-owned utilities, the Senate declined to address the wheeling issue. In conference, a compromise was drafted, which is now part of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978. It contained so many preconditions to the issuance of wheeling orders that those provisions are virtually useless to the wheeling applicant.

Moreover, in a recent case, Southeastern Power Administration against Kentucky Utilities Co., the FERC construed these provisions restrictively and ruled that it lacked authority to order wheeling where the result would be the displacement of power sold by the utilities subject to the wheeling order. Thus, the FERC will not, under PURPA, require large investor-owned utilities to transmit low-cost, surplus power to publicly owned systems which are customers of the private utilities. It is clear, then, that the existing law will not promote competition within the electric utility industry.

Without my proposed amendments, investor-owned utilities will—as they have done routinely in the past—continue peremptorily to deny public power systems access to transmission lines. Competition in the bulk power market is thereby thwarted and potential buyers and sellers are unable to consummate economically attractive deals. My bill will insure that publicly owned utilities have a fair opportunity to compete with investor-owned utilities and that all electric utilities will be able to seek the least expensive power available, thus lowering the cost for the ultimate consumers.

The American Public Power Association, which represents about 1,750 publicly owned electric utilities, surveyed its member systems to determine the extent to which they were experiencing difficulties in obtaining transmission services. The responses reveal numerous problems and bottlenecks. Investor-owned utilities either refuse to wheel or engage in protracted negotiations and insist upon unreasonable terms and prices—thereby effectively refusing to wheel. The publicly owned utilities in my own State of California, for instance, have not been able to obtain access to the Pacific Northwest-Southwest Intertie and other transmission services and, thus, have effectively been denied access to the surplus hydroelectric power now available in the Pacific Northwest and less expensive power in other areas of the country.

The Department of Energy has reported that the regional transfer of electricity could result in substantial savings in electric utility plant investment and energy costs, with corresponding reductions in rates for electric consumers. DOE has identified lack of transmission access as a key to resolving this national problem. Accordingly, this bill would further a sensible, national energy policy.

My proposal would permit FERC, on its own motion or upon application of a State commission, or any electric utility, to order a utility to provide transmission services to another utility under just and reasonable rates, terms, and conditions. FERC would have to issue an order if its effect would be to conserve energy, promote the efficient use of facilities and resources, increase competition in the bulk power supply market, or is otherwise in the public interest.

My proposal also provides that the Commission shall, on its own motion or upon application of a State commission or any electric utility, order an electric utility owning or operating any bulk power tranmission facility to increase the capacity of that facility. Such an order must be issued if its effect is to conserve energy, promote the efficient use of facilities and resources, increase competition, or is otherwise in the public interest. Again, the service to be rendered must be at just and reasonable rates.

This legislation will not impose unfair burdens on the utility subject to the wheeling order. It provides that no order can be issued if it would place an undue burden on a utility, significantly impair the utility's reliability, impair its ability to render adequate service to its customers, or result in the transmission of electricity to an ultimate consumer other than the customers of Federal or State agencies.

These amendments to the Federal Power Act are particularly relevant in light of the recent efforts of the investor-owned utilities to repeal the public preference in the relicensing of hydroelectric projects. In my view, H.R. 4402, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), would reduce competition between public and privately owned utilities, and I am opposed to that bill. The anticompetitive practices of the investor-owned utilities could be curbed by enactment of the antitrust review requirements contained in H.R. 5416, introduced by my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. GORE). But that proposal would require an antitrust review solely in the context of hydroelectric licensing and, in my judgment, further legislation is required. My proposal would be applicable to all electric utilities and would, therefore, deal with this problem on an industrywide basis.

As Federal Power Commissioner Charles Ross observed nearly two decades ago, "It is the parties who control the transmission, the arteries of the industry, that control the destiny of the millions of ratepayers of this Nation." That observation is no less valid today. I hope, therefore, for early consideration of this proposal.●

H.R. 2133—A BILL TO PROMOTE COMPETITION IN FEDERAL PURCHASING

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am making this statement today in an attempt to set the record straight on H.R. 2133. This bill was reported by the Small Business Committee last October and, along with the amendments I plan to offer on behalf of the bill's sponsors, seeks to make competition the rule rather than the exception in Federal procurement practices. The bill is scheduled for House consideration in mid-May.

Some of those opposing H.R. 2133 are the same ones that opposed the small business innovation development bill, Public Law 97-219. Even the Washington Post joined the battle and opposed the SBID bill. It is interesting to see how similar their arguments

against the SBID bill and H.R. 2133 are.

Yet, the SBID bill passed, it passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 353 to 57. And it passed intact, the way its sponsors and the small business community wanted it to read. Guess what—the SBID programs are now being implemented by the very Federal agencies that initially opposed its passage. It is one of the most successful, competitive, and highly lauded Federal programs we have.

SPARE PARTS

Let us get back to H.R. 2133. Just what does the bill intend to do? H.R. 2133 has some very strong and important provisions that deal with the way the Federal Government purchases spare and replacement parts. For the first time, H.R. 2133 would legislate criteria to limit the sole-source contracting of spare parts. Only when the head of the buying activity determines that one of the following five exceptions exist may a sole-source contract be let: First, there is only one possible source; second, there is an urgent need for the parts; third, national security reasons make a sole-source award necessary; fourth, only one source has a legitimate proprietary interest; and, fifth, another statute requires a specific source.

In addition, H.R. 2133 contains provisions that deal with rights to proprietary data. The issue of what is a legitimate proprietary interest is a matter of considerable debate. On the one hand, it is a barrier to competition when a company improperly asserts proprietary rights on products that were developed at the public's expense and could be manufactured by a number of potential competitors. On the other hand, an overly restrictive policy toward proprietary rights could cause many private businesses to think twice before selling a product to the Government.

Accordingly, H.R. 2133 directs the administration to issue rules and regulations that specify the status of rights to technical or other data which is developed in whole or in part with Federal funds. These rules shall set out a requirement that a clause pertaining to data rights be a part of the contract for each major systems acquisition. This clause must spell out the Government's right to own, license, use, or otherwise assess this data and the extent, if any, of the proprietary interest maintained by the contractor.

Furthermore, H.R. 2133 requires that the administration direct appropriate purchasing agencies to establish reverse engineering programs designed to give small businesses the opportunity to borrow or purchase spare parts for the purpose of design replication or modification.

I will also offer an amendment to require the Government to catalog, store, and inventory the technical data it owns in a manner to allow its ready access by small business.

These provisions in H.R. 2133 will go a long way to clean up the way the Federal Government purchases spare parts. And there is a lot to clean up. In fiscal year 1982, the military spent $13 billion on spare and replacement parts; $10 billion, or 77 percent, of these parts were purchased through sole-source, noncompetitive contracts. In a June 1983 report, the General Accounting Office said that savings of 30 to 40 percent could be possible if there were more competition on these purchases.

PREQUALIFICATION CRITERIA

H.R. 2133 also takes another very important step in opening up spare parts procurement practices. The bill seeks to limit the anticompetitive effects of prequalification criteria, such as qualified products and bidders lists. These lists are being used as screening devices to deny businesses who are not on the lists the opportunity to even submit bids.

The military maintains that these qualified lists are necessary to preserve quality on critical items. While qualified lists are undoubtedly used to purchase critical items, there are some items that we are presently purchasing off these lists that are clearly not critical: household lights, floor wax, flashlights, spark plugs, loudspeakers for shipboard entertainment systems, automotive grease, filing cabinets, laminated wooden boat paddles, and saw chains.

This screening out by using qualified lists to determine a bidder's responsiveness to a solicitation may lead to instances where the agency actually rejects a perfectly acceptable product at a price lower than it can purchase the product off of the qualified list. Of course, the agency will never know if other than prequalified suppliers can offer similar or superior products at lower prices if they never even review other bids. In cases where the product is vital to the safety and success of a mission, not reviewing a greater universe of sources may indeed be unwise.

H.R. 2133 simply gives businesses the right to submit offers and have them considered without altering the quality standards for any item. In fact, under this provision of H.R. 2133, it is entirely likely that the procuring agency will find sources that will not only supply the product at less expense, but because the bill will not affect quality standards in any way, the procuring agency may actually find superior products. The legislation does not require that an agency must accept a bid if the offered product does not meet its quality standards, or if there is not time for adequate testing prior to needed delivery time. Likewise, any bid can be rejected if the bidder is not considered to be responsible.

THE RULE OF TWO

A provision of H.R. 2133 that has drawn considerable opposition is the "rule of two." This area, perhaps, has been the most misinterpreted and misrepresented provision of the bill. You have probably been told that "virtually all of the Federal procurement contracts will have to go to small business" if this bill is passed.

Let us start with some facts:

Small business makes up approximately 99 percent of all of the businesses in America.

In fiscal year 1983 small business received only 13.75 percent of the value of prime Federal procurement contracts, down from 15.75 percent in fiscal year 1981.

In fiscal year 1983, the top five Department of Defense contractors received more prime contract dollars than the entire small business community.

Small business firms, in winning their paltry share of Federal prime contract dollars, were highly dependent on small business set-asides. In fact, one-half of the prime contract dollars at DOD going to small businesses went through small business set-asides. To small firms interested in Federal procurement, the set-aside program is vital.

Another point to make here is that small business set-asides are made on a competitive basis. These procurements are open for bidding to 99 percent of the business firms in America. In a report to the Congress transmitted last month, President Reagan said:

> Small business set-asides are by definition competitive and should not be confused with the SBA's 8(a) contract program . . .

Small business set-aside procurements are clearly vital to our goal of maintaining a diverse and healthy defense industrial base and to assuring the taxpayers of wise use of the Federal procurement dollar.

In contrast to the small business set-aside program, 60 percent of DOD's procurements are made on a sole-source, noncompetitive basis (according to DOD's own figures). In fact, less than 6 percent of DOD's procurements are even formally advertised for bid. I submit that competition among only 99 percent of the business firms in America is better than no competition at all.

A contracting officer implements a small business set-aside on a procurement he or she feels the criteria of the "rule of two" has been met. These are the criteria for the "rule of two":

The contracting officer determines that there is a reasonable expectation that, first, offers will be obtained from at least two responsible small business concerns offering the products of different small business concerns, and second, awards will be made at reasonable prices.

An important concept of the "rule of two" is that a contracting officer may cancel a small business set-aside if he or she feels the Government is not getting a reasonable price for the goods or services, or if the contract award to a small business concern would not be in the public interest. The proposed award would then be resolicited on an unrestricted basis.

That criteria can be found in section 19.502-1 of the Federal acquisition regulations (FAR). The "rule of two" is current procurement regulation that guides all Federal procurement. There is nothing new about the "rule of two." It has been a formal procurement regulation at the Department of Defense since 1979. NASA also adopted the "rule of two" as their formal procurement policy in 1982. In a slightly different form, this criteria could also be found in the old Federal procurement regulations that were used by civilian agencies prior to the final adoption of the FAR.

Not only do Federal agencies presently use the "rule of two," they fully endorse it. In a letter to David Stockman dated April 18, 1984, Mary Ann Gilleece, the Deputy Under Secretary for Acquisition Management at the Department of Defense said:

> The only mechanism available to carry out this Congressional mandate is through the small business set-aside program which serves as the underpinning of the Federal agencies small business program.
>
> . . . These have worked effectively for almost thirty years to enhance the opportunities for small business and small disadvantaged business firms who participated in the acquisition of products and services by Federal agencies.
>
> We would like to note that small business set-asides generally result in more, not less competition. This increase in competition results because of two factors: There are a much greater number of small business firms than big business firms; secondly, the small business community perceives that when procurement is set-aside, it, by definition, cannot be a sole source award and that they will be competing against their peers and therefore stand a realistic chance of winning the contract.

H.R. 2133 seeks to codify the "rule of two" as it appears in the FAR with the addition of one additional criterion—that the delivery of the goods or services will be rendered within the time needs of the procuring agency. Small business set-asides are of such importance to the minute share of prime contract awards that small business presently receives, it is necessary to protect this program with the force of law.

Remember almost half of all Federal prime contract dollars going to small business goes through the set-aside program. At the present time, tremendous pressure is being put on the Office of Management and Budget to withdraw the "rule of two" from the FAR. Organizations that wish to expand the 85 percent of the total procurement prime contract dollars that currently go to the largest 1 percent of the businesses in America are fighting tooth and nail to eliminate the "rule of two" from the FAR. Congress must step in and act before this program that is so vitial to small business competition and our goal of maintaining a diverse and healthy defense industrial base is lost.

You undoubtedly have heard vague critcisms about the small business set-aside procurement program. For example, you have probably heard that H.R. 2133 would require that all or most of Federal procurements will have to go to small businesses, or that small firms will simply get contracts, skim off the profits and then subcontract out all the work to a big company. That is simply not true, and in fact cannot happen when the "rule of two" is properly implemented. Small businesses may only offer the products of small businesses under small business set-asides.

Furthermore, since 60 percent of DOD's work goes out under sole source, noncompetitive awards, the "rule of two" cannot be met in those circumstances because the contracting officer believes there is only one firm eligible to perform. Other procurements have defined elements of responsibility and likewise may not be suitable for small business set-aside awards. For example, when the Government is seeking "the best technical approach available" for a research and development task, the contracting officer may not be able to satisfy his or her expectation that the best approach will be found by using the small business set-aside procedure.

This brings me to another important point. Most of the basic research the Federal Government funds is done through grants and cooperative agreements. The National Institutes of Health, for example, uses approximately 90 percent of their research funds to fund unsolicited basic research grants to universities and other nonprofits. H.R. 2133 only applies to procurement contracts, not grants or cooperative agreements. Thus, it would not affect any of the research grant or cooperative agreement programs operated by Federal agencies.

Finally, I want to put to rest once and for all the notion that small business set-asides lead to shoddy performance by contractors that are merely shady fronts that ripoff the taxpayer. That characterization is plainly insulting and demeaning to small business contractors and procurement officials who are hardworking and constantly in battle with a system that is at odds with what is truly good for America. The "rule of two" clearly states that a potential contractor must be responsible. The FAR sets the standards by which a potential contractor is deemed responsible. A firm must: first, have adequate financial resources; second, be able to comply with delivery and performance schedules; third, have a satisfactory performance record; fourth, have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics; fifth, have necessary organization, experience, accounting and operational controls or the ability to obtain them; sixth, have the necessary production, construction and technical equipment and facilities, or the ability to obtain them; and seventh, be otherwise qualified and eligible.

THE "$2 MILLION PRESUMPTION"

While H.R. 2133 adopts a current and time-tested Government policy in the "rule of two," it does require some new documentation with respect to its use.

Under current procurement policy at DOD, whenever that agency prepares solicitation for the acquisition of construction services that will result in a prime contract award for less than $2 million, that solicitation will be presumed to be eligible for a small business set-aside. The Department of Energy has also adopted this policy toward construction services, their threshold is set at $3 million.

H.R. 2133 adopts this policy and applies this presumption to all Federal contracts under $2 million (except where small purchase procurement procedures or reserve programs apply). I will, in addition, offer an amendment to this section that will exempt the procurement of research and development and other professional, technical, and management services from the presumption.

Just what does this presumption mean? I am sure you have heard that the presumption means that all Federal contracts for less than $2 million must now go to small business. Again, this is false.

Under the presumption clause in H.R. 2133, small business set-asides for procurements under $2 million may be lifted if the contracting officer prepares a determinations and findings stating that the criteria for the set-aside will not be met. The intent of this section is to make it administratively easier for the contracting officer to seek competition on contracts under $2 million than it is to sole source or otherwise noncompetitively let the contracts. This provision is vital to the proper implementation of the "rule of two." This provision will help bring the benefits of competition to thousands of procurement actions.

In the fiscal year 1981-83 period, of all procurement contracts going to small business, 67 percent were under $2 million. Overall, small firms received 36 percent of the contracts let by the Government under $2 million in value. Quite obviously, contracts in this range are extremely important to small firms. Hence, this presumption

will make contracting officers think twice about obtaining small business competition on contract that otherwise would have gone out on a sole source, or other noncompetitive procedures.

Remember that the majority of Federal construction contracts are already awarded under this system. In addition, my amendment to this section will not affect the procurement of research and development and other professional, technical and management services (this presently includes architects and engineers). This presumption will get to the procurements that we need competition for the most—basic, low skill services and common hardware and tooled items that are not proprietary or patented. If an item is patented or proprietary, the contracting officer may issue a sole-source contract.

I hope this discussion of the major provisions of H.R. 2133 will help you understand the objectives of the legislation. Along with the other provisions of H.R. 2133, which are designed to fine tune existing procurement programs such as the Small Business Administration's certificate of competency program, small business reserve program, and the administration's small business procurement goal-setting procedures, these new legislative proposals seek to open the procurement process to the vast majority of firms in America that find themselves locked out by present procedures.

H.R. 2133 has the support of over 150 small business groups that represent the broad spectrum of businesses in the United States. These groups include the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Small Business Association, Small Business United, the National Machining and Tooling Association, and the Small Business Legislative Council.

ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS

On a final note, I want to comment on the opposition to H.R. 2133 that is being carried out by the architects and engineers. I understand that A&E firms have been active in contacting many congressional offices in opposition to H.R. 2133.

First, I must point out that my amendment to exempt professional, management, and technical services from the presumption provision would include exempting the procurement of A&E services from that section. The only part of the bill that still affects them is the "rule of two" and that is current regulation. Thus, nothing in H.R. 2133 changes the current system of procuring A&E services.

It is apparent that the lobbying effort against the bill on the part of the architects and engineers is being orchestrated by the largest 200 firms in the industry. Although these 200 firms make up only 0.07 percent of the 30,000 A&E firms in the country, a DOD report found that these firms receive 32.4 percent of DOD's A&E prime contract dollars. The DOD report from Secretary Weinberger further states that from fiscal year 1982 to fiscal year 1983 these firms increased their receipts from DOD from $71,730,000 to $139,819,000, an increase of 94.9 percent. By contrast, awards to small A&E firms increased only 20.1 percent in the same period.

The DOD report goes on to state that:

1. DOD's current implementation of set-asides in support of small business is statutorily authorized and correctly implemented through the Defense Acquisition Regulation.

2. DOD's implementation of the set-aside program has been supported by the courts and the GAO.

3. Quality performance of our requirements is not jeopardized by our current procedures, nor is mobilization readiness impaired.

Clearly, it appears that the opposition to H.R. 2133 on the part of the large A&E firms is an attempt to further increase their already disproportionate share of Federal A&E expenditures. If they can defeat the "rule of two" and have it removed from Federal procurement policy, they will take a large step toward eliminating competition from the small firms in their industry.

I urge you to stand firm against their effort.●

JAPAN PROBLEM ISN'T BEEF; IT'S HIGH-TECH TRADE

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, in a superb column recently, Hobart Rowen addressed the recent announcement that Japan would increase its imports of U.S.-produced beef and citrus. As Rowen points out, both beef and citrus have assumed a symbolic quality that exceed their importance in the overall scheme of our balance of trade with Japan. We cannot assume that the recent announcement—welcome as it may be—indicates an end to our ongoing trade friction with Japan.

I would caution, however, that we cannot now belittle the recent announcement as meaningless. Both beef and citrus were often cited as examples of restrictive Japanese import policies; imports have now, in some measure, been liberalized. I hope that we appreciate that the recent decision was an act of considerable political will by the Japanese Government, and recognize our role in making beef and citrus the most pressing issues that had to be dealt with. In a sense, the Rowen article provides us with a lesson in the importance of choosing our symbols, and a warning to do a more effective job in the future.

As Rowen points out—correctly, in my view—the big issues for the future lie in those manufactured goods where we enjoy a comparative advantage: computing equipment, telecommunications equipment, and other technology goods. There the next battles will have to be fought. We must concentrate our efforts where we will accomplish the most.

For example, after considerable U.S. pressure, the Japanese Government recently modified a proposal that was submitted to the diet that would have restricted foreign ownership of new value added networks for data transmission. This was a welcome decision; it is in an area where the United States has had extensive experience—and Japanese companies relatively little—and shows that it is possible to work with the Japanese Government without resorting to symbolism.

The NTT Procurement Agreement provides another useful model for reconciling differing approaches to high technology policy. NTT is the Japanese telephones monopoly, which historically has procured all of its equipment needs from four Japanese companies. Late in 1980, the Governments of the United States and Japan reached an agreement under which NTT's procurements would be open to competitive bid by American, as well as Japanese companies. Under the terms of the agreement—which was, incidentally, renewed earlier this year—NTT's procurements from U.S. companies have risen from $20 million per year to more than $140 million.

In addition, NTT has instituted procedures that facilitate the participation of U.S. companies in the Japanese market, and has sent several procurement delegations ot the United States to meet with U.S. manufacturers. While sales have not yet approached the level that I had hoped to see, there has clearly been an improvement, both in actual results and in reconciling differing approaches to the high technology marketplace.

I commend the following article to my colleagues' attention, and hope that we will all learn from the recent relaxation of restrictions on imported beef and citrus.

The article follows:

JAPAN PROBLEM ISN'T BEEF; IT'S HIGH-TECH TRADE

The Japanese are canny: For the past several years, they have kept American trade negotiators off balance, ducking demands for larger sales of American beef and citrus products to Japan. To be sure, as Japanese government officials say, there has been great political pressure from Japanese agriculture lobbies to keep out high-quality beef and citrus products from abroad.

But while all attention was focused on these politically volatile products, little

could be done to settle more basic issues, including Japanese resistance to imports of manufactured goods. At the moment, a critical confrontation looms over American efforts to sell satellite and other high-technology products in a growing Japanese market, and to get agreement on licensing computer software, an area where the United States is clearly ahead.

Against an American trade deficit of more than $20 billion a year with Japan, the extra sales of beef, oranges, etc., that will result from a new agreement may amount to a paltry $200 million annually, a mere trickle against the value of other products that the United States would like to sell Japan. As Ford Motor Co. Chairman Philip Caldwell grumbled, "The beef isn't worth more than about 16,000 cars."

But every time U.S. Trade Representative William E. Brock appeared before a congressional committee to discuss the whole range of trade issues between the United States and Japan, he heard a familiar chorus from representatives of farm states:

"How about beef and citrus?"

Japan, for its part, protested that a nation that had been on the edge of starvation in the last few years of World War II had to assure itself of a minimum level of domestic agricultural production, even if it could buy cheaper food abroad.

"Japanese consumers are willing to pay the costs," Ambassador Yoshio Okawara told the National Governors Conference in Portland, Me., last year.

Thus the beef/citrus issue gained enormous symbolic and political importance here and in Japan. A Japanese concession on beef and citrus that would have been small in a macroeconomic sense, muting larger issues, was one that the Japanese were unwilling to make.

So Congress began to chatter about a 10 percent import surcharge, and Brock himself bluntly told Japanese officials that beef and citrus quotas would have to be increased substantially, or the United States would take specific measures to restrict imports of Japanese goods.

Last weekend, Japan capitulated, agreeing to nearly double its import quotas for high-quality beef.

Under an expiring five-year agreement on beef and citrus, allowable U.S. exports of high-grade beef to Japan had been increasing by 3,300 metric tons a year, to the present level of 30,800 tons a year. (The American Cattlemen's Association says, however, that counting all grades of beef, total exports to Japan were 60,575 tons, or 65 percent of the U.S. global total of 93,045 tons last year.)

Under the new deal, Japan's high-quality-beef quota will rise to 58,400 metric tons at the end of four years. The citrus quotas will be boosted from 82,000 tons to 126,000 tons, and there will be comparable increases for juice.

Roger Berglund, president of the Cattlemen's Association, who grumbled that "we're still disappointed," fails to mention that American beef, as well as other meat products, are protected by the Meat Import Act. That provides a formula limiting beef imports here if domestic production exceeds demand. It's one of many American devices protecting farmers, including import restrictions on sugar, butter, cheese, peanuts and cotton.

In a telephone interview just before departing for Korea last week, Brock said candidly: "We can be accused of having more import barriers to agricultural products" than Japan does.

Thus, "nobody has a clean slate" on agricultural protectionism, as Brock likes to say.

But the big issues lie elsewhere. America has a "Japan problem" in terms of manufactured goods imported here, because their companies beat us out—with good business management—in consumer products ranging from video recorders to automobiles. Increasingly, the contest will turn to communications technology as both our economies increasingly become service-oriented.

We may have a merchandise trade deficit with Japan, but we still have a substantial surplus in services.

As Brookings economist Lawrence Kraus has pointed out, Japan has a number of real problems to face: a rapidly aging population, and a restrictive economic policy that is retarding domestic growth. In addition, having taken maximum advantage of existing technology, Japan is on the frontier of some of the newer processes where the United States excells, and Japan's ability to adapt the newer stuff is less certain.

In a little-noticed address to the Japan Society in New York after the Williamsburg summit, Prime Minister Nakasone acknowledged that Japan's future economic development should be in the direction "of the electronics and communications technology necessary to sustain an information society . . . The achievement of the information society seems primary, since it goes beyond changes in the production structure and . . . will mean the unfolding of a new and unprecedented stage of development.

"This may take 20 or even 30 years to realize, yet we should not let the long time span deter us."

So, at least, Japan appears to have the big picture in its sights. We've got the beef.●

ELECTIONS AND THE MILITARY VOTE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that our military personnel, who are serving to defend our Nation, are often unable to get their votes to count in U.S. elections. How ironic that the people who so bravely enlist to defend our right to free elections and our right to vote cannot make their voice heard due to poor election rules. This injustice to American citizens should be stopped and reforms to improve the voting system for military personnel should begin immediately. I am entering a copy of an article that appeared in the Conservative Digest which outlines this problem and the role of Samuel Wright in trying to rectify it.

The article is as follows:

GIVE THE MILITARY A CHANCE TO VOTE!

Approximately 182,000 military personnel who tried to vote in the 1980 presidential election were unable to do so, according to a Department of Defense survey. Reason: they received their absentee ballots too late or not at all.

This figure does not include persons who are not aware that their ballots were not counted, because local election officials received them after the election. The figure also does not include military dependents and overseas civilians.

If all those groups were included, the number of disenfranchised voters would likely approach half a million.

THE BASIC PROBLEM

The basic problem is that regardless of how early the voter applies for an absentee ballot, the local election official probably won't start mailing out ballots until about three weeks before the election, and in 45 states an absentee ballot must be actually received (not just postmarked) by election day.

For many military personnel, especially those at sea or at isolated overseas duty stations, three weeks is insufficient time for the ballot to go from the local election official to the voter and back.

The same is true for many civilians overseas, especially those who live in countries with terrible postal services.

Another problem, particularly for overseas civilians, is cumbersome notarization requirements. About half the states require that either the application for an absentee ballot, or the ballot return envelope, or both, be notarized or otherwise acknowledged by "an official authorized to administer oaths."

In most countries, notaries public are not as inexpenxive or as readily available as they are in this country. In some countries, the system of jurisprudence does not even contain the notion of "an official authorized to administer oaths."

There are cases on record of overseas Americans having to travel up to 75 miles or pay up to $75 to get a single piece of voting material notarized.

PROGRESS BEING MADE

Progress is being made on solving this problem because of the efforts of one Conservative Digest subscriber, Samuel F. Wright. Wright has put together a network of more than 350 volunteers around the country to work for ballot reforms. They encourage state and local elections officials, as well as state lawmakers, to make it easier for military personnel to vote by absentee ballots.

So far, through the efforts of Wright's network and others, reform bills have been enacted in California, Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Tennessee and Texas.

But Wright says more work is needed in these states as well as most others. In Indiana, for example, the new law solved only the notarization problem for military personnel abroad, not the problems involved in ballot transmission to and from military personnel.

"If we can make it possible for more military personnel to vote," says Wright, "it is likely that more pro-defense congressmen will be elected, and those in Congress will pay more attention to the needs of the military. After all, no one has a greater interest in a strong national defense than military personnel themselves.

"I recognize that the reforms we are seeking," he says, "may create some inconvenience for state and local election officials. But it seems to me that these are small accommodations to make to facilitate the enfranchisement of the brave young men and women who are away from home and prepared to lay down their lives in defense of our country."

"After all," says Wright, "were it not for the sacrifices of military personnel now and in the past, none of us would have the opportunity to vote in free elections."

GETTING INVOLVED

Wright became interested in this issue while serving as voting assistance officer for the Navy's Judge Advocate General during the 1978 election and as absentee voting chairman for the Harris County Republican Party, Houston, Texas during the 1980 campaign.

He will send information upon request to anyone about the kinds of reforms that are necessary in any particular state, along with the names and addresses of his contacts in that state.

Those who wish may write him at the following address: Samuel F. Wright, c/o Americans for a Sound Foreign Policy, 418 C St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.●

ENDING AUTO QUOTAS NOT THE ANSWER

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Columnist William Safire, in an article in the May 7 edition of the New York Times, provides a perceptive analysis of what is behind attempts to abolish import quotas on Japanese auto imports.

Mr. Safire, himself a noted conservative, observes that both the Reagan administration and the American auto companies want an end to Japanese import quotas.

And he suggests that the unconscionable bonuses the Detroit auto executives recently voted themselves and the administration's irate criticism of them are devices to achieve the same end.

I ask that the article be reprinted in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THOSE "OBSCENE" SALARIES

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON, May 6—See the obscene auto executive. He is living off the fat of the land: drawing a million-dollar salary, plus a million-dollar bonus, plus rewarding stock options, plus plush perks.

See the irate editorialist. He is writing: Where does this businessman come off, reaping these personal profits? Doesn't he realize that the auto industry's success this year came about because of quotas the U.S. Government imposed on Japanese imports? Doesn't he know that plutocratic compensation is bad public relations, sure to cause politicians to stop protecting the American auto industry from foreign competition?

See the conservative Reagan Administration trade negotiator. He is saying to the naughty businessmen: That's it fellas, we're fed up with your greed. If you are going to line your pockets with profits, I will no longer protect you with quotas.

See the auto union negotiator. He is mounting David Brinkley's podium to say: My people tightened their belts during the recession and suffered more than management did. Now that the bosses are rewarding themselves handsomely, it's only fair that we who bore the brunt of the lean years get the payoff in the fat years.

See the cool economist. He is theorizing: This rush to raise the cost of production is proof that quotas and other forms of protection are wrong. Let the Japanese cars in, and let the American auto worker lower his standard of living.

See the confused auto worker. He is scratching his head and wondering: How come, when the bosses raise their salaries and Washington blows its stack, I'm the one who suffers? The chairman of G.M. gets rich, then the politicians and consumers get mad, then the Japanese get invited in, and then I get laid off.

Sometimes what appears to be dumb is really smart. The decision by many auto executives to flout public opinion by taking what appears to be inordinately high compensation is akin to Br'er Rabbit's cry of "Don't throw me in the briar patch!"

Most auto executives are secretly eager for quotas to end. General Motors has invested capital in Japan to produce cars there, and G.M. would share in the profit from an end to the protection of the U.S. auto worker.

Republican economists are also eager to remove the quotas, on the grounds that the marketplace enforces productivity only if the devil is allowed to take the hindmost.

The irony is in the fire: By getting all red in the face about the executive bonuses, the Reagan men can do what most executives want—that is, to let economic dog eat dog, and to put American capital to work employing cheaper Japanese labor.

We should not be misled, therefore, by the Administration's professed ire at the auto executives' greed. That populist ire clothes a determination to put the squeeze on the too costly American auto worker.

Is this transfer of jobs to Japan in the interest of the American worker, consumer and taxpayer?

I'm for a person's getting as obscene a salary as the market will bear, and I know the catechism: Capitalism harnesses the energy of human greed to the creation of human dignity. The average American worker, who is paid half the wage of the auto worker, should not, when buying a car, have to pay a subsidy to the auto worker. If you can't cut the mustard, step aside for somebody who can; in the long run, protection's kindness is cruelty.

But we have the stick by the wrong end. We should not be beating up on the auto worker for negotiating a high wage, and sending our capital to Japan to hire Japanese; on the contrary, we should be treating our auto worker's achievement as something for other Americans to emulate, and we should be attracting Japanese and other capital here to employ our workers.

Let us stop flagellating ourselves; not everything is our fault. The problem of the U.S. auto industry is less the standard of living of our auto workers and more the uninspired management of many auto executives and, most of all, the standard of unfair competition inflicted on us by the Japanese.

The Government of Japan has been getting away with economic murder. Japan's currency is artifically rigged to make exports cheaper and imports more costly. Japan practices outrageous trade discrimination and pioneered domestic-content legislation. Japan takes our nuclear umbrella for granted and benefits from its tiny investment in defense.

Advocates of free trade in Washington should start pressuring the people in Tokyo, not the people in Detroit. The Reagan administration's promise to end quotas next year is aimed at holding down U.S. wages, not at getting Japan to adopt a free-trade policy.

Maybe we should offer an obscene bonus to the first trade negotiator who comes back with a fairly valued yen and a level playing field.●

QUEENS BOROUGH-WIDE SALUTE TO MUSIC CONCERT

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the many talented young people who performed in the Queens Borough-Wide Salute to Music Concert on Saturday, April 28. More than 200 junior high school students participated in the 26-year-old concert tradition sponsored by the New York City Board of Education.

Each of New York City's five counties has a Borough-wide orchestra, band, and chorus, and offers junior training groups as well. More than 2,500 junior high and intermediate school students participate in the music instruction programs, which give them a unique opportunity to learn music skills and to develop their music appreciation.

This excellent program is supported by a private, non-profit organization called the Friends of Music for Junior High School Pupils of the City of New York, Inc. I applaud the program's executive director, Jerome Parker, for his efforts to discover and develop the musical talents and abilities of the boys and girls in New York City's public high schools. Friends of Music obtains and supplies funds for hiring teachers, purchasing instruments, renting rehearsal and performance facilities, providing scholarships for talented and needy pupils, and defraying other costs incidental to the implementation of the program. Without the support and encouragement of Friends of Music. Many of the students who participated in this year's Borough-Wide Concert would not have been able to pursue their musical talents.

These students were recommended by their junior high and intermediate schools to audition for the Borough-Wide band, orchestra or chorus, in October of last year. Many of these students had never performed publicly before, and welcomed this opportunity to learn and perform great music together for an appreciative audience.

Special credit goes to several participants in the 1984 Queens Concert: Jeffrey Kastin, orchestra conductor; Susan Feldman, orchestra conductor; Fawn Weiner, assistant orchestra conductor; Anne Marie Hudley, choral

conductor; Zora M. Clement, associate choral conductor and accompanist; Emelia Pruyn, assistant choral conductor; Gwendolyn Carter, assistant choral conductor; Lorraine Jeffers, assistant choral conductor; Joseph Joffe, band conductor; Donald Feldman, associate band conductor; and James Corwin, assistant band conductor.

I congratulate the students for their superb musical presentation at this year's Queens Concert program, and encourage their interest in music. I ask that the 1984 concert program listing all of the Queens student participants be printed below.

QUEENS PARTICIPANTS

BAND

Flute: Lauren Ackerman, Maria Alexander, Donna Bodine, Felicia Busto, Lori M. De L'Eveille, Karen Greenberger, Ida Lin, Danielle Luttenberg, Julie Mahdy, Jaquima Norris, Rachel Rashes, Lori Robinson, Tina Sgouros, Carol Anne St. Louis, Sheila Storr, Sandy Wang, Lisa Watts, and Ruschell Wilson.[1]

Oboe: Leonor Acevedo.

Bassoon: Cheri McLeod.[1 2]

Clarinet: Pier Blissett, Linda Cheung, Dionne Dixon, Alex Dranovsky, Denise Durant, Tony Eng, Margie Gonzalez, Beth Ann Gordon, Felicia Goulbourne, Tracy Griffin, Lisa Hinds, Dawn Hughes, You Young Kang, Malaika Kashaka,[1] Jennifer Kong, Richard Kuonqui,[3] Tracy Logan, Johnine Mowatt, Harriet Popadopoulos, Mihcele Perlis, Nicole Reed, Rosalinda Salva, Michele Speruta, Steven Sofia, and Bobson Wong.

Bass Clarinet: Dara Paul.

Alto Saxophone: Alfonzo Blackwell, Andrew Meyer, Talib Shabazz, and Dawn Wilson.

Tenor Saxophone: Tania McLeod.

Baritone Saxophone: Denzil Fearon and Karen Malloy.

Trumpet: Nadine Barnett,[1] Previn Baskin, Matthew Cohen, Alex E. Crosland, Marcus Holley, Kenneth Johnson, Roland Johnson, Ricardo Miranda, and Christopher Planes.

Trombone: Guillermo Asca, Colin Ernst, and Thomas Pullis.

Baritone Horn: Jackie Glass, Akima Rogers, Joachim Rogers, Danielle Woodall, and Ellen Zakin.

Tuba: Kenny Almestica, Stephen Bradshaw, and Wendell Williams.

Percussion: Jimmy Buck, Theodore Holliday, Roxan Jurkevich, Joe Mulholland, and Frances Ann Rubenstein.

CHORUS

Soprano I: Lorraine Coke, Tara Guadalupe,[2] Enid King, Mona Lake, Germaine Ray, Michelle Ryan, Denise Saunders, Eugena Sherman, Francine Sue, Myrna Taylor,[2] Yvette Torres, and Denise Woodall.

Soprano II: Hakima Ahmad, Jennifer Augliera, Yolanda Bryant, Heidi Edu, Yvette Ellis, Carleen Fernandez, Denise Fowler, Cicely Jefferies, Catrice Joseph, Laura McNulty, Tajuana Moore, Vivianne Mussenden, Wendy Owens, Veronica Phelts, Stephanie Rice, Desiree Ricks, Stephanie Rogers, Theresa Sylvester, Diana Velez, Michele Washington, Belinda White, Weletta Williams, and Andrian Wooten.

Alto I: Carla Brickhouse, Lynwana Brinkley, Tammy Bryant, Erica Campbell, Tracy Dailey, Denise Diaz, Mayra Fernandez, Vanessa Fields, Jessica Fry, Karen Goddard, Sinova Greggs, Cynthia Hardy, LaDon James, Andrea Lomita, Loys Lucius, Arnessa McNeill, Deneen Moore, Dawn Mulrain, Kathy Napolitano, Lavern Newtown, Sayeeda Nicholas, Amy Rice, Pamela Ricks, Melissa Rodriquez, Dawn Marie Steiger,[1] Heather Josette Steiger,[1] Bernice Turner, Nocola Waldron, Barnetta White, Tonya Williams, Janice Wilson, and Artina Young.

Alto II: Kara Donovan, Regina Fantroy, Nilacha Foster, Loren Johnson, Krystal Joiner, Darlene Low,[2] Lynelle Ponton, Nadine Redwood, Natalie Rodriquez, Patrina Smalls,[2] Kyra Solomon, Marnay Sylvester, Lisa Walters, Denise Watson, Lana Williams, and Stacy Wilson.

Tenor I: Blain Aiken III, Paul Blair, Su Tong Cho, Rudolph Isaacs, Benjamin Kanstroom, Tommy Millines, Patria Selby,[2] Jesse Wooten.

Tenor II: Steve Hahn, Carlos Johnson, Keith Smith, and Charles Stone.[2]

Bass I: Anthony Avery,[2] Jonathan Cassell, James Hardy, Omel McLean, Tyrone Washington, Tad Wells, Vance Williams,[2] Michael Panton.

ORCHESTRA

1st Violin: Thomas Bloise,[1] Steven Chang, Thomas Gullo,[1] Andrew Lin, Margherita Mattani, Donna Piggott, Rodrigo Pineiro, Amy Quan, Maria Quartarno, Theresa Rocque, Benerex Salva,[1] Mei-Lin Wong, and Jennifer Young.

2nd Violin: Racquel Abobo, Lissette Bernal,[2] Todd Blue, Jennifer Embriano, Remy Esquenet, Anthony Filorimo, Shana Flynn, Jennifer Hergula, Soohwan Kim, Fay Lee, Yvonne Monge, Earlean Nelson, Maribel Ossa, Elisa Piggott, Elayne Redman, Anna Song, and Sung-Hyun Song.

Viola: Keisha Alston, Angela Banks,[2] Celeste Chau, Benjamin Dinglasan, Deidra Dunbar, Brenda Howard, Christine Lewis, Anna Rivera, Lori Sang, Tyrone Stewart, Cornelius Thompson, John Thompson, Nadia Young, and Dorie Zarbis.

Cello: John Barreto, Sue Cho, Margaret Hsu, and Sandy Pesa.

String Bass: Georgette Brown, Vanessa Pogue, and Glenn Stewart.

Flute: Felicia Busto and Ida Lin.

Clarinet: Richard Kuonqui and You Young Kang.

Bass Clarinet: Dara Paul.

Alto Saxophone: Andrew Meyers.

Tenor Saxophone: Tania McLeod.

Bassoon: Cheri McLeod.

Trumpet: Matthew Cohen.

Tuba: Eric Williams.

Percussion: Jimmy Buck, Theodore Holliday, Roxan Jurkevich, Joe Mulholland, and Frances Ann Rubenstein.●

[1] Set up squad.
[2] Librarian.
[3] Concert master.
[2] Section leader.

CONCERNS ABOUT WORLD POPULATION EXPLOSION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have spoken out on the need for a greater understanding of the dangers inherent in the world population explosion. Today there are 82 million more people in the world than 1 year ago. Next year will see an increase of 84 million. It is a compounding problem which is the cause of increasing hardship and suffering around the world, and especially in the developing nations of the world.

This August 6–13, in Mexico City, a World Population Conference will be held by the United Nations to consider international measures to address the problem of overpopulation. This week we are discussing the foreign aid reauthorization. Accordingly, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a timely article by Tad Szulc which appeared in the April 29, 1984 edition of Parade magazine. It explores and outlines the problems facing us as a result of continuing overpopulation. In addition, it provides useful data in which to approach the debate over our country's participation in this program.

The article follows:

[From Parade Magazine, Apr. 29, 1984]

ONE PERSON TOO MANY?

(By Tad Szulc)

Short of nuclear annihilation, the greatest threat to humanity is, ironically, its own sheer mass. Global population grows inexorably and at a rate so prodigious that by the year 2000—only 16 years from now—the world, with its added billions, will be unable to provide adequate food and energy, let alone jobs, housing, education and health care. And what could happen by the mid-21st century (when babies born in this decade approach old age) defies imagination—unless acceptable ways are found of curtailing population growth. This is as true in a special way for the United States as it is generally for the developing Third World, which accounts for 75 percent of the world's population.

Overpopulation on the scale currently taking shape will result in new and greater famines, perhaps wars, civil strife and deep social distortions as well as massive malnutrition and disease, vast migrations and a sharp drop in living standards almost everywhere, including this country. Yet no high-priority international strategy exists to cope with these problems. Emergency assistance is essentially all that is being done by the world community.

To the U.S., where the population growth rate has leveled off, the world population explosion represents an enormous pressure on its southern borders, as tens of millions of destitute migrants from Latin America are pushed north in search of a livelihood. It adds up to one of the most serious challenges to American society.

The latest famine in Africa, the result of one of the worst and longest droughts in history, illustrates dramatically the collapse of the delicate balance between population growth and food supply. The drought, which began three years ago, was *directly* responsible for the famine, of course, but uncontrollable population increases also contribute to mass starvation.

According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, of the 150 million people who live in the 24 African countries hit by the drought, an estimated 100 million face

[1] Librarians.
[1] Set up squad.
[2] Librarian.

hunger and as many as 4 million, mainly children, may die this year and next from starvation, malnutrition and related causes. In Mozambique alone, 200,000 may have died in 1983 and at least 100,000 more this year.

Demographers have long warned that massive overpopulation is a time bomb, but in 1983 the point was finally reached when the threat began to become a reality. Recent discussions, with population specialists at the UN, World Bank, U.S. Bureau of the Census and Washington think-tanks reveal this gloomy picture:

The world population rose by 82 million between mid-1982 and mid-1983—an all-time record, making 1983 a demographic turning point—reaching 4.7 *billion* last September. This is more than twice the global population 20 years ago. The Census Bureau projects an increase of 82.8 million in 1983/84 and 84 million in 1984/85. At this rate, world population will hit 5 billion by 1986 and 6.2 billion by 2000. Try to visualize a new China *and* a new India—more than six times the population of the U.S.—swelling the ranks of humanity.

The World Bank estimates that only 23 of the 98 Third World nations will reach stationary population—no more absolute growth—toward the middle or end of the next century; the rest will quit growing only sometime during the 22nd century. China, now with 1.06 billion inhabitants and already the most populated nation in the world, should attain the stationary level in 2040, with 1.43 billion. India will have 1.8 billion when it stabilizes in 2140. The U.S., its growth rates slowing down, is expected to move from its present 234 million to 289 million when we reach stationary population in 2040.

Though average annual rates of growth are decreasing in the world, the actual numbers are racing out of hand (because each year the base is larger for figuring percentage increase).

Already, more than half the world's people live in cities that cannot house, feed or support them. Older cities—such as Calcutta, Delhi, Mexico, Sao Paulo and Jakarta—are turning into urban nightmares. Since 1960, there have been 245 additional cities with populations exceeding 500,000. And rural inhabitants keep migrating to cities, where at the same time babies are being born to earlier immigrants.

This worldwide population emergency is tragic where the availability of food, shelter, health services and jobs is concerned.

Lester R. Brown, president of the Washington-based Worldwatch Institute and a leading authority on food economics, says that "the way things are going, it's quite possible that per capita food production at the end of the century will be less than today." World food production, in fact, is already declining in many key sectors compared with annual population growth. Although overall world grain production doubled between 1950 and 1973, since then, Brown points out, the output per person "has barely kept pace with world population growth."

In Africa, for example, per capita food production in 30 countries actually *fell* in 1979 and 1980, aggravating the famine. When there is starvation on a vast scale, there are no resources, including human energy, to stimulate greater food production. And as births multiply, so does the overall survival problem. Most African nations lack workable systems of food production, distribution and marketing. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization warns that unless 4 million tons of grain are rapidly supplied to 22 African countries with 145 million people, mass starvation may be inevitable.

By the end of the century, the demand for grain in the developing nations will be twice the 437 million tons required in 1980. But experts note that excessive dependence on foreign assistance discourages local food production.

And problems beget other problems. Grain and cattle production, for example, have been hurt by the huge rise in petroleum prices since 1973. Petroleum is used in the production of fertilizers, which fewer and fewer Third World farmers can afford at today's prices. Compounding the problem is worldwide soil erosion, and farmers everywhere are doing little to protect the topsoil.

In terms of nutrition, the situation is appalling throughout most of the Third World. Although physicians offer no standard measurement for required daily caloric intake, it is well below generally accepted levels in the Third World, according to the World Bank.

In addition, medical care is declining. In Ethiopia, there is one doctor per 58,490 inhabitants; in Indonesia, one per 11,530 (in the U.S., it's one for every 520).

Whereas starving Africans have no place to go to find survival, in Latin America and Asia massive migrations are increasingly the solution for the destitute. Illegal migrants from Mexico are entering the U.S. in uncontrollable numbers. During the year ending last Sept. 30, the Immigration and Naturalization Service apprehended 1.03 million illegals crossing the border from Mexico (most were Mexicans, but there were also thousands of Central Americans). And the Service, short-handed along the frontier, doesn't know how many illegal migrants elude its surveillance.

Between 2 million and 3 million illegal immigrants a year remain in the United States, more than the annual natural increase in U.S. population. Approximately 4 million crossed (or attempted to cross) the U.S. border in 1982/1983. But assuming that Mexico's economic situation will not improve markedly, it is possible that nearly 6 million will be crossing the border 15 years from now.

And between 30 million and 40 million Mexicans and Central Americans are likely to enter the U.S. illegally between now and the end of the century. Hispanics now represent an estimated 10 percent of the U.S. population; this percentage may double by the year 2000.

UN Secretary General Javier Pérez de Cuellar commented recently that "if the rapid population growth in developing countries is left unchecked it will evidently undermine all efforts for economic and social development and could easily lead to widespread depletion of each nation's basic resources."

An expert at the Center for International Research of the U.S. Census Bureau put it even more starkly: "Unless international action is undertaken rapidly to control population, I can see systems of governments breaking down."

What *is* being done? In August in Mexico City, the United Nations will hold its periodic World Population Conference to consider new international measures to keep population down. That the world population jumped by 700 million since the last UN population conference, in 1974, suggests the inadequacy of present world programs.

The opposition of the Roman Catholic Church to most forms of birth control and family planning is a major factor inhibiting population control, especially in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Pope John Paul II has made it clear that he will not depart from this stance, but experts say that increasingly Church views are being ignored, particularly in families suffering less poverty and having more education.

China, using draconian methods to limit families to one child, brought its annual growth rate to 1.06 percent in 1983, one of the lowest in the world. India, with 715 million, has birth-control programs, including voluntary sterilization. There are birth-control clinics in many Third World countries, and contraceptives are sold by street vendors in many Asian cities.

However, the international community—and especially the U.S.—has not faced the urgent need for a coordinated world program that would bring together *all aspects* of the great population crisis: birth control, food and energy production, health and education.

The UN has a population division with a relatively low priority. The World Bank's efforts are confined to studies and recommendations. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization lacks adequate resources. The Reagan Administration has a Coordinator of Population Affairs—a scarcely visible operation—in the State Department. Also buried in the State Department is a small Directorate for Health and Population in the Agency for International Development.

Lester Brown of the Worldwatch Institute charges that "there is a vacuum of leadership created by the U.S. in the population area." He adds, "There is no intellectual leadership. This Administration has no people with vision to see the future if the United States were to commit itself to these problems."

Meanwhile the population time bomb is ticking. When the explosion comes at the end of this century, the United States will not escape the fallout unless we assume leadership to help our species save itself from its own blindness.●

CONGRESS SHOULD CANCEL THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S WORLD COURT DECISION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 the Reagan administration announced that it would not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice on any issue relating to Central America for 2 years. The administration's decision has reduced the United States, a nation founded on the very principle of the rule of law, to the level of an international scofflaw. I am today introducing legislation to declare the administration's action null and void.

The administration's declaration with respect to the nonjurisdiction of the World Court was clearly designed to deflect international criticism of

the President's decision to authorize direct CIA involvement in the general campaign to destabilize the Government of Nicaragua. But the declaration has not and will not succeed in its goal of escaping responsibility. Rather, it will simply reduce the credibility of the United States in the eyes of the law and the eyes of the international community. Worse yet, it abandons our historic commitment to the rule of law, which has been the very foundation of our Nation.

The Reagan administration has made much lately of Soviet cheating on arms control agreements, and of Soviet disregard for international agreements. How ironic that, while denouncing the Russians for allegedly violating the spirit of bilateral and international agreements, the administration would so cavalierly decide that we are simply not going to accept the jurisdiction of the World Court for 2 years. This decision was made notwithstanding the fact that our actions appear to be in clear and direct violation of the declaration of August 2, 1946 accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

The Senate resolution consenting to the declaration of World Court jurisdiction included three specific reservations. The first provides that the declaration shall not apply to—

Disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals * * *

No other tribunal has been entrusted with deciding Nicaragua's complaint against the United States, so it seems clear that the first reservation does not apply.

The second reservation—the so-called Connally Reservation—rejects World Court jurisdiction in—

Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Certainly it would be some straining of the facts to argue that the decision to give military assistance to the Contras amounts to an internal domestic policy matter even if it is determined that it involves the right of the United States to self-defense. The right to self-defense is rooted in international law, and the carrying out of a self-defense claim—itself a tortured reading of our Nicaragua policy—is clearly a matter of international law.

The third reservation denies World Court jurisdiction in—

Disputes arising under a multilateral treaty, unless (1) all parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also parties to the case before the court, or (2) the United States specially agrees to jurisdiction.

Certainly Nicaragua and the United States are both parties to the case, and the Contras are not parties to the treaty. Further, the Court's own statutes specifically provide that the decision in any particular case has no binding force except between the parties and in respect to the particular case in question. So a contention that any rendering by the Court in this case will have a precedential bearing on other future actions and therefore provides grounds for a rejection of Court jurisdiction under the third reservation is also contravened by the Court's own statutes.

Thus the United States is bound to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in Nicaragua's case, unless the United States lawfully terminates the existing declaration, which can only be effective upon 6 months notification. Such notice has not been given. The Reagan administration is, in effect, saying that it will abide by this or that agreement or treaty so long as it pleases, but any time an agreement may prove a hindrance it will not abide by it, or abide by it only selectively.

The administration asserts in one breath that our foes are violating agreements or international law and in the next decides unilaterally that the United States will not abide by international law or international agreements when to do so conflicts with administration policy. What kind of image does that create for America, the Nation that since its founding has championed respect for the rule of law by all nations?

Mr. Speaker, the action of the administration, even though it is legally ineffective, is ill-advised and unworthy of our country. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation declaring that the action of the Secretary of State on April 6, 1984, in attempting to withdraw for 2 years the acceptance by the United States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court is null and void. Since the administration seems determined to play fast and loose with the World Court declaration, the Congress has an obligation to the Nation and the world to see to it that the administration is overruled. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.●

SANDERS' GRADUATION CEREMONY REMARKS

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like the following remarks made by James C. Sanders, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to be included in the RECORD. Mr. Sanders made these remarks on May 3, 1984, at the graduation ceremony of Gulf Coast Community College in Panama City, FL. His remarks are quite inspiring, as you will see.

THE SUMMIT OF YEARS FOUR SCORE

(By Samuel Ullman)

Youth is not a time of life. It's a state of mind. It's a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination,

A vigor of the emotions, a predominance of courage over timidity, of the appetite for adventure over love of ease.

Nobody grows old by merely living a number of years. People grow old only by deserting their ideals.

Years wrinkle the skin, but to give up enthusiasm wrinkles the soul.

Worry, doubt, self-distrust, fear and despair—these bow the head and turn the growing spirit to dust.

Whether 60 or 16, there is in every being's heart the love of wonder, the sheer amazement at the stars and the starlike things and thoughts,

The undaunted challenge of events, the unfailing childlike appetite for what-next, and the joy of the game of living.

You are as young as your faith, as old as your doubt;

As young as your self-confidence, as old as your fear;

As young as your hope, as old as your despair.

So long as your heart receives messages of beauty, cheer, courage, grandeur and power from the earth, from man and from the infinite, so long are you young.

When the wires are all down, and all the central places of your heart are covered with the snows of pessimism and the ice of cynicism,

Then, and only then, are you grown old indeed, and may God have mercy on your soul.

Live every day of your life as though you expect to live forever.

As I look out over your suntanned faces today, I have the sense of the youth and life that this poem describes. It is fitting that your graduation from Gulf Coast Community College occurs during the heart of springtime, when growth, development, and maturation actually can be felt with the hands, seen with the eyes, and smelled in the air. I see and feel this exuberance of life within you.

All of the best emotions of the heart and soul of America are evident today at this special occasion. Within the graduates, of course, there is a feeling of relief—the papers have been turned in and the tests have been completed. With your academic burdens behind, life looms ahead of you like a blank slate. Certainly this must be a time of great satisfaction as many of you can bask in the glow of a job well done. Within parents, there is a pride that is contagious as they see a fulfillment of their dreams, but beyond this personal satisfaction, you are exhibiting the hope for a better future that one generation desires for its offspring, with one generation sweating for the betterment of the new. Your hopes are not only of educating your children, but of maintaining the tradition of economic freedom and prosperity that exists in this country. In a sense, a torch is being passed from one generation to another with the charge to you graduates to continue to kindle the fire that has been so graciously laid before you. Our hope is to ignite your souls with desire to carry out our dreams in sustaining and improving this great land by setting and reaching loftier goals than we were able to attain.

Here in the United States, this spirit of growth and progress seems to be more intense than any other place throughout the world. We see it in the early patriots' vision of America as a city set on a hill, the scene of the penniless Ben Franklin, entering the streets of Philadelphia personifying the rags to riches dream so inherently American.

Alexis de Toqueville visited this country in the 1830's and travelled throughout the young democracy to see what drove the American people, what made them tick. He was constantly amazed at the determination of our entrepreneurs. In "Democracy in America" Toqueville compares the American to the European merchant. In this case he mentions sea traders, but I think this comparison applies across the board.

"The European sailor navigates with prudence; he sets sail only when the weather is favorable; if an unforeseen accident befalls him, he puts into port; at night he 1 furls a portion of his canvas; and when the whitening billows intimate the vicinity of land, he checks his course and takes an observation of the Sun.

The American neglects these precautions and braves these dangers. He weighs anchor before the tempest is over; by night and by day he spreads his sails to the wind; such damage as his vessel may have sustained from the storm, he repairs as he goes along; and when he at last approaches the end of his voyage, he darts onward to the shore as if he already descried a port.

"I cannot better explain my meaning," Tocqueville says, "than by saying that the Americans show a sort of heroism in their manner of trading. The American does not follow calculation, but an impulse of his nature."

This American spirit of progress is able to flourish because genuine freedom of choice really exists. Nowhere else in the world can an entrepreneur identify a need, choose a type of business, implement a strategy for success, and develop goals within his own grasp. We hear of wonderful systems in countries such as Japan and Great Britain, but even these educational and vocational choices are made for you at an early age. In the United States, we alone decide what we will do with our lives. This complete freedom, coupled with an intense spirit, have made this country as great as it is today.

Americans have always had a drive for a richer and fuller life. Edward A. Filene described our pathway to prosperity when he said, "The keynote of progress, we should remember, is not doing away with what is bad; it is replacing the best with something better." A perfect example of this American brand of initiative is the fast food industry. In both the hamburger chain business and the fried chicken business, Americans could have looked at both McDonalds and Kentucky Fried Chicken and said, "These are successful, so no one will be able to successfully compete." It is a good thing that opinion is not mentioned in the boardrooms of Burger King, Wendy's Popeyes, Church's, and Roy Rogers. These takers, or as I call them, pioneers of the last frontier, are constantly expanding opportunities by building free markets that ignite dynamic investment and development.

Until recently, an unhealthy environment for entrepreneurs and small business existed. High taxes, high interest rates, and high inflation which were masking economic realities for years finally began to take their toll on the economy of the world. The result was poor purchasing power, lack of investment incentives and consequently high unemployment and low productivity.

Now this downswing has been turned around, and as the recent President's report on small business indicates, small business is at the cutting edge of recovery. As the Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration, I feel that I have the best job in Washington. In 1983, small business provided 50 percent of the work force, two out of three new jobs, 42 percent of sales, 38 percent of the gross national product, over 600,000 new incorporations and a 19 percent growth in business proprietorships and partnerships. Even during the recession period of 1982 when big business lost 1.5 million jobs, small business created 2.5 million jobs. Small business thus created all of the 1 million net jobs in 1983, accentuating small businesses ability for success during poor economic times and the fact that small business spearheaded our current recovery. Although small businesses were more productive during the recession period than big business, absolute growth occurs only when economic conditions encourage expansion and investment. Small business is surely the biggest business in America.

This past week I have had the difficult task of choosing the Small Business Person of the Year. It was a tough job because there are so many worthy winners who have seen the opportunities available to them and have worked toward fulfilling their dreams. One of my favorite stories is the rise to success of Ginnie Johnasen, Inc. The business started in 1978 while Ginnie was in college. She needed a belt to wear with casual slacks and nothing she saw was striking enough. After making and wearing several of her own creations, fellow students wanted to buy them.

Ginnie began her business with $1,500 in orders. Now 24 years old and president of a company which grosses over $7 million in sales, her company manufactures 57 different accessory products lines, and employs 65 people, most of whom happen to be women.

Another interesting story is the growth of R & D Machine of Aston, Pa. Andy Ruszkay and Michael Draviczky escaped from Communist Hungary under a hail of Russian gunfire in 1957. Upon arriving in America, their first adverse business condition to overcome was that neither of them could speak, read, or write English. They were determined to succeed, however and were hired as machinists in a shop. In 1965, Andy and Mike formed a partnership and started their own machine shop. Just as the business started to flourish, their shop, which had grown from 4 to 40 people, was hit by a flood. Even though the water reached the ceiling and the damage was devastating, these entrepreneurs never gave up. From a business that was started out of a garage and trailer, they are now a firm that has completed over 200 Government contracts, the last being for $1 million to the Department of the Navy.

An interesting sidelight to this success story occurred when I toured their plant last month. After seeing all of the computerized systems and machines, I commented on how intelligent one had to be to run such a healthy business. Mike turned toward me and said, "I will tell you just how smart we are. Soon after arriving in America, we received our first paycheck and went to the grocery store. Since neither of us could read English, we decided that some of the best items seemed to be the large blue cans with cherry pie and fried chicken on the label. We were so smart that we bought twelve large cans of this bargain so we could have dinner and dessert. Unfortunately for us, they were twelve cans of Crisco."

All citizens have the right to partake of the American dream in their own fashion. The opportunities in the business sector for the adventurous are limitless. Successful entrepreneurs possess courage, strong character, initiative, the desire to work long and hard, and the ability to be flexible—qualities that most college students are well acquainted with. There are no real short cuts to success, however. Potential small business owners must have a product that is in demand, a knowledge of fundamental business practices, imagination, besides being prepared for hard work. Too often we hear stories of bad breaks; in successful small business you make your own breaks. To paraphrase President Eisenhower, "If you want to stay in the game, you must be willing to play with the cards you were dealt."

There is no doubt that economic and political freedom are inseparably tied to each other. Real individual freedom exists when people are able to build free markets to create a flowering of economic growth. When countries look for leadership in attaining freedom, they look to the United States. We still are and will continue to be the real hope of the world for free enterprise. It is our responsibility to spread the good news of economic freedom. This road of responsibility is not an easy one, but it is the right and only one. Small business is the wave of the future and the opportunities are available for those who seek them. As Theodore Roosevelt said: "Far better it is to dare mighty things to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat."●

SIEGMUND SPIEGEL: AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an individual whose impressive record of accomplishments in his chosen profession is surpassed only by his dedication and commitment to serving the needs of his fellow man. I refer to Mr. Siegmund Spiegel whose life embodies the humanitarian principles and standards of excellence to which many men aspire, but few achieve.

The United Jewish Appeal and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies (UJA/Federation) will pay tribute to this outstanding citizen at a special breakfast in his honor on May 20. I can think of no person more deserving of this honor.

As a child and young man in Nazi Germany, Sig Spiegel developed a strong sense of survival and unity of spirit with his fellow Jews, which has directed his life ever since. He escaped the horrors of Hitler's destruction of

the Jewish people during the war and arrived a refugee in the United States.

With great determination and talent, overcoming many obstacles, Sig became a licensed architect known and respected for his professional abilities. His many achievements in his chosen profession have won Sig the respect and admiration of his colleagues, and have earned him leadership positions in the architectural field. He is past director of the Long Island Chapter, American Institute of Architects; a member of the Long Island Builders Institute and an honorary life member of its board of directors; an associate member of the Building Inspectors Association of Nassau County; and a member of the Nassau County Rent Guidelines Board.

Despite the time and effort Sig puts into his daily professional responsibilities, he works tirelessly for the benefit of his fellow man. Sig's record of service to the community is long and distinguished. He was chiefly responsible for the organization 13 years ago of the architects, engineers, builders, and real estate division of the UJA/Federation and has remained an active member and significant influence ever since. He is a former president of the Central Nassau Unit of the American Cancer Society; a member of the Kiwanis; and past president of the chamber of commerce. Sig's unselfish commitment to the service of the handicapped, emotionally disturbed children, and the elderly is worthy of the highest commendation.

An esteemed and involved member of the Jewish community as well, Sig serves as executive vice president of the Long Island Regional Board of the Anti-Defamation League; as an Associate of Hadassah; and as a member of the UJA/Federation Cabinet, Long Island.

As one who has been privileged to enjoy Sig's friendship, I would like to express my deepest personal gratitude for his years of outstanding public service to the community, and congratulate him on his many, many personal and professional achievements. I extend to Sig my warmest wishes for happiness and fulfillment in the years ahead. He is in the truest sense an outstanding American.●

BILL POTHOFF: FINE ATHLETE—INCOMPARABLE COACH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Bill Pothoff, a Harbor City resident, is retiring from teaching and coaching after an eventful career spanning 36 years with area public schools. A dinner will be held in his honor Thursday evening, May 10, at Nizetich's, an elegant restaurant in San Pedro. In anticipation of the upcoming evening's main event, I would like to make a few remarks about the honored guest.

Bill is a graduate of San Pedro High School and the University of Southern California. As a high school and university student, he proved an exceptional athlete, setting high school records in track for the 1,320 yard and the mile distances, and participating on the track teams at Compton Junior College and USC. His coaching career marks a noteworthy extension of Bill's own successes as an athlete.

He has served as track coach at Jordan, WA, and Banning High Schools. Each of his teams captured city track championships: Jordan High School in 1955, Washington High School in 1965, and Banning High School in 1976. He also coached Banning's sophomore cross-country team to the city championship in that same year. Some of the young athletes Bill coached include 1980 Olympian Toni Campbell; USC and Oakland Raider great Clarence Davis; NCAA champion Paul Kerry; and Daniel Everage, the first city resident to put the shot beyond 60 feet.

But Bill's achievements are not limited to athletics. He has been a fine teacher, father, and civic leader. He has three children—Clark, Susan, and Wendy—and a grandchild, Forrest Benson. Within the community, Bill is active with the American Legion—the School Master's Post—the USC Alumni Association—the Trojan Club—the Trojan Coaches Club, and the U.S. Marine Corps Association. He also serves as the director of the Lido Isle Yacht Club's youth sailing program; as assistant scoutmaster for Newport Beach's Boy Scout Troop 449, and as a volunteer for the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee. He is a veteran who served in the Marine Corps during World War II and the Korean conflict and held the rank of major when he left the Marine Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Lee, and I would like to wish Bill Pothoff the very best during the years ahead. We hope Thursday evening's celebration marks but the midpoint of his many contributions and accomplishments.●

TRIBUTE TO PAUL LAKE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor a very special constituent. A respected civic leader and close personal friend, Paul Lake, is now retiring after three decades working for Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Thirty-one years ago, Paul Lake began working for Metropolitan Life, as their agent in the small town of Lookout, MD. In February 1970, he was promoted to the Perry district and since 1980 has had responsibility for the Belmar district. It is no wonder that now, upon his retirement, Metropolitan Life honors Paul Lake as an exemplary model of a private sector employee who has contributed to his community.

And the contributions are many.

For over 25 years, Paul Lake has been a Boy Scout leader and has also served as Boy Scout commissioner. Among his other civic responsibilities are his service on the Harford County Board of Appeals, the Harford County Planning and Zoning Commission, and the State of Maryland Crime Commission. He has also served as both State and Federal chairman of the Life Underwriters' Association. While doing all this, Paul has still found time to serve as administrative chairman of his church, St. Paul's Lutheran.

Deeply committed to improving his community through direct civic action, Paul has been a leader in local politics. I first came to know him in 1966, when we both served on the Non-partisan Committee to Defeat the Parallel Bay Bridge. I was later present when he was inaugurated as president of the First District Democratic Club. In 1968, Paul and I began our close relationship when he agreed to serve as vice chairman of my reelection campaign. Later, he took on the position of treasurer, a critical position of responsibility which he has handled flawlessly over the years. Perhaps more than any other member of the community, I owe Paul Lake a debt of gratitude.

Today, I want to share with the Members of Congress, what the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Maryland, as well as the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., have known for years: The invaluable contributions of Paul Lake, husband and father, businessman and citizen, and above all, good friend. In all my career, rarely have I ever known anyone who gave so much and demanded so little in return. I join all of Paul's fellow workers at Metropolitan Life, as well as his wife and children, in honoring him at this milestone in his career, and look forward to his continued involvement with the public life of his community.●

STANDARDIZED LIFEVESTS SHOULD BE A REQUIREMENT ON AIRPLANES

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced legislation, H.R. 5518, that imposes a safety standard on the commercial aviation industry.

This bill will require our commercial airline fleet to carry FAA-approved lifevests. As you may know, much of the overwater emergency equipment in use today is old and out of date and resembles the design of a safety device manufactured in the 1930's and 1940's. Even worse, is the fact that the regulations governing overwater operations have remained virtually unchanged for over 40 years.

Today, FAA regulations require lifevests only for those flights that fly 50 nautical miles beyond the shoreline. This regulation makes no sense when one takes into consideration that 215 air terminal airports in the United States have large bodies of water surrounding their approach and departure areas. In fact, approximately 70 percent of all daily flights in the United States either land or depart over water. However, it is estimated that 75 percent of these planes are flying without life-preserving vests.

I might add that one of the major faults of the present FAA regulations is that there is no requirement for a single standardized lifevest. As a matter of fact, there are three lifevests presently in use, each of which requires a different procedure for use. Even worse, two of the types have extremely low floating capacity.

During this, my first term in Congress, and as a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, I have become increasingly more alarmed and concerned about the FAA's refusal to accept or even acknowledge the dire need for a strong Federal policy that will insure the highest degree of protection for air travelers, in the event there is an overwater accident. Test after test has proven that flotation cushions dependability is highly questionable and in many areas, useless.

What makes this matter further outrageous, is that these flotation devices could easily be replaced by effective, low cost vests. A one time cost to purchase these standardized vests would add only 5 cents to the cost of every airline ticket purchased, for the first year only. The new modern vest, has a 10-year service life, and maintenance is estimated at an additional 3 cents per passenger per year. A cost this low could easily be absorbed into a ticket price.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to allow consideration of this bill as soon as possible. I believe the Members of this body will agree that we should not wait until a catastrophic accident occurs before we take a serious look at the situation.●

BAUDER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS RAISE MONEY TO RESTORE OUR NATION'S SYMBOL OF LIBERTY AND FREEDOM

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Statue of Liberty stands at the entrance to New York Harbor as a symbol of freedom for the world. For the millions of immigrants who have entered our Nation through New York, the statue is a sign of hope that their dreams will someday be realized in their new homeland.

Now 98 years old, the Statue of Liberty is badly in need of repair. Our Nation's schoolchildren have taken up the cause and begun a campaign to raise a large part of the $30 million needed to restore this great national landmark. I am proud to say that students from Bauder Elementary School in Seminole, FL, which I represent, have raised $11,700 for this cause, the largest amount of any school in the Nation.

Friday morning, I had the honor of receiving a check from the students at Bauder on behalf of the Statue of Liberty Ellis Island Foundation. The check was the culmination of many hours of hard work by the students who raised the money through numerous projects.

It is most symbolic that our Nation's students are leading the campaign to restore the Statue of Liberty. More than a century ago, children raised a large portion of the $270,000 necessary to build a base for the statue, which was presented as a gift to our Nation by the people of France. I am confident that the same resourcefulness and energy shown by our Nation's children 100 years ago will make the current campaign a success.

Just as the Statue of Liberty stands with her torch of freedom and hope, the spirit and enthusiasm of our children is our Nation's source of hope for the future. I was proud to be with the students at Bauder Elementary School Friday because their expression of patriotism and belief in our Nation is a sign that the future of the United States will be in strong and able hands.●

NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, Mr. RICK LEHMAN, Mr. "CHIP" PASHAYAN, Mr. BILL THOMAS, and myself, I would like to salute National Raisin Week which will be held from April 27 to May 8.

It is during this week that we celebrate the achievements of the California raisin industry which has worked to put maximum emphasis on the promotion of its products. The California raisin industry has continued to fight to counter the loss of almost one-half of its export markets to subsidized international competitors. In light of the greatest market challenges ever faced in its history, we give special recognition to this agricultural industry.

In the United States, an average of more than 250,000 tons of raisins are produced in a normal crop year within a radius of 125 miles of Fresno, CA. In a big crop year, total production often exceeds 300,000 tons. California produces virtually all of the U.S. raisin supply and nearly one-third of the world's raisins.

The success of the raisin industry is of great significance to the economic welfare of many thousands of U.S. residents who are involved in the production, processing, and marketing of this product. Raisins are purchased by millions of consumers to be used in a variety of ways from eating out of hand as a nutritious snack food, to use in cooking and bakery products, to a special addition to cereal, as well as a multitude of other enjoyable culinary uses.

The healthful characteristics of California raisins are emphasized by the recognition accorded this high-energy product by the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports.

Special recognition is being given to the California Raisin Advisory Board (Calrab) for its aggressive advertising, promotion, and research activities. Utilizing funds provided by participating producer and processor members, Calrab carries on its program of advertising and promotion both in the United States and in 17 countries throughout the world, all in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service.

High commendation is due also to the Raisin Bargaining Association, which has brought growers and packers together in a concerted and successful effort to give them a better voice in marketing. All raisin growers and packers deserve a great deal of credit for their efforts on behalf of this vital industry.

Also meriting special commendation in the raisin industry is the work of the Federal Raisin Advisory Board and the Federal Raisin Administrative Committee, who operate under a Federal marketing order. They have done so much to bring about the orderly marketing of raisin crops and have been highly instrumental in development of export markets.

The raisin industry, which effectively utilizes the self-help tools of sales promotion and advertising in the best American tradition, deserves a special salute during National Raisin Week.●

SAFETY OF FOOD ADDITIVES

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, with over 60,000 manmade chemicals in use in the United States today, we certainly have a continuing duty to identify those few that threaten human health—especially those which might cause cancer. The public has a right to be protected from hazardous substances in the general living environment.

On the other hand, our Nation has become increasingly fearful of exposure to insignificant traces of chemicals—a perception which is unreasonable and unnecessary. Moreover, certain elements of the consumer protection movement have become adept at building emotional momentum against the use of chemical substances in general—even at parts per billion.

One aspect of the problem is the nebulus language of the Delaney clause in the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which mandates that:

> No additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal, or if it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animals * * *"

For example, under the Delaney clause, the Department of Health and Human Services is considering banning the continued use of FD&C red No. 3, a color additive used in foods such as maraschino cherries for over 75 years. This prohibition would be based on a single, controversial study where laboratory animals—male rats which gulped down ridiculous quantities of red No. 3 at the highest dose level of 4 percent of the diet—developed thyroid adenomas—benign tumors. In and of itself, such evidence is not appropriate for evaluating the safety of red No. 3. In fact, for a 157-pound man to equal this feeding level, he would have to consume over 700,000 No. 2½, 20 ounce cans of fruit cocktail—containing red cherries—every day of his life. Furthermore, many notable scientific experts have reviewed the available data on this coloring and believe it safe, stating that the thyroid effect is directly related to the excessive dosage administered to the animals.

While I believe that the Federal Government should maintain its diligence in banning dangerous carcinogens, we should not prohibit the continued use of beneficial substances which do not threaten human health in the normal course of daily living. Premature or unreasonable regulatory action will only devastate vital U.S. industries and hurt consumers. In other words, let us not throw out the baby with the bathwater.

Last month, an article concerning microchemophobia—the fear of trace amounts of chemicals—appeared in Newsweek. The author, Mr. Keith Barrons, underscores the absurdity of this attitude. I commend the article to my colleagues' attention.

NOT TOO MUCH PEPPER, THANK YOU

(By Keith C. Barrons)

For dinner last evening my wife and I had sautéed shrimp with mushrooms. In addition to the arsenic that came with the shellfish, the mushrooms provided us with hydrazine, the baked potato with solanine and the celery with furocoumarin. All three compounds are carcinogenic.

The carrots in our mixed vegetables contained carotene, which converts to vitamin A in the body. This vitamin, essential in the amounts we ordinarily ingest, is a teratogen and harmful to the liver at highly excessive levels. The alfalfa-sprout topping on our salad contained canavanine, which is associated with defects in the immune system. The black pepper carried the mutagen safrole. Chocolate cake provided theobromine, which can activate various carcinogens, and in addition to caffeine, the coffee contained about 250 milligrams per cup of the mutagen chlorogenic acid.

The world around us abounds in nature's toxic substances, and our food is no exception. The scientific literature lists many natural components of foods that are known to be harmful to laboratory animals, but only at dietary levels considerably in excess of likely human intake.

Nonetheless, many Americans have succumbed to a new fear—and one that could in the long run lead to an ever-lowering quality of life. I refer to the current epidemic of "microchemophobia," or the fear of minute traces of chemicals.

GRAINS AND NUTS

In defining a poison my old biochemistry teacher told his classes, "a poison is too much." Yet my wife and I have not consumed too much of nature's chemical oddities. How, pray tell, have we each passed three score and ten while ingesting a myriad of natural toxins, including alfatoxin, an exceedingly potent carcinogen sometimes found in grains and nuts as well as nitrosamines formed in the curing of meats? The answer: our natural defense mechanisms. Were if not for these remarkable biochemical systems we would long since have succumbed.

In tests with laboratory animals some of nature's toxic substances have proven more poisonous than any man-made chemical, and their concentrations in food are generally much greater than the synthetic impurities that have generated so much fear. In a notable paper in Science, Dr. Bruce N. Ames, chairman of the biochemistry department at the University of California at Berkeley, concludes that our intake of natural toxins is ". . . probably at least 10,000 times higher than the dietary intake of man-made pesticides."

If our built-in defense mechanisms can handle relatively large amounts of toxic chemicals that happen to be synthesized by the most accomplished chemist of all, a living plant, there is every reason to believe we can cope with the far lesser amounts of man-made compounds, traces of which occasionally find their way into our food. Our fears should be quelled by the fact of our ever-increasing longevity—now more than 74 years compared with 50 years or less before chemicals were used to help assure an abundance of food.

Microchemophobia has multiple origins. There is the antichemical "lobby" that nurtures and magnifies each report of a real or speculative risk. Parts per billion are often equated with an imminent hazard regardless of the magnitude required to harm laboratory animals. There is never a reminder of the minuscule nature of one part per billion.

A recent example of an overblown pesticide episode contributing to microchemophobia was the flap over EDB residues in grain. Today's knowledge of the carcinogenicity of this compound may well support the cessation of its use as an insecticide. Some food samples analyzed exceeded current safety guidelines, but the destruction of foodstuffs because they contained lesser amounts was uncalled for. With few exceptions, the contaminated samples had less than one thousandth the level of EDB that was found to cause cancer in rats. Add to this margin of safety the fact that grain-derived foods are only a portion of the human diet, and further, that much of any EDB present would be reduced on cooking or baking, and the risk fades into insignificance.

Also contributing to the fear of minute traces of chemicals is an overly cautious interpretation of the so-called Delaney clause in the law dealing with safety of foods. It states that no substance will be permitted in food ". . . if it is found after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animals . . ." Note the word appropriate. Is it not appropriate to consider safety margins or the spread between likely human exposure and the amount required to induce cancer in the laboratory when analysts interpret toxicological data?

POTATO BLIGHT

If we are to avoid pest-induced food shortages and vector-transmitted diseases, mankind must defend itself by one means or another. In spite of much progress with nonchemical controls, pesticides are still vital to most integrated pest-management programs and, indeed, are often our first line of defense. For example: we can control potato late-blight, the same disease that caused the great Irish potato famine of the 1840s.

We will continue to ingest nature's toxins, including, no doubt, many yet to be discovered in our everyday foods. But if we are to continue to have the abundance we have been blessed with in recent decades, traces of man-made chemicals will certainly find a way into our food—from pest control, packaging, protection in storage and other sources. Given today's highly sophisticated

analytical techniques, these minuscule amounts can be detected, even at the parts-per-trillion level.

The only sensible course is to follow the recommendations of authorities and eat a varied diet with less fat than is now commonly consumed and include plenty of fruits, vegetables and fiber-rich cereal products. I would also put some faith in our laws and our regulators. On the whole I think they have served us well. Remember, never have people lived as long and amid such abundance as in the technically advanced world of 1984.●

SAN JACINTO JUNIOR COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS GIVEN AT PASADENA, TX, MAY 5, 1984

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1984, I had the honor of addressing the graduating class of San Jacinto Junior College in Pasadena, TX. In my remarks I urged the students to prepare for the future while considering the importance of our history and heritage as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am impressed that the students of today are seriously accepting this challenge and am optimistic about America's future because of their ambition and spirit. In recognition of these fine young men and women I offer my remarks for the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

Thank you. President Blue, distinguished guests, faculty, friends, and graduates, it is a very special honor to be with you at San Jacinto Junior College this commencement night. As always, I am grateful for the chance to be back at home here in the 25th District. I am proud of this academic community and I thank you for letting me share in such a memorable occasion.

San Jacinto Junior College, both in name and spirit embodies a vital part of our heritage. Not far from here is the great San Jacinto Battle Field, where less than 150 years ago a small army of Texans defeated a Mexican army numbering over a thousand. General Sam Houston, "The Raven", led that valiant fight to secure the independence of the Republic of Texas. We still have fighting "Ravens" at San Jacinto—Coach Ronnie Arrows and his winning basketball squad who recently took their second National Junior Basketball Championship. These modern-day Ravens are truly representative of the fighting spirit which makes all of Texas a wonderful place to live and work.

As we gather here to celebrate this, the 23rd commencement of San Jacinto Junior College, let us be aware of all that this occasion means to you as graduates, and to those of us assembled in your honor. First, We celebrate a turning point in your lives as students who have worked so diligently. We celebrate also the contributions of your friends and families, the dedication of your teachers, and their inspiration and patience in leading you to this point. Yet, on a greater scale, I believe we are celebrating the future and the promises that it holds for all of us.

The Philosopher Victor Hugo once said, "The future has many names. For the weak, it is impossible. For the faint-hearted, it is the unknown. For the thoughtful and the valiant, it is ideal. The challenge is urgent, the task is large, the time is now."

You are completing a phase of life's education . . . believe me learning never really ends. You will now go on to more classes or out into the working world. All of us may look forward to a better people and a brighter future because we have men and women such as you to help solve the problems of our society, in the 80's and beyond.

Higher education is one of the strongest vehicles you can have for entering society. Treasure your experiences here at San Jacinto and make them work for you. Be aware of your great heritage and set goals for the future. Your college degree has equipped you to better enjoy the freedoms of life in America while contributing to our growth as a people.

Our history is constantly building. 1984 will be remembered as an important and exciting year. We are witnessing great changes in America and exciting opportunities. The most visible sign of this is the presidential election this year. Tonight, thousands of would-be delegates are caucusing across Texas to show their support for one of the three Democratic presidential contenders. The Texas caucuses are a critical step in the 1984 race to the White House. Texas, tonight and this fall, will be an important factor in the election. No President since 1845 has been elected who did not carry Texas.

In a major election year, those of us who work for the electorate are scrutinized, sought out by friends and foes alike, examined, rejuvenated and invigorated. One of the necessary evils of holding elected public office is that of defending one's rights to be there in an election year. Speaking as one who ran several tough races in getting to Capitol Hill, I am no stranger to disappointments. I assure you that the joys of my finally getting to Congress far outweigh any frustrations I may have felt along the way. There are times, however, as a Freshman on the Hill, when I realize the struggle never ends.

President Eisenhower once said that "Politics should be the part-time profession of every citizen." I believe this is as true today as ever before. As you go on with your lives, many of you will enter business, some law, some medicine, others religion and social work. As you do so do not leave public affairs to others. Take this opportunity and become a participant in the public life of your community, your state and your nation.

We are blessed to be a part of one of America's most dynamic areas. From the suburbs to the industrial belt along our ship channel, we live in the most ethnically, economically, and politically diverse area in Texas. The time is now for each of you to become involved in this area's future. Resolve yourselves to give a high measure of public service and public support.

In addressing a group of university students in 1960, (then) Senator John F. Kennedy urged those young people to realize the vital role they had to play in America's future. He said, "We want students and graduates to recognize that this college and all the rest, have not been built up, have not been developed, merely to advance the private economic interest of its graduates. They have a greater purpose in mind. No college graduate can go out from any college today without being a man of his nation and a man of his time without pursuing in his own life, not only his private interest, but the welfare of this country."

This is our challenge, today. Our test, as political people involved in our community, is to focus on the fundamental problems which confront us. We must arm ourselves with the facts and with an historical knowledge upon which to gauge our future actions. The great statesman, the late Senator Henry Jackson once lamented, "the real tragedy is that Americans have failed to do their homework in history." Jackson believed that troubles are predictable and can be better handled if we Americans would study our past while looking ahead to our future.

Indeed nowhere is it easier to sustain that belief than in Houston. From certain angles, the downtown Houston skyline betrays not the smallest hint that it was created longer ago than yesterday. Who, looking at it, would not feel immune to history?

The irony is that among the nations of the earth, we are among the closest, chronogically, to the well springs of our history. Jefferson died when Lincoln was 17. Lincoln died when Woodrow Wilson was 8. Wilson died when Ronald Reagan was 13. To apply the same sort of calculation to Texas history, Susannah Dickenson, who was present at the Battle of the Alamo, died the year Sam Rayburn was born and Rayburn died in 1961, the year many of you were born.

In the space of barely more than two lifetimes, Texas, and less dramatically, the nation, has undergone more than one complete metamorphosis. More than once, men and women of vision and energy have recognized and seized on social and economic trends to reshape the world in which we live. It is our inheritance and our task not ony to recaputre this reward, but to reinvent it once again. If there is one lesson that the Texas experience teaches us, it is that in this sprawling, bountiful land, change is as certain as it is dramatic. America has never been a society frozen in the ice of conformity or stillness. As the 18th century Frenchman Jacques Maritain wrote, "Wait a moment, another current will appear and bring the first one to naught. A great country with as many windshifts as the sea."

Some of you may become involved in solving our area's mass transit problems. You may devote yourself to pollution control along the ship channel or to finding new ways to control flooding along our bayous. Perhaps you will fly aboard the Space Shuttle or be a part of our Johnson Space Center's development of the manned space station which is to be launched in 1991. Maybe you will enter politics and bring your talents to the councils of government. Your horizons are endless and the challenges you face are great. Celebrate the limitless possibilities that the future holds for you.

There is an ancient saying that, "In every age, there comes a time when leadership suddenly comes forth to meet the needs of the hour. And so there is no person who does not find his or her time, and there is no hour that does not have its leader." Each of you will have your time to lead—be active, be aware and eager in all that you do and all that you believe in. Build on your experiences here so that when the time comes for you to lead you will be ready.

Look inward. Find all that is of value and quality in your human spirit—the truth,

faith and courage which comprise your individuality. I encourage you also to ask questions—do not merely accept what is told to you. A healthy skepticism tempered with reason will help you discern which course your actions should take. Make your education here your bridge into society's larger challenges and in turn a bridge to human progress. Your respect for your heritage, your vision of a brighter future and your individual achievements will help build a stronger Texas and a greater America for tomorrow.

Good luck to you all and thanks once again for inviting me to this special celebration.●

CONGRATULATIONS, MR. DUARTE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to Jose Napoleon Duarte. According to the unofficial count, he was victorious in the Salvadoran presidential elections. After a hard-fought campaign, the democratic process triumphed. Now, we should help him.

Today is a joyous and historic occasion for the people of El Salvador. They chose their President through a free and open democratic process. They faced guerrilla threats to exercise their right to vote. Mr. Duarte is El Salvador's first popularly elected civilian President in half a century. The democratic process worked.

Mr. Duarte is committed to social reform. He believes in the reconciliation of all Salvadorans interested in peace and social stability.

Obviously, Mr. Duarte needs our help if he is to accomplish these goals. We have delayed long enough on the issue of helping El Salvador. As a Washington Post editorial writer noted, we have run out of reasons for "nickel-and-diming" El Salvador. El Salvador now has a good and fairly elected President. Now, we in the Congress should focus on how we can help him shoulder the burden. As the Washington Post said today, he is a "President to bet on." His challenge is our challenge. The time, my friends, is now.●

MARLIN PINNELL—DEDICATED EDUCATOR

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1984, Marlin Pinnell will retire after 41 years of truly dedicated service to the Diamond, MO, school system.

Marlin started as the coach, moved on to become principal, and for the past 27 years has been the superintendent of the Diamond R-IV School District.

Under his very able leadership the school system has grown and prospered providing thousands of young people with a quality education and a good start in life.

Marlin has been a dedicated educator and an outstanding administrator. He has provided leadership as a member of numerous education associations, as well as being a vigorous participant in civic activities and his church.

It is a considerable pleasure for me to extend my best wishes to Marlin and Jean Pinnell as they close one chapter of their life and begin another. May their future be as rewarding as their past.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO HON. WILLIAM H. RISSER OF OAKLAND, NJ, ESTEEMED SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS AND OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 11, the residents of Oakland, officials of the State of New Jersey, fellow educators, relatives, and friends will join together in testimony to a distinguished citizen, esteemed educator, outstanding school administrator, and good friend—the Honorable William H. Risser—who is retiring from his high office of public trust as superintendent of schools of Oakland, NJ. His standards of excellence in education and exemplary public service have brought area-wide recognition to Oakland through its excellent schools and the quality of its educational program. The results of good education reach far into the future and such outstanding public service is applauded by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our deepest of appreciation to Superintendent Risser and share the pride of his good wife, Barbara; daughters Gail, Jill, and Kim; sons-in-law, Dr. Henry A. Budd, Jr., Dwight A. Healy, and Jan P. Lower; and grandchildren, Henry A. Budd III, Jeffrey W. Budd, Stephanie G. Budd, Elizabeth B. Healy, Amanda K. Healy, and Kyra L. Lower upon this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors. Gail is a New Jersey certified registered nurse, Jill is a New Jersey and New York certified teacher, and Kim is a Michigan certified special education and elementary teacher with an endorsement as a learning disabilities teacher consultant.

Mr. Speaker, when you reflect upon the fact that the cultural, historical, and economic achievements—even the basic health, well being and longevity of a State and Nation—depend in large measure upon how well we educate each generation charged with the trust of carrying out its responsibilities and traditions, we can indeed be proud of Bill Risser's outstanding contribution to the quality of life and way of life for all of our people.

There is much that can be said of Superintendent Risser and his 31 years of service in Oakland, NJ, plus 9 years as a teacher in Ho-Ho-Kus, N.J., and 3 years of service in our Armed Forces during World War II. Sincerity, dedication, and a persistence in striving to achieve improvements in education have been evident throughout his career. He also has served as a library board trustee in Oakland and was elected president for three terms. Superintendent Risser was a member of the Oakland Rotary and a past president of the club, a charter member of the Oakland Elks and a charter member of the board of the Educational Foundation for Human Sexuality at Montclair State College. He is a 22-year member of New Jersey Schoolmasters and a member of the County Superintendents Association legislative committee.

Superintendent Risser has indeed earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us and we are especially proud of three special honors that were extended to him. In 1964 the Oakland Teachers Association held a dinner in his honor and presented him with a signed scroll and an engraved watch as, "A small token of the high esteem in which we hold you as an educator, a superintendent and a friend." In 1969, he was nominated by COGS—Citizens of Oakland for Good Schools—and was named Oakland's Outstanding Citizen of the Year, the Oak Leaf Award presented by the Oakland JayCees. In 1972 William Paterson College in Wayne recognized William H. Risser as an outstanding alumnus of the college.

Bill Risser came from a modest background, the youngest of six children of Ernest and Jessie Risser. Four sisters and a brother shared the family residence on the west side of Paterson, NJ. The family weathered the Depression except for Bill's father who passed away in 1934. In 1937, after graduating from Paterson Central High School, with the urging and support of his mother, Bill entered Paterson State Teachers College, graduating with a B.S. in education in 1941. He was elected president of the senior class in college and was editor of the college newspaper, The Beacon. His

teaching career began in September 1941 in the Ho-Ho-Kus public school and was interrupted in January 1943 by the President's call to military service in World War II.

On April 1, 1944, Bill married Barbara Hendry, then a teacher in Ho-Ho-Kus, and their first child, Gail, was born in June 1945. After serving overseas for a year, in February 1946 he returned to civilian life and Ho-Ho-Kus school as a teacher and director of an adult education program. Graduate study followed and by 1948 he earned his master's degree in education from Teachers College, Columbia University. By 1955, Bill completed the graduate work necessary for a professional diploma in administration.

In 1953 he was appointed administrative principal of the 11-room Oakland Public School, with approximately 300 children plus 70 high school students who attended Pompton Lakes High School. In 1955 an eight-room addition to the school was completed and occupied. In the same year, Franklin Lakes, Oakland, and Wyckoff voted to form a regional high school district, now called the Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District, for grades 9 to 12.

Oakland continued to grow rapidly and in 1957 a second school was planned. Heights School was completed in 1959. A third school was needed plus an addition to Heights School and both were approved in 1959. The nine-room addition to Heights School was completed in 1960, and Manito School was completed and fully occupied in the fall of 1961. Growth continued and a fourth school was approved in 1963. Dogwood Hill School was occupied in the fall of 1965 and was fully utilized that school year.

In 1968 the large Valley Middle School unit adjacent to the original building was approved and completed by 1970. The last school building project was approved and completed in 1972, which was the Manito School multipurpose area, including an auditorium, kitchen, and cafeteria, and a two-station physical education unit.

From 1952 to 1972 the school district expanded from 300 to 3,000 students. In 1955 a 4-year regional high school district was formed. Between 1954 and 1972, four schools and three additions were built in Oakland for the K–8 program. What had been a small "rural" school district in 1950 is now an all-inclusive school system, with an up-to-date 9-year, comprehensive program plus pre-kindergarten classes for handicapped children. Foreign languages, health/drug education and coping, plus computer education and an Algebra I course are some of the special offerings at the Valley Middle School that have been developed in the last decade.

Oakland's comprehensive educational program compares favorably with any school district in the country and has evolved and expanded under the supervision and guidance of our honoree, Bill Risser.

Mr. Speaker, Superintendent Risser has truly inspired and enriched the lives of many of our people in his educational endeavors of vital importance to the dynamics of our destiny and the quality of life for all of us. As he retires his official leadership position as superintendent of schools dedicated to the education and welfare of Oakland's children, we do indeed salute a distinguished citizen and great American—the Honorable William H. Risser of Oakland, NJ.●

MILITARY APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, this week is a very important one for a certain county in Maryland's First District. On May 5, Harford County began celebrating Military Appreciation Week, a well-deserved annual tribute to one of the county's greatest assets, a military installation located in Aberdeen.

This installation, the Aberdeen Proving Grounds, is not only an economic mainstay of the county but also plays a vital role in maintaining strong national defense. These contributions are the reason that the Harford County Chamber of Commerce decided, 7 years ago, to sponsor the county's first Military Appreciation Week.

The members of the chamber deserve our special praise for sponsoring such a worthwhile event. Military Appreciation Week is both a well-deserved salute to the Proving Grounds and a celebration of the very special relationship between the county and the base. That relationship grows stronger every year. And this year, county residents have even more reason to honor APG for its many contributions to the county's financial and employment picture.

In fiscal 1983, the Aberdeen Proving Grounds had a total financial impact on Harford County of about $260 million. Local contractors will be involved in about 50 million dollars' worth of new construction at APG for which I obtained funding from Congress last year. That new construction includes a new weapons training facility, a medical research lab, new barracks and family housing units, and a new gas filter system.

Since President Wilson opened the Proving Grounds by Presidential proclamation in 1917, the base has developed into one of the most diverse military installations in the country and is instrumental in keeping our national security strong.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to pay special tribute to the man who has continued that tradition of excellence for the past 5 years. Gen. John J. Koehler, Jr., arrived at APG in November of 1979 and proved an excellent leader and administrator. As you know, the general is retiring after serving as Commander of the U.S. Army's Test and Evaluation Command longer than anyone in the command's 22-year history. Since you once met General Koehler yourself when you visited APG with me in 1981, I know you will join me in wishing him the very best in his retirement.

My sincerest appreciation also goes to the 12,000 military and civilian employees at APG who are involved in testing crucial pieces of equipment like the M–9 Ace vehicle, the 120-mm. gun on the M–1 tank, the Sergeant York air-defense gun system and the bulk of the Army's new family of military tactical vehicles. These testing activities are just a few examples of the crucial services these men and women perform.

I have every hope that this year's celebration of Military Appreciation Week will be the best ever and I would like to say again how proud I am of the Harford County Chamber of Commerce for establishing this very significant county salute to the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. I am certain that the unique bond between Harford County and the Aberdeen Proving Grounds will continue to grow stronger over the years.●

A CUSTOMS DISTRICT THAT MAKES SENSE

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by my Pacific Northwest colleagues, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BONKER, Mr. LOWRY, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, and Mr. CRAIG in introducing legislation that will cost the Government next to nothing, but which will help stimulate international trade and create jobs in our area of the country.

We are introducing legislation today that will create a Columbia-Snake Customs District, which would be headquartered in Portland, OR.

We are taking this action because we believe our region has the potential to create many more opportunities for international trade and commerce if our shippers, brokers, freight forwarders, and others have the opportunity to work through just one customs office.

At present, the Customs Service has carved the natural geographic bound-

aries and the existing cargo routes of the Columbia-Snake River system into three customs districts—Portland, Seattle, and Great Falls, MT.—and two different customs regions—Los Angeles and Chicago.

In fact, to look at the current customs districts map, one would think that parts of the Columbia-Snake River system have no more connection with each other than New York City has with Portland.

For example, today the Port of Lewiston, just over the eastern Washington border in Idaho, reports to the Great Falls, MT, district office and ultimately to the Chicago regional office. Meanwhile, the Port of Clarkston, which is directly opposite Lewiston on the Washington side of the Snake River, reports and answers to the Seattle customs district office.

With the creation of a Columbia-Snake customs district, we can attain several important goals.

First, the legislation can serve as a new marketing tool for exporters seeking to tap Pacific Rim markets and importers working to promote the Columbia-Snake system as an attractive point of entry for imports.

Second, we will be able to communicate to our trading partners that we are a unique trading zone—something our exporters and importers have tried to do for some time—that can be easily accessed through just one customs district office.

Further, it will allow us to increase the cargo volume handled by the system, which is the only shallow-draft waterway handling barged containers in the United States.

The new Columbia-Snake customs district will include the existing Portland customs district—which is comprised of all of Oregon and a portion of southwest Washington—and will be expanded to include all of the counties in southern Washington directly opposite Oregon. It will also include Franklin, Adams, and Whitman Counties in Washington State as well as that part of Idaho south of the 47th parallel, which lies just to the north of Lewiston.

I have worked very closely with members of the Pacific Northwest trade and transportation communities in putting this proposal together, as well as with the Idaho Governor's office. The concept of a Columbia-Snake custom district has already been endorsed by the Pacific Northwest International Trade Association (PNITA), the Columbia River Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association and the Columbia-Snake Marketing Group, which is an organization of 34 ports on the Columbia-Snake River system.

The legislation we are introducing today as a united delegation is a commonsense, low-cost approach that will help us meet the international trade challenges of the future. And when we meet those challenges, jobs will be created, productivity will increase, and our economy will be one step closer to being anchored on solid ground.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NURSES OF ST. JOHN'S EPISCOPAL HOSPITAL ON NURSE RECOGNITION DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, May 6–12 is National Hospital Week/Nurse Recognition Week and it calls attention to the significant contributions nurses have made to our country's health care profession. It is important that we call attention to these health care professionals because each of us, at sometime or another, has had a personal experience in which we have been helped by a nurse. Often the experience is one that leaves a lasting impression on us, and we never get a chance to thank those who have provided us with their health care services.

May 9 is a particularly significant day in the Rockaways because it is Nurse Recognition Day at St. John's Episcopal Hospital in Far Rockaway, NY. I would like to extend my congratulations to this dedicated nursing staff which is an integral, and vital part of our community.

When I think about nursing, I appreciate the profession because it provides a wide variety of health care services. Nurses do not just observe, assess, and record symptoms, or monitor the reactions and progress of patients. They also administer medications, assist in the rehabilitation of patients, instruct patients and family members in proper health care maintenance. I have found that nurses have one of the most difficult duties in health care; maintaining a physical and emotional environment that promotes recovery. This requires the ability to deal with all the patient's needs, including their family.

The nurses of St. John's Hospital greatly affect the community and provide a stable health care force in the Rockaway's which attracts people to our area. I believe that Nurse Recognition Week and Nurse Recognition Day is important because it calls attention to the contributions of these nurses and helps us reaffirm our commitment to our health care services by continuing to demonstrate an understanding for the duties which are filled by the nursing profession.●

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER OF 1984—MARSHA MARTIN

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in these days of funding cuts for social services, the full measure of contributions from volunteers in American society is being realized. Never before have volunteers, who give their time so selflessly, been so crucial to maintaining American standards of service to those less priviledged than others. This is National Volunteer Week and I am honored to bring to your attention the achievements of a young woman, Ms. Marsha Martin, who resides in my district.

Marsha is being honored today as one of the Outstanding Peace Corps Volunteers of 1984. To be chosen from among more than 5,000 Americans serving overseas is no small accomplishment. However, Marsha is used to great accomplishments. Marsha is a very special Peace Corps volunteer, because she is blind. She has overcome this disability and dedicated herself to helping others who are similarly afflicted.

Marsha is currently serving in Ecuador as an adviser in education for the blind on subjects such as orientation, mobility, daily life skills, and braille. Life in a lesser developed nation is never easy to adjust to yet Marsha has persevered and is providing an exceptional role model to her Ecuadorian counterparts, as well as her fellow Peace Corps volunteers.

Marsha is to be commended for more than her activities in Ecuador. As a student at Fresno State University, Marsha was recognized by many because of her running. She ran up to 20 miles a day without the aid of a dog. Using simply her sharp sense of hearing, Marsha would run all over campus with a running partner. Last year, Marsha decided she wanted to participate in the Fresno Volunteer Bureau's Triathalon. To do so she had to teach herself how to swim. It should come as no surprise by now to learn that Marsha ran all 6.2 miles, biked 26 miles, and swam 400 yards. Marsha placed third and was the only disabled competitor in the race.

Back home in Fresno, Marsha is known for independence and the tireless energy she exhibits teaching other blind individuals braille and mobility skills. She put in long hours at the Disabled Student Studies Center, as well as at the Fresno Volunteer Bureau. The many people I have spoken with in Fresno all miss her and look forward to her return from Ecuador.

Despite the wide variety of Marsha's accomplishments, one thing that everyone has mentioned in speaking of her is the wonderful cookies she makes. I have never tasted these cookies, but they must be good, everyone I spoke to about Marsha remarked on them.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed by the abilities of this young woman and extremely proud to represent in Congress such a remarkable individual. I am sure my colleagues will join with me in commending her perseverance, dedication, selflessness, and hardworking spirit. I would like to echo the quote of a woman who works with Marsha back home in Fresno: "She's a trouper."●

CONGRESS MUST NOT KEEP OUR YOUTH IDLE

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Congress must not keep our youth idle. Some 3.5 million 16- to 24-year-olds cannot find jobs. The unemployment rate among teenagers approaches 20 percent. Yet the other body refuses to act on the bill to create an American Conservation Corps that the House passed by a vote of 301 to 87 last year. I agree with the following editorial from the New York Times which urges the Senate and the Reagan administration to push this legislation forward.

The editorial follows:

IDLERS, IN THE SENATE

A hundred thousand jobless young people are being held hostage on Capitol Hill. Or at least their jobs are. It's been a year since the House voted to create an American Conservation Corps—a new version of the New Deal's Civilian Conservation Corps. But the Senate dawdles and the Reagan administration gives no help.

There are 3.5 million 16 to 24-year-olds who can't find jobs—40 percent of the unemployed. There are a million fewer than last year, but the decline is small consolation to those still jobless. Despite recovery, their problems persist.

The House version of the conservation corps would spend $300 million a year for six years on summer work and training for 50,000 youths and year-round opportunities for 56,000 others. They'd work in every part of the country, in cities as well as forests, and they'd get schooling after work.

Not even the $1.8 billion in the House bill would make a very big dent in overall youth unemployment. But the Senate proposal would make an even smaller one—spreading only $200 million over three years. An eventual House-Senate compromise would probably raise that amount. The problem is that the Senate hasn't yet voted on its bill.

As chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator James McClure of Idaho calls the shots. He has already prevailed in getting the concept scaled down and ringed with restrictions, as if to make certain the forests won't be filled with kids from city slums. Even so, he's made no move for a floor vote. He seems to have been bargaining for something more. Perhaps the breakthrough on wilderness legislation will clear the way for Senate action on the conservation corps.

The Senator feels no heat from the White House, which has opposed the corps mainly on the ground that it would provide only "dead-end" jobs. That's a familiar argument, and one entirely off the point. No one advocates a career corps. Indeed, high turnover is expected. The idea is to give these frustrated young people temporary work and to let them develop work habits, because nothing is so "dead-end" as no job at all.●

NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WEEK

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, during this week of May 6, our country recognizes an essential, though frequently overlooked, position within our criminal justice system. I speak of the national correctional officer.

It is befiting that we observe National Correctional Officers Week and pay tribute to the men and women responsible for the well-being and safety of not only detainees, but also the general public. As a member of a public safety agency, the correctional officer is charged with insuring the smooth and orderly operation of the prison facility as well as guaranteeing security.

The correctional officer must effectively deal with a diverse segment of America's population. A sense of fairness, diplomacy, and the ability to succinctly judge human nature are just a few of the traits a correctional officer displays on a daily basis.

The role of the correctional officer is a difficult one for it is imperative that he or she exhibit quick and accurate judgment when potentially explosive situations arise. A rare combination of the best qualities of a law enforcement officer and a counselor exist in the correctional officer.

Mr. Speaker, the contribution made by our country's correctional officers to the criminal justice system is extremely valuable and is something we cannot afford to ignore. This week let us not forget this important public servant. Instead, let us remember and honor a dedicated professional.●

SOLIDARITY SUNDAY

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise to pay tribute to the estimated 200,000 people who marched and lined the streets of Manhattan on May 6 for Solidarity Sunday.

This annual human rights rally once again demonstrated that Jews in the Soviet Union seeking permission to emigrate to freedom have not been forgotten. The unified voices of rage sent the clear message to the Soviet Union that no matter what type of propaganda it disseminates, we know better. There are at least 400,000 Soviet Jews awaiting permission to leave. Such denials will not quell their voices in the Soviet Union, or ours here.

The work done by organizers of the rally is deserving of commendation. At Sunday's rally support for the Soviet refuseniks was led by concerned citizens such as Broadway producer Joe Papp, New York Archbishop John O'Connor, and New York Governor Mario Cuomo.

I considered it an honor to participate in the rally on Solidarity Sunday and to speak out for those who cannot. The Soviet Union would do well to take note that such activity, and the demand for freedom will continue.●

TRIBUTE TO RAOUL WALLENBERG

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last week in a moving and wrenching ceremony, a symbolic ground breaking for the Holocaust Museum was held here in Washington. As we remember and commemorate this year the 40th anniversary of the Nazi occupation of Hungary and the beginning of the Holocaust in Hungary, it is significant and appropriate that we take note of Raoul Wallenberg.

Allan Kiron, himself a survivor of Auschwitz and now an American, has proposed a Wallenberg Watch to remember and remind ourselves of the unspeakable horror of that event and the spirit of compassion and humanity exemplified by Raoul Wallenberg.

For the benefit of my colleagues in the House, I place in the RECORD the proposal of Mr. Kiron. It deserves our serious consideration.

THE HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL

The proposal to build a Holocaust museum in our nation's capital faces a difficult challenge. As a survivor of Auschwitz, let me explain. The greatest crimes and atrocities committed against humanity did not occur inside the concentration camps; they occurred outside in the hearts and minds of people who were silent and indifferent.

The tragedy of self-delusion for those who were silent and indifferent was best described by Pastor Martin Niemoller, who wrote:

"In Germany, the Nazis came for the Communists, and I did not speak up because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak up because I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I did not speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for Me. By that time there was no one to speak up for anyone."

Yes, we suffered from unspeakable atrocities, barbarism and degradation. Even death, the supreme freedom, can be denied under the rule of tyranny. When at one camp my 14-year-old body could no longer bear the hours and work under inhumane conditions, I asked the guard to shoot me. He replied that a bullet was too expensive for me. I was told I must die from exhaustion.

And yet, the bleeding flesh can heal, the broken bone can mend, but the torment of the mind suffering from the silence and indifference of others never heals and never mends. This torment, like a dagger, cut our last means of survival, hope. With no one willing to speak up, hope becomes hopeless; your perception of humanity is shattered and your will to live dies, because there is nothing left to live for. In a concentration camp you first die inside and then the body follows. The silence and indifference of the world at large killed the inside of most victims in the camps. The Nazis just destroyed their bodies. That is the legacy of silence and indifference.

The lessons of the Holocaust must not be limited to the question of memory: whether it is "evil to forget" or "is it necessary to remember"? These are mute questions.

The question of memory is mute because to remember one must first understand what one is remembering. The Holocaust cannot be understood at the present time. To remember without understanding is like painting without a canvas. It does not stick to anything.

The crucial question we must deal with is the understanding of who we are and what we are. The Holocaust, like space-time, revealed a new dimension of human nature: organized madness, unparalleled in the history of mankind. We are faced with a painful and difficult burden to understand and learn to what degree silence and indifference are part of this organized madness.

Goethe once stated, "With only the slightest shift in my character there is no crime that I could not commit".

Is there something in our psyche or genes, which individually or collectively can be triggered to breakdown our ability to judge humanely and reason with compassion?

Is it possible our lofty ideals about man's grandeur spawned and honed for centuries by philosophy and religion, are merely wishful thoughts floating on the sewers of human experience?

During the Nuremberg trials, the French prosecutor, Francois De Menthon asked:

"How can one explain how Germany, fertilized through the centuries by classic antiquity and by Christianity, by the ideals of liberty, equality and social justice, by the common heritage of Western humanism to which she has brought such noble and precious contributions, could have come to this astonishing return to primative barbarism?"

If it could happen in Germany what country is immune to suffer another Holocaust?

Only recently has the public been informed of the gruesome atrocities committed during World War II by Japan's Devils Brigade, which almost rivals the bestiality of the Nazi medical experiments.

Here, too, we have a nation steeped in culture and tradition fertilized by centuries of Shintoism, Bhuddism and Confucianism; and yet capable of organizing and employing a scientific community to carry out the most bestial medical experiments on innocent victims. How is this possible?

It is this universal quest to learn and understand ourselves and past events, more than anything else, which provides the basic legitimacy for establishing the Holocaust museum.

Another lesson of the Holocaust is the question of allocating responsibility. There could be no greater desecration of the memory of those who suffered and died than to blame exclusively the German people, or, even worse, the Nazis. The allocations of responsibility only to the actual perpetrators of crimes against humanity, absolves those who were silent and indifferent. Indeed, it would be a tragedy of Holocaust proportions if we fail to deal with the problems of silence and indifference, its causes and consequence and any possible solutions. Otherwise we would only reap an arid memorial for victims whose only hope before they died was that the lessons of the Holocaust be understood and not forgotten.

We simply cannot afford again to abdicate our responsibility and let silence and indifference stand unaccounted together with the missing elements of simple courage and common decency. Courage and decency are the high flying banners of free and responsible people, who made a covenant to keep and protect the standards of humanity.

Whenever I have a chance to speak up, I always stress the critical importance of fighting silence and indifference. I urge people to live by one single commandment, and all the other ten will follow. My commandment is to alleviate human suffering. The alleviation of human suffering is a universal maxim that encompasses all noble emotions and ideals of the human spirit and leaves little room for excuses. It requires acts and deeds.

For example, to what degree and how can we now marshal our collective voice and effort to temper tyrants and madmen from creating hell on earth?

Suppose periodically on a specific day at 8 p.m., we no longer choose apathy and instead turn off all our lights for 60 seconds, to honor an individual, group or some specific event especially deserving of our support because of enormous injustice or persecution. I believe this darkness would light up the hearts and hopes of those who suffer; and set a precedent for collective concern and responsibility. Perhaps this periodic warning or proclamation could be one of the responsibilities of the proposed new museum or some other institution.

We could call each proclamation the Wallenberg Watch in honor of a man, Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat, who probably saved more lives during the Holocaust than any other human being.

The momentary darkness would be symbolic of the potential threat to mankind. The participation of people and institutions in the dialogue and decisions leading to the proclamation of the Wallenberg Watch would give flesh and bone to Thomas Jefferson's admonition and pledge for "eternal vigilance against all forms of tyranny".

Another benefit provided by the Wallenberg Watch would be some needed lessons in compassion. Our daily media exposure to all kinds of crimes and atrocities places our society in danger of being desensitized to human suffering. Hopefully, the decision making process leading to the Wallenberg Watch would offer enough discussion and participation by the public to make sure that the spirit of compassion does not become estranged and does not die.

There are many other and probably more effective ways we could deal with our collective voice and effort. But the Wallenberg Watch could be a good beginning because it would provide all individuals with a simple means to participate.

Imagine the fantastic power a simple flick of the finger could produce. There is the potential of momentary total darkness throughout the entire world. Like a total eclipse it would have the force and the sobering effect to be observed and noticed by all, especially the leaders of each country. Perhaps we could even measure an area's enlightenment and the effectiveness of our efforts, by the amount of darkness produced on a specific day at 8 p.m. This could be easily done by satellite pictures or a simple reading of any variations in electric power output. With dedication and determination, I am convinced we could succeed in breaking up some of the cartels of despotism throughout the world and prevent future ones from happening again.

No doubt a great deal of thought and work will need to be done by all of us. We may even be called upon to sacrifice some of our thoughts and deeds. But let me remind you that the most precious gift we enjoy in this shining land, is our freedom. And therefore whatever sacrifice we must make for our freedom to endure we shall endure it freely. This is what freedom is all about.

Finally, I would like to suggest that the following inscription be placed at the entrance to the newly proposed Holocaust museum:

Look and ponder, learn and pray
Above all remember well
That silence and indifference
Fuel the fires of living hell●

TRIBUTE TO DR. IRVING A. GLADSTONE—AN EDUCATOR FOR ALL SEASONS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 of this year, I will have the pleasure of attending a ceremony at which Dr. Irving A. Gladstone will be remembered for his lifetime of work on behalf of the schoolchildren of New York City. The school at which he served as principal for over 20 years will, appropriately, be renamed the Dr. Irving A. Gladstone Elementary School in his honor.

This school will serve as a reminder to all future students in Brooklyn of Dr. Gladstone's contribution to their education. For those who knew him and were familiar with his work, or who had the good fortune of attending the schools or classes of which he was in charge, this school will be only one of many lasting reminders of his contribution to the education of Ameri-

ca's schoolchildren. Indeed, Dr. Gladstone is one of those rare individuals whose efforts and expertise have contributed to the improvement of his profession—an accomplishment which has universal impact and, hence, from which we all benefit.

Dr. Gladstone started his career as a teacher and ended his career as one. I am told he had a very special talent for teaching. Whether he was serving as instructor for elementary and secondary school students, as he did during the early part of his career, or as a teacher for teachers during the last 20 years of his career, he consistently maintained a standard of excellence.

But to focus on Dr. Gladstone's accomplishments as a teacher only identifies the tip of the iceberg of his legacy. From 1953 until his retirement, Dr. Gladstone served in numerous administrative, supervisory, and advisory roles as part of his effort to improve the quality of education offered for our schoolchildren. Beyond serving as the principal in two schools, he undertook several legal projects for the New York City board of education, was chairman of the New York City Elementary School Principals Association's legal rights committee, and sat on the superintendent's law and license committee. In addition, Dr. Gladstone was past president of the New York City Elementary School Principals Association and a founding member of the American Federation of School Administrators. The list goes on and on. All of his activities, however, were directed toward a single purpose—enhancing the education of our youngsters.

Frequently we have debated in this Chamber the merits of different proposals to improve the quality of education in our Nation. We discuss innovative educational programs, determine what spending levels are necessary for federally funded education projects, and a host of other important matters which affect the quality of education nationally. And through it all, I can not help but think that the most important element of our educational system, dedicated and gifted educators like Dr. Gladstone, is what is most needed. We must be thankful for his dedication today and to this important profession and hope that by honoring him on May 31 we can encourage other talented and idealistic young men and women to follow in his footsteps.●

ASAT AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 1985 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, when the Department of Defense fiscal year 1985 authorization bill is considered on the floor next week, I will offer an amendment to limit the U.S. anti-satellite (ASAT) weapon testing program. This test moratorium would continue as long as the Soviets continue to abide by their own declared moratorium, which was cited in the President's March 31, 1984 ASAT report to Congress.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide a window of opportunity to explore a mutual and verifiable ban on Asat's. Until 1979, when negotiations on ASAT's were suspended, the program proceeded on a dual track, entailing research and development, and negotiations. Since then, the research and development program has proceeded, but negotiations have not resumed. This amendment provides the opportunity to resume negotiations on ASAT's before it is too late to avert an expensive and destablizing arms race in space.

Text of amendment to H.R. 5167, Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985:

At the end of title II (page 18, after line 13) add the following new section: Limitation on Funds for Anti-Satellite Weapons.

SEC. 206. No funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be used for testing of the Space Defense system (anti-satellite weapon) against an object in space unless and until the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union has conducted, after the date of enactment of this Act, an equivalent test of any type of dedicated anti-satellite weapon.

Rationale for ASAT amendment:

ASAT AND ARMS CONTROL

The Administration's March 31, 1984 ASAT Report states that the Administration is "searching for limits on such (ASAT) systems which are effectively verifiable . . ." But once flight-testing of the ASAT is complete, verification of a ban on the weapon would be much more difficult. This amendment puts the flight-testing program on "hold", unless the Soviets break their declared moratorium and resume testing, and allows time to pursue negotiations. (The Soviets have not tested their ASAT for two years.)

ASAT'S AND "STAR WARS"

ASATs and "Star Wars" technologies are inextricably linked. If we decide to proceed with ASATs, we will have taken the first step towards an arms race in space. Star Wars, or ballistic missile defense (BMD), would contribute to the nuclear arms race by prompting the Soviets to build more nuclear weapons. This is because they will try to penetrate our BMD "protective shield" with more missiles. Thus, the ASAT will set off an arms race in space which will, in turn, set off a new round in the arms race on earth.

ASAT'S WILL DECREASE NATIONAL SECURITY

ASATs are designed to destroy vital military satellites, including command, control, and communications satellites, as well as satellites used for verification of arms control agreements. These satellites have contributed significantly to stability by denying the element of surprise in a first strike. The U.S. depends more heavily on satellites than does the Soviet Union and has more to gain by limiting the Soviet capability to destroy U.S. satellites.

U.S. ASAT AS BARGAINING CHIP WITH SOVIETS

The Soviets have been working on an ASAT of their own, which, while primitive, is a legitimate cause for concern. Although there are more effective and cheaper ways of negating the Soviet ASAT threat, such as hardening of satellites against attack and increased maneuverability to avoid attack, the U.S. ASAT provides an ideal "bargaining chip" in negotiations because of the U.S. lead in ASAT technology. We should take advantage of this lead and begin negotiations to ban the weapon before the Soviets catch up. (The Soviets have introduced a draft ASAT treaty to the United Nations.)

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.●

A VIEW OF CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent in my district wrote an interesting article on the Central American situation. It is always important to stay in touch with viewpoints outside of the Nation's Capitol. Mr. Hamilton's article reflects his views on how "Realpolitik" and a more idealistic policy of international legality should be synthesized. I commend to my colleagues some excerpts of his article.

BIPARTISAN DEBATE NEEDED ON CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Wm. Alexander Hamilton)

Whether Nicaragua is successful in overthrowing the elected government of its neighbor, El Salvador, depends, in large measure, on the ability of the Nicaraguan communists to maintain a steady flow of arms and ammunition to the communist insurgents in El Salvador.

One of the lessons of the Vietnam War is: once small arms and ammunition hit the shore and get into the jungle they will eventually end up in the hands of the bad guys.

The only effective way to stop the flow of weapons is to keep them from coming ashore. This can be done in three ways: (1) cut them off at the source, (2) cut them off at some intermediate point or (3) impose some sort of blockage on the country sponsoring the insurgency.

To go for the source means a direct confrontation with the Soviets and the Czechs—the makers of the weapons and ammunition. Cuba is often the intermediate

transshipment or waypoint. And, of course, Nicaragua is the country sponsoring the guerrilla war against El Salvador. Tough choices.

At this point, maybe we should ask: how did the United States get tagged as the bad guy in all of this?

Three reasons: (1) a certain element in the Congress is determined to play election-year politics with the communist threat to Central America, (2) there is a sincere debate among other members of Congress as to the importance of Central America to our security and (3) the Congress wants to play a larger role in the conduct of our foreign and-military policy—a role larger than that assigned to it by the Constitution.

Sincere debate on the consequences of a communist takeover of Central America is needed. Indeed, the sooner we understand what is at stake, the sooner the U.S. can behave as the Great Power responsible for the security of a region on its hemispheric doorstep.

But, until we come to a national consensus on Central American policy, any Administration in power will find itself having to exert its power through the backdoor. The alternative is to go down in history as the party that "lost Central America."

Mining Nicaraguan harbors is a backdoor operation. Stopping the flow of communist arms is a great idea, but using naval mines, without a declaration of war and warnings to neutrals, is a bad idea because a naval mine cannot tell the difference between a Soviet Bloc ship carrying weapons and a Norwegian ship carrying a cargo of pickled herring.

Congressional condemnation of harbor mining is the right act performed for largely the wrong reasons—not the least of which is partisan politics.

While public support for playing hardball with Nicaragua may be weak, it might be considerably stronger for a quarantine—a la President Kennedy—of Cuba. Since communist-Cuba is the major exporter of death and destruction in the region, that is where the U.S. should be using its muscle—either overt or covert.

As for the World Court, does anyone believe for a minute that Cuba would agree to go before such a tribunal and face almost certain condemnation for serving as the seedbed of death and destruction in our hemisphere?

In 1979, I stood in the dark outside World Court in the Hague and thought: what a marvelous notion—that nations could bring their disputes for settlement in a court of international law. But it remains a mere notion because sovereign nations cannot, and should not, subordinate their vital interests to the will of anyone save their own peoples.

If the World Court ruled Nicaragua should stop exporting revolution into El Salvador, does anyone think Nicaragua would obey? If the World Court told the United States its sphere of influence could no longer include Central America, does anyone think we would withdraw to Fortress America? For those who believe that, I have some nice costume jewelry at bargain prices.●

H.R. 991

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 991, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that blind persons may not be employed at less than the applicable minimum wage under that act.

Most of our 40,000 blind workers are employed in the private industry. However, 10,000 blind persons are employed in sheltered workshops around the country. Many of these workshops do not pay these workers minimum wage. This is due to a current law which allows the U.S. Department of Labor to issue an exemption that permits payment of subminimum wage to shelter workshop employees. The justification behind this law is that the production rate among blind workers is lower.

Mr. Speaker, studies have shown that, where in fact the production rate is lower, it is due to antiquated and substandard equipment and machinery. This law, which was passed in the late thirties, was instituted when most blind persons were uneducated, untrained, and lumped together irregardless of their condition. The philosophy underlying this law simply does not apply to today's blind person. The blind of today are better educated, more functional, and much more capable of competitive employment.

Mr. Speaker, all the time we are introducing and passing legislation which insures safety and fairness in the workplace. Why should a blind worker be excluded from this national policy? I think we all want to see blind persons become as independent as possible, and I feel that H.R. 991 can help insure that independence. I commend my colleague's effort with regard to the introduction of this piece of legislation, and will assist in any way to help secure its passage.●

BINDING THE WOUNDS

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the Vietnam war 12 years ago, our Nation has had considerable work to do in the area of binding up the wounds of one of the most turbulent periods in American history.

There is still work to be done, but with the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 296, we are moving in the right direction.

The war in Southeast Asia was and remains controversial. However, actions to honor those men who served, fought, and in many cases died in the war, should not be clouded by that controversy.

Memorial Day is a most appropriate time for the remains of the unknown American soldier from the Vietnam war to be honored. House Concurrent Resolution 296, which provides for the use of the Capitol Rotunda for the lying in state of that soldier's remains between May 25 and May 28, 1984, is important to all of those veterans of the Vietnam era, to all of our Nation's veterans, and indeed to all of our Nation.

Clearly, this should not mark the end of our focus on the war; 2,500 Americans are still unaccounted for; their families wait, hope, pray, and count on us to remember their loved ones. With the Arlington National Cemetery interment of the Unknown Soldier from Southeast Asia, this Nation is providing a tangible sign of our support, respect, honor, and dignity for our Vietnam-era veterans.●

ANTHONY "TONY" FAVA, WESTCHESTER VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Mr. Anthony "Tony" Fava, of Mamaroneck, NY, who is being honored as Westchester County Volunteer of the Year by the Volunteer Service Bureau of Westchester County.

Tony Fava, who has been titled Mamaroneck's "Crackerbarrel Statesman" by his neighbors, has successfully led the Washingtonville neighborhood through 8 years of remarkable, effective and recognizable change—all from behind the meat counter at Fava's Market.

Beginning in April 1976, Tony Fava and other leaders in the Washingtonville section of Mamaroneck, my hometown, met with local officials to discuss ways of rehabilitating and preserving the oldest, and, at that time, the most deteriorated section of the village. That meeting resulted in the formation of the Washingtonville Neighborhood Program, Inc.

Tony Fava was the first chairman of the Washingtonville Beautification Committee and has served in that capacity for 4 of the committee's 8 years. Between his terms as chairman, Tony Fava has guided and developed the committee's new leaders.

The once rundown Washingtonville neighborhood can now boast of new sidewalks and curbs; additional and

brighter street lights; three new mini-parks; over 100 rehabilitated homes; a master plan for guidance in zoning and business and commercial development; nearly $1 million for traffic channelization and signalization; and many flood control programs—to name but a few achievements in the committee's 8-year history.

The Washingtonville neighborhood story is a true success story. Its success is summed up by its logo: "Growth, Unity and Pride." Perhaps the Washingtonville neighborhood's greatest success has been its "Crackerbarrel Statesman," Tony Fava. As a 6-day-a-week volunteer, Tony Fava has gently persuaded neighbors, business people, civic and religious organizations, municipal leaders, landlords and tenants, and tomorrow's leaders—the neighborhood's youths, toward implementing creative, sound and socially redeeming goals.

The Washingtonville Beautification Committee project is not, however, Tony Fava's only civic contribution. He has been a ruler of the Mamaroneck Elks Lodge 1457; a member of the Rye Neck School Board Selection Committee; a participant in the St. Vito's Parish Council; the G.I. Civic Association and the newly formed finance committee of the Rye Neck/Rye School Study Committee. Mr. Fava has also recently been appointed Mamaroneck's representative to the Westchester County Community Development Advisory Committee.

Through his imagination and dynamic personality, Tony Fava has moved mountains for the good of his friends, his neighbors, and his community.

I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring Anthony "Tony" Fava as Westchester County's Volunteer of the Year. It is an honor truly deserved.

I would also like to commend four other volunteer group recipients who will be honored by the Westchester County Volunteer bureau.

Miss Devonia Dixon will be honored in the student volunteer category. A junior at White Plains High School, Miss Dixon organized the school's chapter of SADD (Students Against Drunk Driving) which now has a membership of over 35 high school students. The chapter meets each week to plan projects by which to educate the student body.

The Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) award recipient is Ms. Marie Johnston a volunteer at the Howe Avenue Nursing Home in New Rochelle. The nursing home is on the grounds of the New Rochelle Hospital Medical Center. Ms. Johnston averages 15 hours of volunteer time each week to feed, entertain and comfort patients at the nursing home.

Mrs. Diana Valdes-Owens of Pepsico, Inc., is this year's recipient of the Corporate Award. Mrs. Valdes is the founder and director of the Valdes Striders, a track club consisting of 30 members ranging in age from 7 to 35. Through the program, members are taught positive, success-oriented discipline not only for running, but for studies as well.

Finally, I would like to offer congratulations to the tearoom project of the Sound Shore, this year's group award honorees. This project is funded and staffed by volunteers of the Sound Shore Community Advisory Board for the purpose of aiding recoved psychiatric patients to cook, bake, and serve the public. The project takes place every Tuesday through Saturday in the New Rochelle Public Library.●

MAY—OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as May has been designated Older Americans Month, I would like to say a few words today about our Nation's senior citizens and about growing older in our society.

When supporting the passage of the legislation which sets aside this month as Older Americans Month, I hoped it would cause many of us to reflect on the special needs of our older generations as well as cause those of us yet to be considered "older" to set goals for our own later years.

Presently 10.7 percent of the population, or 26 million Americans, are over the age of 60. Over 17.7 percent of the population in my own State of Maine are over 60. Many of these individuals would not consider themselves "elderly," nor should they. But no matter how they feel or how they look, individuals over 60 do have different problems and a different perspective. So will we all when we are in our older years.

We should pay special attention to our elders because, with luck, we all will be among their ranks. As Drs. Skinner and Vaughan remind us in their book, "Enjoy Old Age": "A good time to think about old age is when you are young."

As a ranking minority member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I receive a lot of information regarding our older population, and I will admit I am continuously impressed by the number of elderly people who never planned for their later years. They never thought "it" would happen to them so they did not invest time planning for a steady source of retirement income or health insurance coverage other than perhaps social security and medicare. Nor did many of them plan on what their retirement activities would be.

More than 15 percent of our Nation's elderly population lives on income below the poverty level. That figure represents more than 3.8 million persons 65 or older who are considered poor as their annual income is below $4,626 for an individual and $5,836 for a two-person family. Mr. Speaker, people are very disadvantaged, indeed, who live on only $400 per month in 1984.

We know that in less than 40 years, our older population will double. I think this increase will foster a general acceptance of age. Nevertheless, now is the time for us as individuals to plan ahead, and now is the time for those of us in Congress to look at our Federal programs to determine what services are now helping our retirees, and what are the gaps in those services.

I think we all realize the Federal Government cannot be responsible for all the health and social needs of our older population unless we bankrupt the Treasury. Nevertheless, we should expect the Government to provide an adequate safety net for those less fortunate, less healthy, less able to provide for themselves.

During the past year or two, I believe we in Congress have been attempting to address these very real concerns and plan ahead—both individually and as a society. We have increased funding for research to find the causes and possible cures for the devastating illnesses which affect our older population such as Alzheimer's disease and other neurological disorders. We are adjusting and expanding services as provided under the Older Americans Act, and we are expanding employment programs which allow older persons to augment their incomes if they are able.

Everyone wants to live a long time, but no one wants to be older, or to think about being old. Let us, however, pause a moment this month to reflect on this state of our lives which, although it has its special problems, can be a time of special fulfillment and pleasure. It can be a time we all look forward to if we plan ahead, not forgetting our obligation to those who are older among us and who have already earned our special attention.●

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO CHINA

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan returned last week from his trip to the Peoples Republic

of China. The event was a historic and successful one from many points of view. The trip highlighted the importance of the largest Asian power—and most populous nation on Earth—to the security of the United States and to world peace.

The Lincoln Star has written an excellent editorial on the President's trip which I would commend to my colleagues. The President attempted to further U.S. interests in China in a number of different sectors. In some areas there was widespread agreement, in other areas the two sides agreed to disagree. As the editorial states: "It is not essential that we see things exactly the same in ideological matters." Indeed, what is important is the continuation of dialog with the People's Republic. I have excerpted the Star's article of May 1 for my colleagues.

REAGAN RETURNS HOME WITH SUCCESS IN CHINA

The American people are high on expediency, devoting no end of energy to the task immediately at hand. But in the longer course of events, we are not considered quite so efficient. Thus, it is characteristic that we can go for long periods without a single thought about the People's Republic of China and then spend a week in considerable examination of the subject.

* * * * *

China shares an extensive border with Russian and adjoins, among others, the countries of Afghanistan, Pakistan and India. It is, of course, a key part of all of Asia.

Thus, China is an element in world affairs that impacts upon both European and South Pacific affairs.

Also, China under new leadership is seeking to enter into the modern age of new technology and to open itself to the economic opportunities of Western progress. Thus, Reagan signed an agreement with China for the United States to sell nuclear energy technology, to expand cultural exchanges and for policies to expand trade between the two nations.

But here, too, matters are complex. There are the politically conservative in this country who take strong exception with expanded relations between the United States and China, believing China to be of an ideological nature with which we are at irreconcilable odds.

Also, trade is a two-way street and the garment industry of this nation is disturbed over the United States importing finished clothing products from China's low-wage factories. But China buys a lot of U.S. produced wheat and curtails purchases in that category of goods when we try to limit their export of textiles.

The President, we believe, balanced as well as could be done all the conflicts and possibilities that exist in our relations with China. Reagan has demonstrated the kind of pragmatism in this regard that is needed in today's world.

As he reminded his Chinese hosts, it is not essential that we see things exactly the same in ideological matters for us to exist on relatively friendly terms. We believe the Reagan administration could use more of that realism throughout much of the world.

We are not going to make the world over in our image and we can come to certain common understandings with nations that differ with us politically. Thus, in both a philosophical sense and in the practicalities of international affairs, Reagan's trip to China was a satisfying event for this nation.●

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. W. J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, following is the essay by Alfred J. Lamperez, the Louisiana winner of the 1983-84 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program:

The essay follows:

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

(By Alfred J. Lamperez)

"On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my Country. . .

"I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. . .

"I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President. . ."

These are the pledges taken by the Boy Scout, the United States citizen, and the President-elect. Each reflects a sense of commitment by the individual to uphold the American ideal as presented by our Constitution.

Did you realize that our United States Constitution is the oldest written constitution in the World? In the years since its adoption Russia has moved from czarism to communism, France has passed through five republics and three monarchies. Countless Asian and African colonies have gone from dependence to independence, changing governments many times over.

The document establishing our government was adopted in 1789. What is my role in upholding and maintaining our Constitution today? Needless to say, I have a duty to vote, to serve on juries, and to pay taxes. I have an obligation to fight, if necessary, to defend my homeland. But most of all, I have the responsibility to make our Constitution apply to present problems, to study the alternatives, and to shape the issues.

Government participation and public service are the ways I fulfill this responsibility. For in my multiple phases of individual government involvement, from the neighborhood and municipal level to the national scene, I bring the 194 year old document to life in 1983—this is my role in upholding our Constitution.

A wealth of literature in the form of essays and editorials has been laid before the public concerning social justice, military preparedness and many other controversial subjects. Topics such as these suggest ideas and programs which groups can promote, but do not dictate specific personal positions. My role—in the spirit of democracy—is to find out, what are the issues? Where do I stand? What can I do about it?

It is in the present situation at home and abroad, accompanied by riddled economic times and brittled international relationships that our Constitution is severely challenged. And my role in strengthening and maintaining it is clearly defined!

Having first carefully studied in this way, my role and obligation then becomes the privilege to be an involved active member of civic clubs and community organizations. I must also participate in government by telling elected representatives that I am in favor of certain legislation or disagree with a specific position. Further, if need be, I must serve on commissions, study groups, or school boards. And if the calling comes, I must seek elected office at whatever level.

In summary, my role is a dual one—first to see how our Constitution applies today, and then to do something about it. And this is not simply my role—it is ours!

In the next 194 years many foreign governments will have come and gone. If each of us plays our role in upholding our Constitution the United States can continue to remain "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Our American youth will still be able to "keep physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight." And in 194 years our 80th President will be able to the best of his ability "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."●

CHILD SURVIVAL FUND

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to a very important provision of the foreign aid authorization bill which has the potential for saving thousands of children's lives—the creation of a child survival fund. This program would make funds available to agencies carrying out child health activities in less developed countries, and I commend my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee for supporting the child survival fund.

The child survival fund has been proposed to deal with one of the greatest tragedies, the unnecessary daily deaths of this world's greatest resource—our children. Forty thousand children die every day; most of them from the effects of malnutrition, infection, and repeated attacks of diarrhea. Many of these deaths easily would be prevented if four simple inexpensive health techniques were made available to parents in poor countries. These techniques are often referred to as GOBI, which stands for growth monitoring, oral rehydration therapy, breastfeeding, and immunization. According to UNICEF's Executive Director James Grant, these techniques have the potential to save half of the child deaths annually.

For example, implementation of a national campaign for immunizing children against polio in Brazil reduced the number of child deaths from that disease by 99 percent in 3 years. In Guatemala, a campaign to distribute oral rehydration salts reduced the number of child deaths from diarrhea by one-half in the first year of the campaign alone.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate fact that too many parents in

poor countries continue to lack access to even the most rudimentary forms of health care. For instance, it is estimated that 80 percent of Africa's population has no available health care. The expansion of GOBI—simple, low cost, and easily available methods—is vitally important to improve the quality of life for the desparately poor.

The child survival fund would make funds available to agencies such as the World Health Organization, UNICEF, and AID, as well as private agencies, to carry out measures designed to reduce the large number of unnecessary deaths of children in Third World countries. Authorization for the program has been proposed at an initial level of $25 million. This amount is a reduction from the subcommittee recommendation that $50 million be made available for child health activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the child survival fund will prove to be a worthy addition to our foreign aid programs, and that in future years its funding will be increased. This initial authorization is a positive first step in providing adequate health care for the world's children.

Members of Congress have already addressed the importance of child health care by passing Senate Joint Resolution 111, which gave the full support and encouragement of Congress to child health activities. We now have the opportunity to provide funding as well as verbal support. I encourage my distinguished colleagues to support the child survival fund.●

ANSEL ADAMS: A MAN FOR OUR CENTURY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend just a minute to wish a fond farewell to a great naturalist, a wonderful artist, and a dear friend of humankind, Ansel Adams,

I came to know Ansel Adams when we served together on the board of directors of the Friends of the Earth. The passion for nature that he exhibited in his photography was clearly evident in his dealings with the issues that we handled on the board.

He was a man of many talents: He was a nature photographer who created the art form, a pianist, a teacher, a humanist, and a writer. He was, in fact, a visionary and the world will mourn the loss of this one bright candle in a world of darkness.

I hope that the family of this great man knows and understands that the Nation, in fact the world, shares their grief because we too have suffered a great loss.●

VIEWS ON EQUAL ACCESS LEGISLATION

HON. FREDERICK C. BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, because of the possibility that the House will soon consider H.R. 5345, the Equal Access Act, I urge my colleagues to study carefully the issues raised by this legislation.

As a member of both the House Education and Labor Committee, which had jurisdiction over this measure, and the House Judiciary Committee, which is considering similar legislation introduced by Congressman DON EDWARDS, I have supported the concept of equal access to school facilities for student initiated and student managed organizations.

In hearings before the Education and Labor Committee, however, a number of questions were raised concerning the appropriate remedy that should be made available to students who have been improperly denied access to school facilities. Other questions involving the constitutionality of the equal access proposal were also raised. In my additional views provided for the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, I address both the remedy and the establishment clause issues, and I request that my statement from the committee report be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. BOUCHER

I supported this legislation, both in Subcommittee and in full Committee, and I intend to vote for its passage on the floor of the House. Two issues concern me greatly, however, and I sincerely hope that these matters will be addressed either through floor amendments or in conference.

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDY

Section 2 of H.R. 5345 provides for the termination of federal funding to an entire school district if the U.S. Department of Education determines that a student religious group was improperly denied access to school facilities in any single school within the district. This administrative termination of federal funding would, in my view, make it virtually impossible for local school officials to exercise independent judgment to determine whether a student group seeking to use school facilities is a group which meets the requirements of the legislation.

Local school officials are required by the bill to determine whether student groups seeking access are "voluntary" and "student initiated." If a local school administrator decides that membership in the group is not entirely voluntary or that the group was not student initiated, he would run an enormous risk in denying the group access to school facilities. If a reviewing agent in the U.S. Department of Education disagreed with his conclusion, federal funds for the entire school district would be terminated. Then the burden would fall to the local school district to initiate suit for the purpose of litigating the correctness of the fund cutoff decision.

Under these circumstances, I think it is probable that in virtually all cases, even the most flagrant ones, the applying group will be awarded access to school facilities. The pressures of a possible fund cutoff should the school administrator decide to the contrary will prevent him from exercising the kinds of independent and subtle judgments required by the bill.

Local control and local authority is an important principle in America's educational system, and I am of the view that the administrative remedy set forth in this legislation extends the federal reach beyond its traditional limits.

I would greatly prefer that this legislation contain a judicial remedy similar to that provided in Section 2 of S. 815, Senator Hatfield's version of this legislation. While extending full protection to the rights of student religious groups, a judicial remedy would also respect the prerogatives of local school officials and enhance the principle of local control and local responsibility.

The American Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association and the National School Boards' Association have serious concerns about the administrative remedy contained in this measure. These organizations share the view that a judicial remedy according to aggrieved students or student organizations the right to petition federal courts for enforcement of their rights would be a more appropriate approach. I sincerely hope that during further consideration of this measure a judicial remedy will be substituted for the administrative remedy presently contained in the bill.

ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE ISSUES

During Subcommittee markup, the title of this legislation was changed from the "Religious Speech Protection Act" to the "Equal Access Act." The Subcommittee recognized, I believe, the inherent Constitutional issues raised in any Act of Congress singling out religious speech and according to it special treatment. Changing the title of the bill, however, does not address those serious Constitutional questions, and the possible conflict of this legislation with the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment remains.

Constitutional questions are normally examined in the House Judiciary Committee, but it is widely acknowledged that this legislation was carefully drafted so as to avoid the possibility of a referral to that Committee. As a member of both the Education and Labor Committee and the Committee on the Judiciary, I have attempted to arrange for a limited, sequential referral of this measure to the Judiciary Committee. My purpose in this attempt was not to indefinitely delay or prevent consideration of this legislation in the House. Rather, my purpose was to ensure that this measure and the delicate Constitutional questions which are associated with it have the benefit of the thinking of the Committee normally charged with examining those kinds of questions. I continue to believe that a temporary, limited referral of this measure to the Judiciary Committee is appropriate, and I am hopeful that prior to the conclusion of House consideration of the bill the Establishment Clause questions raised by this legislation will be addressed by that Committee.

EQUAL ACCESS A LEGITIMATE CAUSE

I would like to reiterate my support for this legislation. The concept is simple and

appealing: if you allow the stamp club or the gymnastics club or some other student organization to meet on school grounds, you should also allow the student Bible club or the religious club to have similar privileges.

This principle represents genuine equal access, and I support it. The difficulty arises, as it so often does, when we attempt to translate an attractive general concept into concise legislative language. It is here that Constitutional questions arise. My desire to examine those questions reflects not an opposition to the concept of equal access but a belief in the responsibility of all members of the House to construct the best legislation of which we are capable.●

LISTENING TO THE VOICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, this week, May 6-12, 1984, is Small Business Week. In making this proclamation, President Ronald Reagan declared that "America's strength lies in the ingenuity and perseverance of its people. No other group of Americans better exemplifies these qualities than the Nation's small business owners, who contribute daily to our economic well-being."

Yet these same independent entrepreneurs are being profoundly affected by the administration's current economic policies of high interest rates and tight money, and the massive accumulation of new Government debt. The record number of small business failures suggests that something has gone wrong with this economic policy. More than 98 percent of the businesses filing for bankruptcy during the past 3 years were small, according to information from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

The number of small family farm foreclosures, too, is skyrocketing as our Nation's farmers are being hurt by their inability to compete for credit.

It is time we began listening to the voice of small business—and this is the perfect forum in which to begin.

That voice is telling us, among other things, to make our monetary policy more responsive to the concerns of small business men and women and farmers. That should be among our top priorities.

No sustained economic recovery, in fact, is possible so long as these key sectors, buffeted by tight money problems, remain an object of indifference to our economic planners—particularly, the Federal Reserve Board.

Since 1913, when the Fed was born, the Board members have been primarily economists, not business people. While this has given the Board a high degree of expertise and impartiality, it also has helped create the suspicion in the business and agricultural communities that the Board does not know or even care about the practical consequences of its policies on business men, and women, farmers, and other individuals.

Mr. Paul Volcker, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, recently commented himself that no monetary policy should be pursued without a broad understanding of the objectives and the support from the people whose lives are affected.

A partial solution, then, lies in making the Fed more responsive to the invaluable contributions small business men, and women, and farmers are making to the Nation's economy.

With the aid of my small business task force—a group of small business men and women from the North Shore—I introduced a bill, H.R. 2566, that would place at the earliest openings representatives of small business and agricultural interests on the Federal Reserve Board.

A number of proponents of this idea rallied together and pushed for congressional hearings on H.R. 2566. The House Banking Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy held the hearings at the end of January.

The authors of the Federal Reserve Act did recognize the dangers of the Board becoming too aloof from actual business concerns, and so specified that the members of the Board have knowledge and experience in business, farming, and finance.

As the law now reads, however, the President must merely show due regard for these particular sectors when making his appointment to the Federal Reserve Board. H.R. 2566 would put teeth into the law, mandating that the President must appoint small business and agricultural representatives to the Board at the first two vacancies.

The term of Board member Nancy Hays Teeters expired at the end of January, and a new member has yet to be chosen. I call upon the President, when making his decision, to listen to the voice of the small business and farming communities, and remember what they have to offer our Nation.

A more responsive monetary policy can put us on the road to economic recovery. As the President stated in his Small Business Week proclamation, "we should encourage small business owners by acknowledging their tremendous importance as the mainsprings of continued economic and individual progress for our Nation."

Small Business Week, 1984, is the week to begin.●

DEATH PENALTY IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in light of the ongoing debate over the appropriateness of the death penalty in the United States, I thought that the letter that follows would be of interest to you and my colleagues:

TERRA HAUTE, IN,
March 29, 1984.

Hon. NANCY L. JOHNSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

MADAME: The U.S. Senate's vote to expand the death penalty in federal cases, as I understand it, makes it now obligatory upon you to prepare yourself for the House's vote on that legislation.

You will, no doubt, wish to give consideration to the fundamental moral aspects of the death sentence, so I have decided to make my opinion known on this issue to at least one Representative of each of the fifty states. This decision is based on the fact I am a middle-aged man who is at the present time serving a 50-year sentence in the Terra Haute Federal Penitentiary.

The Elizabeth Bouvia Trial in Riverside, California, forced a significant number of Americans to take heed of the fact that there are those amongst us who realize that the hopelessness of their circumstances makes death far more appealing than their present state of wretchedness. This realization should be taken into account by the Congress in its final legislation on the death penalty. I think it is a self-evident truth that death is the only answer for these humans whose lives are one prolonged agony. It would be in harmony with the principles of Christian charity and logic to terminate the lives of such unfortunates.

Warehousing prisoners such as myself for prolonged periods constitutes cruel and unusual punishment in the most literal sense of that phrase. The cost in tax dollars alone is a criminal waste.

Several of us prisoners have made our desire known to interested parties that we would gladly accept death by lethal injection and donate our bodies to medical science in lieu of enduring the interminable degradation that represents human survival in the federal penal system.

Therefore, I appeal to you to either introduce or lend support to legislation that would grant any defendant sentenced to serve over three years imprisonment in the federal penal system the option of a voluntary death sentence.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES CAREY, 15621-008.●

GENERAL GIAP'S VICTORY

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, this article entitled "General Giap's Victory"

appeared in the Wall Street Journal. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 7, 1984]

GENERAL GIAP'S VICTORY

Great events are worth recalling, for their lessons as well as their memories. So we don't mind pointing out that today is the 30th anniversary of Vietnam's victory over the French army at Dien Bien Phu. That victory, engineered by Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, was one of the first by communist revolutionaries. It marked the end of French rule in Indochina, and, arguably, led to U.S. involvement there and thus to Gen. Giap's greater triumph in 1975.

What can we learn from Dien Bien Phu? The general himself, still vigorous in his 70s, offered his own nostalgic assessment recently while surveying the historic battle site: "The bell tolled after Dien Bien Phu for the sunset of colonialism and encouraged, inspired other nations to stand up for self-liberation." But an alternative lesson occurred to us after we read a report about life in Vietnam since 1975.

The report, based on visitors' accounts and interviews with 500 emigres, is an extraordinary indictment of life under Gen. Giap's comrades. It was compiled by Ginetta Sagan, an Italian-born human-rights activist who was a prisioner of the Nazis in World War II. Mrs. Sagan, who was once a prominent opponent of President Thieu of South Vietnam, first issued her report a year ago, but has continued interviewing since and concludes that "the situation hasn't changed very much."

That "situation" includes the familiar signposts of communist repression. Religious worship is persecuted and churches have become warehouses. Private shops have mostly been confiscated, of course, with ethnic Chinese shopkeepers favorite victims. The report also provides grisly details about life in the "reeducation camps," where several hundred thousand Vietnamese have spent time and as many as 60,000 people remain. The lucky prisoners dig latrines or plant crops. The unlucky clear minefields. Prisoners eat only a few vegetables and a bowl of rice or two a day; they rarely get protein.

Anyone who rebels against this regimen is quickly punished: Prisoners' arms and legs are bound into contorted positions before they're tossed into metal boxes to bake in the tropical sun. One former prisoner was thrown into an abandoned water well for five days because he sang "Silent Night" on Christmas Eve. The "reeducated" hardly have an easier time upon release. Many are dispatched to New Economic Zones, which are hardscrabble areas where growing even enough food to survive is difficult.

No wonder so many Vietnamese gamble on escaping. Hanoi no longer extorts money by encouraging "boat people." But according to the United Nations, in 1983 alone more than 28,000 Vietnamese risked capture pirates and heavy seas to flee anyway. Some 2,000 more leave each month under the U.S.-sponsored Orderly Departure Program. As Hoang Huu Quynh, a former Communist Party member now in France, puts it: "today if Hanoi allowed the people to freely leave the country, even lampposts would apply to leave. . . . The party has betrayed the people and the promises made to them."

The lesson we draw from Dien Bien Phu, then, is simple: Don't ever lose a war to communist revolutionaries, because life under their system will always be worse than it was under the previous regime. Always. Vietnam was no exception and there has never been one. We think that's worth recalling so long as communists elsewhere portray themselves, as Gen. Giap does, as nationalists or liberators or noble enemies of poverty and corruption.●

A SALUTE TO CHRIST HOSPITAL VOLUNTEER SERVICE DEPARTMENT ON ITS 15TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, May 10, 1984, will mark the 15th anniversary of Christ Hospital's Volunteer Services Department. This week also marks the observation of National Volunteer Week throughout the United States. It is my privilege on this occasion to pay a very special tribute to Nancy Beatus Smith, director of Volunteer Services for Christ Hospital, where I have had the privilege of serving for many years on the executive committee.

Voluntarism dates back to the settlers of the American colonies. In 1620, the "Social Compact" document expressed the New World's commitment to voluntary cooperation to achieve mutual goals.

Voluntarism grew out of a need—a need for food, shelter, defense, and survival. Three hundred sixty some years later we share the same needs and concerns.

In 1872, Christ Hospital became the idea of one man who recognized a need—the need for medical services in Hudson County. The Reverend Richard Mason Abercrombie, D.D., rector of St. Matthew's Church and dean of the convocation of Jersey City, was unable to obtain access to proper medical care for one of his parishioners who was seriously injured in an accident at the Pennsylvania Railroad yard.

After transporting this parishioner, and others who were sick and injured, by horse and carriage and then by ferry to the Chambers Street Hospital in Manhattan, Reverend Abercrombie called a meeting of the Episcopal clergy to discuss the possibility of establishing a church affiliated hospital.

At this meeting a name was adopted and the first volunteers formed the Council of Hudson County Church Hospital and Home appointing Reverend Abercrombie as president.

In 1880, a woman, Sister Adelia of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, was placed in charge of the administration of the institution and the name Christ Hospital was adopted. The following years were prosperous and the patient census increased at a steady rate.

A pediatric unit called the Daisy Ward was added to treat ill and injured children. Concerned parents and residents joined together and worked diligently to raise funds to meet needs and supply extras for the children. This group, called the Abercrombie Guild, is one of the oldest remaining in the State and continues to provide for the Daisy Ward.

And so, dedicated citizens from the community banded together in a voluntary effort to comprise the governing board of Christ Hospital and the formation of a service guild. In response to a cry to heal the sick the hospital's mission was established. So too, a solid foundation was laid for the existence of volunteers in the ensuing years to provide both supplemental services within the institution and leadership of the institution.

Throughout the years, indisputable traits that characterize Christ Hospital as a provider of quality health care have been its ability to project community needs, innovation, leadership and the undeniable belief in the value and need for volunteer participation.

The American Hospital Association (AHA) was founded at the end of the 19th century. Located in Chicago, IL, its object, as stated in its bylaws, is "to promote the welfare of the public through its leadership and its assistance to its members in the provision of better health care and service for all the people."

Recognizing the opportunities and benefits offered by the American Hospital Association, Christ Hospital submitted application for institutional membership. From its earliest days, the American Hospital Association has recognized its responsibility to assist those engaged in the practice of health care professions. In 1968 the AHA recommended to all member health care facilities that they institute a department of volunteer services. With the acceptance of this proposal throughout the United States, the American Society of Directors of Volunteer Services, (ASDVS), became the 11th affiliated Society of the American Hospital Association with a membership of over 1,500.

Responding positively to the AHA's recommendation, Christ Hospital's Board of Trustees charged the administration to seek out leadership for the establishment of this new department.

In accordance with AHA guidelines, the administration of an effective volunteer services department requires specialized knowledge, skills, and capabilities in various fields. In 1969, Nancy Beatus Smith was appointed Christ Hospital's first director of volunteer services. Under her direction, a formal, structured department soon became an integral part of the institution.

With an office on the second floor of the hospital's 1888 building, storage space, and adequate equipment, the first order of business was to establish the purpose and philosophy of the department. Soon to follow were goals, standards, and policies to be in harmony with those of the hospital and in keeping with local, State, and Federal regulations.

Once the preliminary steps were in place, and job descriptions prepared, based on needs of specific departments requesting volunteer assistance, thoughts turned to recruiting and training an adequate and competent staff of volunteers.

Serving many community agencies in various volunteer capacities, from driving with the Red Cross Motor Corps to serving on several agency executive boards, Mrs. Smith knew that the key to any successful volunteer undertaking required commitment, dedication, and support from its community residents.

Within the year, December 1969 witnessed the first Volunteer Recognition Ceremony held in the hospital's chapel. Approximately 30 volunteers, teenagers, and adults proudly received awards, praise, and appreciation for their services.

The corps of volunteers has grown substantially during the past 15 years, boasting 140 seniors and 70 juniors to date.

Services offered to patients and employees have dramatically increased over the years and today more than 25 departments receive the benefits of volunteer assistance.

Over and above their scheduled assignments, volunteers are present for hospital dedications, the annual Health Fair, glaucoma and diabetes testing, and many other screenings that are offered free to the public during the year.

A 367-bed voluntary, not-for-profit hospital, Christ Hospital provides diagnostic, medical, and surgical treatments in a modern facility equipped with the most advanced technology.

As the leading diagnostic center in Hudson County and regional oncology treatment center, patients and employees are benefactors also of the supplemental services provided by volunteers. A new program instituted by the Volunteer Services Department is the provision of free wigs, maintenance, and general coiffure service for both in- and out-patients who are victims of cancer.

Along with many major services, the hospital also provides support for the elderly and disabled through their Home Health Care. In addition, the hospital sponsors the Center for Health Awareness, providing a range of programs for the community. Conscious of promoting health awareness and proper health care, the hospital, through its volunteer services, supplies to callers of Tel-Med free information from medically approved tapes.

Combining the best of management and administrative skills with creativity, imagination, and innovation, a contract has been signed between the Volunteer Services Department and Jersey City State College to institute a cooperative hospital internship program. This program, designed by Mrs. Smith, will combine a prescribed course of study for college credit, coordinating classroom learning with practical experience in an off-campus setting. It will offer students exposure and experience to the medical profession or a related field while providing services to Christ Hospital in a volunteer capacity.

The Volunteer Services Department takes positive action to act as a catalyst between departments, volunteers, and staff in regards to services and programs. Through team efforts of staff and volunteers, patients of Christ Hospital receive quality care.

Volunteering offers a multitude of opportunities for young adults. Through volunteering, they have the advantage of career exploration, learning teamwork, enjoying healthy competition, and developing leadership skills. Volunteering adds an important dimension toward their maturity and adulthood.

College students are frequently finding that listing their course work isn't enough to gain entrance into the job market. Volunteering affords the oft-time needed experience for résumés. Colleges and universities are also recognizing the benefits of voluntarism and are offering credit for approved involvement.

For the middle aged, volunteering offers a means for renewing and upgrading skills for reentrance into the work force. For those employed, it offers diversion from laborious, routine work and sometimes a career change. Personnel departments in many corporations are also requesting volunteer experience be listed on application for employment forms.

Finally, to those retired, volunteering is a haven. Utilizing lifetime skills and acquiring new knowledge, senior citizens are parlaying greater enjoyment into leisure time. There may be no "Fountain of Youth" but most psychologists and gerontologists agree that the formula for keeping young is an active and intellectual life. The older persons' accumulated experience and acquired wisdom set them apart as special contributors to the volunteer sector and have placed them in great demand.

Christ Hospital's Volunteer Services Department offers meaningful and important jobs and training to those looking for a change of interest, learning experience, maintaining a skill, fulfilling a school requirement, therapy, or for sheer enjoyment.

As a cooperative agency in the community, the Volunteer Services Department has responded to the Hudson County judicial system in placing court referral volunteers; admitting high school students for required community involvement, retirees both professional and unskilled, short term volunteers for specific projects, and college students seeking needed course related experience.

During the past decade, American companies are recognizing the need for public/private partnerships. In order to respond to the physical, economic, and social problems in American communities, corporations are seeking volunteer assignments for their employees and offering work release time.

Many people are drawn into the volunteer sector: Bankers, lawyers, engineers, teachers, carpenters, handicapped, students, firemen, screen and TV personalities, and Ambassadors' wives to name a few. Their benefactors receive services in the form of advisers, educators, advocates, ombudsmen, fundraisers, typists, statisticians, and many more. In this day of hi-tech, increasing importance is placed upon the rare personal touch of individualized attention. Hi-touch is a luxury only volunteers can provide.

In recent years several Presidents of the United States have called for the mobilization of volunteers. President Kennedy was instrumental in the formation of the Peace Corps and President Johnson initiated VISTA. The first placed volunteer emphasis on activities abroad while the latter focused volunteer involvement on problems here at home.

In President Nixon's administration, six existing volunteer programs were joined together to form ACTION, which became the Federal agency for volunteer service, until Congress mandated an independent private sector agency be established which is known as the National Center for Voluntary Action.

In an ongoing effort to encourage volunteerism, President Ronald Reagan created the President's Volunteer Action Awards "to honor those individuals and groups who are making unique contributions to their communities through Volunteer Service." President Reagan also pronounced this past year the National Year of Voluntarism. A commemorative stamp was issued and the 1984 Tournament of Roses Parade recognized volunteerism in proclaiming "A Salute to Volunteers" as their theme.

As we celebrate Christ Hospital's Volunteer Services Department's 15th anniversary, we cannot overlook that its success reflects strong, sensitive, and diplomatic leadership with a corps of dedicated, committed citizens supportive of the hospital's mission.

In paying tribute today to the volunteers of Christ Hospital we reflect upon their unquestionable value to paid staff and to the thousands of sick and injured they administer to annually. Their worth and humanness of service cannot be measured by dollars and cents—nor can you compute their energy and desire. Fifteen years have passed, virtually every area of the hospital from the emergency room to engineering are staffed by volunteers. Many former Candystripers are present-day nurses, others have been employed by the hospital in clerical and health related positions and some have become physicians.

Their legacy of 300,000 hours of service cannot begin to demonstrate the scope of their concern and commitment.

We are fast seeing sweeping changes in our country and the world around us and the health care profession is witness of one of the most dramatic.

To our volunteers, Christ Hospital and our Nation rely upon the good examples you, as adults, set and teach today's youth. Community participation is vital to our future—your experiences and knowledge are important in the avoidance of repeating the errors and pitfalls of the past. There is no greater resource than human resources.

Each of you are endowed with special qualities—your enthusiasm is invigorating, your contributions, significant and your eagerness to lend a helping hand, refreshing.

You have our respect and our thanks.

The volunteer efforts at this great institution of healing in my district make it necessary for me to offer them this very special salute today.

I would be remiss indeed if I did not pay tribute also to the young lady who oversees the Christ Hospital volunteer service program, my high school classmate, Nancy Beatus, now Nancy Beatus Smith, truly a tremendous individual whose professional affiliations include the American Society of Directors of Volunteer Service (ASDVS), where she is now a board member and has chaired various committees.

As a member of the New Jersey Association of Directors of Volunteer Services she has served as its president on several occasions and has been a guiding light advising the group since 1970.

Presently she is a member of the Rutgers University Advisory Committee on Volunteerism and serves on the Tri-State Directors of Volunteer Services.

Since 1981 she has been a Certified Administrator of Volunteer Services.

The Beatus family has a long and industrious career of community services. Her father, Robert Beatus, a very dear and personal friend of mine, set the tone of community service for the family.

It is for this reason that Nancy has served the Junior Service League of Hudson County; the American Red Cross, on its executive board, and board of directors: on the board of directors of the Mental Health Association of Hudson County; and as a member of the advisory committee of the famous Bergen School in Jersey City.

Her active membership in community functions in volunteer capacities for the past 25 years is a litany, including affiliation with the Bloomfield Federation of Music and Civic Chorus.

The tens of thousands of persons Nancy Beatus Smith has touched through voluntarism no doubt enjoy contentment Oscar Wilde wrote about when he said:

> Contentment lies not the enjoyment of ease—a life of luxury—but comes only to him that labors and overcomes—to him that performs the task in hand and reaps the satisfaction of work well done.

Those who serve indeed echo the words of St. Francis of Assisi when he said:

"Blessed is the servant who loves his brother as much when he is sick and useless as when he is well and can be of service to him."

And in my judgment, also those who can give without remembering are blessed also. The greatest pay of a volunteer is knowing that their good actions are the invisible hinges on the doors of heaven, so please keep up your good work. I quote the words of John Wesley:

> Do all the good you can,
> By all the means you can,
> In all the ways you can,
> In all the places you can,
> At all the times you can,
> To all the people you can,
> As long as ever you can.

In closing, I would like to share a childhood prayer by Grenville Kleiser:

If I can do some good today,
If I can serve along life's way,
If I can something helpful say,
  Lord, show me how.
If I can right a human wrong,
If I can help to make one strong,
If I can cheer with smile or song,
  Lord, show me how.
If I can aid one in distress,
If I can make a burden less,
If I can spread more happiness,
  Lord, show me how.●

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO JUANITA SALAZAR MORALES ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY, MAY 13, 1984

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues that on May 13, 1984, Juanita Salazar Morales will celebrate her 100th birthday.

Juanita S. Morales was born in Guadalupe Hacienda, Durango, Mexico. Her parents were Anastacio Barron and Estefana Salazar. She was raised by her mother and stepfather Euaristo Barragan.

At age 13, Mrs. Morales was taken hostage by Eleuterio Soto for 6 months. Following her release she lived with Miguel Orona. They had 5 children. In 1905 she and Mr. Francisco Morales moved to Indio, CA. They had 13 children. In 1926 the Morales' purchased a ranch in Terrazas, Chihuahua, Mexico. The name of their ranch was Rancho California.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Morales now resides in Pico Rivera, Calif. She is well known for her dedication to her family. As the matriarch of the Morales family, Mrs. Morales has nine surviving children—Gregorio, Carlota, Juanita, Isidra, Jose Eleuterio, Soledad, Cipriano, Irene, and Francisco, 46 grandchildren, 146 great grandchildren, and 23 great great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mrs. Morales happy birthday on this memorable occasion as well as health and prosperity in the years to come.●

WORLD POPULATION CRISIS AND FAMILY PLANNING ISSUES

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the fiscal year 1985 foreign assistance authorization bill this week and immigration reform later this year, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention three articles that appeared in this morning's press. They are particularly relevant. Two of these articles, in the New York Times, address the world population crisis and its impact on the United States. The third article, and editorial in today's Washington Post, addresses the family planning issues we will be debating this week with respect to U.S. foreign aid. The common thread in all three is that population growth affects almost every area of public policy and must be given serious attention as we debate both immigration reform and foreign aid. I commend these articles to my colleagues' attention.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1984]

. . . SPILLS OVER U.S. BORDERS

(By Russell W. Peterson)

WASHINGTON.—The debate over immigration reform has failed to focus on a basic reason for such reform: worldwide population growth.

In most countries of the world, human beings are straining the capacity of their habitat to support them. This is certainly true south of our border, where the burgeoning populations of Mexico and Central America are causing a surge of migration, legal and illegal, into the United States. Our population grew by nearly 2.5 million last year, much of it from immigration. Even at our present growth rate of about 1 percent annually, we are adding to our population the equivalent of a Baltimore or Panama every year, a new California every decade.

The environment of the United States is now under intense pressure from a steadily increasing population. You can see the pressures almost anywhere you go in the United States—in the polluted, water-scarce sprawl of Los Angeles and Phoenix, in the draining (for irrigation) of the Ogallalla Aquifer, which lies under the southern plains states, in the poisoning of drinking water supplies from toxic wastes in many parts of the country, in the contamination and shoreline development afflicting Chesapeake Bay, in the conversion of California's orchards and Long Island's potato fields into housing developments, in the drastic decline of wildlife in the Everglades due to growing human competition for south Florida's water, in the clearcutting of remnant primeval forests in the Northwest, in the spreading impact of acid rain on our lakes and forests nationwide, in the loss of one million acres of prime farmland every year to shopping centers, highways, reservoirs and subdivisions, in the plight of the California condor, grizzly bear, sea otter, Selkirk Mountain caribou, and a host of other less glamorous but nonetheless vital components of the earth's ecosystem that are endangered by expanding human activities.

Environmental stress from growing numbers of human beings is intensified by the exceptionally high per-capita consumption of natural resources here in the United States. But the stresses on our soils are primarily the result of mounting food deficits worldwide. The Department of Agriculture reports that 34 percent of American cropland has become less fertile because of topsoil loss from over-intensive farming. In Iowa alone, 260 million tons of soil are lost from cropland each year.

We can relieve some of this pressure through better conservation and resource management. But the root cause—population growth—must also be addressed. For openers, we need to establish a national policy designed to stabilize our population. This must include immigration reforms based on current realities, not on conditions of the past century when we still had a frontier and were not, as we are today, straining the land's natural carrying capacity. A fair and enlightened approach is embodied in the Simpson-Mazzoli immigration bill now before the Congress. Proponents of this bill seek to limit immigration to 450,000 per year—a number greater, by the way, than the total annual immigration allowed into all other countries of the world combined.

Providing a wide-open escape valve for the population pressures of developing nations serves neither the interests of the United States nor the interests of long-term global stability. Far better that we stabilize our population at an ecologically-acceptable level while vigorously fostering sustainable human progress elsewhere. An integral part of such progress is better access, particularly in the developing countries, to family planning services.

WORLD POPULATION CRISIS

(By Lester R. Brown)

WASHINGTON.—There is some indication that Third World leaders are finally waking up to the fact that population growth is placing intolerable pressures on the earth's land, water and energy supplies. Among the first to reexamine population policies were the Chinese. After weighing a projected population growth of 300 to 400 million people against the future availability of cropland, water, energy and jobs, China's leaders concluded that they had no choice but to press for one-child families, lest they jeopardize hard-earned gains in living standards.

The main difference between China and other densely populated developing countries such as Bangladesh, India, Egypt, Nigeria or Mexico, may be that the Chinese have had the foresight to make projections of their population and resources and the courage to translate their findings into policy. But other countries may also find that one-child families are the only humane alternative.

Administering a one-child family program is not easy. To hold the line at one child, China relies on an established political structure extending down to the individual, strong peer pressure, substantial financial rewards for having only one child and hefty financial penalties for having more than one.

Where a preference for sons is strong, the program is particularly difficult to enforce, as Chinese leaders can attest. And the line between peer pressure, in a society where citizen awareness of the population threat is high, and official coercion is a thin one.

For this reason, many societies regard government-sponsored, one-child family programs as infringements on reproductive freedom. But for many countries, the only alternative is a rate of population growth that undermines living conditions, an alternative that is all too visible in Africa, where population growth has outpaced food production for more than a decade and where starvation is becoming common.

The deterioration of the world economy lends fresh urgency to the need for new policies. Between 1950 and 1973, when world economic growth averaged 5 percent a year, the rising economic tide raised living standards throughout the world. Economic growth outpaced population growth almost everywhere. Average life expectancy in the Third World climbed from 43 to 53 years as nutrition and health improved.

Starting in 1973, however, dramatic increases in oil prices narrowed the gap between economic growth and population growth. During the four years since the 1979 oil price hike, global economic growth has averaged 1.7 percent annually, exactly the same as population growth. A combination of higher energy prices, a broad deterioration of croplands and forests, a burdensome external debt in many Third World countries and the high interest rates now virtually assured by massive United States budget deficits suggests that the world economy will be hard pressed to expand by much more than 2 percent a year during the 1980's.

For countries that have reached zero population growth, such as West Germany, Belgium or Hungary, annual economic growth of 2 percent will still raise incomes a comfortable 2 percent each year. But for countries such as Kenya, Pakistan or Ecuador, whose populations expand at 3 percent or more per year, economic growth of 2 percent will yield a steady decline in income and living standards.

Many countries are suffering from this imbalance in economic and population growth. The World Bank reports that in 18 countries, most of them in Africa, incomes fell during the 1970's. Other African countries have joined the list during this early years of this decade.

The prospects are also discouraging in Latin America. The Inter-American Development Bank reports that per-capita income in 1983 was 10 percent below that of 1980. If rapid population growth continues, many Latin American countries burdened with external debt may finish the decade with incomes lower than those with which they started. One projection of Brazil's economic future anticipates that Brazil should be able to pay off its external debt but warns that austerity measures will keep its depressed industrial output below the 1980 level until 1990. By this time 37 million Brazilians will have been added to the 1980 population of 119 million, sharply reducing output per capita.

The grim choices in Africa, where income decline is closely tied to the fall in per-capita food production, are belatedly coming into focus. Africa's overall food production growth of 2 percent a year remains quite respectable by international standards. But with a population growing at 3 percent annually, the fastest of any continent in history, Africa seems to face a steady decline in per capita output and a slow slide toward disaster.

As the outlines of the new economic era become more visible, population policy may come to command the time and attention of Third World political leaders as much as energy policy did in Western industrial capitals during the 1970's. In an age of slower economic growth, improvements in living standards may depend more on the skills of family planners then on those of economic planners.

Too many governments have delayed facing the issue. When they do so, they may discover that they are forced to choose between a one-child family program or deteriorating living standards. Given the unprecedented numbers of young people who will reach reproductive age within the next two decades, a generation of one-child families may be the key to restoring a sustained improvement in living standards. In effect, this may be the price many societies will be forced to pay for neglecting population policy for too long.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1984]

FAMILY PLANNING UNDER ATTACK

The Forces of the New Right are geared up for another attempt to disrupt U.S. aid for foreign nations' family planning programs. Amendments to be offered during the House debate on foreign aid this week will be forwarded under cover of the anti-abortion campaign. But since no U.S. foreign aid money flows directly or indirectly into either abortion or compulsory sterilization programs, sponsors of the amendments clearly have other goals in mind: to undermine all aid for population control measures and to embarrass their legislative opponents.

Since Sen. Jesse Helms succeeded in banning all U.S. aid for foreign countries' abortion programs a decade ago, the Agency for International Development has been careful to see that no U.S. funds flowed to such programs. Even a small and humanitarian re-

search program to help women suffering from botched illegal abortions, a sadly frequent occurrence in developing countries, was ended to satisfy Sen. Helms and his friends.

Contrary to recent claims, moreover, the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, to which the United States contributes, provides neither direct nor general aid to what are said to be coercive population control programs in China. All U.N. aid is limited to specific projects—including population data development and reduction of infant and child mortaility—that involve neither abortion nor compulsory sterilizaiton.

Simple amendments to restrict government aid to abortion programs would thus have no practical effect. But amendments could seriously damage international family planning programs by preventing the flow of U.S. aid to major voluntary population organizations that, using private money, assist in foreign governments' abortion programs. These organizations carry out a major part of family planning efforts throughout the world. Although abortion-related activities are a very small part of their work, they, and the foreign governments to whose requests they respond, would rightly consider such a ban an unwarranted intrusion by the United States into the decisions of other governments.

The developing countries now face an explosion in population unprecedented in world history. Although the rate of growth has subsided slightly since its 1970 peak, the population base is now so large that record numbers are added to the world each year. Ninety percent of the 1 billion people who will be added to world population in the next 15 years will be born in developing countries. A new World Resources Institute study points out that those countries making the most progress in reducing birth and death rates have pursued both active birth control programs and economic and social policies that benefit the large majority of the population. It is strongly in this country's interest to help developing countries pursue both objectives.●

BEAUTIFY OUR HIGHWAYS: PLANT NATIVE WILDFLOWERS

HON. TOM VANDERGRIFF

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. VANDERGRIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which is twofold in its approach to the improvement of our Nation's highways. My legislation requires the Secretary of Transportation to approve the planting of native wildflower seeds and/or seedlings as part of any landscaping contract. The bill would permit up to one-quarter of 1 percent of landscaping funds to be used for this purpose.

On the face of this legislation, it would appear that it solely addresses highway beautification, and certainly this is an important aspect of my proposal. Equally important, however, are the cost savings which can be achieved under this bill. In my home State of Texas, we have actively pursued the planting of wildflowers along the highways of the State, with favorable results. The Texas Highway Department has demonstrated that these efforts have resulted in cost-cutting, water-saving, and labor-saving benefits. The cost of mowing along highway rights of way in 24 Texas counties has been reduced by 24.8 percent where wildflowers have been planted. Native vegetation has actually been enhanced as well. In fact, if the program is projected statewide, the cost of mowing was reduced from $32 million to $25 million—a savings of $8 million.

The planting of wildflowers can also be credited with reducing the need for the annual application of water from as many as 20 to 30 waterings to as few as 5 or 6. The obvious savings in terms of money and a limited resource would free millions of dollars for other services, such as roadbuilding and repair work. Then, too, it is not incidental that Texas has noted a substantial reduction in litter in areas which have been planted with wildflowers.

Mr. Speaker, we recently commemorated the efforts of Lady Bird Johnson for her beautification efforts here in our Nation's Capital and throughout the country. We now have an opportunity to continue and expand on her efforts, while also enjoying significant cost savings at the same time. As has been proven in Texas, planting native wildflowers enhances our highway landscapes and reduces maintenance costs. I ask that the text of my legislation be printed following this statement, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.●

ADDITIONAL STUDIES ON THE HOMELESS

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, we have seen reports from the Reagan administration indicating the President's lack of understanding about poverty and poor people in this country. The President has publicly stated that many people are homeless by choice, but we all know that is simply not true.

Social service agencies throughout the United States have estimated that between 2 and 3 million people are homeless in this country, and they have asked the Federal Government for money to assist in providing emergency shelter. But the Reagan administration is denying the existence of this severe problem, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development report released last week stating there are less than 350,000 homeless people is a smokescreen designed to convince the American public to agree with the President's policy of limiting Federal funds for emergency shelters.

I have reason to believe the HUD study is not accurate. Sixty cities were examined in the survey, but the city of Memphis, one of the largest metropolitan areas in the South was not included. We know the Memphis Inter-Faith Association (MIFA), the Salvation Army Emergency Shelter, Union Mission, and the Calvary Rescue Mission care for hundreds of homeless people in Memphis every year. We also know that more than 50 agencies in Memphis provide food for the homeless, but these individuals were not included in the HUD survey.

I believe the President is trying to minimize the extent of hunger and the shortage of housing in this country. The HUD report is another example of the lack of compassion of the Reagan administration to seriously solve the problems of poverty and homelessness in our great Nation.

A new study conducted as soon as possible by the General Accounting Office should be undertaken, in an effort to obtain an accurate number of those who are homeless in America. That study should include Memphis and every large city in the United States, so everyone will know how serious this problem has become.

The homeless are not living in the streets by choice. They are there because of circumstances beyond their control, and we in Government have a moral responsibility to provide a decent place to live for all of our citizens.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN KELLY

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it was once said, "Every one of us is given the gift of life, and what a strange gift it is. If it is preserved jealously and selfishly, it impoverishes and saddens. But if it is spent for others, it enriches and beautifies."

In his many years of service to the Long Island Chapter of the March of Dimes, John Kelly has enriched the lives of many. Through his generosity of spirit and devotion to the cause of mankind, John has made a tremendous contribution toward eliminating the incidence of birth defects in our country. John symbolizes to us all the best that an individual can do to help his fellow man.

I am honored to have such a distinguished constituent as John Kelly and I am pleased that the Long Island chapter will be honoring his efforts at a dinner on May 18.

I ask that my colleagues join with me in paying tribute to John Kelly

who has done so much to further the cause of research against childhood disease.●

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FOREIGN AID FUNDS

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing an amendment to H.R. 5119 requiring that the President establish standards of financial accountability for foreign aid funds disbursed under this act. I believe that it is important that we begin to exercise some control over the money we send to foreign governments to insure that it actually be used for the purposes for which it was intended. Too often we hear of incidents of fraud abuse of the funding or its diversion for purposes that may not be in the interests of the American people.

The foreign aid we provide to other countries may be in the better interests of our own security but we have to recognize the disruptive impact this aid can have on the internal and regional political balances of the countries we grant it to. The massive amounts of funding that we have directed to other countries is often not used for the purposes we intend it for. We cannot afford to have our military assistance linked to domestic terrorism or the development of nuclear arsenals far beyond our strategic interests. Therefore, I believe that insuring the financial accountability of the funds we disburse will guarantee a closer approximation of our own strategic goals and cut down on the incidence of fraud and waste.

The people of my district are concerned with the security interests of the United States but they are also angered at reports that the money to further that goal is often wasted or directed for uses contrary to our goals. Accountability and security are not contradictions in terms and this amendment will bring the two goals into closer alinement.●

A FRAGILE UNITY IN IRELAND FAILS WITHIN THE HOUR

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, last summer I had an opportunity to visit Northern Ireland. During the trip, I toured Belfast and many other parts of the six counties. I met with people representing all points of view to discuss the tragic problems facing the people. I learned how the people feel about their lives, their opportunities and their futures.

Having observed the situation in Northern Ireland firsthand, I would like to offer an article that is a thoughtful starting point for those who want to learn about the complex problems of the island and want to understand the tragedy that the people are living with. This article was written by Jane P. Shoemaker, and it appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Sunday, May 6, 1984. I encourage my colleagues to read her article because during my visit I saw many of the same problems she reports.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 6, 1984]

A FRAGILE UNITY IN IRELAND FAILS WITHIN THE HOUR

(By Jane P. Shoemaker)

DUBLIN, IRELAND.—It seemed too good to be true, this show of Irish unity under the glare of television lights.

True, the four Catholic politicians standing together were on one side of the Great Divide that separates the "two traditions" in Ireland—which in practical terms means Roman Catholics and Protestants.

While each represented a different political party with a singular view on how to bridge the division, they were speaking with one voice for the first time in half a century.

The unity held for just under an hour.

Consensus does not come easily on this troubled island, as the release of the New Ireland Forum report demonstrated last week.

Three political parties from the Irish Republic had joined with one from Northern Ireland under the forum umbrella. Their goal was to come up with proposals for ending the violence that has taken 2,371 lives in Northern Ireland over the last 15 years.

The document signed by party leaders Wednesday was a peace offering to the one million Protestants of Northern Ireland so fearful of being forced into a Catholic-dominated Irish state.

And it was a message of hope to the half-million Catholics of Northern Ireland who are just as fearful that change will never come. To Northern Ireland's majority, the party leaders pledged never to impose a change without consent. To the minority, they pledged to work tirelessly toward winning that consent.

But within an hour of the signing ceremony, one of the four, Fianna Fail leader Charles Haughey, declared that his party would never compromise on its unity-or-nothing stand.

By dinnertime, Northern Ireland had responded to: The report, declared leaders of the two main Protestant parties, was an insult and a sham.

And by nightfall, the British government had declared the forum's conclusions about its role in Northern Ireland "one-sided and unacceptable."

The "two traditions" have been in conflict on this island for three centuries. In the ebb and flow of power during that time, both the nationalists committed to an independent Ireland and the unionists loyal to Britain have shown themselves to be guilty of intolerance and injustice.

The latest chapter began in 1969 with civil-rights demonstrations by Catholics in Londonderry, Northern Ireland, where they account for about one-third of the population. Catholic citizens were being discriminated against in civil-service jobs, housing and employment—a fact denied then but acknowledged on all sides today—and they took to the streets.

Those demonstrations triggered counter-protests by Protestant unionists, and the clashes became so violent that British troops were called in to restore what passes in Northern Ireland for peace.

Peace has yet to be restored, and conditions today defy any kind of normal life.

Simply put, Belfast is a war zone. British troops with rifles clutched close to their bodies walk in pairs down the sidewalk or stand in protected doorways. In Catholic neighborhoods, dogs can smell their fear and raise an eerie chorus of barks and howls when a patrol passes by.

Armed personnel carriers rumble through the streets. Police stations are fenced in and protected with heavy gates. There are gaps, like missing teeth, among the rowhouses where bombs have brought down the narrow structures. In the central area, drivers cannot leave cars unattended for even a few seconds: Any empty vehicle is assumed to be a car bomb; troops converge, and the hapless car owner gets a severe reprimand. Every entrance to the shopping district is guarded, and pedestrians must submit to body searches before going inside.

There is a 20-foot brick and reinforced concrete wall between the Catholic Falls Road and Protestant Shankill neighborhoods in West Belfast. Smaller walls separate other working-class Catholic and Protestant areas: A new one longer than a football field is now being built in North Belfast today.

There are 10,000 British troops, most of them teenagers, in Northern Ireland.

Outside the towns, police regularly set up roadblocks, randomly stopping cars to search for weapons and explosives. British soldiers, faces smeared with green camouflage to match the verdant landscape, crouch in ditches along rural roads near the border, waiting for trouble that may or may not develop.

Small-town banks and country post offices are regularly held up by paramilitary groups such as the Irish Republican Army. So commonplace are robberies that victims have come to know which robbers work for which causes.

On Wednesday, the day the forum report was released, 10 IRA men from Londonderry were sentenced to a total of 1,001 years for 21 separate terrorist crimes, including the shooting of a police inspector as he walked out of a church with his family.

Also on Wednesday, a British television documentary featured a former British Army officer describing how undercover intelligence officers in Northern Ireland kidnapped and even assassinated suspected IRA men in the 1970s.

The same day, Belfast police reported that all was relatively quiet on the terrorist front: A car was hijacked and used in a robbery; a cyclist was caught toting a rifle; a "suspected terrorist" accidentally shot himself while cleaning his gun, and a woman cleaning her aging mother's house found a cache of ammunition.

"But you don't get most of the firebombings and shootings midweek," said a police spokesman. "The major offensives are on the weekends."

In that atmosphere, children learn hatred early. Protestant youngsters dress up and

march in the big Orange Day parade each July 12 to commemorate the Battle of the Boyne, when Protestant King William III—William of Orange, or simply King Billy to the marchers—ousted the Catholic King James. As toddlers, they hear and repeat slurs against the "Papies."

It is no different on the other side of the divide, as radio listeners were starkly reminded one morning last week. A British Broadcasting Corp. reporter went to the militantly Catholic Falls Road neighborhood and talked to a group of children between 6 and 8 years old. They did not want to grow up to be firemen: They wanted to join the IRA.

The IRA protects them from the British soldiers and, in one boy's words, "fights the Orangies." The reporter asked the children why they would want to fight the Protestants. Another boy answered: "Because they don't believe Mary was a virgin."

So many in Ireland, especially those on the extreme edges of the fight, emphasize that the undeclared war there is not a religious one. It is a matter of independence and self-determinaiton, say the republican fighters committed to forcing the British to surrender control. It is patriotism and principle, say the loyalists who take up their own arms against the republicans.

But the religious significance is inescapable. Catholics comprise just a third of citizens in the six counties of Northern Ireland. Catholics comprise 97 percent of the 26 counties of the Irish Republic.

In a divided Ireland, each side keeps a firm grip on its own majority standing on its own turf. In a united Ireland, Protestants would be outnumbered by more than three to one.

Independent Ireland is not just Catholic by numbers, but Catholic in social custom and in law. Just before the evening news broadcasts, a religious picture appears and a church bell chimes "The Angelis."

The nation's constitution enshrines Roman Catholic bans on divorce and, as of last year, abortion.

Increasingly, the Catholics are turning to one group for help: Sinn Fein, the IRA's political arm. Once considered extreme and insignificant, Sinn Fein—the name in Gaelic means "Ourselves Alone"—is the strongest political force in the Catholic neighborhoods of Belfast and Londonderry.

Sinn Fein has set up a network of two dozen advice centers to help Catholics with day-to-day problems, and it campaigns against drug pushers that prey on schoolchildren.

Sinn Fein bills itself as the political party of the future, and that possibility was the single strongest catalyst in bringing the New Ireland Forum together.

For while Sinn Fein engages in admirable community projects, it also supports the IRA's "armed struggle" against the British government, which it considers an occupying force no different from, say, the Soviets in Afghanistan.

Sinn Fein has won seats in the Northern Ireland Assembly and the British House of Commons but refuses to sit in either one. It rejects all forms of discussion and negotiation, holding firm to a single-plank platform: Brits out.

In last year's British general elections, Sinn Fein candidates garnered 43 percent of the Catholic vote in Northern Ireland. There are fears in Dublin and London that in next spring's local elections, Sinn Fein will supplant the Social Democratic and Labor Party (SDLP) as the majority party among the province's Catholic minority.

SDLP Leader John Hume, whose party wants reunification of Ireland through peaceful and democratic means, asked for help. He got it from the three mainstream political parties in the Irish Republic.

Together, they formed the New Ireland Forum, to review the history of Northern Ireland, study the present situation and search for ways in which the divisions might be healed.

The report issued by the forum last week went further in offering concessions than Irish nationalist parties had ever gone. While expressing a preference for a single Irish state, forum members said they were open to any sort of arrangement that would satisfy the "two traditions."

It might be two separate Irish states, north and south, under a single federal government. It might be a new government for Northern Ireland administered jointly from Dublin and London.

And under the best of circumstances, the report said, it would be a single government in Dublin structured to give a fair share of power to both sides and operating under a new, nonsectarian constitution.

It all sounded so open-minded, so accommodating.

"Terms of the debate on the future of this island have been completely transformed," declared Hume. "Things cannot be the same again."

But they were, and in a matter of minutes. Fianna Fail leader Haughey, leader of a party founded to fight for a 32-county Ireland, declared at a post-signing news conference that he would countenance nothing short of a single Dublin controlled island. Yes, Northern Ireland's unionists should be consulted—but only on how the two sectors should be rejoined.

"Nobody," he boomed, "is entitled to deny the natural unity and unification of this island."

So much for calm consensus. Unionist politicians responded with predictable outrage, and from London came the usual comments about Irish bully-boy tactics.

The British government did not issue an outright rejection and most likely will not do so. But the unspoken yet undeniable fact is that Haughey's hard line has given British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher reason to question the sincerity of the peace gesture—and therefore reason to discount it.

And that leaves just one question still to be answered: If not a single Irish state or a federal government or joint rule, then what?

Northern Ireland will not remain as it is today: The increasing frustration of young Catholics, the growing power of Sinn Fein and the widening acceptance of violence make change inevitable no matter what happens in London or Dublin.

Unionist politician Robert McCartney suggested at week's end that the forum report ought to be forgotten and that its members go back to the "long-term slog." Perhaps in two generations, perhaps in his grandchildren's time, the two traditions could come to "a mutuality of values."

Ireland's Foreign Affairs Minister Peter Barry offered his own grim warning of what would happen if the gap were not bridged.

"We could drift into civil war," he said, "and in the not-too-distant future."●

A SALUTE TO COLONEL COMMANDANT MICHAEL KOVATS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are striving to insure the basic human rights and freedoms for all people of the world, I feel it is important to reflect on our own Nation's past and salute a man who has played such an important role in helping us gain our independence. I am referring to Col. Commandant Michael Kovats, distinguished Hungarian patriot and American war hero during our Nation's fight for independence.

On May 12 a permanent memorial in honor of Colonel Kovats will be unveiled at our national shrine in Valley Forge, Pa. The establishment of this memorial is due largely to the tireless efforts of a constituent of mine, Gen. Andrew T. Udvardy, president of the Col. Commandant Michael Kovats Historical Society, and his colleagues. They have dedicated themselves, and worked successfully to focus much deserved attention on the supreme sacrifice Colonel Kovats made in the name of American independence. They were the driving force behind the Kovats memorial. Futher, the society has been able to convert the life and death of Colonel Kovats into an inspiration and renewed hope for the many courageous people throughout the world who are being denied even the most basic human freedoms—including the proud people of their ancestral homeland, Hungary.

The life of Colonel Kovats is certainly an excellent reminder to all Americans who often take for granted the opportunities and freedoms which we have been blessed with for over two centuries.

Kovats left his native homeland of Hungary, after serving admirably in the Austro-Hungarian Army, due to the repressive rule of Empress Maria Theresa. Recognizing the serious threat to American freedom at the time and wanting desperately to help preserve it, Kovats contacted Benjamin Franklin, who was our Nation's Ambassador to France, and offered his superior military expertise to the cause of our independence. He was appointed to serve under the Polish Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and later was elevated to the rank of colonel and given the task of forming the first U.S. cavalry, fashioning it after its European counterpart, the Huszar regiments.

It was serving as commander of the newly organized Continental Cavalry that he led the successful effort to save the city of Charleston, SC, from British occupation. While history has documented Colonel Kovats' signifi-

cant contribution to American independence, it also tells us that on May 11, 1779, during the fight to save the city of Charleston, he lost his life.

However, his death should not be viewed tragically. Rather, it should serve as an inspiration to our continuing efforts on behalf of the many courageous people throughout the world who are living under oppression and tyranny. This includes the great freedom fighter's ancestral homeland, Hungary, where those proud people are forced to endure severe repression under Communist domination.

Certainly, the significant contribution Colonel Kovats made to American independence should not go unnoticed, especially since a memorial to this heroic figure is soon to be established. That is why I am introducing a joint resolution today, designating May 11, 1984, as "Colonel Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day" and calling on the President to issue a proclamation urging the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I am confident that our remembrance of Colonel Kovats will help to further our own efforts in the area of human rights and self-determination, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.●

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS DO WORK

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest aspects of the policy of this administration is its sustained attack on programs which are necessary if the poorest among us are to be protected from severe deprivation. Vulnerable children, the disabled, needy elderly—all of these groups have been victimized by the distorted priorities of an administration which seeks untold tens of billions for dubious weapons, and allows lavish agricultural subsidies to skyrocket, while cutting back on programs which sustain a minimal level of existence for many of those who are unable to support themselves.

In an excellent, thoughtful and well-documented article in the Outlook section of Sunday's Washington Post, Spencer Rich demonstrates how important and how successful many of these programs have been, and his article is essential reading for those of us who have the responsibility of voting on these matters.

I ask that the very powerful defense of Federal efforts to aid the programs which Spencer Rich has written be printed here.

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1984]

THE SKEPTICS ARE WRONG—ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS DO WORK

(By Spencer Rich)

Was the Federal Government's war on poverty in the '60s and '70s a failure? Many Americans think so.

In November 1980, a CBS-New York Times national poll found that 62 percent of the public believed that the anti-poverty programs of the '60s either had little impact on the poor or made things worse for them. Another poll taken in 1982 found that 41 percent of all Democrats thought that providing government benefits to poor people encourages them to remain poor.

President Reagan has said, "In the early '60s, we had fewer people living below the poverty line than we had in the later 1960s after the great war on poverty got underway. And there has been from that moment on a steady increase in the level of poverty right up to" the present.

These skeptical views, however, have a serious flaw. Statistical data clearly shows that a much smaller percentage of Americans live below the poverty level today than when the effort to attack the problem got underway in earnest. There has not been a "steady increase in the level of poverty," as the president said in March. Indeed, the opposite is true, as Reagan's own budget director has stated.

"Substantial progress has been made during the last 23 years in reducing poverty," David A. Stockman told a congressional committee last November. "Poverty is not nearly as extensive as it was at the outset of the war on poverty," despite the recent recession-induced upturn.

Census Bureau data backs up this analysis. The official poverty rate stood at 22.4 percent in 1959, three years before the publication of Michael Harrington's book "The Other America," which described the nation's poverty subculture. The precentage of Americans living below the official poverty level dropped rapidly during the 1960s. In 1965 it had fallen to 17.3 percent. It hovered between 11 and 12 percent in the 1970s and only began rising again in 1980, when a severe recession began. It reached 15 percent in 1982, but was still considerably lower than in 1959.

In 1959, according to the official Census Bureau definition, 39.5 million Americans out of about 180 million were living in poverty. In 1982, 34.4 million were counted as poor, even though the nation's population had risen to 230 million. (The official definition of poverty has been basically unchanged for a generation. It covers anyone whose cash income from all sources is less than three times the cost of an adequate diet as defined by the government. In 1982, a family of four with income below $9,862 was considered poor.)

The total number of poor people is even lower when the value of non-cash benefits such as Medicare, food stamps and rental subsidies is counted.

The strong American economy of the last two decades undoubtedly helped improve the economic status of the nation's disadvantaged. But so did the intricate mesh of programs enacted in that period.

According to a study made for the House Ways and Means Committee by the Congressional Research Service, one American in four would now fall below the poverty level without government support programs, compared with the actual percentage of about one in seven in 1982, the latest year for which accurate data is available. Put another way, government cash benefits of one kind or another are keeping some 23 million Americans out of poverty who otherwise would be there. Even more dramatic, 55 percent of the nation's elderly would be living in poverty today if there were no government programs at all, according to none other than Budget Director Stockman himself.

Analyzing the impact of the poverty programs on the disadvantaged is more than just a theoretical exercise engaged in by economists. It goes to the heart of new policy decisions that could emerge after this year's presidential election.

The Reagan administration entered office committed to reducing the size of government, with particular emphasis on what it considered excess spending on key social programs. By August 1983, it had succeeded in reducing spending in fiscal year 1982-1985 by a total of $110 billion from what had been projected had the programs continued unchanged, according to estimates of the Congressional Budget Office.

This "saving" was achieved in large part by cuts in programs that had been introduced, or expanded during and after President Johnson's "Great Society." CETA, the public service job program enacted in 1972, was terminated. There were big cuts in Medicare, food stamp and education benefits. There were cuts in Social Security. (Student benefits were exercised and the guaranteed minimum benefit was stricken for future retirees.) Changes in welfare aid took hundreds of thousands of families with children off the rolls entirely and reduced benefits for many others. Many of these families also lost eligibility for Medicaid. One million people became ineligible for food stamps. Several hundred thousand individuals who would have received unemployment benefits under pre-1981 laws were made ineligible.

This year, Congress has turned back some administration proposals for additional cuts. But the administration is expected to revive some of its proposals, such as higher out-of-pocket payments by Medicare recipients, if Reagan wins the election.

Both Reagan and senior members of his administration have denied repeatedly that they want to do away with social programs entirely. The official position is that the nation's "safety net" system is essential, but needs to be pared down around the edges to eliminate waste, inefficiency and abuse. Martin Anderson, a former Reagan administration social welfare expert and planner, says he still believes that the U.S. welfare system is a "smashing, total success."

Nevertheless, the president's casual dismissal of the post-1965 programs as ineffective in reducing poverty is puzzling.

It is indisputable that the initiatives of Johnson-era war on poverty, and actions taken in the Nixon administration that followed it, substantially enlarged the New Deal income support programs and added to them a whole battery of additional "safety net" devices.

From the start of the Kennedy administration to the end of the Ford administration, the federal government vastly increased the flow of aid to the poor, the near-poor, the elderly, the disabled and the jobless.

In 1972, Social Security benefits were increased 20 percent and were indexed to inflation, a development that Sheldon Danziger of the Institute of Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin calls "the single most important factor in reducing poverty in the last 20 years."

In 1965, Johnson and Congress pushed through two giant medical aid programs: Medicare for the aged and medicaid for the poor.

A tiny food stamp started on a pilot basis by John F. Kennedy as his first official act in office in 1961 was gradually expanded until, in 1974, Congress made it into a full national program which now has 21 million beneficiaries a month—nearly one American out of 10 at any one time.

The federal government also united into a single program aid to the aged, blind and disabled who were poor, with a guaranteed minimum benefit. The price tag on this ran to the billions of dollars.

And the government undertook to increase the amount of money flowing to the poor to help pay rents.

All this more than tripled the real amount of federal and state income and medical support laid out between 1965 and 1982 to low-income, elderly and disabled people, many of whom would otherwise be poor. By 1982, the actual dollar figure had risen to over $300 billion. And this does not even include federal aid to education, job training and various other types of programs.

These programs, costly as they were, have had a major impact on alleviating the poverty that existed in the early 1960s. The best way to measure the effect of all these income programs, according to Martin Anderson, is to calculate how many people would be poor were it not for these programs.

Such calculations have been made by a number of economists and by the government.

Statistics recently published by the Congressional Research Service and by Danziger estimate that one quarter of the entire population of the United States would have fallen below the official poverty line in 1982 were it not for government-support programs. That would total about 58 million people, according to CRS.

Stockman has indicated that 55 percent of the nation's elderly would be living below the poverty line absent these benefits.

There are two ways to calculating the impact of the programs. One counts the effect only of cash benefits. That is the official Census Bureau method, unchanged for a generation. According to this method, payment of cash benefits such as social security, welfare and unemployment checks cuts the poverty rate to 15 percent—in effect, removing 23 million people from the poverty category.

But if the value of non-cash benefits such as food stamps, housing aid and medical assistance is factored in, the poverty rate goes down even more. There are controversies about how to make these measurements. Liberal politicians do not believe, for example, that medical benefits should be included, arguing that this is tantamount to saying the sicker a person is, the richer he or she is.

Nevertheless, many economists believe these benefits should be included in some form. Timothy M. Smeeding, and econcomist at the University of Utah and consultant to the Census Bureau on poverty measurement, recently made his own estimate of what the rate would be if the non-cash benefits were included.

According to Smeeding, the 15 percent rate for 1982 would drop to between 8½ and 9 percent. The Census Bureau, in its own calculations, puts it slightly higher, at 10 percent, or so.

As that suggests, non-cash benefits have been among the fastest growing of all social benefits since 1965, rising from $5.8 billion to $98.5 billion when measured in 1982 dollars. That is the reason the poverty rate goes down so sharply when these programs are included.

These calculations raise some interesting questions about what life would be like for Americans if there were no such benefits.

According to the CRS calculations, if it were not for government programs there would be 14 to 16 million elderly people in poverty instead of only a few million now. This would mean a vastly greater dependence on their children, including sharing homes to a much larger extent than now.

Suppose all the government programs were wiped out for people of all ages.

"There would be a lot of starvation. A lot of people would be willing to accept extremely menial jobs. A lot of people would be living together," says Henry Aaron, economist at Brookings Institution and a former assistant secretary of what was then the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the Carter administration.

Dr. Jacob A. Brody, associate director of the government's National Institute on Aging, says experts agree that the health of the aged has improved in recent years, with higher life-expectancies and, beginning shortly after Medicare (which now covers 30 million Americans), "an astonishing decline" in death rates.

"I don't think there can be any doubt that Medicare is a factor in improving the health of the aged," he says.

For example, "lowering blood pressure is one of the very potent life-prolongers" and Medicare treats the elderly for that. Since Medicare, blacks, who as a group tend to suffer more than others from high blood pressure, "are going to doctors" for high blood pressure.

Cataract operations, cancer surgery, pneumonia treatment—all these life-preserving or life-enhancing treatments and many more are now available to many older people who couldn't previously obtain them.

The argument has occasionally been made that if the vast sums spent by the government on the income and related programs were somehow stopped and diverted into the general economy, it would produce such an increase in economic growth that everyone would ultimately be better off, even those to whom those benefits now go.

But Alice Rivlin, former director of the Congressional Budget Office and now director of economic studies at Brookings said, "We don't know what would happen. Certainly a lot of people would be worse off. There is no evidence that I know of that saving would be much larger" or that it would be a great spur to the economy.

John Palmer, former assistant secretary of Health and Human Services, said, "There would be somewhat stronger economic growth. But it wouldn't begin to pay for the income loss to these people."

"I haven't seen any demonstration backed up by any statistics to show that wholesale elimination of income assistance programs would increase economic growth in the U.S." according to Henry Aarons of Brookings. And even if it did, he added, it wouldn't help elderly people unable to work or welfare mothers with children who would find it difficult to get and keep jobs.

So the secret is out. What we are buying with all these programs is a vast reduction in poverty, misery and sickness. Whatever the cost of these programs has been, it must be acknowledged that they have changed the American social landscape for the better. They have moved the country closer to its own lofty ideals of a society that is compassionate to the disadvantaged, as well as rewarding to the fortunate.●

ROBERT WISE TO RECEIVE TORCH OF FREEDOM AWARD

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1984, Robert Wise will be honored as the recipient of the Torch of Freedom Award at the Fourth Annual Israel Salute to the Film Industry of California.

Robert Wise won acclaim worldwide as a film director of the highest caliber. He was born in Winchester, IN, where he spent his early years. When the Depression forced him to leave Franklin College, he headed west and arrived in Hollywood. There he quickly became part of the emerging film industry which was bustling with creative talent and energy and endless horizons.

Starting as a messenger in RKO Studios' film editing department in 1933, he rose to assistant film editor in 1936, film editor in 1942, director in 1943, and producer in 1959. In his 51 years of filmmaking, comprising 38 motion pictures which range from modest to monumental, the work of Robert Wise is distinguished by technical excellence, artistic skill, and a consummate understanding of character and relationships. These qualities are evident in the diversity of subject matter of his major films ranging from science fiction, biography, adventure, and human interest.

The success of the films, "Sound of Music" and "West Side Story," was due in large part to Robert Wise's sensitive and compassionate handling of stories dealing with human issues—love, hate, happiness, prejudice, despair, and hope. He was honored by the Motion Picture Academy with two Oscars for each of these films as best director and producer of best picture.

Robert Wise's nonworking activities are never far removed from his all-encompassing relationship with the medium of film. Through his efforts, new generations of film students and film audiences will be enriched. Among his affiliations are: Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences since 1965, as a member of the board and chairman of the education committee; American Film Institute vice chairman of the board of trustees and chairman of the AFI's Center for Advanced Film Studios in Los Angeles; University of Southern California chairmanship of Cinema Curiculus, the support group for the Division of Cinema/Television; Directors Guild of

America, president (1970-74) and most recently first recipient of the Robert Aldrich Service Award; membership in the National Council of the Arts; the trustee committee of the department of film, Museum of Modern Art, New York; trustee of the Motion Picture Country Home and Hospital; and most recently, the Los Angeles Olympic Citizen's Advisory Commission.

I ask the Members, as an expression of national tribute, to join with me in saluting Robert Wise for more than 50 years of inspiration and service to his community and profession. Robert Wise represents the highest standard of American tradition: Knowledge, achievement, leadership, respect, and understanding of human values and concern. He is most deserving of the Torch of Freedom Award and our accolade.●

AEROSPACE EDUCATION AND RECOGNITION WEEK

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last week—April 29 to May 5—was celebrated as Aerospace Education and Recognition Week by the State of California. California is a major center of industry and research and a producer of materials and services supporting the aerospace and aviation industry.

Actually, this week provided the citizens of California with an opportunity to grant recognition to the workers, leaders, and supporters of the aerospace industry. Dedicating such a week was to recognize the contributions of the highly dedicated and important individuals who are essential in this complex and advanced industry.

To recognize this worthy enterprise and the continuing importance of educating California's residents in aerospace science is important. This week of recognition is a means of encouraging public schools and local and State governments to give appropriate attention to the importance of the aerospace industry in the State of California.

I join my colleagues in drawing attention to this vital and progressive industry, upon which so much of the prosperity of this great State of California rests and upon which the security and progress of our great Nation depends.●

TROUBLE BREWING IN HAWAII

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with you an article by Mr. Charles C. Keely, Jr., which recently appeared in Western's World. Mr. Keely's article describes the resource management problems in the national parks in Hawaii. I urge my colleagues to take a moment to read this article to gain a better understanding of the need for addressing these unique problems at Volcanoes and Haleakala National Parks. We must act to preserve the natural state of these parks before their exotic beauty is lost forever.

[From Western's World, April 1984]

TROUBLE'S BREWING IN PARADISE AS AN EXOTIC PLANT AND WILDLIFE POPULATION EXPLOSION THREATENS THE FRAGILE ECOSYSTEM OF HAWAII'S NATIONAL PARKS

(By Charles C. Keely, Jr.)

You'd think David Ames had enough problems. He's the superintendent of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park on the Big Island of Hawaii—a rather active place in recent months. Throughout 1983 and again in early 1984, millions around the world were treated to spectacular color television displays of fiery Kilauea volcano as it erupted and sent one dramatic lava flow after another toward the sea. And as if to punctuate year's end, an earthquake measuring 6.7 on the Richter scale was centered in the park last November, causing $1.3 million in damages to park's paved road and trail system.

But such disasters are all part of a day's work for Ames on an island born and shaped for three million years through volcanic eruptions. The excitement comes with the job, he'll tell you.

What really concerns Ames and his counterpart, Superintendent Hugo Huntzinger at Maui's Haleakala National Park, are the environmental threats to these parks posed not so much by nature as by human beings. The threats are in the form of wild animals and exotic, nonnative plants brought to the island shores more than a thousand years ago by adventurers who needed a source of food. Today, the pigs, goats and hundreds of species of plants threaten the fragile ecosystems of Hawaii's two national parks far more than do the volcanic eruptions that built the islands.

In simplest and most graphic terms, according to Ames, the potential threat to Hawaii Volcanoes, which counted 2.6 million visitors last year, is "as if bulldozers were starting work on Independence Hall." Superintendent Huntzinger adds, "We have suffered losses of species we never seen knew existed. And much more is being lost forever, every passing day."

To understand this environmental ruination of America's most precarious park ecosystems ("the most significant biological resources in the entire U.S. National Park System," according to Huntzinger), we must go back 1,200 years to the time when Hawaii's discoverers came 2,400 sea-miles from Polynesia in their great double canoes. The only mammals preceding them to the islands were bats and seals. About two thousand species of distinctive seed plants existed, 90 percent of which still grow only in Hawaii. And at the time, there were about one hundred species of gorgeous native birds on the Hawaiian islands.

These indigenous plants, birds and animals could not have fed the courageous settlers in their new home, so they brought pigs, chickens, dogs, and plants like yams, coconuts, bananas and roots with them. Later, in 1778, visitors of another race arrived to stay. The men who sailed with Captain James Cook forever ended the isolation that had protected the islands and their original inhabitants. The eighteenth-century explorers brought their own food, too, in the form of pigs, goats and plants. So the curse was born that plagues Ames and Huntzinger today.

Those immigrating animals and plants have multiplied in such numbers that today they seriously threaten the very survival of the natural environments that these two extraordinary national parks were created to preserve.

Wild pigs, goats, mongooses and creeping vines brought from abroad may be harmless in nearby ranch or forest land. In fact, the locals have long hunted pigs and goats for sport and luaus. And who can tell an exotic vine or bush from a native one? All are lush and lovely and grow rapidly.

But in the national parks, the mission that Ames and Huntzinger have chosen to accept, impossible or not, is to restore the federal areas to the pristine environment they originally represented. To do that, the two men must fence their parklands, hunt down all the goats and pigs and get rid of many of the plants. It's no easy task.

Without such efforts, says Ames—pointing to a map in his office near the rim of the huge and still-steaming Kilauea caldera that erupted in 1919—the threat is more critical than "acid rain on our forests or the potential cutoff of water to the Everglades in Florida.

"It's an untold horror story," Ames says. "Congress can't get very excited about it. And our millions of visitors hardly know the problem exists."

What has happened since the explorers and first settlers arrived is dramatic. Goat populations, for example, can double every six months. It hasn't happened quite that fast here, but twenty goats became ten thousand in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park in less than a decade. The park supported fifteen thousand goats in 1974, and more than five thousand wild pigs are in the park today, rooting up native ecosystems and transporting seeds throughout the area.

The goats denuded much of the park's lowland vegetation, essential for the survival of birds like the nearly extinct nene, a Hawaiian goose that is the state bird. (There are no nenes left in Hawaii Volcanoes today.) One pig in search of food can dig up fifty square meters of rain forest topsoil a night, creating muddy seed beds for exotic plants and breeding places for mosquitos that carry malaria and kill native birds. Pigs also destroy ground-cover plants, altering the entire rain forest ecosystem. Hawaii Volcanoes' pigs could "turn over half the topsoil in the 230,000-acre park in a year," says Dan Taylor, chief of resource management.

At Haleakala National Park on Maui, rare native birds, insects and plants such as the sunflowerlike silversword, which blooms but once after five to twenty years' growth, have been wiped out in many areas by the park's three thousand or more goats and between one thousand and two thousand pigs.

The similar greensword plant has all but vanished as well. Now more than eighty species of exotic plants—like bamboo, guava, pamakani and kikuyu grass—have spread through park areas.

"This is the top resource management problem in the entire National Park System," says Huntzinger, waving a hand toward the dormant, twelve-thousand-foot summit of Haleakala Crater. Part of the endangered resources, he explains with undisguised passion, are in the Kipahulu Valley, the state's loveliest tropical rain forest, "where we are in danger of losing many native resources and plants forever."

Also in Haleakala, mongooses have destroyed or threatened four hundred nests of the rare Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel, of which 1,800 of the world's 2,000 are thought to be in the park.

"These problems are pretty subtle," says Ames. "Something can become extinct before we even know it exists. And it's hard to get money for that kind of problem if toilets are backing up in Yellowstone or trails need repair in Yosemite. What is so vitally important is that there is a reason for preserving processes that are natural, and that reason is spiritual and esoteric and has real worth and value both for cultural richness and for the diversity of experiences people come to national parks for. Most of this is almost gone in Hawaii."

Says Huntzinger: "If we didn't try to do something, no matter how limited our ability, we would be liable to lawsuits from environmentalists for not making reasonable efforts to save these endangered species." But "reasonable efforts" mean lots of money and manpower, which, until recently, have been almost nonexistent in both parks, despite the efforts in Washington of Howard Chapman, the veteran Western Regional Director of the National Park Service.

"What is the loss of a species," asks Huntzinger? "There is an aesthetic loss in the birds and flowers that have vanished."

"We may not notice the loss of an insect species," Ames adds, "but what is so important is that we are learning every day that scientific and revolutionary medical discoveries frequently are made from [experimenting with] such minor plants and insects. Public pressures here have been to provide pig and goat hunting, not to conserve the environment, which some scientists say it already may be too late to do."

But steps are now being taken, thanks largely to the untiring efforts of Ames, Huntzinger, and Chapman, and their persistent pleadings for funds from Congress. Though progress is visible, no one knows if such efforts have come in time.

According to Dan Taylor at Hawaii Volcanoes, "Within the past several years we have cut the goat population down from fifteen thousand to perhaps twenty." Vegetation is returning to barren slopes, and some of it is native.

So far, this is a success story—but it is only one story, and it took thirty miles of four-foot-high wire mesh fencing to do it. Two-thirds of the park's boundary is now fenced to keep out goats. The staff is turning its attention to the pigs, which will also be fenced, though no one is sure if this is the best procedure for eliminating them. The budget for such work is only $600,000, and only eight staff members, out of a total of forty, are assigned to resource management.

Meanwhile, nearly all the grass in dryland forests and dozens of native plant species have disappeared, including the beautiful Hawaiian flame tree, native legumes and the rare silverwood. Grazing by goats has caused shrubs and low-land trees, vital as habitats for birds, to disappear from park lowlands. In their place are more than four hundred exotic plant species, some of which pose serious threats to what native vegetation remains. Attempts to control these plants have not been successful.

At Haleakala, similar fencing work is just beginning, and additional funding for the project may be forthcoming. "It's been a hit-or-miss approach until now," says a frustrated Huntzinger, who flew to the mainland recently to show Park Service superiors a slide presentation on the park's problems. He now complains that money for the trip would have employed a fence builder for three weeks. "It's been management by crisis at best."

The park, which recorded 860,000 visitors in 1983, did not even have a staff scientist until 1980. In 1981, $60,000 was spent on fencing, which can cost up to $58,000 a mile over rugged terrain at elevations ranging from 4,000 to 9,000 feet. "Our budget for this is about equal to the cost of a couple of Pentagon screwdrivers," says one park ranger, only half in jest.

But for 1983–84, $500,000 has been allocated for Haleakala's boundary fencing, which should cover thirty-five miles of the 28,665-acre park. Just seven miles have been fenced to date, and pigs recently were discovered rooting for worms in the dirt just a few feet behind the park's visitor center and headquarters.

In Kipahula Valley, where visitors are not permitted in the impenetrable jungle, exotic, fast-spreading plants like the strawberry guava, brought from Brazil in the early 1800's, have already taken over a third of the once-pristine rain forest. "No native plants can compete with it," explains Huntzinger. Animals bring in the guava seeds and then destroy the jungle undergrowth, facilitating the spread of the destructive shrub, which in turn kills native plants.

In Hawaii Volcanoes, the chief plant culprit is the colorful but deadly banana polk vine, commonly called passion flower vine. Originally brought from Colombia to a local backyard garden in 1952, it has since spread throughout unfenced jungle areas of the park, choking and strangling ferns and other fragile native plants in areas where pigs have altered forest vegetation growth by rooting up or eliminating ground cover. Bird species have also disappeared from the areas. Natural bird and plant life cycles have been drastically altered.

The Hawaiian Archipelago is said to have the largest number of native flora and fauna of any area in the world, because of its great age and isolation from the continents. A great deal of this uniqueness has been lost, and still more species are nearing extinction.

Nevertheless, much can still be protected and preserved by the National Park Service, its officials believe.

Fortunately, the National Park Service has given Hawaii's environmental crisis its top resource-preservation priority. The hope shared by Ames, Huntzinger and all who care about Hawaii's natural treasures is that there is still time.●

AMBASSADOR TO BE COMMENDED

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to commend someone who I believe is an excellent example of what is right about government service, that is Ambassador Thomas Reene Pickering, our Ambassador to El Salvador. The recent criticisms leveled against him by a colleague in the Senate are unfounded and misguided.

As many of you know, since August of last year my office in conjunction with Project Hope, the Knights of Malta and the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador has delivered over 200,000 pounds of medicine valued in excess of $5 million to 40 camps and hospitals that serve 300,000 displaced people in El Salvador. Ambassador Pickering was essential to the success of this effort. His excellent relations with diverse groups in El Salvador smoothed the path for our distribution. He has a clear and sincere desire to assist the Salvadoran people and their country whenever possible.

During the March 26 election two of my aides, Vaughn Forrest, my administrative assistant, and Kristen Foskett, my legislative aide, were observers. Mr. Forrest's reports to me cited on several occasions the professionalism, evenhandedness, and dedication Ambassador Pickering exhibited during several tense incidents that characterized the first election. Miss Foskett reported on the difficult circumstances, because of terrorist activities in many parts of the country under which the elections were carried out and the extreme lengths our Embassy personnel went to insure fairness for all political parties involved.

El Salvador is probably the most difficult foreign post, and Ambassador Pickering has met the challenge. The political winds in El Salvador are always swift and violent and the political playmaking reaches its zenith just before an election. Ambassador Pickering, Deputy Chief of Mission Ken Bleakley and all staff and military personnel have done a tremendous job under the most adverse of circumstances. We have seen that democracy works in El Salvador and no matter who yells about the results, it will not be the elitists or the military or the special interest groups who will have elected the next president. It will be the poorest of the poor walking for hours to a polling place, standing in line for hours in the hot unforgiving Sun and walking several hours home. The people chose.

We and they have to live with the results because democracy is not a sometime thing. The one thing that we can be sure of is that Ambassador Pickering has done everything in his power to insure a free and honest election for all political parties; to believe otherwise is nonsense.●

CHUN KYUNG HWAN REINVIGORATES SAEMAUL MOVEMENT IN KOREA: FOOD FOR THOUGHT ON HOW TO ACHIEVE RAPID PROGRESS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago the Korean Secretary General Chun Kyung Hwan injected new life into an important movement in South Korea known as the Saemaul Movement. He recognized the need to let business, industry, and the citizens of Korea work together for progress. Although the Saemaul Movement had already made great strides toward improving the economy of Korea since 1970, it was Chun Kyung Hwan who helped to loose Government restraints on business participation in the movement. Now the initiative of the private sector is blossoming in Korea with the result that there is a rebirth of the Saemaul Movement and a new burst of progress in Korea.

Now there are 16,200 industries participating in the movement. Those industries and related components of the movement involve over 10 million Koreans in a concerted effort to continue the awesome economic growth which Korea has been experiencing since 1970.

In 1960, South Korea was a country mired in poverty, especially rural poverty. In the decade of the seventies, Korea experienced an average annual growth rate of more than 10 percent, and its total exports increased by over 400 percent. During a portion of the decade of the seventies, the rate of growth in rural income actually outstripped the rate of urban income growth. Essential to the growth of the economy in Korea, however, is the fact that the growth has been balanced between urban and rural areas. Industry, farming, urban and rural participation, even the growth of credit unions have progressed evenly to avoid distortions in the economy.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and its Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs I have made an effort to observe the methods by which people in other countries are able to raise themselves out of poverty. I was recently able to observe one of the key programs which has accounted for the astounding economic growth of Korea in recent years. That program is known as Saemaul Undong or the New Community Movement. Initiated in 1970 by the late President Park Chung-hee, and now renewed by the far-sighted Secretary General Chun Kyung Hwan, the movement has been largely responsible for not only balancing urban and rural economic expansion, but also has played a significant role in shaping the thinking of the people in a positive and healthy way.

In any country there are competing traditions. This is certainly true in Korea where both a passive and an active spiritual tradition have existed side by side for centuries. The passive tradition has a saying, "Blame the ancestors when things do not go well." For many, many years, this was the accepted reaction to the awful poverty that held the rural areas in its grip. But the activist spiritual movement holds that progress is to be achieved only through self-reliance, diligence, and cooperation. It is this tradition tht Park Chung-hee and Chung Kyung Hwan were able to emphasize in the thinking of the people. It is that phrase which stands as the slogan of the Saemaul Undong. And it is the movement itself which stands as a testament to the wisdom and insight into the innermost traditions of his people which Chun Kyung Hwan now is demonstrating.

The Saemaul Undong is the Korean equivalent of our War on Poverty—but with some important differences. One of those differences is that the New Community Movement has persisted, thanks to Chun Kyung Hwan, while we have begun to see many of those in our country who rose out of poverty in the years of the War on Poverty slip back into poverty now that our attention has turned to other matters. Perhaps one reason that Saemaul Undong has endured while the War on Poverty has largely fallen on a period of neglect is that there is an organic element in Saemaul Undong that permeates the movement in a way that was seen too rarely in the War on Poverty. By organic I mean that the New Community Movement is at its very roots a cooperative, self-help movement. There were certainly elements of that in the War on Poverty. But too often the War on Poverty was viewed by recipients and nonrecipients alike as a Government-owned and operated program.

To be sure, the Government cooperates in the training of community leaders of the New Community Movement. But thanks to Chun Kyung Hwan, private industry is also involved at every step of the process. And after the training period is concluded, those leaders are expected to strive with the other members of their community to create economically beneficial projects that are uniquely fitted to the needs of the land and to the needs of the people. The community and industry work with the community leaders to build the community. It is a grassroots movement in a fundamental sense.

I know of no better way of illustrating this last point than by noting that participation in sports is an important aspect of the movement. But the sports that are emphasized are not the ones in which one individual competes against another. Rather, they are group sports in which teamwork rather than individual prowess wins the game. Those sports include soccer, volleyball, and tug of war. Individual development is not forgotten, however. There are daily calisthenics, bicycle riding, tennis, and badminton. All things are balanced within the movement.

The human initiative, the cooperation, the sense of cohesiveness and willingness to work together that I saw recently in Korea was inspiring. I think it in order to commend the Korean people for the fervor with which they have united behind the Saemaul Undong watchwords, "self-reliance, diligence, and cooperation." There is no doubt that the successful efforts of one culture may need modification before they fit well within the cultural scheme of another country, but I think there is much of value to emulate in the Korean model. I am sure that my fellow Members of Congress join me in commending the Korean people and Secretary General Chun Kyung Hwan for the example they have shown the world through the Saemaul Undong. We wish the Korean people our good will as they grow strong economically under Saemaul Undong.●

A TRIBUTE TO JACOB K. JAVITS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to share with my colleagues a few words of praise for our friend and former colleague, Jacob K. Javits.

The Distinguished Service Award presented to Senator Javits, attempts to exemplify the gratitude and respect felt by those of us who had the privilege of serving with him.

During his 34 years as a public servant, he demonstrated an effectiveness beyond compare. Senator Javits was responsible for numerous landmark measures, in addition to major legislation ranging from the War Powers Act to the Pensions Reform Act, all bearing the signature of his creativity and foresight.

As an ardent debator, his opinions have always been held in the highest

regard. In addition, Senator Javits possessed an admired ability to speak astutely on any issue or concern. For these reasons, and many more, history will remember Senator Jacob K. Javits for the great legislator and great American that he proved to be throughout his 34 years in the U.S. Senate.●

DESECRATION OF PLACES OF WORSHIP VIOLATES OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF RELIGION

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded by men and women who wanted to be free to worship God. They sought to be free of Government imposition of religion and they also sought a land where they would be free from harrassment by others whose beliefs differed from their own.

Unfortunately, while the Constitution prohibits Government interference in religious worship, some religious groups in our Nation continue to be terrorized by vandalism and threats of violence. A synagogue in Seminole, Fla., which I represent, has been the subject of several such attacks in recent months. A storage shed on the grounds of the Congregation Beth Chai was set on fire last November. In the following days, swastikas were painted on the building and the congregation received two bomb threats.

These type of threats and activities impinge on the rights of the congregation to conduct worship services free of fear from harassment. That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1981 which makes it a Federal crime to vandalize a house of worship or any religious articles therein.

I am pleased to note that Florida is one of 16 States that have adopted similar laws at the State level. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in a recent report, notes that the passage of this legislation at the State level is in part responsible for a decline in the number of incidents aimed at places of worship over the past 3 years.

The adoption of Federal legislation of this kind will have even a greater impact on reducing the number of future threats to congregations throughout the United States. Our responsibility is to uphold the Constitution which includes the basic right of freedom of religion. To do so we must insure that the American people are able to worship free from the fear of assault and vandalism.●

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, an unfounded myth that Federal means-tested antipoverty programs have not only failed America's poor, but have also resulted in more Americans becoming poor, has been widely circulated. The current administration has greatly contributed to this inaccuracy. President Reagan, for example, recently stated:

In the early 1960's, we had fewer people living below the poverty line than we had in the later 1960's after the great war on poverty got underway. And there has been from that moment on, a steady increase in the level of poverty.

As with all myths, Mr. Speaker, this myth should be rigorously scrutinized to see if it is substantiated by the facts. Mr. Spencer Rich, a Washington Post reporter, does just this in an article published on May 6, 1984, entitled "The Skeptics Are Wrong—Antipoverty Programs Do Work." By objectively citing statistical data collected over the last 25 years by Government organizations and independent researchers, Mr. Rich demonstrates that many of the programs which the administration has targeted for deep reductions, have indisputably reduced poverty. The facts do not lie, and the facts tell us that before the Reagan administration, the poverty rate in our country was halved from 22.4 percent in 1959 to between 11 and 12 percent during the 1970's. With deep reductions in antipoverty programs in recent years, compounded by the recession, the poverty rate rose to 15 percent in 1982.

Further, Mr. Rich debunks the related myth that only those who are fraudulently abusing Government programs will be hurt by more cuts in means-tested social spending. The data presented by Mr. Rich shows that Government cash benefits prevent approximately 23 million Americans from falling below the poverty level and that 55 percent of our country's elderly population would be living in poverty if Government assistance to them were eliminated.

As Congress deliberates further budget reductions to reduce the massive Federal budget deficit, we must not target the means-tested programs which have borne the brunt of budget cuts over the last 3 years. In making future decisions, we need to take into account the facts, not the myths about poverty programs. Mr. Rich provides us with some very important facts. I commend this article, which follows, to my colleagues.

THE SKEPTICS ARE WRONG—ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS DO WORK

(By Spencer Rich)

Was the Federal government's war on poverty in the '60s and '70s a failure? Many Americans think so.

In November 1980, a CBS-New York Times national poll found that 62 percent of the public believed that the anit-poverty programs of the '60s either had little impact on the poor or made things worse for them. Another poll taken in 1982 found that 41 percent of all Democrats thought that providing government benefits to poor people encourages them to remain poor.

President Reagan has said, "In the early '60s, we had fewer people living below the poverty line than we had in the later 1960s after the great war on poverty got underway. And there has been from that moment on a steady increase in the level of poverty right up to" the present.

These skeptical views, however, have a serious flaw. Statistical data clearly shows that a much smaller percentage of Americans live below the poverty level today than when the effort to attack the problem got underway in earnest. There has not been a "steady increase in the level of poverty," as the president said in March. Indeed, the opposite is true, as Reagan's own budget director has stated.

"Substanital progess has been made during the last 23 years in reducing poverty," David A. Stockman told a congressional committee last November. "Poverty is not nearly as extensive as it was at the outset of the war on poverty," despite the recent recession-induced upturn.

Census Bureau data backs up this analysis. The official poverty rate stood 22.4 percent in 1969, three years before the publication of Michael Harrington's book "The Other America," which described the nation's poverty subculture. The percentage of Americans living below the official poverty level dropped rapidly during the 1960s. In 1965 it had fallen to 17.3 percent. It hovered between 11 and 12 percent in the 1970s and only began rising again in 1980, when a severe recession began. It reached 15 percent in 1982, but was still considerably lower than in 1959.

In 1959, according to the official Census Bureau definition, 39.5 million Americans out of about 180 million were living in poverty. In 1982, 34.4 million were counted as poor, even though the nation's population had risen to 230 million. (The official definition of poverty has been basically unchanged for a generation. It covers anyone whose cash income from all sources is less than three times the cost of an adequate diet as defined by the government. In 1982, a family of four with income below $9,862 was considered poor.)

The total number of poor people is even lower when the value of non-cash benefits such as Medicare, food stamps and rental subsidies is counted.

The strong American economy of the last two decades undoubtedly helped improve the economic status of the nation's disadvantaged. But so did the intricate mesh of programs enacted in that period.

According to a study made for the House Ways and Means Committee by the Congressional Research Service, one American in four would fall below the poverty level without government support programs, compared with the actual percentage of about one in seven in 1982, the latest year for which accurate data is available. Put an-

other way, government cash benefits of one kind or another are keeping some 23 million Americans out of poverty who otherwise would be there. Even more dramatic, 55 percent of the nation's elderly would be living in poverty today if there were no government programs at all, according to none other than Budget Director Stockman himself.

Analyzing the impact of the poverty programs on the disadvantaged is more than just a theoretical exercise engaged in by economists. It goes to the heart of new policy decisions that could emerge after this year's presidential election.

The Reagan administration entered office committed to reducing the size of government, with particular emphasis on what it considered excess spending on key social programs. By August 1983, it had succeeded in reducing spending in fiscal years 1982-1985 by a total of $110 billion from what had been projected had the programs continued unchanged, according to estimates of the Congressional Budget Office.

This "saving" was achieved in large part by cuts in programs that had been introduced, or expanded during and after President Johnson's "Great Society." CETA, the public service job program enacted in 1972, was terminated. There were big cuts in Medicare, food stamp and education benefits. There were cuts in Social Security. (Student benefits were excised and the guaranteed minimum benefit was stricken for future retirees.) Changes in welfare aid took hundreds of thousands of families with children off the rolls entirely and reduced benefits for many others. Many of these families also lost eligibility for Medicaid. One million people became ineligible for food stamps. Several hundred thousand individuals who would have received unemployment benefits under pre-1981 laws were made ineligible.

This year, Congress has turned back some administration proposals for additional cuts. But the administration is expected to revive some of its proposals, such as higher out-of-pocket payments by Medicare recipients, if Reagan wins the election.

Both Reagan and senior members of his administration have denied repeatedly that they want to do away with social programs entirely. The official position is that the nation's "safety net" system is essential, but needs to be pared down around the edges to eliminate waste, inefficiency and abuse. Martin Anderson, a former Reagan administration social welfare expert and planner, says he still believes that the U.S. welfare system is a "smashing, total success."

Nevertheless, the president's casual dismissal of the post-1965 programs as ineffective in reducing poverty is puzzling.

It is indisputable that the initiatives of Johnson-era war on poverty, and actions taken in the Nixon administration that followed it, substantially enlarged the New Deal income support programs and added to them a whole battery of additional "safety net" devices.

From the start of the Kennedy administration to the end of the Ford administration, the federal government vastly increased the flow of aid to the poor, the near-poor, the elderly, the disabled and the jobless.

In 1972, Social Security benefits were increased 20 percent and were indexed to inflation, a development that Sheldon Danziger of the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin calls "the single most important factor in reducing poverty in the last 20 years."

In 1965, Johnson and Congress pushed through two giant medical aid programs: Medicare for the aged and Medicaid for the poor.

A tiny food stamp started on a pilot basis by John F. Kennedy as his first official act in office in 1961 was gradually expanded until, in 1974, Congress made it into a full national program which now has 21 million beneficiaries a month—nearly one American out of 10 at any one time.

The federal government also united into a single program aid to the aged, blind and disabled who were poor, with a guaranteed minimum benefit. The price tag on this ran to the billions of dollars.

And the government undertook to increase the amount of money flowing to the poor to help pay rents.

All this more than tripled the real amount of federal and state income and medical support laid out between 1965 and 1982 to low-income, elderly and disabled people, many of whom would otherwise be poor. By 1982, the actual dollar figure had risen to over $300 billion. And this does not even include federal aid to education, job training and various other types of programs.

These programs, costly as they were, have had a major impact on alleviating the poverty that existed in the early 1960s. The best way to measure the effect of all these income programs, according to Martin Anderson, is to calculate how many people would be poor were it not for these programs.

Such calculations have been made by a number of economists and by the government.

Statistics recently published by the Congressional Research Service and by Danziger estimate that one quarter of the entire population of the United States would have fallen below the official poverty line in 1982 were it not for government-support programs. That would total about 58 million people, according to CRS.

Stockman has indicated that 55 percent of the nation's elderly would be living below the poverty line absent these benefits.

There are two ways of calculating the impact of the programs. One counts the effect only of cash benefits. That is the official Census Bureau method, unchanged for a generation. According to this method, payment of cash benefits such as social security, welfare and unemployment checks cuts the poverty rate to 15 percent—in effect, removing 23 million people from the poverty category.

But if the value of non-cash benefits such as food stamps, housing aid and medical assistance is factored in, the poverty rate goes down even more. There are controversies about how to make these measurements. Liberal politicians do not believe, for example, that medical benefits should be included, arguing that this is tantamount to saying the sicker a person is, the richer he or she is.

Nevertheless, many economists believe these benefits should be included in some form. Timothy M. Smeeding, an economist at the University of Utah and consultant to the Census Bureau on poverty measurement, recently made his own estimate of what the rate would be if the noncash benefits were included.

According to Smeeding, the 15 percent rate for 1982 would drop to between 8½ and 9 percent. The Census Bureau, in its own calculations, puts it slightly higher, at 10 percent or so. (See following table.)

PERCENTAGE OF AMERICANS IN POVERTY

[Amounts in percent]

	Official poverty rate [1]	Poverty rate if food stamps and non-cash benefits are counted as income [2]	Poverty rate without government benefits [3]
1965	17.3	12.1	21.3
1972	11.9	6.2	19.2
1976	11.8	6.7	21.0
1979	11.7	6.1	20.5
1982	15.0	8.8	24.0

[1] U.S. Census Bureau, includes personal income plus cash benefits from the government.
[2] Timothy M. Smeeding, University of Utah, includes adjustments for underreporting and taxes.
[3] Sheldon Danziger, University of Wisconsin.

As that suggests, non-cash benefits have been among the fastest growing of all social benefits since 1965, rising from $5.8 billion to $98.5 billion when measured in 1982 dollars. That is the reason the poverty rate goes down so sharply when these programs are included.

These calculations raise some interesting questions about what life would be like for Americans if there were no such benefits.

According to the CRS calculations, if it were not for government programs there would be 14 to 16 million elderly people in poverty instead of only a few million now. This would mean a vastly greater dependence on their children, including sharing homes to a much larger extent than now.

Suppose all the government programs were wiped out for people of all ages.

"There would be a lot of starvation. A lot of people would be willing to accept extremely menial jobs. A lot of people would be living together," says Henry Aaron, economist at Brookings Institution and a former assistant secretary of what was then the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the Carter administration.

Dr. Jacob A. Brody, associate director of the government's National Institute on Aging, says experts agree that the health of the aged has improved in recent years, with higher life-expectations and, beginning shortly after Medicare (which now covers 30 million Americans), "an astonishing decline" in death rates.

"I don't think there can be any doubt that Medicare is a factor in improving the health of the aged," he says.

For example, "lowering blood pressure is one of the very potent life-prolongers" and Medicare treats the elderly for that. Since Medicare, blacks, who as a group tend to suffer more than others from high blood pressure, "are going to doctors" for high blood pressure.

Cataract operations, cancer surgery, pneumonia treatment—all these life-preserving or life-enhancing treatments and many more are now available to many older people who couldn't previously obtain them.

The argument has occasionally been made that if the vast sums spent by the government on the income and related programs were somehow stopped and diverted into the general economy, it would produce such an increase in economic growth that everyone would ultimately be better off, even those to whom those benefits now go.

But Alice Rivlin, former director of the Congressional Budget Office and now director of economic studies at Brookings said, "We don't know what would happen. Certainly a lot of people would be worse off. There is no evidence that I know of that

saving would be much larger" or that it would be a great spur to the economy.

John Palmer, former assistant secretary of Health and Human Services, said, "There would be somewhat stronger economic growth. But it wouldn't begin to pay for the income loss to these people."

"I haven't seen any demonstration backed up by any statistics to show that wholesale elimination of income assistance programs would increase economic growth in the U.S." according to Henry Aarons of Brookings. And even if it did, he added, it wouldn't help elderly people unable to work or welfare mothers with children who would find it difficult to get and keep jobs.

So the secret is out. What we are buying with all these programs is a vast reduction in poverty, misery and sickness. Whatever the cost of these programs has been, it must be acknowledged that they have changed the American social landscape for the better. They have moved the country closer to its own lofty ideals of a society that is compassionate to the disadvantaged, as well as rewarding to the fortunate.●

CONTINUE THE OCS MORATORIUM

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, I testified before the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Interior to request that a continuation of the moratorium on oil and gas in certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, including Santa Monica Bay, be included in the fiscal year 1985 Interior Department appropriations bill.

Our colleagues LEON PANETTA and BILL LOWERY and I have been engaged in negotiations with the Interior Department over which areas off the coast of California oil and gas development should be prohibited. Secretary William Clark has said that he projects that the moratorium areas will not be included in lease sale 80 in southern California, and that of the nine proposed sales for fiscal year 1985, none would include any area now under moratorium from last year.

William Bettenberg, Director of the Minerals Management Services, stated that lease sale 91 in northern and central California, which was supposed to take place in September 1985, is running about 2 months behind schedule and will probably not take place until fiscal year 1986.

From these statements we can assume that no lease sales will take place in California in fiscal year 1985, that lease sale 80 in southern California will take place in fiscal year 1984 under the conditions of the moratorium. and that lease sale 91 will take place during fiscal year 1986. Under these circumstances, there would be no immediate cause for concern that the economically and environmentally sensitive areas protected in the fiscal year 1984 Interior Department appropriations bill will be leased.

However, since Secretary Clark and Mr. Bettenberg made these statements, the Interior Department published a revised 5-year offshore leasing schedule. As a result of this document, we are getting conflicting messages from the Interior Department. According to this plan, lease sales 80 and 91 are put on hold. Given this administration's past record of opening virtually the entire Outer Continental Shelf to oil and gas exploration without regard to economic and environmental impacts, I am extremely concerned over the failure of the administration to give assurances of exactly when these lease sales will take place. If the Interior Department postpones lease sale 80 and speeds up lease sale 91, these sales could take place without the moratorium protections.

The OCS moratorium included in the fiscal year 1984 Interior appropriations bill was supported by a bipartisan coalition. The moratorium was the result of extensive negotiation and compromise, based upon previous congressional action, State and local government recommendations and administrative exemptions by former Interior Secretaries. While recognizing our need to decrease our dependence on foreign sources of oil, the moratorium includes only those areas in which the negative impacts on the local economies, environment and the military outweigh the benefits of the potential energy.

If an oil spill occured as a result of oil and gas drilling in Santa Monica Bay, we would suffer traumatic economic losses. These costs would include reduced beach use, tourism, tourist taxes, revenue from commercial fishing, revenue from pleasure boats, property taxes and property values. An oil spill would seriously harm the two remaining wetlands in Los Angeles County, Malibu Lagoon and the Ballona Creek Estuary, which serve as habitats for many endangered species. The increased air pollution from oil drilling and refining would result in extremely dangerous health hazards.

The moratorium deleted less than 2.5 percent of the OCS areas under consideration for lease by the department's 5-year plan, leaving 12 million acres off the coast open for lease. The moratorium will not reduce the State's 1.2 million-barrel daily contribution to national oil production, and permits continued exploration of frontier areas off Port Arguello, in the Santa Barbara Channel, and on the Tanner and Cortes Banks off San Diego. The Moratorium includes the following areas:

Northern and central California: the area between a line heading west from a point near Morro Bay, CA, and a similar line from the Oregon border to the seaward edge of the Department of the Interior northern and central California planning area.

Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary.

Santa Barbara Channel Ecological Preserve and Buffer Zone.

Santa Monica Bay.

San Diego/Orange County: a 20-mile buffer zone from Newport Beach south to the Mexican border.

I urge my colleagues to continue the moratorium for another year to preserve our precious environmental and vital economic resources which Congress recognized worthy of protection last year.●